MING LOYALIST FAMILIES AND THE CHANGING MEANINGS OF CHOJONG’AM IN EARLY NINETEENTH-CENTURY CHOSŎN

By HAN SEUNGHYUN

The descendants of Ming loyalists who had migrated to Chosŏn with Prince Pongnim in 1645 were an integral part of the Ming loyalist ideology advocated by the Chosŏn court during the eighteenth century. The significance of their presence in Chosŏn, however, waned with the weakening of this ideology and the rise of Northern Learning in the nineteenth century. Under these adverse circumstances, the Ming loyalist families in the early nineteenth century employed various strategies to re-emphasize Ming loyalism and consolidate their Ming loyalist identity; an initiative they viewed as critical in justifying their presence in Chosŏn society. This article traces the variety of these identity-reinforcing efforts by the Ming loyalist families, ranging from shrine-building and compilation efforts to intermarriage. It focuses on the ritual structures built in Chojong’am by these descendants and analyzes how the symbols of Ming loyalism embedded in this place by the Chosŏn literati in the seventeenth century were manipulated by Ming descendants in the early nineteenth century. Through these initiatives, the descendants asserted a new version of Ming loyalism that not only potentially undermined the claims of the Chosŏn court/literati to be the inheritors of Ming culture but strengthened the symbolic significance of the Ming loyalist families. This study illuminates this implicit tension and disjuncture between the positions of the two parties, which is significant for understanding developments, rather than seeing the Ming loyalists’ activities as an outcome of ongoing cooperative interactions between the Chosŏn court and the Ming families nourished during the eighteenth century.
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This article traces shifting meanings of Chojong’am 朝宗巖 (rocks of Chojong) in Chosŏn’s Ming loyalism, an ideological trend that not only invoked Chosŏn’s indebtedness to the Ming dynasty but also defined Chosŏn as the legitimate inheritor of Ming culture, during the late Chosŏn period. More specifically, it reveals how symbols of Ming loyalism were superscribed on the rocks of Chojong by Chosŏn literati in the seventeenth century and how those instilled meanings were subsequently manipulated by the remaining Ming subjects in the early nineteenth century to assert a new version of Ming loyalism that not only made a significant departure from the position of the Chosŏn court and the literati, but which strengthened the significance of the Ming loyalist families residing in Chosŏn at that time.

It was onto the Chojong rocks, located in Kap’yŏng County in Kyŏnggi Province, that the calligraphies of Chongzhen (r. 1628–44, the last Ming emperor), King Sŏnjo (r. 1567–1608), and Song Siyŏl 宋時烈 (1607–89) were engraved in the late seventeenth century. Chojong’am began as an obscure place, but the symbols transmitted by the engravings eventually gave the place a certain status as an embodiment of Ming loyalism during the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries, along with Mandongmyo 萬東廟 (Shrine to the Ming) and Taebodan 大報壇 (Altar of Great Gratitude) established during the eighteenth century. It
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2 David A. Mason, “The Sam Hwangje Paehyang (Sacrificial Ceremony for Three Emperors): Korea’s Link to the Ming Dynasty,” Korea Journal 31, no. 3 (1991): 124. According to Richard E. Strassberg, rock engraving was a way to perpetuate the engraver’s otherwise fleeting experience and assert the significance of a place. The inscribed landscape “altered the scene by shaping the perceptions of later travelers and guiding those who sought to follow in the footsteps of earlier talents.” See Richard E. Strassberg, Inscribed Landscapes: Travel Writing from Imperial China (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 5–6.

would be fair to say that Chojong’am never enjoyed a reputation and court patronage comparable to that of Taebodan or Mandongmyo during the late Chosŏn period. Around the beginning of the nineteenth century, however, the place was symbolically integrated into the orthodox Ming loyalty espoused by the court when it was included in a section of the *Collected Texts on Honoring the Zhou* (*Chonju hwip’yŏn* 尊周彙編), a court-sponsored compilation that began in 1796 and was completed around 1825, which collected together materials relating to Ming loyalty.⁴

Chojong’am took on a new meaning in 1831, when Wang Tŏgil 王德一 (1779–1854) and Wang Tŏkku 王德九 (1788–1863) built two altars known as “A Temporary Temple of the Great Legitimacy” (Taet’ong haengmyo 大統行廟) and “A Temporary Shrine for Nine Righteous Ancestors” (Kuŭi haengsa 九義行祠).⁵ Wang Tŏgil and Tŏkku were descendants of a member of *kuŭisa* 九義士 (Nine righteous literati), the nine loyal subjects of the fallen Ming dynasty who had migrated to Chosŏn accompanying Prince Pongnim 鳳林大君 (later Hyojong) when he was released from forced captivity in Shenyang 濱陽, Manchuria, in 1645. Taet’ong haengmyo was erected to worship Ming Taizu 明太祖, the founding emperor of the Ming, while Kuŭi haengsa venerated the nine Ming loyalists (*kuŭisa*).

Given that Chosŏn already had sacred places symbolizing Ming loyalty, that is, Taebodan and Mandongmyo, why was there a need to build another ritual structure of a similar nature? Why was the project initiated by Ming refugees and at that particular time? How were the meanings embedded in Chojong’am transformed with the establishment of these altars? What was the symbolic significance of Ming Taizu, who was chosen as the object of their cult?

During the eighteenth century, Yongjo (r. 1724–76) and Chŏngjo (r. 1776–1800) actively patronized and inducted Ming refugee subjects into official posts related to the military and rituals in an effort to display Ming loyalty.⁶ The vigor of Ming loyalty in and out of the court, however, diminished after the demise

---


of Chŏngjo, as the rulers of the nineteenth century were not as committed as their predecessors had been to promote Ming loyalism. The once rigorous Sino-barbarian dichotomy (hwa-i ron 華夷論) gradually dissolved and a new intellectual stance more accommodating toward the Qing increasingly gathered momentum. The Ming loyalist families whose elevated status was ideologically underpinned by Ming loyalism during the eighteenth century were adversely affected by this changing tide. 

This article examines how Ming loyalist families responded to the challenges arising in relation to the court’s treatment of them, and the shifting paradigm in the Sino-barbarian dichotomy, through investigating various strategies the Ming families adopted to re-emphasize Ming loyalism and to underline the significance of their presence in Chosŏn society. This article then focuses on how new ritual structures and rites introduced by some descendants of kuŭisa in 1831 transformed the existing meanings imbued in Chojong’am, and how Ming family descendants appropriated these new meanings to carve out an independent, legitimate ritual niche and to assert an exalted symbolic status for the Ming loyalist families. Before discussing these issues, a brief sketch of the process through which Chojong’am came to be reckoned as a site of Ming loyalism is in order.

CHOJONG’AM AND ITS PLACE IN CHOSŎN’S MING LOYALIST IDEOLOGY

Chojong’am took its appellation from the old name of the county in which it was located, Chojonghyŏn 朝宗縣. Chojongch’ŏn 朝宗川 designated a local stream that flows nearby, running west to east, unlike most of the other rivers in Korea that flow in the opposite direction but similar to rivers in China that generally flow toward the east. The name Chojong has symbolic significance because, as a term, it conveys the meaning of rulers of various tributary states honoring the emperor of China.

Although the name of the stream was coincidental, that name generated a sympathetic interest among those in Chosŏn society who wanted to inscribe an ideological meaning onto the natural landscape and stress a Ming loyalist ideology. 


After the demise of the Ming and the domination of China by the “barbarian” Manchus in 1644, Chosŏn officials and scholars redefined the status of Chosŏn in the world of Confucian civilization, placing Chosŏn at the center of that world as the legitimate inheritor of Ming culture. Under these circumstances, a coterie of intellectuals, Hŏ Kyŏk 許格 (1607–91), Yi Chedu 李齊杜 (1626–87), and Paek Haemyŏng 白海明 (?–?), embarked on a project in 1684 to transform Chojong’am into a site redolent with Ming loyalism. Our knowledge of Hŏ, Yi, and Paek is based less on contemporary sources than on court and private documents produced generations after their deaths, as a renewed interest in these three figures and in Chojong’am, under the influence of Ming loyalism, prompted the inclusion of their biographical entries into official and private sources from the late eighteenth century. These sources describe Hŏ Kyŏk as a scholar who planned to raise a private army to confront invading Manchu forces in 1637. Dismayed by the sudden capitulation of the Yi royal house, he retired to a mountain and remained a recluse before participating in the Chojong’am project. Yi Chedu was the prefect of Kap’yŏng in 1684. Earlier in his career, he had so despained at the news of King Injo’s (r. 1623–49) surrender to the Manchus in 1637 that he had almost abandoned his examination preparation.

Paek Haemyŏng, the son of a local magistrate and a scholar who never passed the official examination, came originally from Suwŏn 水原 and retired to a hermitage
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10 A later source claims that Hŏ Kyŏk chose this site for his engravings when inspired by the meaning of the place name Chojong, See Yun Haengim (1762–1801), “Haedong oesa” 海東外史 (An unofficial history of Korea), in Sŏkchaego 9:8b.

11 Biographies of these three figures can be found in the following sources. Chonju hwip’yŏn 15:724–26; Kim Chonghu (1721–80), “Ch’anghae ch’ŏsa Hŏgong haengjang” 滄海處士許公行狀 (A biography of Hŏ Kyŏk, a recluse scholar), Pon’amjip 10:30a-33b; Yun Haengim, “Haedong oesa,” Sŏkchaego 9:8ab; Sŏng Haeŭng (1760–1839), “Ilmin chŏn” 逸民傳 (Biographies of eremitic subjects), Yŏng’gyoju cheongju 53:52ab; Kim P’yŏngmuk (1819–91), “Chojong’am samhyŏn chŏn” 朝宗巖三賢傳 (Biographies of the three wise ones at Chojong’am), Chung’amjip 52:39a-42b; Song Nachū (1791–1867), “Ch’ungdam Yi sŏnsaeng haengjang” 忠澤李先生行狀 (A biography of Yi Chedu), Kŭmgok sŏnsaeng munjip 18:21a-31b.

