

Two Memories, Two Historiographies

Unfamiliar Territory

To review a symposium is a foray into unfamiliar territory. Usually the subject of a review is a certain piece of work or a monograph. A symposium, on the other hand, is a gathering of various researchers that rarely have a consistent argument tying them together. Symposiums are, simply put, difficult to review. This is the case even when research on a common theme is sought and subsequently presented given that researchers may vary considerably in their arguments as well as the directions their research takes. Comprehending the wide spectrum of presented research as a whole and assessing the significance and limitations of each study is a complicated and difficult task.

This daunting task has been of course suggested with good reason. The year 2018 was the 1,100th anniversary of the founding of Goryeo, the dynasty following Silla, and naturally held a special meaning for researchers studying Goryeo. Museums accordingly held special exhibitions and public lectures, while each learned society held all kinds of symposiums to commemorate the occasion.

But now the party is over, and the remaining work for the researchers and organizers of all the symposiums is to assess how such a meaningful year has been spent and what has been achieved through all the fuss and excitement. The task given to this reviewer was to examine the research presented during the two symposiums in 2018 held by the Korean Medieval History Society and the Korean History Society, two learned societies representing research on Goryeo in South Korea, and consider their significance and limitations. Although both symposiums were held to commemorate the 1,100th year since the founding of Goryeo, I will look at each separately in this review to do justice to the respective themes of each symposium. Normally, the manuscripts of the research presented during a symposium¹ undergo additional editing and revisions before being

1. Out of the eight studies presented during the symposium held by the Korean Medieval History Society, five were published in *Hanguk jungsesa yeongu* (*Journal of Korean Medieval Studies*) 35 (2018).

subsequently published in academic journals into books.² As the aim of this article is to review the symposiums, I examine the research presented originally at each symposium prior to additional changes for publication.

Goryeo as Haedong cheonjaguk: Achievements and Limitations

The Korean Medieval History Society, one of the main scholarly societies leading research on the Goryeo period, held a symposium sponsored by the Northeast Asian History Foundation on July 25, 2018 under the title “The Goryeo Dynasty in East Asia: Worldview, Foundation of State Identity.” The stated agenda of the symposium was to “illuminate the self-perception and identity of Goryeo as a state within a pluralistic world order” and to “reflect upon the historical significance of the founding of Goryeo.” A total of eight presentations were arranged into two parts: four researchers presented their work during Part One under the title “The Identity (*jajon uisik*) of Goryeo as a State within East Asia,” and the other four researchers presented their work during Part Two under the title “State Rituals 禮制 and Identity of Goryeo.”

Table 1. Presenters and Discussants of the Symposium
“The Goryeo Dynasty in East Asia: Worldview, Foundation of State Identity”

	Theme	Presenter	Discussant
Part One: The Identity (<i>jajon uisik</i>) of Goryeo as a State within East Asia	Succeeding Goguryeo: “Goryeo” and its boundaries	Sin Ansik	Yi Seungmin
	Forming notions of “the unification of the Three Hans” and “the Son of Heaven in the east of the sea” in Goryeo	Yun Gyeongjin	Gu Sanu
	The multiethnic composition of Goryeo and identities from “our country” to “we in the East”	Chu Myeongyeop	Yi Jeongil
	The Song dynasty’s foreign policies and perception towards Goryeo and the Khitan during the tenth and eleventh centuries	Yi Janguk	Kim Sunja
Part Two: State Rituals and Identity of Goryeo	Conflict and harmony between Chinese culture and traditional culture during the Goryeo dynasty	Kim Yunjeong	Kim Hyeongsu
	State rituals and the notion of unity in the Goryeo dynasty	Han Jeongsu	Kim Cheoleung
	State festivals and the identity of Goryeo	Seo Geumseok	Choe Jongseok
	Foreign relations during early Goryeo seen through title of ruler	Heo Inuk	Yi Miji

2. The research presented during the symposium held by the Korean History Society was collected and published in 2018 under the title “Goreyo wangjo wa Gyeonggi reul boneun siseon” (Ways of Looking at the Goryeo Dynasty and Gyeonggi) by the Gyeonggi Cultural Foundation.

Part One began with a presentation on the issue of territory. According to Sin Ansik, Goryeo, as the successor of Goguryeo, considered the entire Korean Peninsula south of the Amnok (Yalu) River as their territory and established the two-border-district system while building fortresses to incorporate the northern areas. The Great Wall of Goryeo (Goryeo jangseong) not only marked the border between the east and west of the river but also the point to which civilization could extend its reach.

