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This thesis explores the changing approach of the Chosŏn state to subjects with foreign lineages in the period between the Imjin War (1592-98) and the early nineteenth century. Chosŏn Korea underwent considerable upheaval during the Imjin War and the wars of the Ming-Qing transition. Many Jurchen subjects of the Chosŏn court were forced from their homes in the Tumen Valley into the banner armies of the rising Qing state, with only a remnant persisting in Chosŏn. Additionally, large numbers of Ming Chinese entered Chosŏn either with the Ming army or as refugees from war in Liaodong.

Initially, the Chosŏn state responded to its Jurchen and Ming Chinese subjects primarily through pragmatic concern about the loyalty of these subjects to the Chosŏn and the burden they imposed on the agricultural economy. As a result, the Chosŏn court welcomed and even defended the Jurchen as established Chosŏn subjects but was cautious of the more alien Ming deserters and refugees. Ming migrant status did not improve during the remainder of the seventeenth century. Ming Chinese lineages were considered, along with Jurchen and Japanese, within the same invidious submitting foreigner tax category. During the same period fraudulent Ming migrants became a focus for sedition among non-elites. The eighteenth century rise of Ming Loyalist ritualism transformed the response of the Chosŏn court to such foreign lineages as
Ming migrant lineages were encouraged to participate in court-sponsored Ming loyalist rituals. Along with this ritual participation Ming migrant status was transformed from that of submitting foreigners to that of imperial subjects, while Jurchen and Japanese lineages disappeared. At the same time, hagiographic biographies were written of the original Ming Chinese refugees which praised them for coming to Chosŏn because of Neo-Confucian loyalty to the Ming.

The Chosŏn state responded to foreign lineages according to changing circumstances. Neo-Confucian ritualism only played a role in response to Ming lineages in the eighteenth century when earlier concerns about disloyalty and social disruption had largely passed.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Reign Dates</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Reign Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T’aejo</td>
<td>(1392-1398)</td>
<td>Sŏnjo</td>
<td>(1567-1608)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chŏngjong</td>
<td>(1398-1400)</td>
<td>Kwanghae-gun</td>
<td>(1608-1623)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T’aejong</td>
<td>(1400-1418)</td>
<td>Injo</td>
<td>(1623-1649)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sejong</td>
<td>(1418-1450)</td>
<td>Hyojong</td>
<td>(1649-1659)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munjong</td>
<td>(1450-1452)</td>
<td>Hyŏnjong</td>
<td>(1659-1674)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanjong</td>
<td>(1452-1455)</td>
<td>Sukchong</td>
<td>(1674-1720)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sejo</td>
<td>(1455-1468)</td>
<td>Kyŏngjong</td>
<td>(1720-1724)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yejong</td>
<td>(1468-1469)</td>
<td>Yŏngjo</td>
<td>(1724-1776)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sŏngjong</td>
<td>(1469-1494)</td>
<td>Chŏngjo</td>
<td>(1776-1800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yŏnsan-gun</td>
<td>(1494-1506)</td>
<td>Sunjo</td>
<td>(1800-1834)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chungjong</td>
<td>(1506-1544)</td>
<td>Hŏnjong</td>
<td>(1834-1849)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injong</td>
<td>(1544-1545)</td>
<td>Kojong</td>
<td>(1864-1907)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myŏngjong</td>
<td>(1545-1567)</td>
<td>Sunjong</td>
<td>(1907-1910)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1. Late Ming Reign Titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reign Date</th>
<th>Temple Name</th>
<th>Reign Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1573-1619</td>
<td>Shenzong</td>
<td>Wanli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>Guanzong</td>
<td>Taichang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621-1627</td>
<td>Xizong</td>
<td>Tianqi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628-1644</td>
<td>Sizong</td>
<td>Chongzhen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Anzong</td>
<td>Hongguang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Shaozong</td>
<td>Longwu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647-1661</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yongli</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Later Jin (1616-1636) and Early Qing (1636-1911) Reign Titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reign Date</th>
<th>Temple Name</th>
<th>Personal Name (Manchu)</th>
<th>Reign Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1616-1626</td>
<td>Taizu</td>
<td>Nurhaci</td>
<td>Tianming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1627-1636</td>
<td>Taizong Wen huangdi</td>
<td>Hong Taiji</td>
<td>Tiancong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636-1643</td>
<td>Taizong Wen huangdi</td>
<td>Hong Taiji</td>
<td>Chongde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1644-1661</td>
<td>Shizu Zhang huangdi</td>
<td>Fulin</td>
<td>Shunzhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662-1722</td>
<td>Shengzu Ren huangdi</td>
<td>Hiowan Yei</td>
<td>Kangxi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**English Translations of Titles used in Main Text of Dissertation**

*Biographies of Secondary Officials of the Ming*  
*Myyŏngbaesinjŏn* 明陪臣傳

*Biographies of the Remnant Subjects of Imperial Ming*  
*Hwangmyŏng yumin chŏn* 皇明遺民傳
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Korean Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Biography of the Eight Surnames”</td>
<td>P’alsŏngjon 八姓傳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Record of the Northern Road</td>
<td>Pungo kiryak 北路記略</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamgok’s Brush Talk</td>
<td>Chamgok p’ildam 潛谷筆談</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chojongam Gazetteer</td>
<td>Chojongamji 朝宗巖志</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chosŏn Veritable Records</td>
<td>Chosŏn wangjo sillok 朝鮮王朝實錄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou</td>
<td>Chonju hwip yŏn 尊周彙編</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compendium of Submitting Foreigners</td>
<td>Hyanghwain sŏngch’aeck 向化人成冊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Works of Ch’ungmu-gong Yi Sunsin</td>
<td>Yi ch’ungmugong chŏnso 李忠武公全書</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Ming Gazettean</td>
<td>Daming yitongzhi 大明一統志</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concise Guide to Fortifications and Defences</td>
<td>Chesŏng pangnyak 制勝方略</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Record of King Kwanghae-gun</td>
<td>Kwanghae-gun ilgi 光海君日記</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Record of the Royal Secretariat</td>
<td>Sŭngjŏngwŏn ilgi 承政院日記</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genealogy of the T’ongju Kang Family</td>
<td>T’ongju Kangssi sebo 通州康氏世譜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Code for State Administration</td>
<td>Kyŏng’guk taejŏn 經國大典</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of the Southern Ming</td>
<td>Nammyŏngsŏ 南明書</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal History of Sohwa</td>
<td>Sohwa oesa 小華外史</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Interrogation of Yi Yongch’ang’s Group”</td>
<td>Yi Yongch’ang t’ung ch’uan 李榮昌等推案</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchu Veritable Records</td>
<td>Manzhou Shilu 滿洲實錄</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Miscellaneous Records from a Time of War
Ming History
Mukden Gazetteer
Narrative of Yölyōsil
Daily Record of the Office of the Custodian of Foreign Visitors
Official Reports from Mukden
Old Manchu Archive
P’ungch’on Record
Pukkwan Gazetteer
Record of Chŏng Kam
“Record of Chu Hat Hall”
Record of Honouring the Zhou
Record of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Dynasty
Record of Shipwreck of Lin and Chen
Record of the Dynastic Foundation
Record of the Imjin War
Records of the Border Defence Command

Nanjung chamnok 亂中雜錄
Mingshi 明史
Shengjingji 瀋陽志
Yŏllyōsil kisul 燃藜室記述
Chŏn’gaeksa ilgi 典客使日記
Simyang chang’gye 瀋陽狀啓
Either Manbun Roto 老滿文檔
or Jiu Manzhou dang 舊滿洲檔
P’ungch’on-rok 風泉錄
Pukkwanji 北關誌
Chŏng’gamnok 鄭鑑錄
Ch’ogwan’dang’gi 楚冠堂記
Chonjurok 尊周錄
Hwangjo yumin rok 皇朝遺民錄
Imjin p’yohaerok 林陳漂海錄
Kaiguo fanglue 開國方略
Imjin-rok 임진록
Pibyŏnsa tŭngnok 備邊司牒錄
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Korean Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secret Prophecy of Master Momyŏng</td>
<td>Momyŏng sŏnsaeng yugyŏl 慕明先生遺訣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secret Prophecy of Tu Sach’ong</td>
<td>Tusach’ong pigyŏl 杜師聰秘訣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Self Account of Kang Shijue”</td>
<td>Kangsejak chasul 康世爵自述</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Self-Account of Master Ch’ogwan-dang”</td>
<td>Ch’ogwanddang-gong chasul 楚冠堂公自述</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources for the Acts of Imperial Subjects</td>
<td>Hwangjoin sajok 皇朝人事蹟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Story of Ch’oe Ch’ôk”</td>
<td>Ch’oech’ôkhŏn 崔陟傳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Story of Kim Yŏngch’ŏl”</td>
<td>Kim yŏngch’ŏl chŏn 金英哲傳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplement to the Mirror of the Chosŏn Dynasty</td>
<td>Kukchopam pyŏlp’yŏn 國朝寶鑑別便</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tansŏng Household Registry</td>
<td>Kyŏngsangdo Tansŏng-hyŏn hojŏk taejang 慶尚道 丹誠縣 戶籍臺帳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Commands Concerning the Employment of Chinese</td>
<td>Chungjoin suyong chŏn’gyo 中朝人收用傳教</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revised Veritable Records of King Sŏnjo</td>
<td>Sŏnjo Sujŏng Sillok 宣祖修訂實錄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The Story of Mr. Empty”</td>
<td>Hŏsaengjŏn 許生傳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Veritable Records of King Sŏnjo</td>
<td>Sŏnjo Sillok 宣祖實錄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yŏrha Journal</td>
<td>Yŏrha Ilgi 熱河日記</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Korean and Chinese primary sources come in a wide range of forms, which can complicate citation. A great many books, for instance, have the Korean translation in the first half of the book and the Classical Chinese paginated separately and in reverse order, in the second half of the book. In those cases, it is often helpful to include the page numbers for both the Korean translation and the Classical Chinese original, as well as chapter titles or the date of a particular entry. For example, Na Man’gap, Pyŏngjarok, Trans. Yun Chaeyŏng, (Seoul: Myŏngmundang, 1987), 49-50. Entry for 1637.01.02. For other examples, see 2-5 below.

2. Chosŏn Veritable Records (Chosŏn wango sillok). The Chosŏn Veritable Records is cited as follows: Title, kwŏn [volume] and page number, followed by the reign date with C.E. dating in brackets, month and day by lunar calendar with the day in the sixty year cycle in brackets, then volume and page number for the widely used Kuksa p’yŏnch’an wiwŏnhoe facsimile edition (abbreviations CSW). For instance, Sŏnjo sujŏng sillok 17: 1a, Sŏnjo 11 (1583).02.01 (kapchin), CSW 25:509.

3. The many collected works contained within the Yŏngin p’yŏjŏm Han’guk Munjip Ch’ong’gan (Seoul: Minjok munhwa ch’ujinhoe, 1993) are cited according to the kwŏn and page number of the original text. Additionally, other information (such as section titles) as may aid those using a different edition of the text is also mentioned. In all cases the citation finishes with the volume and page number of the Yŏngin p’yŏjŏm Han’guk Munjip Ch’ong’gan.
Munjip Ch’ong’gan (abbreviated as HMC) facsimile edition. For instance, Sŏng Haeŭng, Hwangmyŏng yumin chŏn, in Yŏn’gyŏngjae chŏn’jip 37:4a, HMC274:303-4.

4. Texts contained within the Kaksa tŭngnok (Seoul: Kuksa p’yŏnch’an wiwŏnhoe, 1981) are cited according to the volume and page of the Kaksa Tŭngnok facsimile edition (abbreviated as KSTR). Other information may also be provided. For example, Chŏn’gaeksa ilgi 9, kyeyu (1754).09.10, KSTR 94:96.

5. Interrogation transcripts included within Kang Man’gil ed., Ch’uan kŭp Kugan (Seoul: Asea munhwasa, 1983) are cited accorded to the title of the interrogation and date of the transcript. This will be followed by the volume and page of the facsimile edition, abbreviated as CKK. For example, “Yi Yŏngch’ang tŭng ch’uan” 01.11, CKK11: 733-735.

6. Manchu is transliterated according to the Norman system. McCune-Reischauer is used for Korean proper nouns and pinyin for Chinese proper nouns. In the case of Ming migrants to Korea, the original migrant to Chosŏn is transliterated according to pinyin. However, McCune-Reischauer is used for the transcription of titles of books written about the migrant by Koreans or the Korean descendents of the migrants. Thus, Kang Shijue (康世爵) but “Kang Sejak chŏn” (康世爵傳) and Kang Hogyun (康好均). Of course, there are a great many ambiguous cases. In the case above, for instance, the English translation of the title is “the Biography of Kang Shijue.” In the case of the legendary Shang Dynasty refugee Kija (Chin. Jizi), the McCune-Reischauer rendering is used to reflect the important role that Kija played as a figure within late Chosŏn philosophy and historiography.

7. Because the author was not able to obtain a hard-copy of the Sŭngjŏngwŏn ilgi, all
references to that text are to http.sjw.history.go.kr, the on-line version provided by the Korean History Compilation Society (Kuksa p’yŏnch’an wiwŏnhoe). The Sŭngjŏngwŏn ilgi is cited according to original volume, followed by the date of the entry in question. For instance, Sŭngjŏngwŏn Ilgi 1076, Yŏngjo 27 (1751).11.26 (kich’uk).

8. *Idu*, a method for writing Korean vernacular using Chinese characters, is distinguished from Classical Chinese through emphasis marks placed over the *idu* characters. For instance, in the latter half of the following sentence is *idu*: “至大冤痛為白良爾.”
Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1) Ming Chinese and Jurchen in Late Chosŏn Korea

The period between the Imjin War of 1592-1598 and the final destruction of the last significant challenger to Qing domination of China proper in 1683 saw large movements, forced and willing, of populations across East Asia and into Korea. During the same period, the relatively open boundaries that had surrounded Chosŏn dynasty Korea hardened as surrounding states became more centralized and populations with ambiguous loyalties became less tolerated. Even in the mid sixteenth century the borders of Chosŏn Korea had been unclear, and there had been significant populations of Jurchen, Koreans and Japanese who were both subject to the Chosŏn court and connected to other polities as well. The unification of the Japanese state to the south and the Qing state to the north involved the steady elimination of such ambiguously situated subjects, and the movement of such people away from border regions.

Among the migrant and border groups who entered into Chosŏn during this period of transition, two were from communities that eventually came under the authority of the Qing, Chosŏn’s hegemon to the West. The first of these two groups, the
Tumen Valley Jurchen, had resided for centuries in Chosŏn’s northern borderlands until they were largely removed from Chosŏn territory by the progenitor of the Qing Dynasty, Nurhaci, in the last decades of the sixteenth century and the first decades of the seventeenth. A significant number, however, remained in Chosŏn. The second, Ming Chinese, entered in large numbers into Chosŏn during the turmoil of the Imjin War (1592-1598) and the wars between the Jurchen/Manchu khanate and the Ming Dynasty.

How did the Chosŏn state respond to these groups? How were their descendents established in Late Chosŏn society? What role, if any, did international conflict play in their settlement? What was the role of Confucianism? There has been relatively little scholarship on this subject, despite considerable research on some other displaced groups, including Chosŏn prisoners-of-war in Japan¹ and on the so-called “brought-back” women or Chosŏn women who were returned from the Qing with their chastity in doubt.² The status of Jurchen and Ming Chinese lineages in the Late Chosŏn, however, is a potentially illuminating topic, revealing new ways of understanding the Chosŏn state’s conception of its subjects, suggesting new approaches to the Sino-Korean relations and Late Chosŏn Ming Loyalism, and providing another case-study of

subjecthood in early modern states. The Chosŏn court’s dealings with its Ming Chinese and Jurchen subjects reveal ideological and administrative changes within the court and among elites, while the responses of Ming Chinese and Jurchen subjects provide an interesting window onto the responses of non-elites to the policies of the Chosŏn court.

1.2) Sino-Korean Relations and Migrant Communities

Broadly speaking, this thesis contributes to three fields of Korean history: Sino-Korean relations, Late Chosŏn social history, and Late Chosŏn Ming Loyalism. In the case of the first, this dissertation shows that, despite the widely assumed sinocentric

---

I use the term “early modern” advisedly, recognizing Jack A. Goldstone’s objection in the “Problem of the ‘Early Modern’ World” Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient 41:3 (1998): 249-284, 249 that “the ‘early modern’ world was not in any way ‘modern’ and certainly not an ‘early’ form of modernity. Somewhat as in the way that the Holy Roman Empire, in a now famous aphorism, was neither Holy, Roman, nor an Empire, so I would now say that a rigorous review of the evidence would show that the ‘early’ modern world was neither ‘early’ nor ‘modern’ although it was arguably, in trade relations, a single ‘world.’ ” Although Early Modern as an economic stage may be, as Goldberg suggests, largely spurious, I follow Laura Hostetler, The Qing Colonial Enterprise: Ethnography and Cartography in Early Modern China (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2001) and Peter Perdue, China Marches West: The Qing Conquest of Central Eurasia (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of the Harvard University Press, 2005) in seeing an increasing tendency towards clearly defined and bureaucratically controlled boundaries between the territory and subjects of separate states as being a characteristic that developed at about the same time in a wide range of states in Eurasia, including Qing China, Romanow Russia and Bourbon France.
tendency of Chosŏn’s elites during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, this sinocentrism did not cause the Chosŏn court to respond favourably to Ming Chinese migrants on Chosŏn soil, or unfavourably to Jurchen. The Chosŏn court’s response to both Jurchen and Ming migrants on Chosŏn soil was determined by the extent to which Chosŏn was certain of the loyalties of the migrants or was afraid of political complications resulting from the presence of the migrants. As a result, the acknowledged superiority of the Ming often made Ming migrants far less welcome than Jurchen to the Chosŏn court.

Scholars have often seen Sino-Korean relations through the prism of “serving the great” (sadaejuŭi), whereby Chosŏn elites are thought to have been abject in their admiration of all things Chinese. In the words of one Western scholar, Chosŏn elites had loyalties not to any abstract notion of Korea but to a “cosmopolitan civilization centered on China.” Consequently, the rituals of the tribute relationship, by which Chosŏn kings received their formal investiture from the Ming court, and Chosŏn envoys provided, annually or even more frequently, tribute and formal expressions of loyalty to the Ming

---

4 For the development of this term in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries see Andre Schmid, Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919 (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 61-64. The term is often translated as “toadyism.”

court, are seen as having determined Chosŏn attitudes towards Chinese and Jurchen also. For instance, in a recent article, Han Kyung-koo criticizes what he sees as naïve multiculturalism by arguing that the Chosŏn dynasty, while not concerned with ethnic or racial homogeneity, nevertheless divided people and cultures into superior and inferior groups. As evidence, he points to a statement made in 1751 during the reign of Yŏngjo (r.1724-1776), in which the monarch was praised for clearly distinguishing Ming Chinese lineages from Jurchen and Japanese lineages. He contrasts this with other statements made during the reign of Yŏnsan-gun (r. 1494-1506), in which Japanese and Jurchen were described as being morally corrupt and disloyal.6

The problem with Han’s argument is that it assumes enormous temporal homogeneity within the Chosŏn state, and ignores the considerable changes, domestic and international, which occurred during the same period. One can find expressions of hostility towards Jurchen quite easily, but by the same token one can find much more positive references elsewhere – the reign of Yŏnsan-gun, in any case, should hardly be seen as representing all periods of Chosŏn history. By the same token, the court discussion in 1751 concerning foreign lineages cannot be divorced from the transformation of attitudes towards the Ming represented by the establishment, in 1704,  

---

of court-sponsored rituals to the Ming. It is certainly correct to expect that relations between Chosŏn and Ming and Qing China would influence the treatment of peoples associated with these empires. It is a mistake to view Ming Chinese migrants as representatives of China and thus welcome, or Jurchen as representatives of barbarity and thus unwelcome.

Indeed, few scholars now understand the Sino-Korean relationship as an especially harmonious relationship within a stable “Chinese World Order.” For instance, for the fifteenth century the Ming-Chosŏn relationship was extremely turbulent, and Chosŏn’s interaction during that period with Jurchen, Japanese and Ryukyuan polities was entirely independent of Ming China. After the rise of the Qing, of course, the formal rituals of tributary relations as practiced during the Ming were maintained, even as Chosŏn elites and even the court sponsored formal and informal

---

7 John K. Fairbanks, *The Chinese World Order* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), is often associated, perhaps unfairly, with such stereotyped views of China’s relationship with its neighbouring states by which China, regardless of dynasty, is seen to be interested in tribute, not trade. In fact, the various articles in the volume suggest considerable diversity in Chinese foreign relations.


expressions of Ming Loyalism which by implication denied the legitimacy of the Qing Dynasty. Especially in the period covered by this dissertation, the Sino-Korean relationship underwent enormous changes, including a seven-year war involving a large scale dispatch of Chinese troops into Chosŏn territory, the collapse of Ming control, first in Liaodong and then in the Ming empire as a whole, the invasion of Chosŏn by the Manchu Qing, and the overthrow of Ming China by the Manchu Qing. Responses within Chosŏn to both Ming and Qing hegemons ranged the gamut from open hostility to cautious acceptance to, in the case of the Ming after its fall, nostalgia.

The changing Sino-Korean relationship certainly influenced the responses of the Chosŏn court to Jurchen and Chinese migrants, although not quite in the manner suggested by Han. For instance, as this dissertation will show, despite the Confucian nature of the Chosŏn court and elites during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, they were by no means unwelcoming to the Jurchen communities on the northern frontier. Jurchen communities in the Tumen Valley were, to a greater or lesser


12 Useful surveys of Sino-Korean relations include Peter I. Yun, “Rethinking the Tribute System: Korean States and Northeast Asian Interstate Relations, 600-1600” (Ph.D. diss., University of California Los Angeles, 1998); Kim Han’gyu, Hanjung kwan’gyesa (Seoul: Arûk’e, 1999).
extent, autonomous of Chosŏn’s direct administration, and had kin ties to communities outside of direct Chosŏn influence; this was, in fact, the reason the Chosŏn court valued its Jurchen subjects, who were referred to as pŏnho or “Fence Jurchen,” as they were a vital source of information and trade. Despite considerable tumult among the Jurchen during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the Chosŏn court did not attempt their expulsion; on the contrary, when in the early seventeenth century Nurhaci and Hong Taiji (r. 1626-1636) forcibly absorbed these Jurchen into their banner armies, the Chosŏn court resisted them as much as it could, allowing Jurchen to flee to Chosŏn’s southern provinces. The cultural heterogeneity of the Tumen Valley Jurchen was less important to the Chosŏn court than their established role as subjects of the Chosŏn court.

By contrast, the Chosŏn court was not very welcoming to the Ming Chinese migrants who entered in enormous numbers during this period. This is related to the particular form that Chosŏn-Ming relations took during the period following the 1593 Ming intervention in the Imjin War. While the sixteenth century is often assumed to be, in contrast to the tense fifteenth century, a relatively tranquil period in Sino-Korean
relations, beginning with the Ming Chinese intervention in the Imjin War and continuing until the defeat of Chosŏn in 1636-7, the relationship was transformed by the presence of Ming military on or near Chosŏn soil, by the growth of much more extensive interference into Chosŏn’s domestic affairs, and by a discourse, present in both Ming and Chosŏn, according to which Chosŏn was supposed to owe a debt of gratitude to the Ming dynasty. The Ming intervention in 1593 against the invading Japanese was motivated, primarily, by self-defence, and was enabled via the standard forms and rhetoric of the tribute relationship. The result, however, was to alter substantially the ways in which Chosŏn and Ming interacted. Although Chosŏn had previously engaged in largely independent diplomacy with Japan, Jurchen and Ryukyu, the presence of Ming military and civil officials forced the Chosŏn court to contact Nurhaci, for instance, indirectly via the Ming court, and the treaty negotiations between Ming China and Hideyoshi’s Japan during 1594-1596 were pursued without Chosŏn contribution despite the obvious interest of Chosŏn in their outcome. Throughout the Imjin War, the presence of Ming generals on Chosŏn soil resulted in a weakening of the autonomy of King Sŏnjo and the Chosŏn court, as Ming generals made demands not

---

13 For instance, see Peter Yun “Rethinking the Tribute System,” 215-219, who argues that “despite the pragmatic and flexible attitude of early Chosŏn kings and yangban scholar officials, by the middle of the sixteenth century the Korean elites began to develop a strong ideological belief in the inherent moral correctness of the tribute system.” This widespread view is in need, I expect, of some revision.
only concerning military matters but also concerning such domestic matters as the opening of markets, the use of currency or the selection of the crown prince. This difficulty continued after the Imjin War, especially after the Manchu conquest of Liaodong, when one Ming general, Mao Wenlung, established himself on Chosŏn’s northern border.14

Not surprisingly, perhaps, considering the general chaos of Chosŏn-Ming relations during this period, Chosŏn was very cautious indeed concerning the presence of Ming Chinese on its soil. Indeed, into the early eighteenth century, the Chosŏn court was no more welcoming of the descendents of Ming Chinese than they were of the descendents of Jurchen, classifying both within the category “submitting foreigner.” During the same period, Ming Chinese soldiers in Chosŏn were not distinguished from Dutch or Japanese. Such unexceptional treatment vis-à-vis Ming migrants and their descendents continued despite the Ming Loyalism of the elites of that period, suggesting that to the Chosŏn court, loyalty to the Ming did not necessarily imply loyalty to individual Ming subjects. By the same token, despite court and elite hostility to the

Qing during the seventeenth century, Jurchen lineages did not receive unusually bad treatment.

The eighteenth century was a general a peaceful period in Sino-Korean relations, but was also an era during which the Chosŏn court reconsidered and re-imagined the Sino-Korean relationship. In 1704 shrines to the Wanli emperor were established both by the court and by Song Siyŏl (1607-1689)’s disciples; during the reigns of Yongjo (r.1724-1776) and Chŏngjo (r.1776-1800), especially, the participation of Ming migrant descendents in these rituals was encouraged by the Chosŏn court. During the same period Ming migrant descendents were increasingly distinguished from Jurchen and Japanese lineages and given positions within the military bureaucracy. Chinese lineages were defined as imperial subject lineages, which, if not equal to the yangban elite proper, nevertheless had secure positions both legally and socially. On the other hand, Jurchen lineages, formerly so important, largely dropped out of view; although they had survived anti-Manchu hostility during the early seventeenth century when such hostility involved practical military preparation, they did not survive the transformation of practical anti-Manchu hostility into abstract and ritually-structured Ming Loyalism.

Sino-Korean relations, in other words, did influence the response of the Chosŏn state to Chinese and Jurchen migrants, but not in the simple sense of Chosŏn preferring...
migrants from China to Jurchen lineages; the military alliance with Ming against Qing did not result in good treatment for Ming Chinese or poor treatment for Jurchen. Rather, a full range of considerations – the need to avoid dangerous entanglements with a powerful ally, the long established nature of Chosŏn’s relationship with its Jurchen communities, suspicion of Ming military leaders – played a role, with a ritualized distinction between Confucian Ming subjects and barbarous Jurchen an eighteenth century development affecting the descendents of the migrants, not the migrants themselves.

1.3) Aliens and Subjects: Social Status and Belonging in Late Chosŏn

The Chosŏn court’s policy to Ming and Jurchen migrants and to their descendents also relates to another topic: that of subjecthood in the late Chosŏn, and its relationship with social status. Chosŏn society was characterized by a relatively rigid status system, described often, indeed, as a caste system; this status system was given official shape in part by the nature of the tax, corvée and military service burden imposed upon Chosŏn’s subjects. For this reason, it has been argued, by James Palais
among others, that membership of a specific status group mattered more during the late Chosŏn than affiliation to a state.\textsuperscript{15} However, there have not been many attempts to test this claim for the late Chosŏn, nor have any very detailed comparisons been made with other regions of the world.\textsuperscript{16}

Although scholars have not shown much interest in the distinction between subject and aliens in the case of Chosŏn, historians of early modern Europe have shown considerable interest. In particular, historians have paid attention to the diversity of practices by which foreigners in European countries and their colonies were distinguished from citizens and also naturalized as citizens, and by which the subjects of a monarch were distinguished from, or identified with, the citizenry of a particular state.

Moving beyond earlier views by which citizenship was seen as exclusively a product of

\textsuperscript{15} James Palais, \textit{Views on Korean Social History}, IMKS Special Lecture Series No. 2 (Seoul: Institute for Modern Korean Studies, Yonsei University, 1998), 5: “National Identity was also weak among the common peasant class as well. It was almost impossible for slaves and commoner sharecroppers to identify with yangban slave owners and landlords and think of themselves as citizens loyal to a nation state.”

\textsuperscript{16} John Duncan has produced a number of articles exploring the possibilities for a “proto-nationalist” consciousness in the Chosŏn Dynasty, among them ”Proto-nationalism in Premodern Korea,” in Perspectives on Korea, eds. Sang-Oak Lee and Duk-Soo Park (Sydney: Wild Peony, 1998), 198-221 and “Imjin-rok tŏng ŭi min’gan chŏnsŏng ŭi nat’anan minjung ŭi minjok ŭisik,” in \textit{Imjin waeran kwa tongasia ŭi samguk chŏnjaeng}, eds. Chŏng Tuhŭi and Yi Kyŏngsun (Seoul: Hyumanisŭt’ŭ, 2007), 145-164. The applicability of the concept proto-nationalism per se is not the focus of this dissertation, but the identification of Chosŏn subjects with the Chosŏn state, and the imposition of central authority over Chosŏn subjects, possibly varying according to class, does.
the Glorious Revolution in England and of the French Revolution, Peter Sahlin has argued that a concept of absolute citizenship – defined as absence of the disabilities suffered by non-citizens (aubain), and embracing French subjects regardless of class, had already come into being in the late sixteenth century. Tamar Herzog discusses a very different context in early modern Peninsular Spain and New Spain, in which, before the eighteenth century, citizenship did not coincide with loyalty to the monarch, but was generally determined first and foremost by a rather informal process of acceptance into the local community, and at times by the intervention of one of the various separate courts of Catalunya, Navarre, or Castile.

Another possible source of comparison with Chosŏn is Qing China. The Qing, like Spain, brought a range of peoples into its empire, all of whom owed their full loyalties to the Qing emperor, but who were not all governed in the same way. Especially among Han Chinese, association with a lineage determined a person’s relationship to the state, such that being outside of a lineage placed one without protection against either local government or the state itself. David Faure, for instance,

---

19 The role of lineage as a basic corporate unit of Chinese society has been discussed extensively in
has discussed how the Pearl River delta was brought under Ming and Qing control through the state-sponsored construction of lineages and their integration into the *lijia* category. This process occurred at the same time as other groups, Yao and Zhuang, were both pushed outside of the category subject and also subject to displacement by both state and favoured lineages. On the other hand, Manchu were not left to organize themselves on their own according to lineages but were governed centrally by a specially constituted state bureaucracy. Other groups, such as the Mongols, were both subject to military assault from the Qing and integrated ideologically and bureaucratically into the Qing regime. As Pamela Crossley has shown, during under the Qing, Mongols, clearly distinguished from both Han Chinese and Manchu, were defined

---

20 David Faure, *Emperor and Ancestor: State and Lineage in South China* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2007). Faure, especially, argues that the “state advanced into local society by embracing differences and melting them all into one. Boundaries were set up, to be sure, between the emperor’s subjects, known as min in the *lijia* context, and people outside, known as in the south as Yao or Zhuang. With a centralized ideology, orthodox ritual, a bureaucracy recruited by examination without regard to ethnic origin, and a clear sense of membership in *lijia* registration, the Ming was possibly one of the

21 Pamela Kyle Crossley, *A Translucent Mirror: History and Identity in Qing Imperial Ideology* (Berkeley, California UP, 2002). The key organ of this bureaucracy, the banner, has been discussed at length by Mark C. Elliott, *The Manchu Way: The Eight Banners and Ethnic Identity in Late Imperial China* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2001), 133-174.
according to acceptance of a Činggisid heritage, use of a standard Mongolian language, and participation in the Mongol military, all three institutions being defined by the Qing court. On the one hand, this brought Mongols clearly under Qing control, and on the other hand, it created the category “Mongol,” in place of diverse and disunited practices that had existed before.\(^{22}\) Whether Mongol, Yao, Manchu or Han Chinese, all equally owed their loyalties to the Qing state and were distinguished from such groups who, despite shared ethnic ties, were part of different polities. However, the process by which the Qing obtained the loyalties of its subjects differed enormously according to circumstance.

How do these multiethnic empires compare with the relatively compact and reputedly homogenous kingdom of Chosŏn? Of course, it is true that status barriers were very rigid during the Chosŏn dynasty, to the extent of being described as a caste system. The top ranks of society were dominated by a small, substantially hereditary yangban (兩班) class, in which were included military and civil officials and their descendents. Yangban status was guaranteed by lineage, and further strengthened through success in civil service examinations or literary reputation. The very top ranks

of the yangban – the lineages whose families were established in the capital – became increasingly exclusive during the late Chosŏn, with many yangban lineages losing all opportunity for official position. Below them, the commoners (yangmin 良民 or sangmin 常民), in which category were included farmers, artisans and merchants, provided the bulk of tax and corvée service, and were by law, if not in reality, allowed to take official examinations. Below them, the base people – primarily slaves (nobi 奴婢) but also including various occupational castes – were responsible for service to their masters, either yangban officials or public offices. As a result, even as slaves fled the harsh domination of their masters, commoners took slave status to escape excessively burdensome and inequitably imposed taxation.

Indeed, far more than was the case with China during the same period, the Chosŏn state was concerned to preserve clear status distinctions among subjects as one of its techniques of population control. Many slaves escaped their status through flight, but legally sanctioned departures from slave status were very difficult indeed, with considerable fluctuation between matrilineal and patrilineal descent for determining slave status, and the complete barring of people with any slave ancestors from

---

23 For an overview of social status during the Chosŏn Dynasty, see Kyung Moon Hwang, *Beyond Birth: Social Status in the Emergence of Modern Korea* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2004).
competing for official position. Controversies over whether slave status should follow maternal or paternal lines continued throughout the seventeenth century, only being fully settled in the mid eighteenth.\(^{24}\) The descendents of unions between yangban men and concubines – whether servile or concubine - were excluded from official positions throughout much of the Chosŏn dynasty.\(^{25}\) As for yangban status, the Chosŏn state was almost completely unable to improve the state of its finances by expanding taxation to include yangban, or even to those who had purchased or illegally obtained Confucian Student (yuhak) status – the successful expansion of the fiscal base of Chosŏn to include yangban did not occur until the Taewongun shadow regency during the early part of the reign of Kojong (r. 1864-1907).\(^{26}\)

Imposing distinctions between status groups domestically surely consumed more of the energies of the Chosŏn court than restricting the entrance of foreigners. Nevertheless, the Chosŏn court was, in fact, concerned to distinguish the affiliation of Chosŏn subjects from those affiliated with other states. Chosŏn subjects, regardless of class, gender or social status, could not freely abandon their loyalty to the Chosŏn state,

---


nor could outsiders freely assume the duties of Chosŏn subjecthood. By the reigns of
Hyŏnjong (r. 1659-1674) and Sukchong (r. 1674-1720), Chosŏn subjects – again
regardless of class and gender – were required to be registered and to possess household
tallies.\(^{27}\) A clear boundary was established in 1712, and border crossers, even such as
had contracted marriages while in China or Japan, were still considered subjects of
Chosŏn and were returned.\(^{28}\) Indeed, as James Lewis has established for frontier
contact between Koreans and Japanese in the Tongnae Japan House, in Tsushima and in
Hakata, the distinction between those with Chosŏn affiliation and Japanese affiliation
became steadily more rigid during the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries,
even when, as was the case of the inhabitants of Tsushima, the Japanese were, in theory
at least, also subjects of the Chosŏn court.\(^{29}\)

In fact, as this dissertation reveals, where the submission of the Ming Chinese
could be obtained, they were treated identically to the Jurchen who had fled south from
Nurhaci; they were organized according to a category known as “submitting foreigners”
(hwanghwain). This category, at once a tax category and a means for defining people

\(^{27}\) Kwŏn Naehyŏn, “Sukchongdae chibang t’ongchi’ron ëi chŏn’gae wa chŏngch’ae unyŏng” \(Yŏksa wa

\(^{28}\) Seonmin Kim, "Ginseng and Border Trespassing Between Qing China and Chosŏn Korea," \(Late
Imperial China\) Vol. 28, No. 1 (June 2007): 33—61.

\(^{29}\) James B Lewis, \(Frontier Contact between Chosŏn Korea and Tokugawa Japan\) (London:
whose origins were outside of Chosŏn authority, was, like lowborn status, inherited if either parent possessed it. Possessors of this status were freed from certain tax and corvée obligations, but were required to provide an at times burdensome tribute in fish or some other product. The Jurchen and Japanese were the most frequent recipients of this status in the early Chosŏn, even though, as was often the case, the Jurchen had been formally subjects of the Chosŏn court well before settling south of the border province of Hamgyŏng. As Han Munjong has shown for Japanese, Japanese who submitted to the Chosŏn court played an important role in Chosŏn’s relationship with the Ashikaga bakufu and the various feuding daimyo formally under the control of the bakufu. As for Chosŏn’s northern border, by the late seventeenth century, the community of border crossing Jurchen had largely disappeared, and the northern border became steadily more clearly defined during the eighteenth century.

Importantly, this dissertation reveals that this category of submitting foreigners was used until the eighteenth century regardless of whether the ancestors of the person in question were Chinese, Jurchen, or Japanese. Beginning in the late seventeenth century the state was concerned to simplify and control the category by removing such

30 Han Munjong, Chosŏn chŏn’gi hyanghwa sujik waein yŏn’gu (Seoul: Kukhak charyowon, 2001), 91-104.
31 One of very few works on this subject in any language is John Duncan, “Hyanghwain: Migration and Assimilation in Chosŏn Korea,” Acta Koreana 3 (June 2000), 99-113.
people as did not properly belong in these communities, but rarely were objections expressed to the concept itself. During the mid-eighteenth century, this process increasingly gained a more explicitly ideological flavour as a court which based its legitimacy primarily on its claim of loyalty to the Ming found it increasingly unpalatable to claim that the descendents of Ming migrants were, in the same manner as the descendents of Jurchen or Japanese, “submitting” to the Chosŏn court or “transforming” themselves to the Confucian civilization of the Chosŏn court. This did not result in the formal elimination of the category, or in the simple removal of Ming migrants from the category – on the contrary, it resulted in the creation of a new category of imperial subjects (hwangiun), in which the descendents of Ming Chinese migrants were included but other groups were not. With this new category some descendents of Ming Chinese migrants gained specific ritual and military roles that linked them directly to the Ming Loyalist ideological underpinnings of the Chosŏn state.

