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The compilation of Kŭnyŏk sŏhwa sa 槿域書畫史 (History of Korean painting and calligraphy) by O Sech’ang 吳世昌 (1864–1953) in 1917 represents the first tangible achievement of a growing “national” and “independent” self-consciousness regarding Korean art history. When, in 1928, the manuscript was typeset and republished by the Kyemyo ˘ng kurakpu 啓明俱樂部 (Enlightenment Club) and widely distributed by Ch’oe Namsŏn 崔南善 (1890–1957) under the new title Kŭnyŏk sŏhwa ching 槿域書畫微 (Biographical records of Korean painters and calligraphers), it became the foundation for all future Korean art historical scholarship.1 This article aims to illuminate the art historical significance of this event through an investigation of the motivation for compiling Kŭnyŏk sŏhwa sa and for publishing Kŭnyŏk sŏhwa ching.2

Background

During the scholarly and cultural flourishing of King Sŏnjo’s reign 宣祖 (r. 1567–1608), connoisseurs began to develop a love of antique paintings and calligraphy. During the reign of King Yŏngjo 英祖 (r. 1724–1776), appreciation and study developed further; then the study of ancient documents and antiquities began in the nineteenth century.3 However, Korean historical remains began to be researched as “art objects” only as late as the 1890s.4 Art history as a field of modern study was introduced by the Japanese through the office of the Residency-General 統監府 (T’onggambu) during the late Enlightenment period 開化後期 (Kaehwa hugi, 1905–10).5

In the first half of the twentieth century, the Japanese Residency-General and Government-General 總督府 (Ch’ŏngdokpu) promoted research on historical places and the study of government manufacturing in Korea in an attempt to fundamentally recast traditional culture as a colonial culture and consolidate imperial Japanese rule. Research and debate over colonial Chosŏn’s (1910–45) traditional art history and theory proliferated in this context.6 Together with an upsurge in the study of Chosŏn antiquities, the Korean nationalist camp stimulated interest in traditional art with the intention of reviving research into indigenous culture. The project of constructing “art” and “beauty” was instigated at the national level, and the art of the past gained historical significance. The Yi Royal Family Museum (Iwangga pangmulgwan 李王家博物館) opened in May of 1909, and in June of that same year, Ôka Chikara 大岡力 (1863–1913), the head of the Kyŏngsŏng ilbo 京都日報 (Seoul Daily) newspaper, attempted to survey traditional Korean paintings according to a historical outlook that maintained a continuity between Korea’s past and the then-current colonial situation. Ayugai Husanosin of Han’guk yŏn’gu-hoe 韓國研究會 (Society for Researching Korea) further supplemented this endeavor by publishing, beginning in 1911, several introductory articles in catalogues such as Iwangga pangmulgwan sajinch’ôp 李王家博物館寫真帖 (Photo album of Royal Yi Family Museum).7

Encouraged by methods in historical scholarship practiced by Japanese researchers from government circles, An Hwak 安廓 (1886–1946) became the first scholar to undertake research from a nationalistic Korean perspective.8 In 1915, he published the essay “Chosŏn ūi misul (Chosŏn art)” in Hakchigwang 學之光 5 (May 1915), in which he laments the current state of Korean art history: “We have many creative artworks from the past, but nothing has been studied. As the inheritors of Chosŏn culture, it is so shameful and pitiful that only the Japanese are concerned with research and scholarship.” He further goads his readers into action: “Scholars, let’s summon the strength of our research abilities and make a great impact.” O Sech’ang would be one of the first scholars to respond to An’s call to arms.

O Sech’ang’s Biography and the Political Background of Kŭnyŏk sŏhwa sa

O Sech’ang (Fig. 1) was born on August 16, 1864, into the Haeju O 海州吳 clan, a family of interpreters who had accumulated a great amount of wealth in private
His father, O Kyŏngsŏk 吳慶錫 (1831–1879), was an active pioneer of Enlightenment ideology and a famous collector and connoisseur of painting and calligraphy. He visited Beijing thirteen times, and it was there that he associated with members of the progressive Yangwu 洋務 group, including Zhang Zhidong 張之洞 (1837–1909), who pursued prosperity and military power through the introduction of Western science and technology at the end of Qing period.

