

***Ha-na-nim*: A Korean Divine Name Taken Over for the Israelite God**

The Bible Translator

64(3) 332–341

© The Author(s) 2013

Reprints and permissions:

sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/2051677013507218

tbt.sagepub.com



Min Suc Kee

Assistant Minister of the Church of Dreams and Lecturer at Mokwon University, Daejeon, South Korea

Abstract

It has been a successful venture for the Israelite god to take the name of the most respected god in Korea. Against the polytheistic background of the country, it seems that orthographical disputes over the name *ha-na-nim* have served to stir up the monotheistic zeal of Korean Protestants, giving support to their passionate mission of proclaiming the absolute oneness of God. As far as the orthography of the name is concerned, the logic of correct grammar has been set aside in the face of practicality and religious fervor around the name *ha-na-nim*.

Keywords

Korean Bible, divine name, *ha-na-nim*, indigenization, orthography, Korean Protestants

It has been a common practice for the “Israelite” god to take another deity’s name as his own.¹ It may have occurred in the biblical periods and certainly afterwards whenever he was carried to foreign soils throughout the world on the wings of Christianity. So the nameless one, initially known as the god of the ancestors, has taken names such as *el* (Canaanite), *yhwh* (Midianite?), *theos* (Greek), “God” and its cognates in European languages, *sang-jae/cheon-jae/cheon-joo* (上帝, 天帝, 天主) in Chinese and *ga-mi* in Japanese

¹ This article was read at the International Conference in Celebration of the Jubilee Year of the Korean Society of Old Testament Studies (28-29 May 2010, Methodist Theological University, Seoul).

Corresponding author:

Min Suc Kee, Han-Bit Apt 120-904, Eo Eun Dong, Yu Seong Gu, Daejeon, 305-755, Republic of Korea.

Email: minsuckee@hotmail.com

(Knight 2003; Ryu 2004; Cross 1973, 3-43; the Chinese and Japanese names are transliterated in Korean pronunciation). Without exception in Korea, the name of a long-revered indigenous god, *ha-na-nim* (하나님), is now used by millions of Korean Christians every day as the name of their Lord. The name was successfully adopted by followers of the Israelite god to translate *elohim* or *theos* in Christian Bibles as *ha-na-nim*. Many Korean people today do not know that the name once belonged to their indigenous god, dearly revered for a long time before Christianity arrived in their land.

The name has gone through some crises, due to grammatical and theological debates, but has managed to retain the title as the name of the supreme and only God in Korean Bibles. As has been discussed widely in studies of Korean Christianity, the remarkable growth of the Christian population in Korea owes much to this name.

In this article I am going to introduce a brief history of the indigenization of the Israelite god under the name of *ha-na-nim*. By considering the history of Korean Bible translation, I will argue that the name *ha-na-nim* is, in fact, absurd. But through studying the history of disputes over the name, I will also argue that this oddity provides us with an excellent insight into Korean Protestant religious enthusiasm. In addition, the study will invite us to think about the nature of the orthographical development of a name or a word in which priority is given to pragmatism rather than to grammatical correctness.

***Ha-na-nim*, an indigenous god in Korea**

Korea is a land of religious plurality. A good number of religions have so far wandered through this small peninsula. Along with changes of regime, before the modern era many different faiths have occupied the position of Korea's primary religion. Before the traditional Chinese religions such as Confucianism, Buddhism, and Taoism began to flourish in the fifth century A.D., *sin-kyo* (神敎 신교) and *mu-kyo* (巫敎 무교) were the major primitive beliefs among the Korean people. From the middle of the seventh century, with the beginning of the Unified Silla kingdom (A.D. 668–935), it was Buddhism that was greatly preferred, and then Confucianism followed, from the fifteenth century of the Choseon era onwards, as the major religious faith. Protestantism arrived in 1884 and in the modern era Christianity has been rising rapidly, so that now one-quarter of the Korean population is reported to be Christian. Christianity can now be labeled as *the* religion of modern Korea, alongside Buddhism, which has equally increased the number of its followers, accounting also for one-quarter of the Korean population (see Yoo 1997, 177-79).