Were these categories – either submitting foreigner or imperial subject - ethnic? The appropriateness of the term ethnic is disputed for late Imperial China, with Pamela Crossley, especially arguing that it is anachronistic to impose the twentieth century term “ethnic” on Late Imperial China.\(^{32}\) Questions on the use of the term aside, this

\(^{32}\) Pamela Kyle Crossley, “Thinking about Ethnicity in Early Modern China,” *Late Imperial China* 11.1
dissertation does show that claims of shared culture and Jurchen descent were indeed treated as significant by the emerging Manchu state as it sought to assert its authority over Chosŏn's Jurchen subjects. The Chosŏn state, on the other hand, was aware of the cultural heterogeneity of the Jurchen and had originally encouraged the Jurchen of Tumen River to stand culturally and politically on the boundary between the Chosŏn state and the Jurchen tribes on the other side of the Tumen. It did not, however, consider that heterogeneity in any way a disqualification for subjecthood to the Chosŏn court.

Yet whether or not Jurchen status in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century should be called an ethnic category, submitting foreigner status, and the imperial subject status which partially superseded it, certainly were not. Submitting foreigner status was originally designed with the purpose of settling foreigners on Chosŏn soil, with a connected hope for moral transformation – the goal of the status was by no means assimilation. By the seventeenth century, however, the status had become hereditary, and it remained so into the mid-eighteenth century. It was a tax/corvée category which originated in the desire of the state to settle foreigners on its soil, a meaning which was not lost despite the presumable disappearance of cultural

(June 1990):1-35. For a different position on this term see Mark C. Elliott, “Ethnicity in the Qing Eight Banners,” in Empire at the Margins: Culture, Ethnicity and Frontier in Early Modern China, ed. Pamela Kyle Crossley, Helen F. Siu and Donald S. Sutton (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 27-57.
distinctiveness among the descendents of Ming and Jurchen migrants. Court support for the establishment of a distinctive imperial subject status in the late eighteenth century did not establish an ethnicity but a category of subject, defined by their lineage originating in the Ming and by their participation in state-sponsored rituals to the Ming. As with Manchu or Mongol status within the Qing, imperial subject status defined a group of people specifically in relation to the Chosŏn court and court-sponsored rituals.

The Chosŏn state, as with the French and Spanish ancient regimes and the Qing empire, employed techniques for categorizing subjects under its control from those outside of its control. Within the category “submitting foreigner” were included those subjects who were originally of foreign origin but who had submitted to the Chosŏn court. Whereas during the sixteenth century it had been possible for Jurchen to exist in an ambiguous relationship with regards to the Chosŏn court, by the late Chosŏn this was no longer possible. The creation, during the eighteenth century, of the category imperial subject was not a revival of such ambiguous subjecthood but the establishment of a new bureaucratic category defined by loyalty to a dynasty which no longer existed, the Ming, to be served through rituals determined by the Chosŏn state itself.
1.4) Migrant Lineage and Ming Loyalism

An additional contribution of this dissertation is to the study of Late Chosŏn Ming Loyalism. The subject has been discussed in detail by Chŏng Okcha, who has argued that Late Chosŏn Ming Loyalism, as it developed both through formal ritual activity and through the production of Ming Loyalist texts, should be seen not as oriented towards the Ming but towards Chosŏn elites who believed themselves to exclusive inheritors of a rich Confucian tradition.\(^3\)\(^3\) Jahyun Kim Haboush has taken a similar position, arguing, in one article, that the use of Ming Loyalist reign titles by Chosŏn elites was a technique for resisting Qing time and Qing hegemony.\(^3\)\(^4\)

This dissertation does not contradict the findings of either scholar. However, the focus on Ming migrants\(^3\)\(^5\) opens the door to investigating the role of non-elites in Late

\(^3\)\(^3\) Chŏng Okcha, *Chosŏn hugi chosŏn chunghwa sasang yŏn’gu* (Seoul: Ilchisa, 1998).


\(^3\)\(^5\) The role of Ming migrant lineages in Late Chosŏn Ming Loyalism has been discussed, if somewhat superficially, by a number of scholars. For instance, Liu Chunlan, “Shilun mingqing zhiji chaoxian shehui de muhua chongming sixiang - daming yimin de yingxiang” in *Disanjie hanguo zhuantong wenhua guoji xueshu tuolunhe lonwenji* (1999), 936-960; David Mason, "The Samhyang paehyang Sacrificial Ceremony for Three Emperors: Korea's Link to the Ming Dynasty. Korea Journal 31, no. 3 (1992): 117-
Chosŏn Ming Loyalism. For instance, it explores the participation of Ming lineages which, classified as imperial subjects, were understood by the late eighteenth century Chosŏn court almost exclusively in their relationship to Ming Loyalist rituals. Initially, at least, the Chosŏn court had to teach, at times with some difficulty, Ming migrants to participate correctly within these rituals. Yet, if the Chosŏn state first took the role of teaching Ming migrant lineages to be good Ming loyalists, by the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries Ming migrant lineages themselves were taking the initiative, establishing their own rituals to the Ming. Ming migrant lineages may have begun as participants in court-sponsored rituals, but soon the social advantages to be gained by association with Ming Loyalism caused the lineages themselves to assert their loyalty autonomously.

The participation of non-elites can be further seen in the development of Ming Loyalist biographies. Indeed, as this dissertation shows, in the late seventeenth century, Ming migrants were associated by marginal elites and non-elites with Ming Loyalism—however, this loyalty to the Ming, and hostility to the Qing, were understood as ultimately also involving hostility to the Chosŏn dynasty as well. For instance, biographies of fictitious Ming migrants were created which bound Ming Loyalist

136; See Son Weiguo, “Chaoxian wangzhao zunzhou siming wenzhi zhi yanjiu” (Ph.D. Diss., Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, 2001), 215-259.
migrants with the subversive world of geomancy and the geomantic messianism of the *Record of Chŏng Kam* (*Chŏng’gammok*). During the late eighteenth century the Chosŏn court, in tandem with the creation of imperial subject status, did begin to commission biographies of Ming migrants which defined them as loyal remnant subjects of the Ming. Yet, as this rewriting benefited many Ming migrants, during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries the migrants themselves participated in this rewriting by which the difficult and troublesome runaway soldiers and refugee Liaodongese of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries were transformed into pillars of Confucianism and loyalty to the Ming.

As the Ming to which these migrants were supposed to have been loyal was also the Ming of which the Chosŏn court imagined itself to be the heir, the court’s sponsorship of the ritual participation of Ming migrants, and the commissioning of official biographies, both served to strengthen the Chosŏn monarchy’s legitimacy. However, while Late Chosŏn Ming Loyalism developed within a context defined by Chosŏn domestic concerns, it was not exclusively a phenomenon of the court or the elites. Non-elite Koreans could also claim Ming Loyalist legitimacy, and Ming migrant descendents could take advantage of a process begun by the state and turn it to their own ends. The Chosŏn court, by defining the descendents of Ming migrants as loyalist
Ming remnant subjects, was arrogating for itself the mantel of Ming legitimacy that others, including non-elite Koreans, claimed for themselves. Ming migrants, by accepting the designation of imperial subject granted to them by the Chosŏn court, were asserting their status, not as Chinese loyal to the fallen Ming, but as Chosŏn subjects participating in the official ideology of Chosŏn monarchy.

1.5) Conclusion: Approaches and Sources

This dissertation considers the largely unexplored topic of Jurchen and Ming migrant lineages in the late Chosŏn. There has been very little scholarship on this subject, but the subject is related to key themes in Korean history, including the three mentioned above: Sino-Korean relations, social status in the Late Chosŏn, and Late Chosŏn Ming Loyalism. This dissertation confirms much current scholarship, including work by scholars who question the trope of a sinocentric Chosŏn, argue against considerable social mobility within Late Chosŏn, or demonstrate that Late Chosŏn Ming Loyalism was oriented not towards China but to the Chosŏn court and elites. However, by focussing on migrant communities, the dissertation also departs considerable from current scholarship. During the initial period of migration, the Chosŏn court and elites
responded very differently to Ming and Jurchen migrants than to the Ming and Qing courts, although, of course, the responses to migrant and court were often related. Ming migrant lineages did experience limited upward mobility, although only more than a century after their original arrival in Chosŏn and long after they had lost all connections to any real Ming polity. Late Chosŏn Ming Loyalism may have been ultimately focussed on Chosŏn court and elites, but its origins were much more diverse, with non-elites creating stories oriented around Ming loyalist migrants to Chosŏn well before the court and elites.

While the study is not arranged chronologically, broadly speaking the thesis begins with the initial disruption and movement of the Jurchen and Ming Chinese communities during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, continues with a discussion of the administrative activities of the Chosŏn state vis-à-vis Ming migrants during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and ends with a consideration of Ming migrant narratives, including the seditious narratives of the late seventeenth and the state-supported narratives of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth. Through this it traces not only the changes that occurred within communities of foreign lineages on Chosŏn soil, but also the development of the Chosŏn state itself, from the relatively open borders of the late sixteenth century, through the bureaucratic reforms of the
seventeenth and the ritual innovation of the eighteenth.

Chapter 2 discusses how the Chosŏn state of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries valued its Jurchen subjects, despite their divided loyalties or "barbarian" culture, because their cultural links with other Jurchen made them important conduits of information and trade. The Manchu state which was developing during the same period, by contrast, attempted to employ an absolute standard of subjecthood, by which all Jurchen were to be the exclusive subjects of the Manchu state. The Chosŏn state and many Jurchen resisted – albeit with limited success – these demands, suggesting a more flexible approach to subjecthood, in the sixteenth and early seventeenth century Chosŏn, with that of later periods.

Chapter 3 discusses the Ming Chinese refugees and deserters who entered Chosŏn in extremely large numbers during the turmoil of the Imjin War and the rise of the Manchu state. Although some of their descendents were glorified in later historiography, at the time they were treated as an additional strain on Chosŏn’s already ravaged agricultural economy and possible source of diplomatic complications. A minority of them were welcomed, but for their skills, not for any supposed Chinese cultural superiority. The Chosŏn state responded to issues of divided subjecthood according to its relationship to practical governance, not according to any grander
Chapter 4 discusses the administrative reforms of the Chosŏn court during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as it redefined the large communities of people who had, or claimed, special tax/corvée status – referred to as submitting foreigner status - by virtue of being possessors of Ming or Jurchen lineage. In part, attempts to reform submitting foreigner status are related to the many attempts at tax reform during this era. Increasingly, however, Ming loyalist ritualism also played a role, as the descendents of Ming migrants were distinguished from other submitting foreigner communities and re-categorized as imperial subjects. The court also attempted to impose its own particular ideological needs on these migrants by encouraging their participation in specialized military units and state-sponsored ritual activity – while inscribing many as “Ming” subjects, this inscription highlighted the fact that Chosŏn elites claimed for themselves the mantle of Ming legitimacy. While the initiative in this recategorization was taken by the state, Ming migrant lineages themselves actively participated in their own recategorization, and for good reason: the process transformed them from harried possessors of the undesirable category submitting foreigner to the recipients of a favourable new ritually-defined status.

Chapters 5 and 6 consider the development of biographies of Ming migrant.
Chapter 5, in particular, points to the existence, even before the establishment of formal Ming Loyalist rituals, of narratives of Ming remnant subjects circulating among marginal elites and non-elites. Not surprisingly, considering the low status which Ming migrants possessed during this period, and their association, beginning in the Imjin War, with geomancy, these narratives were almost as threatening to the Chosŏn state as to the Qing. Uncovered during criminal investigations by the Chosŏn court, these stories placed Ming migrants at the centre of conspiracies against the Chosŏn court. The class background of people participating in the production of these narratives ranged from slaves, isolated islanders to quasi-yangban, suggesting that the narrative of Ming legitimacy extended through a much larger cross-section of Chosŏn society than has normally been thought.

Chapter 6 will look at another aspect of Ming migrant biographies less inimical to the state. Thus, the ritual and institutional reorganization of Ming migrants was expressed in part through late seventeenth and eighteenth century re-imagining of their migration process, both by the court and by the migrants themselves. During the reign of Chŏngjo the court sponsored the creation of anthologies of Ming migrants even as they brought a wider range of Ming migrants into participation in court-sponsored rituals. These anthologies, which defined Ming migrants as a category in much the same
way as did the creation of imperial subject status, were also later produced privately by Ming migrant lineages themselves. While the contents of the biographies differed, they all agreed in treating Ming migrants as a coherent category, with biographies sponsored by lineages even claiming that geographically disparate migrants had historically interacted with each other. Of course, the very process of defining Ming migrants as Ming loyalists necessitated considerable transformation and rethinking of the original facts of the migrants’ arrival. Considerable editing of the facts was required in those few cases where the authors of biographies had access to abundant source materials. In most cases, the scarcity of information of the original migrants meant that the authors of the biographies filled in the gaps in the narrative by asserting that the ancestors of imperial subject lineages had been men of absolutely unswerving loyalty to the Ming. Although these biographies were originally written under the direction of the Chosŏn court, by the early nineteenth century, Ming migrant lineages themselves were producing and developing these biographies, often with relatively little direct court interference. Nevertheless, despite the lack of direct court involvement, these biographies were still a response to the state policy of defining Ming migrant lineages specifically as Ming Loyalist lineages.

The sources used in this study include such widely used and easily available
sources as the Chosŏn Veritable Records (Chosŏn wangjo sillok), the Records of the Border Defence Command (Pibyŏnsa tŭngnok) the Daily Record of the Royal Secretariat (Sŭngjŏngwŏn ilgi) and collected works contained in the Han’guk munjip ch’ong’gan, but also much more obscure sources, including un-translated torture documents (Ch’uan kŭk kugan) and unpublished collections of Ming migrant biographies found in such libraries as the Kyujang’gak or the Korean National Library or the Academy for Korean Studies. The sheer range of sources which contain information concerning Ming and Jurchen subjects in Chosŏn is surprising, considering how little this subject has been discussed.

Of course, all the sources have limitations, with the Chosŏn Veritable Records generally mentioning subjects which were controversial and thus matters for court debate. The daily record of events preserved within the Veritable Records, moreover, is, moreover, oriented towards the bureaucratic concerns of the court as are such sources as the Record of the Border Defence Command, the Daily Record of the Royal Secretariat and Daily Record of the Custodian of Foreign Visitors (Chŏn’gaeksa ilgi). Unfortunately, biographies of Ming migrants – even when contained within the genealogies of Ming migrant lineages – do not always provide much of a counterbalance to court-centered narratives, for, as will be discussed in chapter 6, they were often created partly in
response to court policy. Similarly, the interrogation documents used in chapter 5 certainly suggest non-elite interest in Ming remnant subjects, but are also likely to reflect the views of the officials involved in the interrogation.

A key goal of this dissertation is to describe the development and change of attitudes towards Ming Chinese and Jurchen subjects during the Late Chosŏn. By comparing different accounts of the same people within a wide range of texts spread out over a long period of time – for instance, an early seventeenth century account in the Veritable Records, a late seventeenth century biography, and a late eighteenth century biography – it is possible to explore the ways in which attitudes towards Ming and Jurchen subjects changed, and also uncover some of the responses of the Ming Chinese and Jurchen subjects to these changes.
Figure 1: Provinces of Chosŏn
Chapter 2

Chosŏn’s Jurchen Subjects and the Rise of the Manchu State

2.1) Introduction

From before the founding of the Chosŏn Dynasty a large Trans-Tumen community of Jurchen, with ties both to the Chosŏn court and independent Jurchen polities, had been established in and near Chosŏn’s northern frontier in Hamgyŏng.

---

1 A substantial portion of this chapter was previously published as “‘On either side the River:’ The rise of the Manchu State and Chosŏn’s Jurchen Subjects.” *Toronto Studies in Central and Inner Asia* 9 (2008): 111-125.
Province.² This community was disrupted by the rise of the Manchu³ state in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, with many being forced into the newly formed Manchu banner armies, and others taking refuge further south in the Korean peninsula.

At the time the Chosŏn court responded to the disruption of the Jurchen communities with alarm, as the Trans-Tumen community had possessed a vital role in Chosŏn’s defence, while many of the Jurchen themselves seemed to prefer their established loyalties to Chosŏn to any new sense of belonging to the rising Manchu state.

The vast frontier in which the Trans-Tumen Jurchen had lived was clearly divided in Chosŏn and Qing territory through the 1712 tracing, by Chosŏn and Qing officials, of the source of the Yalu and Tumen Rivers.⁴ In a sense this boundary

---


³ Of course, the term “Manchu” was not used before Nurhaci, and did not come into official use until 1635 during the reign of Hong Taiji, when the term “Jurchen” (Man: jušen) was also proscribed. The term is of uncertain meaning or derivation. See Giovanni Stary, “The Meaning of the Word ‘Manchu’: a new Solution to an Old Problem,” Central Asiatic Journal 34.1-2 (1990): 109-119. That being said, I will occasionally use the term Manchu anachronistically in order to distinguish Jurchen within the state ruled by Nurhaci and Hong Taiji from those outside of their rule, and to refer collectively to the dynasties founded by Nurhaci and Hong Taiji, the Later Jin (1616-1636) and Qing (1636-1912) as well as to the domain under Nurhaci’s control before 1616.

⁴ Three recent treatments in English are Andre Schmid, Korea between Empires, 1895-1919 (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 199-252. Marion Eggert, “A Borderline Case: Korean Travelers’ Views of the Chinese Border (Eighteenth to Nineteenth Centuries),” in China and Her Neighbours:
delimitation was a reflection of the increasing centralization of the various Northeast Asian polities during this period, and the transformation of the region from a mesh of overlapping polities to one of the relatively consolidated polities of the Qing Empire, Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea. Indeed, a major impetus to the delimitation was the Qing court’s increasing concern about the defence of Manchuria and its Inner Asian frontiers against the Russian and Oirat empires, and Chosŏn court’s concern about the dangers that an uncontrolled frontier posed for the always difficult relations with its hated overlord, the Qing Empire. Additionally, the Qing court increasingly valued the region of “Manchuria” – which it had so recently emptied of population - because they had begun to view it as the Manchu homeland, vital for the maintenance of the cultural

---

Borders, Visions of the Other, Foreign Policy, 16th to 19th Centuries, ed. Sabine Dabringhaus and Roderich Ptak, 49-78 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1997) and Seonmin Kim, “Ginseng and Border Trespassing Between Qing China and Chosŏn Korea,” Late Imperial China Vol. 28 (June 2007): 33-61. All three authors refer to the considerable body of work written in Asian languages, especially Korean, of which Kang Sŏkwa, Chosŏn hugi hamgyŏngdo wa pukpang yŏngt’ŏ ṭisik (Seoul: Kyŏngsewŏn, 2000), is a notable example.


6 If the term “Manchu” is somewhat anachronistic before 1635, the term “Manchuria” is even more so. As Mark Elliott reminds us in the “The Limits of Tartary: Manchuria in Imperial and National Geographies,” The Journal of Asian Studies 59, no. 3 (Aug., 2000): 603-646,” no form of the word “Manchuria” was used in European languages until 1830, while the use of variations of “Manchu” in Chinese to denote a location began even later. Because there is no good alternative I will occasionally use the term anachronistically.
separateness of the Manchu banners and the health of the dynasty as a whole. On the other hand, some members of the Chosŏn elites were angered by the seeming capitulation to Qing demands implied by the agreement to participate in the delimitation. Forgotten in many of these debates concerning the frontier were the Trans-Tumen Jurchen who had formerly inhabited it, and whose absence greatly simplified the process of delimitation- in so far as the Chosŏn elites remembered them, they hardly denied the Qing’s claim over the loyalties of Chosŏn’s former subjects. Between the forced removal of the Trans-Tumen Jurchen in the early seventeenth century and the boundary delimitation in the early eighteenth century, attitudes in Chosŏn had changed such that Jurchen were no longer appropriate subjects of the Chosŏn state, and divided loyalties were no longer viewed with so little concern.

The case of Chosŏn’s Jurchen subjects provide a useful example with which to begin the discussion of changing Chosŏn policy concerning divided loyalties and marginal subjects. The Chosŏn court in the sixteenth century had been quite satisfied with ruling over Jurchen communities that were partly subject to Chosŏn and partly

---

7 Mark Elliott, “The Limits of Tartary: Manchuria in Imperial and National Geographies.”
8 Kang Sŏkhwa, Chosŏn hugi hamgyŏngdo wa pukpang yŏngt’o ŭisik, 247-290.
9 Of course, illegal populations, mostly temporary ginseng diggers who did, in fact, establish themselves in these regions were a major spur to the delimitation of the border. See Seonmin Kim “Ginseng and Border Trespassing Between Qing China and Chosŏn Korea.”
outside of the bounds of Chosŏn authority. The fact that the Jurchen were outside of some “sinitic” cultural community did not disturb a Chosŏn court which was more concerned with the vital role the Jurchen played as intermediaries in trade and information. The eventual elimination of such marginal subjects was not part of any supposed “Confucianization” of Chosŏn society but on account of the confederacy-building activity of Nurhaci and Hong Taiji. At the time, the Chosŏn court had opposed such confederation building quite strenuously, and had struggled to preserve its hold over its border-crossing Jurchen subjects. In this they contrasted with Chosŏn officials in the early eighteenth century, when clearly defined boundaries between territory and people became more important to the Chosŏn state. Disputes concerning Chosŏn’s Jurchen subjects in the early seventeenth century provide an important prelude to the later bureaucratic and ritual reorganization of the descendents of migrant populations in the eighteenth, and also reveal a change in Chosŏn society from one which allowed for multiple loyalties to one in which such loyalties were no longer tolerated.

2.2) Porous Frontier: the Pŏnho of the Six Garrisons
In the 1590s and 1610s the Jurchen of the Tumen valley and Mt. Paektu area became the objects of competition between the Chosŏn, the Ula confederacy under Bujantai and the Jianzhou confederacy under Nurhaci. The result of this competition was ultimately that a substantial proportion of the Jurchen of the region were assimilated, – forcibly or willingly, as either soldiers or booi bondservants – into Nurhaci’s banners, while others fled into Chosŏn’s southern provinces. This had far reaching consequences, as it emptied out Chosŏn’s frontier regions, thus clearly securing Chosŏn’s territory. The more immediate result, however, was to deny Chosŏn one of its chief sources of information concerning regions to the north. It was thus opposed vigorously by the Chosŏn court. The pŏnho’s use to the Chosŏn court had been that, though established subjects of the Chosŏn court, they had had ties and loyalties that extended beyond the Chosŏn court. As the Manchu state asserted its absolute rights to the loyalties of the Jurchen, the Chosŏn court lost its control over a vital aspect of its defence of Hamgyŏng Province.

Unfortunately histories of Jurchen-Chosŏn relations have tended to leave the sixteenth century substantially blank, acting as if Chosŏn-Jurchen relations came to an end in the late fifteenth, to be revived only in 1592 with Nurhaci’s offer of assistance to a Chosŏn court beleaguered by the Japanese invasion. The unity which Nurhaci and
Hong Taiji imposed on the Jurchen in the seventeenth century is read back into the sixteenth, as a result placing far more importance on Nurhaci’s offer of assistance than should probably be granted to it. For example, Inaba Iwakichi, in his influential book, *Kokaikun jidai to mansen kangkei* (The Kwanghae-gun Period and Manchuria-Chosŏn relations) went so far as to claim that “nothing much happened in Chosŏn’s relationship with the Jurchen” between the wars of the late fifteenth century and the rise of Nurhaci. This claim should perhaps be seen in the context of his well known association with the Manchukuo project and Qing Restorationism, and the resulting tendency to see the history of the region through the perspective of the Qing. It is, of course, only true to say that Nurhaci revived Chosŏn political relations with Jianzhou Jurchen – considerable interaction continued to occur in the Hamgyŏng region right through the sixteenth century. However, a tendency to see Nurhaci as reviving relations with Chosŏn after a long lull during which nothing much occurred has characterized much later scholarship, in Korean and English as well as Japanese.

11 For the broader ideological implications of Inaba’s scholarship see Han Myŏn’gi, *Imjin waeran kwa han’gun kwan’gye* (Seou: Yŏksa pip’yŏngsa, 1999), 312-314.
12 Numerous examples include Ch’oe Hogyun “Chosŏn chung’gi taeyŏnjin kwan’gye ūi yŏn’gu.”( Ph.D. diss., Sŏng’gyungwan University, 1995), where he discusses, in fact, almost exclusively the relationship between Jianzhou and Chosŏn during this period. Sŏ Pyŏng’guk, in *Sŏnjo sidae yŏjin kyosŏpsa yŏn’gu* (Seoul: Kyomunsa, 1969) widens his focus considerably beyond Nurhaci and Jianzhou, but nevertheless
In Inaba’s defence, many of our sources originate in the Qing and thus have a tendency to read back into early periods the political unity of the region which came into existence in the form of Nurhaci and Hong Taiji’s banner armies, such that the Jurchen of the politically fragmented Hamgyŏng Province and Tumen valley region are seen as only one part of Jurchen as a whole, but also as less representative of the totality of the Jurchen than the Jianzhou region. Indeed, by the eighteenth century not only Qing, but also Chosŏn scholars, had a tendency to view the Qing state as the proper representative of the Trans-Tumen Jurchen. In 1712, a hundred years after the actual expulsion of the Jurchen from Hamgyŏng Province, and in the context of the establishment of the boundary between Qing and Chosŏn territory, the influential Noron minister, Yi Yimyŏng (1658-1722) expressed concern about Chosŏn’s claims to the Mt. Paektu area. Mt. Paektu, he pointed out, was outside of the range of human habitation, located, as it was, six or seven days north of Kapsan. The actual defenses of the country, then, were well south of the established boundaries of Chosŏn at the Yalu and Tumen.

begins his account with Nurhaci’s contact with Chosŏn in 1592. Both Pamela Crossley in A Translucent Mirror: History and Identity in Qing Imperial Ideology (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), and Mark Elliott in The Manchu Way jump from Menggetimur and Li-Man-chu straight to Nurhaci.

13 For instance, the late eighteenth court-sponsored Chonju hwip’yŏn (Seoul: Yŏgang ch’ulp’ansa, 1985) while ostensibly an anti-Qing Ming revivalist writing, actually depends quite heavily on Qing sources, and certainly begins its narrative with Nurhaci. See especially 1:22, where the text openly cites an official Qing history, the Kaiguo fanglue. For a discussion of the compilation of the Chonju hwip’yŏn, see Chŏng Okcha, Chosŏn hugi chosŏn chunghwa sasang yŏn’gu (Seoul: Ichisa, 1998), 129-155.
rivers. Worse still the Comprehensive Ming Gazetteer (Daming yitongzhi) described Mt. Paektu as belonging to the Jurchen, in contradiction to established Chosŏn claims. Yi suggested that the Chosŏn court send envoys to dispute the characterization of Chosŏn’s boundaries in the Gazetteer.\(^\text{14}\) Yi was clearly concerned about security, and this should be considered in the general context of border delimitation. Yi’s desire to have deleted this reference to Mt. Paektu’s association with Jurchen as found in the Comprehensive Ming Gazetteer, despite the fact that the Comprehensive Ming Gazetteer was accurately describing the pre-Qing state of affairs, hints something at the territorial disputes of the present day, where supposed territorial claims often trump all other considerations – historical and administrative.

This hostility to the historical Jurchen presence was not restricted to the Noron faction. Well before the border delimitation, in 1672, an older contemporary of Yi Yimyŏng, Nam Kuman (1629-1711), of the same Westerners faction but from the group later to be associated with the Soron faction, had referred to a similar problem. Also emphasising that the area south of the Yalu and Tumen rivers was originally Korean territory, and providing a fairly comprehensive survey of the history of the region since

---

\(^{14}\) Sukchong Sillok 51:16a, Sukchong 28 (1712):03.08 (sinmyo), CSW 40: 434. “頣命又言：査官之行，以定界爲言，白頭出距甲山六七日程，而人跡不通，故我國鎭、堡把守，皆在山南五六日程．‘大明一統志，” 以白頭山屬於女眞．彼或以我國把守處爲界，則事甚難處．我國既以土、鵠兩江爲界，則水南皆當爲我地，宜使接伴使，以此辨爭也．上許之．”
the fall of Koguryŏ, he nevertheless allowed that the Jurchen had seized control of the area. He lamented that despite the fact that the Jurchen had removed their tribesmen some 50 to 60 years earlier “on their own accord” (胡人自为徙去), the Chosŏn court, considering the region to be Jurchen territory, did not dare occupy it. Yet, Nam pointed out, the Not’o tribe of Jurchen which had lived there had caused particular hardship to Chosŏn; Chosŏn should not miss its chance to reoccupy it before new groups of barbarians should establish themselves in the region.15

Nam and Yi were not speaking independently, but in a context of increased concern in both Chosŏn and Qing concerning territory and boundaries. Just as the late seventeenth century in Qing had been characterized by extensive map-making enterprises,16 so the Chosŏn court had been concerned during the same period to obtain copies of Ming and Qing gazetteers in order to clarify Chosŏn’s territorial rights. Both Yi Yimyŏng and Nam Kuman were very much involved in these activities. Nam

15 Nam Kuman, “Chinbuk pyŏnsamsa:ingjinjido so – kyech’uk sibiwŏl hamgyŏngdo kwanch’alsa si” in “So,” Yakch’ŏnjip 4:25a-37b: “胡人竊據之時，雖難驅逐開拓，胡人自為徙去五六十年之後，我國猶以胡人之故居，而不敢收拾，有若待其還來者然，寧有是理哉。且前日老土之居其地也，為害於我國如彼，則及今空棄之時，占為我有，實是不可失之機會也。設或他日忽有種落復為入據，則朝廷雖欲更取，何可得也。”

obtained, 1694, a copy of the **Mukden Gazetteer (Shengjingji)**, which fortuitously showed the area south of the two rivers to be entirely Chosŏn territory, while Yi’s ability to consult the **Comprehensive Ming Gazetteer** was the result of a long and difficult process, by which such geographic writings were smuggled into Chosŏn.17 Both Nam and Yi found the actual Jurchen past of the Mt. Paektu region troublesome. Where Yi seems to have wanted to deny their presence altogether, Nam saw the once ineradicable Jurchen presence as a warning, a sign of things to come if Chosŏn did not act quickly to establish its control. Noticeable, in both passages quoted above is that Nam and Yi saw the Jurchen of Hamgyŏng Province as clearly belonging to Nurhaci. For Yi, the presence of a passage in the **Comprehensive Ming Gazetteer** stating that Jurchen were once settled in the region was seen as compromising Chosŏn’s sovereignty over that region, while for Nam, the forcible removal by Nurhaci of the Jurchen could be seen as occurring “on their own accord.”

In 1614, Yi Sugwang (1563-1629), from the same Westerners faction as Yi Yimyŏng and Nam Kuman, but writing sixty to a hundred years earlier, expressed great worry concerning the disappearance of the very Jurchen of the Mt. Paektu area whose very memory Yi Yimyŏng had so desired to erase. Remarking that it had been 200 years

17 Kang Sŏkhwa, *Chosŏn hugi hamgyŏngdo wa pukpang yŏng'o úisik*, 48-54.
since Kim Chongsŏ had established the Six Garrisons in the region, he expressed concern that, with the rise of Nurhaci, “those Jurchen (ho) who live at the foot of the fortifications and are thus called pŏnho (Fence Jurchen) had been forced either to join Nurhaci or retreat into the interior of Chosŏn. This, to Yi Sugwang, had seriously compromised Chosŏn’s defences, such that “though someone settles right on our borders, or even illegally enters deep into our territory, there is nobody who dares even to ask who he is. When the lips are gone the teeth grow cold - this is an unspeakable worry!”

Yi Sugwang’s worry at the disappearance of the Jurchen communities of North Hamgyŏng Province was not, it would seem, inspired by an open-minded departure from sinocentrism, or by any particularly pro-Jurchen view points of his own. He discussed the pŏnho in the context of other Pungno or ‘Northern Caitiffs.’ In this he treated them as equivalent to the Sushen (肅慎) and the Tujue (突厥) in the early imperial period, the Jurchen of the Jin (金) Dynasty, the Semuren (色目人) of the Yuan dynasty, and Nurhaci himself. He classified them separately from “Foreign Countries” (Oeguk 外國), but they were clearly not Koreans. In fact, he expressed considerable

---

concern at the large community of submitting Jurchen (向化胡人 hwanghwa hoin) in Kyŏng’gi province. These were the very pŏnho who had fled south rather than face assimilation in Nurhaci’s new state – welcome though they were on the northern border, the density of these Jurchen in Kyŏnggi province, such that the fires of different Jurchen villages are visible to each other, suggested serious troubles in future.¹⁹ For Yi, then, the relative cultural superiority or inferiority of the Jurchen in question mattered less than their importance for security. A different understanding of borders and frontiers, meant that, for Yi Sugwang, the presence of culturally intermediate groups within Chosŏn borders did not worry Yi but was seen as vital for securing Chosŏn’s territory.

Evidently, between Nam Kuman in the late seventeenth and Yi Sugwang in the early seventeenth, attitudes towards ethnicity and territory had changed, such that what had been a positive and necessary presence to Yi became an unpleasant memory to Nam. The late seventeenth century involved the steady growth of interest in the precise measuring of territory, culminating, in 1712, in an accurate delimitation of the Chosŏn-Qing frontier.²⁰ The Tumen River, and the region of Mt. Paektu, in which the Jurchen referred to by both Nam and Yi had lived, was a key part of this newly clarified border.

¹⁹ Yi Sugwang, 2: 91-92. “向化胡人，入居內地者，自 祖宗朝有之，盖來者勿拒之意也。頃年以來，奴酋張甚，攘去藩胡，使之後屬，故藩胡多願內府，十百為群，今畿甸兩湖之間，運村雜處，煙火幾於相望，恐有日後難處之患，謀國者其亦念及於此否.”

²⁰ Schmid, Korea Between Empires, 203-208.
However, in the sixteenth century it was a zone of contact in which Jurchen of different sorts and forced settlers from the southern provinces interacted. Such Jurchen as willingly accommodated themselves to Chosŏn had been a vital aspect of Chosŏn defence since the establishment of military fortifications in the region during the reign of Sejong when a mixture of forces Korean settlers from the south and Jurchen communities from the north were established in the new territories on the south bank of the Tumen river. Even after the tumultuous wars by the Ming and Chosŏn armies against the Jurchen during the mid fifteenth century, Jurchen continued to play key roles on the Chosŏn frontier. In 1649 a community of refugee pŏnho in Ch’unch’ŏng Province remembered their role as that of informing the court of the activities of other Jurchen. The Revised Veritable Records of King Sŏnjo (Sŏnjo Sujŏng Sillok), in the midst of a description of the 1583 Nit’anggae uprising, defined the pŏnho of North Hamgyŏng Province as Jurchen who lived across the river, and who, if properly

23 Chŏn’gaeksa ilgi 4, kich’uk (1649).11.10, KSTR92:281: “彼中事情，每每潛通為白乎可。”
controlled, could provide vital information concerning the deep-dwelling Jurchen (深處胡 simch’ŏ-ho), in which category was combined all Jurchen “from north of the mountains” who had not yet submitted personally to the Chosŏn court. The editor of the Veritable Records, in this case, saw that a firm hand on the part of the administrators of the region was necessary for the maintenance of proper control over the pŏnho.24

The description of the pŏnho living across the river from the defensive structures and the deep-dwelling Jurchen living north of the mountains is in many ways inaccurate; as a very brief review of the materials in question will show, many pŏnho were living south of the Tumen, while ‘deep-dwelling Jurchen’ were less defined geographically as by their political distance from the Chosŏn military structure.25 The

24 Sŏnjo sujong sillok 17: 1, Sŏnjo 11 (1583).02.01 (kapchin), CSW 25:509. “北道胡人，居江外接近邊堡，交貨納貢者為藩胡；山北諸胡，未嘗親附者，謂之深處胡，亦時時款邊。深處胡欲入邊，藩人輒告之，或遮防調球。故自祖宗朝厚待藩胡者以此。及邊防浸謹，藩胡浸盛，撫馭失宜，反為亂階。至是，藩胡首亂，自是或引深處胡入寇，反覆自利，北邊始不安矣。”

25 A report issued during the reign of Tanjong lists the various Jurchen communities of the area of what was then called Hamgil Province, describing communities on both sides of the Tumen River. (Tanjong Sillok 13:45a-56a, Tanjong 3 (1455).03.24 (kisa), CSW 7:23-28. See Phillip Woodruff, “Status and Lineage Among the Jurchens of the Korean Northeast in the Mid-fifteenth Century,” Central and Inner Asian Studies 1 (1987):117-154 and Kim Kujin, “Yŏmal Sŏnch’o Tuman-gang Yuyŏk ŭi Yŏjin punp’o,” Paeksan hakpo 15 (1972): 101-158. Yi Il’s 1588 reworking of the Concise Guide to Fortifications and Defences (Chesŏng pangnyak, National Library # ko 692-42) does not, by contrast, specify the location of villages to the north or south of the river, but the presence of a considerable number of pŏnho villages (pŏnho purak) listed to the south of garrisons and defensive structures suggests that many would have been to the south of the river. For instance, on page 52 the Nimat’oe village is described as being 10 li to the south of Yuwŏnjin, while on page 57 the T’anaeran village is described as being 9 li to the south of
frontier which the pŏnho were helping to defend was not a linear, precisely defined border, nor did the territorial Chosŏn and the jurisdictional or administrative Chosŏn fully correspond.26 Chosŏn attempted to exert influence both north and south of the Tumen River, and was only one source of power over the Jurchen to the south of the river whose communities were “sites of Jurchen culture, administration, governance and social customs as they were sites of Korean administrative entry.”27 Such terms for pŏnho as sŏngjŏ hoin (城底胡人) and sŏngjo yain (城底野人), both which can be translated as “Jurchen who live at the foot of the fortifications,” and kŏsŏngjŏja (居城底者) or “those who live at the foot of the fortifications,”28 emphasises the proximity – cultural, political as well as spatial - between the pŏnho and the Chosŏn administration.

Tong’gwanjin.

26 The tension between the jurisdictional and territorial Chosŏn among the Jurchen in Hamgyŏng Province is discussed in some detail by Kenneth Robinson, “Shaping Interaction with Jurchens in the Early Chosŏn Period” in Embracing the Other: The Interaction of Korean and Foreign Cultures; Proceedings of the First World Congress of Korean Studies (Sŏngnam, South Korea: Han’guk chŏngsin munhwawŏn’guwŏn, 2002), 1443-1450.