Following this, Yun Gyeongjin provided a clear overview of the basics of Goryeo’s worldview. Yun argued that the notion of the unification of the Three Han states was not formed in the seventh century, as commonly believed, but in the ninth century during the secession of the Later Three Kingdoms and continued on to Goryeo. This notion, together with the concept of a universe on the east side of the sea, led Goryeo to consider itself as Haedong cheonjaguk (the State of the Son of Heaven in the East of the Sea 海東天子國).

The third presentation analyzed how Goryeo, as the state of the Son of Heaven, was constituted by various groups (*jongjok*) and how each of these groups were incorporated into or organized within Goryeo. Chu Myeongyeop showed that while Jurchen and Khitan individuals were unable to thrive within the courts of Goryeo, for instance, those from Tamna and Balhae and their descendants continued to be appointed to positions within Goryeo’s courts. Chu also argued that the national identity as being of and belonging to Goryeo was cultivated amidst the antagonism between Goryeo and the Khitan. After Goryeo later became a vassal state of the Yuan dynasty in the fourteenth century, the sense of having a common bloodline and shared ancestry as well as an ethnic dimension was added to this national identity. Similarly, the concept of being people of the east also shifts from an awareness of being the people of Goryeo to a more historical concept encompassing thousands of years since Gija Joseon.

Finally, the fourth presentation of Part One dealt with the foreign policies and perception the Northern Song dynasty maintained towards Goryeo during the tenth and eleventh centuries when Goryeo was solidifying its identity as Haedong cheonjaguk. Self-identity is inseparable from the relationship with the other; by the same token, how Song viewed Goryeo cannot be overlooked in examining Goryeo’s own identity. Yi Janguk argued that Song’s perception of Goryeo continued to shift depending on Song’s situation in their relationship with the Khitans.

Part Two delved into the more specific ways Goryeo formed an identity as Haedong cheonjaguk. The first presentation looked at the culture of Goryeo.

Kim Yunjeong first distinguished the traditional culture of Goryeo (*topung* 土風) from that of China (*hwapung* 華風) and looked at how the two cultures both contended with and coexisted side-by-side with each other. Goryeo pursued Chinese culture during Taejo's reign while also continuing to emphasize the preservation of its traditional culture, thus maintaining a tense balance between the acceptance of Chinese culture and the maintenance of its traditional culture.

The second presentation moved on to the topic of state rituals. One of the most important mechanisms through which a group's identity is built is the practice of rituals, and Goryeo was no exception. Han Jeongsu argued that the rituals of Goryeo gradually became established starting from the founding years under Taejo, the formative years under Seongjong, the years of revolt and transformation during the reign of Hyeonjong, until the years of completion under Munjong. Han categorized the rituals formed throughout this period into those related to Confucianism, Buddhism, and Taoism, and argued that the rituals developed in their respective realms functioned as a way to further consolidate the dynasty.

State rituals were also closely related to the division of time, one of the areas that show how a certain society self-identifies. All civilizations possess unique systems of dividing time. In particular, the dynasties of East Asia have divided time based on observations of the skies, which subsequently work to regulate the everyday lives of the people. Thus, state festivals 節日, the topic the third presentation took up, reflect a community's sense of identity. Seo Geumseok argued that Goryeo, unlike Joseon, placed special meanings on *sangwon* 上元, *sangsa* 上巳, and *jungyang* 重陽. *Sangwon* referred to the fifteenth day of the first lunar month, which Goryeo observed by holding Yeondeunhoe (lantern festivals). *Sangsa* referred to the first snake 巳 day of the third lunar month, which Goryeo designated as a state festival due to its relation to the element of water 水德 Goryeo worshiped. *Jungyang* was observed in Goryeo on the ninth day of the ninth lunar month by holding banquets, which became ways to reinforce the prestige of the royal family or for those in power to display their authority.

Heo Inuk gave the final presentation of Part Two that dealt with the issue of title, i.e., how the ruler of Goryeo was addressed. The title of the ruler of Goryeo not only illustrated the status Goryeo held in the pluralistic world order but was also closely related to how Goryeo constructed its identity as a state. The ruler of Goryeo referred to himself as the Great King 大王 of the east of the Liao River 遼河 and addressed the rulers of various nomadic countries towards

the north as lords of the state 國主. Heo argued that this stemmed from the worldview of the ruler of Goryeo, who considered himself the Great King of the state of the Son of Heaven.