Ha-na-nim, the name for the Hebraic-Christian God in the major Korean translations of the Bible, is actually the name of an indigenous deity in Korea (Kim 2004, 92-93). Presumably *ha-na-nim* was worshiped already in the era of the Goryeo dynasty (tenth to fourteenth century A.D.) and the

name is frequently attested in the writings from the following Choseon dynasty. Most notably we may refer to the writings *Yong-bi-eo-cheon-ga* (*Songs of the Dragons Flying to Heaven*) and *Wol-in-cheon-gang-ji-gok* (*Moonlight Shining over a Thousand Rivers*), in which the deity is sincerely revered (Jeong 1998, 326). In these writings the term *ha-nāl* (하늘), which means “sky” or “heaven,” is personalized and undoubtedly refers to the deity *ha-na-nim*, whose name is composed of *ha-na* (< *ha-nāl* “heaven”) and *nim*, which means “dear” or “lord.” Etymologically *ha-na-nim* means “heavenly lord” (Kim 2004, 103-108).

This god *ha-na-nim* is peculiar in that he does not belong to any of the major Korean religions mentioned above. Regardless of his humble background, *ha-na-nim* was the supreme deity revered and worshiped by most of the Korean people even when their national religions were Confucianism, Buddhism, or Taoism. The same deity was supposedly worshiped in China at that time under the name of *sang-jae*, which means “heavenly lord.” However, the speculation that *ha-na-nim* is of Chinese origin is not necessarily true, since the idea of *ha-na-nim* well precedes the time Chinese religions first came into Korea, as has been emphatically argued by Jong Seo Kim (2004, 87-195). It is probable that the nationalized and institutionalized religions, mainly imported from imperial China, were just considered to provide guidance for the model life or a manual for philosophical contemplation, while many people were much more at home with the shamanistic belief that they were blessed and protected by many spirits or gods, among whom *ha-na-nim* was supreme. From this it could well be concluded that the nationalized religions were practiced mainly in the upper classes of Korean society, while *ha-na-nim* was the god of folk religions, with a much wider following. *Ha-na-nim* was never a god commanding belief but always resided and was revered in the hearts of all people, high and low, intelligent and dull. This is well attested by many sources, particularly in Nam Seon Choi’s words in *A-si-cho-seun* (*The Dawning of Korean History*; see Jeong 1998, 326). Put simply, he was the highest and most general god in Korea.

The nature of *ha-na-nim*, according to Jeong (1998), could be summarized as follows. First, *ha-na-nim* is the supreme god in the ancient pantheistic belief of Korea, where about 273 gods or spirits were adored. Second, *ha-na-nim* was a god of neither systematic theology nor sacred Scripture. Third, he was a god of both fear and blessing. He could cause troubles in the health or fortune of the people, and, in contrast, he might bless people for their well-being when they sincerely served and revered him. The wording of prayers to *ha-na-nim* is remarkably similar to some passages from the Old Testament. One example is found in the passages from *Tae-pyong-sa* (太平詞 태평사), written by In Roh Park (박인로 [1561–1642]): “Dear

ha-na-nim, please look upon and protect our nation for a million years . . . please let our king of virtue and goodness live for a million years and let our people flourish with joy, peace, and pleasure” (quoted from Kim 2004, 105-107, 109-10, my translation; see also Jeong 1998, 329). The God of Exodus seems to have appeared in *Yong-bi-eo-cheon-ga* when it attests how *ha-nāl* “heaven” controlled “water” to save Seong Gae Lee (이성계), the general of the army, from the threat of flooding (*Yong-bi-eo-cheon-ga*, ch. 68; see Kim 2004, 111-12).