28 These and similar phrases were seemingly used earlier than pŏnho. There are numerous examples, among which are Yŏnsan-gun il’gi 08.13a, Yŏnsangun 1 (1495).08.25 (ŭrhae), CSW 13:29, Sŏngjo Sillok 162:9a Sŏngjo 15 (1484).01.15 (kyemyo), CSW 10:560, both of which provide us with something of a definition of the defensive function and social position of the Jurchen in question. The use of pŏnho village (pŏnho purak) in the Guide to Fortifications and Defences as a regular category in the description of the defensive structures may suggest that by the late sixteenth century the category pŏnho was becoming more institutionalized and formalized than previously.
Very often intermarried with the settler communities, engaging increasingly in agriculture, and certainly tied, through gift-giving, visits to Seoul, and military connections, to the Chosŏn state, the pŏnhoh nevertheless continued to possess extensive contacts, and presumably kin-connections, with other Jurchen, the deep-dwelling Jurchen. It was, of course, these connections to deep-dwelling Jurchen that made them useful to the Chosŏn state, as is shown in numerous passages from the Chosŏn Veritable Records in which pŏnhoh either successfully provide information to the Chosŏn military or fail to provide information to the Chosŏn court and are criticized for their failure in this regard. Their intermediate status also meant that they were ideally suited to play the role of middleman in trade relations between Chosŏn and other Jurchen. In fact, the pŏnhoh, as the eyes and ears of the Chosŏn military, were useful

---

32 For instance, in the Sŏnjo Sillok 167:13, Sŏnjo 36 (1603).10.26 (mujin), CSW 24:549, the North Hamgyŏng army commander Yi Yongsun, while calling for strong measures against the Ula to restore the loyalty of the pŏnhoh, says that: “the reason why the state protects and supports the pŏnhoh, is simply this: those who want to submit to our authority must discover for us the movements of the deep-dwellers. That is to say, all we expect from the pŏnhoh is that they provide us with information.” (國家所以卵育藩胡者，無他，只欲歸順於我，探知深處動靜也。然則我所望於藩胡者，惟進告一事而已。)
33 Late fifteenth and sixteenth century Jurchen-Chosŏn trade in pelts is discussed by Kawachi, *Mindai jioshinshi no kengkyu*, 592-656, who also quotes passages which emphasise the role “those at the foot of the fortifications” (kŏsŏngjŏja) as being the primary middle-men in the peasant-yain trade (633). The connection between pŏnhoh and trade was also brought up when the Later Jin, in the spring of 1628,
only in so far as their loyalties and connections extended to areas and people outside of the range of Chosŏn administration. Their submission to the Chosŏn court, then, was not predicated on their locating themselves unambiguously within either the administrative or territorial boundaries of Chosŏn society; in fact, their marginal status, as borderland people, providing them as it did access both to the Chosŏn court and to the world of the various Jurchen tribes, was what made them valuable.

At the same time, the above passage from the Revised Veritable Records of King Sŏnjo suggests, the borderland loyalties of the pŏnho could place the state at risk. Their connections to other Jurchen meant that they could also join with deep-dwelling Jurchen for attacks on settlers and military facilities in North Hamgyŏng Province. The area had been, since the reigns of Sejong (r.1418-1450) and Sejo (r.1455-1468) populated not demanded the opening of markets in Hamgyŏng and P’yŏngan Provinces. The court of Injo attempted to dampen Manchu expectations in this regard by arguing that, while formally when the Warka had lived in the Six Garrisons, people came from far and wide for trade, following their expulsion there was no trade to speak of in that region; while in the case of P’yŏngan Province, the ravages of war meant that there was no trade there either. This text can be found in the Jiu Manzhou dang (henceforward JMD) 6: 2807-2808 (10 vols. Taipei: National Palace Museum, 1969), and in Romanized form in the Manbun Roto (henceforward MR.) 4: 125-126 (trans., Kanda Nobuo. Tokyo: Toyo Bunko, 1956). The court discussions concerning the preparation of the very document found in the Old Manchu Archive can be found in the Injo Sillok 18:80a, Injo 6 (1628).02.22 (mujin), CSW 34:260, in which the officials discussing the matter also mention the fact that the request did not seem to come directly from Hong Taiji, and so would probably not be pursued with any great vigour. Of course, the main aim of the letter was to prove to the Jin that, not only was there no point attempting to trade with Chosŏn, but that the lack of trade in Chosŏn was entirely the Jin’s fault, as the lack of pŏnho in North Hamgyŏng Province, and the ravaging of North P’yŏngan Province, could all be quite justly traced to them.
only by communities of Jurchen but also by a large numbers of settlers from Kyŏngsang, Chŏlla and Ch’ungch’ŏng Provinces, many of them settled by force.\(^{34}\) The need to buy the loyalty of the impoverished settlers (as they were, like the Jurchen, essential for defence) meant that, during the reign of Sŏnjo (r.1567-1608), there were a series of conflicts which developed as settlers encroached on Jurchen land. These encroachments attracted violence on the part of the Jurchen in question, which brought upon the Jurchen reprisals from the Chosŏn military, which in turn resulted in large scale uprisings from the Jurchen.\(^{35}\) For instance, in 1583, when a pŏnho, Nit’anggae, was able to stage a large uprising with support from not only the Hurhan Wutiha but also numerous other pŏnho, including especially the Yulp’ori of Chu’ron-bo in Chongsŏng; this unrest continued until the 1587 troubles around Noktun Island, where another group of settlers had displaced a pre-existing community of Jurchen.\(^{36}\) With the 1592 invasion of the region by the Japanese under Katō Kiyamasa, the local people rose up to assisted

\(^{34}\) Yi Sanghyŏp,  *Chosŏn chŏn’gi pukpang samin yŏn’gu* (Seoul: Kyŏngin munhwasa, 2001).

\(^{35}\) Kawachi, *Mindai jioshinshi no kengkyu*, 592-715, esp. 704-715, discusses sixteenth century economic developments, as well as some of the resulting conflict between Jurchen and Korean settlers in Hamgyŏng Province.

\(^{36}\) The Nit’anggae uprising and the Noktun Island conflict are extensively discussed in the *Chesŏng pangnyak* (esp. 1:7-9), and in *Sŏnjo sujong sillok* 17: 1 Sŏnjo 11(1583).02.01 (kapchin), CSW 25:509. Also see Kawachi, *Mindai jioshinshi no kengkyu*, 604-715.
his conquest, allowing, in the process “sundry Jurchen from across the river,” to make raids across the river. As the Chosŏn administration collapsed in the face of Japanese troops and rebellious peasantry, the Hoeryŏng area was attacked by a mixture of pŏnho and deep-dwelling Jurchen. The withdrawal of the Japanese from Chosŏn in 1598 coincided with the revolt of the Not’o tribe of the Mt. Paektu. Unrest had become endemic to the region: one account, a local record for Kyŏngsŏng and Kilchu preserved within the Pukkwan Gazetteer (Pukkwanji) a gazetteer of North Hamgyŏng Province, suggests a regular pattern of raids only indirectly connected to the major revolts.

---

37 Sŏnjo Sujŏng Sillok 26:25b-27a, Sŏnjo 25 (1592).07.01 (muo), CSW 25:623-624. “江外雜胡，乘時寇掠，邊堡土民，反與連結.” Katô Kiyomasa, during his invasion of the region as part of the Imjin War (1592-1598), allied himself with the malcontented members of both the Korean settler community and the pŏnho, but engaged in ill-considered and unsuccessful raids against Jurchen across the river. Both rebellious Korean settlers and the Japanese army were driven out by irregulars under the leadership of the Military Aid Chŏng Munbu (1565-1624). The subject of Katô’s invasion of Hamgyŏng Province has been extensively discussed, for instance, by Chŏng T’aesŏp in “Pukkwan taech’ŏp kwallyŏn saryo ū chaegŏmt’o pon Chŏng Munbu ūbyŏng’gu injŏk kusŏng.” Myŏngch’ŏng Sahak 27 (2007), Ogŭmsŏng kyosu Chŏngnyŏn kinyŏm t’ukechip ho: 153-188. Chŏng attempts to understand the initial participation of both Korean settlers and Jurchen in terms of a revolt by two oppressed communities.

38 Chŏng Munbu, Nongp’ojip 1:41a-47a, esp. 46a, HMC 71:114-117 (Seoul: Minjok munhwa ch’ujinhoe, 1991), “Ch’angŭi kibyŏng ipsu kyŏngsŏng hu kyŏkch’am waejŏk chang’gye.” Document dated to 1592.09.20. Han Myŏng’gi, in Imjin Waeran kwa Hanjung Kwan’gye, 227, discusses this particular document in relation to the rise of Nurhaci. However, this disorder should not be seen as an unexpected result of the Imjin War, unrest having been endemic to that region since 1583.

39 Sŏ, 66-133, discusses the Not’o uprisings in some detail.

40 The Pukkwan Gazetteer which was produced by several authors between the years 1616-1724. (Yi T’aejin ed., Chosŏn sidae sach’an ūpchi, Seoul: Han’guk inmun kwahagwŏn, 44:207-497.) The compilers of the Pukkwan Gazetteer introduces, within the “Miscellaneous Records” (chapki) for
What is clear from all these sources is that, Nurhaci, far from restarting a relationship between Chosŏn and the Jurchen which had died following the 1566-67 campaign, was competing for control of an already volatile Jurchen community in Northern Hamgyŏng Province. Chosŏn’s control in that region was no doubt made worse by the Imjin War, but had already been weakened seriously beginning, especially, with the 1583 Nit’angae uprising. The sixteenth century was a period of both considerable turmoil and significant economic development in Jurchen society in general – the decline of traditional tribal and clan loyalties, on account of the fifteenth century wars, greater diversity of the Jurchen communities and the transforming economies of the Jurchen regions led to a situation conducive to the formation of large confederacies in the Nurgan region. North Hamgyŏng Jurchen participated in the economic development, and, at least partially, in the turmoil, of that period. The turmoil

Kyŏngsŏng (44:262-277), a set of documents possessed privately by a local family which are extremely detailed about Jurchen unrest within Hamgyŏng Province after 1583 (癸未以後境内胡變甚詳). Perhaps because the compilers of the Pukkwan Gazetteer were primarily interested in these records as a supplement to the more usual sources, the raids mentioned occur largely during years in which no major conflict is recorded.

41 It is interesting that this was true both in Nurgan and in Hamgyŏng Province. To my knowledge, nobody has attempted to describe whether the increasing violence on the frontier in the 1580s resulted from similar economic and cultural developments as were then developing in Nurgan. At least in terms of the pelt trade and expanding agriculture, it is clear that the two regions shared a considerable number of similarities.
of Hamgyŏng Province of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century would have presented both a threat and an opportunity to the builders of these confederacies including Bujantai and Nurhaci, just as it did in Nurgan. As bile, they operated by dominating the weapon production and trade of the headmen of individual Jurchen villages. The presence of Jurchen communities partially protected by Chosŏn political cover and actively engaged in trade with Chosŏn would have weakened their ability to maintain control in their home territories as well.

The internal disorder that overwhelmed Hamgyŏng Province during this period also attracted the interference of large Jurchen federations. In the period between 1590 and 1610, rivalry between Nurhaci of the Jianzhou and Bujantai of the Ula deeply involved the Jurchen of the Tumen Valley, with both powers trying to deny the other access to the material and personal resources of this community. According to Kim Siyang (1581-1643), Bujantai had had a significant foothold north of the Tumen valley already in 1591, only shortly after his rise to power among the Ula. In the period 1600-1605, Bujantai attempted to build the strength of the Ula by regular raids against the pŏnho in Hamgyŏng Province, by which he was able to greatly expand his army. Nurhaci also

43 Zhou Yuanlian, Qing Taizu zhuan (Beijing: Renmin Chubanshe, 2004), 149-153.
had extensive involvement in this region during the same period. 1595, Sin Ch’ung’il describes a pŏnho called Kim Waedu (Chin: Waidou, Adun in Manchu), whose father had lived in Seoul for eight years, but who had abandoned Chosŏn on his own accord and submitted to Nurhaci.\(^{44}\) There are also records of family members of Nit’anggae and branches of the Not’o tribe allying themselves with Nurhaci.\(^{45}\) Rivalry between Bujantai and Nurhaci over the loyalty of Chosŏn’s Jurchen subjects developed, coming to a head in 1607 in fighting at Munam, across the river from the Chosŏn garrison of Chongsŏng. This fighting, which occurred partly within Chosŏn territory, brought the Jurchen community of Fio-hoton (Kor. Hyŏnsŏng) north of Kyŏngsŏng into Nurhaci’s control. It also involved further demands by Nurhaci for the “repatriation” of the pŏnho, and, indeed, direct action on the part of Nurhaci to remove Chosŏn’s pŏnho into his control. Ultimately, most were removed from the region.\(^{46}\)

---

\(^{44}\) Pamela Crossley, *Translucent Mirror*, 92-93. Crossley refers to him as Kim Ado. Kim Waedu or Adun’s family history is preserved by Sin Ch’ung’il in famous report of 1595. It is found in *Sŏnjo Sillok* 71:46b, Sŏnjo 29 (1595).01.30 (chŏngyu), CSW 22:643.

\(^{45}\) *Sŏnjo Sillok* 134:29a-b, Sŏnjo 34 (1601).02.20 (kich’uk), CSW 24:202.

\(^{46}\) This battle is discussed in considerable detail by Zhou, *Qing Taizu zhuan*, 142-164 and Inaba, *Kokaiken jidai no mansen kangkei*, 50-59. Zhou, especially, provides an excellent discussion of the implications of the battle. The lack of a good alternative for the term repatriation means that I will use it in the following text, despite the fact that to those forcibly removed into Manchu/Qing control, it would have not been as much repatriation as abduction.
Despite the considerable unrest among the pŏnho of Hamgyŏng Province during this period, most references to pŏnho in the early seventeenth century continue to emphasize, like Yi Sugwang, their vital role in defence, gathering information, and even in the economic life of the Six Garrisons region;\(^{47}\) despite all the difficulties caused by Jurchen subjects during his reign, Sŏnjo’s court most certainly did not acquiesce willingly to their forcible removal by Nurhaci’s forces.\(^{48}\) Perhaps the same unrest which made the pŏnho at times a source of disorder also made them indispensable as sources for information on the movements of the rising powers in the vicinity.

2.3) Han of All the Jurchen

Where Yi Sugwang differed from Yi Yimyŏng and Nam Kuman was not in seeing the pŏnho of Hamgyŏng Province as less culturally heterogeneous to Korea and more culturally linked to Jianzhou, but in the political meaning that he imposed upon this heterogeneity. Unlike Yi Sugwang, Yi Yimyŏng and Nam Kuman saw the cultural links between pŏnho and Manchu as determining political affiliation. In fact, they saw

\(^{47}\) For instance, Sŏnjo Sillok 207:8b-9a, Sŏnjo 40 (1607).10.27 (pyŏngsul), CSW25:370.

\(^{48}\) Sŏ, Sŏnjo sidae yŏjik kyoṣosa yŏn’gu, 259-191, describes the general dismay of Sŏnjo’s court at the prospect of the removal of the Jurchen.
their historical presence in territories which they considered integral Chosŏn territory a possible source of challenge to Chosŏn’s territorial claims – rightly so, as the Qing, during their period were not only increasingly conscious of territory, they were also taking an increasingly bureaucratic approach to administering the various groups in their domain, including the Manchu. Yi Sugwang also allowed that the pŏnho were heterogeneous to the population of Chosŏn as a whole. He was writing in a situation in which Nurhaci was increasingly using claims to shared ancestral ties with the pŏnho as a reason for asserting his authority over them. He did not, however, accept Nurhaci’s political logic in this respect, anymore than did the Chosŏn court of that period.

To an extent, then, the positions taken by Nam Kuman and Yi Yimyŏng reflected the reality of late seventeenth and eighteen century Qing, where increasingly the various disparate tribes of Mongols, Jurchen and others were being treated not as independent entities, but as homogenous groups, each bureaucratically managed according to different administrative systems and linked to the Qing court by imperially approved rituals. The diverse tribes of the Mongols were generally described vaguely as ‘Meng’ by the Ming who were, for the most part, only marginally interested in the complexities of their cultural allegiances. Under the Qing, the Mongols, in all their diversity, with some accepting the Činggisid heritage and some, especially the Jungar,
rejecting it, were wielded together, in a gradual process beginning with the reign of Nurhaci, and continuing through the genocidal wars against the Oirats from Kangxi to Qianlong, into a community organized around bureaucratically determined allegiance to Činggis Khan, then gradually, through conflict between Mongols and Han Chinese settlers and traders, into something resembling the modern Mongol nation. 49 Through a process which Crossley terms “simultaneity” (kamcime), 50 and Eliott terms “throwing of the voice,” 51 the Qing emperor’s declarations were produced simultaneously in at least Chinese and Manchu, and very often in Mongol, Tibetan and Turki as well. Although none of these languages had been spoken or written by unified constituencies before the Qing, by the Qing each was wielded as unified groups into the Aisin Gioro imperium according to ritual, linguistic and bureaucratic practices designed especially for them. 52

Ultimately, Nurhaci’s activities vis-à-vis the Hamgyŏng pŏnho should be seen as a process of confederation building, driven by practical exigencies. At the same time,

---

52 Crossley, Translucent Mirror, 262-336.
a supposed shared Jurchen origin was one of the tools used by Nurhaci for establishing his control over the various Jurchen tribes. Elliott, building on Fletcher’s research into steppe tribes, argues that steppe confederations always used myths of shared origin in order to wield the often politically and cultural heterogeneous elements of their coalition together. Nurhaci and Hong Taiji, as befitted their roots among the Jurchen beile, manipulated and attempted to control the category “Jurchen” in constructing their state, also attempting to establish standard Manchu customs and language.53

The vocabulary used by Nurhaci corresponds to Elliott’s discussion of the use by the Manchu state of genealogical categories in the early seventeenth century. The claim of shared Jurchen origin was an essential tool used by those two rulers when claiming the loyalties of the Jurchen. Already in the late sixteenth century, well before the exclusive adoption of the term “Manchu,” Nurhaci was acquiring the habit of claiming jurisdiction, by virtue of shared ties extending to the Jin Dynasty (1115-1123), to all Jurchen, regardless of current political affiliation. Thus in 1595 Nurhaci had asked that Chosŏn “return runaways,”54 with this defining Chosŏn’s Jurchen subjects as

---


54 Sŏnjo sujong Sillok, 29:3b, 1595(28).07.01(imsin), CSW 25:655. “建州胡酋奴兒哈赤通書江界，请刷還逃口。女眞部落散處近塞者，稱爲藩胡。深處胡時或作賊，而未有書契關請。至是，建州胡團聚始盛，投書于江界府使許頊，請通好往來，又請刷還向化人口。頊不復書，辭以無舊例。事聞，命
delinquent subjects of the new Jurchen state. Although, Nurhaci pressed his cause militarily, Nurhaci’s court seems to have gone to great lengths to treat their claim to the Jurchen as based on universally accepted authority. Thus a document in the *Old Manchu Archive* claims that, in 1609, Nurhaci sent word to the Wanli emperor requesting the repatriation of his subjects across the Tumen. Referring to himself as the “Sure Kundulen Han” he addressed a letter to “the Wan Lii Han of the Great Chinese State (Amba Nikan Gurun).” He informed the Wanli emperor that the Warka people, who scattered during the time of the Old Aisin Han, entered Korea (Solho) and had been residing along the borders of Korea. He requested that an investigation be made and that all Warka be returned. In response the Wanli emperor gave word to Kwanghae-gun, the “Han of Korea,” and had him investigate. The Korean Han investigated the Warka nation and had a thousand households of the Warka removed and “forcibly repatriated.”

55 MR 1:10, JMD 1:19. The event is also described in similar terms in the *Manchu Veritable Records*: *Qing Shilu* (Taipei: Hualian chubanshe, 1964) vol. 1, “Manzhou Shilu,” 138-139. Entry for second month of 1609 (Chin: *yiyou*, Man: *sohon coko*). The text in MR is as follows: “Julge aisin han i fonde samsiha warka gurun, solhode dosifii, solhoi jasei jakarame tehe warka be, sure kundulen han baicame gumu gaiji seme, amba nikan gurun i wan lii han de bithe wesimbume hašame manggi, wan lii han, solho i han de hendune baicabufi, julgei jalan de samsiha ududu jalan i waliyabuha warka gurun be, solho han baicafi, sure kundulen han i susai emu se de, sohon coko aniya juwe biyade, warka gurun i minggan boigon be tucibufi elgeme unggih.”
The key aspect to the above-quoted passage from the *Old Manchu Archive* is the claim, by Nurhaci, to possess jurisdiction over all Jurchen. The historical process described by him, in which the Warka people scattered during the old Jin dynasty to eek out a living on Chosŏn’s frontier, is recognizably and obviously a distortion – only about a hundred and fifty years previous Hamgyŏng province had been dominated by Jurchen, being only gradually and precariously Koreanized by forced settlement from the south. Finally, the measured and peaceful diplomatic exchange described in the passage is not reflected in the *Daily Record of King Kwanghae-gun* (*Kwanghae-gun Ilgi*), *The Veritable Records of King Sŏnjo* (*Sŏnjo Sillok*), or for that matter, elsewhere in the *Old Manchu Archive*. Certainly this passage should not be seen as an accurate reflection of early sixteenth century Chosŏn-Jianzhou politics, although it is often treated as being just that.\(^{56}\) This passage does inform us, however, that for the new Manchu state it was important to produce the impression that their authority over the Jurchen was so clearly legitimate as to be accepted by both the Ming and Chosŏn courts.

Immediately preceding sections of both the *Old Manchu Archive* and the *Manchu Veritable Records* (*Manzhou Shilu*) suggest that Nurhaci pressed his genealogical claims through military means against often recalcitrant Warka

---

communities. Thus, even following Nurhaci’s defeat of Bujantai in 1607, the Warka of the Tumen Valley, in particular the communities of Hesihe and Fenehe, did not accept Nurhaci’s pretensions in this regard, and were intractable in their refusal to uproot themselves at Nurhaci’s command. In response, Nurhaci argued that they were “one people divided from each other only by the Ula.” Since he had destroyed the Ula, he insisted that they submit to him as “the Han of our One Country.” Despite this appeal, he was ultimately forced to have the communities overcome by force, “taking two thousand prisoner.”

The Warka mentioned here as residing in Fio Hoton, Hesihei and Fenehei, and the Warka or pŏnho described as living on the borders of Chosŏn, are, of course, substantially the same people, being removed against their will and against the will of the Chosŏn court into the power of the rising Manchu State. Indeed, according to the Daily Record of King Kwanghae-gun, pŏnho in Nurhaci’s armies, continued, even following the Battle of Sarhu, to refer to Nurhaci as a “great bandit,” to describe “Tong’guk (Korea) as their homeland, and to resent the Chosŏn court for allowing them to be taken prisoner in the first place. This same document also suggested that the

---

57 MR, 1:4-5, JMD 1:12-13. A much simplified description of the forcible removal of these communities of the same event is also found in the Qing Shilu vol. 1, “Manzhou Shilu,” 130-131. Entry for fifth month of 1607 (Chin: dingwei, Man: fulahūn gūnīn).
Jianzhou Jurchen were aware of this recalcitrance, and demanded of the Jurchen that they refer to Jianzhou as their home country. Indeed, it is generally quite clear that Nurhaci and Hong Taiji were quite clear that their claims to the pŏnho were disputed. Their hostility to the Manchu state did not end with this battle. As the passage above from Yi Sugwang suggests, of those Jurchen who were not forcibly removed from Hamgyŏng Province, many removed themselves into the southern provinces. This is confirmed in numerous other records. In 1649, the chief of the Jurchen of Hansan in Ch’ungch’ŏng Province, one Sŏ Pongyong, described his ancestors, although originally Jurchen of the Amur River (Hŭngnyong-gang), as having passed to the south bank of the Tumen because they had heard that Chosŏn had beautiful customs; clearly describing his ancestors as pŏnho whose role had been to surreptitiously inform the court of the actions of the Jurchen on the other side of the river, he also described his grandfather as having been gradually pushed away from the river because of the hatred of the Qing who wanted to kill them, and were thus removed by the Chosŏn court further south.

---


59 Chŏn’gaeksa ilgi 4, kich’uk (1649).11.10, KSTR92:281: “臣矣徒等，本以黑龍江胡人也，聞我國風
In other documents, moreover, it is quite clear that Nurhaci and Hong Taiji were aware of Chosŏn resistance to their claims on the pŏnho. Attempts by the Chosŏn court to interfere with Nurhaci’s military activities against Bujantai and the Jurchen became a regular subject of complaint from both Nurhaci and Hong Taiji. Thus, in document preserved in the *Old Manchu Archive* dating to the period immediately before the 1627 Chŏngmyo War, a letter from “the Jacin Prince (beile) and all the princes (beise) of the Great Manchu Kingdom” complained that, while the Chosŏn court accused the Manchu of fighting a war for no reason, in fact they had rather extensive reasons for their attack, among them the fact that when Nurhaci’s army was expelling the Warka, Chosŏn sent an army to the borders for no reason and attacked Nurhaci’s army. Na Mangap (1592-1642) tells us that, during the Pyŏngja War (1636-1637), a letter from Hong Taiji denounced the Chosŏn court once more for the fact that they had attacked them when,

---

60 MR 4:39. JMD 6: 2617. The text in MR is as follows: “orin jakŭn de, solho de karu unggihoe bithei gisun, amba manju gurun i jacin beile, geren beise, coohiyan gurun i wang de unggihoe, membe suwe turgun akŭ dailaha sehebi, turgun serengge neneme meni cooha, meni warka be ganaha fonde suweni solho umai weile akŭ de jase tucifi, meni coohai baru afaha, ere emu, jai ula i bujantai beile, suweni solho be dailame embdubei gaijira de, suwe meni baru hendume, sini hojihon kai, si tafulacina sehe manggi, be tafulafi dain nakaha, ede emus ain gisun henduhekŭ.”
“in previous years our army was attacking eastwards against the Uriyangkhad.”

The forced removal of Hamgyŏng Province Jurchen culminating in 1607-1609 must surely have ended the potential use to which the Chosŏn court could put them, and thus most of the threat to Nurhaci himself. It did not end demands on the part of Nurhaci or Hong Taiji for their return. Not only the memory of Chosŏn past recalcitrance, but also the presence of submitting Jurchen (hyanghwa hoin) in the interior of Chosŏn continued to be a major source of friction between Chosŏn and the Manchu courts. As Yi Sugwang describes above, Jurchen did indeed retreat in unusual numbers from the border regions for the interior of Chosŏn as Nurhaci increasingly made their position untenable. The Manchu rulers were by no means pleased when they came to know of their continued presence within Chosŏn. In 1625, after the failure of Yi Kwal’s uprising (1624), supporters of Yi Kwal took refuge with Hong Taiji, where they reported the presence of “more than a hundred households” of Warka “who had entered

---

from the north” to settle in a communities south of “Han i Hecen” or Seoul.\textsuperscript{62} The Jurchen of the Kyŏng’gi region were forcibly repatriated to Mukden during the Pyŏngja War of 1637,\textsuperscript{63} but not all Jurchen were successfully removed during this campaign, although the Chosŏn court certainly tried to argue that this had occurred. A repeated demand by the Qing recorded in Chosŏn Dynasty documents was that all Jurchen be returned; it was also suggested that it would be quite easy for the Chosŏn court to do so, as their status as foreigners would almost certainly be recorded in the Household Registry and other documents.\textsuperscript{64}

The constant insistence on the part of the Chosŏn court that there were no more Jurchen to be returned\textsuperscript{65} was, as it happens, dishonest from a purely empirical perspective\textsuperscript{66} but it may well have been accurate from the point of view of practical

\textsuperscript{62} MR, 3:955-958, esp. 957, JMD 1850-1856, esp. 1853. The text in MR is as follows: “hani in hecen ci julesi orin ba i dubeđe amargici dosika Warka tanggū funceme bi, güwa bade inu ambula bi, tere genu aisin gurun i niyalma, tere de bederebume gaiji seme gisureci, inu ombi.”


\textsuperscript{64} Simyang chang’gye, 39-40. Entry for 1637 (chŏngch’uk).09.06. “前者所言，向化及漢人等刷送，何至今無早白，向化則當初投入之時，必為成籍，分置於各邑，按籍而查，則刷送不難.” Page numbers refer to edition from the Department of Law, Keijŏ Imperial University, original printing Showa 10 (1935) Keijŏ, reprinted as Sohyŏn Seja ui Simyang Changgye (Seoul: Kukhak Charyowon, 1987).

\textsuperscript{65} Simyang chang’gye, 45-36. Entry for 1637 (chŏngch’uk).08.19. “向化藩胡及漢人等，留在貴國者，必多，而亦無意刷送，此又不可云云為白去乙。世子答，以漢人則年前黃監軍盡數刷還，向化則兩界及畿甸近處，果有若干，而大軍之還，幾盡擄來，此外或有餘存者，朝廷豈不刷送乎.”

\textsuperscript{66} It should be noted that self-described descendents of Jurchen were still present in Hamgyŏng Province
administration. Inevitably, the actual process of returning Jurchen was not easy because the Jurchen themselves were often unwilling to leave, and had, at least in some cases, chosen to enter Chosŏn at least partly with the purpose of escaping assimilation into the Manchu banner armies. Some submitting Jurchen seem to have resisted assimilation into Hong Taiji’s armies through flight. At times, this flight occurred against great odds; in 1649, Sŏ Pongnyong, the leader of a Jurchen community in Hansan mentioned above, referred to the hardship of the Pyŏngja War, when they had been forced to scatter in all four directions, were deprived of any secure resting place,

in 1755 (Yŏngjo Sillok 84:8a-b, Yŏngjo 31 (1755).04.24 (chŏngmyo), CSW 43:573), when the Yŏngjo court laboured to establish the clear distinction between “submitting foreigners” in which category could be included the descendents of either Japanese or Jurchen, on the one hand, and “descendents of Chinese (hwain chason), on the other. See chapter 4.

Constant reference is made in the various entries on this subject to the difficulties of forcing young children, the sick, the starving, and the sole supporters of the elderly and the young, to make the trip to the Mukden. Thus, in the case of the family Kim Hanhong of Hamhŭng, Chosŏn officials objected to his repatriation on account of the fact that the family had now largely consumed their store of food, and his children were younger than seven; the officials worried that the children would starve if sent to Qing territory. See Simyang chang’gye, 465-466, entry for 1642 (imo).06.26. At times it seems that the Chosŏn officials were deliberately trying to reduce the number of people sent to the Qing. An additional aspect, however, is likely to have been the resistance of the people in question to being uprooted from their homes, and the very difficulty for the Chosŏn court of compelling the people in these instances to obey their orders.

Reference is made throughout the Official Reports from Mukden to the high rate of flight of all the former inhabitants of Chosŏn, regardless of classification. For one example of the return of Chosŏn’s Jurchen subjects to Chosŏn, see Simyang Chang’gye 434 -435, entry for 1642 (imo).04.10.
and nearly all died except for those few who were able to subsist by begging. 69 Nevertheless, the Records of the Border Defence Command (Pibyŏnsa tŭngnok) for the years between 1637 and 1644 describe a constant series of repatriations of submitting foreigners, until, in 1644.04.24, the Qing court informed Chosŏn that no more repatriations of submitting foreigners would be demanded. 70

In addition to flight, some Jurchen sought to manipulate real ambiguities in their status to avoid both Chosŏn and Manchu bureaucracies. The case of Kim Kyedŭk is particularly striking. According to the Official Reports from Mukden (Simyang chang’gye), a group of illegal Chosŏn ginseng diggers were suspected by the Qing of having earlier fled from the Qing after being captured during the Pyŏngja Invasion. Most of the ginseng diggers were ordered returned to Chosŏn, and as they were assembling for the trip back to Chosŏn, a previously repatriated Jurchen from the town of Hamhŭng happened upon them by chance. This repatriated Jurchen, pointing out one man called Kim Kyedŭk, declared: “You are also a submitting Jurchen. Why have only I come!” When he was seized and brought to the yamen, he said: “That man’s father is a

---

69 Chŏn’gaeksa ilgi 4, kich’uk (1649).11.10, KSTR92:281: “不幸遭于丙子之亂，臣矣徒等，流離四方，不得安接，幾盡死亡，只有若干，臣矣徒等，幸遇聖明，處處丐乞，情理可惜是如…”

Chosŏn person, and his mother is a Qing person. He has multiple affiliations.” Kim Kyedŭk, when questioned, accepted this as being a factual description of his family background.71

The extent of the multiple affiliations continued to cause a problem for the Chosŏn side of the negotiations, as did the problem of dealing with a population which had good reasons to avoid telling the truth. For the Chosŏn officials, an additional concern lay in the fact that his wife, Naejong, was a post-station servant and she and her children had hereditary duties in Chosŏn – “they were not like ordinary subjects” and so should not be considered subjects for repatriation. From the Qing perspective, however, their two daughters and one son, on account of decent from Kim’s mother, were clearly subjects of the Qing, although they made no very strong claim for his wife.72

However the case was ultimately decided, Kim Kyedŭk’s family clearly must


72 Simyang chang'gye, 404. Entry for 1642 (imo).02.22. “嘗日，採蔘者被捉人中，咸與金季得，向化子孫是如，衙門留此事不送事段，前以狀啓為白有在果。今者，鄭譯又言，金季得妻，駸婢乃終，其所生子女承玉年十五，次女三玉年十三，男子順貴年十歲是如白。同乃終雖不當送，其子女等乙良井為捉送亦為白去乙。答曰，駸婢子孫，則異於凡民，又不當刷送云，則鄭譯曰：駸母雖是駸婢，駸父其是向化，則其子女段，不可不刷送是如白有事。”
have suffered. The Chosŏn definition of the children’s status considered them to have hereditary duties in the post-station. The Qing definition of their status would have removed the children from their mother. Although ultimately the repatriation process worked against the interests of the subjects, the Chosŏn officials worried that the subjects, in this case, were manipulating the process. They saw Kim Kyedŭk as the ring-leader of the ginseng diggers and believed that he was lying about his background only in order to avoid punishment in Chosŏn. In any case, if Kim was lying, he was taking advantage of the actual ambiguity between Jurchen and Korean in Hamgyŏng Province. When the Chosŏn officials brought the fact that Kim Kyedŭk was actually a man from Kilchu in Hamgyŏng Province, and not of submitting foreigner lineage at all, the Qing argued, on the contrary, that although Kim Kyedŭk calls himself a “man of Chosŏn,” in that region there were many people with submitting Jurchen affiliation. “How can he be referred to as a Chosŏn subject?”

The Qing court, of course, were concerned to establish a maximalist interpretation of submitting foreigner status, while it was, for the most part, in the interests of the Chosŏn court to reduce the number of people being returned to the Qing, especially, of course, in the case of such people as Naejong and her children who were

---

burdened with hereditary duties. How the culturally diverse people of Hamgyŏng and Kyŏng’gi Provinces responded to these changes is more difficult to determine – one can assume, of course, that, in addition to Chosŏn and Qing negotiations with each other, there would be even more extensive communication between the Chosŏn and Qing officials and the various people caught up in the repatriation net. Such negotiations, inspired by the desire of the people themselves to avoid the break-up of their families, to allow for a somewhat later departure or to provide for ailing or aging relatives or young children, may well have determined aspects of Chosŏn-Qing interaction.

It is true, of course, that lineage was only one of the factors used in determining whether or not someone was treated as owing loyalty to the Qing – runaways of Chosŏn origin were also considered Qing subjects, as were Liaodongese of ostensibly Chinese backgrounds. However, it was one key factor, and was understood as such by both the Chosŏn and Qing courts. The assertion of Qing authority over all Jurchen, regardless of their declared loyalties, represented a transformation of the previous trans-Tumen community which had possessed an accepted role in Chosŏn society even while deliberately positioned somewhat outside of the formal span of Chosŏn authority.

2.4) Conclusion
Between the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries Chosŏn underwent a transformation into a centralized state with clearly defined barriers. On its south coast during the Koryŏ Dynasty Cheju had been a largely autonomous jurisdiction, often referred to as T’amna-guk – this was brought into more direct control during the Chosŏn Dynasty.75 Beginning in the fifteenth centuries, the policing of Chosŏn’s maritime ‘frontier contact’ with Japan underwent considerable transformation as well. As is well known, the status of Tsushima was deliberately left ambiguous into the nineteenth century, with both Chosŏn and the various Japanese regimes claiming jurisdiction, but actual control residing, for most of the period, with the Sō rulers of Tsushima themselves. However, the relatively unregulated contact between resident Japanese and the Chosŏn populace in the fifteenth century was, in a series of policy changes following the Three Ports Uprising of 1510, transformed into a much more strictly policed frontier, with private contact between Japanese and Koreans being steadily limited into the eighteenth century.76

The cooption of Chosŏn’s Jurchen subjects into the Manchu banner armies was not, of course, initiated by Chosŏn. On the contrary, it was forced upon an unwilling Chosŏn court by an emerging Manchu state which used the fiction of genealogical connection to the Jurchen to justify their cooption of Chosŏn’s Jurchen subjects through military means. While the Chosŏn state’s independent agency was less in evidence than it was in the restrictions placed on interaction with the Japanese, this removal of Chosŏn’s Jurchen subjects had much the same result; the mismatch between the administrative and jurisdictional Chosŏn was reduced, and a key locus of informal interaction between those within Chosŏn authority and those outside of this same authority was removed.

The mid to late Chosŏn period is often understood through the concept of Confucianization.77 Certainly, as will be discussed in later chapters, Confucian distinctions between hwa (Chin. hua, Chinese or civilized) and yi (Chin: yi, “barbarian” or uncivilized) peoples came to influence Chosŏn response to the descendents of migrant and border communities. As will be discussed in in following chapters, such

---

hwa and yi distinctions were not employed to the benefit of Ming migrants well into the seventeenth century, and were used only for a minority of such Ming migrants in the eighteenth. Confucianization, in fact, would seem to be a poor model for understanding changing attitudes to Chosŏn’s Jurchen subjects. In the early seventeenth century Yi Sugwang and other officials saw Jurchen as “barbarians” and yet still considered them vital subjects of the Chosŏn state. By the late seventeenth century, the changing political landscape had caused officials to see cultural heterogeneity as a disqualification for loyalty to Chosŏn. More important than Confucianization, perhaps, was the context of the increasingly centralized Qing Empire and increasingly clearly delimitated and bureaucratically administered boundaries. Even as the boundary between Chosŏn and the Qing was being solidified, Chosŏn officials came to accept as natural the political and cultural boundary between Jurchen and Korean which their predecessors had rejected. Within a period of slightly less than a century, in other words, Chosŏn elites had come to take for granted the strict distinctions between subject populations which their ancestors had vigorously opposed.
Chapter 3

Ming Chinese in Chosŏn

3.1) Introduction

During the same period in which Tumen Valley Jurchen were either being forcibly removed to Manchu banners or retreating into Chosŏn proper, Ming Chinese migrants were entering into Chosŏn in large numbers. Beginning with the Imjin War (1592-1598) and continuing through the Manchu invasion of Liaodong of the early seventeenth century, Ming Chinese entered Chosŏn on a destabilizing scale, with their numbers recorded into the hundreds of thousands. While many later left, or were
forcibly removed, quite a number remained; of those, a small number established
lineages, and were honoured by the Chosŏn court in the eighteenth century with titles
and hagiographic biographies.

