
This book is volume 3 in the series “History of Korea in the Twentieth Century” (20 segi Han’guksa) published by the Institute for Korean Historical Studies (Yŏksa munje yŏn’guso). Whereas volume 1 and volume 2 are concerned with the periods of Presidents Rhee Syngman and Park Chung Hee respectively, volume 3 covers the economic history of the 20th century, focusing on several controversial topics.

The author is one of the few scholars of Korean history who mainly study economic history. Unlike other economic historians, who are more concerned with economics, he maintains a nationalistic perspective. Also, he can be considered an economic historian who follows the tradition of critical historical studies based on Marxism. Thus, he rejects Neo-classical interpretations of Korean economic history by the Naksungdae Institute of Economic Research (Naksŏngdae yŏn’guso), and he supports “financial sovereignty and autonomy, democratization and stabilization” under a “Democratic, Harmonized Economy” as alternatives.

Along these lines, he tries to re-interpret Korean economic history from the nineteenth to the late twentieth century, dealing with crucial issues such as the recognition of modernity, the significance of the “capitalist sprouts” theory, the possibility of autonomous modernization of Korea in the late nineteenth century, the essential meaning of the Land Survey of the Korea Peninsula, the aim and nature of the colonial policies, the characteristics of South Korea’s economic growth, changes in the North Korean economy, and the Kaesong Industrial Complex.

The author explains these issues in a style that is easily accessible for the
general public. Nevertheless, he carefully introduces all the main issues and debates on them, and presents his own perspectives on these issues. This approach is very distinct from the previous studies in economic history which are full of indexes, statistics, and graphs.

In addition, he focuses on the “purpose” of economic policy. Whereas Neo-classical economics has been concerned with the outcome of statistical analysis without paying attention to purposes or processes, this work places more emphasis on what the purpose of a policy is, and what happened during the processes of policy implementation. For instance, the general argument is that capitalism was introduced to colonial Korea by the Japanese colonial policies. However, he contends that the capitalism of the colonial period gave birth to “capitalism without state,” and that it can therefore not be regarded as the normal path towards capitalism, since the state is a basic premise for economic management under capitalism.

Also, we should note that this work pays more attention to rural areas, whereas most studies of twentieth century Korean economic history have focused on the cities. He covers the Project for the Increased Rice Production (or Rice Production Growth Plan, sanmi chǔng sik kyehoek) during the colonial era to show how these policies changed the rural communities and how they related to the rise of peasant movements. The author shows this by matching result, i.e. the numerical data showing an increase in rice production, with the causes for the peasant movements. Even in the chapter on “the reality of the rural economy” after 1945, he shows that the effects of the Land Reform cannot be given a positive evaluation. Last but not the least, this book also includes an outline of the North Korean economy, which is another strong point.

In conclusion, even though it deals with twentieth-century Korean economic history through important topics, this book is very useful to trace the economic circumstances comprehensively. However, as this works aims to criticize Neo-classical economics, important achievements of previous studies have not been pointed out. In order to make a more objective argument, perhaps it would have been better to go beyond a critical interpretation of Neo classical economics, and embrace the results of this research critically.

Park Tae-Gyun
Professor, Graduate School of International Studies
Seoul National University
Park Noja’s star shines brightly in the firmament of Korean history. His books have shown up in best-seller lists many times, which means that he is popular not only among historians and scholars but also among the general public. He has written mainly about modern and contemporary Korean history, but in this book he returns to the ancient history of Korea, originally his major area of research.

In this book, he proposes to look at ancient history “upside down,” or in other words to turn established notions on their heads. But what exactly, and how does he want to turn things on their heads? The answer can be found in a congratulatory remark written by Prof. Yi Sŏngsi, the author of Manufactured Antiquity (Mandūrōjin koda, tr. Pak Kyŏnghŭi; Seoul: Samin, 2001). He urges us to observe ancient history not literally “upside down,” but from a perspective that is appropriate to the actual historical context, not from a perspective that is far removed from antiquity.

The most outstanding characteristic of the book is that it deals with the most controversial issues in ancient history: Manchuria (Dongbei sansheng; the three northeastern provinces), the relationship between Goguryeo and China, the perception of people in the Three Kingdoms of Korea (Samguk sidae), and the relationship between the Korean peninsula and Japan in the ancient period. Not only historians, but ordinary Koreans as well are very interested in these issues. Since the public has become “expert” on these issues through historical dramas, these are “dangerous topics” – therefore saying the wrong thing can easily lead to strong reactions from the public.