Indigenization of the Israelite god in Korea

It was a blessing for the Israelite god about to settle in a new territory that the host *ha-na-nim* was a blank sheet with neither a clearly worked-out theology nor any scripture. He was blindly ready to welcome another deity to wear his skin—the exact process the Israelite god was most skillful at and least likely to waste. It is also intriguing that *ha-na-nim* and the Israelite god had so much in common. The belief systems of both gods share the idea of the divine sonship of the king (Ps 2.4-7), denounce use of an image of their deities (Exod 20.4), have no descriptions of the origin of their gods, and enjoy the use of anthropomorphism in describing them. Also, heaven is the much-revered dwelling place of both gods, and may replace them when personified. Particularly, I would like to highlight the reading of a personified “heaven” in the book of Daniel (4.26), the apocryphal books, and Matthew’s Gospel, where it occurs frequently. The same substitution is found when *ha-nāl* (하늘 “heaven”) represents *ha-na-nim* in many Korean writings (see again Nam Seon Choi’s words from *A-si-cho-seun* [兒詩朝鮮] in Jeong 1998, 326). Just as with the Israelite god in the Old Testament, *ha-na-nim* is often said to be incomparable among the multitude of the gods (see Exod 15.11; Deut 3.24; 1 Kgs 8.23; Pss 86.8; 95.3; 96.4-5 [= 1 Chr 16.25]; 97.7, 9; and 135.5; for these comparisons see Noh Soon Kwak’s summary in Jeong 1998, 329). Notably, Seok Heon Ham (함석헌), a leading theologian and Old Testament scholar in Korea, said that such a rapid growth of Christianity in Korea should be ascribed to *ha-na-nim*, the indigenous god deeply rooted and long revered in the hearts of Koreans (Knight 2003, 23). Surely, as some evangelists have claimed, the Israelite god was incarnated as *ha-na-nim* in Korea (Jeong 1998, 329-30). Or, to put it the other way round, “*ha-na-nim* was baptized to be born again,” as Sung Deuk Ok has wittily observed (Jeong 1998, 331). To me this sounds the best way to describe the deity’s transformation.

There was another key factor that helped the Israelite god’s successful expansion in Korea. In the past, *ha-na-nim* was also called by the names

sang-jae (上帝 상제), *cheon-jae* (天帝 천제), or *cheon-joo* (天主 천주), which are made up of Chinese letters. They were particularly used by the people in upper-class society who much preferred Chinese to the Korean alphabet; the name *ha-na-nim* written in Korean letters was obviously looked down on by the elite (see Kim 2004, 108-109). The Korean alphabet, invented in the middle of the fifteenth century, was mainly used by the lower-class people at that time. The god named in Korean, along with the Korean translated Bible, penetrated into the hearts of the vast number of common people, who came to find a sort of liberation, and not only from “original sin” as taught by the Christian missionaries. They were also liberated from the insecurity they had felt because their language, which was regarded as lower class, seemed to hold no special riches (see Jeong 1998, 340). The translation of the Bible into Korean boosted the widespread use of the Korean alphabet and thus disturbed the complacency of the conservative and Confucian upper-class gentlemen *yang-ban* (양반).

Disputes over the name

As time went by, with the rapid growth of Christianity, theological consciousness became keener and keener among the leaders of Korean Christianity, both foreign missionaries and indigenous theologians. They began to examine the divine name *ha-na-nim* and were seriously concerned that the name could well bring with it the gentile deity’s pantheistic and idolatrous nature. L. G. Underwood (1859–1916), one of the most respected and influential missionaries in Korea, agonized over using the gentile Korean god’s name for the Christian God in the Bible (Underwood 1918, 125-26). Apart from *ha-na-nim*, other names such as *sin*, *cham-sin*, *sang-jae*, *cheon-jae*, or *cheon-joo* were considered for the name of God in the early Korean translations from 1882 to 1904. (See an excellent summary and well-balanced history of the debates concerning the name in Knight 2003, 79-104. There are further early references in the library of the Korean Bible Society, such as *The Korea Mission Field* [1905–1941], *The Korea Review* [1901–1906], *The Korean Repository* [1892–1898], and a number of the missionaries’ reports and letters, which are precious documents in the study of God’s naming in Korean Bibles.) Yet the name *ha-na-nim* has overcome all obstacles so far and remained as the name of the Hebraic and Christian God in Protestant Bibles.

Reviewing the history of the survival of the name is truly intriguing. We may enjoy the irony which is evident when a logical absurdity no longer matters in the face of purely practical considerations. As mentioned above, *ha-na-nim* is composed of *ha-na* and *nim*. While the latter means “dear one”