Just as the Chosŏn state was not incorrigibly hostile to its Jurchen subjects, so it
is was not invariably welcoming to Ming Chinese. The bestowal of ritual privileges and
hagiographies to Ming migrants began in the mid-eighteenth century, long after the
turbulence of the period of migration in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth.¹ Just
as with the Jurchen, broad, Confucian claims were less important than a diverse range of
policy considerations unrelated to any strict distinction between “Confucian Culture” on
the one hand and barbarian Jurchen on the other. Many Ming migrants had skills that
the Chosŏn court needed, while others made connections with prominent Chosŏn elites,
all allowing them to stay within Chosŏn. Moreover, the presence of hundreds of
thousands of Ming migrants placed a considerable burden on a country already
devastated by seven years of war.

A certain amount of scholarship exists concerning Ming migrants of this period,
mostly seeing them as a destructive force, and as arousing hostility and anger among the
common people; in so far as affection for Ming soldiers is allowed, it is usually

¹ See chapters 4 and 6.
understood as existing among the top ranks of society. It is undeniable, of course, that considerable violence, destruction and conflict would have existed in the context of such a large number of soldiers and migrants. However, it is also true that the description of Ming migrants in the *Chosŏn Veritable Records* (*Chosŏn Wangjo Sillok*) and other sources, produced as they were from the point of the bureaucracy, inevitably drew Ming migrants in a negative light. To the common people themselves, Ming soldiers, deserters and refugees would indeed have often been an object of fear or hatred, as would be true of any large military force or group of refugees. However, many elements in the large, multicultural, Ming army were probably not much closer culturally to elite Chinese culture than they were to the common people of Chosŏn, and the context of the camps encouraged considerable fraternization between Chosŏn subjects and Ming soldiers.

Furthermore, the border between Chosŏn and Liaodong, always somewhat porous, with Chinese, Korean and Jurchen speakers on both sides, was made more porous by the passing to and fro of soldiers and traders during the Imjin War; this contributed to the refugee crisis post-1618. The very ease with which Chosŏn and Ming subjects could cross political and cultural boundaries – learning each others languages, wearing each others clothes, making friends and finding spouses among people of other
polities – threatened the authority of a Chosŏn state, in this partly accounting for the negative portrayal of migrants in many of our sources; the crossing by Chosŏn subjects the cultural barrier to the Ming amounted to the loss of authority on the part of the Chosŏn state over its subjects, while the crossing of Ming migrants into the Chosŏn cultural sphere brought in people who, unlike the pŏnho, were not established subjects of the Chosŏn state, and over whom the Chosŏn state could not readily assert its authority. Furthermore, an additional and unwelcome element of political complication was added by the connection of the Ming migrants with, alternately, Chosŏn’s far more powerful ally Ming China, its hated hegemon the Manchu Qing empire, or pirate satraps such as Mao Wenlung of Liaodong and the Zheng family of Fujian.

3.2) Ming Deserters during the Imjin War

The entrance of Ming migrants into Chosŏn during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century occurred in the context of near constant warfare and the movement of Ming armies in or near Chosŏn territory. Though the entrance of Chinese into Korea was hardly unprecedented, the extent of the entrance into Chosŏn was, with well more than a hundred thousand Ming soldiers entering Korea during the seven years of the
Imjin War.² This population has inevitably left its mark; in addition to numerous references in the Chosŏn Veritable Records and other official sources, Ming migrants and soldiers appear in popular romances and hagiographic biographies. In the official sources we are shown the actions of a state attempting to maintain its control over a refractory and often semi-criminal group of deserters and refugees at the same time as it sought to make use of those members of the Ming migrant community which had skills useful to the state; popular romances and hagiographic biographies contain a similar diversity of images, from descriptions of violent, destructive Li Rusong in the Record of the Imjin War (Imjin-rok),³ to Ming soldiers interacting on a friendly and informal level with local people,⁴ to deeply moral Ming loyalists.⁵ Rather than welcoming Ming migrants with open arms, the overburdened Chosŏn court attempted to restrict the activities of the communities of Ming deserters, preventing them from establishing

² Kenneth M. Swope, “The Three Great Campaigns of the Wanli Emperor, 1592-1600: Court, Military, and Society in Late Sixteenth-Century China,” (Ph.D. Diss, University of Michigan, 2001), 381.
³ One example of this tradition of describing Li Rusong is found in the English translation of the Record of the Imjin War by Peter H. Lee, The Record of the Black Dragon Year (Seoul: Institute of Korean Culture, Korea University and Honolulu: Center for Korean Studies, University of Hawaii, 2000). As Im Ch’ŏrho points out in Sŏrhwa wa mingjang ūi yŏksa ūisik – imjin waeran sŏrhwa chungsim ūro (Seoul: Chimmundang, 1989) 79-113, descriptions of Li Rusong in the Record of the Imjin War vary quite widely, with some describing him uncomplicatedly as a hero, others suggesting doubt through description of his family background or his geomantic vandalism, and some oral traditions collected during the twentieth century suggesting extreme sexual misdeeds on his part.
⁴ For instance, consider Chin Wigyŏng of the “Story of Ch’oe Ch’ŏk,” described below.
⁵ For examples of such hagiographic literature, see chapters five and six of this thesis.
themselves on Chosŏn soil.

People who we would now refer to as “Chinese” had long been entering territory controlled by dynasties now understood to be Korean. The eastward journey of Kija (Chin: Jizi), reputedly in 1122 B.C.E, may now be considered by most to be a later invention, but the story of Wiman (Ch. Weiman. r. circa 194 BCE) at least seems to reflect extensive migration from the Zhou states into Manchuria and the Korean peninsula. Han Wudi (r.141-87 BCE)’s establishment of the Three Commanderies in

---

6 Kija (Chin: Jizi) supposedly was a loyal official who, though opposed to the misrule of the last years of the Shang dynasty, also refused to serve under the new Zhou dynasty, establishing himself as ruler of the state of Chosŏn (Chin: Chaoxian) in southern Manchuria and northern Korea, where he established sage Confucian rule. There is a tendency to dismiss Kija in North and South Korea in favour of the more nationally acceptable Tan’gun, although for many Chosŏn dynasty scholars and for a fair number of modern scholars, Kija represented the existence of a “Ruist” or “Confucian” tradition independent of any dynasty then in power in China and in some ways also superior. For the historiography of Kija during the Koryŏ and Early Chosŏn dynasties see Han Young-woo, “Kija Worship in the Koryŏ and Early Yi Dynasties: A Cultural Symbol in the Relationship Between Koryŏ and Chosŏn,” in The Rise of Neo-Confucianism in Korea, ed. Wm. Theodore de Bary and JaHyun Kim Haboush (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), 349-374.

7 The original story of Wiman describes him as the leader of a group of migrants from the state of Yan, to establish their own kingdom. Wiman’s group initially served Kija’s descendent Ki Chun, but later rose in revolt against him. For a survey of scholarship on Wiman Chosŏn see Gina Barnes, State Formation in Korea: Historical and Archaeological Perspectives (Richmond, Surrey: Curzon, 2001), 9-15 and Kim Han’gyu, Hanjung kwan’gyesa yŏn’gu (Seoul: Arûk’e, 1999), 1:74-86.

8 Such is the interpretation of Kim Han’gyu, Hanjung Kwan’gyesa yŏn’gu, 96, who argues that: “Chinese fled in groups to Korea whenever there was political strife in China. Just as Wiman represented historically the mass migration of Chinese during the Qin-Han dynastic transition, so Kija represented historically the movement of Chinese to Chosŏn during the Yin-Zhou dynastic transition. For this reason the story of Kija’s travel to the east was always convincing.”
108 BCE resulted in the establishment of a formal Chinese political presence in Liaodong and the Korean peninsula, and with it a significant community of migrants.\(^9\) Large numbers of Chinese and Inner Asians entered during the period of Mongol domination of the Koryŏ period.\(^10\) However, since the founding of the Chosŏn Dynasty, there was no entrance of Chinese on the scale experienced during the Imjin period.\(^11\)

In 1592, shortly after overcoming his last rivals in Japan, Hideyoshi directed the Japanese army to attack Chosŏn, successfully overwhelming the garrison at Tongnae. Despite the superior Chosŏn navy, the Chosŏn court itself was pushed by the Japanese land armies out of the capital in Seoul, past the fortified city of P'yŏngyang onto the very border of Chosŏn at Úiju on the Yalu River. Only with the arrival of the Ming armies and the defeat of the Japanese in the second battle of P’yŏngyang in February 8, 1593, were the Japanese pushed south, although the Ming reverse at Pyŏkche-gwan in

---


\(^11\) Yi Kang’ik, “Sŏbyŏn,” in Yŏllyŏsil kīsul 18, Kugyŏk Yŏllyŏsil kīsul (Seoul: Minjok munhwach’u’jinhoe, 1977), 11:406-408, mentions a Chinese migrant to Korea during the Koryŏ-Chosŏn transition, Zhen Li. That being said, clearly, the mass movements that occurred during the Imjin and post-Sarhu periods obviously do not apply to the Koryŏ-Chosŏn transition.
February allowed the Japanese to hold out at the southern coast for a number of years. The second Japanese offensive of 1597-8, or Chŏngyu War, ended as a resounding defeat for the Japanese at the hands of the joint Chosŏn-Ming armies.12

This seven year war has attracted considerable discussion, not the least of which being the demographic implications of the war. While the precise rate of death is unknowable, it is clear that the war resulted in widespread civilian death from disease and starvation, in addition to those directly killed in the fighting.13 The war was, moreover, partly funded by the forced transportation to Japan of tens of thousands of Koreans, of whom a minority were later returned to Chosŏn.14 Of the half million

12 Although very little has been written on the Imjin War in English, surveys of the war include a Japanese-centric popular account by Stephen Turnbull named The Samurai invasion: Japan's Korean War, 1592-98 (London: Cassell & Co, 2002), a forthcoming book by Kenneth Swope, A Dragon’s Head and a Serpent Tail: Ming China and the First Greater East Asian War (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2008), and Samuel Hawley, The Imjin War: Japan’s Sixteenth-Century Invasion of Korea and Attempt to Conquer China (Seoul: Royal Asiatic Society, Korea Branch, 2005), another popular account, but written from a Korean perspective. Much more, of course, has been written on the subject in Asian languages, notably Kitajima Manji, Toyotomi Hideyoshi no Chôsen shinryaku (Tôkyô: Yoshikawa Kôbunkan, 1995), and Li Guangtao, Chaoxian Renchen Wohua (Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjusuo, 1972). An enormous amount has been written on this subject in Korean. Good surveys of the state of the field in Korean Imjin War research include Cho Wôllae, "Imjin Waeransa yŏn'gu ūi ch'ui wa kwaje" in Chosŏn hugisa yŏn'gu ūi hyŏnhwang kwa kwaje (Seoul: Ch'angjak kwa pip'yŏngsa, 2000), 123-149.

13 See Ch’oe Yonghŭi, Imjin waeran chung ūi sahoe tongt’ae – ūhyŏngil chungsim ūro (Seoul: Han’guk yŏn’guwŏn, 1975), 82-105.

14 Recent work on this subject include Yonetani Hitoshi, “Chŏnhu Chosŏn p’oro ūi songhwan ūi taehayŏ,” in Imjin waeran: tongasia ūi sam’guk chŏnjaeng, ed. Chŏng Tuhŭi and Yi Kyŏngsun (Seoul: Hyumanisŭt’ŭ ch’ulp’ansa, 2007), 85-112.
Japanese who took part in the conflict, a significant number remained behind to serve in
the Chosŏn army.\textsuperscript{15}

Not least of the demographic disruptions of the period was the large-scale
entrance of Ming soldiers. Beginning with a small force of three thousand in the ill-
fated first assault on P’yŏngyang in August 22, 1592, encompassing the thirty to forty
thousand Ming troops assembled for the Second Battle of P’yŏngyang of February 8,
1593,\textsuperscript{16} and the 70,000 troops dispatched during the second Japanese Chŏngyu
offensive of 1597-8,\textsuperscript{17} a total of approximately 167,000 Ming soldiers fought in Chosŏn
during the Imjin War.\textsuperscript{18} Beyond that, an uncertain number of traders and camp-
followers also took part, with traders especially travelling very generally throughout the

\textsuperscript{15} This subject has been discussed in some detail in both Korean and Japanese. A recent work on those
Japanese who were granted official employment in Chosŏn is Han Munjong’s \textit{Chosŏn chŏn’gi hyanghwa sujk waein yŏn’gu} (Seoul: Kukhak charyowon, 2001), the last two chapters of which “Imjin waeran’gi ūi hangwae,” 133-174, and “Imjin waeran ihu ūi hangwae wa sujk waein,” 175-192, discuss those Japanese soldiers of the Imjin War who joined the Chosŏn army.

\textsuperscript{16} Swope, “Three Great Campaigns of the Wanli Emperor,” 228.

\textsuperscript{17} 240-50.

\textsuperscript{18} The troop numbers are, of course, uncertain, especially as Korean troops and Chinese troops fought
together in the same armies. The above number is from Swope, “The Three Great Campaigns of the Wanli
Emperor,” 381. Note that Yi Kŭngik refers to the participation of some 221,500 from all corners of the
democracy. See “Nanjung chammok,” “Sŏnjo kosa ponmal” in \textit{Yŏllyŏsil kisul} 17, \textit{Kukyŏk Yŏllyŏsil kisul} 4:336: “More than 221,500 soldiers were mobilized from Zhejiang, Shanxi, Hubei, Sichuan, Gueizhou, Yunnan and Burma” (微發浙陝湖川貴雲緬南北兵通二十二萬一千五百餘員).
peninsula by the end of the war.\textsuperscript{19} Assuming a pre-war population of 9.8 million and post-war population of 7.8 million,\textsuperscript{20} the total Ming military amounted to some 1%-2% of Chosŏn’s total population, although at any given moment the size of the Ming army and associated traders would have been considerably smaller.

The entrance of the Ming army into the war was almost certainly vital for turning the tide against the Japanese. Inevitably, the entrance of such a large number of soldiers into Chosŏn was also a source of considerable problems. Throughout the world, the presence of a large force of soldiers – allied or enemy – has been associated with the disruption of civilian lives, if not with serious atrocities, and the Imjin War is no exception.\textsuperscript{21} The need to feed the Ming armies despite a harvest disrupted by war put considerable burden on Chosŏn’s agricultural economy.\textsuperscript{22} Indeed, one reason for the

\textsuperscript{19} A discussion of traders in Chosŏn may be found in Han Myŏng’gi, \textit{Imjin waeran kwa han’gun kwan’gye} (Seou: Yŏksa pip’yŏngsa, 1999), 98-105.

\textsuperscript{20} Such is the population estimate made by Tony Michell, “Fact and Hypothesis in Yi Dynasty Economic History: The Demographic Dimension,” \textit{Korean Studies Forum}, no. 6 (Winter-Spring 1979-80):77-79. Also see table, 71-2. An alternate figure is suggested by Kwŏn T’ae-hwan and Sin Yongha, “Chosŏn wangjo sidae ŭi in’gu ch’ujin ŭi kwanhayŏ,” \textit{Tonga munhwa} 14 (1975): 289-330, who see the population as peaking at 14,095,000 in 1591, declining to 11,791,000 by 1599, and continuing to fall during the early seventeenth century (especially see table on 324-328).

\textsuperscript{21} The most extensive recent discussion of the destruction caused by Ming soldiers and deserters during the Imjin War is Han Myŏng’gi, \textit{Imjin waeran kwa hanjung kwan’gye}, 125-155. My selection of primary sources for this chapter has been significantly influenced by his book, although my analysis of the same generally differs.

\textsuperscript{22} Ch’oe Yŏnghŭi, \textit{Imjin waeran chung ŭi sahoe tongt’ae}, 82-89.
peace negotiations with Japan following 1593 was the inability of the Chosŏn agricultural economy to support a substantial force of Ming soldiers.\(^{23}\)

Additionally, the Chosŏn state had to deal with numerous runaway soldiers. There is considerable reference in the *Chosŏn Veritable Records* of violence committed by Ming deserters, or *Todangbyŏng* (逃唐兵. Literally “runaway Tang troops”).\(^{24}\) In 1601, in the immediate post-Imjin period Third Royal Secretary Yun Ansŏng (1542-1615) emphasized the particular destruction caused by runaway Ming soldiers in the P'yŏngan and Hwanghae provinces, which he saw as having nipped in the bud the beginnings of the restoration of agriculture in these regions. Indeed, he claimed that the destruction caused in the region was ten times worse than when the Ming army was stationed in the region.\(^{25}\) While unrest, violence and brigandage were hardly unknown


\(^{24}\) Discussed in detail by Han Myŏng’gi, *Imjin Waeran kwa Hanjung Kwan’gye*, 152-155. Hwang Paekkang, *Imjin waeran kwa silgi munhak* (Seoul: Ichisa, 1992), includes a fair number of hostile descriptions of Ming soldiers and deserters as recorded in the diaries of Chosŏn generals. For instance, see pages 60-61 and 107.

\(^{25}\) Sŏnjo *Sillok* 136:12a-b, Sŏnjo 34 (1601).04. 14 (sinsa), CSW 24:233: "右承旨尹安性啓曰: “臣往來西路，見沿途農事形止，則雨澤頗不足，然亂後弛廢田畑，多有開墾之處。及此時，小民之力，則庶有生聚之望，而天兵之散沒行走者，不知其數。逃兵與否，不能致詰，路傍釋文，所錄名疋之數，督徵紬木，一人之所得於一邑者，多至五十餘匹，侵虐之患，什倍於大軍之日。人心散亂，冤痛載路。令該司，早加堤防宜當。”
among Korean soldiers either during this period. Ming deserters were an additional, and significant, source of worry.

Although the policy of the Ming court itself was to force the return of Ming deserters, there seems to have been a general resistance to this from the soldiers themselves, who despite the destructiveness discussed by Yun Ansŏng, had often set down roots in Chosŏn. Of course, the Ming armies included diverse peoples – Mongols and Jurchen (Talta), Yunnanese, South Chinese and South East Asians – for whom Chosŏn may have been no more foreign than Shandong or Beijing; this, as well as conflicts with superiors, often encouraged Ming deserters to stay in Chosŏn rather than make the trip back to Ming. Thus, in 1601 a group some 100 runaway soldiers and Ming merchants are described living in Chŏlla Province, having remained behind because of injury, because of having sold their possessions, or because of having fought with their commanding officer, and thus establishing themselves in Chŏlla Province either as farmers or as salt-merchants. Their opposition to repatriation was absolute – to the extent that some threatened to submit to the enemy (the Japanese) if they were

---

26 The process by which Righteous Guerrillas became rebels or brigands is discussed by Ch’oe Yonghŭi, *Imjin waeran chung ūi sahoe tongt’a*, 128-164, esp. 154-157, while Yi Changhŭi, *Imjin waeransa yŏn’gu*, 315-361, discusses general popular unrest during this period.
repatriated. In another case, Ming deserters staged an open revolt when attempts were made to have them returned to China.

Nor was Chosŏn court opposition to the continued presence of Ming migrants in any way absolute – in fact, the Chosŏn court also made considerable use of Ming deserters. Medicine, geomancy and other technical fields became established Chinese specialties. Of numerous examples discussed by Han Myŏng’gi, the 1596 case of the two Yunnanese Li Yi (Kor. Yi Úl 李乙) and Hua Yingchun (Kor. Hwa Úngch’un 花應春) stand out. The Chosŏn court chose to employ them for their ability to make gunpowder and poison powder. They were described as choosing to remain in Chosŏn because of illness – closer investigation suggested, however, that their real reasons were that, as Yunnanese, they did not want to make the return journey, and also because, as associates of an executed Ming officer, they were themselves at risk of arrest.


28 Imjin waeran kwa hanjung kwan’gye, 152-156.

29 Sŏnjo Sillok 72:5b-6a, Sŏnjo 29 (1596).02.14 (sinhae), CSW 22:647:”訓鍊都監啓曰: “劉總兵標下花應春、李乙兩人，回到遼陽，得病落後，胡遊擊一行之來，與之偕來。派往嶺北，各人遂爾撤回，應春等欲留此地，製造砲藥器械，以效其誠。盤問其事情，則渠本是雲南人，家鄉九千餘里，囊無錢資，
common area of specialty, geomancy, brought geomancers such as Shi Wenyung into the Chosŏn court itself, and established Du Shizhong as a well-respected geomancer referred to by contemporary yangban elites.

It is impossible to establish with any certainty the number of Ming deserters who remained in Chosŏn – with official connivance or without it – after the formal withdrawal of troops. It can be assumed, however, that in the general disorder of the post-Imjin period, when the state was incapable of raising taxes on one third of the land, and the household registration system was largely ineffectual, that far more Ming soldiers would have established themselves in Chosŏn than are recorded within court documents such as the *Chosŏn Veritable Records*, or have their names preserved in later biographies. While some Ming deserters, as described above, declared the intention of leaving for Japan before they would return to Ming China, or participated in uprisings,

Another figure, Sun Long (Kor. Son Yong), is recorded as residing in the Cholla Region were he was given official employment as an instructor of methods for producing gunpowder and poison powder, all activities, the *Chosŏn Veritable Records* historian claims, which “the people of our country (Chosŏn) cannot do.” Sŏnjo Sillok 133:20a-b, Sŏnjo 34.06.21 (kabo), CSW24:270. See Han Myŏng’gi, *Imjin Waeran kwa Hanjung kwan’gye*, 154.

31 Yi Sibal, “Ch’ungh Tusach’ung” in *Pyŏgo yugo* 2:25a, HMC 74:418. See section 5.3 for a more extensive discussion of the trope of Ming migrant geomancers.
many more would simply have kept out of the sight of the state in the first place. On the other hand, the state neither responded to them all as loyal representatives of the Ming, nor with disapproving hostility. Certain Ming deserters were seen as useful, and their presence in Chosŏn was actively supported by authorities, even as attempts were made to gain control over the large, sometimes criminalized bands of Ming deserters.

3.3) Liaodongese\textsuperscript{32} Refugees Following the Battle of Fushun

The initial migration of Ming deserters during the Imjin War was followed in the early seventeenth century by another, larger migration of Ming subjects, also driven by military conflict and political unrest. Forced across the border in large numbers by the war between the rising Manchu state and the persistent Ming military effort in Liaoxi and the Liaodong peninsula, and organized militarily by the Ming general Mao Wenlung, they further strained Chosŏn’s already weakened agricultural economy. While many of these migrants were later repatriated to Liaodong by either the Ming or Qing armies, a portion of these migrants also remained in Chosŏn. As with Ming deserters

\textsuperscript{32} “Liaodongese,” is here used, as by Crossley in the Translucent Mirror: History and Identity in Qing Imperial Ideology (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 57-88, to represent the border-crossing community of Jurchen, Chinese and Koreans within the Ming region of Liaodong.
during the Imjin War, the dealings of the Chosŏn state with Liaodongese refugees were driven by their concern for the potential disruption that such a large community of non-subjects could pose for the Chosŏn state, and because of the difficulties in feeding these Liaodongese. At the same time, such Liaodongese as were useful to the Chosŏn state obtained positions within Chosŏn, while other Liaodongese simply avoided the Chosŏn state as they established themselves in their new home.

The period of peace which followed the departure of Ming armies in 1599 was soon followed by renewed conflict in the north, as the Jurchen leader Nurhaci increasingly challenged the Ming in Liaodong. Attempts by the Ming to control Nurhaci, the latest in a series of powerful Jurchen strongmen to rise in Nurgan during the sixteenth century, failed when Nurhaci responded to the blocking of the markets by conquering the important trading centre of Fushun in 1618. The Ming, fearing a complete rout in the strategically important Liaodong, demanded that Chosŏn send soldiers to participate in a joint expedition against Nurhaci. The failure of the joint forces of Chosŏn and Ming at the Battle of Sarhu resulted in Nurhaci seizing most of Liaodong in short order, taking Chosŏn out of the war and throwing the Ming armies on the defensive for much of the remainder of the conflict.33

33 Frederick E. Wakeman Jr., *The Great Enterprise* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985);
Unfortunately for Chosŏn, although it never again sent soldiers against the Manchu, established ties between Chosŏn and Ming courts, and the fact that the conflict was happening immediately upon its northern border, meant that Chosŏn continued to be intimately involved in the struggle. In particular, in 1621, one Ming general, Mao Wenlung (1576-1629), was able to reconstitute his army at Zhenjiang at the mouth of the Yalu. Shortly afterwards he was pushed across the Yalu into North P’yŏngan Province, moving once more in 1622 to Ka Island of the coast of Ch’ŏlsan. Employing Chosŏn as a base, and demanding considerable logistic support from Chosŏn, he organized a large numbers of Liaodongese refugees. Nearly autonomous in his actions, and receiving his support from a community of tax-dodgers and pirates of the Yellow Sea islands, he was able to control much Ming-Chosŏn interaction until, as doubts as


34 This particular perspective on Mao is taken by Chŏng Pŏmc’hŏl in “Myŏngmal yodong iltae ŭi haesang seryŏk,” Myŏngch’ŏngsa yŏng’gu 23 (2005): 143-170. Chŏng treats Mao as an independent maritime power; the peasantry of Shandong and Liaodong had been fleeing to the islands of the Yellow Sea well before the rise of Nurhaci, and Mao was largely organizing this particular constitutency into a political unit.
to his military efficacy grew and rumours of his double-dealing spread, he was executed, in 1629, by Ming general Yuan Chonghuan (1584-1630). The result of this execution, however, was not the elimination of the threat from island dwellers and Liaodongese refugees, but the defection of Mao’s subordinates – notably Kong Youde and Geng Zhongming - to the Manchu Qing, giving the Qing the navy and artillery necessary to overcome the Ming in 1644. With the defeat at the hands of the Qing in 1636-7, Chosŏn was forced into much narrower domination by the Qing, with the crown prince and other officials being taken hostage, numerous Chosŏn subjects being taken as slaves, and the Manchu court interfering considerably in Chosŏn’s internal affairs.

While a certain amount has been written on the large number Korean prisoners-of-war taken by the Qing armies in 1627 and 1636-1637, relatively little has been said

35 There has been little research in English on Mao Wenlung, but a certain amount in Korean, Chinese and Japanese. For instance, see Tagawa Kōzō, Mō Bunryū to Chōsen to no kankei ni tsuite (Keijō: Imanishi Ryū, 1932), Li Guangtao "Mao Wenlung niangluan dongjiang benmo" Zhong yang yan jiu yuan li shi yu yan yan jiu suō jikan 19 (1948): 367-488, and Chŏng Pŏmch’ŏl, “Myŏngmal yodong itlae ǔi haesang seryŏk,” 143-170.

36 Wakeman, The Great Enterprise, 194-202

37 Recent discussions of the Pyŏngja War and Chosŏn-Qing relations after the war include Han Myŏng’gi, “Pyŏngja horan p’aejŏn ǔi chŏngch’ijŏk p’ajang – ch’ŏng ǔi Chosŏn appak kwa Injo taeŭng chungsim ŭro,” Tongbang hakchi 119 (2003): 53–94. A military historical view of the war may be found in Chŏnsa p’yŏnch’an wiwŏnho ed., Pyŏngja horansa (Seoul: Kukpangbu p’yŏnch’an wiwŏnhoe, 1986).

38 For instance, see Pak Yŏngok, “Pyŏngjaran p’iroin sokhwan’go,” Sach’ong 9 (1964): 51-67; Kim Chongwŏn, “Ch’agi choch’ŏng kwan’gye e taehan ilkoch’al: pyŏngja horansi ǔi p’iroin munje rŭl
about the Liaodongese who entered Chosŏn in the period preceding. The border between North P’yŏngan Province and Liaodong had always been somewhat porous, and became more so during the Imjin War; after the Imjin War, officials complained the subjects on either side of the river had begun to make a habit of crossing the river “under the pretext of engaging in trade,” with some entering deep into each other’s territory. The real increase of Liaodongese migrants in Chosŏn occurred after the 1618 Battle of Fushun and the 1619 Battle of Sarhu, with their numbers steadily increasing as Nurhaci and his Later Jin Dynasty strengthened control in the region. While precise numbers are not generally given for Ming deserters in the pre-Sarhu period, extensive discussion between the Ming and Chosŏn courts concerning the Liaodongese refugee community did occur. In 1621 a military official, Tao Langxian, estimated that 200,000 Liaodongese, isolated from Ming military base at Luxun, had

39 Kwanghae’gun Taebaeksan kobon 9:9:107a, Kwanghae-gun 02(1610).02.14 (kyongsin), CSW 26:533: “往在壬辰年，本國不幸，被前古所未有之兵患，漂泊一隅，欽蒙聖天子拯濟之洪恩，前後發兵運糧勞費甚鉅。又荷遼東布政使司，體聖上救火之意，創關市懋遷之利，以救本國奔竄無托之民，至于倭退之後，種種弊端，愈益滋生，總督軍門萬巡撫都察院，深軫彼此難處之患，節續移咨，準擬罷。適因太監高重其抽稅，搪塞其議，照舊仍設，未知所抽市稅，其有補於中朝軍餉者，幾許萬矣。而第以目前弊瘼言之，無籍奸民，託以交市，互為變服，散漫深入，其間姦弊，罔有紀極。頃日陳少峯、王近泉諸人，潛入安州地方，罹殺越之患，而糾禁無所。日後又有重於此事者，則何以處置？惹釁生事，必在不遠。”

40 Han Myŏng’gi, Imjin Waeran kwa Hanjung kwan ’gye, 281.
been forced to take refuge in Chosŏn. In 1622 Sun Chengzong, who was then in command of the anti-Manchu campaign, estimated a population of more than 100,000 Liaodongese migrants in those regions of Chosŏn as were under the control of Mao Wenlung. According the Ming History (Mingshi), in 1626, shortly before the first Manchu invasion, the Chosŏn court claimed that the constantly increasing population of Liaodongese, coupled with the flight of duty soldiers incapable of controlling the chaos of the North P’yŏng’an region, had resulted in a state of affairs where the guests (the Liaodongese) outnumbered the hosts (Koreans) in the area “south of Úiju and Ch’angsŏng and north of Sukch’ŏn and Anju,” making up sixty to seventy percent of the population (자昌 義以南, 安肅以北, 客居六七, 主居三四). Many, but not all, of these were later removed by Ming or Qing armies; other records record the claim that all Han Chinese had been removed by Ming army, a claim that the Qing did not believe, and the Chosŏn officials probably had not expected to be credible.

43 Chung’guk chŏnsa Chosŏn chŏn yŏkchu (Seoul: Kuksa p’yŏnch’an wiwŏnhoe, 2004), 4: 25, Korean Translation on 4:72. This passage originates from a slightly different passage in the Ming Xizong Shilu, Tianqi 06.10.22 (xinyu), also contained in endnote 898 on 4:301 of Chung’guk chŏnsa Chosŏn chŏn.
The 167,000 Ming soldiers in Chosŏn mentioned previously referred to the total number of soldiers during the seven years of the Imjin War. In that context, the 200,000 Liaodongese referred to by Tao Langxian in 1621 is significant in that it describes only one event in the flight of Liaodongese into Chosŏn — the total number of Liaodongese who entered Chosŏn throughout the period between 1618 and 1637 may be assumed to have been much larger, especially if those who fled the region of North P’yŏngan Province are taken into account. None of these vague figures, of course, should be taken at face value, especially as in all three cases the numbers are playing a key political role. Tao especially argued for the use of Liaodongese refugees by Mao as a source of troops to fight Nurhaci and prevent a Chosŏn-Manchu alliance. By contrast, the Chosŏn court was calling for relief in its burden of supporting both Mao Wenlung’s army at Ka Island and the large number of Liaodongese in North P’yŏngan. For the opposite reasons, both Son and the Chosŏn court may have deliberately exaggerated the population of Liaodongese, although also sources do agree that huge numbers of Liaodongese fled to Chosŏn, China proper and off-shore islands during this period.\textsuperscript{45} In any case, if Tao’s

\textsuperscript{45}  Chŏng Pŏmch’ŏl, “Myŏngmal yodong itae ūi haesang seryŏk,” 145-9. It should be noted that some of the numbers given in contemporary sources for Liaodongese refugees are incredibly large, with some claiming millions of Liaodongese fleeing for other regions of China, and others arguing for 300,000 Liaodongese in the various islands under Mao Wenlung’s control. See Chŏng Pŏmch’ŏl, 143-170 for a useful survey of some of these figures.
number is taken at face value, then the population of Liaodongese who fled from the upper Yalu during 1621 alone was equal the population of Seoul, the capital, at its pre-nineteenth century peak of 200,000,46 and was approximately 2% of the population of Chosŏn47 – an astonishingly large number.

Merely demographically, such a large number of Liaodongese could not but cause social unrest. Thus, in 1624, there is reference to Liaodongese (yomin 遼民) “scattering throughout Kwansŏ (P’yoŋgan Provinces, or possibly both P’yoŋ’an and Hwanghae provinces),” and plundering the goods of the residents of that region.48 Certainly, the appeal made by the Chosŏn court to the Ming, cited above, suggests that the large scale entrance of Liaodongese was a source both of violence and of economic hardship. Having recently escaped from the “barbarian lair,” and with the coastal islands controlled by Mao insufficient to support them, they were forced to seize what they could take in Chosŏn, with the strong resorting to force and the weak resorting to begging; the people of North P’yoŋgan, however, being seriously burdened by military duties and still recovering from the Imjin War, were ill-equipped to deal with the triple

46 For an estimate of the population of Seoul during the Chosŏn Dynasty, see Kwŏn T’aehwan and Sin Yongha, 298-303.
47 See footnote 20, above.
48 Injo Sillok 5:24b, Injo 02(1624).03.20 (kapsul), CSW 33:601: “遼民散入關西，攘奪居民財産，淸川以北，尤受其害，不得安堵，備局諸令伴臣及道臣，善諭督府，聽我國地方官，隨現禁斷，或拿送督府，使不得擾害民間.”
burden of supporting Mao’s establishment on the coastal islands, supporting the Chosŏn army, and dealing with the depredations of numerous starving Liaodongese; in a no doubt serious overstatement, the memorial suggests that “the land farmed by one person is required to feed a hundred (一人所耕百人食之).”49 Exaggeration aside, that North P’yŏngan Province was overburdened by Liaodongese refugees can hardly be doubted.

The situation was further worsened by the fact that the Liaodongese were organized militarily by Mao Wenlung. Clashes between the Chosŏn officials and Mao Wenlung were extremely frequent, especially during the reign of Injo (r.1623-1649). Thus, in 1627, Sin Talto, in the process of investigating Mao Wenlung’s activities, describes numerous violent raids against civilians in P’yŏngan Province, describing the theft both of goods and often of people, with the numbers of women taken captive into Ka Island by Chinese ships (唐船) being, in his words, uncountable.50 This in turn should not be

49 Chung’guk chŏnsa Chosŏn chŏn 4:301: “毛鎭當全遼淪沒之後 孤軍東渡 寄寓海上 招集遼民 襲負而至者前後數十萬 亦小邦之所仰籍也 顧以小邦封疆褊小 土瘠民貧 兵興數載 外內騷動 四民失業 毛鎭統兵民男婦數十萬口 其明責支給 固已不費卽種種取資動 以賄賂為名 然其所用賄送皆難得之貨 小邦謠俗所不須者 而藐爾之地生穀有限 內以供本國之軍餉 外以濟毛兵之待哺 一人所耕百人食之 設令鈴積貨如山奈無采何 遼民之離穴者 迫於饑餓 散布村閭 強者攫奪 弱者丐乞 督府鈴東非不嚴重 顧耳目有所未及到法度有所未盡 加兵民被撓不堪其苦 拋棄鄉井 轉徙內地 遼民逐食 亦漸入內地 自昌義以南 安肅以北 客居六七 主居三四 無論 客勝而主不堪 即主既不存客將安傳.”

50 For instance, Mano sŏnsaeng munjip 5:11b, National Library # ko: 3648-40, 3:24; Tagawa, Mŏ Bunryū to Chōsen to no kankei ni tsuite, discusses the problems, on the Chosŏn side, of feeding Mao Wenlung’s camp and dealing with the large scale entrance of Liaodongese.
seen as exclusively an issue of Chosŏn-Ming relations, but a general difficulty engulfing both the Ming and the Manchu, as poor harvests and realigning politics meant that large communities were on the move, both spatially and politically. Along side the increasingly violent atmosphere of Liaodongese in Chosŏn must be set the nearly contemporary Liaodongese risings against the Manchu of 1623 and 1625, and the brutal punishment of the same, as well as the 1622 White Lotus Uprising in Shandong.

In the “Story of Ch’oe Ch’ŏk” (Ch’oech’ŏkchŏn), a Ming soldier of Korean extraction, Ch’oe Ch’ŏk, and his son, a Chosŏn soldier, are described as passing, unseen, across the border into Chosŏn and through the peninsula into the southern provinces, while Ch’oe Ch’ŏk’s wife, Yi Ogyŏng, passes from Shandong to Chosŏn by boat. In a poetic attack upon that story, Yi Minsŏng makes particular reference to the improbability of people passing into Chosŏn without being noticed by the formal state;

---

51 Both these risings are discussed by Gertraude Roth (Li) in “The Manchu-Chinese Relationship, 1618-1636,” and by Wakeman, The Great Enterprise, 66-74.
53 I follow the printed text of the “Story of Ch’oe Ch’ŏk” as found in Pak Hŭibyŏng ed., Han’guk hanmun sosŏl kyohap kuhae (Seoul: Somyŏng ch’up’ansa, 2005), 421-451. The event described above may be found on 441-442. Scholarship on the text includes Min Yŏng’dae, Cho Wihan kwa Ch’oech’ŏkchŏn (Seoul: Asea munhwasa, 1993).
rather, they would be caught by the guards on the Yalu and exposed to an elaborate investigations and lengthy interrogations by officials P’yŏngyang.\textsuperscript{54} As many of the preceding references have shown, from the last years of the Imjin War to the fall of Chosŏn to the Qing, the Chosŏn Veritable Records makes considerable reference to attempts by the state to control the movements of Liaodongese;\textsuperscript{55} one example is that of Li Chenglong, the descendent of Imjin Era general Li Rumei, who was intercepted in 1630 as he fled by sea to Chosŏn, and caused considerable embarrassment to the Chosŏn court when the Ming military establishment on Ka Island demanded his repatriation.\textsuperscript{56}

However, what biographical information we have for Liaodongese and Shandongese migrants suggests that, to a considerable extent, their journey into Chosŏn occurred with little regard to the formal state, and generally in the context of fleeing from the considerable disorder in the Yalu region and in Mao Wenlung’s establishment.