12 Yŏngjo sillok 40:22b [1735-3-27]; Sŏng Haeŭng, Yŏng’gyoju cheongju (Complete literary collection of Sŏng Haeŭng) 53:52ab.

13 A posthumous honorary official title was bestowed on Hŏ Kyŏk by Yŏngjo in 1735. See Yŏngjo sillok 40:22b [1735-3-27].

14 Song Nachū, Kŭmgok sŏnsaeng munjip 18:23a. Yi Chedu’s participation in the Chojong’am engraving project was reported to Sukchong by Yi’s son in 1708. Sukchong sillok 46:1b [1708-1-5].
in Kap’yŏng when he heard the news of the fall of the Ming dynasty.\(^\text{15}\)

The transformation of Chojong’am into a place of Ming loyalism began in 1684 when Hŏ, together with Yi and Paek, engraved a rock there with the three-character phrase “sa mu sa” 思無邪 (Have no depraved thoughts), the calligraphy of the Chongzhen emperor.\(^\text{16}\) This calligraphy had been procured by Kim Sanghŏn 金尚憲 (1570–1652), a vigorous proponent of aggressive policies toward the Manchus, in Shenyang when he was forcibly detained there in the wake of the 1636–37 Manchu invasion of Korea.

The rock engraving of Chongzhen’s calligraphy had a precedent in Chosŏn history. In 1669, Min Chŏngjung 閔鼎重, a disciple of Song Siyŏl, obtained a calligraphy of Chongzhen in Beijing during his mission to China as an envoy. Song had these words, reading “pirye pudong” 非禮不動 (Do not move unless it conforms to proper rituals), carved on a rock in Hwayangdong 華陽洞, his hometown in Ch’ungch’ŏng Province. Song later built a structure called Hwanjangam 燦章菴 (A hermitage of resplendent culture) near the carved rock around 1674, which housed the original copy of the imperial calligraphy and symbolized the elevated status of Chosŏn as the only place where the essence of Ming culture was preserved.\(^\text{17}\) The engraving efforts by Hŏ, Yi, and Paek in 1684 might have been motivated by this event a decade earlier, but boasted a scale and variety exceeding the effort in Hwayangdong.\(^\text{18}\)

Below the carving “sa mu sa,” a calligraphy of Sŏnjo was inscribed, reading “manjŏl p’il tong” 萬折必東. The phrase originated from Sŏnjo’s memorial to the Wanli emperor (r. 1572–1620) and signified that, just as the “Yellow River would necessarily flow east despite numerous curves,” the loyalty of Chosŏn kings toward the Ming emperors would not wane despite any obstacles. “Chaejo pŏnbang” 再造藩邦 (Remaking of a tributary state), another calligraphy of Sŏnjo, was also inscribed there, which was copied from a plaque hung in the Sŏnmusa 宣武祠 (Shrine for displaying martial prowess) erected in 1599 to commemorate Supreme Commander Xing Jie 邢玠, who, with Ming troops, had come to the aid of Korea

\(^{15}\) Kim P’yŏngmuk, Chung’amnip (Literary collection of Kim P’yŏngmuk) 52:41b.

\(^{16}\) For an overview of the engravings in Chojong’am and the three figures who initiated this effort, See O Yŏngsŏp, “Wijŏng ch’ŏksa ŭi sangjingmul Chojong’am” (Chojong’am, the symbol of “Defend orthodoxy, reject heterodoxy” thought), T’aedong kojŏn yŏn’gu 11 (1994): 70–76; Sun Weiguo, Daming qihao yu xiaozhonghua yishi: Chaoxian wangchao zunzhou sixiang wenti yanjiu (1637–1800) (Banner of the Great Ming and the Small-China Consciousness: A study of Chosŏn’s ideology of honoring the Zhou) (Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2007), 202–07.

\(^{17}\) U, Chosŏn Chungbwa chun’i, 77.

\(^{18}\) Shi Shaoying, “Lun Chaoxian shilin yu Chaozongyan siming wenhua de guanxi” (A study on the relationship between Chosŏn literati and Chojong’am culture), Han Chung immunhak yŏn’gu 41 (2013): 311.
during the Imjin War (1592–98). Along with these inscribed words, Hŏ, Yi, and Paek also engraved the words “ilmu towŏn chi’ong chaesim” (The road is still long ahead of us, but the sun is about to set. Extreme agony lies in my mind.), which originated from King Hyojong (r. 1649–59). The phrase referred to the king’s frustration in not being able to seek revenge on the Manchus who were seen as having deeply humiliated Korea during the two invasions of 1627 and 1636.

Below the engraved rocks, Hŏ Kyŏk and Yi Chedu built an altar (tan) for sacrifices to Chongzhen. Their original plan had been to construct a temple (nyo) to venerate the Wanli emperor, and they had conveyed their intention to Song Siyŏl. On hearing of the plan, Song urged that sacrifice to Chongzhen also be initiated, suggesting co-worship of the two emperors. Ultimately, a temple was
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20 Taebodansa yŏnsŏl (Discussions of matters concerning Taebodan during royal lectures), 10b-11a; Chonju hwip’yŏn 8:150; Wang Sugyŏl, “Chojong’am kosil nyŏnp’yo” (A chronological table of the stories related to Chojong’am), in Kim Yŏngnok, ed., Chojong’am chi kwŏn sang (Not paginated). Song Siyŏl’s literary collection includes a letter to Yi Chedu. It acknowledges Chojong’am’s place in Ming loyalist ideology but makes no reference to the temple-building initiative in Chojong’am. See Song Siyŏl, “Tap Yi Han’gyŏng” (A reply to Yi Chedu), Songja taejŏn soksihyŏn 1:20b-21a. Taebodansa yŏnsŏl is a court-compilation recording the discussions that took place between Sukchong and his ministers during royal lectures from 1704 to 1705 regarding the establishment of Taebodan and its rituals. The description of the activities related to Chojong’am during the eighteenth and the early nineteenth centuries in this section draws from “Chojong’am kosil nyŏnp’yo” written in the late nineteenth century, unless otherwise noted. As discussed further below, Wang Sugyŏl (1814–?), Taebodan Guard in 1841) was a son of
never built, but an altar was set up as an alternative. On the nineteenth day of the third lunar month every year, on the anniversary of Chongzhen’s death, the three men would gather and head north, wailing, burning incense, and performing rites for the deceased emperor.

The efforts to build a temple for the Ming emperors in Chojong’am bore no fruit at that time, but the initiative was then taken up by disciples of Song Siyŏl and by the court. In 1704, to honor Song’s last wishes on his death in 1689, Song’s students completed the construction of Mandongmyo in Hwayangdong to venerate Wanli and Chongzhen. In the same year, when the Chosŏn court established Taebodan in the palace courtyard to offer sacrifices to Wanli, the precedent set in Chojong’am was reported to King Sukchong (r. 1674–1720) in support of the court action. Many sources have highlighted that the idea to construct Mandongmyo was inspired by the earlier efforts in Chojong’am.

The establishment of Mandongmyo in 1704, however, heralded a reduced status for Chojong’am as a site of Ming loyalism. With the ascendant dominance of the Noron (Patriarch) faction at court during the eighteenth century, Mandongmyo, along with the Hwayang Academy nearby that venerated Song Siyŏl, a spiritual leader of the Noron faction, came to enjoy an enhanced reputation and influence among scholar-officials throughout the late Chosŏn.
period, before its abolition by Taewŏn’gun in 1865. Recognizing its status, the court also continuously patronized Mandongmyo with sacrificial lands, slaves, and even a symbol of royal recognition—a plaque carved with the royal calligraphy of the temple name.

While Chojong’am experienced limited court patronage, it still drew support from some local officials and scholars recognizing the significance of the place. In 1744, a Kap’yŏng County scholar requested to the local authority that the court should re-carve the engravings in Chojong’am to ensure their better preservation. Forty years later in 1784, Hwang Sŭngwŏn 黃昇源 (1732–1807), then Kap’yŏng prefect, erected a small building known as “a hermitage at Chojong” (Chojong’am 朝宗庵) across from the Chojong’am rocks, to provide a place of remembrance for the fallen Ming dynasty.

From the late eighteenth century, Chojong’am finally began to benefit from specific court initiatives. In 1796, Chŏngjo ordered the filling of Chojong’am engravings with red ink to enhance their visibility. In 1804, a group of Kap’yŏng scholars set up a stone stele in Chojong’am to commemorate the importance of the site, which attracted the participation of court luminaries such as Cho Chin’gwan 趙鎮寬 (1739–1808), Kim Talsun 金達淳 (1760–1806), and Sŏ Maesu 徐邁修 (1731–1818) as writers and calligraphers of the stele inscription. The status of Chojong’am was further recognized by the court in the early nineteenth century through the court’s decision to include Chojong’am in the Chonju hwip’yŏn (appended to the section on Hwayangdong).

From this point onward, however, there is no evidence to indicate that Chojong’am received any further support, either material or symbolic, from the court. Rather, interest in Chojong’am was now expressed by private individuals, such as Yi Hangno 李恒老 (1792–1868), a renowned scholar and a fervent advocate of the strict Sino-barbarian distinction. Along with his students, Yi visited Chojong’am in 1824 to appreciate the engravings. He intended to build a pavilion there and even prepared a small house later in a nearby village to move into, but these plans remained unfulfilled.