or “lord,” the tricky problem lies with the first part, *ha-na*. The earliest form of this is *ha-nāl* (하날) or *ha-nal* (하날) meaning “heaven,” which orthographically developed into both *ha-nal* (하날) and *ha-neul* (하늘). When the suffix *nim* is added, they are spelled, respectively, *ha-na-nim* (하나님) and *ha-neu-nim* (하느님), with the phoneme /l/ (ㄹ) omitted, as is common in Korean orthography. Though both mean the same, “heavenly lord,” *ha-na-nim* was much preferred to *ha-neu-nim*. This is partly due to a wordplay on *ha-na*. While it is a shortened form of *ha-nāl* (“heaven”), *ha-na* by itself, independent of *ha-nāl*, signifies the number “one.” Consequently *ha-na-nim*, regardless of its original meaning “heavenly lord,” sounds like a proud reference to “One Lord.” Interestingly, it is known that a prominent Korean language scholar Si Kyeong Joo (주시경) told J. S. Gale (1863–1937), missionary to Korea and a member of the Council of Translation for the Korean Bible, that *ha-na* in the name means “one” without mentioning the true meaning “heaven,” while he was then not even a Christian. The anecdote is reported in Gale’s books (1900, 573; 1909, 78-79).

It was when the Korean Catholics and Protestants together launched a new translation of the Bible *Gong-dong-bun-yeok* (공동번역) in the late 1960s that a problem arose. The work was done by scholars from both sides, but it was strongly rejected by the major Korean Protestant denominations for its use of *ha-neu-nim* rather than *ha-na-nim* as the name of God. As a result, nearly all Protestant churches today still read the older version *Gae-yeok* (개역, 1952/1961) and its modernized version *Gae-yeok-gae-jung* (개역개정, 1998), while the Catholics took the new translation as their official version of the Bible.

There have been fervent exchanges of arguments among Protestant biblical and theological specialists over which spelling ought to be accepted. This is illustrated by the notorious arguments between Noh Soon Kwak (1971a, 1971b) and Hee Gun Jeong (1971), whose articles were published in turn in *Gi-dok-gyo sa-sang* (기독교 사상) in 1971.

Noh Soon Kwak, and more recently Kwang Shik Kim (1998, 1999, 119-21), have argued that the name *ha-neu-nim* should be supported on the basis of grammatical correctness. “Heaven” was written down either as *ha-nāl* (하날) or *ha-nal* (하날), but when modern standard Korean grammar was taking shape in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, *ha-neul* (하늘) took the place of the standard word for “heaven.” Etymologically, *ha-neu-nim* “the heavenly lord” should be the name of God in the Bible. Nevertheless, support for *ha-na-nim* and its popularity were immense because, first of all, zealous Christians keenly wanted to find in it the word *ha-na*, abandoning the original meaning “heaven” and taking instead the meaning “one” which resulted from the wordplay. The growing theological

enthusiasm for the monotheistic Christian God was overwhelming in the religious feelings of conservative Korean Christians. The one-sidedness of their fervent claim is well demonstrated in the article by Hee Gun Jeong, who essentially refused to argue in a balanced and reasoned manner, but literally cried out for the entire length of his paper. Such people seemed to block their ears deliberately, unwilling to hear of another grammatical weakness of *ha-na*: it cannot take the suffix *nim* (“dear,” “lord”), since the stem is not countable as person (Kwak 1971a, 108-109). Neither did they admit that the use of *ha-na-nim* was partially influenced by the majority of early Korean Christian leaders whose northwestern dialect plainly pronounces *ha-nal* for the standard word for “heaven” *ha-neul* (Kwak 1971a, 124-25). *Ha-na-nim* supporters publicized their mistaken idea that *ha-na-nim* means “One Lord” while *ha-neu-nim* means a pantheistic heavenly lord, ignoring the etymology of *ha-na-nim*, which is associated with the worship of heaven and not with monotheistic belief at all. These conservative Protestants despised Catholics for worshiping *ha-neu-nim*, a pantheistic god (Hanguok Seongseo Beonyeok Hooeu 1976, 292-99). Embarrassingly, in their official paper, everyone advocating *ha-neu-nim* was branded as mentally ill and controlled by Satan’s plot (1976, 299).

As a consequence, the dialect-specific spelling of the divine name had to be kept in the major versions of the Korean Bible, while all other words were revised following the newly established standard grammar. In the end, the name *ha-na-nim*, grammatically incorrect and dialect-specific, has survived despite its peculiarity.

The peculiar power of the name

Table 1 shows the orthographical development of the words in question in the history of Korean Bible translations. (The table is from Kwak 1971b, 126; translation mine; see *The New Testament in Korean* [Tokyo, Japan: Methodist Publishing House, 1906] and *The New Testament in Korean* [Wonsan, Korea; Japan: The Flock of Christ in East Asia, 1938].)