Though this work is conceived in the same vein as Manufactured Antiquity, it is more effective in delivering new perspectives in an accessible way. In addition, the way it raises questions is quite refreshing. In particular, it points out that the orthodox view of Korea as a “victim” that is predominant in modern historiography contradicts the narratives of great conquering heroes who are the main characters in ancient Korean history. This is an important issue in that it applies to all those who have learned Korean history in Korea.

In many history books it is written that Koreans are “peace-loving” and “do not invade others even though Korea has been invaded many times.” Also, they mention that Koreans “like to wear white clothes.” However, Pak Noja contends that these things are not true for ancient history. He points out that in historiography of the ancient period people like to define Koguryeó as an
expansionist “empire” that stretched far beyond the Yalu River and regard it as a “glorious” history. Also, he argues that Koreans are very sensitive to find out who first transmitted what in the interaction between Korea and Japan.

The point is that the perception of a “victim” can be utilized as the basis for justification of actions in the present. The glorious era of a conqueror in the ancient period can be rationalized in the mind of the “victim.” Although it is not objective to describe the ancient period as a glorious era of conquerors, the re-creation of the glorious past can work as a veil that hides the appearance of the victim, and is not about the harming of others but about compensation for the harm inflicted on oneself.

Pak Noja effectively criticizes the problematic perceptions that are rooted deeply in Korean society. For instance, King Kūn’ch’ogo, the hero in a television drama, and Chumong, hero of another television drama, have been praised as great conquerors, but when it comes to foreigners who have expanded their influence sphere, the evaluation becomes very negative. Here the new equation “What if not Silla but Koguryŏ had unified the peninsula” is also a new invention. When reading the author’s rhetorical question “how is an anachronistic understanding of ancient history different from Israel’s understanding of its past?” one cannot but admire the universality of the author’s vision.

As a result, the main ‘outdated” historical interpretation the author wants to criticize here is that the Northeast Asia that appears in historiography of the ancient period is depicted as internally as already having “peoples/nations,” but externally is marked by adversarial relationships. He would rather argue that it is more appropriate and important for ancient history to focus on East Asia as a whole and to interpret it as an “area beyond borders” centering on “interchange, fusion, and harmony,” rather than just focusing on the Korean peninsula. This is the conclusion that the author wants to impart on his readers. In order to do so, he wants to tell the story of “human beings” and “culture,” rather than the story of the “sword” in the ancient Korean peninsula.

The author made great efforts to overcome the conventional historical perspectives of nationalism and statism of East Asia in the 20th century. Right after the book was published, we could find one netizen commenting that “we should guard against Pak Noja’s betrayal.” It shows how provocative and revolutionary Pak’s argument is for Korean society.

However, Pak’s analysis in this book is just a starting point. His argument is meaningful and resonant, but there should be more efforts to provide solid evidence to support the argument firmly. For example, the perception of
peoples who lived during the Three Kingdoms era, the issue of new interpretations on tribute diplomacy, the problem of Silla and Parhae, the relationship between Korea and Japan, etc. are issues that cannot be easily proved and supported by a few cases. Even though all agree with the need of new perspectives, if they are not fully supported, they cannot be considered as more than a hollow argument. It is precisely on this point that many historians in Korea criticize this work.

Nevertheless, his suggestion is very important for the development of an objective historical perspective and narration in that it urges us to stop clinging to homogeneity and to view Korea’s ancient history more broadly, as a stream of co-existence and harmony. And, it applies not only to ancient history, but also to all historical analysis and narration from the Koryo dynasty to the present.

Park Tae-Gyun
Professor, Graduate School of International Studies
Seoul National University


To say that there is not a great abundance of works in Western languages on the Koryo dynasty would be a massive understatement; in fact, the number of works in English that deal specifically with Koryo history can still be counted on the fingers of one hand. Remco Breuker’s *Establishing a Pluralist Society in Medieval Korea* is therefore a very welcome addition, and not simply because it boosts the numbers: it is a very persuasive account of the Koryo worldview, revisionist in its interpretation of key events and frameworks, yet also building on the achievements of previous research. It therefore challenges the few specialists in this field to rethink some of their notions about this era, and at the same time can also serve as a useful introduction and reference work for students and researchers interested in this part of pre-modern Korean history.