From this brief description of the history of Chojong’am, two considerations

27 He was a cousin of Hwang Kyŏngwŏn 黃景源 (1709–87), a high court official and the author of Ming loyalist works such as Nammyŏngsŏ 南明書 (History of the Southern Ming) and Myŏngjo paesinjŏn 明朝陪臣傳 (Biography of the Minister’s Ministers of the Ming Dynasty).
emerge as noteworthy. First, together with Taebodan and Mandongmyo, Chojong’am was a site replete with symbols of Ming loyalism that invoked the centrality of Chosŏn as the successor of the Ming civilization. Second, Ming loyalist ritual sites in Chosŏn had close connections with Wănli and Chongzhen. Both Chojong’am and Mandongmyo were intimately intertwined with the memories of Wănli and Chongzhen, since sacrificial rites had been planned, if not all realized, for these two emperors there. In 1704, Taebodan had also been initiated as a site to mark the cult of Wănli, and earlier in that year, Sukchong had offered a sacrifice to Chongzhen. 28 It was not until 1749, when Yŏngjo added Hongwu (Ming Taizu) along with Chongzhen to the Taebodan altar, that a Ming emperor other than Wănli and Chongzhen could finally claim a connection to a Ming loyalist ritual place in Chosŏn.

COURT POLICIES TOWARD MING LOYALIST FAMILIES AND THE CHANGING INTELLECTUAL MILIEU

Before turning to examine how the symbols embedded in Chojong’am were appropriated by Ming loyalist family members in the early nineteenth century, an examination of the social and intellectual conditions under which those families lived is first required. Existing research on the cultural politics pursued during the reigns of Yŏngjo and Chŏngjo indicates the favorable treatment of Ming Chinese conferred by these two kings as part of their larger agenda to encourage Ming loyalism. 29 Yŏngjo, for example, established a special examination called ch’ungnyang kwa 忠良科 (Examination for the loyal and the wise) in 1764 for the descendants of martyred Chosŏn ministers and the “imperial subjects” (hwangjoin 皇朝人, Ming subjects). 30 Yŏngjo and Chŏngjo inducted some Ming Chinese descendants into lower government posts, largely those related to the military and to sacrifices to Ming emperors. 31 Later, in 1790, Chŏngjo created a special military unit called the Chinese Brigade (hallyŏ 漢旅), consisting of the descendants of

29 On the favorable treatment of Ming loyalist families during the reigns of kings Yŏngjo and Chŏngjo, see Sun, Daming qihao, 213–25.
30 For more information on the creation of the category of “imperial subjects” in the 1750s, see Adam Bohnet. “Migrant and Border Subjects in Late Chosŏn Korea” (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 2008), 182–201; U, Chosŏn Chunghwa chuŭi, 119–20. For information on the different treatment of Ming Chinese and other foreigners by the Chosŏn court, see Han Kyung-koo, “The Archaeology of the Ethnically Homogeneous Nation-State and Multiculturalism in Korea,” Korea Journal 47, no. 4 (2007): 19–20.
Han: Ming Loyalist Families

Ming Chinese had been included in a military unit known as Hanin abyŏng (Chinese royal guard) since the days of Hyojong to provide them with a means to support themselves. Their status, however, had deteriorated to a miserable level by the time of Chŏngjo’s reign. The newly created Chinese Brigade was intended to exalt their status and rescue them from their severely reduced circumstances. Provision was also made to select three men from members of the Chinese Brigade to serve as more prestigious Taebodan Guards (Taebodan sujikkwan 大報壇守直官).

These policies beneficial to the Ming Chinese were comprehensively documented not only in court records but also in the private writings of Ming loyalist families such as the Sangaenggong nyŏnbo 庫生公年譜 (A chronicle of our licentiate ancestor). There are two versions of Sangaenggong nyŏnbo, one by Wang Tŏgil compiled around 1822 and the other by P’ung Hŏnjo 馮憲祖 compiled in 1834. Wang Tŏgil and P’ung Hŏnjo were fifth-generation descendants of Wang Yiwen 王以文 (K. Wang Imun. Original name Fenggang 鳳崗) and Feng Sanshi馮三仕 (K. P’ung Samsa) respectively, both considered as kuŭisa members. These two texts illustrate how Ming migrant families commemorated the reigns of Yŏngjo and Chŏngjo, as they portray in detail the special favors offered to them during the period. For example, Yŏngjo, after 1749, regularly ordered selected members of Ming Chinese families to attend Ming loyalist rituals at the palace. He was particularly adept at showing personal concern for Ming Chinese in a less formal setting, as he frequently visited the “Chinese village” in Seoul, their residential area in the Ŭŭidong 韓村 neighborhood, variously called at the time Hanch’on 漢村, Haninch’on 漢人村, or Tanginch’on 唐人村 and later renamed with the more prestigious title “imperial subject village” (Hwang-joinch’on 皇朝人村) by the order of Chŏngjo in 1798. On one such visit in 1751, he summoned all the Chinese inhabitants and asked about their welfare, why some had left the village, and whether any such departures were related to the corvée labor they were expected to provide. On other occasions, he showered them with gifts and food, and ordered official appointments for some individuals.

For the names of kuŭisa who migrated from China, I use both pinyin Romanization and McCune-Reischauer Romanization when first mentioning them, and only pinyin Romanization thereafter. For their descendants in Korea, I use McCune-Reischauer Romanization for their names and ancestral seat designations.

32 U, Chosŏn Chungwa chuŭi, 110.
33 For the names of kuŭisa who migrated from China, I use both pinyin Romanization and McCune-Reischauer Romanization when first mentioning them, and only pinyin Romanization thereafter. For their descendants in Korea, I use McCune-Reischauer Romanization for their names and ancestral seat designations.
34 Yŏngjo sillok 97:21ab [1761-5-10]; Chŏngjo sillok 49:29a [1798-9-1]; Sŏngjŏngwŏn ilgi 1075:45a [1751-10-8]; 1316:18a [1771-4-3].
35 P’ung Hŏnjo, Sangaenggong nyŏnbo 2: 20b-21b; Wang Tŏgil, Sangaenggong nyŏnbo 2: 3a-4a.
36 Wang Tŏgil, Sangaenggong nyŏnbo 2:5b, 6b-7a, 8b.
1758, he even proclaimed that military service should not be imposed on the “imperial subjects.”

It should be noted, however, that in relation to the two chronicles above, all these special concerns and kindnesses shown by the kings ceased abruptly in the nineteenth century. Although the two chronicles covered the period leading up to the time when they were completed (1822 and 1834, respectively), in terms of the nineteenth century, they lack any mention of the royal favor that had uniquely characterized the last five decades of the eighteenth century. Instead, the two chronicles portray the emergence of private efforts by Ming families to reinforce their Ming loyalist identity beginning in the early nineteenth century.

The demise of Chŏngjo ushered in a prolonged period in which the rulers and the court lost fervor and initiative, unlike their predecessors in the eighteenth century, in actively promoting Ming loyalism as a primary state agenda and in exhibiting personal care and patronage toward Ming loyalist families. This is not to suggest that the court’s sponsorship of Ming loyalism completely disappeared in the nineteenth century. In fact, one can still find references to Ming loyalist rituals in the nineteenth-century portion of Chosŏn wangjo sillok and Sŏngjŏngwŏn ilgi. However, evidence clearly indicates unmistakable signs of a reduction in royal initiatives to patronize Ming loyalist ideology and members of Ming descent groups during the nineteenth century. For example, Chosŏn wangjo sillok records fourteen instances of a royal audience (sogyŏn) with “imperial subjects,” usually after Taebodan rites, during the twenty-four-year reign of Chŏngjo, while the same source records a mere three instances for the thirty-four-year rule of Sunjo (r. 1800–34). Furthermore, all three instances occurred in the third and fourth year of Sunjo’s reign before the king came of age to begin his personal rule, perhaps out of respect for the legacy of his deceased predecessor. Royal


38 This loss of enthusiasm to promote Ming loyalism is also evidenced through the dramatic decline in personal visits to Taebodan by Chosŏn kings during the first half of the nineteenth century. See Kye Sŏngbŏm, Chŏngji toen sigan: Chosŏn ŭi Taebodan kwa kŭndae ŭi munt’ŏk (Suspended time: Chosŏn’s Taebodan and the threshold of modernity) (Seoul: Sŏgang taehakkyo ch’ulp’anbu, 2011), 185.