These eight individual presentations arranged into two parts ultimately coalesce around a common aim: to see Goryeo as Haedong cheonjaguk. The argument that Goryeo was able to refer to itself as the state of the Son of Heaven within the pluralistic world order East Asia was embedded in at that time is one that no researcher would deny. Despite this fact, the studies presented during the symposium were determined to explicate how Goryeo, succeeding Goguryeo after late Silla, built an identity as an independent state of the Son of Heaven in the east as evidenced by its traditional culture, state rituals, state festivals, and the ruler's title. Due to space limits, I will review the symposium as a whole instead of providing an analysis of the contributions and limitations of each individual presentation, which were sufficiently addressed during the symposium by the respective discussants.

The common premise of all the presentations is Goryeo's status as Haedong cheonjaguk; the presentations share the goal of examining how the people of Goryeo internalized this status of their country. In other words, the aim of the symposium was to examine how Goryeo established their identity as a state of the Son of Heaven. Interestingly, all of the presenters approached the issue of identity either from the awareness or consciousness the people possessed or from the point of view of culture, a tendency undoubtedly influenced by cultural history since the twenty-first century. Cultural history, which sees culture not as being determined by a certain material base but as having its own unique identity, has influenced and continues to influence many researches ever since it was introduced into Korea from the late twentieth century. The work emphasizing the practice of state rituals, for instance, shows influences of cultural anthropology, a discipline that sees the performance of ritual as forming a group's identity, which became widespread in South Korea since the 1960s (Geertz 1998). The attempts to understand Goryeo as a state of the Son of Heaven through the lens of identity or culture, on the other hand, have been influenced by Benedict Anderson's (2002) argument regarding nationalism although none of the presenters specifically cited him—that is, by Anderson's emphasis on a group or community as a “cultural system.”

Such attempts to understand Goryeo's identity as Haedong cheonjaguk on the one hand signals the decline of the approach based on historical

materialism, which held sway in the research of Korean history after the 1980s, while on the other hand indicates the rapid rise of the influence of the cultural approach since the twenty-first century. If the 1100th anniversary of Goryeo's founding had occurred in the 1990s, the same symposium might have focused on investigating the historical significance of Goryeo regarding the process of internal development in medieval Korea.

At the same time, new attempts do not necessarily indicate a break from the past: they also exist on a continuum extending from the past. Underlying the common emphasis on Goryeo's identity as Haedong cheonjaguk is a nationalistic point of view. In this reviewer's opinion, the emphasis on Goryeo's status as a state of the Son of Heaven, not as the vassal state of China is based on a nationalistic stance that is no different from the attempt to highlight the unique status of Goryeo within the history of Korea.

In addition, cultural approaches should be based on a more careful and specific definition of the concepts that are used. The terms used in the presentations such as *jongjok* (ethnicity, tribe, race, or species), *munhwa uisik* (sense of culture or cultural awareness), or *jajon uisik* (self-esteem or sense of holding oneself in high esteem) should be first and foremost defined and explicated. For example, the term *jongjok* in the East Asian literature generally refer to one's kin based on bloodline. This is not, however, how the term has been used in the Chu's presentation, for example; Chu seems to have used the term to refer to racial or ethnic groups. To close the gap between the two different meanings—kinship based on bloodline, and racial or ethnic groups—requires a more rigorous step of clarification.

The term *munhwa uisik* also should be evaluated more carefully before using it in relation to the identity of Goryeo. Culture has been used after the Second World War to refer to a certain community or a nation's spiritual and artistic achievements;³ more generally, it can also be used to refer to a way of living that reflects the identity of a certain community or class. In this sense, the identity of Goryeo could be described by the term culture. Whether or not traditional Goryeo culture can be considered as a formative element of Goryeo's identity, however, warrants further study.

History and Memory of Goryeo and Gyeonggi

The Korean History Society, which has represented historical associations in South Korea since the 1980s, also did not let the 1,100th anniversary of the founding of Goryeo go by unnoticed. The society held a symposium sponsored by the Gyeonggi Cultural Foundation on April 28, 2018 under the title "The Historical Significance of the Founding of Goryeo and the Formation of Gyeonggi." The symposium was arranged into two parts mirroring the two events to celebrate: the 1,100th anniversary of the founding of Goryeo and the 1,000th anniversary of the naming of Gyeonggi. Four researchers presented their work in Part One under the theme "Goryeo and the History of the Gyeonggi Area," followed by four researchers presenting their work in Part Two under the theme "A Metahistorical Approach to Goryeo and Gaegyeong."