\textsuperscript{54} Yi Minsŏng, “Che Ch’oech’ŏkkchŏn” in “si,” Kyŏngjŏng sŏnsaengjip 4, HMC 76:252b: “題崔陟傳 商山有一士人，自言渠所作” HMC 076:252b: “前後走回者, 越江即時刻, 鎮將取供申, 監兵詰巡問, 押解平壤府, 逐一嚴查覈, 某年某月日, 某地某甲乙, 二千四百餘, 一一注簿冊, 然後馳啓聞, 仍拆下備局, 備局引其人, 視同許還籍, 陟云喬標下, 與他走回別, 殘跡既新異, 宜播遠耳目, 奚暇此傳出, 始獲其顚末, 況聞帶方郡, 原無還人物.”

\textsuperscript{55} Also see section 3.4 below.

Quite a number of Chinese, in fact, are described, just as with Yi Ogyŏng, as passing over the Yellow Sea into Chosŏn, although in some cases these stories seem to be later inventions.⁵⁷ One seemingly genuine example, Ma Shunshang, reputedly the grandson of Imjin era Ming general Ma Gui, who was captured by the Manchu after the Battle of Sarhu, escaping to Dengzhou in 1625, from where he seems to have continued military activities against the Manchu. While pursuing his duties around Dengzhou in 1627, the same year as Hong Taiji’s first invasion of Chosŏn, he was blown off course near Myo Island, coming ashore at P’ungch’ŏn in Hwanghae Province; from there he, the only member of the 29 person crew to survive, set out for Kwangju in Chŏlla Province, where he established himself as a silk farmer, and was discovered by the illustrious official Kim Yuk (1580-1658).⁵⁸ This certainly suggests that the narrative of Yi Ogyŏng’s journey over the Yellow Sea is less unusual than Yi Minsŏng claimed. An even more unusual story is that of a Daoist called Zhang Yunqi, who is described as passing in 1622 from the community of Zhenjiang near ûiju into Chosŏn and “on account of the war, not being able to return, but disappearing east over the sea.”

---

⁵⁷ O Kyŏngwŏn, Sohwa oesa: genbu wayaku taishō (Keijō: Chŏsen kengkyukai, 1914), 275-293.
⁵⁸ The story of Ma Shunshang originates in Kim Yuk’s Chamgok p’ildam, Kyujang’gak # 6685, fr. 18. “麻同知舜裳中朝人時來謁自言：遵化總兵里光子之子，都督貴之孫，世襲指揮同知故，稱同知云．其父死於深河之戰．舜裳被俘在虜中六年而逃，丁卯年督糧登州，飄風於廟島，三日而至豊川，同舟二十九人，皆溺死．渠獨生全，今寓光州地”云；麻言中國養蠶種蠶之事曰…” A modified version is also also recorded in the Hwangjoin sajŏk, Kyujang’gak # 2542, fr. 57.
crossing of the sea in 1622 occurred at much the same time as Mao Wenlung’s decampment to Ka Island and the migrant fuelled White Lotus uprising in Shandong. This disorder seems to have pushed him to Japan, from which, by 1665, he returned to Japan House in Pusan, where he came to the attention of Kim Sŏkchu.\(^59\)

The self-account of one Liaodongese refugee, Kang Shijue, provides a much more vivid image of the chaos of that period, and the lack of direct official involvement.\(^60\) Kang, having being involved in the battle of Sarhu and also in the series of conflicts with the Later Jin in the early 1620s, was eventually captured after serving in a righteous militia (ŭibyŏng 義兵), probably connected with Mao Wenlung, in Fenghuang Mountain near the Chosŏn border at Úiju.\(^61\) He himself describes how he was captured by the Manchu, successfully escaping, however, and passing into Chosŏn

---

\(^{59}\) The origin of this piece of information is in the preface “Poem to Daoist Zhang,” which is found in the *Sigamjip*, the collected works of Kim Sŏkchu (1634-1684) and seems to have been written when he was magistrate in charge of the Japan House in Tongnae (Pusan). Slightly altered version of the text can be found in the *Hwangjoin sajŏk* frame 51, the *Sohwa oesa* 2:281. Kim Sŏkchu, “Ch’ŭng Chang Tosa” in “Ch’ilŏn yulsi,” *Sigamjip* 4, HMC145:168d: “張道士名雲起，金陵人，龍虎天師道陵之後裔，道陵為道家所宗，其孫世為天師焉。”

\(^{60}\) The self-account can be found in a number of editions, but here I follow that preserved in *Hwangjoin sajŏk*, fr. 10-25, where it is called the “Kangsejak chasul (康世爵自述).” See chapter 6 for a discussion of the bibliographic development of this text. The text was written sometime during the 1680s.

\(^{61}\) *Hwangjoin sajŏk* fr. 14-23.
via Mamp’o in the eighth or ninth months of 1625. He did not, at this point, join Mao Wenlung’s army, but wandered aimlessly around the 42 administrative districts of P’yŏng’an and Hwanghae Provinces for about a year after he entered through Mamp’o, moving to Hamhŭng in South Hamgyŏng Province only on the seventh month of 1626. Following this he lists a series of communities (most of them quite isolated) in Hamgyŏng, spending considerable periods of time, at least half a year, and generally much more, in each. He then spent the rest of his life in this province, coming to the attention of the central court only in the 1660s.

Even as the Chosŏn court attempted to control the entrance of Liaodongese, and as Liaodongese ignored these attempts, the Chosŏn made use of some of the Liaodongese refugees. Fifty year after his migration, we have records of Kang being employed by the North Hamgyŏng administration as a Chinese-Korean interpreter, as was also Zhang Yunqi in 1687 and Huang Gong in 1667, while Ma Shunshang

---

62 Hwangjoin sakŏk fr. 23-24. The self-account describes him as setting out into the wilderness on the eighth month of the fifth year of Tianqi or yichou (乙丑) year and arriving in Mamp’o after thirteen days.

63 Hwangjoin sajŏk, fr. 23-24: “時于禦滿浦警，留十餘日，又來江界地，留三十餘日，其後西路四十二官殆無不踏，丙寅七月入咸興地，留一年，至北靑留半年，戊辰來於端川吉州互相竝居，丙子春來居于慶源留十日年，丙戌移去於鍾城境長豊留十六年，辛丑春此移去會寧境都昆地，于今二十餘年矣。”

64 See chapter 5.

65 See chapter 5. Reference to Huang Gong’s involvement is found in numerous sources, including a text known as the Chŏngmi chŏnsin rok, Kyujang’gak # 4239, in which the complete transcript of Huang
seems to have stayed completely out of the reach of the state except for a brief encounter with Kim Yuk. Some Liaodongese, however, were employed by the state very shortly after their arrival in Chosŏn. For instance, one Ming migrant, Tian Haoqian (K. Chŏn Hogyŏm), who escaped from Ka Island to Chosŏn after the Qing took control of the island in 1637, is recorded as having joined the Military Training office, supervised by Ku Koeng (1577-1642). During the reign of Injo, he and Dutch castaway Pak Yŏn (Original name Jan Janse Weltevree) are said to have lead a troop of surrendered Japanese (hangwae) as well as Chinese Brigades or Hallyŏ (漢旅). In 1654, during the reign of Hyojong (r.1649-1659), Hamel and his companions were enrolled in this very guard under the supervision of Weltevree and one unnamed Chinese guard – one of many, according to Hamel. While records for this unit are scarce for the reign of

Gong’s interview of the castaways in question is preserved.

66 Hwangjoin sajkŏ, fr 43: The text refers to the army which he led as Hallyŏ (漢旅) or Han Brigade. This is almost certainly anachronistic, as, according to the Chosŏn Veritable Records, the term Hallyŏ was established only under Chŏngjo, and troops of Chinese were referred to as Hanin Abyŏng during the Hyŏnjong’s reign. What they were called previously is unclear. See section 4.2.

67 “Stelden een Chines (door dien mede veel Chineesen tot līfschutten heeft) nevens den veelmael gen. Weltevree over ons als hoofden, om van alles op hare wijse te onderrrechten ende opsicht over ons te hebben.” Hendrick Hamel, Verhaal van hetvergaan van het jacht de Sperwer en van het wedervaren der schipbreukelingen op het eilaand Quelpaert en het vasteland van Korea (1653-1666). The Hague: Linschoten-Vereenigen, 1920. Br. Jean-Paul Buys, in Hamel’s Journal and a description of the Kingdom of Korea, 1653-1666 (Seoul: Royal Asiatic Society, Korea Branch, 1998), 15, translates the above passage as follows: “A Chinese guard (there were many Chinese serving as guards) and the oft mentioned Weltevree were put in command of us to teach us everything about their (Korean) way and to supervise
Hyojong, reference is made under Chŏngjo (r.1776-1800) to the presence of a unit of guards established under Hyŏnjong (r.1659-1674) called the Chinese Dog Fang Troop or Hanin Abyŏng (漢人牙兵).68

As was the case in the Imjin Period, Ming migrants were still employed for their presumed skills in the manufacture of gunpowder. During the reign of Sukchong (r.1674-1720), when one Ming migrant, Huang Gong, was attacked for claiming to be an expert in gunpowder production when actually he had no skills in that department;69 reference is made to this episode in his hagiographic biography by Wang Tŏkkū, in which he is credited with brilliant improvements to Chosŏn’s gunpowder technology.70 At the time, however, he was described a typical example of a Chinese refugee post-1597 who, despite claiming to teach military matters, ended up providing nothing at all.71

---

71 Sukchong Sillok 03:24a, Sukchong 01 (1675), 04, 03 (sinmyo), CSW 38: 260: “張善澂曰: “丁酉後唐人請留, 敎我人技藝, 而終為無實之歸矣.””
The concern expressed by the Chosŏn court, quoted in the *Ming History*, was that the large number of Liaodongese in P’yŏngan Province threatened to erase the distinction between “host” and “guest,” expressing the concern that, with the overwhelming power of the guests within North P’yŏngan Province, the status of the host was badly shaken, and the situation of the guests was by no means secure (客勝而主不堪 卽主旣不存 客將安傳). Far from treating the arriving Liaodongese as representatives of a superior Chinese civilization, the Chosŏn court itself, in an official document sent to the Ming court, referred to Chinese in Chosŏn as “guests,” and, with full expectations of an understanding Ming court, spoke of the need to maintain the supremacy of the Korean hosts within Korean territory. However, it would also be a mistake to look for some exclusive hostility to all foreigners – just as it had during the Imjin Period, the Chosŏn court continued to seek to employ skilled Ming migrants within Chosŏn. Even more would have established themselves outside the range of the court. If Huang Gong and Tian Haoqian remained in Chosŏn under the direct control of the Chosŏn court, the troop in which they were enrolled included Japanese and even Dutch castaways. Kang Shijue and Zhang Yunqi, as well as many others, established themselves in various regions of Chosŏn on a much more informal basis, only coming

---

72 *Chung'guk chŏnsa Chosŏn chŏn* 4:301. See footnote 42, above.
to the attention of the court much later. Nevertheless, even as the Chosŏn state varied in its approaches to the Liaodongese, Liaodongese, like Imjin-era Ming deserters, found corners of Chosŏn society in which to establish themselves.

3.4) Changing Clothes: Flexible Cultural and Political Loyalties

Much scholarship in Korean on Ming deserters during the Imjin War, and Liaodongese refugees of the early seventeenth century has focussed on the destructiveness of both groups, and has assumed greater hostility from the common people than from the elites. While this thesis does not argue against the destructiveness of Ming soldiers, it does suggest that, in terms of social class, Ming migrants were more associated with non-elites than with elites, and this is partly the reason why the description of them during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century is often so negative. In particular, the large-scale entrance of Chinese migrants

---

73 For instance, see Im Ch’ŏrho, Sŏrhwasa minjung ŭi yŏksa ŭisik, 79-113. He describes hostility to Chinese migrants expressed in oral traditions of the Record of the Imjin War collected in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and the hostility to Li Rusong expressed in some written Chosŏn dynasty versions of the Record of the Imjin War, as revealing popular hostility to toadyism (sadaejuŭi) which was weaker in more purely elite versions of the text. Such an approach is also reflected in John Duncan, “Imjin-rok ŭi min’gan chŏnsŭng ŭi nat’anan minjung ŭi minjok ŭisik” in Chŏng Tuhŭi and Yi Kyŏngsun ed., Imjin waeran kwa tongasia ŭi samguk chŏnjaeng , 145-164 (Seoul: Hyumanisit’ŭ, 2007), esp. 157 and Peter H. Lee, The Record of the Black Dragon Year, 204.
into Chosŏn during the Imjjin War, and the continuing entrance of Liaodongese in the period following the Imjin War, reduced considerably the cultural boundary between Ming Chinese and Chosŏn subjects. If the equivalent of pŏnho did not exist in the case of Chosŏn-Ming relations, during this period there were increasingly large communities of people who could speak both Chinese and Korean and who, by the simple expedient of “changing clothes” could pass from one political loyalty to another. Yet, the boundary on the Yalu River and the Yellow Sea being poorly policed, the ability of the Chosŏn state to control the cultural barrier was vital for preventing the flight of subjects – and tax payers – of established loyalties, and the entrance of the disloyal subjects of other states. Whereas with the pŏnho of the Tumen Valley, their ability to live both in Chosŏn and in Jurchen political and cultural worlds had been of vital importance to the Chosŏn state, in the case of Chinese-speaking Koreans and Korean-speaking Chinese their ability to leave one cultural and political sphere for another through the simple expedient of changing clothes shook Chosŏn’s control over its subject population.

The “changing of clothes” in Northeast Asia has been much discussed by historians, especially from the point of view of social control on the part of the state, or as a sign of social class. During the early seventeenth century, the Qing imposed the queue and Manchu clothes on nearly all of its subjects – Chinese, Jurchen or Mongol –
as it established control over them; it did so partly as a symbol of loyalty, and partly to prevent their flight to enemy jurisdictions. The queue gained lively ideological meaning, as, shortly after the Qing conquest of North China, it caused new revolts by Chinese who refused to abandon their hair, cap and gown.\(^74\) By contrast, Korean elites boasted of their success in maintaining their clothes and top-knots into the twentieth century,\(^75\) with serious factional conflict breaking out over the correct clothes to be worn in mourning during the seventeenth century.\(^76\) Despite the queue, Manchu clothes, especially in the case of women, continued to be distinguished clearly from those of Han Chinese.\(^77\) In eighteenth century China, sorcery scares broke out associated with the fear of queue-cutting magicians,\(^78\) while queues were actually snipped off by both

---

\(^74\) See Wakeman, *The Great Enterprise*, 646-655.

\(^75\) This was a common boast of Chosŏn officials visiting Qing China during the eighteenth century. See Im Kijung, *Yŏnhaengkŏ yŏng'gu* (Seoul: Ilchisa, 2002), 303-385, for a discussion of varying responses of Chosŏn envoys to both Ming and Qing clothes. Also see Sŏng Haeŭng’s “Discussion of Legitimate Succession” (*ch'ŏngt'ongron*) in the *P'ungch'ŏnrok*, Yŏn'gyŏngjae chŏnjip 32, HMC274:221-223, in which he closes the argument proving the illegitimacy of the Qing by arguing that they had a dynasty which dressed its subjects “in the clothes of dogs and horses” could not be considered legitimate.


Taiping and Republican revolutionaries.⁷⁹

Somewhat less extensively discussed is the ease with which various subject people of Northeast Asia were donning and doffing clothes and practicing new languages as they crossed from the purview of one state – or sub-state entry - to another. In the case of Chosŏn, “changing clothes,” and the crossing of political boundaries through so doing, is referred to frequently in historical records and even imaginative literature of this period. An example, Cho Wihan’s “Story of Ch’oe Ch’ŏk” features a man called Ch’oe Ch’ŏk, and his wife, Yi Ogyŏng, who, though originally of Chosŏn, end up living in Jiangnan in Ming China. After her husband’s participation in the Battle of Sarhu, and his disappearance in the aftermath, Yi Ogyŏng, her younger son and Chinese daughter-in-law pass across the sea to Chosŏn. In order to pass unharmed through the ships of Ming, Japan and Chosŏn, they bring with them clothing from all three countries, with Yi Ogyŏng especially taking advantage of her linguistic ability in Chinese, Japanese and Korean, developed through her forced travels after the Imjin War. To the first ship they encounter, Ogyŏng declares that she is a woman of Hangzhou, come to sell tea in Shandong. Upon encountering a Japanese ship, Ogyŏng changes into Japanese clothes (變着日本衣服) and responds to their questions in Japanese (玉英作

倭語), claiming to be Japanese fishermen blown off-course. They run into trouble, however, at the hands of a group of Haerangjŏk (海浪賊), or Sea Wolves, whose language and clothes are neither Korean or Japanese, but approximately like Chinese (語音衣服，具非鮮倭，略如華人相似), and who owe no loyalty to China, plundering the seas between Chosŏn and China (在華鮮之間，出沒搶掠).

Another account produced during the same period, the “Story of Kim Yongch’ŏl” (Kim yŏngch’ŏl chŏn) describes the life of a hereditary soldier in North P’yŏngan province. Suffering under the exactions of a brutal officer, enslaved by the Manchu after the Battle of Sarhu, eventually escaping to Shandong in North China, he changes his clothes and language three times (explaining his queue to Ming officials with some difficulty), and marries twice, once to a Manchu, and once to a Korean, in the process.

Changing of clothes, however, did not only occur in imaginative romances. Just as the competing states in Northeast Asia used the imposition of standardized clothing to control the different peoples under their control, so the various “transfrontier”

---

80 Pak Hŭibyŏng, Han’guk hanmun sosŏl kyohap kuhae, 445-448.
81 A printed text may be found on Pak Hŭibyŏng, Han’guk hanmun sosŏl kyohap kuhae, 540-550 and Kim Jin’gyu, “Kimyŏngch’ŏlchŏn’ ūi yŏkhae” Saeŏl ŏmullonjip 12 (1999): 209-236. The original is found in Hong Set’ae (1653-1725)’s Yuhajip 9, HMC167:145b. The text, however, is based on an earlier Kim yŏngch’ŏl yusa, possibly identical with a recently discovered text. See Kwŏn Hyŏngnae, “Hanmun sosŏl ū pŏnyŏk mit kaejak yangsang e taehan yŏn’gu,” Kojŏn munhak yŏn’gu 20 (2001): 141-168, for details.
communities of Northeast Asia sought to camouflage their heterogeneity so as to pass from the sphere of influence of one power to another.\textsuperscript{82} Especially, during the Imjin War the context of the Ming camp life, in which large numbers of Chosŏn subjects participated, weakened Chosŏn-Ming boundaries, and these weakened boundaries ultimately resulted in the departure of Chosŏn subjects with the Ming armies, further reducing Chosŏn’s already limited ability to demand tax and corvée obligations of its subjects. Chosŏn, already depopulated by the violence and abductions of the Imjin War, endured further haemorrhages of population resulting from the departure of Ming troops. According to the Office of Military Training (Hullyŏn togam 訓鍊都監 ) in 1594, many Chosŏn subjects “starving and with no means for maintaining their livelihood … changed their clothes” as preparation for crossing the Yalu river into Ming territory. The Office called for the careful patrol of frontiers to ensure that they did not depart, partly because many of these internal refugees had gained valuable skills within the Ming camps.\textsuperscript{83} In general, the loss of skilled labour, and especially potential soldiers, was a

\textsuperscript{82} Wakeman refers to marginal “frontiersmen” or “transfrontiersmen,” with the former referring to such Liaodongese Chinese who, even while maintaining a modicum of separation from Jurchen society, still gained substantially hybrid customs, and the latter referring to those Chinese who passed politically and culturally completely out of Chinese society. The Great Enterprise, 38-46.

\textsuperscript{83} Sŏnjo Sillok 56:11 a-b, Sŏnjo 27(1594).10. 08(imja), CSW 22:362.
matter of considerable concern to the Chosŏn court during the Imjin War. They were fighting a losing battle, however. Ships left Chosŏn in 1599 with thousands of Chosŏn subjects, and large numbers of the soldiers in Liu Ting’s camp are known to have spoken Korean with a distinct Yŏngnam accent. Well after the war, Yun Ansŏng, in discussing the problems caused by deserters in Hwanghae province, conceded that “one cannot know the exact number of Ming deserters scattered about the region, or who is or is not a runaway soldier,” so deeply had the deserters integrated themselves into village life in Chosŏn.

This deep integration did not make the soldiers any more welcome, as the ignoring of obligations by Ming soldiers to the Ming emperor could be seen as contributing to a general failure to fulfill status obligations in Chosŏn as well. The

---

84 For instance one passage, from 1594 rather amusingly describes matters as follows: “It doesn’t seem that they (the Ming) army will cooperate with us on the matter of our request that they not take away subjects of our country. With women then it is of no account, but in a country on a war footing, how could the loss of one man not be extremely regretted.” Sonjo Sillok 54:31a, Sŏnjo 27 (1594), 08, 25 (kyŏng’o), CSW 22:335: “昨總兵回咨，我國人勿為率去事，似無快諾之意，女人則已，當此兵伐之日，男丁一人，豈非可惜，今宜唐人率去男丁，自為出來者，公私賤則為良，良人則除禁軍。”

85 Sonjo Sillok 109:16a, Sŏnjo 32 (1599), 02.08 (muo), CSW 23:573.

86 Sonjo Sillok 136:12a-b, Sŏnjo 34 (1601), 04, 14 (sinsa), CSW 24:233: “右承旨尹安性啓曰: “臣往來西路，見沿途農事形止，則雨澤頗不足，然亂後患廢田畑，多有開墾之處，及此時，小寛民力，則庶有生聚之望，而天兵之散沒行走者，不知其數，逃兵與否，不能致詰，路傍列邑，被其擾害，至殘人命，左右問路，無邑不往，其所索索，馬軍及護送軍，遂其所持票文，所錄名疋之數，督徵紬木，一人之所得於一邑者，多至五十餘匹，侵虐之患，什倍於大軍之日，人心散亂，冤痛載路，令該司，早加堤防宜當。”
influential volunteer militia leader of the Pugin faction, Chŏng Inhong, became known for gathering about him Ming soldiers from the Zhejiang region, on account of the origin of his own family in the Zhejiang region. His political enemies, in particular, criticized him for this practice. Notably, Hong Yangho (洪良浩) described what he saw as the shameless manner in which he hid five Ming deserters – including Shi Wenyung, Zhu Jiansong, Guan Yinghua – in his house to protect them from forced repatriation to China, in the process providing a shield, Hong claimed, for hundreds of others, as no official or runner would dare to challenge the authority of the “chief of deserters” (逋逃主) Chŏng Inhong. Such rampant disrespect for the Ming emperor, Hong argued, could not but lead to more general disrespect of status obligations, by commoners avoiding military service, and runaway slaves fleeing from the private master or public office that owned them; indeed, if Chŏng dared hid fugitive Ming migrants, who could know how many fugitive Chosŏn subjects his relatives and allies might be hiding. 87

Despite such criticism from the Sŏin faction, another Ming deserter, Du Shizhong, was often praised in the writings of prominent members of Chŏng’s rivals in the Sŏin faction,

---

87 Hongjŏng p’ŏllok 7, in Kukyŏk Taedong yasŭng (Seoul: Minjon munhwa ch’ujinhoe, 1971), vol. 16. Korean translation is on page 525, Classical Chinese original is on 114. “皇朝發遣差官，追捕逃軍時，仁弘潛隱逃命漢人施文用，朱見松，管應華等五人于其家，至今使之窟穴莊園，而不許州郡之刷括，則因之以兩南諸城邑，散布逃唐兵數百餘名，皆依仁弘爲聲勢，而吏不敢根究，官不得覈實者無他，以仁弘爲逋逃主故也..”
suggesting that the shielding of Ming deserters may well have occurred more generally.\textsuperscript{88} Nevertheless, Hong’s attacks on Chŏng are meaningful in that they reveal clearly, the source of some of the ambivalence concerning the continued presence of Ming deserters in Chosŏn. Beyond the accusations of brigandage, the very failure to return with the departing Ming army suggested to him a general refusal to respect obligations of loyalty, which in turn raised questions about the ability of the state and elites to demand obligations from their inferiors: “if those who flee from imperial commands can be hidden in such a manner, then what about commoners in our country who flee from service obligations, or escaped public and private slaves? They are also all because of this Chŏng Inhong’s family.”\textsuperscript{89}

Beyond simply a threat to the populace, then, Ming deserters, and the ease with which both Ming deserters and Chosŏn subjects crossed the cultural barrier into each others camps, suggested the denial of obligations of loyalty to superiors; in quite a number of cases, Ming deserters could join up with Chosŏn subjects to commit crimes or attack enemies. For instance, an official Hong Yŏsun (洪汝諄), amid a more general discussion of the departure of Ming soldiers, describes the actions of a number of

\textsuperscript{88} Yi Sibal, “Chŏng Tusach’ung” in Pyŏgo yugo 2:25a, HMC 74:418.

\textsuperscript{89} “天子亡命，敢為藏匿如此，況本國遊民私叛主奴婢，又其獨仁弘一家而已也.”
Chosŏn sub-officials in using Ming soldiers to attack more prominent officials. During the same year a slave from Suwŏn called Maktong who lived in the Ming camp claimed to be Chinese and engaged in various attacks on yangban families within the area, “terrifying yangban wives, plundering their possessions, and when he broke in at night, raping female slaves, and when someone did not follow is orders, leading Tartar troops and raising revolt.” He was able to claim Ming military support, not only because he was within the Ming army, but also because “in clothes and language he imitated the appearance of a Chinese person (Tangin 唐人).” By donning Ming uniforms and mastering Chinese, Chosŏn subjects could benefit from the status of Ming subject to leave Chosŏn for Ming China or commit crimes against their superiors in Chosŏn.

90 Sŏnjo Sillok 109:2a, Sŏnjo 32 (1599).02.01 (sinhae), CSW 23:566, 洪汝諄曰: “今見都監啓辭，極爲惶恐。臣早知如此，黃海逃軍二百名及京畿軍啓達，六度催促，而零星上來，又為啓請下諭矣。大概各衙門衙子，無數來貢，各都監下人，作弊操縱，不勝支吾，至於陰嗾唐兵，侵脅官員，至作揭帖，達於天聴，甚者題名來督。天朝將官，豈知我國下卒之名哉?”

The end of the Imjin War did not bring an end to such cultural border crossing, nor of attempts to prevent them. Increasingly, the zone of interaction moved from military bases across the peninsula to Yellow Sea islands and the Yalu River on the border between Chosŏn and Liaodong. Of course, as with the pŏnho, our picture of Chosŏn-Liaodong interaction is complicated by the fact that precise borders between Chosŏn and China were not clearly demarcated before the eighteenth century. This was true not only of the Mt. Paektu and Tumen river boundary, but also of the lower Yalu and Yellow Sea. The lower Yalu ceased to be seriously contested as a border after the early Chosŏn, and in this was one of Chosŏn’s more stable land frontiers.\(^{92}\) This does not mean that it was unchanging. If the equivalent of the pŏnho did not exist in the case of the lower Yalu, both sides of the Yalu frontier, and especially the Ming military colony of Liaodong, were populated by mixed communities of Chinese, Mongol, Korean and Jurchen.\(^{93}\) In the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the steady expansion of Ming administration towards the Yalu had encroached on Chosŏn’s de

\(^{92}\) There were some disputes concerning the islands at the mouth of the Yalu. See Sŏ Inbŏm, “Amnokkang hagu yŏn an to’yŏ rŭl tullŏssan cho myŏng yŏng’t’o punjaeng” Myŏngch’ŏng sahak, 10 (2006), 31-68.

\(^{93}\) The presence of a considerable population of Koreans in Liaodong during the Koryŏ and Chosŏn dynasties is discussed by Sŏ Inbŏm, “Amnokkang hagu yŏn an to’yŏ rŭl tullŏssan cho myŏng yŏng’t’o punjaeng,” 31-33 and by Okada Hidehiro, "The Koreans in Manchuria in the Yuan Times," Han-kuo hsueh-pao 5 (1985): 181-199. The presence of diverse peoples in Liaodong and Nurgan is also discussed by Crossley, Translucent Mirror, 57-88, and Wakeman, Jr., The Great Enterprise, 37-45.
facto sphere of influence in the region, placing the Korean speaking communities of the northern bank securely in Ming and Qing control. Furthermore, the Yellow Sea was not, of course controlled and demarcated precisely, and throughout the Chosŏn dynasty, communities of Maritime Chinese – often also outside of the clear authority of any Chinese court - threatened Chosŏn’s security. Liaodong itself was a multi-ethnic community of Jurchen, Mongols, Han Chinese and Koreans, including as well numerous “transfrontier” Chinese who had established themselves in Jurchen society, and of Jurchen who had established settled lives in Liaodong.

Both the Manchu and Ming states attempted to bring the cultural mix of Liaodong under their control during the early seventeenth century. Despite the fact that the Manchu state itself was in many ways the product of such frontier crossing communities, it was particularly concerned to control over the fluid identities of its Liaodongese subjects. The Manchu elites depended for both prestige and power on the labour of slaves, Chinese, Korean and Jurchen, while the Manchu state needed ample

---

95 For instance, see Marion Eggert’s discussion of the Yi Tŏngmu’s “Sŏhaeyŏ’ŏn,” in which she explores his description of the Yumanzi (漁蠻子) or Fishing Barbarians of Shandong Province, “A Borderline Case: Korean Traveller’s Views of the Chinese Border,” in *China and her Neighbours: Borders, Visions of the Other, Foreign Policy 10th to 19th Century*, ed. Sabine Dabringhaus, Robert Ptak & Richard Teschke (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1997), 49-78, esp. 60-64.
man-power to engage in the interminable wars with the Ming empire during the
seventeenth century. To a limited extent, they maintained the necessary control over
population through controlling physical boundaries; more than through physical
boundaries, the Manchu state maintained its control over its multiethnic slave
population through the compulsory imposition of the Manchu queue.97 Similarly, in
diplomatic disputes with Chosŏn concerning the return of fugitives, the Manchu would
generally claim the fact that a Chosŏn subject had previously had his head shaved as
sufficient evidence that he had had his loyalties transferred;98 the so-called Chuhoeja
(走回者) – “those who had run away and returned (to Chosŏn)” - were treated, along
with Jurchen and Liaodongese, as equally requiring repatriation to the Qing.99

In the case of the Ming, the cultural fluidity of Liaodong became less welcome
after the rise of Nurhaci, and the increasing genealogical turn of Ming ethnography

97 As Weiers points out, in documents concerning the arrival or departure of refugees and fugitives, the
word for boundary – “jase” - appears very rarely indeed, but the unpublished Manchu documents quoted
by him reveal that the most common approach by the Manchu officials to the arrival of fugitives from
Liaodong in the late 1620s and early 1630s was to give them “new clothes” before distributing them as
household slaves to their new owners. Michael Weiers “Die unruhigen Grenzen des Aisin-Staats Ende der

98 For instance in the passage in the Simyang chang’gye dealing with Kim Kyedŏk, quoted in chapter 2,
the scalps of all the fugitives are checked for recent growth. Those whose hair seems to have been
shaved were kept behind. Simyang chang’gye, 371-372. Entry for 1641 (sinsa).11.13. “韓卞兩譯，看審
各人頭髮，有若斷而還長者十二名乙，以衙門之意，姑為留置，其餘則盡為出送為白如乎.”

99 Kim Chongwŏn, “Ch’ogi choch’ŏng kwan’gye e taehan ilkoch’al: pyŏngja horansi ŭi p’iroin munje rŭl
made the court suspect, and in some cases execute, those Liaodongese who had family connections to the Jurchen of Nurgan to the north.\(^{100}\) Quite apart from Jurchen roots, there are numerous records of Liaodongese willingly submitting to Nurhaci, while the proliferation of White Lotus societies in Liaodong, especially one sect led by a Jin Deshi from near the Yalu River and seen by the Ming and Chosŏn courts as a potential ally of Nurhaci, could not but provide new causes of worry for both Ming and Chosŏn.\(^{101}\) Such worries were shown to be not without basis when, in 1622, Xu Hongru, a White Lotus member of the Incense-Smelling Sect (Wenxiangjiao) led a revolt in areas in Shandong with large Liaodongese refugee communities\(^{102}\) well before the revolts leading up to the Xun (順) uprising. In any case, loyalties which may often have been seen as absolute by the states and rulers were permeable to the Liaodongese

\(^{100}\) Crossley, *Translucent Mirror*, 53-89.

\(^{101}\) Li Guangtao *Mingjie liuko shimo* (Nan’gang: Zhongyang yanjiu yan lishi yuan yanjiusuo, 1965), 4, quotes a passage in the *Veritable Records of King Sŏnjo* in which Nam Yisin discusses a geomancer with the suspiciously Korean sounding name of Jin Deshi (Kor: Kim Tŭkshi 金得時) who gathered together his supporters who amounted to 40-50 thousand, and mobilized them in the area Qinghebao with nothing but clubs, in preparation for an uprising. The Ming army, fearing that the group might form an alliance with Nurhaci, has watching them with considerable concern. Nam Yisin suggested, furthermore, that the group was only three days travel away from Chosŏn’s border, and so was a significant danger to Chosŏn as well. *Sŏnjo Sillok* 127:28a-b, *Sŏnjo 33* (1600).07.20 (sinyu), CSW 24:201 到遼東，聞有術士稱號金得時者，聚其徒黨，幾至四五萬，據險於淸河堡近處，無他兵器，只持大（梃）[梃]，將欲作亂，天朝患其或與老酋相通，令祖總兵，來在廣寧，以觀其發動云。所謂淸河堡、距碧潼三日程，我國亦不無意外之慮矣。”

\(^{102}\) See 3.3.
peasantry – they may have been willing to submit to Nurhaci initially, but following Nurhaci’s take-over, many Liaodongese rejected Nurhaci and their Jurchen overlords through poisonings and outright revolt.103

This fluidity was as much of a problem for Chosŏn as for the Ming. In the royal response to Nam Yisin’s report on Jin Deshi’s sect in Qinghebao, reference was made particularly to the fact that, since the Ming intervention in the Imjin War, the people of Liaodong had gained extensive knowledge of Chosŏn through frequent trips across the border; moreover, they almost certainly were a mixture of Jurchen (Yi 夷) and Chinese (Han 漢). After considering a number of worrisome possibilities – that Chosŏn might be forced to participate in the suppression, that the rebels might conspire with Nurhaci to attack Chosŏn, or that they might be forced into Chosŏn by the Ming armies – the monarch suggested an extensive program of military preparation, including advanced espionage by which those local soldiers with good knowledge of Chinese, would be dressed in Chinese clothes and sent to investigate the plans of the cultists.104

104 Sŏnjo Sillok 127:28a-b, Sŏnjo 33 (1600).07.20 (sinyu), CSW24:201: “備忘記曰: “今見南以信書啓金得時事，眾至四五萬云，此非一醜，設使止於一二萬，此賊在我境至近之地，而皆是遼左之人，自東征之後，往來我境，山川道路，防備虛實，無不慣知者。且必夷、漢相雜，天朝至以祖總兵為將，而鎭之，其勢亦可知矣。鴨綠江雖限彼此，夏月則盈盈隔水，一葦航之，冬月則水合成陸，坦然長驅，不足恃也。沿江列堡，内地郡邑，防備諸具，舉皆蕩然，倘變生意外，其何能禦？予之妄意，萬一遼東，令我兵挾擊，一可慮也。此賊與老酋，相連合謀，作耗於我境，二可慮也。為天兵所壓，勢必為
Such cultural fluidity, suggesting as it also did political inconstancy, continued to worry the Chosŏn court throughout the early seventeenth century. The Chosŏn court attempted to prevent the “changing of clothes” by which Chosŏn subjects became Ming, and Ming subjects became Chosŏn subjects, even as it was celebrated in such texts as “The Story of Ch’oe Ch’ŏk,” or by the submitting foreigner Kim Kyedŭk,105 although, as the above example suggests, in the very attempt to control border crossing, the skills of linguistic and sartorial border crossers from within the North P’yŏngan army were also required. Furthermore, as the above example suggests, the Imjin War and the large scale entrance of Ming soldiers resulted in the creation of flexible communities of multi-lingual subjects, especially in the P’yŏngan Province and Liaodong regions.

This problem for the Chosŏn court rose to a height after the Battle of Sarhu, when numerous Ming soldiers attempted to escape death or enslavement at the hands of the Manchu by donning Chosŏn clothes. Cho Wihan has Ch’oe Ch’ŏk survive the defeat at the Battle of Sarhu because he follows his commander to dress in Chosŏn clothes (乞着鮮衣); speaking as he does Korean, he is more easily able to become associated

105 See section 2.3.
with Chosŏn soldiers – by chance, the same prison contains his son, a Korean in the Chosŏn army, who initially expected that Ch’oe Ch’ŏk was merely a Chinese soldier pretending to be a Korean in order to survive. There are numerous stories of Ming soldiers really using such methods to escape Nurhaci. Kang Shijue, for instance, claimed in his self-account that he donned the armour of a fallen Chosŏn soldier, as a result living to fight another day. In *Official Reports from Mukden* (*Simyang chang’gye*), a recently recaptured Liaodongese fugitive reports to the Qing that his two fellows, both Liaodongese who were competent in Korean, were taken as servants by a landholder, with only he being returned to the Qing. This passages hint strongly at the ability of Liaodongese migrants to vanish, through personal connections or familiarity with Korean language and customs, into Korean society, although it also reminds us that such border crossing would not necessarily be to the benefit of the Liaodongese in question.