39 Measures were taken during Sunjo’s reign both to enlarge the pool of attendees of the Taebodan rites, through identifying some previously unrecognized Ming Chinese descendants and allowing their participation in the Taebodan rites, and to facilitate advancement within the bureaucracy for the descendants of Ming Chinese. See Sunjo sillok 9:33a [1806-7-13]; 28:34a [1827-3-10]; 32:11a [1831-9-1]. However, these measures were only intermittent and minor additions to the otherwise diverse, consistent, and significant favors granted to the Ming loyalist families by Yŏngjo and Chŏngjo. Moreover, the initiatives for such measures during Sunjo’s reign usually came from court ministers, not from the king, with Sunjo simply implementing their proposals. This absence of strong royal initiatives stands in sharp contrast to the royal activism of Yŏngjo and
audiences with “imperial subjects” ended under Sunjo’s personal rule and were not resumed in the subsequent Hŏnjong (r. 1834–49) and Ch’ŏlchong (1849–63) periods. The Ming loyalist descendants continued to participate in Taebodan rites in the nineteenth century, but their attendance became increasingly perfunctory.40

This shift in court policies was not only related to ineffectual royal leadership during the royal in-law government period, but also linked to changes in the ideological milieu. A new intellectual viewpoint known as pukhak 北學 (Northern Learning), that accommodated a more tolerant stance toward the political and cultural legitimacy of the Manchu Qing, increasingly gained ground from the late eighteenth century. This was a trend that worked against the Ming loyalist families by undermining the ideological significance of their presence in Chosŏn.41

There is some evidence from the first half of the nineteenth century that allows us a glimpse into the less secure position of Ming Chinese families. In a preface written in 1818 to his Hwangjo yuminrok 皇朝遺民錄 (Records of the loyalist subjects of the August Dynasty), Wang Tŏkku deplored a situation where, with the passage of time, there were scarcely any people who had knowledge concerning kuŭisa, which had prompted him to compile the volume.42 In the introductory note to a Wang family genealogy, written around 1840, Wang Tŏkku lamented: “Alas, in the recent one-hundred-year period, the people who respect

40 A search of the Chosŏn wangjo sillok database with the keyword “Hwangjo” 皇朝 (Ming dynasty) produced 156 and 103 results for the reigns of Yŏngjo and Chŏngjo, respectively. These results decreased to 34, 2, and 1 for the Sunjo, Hŏnjong, and Ch’ŏlchong periods, respectively. A similar search with the keyword “Hwangdan” 皇壇 (Taebodan) yielded 175 and 99 results for the reigns of Yŏngjo and Chŏngjo, respectively, and the numbers decline to 77, 6, and 8 for the reigns of Sunjo, Hŏnjong, and Ch’ŏlchong, respectively. These results reveal a general pattern of severely reduced activities and discourses related to the Ming dynasty and Taebodan during the nineteenth century.


42 Wang Tŏkku, “Hwangjo yuminrok só” 皇朝遺民錄序 (Preface to the Records of the loyalist subjects of the August Dynasty), Ch’anghaejip 2:3a.
China and degrade barbarians have become very scarce.”43 Wang Tŏkku’s lamentation over the fading memories of venerable ancestors and the weakening of the Sino-barbarian distinction may appear to echo hackneyed expressions frequently found in Confucian texts. However, in the context of the mid-nineteenth century when the Sino-barbarian distinction was on a path of gradual dissolution, his observation had some element of truth.

The decline of the once-rigorous hwa-i ron is further corroborated by Kim P’yŏngmuk’s 金平默 (1819–91, a student of Yi Hangno) recollection of Wang Tŏkku. When Wang Tŏgil died in 1854 and Tŏkku succeeded him in maintaining the rites at Taet’ong haengmyo, Kim recalled that Tŏkku never set foot beyond the mountain, and “people at that time regarded him as alienated from reality and did not help him.”44 The most striking evidence, however, comes from a conversation Tŏkku had with Kim sometime between 1854 and 1863. Wang complained to Kim that many of his contemporaries considered the Qing emperors as judicious rulers. According to this view, the Qing emperors had brought relative prosperity to the realm and were thus superior to some unwise Chinese rulers of the Han 漢 and Tang 唐 dynasties who had initiated bitter disorder in the world. Song Siyŏl, these contemporaries claimed, had opposed this positive view of the Qing and vehemently rejected those who acknowledged the legitimacy of the Qing. However, they regarded Song’s view, which they criticized severely, as not coming from the mind of a benevolent person.45

Despite their constant access to lower-level officialdom regularized since the late eighteenth century, the Ming families during the nineteenth century never again became an object of as much royal attention and patronage as they once had been during the eighteenth century. In contrast to their moderate bureaucratic success in attaining access to official positions, the justification for the promotion and patronage of the Ming families was increasingly less certain due to an ideological shift from strong Ming loyalism to a more tolerant attitude toward the Qing. It was against this backdrop that private initiatives were taken by Ming loyalist families to re-emphasize Ming loyalty and to consolidate their loyalist identity.

43 “百年以來，內華夏外夷狄者，幾希,” in Wang Tŏkku, “Chenam Wangssi poge pŏmne” 濟南王氏譜系凡例 (Style notes for the Genealogy of the Chenam Wangs), Ch’anghae chip 3:51a.
44 “時輩，指以爲迂，而不恤也,” in Kim P’yŏngmuk’s preface to Ch’anghae chip.
45 Kim P’yŏngmuk, “Ch’anghae Wang sŏnsaeng haengjang” 滄海王先生行狀 (A biography of Wang Tŏkku), Ch’anghae chip 4:5b.
CONSOLIDATION OF LOYALIST IDENTITY BY MING FAMILIES
IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

These private Ming family initiatives included the production of texts and the building of ancestral shrines for the reinforcement of each lineage’s solidarity and identity. This is evident in the case of the Wang, P’ung, and Ch’ong descent groups. The lineage shrine intended for the worship of Wang Yiwen as the founding ancestor of the Chenam 济南 (C. Jinan, Shandong province) Wang was first established in 1775.46 The shrine was located in the Ŭidong sector in Seoul where the Wangs and other Ming Chinese families had settled. The ritual for ancestral worship, however, seems to have been discontinued and was resumed only in 1802. In 1802, the Wang lineage members lamented the lack of a lineage estate and annual sacrifice, and collected cotton textiles and money from their members, purchasing sacrificial land and saving the rest for other regular lineage activities.47 They also set out specific details governing the ritual procedures.48 Annual sacrificial rites were held thereafter. Despite repairs, the shrine remained in poor condition, and a new shrine had to be built in 1816.49

Various Wang lineage histories also began to emerge. The first genealogy of the Wangs appeared in 1840,50 but it was predated by earlier versions of Wang family histories that laid the foundations for it. In 1804, two years after the restoration of the ancestral shrine, Wang Tŏgil produced a genealogy (sebo 世譜), and Wang Tohyŏp 王道協, another descendant of Yiwen, compiled a different version (kasŭng 家乘) in 1810. This was followed five years later in 1815 by Wang Tŏgil’s Sangsaenggong nyŏnbo.51

The P’ung lineage undertook similar efforts around the same time. In 1825, P’ung Hakcho 馮學祖, a fifth-generation descendant of Feng Sanshi, the founding ancestor of the Imgu 臨胊 (C. Linqu, Shandong) P’ung lineage in Korea, led a discussion among fellow lineage members and built an ancestral shrine for Feng Sanshi.52 Sacrificial rites were held annually. In 1834, P’ung Hŏnjo 馮憲祖, another fifth-generation descendant, completed the Sangsaenggong nyŏnbo, a combination of the chronological records of Feng Sanshi and his progeny,

---

46 Wang Tŏgil, Sangsaenggong nyŏnbo 2:8a.
48 Wang Tŏgil, “Sŏnjo sangsaenggong sadang sŏllip sŏ” 先祖庠生公祠堂設立序, Panch’ŏn yugo 1:25b;
49 Ibid.
50 Wang Tŏkku, preface, Huwangmyŏng yumin Chenam Wangssi chokpo, 6a.
51 Wang Tŏgil, Sangsaenggong nyŏnbo 2:23a. Sangsaenggong nyŏnbo was not simply a chronicle of Wang Yiwen but also covered major events related to his progeny through to the compilation date.
52 P’ung Hŏnjo, Sangsaenggong nyŏnbo 2:29b-30a.
comparable to Wang Togil’s work with the same title. Furthermore, P’ung Honjo produced a P’ung genealogy (sebo 世譜) a year later in 1835. An updated genealogy of the P’ungs followed three decades later in 1864, which was compiled by P’ung Hakcho, a major contributor to the establishment of the lineage shrine in 1825.54

As for the Nangya 邗琊 (C. Langya) Chŏngs 鄭 whose founding ancestor was Zheng Xianjia 鄭先甲 (K. Chŏng Sŏngap), one of the kuũisa members,55 the first genealogy appeared in 1811, compiled by Chŏng Yangch’ŏl 鄭良哲 (1766–1833), a fourth-generation descendant of Zheng Xianjia.56

The Ming Chinese descent groups’ initiatives to trace their family origins, reconstruct their lineage histories, and illuminate the special position they occupied in relation to the Chosŏn court were attempts to reinforce their identity as Ming loyalist families.57 However, these efforts did not remain as individual projects within each descent group. The Ming loyalist families also reinforced their collective identity as the descendants of kuũisa by presenting a combined