Table 2. Presenters and Discussants of the symposium
"The Historical Significance of the Founding of Goryeo and the Formation of Gyeonggi"

	Theme	Presenter	Discussant
Keynote Address	From a reunited society to an aristocratic society: the history curriculum of middle and high schools, and changes in textbooks' portrayals of Goryeo	An Byeongu	
Part One: The History of Goryeo and the Gyeonggi Area	The worldview and world order of Goryeo	Han Jeongsu	Choe Jongseok
	Current status and future prospects of research on Goryeo's capital, Gaegyeong	Sin Ansik	Hong Yeongeui
	The expansion and contraction of Gyeonggi during the Goryeo period: focusing on the continuity between Gyeonggi and Gyeonggi-do from the tenth to late fourteenth century	Jeong Eunjeong	Jeong Haksu
	Foreign relations and the transfer of the capital to Ganghwa Island, and the military response of the Gyeonggi-do district during the anti-Mongol struggle	Gang Jaegwang	Bak Jaeu
Part Two: A Metahistorical Approach to Goryeo and Gaegyeong	Jumong Goryeo, Gungye Goryeo: ruptures and continuations of Korea	Ju Gyeongcheol	Seo Geumseok
	Changes in the perception of King Gongmin in Joseon	Yi Gyucheol	Yi Hyeongyeong
	The influence of Goryeo on modern and contemporary people of Gaeseong	Yang Jeongpil	Ha Myeongjun
	The argument in favor of Goryeo as title for new state following Liberation and the image of Goryeo	Jo Hyeongyeol	Ryu Sihyeon

3. For more on the concept of culture, see Koselleck 2010.

The presentations, although brought together under a common theme, can largely be divided into three parts depending on their specific content, which is how the review of them will proceed below. The first group of presentations deals with the status of Goryeo as Haedong cheonjaguk; the second group comprises the three presentations on the history of Gaegyeong and Gyeonggi; and the third group includes the four presentations about the metahistorical approach to Goryeo and Gaegyeong.

Numerous researchers have relentlessly sought to understand Goryeo as Haedong cheonjaguk, particularly leading up to the year marking the 1,100th anniversary of the founding of Goryeo. The argument presented by Han Jeongsu in the first group was along the same lines as the eight studies presented during the Korean Medieval History Society symposium I have reviewed above: namely, that Goryeo began to perceive itself as the state of the Son of Heaven of the East after Taejo united the Three Han states, and that this perception gradually settled into place throughout the reign of Hyeonjong, until it became complete during the reign of Munjong.

The second group of presentations displayed attempts to reevaluate the history of Gyeonggi to mark the 1,000th anniversary of its naming. Three researchers presented their work on Gaegyeong, the Gyeonggi area, and Gangdo during the Goryeo period in this order. Sin Ansik summarized the research that has been done on Gaegyeong until now and proposed that the data should be sorted into the following categories of the main written sources, supplementary written sources, and audiovisual data, and that each group should be further subdivided into the categories of nature, administrative districts, infrastructure, and images.

Jeong Eunjeong followed with a presentation on the expansion and contraction of the Gyeonggi area during the Goryeo dynasty and how this continued into the early years of Joseon. The districting of Gyeonggi during the Goryeo dynasty originated from the districting of Jeokhyeon 赤縣 and Gihyeon 畿縣 during the fourteenth year of Seongjong and assumed its basic form under Hyeonjong. Jeong saw Gyeonggi as expanding into the so-called Greater Gyeonggi area during the rule of Munjong. This expanded Gyeonggi area shrunk during the military regime, the war between Goryeo and the Mongol Empire, and period of the Mongol interference, after which it re-expanded under King Gongyang following Gyeonggi's division into two administrative units—Left and Right. Jeong emphasized that this system was maintained up until the early years of Joseon.

The last presentation in this group dealt with Gangdo. Gang Jaegwang argued that the transfer of the capital to Ganghwa Island by the Choe regime was a diplomatic action taken in face of the six demands made by the Mongol Empire (i.e., pay tribute, send hostages, install Darughachi, erect post-stations, provide military assistance, and conduct census of the households). Battles against the Mongol Empire broke out across the Gyeonggi area after the capital was moved, during which the magistrates dispatched from the central government and the Special Night Patrol Troops (*yabyeolcho*) fought gallantly to some success, and local residents rose up to defend their district.