The usual approach of the Chosŏn court to such “changing of clothes” was to prevent such easy border crossing. Elsewhere in the *Official Reports from Mukden*,

---


107 Hwangjoin sajŏk, fr. 16.

Qing officials accuse Chosŏn officials of deliberately subverting the demand to return all Liaodongese Chinese by providing them with clothes and caps. In later hagiographic literature, the process by which Ming soldiers imitated Koreans in order to escape execution is described heroically, and motivated, above all, by the desire to avoid a much worse change to Manchu clothes. For the Chosŏn court, the switch from Chosŏn clothes to Ming clothes, and vice-versa, treated as seriously as the switch from Ming to Manchu, and of far more immediate concern. Thus, three years after the Battle of Sarhu, in 1621, the governor for P’yŏng’an Province, Yi Sang’gil made particular reference to the large number of fugitive Chinese military (Tangjang 唐將) in Yongch’ŏn. They had stayed a long time, and had started wearing Chosŏn clothes (pyŏnch’ak aguk ŭi bok 變着我國衣服). He had suggested that thorough patrols to ensure that the Ming military in question could not interact directly with the common people.

Such attempts by the state aside, in reality Ming and Chosŏn subjects were able quite easily to cross over from one affiliation to another. Frequently, the tool through

---


110 See section 6.3, for a discussion of the development of biographies of one such sartorial border cross, Kang Shijue.

which this was achieved was intermarriage with Chosŏn subjects. Just as other sorts of uncontrolled fraternization, sexual and marital unions between Ming and Chosŏn subjects was a matter of considerable concern to the Chosŏn court. At the same time, it is clear that such unions were extremely common indeed. A variety of sources suggest that Ming soldiers during the Imjin War quite frequently gained Chosŏn lovers – for instance, Liu Ting in 1594 is said to have left particular orders to the Chosŏn court to protect his lover (described as a ch’angnyŏ or prostitute) while he was in China – a request which, on account of his high status, was accepted only slightly grudgingly.112

Yi Sugwang describes a prophecy in which the Imjin War would end when “children know their mothers but do not know their own fathers” – which, we are told, was proven correct when, as a result of the war “sons would grow old and not know their father’s face, while the children of women who were dirtied by Ming soldiers would give birth to children and not know the father’s surname.”113

The last, of course, a clearly suggests that the Ming soldier-Chosŏn woman


union had become a widely recognized type by the time that Yi Sugwang was writing in the early seventeenth century, with adulterous Ming-Chosŏn unions becoming a stereotype. Adulterous unions, however, were by no means the only form of connection. More stable marriages were also contracted between Ming Chinese and Chosŏn Koreans; these were no more popular than adulterous unions, and the Chosŏn court often responded by expelling the Ming Chinese partner and preventing the departure of the Chosŏn Korean spouse. While in some documents preserved in the Chosŏn Veritable Records, especially in the early years of the war, the departure of women with the Ming army was considered a minor matter, compared to the departure of male subjects, in other passages, the departure of women with Ming migrants, and the continued formation of unions between Chosŏn women and Ming soldiers was treated as a significant threat. Already in 1593, concerns are raised about Chosŏn women departing with the Ming soldiers under Li Rusong, and policies were brought into effect to prevent the departure of Chosŏn women with Ming soldiers. A similar description may be found in the Miscellaneous Records from a Time of War (Nanjung chamnok) for Liu Ting’s army, the troops of which were supposed, during its period stationed in Namwŏn, to have married Chosŏn women from Chŏlla and Kyŏngsang Provinces on a

---

114 Sŏnjo Sillok 41:13a-b, 1593.08.06 (chŏnghae), CSW 22:62.
wide scale – Liu Ting himself being supposed to have married more formally a woman of private slave origin with whom he had a son, for which reason he considered it expedient to buy her from the original owner, while Li Rusong, according to later tradition, sired a child by a woman of the T’ongjin Kŭm family in Kŏje Island.\textsuperscript{115} The various communities of Ming deserters and Liaodongese refugees that remained in Chosŏn, moreover, were almost always solidified by marriage ties with Chosŏn subjects. In a text purportedly written in the late seventeenth century by Ma Fengzhi, for instance, we are told that “many Chinese came and settled in Korea. The first were those soldiers of the Imperial Army who came during the punishment of the Japanese during the Imjin and Chŏngyu years of the Wanli emperor and who settled in Korea. Some were those who had children and could not return with them.”\textsuperscript{116} Occasionally, we know some information concerning the circumstances of the marriage. In Kang Shijue’s case, he

\textsuperscript{115} Described in the Hwangjoin sajŏk. fr. 59. For a discussion of the Nongsŏ Yi family, see chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{116} Quoted in O Kyŏngwŏn, “P’iji tongnae chein” in ’Hwangjo yumin rok,’ Sohwa oesa 2:203: “中國之人, 來居東土者, 甚多, 初卽 萬曆壬辰丁酉間定倭時, 天朝諸將多取于東邦, 或有子有女不能率歸, 仍為東土人多矣. 萬經理世德之孫居于平壤, 千中軍志中之孫居于清州, 彭參將友德之孫, 居于東萊, 彭遊擊信古之孫居于醴泉.” The text purports to originate with a Hwangjo yumin rok, written by Ma Pengzhi, the son of Ma himself the descendent of Ming general Ma Gui. It is of somewhat doubtful authenticity, and first is quoted in the late nineteenth early twentieth century. However, this particular passage would not seem to perpetuate Ming migrant hagiography, so seems to refer to genuine events. See chapter 6 on the textual tradition.
formed a connection (as the *Chosŏn Veritable Records* disapprovingly phrases it)\(^{117}\) or married (as some other texts more charitably claim)\(^{118}\) a post-station slave or kisaeng from Kwŏngwŏn.

In his discussion of the Waegwan, James Lewis describes the tightening restrictions on sexual and martial relations between Japanese and Chosŏn subjects following the Three Ports Uprising and the Imjin War – this he argues, was inspired less by Confucian disapproval of irregular unions, or with national hostility to foreigners establishing roots in Chosŏn, but in a fear, made especially strong following the Imjin War, that mixed subjects with multiple political affiliations could pose a military threat to the Chosŏn state.\(^{119}\) While it is hardly surprising that they should take such an approach to the Japanese enemy, in fact the Chosŏn state established a similar approach to Ming migrant-Chosŏn women relationships as well. The Chosŏn court seems to have been relatively unconcerned by the matter during the early part of the war, but increasingly hostile to such unions during the last years of the war and the period immediately following it. If the Chosŏn court had restricted itself to slightly disapproving language in the case of Kang Shijue, far more serious action was taken

---

\(^{117}\) *Sukchong Sillok* 19:124a, Sukchong 14 (1688) 03.08(sinsa), 39:124.

\(^{118}\) Nam Kuman, “Kangsejakchŏn,” *Yakch’ŏnjip* 18, HMC 132: 474-476.

against other women who crossed the political barrier in this manner. As a general rule, just as with men, the Chosŏn court attempted to keep their female subject in Chosŏn even as they expelled the male alien. According to the *Micellaneous Records from a Time of War*, the Chosŏn women departing with their Ming soldier husbands were all stopped at Shanhaiguan, and thus forced to remain in the Liaodong and Liaoxi region. Cho claims that their total population was said to reach in the several tens of thousands, although he also asserts that they were all returned to Chosŏn in 1609. Whether such could be effected in the increasingly tumultuous atmosphere of 1609 Liaodong is, of course, very much to be doubted, but it is significant that Cho Kyŏngnam considers it desirable that such a return occurred. Following the Pyŏngja War, the Chosŏn court, in one instance, forcibly returned a Chinese woman (Hannyŏ 漢女) to Qing while concealing the Korean husband she had met while he was a prisoner-of-war of the Manchu; as with the submitting Jurchen repatriated to the Qing, hereditary duties and subjection, as Korean, private or public slave, or petty official, mattered more to the Chosŏn court then the family ties of the subjects themselves.

---

120 Cho Kyŏngnam *Nanjung Chamnok* 3, kabo 08.02, in *Kugyŏk Taedong yasŭng* 8:65.

121 *Simyang chang’gye*, 1638.09.28, p. 113, “Thus, see 1638.09.28, p. 113: “過三日後, 押來為白在, 逃漢,向化,走回人等, 招致於衙門, 宣傳官眼同推問, 後馬將言於黃漢曰: “漢人則優數捉送事, 固當矣, 至於前日小名出送為在, 向化段, 何至今無黑白耶, .刻期待之, 而尚不入送, 此何道也. 走回人則此處之逃走者, 日以百數, 儀往愈甚, 只送一名之女, 甚無謂也. 漢女則在此處時, 丁卯年被虜朝鮮人交嫁居生為如可, 一時出去, 而其夫則惟置. 女人叱分入送是如, 其女明白言之為旅.””
Despite preventing the departure of such women, the Chosôn court did not exert itself to treat well those who remained behind. Certainly, during the last years of Sŏnjo (r.1567-1608) and early years of Kwanghae-gun (r.1608-1623), action was demanded against women in Seoul who had been seduced by with Chinese soldiers (唐軍奸犯女人), and who were suspected of continuing to engage in sexual relationships with the participants of various visiting Ming legations. In shocked tones they suggest that the soldiers had been so shameless as to bring with them not only prostitutes but also commoner women (潛率娼女, 至於民家處子, 亦不顧忌); even after the departure of Ming soldiers, many such women became prostitutes for the Ming legations which visited the capital. Under both kings, some of such women were ordered sent ten li outside of Seoul, with the worst cases to be exiled to Pusan. Exceptions were to be made for cases in which the women were not in the relationships freely – although how such a determination would have been made is unclear. 122 Even with marriage, outright

122 It is not clear that either order was carried out – certainly, the fact that the order was made more than once suggests that it was not successfully carried out, while I have found no evidence for the second. Sŏnjo Sillok 147:13a-b 1602.Yun02.23(pyŏngjin ), kukp’yŏn 24:355: 備忘記, “天朝人出來者, 奸我國遊女, 曾所未有. 自軍興以來, 大兵布滿, 無知將士等, 潛率娼女, 至於民家處子, 亦不顧忌, 極駭極愕. 此皆由於譯官等之從臾. 今此天使時, 如有如此之弊, 差備譯官及其女, 釜山定配, 並與其女之主, 而重究, 被掠者, 則否. 政院議啓.” 政院啓曰: “今者詔使之行, 頭目、軍丁之輩, 頃日來往本國, 留連作弊端, 必多得逢曾奸娼女, 贽弊生事, 果如聖慮所及. 嚴立科條, 使不得相接, 極為允當. 但我國之人, 專不畏法, 犯刑戮如飲食. 犯罪作挐之後, 雖治以重律, 固無所益. 令漢城府,
political hostility was aroused by the marriage of another Ming migrant, the deserter Shi Wenyung. He married a relative, surnamed Chang, of Chŏng Inhong. This marriage may or may not have been effected by force. The union itself became a subject of factional controversy, such that it is now probably impossible to pass judgement one way or the other. It is noticeable that, in the controversies concerning this union that developed, some claimed that marriage between Chosŏn women and foreigners was “the most shameful union imaginable,” also claiming that the young woman had been married to Shi because she had been defiled by the Japanese, while defenders of the union responded that it had been entered into willingly, and being inspired by Chŏng’s well known support for people from Zhejiang Province – the foreignness of the marriage could certainly be a problem, but was not necessarily so, and could be interpreted differently according to context, with Chŏng Inhong’s friendship towards Zhejiang.

123 Hongjong p’yŏllok 7, in Taedong yasŏng 16, Korean translation is on page 525, classical Chinese original is on 114.
province seen as perfectly comprehensible.\textsuperscript{124}

Why did the Chosŏn state worry about the Ming Chinese intermarrying with, or masquerading as, Chosŏn subjects? The case of the Jurchen discussed in chapter 2 suggests that it was not on account of any general xenophobia in Chosŏn society. The Chosŏn state was not a modern nation state, seeking to impose a universal culture on its subjects, but a court and elite which maintained authority through the scrupulous protection of status distinctions. Hong Yanghŭi’s accusation against Chŏng Inhong is especially telling: Hong argues that Chŏng’s willingness to protect deserters from the Ming emperor will weaken the ability of mere Chosŏn yangban to demand obedience from their own slaves.\textsuperscript{125} The Chosŏn state depended on the obedience of low status groups and the proper maintenance of status distinctions, and this ability was badly shaken during the chaos of the Imjin Period and early seventeenth century. When Hong compares the ability to “change clothes” and pass from one loyalty to another to the maronage of slaves, he is explictely making a comparison between state loyalties and

\textsuperscript{124} Sŏnjo Sillok 154:15a-b., Sŏnjo 5 (1602).09.25 (kapsin), CSW24:413: “且以被擄女，脅嫁逃唐兵云者，安有是理也？臣竊聞之，仁弘之先鄭臣保，浙之浦江人也。仕宋為刑部尚書。宋亡不事元，元謫我海西。其子仁卿，事高麗，遂爲瑞山人，原其本，則實浙之著姓，故頃者天兵之來，有陳剛、茅國器，許仁弘爲鄉長，有鄭軾、鄭輅，自稱爲姓末，而仁弘之待浙人，詎許以同鄉之義。今有施文用者，亦自浦江來，落後不歸，時或往來，亦以鄉井舊義，直不拒耳。至其娶妻之事，女之母親在焉，父族存焉，脅嫁之說，亦時益之所自作也。”

\textsuperscript{125} See footnote 89, above.
status distinction, and seeing either as resulting in social breakdown. Similarly, when
the Chosŏn court expressed concern about the Liaodongese “guests” outnumbering the
Korean “hosts” in North P’yŏngan Province, they expected to be understood by the
Ming because the key concerns - the ignoring by subjects of their obligations to the state,
and the collapse of status distinctions upon which social order – was equally important
to both Ming China or Chosŏn Korea.

In the “Self Account of Kang Shijue” (Kangsejak chasul), written
approximately in 1686, Kang Shijue describes his reason for coming to Chosŏn as
follows:

Although I desired to return to my home in the south, with wolves blocking the
road, and with my body lacking wings, (I decided) rather than cutting my hair and
hooking my clothes to the left it would be preferable to wear the cap and loosen
my sash. Therefore, I headed to the Eastern Kingdom (Korea).

In 1686, the choice of moving to Chosŏn was described as a choice not to
“change clothes.” Fleeing across the Yalu River was seen as escaping from barbarity to
the last redoubt of civilization, to maintain the cap and gown of civilization. In the late

---

126 See footnote 42, above.
127 Hwangjoin sajŏk fr. 23.
eighteenth century “Record of Chu Hat Hall” (Ch’ogwan’dang’gi) by mid-eighteenth century Ming Loyalist historian Hwang Kyŏngwŏn, this trope had become part of the myth of Kang Sejak as Ming loyalist. The contemporary record suggests that the “changing of clothes” was a far more frequent and subversive process than in described by Kang. Ming deserters, Liaodongese refugees, and Chosŏn subjects were not stable categories easily demarcated from each other, but fluid, diverse groups, divided within as much as without, and able to change cultural and political loyalties through the simple expedient of changing clothes – indeed, the violent context of Korea and Liaodong post-1592 forced them to do so. The Chosŏn state attempted to establish control over the floating population within its borders, and worried about the potential of this population for unrest; to the extent that possible, it drove out trouble-makers and cultivated such migrants as had skills that the Chosŏn court wanted. Despite the attempts of the state to administer and control migrants, the ability of the migrants to cross cultural and political boundaries allowed many of them to establish themselves in Chosŏn.

3.5) Whose Subject? International Conflict and Ming Migrant Communities

The fact that subjects could, by changing clothes, disappear into Chosŏn, Ming, Japan or the Manchu state did not therefore mean that their original state abandoned its claims to them. In fact, a problem for Chosŏn in dealing with floating communities of people with ambiguous loyalties was the considerable political risk connected with bringing in people whose loyalties were claimed by other polities, especially the Ming or Qing hegemon. The Chosŏn court’s interaction with Ming migrants was deeply intertwined with Sino-Korean relations, reflecting the complexities of this most important of Chosŏn’s international relations. This interaction, however, hints at a much more complicated picture than the trope of a Sino-Centric, or anti-Qing, Chosŏn might suggest. The tension inherent in the Ming-Chosŏn relationship could cause official Chosŏn court policy to restrict the activities of Ming refugees. On the other hand, despite the fact that during the virulently anti-Qing reigns of Injo and Hyojong, refugee Ming soldiers were organized as a military division, hostility to the Qing was not the always the key motivating factor for the migration of Ming Chinese, and at times the Qing seems to have been relatively unconcerned at the presence of Ming migrants in Chosŏn.
The period beginning with the Imjin War and continuing through the seventeenth century was a turbulent one in Sino-Korean relations. The fact that the Chosŏn court’s very survival was thanks to the Ming intervention against the Japanese resulted in a Chosŏn monarchy for whom good relations with Ming China was absolutely vital for its legitimacy. Especially during the period between the Imjin War and the Manchu conquest, the Chosŏn court put increasing weight on its connection with Ming China.129 One of the justifications for Injo’s 1623 coup against Kwanghaegun was his supposed disloyalty against the Ming, especially suspicions that Kwanghaegun had, through Kang Hong-rip, formed a secret pact with Nurhaci, while despite Injo’s protestations of loyalty, he and his court was ultimately forced into a humiliating submission to the Manchu after the Pyŏngja War.130 This humiliation of forced submission was expressed during the mid-seventeenth century both in secret military mobilization against the Qing under Hyojong131 and in increasingly virulent controversies about proper Confucian ritual practice,132 even as the established rituals

130 Han, 204-208.
131 Han, 208-212; Chŏng Tuhŭi, Chosŏn sidae inmul ū chae palkyŏn (Seoul: Ilchogak, 1997), 90-117.
of tribute which had been offered to Ming China were carried out with Qing China.\textsuperscript{133}

At the same time, beginning with the Imjin War the presence of Ming or Qing military in or near Chosŏn transformed the Chosŏn-Ming relationship from one of regular tribute missions and arms length diplomacy to one in which military representatives of the Ming court could and did overrule the Chosŏn court on domestic matters. Near the end of the conflict, from 1597-1599, a Ming censorial official, Ding Yingtai, even accused the Chosŏn monarch of treachery, throwing the Chosŏn state into a serious crisis.\textsuperscript{134} During the period following the Battle of Sarhu, Mao Wenlung gained considerable direct control of North P’yŏngan Province, demanded considerable logistic support, and, with land routes to the Ming controlled, was able to interfere considerable in Ming-Chosŏn diplomacy. Even while support for Mao was demanded of the Chosŏn court on account of the gratitude that it supposedly owed Ming, Mao himself engaged in largely unsuccessful military action against the Manchu, and even established secret trade and diplomatic relations with both Nurhaci and Hong Taiji, facts


which Chosŏn reported to Ming in some detail.\textsuperscript{135} After the fall of the Manchu, the rise of the Zheng family in Fujian and Taiwan as one of the few viable alternatives to Qing rule complicated the Ming Loyalism of a Chosŏn court which considered the Zheng clan pirates with supposed Japanese connections a source of considerable danger.\textsuperscript{136} During the early seventeenth century, the Manchu themselves interfered with Chosŏn’s internal affairs far more than had been the case with the Ming, even demanding the arrest of anti-Manchu officials in the Chosŏn court, and generally maintaining knowledge of the Chosŏn court.\textsuperscript{137}

Behind discussion of Ming migrants one can often discern hints of broader interstate political tensions. In the case of Ming deserters, the Ming court demanded their return, a command which the Chosŏn court followed for the most part.\textsuperscript{138} The Liaodongese refugees following the Battle of Sarhu were involved in a considerably more difficult set of political calculations. Despite reports by the Chosŏn court of Mao’s

\textsuperscript{135} The Chosŏn court’s accusations against Mao are summarized by Tagawa Kōzō, Mō Bunryū to Chōsen to no kankei ni tsuite, especially pages 88-111.


\textsuperscript{138} An example of such caution may be found in Sŏnjo Sillok 133:10a-b, Sŏnjo 34 (1601) .01.09 (musin), CSW24:178. Also see 3.2 and 3.4, above.
many crimes and disloyalties, support for Mao continued to be demanded of Chosŏn until his overthrow; attempts by the Chosŏn court to cease providing support for Liaodongese refugees also met with considerable hostility from the Ming court, partly because it considered the presence of Liaodongese soldiers on the Yalu River as a useful check against a Chosŏn-Manchu alliance.\textsuperscript{139} At the same time, Nurhaci, upon gaining control over Liaodong, declared the Chinese (Nikan) of Liaodong to be heaven’s gift to him; both Nurhaci and Hong Taiji called Liaodongese their subjects and demanded their return. Nurhaci’s armies clashed with Liaodongese soldiers on Chosŏn soil in 1621, and the presence of Liaodongese worried Chosŏn partly because they were a potential source of conflict with the Manchu.\textsuperscript{140} Indeed, one cause of the Chŏngyu War of 1627 was Mao Wenlung’s move back to the North P’yŏngan Province mainland. Ceasing support for Mao Wenlung was a persistent demand made by the Manchu court to the Chosŏn court.\textsuperscript{141}

\textsuperscript{139} Tao Langxian claimed that the presence of Mao and Liaodongese blocked an alliance between Nurhaci and Chosŏn. \textit{Ming Xizong Shilu} 10:15, tianqi 01 (1621). 05.12 (guichou), AS vol. 125, p. 0514: “五千人住朝鮮境上與朝鮮合兵夾鴨綠江以陣以絕奴連和朝鮮之謀.”

\textsuperscript{140} \textit{Kwanghaegun il’gi} 129:54-56, Kwanghaegun 10(1618).06.25 (imo), CSW 3:141-142.

\textsuperscript{141} For instance, MR 4:39: “as for the third crime, after Heaven gave Liaodong to me, you let Mao Wenlung, who fled from us, enter your territory, and even though you have been sending spies to harm the people of our land Liaodong, and have caused them to enter to agitate, we, wanting to be on good terms with you, said: ‘Capture Mao Wenlung and bring him to us – we wish our two countries to be on good terms.’ However, you do not obey.” Ere ilan: liyoodung be abka mende buhe manggi, menci ukame
Following Chosŏn’s defeat at the hands of the Manchu in 1637, the Manchu also demanded the “repatriation” of Han Chinese living in Chosŏn and of any Ming castaways that should arrive on Chosŏn’s coasts. Though Chosŏn records suggests that the repatriation of Han Chinese was pursued with much less vigour than the repatriation of the “submitting Jurchen” it is clear that, some Han Chinese, at least, were sent to Liaodong as demanded.\textsuperscript{142} Just as the Chosŏn court sought to subvert demands from the Qing for the repatriation of Chosŏn’s Jurchen subjects, so it did not freely cooperate with the Qing in the repatriation of Han Chinese, claiming that all Liaodongese had returned when this was clearly not the case.\textsuperscript{143}

Indeed, in later hagiographies of Ming migrants, fear or hatred of the Qing is usually the primary reason for migration to Chosŏn – or, in those cases where Ming
soldiers did not leave Chosŏn, an explanation for their failure to return;\textsuperscript{144} on the other hand, the danger that the Qing would demand their return is often emphasized. For instance, Sŏng Haeŭng, in his description of Ming migrants referred to the improbability of the Qing being more vigorous in its demands for the return of submitting foreigners than it was in its demands for the return of Ming migrants.\textsuperscript{145} However, ultimately, even as the Qing court demanded the return of all Han Chinese, in its practical policy it seems to have been somewhat more flexible, and the actual departure of Ming migrants seem to be more closely related to the difficulties in surviving within Mao Wenlung’s satrapy in Ka Island than with any hostility from the Qing. For instance, Li Chenglong is described in \textit{Sources for the Acts of Imperial Subjects (Hwangjoin sajŏk)} as fleeing to Chosŏn after the Battle of Sarhu.\textsuperscript{146} Whatever the truth of his involvement in the battle, the \textit{Chosŏn Veritable Records} is quite clear that his entrance into Chosŏn was precipitated by his fear of the Ming military establishment in Ka Island.\textsuperscript{147} Similarly, while in some accounts of Liadongese refugee Kang Sijue’s life, his frequent moves following his crossing of the Yalu was ascribed to

\textsuperscript{144} See chapter 6 for elaboration on this theme.

\textsuperscript{145} Sŏng Haeŭng, “P’alsŏngjŏn,” in \textit{P’ungch’ŏn-rok, Yŏn’gyŏngjae chŏnso sokchip 15}, HMC 379c:”然丙丁之際. 清人所擄我人，多走回，虜喝甚急，且索我向化人，刷還相續. 中州之俘，尤豈肯許其東來乎.”

\textsuperscript{146} \textit{Hwangjoin sajŏk} fr. 80.

\textsuperscript{147} \textit{Injo Sillok} 23:25a, Injo 8 (1630).10.22, CSW 34:402. See 3.3 above.
his fear of the Manchu to the north, the description of his flight raises doubts. In 1625 and 1626 in P’yŏng’an and Hwanghae Province, the general chaos was such that, beyond the first two resting places of Mamp’o and Kang’gye, he does not even bother to list the places where he went. Yet, while the Manchu were concerned to gain control over the Liaodongese community in Chosŏn, and certainly put this desire into more direct effect in 1627 and especially during the period post 1637, in 1625 Kang was in relatively little danger, certainly not such as to explain such extensive wanderings throughout this region. More likely, for Kang, the general chaos of the region itself, coupled with enormous difficulties obtaining food, drove him into isolated regions of Hamgyŏng Province. Possibly, the violence of troops associated with Mao Wenlung may also have compelled him to leave. In any case, upon moving into Hamgyŏng Province, he continued to move further north and closer to the Qing border, in fact establishing himself near a major center of Qing-Chosŏn trade, hardly the action of someone shivering at the thought of detection by Qing officials.

On the other hand, Hamel clearly describes the Chinese of the capital, with whom he and his fellows were lodged, as fugitives, and nearly all hagiographies of

148 For instance, the Nam Kuman’s “Kangsejakchŏn” in Yakch’ŏnjip 18, HMC 132: 474-476.
149 Hwangjoin sajŏk fr. 23, also see fr. 42 for the somewhat similar case of Ho Keji.
150 Hamel, Verhaal van hetvergaan van het jacht de Sperwer, 21-22: “Wierden doen bijde Chinesen die
the Ming subjects who entered Chosŏn before or after the Pyŏngja War emphasise the anti-Manchu beliefs and actions of these migrants. However, while Hamel and his crew were ordered to conceal themselves in Namhan Sansŏn during the arrival of the Qing envoy, lest they be detected, it seems unlikely that such a policy would have been conceivable with the much larger community of Chinese soldiers in the capital; were the prime goal of Chosŏn state be to keep the migrants secret from the Qing envoy, the capital seems a very poor place to station them. The well-documented ease with which the Qing gained information on Chosŏn’s internal politics makes it seem very unlikely that these Chinese soldiers could assemble in Seoul without some knowledge spreading to the Qing.

Indeed, records suggest significant complicity on the part of the Qing in allowing Han Chinese soldiers to enter Chosŏn. Thus Tian Haoqian from Ka Island, who is described as serving in the army under Injo, entered Chosŏn after being released with more than ten other Liaodongese because “the Tartar soldier liked his

\[\text{aldar woonachtich ende uijt haer lant gevlucht zijn, verdeelt, 2, 3, 4 to yder.}^5\]

\[151\] See chapter 6.

\[152\] Hamel, *Verhaal van hetvergaan van het jacht de Sperwer*, 24-25.

At least eleven Ming migrants who later came to prominence seem to have been formally emancipated from the Qing either by Pongnim taegun or, more probably, by Sohyŏn Seja. Later described as the Nine Righteous Officials, these migrants, among whom were included Wang Pong’gang, Huang Gong, Zheng Xianjia, and others, have been described in later sources as vigorous loyalists who chose to accompany Pongnim taegun to Chosŏn in order to fulfil Pongnim taegun’s heartfelt desire to avenge the Ming. They certainly seem to have later become very closely associated with Pongnim taegun (later Hyojong), although precise sources during Hyojong’s life are not available. Despite seemingly being enrolled in the Chinese Dog Fang Troop, and living in the Ŭŭidong neighbourhood in Seoul, sources from the Sukchong era suggest that the Ming migrants in question were formally emancipated from the Qing at the request of the Chosŏn court, as do later biographies. These Ming “Loyalists” were not hiding in rural regions out of public knowledge, but were

---

154 Hwangjoin sajŏk fr. 43.
155 Thus, one of the more notorious members of this group, Huang Gong, is described by Hŏ Chŏk as having been emancipated by Hyojong, but lacking the proper gratitude to serve the Chosŏn court honestly. Sukchong Sillok 03:24a, Sukchong 01(1675), 04, 03 (sinmyo), CSW 38: 260: “積曰：‘臣請先言功之為人。孝廟贖出率來，舍之本宮之側，給料厚待，渠必為感，而但虛談，無實功。’”
156 For instance, Sŏng Haeŭng, “P’alsŏngjiŏn,” in P’ungch’ŏn-rok, Yŏn’gyŏngjae chŏnso sokchip 15, HMC 379c: “此乃孝廟曆皇朝遺黎. 用重貨贖之也。” Even Wang Tŏkku do not really contradict the claim that the Qing approved their return, although they hint that the people in question were able to return largely because the extent of their loyalty touched the Qing generals who captured them.
parading relatively openly in the capital. Even as the Qing pursued a formal policy of repatriation of Chinese in Chosŏn, in practice it allowed Chosŏn considerable latitude.

The balance was struck differently in the case of castaways from those areas of Fujian and Taiwan under Zheng family control. The Qing, fearful of alliances between Chosŏn and southern Chinese Ming holdouts, insisted that Chosŏn return all Ming castaways immediately to the Qing, and made strict rules against any interaction with Chinese ships (Tangsŏn 唐船). Under Hyojong, (r.1649-1659) attempts were made to balance Chosŏn subservience to the Qing and sympathy with the Ming in the case of castaways. The policy as it was then established was to have local magistrates send ships on their way, when the ships themselves were in good condition. Knowledge of the ships arrival would be concealed from the Qing by restricting central government involvement to a secret report to the Border Defence Commission. Only when the ships were too damaged for the journey would the crew be returned to the Qing.157

At the same time, even as the Ming Loyalism of the Chosŏn court made returning Ming castaways unpalatable, so the reality of the Ming remnant regime of the Zheng family, resembling more the dangerous, uncontrolled generals such as Ding or

---

Mao than they did the idealized Ming overlord, made the Chosŏn court suspicious of any extensive dealings with Ming migrants. The balance struck under Hyojong between complete cooperation with the Qing and preservation of some vestige of Ming loyalist policy collapsed under Hyŏnjong in 1667, when a group of traders from the Zheng family domains in Taiwan, but proffering loyalty to the Yongli emperor, ran ashore at Cheju Island. The Cheju magistrate, following current precedent, had the sailors, who were led by Lin Yinguan, sent up to Seoul for repatriation. Perhaps because the migrants in question had brought with them documents with the Yongli reign date on it (establishing, in the process, the first clear evidence for some time of the survival of the Zhu line of Ming emperors in China)\textsuperscript{158} the repatriation became a matter of serious controversy, dividing the dominant Sŏin faction between practical politicians such as Chŏng Ch’ihwa and ideologues emerging from the tutelage of Song Siyŏl.\textsuperscript{159} The changing ideological landscape of Chosŏn, in which increasingly absolute loyalty to an abstract Confucian Civilization was being demanded even as actual military preparations against the Qing had been largely abandoned no doubt contributed to some

\textsuperscript{158} This was the point specifically made by one of Song Siyŏl’s students, Ch’oe Chin, although Song Siyŏl largely rejected its importance, preferring to concentrate instead on the fact that the Ming migrants in question were from Fujian, where Zhu Xi had served as magistrate. Songja taejŏn, purok (supplement) 17:10a-11b, HMC 115:544.

\textsuperscript{159} Kim Ch’angnyong, “17 segi chungyŏp chung’gugin ūi cheju p’yoch’ak,” 25-59.
of the political furor. The anger concerning the repatriation of Lin Yin-guan’s crew occurred at the same time as considerable discussion concerning the acceptability for official position of the children of women who had been kidnapped by the Manchu during the Pyŏngja Invasion; the controversy should be seen in the context of the growing ideological rigidity of the Sŏin faction.

The Lin Yin-guan case had significant policy implications as well. Henceforward Ming castaways would not, under any circumstances, be returned to the Qing – in cases where the ship was too damaged to make the journey to Japan, the magistrate would provide them with some seaworthy vessel and push them onto Nagasaki without reporting the matter to the court in Seoul. Furthermore, wherever possible magistrates in coastal counties were instructed to do their best to prevent Ming vessels from landing in the first place. Such a policy continued into the late 1680s, when the disappearance of all serious Ming claimants, and a changing relationship with the Qing court meant that castaways ceased to be a serious problem.

Security concerns vis-à-vis the Zheng family regime in Taiwan hurt the cause of Lin Yin-guan’s crew. In discussions of Lin Yin-guan and crew, the fact that they were

---

161 Kim Ch’angnyong, “17 segi chungyŏp chung’gugin ŭi cheju p’yoch’ak,” 36-52.
actually connected not with the Yongli emperor but with Zheng’s maritime empire was treated as an insurmountable point in their disfavour, with Zheng himself being described as “unsubmissive” to the Ming; certainly, in terms of preference, Lin Yin-guan far preferred to be sent to Nagasaki over remaining in Chosŏn. At the time of the arrival and the lengthy political arguments concerning Lin Yin-guan, numerous references were certainly made to the continuing loyalties of Chosŏn to the Ming and to a broader Confucian civilization. However, these declarations of loyalty were largely


164 The Revised Veritable Records of King Hyöngjong (*Hyöngjong kaejong sillok*) generally preserves more information invidious the original decision to repatriate the castaways to the Qing than does the original *Veritable Records of King Hyöngjong* (*Hyöngjong sillok*). For instance, see *Hyöngjong kaejong sillok* 17:44b, Hyöngjong 8 (1667).06.28 (sinch’uk), CSW37:571, in which is recorded the memorial of one Kwŏn Kyŏk, who argues that: “I have heard concerning the Chinese who were wrecked on Cheju, that all who have read the text of their interrogation were so overwhelmed with emotion that they, to their own surprise, burst into tears. The court wishes to forcibly repatriate them to the Qing? My goodness, how can this be possible? These descendents of the Ming preserve the glories of the Emperor, and they have passed this on to us in great detail.” (前正言權格上疏，略曰: 臣伏聞唐船漂泊濟州，其問答說話及呈文語意，讀之，令人氣塞，不覺流涕也，朝家將欲押送於彼中，嘆呼！是何措措也？大明之裔，能保綴旒之業，而此人傳之甚悉，其在思漢之心，所當遣一介行李，奔問官守，有若高麗之於宋末，而不惟不此之為，纜視上朝之人，束縛之仍辱之，投之餓虎之口，甘心得罪於天下後世，臣竊痛之。上留中不報。)
ineffective in terms of actual court policy, despite the fact that the court at that time was dominated entirely by the Sŏin faction. Later, during the Rebellion of the Three Feudatories, with the exception of Yun Hyu (1617-1680), a member of the Namin faction, few advocated establishing contact with the Zheng regime,\textsuperscript{165} even in the 1680s, the Zheng regime was suspected, as with Mao Wenlung, as being not so much a vigorous source of opposition to Qing but a group of disloyal pirates who had betrayed the Ming and could thus betray Chosŏn as well.\textsuperscript{166}

Of course, Chosŏn interaction with Ming migrants was partly determined by the loyalty which Chosŏn elites felt for the Ming, both before and after the fall of the Ming. However, Ming Loyalism cannot be separated from changing political and military circumstances of the period between 1592 and the late seventeenth century; the Ming-Chosŏn relationship of this period was in fact a highly tumultuous one, and the Chosŏn submission to the Qing, while coerced, was not without exception a hostile one. Chosŏn policy concerning the Ming migrants, and the actions of the Ming migrants themselves, was determined by a mix of policy concerns, which themselves changed considerably.

\textsuperscript{165} Hong Chongp’il, “Sambŏllan ūl chŏnhuahan Hyŏnjong Sukchong yŏn’gan ŭi, pukpŏllon,” 101-107.

over time.

3.6) Conclusion

In contrast to the pŏnho, Ming migrants in Chosŏn were generally not people with generations of loyalty to the Chosŏn court. Most Ming migrants entered Chosŏn in the extraordinary circumstances of the Ming intervention against the Japanese and the Manchu conquest of Liaodong. Perhaps as a result, there was relatively more suspicion within Chosŏn officialdom concerning Ming migrants than concerning its Jurchen subjects. They came in numbers that were beyond the capabilities of the Chosŏn court, and owed loyalties to Chosŏn’s powerful allies.

Although Ming migrants did not have the long and close connection to Chosŏn that was possessed by the pŏnho, evidence suggests that they melded quickly and easily into Chosŏn society. They married, made friends with Chosŏn subjects and became political allies of Chosŏn officials. This ability to fade into Chosŏn society was not necessarily welcome to Chosŏn state – it was not a modern nation-state aiming to assimilate, but a monarchy primarily concerned with submission and loyalty of all people under its control. The Chosŏn court did, however, seek to control these migrants
– either by making use of their skills and establishing them within Chosŏn, or by preventing them from “changing clothes” and disappearing into Chosŏn society.

While the loyalties of the Jurchen had been claimed variously by Bujantai, Nurhaci, and Chosŏn, Chosŏn had been relatively certain of its claim. This was not the case with the Ming migrants, whose loyalties clearly belonged to Ming, Qing or one of the pirate regimes of Mao Wenlung or the Zheng family. The loyalty and gratitude which, increasingly during the seventeenth century, the Chosŏn court felt it owed to the Ming if anything made the presence of such “guests” in Chosŏn territory more difficult to deal with – most especially in the case of Mao Wenlung. While the furor among Song Siyŏl’s students surrounding the 1667 repatriation of Lin Yin-guan and crew does suggest that Ming Loyalism could cause even piratical representatives of the Ming to be seen as worth of protection, the fear of political complications from both the Zheng family and the Qing caused even the Sŏin dominated court to decide to return them to the Qing.
Chapter 4

From Submitting Foreigners to Imperial Subjects:

The Ritual Transformation of Migrant Communities

4.1) Introduction

Despite the vigorous forced repatriations of the period 1636-1645, a considerable population of Jurchen and Han Chinese continued to reside in Chosŏn throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Although presumably they became steadily less distinguishable in language and dress throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, both Jurchen and Ming migrants continued to be defined by the category “submitting foreigner;” indeed, Ming migrant lineages becoming steadily more visible during the eighteenth century, also becoming clearly distinguished from the Jurchen through new terminology and specific ritual roles in court-sponsored Ming Loyalism. If the Imjin War and the early seventeenth century was a period during which large numbers of Ming Chinese entered Chosŏn and pŏnho communities were disrupted, the eighteenth century was a period during which Ming migrant lineages – but not Jurchen - were recreated as respectable members of Chosŏn society. These lineages,
however, gained respectability not by having their differences with the rest of Chosŏn society erased, but by having them emphasised, with their status as subjects of the Ming state codified ritually by the court.