Preparing to inherit the family business, O Sech’ang passed the interpreting service examination in 1879. His subsequent work as a journalist at the newspaper Hansŏng chubo 漢城週報 (Hansŏng Weekly) and as secretary to the governor at the Chamber of Affairs for the State Militant (軍國機務處) brought him into the progressive government as an active proponent of the Enlightenment policy. After King Kojong 高宗 (r. 1863–1907) moved to the Russian Legation in 1896 and the Enlightenment party collapsed, O was recommended the next year to the foreign language school at Tokyo Commercial School as a Korean language teacher by the Japanese minister to Chosŏn. After a stay of only one year, O returned to Korea and began a course of concerted political activity as an assistant administrator of the Tongnip hyŏphoe 獨立協會 (Independence Club). In 1902, he returned to Japan when his association with Ilsimhoe 一心會, an organization of Korean officers from the Japanese military academy under Yu Kiljun who planned to overthrow the Kwangmu regime, was exposed. While living by “selling ink” in Japan, O Sech’ang met Son Pyŏnghŭi 孫秉熙 (1861–1922) the leader of Ch’ŏndogyo 天道教 (Religion of the Heavenly Way), and became a trusted member of his staff. Japan, fresh from victory in the Russo-Japanese War, established a Residency-General in Korea, and O Sech’ang returned there in 1906. After serving as a vice–assistant secretary at Chungch’uwŏn 中樞院 (Central Council) and in other roles, he became president of Mansebo 萬歲報 (Everlasting Newspaper) and Taehan minbo 大韓民報 (Korean People’s Newspaper) and vice president of the political party Taehan hyŏphoe 大韓協會 (Korean Association).

O used his influential positions to garner political power under the Residency-General, advocating Enlightenment values based on the organization of Ch’ŏndogyo. O Sech’ang’s political ambition came to an end when Korea was annexed by Japan in 1910. He signed the Declaration of Independence as a national representative of the March First Independence Movement, but this attempt at a political comeback failed. He then focused his attention on the study of painting and calligraphy and earned renown as a connoisseur. He distinguished himself by his passion for the arts and by employing a document-centered archaeological approach (the study of epigraphy and the antique) that he learned from his father, O Kyŏngsŏk, who, in turn, followed the scholarship of Kim Chŏnghŭi 金正喜 (1786–1856) and Yi Sangjŏk 李尙迪 (1804–1865). Perhaps his greatest contribution is to the field of cultural art theory that
emerged during the 1910s, which considered the development of painting and calligraphy as a driving force in the development of civilized society.13

The Conception of Kūnyŏk sŏhwasa and Its Structure

Kūnyŏk sŏhwasa (Fig. 2) is O Sech’ang’s most representative achievement during the Japanese occupation of Korea. At that time, historical documents relating to painting and calligraphy had not been properly compiled, and it must have been a considerable feat for him to arrange them comprehensively in chronological order. Cho Huiyong 趙熙龍 (1789–1866), one of the great literati artist/collectors of the nineteenth century, attempted to compile a book of biographies of painters and calligraphers similar to the Qing-period Biographical records of court painters 朝畵徵錄 (Guo chao hua zheng lu) by Zhang Geng 張庚 (1685–1750). However, Cho was eventually forced to give up because he found it difficult to verify the small amount of data that he was able to collect.14

O Sech’ang seems to have begun collecting the data for compiling Kūnyŏk sŏhwasa around 1910. O told Han Yongun 韓龍雲 (1879–1944)—who visited O’s house in Tonuidong, Seoul, in order to present his collection of paintings and calligraphy—in November of 1916 that he had been ardently collecting artworks for about seven years.15 According to O’s own memory, it seems to have been in the mid-1890s that he developed an interest in collecting painting and calligraphy following in the footsteps of his father, O Kyŏngsŏk.16 This timing corresponds to the difficult period after he stepped down from his official position during the collapse of the progressive party when King Kojong moved to the Russian Legation in 1896. It seems that his serious collecting efforts around this time were related to the compilation of Kūnyŏk sŏhwasa. This was a more focused undertaking than his earlier leisurely collecting following literati models like that of his father, who embraced the late-Chosŏn style of connoisseurship. As he stated in his introductory remarks, O Sech’ang “collected and compiled” various data “due to his deep regret at seeing their dispersion and disappearance.” It is clear, therefore, that he intended to gather and preserve historical facts and materials related to Korean heritage that might have disappeared during the country’s assimilation under the Japanese colonialism. This purpose seems to reflect a continuation of the patriotic historical consciousness of the late Enlightenment period, in which collecting and preserving the country’s historical inheritance were considered the foundation of national superiority and strength.17

O Sech’ang’s intention to this effect is made clear in his introduction: “The reason for compiling this book is to collect materials, not for discussing their merits and demerits.” Ch’oe Namsŏn also stressed this significant fact in his review of the book, stating that it “strove to search out buried materials, which prove the artistic worth of Chosŏn but have been concealed, preserving the artistic foundation of Chosŏn.”18

However, O Sech’ang did not consider Kūnyŏk sŏhwasa simply a sourcebook for collecting and preserving documents related to painting and calligraphy. As he stated in the very first line of his introductory remarks: “This book was compiled as a genealogy, recording the names and achievements of Korean painters and calligraphers.”19 A genealogy, with its emphasis on lineage, presupposes that information regarding a person’s family line and their activities in traditional society, in which personal lineage is more important than any external references, is the basis of all other knowledge. Kūnyŏk sŏhwasa was compiled with similar consciousness of a Korean family of artists. This genealogical consciousness is projected in the contents of O’s preface, with a title translated as “Earnest Will,” written in the spring of 1917.20

Every painting and calligraphy invaluably counts toward the complete technical creation of all things, the revelation of the secret of original vitality, the promotion of civilization, and all last eternally. Such examples of painting and calligraphy have continued for generations and eventually evolved into a single realm in which they share similar characteristics. Our earlier painters and calligraphers in Korea developed in such close interconnectivity and familiarity with each other that they can be considered as members of one family.21
O Sech'ang continued, “Therefore, I compiled a record of artists from Solgō to close companions in the current time to enable historical investigation without evaluating their quality and grade.”

By stating, “without evaluating their quality and grade,” O emphasized that he compiled his history from a perspective different from those of other painting books that judged artists’ merits and demerits. That is, he followed a genealogical model, recording the pedigree and achievement of Korean painters and calligraphers from Solgō, the progenitor, to the contemporary.

A genealogy ultimately supports the solidarity and prosperity of a family by promoting its long history and the achievements of its ancestors and by reinforcing a genealogical consciousness. O Sech’ang compiled his history from a perspective different from those of other painting books that judged artists’ merits and demerits. That is, he followed a genealogical model, recording the pedigree and achievement of Korean painters and calligraphers from Solgō, the progenitor, to the contemporary.

The compilation of Kūnyōk sōhua sa in the early 1910s was linked to promoting the training of contemporary painters and calligraphers through the Sōhwa misulhoe (Arts Society of Painting and Calligraphy), of which O was a member. O had not joined the preceding organization, Kyōngsōng sōhwa misulwŏn (Seoul Arts Institute of Painting and Calligraphy), when it was established on March 22, 1911, as a club for members who shared a similar taste in painting and calligraphy. However, he joined the board when it was reorganized for training young painters and calligraphers under the name Sōhwa misulhoe on June 1, 1912, by An Chungsik 安中植 (1861–1919), Cho Sŏkchin 趙錫晉 (1853–1920), and Kim Úngwŏn 金應元 (1855–1921). O also presented his own works of painting and calligraphy as well as his collection of old paintings and calligraphy at the First Anniversary Exhibition of the group’s reorganization on June 1, 1913. In addition, he was one of the founding members of Sōhwa hyŏphoe (Society of Painting and Calligraphy), which was inaugurated on June 18, 1918, as the first independent organization of Korean painters and calligraphers without the support of the colonial government.

Kūnyōk sōhua sa was compiled and arranged into three manuscript volumes in the spring of 1917. It included a total of 1117 persons: 392 calligraphers, 576 painters, and 149 painter-calligraphers dating from Solgō 率居 of the Silla period (57 BCE–935 CE) to Na Suyŏn 羅壽淵 (1861–1926) of the early modern era (Fig. 3). The tradition of beginning a history of painters and calligraphers with Solgō was started by Yi Ku űngik 李肯翊 (1736–1806) in Munyejŏn’go hwaga (Models of cultural production and artists), the special volume of Yo˘llyo˘sil kisul (Descrip-
record of the painters and calligraphers of Liang Qi), Wulin shu hua xiao zhuanshù 林書畫小傳 (Collection of the painters and calligraphers of Wulin), or Lingnan hua zheng lue Lingnan画征錄 (Biographical record of Ling-nan painters) of the Qing period and Fusō Gajinden 扶桑畫人傳 (Biographies of Japanese painters), or Fusō meigaden 扶桑名畫傳 (Collection of famous Japanese paintings) of Japan.

O Sech’ang collected and verified a wide range of materials from more than 270 kinds of books and documents in and outside of Korea, including various genealogies and ancient documents, epitaphs, titles, signatures and seals on paintings and calligraphies, and interviews in order to compile Kūnyōk sōhwa sa. Through his own experience of collecting and appreciating the artworks of earlier generations, he discovered and recorded eighty-six artists who had not been otherwise documented, and, in the case of thirty-four artists, he made brief annotations to supplement the historical records. In principle, however, he cited the sources of the data he collected and reproduced the original writing as it was. This method follows in the spirit of suribujak (延而不作) in the Analects of Confucius, that is, to transcribe an inherited story rather than create a narrative oneself; and the nuimingbulsin (無徵不信) approach of not trusting sources without evidence, as stressed in the positivist historical studies of antiquity from the late Chosŏn period. It is closely related to the approach of Yi Kŭngik, one of three famous late-Chosŏn historians who argued for the assembling of historical data in order to avoid subjective explanations. This also corresponds to the spirit of suribujak, meaning to record as previously recorded in order to transmit historical facts correctly and pass them down without creating new content.

Although it refers back to the biographical records of painters and calligraphers as well as historical records of China and Japan, Kūnyōk sōhwa sa organizes artists by period rather than categories of faction, class, or region. The chronology is divided into five parts: Unified Silla, Koryŏ, Early Chosŏn, Middle Chosŏn, and Late Chosŏn. Of particular interest is the division of the Chosŏn period into three parts, the first attempt by an art historian to undertake such a system of periodization. O Sech’ang identifies 221 artists born between the reigns of King T’aejo 太祖 (r. 1392–1398) and King Injong 仁宗 (r. 1544–1553) as being from the Early Chosŏn period, 279 artists from the Middle Chosŏn period (King Myŏngjong 明宗 [r. 1545–1567] to King Hyŏnjong 孝宗 [r. 1659–1674]), and 371 artists from the Late Chosŏn period (King Sukchong 肅宗 [r. 1674–1720] to King Chŏlchong 誠宗 [r. 1849–1863]). The unequal number of artists in each period indicates that the division was not merely for convenience. While he does not mention the criteria he used to undertake the periodization, it is highly likely that he formulated the periods according to stylistic variations he identified while examining the artworks and documents. The system of dividing Chosŏn painting into three periods, marked by the reigns of King Myŏngjong in the mid-sixteenth century and King Sukchong in the late seventeenth century, is still employed today, as in Yi Tongju’s 1972 Han’guk boeuba sosa 韓國繪畫小史 (Short history of Korean painting), the first introductory book on painting history in Korea. Moreover, O Sech’ang’s book also articulated the idea of a national aspect to painting and calligraphy. In his article on Chŏng Sŏn, he states that “[Chŏng] excelled in landscape, particularly in his true-scenery (or ‘true-view,’ chin’gyŏng 真景)27 paintings, which became a distinct school within Korean landscape painting.” This emphasis on Chŏng Sŏn’s true-scenery landscapes as the origin of Korean landscape painting is different from the evaluation by Chŏng’s contemporary Yi Hagon 李夏坤 (1677–1724), who praises Chŏng’s autodidactic training and his ability to create “a new world by cleansing the bad customs” of painting in imitation of ancient styles that had plagued Chosŏn art. The early-twentieth-century artist Ko Hŭidong 高義東 (1886–1965) likewise celebrated Chŏng’s true-scenery painting, but as the origin of “landscape sketching” that led to a new kind of objective realism in modern art, without ascribing a national character to Chŏng’s work.28 O Sech’ang’s desire to revive painting and calligraphy as a national art reflects a broader trend in this period toward patriotic enlightenment and the spiritual awakening of Korea. In 1908 in the magazine Taehan hyŏphoe boebo 大韓協會會報, O praised the calligrapher Han Ho together with Chŏng Sŏn as two historical figures who saved the country from crisis and enhanced national culture, and so should be regarded as role models for youth of the time.29

In relation to his own painting, O says in the Kūnyōk sōhwa sa’s preface, “It is deplorable that [now] we cannot follow the way that earlier painters and calligraphers paved.” This indicates it is likely that O compiled Kūnyōk sōhwa sa in the hope that traditional painting and calligraphy would continue to flourish among a new generation of practitioners. As opposed to Vasari’s Lives of the Artists, which formed the basis for the study of European modern art history and urged modern artists to achieve renown by overcoming the anonymity of medieval artists, O’s Kūnyōk sōhwa sa sought solidarity with past artists and the revival of painting and calligraphy as a national art. This attitude emerged from a
genealogical consciousness that urged modern painters and calligraphers to carry on the legacy of a lineage of painters and calligraphers dating back to the ancient period. O’s desire to promote the continuity with the past and restore this spirit to national art is linked to the emergence of a new sense of heritage and traditionalism that sought out past sources in order to recreate a modern, national art. This trend is significant in that it regarded old paintings and calligraphy not as remnants of a feudal elitist culture to be passed over but as a valuable inheritance necessary to the success of a contemporary national culture. As O wrote at the end of the preface, he endeavored to compose the book like a “scripture which lists the names of the thousand buddhas.” At the very beginning he announces his intention that the book will be as useful as a Buddhist scripture that comprehensively includes all the names of the buddhas of the past, the present, and the future, and his hope that it should be as pervasive as the idea of the thousand buddhas.

The Publication of *Kûnyŏk sŏhwa ching*  

*Kûnyŏk sŏhwa sa*, which was completed in the spring of 1917, was produced as twin serials, entitled “Sŏjing” 書徵 (Biographical records of calligraphers) and “Hwa-jing” 萬徵 (Biographical records of painters), in the first issue of Sŏhua hyŏphoebŏ 書畫協會報 (*Journal of the Society of Painting and Calligraphy*), published in October 1921. However, the journal was discontinued after the second issue and O’s work was not widely distributed. It was Ch’oe Namsŏn who suggested that O publish *Kûnyŏk sŏhwa sa*, which still was in manuscript form, as a printed book. Ch’oe Namsŏn, who drew his historical awareness from the patriotic Enlightenment movement, established Chosŏn kwangmunhoe 朝鮮光文會 (*Society of Korean Enlightenment Literature*) in December 1912, right after the Japanese annexation of Korea, in order to preserve ancient writings and culture, and to publish books such as Tongguk t’onggam 東國通鑑 (*A comprehensive mirror of the Eastern Kingdom*) and Yŏlha ilgi 熱河日記 (*Jehol diary*). This group of intellectuals, who attempted to organize a modern nation-state during the late Enlightenment period, lost their effectiveness when the country was made into a colony. As a result, they changed their mandate from attempting to affect material civilization to promoting cultural civilization. In line with this new direction that prioritized the mental faculties, they emphasized competence training and did their best to clarify ancient culture through Sirhak 實學 (*Practical Learning*) ideas related to the “modern” period. Therefore, art, including painting and calligraphy, began to be recognized as an expression of “beauty” that was in itself valuable for the mental faculties and an essential aspect of culture.

Ch’oe Namsŏn founded Kyemyŏng kurakpu in 1918 with Pak Sungbin 朴勝彬 (1880–1943) and Yi Nŭnghwa 李能和 (1869–1943) on the ideals of the cultural Enlightenment, with a special emphasis on ethnic enlightenment and improvement through academic and cultural research. From around 1927, Ch’oe Namsŏn was a leading figure in this group that was variously known as Kyemyŏng kurakpu or Kyemyŏngsa 啓明社 (*Enlightenment Company*), and he stated his intention to publish *Kûnyŏk sŏhwa sa* when he became in charge of the editorial board. Under the auspices of this club, *Kûnyŏk sŏhwa sa* was renamed *Kûnyŏk sŏhwa ching*, supplemented, typeset, and published on May 5, 1928. Twenty-six days later, on May 31, the newspaper Tonga ilbo 東亞日報 (*Tonga Daily*) published another edition of *Kûnyŏk sŏhwa ching*, this time edited by Kyemyŏng kurakpu. This edition included a supplement to O Se’chang’s edition of June 2 in the same newspaper, introducing the active publication, academic, and cultural research activities undertaken by Kyemyŏng kurakpu at that time.

Ch’oe discusses *Kûnyŏk sŏhwa ching* in a three-part book review published in *Tonga ilbo* from December 17 to 19 in 1928. He wrote from the perspective of the cultural arts: “As the apex of all culture, art is very significant in the development of a people, a society, and a history, and it is an accurate cultural barometer of the advancement of the people and the time.” Ch’oe also claimed that aesthetic and historical illumination was essential in order to prove that Korea was a nation of enduring culture and art. For him, *Kûnyŏk sŏhwa ching* was the very book that could “illuminate the artistic aspect of Korea” in accordance with his essential plea that “we must know Korea at this time.” Ch’oe continued by insisting that O’s book “has great significance to the whole realm of culture and history in Korea.”

This review by Ch’oe Namsŏn reveals his great personal effort to publish *Kûnyŏk sŏhwa ching* despite difficulties in editing, proofreading, and printing. In other words, while *Kûnyŏk sŏhwa sa* was compiled to promote the thriving of painting and calligraphy traditions within a single genealogical record, *Kûnyŏk sŏhwa ching* was published to serve the decidedly nationalistic purpose of documenting and validating Korea’s long cultural tradition during the period of Japanese occupation. The reason for the change in title from *sa* (history) to *ching* (biographical records) for the republication alludes to the contemporary idea that history follows an evolutionary path in consequential sequence. More than simply a collection of cultural records, *Kûnyŏk sŏhwa ching*
represented a cultural history of the nation of Korea, at a
time when the Japanese occupying forces were attempting
to assimilate Korean history into their own.

In sum, while O Sech’ang’s Kūnyŏk sŏhwasa sa was
compiled within a genealogical tradition for the continued
flourishing of painting and calligraphy as national arts,
Ch’oe Namsŏn’s publication in 1928 was intended as a
sort of sourcebook or biographical dictionary, from a
culturally traditionalist perspective, in the hope of establish-
ing a modern national cultural history (art history)
for studies on Korea. Ch’oe promoted Korean national
art history not as a natural bloodline connected to the
past but as the basis for a greater project of Korean
studies. Such efforts, he hoped, would speak to an in-
dependent national cultural and historical identity, an
internal consolidation and continuity that could be
recognized within the greater history of world cultures.
Kūnyŏk sŏhwasa ching, which was published because of
Ch’oe’s intention to investigate and define the identity
of the cultural and historical community, provides an
important record, invaluable to the study of Korean
painting history even up to the present day.
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