The four presentations of the third group dealing with a metahistorical approach to Goryeo may well be seen as the center of the symposium held by the Korean History Society. These four presentations can be further divided into two: studies on Goryeo as the name of a country (the first and fourth presentations of Part Two), and studies on the issue of the memory of Goryeo (the second and third presentations of Part Two). The former subgroup began with Ju Gyeongcheol's presentation focusing on the relationship between Goguryeo and Goryeo. Ju's emphatic argument was that since Goguryeo was the nickname of Goryeo, the trajectory of state names from Goguryeo, Taebong, to Goryeo is actually a relationship of succession—from Goryeo (Jumong), Goryeo (Gung Ye), to Goryeo (Wang Geon). The other presentation on Goryeo as the name of a state by Jo Hyeongyeol pointed out that right after Liberation, a group of scholars and politicians—mainly those on the center-right, although Jo does not particularly specify this—argued that Goryeo should be the new name for the country at the same time the names the Republic of Korea and the People's Republic of Korea (the Democratic People's Republic of Korea) were being considered.

The second subgroup focused on how King Gongmin was perceived during the Joseon dynasty. Yi Gyucheol argued that King Gongmin was positively evaluated during early Joseon, but this increasingly took on a more negative note in the years following King Sejo. Yang Jeongpil followed with an intriguing presentation on how modern and contemporary people of Gaeseong saw Goryeo and the influence Goryeo had on them. As the status of the people of Gaeseong started to rise in tandem with the rise of Gaeseong as a modern and contemporary commercial city, the people of Gaeseong began to think beyond the previous perception of Goryeo based on *Goryeosa* (*History of Goryeo*) and started to newly assess Goryeo and its notable figures. Evidence of this can be found in the writings

of an individual from Gaeseong named Kim Taegyeong, who classified significant figures of Goryeo in his own way without relying on how the biography section in *Goryeosa* was arranged. Yang further stressed that people of Gaeseong retained traces of the beliefs of the stateless migrants of Goryeo as evidenced by the following: the Gwandeunghoe (lantern festival) practiced by modern and contemporary Gaeseong merchants, the remnants of Goryeo customs in their shamanistic beliefs, and the frequent appearance of Goryeo in the reminiscences of the people of Gaeseong who later defected to South Korea.

Depending on the spectrum of what the presenters perceive as a problem and how they work it out in their research, a symposium organized under a single theme can easily lose its focus. Successfully holding a thematically consistent and well-integrated symposium is thus not an easy task. Given the difficulties in reviewing the Korean History Society symposium using a single point of reference, the review will instead zoom in on two specific aspects of the symposium; the review on the theme of Haedong cheonjaguk will be omitted since I have already discussed it earlier in this article.

The first issue concerns the presentations given on the history of Gyeong 京 and Gi 畿 during the Goryeo dynasty. Despite seemingly dealing with a common subject matter, grouping them under a single theme does not seem to have worked out quite well. A better way of organizing the contents would have provided a more consistent presentation overall: for instance, the theme could have been divided into three parts by focusing on the history of the systems and institutions of Gaegyeong, Gangdo, and Gyeonggi, providing a chronological survey of the history of Gyeong and Gi, and, in the case of Gaegyeong, examining the internal structure in relation to the city walls and royal tombs.

The second issue is of the metahistorical approach to the subject matter. As written above, the main focus of the symposium was the four presentations on the metahistorical approach to Goryeo. Metahistory is a complex term Hayden White used in his renowned text *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (1991). White analyzes the writings of the historians of the nineteenth century—Michelet, Ranke, Tocqueville, Burckhardt, Marx, Nietzsche, and Croce—and argues that a formalist approach can be taken in analyzing the deep structure of their historical narratives. White divides the types of emplotment into Romance, Comedy, Tragedy, and Satire; the forms of argument into Formist, Organicist, Mechanistic, and Contextualist; the basic ideological positions into Anarchism, Conservatism, Radicalism, and

Liberalism, and analyzes how these forms function as the deep structure in the historical narratives of historians. Thus, data in metahistory no longer holds any holy superiority, and history becomes equivalent to literature. Based on White's conception of metahistory, it would seem difficult to call the presentations of Part Two metahistory; rather, they are more issues of memory and commemoration than they are metahistory.