The period after the Pyŏngja War was characterized by a vigorous effort to reform fiscal policy by means of the Taedong-bŏp (大同法), and to reform the institution of slavery through the matrilineal law. As Chosŏn population recovered, there was even a considerable growth in commerce. The reigns of Sukchong (r. 1674-1720), Yŏngjo (r. 1724-1776) and Chŏngjo (r. 1776-1800) were periods during which many of these attempts at institutional reform were brought to fruition, with currency gaining a clear, if, compared to China and Japan, limited role in Chosŏn society. At the same time, servile (nobi) people declined substantially as a proportion of the population – a phenomenon which partly resulted from the reforming activities of the state, and partly resulted from widespread maronage among servile people themselves.¹

The reign of Sukchong, cursed as it was by poor harvest, also suffered from serious popular unrest, as groups of peasants and marginalized elites rose in armed

revolt against the dynasty.² Yet despite this unrest, increased commercialization and the declining slave population, established yangban lineages largely maintained their hold on power at the village level, with the most prominent lineages and sub-lineages dominating the court.³ The social mobility of Ming migrant lineages is one unusual but noticeable case of a generally low-status community rising into a relatively prominent social class. Although many Ming migrants had been employed as soldiers during the seventeenth century, during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries certain groups gained positions in the military bureaucracy. Additionally, in the eighteenth century the fact that many of these migrant lineages also had connections – real or apparent – to both the Imjin War and Ming Loyalism granted them a specific and important ritual role. They thus benefited, especially after 1750, from the growth of ritual Ming Loyalism that characterized the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to

³ There is considerable dispute concerning the nature of the economic and social change in the Late Chosŏn dynasty. The claim that the late Chosŏn experienced widespread social transformation, with the distinction between yangban and commoner essentially disappearing, was championed, especially, by Kim Yongsŏp, *Chosŏn hugi nong APS a yŏn’gu: nongch’ ong kyŏngje, sahoe pyŏndong* (Seoul: Ilchogak, 1970) and Chŏng Sŏkchong, *Chosŏn hugi sahoe pyŏndong yŏn’gu* (Seoul: Ilchogak, 1983). By contrast, Fujiya Kawashima, “A Study of Hyangan: Kin Groups and Aristocratic Localism in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Korean Countryside,” *The Journal of Korean Studies* 5 (1984): 3-38 and Song Chunho (Song June-ho), *Chosŏn hugi sahoes a yŏn’gu* (Seoul: Ilchogak, 1987) have demonstrated that very little change indeed occurred in the leading lineages on either the village level or within the court.
gain new status as imperial subjects - a status which, unlike submitting foreigner status, granted them an exalted social status. While this rising social status benefited the migrants themselves, it also benefited the state, which was able to use the presence of these lineages in Chosŏn to establish itself as true heir to the Ming Dynasty. Ming migrant lineages were transformed into “imperial subject” lineages through the combination of the activities of the Chosŏn state - including both its concern to establish control over its subjects and its increasing effort to establish itself as the ritual heir to the Ming - and the effort upon the part of the Ming migrant lineages themselves to recreate themselves as respectably members of Chosŏn society.

4.2) Submitting Foreigner Status in the Late Chosŏn

One social and fiscal institution of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that has attracted very little attention is that of “submitting foreigners” or hwanghwain. The term, which denotes submission to the court, and hints also at the acceptance of Confucian morality, was used to settle foreigners in Chosŏn. It was used extensively vis-à-vis Japanese, Jurchen and Ryukyuans during the early Chosŏn, and was an important aspect of Chosŏn’s interaction with neighbouring peoples, and was one aspect of the lively border contact of the fifteenth century. The term did not disappear in the
seventeenth century, despite the increasingly clear organization of Chosŏn’s frontiers with its neighbours. Rather, it lived on as a status related to tax, corvée and military service obligations, and as such, became part of the general discussion of fiscal reorganization that characterized the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.⁴

The term itself, *hyanghwain* (Chin. *xianghuaren*) originates, along with *kwihuain* (Chin. *guihuaren*), “t’uhwain” (touhuaren) already in Zhou Dynasty China, and was used to imply the submission of frontier or alien people to the royal court, and also surrender to moral improvement.⁵ In Korea, submitting foreigner status had origins preceding the Chosŏn dynasty, existing already during the Three Kingdoms Period.⁶ During the early Chosŏn dynasty, the status was used to settle communities of Japanese, Ryukyuans, Jurchen, Chinese and others who had established themselves in Chosŏn

---

⁴ For a survey of changes in tax, corvée and military service obligations, see James Palais, *Confucian Statecraft and Korean Institutions*.

⁵ Chŏn Haejong, “kwihwa e taehan sogo – tongyang kodaesa e issŏsŏ kǔ úiũi” *Paeksan hakpo* 13 (1972.12): 1-25, discusses the meaning of the related term *kwihwa* (歸化, Chin. *guihua*, Jap. *kika*) as used in China, Korea and Japan previous to the fall of the Yuan Dynasty. Although discussing a number of related terms, he does not consider the term *hyanghwain*, nor, of course, does he discuss the Chosŏn dynasty use of such terminology. Nevertheless, his conclusion, that *kwihwa* and related terms could mean submission of a domestic population, or the return to Confucian morality of disorderly subjects, applies to *hyanghwa* as well. For instance, see *Sunjo Sillok* 15, Sunjo 12 (1812). 04.21 (kyehae), CSW 48:20, where the term is used in the context of restoring the proper loyalties of Chosŏn subjects involved in the Hong Kyŏngnae rebellion.

territory. The Chosŏn law code for the fifteenth century, the *Great Code for State Administration* (*Kyŏng’guk taejŏn*), simply says that “submitting foreigners are freed from tax for three years.” During the early Chosŏn, Japanese submitting foreigners were settled by granting them, according to status, land, clothing, wives, Korean surnames and, because of the incongruity of imposing military service obligations on those who have come from abroad, exemption from military service. This status was a means for accommodating the large number of people who passed over the vaguely controlled frontiers to the south and north of Chosŏn, and, just as with the various measures established to encourage peaceful trade with frontier people, was an attempt to settle the often violent frontier of the late Koryŏ period. During the early Chosŏn, especially, the decentralized nature of Muramachi Japan and post-Yuan Manchuria meant that the Chosŏn state had to manage frontier peoples without appealing to neighbouring courts through standard diplomatic channels.

This status did not disappear with the consolidation of the Qing and Tokugawa

---

9 Han Munjong, *Chosŏn chŏn’gi hyanghwae sujik waein yŏn’gu*, 65-90.
states, however. The Chosŏn court continued occasionally to face the difficulty of dealing with the subjects of no known polity even in the nineteenth century, and so continued to use submitting foreigner status to settle foreigners in Chosŏn soil,\(^\text{11}\) but the greater organization of the frontier during the late Chosŏn meant that most castaways and fugitives were simply returned home along standard diplomatic channels.\(^\text{12}\) Yet, submitting foreigner status did not disappear, as the descendents of migrants continued to be categorized as submitting foreigners into the eighteenth century. Thus, in 1751, Hong Ponghan (1713-1778), discussing the submitting foreigners of Hamgyŏng Province, could describe them generally, according to documents preserved in the Board of Rights, as including “the pŏnho of the Six Garrisons, with choronyms such as Hŭngnyong-gang (Chin. Heilongjiang, Russian Amur) who established themselves within Chosŏn territory (本以六鎮蕃胡, 以黑龍江爲姓貫而內附者),” “Japanese who came during the Imjin War but did not return to Japan (壬辰倭奴之不歸者),” and

\(^{11}\) For instance, in 1802, a group of foreigners of uncertain origin were settled in Cheju with royal approval. Of course, conversely, this passage suggests that, during the late Chosŏn, the Chosŏn court avoided, if at all possible, settling foreigners of uncertain origin, in this contrasting with the more welcoming attitude of earlier periods. See *Sunjo Sillok* 4:08 Sunjo 2 (1802).03.15 (ŭryu), CSW 47:425: “備局啓言：‘今此漂人，不知為何國人物，則縱欲貲送，其勢末由。不得不還送漂到地方，待彼船之更來，因便付送，如或不來，則勢將依向化人例，仍作編氓，定差員交付下送于濟州，就官府近處，擇定一所，官給廩料衣資，待其歲月稍久，言語漸通，或從便授業，或隨宜立役，以示朝家懷柔之意。’從之。”

\(^{12}\) Discussions of castaways include Yi Hun, *Chosŏn hugi p'oryumin kwa hanil kwangye* (Seoul: Kukhak Charyowon, 2000).
finally “Liaodongese who fled after the *kapsin* year (the 1644 fall of Beijing to the Qing) and who have choronyms in Sichuan, Taiyuan and Zhejiang; they came and did not return to China, and their descendents are also called submitting foreigners (甲申以後，遼瀋人之避虜東奔者稱向化，西蜀·大原·浙江人之仍留不歸者，子孫亦稱向化云).” As the above list suggests, these were the distant descendents of migrants who entered Chosŏn during the early seventeenth century, and yet were still categorized as submitting foreigners. In another record referring to Cholla Province, a secret censor, Han Kwanghoe, described submitting foreigners as divided between Chinese Remnant Subjects (Taeguk yuin 大國遺人) and commoners who wandered in from other regions (Yiyŏk yumaeng 異域流氓); Han insisted that was clearly inappropriate to demand the same duties of them as of other subjects (其不可與齊民混役也審矣). The only structured study of submitting foreigners in the Late Chosŏn has been by Han Munjong, whose work, however, focuses exclusively on the descendents of surrendered Japanese. He describes a process of a fairly general policy of settling

---

13 *Sŏnggwon Ilgi* 1076, Yŏngjo 27 (1751).11.26 (kich’uk). Surrendered Japanese had been settled in Hamgyŏng Province early in the seventeenth century, partly because their military skills were needed against the growing Jurchen threat, and partly because of concerns that they might establish alliances with the Japanese state.

14 *Chŏn’gaeksa ilgi* 9, Kyesu (1754).09.10, KSTR 94:96: “一，湖南暗行御史韓光會別單書啓，沿海邑向化民段，或大國遺民，或異域流氓，其不可與齊民混役也審矣。其始來也，自禮曹別為之厚接，又慮其無所資業，居處於海邊，使之漁採為生，名曰向化以別之，蠲其身役以復之，此聖朝所以柔遠人之至義也。渠亦沐浴聖澤，同歸化育，樂之利之，以保其殘落矣。”
Japanese in Chosŏn during the fifteenth century being augmented by the large scale entrance of surrendered Japanese during the Imjin War, and being followed by the simple inheritance of submitting foreigner status during the late Chosŏn. He describes how, in the early Chosŏn, Japanese were settled in Chosŏn, or even granted status as Chosŏn subject status in Japan, so as to settle Chosŏn’s turbulent frontier with Japan and channel trade and diplomacy; after the Imjin War, increasingly surrendered Japanese were employed for their military skills.\(^\text{15}\) His research reads nicely along side that of James Lewis, who describes a steadily narrowing acceptance of unregulated interaction between Japanese and Chosŏn subjects during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.\(^\text{16}\)

Otherwise, very little work has been done on exploring the social history of the descendents of Jurchen and Chinese during the late Chosŏn. One early attempt to explore Ming descendents as a social class was by Yi Chongil, who made a number of interesting guesses as to the likely status of Ming migrants. Referring especially to the passage in “The Story of Mr. Empty” (Hŏsaengjŏn) in which the descendents of Ming soldiers are referred to travelling about Chosŏn as widowers, in a state of extreme

\(^{15}\) Han Munjong, *Chosŏn chŏn’gi hyanghwa sujik waein yŏn’gu*.

poverty, he suggests that Ming migrants were generally from elite classes who could not endure the new Qing conquerors, and whose Korean issue, on account of the migrants having been generally already married in China, would have been treated as the children of concubines, or sŏol. Another notable attempt, by John Duncan, investigates changes in submitting foreigner status as a window through which to observe the growth or lack of growth of protonationalism in the late Chosŏn. Seeing submitting foreigner status as primarily as a tool of assimilation, he sees the widespread presence of this status during the early Chosŏn as a sign of a lack of a clear idea of nation or pure blood lines. He thus understands the disappearance of submitting foreigner status in the late eighteenth century as evidence of an increasingly racially exclusive society; he sees the same process in the creation of a new status, hwangjoin (imperial subject) status. In his own words, by the mid-eighteenth century “the Chosŏn court abandoned its centuries old policy of assimilation of hyanghwain and began to treat the Han Chinese living in Chosŏn as a permanent foreign element; this change, he

18 Yi Chongil, “Chosŏn hugi sahoe kyeh’ŭng ko: chibaejŏk sinbunch’ŭng ŭl chungsim ŭro,” in Hyŏnam sin kukchu paksa hwagap kinyŏm, Han’gukhak nonch’ong, 265- 296 (Seoul: Tong’guk taehakkyo ch’up’anbu, 1985), esp. 291-293. Sŏol are the issue of yangban and concubines, translated by Palais as nothoi. They suffered from a large number of restrictions during the Chosŏn dynasty and were unable, generally, to take civil service exams or participate in the upper echelons of the bureaucracy.
argues, is related to the increasing centralization of Qing and Japan, and an increasing proto-nationalist focus on blood on the part of the Chosŏn court.\(^\text{19}\) A third, in a recent article by Han Kyung-koo, compares the positive response of the Chosŏn court to Chinese descendents during the reign of Yŏngjo (r. 1724-1776) with the hostile response to submitting foreigners of Jurchen descent during the reign of Yŏnsan’gun, and concludes from this that, despite a self-evident lack of interest within Chosŏn to maintain racial homogeneity, there was a general feeling of superiority on the part of the Chosŏn people to non-Koreans other than Chinese. From this he argues that eliminating the concept of a homogenous state will not, in itself, eliminate racial and cultural discrimination.\(^\text{20}\)

With the exception of Han Munjong, these attempts fail to account for the fact that submitting foreigner status was substantially defined by tax and service obligations. As chapter 3 has shown, it is not true that the Ming migrants in Chosŏn all had high status in China, although as will be discussed in this chapter, the assertion of scholar-official status of their Ming ancestors was key to the upward mobility achieved by some

\(^\text{19}\) Duncan, “Hyanghwain,” 99-113. Erroneously, Duncan posits the disappearance of Jurchen and Japanese descent groups in Chosŏn after the early seventeenth century. Thus, the change in the status of Chinese submitting foreigners to hwangjoin he sees as involving the disappearance of the category hyanghwain.

Ming migrant descendants during the eighteenth century. The attempts by Han and Duncan, in orienting the discussion to exclusively towards the worthy goal of refuting modern concepts such as multiculturalism and racial homogeneity within the general context of Chosŏn dynasty as a whole, fail to properly grasp the complexity of the development of submitting foreigner status as an institution. Submitting foreigner status was not defined by assimilation, nor was the creation of imperial subject status an attempt to prevent assimilation.

Above all, submitting foreigner status was a status used for determining tax, corvée and military service burden, and was a tool of state control over foreign populations. As suggested by the above-quoted reports of both the Han Ponghan and the Secret Censor Hong Kwanghoe, by the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it had become hereditary, such that, hundreds of years after the status had first been granted, recipients of the status were still be defined by their genealogical link to Jurchen, Japanese, Chinese or other group. A key category of hereditary submitting foreigners were those who took upon the task of fishing, whose tax and corvée duties were restricted to the boat tax which was paid exclusively to the Board of Rites, and who were in theory protected from tax and corvée demands of all other agencies. In a passage in the *Daily Record of the Office of the Custodian of Foreign Visitors*
(Chŏn’gaeksa ilgi) for 1649, one Sŏ Pongnyong, the chief of a community of Tumen Valley pŏnho who had fled south from Nurhaci,\textsuperscript{21} describes the exemption for the descendents of submitting foreigners (hwanghwa chason) from all state exactions other than tribute to the Board of Rites as clearly premised on settlement, not cultural assimilation per se; this need for settlement was seen as extending, not only to the original settler, but to their descendents, who were equally seen as “rootless people.”

Although in 1649 it was reasonably understandable to give special treatment to a pŏnho tribe until recently suffering from war, violence and the threat of repatriation,\textsuperscript{22} the status lasted long after the danger from such attempts had entirely disappeared. Institutional inertia and the difficulty that the central government had in imposing its will on local administration seem to have resulted in the continuing survival of the status, as indeed, perhaps, did the general concern that any change, however rational, would end up causing more trouble than it was worth. In 1700 a local yangban suggested the elimination of the status, for the fourth generation after migration, of Chinese-origin submitting foreigners in Ch’unch’ŏng Province. He made especial reference to those whose ancestors had migrated to Chosŏn before 1591, arguing that if

\textsuperscript{21} Sŏ is mentioned in section 2.3.

\textsuperscript{22} Chŏn’gaeksa ilgi 4, kich’uk (1649).11.10, KSTR92:281.
the court took his advice the court would gain tens of thousands of elite soldiers.\textsuperscript{23}

Despite the fact that the vast majority of submitting foreigners seem to have arrived after 1592, the Board of Rites protested this change vigorously, arguing that to change established methods in this case would only cause confusion.\textsuperscript{24} Possibly because of the particular needs of the Board of Rites, a community that must have, by then, had almost no memory of their migration experience or original homeland were nevertheless being treated as a special social class in need of protection, although some, at least recognized that the status had become somewhat anachronistic.

The context within which submitting foreigner status during the late Chosŏn must be explored is ultimately that of the lively debates concerning institutional and social change that characterized the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were characterized by a series of attempts at fiscal reform by which the various tax and service obligations owed by the peasantry would be simplified as payments in cloth, grain, and ultimately metal currency, levied on land

\textsuperscript{23} Sukchong Sillok 34, Sukchong 26 (1700).10.12 (sinmi), CSW 39:580: “高敞幼學柳新雨上疏，備陳沿海備禦之策，且曰：所謂向化人者，古昔華人之漂到我地，因我民者也。入我地作我民，不知幾百年，而每稱向化，水業者、農作者，竝無身役。宜使其所居官，考其帳籍，限其年代，在浦邊者充水軍，在陸地者定陸軍，則可得數萬精兵，而少有補於物故之代矣。上下廟堂稟處，覆奏，據萬曆辛卯承傳，向化人曾孫以下定役事，請更加申明。”

\textsuperscript{24} Sukchong Sillok 34, Sukchong 26 (1700).10.12 (sinmi), CSW 39:580: “禮曹以爲：‘本曹例收向化人浦居者船稅，以供一應用度，其來已久，今不可移定他役。’上允之。”
or on the household, not, as in the established system, upon the individual. These reforms were met by predictable opposition from yangban, who objected to the stigma of taxation and military service, and from the various vested interests who benefited from the considerable profits involved by the corruption of the current system. These reforms – the Taedong Law and the Equal-Service Law – were imposed only with great difficulty, against often quite vigorous opposition, and in the face of local practice which accorded very little to the official directives of the court.25

A connected but different issue was the attempt to increase the tax-paying population by reducing slavery through restricting the inheritance of slave status to the maternal line; this reform also encountered considerable opposition from elites, who objected to the loss of financial control and the removal of clear status distinctions, while being supported by other elites on account of the expansion of the tax-paying population and, by some such as Yu Hyŏngwŏn who saw slavery as a great evil in need of elimination.26 These institutional changes, even when, after more than a century of debate, they were formally instituted, were complicated by the considerable tenacity of local institutions, the persistence of corrupt tax-collecting practices and inequitable

imposition of corvée labour, and the assumption of false yangban status by tax-evading commoners, just as widespread marronage by Chosŏn’s slave population anticipated the final establishment of the matrilineal law (chongmo-pŏp).27

Furthermore, during the reigns of Hyŏnjong (r. 1659-1674) and Sukchong, there were increasing efforts on the part of the court to record and track population of the state as a whole. The Household Tally Law (hop’ae-bŏp), by which all subjects of the Chosŏn court were required to possess a household tally establishing their identity, and the Five Household Mutual Surveillance Unit Law (Oga chakt’ong-bŏp), by which groups of five households would be combined together to form a t’ong for the purposes of tax, corvée and social control, were hotly debated during the reign of Hyŏnjong (r. 1649-1659) and eventually brought into effect under Sukchong. Both laws were part of a revitalized household registry, legally collected once every three years, and pursued with greater vigour during the late seventeenth century. As with attempts at fiscal and institutional reform, this attempt at expanding the authority of the state initially received considerable opposition from officials who worried of the likely resistance among the impoverished population to registration. Much as these are likely to have improved records of population, studies on household records suggest that, nevertheless, only

about 40% of the population was ever successfully recorded, with large numbers of people of all classes successfully removing their names from registration.\textsuperscript{28} As Kwŏn Naehyŏn has argued, these laws, while certainly an attempt to expand state control, were only to a very limited extent successful.\textsuperscript{29}

What place did submitting foreigners play in these evolving debates about fiscal reform, slave reform, and household registration? A search of one of the most complete household registry documents, the \textit{Tansŏng Household Registry} (Kyŏngsangdo Tansŏng-hyŏn hojŏk taejang) turned up only one record of a descendent of submitting foreigners, a commoner woman listed as Yu Sosa (劉召史), who is recorded in the 1662 household register as the wife of Ch’oe Tongbo (崔東寶) of the village of Panghwabok-ri in Saengbiryang-myŏn, Tansŏng-hyŏn. Her father, a duty soldier (chŏnbyŏng 正兵) called Yu Moûlsŏki (劉毛乙石伊), is described as the descendent of submitting foreigners (向化子孫), as also, presumably, was her grandfather Yu Malchilchŏm

\textsuperscript{28} One representative household registry, the Tansŏng-hyŏn Household Registry is discussed in detail in a series of articles contained within Hojŏk taejang yŏn’gu t’im ed., \textit{Tansŏng hojŏk taejang yŏn’gu} (Seoul: Sŏn’gyun’gwan taehaekkyo taedong munhwa yŏn’guwŏn 2003). In particular, the subject of population estimates is discussed by Kim Kŏnt’aed in two articles, “Chosŏn hugi hojŏk taejang ŭi in’gu kijae yangsang – tansŏng hojŏk ŭl chungsim ūro” 306-334, and “Chosŏn hugi ŭi in’gu p’aak silsang kwa kŏsŏng’gyŏk – tansŏng-hyŏn hojŏk punsŏk,” 334-369. Chŏng Hae’ın’s article, “Tansŏng-hyŏn hojŏk taejang e tŭngjaedoen ho ŭi ch’urip,” 211-240, discussed the reasons for households ceasing to be listed in the registry.

\textsuperscript{29} Kwŏn Naehyŏn, “Sukchongdae chibang t’ongchi’ron ŭi chŏn’gae wa chŏngch’ae unyŏng” \textit{Yŏksa wa hyŏnsil} 25 (1997): 87-112.
(劉末叱占), her paternal great-grandfather Yu Hŭngbyŏk (劉興碧), and possibly also her maternal grandfather Han Malchilman (韓末叱萬). Either because they moved away, or because they successfully bribed the sub-bureaucrats in charge of the household registry, this family does not appear in the 1780 registry, whether possessing submitting foreigner status or otherwise. Interesting though this entry is, very little can be concluded on the basis of it. Careful investigation of a larger number of gazetteers and fragments of the *Household Registry*, especially for Hamgyŏng and Chŏlla Provinces, the two provinces most frequently mentioned as having a large submitting foreigner population, might well reveal more examples.

It is clear, however, from a diversity of other sources that submitting foreigner status was the subject of regular court discussion during between Injo (r. 1623-1649) and Chŏngjo (r. 1776-1800)’s reigns. Sources in which the status of submitting foreigners is discussed include the *Veritable Records* (*Chosŏn wangjo sillok*), the *Daily Record of the Royal Secretariat* (*Sŭngjŏn ilgi*), the *Record of the Border Defence* (*Sŭngjŏngwŏn ilgi*), the *Record of the Royal Secretariat* (*Sŭngjŏngwŏn ilgi*), the *Record of the Border Defence* (*Sŭngjŏngwŏn ilgi*), the *Record of the Border Defence*. 

---

30 See 1762, the entry for Saengbiryang, 6 ri (panghwagok), 2 t’ong, 2 ho, Ch’oe Tonbo’s household. Found in CDs for *Kyŏngsangdo Tansŏnghyŏn Hojŏk Taejang, chŏnsan deit’a beisū* (Seoul: Tongasia haksul yŏn’guwŏn, Taedong munhwa yŏn’guwŏn, Sŏng’gyun’gwan taehakkyo, 2003), CD 4, 1762-06 saengbiryang, entry # 1020. The excel file for “Saengbiryang” in the CD renders “hyanghwain” as sanghwain (尙化人). However, investigation of the photograph of the original text for “saengbiryang 017,” which is also contained within the CD, reveals this to be a misreading of the text, which actually has hyanghwain (向化人). The CDs were kindly given to me by the Tong Asia Haksul Yŏn’guwŏn at the Taedong munhwa yŏn’guwŏn of Sungkyunkwan University, Seoul, South Korea.
Command (Pihyŏnsa tŭngnok), but also, interestingly, including the diplomatically oriented Daily Record of the Office of the Custodian of Foreign Visitors. Through these sources it is possible to connect the submitting foreigner status to the vigorous discussion on social policy that occurred in other aspects of fiscal and social policy at that time; much as with other aspects of fiscal and social policy, in the case of submitting foreigners the state was forced to balance the need to expand its fiscal base even as it

Already in 1645, very shortly after Qing pressure on Chosŏn had been loosened with respect to the forced repatriation of Jurchen, there are records in the Daily Record of the Office of the Custodian of Foreign Visitors of Yi Hwarandolsi, a submitting foreigner of unspecified origin, appealing for protection from the Board of Rites. He informed the Board that following 1637, when the court had transferred the boat tax from the Board of Rites to the then financially strapped Board of Taxation; however, he complained, his new board did not care for him, but actually forced him to provide taxes to the Military Training Agency (Hullyŏn togam 訓鍊都監) and the Merit Awards Administration (Ch’unghunbu 忠勳府) and lamented that, unable to preserve himself, his distress was very great indeed (將不得保存, 至大冤痛為白良爾); He begged that

---

31 See section 2:3.
he and other submitting foreigners be put once more under the control of the Board of Rites, and treated with the same care as formerly.\textsuperscript{32} The Board of Rites ruled, however, that while they recognized his hardship, as no great differences could be seen in the consolation provided by the Board of Rites and the Board of Taxation, and so he should be left as is, if perhaps the earlier protection provided to submitting foreigners from miscellaneous exactions be restored.\textsuperscript{33}

In some cases, however, the protection of the Board of Rites was restored, but was not on its own effective in preventing the random exactions of Board of Taxation and other organizations. Thus, in a document dated to 1649, the chief of a community of submitting foreigners, one Sŏ Pongnyong, lamented, that, despite the fact that they had been transferred to the Board of Rites, the Board of Taxation and the lower orders of the Merit Awards Administration had been making excessive demands upon his

\textsuperscript{32} Chŏn’gaeksa ilgi 03, ūryu (1645), yun06.24, KSTR92:209 : “一，曹啓目，全南道臨陂向化李難乭屎等，聯名呈訴内 ... 自丁丑年，向化船隻，移屬於戶曹是如。禮曹段，專不收拾，戶曹亦不護恤是白乎等以，如忠勳府訓鍊都監各處，勒定收稅，與百姓一樣侵責，將不得保存，至大冤痛爲白良爾。依舊例還屬禮曹，使之收拾，俾無各處被侵之弊事，入啓善處事是白置有亦。”

\textsuperscript{33} Chŏn’gaeksa ilgi 03, ūryu (1645), yun06.24, KSTR92:20: 9: “順治三年十月初九日，右副承旨臣李禾來次知啓，依允事據，備邊司啓目粘連啓下是白有亦，丁丑之後，移屬戶曹，固出於軫念經費之意，而目今事勢，又與平時不同，拈出此輩，別爲案籍，別屬禮曹，似未妥當，至於撫恤安接之道，則戶禮似無異同，內外上司監兵使之侵責，亦不係於移屬還屬之間是白置，依前啓下，姑爲仍屬戶曹爲白乎矣。護恤勿侵等事，依舊例着實擧行爲白乎矣。所捧稅魚，優送禮曹，俾成衙門模樣之意，分付該曹何如。順治二年十月二十一日，左承旨臣李曼次知啓，依回啓施行爲乎矣。久假不歸，殊未妥當，限明年仍屬戶曹爲良如敎。”
community; the begged the Board of Rites to prevent these unjustified exactions; the Board of Rites, while recognizing that the community in question had been in Chosŏn long enough as to be truly Chosŏn subjects (今此向化等，出来已久，仍為我民)， took pity at them for their mistreatment at the hands of the Board of Taxation and the petty officials of the Merit Awards Administration, and passed on their demand that such petty exactions cease.

Such inter-office conflict did not cease, however, with the reign of Injo. Indeed, during the reigns of Sukchong (r. 1674–1720) and the early part of the reign of Yŏngjo (r. 1724–1776), discussion of the submitting foreigner tax and service exemption was a significant sideline to the broader controversies concerning institutional and social

---

34 Chŏn’gaeksa ilgi 4, kich’uk (1649).11.10, KSTR92:281: “一，洪淸道韓山居向化酋長臣徐福龍等，駕前上言內，... 凡民船段船稅，各其衙門所納之後，別無御供之役，而臣矣徒等段，既是自古，除稅案復戶船以，不計先朝時還屬禮曹，護恤安接事啓下之意，權屬戶曹時段置，稅魚二同弊所納外，別無御供之役是白如乎，還屬禮曹之後，戶曹御供是如段等，如責定貧寒無根着丐乞之等人，一身兩役，將不得保存，流離四方，至天呼寃為白去乎，今亦新化之初，一依法典，復戶及先朝時護恤安接事啓下之意，無前規御供之役，顧下保存為白如乎，臣矣徒，異域出來，資活無路，各自盡賣家産，自備風雨船，捉魚連命為白如乎，今年分忠勳府，以末端木造給船，威力行移，船稅責徵，無依止向化，懸於上司之令，至於科外船稅責納，如此冤抑情由，呈禮曹，則移文于忠勳府為白在果，忠勳府乃上司衙門，若不變通，便亦謀占，則臣矣徒等，自備船隻，將為橫奪，至天罔極為白良爾。當此新化恤民革弊之時，痛禁俾無橫奪之弊事，特蒙恩為白良結望良白去乎事據。”

35 Chŏn’gaeksa ilgi 4, kich’uk (1649).11.10, KSTR92:281: “今此向化等，出來已久，仍為我民，無根着流離四方，僅以連命云者，果如渠等之訴冤是白去乎，況除原船稅外，各衙門所屬凡民段置，不為徵捧是白去等，御供是如石首魚乙，獨定於此輩，則無依止異域之輩，其為呼寃，在所不已是白，令戶曹使之顧下為白乎矣。船隻段，既非忠勳府末端木造給船，而欲为占奪，則渠等稱冤，實為可矜，自今以後，雜役幷以更勿侵責事，行移何如。順治六年十一月初一日，行左承旨臣申翊全次知啓依允。”
reform that characterized that period. Already in the third year of Sukchong, the Board of Rites expressed worry that Injo’s attempts to protect submitting foreigners from the random extortion of various offices failed. Such were the exactions imposed on submitting foreigners that they soon would not be able to survive. Moreover, these exactions were clearly in violation of Injo’s original intentions in this regard, and should thus be stopped.36 This did not bring and end to the problem, as only seven years later a group of submitting foreigners in Chŏlla Province once more appealed to the court for protection against the unjustified exactions of petty officials,37 while under Kyŏngjong (r. 1720-1724), concern was raised that the tribute in fish being raised on submitting foreigners was being directed improperly to the local Agency for the Elderly (Kirohoe

36 Kugyŏk Pibyŏnsa tūngnok 10:399, Sukchong 03 (1677).08.11: “禮曹啓曰，向化等，本以異域之人，子枝棄暴，投仁之後，無所依著，流離丐包，散在遐方，故自朝家蠲除雜役，專屬本曹，農業者則慰賜農牛·農器，水業者則除稅案，各食其力，俾得保存焉，而曾在仁祖朝，本曹與廟堂，別為商確，至於漁採者，戶曹所納及本曹若干收稅外，各衙門及監兵水使切勿侵責事，覆啓蒙允。卽接結城縣監權萬濟報，則近來諸宮家各衙門科水差人等，下去各浦，不有朝家命令，向化等處侵徵之弊，罔有紀極云，誠如所報，則無告向化之流，將無以保存，有違於仁祖朝定奪之意，自今以後，諸宮家·忠勳府·訓鍊都監·成均館等衙門差人及監兵水使監考色吏，如有猶踵前習，橫侵之弊，則隨現在啓科罪之意更為捧承傳施行，何如，傳曰：允。”

37 Kugyŏk Pibyŏnsa tūngnok 12:156, Sukchong 09 (1683).07.22: “今七月二十一日晝講入侍時知事李䎘所啓，禮曹素稱淸寒，而自今年裁減以後，下輩所給料布，亦皆縮損無餘，故下輩之自願退去者甚多，既無所給料布，而勒使立役，亦甚不當矣，全羅道向化所納魚物，在前本曹次知收捧，以充下輩之料布，上年本道監司欲為補用於賑資，啓請朝家而取用矣，今則賑事已過，而本曹下輩料布，誠無可出之處，向化所納魚物，自今更屬本曹，何如，上曰，全羅監司之啓聞取用，蓋以一時賑政之故也，不必因此永給該曹，如此舉行可也。”
Rites restored. On the other hand, the fact that formal requests were also occasionally made to allow for the direction of the boat tax to other agencies such as the Merit Award Office suggests that, at times at least, the Board of Rites’ regular appeals on behalf of submitting foreigners also had some effect. Further juggling, however, in the context of the Equal-Service Law of 1751, seem to have resulted in one community of submitting foreigners in Chŏlla becoming heavily burdened by taxes and other obligations.

Even as opinions differed over the proper burden for submitting foreigners, attempts were made to weed from the ranks false claimants to the status of submitting foreigner. During the reign of Sukchong (r. 1674-1720), Min Chinwŏn expressed concern at the number of people in coastal communities who established themselves fraudulently in submitting foreigner villages (hyanghwainch’ŏn). In 1751, a year after the Equal-Service Tax Law, the Board of Rites demanded a general investigation of

---

38 Sŭngjŏngwŏn ilgi 531, Kyŏngjong 01 (1721).06a.05 (kapcha).
40 Yŏngjo Sillok 81:23a, Yŏngjo 30 (1754).04.29 (musin), CSW 43:522.
41 Sŭngjŏngwŏn ilgi 477, Sukchong 39 (1713).04.22 (kisa): “比之本曹所攢, 多至四倍, 至於缺向化人,亦爲侵責云, 今後自廟堂酌定, 勳府缺有定數外加捧之弊, 則缺向化人混同缺國家之患缺護恤, 而至於他民之居向化村者, 混稱缺此良民, 多遊食之徒, 而軍額有難充之弊, 田縣亦有向化村, 其民皆以漁採爲生理, 各有大中小缺當捉魚時, 率其妻子鷄犬, 乘船而出, 假海爲家, 缺民充補軍額, 及其乘船一去之後, 有同捕風而捉影, 契奈何?”
submitting foreigner status throughout the country, beginning the difficult task of sorting submitting foreigner lineages from the rest of the population.\textsuperscript{42} As a result of searching through submitting foreigner lineages, several problems were uncovered, including that of the expanded population of the submitting foreigner status; both agnatic and non-agnatic were unnecessarily inheriting submitting foreigner status, thus expanding submitting foreigner status excessively. When this problem was raised several times during the reign of Yŏngjo, the goal of the officials who raised the issue was never to entirely eliminate the status, but only to bring the expansion of this status under control.\textsuperscript{43} The names used by submitting foreigners were also a source of difficulty – Yŏngjo inquired especially concerning the surprising presence of people surnamed Kim and Pak within the Compendium of Submitting Foreigners (hyanghwain sŏngch’aek) to be told that these were “artificially imposed surnames” (Mosŏng 冒姓) given to Jurchen and Japanese.\textsuperscript{44} In 1754 Yi Ch’ŏnp’o raised the issue of the general presence of miscellaneous Korean families in Hamgyŏng Province registered as either

\textsuperscript{42} See next section, 4.3.

\textsuperscript{43} Sŏnjŏngwŏn ilgi 1159, Yŏngjo 34 (1758).08.26 (kimyo): “領議政兪拓基曰，向化人性孫之不為收布，猶或可也，而至於外外孫之贐給，極為過矣。上曰，禮曹員役之以向化布給料者，豈不苟艱乎？為一疋之役後，良民皆蒙實惠，而向化人則本納一疋，獨無所減，豈不冤乎？若是應給之物，則豈以二十餘同為多乎？” The issue was raised against a month later, with more or less the same concerns. See Sŏnjŏngwŏn ilgi 1160, Yŏngjo 34 (1758), 09.05 (muja).

\textsuperscript{44} Sŏnjŏngwŏn ilgi 1108, Yŏngjo 30 (1754).06.12 (kyŏngsin): “上曰，禮曹向化人成冊入之，注書臣正吾，承命趨出持入。上覽成冊曰，向化人中有金姓·朴姓安。鳳漢曰，皆冒姓安。”
submitting foreigners or as Chinese, referring especially to the need for careful review, while in 1755 Cho Yong’guk made reference to the difficulties inherent in distinguishing people lineages with choronyms referring to historical Korean locations which used identical characters to current prominent sources of Chinese migrants such as Dengzhou and Taiyuan.