53 1973 Imgu P’ungsisi chokpo, 54a.
55 Zheng Xianjia was affiliated to Uŏch’ŏng 偶語廳, an institution established by Sukchong in 1682 to teach foreign languages. He played a role in teaching Chinese to Koreans and educating them as translators. See Liu Ranran, “Mingmo fu Chao Shandong yimin Zheng Xianjia ji qihouyi yanjiu,” Jinan xuebao (Zhexue shehui kexueban) 3 (2010): 230–31.
56 1981 Nangya Chŏngssi chokpo, 13, 17, 192. Chŏng Yangch’ŏl served as a Taebodan Guard around 1797 and was promoted to Owijang 五衛將 (Five Guards General) in 1801. See Sŏngjŏngwŏn ilgi 1780:8b [1797-8-2] and 1839: 83b [1801-7-22].
57 The kuũisa descendants were considered as chungin 中人 in Chosŏn’s social stratification. It is possible that their genealogy compilation efforts at this time reflected a larger trend within the nineteenth century in which chungin produced various genealogies and other literary works that aimed to enhance their social status and prestige in a context of discrimination against them. These considerations help us understand the multiple reasons behind the compilation of the Ming descendant genealogies. The prefaces and other parts of their genealogies, however, emphasize the genealogy’s role as a medium to solidify Ming loyalist consciousness in adverse social conditions. On the chungin status of the kuũisa descendants, see U, Chosŏn Chunghwa chuũi, 118. For recent scholarships on the compilation of collective chungin genealogies, such as various p’alsebo 八世譜 (eighth-generation genealogies) and Sŏngwŏllok 姓源錄 (records of surname origins) during the nineteenth century, see, for example, Yi Namhŭi, “Chosŏn hugi ŭigwa p’alsebo ſi charyojŏk t’ŏksŏng kwa ŭimi” (Characteristics and significance of the eight-generation genealogies of physician-examination passers in the late Chosŏn period), Chosŏn sidaesa hakpo 52 (2010): 231–62; Kim Tuhŏn, “Sŏngwŏllok’ŏ ū t’onghaesŏ pon Sŏul chungin kagye yŏng’gu: Chungan kagye ſi yuhyŏng kwa kyumot chŏngch’esŏng” (A study of Seoul chungin families through Sŏngwŏllok: Forms, size, and identities of chungin families), Štourbuk yŏng’gu 39 (2010): 41–77; Eugene Y. Park, A Family of No Prominence: The Descendants of Pak Tŏkhwa and the Birth of Modern Korea (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2014), 18, 75.
genealogy of themselves (the Wangs were not included). This genealogy, entitled *Hwangjo yumin segye wollyubop* 《皇朝遺民世系源流譜》 (Genealogy of the loyalist subjects of the August Dynasty), was compiled around 1828 by P’ung Hakcho and contained generational family trees of each surname and brief biographical sketches of the descendants. Like other literary writings by Ming loyalist families, this genealogy used the reign title of Yongli 永曆, the last emperor of the Southern Ming, instead of the Chongzhen title commonly used by the Chosŏn literati. As one scholar has argued, the persistent insistence on using the Yongli reign title by Ming Chinese descendants was a way for them to highlight their importance as legitimate inheritors of Ming culture, a claim that put emphasis on their Han ethnicity as a critical component of that legitimacy.\(^\text{58}\) The compiler of this genealogy also refused to record the official titles the families had received from the Chosŏn court, except for posts of the Chinese Brigade and the Taebodan Guard, both related to Ming loyalism, in order to remain loyal to the fallen Ming.

P’ung Hakcho displayed a similar initiative when he compiled the *Hwangdan ch’amban yusin chegarok* 《皇壇參班遺臣諸家錄》 (Records of the families of the Ming loyalist ministers attending the rituals at Taebodan) in 1818, which illustrated the lives of *kuŭisa* whose descendants had come to participate in the rituals at Taebodan.\(^\text{59}\) The *Hwangdan ch’amban yusin chegarok* was based on a similar work, *Hwangjo yuminrok*, by Wang Tŏkku, which appeared that same year (mentioned above).\(^\text{60}\)

In addition, another strategy employed by the Ming loyalist lineages in the nineteenth century to bolster their collateral ties and collective identity was to forge close marital ties across their lineages. This is evidenced through the significantly higher number of intermarriages among *kuŭisa* descendants in the nineteenth century. According to various genealogical records of the Ming Chinese, such as the *Hwangjo yumin segye wollyubop* and the genealogies of the Imgu P’ungs, the Chenam Wangs, and the Nangya Chŏngs, that detail their marriage patterns, finding a spouse from the pool of Ming loyalist families was not common until the early nineteenth century. The first such instance took place probably in the late seventeenth century, when Wang Chinho 王震豪 (1662–1716), a son of Wang Yiwen, married a daughter (1663–1704) of Pei Sansheng 裴三生

\(^{58}\) U Kyŏngsŏp, “Chosŏn hugi chisigin tül ŭ Nammyŏng wango insik” (Intellectuals’ perceptions of the Southern Ming dynasty in the late Chosŏn period), Han’guk munhwa 61 (2013): 150–51.

\(^{59}\) P’ung Hakcho, born in 1792, was a member of the Chinese Brigade and later promoted to the Taebodan Guard in 1828.

\(^{60}\) Wang Tŏkku, born in 1788, became a Taebodan Guard in 1808.
(K. Pae Samsaeng), also a kuniisa member.61 Around the same time, Hwang Yong 黃用 (1671–1725), a second-generation descendant of the Hangju 杭州 (C. Hangzhou, Zhejiang) Hwang 黃 lineage founded by Huang Gong 黃功 (K. Hwang Kong, a kuniisa member), married a daughter (1675–1711) of Wang Chinyŏng 王震英 (1648–1734) of the Chenam Wang family.62 The next such event occurred in the early eighteenth century between the Hangju Hwangs and the Taedong 大同 (C. Datong, Shanxi) Yus 柳, when Hwang Suman 黃秀萬 (1700–74) married a daughter of Yu Chŏnggŏn 柳廷健, the only son of Liu Xishan 柳溪山 (K. Yu Kyesan, 1627–58), also a kuniisa member.63 The fourth known intermarriage took place sometime in the mid-eighteenth century. P’ung Kwihan 馮貴漢 (1684–1747) of the Imgu P’ungs gave his daughter (1737–63) in marriage to Hwang Sech’ŏl 黃世哲 (1735–74), a great-grandson of Huang Gong.64 The fifth known intermarriage involved the Hangju Hwangs and the Nangya Chŏngs, as Hwang Sŏn 黃先 (1743–78) married a daughter (1737–80) of Chŏng Kyŏngju 鄭敬周 (1711–43).65

While there had been only five known instances of intermarriage among the Ming loyalist families until the end of the eighteenth century, intermarriage became much more common from the beginning of the nineteenth century, as shown in Table 1 in the appendix.

Table 1 demonstrates that a total of twenty-nine marriages took place among the Ming loyalist descent groups during the nineteenth century, which was a dramatic increase from the five instances recorded from the late seventeenth century to the end of the eighteenth century. Marriages were most frequent between the Chenam Wangs and the Imgu P’ungs, with ten such cases. The second most frequent marriages occurred between the Wangs and the Hangju Hwangs (six cases), followed by the P’ungs and the Nangya Chŏngs (five cases), and the Wangs and the Chŏngs (four cases). Marriages between the Wangs and the Taedong 大同 Paes 裵 ( traced to Pei Sansheng), the P’ungs and the Paes, the Chŏngs and the Paes, and the P’ungs and the Hwangs each occurred once during this period. For these Ming descent groups, intermarriage was rapidly gathering

---

61 Hwangmyŏng yumin Chenam Wangssi chokpo, 84a. Wang Chinsŏng, a brother of Chinho from the same generation, married a daughter of Yu Yŏngdal of the T’aewŏn 太原 Yus 錄. See Hwangmyŏng yumin Chenam Wangssi chokpo, 25a. Although the T’aewŏn Yus are a descent group whose place of origin is Shanxi province in China, they were not considered as descendants of Ming loyalist ancestors.
62 P’ung Hakcho, Hwangjo yumin segye wŏllyubo (Genealogy of the loyalist subjects of the August Dynasty). Not paginated. Microfilm page number 16.
63 Ibid., 16–17.
64 Ibid., 18.
65 Ibid.
momentum in the nineteenth century.

Moreover, a closer look at Table 1 also reveals that such intermarriages were more popular in the first half than in the second half of the nineteenth century. A recent study has claimed that, during the eighteenth century, the average ages at first marriage for women and men were 17.5 and 18 years, respectively.\textsuperscript{66} When this consideration is applied in interpreting table 1, it appears that sixteen instances of intermarriage (case nos. 1-16) occurred in the first half of the nineteenth century, while nine instances (case nos. 17-25) took place in the second half of the century (excluding four cases, case numbers 26-29, which certainly occurred during the nineteenth century but for which we lack data concerning the birth years of both husbands and wives).

The increase in intermarriage among the Ming families in the nineteenth century, particularly in its first half, was a strategy consciously employed by the Ming families to shore up their loyalist identity, similar to other related activities. It should also be noted that, from the beginning of the twentieth century through to the present, such intermarriages have been negligible. The 1973 Imgu P’ung genealogy records only one more such instance, which took place in the mid-twentieth century.\textsuperscript{67} The 1998 Chenam Wang genealogy includes no other instances.\textsuperscript{68} Intermarriage among Ming loyalist lineages was thus primarily a nineteenth-century trend, suggesting the development of a stronger sense of community and Ming loyalist identity among Ming loyalist descendants during that period.

\textsuperscript{66} Kim Kŏnt’ae, “18 se gi ch’ohon kwa chaehon ŭi sahoea: Tansŏng hojŏk ĭl chungsim ĭro” (A social history of first and second marriages during the eighteenth century: With a focus on the household registers of Tansŏng), in Son Pyŏnggyu, et al., eds., Han’guk yŏksa in’guhak yŏn’gu ŭi kanŭngsŏng (Possibility of the historical demography of Korea) (Seoul: Sŏnggyun’gwan taehakkyo ch’ulp’anbu, 2016), 174, 183.

\textsuperscript{67} 1973 Imgu P’ungsì chokpo, 46b; 1981 Nangya Chŏngsì chokpo, 200–01. This marriage was between a man from the Nangya Chŏngs and a woman from the Imgu Pungs.

\textsuperscript{68} In the twentieth century, there were two instances in which the Chenam Wangs married within descent groups originating in China. Wang Sun’gyun 王順均 (1946–) married a woman from the Kokpu 孔 descent group and Wang Hŭiyŏng 王熙永 married a daughter of the Sandong 山東 Choe 崔 group. Despite their Chinese origins, they should be differentiated from Ming loyalist lineages. For information on these two marriages, see Hwangmyŏng yumin Chenam Wangsì chokpo, 151a, 152a.
THE TRANSFORMATION OF CHOJONG'AM
IN THE EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY

As noted earlier, the creation of Chojong’am as a place of Ming loyalism was initiated by the Chosŏn literati, and the inscriptions there symbolized Chosŏn’s newly-found status as the legitimate successor to Ming civilization. In the early nineteenth century, however, the place came to take on a different meaning as some descendants of kuŭisa created new ritual structures and offered sacrifices to a figure previously seldom associated with the place. Through these efforts, they promoted Ming loyalism on their own when the court’s support of the ideology became increasingly apathetic, re-asserted their symbolic status within the ideology, and consolidated their group consciousness as Ming loyalists.