Previous scholarship on the first half of Koryo, from the founding in 918 to the start of the military rebellion in 1170, has almost exclusively tried to explain the main politics, ideology and even society in terms of a split identity,
as a struggle between Silla successionists and Koguryo successionists. In this view, the early centuries were dominated by those in favor of a Koguryo identity, among whom first and foremost the dynastic founder, Wang Kôn himself. Hence the choice of the name Koryo – interchangeable with Koguryo – and the ambition to reclaim the Koguryo lands across the Yalu river. This ambition was, however, never put into practice, until Myoch’öng persuaded the king and many officials to relocate the capital to Pyongyang and use it as a launch pad to re-conquer the Manchurian territories. His movement was crushed, however, by Kim Pusik (1075-1151), a scion of the Silla royal clan, in 1136, and henceforth Koryo was dominated by the Sinophile, peninsular, Silla-dominated group, and the northern territories were irretrievably lost.

The problems with this view have already been noted, to the point that it is now commonly accepted that it was created by Sin Ch’aeho (1880-1936) at a time when it was felt a radical new interpretation of history was needed as a counter-narrative against the colonial discourse. However, no alternative interpretation has yet been proposed, and this is where Breuker’s work steps in. His explanation is both radical and simple: rather than tracing Koryo’s official ideology to one or the other of the previous kingdoms on the peninsula, he boldly states that they were all considered equally part of the Koryo polity; thus he points out that Koryo never used the name “Koryo” for itself, but mostly “Samhan” or the “Three Han” (besides some other names as well; see chapter 1), originally referring to three states sometimes thought to have been precursors of the Three Kingdoms (i.e., Silla, Koguryo, and Paekche). Such previous political entities he calls “charter states” (after Victor Lieberman; p. 17), which, though defunct, continue to shape the identity of the current polity. Eventually, Koryo was seen as simply a temporally bounded representation of the community, while its “eternal” representation was the Samhan; this, however, has the effect of devaluing Koryo, and paves the way for pluralist interpretations of the community’s identity (p. 81).

However, “pluralism” is here not merely used in a loose sense, for example as simply the opposite of “monism” or “exclusivism.” Breuker sees Koryo pluralism as an ideological program: in other words, Koryo elites were very much conscious that their community was pluralist and proceeded to solidify this ideology in their actions, structures and institutions (p. 7). The main examples, in my opinion, through which he shows this pluralism are through the actions of Koryo literati (ch. 7), the composition of the Samguk sagi (ch. 9), and the Myoch’öng rebellion (ch. 11). Here it can suffice to look at the figure of Kim Pusik, who figures prominently in all these chapters; although he is always portrayed as “Confucian” and “pro-Chinese,” Breuker convincingly
debunks such notions, showing that he was instead very typical of pluralist Koryo literati. It was Myoch’ông who broke out of this mould: not so much in terms of his ideas – the mixture of geomancy, Taoism, Buddhism etc. and virtually all he stood for is standard fare for Koryo (pp. 421-422) – but in terms of his ideals: his exclusivism and anti-pluralist notion of a unilateral Koryo world order. As soon as the rebellion broke out, most of his supporters in the capital deserted him. Kim Pusik did not see this as an opportunity to defeat the Koguryoists and cement the Silla heritage, but rather he did his utmost to restore the balance. Thus, his Samguk sagi is not an attempt to privilege Silla, but rather to give equal weight to all three kingdoms as legitimate predecessors of Koryo. However, while he was successful in the short term, by concentrating so much power in his person, and by the lingering effects of Myoch’ông’s idealist, unilaterally Koryo-centered vision, the pluralist period was doomed, and effectively came to an end with the period of military rule.

In this narrative, chapter 8 serves as a kind of hinge chapter, which tries to explain the origins of Koryo pluralism, and show that it was pervasive and codified. Here I am not entirely convinced; for one thing, only two factors are provided by way of explanation, i.e. the complexity of the family system (with the hybrid nature of the descent system forcing people to live with and choose from several options) and the geo-political factors, i.e. Koryo’s size and location in between Manchuria and the Chinese mainland. Yet it is hard to see how these factors in concreto led to the formation of a pluralist ideology. Here one would expect to see a concrete sketch of its development, but this is not given in this chapter: instead, the examples given (of Wŏngwang’s Five Secular Commandments) and of the “historicization” of the landscape (connecting it with concrete events that situate it in the context of the state) are interesting but in need of more sustained argumentation.