How King Gongmin was evaluated in Joseon, how modern and contemporary people of Gaeseong perceived Goryeo, the development of the argument to call the country Goryeo, and the attachment towards the name Goryeo all involve remembering and commemorating Goryeo. The presentations emphasizing Goryeo as the name of the country or Goryeo as a name in general all seem to be trying too hard to highlight the meaning Goryeo as the name of a dynasty has within the history of Korea. The premise seems to be that Goryeo as a state was important or that it should not be forgotten in the history of Korea. Such efforts to stress Goryeo as the name of a state, however, may actually be proof that the status of Goryeo as a country name or Goryeo itself is being forgotten. According to Pierre Nora (2010), one of the leading thinkers in the research on memory, remembering or commemorating begins when the connection with the past is broken. The emphasis on the name Goryeo may in fact be a signal that the connection between the present and the Goryeo dynasty is in danger of being lost.

One point that should not be forgotten when thinking of memory is that memory is always being formed in the present. The past may be what is being remembered, but memories are invariably reflections of the circumstances when the act of remembering is taking or had taken place; they are never reproductions of the past. This is why memory research must be accompanied with a detailed account of the circumstances surrounding the moment of remembering. For instance, the argument that King Gongmin had been positively assessed during early Joseon should be preceded by an analysis of why this had been so; the argument that the people of Gaeseong were nostalgic about Goryeo should focus on why they felt that way. If Admiral Yi Sun-sin was seen as a great hero during the 1960s, the key point is not that he was seen this way but why. This is what is crucial in memory research. In this sense, the research on the evaluation of King Gongmin or the perception of modern and contemporary people of Gaeseong as stateless migrants of Goryeo falls far short of memory research.

Crisis or Turning Point of Historiography

The two symposiums reviewed here are forms of memory—marking the 1,100th year since the founding of Goryeo and/or the 1,000th year since the naming of Gyeonggi—and history—telling the story of Goryeo in various ways. Memory and history, however, exist in different realms. Pierre Nora argues that memory is used to retain the past within the present when the former becomes disconnected from the latter. In the same vein, the memory of the 1,100th anniversary of the founding of Goryeo may be the product of a time when the history of Goryeo is gradually losing its influence on the everyday lives of present-day people. Strictly speaking, it is a reflection of the diminishing influence the field of history has over the public in South Korea since the twenty-first century. Memory, in other words, is the product of an impending crisis. The two symposiums thus seem to have been conceived of to conjure up Goryeo to the present in face of this sense of imminent crisis.

At the same time, the research presented at the symposiums is also part of a larger historiography. They show dis/continuities; they reflect the academic currents of the field of Korean history. Through them we can see the decline of socioeconomic history, which has dominated the field of Korean history ever since the 1980s under the influence of historical materialism, and the dawn of cultural history. Identity and memory are two fields that have not received much attention during the research aiming to explicate the process of internal development within the history of Korea. The fact that these areas have now taken center stage indicates a new shift in the field: culture is now taking over as protagonist in the research of history.

And yet, there is another presence casting its dark shadow on the field. Deep underneath the arguments desiring to see Goryeo as Haedong cheonjaguk and the attachment to the name Goryeo lurks its presence: nationalism. Even with all the criticism directed towards nationalism, it remains an obstacle the field of Korean history has not yet been able to overcome. Perhaps Korean historians are fated to deal with its presence.

The two symposiums I have reviewed in this article clearly show the reality of the field of Korean history. History is losing its influence on the public and facing a crisis. New changes are being sought, leaving behind *minjung* historiography, the once prevalent method since the 1980s. These new attempts, however, are yet unripe and crude. Researchers are participating in the cultural

turn; issues of memory are being researched; yet, culture and memory remain unfamiliar and complicated topics. We still have a long way to go.

References

- Anderson, Benedict. 2002. *Sangsang ui gondongche* [Imagined Communities]. Translated by Hyeongsuk Yun. Seoul: Nanam.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1998. *Munhwa ui haeseok* [The Interpretation of Cultures]. Translated by Okpyo Mun. Seoul: Kkachi.
- Koselleck, et al., eds. 2010. *Kojellek ui gaenyeomsa sajeon 1: munmyeong gwa munhwa* [Dictionary of Conceptual History of Koselleck 1: Civilization and Culture]. Translated by Samhwan An. Seoul: Pureun yeoksa.
- Nora, Pierre, et al. 2010. *Gieok ui jangso* [Realms of Memory]. 5 vols. Translated by Injung Kim, et al. Seoul: Nanam.
- White, Hayden. 1991. *Sipgu segi Yureop ui yeoksajeok sangsangnyeok: meta yeoksa* [Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe]. Translated by Hyeonggyun Cheon. Seoul: Moonji.

SIN Eunjae (peoplere@hanmail.net)

Dong-A University

Translated by Woo Jong PARK and Boram SEO