In 1831, Wang Tŏgil and his cousin Wang Tŏkku, both former members of the Taebodan Guard, retired to Chojong’am and erected Taet’ong haengmyo in the vicinity of Chojong’am to commemorate Ming Taizu. Sacrificial rites were held in his memory on the fourth day of the first lunar month, on the anniversary of the founding day of the Ming dynasty. Among the families with Ming loyalist backgrounds, the idea to hold sacrificial rites for Ming Taizu had been actually gestated earlier. The discussion became more urgent in 1824, which marked the third sexagesima of the fall of the Ming, but it was only seven years later, in 1831, that the plan finally materialized.69

Although Taet’ong haengmyo was named as a temple (myo), it was in fact an open altar. Despite the original intention to establish a temple, an altar was chosen as an alternative due to insufficient resources. Only the name temple remained unchanged.70 The term “haeng” 行 (temporary) as part of the altar name expressed the builders’ wishes to return to China soon, while respectfully maintaining the worshiped tablets in the meantime.71

Alongside the Taet’ong haengmyo, Ming families established another altar called the Kuŭi haengsa where sacrificial rites were held on the sixth day of the

69 Wang Tŏgil, “Taet’ong haengmyo ŭi sŏ” 大統行廟儀序 (Preface to the rites of Taet’ong haengmyo), Panchŏn yugo 1:31a. Several primary sources used for this section of the paper, including this preface by Wang Tŏgil, are also included in P’ung Yŏngsŏp, ed., Chojong’am munbōlok: 韓宗巖文獻錄 (Collection of literature related to Chojong’am) (Seoul: Chojong’am chaegŏn-ch’ujinhoe, 1977).

70 Kim P’yŏngmuk 金平默, “Panchŏn Ch’anghae i Wang sŏnsaeng chŏn” 盤川滄海二王先生傳 (Biographies of Wang Tŏgil and Wang Tŏkku), Chojong’am chi kwŏn sang (The first chapter of the Records of Chojong’am).

71 Yu Chunggyo, “Chojong’am chi pal” 朝宗巖誌跋 (Postscript to the Records of Chojong’am), Chojong’am chi.
first month, two days after the rituals for Ming Taizu. Kuŭi haengsa, too, was originally intended as a shrine but was scaled down to an altar for economic reasons. Kuŭi haengsa was constructed to worship the founding ancestors (kuŭisa) of the nine Ming loyalist lineages, but the significance of the altar did not just remain at the lineage level. Its location and the day chosen for sacrifices, both in close proximity to those of Taet’ong haengmyo, were intended to embody the ideal that a ruler and his ministers should be worshipped together because of their intimate connections (ilch’egunsin chesadong 一體君臣，祭祀同). Kuŭi haengsa, therefore, served to emphasize that kuŭisa were former ministers of the Ming who had remained loyal.

Apart from the Taet’ong haengmyo and the Kuŭi haengsa, a small study was constructed nearby. Wang Tŏgil lived in this study until his death in 1854, presiding over the rituals conducted at the altars. When Wang Tŏgil died, the responsibility of holding sacrificial rites was shouldered by Wang Tŏkku, until his own death in 1863, and then was inherited by Wang Suguyl (1814–?), Tŏgil’s son.

In his “Taet’ong haengmyo ŭi sŏ” 大統行廟儀序, the preface written to a work describing ritual procedures at Taet’ong haengmyo, Wang Tŏgil expounded on why the word “taet’ong” had been adopted in the altar name and why he had decided to venerate Ming Taizu. Since the emergence of people between heaven and earth, there had been no one greater than Confucius, Wang argued, and among Confucius’ achievements, there was nothing more important than the Spring and Autumn Annals (Chunqiu 春秋) that he had compiled. Among the moral lessons preached in Chunqiu, nothing had more weight than the value of unified rule by legitimate rulers (t ae ill’ong 大一統). From the Han to the Song dynasties,

---

72 There have been previous studies that have researched Taet’ong haengmyo and Kuŭi haengsa. See, for example, Shi, “Lun Chaoxian,” 314–15; Sun, Daming qihao, 207–13; U, “Chosŏn hugi Taemyŏng yumin,” 193–98. These studies, however, either did not analyze or insufficiently analyzed the meanings associated with the altars.

73 Efforts to worship the nine ancestors had actually begun earlier. In 1825, after the rituals at Taebodan in the third month, Wang Tŏkku, Hwang Chaegyŏm (who served in the Chinese Brigade in 1795 and in the Taebodan Guard in 1801) of the Hangju Hwangs, and P’ung Chaesu of the Imgu P’ungs held a sacrificial rite to worship the nine founding ancestors in the house originally awarded to their ancestors by Hyojong, located in the “imperial subject village” in eastern Seoul. See Wang Tŏkku, “Che yusin kugong yong ch’uk’un i chi kaehoe” 祭遺臣九公用祝韻以志慨懷 (Using ch’uk rhyme to record a sorrowful mind while offering sacrificial rites to the nine loyalist ministers), Ch’anghaejip 1:9b-10a. Wang Tŏgil noted that, because the families regularly received official salaries from the state thanks to these ancestors, it was imperative that they establish a proper ritual for them. Wang Tŏgil, “Kuŭi haengsa ŭi chi” 九義行祠儀識 (Record of the rituals at Kuŭi haengsa), Panch’ŏn yugo 1:32b.


75 Sun, Daming qihao, 210.
although China had experienced political upheavals, the ideal of unified rule by rulers of legitimate dynasties ( wangjong ilt'ong 王政一統 ) had remained intact. It was only when the Yuan defeated the Song that this ideal had faded. Wang Tŏgil, therefore, believed Ming Taizu’s greatest achievements were in expelling the Yuan barbarians and restoring China, as well as in having institutionalized proper rituals and music, and thereby realizing the ideal of the great unification. In other words, Wang selected Ming Taizu to commemorate the resumption of tae ilt'ong (or taet’ong). With the fall of the Ming dynasty, however, China had lost ritual propriety, but the essence of Chinese civilization had been preserved in Chosŏn. Wang Tŏgil offered additional reasons in support of Chosŏn as a legitimate inheritor of Chinese culture. He regarded the existence of Taebodan in the court and Mandongmyo in the locale as evidence of Chosŏn’s respect for and preservation of Chinese culture. The Chosŏn court generously saw to it that Ming Chinese received official salaries through their posts at Taebodan, protected them from facing Qing envoys, and permitted them to reject the reign titles used by Qing barbarians. The Chosŏn court protected Ming loyalist families because they preserved a proper morality as loyal subjects of a fallen dynasty ( mangbok chi ŭi 囚僕之義 ).

After presenting Chosŏn as an inheritor of Chinese civilization, Wang Tŏgil then shifted the focus to Ming loyalist families themselves. Because the families had preserved proper attire when China itself was transformed into a barbarian land and because they continued to adhere to the strict Sino-barbarian distinction, steadfastly upholding the ideal of an ultimate revenge on the Qing, Wang Tŏgil considered they were eligible now to legitimately worship Ming Taizu. Wang further related that, by erecting these ritual structures and regularly holding sacrificial rites, they could remind Ming Chinese descendants of the humiliation caused by the barbarian invasions and signal that the spirit of taet’ong was still preserved at Taet’ong haengmyo.

Wang Tŏkku, the co-founder of Taet’ong haengmyo, also explained their choice of Ming Taizu as the object of their cult. He praised Ming Taizu as having a “sagacity unleashed by heaven” ( ch’ŏnjong chi sŏng 天縱之聖 ), a phrase typically reserved for Confucius. As with Wang Tŏgil, Tŏkku also believed the greatest
achievements of Ming Taizu to have been his expulsion of the barbarian Mongols and the restoration of Chinese culture. Ming Taizu thus put an end to a dark period when the transmission of dynastic legitimacy was disrupted and China was transformed into a barbarian land. These extraordinary achievements, he claimed, had to be repaid through Ming Taizu’s enshrinement.\textsuperscript{80} Wang Tŏkku also shared Tŏgil’s view that Tae’r’ong haengmyo was the very place where the ideal of tae il’\’ong was preserved. He noted, “As there exists Chojong(am), tae’r’ong is preserved intact,” and “Tae’r’ong continues endlessly here [Chojong’am].”\textsuperscript{81} In a similar vein, he declared his role to be the successor and preserver of this legitimacy: “Facing a time when heaven and earth are blocked, how can it be not me who will preserve and transmit the flow [of legitimacy] and wait for the future?”\textsuperscript{82}

As described above, Wang Tŏgil and Tŏkku both highlighted the significance of Ming Taizu primarily as a hero who had expelled the barbarians and restored Chinese civilization, and defined Ming loyalist families as tenacious preservers of that civilization and the ideal of the strict Sino-barbarian distinction. In this way, they were able to claim that the Ming families in Chosŏn, and not those in China proper who had in their view become barbarianized, were the true inheritors of the legacy Ming Taizu had left, and therefore justified in worshiping Ming Taizu.