The reinterpretation of the Ten Injunctions in chapter 10 is perhaps the most convincing case that pluralism was inscribed into the Koryo system (and the author’s injunction that they should be seen in their entirety is certainly worth heeding; see pp. 402-406), but here too questions remain. If, as the author has argued elsewhere,¹ the Ten Injunctions were indeed fabricated under Hyŏnjong after 1010, it would mean that the key pluralist program emerged fairly late, and would last only about a century, until it was shaken by

---

¹ See Remco E. Breuker, Forging the Truth: Creative Deception and National Identity in Medieval Korea; separate issue of East Asian History 35 (Canberra: Division of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australia National University, 2009).
Myoch’ông’s challenge in 1127-1136. At times the author seems to be pushing his agenda too much in trying to explain everything through a pluralist lens. Particularly in foreign relations, for example, it is difficult to see anything other than realpolitik, a very coldblooded pragmatism: as shown especially by the research of Michael Rogers, Koryō went to great lengths in creating a kind of parallel world that was presented to the outside world: rulers and reigns were systematically faked, and while internally an imperial system was maintained, externally Koryō presented itself as vassal and kingdom. Although the author preempts this criticism by pointing out that this pragmatism was tied to ideological concerns (p. 235), one could also argue that it was simply a coping mechanism, an attempt to work within the limitations of a given situation.

In this context, it would be instructive to look at Koryō’s often fruitless efforts at imposing its authority over areas removed from the center. Koryō pluralism may well have been the reflection of a situation where it was simply impossible to impose a central view, and the co-existence of different ideologies may thus have been simply an acceptance of this reality rather than an ideological choice. In this respect it may be instructive to look at a recent work by No Myŏngho, who, rather than looking for a unified ideology, decides to focus on four different strands of communal consciousness (chiptan üisik) that operated. He calls these four groups self-protective communities, descendants of the Three Kingdoms, the unified Three Han states, and the realm of the Korean son of Heaven.2 While the first two are actual communities or groups, the latter two are more ideals that inspired literati. As such, the last two are also extensively covered by Breuker, but the consideration of the former two – especially regional society, but also concrete remnants of loyalty to the ancient Three Kingdoms – would have helped to further strengthen and refine his arguments. Nevertheless, this remains an impressive work of scholarship, and I hope that it will serve as a model and incentive for further studies on the Koryō period and Northeast Asia from the tenth to fifteenth centuries.

Sem Vermeersch
Assistant Professor, Department of Religious Studies
Seoul National University

2. No Myŏngho [Ro Myoungho], Koryŏ kukka wa chiptan üisik. Chawi kongtongch’ei, Samguk yumin, Samhan ilt’ong, Haedong ch’önja ū ch’önha (Seoul: Sŏuldae ch’ulp’an munhwawon, 2009).
The song of our people, Arirang

“Arirang- Arirang- Arariyo, crossing over Arirang Pass,
You, my love, forsook me and left, but ere ten ri have passed your feet will ache”

These are the lyrics of Arirang, which has also been called the “new folk song Arirang,” or “Bonjo Arirang” (hereafter abbreviated as Arirang). If not Arirang, which folk song could come close in its power to unite our people? This Arirang was based on “Chajin Arirang,” which itself derived from a Kyönggi Province folk song called “Long Arirang.” After it was used as the theme song of the film Arirang, directed by Na Ungyu in 1926, it was sublimated as “the song of our people;” thus despite the weight and power it carries, its history is not that long.

Although a number of versions of Arirang had been sung even before Na Ungyu’s film, none has managed to bring Koreans together and unite them in song like this one. It is only a short song, but it is charged with many problems, with a network of meanings that can otherwise not be laid bare. This network of meanings can only be grasped by someone who takes “modernity” very seriously.

How did the new folk song Arirang become imbued with such weight of meaning? It was due to nothing less than the weight of the “modern,” not by any means a light era. This “modern” does not just refer to the “modern” as an axis of time. The “modern” in question is a network of meaning that reveals the convulsions of an era, including the collapse of traditional norms, rapidly changing values, unforeseeable changes, the confused minds of people exposed to such changes that cannot find any stability, and the intractable crossroads where it meets the norms of the past.

About The Song of Modernity and Arirang

For these reasons, the book is very appropriately titled The Song of Modernity and Arirang. Arirang is the crucial problem of this book, and the axis of this problem is precisely “modernity;” Arirang itself and the space surrounding it are the parameters that are used as a mechanism to see through modernity. The book is divided into three parts and includes fourteen chapters. In this work, scholars from different fields such as Korean musicology, classical literature, modern literature, popular culture studies, Japanese literature or modern
poetics, express their unique voices and colors towards the common goal of describing *The Song of Modernity*.