As shown in Table 1, *ha-na-nim* clearly associates itself with the meaning “heaven” in the earliest period of Bible translation. When the standardization of orthography was reached in stage III, the word for “heaven” was settled as *ha-neul*. However, the divine name resisted being corrected according to this standardization, but remained in the anomalous form *ha-na-nim*. Then, instead, *ha-na-nim* became associated with the word *ha-na* meaning “one.” By means of this association, the name has enjoyed great power. It is considered absolute and exclusive and thus serves to push away other deities in Korea.

Table I. Orthographical development in Korean Bible translations.

Years	Period	“heaven”	“God”	“one”
I 1882–1936	55 years	<i>ha-nal</i> (하날) <i>ha-näl</i> (하늘)	<i>ha-na-nim</i> (하나님) <i>ha-nä-nim</i> (하느님)	<i>han-na</i> (하나) <i>hä-na</i> (헨나)
II 1937–1951	15 years	<i>ha-nal</i> (하날)	<i>ha-na-nim</i> (하나님)	<i>ha-na</i> (하나)
III 1952–1970	19 years	<i>ha-neul</i> (하늘)	<i>ha-na-nim</i> (하나님)	<i>ha-na</i> (하나)

Could the spelling *ha-neu-nim* possibly challenge *ha-na-nim* again in the future? I would answer that this is very unlikely and unnecessary. The name *ha-na-nim* may be absurd, but ironically its inherent weakness may turn to great advantage in situations where it is challenged. The proud oneness of the Christian God implied and applied in the name must be left untouched. I personally dislike the zealous and irrational support put forward for the spelling *ha-na-nim* by such writers as Hee Gun Jeong. But the battle is over, in my judgement, won by the power of zeal. Truly, we must admit, *ha-na-nim* is a brand new word, created and nurtured by ardent Korean Protestants who have been persistent and uncompromising.

On the other hand, there are some *ha-neu-nim* supporters (e.g., Kim 1999, 129) who denounce *ha-na-nim* as the idolatry of worshiping numbers, or “numerolatry” (數神 수신). There is no evidence to support this in the actual and common belief about *ha-na-nim*. The attraction to “oneness” in *ha-na-nim* does not come from numerolatry, nor has it anything to do with the “nature” of God, as Kim argues. Rather it stems from concerns like those expressed in Deuteronomy, aimed at the “survival” of God in a foreign pantheistic environment. Kim’s argument sounds like a childish and vengeful counterattack to *ha-na-nim* supporters. *Ha-na-nim* is now a new word whose etymology is in no way associated with “heaven”; now it means “One Lord” absolutely. Now, if anyone again challenges *ha-na-nim* because of its grammatical problem, she or he is the one who is mistaken in believing that grammar takes priority over the meaning of words as they are used. We understand that the meanings of words are determined pragmatically, by their use, and that this comes before grammar.

It is therefore significant to note an article by Jang Sik Lee (1980) in *Gi-dok-gyo sa-sang*, the same journal in which Kwak and Jeong battled a decade earlier. Lee gives a good summary of the disputes between the two opposing sides concerning the name and concludes that *ha-na-nim*, despite its linguistic absurdity, has been settled on as the form which lives in the hearts of Korean Christians, particularly Protestants, and is a new word. Doh Won Kwon (1980) also published an article in the same journal

supporting *ha-na-nim*, still in the voice of religious enthusiasm. See also Eung Sung So (1994) for a thorough examination of the name and its problems.

Conclusion

To a large extent it has been a successful venture for the Israelite god to take the name of the most respected god in Korea. Against the polytheistic background of the country, it seems that orthographical disputes over the name *ha-na-nim* have only served to stir up the monotheistic zeal of Korean Protestants, giving support to their passionate mission of proclaiming the absolute oneness of God. The formerly witty wordplay on *ha-na*, which covers both “heaven” and “one,” turned out to be the detonating fuse for a one-god movement’s explosive influence in the field of Korean religiosity. If the name’s linguistic problem were to be raised again, another tsunami of religious fervor would rush to engulf all opposition.

As far as the orthography of the name is concerned, the logic of correct grammar has been set aside in the face of the sheer practicality and religious fervor around the name *ha-na-nim*. There is a lesson to be learned: the orthographical development of a word will be carried out by utterly practical linguistic exercises that put “convenience” and “acceptability” at the top of the list of priorities, regardless of any grammatical problems. The name *ha-na-nim* is one of best examples, but in fact there are many. (In my article, Kee 2012, I claim the same in the case of the orthographical nature of the Hebrew word *mayim* “water.”) The earlier over-reaction of the supporters of *ha-na-nim* displayed ignorance. Meanwhile, the current supporters of *ha-neu-nim*, particularly rigid grammarians and theologians, also appear to be ignorant of the down-to-earth nature of the orthography of a word. Unfortunately, Catholics and Protestants in Korea have differently spelled names for the one God, and it is possible that there will again be a call to share one divine name. Learning from the past, hopefully, we shall not be fooled again by the name.

References

- Cross, Frank Moore. 1973. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gale, James S. 1900. “Korean Ideas of God.” *Missionary Review of the World* 23: 696-98.
- . 1909. *Korea in Transition*. New York: Eaton & Mains.
- Hangook Seongseo Beonyeok Hoeu 한국성서번역회의[Korean Council of Bible Translation]. 1976. 성서 번역의 바른 진로: 한국성서번역위원회의 연혁과

- 활동 [The right path of Bible translation: history of the KCBT]. Seoul: Ye-su-gyo-dea-han-sung-kyul-kyo-hoe Press.
- Jeong, Haeng Up 정행업. 1998. “하나님 칭호에 대한 소고” [Thoughts on the names of God]. Pages 323-43 in 나채운 교수 은퇴기념 논문집 편찬위원회 (편집), 하나님 말씀과 우리말 성경 [The word of God and Korean Bibles: Festschrift in honour of Prof. Chae Un Na]. Seoul: Presbyterian Theological Seminary.
- Jeong, Hee Gun 정희건. 1971. “한국교회와 하나님칭호를 읽고” [A review of *the Korean church and the titles of God*]. 기독교 사상 [Christian thought] 15.4: 140-44.
- Kee, Min Suc. 2012. “A Study of the Dual Form of *Mayim*, Water.” *The Jewish Bible Quarterly* 40.3: 183-89.
- Kim, Jong Seo 김종서. 2004. 신화로 날조되어 온 신시단군조선사 연구 [Mythologized history of Dan-gun’s Chosun]. Seoul: Korea Science Institute.
- Kim, Kwang Shik 김광식. 1998. “Nonduality of God and Earth: The Problem of God’s Name.” *Korea Journal of Systematic Theology* 2: 45-55.
- . 1999. “하느님과 하나님” [Ha-naa-nim and haa-na-nim]. 신학논단 [Theological forum] 27. <http://yonshin.yonsei.ac.kr/data/4555990206.pdf>.
- Knight, George A. F. 2003. 나는 나다: 이것이 나의 이름이다 [I am: this is my name]. Translated by Seong Il Choi. Osan: Hanshin University Press.
- Kwak, Noh Soon 곽노순. 1971a. “한국교회와 하나님 칭호” [The Korean church and the titles of God]. 기독교 사상 [Christian thought] 15.2: 105-13.
- . 1971b. “한국교회와 하나님 칭호 (II)” [The Korean church and the titles of God, II]. 기독교 사상 [Christian thought] 15.3: 121-24.
- Kwon, Doh Won 권도원. 1980. “절대자의 칭호문제” [The problem of the titles of God]. 기독교 사상 [Christian thought] 24.7: 88-94.
- Lee, Jang Sik 이장식. 1980. “하나님 칭호의 신학적 근거” [Theological concerns about the titles of God]. 기독교 사상 [Christian thought] 24.8: 126-33.
- Ryu, Han Gook 류한국. 2004. “상황화의 관점에서 조명한 하나님 칭호에 관한 연구” [A study of the names of God and the problem of contextualisation]. Th.M. thesis, HanShin Seminary.
- So, Eung Sung. 1994. “A Study of the Korean Name ‘Ha-Na-Nim’ for God.” Master’s thesis, Houston Graduate School of Theology.
- Underwood, L. G. 1918. *Underwood in Korea*. New York: Fleming H. Revell.
- Yoo, Dong Shik 유동식. 1997. 풍류도와 한국의 종교사상 [Pung-ryu-do and religious thought in Korea]. Seoul: Yonsei University Press.