It is worth noting that Chojong’am, although a site closely associated with Ming loyalism, had had no link to Ming Taizu. Instead, the place had been intimately related to the memory of Wanli and Chongzhen. The annual sacrificial rites performed by Hŏ Kyŏk, Yi Chedu, and Paek Haemyŏng were carried out on the anniversary of Chongzhen’s death, and they had also intended to build a temple for Wanli. However, at Taet’rong haengmyo, the sacrificial rites were performed annually for Ming Taizu, on the day commemorating his foundation of the Ming dynasty.\textsuperscript{83}

Although associated with Chojong’am for the first time in 1831, Ming Taizu had already been worshiped, as noted, at another Ming loyalist shrine, Taebodan. The meanings attached to the memory of Ming Taizu, however, differed between these two places. Ming Taizu was first worshiped at Taebodan when the worship

\textsuperscript{80} Wang Tŏkku, “Yŏ Hwang Ch’ido Hyŏnt’aek 與黃致道顯宅 (A letter to Hwang Hyŏnt’aek), Ch’anghaejip 1:36a–37a.

\textsuperscript{81} “惟有朝宗, 大統全,” in Wang Tŏkku, “Chojongjae sulhoe 朝宗齋述懷 (Expression of my feelings at the Chojong Studio); “大統綿綿于此兮,” in “Sulhoe 述懷 (Expression of my feelings), Ch’anghaejip 1:12ab. See also “Myŏngsuk yu karye chŏl sŏ 明熟有家禮節序 (Preface to the Illuminating and practicing “Family rituals”), Ch’anghaejip 2:8b.

\textsuperscript{82} “當天地閉塞之運, 保傳一脈, 以待後日者, 堪非余乎,” in Wang Tŏkku, “Kwan Maesil ki 觀梅室記 (Records of the Chamber of Viewing Plum Blossom), Ch’anghaejip 2:10b-11a.

\textsuperscript{83} Wang Tŏgil, “Tae’r’ong haengmyo ŭi 大統行廟儀 (Rites of Taet’rong haengmyo), Panchŏn yugo 2:18a.
category was enlarged to include him and Chongzhen in 1749, in addition to the already enshrined Wanli. 84 The induction of Ming Taizu into Taebodan by Yŏngjo, however, had to face opposition from bureaucrats. Many court officials hesitated to consider, or even refused to endorse Yŏngjo’s suggestion. Some argued that while Chosŏn was indebted to Wanli and Chongzhen for dispatching or attempting to send Ming troops to rescue Chosŏn during the invasions by Japan and the Manchus, respectively, which were kindnesses that could legitimately be repaid by enshrining them at Taebodan, Chosŏn had no such debt to repay to Ming Taizu. 85 More significant as a factor influencing this hesitation and rejection of the proposed worship, however, was a long-held view of the Chosŏn literati that Ming Taizu had been an autocratic ruler who had arbitrarily imposed brutal punishments and persecuted scholar-officials. 86 Yŏngjo, nonetheless, repeatedly underlined that Ming Taizu, like Wanli and Chongzhen, had done a great favor to Chosŏn through the investiture of King T’aejo, the founder of the Chosŏn dynasty, and the conferral of the state name Chosŏn. Therefore, Yŏngjo argued, Ming Taizu could rightfully claim a seat on the Taebodan altar. 87 He called the favor conferred by Ming Taizu “the benevolence of great-making [of Chosŏn]” (taejo chi ŭn 大造之恩), in comparison to the “benevolence of re-making [of Chosŏn]” (chaejo chi ŭn 再造之恩) attributed to Wanli.

From the descriptions above, we can see that the Chosŏn court and the Ming loyalist families superimposed different meanings onto Ming Taizu. At Taebodan, Ming Taizu’s benevolence and favor toward Chosŏn was considered his crucial achievement that warranted his inclusion at the altar. At Taet’ong haengmyo, however, Ming Taizu took on a different character. 88 He was portrayed as a hero who had brought the resumption of taet’ong and the restoration of Chinese civilization by ousting barbarians, with no relation whatsoever to Chosŏn. Wang Tŏgil and Tŏkku reinterpreted the symbols associated with Ming Taizu and

84 For a discussion on the expansion of venerated objects at Taebodan in 1749, see Kim Ho, “Yŏngjo ŭi Taebodan chŭngsu wa Myŏng samhwang ŭi hyangsa” (Rebuilding of Taebodan by Yŏngjo and the veneration of the three Ming emperors), Han’guk munhwawon 32 (2003): 183–96.
87 On Yŏngjo’s emphasis on the rituals related to Ming Taizu at Taebodan, see Kye, Chŏngji toen sign, 111–34.
88 Yu Chunggyo was keenly aware of the difference between Taet’ong haengmyo and Taebodan/Mandongmyo. He propagated the view that Taet’ong haengmyo was for the inheritance of taet’ong while Taebodan and Mandongmyo were for sacrifices to repay favors Chosŏn had received. See Yu Chunggyo, “Chojong’am chi pal.”
reshaped him into a character that better fitted their own agenda. As with Ming Taizu, they were the ones who preserved Chinese culture vis-à-vis barbarians. Like Ming Taizu, they also hoped for a future where they could perform a key role in driving off the Qing barbarians and restoring China.

In his “Taet’ong haengmyo ŭi sŏ,” Wang Tŏgil stressed that their veneration of Ming Taizu was an action by former ministers of the Ming toward their former ruler.89 This was a critical feature that rendered Taet’ong haengmyo distinct from Taebodan and Mandongmyo. Wáng was thus able to carve out a legitimate ritual niche for the Ming loyalist families. By erecting an altar for a Ming emperor at their own initiative, Ming loyalist families gained a new ritual ground within Ming loyalist ideology. They no longer remained a subsidiary presence in the rites for their own emperor as they had been at Taebodan, and established an alternative ritual space in which former Ming subjects could themselves preside over rituals for their own emperor.

The establishment of an altar for a Ming emperor by Ming loyalist descendants, however, fostered a possibility of undermining the significance of Taebodan and Mandongmyo. Implicit in that altar establishment lay the assumption that, as performed by descendants of former subjects of the Ming, their rites for the Ming emperor might have more relevance than similar rituals performed by the Chosŏn court and the literati. Together with the assertion by Wang Tŏgil and Tŏkku that taet’ong continued in Chojong’am, their rituals could suggest that the Ming families could more legitimately claim the position of heirs to the legacy of the Ming dynasty.90

This interpretation was alluded to in a statement from Wang Tŏkku himself. In a letter he wrote to a fellow descendant of the Ming Chinese, Wang deplored that there were so few among the court officials and the Ming Chinese who understood why it was that Ming loyalist families were treated more favorably than Chosŏn officials during the loyalist rituals at Taebodan, where the former were positioned in rows in front of the latter.91 He cited two sentences from ancient Chinese classics: “The guest of Yu is in his place, and all the feudal lords show their virtue of courtesy” (虞賓在位, 羣后德讓) from the Book of Documents.

90 U Kyŏngsŏp uses the metaphor “one’s own child and a stepchild” to characterize the awkward relations between the loyalist families of Ming origin and the Chosŏn literati who believed in the centrality of Chosŏn as the successor of Ming culture after 1644. See his book Chosŏn Chungwha chu'ii, 130 and also his article “Chosŏn hugi chisign tŭl,” 151.
91 Wang Tŏkku, “Tap Chŏng Nŭngwŏn Sŏkhwa” 答鄭能元錫華 (A reply to Chŏng Sŏkhwa), Ch'anghaejip 1:51b. For information on the change in the spatial position of Ming subjects in court rituals, see Yi Uk, “Chosŏn hugi chŏnjaeng ŭi kiŏk kwa Taebodan chehyang” (Memories of war in the late Chosŏn period and the sacrificial rites at Taebodan), Chonggyo yŏn'gu 42 (2006): 158–60.
(Shu jing 書經) and “Although a courtier of a king is lowly, he should still be placed above feudal lords” (王人雖微，序于公侯之上) from the Comprehensive Mirror in Aid of Governance (Zizhi tongjian 資治通鑑. This sentence was originally included in the Spring and Autumn Annals). Both sentences documented the exalted status of a king’s minister vis-à-vis feudal lords, and Wang appropriated this canonical authority to justify the preferential treatment of the Ming Chinese in Chosŏn court rituals, as they were descendants of former ministers of the Ming.

Although a more rigorous interpretation of the sentences could have led to a bold claim involving a demand for the recognition of a superior position for Ming Chinese above that of Chosŏn kings as the feudal lords in Sino-centric tributary relations, Wang Tŏkku stopped just short of crossing this irreverent line. He only approved a symbolic superiority of the Ming Chinese over the Chosŏn courtiers in loyalist rituals. This point, however, was brought to the fore and made more explicit by Yu Chunggyo 柳重敎 (1832–93), a renowned Confucian scholar in the nineteenth century, who maintained intimate relations with Wang family members.

In a postscript he wrote to Chojong’ám chi 朝宗巖誌 (Records of Chojong’ám), compiled around 1875, Yu Chunggyo expressed a wish that someone would combine in a single volume the records of the three sites holding Ming loyalist rites in Chosŏn, namely, Taebodan, Mandongmyo, and Chojong’ám. In such a volume, he claimed, the records of Chojong’ám would occupy the foremost place because “the principle of Chunqiu will necessarily place courtiers of a king (王人) above feudal lords (諸侯).”

The discussions in this section have shown how some members of the Ming loyalist families instilled new meanings into Chojong’ám in the early nineteenth century. Through this process, Chojong’ám was transformed from a site symbolizing Chosŏn’s exalted status in the post-Ming Confucian world to a setting that bolstered the independent ritual status of Ming loyalist descendants and the significance of their presence in Chosŏn. Wang Tŏkku and Tŏgil could claim no particular connection to Chojong’ám prior to 1831, but they chose this place for their veneration project since it was where the Ming loyalist ideology was most evidently embedded. The newly created altars in Chojong’ám certainly benefited from this legacy inherent in the place, but the ideas they represented diverged, in certain important aspects, from those with which the site had long been associated.

93 “然春秋之法，叙王人，必於諸侯之上，則斯誌也，其將為三編之首也,” in Yu Chunggyo, “Chojong’ám chi pal.”
CONCLUSION

The early nineteenth century was a time when certain Ming Chinese families actively re-emphasized Ming loyalism and attempted to strengthen their identity as Ming loyalist families. To this end, they commemorated their lineage-founding ancestors, produced genealogies, and consolidated their marital networks through intermarriage. Moreover, an altar was constructed at Chojong'am to venerate Ming Taizu on the anniversary of the founding day of the Ming. They gave new meanings to Ming Taizu, as a figure who had ousted Mongol barbarians and restored a legitimate unified rule. In other words, Ming Taizu was portrayed as the re-initiator of *taet’ong*, a concept that they viewed as lying at the heart of Ming culture, and which they implicitly claimed they had inherited outside of China, as descendants of former ministers of the Ming.

Why did the Ming loyalist families take these new initiatives in the early nineteenth century? One view to explain these developments would be to see them as an outgrowth of the court’s policies during the eighteenth century. The designation of the Ming Chinese as “imperial subjects” and their subsequent mobilization into military and ritual posts, especially after 1790 by the Chosŏn court, brought a steady influx of Ming Chinese into the lower levels of Chosŏn’s officialdom. This bureaucratic upturn certainly played a role in fostering various identity-construction activities by the Ming Chinese. It re-invoked in their minds the need to consolidate their loyalist identity because their access to officialdom and their newly gained social status were premised on their identity as Ming loyalists. Also, the economic resources and elevated self-pride that accrued from their moderate bureaucratic success helped to motivate, both materially and psychologically, their identity-seeking activities in the nineteenth century.

On the other hand, however, the vicissitudes of court policies and developing intellectual trends in the nineteenth century challenge assumptions that Ming loyalists’ activities were an inevitable outcome of cooperative interactions between the Chosŏn court and the Ming families that had been nourished during the previous century. The court in the nineteenth century no longer exhibited as much enthusiasm in promoting Ming loyalty and patronizing Ming loyalist families as its eighteenth-century counterpart had done. The families’ accession to military and ritual posts had already been institutionalized and remained intact in the nineteenth century, but such a routine recruitment was a far cry from the eighteenth century where the state had made the Ming Chinese a necessary component of the Ming loyalist ideology the court was so eager to display.

---

94 Adam Bohnet, “Migrant and Border Subjects,” 328, 336.
The ideological tide was also increasingly turning against the Ming families, as the new trend of Northern Learning gained ground. Under these adverse circumstances, the significance of Ming loyalist families was becoming harder to justify and uphold, not only among Chosŏn scholar-officials but also among the Ming families themselves. They were becoming a routine part of the bureaucracy, wedged within the middle rungs of Chosŏn’s social stratification as chungin, with their political and cultural significance gradually being forgotten. In such an environment, they decided to go their own way by reinforcing their loyalist identity and re-invoking their significance on their own terms, apart from and without the support of the Chosŏn court.
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95 On their chungin status, see note 57.
### Appendix

Table 1: Marriages among the Kuŭisa Descent Groups during the Nineteenth Century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wang Tŏgo 王德五 (1783–1821, TG)</td>
<td>a daughter (1793–1820) of Chŏng Chaech’ŏl 鄭載哲 (1768–1825, CB) as his second wife after 1816</td>
<td>W, 51a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wang Tŏkku 王德九 (1788–1863, TG in 1808)</td>
<td>a daughter (1785–1863) of P’ung Kyŏngu 鄭慶瑀 (1748–1815, CB) and then promoted to TG in 1808</td>
<td>W, 54ab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wang Poyŏl 王輔說 (1803–46, CB)</td>
<td>a daughter (1799–1860) of P’ung Chaegŏm 鄭載儉 (1775–1813, TG in 1804 or 1808)</td>
<td>Y, 8; W, 51a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wang Suyŏl 王修說 (1806–27)</td>
<td>a daughter (1805–32) of P’ung Chaegŏm (above)</td>
<td>Y, 8, 48ab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>P’ung Hŏnjo 鄭憲祖 (1806–36, CB)</td>
<td>a daughter (1810–62) of Wang Tŏgil (1779–1854, TB)</td>
<td>Y, 9; W, 48ab, P, 54a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>P’ung Wŏnjo 鄭愿祖 (1809–1883, CB in 1837 and SG in 1852)</td>
<td>a daughter (1823–1898) of Chŏng Yunch’ŏl 鄭潤哲 (1777–1838, CB) as his third wife after 1841</td>
<td>Y, 36; P, 56b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>P’ung Kŭnjo 鄭近祖 (b. 1813, CB)</td>
<td>a daughter (b. 1819) of Wang Tŏgo (1783–1821, TG)</td>
<td>W, 51b; P, 23a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wang Sugyŏl 王俶說 (1814–?, TG in 1841)</td>
<td>a daughter (1813–77) of P’ung Chaesu 鄭載修 (1782–1830, first CB and then SG in 1804)</td>
<td>Y, 9; W, 49b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>P’ung Yŏmjo 鄭念祖 (1818–85, CB in 1836 and SG in 1847)</td>
<td>a daughter (b. 1824) of Wang Poyŏl 王輔說 (1802–37, TG in 1820) as his second wife after 1840</td>
<td>Y, 11; P, 59b-60b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Chŏng Suk 鄭淑 (b. 1820)</td>
<td>a daughter of P’ung Sulcho 鄭述祖 (1807–53, CB)</td>
<td>Y, 41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Wang Chech’uk 王濟樁 (1822–75)</td>
<td>a daughter (1822–66) of Hwang Hyŏmt’aek 黃顯宅 (TG)</td>
<td>W, 48a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wang Chech’on 王濟新 (1825–87)</td>
<td>a daughter (1826–84) of Pae Changson 表昌孫 (b. 1799, SG)</td>
<td>W, 51a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Chŏng Sŏkyŏng 鄭錫榮 (b. 1826)</td>
<td>a daughter (b. 1827) of Wang Tŏkhong 王德弘 (1787–1848, CB in 1812 and SG in 1824)</td>
<td>Y, 40; C, 223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Wang Chemok 王濟穆 (1827–90, TG)</td>
<td>a daughter (1825–93) of Hwang Hyŏmt’aek 黃顯宅 (TG)</td>
<td>W, 13a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>P’ung Sebaek 鄭世百 (1829–53)</td>
<td>a daughter (1830–72) of Pae Changson 表昌孫 (b. 1799, SG)</td>
<td>Y, 49; P, 54a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>P’ung Seman 鄭世萬 (1833–1907, TG in 1857)</td>
<td>a daughter (1831–1904) of Wang Poyŏl (above)</td>
<td>Wang Poyŏl was Wang Tŏgil’s son.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relation to Previous</td>
<td>Dates/Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Wang Chehong</td>
<td>a daughter (1850–1929) of Chŏng Sŏkkyu</td>
<td>W, 98b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>P’ung Seryong</td>
<td>a daughter (1847–1919) of Wang Hakyŏl</td>
<td>W, 99a; P, 55b-56a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Wang Chegwan</td>
<td>a daughter (1851–83) of P’ung Sulo (above)</td>
<td>W, 56a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Chŏng Kŏnsun</td>
<td>a daughter (1845–1913) of P’ung Seho (1819–77, TG in 1848, SG in 1860)</td>
<td>P, 20a-27a; C, 204-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Chŏng Myŏngsik</td>
<td>a daughter (b. 1853) of Pa’c Sanghyŏn</td>
<td>C, 167-68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Chŏng Ch’angsun</td>
<td>a daughter (b. 1864) of P’ung Wŏnjo (1809–83, SG in 1852)</td>
<td>P, 56b; C, 133-34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>P’ung Sŏngnyun</td>
<td>a daughter (1869–1942) of Chŏng Kwangsun</td>
<td>P, 55b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Wang Chewan</td>
<td>a woman (1876–1938) from the Hangju Hwangs</td>
<td>W, 41b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Hwang K’it’aek</td>
<td>a daughter of P’ung Hakcho (1792–1875, CB in 1829 and TG in 1833)</td>
<td>Kit’aek was a son of Hwang Chaegon (b. 1784, CB in 1837)</td>
<td>Y, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Hwang Ŭit’aek</td>
<td>a daughter of Wang Tŏksu (1799–1859, TG in 1815)</td>
<td>Ŭit’aek was a son of Chaegon</td>
<td>W, 136a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Hwang Hyŏnm’aeak</td>
<td>a daughter of Wang Tŏkku (above)</td>
<td>Hyŏnm’aeak was a son of Hwang Chaegyŏm (b. 1779, CB in 1795, TB in 1801)</td>
<td>W, 54b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Hwang Hyŏn(Ho?)’y’aeak</td>
<td>a daughter of Wang Tŏgo (above)</td>
<td>Hwang Ho’y’aeak was a son of Chaegyŏm</td>
<td>W, 51b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Hwangjo yumin segye wŏllyubo: Y Taebodan Guard: TG Chinese Brigade: CB Sŏnmusa Guard: SG_

* _Hwangjo yumin segye wŏllyubo_ does not record this name among the descendants of the Hangju Hwangs, but does include the name Hot’aeek 霖宅 among the sons of Hwang Chaegyŏm (p. 21). The discrepancy seems to stem from a mistake committed during the compilation of the 1998 Chenam Wang genealogy. Since _Hwangjo yumin segye wŏllyubo_ is a nineteenth-century work, it seems more reasonable to record his name as Hot’aeek.
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