The book begins with ‘The Scene of Modern Songs and Arirang” written by professor Kim Siöp. Professor Kim tells the story of how Arirang became the “national song” that represents the “identity of “Korean people” for North and South Koreans, as well as overseas Koreans. Starting from the thesis that Arirang is the song that reflects the dynamic scene of modern songs, he tried to collect information on the formation and development of popular songs from the late nineteenth century to the 1930s.

In part 1, there are four chapters under the theme of “The modern innovation of traditional songs:” ‘The formation of modern music society” by Kwôn To hüi, “Trends in popular songs after the nineteenth century and the problem of the introduction of foreign styles” by Kang Túng hak, ‘The status of popular culture and *siga* in the early twentieth century” by Pak Aegyöng, and “The formal characteristics of vulgar songs (*chapka*) and their contemporaneous meaning in the early twentieth century” by Ko Misuk.

In part 2, there are 4 chapters under the theme of “The characteristics of modern popular song:” “Issues in the research on popular song during the colonial period and their meaning” by Yi Yöngmi, “A music-social historical approach to 1930s’ popular songs” by Song Pangsong, “New folk songs and popular songs” by Chang Yujoong, and “Seditious modern *siga* and censorship in the colonial period” by Han Kihyöng.

In part 3, there are 5 chapters under the theme of “Arirang, the modern folk song:” ‘Formation of the character of Arirang, the modern folk song” by Kim Siöp, “Musical research on the root of the sound of Arirang its changes” by Yi Pohyöng, ‘The development of the formative period of popular songs and the existence of Arirang” by Kang Túng hak, “A study on the canonization process of Arirang” by Chǒng Ut’aek, and “The creation of *Arirang*, sound of our people” by Im Kyŏnghwa.

These articles were originally written over a thirty-two year period, from 1977 to 2009. Nowadays, the shelf life of academic articles is getting shorter and shorter. However, the texts by Yi Pohyöng and Kim Siöp, about the root of the Arirang sound and the formation of its character, respectively, retain their value as key studies in the field and deserve to be read. On the other hand, Kwôn To hüi’s article gives a bird’s eye overview of the structure of modern music society, and provides an essential perspective for understanding the multi-layered aspects of music society in its transition from pre-modern to modern times. Moreover, the texts by Kang Túng hak, Pak Aegyöng, and Ko Misuk allude to the way to read the symptoms of contemporary popular
culture: Kang studies the previously ignored trends of popular songs after the nineteenth century, Pak ascertains that popular *siga* (which started to circulate widely with the rise of cities in the nineteenth century) became the most prominent popular culture at the beginning of the twentieth century, and Ko pays attention to the vulgar song (chapka) to find out the origin and reality of the popular song in the early twentieth century.

The texts by Yi Yongmi, Song Pangsong, Chang Yujong, and Han Kihyoung reflect their deep engagement with the problems at hand, considering that they found out the range and spread of popular song that had been repressed by the censorship of the colonial authorities. Especially Yi Yongmi, in the process of dealing with the scope and definition of the popular song, which are key issues in research on the history of popular songs in the colonial era, points to the central question of how to understand the hybridity of popular songs. Han Kihyoung suggests a new approach to studies of literature in “the era of censorship,” urging us to consider the possibility that the censorship mechanisms established by the colonizers spurred the colonized to come up with a unique modern poetics.

In part 3, the themes treated by Chang Tung-hak, Chong Ut’aek, and Im Kyong-hwa together form a linked argument. The common thread is the research on the existence of Arirang and its canonization, and the process of its acceptance as the “voice of the people.” Chong Ut’aek focuses on the canonization process of Arirang. By becoming the song that was considered to best represent Koreans’ identity, and by being cherished by overseas Koreans as the affective correlative representing their self identity, the song became canonized. Chong Ut’aek investigates how, from when, and why Arirang became the song that represented Korean identity, and concludes that the process of becoming the representative song of a people is closely related to the consolidation of its modern characteristics.

The Future Shape of Arirang

The chapters included in *The Song of Modernity and Arirang* lead us to reflect on Korean music society in modern times. Although each chapter deals with rather heavy and oppressive subjects, they are conducive to a course of reflection we definitely need to pass through. However, researchers use terms that are not universally agreed on, conveying the same meaning in different terms or delivering different meanings with the same term, as a result of which communication is often obstructed. This is why scholars from a variety of fields should frequently meet and discuss such issues.

There are many reasons why we need to pay attention to Arirang. It is not
because it is a song that had been, is still, and will be sung now and forever, but because Arirang has its own “openness.” It is because the various forms of Arirang that we encounter in research, in everyday life, and in the cultural area, are all true interpretations of Arirang. Because of that, we cannot but look forward to the future manifestations of Arirang and research on it.

Song Ji-won
HK Research Professor, Kyujanggak Institute of Korean Studies
Seoul National University


In this book the author, an anthropologist (the author defines himself as ethnologue) specializing in Korea, looks back at the career of one of his informants, and also engages in a good deal of self-reflection in the process. The main protagonist is a shaman who is affectionately known as Puch’ae, “Fan,” after one of the shaman’s main attributes. In the first part of the book, we hear her life story, as told to the author over several sessions, the first one taking place in 1976 and the last one in 1986. The second part tells the story from the anthropologist’s point of view, how he encountered Puch’ae and how she shaped his study of Korean shamanism.

Puch’ae’s narrative is both fascinating and challenging; as the author notes in his introduction, her account is full of contradictions, but since the anthropologist has no way of verifying her story, he can only record it as it is, explaining only the religious terminology in more abstract, “scientific” terms. Puch’ae was born in Hwanghae province in either 1917 or 1920 (the date changes depending on the story she tells), and because her father, who owned a pottery kiln, went bankrupt when she was still young, her life was full of hardship. In the description of her childhood in the northern part of the peninsula, we find the first signs of her future vocation: she remembers instructions received from deities, and her play-acting of being a mudang. The account is especially valuable for transporting the reader into the worldview of the shaman, which the author later describes as “a coherent thought system . . . inscribed in a worldview that the kut enacts.” (p. 166) But as a reader
accustomed to a linear historical perspective and clear facts, I found myself trying to force it into familiar parameters, such as the historical background (colonization, liberation etc.), her exact family relations, her initiation as a shaman etc. However, Puch’ae sees everything in very different terms: there is little or no reference to the objective history; since she regards everyone as her children it is sometimes difficult to say whether she is talking about her own children or her clients; and her vocation is seen mostly as something between her and the spirits, not as something learned from another shaman. In the second part, however, we find that surprisingly, besides her worldview, there are sometimes very concrete reasons for her way of representing things.

Interestingly, the second part – the anthropologist’s story – also seems to have been recorded by another; in this case Hervé Péjaudier, co-editor of the series in which this book appears (Collection “scènes coréennes”). As the author reveals (p. 135), “I was too implicated in this story to treat it as an ethnographic object.” Thus it took a long time to reach enough critical distance to publish this story. Although the second part is said to be based on interviews – partly also to preserve some spontaneity in what is after all a description of an oral tradition (p. 98) – it is of course also the reflection of years of seminars based on the author’s fieldwork and the interviews were also checked with field notes.

In a candid account of his meetings and interactions with Puch’ae, we can indeed ascertain that it was not the anthropologist who chose his object of study, but very much the shaman who chose the researcher! And although the author admits to have been reluctant in the beginning to respond to her invitation, gradually he came to realize that through her he could obtain a unique window into the Shamanist worldview and belief system – not only her own, but those of her clients as well, to whom he had unique access. In fact, the author became registered as one of her clients, whom Puch’ae sees in terms of family relations rather than economic relations. But the personal reflections on this entanglement – leading ultimately to a performance in Paris, the first Korean kut in France – serve a purpose, as the author’s development of his relations with the shaman and the ensuing changes in his views on the shaman’s religious and social roles forces us to rethink our own fundamental stance regarding shamanism and contain many very interesting insights into how they operate.

What I appreciated especially about this work is that it eschews the heavy footnoting and referencing to a veritable pantheon of scholarly luminaries that is so dominant in most anthropological literature in English without sacrificing anything in terms of scholarly acumen. This would make the book very useful
in the classroom, both at the undergraduate and graduate level, so it is to be hoped that an English translation may someday be published. To end on a nitpicking note, in the discussion of East-coast village rituals (the subject of the author’s first book, *Les Algues, les Anciens, les Dieux: la vie et la religion d’un village de pêcheurs-agriculteurs coréens*, 1983), the author refers to an English ethnomusicologist called “Richard Mills” (p. 109) who studied the musical aspects of these rituals; I assume that Simon Mills is meant here, who has indeed worked in this area.

Sem Vermeersch

Assistant Professor, Department of Religious Studies
Seoul National University