The foreign lineage of the submitting foreigners, in other words, permanently inscribed their status within Choson, even as the Choson state attempted to manage and control these lineages. Already during the reign of Injo it had been recognized that the transforming Jurchen community under Sŏ Pongnyong had become clearly subjects of the Choson court, although this did not change the intention of the court to protect the submitting foreigners from tax and service obligations. Notably, Sŏ Pongnyong

---

45 Sŏngjongwŏn ilgi 1111, Yongjo 30 (1754).09.10 (pyŏngsul): “天輔曰，此則或覲監司金漢喆狀達也。枚挐禮曹，以爲各邑所在華人子孫及向化人等姓字，多有雜姓之混入，有難區別。而各邑，懸於該曹論責，發牌鞭督，一境騷擾，多有疊徵身布者，恐非朝家矜念之德意。徵布之令，姑爲停寢，更令各邑，詳査其族派姓貫，修案上送後擧行事，爲請矣。狀辭誠然，依所請施行。而各邑或故爲延拖，不卽修報，則有非明査覈實之本意。各別嚴飭，其中慢忽不善擧行者，從重論罪之意，分付，何如？令曰，依爲之。”
46 Yongjo Sillok 84:8a-b, Yongjo 31 (1755).04.24 (chŏngmyo), CSW 43:573: “榮國曰：‘曾因李敏坤上疏，使四王子孫之居在北道者，歲納布一匹，仍立一腆，名曰四王子孫腆，後因廟堂所達，四王子孫勿許役役，一道之內，四王子孫將至累萬，冒屬亦多。非但北路簽丁之極難，累萬丁壯，恐亦不可使之閑游矣。向來禮曹，以華人向化人子孫，詳考帳籍，査出姓貫，成冊開報之意，啓稟行會於各道矣。北道則向化人子孫甚多，査出之際，不但有騷擾之弊，其中以登州、太原爲姓貫者，一竝謂之華人子孫，而使之査報，卽今安邊之爲登州，忠州之爲太原，考事可考，則一切皆華人而入於成冊者，豈非稱冤之端乎?’上曰：‘頃聞上朝人，混稱向化人，故命此後勿侵，今聞所奏，與所敕一何相左？命禮判，後日登對棄處’”
continued to place great weight on the story of his ancestor’s origins in the Amur region, their long establishment as pŏnho in the Tumen Valley, and their unsuccessful quarrel with Nurhaci; the fact that he brought up this fact in official discussion suggests that this particular historical origin was by no means a source of shame. While Sŏ Pongnyong was within living memory of an active and autonomous Tumen valley pŏnho community, even in the eighteenth century submitting foreigners continued to emphasise their Jurchen lineages through the Hŭngnyong’gang choronym; whether or not all using that choronym were in fact descendents of Jurchen is perhaps less important than the fact that, until the late eighteenth century, it was considered desirable to have such status in the first place.

Their foreignness would seem to have had advantages to the Chosŏn court as well. The kind treatment extended to submitting foreigners is frequently described as a sign of the benevolence of the Chosŏn court. During the reign of Sukchong, the Board of Rites outlined submitting foreigners as foreigners who had “abandoned savagery and had submitted to benevolence,” (棄暴投仁) but who were forced to survive by begging to the far corners of Chosŏn. Such an understanding of submitting foreigner status is also reflected in the Jurchen leader Sŏ Pongnyong’s statement that his ancestors had
come to Chosŏn “having heard of Chosŏn’s beautiful customs (聞我國風俗善美),”\(^{47}\) while his comment on the good treatment that his ancestors had received as “extraordinary concern and solicitude for foreign rootless people (極其護恤優待之仍子, 異域出來, 無根着之人, 祝手保存為白如乎),”\(^{48}\) further develops the image of a grateful community of the uncivilized submitting to a benevolent Confucian monarchy.

Projecting such an image was vital for a monarchy asserting its legitimacy, even before the fall of the Ming, as the purest refuge of Confucianism.\(^{49}\) After 1645 there may have been no danger that the Jurchen might be forcibly repatriated by the Qing, but ideologically the Chosŏn court had even stronger reasons to emphasise the decision by the Jurchen to take refuge with in its territory.

Whatever the original purpose of submitting foreigner status, during the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it most certainly was not assimilation. As with slave status and various forms of taxation or corvée labour, submitting foreigner status developed through the interaction between royal commands, established local practice, and the resistance to taxation among the populace. As a result, it does not seem to have been an unquestionably desirable status, despite the presence of false claimants. They

---

\(^{47}\) *Chŏn’gaeksa ilgi* 4, *kich’uk* (1649).11.10, KSTR92:281: “臣矣徒等，本以黑龍江胡人以，聞我國風俗善美，豆滿江越邊居生為白乎，彼中事情，每每潛通為白乎可。”


\(^{49}\) See section 4.3 below.
were, after all, permanent recipients of protection and humanity, and the attempts on the part of the Board of Rites to protect them from other tax collection or the imposition of corvée labour seem to have been only intermittently successful. Of course, in a society as stratified as Chosŏn, was it easy for outsiders to gain membership in the ranks of the yangban elite, regardless of the high regard with which Chosŏn elites held the fallen Ming. For the Chosŏn court the submitting foreigner status of these families was an opportunity to emphasize the Confucian nature of the dynasty, but was, as with many such inherited tax-statuses, seen at times as a drain on the treasury. Both attempts to reform it and attempts to preserve it, however, faced difficulties, because of the distress potentially caused by its elimination, and because of widespread locally-generated corruption. For the submitting foreigners themselves, whether they were of Japanese, Jurchen, Chinese, or, illegitimately, Korean ancestry, submitting foreigner status was one more category to be manipulated for their benefit; until the nineteenth century, the fact that the status confirmed upon its holder foreign and exterior status was not a major source of concern to the state.
4.3) The Rectification of Names: From Submitting Foreigner to Imperial Subject

Beginning in the eighteenth century, some of those submitting foreigners whose origins lay in Ming China were able to raise themselves from a socially disadvantageous tax-status to the ritually protected status of imperial subject (皇朝人). This process, beginning mostly during the reign of Yŏngjo, continued through the reigns of Chŏngjo and Sunjo (r. 1800-1834) in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and effectively raised to relative prominence some formerly undistinguished or even impoverished groups of submitting foreigners, even as the submitting foreigners themselves largely disappeared from the record. In part this was an extension of the classifying and reforming activity of the state described above, in part this was influenced by the increasing importance of Ming Loyalist rituals following the 1704 establishment of a shrine to the Wanli Emperor under the authority of the Chosŏn monarch. Yet, the activity of the state occurred in concert with the status ambition of the Ming migrant lineages themselves, who used the changing ideological interests of the state to form themselves as respectable lineages.

In studies concerning lineages in late imperial China, scholars have demonstrated the often complicated process by which groups incorporated themselves
as lineages with respectable ancestors, and how these lineages themselves united with other lineages to form supra-lineage associations. Michael Szonyi, for instance, has shown the often still visible process by which Dan fishing people in coastal Fujian transformed themselves into north Chinese migrants - in many cases, both in the written genealogical materials and in the oral traditions, it is possible to find reference both to the actual Dan origins of the lineages and their adopted northern Chinese origins. 50 David Faure, studying the formation of lineages in the Pearl River delta, has explored the role the state played in defining and organizing lineages, and the role that lineages played in integrating the Pearl River delta into the Ming and Qing states. 51 There has been considerable work on Chosŏn lineages as well, with Fujiya Kawashima, for instance, demonstrating the relative stability of Chosŏn lineages compared to Chinese lineages, and exploring the extent to which yangban lineages established themselves as local power-brokers, preventing outside groups from inveigling themselves into positions of leadership in local society. 52 Paek Sŭngjong, by contrast, while agreeing

50 Michael Szonyi, Practicing Kinship: Lineage and Descent in Late Imperial China (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2002).

51 David Faure, Emperor and Ancestor: State and Lineage in South China (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2007).

with Kawashima’s belief in the relative stability of yangban status itself, has argued that, during the late Chosŏn, yangban lineages in Chŏlla Province had increasing difficulty maintaining their role as a corporate entity in the face of the impoverishment of many of their constituents, intra-linage political conflict, and the de facto rise of non yangban groups into positions of influence.  

Despite the well documented lack of upward social mobility during the late Chosŏn, a portion of the submitting foreigner community successfully rose in status during the period in question. The ideological framework for their rise was the Ming Loyalist ritualism upon which the Chosŏn court increasingly depended to buttress its shaky legitimacy. The Ming-Chosŏn relationship had by no means been always harmonious. However, during the turmoil of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, loyalty to the Ming had become increasingly the tool by which kings buttressed their otherwise weak legitimacy. Sŏnjo, who was forced to retreat in Ŭiju to escape the invading Japanese, could claim success primarily through his successful appeal to the Ming for military aid. Injo, came to power through a coup which he justified partly

---


through the supposed secret communication between Kwanghae-gun and the Manchu; after his forced submission to the Manchu his need to protest unchanging loyalty to the Ming became all the more urgent. Hyojong, whose older brother, the Sohyŏn Seja, was believed to have been murdered, pursued, with Song Siyŏl (1607-1689), a vigorous, if ultimately unsuccessful, policy of anti-Manchu preparations.55

While Hyojong had, with the assistance of Song Siyŏl moved some aspects of Ming Loyalism into practical effect, after his death, the ideology and rituals of Ming Loyalism became increasingly ritualized, carried on, somewhat covertly, by the same court which was also engaging in formal rituals of submission to the Qing. With the last traces of the Ming eliminated, the Chosŏn court and elites were free to pursue Ming Loyalism as a ritual expression of their own superior legitimacy, and make some amends for the desultory and unsuccessful attempts at more practical Ming Loyalism during the early seventeenth century. This aspect, especially, was pioneered by the powerful Noron faction of Song Siyŏl’s disciples. Despite suspicion of hypocrisy and mere opportunism by rival factions, the Noron were able to claim to themselves the Ming Loyalist banner, even building a shrine to the Ming in Hwayangdong near

Ch’ŏngju in 1704.  

Faced with the challenge of the powerful Noron bureaucratic faction claiming exclusive rights to Ming ritualism, the Chosŏn court under Sukchong established a shrine to the Ming Wanli emperor on palace grounds, the Taebodan, in the same year. Yŏngjo, in 1727, expanded the scope of rituals to the Ming emperors to include both the Hongwu and Chongzhen emperors, placing great focus on his personal involvement in these rituals, as did his successor, Chŏngjo. Whether the kings of the early seventeenth century who had taken Ming Loyalism as practical (if generally unsuccessful) military policy, or the kings of the eighteenth century who practiced Ming loyalist rituals as a symbol of their inheritance of the Ming mantel, and their fitness to rule over a state dominated by the powerful Ming Loyalist Noron faction. Ultimately, Ming Loyalist ritualism thus constituted was oriented towards the elevation of Chosŏn and the Chosŏn monarchy, not China or the long-defunct Ming Dynasty.

---


59 This particular line of argument is particularly associated with Chŏng Okcha, Chosŏn hugi Chosŏn chungwha sasang yŏn’gu, who has introduced the otherwise unattested term Chosŏn chungwha chu’ŭi (literally, Chosŏn-is-Confucian-Civilization-ism) into the scholarly lexicon.
The symbolic value of Ming migrant lineages on Chosŏn soil meant that it became worth the effort of the Chosŏn state to raise these lineages in status and give them formal, and respectable, roles in the Chosŏn state; the transformation of Ming migrant lineages was one of many cases in which, as James Palais has shown, arguments concerning administration and governance were strongly influenced by the varied understandings of Confucian morality championed by the officials involved in the process. In the case of Ming migrants, it was specifically the Ming Loyalist ritualism of the eighteenth century that raised their status. During the seventeenth century, the presence of diverse submitting foreigners in Chosŏn was represented as originating in the Chosŏn’s courts solicitude to those “people of other regions” who sought to achieve a proper moral culture, yet despite Injo’s avowed hostility to the Qing, Hyojong’s military preparation against the Qing, and the staunch Ming Loyalism of Song Siyŏl, it was not considered problematic during the seventeenth century that Ming Chinese descendents were also classified as “submitting foreigners.” During the mid-eighteenth century, however, the increasingly ritualized Ming Loyalism of the Chosŏn court made such terminology unpalatable to Yŏngjo court. Ming Chinese were, for this reason, removed from the category submitting foreigner and provided with their own

---

60 James Palais, Confucian Statecraft and Korean Institutions: Yu Hyŏngwŏn and the Late Chosŏn Dynasty.
category “Chinese” (both Hwain 華人 and Chungjoin 中朝人), “Chinese descendent” (Hwain chason 華人子孫), “imperial subject” (Hwangjoin 皇朝人), or even “remnant subjects of the Imperial Dynasty” (Hwangjo yumin 皇朝遺民). While maintaining the original tax and service exemptions originally granted to them as submitting foreigners, the court also granted them a far more exalted social status than most had enjoyed before; inevitably, many Ming migrant descendents themselves participated actively in their own reclassification. Even as the change in terminology, it also involved the state in the investigation and sorting out of the genealogies of its subjects, much as had always been the case in the management of submitting foreigner status.

Indeed, throughout the seventeenth century, the terminology used to describe Ming migrants was not particularly elevated, a far cry from the imperial subjects of the eighteenth century. Despite the well-known pro-Ming policy of the Injo court, Tang Person (Tangin 唐人) is how Chinese are described in the early seventeenth century “Story of Ch’oe Ch’ŏk.”⁶¹ In general, in the Veritable Records and other documents from the period between 1592 and 1650, Chinese deserters and Liaodongese refugees are referred to by such terms as Runaway Tang Soldier (Todangbyŏng 逃唐兵), Tang

⁶¹ Pak Hŭibyŏng ed., Han’guk hanmun sosŏl kyohap kuhae (Seoul: Somyŏng ch’up’ansa, 2005), 441: “爾是天朝人，家在何處，姓名云何?” 答曰: “姓陳名偉慶，家在於杭州湧金門內，萬曆二十五年，從軍于劉提督，來陣于順天，一日以偵探賊勢，忤主將志，將行軍法，夜半潛逃，仍留至此.”
Person (唐人), Han Person (漢人), Tang Person and Han Person being, as was and is general in East Asia, general terms for Chinese regardless of dynasty.\(^{62}\) Otherwise, Chinese are often referred to by the specific region in which they originated, as frequently with Liaodongese (遼人).\(^{63}\) While in the *Official Reports from Simyang* (Simyang chang’gye), “submitting foreigner” (hyanghwain) was used as synonymous with “transforming Jurchen” (hwanghwa hoin) or Warka (ᠸᠠᡵ kè), and in contrast to both escaped Korean captives (Chuhoein) and Han Chinese (Hanin),\(^{64}\) it seems likely that the distinction being drawn by Chosŏn and Qing was between the well-established communities of Jurchen with long-standing institutional connections to the Chosŏn court, and that of the much more recent Liaodongese refugees, concerning whom the disordered Chosŏn state of the early seventeenth century is unlikely to have established much in the way of institutional control; perhaps this was also a reflection of Qing distinctions between Nikan or Hanren with Manchu. As has been shown, in the years between 1645 and the early eighteenth century, no clear terminological or fiscal distinction between Jurchen and Japanese lineages on the one hand, and Ming Chinese lineages on the other, was made.

---

63 *Injo Sillok* 5:24b, Injo 02(1624).03.20 (kapsul), CSW 33:601.
64 See sections 2:3 and 3:5.
This lack of terminological distinction between Ming Chinese and other foreign lineages began to change during the reign of Yŏngjo, and this change in terminology reflected ideological developments within the Chosŏn court and among Chosŏn elites. Within this context of greater official sponsorship of Ming rituals, the court also encouraged greater ritual involvement of Ming descendents, in which cases the term imperial subject (hwangjoin) was occasionally used. However, it was not until 1751 that Yŏngjo took notice of the fact that Ming migrants were, as a general rule, not clearly distinguished from submitting foreigners. During a tour of the birthplaces of the various monarchs, Yŏngjo and his ministers came to discuss the Ming migrant community in Ŭûidong in Seoul; in the midst of this discussion, one official, Nam T’aero, brought up as matter of concern to the monarch, that, within Yŏngnam Province, imperial subjects were classified, with Jurchen and Japanese descendents, as submitting foreigners, and forced to pay taxes and provide services as commoners, in the same manner as other submitting foreigners. Yŏngjo initially responded to this piece of

65 For instance, see Yŏngjo Sillok 8, Yŏngjo 01 (1725).12.13 (pyŏngja), CSW 41:569, in which Ho Tup’il is described in the context of placing his son in a position in the Mandongmo: “Ho is originally an Imperial descendent, who fled into our country and whose descendents are scattered about P’yŏngan Province: “今此胡斗弼, 本以皇朝人子孫, 流落我國, 其族屬散在西北云.”

66 Sŏngjongwŏn ilgi 1075, Yŏngjo 27 (1751), 10.08 (sinch’uk): “泰耆曰, 小臣, 因命福等事, 有仰達之事矣. 所謂向化人者, 即指倭人及野人之來留我國者之稱.而嶺南有皇朝人居生者, 而一例謂之向化, 納布禮曹. 此輩以向化之稱, 深切冤痛. 窮願編於良役, 納二匹布而不能得, 此事甚為怪異矣.”
information with disbelief; having received confirmation from other ministers, Yŏngjo lamenting his lack of sincerity, and recalling the necessity of rectifying names, called upon the Board of Rites to inquire within all regions as to who was recorded as submitting foreigner. The vigorous bureaucratic discussion of submitting foreigner status that occurred especially following 1751 has its origin in this attempt to clearly distinguish submitting foreigner and Ming Chinese status.67

In a very short while Yŏngjo received responses to his request. In the same year Hong Ponghan reported, responding, as he said, to the monarch’s question of “who submitting foreigners were?” He revealed that, in Hamgyŏng Province, the category included various people with non-Korean lineages, including former pŏnho, surrendered Japanese and Chinese who had entered during the Ming-Qing transition;68 he also raised concern at the excessive tax imbalances caused by the large number of submitting

---

67 Sŭngjongwŏn ilgi 1075, Yŏngjo 27 (1751), 10.08 (sinch’uk): “上曰，豈有此理耶？洪啓禧曰，果有是事矣。泰蓍曰，臣豈敢以未詳之事仰達乎？臣之兄，方為軍威海監，而軍威海，亦有如此事矣。上曰，然乎？然則一隅青丘，豈是有大明之意乎？是予向朝之誠不足故也。古語曰，必也正名，正謂此事也。承旨書之。傳曰，所謂諸道向化人，稱誰乎？令禮曹，問于諸道以啓。泰蓍讀而告之。上曰，如是則可以知之矣。朝臣中，豈不有自中原來者乎？判府事金若魯曰，大司成李鼎輔，本是陜西人也。上曰，何為出來耶？鼎輔曰，臣之始祖，以蘇定方部下，留在東國矣。上曰，姓本何處？鼎輔曰，臣之始祖，封為延安伯。故以延安為姓本矣。上曰，陞補設幾抄乎？鼎輔曰，纔行初抄，而有身病，更不設行矣。泰蓍曰，有實病屢呈辭單矣。今日不得已入參矣。上還入。以次退出。”

68 Sŭngjongwŏn ilgi 1076, Yŏngjo 27(1751). 11.26 (kich’uk): “鳳漢曰，前日傳敎，有向化人稱誰乎？令禮曹問于諸道以啓之命矣。問于諸道，且考本曹久遠文書，則向化人，本以三韓蕃胡，以黑龍江為姓貫而內附者，壬辰倭奴之不歸者，甲申以後，遼瀋人之避虜東奔者稱向化，西蜀·大原·浙江人之仍留不歸者，子孫亦稱向化云，故敢此仰達。”
foreigners within the region. In response to Hong Ponghan’s report, Yŏngjo demanded the rectification of names: henceforth, the term “submitting foreigner” should be restricted to the descendants of Jurchen and Japanese, with the descendants of Ming migrants being referred to as Chinese (Hwain). Additionally, he demanded that the descendants of Ming migrants be granted clear exemptions from military service and other taxes. Hong Ponghan accepted this suggestion for royal attention, also demanding a general modification of the king’s instructions concerning tax/service exemptions granted to submitting foreigners in general.

Three years later, a report from Cholla Province by a secret inspector also informed the royal court as to who those submitting foreigners who were paying the boat tax were, dividing them clearly into Chinese Remnant Subjects (Taeguk yumin 大國遺民) and commoners who had wandered in from other regions (Yiyŏk yumaeng 异域流氓), although treating them both in the same general category.

---

69 Sŭngjongwŏn ilgi 1076, Yŏngjo 27(1751). 11.26 (kich’uk): “上曰，野人·倭人外，名以向化，其名不可，子不云乎？必也正名。此後野倭子孫外，其除向化之名，稱以華人子孫，只屬禮曹，勿捧其布，亦除軍役為可，以此分付。”

70 Sŭngjongwŏn ilgi, Yŏngjo 27(1751).11.26 (kich’uk): “鳳漢曰，華人子孫，勿用野倭向化例，特除身布之聖意，臣實欽仰。而第念名雖屬於禮曹，全無所納，則來頭必有恝視之弊。各邑雖充軍額，亦將以無損益於本曹，等閒視之。今當聖上垂惠之初，宜軫日後受害之端。臣意則以為，無寧以若干土產不甚費力者，定其所納，使渠輩知有所屬，而有冤來訴，使該曹知有所管，而隨事顧恤。則可無外邑橫侵之患，而實為永施惠澤之道矣。上曰，依之。”
“submitting foreigner.” Surprisingly, the Daily Record of the Office of the Custodian of Foreign Visitors records no royal rebuke for this oversight. In general, however, later discussion of Ming migrants and submitting foreigners was scrupulous in its concern to distinguish terminologically submitting foreigners and Chinese. Thus, Cho Yong’guk, like Hong Ponghan concerned about the imbalanced tax and service burden in Hamgyŏng Province, made certain to distinguish Chinese (Hwain), who he described as the descendents of Ming migrants, especially those who entered during the Imjin War and members of Mao Wenlung’s army (漢人之隨提督出來者, 有留在我邦者, 且毛文龍軍, 有流入者, 此謂華人), from submitting foreigners, who in this context he describes as exclusively comprising of those Jurchen who succeeded in avoiding Nurhaci’s forced removals in the early seventeenth century (向化人則乃是野人, 魯哈赤感後, 盡為率入建州, 而未及率去, 亦有落留我邦者). A year later, referring to the same problem, and also clearly distinguishing between submitting foreigners and

---


72 Sŏngjongwŏn ilgi 1111, Yongjo 30 (1754).09.10 (pyŏngsul): “榮國曰, 壬辰倭亂, 至於十年之久. 其時漢人之隨提督出來者, 有留在我邦者, 且毛文龍軍, 有流入者, 此謂華人. 向化人則乃是野人, 魯哈赤感後, 盡為率入建州, 而未及率去, 亦有落留我邦者, 至今六鎭空虛之地, 多有野人所居形地矣.”
Chinese,\textsuperscript{73} he was nevertheless rebuked mildly by Yŏngjo for treating Imperial subjects as equivalent category with submitting foreigners.\textsuperscript{74}

Such scrupulousness on Yŏngjo’s part inevitably influenced later reports on the matter, with most later reports on the subject taking great care to distinguish the two categories. Regionally, however, practices seem to have been more diverse, with Chŏngjo, even in 1798, expressing anger at the illogical nature of referring to Ming migrants as “submitting foreigners,” and demanding that villages inhabited by Chinese migrants in Honam Province, then referred to as “submitting foreigner villages” (hyanghwainch’ŏn), be changed to “imperial subject villages” (hwangjoinch’ŏn): “It is utterly nonsensical to describe the descendants of imperial subjects who fled to our country as submitting foreigners (皇朝人之流寓我國者, 名之以向化, 極不成說).”\textsuperscript{75}

\textsuperscript{73} Sŭngjŏngwŏn ilgi 1118, Yŏngjo 31 (1755).04. 24 (chŏngmyo): “榮國曰臣因言端, 敢有所達, 向來禮曹, 以華人向化人子孫, 祥考帳籍, 查出姓貫, 成冊開報之意, 啓稟行會于各道矣. 北路, 則向化人子孫頗多, 查出之際, 不但有騷擾之弊, 其中以登州·太原為姓貫者, 一竝謂之華人子孫, 而使之查報, 即今安邊之為登州, 忠原之為太原, 古蹟分明可考, 則一切謂之華人, 而入於成冊中, 宜有稱冤之端, 此則似當分揀矣.”

\textsuperscript{74} Sŭngjŏngwŏn ilgi 1118, Yŏngjo 31 (1755).04. 24 (chŏngmyo): “上曰, 頃聞皇朝人, 混稱向化人, 其涉異矣. 此後勿侵事下敎矣. 今聞所奏, 與下敎, 一何相左, 令禮判, 日後登對時, 稟處.”

Indeed, in a Chosŏn society which increasingly made a virtue of its subordination to a long fallen Ming, it made very little sense to define people whose lineages located them within the Ming with a status describing their willingness to submit to Chosŏn and Confucian culture.

If the rectification of names was initially driven by concern at the court, the Chinese migrants themselves soon began to demand such corrections themselves. In a series of documents recorded in the *Veritable Records*, the *Royal Commands Concerning the Employment of Chinese* (*Chungjoin suyong chŏn’gyo*), and the *Daily Record of the Office of the Custodian of Foreign Visitors*, there are records of the descendents of Ming migrants themselves demanding that the distinction be made. Thus, in 1754, several Ming migrants “fearing that they might be included in the *Compendium of Submitting Foreigners* (*Hwanghwain sŏngch’aeck*), checked the record, upon which they discovered that Yi Hwon, the fifth descendendent of the Nyŏngwŏn Marquis – Yi Rusong – was included within. Overwhelmed with horror, they had his name removed, along with the names of Ch’o Haech’ang, Chŏn Sidong and Pŏn Chagŏn, each the descendents of Ming soldiers who had made a name for themselves in the Imjin War, and who were then dwelling in the capital. The response of the court was to renew the rules whereby the descendents of these Ming soldiers would be guaranteed freedom
from tax, corvée and military service in perpetuity, and to more formally declare that all records of such Ming migrants should be struck from the *Compilation of Submitting Foreigners*, and that the Seoul administration should be sure to define such migrants as continued to be recorded not as submitting foreigners but as Chinese (Hwain), in the case of Ch’o Haech’ang, he was also freed from base status (免賤) which he had presumably gained on account of his ancestor marrying a woman of servile origin.

The precedent of these three was referred to later by various Ming migrants of less illustrious backgrounds during the reigns of Chŏngjo and Sunjo who sought, by their own self-descriptions, to improve their social positions. Thus, during the reign of Chŏngjo, a Ch’o Kan, an inhabitant of Hamgyŏng Province with the undistinguished rank of Confucian student (yuhak), particularly requested that the court confirm his families status as Ming migrants and descendants of elites, while under Sunjo, three

---

76 Chungjoin suyong chŏn’gyo p. 1-2, “kapsul yuwŏl samil” (1754.06.04); Yŏngjo Sillok 81:40b, Yŏngjo 30 (1754).06.12 (kyŏngsin), CSW 43:530:  "又敎曰: “皇朝人楚、田、潘三姓世世免役，楚海昌孫特為免賤，李萱令軍門調用。向化人成冊，不可不一番釐正，令禮曹、漢城府考帳籍，卞眞僞，精抄成案，名曰《華人錄》，一件藏禮曹，一件藏本道，永勿徵布。”

77 Chŏn’gaeksa ilgi 44, Chŏngjo 21 (1797).02.02, KSTR 9: “咸鏡道明川府幼學臣楚珏上言內云云，臣矣身敢將至懇私悃，不避猥越，冒死仰籲往駕之前，冀蒙矜素之澤為白齊。。。臣矣身。。十一代祖臣楚海昌，本以皇朝人，東出我國，始到於慶尙道星州地是白如可。。。轉而入北，以星州貫姓入籍，居生於咸鏡道明川地是白乎所。。。其在中朝時，居住官啣及東出時事蹟年月，必有家傳文蹟是白乎矣。。。海昌子孫累世單傳，僅得繼姓是白乎乃。。。至臣矣身六代祖臣遇春，家中失火，先世文蹟，盡付灰燼，仍又病沒，只有十歲種子，幸得繼姓是白乎乃，明川府近年帳籍所錄外，幷與先系，無所考據是白遣。。。我國域內，更無以楚為姓者，而臣矣家門孤寒，亦無閥族結姻之事故，雖於他姓系譜，實無溯古憑考之路是白如兮，遐土孤
other Confucian student, of Kŭmhwa in Kangwon Province, one Pan Chung’gyŏm,78
and on Ch’ŏn Ilsi79 of Myŏngch’ŏn in Hamgyŏng Province requested similar
confirmation of elite Ming migrant lineages to the Chosŏn court, in both cases
specifically citing the decision of 1751.

The record the Veritable Records and the Royal Commands Concerning the
Employment of Chinese tend to treat these further changes in terminology as purely
motivated by Ming loyalist outrage on the part of the monarch – to associate Ming
migrants with Jurchen, or to treat them as, in any way, being subjects of transformation,
was an absolute violation of the “Great Meaning of the Spring and Autumn Annals”

78 Chŏn’gaeksa ilgi 53, Sunjo 06 (1806).03.15, KSTR101: 346: “臣矣身，東來以後，世作峽氓，力田資生，不出山外是白如可，臣矣身，始自年前，往來京路，而瞻望北苑，陟降孔邇，跡阻參拜之列，心切風泉之悲是自可也，李田楚三姓之孫，無所枳碍，而臣矣身，以一體之人，獨為見漏，則豈非至寃乎，東國陪臣，一節一行，後孫皆許入參，而獨於臣矣身，以大明遺民名祖後裔，未伸瞻慕之誠，空抱向隅之嘆，徊徨飲泣於壇門之外者，顧其情地，豈不矜惻也哉，不勝痛迫，裹足上京，不避鈇鉞之誅，泣血哀籲於法駕之所為可去乎，伏乞天地父母，特察臣矣身情願，亟令該曹，詳考公私文蹟，一依李田楚三姓例，許以參班，俾伸至願之地事，伏蒙天恩云云事據。”

79 Chŏn’gaeksa ilgi 53, Sunjo 06.03.15, KSTR101: 346: “一, 咸鏡道明川幼學臣千一時等(二月十九日健陵幸行, 二十七日啓下): 右謹啓臣矣段, 臣矣身等, 伏以臣矣身, 十二代祖花山君臣千萬里, 即皇明朝魯國潁陽人也, 特為惕而許之, 是以不歸, 與其子祥, 卜居於王儉古城是白如乎, 自朝家不忘壬辰之功勞, 封之以花山君, 給復世祿是白加尼, 及夫丙子之亂, 痛皇朝之淪喪, 而慟哭都門, 携挈妻子, 轉入北關明川之地, 盖取諸明之一字而居之也, 子孫仍為北氓, 而在朝家酬勞之澤, 憫恤之典, 非不至矣盡矣是乎, 但後裔零替, 居土僻遐, 給復之特恩, 录用之聖敎, 仍歸有名無實之科。”
(Ch’unch’u taeũi 春秋大義), by which barbarians were to be resisted at all costs.\textsuperscript{80} What should not be obscured by such references is the extent to which this ideological change was also an extension of earlier attempts to record submitting foreigners. Even as the supposed descendents of Ming migrants appealed, during the reigns of Chŏngjo and Sunjo, their classification as submitting foreigners, and demanded instead to be referred to as imperial subjects, so the Board of Rites struggled, in much the same manner as it had attempted to weed the false claimants to submitting foreigner status earlier, to distinguish the false claimants to Ming migrant status from the legitimate claimants. Few Ming migrant descendents could boast, with the descendents of Li Rumei, to have preserved a genealogy from before their flight to Chosŏn,\textsuperscript{81} but had to, as with Cho Chan, have their genealogies confirmed, with whatever records were available, by the court.\textsuperscript{82} In other cases the court demanded that a search be made for the descendents of migrants for whom there were records – thus Chŏngjo ordered a search of Ma Shunchang’s descendents in Honam, and those of Wen Shen’guo. This was, of course, very much to their advantage, if found, but an extension of court power, none

\textsuperscript{80} Chŏngjo Sillok 49, Chŏngjo 22 (1798).09.01 (sinyu), CSW 47:108: “先自湖南，另査狀聞，諸道準此之意，即令廟堂，措辭關飭。而近來名敟日晦，事有關於《春秋》大義，為官長者，不識扶植之方，其害及於無告之向化村，豈非寒心之甚乎?”

\textsuperscript{81} Hwangjoin sajŏk, Kyujang’gak # 2542, fr. 75.

\textsuperscript{82} Chŏn’gaeksa ilgi 53, Sunjo 06 (1806).03.15, KSTR101: 346.
The motives of the Ming descendents themselves are not hard to evaluate. As the preceding discussion has suggested, submitting foreigner status, while inspired by the desire to protect and settle those who entered Chosŏn from abroad, was not, in fact, a particularly prestigious one; the tax and service exemptions, moreover, were frequently ignored. Chinese lineages, even those in Seoul, do not seem to have been provided with any special treatment at all, and were exposed to various corvée obligations and levies. Chinese or imperial subject status, however, removed all such duties from its bearer, also, through the granting of an elite lineage, raising the members of the lineage notionally to quasi-yangban status. This would have been a significant change in status for many as Ming Chinese lineages had not only failed to maintain status on par with Chosŏn yangban, but had even failed, as in the case of Ch’o Haech’ang above, to marry within the ranks of commoners. If social class was relatively rigid during the Chosŏn dynasty, the case of imperial subjects, at least, provides one case of clear, and meaningful, improvement in social status. Notably, by the nineteenth century submitting foreigner lineages had largely disappeared, and there seem to be now no lineages with

83 Chŏngjo, Kugyŏk Hongjae chŏnsŏ (Seoul: Minjok munhwa ch’ujinhoe, 1998) 4:504. While the document in the Hongjae chŏnsŏ is undated, from the Kukcho pogam pyŏlp’yŏn 8:25a (Seoul: Yŏgang ch’ulp’ansa, 1985), 231-2 it would seem to have occurred in the fifth month of Chŏngjo 24 (1800).
the choronym Hŭngnyong-gang; during the same period the old Mongol and Yunnanese
choronyms of Cheju’s local elites disappeared. By contrast there are now numerous
lineages with Ming Chinese choronyms such as Chŏlgang, T’ongju, or Chenam.

The collusion of ideological change within the state and the interest of the
lineages themselves encouraged the creation and development of Ming migrant lineages,
and the emergence of imperial subject status out of submitting foreigner status. Ming
migrants, when appealing to have their status restored, repeatedly made reference to the
unfortunate loss of vital documents. The Chosŏn court, in turn, exerted itself to evaluate
their claims, investigating the record for any documentary evidence of submitting
foreigner status. The category imperial subject or Chinese, in other words, developed
through the interaction between the fiscal and ideological needs of the Chosŏn court, on
the one hand, and the desire for social improvement among Ming descendents, on the
other. Conversely, to the modern scholar, the fact that the category needed to be created
and clarified during the reign of Yŏngjo and Chŏngjo is a reminder that the distinction
was not made consistently before that period, and that even within the vigorously anti-
Qing political discussion of the reigns of Injo, Hyojong, Hyŏnjong and Sukchong, Ming

---

84 Kim Iru, “Koryŏ hugi cheju mongol ūi mannam kwa cheju sahoe ū pnyŏhwaha,” Han’guk sahak 15

85 P’ung Yŏngsŏp, Taemyŏng yumin sa (Seoul: Myŏng ŭihoe, 1989), 123-282.
Chinese descendents were routinely treated as equivalent to Jurchen and Japanese lineages.

4.4) Military Mobilization of Ming Migrants

The origin of the transformation of Ming migrant lineages from submitting foreigners to imperial subjects was associated, initially, through those lineages associated with Ming Chinese military units based in the capital. The original Ming migrants had often been from military classes, or at least claimed descent, rightly or wrongly, from Imjin era soldiers. This connection persisted through the eighteenth century. The heightened prestige of Ming migrant families described in the previous section occurred partly through the reorganization of military units encompassing Ming migrant descendents, and the enrolment as military officers of such Ming lineages as had been previously outside of the military bureaucracy. If Ming deserters, Liaodongese refugees, and submitting foreigners had all been, in different ways, troublesome statuses, the Ming migrant descendents brought into the military were clearly inscribed as Ming loyalists, hostile to the Qing and supporters of the Chosŏn monarchy. Despite the association of Confucianism with “civil” (mun 文) matters rather than military (mu 武),
the reshaping of Ming military units was key for the transformation of these lineages of deserters and refugees into respectable symbols of Chosŏn’s sole inheritance of Confucian legitimacy.

One lineage discussed, early on, in the context of enrolment in the Chosŏn military was the Nongsŏ Yi family of descendants of Li Chengliang, who gained a significant rank within the military bureaucracy, through this gaining the status in the junior branch, of the yangban elites.\textsuperscript{86} Li Chengliang, of course, was a prominent military official from Tieling in Liaodong, of presumably Hamgyŏng Jurchen origin who had, famously, killed Nurhaci’s father and grandfather. Two sons of Li Chengliang, Li Rusong and Li Rumei, had led troops in Chosŏn against theJapanese, with Li Rusong eventually falling in an expedition against the Mongols in 1698. However, of those descendents of Li Chengliang who remained within Liaodong, several passed once more over the cultural frontier, becoming members of the Manchu banners.\textsuperscript{87} Three families in Chosŏn claimed descent from Li Chengliang, including a branch on Kŏje which claimed origin in a brief marriage during Li Rusong’s time in Chosŏn,\textsuperscript{88} as


\textsuperscript{87} Pamela Crossley, \textit{A Translucent Mirror: History and Identity in Qing Imperial Ideology} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 86-7.

\textsuperscript{88} \textit{Hwangjoin sajŏk}, fr. 59.
well as Li Chenglong, who is recorded already during the reign of Injo as fleeing from the Ming military establishment in Ka Island; his descendents ultimately established themselves in Kanghwa Island.\(^{89}\) A third branch was that of Li Yingren, whose family claimed descent from Li Rusong’s second son Li Xingzhong who, before falling in battle, ordered his son to flee to Chosŏn; Li Yingren, passed into Chosŏn via the ancestral homeland of Hamgyŏng Province, eventually establishing himself in Hwiyang deep in the Kŭmgang Mountains, in which, according to an eighteenth century genealogy: “to the end of his days, he did not change his Chinese speech, and his feet did not pass out of the village (至死不變華音, 足跡不出洞門外).”\(^{90}\)

The three families, differing substantially in family background and migration history, were formed during the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as one united military yangban family. This process began with the descendents of Li Chenglong who began serving in the ranks of Chosŏn officials, and whose grandson Yi Myŏn gained early success as a military official during the reigns of Hyŏnjong and Sukchong, and whose son, Yi Hun, rose to the ranks of Commander of the Five Military Commands (Owi t’ongjesa).\(^{91}\) During the reigns of Yŏngjo and Chŏngjo, both the Kanghwa and

\(^{89}\) See section 3.3. Also, Hwangjoin sajŏk, fr. 80.
\(^{90}\) Hwangjoin sajŏk, fr. 58.
\(^{91}\) Hwangjoin sajŏk, fr. 80-83.
Kŏje branches of the Nongsŏ Yi family were brought into the bureaucracy; the Nongsŏ Yi genealogy, especially, describes both Yi Hun, by then a prominent military official, and Yi Hwon, at that point a commoner, being brought into the presence of Yŏngjo. Describing Yi Hwon’s family as peasants from a remote mountain valley (hyŏmmaeng 峽氓), Yŏngjo had Hwon take the military examination, in which, the genealogy claims, