SOAS University of London

Son, Jiyun (2023)
Visual Representations of the Korean Nation-State: 1880s-1910s
PhD thesis. SOAS University of London
DOI: https://doi.org/10.25501/SOAS.00038659
https://eprints.soas.ac.uk/38659/

Copyright © and Moral Rights for this thesis are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder/s.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

When referring to this thesis, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given e.g. AUTHOR (year of submission) "Full thesis title", name of the School or Department, PhD Thesis, pagination.

Visual Representations of the Korean Nation-State: 1880s-1910s

Jiyun Son

Thesis submitted for the degree of PhD

2023

History of Art and Archaeology
SOAS, University of London

Abstract

This thesis investigates visual representations of the Korean nation-state from the 1880s to the 1910s and their impacts on state and nation-building of the period. After the opening of ports in 1897, Korea faced the task of reconciling the traditional and new, both in the interpretations of the Korean nation-state and methods of visual representation. In this setting, this study explores the role of visual imagery in the authentication of information and intangible ideas, particularly in rationalising the various intertwining and at times conflicting visions of the new Korean nation-state. Thematic case studies of royal portraits, illustrations of historical figures, the Korean flag, imperial emblem, the map of Korea, and geographic landscapes are analysed in relation to core strands of nation-building that coexisted at the turn of the twentieth century. Through these cases, the research deciphers the relationship between the processes of the creation and re-contextualisation of representative images and the gradual formation of a modern Korean nation-state.

Notes on Romanisation and Translation

This thesis uses the Revised Romanisation of Korean. All Korean names will be shown surname first, followed by their first names without commas, e.g. Yun Se-jin (윤세진), rather than Sejin Yun or Yun, Se-jin. Surnames will follow the more popular form, e.g. Park (박), rather than Bak. Relatively well-known and frequently cited names will be cited as shown in their publications, e.g. Lee Do-young (이도영), rather than Yi Do-yeong. For Korean authors' names already Romanised in English language publications, originals will be used. Romanisation will not reflect sound changes, e.g. *Doklip sinmun* (독립신문), rather than *Dongnip sinmun*. In cases where romanisation may cause confusion, hyphens will be used, e.g. *min-gwon* (민권), rather than *mingwon*. Hangeul versions of all Korean names and titles will be provided in the bibliography.

Translations of book and journal titles in the bibliography are taken from English abstracts of publications when available. In some cases, I have edited these translations. I have translated titles of publications that do not provide any English titles. Any changes made to quotes and romanisations in quotes will be in square brackets. Quotes that have been translated from Korean sources are my own translations unless otherwise stated.

Table of Contents

Introduction **7**

Setting the Scene **7**

Research Objectives and Outline of Thesis **19**

Literature Review **27**

Methodological Issues of Approaching Visual Imagery in the 1880s-1910s **47**

Chapter 1. Discussion of Key Terminology **59**

1.1. *Gukga*, State, Nation-State **59**

1.2. *Baekseong, Sinmin, Inmin, Gukmin, Minjok* **71**

Chapter 2. The National Flag and Emblem **85**

2.1. Introduction **85**

2.2. The Emergence of National Flags **87**

2.3. The Creation of Korea's First National Flag and State Representation Abroad **94**

2.4. The Creation of Korea's Imperial Emblem **110**

2.5. Domestic Applications **116**
- **2.5.a. Branding State Projects and National Imagery** 116
- **2.5.b. Education and Self-identification** 129
- **2.5.c. Contrasting Fates of the Ihwamun and Taegeukgi** 143

2.6. Conclusion **158**

Chapter 3. Portraits **161**

3.1. Introduction **161**

3.2. Royal Portraits of Gojong and Sunjong **167**
- **3.2.a. Foreign Representation and New Media Experimentation** 167
- **3.2.b. Public Edification and Politicisation** 181
- **3.2.c. Inspiration for Resistance Movements** 191

3.3. Portraits of Historic Figures and Martyrs **203**

3.3.a. Construction of Korean Historical Narratives 210
3.3.b. Encouraging Collective Resistance 223

3.4. Conclusion **243**

Chapter 4. Geographic Imagery **246**

4.1. Introduction **246**

4.2. Map of Korea **249**
4.2.a. Identifying Boundaries and Placing Korea 249
4.2.b. Amalgamation of Nation and Territory 264

4.3. Cityscapes of Seoul **275**

4.4. Natural Landmarks **287**
4.4.a. Internalising National Landscapes 287
4.4.b. Rationalising and Contextualising National Territory 311

4.5. Conclusion **337**

Chapter 5. Conclusion **341**

Bibliography **353**

Introduction

Setting the Scene

The late nineteenth and early twentieth century were a time of drastic change in Korea. The opening of ports to Japan in 1876 was followed by a series of treaties and state-level contact with Western powers throughout the 1880s.[1] The following period from the 1890s to 1905 was characterised by a wave of reformist movements that influenced all levels of society. Western ideologies, technology, and arts were perceived as something to aspire towards, more so after Western and Japanese powers proved that China was no longer the centre of the modern world order. This revelation was central to the development of modern state and nation-building and representations thereof. Finally, the gradual loss of Korean sovereignty from 1905 induced a reactionary form of nationalism and resulted in a national identity that was founded upon collective differentiation from and resistance against 'the other.' This thesis investigates visual representations of the Korean nation-state after the opening of ports and the symbolic separation from the traditional Sinocentric world order, and their impacts on formulating new conceptions of the modern Korean nation-state and the fostering of a collective sense of nationhood, up to the 1910s.

The various socio-political changes that took place at the turn of the twentieth century gave way to a new understanding of the Korean nation-state that drastically changed ways in which it was visually expressed and consumed. First, the traditional concept of the kingdom and its people was reconciled with Western notions of

[1] Korea signed treaties with the U.S. in 1882, Britain in 1883, Germany in 1883, Russia in 1884, Italy in 1884, and France in 1886.

nationhood and citizenship. These changes were reflected in the use of new terminologies which entered the Korean language in the 1890s and after 1900. Terms such as *gukga* (국가, 國家, state, country, nation-state), *gukmin* (국민, 國民, people of the nation state), and *inmin* (인민, 人民, people, subjects), which will be discussed in Chapter 1, were frequently used in modern media and school curricula to promote a new idea of a modern Korean nation-state, expanding traditional Joseon understanding that equated the state and country with the government or monarch.[2] However, typical Western or modern traits of a modern nation-state such as economic and military autonomy, civil rights, and constitutional governance were not perfectly instituted within the three short decades of reformation before annexation.[3] Instead, the Korean nation-state of this time can be seen as a mixture of a traditional dynastic Joseon and the new Korean nation-state modelled after Western and Japanese equivalents.

Secondly, to secure a place in the international arena, it became imperative to visualise the Korean nation-state in adherence to Western customs of representation, however fragile its status. Modernity, or more specifically, Western formulations of making sense of the self-constructed modern world, was heavily dependent on 'visuality.'[4] The eighteenth-century triumph of science and realism in the West and the

[2] It was only after 1905 that textbooks started to explain the duties and rights of *gukmin*. Kim So-yeong, "Gabo gaehyeokgi (1894-1895) gyogwaseo sok ui 'gukmin,'" *Hanguksa hakbo* 29 (November 2007): 171–208.

[3] Kyung Moon Hwang, *Rationalizing Korea: The Rise of the Modern State, 1894-1945* (Oakland, California: University of California Press, 2016).

[4] Stephen Houlgate argues that the Western world was "holding human knowledge of the world to be analogous to visual perception," notwithstanding the criticism on this "domination" of sight. Stephen Houlgate, "Vision, Reflection, and Openness: The 'Hegemony of Vision' from a Hegelian Point of View," in *Modernity and the Hegemony of Vision*, ed. David Michael Levin (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 87.

consequent flourishing of visual culture and "ocularcentrism of modernity" required that Joseon and the subsequent Korean Empire provide tangible visual indicators to realise the intangible and complex idea of Korean nationhood and sovereignty.[5] During the forty-year period from the 1880s to the 1910s, visual representations of the Korean state and nation underwent significant change, not only in their style and medium but also in their purpose of representation.

One of the key factors behind the increased use of visual representations was the structural change of Korean society. The Joseon dynasty (조선, 朝鮮, 1392-1897) founded and maintained a highly sophisticated state system from the late fourteenth century. The state was centred around the Yi (이, 李) monarchy and maintained by the educated bureaucratic yangban (양반, 兩班) elites who validated and supported the royal family their governance.[6] However, this centralised body of power was monopolised by the few elites of the Korean society, while the majority of the Joseon population remained as subjects (*baekseong*, 백성, 百姓) ruled over by the monarch. The Joseon king enjoyed the *L'etat, c'est moi* status and together with the government claimed absolute ownership of public power in Joseon Korea.[7]

The king's divine right to rule, which was ideologically supported by the Mandate of Heaven, gave the Joseon dynastic state automatic and deeply sanctioned domestic authority during its five hundred years wherein the king did not have to continuously validate his legitimacy to the common person.[8] Nevertheless, the Joseon

---

5 David Michael Levin, ed., *Modernity and the Hegemony of Vision* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).
6 Kyung Moon Hwang, *Rationalizing Korea*, 4-6.
7 Kyung Moon Hwang, *Rationalizing Korea*, 1–24.
8 Note that the absolute power of the king was often contested by the influence of his

monarch and the state visualised themselves, and most importantly their authority, in a range of symbolic systems that existed in forms of portraiture, emblems, architectural decorations, processions and rituals, clothing, and decorative paintings. In these state symbols lay the core characteristic of the Joseon dynasty in which the ruling absolute monarch was equated with the state and country.

Moreover, traditional Joseon visual representations did not exhibit Korea as a unique and sovereign state but served to express a level of civilised culture and monarchical authority, sanctioned by Sinocentric codes of conduct. Carter Eckert explains that "[t]he Joseon elite would have found the idea of nationalism not only strange but also uncivilized. […] Korea had thought of themselves in cultural terms less as Koreans than as members of a larger cosmopolitan civilization [centred] on China."[9] This is in contrast with visual representations of the Korean nation-state produced from the 1880s for public edification of Joseon's national boundaries and differentiated identity from other countries, including China.

---

bureaucrats who served the purpose of checking and balancing each other and 'guiding' the king. Nevertheless, heavenly-appointed power, at least in its official sense, belonged to the monarch. An interesting comparative analysis of the European divine right to rule and Mandate of Heaven can be found in Kim Chun-sik, "Wang-gwon sinsuseol gwa cheonmyeong sasang ui yeon-gu," *Hanguk jeongchihak hoebo* 30, no. 3 (December 1996): 27–46.

[9] Carter J. Eckert, *Offspring of Empire: The Gochang Kims and the Colonial Origins of Korean Capitalism, 1876-1945* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1991), 226–27. Although Eckert highlights the elite's general inclination toward the Sinocentric cosmopolitan over the five-hundred-year span of the Joseon period, there was a significant period in the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries when cultural independence from China was pursued with the rise of Silhak (실학, 實學, Realist School of Confucianism/School of Practical Learning). However, this phenomenon can also be interpreted as an extension of Sinocentrism as Joseon elites used *Sojunghwa* (小中華, Little Sinocentrism) to justify their rejection of the Qing Empire and ideological succession of Ming China. See Kim In-gyu, "Joseon hugi silhakpa ui hwairon gwa cheolhakjeok hamui: Juja hakpa wa ui bigyo reul jungsim euro," *Dasan gwa hyeondae* 2 (December 2009): 443–79.

In Joseon, the common person's belonging to the dynasty did not depend on their voluntary and active self-identification as a rightful citizen of the state, but enforced via laws of taxation, military and labour obligations, and the Confucian hierarchical social construct that bound him to the dutiful role of servant to the king.[10] Accordingly, public accessibility of Joseon state and monarchical representations and the affiliation of the common person to the country was not a completely irrelevant task for the state, but neither a vital issue until the turn of the twentieth century. For example, although monarchical portraits were produced under extreme scrutiny by the most qualified and talented court artists, they were enshrined in the palace or regional shrines, hidden from the public. Public processions, through which the monarch was made visible to the general public, were unilateral and ostentatious expressions of the absolute power of the monarch in which he "represented their lordship, not for but [']before['] the people" and existed as a symbolic reaffirmation of Joseon's place in the Sinocentric world.[11] Therefore, state representation of the Joseon dynastic period was in many ways disconnected from the majority of the public.

---

[10] Sin Yong-ha argues that the difference between pre-modern and modern nations is the level of *minjok uisik* (민족 의식, 民族 意識, national awareness). According to Sin's borrowing of the Hegelian dialectic, pre-modern nations qualify as *jeukjajeok minjok* (즉자적 민족, 卽自的 民族, nation in itself, Nation au Sich) while the elevated awareness and voluntary and active self-identification to the nation puts modern nations in the category of *daejajeok minjok* (대자적 민족, 對自的 民族, nation for itself, Nation für Sich). He also lists general conditions that prevent the development of a modern *minjok*: social class systems; hindrances to economic circulation such as regional tariffs, tollage, and discriminatory policies; restraints on political participation, including the system of constitutional monarchy; the restrictions on the education of commoners. Sin Yong-ha, *Hanguk minjok ui giwon gwa hyeongseong yeon-gu* (Seoul: Seoul Daehakgyo Chulpan Munhwawon, 2017), 246–48.

[11] Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (Cambridge: Polity, 1989), 7–8.

What directly influenced the transformation of state and national representation in the late nineteenth to early twentieth centuries was the reconfiguration of the relationship between the Korean state and people which formed part of an array of reformation and modernisation projects. From late Joseon, monarchical power was in decline, while political factions and hereditary oligarchic clans continuously fought to dominate the few higher bureaucratic posts to exert greater influence over the "delegation of political power" and management of public resources.[12] From the late seventeenth century there was a gradual rise of *yeohang munin* (여항문인, 閭巷文人, middle class literati), consisted of the successful *jung-in* (중인, 中人) class (literally translated as 'middle people').[13] Many of these "secondary status groups" had opportunities to access Western knowledge in China or Japan before state-level contact with the West in the 1880s, which helped their debut as core members in the reformation movement.[14] Such changes, as well as the eventual legal abolishment of the class system and the

[12] Mark Setton, "Factional Politics and Philosophical Development in the Late Choson," *The Journal of Korean Studies* 8 (1992): 44-46; Yeon Gap-su, "Gojongdae Pungyang Jomun ui donghyang," in *Joseon jeongchi ui majimak eolgul: 19 segi Joseon ui jeongchi seryeok gwa daeoe gwan-gye* (Seoul: Sahoe Pyeongron, 2012), 91-127. For more on the conflict among political factions in late Joseon, see Lee Seong-mu, *Joseon sidae dangjaengsa*, vol. 2, 2 vols. (Seoul: Areumdaun Nal, 2007).

[13] These people consisted of professionals such as doctors, translators, accountants, low-level officials, and even artists, all of whom exerted influence on the literary culture of the yangban. The growth of commercialism in late Joseon also boosted the influence of these groups. Hong Sun-pyo, "19 segi yeohang munindeul ui hoehwa hwaldong gwa changjak seonghyang," *Misulsa nondan* 1 (June 1995): 191–219.

[14] This new generation of intellectuals would later form an integral part of the Reform Party that would shape Korean socio-political reformation movements modelled after the West and Japan in the 1890s, reflected in the membership of the Independence Club. Kyung Moon Hwang, *Beyond Birth: Social Status in the Emergence of Modern Korea*, Harvard East Asian Monographs (Cambridge, Mass.; London: Harvard University Asia Center: Distributed by Harvard University Press, 2004); Michael Edson Robinson, *Korea's Twentieth-Century Odyssey: A Short History* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2007), 24–25.

Confucian state examination system during the Gabo Reforms (갑오개혁, 甲午改革, 1894-1896), can be understood as a shift of (albeit not complete transference of) power from minority elites to the broader public. This shift compelled the re-evaluation of the notion of the Korean *gukga* and expanded the target audience for visual representations of the nation-state.[15]

Another compelling reason for the alteration and expansion of visual imagery of the Korean nation-state at the turn of the twentieth century was the fundamental change in Korea's international relationships. Despite many cases of internal conflict among political factions competing for dominance within the government, traditional Joseon's only significant and consistent foreign diplomatic relation was with China, with all others recognised as outsiders or barbarians, in accordance with the Sino-barbarian dichotomy of '*hwa'* (화, 華, the civilised Chinese) and '*i'* (이, 夷, the barbarians).[16] Joseon was forced to re-evaluate this position when faced with increasing pressure to open its borders to Japan and Western powers from the 1870s.[17] Regent Heungseon Daewongun (흥선대원군, 興宣大院君, 1820-1898, r. 1864-1873), who advocated a strong closed-door policy, was forced to withdraw from power in 1873, and Joseon began to establish diplomatic ties with Western states under the direct rule of

---

[15] The general public of this period was still politically represented by elite intellectuals. The concept of *umin-gwan* (愚民觀, ignorant people perspective) was still pervasive, and intellectuals such as Yu Gil-jun stressed the need to educate the ignorant masses before they are given equal rights of political participation. See 1.2.

[16] For Korea-Japan relations and the *hwa-i* (C. *hua-yi*) distinction during the late Joseon period, see Hiroshi Watanabe, "Hwai wa muwi: 'Pyeonghwa' jisok ui eoryeoum e daehayeo," trans. Lee Gyeong-mi, *Gaenyeom gwa sotong* 17 (June 2016): 5–38.

[17] The General Sherman incident (1866) and Byeong-in yangyo (병인양요, 丙寅洋擾, French campaign against Korea, 1866) were early examples of Western attempts to forge 'gunboat diplomacy' with Korea, and Regent Heungseon Daewongun's response was to further strengthen his closed-door policies.

King Gojong (고종, 高宗, 1852-1919, r. 1863-1907) and influence of the Reform Party (개화파, Gaehwapa, 開化派).[18] Moreover, upon witnessing China's humiliating defeat to the British Empire in the Opium Wars (1839-1842, 1856-1860) and later to Japan in the First Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895), Korea realised first-hand the need to decentre China.[19]

The need to construct a competitive and viable modern Korean nation-state in adherence to new international norms was placed at the forefront of all socio-political agendas and Korea attempted to not only adopt Western systems of state representation but also to nurture a patriotic nation. Nation-building took place via public education and internalisation of national boundaries and identity, forging an immediate and interdependent connection between the Korean people and their country. The state, and later the intellectual elite, took the lead in visually proclaiming the legitimacy and autonomy of the country, fostering an awareness or collective imagination of the intimate connection between the individual and the intangible entity of the Korean nation-state, and inducing loyalty and devotion to the country.[20]

From the 1880s, the Joseon state employed various symbols to visualise and realise the Korean nation-state. Most prominent were the national flag and imperial

---

[18] The Reform Party were responsible for a series of reformist agendas that surfaced from the 1880s, most noticeably those of the Gabo Reforms, a follow-up from the failed Gapsin Coup (갑신정변, 甲申政變) of 1884. Many of these agendas persisted and were implemented under the new Gwangmu Administration after the disbandment of the party following the assassination of Queen Min (Empress Myeongseong, 1851-1895).

[19] Andre Schmid, *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 55–100; Kim Yeong-ho, "Geundae Hanguk ui buguk gangbyeong ui gaenyeom," in *Geundae hanguk ui sahoe gwahak gaenyeom hyeongseongsa* (Paju: Changbi, 2009), 158.

[20] Jeong Yong-hwa, "Seogu in-gwon sasang ui suyong gwa jeon-gae: Doklip sinmun eul jungsim euro," *Hanguk jeongchihak hoebo* 37, no. 2 (July 2003): 70–72.

emblem. Korea's first national flag, Taegeukgi (태극기, 太極旗), was strategically created by the state to represent Korea in the international arena and to highlight autonomy and independence from China.[21] (Fig. 1.1.) The court also adopted a unique Korean imperial emblem (Ihwamun, 이화문, 李花紋) to represent the newly elevated Korean Empire (Daehan Jeguk, 대한제국, 大韓帝國, 1897-1910) in the 1890s.[22] (Fig. 1.2.) The national flag and imperial emblem were created and utilised by the state to represent Korea and in branding state projects but were also appropriated by the civil society to educate the Korean masses of modern nationalism and to induce national identification.

Another historically significant change in visually representing monarchical authority and the Korean state was the exposure of its ruler. In adherence to Western norms of representation and diplomacy, images of the Korean king and emperor were publicised for the first time at the end of the nineteenth century.[23] (Fig. 1.3., Fig. 1.4., Fig. 1.5.) State representations, such as royal portraits, had to be made increasingly public at this time due to the growing need to reaffirm modern state sovereignty and legitimacy through both international recognition and domestic support.[24] As

---

[21] For details on the process of negotiation and Chinese intervention in the signing of international treaties in the 1880s see Kirk W. Larsen, *Tradition, Treaties, and Trade: Qing Imperialism and Chosŏn Korea, 1850-1910*, Harvard East Asian Monographs (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center: Distributed by Harvard University Press, 2008), 72–94.

[22] Myeonryugwan (면류관, 冕旒冠), another type of ceremonial headgear was also altered from having nine rows of beads to twelve. For changes in royal dress, see Lee Min-ju, *Yong eul geurigo bonghwang eul sunota: Joseon ui wangsil boksik* (Seongnam: Hangukhak Jungang Yeon-guwon, 2013).

[23] Gwon Haeng-ga, *Imiji wa gwonryeok: Gojong ui chosang gwa imiji ui jeongchihak* (Dolbegae, 2015), 16.

[24] Kyung Moon Hwang, *Rationalizing Korea,* 86; Christopher Pierson, *The Modern State*, 3rd. ed. (Abingdon: Routledge, 2011), 22–25.

reformation movements progressed throughout the 1890s and a modern civil society developed in Korea, images that initially symbolised the narrow state were soon reproduced, popularised, and re-contextualised by civil groups and intellectuals to eventually represent the broader and more inclusive nation-state. For instance, the Taegeukgi that was also created by the state for official representation abroad was employed by non-state actors in public monuments, newspapers, textbooks, and even commercial advertisements, reinterpreted as a flag that represented the people of Korea and their collective nationhood.[25]

In addition to state-produced symbols, new types of images came to visually represent the Korean nation-state. In creating a standardised historic narrative of an independent and homogeneous ethnic nation, illustrations of heroic historical figures were utilised in textbooks that educated the Korean people of their collective memory and identity. (Fig. 1.6.) Portrait images of nationalistic martyrs like Min Yeong-hwan (민영환, 閔泳煥, 1861-1905) and An Jung-geun (안중근, 安重根, 1879-1910) were also used to induce resistant nationalism (*jeohang minjok juui,* 저항 민족주의, 抵抗民族主義) after 1905. (Fig. 1.7., Fig. 1.8.)

Geographic imagery of the Korean Peninsula (Hanbando, 한반도, 韓半島) were also widely reproduced and contextualised as symbols of Korean territory. (Fig. 1.9.) Map images placed Korea in the world and spatially confined the Korean population, as well as their shared history and fate. Images of natural landmarks such as

[25] Traditional court customs of using flags in ceremonies and processions continued in the Korean Empire period and the Taegeukgi was also used as one of the king's flags (*eogi*, 어기, 御旗). See Baek Yeong-ja, *Joseon sidae ui eoga haengryeol* (Seoul: Hanguk Bangsong Tongsin Daehakgyo Chulpanbu, 1994); Baek Yeong-ja, *Hwangje reul suho haneun jadeul: Gungjung uijang-gi ui buhwal* (Seoul: Gyeongchunsa, 2010).

Geumgangsan Mountain (금강산, 金剛山) and Baekdusan Mountain (백두산, 白頭山) were also disseminated and consumed as representations of the Korean landscape and territorial boundaries, as well as a manifestation of Korean cultural history. (Fig. 1.10., Fig. 1.11.) As such, a wide variety of visual images thus came to play a vital role in displaying, consolidating, and internalising the idea of the nation-state as a basic unit of survival within a new world order.

Important contemporary developments in visual culture further strengthened the impact of visual representations of the Korean nation-state. 'Art' of this period was implemented as an efficient tool or 'technology' (*gisul*, 기술, 技術) to amassing national prosperity and power (*buguk gangbyeong*, 부국강병, 富國强兵) in an increasingly competitive international arena.[26] The introduction of photography, print technology, and Western painting styles to Korea was crucial to the overall dominance of and dependency on visual authentication and materiality in the twentieth century as reality could be accurately duplicated and reproduced and its substantiality (*silcheseong*, 실체성, 實體性) be consistently certified.[27]

The development of Western visual culture and public consumption of images was fundamental to the reception of representative imagery. The Korean experience of participating in the two world expositions in Chicago in 1893 and Paris in 1900 marked

---

[26] Art is presently translated as "*misul*" (미술, 美術), but the neologism of the late nineteenth century was an adoption of Japanese translations of Western texts. *Dohwa* (도화, 圖畫) was more commonly used to refer to the act of producing visual imagery and, in particular, painting. The increasing popularity of the term "*misul*" toward the 1910s is also related to the rise of modern 'fine arts' and art institutions. See Yun Se-jin, "Geundaejeok 'misul' gaenyeom ui hyeongseong gwa misul insik: 1890 nyeon gyeong buteo 1910 nyeondae ggaji reul jungsim euro" (Seoul National University, 1999).

[27] Hong Sun-pyo, *Hanguk geundae misulsa: Gabo gaehyeok eseo haebang sigi ggaji* (Seoul: Sigongsa, 2009), 60.

the beginnings of modern exhibition culture and the utilisation of art and culture in promoting the competitiveness and identity of the nation-state.[28]

In addition, the advent of print technology facilitated the growth of new visual culture dominated by commercialism and public visual spectacles throughout the twentieth century.[29] Image-oriented nation-building prevailed with the introduction of new types of imagery and media, and these visual pointers were exploited to successfully, albeit belatedly, politically mobilise the Korean people by indoctrinating collective thinking of nationhood and identity, materialising intangible entity of the nation-state, and validating national boundaries.[30]

---

[28] Henry Mayhew, *London Labour and the London Poor* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985); Chris Jenks, *Culture*, 2nd ed. (London: Taylor & Francis Group, 2004), 20–21. The Gyeongseong Exposition in 1907 was the first major exhibition co-hosted by the Korean and Japanese governments.

[29] Kim Young-na, *20 segi ui Hanguk misul 2: Byeonhwa wa dojeon ui sigi* (Seoul: Yegyeong, 2010), 15–50; Kim Young-na, "'Bakramhoe' raneun jeonsi gong-gan: 1893-nyeon Sikago man-guk bakramhoe wa Joseon-gwan jeonsi," *Seoyang misulsa hakhoe nonmunjip* 13 (June 2000): 75–111; Hong Sun-pyo, "Gyeongseong ui sigak munhwa gongram jedo mit yutong gwa gwanjung ui tansaeng," in *Modeon Gyeongseong ui sigak munhwa wa gwanjung* (Seoul: Hanguk Misul Yeon-guso, 2012); Park No-hyeon, "Geukjang ui tansaeng," *Hanguk geuk yesul yeon-gu* 19 (June 2004): 7–39.

[30] Gabriella Elgenius, *Symbols of Nations and Nationalism: Celebrating Nationhood* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, UK; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 31–56. The visible effects of such mobilisation peaked after annexation in 1910, in the form of mass nationalistic movements such as the 1919 March First Movement.

Research Objectives and Outline of Thesis

The primary aim of this thesis is to investigate visual representations of the Korean nation-state from the 1880s to the 1910s and their impacts on state and nation-building of the period. The study deciphers the role of visual imagery in the authentication of information and intangible ideas, one of them being the truly untidy idea of the nation-state. I connect key visual imagery to core strands of pre-colonial nation-building as the selection and re-contextualisation of images in these projects gave way to rationalising the inconsistency, intertwining, conflict, and fusion of ideas surrounding the Korean nation-state. In addition, I inspect strategies used in reconciling the traditional and new, both in the interpretations of the Korean nation-state and methods of visual representation. By doing so, I hope to portray the dynamic nature of the period, rather than fitting ideas and images into a chronological timeline of transition from the traditional to the Western.

In researching visual representations of the Korean nation-state of the 1880s to the 1910s, I drew upon Michael Geisler's standpoint on national symbols:

> "[W]e need to look at the role played by national symbols in the formation and maintenance of collective identity as an ongoing, dynamic process in which historical symbolic meanings are constantly recycled, actualized, challenged, renegotiated, and reconfirmed- or rewritten, depending on changes in public consensus or the ability or inability of a particular hegemonic societal group to maintain its hold on the collective imaginary."[31]

[31] Michael E. Geisler, ed., *National Symbols, Fractured Identities: Contesting the National Narrative* (Middlebury, Vermont: Middlebury College Press, 2005), XVIII.

Certainly, reflected in representative imageries at the turn of the twentieth century were pervasive inconsistencies and contending strands of thought surrounding the nation-state that emerged from different political interests. While Korean scholars often refer to this period as a modern transitional period (*geundae jeonhwan-gi*, 근대전환기, 近代轉換期) which implies that there was a linear progression from A to B, the reality of pre-colonial Korea cannot be simplified as a clear-cut transition. On one hand, progressive developments such as the participation in international relations, the reformation of social structures, and construction of a domestic "public sphere" provided room for an open discussion of a new and modern Korean nation-state.[32] However, seemingly progressive reformation and nation-building projects were often contradictory, and even took a turn back toward the promotion of statist autocracy in the late Korean Empire period. Moreover, there was never a solid agreement of what the ultimate goal of the so-called transition should be. Accordingly, Chapter 1 investigates these untidy attempts of state and nation-building by looking at how various terminologies were adopted and used, which reflected such contemporary conflicts in envisioning a modern Korean nation-state.

The research acknowledges such diversity and fluctuations of the envisioned Korean nation-state and approaches groups of images as case studies rather than focusing on a specific object or image. This involves an expansive range of visual material, though the aim is not to merely assemble and chronologically list cases of the

---

[32] Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*; Choi Chang-seok, "Gaehwagi Doklip Hyeophoe ui hwaldong gwa 'gukmin-mandeulgi' peurojekteu: Doklip sinmun gisa naeyong bunseok eul jungsim euro" (Master's thesis, Seoul, Korea University, 2004); Jo Gyu-tae, "Hanguk geundae jeongchi, sahoe danche ui 'gukmin' mandeulgi: Doklip Hyeophoe, Daehan Jaganghoe, Daehan Hyeophoe, Sin-ganhoe reul jungsim euro," *Sungsil sahakhoe* 39 (December 2017): 5–37.

visualisation of the nation-state. There are clusters of popularised images that accompanied and greatly facilitated major strands of nation-building that appeared and gained prominence at different points in time. For example, in promoting the newly revisited narrative of an autonomous Korean ethnic genealogy after 1900, there was a mounting need for nationalistic intellectuals to promote the myth and images of Dangun (단군, 檀君), the mythical founder of Gojoseon (古朝鮮, 2,333 BCE-108 BCE).[33] Moreover, the thesis takes into account that there were many different ways that visual images represented the Korean nation-state. While some visual images were active pointers of Korean nationhood that were used in impassioned nationalistic events, some were gentle and "metonymic" reminders; even a single imagery such as the Taegeukgi played both active and "banal" roles of reminding viewers of state and nationhood that both had pervasive impacts on the formation of the Korean nation-state.[34]

The first group of images examined in Chapter 2 is the national flag and the imperial emblem. Flags and national coats of arms are the most prominent symbols that define the identity of a state.[35] Until the late 1890s, the Taegeukgi was most noticeably used to visually represent Korea abroad and to express the independence of the country

---

[33] The founding date is based on *Samguk yusa* (삼국유사, 三國遺事, 1281) and the first mention of Gojoseon in Chinese texts appears in seventh century BCE. Mark Peterson and Philip Margulies, *A Brief History of Korea* (New York, NY: Facts On File, 2009), 6; A. D. Smith, *Myths and Memories of the Nation* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Schmid, *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919,* 171–98.

[34] Michael Billig, *Banal Nationalism* (London: Sage, 1995), 13, https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/soas-ebooks/detail.action?docID=1024116, accessed 7 September, 2022.

[35] Stanley D. Brunn, "Stamps as Iconography: Celebrating the Independence of New European and Central Asian States," *GeoJournal* 52, no. 4 (December 2000): 315; David Lowenthal, "European and English Landscapes as National Symbols," in *Geography and National Identity*, by David Hooson (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1994), 199–232; Ihor Stebelsky, "National Identity of Ukraine," in *Geography and National Identity*, by David Hooson (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1994), 233–48.

and the departure from Joseon's traditional relationship with China.[36] However, the Korean flag also came to represent the Korean nation as civil organisations and intellectuals used the Taegeukgi to consolidate the public's affiliation to the collective nation-state. When public education through print media reached a new height in the beginnings of the twentieth century, intellectuals attempted to implant emotional connections between the Korean public and the invisible entity of the nation-state using modern flag-waving customs. Moreover, the loss of an autonomous Korean state after annexation allowed for the use of the national flag as a symbol of the stateless nation and collective resistance against colonial rule.

Ihwamun, the imperial emblem of the Korean Empire, is also studied in Chapter 2. After the inauguration of Gojong as emperor in 1897, imperial symbols and court decorations were altered to portray Korea as equal to China. Yet, ironically, many visual mechanisms that emphasised Korea's elevated and equal status to China were still reliant on traditional Sinocentric systems of visual symbolisms.[37] The Ihwamun, first used in coin designs from 1885, was an exception that played a key role in emphasising the separation from China by using a distinctly Korean image. Emulating Japanese examples of applying the flower emblem to modern objects, the Ihwamun was

---

[36] Mok Soo-hyun, "Doklipmun: Geundae ginyeommul gwa mandeuleojineun gieok," *Misulsa wa sigak munhwa* 2 (October 2003): 63–66; Mok Soo-hyun, "Geundae gukga ui 'gukgi' raneun sigak munhwa: Gaehang gwa Daehan Jegukgi Taegeukgi reul jungsim euro," *Misulsa hakbo* 27 (December 2006): 312.

[37] After Gojong declared himself emperor, he replaced his *gujangbok* (구장복, 九章服, nine-symbol ceremonial gown) robe to the imperial *sibijangbok* (십이장복, 九章服, twelve-symbol ceremonial gown) and his headgear changed from *wonyugwan* (원유관, 遠遊冠) to *tongcheon-gwan* (통천관, 通天冠). Kim Ji-yeong et al., *Jeukwisik, gukwang ui tansaeng*, Wangsil munhwa chongseo (Paju: Dolbegae, 2013), 166–69; Im So-yeon, "Hwangjeguk ui wisang eul gatchuda," in *Daehan Jeguk: Itchyeojin 100 nyeon jeon ui hwangjeguk* (Seoul: Minsokwon, 2011), 47–68.

used to ‘brand’ state projects of modernisation to express state authority and Korea’s status as a competitive empire. Nationalistic intellectuals attempted to embrace and apply the emblem as a national symbol toward and after 1900. However, after annexation, the emblem was quickly assimilated to Japanese imperial symbols, and popularly consumed as a decorative motif that symbolised the powerless Korean royal family that was absorbed to the Japanese imperial family.

Chapter 3 centres on representative portrait images of the Korean state leader and historic figures. These portrait images represented Korean statehood abroad, induced allegiance and nostalgia for the nation-state, standardised modern historical narratives, and prompted resistant nationalism. First, traditional royal portraits that recorded and preserved the legacy of the Yi monarchy continued to be produced, but illustrations and photographic portrait images of Gojong and Sunjong were made public from the end of the nineteenth century. Not only did the exchange of royal portrait imagery with Western states mark the beginnings of international representation of Korea and its rulership, but the gradual domestic dissemination of portrait imageries of Gojong from the late 1890s marked a pivotal shift from traditional *eojin* (어진, 御眞, the king’s portrait) to the modern portrait of a state leader that reaffirmed the people’s allegiance to the state and county. Despite initial intentions of using royal portrait images to promote Japanese protectoral rule after 1907, royal portrait images fuelled resistance against colonial rule and reinforced public support for the monarchy toward and after annexation.[38]

[38] Christine Kim, “Politics and Pageantry in Protectorate Korea (1905-10): The Imperial Progresses of Sunjong,” *The Journal of Asian Studies* 68, no. 3 (August 2009): 835–59.

Chapter 3 also studies textbook illustrations of historic figures that contributed to public edification of national history and ethnic origin as well as fuelling resistant nationalism. Myths of genealogy and the relationship between the two progenitors Dangun and Gija (기자, 箕子, founder of Gija Joseon around BCE 1100-195) at the turn of the century reflected the process in which Korean intellectuals slowly pushed for a distinctly Korean ethnic origin and severed ethnic ties with the Chinese.[39] The eventual standardisation and triumph of Dangun genealogy led to the construction of Korea's ethnocentric nationalism. Illustrations of key historic figures that were strategically chosen for their masculine traits as military heroes who defended the Korea from foreign invasions became prominent after 1905.[40] Moreover, after the 1905 Eulsa Treaty (을사조약, 乙巳條約), martyrdom emerged as a powerful symbol of resistant nationalism. Min Yeong-hwan's portrait and the Blood Bamboos (*hyeoljuk*, 혈죽, 血竹), as well as independence activist An Jung-geun's photographs highlighted martyrdom as an expression of *chung-gun aejok* (충군애족, 忠君愛族, loyalty to the king and devotion to the people) that became manifestly anti-Japanese in nature.[41]

Chapter 4 focuses on the map of the Korean Peninsula and popular geographical landmarks of Geumgangsan Mountain and Baekdusan Mountain. Spatial recognition of the invisible nation-state was one of the most essential and instrumental

---

[39] Schmid, *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919*, 180–81.
[40] Sheila Miyoshi Jager, *Narratives of Nation Building in Korea: A Genealogy of Patriotism* (Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 2003), 4–9.
[41] Lee Seong-hyeon, "Min Yeong-hwan ui 'sun-guk' damron e daehan gochal," *Gangwon sahak* 26 (2014): 141; Cho Eun-jeong, "Chae Yong-sin yurim chosang ui inmul gwa sasang e daehan yeon-gu," *Inmun misul sahak* 2 (December 2006): 187; Choi Yeol, "Hyeoljuk ui norae, Gyejeong Min Yeong-hwan," *Naeil eul yeoneun yeoksa* 49 (December 2012): 220.

foundations of nation-building. The map of the Korean Peninsula, traditionally used for practical purposes such as military operations and taxation, began to be printed alongside world maps in geography and history textbooks. These scientifically verified geographical pointers placed Korea within a new world and signalled a definitive departure from the traditional Sinocentric world view. Soon, simplified Hanbando images gained a status as "map-as-logo" and conveyed not only geographical information, but also nationalist agendas and identities.[42]

Popular geographical landmarks and the reproduction of local scenery of Geumgangsan Mountain and Baekdusan Mountain were also instrumental in propounding visible recreations of "placeness" of the nation-state.[43] Traditional paintings of Geumgangsan Mountain that constituted a central position in Joseon cultural history were popularised and commercialised among a wider population from the late nineteenth century. As modern tourism flourished from the onset of the twentieth century, photographs and illustrations of famous scenic spots promoted the beauty of Korean terrains and consolidated Geumgangsan Mountain as a symbolic landmark and pride of Korean territory. Depictions of Baekdusan Mountain in late Joseon maps highlighted the landmark as a symbol of northern territorial boundaries, which continued in twentieth century pictorial maps, sketches, and photographs.

---

[42] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Rev. ed. (London; New York; Verso, 2006), 175.

[43] Traditionally, scenes of Geumgangsan Mountain were one of the most popular images of local scenery emphasised in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Jang Jeong-su, "19 segi cheosa jak Geumgang-san gihaeng gasa e natanan Geumgangsan ui uimi," *Hanguk siga yeon-gu* 34 (May 2013): 153; Gu Ja-hwang, "Geundae gyogwaseo wa gihaengmun seongrip e gwanhan yeon-gu: Ilje gangjeomgi Joseoneo gyogwaseo e natanan myeongseung gojeok eul jungsim euro," *Han minjok eomunhak* 69 (April 2015): 83–113; Park Carey and Mun Jeong-hui, "Baekdusan: Mandeuleojin jeontong gwa pyosang," *Misulsa hakbo* 36 (June 2011): 43–74.

Moreover, ethnocentric nationalism added importance to the mountain as it was promoted as the birthplace of Dangun and the place of origin of the Korean ethnic nation. Through these examples, the chapter examines the effects of providing and consuming images that indirectly realised the concept of national territory and geographical boundaries of the Korean nation-state.

Finally, the last chapter will provide a conclusion of the study and apply the findings of previous case studies to the broader narrative of Korean modern visual culture and the development of Korean nationalism past the 1910s. Connections will be made to popularised images of the succeeding 1920s as many of the representative imageries of the 1880s-1910s were retained and further re-contextualised, and some have maintained their relevance and influence as national representations to this day.

Literature Review

The period between the opening of Korean ports in 1876 and annexation in 1910 has been actively investigated by historians, sociologists, and political scientists, and relevant literatures are thus expansive and diverse. Scholars such as Kim Won-mo, Choi Deok-su, Kim Yeong-ho, Jeong Yong-hwa, Kim Seok-geun, and Pae Keun Park have investigated early contact with Western nation-states and the introduction of their technology, political ideologies, and social policies.[44] Yu Geun-ho investigated the formation and disintegration of Sinocentrism from the late Joseon period and its impact on modern Korean foreign relations, and Jo Seong-eul researched the relationship between Sinocentrism and the formation and development of "modern consciousness."[45] Seo Yeong-hui and Lee Yun-sang provided insights on the various attempts of the Reform Party to constitute a modern nation-state during the Korean Empire period.[46] Kim Yeong-ho and Vladimir Tikhonov have paid attention to the

---

[44] Kim Won-mo, "Jo Mi joyak chegyeol yeon-gu," *Dongyanghak* 22, no. 1 (October 1992): 49–123; Choi Deok-su, *Joyak euro bon Hanguk geundaesa* (Paju: Yeollin Chaekdeul, 2010); Kim Yeong-ho, "Hanmal Seoyang gisul ui suyong," *Asea Yeon-Gu* 11, no. 3 (September 1968): 295–348; Jeong Yong-hwa, "Yu Gil-jun ui yangjeol chejeron: Ijungjeok gukje jilseo eseo ui bang-guk ui gwonri," *Gukje jeongchi nonchong* 37, no. 3 (August 1998): 297–318; Kim Seok-geun, "Gaehwagi 'jayu juui' ui suyong gwa gineung geurigo jeongchijeok hamui," *Hanguk Dongyang jeongchi sasang yeon-gu* 10, no. 1 (March 2011): 65–87; Pae Keun Park, "Introduction of Western International Law into East Asia: Mergence or Conflict and Substitution: Yu Kil-Chun's Argument of the Yangjul (Twice Folded) System," *Gukjebeop hakhoe nonchong* 56, no. 4 (December 2011): 247–73.

[45] Yu Geun-ho, *Joseonjo daeoe sasang ui heureum: Junghwajeok segyegwan ui hyeongseong gwa bung-goe* (Seoul: Seongsin Yeoja Daehakgyo Chulpanbu, 2004); Jo Seong-eul, "Joseon hugi hwaigwan ui byeonhwa: Geundae uisik ui seongjang gwa gwanryeon hayeo," in *Geundae gukmin gukga wa minjok munje* (Seoul: Jisik Saneopsa, 1995), 237–60.

[46] Seo Yeong-hui, "Gaehwapa ui geundae gukga guseong gwa geu silcheon," in *Geundae gukmin gukga wa minjok munje* (Seoul: Jisik Saneopsa, 1995), 261–302.

contemporary development of Korean nationalism including the promotion of *buguk gangbyeong* (부국강병, 富國強兵, national prosperity and military power) among other methods of survival that were employed by the state at the turn of the twentieth century.[47]

Many historical and socio-political research specified on the Korean Empire period are focused on the relationship between imperial power and contemporary civil movements.[48] Specifically, research on key reformist intellectuals such as Kim Hong-jip 김홍집, 金弘集, 1842-1896), Kim Ok-gyun (김옥균, 金玉均, 1851-1894), Yu Gil-jun (유길준, 兪吉濬, 1856-1914), Park Yeong-hyo (박영효, 朴泳孝, 1861-1939), Seo Jae-pil (서재필, 徐載弼, also known as Philip Jaisohn, 1864-1951), and Yun Chi-ho (윤치호, 尹致昊, 1865-1945), as well as Korea's first modern civil organisation, the Independence Club (Doklip Hyeophoe, 독립협회, 獨立協會, 1896-1898) are central topics.[49]

---

[47] Kim Yeong-ho, "Geundae Hanguk ui buguk gangbyeong ui gaenyeom," 151–58; Vladimir Mikhaĭlovich Tikhonov, *Social Darwinism and Nationalism in Korea: The Beginnings (1880s-1910s): 'Survival' as an Ideology of Korean Modernity*, Brill's Korean Studies Library (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010).

[48] Jo Jae-gon, *Hwangje jungsim ui geundae gukga cheje hyeongseong* (Seoul: Yeoksa Gong-gan, 2020); Han Yeong-u, *Daehan Jeguk eun gendae gukga in-ga* (Seoul: Pureun Yeoksa, 2006); Jo Gye-won, "Geundae jeonhwan-gi ui maekrak eseo bon jeongchijeok chungseong: Daehan Jegukgi ui jeongchi, sahoejeok sageon eul jungsim euro" (PhD diss., Seoul, Korea University, 2015); Kim Dong-taek, "Daehan Jegukgi geundae gukga hyeongseong ui se gaji gusang," *21 segi jeongchihak hoebo* 20, no. 1 (May 2010): 99–121; Lee Ha-gyeong, "Daehan Jeguk sigi gunjugwon ganghwa wa min-gwon hwakdae nonui: Jugwonron eul jungsim euro," *Hanguk jeongchi yeon-gu* 21, no. 1 (February 2012): 181–204; National Palace Museum of Korea, ed., *Daehan Jeguk: Ichyeojin 100-nyeon jeon ui hwangjeguk* (Seoul: Minsokwon, 2011); Seo Yeong-hui, *Daehan Jeguk jeongchisa yeon-gu* (Seoul: Seoul Daehakgyo Chulpanbu, 2003); Song Seok-yun, "Gunmin gongchi wa ipheon gunjuje heonbeop: Bigyo heonjeongsajeok yeon-gu," *Beophak* 53, no. 1 (March 2012): 497–527.

[49] Hyeon Gwang-ho, "Ju Han Miguk gongsa ui Doklip Hyeophoe undong insik gwa daeeung," *Dongbuka yeon-gu* 29, no. 2 (December 2014): 199–234; Im Seon-hwa,

The *Doklip sinmun* (독립신문, 獨立新聞, 1896-1899) and *The Independent* (English print of *Doklip sinmun*), newspapers published by the Independence Club, have also been thoroughly examined, and Choi Chang-seok, Jeong Yong-hwa, Kim Dong-taek, and Lee Na-mi offer critical analyses of ideologies surrounding nationalism and the modern nation-state as reflected in articles of *Doklip sinmun*.[50] Other newspapers such as *Hwangseong sinmun* (황성신문, 皇城新聞, 1898-1910), *Jeguk sinmun* (제국신문, 帝國新聞, 1898-1910), *Daehan maeil sinbo* (대한매일신보, 大韓每日申報, 1904-1910), *Mansebo* (만세보, 萬歲報, 1906-1907), and *Daehan minbo* (대한민보, 大韓民報, 1909-1910) have also been popular subjects of research.[51]

"Seon-gyosa ui Doklip Hyeophoe wa Daehan Jeguk insik: Eondeoudeu wa Apenjelreo reul jungsim euro," *Yeoksahak yeon-gu* 14 (June 2000): 67–95; Jo Gyu-tae, "Hanguk geundae jeongchi, sahoe danche ui 'gukmin' mandeulgi"; Kim Hyeon, "Doklip Hyeophoe gukga gaehyeok sasang ui minjujeok jeonhoe e gwanhan yeon-gu: Gun-gwon ui jedohwa reul jungsim euro" (PhD diss., Seoul, Yonsei University, 2019); Sin Yong-ha, *Doklip Hyeophoe ui minjok undong yeon-gu* (Seoul: Hanguk Munhwa Yeon-guseo, 1974).

[50] Choi Chang-seok, "Gaehwagi Doklip Hyeophoe ui hwaldong gwa 'gukmin-mandeulgi' peurojekteu"; Jeong Yong-hwa, "Seogu in-gwon sasang ui suyong gwa jeon-gae," 67–86; Kim Dong-taek, "Doklip sinmun ui geundae gukga geonseolron," *Sahoe gwahak yeongju* 12, no. 2 (August 2004): 68–97; Lee Na-mi, "19 segi mal gaehwapa ui jayu juui sasang: Doklip sinmun eul jungsim euro," *Hanguk jeongchi hakhoebo* 35, no. 3 (December 2001): 29–47.

[51] Hanguk eonronsa yeon-guhoe, ed., *Daehan maeil sinbo yeon-gu* (Seoul: Keomyunikeishyeon Bukseu, 2004); Jeong Jin-seok, *The Korean Problem in Anglo-Japanese Relations, 1904-1910: Ernest Thomas Bethell and His Newspapers: The Daehan Maeil Sinbo and the Korea Daily News* (Seoul: Nanam, 1987); Kim Jae-yeong, "Daehan minbo ui munche sanghwang gwa dokja cheung e daehan yeon-gu," *Hanguk munhak ui yeon-gu* 40 (February 2010): 265–308; Choi Gi-yeong, *Daehan Jeguk sigi sinmun yeon-gu* (Seoul: Iljogak, 1991); Gang Eung-cheon, ed., *Geunhyeondaesa sinmun*, vol. 2, 2 vols. (Paju: Sagyejeol, 2010); Lee Yong-seong, "Minjok jeoncheseong hyeongseong e iteoseo geundae sinmun ui yeokhal: Hanseong sunbo wa Hanseong jubo reul jungsim euro," *Hanguk minjok undongsa yeon-gu* 21 (March 1999): 93–115; Gang Jun-man, *Hanguk daejung maechesa* (Seoul: Inmul Gwa Sasangsa, 2007).

Art historical research have also been conducted on cartoons and illustrations of contemporary newspapers. This includes research on images printed in *Daehan minbo* during the Korean Empire period and those published in *Maeil sinbo* (매일신보, 每日申報, 1910-1945) and *Donga ilbo* (동아일보, 東亞日報, 1920-1940, 1945-present) in the colonial period.[52] In the field of art history, however, the dominant theme investigated is the introduction of Western painting styles and media. Most prominently, in *20th Century Korean Art*, Kim Young-na provided a macroscopic account for the development of Western-style art and visual culture in Korea from the nineteenth century.[53] However, there is an overt tendency to focus on the colonial period and the post-war period in discussing modern Korean art. This thesis aims to expand and diversify the approaches to understanding modern Korean art and visual culture.

This thesis also draws on literatures on modern exhibition culture and world expositions as reference for understanding the gradual development of modern visual culture in Korea. Penelope Harvey shed light on Western exposition culture that took flight in the nineteenth century.[54] She highlighted important concepts on the

---

[52] Lee Gu-yeol, "Sinmun e hang-Il, guguk sisa manhwa reul geurin Lee Do-young," *Misul segye*, Lee Gu-yeol ui geundae misul imyeon-gi, January 2004, 96–99; Jeong Hui-jeong, "Daehan minbo ui manhwa e daehan yeon-gu" (Master's thesis, Seoul, Hongik University, 2001); Park Ji-hun, "Daehan Hyeophoe ui Daehan minbo (1909-1910) ui balgan gwa sisa manhwa yeonjae ui seonggyeok," *Yeoksa minsokhak* 44 (March 2014): 215–54; Seo Eun-yeong, "Geundae inswae munhwa ui hyeongseong hwa Daehan minbo 'saphwa' ui deungjang: Aeguk gyemong-gi reul jungsim euro," *Uri eomun yeon-gu* 44 (September 2012): 541–72; Song Min-ho, "Chogi Maeil sinbo yeonjae soseol saphwa ran ui pung-gyeong (2): Sseuruta Goro (1890-1969) wa saeroun 'Joseon' ui insang," *Hangukhak yeon-gu* 44 (February 2017): 211–50; Choi Yu-gyeong, "1920-nyeondae choban, Donga ilbo saphwa e pyohyeondoen Hanguk godae sinhwa," *Jonggyo wa munhwa* 23 (December 2012): 109–29.

[53] Kim Young-na, *20th Century Korean Art* (London: Laurence King, 2005).

[54] Penelope Harvey, *Hybrids of Modernity: Anthropology, the Nation State and the*

relationship between modern nation-states and world expositions, describing world fairs as one of the social mechanisms through which nations were "promoted and continually recreated to be sustained as real."[55] In other words, expositions served the purpose of realising nations and nationhood by providing a public stage on which they could express each its own distinct national identity and thus fortify its sovereignty.

Daniel Kane's "Korea in the White City" and "Display at Empire's End" specifically focused on motivations and objectives behind the Korean participation in the 1893 Chicago and 1900 Paris exhibitions, key figures that influenced the organisation of the exhibitions, and how Korean representations were consumed by Western audiences.[56] In addition to Kane, Kim Young-na positively evaluated the Korean experience of world expositions and emphasised the fact that such experience in exhibition culture eventually gave way to the promotion of crafts and visual arts, encouraged the establishment of art educational institutions, and led to the 1907 Gyeongseong Exposition (경성박람회, 京城博覽會) and 1915 Joseon Industrial Exhibition (Joseon Mulsan Gongjinhoe, 조선물산공진회, 朝鮮物産共進會, 1915) in Korea.[57] This timeline in explaining the development of visual and exhibition culture is accepted and drawn upon in this research but adds to existent studies by investigating

---

Universal Exhibition (London: Routledge, 1996).

[55] Harvey, *Hybrids of Modernity,* 53.

[56] These figures include Horace Allen (1858-1932) and Collin de Plancy (1853-1924). Daniel Kane, "Korea in the White City: Korean Participation in the World's Columbian Exhibition of 1893," *Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society, Korea Branch* 77 (January 1, 2002): 1–57; Daniel Kane, "Display at Empire's End: Korea's Participation in the 1900 Paris Universal Exposition," *Sungkyun Journal of East Asian Studies* 4, no. 2 (August 1, 2004): 41–66; Lee Min-sik, *Kolleombia segye bakramhoe wa Hanguk* (Seoul: Baeksan Jaryowon, 2006).

[57] Kim Young-na, *20th Century Korean Art*; Kim Young-na, *20 segi ui Hanguk misul 2*, 21–50; Kim Young-na, "'Bakramhoe' raneun jeonsi gong-gan," 75–111.

the more banal elements of visual culture, through images found on post stamps, coins, architecture, postcards, advertisements, and textbooks.

Notwithstanding the meaningful investigations of the art historical overview of the period between the opening of ports to the 1910s, visual material of the period was generally used as a prelude to the beginnings of modern art of the 1920s and 30s. Art historical research has typically prioritised paintings, sculpture and crafts over photographs, illustrations, and designs, but even paintings of the 1870s to the 1910s were ambiguously categorised as both early modern or late Joseon art, which left many visual materials in the peripheries or "blind spots" in the discussion on the development of modern art and visual culture of Korea.[58] Nevertheless, recent scholars of Korean art history such as Mok Soo-hyun, Choi Yeol, Hong Sun-pyo, Yun Se-jin, Yun Beon-mo, and Jeong Ho-gyeong have conducted meaningful research on the development of modern visual culture and its various forms, as well as the conceptualisation of modern 'art' (*misul*, 미술, 美術) that took place from the 1880s.[59]

In this respect, this thesis aims to further contribute to the field by reviewing the qualifications of 'national imagery,' expanding on the conventional focus on the

---

[58] Mok Soo-hyun, "Hanguk gendae jeonhwan-gi gukga sigak sangjingmul" (PhD diss., Seoul, Seoul National University, 2008), 1–2; Kim Yun-su, *Hanguk misul 100-nyeon*, ed. National Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art, Korea, vol. 1 (Paju: Hangilsa, 2006).

[59] Choi Yeol, *Hanguk geundae misul ui yeoksa: 1800-1945 Hanguk misulsa sajeon* (Seoul: Yeolhwadang, 1998); Hong Sun-pyo, ed., *Geundae ui cheot gyeongheom: Gaehwagi ilsang munhwa reul jungsim euro* (Seoul: Ewha Yeoja Daehakgyo Chulpanbu, 2006); Hong Sun-pyo, *Hanguk geundae misulsa*; Yun Se-jin, "Geundaejeok 'misul' gaenyeom ui hyeongseong gwa misul insik"; Yun Beom-mo, *Hanguk geundae misul: Sidae jeongsin gwa jeongcheseong ui tamgu* (Seoul: Hangil Art, 2000); Jeong Ho-gyeong, "Hanguk geundaegi misul ui jedohwa gwajeong yeon-gu: Gaehang hu Han Il hapbang ggaji reul jungsim euro" (Master's thesis, Seoul, Korea National University of Arts, 2005); Jeong Ho-gyeong, "Hanguk geundaegi 'misul' yong-eo ui doip gwa geu jedojeok insik," *Hyeondae misulsa yeon-gu* 26 (December 2009): 7–36.

limited collections of official, state-produced images and those categorised as fine art. Certainly, it is the diversity of visual imagery and conceptions of what was deemed representative of the nation-state that makes this period meaningful, especially as it lies between dynastic Joseon and stateless Korea of the colonial period. Verifying the often-overlooked significance and effectiveness of employing visual imagery in nation-building agendas is also an important goal of this research. This research aims to contribute to explaining the remaining implications of pre-colonial imagery on present day Korean national representations and nationalism by providing an inclusive and interdisciplinary drawing of the dynamics of Korea at the turn of the twentieth century that goes beyond the portrayal of the period as an intermediary period between Joseon and colonial Korea.

Although the period is relatively less studied by art historians than the subsequent colonial period, some topics have been more actively studied, such as royal portraits of Gojong. Gwon Heang-ga's *Imiji wa gwonryeok* is focused on the formative changes of Gojong's portraits throughout his reign and the political significance of the public exploitation of the image.[60] Gwon Haeng-ga effectively explained the link between portraits and power by situating the different types of Gojong's portraits in the socio-political circumstances that they were created and consumed in, and highlighted the impact of increased direct state-level contact with the West on the development of Korean modern visual culture. The book differentiated itself from more general historical summations of Gojong's portraits by including analyses of Japanese royal

[60] Gwon Haeng-ga, *Imiji wa gwonryeok*. The word "*chosang"* (초상, 肖像) is used to describe both painted and photographed portraits.

portraits, the influence of British royal photographs, and comparisons of their compositions and pairings.[61]

The transformation of royal attires, objects of state affairs, rituals, and architectural designs to reflect Korea's elevated status as empire is explored in *Jeukwisik, gukwang ui tansaeng* and *Wangsil ui cheonji jesa*.[62] The former book studied the variations of coronation ceremonies and their development from the Joseon period to the Korean Empire, while the latter explained the construction of the Hwan-gudan Altar (환구단, 圜丘壇, also known as Won-gudan, 원구단, 圓丘壇) in 1897 as state efforts to elevate the country's status as empire. However, both books fell short of addressing the implications of maintaining and re-enforcing symbols of traditional Sinocentric customs, notwithstanding the superficial visual expressions of the elevated status of the Korean Empire to that equal to China.

Park Hyeon-jeong's study is one of the few that specifically focused on the Ihwamun and its art historical significance and socio-political associations.[63] Park Hyeon-jeong provided an overview of the historical background on the creation of the new royal emblem and its usage in 'Western objects' such as newly minted coins, court decoration, public architecture, military uniforms, print media, and post stamps; she argued that the emblem is historically significant as a purely Korean *munjang* (문장, 紋章, coat of arms), unlike the dragon or peony motif adopted from Chinese

---

[61] Gwon Haeng-ga, *Imiji wa gwonryeok*, 44–123, 172–204.
[62] Kim Ji-yeong et al., *Jeukwisik, gukwang ui tansaeng*; Kim Mun-sik et al., *Wangsil ui cheonji jesa* (Paju: Dolbegae, 2011).
[63] Park Hyeon-jeong, "Daehan Jegukgi oyatggot munyang yeon-gu," (Master's thesis, Seoul, Seoul National University, 2002). For Ihwamun used in stamp designs, see Lee Gyeong-ok, "Gaehwagi upyo munyang yeon-gu," (Master's thesis, Seoul, Ewha Womans University, 2007).

symbolisms.[64] She also explained that the creation of the Ihwamun and Korean flag and their application were heavily motivated and influenced by Western systems of national representation rather than Sinocentric visual traditions.[65] This thesis adds to the study on Ihwamun by including less conspicuous examples of the plum blossom imagery and studying the attempts of nationalistic intellectuals to use the emblem as a national symbol.

Like the Ihwamun, the Korean national flag was a newly created symbol of the nation-state. In "Geundae gukga ui 'gukgi' raneun sigak munhwa," Mok Soo-hyun offered her interpretations of the timeline of the creation of the Taegeukgi but moved away from the much debated question of who was responsible for the creation of the first Korean national flag.[66] Instead, she highlighted the political dynamics that went into play in the decision-making process of selecting a national flag and approached it as a product of the state's project to represent Korea abroad to participate in modern international relations.[67] Her article also investigated the iconographical origins of the Taegeuk and trigrams, their historical usage in both Korea and China, as well as the varying designs of the Korean national flag.[68] Mok Soo-hyun also conducted research

---

[64] Park Hyeon-jeong, "Daehan Jegukgi oyatggot munyang yeon-gu," 47.
[65] Park Hyeon-jeong, "Daehan Jegukgi oyatggot munyang yeon-gu," 45–47.
[66] Mok Soo-hyun, "Geundae gukga ui 'gukgi' raneun sigak munhwa," 309–44. For the various theories surrounding the creation of the Taegeukgi, see Han Cheol-ho, "Uri nara choecho ui gukgi ('Park Yeong-hyo Taegeukgi' 1882) wa Tongli Gyoseop Tongsang Samu Amun jejak gukgi (1884) ui wonhyeong balgyeon gwa geu yeoksajeok uiui," *Hanguk doklip undongsa yeon-gu* 31 (December 2008): 125–87; Gwon Seok-bong, "Gukgi jejeong ui yurae e daehan gwan-gyeon," *Yeoksa hakbo* 23 (April 1964): 41–54; Kim Mun-sik, "1882-nyeon Park Yeong-hyo ga sayonghan Joseon gukgi", *Munheon gwa haeseok tong-gwon* 36 (August 2006): 121–33; Kim Won-mo, *Taegeukgi ui yeonhyeok* (Seoul: Haengjeong Jachibu Uijeong-gwa, 1998).
[67] Mok Soo-hyun, "Geundae gukga ui 'gukgi' raneun sigak munhwa," 338.
[68] Mok Soo-hyun, "Geundae gukga ui 'gukgi' raneun sigak munhwa," 315–37.

on the relationship between the Taegeukgi and the formation of a Korean diasporic identity in the absence of a Korean state after annexation.[69] I draw on these points made in Mok Soo-hyun's comprehensive studies and offer analyses on the fragmented and contested usage of the Taegeukgi in diverse state and nation-building agendas and the eventual contrasting fates of the Taegeukgi and Ihwamun.

A more universal explanation of the national flag was provided by Gabriella Elgenius who connected national flags, public commemorations, and national holidays to nation-building. She argued that flags effectively symbolise and reaffirm national identities by authenticating national boundaries that are in their nature blurred and flexible.[70] She identified three primary functions of national symbolism; self-reference, differentiation, and recognition; visual pointers like flags remind the general public of their national identity and membership, provide a way of distinguishing 'others' to clarify national boundaries, and is a way of obtaining legitimacy among other contesting nations.[71] These points are applied in my approach to analysing examples of the Korean flag at the turn of the twentieth century and contemporary intellectuals' attempts to understand and apply Western flag culture to Korea.

A significant share of literature on visual representation of Korea in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries equate national imagery with state-produced imagery such as royal portraits, the national flag, and imperial emblem. However, the new Korean public went on to reproduce images provided by the state to alter and re-establish these images in new socio-political contexts. Representative imageries were

---

[69] Mok Soo-hyun, "Diaspora ui jeongcheseong gwa Taegeukgi: 20 segi jeonban-gi ui Miju Hanin eul jungsim euro," *Sahoe wa yeoksa* 86 (2010): 47–79.
[70] Elgenius, *Symbols of Nations and Nationalism*.
[71] Elgenius, *Symbols of Nations and Nationalism,* 2.

also interpreted, reproduced, and consumed by foreign agents, contributing to an international acknowledgement of the Korean nation-state. In this process, mass production and reproduction of images through modern media such as photography, newspapers, and textbooks took centre place.

The development of photography and print media was instrumental in decentring the state as sole manipulators of national imagery. In *Hanguk sajinsa: 1631-1945*, Choi In-jin gave an expansive historical account of the import of photographic technology and growth of photographic practices in Korea from the late nineteenth century.[72] She also placed Gojong's photographs into the wider narrative of the development and commercial consumption of modern Korean portrait photography, and provided detailed background information on the gradual diversification of photographs and their dissemination in twentieth century Korea.[73] In *Hanguk sinmun sajinsa*, she also presented a more in-depth analysis of photographic images used in newspapers from the onset of the twentieth century to the colonial period.[74] These comprehensive readings on the history of modern Korean photography offers an important chronological reference used in this thesis to understand the accessibility of imagery and the role of individuals and non-governmental organisations in politically utilising photographic images in state and national representation.

Non-state actors were influential in creating representative images of ethnocentric national history. The importance of historical narratives in forming a modern nation-state was supported by A.D. Smith who explained that "ethno-

---

[72] Choi In-jin, *Hanguk sajinsa: 1631-1945* (Seoul: Nunbit, 1999).
[73] Choi In-jin, *Hanguk sajinsa*.
[74] Choi In-jin, *Hanguk sinmun sajinsa* (Seoul: Yeolhwadang, 1992).

symbolism" in myths and historical figures give nationalism its power.[75] He argued that patriotic death and self-sacrifice for the country exemplify the "overriding commitment and bond for the community" that cannot be fully explained with the idea that the nation is a mere composite of political sovereignty over a territory occupied by people of the same cultural history.[76] According to Smith, this is where myths of ethnic origins create an inclusive nationhood and ethnic bond that leads to the popular appeal of nationalism and fervent dedication to the nation.[77] In this research, Smith's argument is applied to the Korean case of constructing and altering ethnic myths, specifically in the selection of a dominant ethnic progenitor.[78]

Hong Sun-pyo led the study of printed arts (*inswae misul,* 인쇄미술, 印刷美術) of early twentieth century Korea and delivered an overview of the development of mass-produced print imagery.[79] He argued that textbook illustrations were instrumental to the growth of printed arts and an image-oriented education system dependent on the visual authentication of knowledge.[80] Hong Sun-pyo also drew similarities with the Japanese experience of nurturing a nationalistic public through modern education, textbooks, and illustrations to effectively mobilise the public, promote increased awareness of national boundaries, and induce assimilation and allegiance to the Japanese Empire.[81] In analysing illustrations of historical figures,

---

[75] Smith, *Myths and Memories of the Nation,* 9.
[76] Smith, *Myths and Memories of the Nation,* 6, 57.
[77] Smith, *Myths and Memories of the Nation,* 9.
[78] Andre Schmid's explanations on the historical developments of Dangun superiority as part of Korea's separation from China in *Korea Between Empires* serves also as an important argument to support the Korean case of ethnic symbolism. Schmid, *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919*, 175–81.
[79] Hong Sun-pyo, ed., *Geundae ui cheot gyeongheom.*
[80] Hong Sun-pyo, ed., *Geundae ui cheot gyeongheom*, 23–29.
[81] Hong Sun-pyo, "Hanguk gaehwagi ui saphwa yeon-gu: Chodeung gyogwaseo reul

Hong Sun-pyo also emphasised the fact that Dangun appeared as Korea's ethnic progenitor over Gija from the twentieth century and provided some insight to the stylistic origins of his portrait illustration.[82]

Interestingly, Andre Schmid's observation that the historical focus on Dangun was a relatively new phenomenon that gained weight after 1905 was not properly addressed in Hong Sun-pyo's study on textbook illustrations on historical figures.[83] I aim to fill these gaps by referencing actual illustrations of both Dangun and Gija and connecting them to the more recent works such as "20 segi cho Dangun yeongjeong ui bogeup gwa hwabon geomto" by Kim Seong-hwan that investigated the stylistic changes of Dangun ancestral portraits from 1910 and their popular dissemination in the colonial period as a result of "Dangun-nationalism" (단군 민족주의, 檀君 民族主義) that began after 1905.[84] This thesis also supplements points that were simplified in Park Carey's work on historical figures of *Yunyeon pildok* (유년필독, 幼年必讀, 1907) by addressing the impact of the illustrations on the formation of Korea's ethnocentric nationalism and by looking at both the debilitating and ironically beneficial impact of censorship on representations of Korean history and nationhood toward and after 1910.

Another case in which visual depictions of historical figures came to symbolise nationhood is the depiction of nationalistic martyrs like Min Yeong-hwan, as studied by

---

jungsim euro," *Misulsa nondan* 15 (December 2002): 260-261.

[82] Hong Sun-pyo, "Hanguk gaehwagi ui saphwa yeon-gu," 281-282.

[83] Note that historic accuracy in visual representation is a separate issue. As Hong Sun-pyo explains, in the case of Dangun images, his headgear and facial features were most likely modelled after Western depictions of heroic figures. Hong Sun-pyo, "Hanguk gaehwagi ui saphwa yeon-gu," 280–82; Schmid, *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919*, 178.

[84] Kim Seong-hwan, "20 segi cho Dangun yeongjeong ui bogeup gwa hwabon geomto," *Dongbuka yeoksa nonchong* 65 (September 2019): 201–4.

Choi Yeol.[85] Choi Yeol provided stylistic analyses and historic accounts behind the creation of *hyeoljukdo* (혈죽도, 血竹圖, Blood Bamboo paintings) that were reproduced and disseminated as proof of Min Yeong-hwan's fidelity and a stimulus for national resistance.[86] I also interpret textbook illustrations of martyrs like Min Yeong-hwan and photographs of An Jung-geun using Lee Seong-hyeon's historical take on Min Yeong-hwan's death and the formation of *sun-guk damron* (순국 담론, 殉國談論, discourse on patriotic martyrdom).[87]

The Independence Arch (독립문, 獨立門), Korea's first modern public monument erected by the Independence Club, is another prominent visual representation produced by non-state actors during this period. Most of the extensive volumes of works written on the Independence Club and the construction of the club's Western-style gate recognise the importance of the monument that celebrated Korea's departure from tributary relations with China and newfound autonomy.[88] In "Doklipmun: Geundae ginyeommul gwa mandeuleojineun gieok," Mok Soo-hyun explained that Seo Jae-pil's design of the monument, based on the Arc de Triomphe, derives from European visual customs of erecting a grand structure to commemorate historical events.[89] She argued that this signalled the development of a modern visual culture in which a public monument came to act as a visual embodiment of collective

---

[85] Choi Yeol, "Hyeoljuk ui norae, Gyejeong Min Yeong-hwan," 212–41.
[86] Choi Yeol, "Hyeoljuk ui norae, Gyejeong Min Yeong-hwan," 212–41.
[87] Park Carey, "Hanguk geundae yeoksa inmulhwa," *Misulsa hakbo* 26 (June 2006): 33–60; Lee Seong-hyeon, "Min Yeong-hwan ui 'sun-guk' damron e daehan gochal," 99–146.
[88] Kim Se-min, "Yeongeunmun, Mohwagwan ui geonrip gwa Doklipmun, Doklipgwan euro ui byeoncheon," *Seoul gwa yeoksa*, no. 82 (2012): 141–78.
[89] Mok Soo-hyun, "Doklipmun."

memory, whereas Yeong-eunmun Gate (영은문, 迎恩門), which demolished to erect the Independence Arch, served the purpose of marking restricted areas and symbolised the divinity of a king or emperor.[90]

This idea of collective memory applied in my research was further explored in *A Companion to Political Geography* and *A Companion to Cultural Geography*, linked to space, placeness, and national geography.[91] Karen Till and John Agnew recognised the importance of "places of memory" in creating a bond between citizens by reminding them of the collective past of their nation-state.[92] Among various places of memory, the selective creation and appropriation of natural landscapes played a crucial role in nation-building as "the nation [was] given concrete form as a reminder of what [']we[']have been through and why [']we['] need to remember" and supported "social myths of identity."[93]

Popular landscapes of Geumgangsan Mountain and Baekdusan Mountain and their contributions to Korean nation-building have been investigated by Choi Yu-gyeong, Park Eun-jung, Yang Bo-gyeong, and Park Chan-seung. Choi Yu-gyeong analysed Choe Nam-seon's (최남선, 崔南善, 1890-1957) *Geumgang yechan* (금강예찬, 金剛禮讚, 1924-1927) and Go Hui-dong's (고희동, 高羲東, 1886-1965)

---

[90] Mok Soo-hyun, "Doklipmun," 67-68.
[91] John Agnew, Katharyne Mitchell, and Gerard Toal, *A Companion to Political Geography* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003); James S. Duncan, Nuala C. Johnson, and Richard H. Schein, *A Companion to Cultural Geography* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2004).
[92] Karen E. Till, "Places of Memory," in *A Companion to Political Geography* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), 289–301; John Agnew, "Nationalism," in *A Companion to Cultural Geography* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2004), 223–37.
[93] Agnew, "Nationalism," 233; Till, "Places of Memory"; Karen E. Till, "Staging the Past: Landscape Designs, Cultural Identity and Erinnerungspolitik at Berlin's Neue Wache," *Ecumene* 6, no. 3 (July 1999): 255.

series of Geumgangsan Mountain paintings that promoted the mountain as a symbolic landscape of the Korean nation-state, and Park Eun-jung investigated Choe Nam-seon's efforts to form a Korean ethnic identity and national consolidation through Geumgangsan Mountain.[94] Yang Bo-gyeong researched the depiction of the Baekdusan Mountain in traditional pictorial maps throughout the Joseon period and the gradual conceptualisation of Korean national territory with Baekdusan Mountain as the central marker of northern territorial boundaries.[95] Park Chan-seung highlighted the symbolic significance of the Baekdusan Mountain as the place of origin of the Korean ethnic nation.[96] This thesis combines such points under the overarching theme of the construction of an image of the territorial Korean nation-state and the embedding of collective memory within the represented space.

The demarcation of Korean national territory and the growth of modern geographic knowledge in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth centuries have been widely investigated, but studies of Korean territorial awareness and maps of the Korean Peninsula have generally been led by historians and geographers.[97]

---

[94] Choi Yu-gyeong, "Choe Nam-seon ui Geumgang yechan gwa Go Hui-dong ui Geumgangsan yeonjak sseo pyohyeondoen gukto chanmi," *Bigyo munhak* 64 (October 2014): 281–305; Park Eun-jeong, "20 segi cho Geumgangsan pyosang yeon-gu: Choe Nam-seon ui Pung-ak giyu wa Geumgang yechan eul jungsim euro," *Dongbanghak* 46 (February 2022): 245–67.

[95] Yang Bo-gyeong, "Joseon sidae ui 'Baekdu daegan' gaenyeom ui hyeongseong," *Jindan hakbo* 83 (June 1997): 85–106; Yang Bo-gyeong, "Yet jido e natanan bukbang insik gwa Baekdusan," *Yeoksa bipyeong*, Joseon sidae bukbang jiyeok e daehan insik, 35 (May 1996): 300–322.

[96] Park Chan-seung, "Baekdusan ui 'minjok yeongsan' euro ui pyosanghwa," *Dong Asia munhwa yeon-gu* 55 (November 2013): 9–36.

[97] Park Seon-yeong, "Geundae Dong Asia ui gukgyeong insik gwa Gando: Jido e natanan Han Jung gukgyeongseon byeonhwa reul jungsim euro," *Jungguksa yeon-gu* 32 (October 2004): 199–233; Park Tae-ho, "Geundae gyemong-gi sinmun eseo yeongtojeok gong-gan gaenyeom ui hyeongseong," in *Geundae gyemong-gi jisik ui balgyeon gwa sayu jipyeong ui hwakdae* (Seoul: Somyeong Chulpan, 2006), 145–87;

Nevertheless, the role of selecting and reproducing images of national territory in Korean nation-building has been further explored in art historical terms by Mok Soo-hyun in "Gukto ui sigakjeok pyosang gwa aeguk gyeoming ui jirihak."[98] Here, she highlighted the importance of map imagery that clearly marked the shape and boundaries of the Korean Peninsula in forming modern notions of national territory and studied the application of Choe Nam-seon's tiger-shaped Hanbando in nationalistic geographic education from 1908 to the 1920s.[99] In addition, Sin Su-gyeong researched the changes made to visual references in geography textbook illustrations of the colonial period and their impact on the perception of Korean national territory and on colonial rule.[100]

Benedict Anderson also provided crucial insight in understanding map imagery and their impact in visualising the nation-state. Anderson coined the term "map-as-logo" to describe simplified images of national territories that have become "[i]nstantly recognizable, everywhere visible" emblems that "penetrated deep into the popular

---

Kim Hyeon-cheol, "Hanmal Joseon ui daeoe gwan-gye wa yeongto insik: Park Eun-sik Sin Chae-ho ui jagang sasang gwa godaesa insik eul jungsim euro," *Manju yeon-gu* 12 (December 2011): 101–29; Seo Tae-yeol, "Yeongto gyoyuk ui ganyeomhwa wa yeongto gyoyuk mohyeong e daehan jeopgeun," *Hanguk jiri hwan-gyeong gyoyuk hakhoe* 17, no. 3 (December 2009): 197–210; Bando Miya, "Daehan Jegukgi ui toji josa wa jido jejak e gwanhan gochal: Hanseongbu daechukjeok silchukdo reul jungsim euro," *Jirihak nonchong* 52 (September 2008): 49–73; Bang Dong-in, *Hanguk jido ui yeoksa* (Seoul: Sin-gusa, 2001); Jeong In-cheol, *Hanbando, Seoyang gojido ro mannada* (Seoul: Pureungil, 2015); Seoul Museum of History, *(Lee Chan gijeung) uri yet jido* (Seoul: Seoul Museum of History, 2006).

[98] Mok Soo-hyun, "Gukto ui sigakjeok pyosang gwa aeguk gyeomong ui jirihak: Choe Nam-seon ui nonui reul jungsim euro," *Dong Asia munhwa yeon-gu* 57 (May 2014): 13–39.

[99] Mok Soo-hyun, "Gukto ui sigakjeok pyosang gwa aeguk gyeomong ui jirihak."

[100] Sin Su-gyeong, "Ilje gangjeomgi jiri gyogwaseo saphwa yeon-gu: Naejae doen ideologi wa pyohyeon bangsik ui byeonhyeong," *Misulsa nondan* 29 (December 2009): 249–72.

imagination" that formed powerful nationalisms.[101] I use Anderson's concept to analyse Choe Nam-seon's tiger peninsula and how simplified depictions of geographical boundaries came to be "detached from its geographical context" and used as popular icons that the public could easily identify with.[102] Overall, Benedict Anderson's well-known theory of the nation as an "imagined community" is also applied to this research, but in the case of Korea at the turn of the twentieth century, the identification of territorial boundaries and the constituents of the collective nation was well-established, especially compared to European nations.[103] Rather, what had to be imagined was 'how' the Korean nation wanted to be understood and perceived.

This review has looked at an expansive range of literature from various fields of study. The topic of the Korean nation-state and its representation through visual imagery in the 1880s-1910s inevitably calls for an interdisciplinary approach, crossing between art history, history, political science, history, and more. There are, however, shortfalls of interdisciplinary literatures relevant to this topic. For instance, most visual materials mentioned in non-art-historical literatures pop up sporadically as supplementary evidence to validate historical events without any in-depth discussion. Moreover, there is a general assumption that art or visual materials are unilaterally influenced by contemporary socio-political changes, while the impact visual culture has had on society and politics is frequently overlooked.

---

[101] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 175. See also Mark S. Monmonier, *How to Lie with Maps* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).
[102] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 175.
[103] Charles Tilly, *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1992* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1992); E. J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Hugh Seton-Watson, *Nations and States: An Enquiry into the Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism* (London: Methuen, 1977).

On the other hand, art historians habitually refer to well-known historical events and socio-political ideals, but these descriptions often remain as simple background information. Moreover, historical and socio-political contexts tend to be concentrated on supplementing discussions surrounding the Westernisation of painting styles and the categorisation of art into either traditional or modern. Although these issues are crucial to the discussion of modern Korean art history, there is a need to diversify topics of discussion. Fortunately, over the last twenty years, there has been a substantial increase in art historical publications concerning materials that were conventionally excluded from the narrow definition of 'fine arts' such as stamps, coinage, advertisements, and photography.[104] The expansion and diversification of art historical narratives will provide comprehensive insight on the relationship between art or visual imagery and society that it is produced and consumed in, especially in the dynamic turn of the twentieth century.

Research on this period also requires careful examination of nationalistic narratives in secondary literatures. Strong nationalistic and emotional undertones can

---

[104] Jin Gi-hong, *Gu Hanguk sidae ui upyo wa ujeong* (Seoul: Gyeongmun-gak, 1964); Lee Gyeong-ok, "Gaehwagi upyo munyang yeon-gu"; Kim Pan-su, "Geundae Ilbon hwapye yangsik ui Seoyanghwa," *Sahoe wa yeoksa* 81 (March 2009): 213–52; Kim Bong-cheol, "Guhanmal 'Sechang Yanghaeng' gwang-go ui gyeongje, munhwasajeok uimi," *Gwang-gohak yeon-gu* 13, no. 5 (December 2002): 117–35; Park Hye-jin, "Gaehwagi sinmun gwang-go sigak imiji yeon-gu" (Master's thesis, Seoul, Ewha Womans University, 2009); "Geumgangsan tamseunghoe mojip gwang-go," *Maeil sinbo*, May 6, 1915; Gwon Haeng-ga, "Geundaejeok sigak cheje ui hyeongseong gwajeong: Cheong Il jeonjaeng jeonhu Ilbonin sajinsa ui sajin hwaldong eul jungsim euro," *Hanguk geunhyeondae misulsahak* 26 (December 2013): 195–228; Gwon Hyeok-hui, Geundaejeok juche ui jaehyeon gwa hyeongseong (Seoul: Mineumsa, 2005); Han Hye-yeon, "Geundaejeok juche ui jaehyeon gwa hyeongseong: 19 segi chosang sajin yeon-gu" (Master's thesis, Seoul, Jungang University, 2000); Lee Gyeong-min, "Daehan Jegukgi jeonhu sajin-gwan munhwa: Chosang sajin ui saengsan gwa yutong bangsik eul jungsim euro," in *Daehan Jeguk ui misul: Bit ui gil eul ggum gguda* (Seoul: National Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art, 2018), 132–37.

easily be detected in works of significant influence, especially when dealing with topics related to colonial occupation. The use of subjective terms such as '*uri'* (우리, our, us) is prevalent and many scholars end up dichotomising events, people, and artworks into either nationalist or collaborative.[105] Scholars like Hong Sun-pyo and Hyung Il Pai have acknowledged this problem, claiming that the strong anticolonial view of history and remaining resistant nationalism has resulted in yet another distortion in the narrative of Korean modern art history.[106]

Conversely, these issues mean that the study of the nation, nationalism, and its embodiment in art is still relevant to this day. To fill some gaps between the expansive range of scholarly works, and between those written in Korean and English, Chapter 1 will address the issues in discrepancies between Western usage of key terminologies such as the state, nation, nation-state, and their Korean equivalents, and their periodic developments as seen in Korean print media of the 1880s-1910s. This will facilitate the understanding of the context in which Western models were adopted and transformed by late nineteenth century reformist movements and created a Korean understanding of the modern nation-state, or *geundae minjok gukga* (근대 민족국가, 近代 民族國家).

---

105 Shin Gi-Wook and Michael Edson Robinson, eds., *Colonial Modernity in Korea* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2000).
106 Hong Sun-pyo, *Hanguk geundae misulsa*, 10; Hyung Il Pai, "The Search for Korea's Past: Japanese Colonial Archaeology in the Korean Peninsula (1905-1945)," *East Asian History*, no. 7 (June 1994): 25–48.

Methodological Issues of Approaching Visual Imagery in the 1880s-1910s

As mentioned above, the period of the 1880s to the 1910s is meaningful as it marked the beginning of the formation of a modern Korean nation-state as well as the gradual adoption of Western visual media and culture. However, excluding early examples of the Korean flag, photographs of Gojong, and the Ihwamun, a significant share of images studied in this research were created and popularised from the beginning of the twentieth century.[107] Concentration of images in the later years can be attributed to the lack of mass print technologies and public aversion to photography in the 1880s and early 1890s. Nevertheless, the 1880s provides important examples of early visual material that help explain the developments in representative imagery and the multifaceted interpretations of the Korean nation-state at the turn of the twentieth century.

The development of mass print media is an important factor that directly contributed to the proliferation of reproducible imagery in Korea. In 1882, Park Yeong-hyo returned from his diplomatic mission to Japan with a set of manual letterpress and movable type and brought a Japanese newspaper editor and print technician Inoue Kakugoro (井上角五郎, 1860-1939) at the recommendation of Fukuzawa Yukichi (福澤諭吉, 1835-1901).[108] Modern printing facilities were first formed with the

---

[107] Even the flag and imperial emblems were most arduously reproduced, and their images actively consumed among the public toward 1900.

[108] Jo Maeng-gi, *Hanguk eonronsa ui ihae* (Seoul: Sogang University, 1997); Kim Yeong-hun, "Gaehwagi gyogwaseo sok ui segye wa yeoksa: Man-guk jiri wa man-guksa reul jungsim euro," *Bigyo munhwa yeon-gu* 16, no. 2 (July 2010): 8; Kim Bong-hui, *Hanguk gaehwagi seojeok munhwa yeon-gu* (Seoul: Ewha Yeoja Daehakgyo Chulpanbu, 1999), 13–35; Seo Eun-yeong, "Geundae inswae munhwa ui hyeongseong gwa Daehan minbo 'saphwa' ui deungjang," 546, 554. For Inoue Kakugoro's accounts

establishment of Bakmun-guk (박문국, 博文局, Office of Culture and Information) in 1883 and the creation of Korea's first state-produced newspaper *Hanseong sunbo* (한성순보, 漢城旬報, 1883-1884) and *Hanseong jubo* (한성주보, 漢城周報, 1886-1888), with the guidance of Japanese technicians.[109]

Circulation of newspapers was still limited in the 1880s and 1890s due to the lack of printing facilities, "illiteracy, the isolation of many communities, and the lack of purchasing power in the general public."[110] However, the "real outreach" of newspapers was most likely more broader "as it was customary to recite newspapers collectively in schools, city residential quarters, and villages."[111] These newspapers, "supplemented by verbal communication of its content between those who had direct access to it and those who did not, did serve to relay information on certain issues and events."[112] Circulation rates, though meaningful in inferring the different developmental stages of press media in Korea, should be contextually referenced with the understanding that media would have reached far more audiences than that implied by circulation rates.[113]

---

of his stay in Seoul, see Inoue Kakugoro, "Hanseong jijanmong," in *Seoul e namgyeodun ggum*, trans. Han Sang-il (Seoul: Konkuk Daehakgyo Chulpanbu, 1993), 23-73.

[109] *Hanseong sunbo* was the first modern newspaper published in Korea. After the Gapsin Coup in 1884 and the discontinuation of the paper, *Hanseong jubo* succeeded it. Hong Seon-ung, *Hanguk geundae panhwasa* (Seoul: Misul Munhwa, 2014), 44–48.

[110] C. I. Eugene Kim and Han-kyo Kim, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism, 1876-1910* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), 158.

[111] Kim Min-hwan, *Hanguk eonronsa* (Seoul: Nanam Chulpan, 2002), 138–40; Vladimir Mikhaĭlovich Tikhonov, "Masculinizing the Nation: Gender Ideologies in Traditional Korea and in the 1890s-1900s Korean Enlightenment Discourse," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 66, no. 4 (November 2007): 1053.

[112] C. I. Eugene Kim and Han-kyo Kim, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism, 1876-1910,* 158.

[113] Schmid, *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919*, 52–53.

Isabella Bird Bishop (1831-1904) also noted the meaningful development of press that occurred in Seoul from 1894 to 1897:

> "The sight of newsboys passing through the streets with bundles of newspaper in [Eonmun (언문, 諺文, Hangeul)] under their arms, and of men reading them in their shops, is among the novelties of 1897. Besides the *Independent*, there are now in Seoul two weeklies in [Eonmun] the *Korean Christian Advocate*, and the *Christian News*; and the Korean Independence Club publishes a monthly magazine, *The Chosen*, dealing with politics, science, and foreign news, which has 2,000 subscribers. Seoul has also a paper, the *Kanjo Shimbo*, or *Seoul News*, in mixed Japanese and Korean script, published on alternate days, and there are newspapers in the Japanese language, both in [Busan (부산, 釜山)] and [Jemulpo (제물포, 濟物浦, old name of Incheon, 인천, 仁川)]. All these, and the admirable *Korean Repository*, are the growth of the last three years."[114]

Despite the gradual increase in newspapers and journals in the late 1890s, even popular newspapers such as *Hwangseong sinmun* and *Doklip sinmun* continuously struggled with low readership, averaging two to three thousand copies.[115] Circulation

---

[114] Isabella Bird Bishop, *Korea and Her Neighbors: A Narrative of Travel, with an Account of the Recent Vicissitudes and Present Position of the Country* (New York: F. H. Revell Co., 1898), 440.

[115] In addition to censorship, scripts used in publications (Chinese script, Hangeul, mixed, or English) would also have affected readership. Until 1895, vernacular and privately managed newspaper was yet to be published, except for government publications such as *Hanseong sunbo, Hanseong jubo,* and *Gwanbo* (관보, 官報, 1894-1910). However, starting with *Doklip sinmun* in 1896, several other private newspapers in vernacular script such as *Daehan maeil sinbo* (1904-1910) were published. Once *Daehan maeil sinbo* started printing a variety of scripts, circulation rose to around thirteen thousand. See Schmid, *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919*, 51; Hanguk

and access to newspapers were significantly improved from 1905 and by 1909, there were seven daily newspapers in circulation with *Daehan maeil sinbo* as the most widely circulated, reaching around ten times that of any other newspapers.[116] *Daehan maeil sinbo*'s three editions of vernacular, mixed, and English scripts had 13,256 subscribers by 1907, and *Hwangseong sinmun* and *Jeguk sinmun* had 5,357 readerships combined, most of them consisting of "bureaucrats, modernist yangban landlords, richer traders, and peasants."[117] Moreover, nationally published publications flourished from 1905, whereas those of the 1890s were concentrated within and around Seoul.[118]

Images in mass print media took longer to flourish due to the lack of adequate printing equipment and technology needed for the printing of intricate imagery.[119] The editors of *Hwangseong sinmun* lamented that the lack of illustrations and maps in the paper is a significant flaw and argued that foreign land, machines, and figures should be illustrated in their newspaper as it helps those less educated understand complex issues at first glance; they claimed that although it is unrealistic to emulate papers like the more expensive but popular weekly papers in New York due to the lack of printing technology in Korea, hiring Japanese technicians would facilitate this goal.[120] The

---

eonronsa yeon-guhoe, ed., *Daehan maeil sinbo yeon-gu*.

116 In addition to newspapers, there were eight monthly journals in 1909 and two of them were circulated nationwide while the rest were confined to provincial regions. C. I. Eugene Kim and Han-kyo Kim, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism, 1876-1910*, 159.

117 The highly nationalist newspaper was secretly financed by Gojong's court. Kim Min-hwan, *Hanguk eonronsa*, 230; Gye Hun-mo, *Hanguk eonron yeonpyo: 1881-1945* (Seoul: Gwanhun keulreop sinyeong yeon-gu gigeum, 1979), 128; Tikhonov, "Masculinizing the Nation," 1053.

118 Jin Deok-gyu et al., "Geundae jeonhwan-gi (1894-1910) inswae maeche reul tonghae bon geundae jisik gwa gaenyeom ui hyeongseong mit byeonmo yangsang e gwanhan yeon-gu jung-gan bogoseo" (Seoul: Hanguk Yeon-gu Jaedan (NRF), 2006): 1.

119 Hong Sun-pyo, ed., *Geundae ui cheot gyeongheom*, 23–24.

120 Yi Beom-jin, "Giseo," *Hwangseong sinmun*, 24 November, 1899.

government was suffering from fiscal deficit and was only able to purchase proper printing equipment in 1898.[121] It was only in the early 1910s when halftone print and rotary press facilities were established in Korea, which allowed for the mass printing of more complex images.[122]

The delayed development of photography in Korea was also a contributing factor. Early photographers like Kim Yong-won (김용원, 金鏞元, 1842-1892) began to produce photographs in Seoul from 1883, but there was great fear of and disinclination to photography among the public until the Gabo Reforms, and even more affordable printed photographs in newspapers were not prominent prior to the colonial period.[123] Other than some exceptions like *Geuriseudo sinmun* (그리스도신문, The Christian News, 1897-1910) that used lithographic print for photographic imagery, photographs were not frequently printed in newspapers until the late 1910s.[124] Nevertheless, during the Korean Empire period, private printing facilities slowly grew in number and the proliferation of lead types and lithography enhanced productivity and quality of prints to an extent, and improved general accessibility of imagery in newspapers, journals, and textbooks, especially after 1906.[125]

---

121 Kim Bong-hui, *Hanguk gaehwagi seojeok munhwa yeon-gu*, 34–35; Seo Eun-yeong, "Geundae inswae munhwa ui hyeongseong gwa Daehan minbo 'saphwa' ui deungjang," 559.

122 Kim Bong-hui, *Hanguk gaehwagi seojeok munhwa yeon-gu*, 45–46; Hong Sun-pyo, "Geundaejeok ilsang gwa pungsok ui jingjo: Hanguk gaehwagi inswae misul gwa sinmunmul imiji," *Misulsa nondan* 21 (December 2005): 253–79; Seo Eun-yeong, "Geundae inswae munhwa ui hyeongseong gwa Daehan minbo 'saphwa' ui deungjang," 559.

123 Choi In-jin, *Hanguk sajinsa*, 83–136.

124 Kim Yeong-hun, "Gaehwagi gyogwaseo sok ui segye wa yeoksa," 23.

125 Hong Sun-pyo, ed., *Geundae ui cheot gyeongheom*, 19–28; Hong Seon-ung, *Hanguk geundae panhwasa*, 76.

Moreover, it is worth noting that while exhibition cultures did begin to develop from this period, the establishment of permanent museums was slow to take place. The Yi Royal Family Museum (이왕가박물관, 李王家博物館) was established in 1909 under the influence of the Japanese Residency-General (통감부, 統監府, 1905-1910), but its function as a public, modern museum developed toward the 1920s.[126] In 1915, the Government-General (총독부, 總督府, 1910-1945) hosted the Joseon Industrial Exhibition (조선물산공진회, 朝鮮物產共進會) in Gyeongbokgung Palace (경복궁, 景福宮), tearing down up to a third of original palace grounds to construct Western-style buildings for the display of antique Korean art and modern paintings by both Korean and Japanese painters.[127] On this site, the Government-General Museum (조선총독부박물관, 朝鮮總督府博物館) was established, after which it was promoted as a popular attraction throughout the colonial period.[128] Though the establishment of such modern art institutions marked a pivotal change in the visual culture of Korea in the twentieth century, Korean influence over curation and museum administration was greatly limited, with Japanese authorities implementing and executing most cultural agendas after 1907.[129]

---

126 In the early years, it resembled traditional court treasuries in its core function. See Mok Soo-hyun, "Ilje ha Yiwang-ga Bakmulgwan ui sikminjijeok seong-gyeok," *Misulsahak yeon-gu*, no. 227 (September 2009): 81-104.
127 Charlotte Horlyck, *Korean Art: From the 19th Century to the Present* (London: Reaktion Books, 2017): 31.
128 Oh Young-chan, "Sikminji bakmulgwan ui yeoksa mandeulgi: Joseon chongdokbu bakmulgwan sangseol jeonsi ui byeoncheon," *Yeoksa wa hyeonsil*, no. 110 (December 2018): 219-51.
129 For an overview of the development of modern museums in Korea from 1900, see Jungwon Lee, "Conflation of the Japanese Colonial Museums in Korea," *The International Journal of the Inclusive Museum* 14, no 2 (August 2021): 83-94; Park Hun-ha, "Hanguk geundae bamulgwan ui gyebohak: Minjok juui wa jiyeok ui giwon," *Inmunhak nonchong* 12, no. 1 (February 2007): 115-133.

The short period between 1907 and 1909 saw a peak in the publishing of textbooks. Already by 1908, there were three to four thousand private schools in Korea.[130] The instituting of private schools began to be regulated from August 1908, but even in May of 1910, out of the 2,250 Hakbu-approved (학부, 學部, Ministry of Education) private schools, 1,402 were those founded by Koreans.[131] Accordingly, many private textbooks were actively produced, including those with illustrations. Today, 43 types of textbooks that were published until 1909 survive and 13 of them contain illustrations, most of them found in Korean language, ethics, and history textbooks.[132] By this point on, accessibility to education and imagery was significantly enhanced.

Readership and impact of printed imagery was affected by censorship when the Residency-General and Government-General slowly began to censor politically-sensitive material from 1900.[133] Generally, the mid to late 1890s is often characterised as a period of civil political activities led by the Independence Club, whereas the period after the abolishment of *Doklip sinmun* in 1899 to 1905 is seen as a return to statist control and repression of civil organisations and media.[134] The signing of the 1905

---

[130] Cha Seok-gi, "Gawhwagi sarip hakgyo gyogwaseo bunseok ui yeon-gu: Gukeo gyogwaseo e natanan minjok, sahoe, gaein," *Hanguk gyoyuk munje yeon-guso nonmunjip*, no. 8 (December 1993): 60.

[131] In addition, there were around 150 governmental and semi-governmental educational establishments. Jeong Jae-cheol, *Ilje ui dae Hanguk sikminji gyoyuk jeongchaeksa* (Seoul: Iljisa, 1985), 255; Cha Seok-gi, "Gawhwagi sarip hakgyo gyogwaseo bunseok ui yeon-gu," 62; Carter J. Eckert et al., *Korea Old and New: A History* (Seoul: Iljogak, 1990), 247–53; Tikhonov, "Masculinizing the Nation," 1054.

[132] Hong Sun-pyo, "Bokje doen gaehwa wa gyemong ui imiji," *Wolgan misul*, December 2002, 136.

[133] Japanese censorship and control were somewhat alleviated in the 1920s when the March First Movement compelled Japanese authorities to adopt the so-called 'cultural rule.'

[134] Jin Deok-gyu et al., "Geundae jeonhwan-gi (1894-1910) inswae maeche reul

Eulsa Treaty ironically led to greater vitality in media, civil movements, due to the decrease in state authority throughout the first decade of the twentieth century.[135] However, Japanese authorities soon began controlling the press as preparation for colonial rule, despite contemporary hopes that the protectorate status of Korea would not lead to annexation.[136] The censoring of newspaper articles and even the discontinuation of whole newspapers after the 1907 Publishing Law (Sinmunjibeop, 신문지법, 新聞紙法) deeply impacted the agenda-setting process of socio-political issues surrounding nation-building.[137]

Mass confiscation and banning of nationalistic textbooks after 1907 not only affected the accessibility of textbooks but shaped the ways in which students were educated and perceived the nation-state. Textbooks were heavily censored from 1908 when the Residency-General started to exert major influence on Hakbu and even private

---

tonghae bon geundae jisik gwa gaenyeom ui hyeongseong mit byeonmo yangsang e gwanhan yeon-gu jung-gan bogoseo," 35–36.

[135] There was a lack of critical text published during the period after the forced abolishment of the Independence Club and *Doklip sinmun* to 1904 due to state repression of civil political activities. "Giseo," *Hwangseong sinmun*, 12 November, 1900; "Giseo," *Hwangseong sinmun*, 9 September, 1902; "Nonseol," *Hwangseong sinmun*, 7 April, 1902; Guksa Pyeonchan Wiwonhoe, *Gojong sidaesa*, vol. 5 (Seoul: Guksa Pyeonchan Wiwonhoe, 1971); Guksa Pyeonchan Wiwonhoe, *Gojong sidaesa*, vol. 6 (Seoul: Guksa Pyeonchan Wiwonhoe, 1972); Jin Deok-gyu et al., "Geundae jeonhwan-gi (1894-1910) inswae maeche reul tonghae bon geundae jisik gwa gaenyeom ui hyeongseong mit byeonmo yangsang e gwanhan yeon-gu jung-gan bogoseo," 36–37.

[136] Jin Deok-gyu et al., "Geundae jeonhwan-gi (1894-1910) inswae maeche reul tonghae bon geundae jisik gwa gaenyeom ui hyeongseong mit byeonmo yangsang e gwanhan yeon-gu jung-gan bogoseo," 38.

[137] Sinmunjibeop, Korea's first press regulation, was promulgated on 24 July, 1907, with the superficial objective of preventing the publishing of sensitive information in light of the Russo-Japanese War. The only publication that was exempt from censorship was Ernest Bethell's *Daehan maeil sinbo*, but yet another law that allowed censorship of newspapers in foreign languages was promulgated in April 1908, which made it possible to regulate all published material in Korea. Jin Deok-gyu et al., "Geundae jeonhwan-gi (1894-1910) inswae maeche reul tonghae bon geundae jisik gwa gaenyeom ui hyeongseong mit byeonmo yangsang e gwanhan yeon-gu jung-gan bogoseo," 3–4.

schools were obliged to use either Hakbu-published or approved textbooks. Ethics, Korean language, history, and geography textbooks were often rejected for approval by Hakbu, whereas those of natural science and industries were mostly approved.[138] While it is important to be wary of the pervasive impacts of censorship on restricting nation-building, scholars like Park Carey have shown that despite pressure and repression from colonial authorities, readership and influence of banned books such as *Yunyeon pildok* persisted and contributed to resistant nationalism, precisely because of censorship.[139] A few openly nationalistic newspapers such as *Daehan maeil sinbo* and *Hwangseong sinmun* also continued to adopt "openly anti-Japanese editorial policies" for however limited time they had before they were forced to discontinue or succumb to Japanese censorship.[140]

Censorship of images also took place at this time. Lee Do-young's (이도영, 李道榮, 1884-1934) satirical cartoons condemning corrupt officials, encouraging resistance against Japan, and questioning state policies were frequently censored, and cartoons of *Daehan minbo* were frequently redacted.[141] Lee Gu-yeol similarly argues

---

138 Son In-su, *Hanguk gaehwa gyoyuk yeon-gu* (Seoul: Iljisa, 1981), 328–29; Cha Seok-gi, "Gawhwagi sarip hakgyo gyogwaseo bunseok ui yeon-gu," 61–62; Chae Hwi-gyun, "Tong-gambu sigi geumji doen yeoksa gyogwaseo yeon-gu," *Gyoyuk cheolhak* 66 (March 2018): 109–11; Cha Seok-gi, *Hanguk minjok juui gyoyuk yeon-gu: Yeoksajeok insik eul jungsim euro* (Seoul: Jinmyeong Munhwasa, 1976), 277; Jin Deok-gyu et al., "Geundae jeonhwan-gi (1894-1910) inswae maeche reul tonghae bon geundae jisik gwa gaenyeom ui hyeongseong mit byeonmo yangsang e gwanhan yeon-gu jung-gan bogoseo," 36–37; Kim Bong-hui, *Hanguk gaehwagi seojeok munhwa yeon-gu*, 82–88, 111.

139 Park Carey, "Hanguk geundae yeoksa inmulhwa," 33–60; Choi Gi-yeong, "Han mal gyogwaseo *Yunyeon pildok* e gwanhan ilgochal," *Seoji hakbo* 9 (March 1993).

140 Frederick Authur McKenzie, *Tragedy of Korea* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908), 140, 214–15; C. I. Eugene Kim and Han-kyo Kim, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism, 1876-1910*, 181–82.

141 For example, in "Baeu chang-gokdo" (배우창곡도, 俳優唱曲圖) a Pansori

that severe Japanese censorship proves that the cartoons stirred substantial nationalistic sentiments among the public, especially because unlike texts, imagery could appeal to people of all backgrounds, even the uneducated and illiterate.[142]

The Taegeukgi image was restricted in its use in political contexts after annexation, but the use of the Taegeukgi in the 1919 March First Movement demonstrated how it continued to be used as a symbol of the Korean nation-state and resistant nationalism. However, the nationwide protest led to intensified censorship of the Taegeukgi image by Japanese authorities, and even the application of the Taeguek design "as an ornament on finger rings or fans" was banned.[143] The production and consumption of Taegeukgi in the colonial period was more active among Korean diaspora, especially in the United States.[144] However, this factor has little impact on this research as it is focused on the analysis of the Taegeukgi until the 1910s.

(판소리) singer sings a song titled "Saetaryeong" (새타령, bird song), but the original lyrics "*bbeogguk, bbeogguk*" (뻐꾹, sound of a cuckoo) are changed to "*bokguk, bokguk"* (복국, 復國, recover the nation). Lee Gu-yeol, "Sinmun e hang-Il, guguk sisa manhwa reul geurin Lee Do-young," 87–88.

[142] Lee Gu-yeol, "Sinmun e hang-Il, guguk sisa manhwa reul geurin Lee Do-young," 90–91.

[143] Yun Chi-ho explained that the bureaucrats' "pettiness" in banning the Taegeuk design came from "copying the Germans in colonial administration" who "would not allow the Danes in Schleswick to paint their homes red and white as they are national colors of Denmark." Yun Chi-ho, "Yun Chi-ho ilgi," 23 June, 1919, http://db.history.go.kr/item/level.do?sort=levelId&dir=ASC&start=1&limit=20&page=1&pre_page=1&setId=-1&totalCount=0&prevPage=0&prevLimit=&itemId=sa&types=&synonym=off&chinessChar=on&brokerPagingInfo=&levelId=sa_030_0040_0060_0210&position=-1, accessed 12 September, 2022; Hong Seung-pyo, "Ileo beorin Taegeuk, jiwo beorin Iljang-gi," *News & Joy*, 24 February, 2021, https://www.newsnjoy.or.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=302303, accessed 12 September, 2022.

[144] Mok Soo-hyun, "Diaspora ui jeongcheseong gwa Taegeukgi."

Admittedly, it is difficult to accurately calculate the level of accessibility of mass media and reproduced images from the 1880s to the 1910s. Hence, this thesis approaches groups of representative images that are found in a wide range of media types, from textbooks, newspapers, postcards, maps, to photographs. Moreover, during the short period of forty years, images of the flag, imperial emblem, royal portraits, historical figures, maps, and national landscape, as well as written sources discussing the idea of the nation-state were continuously and repetitively produced and disseminated, adding weight to the argument that conceptualising and visualising the Korean nation-state was indeed, the 'zeitgeist' of the 1880s-1910s. For this reason, I believe the impact of these representative images is valid and relevant, notwithstanding some periodic inconsistencies in the appearance of specific imagery and concerns over readership or circulation. Indeed, the examination of the impact of representative images during a time of great political turmoil and technological shortfalls and disruptions is a critical point addressed throughout this thesis and is the reason for my investigation of diverse groups of images. The thesis will conclude by offering an overview of the collective impact of the sets of representative images on formulating the idea of the modern Korean-nation state.

Finally, it is important to note that in many cases, especially in printed illustrations or commercial and popular art, artists or producers are unknown and uncredited. Although the identification of the producers of images is not the main purpose of this study, the lack of this information does raise issues on how the decision-making processes in the production and selection of representative imagery took place, and in interpretating the intimacy between nation-building objectives and actual

production of visual material.[145] Moreover, the influence of Japanese imagery and Japanese agents of image production cannot be overlooked, even in images with the strongest nationalistic messages, as Korean reformation and modernisation of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries largely benchmarked Japanese precedents. Therefore, when possible and relevant, the research provides some inference of the human relationship and ideological communication among artists, intellectuals, and government officials that affected the creation and dissemination of imagery using both primary records and secondary literature.

[145] One example is the editorial cartoons of Lee Do-young. Although he was responsible for the creation of images in the cartoons, his role in the topic-selection and narrative of the cartoons seems to have been rather limited. See Park Ji-hun, "Daehan Hyeophoe ui *Daehan minbo* (1909-1910) ui balgan gwa sisa manhwa yeonjae ui seonggyeok," 223–24.

Chapter 1. Discussion of Key Terminology

1.1. *Gukga*, State, Nation-State

A crucial task in modern nation-building of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century Korea was the interpretation of neologisms and authentication of novel ideologies surrounding the expansive and intangible idea of the nation-state that was imported from the West via China or Japan. As in the case of all imported terminologies, there existed limitations in expressing compatible and homogenous ideas of the state, nation, and nation-state, which led to various discrepancies in their usage. Moreover, Joseon socio-political structures underwent real and substantial change from the Gabo Reforms in the mid 1890s, reflected in the emergence of new terminologies and continuous reinterpretations. Research on the visual representations of the Korean nation-state first requires the analysis of the relevant terms that were developed and used in pre-colonial Korea as they, however inconsistently used, have several implications on how we may understand the socio-political context of visual imageries of the period.

There are innumerable definitions of a nation-state, but it is generally understood as a collective entity that has a governing body, a fixed and distinct territory of governance and occupation, and people who share a common history, culture, language, and ethnicity.[146] All descriptions of the nation-state, nation, and nationalism

---

[146] Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*; Anderson, *Imagined Communities*; Agnew, “Nationalism”; Seton-Watson, *Nations and States*; Kyung Moon Hwang, *Rationalizing Korea*; Pierson, *The Modern State*; Michael J. Shapiro, “Nation-States,” in *A Companion to Political Geography* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), 271–88; Susan Schulten, *Mapping the Nation: History and Cartography in Nineteenth-Century America* (Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press, 2012).

are unavoidably broad and general with countless exceptions. Eric Hobsbawm claims that though many have made constructive descriptions of the nature and attributes of a nation, attempts to permanently and universally define the term "nation" have been unsuccessful, owing to numerous exceptions and irregularities to the underlying criteria of what qualifies as a nation.[147] Benedict Anderson also admits that providing a clear workable definition of the nation and nationalism has been "irritating," but offers to define the nation as "an imagined political community" that is "both inherently limited and sovereign," while Robert Wiebe refers to nationalism as the "desire among people who believe that they share a common ancestry and a common destiny to live under their own government on land sacred to their history."[148]

At first glance, the Korean transition from a dynastic kingdom to a modern nation-state seems to be easier to assess due to its relatively stable territorial borders, the pervasive belief of a homogeneous ethnicity, as well as the fact that the governing system has been more or less consistent from the founding of the Joseon dynasty to the succeeding Korean Empire.[149] Yet, Joseon dynasty's longevity and communal cohesion based on relatively sophisticated forms of central governance and Confucian belief have resulted in the confusion, or rather, an overgeneralisation of the Korean nation, state, and the nation-state. These concepts are still used interchangeably or without careful consideration.

---

[147] Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*, 5–6.

[148] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 5–6; Robert H. Wiebe, *Who We Are: A History of Popular Nationalism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 5; Agnew, "Nationalism."

[149] For further discussions on the construction of an imagined homogeneous Korean ethnic identity, see Kim Seung-hwan, "Damunhwa damron gwa rokeolliti ui iwonseong," *Rokeollity inmunhak* 3 (April 2010): 83–84.

The umbrella term "*gukga"* (국가, 國家) is a major contributor to this ambiguity. Historically, the term has been used in an array of contexts without clarification of its precise definition, so much that it has come to translate all English terms of "country," "nation," "state," and "nation-state."[150] In Korean, it has been and remains interchangeable with "*nara"* (나라, country).[151] Unlike neologisms devised in the nineteenth century such as "*minjok"* (민족, 民族), "*gukga"* has a long history in East Asian languages and the Chinese equivalent appears in Confucian classics.[152] However, the term underwent radical changes in its meaning at the turn of the twentieth century initiated by intellectuals who argued for a reformation of the Korean nation-state.

Kyung Moon Hwang offered an insightful evaluation of the different adoptions of the term "*gukga"* during the "Korean enlightenment period."[153] He argued that while

---

[150] Gang Dong-guk argues that in addition to poor translations of texts, the incomplete delivery of knowledge on Western theoretical political thought of the nation and state was partly owing to "agenda-setting" disparities in which disproportionate focus was placed on more practical subjects such as international law, international affairs, and military technology. Gang Dong-guk, "Geundae Hanguk ui gukmin, injong, minjok gaeyeom," in *Geundae Hanguk ui sahoe gwahak gaenyeom hyeongseongsa* (Paju: Changbi, 2009), 255–57; Kyung Moon Hwang, "Country or State? Reconceptualizing 'Kukka' in the Korean Enlightenment Period, 1896—1910," *Korean Studies*, 2000, 1–24.

[151] Kim Seong-bae, "Hanguk ui geundae gukga gaenyeom hyeongseongsa yeon-gu," *Gukje jeongchi nonchong* 52, no. 5 (June 2012): 7–35.

[152] Kyung Moon Hwang, "Country or State?," 18–19.

[153] Kyung Moon Hwang, "Country or State?," 7. Technically, the "enlightenment period" (*gaehwagi*, 개화기, 開化期) cannot be seen as a historical period or era, as argued by many academics such as Ju Jin-o, Lee Yun-sang, and Kim Nam-gyu, but Hwang uses the term to refer the period between 1896 and 1910 when so-called 'enlightenment movements' were most prevalent. See Ju Jin-o, "Gijon gaehwapa yong-eo e daehan bipan gwa daean," *Yeoeksa bipyeong*, no. 73, (November 2005): 23–27; Lee Yun-sang, "Han mal, gaehang-gi, gaehwagi, aeguk gyemong-gi," *Yeoksa bipyeong*, no. 73, (February 2006): 300–304; Kim Nam-gyu, "Gaehwagi sijo ui geundaeseong yeon-gu" (Korea University, 2012).

Korean intellectuals who were directly influenced by Western notions of state-centric nationalism pushed for a form of *gukga* with a powerful and authoritarian state, relatively "liberal" intellectuals utilised Confucian teachings to argue for a more encompassing people-centred notion of a familial *gukga*.[154] The term "*nara"* was also frequently used instead of "*gukga"* to portray an encompassing idea of the Korean nation-state that included not only the leadership of the state and monarch but also its constituting people (*inmin,* 인민, 人民).[155] Moreover, Hwang points out that in an article of *Doklip sinmun*, a hierarchy of the terms *inmin*, *nara*, and *jeongbu* (政府, government) was expressed:

> "Only after there is a people [*inmin*] can there be a country [*nara*], and only after there is a country can there be a government [*jeongbu,* 정부, 政府]. The government's task is to lead by correctly evaluating the conditions of the people, and thereby secure the country's welfare [*gukga annyeong,* 국가 안녕, 國家 安寧]."[156]

This editorial implies the emergence of a people-centred *gukga,* wherein the people constitute the country, and the governing state is dependent on the existence of a country comprised by its people.

Note that throughout his work, Hwang continuously uses the word "state" as a translation of the general idea of *gukga* in contemporary settings. However, if not for the sake of consistency, it is more fitting to use the term nation-state in this context. If the term "*nara"* is to be seen as an interchangeable term with "*gukga",* as exemplified

---

[154] Kyung Moon Hwang, "Country or State?," 1–2.
[155] Kyung Moon Hwang, "Country or State?," 4.
[156] "Editorial," *Doklip sinmun*, 31 October, 1896 in Hwang, "Country or State?", 4.

in the editorial quoted above, the terms encompass not only the narrow Korean state but also the wider body of the collective nation. While it is true that the government is a narrower concept that is included in the state, the state is equally a narrow and an insufficient term to describe *gukga*, given such contemporary diversity in interpretation, including the new emphasis on the people. Although Hwang explains that after 1905, Hegelian-German models of the nation and the inclination toward Social Darwinism led to a return to a statist notion of *gukga*, he also recognises the long-term triumph of its collective reconceptualization.[157] Throughout this thesis, "nation-state" is used to refer to the Korean *gukga* that includes not only the official governing body and state, but also the people that comprise the Korean nation.

Much like the fluid and ambiguous nature of terminologies surrounding the nation-state, national imagery of the 1880s-1910s was more complex and diverse in nature than those of the Joseon period. The visual representations of the Korean *gukga* shifted from representing the court, monarch, or state and gradually expanded to accommodate a collective nation-state. However, representations of the narrow and broader *gukga* continued to coexist. National symbols that represented the monarch, royal family, and court, and the traditional, narrow idea of the *gukga* were still actively used in the early twentieth century and sometimes became more prevalent and authoritative. For instance, from the late 1890s to 1905 Gojong attempted to strengthen imperial authority through elaborate processions using traditional visual symbols. In

[157] Kyung Moon Hwang, "Country or State?," 6. Although Hwang simplifies the rise of statist nationalism after 1905, thoughts of Social Darwinism were already influential by the 1890s and advocators of collective *gukga* also engaged with and promoted the importance of "survival" in a competitive international arena. See Tikhonov, *Social Darwinism and Nationalism in Korea*.

particular, the Ihwamun, originally devised to represent the Yi (李) imperial family, was also was used to 'brand' various official objects of state affairs such as passports, court ceramics, silverware, stamps, and royal dress.[158] Yet the imperial emblem was also used by non-state agents to politicise and nationalise textbook illustrations of historical figures, or even highlight nationality in advertisements. As such, some representations of the narrow *gukga* also came to encompass the collective *gukga* in later periods.

It is important to note that in addition to the influx of Western notions of a modern nation-state in the late nineteenth century, Confucian interpretations of the idea of *gukga* also exerted a strong influence in both state and nation-building agendas and visual expressions thereof. Surprisingly, it was the more 'liberal' intellectuals who actively exploited the traditional teachings of Mencius (맹자, 孟子, 372–289 BCE) that emphasised the "holistic connection between self-cultivation and the condition of the larger [*gukga*]."[159] Although *Mencius* had been an influential classic all throughout the Joseon dynasty, it provided room for a re-evaluation of the conventional emphasis on the ruling monarchical state. In the Joseon period, subjects were recognised as an indispensable component of the *gukga*, but their primary duty was to demonstrate loyalty and obedience to the monarch, and their well-being rested not upon their given rights as citizens but on non-legal, moral principles, dependent on the benevolence and virtue (*deok,* 덕, 德) of the king.[160] Reformists' manoeuvrings of Confucian views to

---

[158] The Ihwa flower is also referred to as Oyatggot (오얏꽃).
[159] Kyung Moon Hwang, "Country or State?," 1-2.
[160] The Confucian ideal of moral virtue as a core principle of statecraft and its symbolic embodiment in state rituals are well explained in Park Rye-gyeong, "Deokchi ui sangjing chegye roseo yugyo gukga ui jeukwi uirye: Deokchi wa wang-gwon hwaklip, geu gilhang gwangye ui uiryejeok guseong gwa geu haeseok," *Hanguk silhak yeon-gu* 12 (June 2011): 149–200.

construct the collectively harmonious *gukga* reveal the flexibility of Confucian thought that facilitated modern understandings of the Korean nation-state. *Hwangseong sinmun,* for example, seems to have preferred the idea of the familial *gukga*, to reconcile Western concepts of the nation-state with existing traditions of the Joseon dynasty.[161]

Korean intellectuals' accommodation of Western liberalism was infused with the familiar Confucian emphasis on collectivism. Confucianism was a particularly convenient and effective way of politically mobilising the Korean masses, as the ideology prized role-centred, relationship-centred, and community-centred ethics that placed virtue above rights, common good and harmony above liberty and autonomy, and generosity above personal gains.[162] This way, the Joseon people could easily be incorporated into political agendas to strengthen sovereignty at a time of crisis, reaffirming the inseparable and complementary relationship between the individual and *gukga*.[163] The phenomenon was seen by Jeong Yong-hwa as a common experience of contemporary East Asian nation-states, where the autonomy and rights of individuals could only be acknowledged and legitimised under the affirmation and sustainability of larger, collective identities.[164]

Despite the overarching push for modernisation and an inevitable move away from outdated traditions even in visual arts, the continued application of traditional

---

[161] Schmid, *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919*, 47–48; "Gukga jeuk il gajok," *Daehan maeil sinbo*, 31 July, 1908; "Tapa gajokjeok gwannyeom," *Daehan maeil sinbo*, 4 September, 1908; "Guk eun jeukil daega," *Daehan maeil sinbo*, May 13, 1909; Kyung Moon Hwang, "Country or State?," 3.
[162] Jeong Yong-hwa, "Yugyo wa jayu juui: Yu Gil-jun ui jayu juui gaenyeom suyong," *Jeongchi sasang yeon-gu* 2 (April 2002): 62.
[163] Lydia He Liu, "Translingual Practice: The Discourse of Individualism Between China and the West," *Positions* 1, no. 1 (1993): 179–80 in Jeong Yong-hwa, "Yugyo wa jayu juui," 67.
[164] Jeong Yong-hwa, "Yugyo wa jayu juui," 67.

Confucian undertones in nationalistic imagery is easy to find. A primary example is the image of the Blood Bamboos of Min Yeong-hwan. (Fig. 1.12.) The bamboo, in Confucian traditions, is a symbol of fidelity, loyalty, and resilience, and was one of the most popular subject of paintings in the Joseon period.[165] Already a familiar and auspicious image to the Korean public, the bamboo image was not only harmonious with the Confucian emphasis of the collective community that the liberal reformist intellectuals pursued, but also dually fitting in retaining and promoting traditional values of the dutiful *sinmin* (신민, 臣民, subjects) to serve the monarch and uphold statist nationalism when faced with imminent threats to the country and king. The Blood Bamboo image even added another layer of resistant nationalism in its message and served as a symbol of defiance against Japanese colonialism and forged solidarity among the Korean people in the colonial period.

There was, indeed, a periodical resurgence of strong statism during the initial years of the Korean Empire. Scholars like Kim Dong-taek are highly critical and sceptical of the level of substantial support on behalf of the Gwangmu Administration of the Korean Empire and even the Independence Club in building a modern, people-centred nation-state (*geundae gukmin gukga,* 근대 국민국가, 近代 國民國家).[166]

---

[165] The popularity of the bamboo in arts of Joseon can be inferred from the marking criteria for the admission exam for professional court painters. An Hwi-jun, *Hanguk hoehwasa yeon-gu* (Seoul: Sigongsa, 2000), 738–39.

[166] Kim Dong-taek's interpretation of a *gukmin gukga* had its roots in the French Revolution, the German model of top-down modernisation, and the British struggle for suffrage, and he argued that a modern nation-state requires the construction of a participatory political system. In his more recent work, he contrasts the fallbacks of the Independence Club with the more progressive pursuits of the Sinminhoe (신민회, 新民會, 1907-1911) and the club's newspaper, *Daehan maeil sinbo,* that he perceives to be in favour of a true modern nation-state. Kim Dong-taek, "Daehan Jegukgi geundae gukga hyeongseong ui se gaji gusang," 99–121.

He argues that the government and even intellectuals of the Independence Club were in pursuit of a "*geundae gukga,*" (modern state) short of a "*geundae gukmin gukga*" (modern nation-state). Indeed, Gojong and his court wished to retain autocracy and centralise power to the emperor, and their superficial support of the collective, people-centred *gukga* can be seen as a strategy to mobilise the public to defend the country.[167] In addition, though it is true that leaders of the Independence Club theoretically envisioned a constitutional monarchy and even a parliamentary system, their passion primarily lay in the proliferation of modern political "awareness" rather than fundamental changes to the system that allowed actual political participation of the collective nation, and maintained a level of paternal responsibility to guide the general public.[168]

The idea of an inclusive *gukga* as a collective nation-state was not a completely unprecedented notion in the Joseon period. However, traditional collective identity or sense of belonging to the community may not have necessarily been directed to the country but to smaller, provincial regions.[169] Identification with the Joseon state likely

---

[167] Kim Dong-taek, "Daehan Jegukgi geundae gukga hyeongseong ui se gaji gusang," 111.

[168] Kim Dong-taek, "*Doklip sinmun* ui geundae gukga geonseollon," *Sahoe gwahak yeon-gu* 12, no. 2 (August 2004): 68–97. Technically, a nation-state, while relying on the broad assumption that the people share a common culture, language, and ethnicity, does not necessarily require a politically democratic, participatory, nor even constitutional governing system. Nevertheless, in the discourse of modern nation-states, the political participation of the general public is a crucial factor in determining the 'modernity' (*geundaeseong*, 근대성, 近代性) of individual nation-states. Pierson, *The Modern State*, 20–22.

[169] James B. Palais, "Political Participation in Traditional Korea, 1876-1910," *The Journal of Korean Studies* 1 (1979): 80; John K. Fairbank, *The Chinese World Order* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968). For more on national territoriality and spatial understanding of the Joseon period, see Schmid, *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919*, 199–223.

took the form of a hierarchical connection between a subject and his ruler. Cultural affiliation and identification with the state would have been difficult, more so for those who were not part of the yangban class or governing officials.[170] Provincialism in traditional Joseon outranked identification with the remote and "alien" central government:

> "Clan solidarity was considered a self-protective device by the villagers who thought that the government was more against them than for them. To them, the government of the land-owning yangban officials was an exploiter and a suppressor that collected heavy taxes, demanded unquestioning obedience, and gave little in return."[171]

Nevertheless, collective identity among the Korean ethno-cultural community existed in Joseon, as evident in various popular media such as plays, novels, songs, and folk art. Popular folk culture (*minsok munhwa*, 민속문화, 民俗文化) serve as remnants of the level of cultural homogeneity in late Joseon. Even the yangban class was organically tied to the broader public as folk culture emulated and branched from elite cultures. Furthermore, in the eighteenth century, the growth of the private market and commercial exchange allowed for a wider distribution and easier replication of cultural goods which resulted in the standardisation and centralisation of previously

---

[170] Jeong Yeong-hun sheds light on the contribution of Dangun mythology in constructing a national ethnic identity among Koreans that transcended such fragmented and pre-modern Joseon identity constrained by social class, smaller familial or regional communities, and identity as subjects under monarchical rule. See Jeong Yeong-hun, "Han minjok ui jeongcheseong gwa Dangun minjok juui," *Minjok munhwa nonchong* 55 (December 2013): 94–95.

[171] C. I. Eugene Kim and Han-kyo Kim, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism, 1876-1910*, 9–10.

regionalised cultures.[172] Minhwa (민화, 民畵, folk paintings) and even literati paintings became readily available to the broader public and formed a shared cultural experience.[173]

For example, the auspicious tiger image that was a common subject in both yangban and *minsok* visual cultures, grew in popularity through standardised models of minhwa, such as the auspicious dragon-tiger paintings (*yonghodo*, 龍虎圖) and the satirical tiger-magpie paintings (*hojakdo*, 虎鵲圖) that the masses could easily relate to.[174] (Fig. 1.13., Fig. 1.14.) Its popularity and inclusivity were later effectively used to arouse nationalistic sentiments when the tiger image was strategically selected by Choe Nam-seon as a metaphorical image of the map of the Korean Peninsula.[175] (Fig. 1.15.) Geumgangsando (금강산도, 金剛山圖, Geumgangsan Mountain painting) was also a popularised image that tied the Joseon people as a unified cultural entity. Although the production and consumption of Geumgangsando had been led by cultural elites of the late Joseon period, by the nineteenth century, minhwa Geumgangsando had permeated all levels of Joseon society.[176] (Fig. 1.16.)

[172] For the influence of commercial novels in 'standardising' Korean culture and further facilitating the establishment of a modern Korean nation-state, see Lee Chang-heon, "Banggak soseol chulpan gwa gwanryeon doen myeot gaji munje," *Gojeon munhak yeon-gu* 35 (June 2009): 141–82.
[173] Lee Seong-hye, *Hanguk geundae seohwa ui yutong* (Busan: Haepi Buk Midieo, 2014).
[174] Early models of tiger and magpie paintings were already established by the Yuan period (1271-1368). See Hong Sun-pyo, "Gaein sojang ui 'chulsan hojakdo': Hanguk ggachi horang-i geurim ui wonryu," *Misulsa nondan* 9 (November 1999): 345–50; Jeong Byeong-mo, *Mumyeong hwagadeul ui banran, minhwa*, Jeong Byeong-mo gyosu ui minhwa ilgi (Seoul: Dahal Midieo, 2011), 170–215, 251–63.
[175] Mok Soo-hyun, "Gukto ui sigak jeok pyosang gwa aeguk gyeomong ui jirihak," 13–39; Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 175–78.
[176] See Chapter 4.

Despite their expression of shared cultural identity, images from popular folk culture of the Joseon period only become apparent and vocal as representative imagery of the Korean nation-state from the end of the nineteenth century. The abolishment of the social class system, increased opportunities of education, the development of civil groups, and subsequent growth of mass politics after the Gabo Reforms and the state-led Gwangmu Reforms (광무개혁, 光武改革) from 1896 allowed for the formation of a public platform for increased political participation.[177] Neologisms that refer to the new Korean nation and people also further elevated non-state representation into mainstream politics.

[177] James B. Palais, "Political Participation in Traditional Korea, 1876-1910," 87–88; Young-ick Lew, "The Kabo Reform Movement: Korean and Japanese Reform Efforts in Korea, 1894" (PhD diss., Cambridge, Harvard University, 1972), 249–68, 340–91. Gang Myeong-gu argues that the public sphere that was conceived from the late Joseon period was highly statist in character compared to Western equivalents. The role of the Joseon public was two-fold; sustaining the ruling authority of the state composed of the king and elite, but also checking and balancing the power of the monarch. He describes this Korean public sphere as a "*hunmin* (훈민, 訓民) public sphere" in which the public exists, but also acts as an intermediary realm between the state and the private sphere that aims to edify the civil society. See Gang Myeong-gu, "Hunmin gongronjang ui ironjeok guseong eul wihayeo: Habeomaseu billigi, bikyeo gagi, neomeo seogi," *Keomyunikeisyeon iron* 9, no. 2 (June 2013): 10–51.

1.2. *Baekseong, Sinmin, Inmin, Gukmin, Minjok*

The core idea of the Korean nation-state that differentiates it from the traditional Joseon dynasty rests upon its relation to terminologies that refer to the people or nation that gained importance in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These terminologies reveal the complexities and fragmentations of major factions of thought that coexisted in the 1880s-1910s. In the process of the reconstruction or reformation of the Korean nation-state, several terms referring to the people, both traditional and new, were employed: *baekseong* (백성, 百姓)*, sinmin* (신민, 臣民), *inmin* (인민, 人民), *gukmin* (국민, 國民), and *minjok* (민족, 民族). It is essential to discuss the interpretations of the relationship between the *gukga* and its people reflected in these terms as they resulted in a drastic expansion and diversification of images expressive of national identity or the 'essence' of the Korean nation-state. Intellectuals and civil organisations of the 1880s-1910s accordingly utilised visual imagery to demonstrate, validate, and enforce these various directions of nation-building to the Korean people, especially to effectively internalise invisible notions of national identity to audiences with little or no literacy skills.

To unite the public, induce nationalistic sentiments, and thereby 'save the country' (*guguk*, 구국, 救國) at times of distress, images used in newspapers, textbooks, and magazines presented a new understanding of the Korean people. However, the newly attained social status of the masses exposed significant disparities between theory and reality, subject to inconsistent interpretations.[178] While top-down

[178] Kim Sin-jae, "Yu Gil-jun ui min-gwon uisik ui teukjil," *Donghak yeon-gu* 22 (March 2007): 135–58; Jeong Yong-hwa, "Yugyo wa jayu juui," 61–86.

reformist movements led to the abolishment of the social class system and other progressive agendas in alignment with the creation of a civil society, the elite still maintained a paternalistic attitude when it came to 'enlightening' the Korean people. Influential reformist such as Park Yeong-hyo and Yu Gil-jun agreed that the new Korean nation should be given modern rights and duties, but argued that the public had to be educated before granted the right to participate in politics.[179] Jeong Yong-hwa and Kim Sin-jae argue that the greatest shortfall of Yu Gil-jun's otherwise forward-thinking idea of *min-gwon* (민권, 民權, people's rights) is that he ultimately aimed to achieve reformation and strengthening of the nation-state by restricting individuals' rights, especially in political participation.[180]

Embedded in Yu Gil-jun's vision of the role of the Korean nation was *umin-gwan* (우민관, 愚民觀, ignorant people perspective). According to this view, the Korean masses were not educated or experienced enough to wield legal rights to political participation. Yu Gil-jun's emphasis on people's rights can be seen as a means to politically mobilise the nation to better the collective fate of Korea, rather than to establish a people-centred nation-state.[181] Yet, neither was he entirely supportive of the 'monarchical-civil cooperative governance' (*gunmin gongchi,* 군민공치, 君民共治), which was a compromise between traditional monarchism and constitutional monarchy. He believed in the clear distinction between the monarch and the state, and in theory, desired a cooperation between the civil society and monarch that was bound by the law,

---

[179] Gang Dong-guk, "Geundae Hanguk ui gukmin, injong, minjok gaeyeom," 256.
[180] Jeong Yong-hwa, "Yugyo wa jayu juui," 76–79, 82–83.
[181] Kim Sin-jae, "Yu Gil-jun ui min-gwon uisik ui teukjil," 151; Kim Dong-taek, "Daehan Jegukgi geundae gukga hyeongseong ui se gaji gusang," 115–17.

resembling the constitutional monarchy (*ipheon gunjuje*, 입헌군주제, 立憲君主制) of European countries, rather than that dependent on Confucian ethical obligations.[182] Yu Gil-jun supported *gunmin gongchi* as an inevitable choice, the lesser of two evils of absolute monarchism and foreign invasion.[183] In the perspective of Yu Gil-jun and many other contemporaries, for the immediate betterment and survival of the country, and thereby the people themselves, political decision-making was to be entrusted with intellectuals who would serve and cooperate with the monarch; the gradual and strategic dispersal of power to the masses were to only take place after sufficient edification.[184]

The contradictions that lie in Yu Gil-jun's theoretical ideals surrounding the nation-state and its people is evident in visual imagery. The cover illustration of *Nodong yahak dokbon* (노동야학독본, 勞動夜學讀本, 1908), Yu Gil-jun's book that promoted diligent labour and learning, presents Yu Gil-jun, dressed in Western attire and shaking hands with a labourer in traditional workers' clothes. (Fig. 1.17.) The labourer, who in traditional Joseon customs would have had to bow his head and avoid direct eye contact with a yangban, is now facing him as an equal.[185] However, the equality between the two figures is superficial and restrictive.[186] That is, although the

---

[182] Song Seok-yun, "Gunmin gongchi wa ipheon gunjuje heonbeop," 497–527.
[183] Jeong Yong-hwa, "Yugyo wa jayu juui," 73. Note that Yu Gil-jun's influence and promotion of prioritisation of national sovereignty over the sovereignty and rights of individuals peaked in 1907 when he returned from Japan, two years after Korea was made a protectorate in 1905. Many intellectuals of this period regressed to the statist notion of the Korean *gukga*.
[184] Kim Sin-jae, "Yu Gil-jun ui min-gwon uisik ui teukjil," 141–43; Lee Na-mi, "19 segi mal gaehwapa ui jayu juui sasang," 44–45; Jeong Yong-hwa, "Seogu ing-won sasang ui suyong gwa jeon-gae," 81.
[185] Schmid, *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919*, 41.
[186] Jo Yun-jeong explains that the narrative of the book contained the hierarchical categorisation of 'high' and 'low' labour and labourers. Yu Gil-jun was attempting to educate a less fortunate crowd of lowly labourers through his book, revealing his strong *umin-gwan*. See Jo Yun-jeong, "Nodongja gyoyuk eul dulleossan jisik ui jeolhap gwa

act of shaking hands while making eye contact may signify an elevated status of the labourer, the elite figure, Yu Gil-jun, is significantly larger in size and is facing the viewer whereas the labourer is smaller, with only half of his face visible and with his back to the viewer. Andre Schmid insightfully explained that "[t]he two might join hands in the same struggle, but in the author's eyes, it was clear who actually spoke for the nation."[187] The image is a symbolic testament to the contemporary *umin-gwan* and shows the very precise level of equality and freedom bestowed upon the public and the obedient participation required of them.

The Independence Club was instrumental in initiating the discussion on what the relationship between the country and its people should be like in the late 1890s. The club greatly contributed to the initiation in the discussion of modern state and nation-building as it "sought both to foster a new nationalistic consciousness in the Korean population, by invoking among the citizenry a strong emotional attachment to the state, and to create an ideology befitting Korea's new nation-state status."[188] The club's leaders like Seo Jae-pil and Yun Chi-ho, considered to be more progressive counterparts to Yu Gil-jun and Park Yeong-hyo, took the lead in monitoring the government and fostering a civil society and also held ambiguous positions when it came to the rights of the Korean people.[189]

The club newspaper, *Doklip sinmun,* steered the movement to elevate the people's rights as a way of making the public direct stakeholders of the country's well-

---

gyemong ui jeongchiseong: Yu Gil-jun ui nodong yahak dokbon gochal," *Inmun nonchong* 69 (June 2013): 414–16.

[187] Schmid, *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919*, 42.

[188] Vipan Chandra, "Sentiment and Ideology in the Nationalism of the Independence Club (1896-1898)," *Korean Studies* 10 (1986): 13.

[189] Lee Na-mi, "19 segi mal gaehwapa ui jayu juui sasang," 30.

being. Editorials written in the short period from 1896 to 1898 pointed out that the reason why the Korean people were ignorant of and unbothered by threats to the country was because they do not realise that "Joseon belongs to none other than the Joseon people and the rise and fall of the country is nothing other than their own rise and fall."[190] By asserting people's ownership of the country via the granting of rights was seen as a way to instil a sense of belonging, foster an awareness (or imagination) of the intimate connection to the intangible entity of the Korean nation-state, and thereby induce their loyalty and devotion.[191]

The inclusion of the general masses as active contributors to Korea's fate was an objective shared by most nationalist intellectuals of the time. Of course, even textbooks published after 1905, such as *Godeung sohak dokbon* (고등소학독본, 高等小學讀本, 1906-1908, published by Hwimun-gwan, 휘문관, 徽文館) and *Chomok pilji* (초목필지, 樵牧必知, 1909, written by Jeong Yun-su, 정윤수, 鄭崙秀, edited by Namgung Eok, 남궁억, 南宮檍, 1863-1939), clearly defined the political system of the Korean Empire as a "monarchical autocracy" (*gunju jeonje,* 군주전제, 君主專制) and continued to use terms like "*baekseong*."[192] However, *Chomok pilji* also highlighted the importance of the *baekseong* as the fundamentals of the country and used the term "*gukmin*" to refer to an obtainable entitlement or status of *baekseong* if they should fulfil their rightful duties for the collective betterment of the country.[193] At the same time, both *Chomok pilji* and *Yunyeon pildok* also stressed that the *gukga* is not

[190] "Editorial," *Doklip sinmun*, 7 August, 1897 in Jeong Yong-hwa, "Seogu ingwon sasang ui suyong gwa jeon-gae," 71.
[191] Jeong Yong-hwa, "Seogu ingwon sasang ui suyong gwa jeon-gae," 70–72.
[192] Cha Seok-gi, "Gawhwagi sarip hakgyo gyogwaseo bunseok ui yeon-gu," 65.
[193] Cha Seok-gi, "Gawhwagi sarip hakgyo gyogwaseo bunseok ui yeon-gu," 66.

a possession of the imperial court, and both *Yunyeon pildok* and *Godeung sohak dokbon* argued that *gukga* is comprised of territory and *inmin*, emphasising the importance of the people.[194] As such, though various different terms were used to refer to the Korean people and some textbooks continued to described them as subjects protected by the king or emperor, the general recognition of the nation as a crucial component of the *gukga* was stressed, especially after 1905.

It is important to keep in mind that the increasing attention paid to the collective nation at this time was not automatically extended to the individual. According to Kim Seok-geun, Yun Chi-ho used the English word "individual" in his diary as early as the 1890s and Korean translations of the term appear around 1900, but the significance of *gaein* (개인, 個人, individual) lost its standing and the pursuit of individual rights were postponed as intellectuals pushed for increasingly defensive nation-building strategies that prioritised protecting official state sovereignty.[195] *Min-gwon* meant the rights of the collective Korean people and encouraged a cohesive, patriotic sentiment by prioritising national sovereignty over individual liberty, collective civil rights (*simin-gwon*, 市民權) over individual rights (*gaein-gwon*, 個人權), and solidifying the image of the Korean nation as an organic entity rather than the aggregate sum of sovereign individuals that could in any way conflict with the interests of the greater nation-state.[196] Therefore, emphasis placed on the inclusive nation toward the twentieth century should not be confused with an interest in the individual citizen that

---

[194] Cha Seok-gi, "Gawhwagi sarip hakgyo gyogwaseo bunseok ui yeon-gu," 66.
[195] Kim Seok-geun, "Gaehwagi 'jayu juui' ui suyong gwa gineung geurigo jeongchijeok hamui," 75, 82.
[196] Kim Sin-jae, "Yu Gil-jun ui min-gwon uisik ui teukjil," 144–45; Jeong Yong-hwa, "Yugyo wa jayu juui," 67.

goes beyond the collective community.[197] Representations of Korea that reach beyond the scopes of the narrow state in the 1880s-1910s was a visual demonstration of collectivism that was thought to be instrumental to the strengthening of the entire Korean nation-state, not a yearning for the eventual development of democratic political rights of individual citizens.

The term "*minjok*" is prevalently used as the translation for "nation" today, but it was the slowest to develop and was only popularised after 1905. Before the introduction of "*minjok*," "*gukmin*" was frequently used to refer to the Korean people and consistently grew in popularity from the 1890s.[198] On the other hand, terms like "*baekseong*" that referred to the Korean people as "subjects" and "*sinmin*" that connoted servitude to the king, were heavily used in the 1890s in *Doklip sinmun* but were barely mentioned in newspapers after 1900.[199] "*Gukmin"* and "*inmin"* were generally used to describe the proactive Korean people; "*gukmin*" most often accompanied discussions on the duties of citizens, while "*inmin*," though implicative of people that were more active than subjects, was an intermediary term between

---

[197] The discussion of the lack of political representation of individuals due to the prioritisation of public mobilisation is meaningful as these ideals had a significant effect on the didactic artworks of this period. The individual in art only clearly surfaced in the colonial period when the Korean state had already lost its sovereignty. This is also related to the rise of Western 'fine arts' and the recognition of artists as sovereign and creative individuals and as each their own identities were expressed via works of art. However, this is not to say artists of the colonial period were completely free from social and political collectivism.

[198] Jin Deok-gyu et al., "Geundae jeonhwan-gi (1894-1910) inswae maeche reul tonghae bon geundae jisik gwa gaenyeom ui hyeongseong mit byeonmo yangsang e gwanhan yeon-gu jung-gan bogoseo," 5.

[199] Jin Deok-gyu et al., "Geundae jeonhwan-gi (1894-1910) inswae maeche reul tonghae bon geundae jisik gwa gaenyeom ui hyeongseong mit byeonmo yangsang e gwanhan yeon-gu jung-gan bogoseo," 40–42.

"*baekseong"* and "*gukmin*."[200] The term "*gukmin*" was never directly associated with the king's love, protection, or sympathy which differentiated the term from "subjects."[201] Eventually, "*gukmin,*" followed by "*inmin*," came to be the most popular term to refer to the Korean people, while the traditional term "*baekseong*" was rarely used in newspapers like *Daehan maeil sinbo* after 1908.[202]

Resistant nationalism that flourished after the signing of the Eulsa Treaty was showcased in the utilisation of terminology such as "*minjok"* that not only survived but thrived in the absence of a Korean state in the colonial period. As one of the most influential neologisms that developed in the late nineteenth century, "*minjok"* (민족, 民族, J. *minzoku*) has also had a pervasive and long-lasting impact on the visual arts. The term was coined in Meiji Japan (明治, 1868-1912) in the 1880s, influenced by Western literatures on imperialism, and was originally used as a less popular translation of nationalism (民族主義, *minjok juui,* J. *minzoku shugi*).[203] Compared to the already popularised term "*gukmin"* (J. *kokumin*) in Japan, "*minjok"* was not the dominant term for the "nation," but was mainly used in conjunction with its inseparable relation to imperialism.[204] According to Gang Dong-guk, despite the introduction of the term in

---

200 Park Myeong-gyu, *Gukmin, inmin, simin: Gaenyeomsa ro bon Hanguk ui jeongchi juche*, Hanguk gaenyeomsa chongseo 4 (Seoul: Sohwa, 2009), 97; Park Tae-ho, "Geundae gyemong-gi sinmun eseo yeongtojeok gong-gan gaenyeom ui hyeongseong," 161–62; Jeong Byeong-jun, "Hanmal, Daehan Jegukgi 'min' gaenyeom ui byeonhwa wa jeongdang jeongchiron," *Sahoe iron*, no. 43 (June 2013): 373.

201 Park Tae-ho, "Geundae gyemong-gi sinmun eseo yeongtojeok gong-gan gaenyeom ui hyeongseong," 163.

202 Park Tae-ho, "Geundae gyemong-gi sinmun eseo yeongtojeok gong-gan gaenyeom ui hyeongseong," 178.

203 Michael Weiner, "The Invention of Identity: Race and Nation in Pre-War Japan," in *The Construction of Racial Identities in China and Japan* (London: Hurst & Company, 1997), 96–117.

204 Gang Dong-guk, "Geundae Hanguk ui gukmin, injong, minjok gaeyeom," 267–70.

Korea in after 1900, it was only proliferated after 1905 when Liang Qichao's (양계초, 梁啓超, 1873-1929) interpretation of "*minjok"* and "*minjok juui"* as an opposing force against imperialism in his essay "Sinminseol" (신민설, 新民說, 1902-1906) gained weight.[205] In essence, the Korean term "*minjok"* began with ideas of resistance.

Daehan maeil sinbo was one of the earliest newspapers that began to use the term *minjok* from 1904.[206] Although "*minjok"* was used sporadically in media before 1905 to refer to the race of different nations, early usage of the term was not clearly differentiated from traditional terms like "*dongpo"* (동포, 同胞, fellow countryman), "*baekseong*," or "*inmin*."[207] As the paper was owned by Ernest Bethell, the newspaper was free from censorship and could publish many nationalistic articles after 1905, such as "Minjok gwa gukmin ui gubyeol" (민족과 국민의 구별, The differentiation

---

[205] In the essay, Liang Qichao echoed much of his earlier ideas in the 1890s of encouraging resistance against the spread of imperialism but the term "*minjok"* replaced his earlier use of the term "*gukmin*." See Gang Dong-guk, "Geundae Hanguk ui gukmin, injong, minjok gaeyeom," 270–76. Gang Dong-guk explains that Japan and China had different interpretations and applications of the term due to their contrasting positions in international relations. While China was threatened by Western imperialists and faced difficulties in dealing with its heterogeneous ethnic groups, Japan had no prominent problems of ethnic fragmentation and was preparing for its own expansionist agendas.

[206] The earliest newspaper that used the term "*minjok*" was *Hwangseong sinmun* in 1900. Jeong Byeong-jun, "Hanmal, Daehan Jegukgi 'min' gaenyeom ui byeonhwa wa jeongdang jeongchiron," 369; Jin Deok-gyu et al., "Geundae jeonhwan-gi (1894-1910) inswae maeche reul tonghae bon geundae jisik gwa gaenyeom ui hyeongseong mit byeonmo yangsang e gwanhan yeon-gu jung-gan bogoseo," 25; Schmid, *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919*, 171–79.

[207] Jeong Byeong-jun, "Hanmal, Daehan Jegukgi 'min' gaenyeom ui byeonhwa wa jeongdang jeongchiron," 367–70; Jin Deok-gyu et al., "Geundae jeonhwan-gi (1894-1910) inswae maeche reul tonghae bon geundae jisik gwa gaenyeom ui hyeongseong mit byeonmo yangsang e gwanhan yeon-gu jung-gan bogoseo," 25; Baek Dong-hyeon, "Reo, Il jeonjaeng jeonhu 'minjok' yong-eo ui deungjang gwa minjok insik: Hwangseong sinmun gwa Daehan maeil sinbo reul jungsim euro," *Hanguksa hakbo*, no. 10 (March 2001): 167, 172.

between *minjok* and *gukmin*) in 1908.[208] According to this article, "*minjok"* refers to people who share the same ancestry and language, but in order to become *gukmin*, people must also have common spirit and interests, and display the same collective actions, like a living organism. *Minjok* was seen as a requisite to forming *gukmin* and was also used in other cases to describe people of smaller, regional identities.[209]

Moreover, unlike the general connotation of *gukmin* as being modern and politically active constituents of the Korean nation-state, *minjok* was often tied with ethnic myths, race, and historical accounts; common ancestry and collective history of resilience from foreign invasions were emphasised, especially towards annexation and the loss of a sovereign state.[210] After colonisation, the term was embedded in mass nationalist movements and shaped an early foundation for the expression of *minjokseong* (민족성, 民族性, national characteristics) in art, such as in the case of *hyangtosaek* (향토색, 鄉土, local colour) of the 1920s and 1930s.[211]

---

[208] "Minjok gwa gukmin ui gubyeol," *Daehan maeil sinbo*, 30 July, 1908, https://nl.go.kr/newspaper/detail.do?content_id=CNTS-00093161003, accessed 14 September, 2022; Jin Deok-gyu et al., "Geundae jeonhwan-gi (1894-1910) inswae maeche reul tonghae bon geundae jisik gwa gaenyeom ui hyeongseong mit byeonmo yangsang e gwanhan yeon-gu jung-gan bogoseo," 5.

[209] Jin Deok-gyu et al., "Geundae jeonhwan-gi (1894-1910) inswae maeche reul tonghae bon geundae jisik gwa gaenyeom ui hyeongseong mit byeonmo yangsang e gwanhan yeon-gu jung-gan bogoseo," 25–26.

[210] "Minjok gyeongjaeng ui choehu seungri," *Daehan maeil sinbo*, 23 April, 1910, https://nl.go.kr/newspaper/detail.do?content_id=CNTS-00093201252, accessed 14 September, 2022; Park Ji-hyang et al., *Yeong-ung mandeulgi: sinhwa wa yeoksa ui gallimgil* (Seoul: Hyumeoniseuteu, 2005), 22.

[211] Sim Yeong-ok, "Joseon misul jeonramhoe jakpum ui Joseon hyangtosaek bipyeong yeon-gu," *Dongyang yesul*, no. 48 (August 2020): 25–54; Im Jong-myeong, "1930-nyeondae jeonban-gi sikminji Joseon, Yi In-seong ui hoehwa jakpum gwa misulgye ui Joseon hyangtoseong: Jeguk/sikminji cheje wa eseunik juui, geurigo mihak," *Yeoksa yeon-gu*, no. 29 (December 2015): 35–93; Park Seok-tae, "Joseon misul jeonramhoe reul tonghae bon 'hyangtoseong' gaenyeom yeon-gu," *Incheonhak yeon-gu* 3 (September 2004): 255–94.

The eventual triumph of *minjok* over *gukmin* took place after the Korean state ceased to exist as the term "*gukmin*" (국민, 國民) was literally dependent on the existence of a state (국, 國).[212] Annexation meant that the Korean people were to become subjects of the Japanese Empire (*jeguk sinmin,* 제국신민, 帝國臣民), and when faced with the absence of the Korean state, some decided to partially reject the new implications of *gukmin* as imperial subjects of Japan and continued to use the term to mean *gukmin* of the Korean Empire. Others discarded the term altogether as the promotion of the term would mean support for the new status as subjects of the Japanese Empire. The alternative resolution was to adopt the term "*minjok,*" creating a whole new generation of *minjok* discourse throughout the colonial period.[213]

Minjok was also actively utilised in forming an ethnocentric notion of the nation. As mentioned above, privately published textbooks after 1905 displayed images of prominent historical figures, and among them was Dangun, who played a central role in constructing an imagined common ancestry of the familial nation. As Schmid and Jeong Yeong-hun explains, the promotion of Dangun and his image was highly strategic, and clearly distinguished Korean ethnic origins from the Chinese and solidified the communal bond among Korean *minjok* through inherent kinship and race.[214] The imagined idea of a homogenous ancestry was an efficient tool to

---

[212] Seou Hakhoe, "Gukga ui gaenyeom," *Seou*, no. 16 (March 1908): 16–19; Jeong Byeong-jun, "Hanmal, Daehan Jegukgi 'min' gaenyeom ui byeonhwa wa jeongdang jeongchiron," 375–79. There were efforts to sustain the term "*gukmin*" even in face of imminent annexation. After witnessing the forced abdication of Gojong and the apparent demise of the Korean Empire in 1907, Gonglip Hyeophoe (공립협회, 共立協會, 1905-1909), a Korean civil association formed in San Francisco, argued that national sovereignty rested upon the *gukmin* rather than the state.

[213] Gang Dong-guk, "Geundae Hanguk ui gukmin, injong, minjok gaeyeom," 286–87.

[214] Schmid, *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919*, 175–83; Jeong Yeong-hun, "Han

distinguishing 'others' and creating an effective "agent of resistance" (*jeohang juche,* 저항 주체, 抵抗 主體).[215] This defence against 'the other' in shaping national identity also compelled the creation of the "[i]deology of the Cultural Pure Blood" (*munhwa sunheyol juui*, 문화순혈주의, 文化純血主義) and monoculturalism in which Korean culture came to represent a clearly differentiable and intrinsic ethnic trait, contained by the term "*minjok*."[216] Thus, Korean translations of "nationalism" into "*minjok juui"* that continue today differs from Western interpretations of the 'nation' in which stronger connotations of state-led cultural integration or citizenship are implied. Rather, Korean *minjok juui* denotes a fundamental connotation of ethnocentric or ethnic nationalism, most expressive in visual material that surfaced close to and after annexation, when the Korean state and official nationalism was seen as an unreliable foundation on which national identities were to be constructed.[217]

Throughout the 1880s-1910s, mixed interpretations of the relationship between the Korean people and the nation-state led to the strategic employment of a variety of images and terminologies, depending on the creators, target audiences, and chronological trends. For instance, while early public school textbooks modelled after Japanese educational legislations and published by Hakbu such as *Gukmin sohak dokbon* (국민소학독본, 國民小學讀本, 1895) and *Sinjeong simsang sohak*

---

minjok ui jeongcheseong gwa Dangun minjok juui." 'Race' and 'ethnie' in the Korean sense is not clearly distinguished. See Shin Gi-wook, *Ethnic Nationalism in Korea: Genealogy, Politics, and Legacy*, Shorenstein Asia-Pacific Research Center Series (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2006), 4.

[215] Kim Seung-hwan, "Damunhwa damron gwa rokeolliti ui iwonseong," 76; Jeong Yeong-hun, "Han minjok ui jeongcheseong gwa Dangun minjok juui."

[216] Kim Seung-hwan, "Damunhwa damron gwa rokeolliti ui iwonseong," 84–85.

[217] Jeong Yeong-hun, "Han minjok ui jeongcheseong gwa Dangun minjok juui," 98; Shin Gi-wook, *Ethnic Nationalism in Korea*, 5–7.

(신정심상소학, 新訂尋常小學, 1896) used the term "*gukmin"* in the 1890s, others still used *baekseong*, *sinmin*, and *inmin,* reflecting Japanese influence on the early popularisation of the term "*gukmin*."[218] Such books also often used images directly appropriated from Japanese textbooks that they were modelled after and Hakbu refrained from using images that promoted a specifically Korean identity.[219] Although *Sinjeong simsang sohak* is historically significant as Korea's first modern textbook with illustrations, its images were primarily focused on delivering apolitical information such as introducing Western objects and depicting scenes of a modernised society.[220]

The difference in the political undertones of textbooks depending on publishers became increasingly apparent as a significantly larger number of private textbooks were published after 1900. Towards annexation, there was a noticeable growth in private textbooks that displayed resistant nationalist narratives.[221] "*Minjok"* came to emphasise a distinctly Korean nation, clearly distinguishable from China, and Dangun gained prominence in historical narratives.[222] Private history textbooks such as *Chodeung Daehan yeoksa* (초등대한역사, 初等大韓歷史, 1908) and *Yunyeon pildok* of the incorporated not only chapters dedicated to the historical feats of national heroes but also featured their illustrations, and Dangun was actively used to explain the ethnic

[218] Kim So-yeong, "Gabo gaehyeokgi (1894-1895) gyogwaseo sok ui 'gukmin,'" 172.
[219] Hong Sun-pyo, "Hanguk gaehwagi ui saphwa yeon-gu," 262.
[220] Hong Seon-ung, *Hanguk geundae panhwasa*, 58–59, 75–76.
[221] Many private textbooks were relatively more nationalistic than those published by Hakbu, and were censored, banned, and confiscated. Chae Hwi-gyun, "Gaehwagi geumji gyogwaseo ui yuhyeong gwa naeyong yeon-gu," *Gyoyuk cheolhak* 26 (December 2004): 175–96; Park Carey, "Hanguk geundae yeoksa inmulhwa," 33–60.
[222] *Daehan maeil sinbo* recognised Dangun as the sole ethnic progenitor from 1908 and *Hwangseong sinmun* from 1909. Baek Dong-hyeon, "Reo, Il jeonjaeng jeonhu 'minjok' yong-eo ui deungjang gwa minjok insik," 169, 173–74; Jeong Byeong-jun, "Hanmal, Daehan Jegukgi 'min' gaenyeom ui byeonhwa wa jeongdang jeongchiron," 370.

origins of the Korean nation.[223] Continued attempts to identify the Korean *minjok* through Dangun also led to the birth of Dangun-gyo (단군교, 檀君敎, later renamed Daejong-gyo, 대종교, 大倧敎) and the increased production of illustrations and religious portraits of Dungun from the 1910s, which attempted to consolidate the ethnic identity of the Korean people and to foster resistant nationalism.[224] (Fig. 1.18.)

[223] Hakbu-published books such as *Gukmin sohak dokbon* also included chapters on Eulji Mundeok (을지문덕, 乙支文德) and King Sejong (세종, 世宗, 1397-1450, r. 1418-1450). However, after 1905 and the popularisation of the term "*minjok,*" these figures came to represent and promote a stronger ethnic identity. Jager, *Narratives of Nation Building in Korea*, 8–9.
[224] Henry Em, *The Great Enterprise: Sovereignty and Historiography in Modern Korea*, Asia-Pacific (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2013), 80; Jeong Byeong-jun, "Hanmal, Daehan Jegukgi 'min' gaenyeom ui byeonhwa wa jeongdang jeongchiron," 370.

Chapter 2. The National Flag and Emblem

2.1. Introduction

National symbols are one of the most powerful contributors to the formation of a nation-state. It not only differentiates a particular nation-state among others, but also embodies the idea of the modern nation-state as we know it.[225] Indeed, national symbols are so powerful that they are described as "modern totems" that "merge the mythical sacredness of the nation into forms experienced by sight and sound by blending of subject and object beyond simple representations of nations […]"[226] Among the various types of national symbols, flags- specifically national flags- have since the nineteenth century gained dominant authority in representing nation-states. Flags have now become a diplomatic prerequisite, and without them, the sovereignty, autonomy, and independence of a nation-state cannot be effectively verified.

The Taegeukgi, the Korean national flag, was created in the early 1880s. The opening of ports from the late 1876 catapulted Korea into modern international relations and compelled the state to hastily postulate a national flag, particularly in occasion of the 1882 Korea-U.S. Treaty, which was Korea's first treaty signed with a Western country. Once created, however, the flag was quickly used abroad to represent Korea among world nations, to achieve an array of socio-political reformation and education, and to induce solidarity and patriotism to restore Korean sovereignty, even after

---

[225] Elgenius, *Symbols of Nations and Nationalism*, 14–18.
[226] Elgenius, *Symbols of Nations and Nationalism*, 14.

annexation. The Korean national flag became a visual pointer that embodied the idea of nationhood and the "character" of the Korean nation-state.[227]

In addition to the Taegeukgi, the Ihwamun or the plum-blossom emblem was employed to represent the Korean state and monarchy during the Korean Empire period. The creation of an imperial emblem was, much like the national flag, an unprecedented experience for Joseon. The emblem marked both the elevation of the Joseon kingdom to the Korean Empire and reflected the shift in using methods of visual representation influenced by Western countries and Japan, in contrast to previous court symbols that were reliant on Chinese symbolisms. After annexation, the emblem was absorbed into Japanese imperial symbolisms to represent and commodify the Yi royal family.

This chapter addresses the impact of the Taegeukgi and Ihwamun on state and national representation and nation-building agendas of the 1880s to the 1910s. The fundamentally different nature of conventional Joseon flags and the new national flag will by analysed. The decision-making process in the creation of a Korean national flag will then be investigated to interpret state directions in representing Korea in the international arena as an independent and autonomous country in the 1880s. Applications of both the Taegeukgi and Ihwamun in state representation, education of national identity, and promotion of the colonial regime or resistance will be studied to explain how various interpretations of the Korean nation-state were consolidated and congregated through the symbols. Finally, factors that contributed to the contrasting fates of the national flag and imperial emblem will be analysed.

[227] Raymond Firth, *Symbols: Public and Private* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1973), 356; Billig, *Banal Nationalism*, 40.

2.2. The Emergence of National Flags

From the emergence of complex social systems and the establishment of centralised governments and military organisations in Korea, flags have had a long history of serving a core and primary function as visual signals. As easily recognisable signifiers composed of simple colours and patterns, flags and banners have been widely employed as essential components of communication in the battlefield and large-scale military operations where spoken and written communication was inevitably constrained.[228]

In addition to pragmatic roles of delivering command and coordinating operational strategies, flags were also used for signifying the identity or status of a person or a group of people, most prominently the ruling class. In the battlefield, flags expressed the identity of troops and troop leaders which facilitated the following of a strict chain of command.[229] These flags of status and identity not only helped differentiate enemies from allies but also allowed for complex communication by revealing the identity of the parties involved.

In Europe, systems of heraldry, most prominently in the form of coats of arms or emblems, were used in addition to flags to identify and represent specific people or groups of people of the ruling class, as well as their rank and lineage.[230] This later gave way to the combined usage of the flag and royal emblems that eventually was

---

[228] Whitney Smith, *Flags Through the Ages and Across the World*, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975), 6; Jeong Myeong-gyo, "Joseon sidae ihu Hanguk jeontong gi (gitbal) yeon-gu" (Master's thesis, Seoul, Hongik University, 2003), 16.
[229] Jeong Ho-wan, ed., *(Yeokju) Byeonghakjinam* (Seoul: Sejong daewang ginyeom saeophoe, 2013), 62.
[230] Tim Marshall, *A Flag Worth Dying For* (New York, NY: Scribner, 2018), 5; Elgenius, *Symbols of Nations and Nationalism*, 32–33.

transferred to Korea at the turn of the twentieth century. Existing literatures on vexillology, especially those written in English, are mostly centred on European flag history and heraldry, and are not seamlessly applicable to those of East Asia and Korea.[231] Nonetheless, it is worthwhile to briefly explore the history of vexillology and the creation of national flags in the West to better understand the context of the use of the national flag in Korea from the 1880s to the 1910s as the Korean experience was greatly influenced by European customs of flag-bearing.

In the case of many European countries, war flags or military flags were adopted or altered to serve as national flags. For example, the Danish flag, generally identified as 'the world's oldest continuously used flag,' was a war flag used by Danish troops in battle from the fourteenth century.[232] The United Kingdom's Union Jack was also a combination of military flags used in England, Scotland, and Ireland.[233] Many of these simple European cross-type war flags that were incorporated in national flag designs

---

[231] The term "vexillology" was coined by Whitney Smith and refers to "the study of the history and symbolisms of flags." Elgenius, *Symbols of Nations and Nationalism*, 28. Smith, *Flags Through the Ages and Across the World*.

[232] The flag was also part of the arms of King Valdemar IV Atterdag (r.1340-1375). Elgenius tries to avoid this generalised term by describing the Danish flag as "one of the oldest national flags in Europe" but this still remains questionable due to the difficulties in drawing a clear timeline on which a specific flag can be called a 'national flag.' Elgenius, *Symbols of Nations and Nationalism*, 34.

[233] The three combined jacks were all based on Christian influences of St. George, St. Andrew, and St. Patrick. During the Crusades, European countries employed cross designs of different colour to express their nationality. "England is, however, the only nation which has adopted the Red cross of St. George as its special national ensign." Barlow Cumberland, *History of the Union Jack and Flags of the Empire* (Project Gutenberg, 2014), 32–40, https://www.gutenberg.org/files/45498/45498-h/45498-h.htm, accessed 6 September, 2022.

reflected the influence of Christianity, most recognisably used in the Crusades from the eleventh century.[234]

The creation of modern national flags in the West signalled a departure from mere honorary representations of an elite group of the feudal society and was a turning point in the history of flag usage that reflected a "more democratic vision of community."[235] The American (1775) and French revolutions (1789), and the series of European revolutions in 1848 were crucial events that initiated democratic representations of modern nation-states through new national flags.[236] The revolutions were pivotal in fuelling pervasive reformations of pre-modern European monarchical and feudal systems. Widespread support for and new discussions of democracy sprouted and changed social structures typically designed to retain power among elite minorities. Even though many European powers were still governed by monarchies and nobilities remained in power in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, they could no longer turn a blind eye to the public and were compelled to surrender an adequate level of power to the majority of their people.

The representative function of flags evolved in accordance with these pivotal socio-political changes. Most importantly, the subject of representation expanded from elite minorities of royalty and nobility to the inclusive nation. Many countries, albeit not all, used new designs to represent the newly understood nation-state. For instance, the French tricolour was influential to the designs of many newly devised national flags in

---

[234] Krzysztof Jaskulowski, "The Magic of the National Flag," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39, no. 4 (March 2016): 558–59.
[235] Elgenius, *Symbols of Nations and Nationalism*, 27–28.
[236] Christopher Alan Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780-1914: Global Connections and Comparisons* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2004), 1–3; Elgenius, *Symbols of Nations and Nationalism*, 36–37.

Europe.[237] On the other hand, many other European nations retained their previous state flags but simply extended the representative scope of the flags to the wider population by embedding modern flag culture to nation-building strategies. From the American and French revolutions, flags have been transformed into “graphic manifestations of political programs” and “[t]heir designs explain succinctly which people are to be unified, why, and what their avowed goals are.”[238]

Modern flags also represented and differentiated a nation-state among all other equal and sovereign nation-states, granting a recognisable visual authentication in its sovereign identity.[239] Long-distance sailing from the sixteenth century and aggressive expansionist movements of Western countries and mercantilist enterprises such as the East India Company formulated the practices of utilising national flags. The increased complexity of sea-bound endeavours led to the proliferation of national flags as centralised control and organisation were crucial for large scale operations, especially when faced with the competition of equally large fleets of other nations.[240] Interestingly, as national flags were used to mark the fiercely expanding territories of Euro-American expansionist powers, the accumulation of these colonial flags also

---

[237] It was not until 1794 when the Republican Convention passed that authorised the tricolour to be used as the French national flag. Adolphe Thiers, *The History of the French Revolution*, vol. 1 (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1861), 74; Cumberland, *History of the Union Jack and Flags of the Empire*, 21–31.
[238] Smith, *Flags Through the Ages and Across the World*, 55.
[239] The issue of equal sovereignty according to Western international laws and treaties of this period is not without its fallacy. Cumings even argues that the “Sino-Korean tributary system was one of inconsequential hierarchy and real independence, if not equality. The Western system that Korea encountered, however, was one of fictive equality and real subordination.” See Bruce Cumings, *Korea’s Place in the Sun: A Modern History* (New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, 2005), 95.
[240] Smith, *Flags Through the Ages and Across the World*, 45.

became an ostentatious symbol of national power and prosperity.[241] The sight of national flags became not only a marker of nationality and sovereignty but also a message of "[t]he supremacy of one nation over another" and gave birth to the sentiments of national pride associated with the presence of the flag.[242] (Fig. 2.1, Fig. 2.2.)

Joseon experience with such 'national flags' did not fully begin until the late nineteenth century. Compared to many European feudal societies, the dynastic Joseon state was much more centralised, despite the periodical dominance of some influential families.[243] Joseon's social elite and political factions did not have specially assigned family crests or coats of arms to represent their pedigree and lineage.[244] Instead, traditional Joseon flags of identification were reserved for the royal family, most prominently used in processions and rituals.[245] These processional flags (*uijang-gi*, 의장기, 儀仗旗) of the Joseon period were systematically intricate and visually elaborate, but were dependent on state protocols that were not publicly educated or

[241] Cumberland, *History of the Union Jack and Flags of the Empire*, 53.
[242] Cumberland, *History of the Union Jack and Flags of the Empire*, 63.
[243] While it is true that in the Goryeo period (고려, 高麗, 918-1392) and even in fourteenth century Joseon, prominent families did possess private armies (*sabyeong*, 사병, 私兵), private armies were banned during King Jeongjong's reign (정종, 定宗, 1398-1400) and such families never progressed into the feudal lords with official authority of governance over regional provinces like their European or Japanese counterparts. Yu Jae-ri, "Goryeo mal Joseon cho sabyeong yeon-gu" (Master's thesis, Seoul, Sookmyung Women's University, 1996).
[244] Japanese heraldry is the only comparable East Asian counterpart to European heraldry, notwithstanding its inevitable differences in detailed systems of heraldry. See David F. Phillips, Emmanuel Valerio, and Nozomi Kariyasu, *Japanese Heraldry and Heraldic Flags* (Danvers, Mass.: Flag Heritage Foundation, 2018), Editor's Preface.
[245] Lee Gi-hun, "Hanguk geunhyeondaesa ui minjok, minjuhwa undong gwa Taegeukgi," in *Daehan, Taegeukgi: 3.1 Undong mit Daehan Minguk Imsi Jeongbu surip 100 junyeon ginyeom Lee Byeong-geun sojang yumul teukbyeoljeon* (Cheongju: Gyowon Daehakgyo Gyoyuk Bakmulgwan, 2019), 136.

commonly understood; the procession itself, rather than the array of flags represented monarchical power and authority.

Throughout the long lifespan of the Joseon kingdom, the fundamental designs of military and processional flags were more or less consistent.[246] Visual symbolisms used by the state and king largely followed indoctrinated customs until the end of the Joseon period, as recorded in many *uigwe* (의궤, 儀軌, Royal Protocols) and historical records.[247] Yet, there was no one exclusive, standardised flag that represented the king. Rather, processional flags existed as a series of flags that accompanied the king and the royal family for specific occasions. Neither was there a concept of a national flag. Not only was the king equated with the country itself, but it was also deemed unnecessary to identify Joseon among other nations outside of the Sinocentric world order through flags. However, with the opening of ports and the forging of new diplomatic relations with Western powers in the late nineteenth century, Joseon was self-obliged to provide

[246] There were some minor periodic trends. For instance, during King Gojong's reign, many processional flags employed symbols of philosophical cosmology. Jeong Myeong-gyo, "Joseon sidae ihu Hanguk jeontong gi (gitbal) yeon-gu," 16; National Palace Museum of Korea, *Wangsil munhwa dogam: Uijang* (Seoul: National Palace Museum of Korea, 2018).

[247] Joseon processional flag designs used to represent the king, his court, and the monarchical system can be broadly categorised according to their motifs. These include animal design (*dongmulmun*, 동물문,動物紋); four guardians design (*sasinmun*, 사신문, 四神紋); Taegeuk design (태극문, 太極紋, also known as *inbongmun*, 인봉문, 人封紋); heavenly design (*cheonsangmun*, 천상문, 天上紋), landscape-scenery design (*sansumun*, 산수문, 山水紋); demigod design (*sininmun*, 신인문, 神人紋); talismanic writing design (*bujeokmun*, 부적문, 符籍紋); letter design (*munja*, 문자, 文字). Cloud designs were also often added onto these designs as decorative elements. These designs had their own specific associations and symbolic meanings, but all were of auspicious nature. Among these designs, some noticeable motifs such as the phoenix and dragon were consistently associated with the king and royal family. Jeong Myeong-gyo, "Joseon sidae ihu Hanguk jeontong gi (gitbal) yeon-gu," 22–39; Baek Yeong-ja, *Hwangje reul suho haneun jadeul: Gungjung uijang-gi ui buhwal*.

a national flag and accommodate the pre-established rules of international law and Western systems of visual communication to compete in the new world order.

2.3. The Creation of Korea's First National Flag and State Representation Abroad

The creation of the Taegeukgi in the 1880s was a belated response and Korea's compliance to the changing world order that was centred around the West. Until the nineteenth century, Joseon autonomy was not subject to international contestation and validation. Indeed, Joseon's only substantial and consistent foreign relation was that with China, and even this relationship cannot be seen as analogous to the Western idea of legally bound international relations among equal sovereign nations-states. Despite the ambiguity of Sino-Joseon relations when applied to the standards of Western international law, the system had been maintained with considerable stability and satisfactorily for centuries.[248]

The term 'tributary relations' is often used to describe traditional Sino-Joseon relations, but in reality, it displayed multi-faceted conventions of 'giving and receiving.' While China received tribute, Joseon was not completely submissive or unilaterally in servitude of China.[249] In fact, China provided most of the expenses of the tributary visits and the value of gifts bestowed upon Joseon envoys would often exceed those

[248] Seung-jin Oh, "Historical Injustice and Its Implications on International Law in East Asia," *Pacific Focus* 33, no. 3 (December 2018): 398.
[249] China received material tribute but also ostensible political authority in the form of *chaekbong* (책봉, 冊封, investiture). *Chaekbong* was a crucial part of the Sinocentric order and refers to the authority to approve but not unilaterally determine the monarch of Joseon. See Pae Keun Park, "Introduction of Western International Law into East Asia," 250–51; Seung-jin Oh, "Historical Injustice and Its Implications on International Law in East Asia," 398; Jonathan D. Spence, *The Search for Modern China* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1990), 118–19; Jeong Yong-hwa, "Yu Gil-jun ui yangjeol chejeron," 297–318.

received by China.[250] Also, Joseon autonomy in its own domestic affairs and foreign diplomacy was fully protected.[251] The symbolic continuation of the trust between the 'centre' and 'periphery' and the maintenance of peace and diplomatic order based on Confucian familial relations were demonstrated through such tributes.

When Joseon opened its ports to Japan in 1876, and soon after to Western nations throughout the 1880s, the incompatibility of this tributary relationship with Western international law became apparent and it became imperative that Joseon be able to represent itself as a sovereign and fully independent nation-state. Despite having already made several legal declarations on Joseon's sovereignty and independence from the signing of the 1876 Joseon-Japan Treaty, Joseon still had to fully demonstrate and consolidate its status as a sovereign country throughout the late nineteenth century, particularly in relation to China.[252] One of the ways in which this was done was through visual imagery, most prominently its national flag.

Joseon first witnessed and experienced modern flag-bearing customs through the Ganghwa Island Incident of 1875, prior to the signing of the Joseon-Japan Treaty. According to the dialogue between Joseon Representative Sin Heon (신헌, 申櫶, 1810-1884) and Japanese Ambassador Kuroda Kiyotaka (黑田淸隆, 1840-1900) in February 1876, Joseon failed to fully understand the system of flag-bearing on ships and attacked

---

[250] Pae Keun Park, "Introduction of Western International Law into East Asia," 250; Li Zhaojie, "Traditional Chinese World Order," *Chinese Journal of International Law* 1, no. 1 (March 2002): 55.
[251] Pae Keun Park, "Introduction of Western International Law into East Asia," 253–54; Cumings, *Korea's Place in the Sun*, 90.
[252] Article 1 of the Joseon-Japan Treaty clearly stated that Joseon was an independent and autonomous state with equal rights as Japan. Woong Joe Kang, *The Korean Struggle for International Identity in the Foreground of the Shufeldt Negotiation, 1866-1882* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 2005), 59.

the Japanese gunboat, *Unyo,* despite it bearing a Japanese ensign.[253] Although the Japanese vessel had intentionally occupied Korean coasts and attempted to illegally dock on Korean soil, the Japanese were successful in demanding indemnification, as well as prompting the signing of the Joseon-Japan Treaty (Ganghwa Treaty) that opened Joseon ports.[254] The occasion also led to increased awareness within the government of the need to devise a new Joseon flag.[255]

The exact details on the creation of the Taegeukgi remain disputed, but there are two main theories.[256] The first theory is that Park Yeong-hyo, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Japan in September 1882, produced a design of the Taegeukgi aboard the *Meiji Maru* (明治丸). According to Park's personal accounts of his trip to Japan in *Sahwa giryak* (사화기략, 使和記略, 1882), prior to the mission he had already been given an order from the king to devise a new national flag.[257] After selecting the design of the national flag onboard the ship to Kobe (고베, 神戸), he

[253] Mok Soo-hyun, "Geundae gukga ui 'gukgi' raneun sigak munhwa," 313; Kim Jong-hak, "1876-nyeon Jo Il suho jogyu chegyeol gwajeong ui jaeguseong: Simhaeng ilgi wa myeot gaji migan munheon e gicho hayeo," *Hanguk jeongchi hakhoebo* 51, no. 5 (December 2017): 193.
[254] Jihyun Son, "The Creation of a Korean National Flag, 1880s–1910s," *Smarthistory*, 15 July, 2022, https://smarthistory.org/korean-national-flag/, accessed 6 September, 2022.
[255] Choi Jeong-jun, "Taegeukgi e gwanhan yeokhakjeok geomto: Gaejeong nonui wa gwanryeon hayeo," *Hanguk sasangsahak* 47 (August 2014): 355–57.
[256] For a comprehensive overview and timeline of events leading to the production of the Taegeukgi, see Mok Soo-hyun, "Geundae gukga ui 'gukgi' raneun sigak munhwa," 312.
[257] Kim Won-mo interprets this statement to mean that Gojong had instructed Park Yeong-hyo of the specific Taegeuk design itself, not just that he should create a national flag. This is another sub-theory arguing that Gojong was behind the creation of the Taegeukgi. Kim Won-mo, "Jo Mi joyak chegyeol yeon-gu," 65; Lee Seon-geun, "Uri gukgi jejeong ui yurae wa geu uiui," in *Guksasang ui jemunje*, vol. 2 (Seoul: Guksa Pyeonchan Wiwonhoe, 1959), 200.

reported this back to the government on 3 October, 1882, and the Taegeukgi became the official national flag on 6 March, 1883.[258]

The Park Yeong-hyo theory provides an interesting insight into how the design for the Taegeukgi may have been selected. When Park presented his design to British interpreter William George Aston (1841-1911), who would later become British consul to Korea in 1884, Aston suggested that he also consult a certain "Captain James" who had plenty of experience with national flags.[259] The captain remarked that the eight trigrams may be too complex and difficult to replicate and suggested placing four trigrams around the Taegeuk instead.[260] This account demonstrated that in addition to the relevance of the symbol to the nation's identity, effective visual recognition and replication was an important factor considered during the selection of the national flag design.[261]

The second theory stems from a drawing of the Taegeukgi with the caption 'COREA Ensign' in *Flags of Maritime Nations,* published in July 1882.[262] (Fig. 2.3.)

---

[258] Lee Wan-beom, "Godae robuteo hyeondae Hanguk ui sangjing euroseo ui Taegeuk gwa Taegeukgi," in *Daehan, Taegeukgi: 3.1 Undong mit Daehan Minguk Imsi Jeongbu surip 100 junyeon ginyeom Lee Byeong-geun sojang yumul teukbyeoljeon* (Cheongju: Gyowon Daehakgyo Gyoyuk Bakmulgwan, 2019), 143–44; Park Yeong-hyo, *Sahwa giryak*, trans. Lee Hyo-jeong (Paju: Bogosa, 2018), 26–30.
[259] Han Cheol-ho, "Uri nara choecho ui gukgi ('Park Yeong-hyo Taegeukgi' 1882) wa Tongli Gyoseop Tongsang Samu Amun jejak gukgi (1884) ui wonhyeong balgyeon gwa geu yeoksajeok uiui," 155–57.
[260] The exact identity of Captain James is unclear but in Park Yeong-hyo's account, he is said to be an Englishman. Park Yeong-hyo, *Sahwa giryak*, 26-27.
[261] Mok Soo-hyun, "Geundae gukga ui 'gukgi' raneun sigak munhwa," 314.
[262] Bureau of Navigation, *Flags of Maritime Nations: From the Most Authentic Sources*, 5th ed. (Washington D.C.: Bureau of Navigation, 1882), https://archive.org/details/flagsofmaritimen00unitrich/page/n5/mode/2up?ref=ol&view=theater, accessed 6 September, 2022; Han Cheol-ho, "Uri nara choecho ui gukgi ('Park Yeong-hyo Taegeukgi' 1882) wa Tongli Gyoseop Tongsang Samu Amun jejak gukgi (1884) ui wonhyeong balgyeon gwa geu yeoksajeok uiui," 150.

Han Cheol-ho argues that this is most likely the so-called Lee Eung-jun Taegeukgi created for the 1882 Joseon-U.S. Treaty (Shufeldt Treaty), which would precede the Park Yeong-hyo Taegeukgi.[263] According to this theory, the Taegeukgi design was selected despite explicit recommendations on behalf of Chinese officials to use a dragon flag as the Joseon flag. From 1880, Chinese officials continuously suggested that Joseon adopt a modified version of the Qing dragon flag.[264] When translator Lee Eung-jun (이응준, 李應浚, 1832-?) presented a Taegeukgi flag design during meetings for the 1882 Joseon-U.S. Treaty, Ma Jianzhong (馬建忠, 1845-1900) who was present as Joseon's 'advisor' strongly recommended leading representative Kim Hong-jip (김홍집, 金弘集, 1842-1896) to adopt a red four-clawed dragon on a white background with blue clouds as the Taegeukgi may be confused with the Japanese flag.[265] (Fig. 2.4.)

Chinese intentions were simple and evident- to effectively maintain their control and influence over Joseon as its vassal state (*sokbang,* 속방, 屬邦) in order to preserve their influence on the peninsula.[266] The dragon flag proposed by Ma Jianzhong would

---

[263] Han Cheol-ho, "Uri nara choecho ui gukgi ('Park Yeong-hyo Taegeukgi' 1882) wa Tongli Gyoseop Tongsang Samu Amun jejak gukgi (1884) ui wonhyeong balgyeon gwa geu yeoksajeok uiui," 147–51.

[264] There are records of suggestions from Huang Zunxian (黃遵憲, 1848-1905) in 1880, Li Hongzhang (李鴻章, 1823-1901) in 1881, and Ma Jianzhong in 1882. Kim Mun-sik, "1882-nyeon Park Yeong-hyo ga sayonghan Joseon gukgi," 122–25; Kim Won-mo, *Taegeukgi ui yeonhyeok*, 7; Kim Won-mo, "Jo Mi joyak chegyeol yeon-gu," 60–67.

[265] Mok Soo-hyun, "Geundae gukga ui 'gukgi' raneun sigak munhwa," 312.

[266] Ju Jin-o, "19 segi mal Joseon ui jaju wa doklip," in *(Je 2 gi) Han Il yeoksa gondong yeon-gu bogoseo*, vol. 4 (Seoul: Han Il Yeoksa Gongdong Yeon-gu Wiwonhoe, 2010), 18–19; Kim Sang-seop, *Taegeukgi ui jeongche: Jejak gwajeong gwa juyeok wonri reul tonghae bon Taegeukgi nonui* (Seoul: Dong Asia, 2001), 77; Kim Won-mo, "Jo Mi joyak chegyeol yeon-gu," 62–63.

have not only resembled the Qing flag but expressed Joseon's status as a vassal state through the political hierarchy coded in traditional Sinocentric iconographies; the four-clawed dragon compared to Qing's five-clawed dragon, as well as the colour red compared to the imperial yellow used to decorate Qing's dragon, all reaffirmed Korea's tributary relation to China.[267]

The direct support of Commodore Robert W. Shufeldt (1822-1895) to abandon the tributary relation, added with the ongoing struggle to be seen as an independent nation-state from China compelled the Joseon government to reject the dragon flag. According to Kim Won-mo, during the Joseon delegates' reception with Commodore Shufeldt, the commodore recommended that Korea discard the conventional triangular dragon flag used in court and urged the production of a new Joseon national flag to make it known that the Joseon-U.S. treaty was a treaty between two independent nation-states.[268] This direct intervention from Shufeldt would have greatly affected Joseon representatives' decision to create a new national flag and gave them further ground to reject Chinese representatives' suggestions.[269]

In addition to political motivations to separate Joseon from China, it is evident that effective visual recognisability of the flag design was, again, an important factor that played into the selection of the Taegeukgi design. During a conversation with Ma Jianzhong at a farewell banquet at Nambyeolgung Palace (남별궁, 南別宮), Kim

[267] Roh Yeong-don, "Taegeukgi ui gukgi rosseo ui choecho sayong gwa Incheon," *Incheonhak yeon-gu* 26 (February 2017): 23; Kim Won-mo, "Jo Mi joyak chegyeol yeon-gu," 64.
[268] Shufeldt Papers: Letters, "The History of the Treaty With Korea, An Incident in the Life of Rear Admiral R. W. Shufeldt," December, 1898 in Kim Won-mo, "Jo Mi joyak chegyeol yeon-gu," 59.
[269] Roh Yeong-don, "Taegeukgi ui gukgi rosseo ui choecho sayong gwa Incheon," 25–26.

Hong-jip stated that the dragon flag design would be laborious and expensive to manufacture, and offered instead to further develop the Taegeuk design to differentiate it from the Japanese flag.[270] Although this was a polite excuse for declining Qing representatives' insistence on the dragon flag, it derived from a legitimate consideration in choosing any representative symbol of a modern nation-state. Eventually, Ma Jianzhong reluctantly and privately proposed that Joseon add eight trigrams around the Taegeuk symbol to differentiate the design from the Japanese flag.[271]

Despite Ma Jianzhong's suggestion of using eight trigrams, the Taegeukgi published in *Flags of Maritime Nations* only had four trigrams of *geon* (건, 乾), *gon* (곤, 坤), *gam* (감, 坎), and *ri* (리, 離), like the Park Yeong-hyo Taegeukgi design.[272] As mentioned above, Park Yeong-hyo similarly accepted Captain James' proposal aboard the *Meiji Maru* to use four trigrams instead of eight to ensure that the flag could be easily recognised and reproduced. The fact that visual elements were altered and deliberately selected for these pragmatic reasons of effective recognition and efficient reproduction further demonstrate the move away from traditional flags that were focused on preserving tradition, portraying philosophical and ideological customs, and

[270] Kim Won-mo, "Jo Mi joyak chegyeol yeon-gu," 63.
[271] From this, it can be assumed that the flag design that Lee Eung-jun brought with him most likely had only the Taegeuk symbol or had fewer trigrams than eight. Kim Mun-sik thinks that Park Yeong-hyo may have based his preliminary design on this eight-trigram Taegeuk proposed by Ma Jianzhong and presented a similar design to Aston before Captain James recommended simplifying the trigrams. Kim Mun-sik, "1882-nyeon Park Yeong-hyo ga sayonghan Joseon gukgi," 126–30.
[272] The flag was labelled as an ensign rather than a national flag because it was yet to be fully approved by the Joseon government. In the 1899 edition, the caption refers to the Taegeukgi as 'National Flag.' Han Cheol-ho, "Uri nara choecho ui gukgi ('Park Yeong-hyo Taegeukgi' 1882) wa Tongli Gyoseop Tongsang Samu Amun jejak gukgi (1884) ui wonhyeong balgyeon gwa geu yeoksajeok uiui," 152.

emphasising the mystic authority of the monarch through systemised Sinocentric iconography.

Moreover, the Taegeuk and trigrams had a long history and pervasive presence within Korean society, both high and low, from at least the seventh century.[273] They were symbols of ancient philosophical conceptualisations of the natural world that were popularised throughout East Asia, especially after the popular dissemination of *Changes of Zhou* (*Juyeok*, 주역, 周易, also known as *Yeokgyeong*, 역경, 易經, Book of Changes) and Zhou Dunyi's (주돈이, 周敦頤, 1017–1073) *Taegeuk doseol* (태극도설, 太極圖說, Explanations of the Diagram of the Supreme Ultimate) that theorised the Taegeuk ideology in eleventh century China.[274] When simplified, Taegeuk or Great Extreme exists in a world wherein the *eum* (음, 陰, negative forces) and *yang* (양, 陽, positive forces) are in constant change, and the eight trigrams refer to the processes of division and categorisation of all matter, which concretises the world view and provides an explanation of all creation and change in this universe.[275]

The Taegeuk and trigrams were pervasive in the visual culture of the Joseon period, and the *jwadokgi* (좌독기, 坐纛旗)*,* a processional flag used from at least from the late eighteenth century, was composed of Zhou Dunyi's geometric Taegeuk design, eight trigrams, and a constellation design (*seongjwamun*, 성좌문, 星座紋) of the

[273] Lee Wan-beom, "Godae robuteo hyeondae Hanguk ui sangjing euroseo ui Taegeuk gwa Taegeukgi," 142.
[274] Baek Gwang-ha, *Taegeukgi: Yeokri wa gwahak e gwanhan yeon-gu* (Seoul: Dongyang Suri Yeon-guwon Chulpanbu, 1965), 25–30.
[275] Lee Yu-jin, "Taegeukgi ui yeokhakjeok uimi yeon-gu" (Master's thesis, Gongju, Gongju National University, 2012), 41; Jeong Byeong-seok, "Taegeuk gaenyeom hyeongseong ui yeonwonjeok baegyeong gwa haeseok," *Cheolhak* 88 (August 2006): 46.

thirteenth star of the Twenty-Eight Mansions (*isip-palsu*, 이십팔수, 二十八宿).[276] Despite some similarities to the Taegeukgi in design, however, the fact remains that the *jwadokgi* was merely a component in a wider system of flags used to represent the king and state in the Joseon period.[277]

The Taegeukgi was officially recognised by the Joseon government in 1883 but was immediately used to represent Joseon after its creation in 1882. One of the earliest examples of its use abroad was when the Taegeukgi was hoisted in front of Park Yeong-hyo's accommodation in Kobe on 25 September, 1882 and used during official diplomatic events at Tokyo on the 3 and 13 November, 1882. [278] Although the Joseon government had yet to officialise the Taegeukgi as the national flag, it seems that Park Yeong-hyo had received permission to create and immediately use the Taegeukgi prior to his departure, revealing the government's urgent need for a national flag for state representation in international settings.[279]

The Taegeukgi was also used to represent Korea in the 1893 World's Columbian Exhibition of 1893.[280] (Fig. 2.5.) Joseon's participation in the fair, as well as the use of

---

[276] Minjok Munhwa Chujinhoe, ed., *(Gukyeok) Man-giyoram: Gunjeong pyeon*, vol. 2 (Seoul: Minjok Munhwa Chujinhoe, 1971); Mok Soo-hyun, "Geundae gukga ui 'gukgi' raneun sigak munhwa," 318–19.

[277] A possible factor behind the selection of this archaic Taegeuk over the Ming (명, 明, 1368-1644) *eum-yang-eo Taegeukdo* (음양어태극도, 陰陽魚太極圖, *eum-yang* fish Taegeuk) could be its relatively strong and apparent association with the ancient *Changes of Zhou* and the ideological explanations of the Taegeuk and trigrams that emphasised legitimacy and dignity of the heavenly appointed king. However, Ming-style Taegeuk eventually replaced the geometric Taegeuk to become the basis for the two-part Taegeuk design of Korea's first national flag. Kim Sang-seop, *Taegeukgi ui jeongche*; Sin Won-bong, "Taegeukgi Jung-guk yuraeseol e daehan banbak," *Dongyang munhwa yeon-gu* 8 (November 2011):145–77.

[278] Park Yeong-hyo, *Sahwa giryak*, 22, 72, 77–81.

[279] Park Yeong-hyo, *Sahwa giryak*, 22, 26–27.

[280] Lee Min-sik, *Kolleombia segye bakramhoe wa Hanguk*, 108–10.

the Taegeukgi, was significant as it was the first direct attempt to be recognised by the Western public as a sovereign and independent country.[281] Due to the government's inexperience in organising a public exhibition, the lack of sufficient time and resources for preparation, and the Orientalist gaze of the Western audience, the Joseon exhibition was interpreted as a "mixture of curiosity and puzzlement."[282] Nevertheless, through the exhibition, Joseon was officially introduced to the Western public and the Taegeukgi received attention and recognition as the Joseon flag.

The Taegeukgi had, in fact, already been hoisted on top of the Korean Legation in Washington D.C. in 1888, and Horace Allen's *Korean Tales* (1889), published in the United States, used the Taegeuk motif for its cover design, but the spectacle of the exposition was instrumental in the wider reception and recognition of Korea and its national flag.[283] (Fig. 2.6.) Interestingly, the Taegeukgi shown in the exhibition even inspired the Northern Pacific Railway to employ the Taegeuk motif as their trademark.[284] (Fig. 2.7.) In the company pamphlet, *Wonderland: The History of a Trade-mark* (1901), the author clearly stated that the company trademark was modelled after the Korean flag which was discovered by Mr. E. H. McHenry and Mr. Chas. S.

---

[281] Kane, "Korea in the White City," 38–39.
[282] Kane, "Korea in the White City," 39–40.
[283] Horace N. Allen, *Korean Tales: Being a Collection of Stories Translated from the Korean Folk Lore* (New York; London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1889), https://archive.org/details/koreantalesbeing00alle/mode/2up, accessed 6 September, 2022; Lee Hyeon-pyo, *Uju reul pumeun Taegeukgi* (Goyang: Koreoseu, 2015), 82.
[284] The use of the Taegeuk motif as a trademark logo of an American railroad company may seem unfitting, but it seems that the company associated the 'exoticness' of the Taegeuk with the mystical railroad trips they were trying to promote, as can be seen in their promotional booklet. A. M. Cleland, *Through Wonderland: Yellowstone National Park* (Northern Pacific Railroad Company, 1910), https://archive.org/details/throughwonderlan00clelrich/mode/2up, accessed 30 August, 2022; Lee Hyeon-pyo, *Uju reul pumeun Taegeukgi,* 82–111. Korea also participated in the 1900 Paris Expositions. See Kane, "'Display at Empire's End," 41–66.

Fee in the Korean Exhibit at the World's Fair of 1893.[285] (Fig. 2.8.) Ironically, this short commercial publication became the first literature that researched and analysed the design of Korea's national flag.[286]

An early example of the Taegeukgi produced by the Joseon state for official diplomatic purposes is the 'Denny Taegeukgi,' gifted to Owen N. Denny (1838-1900), U.S. Consul to Korea. (Fig. 2.9.) The Denny Taegeukgi is historically significant as the earliest surviving Taegeukgi presently kept in Korea and as an example that closely resembles the Lee Eung-jun Taegeukgi design found in *Flags of Maritime Nations*. Although *Flags of Maritime Nations* depicts the Taegeukgi with the flagpole on the left side like Western flags, it is thought that the Korean flag was initially designed with the intention of placing the flagpole on the right-hand side like traditional Joseon flags.[287] It is possible that a mistake was made while transferring the Taegeukgi design onto *Flags of Maritime Nations*, resulting in the displacement of the flagpole and the reversal of the flag design.[288] The Denny flag supports this theory as it too was designed to have the flagpole on the right-hand side. Consequently, if the Denny flag is reversed, the

---

[285] Olin D. Wheeler, "The History of a Trade-Mark," *Wonderland*, 1901, 5–6.
[286] Lee Hyeon-pyo, *Uju reul pumeun Taegeukgi*, 86–87.
[287] It is unlikely that the makers of the flag would have made a mistake as the flag is thought to have been a gift from Gojong himself. For a brief outline of Denny's activities, see Park So-yul, "Gojong sigi oegukin gomun ui donghyang: Meril gwa Deni ui hwaldong eul jungsim euro" (Master's thesis, Busan, Pusan National University), 19–32.
[288] Han Cheol-ho, "Uri nara choecho ui gukgi ('Park Yeong-hyo Taegeukgi' 1882) wa Tongli Gyoseop Tongsang Samu Amun jejak gukgi (1884) ui wonhyeong balgyeon gwa geu yeoksajeok uiui," 171–72; Mok Soo-hyun, "Geundae gukga ui 'gukgi' raneun sigak munhwa," 130.

design and placement of the four trigrams are identical to the Lee Eung-jun flag.[289] (Fig. 2.10.)

The Royal Archives Taegeukgi also illustrates the context in which the initial Taegeukgi design was made.[290] (Fig. 2.11.) The drawing of the Taegeukgi by an anonymous artist, produced by the request of British Consul, Sir Harry S. Parkes (1828-1885), in November 1882, also depicts the new flag with the flag pole on the right-hand side.[291] As the flag was sent to Sir Harry Parkes by Yoshida Kiyonari (吉田 清成, 1845-1891), Japanese Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs, in order to inform the British government of Korea's new official national flag, the accuracy of the design can be seen as credible. Moreover, the letter and drawing were sent on 1 November, 1882, during Park Yeong-hyo's stay in Japan, which makes it likely that whoever drew the flag would have had seen the flag that Park Yeong-hyo had in his possession.[292] This further corroborates the fact that the design in *Flags of Maritime Nations* inaccurately reversed

---

[289] In the 1899 edition of *The Flags of Maritime Nations*, it seems that the original design was accounted for. In this edition, the trigrams are positioned in the same way as the Denny Taegeukgi but the Taegeuk's spiral is reversed anti-clockwise and is labelled as "National Flag" rather than "Ensign."

[290] Han Cheol-ho, "Uri nara choecho ui gukgi ('Park Yeong-hyo Taegeukgi' 1882) wa Tongli Gyoseop Tongsang Samu Amun jejak gukgi (1884) ui wonhyeong balgyeon gwa geu yeoksajeok uiui."

[291] Parkes was the British Consul General to Japan (1865-1883) and China (1883-1885), as well as Minister to Korea in 1884. Han Cheol-ho, "Uri nara choecho ui gukgi ('Park Yeong-hyo Taegeukgi' 1882) wa Tongli Gyoseop Tongsang Samu Amun jejak gukgi (1884) ui wonhyeong balgyeon gwa geu yeoksajeok uiui," 125–87.

[292] Park Yeong-hyo arrived in Japan on the 25 September, 1882 and 27 December. Han Cheol-ho, "Uri nara choecho ui gukgi ('Park Yeong-hyo Taegeukgi' 1882) wa Tongli Gyoseop Tongsang Samu Amun jejak gukgi (1884) ui wonhyeong balgyeon gwa geu yeoksajeok uiui," 129–30. A very similar illustration of the Taegeukgi was also featured in the Royal Asiatic Society of Japan in 1894 by W. G. Aston. William G. Aston, "The 'Hi No Maru,' or National Flag of Japan," *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan* 22 (1894): 33.

the Taegeukgi design so that the flagpole was shown on the left.[293] The letter also documented the heated interest of foreign nations in acquiring Joseon's national flag, attesting to the fact that the creation of the Taegeukgi was not only important for the Joseon state but also foreign representatives interested in establishing diplomatic relations with Joseon as national flags were a crucial component of international diplomacy.

The Taegeukgi that was given to Pierre Louis Jouy (1856-1894) who worked at the U.S. legation in 1883 is also noteworthy. The 'Jouy Taegeukgi' was taken back to the U.S. in 1884 and is now housed in the Smithsonian Institutution and is currently regarded as the earliest surviving example of the Korean flag. (Fig. 2.12.) Again, this flag is also identical in its elements as the Harry Parkes Taegeukgi, with the flagpole on the right. This reaffirms the argument that at least the original composition of the trigrams in both the Lee Eung-jun and Park Yeong-hyo Taegeukgi would have closely resembled the Denny Taegeukgi, notwithstanding confusion or inadvertent negligence of details such as the position of the flagpole in reproductions of the new flag design in secondary records like the *Flags of Maritime Nations*.

Certainly, by the late 1890s, the placement of the flagpole on the left-hand side was widely accepted and conventionalised. Regardless, the components of the Taegeukgi design greatly varied throughout the Joseon and Korean Empire period and was never fully standardised or regulated until after liberation in 1945. This is in sharp contrast to Western examples where the flag's uniformity was equated with legitimacy

---

[293] However, the Taegeuk spiral is anti-clockwise and has a shorter tail.

and authenticity, and the correct depiction of the flag was seen as a vital requirement to grant state authority over the bearers' activities.[294]

Despite inconsistencies in design, there are some general characteristics shared by Taegeukgi examples of different time periods. For instance, many early examples exhibit relatively large circular Taegeuk marks in the centre with smaller four trigrams closely surrounding it. (Fig. 2.13.) Also, the spiral of the Taegeuk motif tends to be stronger, shown with a longer tail. Some early examples have eyelets in the heads of the Taegeuk spirals, which can be frequently seen in Chinese depictions of the Taegeuk motif.[295] In later periods, the spirals are often simplified and shortened into half spirals, like the Taegeukgi used in South Korea today. The direction of the spiral and position of the four trigrams are inconsistent all throughout the 1880s to the 1910s, but it is relatively rare to find a Taegeuk with the *geon* trigram on either of the bottom corners.[296] In addition, Taegeukgi examples produced in the U.S. toward and after annexation often employed blue trigrams instead of black.[297]

The inconsistencies in the composition of the Taegeukgi may suggest that from the 1880s to the 1910s, the precision and standardisation of the flag design was less of a

---

[294] England, for instance, controlled identification flags and their usage by issuing registration forms proving legality and outlawed false flags from as early as 1270. Smith, *Flags Through the Ages and Across the World*, 46.

[295] Mok Soo-hyun, "Geundae gukga ui 'gukgi' raneun sigak munhwa," 330.

[296] Noticeable examples of Taegeukgi with the *geon* trigram on the bottom are found in the banner design of *Doklip sinmun*, the Independence Arch, and luggage tickets of Sontag's Hotel (1909) and the Palace Hotel (1907), which all seem to have been modelled after the *Doklip sinmun* Taegeukgi. Mok Soo-hyun, "Geundae gukga ui 'gukgi' raneun sigak munhwa," 326–29; Gyowon Daehakgyo Gyoyuk Bakmulgwan, *Daehan, Taegeukgi: 3.1 Undong mit Daehan Minguk Imsi Jeongbu surip 100 junyeon ginyeom Lee Byeong-geun sojang yumul teukbyeoljeon* (Cheongju: Gyowon Daehakgyo Gyoyuk Bakmulgwan, 2019), 13, 25.

[297] Gyowon Daehakgyo Gyoyuk Bakmulgwan, *Daehan, Taegeukgi,* 84–85.

priority than the actual provision of a national flag and the widespread usage and acknowledgement of the flag image. The belated creation of the Taegeukgi led to the rather rushed and inconsistent production and display of the new national flag, primarily in diplomatic events and publications informing foreign audiences of Joseon. State-regulated flag production and the need for a consistent and unified design may also have been overlooked, owing to the inexperience in understanding modern flags customs.

Furthermore, the Taegeuk and trigrams are, in their very nature, fluid symbols; different styles or positions of the visual elements do not affect their symbolic meanings.[298] Therefore, there were no 'incorrect' depictions of the Taegeuk and trigrams, with very few exceptions where trigrams other than *geon*, *gon*, *gam*, or *ri* were used. Also, various inconsistencies in depiction may ironically highlight the relative uniqueness and effective recognisability of the Taegeukgi design, contrary to Chinese concerns over the Taegeukgi's resemblance to the Japanese flag. Unlike European tri-coloured flags, the Taegeukgi was an easily distinguishable design, and naturally there was no urgent need to standardise its detailed elements.

On a more realistic note, when looking at the fact that the state did not provide a legal framework for the national flag design even until annexation, it seems likely that there simply was a shortage of state budget or manpower for a task that was not overwhelmingly urgent or critical. The lack of government control over the production and utilisation of the flag is made evident in a written account by Ernst von Hesse-Wartegg (1854-1918) during his stay in Joseon in late June of 1894. Here, he writes that

[298] For instance, while tricoloured flags would be greatly affected by the positioning of each coloured stripe, the Taegeuk and trigrams are less affected in identification and differentiation.

when he attempted to purchase a Taegeukgi in Busan, he was charged a high price for a poorly made rag brushed with red paint and black tar. A foreign customs officer informed him that a local government worker had monopolised the sales of Taegeukgi in the area and overcharged buyers as he knew that ships in the port would have to buy a new flag once the old one wore out as they were all required to hoist the Taegeukgi.[299] As such, it seems likely that low-level government workers were able to control the quality and quantity of flags, and likely would have produced inaccurate, inconsistent, and poor quality Taegeukgi without facing substantial state intervention or penalties.

Notwithstanding these cases of incomplete state regulation and standardisation of the Taegeukgi, the initial objective to visually proclaim Korean independence and sovereignty among nation-states and to separate Korea from China was met after the creation of the national flag. What is of great importance is that even though treaties and legal statutes had the formal power in declaring Joseon as independent from China, it was the visual symbol of the Taegeukgi that was most expressive. As the most prominent national symbol that was repeatedly and systematically represented Korea, the simple differentiation from the Chinese dragon flag clearly and effectively expressed the desire to definitively depart from traditional Joseon-China relations.

[299] Ernst von Hesse-Wartegg, *Korea: Eine Sommerreise Nach Dem Lande Der Morgenruhe* (Dresden: Reissner, 1895), 9, https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_fDJDAQAAMAAJ/page/n15/mode/2up, accessed 30 August, 2022; Lee Hyeon-pyo, *Uju reul pumeun Taegeukgi*, 118–22.

2.4. The Creation of Korea's Imperial Emblem

The proclamation of the Korean Empire in 1897 resulted in a major reconfiguration of state representation. The elevation from kingdom to empire after the assassination of Queen Min (Posthumous title Empress Myeongseong, 명성황후, 明成皇后, 1851-1895) in 1895 and Gojong's flight to the Russian Legation in 1896 can be seen as a symbolic attempt to further assert Korean independence and autonomy. Gojong also attempted to strengthen his own waning authority from 1900 as domestic threats to absolute monarchy were growing. This gave occasion to promote a new, imperial symbol, one which could reaffirm the power of the state and emperor and reconstruct the image of the new, modern Korean Empire.

The Ihwamun, a plum blossom emblem, shares the same Chinese character with the royal family name Yi and was thus directly connected to monarchical rule and lineage of the monarchy. Most significantly, the emblem was not selected among traditional imagery used in court to signify royal authority such as the dragon, phoenix, or the peony that had their origins in Sinocentric doctrines of visual symbolism. Even during the Korean Empire, the court employed strategies of borrowing Chinese symbolisms to express the elevated and equivalent status of the Korean Empire to China; for instance, Emperor Gojong dressed in yellow robes instead of red, decorated his carriage and court objects with golden colours and peony and dragon motifs.[300] In contrast, the Ihwamun was a distinctly Korean motif that emphasised Korea's own self-defined significance as an independent and competitive nation-state.

[300] Park Hyeon-jeong, "Daehan Jegukgi Oyatggot munyang yeon-gu," 47.

Of course, the plum blossom also appeared in court and Joseon culture prior to the adoption of the Ihwamun as the state emblem at the end of the nineteenth century. There are records of the plum blossoms in the *Annals of the Joseon Dynasty* (*Joseon wangjo sillok*, 조선왕조실록, 朝鮮王朝實錄) that reach as far back as King Taejo's reign (태조, 太祖, 1335-1408, r. 1392-1398), where the plum tree was used as a metaphor for the Joseon dynasty's strong roots.[301] Nevertheless, the Ihwamun at the turn of the twentieth century differentiated itself from other auspicious images used in court as it was a visual symbol that officially and systematically cemented the political position of the royal family in various public settings outside of the court.

Most examples of the Ihwamun from the Korean Empire period were standardised in their form; they are typically depicted with five round petals, each containing three to four stamens. Prior to this, however, many examples of the Ihwa design display either a naturalistic depiction of the plum blossom flower or an over-generalised flower image. For instance, in 1885, the Ihwa motif was employed as part of a sample coin design minted by the newly founded Gyeongseong Jeonhwan-guk (경성전환국, 京城典圜局, Gyeongseong Mint Bureau).[302] (Fig. 2.14.) The Ihwa

---

[301] *Taejo sillok*, vol. 4, 1393, http://sillok.history.go.kr/id/kaa_10209018_002, accessed 30 August, 2022; Park Hyeon-jeong, "Daehan Jegukgi Oyatggot munyang yeon-gu," 41–43.

[302] Park Hyeon-jeong, "Daehan Jegukgi Oyatggot munyang yeon-gu," 48. On the other hand, Mok Soo-hyun dates 1892 as the first usage of the Ihwa motif on the Incheon Jeonhwan-guk coin. Mok Soo-hyun, "Mang-guk gwa gukga pyosang ui uimi byeonhwa: Taegeukgi, Oyatggot, Mugunghwa reul jungsim euro," *Hanguk munhwa* 53 (March 2011): 160. These different timelines may derive from different interpretations of the fact that the 1885 coin produced by the Gyeongseong Jeonhwan-guk was not actually put to use as it was an experimental stage of configuring the production of modern Korean mintage. Moreover, although the Ihwa in the form of a plum blossom branch appears in the 1885 experimental coins, they only appear as an independent symbol in the 1892 coin. Lee Gyeong-ok, "Gaehwagi upyo munyang yeon-gu," 34.

motif is rendered in a relatively small, naturalistic, and decorative manner in the form of a blossoming branch. In 1892, the Ihwa design was once again used in coins from the Incheon Jeonhwan-guk (인천전환국, 仁川典圜局, Incheon Mint Bureau) in a more simpler form, without the branches.[303] (Fig. 2.15.)

Taegeuk Stamps, printed in 1895, also contain what is generally accepted as an early rendition of the Ihwamun on the four corners of the outer frame. (Fig. 2.16.) The flowers in the stamp omitted the distinguishable element of the stamens, but they have five round petals. Although it is highly probable that the flowers are indeed plum blossoms, they lack sufficient characteristics to positively identify them as Ihwamun as they are over-generalised renditions. The over-simplification of the image in early stamps may be attributed to technical difficulties in printing intricate designs, bureaucratic negligence, or indifference in the exact depiction of the Ihwamun, or the incomplete standardisation of the design.[304]

It is unlikely that the plum blossom design was initially employed on these objects with the premeditated intent of representing the Korean Empire. Not only was the 1897 proclamation unforeseeable in the late 1880s and even the early 1890s, but it is more fitting that the Ihwa design, despite having been traditionally used as an auspicious symbol of the royal family, was simply a convenient design element of

---

[303] Park Hyeon-jeong, "Daehan Jegukgi Oyatggot munyang yeon-gu," 4–5, 50; Lee Seok-ryun, *Uri nara hwapye geumyungsa: 1910-nyeon ijeon* (Seoul: Bakyeongsa, 1994), 241–42, 327. Interestingly, the Incheon Mint coin added a Mugunghwa branch on the left side of the semi-wreath, opposite a branch of the Ihwa branch on the right.

[304] However, there is also the relatively unlikely possibility that the motifs are simply decorative flower motifs, not specific to plum blossoms. Lee Gyeong-ok also points out that the flower motifs are assumed to be Ihwa emblems in other research, but she also considers the 1900 Ihwa Stamp as the first stamp design where the Ihwa emblem decisively appears. Lee Gyeong-ok, "Gaehwagi upyo munyang yeon-gu," 20, 32–35.

newly introduced modern objects that that benchmarked Japanese or Western examples and only required a certain level of localisation. For instance, the 1892 Incheon '5 nyang' silver coin is almost identical to the contemporary Japanese Meiji sen and yen silver coin designs, but while most of the core design was maintained, the Japanese chrysanthemum emblem was replaced with the plum blossom.[305] (Fig. 2.17.) The initial application of the Ihwa motif prior to the Korean Empire can be seen as a reactionary decision amidst the rapid influx of Western technology and material goods and the eager attempts of the court to fashion a 'new look' of the country through such modern objects.[306] Nevertheless, it is meaningful that the Ihwa motif was used in a broader context of identification and branding of the Korean state and her industries even prior to the proclamation of the Korean Empire.[307]

As the Ihwa motif began to be repeatedly used in objects like coins and stamps, throughout the late 1880s and early 1890s, by the Korean Empire period, the image was substantially standardised and schematised to look more like a logo rather than a truthful depiction of the plum blossom, which helped to effectively represent the imperial family.[308] It was the consistency and instant recognisability of the design that

---

[305] Park Hyeon-jeong, "Daehan Jegukgi Oyatggot munyang yeon-gu," 50; Lee Seok-ryun, *Uri nara hwapye geumyungsa*, 241–42.

[306] Indeed, the Gyeongseong Bureau of Mint was criticised for its operational impracticalities and overspending of government budgets. Jo Yeong-jun, "Seolrip chogi jeonhwan-guk ui unyeong siltae, 1883-1892," *Hangukhak* 37, no. 1 (March 2014): 318–19; Park Hyeon-jeong, "Daehan Jegukgi Oyatggot munyang yeon-gu," 71–72.

[307] Mok Soo-hyun, "Mang-guk gwa gukga pyosang ui uimi byeonhwa," 160.

[308] Although the image of the Ihwamun appeared from the 1880s, the first official record of the emblem appears on 17 April, 1900 in "Hunjang jorye." See Gojong sillok, vol. 40, 17 April, 1900, http://sillok.history.go.kr/id/kza_13704017_002, accessed 30 August, 2022.

granted authority to the emblem, hence the simple, two-dimensional, and static design of many emblems.[309]

The assertive use of the Ihwamun as an imperial emblem took flight after the proclamation of the Korean Empire. In the 1900 Ordinance on Medals (*Hunjang jorye*, 훈장조례, 勳章條例), the Ihwamun was officially referred to as the "state emblem" (*gukmun*, 국문, 國文).[310] Objects other than medals, such as court ceramics, metal ware, textiles, medals, official documents, and state buildings were also decorated with the Ihwa emblem during the Korean Empire period.[311] For instance, Isabella Bird Bishop recollects that the "five-petaled plum blossom, the dynastic emblem" decorated the roofs of Gyeong-un-gung Palace (경운궁, 慶運宮, also known as Deoksugung Palace, 덕수궁, 德壽宮) when she had an audience with Gojong in 1897.[312] As an imperial emblem that symbolised the Yi family, it emphasised the authority of the emperor and the state, particularly in court settings. (Fig. 2.18)

From the general point of its appearance in modern objects in the 1880s, it took more than ten years for the Ihwamun to gain the status as an imperial emblem, at which point the usage of the emblem was diversified in its political applications. Notwithstanding the restriction the Ihwamun had as a relatively narrow representation

---

309 Park Hyeon-jeong, "Daehan Jegukgi Oyatggot munyang yeon-gu," 53–54.
310 *Gojong sillok*, vol. 40, 17 April, 1900, http://sillok.history.go.kr/id/kza_13704017_003, accessed 30 August, 2022.
311 The Ihwamun was used to decorate Injeongmun Gate (인정문, 仁政門), Injeongjeon Hall (인정전, 仁政殿), and Huijeongdang Hall (희정당, 熙政堂) of Changdeokgung Palace (창덕궁, 昌德宮), as well as Seokjojeon Hall (석조전, 石造殿) and Deokhongjeon Hall (덕홍전, 德弘殿) of Gyeong-un-gung Palace. Mok Soo-hyun, "Daehan Jegukgi gukga sigak sangjing ui yeonwon gwa byeoncheon," *Misulsa nondan* 27 (December 2008): 302–3.
312 Bishop, *Korea and Her Neighbors,* 429.

of the Korean state and its rulership, the proliferation of the imagery was significant in that it furthered public reception and acceptance of modern systems of visual representation, communication, and consumption.

2.5. Domestic Applications

2.5.a. Branding State Projects and National Imagery

National symbols such as the flag and emblem not only embody the collective memory and identity of the nation-state but also legitimise the authority and "power of the state to define a nation."[313] Michael E. Geisler elaborates:

> "[N]ational symbols are located in the crossover region where the nation as an [‘imagined community’] meets the state as a collective institution acting in empirical reality. Through the ubiquitous display of national symbols, the state legitimizes itself vis-à-vis the concept of the nation that undergirds it; on the other hand, the state also makes use of these same symbols to communicate its authority as a hegemonic power structure."[314]

Both the Taegeukgi and Ihwamun were initially created by the state. The state primarily used the Taegeukgi to represent Korea for diplomatic occasions and both the Ihwamun and Taegeukgi in ‘branding’ the state and its modernisation projects within Korea. Branding marked state presence and ownership that reminded viewers of the hegemonic power structure of the Korean state and government.

State-branding became increasingly important as the government proceeded to modernise the country and imported more and more Western goods and technologies that required similarly Western and standardised visual presentation.[315] As the government was the primary supplier of imported modern technologies and new

---

[313] Geisler, ed., *National Symbols, Fractured Identities,* XV–XVI.
[314] Geisler, ed., *National Symbols, Fractured Identities*, XIX–XX.
[315] For instance, postage stamps and postcards were produced in accordance with international standards, and diplomatic documents and medals that were exchanged with foreign representatives were designed in reference to Western models. Park Hyeon-jeong, "Daehan Jegukgi Oyatggot munyang yeon-gu," 71–72.

infrastructure, many objects and images were branded with the Taegeukgi and Ihwamun as a type of logo for the state. The Ihwamun and the Taegeukgi were used to decorate a wide array of objects such as post stamps, trams, passports, and court objects that symbolised the modern state-building of the early twentieth century. These were not simple ornamentations, but visual signifiers of royal or imperial authority and Korean nationhood bound by the governance of the state. For newly imported goods and technology, it was also important for the state to claim ownership and control of foreign goods and infrastructures. After the proclamation of the Korean Empire, the project to strengthen the status of the imperial family became all the more reason for aggressive state-building and branding through the flag and emblem.[316]

The establishment of many modern infrastructures and institutions were two-fold in their significance; it was central to both the socio-economic reformation of the country and to the elevation of the fragile standing of the state from the late nineteenth century. The establishment of the Postal Bureau (Ujeong-guk, 우정국, 郵政局) in 1884 was a vital part of modernisation and state-building agendas of the turn of the twentieth century.[317] It was symbolic of the rising power of the Reform Party and the state's belated embarkment on its nationwide modernisation plans.[318] The timing of the

[316] Lee Yun-sang, "Dahan Jegukgi gukga wa gukwang ui wisang jego saeop," *Jindan hakbo* 95 (June 2003): 81–112.
[317] In 1882, Ujeongsa (우정사, 郵政司) was established under the Foreign Office (Tongli Gyoseop Tongsang Samu Amun, 통리교섭통상사무아문, 統理交涉通商事務衙門), but postal services commenced in 1884 when it was renamed Ujeong-guk under the Home Office (Gun-guk Samu Amun, 군국사무아문, 軍國事務衙門).
[318] The celebratory banquet for the grand opening of the Postal Bureau was used as a backdrop for the failed Gapsin Coup, which led to the closing of the office and more than a decade-long absence of a postal system. The banquet was a convenient occasion for a coup as many officials that were assigned to the new Postal Bureau were

second re-establishment of the Postal Bureau and the active postal services in Korea also aligned with the Japanese triumph in the Sino-Japanese War and increased Japanese influence in Korean modernisation projects.

The establishment of a modern postal service entailed the production of stamps. From 1884 to 1910, there have been a total of 44 stamp designs, the majority of those embellished with either the Taegeuk or Ihwa motifs. The first postage stamp issued by the Post Office and printed in Japan in 1884 was the Munwi Stamp (문위우표, 文位郵票) which employed the archaic Taegeuk diagram of Zhou Dunyi's *Taegeuk doseol* but was hardly used due to the 1884 Gapsin Coup.[319] (Fig. 2.19.) The inclination to use this type of Taegeuk design even after the creation of a national flag could be traced back to the reference of processional flag designs and the *eogi* design.[320] (Fig. 2.20.) There is a possibility that either the newly devised Taegeukgi design was not yet made readily available for print in Japan, or the archaic design was deliberately selected to emphasise the long history and legitimacy of the Joseon dynasty and the royal family.

In 1893, the Postal Bureau was briefly reinstated under the name Jeonuchong-guk (전우총국, 電郵總局) after a hiatus due to the Gapsin Coup. At this time, the office was poorly equipped to print the stamps independently and was aided by the U.S. government. A total of 8,000,000 Taegeuk Stamps (태극우표, 太極郵票) were printed by Andrew B. Graham Bank Notes Bonds Company in Washington, and the new

reformists who had been educated in Japan or China. Lee Gyeong-ok, "Gaehwagi upyo munyang yeon-gu," 10–11; Inoue Kakugoro, "Hanseong jijanmong," 23-73.

[319] The name 'Munwi' derived from the currency 'mun' that was used in the 1880s. Lee Gyeong-ok, "Gaehwagi upyo munyang yeon-gu," 16–17.

[320] Kim Sang-seop, *Taegeukgi ui jeongche:* 92–93; Lee Tae-jin, "Gojong ui gukgi jejeong gwa gunmin ilche ui jeongchi inyeom," in *Gojong sidae ui jaejomyeong* (Seoul: Taehaksa, 2000).

Taegeuk Stamp was disseminated in 1895.[321] (Fig. 2.16.) The 1895 Taegeuk Stamp was revised in 1897 when the official name of the country 'Dae Joseon-guk (대조선국, 大朝鮮國, Great Country of Joseon)' was changed to 'Daehan Jeguk.' Accordingly, existing Taegeuk Stamps were printed with the word 'Daehan' over 'Joseon.' (Fig. 2.21.) Taegeuk Stamps were further altered in 1900 and 1902 due to revised prices, pointing to the long and widespread usage of the Taegeuk Stamps and their impact as modern daily objects branded by the state.[322] (Fig. 2.22.)

Due to budget shortages, printers for stamps and postcards were only imported in 1898.[323] From 1900, stamps and postcards were printed domestically, supervised by Japanese technicians.[324] Interestingly, it was during this period that Gojong aimed to strengthen his authority and statist nationalism, as reflected in the increased level of state control in stamp production. It was in this stage of domestic production, using imported German printers, that the eleven types of Ihwa Stamps (이화우표, 李花郵票) were created.[325] (Fig. 2.23.) Although this stamp also features the Taegeuk motif, the

---

[321] There were four versions of the Taegeuk Stamp according to their price: 5 pun (푼, 分), 1 don (돈, 戔), 2 don 5 pun, and 5 don. Postal duties were once again halted in 1894 due to the outbreak of the First Sino-Japanese War, but soon afterwards were resumed and continued throughout the Korean Empire. Lee Hae-cheong, *Segye ui jin-gwi upyo* (Seoul: Myeong-ok Chulpansa, 1983), 54; Jin Gi-hong, *Gu Hanguk sidae ui upyo wa ujeong*, 18–19; Lee Gyeong-ok, "Gaehwagi upyo munyang yeon-gu," 11-12.
[322] Lee Gyeong-ok, "Gaehwagi upyo munyang yeon-gu," 12; Lee Sang-ho, *Geundae ujeongsa wa upyo: Amjeong Lee Sang-ho gu Hanguk upyo sojangpum seonjip* (Seoul: Jeonil Sileop Chulpanguk, 1994).
[323] Kim Bong-hui, *Hanguk gaehwagi seojeok munhwa yeon-gu*, 34–35; Seo Eun-yeong, "Geundae inswae munhwa ui hyeongseong gwa Daehan minbo 'saphwa' ui deungjang," 559.
[324] Hong Sun-pyo, "Geundaejeok ilsang gwa pungsok ui jingjo," 253–79.
[325] An artist named Ji Chang-han (지창한, 池昌翰, 1851-1921) from Hamgyeongbuk-do Province, is known to be behind the Ihwa Stamp design, but little is known about him. In addition, among the eleven types of prototype designs, one design also featured

name Ihwa Stamp was coined by South Korean government official Jin Gi-hong as it was the first stamp that featured a clearly identifiable Ihwamun as the primary motif.[326] Yet, the Taegeuk remains central to the overall composition. The fact that all stamps, with the exception of the 1902 celebratory stamp of the fortieth anniversary of Gojong's accession to the throne (어극 40 주년 기념우표, 御極 40 年紀念郵票), employed the Taegeuk image as their central motif further exposes the subtle yet evident hierarchy in the importance placed on the Taegeuk and Ihwa as representative symbols of the Korean nation-state.[327] (Fig. 2.24.)

The Postal Bureau and the operation of postal services visualised the sovereignty and authority of the invisible state and government:

> "Although that State should have mythical, impersonal qualities, it could be conjured and reified by the existence of government institutions like the Post Office creating bureaucracies, legal regimes, and administrative practices that constantly reiterated the State as the locus of governance and authoritative power."[328]

By shifting the "locus of sovereignty" from the "person of the Emperor to the impersonal state," the visual symbols associated with the Korean Postal Bureau were

---

the Mugunghwa as a design element. Lee Gyeong-ok, "Gaehwagi upyo munyang yeon-gu," 20, 36.

[326] Jin Gi-hong, *Gu Hanguk sidae ui upyo wa ujeong*.

[327] Lee Gyeong-ok, "Gaehwagi upyo munyang yeon-gu," 32. Other than the stamps mentioned, Jeonwi cheomswae Stamps (전위 첨쇄 우표, 錢位添刷郵票), and Hawk Stamps (매 우표, 鷹郵票) were also printed throughout the Korean Empire period. Jeonwi cheomswae Stamps were unused Taegeuk Stamps that were printed with a larger currency 'jeon' (전, 錢). Lee Gyeong-ok, "Gaehwagi upyo munyang yeon-gu," 21-22.

[328] Lane Jeremy Harris, "The Post Office and State Formation in Modern China, 1896-1949" (PhD diss., Urbana, Illinois, University of Illinois, 2012), 447.

also expanded in their scope of representation from monarch to state.[329] In particular, the Ihwamun was made into a much more encompassing symbol that not only represented the Yi royal family but also the authority of the state, its modernisation projects, and even Korean sovereignty. While the Taegeukgi already enjoyed such status from its creation, the Ihwamun also became a visible index of the invisible entity of the state and its constituent bureaucracy by offering itself as a consistent representative logo.

The socio-political climate of the Korean Empire, however, was tense and fast-changing. On one hand, civil organisations such as the Independence Club and reformist intellectuals began to voice their desire to reconstruct the Korean nation-state into one that was inclusive of the collective people to enhance national power and preserve Korean independence. In the 1890s, the interests of civil organisations and the state generally aligned; while the state had the power to deliberate and execute broader agendas aimed at foreign diplomacy, the civil organisation provided domestic edification and support for modernisation and reformist policies. Chandra explains the appeal of the royal family in achieving the club's objectives:

> "To the leaders of the Independence Club there was no better living focus for the Korean people's loyalty to their nation than the Yi royal house. If the royal house could be visibly identified with the change in Korea's international status, the Club leaders seem to have reasoned, that should lead to a palpable change in the Korean people's perception of the rights accruing to their nation as a free state. Any onslaught on these rights would thus be viewed as an attack on the

---

[329] Harris, "The Post Office and State Formation in Modern China, 1896-1949," 4.

> royal house itself and hence unacceptable. Not only should this be sound psychological preparation against any possible foreign designs upon Korea, but it should also isolate and neutralize those within Korea who were still clinging to the traditional attitude of subservience to China or were otherwise wary of national independence."[330]

The boundary between government and intellectuals active outside of the government was also fluid, resulting in unofficial cooperation and collaboration in realising many modernisation and nation-building agendas.

It was in 1898 when a major shift in the relationship between the state and the Independence Club occurred, resulting in a regressive pursuit of statist and monarch-centred nationalism. Despite efforts to achieve the mutually beneficial goal of edifying the public of the importance of national autonomy and independence and instilling in them a coordinated sense of allegiance to their king and country (*chung-gun aeguk*, 충군애국, 忠君愛國), the new Korean nation-state that the Independence Club and its members had envisioned ultimately entailed the political reconstruction to a constitutional monarchy or a parliamentary system (*gunmin gongchi*, 군민공치, 君民共治) that limited the authority of the emperor.[331] When members of the club hosted a series of Manmin Gongdonghoe (만민공동회, 萬民共同會, People's Joint Association) meetings in 1898, Emperor Gojong forcibly disbanded the club.[332]

---

330 Chandra, "Sentiment and Ideology in the Nationalism of the Independence Club (1896—1898)," 16.
331 Song Seok-yun, "Gunmin gongchi wa ipheon gunjuje heonbeop," 497–527; Lee Hyeon-pyo, *Uju reul pumeun Taegeukgi*, 165–68.
332 Choi Chang-seok, "Gaehwagi Doklip Hyeophoe ui hwaldong gwa 'gukmin-mandeulgi' peurojekteu," 17–36.

The state, and Gojong in particular, became increasingly threatened by civil movements that challenged the status quo. The forced disbandment of the club and the 1899 Daehanguk gukje (대한국국제, 大韓國國制, Constitution of the Daehan Empire) that reemphasised the emperor's power was a pivotal turning point in state-led nation building.[333] The following describes the contemporary political circumstances:

> "The years between 1899 and 1904 were to demonstrate what Korea could do for itself in the relative absence of pressure from foreign powers. As a result of the failure of the 1898 reform movement, the emperor was left relatively free for five years to direct affairs in accordance with his own ideas and judgement. A simple description of the Korean scene during these five years prior to the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese War is that the political, economic, and social conditions of the nation continued to deteriorate under an absolutistic regime dominated by petty, rapacious, and irresponsible court [favourites.] There were no large-scale convulsions; it was a gradual process of system decay."[334]

From the onset of the twentieth century, Gojong embarked on a series of projects to strengthen the status of the imperial family. The 'Imperial Status Elevation Project' (*hwangsil wisang jego saeop*, 황실 위상제고사업, 皇室 位相提高事業) was conducted in reaction to the aggressive intervention of Japan and Russia as well as the increasing public discussion of a constitutional monarchy and parliamentary system, both interpreted by the court as threats to the survival of not only the imperial family

[333] Min Gyeong-sik, "Daehanguk gukje," *Beophak nonmunjip* 31, no. 1 (August 2007): 23–55; Lee Ha-gyeong, "Daehan Jeguk sigi gunjugwon ganghwa wa min-gwon hwakdae nonui," 181–204.

[334] C. I. Eugene Kim and Han-kyo Kim, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism, 1876-1910*, 115.

but also the country. The Taegeukgi and Ihwamun were both actively used in this process.

One of the ways in which the court conducted the Imperial Status Elevation Project was through ancestral worship. After Gojong declared himself emperor, the status of ancestors Taejo, Jangjong (장종, 莊宗, otherwise known as Sado Seja, 사도세자), Jeongjong, (정종, 正宗), Sunjo (순조, 純祖), and Ikjong (익종, 翼宗) were also accordingly elevated to emperors in 1899.[335] In 1900, a new grave-post (*myopyo*, 묘표, 墓表) of founding king Taejo was erected at Geonwonreung Tomb (건원릉, 健元陵), located in Gyeong-gi-do Province (경기도, 京畿道) near the capital. The post was decorated with the Ihwamun and its script carved with Gojong's own handwriting.[336] (Fig. 2.25.) Gojong also decorated the commemorative stele of the fortieth anniversary of his reign (Ching-gyeong ginyeombi, 칭경기념비, 稱慶紀念碑) in 1902 with the Ihwamun, in a similar style to Taejo's tombstone.[337] (Fig. 2.26.) The use of the Ihwamun on these monuments represented and emphasised the lineage and legitimacy of the Yi imperial family. In turn, from this association, the Ihwamun also acquired extra authority as an unmistakable imperial emblem.

---

[335] Jinjong (진종, 眞宗), Heonjong (헌종, 憲宗), and Cheoljong (철종, 哲宗) were honoured as emperors in 1908.

[336] Hwang Jeong-yeon, "Joseon sidae neungbi ui geonrip gwa eopilbi ui deungjang," *Munhwajae* 42, no. 4 (December 2009): 45–47; *Gojong sillok*, vol. 41, 5 March, 1901, http://sillok.history.go.kr/id/kza_13803005_002, accessed 30 August, 2022.

[337] Kim Yeon-hwa, "Daehan Jeguk hwangsil pyosang euroseo ui Ihwamun i jinin yungbokhapjeok jonjae hyeongsik ui jeongcheseong yeon-gu," *Hanguk gwahak yesul yunghap hakhoe* 24 (June 2016): 83; Cultural Heritage Administration, "Seoul Gojong eogeuk 40-nyeon ching-gyeong ginyeombi jeongmil silcheuk josa bogoseo" (Seoul, Cultural Heritage Administration, December 1997).

In addition to the erection of imperial tombstones and commemorative steles, the court also incorporated the Ihwamun and the Taegeuk motifs in state medals. Korea's first medal system was employed via the 1900 Ordinance on Medals. Medals formed part of the new Western military uniform imported in the Korean Empire period and was a new system of commendation that emulated Western modes of publicly displaying rank, royal authority, and prestige given to those who serve their emperor and country.

The ordinance provided a description of the types and ranks of medals, as well as brief explanations on the origins of the medal designs. There were three Grand Orders (*daehunwi*, 대훈위, 大勳位), consisting of the Geumcheokjang Medal (대훈위금척대수장, 大勳位金尺大綬章), the Ihwajang Medal (대훈위이화대수장, 大勳位李花大綬章), and the Seoseongjang Medal (대훈위서성대수장, 大勳位瑞星大綬章).[338] Geumcheokjang Medal was at the highest order, followed by the Seoseongjang Medal, a later addition added in 1902.[339] (Fig. 2.27.) The Ihwajang Medal was next in line as the third highest order. (Fig. 2.28.) The Taegeukjang Medal (태극장, 太極章), though not a Grand Order, was the next highest medal, followed by the Palgwaejang Medal (팔괘장, 八卦章).[340] (Fig. 2.29., Fig. 2.30.) Unlike medals of

[338] In the original ordinance in 1900, there were only two Grand Orders: Geumcheok and Ihwa daehunjang. The Seoseongjang Medal was added as the second highest order in 1902.
[339] The founding king of Joseon, Taejo, was known to have had a premonition of a new dynasty through a dream he had of gaining a *geumcheok*, a legendary 'golden ruler' from the Silla period. According to legend, the golden ruler had the power to revive the dead and heal the sick. *Gojong sillok*, vol. 40, 17 April, 1900, http://sillok.history.go.kr/id/kza_13704017_003, accessed 30 August, 2022; *Gojong sillok*, vol. 42, 12 August, 1902, http://sillok.history.go.kr/id/kza_13908012_001, accessed 30 August, 2022.
[340] The Palgwaejang Medal was added in 1901. *Gojong sillok*, vol. 41, 16 April, 1901,

the Grand Order, from the Taegeukjang Medals, there were eight consecutive rankings within each medal, with specific guidelines as to eligibility of recipients, primarily according to prior rankings and years served in official posts. Officials and public servants who were most highly celebrated received the Taegeukjang Medal, which made it the *de facto* highest medal attainable without exceptional causes.[341]

The ordinance and *Annals of Gojong* (*Gojong sillok*, 고종실록, 高宗實錄) specified that the Ihwajang Medal employed the design of the "state emblem" (국문, 國文) and that the Taegeukjang Medal incorporated the design of the "national sign" (국표, 國標).[342] The explanations on the origins of the Ihwajang and Taegeukjang medals reveal the state's gradual adoption of Western methods of representation; while the Geumcheokjang and Seoseongjang medals were still in reference to traditional Joseon legends that legitimised founding of the Joseon kingdom and the Yi lineage, the Ihwajanag and Taegeukjang medals were clearly chosen from modern national symbols.

The general composition of medal designs also benchmarked Western and Japanese medals. For instance, Geumcheokjang Medal's star-shaped design over a central cross was a modification of the Order of St Michael and St George and Queen Victoria's Star, which was created in Great Britain in 1818 and popularised in many

---

http://sillok.history.go.kr/id/kza_13804016_002, accessed 30 August, 2022.

[341] The Geumcheokjang Medal was only awarded to members of the imperial family, with exceptional cases for which the emperor himself awarded medals to relatives of the imperial family or high-ranking officials with remarkable commendations. The Seoseongjang and Ihwajanag medals were granted to very few Korean officials with notable merits or foreigners. There were only 4 non-royal, Korean officials awarded the Ihwajang Medal from 1900 to annexation. Lee Gang-chil, *Daehan Jeguk sidae hunjang jedo* (Seoul: Jayu Chulpansa, 1999), 115–209.

[342] *Gojong sillok*, vol. 40, 17 April, 1900, http://sillok.history.go.kr/id/kza_13704017_003, accessed 30 August, 2022.

other countries.[343] (Fig. 2.31., Fig. 2.32.) Also, the overall layout shared by the Geumcheokjang, Seoseongjang, and Ihwajang medals that are composed of the central Taegeuk motif surrounded by the Ihwa flowers are similar to the Japanese Order of the Chrysanthemum.[344] (Fig. 2.33.) Moreover, the use of Ihwa leaves that decorate and support the central motifs of not only medals but also aforementioned coin designs similarly derived from Western visual customs of utilising laurel leaves and wreaths that symbolise glory, like that seen in the French Ordre de la Légion d'Honneur.[345] (Fig. 2.34.) The Korean state borrowed well-established and easily identifiable medal designs and visual elements in order to grant the medals of the Korean Empire with a universally recognisable authority.

From the medal system of the Korean Empire, the importance placed on both the national flag and imperial emblem, as well as the dependency on Western examples of medal designs can be witnessed. However, the system also reveals the reverse hierarchy of the Ihwamun and Taegeuk; within the court, the Ihwa outranked the Taegeuk, in contrast to the overall dominance of the Taegeukgi image over the Ihwamun outside the court. For instance, the Taegeukgi was a far more dominant symbol in stamps, textbook illustrations, and even in advertisements, while the Ihwamun tended to play a supporting role in Taegeuk-Ihwa combinations. On the other hand, the Ihwajang Medal outranked the Taegeukjang Medal in systematic commendations sanctioned by the state. This reverse hierarchy seen in state-elevation agendas was in many ways inevitable as there was a bigger need for the court to emphasise the Yi monarchy. Interestingly, as the

---

343 Park Hyeon-jeong, "Daehan Jegukgi Oyatggot munyang yeon-gu," 55–56.
344 Park Hyeon-jeong, "Daehan Jegukgi Oyatggot munyang yeon-gu," 55–56.
345 Park Hyeon-jeong, "Daehan Jegukgi Oyatggot munyang yeon-gu," 58–59.

Ihwamun received wider public recognition by official association with the new Korean Empire and the imperial family, it was also used by non-state actors for public edification in textbook illustrations, and even appeared in newspaper advertisements for commercial purposes.

2.5.b. Education and Self-identification

From the late 1890s, there was a general increase in the consumption of imagery attributed to the development of print media and the diversification of suppliers of image production, including not only the state but also reformist intellectuals, foreigners, and civil organisations. Although the state played a crucial role in creating the Taegeukgi and Ihwamun and granting them legitimacy as national symbols, it was through such non-state actors that the national flag and emblem began to be popularly used for purposes other than state representation in diverse media such as newspaper banner designs, photographic albums, textbook illustrations, and even advertisements.[346]

Following the initial stage of creating the national flag and its usage for state representation, came its application in nation-building agendas that educated the public of Korean national identity and collective demonstration of patriotism. A large part of these projects was led by non-state actors and were aimed at constructing a patriotic Korean nation through the public internalisation of the national flag. Modern flag culture that directly benchmarked Western and Japanese examples, including flag-waving, the hoisting of flags on national holidays, and saluting the flag in institutional settings emerged during this period. This period was crucial as it resulted in the public understanding and acceptance of the Taegeukgi as the Korean national flag which contributed to its longevity as a national symbol.

[346] Notwithstanding the increased visibility of the symbols, different versions and styles of the Taegeukgi and Ihwamun continued to be created and disseminated without any set state regulations on the detailed elements of the flag and emblems.

The Independence Club, founded by Seo Jae-pil, initiated public nation-building through the national flag in the late 1890s by not only rigorously promoting the idea of a people-based nation-state but also by ritualising acts of patriotism, utilising public monuments, national symbols, and orchestrated public ceremonies.[347] Prior to establishing the Independence Club, Seo Jae-pil had already started printing Korea's first private newspaper, *Doklip sinmun*, which bore the Taegeukgi in the centre of its heading banner from 2 May, 1896.[348] (Fig. 2.35.) *Hwangseong sinmun*, published by a group of young intellectuals who studied abroad, such as Namgung Eok (남궁억, 南宮檍, 1863-1939) and Na Su-yeon (나수연, 羅壽淵, 1861-1926), also decorated its banner with a couple of crossed Taegeukgi from its first issue on 5 September, 1898.[349] (Fig. 2.36.)

Private newspapers of the 1890s, such as *Doklip sinmun* and *Hwangseong sinmun* provide valuable insight to the important developing stages of print media and the use of visual imagery using the new medium of newspapers, as well as the active

[347] Choi Chang-seok, "Gaehwagi Doklip Hyeophoe ui hwaldong gwa 'gukmin-mandeulgi' peurojekteu," 5. As a yangban-born reformist and intellectual, Seo Jae-pil was exposed to the ideas of reformation and Western governance during his stay in Japan in the early 1880s, after which he took part in the Reform Party's unsuccessful Gapsin Coup of 1884. After the failed coup, he sought refuge from persecution in Japan and later moved to the United States with party members Park Yeong-hyo and Seo Gwang-beom (서광범, 徐光範, 1859-1897). In the United States, he developed his political ideals of liberal democracy and attempted to achieve socio-political reform in Korea by benchmarking Western nations. Se Eung Oh, *Dr. Philip Jaisohn's Reform Movement 1896-1898: A Critical Appraisal of the Independence Club* (Lanham; New York; London: University Press of America, 1995), 4–18.

[348] Early issues of *Doklip sinmun* printed from 7 April, 1896, lacked any design elements. Another important characteristic of the *Doklip sinmun* and the overall accomplishments of the Independence Club was its active use of Hangeul. Jungang Munhwa Chulpansa, *Doklip sinmun chukswaepan*, vol. 1 (Seoul: Jungang Munhwa Chulpansa, 1969), 1, 45.

[349] Hwangseong Sinmunsa, *Hwangseong sinmun chukswaepan*, vol. 1 (Seoul: Hwangseong Sinmunsa, 1898-1899).

role that prominent reformist-intellectuals took on in the process of nation-building at the turn of the twentieth century. The newspapers were influential and pioneering examples of graphic design used in Korean popular media, and many other educational magazines that targeted young readers such as *Taegeuk hakbo* (태극학보, 太極學報, 1906-1908) followed suit and employed similar Taegeukgi motifs in their cover designs.[350] (Fig. 2.37.)

The first major project of the Independence Club and the central motivation behind the club's very creation, however, was an ambitious two-part project of the erection of the Independence Arch and the building of the Independence Park (Doklip Gong-won, 독립공원, 獨立公園).[351] The projects were designed to provide representative public spaces of gathering, to proclaim the independence and autonomy of the Korean nation-state, and to elevate collective pride and love for the country.[352] The Independence Arch bore the Taegeukgi on either side of its frontispiece alongside the 'Doklipmun' inscription in Hangeul on one side and Hanja (한자, 漢字) on the other. In addition, the Ihwamun was used under this frontispiece at the centre of the arch. (Fig. 2.38., Fig. 2.39.) The Independence Arch's Taegeukgi design is an

[350] The Taegeuk motif was the most popular type used for magazine covers from 1904 to 1910. Seo Yu-ri, "Hanguk geundae ui japji pyoji imiji yeon-gu" (PhD diss., Seoul, Seoul National University, 2013), 36–45; Hong Sun-pyo, "Hanguk gaehwagi ui saphwa yeon-gu," 271; Hong Sun-pyo, "Gyeongseong ui sigak munhwa gongram jedo mit yutong gwa gwanjung ui tansaeng," 46.

[351] Unfortunately, only the Independence Arch project was fully accomplished. Kim Se-min, "Yeongeunmun, Mohwagwan ui geonrip gwa Doklipmun, Doklipgwan euro ui byeoncheon," 141–78.

[352] The leaders of the club also argued that the construction of the monument should be funded by the people as to instill a sense of ownership and active participation in the betterment of the country. Choi Chang-seok, "Gaehwagi Doklip Hyeophoe ui hwaldong gwa 'gukmin-mandeulgi' peurojekteu," 57-59.

interesting piece for a couple of reasons. First, although the trigrams are in the same composition as the *Doklip sinmun* Taegeukgi, the Taegeuk spirals are longer and have round eyelets in them. Second, it is rare to find such a Taegeukgi design with the *geon* trigram at the bottom. These traits raise questions on why an unusual type of Taegeukgi design was chosen for this monument, erected by the most influential civil association of the time.

A meaningful point in answering this question is the fact that the design is almost identical to the "Dae Cheong-guk sok Goryeo gukgi" (대청국속 고려국기, 大淸國屬高麗國旗, National Flag of Goryeo, Tributary State of Great Qing) in Li Hongzhang's *Tongsang jangjeong seong-an hwipyeon* (통상장정성안휘편, 通商章程成案彙編, 1883), and "Dae Cheong sok Goryeo gukgi" (대청속 고려국기, 大淸屬高麗國旗, National Flag of Goryeo, Tribute of Great Qing) in *Tongsang yakjang yuchan* (통상약장유찬, 通商約章類纂, 1886).[353] The thin, elongated spiral and eyelets of the Taegeuk are identical to that of the Independence Arch, and the placement of the four trigrams become identical when vertically reversed. Although it cannot be confirmed for certain why and how this particular design was selected by the Independence Club, the result is an ironic display of a Taegeukgi design, heavily influenced by Chinese Taegeuk interpretations, on a public monument that expressed independence and separation from China and traditional tributary relations.

Nevertheless, the fact that a civil organisation like the Independence Club was able to erect a public monument of this scale reaffirms the unique circumstance of Korean intellectuals and their relationship with the government and monarch.

---

[353] Mok Soo-hyun, "Geundae gukga ui 'gukgi' raneun sigak munhwa," 327–28.

Individuals and non-state organisations began to take on public operations that were central to the recognition of visual symbols of the Korean nation-state with the blessing or passive consent of the state. The fact that Crown Prince Sunjong donated a sizable sum of 1000 won for the project further reveals the complex role this organisation played in edifying the public of the new Korean Empire; it almost acted on behalf of the state but simultaneously commenced on achieving the organisation's own socio-political agendas such as attempting to gradually democratise political power within Korea.[354]

In particular, the Independence Club increasingly promoted the public use of the national flag in schools and public events, referencing Western and Japanese examples of flag utilisation.[355]

> "Judging from the fact that the place for the gymnastics demonstration here is decorated with Korean flags, we can assume that the Koreans gradually began to understand what the national flag is and appreciate its importance. The hoisting of the national flag represents the King above and the people below, and it means that it represents the country [as a whole]. That the students at their sports demonstration have hoisted the national flag means that the Korean people have gradually come to wish Korea to be as sovereign and independent in the world as the other countries. Then, to train their bodies and enhance their health

[354] Tsukiashi Tatsuhiko, *Joseon ui gaehwa sasang gwa naeshyeoneollijeum*, trans. Choi Deok-su (Paju: Yeollin Chaekdeul, 2014), 209; Mok Soo-hyun, "Doklipmun: Geundae ginyeommul gwa mandeuleojineun gieok," 61–62.

[355] "Nonseol," *Doklip sinmun*, 22 September, 1896; "Nonseol," *Doklip sinmun*, 12 February, 1898; Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang: Geundae sigak maeche ui yuip gwa eojin ui byeonyong gwajeong" (PhD diss., Seoul, Hongik University, 2006), 67–68; Takashi Fujitani, *Splendid Monarchy: Power and Pageantry in Modern Japan*, Twentieth-Century Japan (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 1.

> through sports is no less important for the students than diligent learning. For a weakling… the learning is of no avail, but strength without learning is useless as well."[356]

In addition, an article of *Doklip sinmun,* 5 September, 1896, writes that foreign vessels docked at Jemulpo hoisted the Korean flag and fired 21 gun salutes in commemoration of Gojong's birthday, but Joseon people did not know to hoist the flag nor respond to the salute; it urged that the Joseon people forget about their kimchi (김치) and gochujang (고추장, red pepper paste) and said that they should feel ashamed that they are not able to practice basic civil conventions.[357] Indeed, that year's celebratory event for Gojong's birthday was hosted by Horace G. Underwood, an American missionary and close confidant of the king, rather than by the Joseon court. Although Gojong would have had little desire to celebrate his birthday so soon after the assassination of Queen Min and his flight to the Russian Legation, it is revealing of the state's reliance on foreigners to host such national events up to the 1890s. Lillias Underwood recollects the efforts of her husband:

> "He first got permission to have the use of a large public building outside the gate at the north side of the city. It held about a thousand people. […] A platform was erected, the building was draped with flags, […] while an immense throng of people of all classes, ages and conditions surged around the place and far along the highway."[358]

---

[356] Tikhonov, "Masculinizing the Nation," 1049–50; "Nonseol," *Doklip sinmun*, 29 April, 1897, https://www.koreanhistory.or.kr/newsPaper.do., accessed 7 September, 2022.

[357] "Japbo," *Doklip sinmun*, 5 September, 1896; Lee Hyeon-pyo, *Uju reul pumeun Taegeukgi*, 191–92.

[358] Lillias Horton Underwood, *Underwood of Korea: Being an Intimate Record of the*

The celebration for Gojong's accession as emperor in the following year in 1897 showed an improvement in public recognition and collective action to commemorate the national holiday. In contrast to the *Doklip sinmun* article of 1896, Taegeukgi were hoisted from house to house, and crowds waved the Korean flag in front of the golden carriage carrying the yellow-robed emperor on his procession to the Hwan-gudan Altar.[359]

For Gojong's fiftieth birthday, the emperor even took it into his own hands to host a grand celebration, and the court managed to obtain a sizable budget of $200,000.[360] *Sinchuk jinyeon dobyeong* (신축진연도병, 辛丑進宴圖屛), a record painting of the 1901 celebration shows the court's appropriation of the Taegeukgi in a national celebratory event.[361] (Fig. 2.40.) It is unknown why the Taegeukgi in this painting bore a yellow background, but it is likely that the traditional imperial yellow was used for this specific flag at a time when Gojong was eager to elevate his authority as emperor. It also reveals once more that the court was not particularly invested in standardising the design of the national flag. Moreover, even when modern flag culture had started to take root in Korea, the court still required traditional colour codes to visually communicate the authority of the emperor. Nevertheless, the utilisation of the

---

Life and Work of the Rev. H. G. Underwood, D.D., LL.D., for Thirty One Years a Missionary of the Presbyterian Board in Korea, n.d., 163–64.

[359] "Nonseol," *Doklip sinmun*, 14 October, 1897; Park Hyeon-jeong, "Daehan Jegukgi Oyatggot munyang yeon-gu," 36; Tsukiashi Tatsuhiko, *Joseon ui gaehwa sasang gwa naeshyeoneollijeum*, 217.

[360] The court's first Western-style military band led by Dr. Franz Eckert made its first appearance for this event and 1,000 silver commemorative medals were given out to the attendees. Homer B. Hulbert, ed., "News Calendar," *Korea Review* 1 (September 1901): 411–13.

[361] Lee Hyeon-pyo, *Uju reul pumeun Taegeukgi*, 192.

national flag in national events and holidays became customary during the Korean Empire period, at least for state-led events.

The provision of modern education and the production of modern illustrated textbooks also influenced public reception of the Taegeukgi and modern flag culture. Hakbu-published *Sinjeong simsang sohak* (신정심상소학, 新訂尋常小學, 1896) was the first Korean textbook with illustrations. In Chapter 1 of volume 3, an illustrated scene depicting rows of Taegeukgi hosted alongside the street accompanied the explanation of the national holiday Mansuseongjeol (만수성절, 萬壽聖節, birthday of Gojong).[362] (Fig. 2.41.) *Sinjeong simsang sohak* only slightly altered original illustrations in Japanese textbook *Simsang sohak dokbon* (심상소학독본, 尋常小學讀本, 1887), by inserting illustrations of the Taegeukgi in the place of the Japanese flag to inform readers of ways to demonstrate patriotism through flags.[363] Despite the somewhat passive utilisation of imagery in these Hakbu-published books, this was the earliest case where the Korean national flag was depicted in print illustrations.[364]

As there were significant limitations to the number and variety of textbooks that Hakbu could produce, individuals and newly founded private educational institutions also provided their own textbooks. This responsibility was magnified after the signing of the Eulsa Treaty and the noticeable increase of Japanese intervention in domestic

[362] Mok Soo-hyun, "Ilje gangjeomgi gukga sangjing sigakmul ui wisang byeoncheon: Aeguk ui aikon eseo sangpyo ggaji," *Hanguk geundae misulsahak* 27 (June 2014): 368.
[363] Gu Ja-hwang, "Geundae gyemong-gi gyogwaseo ui saengsan gwa heureum: Sinjeong simsang sohak (1896) ui gyeong-u," *Han minjok eomunhak* 65 (December 2013): 530.
[364] *Sinjeong simsang sohak* printed the Taegeukgi illustration in February 1896. Hong Sun-pyo, "Hanguk gaehwagi ui saphwa yeon-gu," 271.

affairs. Private textbooks became one of the few outlets for nationalistic messages, and private publishers took the reins in educating the public of national sovereignty and independence, amplifying nationalistic narratives through visual imagery.

In addition to the Taegeukgi, the Ihwamun also began to appear in textbooks. *Chodeung sohak* (초등소학, 初等小學, 1906) published by Daehan Gukmin Gyoyukhoe (대한국민교육회, 大韓國民教育會, also referred to as Gukmin Gyoyukhoe) was a collection of primary school textbook that began with spelling books for first-year students, progressively advancing to the format of lengthy texts. In the first volume, the first letter of the Hangeul alphabet, *giyeok,* (기역, 'ㄱ') is accompanied by the image of two crossed Taegeukgi under the caption 'national flag' (*gukgi*, 국기) as the term in Korean is spelt with the character, *giyeok*.[365] (Fig. 2.42.) The image of the Ihwa flower (이화, also written as 리화) coupled with a carp (잉어, old spelling 리어) also appears alongside the letter '리' (*ri*).[366] (Fig. 2.43.)

Other textbooks like *Chodeung sohak* (초등소학, 初等小學, 1906) published by Boseong-gwan (보성관, 普成館) also featured the Taegeuk and Ihwa image in the spelling-book style, while Jeong In-ho's (정인호, 鄭寅琥, 1869-1945) *Choesin chodeung sohak* (최신초등소학, 最新初等小學, 1908) referred to the Ihwa illustration

[365] Hong Sun-pyo points out that the illustrator would likely have referred to the banner design of two crossed Taegeukgi used for *Hwangseong sinmun*. However, the cross-flag layout is a common design used in many different countries and their flags. Hong Sun-pyo, "Hanguk gaehwagi ui saphwa yeon-gu," 271.
[366] Although the white-coloured pear flower is also pronounced and spelt as 'Ihwa' (이화, 梨花), Mok Soo-hyun argues that the flower in *Chodeung sohak* is likely a plum flower as the rendition of the petals suggest that the flower is dark-coloured like plum blossoms. Mok Soo-hyun, "Ilje gangjeomgi gukga sangjing sigakmul ui wisang byeoncheon," 369.

as a 'flower' (*ggot*, 꽃), possibly due to increased Japanese censorship. (Fig. 2.44., Fig. 2.45., Fig. 2.46.) In May 1909, the magazine *Sonyeon* also explained the history and botanical traits of the Ihwa flower, as well as the flower's association to virtues of fidelity, truthfulness, loyalty, and honesty, and stressed the need to treat the flower with care as it is an imperial emblem.[367] The appearance of the Ihwa flower in publications of this period encouraged allegiance to the emperor and the state, but also associated the flower and emblem with the idea of the Korean nation-state and the integrity of its people.[368] Although the court utilised the Ihwamun to accentuate their new imperial status and the power of the country, the civil society edified the public of the emblem and contextualised it to express national pride and identity.

A similar example is *Chodeung Daehan yeoksa* that included an illustration depicting the feats of Admiral Yi Sun-sin (이순신, 李舜臣, 1545-1598) in defending Joseon during the Imjin Japanese Invasions (임진왜란, 壬辰倭亂, 1592-1598). The portrait of Admiral Yi Sun-sin was decorated with the Ihwa flower and leaves. (Fig. 2.47.) This small but important example of the use of the Ihwa flower in a textbook illustration of a historical figure that protected the country from Japanese invasions is telling of the evolution of the meaning of the Ihwamun and methods of utilising the imperial emblem toward annexation. Yi Sun-sin was not a member of the Yi royal family, yet his noble and self-sacrificial patriotism led to his association with the Ihwamun.[369] The imperial emblem, which was primarily a direct symbol of the imperial

[367] "Jeonmun-gwa: Ihwa," *Sonyeon* 2, no. 5 (May 1909): 30–32; Park Hyeon-jeong, "Daehan Jegukgi Oyatggot munyang yeon-gu," 70–71.
[368] Park Hyeon-jeong, "Daehan Jegukgi Oyatggot munyang yeon-gu," 83.
[369] For more on Yi Sun-sin's status as a national hero, see Chapter 3.

family and their authority, came to encompass the general idea of Korean national history, its people, and their collective identity as a nation. While the government persistently emphasised national symbols in order to present a monarch-centred vision of the Korean Empire through the decoration of court related objects, private textbooks after 1905 was less concerned with the flower's affiliation with the court but promoted public familiarity and general awareness of the flower as a national symbol.[370] (Fig. 2.48.)

In addition to the appearance of the national flag and emblem in illustrations, private textbooks such as *Chodeung sohak, Yunyeon pildok*, and *Choesin chodeung sohak* also explained in their text the importance of demonstrating patriotism and fulfilling duties as Korean nationals by hoisting the Taegeukgi and singing the national anthem.[371] (Fig. 2.49.) Gukmin Gyoyukhoe's *Chodeung sohak* shows rows of soldiers marching with guns and the Taegeukgi, as well as explaining the meaning of national holidays such as the national founding day of Joseon and the custom of hoisting the national flag and singing the national anthem on such occasions.[372] (Fig. 2.50.) The textbook also featured an illustration of a warship hoisting the Taegeukgi, in emphasis

---

370 For instance, in *Choesin chodeung sohak,* vol. 1, under an illustration of the Ihwa flower, rather than stating its importance as an imperial emblem, it simply suggested that students wear the flower on their hats for sports days at school where they can exercise and enjoy sightseeing. Hangukhak Munheon Yeon-guso, *Hanguk gaehwagi gyogwaseo chongseo*, vol. Gukeopyeon 5, (Seoul: Asea Munhwasa, 1977), 231.

371 Hangukhak Munheon Yeon-guso, *Hanguk gaehwagi gyogwaseo chongseo*, vol. Gukeopyeon 4 (Seoul: Asea Munhwasa, 1977), 218; Hangukhak Munheon Yeon-guso, *Hanguk gaehwagi gyogwaseo chongseo*, vol. Gukeopyeon 2 (Seoul: Asea Munhwasa, 1977), 70; Hangukhak Munheon Yeon-guso, *Hanguk gaehwagi gyogwaseo chongseo*, vol. Gukeopyeon 5, 230, 248.

372 Gukmin Gyoyukhoe, *Chodeung sohak ha*, ed. Park Chi-beom and Park Su-bin, Hanguk gaehwagi gukeo gyogwaseo 7 (Seoul: Gyeongjin, 2014), 389–90; Mok Soo-hyun, "Ilje gangjeomgi gukga sangjing sigakmul ui wisang byeoncheon," 369–70.

of national power.[373] (Fig. 2.51.) An illustration in Jeong In-ho's *Choesin chodeung sohak* similarly visualised this in an illustration of rows of students marching with wooden swords and holding up the Taegeukgi, commending the gallant composure and discipline of the well-coordinated march.[374] (Fig. 2.52.) *Yunyeon pildok* also wrote about the need to demonstrate love and devotion for the country and encouraged students to express their determination to protect the country's independence and freedom by hoisting the Taegeukgi and singing the national anthem.[375]

It is meaningful that these private organisations led the nationwide movement recognition of the national flag and the public education of the modern culture of demonstrating patriotism through collective actions of flag-waving and anthem-singing. All these projects were deliberated without conspicuous efforts made on behalf of the state to enforce a systemised culture surrounding national symbols, such as setting strict regulations on the design and usage of the national flag and imperial emblem or the provision of a standardised and state-approved national anthem.[376]

Despite these important developments that took place surrounding the socio-political participation of non-state actors and their utilisation of nation symbols, even

---

[373] Hong Sun-pyo, *Hanguk geundae misulsa,* 73; Mok Soo-hyun, "Ilje gangjeomgi gukga sangjing sigakmul ui wisang byeoncheon," 369–70.
[374] Mok Soo-hyun, "Ilje gangjeomgi gukga sangjing sigakmul ui wisang byeoncheon," 371.
[375] Hyeon Chae, ed., *Yunyeon pildok*, trans. Lee Jeong-chan, Hanguk gaehwagi gukeo Gyogwaseo 4 (Gwangmyeong: Gyeongjin, 2012), 331.
[376] There were various versions of anthems that were created and sung among the public on occasions such as the Gaeguk giwonjeol (개국기원절, 開國紀元節, anniversary of the founding of Joseon) celebratory events hosted in 1897 and 1898 by the Independence Club, but there was no standardised and officialised national anthem during the period. For more on national anthems, see Lee Myeong-hwa, "Aegukga hyeongseong e hwanhan yeon-gu," *Yeoksa wa silhak* 10, 11 (January 1999): 637–67; Lee Jeong-hui, "Daehan Jegukgi Gaeguk giwonjeol ginyeom haengsa wa eumak," *Gong-yeon munhwa yeon-gu* 25 (August 2012): 135–81.

private textbooks could not escape Japanese censorship after the enforcement of the 1907 Hakburyeong (학부령, 學部令, Hakbu Ordinance) that required all schools to use Hakbu-published or Hakbu-approved textbooks, and the 1909 Chulpanbeop (출판법, 出版法, Publication Law) that mandated censorship of all monographs both before printing and before dissemination.[377] By 1915, a total of 117 books, including nationalistic textbooks like *Yunyeon pildok* were completely banned, and 213 textbooks failed to obtain Hakbu-approval.[378] Toward annexation, even books like *Sinchan chodeung sohak* (신찬초등소학, 新纂初等小學, 1909), published by Hyeon Chae, the same author of *Yunyeon pildok*, came to replace images of the Taegeukgi with the Hinomaru under the caption, "The national flag was hoisted high up on every house."[379] (Fig. 2.54.) As a result of censorship toward annexation, Taegeukgi designs also

---

[377] Hakbu-published books like *Gukeo dokbon* (국어독본, 國語讀本, 1907-1909) used the Taegeukgi image in an apolitical manner, simply describing the design of the Taegeukgi that differentiated it from other flags. (Fig. 2.53.) Gang Yun-ho, *Gaehwagi ui gyogwa yong doseo* (Seoul: Gyoyuk Chulpansa, 1973), 65–67; Chae Hwi-gyun, "Gaehwagi geumji gyogwaseo ui yuhyeong gwa naeyong yeon-gu," 177–80; Mun Han-byeol, "Ilje gangjeomgi chogi gyogwaseo geomyeol eul tonghaeseo bon sasang tongje ui yangsang: Daejeong 4-nyeon (1915-nyeon) Joseon Chongdokbu gyogwayong doseo illam eul jungsim euro," *Journal of Korean Culture* 44 (February 2019): 213.

[378] Mun Han-byeol, "Ilje gangjeomgi chogi gyogwaseo geomyeol eul tonghaeseo bon sasang tongje ui yangsang," 215, 236–43.

[379] Hong Sun-pyo, "Hanguk gaehwagi ui saphwa yeon-gu," 271; Hong Sun-pyo, "Bokje doen gaehwa wa gyemong ui imiji," 137; Hangukhak Munheon Yeon-guso, *Hanguk gaehwagi gyogwaseo chongseo*, vol. Gukeopyeon 7, (Seoul: Asea Munhwasa, 1977), 54. However, the book also used the Taegeukgi image on its chapter on warships. (Fig. 2.55.) There are some differing opinions over the collaborative narrative of *Sinchan chodeung sohak*; while most agree that the book is reflective of Japanese censorship and its colonial ideals, Keiko Ishimatsu argues that Hyeon Chae chose to comply to Hakbu standards of publication in order to continue the enlightenment movement during the colonial period, despite having to make considerable compromises. Park Min-yeong, "Gaehwagi gyogwaseo Sinchan chodeung sohak yeon-gu: Hakbu pyeonchan gyogwaseo ui bigyo reul jungsim euro," *Asia munhwa yeon-gu* 32 (December 2013): 99–129; Keiko Ishimatsu, "Tong-gambu chiha Daehan Jeguk ui susin gyogwaseo Gukeo dokbon bunseok: Dongsigi Ilbon gyogwaseo ui bigyo reul

disappeared from magazine covers from 1909.[380] On the other hand, there seems to have been no specific regulation against the use of the plum blossom image, and a conventional illustration of the flower with caption "Rihwa" appeared once more in *Sinchan chodeung sohak.* (Fig. 2.56.)

jungsim euro" (Master's thesis, Seoul, Yonsei University, 2003), 72–76.

[380] Hong Sun-pyo, "Gyeongseong ui sigak munhwa gongram jedo mit yutong gwa gwanjung ui tansaeng," 46.

2.5.c. Contrasting Fates of the Ihwamun and Taegeukgi

The signing of the Eulsa Treaty in 1905, the gradual loss of Korean sovereignty, and eventual annexation in 1910 greatly impacted both the Taegeukgi and Ihwamun. This period between 1905 and the 1910s exhibits sharply contrasting ways of using the two symbols by Korean nationalists and Japanese authorities. After Gojong's forced abdication in 1907, Japanese authorities actively exploited Korean national symbols to promote colonial rule. At this time, owing to improvements in print technology and growing demand for Korean imagery among new Japanese consumers, the Ihwamun and Taegeukgi frequently appeared as commercialised imagery. In particular, mass produced picture and photographic postcards became popular commodities when private and Japanese printing houses increased as a result of the 1900 revision of the Guknae uche gyuchik (국내우체규칙, 國內郵遞規則, Regulation on Domestic Post), which proved to be effective media for imperialist propaganda after 1905.[381]

The Japanese administration first issued picture postcards to commemorate Itō Hirobumi's consecutive appointment as Resident-General in 1906, after which the Residency-General and the Government-General issued a total of 26 official postcards

[381] Residency-General postcards first appeared after 1906 and continued to be produced by the Japanese Government-General until 1933. Japan had already experienced the political function of picture postcards from the Russo-Japanese War. Countless celebratory postcards of the victory were issued, and the demand for these commodities was incredibly high. Kim Guk-hwa, "Ilje gangjeomgi gwanje sajin yeopseo reul tonghae bon pyosang ui jeongchihak: 1906-nyeon buteo 1933-nyeon ggaji balhaeng doen gwanje sajin yeopseo reul jungsim euro" (Master's thesis, Seoul, Hongik University, 2015), 8; Lee Ga-yeon, "1910-nyeondae Joseon Chongdokbu balhaeng sijeong ginyeom sajin yeopseo reul tonghae bon sikminji Joseon ui imiji" (Master's thesis, Busan, Dong-a University, 2007), 5–7; Choi In-jin, *Hanguk sajinsa*, 160; Gwon Haeng-ga, "Ilje sidae upyeon yeopseo e natanan gisaeng imiji," *Misulsa nondan* 12 (September 2001): 85–86.

until 1935.[382] Among the 26 postcards, 12 were issued as annual celebratory postcards in commemoration of annexation and the establishment of the Government-General.[383] From this, the highly political nature of picture postcards can be witnessed. After the 1919 March First Movement, however, the Government-General grew wary of public desire for independence and became sceptical of the effectiveness of colonial propaganda through commemorating the establishment of the Government-General via postcards.[384]

Nevertheless, the Taegeukgi and Ihwamun were actively employed in celebratory postcards to promote the protectoral relationship of Korea and Japan from 1905, often juxtaposed with portrait images of the royal family or placed alongside the Japanese flag and the chrysanthemum emblem. The combined use of the Japanese and Korean flag is most prominent after the accession of Sunjong and the visit of Japanese Crown Prince Yoshihito (嘉仁, later Emperor Taishō, 大正天皇, 1879-1926, r. 1912-1926) to Korea in 1907. The series of Japanese picture and photo postcards often bore the flags and emblems of Korea and Japan, accompanied by portraits of Sunjong, Gojong, Prince Yeongchinwang, Itō Hirobumi, the Japanese Crown Prince, and mixtures thereof. For instance, Fig. 2.57. and Fig. 2.58. show similar formats of coupling the portraits of Emperor Sunjong and Prince Yoshihito and the two national flags that cross each other. The two flags of Korea and Japan on a single postcard

---

382 This postcard, however, was informally issued to guests of the celebratory banquet. Lee Ga-yeon, "1910-nyeondae Joseon Chongdokbu balhaeng sijeong ginyeom sajin yeopseo reul tonghae bon sikminji Joseon ui imiji," 8.
383 Lee Ga-yeon, "1910-nyeondae Joseon Chongdokbu balhaeng sijeong ginyeom sajin yeopseo reul tonghae bon sikminji Joseon ui imiji," 8–9.
384 Lee Ga-yeon, "1910-nyeondae Joseon Chongdokbu balhaeng sijeong ginyeom sajin yeopseo reul tonghae bon sikminji Joseon ui imiji," 10–11.

superficially represented peaceful diplomatic relations of the two countries but used compositions that implied Japanese superiority over Korea. For example, in Fig. 2.59. and Fig. 2.60., a cherry-blossom-shaped photograph of Itō Hirobumi, the first Japanese Resident-General of Korea, takes centre stage while the Korean Taegeukgi and Japanese Hinomaru flanks the two sides. However, the Hinomaru on the right is placed higher than the Taegeukgi on the left, revealing the implications of hierarchy between the two countries.

The Ihwamun was strongly associated with Sunjong in postcards and photographs of the period. The photo postcard to commemorate Sunjong's accession to the throne, the "*Hanguk hwangje pyeha jeukwi ginyeom* (한국 황제 폐하 즉위 기념, 韓國皇帝陛下卽位祈念, in celebration of the accession of His Majesty the Emperor of Korea)" postcard is such an example.[385] (Fig. 2.61.) Mok Soo-hyun argues that the continued emphasis of the association of the Ihwamun as Sunjong's emblem rather than the association of the Taegeukgi with Sunjong was an attempt to degrade Sunjong's authority by correlating his image to a narrower royal emblem rather than the Taegeukgi that represented Korean sovereignty.[386] Indeed, Japanese attempts to demote the political standing of the Korean monarch and imperial family was evident in the explicit renaming of the imperial family to the Yi royal family (Yi wang-ga, 이왕가, 李王家) and the absorbance of the family within the Japanese extended royal family (王公族, J. *ōkōzoku*).[387] In many visual imagery that represented Sunjong and the royal family in

---

385 Mok Soo-hyun, "Ilje gangjeomgi gukga sangjing sigakmul ui wisang byeoncheon," 75–76.
386 Mok Soo-hyun, "Mang-guk gwa gukga pyosang ui uimi byeonhwa," 137–40; Mok Soo-hyun, "Ilje gangjeomgi gukga sangjing sigakmul ui wisang byeoncheon," 376.
387 Lee Wang-mu, "Daehan Jeguk hwangsil ui bunhae wa wang-gongjok ui tansaeng,"

the 1910s, the Ihwamun was used as a family emblem. In this way, the Ihwamun gradually lost authority as a state and imperial emblem after annexation.

The incorporation of both the Taegeukgi and Ihwamun imagery into Japanese colonial symbolisms was further intensified when annual commemorative postcards were produced by the Japanese Government-General from annexation in 1910.[388] From this point on, the hierarchy between the Japanese Empire and its colony was made explicit by the placement of portraits and flags. In the postcard celebrating the annexation of 1910, the Korean Taegeukgi is merged with the Japanese Hinomaru, symbolising the complete colonisation of Korea. (Fig. 2.62.) It is also interesting to note that such strategic coupling of Korean and Japanese national symbols was facilitated by the fact that both the Taegeukgi and Ihwamun were conveniently similar in appearance to the Japanese Hinomaru and chrysanthemum. The effort to visually detach Korea from China and elevating the country's autonomy by selecting the Taegeukgi design in favour of the dragon flag and by creating an imperial emblem that emulated Western modes of expressing imperial authority ironically made it compatible with the Japanese flag and emblem to facilitate the visual merging of the two countries' symbols.

In contrast, the use of the Korean symbols by nationalists became drastically restricted toward annexation. According to *Maeil sinbo*, the use of the Taegeukgi in Western stone structures of schools and public offices were banned by September 1910 and were replaced with the Japanese Hinomaru design.[389] Images of the Ihwamun and

---

Hanguksa hakbo, no. 64 (August 2016): 7–31.

[388] In many ways, this was a continuation of the appeasement strategy of the Japanese Residency-General in reaction to hostile sentiments of the Korean public. Kim Guk-hwa, "Ilje gangjeomgi gwanje sajin yeopseo reul tonghae bon pyosang ui jeongchihak," 2.

[389] "Japbo," *Maeil sinbo*, 3 September, 1910.

Taegeukgi were mostly used for passive, apolitical, commercial purposes.[390] (Fig. 2.63.) The Taegeukgi and Ihwamun had already been used in commercial advertisements in the late 1890s. An advertisement of E. Meyer & Co., a German company that sold various goods such as medicine, oil, fabric, and printing presses, used the Taegeukgi image, crossed with a flag bearing the letter "M" for "Meyer" in an issue of in *The Independent* on 5 January, 1897.[391] (Fig. 2.64.) The Taegeukgi seems to have been used to appeal to Korean consumers at a time when competition among foreign companies were increasing.[392] (Fig. 2.65.) Similarly, foreign companies used the Taegeukgi image and coupled it with other national flags to highlight the amicable diplomatic relationship between Korea and the country of the company's origin to attract local customers.[393] (Fig. 2.66.)

The use of the Taegeukgi as a symbol of the Korean nation and the active encouragement of patriotism and resistance was predominantly conserved for Koreans abroad as they were able to use the symbol without being censored or persecuted.[394]

---

[390] Park Hye-jin, "Gaehwagi sinmun gwang-go sigak imiji yeon-gu"; Mok Soo-hyun, "Ilje gangjeomgi gukga sangjing sigakmul ui wisang byeoncheon," 379–82.

[391] *The Independent* was the English-print of *Doklip sinmun*. Park Hye-jin, "Gaehwagi sinmun gwang-go sigak imiji yeon-gu," 46–48. The use of the Taegeukgi in their advertisements ceased in 1899 due to government restrictions. E. Meyer & Co. was one of the biggest foreign trading companies present in Korea during the turn of the twentieth century, also known in Korean as Sechang Yanghaeng (세창양행, 世昌洋行). The company benefitted from close relations with German diplomat and close confidant of Gojong, Paul Georg von Möllendorff (1847-1901), which opened up opportunities to obtain mining concessions, contracts for shipments, and to conduct extensive trade. It is also considered the first foreign company that made use of modern newspaper advertisements. See Kim Bong-cheol, "Guhanmal 'Sechang Yanghaeng' gwang-go ui gyeongje, munhwasajeok uimi," 119–21, 130-31.

[392] Park Hye-jin, "Gaehwagi sinmun gwang-go sigak imiji yeon-gu," 48.

[393] Park Hye-jin, "Gaehwagi sinmun gwang-go sigak imiji yeon-gu," 48–50.

[394] This includes the use of the Taegeuk in the United States via *Sinhan minbo* (신한민보, 新韓民報), a newspaper published by Gukminhoe (국민회, 國民會), and

However, the passive usage of the Taegeukgi image in advertisements also contributed to the longevity of the Taegeukgi as a symbol of the Korean nation. In advertisements of cigarettes, medicine, fabric, and other domestic goods, the Taegeuk symbol was used to encourage the purchasing of domestically produced goods as an extension of patriotism.[395] Advertisements after annexation could not use aggressive expressions of resistance but slogans and newspaper articles encouraged the purchasing of 'domestic goods' through moderate expressions like "*mulsan jangryeo*" (물산장려, 物産奬勵, supporting local products), "*tosan aeyong*" (토산애용, 土産愛用, buying and using local products) "*jageup jajok*" (자급자족, 自給自足, self-sufficiency) and "*jahwal undong*" (자활운동, 自活運動, movement for self-support).[396] Although these marketing strategies involving the Taegeukgi image would have been in pursuit of economic interests of individuals, it led to the association of the Taegeukgi with the interests and identity of the Korean people, despite the absence of a sovereign state.[397]

The Ihwamun was also used for commercial advertisements. In an issue of *Hwangseong sinmun* in 4 June, 1910, a pharmacy named Hwapyeongdang Daeyakbang (화평당대약방, 和平堂大藥房) used the emblem to advertise its digestive medicine, Palbodan (팔보단, 八寶丹).[398] (Fig. 2.67.) *Hwangseong sinmun* also used both the

---

usage among independence activists based in Manchuria. Mok Soo-hyun, "Ilje gangjeomgi gukga sangjing sigakmul ui wisang byeoncheon," 380.

[395] Mok Soo-hyun, "Ilje gangjeomgi gukga sangjing sigakmul ui wisang byeoncheon," 378–80.

[396] Mok Soo-hyun, "Ilje gangjeomgi gukga sangjing sigakmul ui wisang byeoncheon," 380–81; Gwon Chang-gyu, *Sangpum ui sidae* (Seoul: Mineumsa, 2014), 320–25.

[397] Mok Soo-hyun, "Ilje gangjeomgi gukga sangjing sigakmul ui wisang byeoncheon," 382–84; Park Hye-jin, "Gaehwagi sinmun gwang-go sigak imiji yeon-gu," 50.

[398] Park Hye-jin also points out that the founder of Hwapyeongdang, Lee Eung-seon (이응선, 李應善, 1879-1927), recognised the importance of using visual aids in

Ihwamun and Taegeukgi image on the newspaper's new years' messages of 1908, 1909, and 1910.[399] (Fig. 2.68.)

Unlike the Taegeukgi, however, the Ihwamun did not survive as a national symbol past the colonial period. Despite the meaningful application of the emblem in modern state objects and within nation-building narratives prior to annexation, it was fundamentally a symbol of the Joseon Yi monarchy. The Ihwamun represented a political structure that lost its ground once Korea lost its sovereignty. Moreover, it was not the royal family that most ardently fought for liberation and independence during the colonial period, but the Korean public. Thus, during the colonial period, the Ihwamun, although increasingly emphasised, promoted, and consumed as the imperial emblem of the Yiwang-ga by the Japanese administration for Japanese consumers, became obsolete as a symbol of an independent Korean nation-state. It was later completely replaced by the Mugunghwa (무궁화, 無窮花, Korean Rose) as the representative floral emblem of South Korea.[400]

---

advertisements and dedicated a separate team for the creation of advertisement designs. Park Hye-jin, "Gaehwagi sinmun gwang-go sigak imiji yeon-gu," 52.

[399] Park Hye-jin, "Gaehwagi sinmun gwang-go sigak imiji yeon-gu," 52–53.

[400] The Mugunghwa was also used as decorative motifs in state-related objects such as coin designs, the Jaeungjang Medal (자응장, 紫鷹章) design, military uniform and court attire designs for government officials during the Korean Empire after 1900, but it was mainly popularised among the public through songs and poems rather than visual imagery. (Fig. 2.69.) Mok Soo-hyun, "Mang-guk gwa gukga pyosang ui uimi byeonhwa," 162–65; "Nonseol," *Doklip sinmun*, 29 April, 1897. For more on the Mugunghwa, see Song Won-seop, *Mugunghwa: Mugunghwa ran eotteon ggot in-ga?* (Seoul: Semyeong Seogwan, 2004); Gang Hyo-baek, *Du eolgul ui Mugunghwa: Gukga sangjing baro japgi* (Paju: Idam Bukseu, 2020); Ryu Cheong-san, "Nara ggot Mugunghwa gyoyuk eul wihan gyoyuk gwajeong mohyeong gaebal," *Silgwa gyoyuk yeon-gu* 2, no. 1 (January 1996); Yu Yeong-ok, "Daehan Minguk eul daepyo haneun sangjingseong e daehan gochal," *Hanguk bohun nonchong* 11, no. 4 (December 2012).

The Ihwamun was reduced to a decorative symbol of a powerless royal family, the frontispiece of a colony. After Sunjong's accession to the throne in 1907, the Ihwamun was selected as the design of Sunjong's new imperial flag, a noticeable change from Gojong's processional flag that used the Zhou Dunyi Taegeuk design.[401] (Fig. 2.70.) This Ihwamun flag design also used as the motif of the celebratory medal for Sunjong's national tours.[402] (Fig. 2.71.) As the Yi royal family became a decorative component the Japanese colonial rule, the Ihwamun accordingly lost its authority as a symbol of the sovereign state and was consumed as a decorative and commercial image.

Most noticeably, the The Yiwangjik Craftwork Manufactory (Yiwangjik Misulpum Jejakso, 이왕직 미술품제작소, 李王職美術品製作所) produced large quantities of Ihwa-adorned objects and greatly contributed to the commercialisation of the Ihwamun.[403] The manufactory produced daily objects to be used by the royal family and gifts to be handed out on behalf of the court, but continuously struggled with low production efficiency and financial deficit.[404] After a restructuring of the manufactory by colonial authorities after annexation, commercial sales became the main source of revenue.[405] Japanese officials took on supervisory roles in the workshop from 1911 and

---

401 Mok Soo-hyun, "Mang-guk gwa gukga pyosang ui uimi byeonhwa," 160–65.
402 Lee Gang-chil, *Daehan Jeguk sidae hunjang jedo*, 109; Mok Soo-hyun, "Daehan Jegukgi gukga sigak sangjing ui yeonwon gwa byeoncheon," 302.
403 The manufactory was established in 1908 and initially received funding from the Yi royal family, added with investments from Korean businessmen. The royal family offered a generous 60,000 won and businessmen Lee Bong-rae, Baek Wan-hyeok, Lee Geon-hyeok, and Kim Si-hyeon provided 10,000 won each. "Japbo," *Hwangseong sinmun*, 12 January, 1909; Seo Ji-min, "Yiwangjik Misulpum Jejakso yeon-gu" (Master's thesis, Seoul, Ewha Womans University, 2015), 8–9.
404 Jeong Ji-hui, "Hanseong Misulmpum Jejakso mit byeoncheon gwajeong yeon-gu," *Misulsahak yeon-gu* 303 (September 2019): 234; Seo Ji-min, "Yiwangjik Misulpum Jejakso yeon-gu," 8–9, 85-88.
405 Jeong Ji-hui, "Hanseong Misulmpum Jejakso mit byeoncheon bwajeong yeon-gu," 235, 239–40; Seo Ji-min, "Yiwangjik Misulpum Jejakso yeon-gu," 9–16, 92.

began to exert influence on production operation and sales, designs, and marketing strategies.[406] The workshop targeted the Joseon Industrial Exhibition as an opportunity to promote the new and improved manufactory; they renovated the manufactory building and produced works to be displayed in the exhibition.[407] A permanent display stall was created for customers to walk in and purchase products after viewing displays in shelves.[408] This development was a pivotal change for court objects; they were transformed from private and precious objects used by the ruling authorities of the imperial household to a showcased collection for public viewing and consumption.

In 1915, the Ihwa flower pattern with the character '美' (*mi*, 미) that stands for 'art' (*misul*, 미술, 美術) and art workshop (*misulpum jejakso,* 미술품 제작소, 美術品製作所) in its centre became the official licensed trademark for the manufactory.[409] The Ihwamun was made a trademark and altered this way to promote sales by emphasising the close connection of the manufactory to the royal household to target consumers fascinated by the Korean court and its objects. Mass production of Ihwa-emblazoned objects led to the commercialisation of the ex-imperial emblem into a decorative component of popular commodities consumed by Japanese tourists and collectors of court-related objects. (Fig. 2.72.)

---

[406] Seo Ji-min, "Yiwangjik Misulpum Jejakso yeon-gu," 10–11; Lee Gu-yeol, *Geundae Hanguk misulsa ui yeon-gu* (Seoul: Mijinsa, 1992), 365; Park Hyeon-jeong, "Daehan Jegukgi Oyatggot munyang yeon-gu," 69–70.

[407] "Gongjinhoe wa misulpum, Misulpum Jejakso ui chulpumjak," *Maeil sinbo*, 17 June 1915; Jeong Ji-hui, "Hanseong Misulmpum Jejakso mit byeoncheon gwajeong yeon-gu," 243–44.

[408] "Liwangjik Misul Gongjang jinryeoljang eseo gisaengdeul ui mulgeon heungjeong haneun gwang-gyeong," *Maeil sinbo*, 30 March, 1916; Jeong Ji-hui, "Hanseong Misulmpum Jejakso mit byeoncheon gwajeong yeon-gu," 244.

[409] Jeong Ji-hui, "Hanseong Misulmpum Jejakso mit byeoncheon gwajeong yeon-gu," 245–46.

Much like the Ihwamun, the Taegeukgi was a used as a tool for the Japanese administration to promote and consolidate colonial rule. (Fig. 2.73., Fig. 2.74., Fig. 2.75., Fig. 2.76.) Yet, the Taegeukgi was also used to fuel public support for resistant nationalism. For instance, in organising the reception of the emperor during Sunjong's national tours of 1909, the Residency-General had civilian greeters wave the two flags of Korean and Japan, as well as requiring public buildings, schools, and shops to hoist both flags.[410] However, in several northern regions including Pyeongyang (평양, 平壤) and Uiju (의주, 義州), students and civilians refused to wave the Japanese flag and only held the Korean flag as a protest to the event and protectorate regime, while some even defaced the Japanese flag.[411] (Fig. 2.77., Fig. 2.78.)

The transformation of the Taegeukgi from a top-down symbol of the state to the representation of the collective Korean nation and their desire to restore sovereignty during the colonial period is intriguing. On one hand, the imperial family and government that initially created the national flag failed to preserve the sovereignty of the country and allowed for the exploitation of the symbol on behalf of the Japanese administration that cemented and promoted the new colonial regime through the

410 "Min-ga gukgi," *Hwangseong sinmun*, 10 January, 1909; Mok Soo-hyun, "Mang-guk gwa gukga pyosang ui uimi byeonhwa," 158–59; Lee Hyeon-pyo, *Uju reul pumeun Taegeukgi*, 238.

411 The incident is also referred to as known as the 'Flag Incident' (*Gukgi sageon*, 국기 사건). *Daehan maeil sinbo* later justified this act by explaining that while the Taegeukgi was rightly used to greet the Emperor of Korea, it was unfitting to wave the Japanese flag to greet a Japanese official, referring to the Resident-General. Mok Soo-hyun, "Mang-guk gwa gukga pyosang ui uimi byeonhwa," 157–59; "Gukgi munje reul byeonron ham," *Daehan maeil sinbo*, 19 February, 1909; "Japbo," *Daehan maeil sinbo*, 5 February, 1909; Guksa Pyeonchan Wiwonhoe, "Sunhaeng bong-yeong ui haksaeng Ilbon gukgi hyudae e gwanhan geon," in *Tong-gambu munseo*, vol. 9 (Seoul: Guksa Pyeonchan Wiwonhoe, 1999).

Taegeukgi. On the other hand, during the brief yet significant period of the Korean Empire, non-state actors succeeded in embedding the image of the Taegeukgi into the minds of the public and embedding in the flag an integral sense of national identity and cultural sovereignty. Public commitment to the flag formed in this short and tumultuous period was indeed an incredible feat of nationalistic education projects led by non-state actors.

Allegiance to the flag was also the result of a highly negative public reaction to the signing of the Eulsa Treaty and annexation, which formed the essence of resistant nationalism that thrived in the colonial period. In particular, resistant martyrdom that gained force after 1905 was hugely influential in fostering a new, more aggressive direction of nationalism and the use of the Taegeukgi in such independence movements throughout colonial period. Independence activists and martyrs utilised the flag to remind the public that the country was in great peril and that everyone must fight for national salvation (*guguk*, 구국, 救國). Images of widely celebrated martyrs such as An Jung-geun who was executed for the assassination of Itō Hirobumi in 1909 was circulated along with the image of the Taegeukgi with An's blood-written words, 'Daehan *doklip*' (대한독립, 大韓獨立, Korean Independence), which amplified emotions of both anger and patriotism.[412]

The successful internalisation of the Taegeukgi as a Korean national flag became evident in the March First Movement in 1919, in which the Korean public engaged in a nationwide protest declaring the independence of Korea. In preparing for

---

[412] See Chapter 3.

the march, a large number of Taegeukgi were secretly produced.[413] Due to Japanese censorship of publications and monitoring of printing facilities, as well as the lack of time and resources, many students and activists resorted to hand-printing the flag or even hand-painting the Taegeukgi over Japanese flags.[414] (Fig. 2.79., Fig. 2.80.) The Taegeukgi was a powerful visual symbol that not only expressed the nation's desire to recover state sovereignty and their refusal to become colonial subjects but also visually proclaimed national consolidation for a unified purpose of the salvation of the Korean nation-state. But most importantly, the use of the flag in the March First Movement signalled the shift in the primary agents of the utilisation of national symbols from the state and elite intellectuals to the collective nation.[415]

What is noteworthy is that while the Ihwamun continued to be restricted to representing the fallen royal family and was gradually forgotten in the latter years of the colonial period and after liberation, the Taegeukgi survived the thirty-five years of colonial rule and was chosen as the official flag of the Provisional Government of the Republic of Korea in Shanghai.[416] It even succeeded in representing South Korea after the Korean War and still remains as the national flag.[417] Even North Korea employed

---

[413] Yun Seon-ja, "Doklip undong gwa Taegeukgi," *Yeoksahak yeon-gu* 35 (February 2009): 88.
[414] The drawing of Taegeukgi on top of the Japanese flag continued throughout the colonial period. Han Cheol-ho, "Jin-gwansa Taegeukgi ui hyeongtae wa geu yeoksajeok uiui," *Hanguk doklip undongsa yeon-gu* 36 (August 2010): 5–31; Gyowon Daehakgyo Gyoyuk Bakmulgwan, *Daehan, Taegeukgi*, 86–87.
[415] Although the March First Movement did not succeed in recovering Korean sovereignty, it greatly impacted Japanese governance and confidence in colonisation and resulted in the so-called 'cultural rule,' a form of appeasement to reduce aggressive revolt against colonial authorities.
[416] It was on 29 June, 1942 when the first regulation on the Taegeukgi design was set. However, the placement of the trigrams and the flagpole differs from the present-day Taegeukgi.
[417] The South Korean government finalised and promulgated the law on Taegeukgi

the flag as their national symbol before the creation of their own Ingong-gi (인공기, 人共旗) in 1948.[418]

Four main reasons may be accredited for the survival of the Taeguekgi. The first is that the Taegeukgi was a persistently familiar and universally auspicious image. The antiquity and geographic pervasiveness of its origin and usage ironically facilitated its adaptability in nation-building agendas of Korea during a politically dynamic period. The Taegeuk and trigrams were neither exclusively Korean symbols nor entirely Chinese.[419] Although the underlying Daoist philosophy and Zhou Dunyi's *Taegeuk doseol* (太極圖說, *Explanations of the Diagram of the Supreme Ultimate*) did originate from China, the imagery was widely used throughout East Asia and beyond, prior to the popularisation of the literature.[420] Unlike the new Ihwamun, the Taegeuk and trigrams had a long history within Joseon as relatively neutral but auspicious icons, granting

---

production (Gukgi jejakbeop, 국기제작법) on 15 October, 1949.

[418] Im Chae-bang, "Nambukhan ui sangjing gitbal gwa Taegeukgi ui jeongtongseong," *Bukhan*, Seoul munhwa wa Pyeongyang munhwa, no. 171 (March 1986): 95–96. Ingong-gi is short for *inmin gonghwagukgi* (인민공화국기, , 人民共和國旗). In North Korea it is also known as *hongram ogakbyeolgi* (홍람오각별기, 紅藍五角星旗) or *ramsaek gonghwagukgi* (람홍색공화국기, 藍紅色共和國旗). For more on North Korean symbolisms, see Im Chae-uk, *Bukhan sangjing munhwa ui segye: Ingong-gi wa aegukga reul eotteotge bol geotinga* (Seoul: Hwasan Munhwa, 2002).

[419] Kim Sang-seop even argues that there is no specific reason for why the Taegeukgi should be seen as a symbol of the Korean nation as it is merely a picture that depicts the process of the Taegeuk producing the four trigrams through the *eum* and *yang*. Kim Sang-seop, *Taegeukgi ui jeongche,* 65–67.

[420] The earliest surviving example of the Taegeuk in Korea is that found in Bokam-ri (복암리, 伏岩里) of Naju (나주, 羅州), Jeolla-do Province (전라도, 全羅道), thought to be from approximately 618 CE, Baekje period (백제, 百濟, 18 BCE-660 CE). This is much earlier than the publishing of the *Taiji Tusho* which is thought to be from the Song period. Lee Wan-beom, "Godae robuteo hyeondae Hanguk ui sangjing euroseo ui Taegeuk gwa Taegeukgi," 142. For examples of the usage of the Taegeuk design in China and Joseon prior to the nineteenth century, see Mok Soo-hyun, "Geundae gukga ui 'gukgi' raneun sigak munhwa," 315–21.

them the advantage of being familiar visual symbols that were instantly recognisable among all Korean people.

Secondly, the Taegeukgi design was deliberately chosen to distinguish Korea from China, visually differentiating Korean identity, and simultaneously declaring its independence and sovereignty. Although it was ultimately Japan, not China, that stripped Korea of its sovereignty, the Taegeukgi initially expressed complete independence, autonomy, and sovereignty of a country that had previously maintained arbitrary Sinocentric relations with China. This added to Taegeukgi's capacity to strengthen the cohesion of the Korean nation by visually emphasising the boundaries between 'us' and 'the others,' especially when the Korean people found themselves without a self-governing state. Moreover, the process of resistance against Japanese colonial rule using the Taegeukgi cemented the association of the flag and the Korean ethno-cultural nation.

Another advantage is that the Taegeukgi had the flexibility to be appropriately adopted in various, even contesting socio-political circumstances, owing to its freedom from hierarchical associations. In contrast to the Ihwamun, the Taegeukgi did not represent a select, elite minority. It was not restrictive in what or who it represented. It represented the state, the public, and even the Korean ethnicity. It also did not specifically symbolise a particular political system such as the monarchical rule of the Joseon dynasty- a system which was already losing favour, even during the Korean Empire. Thus, in the colonial period, it was easily transformed into a symbol of civil resistance, and after liberation a symbol of the survival and continuation of a new, democratic Korean nation-state. The Taegeukgi proved to be "[…] effective precisely because they are ambiguous, imprecise and their meanings are 'subjective' without

undermining their collective nature."[421] The Taegeukgi became an integral component of national identification and a facilitator of various nation-building strategies through such versatility and malleability.

Finally, the Taegeukgi had an advantage over the Ihwamun due to its physical property as a flag. Flag-waving customs that were educated from the twentieth century had an immense impact in the March First Movement that consolidated the Taegeukgi as a symbol of Korean resistance. Students and citizens were educated to bow to the flag, hoist the flag, and wave flags in different public events, and through such uniform and standardised physical action and visual communication, their collective identity as the Korean nation was constantly reminded. These "bodily practices" that utilised the Taegeukgi greatly facilitated the understanding and internalisation of the modern national symbol.[422] On the other hand, the Ihwamun, though popularised and well-respected, lacked this direct and physical connection to the people. It was a symbol that was seen and understood, not experienced.

---

[421] Elgenius, *Symbols of Nations and Nationalism,* 15.
[422] Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780-1914,* 12–19.

2.6. Conclusion

This chapter focused on the impact of the Taegeukgi and Ihwamun on national representation and nation-building of the 1880s to the 1910s. To better understand the dynamics and processes behind the creation, application, and impact of the national flag and the imperial emblem, the symbolic functions of both traditional and modern flags were addressed in order to give background to the Korean experience of adopting national symbols that were fundamentally different in nature from those of dynastic Joseon.

Secondly, the creation of the new national flag in Korea from the 1880s to the 1910s was studied. The decision-making processes behind the selection of the Taegeukgi as a national flag revealed state objectives of the 1880s to represent Korea in the international arena, most importantly as an independent and autonomous country. Moreover, an analysis of the historical and ideological origins of the Taegeukgi design was provided to give context to the symbolic meaning of the flag and reasons for its survival as a national symbol throughout Korean history.

Next, the creation of Korea's imperial emblem, the Ihwamun was studied. From an auspicious decorative symbol of the Yi royal family of the Joseon period, the Ihwamun was transformed as an emblem of the newly elevated Korean Empire. The stylistic developments found in this transformation process was observed through early examples of the Ihwa motif in coins and stamps of the 1880s.

Applications of the Taegeukgi and Ihwamun in nation-building of the 1880s to the 1910s were explored in three aspects: state-branding, public education and self-identification, and promotion of the colonial regime or resistance. To begin with, the

state used both the Taegeukgi and Ihwamun for branding modern objects and technology to express state control and ownership in the 1880s and 1890s. Both the Taegeukgi and Ihwamun images were used for new modern state-led projects such as postal stamps, modern architecture, medals, and transportation. These images helped embed the idea of the Korean modern nation-state in the daily lives of its people and institutionalise the relationship between the individual and the nation-state. State-branding that emphasised statist nationalism intensified when Gojong attempted to strengthen absolute monarchical power in domestic Korea.

From the late 1890s, the flag and imperial emblem were used as tools to educate the public of modern systems of displaying patriotism and allegiance to the nation-state. Civil organisations, educational institutions, as well as nationalistic individuals utilised the two symbols to educate the public of Korean history, national identity, and institutionalised practices of demonstrating citizenship through new media such as newspapers and textbooks. The period was a stage in which the top-down and statist process of creating the national flag and emblem and utilising them for state representation was accepted by the civil society but further proliferated to represent the broader nation-state. Moreover, the period also witnessed the rise in the contention between the monarchy and civil society, in which the Ihwamun and Taegeukgi images began to express contrasting ideas of the Korean nation-state.

Finally, the chapter investigated the contrasting fates of the Taegeukgi and Ihwamun after the signing of the Eulsa Treaty in 1905. The period from 1905 to the 1910s displayed disparities in the contextual applications of the Korean flag and the imperial emblem. Japanese authorities exploited both symbols to promote colonial rule over Korea. On the other hand, independence activists and nationalists used the

Taegeukgi as a symbol of resistance against Japan. The Ihwamun, on the other hand, became increasingly associated with the powerless Yi royal family was used as decorations for souvenirs. In making sense of such contrasting fates, the chapter investigated the fluid visual and ideological characteristics of the Taegeukgi, as well as the successful education of bodily practices using the flag that contributed to its resilience as a national symbol. The demise of the Ihwamun was approached in relation to the fall of the Korean state and royal family after annexation, in contrast to the increased influence of civil independence activists in fuelling resistant nationalism during the colonial period.

Chapter 3. Portraits

3.1. Introduction

Portraits contain and express the likeness and spirit of an individual. Through portraits, the memory of the mortal sitter transcends time and space, preserving and commemorating the individual's unique appearance, character, bodily gestures, social status, gender, age, and lifeworks.[423] Historically, portraits of powerful, historic, and heroic figures have been most ardently produced and preserved.[424] Yet at times, portraits of influential individuals become something more than a visual depiction of their own appearance and character. In Korea at the turn of the twentieth century, portrait imagery played a crucial role in representing the country to foreign audiences, fostering a close emotional connection between individuals and the invisible nation-state, solidifying nationhood through the construction of a standardised historical narrative, and in inducing nostalgia, patriotism, and collective action to restore Korean sovereignty and independence.

In dynastic Joseon, portraits recorded and captured the likeness of individuals and simultaneously expressed their virtues and spirit to be predominantly used for ancestral worship.[425] Portraits of the king that were used for royal ancestral rites were

---

423 Kim Young-na, "Hwaga wa chosanghwa," *Misulsa yeon-gu*, no. 20 (December 2006): 7.
424 Park Ji-hyang, "Chosanghwa ro guseong doen gukmin ui yeoksa: Reondeon Guklip Chosanghwa Misulgwan (National Portrait Gallery) ui sijak," *Yeong-guk yeon-gu*, no. 30 (December 2013): 107–38; Shearer West, *Portraiture* (Oxford: OUP Oxford, 2004), 12, 48; Kim Young-na, "Hwaga wa chosanghwa," 7–8.
425 Jo Seon-mi, *Hanguk ui chosanghwa* (Seoul: Yeolhwadang, 1983), 17; Jo Seon-mi, *Hanguk chosanghwa yeon-gu*, (Seoul: Yeolhwadang, 1994), 113; Lee Gwang-su, "Godae Hanminjok inmulsang ui johyeongjeok teukseong: Goguryeo Deokheung-ri gobun byeokhwa myoju chosang eul jungsim euro," *Gojoseon Dangunhak* 32 (June

the epitome of portrait production in Joseon, produced by the most talented court artists. However, they were not openly displayed as ornamental paintings but consecrated in shrines to be preserved and used for rituals. '*Hwi*' (휘, 諱), the tradition of avoiding direct reference of the monarch or his name in written script and verbal language was also practiced in China, but in Joseon, the practice was extended to the visual representations of the king.[426] In addition to consecrating royal portraits or *eojin* in shrines, record paintings of court events and ceremonies also 'hid' the appearance of the monarch; there are no known examples where the physical appearance of the king is exposed in such paintings.[427] Instead, the presence of the monarch was indirectly suggested through his absence. For instance, an empty throne or carriage in a court record painting symbolised the presence of the king.

From the seventeenth century, royal portraits were utilised as highly political tools to legitimise rulership, and to enhance the centralised power of the monarch within the government.[428] *Eojin* production was a critical institutional component that preserved the political foundations of the Joseon kingdom by recording and perpetuating the Yi royal lineage.[429]

2015): 277–80.

[426] Jeonju National Museum, ed., *Wang ui chosang*: *Gyeong-gijeon gwa Taejo Yi Seong-gye* (Jeonju: Jeonju National Museum, 2005), 274–75.

[427] Jeonju National Museum, ed., *Wang ui chosang,* 274.

[428] Jo In-su, "Joseon huban-gi eojin ui jejak gwa bong-an," in *Dasi boneun uri chosang ui segye: Joseon sidae chosanghwa haksul nonmunjip*, ed. Lee Nan-yeong, Park Hyeon-ju, and Hwang Jeong-yeon (Daejeon: Guklip Munhwajae Yeon-guso, 2007), 6–37; Gang Gwan-sik, "Joseon sidae chosanghwa reul ilg-neun daseot gaji kodeu," *Misulsa hakbo* 38 (June 2012): 141–42; Jo Seon-mi, *Eojin, wang ui chosanghwa* (Seongnam: Hangukhak Jungang Yeon-guwon, 2019), 54–57.

[429] Jo Seon-mi and Gwon Haeng-ga argue that the political significance of Joseon period's royal portraits revolved around the continuation of systematic rituals surrounding the actual portraits and the resulting traditions rather than the actual image of the monarch himself. See Jo Seon-mi, *Hanguk chosanghwa yeon-gu*, 128; Gwon

In addition to royal portraits, *gongsin* (공신, 功臣, meritorious subjects) portraits were closely intertwined with political efforts to support the authority of the monarchical court but were often vulnerable to domestic political power shifts.[430] *Gongsin* portraits were essentially a visual statement of commendation given to individuals who demonstrated exceptional patriotic and loyal acts. The active production of portraits of 'loyal subjects' in early to mid-Joseon reveals the political drive of the state to use portraits to strengthen the allegiance to the king and to promote political campaigns.[431] The creation and destruction of certain *gongsin* portraits after major political upheavals also reflect the significance of these portraits in consolidating support for new regimes and their sensitivity to political power shifts during the Joseon period.[432]

Commodified and reproducible portraits, such as those in the form of *cartes-de-visite,* made their way into Korea by the beginning of the twentieth century but were consumed by a relatively small pool of royalty, affluent intellectuals, and social elites.[433] Moreover, portraits depicting prominent figures such as the king and state

---

Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 22–23.

[430] Jo In-su, "Joseon sidae ui chosanghwa wa josang sungbae," *Misul jaryo* 81 (June 2012): 68–71; Gang Gwan-sik, "Joseon sidae chosanghwa reul ilg-neun daseot gaji kodeu," 145–47; Jo In-su, "17 segi gongsinsang e daehayeo," in *Dasi boneun uri chosang ui segye: Joseon sidae chosanghwa haksul nonmunjip*, ed. Lee Nan-yeong, Park Hyeon-ju, and Hwang Jeong-yeon (Daejeon: Guklip Munhwajae Yeon-guso, 2007), 38–77.

[431] The production of *gongsin* portraits in late Joseon was not as frequent due to the decline in foreign invasions and domestic political upheaval. *Gongsin* portraits then gained a stronger association of familial pride rather than their affiliation to state authority and allegiance to the king. Gang Gwan-sik, "Joseon sidae chosanghwa reul ilg-neun daseot gaji kodeu," 146–49; Jo In-su, "Joseon sidae ui chosanghwa wa josang sungbae," 68.

[432] Gang Gwan-sik, "Joseon sidae chosanghwa reul ilg-neun daseot gaji kodeu," 146–48.

[433] Relatively cheaper and popularised cartes-de-visite photographs were still expensive

officials at the turn of the twentieth century were largely created due to practical and politicised needs of visual representation, rather than private expressions of individual identity due to the high cost of production and the more pressing and immediate need to use portrait imagery to represent Korea abroad.

The introduction of photography to Korea, however, was far from unchallenged. Resistance to Western thought and technology was strong at the end of the nineteenth century. While some accepted the idea of "Eastern Ways and Western Means" (*Dongdo Seogi*, 동도서기, 東道西器), others rejected all things Western.[434] The adverse reaction to new technology such as photography continued throughout the 1880s when the government sent officials on a series of inspection tours to Japan to learn Western science.[435] Even after Kim Yong-won opened his photo studio Chwalyeong-guk (촬영국, 撮影局), there were even rumours that sitting for a photograph reduces longevity and that the chemicals used for printing photographs were made from the eyes of kidnapped children.[436] Yet the fear and dislike of photography was more severe among the masses as many elites' fascination with photography continuously grew throughout the 1880s.[437]

---

for European labourers in the 1860s, notwithstanding their widespread popularity among the bourgeoisie. Han Hye-yeon, "Geundaejeok juche ui jaehyeon gwa hyeongseong," 36–37; Jean-Claude Lemagny and André Rouillé, eds., *A History of Photography: Social and Cultural Perspectives* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 36–40.

434 Seong-rae Park, "Introduction of Western Science in Korea, 1876-1910," *Korea Journal* 21, no. 5 (May 1981): 29-30.

435 Seong-rae Park, "Introduction of Western Science in Korea, 1876-1910," 31.

436 For more on the history of early Korean photography and Kim Yong-won's experience of importing photographic technology and practices into Korea, see Lee Eun-ju, "Gaehwagi sajinsul ui doip gwa geu yeonghyang: Kim Yong-won ui hwaldong eul jungsim euro," *Jindan hakbo*, June 2002, 36.

437 Lee Eun-ju, "Gaehwagi sajinsul ui doip gwa geu yeonghyang," 37.

Photography and print media had a definite advantage over paintings in reproducing and disseminating portrait images.[438] "[Photography] was more accurate, quicker and far cheaper; it offered the opportunity of portraiture to the whole society: previously such an opportunity had been the privilege of a very small élite."[439] Moreover, through photography, reality could be duplicated and reproduced and its substantiality (*silcheseong*, 實體性) be consistently certified, especially when depicting specific figures in portrait imagery.[440] Portraits of representative figures in modern media thus gave substance to the abstract and invisible idea of the nation-state. Popular print media such as newspapers or textbooks and the newly institutionalised education system provided an accessible platform of propagation, facilitating the construction of a Korean nation-state through the wider public; the ability to reproduce and distribute images amplified the vocality of portraiture by reaching a wider audience.

While traditional *eojin* were produced to record and conserve the legacy of the Joseon royal family, portraits of King Gojong also came to be an extension of his many reformist policies that were aimed at achieving *munmyeong gaehwa* (문명개화, 文明開化, cultural enlightenment). His portraits, which were once inaccessible to the public, came to openly represent Korea in international diplomatic contexts, were diversified in their forms, and embodied various visions of the new Korean nation-state. *Gongsin* portraits were discontinued in the early eighteenth century but were later

[438] For a discussion on the the human-derived conclusiveness of paintings in contrast to the mechanical process of producing photographic portraits, see John Berger, "The Changing View of Man in the Portrait," in *The Moment of Cubism: And Other Essays* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1969), 42–43.
[439] Berger, "The Changing View of Man in the Portrait," 41.
[440] Hong Sun-pyo, *Hanguk geundae misulsa*, 60.

appropriated in history textbooks of the twentieth century to depict national heroes and historical figures and glorified their feats and contributions to the country.

3.2. Royal Portraits of Gojong and Sunjong

3.2.a. Foreign Representation and New Media Experimentation

The long history of painting and enshrining royal portraits was preserved throughout King Gojong's reign and official *eojin* were still treated as a physical extension of the king up to the very end of the nineteenth century. However, a pivotal change in the perception of royal portraits was slowly but surely taking place from the 1880s. Gojong took a keen interest to new media such as photography, oil paintings, and illustrations.[441] Arnold Henry Savage Landor (1865-1924) who visited Korea in 1891 wrote about the king's genuine fascination with oil painting:

> "So great was the sensation produced by this portrait, that before many days had passed the King ordered it to be brought into his presence, upon which being done he sat gazing at it, surrounded by his family and whole household. The painting was kept at the Palace for two entire days, and when returned to me was simply covered with finger marks, royal and not royal, smeared on the paint, which was still moist, and that, notwithstanding that I had been provident enough to paste in a corner of the canvas a label in the [Korean] language to the effect that fingers were to be kept off. The King declared himself so satisfied with it that he expressed the wish that before leaving the country I should paint the portraits of the two most important personages in [Joseon] after himself, viz.: the two Princes, [Min Yeong-hwan], and [Min Yeong-jun], the former of

441 Gwon Haeng-ga, "Sajin sok e jaehyeondoen Daehan Jeguk hwangje ui pyosang: Gojong ui chosang sajin eul jungsim euro," *Hanguk geunhyeondae misulsahak* 16 (August 2006): 28–31.

whom was Commander-in-chief of the [Korean] land forces, and the other, Prime Minister of the kingdom, in fact, the Bismarck of [Joseon]."[442]

Most importantly, Landor explains that Gojong, "with a craze for Western civilization," preferred to sit in a "cheap foreign arm-chair with his elbow reclining on a wretched little twopence-halfpenny table covered with a green carpet" despite having a magnificent throne to sit on, and that he "imagines that he thus resembles a potentate of Europe."[443] This account demonstrates that Gojong was aware of European examples of royal portraiture and attempted to emulate such modes of representation by the 1890s.

This is not to mean that traditional *eojin* were discarded in favour of modern portraiture introduced after the opening of ports. Gojong had his first set of official *eojin* produced in 1872 to mark the ten-year anniversary of his accession to the throne and a second *eojin* of himself and a *yejin* (예진, 睿眞, portrait of the crown prince) of the Crown Prince Sunjong made to mark his fortieth anniversary of ascent to the throne in 1902.[444]

Historically, official royal portraits were actively produced when the legitimacy of rulership and national power was contested.[445] In particular, the production and

---

[442] Arnold Henry Savage Landor, *Corea or Cho-Sen: The Land of the Morning Calm* (Project Gutenberg, 2004), 232, https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/13128, accessed 7 September, 2022.

[443] Landor, *Corea or Cho-Sen,* 268–69.

[444] Unfortunately, the originals of Gojong's official portraits are lost. Chae Yong-sin, who was privately commissioned by Gojong to produce his portraits left several replicas, including a full-sized high quality painting of Gojong. Gwon Haeng-ga, *Imiji wa gwonryeok,* 160; Sin Myeong-ho, "Daehan Jeguk gi ui eojin jejak," *Joseon sidaesa hakbo* 33 (June 2005): 263; Jo Seon-mi, *Eojin, wang ui chosanghwa*, 291–92.

[445] This phenomenon of politicising royal portraits also took place in late Joseon, particularly from King Yeongjo and Jeongjo's reign. See Jo Seon-mi, *Eojin, wang ui chosanghwa*, 60–61. This period is also often referred to as the 'renaissance period' of

reproduction of the portrait of Taejo, the founding king of Joseon, was a political tactic that was repeatedly employed when there was a need to emphasise and strengthen the legitimacy and authority of the king and legacy of the Yi monarchy.[446]

King Gojong actively used his portraits not only to legitimise the Yi monarchy within Korea but also as a way of representing Korea in international settings in the late nineteenth century. Gojong's portraits in photographs, sketches, oil paintings, and prints from the 1880s to the 1890s can be seen as the king's determination to participate in Western international politics and to engage with modern diplomatic customs.[447] The exchange of portrait images of state heads was equated with peaceful and amiable relationships between countries and symbolically reaffirmed the understanding that they were equal in their sovereign rights.[448] Yet Gojong's portraits were often produced by foreign agents, leaving less room for Gojong's active participation in image production, selection, and interpretation. Nevertheless, he was able to reciprocate in the exchange of portrait images and offered a symbolic gesture of willingness to participate in modern diplomacy through visual communication.

Among various portrait images of Gojong, a key example is Percival Lowell's (1855-1916) photograph of the king. (Fig. 3.1., Fig. 3.2., Fig. 3.3.) Gojong and Sunjong sat for a photographic portrait for the first time in 1884 with Percival Lowell. Lowell's

---

Joseon. See Yeoksa Bipyeong Pyeonjip Wiwonhoe, *Jeongjo wa Jeongjo ihu: Jeongjo sidae wa 19 segi ui yeonsok gwa danjeol* (Goyang: Yeoksa Bipyeongsa, 2017).

[446] Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 19.

[447] Kim Eun-ho (김은호, 金殷鎬, 1892-1979), one of the last court-employed painters, wrote in a personal account that Gojong enjoyed taking photographs and left a large number of snap photos as well as official photographic portraits. Kim Eun-ho, *Seohwa baeknyeon* (Seoul: Jungang Ilbo Dongyang Bangsong, 1977), 67–68; Jo Seon-mi, *Eojin, wang ui chosanghwa*, 183.

[448] Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 27.

involvement in the 1882 Joseon-U.S. Treaty and the subsequent establishment of official Korea-US relations enabled the American photographer to capture the monarch in court.[449] A month after Lowell took the photographs in March 1884, Lucius Foote (1826-1913), a US diplomat who visited Korea to sign the 1882 Joseon-U.S. Treaty, received portrait images of the king and crown prince and took it back to the U.S.[450] This became the first of many other occasions in which Gojong sat for photographs for foreign visitors.[451] Audiences for portraits by foreign photographers and artists were welcomed by the king as it was a convenient occasion to strengthen diplomatic ties with Western countries. Portrait images offered foreigners the valuable opportunity to share information on the lesser-known East Asian country at home but also allowed Gojong to have himself and Korean statehood represented abroad. Reliance on foreign agents of portrait image production continued throughout the 1880s up to the 1910s.

Korean photographers slowly emerged after the legalisation of private trade with Japan in 1882, which included the trade of goods such as cameras and

[449] Lowell had previously assisted the Korean Legation that visited the U.S. in 1883. Lee Sa-bin, "Geundaegi chosang sajin ui oegyojeok gineung: Seumisonieon Misulgwan sojang Gojong chosang eul jungsim euro," *Guklip hyeondae misulgwan yeon-gu nonmun* 4 (2012): 27–28; Gwon Haeng-ga, *Imiji wa gwonryeok*, 66–72.
[450] Yun Chi-ho, "Yun Chi-ho ilgi," 24 April, 1884, https://db.history.go.kr/item/level.do?sort=levelId&dir=ASC&start=1&limit=20&page=1&pre_page=1&setId=-1&totalCount=0&prevPage=0&prevLimit=&itemId=sa&types=&synonym=off&chinessChar=on&brokerPagingInfo=&levelId=sa_024r_0020_0040_0290&position=-1, accessed 8 September, 2022; Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 30–33; Choi In-jin, *Hanguk sajinsa,* 139–41; *Gojong sillok*, vol. 40, 14 April, 1883, https://sillok.history.go.kr/search/inspectionDayList.do, accessed 7 September, 2022. Likewise, the Korean delegation to the U.S. in 1883 also received portraits of "distinguished men of the United States" as souvenirs. See Daehan Minguk Oemubu Jeongmuguk, *Guhanmal eogyo munseo 1: Miguk pyeon 1* (Seoul: Oemubu, 1960), 89; Gary D. Walter et al., "The Korean Special Mission to the United States of America," *Journal of Korean Studies* 1, no. 1 (December 1969): 135.
[451] Lee Sa-bin, "Geundaegi chosang sajin ui oegyojeok gineung," 28–29.

supplementary equipment.[452] Most of these few individuals such as Kim Yong-won, Ji Un-yeong (지운영, 池雲英, 1852-1935), and Hwang Cheol (황철, 黃鐵, 1864-1930) were also state officials close to Gojong, who were able to travel to China and Japan and learn photography as a supplementary activity to official duties.[453] Gojong also granted Korean photographers opportunities to capture his image. According to Choi In-jin, when Lowell took photographs of Gojong, Ji Un-yeong was also given the opportunity to photograph the king.[454] (Fig. 3.4.) The fact that Ji Un-yeong took photographs of the king reveals Gojong's support for the fostering of Korean photographers and his attempts to exert some level of influence in the production of his portrait imagery using new media.[455]

A similar photograph of Gojong, likely taken on the same occasion was also found in Commodore Shufeldt's possession. (Fig. 3.5.) The photograph, now in the Smithsonian Institution, has Shufeldt's signature and is recorded with the name of an unknown figure, "Higuchi."[456] As Japanese photographers and photo studios were

---

[452] Choi In-jin, *Hanguk sajinsa*, 83–118; Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 31; "Editorial," *Hanseong sunbo*, 21 February, 1884.
[453] Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 31–35.
[454] Choi In-jin, *Gojong, eosajin eul tonghae segye reul ggumgguda: 19 segi eosajin ui jeongchihak* (Seoul: Munhyeon, 2010), 24–26; Yun Chi-ho, "Yun Chi-ho ilgi," 13 March, 1884, https://db.history.go.kr/item/level.do?sort=levelId&dir=ASC&start=1&limit=20&page=1&pre_page=1&setId=-1&totalCount=0&prevPage=0&prevLimit=&itemId=sa&types=&synonym=off&chinessChar=on&brokerPagingInfo=&levelId=sa_024r_0020_0030_0160&position=-1, accessed 8 September, 2022.
[455] There is also a high possibility that the photographic portrait handed to Foote was taken by Ji Un-yeong's as Lowell's photo album was only delivered to the court in August of 1884, meaning that Foote could not have received Lowell's photographs before he left for the United States. Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 33.
[456] Gwon Haeng-ga, "Sajin sok e jaehyeondoen Daehan Jeguk hwangje ui pyosang," 19–20.

active producers, reproducers, and distributors of photographic imagery in Korea, there is a high possibility that Gojong's image was similarly reproduced and disseminated to Westerners via Japanese agents. Although some Korean photographers were active during the 1880s and 1890s, they were not as influential in the production and dissemination of royal portraits in these early periods. Photography in the 1880s was perceived as a threatening technology and after the failure of the 1884 Gapsin Coup, photo studios were destroyed by angry mobs as they were perceived as manifestations of the modern pursuits of the Reform Party.[457] Korean photographers only reappeared after 1900, when public fear of the foreign technology subsided, and photographs were made more affordable and accessible.[458]

The Japanese victory in the First Sino-Japanese War, the assassination of Queen Min in 1895, and the proclamation of the Korean Empire in 1897 resulted in the overbearing dominance of Japanese influence over the peninsula which compelled Gojong to counterbalance the growing power of Japan and the threats it posed. Gojong perceived his friendships with Westerners such as American missionaries and officials who helped him flee to the Russian Legation in 1896 as a protective mechanism, especially after the Japanese assassination of the queen. As Gojong was politically motivated to strengthen ties with Western powers, portrait production catered to this objective, providing further opportunities for amiable foreign artists and photographers to produce his portraits.

---

[457] Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 34; Byeon Gyeong-hwa, "Baekryeon Ji Un-yeong ui saeng-ae wa jakpum segye" (Master's thesis, Seoul, Ewha Womans University, 2007), 9–10.

[458] Ju Hyeong-il, "Sajin eun jukeum eul eotteohge jaehyeon haneun-ga?: Jukeum sajin ui yuhyeong gwa gineung," *Hanguk eonron jeongbo hakbo* 68 (November 2014): 74; Choi In-jin, *Hanguk sajinsa,* 178–91.

Isabella Bird Bishop was a frequent guest of Queen Min.[459] Shortly after the king's return to the palace from the Russian Legation in 1897, Bishop asked to take a photograph of Gojong to be given to Queen Victoria, which Gojong gladly permitted, even while still in mourning. Gojong even made the conscious decision to change his mourning attire to his royal robe for the photograph.[460] Although the original photographs are lost, Bishop's book, *Korea and Her Neighbours*, includes an illustrated portrait of Gojong that is likely based on her photographic portrait of Gojong. (Fig. 3.6.) This account reveals the increasing importance placed in the manner of Gojong's presentation in portraits as the need to express Korean sovereignty and power abroad grew.

Hubert Vos' (1855-1935) oil painting of Gojong in 1898 is also noteworthy in that the painting was starkly different in style and method of display compared to traditional *eojin.*[461] (Fig. 3.7.) The oil painting is a typical example of a more secular approach to royal portraits that began to gain prevalence at the end of the nineteenth century. Hubert Vos was handsomely paid by the court and was permitted to take one of

---

[459] Isabella Bishop travelled to Korea four times between 1894 and 1897. Bishop, *Korea and Her Neighbors*.

[460] Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 62; Bishop, *Korea and Her Neighbors*, 430.

[461] Hubert Vos was a Dutch painter frequently commissioned for portrait paintings. After participating in the 1893 Chicago World Fair, he started to paint numerous individuals of various ethnicities with a focus on ethnographic interpretations. He was able to paint portraits of influential figures such as Li Hongzhang and Empress Dowager Cixi (西太后, 1835–1908) using his connections with high-ranking officials and ambassadors. When he visited Korea in 1899, he was able to paint a portrait of Min Sang-ho (민상호, 閔商鎬, 1870-1933), a high-ranking official, with the help of the Russian Minister which led to the opportunity to paint Gojong's portrait. Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 42; Lee Bo-ram, "Hyubeot Boseu (Hubert Vos, 1835-1955) ui saeng-ae wa hoehwa yeon-gu," Master's thesis, Yong-in, Myeongji University, 2014, 1, 30–46.

the two copies of Gojong's portrait to exhibit it at the 1900 Paris Exposition, marking a major change in the treatment of royal portraits.[462] Vos' painting does not portray Gojong as a powerful and divine ruler. Rather, his standing pose, awkward tilt and hand gesture, and a simple background gives the impression of gentle and timid man.[463] Moreover, the portrait was treated as one of many images of ethnic specimens of non-Western nations at the Paris Exposition.[464] Given that there were many contemporary newspaper articles explaining the exposition and the fact that the royal portraits were specifically produced for the occasion, Gojong would have been aware that his portrait image would be openly displayed for the Western public. However, what he wouldn't have known was that his portrait would be displayed as part of a collection of ethnographic images of non-Western races. Regardless, it seems that priority was placed on having a portrait produced for the representation of Korea rather than the preservation of monarchical authority.

Antonio Shindler's (1823-1899) 1893 painting of Gojong also displays similar intentions of displaying Korean ethnicity through Gojong's image. Shindler was employed by the Smithsonian Institution and produced paintings of people of various

---

[462] *Hwangseong sinmun* writes that Vos was paid a grand sum of 10,000 won and that he also took a portrait of the crown prince. "Hwajin sugeum," *Hwangseong sinmun*, 12 July, 1899, National Library of Korea, https://nl.go.kr/newspaper/detail.do?content_id=CNTS-00093702171, accessed 8 September, 2022; Seo Seong-rok, *Hanguk hyeondae hoehwa ui baljachwi* (Seoul: Munye Chulpansa, 2006), 29; National Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art, Korea, *Guhanmal Migukin hwaga Boseu ga geurin Gojong hwangje chosanghwa teukbyeol jeonsi* (Seoul: National Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art, 1982); Lee Bo-ram, "Hyubeot Boseu (Hubert Vos, 1835-1955) ui saeng-ae wa hoehwa yeon-gu," 52–53; Kim Young-na, "'Bakramhoe' raneun jeonsi gong-gan," 96.

[463] Lee Bo-ram, "Hyubeot Boseu (Hubert Vos, 1835-1955) ui saeng-ae wa hoehwa yeon-gu," 52. Unfortunately, only Vos' copy survives and is now in a private collection.

[464] Kim Young-na, *20 segi ui Hanguk misul 2*, 35–36.

ethnicities. (Fig. 3.8.) Much like Hubert Vos' painting that was displayed in the Paris Exposition, Shindler's portrait of Gojong was planned to be displayed in the 1893 Chicago World Fair, but there are no official records of it actually being displayed.[465] Shindler's portrait, when compared to Vos' work, is far less accurate in depicting Gojong and falls closer to an imagined or over-generalised depiction of a Korean king, in part owing to Shindler's initial aim of depicting a specimen of the Korean ethnie that did not require detailed accuracy. It is also highly likely that he used Lowell's photograph to paint the portrait, which explains the crude depiction of Gojong's likeness.

As Hubert Vos and Shindler's paintings show, Gojong's portraits produced by foreign artists that made their way back to the West were often perceived as visual catalogues of race and ethnicity of the exotic country. Early depictions of Gojong had neither an aura of a divine ruler nor the authority of a strong state leader. They were closer to components of the collector's cabinet of curiosities that reflected the Westerners' gaze of the Extrême-Orient. Regardless, early examples of Gojong's image in public display are significant as they were visual introductions of Korea and its people when the Western public was only beginning to realise the existence of the 'hermit country.' Nevertheless, there was a clear disparity between traditional preconceptions of royal portraits and the actual treatment of Gojong's portraits once it left palace grounds.

Many portrait images of Gojong, particularly those produced or consumed by Westerners, thus suggest a lack of control on Gojong's behalf in directing image

[465] Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 40; Kim Young-na, "'Bakramhoe' raneun jeonsi gong-gan," 96.

production and methods of consumption. Gojong's active involvement in portrait production was more evident in traditional portraits. When Gojong ordered the reproduction of King Taejo's *eojin* and the painting of the first set of his own *eojin* to commemorate the 480-year anniversary of the founding of Joseon, it was recorded that he researched the styles of earlier *eojin* examples and commented on details of the periodic changes in the style of royal attire, including robe colour, height of the crown, and the width of sleeves.[466] He went on to direct that his crown should be painted in the same style as the crown in the old Taejo *eojin*.[467] He was also very particular when it came to the style of his own official *eojin* and ordered to have the 1872 *eojin* in military attire washed when he ordered the production of a new set in 1902 to commemorate the 40-year anniversary of his accession to the throne.[468]

Gojong's desire to utilise his portraits to fulfil political agendas are evident in his attention to detail in portrait production. For instance, after the completion of his 1872 *eojin*, he asked his officials if the Taejo *eojin* kept in Junwonjeon Hall (준원전, 濬源殿) in Hamgyeong-do Province (함경도, 咸鏡道) was also painted in full-frontal view.[469] He was consciously aiming to reinforce his authority and legacy of the Yi

---

466 *Seungjeong-won ilgi*, 10 February, 1871, https://www-krpia-co-kr.ezproxy.soas.ac.uk/viewer?plctId=PLCT00006569&tabNodeId=NODE06403599#none, accessed 8 September, 2022; Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 77, 129-130.

467 *Seungjeong-won ilgi,* 11 February, 1872, https://www-krpia-co-kr.ezproxy.soas.ac.uk/viewer?plctId=PLCT00006569&tabNodeId=NODE06403599#none, accessed 8 September, 2022.

468 Typically, when recreating *eojin* of deceased kings, old copies were washed, burned, or buried. Jo Seon-mi argues that the reproduction of Gojong's *eojin* would have been due to the stylistic changes of painter Lee Han-cheol who was responsible for the military attire *eojin*. She points out that from 1861, Lee Han-cheol began to use darker shades to depict the face and used thicker lines to depict curves of the face which Gojong seems to have disliked. Jo Seon-mi, *Eojin, wang ui chosanghwa*, 183.

469 *Seungjeong-won ilgi*, 3 May, 1872, https://www-krpia-co-

royal family by adhering to early Joseon portrait customs of using full-frontal views rather than conforming to the late Joseon trend of using the tilted view.[470] These conscious decisions and active involvement by Gojong in traditional portrait production suggest that he was aware of and sensitive to the political power of portrait imagery.

Gojong also seems to have had some prior knowledge of how foreign monarchs and officials were portrayed in modern portraiture. In 1876, he dispatched a survey team to Japan. The dispatched officials had their photographs taken in a Japanese photo studio and collected samples of photographs of modern Japanese railroads, schools, factories, and company buildings.[471] Another survey team dispatched to Japan in 1881 collected photographic portraits of Japanese officials, as well as those of monarchs and aristocrats of Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, and United States.[472] These photographs would have been delivered to Gojong who would have learned the general method of the depiction of a monarch in photographic portraits. However, Gojong neither clearly emulated Western portraits nor consistently abided by traditional Joseon portrait styles during his reign. He depended on and permitted a level of freedom in foreigners' depiction of himself in order to have himself represented in the West and to participate in modern international relations.

One of the most popularly reproduced royal photographs of the Korean Empire that demonstrated, albeit incompletely, the emperor's awareness and implementation of Western modes of visual representation was that of Gojong dressed in his new

---

kr.ezproxy.soas.ac.uk/viewer?plctId=PLCT00006569&tabNodeId=NODE06403599#none, accessed 8 September, 2022; Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 22.

[470] Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 22.

[471] Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 25-26; Lee Eun-ju, "Gaehwagi sajinsul ui doip gwa geu yeonghyang," 151–53.

[472] Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 26-27.

commander-in-chief uniform. Murakami Tenshin (村上天眞, 1867-?) frequently photographed the Korean emperor from 1900, and the photograph of Gojong and Sunjong dressed in uniform was reproduced as photographic postcards that were popularly consumed among foreigners. (Fig. 3.9.) However, Gwon Haeng-ga argues that these images cannot be seen as Gojong's self-initiated and self-deliberated portraits but rather a product of the foreigners' gaze.[473] His awkward and seemingly uncalculated stance, uncharismatic composure, and dull backdrop all add weight to this argument.

Nevertheless, it would be hasty to completely discredit Gojong's efforts to politicise his image and dismiss their implications.[474] The fact that the court expended a large budget into purchasing Western military uniforms for Gojong and Sunjong also reveals that the portrait production was recognised as an important project by the emperor and government. In 1899, the establishment of the Board of Marshals (Wonsubu, 원수부, 元帥府) led to the adoption and institutionalisation of Western military uniforms, and the State Council (Uijeongbu, 의정부, 議政府) spent a sizeable sum of 3,967 won and 50 jeon on purchasing uniforms, epaulets, belts, collars, gloves, shoes, and swords for the emperor and crown prince.[475] Yet despite the apparent commitment to construct a new image of the Korean Empire through Western dress, it is evident that Gojong had limited control and expertise in the way he was portrayed

[473] Gwon Haeng-ga, *Imiji wa gwonryeok*, 179-190.
[474] Jo Seon-mi, *Wang ui eolgul: Han Jung Il gunju chosanghwa reul malhada* (Seoul: Sahoe Pyeongron, 2012), 97.
[475] Gwon Haeng-ga, *Imiji wa gwonryeok*, 182.

and how his image was consumed, especially when foreign agents were the producers and distributers of his portrait imagery.

Another noteworthy photographic portrait of Gojong that displays the different levels of comfort and control Gojong had in portrait production depending on the modes of representation and photographers was a 1905 photograph presented to Alice Lee Roosevelt Longworth (1884-1980). (Fig. 3.10.) The tinted photograph taken by Kim Gyu-jin (김규진, 金奎鎭, 1868-1933) portrays Gojong in a traditional imperial robe, seated in a chair against court folding screens.[476] The portrait was created as an official gift for the daughter of President Theodore Roosevelt (1858-1919, in office 1901-1909) who visited Korea with the Taft Mission delegation.[477] The tour eventually resulted in the Taft-Katsura Secret Agreement which secured Japan's control over Korea and the U.S. occupation of the Philippines. Unaware of this agreement, Gojong made strenuous efforts to make a positive impression on the 'princess' of the United States.[478]

The work is not only significant as the second earliest identified photograph produced by a Korean photographer, after Ji Un-yeong in 1884, but also as an official photographic portrait of Gojong formally presented to a diplomatic guest by the court.[479] The employment of a Korean photographer to produce Gojong's portrait for

[476] An almost identical photograph was granted to Edward Henry Harriman (1848-1909), a successful US railroad businessman. The copy given to Harriman is housed in Newark Museum and contains the printed name of Kim Gyu-jin. Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong Hwangje sajin," in *Miguk Nyueokeu Bakmulgwan sojang Hanguk munhwajae* (Seoul: Gukoe Sojae Munhwajae Jaedan, 2016), 30–39; Gwon Haeng-ga, "Geundaejeok sigak cheje ui hyeongseong gwajeong," 129–30.
[477] Lee Sa-bin, "Geundaegi chosang sajin ui oegyojeok gineung," 25.
[478] Hanmi Sajin Misulgwan, Guklip Hyeondae Misulgwan, and Gahyeon Munhwa Jaedan, *Daehan Jeguk hwangsil ui chosang 1880-1989* (Seoul: Gahyeon Munhwa Jaedan; Hanmi Sajin Misulgwan, 2012), 24.
[479] Gwon Haeng-ga, "Geundaejeok sigak cheje ui hyeongseong gwajeong," 129–30.

diplomatic purposes is telling of both the proliferation of photography in Korea and the increasing level of Gojong's self-determination and comfort over the way his image was presented. Compared to images produced by foreign agents in the 1890s, the emperor is portrayed in a manner that much resembles traditional *eojin*. Even after the purchasing of Western uniforms, Gojong continued to utilise both traditional and Western dress for different occasions according to the different images he intended to create. (Fig. 3.11., Fig. 3.12., Fig. 3.13., Fig. 3.14., Fig. 3.15., Fig. 3.16.) For the official portrait presented to the United States, Gojong attempted to displayed himself as an authoritative ruler by using the full-frontal view, yellow imperial robe, and decorative folding screens.

3.2.b. Public Edification and Politicisation

Royal portraits were actively produced and disseminated in Korea from the late 1890s. From this time to 1905, Gojong showed increased confidence and comfort in having his portraits reproduced via diverse media and attempted to strengthen monarchical authority through his image. Such portraits reflected the desire to promote Gojong as a newly elevated emperor, especially as domestic desire for a constitutional monarchy began to surface and foreign threats to Korean sovereignty intensified toward 1900. This was also a time when Korean agents of image production and distribution emerged and used Gojong's portraits to instil in the Korean public collective loyalty and allegiance to their emperor and country.

There was also stronger public desire to consume the emperor's image. Even up until the Sino-Japanese War, Gojong's presence within Korea remained within an enclosed space such as the palace grounds or a royal carriage.[480] He was 'understood' by the Korean public through symbolic spaces associated with the king, rather than 'seen.' Gojong's image was gradually disseminated among Koreans and were even commercialised and sold as commodities from the end of the 1890s. In many ways, Gojong's image itself was desacralized and demystified, but this did not deteriorate his status as heavenly-appointed ruler in domestic Korea. Rather, as the visibility of Gojong was significantly elevated, the gap between the Korean public and their ruler was reduced and their allegiance to the nation-state strengthened.

It was during Gojong's stay in the Russian Legation from 1896 to 1897 when his portrait image was first openly distributed within domestic Korea. After the

---

[480] Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 60.

assassination of Queen Min, Gojong relied on the loyalty of several close Americans for protection, including Horace Grant Underwood (1859-1916) and Homer Hulbert (1863-1949), who guarded the king night and day.[481] Likely as a gesture of gratitude for their allegiance and dedication, Underwood was given a photograph of Gojong dressed in a white mourning robe that was taken in the Russian Legation.[482] An almost identical image, photographed by L. B. Graham (?-?), wife of U.S. minister John M. B. Sill (1831-1901), was published in *The Korean Repository* edited by Henry G. Appenzeller (1858-1902) in an article titled "His Majesty, The King of Korea" in November of 1896, with full approval from Gojong himself.[483] (Fig. 3.17.)

Soon afterwards in 1897, *Geuriseudo sinmun* (그리스도신문, *The Christian News*), Underwood's weekly newspaper written in Hangeul, also offered its readers photolithographs of Gojong.[484] Printed in Japan, it was originally planned to offer the printed photograph for purchase at 50 jeon a piece, but they were offered exclusively as annual subscription gifts due to high demand.[485] Though the original is yet to be located, Lillias Horton Underwood's book, *Fifteen Years Among the Top Knots,* contains an image of Gojong in imperial dress that fits the description of the photolithograph.[486] (Fig. 3.18.) The image, in comparison to Gojong's photograph in

---

[481] Choi In-jin, *Gojong, eosajin eul tonghae segye reul ggumgguda,* 179–80.
[482] Choi In-jin, *Gojong, eosajin eul tonghae segye reul ggumgguda*, 183–88; Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 60-61.
[483] "His Majesty, The King of Korea," *The Korean Repository* 3 (November 1896): 423–30; Choi In-jin, *Gojong, eosajin eul tonghae segye reul ggumgguda*, 179–80.
[484] It is noteworthy that *Geuriseudo sinmun* attempted to incorporate visual imagery even when there were very limited printing facilities in Korea. The newspaper printed images of Christian figures and various celebrities through printing houses in Japan. Choi In-jin, *Hanguk sinmun sajinsa*, 43–50.
[485] Choi In-jin, *Gojong, Eosajin eul tonghae segye reul ggumgguda*, 183–88; Gwon Haeng-ga, *Imiji wa gwonryeok*, 129–33; "Nonseol," *Doklip sinmun*, 28 August, 1897.
[486] While Choi In-jin argues that this photograph is highly likely to be identical to the

The Korean Repository, would have been more accessible to the Korean public as *Geuriseudo sinmun* was written in Hangeul script. Moreover, the newspaper openly advertised that the people would have the opportunity to obtain a photograph of the monarch for the first time since the founding of Joseon.[487] Although the exact level of accessibility of the image is unclear, the high demand of Gojong's portrait in the late 1890s was clearly demonstrated.

It is important to mention that the publishing of Gojong's image in newspapers was more than a marketing ruse to increase sales. As missionaries and close confidents of Gojong, both Appenzeller and Underwood contributed to the development of "*chung-gun aeguk"* (충군애국, 忠君愛國, loyalty to the sovereign and love for the country) patriotism and monarch-centred nation-building of the Korean Empire period, most effectively expressed in the form of public ceremonies and education.[488] Members of the American-Protestant society in Korea primarily utilised their amiable relationship with the Korean emperor to preserve their rights to continue their missionary work, but also greatly contributed to the instituting of modern public education as well as promoting 'national events' such as the celebration of Gojong's birthday, often in cooperation with members of the Korean civil society.

The relationship between core members of the American-Protestant society and the Independence Club was central to the popular utilisation of both Gojong's portraits

---

photolithograph, Gwon Haeng-ga disagrees. Choi In-jin, *Gojong, eosajin eul tonghae segye reul ggumgguda*, 183–85; Gwon Haeng-ga, *Imiji wa gwonryeok*, 132–33; Lillias Horton Underwood, *Fifteen Years Among the Top-Knots: Life in Korea* (Boston: American Tract Society, 1908), 23.

[487] "Editorial," *Geuriseudo sinmun*, 15 July, 1897; Gwon Haeng-ga, *Imiji wa gwonryeok*, 132.

[488] Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 64.

and the Taegeukgi in educating and instilling in the Korean public the systematic expression of allegiance to the king and country in their daily lives. While individuals such as Appenzeller and Underwood publicly distributed the portrait images of the king, the Independence Club delivered information on examples of educating and inducing patriotism in the West and Japan, such as saluting the national flag and bowing to the portrait of their kings in schools and when celebrating national days, in the club's newspaper *Doklip sinmun*.[489]

> "Patriotism is a crucial part of school learning. This is why public schools abroad have a rule that all students should gather each morning to salute the national flag and cry 'manse' [(만세, 萬歲, hooray)] while saluting the photograph of their king. If students learn to care for the country and love their king as their rightful duty day and night, it will become embedded in their hearts even after they grow older and their love for their country will come before anything else."[490]

After the eventual fallout with the Independence Club in 1899, Gojong took initiative to produce official *eojin* to strengthen monarchical authority. The decision to utilise traditional royal portraiture was in line with Gojong's determination to emphasise his image as a powerful emperor. Particularly between 1900 and 1902, Gojong commenced on elaborate plans to commemorate the fortieth anniversary of his accession to the throne and his fiftieth birthday.[491] He first had *eojin* of preceding kings

---

[489] For more on the relationship between Americans in Korea and the Independence Club, see Hyeon Gwang-ho, "Ju Han Miguk gongsa ui Doklip Hyeophoe undong insik gwa daeeung," 199–234.

[490] "Nonseol," *Doklip sinmun*, 22 September, 1896; Gwon Haeng-ga, *Imiji wa gwonryeok*, 138–40.

[491] Gwon Haeng-ga, "Sajin sok e jaehyeondoen Daehan Jeguk hwangje ui pyosang,"

Taejo, Sukjong (숙종, 숙종(肅宗, 1661-1720, r. 1674-1720), Yeongjo (영조, 英祖, 1694-1776, r. 1724-1776), Jeongjo (정조, 正祖, 1752-1800, r. 1776-1800), Sunjo, Ikjong, and Heonjong painted and enshrined from 1900 to 1901 as part of his project for the reinforcement of the authority of the Yi monarchy.[492]

As explained above, the repainting of preceding kings, especially that of Taejo, the founding father of Joseon, was a political strategy often used in face of foreign threats to national security or internal political contestation. In Gojong's case, both external and internal threats played in; after the assassination of Queen Min, he was constantly wary of Japanese or Russian encroachment of Korean sovereignty, but also conscious of the growing domestic support for a constitutional monarchy or parliamentary system. His birthday, anniversary of accession to the throne, and entering of Giroso (기로소, 耆老所, Agency for the Elderly) in 1902 was a much needed opportunity for him to reassert his authority as a powerful monarch and declare the strength of the Korean Empire via public celebratory events and rituals surrounding the painting and enshrinement of traditional *eojin*.[493]

After the completion of *eojin* of preceding kings, Gojong ordered the painting of a new set of his own enshrined *eojin* in 1901. This was the second time he had his official *eojin* produced during his reign after the first set in 1872. Gojong was deeply committed to the production of *eojin* and while painting the new set of official *eojin* in

31.

[492] Jo Seon-mi, *Eojin, wang ui chosanghwa*, 66–70; Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 74–80.

[493] Giroso was an honorary social organisation for senior civil ministers over the age of seventy. Gojong became a dignitary at the age of 51 in 1902. Gwon Haeng-ga, "Sajin sok e jaehyeondoen Daehan Jeguk hwangje ui pyosang," 31.

1902, he sat for painters almost fifty times.[494] During the production of the primary templates for the 1902 *eojin* to commemorate his joining of Giroso, he sat for the paintings in person ten times and an additional seven times for the completion of the final paintings, amounting to seventeen times in total over the course of a month.[495] It seems that he desired to completely re-establish his image so that the portraits recorded and expressed his authority as the first Korean emperor.

Despite such attentive production, Gojong's new imperial *eojin* were enshrined and kept away from public view, just like traditional Joseon *eojin*. The impact these official portraits had on promoting *chung-gun aeguk* patriotism lay not in the actual paintings but in the rituals involved with their enshrinement. *Eojin* were only indirectly made visible through public processions that took place while enshrining the portraits, particularly when the shrines were located in regions outside palace grounds. For instance, when *eojin* of Taejo were completed in 1900, one of the portraits was enshrined in Hamheung (함흥, 咸興), Hangyeongdo Province (함경도, 咸鏡道).[496] To enshrine the portrait, Gojong had hundreds of peddlers (*bobusang*, 보부상, 褓負商), who had previously aided Gojong disband the Independence Club, cheer and lead the procession to Hamheung, wearing yellow-coloured clothes and waving the national flag.[497] Although the actual *eojin* was still hidden from sight, this public

[494] Sunjong also sat for his own set of portraits with his father. Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 83.
[495] Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 87.
[496] William Richard Carles, "Report of a Journey by Mr. Carles in the North of Corea," Corea (London: British Parliament, 1885), 27.
[497] *Gojong sillok*, vol. 40, 20 April, 1900, https://sillok.history.go.kr/id/kza_13704020_003, accessed 8 Sepember, 2022; Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 80.

spectacle of orchestrated ritual visually demonstrated Gojong's authority and power of the Korean Empire.[498] This was a noticeable improvement in state utilisation of modern visual customs of public ceremonies compared to the previous decade. Isabella Bishop's account in the 1890s reveals her disappointment with processions:

> "There was no jollity or excitement, no flags or popular demonstrations, and scarcely a hum from a concourse which must have numbered at least 150,000, half the city, together with numbers from the country who had walked three and four days to see the spectacle. Squalid and mean is ordinary Korean life, and the King is a myth for most of the year. No wonder that the people turn out to see as splendid a spectacle as the world has to show, its splendour centring round their usually secluded sovereign. It is to the glory of a dynasty which has occupied the Korean throne for five centuries as well as in honour of the present occupant."[499]

Gojong not only produced several sets of both official and unofficial portraits from 1900 but also planned celebratory events: a feast for his Giroso admission, private and official birthday feasts, and a ceremony to commemorate the fortieth anniversary of his accession to the throne.[500] While previous celebratory events of Gojong's birthday from 1896 to 1898 were planned and hosted by missionaries and the Independence Club as part of their agenda of public edification of national holidays, these events were officially sponsored and hosted by the government and Gojong himself, with budgets directly bestowed upon relevant offices from the king, official invitations handed out to

[498] Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 16, 80.
[499] Bishop, *Korea and Her Neighbors,* 51-52.
[500] Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 81.

foreign representatives, and orders given out to shops and government offices to hoist the national flag.[501] Gojong's direct control of these events was reflective of his decision to retain and strengthen absolute monarchy and marked the beginnings of state-controlled public national events that promoted the awareness of statist patriotism up to 1905.

Originals of Gojong's official *eojin* created in 1901 and 1902 are now lost, but a later replica attributed to Chae Yong-sin (채용신, 蔡龍臣, 1850-1941) survives as one of the few high-quality pieces that closely resemble official *eojin* of Gojong.[502] (Fig. 3.19.) The rendering of his facial features and use of light hints the use of photographs or at least a photographic take on portrait painting. Yet his posture, composition, and the use of the throne and carpet resemble traditional *eojin*.[503] The mixture of Western painting techniques and traditional *eojin* features makes the painting an insightful example of portrait practice in the early twentieth century.

More importantly, Chae Yong-sin is known to have used a *chobon* (초본, 初本, primary template) of the *eojin* commissioned by Gojong that allowed him to create multiple replicas throughout the early twentieth century. This was a highly unusual case in which the monarch's image used in the court production of an *eojin* left

[501] Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 86.
[502] Chae Yong-sin was commissioned by Gojong to produce a private set of portraits in 1901 and 1902. Chae Yong-sin, *(Seokji) Chae Yong-sin silgi: Seokgang silgi*, trans. Lee Du-hui and Lee Chung-gu (Seoul: Gukhak Jaryowon, 2004). The painting attributed to Chae Yong-sin is not an official *eojin*, but a copy that is thought to be a privately commissioned.
[503] Other notable developments include frontality and the depiction of hands in a royal portrait. See Jo Seon-mi, *Wang ui eolgul*, 100–101; National Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art, Korea, *Seokji Chae Yong-sin* (Seoul: Sam Gwa Ggum, 2001), 45–54.

palace grounds to be reproduced.[504] As aforementioned, Hubert Vos was also permitted to leave with a copy with Gojong's portrait, but this can be seen as a diplomatic exception aimed at Gojong's representation abroad. If Chae Yong-sin was granted official permission to keep the templates from Gojong, it indicates a crucial change in the treatment of the king's portrait, a transition from a sacred and invisible symbol to the public visual representation of a country's leader.[505]

Despite active *eojin* production and grand public events of 1900-1902, the actual visibility of Gojong's image and public accessibility was slow to improve. Gojong's image was not applied on objects such as modern coins and postal stamps that would typically bear the state head's image in Western countries as these common and daily objects were thought to "defile" the "effigy of his majesty."[506] Similarly, the use of Gojong's image to promote sales of commodities such as cigarette boxes, were banned in 1901.[507] Clearly, there remained a clear distinction in the permissible occasions of displaying Gojong's image, especially as state control increased in the final years of the Korean Empire. However, Gojong's portraits were slowly and inevitably popularised and commodified as more photographers and publishers emerged toward 1910. Before the popularisation of commercial photographic portraits of Gojong in

---

[504] Jo Seon-mi, *Wang ui eolgul,* 92–93. Normally, the primary template would be washed, burned, and buried or otherwise disposed of after the completion of the *eojin*.
[505] Gwon Haeng-ga assumes that he was able to do so as it was an unofficial commissioning rather than an official *eojin* project. Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 95.
[506] Constance J. D. Taylor, *Koreans at Home* (London: Casselland Company, 1904), 37.
[507] A Japanese cigarette company that had a branch in Korea from 1899 sold with their products with photographs of celebrities, politicians, and state heads of the world to promote sales. Their use of Gojong's portrait was quickly banned by the government. See "Nonseol," *Hwangseong sinmun*, 25 June, 1901; "Nonseol," *Hwangseong sinmun*, 26 June, 1901; "Editorial," *Jeguk sinmun*, 25 June, 1901; "Editorial," *Jeguk sinmun*, 26 June, 1901; Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 93.

domestic Korea, people had access to printed illustrations of both Gojong and Sunjong's portrait that were published in history textbook *Chodeung Daehan yeoksa* in 1908. (Fig. 3.20., Fig. 3.21.) The public dissemination of Gojong's image in both photographs and print illustrations toward 1910 contributed to the forging of the public's personal affiliation to their ruler who had always remained hidden from public view throughout Joseon history.

3.2.c. Inspiration for Resistance Movements

Royal portraits from 1905 to the 1910s display major shifts and dichotomisation in the utilisation and consumption of royal portrait imagery. From the signing of the Eulsa Treaty in 1905, rights to diplomacy were surrendered and the Korean Empire was made a protectorate of Japan. With intensifying levels of political interference, Gojong was eventually forced to abdicate the throne to his son Sunjong in 1907, after his failed attempt to seek aid from European countries and China. On one hand, the production and dissemination of royal portrait imagery began to be actively used to publicise Japanese control of protectorate Korea and to formalise the hierarchical relationship between the Japanese Emperor and the Korean monarch. Sunjong's image was clearly used to proclaim and promote Japanese occupation and the merging of the two countries. His status was reduced to the head of the Yi royal family from the emperor of the Korean Empire and his image was incorporated in Japanese colonial propaganda.

On the other hand, portraits of both Gojong and Sunjong remained in great demand among Koreans and induced nostalgia for the autonomous nation-state and reflected the collective desire to restore Korean sovereignty and resist Japanese colonialism. Despite Japanese exploitation of royal portrait imagery of both Gojong and Sunjong as tools to convert Koreans into loyal servants of the Japanese Empire, the Korean public also used images of Gojong and Sunjong to form a new form of resistant nationalism.

Prior to enthronement in 1907, Sunjong already had several portraits of himself made as crown prince, in both traditional painted *eojin* and photographs. He was first

photographed when Gojong met with Percival Lowell in 1884 and was also alongside Gojong in an 1896 photograph and had a separate photograph taken by Kim Gyu-jin in 1905. (Fig. 3.22.) Gojong also had an official *yejin* of Sunjong produced in 1902.[508] (Fig. 3.23.) However, for Japanese politicians, it was imperative that Sunjong's image be newly presented to publicise the supposedly peaceful abdication of the throne from Gojong to Sunjong and to alleviate tensions surrounding Japanese intervention in internal affairs. For instance, immediately after Gojong''s abdication and the opening of the 1907 Gyeongseong Exposition, postcards with Sunjong's photograph were sold as commemorative souvenirs.[509]

Japanese efforts to converse the growing negative public opinion of protectoral governance continued with the photo album released to commemorate Sunjong's first birthday after his accession to the throne in 1908. The album included not only a photograph of Sunjong but also scenes of the birthday celebration, a group photograph of attendees, the public procession, palace sceneries, and other snap shots of festive entertainments.[510] However, such photo albums were still expensive and exclusive items reserved for a restrictive group officials and foreign representatives rather than commercialised for the public.[511]

Postcards, on the other hand, were much more accessible compared to costly photo albums. Sunjong's image was quickly applied to picture postcards, beginning

---

[508] Although mostly damaged from a fire during the Korean War, there is a portrait thought to be of Sunjong as a Crown Prince in the National Palace Museum of Korea. See Fig. 3.23.
[509] "Bakramhoe naesin," *Hwangseong sinmun*, 10 September, 1907; Tsukiashi Tatsuhiko, *Joseon ui gaehwa sasang gwa naeshyeoneollijeum*, 357.
[510] *Guhanguk gwanbo*, 4 April, 1908; Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 119.
[511] Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 119–20.

with those produced to commemorate Sunjong's accession to the throne and the visit of Japanese crown prince, Prince Yoshihito to Korea in 1907. These events were opportunities for the Japanese authorities to promote the beginnings of a new and mutually beneficial Korea-Japan relationship, "remove old prejudices that existed between the two countries, and to soften more or less the ill-feeling of the Korean people toward Japan."[512] (Fig. 3.24.)

Commemorative postcards demonstrate the way in which Japan wished to present Sunjong. The 1907 postcard celebrating the Japanese crown prince's visit to Korea used an old photograph of Sunjong taken between 1900 and 1901 as a crown prince. (Fig. 3.25.) The image was a cut-out of a 1900 photograph of Sunjong and Gojong in military uniform and was used in several other postcards. (Fig. 3.26.) Here, Sunjong stands, with his body slightly tilted away from the camera, mouth slightly open. Lacking in authority and charisma, his image is juxtaposed against the official photographic portrait of the Japanese prince, donning an imperial uniform emblazoned with numerous medals. In between them is a photograph of the Japanese Residency-General building, reiterating the underlying agenda of re-establishing the image of the Korean ruler and his relationship to Japan after the Eulsa Treaty.

Sunjong was made much more visible to the public compared to his father Gojong, not only in print media but also in person.[513] Just weeks after accession, he went on a tour to the royal tombs (*neunghaeng*, 능행, 陵幸), and soon travelled to Incheon to greet the Japanese Crown Prince.[514] Both Sunjong and Gojong attended

---

[512] H.I.J.M's Residency General, *The Second Annual Report on Reforms and Progress in Korea (1908-9)* (Seoul: H.I.J.M's Residency General, 1909), 4.
[513] Tsukiashi Tatsuhiko, *Joseon ui gaehwa sasang gwa naeshyeoneollijeum*, 343-351.
[514] Christine Kim, "Politics and Pageantry in Protectorate Korea (1905-10)," 837–41.

public ceremonies that were much physically closer and open to the public view than traditional processions:

> "The new emperor proceeded to the Ancestors' Temple on November 18, 1907, to proclaim the policy of reform. […] The new and ex-emperors both drove about the city of Seoul in open carriages- a precedent-breaking policy. The empress herself appeared in an open carriage with her face uncovered."[515]

Celebratory postcards were also produced for the 1907 Gyeongseong Exposition, using a more recent photograph of Sunjong, rather than his photo as crown prince. (Fig. 3.27.) These celebratory spectacles were planned and executed by the Resident-General to subdue public antagonism that grew after the signing of the Eulsa Treaty and forced abdication of Gojong.[516] Gojong and Sunjong's appearance in these events and the release of celebratory goods decorated with royal portraits were seen as tools to foster public support and, to an extent, drive public attention away from the politically sensitive issues of protectorate rule and forced abdication of the throne.

Gojong and Sunjong's portraits were also institutionally displayed in schools toward 1910. The Independence Club had promoted the institutional usage of royal portraits and flags in schools and public events as a way of demonstrating allegiance to the king and country in the 1890s. Yet the actual implementation of this institutionalised

---

Indeed, during this time, regional activities of *uibyeong* (의병, 義兵, righteous armies) were on the rise, rebelling against Japanese control of the country and the forced abdication of Gojong. Ironically, both Gojong and Sunjong and the Korean government consistently discouraged the physically aggressive *uibyeong* activities, due to Japanese pressure. Park Seong-sun, "Go, Sunjong nyeon-gan uibyeong ui gaenyeom gwa wisang byeoncheon yeon-gu," *Dongyang gojeon yeon-gu* 38 (March 2010): 199–228.

[515] C. I. Eugene Kim and Han-kyo Kim, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism 1876-1910*, 165–66.

[516] Han Gyu-mu, "1907-nyeon Gyeongseong Bakramhoe ui gaechoe wa seong-gyeok," *Yeoksahak yeon-gu* 38 (February 2010): 300.

custom was achieved by colonial rulers toward annexation. From December of 1907 to 1908, portrait images of Sunjong in short hair and Western-style uniform were bestowed upon public schools, each of the thirteen provincial offices, and each their own local offices (*buyunbu*, 부윤부, 府尹府), and students were taught to pay their respects and pledge allegiance to the portraits, like Japanese students would do to the portrait of Emperor Meiji.[517] (Fig. 3.28.) It is unclear which photographs of Sunjong, Gojong, and Crown Prince Uimin (의민태자, 懿愍太子, 1897-1970, also known as Prince Imperial Yeong, 영친왕, 英親王) were distributed for this purpose, Lee Gyeong-min argued that they were most likely photographs taken by Murakami Tenshin in 1907 and Iwata Kanae (岩田 鼎, 1870-?) in 1907 and 1909.[518] (Fig. 3.29., Fig. 3.30.)

Itō Hirobumi (伊藤博文, 1841-1909), the first Resident-General, also planned and executed two national tours in January and February of 1909 that further publicized Sunjong and increased the visibility of the leader to regions outside the city gates.[519] Between January and February of 1909, Sunjong and the Resident-General entourage embarked on a tour of Gyeongsang-do (경상도, 慶尙道) and Pyeongan-do (평안도,

[517] Portraits of Gojong and Prince Uimin were also distributed with Sunjong's portraits. Tsukiashi Tatsuhiko, *Joseon ui gaehwa sasang gwa naeshyeoneollijeum*, 358-59; Taki Kōji, *Cheonhwang ui chosang*, trans. Park Sam-heon (Seoul: Somyeong Chulpan, 2007), 193–213; "Eosajin bong-anseol," *Hwangseong sinmun*, 12 September, 1907; "Eojin bong-an," *Hwangseong sinmun*, 1 December, 1907; Lee Gyeong-min, "Sikminji Joseon ui sigakjeok jaehyeon," in *Daehan Jeguk hwangsil sajinjeon* (Seoul: Hanmi Sajin Misulgwan, 2009), 18.

[518] The exact date of Iwata's photograph of Sunjong is debatable. While the National Palace Museum lists the date as 1909, Lee Gyeong-min argued that the copy held in Museum of Photography, Seoul was produced in 1910. Lee Gyeong-min, "Sikminji Joseon ui sigakjeok jaehyeon," 18.

[519] C. I. Eugene Kim and Han-kyo Kim, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism, 1876-1910*, 166.

平安道) provinces. He began with a tour of southern Korea (*Namsunhaeng*, 남순행, 南巡幸), visiting three major cities, Daegu (대구, 大邱), Busan, and Masan (마산, 馬山) from 7 to 13 January to and then quickly proceeded to a tour of north-western Korea (*Seosunhaeng*, 서순행, 西巡幸) and visited Pyeongyang, Sinuiju (신의주, 新義州), Jeongju (정주, 定州), Hwangju (황주, 黃州), and Gaeseong (개성, 開城) from 27 January to 3 February. The tour was planned and directed by Itō Hirobumi, contrary to the public statement that Sunjong issued, stating that he decided to undertake these tours to ease the troubles of his people.[520] The tours were in essence a direct imitation of Emperor Meiji's tours from the 1860s that were focused on nation-building by reasserting the presence of the emperor to the public after the Meiji Restoration.[521]

> The official report published by the Residency-General justifies the tours: "In the former days, the visit of the Sovereign would have been made an occasion for extortionate exactions imposed on the people by officials, the visit being rendered an almost intolerable burden. Nothing of the kind occurred in this instance. The expenses of the trip were all borne by the Governments of Japan and Korea, and liberal gifts were bestowed on the cities and towns through which the Emperor and the Resident General passed. [… T]he Resident General particularly announced the object of undertaking the Imperial Journey and often pointed out his duty of guiding the Korean Emperor and his Government toward enlightened administration, which is of vital importance

---

[520] "Sisa pyeongron," *Daehan maeil sinbo*, 10 January, 1909; Kim So-yeong, "Sunjong hwangje ui Nam, Seosunhaeng gwa chung-gun aegukron," *Hanguksa hakbo* 39 (May 2010): 162–67.

[521] Fujitani, *Splendid Monarchy*, 42–55, 83–92; Kim So-yeong, "Sunjong hwangje ui Nam, Seosunhaeng gwa chung-gun aegukron," 165.

not only for the welfare of the Korean people but also for the preservation of peace in the East and this ultimately for the peace of the world at large."[522]

The tour was a rare opportunity for people outside of the capital to witness their ruler in real life. Swarms of crowds gathered everywhere the emperor travelled, but the Korean people easily saw through the superficial tour objectives of inspecting the lives of the people and declaring a new era of reformation and progress.[523] In contrast to Japanese intentions for the tour, many students and local officials refused to raise the Japanese flag to greet the entourage and even attempted to stop their boarding a Japanese vessel and blocked rail tracks in fear that the Japanese authorities were going to kidnap their emperor.[524] "It may also be suggested that the general impact of the tour was an increased sense of nationalism among the people."[525] Yet, compared to Gojong, Sunjong was easily exploited in Japanese colonial propaganda and his image conspicuously represented Korea under Japanese rule.

Photographs of Sunjong and Itō Hirobumi's entourage were published in commemorative photo albums of the tours. Although these photo albums were still expensive and were produced for government officials rather than the Korean public, they expressed the political motivations behind the tours. Most noticeably, Sunjong is not portrayed as the central figure of the national tours. In group photographs, Sunjong is seated in chairs and underneath portable screens that denote his importance and

---

[522] H.I.J.M's Residency General, *The Second Annual Report on Reforms and Progress in Korea (1908-9)*, 25–26.
[523] C. I. Eugene Kim and Han-kyo Kim, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism, 1876-1910,* 166.
[524] Gwon Haeng-ga, "Geundaejeok sigak cheje ui hyeongseong gwajeong," 214; Kim So-yeong, "Sunjong hwangje ui Nam, Seosunhaeng gwa chung-gun aegukron," 169–71.
[525] C. I. Eugene Kim and Han-kyo Kim, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism, 1876-1910,* 167–68.

authority as the Korean emperor, but the subtle positioning of Sunjong, slightly to the back or the side, and the lack of proper eye contact with the camera lens diminishes his presence in the images. (Fig. 3.31.) Contrastingly, Itō Hirobumi often stands in the centre or maintains direct eye contact with the camera, leading the viewer to regard him as the most important figure in group photographs. (Fig. 3.32.) These images reveal that although Japanese authorities attempted to use Sunjong's prestige and popularity among the Korean public to alleviate tensions surrounding Japanese rule, the *de facto* power was already with Itō Hirobumi and his Japanese administration.

The 1909 and 1910 ploughing ceremony (*chin-gyeongsik*, 친경식, 親耕式) and harvesting ceremony (*chinyesik*, 친예식, 親刈式) in 1909 was also an extension of publicising Sunjong's imagery through public exposure.[526] These events that promoted and encouraged domestic agriculture were smaller in scale and were held in close proximity to the city gates. The ploughing ceremonies involved a demonstration by Sunjong himself, officials, and farmers, the planting of various trees and plants, followed by the bestowment of food and drinks.[527] The harvesting also took place in a similar manner, beginning with the cutting of barley by Sunjong, Prince Uimin, officials, and farmers, followed by the offering of the harvested barley to Sunjong and the sharing of drinks.[528]

Albums containing photographs of both the national tours and ploughing

---

[526] Iwata Kanae was hired as the official photographer for the 1909 *chin-gyeongsik*. Lee Gyeong-min, "Iwata Kanae wa Amjeon sajin-gwan (2)," *Sajin yesul*, September 2015, 118.
[527] "Chin-gyeong seonghwang," *Sinhan minbo*, 12 May, 1909; "Chin-gyeong seonghwang," *Hwangseong sinmun*, 6 April, 1909; Lee Gyeong-min, "Sikminji Joseon ui sigakjeok jaehyeon," 25.
[528] Lee Gyeong-min, "Sikminji Joseon ui sigakjeok jaehyeon," 25–26.

ceremony were mostly consumed in Japan or among the Korean elite, but photographs depict eager crowds gathered to witness their emperor for the incredibly rare occasion. (Fig. 3.33.) Christine Kim explains:

> "[e]ven as late as 1909, the vast majority of Koreans had never stepped foot in the capital, and few outside the major urban centers had laid eyes on a photographic likeness of the monarch. The progresses thus presented an unprecedented opportunity to create, however fleetingly, a sense of meaningful contact between the throne and its subjects."[529]

On the other hand, Itō Hirobumi's plans to reinforce public support of the Korean sovereign and simultaneously extend their allegiance and submission to the Japanese administration in preparation for annexation proved unsuccessful. In fact, plans to pacify public objection to the 1905 Eulsa Treaty and the threats of annexation greatly backfired during Sunjong's tours, as demonstrated in the many cases of protests and clear acts of defiance of Japanese presence from crowds in Anseong (안성, 安城), Daegu, Busan, Mokpo (목포, 木浦), Masan, Gaeseong (개성, 開城), Uiju (의주, 義州), Sinuiju, and Pyeongyang.[530] Japanese implantation of Meiji nation-building techniques into Korea only powered the nation's aversion toward colonial rule and created a new type of nationalism that fed on their desire to resist against Japan and differentiate the Korean nation and identity from their so-called 'protector.' Gojong, Sunjong, and the Korean monarchy that they represented, became a consolidating force

[529] Christine Kim, "Politics and Pageantry in Protectorate Korea (1905-10)," 836.
[530] For more on the regional reception of the tour, see Christine Kim, "Politics and Pageantry in Protectorate Korea (1905-10)," 848–52; Tsukiashi Tatsuhiko, *Joseon ui gaehwa sasang gwa naeshyeoneollijeum*, 382-383.

that triggered both the public's anger and nostalgia for their once sovereign homeland.

This is not to say that there existed a uniform public opinion over the Japanese protectorate administration. For instance, many reformists found Japanese control of Korean domestic affairs attractive as it entailed pro-reformist political agendas such as further modernisation of education, the provision of modern infrastructure, and the overall "civilising" of Korean culture.[531] However, even the most radical and pro-Japanese reformists, such as members of the Iljinhoe (일진회, 一進會, 1904-1910) that welcomed annexation, retained their allegiance and loyalty toward the royal family.[532] Likewise, Japanese imperialists had no real intent to completely abolish the royal family. On the contrary, maintaining and promoting the Korean monarchical system, while reducing their practical authority to govern and solidifying the hierarchical relationship to the Japanese Emperor was a much more efficient way of controlling the public opinion of this period. Hence, the image of Sunjong, rather than the incompliant Gojong, was the suitable figurehead that the Japanese administration could fully exploit.

A clear hierarchy of power was created as both Gojong and Sunjong's portraits were assimilated into the visual symbolisms of the Japanese Empire after annexation. This entailed the complete incorporation of Korean royal portraits into Japanese visual symbolisms to represent the new Japanese colony. The 'family tree portraits' of the Yi royal family were one way that colonial authorities further incorporated Sunjong and Gojong's image into the system of Meiji imperial symbolism after annexation. (Fig. 3.34., Fig. 3.35., Fig. 3.36., Fig. 3.37., Fig. 3.38.) Japan used the family tree image to reduce the Korean monarchical system to a decorative and nominal 'Yi royal family,'

[531] Christine Kim, "Politics and Pageantry in Protectorate Korea (1905-10)," 839.
[532] Christine Kim, "Politics and Pageantry in Protectorate Korea (1905-10)," 839–40.

stripped of any sovereign authority. The Yi family was incorporated into a subbranch of the Japanese imperial family (王公族, J. *ōkōzoku*).[533]

Gojong's death in 1919 led to a second spike in public demand for Gojong's portrait and even fuelled the March First Movement. (Fig. 3.39.) The forced abdication of the throne had already sparked the demand to obtain portrait images of Gojong, both for personal collection and as part of the anti-Japanese movement that was gaining momentum after 1905.[534] Portraits of influential individuals, especially state leaders, are further amplified in their power after the death of the sitter; it often leads to a higher demand and for the image due to the desire to preserve and honour the prominent individual.[535]

Chae Yong-sin's reproduced portrait of Gojong's *eojin* is an example of how such demand was fulfilled for the economic and social elite. The painting was commissioned by Jeon U (전우, 田愚, 1841-1922), a leading figure of the Wijeongcheoksa Movement (위정척사 운동, 衛正斥邪 運動, movement to defend orthodoxy and reject heterodoxy) in 1920, a year after Gojong's death to honour and pay tribute to the deceased emperor, as shown in Jeon U's detailed letter to Chae Yong-sin where he even specifically pointed out the corrections to be made to the inscriptions'

---

[533] Lee Wang-mu, "Daehan Jeguk hwangsil ui bunhae wa wang-gongjok ui tansaeng," 7–31.

[534] Jo Seon-mi, "Chae Yong-sin iraneun jakga wa geu ui jakpum," in *Chosanghwa yeon-gu: Chosanghwa wa chosanghwaron* (Seoul: Munye Chulpansa, 2007), 286–87; Jo Seon-mi, *Eojin, wang ui chosanghwa*, 302–3.

[535] For instance, 70,000 copies of Prince Albert's (1819-1861) cartes-de-visite photograph were sold after his death in 1861. Han Hye-yeon, "Geundaejeok juche ui jaehyeon gwa hyeongseong," 38.

reference to Gojong and Chae Yong-sin's name in accordance with the appropriate honorary forms.[536]

The popularity of Gojong's portrait imagery after his death was a form of tribute and solidification of the memory of the emperor's being.[537] By having permanent access to the image that reminds the viewer of the sitter's death, the sitter lives on in the viewer's memory. Portraits of a national leader, and particularly in a dictatorship or centralised monarchical system, are highly effective in generating strong collective affiliation and collective allegiance to the deceased ruler, consolidating their affection to the country or governing group.[538] Likewise, Gojong's image after his death reminded the viewer of not only the loss of their emperor but of the loss of national sovereignty and pointed to the Japanese administration as the target of anger and resistance. In this sense, although Japanese authorities gained control of the production and presentation of both Gojong and Sunjong's portrait imagery after the Eulsa Treaty, the public's interpretations of the images could not be controlled. Portraits of both Gojong and Sunjong thus obtained a stronger function as a visual symbol that reiterated the devastating loss of national sovereignty and the need for collective resistance.

[536] Jo Seon-mi, *Eojin, wang ui chosanghwa*, 303–4.
[537] Sontag, *On Photography*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux), 1977, 14.
[538] Ju Hyeong-il, "Sajin eun jukeum eul eotteohge jaeyeon haneun-ga?," 82–84.

3.3. Portraits of Historic Figures and Martyrs

Portraits of historic figures and martyrs were also critical components of nation-building in the 1890s-1910s. While royal portraits of Gojong and Sunjong were in emphasis of top-down statist nationalism that fostered collective allegiance and affiliation to the monarch and state prior to annexation, portraits of historic figures were utilised by non-state actors to construct a unified and institutionalised narrative of Korean history and to provide symbolic origins of the ethnic identity shared by the collective nation. Portrait images of martyrs that emerged after the 1905 Eulsa Treaty and 1910 annexation also became powerful symbols that inspired collective resistance against Japanese authorities and consolidated the nation by emphasising the boundaries between 'us' and 'the others.'

The development of mass print media was a crucial foundation for the flourishing of portrait images of historical figures and martyrs. In particular, the proliferation of textbook illustrations was instrumental to the growth of printed arts and fostered an image-oriented education system dependent on visual authentication of knowledge.[539] The government imported its first printing press for Bakmun-guk in 1883.[540] Hakbu was primarily responsible for the few illustrated textbooks that were used in public schools such as *Sinjeong simsang sohak*, but were reliant on Japanese textbook models and illustrations.[541] It was not until the late 1890s that printing presses

[539] Hong Sun-pyo, ed., *Geundae ui cheot gyeongheom*, 23–29.
[540] Kim Bong-hui, *Hanguk gaehwagi seojeok munhwa yeon-gu*, 29.
[541] *Sinjeong simsang sohak* was the first textbook with illustrated images. However, many of the illustrations in this book were directly taken from the Japanese textbook *Simsang sohak dokbon* (심상소학독본, 尋常小學讀本, 1887) or slightly altered. Hong Sun-pyo, "Hanguk gaehwagi ui saphwa yeon-gu," 261–62; Gang Jin-ho, "Gukeo gyogwaseo wa geundae seosa ui suyong: Sinjeong simsang sohak (1896) eul jungsim

began to be actively imported and utilised by non-state actors. Visual imagery in the form of cartoons and illustrations available for consumption by the public were actively employed in a wider variety of magazines, newspapers, and textbooks toward 1910.[542]

Educational agendas of the 1890s paved the way for nationalistic history education and utilisation of imagery. The Royal Education Protocol (Gyoyuk joseo, 교육조서, 教育詔書) and Primary Education Ordinance (Sohakgyoryeong, 소학교령, 小學校令) in 1895 prioritised public education as a means to achieving national prosperity and military power.[543] Core curricula were standardised and institutionalised, and national history (*bon-guksa*, 본국사, 本國史) was made an independent subject.[544] Although Hakbu was responsible for the production of all state-published textbooks, many individuals and private organisations also produced their own textbooks from 1900.[545] Textbooks published from 1906 were all written in either

euro," *Ilbonhak* 39 (November 2014): 26–29.

[542] Cheon Jeong-hwan, *Geundae ui chaek ilg-gi: Dokja ui tansaeng gwa Hanguk geundae munhak* (Seoul: Pureun Yeoksa, 2003), 134–39; Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 44. According to Hong Sun-pyo, around 120 textbooks were published from 1895 to 1909 and of these, 23 have supplementary images. Excluding books that used photographic images, 14 of the 23 textbooks have illustrated imagery. See Hong Sun-pyo, "Hanguk gaehwagi ui saphwa yeon-gu," 258–59.

[543] Hong Sun-pyo, "Hanguk gaehwagi ui saphwa yeon-gu," 260–61.

[544] This was a major development as prior to the Gabo Reforms, Korean history was only a supplementary part of world history as foreigners were the active providers of modern education. Seo Su-yeon, "Hyeon Chae ui Yunyeon pildok e surok doen inmul bunseok" (Master's thesis, Seoul, Ewha Womans University, 1998), 7–10.

[545] Hakbu produced around 31 textbooks from 1895 and 1899, but these were not enough to fulfil growing demand for textbooks. Textbooks published by private organisations are particularly important as Hakbu-approved books were under severe censorship from 1905 and thus lacked images that portrayed a distinctly Korean national identity. Kim Bong-hui, *Hanguk gaehwagi seojeok munhwa yeon-gu*, 109–10; Chae Hwi-gyun, "Gaehwagi geumji gyogwaseo ui yuhyeong gwa naeyong yeon-gu," 177.

Hangeul or mixed script and many primary-level textbooks were produced, which increased the accessibility of information and education.[546]

Images played a key role in these textbooks as visual aids. Primary-level Korean language textbooks employed imagery in the form of alphabet books, using illustrations of objects that begin with specific Hangeul characters. In ethics textbooks (*susinseo,* 수신서, 修身書) general scenes of modern life and fables facilitated the contextual understanding of the text describing institutional or social events and practices, as well as desirable virtues. Science textbooks utilised images of anatomy, plants and animals, industrial scenes, and informative diagrams of modern objects and technology.[547] Geography textbooks relied on map and landscape imagery to visualise the immaterial Korean territory and its place in the world.

History textbooks, however, contained the most direct message of nation-building. According to Sohakgyryeong, history textbooks had the purpose of teaching students the roots or fundamentals (*geunbon*, 근본, 根本) of the country, the virtuous integrity and principles that the Korean *gukmin* should have, and the knowledge of the origins of the nation and achievements of preceding sages.[548] This theme of 'national origins' and the feats of ancestors was continuously touched upon in many history and ethics textbooks after 1900, aided by illustrations.

Some of the most influential illustrated textbooks of this time were *Chodeung Daehan yeoksa* by Jeong In-ho (정인호, 鄭寅琥, 1869-1945), and *Yunyeon pildok*

---

[546] Seo Su-yeon, "Hyeon Chae ui Yunyeon pildok e surok doen inmul bunseok," 17.
[547] Hong Sun-pyo, "Hanguk gaehwagiui saphwa yeon-gu," 265–70.
[548] Seo Jae-bok, "Hanaml gaehwagi chodeungyong gyogwaseo bunseok," *Gyoyuk jonghap yeon-gu* 3, no. 2 (December 2005): 30.

written by Hyeon Chae (현채, 玄采, 1856-1925).[549] Illustrated textbooks were generally those used in primary-level education (*chodeung gyoyuk*, 초등교육, 初等教育) as they provided supplementary aid in delivering information to those without advanced literacy skills. However, they were also popular literature among the general public, as literary education was not publicly accessible for the majority of the population at this time.[550] Textbooks of this period not only educated students enrolled in schools but also edified the general public of their national identity and induced patriotic sentiments, giving rise to the 'save-the-nation education movement' (*gyoyuk guguk undong*, 교육구국운동, 教育救國運動) that gained momentum after 1905.

Toward annexation, however, Japanese regulation and censorship of textbooks, especially those that carried nationalistic messages, greatly affected nation-building in public education. From 1908, all textbooks to be used in schools had to be sent to Hakbu for approval to prevent the distribution of textbooks "incompatible with the

---

[549] *Chodeung Daehan yeoksa* was banned by Japanese authorities in 1911 and *Yunyeon pildok* in 1909.

[550] In the Joseon period, literary education (*hakmun*, 학문, 學問) was encouraged by the state, but the target group of education was limited to the male yangban class. However, this should not be confused with practical literacy. Although the literacy rate of the Joseon public is presumed to have been low, there is a high possibility that even the lower class had basic literacy skills, more so in the proficiency of Hangeul (한글, Korean script) than Hanmun (한문, 漢文, Chinsese script). James Scarth Gale, *Korea in Transition* (New York: Eaton & Mains, 1909), 136–40, https://archive.org/details/koreaintransitio0000gale/page/140/mode/2up, accessed 9 September, 2022; Bird, *Korea and Her Neighbours*, vol. 2, 210–12. Nevertheless, illiteracy rates were still seen as a major problem even in the 1920s and 30s and newspapers such as *Donga ilbo* and *Joseon ilbo* attempted to improve low literacy rates by promoting the education of Hangeul, which the Japanese authorities banned several times. The Japanese administration, on the other hand, focused on the provision of basic Japanese language education in order to better colonise and mobilise the Korean public. Roh Yeong-taek, "Ilje sigi ui munmaengryul toechi," *Guksagwan nonchong* 51 (June 1994): 107–57.

conditions now existing in the peninsula" as private publishers took "advantage of the unsettled state of minds of the Koreans [and compiled] text-books of a seditious nature referring to the independence of the country, inculcating anti-Japanese insurrection or using dangerous words to excite students."[551] Most noticeably, textbooks that criticised Korea-Japan relations, fostered "senseless or mistaken patriotism," induced resentment toward foreigners, or otherwise harmed "peace and order" were targeted.[552] The fact that private schools and textbooks were specifically monitored and regulated proves the social impact that non-state actors had on nation-building at this time.

It should be noted that most textbook illustrations were uncredited, which makes it difficult to assess the processes of image production. There have been suggestions among art historians that government official and court-employed painter An Jung-sik (안중식, 安中植, 1861-1919) was responsible for the illustrations in *Yunyeon pildok*, but Hong Sun-pyo argues that his drawing style in the cover illustration of a 1914 magazine, *Cheongchun* (청춘, 青春, 1918) greatly differs from the illustrations in *Yunyeon pildok*.[553] However, it is fair to say that as An Jung-sik was a distinguished artist of the time, his artistic styles exerted significant influence on his students. On such student was Lee Do-young, who worked as an editor in Gukmin Gyoyukhoe and Boseong-gwan from 1905 and 1906. It highly likely that illustrations in the two textbooks published by the two institutions, *Chodeung sohak* (초등소학,

---

[551] H.I.J.M Residency General, *The Second Annual Report On Reforms And Progress In Korea (1908-9)* (Seoul: H.I.J.M's Residency General, 1909), 175-176; C. I. Eugene Kim and Han-kyo Kim, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism, 1876-1910,* 170–71.
[552] H.I.J.M Residency General, *The Second Annual Report On Reforms And Progress In Korea (1908-9),*175-176; C. I. Eugene Kim and Han-kyo Kim, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism, 1876-1910,* 171.
[553] Hong Sun-pyo, "Bokje doen gaehwa wa gyemong ui imiji," 137.

初等小學, 1906) and *Monghak pildok* (몽학필독, 蒙學必讀, ca. 1906), were created by artist and cartoonist Lee Do-young.[554]

The few known artists such as An Jung-sik and Lee Do-young were influential in forming the foundations of portrait illustrations of historical figures that continued to be used in the colonial period, particularly as many illustrated textbooks used similar templates or identical illustrations. More importantly, it can be understood that many artists of the time played a multitude of roles in Korean society; they were not only creators of paintings or images that were consumed by the public but were also personally involved with key intellectuals and organisations that led nation-building and were also closely connected to officials and ex-officials. The boundaries between government and non-state political actors, and between artists and 'intellectuals' responsible for leading nation-building agendas in the beginning of the twentieth century were fluid and even ambiguous. This enabled non-state actors to take on the task of nation-building when the state and government were no longer able to exert substantial influence on Korean society after annexation.

Although most artists responsible for textbook illustrations were not credited, they would most likely have had some experience as working as professional painters in traditional ink and colour painting, like An Jung-sik or Lee Do-young. Historical scenes and figures were often influenced by styles used in illustrations of Ming and Qing period 'vernacular novels' (白話小說, C. *baihua xiaoshuo*) and landscape illustrations incorporated traditional ink painting styles.[555] However, many illustrations were also heavily influenced by Meiji Japanese textbooks published between 1887 and 1903 in

[554] Hong Sun-pyo, "Bokje doen gaehwa wa gyemong ui imiji," 137.
[555] Hong Sun-pyo, "Bokje doen gaehwa wa gyemong ui imiji," 136.

their overall composition and expressions.[556] For instance, the portrait of Onjo (온조, 溫祚, r. 18 BCE-28CE), the founding king of Baekje (백제, 百濟, 18 BCE-660 CE), in Hyeon Chae's 1907 *Yunyeon pildok* is almost identical to the portrait of Japanese Prince Shōtoku (574-622 CE) housed in the Imperial Household Agency of Japan.[557] (Fig. 3.40.) Mixed references of Korean, Chinese, and Japanese traditional paintings, as well as photography and modern Japanese illustrations coexisted in textbook illustrations of the beginnings of the twentieth century.

[556] Hong Sun-pyo, "Bokje doen gaehwa wa gyemong ui imiji," 136.
[557] Chari Pradel, "'Portrait of Prince Shōtoku and Two Princes': From Devotional Painting to Imperial Object," *Artibus Asiae* 74, no. 1 (2014): 191–219; Hong Sun-pyo, "Bokje doen gaehwa wa gyemong ui imiji," 137.

3.3.a. Construction of Korean Historical Narratives

Primary-level history textbooks of the early twentieth century were character-driven and the narrative of Korean history unfolded with key historical figures and their accomplishments at its centre. The most prominent characters were monarchs who provided the main chronological framework of history, followed by national heroes, celebrated scholar-officials, and other individuals of exemplary moral virtue.[558] As history textbooks tended to be chronological, most of them began with ancient Korean history and introduced Dangun (단군, 壇君, founder of Dangun Joseon in 2,333 BCE) and Gija (기자, 箕子, founder of Gija Joseon ca. 1,100 BCE), the two progenitors of Korea.[559] A central part of the save-the-nation education movement was to imbed within the Korean people the idea of the collective nation through shared history and genealogical and ethnic origin. Illustrated portraits were instrumental in achieving this goal as it brought to life deceased ancestors, granted physicality to an intangible and imaginary ethnic genealogy, and homogenised historical narratives, notwithstanding their highly mythical nature and consequent subjectivity.[560] For this, Dangun and Gija's presence in textbooks were actively utilised.

The two ancient figures had coexisted throughout Joseon history narratives, but their relative dominance over the role of genealogical progenitor underwent some

---

[558] Park Carey, "Hanguk geundae yeoksa inmulhwa," 34–35; Seo Su-yeon, "Hyeon Chae ui yunyeon pildok e surok doen inmul bunseok," 46–40.
[559] Of course, there are exceptions such as *Yunyeon pildok* that began with general explanations about Korea and the Three Kingdoms period.
[560] Seo Yeong-dae, "Geundae Hanguk ui Dangun insik gwa minjok juui," *Dongbuka yeoksa nonchong* 20 (June 2008): 16; Anderson, *Imagined Communities*; Choi Yu-gyeong, "1920-nyeondae choban, Donga ilbo saphwa e pyohyeondoen Hanguk godae sinhwa," 110.

changes between the 1890s to the 1910s. Until the twentieth century, Gija had generally maintained superiority over Dangun in his standing in Korean ancient history. Gija, who was essentially a refugee from China who travelled East after the collapse of the Shang dynasty, is said to have settled on the Korean Peninsula around 1,100 BCE, after which he introduced Chinese governance and Confucian edification to the Korean people. His popularity in the Joseon period derived from his Chinese background that strengthened the Confucian legitimacy of Joseon and further supported seventeenth century intellectuals' pursuit of cultural and political equality with China through volunteering as the new centre of Neo-Confucianism or "Little China" (*Sojunghwa*, 소중화, 小中華) after the fall of the Ming dynasty.[561]

Gija's presence remained strong even after the Gabo Reforms and even Western visitors to Korea were aware of Gija as a Korean progenitor. William Carles, British Vice-Consul in Korea from 1884, wrote:

> " [Gija], who is reported to have emigrated from China in 1122 B.C., and to have founded a dynasty which lasted until the fourth century B.C., made [Pyeongyang] his capital, and his memory is still kept in the names of the different yamêns, while his grave is preserved with great respect, and a hall containing his portrait lies to the south of the city. […] A hall also exists in honour of [Dangun], the fabulous hero who founded the country in 2356 B.C. [...]"[562]

---

561 Schmid, *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919*, 175–77; Park Dae-jae, "Gija-Joseon gwa Sojunghwa," *Hanguksa hakbo* 65 (November 2016): 7–49.
562 Carles, "Report of a Journey by Mr. Carles in the North of Corea," 9.

Joseph Longford who worked for the British consular service in Japan from 1869 to 1902 similarly introduced Gija and Dangun in his book, and that the tombs of both figures were being worshiped.[563] (Fig. 3.41.) Longford also mentions how Dangun and Gija are historically linked:

> "[Dangun] had a son who was driven from his father's kingdom by [Gija], and who, flying northwards, founded a new kingdom in the far north to which he gave the name of [Buyeo (부여, 夫餘, 2nd century BCE–494 CE)], which we shall find influencing the destinies of Korea after another thousand years have passed. [Gija], before whom the son of [Dangun] fled, is regarded as the founder of Korean civilisation."[564]

From these contemporary writings on ancient Korean history, it can be understood that both figures were widely accepted and worshipped as 'founders of the country.' It can also be observed that Gija was clearly described as having moved to the Korean Peninsula from China, while Dangun was portrayed as a heavenly figure; while the mythical story of Dangun emphasised his heavenly origins, Gija retained a stronger association with the establishment of a Korean government that followed Chinese modes of governance and culture.

At the turn of the twentieth century, Dangun and Gija continued to accompany each other in ancient Korean history. *Chodeung Daehan yeoksa* begins with the mythical story of Dangun's heavenly ancestry and his founding of Joseon (Dangun

---

[563] Longford claims that he first visited Korean 'coasts' when he was aboard a British vessel in 1875, but he most likely properly travelled Korea in later years. Joseph H. Longford, *The Story of Korea* (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1911), 19, 50, 226, https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=coo1.ark:/13960/t1ng5713g&view=1up&seq=12&skin=2021, accessed 9 September, 2022.

[564] Longford, *The Story of Korea*, 51.

Joseon, 단군조선, 檀君朝鮮, 2,333 BCE- twelfth century BCE) in Chapter 1. In Chapter 2, Gija is introduced as the founder of Gija Joseon (기자조선, 箕子朝鮮, ca. 1,100 BCE- 195 BCE), but the book clearly states that he is from "Eun" (은, 殷, Yin dynasty, also known as Shang).[565] The chapter explains Gija's relocation to the peninsula from China and the introduction of poetry, literature, rituals, music, dry-field farming, silkworm breeding, weaving, as well as general civilized teachings and enlightenment (*gyo*, 교, 敎) is attributed to Gija.[566]

Chodeung Daehan yeoksa printed portrait illustrations of both Dangun and Gija. Dangun's portrait in Chapter 1 depicts him close to a semi-Western hero, with somewhat ambiguous visual components such as a semi-spherical hat reminiscent of a Jewish kippah, curly hair, and a decorative bay-leaf banner that surrounds his chest.[567] (Fig. 3.42.) Gija, on the other hand, is depicted wearing a traditional 9-row royal crown (9-*ryu myeonryugwan*, 9 류 면류관, 九旒 冕旒冠), expressive of his Chinese origin and his legacy of implementing a civilised government on the Korean Peninsula. (Fig. 3.43.) Although historical accuracy in unaccounted for, the contrasting depictions of the two figures reveal the differentiation in each their own contextualisation in Korean historical narratives.

---

[565] Jeong In-ho, "Chodeung Daehan yeoksa," in *Geundae yeoksa gyogwaseo: Chodeung Daehan yeoksa, Chodeung Daehan ryeoksa, Chodeung bon-guk yeoksa*, trans. Gang Yeong-sim, vol. 4, Geundae yeoksa gyogwaseo (Seoul: Somyeong Chulpan, 2011), 62.
[566] Jeong In-ho, "Chodeung Daehan yeoksa," 63.
[567] Jeong In-ho, "Chodeung Daehan yeoksa," 352; Hong Sun-pyo, "Bokje doen gaehwa wa gyemong ui imiji," 139.

The illustration of Dangun in *Chodeung Daehan yeoksa* is currently the oldest dated image of Dangun that is officially recognised as Dangun's portrait.[568] Portraits of Dangun were actively produced from the 1910s when Dangun was widely promoted as the dominant progenitor by nationalist intellectuals such as Sin Chae-ho (신채호, 申采浩, 1880-1936) and Na Cheol (나철, 羅喆, 1864-1916), founder of Dangun-worshipping religion, Dangun-gyo, and generally followed the style seen in *Chodeung Daehan yeoksa*.

Despite his historical significance as the ethnic progenitor of the nation, Dangun's appearance is not immediately identifiable with the typical Korean ethnie. As Hong Sun-pyo pointed out, his facial features and attire suggest that the artist incorporated images of theocratic shamans and images of Western heroes.[569] It can be reasoned that the artist aimed to portray him as an archaic and divine progenitor by stylistically differentiating him from typical depictions of Korean or Chinese portraits but that there may have been an older prototype that the illustration was modelled after. Many other Dangun portraits produced toward and after 1910 also share characteristics such as the curly hair and distinct headwear.[570] (Fig. 3.44.) The image in *Chodeung Daehan yeoksa* was frequently reproduced, recreated, and readapted in the 1910s and

---

[568] A painting recently revealed to the public is supposedly dated to "ninth year of Gwangseo" (광서, 光緒) that was calculated to be 1883. Hong Sun-pyo, "Bokje doen gaehwa wa gyemong ui imiji," 139; Park Sang-hyeon, "1883-nyeon e geurin hyeonjon choego chujeong Dangun chosanghwa gong-gae," *Yeonhap nyuseu*, 23 September, 2019, https://www.yna.co.kr/view/AKR20190923078800005, accessed 9 September, 2022.

[569] Hong Sun-pyo, "Bokje doen gaehwa wa gyemong ui imiji," 139.

[570] Kim Jang-hyeon argues that the hemispherical hat may be a symbolic representation of the heavens and Dangun's divine right to rule as a descendent of the heavens. Kim Jang-hyeon, "Sinhwa reul wonhyeong euro haneun hoehwa e banyeong doen sahoesang gwa sinhwajeok sangjing e gwanhan gochal: Dangun yeongjeong gwa geumgwedo reul jungsim euro," *Dongyang yesul* 27 (April 2015): 112.

20s in the form of ritual paintings and prints, attesting to the influence textbook illustrations had on visual culture of the early twentieth century.[571]

On the other hand, the illustration of Gija in *Chodeung Daehan yeoksa* is a typical depiction of a Korean king, and similar depictions are used in illustrations of other kings such as Silla king Munmu (문무, 文武王, 626-681) and Goryeo king Taejo (태조, 太祖, 877-943) in the same book. (Fig. 3.45., Fig. 3.46.) Gija is similarly depicted in Park Jeong-dong's (박정동, 朴晶東, ?-1919) *Chodeung daedong yeoksa* (초등대동역사, 初等大東歷史, 1909), where he sits in a horse-drawn carriage, presumably on his way to Pyeongyang to establish Gija Joseon. (Fig. 3.47.) Another illustration of Gija is found in *Chodeung bonguk yaksa* (초등본국약사, 初等本國略史, 1909, Heungsadan Pyeonjipbu), where he stands in a three-quarter view with his hand covered in his sleeves. (Fig. 3.48.) Again, his attire, though different from that in *Chodeung Daehan yeoksa*, is in reference to archaic Chinese and Korean dress, hinting to the viewer his Chinese origin and symbolising his accomplishment of implementing Chinese governance and civilised teachings in Korea.

Gija retained his importance in historical narratives even after the Sino-Japanese War and subsequent social movements that expressed Korean independence from China. Turning to conventional late Joseon interpretations of ancient history rather than completely redesigning historical narratives was the more practical solution to immediately integrate and standardise historical education to be taught in schools.[572]

---

[571] Kim Seong-hwan, "Nampa Park Chan-ik jipan sojang Dangun yeongjeong," *Jeongsin munhwa yeon-gu* 41, no. 2 (June 2018): 41–64; Choi Yu-gyeong, "1920-nyeondae choban, Donga ilbo saphwa e pyohyeondoen Hanguk godae sinhwa," 109–29.
[572] Schmid, *Korea Between Empires*, *1895-1919,* 177.

Another compelling reason for the continuation of the traditional narrative of ancient history was to newly strengthen the legitimacy and autonomy of Korean history. Although Gija's presence in ancient Korean history implied a deep and undeniable connection to China in defining the ethnic roots of the Korean nation, contexts of the founding of Gija Joseon were deliberately tweaked from 1905 to emphasise the autonomous self-determination of the Korean people in choosing their leader.

In the 'legitimacy theory' (*jeongtongron*, 정통론, 正統論) of Korean ancient history used in the Joseon period, Gija Joseon was one of the three founding nations that comprised the foundations of Korean history; the chronology of Dangun Joseon, Gija Joseon, and Mahan (마한, 馬韓) had long been recognised and applied throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.[573] However, conventional interpretation over the founding of Gija Joseon was that Gija received the official investiture by King Wu of Zhou (*Ju Muwang inbongseol*, 주무왕인봉설, 周武王因封說).[574] This theory highlighted the beginnings of the hierarchical tributary relationship between Korea and China by placing the King of Zhou as the authority with the power to grant Gija the right to govern his own country.

The legitimacy theory continued to be applied in textbooks after the 1895 educational reforms, but after 1905, when larger volumes of new textbooks were produced, the investiture theory began to be discredited.[575] Instead of receiving Zhou

---

573 Jeong Lip-bi, "Hanmal Gija Joseon insik e daehan jaegochal: Daedong yeoksa e natanan Gija Joseon yeoksa seosul eul jungsim euro," *Sarim* 65 (July 2018): 210–11.
574 Jeong Lip-bi, "Hanmal Gija Joseon insik e daehan jaegochal," 212–14.
575 Jeong Lip-bi, "Hanmal Gija Joseon insik e daehan jaegochal," 207–40; Lee Si-yeong, "Jeong Gyo ui Daedong yeoksa yeon-gu" (Master's thesis, Seongnam, Hanguk Jeongsin Munhwa Yeon-guwon, 1998).

investiture to found and rule Gija Joseon, new historical narratives explained that Gija Joseon succeeded Dangun Joseon with the peaceful forfeit of power from Dangun's descendent rulers who later relocated to and reigned over Buyeo, making Dangun's descendants the origins of Gija's political legitimacy.[576] Unlike Longford's book, *Chodeung Daehan yeoksa* states that Dangun's descendent abdicated his throne to Gija and relocated to northern Buyeo, which was later absorbed to Goguryeo (고구려, 高句麗, first century BCE- 668 CE).[577] Dangun Joseon was succeeded by Gija Joseon, and the two figures were presented to demonstrate as a set of chronological time frames of ancient Korean history. Jeong In-ho's interpretation of a peaceful succession from Dangun's descendent to Gija rather than Gija's invasion of Dangun Joseon territory is distinctive of the early stages of elevating Dangun's status over Gija as the dominant ethnic progenitor.

Jeong Gyo (정교, 鄭喬, 1856-1925), Choi Gyeong-hwan (최경환, 崔景煥, ?-?), and Yu Ho-sik's (유호식, 劉鎬植, ?-?) *Daedong yeoksa* (대동역사, 大東歷史, 1905) wrote that the Korean people (*gukin*, 국인, 國人) who recognised the wisdom and virtuous character of Gija willingly embraced him as their leader, inserting the will of the Korean people as a contributory factor in the investiture of Gija as a Korean leader.[578] While retaining Gija and Gija Joseon in Korean ancient history in

---

[576] An Jong-hwa's (안종화, 安鍾和, 1860-1924) textbook *Dongsa jeolyo* (동사절요, 東史節要, 1902) also included explanations on the succession from Dangun Joseon to Gija Joseon by including Dangun's descendants in order to explain the historical severance between the alleged death of Dangun and the reign of Gija. Jeong Lip-bi, "Hanmal Gija Joseon insik e daehan jaegochal," 218–19.

[577] Jeong In-ho, "Chodeung Daehan yeoksa," 62.

[578] *Chodeung bonguk yaksa*, *Chodeung Daehan ryeoksa*, and *Chodeung daedong yeoksa* also used similar expressions. Jeong Lip-bi, "Hanmal Gija Joseon insik e daehan jaegochal," 220–22; Hangukhak Munheon Yeon-guso, *Hanguk gaehwagi gyogwaseo*

accordance with the legitimacy theory, they were portrayed as a continuance of Dangun Joseon where the Korean people, who were the descendants of Dangun, accepted and voluntarily upheld Gija as their leader.[579]

Toward the 1910s, Gija noticeably lost dominance as progenitor when historians such as Sin Chae-ho, Choe Nam-seon, and Park Eun-sik (박은식, 朴殷植, 1859-1925) began to emphasise Dangun in search for a more autonomous Korean history that separated itself from Confucian sages who then came to be recognised as distinctly Chinese.[580] Sin Chae-ho even rejected the revised narrative where Dangun's descendent peacefully forfeited his power to Gija and the Korean people accepted him as their ruler. Instead, Gija was reduced to a king that answered to the more powerful Dangun-descendant rulers of Buyeo.[581]

The elevation of Dangun as the dominant progenitor was not immediate, and even after 1900 there were mixed assessments on the historic validity of the so-called '*Dangun minjok juui* (단군민족주의, 檀君民族主義, Dangun ethnic nationalism).'[582] When faced with new political powers of the West and increasing encroachment of national sovereignty, the desire to consolidate and modernise history and history education led to the search for a new perspective of placing Dangun within Korean ancient history, as reflected in textbooks from 1900. Yet, while Jeong In-ho may have

---

chongseo, vol. Guksapyeon 7 (Seoul: Asea Munhwasa, 1977), 446; Hangukhak Munheon Yeon-guso, *Hanguk gaehwagi gyogwaseo chongseo*, vol. Guksapyeon 10 (Seoul: Asea Munhwasa, 1977), 83, 365.

579 A nation-based interpretation was a natural trait of the narrative of *Daedong yeoksa* as it was written and published by members of the Independence Club.

580 Schmid, *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919*, 178–81; Hong Sun-pyo, "Hanguk gaehwagiui saphwa yeon-gu," 280–82.

581 Sin Chae-ho, "Doksa sinron: Je i jang Buyeo wangjo wa Gija," *Daehan maeil sinbo*, 8 September, 1908.

582 Kim Seong-hwan, "Nampa Park Chan-ik jipan sojang Dangun yeongjeong," 42.

appraised Dangun as a prominent progenitor in *Chodeung Daehan yeoksa*, Hyeon Chae pointed out in his textbook, *Botong gyogwa Dong-guk yeoksa* (보통교과 동국역사, 普通教科東國歷史, 1899, published by Hakbu), the lack of historic records on Dangun.[583] Unsurprisingly, Hyeon Chae omitted both Dangun and Gija from *Yunyen pildok* and began to explain Korean history from the Three Kingdoms period. It was only with the loss of national sovereignty and the incapacitation of the Yi monarchy, that the Dangun narrative began to be aggressively used to consolidate the people of Korea through their common ethnic progenitor rather than the history of monarchies that reigned over them. The effect of Dangun's implementation in historical narratives further gave way to the proliferation of ethnic-centred nationalism in the colonial period.

There are several reasons for the appeal of Dangun in nation-building toward and after 1910. Until 1905, both Dangun and Gija were instrumental in attesting to the longevity and validity of Korean ethnic origin, but while Gija was portrayed as a figure of cultural enlightenment and deliverer of Chinese civilisation, Dangun was a symbol of the distinct and autonomous Korean genealogy.[584] Moreover, as a heavenly figure, he added a mythical element to Korean history. This granted the Korean people, the ethnic descendants of Dangun, a sacred and superior identity that distinguished them from other nations.[585] The selection of Dangun as the progenitor of the Korean nation also

---

[583] Hyeon Chae, *Geundae yeoksa gyogwaseo: Botong gyogwa Dongguk yeoksa*, trans. Na Ae-ja, vol. 1 (Seoul: Somyeong Chulpan, 2011), 66–68. Both Dangun and Gija's characteristics as mythical figures were also subject to criticism in mid-late Joseon.
[584] Choi Yu-gyeong, "1920-nyeondae choban, Donga ilbo saphwa e pyohyeondoen Hanguk godae sinhwa," 121–25.
[585] Seo Yeong-dae, "Geundae Hanguk ui Dangun insik gwa minjok juui," 16–17; Jeong Seon-tae, "Geundae gyemong-gi minjok, gukmin seosa ui jeongchijeok sihak: Daehan maeil sinbo nonseol eul jungsim euro," *Inmun yeon-gu*, no. 50 (June 2006): 154–56.

emphasised ethnic homogeneity, a narrative that still persists today. Toward and after 1910, Dangun provided intellectuals and independence activists a symbolic tool to integrate the nation amidst the loss of state sovereignty and pressing need to pursue resistant nationalism by providing a simple way of distinguishing 'us' against 'the others.'

Gija's status as ethnic progenitor noticeably declined throughout the colonial period. Gija embodied Joseon's old and outdated tributary relationship with China that was not compatible with independence activists' emphasis on national autonomy. For instance, though *Hwangseong sinmun* had written that Korean national identity originated from both Dangun and Gija, only Dangun was mentioned from 1909; *Daehan maeil sinbo* also only emphasised Dangun from 1908.[586]

Although divided opinions of Dangun persisted until the 1910s, portrait illustrations of Dangun after 1905 played a significant role in laying the foundation for the Dangun-centred narrative of Korean ethnic history. The consistent development of Dangun portraiture from this period onto the 1920s proves that Dangun ultimately prevailed as the sole ethnic progenitor of the Korean nation. With the establishment of Dangun-gyo in 1909, religious portraits of Dangun were frequently produced and distributed for worship. The religion displayed highly political characteristics that formed part of the save-the-nation movement (*guguk undong*, 구국운동, 救國運動) and saw Dangun as a way to unify the Korean nation to resist Japanese rule.[587] Led and

[586] Baek Dong-hyeon, "Reo, Il jeonjaeng jeonhu 'minjok' yong-eo ui deungjang gwa minjok insik," 165–77; Jeong Byeong-jun, "Hanmal, Daehan Jegukgi 'min' gaenyeom ui byeonhwa wa jeongdang jeongchiron," 370.
[587] Seo Gwang-il, "Dangun-gyo pomyeongseo wa hang-Il minjok undong," *Gukhak yeon-gu* 13 (December 2009): 97–120.

joined by many independence activists, Dangun-gyo rejected the outdated Joseon pursuits of 'Little China.' Instead, the religion argued for the rectification of 'true' Korean identity as descendants of Dangun and as a nation of four-thousand years' history to ensure the survival and advancement of the nation.[588]

Dangun portraits produced for worship display typical features shared by textbook illustrations but also show some exaggerated features, reflective of their purpose as religious paintings.[589] For instance, in religious portraits of Dangun, his ears are further elongated to the point of it being unrealistic and reminiscent of Buddha's image. Traditionally, large, elongated ears were signs of a great figure, virtue, wisdom, and longevity, often used to portray wise men, mythical or religious figures, and heroes that were distinguished from ordinary people.[590] The super-human depiction of Dangun correlates with the contemporary drive to portray Dangun as the supreme progenitor and saviour of the Korean people.

The veneration for Dangun and his image was not limited to religious worship, nor was it in conflict with the fundamentals of other religions in the 1910s. Dangun's status as progenitor and subject of worship transcended religious beliefs to form part of national consciousness (*minjok uisik*, 민족의식, 民族意識) as a symbol of the collective ethno-national identity. National consolidation through a homogenous origin proved to be especially useful when resistance against the primary aggressor, Japan,

---

[588] Jeong Yeong-hun, "Dangun-gyo pomyeongseo wa geu sasangjeok uiui: Dangun minjok juui wa ui gwanryeonseong eul jungsim euro," *Gukhak yeon-gu* 13 (December 2009): 67–68.
[589] Similarities include the hemispherical headwear, bold facial features, long beard, and plain robes.
[590] Kim Jeong, "Dangun chosanghwa e gwanhan yeon-gu," *Johyeong gyoyuk* 20 (January 2002): 62–77.

became the indisputable priority for all nationalists and independence activists after the fall of the imperial court and government. Although the utilisation of Dangun's portrait imagery in public education was discontinued during the colonial period when Japan gained control of formulating historical narratives, independence activists continuously produced and disseminated Dangun imagery.[591]

[591] Kim Seong-hwan, "20 segi cho Dangun yeongjeong ui bogeup gwa hwabon geomto," 201–41.

3.3.b. Encouraging Collective Resistance

In addition to visually rendering genealogical ancestors, portrait images of heroic historical figures were utilised in representing the shared history of the collective nation and effectively encouraging similar acts of patriotism. Hyeon Chae's *Yunyeon pildok* contains various portraits of such figures. The textbook's explicitly nationalistic narrative resulted in the gross confiscation of its copies after the enactment of the Publication Law (Chulpanbeop, 출판법, 出版法) in 1909 that prohibited all publications that disrupted public order and safety.[592] According to Park Carey's survey, out of the 23 illustrations of historical figures, 9 are military figures who defended Korea from foreign invasions, including Admiral Yi Sun-sin and Eulji Mundeok (을지문덕, 乙支文德, active during the late sixth-early seventh centuries), 7 depict martyrs and intellectuals including Min Yeong-hwan and Jeong Yak-yong (정약용, 丁若鏞, 1762-1836), 3 are scenes from ancient history, and 4 show cases of Western history of the struggle for national independence.[593]

It is meaningful that military heroes take up over a third of all figures depicted. Throughout the Joseon period, civil officials (*mun-gwan,* 문관, 文官) enjoyed a superior social standing compared to military officials (*mugwan*, 무관, 武官) as Joseon was founded upon strict Neo-Confucianist ideals that prioritised scholarly principles and virtues over physical or military power. Portrait production during the

[592] Park Carey, "Hanguk geundae yeoksa inmulhwa," 34; Seo Su-yeon, "Hyeon Chae ui Yunyeon pildok e surok doen inmul bunseok," 22–28.
[593] Park Carey, "Hanguk geundae yeoksa inmulhwa," 34–35. Note that Park Carey uses the term *inmulhwa* (人物畫, figure painting) rather than *chosanghwa* (肖像畫, portrait) in her study. As the former refers to the wider 'images of people,' it means that she also included narrative scenes in her survey, in addition to portrait images.

late Joseon period also revolved around Confucian scholars, while portraits of military officials grew increasingly scarce, particularly after the last of the *gongsin* commendation in 1728.[594] However, in history textbooks of the 1890s to 1910, military heroes who defended the country in the face of foreign invasion set a better example for students to follow.

Frequent depictions of Eulji Mundeok and Yi Sun-sin are depictive of this change in perception. Eulji Mundeok was a general of the Goguryeo period in the sixth to seventh centuries. In addition to a battle scene of "Eulji Mundeok and the Sui Army in Havoc at Cheongcheon-gang River" (을지문덕 청천강 대파 수군도, 乙支文德淸川江大破隋軍圖) in *Yunyeon pildok*, Eulji Mundeok's portrait depicts in his battle armour and helmet, expressive of his occupation as a military leader and warrior. (Fig. 3.49., Fig. 3.50.) Accompanied with the war scene of his triumphant battle that defended Goguryeo from Sui invasions, his portrait is embedded with an aura of authority and pride.

The depiction of military leaders in armour was not unprecedented in the Joseon period but it was more common to depict them in their civil uniform in official portraits.[595] Rather, portraits with the sitter dressed in armour was more commonly seen in portraits used for Shamanistic rituals (*musindo*, 무신도, 巫神圖).[596] The decision

---

594 Gwon Hyeok-san, "Joseon sidae mugwan chosanghwa wa hyungbae e gwanhan yeon-gu," *Misulsa yeon-gu* 26 (December 2012): 170, 182–86; Jo Seon-mi, *Hanguk ui chosanghwa*, 41.

595 Lee Seong-hun, "Gunbok bon Jeongjo eojin ui jejak gwa bong-an yeon-gu: Sado seja e daehan Jeongjo ui hyosim gwa gyeseung uiji ui cheonmyeong," *Misulsa wa sigak munhwa*, no. 25 (May 2020): 134.

596 Gang Yeong-ju, "19 segi mal- 20 segi jeonban-gi Choe Yeong jang-gun sinang gwa musindo yeon-gu," *Hanguk minhwa*, no. 11 (October 2019): 58–97.

to portray Eulji Mundeok in his armour was a deliberate reference to his strength and authority as a military hero that reflected contemporary desires to depend on a strong warrior in face of external threats. (Fig. 3.51., Fig. 3.52.) The story of Eulji Mundeok also became a popular topic for novels and newspaper articles that lionised his military accomplishments and devotion to the country. (Fig. 3.53.) The illustration in *Yunyeon pildok* was most likely the template for Eulji Mundeok's portrait illustration in *Chodeung Daehan yeoksa* as the two images are almost identical to each other.[597] (Fig. 3.54.)

Chodeung Daehan yeoksa also has a portrait illustration of Admiral Yi Sun-sin, one of the most well-known and highly celebrated military heroes of the Joseon period. Yi Sun-sin was "worshipped as a paragon of loyalty to the king in late [Joseon]" and was remade into an iconic, courageous, and patriotic hero, or "Korea's Nelson" in nationalistic history education of the twentieth century.[598] Yi Sun-sin's portrait is accompanied by an illustration of the Turtle Ship (Geobukseon, 거북선), his iconic battleship which became a symbol of his victory in a series of battles against Japan during the Imjin Japanese Invasions. (Fig. 3.55.) Yi Sun-sin is dressed in a military officers' dress (*gugunbok*, 구군복, 具軍服) and hat, rather than in armour and helmet.[599] His face bears a solemn expression, perhaps to hint his noble yet tragic death

[597] Park Carey argues that the illustrations in *Yunyeon pildok* were the work of An Jung-sik. Park Carey, "Hanguk geundae yeoksa inmulhwa," 36–37.
[598] Young-koo Roh, "Yi Sun-shin, an Admiral Who Became a Myth," *Review of Korean Studies* 7, no. 3 (September 2004): 15–37; Tikhonov, "Masculinizing the Nation," 1035; Kim Gang-nyeong, "Sin Chae-ho ui Yi Sun-sin yeon-gu wa hyeondaejeok hamui," *Yi Sun-sin yeon-gu nonchong*, no. 32 (June 2020): 316-324.
[599] Jeong Hye-gyeong, "Joseon sidae gunbok e gwanhayeo," *Yeon-gu nonchong* 8 (1978): 347–59; Yeom Jeong-ha and Jo U-hyeon, "Joseon jung, hugi hunryeon dogam ui gunsa boksik e gwanhan yeon-gu," *Boksik* 63, no. 8 (December 2013): 171–87.

in action. Similar illustrations were reproduced when short stories and novels of Yi Sun-sin were popularised during the so-called 'cultural rule' (*munhwa tongchi*, 문화통치, 文化統治) period of the 1920s.[600] (Fig. 3.56., Fig. 3.57.)

Noticeably, the portrait in *Chodeung Daehan yeoksa* is framed by an oval bay-leaf banner, similar to the decoration used in Dangun's portrait illustration, but has an additional Ihwamun at the top of the frame.[601] Public veneration of the Joseon admiral was deep-rooted and had continued from the Imjin Japanese Invasions; shrines dedicated to Yi Sun-sin were constructed from as early as 1601 in Yeosu (Chungminsa Temple, 충민사, 忠愍祠) and his prominence as a dedicated and exceptionally loyal servant (*chungsin*, 충신, 忠臣 or *seonjeong*, 선정, 先正) was indisputable from the Joseon period.[602] In the beginnings of the twentieth century, this pre-modern Confucian warrior was appropriated into an embodiment of national military heroism. By marketing him as '*minjok yeong-ung*' (민족의 영웅, hero of the nation), the Joseon war hero and loyal servant was converted to a modern national hero who triumphed in battles between nations (i.e., Joseon Korea versus Japan).[603] The application of the imperial plum blossom motif for his portrait imagery emphasised the authority and

---

[600] Kim Gang-nyeong, "Sin Chae-ho ui Yi Sun-sin yeon-gu wa hyeondaejeok hamui," 294-351.

[601] The fact that the Ihwamun was added to Yi Sun-sin's portrait that has an identical leaf banner decoration as Dangun's portrait suggests that the 'bay leaves' in Dangun's portrait may be the leaves of a plum blossom.

[602] Kim Dae-hyeon, "Yeosu Chungminsa ui geonrip gyeongwi mit yeondae e gwanhan jaegochal," *Yi Sun-sin yeon-gu nonchong*, no. 22 (December 2014): 1-44; O Jong-rok, "Botong jangsu eseo guguk ui yeong-ung euro: Joseon hugi Yi Sun-sin e daehan pyeong-ga," *Naeil eul yeoneun yeoksa* 18 (December 2004): 151-161.

[603] Roh Yeong-gu, "Yeoksa sok ui Yi Sun-sin insik," *Yeoksa bipyeong*, no. 69 (November 2004): 338-39; Kim Gang-nyeong, "Sin Chae-ho ui Yi Sun-sin yeon-gu wa hyeondaejeok hamui," 313-314.

importance of Yi Sun-sin's image and the prominence of his patriotic feats within the narrative of shared, collective Korean history.[604] As there were no official regulations over the use of the Ihwamun, non-state agents also freely used the emblem to nationalise and politicise images such as Yi Sun-sin's portrait illustration.

Although the two military heroes of Goguryeo and Joseon were already well-known historic figures in the Joseon period, their position within the framework of Korean history was significantly elevated in the twentieth century and their relevance as historical figures renewed. The importance placed on military figures in history textbooks, aided by their portrait imagery, also contributed to the masculinisation of Korea's national history and the push for aggressive resistance of foreign threats.[605] In addition, it is noteworthy that while Eulji Mundeok, who fought off Chinese invaders, was described as "*jeil inmul*" (제일인물, 第一人物, the greatest figure) in the 1895 *Gukmin sohak dokbon* (국민소학독본, 國民小學讀本) when separation from China was prioritised, Yi Sun-sin was highlighted as "*jeil myeongjang*" (제일명장, 第一名將, the greatest warrior) of the country in *Yunyeon pildok* in 1907 when Japanese colonial power reached a new height.[606] Yi Sun-sin's feats in defeating the Japanese navy in the Imjin Invasions greatly elevated his status and relevancy in

---

[604] Moreover, Roh Yeong-gyu argues that the twentieth-century emphasis on Geobukseon, the Turtle Ship, can also be seen as a reflection of the Western recognition of grand battleships as symbols of national power. Roh Yeong-gu, "Yeoksa sok ui Yi Sun-sin insik," 339, 349-350.
[605] Tikhonov, "Masculinizing the Nation," 1029–65; Jager, *Narratives of Nation Building in Korea*, 8–9.
[606] Kim Heung-su, "Hanmal yeoksa gyoyuk mit gyogwaseo e gwanhan yeon-gu," *Yeoksa gyoyuk* 29 (June 1981): 79–80.

historical narratives as Korea once again faced Japanese encroachment. In times of similar threats, his image reflected the longing for the salvation of the country.

Mass media repeatedly expressed the general craving for heroes and the salvation of the country after 1905. A 1908 editorial article in *Daehan maeil sinbo* wrote that a hero creates opportunities and opportunities create heroes and argued that the present time when the country is at the brink of collapse (*mang-guk,* 망국, 亡國) is the perfect time for the birth of a hero.[607] *Daehan maeil sinbo* also wrote in a 1909 article titled "A Time When Heroes are Born" (*Yeong-ung i naneun sidae*, 영웅이 나는 시대) that Korea is faced with the biggest crisis in the four thousand years of its history but should someone arise to strengthen the country like a mountain and lead the people to paradise to open a new era of pleasure and peace, that person would be known as a hero.[608] The 'hero' that these articles longed for was not a specific person of great prestige but was referring to the "nameless heroes" (*ireum eobneun yeong-ung*, 이름없는 영웅) of the Korean people.[609] Such hope for and encouragement of heroic acts of national salvation continued throughout the colonial period, and portrait images of military heroes were popularised in both print media and minhwa consumed among the Korean public.[610]

607 Jeong Seon-tae, "Geundae gyemong-gi minjok, gukmin seosa ui jeongchijeok sihak," 157.
608 "Yeong-ung i naneun sidae," *Daehan maeil sinbo*, 9 April, 1909.
609 Jeong Seon-tae, "Geundae gyemong-gi minjok, gukmin seosa ui jeongchijeok sihak," 160–61; Jin Deok-gyu et al., "Geundae jeonhwan-gi (1894-1910) inswae maeche reul tonghae bon geundae jisik gwa gaenyeom ui hyeongseong mit byeonmo yangsang e gwanhan yeon-gu jung-gan bogoseo," 30.
610 The portrait of Choe Yeong (최영, 崔瑩, 1316-1388), a renowned Goryeo General, was popularised in a folk paintings that were used for Shamanistic rituals. Gang Yeong-ju, "19 segi mal- 20 segi jeonban-gi Choe Yeong jang-gun sinang gwa musindo yeon-gu."

The press and non-state actors grew ever more important in nation-building toward annexation and independence activists took on the role of defending the country once the government was overrun by pro-Japanese officials after 1905. A crucial part of resistant nationalism that was beginning to gain strength in this period was martyrdom. Activists after 1905 and in the 1910s actively participated in both literary and physical resistance against Japanese colonialists, and in this setting, martyrs gained immense public support and influence. Among the many patriotic martyrs of this period, key figures such as Min Yeong-hwan and An Jung-geun were especially celebrated and respected, owing to several factors: their well-respected social status, sensational events surrounding their heroic death, and their accomplishments in resisting Japanese repression. Portrait imagery of the particularly well-known martyrs were instrumental in perpetuating the memory of their noble death and provoking patriotic sentiments and actions among the Korean people.

The utilisation of textbook illustrations of historical figures in nation-building was extended to contemporary figures as very recent events were also included in textbooks to educate the public of important current affairs. One such event was the suicide of Min Yeong-hwan, a high ranking official and relative of both Gojong and Queen Min. Min Yeong-hwan was born into the prestigious Min family and his reputation within the court and among the public had always been positive. He was an advocator for state-led reformation and the strengthening of imperial power but also actively contributed to the strengthening of people's rights (*min-gwon*, 민권, 民權).[611] He retained a close relationship with Gojong and also supported the broader public and

[611] Lee Seong-hyeon, "Min Yeong-hwan ui 'sun-guk' damron e daehan gochal," (Master's thesis, Chuncheon, Kangwon National University, 2014), 13.

their political participation as a supporter of the Independence Club and their activities, including the hosting of the *Manmin gongdonghoe* (만민공동회, 萬民共同會, People's Joint Association).[612]

After the signing of the Eulsa Treaty in 1905, nationalist government officials, led by Min Yeong-hwan and Jo Byeong-se (조병세, 趙秉世, 1827-1905) appealed to Gojong for the nullification of the treaty but they were disbanded by Japanese armed forces and eventually by the orders from the emperor himself. After realising that his resistance was futile, Min Yeong-hwan met with his family for the last time and committed suicide with a knife at the house of his servant, Lee Wan-sik on 30 November, 1905.[613] In his pocket were two sets of suicide notes, one written for the Korean people and the other for foreign diplomatic offices. The former warned the Korean people of the dangers the country faced and urged that they strive to restore national sovereignty while the latter pleaded for the aid of foreign representatives in spreading the news of Japanese encroachment of sovereignty and salvaging the country and its people.[614]

News of the well-known and respected official's death was reported extensively in *Daehan maeil sinbo* and Gojong sent over a messenger to pay his respects to Min Yeong-hwan's family and help lead the funerary process, along with three-hundred

[612] When tensions escalated between Gojong and the Independence Club, Min Yeong-hwan was temporarily released from office due to his affiliation with the club but was soon reinstated. Sin Seok-ho, "Haeseol," in *Min chungjeong-gong yugo: Jeon*, ed. Min Hong-gi, trans. Lee Min-su (Seoul: Iljogak, 2000), 307–8.
[613] Min Yeong-hwan, "Min Chungjeong-gong yugo gwon 5," in *Min Chungjeong-gong yugo: jeon*, ed. Min Hong-gi, trans. Lee Min-su (Seoul: Iljogak, 2000), 282–84.
[614] "Min Yeong-hwan ui yuseo," *Daehan maeil sinbo*, 1 December, 1905; Min Yeong-hwan, "Min Chungjeong-gong yugo gwon 5," 290–91.

soldiers on horseback to escort the casket to the graveyard.[615] On the day of burial, Gojong personally paid respect by the Daehanmun Gate (대한문, 大漢門) of Gyeong-un-gung Palace.[616] Thousands of mourners surrounded Min Yeong-hwan's house and a report was made on an attack of a Japanese police dispatch station in Jongro (종로, 鐘路) by angry mobs the very same day of Min's death.[617]

The signing of the Eulsa Treaty and Min Yeong-hwan's death were major triggers for a series of suicides that took place among all levels of society.[618] Jo Byeong-se committed suicide the day after Min Yeong-hwan's suicide, along with a string of individuals including government officials, scholars, and even a rickshaw-puller who had paid respect at Min Yeong-hwan's house after his death.[619] Japanese authorities closely monitored the situation in fear of a revolt and agreed that an appeasement strategy was needed to soothe public sentiments.[620]

> "Min [Yeong]-hwan, a highly respected official and currently the chief aide-de-camp to the emperor, committed suicide leaving behind an impassioned plea for independence. [Jo Byeong]-se, a former prime minister, also took his own life

---

[615] Lee Seong-hyeon, "Min Yeong-hwan ui 'sun-guk' damron e daehan gochal," 17.
[616] Sin Seok-ho, "Haeseol," 309–10.
[617] Lee Seong-hyeon, "Min Yeong-hwan ui 'sun-guk' damron e daehan gochal," 19.
[618] Min Yeong-hwan was not the only one to commit suicide after the signing of the Eulsa Treaty. Lee Han-eung (이한응, 李漢應, 1874-1905), diplomat to Great Britain had already sensed the downfall of the country in May 1905 after failing to acquire the aid from Britain and committed suicide in London. Lee Ji-eun, "Gyeongsul gukchigi Jeonbuk jiyeok jajeong sun-gukja e daehan geomto" (Master's thesis, Jeonju, Jeonbuk National University, 2016), 1-8.
[619] For more on the phenomenon of mass suicide around 1905, see O Yeong-seop, *Hanmal sun-guk, euiyeol tujaeng* (Cheonan: Doklip Ginyeomgwan Hanguk Doklip Undongsa Yeon-guso, 2009), 83–84; Lee Ji-eun, "Gyeongsul gukchigi Jeonbuk jiyeok jajeong sun-gukja e daehan geomto," 9–10.
[620] Lee Seong-hyeon, "Min Yeong-hwan ui 'sun-guk' damron e daehan gochal," 20; McKenzie, *Tragedy of Korea*, 137–41.

in protest when his memorials had proven futile. The news of these suicides caused spontaneous public rallies in the streets but were dispersed by the Japanese gendarmes; dozens of the demonstrators were arrested. Storekeepers put up their shutters as a sign of mourning."[621]

Among the many martyrs of 1905 and 1906, Min Yeong-hwan's death was undoubtedly the most widely known and grieved. The extraordinary event of the sprouting of the so-called Blood Bamboos (*hyeoljuk*, 혈죽, 血竹) sensationalised his suicide that amplified public anger and resistance. Eight months after Min Yeong-hwan's suicide, his wife discovered four branches of bamboo that had grown though the wooden floor of the room where Min's bloodstained uniform was kept.[622] The peculiar growth of the bamboos was even more meaningful as bamboos were traditionally associated with fidelity. In particular, the story of bamboos that sprouted on Seonjukgyo Bridge (선죽교, 善竹橋) where Goryeo official Jeong Mong-ju (정몽주, 鄭夢周, 1337-1392) was assassinated for refusing to betray his allegiance to the Goryeo dynasty added to the mystique of the Blood Bamboos.[623] Min Yeong-hwan's death was immediately contextualised in a strongly nationalistic narrative that was popularised via songs, poems, and imagery.

Daehan gurakbu (대한구락부, 大韓俱樂部), a club established in 1905 to educate the public and raise awareness of nationalism and patriotism, hired Kikuta Photo Studio (기쿠타 사진관, 菊田寫眞館) to photograph the Blood Bamboos on 15

---

621 C. I. Eugene Kim and Han-kyo Kim, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism, 1876-1910,* 132–33.

622 Remains of the bamboos were secretly preserved by his wife and donated to Korea University Museum. Min Yeong-hwan, "Min Chungjeong-gong yugo gwon 5," 301–10.

623 Lee Seong-hyeon, "Min Yeong-hwan ui 'sun-guk' damron e daehan gochal," 40.

July, 1906, and a painting by Yang Gi-hun (양기훈, 楊基薰, 1843-?) was published in *Daehan maeil sinbo* as a woodblock print on 17 July, 1906.[624] (Fig. 3.58., Fig. 3.59.) One full page was dedicated to Yang Gi-hun's Blood Bamboos, attesting to the significance of the event and the newspaper's determination to publicise it.[625] Kikuda Studio's photograph was commercialised as picture postcards and Yang Gi-hun's print was reproduced and several copies of the same image survive, including that in an issue of *Gongrip sinbo* (공립신보, 公立新報, 1905-1909), a Korean newspaper printed in San Francisco, on 25 August, 1906.[626] (Fig. 3.60., Fig. 3.61.) News of Min Yeong-hwan's suicide and the Blood Bamboos greatly stirred the Korean public, despite Japanese attempts to control the growing discontent and resentment toward colonial authorities.[627]

Several other *hyeoljukdo* images followed suit, including paintings by An Jung-sik.[628] He was said to have painted the Blood Bamboos at Min Yeong-hwan's house which was printed in *Daehan Jaganghoe wolbo* in 1907. (Fig. 3.62.) An unknown artist produced a collage that consisted of a gold-pigment painting and writing of the Blood Bamboos and Min Yeong-hwan's suicide note combined with a printed portrait

---

[624] Yang Gi-hun's blood bamboo image was later further reproduced in print format and sold to the public. Lee Seong-hyeon, "Min Yeong-hwan ui 'sun-guk' damron e daehan gochal," 27–28; Choi Yeol, "Hyeoljuk ui norae, Gyejeong Min Yeong-hwan," 221–22. Daehan gurakbu was later absorbed into Daehan Hyeophoe (대한협회, 大韓協會) in 1907.

[625] Choi Yeol, "Hyeoljuk ui norae, Gyejeong Min Yeong-hwan," 221–23.

[626] Kim Gyeong-mi, "Hyeoljuk ui norae," Doklip Ginyeomgwan, https://www.i815.or.kr/upload/kr/magazine/magazine/35/post-365.html, accessed 29 June, 2022.

[627] C. I. Eugene Kim and Han-kyo Kim, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism, 1876-1910,* 181–82.

[628] Choi Yeol, "Hyeoljuk ui norae, Gyejeong Min Yeong-hwan," 225–27.

photograph in a single hanging scroll.[629] (Fig. 3.63.) Min Yeong-hwan's portrait and bamboo image was also printed in both *Yunyeon pildok* and *Chodeung Daehan yeoksa*. (Fig. 3.64., Fig. 3.65.) The illustration in *Chodeung Daehan yeoksa* is almost identical to the Kikuta Studio photograph, while *Yunyeon pildok*'s illustration is a slightly altered piece. (Fig. 3.66.) As such, Min Yeong-hwan's portrait image, coupled with the symbolic image of the blood bamboos, instantly became part of save-the-nation education movement, and was used to ignite public resistance against Japan.

Contrary to the Christian taboo of suicide, Confucian ideology surrounding the act of suicide was, in many cases, positive and even glorified; Confucius's famous teaching that a wise scholar would not seek to live at the expense of injuring their virtue, and would sacrifice their lives to preserve their virtue (志士仁人 無求生以害仁 有殺身以成仁) had a profound impact on Korean perceptions of "death with dignity," even prior to the Joseon dynasty.[630] Throughout Joseon history, suicide was portrayed as the ultimate sacrifice and demonstration of devotion to one's parents, husband, king, or country.[631] In the first decade of the twentieth century, many Korean scholars of the Wijeongcheoksa Movement and nationalists such as Choe Ik-hyeon (최익현, 崔益鉉, 1833-1906), Hwang Hyeon (황현, 黃玹, 1855-1910), and Park Se-hwa (박세화,

---

[629] The bamboo image is almost identical to Kikuta Studio's photograph and is printed using gold pigment. Choi Yeol, "Hyeoljuk ui norae, Gyejeong Min Yeong-hwan," 226–27.

[630] Lee Hui-jae, "Jukeum e daehan yugyo ui insik," *Gongjahak* 15 (December 2008): 125; Ping-cheung Lo, "Confucian Ethic of Death with Dignity and its Contemporary Relevance," *The Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics* 19 (1999): 313-333.

[631] Of course, filial piety required the preservation of life as life itself was indebpted to parents and ancestors, but in cases where supreme virtue was at sake, the cause outweighed life itself. Ping-cheung Lo, "Confucian Ethic of Death with Dignity and its Contemporary Relevance," 316-318; Lee Hui-jae, "Jukeum e daehan yugyo ui insik," 119–30.

朴世和, 1834-1910) all willingly gave up their lives in protest of Japanese occupation.[632] Their acts of physical sacrifice was not understood as a defeatist act but as a display of the scholars' determination to follow through with the noble cause of protecting their virtue.[633]

In this Confucian narrative, the death of Min Yeong-hwan and many selfless patriots that followed during Japanese occupation was a heart-breaking tragedy but also catalysed active resistance on a national scale. *Sun-guk damron* had a significant impact on the shaping of Korean nationalism in that it highlights resistance against the oppressor in order to consolidate national identity.[634] Min Yeong-hwan's sacrificial death came to strengthen the identity of the Korean nation by setting Japan as the clearly identifiable 'other.' His portrait and the fantastic element of the Blood Bamboos served as an icon of the national struggle against Japan and fuelled a pervasive nationalistic and anticolonial sentiment among the sympathetic Korean public which later came to formulate the self-sacrificial patriotism of independence activists.[635]

An equally influential martyr image that symbolised Korean resistant nationalism was that of An Jung-geun, an independence activist executed for the assassination of Itō Hirobumi. An Jung-geun was born into an affluent family of mid-level military officials and from an early age, he was exposed to reformist ideals, influenced by his father An Tae-hun (안태훈, 安泰勳, 1862-1905) who was a Catholic and political socialite who had a wide net of connections with reformists such as Park

---

[632] Lee Hui-jae, "Jukeum e daehan yugyo ui insik," 126.
[633] Antonio S. Cua, "Reflections on the Structure of Confucian Ethics," *Philosophy East and West* 21, no. 2 (April 1971): 128-129.
[634] Lee Seong-hyeon, "Min Yeong-hwan ui 'sun-guk' damron e daehan gochal," 100.
[635] Lee Seong-hyeon, "Min Yeong-hwan ui 'sun-guk' damron e daehan gochal," 100–101.

Yeong-hyo.[636] Though greatly influenced by reformist ideals and Western beliefs, An Jung-geun also retained Confucian ethics, and from his calligraphic works such as "Jisainin salsinseong-in" (지사인인살신성인, 志士仁人殺身成仁, Scholar of cause and virtuous man would sacrifice himself to achieve virtue) and "Wiguk heonsin gunin bonbon" (위국헌신군인본분, 爲國獻身軍人本分, Self-sacrifice for the sake of the country is the rightful duty of a soldier), produced during his detention from 1909 to 1910, his inclination to the Confucian idea of death for a greater cause is evident.[637] (Fig. 3.67., Fig. 3.68.)

By 1905, An Jung-geun had already planned to participate in the 'patriotic struggle' (*uiyeol tujaeng*, 의열투쟁, 義烈鬪爭) and resistance against Japanese colonial forces, but the signing of the Eulsa Treaty confirmed An Jung-geun's belief that Itō Hirobumi had to be eliminated for the salvation of the country.[638] Of course, by devoting himself to this cause, he was accepting his probable death. When he relocated to Vladivostok and Primorsky Krai (Yeonhaeju, 연해주, 沿海州) in 1907, he further realised the limitations of peaceful resistance through educating the public and became determined to take physical action by taking part in the righteous army (*uibyeong*, 의병, 義兵) movement.[639] Upon hearing news of Itō Hirobumi's visit to Manchuria, An Jung-geun finally embarked on his long-term plan to assassinate Itō and made his

---

[636] O Yeong-seop, "Gaehwagi An Tae-hun (1862-1905) ui saeng-ae wa hwaldong," *Hanguk geunhyeondaesa yeon-gu* 40 (March 2007): 7–44.
[637] An Jung-geun had received Confucian education for 8-9 years from the age of 6-7. O Do-yeol, "An Jung-geun seoye ui yuga mihakjeok yeon-gu," (Master's thesis, Seoul, Sungkyunkwan University, 2011), iv-v, 11-12, 76-80, 94.
[638] Sin Un-yong, "An Jung-geun ui minjok undong yeon-gu" (PhD diss., Seoul, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, 2007), 14–31.
[639] For his activities as a leader of Russia-based *uibyeong*, see Sin Un-yong, "An Jung-geun ui minjok undong yeon-gu," 42–63.

way to Harbin.[640] On 26 October, 1909, An Jung-geun fired three shots at a figure he presumed to be Itō Hirobumi and three more shots at other senior officials to make sure that he had not mistaken his target. Itō Hirobumi was killed by a gunshot to his chest and An Jung-geun was ceased by Russian guards and taken to the Japanese Consulate.[641]

After An Jung-geun's arrest, he was quickly photographed at the detention centre for record-keeping purposes. These portrait images were quickly disseminated by the Japanese.[642] Iwata Photo Studio was one of the first studios in Korea to commercialise An Jung-geun's portrait image, but was banned from selling the photographs by the Japanese authorities due to the unexpectedly high demand for the photographs.[643] Contrary to the intentions of Japanese authorities, portrait images of An Jung-geun were used to glorify the heroic act of the martyr, which forced Japanese

---

[640] The assassination itself was not an operation of the well-known Danji Dongmaeng (단지동맹, 斷指同盟) that he was leader of, but rather An's personal operation. An kept his plans almost completely confidential as he was aware that there were many spies in Vladivostok and because he was conscious of other competitors that were eager to assassinate Itō. Only U Deok-sun, who assisted the execution and provided the pistol that killed Itō, shared An Jung-geun's plans on the assassination. Sin Un-yong, "An Jung-geun ui minjok undong yeon-gu," 75–77.

[641] Sin Un-yong, "An Jung-geun ui minjok undong yeon-gu," 87.

[642] Opinions over An Jung-geun's assassination of Itō Hirobumi was divided at the time. In domestic Korea, the public rejoiced over the death of Itō, but due to increased Japanese control, Korean newspapers were cautious in reporting the events. Only *Daehan maeil sinbo*, then owned by Englishman Alfred W. Marnham (?-?), was able to commend An Jung-geun as a national hero as it was the only newspaper free from censorship. Many elites, especially the royal family, condemned An Jung-geun as the assassination posed the real threat of complete annexation of Korea. The royal family was conscious of both the fall of monarchical rule and the safety of Crown Prince Uimin who was taken to Japan in 1907. However, the assassination was much praised and celebrated among Koreans abroad in Russia, China, and the United States. Sin Un-yong, "An Jung-geun ui minjok undong yeon-gu," 158–207.

[643] "Chian banghae do mana," *Daehan maeil sinbo*, 31 March, 1910; Lee Gyeong-min, "Iwata Kanae wa Amjeon sajin-gwan (2)," 118; Gwon Haeng-ga, "Gojong hwangje ui chosang," 90-91.

authorities to ban the production and selling of the photographic images.[644] Despite the banning of the selling or purchasing of An Jung-geun's photographs in Korea, postcards of An Jung-geun were secretly reproduced and distributed in Korea and abroad. An Jung-geun's family and fellow activists based in Primorsky Krai and the United States produced and sold photographs in the 1910s.[645] An Jung-geun's photographs were also popular in China, but sales were soon banned by the request of the Japanese Government-General.[646]

Photographs of An Jung-geun can be categorised into four types. The first type is photos of An Jung-geun taken before the assassination. On 23 October, 1909, An Jung-geun, U Deok-sun (우덕순, 禹德淳, 1880-1950), and translator Yu Dong-ha (유동하, 劉東夏, 1892-1918) visited a photo studio in Harbin after getting fresh haircuts to record and commemorate the assassination.[647] An Jung-geun deliberately sat for the photograph prior to the assassination in order to consolidate the message of resistance, and he specifically asked his brothers to collect the photographs from the studio during his final visitation before his execution.[648] An Jung-geun's solo portrait was cut from the group shot and printed as postcards that were sold in Manchuria and

[644] According to an article in *Daehan maeil sinbo* on 6 April, 1910, over 300 copies of An Jung-geun's photograph were purchased in Pyeongyang and many Koreans were searching for photo studios with An's portrait to purchase. Yun Byeong-seok, "An Jung-geun ui sajin," *Hanguk doklip undongsa yeon-gu* 37 (December 2010): 400.
[645] Yun Byeong-seok, "An Jung-geun ui sajin," 399.
[646] Yun Byeong-seok, "An Jung-geun ui sajin," 401.
[647] Yu Dong-ha had no prior knowledge of the plans of assassination. Sin Un-yong, "An Jung-geun ui minjok undong yeon-gu," 81–82.
[648] Unfortunately, Japanese authorities collected the photographs before An's brothers and published it in Manshū Nichi-Nichi Shimbun (满州日日新聞) in 4 February, 1910. Sin Un-yong, "An Jung-geun ui minjok undong yeon-gu," 107–8; Yun Byeong-seok, "An Jung-geun ui sajin," 405.

the United States.[649] (Fig. 3.69.) This self-initiated portrait can be understood as An Jung-geun's final testimony of his fight for Korean independence.

The second type consists of photographs taken immediately after his arrest. In these photographs, he is dressed in a double-breasted coat with or without a hat. This type is almost like a passport photograph and captured An Jung-geun's stiff face and torso, with his hands tied to the back. The photograph without a hat was chosen as the 'standard photographic portrait' (*pyojun sajin yeongjeong*, 표준 사진 영정, 標準影幀影幀) by Ahn Jung-geun Memorial Hall (안중근 의사 기념관).[650] (Fig. 3.70.) Though it does not have many visual symbols that denote An Jung-geun as an independence activist, the image seems to have been chosen as the standard portrait as it shows him in dignified manner, especially in comparison to those taken after his transference to the Japanese Consulate.

The third group of photographs were taken after An Jung-geun was transferred to the Japanese Consulate. An Jung-geun is pictured in handcuffs, standing against a wooden door. A similar photograph was shot in the same spot, but he is knelt and bound by steel chains. (Fig. 3.71.) Despite being dressed in the same clothes as in the photographs taken immediately after his arrest, his appearance is noticeably unkempt and the chain around his waist conspicuously displays him as a prisoner. A Japanese seller printed this photograph on postcards with the caption "Hyung Han An Jung-geun" (흉한 안중근, 兇漢 安重根, An Jung-geun, the vile Korean) but was almost

[649] Yun Byeong-seok, "An Jung-geun ui sajin," 405–7.
[650] Yun Byeong-seok, "An Jung-geun ui sajin," 408–11.

immediately banned by the Japanese authorities.[651] However, the same type of photographs was also reproduced and purchased to commemorate An Jung-geun.[652]

The final type of An Jung-geun's portraits deliberately includes his hand to show his severed finger. This particular photograph was also chosen by the Japanese to be reproduced in postcards with a photograph of the gun used in the assassination, alongside the captions "Hyung Han An Jung-geun bok hyung-gi" (흉한 안중근 복 흉기, 兇漢安重根卜兇器, An Jung-geun, the vile Korean and weapon).[653] (Fig. 3.72.) This type was also used to portray An Jung-geun as a representation of the uncultured Korean race; Japanese postcards incorrectly described that Koreans have a tradition of cutting off a finger before an assassination, attempting to demonise the act of Itō's assassination by connecting it to what they deemed an uncivilised culture.[654] (Fig. 3.73.) However, the same photographs were sold and consumed in veneration of An Jung-geun's patriotism. (Fig. 3.74.) Japanese newspaper *Osaka mainichi simbun* (大阪毎日新聞) and Korean newspaper *Sinhan minbo* printed a photograph of An Jung-geun with a short poem by Japanese anarchist, Kōtoku Shūsui (幸德秋水, 1888-1911), praising the courage and selfless sacrifice of An Jung-geun.[655] (Fig. 3.75.) In

[651] Yun Byeong-seok, "An Jung-geun ui sajin," 414.
[652] Recent media coverage tends to exaggerate the 'dishevelled' appearance of An Jung-geun in this group of photographs taken during incarceration, but as Do Jin-sun points out, there is contrasting evidence including a written account by An Jung-geun himself saying that he was treated kindly by Japanese guards while detained. Do Jin-sun, "An Jung-geun sajin yeopseo wa gukje yeondae: Biha wa chanyang, geurigo jeonyong, jeonyu," *Yeoksa hakbo* 248 (December 2020): 191–226.
[653] The caption is in Japanese, and "*bok*" is pronounced *"to"* (卜, and).
[654] Yun Byeong-seok, "An Jung-geun ui sajin," 421. The cutting of his finger was an act of determination of An Jung-geun and his fellow members of Danji Dongmaeng.
[655] The verse reads "舍生取義 殺身成仁 安君一擧 天地皆振" (He gives up his life for righteousness and kills his body for virtue. The deeds of Mr. An shakes heaven and earth).

addition, a Chinese named Jang A-hyeong (Zhang Yaxin, 張亞馨) who was an English teacher of Sileop Hakdang (실업학당, 實業學堂) was banned from selling postcards with this photograph in Shenyang (瀋陽) in 1914.[656]

These various types of An Jung-geun's portraits were mostly sold as postcards and prints by the Japanese or Koreans abroad, but many of them made their way back to Korea.[657] On a postcard with the Taegeukgi An Jung-geun scribed "Daehan *doklip*" with the blood from his severed finger, one of each type of photographs were incorporated into the four corners. Despite Japanese censorship, the demand and popularity of An's portrait imagery continued throughout the late 1920s, and many Koreans kept the portraits to remind themselves of An Jung-geun's bravery and reaffirm their determination to seek Korean independence.[658] Independence activists even kept the postcards as a good-luck charm.[659] An Jung-geun's assassination of Itō in 1909 and his execution and Korean annexation in 1910 marked a shift in Korean nation-building. From this point on, the Korean people, rather than the state, king, or minority intellectuals became the main protagonists of nationalistic movements, and the idea of collective resistance against Japan was realized and persisted throughout the colonial period. (Fig. 3.76.)

Independence Hall of Korea, "An Jung-geun sajin yeopseo," *Doklip Ginyeomgwan* (blog), https://search.i815.or.kr/sojang/read.do?isTotalSearch=Y&science=&adminId=1-019897-122, accessed 30 June, 2022.

[656] This photograph was also highly sought after and banned by Japanese authorities. Yun Byeong-seok, "An Jung-geun ui sajin," 416–17.

[657] "Syajin sagasio uiga itjimothal guinyeom," *Gwoneop sinmun*, 17 January, 1914 in Sin Un-yong, "An Jung-geun ui minjok undong yeon-gu," 188.

[658] Sin Un-yong, "An Jung-geun ui minjok undong yeon-gu," 166.

[659] Sin Un-yong, *An Jung-geun gwa Hanguk geundaesa* (Seoul: Chaeryun, 2009), 423.

Portrait images of martyrs were differentiated from royal portraits, traditional *gongsin* portraits, and even portrait illustrations of heroic historic figures. Not only did portraits of martyrs represent the highest form of patriotism and self-sacrifice to resist colonial rule, but they were not selected or distributed in a top-down, statist, or elitist manner. Independence activists and martyrs from the 1910s were not kings nor mythical figures in historic texts. Many of them, despite being members of the social elite, were individuals who sacrificed their lives for the betterment of the Korean nation, even in the absence of a sovereign governing body. The rise of the more relatable martyr imagery in the colonial period marked the beginnings of the democratisation of portrait imagery under colonial repression, which further created an intimate yet powerful emotional connection between ordinary individuals and the state-less, invisible Korean nation. Through this process, martyrs became representative of the people-based nation and motivated the Korean masses to recover sovereignty and independence.

3.4. Conclusion

The active production and consumption of portrait images in Korea in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries links to the establishment of diplomatic ties with Western powers and the introduction of photography and mass print media as part of modernisation and reformation movements. This brought about a major shift from traditional ways of creating, displaying, and consuming portrait images. The period was a pivotal stage of understanding and appropriating Western portrait imagery and its impacts on national and state representation. King Gojong was open to the adoption of new technologies and visual media and sat for photographs and oil paintings that were given to foreign representatives as part of diplomatic exchanges from the 1880s. These early royal portraits were not only amiable state-level gestures but were also representations of Korea, the unknown country of the Far East. It was also the first time that an image of the Korean king had left palace grounds, signalling a significant shift in Korean visual culture. Royal portraits were no longer seen as physical or spiritual extensions of the divine monarch but tools of representation.

The late 1890s to 1910, when print technology was significantly improved, was a period when portrait images were used for public edification. By this time, visual imagery in the form of photographs and printed illustrations were further proliferated and substantially commercialised. The image of the Korean ruler was publicly disseminated from the late 1890s and further proliferated throughout the first decade of the twentieth century in order to induce close emotional connection between the Korean public and their leader. Royal portraits of King and Emperor Gojong and Sunjong openly represented Korean rulership and fostered direct emotional affiliation between

the public by revealing the face of the monarch for the first time in Joseon history. Personal consumption of these imagery also significantly increased from the 1910s, reflecting the successful cohesion between ruler and nation at the turn of the twentieth century.

Portraits of prominent historical figures were used toward 1910 to educate the public of national history. After the end of the Sino-Japanese War in 1895 and the proclamation of the Korean Empire in 1897, Korea had to newly establish themselves as an independent and autonomous nation-state by departing from the traditional tributary relationship with China, which involved the redesigning of an autonomous Korean history. The implementation of modern educational agendas, an increase in modern educational institutions, and the emergence of non-state actors facilitated a new direction of nation-building that took to education as a form of salvaging and restoring the strength of the Korean nation-state. These non-state actors led the edification of Korean national identity and collective memory and standardised the narrative of Korean history taught in school. Portrait images employed in textbooks and newspapers became a novel yet effective way of educating children and adults alike, especially the illiterate who constituted the bulk of the population.[660] Character-driven narratives in history textbooks, aided by portrait images, materialised history and abstract collective memory that the individuals of the Korean public could not directly experience.

The standardisation of historical narratives was impacted by contemporary political circumstances wherein Korean sovereignty was constantly threatened. This directly influenced the creation of a sole ethnic progenitor, Dangun, whose image was

[660] Schmid, *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919,* 52–53.

popularised in textbooks and religious paintings of the period. Historical narratives that emphasised distinctly Korean ethnic origins and common ancestry, resulting in an ethnocentric nationalism that still persist today. Moreover, as foreign threat to Korean sovereignty and independence intensified, key historic figures who encouraged heroic acts of patriotism in defending the country from foreign invasion played crucial roles in formulating resistant nationalism through history education.

The period after 1905 and throughout the 1910s also saw a stronger input of Japanese agents in image production, both public and private, owing to the ever-increasing Japanese population and political intervention in Korea. In particular, the 1905 Treaty that forced Korea to relinquish its diplomatic sovereignty ignited an explosive reaction by individual intellectuals, the press, students, and civil organisations. Nationalism based on resistance against Japanese colonial rule gained immense strength, and in this process, photographs and paintings of martyrs and independence activists further compelled the public to fight for Korean sovereignty.

Royal portraits also played a key role in fuelling resistant nationalism toward and after annexation. Paintings and photographs of Gojong and Sunjong, was a reminder of the Korean nation-state that needed salvation. These portrait images aroused great nostalgia for the independent and sovereign Korean nation-state and induced the collective drive for mass independence movements, especially after the death of Gojong in 1919. Representative icons of resistance in the form of portrait imagery highlighted the national boundaries of stateless Korea and the ruling Japanese Empire, signalling the beginning of people-led independence movements that continued throughout the colonial period.

Chapter 4. Geographic Imagery

4.1. Introduction

Though the importance of placeness in defining the nation-state has been widely recognised in academia and seems to be self-evident in today's discussion of the nation-state, the modern conception of national territory had to be actively learned and educated in Korea at the turn of the twentieth century. Public education of modern geography and territorial awareness at this time was facilitated by the proliferation of visual imagery. Although Korea had been receiving Western knowledge and technology from the late nineteenth century, both indirectly via China before the opening of ports and directly after the signing of treaties with Western nations in the 1880s, it was not until the 1890s when mass print media advanced that discussion on the placeness of the Korean nation-state took place. New terms and ideas surrounding space and territory began to be used in mass media and the fusion of the empty and abstract 'space' (*gong-gan,* 공간, 空間) with a specified and unique human experience created 'placeness' (*jangsoseong*, 장소성, 場所性) of the nation-state.[661]

In these early years, instead of abstract terminologies of abstract space, pre-existent terms surrounding physical territory, such as *yeongto* (영토, 領土, territory) or *gangsan* (강산, 江山, land, landscape) were frequently used, but even *yeongto* was not used in *Hwangseong sinmun* until 1900 and in the Hangeul-print *Daehan maeil sinbo*

---

[661] Gu Chun-mo, "Choe Nam-seon ui gihaengmun e natanan gyeong-gwan insik gwa minjok jeongcheseong ui gwan-gye" (Master's thesis, Cheongju, Korea National University of Education, 2016), 17; Park Tae-ho, "Geundae gyemong-gi sinmun eseo yeongtojeok gong-gan gaenyeom ui hyeongseong," 145-149.

until 1905.[662] The development of the idea of modern territory was slow and gradual; in early newspaper articles, *gangto* (강토, 疆土) was used to describe the land of a country, first appearing in *Doklip sinmun* and *Hwangseong sinmun* in 1898 and *Daehan maeil sinbo* from 1904.[663] It was often indicative of quantifiable land, used to describe the vastness of a country or land that was to be protected and preserved.[664] For instance, *Doklip sinmun*'s article that explains international law in 1899 writes that "There is no better age than now to protect the country's land (*gangto*) and govern the people."[665] From 1905, *gangto* was used more frequently, and was synonymous with *yeongto* in that it referred to the modern national territory, tied in with concepts of national sovereignty. Interestingly, many articles used the term to stress the importance of preserving territory from invasion or threat. For instance, in criticising Iljinhoe (일진회, 一進會), *Daehan maeil sinbo* wrote in 1907, "Each day the country's welfare and the people's lives are deteriorating as the officials of the Korean government has sold off your land (*gangto*) and sold your people as slaves…"[666]

The slow but gradual appearance of terminologies surrounding national territory is suggestive of the growing interest in the idea of placeness of the Korean nation-state. Indeed, solidifying the geographic boundaries of a nation-state in both the terms of international law and popular recognition is an integral part in nation-

---

[662] More descriptive terms like *gangsan* and *sancheon* (산천, 山川) that retained a traditional and naturalistic connotation to territory and space were also used to express the beauty or pride of land and landscape. Park Tae-ho, "Geundae gyemong-gi sinmun eseo yeongtojeok gong-gan gaenyeom ui hyeongseong," 150–51.

[663] Park Tae-ho, "Geundae gyemong-gi sinmun eseo yeongtojeok gong-gan gaenyeom ui hyeongseong," 151.

[664] Park Tae-ho, "Geundae gyemong-gi sinmun eseo yeongtojeok gong-gan gaenyeom ui hyeongseong," 154.

[665] "Nonseol," *Doklip sinmun*, 5 October, 1899.

[666] "Nonseol," *Daehan maeil sinbo*, 11 September, 1907.

building.[667] Legal and international recognition of the country's territory and its boundaries is a prerequisite to arguing the sovereignty of a modern nation-state, but equally so is the public communication of the intangible idea of nationhood through a homogeneous and *real* territory. For the individual, national territory is an abstract idea. The average person cannot realistically perceive and directly experience the scope of the nation-state without the help of secondary and symbolic representation of territory in a much smaller and abbreviated scale. This is where geographic imagery, including maps, its icons, and images of landmarks and landscapes facilitate the understanding of invisible boundaries of the nation-state.[668] This chapter will investigate how images of Korean geography, including maps, simplified images of the Korean Peninsula (Hanbando, 한반도, 韓半島), cityscapes of Seoul, and landscapes of Geumgangsan Mountain (금강산, 金剛山, Diamond Mountains) and Baekdusan Mountain (백두산, 白頭山) provided tangible references to the territory and placeness of the Korean nation-state.

[667] David Storey, *Territories: The Claiming of Space* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2012), 8–10, https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/soas-ebooks/reader.action?docID=958674, accessed 9 September, 2022.
[668] Storey, *Territories,* 111–12.

4.2. Map of Korea

4.2.a. Identifying Boundaries and Placing Korea

Maps of late Joseon and the Korean Empire reveal the complex and multi-layered methods and objectives of visualising the nation-state. The close relationship between maps and the forging of modern national identity has been widely recognised:

> "[…] maps are not just important for analysis, research and illustration; mapping has been linked to national identity from the beginnings of modern nationalism because maps are crucial to visualize the nation, to make its territory tangible. While verbal references to natural boundaries, such as rivers and mountain ranges can provide a general idea of the extent of the nation, only maps show clear and unambiguous boundaries."[669]

Indeed, maps provide visual proof of the existence of a secured and self-determined territory and solidify the public's collective identification as citizens of a united and sovereign nation-state. Maps in the modern world also placed nations among nations; it gave countries a unique place in the international arena and made them members of the system of sovereign nation-states. However, this modern role of maps was not immediately apparent after the reception of modern cartography in Korea but gradually developed at the turn of the twentieth century.

In the Joseon period, maps mainly had a practical, navigational function, and were mostly used for political and administrative purposes or for military operations. Many national maps that included information on the geographic locations of villages,

[669] Guntram H. Herb, *Under the Map of Germany: Nationalism and Propaganda 1918-1945* (New York: Routledge, 1997); David H. Kaplan and Guntram H. Herb, "How Geography Shapes National Identities," *National Identities* 13, no. 4 (November 2011): 355–56.

towns, cities, mountain ranges, rivers, streams, roads, government offices, forts, and even scenic spots were produced from the founding of the Joseon kingdom in order to sustain a new centralised government.[670] The Joseon state also produced maps for defence purposes, particularly of regions surrounding the Duman-gang River (두만강, 豆滿江) in the northeast frontier and Amrokgang River (압록강, 鴨綠江) in the northwest to keep in check the continuing threat of invasion, in addition to creating maps of Japan that also posed a consistent threat from the Goryeo period.[671] In addition to these pragmatic functions, some maps were also pictorial and decorative in nature, produced and consumed as pictures, painted on silk, and in forms of hanging scrolls or folding screens.[672] From the eighteenth century, private commissions of maps increased, leading to a rise in diversity and general quality of map-making.[673]

In the Joseon period, however, scaled maps- especially those of the entire Korean Peninsula- were not popular commodities since such elaborate maps were mainly used for state-led projects and governance. The shape and size of topography expressed in maps would also vary according to the size of the paper and the skill of the artist or cartographer.[674] Although the lack of precise scale measurement and modern printing techniques restricted the consistency of Joseon maps, detailed and relatively accurately scaled maps were commissioned and produced.[675]

---

670 Bang Dong-in, *Hanguk jido ui yeoksa*, 47–49.
671 Bang Dong-in, *Hanguk jido ui yeoksa,* 47.
672 Bang Dong-in, *Hanguk jido ui yeoksa,* 54.
673 Park Jeong-ae, *Joseon sidae Pyeong-an-do Hamgyeong-do silgyeong sansuhwa* (Seoul: Sungkyunkwan University, 2014), 16.
674 Bang Dong-in, *Hanguk jido ui yeoksa*, 53–54.
675 Sin Eun-gyeong, "Jiri gong-gan ui damronhwa gwajeong e daehan ilgochal: Sinjeung dong-guk yeoji seungram gwa Taekriji reul jungsim euro", *Jeongsin munhwa yeon-gu* 32, no. 1 (March 2009): 313–43; Bang Dong-in, *Hanguk jido ui yeoksa,* 56-119.

In late Joseon, Jeong Sang-gi (정상기, 鄭尙驥, 1678-1752) used a unique scale, *baek-ri cheok* (백리척, 百里尺) to produce an even more accurate scaling system that was used to create *Dong-guk jido* (동국지도, 東國地圖).[676] In this period, Western geographic knowledge and cartography also entered Joseon through China as missionaries such as Matteo Ricci (1552-1610), Giulio Alenio (1582-1642), and Ferdinand Verbiest (1623-1688) led major measurement operations to create extensive maps of China.[677] In particular, the Jesuit priest Matteo Ricci played a central role in the introduction of Western cartography to China, and further to the rest of East Asia. In 1602, Ricci and Ming scholar and astronomer Li Zhizao (K. Yi Ji-jo, 이지조, 李之藻, 1571-1630) produced a woodblock print world map, *Gonyeo man-guk jeondo* (곤여만국전도, 坤與萬國全圖, Ch. *Kunyu wanguo quantu*) which encompassed new knowledge of continents, oceans, and modern astronomy, including explanations of the spherical earth, diagrams of solar and lunar eclipses, and celestial orientation.[678] (Fig. 4.3.)

World maps that displaced China from the centre of the world rattled the traditional Sinocentric world view of the Chinese and also led to the proliferation of

---

[676] Although *Dong-guk jido* (circa 1740) is also lost today, *Dong-guk daejido* (동국대지도, 東國大地圖, 1755-1767) housed in the National Museum of Korea is considered to be a very close reproduction created during King Yeong-jo's reign (Fig. 4.1., Fig. 4.2.)

[677] Bang Dong-in, *Hanguk jido ui yeoksa*, 58, 162–77. Ricci's map and books made their way to Joseon through envoys to China from 1603, while Alenio's book *Jikbang oegi* (직방외기, 職方外紀, 1623) was brought to Joseon by envoy Jeong Du-won (정두원, 鄭斗源, 1581-?) and translator Yi Yeong-jun (이영준, 李榮俊,?-?) in 1631.

[678] Kim Gi-hyeok, "Matteo Ritchi Gonyeo man-guk jeondo yeon-gu 1," *Jirihak nonchong* 45 (February 2005): 151, 162; Seo Tae-yeol, "Mateo Richi ui Gonyeo man-guk jeondo e gisuldoen segye jiri naeyong ui bunseok," *Hanguk jiri hakhoeji* 7, no. 3 (December 2018): 319–36.

modern cartographic measurement of longitude, as well as the general expansion of geographic and scientific knowledge in the East.[679] Copies of Ricci's map were widely dispersed throughout East Asia from its initial creation and was reproduced in Joseon, including a surviving 8-panel copy of *Gonyeo man-guk jeondo* (1708) that was commissioned during King Sukjong's reign, attributed to court painter Kim Jin-yeo (김진여, 金振汝, ?-?).[680] (Fig. 4.4.) However, it took more than another century for Joseon maps to decidedly move away from Sinocentric conventions of map making and visual representation of Korea's national territory.

In the meanwhile, modelled on Jeong Sang-gi's eighteenth century map, Kim Jeong-ho (김정호, 輿地圖, 1804-1866) produced his celebrated masterpiece, *Daedong yeojido* (대동여지도, 大東輿地圖, 1861), a scaled map with the ratio of approximately 160,000:1 that captures the entire Korean Peninsula in immaculate detail and accuracy.[681] (Fig. 4.5.) Unlike preceding maps that were produced as visual appendices to books, and thus included many written notes, *Daedong yeojido* showed its originality as an independent map with thorough visual reference to geographic information and deliberately omitted written notes.[682] Yet, even these maps were not targeted for the general public. *Daedong yeojido* was woodcut to facilitate reproduction, but it was approximately 6.7m in height and 3.8m in width; the production of these large-scale, detailed maps was not only time consuming, but correspondingly

[679] Bang Dong-in, *Hanguk jido ui yeoksa*, 162–69.
[680] Kim Gi-hyeok, "Matteo Ritchi Gonyeo man-guk jeondo yeon-gu 1," 142.
[681] Kim Jeong-ho also produced *Cheong-gudo* (청구도, 靑邱圖, 1834), the largest surviving Joseon map of the Korean Peninsula.
[682] Bang Dong-in, *Hanguk jido ui yeoksa*, 237–38. Even Kim Jeong-ho's *Cheong-gudo* of 1834 had many notes written in it.

expensive.[683] Thus, such accurately scaled national maps were still primarily produced and used for state-led political, administrative, and military purposes.

While it is unknown how common the knowledge of the image of the Korean Peninsula was among the Joseon public, it is highly probable that national identification via maps and images of the Korean territory was not a conceivable interest, both for the state and the common person. Yet, fortunately, the idea of the boundaries of Joseon territory, primarily the northern boundary, were largely consistently set around the Duman-gang River and Amrokgang River, notwithstanding periodic political aspirations to retrieve Goguryeo's old territories of Liaodong (요동, 遼東).[684] Although the visual perception of these precise boundaries and national territory may have been wanting among the public, the conceptual knowledge of national territory persisted in reference to key geographical landmarks such as Duman-gang River and Amrokgang River in many literature and popular culture that revealed Joseon consciousness of the national border.[685] The prevalent use of common phrases, such as *bando samcheon ri* (반도 삼천리, three thousand ri of the peninsula) or *samcheon ri geumsu gangsan* (삼천리 금수강산, three thousand ri of beautiful scenery) embodied the idea of a common geographical space that belonged to the Korean nation.[686]

---

683 Measurements are the approximate of the collated prints of the *Daedong yeojido* woodblocks housed in the National Museum of Korea.

684 Park In-ho, "Nam Gu-man gwa Yi Se-gu ui yeoksa jiri yeon-gu: Nam Gu-man ui dongsa byeonjeung, Yi Se-gu ui Dong-guk Samhan sagun gogeum gang-yeokseol eul jungsim euro," *Yeoksa hakbo* 138 (June 1993): 33–72; Ryu Si-hyeon, "Hanmal Ilje cho Hanbando e gwanhan jirijeok insik: Bando nonui reul jungsim euro," *Hanguksa yeon-gu* 137 (June 2007): 272.

685 Park In-ho, "Nam Gu-man gwa Yi Se-gu ui yeoksa jiri yeon-gu," 38-39; Ryu Si-hyeon, "Hanmal Ilje cho Hanbando e gwanhan jirijeok insik," 273-274.

686 Ryu Si-hyeon, "Hanmal Ilje cho Hanbando e gwanhan jirijeok insik," 273–74. 'Ri' was a measurement of distance used in Joseon, amounting to approximately 400 to 440

From the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, territoriality became a critical component of building a modern Korean nation-state; "[t]he contemporary nation-state's departure from the pre-modern state consisted of both its establishment of clearly marked borders rather than ambiguous frontiers and its development as a political form that became increasingly associated with territorial rather than dynastic markers."[687] The replacement of ambiguous 'areas' of borders with specified and legally stipulated borderlines marked the departure from Sinocentric East Asian relations where territorial autonomy was reliant on mutual trust and familial and hierarchical relationships.[688] Moreover, the positioning of Joseon in the new modern world map was also a metaphorical placement of the country among other sovereign nation-states.

As Joseon slowly withdrew from the Sinocentric map of the world, the production of scaled and scientifically verifiable maps became a prerequisite, not just in solidifying territorial boundaries, but in geographically and politically placing Korea within the new internationalised arena. There was a growing demand for maps of Joseon among Western countries. In the West, maps had already become common "scientific tool[s] to identify spatial patterns and relationships" and to "demystify the West" under the influence of Alexander von Humboldt (1769-1859).[689] Such demystification led to accurate understanding of fixed locations of countries, as well as their relative positions in the world among nations. All countries constituted a specific place on the atlas as homogeneous blocks of territories, and increasingly accurate

---

metres.

[687] Shapiro, "Nation-States," 279.

[688] Park Seon-yeong, "Geundae Dong Asia ui gukgyeong insik gwa Gando," 202.

[689] Schulten, *Mapping the Nation*, 3–4.

depictions of the Korean Peninsula began to frequently appear in Western world maps from the nineteenth century. The first Joseon Roman Catholic priest, Kim Dae-geon (김대건, 金大建, 1821-1846, also known as André Kim) was a rare late Joseon cartographer who contributed to the dissemination of accurate maps of Joseon during this period.[690] In 1845, he created *Joseon jeondo* (조선전도, 朝鮮全圖, Carte de la Corée) which was sent to Paris in 1849.[691] (Fig. 4.6.)

General interest in the national territory and geography of the Korean Peninsula greatly increased at the turn of the twentieth century. However, strict and accurate usage of Western cartography was yet to be applied and Joseon cartographers tended to rely on Sinocentric knowledge and customs, such as marking seasonal demarcations on top of lines of longitude and latitude or relying on Chinese copies of maps produced by Western missionaries such as Ricci and Alenio.[692] Wider usage of modern cartographic measurement in Joseon map-making flourished toward the end of the nineteenth century.[693] National maps were mostly produced by Japanese cartographers using their topographic surveys of the peninsula conducted after the Sino-Japanese War in 1895, during the Russo-Japanese War in 1904, and after annexation in 1910.[694] Nevertheless,

---

[690] André Kim provided translations of Western world maps and geography texts for the Joseon government during his incarceration for his religious beliefs in 1846 and before his execution in the same year. Lee Won-sun, "Kim Dae-geon: Hanguk gyohoe ui hyangdoja ro sungyo han cheongnyeon saje," *Hanguksa simin gangjwa* 30 (February 2002): 183.

[691] Jeong In-cheol, *Hanbando, Seoyang gojido ro mannada,* 245–46; Song Ran-hui and Lee Yong-ho, "Dasi chajeun Kim Dae-geon sinbu ui Joseon jeondo (Carte de La Corée)," *Gyohoesa yeon-gu* 55 (December 2019): 275–301.

[692] Jeong Eun-ju, "Joseon jisikin ui jido jejak gwa jiri insik," *Hangukhak nonjip* 69 (December 2017): 123–31.

[693] Park Seon-yeong, "Hanguk geundae jihyeongdo ui sojang hyeonhwang gwa teukjing: Guknaeoe juyo sojangcheo reul jungsim euro," *Hanguk gojido yeon-gu* 11, no. 1 (June 2019): 94.

[694] Park Seon-yeong, "Hanguk geundae jihyeongdo ui sojang hyeonhwang gwa

education of the location of the Korean Peninsula was repeatedly taught in school using simplified world maps from the late 1890s.[695]

From the onset of the Gabo Reforms, great value was placed on geographic education as a means to achieve national prosperity and power, and in 1895, domestic geography became a compulsory subject in most curricula.[696] By 1900, geography textbooks, monographs, and magazine articles began to be actively published, pointing to the increased interest in geographic education among the wider public. For instance, *Hanseong sunbo* printed 16 geography-related articles from its first to its fourteenth issue.[697] (Fig. 4.7.) In addition, more than 18 geography textbooks were published from 1889 to 1910, reflecting the invigorated interest and passion for geographic knowledge and education at the turn of the twentieth century.[698] Modern geographic education from the end of the nineteenth century aimed to escape from traditional perceptions of nature, provide information of the modern world outside Korea, and break down Sinocentric views of the world.[699]

---

teukjing," 94–95.

[695] *Hanseong sunbo* first printed an illustration of the world map on 31 October, 1883. Seo Eun-yeong, "Geundae inswae munhwa ui hyeongseong gwa Daehan minbo 'saphwa' ui deungjang," 548.

[696] Nam Sang-jun, "Gaehwagi geundae gyoyuk jedo wa jiri gyoyuk," *Jiri gyoyuk nonjip* 19, no. 1 (June 1988): 108–9.

[697] Jang Bo-ung, "Gaehwagi ui jiri gyoyuk," *Jirihak* 5, no. 1 (May 1970): 42; Hong Sun-ae, "Geundae gyemong-gi jirijeok sangsangryeok gwa seosajeok jaehyeon," *Hyeondae soseol yeon-gu* 40 (April 2009): 361.

[698] Hong Sun-ae, "Geundae gyemong-gi jirijeok sangsangryeok gwa seosajeok jaehyeon," 361–62; Park Ju-won, "1900-nyeondae choban danhaengbon gwa gyogwaseo tekseuteu e natanan sahoe damron ui teukseong," in *Geundae gyeomong-gi jisik ui balgyeon gwa sayu jipyeong ui hwakdae* (Seoul: Somyeong Chulpan, 2012), 117–44.

[699] Sin Su-gyeong, "Ilje gangjeomgi jiri gyogwaseo saphwa yeon-gu," 250.

Homer Hulbert wrote and published Korea's first geography textbook, *Samin pilji* (사민필지, 士民必知) around 1891.[700] The book was also the first to be written entirely in Hangeul. Hulbert's preface in his geography textbook written in Hangeul explains his intentions for writing the book:

> "The state of the world today is very different from before. In the past, countries had only to protect its own land and follow its own customs, but now all countries of the world have exchanged vows. People, goods, and customs are exchanged as if they are within a single house. This new order of the world cannot be changed, and because it cannot be changed, countries can no longer simply learn their own language and knowledge like in the past. […] In addition to previous subjects that were learned, students need to learn the names and size of different countries, their regions, terrains, produce, political and economic circumstances, military forces, customs, academics and ethics."[701]

Hulbert also made sure to include 9 illustrations in his textbook and made the effort to use quality maps from "old wood cuts" that he received from his brother Henry Hulbert in the United States.[702] (Fig. 4.8., Fig. 4.9., Fig. 4.10., Fig. 4.11., Fig. 4.12., Fig. 4.13., Fig. 4.14., Fig. 4.15., Fig. 4.16.) Although the text was printed in Japan due to the lack of decent lead Hangeul types in Seoul in the late 1880s, Hulbert

---

[700] There are several different opinions surrounding the exact date of publication, ranging from 1888 to 1891. Choi Bo-yeong, "Yukyeong Gong-won ui seolrip gwa unyeong siltae jaegochal," *Hanguk doklip undongsa yeon-gu* 42 (August 2012): 302.

[701] Homer B. Hulbert, *Samin pilji*, 1891, trans. Baek Nam-gyu and Yi Myeong-sang (Seoul: Hakbu, 1895), 6–7.

[702] Homer B. Hulbert, "Hulbert to His Mother," 25 March, 1890, https://search.i815.or.kr/contents/independenceFighter/detail.do?independenceFighterId=3-008785-101, accessed 10 September, 2022; Gang Se-yeong, "Heolbeoteu ui gyoyuk gwanryeon hwaldong yeon-gu: Geu ui seosin jungsim euro" (Master's thesis, Cheongju, Korea National University of Education, 2013), 20.

commissioned a Korean craftsman to carve out the maps and printed the map images in Seoul.[703] Hulbert's letter to his mother provides some intriguing information on how he produced the map imagery:

> "The past week has brought to me one great pleasure and source of gratification namely the perfect success in the working out of the maps for my books. You must understand that up to this time no woodcut has been made here which has required the delicacy and skill which this man has shown in the execution of these maps. When I gave him the map of Europe worked out with a fine steel pen and containing an enormous amount of work for the engraver or cutter I never dreamed that he would be able to bring me anything like a perfect woodcut of it, but if you will believe me, he improved on my drawing. In several places where there was so little space for a name that I could scarcely crowd it in he has produced it fairly and neatly, and the fine hair lines I need to indicate the seacoast he has done better than I. I will have a copy stuck off and send it to you that you may see how well it is done. It will give you an idea of the skill of the Koreans."[704]

Although it is a shame that Hulbert fails to mention a name for the engraver responsible for this fine skill, the letter reveals the fact that woodcuts for textbook illustrations took

---

[703] Underwood found and purchased Hangeul types in Japan for Hulbert's publication. Homer B. Hulbert, "Hulbert to Henry," 23 September, 1890, https://search.i815.or.kr/contents/independenceFighter/detail.do?independenceFighterId=3-008785-114, accessed 10 September, 2022; Homer B. Hulbert, "Hulbert to Henry," 29 May, 1890, https://search.i815.or.kr/contents/independenceFighter/detail.do?independenceFighterId=3-008785-106, accessed 10 September, 2022.

[704] Homer B. Hulbert, "Hulbert to His Mother," 23 November, 1890, https://search.i815.or.kr/contents/independenceFighter/detail.do?independenceFighterId=3-008785-119, accessed 10 September, 2022.

place in Seoul by the 1890s, at a level that was fully satisfactory, even in Western standards. It is likely that the production of later illustrations also took place through similar processes.

From these visual aids, Hulbert explained basic concepts of astronomy and placed Korea within a scientifically verified map of the world, using the Mercator system.[705] Moreover, Hulbert used English names of countries, signalling a departure from Sinocentric naming in Korean textbooks.[706] Hulbert's textbook was published during his final year of teaching at Yukyeong Gongwon (육영공원, 育英公院), but it is most likely that the book was also read by the public as Hulbert printed at least 2,000 copies.[707] Hulbert's textbook seems to have been incredibly popular as Kim Hong-jip instructed the translation of the book into a Hanmun version in 1895 in order to increase readership of the book among the yangban class who were still reluctant to learn Hangeul.[708] The impact of this illustrated textbook seems to have been significant, and textbooks in the 1890s increasingly made use of maps in order to deliver geographic information and to place Korea in the modern world.

---

[705] The Mercator projection is the standard map projection method that represents north as up and inflates objects according to the distance away from the equator due to its cylindrical projection.

[706] Min Hyeon-sik, "Gaehwagi Hangeul bon 'Samin pilji' e daehayeo," *Gukeo gyoyuk* 100 (1999): 377–78.

[707] The textbook was also used in Hanseong Sabeom Hakgyo (한성사범학교, 漢城師範學校) when Hulbert began his work there from 1897. Hulbert had planned to print 1,000 to begin with, but decided to print 2,000 at the encouragement of Canadian missionary James S. Gale (1863-1937). Gang Se-yeong, "Heolbeoteu ui gyoyuk gwanryeon hwaldong yeon-gu," 20–22; Kim Hyeong-mok, "Hanguk munhwa ui ususeong gwa Ilje chimryak manhaeng eul segye e alrida, Heolbeoteu," *Girokin*, 2014, 66–67; Homer B. Hulbert, "Hulbert to Henry," 15 June, 1890, https://search.i815.or.kr/contents/independenceFighter/detail.do?independenceFighterId=3-008785-108, accessed 10 September, 2022.

[708] Homer B. Hulbert, *Samin pilji*.

The overall image of maps of Korea and its territory was made accessible to an even wider public through their dissemination in mass publication from the late 1890s. In 1899, *Daehan jeondo* (대한전도, 大韓全圖), a national map with longitude and latitude markers was distributed by the publishing department of Hakbu and printed in Hyeon Chae's geography textbook, *Daehan sinjiji* (대한지지, 大韓地誌, 1899).[709] (Fig. 4.17.) However, this early map displayed a mixture of traditional and modern map-making; although it contains longitude and latitude lines, it uses Beijing as the Prime Meridian rather than Greenwich.[710] In a later version of *Daehan jeondo* printed by Jang Ji-yeon (장지연, 張志淵, 1864-1921) as part of his textbook *Daehan sinjiji* (대한신지지, 大韓新地志, 1907), Greenwich is used. (Fig. 4.18.) As such, public recognition and acceptance of the 'reality' of the Korean Empire among the Korean public was facilitated through the media of maps; the Korean Empire existed on a homogenised geometric field governed by longitude and latitude rather than the traditional and hierarchical space of heaven and earth.[711]

Awareness of the geographic location and traits of the Korean Peninsula was not only knowledge that was compulsory for the education of individuals, but also a prerequisite to fostering a competitive and patriotic nation. (Fig. 4.19.) For instance, in *Chodeung sohak* (1906), Chapter 1 of Volume 5, titled "Daehan Jeguk," shows a map of the Korean Peninsula and elaborates:

---

[709] Lee Jong-ho, "Choe Nam-seon ui jiri(hak)jeok gihoek gwa pyosang," *Sangheo hakbo* 22 (February 2008): 283–84.

[710] Seoul Museum of History, *(Lee Chan gijeung) Uri yet jido*, 219.

[711] Wakabayashi Mikio, *Jido ui sangsangryeok: Jido ga hyeonsil eul mobang haneun geot i anira hyeonsil i jido reul mobanghanda!*, trans. Jeong Seon-tae (Seoul: Sancheoreom, 2006), 23; Lee Jong-ho, "Choe Nam-seon ui jiri(hak)jeok gihoek gwa pyosang," 283–84.

"The country that we are born and raised in is Daehan Jeguk. Daehan Jeguk is in the east of the Asian Continent, three sides bound by the sea and the north by China. The gross area of the country is 2,000 bangri and the population is 20,000,000. The climate is cold and warm, plenty of grains are cultivated due to the fertile soil, and there are abundant minerals. It is the best country in the world. As we are born in such a great country, we must study hard and help enrich and strengthen the nation-state (*gukga*)."[712]

The promotion of the awareness and love of the country was made very clear, and students were led to associate the image of the Korean map with their duty to cherish and develop the nation-state. Hakbu-published *Gukeo dokbon*, also provided similar but relatively simpler maps of the peninsula. (Fig. 4.20., Fig. 4.21.) The textbook, which was widely used and emulated in style, was promoted by the Japanese Government-General as a model textbook.[713] Compared to *Chodeung sohak*, it limited itself to the delivery of objective, non-emotional information:

"Our Daehan-guk (대한국, 大韓國) is surrounded by the sea on three sides and joined to the continent on one side, with the Sea of Japan (Ilbonhae, 일본해, 日本海) in the east and the Yellow Sea (황해, 黃海) in the west. In the East Sea, there is no island outside Ulleungdo Island (울릉도, 鬱陵島), but there are countless islands in the sea of the southeast and Yellow Sea. Among those, the largest are Geojedo Island (거제도, 巨濟島), Namhaedo Island

[712] Hangukhak Munheon Yeon-guso, *Hanguk gaehwagi gyogwaseo chongseo*, vol. Gukeopyeon 4, 143–45.
[713] Park Min-yeong, "Gaehwagi gyogwaseo Sinchan chodeung sohak yeon-gu," 99–129.

(남해도, 南海島), Jindo Island (진도, 珍島), and Ganghwado Island (강화도, 江華島). Land that is surrounded by the sea on all sides are called an island (*seom*, 섬, 島), while that surrounded by the sea on three sides and conjoined to the continent on one side is called a peninsula (*bando*, 반도, 半島). Our Daehan-guk is a peninsula country. Our Daehan-guk is long to the north and south and short to the east and west. The vertical length is 3,000 ri and the horizontal length is 5 or 600 ri."[714]

Although the maps are very similar apart from the extensive labelling of regional names and the longitude and latitude markers in *Chodeung sohak*, messages conveyed through the map images differed. By the time *Gukeo dokbon* was published, from 1907 to 1909, Hakbu was already fully controlled by Japanese authorities who were apparently reluctant to add strong undertones of nationalistic pride or emotional affiliation to the image of the Korean Peninsula.

Textbooks with nationalistic overtones such as Jeong In-ho's *Choesin Daehan godeung jiji* were banned by colonial authorities after annexation. Jeong In-ho's geography textbook, however, is significant as a rare advanced-level textbook that includes numerous illustrations. The book is also nationalistic in its tone and labels the East Sea in the map of the Korean Peninsula as "Joseonhae" (조선해, 朝鮮海), which is hard to find in other contemporary maps that normally borrow Japanese labels of "Ilbonhae" (일본해, 日本海, Sea of Japan) or use "Donghae" (동해, 東海, East

[714] Hakbu, *(Botong hakdoyong) Gukeo dokbon sang*, ed. Kim Hye-ryeon and Jang Yeong-mi, Hanguk gaehwagi gukeo gyogwaseo 11 (Gwangmyeong: Gyeongjin, 2012), 145.

Sea).[715] (Fig. 4.22.) Despite the fact that nationalistic narratives were censored by colonial authorities, maps of the Korean Peninsula could not be banned. Thus, map imagery of Korea persevered as a symbol of the nation-state, strengthened by the popularisation of the simplified Hanbando image.

[715] For more on the issue of names of the East Sea, see Sim Jeong-bo, *Bulpyeonhan Donghae wa Ilbonhae: Godae eseo hyeondae ggaji Donghae wa Ilbonhae jimyeong eul yeoksajeok chujeok* (Seoul: Bapbuk, 2017).

4.2.b. Amalgamation of Nation and Territory

Notwithstanding the influx of 'scientific' maps and cartographic technology as well as the retention of the predominantly pragmatic use of maps, maps also signified a nationalistic rhetoric. From the end of the nineteenth century, the representativeness of map imagery went beyond simply reflecting accurate aerial views of the Korean Peninsula; it represented ideas of what the Korean nation-state should be. J. B. Harley sheds light on the common misconception that maps are neutral and value-free:

> "Maps are also rhetorical images. It is commonplace to say that cartography is an art of persuasion. What goes against modern wisdom is to suggest that *all* maps are rhetorical. Today's map makers distinguish maps that are impartial or objective from other maps used for propaganda or advertising that become "rhetorical" in a pejorative sense. Cartographers also concede that they employ rhetoric devices in the form of embellishment or ornament, but they maintain that beneath this cosmetic skin is always the bedrock of truthful science. What I am suggesting is that rhetoric permeates all layers of the map. As images of the world, maps are never neutral or value-free or ever completely scientific. Each map argues its own particular case. […] Most maps speak to targeted audiences, and most employ invocations of authority, especially those produced by government, and they appeal to readerships in different ways."[716]

The use of rhetoric in maps becomes more conspicuous the simpler the image becomes. Compared to the scaled and pragmatic national maps that highlighted the delivery of

---

[716] J.B. Harley, *The New Nature of Maps: Essays in the History of Cartography*, ed. Paul Laxton (Baltimore: The John's Hopkins University Press, 2001), 37.

geographic information, logo-like, simplified Hanbando images in textbooks, magazine covers, and articles functioned as convenient tools for embedding nationalistic messages.

As the increased public visibility of maps and public knowledgeability of recognising standardised visual depictions of Korean national territory greatly increased, simplified images of Hanbando gradually became iconised. Oftentimes, world maps that use the Mercator projection are presented with the territories of countries coloured in different shades to differentiate them from one another.[717] The world, as shown through this projection, consists of countries of unique shapes, much like pieces of jigsaw puzzles, but these 'shapes' are associated with the idea of a sovereign country, and people of a specific country are expected to know and identify with the shape of their national territory when imagining their country.[718]

According to Benedict Anderson, the "map-as-logo" has its origins from "the practice of the imperial states of colouring their colonies on maps with an imperial dye."[719]. For instance, London's imperial maps, British, French, Dutch colonies were coloured in red, blue, and yellow to distinguish each their own expansion of territory that resembled pieces of a jigsaw puzzle which allowed each "piece" to "be wholly detached from its geographic context."[720] The simplified "shapes" of these colonised territories were then used in posters, seals, letterheads, magazine and textbook covers, and other commercial objects.[721] The treatment of "map-as-logo" transformed maps of

---

[717] Wakabayashi Mikio, *Jido ui sangsangryeok,* 165–66.
[718] Wakabayashi Mikio, *Jido ui sangsangryeok*, 165–66.
[719] Anderson, *Imagined Communities,* 175.
[720] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 175.
[721] Anderson, *Imagined Communities,* 175.

function into icons of representation. In addition to the codified geographic information that maps contain, the mere shape of national territory became a symbolic and iconic representation of the nation-state and the surface onto which ethnic histories, national spirit and character, and the self-fulfilling sense of independence and autonomy was embedded. Placing Korea in the new world and identifying and internalising national territory was achieved with the help of such visual aids.

The Hanbando icon also provided a sense of "bounded totality beyond immediate experience of place."[722] Even if people weren't experienced or knowledgeable of the entirety of the Korean Peninsula, they were still able to identify with the Hanbando image and interpret it as a wholistic, bound unit of their homeland. In many ways, this association of Hanbando icon to the idea of the nation-state was a prerequisite to achieving the desired goal of public geography education; intellectuals of the period responsible for the creation of textbooks constantly strived to bring about the widespread acceptance of the conviction to use geographic awareness as a form of patriotism through nationalistic narratives that accompanied the Hanbando image. For instance, Jang Ji-yeon explained in his 1907 textbook *Daehan sinjiji* that France would colour in territories lost to Prussia in a different colour to raise awareness of national territory and instil in students the desire to retrieve the rightful national territory.[723] The emotional connection to visual renditions of national territory, even in the simplest forms, was emulated and much sought after by Korean intellectuals who aimed to foster

---

[722] Billig, *Banal Nationalism*, 69.
[723] Hong Sun-ae, "Geundae gyemong-gi jirijeok sangsangryeok gwa seosajeok jaehyeon," 364–65; Jang Ji-yeon, "Daehan sinjiji," in *Geundae gyemong-gi ui haksul, munye sasang*, ed. Minjok Munhaksa Yeon-guso (Seoul: Somyeong Chulpan, 2000), 268–89.

a collective nation committed to the idea of an independent and sovereign Korean nation-state. As such, maps as visual pointers became an integral part of creating a bond between the nation and their territory.

The increased frequency of exposure to map imagery, both scientific and popular, was key to prompting a "stronger identification and attachment with the territory" and making an "emblematic icon of the nation."[724] The icon of the Korean Peninsula provided consistency and versatility in symbolising the Korean nation-state after 1900 when mass print media developed. Not only geography textbooks but also history textbooks included maps of Korea. In history textbooks, simple illustrations of 'old maps' of Korea were also used to indicate Korean territory of previous dynasties. (Fig. 4.23.) These illustrations had the "purpose of not just documenting the past, but of fostering loyalty and love of country by explaining the path to nationhood."[725]

Toward annexation, more active utilisation of the Hanbando icon took place; in addition to the use of simplified maps and the 'silhouette' of the Korean Peninsula in textbooks and commercial print, visual metaphors of national territory were also utilised. Like spelling books targeted at young students that depict alphabets and words in association with relevant imagery, the comparison of national territory to objects, animals, or the shape of people is frequently used for geography or history education as it makes it easier to memorise the general shape of national boundaries. (Fig. 4.24., Fig. 4.25., Fig. 4.26., Fig. 4.27., Fig. 4.28.) In the Joseon period, the shape of the Korean Peninsula was often compared to that of an old man facing China:

---

[724] Kaplan and Herb, "How Geography Shapes National Identities," 357; Katariina Kosonen, "Making Maps and Mental Images: Finnish Press Cartography in Nation-Building, 1899-1942," *National Identities* 10, no. 1 (March 2008): 44.
[725] Schulten, *Mapping the Nation,* 4.

"People of the past have found our country to look like the shape of an old man with his head facing the west and bowing to China, hence the long history of friendly relations with China. It is also said that giants cannot emerge from our land as we do not have a thousand ri of water nor one hundred ri of land. This is why we have never been able to enter China and rule the empire when western barbarians and Jurchens were able to. We have only been able to care for our own land, with no other desires. However, because our land is remote and special, Gija became king on our land in order to avoid becoming a servant of Zhou. Hence, this land has become the home of a loyal servant's fidelity. Because this convention has been passed down and the grace of our land remains, we have surrendered to Qing yet we hold loyalty in gratitude of the assistance of their king, officials, and all classes of people during the Imjin Invasions."[726]

This explanation behind the comparison found in *Taekriji* (택리지, 擇里志, On Selecting a Village, 1751) reveals the Sinocentric perception of Joseon-Qing relation of the time.

From the twentieth century, however, new analogies gained prominence. In his 1903 article, "An Orographical Sketch of Korea," Japanese geologist Kotō Bunjirō (小藤 文次郎, 1856-1935) compared the shape of the Korean Peninsula to that of a rabbit and of an old man bowing toward China:

"As is well known, the outline of Italy is compared to that of a boot. That of Korea may be taken to represent a rabbit in a standing position with [Jeolla-do

[726] Yi Jung-hwan, "Sansu," in *Taekriji*, trans. Lee In-seong (Seoul: Eulyu Munhwasa, 1993), 149–96.

> Province (전라도, 全羅道)] for the hindlegs, [Chungcheong-do Province (충청도, 忠淸道)] for the anterior extremities, [Hwanghae-do Province (황해도, 黃海道)] and [Pyeong-an-do Province] for the head, and [Hamgyeong-do Province] for the disproportionally large ear; [Gangwon-do (강원도, 江原道)] and [Gyeongsang-do Province] will then correspond to the shoulders and back. The Koreans have their own fictitious representation of the outline of their country. The figure, they imagine, is that of an old man, his back bent with age, his arms folded in the attitude of paying paternal homage to China. They thought their country was by nature formed to be a dependency of the Middle Kingdom, and this notion drove its roots deep into the mind of the literary class, though it has been dispelled since the Sino-Japanese war of [1894]-95."[727]

Although Kotō Bunjirō's statement may have been intended to facilitate the visualisation of Korean territory for the foreign public unfamiliar with Korea, early Japanese colonial interests in depicting Korea as a weak and submissive country is evident. Moreover, his reference to the traditional comparison of the peninsula with a bowing man also emphasises the image of a country that is willingly subordinate to China.

To this, Korean historian Choe Nam-seon provided his own refutation in his magazine, *Sonyeon* (소년, 少年, 1908-1911), where he replaced Kotō Bunjirō's rabbit with a tiger. (Fig. 4.29.) Choe Nam-seon dedicated a section in the magazine's very first

---

[727] Kotō Bunjirō, "An Orographical Sketch of Korea," *The Journal of the College of Science* 19 (1903): 3.

issue to introduce Arnold Henry Guyot's (1807-1884) method of comparing the shape of national borders and costal lines to objects, animals, and people, using illustrations from Japanese geographer and educator Yazu Masanaga's (矢津昌永, 1863-1922, also referred to as Yaz Shoai) *Jirihak sopum* (J. *Chirigaku shōhin,* 지리학 소품, 地理學小品, 1902), where the shape of the "Sea of Japan" was compared to a rabbit.[728] (Fig. 4.30.) Moreover, by denying Kotō Bunjirō's rabbit and comparing the Korean Peninsula to the shape of a tiger, he consolidated the territory of the Korean Empire into an organic body that was strong, fierce, and proactive in spirit, rather than a tame, passive, and vulnerable rabbit hopping toward China.[729] He claimed that the peninsula is reminiscent of a whiskered tiger "with its hind legs closed together, front paws waving, and roaring and pouncing toward the Eurasian continent," and expressed a more aggressive and participatory attitude of Korea in its international relations.[730] In this way, Choe Nam-seon demonstrated how images of the map could be iconised and fused with nationalism to create a new idea of national territory.[731]

In the poem "Taebaekbeom (태백범, read Taebaekho, 태백호, 太白虎, Taebaek tiger)" in an issue of *Sonyeon*, November 1909, Choe Nam-seon uses his tiger illustration once again in order to emphasise the association of the Korean spirit with

[728] He also criticised traditional and premodern notions of fengshui and emphasised the new image of the Korean Peninsula as shown on modern maps. Jo Yun-jeong, "Japji Sonyeon gwa gukmin munhwa ui hyeongseong," *Hanguk hyeondae munhak yeon-gu* 21 (April 2007): 31; Gwon Jeong-hwa, "Choe Nam-seon ui chogi jeosul eseo natananeun jirijeok gwansim: Gaehwagi Yukdang ui munhwa undong gwa Meiji jimunhak ui yeonghyang," *Eungyong jiri* 13 (December 1990): 13–16.
[729] Lee Jong-ho, "Choe Nam-seon ui jiri(hak)jeok gihoek gwa pyosang," 287–88.
[730] Lee Jong-ho, "Choe Nam-seon ui jiri(hak)jeok gihoek gwa pyosang," 291; Ryu Si-hyeon, "Hanmal Ilje cho Hanbando e gwanhan jirijeok insik," 277–78.
[731] Lee Jong-ho, "Choe Nam-seon ui jiri(hak)jeok gihoek gwa pyosang," 287–88.

the honourable characteristics of a tiger. (Fig. 4.31., Fig. 4.32.) The Taebaeksan Mountain (태백산, 太白山) constitutes the so-called 'backbone' of the Korean peninsula as the mountain range stretches across the eastern edge of Korea. The ridge often symbolises the entirety of Korea's geographic terrains, which Choe Nam-seon strategically utilised in naming the tiger which in turn symbolised the Korean national spirit. He goes on to describe that the Taebaek tiger as a progressive and regal animal of 4,000 years that seeks honour and justice.[732]

Choe Nam-seon continued to strengthen the tiger-peninsula narrative in the 1920s. In a series of articles in *Donga ilbo* from January to February of 1926, he reiterated that the tiger was to Korea what the dragon is to China, the elephant to India, the lion to Egypt, and the wolf to Rome.[733] He drew connections from the Dangun mythology in which the tiger and bear symbolised local Korean tribes and emphasised the long history of the tiger in Korean civilization. Moreover, he argued that frequent and popular visual depictions of tigers in tomb murals of Goguryeo, metalware of Baekje, and folk paintings of the late Joseon period all demonstrate the longevity of, and inevitable connection between the Korean people and the tiger.[734] In this way, Choe Nam-seon attempted to create a new line of mythology to compose a stronger image and belief of the Korean nationhood.

Several magazine covers also utilised the Hanbando icon. Cover illustrations were novel in Korea in the 1890s but Chinmokhoe (친목회, 親睦會), a group of

---

[732] Mok Soo-hyun, "Gukto ui sigakjeok pyosang gwa aeguk gyeomong ui jirihak," 28–29; Choe Nam-seon, "Taebaekbeom (Taebaekho)," *Sonyeon*, November 1909.
[733] Mok Soo-hyun, "Gukto ui sigakjeok pyosang gwa aeguk gyeomong ui jirihak," 29–30.
[734] Mok Soo-hyun, "Gukto ui sigakjeok pyosang gwa aeguk gyeomong ui jirihak," 30.

Korean students in Japan, published *Chinmokhoe hoebo* (친목회회보, 親睦會會報) from 1896 to 1898 in Japan and decorated it with the map of Eurasia.[735] (Fig. 4.33.) From 1906, Hanbando images began to be used for cover designs and *Daehan Jaganghoe wolbo* (대한자강회월보, 大韓自强會月報, 1906-1907), *Daehan Hyeophoe hoebo* (대한협회회보, 大韓協會會報, 1908-1909), and *Gyoyuk wolbo* (교육월보, 教育月報, 1908) used map imagery to promote patriotic sentiments and public consciousness of the Korean nation-state.[736] (Fig. 4.34., Fig. 4.35., Fig. 4.36.) Hanbando logos continued to be used for decoration on print media throughout the colonial period, unlike Taegeukgi designs that were censored after the 1909 Publication Law.[737]

The Hanbando icon had several advantages in serving as a symbol of the Korean nation-state during the dynamic period from the opening of ports to annexation. First, as a seemingly objective and standardised image of the certifiable visual depiction of the Korean territory, the Hanbando image was also free from the restraints of internal political differences in nation-building. That is, no matter the political inclinations or desired agendas regarding social reform or modernisation, the image could be easily incorporated to express the larger vision or goals of nation-building. Both elites and

[735] Kim So-yeong, "Jae Il Joseon yuhaksaengdeul ui 'gukminron' gwa 'aegukron': Chinmokhoe hoebo (1896-1898) naeyong bunseok eul jungsim euro," *Hanguk minjok undongsa yeon-gu* 66 (March 2011): 5–48; An Nam-il, "1910-nyeon ijeon ui jae Ilbon Hanguk yuhaksaeng japji yeon-gu," *Hangukhak yeon-gu*, no. 58 (September 2016): 259–79.

[736] Seo Yu-ri, "Hanguk geundae ui japji pyoji imiji yeon-gu," 27–45; Hong Sun-pyo, "Gyeongseong ui sigak munhwa gongram jedo mit yutong gwa gwanjung ui tansaeng," 46.

[737] Hong Sun-pyo, "Gyeongseong ui sigak munhwa gongram jedo mit yutong gwa gwanjung ui tansaeng,"46.

commoners, conservatives and progressives, monarchists and republicans could all identify with the Hanbando icon with ease and affection. Secondly, the Hanbando icon also had a consistent form that was scientifically verified. Its reliability and uniformity stemmed from the tangibility and physically determinable nature of geographic terrains, as well as the long history of territorial recognition throughout much of Joseon history, both within domestic Korea and in the relation with neighbouring China.

The fact that Hanbando image was equated with the abstract but standardised space of national territory among the Korean people was used to overcome the emotional inclination to and self-identification with smaller, local regions based on direct experience and familiarity, a critical requirement for constructing a modern nation-state.[738] Popular expressions of the late Joseon period, mentioned above, such as *bando samcheon-ri* (반도 삼천리, 3000 ri of the peninsula) or *samcheon-ri geumsu gangsan* (삼천리 금수강산, 3000 ri of beautiful scenery) moved beyond the referral to specific regions into a "distinctive block of space and elicit shared values and meanings."[739] Moreover, the awareness of national territory was highly valued in society and the idea of territory was made inseparable from the fate of the collective nation, adding to the compelling affection for the image of the Korean Peninsula in the face of external threat to sovereignty toward and after the 1910s.[740]

Inevitably, the Hanbando image was also utilised as part of colonial propaganda after annexation. The Hanbando image was frequently coupled with the image of the

---

[738] Tuan Yi-fu, *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977), 176-178; Ryu Si-hyeon, "Hanmal Ilje cho Hanbando e gwanhan jirijeok insik," 273–74.
[739] Agnew, "Nationalism," 233.
[740] Ryu Si-hyeon, "Hanmal Ilje cho Hanbando e gwanhan jirijeok insik," 273–74.

Japanese Islands to promote the *naeseon ilche* (내선일체, 內鮮一體) ideology that argued that Korea and Japan were one entity. Commemorative postcards celebrating annexation and anniversaries of annexation are primary examples. (Fig. 4.37., Fig. 4.38., Fig. 4.39.) Nonetheless, as the Hanbando image was never subject to censorship, except in cases where overtly nationalistic written narratives accompanied it, the image was continuously used by Koreans to represent the Korean nation-state, even in the absence of an autonomous governing body and sovereign state.

4.3. Cityscapes of Seoul

Images of natural landscapes can be powerful tools in representing a nation-state. Unlike maps or Hanbando logos, images of landscapes and their palpable reality can be experienced. The selection and promotion of a representative landscape and the imbedding of those images into nationalistic narratives can effectively induce personal identification with national territory.[741] Successful images of landscapes "would evoke a geographical area, each region a narrative, thus triggering national pride, melancholy or aesthetic appreciation."[742] Selecting a distinctive landscape to represent the nation-state greatly generalises the image of the country but also facilitates the effective and efficient association of a particular location with the vast, intangible territory of the nation-state. Roland Barthes describes landscapes as "signifiers" that consist of a system of signs and symbols that provide "cultural context to reveal human values and plurality of meanings."[743] Thus, images of national landscapes are indicative of the values emphasised in a particular nation and can contain an array of socio-political messages that are envisioned by diverse nation-building parties. Between the 1880s and the 1910s, representative landmarks were used to internalise the idea and image of the Korean territory.

---

[741] Maunu Hayrynen, "The Kaleidoscopic View: The Finnish National Landscape Imagery," *National Identities* 2, no. 1 (March 2000): 5–19; Billig, *Banal Nationalism*; Crameri, "Banal Catalanism?," *National Identities* 2, no. 2 (August 2010); Agnew, "Nationalism," 233.

[742] Hayrynen, "The Kaleidoscopic View," 16.

[743] Roland Barthes, *Image-Text-Music*, trans. Stephen Heath (Glasgow: Fontana/Collins, 1977); Ken Taylor and Jane L. Lennon, "Introduction: Leaping the Fence," in *Managing Cultural Landscapes* (London: Routledge, 2012), 2.

In addition to map images, cityscapes of Seoul, including palaces, modern buildings, and public monuments also became images symbolic of the Korean nation-state. The space of the Joseon capital was continuously politicised and its image was consumed as representations of the Korean nation-state in the 1880s to the 1910s. Traditionally, the five palaces of Seoul- Gyeongbokgung Palace, Changdeokgung Palace (창덕궁, 昌德宮), Chang-gyeong-gung Palace (창경궁, 昌慶宮), Gyeong-un-gung Palace, and Gyeonghuigung Palace (경희궁, 慶熙宮, also known as Gyeongdeokgung Palace, 경덕궁, 敬德宮)- had always been symbolic of the authority of the Joseon state and Yi dynasty and marked the centrality of Hanseong (한성, 漢城, present-day Seoul) as the country's capital city.[744]

The centrality and symbolic power of the capital city of the Korean nation-state was intensified as visual imagery of Seoul were mass produced and disseminated. City views of Seoul were frequently consumed by foreign visitors who used images of palace grounds and city gates as a visual introduction of Korea to Western audiences. In addition, with urban development, modern buildings and public monuments reshaped the cityscape of the capital to provide open, inclusive public arenas where the new collective nation interacted and ideas of the Korean nation-state were exchanged. This allowed for the identification of public city space with the collective nation-state.

---

744 Seoul was given several different names throughout history. In the Goryeo period, it was referred to as Yangju (양주, 楊州), Namgyeong (남경, 南京), and Hanyang (한양, 漢陽). After the founding of Joseon, it was officially referred to as Hanseong after 1395. However, Hanseong was also referred to as Hanyang, Gyeongdo (경도, 京都), Gyeongseong (경성, 京城). After annexation, Japan officially renamed Hanseong to Gyeongseong. Na Gak-sun, "Seoul jimyeong ui byeoncheon gwa teukjing," *Seoul gwa yeoksa* 72 (October 2008): 5–17.

Images of Seoul are too varied and inconsistent to be studied in their entirety in the scope of this research. However, prominent types of cityscapes warrant discussion as capital cities "are expected to represent- or even shape- the state, the country's national identity, and its political regime as much as they disclose the conflicts over political power and identity in nation-states."[745] Moreover, a compilation of all the different components of a cityscape permeates the minds of its inhabitants to form a sense of "banal nationalism."[746]

To begin with, in the 1880s and early 1890s, cityscapes of Hanseong were predominantly consumed by foreign audiences. Most were photographs taken by foreign visitors, many of them published in early books on Korea that introduced the mysterious East Asian kingdom to Western audiences. (Fig. 4.40., Fig. 4.41., Fig. 4.42., Fig. 4.43., Fig. 4.44., Fig. 4.45.) Images of palace grounds and city gates that exposed the traditional city of the newly opened Joseon kingdom were popular; by principle, foreigners were not permitted to reside in Hanseong in the Joseon period, and it was only after the opening of ports that foreign nationals, beginning with the Japanese, were allowed to live in the city.[747] The opening of ports in the 1880s and introduction of photography and picture postcards in the following decades led to an increased visibility of the Korean capital.

---

[745] Wolfgang Sonne, *Representing the State: Capital City Planning in the Early Twentieth Century* (Munich; London: Prestel, 2003); Michael Minkenberg, ed., *Power and Architecture: The Construction of Capitals and the Politics of Space* (New York: Berghahn, 2014), 6.

[746] Billig, *Banal Nationalism*; Kathryn Crameri, "Banal Catalanism?," 145–57; Agnew, "Nationalism," 233.

[747] Park Eun-suk, "Gaehang hu (1876-1894) Seoul ui jabon juui dosihwa wa gong-gan jaepyeon," *Hyangto Seoul*, no. 74 (October 2009): 86–87.

Western visitors who published images were immediately aware of the importance of Hanseong as the capital city.[748] Percival Lowell, in describing the geography of the Korean Peninsula, described Hanseong as "the most important place in Korea," while Isabella Bird Bishop asserted that "Seoul is Korea."[749] Korean textbooks also began to emphasise the importance of the capital city in after 1905. (Fig. 4.46.) For instance, along with illustrations of Hanseong's high street and Namdaemun Gate that closely resemble contemporary photographic cityscapes, *Gukeo dokbon* (국어독본, 國語讀本, 1907-1909) explains:

> "Hanseong's other name is Gyeongseong. It is the place his Imperial Majesty of the Korean Empire rules as capital. All government offices, including the Cabinet (외각, 外閣), the Royal Household Department (궁내부, 宮內府), Ministry of Home Affairs (내부, 內部), Treasury (탁지부, 度支部), Ministry of Education, Commerce and Industry Department (농상공부, 農商工部) are here. Hanyang is surrounded by mountains on four sides, and city walls guard these mountains. There are eight gates for each of the four directions of east, west, south, north, and those in between. Among the eight gates, gates of the east, west, south, and north are the most grand, and the gates are called Sadaemun Gates (사대문, 四大門)."[750]

[748] Interestingly, "Seoul" was used rather than "Hanseong" in many travelogues of Western visitors. Seong Hyo-jin, "Seoul ui dosi imiji hyeongseong (1897-1939) e daehan yeon-gu" (PhD diss., Seoul, Seoul National University, 2020), 67.
[749] Percival Lowell, *Choson: The Land of the Morning Calm*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Ticknor and Company, 1888), 20, https://openlibrary.org/books/OL13527665M/Chos%C3%B6n_the_land_of_the_morning_calm, accessed 9 September, 2022; Bishop, *Korea and Her Neighbors,* 59; Seong Hyo-jin, "Seoul ui dosi imiji hyeongseong (1897-1939) e daehan yeon-gu," 67.
[750] Hakbu, *(Botong hakdoyong) Gukeo dokbon sang*, 158–59.

Sinchan chodeung sohak (신찬초등소학, 新纂初等小學, 1909) also mentions the Sadaemun Gates and government offices and also provides a map of Hanyang and illustrations of Samgaksan Mountain (삼각산, 三角山) and Bukhansan Mountain (북한산, 北漢山) (Fig. 4.47.):

> "Hanyang is the capital of Joseon, with Samgaksan Mountain and Baekaksan Mountain (백악산, 白岳山, also known as 북악산, 北岳山) in the north and Mokmyeoksan Mountain (목멱산, 木覓山, also known as Namsan Mountain, 남산, 南山) to the south. [...] Samgaksan Mountain is the guardian mountain to Gyeongseong of this country."

In addition to the importance placed on the capital city, the textbooks also retain an element of traditional fengshui in their narratives. The emphasis placed on the city gates that were constructed based on traditional geomancy and the auspicious location of the city in relation to its surrounding mountains are all expressive of traditional Joseon conceptions of geography.

Choesin Daehan godeung jiji (최신대한고등지지, 最新高等大韓地誌, 1909) also contains a detailed map and illustrations of the mountains of Hanyang, with humorous notes that comment on the likeness of the mountains to figures wearing different types of traditional headgear, a camel, "three blossoms of lotuses," "a peony that has yet to bloom," and "the head of a silkworm."[751] (Fig. 4.48., Fig. 4.49.) It also included very detailed illustrations of the city gates and Gyeonghoeru Pavilion (경회루,

[751] Much of the textbook repeated similar explanations to *Gukeo dokbon* and *Choesin chodeung sohak*. Jeong In-ho, *Choesin Daehan godeung jiji* (Seoul: Okho Seorim, 1909), 7.

慶會樓) of Gyeongbokgung Palace, Namdeamun Gate (남대문, 南大門, also known as 숭례문, 崇禮門), Daehanmun Gate of Gyeong-un-gung Palace, and Donhwamun Gate (돈화문, 昌德宮) of Dong-gwol Palace (동궐, 東闕, also known as Changdeokgung Palace and Chang-gyeong-gung Palace) as notable sites of the capital. (Fig. 4.50., Fig. 4.51.) It is likely that similar textbook illustrations of the period were based on photographs as they closely resemble photographic postcards of the period, attesting to the significant impact that photographic imagery had in contemporary artistic depictions. (Fig. 4.52., Fig. 4.53., Fig. 4.54., Fig. 4.55., Fig. 4.56., Fig. 4.57., Fig. 4.58., Fig. 4.59.) These early images of Seoul not only made the capital accessible to both foreigners and Koreans outside the capital but also strengthened the centrality of Hanseong as a representative space and place of the modern Korean nation-state.

Gojong also embarked on a reconstruction of the city and the centrality of Hanseong as a capital city intensified as almost all newly created modern institutions and government departments of the 1880s and 1890s were located within the city.[752] During the Korean Empire period, Gyeong-un-gung Palace served as the primary palace of Emperor Gojong, and the newly named imperial city Hwangseong (황성, 皇城) developed with Gyeong-un-gung Palace at its centre. This was a strategic move as the area of Jeong-dong (정동, 貞洞), surrounding the palace, was inhabited by Western legations, while the southern areas of the city walls were inhabited by a growing

[752] Plans to redesign and modernise the capital were already proposed in the 1880s. Reformists Kim Ok-gyun and Park Yeong-hyo argued that hygiene, agriculture and commerce, and roads were priorities in the creation of a modern Joseon capital. Plans to redesign and construct modern roads were unsuccessful due to strong resistance from residents. Park Eun-suk, “Gaehang hu (1876-1894) Seoul ui jabon juui dosihwa wa gong-gan jaepyeon,” 89–93.

Japanese population.[753] To differentiate the new imperial city from premodern Hanseong, Gojong also embraced modern architecture, most symbolically by commissioning the construction of Seokjojeon Hall (석조전, 石造殿, completed in 1910), a modern stone building, that was originally constructed to serve as the new, central hall of Gyeong-un-gung Palace.[754]

After setting Gyeong-un-gung Palace as the primary palace, Gojong attempted to expand palace grounds by constructing a stone bridge that connected Gyeong-un-gung Palace, Gyeonghuigung Palace, and government offices outside of palaces (Gwoloegaksa, 궐외각사, 闕外閣司), circa 1903.[755] Palace grounds were also symbolically expanded through the construction and utilisation of Hwan-gudan Altar where Gojong held his coronation in 1897.[756] (Fig. 4.60.) Roads and commercial areas were formed with Gyeong-un-gung at the centre, furthering the centrality and symbolic significance of the palace in the cityscape of Seoul during the Korean Empire period.[757] In addition, the imperial city included several "contact zones between the sovereign and his subjects."[758] For example, Hwangseong residents used Daehanmun Gate of

---

753 Kim Hyeon-suk, "Daehan Jegukgi Jeongdong ui gyeong-gwan byeonhwa wa yeongyeok gan ui gyeongjaeng," *Hyangto Seoul*, no. 84 (June 2013): 115–57; Seo Jeong-hyeon, "Geundae Jeongdong ui gong-gan byeonhwa wa Gojong," *Hyangto Seoul*, no. 84 (June 2013): 83–113.

754 Gang Seong-won and Kim Jin-gyun, "Deoksugung Seokjojeon ui wonhyeong chujeong gwa gisulsajeok uiui," *Daehan geonchuk hakhoe nonmunjip- Gyehoekgye* 24, no. 4 (April 2008): 141–48.

755 Yang Geun-chang, "Gyeong-un-gung un-gyo bokwon e gwanhan yeon-gu" (Master's thesis, Suwon, Kyonggi University, 2012).

756 Seong Hyo-jin, "Seoul ui dosi imiji hyeongseong (1897-1939) e daehan yeon-gu," 88–89.

757 Seong Hyo-jin, "Seoul ui dosi imiji hyeongseong (1897-1939) e daehan yeon-gu," 92.

758 Todd A. Henry, *Assimilating Seoul: Japanese Rule and the Politics of Public Space in Colonial Korea, 1910-1945* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014), 27.

Gyeong-un-gung Palace as gathering spots for "new national events," such as the commemoration of Emperor Gojong's enthronement as emperor.[759] (Fig. 4.61.) Thus, the cityscape of Seoul in the brief period from the late 1890s to 1905 not only represented the authority of the Korean Empire but also the collective nation and the placeness of public arenas as national points of assembly.

Despite these changes in the cityscape of Seoul, Japanese authorities gradually gained control of promoting a new image of colonial Gyeongseong. The transformation of Seoul from Hanseong or Hwangseong, to Gyeongseong had a profound impact on what the capital represented. The identity of the colonised capital was manipulated through images of a new, 'improved,' and distinctively different city than that of the autonomous Korean nation-state. This involved the construction of the new Government-General building in Gyeongbokgung Palace in 1926, the construction of a botanical garden, zoo, and museum in Chang-gyeong-gung Palace (renamed Chang-gyeong-won Park, 창경원, 昌慶苑 in 1911), as well as the demolition of Hwan-gudan Altar for the construction of Josun Hotel (조선호텔) for the 1915 Joseon Industrial Exhibition that was held in Gyeongbokgung Palace grounds.[760] (Fig. 4.62., Fig. 4.63.)

---

[759] After a fire in 1904, the main gate Daeanmun Gate (대안문, 大安門) was reconstructed as Daehanmun Gate in 1906 and frequently appeared in postcards, along with the main Junghwajeon Hall (중화전, 中和殿) and Seokjojeon Hall. Jeon U-yong, "Daehan Jegukgi- Ilje chogi Seoul gong-gan ui byeonhwa wa gwonryeok ui jihyang," *Jeonnong saron* 5 (March 1999): 39–72; Henry, *Assimilating Seoul*, 27–28; Busan Museum, *Sajin yeopseo ro boneun geundae pung-gyeong 4: Gwan-gwang*, Hanguk geundae sigak munhwa akaibeu 4 (Seoul: Minsokwon, 2009), 279–311.

[760] After annexation in 1910, the Japanese Government demolished and even sold off parts of Gyeongbokgung Palace. Josun Hotel was constructed to host state guests for the exhibition. The Government-General also planted thousands of cherry blossom trees in Chang-gyeong-won Park, and according to a tour guide leaflet, "Dae Gyeongseong" (대경성, 大京城, 1929), the daily number of visitors during cherry blossom season reached over 20,000. Busan Museum, *Sajin yeopseo ro boneun geundae pung-gyeong 4*,

New photographic postcards of Gyeongbokgung Palace, like that showing two entertaining women freely enjoying the palace grounds, were completely new images that stripped the palace of its authority and exclusivity. (Fig. 4.64.) Images of the remaining Hwang-gung-u (황궁우, 皇穹宇), a subsidiary shrine to Hwan-gudan Altar that was used to store ancestral tablets, visually proclaimed the complete colonisation of Korea and revealed Japanese efforts to break down symbolic spaces of Korean autonomy and sovereignty.

Through these changes that altered, desacralized, and publicised Joseon palaces, spaces that used to symbolise the authority of the Yi monarchy and Joseon statehood became relics of past history rather than "enlivening symbols of an autonomous Korean nation."[761] The colonial government, as well as private photo studios disseminated many photographic postcards from the 1910s that flaunted the new image of Gyeongseong, promoted visits to newly open palace grounds for entertainment, and assimilated the city of Gyeongseong as part of the territory of imperial Japan. For instance, photographs of Geunjeongjeon Hall (근정전, 勤政殿) and Injeongjeon Hall (인정전, 仁政殿), symbolic and exclusive spaces that represented the monarch and his authority in the Joseon period, reduced the aura of power and inviolability of the monarch and transformed the spaces into relics of

---

55, 227; Henry, *Assimilating Seoul*, 29–30; Seong Hyo-jin, "Seoul ui dosi imiji hyeongseong (1897-1939) e daehan yeon-gu," 155; Kim Je-jeong, "Sikmin sigi Joseonin gwa jaeJo Ilbonin ui gyeongseong annaeseo bigyo: Gyeongseong pyeonram (1929) gwa Dae Gyeongseong (1929)," *Dosi yeon-gu* 19 (April 2018): 63–86.

[761] Henry, *Assimilating Seoul*, 98.

Korea's past and a curious spectacle that the colonialists 'allowed' the people to enjoy and consume.[762] (Fig. 4.65., Fig. 4.66.)

The city walls were also demolished in 1907 when the Gyeongseong Exposition and the Japanese Crown Prince Yoshihito's visit to Korea gave the colonial authorities the opportunity to reshape the city prior to annexation.[763] The southern area of Seoul, Namchon (남촌, 南村), underwent rapid development and modern buildings like the Bank of Chosen (Joseon Eunhaeng, 조선은행, 朝鮮銀行), newly paved roads, and Namdaemun Gate became representative images of modern Gyeongseong while northern Seoul, Bukchon (북촌, 北村), and palace grounds were reflective of 'old' Joseon.[764] (Fig. 4.67.) Interestingly, this north-south divide of the capital was already recognised in the 1907 Hakbu-published textbook, *Gukeo dokbon*:

> "At the centre of Hanseong is a stream running east. This stream divides the city into the south and the north. Changdeokgung Palace and Gyeongbokgung Palace is situated north of the stream and Gyeong-un-gung Palace is at the

---

[762] Isabella Bird Bishop had already published a photograph of a "Korean Throne" in her book, *Korea and Her Neighbors*, but Bird's photographing of the palace was a special privilege given to the Western visitor, most likely in anticipation to secure the favour and possible assistance of the British in times of need. Moreover, the images were not disseminated among the Korean public, who at this point, had no access to the palace.

[763] It was argued that the walls needed to be demolished to improve traffic routes in and out of Hanseong. *Gojong sillok*, vol. 48, 30 March, 1907, https://sillok.history.go.kr/id/kza_14403030_001, accessed 22 December, 2022; Seong Hyo-jin, "Seoul ui dosi imiji hyeongseong (1897-1939) e daehan yeon-gu," 25, 136.

[764] Sungryemun Gate, or Namdaemun Gate, was the most frequently depicted landmark in photo postcards of the period. Hyung Il Pai, "Navigating Modern Keijo: The Typology of Reference Guides and City Landmarks," *Seoulhak yeon-gu*, no. 44 (August 2011): 20; Seong Hyo-jin, "Seoul ui dosi imiji hyeongseong (1897-1939) e daehan yeon-gu," 143; Hanguk Misul Yeon-guso, *Modeon Gyeongseong ui sigak munhwa wa gwanjung* (Seoul: Hanguk Misul Yeon-guso CAS, 2018), 151; Busan Museum, *Sajin yeopseo ro boneun geundae pung-gyeong 4*, 313.

south of the stream. His Imperial Majesty is temporarily residing in Changdeokgung Palace. There is a large road in front of Gyeongbokgung Palace, in front of the Six Offices (육조, 六曹). Each of the offices are generally situated at either side of the road. Most foreigners live in the south of the city. Southwards of Ihyeon (이현, 泥峴, also known as Jin-gogae, 진고개) is the residential area of the Japanese, and it is currently the most busy area of Hanseong."[765]

The apparent disparity of the image of the two areas of the capital revealed the power shift that occurred toward annexation. It also demonstrated that the creation of representative imagery of placeness was not only important for nation-building on behalf of Koreans, but also Korean "nation-destroying" and colony-building.[766] However, these commodified postcards were popular souvenirs among Japanese tourists, Western consumers, and Koreans alike.

The treatment of images of Seoul were similarly applied to maps of the Korean Peninsula, the Hanbando image, and landscapes of Geumgangsan Mountain and Baekdusan Mountain. The representativeness of these symbolic images was intensified as repetitive production and consumption increased with the advent of modern print media and the development of tourism. Maps were used to place Korea in a new, modern world of sovereign nation-states, simplified Hanbando images standardised the form of the Korean national territory into an instantly recognisable symbol, illustrations and photographs of Geumgangsan Mountain helped strengthen the collective and

---

[765] Hakbu, *(Botong hakdoyong) Gukeo dokbon sang*, 158–59.
[766] Walker Connor, "Nation-Building or Nation-Destroying?," *World Politics* 24, no. 3 (April 1972): 319–55; Henry, *Assimilating Seoul*.

emotional connection to national territory, and representations of Baekdusan Mountain amplified public consciousness of Korea's territorial and historical autonomy. As seemingly 'neutral' images, geographic imageries were relatively freely used during the colonial period, acting as consistent and persistent symbols of the Korean nation-state.

4.4. Natural Landmarks

4.4.a. Internalising National Landscapes

Natural landscapes were central to the visual culture of the Joseon period. Daoist and Confucian teachings emphasised the need for life in harmony with nature and capturing landscapes and its symbolisms was a crucial part of Neo-Confucian literati culture and artistic practice.[767] Historically famous scenic spots such as Jeju Island (제주도, 濟州島, also known as Tamrado Island, 탐라도, 耽羅島), Yeseong-gang River (예성강, 禮成江), Cheonsusa Temple (천수사, 天壽寺), Jinyang (진양, 晋陽, present day Jinju, 진주, 晋州), Songdo (송도, 松都, present day Gaeseong, 개성, 開城) and Geumgangsan Mountain (금강산, 金剛山) became subjects of real-view landscape painting (*silgyeong sansuhwa*, 실경산수화, 實景山水畵).[768] Landscape paintings of local Korean scenery continued to be produced throughout the Joseon period, although there are few surviving examples of early Joseon real-view landscape paintings.[769]

In late Joseon, the painting of local scenery rather than the conceptual and idealised landscapes of China grew in popularity, in light of a general cultural autonomy that flourished from Sukjong to Jeongjo's reigns.[770] In the eighteenth century,

---

[767] Ji Sun-im, "Hanguk jeontong sansuhwa ui jayeon-gwan gwa geu hyeondaejeok uiui," *Hangukhak nonjip*, no. 41 (December 2010): 5–42.

[768] Unfortunately, Goryeo examples of real-view landscape paintings are only confirmed through written records. An Hwi-jun, *Hanguk hoehwa ui jeontong* (Seoul: Munye Chulpansa, 1988), 112–24; Hong Sun-pyo, "Silgyeong sansuhwa," in *Encyclopedia of Korean Culture* (Academy of Korean Studies, 1996), http://encykorea.aks.ac.kr/Contents/Item/E0033641, accessed 10 September, 2022.

[769] Jin Jun-hyeon, "Joseon chogi, jung-gi ui silgyeong sansuhwa: Siljae jakpum gwa geu hyeonjang eul jungsim euro," *Misul sahak* 24 (August 2010): 39–66.

[770] Yang Ji-seon, "Hanguk ui jin-gyeong sansuhwa e gwanhan gochal: Jeong Seon gwa Byeon Gwan-sik ui Geumgangsan jakpum eul jungsim euro" (Master's thesis, Daejeon,

celebrated painter Jeong Seon (정선, 鄭敾, 1676-1759) developed what is now referred to as true-view landscape painting (*jin-gyeong sansuhwa*, 진경산수화, 眞景山水畵) which emphasised artistic expression in the depiction of real Joseon landscapes using Joseon interpretations of Namjonghwa (남종화, 南宗畵, Southern School).[771] Yet, Joseon intellectual elite and literati artists drew a definitive line between maps and paintings, as well as differentiating precise depictions of 'real' likeness and convincing artistic expressions.[772] In a comment on Gang Hui-eon's (강희언, 姜熙彦, 1710-1764) *Inwangsando* (인왕산도, 仁王山圖), Gang Se-hwang (강세황, 姜世晃, 1712-1791) writes that though he was always wary of real-view (true-view) paintings resembling maps due to them being too realistic, Gang Hui-eon was able to capture the verisimilitude of the view without 'losing the way of an artist.'[773] Notwithstanding such evasion of being 'too realistic,' toward the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, Gang Se-hwang and Kim Hong-do (김홍도, 金弘道, 1745-?) also incorporated Western-style naturalism to true-view landscapes of Joseon natural scenery.[774]

Chungnam National University, 2018), 5–8.

[771] Yang Ji-seon, "Hanguk ui jin-gyeong sansuhwa e gwanhan gochal."

[772] Lee Yeong-su, "Minhwa Geumgangsando e gwanhan gochal," *Misulsa yeon-gu* 14 (December 2000): 117–18.

[773] An Hwi-jun, ed., *Sansuhwa (ha)*, Hanguk ui mi 12 (Seoul: Jungang Ilbo Dongyang Bangsong, 1982), 232.

[774] Kim Hong-do's application of Western perspective in his works were more evident in his earlier works, whereas his later works retreated to the Southern School style. Lee Su-jeong, "Seoyang hwabeop i banyeong doen Joseon sidae hugi hoehwa jakpum yeon-gu" (Master's thesis, Cheongwon, Korea National University of Education, 2010), 71–78; Yi Song-mi, *Joseon sidae geurim sok ui Seoyang hwabeop* (Seoul: Daewonsa, 2000), 160–61.

Among various subjects of natural landscapes, mountains were the most popular. As the Korean Peninsula is mountainous in terrain, mountains and mountain ranges were naturally attractive sightseeing destinations and popular subjects of literature. The most frequently visited mountains among Joseon literati were, as reflected in the titles of travelogues, Geumgangsan Mountain, Jirisan Mountain (지리산, 智異山), Cheongryangsan Mountain (청량산, 淸涼山), Gayansan Mountain (가야산, 伽倻山), Samgaksan Mountain, and Sokrisan Mountain (속리산, 俗離山).[775] Among these mountains, Geumgangsan Mountain was undeniably the most popular, and was frequently written about and painted.[776]

There are many names that were used to refer to what is now known as Geumgangsan Mountain, some depending on the season or specific views of the mountain. Yet, the name "Geumgangsan" was widely used due to the historic recognition of the mountain as a sacred Buddhist site.[777] (Fig. 4.68., Fig. 4.69.) The beauty of the mountain inspired countless paintings, poems, and even ceramics throughout Korean history, but surviving paintings are largely those from the late Joseon period. (Fig. 4.70.) In particular, from the eighteenth century, professional

---

775 Kim Mi-seon, "Gihaeng ilgi ro bon Joseon sidae myeongseungji," *Han minjok eomunhak* 89 (September 2020): 125; Park Yeong-min, "Yusan-gi ui sigong-ganjeok chuui wa geu uimi," *Minjok munhwa yeon-gu* 40 (June 2004): 81.

776 There are more than 200 surviving literary works on Geumgangsan Mountain. Jo Pil-gam, *Buyeo ui Jo jinsa Geumgangsan e gada: Cheomuiheon ui Donghaeng ilgi,* trans. Choi Gang-hyeon (Seoul: Sinseong Chulpansa, 2001); Yuk Jae-yong, "Sansu yuramrok e natanan seonindeul ui gwan-gwang uisik ilgochal: Geumgangsan yuramrok eul jungsim euro," *Gwan-gwang yeon-gu* 25, no. 4 (October 2010): 1–20; Park Min-chun, "Joseon sidae Geumgangsan yuramrok eul tonghan sanrim gihaeng munhwa yeon-gu" (Master's thesis, Jinju, Gyeongnam National University Of Science And Technology, 2018), 6.

777 Jo Seon-mi, "Dong-yucheop e daehayeo," in *Dong-yucheop* (Seoul: Sungkyunkwan University, 2005), 280.

painters were hired to accompany literati on their trips and left numerous real-view landscapes of the beloved mountain.[778] Jeong Seon painted true-view landscapes of Geumgangsan Mountain as early as 1711 and Kim Hong-do is also known to have painted approximately 100 paintings of Geumgangsan Mountain and Gangwon-do Province for the king.[779] (Fig. 4.71., Fig. 4.72., Fig. 4.73.)

Sightseeing to Geumgangsan Mountain became a major trend in late Joseon, and most literati as well as notable artists such as Kim Hong-do, Sim Sa-jeong (심사정, 沈師正, 1707-1769), Gang Se-hwang, Yi In-sang (이인상, 李麟祥, 1710-1760) visited the mountain and left many real-view and true-view landscape paintings.[780] In the nineteenth century, Yi Pung-ik (이풍익, 李豊翼, 1804-1887) created *Dong-yucheop* (동유첩, 東遊帖, 1825-1838), an album of his tour of Geumgangsan Mountain with 28 real-view paintings, in order to record and preserve his memories.[781] In many cases, literati would write poems and hired painters would produce paintings. For instance, Yi Gwang-mun (이광문, 李光文, 1778-1838) hired Kim Ha-jong (김하종, 金夏鐘, circa 1793- circa 1875) for his tour of Geumgangsan in 1815.[782] (Fig. 4.74.)

---

[778] Park Yeong-min, "Yusan-gi ui sigong-ganjeok chuui wa geu uimi," 92–94.

[779] Kim Hong-do's paintings commissioned by the king exist only in much debated copies. The only definitively authentic Geumgangsando painted by Kim Hong-do is *Chongseokjeongdo* painted in 1795, now in a private collection. Lee Tae-ho, "Joseon hugi silgyeong sansuhwa ui yeoun," in *Dong-yucheop* (Seoul: Sungkyunkwan University, 2005), 313–18; O Ju-seok, *Danwon Kim Hong-do* (Seoul: Sol Chulpansa, 2006), 213–31.

[780] Lee Seon-ok, *Ubong Jo Hui-ryong: 19 segi mukjang ui yeongsu* (Paju: Dolbegae, 2017); Park Min-chun, "Joseon sidae Geumgangsan yuramrok eul tonghan sanrim gihaeng munhwa yeon-gu," 1.

[781] Yuk Jae-yong, "Sansu yuramrok e natanan seonindeul ui gwan-gwang uisik ilgochal," 11.

[782] Choi Ji-eun, "19 segi Joseon Yudang Kim Ha-jong ui silgyeong sansuhwa yeon-gu: Haesandocheop gwa Pung-akgwon eul jungsim euro" (Master's thesis, Seoul, Hongik University, 2018).

Toward the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, late Joseon styles of Geumgangsando, especially those of Jeong Seon were gradually transferred to minhwa and became increasingly popularised and commercialised.[783] The active production of Geumagangsando during the late Joseon period greatly increased the familiarity of and identification with the Geumgangsan Mountain image, even among the lower strata of society. (Fig. 4.75., Fig. 4.76., Fig. 4.77.) However, it is important to note that Geumgangsando of late Joseon were not produced to explicitly represent the collective Joseon nation-state or national identity; though its historic and cultural significance was inertly embedded in its portrayal, the paintings were largely a part of literati leisure and popular culture. Nevertheless, frequent depiction of popular scenic spots created a popular rhetoric of visual expression of Geumgangsando and intensified the emotional intimacy between the mountain and the Korean people.[784] Geumgangsan Mountain was already well established as a national landmark in the Joseon period, but this recognition greatly increased and intensified as a larger population gained access to actual images of the mountain at the turn of the twentieth century.

---

[783] Jin Jun-hyeon, "Minjung ui ggum, minhwa Geumgangsando ui yangsik gyebo," *Misulsahak yeon-gu* 279/280 (December 2013): 298–99; Lee Sang-guk, "Jeong Seon ui Geumgangsan hwacheop gwa minhwa Geumgangsando: Minhwagadeul eul maeryo sikin Gyeomjae ui Geumgangsando," *Wolgan minhwa*, June 2019, 110.

[784] Some popular spots include peaks like Birobong Peak and waterfalls like Sipi pokpo Falls (십이폭포, 十二瀑布), Guryong pokpo Falls (구룡폭포, 九龍瀑布), Bibong pokpo Falls (비봉폭포, 飛鳳瀑布), Joyang pokpo Falls (조양폭포, 朝陽瀑布), as well as Chongseokjeong Rocks (총석정, 叢石亭) and Manmulcho Rocks, Danbalryeong Hills, Manpokdong Valley (만폭동, 萬瀑洞), Guryong-yeon Pond (구룡연, 九龍淵), Okryudong Valley (옥류동, 玉流洞), Myeong-gyeongdae (명경대, 明鏡臺), Bodeokgul Temple, (보덕굴, 普德窟), Jeongyangsa Temple, Jang-ansa Temple (장안사, 長安寺), and more.

The influence of the Geumgangsan Mountain as a symbol of Korean national territory noticeably thrived once Western visual media was introduced by foreign visitors in the late nineteenth century. Photography and the mass reproduction of imagery was central to Western and modern customs of recording and consuming landscape. In describing the history of the development of "territorial photography," Joel Snyder explains:

> "To a great extent, the work of the early landscape photographers was personal work, or work intended for a rather small audience of dedicated amateurs and educated professionals […] The creation of a large and definable market for landscape photographs began in the mid-to-late 1850s by means of the incorporation of localized photographic businesses, in the form of combined photographic and publishing houses, that were dedicated to the production and sale of travel, architectural, and landscape prints and stereographic views to incoming tourists. Prints were initially sold at or close to points of geologic or geographic interest, either one at a time or in multiples arranged in the form of photographic albums. These photographic publishing houses first appeared in Europe in the 1850s and in the western United States by the early 1860s."[785]

Western landscape photography started off with similar purposes to Joseon customs of depicting landscapes for personal enjoyment and recollection, yet, in its development, the mass reproduction of photographic images amplified the power of photographic landscapes as representative and symbolic imagery. Landscape photographs standardised different variations of a specific place and increased indirect accessibility

[785] Joel Snyder, "Territorial Photography," in *Landscape and Power*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 179.

to such locations to a large population that allowed for the collective recognition and identification with the representative scenery.

Notwithstanding the historic and cultural significance of Geumgangsan Mountain for Joseon people, in the eyes of foreign visitors who visited Korea after the opening of ports, the mountain was generally perceived as an exotic attraction that was unique to the hermit kingdom. Nevertheless, many Western visitors were aware of the historic and cultural significance of the mountains and delivered such information alongside images in their publications that introduced Korea and Korean topography to Western audiences.

Early travellers to Geumgangsan Mountain include British Vice-Consul in Korea, Charles William Campbell (1861-1927) in 1889, Lord George Nathaniel Curzon (1859-1925) in 1892, Isabella Bird Bishop, and Reverend F. S. Miller (1866-1937) in 1894.[786] In the early twentieth century, more Westerners made their way to the mountain, including German geographer and journalist Dr. Siegfried Genthe (1870-1904) in 1902, British journalist Angus Hamilton (1874-1913) in 1903, Mrs. Elizabeth Anna Gordon (1851-1925), Canadian translator and Presbyterian missionary James S. Gale (1863-1937) in 1917, German Archabbot Norbert Weber (1870-1956) in 1925, Swedish Crown Prince Gustaf VI Adolf (1882-1973) in 1926, and American journalist Helen Foster Snow (1907-1997) in 1936.[787]

In *Korea and Her Neighbors*, Isabella Bird Bishop provided a photograph of Geumgangsan Mountain and explained (Fig. 4.78.):

---

[786] Kim Hyeon-suk, "Geundaegi honseong munhwa gong-gan eurosseo ui Geumgangsan gwa Geumgangsan geurim" (Seoul: NRF, 2011), 464.
[787] Kim Hyeon-suk, "Geundaegi honseong munhwa gong-gan eurosseo ui Geumgangsan gwa Geumgangsan geurim" 464.

> "A visit to the [Geumgangsan Mountain] elevates a Korean into the distinguished position of a traveller, and many a young resident of Seoul gains this fashionable reputation. It is not as containing shrines of pilgrimage, for most Koreans despise Buddhism and its shaven medicant priests, that these mountains are famous in Korea, but for their picturesque beauties, much celebrated in Korean poetry. The broad backbone of the peninsula which has trended near to the east coast from [Bukcheong] southwards has degenerated into tameness, when suddenly [Geumgangsan Mountain], or the Diamond Mountain, with its elongated mass of serrated, jagged, and inaccessible peaks, and magnificent primæval forest, occupying an area of about 32 miles in length by 22 in breadth, starts off from it near the 39th parallel of latitude in the province of [Gangwon]."[788]

From her account, it can observed that in the 1890s, travelling to Geumgangsan Mountain was still a privilege, something to boast about in Seoul. Moreover, Taebaeksan Mountain range was already widely recognised as the "backbone" of Korea that connected the many prominent mountains of the peninsula. Lastly, Geumgangsan Mountain's status as a representative natural feature and as a revered site of beauty is apparent.

Campbell's account from 1892 distinguishes the strong Buddhist significance of the mountain:

> "On the fifth day I branched into untrodden country for the purpose of visiting a remarkable range, called the [Geumgangsan], or Diamond Mountains, where

[788] Bishop, *Korea and Her Neighbors,* 140.

the most notable collection of Buddhist monasteries in Korea is to be found. […] The pass we now crossed, known as [Danbalryeong Hills (단발령, 斷髮嶺)], is the western barrier of the [Geumgang] region. The summit is about 2800 feet above sea-level. Thence in clear weather a view of the Diamond Mountains was said to be obtainable, and the name [Danbal], which means "Crop-hair," was given to the ridge in the early days of Korean Buddhism to signify that those who once reached this point had taken refuge in the cloister, and should sever their connection with the world by parting with their hair. […] Few places are more renowned in any country than these mountains are in Korea: in popular estimation they are the beau ideal of scenic loveliness, the perfection of wild beauty in nature. I found that both Chinese and Japanese spoke and wrote of them, but more because they are a Buddhistic centre than for any other reason. At [Seoul] a visit to [Geumgangsan] is quite fashionable, and supplies all the material necessary for reputation as a traveller."[789]

Once more, the popularity of Geumgangsan Mountain is emphasised, but interestingly, the account also confirms the popularity of Danbalryeong Hills as a scenic spot for appreciating the view of the Geumgangsan Mountains, a point reiterated in later imagery of the mountain in many textbook illustrations published after 1905.

Despite such popularity of Geumgangsan Mountain among domestic and foreign visitors alike, photographs of the representative landscape were not made popular commodities in Korea until toward annexation. Instead, minhwa

[789] Charles William Campbell, "A Journey Through North Korea to the Ch'ang-Pai Shan," *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society and Monthly Record of Geography* 14, no. 3 (March 1892): 145–47.

Geumgangsando constituted the popular form of imagery that depicted the famous mountains in the late nineteenth century. (Fig. 4.79., Fig. 4.80., Fig. 4.81., Fig. 4.82., Fig. 4.83.) The consumption of paintings, especially decorative paintings, was no longer the exclusive culture of the elite; newly wealthy middle classes and commoners also decorated their homes with paintings.[790] Folding screens produced by court artists were even sold outside the court and were in great demand among the general public.[791]

Decorative Geumgangsando were mostly produced in the form of folding screens with six or more panels, and repeatedly depicted Geumgangsan Mountain in a highly stylised pattern of views of the typical Naegeumgang (내금강, 內金剛, inner Geumgang)- Oegeumgang (외금강, 外金剛, outer Geumgang)- Haegeumgang (sea Geumgang 해금강, 海金剛) course that became popular in late Joseon or groups of famous locations.[792] Surviving examples from the nineteenth century depicted Geumgangsan Mountain in a simplified and stylised manner that distinguished it from those produced by literati and professional painters of the late Joseon period.[793] They are not true to form but combine and juxtapose real elements with those exaggerated or

[790] Joseon homes were not only decorated with paintings in the form of folding screens or hanging scrolls but were also directly pasted on walls as wallpaper. Kim Yun-jeong, "Hanguk minhwa ui jonjae wa yangsang: 19 segi huban 20 segi jeonban eul jungsim euro," *Minsokhak Yeon-Gu*, no. 19 (December 2006): 251–52; Lee Yeong-su, "Minhwa Geumgangsando e gwanhan gochal," 101.
[791] Go Yeon-hui, "19 segi Geumgangsando ui ilmyeon: Gaein sojang 'Geumgangsando 10 pok byeongpung' gochal," *Onji nonchong*, no. 58 (January 2019): 309.
[792] Typically, travelers would start from Danbalryeong Hills in the entrance to Naegeumgang to Chongseokjeong Rocks of Haegeumgang, passing by popular spots including but not limited to Jang-ansa Temple, Pyohunsa Temple (표훈사, 表訓寺), and Birobong Peak of Naegeumgang, Manmulcho Rocks, Guryong pokpo Falls, Guryong-yeon Pond, Baekcheon-gyo Bridge (백천교, 百川橋), and Eunseondae Rocks (은선대, 隱仙臺) of Oegeumgang. Lee Yeong-su, "Minhwa Geumgangsando e gwanhan gochal," 110.
[793] Jin Jun-hyeon, "Minjung ui ggum, minhwa Geumgangsando ui yangsik gyebo."

drawn from the artists' interpretations. Unlike Joseon literati Geumgangsando, many of them included the newly popularised views of Oegeumgang, some used fake signatures of well-known artists of late Joseon, and are implicative of the persistent popularity of Jeong Seon and Kim Hong-do styles.[794] The repetitive and stylised expressions, exaggerated distinctive features, and emphasis of mythical connections or entertaining points of interest catered to the broader, general public's taste.[795] The expansion of consumers of Geumgangsando contributed to the collective recognition of the mountain as a symbol and shared experience of the Korean nation-state.

While many art historians characterise these changes in Geumgangsando as an artistic 'decline' (쇠퇴, 衰退/衰頹), they also enabled the popular identification with Geumgangsan Mountain and the transference of Geumgangsando to other visual media. Print Geumgangsando were also produced in the Joseon period but were scarce. A rare surviving example is *Geumgangsan sa dae chal jeondo* (금강산사대찰전도, 金剛山四大刹全圖, Complete View of the Four Principle Temples of Geumgangsan Mountain), painted by Buddhist monk Sangsaeng (상생, 上生, ?-?) and printed by monks Seolho (설호, 雪湖, ?-?) and Cheolsan (철산, 鐵山, ?-?).[796] (Fig. 4.84.) Although this example is significant in recognising the diversity of Geumgangsando produced in the Joseon period, it was from the beginnings of the twentieth century when

---

794 Jin Jun-hyeon; "Minjung ui ggum, minhwa Geumgangsando ui yangsik gyebo"; Lee Yeong-su, "Minhwa Geumgangsando e gwanhan gochal," 123–25.
795 Lee Yeong-su, "Minhwa Geumgangsando e gwanhan gochal," 118–26.
796 Wongaksa Seongbo Bakmulgwan, "Geumgangsan sa dae chal jeondo, 1899-nyeon, mokpanbon," *Wongaksa Seongbo Bakmulgwan*, 30 August, 2015, http://wongaksa.or.kr/g4/bbs/board.php?bo_table=sungbo_01&wr_id=15&page=1, accessed 10 September, 2022; Lee Yeong-su, "19 segi Geumgangsando yeon-gu" (PhD diss., Seoul, Myeongji University, 2016), 126–27.

simplified styles of Geumgangsando began to be transferred to mass print media, notably in illustrated textbooks.

Most print imagery of Geumgangsan Mountain in textbooks of this period depicted the Twelve Thousand Peaks (일만이천봉, 一萬二千峯) as seen from Danbalryeong Hills, a popular scenic spot that Campbell also visited.[797] A typical example is Hyeon Chae's comprehensive primary-level textbook *Yunyeon pildok* (1907), of which the illustration is attributed to An Jung-sik.[798] (Fig. 4.85.) Although the nationalistic textbook was banned by colonial authorities in 1909, it was well-received not just in educating students Korean language, history, and geography in school, but as popular literature that provided basic-level information and knowledge to the general public.[799] An identical illustration was printed in *Sinchan chodeung sohak* (1909), also published by Hyeon Chae.[800] (Fig. 4.86.) The depiction of the many peaks of Geumgangsan Mountain is realistic, yet when compared to paintings in the style of Jeong Seon or Kim Hong-do, they are inevitably simplified and conventionalised. The textbook provides basic information of Geumgangsan Mountain, describes it as "the

---

[797] Lee Yeong-su, "19 segi Geumgangsando yeon-gu," 127.

[798] Although illustrations of *Yunyeon pildok* are attributed to An Jung-sik due to his name being printed on the book, I agree with Hong Sun-pyo and Park Carey's observation that it is likely that An Jung-sik's students were also involved in the production of illustrations, including Lee Do-yeong. Hong Sun-pyo, "Hanguk gaehwagi ui saphwa yeon-gu: Chodeung gyogwaseo reul jungsim euro," 264–65; Park Carey, "20 segi Hanguk hoehwa eseo ui jeontongron" (PhD diss., Seoul, Ewha Womans University, 2006), 56.

[799] Lee Jeong-chan, "Yunyeon pildok ui chulgan baegyeong gwa nonri: Gukga juui yeoksagwan ui seongrip gwajeong eul jungsim euro," *Gukje eomun* 58 (August 2013): 73–103.

[800] For a comparative analysis of *Sinchan chodeung sohak*, see Park Min-yeong, "Aeguk gwa chin Il, Sinchan chodeung sohak ui ijungseong: Gaehwagi min-gan pyeonchan gyogwaseo wa ui bigyo reul jungsim euro," *Uri eomun yeon-gu* 48 (January 2014): 219–46.

greatest of all Joseon mountains and the southern branch (*nammaek*, 남맥, 南脉) of Baekdusan Mountain," and explains the reason for the popularity of the view seen from Danbalryeong Hills:

> "The Twelve Thousand Peaks tower toward the East Sea and the pine trees pierce the sky. The peculiar scenery is just like the writings and paintings. In the Inner and Outer Mountains, there are a hundred and eight Buddhist temples, of which Jeongyangsa Temple (정양사, 正陽寺) and Yujeomsa Temple (유점사, 楡岾寺) are most famous. The chanting sounds of Buddhist monks wake the layman's heart. Danbalryeong Hills are at the entrance to Geumgangsan Mountain. When one reaches the top of the hills, the entirety of the mountains may be seen. Naturally, it feels as if one is in the land of the spiritual sages. The hill is named Danbalryeong Hill as once travellers see the view, those who came sightseeing wish to shave their head and become monks. The blue and white light that radiates from the ten thousand valleys and a thousand peaks seem as if to rejoice at the sight of its beholder. The Chinese wish that they were born in this country so as to see this mountain."[801]

The prominent status of Geumgangsan Mountain as a representative landmark of Korea and its association with the mother mountain, Baekdusan Mountain, is emphasised, but most of all, the natural beauty of the mountain and its scenery is poetically elaborated, inducing an emotional experience of the reader. The text also induces a sense of collective national pride to be felt at the fact that Chinese people also revere the

---

[801] Hangukhak Munheon Yeon-guso, *Hanguk gaehwagi gyogwaseo chongseo*, Gukeopyeon 7: 360–63.

mountain and "wish that they were born" in Korea. As such, many textbooks of the period attempted to strengthen the affiliation between the Korean nation and its beloved mountain. Moreover, through the repeated exposure to these standardised images of Geumgangsan Mountain would have had a significant impact in the students' identification with the mountain as a representative symbol of the Korean land and territory, just like standardised images of Hanbando.

Similar formats of the Twelve Thousand Peaks as seen from Danbalryeong Hills were used in textbooks and newspapers, including Park Jeong-dong's *Chodeung bon-guk jiri* (초등본국지리, 初等本國地理, 1909) and Lee Do-young's "*Danbalryeong mang Geumgang jeon-gyeong* (단발령망금강전경, 斷髮嶺望金剛前景, View of Geumgang from Danbalryeong Hills)," in *Daehan minbo,* on 14 July, 1909.[802] These illustrations were used as visual aids to teaching students the cultural and historical significance of Geumgangsan Mountain and delivering information to general readers. Continuing traditional Joseon customs, many contemporary textbooks and newspapers described Geumgangsan Mountain as the greatest beauty and pride of the Korean land, which elevated the contemporary fame and reputation of the mountain.[803]

An interesting illustration of the Twelve Thousand Peaks in Jeong In-ho's geography textbook *Choesin Daehan godeung jiji* (1909) applied the custom of labelling the names of the many different peaks of Geumgangsan Mountain and used

---

802 "Danbalryeong mang Geumgang jeon-gyeong," *Daehan minbo*, 14 July, 1909.
803 Gu Chun-mo, "Choe Nam-seon ui gihaengmun e natanan gyeong-gwan insik gwa minjok jeongcheseong ui gwan-gye," 118–20.

strong contrast in depicting the rugged peaks, suggestive of Jeong Seon's influence.[804] (Fig. 4.87.) On one hand, this typical view of the Twelve Thousand Peaks as seen from Danbalryeong Hills was an easily recognisable image of the representative mountain and its beautiful natural landscape that educated students of Korean geography and helped them internalise the idea of the Korean territory. On the other hand, by employing the labelling practice of distinctive peaks that was typically used in Jeong Seon's early Geumgangsando, pictographic maps, or minhwa Geumgangsando, as well as rendering the mountain views in a 'Jeong-Seon-esque' manner, it also retained the traditional painting customs of Geumgangsando. The application of traditional painting styles and customs emphasised the long history of Geumgangsando and its significance in the shared cultural experience of the Korean nation.

Photographic images of Geumgangsan Mountain quickly outnumbered print illustrations from the early colonial period. For the Japanese authorities of the 1910s, the mountain was also a source of potential profit from colonial exploitation.[805] In the 1910s, Japanese photographs and photo postcards became the most popular forms of

---

[804] Lee Yeong-su, "19 segi Geumgangsando yeon-gu," 128.

[805] In 1915, the Japanese Government-General sent Sekino Tadashi (関野貞, 1868-1935), Yatsui Seiichi (谷井濟一, 1880-1959), and Kuriyama Shunichi (栗山俊一, 1882- ?) to locations all around the Korean Peninsula, including Geumgangsan Mountain. Here, they surveyed and photographed Buddhist temples and artifacts. Photographs taken during the survey were later published in *Joseon gojeok dobo* (조선고적도보, 朝鮮古蹟圖譜, 1915-1935), and were repeatedly used for photo postcards and tourist pamphlets in the colonial period. A model of Geumgangsan Mountain was also exhibited in the Joseon Industrial Exhibition of 1915, and the Government-General also promoted Geumgangsan Mountain sightseeing through newspaper advertisements. National Museum of Korea, *(Yuri wonpan sajin) Areumdaun Geumgangsan* (Seoul: Hanguk Bakmulgwanhoe, 1999); "Geumgangsan tamseunghoe mojip gwang-go," *Maeil sinbo*, 6 May, 1915; Kim Hyeon-suk, "Geundaegi honseong munhwa gong-gan eurosseo ui Geumgangsan gwa Geumgangsan geurim," 464–65.

Geumgangsan Mountain imagery consumed by the public.[806] Photo albums began to be produced in Gyeongseong or Wonsan (원산, 元山), and Deokjeon Photo Studio (德田寫眞館, 덕전사진관, Tokuda Photo Studio) in Wonsan published *Geumgangsan sajincheop* (금강산사진첩, 金剛山寫眞帖, Photo Album of Geumgangsan Mountain), which became a bestselling photo album in 1912 and was reprinted many times over throughout the colonial period.[807] The album not only included many photographs of Geumgangsan Mountain but also brief explanations of the mountain and an informational map for tourists.

Tourism to Geumgangsan Mountain was gradually made accessible to the broader public during the colonial period when the Gyeongwonseon Line (경원선, 京元線) railroad that reached Wonju (원주, 原州) from Gyeongseong was completed in 1914. Accordingly, numerous pamphlets were created in the 1910s, such as Takeuchi Naoma's (竹內直馬, ?-?) *Joseon Geumgangsan tamseung-gi* (조선금강산탐승기, 朝鮮金剛山探勝記, Tour of Joseon Geumgangsan Mountain, 1914) that inserted paintings of the popular views of Geumgangsan Mountain.[808] These images were used to enhance the appeal of Geumgangsan Mountain as a tourist attraction rather than a site

---

[806] National Museum of Korea, *(Yuri wonpan sajin) Areumdaun Geumgangsan*, 228; Kim Hyeon-suk, "Geundaegi honseong munhwa gong-gan eurosseo ui Geumgangsan gwa Geumgangsan geurim," 465.

[807] Lee Tae-ho, "Geumgangsan dolabogi wa geurigi," in *Geumgangsan gwan-gwang: Dolabogo naedabom* (Gwacheon: Jininjin, 2018), 17–68.

[808] Artists are uncredited. Tatsuno Sayo, "Geumgangsan jeonseol ui munheon jeonseung yeon-gu: Jong-gyojeok pyosangseong eul jungsim euro" (PhD diss., Seoul, Seoul National University, 2013), 133; Lee Yeong-su, "19 segi Geumgangsando yeon-gu," 128–29; Choi Ji-eun, "19 segi Joseon Yudang Kim Ha-jong ui silgyeong sansuhwa yeon-gu." Lee Yeong-su points out that the paintings resemble Kim Ha-jong's Gemgangsando in *Pung-akgwon* (풍악권, 楓岳卷, Album of Geumgangsan in Autumn, 1865, private collection).

of Korean cultural heritage and history. During this period, many Japanese publishers, such as the Chosen Government Railway (조선철도국, 朝鮮鐵道局), Wonsan Tokuda Photo Studio, Gyeongseong Hinode Trade (경성 히노데상행, 京城 日之出商行), Taisho Photo Workshop (다이쇼 사진공예소, 大正 寫眞工藝所), and Asahi Shimbun Company (아사히 신문사, 朝日新聞社) produced guidebooks of not only Geumgangsan Mountain but all corners of the Korean Peninsula which enticed readers with photographic images.[809] (Fig. 4.88., Fig. 4.89.)

Similarly, in order to promote tourism, South Manchuria Railway and the Railway Bureau of the Japanese Government-General of Korea (Chosen Government Railway) commissioned renowned artists to produced paintings of Geumgangsan Mountain and promoted exhibitions in the 1910s.[810] However, efforts of Korean artists and intellectuals to maintain a level of Korean consciousness of Geumgangsan Mountain as a national landmark persisted. Despite the colonial government's pressure to hire a Japanese artist, Artist Kim Gyu-jin was personally commissioned by Sunjong to paint the Geumgangsan Mountain 'murals' in Huijeongdang Hall (희정당, 熙政堂) of Changdeokgung Palace.[811] (Fig. 4.90., Fig. 4.91.) Painted in the traditional court-style 'blue-green landscape' (*cheongrok sansu,* 청록산수, 青綠山水), there are also

---

[809] Park Do-jin, "Geun, hyeondae Geumgangsando yeon-gu" (Master's thesis, Seoul, Hongik University, 2017), 20; Seo Gi-jae, "Giihan segye ro ui chodae: Geundae yeohaeng annaeseo reul tonghayeo bon Geumgangsan," *Ilboneo munhak* 40 (2009): 236–37.

[810] Kim Hyeon-suk, "Geundaegi honseong munhwa gong-gan eurosseo ui Geumgangsan gwa Geumgangsan geurim," 470–71.

[811] The murals are actually long, panoramic paintings on silk, mounted on the walls of the hall. The painted mural is in the Palace Museum of Korea collection while the primary template is in a private collection. See Lee Yeong-su, "20 segi cho Kim Gyu-jin (1868-1933) ui Geumgangsan yuram gwa yesul hwaldong," *Hanguk gojido yeon-gu* 10, no. 1 (June 2018): 41.

traces of influence from Japanese styles of painting, possibly owing to Kim Gyu-jin's reference to Japanese-style sketches for his *Maeil sinbo* articles.[812] (Fig. 4.92., Fig. 4.93., Fig. 4.94.) As Kim Gyu-jin was also a photographer himself, the popularised horizontal and panoramic layout of Geumgangsan Mountain views was also applied in *Chongseokjeong jeolgyeongdo* (총석정절경도, 叢石亭絶景圖, Painting of the Great Scenery of Chongseokjeong Rocks), which closely resembles the photograph printed by Tokuda Photo Studio.[813] (Fig. 4.95.)

Although Kim Gyu-jin was not a professional court painter, he was already a well-known painter-calligrapher and was also known for his depictions of views of Geumgangsan Mountain in a series of sketches in Government-General-issued *Maeil sinbo* from 1919 to 1920.[814] (Fig. 4.96., Fig. 4.97.) These articles were in emphasis of the natural beauty of the mountain and entertaining features of tourism, rather than the nationalistic, cultural, or historical context of the mountain. The fact that Geumgangsan Mountain was chosen as a decorative motif for the court and that it also frequently appeared in newspaper articles of the early colonial period reveals two characteristics in the perception of the mountain in this period. First, it suggests that both the court and

---

812 Lee Tae-ho, "Geumgangsan dolabogi wa geurigi."

813 Lee Do-yeong also used Geumgangsando to decorate lacquered furniture for the court in the colonial period. Lee Yeong-su, "20 segi cho Yi wang-ga gwanryeon Geumgangsando yeon-gu," *Misulsahak yeon-gu* 271, 272 (December 2011): 210, 218–19.

814 Lee Tae-ho, "Geumgangsan dolabogi wa geurigi"; Lee Yeong-su, "20 segi cho Yi wang-ga gwanryeon Geumgangsando yeon-gu," 211–12; Lee Yeong-su, "20 segi cho Kim Gyu-jin (1868-1933) ui Geumgangsan yuram gwa yesul hwaldong." He was also actively involved with the Yi royal family, having taught Yeongchinwang Prince calligraphy. In 1925, he collected his short articles from *Maeil sinbo* and published a lyrical book, *Geumgang yuramga* (금강유람가, 金剛遊覽歌, Songs on Sightseeing of Geumgang), decorated with his own paintings, which was also consumed as guidebooks.

Japanese authorities actively acknowledged the significance of Geumgangsan Mountain as a national landmark and symbolic landscape of Korean territory. Second, it also reveals the increasingly decorative and commercial use of Geumgangsando by the court and wider public, which grew stronger throughout the 1920s.

Choe Nam-seon's *Pung-ak giyu* (풍악기유, 楓嶽記遊, 1924) and *Geumgang yechan* (금강예찬, 金剛禮讚, 1928) were essays written in emphasis of the cultural and historical significance of the Geumgangsan Mountain in forming Korean national identity and also attempted to provide in-depth information of the mountains.[815] Choe Nam-seon clearly defined Geumgangsan Mountain as Korea's most treasured and symbolic natural landmark:

> "If a foreigner would ask us what can be found in Joseon, we would immediately reply that Joseon has Geumgangsan Mountain. […] For the Joseon people, Geumgangsan Mountain is not just an ordinary natural landscape. It is a symbol of all of our hearts and minds and the greatest hall of enlightenment that touches us with ancient light and strength."[816]

---

[815] Han Ju-hui, "Choe Nam-seon ui Geumgang yechan yeon-gu," *Chungcheong munhwa yeon-gu* 10 (June 2013): 81–98; Park En-jeong, "20 segi cho Geumgangsan pyosang yeon-gu," 245–67; Choi Yu-gyeong, "Choe Nam-seon ui Geumgang yechan gwa Go Hui-dong ui Geumgangsan yeonjak eseo pyohyeondoen gukto chanmi," 281–305; Bok Do-hun, "Gukto sunrye ui mokgajeok seosasi: Choe Nam-seon ui Geumgang yechan, Baekdusan geunchamgi reul jungsim euro," *Hanguk geundae munhak yeon-gu*, Mi wa jeongchi, 6, no. 2 (October 2005): 37–62; Gu Chun-mo, "Choe Nam-seon ui gihaengmun e natanan gyeong-gwan insik gwa minjok jeongcheseong ui gwan-gye"; Seo Gi-jae, "Giihan segye ro ui chodae: Geundae yeohaeng annaeseo reul tonghayeo bon Geumgangsan," 231.

[816] Choe Nam-seon, *Geumgang yechan*, trans. Mun Seong-hwan (Seoul: Gyeongin Munhwasa, 2013), 1.

Published from 1924 to 1927, *Geumgang yechan* included paintings by An Jung-sik, Jo Seok-jin (조석진, 趙錫晉, 1853-1920), Lee Do-yeong, and Go Hui-dong (고희동, 高羲東, 1886-1965).[817] These prominent artists were members of Korea's first artists' association, Seohwa Hyeophoe (서화협회, 書畵協會, Calligraphy and Painting Association, 1918-1936) and travelled to Geumgangsan Mountain in 1918 in celebration of the establishment of the association.[818] Choe Nam-seon included these paintings with the intention of enriching the relationship between the reader and the mountain and fuelling continued public interest in the Korean natural landmark in the colonial period.[819] Despite Choe Nam-seon's apparent nationalistic narrative, it seems that Japanese authorities were permissive of his works as it ultimately promoted Geumgangsan Mountain that was perceived as a source of economic revenue. This ostensible 'neutrality' of geographic imagery allowed maps and paintings of natural landscapes to serve as resilient imagery that the Korean nation could identify with in the absence of a sovereign state.

This, however, did not stop a level of distortion Korean cultural history as tourism to Geumgangsan Mountain led by the Japanese authorities increased throughout the colonial period. Following the opening of Gyeongwonseon Line in 1914, in 1931, Geumgangsan Jeon-gi Cheoldo Jusik Hoesa (금강산 전기 철도 주식회사, 金剛山電気鉄道株式会社, Geumgangsan Electric Railway) extended its own railway

[817] Lee Yeong-su, "19 segi Geumgangsando yeon-gu," 130.
[818] Lee Yeong-su, "19 segi Geumgangsando yeon-gu," 130.
[819] Seo Gi-jae, "Giihan segye ro ui chodae: Geundae yeohaeng annaeseo reul tonghayeo bon Geumgangsan," 235.

line to Naegeumgang Station which greatly facilitated travel and drastically increased the number of tourists to Geumgangsan Mountain.[820]

From the colonial period, Geumgangsan Mountain began to be referred to as 'Kongosan' and authorities also 'reinvented' pre-existent sites by simply renaming them. For instance, they renamed Manmulcho Rocks (만물초, 萬物草) and Birobong Peak (비로봉, 毘盧峯) into Sinmanmulsang (신만물상, 新萬物相) and Sinbirobong (신비로봉, 新毘盧峯) and the southern part of Oegeumgang to Singeumgang (신금강, 新金剛) as if they were newly discovered by the Japanese, effectively nullifying thousands of years of Korean history and heritage.[821]

Moreover, leaflets produced by Japanese agents to promote tours to Geumgangsan Mountain almost always read that while many people visited the mountains during the Goryeo period, there was a great decline of interest during the Joseon period until a revival in tourism in from the twentieth century, implying that Japanese authorities took on the responsibility of reviving Geumgangsan Mountain into a national landmark because Joseon had failed to do so.[822] These implicit strategies involved in the commercialisation of Geumgangsan Mountain were tools to usurp

---

[820] In 1932, Chosen Government Railway also extended the Gyeongwonseon Line to Oegeumgang Station. It was also in the 1930s that Korean tourists outnumbered Japanese tourists, in contrast to the 1920s. Kim Hyeon-suk, "Geundaegi honseong munhwa gong-gan eurosseo ui Geumgangsan gwa Geumgangsan geurim," 459, 463.
[821] Samseonam Rock (삼선암, 三仙岩), Manmulcho Rocks, and Guryong Pokpo Falls were the most popular spots of Geumgangsan Mountain as represented in photographic postcards of the colonial period. Park Do-jin, "Geun, hyeondae Geumgangsando yeon-gu," 20–21; Kim Hyeon-suk, "Geundaegi honseong munhwa gong-gan eurosseo ui Geumgangsan gwa Geumgangsan geurim," 468.
[822] Park Do-jin, "Geun, hyeondae Geumgangsando yeon-gu," 21–22; Kim Hyeon-suk, "Geundaegi honseong munhwa gong-gan eurosseo ui Geumgangsan gwa Geumgangsan geurim," 468.

agency in the representation of the landmark and its cultural contextualisation throughout the colonial period.

Nevertheless, once Western visitors and artists, as well as Japanese artists began to produce larger volumes of Geumgangsan Mountain imagery from the twentieth century, Geumgangsando became diversified in media, including watercolour, coloured print, oil painting, and photography.[823] In 1915, *Maeil sinbo* printed "Dongyang myeongseung Geumgangsan" (동양명승 금강산, 東洋名勝 金剛山, Geumgangsan Mountain, Scenic Spot of the East), a series of articles that promoted the beauty of Geumgangsan Mountain, often accompanied by photographs of the mountain scenery.[824] (Fig. 4.98., Fig. 4.99., Fig. 4.100.)

Maeil sinbo also published Japanese artists' sketches of Geumgangsan Mountain, such as those by Tsuruta Gorō (鶴田吾郎, 1890-1969, pen name 鶴田櫟村) in his series of sketches titled "Geumgangsan sasaengcheop eseo" (금강산 사생첩에서, 金剛山寫生帖에서, From the sketches of Geumgangsan Mountain) in 1914.[825] (Fig. 4.92., Fig. 4.93., Fig. 4.94.) Although these were simple sketches rather than extravagant works of art, they influenced Korean artists' depiction of the mountain using Western media, such as Kim Gyu-jin's previously mentioned sketches of his

---

[823] Although the vast majority of Geumgangsan Mountain paintings were produced by Korean and Japanese artists, some Western artists such as Ellizabeth Keith and Lilian May Miller (1895-1943) also depicted the mountain in the 1920s and Archabbot Norbert Weber (1870-1956) discussed stylistic diversities of Geumgangsando in his book, *In den Diamantbergen Koreas* (1927). Kim Hyeon-suk, "Geundaegi honseong munhwa gong-gan eurosseo ui Geumgangsan gwa Geumgangsan geurim," 470; Park Do-jin, "Geun, hyeondae Geumgangsando yeon-gu," 44–54.
[824] Lee Tae-ho, "Geumgangsan dolabogi wa geurigi."
[825] Song Min-ho, "Chogi Maeil sinbo yeonjae soseol saphwa ran ui pung-gyeong (2)," 211–50.

travels to Geumgangsan Mountain in *Maeil sinbo*.[826] Western and Japanese styles and a mixture of the two were also used to visually depict Geumgangsan Mountain from the late 1910s.[827] For instance, Elizabeth Keith (1887-1956) painted Geumgangsan Mountain using water colour during her visit in 1915, and later used the paintings to create Japanese-style woodblock prints, such as *Nine Dragon Pool* and *The Diamond Mountains, Korea, A Fantasy* in 1922.[828] (Fig. 4.101., Fig. 4.102.)

Repeated usage of specific landscapes of Geumgangsan Mountain in reproducible media such as photo postcards, pamphlets, newspapers, and magazines standardised the image of Geumgangsan Mountain and greatly permeated the popular perception of the representative landmark.[829] Photographs of the mountain exploded in number as more and more tourists hired their own photographers to accompany them on the tour from the colonial period.[830] The mountain that was embedded in Korea's history and collective memory also became increasingly desacralized and commercialised as mass tourism increased.[831] Although the mountain was demystified, it enabled the more intimate and popular understanding and internalisation of the

---

826 Lee Tae-ho, "Geumgangsan dolabogi wa geurigi."
827 Kim Si-hyeon, "19 segi jin-gyeong sansuhwa yeon-gu: Geumgangsando reul jungsim euro" (Master's thesis, Daejeon, Hannam University, 2007), iv.
828 Dong-ho Jeon, "Selling East Asia in Colour: Elizabeth Keith and Korea," *Misulsa wa sigak munhwa*, no. 25 (May 2020): 6–33; Park Do-jin, "Geun, hyeondae Geumgangsando yeon-gu," 47–50.
829 Kim Hyeon-suk, "Geundaegi honseong munhwa gong-gan eurosseo ui Geumgangsan gwa Geumgangsan geurim," 471.
830 Yu Seung-hun, "Geundae jaryo reul tonghae bon Geumgangsan gwan-gwang gwa imiji," *Silcheon minsokhak yeon-gu* 14 (August 2009): 346.
831 An 1934 newspaper article by reporter and cartoonist Choi Yeong-su (최영수, 崔永秀, 1911-?) accounts for the racket caused by photographers hustling to sell photographs to visitors. Choi Yeong-su, "Geumgangsan manhwa haeng-gak (wan)," *Donga ilbo*, 3 October, 1934; Kim Hyeon-suk, "Geundaegi honseong munhwa gong-gan eurosseo ui Geumgangsan gwa Geumgangsan geurim," 457.

Geumgangsan Mountain imagery as representative landscapes of Korean territory and natural topography. Strong public familiarity of the mountain also allowed for easier emotional connection to the mountain as a symbol of Korean nationhood.

Simultaneously, throughout the early twentieth century, Korean painters like An Jung-sik, Jo Seok-jin, Kim Gyu-jin, Byeon Gwan-sik (변관식, 卞寬植, 1899-1976), Lee Sang-beom (이상범, 李象範, 1897-1972), Noh Su-hyeon (노수현, 盧壽鉉, 1899-1978), Lee Ungno (이응노, 李應魯, 1904-1989), Bae Ryeom (배렴, 裵濂, 1911-1968), and Heo Geon (허건, 許楗, 1907-1987) continued to use traditional Joseon true-view painting style to portray the mountain as a mysterious place and add elements of artistic creativity.[832] The Korean cultural practice of referring to Geumgangsan Mountain for artistic inspiration continued even throughout the colonial period, and the mountain's significance in forming the imagined image of the Korean nation-state was conserved as Korean artists and intellectuals attempted to reclaim ownership over the site. Geumgangsando was continuously created throughout the colonial period and established itself as an icon symbolic of the natural landscape of Korean territory.[833]

[832] Kim Hyeon-suk, "Geundaegi honseong munhwa gong-gan eurosseo ui Geumgangsan gwa Geumgangsan geurim," 458, 471.
[833] Yang Ji-seon, "Hanguk ui jin-gyeong sansuhwa e gwanhan gochal," 99.

4.4.b. Rationalising and Contextualising National Territory

Along with Geumgangsan Mountain, Baekdusan Mountain was also a crucial Joseon landmark. Geumgangsan Mountain was recognised as a cultural landmark that was 'enjoyed' by the collective nation, both directly and indirectly; yangbans were able to travel to the mountains in person while the general public indirectly experienced the mountain through literature and paintings.[834] Baekdusan Mountain had a stronger association with political expressions of national sovereignty as the northernmost natural marker of Korean territory. The recognition of Baekdusan Mountain as a representative natural landmark continued all throughout the Joseon period and into the twentieth century. In an 1897 *Doklip sinmun* article that boasted the geographic attributes of Korea, Baekdusan Mountain and Geumgangsan Mountain, along with Taebaeksan Mountain and Myohyangsan Mountain (묘향산, 妙香山) were listed as great features of Joseon:

> "Joseon is a great country that is as big and populous as New York and Pennsylvania […] and the climate and terrains of the *samcheon-ri gangsan* are diverse […] Baekdusan Mountain is the largest at 8,900-*cheok*. At its peak is a large lake that measures over 10 ri in diameter and the height of its hills measure 250 cheok. This mountain is the greatest out of all Joseon mountains. Geumgangsan Mountain has excellent views that are both wild and exceptional. Clear blue water runs over the golden sand and its clean air was where Buddhists, the sick, and the studious would gather."[835]

[834] These paintings consumed by the general public were naturally of lesser quality than those produced by professional painters and literati.
[835] "Nonseol," *Doklip sinmun*, 19 August, 1897.

Baekdusan Mountain was described as the progenitor of all Joseon's nature (산천의 조종, 山川의 祖宗) from the Goryeo period.[836] According to legend, Goryeo's founding king, Taejo, was born in Baekdusan Mountain. Thus, the mountain of Taejo's birth and his capital Gaeseong (개성, 開城) was sacralised based on auspicious geomancy.[837] However, the area surrounding Baekdusan Mountain was not included in Goryeo territory and was inhabited by the Jurchens until the fifteenth century. It was not until King Sejong (세종, 世宗, 1397-1450, r. 1418-1450) expanded Joseon territory into the border of Amrokgang River and Duman-gang River, recovering northern territories that had been lost for over seven hundred years since the Silla unification in 676, that the area became part of Joseon territory.[838] Despite this feat, the region was geologically treacherous and unsuitable to sustain a large Joseon population and the northern region of Baekdusan Mountain remained as a grey area in the early Joseon period when national territory was seldom rigidly determined.[839]

Jurchens continued to periodically invade northern borders up to the seventeenth century, at which point it became a major contested issue between Qing China and Joseon. From the late sixteenth century, Joseon maps emphasised northern territorial boundaries in improved accuracy, through the clear distinction of the Amrokgang River and Duman-gang River and Baekdusan Mountain as territorial

---

[836] Park Chan-seung, "Baekdusan ui 'minjok yeongsan' euro ui pyosanghwa," 11.
[837] Yang Bo-gyeong, "Baekdusan gwa Baekdudaegan gaenyeom hyeongseong gwa sikminjijeok byeoncheon" (*Hanguk munhwa yeoksa jiri hakhoe*, Seoul: Hanguk Munhwa Yeoksa Jiri Hakhoe, 2012), 7–8.
[838] Yang Bo-gyeong, "Baekdusan gwa Baekdudaegan gaenyeom hyeongseong gwa sikminjijeok byeoncheon," 7–9.
[839] Song Yong-deok, "Goryeo-Joseon jeon-gi ui Baekdusan insik," *Yeoksa wa hyeonsil*, no. 64 (June 2007): 147–49.

markers, reflecting the growing interest and awareness of areas surrounding the northern border. A national map in woodblock print, *Paldo chongdo* (팔도총도, 八道總圖) in *Sinjeung Dongguk yeoji seungram* (신증동국여지승람, 新增東國輿地勝覽, supplemented in 1530, published in 1531), deliberately depicted Baekdusan Mountain and explained that the Baekdusan Mountain 'vein' (*jimaek*, 지맥, 地脈) formed Geumgangsan Mountain and Jirisan Mountain.[840] (Fig. 4.103.) Although this type of map was mass produced and even ordinary people also had access to copies of lesser quality copies, the shape of the northern regions remain distorted and there are substantial cartographic inaccuracies.[841]

In the late seventeenth century, Qing claimed that the area surrounding Jangbaeksan Mountain (장백산, 長白山, another name for Baekdusan Mountain) was the ancestral birthplace of the Jurchens, which led to the official consecration of the mountain by the Qing dynasty and rituals devoted to the mountain god in 1677, just like the Chinese Five Sacred Mountains (*oak*, 오악, 五嶽, C. *wuyue*).[842] Tensions surrounding the northern Joseon-Qing border, especially areas of Gando (간도, 間島, c. Jiandao), continued in the late eighteenth century, but this contestation also induced

---

[840] During King Sejong's reign, there was a push to make Baekdusan Mountain an official a ritual site, but it was only officially claimed as a ritual site in King Yeongjo's reign in the eighteenth century. Gwon Nae-hyeon, "Joseon Yeongjodae Baekdusanje sihaeng nonjaeng: Chamyeo inmul ui jujang eul jungsim euro," *Hanguk inmulsa yeon-gu*, no. 15 (March 2011): 273–301; Gang Seok-hwa, "Joseon hugi Baekdusan e daehan insik ui byeonhwa," *Joseon sidaesa hakbo* 56 (March 2011): 199; Song Yong-deok, "Goryeo-Joseon jeon-gi ui Baekdusan insik," 153–54; Lee Sang-tae, *Hanguk gojido baldalsa* (Seoul: Hyean, 1999), 43–44; Bang Dong-in, *Hanguk jido ui yeoksa*, 99–102.

[841] Seoul Museum of History, *(Lee Chan gijeung) Uri yet jido*, 10.

[842] Yang Bo-gyeong, "Baekdusan gwa Baekdudaegan gaenyeom hyeongseong gwa sikminjijeok byeoncheon," 7–9.

renewed interest in Joseon's northern territory and "economic activities on the Korean side of the region."[843] Eventually, a general consensus on Joseon territory was met in 1712, which placed the Baekdusan Mountains within Joseon territory.[844] The agreement set the Qing-Joseon border at "Amrok-gang river to the west and Duman-gang River at the east" and the Baekdusan Jeong-gyebi (백두산정계비, 白頭山定界碑, Baekdusan Mountain Border Stele) was erected 10 ri south of Baekdusan Cheonji (천지, 天池, Heaven Lake).[845] (Fig. 4.104.)

Subsequently, during King Yeongjo's reign in the eighteenth century, the association of Baekdusan Mountain as the birthplace of the Joseon dynasty was emphasised, which refuted Qing China's claim that the mountain was historically home to the Jurchens and strengthened the authority of the Joseon sovereign.[846] While it is true that Taejo, originally a Goryeo military official, was active in northern regions of Hamheung, Yeongheung (영흥, 永興), and Gyeongheung (경흥, 慶興), the Yi royal family had their ancestral roots in Jeonju (전주, 全州), Jeolla-do Province, and even areas where Taejo was active were relatively distant from Baekdusan Mountain.[847] Yeongjo's fixation on the landmark was in part a strategy to strengthen the authority of the crown but also a reaction to Qing China's claim that Baekdusan Mountain was the

---

843 Marion Eggert, "Views of the Country, Visions of Self: Choson Dynasty Travel Records on Chiri-san and Paektu-san," *Asiatische Studien* 52, no. 4 (1998): 1087.
844 Gang Seok-hwa, "Baekdusan Jeong-gyebi wa Gando munje," *Gijeon munhwa yeon-gu* 32 (March 2005): 181–203.
845 Yang Bo-gyeong, "Baekdusan gwa Baekdudaegan gaenyeom hyeongseong gwa sikminjijeok byeoncheon," 8–9.
846 The consolidation of national territory was strongly affiliated with political agendas to strengthen central authority of the monarch. Gang Seok-hwa, "Joseon hugi Baekdusan e daehan insik ui byeonhwa," 207–9; Park Chan-seung, "Baekdusan ui 'minjok yeongsan' euro ui pyosanghwa," 14.
847 Gang Seok-hwa, "Joseon hugi Baekdusan e daehan insik ui byeonhwa," 207.

birthplace of the Qing dynasty, and fuelled interest, reverence, and topographical research of the region for both dynasties.[848] Notwithstanding substantial opposition, the mountain continued to be sacralised in the succeeding period of King Jeongjo's reign and throughout late Joseon.[849] The eighteenth-century association of the Baekdusan Mountain with the Yi royal family consolidated the mountain as Joseon territory.

According to Joseon period understanding, national territory was composed of three components: land (territory), residents (subjects), and state authority.[850] In other words, for a specific space to be considered national territory, the land had to be inhabited by Joseon subjects and the government's authority had to reach the population. The drive to control and rule over territories and subjects using direct state governance was strengthened during King Yeongjo and Jeongjo's reigns and led to a rise in 'territorial consciousness' (*yeongto uisik*, 영토의식, 領土意識) in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[851] The Joseon-Qing relationship had stabilised by the eighteenth century, which allowed for a population growth and active regional development, as well as increased state surveys of the peripheries of the country, including regions close to the northern border.[852] Efforts to not only reinterpret national history and territory but also digest the geographical space of Joseon in a more

---

848 Gang Seok-hwa, "Joseon hugi Baekdusan e daehan insik ui byeonhwa," 208–9.
849 Yang Bo-gyeong, "Yet jido e natanan bukbang insik gwa Baekdusan," 315; Gang Seok-hwa, "Joseon hugi Baekdusan e daehan insik ui byeonhwa," 209–10.
850 Bang Dong-in, *Hanguk ui gukgyeong hoekjeong yeon-gu* (Seoul: Iljogak, 1997), 198; O Jong-rok, "Joseon chogi ui gukbang-gwan," *Jindan hakbo* 86 (December 1998): 140; Park Seon-yeong, "Geundae Dong Asia ui gukgyeong insik gwa Gando," 204.
851 Park Seon-yeong, "Geundae Dong Asia ui gukgyeong insik gwa Gando," 204.
852 Yang Bo-gyeong, "18 segi jiriseo: Jido ui jejak gwa gukga ui jibang jibae," *Eung-yong jiri* 20, no. 20 (December 1997): 34–36.

encompassing and systematic manner were visible in the increased volume of records related to territory and regional development.[853]

Accordingly, from the eighteenth century, Baekdusan Mountain was stylistically emphasised in pictorial maps such as *Yogye gwanbang jido* (요계관방지도, 遼薊關防地圖, 1706), where the mountain was painted in serene white, in contrast to the general use of green. (Fig. 4.105., Fig. 4.106.) Moreover, Baekdusan Mountain was deliberately enlarged in order to present the mountain as Joseon's most symbolic natural feature.[854] This is a common trend in almost all pictorial maps of late Joseon; many maps depict Baekdusan Mountain larger than life, using a mixture of white over blue or green, or even gold.[855] An eighteenth century copy of Jeong Sang-gi's *Dong-guk daejido* (동국대지도, 東國大地圖) also clearly emphasises the status of Baekdusan Mountain, as does an early nineteenth century map, *Yeojido* (여지도, 輿地圖). (Fig. 4.29., Fig. 4.107.) Indeed, the tendency to emphasise the sacredness of Baekdusan Mountain on maps grew even stronger in late Joseon.[856]

The recognition of Baekdusan Mountain as a representative geographic landmark of Joseon, coupled with the development of surrounding farmland and residential areas, led to an increase of recreational travelling and the creation of travelogues to the mountain among literati of the late eighteenth century, in contrast to the predominance of trips for official duties in previous years.[857] The remote location

---

[853] Park Seon-yeong, "Geundae Dong Asia ui gukgyeong insik gwa Gando," 204.
[854] Schmid, *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919*, 218; Yang Bo-gyeong, "Yet jido e natanan bukbang insik gwa Baekdusan," 312–15.
[855] Yang Bo-gyeong, "Yet jido e natanan bukbang insik gwa Baekdusan," 315.
[856] Yang Bo-gyeong, "Yet jido e natanan bukbang insik gwa Baekdusan," 307–8.
[857] Examples of travelogues of official business include Park Gwon's (박권, 朴權, 1658-1715) *Bukjeong ilgi* (북정일기, 北征日記), Kim Ji-nam's (김지남, 金指南,

and harsh terrains of Baekdusan Mountain had made it a relatively unpopular destination for visitors who travelled for pleasure in the past, but after the construction of roads, relocation of Joseon residents along the Amrokgang and Duman-gang rivers, and the cultivation of farmland from the late eighteenth century, travel among Joseon literati became more frequent.[858] The overall popularity of travelogues from the eighteenth century also led to a rise in the production of travel writings of Baekdusan Mountain, but many still recorded the hardship faced on the treacherous hike, which made the tours a "heroic deed," with the emphasis on not on "having seen" but on "having done."[859]

While Baekdusan Mountain was perceived as a general signifier of northern territorial boundaries and a symbolic landmark in the Joseon period, it became the central axis of the Korean nation and its culture after Qing's official recognition of the mountain as Joseon territory in 1712.[860] At the same time, the conceptualisation of the

---

1654-?) *Bukjeongrok* (북정록, 北征錄), and Hong Se-tae's (홍세태, 洪世泰, 1653-1725) Baekdu-san-gi (백두산기, 白頭山記), all written in 1712 at the time of the official demarcation of Baekdusan Mountain. Travelogues for pleasure include Yi Ui-cheol's (이의철, 李宜哲, 1703-1778) Baekdu-san-gi (백두산기, 白頭山記, 1751), Park Jong's (박종, 朴琮, 1735-1793) Baekdu-san yurok (백두산유록, 白頭山遊錄, 1764), and Seo Myeong-eung's (서명응, 徐命膺, 1716-1787) Yu Baekdu-san-gi (유백두산기, 遊白頭山記, 1766). Son Hye-ri, "Joseon hugi munindeul ui Baekdusan yuram gwa girok e daehayeo," *Minjok munhaksa yeon-gu* 37 (August 2008): 136–37, 140, 144.

[858] Son Hye-ri, "Joseon hugi munindeul ui Baekdusan yuram gwa girok e daehayeo"; Gang Seok-hwa, "Joseon hugi Baekdusan e daehan insik ui byeonhwa," 210.

[859] Eggert, "Views of the Country, Visions of Self," 1088; Son Hye-ri, "Joseon hugi munindeul ui Baekdusan yuram gwa girok e daehayeo," 138–39. For more on Joseon literati perceptions of Baekdusan Mountain's "border-like features," see Marion Eggert, "A Borderline Case: Korean Travelers' Views of the Chinese Border (Eighteenth to Nineteenth Century," in *China and Her Neighbours: Borders, Visions of the Other, Foreign Policy 10th to 19th Century*, edited by Sabine Dabringhaus and Roderich Ptak (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1997): 49-78.

[860] Baekdusan Mountain was officially made a subject of ancestral ritual in 1767,

country's territory as an organic body, with Baekdusan Mountain as the head and the rest of the peninsula as the body and limbs, became prevalent when spiritual recovery of national pride was desperately needed after the two invasions of Japan and Qing in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[861] The idea of 'Baekdudaegan Mountain Range'(백두대간, 白頭大幹), that rationalised the peninsula as an interconnected system of mountain ranges that originated at Baekdusan Mountain, gained popularity from such heightened interest in national territory.[862] Silhak (실학, 實學, Realist School of Confucianism/School of Practical Learning) scholar and author of *Taekriji*, Yi Jung-hwan (이중환, 李重煥, 1691-1756), describes Baekdusan Mountain as the "eyebrows" of the Korean Peninsula that sits on the border of Joseon and the Jurchens:

> "The main branch of Baekdudaegan Mountain Range stretches straight to the sides and thousands of ri south to Taebaeksan Mountain of Gyeongsang-do Province as a continuous ridge. […] The ridge connects Chujiryeong Ridge (추지령, 楸地嶺), Geumgangsan Mountain, Yeonsuryeong Ridge (연수령, 延壽嶺), Osaekryeong Ridge (오색령, 五色嶺), Seoraksan Mountain (설악산, 雪嶽山), Han-gyesan Mountain (한계산, 寒溪山), Odaesan Mountain (오대산, 五臺山), Dae-gwanryeong Pass (대관령, 大關嶺), Baekbongryeong

reflecting increased interest in and veneration for the northern mountain from King Yeongjo's reign. Gang Seok-hwa, "Joseon hugi ui bukbang yeongto uisik," *Hanguksa yeon-gu* 129 (June 2005): 103–4; Ryu Si-hyeon, "Hanmal Ilje cho Hanbando e gwanhan jirijeok insik," 272–73.

[861] Gang Seok-hwa, "Joseon hugi Baekdusan e daehan insikui byeonhwa," 196.

[862] Yang Bo-gyeong, "Baekdusan gwa Baekdudaegan gaenyeom hyeongseong gwa sikminjijeok byeoncheon," 13–14.

Ridge (백봉령, 白茯嶺), and Taebaeksan Mountain together in a complex system of mountains, peaks, and ridges."[863]

Baekdudaegan Mountain Range was frequently compared to the backbone of a person in maps and geographic writings of the eighteenth and nineteenth century, such as *Daedong chongdo* (대동총도, 大東總圖) of *Haedong jido* (해동지도, 海東地圖, ca. 1750) and *Joseon-guk paldo tonghapdo* (조선국팔도통합도, 朝鮮國八道統合圖, ca. 1822-1823). Baekdusan Mountain Range was the spine that connected the head, Baekdusan Mountain, to the peninsula, while Daemado Island (대마도, 對馬島, Tsushima Island) and Jeju Island were the two feet.[864] (Fig. 4.108., Fig. 109., Fig., 4.110., Fig. 4.111., Fig. 4.112., Fig. 4.113.)

The influx of foreign visitors and Western visual culture in the late nineteenth century brought about the diversification of the types of Baekdusan Mountain imagery, mostly in the form of sketches and photography. Foreign travellers in Korea and China were the main producers of images of Baekdusan Mountain in the 1880s and 1890s. Although he didn't visit the mountain in person, British diplomat William Richard Carles (1848-1929) introduced Baekdusan Mountain in writing:

> "At the extreme north lies [Baekdusan], the great mountain on which are the sources of the two rivers which form the northern boundary. With it are connected many myths and legends regarding the prehistoric times of the country. From it extends a range of mountains running north and south, which

---

[863] Yi Jung-hwan, "Sansu."

[864] Yang Bo-gyeong, "Baekdusan gwa Baekdudaegan gaenyeom hyeongseong gwa sikminjijeok byeoncheon," 18–19. Yang Bo-geyong refers to *Daedong chongdo* as *Paldo chongdo* (팔도총도, 八道總圖).

generally follows the line of the eastern coast at no great distance from its waters."

In 1886, Henry Evan Murchison James (1846-1923), a British civil officer, travelled to Manchuria and Baekdusan Mountain with fellow officer Francis Younghusband (1863-1942) and published *The Long White Mountain* in 1888, which included Younghusband's sketch of Cheonji in its frontispiece.[865] (Fig. 4.114.) James' book is informative of the contemporary recognition of the mountain as a symbolic marking of the Joseon-Qing border:

"They also told us a commissioner came not long ago from China to look for a boundary pillar erected in the fifty-first year of the Emperor [Kangxi] (A.D. 1712) to mark the Corean frontier, but that he could not find it for the snow."[866]

In addition, Captain Younghusband's impression of Baekdusan, as written in his own words in William Campbell's 1892 article provides a descriptive account of his ascent to the mountain:

"It was in the summer of 1886 that Mr. James, a member of the Bombay Civil Service, with Dr. Fulford and myself, journeyed from [Beijing] towards Manchuria, having heard of this Mount [Baekdusan], of which we have had such an interesting account this evening from Mr. Campbell. […] At the foot of it we found some most lovely meadows covered with iris, lilies, and columbine, surpassing even those of Kashmir. Passing on up through the forest we came to the summit of the [Jangbaeksan]. Before us were two prominent peaks seen

---

865 Henry Evan Murchison James, *The Long White Mountain or A Journey in Manchuria: With Some Account of the Highway, People, Administration and Religion of That Country* (London: Longmans, 1888).
866 James, *The Long White Mountain or A Journey in Manchuria,* 263.

> from the north side- there are really five all round and between them the saddle. Arriving there, we expected to see a view on the other side towards Korea; instead of that, however, we saw straight under our feet this wonderful lake situated right at the top of the mountain. It was of the most clear deep blue, and surrounded by a magnificent circle of jagged peaks, ascending one of which I got a view of all this country over which Mr. Campbell travelled later on."[867]

Although James and Younghusband travelled to Baekdusan from Manchuria, he accounts for the Korean inhabitants of the region:

> "I may mention that all this country was formerly part of Korea, for we frequently came across signs of ancient Korean habitations, one trace being the strawberries […] and the Chinese settlers informed us that these were the remains of ancient gardens made by the Koreans in former times. I remember also, further up in the forest of Manchuria we met some French Roman Catholic missionaries, who showed us some old pottery and some old coins which had been found by some of the settlers in a part of the forest they were clearing, thus showing it was more inhabited in former times than now."[868]

It seems that Joseon people did indeed regard areas surrounding Baekdusan Mountain to be Joseon territory in the late nineteenth century. In 1867, Qing allowed the entry of Joseon people in the northeast area of Gando when their policy of restricting entry to areas of Gando north of Amrokgang and Duman-gang rivers failed to keep Joseon people out.[869] It is likely that Qing authorities had little to no control over the region as

---

[867] Campbell, "A Journey Through North Korea to the Ch'ang-Pai Shan," 157–59.
[868] Campbell, "A Journey Through North Korea to the Ch'ang-Pai Shan," 158–59.
[869] Park Chan-seung, "Baekdusan ui 'minjok yeongsan' euro ui pyosanghwa," 16.

late as 1881, when Qing officials reported being startled to find officials of Hamgyeong-do Province authorising cultivation permits to Joseon residents and governing them north of Duman-gang River.[870] As a result, contact and conflict between Joseon residents of Hamgyeong-do Province and Pyeong-an-do Province and Jurchens increased. Moreover, disagreement in interpreting Tomun-gang River (토문강, 土門江) as Duman-gang River in distinguishing Qing-Joseon boundaries led to unresolved negotiations between the two countries.[871] After two unsuccessful rounds of settling territorial boundaries in 1885 and 1886, the area surrounding Duman-gang River technically remained disputed throughout the first decade of the twentieth century until the Japanese administration signed the Gando Convention (간도협약, 間島協約) in 1909.[872]

Despite continued territorial contestations, Joseon people clearly acknowledged Baekdusan Mountain as national territory, as reflected in maps of the late nineteenth century. Related to this, British diplomat Charles William Campbell, who also travelled to both Geumgangsan and Baekdusan mountains in 1889, provided an intriguing story of how he was enticed to visit Baekdusan Mountain (Fig. 4.115., Fig. 4.116.):

> "One of the first purchases I made in Korea after my arrival there in September 1887, was a native atlas which I saw displayed in a shop during one of my earliest walks in the City of [Seoul]. It was by no means the first map of Korea that I had seen, but it was the first to interest me, and my attention was instantly drawn to a mountain called [']White Head Mountain,['] which figured very

870 Park Seon-yeong, "Geundae Dong Asia ui gukgyeong insik gwa Gando," 204–5.
871 Kim Yun-jin, "19 segi mal Jo, Cheong hoedam gwa Tomun-gang" (Master's thesis, Seoul, Dongguk University, 2020).
872 Park Chan-seung, "Baekdusan ui 'minjok yeongsan' euro ui pyosanghwa," 17–19.

> prominently at the top of it. It seemed to consist of a circle of jagged peaks enclosing a moderately-sized lake. Turning overleaf for some explanation of this extraordinary place I found a short description of it in Chinese […] Making every allowance for the usual exaggeration in such matters, this notice clearly referred to a very uncommon sort of mountain. At the same time, I was not aware that it had ever been seen by Europeans, and I at once resolved to visit it as soon as an opportunity presented itself. Later on I learnt that Mr. James and his party had explored it hurriedly in the summer of 1886 from the direction of Manchuria, being the first foreigners to do so; but I still though the neighbourhood worthy of examination from the Korean side, and, needless to say, my own curiosity to see the lake so wonderfully situated was not lessened by Mr. James's graphic description of it in his book entitled 'The Long White Mountain.' It is true that the Korean stories of the dimensions of both lake and mountain were toned down greatly by Mr. James; nevertheless, lakes in mountain tops 7,000 or 8,000 feet above sea-level are rare enough, and this one on [Baekdusan] yields precedent in interest, historically and geographically, to few others in the world."[873]

There are two important notes to make from Campbell's description. First, one can infer that pictorial maps that depicted the physical form of Baekdusan Mountain could be easily found and purchased in Seoul. Secondly, it seems that there was readily available basic information of Baekdusan Mountain and its significance as both a unique Korean landmark and also a marker of Joseon-Qing territorial border. Another important

[873] Campbell, "A Journey Through North Korea to the Ch'ang-Pai Shan," 141-143.

observation made by Campbell which proves that rites were continuously performed to the northernmost ancestral mountain:

> "Just at the point where this mountain is first visible, a small temple has been erected for the purpose of offering sacrifices which is done by the King of Korea every year on the 4th of the 8th moon (August) to the [Baekdusan] deities. At [Seoul] I was led to believe that the officials deputed to perform this function actually ascended the mountain, but they evidently prefer a compromise, the efficacy of which has apparently never been doubted."[874]

It is also intriguing that the beauty of Baekdusan Mountain greatly appealed to British visitors at this time, possibly owing to the 'uncommonness' of the volcano mountain and its fascinating traits such as the white mountain surface that warranted scientific research:

> "[Baekdusan], or Lao-pai Shan (Old White Mountain) as it is at present called by the Chinese of Manchuria, is the most remarkable mountain, naturally and historically, in this part of Asia. The perennial white-ness of its crest, now known to be caused by pumice when not by snow, made the peoples that beheld it from the plains of Manchuria give it names whose meanings have survived in the Chinese [Jangbaeksan] or Ever White Mountain. This designation, obviously assigned to the peak of it, so far as is known, can pretend to perpetual whiteness, whether of pumice or snow. […]"[875]

British Captain Hamilton John Goold-Adams (1858-1920) also left images of Baekdusan Mountain after he travelled to the mountain via Jemulpo in 1891, which he

---

[874] Campbell, "A Journey Through North Korea to the Ch'ang-Pai Shan," 151–52.
[875] Campbell, "A Journey Through North Korea to the Ch'ang-Pai Shan," 153–55.

and Captain Alfred Edward John Cavendish (1859-1943) published in their book, *Korea and the Sacred White Mountain* (1894). (Fig. 4.117., Fig. 4.118.) The images of Baekdusan Mountain Cheonji are not remarkable in quality; they appear to be coloured sketches or watercolour paintings that were printed in black and white. An introduction written by Cavendish explains that he was able to make use of photographs given to him by Charles Campbell who had travelled to the mountain in 1889, as well as photographs from Mr. Hillier and Mr. Brazier.[876] He goes on to explain:

> "The photograph of the lake in the summit of the [']White Mountain['] is combined from three views taken by Captain Goold-Adams; owing to the defective state of the films, our Kodak pictures were, with this solitary exception, total failures."[877]

Captain Goold-Adams also states that he took "a number of photographs" of Cheonji, but it seems that drawings replaced the photographs in the process of publishing the book to supplement the poor quality of films.[878] Though the images are not excellent in quality, they are also one of the earliest depictions of the Baekdusan Mountain by Westerners, in Western medium. Moreover, the account by Cavendish and Goold-Adams is telling of the widespread recognition of Baekdusan Mountain as a prominent landmark, even among new Western visitors.

As can be inferred from Cavendish's reference to Baekdusan Mountain as a "Sacred White Mountain," and Campbell's explanation that Cheonji "is the nucleus of a

---

[876] From the book, one can deduce that Campbell would have supplied the photograph of the forest view near Baekdusan (Fig. 4.116.). A. E. J. Cavendish and H. E. Goold-Adams, *Korea and the Sacred White Mountain: Being a Brief Account of a Journey in Korea in 1891* (London: G. Philip & Son, 1894), 5.

[877] Cavendish and Goold-Adams, *Korea and the Sacred White Mountain,* 6.

[878] Cavendish and Goold-Adams, *Korea and the Sacred White Mountain,* 175.

mass of legend and fable" and "a sacred spot […] not to be profaned by mortal eye with impunity," the widespread perception of the mountain as an extraordinary Korean landmark was prevalent in the late nineteenth century.[879] Campbell, in particular, seems to have an extensive knowledge of contemporary Joseon understanding of Baekdusan Mountain, and he himself uses the term "*cho-san* of Korea" (*josan,* 조산, 祖山, ancestral mountain) in his accounts.[880]

It is surprising, then, that surviving examples of Korean depictions of Baekdusan Mountain during this time was fewer than, or at least as few as, those produced by foreign visitors. Unlike Geumgangsan Mountain, Baekdusan Mountain did not become a major subject of painting in the late Joseon period.[881] In fact, Baekdusan Mountain was hardly depicted as a painting in its own right except in rare cases such as 'Nam Gu-man (남구만, 南九萬, 1629-1711) style' *Gwanbuk sipseungdo* (관북십승도, 關北十勝圖), attributed to court painter Jo Jung-muk (조중묵, 趙重默, 1820-after 1894), where Baekdusan Mountain and Cheonji is depicted in the eighth screen, or *Baekdusando* (백두산도, 白頭山圖) attributed to Ji Chang-han (지창한, 池昌翰, 1851-1921).[882] (Fig. 4.119., Fig. 120., Fig. 4.121., Fig. 4.122.) However,

---

[879] Campbell, "A Journey Through North Korea to the Ch'ang-Pai Shan," 153–55.
[880] Campbell, "A Journey Through North Korea to the Ch'ang-Pai Shan," 154–55; For more on Campbell's travelogue, see Yoong-hee Jo, "Joseon and Her People Shown in the Travel Report of Campbell in the Late 19th Century," *The Review of Korean Studies* 11, no. 1 (March 2008): 47–66.
[881] North Korean artists frequently paint Baekdusan Mountain as it is seen as the birthplace of Kim Il-sung's revolutions. Kim Chang-hui, "Bukhan ui Baekdu hyeoltong eul wihan yeoksa mandeulgi," *Hanguk jeongchi oegyosa nonchong* 39, no. 1 (August 2017): 147–78; Park Sang-hui, "Bukhan ui 'jeongchijeok punggyeonghwa' yeon-gu: Gieok gwa mang-gak ui jeongchijeok jangchi," *Tong-il inmunhak* 88 (December 2021): 223–61.
[882] National Museum of Korea, *Joseon sidae silgyeong sansuhwa 2*, Guklip Jungang Bakmulgwan Hanguk seohwa dorok 27 (Seoul: National Museum of Korea, 2019),

simplified images of Baekdusan Mountain on pictorial maps throughout the Joseon period resulted in a widespread awareness of the ancestral mountain, and the distinctive and unique feature, Cheonji, facilitated the differentiation of Baekdusan Mountain from countless other mountains.[883] (Fig. 4.123.)

Jeong In-ho's *Choesin Daehan godeung jiji* (1909) is a rare example of an illustration of Baekdusan Mountain used in textbooks. (Fig. 4.124.) Here, Jeong In-ho wrote:

> "Baekdusan Mountain is the tallest mountain that towers in Hamgyeongbuk-do Province (함경북도, 咸鏡北道), near Gilrimseong (길림성, 吉林省, Jilin) of China. On top of the head of the mountain is white snow in all four seasons. At the waist of the mountain are thick forests and steep cliffs that make up thousands and tens of thousands of sceneries that are truly remarkable sights. All the mountains of our country stem from this mountain's range and they make up thousands and tens of thousands of different shapes, bowing quietly and standing one over another."[884]

Similar variations of this description of Baekdusan Mountain can be found in many other contemporary geography textbooks such as Hyeon Chae's *Daehan jiji* (대한지지, 大韓地誌, 1899), Jang Ji-yeon's *Daehan sinjiji* (1907), and Kim Geon-jung's (김건중, 金建中) *Sinpyeon Daehan jiri* (신편대한지리, 新編大韓地理, 1907), but Jeong In-ho's book is the only one that includes illustrations.[885] When looking at

---

190–217, 282–87.

[883] It is highly likely that more examples of Baekdusan Mountain paintings and imagery will be found in the future as further research on the topic is conducted.

[884] Jeong In-ho, *Choesin Daehan godeung jiji*, 137.

[885] Sin Su-gyeong, "Ilje gangjeomgi jiri gyogwaseo saphwa yeon-gu," 251.

the depiction of the mountain, it is heavily influenced by the appearance of Baekdusan Mountain in pictorial maps, including the label of "Cheonji" in the picture. It can also be reasoned that photographic imagery of Baekdusan Mountain, or other Western-style images of the mountain were not so widely proliferated in domestic Korea, at least until 1910. This is comparable to textbook illustrations of Geumgangsan Mountain as seen from Danbalryeong Hills that were already influenced by vertical compositions commonly used for photography.

Another illustration used to describe famous spots in the region deliberately depicted and exaggerated Baekdusan Jeong-gyebi and Duman-gang River that marked the territorial boundary of Korea and China. (Fig. 4.125.) Jeong In-ho explained:

> "In the ninth year of the great King Sejong's reign, he sent Kim Jong-seo (김종서, 金宗瑞, 1383-1453) to the northern frontier completely recover 100 ri of territory. In the thirty-eighth year of great King Sukjong, he sent Park Gwon (朴權, 1658-1715) as an envoy to set boundaries. Qing Emperor Kangxi's official Fuca Mukdeng, (富察 穆克登, K. Mokgeukdeung, 목극등, 1664-1735) climbed to Baekdusan Mountain together and carefully set the two countries' territorial boundary and erected Jeong-gyebi at the watershed on top of Baekdusan Mountain."[886]

The appearance of the mountain view was inevitably distorted in order to show all main elements: Cheonji, the watershed, Jeong-gyebi, and Duman-gang River. Again, the depiction of the mountain itself is similar to those shown in pictorial maps.

---

[886] Jeong In-ho, *Choesin Daehan godeung jiji*, 142.

The proliferation of modern maps in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century was closely linked with the objective of modern nation-building processes wherein "[g]eographical knowledge framed the country as territorially coherent- even destined- while history projected its development back in time and gave it depth."[887] Baekdusan Mountain was also utilised in the creation of an ethno-historic narrative that tied the people of Joseon to the abstract idea of the nation-state. This was a new development that became acute toward the twentieth century. While Baekdusan Mountain had already rationalised Joseon territory in reaction to Qing claims over the region and was even associated with the Yi royal family in the Joseon period, the direct association with the collective ethnic nation was yet to be theorised.

Prior to the late nineteenth century, many late Joseon scholars still viewed Baekdusan Mountain in Sinocentric perspectives, and argued that China's Kunlun Mountains (Gonryunsan Mountain, 곤륜산, 崑崙山) reach eastward to form the Baekdusan Mountain.[888] Baekdusan Mountain was gradually used to portray the autonomous development of Joseon mountain ranges from the nineteenth century, notwithstanding the continued reference to its organic connection to the Kunlun Mountains. For example, Silhak philosopher Jeong Yak-yong (정약용, 丁若鏞, 1762-1836) admitted that as all mountain ranges are connected, Baekdusan and the Kunlun mountains are also connected. Yet, he argued that there is no need to view and serve the Kunlun Mountains as an 'ancestral mountain' (조종산, 祖宗山) as the Earth is round and highs and lows have no meaning.[889]

---

[887] Schulten, *Mapping the Nation*, 3–4.
[888] Park Chan-seung, "Baekdusan ui 'minjok yeongsan' euro ui pyosanghwa," 14–15.
[889] Jeong Yak-yong, *Yeoyudang jeonseo*, ed. Kim Seong-jin, vol. 3, 6 vols, Jirijip 6

Toward 1910, historian Sin Chae-ho emphasised Baekdusan Mountain as a symbol of not only Korea's geographic features but also autonomous ethnic history in "Doksa sinron" (독사신론, 讀史新論), a series of articles published in *Daehan maeil sinbo* in 1908. In the series, Hamgyeong-do Province and the north-eastern region was contextualised as the ancient site of Goguryeo and Balhae (발해, 渤海, 698-926) states, and Baekdusan Jeong-gyebi visually proclaimed Joseon-Qing national borders and helped strengthen the territorial awareness of national borders.[890]

Most importantly, Sin Chae-ho contextualised and rationalised Korean territory in the early twentieth century by asserting that Baekdusan Mountain was the birthplace of Dangun, the progenitor of the Korean ethnic nation.[891] Sin Chae-ho's theory was dependent on the late Joseon re-interpretation of the 'Taebaeksan Mountain' reference made in the Dangun myth in *Samguk yusa* (삼국유사, 三國遺事, 1281). He argued that this 'Taebaeksan Mountain' is in fact Baekdusan Mountain, based on the fact that Jangbaeksan Mountain (Baekdusan Mountain) was an older name for Taebaeksan Mountain.[892] This theory is indeed plausible to an extent; from as early as the Goryeo period, the term "Baekdusan" was used interchangeably with several other names, including Bulhamsan (불함산, 不咸山), Gaemadaesan (개마대산, 蓋馬大山),

---

(Seoul: Sin Joseonsa, 1934), http://db.itkc.or.kr/inLink?DCI=ITKC_MO_0597A_1470_010_0090_2004_A286_XML, accessed 11 September, 2022; Gang Seok-hwa, "Joseon hugi Baekdusan e daehan insik ui byeonhwa," 217–18.

[890] Gang Seok-hwa, "Joseon hugi Hamgyeong-do ui jiyeok baljeon gwa bukbang yeongto uisik" (PhD diss., Seoul, Seoul National University, 1996), 113; Park Seon-yeong, "Geundae Dong Asia ui gukgyeong insik gwa Gando," 204–6.

[891] Jang Won-seok, "Minjok ui sangjing, Baekdusan ui tansaeng," in *Baekdusan: Hyeonjae wa mirae reul malhanda* (Seongnam: Hangukhak Jungang Yeon-guwon, 2010), 385–86.

[892] Park Chan-seung, "Baekdusan ui 'minjok yeongsan' euro ui pyosanghwa," 21–22.

Dotaesan (도태산, 徒太山), Jongtaesan (종태산, 從太山), Taebaeksan, and Jangbaeksan.[893] Nevertheless, there remain substantial confusion over which mountain 'Taebaeksan' of the legend of Dangun referred to in *Samguk yusa*.[894]

Overall, the strategy of sacralising Baekdusan Mountain was the dominant trend of the nationalist discourse in the early twentieth century. The authority of Baekdusan Mountain had briefly declined in the late nineteenth century when reformist movements criticised the 'old knowledge' of geomancy; Baekdusan Mountain relied on geomancy as the belief was that the mountain collected *gi* (기, 氣, Ch. *chi*) from Manchuria and pumped it through the "arteries that extended through the peninsula."[895] Nevertheless, in the early twentieth century, when Korea was faced with the real threat of colonialism, ethnic narratives surrounding Baekdusan Mountain regained popularity among intellectuals like Choe Nam-seon. The issue of unclear national borders surrounding Gando, the threat posed to the sovereignty of the Korean Empire, reactionary interest in Dangun as ethnic progenitor, and the impending possibility of annexation offered opportunities for Baekdusan Mountain to contextualise and legitimise Korean territory.[896]

Although Sin Chae-ho's theory lacked empirical evidence, it gained the support of many nationalists including Na Cheol and Park Eun-sik, and newspapers like *Donga ilbo* and *Joseon ilbo* and their writers Gwon Deok-gyu (권덕규, 權悳奎, 1890-1950)

---

[893] Song Yong-deok, "Goryeo-Joseon jeon-gi ui Baekdusan insik," 129–30.
[894] In the Goryeo period, Myohyangsan was known as the mountain where Dangun originated from. Song Yong-deok, "Goryeo-Joseon jeon-gi ui Baekdusan insik," 132–34; Schmid, *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919*, 218.
[895] Schmid, *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919*, 218–19.
[896] Schmid, *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919*, 216–23; Lee Jong-ho, "Choe Nam-seon ui jiri(hak)jeok gihoek gwa pyosang," 297.

and Choe Nam-seon further proliferated the idea of Baekdusan Mountain as the birthplace of Dangun from the 1920s.[897] Choe Nam-seon even described the water of Cheonji as the "life-giving water" (생명수, 生命水) and argued that all of Joseon descends from Baekdusan Mountain's Cheonji.[898] Na Cheol, the founder of the religion Dangun-gyo, continued to develop this theory throughout the 1910s and performed religious ceremonies at Baekdusan Mountain.[899] Both *Donga ilbo* and *Joseon ilbo* continuously promoted Baekdusan Mountain in the 1920s and 30s by holding 'exploration events' at Baekdusan Mountain and hosting exhibitions, film screenings, and lectures.[900] Through nationalistic narratives of the early twentieth century, Baekdusan Mountain concreted its status as the nation's key geographical landmark which contextualised and rationalised an imagined idea of the Korean territory.

The Japanese Resident-General produced images of Baekdusan Mountain as part of their initiative to expand political control over the Gando region. In 1907, the Resident-General Temporary Gando Police Station (통감부 임시간도파출소, 統監府臨時間島派出所) was established, and in 1909, *Gando sajincheop* (간도사진첩, 間島寫眞帖), a photo album was published, containing 138 photos that were taken from 23 August, 1907 to 2 November, 1909.[901] The album is historically significant as contains the earliest surviving photograph of Baekdusan Jeong-gyebi, which was

---

[897] Park Chan-seung, "Baekdusan ui 'minjok yeongsan' euro ui pyosanghwa," 22–24.
[898] Choe Nam-seon, *Baekdusan geunchamgi*, trans. Im Seon-bin (Seoul: Gyeongin Munhwasa, 2013), 258–61; Gu Chun-mo, "Choe Nam-seon ui gihaengmun e natanan gyeong-gwan insik gwa minjok jeongcheseong ui gwan-gye," 124.
[899] Park Chan-seung, "Baekdusan ui 'minjok yeongsan' euro ui pyosanghwa," 21–22.
[900] Jang Won-seok, "Minjok ui sangjing, Baekdusan ui tansaeng," 389.
[901] Park Hwan, "Manju, jeguk juui ui siseon gwa ui cheot mannam: Gando sajincheop," *Hanguk minjok undongsa yeon-gu* 86 (March 2016): 325–26.

destroyed and lost in 1931, among other views of Baekdusan Mountain and areas of Gando. However, the album was not published for the general public and few copies survive. The album was first and foremost focused on delivering information, especially those directly concerned with Japanese interests in furthering their colonial occupation.

The visual depiction of Baekdusan Mountain that targeted the general public belatedly gained prominence from the colonial period when travel to the mountain increased and the production of photographed imagery further advanced. Photographs were disseminated as affordable postcards and newspaper prints to both Korean and Japanese consumers throughout the 1920s and 30s. (Fig. 4.126., Fig. 4.127.) In 1921, *Donga ilbo* recruited a group of 'Baekdusan Explorers' (백두산 탐험대, 白頭山探險隊) in hopes of publicising the historical importance of the mountain as the site of origin of the Korean ethnic nation and strengthening the Dangun-Baekdusan Mountain association.[902] The team photographer, Yamahana Yoshiyuki's (also known as Yamahana Yoshikiyo, 山塙芳潔, 1890-1935) photograph of Baekdusan Mountain was printed in black and white.[903] (Fig. 4.128.) Eighteen consecutive issues printed new photos of Baekdusan Mountain as a series called "Baekdusan tamseung hwabo" (백두산탐승화보, 探勝畵報), and the team later hosted slideshow sessions of these photographs for audiences with tickets printed in *Donga ilbo* which turned out to be greatly popular.[904]

---

[902] "Aminjok ui balsangji! Sinhwa jeonseol ui Baekdusan e," *Donga ilbo*, 6 August, 1921; Park Chan-seung, "Baekdusan ui 'minjok yeongsan' euro ui pyosanghwa," 24.
[903] Gang Jun-man, *Hanguk daejung maechesa*, 205–6; Yu Seon-yeong, "Sigak gisul roseo hwandeung gwa sikminji ui sigakseong," *Eonron gwa sahoe* 24, no. 2 (May 2016): 213.
[904] Yu Seon-yeong, "Sigak gisul roseo hwandeung gwa sikminji ui sigakseong," 214.

From the early 1920s, a Japanese folk song, "Baekdusanjeol," (백두산절, 白頭山節) that praised the beauty of Baekdusan Mountain also gained popularity, along with picture postcards with printed lyrics.[905] Three different types of postcards were issued, all of which were very popular among the Japanese throughout the 1930s.[906] (Fig. 4.129.) However, these images were produced by Japanese agents with the aim of not only commercialising the Baekdusan Mountain image but also for mobilisation under Japanese imperialist concepts of Five Races Under One Union (오족협화, 五族協和) and Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere (대동아공영권, 大東亞共榮圈).[907]

In addition to images of the 1920s and 30s, earlier examples of Baekdusan Mountain photo postcards have been brought to attention in recent studies. While Yamahana Yoshiyuki was generally accepted as the first photographer to have published a photographic view of Baekdusan Mountain Cheonji in 1921, Choi Hyeon-sik has recently published an earlier photo postcard that bears a stamp marking the year 1910 (Meiji 43).[908] (Fig. 4.130.) There are also claims that artist and photographer Ji Un-yeong photographed Baekdusan Mountain Cheonji much earlier than Yamahana Yoshiyuki.[909] A descendant of Na Cheol had kept a photogravure plate that was in Na

---

905 The song was composed by Udeda Kokukyōshi (植田國境者, ?-?) in 1914 and was popularised after a celebrated geisha, Akasaka Koume (赤坂小梅, 1906-1992) sang it. Choi Hyeon-sik, "Ilje sajin yeopseo, sikminji Joseon eul norae hada" (Seoul: NRF, 2015), 10.

906 Choi Hyeon-sik, "Ilje sajin yeopseo, sikminji Joseon eul norae hada," 6.

907 Choi Hyeon-sik, "Ilje sajin yeopseo, sikminji Joseon eul norae hada," 3–4; Choi Hyeon-sik, "Baekdusanjeol, Ojokhyeophwa, Daedonga gong-yeongron: Geurim yeopseo Baekdusanjeol ui gyeong-u," *Minjok munhaksa yeon-gu* 61 (2016): 71–129.

908 Choi Hyeon-sik, "Baekdusanjeol, Ojokhyeophwa, Daedonga gong-yeongron."

909 Byeon Gyeong-hwa, "Baekryeon Ji Un-yeong ui saeng-ae wa jakpum segye," 27–31.

Cheol's possession and dated the photograph to have been taken from 1916 at the latest, based on the year of Na Cheol's death.[910] This is indeed possible as Ji Un-yeong is also thought to have photographed King Gojong in 1884 as the first Korean photographer to do so. Nevertheless, it is undeniable that full-fledged mass production of Baekdusan Mountain imagery did not take place in until 1920. (Fig. 4.131., Fig. 4.132.)

Despite the late proliferation of photographs and mass-produced images of Baekdusan Mountain, the mountain's status as a symbol of the ethnic origins of the Korean nation persisted and was intensified from the early 1920s with the growth of the Dangun-Baekdusan Mountain rhetoric. In an article of *Donga ilbo* in 1921, leading member of the Baekdusan Mountain Explorers, Min Tae-won (민태원, 閔泰瑗, 1894-1934) explained that in order to truly appreciate the land of Korea, one must visit Baekdusan Mountain before Geumgangsan Mountain as Baekdusan Mountain is the ancestral mountain and the head (brain) of the country, while Geumgangsan Mountain is the spine.[911] Moreover, already in 1921, independence activists understood Baekdusan Mountain as a symbol of the desire for Korean independence. Min Tae-won wrote in his later article of the trip that he found stone carvings near the peak of the mountain that read "In Commemoration of the Korean Independence Army" (대한독립군기념, 大韓獨立軍紀念), signed by Son Gi-yul (손기율, 孫基律, ?-?), and "The Korean Independence Army Visits the Land and Will Return" (대한독립군내지왕환차, 大韓獨立軍內地往還次), signed by platoon commander

[910] The photograph initially was revealed through a Korean television documentary, "Doklip tujaeng ui daebu, Hong-am Na-cheol," broadcast by MBC in 29 February, 2004. Byeon Gyeong-hwa, "Baekryeon Ji Un-yeong ui saeng-ae wa jakpum segye," 30.
[911] Min Tae-won, "Baekdusanhaeng," *Donga ilbo*, 21 August 1921.

Park Uk (박욱, 朴郁, ?-?).[912] The mountain where the Korean nation originated thus became the mountain where the Korean nation was to be saved.

[912] Min Tae-won, "Baekdusanhaeng," *Donga ilbo*, 8 September, 1921.

4.5. Conclusion

After Korea opened its ports to the world and departed from the pre-modern, Sinocentric world order, its placement in the world among sovereign nations had to be clearly expressed and visualized. Scaled maps of the world provided visual pointers to Korea's place in the world that was scientifically verified. Maps that placed the Korean Peninsula in its specific place in the world also provided a credible image of national territory. While traditional Joseon maps had also reached a high level of sophistication and accuracy, new maps produced according to the universally recognised Mercator projection was legitimised as the 'truthful' depiction of Korean territory. These images were used to not only educate the public of scientific knowledge and world cultures but also to consolidate the abstract idea of national territory.

Once modern scaled maps were proliferated, simplified renditions of the Korean Peninsula were widely circulated in print media. On this supposedly scientifically verified image of the Korean Peninsula were repeatedly consumed through newspapers, textbooks, and educational magazines, nationalistic narratives of shared history and ethnic origins were embedded into the image. The shape and silhouette of the Hanbando was made into an instantly recognisable icon and were contextualised so that the Korean people could identify with the icon as a symbol of the collective nation and the place wherein shared Korean history and culture were bound. The icon expressed the placeness of the Korean nation and their collective 'spirit.' Throughout the early twentieth century, the Hanbando image was continuously used to promote nationalistic learning and to construct a more masculine and proactive identity of the Korean nation.

While images of the entirety of the Korean Peninsula provided visual references to understanding the relative location of the country in the world and was an icon of the self-contained space inhabited by the Korean people and the place where shared history and culture were rooted, representative landmarks provided more tangible examples of Korean national territory. Cityscapes of Seoul highlighted the importance of the capital city of the Korean nation-state and amplified its centrality. Early photographs and illustrations of palace grounds and city gates introduced Korea to foreign readers and educated the Korean people of their own capital city, and photographs of intimate, inner quarters of palace grounds that were gradually disseminated in the beginning of the twentieth century became a popular commodity and promoted the city as an attraction. As the city was reconstructed throughout the colonial period, contrasting views of north and south Seoul expressed the disparity between the old, outdated Joseon capital and the new, modern capital reformed by the colonial authorities.

Among popular local sceneries, Geumgangsan Mountain was the most symbolic of Korean natural beauty. Landscape paintings of Geumgangsan Mountain had been continuously produced throughout Korean history and was both a prominent geographic site and cultural reference. From the nineteenth century, minhwa Geumgangsando was popularised, and images of the beloved mountain became more accessible to the wider public. From 1900, print illustrations and sketches of Geumgangsan Mountain were widely distributed, especially the iconic view of the Twelve Thousand Peaks as seen from Danbalryeong Hills. After annexation, commercialised tours to Geumgangsan Mountain resulted in further prominence of landscape images of the landmark. While Japanese authorities aggressively marketized these images, Korean intellectuals such as Choe Nam-seon contextualised the mountain

with Korean history and culture, fostering a nationalistic interpretation of the representative landmark.

Baekdusan Mountain was another symbolic natural landmark of Korea that was used to demarcate the Korean territorial border and to support and strengthen Dangun ethnonationalism. As the tallest mountain in Joseon territory, Baekdusan Mountain had historically been a mysterious and sacred mountain, but after the official recognition of the mountain as Joseon territory in the eighteenth century, it was conspicuously emphasised in many pictorial maps of the late Joseon period. The prominence of the Baekdusan Mountain as a northern marker of Joseon territory was sustained throughout the late nineteenth century and photographs and sketches were produced and published as a representative Korean scenery and topography by early Western visitors. Baekdusan Mountain gained further recognition as a representative Korean landmark after annexation. In the absence of a sovereign state, the idea of a homogeneous Korean ethnic identity that originated from Dangun bound the nation together. Despite the lack of substantial evidence, Baekdusan Mountain was contextualised as the birthplace of Dangun, the heavenly ethnic progenitor of the Korean nation and became a sacred place of origin for Korean independence activists.

Images of Korean geography were the most 'banal' of representative imagery of the Korean nation-state that were created or used from the 1880s to the 1910s. They were not newly created images, nor did they distinctly represent any particular political objective or nation-building vision. This 'neutrality' of the images allowed for their resilience in the colonial period. Even though images of the Korean Peninsula, Seoul, Geumgangsan Mountain, and Baekdusan Mountain were often informational, and at times commercial, they reiterated the idea of Korean national territory, as well as the

history and culture shared by the Korean people. This banal reminder of the nation was, in many ways, much more pervasive and deeply resonated within the minds of the public, as reflected in many literary and artistic references to Hanbando, Gyeongseong, Geumgangsan Mountain, and Baekdusan Mountain that persisted throughout the colonial period.

Chapter 5. Conclusion

This thesis has addressed key terminological developments that took place concerning the understanding of the modern nation-state and its people in Korea at the turn of the twentieth century and analysed three sets of representative imageries of the Korean nation-state. In Chapter 2, the creation of the national flag and imperial emblem in four aspects of state and nation-building were studied. The use of the Taegeukgi in state representation abroad in the 1880s and 1890s signalled a major shift in flag culture in Korea where a single national flag was created and selected to represent an independent and sovereign Korea in international politics. Taegeukgi and Ihwamun images were also used for state-branding as a sort of logo that symbolised state authority and control of modernisation projects. At the same time, non-state actors incorporated the two symbols for public edification to elevate 'national consciousness' and collective identification with the Korean nation-state. Finally, toward and after annexation, the Taegeukgi became a symbol of Korean resistance in independence movements while the Ihwamun was exploited by colonial authorities to commodify the Yi royal family.

Chapter 3 analysed portrait imageries of the state leader and historic figures that represented the Korean nation-state. Royal portraits of Gojong and Sunjong were instrumental to the visualisation of the Korean state. Gojong's portraits were used as diplomatic gifts when Korea first established official relations with foreign countries and were leveraged as political favours for Westerners who supported Gojong. After royal portraits were disseminated in domestic Korea, they were used to educate the public of their ruler and to induce collective allegiance to the country. After Gojong's

forced abdication in 1907 and annexation in 1910, both Gojong and Sunjong's portrait images were incorporated by the colonial regime to promote a supposedly peaceful and mutually beneficial merger of the two countries but induced public outrage and nostalgia for the autonomous Korean nation-state. Portrait illustrations of prominent figures of Korean history were also popularised, standardising distinctly Korean ethnocentric historic narratives and emphasising patriotism and encouraging collective action to defend the country from external threats. Martyrdom was also amplified in its message through portrait images of prominent figures like Min Yeong-hwan and An Jung-geun who sacrificed their lives in resistance against colonial invasion.

Finally, map imagery of the Korean Peninsula and representative local landscapes visualised the space and place of the Korean nation-state. Scientifically scaled maps of the Korean Peninsula were gradually popularised and simplified map imagery were used to place Korea in the new world. Not only were they crucial elements of geographic education but were also used as icons as nationalistic messages were embedded into the map imagery. Cityscapes of Seoul introduced Korea to foreign readers, visually centralised Korean territory and governance, and also popularised and commercialised colonial Gyeongseong. Representative landscapes of popular scenic spots of Geumgangsan Mountain were used to emphasise Korean natural features as well as cultural history. After annexation, these images were actively produced and consumed as popular commodities as a result of the growth of mass tourism. Baekdusan Mountain was also frequently depicted in pictorial maps at the turn of the twentieth century as it marked territorial boundaries of Korea and China. Moreover, as Dangun became a central part of Korean historic narratives, Baekdusan Mountain served as a representative place of origin of the Korean ethnie and nation.

Although this thesis has approached the various types of images in thematic groups, images oftentimes appeared in combination of each other from the 1880s to the 1910s. The most prominent image that was used in conjunction with other representative imageries was the Taegeukgi. The Taegeukgi frequently accompanied the Ihwamun in various designs, such as on coins and stamps, architecture, official documents, and celebratory postcards. The coupling of the national flag and emblem amplified authority embedded in both symbols and further legitimised the object, place, or message that they were used for. In the case of modern objects like coins or stamps, the two symbols represented and expressed state ownership and control of the objects and their industry. In public monuments like the Independence Arch, it primarily expressed Korean independence and legitimacy of autonomy but also revealed the close connection between the Independence Club and the state. In celebratory postcards printed by the Japanese after 1905, the two symbols were gradually absorbed into Japanese imperial symbolisms as correlating but subordinate symbols to the Japanese flag and chrysanthemum emblem.

The Taegeukgi and Ihwamun, though closely affiliated and frequently conjoined, were different symbols. While the Ihwamun ultimately represented the authority of the Yi monarchy and legitimised and strengthened their rule, the Taegeukgi, despite also representing the state, was much more encompassing. There were efforts to incorporate the Ihwamun in nation-building led by non-state actors, as can be witnessed through the coupling of the image with Admiral Yi Sun-sin's portrait in *Chodeung Daehan yeoksa*, but the emblem was predominantly coupled with images that represented the Yi monarchy, such as royal portraits. Indeed, the combination of the Taegeukgi, Ihwamun, and royal portraits were often used on postcards by Japanese

printers. Though these postcards were not produced to strengthen or emphasise Korean state or monarchical authority, the combination of the representative imageries all expressed and symbolised the narrower state and statehood rather than Korean nationhood. After annexation, these types of postcards become explicit in their subordination to the Japanese Empire when grouped with the Hinomaru, chrysanthemum emblem, and portraits of the Japanese royal family or officials.

Royal portraits were often juxtaposed against landscape imagery, mostly those of palace grounds or governmental buildings in various photographs and photographic postcards. As rulership and the maintenance of geographic territory are closely tied, the two images emphasised the importance of both national territory and state autonomy and independence. These combined images also commercialised the image of Korea to foreign audiences. Although the portrait of the Korean king or emperor and photographs of his palace or capital city may have visually amalgamated Korean rulership with territory, these postcards themselves were consumed as souvenirs for foreigners who were generally unfamiliar with or newly introduced to Korea. It catered to the contemporary demand for scenes of the Orient by providing an image of a representative Korean person and landscape. (Fig. 5.1.)

Interestingly, natural landscapes such as those of Geumgangsan Mountain or Baekdusan Mountain were not commonly used in conjunction with the flag, emblem, or portraits. For instance, in most postcards that employed Korean landscape imagery used them alone rather than crowding the small surface with other images. What can be inferred from this is that natural landscapes, though representative of Korean territory and even symbolic of Korean nationhood, were also actively consumed for either highly commercial purposes by foreigners or in non-statist contexts of Korean nationalism. In

addition, the Hanbando icon, one of the least political images that are representative of the Korean nation-state, was not commonly used with the flag, emblem, or portrait imageries except in cases where the image was used for highly informative purposes. Instead, some Korean nationalists utilised the Hanbando image alone or, in a few cases, with the Mugunghwa flower rather than the Ihwa flower in the colonial period.[913] (Fig. 5.2.) This also hints that greater emphasis was placed on the Hanbando icon and natural landscapes as a representation of the Korean nation-state after explicitly nationalistic images came to be censored by colonial authorities.

Toward and after annexation, portrait images of martyrs were often used with the Korean flag. Not only prominent individuals like An Jung-geun were depicted with the Taegeukgi; many independence activists deliberately took photographs with the Taegeukgi as a sign of protest and determination to restore Korean sovereignty when the political use of the Korean flag was censored by Japanese authorities. This was more common among activists based abroad who would often take photographs with the Taegeukgi before attempting physical or armed protest. (Fig. 5.3.) These images were not only declarations of the collective desire and action for Korean independence but were often last wills of martyrs. This combination not only categorised portraits into nationalistic imagery but also amplified the context of resistant nationalism that the Taegeukgi bore.

The residual impact of the representative imageries of the Korean nation-state that developed during this period is another important point of discussion. In the subsequent colonial period after the 1910s, most of the representative images survived

[913] Mok Soo-hyun, "Mang-guk gwa gukga pyosang ui uimi byeonhwa," 168–72.

and continued to express Korean nationhood with the exception of the Ihwamun. The survival of the Taegeukgi during the remainder of the colonial period was, as mentioned above, due to its incorporation into independence movements, and more specifically due to activists and martyrs. After the 1919 March First Movement that utilised the Taegeukgi as a symbol of Korean resistance and collective desire for independence, the Taegeukgi, despite Japanese censorship, was cemented as a symbol of Korean nationhood. It not only induced nostalgia for the once independent Korean nation-state but also continuously invigorated the drive for resistance against colonial rule due to its strong affiliation with martyrs and independence activists. Moreover, as the Taegeukgi was encompassing of all Korean people, it also emphasised the contribution of ordinary citizens to fight for liberation. Thus, from the colonial period and onwards, the Taegeukgi gained a stronger bond with the Korean people and nationhood than with lost statehood.

Royal portraits continued to exert a level of influence as a representative image of the nation-state in the early years of the colonial period. Though they lost much of their representativeness after the 1920s, photographs of Gojong and even the lesser prominent Sunjong were visual triggers of both nostalgia and outrage. In particular, Gojong's death in 1919 greatly revived public allegiance to their past ruler and sparked mass outrage over the colonial authorities' occupation of Korea which culminated in the March First Movement. In 1925, *Donga ilbo* also published a series of articles titled "Photographs that people want to see" (보고 싶은 사진), of which the first article selected Gojong's photograph as the picture most demanded by the public.[914] (Fig. 5.4.)

[914] "Gojong Taehwangje bogo sipheun sajin," *Donga ilbo*, 16 October, 1925; Gwon Haeng-ga, *Imiji wa gwonryeok,* 24–25.

However, as independence movements continued to be led by non-state actors in the absence of a sovereign Korean state and monarch, and as democratic values gained dominant support, the Yi monarchy lost its power as did public affiliation to royal portraits.

Portraits of historic figures greatly flourished in the colonial period, especially from the so-called 'cultural rule' after the March First Movement. As press censorship was somewhat alleviated, Korean novels and short stories were popularised. Sin Chae-ho's "Sugun jeil wiin Yi Sun-sin jeon" (수군제일위인 이순신전, 水軍第一偉人李舜臣傳, story of Yi Sun-sin, the greatest naval hero, 1908), a series of short stories published in *Daehan maeil sinbo*, and Yi Gwang-su's "Yi Sun-sin" (이순신, 李舜臣, 1931) in *Donga ilbo* were influential in lionising Admiral Yi Sun-sin and his feats.[915] Illustrations of Admiral Yi Sun-sin and Eulji Mundeok were printed for these short stories, further facilitated by the continuous development in print technology available in Korea. (Fig. 5.5.)

The popularity of these historic figures were reflected in the fine arts, and artist Choe U-seok (최우석, 崔禹錫, 1899-1965) submitted portrait paintings of Yi Sun-sin and Eulji Mundeok in Joseon Arts Exhibition (조선미술전람회, 朝鮮美術展覽會, 1922-1944), a prestigious annual exhibition hosted by the Japanese Government-

[915] Popular stories of Yi Sun-sin were first published after the end of the Imjin Invasions at the end of the sixteenth century, based on various veritable records (*silgiryu*, 실기류, 實記類) and records made by Yi Sun-sin's nephew, Yi Bun (이분, 李芬, 1566-1619). However, Yi Sun-sin novels were actively popularised toward and after the twentieth century. See Jang Gyeong-nam, "Yi Sun-sin ui soseoljeok hyeongsanghwa e daehan tongsijeok yeon-gu," *Minjok munhaksa yeon-gu*, no. 35 (2007): 339–72.

General, in 1929 and 1932 respectively.[916] (Fig. 5.6., Fig. 5.7.) Ancestral portraits were also actively produced and enshrined in shrines dedicated to Yi Sun-sin during the colonial period. For instance, artist Yi Sang-beom (이상범, 李象範, 1897-1972), who was responsible for Yi Sun-sin illustrations in *Donga ilbo*, also painted an ancestral portrait based on portraits enshrined in Chungryeolsa Temple (충렬사, 忠烈祠) and Jeseungdang Shrine (제승당, 制勝堂) in Tongyeong (통영, 統營), which was enshrined in the newly built Hyeonchungsa Shrine (현충사, 顯忠祠) in South Chungcheong Province (충청남도, 顯忠祠).[917] (Fig. 5.8.) Among the many military heroes that appeared in textbooks of the early twentieth century, Yi Sun-sin's popularity as a national hero was amplified in the colonial period through stories and portrait imagery as he symbolised Korean defiance against foreign invasion, and more specifically, Japanese invasion.

From Sin Chae-ho and Choe Nam-seon's avid marketing and promotion of Dangun, he cemented his status as the sole ethnic progenitor in the colonial period. Dangun was incorporated in many religious paintings as Dangun-gyo continued to grow in the colonial period as Daejong-gyo. Even in the absence of nationalistic history

[916] Yu Hui-seung, "'Seonjeon' gwa 'Gukjeon' ui inmulhwa yeon-gu: 'Dongyanghwa' reul jungsim euro" (PhD diss., Seoul, Dongduk Women's University, 2010), 50–51.
[917] Unfortunately, the original painting was reported stolen in 2015. Elisabeth Keith is also known to have painted a watercolour painting of Yi Sun-sin seated against a folding screen decorated with paintings of the Turtle Ship, most likely based on Yi Sang-beom's painting, reflecting the immense popularity of the Joseon admiral in the colonial period. Song Mi-suk, "Geundae ihu jejak doen 'Yi Sun-sin' chosang imiji ui tongsijeok gochal," *Misulsahak*, no. 44 (August 2022): 248–50; Elizabeth Keith and Elspet Keith Robertson Scott, *(Yeong-guk hwaga Elrijabeseu Kiseu ui) Oldeu Koria: Wanjeon bokwonpan*, trans. Song Yeong-dal, 2nd ed. (Seoul: Chaek Gwa Hamgge, 2020).

education, images of military heroes continued to represent shared Korean history and race.

Portraits of martyrs became even more powerful as visual representations of Korean nationhood as they became contemporary heroes and celebrities after annexation. Independence activists became the main protagonists of nation-building in the colonial period and martyrdom gained full force as many saw physical resistance as the only way to achieve Korean liberation. Activists who succeeded in their goals, such as Yun Bong-gil (윤봉길, 尹奉吉, 1908-1932), who threw a bomb concealed in a thermos at a celebratory event at Hongkou Park for the birthday of the Japanese Emperor Hirohito (裕仁, 1901-1989, r. 1926-1989) in 1932, became prominent figures in colonial Korea.[918] (Fig. 5.9.) The veneration of these patriotic individuals was key to the continuation of Korean resistance throughout the colonial period.

Finally, the Hanbando icon and images of Geumgangsan Mountain and Baekdusan Mountain thrived when censorship prevented explicitly nationalistic images from being openly consumed. The development of mass tourism and travel infrastructure in the colonial period was instrumental to the popularisation of images of Geumgangsan Mountain and Baekdusan Mountain. Accessibility to images of representative landscapes greatly increased due to the proliferation of affordable photographic postcards and prints. Images of Geumgangsan Mountain and Baekdusan Mountain deeply infiltrated the minds of the Korean people and consolidated their place as 'national' landmarks through popularised imagery. The Hanbando icon also became

[918] For more on Yun Bong-gil and photographs published in Japanese news media, see Kim Sang-gi, "Yun Bong-gil ui Sanghae uigeo e daehan Ilbon enron ui bodo," *Hanguk doklip undongsa yeon-gu*, no. 32 (April 2009): 5–42.

a familiar and convenient symbol of the Korean nation under colonial rule. Choe Nam-seon's 'tiger Hanbando' image continued to be applied to emphasise Korean nationhood and national pride. In 1921, *Donga ilbo* awarded prizes to artists who best decorated the Hanbando image. Among the four awarded paintings were a Mugunghwa Hanbando and a tiger Hanbando, attesting to the widespread popularity of these nationalistic associations to the Hanbando images in the colonial period. (Fig. 5.10., Fig. 5.11.)

An article written by William Elliot Griffis, author of *Corea, the Hermit Nation*, a popular and influential early monograph that introduced Korea to Western readership, provides a good summary of the core socio-political issues of Korea from the 1880s to the 1910s:

> "But the people- do they care? Will Kim, the average Korean, weep or mourn? Has he any patriotism? And what kind of semi-civilization have these white coated peninsulars? What manner of man is their King? Further, and here is the real question, [w]hat sort of loafers and bloodsuckers are the nobles, or [yangban] (civil and military)? These prey on the public treasury, and are, for the most part, without an idea of patriotism, except as that word means intrigue, clan fights, and the spoils of office. There is a reason for Korea's frightful poverty, which persists, despite her gold-filled rocks, her fertile soil, and her superb forests, in which the Russian [axe] now resounds."[919]

Though Griffis' article generally paints a bleak picture of Korea based on his impressions of the country's "degeneracy," the questions raised above effectively capture key contemporary issues that both foreign spectators and Korean intellectuals

[919] William Elliot Griffis, "Kim the Korean," *The Outlook* 75, no. 10 (5 March, 1904): 543.

and the state were most concerned about.[920] First was the issue concerning the awareness of the average Korean person in his knowledge of and passion for his country's betterment. This issue was at the forefront of non-state-led nation-building at the time of publication; Korean intellectuals and organisations hosted public events to promote collective allegiance to the state, founded private schools and published textbooks aimed at edifying and 'civilizing' the public of their shared history, and began to aggressively publicise the need for active defence against foreign threats to Korean sovereignty.

The second issue was the general standing or "manner" of the Korean ruler, Gojong. Foreigners were most curious of the type of person Gojong was, and to a lesser extent, his political inclinations, and the Korean acknowledgement of such general curiosity was reflected in the contemporary importance placed on publicly presenting Gojong as a Korean ruler and state head. From the 1880s up to 1905, the state genuinely attempted to present and display Gojong as a legitimate, authoritative, and competent ruler of Korea. Much effort was also made on behalf of Gojong himself to paint such an image of himself, notwithstanding realistic difficulties in achieving the objective.

The contemporary struggles to present Gojong as a serious ruler of Korea was then also linked to the third and final problem of the political structure of contemporary Korea that underwent constant change from the 1880s. Contemporary debates on the viability of the Korean nation-state reflected problems of not only corruption of yangban as pointed out by Griffis, but also multi-faceted political rivalries and conflicts between intra-governmental factions, those among the many reformists on the direction

[920] Griffis, "Kim the Korean," 544.

of modernisation, and that of the emperor and state versus the progressive civil society. Contending interests and visions of how and by whom the new Korean nation-state was to be constructed was indeed the greatest concern of the time and these issues raised by Griffis strongly influenced the use and understanding of representative imagery that were investigated in this thesis.

Bibliography

Agnew, John, Katharyne Mitchell, and Gerard Toal. *A Companion to Political Geography. Oxford: Blackwell*, 2003.

Agnew, John. "Nationalism." In *A Companion to Cultural Geography*, 223–37. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2004.

Allen, Horace N. *Korean Tales: Being a Collection of Stories Translated from the Korean Folk Lore*. New York; London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1889. https://archive.org/details/koreantalesbeing00alle/mode/2up.

An Hwi-jun 안휘준, ed. *Sansuhwa (Ha)* 산수화 (하) (Landscape Painting: 2nd). Hanguk ui mi 12. Seoul: Jungang Ilbo Dongyang Bangsong 중앙일보 동양방송, 1982.

———. *Hanguk hoehwasa yeon-gu* 한국 회화사 연구 (History of Korean Painting). Seoul: Sigongsa 시공사, 2000.

———. *Hanguk hoehwa ui jeontong* 한국회화의 전통 (Korean Painting Tradition). Seoul: Munye Chulpansa 문예출판사, 1988.

An Nam-il 안남일. "1910-nyeon ijeon ui jae Ilbon Hanguk yuhaksaeng japji yeon-gu" 1910 년 이전의 재일본 한국 유학생 자필연구 (A Study on Korean Students Magazines in Japan Before 1910). *Hangukhak yeon-gu* 한국학연구, no. 58 (September 2016): 259–79.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. London; New York; Verso, 2006.

Aston, William G. "The 'Hi No Maru,' or National Flag of Japan." *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan 22* (1894): 27–34.

Baek Dong-hyeon 백동현. "Daehan Jegukgi eonron e natanan Dongyang juui nonli wa geu geukbok" 대한제국기 언론에 나타난 동양주의 논리와 그 극복 (A Study on the Asiacentrism in the Korean Empire). *Hanguk sasanghak* 한국사상학 17 (December 2001): 513–51.

———. "Reo, Il jeonjaeng jeonhu 'minjok' yong-eo ui deungjang gwa minjok insik: Hwangseong sinmun gwa Daehan maeil sinbo reul jungsim euro" 러일전쟁 전후 '민족' 용어의 등장과 민족 인식: 황성신문과 대한메일 신보를 중심으로 (The Emergence of the Term 'Nation' and National Perception Before and After the Russo-Japanese War: Focusing on Hwanseong sinmun and the Daehan maeil sinbo). *Hanguksa hakbo* 한국사 학보, no. 10 (March 2001): 149–79.

Baek Gwang-ha 백광하, *Taegeukgi: Yeokri wa gwahak e gwanhan yeon-gu* 태극기: 역리와 과학에 관한 연구 (Taegeukgi: Research on the Theory of Change and Science). Seoul: Dongyang Suri Yeonguwon Chulpanbu 동양수리연구원출판부, 1965.

Baek Yeong-ja 백영자. *Hwangje reul suho haneun jadeul: Gungjung uijang-gi ui buhwal* 황제를 수호하는 자들: 궁중 의장기의 부활 (Guardians of the Emperor: The Revival of Court Ceremonial Flags). Seoul: Gyeongchunsa 경춘사, 2010.

———. *Joseon sidae ui eoga haengryeol* 조선시대의 어가 행렬 (Royal Processions of the Joseon Period). Seoul: Hanguk Bangsong Tongsin Daehakgyo Chulpanbu 한국 방송통신대학교 출판부, 1994.

Bancroft, Hubert Howe. *The Book of the Fair: An Historical and Descriptive Presentation of the World's Science, Art, and Industry, as Viewed Through the Columbian Exposition at chicago in 1893*. Chicago; San Francisco: The Bancroft Co., 1893.

Bando Miya. "Daehan Jeguk gi ui toji josa wa jido jejak e gwanhan gochal: Hanseongbu daechukjeok silchukdo reul jungsim euro" 대한 제국기의 토지조사와 지도제작에 관한 고찰: 한성부 대축척 실측도를 중심으로 (The Land Surveys and Cadastral Maps of Seoul, During the Korean Empire). *Jirihak nonchong* 지리학논총 52 (September 2008): 49–73.

Bang Dong-in 방동인. *Hanguk jido ui yeoksa* 한국지도의 역사 (History of Korean Maps). Seoul: Sin-gusa 신구사, 2001.

———. *Hanguk ui gukgyeong hoekjeong yeon-gu* 한국의 국경 획정 연구 (Korean Demarcation Study). Seoul: Iljogak 일조각, 1997.

Barthes, Roland. *Image-Text-Music*. Translated by Stephen Heath. Glasgow: Fontana/Collins, 1977.

Bayly, Christopher Alan. *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780-1914: Global Connections and Comparisons*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2004.

Berger, John. "The Changing View of Man in the Portrait." In *The Moment of Cubism: And Other Essays*, 41–47. New York: Pantheon Books, 1969.

Billig, Michael. *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage, 1995. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/soas-ebooks/detail.action?docID=1024116.

Bishop, Isabella Bird. *Korea and Her Neighbors: A Narrative of Travel, with an Account of the Recent Vicissitudes and Present Position of the Country.* New York: F. H. Revell Co., 1898.

Bok Do-hun 복도훈. "Gukto sunrye ui mokgajeok seosasi: Choe Nam-seon ui Geumgang yechan, Baekdusan geunchamgi reul jungsim euro" 국토순례의 목가적 서사시: 최남선의 금강예찬, 백두산근참기를 중심으로 (A Pastoral Epic of Country Pilgrimage: Choi Nam-seon's Admiration of Geumgangsan Mountain and Pilgrimage to Baekdusan Mountain). *Hanguk geundae munhak yeon-gu* 한국근대문학연구, Mi wa jeongchi 미와 정치, 6, no. 2 (October 2005): 37–62.

Brunn, Stanley D. "Stamps as Iconography: Celebrating the Independence of New European and Central Asian States." *GeoJournal* 52, no. 4 (December 2000): 315–23.

Bureau of Navigation. *Flags of Maritime Nations: From the Most Authentic Sources*. 5th ed. Washington D.C.: Bureau of Navigation, 1882. https://archive.org/details/flagsofmaritimen00unitrich/page/n5/mode/2up?ref=ol&view=theater.

Busan Museum. *Sajin yeopseo ro boneun geundae pung-gyeong 4: Gwan-gwang* 사진 엽서로 보는 근대 풍경 4: 관광 (Modern Landscapes Through Photographs

and Postacrds 4: Toursim). Hanguk geundae sigak munhwa akaibeu 한국 근대 시각 문화 아카이브 4. Seoul: Minsokwon 민속원, 2009.
Byeon Gyeong-hwa 변경화. "Baekryeon Ji Un-yeong ui saeng-ae wa jakpum segye" 백련 지운영의 생애와 작품세계 (The Life and Works of Baekryeon Ji Un-yeong). Master's thesis, Ewha Womans University 이화여자대학교, 2007.
Campbell, Charles William. "A Journey Through North Korea to the Ch'ang-Pai Shan." *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society and Monthly Record of Geography* 14, no. 3 (March 1892): 141–61.
Carles, William Richard. "Report of a Journey by Mr. Carles in the North of Corea." Corea. London: British Parliament, 1885.
Cavendish, A. E. J., and H. E. Goold-Adams. *Korea and the Sacred White Mountain: Being a Brief Account of a Journey in Korea in 1891*. London: G. Philip & Son, 1894.
Cha Seok-gi 채석기. "Gawhwagi sarip hakgyo gyogwaseo bunseok ui yeon-gu: Gukeo gyogwaseo e natanan minjok, sahoe, gaein" 개화기 사립학교 교과서 분석의 연구: 국외 교과서에 나타난 민족, 사회, 개인 (The Study on the Analysis of Private Schools in the Enlightenment Period: The Appearance of Ethnicity, Society, and Individuals in Private Textbooks). *Hanguk gyoyuk munje yeon-guso nonmunjip* 한국교육 문제 연구소 논문집, no. 8 (December 1993): 49–70.
———. *Hanguk minjok juui gyoyuk yeon-gu: Yeoksajeok insik eul jungsim euro* 한국 민족주의 교육 연구: 역사적 인식을 중심으로 (A Study on Korean Nationalism Education: Focusing on Historical Perceptions). Seoul: Jinmyeong Munhwasa 진명 문화사, 1976.
Chae Hwi-gyun 채휘균. "Gaehwagi geumji gyogwaseo ui yuhyeong gwa naeyong yeon-gu" 개화기 금지 교과서의 유형과 내용 연구 (A Study on the Types and Contents of Prohibited Textbooks in the Enlightenment Period). *Gyoyuk cheolhak* 교육철학 26 (December 2004): 175–96.
———. "Tong-gambu sigi geumji doen yeoksa gyogwaseo yeon-gu" 통감부 시기 금지된 역사 교과서 연구 (A Study of Prohibited History Textbooks in the Protectoral Period). *Gyoyuk cheolhak* 교육철학 66 (March 2018): 105–32.
Chae Yong-sin 채용신. *(Seokji) Chae Yong-sin silgi: Seokgang silgi* (석지) 채용신 실기: 석강실기 (Seokji Chae Yong-sin's Records). Translated by Lee Du-hui 이두희 and Lee Chung-gu 이충구. Seoul: Gukhak Jaryowon 국학자료원, 2004.
Chandra, Vipan. "Sentiment and Ideology in the Nationalism of the Independence Club (1896-1898)." *Korean Studies* 10 (1986): 13-34.
Cheon Jeong-hwan 천정환. *Geundae ui chaek ilg-gi: Dokja ui tansaeng gwa Hanguk geundae munhak* 근대의 책읽기: 독자의 탄생과 한국 근대문학 (Modern Reading: The Birth of Readers and Korean Modern Literature). Seoul: Pureun Yeoksa 푸른역사, 2003.
Cho Eun-jeong 조은정. "Chae Yong-sin yurim chosang ui inmul gwa sasang e daehan yeon-gu" 채용신 유림 초상의 인물과 사상에 대한 연구 (A Study on the

Characters and Ideas of Confucian Scholars in Portraits by Chae Yong-sin). *Inmun misul sahak* 인문미술사학 2 (December 2006): 179–226.

Choe Nam-seon 최남선. *Baekdusan geunchamgi* 백두산근참기 (Pilgrimage to Baekdusan Mountain). Translated by Im Seon-bin 임선빈. Seoul: Gyeongin Munhwasa 경인 문화사, 2013.

———. "Daehan ui oewi hyeongche" 대한의 외위형체 (The Shape of the Boundary of Daehan). *Sonyeon* 소년 1, November 1908.

———. *Geumgang yechan* 금강예찬 (Admiration of Geumgangsan Mountain). Translated by Mun Seong-hwan 문성환. Seoul: Gyeongin Munhwasa 경인 문화사, 2013.

———. "Taebaekbeom (Taebaekho)" 태백범 (태백호) (Taebaek Tiger). *Sonyeon* 소년, November 1909.

Choi Bo-yeong 최보영. "Yukyeong gong-won ui seolrip gwa unyeong siltae jaegochal" 육영공원의 설립과 운영실태 재고찰 (Review on the Establishment of Yukyeong Gongwon (Royal English School) and its Management Conditions). *Hanguk doklip undongsa yeon-gu* 한국 독립운동사 연구 42 (August 2012): 287–319.

Choi Chang-seok 최창석. "Gaehwagi Doklip Hyeophoe ui hwaldong gwa 'gukmin-mandeulgi' peurojekteu: Doklip sinmun gisa naeyong bunseok eul jungsim euro" 개화기 독립협회의 활동과 '국민 만들기' 프로젝트: 독립신문 기사 내용 분석을 중심으로 (The Activities and Nation-building Project of the Independence Club in the Enlightenment Period: On the Articles of The Independence). Master's thesis, Korea University 고려대학교, 2004.

Choi Deok-su 최덕수. *Joyak euro bon Hanguk geundaesa* 조약으로 본 한국 근대사 (Korean Modern History Through Treaties). Paju: Yeollin Chaekdeul 열린책들, 2010.

Choi Gi-yeong 최기영. *Daehan Jeguk sigi sinmun yeon-gu* 대한제국 시기 신문 연구 (Study of Newspapers in the Korean Empire Period). Seoul: Iljogak 일조각, 1991.

———. "Han mal gyogwaseo Yunyeon pildok e gwanhan ilgochal." 한말 교과서 유년필독에 관한 일고찰 (A study on the Late Han Textbook Yunyeon pildok*) Seoji hakbo* 서지학보 9 (March 1993): 97–131.

Choi Hyeon-sik 최현식. "Baekdusanjeol, Ojokhyeophwa, Daedonga gong-yeongron: Geurim yeopseo Baekdusanjeol ui gyeong-u" 백두산절, 오족협화, 대동아 공영론: 그림 엽서 백두산절의 경우 (Hakutosan bushi Five Races Under One Union Greater East Asia). *Minjok munhaksa yeon-gu* 민족 문학사 연구 61 (2016): 71–129.

———. "Ilje sajin yeopseo, sikminji Joseon eul norae hada" 일제 사진엽서, 식민지 조선을 노래하다 (Postcards of Japanese Imperialism, Singing Colonial Joseon). Seoul: NRF, 2015.

Choi In-jin 최인진. *Gojong, eosajin eul tonghae segye reul ggumgguda: 19 segi eosajin ui jeongchihak* 고종, 어사진을 통해 세계를 꿈꾸다: 19 세기

어사진의 정치학 (Gojong Dreams of the World Through Royal Photographs: The Politics of 19th Century Royal Photographs). Seoul: Munhyeon 문현, 2010.

———. *Hanguk sajinsa: 1631-1945* 한국 사진사: 1631-1945 (History of Korean Photography: 1631-1945). Seoul: Nunbit 눈빛, 1999.

———. *Hanguk sinmun sajinsa* 한국신문사진사 (History of Korean Newspaper Photography). Seoul: Yeolhwadang 열화당, 1992.

Choi Jeong-jun 최정준. "Taegeukgi e gwanhan yeokhakjeok geomto: Gaejeong nonui wa gwanryeon hayeo" 태극기에 관한 역학적 검토: 개정 논의와 관련하여 (The Review of the Korean National Flag Taegeukgi Based on the Principle of Iching: In Relation to Taegeukgi Reform) *Hanguk Sasangsahak* 한국사상사학 47 (August 2014): 351-379.

Choi Ji-eun 최지은. "19 segi Joseon Yudang Kim Ha-jong ui silgyeong sansuhwa yeon-gu: Haesandocheop gwa Pung-akgwon eul jungsim euro" 19 세기 조선 유당 김하종의 실경산수화 연구: 해산도첩과 풍악권을 중심으로 (Study on Landscape Paintings of Real View Landscapes of Yudang Kim Ha-jong of 19th-century Joseon: Focusing on Haesandocheop and Pung-akgwon). Master's thesis, Hongik University 홍익대학교, 2018.

Choi Yeol 최열. *Hanguk geundae misul ui yeoksa: 1800-1945 Hanguk misulsa sajeon* 한국 근대 미술의 역사: 1800-1945 한국 미술사 사전 (History of Korean Modern Art: 1800-1945 Korean Art History Dictionary). Seoul: Yeolhwadang 열화당, 1998.

———. "Hyeoljuk ui norae, Gyejeong Min Yeong-hwan." 혈죽의 노래, 계정 민영환 (Song of the Blood Bamboos, Gyejeong Min Yeong-hwan) *Naeil eul yeoneun yeoksa* 내일을 여는 역사 49 (December 2012): 212–41.

Choi Yeong-su 최영수. "Geumgangsan manhwa haeng-gak (wan)" 금강산 만화행각 (완) (Stories of Things Happening at Geumgangsan Mountain: Complete). *Donga ilbo* 동아일보. 3 October, 1934.

Choi Yu-gyeong 최유경. "1920-nyeondae choban, Donga ilbo saphwa e pyohyeondoen Hanguk godae sinhwa" 1920 년대 초반, 동아일보 삽화의 표현된 한국 고대 신화 (Korean Ancient Myths Expressed in Donga ilbo Illustrations in the Early 1920s). *Jonggyo wa munhwa* 종교와 문화 *23* (December 2012): 109–29.

———. "Choe Nam-seon ui Geumgang yechan gwa Go Hui-dong ui Geumgangsan yeonjak eseo pyohyeondoen gukto chanmi" 최남선의 금강예찬과 고희동의 금강산 연작에서 표현된 국토 찬미 (Praise of National Territory in Geumgang yechan by Choe Nam-seon and in the Geumgangsan Series by Go Hui-dong). *Bigyo munhak* 비교문학 64 (October 2014): 281–305.

Cleland, A. M. *Through Wonderland: Yellowstone National Park.* St. Paul, MN.: Northern Pacific Railroad Company, 1910. https://archive.org/details/throughwonderlan00clelrich/mode/2up.

Connor, Walker. "Nation-Building or Nation-Destroying?" *World Politics* 24, no. 3 (April 1972): 319–55.

Crameri, Kathryn. "Banal Catalanism?" *National Identities* 2, no. 2 (August 2010): 145–57.
Cua, Antonio S. "Reflections on the Structure of Confucian Ethics." *Philosophy East and West* 21, no. 2 (April 1971): 125-140.
Cultural Heritage Administration 문화재청. "Seoul Gojong eogeuk 40-nyeon ching-gyeong ginyeombi jeongmil silcheuk josa bogoseo" 서울 고종 어극 40 년 칭경기념비 정밀 실측 조사 보고서 (Report on Survey of Commemorative Stele of the 40th Anniversary of Gojong's Accession to the Throne in Seoul). Seoul: Cultural Heritage Administration 문화재청, December 1997.
Cumberland, Barlow. *History of the Union Jack and Flags of the Empire.* Project Gutenberg, 2014. https://www.gutenberg.org/files/45498/45498-h/45498-h.htm.
Cumings, Bruce. *Korea's Place in the Sun: A Modern History.* New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, 2005.
Daehan maeil sinbo 대한매일신보. "Chian banghae do mana" 치안 방해도 많아 (So Many Disruptions to Public Order). 31 March 1910.
———. "Guk eun jeuk il daega" 국은 즉 일 대가 (The Country is One Big Family). *Daehan maeil sinbo*, 대한매일신보, May 13, 1909.
———. "Gukga jeuk il gajok" 국가 즉 일 가족 (The Country is One Big Family). *Daehan maeil sinbo* 대한매일신보. July 31, 1908.
———. "Gukgi munje reul byeonron ham" 국기 문제를 변론함 (Defending the Flag Issue). *Daehan maeil sinbo* 대한매일신보. 19 February, 1909.
———. "Hyeoljukdo" 혈죽도 (Blood Bamboo Painting). *Daehan maeil sinbo* 대한매일신보. 17 July, 1906.
———. "Japbo" 잡보 (Editorial). *Daehan maeil sinbo* 대한매일신보. 5 February, 1909.
———. "Min Yeong-hwan ui yuseo" 민영환의 유서 (Min Yeong-hwan's Will). *Daehan maeil sinbo* 대한매일신보. 1 December, 1905.
———. "Minjok gwa gukmin ui gubyeol" 민족과 국민의 구별 (Distinction Between Nation and the People). *Daehan maeil sinbo* 대한매일신보. July 30, 1908. https://nl.go.kr/newspaper/detail.do?content_id=CNTS-00093161003.
———. "Minjok gyeongjaeng ui choehu seungri" 민족 경장의 최후 승리 (The Final Victory of the Race of Nations). *Daehan maeil sinbo* 대한매일신보. April 23, 1910. https://nl.go.kr/newspaper/detail.do?content_id=CNTS-00093201252.
———. "Nonseol" 논설 (Editorial). *Daehan maeil sinbo* 대한매일신보. 11 September, 1907.
———. "Sisa pyeongron" 시사평론 (Current Affairs Review). *Daehan maeil sinbo* 대한매일신보. 10 January, 1909.
———. "Tapa gajokjeok gwannyeom" 타파 가족적 관념 (Breakdown of Familial Conceptions). *Daehan maeil sinbo* 대한매일신보. September 4, 1908.
———. "Yeong-ung i naneun sidae" 영웅이 나는 시대 (The Era of the Birth of Heroes). *Daehan maeil sinbo* 대한매일신보. 9 April, 1909.

Daehan minbo 대한민보. “Danbalryeong mang Geumgang jeon-gyeong” 단발령망금강전경 (View of Geumgang from Danbalryeong Hills). *Daehan minbo* 대한민보. 14 July, 1909.
Daehan Minguk Eomubu Jeongmuguk 대한민국 외무부 정무국. *Guhanmal eogyo munseo 1: Miguk pyeon 1* 구한말 외교문서 1: 미국편 1 (Old Korean Diplomatic Documents 1: The United States 1). Seoul: Oemubu 외무부, 1960.
Daejong-gyo chongbonsa 대종교 총본사. *Daejong-gyo yoram* 대종교 요람 (Daejong-gyo Bulletin), 1987.
Do jin-sun 도진순. “An Jung-geun sajin yeopseo wa gukje yeondae: Biha wa chanyang, geurigo jeonyong, jeonyu” 안중근 사진 엽서와 국제 연대: 비하와 찬양, 그리고 전용, 전유 (Postcard of An Jung-geun’s Photo and International Solidarity: Depreciation, Exaltation, and Appropriation). *Yeoksa hakbo* 역사학보 248 (December 2020): 191–226.
Doklip sinmun 독립신문. “Japbo” 잡보 (Editorial). *Doklip sinmun* 독립신문. 5 September, 1896.
———. “Nonseol” 논설 (Editorial). *Doklip sinmun* 독립신문. 22 September, 1896.
———. “Nonseol” 논설 (Editorial). *Doklip sinmun* 독립신문. 31 October, 1896.
———. “Nonseol” 논설 (Editorial). *Doklip sinmun* 독립신문. 29 April, 1897
———. “Nonseol” 논설 (Editorial). *Doklip sinmun* 독립신문. 7 August, 1897.
———. “Nonseol” 논설 (Editorial). *Doklip sinmun* 독립신문. 19 August, 1897.
———. “Nonseol” 논설 (Editorial). *Doklip sinmun* 독립신문. 28 August, 1897.
———. “Nonseol” 논설 (Editorial). *Doklip sinmun* 독립신문. 14 October, 1897.
———. “Nonseol” 논설 (Editorial). *Doklip sinmun* 독립신문. 12 February, 1898.
———. “Nonseol” 논설 (Editorial). *Doklip sinmun* 독립신문. 5 October, 1899.
Donga ilbo 동아일보. “Aminjok ui balsangji! Sinhwa jeonseol ui Baekdusan e” 아민족의 발상지! 신화 전설의 백두산에 (The Birthplace of the Korean People! At the Mythical and Legendary Baekdusan Mountain). 6 August, 1921.
———. “Gojong Taehwangje bogo sipheun sajin” 고종 태황제 보고 싶은 사진 (Retire Emperor Gojong, Photographs that People Want to See). 16 October, 1925.
Duncan, James S., Nuala C. Johnson, and Richard H. Schein. *A Companion to Cultural Geography*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2004.
Eckert, Carter J., Ki-baik Lee, Michael Edson Robinson, Edward W. Wagner, and Young Ick Lew. *Korea Old and New: A History.* Seoul: Iljogak, 1990.
Eckert, Carter J. *Offspring of Empire: The Gochang Kims and the Colonial Origins of Korean Capitalism, 1876-1945*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1991.
Eggert, Marion. “A Borderline Case: Korean Travelers’ Views of the Chinese Border (Eighteenth to Nineteenth Century.” In *China and Her Neighbours: Borders, Visions of the Other, Foreign Policy 10th to 19th Century*. Edited by Sabine Dabringhaus and Roderich Ptak, 49-79. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1997.
———. “Views of the Country, Visions of Self: Choson Dynasty Travel Records on Chiri-san and Paektu-san.” *Asiatische Studien* 52, no. 4 (1998): 1069-1102.

Elgenius, Gabriella. *Symbols of Nations and Nationalism: Celebrating Nationhood.* Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, UK; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Em, Henry. *The Great Enterprise: Sovereignty and Historiography in Modern Korea*. Asia-Pacific. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2013.

Fairbank, John K. *The Chinese World Order.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Firth, Raymond. *Symbols: Public and Private*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1973.

Fujitani, Takashi. *Splendid Monarchy: Power and Pageantry in Modern Japan*. Twentieth-Century Japan. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Gale, James Scarth. *Korea in Transition.* New York: Eaton & Mains, 1909. https://archive.org/details/koreaintransitio0000gale/page/140/mode/2up.

Gang Dong-guk 강동국. "Geundae Hanguk ui gukmin, injong, minjok gaeyeom" 근대 한국의 국민, 인종, 민족 개념 (Ideas of the Modern Korean People, Race, Nation). In *Geundae Hanguk ui sahoe gwahak gaenyeom hyeongseongsa* 근대 한국의 사회 과학 개념 형성사 (The History of the Formation of Modern Korean Concepts of Social Science), 249–88. Paju: Changbi, 창비 2009.

Gang Eung-cheon 강응천, ed. *Geunhyeondaesa sinmun* 근현대사 신문 (Modern and Contemporary Newspapers). Vol. 2. 2 vols. Paju: Sagyejeol 사계절, 2010.

Gang Gwan-sik 강관식. "Joseon sidae chosanghwa reul ilg-neun daseot gaji kodeu" 조선시대 초상화를 읽는 다섯가지 코드 (Five Codes for Reading Joseon Portraits). *Misulsa hakbo* 미술사학보 38 (June 2012): 135–83.

Gang Hyo-baek 강효백. *Du eolgul ui Mugunghwa: Gukga sangjing baro japgi* 두 얼굴의 무궁화: 국가 상징 바로 잡기 (Two-faced Mugunghwa: Correcting the National Symbol). Paju: Idam Bukseu 이담북스, 2020.

Gang Jin-ho 강진호. "Gukeo gyogwaseo wa geundae seosa ui suyong: Sinjeong simsang sohak (1896) eul jungsim euro" 국어 교과서와 근대 서사의 수용: 신정심상소학(1896)을 중심으로 (Korean Language Textbooks and the Adoption of Modern Narratives: Focusing on Simsang sohak dokbon). *Ilbonhak* 일본학 39 (November 2014): 36–73.

Gang Jun-man 강준만. *Hanguk daejung maechesa* 한국대중매체사 (History of Korean Mass Media). Seoul: Inmul Gwa Sasangsa 인물과 사상사, 2007.

Gang Myeong-gu 강명구. "Hunmin gongronjang ui ironjeok guseong eul wihayeo: Habeomaseu billigi, bikyeo gagi, neomeo seogi" 훈민공론장의 이론적 구성을 위하여: 하버마스 빌리기, 비켜가기, 넘어서기 (Toward a Formation of the Humin Public Sphere: Appropriating and Reformulating Habermas). *Keomyunikeisyeon iron* 커뮤니케이션 이론 9, no. 2 (June 2013): 10–51.

Gang Se-yeong 강세영. "Heolbeoteu ui gyoyuk gwanryeon hwaldong yeon-gu: Geu ui seosin jungsim euro" 헐버트의 교육 관련 활동 연구: 그의 서신 중심으로 (A Study on Hulbert's Education-Related Activities: Focusing on His Correspondence). Master's thesis, Korea National University of Education 한국교원대학교, 2013.

Gang Seok-hwa 강석화. “Baekdusan Jeong-gyebi wa Gando munje” 백두산 정계비와 간도 문제 (Baekdusan Jeong-gyebi and the Issue of Gando). *Gijeon munhwa yeon-gu* 기전문화연구 32 (March 2005): 181–203.
———. “Joseon hugi Baekdusan e daehan insik ui byeonhwa” 조선 후기 백두산에 대한 인식의 변화 (Change in the Perception on Baekdusan Mountain in Late Joseon). *Joseon sidaesa hakbo* 조선시대사학보 56 (March 2011): 195–224.
———. “Joseon hugi Hamgyeong-do ui jiyeok baljeon gwa bukbang yeongto uisik” 조선 후기 함경도의 지역 발전과 북방 영토 의식 (Regional Development and Northern Territory Consciousness of Hamgyeong-do in the Late Joseon Dynasty). PhD diss., Seoul National University 서울대학교, 1996.
———. “Joseon hugi ui bukbang yeongto uisik” 조선 후기의 북방 영토의식 (Consciousness of Northern Territory in the Late Joseon Dynasty). *Hanguksa yeon-gu* 한국사연구 129 (June 2005): 95–115.
Gang Seong-won and Kim Jin-gyun. 강성원, 김진균. “Deoksugung Seokjojeon ui wonhyeong chujeong gwa gisulsajeok uiui” 덕수궁 석조전의 원형 추정과 기술사적 의의 (The Estimated Original Form of Seokjojeon in Deoksugung Palace and the its Technological Significance). *Daehan geonchuk hakhoe nonmunjip- Gyehoekgye* 대한 건축 학회 논문집- 계획계 24, no. 4 (April 2008): 141–48.
Gang Yeong-ju 강영주. “19 segi mal- 20 segi jeonban-gi Choe Yeong jang-gun sinang gwa musindo yeon-gu” 19 세기말-20 세기 전반기 최영장군 신앙과 무신도 연구 (A Study on the Religion of General Choe Yeong and Shamanistic Paintings of the Late 19th and Early 20th Century). *Hanguk minhwa* 한국민화, no. 11 (October 2019): 58–97.
Gang Yun-ho 강윤호. *Gaehwagi ui gyogwayong doseo* 개화기의 교과용 도서 (Textbooks in the Enlightenment Period). Seoul: Gyoyuk Chulpansa 교육출판사, 1973.
Geisler, Michael E., ed. National Symbols, *Fractured Identities: Contesting the National Narrative.* Middlebury, Vermont: Middlebury College Press, 2005.
Geuriseudo sinmun 그리스도 신문. “Editorial.” *Geuriseudo sinmun* 그리스도 신문. 15 July, 1897.
Go Yeon-hui 고연희. “19 segi Geumgangsando ui ilmyeon: Gaein sojang ‘Geumgangsando 10 pok byeongpung’ gochal” 19 세기 금강산도의 일면: 개인 소장 ‘금강산도 10 폭 병풍’의 고찰 (A Perspective of Geumgangsan Paintings of the 19th Century: A Study of Ten Panel Folding Screen Painting of Geumgangsan in a Private Collection). *Onji nonchong* 온지논총, no. 58 (January 2019): 303–38.
Gojong sillok 고종실록. Vol. 20, 14 April, 1883. https://sillok.history.go.kr/search/inspectionDayList.do.
———. Vol. 40, 17 April, 1900, http://sillok.history.go.kr/id/kza_13704017_002.
———. Vol. 40, 17 April, 1900. http://sillok.history.go.kr/id/kza_13704017_003.
———. Vol. 40, 20 April, 1900. https://sillok.history.go.kr/id/kza_13704020_003.
———. Vol. 41, 5 March, 1901. http://sillok.history.go.kr/id/kza_13803005_002.
———. Vol. 41, 16 April, 1901. http://sillok.history.go.kr/id/kza_13804016_002.

———. Vol. 42, 12 August, 1902. http://sillok.history.go.kr/id/kza_13908012_001.
———. Vol. 48, 30 March, 1907. https://sillok.history.go.kr/id/kza_14403030_001.
Gongrip sinbo 공립신보. ""Min Chungjeong-gong hyeoljuk" 민충정공 혈죽 (Blood Bamboos of Min Chungjeong-gong). *Gongrip sinbo* 공립신보. 25 August, 1906.
Government-General of Chosen. *Annual Report on Reforms and Progress in Chosen (Korea) (1908-1909)*. Seoul: Government-General of Chosen, 1909.
Griffis, William Elliot. "Kim the Korean." *The Outlook* 75, no. 10 (March 5, 1904): 543–49.
Gu Chun-mo 구춘모. "Choe Nam-seon ui gihaengmun e natanan gyeong-gwan insik gwa minjok jeongcheseong ui gwan-gye" 최남선의 기행문에 나타난 경관 인식과 민족 정체성의 관계 (The Relationship Between Landscape Perception and National Identity in Choi Nam-seon's Travelogues). Master's thesis, Korea National University of Education 한국교원대학교, 2016.
Gu Hanguk hunjangdo 구한국훈장도. 1910.
Gu Ja-hwang 구자황. "Geundae gyemong-gi gyogwaseo ui saengsan gwa heureum: Sinjeong simsang sohak (1896) ui gyeong-u" 근대 계몽기 교과서의 생산과 흐름: 신정심상소학 (1896)의 경우 (Production and Flow of Textbooks in the Modern Enlightenment Period: The Case of Sinjeong simsang sohak (1896)). *Han minjok omunhak* 한민족어문학 65 (December 2013): 501–38.
———. "Geundae gyogwaseo wa gihaengmun seongrip e gwanhan yeon-gu: Ilje gangjeomgi Joseoneo gyogwaseo e natanan myeongseung gojeok eul jungsim euro." 근대 교과서와 기행문 성립에 관한 연구: 일제강점기 조선어 교과서에 나타난 명승고적을 중심으로 (A Study on Modern Textbooks and the Establishment of Travelogues: Scenic Spots in Korean Language Textbooks of the Japanese Occupation Period) *Han minjok eomunhak* 한민족어문학 69 (April 2015): 83–113.
Guhanguk gwanbo 구한국관보. 4 April, 1908.
Gukmin Gyoyukhoe 국민 교육회. *Chodeung sohak ha* 초등소학 하 (Chodeung sohak ha). Edited by Park Chi-beom 박치범 and Park Su-bin 박수빈. Hanguk gaehwagi gukeo gyogwaseo 한국 개화기 국어 교과서 (Korean Language Textbooks of the Korean Enlightenment Period). 7. Seoul: Gyeongjin 경진, 2014.
Guksa Pyeonchan Wiwonhoe 국사편찬위원회. *Gojong sidaesa* 고종시대사 (History of Gojong's Reign). Vol. 5. Seoul: Guksa Pyeonchan Wiwonhoe 국사 편찬 위원회, 1971.
———. *Gojong sidaesa* 고종시대사 (History of Gojong's Reign). Vol. 6. Seoul: Guksa Pyeonchan Wiwonhoe 국사 편찬 위원회, 1972.
———. "Sunhaeng bong-yeong ui haksaeng Ilbon gukgi hyudae e gwanhan geon" 순행 봉영의 학생 일본 국기 현대에 관한 건 (Issue of Students' Holding of the Japanese Flag for the Welcoming of the Royal Tour). In *Tong-gambu munseo* 통감부 문서 (Documents of the Resident-General), Vol. 9. Seoul: Guksa Pyeonchan Wiwonhoe 국사 편찬 위원회, 1999.

Gwon Chang-gyu 권창규. *Sangpum ui sidae* 상품의 시대 (The Age of Commodities). Seoul: Mineumsa 민음사, 2014.

Gwon Haeng-ga 권행가. “Geundaejeok sigak cheje ui hyeongseong gwajeong: Cheong Il jeonjaeng jeonhu Ilbonin sajinsa ui sajin hwaldong eul jungsim euro” 근대적 시각체제의 형성과정: 청일전쟁 전후 일본인 사진사의 사진 활동을 중심으로 (The Constitution of Modern Visuality in Korea: Focused on Works of Japanese Photographers Around the Sino-Japanese War). *Hanguk geunhyeondae misulsahak* 한국근현대미술사학 26 (December 2013): 195–228.

———. “Gojong hwangje sajin” 고종황제 사진 (Emperor Gojong's Photo) In *Miguk Nyueokeu Bakmulgwan sojang Hanguk munhwajae* 미국 뉴어크 박물관 소장 한국 문화재 (Korean Cultural Assets in the Collection of the Newark Museum), 30–39. Seoul: Gukoe Sojae Munhwajae Jaedan 국외 소재 문화재단, 2016.

———. “Gojong hwangje ui chosang: Geundae sigak maeche ui yuip gwa eojin ui byeonyong gwajeong.” 고종황제의 초상: 근대 시각 매체의 유입과 어진의 변용 과정 (Emperor Gojong’s Portraits: The Influx of Modern Visual Media and the Transformation of Royal Portraits). PhD diss., Hongik University 홍익대학교, 2006.

———. “Ilje sidae upyeon yeopseo e natanan gisaeng imiji” 일제시대 우편 엽서에 나타난 기생 이미지 (The Image of Gisaeng in Postcards of the Colonial Period). *Misulsa nondan* 미술사논단 12 (September 2001): 83–103.

———. *Imiji wa gwonryeok: Gojong ui chosang gwa imiji ui jeongchihak* 이미지와 권력: 고종의 초상과 이미지의 정치학 (Image and Power: Politics of Gojong’s Portraits and Images). Dolbegae 돌베개, 2015.

———. “Sajin sok e jaehyeondoen Daehan Jeguk hwangje ui pyosang: Gojong ui chosang sajin eul jungsim euro” 사진속에 재현된 대한제국 황제의 표상: 고종의 초상사진을 중심으로 (The Image of the Emperor of Daehan Jeguk in Photographs: A Study on the Portrait Photographs of Emperor Gojong). *Hanguk geunhyeondae misulsahak* 한국근현대미술사학 16 (August 2006): 7–44.

Gwon Hyeok-hui 권혁희. *Joseon eseo on sajin yeopseo* 조선에서 온 사진 엽서 (Photo Postcards from Joseon). Seoul: Mineumsa 민음사, 2005.

Gwon Hyeok-san 권혁산. “Joseon sidae mugwan chosanghwa wa hyungbae e gwanhan yeon-gu” 조선시대 무관 초상화와 형배에 관한 연구 (A Study on Portraits and Hyeongbae of Military Officers in the Joseon Dynasty). *Misulsa yeon-gu* 미술사 연구 26 (December 2012): 165–91.

Gwon Jeong-hwa 권정화. “Choe Nam-seon ui chogi jeosul eseo natananeun jirijeok gwansim: Gaehwagi Yukdang ui munhwa undong gwa Meiji jimunhak ui yeonghyang” 최남선의 초기 저술에서 나타나는 지리적 관심: 개화기 육당의 문화 운동과 메이지 지문학의 영향 (Geographical Interest in Choi Nam-seon's Early Writings: Cultural Movement of Yukdang During the

Reformation Period and the Influence of Meiji Linguistics). *Eung-yong jiri* 응용지리 13 (December 1990): 1–34.

Gwon Nae-hyeon 권내현. "Joseon Yeongjodae Baekdusanje sihaeng nonjaeng: Chamyeo inmul ui jujang eul jungsim euro" 조선 영조대 백두산제 시행 논쟁: 참여 인물의 주장을 중심으로 (Disputes about the Holding of Rituals at Baekdusan Mountain During King Yeongjo's Reign of Joseon: Focused on Statements of Participants). *Hanguk inmulsa yeon-gu* 한국 인물사 연구, no. 15 (March 2011): 273–301.

Gwon Seok-bong 권석봉. "Gukgi jejeong ui yurae e daehan gwan-gyeon" 국기 제정의 유래에 대한 관견 (Perspectives on the Origins of the National Flag). *Yeoksa hakbo* 역사학보 23 (April 1964): 41–54.

Gwoneop sinmun 권업신문. "Syajin sagasio ui ga itjimothal guinyeom." 샤진사가시오 우이가잇지못할 긔념 (Come and Buy Photographs, Unforgettable Commemoration). *Gwoneop sinmun* 권업신문. 17 January, 1914.

Gye Hun-mo 계훈모. *Hanguk eonron yeonpyo: 1881-1945* 한국 언론연표: 1881-1945 (Korean Press Chronology: 1881-1945). Seoul: Gwanhun Keulreop Sinyeong Yeon-gu Gigeum 관훈클럽신영연구기금, 1979.

Gyowon Daehakgyo Gyoyuk Bakmulgwan 교원 대학교 교육 박물관. *Daehan, Taegeukgi: 3.1 Undong mit Daehan Minguk Imsi Jeongbu surip 100 junyeon ginyeom Lee Byeong-geun sojang yumul teukbyeoljeon* 대한, 태극기: 3.1 운동 및 대한민국 임시 정부 수립 100 주년 기념 이병근 소장 유물 특별전 (Daehan, Taegeukgi: Special Exhibition of Lee Byung-geun Collection to Commemorate the 100th anniversary of the March First Movement and the Establishment of the Provisional Government of the Republic of Korea). Cheongju: Gyowon Daehakgyo Gyoyuk Bakmulgwan 교원 대학교 교육 박물관, 2019.

H.I.J.M's Residency General. *The Second Annual Report on Reforms and Progress in Korea (1908-9)*. Seoul: H.I.J.M's Residency General, 1909.

Ha Yeong-seon, Choi Jeong-un, Sin Uk-hui, Kim Yeong-ho, Jang In-seong, Gang Dong-guk, Kim Yong-jik, Son Yeol, Kim Seok-geun, and Lee Heon-mi 하영선, 최정운, 신욱희, 김영호, 장인성, 강동국, 김용직, 손열, 김석근, 이헌미. *Geundae Hanguk ui sahoe gwahak gaenyeom hyeongseongsa* 근대한국의 사회 과학 개념 형성사 (The Formation of Modern Korean Social Science Concepts). Seonam Dongyang haksul chongseo 서남동양학술총서. Paju: Changbi 창비, 2009.

Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society.* Cambridge: Polity, 1989.

Hakbu 학부. *(Botong hakdoyong) Gukeo dokbon sang* (보통학도용) 국어독본 상 ((Primary School) Gukeo dokbon sang). Edited by Kim Hye-ryeon 김혜련 and Jang Yeong-mi 장영미. Hanguk gaehwagi gukeo gyogwaseo 한국개화기국어교과서 11. Gwangmyeong: Gyeongjin 경진, 2012.

Han Cheol-ho 한철호. “Jin-gwansa Taegeukgi ui hyeongtae wa geu yeoksajeok uiui” 진관사 태극기의 형태와 그 역사적 의의 (The Form of Jin-gwansa Temple Taegeukgi and its Historical Significance). *Hanguk doklip undongsa yeon-gu* 한국 독립 운동사 연구 36 (August 2010): 5–31.

———. “Uri nara choecho ui gukgi (‘Park Yeong-hyo Taegeukgi’ 1882) wa Tongli Gyoseop Tongsang Samu Amun jejak gukgi (1884) ui wonhyeong balgyeon gwa geu yeoksajeok uiui” 우리나라 최초의 국기 (‘박영효 태극기’ 1882)와 통리교섭통상사무아문 제작 국기(1883)의 원형 발견과 그 역사적 의의 (Korea’s First National Flag (‘Park Yeong-hyo’s 1882 National Flag’) and the Discovery of the National Flag Prototype Produced by the Foreign Office and its Historical Significance). *Hanguk doklip undongsa yeon-gu* 한국 독립 운동사 연구 31 (December 2008): 125–87.

Han Gyu-mu 한규무. “1907-nyeon Gyeongseong Bakramhoe ui gaechoe wa seong-gyeok” 1907 년 경성 박람회의 개최와 성격 (The Hosting of Gyeongseong Exposition in 1907 and its Characteristics). *Yeoksahak yeon-gu* 역사적연구 38 (February 2010): 293–322.

Han Hye-yeon 한혜연. “Geundaejeok juche ui jaehyeon gwa hyeongseong: 19 segi chosang sajin yeon-gu.” 근대적 주체의 재현과 형성: 19 세기 초상사진 연구 (The Representation and Formation of a Modern Agent: Research on 19th Century Portrait Photography). Master’s thesis, Jungang University 중앙대학교, 2000.

Han Ju-hui 한주희. “Choe Nam-Seon ui Geumgang yechan yeon-gu” 최남선의 금강예찬 연구 (Study on Choe Nam-seon’s Geumgang yechan). *Chungcheong munhwa yeon-gu* 충청 문화연구 10 (June 2013): 81–98.

Han Yeong-u 한영우. *Daehan Jeguk eun gendae gukga in-ga* 대한제국은 근대 국가인가 (Is the Korean Empire a Modern Country). Seoul: Pureun Yeoksa 푸른역사, 2006.

Hanguk eonronsa yeon-guhoe 한국 언론사 연구회, ed. *Daehan maeil sinbo yeon-gu* 대한매일신보 연구 (Studies on *Daehan maeil sinbo*). Seoul: Keomyunikeisyeon Bukseu 커뮤니케이션 북스, 2004.

Hanguk Misul Yeon-guso 한국 미술연구소. *Modeon Gyeongseong ui sigak munhwa wa gwanjung* 모던 경성의 시각 문화와 관중 (Modern Gyeongseong's Visual Culture and Audience). Seoul: Hanguk Misul Yeon-guso 한국 미술연구소 CAS, 2018.

Hangukhak Munheon Yeon-guso. 한국학 문헌 연구소. *Daehan Jaganghoe wolbo yeong-inbon ha* 대한자강회월보 영인본 (Reprinted Collection of Daehan Jaganghoe wolbo). Seoul: Asea Munhwasa 아세아문화사, 1976.

———. *Hanguk gaehwagi gyogwaseo chongseo* 한국 개화기 교과서 총서 (Collection of Textbooks during the Korean Enlightenment Period). Vol. Gukeopyeon 1. Seoul: Asea Munhwasa 아세아 문화사, 1977.

———. *Hanguk gaehwagi gyogwaseo chongseo* 한국 개화기 교과서 총서 (Collection of Textbooks during the Korean Enlightenment Period). Vol. Gukeopyeon 2. Seoul: Asea Munhwasa 아세아 문화사, 1977.

———. *Hanguk gaehwagi gyogwaseo chongseo* 한국 개화기 교과서 총서 (Collection of Textbooks during the Korean Enlightenment Period). Vol. Gukeopyeon 3. Seoul: Asea Munhwasa 아세아 문화사, 1977.

———. *Hanguk gaehwagi gyogwaseo chongseo* 한국 개화기 교과서 총서 (Collection of Textbooks during the Korean Enlightenment Period). Vol. Gukeopyeon 4. Seoul: Asea Munhwasa 아세아 문화사, 1977.

———. *Hanguk gaehwagi gyogwaseo chongseo* 한국 개화기 교과서 총서 (Collection of Textbooks during the Korean Enlightenment Period). Vol. Gukeopyeon 5. Seoul: Asea Munhwasa 아세아 문화사, 1977.

———. *Hanguk gaehwagi gyogwaseo chongseo* 한국 개화기 교과서 총서 (Collection of Textbooks during the Korean Enlightenment Period). Vol. Gukeopyeon 6. Seoul: Asea Munhwasa 아세아 문화사, 1977.

———. *Hanguk gaehwagi gyogwaseo chongseo* 한국 개화기 교과서 총서 (Collection of Textbooks during the Korean Enlightenment Period). Vol. Gukeopyeon 7. Seoul: Asea Munhwasa 아세아 문화사, 1977.

———. *Hanguk gaehwagi gyogwaseo chongseo* 한국 개화기 교과서 총서 (Collection of Textbooks during the Korean Enlightenment Period). Vol. Guksapyeon 4. Seoul: Asea Munhwasa 아세아 문화사, 1977.

———. *Hanguk gaehwagi gyogwaseo chongseo* 한국 개화기 교과서 총서 (Collection of Textbooks during the Korean Enlightenment Period). Vol. Guksapyeon 7. Seoul: Asea Munhwasa 아세아 문화사, 1977.

———. *Hanguk gaehwagi gyogwaseo chongseo* 한국 개화기 교과서 총서 (Collection of Textbooks during the Korean Enlightenment Period). Vol. Guksapyeon 10. Seoul: Asea Munhwasa 아세아 문화사, 1977.

Hanmi Sajin Misulgwan, Guklip Hyeondae Misulgwan, and Gahyeon Munhwa Jaedan 한미 사진 미술관, 국립현대미술관, 가현문화재단. *Daehan Jeguk hwangsil ui chosang 1880-1989* 대한제국 황실의 초상 1880-1989 (Portraits of the Imperial Family of the Korean Empire 1880-1989). Seoul: Gahyeon Munhwa Jaedan; Hanmi Sajin Misulgwan 한미 사진 미술관, 2012.

Hanseong sunbo 한성순보. "Editorial." *Hanseong sunbo* 한성순보. 21 February, 1884.

———. "Jigu jeondo" 지구전도 (World Map). *Hanseong sunbo* 한성순보. 31 October, 1883.

Harley, J.B. *The New Nature of Maps: Essays in the History of Cartography*. Edited by Paul Laxton. Baltimore: The John's Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Harris, Lane Jeremy. "The Post Office and State Formation in Modern China, 1896-1949." PhD diss., University of Illinois, 2012.

Harris, Nicolas. *History of the Orders of Knighthood of the British Empire*. London: Wentworth Press, 1839.

Harvey, Penelope. *Hybrids of Modernity: Anthropology, the Nation State and the Universal Exhibition*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Hayrynen, Maunu. "The Kaleidoscopic View: The Finnish National Landscape Imagery." *National Identities* 2, no. 1 (March 2000): 5–19.

Henry, Todd A. *Assimilating Seoul: Japanese Rule and the Politics of Public Space in Colonial Korea, 1910-1945.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014.

Herb, Guntram H. *Under the Map of Germany: Nationalism and Propaganda 1918-1945*. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Hesse-Wartegg, Ernst von. *Korea: Eine Sommerreise Nach Dem Lande Der Morgenruhe*. Dresden: Reissner, 1895. https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_fDJDAQAAMAAJ/page/n15/mode/2up.

Hobsbawm, E. J. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. 2nd ed. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Hong Seon-ung 홍선웅. *Hanguk geundae panhwasa* 한국 근대 판화사 (The History of Modern Korean Prints). Seoul: Misul Munhwa 미술문화, 2014.

Hong Seung-pyo 홍승표. “Ileo beorin Taegeuk, jiwo beorin Iljang-gi” 잃어버린 태극, 지워버린 일장기 (The Lost Taegeuk, the Erased Japanese Flag). *News & Joy*. 24 February, 2021. https://www.newsnjoy.or.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=302303.

Hong Sun-ae 홍순애. “Geundae gyemong-gi jirijeok sangsangryeok gwa seosajeok jaehyeon” 근대 계몽기 지리적 상상력과 서사적 재현 (Geographical Imagination and Narrative Reproduction of the Modern Enlightenment Period). *Hyeondae soseol yeon-gu* 현대소설연구 40 (April 2009): 359–80.

Hong Sun-pyo 홍선표. “Bokje doen gaehwa wa gyemong ui imiji.” 복제된 개화와 계몽의 이미지 (Reproduced Images of Reformation and Enlightenment). *Wolgan misul* 원간미술, December 2002.

———. “Gaein sojang ui ‘Chulsan hojakdo’: Hanguk ggachi horang-i geurim ui wonryu.” 개인 소장의 출산호작도: 한국 까치 호랑이 그림의 원류 (‘Tiger Coming Down from the Mountain and Magpies’ in Private Collection), *Misulsa nondan* 미술사논단 9 (November 1999): 345–50.

———. “Geundaejeok ilsang gwa pungsok ui jingjo: Hanguk gaehwagi inswae misul gwa sinmunmul imiji” 근대적 일상과 풍속의 징조: 한국 개화기 인쇄 미술과 신문물 이미지 (Modern Daily Life and Signs of Folk Culture: Print Art and the Images of New Technology and Objects during the Korean Enlightenment Period). *Misulsa nondan* 미술사논단 21 (December 2005): 253–79.

———, ed. Geundae ui cheot gyeongheom: Gaehwagi ilsang munhwa reul jungsim euro 근대의 첫 경험: 개화기 일상 문화를 중심으로 (The First Experience with Modernity: On the Daily Cultures of the Enlightenment Period). Seoul: Ewha Yeoja Daehakgyo Chulpanbu 이화여자대학교출판부, 2006.

———. “Hanguk gaehwagi ui saphwa yeon-gu: Chodeung gyogwaseo reul jungsim euro.” 한국 개화기의 삽화 연구: 초등교과서를 중심으로 (Studies on Illustrations of the Korean Enlightenment Period: On Primary School Textbooks) *Misulsa nondan* 미술사논단 15 (December 2002): 257–93.

———. *Hanguk geundae misulsa: Gabo gaehyeok eseo haebang sigi ggaji.* 한국 근대 미술사: 갑오개혁에서 해방시기까지 (Modern Korean Art History: From Gabo Reforms to Liberation). Seoul: Sigongsa 시공사, 2009.

———. "Gyeongseong ui sigak munhwa gongram jedo mit yutong gwa gwanjung ui tansaeng" 경성의 시각문화 공람제도 및 유통과 관중의 탄생 (Gyeongseong's Public Exhibition Visual Culture and its Distribution and the Birth of Spectators). In *Modeon Gyeongseong ui sigak munhwa wa gwanjung* 모던 경상의 시각 문화와 관중 (Modern Gyeongseong's Visual Culture and Audience). Seoul: Hanguk Misul Yeon-guso 한국 미술 연구소, 2012.

———. "Silgyeong sansuhwa" 실경 산수화 (Real-View Landscape Painting) In *Encyclopedia of Korean Culture. Academy of Korean Studies*, 1996. http://encykorea.aks.ac.kr/Contents/Item/E0033641.

———. "19 segi yeohang munindeul ui hoehwa hwaldong gwa changjak seonghyang." 19 세기 여항문인들의 회화활동과 창작성향 (Painting Activities and Creative Tendencies of 19th Century Middleclass Literati) *Misulsa nondan* 미술사논단 1 (June 1995): 191–219.

Horlyck, Charlotte. *Korean Art: From the 19th Century to the Present.* London: Reaktion Books, 2017.

Houlgate, Stephen. "Vision, Reflection, and Openness: The 'Hegemony of Vision' from a Hegelian Point of View." In *Modernity and the Hegemony of Vision*. Edited by David Michael Levin, 87–123. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Hulbert, Homer B. "Hulbert to Henry." 29 May, 1890. https://search.i815.or.kr/contents/independenceFighter/detail.do?independenceFighterId=3-008785-106.

———. "Hulbert to Henry." 15 June, 1890. https://search.i815.or.kr/contents/independenceFighter/detail.do?independenceFighterId=3-008785-108.

———. "Hulbert to Henry." 23 September 1890. https://search.i815.or.kr/contents/independenceFighter/detail.do?independenceFighterId=3-008785-114.

———. "Hulbert to His Mother." 25 March, 1890. https://search.i815.or.kr/contents/independenceFighter/detail.do?independenceFighterId=3-008785-101.

———. "Hulbert to His Mother." 23 November, 1890. https://search.i815.or.kr/contents/independenceFighter/detail.do?independenceFighterId=3-008785-119.

———. *Samin pilji* 사민필지 (Essential Knowledge for Scholarly People). Translated by Baek Nam-gyu 백남규 and Yi Myeong-sang 이명상. Seoul: Hakbu 학부, 1895.

———, ed. "News Calendar." *Korea Review* 1 (September 1901): 411–13.

Hwang Jeong-yeon 황정연. "Joseon sidae neungbi ui geonrip gwa eopilbi ui deungjang" 조선시대릉비의 건립과 어필비의 등장 (Formative Stages of Establishing Royal Tombs and Steles and the Appearance of Kings' Calligraphic Tombstones in the Joseon Dynasty). *Munhwajae* 문화재 42, no. 4 (December 2009): 20–49.

Hwang, Kyung Moon. *Beyond Birth: Social Status in the Emergence of Modern Korea*. Harvard East Asian Monographs. Cambridge, Mass.; London: Harvard University Asia Center: Distributed by Harvard University Press, 2004.

———. "Country or State? Reconceptualizing 'Kukka' in the Korean Enlightenment Period, 1896—1910." *Korean Studies*, 2000, 1–24.
———. *Rationalizing Korea: The Rise of the Modern State, 1894-1945.* Oakland, California: University of California Press, 2016.
Hwangseong sinmun 황성신문. "Bakramhoe naesin" 박람회내신 (Letters from the Exposition). *Hwangseong sinmun* 황성신문, 10 September, 1907.
———. "Chin-gyeong seonghwang" 친경성황 (Successful Ploughing Ceremony). *Hwangseong sinmun* 황성신문. 6 April, 1909.
———. "Eojin bong-an" 어진봉안 (Consecration of Royal Portrait). *Hwangseong sinmun* 황성신문. 1 December, 1907.
———. "Eosajin bong-anseol" 어사진 봉안설 (Talks of the Consecration of Royal Photographic Portrait). *Hwangseong sinmun* 황성신문. 12 September, 1907.
———. "Giseo" 기서 (Letter). *Hwangseong sinmun* 황성신문. 12 November, 1900.
———. "Giseo" 기서 (Letter). *Hwangseong sinmun* 황성신문. 9 September, 1902.
———. "Geunha sinnyeon" 근하신년 (Happy New Year). *Hwangseong sinmun* 황성신문. 1 January, 1902.
———. "Hwajin Sugeum" 화진수금 (Artist Receives Pay). *Hwangseong sinmun* 황성신문. 12 July, 1899. National Library of Korea 국립중앙도서관. https://nl.go.kr/newspaper/detail.do?content_id=CNTS-00093702171.
———. "Japbo" 잡보 (Editorial). *Hwangseong sinmun* 황성신문. 12 January, 1909.
———. "Min-ga gukgi" 민가국기 (National Flag in Civilian Houses). *Hwangseong sinmun* 황성신문. 10 January, 1909.
———. "Nonseol" 논설 (Editorial). *Hwangseong sinmun* 황성신문. 7 April, 1902.
———. "Nonseol" 논설 (Editorial). *Hwangseong sinmun* 황성신문. 25 June, 1901.
———. "Nonseol" 논설 (Editorial). *Hwangseong sinmun* 황성신문. 26 June, 1901.
Hwangseong Sinmunsa 황성신문사. *Hwangseong sinmun chukswaepan* 황성신문 축쇄판 (Hwangseong sinmun Reduced Print). Vol. 1. Seoul: Hwangseong Sinmunsa 황성신문사. 1898-1904.
Hyeon Chae 현채, ed. *Yunyeon pildok* 유년필독 (Essential Reading for Young Students). Trans. Lee Jeong-chan 이정찬. Hanguk gaehwagi gukeo Gyogwaseo 한국 개화기 국어교과서 4. Gwangmyeong: Gyeongjin 경진, 2012.
———. *Geundae yeoksa gyogwaseo: Botong gyogwa Dong-guk yeoksa* 근대 역사 교과서: 보통 교과 동국역사 (Modern History Textbook: Primary School Korean History). Translated by Na Ae-ja 나애자. Vol. 1. 6 vols. Geundae yeoksa gyogwaseo 근대역사교과서. Seoul: Somyeong Chulpan 소명출판, 2011.
Hyeon Gwang-ho 현광호. "Juhan Miguk gongsa ui Doklip Hyeophoe undong insik gwa daeeung" 주한미국 공사의 독립 협회 운동 인식과 대응 (Understanding and Respondence of the U.S. Consul to the Movement of Independence Club). *Dongbuka yeon-gu* 동북아 연구 29, no. 2 (December 2014): 199–234.
Im Chae-bang 임채방. "Nambukhan ui sangjing gitbal gwa Taegeukgi ui jeongtongseong" 남북한의 상징 깃발과 태극기의 정통성 (Representative

Flags of South and North Koreas and the Legitimacy of the Taegeukgi). *Bukhan* 북한, Seoul munhwa wa Pyeongyang munhwa 서울문화와 평양문화, no. 171 (March 1986): 90-96.

Im Chae-uk 임채욱. *Bukhan sangjing munhwa ui segye: Ingong-gi wa aegukga reul eotteotge bol geotinga* 북한 상징문화의 세계: 인공기와 애국가를 어떻게 볼 것인가 (The World of North Korean Symbols: How to Understand the Ingong-gi and National Anthem). Seoul: Hwasan Munhwa 화산문화, 2002.

Im Jong-myeong 임종명. "1930-nyeondae jeonban-gi sikminji Joseon, Yi In-seong ui hoehwa jakpum gwa misulgye ui Joseon hyangtoseong: Jeguk/sikminji cheje wa eseunik juui, geurigo mihak" 1930 년대 전반기 식민지 조선, 이인성의 회화 작품과 미술계의 조선 향토성: 제국/식민지 체제와 에스닉주의, 그리고 미학 (Colonial Joseon in the Early 1930s, Local Colour in Yi In-seong's Paintings and the Art Scene: Imperial/Colonial Regime, Ethnicism, and Aesthetics). *Yeoksa yeon-gu* 역사연구, no. 29 (December 2015): 35–93.

Im Seon-hwa 임선화. "Seon-gyosa ui Doklip Hyeophoe wa Daehan Jeguk insik: Eondeoudeu wa Apenjelreo reul jungsim euro" 선교사의 독립 협회와 대한제국 인식: 언더우드와 아펜젤러를 중심으로 (The Missionaries' Understanding of the Independence Club and Korean Empire: Focused on Underwood and Appenzeller). *Yeoksahak yeon-gu* 역사학 연구 14 (June 2000): 67–95.

Im So-yeon 임소연. "Hwangjeguk ui wisang eul gatchuda" 황제국의 위상을 갖추다 (Fulfilling the Status of an Empire). In *Daehan Jeguk: Itchyeojin 100 nyeon jeon ui hwangjeguk* 대한제국: 잊혀진 100 년 전의 황제국 (Daehan Jeguk, The Forgotten Empire of 100 Years Past), 47–68. Seoul: Minsokwon 민속원, 2011.

Independence Hall of Korea 독립기념관. "An Jung-geun sajin yeopseo" 안중근 사진 엽서 (An Jung-geun's Photo Postcard). *Doklip Ginyeomgwan* 독립 기념관 (blog). Accessed 30 June, 2022. https://search.i815.or.kr/sojang/read.do?isTotalSearch=Y&science=&adminId=1-019897-122.

Inoue Kakugoro. "Hanseong jijanmong" 한성지잔몽 (Dreams left in Seoul). In *Seoul e namgyeodun ggum* 서울에 남겨둔 꿈 (Dreams left in Seoul). Translated by Han Sang-il 한상일. Seoul: Konkuk Daehakgyo Chulpanbu 건국대학교출판부, 1993, 23-73.

Ishimatsu, Keiko. "Tong-gambu chiha Daehan Jeguk ui susin gyogwaseo Gukeo dokbon bunseok: Dongsigi Ilbon gyogwaseo ui bigyo reul jungsim euro" 통감부 치하 대한제국의 수신교과서 국어독본 분석: 동시기 일본 교과서의 비교를 중심으로 (Study on Gukeo dokbon, Ethics Textbook of the Korean Empire Under Japanese Protectorate Rule: Comparison with Contemporary Japanese Textbooks). Master's thesis, Yonsei University 연세대학교, 2003.

Jager, Sheila Miyoshi. *Narratives of Nation Building in Korea: A Genealogy of Patriotism*. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 2003.

James, Henry Evan Murchison. *The Long White Mountain or A Journey in Manchuria: With Some Account of the Highway, People, Administration and Religion of That Country*. London: Longmans, 1888.
Jang Bo-ung 장보웅. “Gaehwagi ui jiri gyoyuk” 개화기의 지리교육 (Geography Education in the Enlightenment Period). *Jirihak* 지리학 5, no. 1 (May 1970): 41–58.
Jang Gyeong-nam 장경남. “Yi Sun-sin ui soseoljeok hyeongsanghwa e daehan tongsijeok yeon-gu” 이순신의 소설적 형상화에 대한 통시적 연구 (Diachronic Study of the Literary Formation of Yi Sun-sin). *Minjok munhaksa yeon-gu* 민족문학사연구, no. 35 (2007): 339–72.
Jang Jeong-su 장정수. “19 segi cheosa jak Geumgang-san gihaeng gasa e natanan Geumgang-san ui uimi” 19 세기 처사작 금강산 기행가사에 나타난 금강산의 의미 (The Placeness of Mt. Geumgang in 19th Century Mt. Geumgang Travelogue Lyrics of Cheosa). *Hanguk siga yeon-gu* 한국시사연구 34 (May 2013): 151–88.
Jang Ji-yeon 장지연. “Daehan sinjiji” 대한 신지지 (New Korean Geography). In *Geundae gyemong-gi ui haksul, munye sasang* 근대 계몽기 학술, 문예 사상 (Modern Enlightenment Scholarship, Literary Thought). Edited by Minjok Munhaksa Yeon-guso 민족 문학사 연구소, 266–71. Seoul: Somyeong Chulpan 소명출판, 2000.
Jang Won-seok 장원석. “Minjok ui sangjing, Baekdusan ui tansaeng” 민족의 상징, 백두산의 탄생 (The Birth of Baekdusan Mountain, Symbol of the Korean Nation). *In Baekdusan: Hyeonjae wa mirae reul malhanda* 백두산에서: 현재와 미래를 말한다 (Baekdusan Mountain: Talking about the Present and the Future), 378–91. Seongnam: Hangukhak Jungang Yeon-guwon 한국학 중앙 연구원, 2010.
Jaskulowski, Krzysztof. “The Magic of the National Flag.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39, no. 4 (March 2016): 557–573.
Jeguk sinmun, “Editorial.” *Jeguk sinmun* 제국신문. 25 June, 1901.
———. “Editorial.” *Jeguk sinmun* 제국신문. 26 June, 1901.
Jenks, Chris. *Culture*. 2nd ed. London: Taylor & Francis Group, 2004.
Jeon, Dong-ho. “Selling East Asia in Colour: Elizabeth Keith and Korea.” *Misulsa wa sigak munhwa*, no. 25 (May 2020): 6–33.
Jeon U-yong 전우용. “Daehan Jegukgi- Ilje chogi Seoul gong-gan ui byeonhwa wa gwonryeok ui jihyang” 대한 제국기- 일제 초기 서울 공간의 변화와 권력의 지향 (Changes in the Space of Seoul and Orientation of Power in the Colonial Period). *Jeonnong saron* 5 전농사론(March 1999): 39–72.
Jeon Dong-ho 전동호. “Selling East Asia in Colour: Elizabeth Keith and Korea.” *Misulsa wa sigak munhwa* 미술사와 시각문화, no. 25 (May 2020): 6–33.
Jeong Byeong-jun 정병준. “Hanmal, Daehan Jegukgi ‘min’ gaenyeom ui byeonhwa wa jeongdang jeongchiron” 한말, 대한 제국기 ‘민’ 개념의 변화와 정당 정치론 (The Changes of the Understanding of the ‘People’ in Late Han, Korean

Empire Period and Party Politics). *Sahoe iron* 사회이론, no. 43 (June 2013): 361–403.
Jeong Byeong-mo 정병모. *Mumyeong hwagadeul ui banran, minhwa* 무명화가들의 반란, 민화 (The Revolt of Nameless Painters, Minhwa). Jeong Byeong-mo gyosu ui minhwa ilgi 정병모 교수의 민화 일기. Seoul: Dahal Midieo 다할미디어, 2011.
Jeong Byeong-seok 정병석. "Taegeuk gaenyeom hyeongseong ui yeonwonjeok baegyeong gwa haeseok: Taegeuk gaenyeom ui wonsaengjeok uimi wa haeseok eul jungsim euro" 태극 개념 형성의 연원적 배경과 해석: 태극 개념의 원생적 의미와 해석을 중심으로 (Background and Interpretation of the Formation of the Taegeuk Concept: Focusing on the Original Meaning and Interpretation of the Taegeuk Concept). *Cheolhak* 철학 88 (August 2006): 45–66.
Jeong Eun-ju 정은주. "Joseon jisikin ui jido jejak gwa jiri insik" 조선 지식인의 지도 제작과 지리 인식 (The Making of Maps and the Geographical Understandings of Joseon Intellectuals). *Hangukhak nonjip* 한국학 논집 69 (December 2017): 93–140.
Jeong Ho-gyeong 정호경. "Hanguk geundaegi 'misul' yong-eo ui doip gwa geu jedojeok insik" 한국 근대기 '미술' 용어의 도입과 그 제도적 인식 (The Introduction of the Term, 'Fine Art' and its Social and Historical Cognition in Korean Modern Period: Focused on the Experiences of World Exhibitions during the Open-port Period). *Hyeondae misulsa yeon-gu* 현대 미술사 연구 26 (December 2009): 7–36.
———. "Hanguk geundaegi misul ui jedohwa gwajeong yeon-gu: Gaehang gu Han Il hapbang ggaji reul jungsim euro" 한국 근대기 미술의 제도화 과정 연구: 개항 후 한일 합방까지를 중심으로 (The Systematization of the Fine Art in Korean Modern Period: Open-port to the Japanese Annexation of Korea). Master's thesis, Korea National University of Arts 한국예술종합학교, 2005.
Jeong Ho-wan 정호완, ed. *(Yeokju) Byeonghakjinam* (역주) 병학지남 ((Translated and Annotated) Byeonghakjinam). Seoul: Sejong daewang ginyeom saeophoe 세종대왕기념사업회, 2013.
Jeong Hui-jeong 정희정. "Daehan minbo ui manhwa e daehan yeon-gu" 대한민보의 만화에 대한 연구 (A Study on Daehan minbo Cartoons). Master's thesis, Hongik University 홍익대학교, 2001.
Jeong Hye-gyeong 정혜경. "Joseon sidae gunbok e gwanhayeo: Gugunbok eul jungsim euro" 조선시대 군복에 관하여: 구군복을 중심으로 (On the Military Uniform of the Joseon Dynasty: Focused on Gugunbok). *Yeon-gu nonchong* 연구논총 8 (1978): 347–59.
Jeong In-cheol 정인철. *Hanbando, Seoyang gojido ro mannada* 한반도, 서양 고지도로 만나다 (Meeting the Korean Peninsula Through Western Maps). Seoul: Pureungil 푸른길, 2015.
Jeong In-ho 정인호. "Chodeung Daehan yeoksa" 초등대한역사 (Primary School Korean History). In *Geundae yeoksa gyogwaseo: Chodeung Daehan yeoksa,*

Chodeung Daehan ryeoksa, Chodeung bon-guk yeoksa 근대 역사 교과서: 초등 대한 역사, 초등 대한 력사, 초등 본국 역사 (Modern History Textbooks: Chodeung Daehan yeoksa, Chodeung Daehan ryeoksa, Chodeung bon-guk yeoksa). Translated by Gang Yeong-sim 강영심, 4: 60–180. Geundae yeoksa gyogwaseo 근대역사교과서. Seoul: Somyeong Chulpan 소명 출판, 2011.

———. *Choesin Daehan godeung jiji* 최신대한고등지지 (Latest Daehan Advanced Geography). Seoul: Okho seorim 옥호서림, 1909.

Jeong Jae-cheol 정재철. *Ilje ui dae Hanguk sikminji gyoyuk jeongchaeksa* 일제의 대한국 식민지 교육 정책사 (A History of the Imperial Japanese Educational Policy for Colonial Korea). Seoul: Iljisa 일지사, 1985.

Jeong Ji-hui. 정지희. "Hanseong Misulmpum Jejakso mit byeoncheon gwajeong yeon-gu" 한성미술품제작소 및 변천 과정 연구 (Hanseong Misulmpum Jejakso and the Investigation of its Transformation*). Misulsahak yeon-gu* 미술사학연구 303 (September 2019): 233–56.

Jeong Jin-seok 정진석. *The Korean Problem in Anglo-Japanese Relations, 1904-1910: Ernest Thomas Bethell and His Newspapers: The Daehan Maeil Sinbo and the Korea Daily News*. Seoul: Nanam 나남, 1987.

Jeong Lip-bi 정립비. "Hanmal Gija-Joseon insik e daehan jaegochal: Daedong yeoksa e natanan Gija-Joseon yeoksa seosul eul jungsim euro" 한말 기자조선 인식에 대한 재고찰: 대동역사에 나타난 기자조선 서술을 중심으로 (Rethinking the Understandings on Gija Joseon during the Late Han Period: On the Narrative of Gija Joseon in Daedong yeoksa). *Sarim* 사림 65 (July 2018): 207–40.

Jeong Myeong-gyo 정명교. "Joseon sidae ihu Hanguk jeontong gi (gitbal) yeon-gu" 조선시대 이후 한국 전통기 (깃발) 연구 (A Study on Korean Traditional Flags From the Joseon Period). Master's thesis, Hongik University 홍익대학교, 2003.

Jeong Seon-tae 정선태. "Geundae gyemong-gi minjok, gukmin seosa ui jeongchijeok sihak: Daehan maeil sinbo nonseol eul jungsim euro" 근대계몽기 민족, 국민서사의 정치적 시학: 대한매일신보 논설을 중심으로 (The Political Poetry of the Narrative of Minjok and Gukmin in the Modern Enlightenment Period: Focused on Editorials of Daehan maeil sinbo). *Inmun yeon-gu* 인문연구 no. 50 (June 2006): 147–71.

Jeong Yak-yong 정약용. *Yeoyudang jeonseo* 여유당전서 (Complete Works of Yeoyudang). Edited by Kim Seong-jin 김성진. Vol. 3. 6 vols. Jirijip 지리집 6. Seoul: Sin Joseonsa 신조선사, 1934. http://db.itkc.or.kr/inLink?DCI=ITKC_MO_0597A_1470_010_0090_2004_A286_XML.

Jeong Yeong-hun 정영훈. "Han minjok ui jeongcheseong gwa Dangun minjok juui." 한민족의 정체성과 단군 민족주의 The Korean National Identity and Dangun-Nationalism) *Minjok munhwa nonchong* 민족문화논총 55 (December 2013): 93–137.

———. “Dangun-gyo pomyeongseo wa geu sasangjeok uiui: Dangun minjok juui wa ui gwanryeonseong eul jungsim euro” 단군교 포명서와 그 사상적 의의: 단군민족주의와의 관련성을 중심으로 (Declaration of Dangun-gyo and its Ideological Significance: Focused on the Relation with Dangun Nationalism). *Gukhak yeon-gu* 국학연구 13 (December 2009): 65–96.

Jeong Yong-hwa 정용화. “Seogu ingwon sasang ui suyong gwa jeon-gae: Doklip sinmun eul jungsim euro.” 서구 인권 사상의 수용과 전개: 독립신문을 중심으로 (Early Reception of the Concept of Human Rights Through the Eyes of Doklip sinmun) *Hanguk jeongchihak hoebo* 한국정치학회보 37, no. 2 (July 2003): 67–86.

———. “Yu Gil-jun ui yangjeol chejeron: Ijungjeok gukje jilseo eseo ui bang-guk ui gwonri” 유길준의 양절 체제론: 이중적 국제 질서에서의 방국의 권리 (Yu Gil-jun’s Theory of Two-Fold System: Korea’s Right in a Hypocritical International Order). *Gukje jeongchi nonchong* 국제정치논총 37, no. 3 (August 1998): 297–318.

———. “Yugyo wa jayu juui: Yu Gil-jun ui jayu juui gaenyeom suyong.” 유교와 자유주의: 유길준의 자유주의 개념 수용 (Confucianism and Liberalism: Yu Gil-jun’s Adoption of the Concepts of Liberalism) *Jeongchi sasang yeon-gu* 정치사상연구 2 (April 2002): 61–86.

Jeonju National Museum 국립전주박물관, ed. *Wang ui chosang: Gyeonggijeon gwa Taejo Yi Seong-gye* 왕의 초상: 경기전과 태조 이성계 (Portrait of the King: Gyeonggijeon and Taejo Yi Seong-gye). Jeonju: Jeonju National Museum 국립 전주 박물관, 2005.

Ji Sun-im 지순임. “Hanguk jeontong sansuhwa ui jayeon-gwan gwa geu hyeondaejeok uiui” 한국 전통 산수화의 자연관과 그 개혁적 의의 (View on Nature in Traditional Korean Landscape Painting and its Reformative Significance). *Hangukhak nonjip* 한국학 논집, no. 41 (December 2010): 5–42.

Jin Deok-gyu, Jeong Seon-tae, Go mi-suk, Ham Dong-ju, Gwon Bodeurae, Jeon Dong-hyeon, Park Tae-ho, et al. 진덕규, 정선태, 고미숙, 함동주, 권보드레, 정동현, 박태호, 그 외. “Geundae jeonhwan-gi (1894-1910) inswae maeche reul tonghae bon geundae jisik gwa gaenyeom ui hyeongseong mit byeonmo yangsang e gwanhan yeon-gu jung-gan bogoseo” 근대 전환기(1894-1910) 인쇄 매체를 통해 본 근대 지식과 개념의 형성 및 변모 양상에 관한 연구 중간 보고서 (A Study on the Formation and Transformation of Modern Knowledge and Conceptions through Print Media in the Modern Transitional Period (1894-1910)). Seoul: NRF, 2006.

Jin Gi-hong 진기홍. *Gu Hanguk sidae ui upyo wa ujeong* 구한국시대의 우표와 우정 (Postage Stamps and Postal Duties in the Old Korean Era). Seoul: Gyeongmungak 경문각, 1964.

Jin Jun-hyeon 진준현. “Minjung ui ggum, minhwa Geumgangsando ui yangsik gyebo” 민중의 꿈, 민화 금강산도의 양식계보 (Dreams of the People - Genealogy of the Style of Geumgangsan Mountain Landscapes in Folk Painting). *Misulsahak yeon-gu* 미술학연구 279/280 (December 2013): 295–320.

———. "Joseon chogi, jung-gi ui silgyeong sansuhwa: Siljae jakpum gwa geu hyeonjang eul jungsim euro" 조선 초기, 중기의 실경산수화: 실재 작품과 그 현장을 중심으로 (Real-View Landscape Painting in the Early and Mid Joseon Era: Focused on Surviving Works and its Surroundings). *Misul sahak* 미술사학 24 (August 2010): 39–66.

Jo Gye-won 조계원. "Geundae jeonhwan-gi ui maekrak eseo bon jeongchijeok chungseong: Daehan Jegukgi ui jeongchi, sahoejeok sageon eul jungsim euro" 근대 전환기의 맥락에서 본 정치적 충성: 대한 제국기의 정치, 사회적 사건을 중심으로 (Political Loyalty in the Context of the Modern Transition Period: Focused on Political and Social Events of the Korean Empire). PhD diss., Korea University 고려대학교, 2015.

Jo Gyu-tae 조규태. "Hanguk geundae jeongchi, sahoe danche ui 'gukmin' mandeulgi: Doklip Hyeophoe, Daehan Jaganghoe, Daehan Hyeophoe, Sin-ganhoe reul jungsim euro" 한국 근대 정치, 사회 단체의 '국민' 만들기: 독립협회, 대한 자강회, 대한협회, 신간회를 중심으로 (Nation-Building of the Political and Social Organisations of Modern Korea: On Doklip Hyeophoe, Daehan Jaganghoe, Daehan Hyeophoe, Sin-ganhoe) *Sungsil sahakhoe* 숭실사학회 39 (December 2017): 5–37.

Jo In-su 조인수. "Joseon huban-gi eojin ui jejak gwa bong-an." 조선 후반기 어진 제작과 봉안 (The Production and Consecration of Royal Portraits in Late Joseon). In *Dasi boneun uri chosang ui segye: Joseon sidae chosanghwa haksul nonmunjip* 다시보는 우리 초상의 세계: 조선시대 초상화 학술논문집 (Revisiting the World of Portraits: Academic Essays on Portraits of the Joseon Period). Edited by Lee Nan-yeong 이난영, Park Hyeon-ju 박현주, and Hwang Jeong-yeon 황정연, 6–37. Daejeon: Guklip Munhwajae Yeon-guso 국립문화재연구소, 2007.

———. "Joseon sidae ui chosanghwa wa josang sungbae." 조선시대의 초상화와 조상 숭배 (Portraits of the Joseon Period and Ancestral Worship). *Misul jaryo* 미술자료 81 (June 2012): 57–80.

———. "17 segi gongsinsang e daehayeo" 17 세기 공신상에 대하여 (On 17th Century Gongsin Portraits) In *Dasi boneun uri chosang ui segye: Joseon sidae chosanghwa haksul nonmunjip* 다시보는 우리 초상의 세계: 조선시대 초상화 학술논문집 (Revisiting the World of Portraits: Academic Essays on Portraits of the Joseon Period). Edited by Lee Nan-yeong 이난영, Park Hyeon-ju, 박현주, and Hwang Jeong-yeon 황정연, 6–37. Daejeon: Guklip Munhwajae Yeon-guso 국립문화재연구소, 2007.

Jo Jae-gon 조재곤. *Hwangje jungsim ui geundae gukga cheje hyeongseong* 황제 중심의 근대 국가 체제 형성 (Formation of a Modern State System Centered on the Emperor). Seoul: Yeoksa Gong-gan 역사공간, 2020.

Jo Maeng-gi 조맹기. *Hanguk eonronsa ui ihae* 한국 언론사의 이해 (Understanding of the History of Korean Press Media). Seoul: Sogang University 서강대학교, 1997.

Jo Pil-gam 조필감. *Buyeo ui Jo Jinsa Geumgangsan e gada* 부여의 조진사 금강산에 가다 (Jo Jinsa of Buyeo Goes to Geumgangsan Mountain). Translated by Choi Gang-hyeon 최강현. Seoul: Sinseong Chulpansa 신성 출판사, 2001.

Jo Seon-mi 조선미. "Chae Yong-sin iraneun jakga wa geu ui jakpum." 채용신이라는 작가와 그의 작품 (An Artist Called Chae Yong-sin and His Works). In *Chosanghwa yeon-gu: Chosanghwa wa chosanghwaron* 초상화연구: 초상화와 초상화론 (Portrait Studies: Portraits and Theories of Portraits), 269–325. Seoul: Munye Chulpansa 문예출판사, 2007.

———. "Dong-yucheop e daehayeo" 동유첩에 대하여 (About Dong-yucheop) In *Dong-yucheop* 동유첩 (Dong-yucheop), 273–309. Seoul: Sungkyunkwan University 성균관대학교, 2005.

———. *Eojin, wang ui chosanghw*a 어진, 왕의 초상화 (Eojin, The King's Portrait). Seongnam: Hangukhak Jungang Yeon-guwon 한국중앙연구원, 2019.

———. *Hanguk chosanghwa yeon-gu* 한국초상화연구 (Study of Korean Portraits). Seoul: Yeolhwadang 열화당, 1994.

———. *Hanguk ui chosanghwa* 한국의 초상화 (Portraits of Korea). Seoul: Yeolhwadang 열화당, 1983.

———. *Wang ui eolgul: Han Jung Il gunju chosanghwa reul malhada* 왕의 얼굴: 한중일 군주 초상화를 말하다 (The King's Face: Talking About the Portraits of Korean, Chinese and Japanese Monarchs). Seoul: Sahoe Pyeongron 사회평론, 2012.

Jo Seong-eul 조성을. "Joseon hugi hwaigwan ui byeonhwa: Geundae uisik ui seongjang gwa gwanryeon hayeo" 조선후기 화이관의 변화: 근대의식의 성장과 관련하여 (The Changes is the Hwa-I Distinction in Late Joseon: Related to the Development of Modern Consciousness). In *Geundae gukmin gukga wa minjok munje* 근대국민국가와 민족 문제 (The Problem of the Modern Nation-State and the Nation), 237–60. Seoul: Jisik Saneopsa 지식산업사, 1995.

Jo Yeong-jun 조영준. "Seolrip chogi Jeonhwan-guk ui unyeong siltae, 1883-1892" 설립 초기 전환국의 운영실태 (A Case Study of the Early Stage of the Mint Bureau). *Hangukhak* 한국학 37, no. 1 (March 2014): 291–323.

Jo, Yoong-hee 조융희. "Joseon and Her People Shown in the Travel Report of Campbell in the Late 19th Century" *The Review of Korean Studies* 11, no. 1 (March 2008): 47–66.

Jo Yun-jeong 조윤정. "Japji Sonyeon gwa gukmin munhwa ui hyeongseong" 잡지 소년과 국민 문화의 형성 (Magazine Sonyeon and Formation of National Culture). *Hanguk hyeondae munhak yeon-gu* 한국 현대문학연구 21 (April 2007): 9–44.

———. "Nodongja gyoyuk eul dulleossan jisik ui jeolhap gwa gyemong ui jeongchiseong: Yu Gil-jun ui Nodong yahak dokbon gochal." 노동자 교육을 둘러싼 지식의 절합과 계몽의 정치성: 유길준의 노동야학독본 고찰

(Articulation of Knowledge and Politics of Enlightenment: Related with Laborers' Education). *Inmun nonchong* 인문논총 69 (June 2013): 407–45.
Joseon Sajin Tongsinsa 조선사진통신사. Joseon misul jeonramhoe dorok 조선미술전람회도록 (Catalogue of the Joseon Art Exhibition). Vol. 8. Seoul: Joseon Sajin Tongsinsa 조선사진통신사, 1929.
———. Joseon misul jeonramhoe dorok 조선미술전람회도록 (Catalogue of the Joseon Art Exhibition). Vol. 11. Seoul: Joseon Sajin Tongsinsa 조선사진통신사, 1932.
Ju Hyeong-il 주형일. "Sajin eun jukeum eul eotteohge jaehyeon haneun-ga?: Jukeum sajin ui yuhyeong gwa gineung." 사진은 죽음을 어떻게 재현하는가?: 죽음 사진의 유형과 기능 (How Does Photography Reproduce Death? Types of Death Photographs and Their Functions). *Hanguk eonron jeongbo hakbo* 한국언론정보학보 68 (November 2014): 65–86.
Ju Jin-o 주진오. "Gijon gaehwapa yong-eo e daehan bipan gwa daean" 기존 개화파 용어에 대한 비판과 대안 (Critiques and Alternatives to Conventional Terminologies of the Reform Party). *Yeoeksa bipyeong* 역사비평, no. 73 (November 2005): 23–27.
———. "19 segi mal Joseon ui jaju wa doklip" 19 세기 말 조선의 자주와 독립 (Joseon Autonomy and Independence in the Late 19th Century), in *(Je 2 gi) Han Il yeoksa gondong yeon-gu bogoseo* 한일 역사 공동연구 보고서 (Report of Joint Research on Korea-Japan History), vol. 4, 13-34. Seoul: Han Il Yeoksa Gongdong Yeon-gu Wiwonhoe 한일 역사 공동연구 위원회, 2010,
Jungang Munhwa Chulpansa 중앙 문화 출판사. *Doklip sinmun chukswaepan* 독립신문 축쇄판 (Doklip sinmun Reduced Print). Vol. 1. Seoul: Jungang Munhwa Chulpansa 중앙 문화 출판사, 1969.
———. *Doklip sinmun chukswaepan* 독립신문 축쇄판 (Doklip sinmun Reduced Print). Vol. 7. Seoul: Jungang Munhwa Chulpansa 중앙 문화 출판사, 1969.
Kane, Daniel. "Display at Empire's End: Korea's Participation in the 1900 Paris Universal Exposition." *Sungkyun Journal of East Asian Studies* 4, no. 2 (1 August 2004): 41–66.
———. "Korea in the White City: Korean Participation in the World's Columbian Exhibition of 1893." *Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society, Korea Branch* 77 (1 January 2002): 1–57.
Kang, Woong Joe. *The Korean Struggle for International Identity in the Foreground of the Shufeldt Negotiation, 1866-1882.* Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 2005.
Kaplan, David H., and Guntram H. Herb. "How Geography Shapes National Identities." *National Identities* 13, no. 4 (November 2011): 349–60.
Keith, Elizabeth, and Elspet Keith Robertson Scott. *(Yeong-guk hwaga Elrijabeseu Kiseu ui) Oldeu Koria: Wanjeon bokwonpan* 영국화가 엘리자베스 키스의 올드 코리아: 완전 복원판 (Complete Restored Edition of British Artist Elizabeth Keith's Old Korea). Translated by Song Yeong-dal 송영달. 2nd ed. Seoul: Chaek Gwa Hamgge 책과 함께, 2020.

Kim Bong-cheol 김봉철. “Guhanmal ‘Sechang Yanghaeng’ gwang-go ui gyeongje, munhwasajeok uimi” 구한말 ‘세창양행’ 광고의 경제 문화사적 의미 (The Economic and Cultural Significance of ‘Sechang Yanghaeng's advertisement in the end of Joseon Dynasty). *Gwang-gohak yeon-gu* 광고학 연구 13, no. 5 (December 2002): 117–35.
Kim Bong-hui 김봉희. *Hanguk gaehwagi seojeok munhwa yeon-gu* 한국 개화기 서적문화 연구 (Study on Korean Publication Culture in the Reformation Period). Seoul: Ewha Yeoja Daehakgyo Chulpanbu 이화여자대학교 출판부, 1999.
Kim, C. I. Eugene, and Han-kyo Kim. *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism, 1876-1910*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.
Kim Chang-hui 김창희. “Bukhan ui Baekdu hyeoltong eul wihan yeoksa mandeulgi” 북한의 백두 혈통을 위한 역사 만들기 (Making History for the Baekdu Lineage in North Korea). *Hanguk jeongchi oegyosa nonchong* 한국정치외교사논총 39, no. 1 (August 2017): 147–78.
Kim, Christine. “Politics and Pageantry in Protectorate Korea (1905-10): The Imperial Progresses of Sunjong.” *The Journal of Asian Studies* 68, no. 3 (August 2009): 835–59.
Kim Chun-sik 김춘식. “Wanggwon sinsuseol gwa cheonmyeong sasang ui yeon-gu.” 왕권신수설과 천명사상의 연구 (A Comparative Study of the Divine Right of the Kings in Europe and the Mandate of Heaven in Asia) *Hanguk jeongchihak hoebo* 한국정치학회보 30, no. 3 (December 1996): 27–46.
Kim Dae-hyeon 김대현. “Yeosu Chungminsa ui geonrip gyeongwi mit yeondae e gwanhan jaegochal” 여수 충민사의 건립경위 및 연대에 관한 재고찰 (A Study of the Construction Process and History of Chungminsa Temple). *Yi Sun-sin yeon-gu nonchong* 이순신연구논총, no. 22 (December 2014): 1-44.
Kim Dong-taek 김동택. “Daehan Jegukgi geundae gukga hyeongseong ui se gaji gusang.” 대한제국기 근대국가 형성의 세 가지 구상 (Three Conceptions of Modern State Formation in Daehan Jeguk) *21 segi jongchihak hoebo* 21 세기정치학회보 20, no. 1 (May 2010): 99–121.
———. “Doklip sinmun ui geundae gukga geonseollon.” 독립신문의 근대국가 건설론 (Theories of Modern Nation Building in Doklip sinmun) *Sahoe gwahak yeon-gu* 사회과학연구 12, no. 2 (August 2004): 68–97.
Kim Eun-ho 김은호. *Seohwa baeknyeon* 서화백년 (100 years of Calligraphy and Painting). Seoul: Jungang Ilbo Dongyang Bangsong 중앙일보 동양방송, 1977.
Kim Gang-nyeong 김강녕. “Sin Chae-ho ui Yi Sun-sin yeon-gu wa hyeondaejeok hamui” 신채호의 이순신 연구와 현대적 함의 (Sin Chae-ho’s Study of Yi Sun-sin and its Contemporary Implications). *Yi Sun-sin yeon-gu nonchong* 이순신연구논총, no. 32 (June 2020): 294-351.
Kim Gi-hyeok 김기혁. “Matteo Ritchi Gonyeo man-guk jeondo yeon-gu 1” 마테오 리치 곤여만국 전도 연구 1 (Matteo Ricci's The Map of the Myriad

Countries of the World and Study on His Evangelist Activities 1). *Jirihak nonchong* 지리학 논총 45 (February 2005): 141–64.
Kim Guk-hwa 김국화. "Ilje gangjeomgi gwanje sajin yeopseo reul tonghae bon pyosang ui jeongchihak: 1906-nyeon buteo 1933-nyeon ggaji balhaeng doen gwanje sajin yeopseo reul jungsim euro" 일제 강점기 관제 사진 엽서를 통해 본 표상의 정치학: 1906 년부터 1933 년까지 발행된 관제 사진 엽서를 중심으로 (The Politics of Representation Viewed through Governmental Photographic Postcards of the Japanese Occupation Period: Focused on Governmental Photographic Postcards Issued from 1906 until 1933). Master's thesis, Hongik University 홍익대학교, 2015.
Kim Gyeong-mi 김경미. "Hyeoljuk ui norae" 혈죽의 노래 (Song of the Blood Bamboos). Doklip Ginyeomgwan 독립기념관. Accessed 29 June, 2022. https://www.i815.or.kr/upload/kr/magazine/magazine/35/post-365.html.
Kim Heung-su 김흥수. "Hanmal yeoksa gyoyuk mit gyogwaseo e gwanhan yeon-gu." 한말 역사교육 및 교과서에 관한 연구 (History Education and Textbooks in the Later Yi Dynasty). *Yeoksa gyoyuk* 역사교육 29 (June 1981): 43–81.
Kim Hyeon 김현. "Doklip Hyeophoe gukga gaehyeok sasang ui minjujeok jeonhoe e gwanhan yeon-gu: Gun-gwon ui jedohwa reul jungsim euro" 독립 협회 국가 개혁사상의 민주적 전회에 관한 연구: 군권의 제도화를 중심으로 (A Study of the Democratic Revolution of the National Reform Ideology of the Independence Club: Focused on the Institutionalisation of Monarchical Authority). PhD diss., Yonsei University 연세대학교, 2019.
Kim Hyeon-cheol 김현철. "Hanmal Joseon ui daeoe gwan-gye wa yeongto insik: Park eun-sik Sin Chae-ho ui jagang sasang gwa godaesa insik eul jungsim euro" 한말 조선의 대외관과 영토 인식: 박은식 신채호의 자강사상과 고대사 인식을 중심으로 (Late Joseon's Perception on the International Law and Territory: With Special Reference to the Theory of Self-Strengthening and Research on Korean Ancient History of Park Eun-sik and Shin Chae-ho). *Manju yeon-gu* 만주연구 12 (December 2011): 101–29.
Kim Hyeon-suk 김현숙. "Daehan Jegukgi Jeongdong ui gyeong-gwan byeonhwa wa yeong-yeok gan ui gyeongjaeng" 대한 제국기 정동의 경관 변화와 영역 간의 경쟁 (Power Struggles and Competitions Represented in Jeongdong Landscapes during the Late 19th Century Korea). *Hyangto Seoul* 향토 서울, no. 84 (June 2013): 115–57.
———. "Geundaegi honseong munhwa gong-gan eurosseo ui Geumgangsan gwa Geumgangsan geurim" 근대기 혼성문화공간으로서의 금강산과 금강산 그림 (A Study on the Hybridism of Geumgangsan Mountain and Paintings in the Modern Period). Seoul: NRF, 2011.
Kim Hyeong-mok 김형목. "Hanguk munhwa ui ususeong gwa ilje chimryak manhaeng eul segye e alrida, Heolbeoteu" 한국 문화의 우수성과 일제 침략 만행을 세계에 알리다, 헐버트 (Informing the World of the Excellence of Korean Culture and the Atrocities of Japanese Aggression, Hulbert). *Girokin* 기록인, 2014.

Kim In-gyu 김인규. “Joseon hugi silhakpa ui hwairon gwa cheolhakjeok hamui: Juja hakpa wa ui bigyo reul jungsim euro” 조선후기 실학파의 화이론과 철학적 함의: 주자학파와의 비교를 중심으로 (Theory on the Civilised and Barbarians and Philosophical Implications of the School of Korean Practical Philosophy in the Late Joseon Dynasty: In Comparison with the School of Zhu-Xi Studies). *Dasan gwa hyeondae* 다산과 현대 2 (December 2009): 443–79.
Kim Jae-yeong 김재영. “Daehan minbo ui munche sanghwang gwa dokja cheung e daehan yeon-gu” 대한민보의 문체상황과 독자층에 대한 연구 (The Study on the Condition of Language Style and the Readers of Daehan minbo). *Hanguk munhak ui yeon-gu* 한국 문학의 연구 40 (February 2010): 265–308.
Kim Jang-hyeon 김장현. “Sinhwa reul wonhyeong euro haneun hoehwa e banyeong doen dahoesang gwa sinhwajeok sangjing e gwanhan gochal: Dangun yeongjeong gwa geumgwedo reul jungsim euro” 신화를 원형으로 하는 회화에 반영된 사회성과 신화적 상징에 관한 고찰: 단군 영정과 금괴도를 중심으로 (A Study on Sociability and Mythological Symbols Reflected in Paintings Based on Myth: Focusing on Dangun Portraits and Gold Bullion). *Dongyang yesul* 동양예술 27 (April 2015): 99–128.
Kim Je-jeong 김제정. “Sikmin sigi Joseonin gwa jaeJo Ilbonin ui Gyeongseong annaeseo bigyo: Gyeongseong pyeonram (1929) gwa Dae Gyeongseong (1929)” 식민시기 조선인과 재조 일본인의 경성안내서 비교: 경성편람 (1929)와 대경성 (1929) (Comparison of Gyeongseong Tour Pamphlets Published by Joseon People and Japanese Residents in Joseon: Gyeongseong pyeonram (1929) and Dae Gyeongseong (1929). *Dosi yeon-gu* 도시연구 19 (April 2018): 63–86.
Kim Jeong 김정. “Dangun chosanghwa e gwanhan yeon-gu” 단군 초상화에 관한 연구 (A Study on Dangun Portraits). *Johyeong gyoyuk* 조형교육 20 (January 2002): 47–80.
Kim Ji-yeong, Kim Mun-sik, Park Rye-gyeong, Song Ji-won, Sim Seung-gu, and Lee Eun-ju 김지영, 김문식, 박례경, 송지원, 심승구, 이은주. *Jeukwisik, gukwang-ui tansaeng* 즉위식, 국왕의 탄생 (Coronation, the Birth of a King). Wangsil munhwa chongseo 왕실문화총서. Paju: Dolbegae 돌베개, 2013.
Kim Jong-hak 김종학. “1876-nyeon Jo Il suho jogyu chegyeol gwajeong ui jaeguseong: Simhaeng ilgi wa myeot gaji migan munheon e gicho hayeo” 1876 년 조일수호조규 체결과정의 재구성: 심행일기와 몇가지 미간문헌에 기초하여 (Reconstruction of the Treaty-Making Process of the 1876 Joseon-Japan Treaty: Based on Primary Sources Including Simhaeng ilgi). *Hanguk jeongchi hakhoebo* 한국정치학회보 51, no. 5 (December 2017): 185-215.
Kim Mi-seon 김미선. “Gihaeng ilgi ro bon Joseon sidae myeongseungji” 기행일기로 본 조선시대 명승지 (Joseon-period Scenic Spots Seen Through Travelogues). *Han minjok eomunhak* 한민족 어문학 89 (September 2020): 117–45.

Kim Min-hwan 김민환. *Hanguk eonronsa* 한국 언론사 (History of Korean Media). Seoul: Nanam Chulpan 나남출판, 2002.
Kim Mun-sik, Kim Ji-yeong, Park Rye-gyeong, Song Ji-won, Sim Seung-gu, and Lee Eun-ju 김문식, 김지영, 박례경, 송지원, 심승구, 이은주. *Wangsil ui cheonji jesa* 왕실의 천지제사 (Royal Ancestral Rites). 왕실문화총서 Wangsil munhwa chongseo. Paju: Dolbegae 돌베개, 2011.
Kim Mun-sik 김문식. “1882-nyeon Park Yeong-hyo ga sayonghan Joseon gukgi” 1882 년 박영효가 사용한 조선 국기 (Korean Flag used by Park Young-hyo in 1882). *Munheon gwa haeseok tong-gwon* 문헌과 해석 통권 36 (August 2006): 121–33.
Kim Nam-gyu 김남규. “Gaehwagi sijo ui geundaeseong yeon-gu.” 개화기 시조의 근대성 연구 (A Study on the Modernity of Enlightenment Period Poetry). Master’s thesis, Korea University 고려대학교, 2012.
Kim Pan-su 김판수. “Geundae Ilbon hwapye yangsik ui Seoyanghwa” 근대 일본 화폐 양식의 서양화 (The Westernisation of Modern Japanese Mint). *Sahoe wa yeoksa* 사회와 역사 81 (March 2009): 213–52.
Kim Sang-gi 김상기. “Yun Bong-gil ui Sanghae uigeo e daehan Ilbon enron ui bodo” 윤봉길의 상해 의거에 대한 일본언론의 보도 (Japanese Reportings on Yun Bong-gil’s Shanghai Patriotic Deed). *Hanguk doklip undongsa yeon-gu* 한국독립운동사연구, no. 32 (April 2009): 5–42.
Kim Sang-seop 김상섭. *Taegeukgi ui jeongche: Jejak gwajeong gwa Juyeok wonri reul tonghae bon Taegeukgi nonui* 태극기의 정체: 제작 과정과 주역의 원리를 통해 본 태극기 논의 (The Identity of Taegeukgi: A Discussion of Taegeukgi through the Production Process and the Changes of Zhou). Seoul: Dong Asia 동아시아, 2001.
Kim Se-min 김세민. “Yeongeunmun, Mohwagwan ui geonrip gwa Doklipmun, Doklipgwan euro ui byeoncheon” 영은문 모화관의 건립과 독립, 독립관으로의 변천 (Erecting Yeongeun Gate, Mohwagwan Hall and Their Transformations into the Independence Arch and Independence Hall). *Seoul gwa yeoksa* 서울과 역사, no. 82 (2012): 141–78.
Kim Seok-geun 김석근. “Gaehwagi ‘jayu juui’ ui suyong gwa gineung geurigo jeongchijeok hamui” 개화기 ‘자유주의’의 수용과 기능 그리고 정치적 함의 (The Adoption and Function of Liberalism and its Political Meaning 19th Century Korea). *Hanguk Dongyang jeongchi sasang yeon-gu* 한국동양정치사상연구 10, no. 1 (March 2011): 65–87.
Kim Seong-bae 김성배. “Hanguk ui geundae gukga gaenyeom hyeongseongsa yeon-gu” 한국의 근대국가 개념 형성사 연구 (The Transformation of Modern State Concept in Korea). *Gukje jeongchi nonchong* 국제정치논총 52, no. 5 (June 2012): 7–35.
Kim Seong-hwan 김성환. “Nampa Park Chan-ik jipan sojang Dangun yeongjeong” 남파 박찬익 집안 소장 단군영정 (Dangun’s Portrait in the Collection of Park Chan–ik Family). *Jeongsin munhwa yeon-gu* 정신문화연구 41, no. 2 (June 2018): 41–64.

———. "20 segi cho Dangun yeongjeong ui bogeup gwa hwabon geomto" 20 세기 초 단군영정의 보급과 화본 검토 (The Dissemination of Dangun's Portrait in the Early 20th Century and a Review of Drawings). *Dongbuka yeoksa nonchong* 동북아 역사 논총 65 (September 2019): 201–41.

Kim Seung-hwan 김승환. "Damunhwa damron gwa rokeolliti ui iwonseong." 다문화담론과 로컬리티의 이원성 (Duality in the Discourse of Multiculture and Locality). *Rokeollity inmunhak* 로컬리티 인문학 3 (April 2010): 75–105.

Kim Si-hyeon 김시현. "19 segi jin-gyeong sansuhwa yeon-gu: Geumgangsando reul jungsim euro" 19 세기 진경 산수화 연구: 금강산도를 중심으로 (A Study on Landscape Painting in the 19th century: Focusing on Geumgangsando). Master's thesis, Hannam University 한남대학교, 2007.

Kim Sin-jae 김신재. "Yu Gil-jun ui min-gwon uisik ui teukjil" 유길준의 민권의식의 특질 (The Characteristics of Yu Gil-jun's Civil Rights Ideology). *Donghak yeon-gu* 동학연구 22 (March 2007): 135–58.

Kim So-yeong 김소영. "Gabo gaehyeokgi (1894-1895) gyogwaseo sok ui 'gukmin'" 갑오개혁기 (1894-1895) 교과서 속의 '국민' ('Gukmin' in Textbooks of the Gabo Reforms Period (1894-1895)). *Hanguksa hakbo* 한국사학보 29 (November 2007): 171–208.

———. "Jae Il Joseon yuhaksaengdeul ui 'gukminron' gwa 'aegukron': Chinmokhoe hoebo (1896-1898) naeyong bunseok eul jungsim euro" 재일 조선 유학생들의 '국민론'과 '애국론': 친목회회보 (1896-1895) (The Discourse on 'Gukmin' and 'Patriotism' of Joseon Students Studying in Japan (1896-1898)). *Hanguk minjok undongsa yeon-gu* 한국 민족 운동사 연구 66 (March 2011): 5–48.

———. "Sunjong hwangje ui nam, seosunhaeng gwa chung-gun aegukron" 순종 황제의 남, 서순행과 충군 애국론 (Emperor Seonjong's Tours and Patriotism). *Hanguksa hakbo* 한국사 학보 39 (May 2010): 159–93.

Kim Won-mo 김원모. "Jo Mi joyak chegyeol yeon-gu" 조미조약체결 연구 (A Study On the Conclusion of Treaty betwen the United States of America and Joseon). *Dongyanghak* 동양학 22, no. 1 (October 1992): 49–123.

———. *Taegeukgi ui yeonhyeok* 태극기의 연혁 (History of Taegeukgi). Seoul: Haengjeong Jachibu Uijeong-gwa 행정자치부 의정과, 1998.

Kim Yeon-hwa 김연화. "Daehan Jeguk hwangsil pyosang euroseo ui Ihwamun i jinin yungbokhapjeok jonjae hyeongsik ui jeongcheseong yeon-gu" 대한제국 황실 표상의로서의 이화문이 지닌 용복합적 존재형식의 정체성 연구 (Ihwamun's Identity in its Metaphysical & Physical Existence as an Emblem of the Korean Empire's Royal Family). *Hanguk gwahak yesul yunghap hakhoe* 한국과학 예술 융합 학회 24 (June 2016): 79–88.

Kim Yeong-ho 김영호. "Geundae Hanguk ui buguk gangbyeong ui gaenyeom" 근대한국의 부국강병의 개념 (The Concept of Modern Korean National Prosperity and Military Power). In *Geundae Hanguk ui sahoe gwahak gaenyeom hyeongseongsa* 근대한국의 사회 과학 개념 형성사 (The History of Social

Science Concept Formation in Modern Korea), 149–72. Paju: Changbi 창비, 2009.
———. "Hanmal Seoyang gisul ui suyong" 한말 서양 기술의 수용 (Acceptance of Korean and Western Technologies). *Asea yeon-gu* 아세아 연구 11, no. 3 (September 1968): 295–348.
Kim Yeong-hun 김영훈. "Gaehwagi gyogwaseo sok ui segye wa yeoksa: Man-guk jiri wa man-guksa reul jungsim euro" 개화기 교과서 속의 세계와 역사: 만국 지리와 만국사를 중심으로 (New World and Its History in the Textbooks of the Enlightenment Period: Focusing on World Geography and World History Textbooks). *Bigyo munhwa yeon-gu* 비교 문화연구 16, no. 2 (July 2010): 5–30.
Kim Young-na 김영나. "'Bakramhoe' raneun jeonsi gong-gan: 1893-nyeon Sikago man-guk bakramhoe wa Joseon-gwan jeonsi" '박람회'라는 전시공간: 1893 년 시카고 만국박람회와 조선관 전시 ('Universal Exposition' as an Exhibition Space: Korean Exhibition at the 1893 World Columbian Exposition, Chicago). *Seoyang misulsa hakhoe nonmunjip* 서양미술사학회논문집 13 (June 2000): 75–111.
———. "Hwaga wa chosanghwa" 화가와 초상화 (The Painter and Portrait). *Misulsa yeon-gu* 미술사연구, no. 20 (December 2006): 7–28.
———. *20 segi ui Hanguk misul 2: Byeonhwa wa dojeon ui sigi* 20 세기의 한국미술 2: 변화와 도전의 시기 (20th Century Korean Art 2: Times of Change and Challenge). Seoul: Yegyeong 예경, 2010.
———. 20th Century Korean Art. London: Laurence King, 2005.
Kim Yun-jeong 김윤정. "Hanguk minhwa ui jonjae wa yangsang: 19 segi huban 20 segi jeonban eul jungsim euro" 한국 민화의 존재와 양상: 19 세기 후반 20 세기 전반을 중심으로 (Korean Folk Paintings: Their Aspects During the Late 19th and Early 20th Centuries). *Minsokhak yeon-gu* 민속학 연구, no. 19 (December 2006): 249–59.
Kim Yun-jin 김윤진. "19 segi mal Jo, Cheong hoedam gwa Tomun-gang" 19 세기 말 조, 청 회담과 토문강 (Joseon-Qing Talks and the Tomungang River, Later 19th Century). Master's thesis, Dongguk University 동국대학교, 2020.
Kim Yun-su 김윤수. *Hanguk misul 100-nyeon* 한국 미술 100 년 (100 years of Korean Art). Edited by National Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art, Korea 국립현대미술관. Vol. 1. Paju: Hangilsa 한길사, 2006.
Kosonen, Katariina. "Making Maps and Mental Images: Finnish Press Cartography in Nation-Building, 1899-1942." *National Identities* 10, no. 1 (March 2008): 21–47.
Kotō Bunjirō. "An Orographical Sketch of Korea." *The Journal of the College of Science* 19 (1903): 1–62.
Landor, Arnold Henry Savage Landor. *Corea or Cho-Sen: The Land of the Morning Calm*. Project Gutenberg, 2004. https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/13128.
Larsen, Kirk W. *Tradition, Treaties, and Trade: Qing Imperialism and Chosŏn Korea, 1850-1910.* Harvard East Asian Monographs. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center: Distributed by Harvard University Press, 2008.

Lee Bo-ram 이보람. "Hyubeot Boseu (Hubert Vos, 1835-1955) ui saeng-ae wa hoehwa yeon-gu: Jung-gukin gwa Hangukin chosanghwa reul jungsim euro" 휴벗 보스 (Hubert Vos, 1835-1955)의 생애와 회화 연구: 중국인과 한국인 초상화를 중심으로 (Study on the Life and the Paintings of Hubert Vos: Focused on Portraits of Chinese and Korean Subjects). Master's thesis, Myeongji University 명지대학교, 2014.

Lee Chang-heon 이창헌. "Banggak soseol chulpan gwa gwanryeon doen myeot gaji munje" 방각소설 출판과 관련된 몇 가지 문제 (An Essay on Questions of Xerographic Stories). *Gojeon munhak yeon-gu* 고전문학연구 35 (June 2009): 141–82.

Lee Eun-ju 이은주. "Gaehwagi sajinsul ui doip gwa geu yeonghyang: Kim Yong-won ui hwaldong eul jungsim euro" 개화기 사진술의 도입과 그 영향: 김용원의 활동의 중심으로 (Introduction of Photography and Its Effects in the Enlightenment Period of Korea: Focusing on the Activities of Kim Yong-won). *Jindan hakbo* 진단학보, June 2002, 145–72.

Lee Ga-yeon 이가연. "1910-nyeondae Joseon Chongdokbu balhaeng sijeong ginyeom sajin yeopseo reul tonghae bon sikminji Joseon ui imiji" 1910 년 대 조선 총독부 발행 시정 기념사진 엽서를 통해 본 식민지 조선의 이미지 (The Image of Colonial Joseon as Seen Through Postcards with a Commemorative Photo, Issued by the Japanese Government-General of Korea in the 1910s). Master's thesis, Dong-a University 동아대학교, 2007.

Lee Gang-chil 이강칠. *Daehan Jeguk sidae hunjang jedo* 대한제국 시대 훈장제도 (Korean Empire Period Medal System). Seoul: Jayu Chulpansa 자유 출판사, 1999.

Lee Gi-hun 이기훈. "Hanguk geunhyeondaesa ui minjok, minjuhwa undong gwa Taegeukgi" 한국 근현대사의 민족, 민주화 운동과 태극기 (Modern and Contemporary Korean Minjok and Democratic Movements and Taegeukgi). In *Daehan, Taegeukgi: 3.1 Undong mit Daehan Minguk Imsi Jeongbu surip 100 junyeon ginyeom Lee Byeong-geun sojang yumul teukbyeoljeon* 대한, 태극기: 3.1 운동 및 대한민국임시정부 수립 100 주년 기념 이병근 소장유물 특별전 (Daehan, Taegeukgi: Special Exhibition of Lee Byung-geun Collection to Commemorate the 100th anniversary of the March First Movement and the Establishment of the Provisional Government of the Republic of Korea). Cheongju: Gyowon daehakgyo gyoyuk bakmulgwan 교원대학교 교육박물관, 2019, 136-141.

Lee Gu-yeol 이구열. *Geundae Hanguk misulsa ui yeon-gu* 근현대 한국 미술사의 연구 (A Study of Modern and Contemporary Korean Art History). Seoul: Mijinsa 미진사, 1992.

———. "Sinmun e hang-Il, guguk sisa manhwa reul geurin Lee Do-young" 신문에 항일, 구국 시사 만화를 그린 이도영 (Lee Do-young, Who Drew Anti-Japanese and National Rescue Cartoons for Newspapers). *Misul segye* 미술세계, Lee Gu-yeol ui geundae misul imyeon-gi 이구열의 근대미술 이면지, January 2004, 96–99.

Lee Gwang-su 이광수. “Godae Hanminjok inmulsang ui johyeongjeok teukseong: Goguryeo Deokheung-ri gobun byeokhwa myoju chosang eul jungsim euro” 고대 한민족 인물상의 조형적 특성: 고구려 덕흥리 고분벽화 묘주 초상을 중심으로 (Study on Formative Characteristic of the Portrait Images of the Korean People: Murals of Deokheung-ri Tomb of Ancient Goguryeo). *Gojoseon Dangunhak* 고조선 단군학 32 (June 2015): 273–97.

Lee Gyeong-min 이경민. “Daehan Jegukgi jeonhu sajin-gwan munhwa: Chosang sajin ui saengsan gwa yutong bangsik eul jungsim euro” 대한 제국기 전후 사진관 문화: 초상사진의 생산과 유통방식을 중심으로 (Photo Studio Culture Before and After the Korean Empire: Focusing on the Production and Distribution Method of Portrait Photography). In *Daehan Jeguk ui misul: Bit ui gil eul ggum gguda* 대한제국의 미술: 빛의 길을 꿈꾸다 (Art of the Korean Empire: Dreaming of a Path of Light), 132–37. Seoul: National Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art 국립현대미술관, 2018.

———. “Iwata Kanae wa Amjeon sajingwan (2).” 이와타 카나에와 암전사진관 (2) (Iwata Kanae and Amjeon Photo Studio (2)). *Sajin yesul* 사진예술, September 2015.

———. “Sikminji Joseon ui sigakjeok jaehyeon” 식민지 조선의 시각적 재현 (Visual Reproduction of Colonial Joseon). In *Daehan Jeguk hwangsil sajinjeon* 대한제국 황실 사진전 (Korean Empire Imperial Photo Exhibition), 7–38. Seoul: Hanmi Sajin Misulgwan 한미 사진 미술관, 2009.

Lee Gyeong-ok 이경옥. “Gaehwagi upyo munyang yeon-gu” 개화기 우표문양 연구 (A Study on Stamp Patterns of the Enlightenment Period), Master’s thesis. Ewha Womans University 이화여자대학교, 2007.

Lee Ha-gyeong 이하경. “Daehan Jeguk sigi gunjugwon ganghwa wa min-gwon hwakdae nonui: Jugwonron eul jungsim euro” 대한제국 시기 군주권 강화와 민권 확대 논의: 주권론을 중심으로 (Monarchical Power and the People in the Daehan Empire: Focusing on the Theory of Sovereignty). *Hanguk jeongchi yeon-gu* 한국 정치연구 21, no. 1 (February 2012): 181–204.

Lee Hae-cheong 이해청. *Segye ui jin-gwi upyo* 세계의 진귀 우표 (Rare Stamps of the World). Seoul: Myeong-ok Chulpansa 명옥출판사, 1983.

Lee Hui-jae 이희재. “Jukeum e daehan Yugyo ui insik” 죽음에 대한 유교의 인식 (The Confucian View on Death) *Gongjahak* 공자학 15 (December 2008): 119–30.

Lee Hyeon-pyo 이현표. *Uju reul pumeun Taegeukgi* 우주를 품은 태극기 (Taegeukgi that Embraces the Universe). Goyang: Koreoseu 코러스, 2015.

Lee Jeong-chan 이정찬. “Yunyeon pildok ui chulgan baegyeong gwa nonri: Gukga juui yeoksagwan ui seongrip gwajeong eul jungsim euro” 유년필독의 출간 배경과 논리: 국가주의 역사관의 성립과정을 중심으로 (Yunyeon pildok: The Background and Logic of its Publication). *Gukje eomun* 국제어문 58 (August 2013): 73–103.

Lee Jeong-hui 이정희. “Daehan Jegukgi gaeguk giwonjeol ginyeom haengsa wa eumak” 대한 제국기 개국기원절 기념행사와 음악 (Celebrations and

Music for the Foundation Day of the Korean Empire). *Gong-yeon munhwa yeon-gu* 공연문화 연구 25 (August 2012): 135–81.

Lee Ji-eun 이지은. "Gyeongsul gukchigi Jeonbuk jiyeok jajeong sun-gukja e daehan geomto" 경술국치 전북지역 자정순국자에 대한 검토 (A Review of Patriotic Martyrs in the Region of Jeonbuk Province from the National Humiliation of the Gyeongsul Year). Master's thesis, Jeonbuk National University 전북국립대학교, 2016.

Lee Jong-ho 이종호. "Choe Nam-seon ui jiri(hak)jeok gihoek gwa pyosang" 최남선의 지리학적 기획과 표상 (Choi Nam-son's Geographical Project and Representation). *Sangheo hakbo* 상허학보 22 (February 2008): 275–303.

Lee, Jungwon. "Conflation of the Japanese Colonial Museums in Korea." *The International Journal of the Inclusive Museum* 14, no 2 (August 2021): 83-94.

Lee Min-ju 이민주. *Yong eul geurigo bonghwang eul sunota: Joseon ui wangsil boksik* 용을 그리고 봉황을 수놓다: 조선의 왕실 복식 (Painting the Dragon and Embroidering the Phoenix: Joseon Royal Costumes). Seongnam: Hangukhak Jungang Yeon-guwon 한국학중앙연구원, 2013.

Lee Min-sik 이민식. *Keolleombia segye bakramhoe wa Hanguk* 컬럼비아 세계박람회와 한국 (World's Columbian Expositions and Korea). Seoul: Baeksan Jaryowon 백산자료원, 2006.

Lee Myeong-hwa 이명화. "Aegukga hyeongseong e gwanhan yeon-gu" 애국가 형성에 관한 연구 (Study on the Formation of the National Anthem). *Yeoksa wa silhak* 역사와 실학 10, 11 (January 1999): 637–67.

Lee Na-mi 이나미. "19 segi mal gaehwapa ui jayu juui sasang: Doklip sinmun eul jungsim euro" 19 세기 말 개화파의 자유주의 사상: 독립신문을 중심으로 (Korean Liberalism in the 19th Century: On Doklip sinmun). *Hanguk jeongchihak hoebo* 한국정치학회보 35, no. 3 (December 2001): 29–47.

Lee Sa-bin 이사빈. "Geundaegi chosang sajin ui oegyojeok gineung: Seumisonieon Misulgwan sojang Gojong chosang eul jungsim euro" 근대기 초상사진의 외교적 기능: 스미스소니언 미술관 소장 고종 초상을 중심으로 (The Diplomatic Functions of Portraits: Focused on Gojong's Portrait in the Smithsonian Collection). *Guklip hyeondae misulgwan yeon-gu nonmun* 국립현대미술관 연구논문 4 (2012): 25–34.

Lee Sang-guk 이상국. "Jeong Seon ui Geumgangsan hwacheop gwa minhwa Geumgangsando: Minhwagadeul eul maeryo sikin Gyeomjae ui Geumgangsando" 정선의 금강산 화첩과 민화 금강산도: 민화가들을 매료시킨 겸재의 금강산도 (Jeongseon's Geumgangsan Painting Albums and Folk Paintings of Geumgangsan Mountain: Gyeomjae's Geumgangsando that Fascinated Folk Artists). *Wolgan minhwa* 월간민화, June 2019.

Lee Sang-ho 이상호. *Geundae ujeongsa wa upyo: Amjeong Lee Sang-ho gu Hanguk upyo sojangpum seonjip* 근대 우정사와 우표: 암정 이상호 구한국 우표 소장품 선집 (History of the Modern Postal Office and Stamps: Amjeong Lee Sang-ho's Collection of Old Korean Stamps). Seoul: Jeonil Sileop Chulpanguk 전일실업출판국, 1994.

Lee Sang-tae 이상태. *Hanguk gojido baldalsa* 한국 고지도 발달사 (History of the Development of Old Maps in Korea). Seoul: Hyean, 혜안 1999.
Lee Seok-ryun 이석륜. *Uri nara hwapye geumyungsa: 1910-nyeon ijeon* 우리나라 화폐 금융사: 1910 년 이전 (Korean Currency and Financial History: Before 1910). Seoul: Bakyeongsa 배경사, 1994.
Lee Seon-geun 이선근. "Uri gukgi jejeong ui yurae wa geu uiui" 우리 국기제정의 유래와 그 의의 (The Origins of the Selection of Our National Flag and its Significance). In *Guksasang ui jemunje* 국사상의 제문제 (Problems of National History). Vol. 2. Seoul: Guksa Pyeonchan Wiwonhoe 국사편찬위원회, 1959.
Lee Seon-ok 이선옥. *Ubong Jo Hui-ryong: 19 segi mukjang ui yeongsu* 우봉 조희룡: 19 세기 묵장의 영수 (Ubong Jo Hui-ryong: The 19th Century Mukjang Master). Paju: Dolbegae 돌배게, 2017.
Lee Seong-hun 이성훈. "Gunbok bon Jeongjo eojin ui jejak gwa bong-an yeon-hu: Sado seja e daehan Jeongjo ui hyosim gwa gyeseung uiji ui cheonmyeong" 군복본 정조어진의 제작과 봉안 연구: 사도세자에 대한 정조의 효심과 계승 의지에 천명 (A Study of the Production and Enshrinement of the Portraits of King Jeongjo in Military Attire: Some Thoughts on Jeongjo's Filial Piety and His Wish of Succeeding Crown Prince Sado). *Misulsa wa sigak munhwa* 미술사와 시각문화, no. 25 (May 2020): 132–83.
Lee Seong-hye 이성혜. *Hanguk geundae seohwa ui Yutong* 한국 근대 서화의 생산과 유통 (The Production and Distribution of Modern Korean Paintings). Busan: Haepi Buk Midieo 해피북미디어, 2014.
Lee Seong-hyeon. "Min Yeong-hwan ui 'sunguk' damron e daehan gochal" 민영환의 '순국'담론에 대한 고찰 (A Study on the Discourse of Min Yeong-hwan's Patriotic Martyrs Discourse). *Gangwon sahak* 강원사학 26 (2014): 99–146.
———. "Min Yeong-hwan ui 'sunguk' damron e daehan gochal" 민영환의 '순국' 담론에 대한 고찰 (A Study on the Discourse of Min Young-hwan's the Patriotic Martyrs for Country). Master's thesis, Kangwon National University 강원국립대학교, 2014.
Lee Seong-mu 이성무. *Joseon sidae dangjaengsa* 조선시대 당쟁사 (The History of Factional Strifes in Joseon Dynasty). Vol. 2. 2 vols. Seoul: Areumdaun Nal 아름다운날, 2007.
Lee Si-yeong 이시영. "Jeong Gyo ui Daedong yeoksa yeon-gu" 정교의 대동 역사 연구 (A Study of Jeong Gyo's Daedong yeoksa). Master's thesis, Hanguk Jeongsin Munhwa Yeon-guwon 한국 정신문화 연구원, 1998.
Lee Su-jeong 이수정. "Seoyang hwabeop i banyeong doen Joseon sidae hugi hoehwa jakpum yeon-gu" 서양화법이 반영된 조선시대 후가 회화 작품 연구 (Research on Late Joseon Dynasty Paintings with Western Painting Techniques). Master's thesis, Korea National University of Education 한국교원대학교, 2010.
Lee Tae-ho 이태호. "Geumgangsan dolabogi wa geurigi" 금강산 돌아보기와 그리기 (Looking Around and Drawing Geumgangsan Mountain). In

Geumgangsan gwan-gwang: Dolabogo naedabom 금강산 관광 돌아보고 내다봄 (Looking Back and Toward Geumgangsan Mountain Tourism), 17–68. Gwacheon: Jininjin 진인진, 2018.

———. "Joseon hugi silgyeong sansuhwa ui yeoun" 조선후기 실경 산수화의 여운 (The Lingering Imagery of Real-View Landscape Painting in the Late Joseon Dynasty). In *Dong-yucheop* 동유첩 (Album of Sightseeing to the East), 310–29. Seoul: Sungkyunkwan University 성균관대학교, 2005.

Lee Tae-jin 이태진. "Gojong ui gukgi jejeong gwa gunmin ilche ui jeongchi inyeom" 고종의 국기 제정과 군민일체의 정치 이념 (The Enactment of the National Flag by King Gojong and the Political Ideology of Military and Civilian Unity). In *Gojong sidae ui jaejomyeong* 고종시대의 재조명 (Re-Examination of Gojong's Reign). Seoul: Taehaksa 태학사, 2000.

Lee Wan-beom 이완범. "Godae robuteo hyeondae Hanguk ui sangjing euroseo ui Taegeuk gwa Taegeukgi" 고대로부터 현대한국의 상징으로서의 태극과 태극기 (Taegeuk and Taegeukgi as Symbols of Modern Korea from Ancient Times). In *Daehan, Taegeukgi: 3.1 Undong mit Daehan Minguk Imsi Jeongbu surip 100 junyeon ginyeom Lee Byeong-geun sojang yumul teukbyeoljeon* 대한 태극기: 3.1 운동 및 대한민국 임시정부 수립 100주년 기념 이병근 소장 유물 특별전 (Daehan, Taegeukgi: Special Exhibition of Lee Byung-geun Collection to Commemorate the 100th anniversary of the March First Movement and the Establishment of the Provisional Government of the Republic of Korea). Cheongju: Gyowon Daehakgyo Gyoyuk Bakmulgwan 교원 대학교 교육 박물관, 2019.

Lee Wang-mu 이왕무. "Daehan Jeguk hwangsil ui bunhae wa wang-gongjok ui tansaeng" 대한제국 황실의 분해와 왕공족의 탄생 (A Study on the Birth of the King and Princes Group about Decomposition of Korean Empire Imperial Family). *Hanguksa Hakbo* 한국사학보, no. 64 (August 2016): 7–31.

Lee Won-sun 이원선. "Kim Dae-geon: Hanguk gyohoe ui hyangdoja ro sungyo han cheongnyeon saje" 김대건: 한국 교회의 향도자로 선교한 청년 사제 (Kim Dae-geon: A Young Priest Who Served as a Guide for the Korean Church). *Hanguksa simin gangjwa* 한국사 시민 강좌 30 (February 2002): 177–89.

Lee Yeong-su 이영수. "Minhwa Geumgangsando e gwanhan gochal" 민화 금강산도에 관한 고찰 (A Study on the Minhwa Geumgangsando). *Misulsa yeon-gu* 미술사 연구 14 (December 2000): 99–136.

———. "19 segi Geumgangsando yeon-gu" 19세기 금강산도 연구 (A Study of 19th Century Ten Panel Folding Screen Painting of Gumgangsan Mountain) PhD diss., Myeongji University 명지대학교, 2016.

———. "20 segi cho Kim Gyu-jin (1868-1933) ui Geumgangsan yuram gwa yesul hwaldong" 20세기 초 김규진(1868-1933)의 금강산 유람과 예술 활동 (The Early 20th-Century Travel of Kim Gyu-jin (1868~1933) to Geumgangsan Mountain and Art Career). *Hanguk gojido yeon-gu* 한국고지도연구 10, no. 1 (June 2018): 23–49.

———. “20 segi cho Yi wang-ga gwanryeon Geumgangsando yeon-gu” 20 세기 초 이왕가 관련 금강산도 연구 (A Study on Paintings of Geumgangsan Mountain for the Yi Royal Family) *Misulsahak yeon-gu* 미술학연구 271, 272 (December 2011): 205–36.

Lee Yong-seong 이용성. “Minjok jeoncheseong hyeongseong e iteoseo geundae sinmun ui yeokhal: Hanseong sunbo wa Hanseong jubo reul jungsim euro” 민족 정체성 형성에 있어서 근대 신문의 역할: 한성순보와 한성주보를 중심으로 (The Role of Modern Newspaper in Making of National Identity: Hanseong sunbo and Hanseong jubo). *Hanguk minjok undongsa yeon-gu* 한국 민족 운동사 연구 21 (March 1999): 93–115.

Lee Yu-jin 이유진. “Taegeukgi ui yeokhakjeok uimi yeon-gu” 태극기의 역학적 의미 연구 (Study of the Taegeukgi in Relation to the Philosophy of the Book of Changes). Master’s thesis, Gongju National University 공주대학교, 2012.

Lee Yun-sang 이윤상. “Dahan Jegukgi gukga wa gukwang ui wisang jego saeop” 대한제국기 국가와 국왕의 위상제고사업 (The Status Elevation Projects of the King and Country in the Korean Empire Period). *Jindan hakbo* 진단학보 95 (June 2003): 81–112.

———. “Han mal, gaehang-gi, gaehwagi, aeguk gyemong-gi” 한말, 개항기, 개화기, 애국계몽기 (Late Joseon, Opening of Ports, Enlightenment Period, Patriotic Enlightenment Period). *Yeoksa bipyeong* 역사비평, no. 74 (February 2006): 300–304.

Lemagny, Jean-Claude, and André Rouillé, eds. *A History of Photography: Social and Cultural Perspectives*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Levin, David Michael, ed. *Modernity and the Hegemony of Vision*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Lew, Young-ick. “The Kabo Reform Movement: Korean and Japanese Reform Efforts in Korea, 1894.” PhD diss., Harvard University, 1972.

Li, Zhaojie. “Traditional Chinese World Order.” *Chinese Journal of International Law* 1, no. 1 (March 2002): 20-58.

Liu, Lydia He. “Translingual Practice: The Discourse of Individualism between China and the West.” *Positions* 1, no. 1 (1993): 160–93.

Lo, Ping-cheung. “Confucian Ethic of Death with Dignity and its Contemporary Relevance.” *The Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics* 19 (1999): 313-333.

Longford, Joseph H. *The Story of Korea.* London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1911. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=coo1.ark:/13960/t1ng5713g&view=1up&seq=12&skin=2021.

Lowell, Percival. *Choson: The Land of the Morning Calm.* 2nd ed. Boston: Ticknor and Company, 1888. https://openlibrary.org/books/OL13527665M/Chos%C3%B6n_the_land_of_the_morning_calm.

Lowenthal, David. “European and English Landscapes as National Symbols.” In *Geography and National Identity,* by David Hooson, 199–232. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1994.

Maeil sinbo 매일신보. “Geumgangsan tamseunghoe mojip gwang-go” 금강산 탐승회 모집 광고 (Advertisement for the Recruitment of Geumgangsan Mountain Tour). *Maeil sinbo* 매일신보. 6 May, 1915.

———. “Gongjinhoe wa misulpum, Misulpum Jejakso ui chulpumjak” 공진회와 미술품, 미술품 제작소의 출품작 (Industrial Exposition and Artworks, Artworks Submitted by the Misulpum Jejakso). *Maeil sinbo* 매일신보. 17 June, 1915.

———. “Japbo” 잡보 (Editorial). *Maeil sinbo* 매일신보. 3 September, 1910.

———. “Liwangjik misul gongjang jinryeoljang eseo gisaengdeul ui mulgeon heungjeong haneun gwang-gyeong” 리왕직 미술 공장 진열장에서 기생들의 물건 흥정하는 광경 (The Spectacle of Gisaengs Bargaining for Goods in the Display Case of the Yiwangjik Art Factory). *Maeil sinbo* 매일신보. 30 March, 1916.

Mansebo 만세보. “Samhan isipsa geol jung jeildeung-in Goguryeo daesin Eulji Mundeok sang” 삼한 이십사걸 중 제일등인 고구려 대신 을지문덕상 (Portrait of Goguryeo Official Eulji Mundeok, the Greatest of Twenty-four Great Men of Samhan.” *Mansebo* 만세보*,* 1 January 1907.

Marshall, Tim. *A Flag Worth Dying For*. New York, NY: Scribner, 2018.

Mayhew, Henry. *London Labour and the London Poor*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.

McKenzie, Frederick Authur. *Tragedy of Korea*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908.

Min Gyeong-sik 민경식. “Daehanguk gukje” 대한국국제 (Constitution of the Korean Empire). *Beophak nonmunjip* 법학 논문집 31, no. 1 (August 2007): 23–55.

Min Hyeon-sik 민형식. “Gaehwagi Hangeul bon ‘Samin pilji’ e daehayeo” 개화기 한글본 ‘사민필지’에 대하여 (A Study on the ' Saminpilji ' Written in Hangul). *Gukeo gyoyuk* 국어교육 100 (1999): 357–91.

Min Tae-won 민태원. “Baekdusanhaeng” 백두산행 (To Baekdusan Mountain). *Donga ilbo* 동아일보. 21 August, 1921.

———. “Baekdusanhaeng” 백두산행 (To Baekdusan Mountain). *Donga ilbo* 동아일보. 8 September, 1921.

Min Yeong-hwan 민영환. “Min Chungjeong-gong yugo gwon 5” 민충정공유고 권 5 (Posthumous Works of Min Yeong-hwan, Vol. 5). In *Min Chungjeong-gong yugo: jeon* 민충정공 유고: 전 (Posthumous Works of Min Yeong-hwan Part 1). Edited by Min Hong-gi 민홍기, translated by Lee Min-su 이민수, 277–305. Seoul: Iljogak 일조각, 2000.

Minjok Munhwa Chujinhoe 민족문화추진회, ed. *(Gukyeok) Man-giyoram: Gunjeong pyeon* (국역) 만기요람: 군정편 ((Translated) Man-gi yoram: Military Administration). Vol. 2. Seoul: Minjok Munhwa Chujinhoe 민족문화추진회, 1971.

Minkenberg, Michael, ed. *Power and Architecture: The Construction of Capitals and the Politics of Space*. New York: Berghahn, 2014.

Mok Soo-hyun 목수현. "Daehan Jegukgi gugka sigak sangjing ui yeonwon gwa byeoncheon" 대한제국기 국가 시각 상징의 연원과 변천 (The Origins and Transformations of Visual Representations of the Nation-State in the Korean Empire Period). *Misulsa nondan* 미술사논단 27 (December 2008): 289–321.

———. "Doklipmun: Geundae ginyeommul gwa 'mandeuleojineun' gieok." 독립문: 근대 기념물과 '만들어지는' 기억 (The Independence Arch: Korean Modern Monument and the 'Invented' Memory) *Misulsa wa sigak munhwa* 미술사와 시각문화 2 (October 2003): 60–83.

———. "Diaspora ui jeongcheseong gwa Taegeukgi: 20 segi jeonban-gi ui Miju Hanin eul jungsim euro" 디아스포라의 정체성과 태극기: 20 세기 전반기의 미주 한인을 중심으로 (The Identity of Diaspora and the Taegeukgi: Focused on Korean Residents in the United States in the Early Twentieth Century). *Sahoe wa yeoksa* 사회와 역사 86 (2010): 47–79.

———. "Geundae gukga ui 'gukgi' raneun sigak munhwa: Gaehang gwa Daehan Jegukgi taegeukgi reul jungsim euro."근대국가의 '국기'라는 시각문화: 개항과 대한제국기 태극기를 중심으로 (The Visual Culture of 'National Flags' of the Modern Nations: Focused on the 'Taegeukgi'). *Misulsa hakbo* 미술사학보 27 (December 2006): 309–44.

———. "Gukto ui sigak jeok pyosang gwa aeguk gyeomong ui jirihak: Choi Nam-seon ui nonui reul jungsim euro." 국토의 시각적 표상과 애국 계몽의 지리학: 최남선의 논의를 중심으로 (The Imagination of Korean Territory in the Period of Patriotic Enlightenment: Focused on the Theory of Choi Nam-seon). *Dong Asia munhwa yeon-gu* 동아시아문화연구 57 (May 2014): 13–39.

———. "Hanguk gendae jeonhwan-gi gukga sigak sangjingmul" 한국 근대 전환기 국가 시각 상징물 (A Study on National Visual Symbols of Korea in the Modern Transitional Period). PhD diss., Seoul National University 서울대학교, 2008.

———. "Ilje gangjeomgi gukga sangjing sigakmul ui wisang byeoncheon: Aeguk ui aikon eseo sangpyo ggaji" 일제 강점기 국가 상징 시각물의 위상 변천: 애국의 아이콘에서 상표까지 (The Transformation of National Symbols during the Japanese Colonialism: from the Icon of Patriotism to that of Commercial Emblems). *Hanguk geundae misulsahak* 한국근현대미술사학 27 (June 2014): 365–89.

———. "Ilje ha Yiwang-ga Bakmulgwan ui sikminjijeok seong-gyeok" 일제하 이왕가 박물관의 식민지적 성격 (The Colonial Construct of the Yi Royal-Family Museum during the Japanese Occupation). *Misulsahak yeon-gu* 미술사학연구, no. 227 (September 2009): 81-104.

———. "Mang-guk gwa gukga pyosang ui uimi byeonhwa: Taegeukgi, Oyatggot, Mugunghwa reul jungsim euro" 망국과 國家 表象의 의미 변화 : 태극기, 오얏꽃, 무궁화를 중심으로 (Shifting Meanings of Korean National Symbols in the Japanese Occupation Period: Taegeukgi, Ihwa, and Mugungwha). *Hanguk munhwa* 한국문화 53 (March 2011): 153–74.

Monmonier, Mark S. *How to Lie with Maps*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
Morrimer, Charles. "A Japanese 'Cause Célèbre': The Trial of Prince Ito's Murderer." *The Graphic*. 16 April 1910.
Mun Han-byeol 문한별. "Ilje gangjeomgi chogi gyogwaseo geomyeol eul tonghaeseo bon sasang tongje ui yangsang: Daejeong 4-nyeon (1915-nyeon) Joseon Chongdokbu gyogwayong doseo illam eul jungsim euro" 일제 강점기 초기 교과서 검열을 통해서 본사상 통제의 양상: 대정 4 년 (1915 년) 조선 총독부 교과용 도서 일람을 중심으로 (Aspects of the Thought Control through the Early Textbooks Censorship of the Japanese Colonial Era - Focused on the Curriculum Books List made by the Japanese Government General of Korea in Daejeong 4th Year (1915)). *Journal of Korean Culture* 한국어문화국제학술 44 (February 2019): 211–49.
Na Gak-sun 나각순. "Seoul jimyeong ui byeoncheon gwa teukjing" 서울 지명의 변천과 특징 (A Study of Changes in the Geographical Names and Characteristics of the Capital City of Korea). *Seoul gwa yeoksa* 서울과 역사 72 (October 2008): 121–72.
Nam Sang-jun 나상준. "Gaehwagi geundae gyoyuk jedo wa jiri gyoyuk" 개화기 근대 교육제도와 지리 교육 (Modern Education System and Geography during the Enlightenment Period). *Jiri gyoyuk nonjip* 지리교육논집 19, no. 1 (June 1988): 99–111.
National Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art, Korea 국립현대미술관. *Guhanmal Migukin hwaga Boseu ga geurin Gojong hwangje chosanghwa teukbyeol jeonsi* 구한말 미국인 화가 보스가 그린 고종 황제 초상화 특별 전시 (Special Exhibition of Emperor Gojong's Portrait Painted by Vos, an American Painter in Late Joseon). Seoul: National Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art, Korea 국립현대미술관, 1982.
———. *Seokji Chae Yong-sin* 석지 채용신. Seoul: Sam Gwa Ggum 삶과 꿈, 2001.
National Museum of Korea 국립중앙박물관. *Joseon sidae silgyeong sansuhwa 2* 조선시대 실경 산수화 (Real-View Landscape Painting from the Joseon Dynasty). Guklip Jungang Bakmulgwan Hanguk seohwa dorok 국립중앙박물관 한국서화 도록 27. Seoul: National Museum of Korea 국립중앙박물관, 2019.
———. *(Yuri wonpan sajin) Areumdaun Geumgangsan* (유리 원판 사진) 아름다운 금강산 ((Original Glass Plate) Beautiful Geumgangsan Mountain). Seoul: Hanguk Bakmulgwanhoe 한국박물관회, 1999.
National Palace Museum of Korea 국립고궁박물관, ed. *Daehan Jeguk: Ichyeojin 100-nyeon jeon ui hwangjeguk* 대한제국: 잊혀진 100 년 전의 황제국 (The Korean Empire: The Forgotten Empire of 100 Years Ago). Seoul: Minsokwon 민속원, 2011.
———. *Changdeokgung Huijeongdang byeokhwa* 창덕궁 희정당 벽화 (Murals of Huijeongdang Hall of Changdeokgung Palace). Seoul: National Palace Museum of Korea 국립고궁박물관, 2017.

———. *Wangsil munhwa dogam: Uijang* 왕실문화 도감: 의장 (Royal Culture Encyclopedia: Emblems). Seoul: National Palace Museum of Korea 국립고궁박물관, 2018.

O Do-yeol 오도열. "An Jung-geun seoye ui yuga mihakjeok yeon-gu" 안중근 서예의 유가미학적 연구 (Study on An Jun-geun's Calligraphy According to Confucian Beliefs and Aesthetics). (Master's thesis, Sungkyunkwan University 성균관대학교, 2011).

O Jong-rok 오종록. "Botong jangsu eseo guguk ui yeong-ung euro: Joseon hugi Yi Sun-sin e daehan pyeong-ga" 보통 장수에서 구국의 영웅으로: 조선후기 이순신에 대한 평가 (From an Ordinary General to a Hero of National Salvation: The Appraisal of Yi Sun-sin in Late Joseon). *Naeil eul yeoneun yeoksa* 내일을 여는 역사 18 (December 2004): 150-161.

———. "Joseon chogi ui gukbang-gwan" 조선 초기의 국방관 (Perceptions on National Defence in Early Joseon). *Jindan hakbo* 진단학보 86 (December 1998): 137–55.

O Ju-seok 오주석. *Danwon Kim Hong-do* 단원 김홍도 (Danwon Kim Hong-do). Seoul: Sol Chulpansa 솔 출판사, 2006.

O Yeong-seop 오영섭. "Gaehwagi An Tae-hun (1862-1905) ui saeng-ae wa hwaldong" 개화기 안태훈 (1862-1905)의 생애와 활동 (The Life and Activities of An Tae-hun (1862-1905) in the Enlightenment Period). *Hanguk geunhyeondaesa yeon-gu* 한국근현대사연구 40 (March 2007): 7–44.

———. *Hanmal sunguk, euiyeol tujaeng* 한말 순국, 의열 투쟁 (The Struggle of Patriotic Martyrdom in Late Han). Cheonan: Doklip Ginyeomgwan Hanguk Doklip Undongsa Yeon-guso 독립기념관 한국 독립운동사연구소, 2009.

Oh, Se Eung. *Dr. Philip Jaisohn's Reform Movement 1896-1898: A Critical Appraisal of the Independence Club*. Lanham; New York; London: University Press of America, 1995.

Oh, Seung-jin. "Historical Injustice and Its Implications on International Law in East Asia." *Pacific Focus* 33, no. 3 (December 2018): 390-413.

Oh Young-chan 오영찬. "Sikminji bakmulgwan ui yeoksa mandeulgi: Joseon chongdokbu bakmulgwan sangseol jeonsi ui byeoncheon" 식민지 박물관의 역사 만들기: 조선총독부박물관 상설전시의 변천 (The Making of History by the Colonial Museum: The Change of Permanent Exhibitions at the Japanese Government-General Museum of of Korea). *Yeoksa wa hyeonsil* 역사와 현실, no. 110 (December 2018): 219-51.

Pai, Hyung Il 배형일. "Navigating Modern Keijo: The Typology of Reference Guides and City Landmarks." *Seoulhak yeon-gu*, no. 44 (August 2011): 1–40.

———. "The Search for Korea's Past: Japanese Colonial Archaeology in the Korean Peninsula (1905-1945)." *East Asian History,* no. 7 (June 1994): 25–48.

Palais, James B. "Political Participation in Traditional Korea, 1876-1910." *The Journal of Korean Studies* 1 (1979): 73-121.

Park Carey 박계리. "Hanguk geundae yeoksa inmulhwa." 한국 근대 역사인물화 (A Study on Modern Korean Historical Portrait Paintings). *Misulsa hakbo* 미술사학보 26 (June 2006): 33–60.

———. “20 segi Hanguk hoehwa eseo ui jeontongron.” 20 세기 한국회화에서의 정통론 (The Orthodoxy in 20th Century Korean Painting). PhD diss., Ewha Womans University 이화여자대학교, 2006.

Park Carey, and Mun Jeong-hui 박계리, 문정희. “Baekdu-san: Mandeuleojin jeontong gwa pyosang.” 백두산: 만들어진 전통과 표상 (Baekdu Mountain: The Invention of Tradition and Emblems) *Misulsa hakbo* 미술사학보 36 (June 2011): 43–74.

Park Chan-seung. 박찬승 “Baekdusan ui ‘minjok yeongsan’ euro ui pyosanghwa” 백두산의 ‘민족 영산’으로의 표상화 (The Visualisation of Baekdusan Mountain as a National Sacred Mountain). *Dong Asia munhwa yeon-gu* 55 (November 2013): 9–36.

Park Dae-jae 박대재. “Gija-Joseon gwa sojunghwa” 기자조선과 소중화 (Gija-Joseon and Little Sinocentrism). *Hanguksa hakbo* 한국사학보 65 (November 2016): 7–49.

Park Do-jin 박도진. “Geun, hyeondae Geumgangsando yeon-gu” 근, 현대 금강산도 연구 (The Study of Modern and Contemporary Geumgangsan Paintings). Master’s thesis, Hongik University 홍익대학교, 2017.

Park Eun-jeong 박은정. “20 segi cho Geumgangsan pyosang yeon-gu: Choe Nam-seon ui Pung-ak giyu wa Geumgang yechan eul jungsim euro” 20 세기 초 금강산 표상 연구: 최남선의 풍악기유와 금강예찬을 중심으로 (The Study of the Symbolism of Geumgangsan Mountain in the Early 20th Century: Focused on Choe Nam-seon’s Pung-ak giyu wa Geumgang yechan). *Dongbanghak* 동방학, no. 46 (February 2022): 245–67.

Park Eun-suk 박은숙. “Gaehang hu (1876-1894) Seoul ui jabon juui dosihwa wa gong-gan jaepyeon” 개항후 (1876-1894) 서울의 자본주의 도시화와 공간재편 (The Capitalist Urbanisation and Spatial Reformation of Seoul after the Opening of Ports (1876-1894)). *Hyangto Seoul* 향토서울, no. 74 (October 2009): 83–126.

Park Hun-ha 박훈하. “Hanguk geundae bamulgwan ui gyebohak: Minjok juui wa jiyeok ui giwon” 한국 근대박물관의 계보학: 민족주의와 지역의 기원 (A Genealogy of Modem Museum in Korea- The Origin of Nationalism and Locality). *Inmunhak nonchong* 인문학 논총 12, no. 1 (February 2007): 115-133.

Park Hwan 박환. “Manju, Jeguk juui ui siseon gwa ui cheot mannam: Gando sajincheop” 만주, 제국주의의 시선과의 첫 만남: 간도사진첩 (Manchuria, the First Encounter with Imperialist Gaze: Gando Photo Album). *Hanguk minjok undongsa yeon-gu* 한국민족운동사연구 86 (March 2016): 325–69.

Park Hye-jin 박혜진. “Gaehwagi sinmun gwang-go sigak imiji yeon-gu” 개화기 신문광고 시각 이미지 연구 (The Study of Visual Images of Newspaper Advertisements in the Enlightenment Period). Master’s thesis, Ewha Womans University 이화여자대학교, 2009.

Park Hyeon-jeong 박현정. “Daehan Jegukgi oyatggot munyang yeon-gu.” 대한제국기 오얏꽃 문양 연구 (A Study on Plum Blossom Patterns of the Korean Empire Period). Master’s thesis, Seoul National University 서울대학교, 2002.

Park In-ho 박인호. “Nam Gu-man gwa Yi Se-gwi ui yeoksa jiri yeon-gu: Nam Gu-man ui Dongsa byeonjeung, Yi Se-gwi ui Dong-guk Samhan sagun gogeum gang-yeokseol eul jungsim euro” 남구만과 이세귀의 역사지리 연구: 남구만의 동사병증, 이세구의 동국삼한사군고금강역설을 중심으로 (Study of the History and Geography of Nam Gu-man and Yi Se-gwi: Focused on Nam Gu-man’s Dongsa byeonjeung, Yi Se-gwi’s Dong-guk Samhan sagun gogeum gang-yeokseol). *Yeoksa hakbo* 역사학보 138 (June 1993): 33–72.

Park Jeong-ae 박정애. *Joseon sidae Pyeong-an-do Hamgyeong-do silgyeong sansuhwa* 조선시대 평안도 함경도 실경산수화 (Real-View Paintings of Pyeong-an-do Province and Hamgyeong-do Province in the Joseon Dynasty). Seoul: Sungkyunkwan University 성균관대학교, 2014.

Park Ji-hun 박지훈. “Daehan Hyeophoe ui Daehan minbo (1909-1910) ui balgan gwa sisa manhwa yeonjae ui seonggyeok.” 대한협회의 대한민보 (1909-1910)의 발간과 시사만화 연재의 성격 (Editorial Cartoons in the Late 1900s and the Publication of Daehan minbo by Daehan Hyeophoe). *Yeoksa minsokhak* 역사민속학 44 (March 2014): 215–54.

Park Ji-hyang 박지향. “Chosanghwa ro guseong doen gukmin ui yeoksa: Reondeon Guklip Chosanghwa Misulgwan (National Portrait Gallery) ui sijak.” 초상화로 구성된 국민의 역사: 런던 국립초상화미술관 (National Portrait Gallery)의 시작 (National History Composed of Portraits: The Beginnings of the National Portrait Gallery in London). *Yeong-guk yeon-gu* 영국연구, no. 30 (December 2013): 107–38.

Park Ji-hyang, Gang Ok-cho, Seong Baek-yong, Lee Yong-jae, Jang Mun-seok, and Jeong Sang-su 박지향, 강옥초, 성백용, 이용재, 장문석, 정상수. Yeong-ung *mandeulgi: sinhwa wa yeoksa ui gallimgil* 영웅만들기: 신화와 역사의 갈림길 (Making a Hero: The Crossroads Between Legend and History). Seoul: Hyumeoniseuteu 휴머니스트, 2005.

Park Ju-won 박주원. “1900-nyeondae choban danhaengbon gwa gyogwaseo tekseuteu e natanan sahoe damron ui teukseong” 1900 년대 초반 단행본과 교과서 텍스트에 나타난 사회담론의 특성 (The Characteristics of Social Discourse of Manuscripts and Textbooks of the Early 1900s), In *Geundae gyeomong-gi jisik ui balgyeon gwa sayu jipyeong ui hwakdae* 근대계몽기 지식의 발견과 사유지평의 확대, 117–44. Seoul: Somyeong Chulpan 소명출판, 2012.

Park Min-chun 박민춘. “Joseon sidae Geumgangsan yuramrok eul tonghan sanrim gihaeng munhwa yeon-gu” 조선시대 금강산 유람록을 통한 산림기행문화 연구 (The Study of Forestry Travel Through Geumgangsan Mountain Travelogues of the Joseon Period). Master’s thesis, Gyeongnam National University Of Science And Technology 경남과학기술대학교, 2018.

Park Min-yeong 박민영. "Aeguk gwa chin Il, Sinchan chodeung sohak ui ijungseong: Gaehwagi min-gan pyeonchan gyogwaseo wa ui bigyo reul jungsim euro" 애국과 친일, 신찬초등소학의 이중성: 개화기 민간 편찬 교과서와의 비교를 중심으로 (The Two Sides of Sinchan chodeung sohak: A Comparison with Private Textbooks of the Enlightenment Period). *Uri eomun yeon-gu* 우리어문연구 48 (January 2014): 219–46.

———. "Gaehwagi gyogwaseo Sinchan chodeung sohak yeon-gu: Hakbu pyeonchan gyogwaseo ui bigyo reul jungsim euro" 개화기 교과서 신찬초등소학 연구: 학부편찬 교과서의 비교를 중심으로 (The Study on Sinchan chodeung sohak, Textbook of the Enlightenment Period: A Comparison with Hakbu-published Textbooks). *Asia munhwa yeon-gu* 아시아문화연구 32 (December 2013): 99–129.

Park Myeong-gyu 박명규. Gukmin, inmin, simin: Gaenyeomsa ro bon Hanguk ui jeongchi juche 국민, 인민, 신민: 개념사로 본 한국의 정치주체 (Gukmin, Inmin, Sinmin: Korean Politial Agents as Seen Through History of Concepts). *Hanguk gaenyeomsa chongseo* 한국개념사총서 4. Seoul: Sohwa 소화, 2009.

Park No-hyeon 박노현. "Geukjang ui tansaeng" 극장의 탄생 (The Birth of the Cinema). *Hanguk geuk yesul yeon-gu* 한국극예술연구 19 (June 2004): 7–39.

Park, Pae Keun. "Introduction of Western International Law into East Asia: Mergence or Conflict and Substitution: Yu Kil-Chun's Argument of the Yangjul (Twice Folded) System." *Gukjebeop hakhoe nonchong* 국제법학회논총 56, no. 4 (December 2011): 247–73.

Park Rye-gyeong 박례경. "Deokchi ui sangjing chegye roseo yugyo gukga ui jeukwi uirye: Deokchi wa wang-gwon hwaklip, geu gilhang gwangye ui uiryejeok guseong gwa geu haeseok." 덕치의 상징체계로서 유교국가의 즉위의례: 덕치와 왕권확립 그 길항관계의 의례적 구성과 그 해석 (The Enthronement Rite of Confucian States as the Symbol System of Rule of Virtue: The Ritual Formation and its Interpretation on the Antagonistic Relationship Between Rule of Virtue and Establishment of Royal Authority). *Hanguk silhak yeon-gu* 한국실학연구 12 (June 2011): 149–200.

Park Sang-hui 박상희. "Bukhan ui 'jeongchijeok punggyeonghwa' yeon-gu: Gieok gwa mang-gak ui jeongchijeok jangchi" 북한의 '정치적 풍경화' 연구: 기억과 망각의 정치적 장치 (A Study on "Political Landscape" in North Korea: The Political Device of Memory and Oblivion). *Tong-il inmunhak* 통일인문학 88 (December 2021): 223–61.

Park Sang-hyeon 박상현. "1883-nyeon e geurin hyeonjon choego chujeong Dangun chosanghwa gong-gae" 1883 년에 그린 현존 최고 추정 단군 초상화 공개 (The Unveiling of 1883 Dangun Portrait, Currently Though to Be The Oldest Surviving Example). *Yeonhap nyuseu* 연합뉴스 (blog), 23 September, 2019. https://www.yna.co.kr/view/AKR20190923078800005.

Park Seok-tae 박석태. "Joseon Misul Jeonramhoe reul tonghae bon 'hyangtoseong' gaenyeom yeon-gu" 조선미술전람회를 통해 본 '향토성' 개념 연구 (The

Study of 'Local Colour' Through Joseon Arts Exhibitions). *Incheonhak yeon-gu* 인천학연구 3 (September 2004): 255–94.
Park Seon-yeong 박선영. "Geundae Dong Asia ui gukgyeong insik gwa Gando: Jido e natanan Han Jung gukgyeongseon byeonhwa reul jungsim euro" 근대 동아시아의 국경 인식과 간도: 지도에 나타난 한중 국경선 변화를 중심으로 (The Idea of National Borders in Modern East Asia and Gando: Focused on the Changes in the Korea-China Border as Shown in Maps). *Jungguksa yeon-gu* 중국사연구 32 (October 2004): 199–233.
———. "Hanguk geundae jihyeongdo ui sojang hyeonhwang gwa teukjing: Guknaeoe juyo sojangcheo reul jungsim euro" 한국 근대 지형도의 소장 현황과 특징: 국내외 주요 소장처를 중심으로 (The Collection and Characteristics of the Topography Maps of Korea made Between the End of 19th and the Middle of 20th Century: Focusing on the Places in Korea and Other Countries). *Hanguk gojido yeon-gu* 한국고지도연구 11, no. 1 (June 2019): 93–116.
Park, Seong-rae. "Introduction of Western Science in Korea, 1876-1910." *Korea Journal* 21, no. 5 (May 1981): 29-38.
Park Seong-sun 박성순. "Go, Sunjong nyeon-gan uibyeong ui gaenyeom gwa wisang byeoncheon yeon-gu" 고, 순종 년간 의병의 개념과 위상 변천 연구 (Study on the Changes in the Concept and Status of Righteous Army in Gojong and Sunjong Era). *Dongyang gojeon yeon-gu* 동양고전연구 38 (March 2010): 199–228.
Park So-yul 박소율. "Gojong sigi oegukin gomun ui donghyang: Meril gwa Deni ui hwaldong eul jungsim euro" 고종시기 외국인 고문의 동향: 메릴과 데니의 활동을 중심으로 (The Trend of Foreign Advisors in the Gojong Era: Focused on H. F. Merrill and O. N. Denny's Activity). Master's thesis, Pusan National University 부산대학교, 2013.
Park Tae-ho 박태호. "Geundae gyemong-gi sinmun eseo yeongtojeok gong-gan gaenyeom ui hyeongseong" 근대계몽기 신문에서 영토적 공간개념의 형성 (The Formation of Territorial Space in Newspapers of the Modern Enlightenment Period). In *Geundae gyemong-gi jisik ui balgyeon gwa sayu jipyeong ui hwakdae* 근대계몽기 지식의 발견과 사유 지평의 확대 (The Discovery of Knowledge and Expansion of the Horizons of Thought in the Modern Enlightenment Period), 145–87. Seoul: Somyeong Chulpan 소명출판, 2006.
Park Yeong-hyo 박영효. *Sahwa giryak* 사화기략 (Sahwa giryak). Translated by Lee Hyo-jeong 이효정. Paju: Bogosa 보고사, 2018.
Park Yeong-min 박영민. "Yusan-gi ui sigong-ganjeok chuui wa geu uimi" 유산기의 시공간적 추의와 그 의미 (The Time and Space of Yusan-gi). *Minjok munhwa yeon-gu* 민족문화연구 40 (June 2004): 73–98.
Peterson, Mark, and Philip Margulies. *A Brief History of Korea*. New York, NY: Facts On File, 2009.
Phillips, David F., Emmanuel Valerio, and Nozomi Kariyasu, *Japanese Heraldry and Heraldic Flags.* Danvers, Mass.: Flag Heritage Foundation, 2018.
Pierson, Christopher. *The Modern State*. 3rd. ed. Abingdon: Routledge, 2011.

Pradel, Chari. '"Portrait of Prince Shōtoku and Two Princes": From Devotional Painting to Imperial Object. *Artibus Asiae* 74, no. 1 (2014): 191–219.

Robinson, Michael Edson. *Korea's Twentieth-Century Odyssey: A Short History*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2007.

Roh Hyeong-seok 노형석. "Chochwehan An Jung-geun sajin eun gwayeon Ilje ga geu reul biha haryeo yeonchul haetna" 초췌한 안중근 사진은 과연 일제가 그를 비하하려 연출했나 (Did the Japanese Really Stage An Jung-geun's Gaunt Photos to Depreciate Him). *Hangyeorye*. 10 February, 2021. https://www.hani.co.kr/arti/culture/culture_general/982647.html.

Roh Yeong-don 노영돈. "Taegeukgi ui gukgi rosseo ui choecho sayong gwa Incheon" 태극기의 국기로써의 최초 사용과 인천 (The First Usage of the Taegeukgi as a National Flag and Incheon). *Incheonhak yeon-gu* 인천학연구 26 (February 2017): 185-225.

Roh Yeong-taek 노영택. "Ilje sigi ui munmaengryul toechi" (The Alleviation of Illiteracy Rates in the Colonial Period). *Guksagwan nonchong* 국사관 논총 51 (June 1994): 107–57.

Roh Yeong-gu 노영구. "Yeoksa sok ui Yi Sun-sin insik" 역사 속의 이순신 인식 (The Recognition of Yi Sun-sin Through the Ages). *Yeoksa bipyeong* 역사비평, no. 69 (November 2004): 338-358.

———. "Yi Sun-Shin, an Admiral Who Became a Myth." *Review of Korean Studies* 7, no. 3 (September 2004): 15–37.

Ryu Cheong-san 류청산. "Nara ggot Mugunghwa gyoyuk eul wihan gyoyuk gwajeong mohyeong gaebal" 나라 꽃 무궁화 교육을 위한 교육과정 모형 개발 (The Development of a Model Curriculum for the Education on the National Flower, Mugunghwa). *Silgwa gyoyuk yeon-gu* 실과교육연구 2, no. 1 (January 1996): 97–106.

Ryu Si-hyeon 류시현. "Hanmal Ilje cho Hanbando e gwanhan jirijeok insik: Bando nonui reul jungsim euro" 한말 일제 초 한반도에 관한 지리적 인식: 반도 논의를 중심으로 (The Geographic Awareness of the Korean Peninsula at the End of Han and the Beginning of the Colonial Period: Focused on the Discussion of Peninsula). *Hanguksa yeon-gu* 한국사연구 137 (June 2007): 269–94.

Schmid, Andre. *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.

Shufeldt Papers: Letters. "The History of the Treaty With Korea, An Incident in the Life of Rear Admiral R. W. Shufeldt." December, 1898.

Schulten, Susan. *Mapping the Nation: History and Cartography in Nineteenth-Century America*. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press, 2012.

Seo Eun-yeong 서은영. "Geundae inswae munhwa ui hyeongseong gwa Daehan minbo 'saphwa' ui deungjang: Aeguk gyemong-gi reul jungsim euro" 근대인쇄문화의 형성과 대한민보 '삽화'의 등장: 애국계몽기를 중심으로 (The Formation of Modern Print Culture and the Emergence of Daehan minbo 'Illustrations': Patriotic Enlightenment Period). *Uri eomun yeon-gu* 우리어문연구 44 (September 2012): 541–72.

Seo Gi-jae 서기재. "Giihan segye ro ui chodae: Geundae yeohaeng annaeseo reul tonghayeo bon Geumgangsan" 기이한 세계로의 초대: 근대 여행안내서를 통해 본 금강산 (An Invitation to the Mysterious World: Geumgangsan Mountain as Seen in Modern Tour Guides). *Ilboneo munhak* 일본어문학 40 (2009): 227–52.

Seo Gwang-il 서광일. "Dangun-gyo pomyeongseo wa hang-Il minjok undong" 단군교 포명서와 항일 민족운동 (Dangun-gyo Declaration and Anti-Japanese Nationalistic Movements). *Gukhak yeon-gu* 국학연구 13 (December 2009): 97–120.

Seo Jae-bok 서재복. "Hanaml gaehwagi chodeung yong gyogwaseo bunseok" 한말 개화기 초등용 교과서 분석 (Analysis of Primary Level Textbooks of the Enlightenment Period). *Gyoyuk jonghap yeon-gu* 교육종합연구 3, no. 2 (December 2005): 25–46.

Seo Jeong-hyeon 서정현. "Geundae Jeongdong ui gong-gan byeonhwa wa Gojong" 근대 정동의 공간 변화와 고종 (The Spatial Transformation of Jeongdong and Gojong). *Hyangto Seoul* 향토서울, no. 84 (June 2013): 83–113.

Seo Ji-min 서지민. "Yiwangjik Misulpum Jejakso yeon-gu" 이왕직미술품제작소 연구 (They Study of Yiwangjik Misulpum Jejakso). Master's thesis, Ewha Womans University 이화여자대학교, 2015.

Seo Seong-rok 서성록. *Hanguk hyeondae hoehwa ui baljachwi* 한국 현대회화의 발자취 (Footsteps of Korean Contemporary Painting). Seoul: Munye Chulpansa 문예출판사, 2006.

Seo Su-yeon 서수연. "Hyeon Chae ui Yunyeon pildok e surok doen inmul bunseok." 현채의 유년필독에 수록된 인물 분석 (Analysis of Figures that Appear in Hyeon Chae's Yunyeon pildok). Master's thesis, Ewha Womans University 이화여자대학교, 1998.

Seo Tae-yeol 서태열. "Mateo Richi ui Gonyeo man-guk jeondo e sisuldoen segye jiri naeyong ui bunseok" 마테오 리치의 곤여만국전도에 시술된 세계지리 내용 분석 (Analysis of World Geography Narrated in Matteo Ricci's Gonyeo man-guk jeondo). *Hanguk jiri hakhoeji* 한국지리학회지 7, no. 3 (December 2018): 319–36.

———. "Yeongto gyoyuk ui ganyeomhwa wa yeongto gyoyuk mohyeong e daehan jeopgeun" 영토교육의 개념화와 영토 교육 모형에 대한 접근 (Approaching the Conceptualisation of Territorial Education and Model Curricula). *Hanguk jiri hwan-gyeong gyoyuk hakhoe* 17, no. 3 (December 2009): 197–210.

Seo Yeong-dae 서영대. "Geundae Hanguk ui Dangun insik gwa minjok juui" 근대 한국의 단군인식과 민족주의 (The Consciousness of Dangun and Nationalism in Modern Korea). *Dongbuka yeoksa nonchong* 동북아역사논총 20 (June 2008): 7–51.

Seo Yeong-hui 서영희. *Daehan Jeguk jeongchisa yeon-gu* 대한제국 정치사 연구 (Study on the Political History of the Korean Empire). Seoul: Seoul Daehakgyo Chulpanbu 서울대학교 출판부, 2003.

———. "Gaehwapa ui geundae gukga guseong gwa geu silcheon" 개화파의 근대국가 구성과 그 실천 (The Construction of the Reform Party's Modern Nation-State and Their Deliberation). In *Geundae gukmin gukga wa minjok munje* 근대 국민국가와 민족문제 (The Problem of the Modern Nation-State and the Nation), 261–302. Seoul: Jisik Saneopsa 지식산업사, 1995.

Seo Yu-ri 서유리. "Hanguk geundae ui japji pyoji imiji yeon-gu" 한국 근대의 잡지 표지 이미지 연구 (Study of Magazine Cover Designs of Modern Korea). PhD diss., Seoul National University 서울대학교, 2013.

Seong Hyo-jin 성효진. "Seoul ui dosi imiji hyeongseong (1897-1939) e daehan yeon-gu" 서울 도시 이미지 형성 (1897-1939)에 대한 연구 (Study on the Formation of Seoul's Urban Image (1897-1939). PhD diss., Seoul National University 서울대학교, 2020.

Seou Hakhoe 서우학회. "Gukga ui gaenyeom" 국가의 개념 (The Concept of a Nation-State). *Seoul* 서울, no. 16 (March 1908): 16–19.

Seoul Museum of History 서울역사박물관. *(Lee Chan gijeung) Uri yet jido* (이찬 기증) 우리 옛 지도 ((Lee Chan Donations) Our Old Maps). Seoul: Seoul Museum of History 서울역사박물관, 2006.

Seton-Watson, Hugh. *Nations and States: An Enquiry into the Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism*. London: Methuen, 1977.

Setton, Mark. "Factional Politics and Philosophical Development in the Late Choson." *The Journal of Korean Studies* 8 (1992): 37-80.

Seungjeong-won ilgi 승정원일기 (Daily Records of Royal Secretariat of Joseon Dynasty), 10 February, 1871. https://www-krpia-co-kr.ezproxy.soas.ac.uk/viewer?plctId=PLCT00006569&tabNodeId=NODE06403599#none.

———. 11 February, 1872. https://www-krpia-co-kr.ezproxy.soas.ac.uk/viewer?plctId=PLCT00006569&tabNodeId=NODE06403599#none.

———. 3 May, 1872. https://www-krpia-co-kr.ezproxy.soas.ac.uk/viewer?plctId=PLCT00006569&tabNodeId=NODE06403599#none.

Shapiro, Michael J. "Nation-States." In *A Companion to Political Geography,* 271–88. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.

Shin Gi-wook 신기욱, and Michael Edson Robinson, eds. *Colonial Modernity in Korea*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2000.

Shin Gi-wook 신기욱. *Ethnic Nationalism in Korea: Genealogy, Politics, and Legacy*. Shorenstein Asia-Pacific Research Center Series. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2006.

Sim Jeong-bo 신정보. *Bulpyeonhan Donghae wa Ilbonhae: Godae eseo hyeondae ggaji Donghae wa Ilbonhae jimyeong eul yeoksajeok chujeok.* 불편한 동해와 일본해: 고대에서 현대까지 동해와 일본해 지명을 역사적 추적 (Uncomfortable East Sea and Sea of Japan: Tracking Down Names of East Sea and Sea of Japan from Ancient Times to Today). Seoul: Bapbuk 밥북, 2017.

Sim Yeong-ok 심영옥. “Joseon misul jeonramhoe jakpum ui Joseon hyangtosaek bipyeong yeon-gu” 조선미술전람회 작품의 조선 향토색 비평 연구 (The Study of Critique on Local Colour of Artwork From Joseon Arts Exhibition). *Dongyang yesul* 동양예술, no. 48 (August 2020): 25–54.

Sin Chae-ho 신채호. “Doksa sinron: Je i jang Buyeo wangjo wa Gija” 독사신론: 제이장 부여왕조와 기자 (Doksa sinron: Chapter 2 Buyeo Dynasty and Gija). *Daehan maeil sinbo* 대한매일신보, 8 September, 1908.

Sin Eun-gyeong 신은경. “Jiri gong-gan ui damronhwa gwajeong e daehan ilgochal: Sinjeung Dong-guk yeoji seungram gwa Taekriji reul jungsim euro” 지리공간의 담론화 과정에 대한 일고찰: 신증동국여지승람과 택리지를 중심으로 (A Study on the Development of Geographic Space Discourse: On Sinjeung Dong-guk yeoji seungram and Taekriji). *Jeongsin munhwa yeon-gu* 정신문화연구 32, no. 1 (March 2009): 313–43.

Sin Myeong-ho 신명호. “Daehan Jegukgi ui eojin jejak.” 대한제국기의 어진 제작 (The Production of Royal Portraits in the Korean Empire Period). *Joseon sidaesa hakbo* 조선시대사학보 33 (June 2005): 245–80.

Sin Seok-ho 신석호. “Haeseol.” 해설 (Translations). In Min chungjeong-gong yugo: jeon, 민충정공 유고: 전 (Posthumous Works of Min Yeong-hwan Part 1). Edited by Min Hong-gi 민홍기, translated by Lee Min-su 이민수, 307–12. Seoul: Iljogak 일조각, 2000.

Sin Su-gyeong. “Ilje Gangjeomgi jiri gyogwaseo saphwa yeon-gu: Naejae doen ideologi wa pyohyeon bangsik ui byeonhyeong” 일제강점기 지리교과서 삽화 연구: 내재된 이데올로기와 표현된 방식의 변형 (Research on Illustrations of Geography in Japanese Occupation Period: Immanent Ideology and Stylistic Transformations). *Misulsa nondan* 미술사논단 29 (December 2009): 249–72.

Sin Un-yong 신운용. “An Jung-geun ui minjok undong yeon-gu.” 안중근의 민족운동 연구 (Study of An Jung-geun’s Nationalistic Activities). PhD diss., Hankuk University of Foreign Studies 한국외국어대학교, 2007.

———. *An Jung-geun gwa Hanguk geundaesa* 안중근과 한국 근대사 (An Jung-geun and Korean Modern History). Seoul: Chaeryun 채련, 2009.

Sin Won-bong 신원봉. “Taegeukgi Jung-guk yuraeseol e daehan banbak” 태극기 중국 유래설에 대한 반박 (Rebuttal on the Theory of Chinese Origin of Tegeukgi). *Dongyang munhwa yeon-gu* 동양문화연구 8 (November 2011): 145–77.

Sin Yong-ha 신용하. *Doklip Hyeophoe ui minjok undong yeon-gu* 독립협회의 민족운동 연구 (Study of Nationalistic Movements of the Independence Club). Seoul: Hanguk Munhwa Yeon-guseo 한국문화연구소, 1974.

———. *Hanguk minjok ui giwon gwa hyeongseong yeon-gu* 한국민족의 기원과 형성 연구 (A Study on the Origins and Formation of Korean Nation). Seoul: Seoul Daehakgyo Chulpan Munhwawon 서울대학교출판문화원, 2017.

Sinhan minbo 신한민보. “Chin-gyeong seonghwang” 친경성황 (Successful Ploughing Ceremony). *Sinhan minbo* 신한민보. 12 May, 1909.

Smith, A. D. *Myths and Memories of the Nation*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Smith, Whitney. *Flags Through the Ages and Across the World*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Snyder, Joel. "Territorial Photography." In *Landscape and Power*, 2nd ed., 176–203. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.

Son Hye-ri 손혜리. "Joseon hugi munindeul ui Baekdusan yuram gwa girok e daehayeo" 조선후기 문인들의 백두산 유람과 기록에 대하여 (On Travel and Records of Sightseeing to Baekdusan Mountain by Late Joseon Literati). *Minjok munhaksa yeon-gu* 민족문화사연구 37 (August 2008): 134–66.

Son In-su 손인수. *Hanguk gaehwa gyoyuk yeon-gu* 한국 개화 교육 연구 (Study of Enlightenment Education of Korea). Seoul: Iljisa 일진사, 1981.

Son, Jihyun. "The Creation of a Korean National Flag, 1880s–1910s." *Smarthistory*, 15 July, 2022. https://smarthistory.org/korean-national-flag/.

Song Mi-suk 송미숙. "Geundae ihu jejak doen 'Yi Sun-sin' chosang imiji ui tongsijeok gochal" 근대이후 제작된 '이순신' 초상 이미지의 통시적 고찰 (Diachronic Study on the Portrait Images of 'Yi Sun-sin' after the Modern Period. *Misulsahak* 미술사학, no. 44 (August 2022): 241–66.

Song Min-ho 송민호. "Chogi Maeil sinbo yeonjae soseol saphwa ran ui pung-gyeong (2): Sseuruta Goro (1890-1969) wa saeroun 'Joseon' ui insang" 초기 매일신보 연재 소설 삽화란의 풍경: 쓰루타 고로 (1890-1969)와 새로운 '조선'의 인상 (On the Landscape Illustrations of Serial-Novels in the Early Period of Maeil sinbo (每日申報) (2)－Tsuruta Goro (鶴田吾郎) and New Korean Representation). *Hangukhak yeon-gu* 한국학연구 44 (February 2017): 211–50.

Song Ran-hui, and Lee Yong-ho 송란희, 이영호. "Dasi chajeun Kim Dae-geon sinbu ui Joseon jeondo (Carte de La Corée)" 다시 찾은 김대건 신부의 조선 전도 (Carte de La Corée) (Rediscovered Original Map of Kim Dae-geun). *Gyohoesa yeon-gu* 교회사연구 55 (December 2019): 275–301.

Song Seok-yun 송석윤. "Gunmin gongchi wa ipheon gunjuje heonbeop: Bigyo heonjeongsajeok yeon-gu." 군민공치와 입헌군주제 헌법: 비교헌정사적 연구 (Gunmingongchi and Constitutional Monarchy: Historical Comparisons of Constitutions). *Beophak* 법학 53, no. 1 (March 2012): 497–527.

Song Won-seop 송원섭. *Mugunghwa: Mugunghwa ran eotteon ggot in-ga?* 무궁화: 무궁화란 어떤 꽃인가? (Mugunghwa: What Flower is Mugunghwa?). Seoul: Semyeong Seogwan 세명서관, 2004.

Song Yong-deok 송영덕. "Goryeo-Joseon jeon-gi ui Baekdusan insik" 고려-조선 전기의 백두산 인식 (Understandings on Baekdusan Mountain from Goryeo to Early Joseon). *Yeoksa wa hyeonsil*, no. 64 (June 2007): 127–159.

Sonne, Wolfgang. *Representing the State: Capital City Planning in the Early Twentieth Century*. Munich; London: Prestel, 2003.

Sontag, Susan. *On Photography*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1977.

Sonyeon 소년. "Jeonmun-gwa: Ihwa" 전문과: 이화 (Topic: Ihwa). *Sonyeon* 2, no. 5 (May 1909): 30–32.
Spence, Jonathan D. *The Search for Modern China.* New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1990.
Stebelsky, Ihor. "National Identity of Ukraine." In *Geography and National Identity*, by David Hooson, 233–48. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1994.
Storey, David. *Territories: The Claiming of Space*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2012. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/soas-ebooks/reader.action?docID=958674.
Taejo sillok 태조실록. Vol. 4, 18 September, 1393. http://sillok.history.go.kr/id/kaa_10209018_002.
Taki Kōji. *Cheonhwang ui chosang* 천황의 초상 (Portrait of the Japanese Emperor). Translated by Park Sam-heon 박삼헌. Seoul: Somyeong Chulpan 소명출판, 2007.
Tatsuno Sayo. "Geumgangsan jeonseol ui munheon jeonseung yeon-gu: Jong-gyojeok pyosangseong eul jungsim euro" 금강산 전설의 문헌 전승 연구: 종교적 표상을 중심으로 (A Study on the Legends of Geumgangsan Mountain: Their Religious Representation). PhD diss., Seoul National University 서울대학교, 2013.
Taylor, Constance J. D. *Koreans at Home.* London: Casselland Company, 1904.
Taylor, Ken, and Jane L. Lennon. "Introduction: Leaping the Fence." In *Managing Cultural Landscapes*, 1–17. London: Routledge, 2012.
The Korean Repository, "His Majesty, The King of Korea." *The Korean Repository* 3 (November 1896): 423–30.
Thiers, Adolphe. *The History of the French Revolution*. Vol. 1. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1861.
Tikhonov, V. M. "Masculinizing the Nation: Gender Ideologies in Traditional Korea and in the 1890s-1900s Korean Enlightenment Discourse." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 66, no. 4 (November 2007): 1029–65.
———. *Social Darwinism and Nationalism in Korea: The Beginnings (1880s-1910s): "Survival" as an Ideology of Korean Modernity.* Brill's Korean Studies Library. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010.
Till, Karen E. "Places of Memory." In *A Companion to Political Geography*, 289–301. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.
———. "Staging the Past: Landscape Designs, Cultural Identity and Erinnerungspolitik at Berlin's Neue Wache." *Ecumene* 6, no. 3 (July 1999): 251–83.
Tilly, Charles. *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1992*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1992.
Tsukiashi Tatsuhiko, *Joseon ui gaehwa sasang gwa naeshyeoneollijeum* 조선의 개화사상과 내셔널리즘 (Joseon Thoughts on Reformation and Nationalism). Translated by Choi Deok-su 최덕수. Paju: Yeollin Chaekdeul 열린책들, 2014.
Tuan, Yi-fu. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977.
Underwood, Lillias Horton. *Fifteen Years Among the Top-Knots: Life in Korea*. Boston: American Tract Society, 1908.

———. *Underwood of Korea: Being an Intimate Record of the Life and Work of the Rev. H. G. Underwood, D.D., LL.D., for Thirty One Years a Missionary of the Presbyterian Board in Korea*, n.d.

Wakabayashi Mikio. *Jido ui sangsangryeok: Jido ga hyeonsil eul mobang haneun geot i anira hyeonsil i jido reul mobanghanda*! 지도의 상상력: 지도가 현실을 모방하는 것이 아니라 현실이 지도를 모방한다! (The Imagination of Maps: Maps Do Not Imitate Reality, Reality Imitates Maps! Translated by Jeong Seon-tae 정선태. Seoul: Sancheoreom 산처럼, 2006.

Walter, Gary D., Robert W. Shufeldt, Shin Chen, and Chin Hong Chi. "The Korean Special Mission to the United States of America." *Journal of Korean Studies* 1, no. 1 (December 1969): 89–142.

Watanabe, Hiroshi. "Hwai wa muwi: 'Pyeonghwa' jisok ui eoryeoum e daehayeo." 화이와 무위: '평화' 지속의 어려움에 대해서 (Military Majesty, the Middle Kingdom and the Barbarians: Difficulties of Sustaining Peace) Translated by Lee Gyeong-mi 이경미. *Gaenyeom gwa sotong* 개념과 소통 17 (June 2016): 5–38.

Weiner, Michael. "The Invention of Identity: Race and Nation in Pre-War Japan." In *The Construction of Racial Identities in China and Japan*. London: Hurst & Company, 1997.

West, Shearer. *Portraiture*. Oxford: OUP Oxford, 2004.

Wheeler, Olin D. "The History of a Trade-Mark." *Wonderland*, 1901.

Wiebe, Robert H. *Who We Are: A History of Popular Nationalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Wongaksa Seongbo Bakmulgwan 원각사성보박물관. "Geumgangsan sa dae chal jeondo, 1899-nyeon, mokpanbon" (Complete View of the Four Great Temples in Geumgangsan, Woodblock of 1883) *Wongaksa Seongbo Bakmulgwan* 원각사성보박물관 (blog), 30 August, 2015. http://wongaksa.or.kr/g4/bbs/board.php?bo_table=sungbo_01&wr_id=15&page=1.

Yang Bo-gyeong 양보경. "Baekdusan gwa Baekdudaegan gaenyeom hyeongseong gwa sikminjijeok byeoncheon" 백두산과 백두대간 개념 형성과 식민지적 변천 (Baekdusan Mountain, the Formation of the Concept of Baekdu daegan and Their Colonial Transformations). 1–22. Seoul: *Hanguk munhwa yeoksa jiri hakhoe* 한국문화역사지리학회, 2012.

———. "Joseon sidae ui 'Baekdudaegan' gaenyeom ui hyeongseong" 조선시대의 '백두대간' 개념의 형성 (The Formation of the Concept of 'Baekdu daegan' in Joseon). *Jindan hakbo* 진단학보 83 (June 1997): 85–106.

———. "Yet jido e natanan bukbang insik gwa Baekdusan" 옛 지도에 나타난 북방인식과 백두산 *(*Consciousness of Northern Territories and Baekdusan Mountain in Old Maps). *Yeoksa bipyeong, Joseon sidae bukbang jiyeok e daehan insik*, 역사비평, 조선시대 북방지역에 대한 인식 35 (May 1996): 300–322.

———. "18 segi jiriseo: Jido ui jejak gwa gukga ui jibang jibae" 18 세기 지리서: 지도의 제작과 국가의 지방 지배 (Geography Books of the 18th Century:

The Production of Maps and State Domination of Regional Areas). *Eung-yong jiri* 응용지리 20, no. 20 (December 1997): 21–42.

Yang Geun-chang 양근창. “Gyeong-un-gung Un-gyo bokwon e gwanhan yeon-gu” 경운궁 운교 복원에 관한 연구 (Research on the Restoration of Un-gyo Bridge of Gyeong-un-gung Palace). Master’s thesis, Kyonggi University 경기대학교, 2012.

Yang Ji-seon 양지선. “Hanguk ui jin-gyeong sansuhwa e gwanhan gochal: Jeong Seon gwa Byeon Gwan-sik ui Geumgangsan jakpum eul jungsim euro” 한국의 진경산수화에 관한 고찰: 정선과 변관식의 금강산 작품을 중심으로 (The Study of the Real-View Landscape Painting of Korea: Focusing on Geumgangsan Mountain Works of Jeong Seon and Byeon Gwan-sik). Master’s thesis, Chungnam National University 충남대학교, 2018.

Yazu Masanaga (Yaz Shoai). *Chirigaku shōhin.* Tokyo: Minyusya, 1902. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/keio.10811071294.

Yeoksa Bipyeong Pyeonjip Wiwonhoe 역사비평편집위원회. *Jeongjo wa Jeongjo ihu: Jeongjo sidae wa 19 segi ui yeonsok gwa danjeol* 정조와 정조 이후: 정조시대와 19 세기의 연속과 단절 (Jeongjo’s Reign and Thereafter: Jeongjo’s Era and the Continuation and Severance of the 19th Century). Goyang: Yeoksa Bipyeongsa 역사비평사, 2017.

Yeom Jeong-ha, and Jo U-hyeon 염정하, 조우현. “Joseon jung, hugi hunryeon dogam ui gunsa boksik e gwanhan yeon-gu” 조선 중, 후기 훈련도감의 군사복식에 관한 연구, (Research on the Military Uniform Shown in the Training Manuals of Mid, Late Joseon). *Boksik* 복식 63, no. 8 (December 2013): 171–87.

Yeon Gap-su 연갑수. “Gojongdae Pungyang Jomun ui donghyang” 고종대 풍양 조문의 동향 (Activities of Pungyang Jo Family during Gojong’s Reign). In *Joseon jeongchi ui majimak eolgul: 19 segi Joseon ui jeongchi seryeok gwa daeoe gwan-gye* 조선정치의 마지막 얼굴: 19 세기 조선의 정치세력과 대외관계 (The Last Face of Joseon Politics: Political Powers and Foreign Relations of 19th Century Joseon). (Seoul: Sahoe Pyeongron 사회평론, 2012), 91-127.

Yi Beom-jin. “Giseo.” 기서 (Contribution). *Hwangseong sinmun* 황성신문. 24 November, 1899.

Yi Jung-hwan 이중환. “Sansu” 산수, (Landscape). In *Taekriji* 택리지 (On Selecting Location). Translated by Lee In-seong 이인성, 149–96. Seoul: Eulyu Munhwasa 을유문화사, 1993.

Yi Song-mi 이성미. *Joseon sidae geurim sok ui Seoyang hwabeop* 조선시대 그림 속의 서양화법 (Western Painting Techniques in Joseon Paintings). Seoul: Daewonsa 대원사, 2000.

Yu Geun-ho 유근호. *Joseonjo daeoe sasang ui heureum: Junghwajeok segyegwan ui hyeongseong gwa bung-goe* 조선조 대외사상의 흐름: 중화적 세계관의 형성과 붕괴 (The Flow of Ideologies Surrounding the External World: The

Formation and Collapse of Sinocentrism). Seoul: Seongsin Yeoja Daehakgyo Chulpanbu 성신여자대학교출판부, 2004.

Yu Gil-jun 유길준. *Nodong yahak dokbon* 노동야학독본 (Nodong yahak dokbon). Gyeongseong: Gyeongseong Ilbosa 경성일보사, 1908.

Yu Hui-seung 유희승. "'Seonjeon' gwa 'Gukjeon' ui inmulhwa yeon-gu: 'Dongyanghwa' reul jungsim euro" '선전'과 '국전'의 인물화 연구: '동양화'를 중심으로 (A Study on Figure Paintings of 'Seonjeon' and 'Gukjeon' Exhibitions: Focusing on 'Eastern Paintings). PhD diss., Dongduk Women's University 동덕여자대학교, 2010.

Yu Jae-ri 유재리. "Goryeo mal Joseon cho sabyeong yeon-gu" 고려 말 조선 초 사병 연구 (Study of Private Soldiers in Late Goryeo and Early Joseon). Master's thesis, Sookmyung Women's University 숙명여자대학교, 1996.

Yu Seon-yeong 유선영. "Sigak gisul roseo hwandeung gwa sikminji ui sigakseong" 시각기술로서 환등과 식민지의 시각성 (Magic Lantern as a Technology of Vision). *Eonron gwa sahoe* 언론과 사회 24, no. 2 (May 2016): 191–229.

Yu Seung-hun 유승훈. "Geundae jaryo reul tonghae bon Geumgangsan gwan-gwang gwa imiji" 근대자료를 통해 본 금강산 관광과 이미지 (Geumgangsan Mountain Tourism and Images as Seen Through Modern Materials). *Silcheon minsokhak yeon-gu* 실천민속학연구 14 (August 2009): 339-68

Yu Yeong-ok 유영옥. "Daehan Minguk eul daepyo haneun sangjingseong e daehan gochal" 대한민국을 대표하는 상징성에 대한 고찰 (Investigation of the Representativeness of South Korea). *Hanguk bohun nonchong* 한국보훈논총 11, no. 4 (December 2012).

Yun Beom-mo 윤범모. *Hanguk geundae misul* 한국근대미술 (Modern Korean Art). Seoul: Hangil Art 한길아트, 2000.

Yun Byeong-seok 윤병석. "An Jung-geun ui sajin." 안중근의 사진 (Photographs of An Jung-geun). *Hanguk doklip undongsa yeon-gu* 한국독립운동사연구 37 (December 2010): 393–439.

Yun Chi-ho 윤치호. "Yun Chi-ho ilgi" 윤치호일기 (Yun Chi-ho Diaries). 13 March, 1884. .

———. "Yun Chi-ho ilgi' 윤치호일기 (Yun Chi-ho Diaries). 24 April, 1884. https://db.history.go.kr/item/level.do?sort=levelId&dir=ASC&start=1&limit=20&page=1&pre_page=1&setId=-1&totalCount=0&prevPage=0&prevLimit=&itemId=sa&types=&synonym=off&chinessChar=on&brokerPagingInfo=&levelId=sa_024r_0020_0040_0290&position=-1.

———. "Yun Chi-ho ilgi" 윤치호일기 (Yun Chi-ho Diaries). 23 June, 1919. http://db.history.go.kr/item/level.do?sort=levelId&dir=ASC&start=1&limit=20&page=1&pre_page=1&setId=-1&totalCount=0&prevPage=0&prevLimit=&itemId=sa&types=&synonym=off&chinessChar=on&brokerPagingInfo=&levelId=sa_030_0040_0060_0210&position=-1.

Yun Se-jin 윤세진. "Geundaejeok 'misul' gaenyeom ui hyeongseong gwa misul insik: 1890 nyeon gyeong buteo 1910 nyeondae ggaji reul jungsim euro." 근대적 '미술'개념의 형성과 미술 인식: 1890 년경부터 1910 년대까지를 중심으로 (Formation of the Concept of 'Fine Art' and its Understanding: From the 1890s to the 1910s), Master's thesis, Seoul National University 서울대학교, 1999.
Yun Seon-ja 윤선자. "Doklip undong gwa Taegeukgi" 독립운동과 태극기 (Independence Movements and the Taegeukgi). *Yeoksahak yeon-gu* 역사학연구 35 (February 2009): 85-112.
Yuk Jae-yong 육재용. "Sansu yuramrok e natanan seonindeul ui gwan-gwang uisik ilgochal" 산수유람록에 나타난 선인들의 관광의식 일고찰 (The Understanding of Tourism Among Ancestors as seen from Sightseeing Travelogues). *Gwan-gwang yeon-gu* 관광연구 25, no. 4 (October 2010): 1–20.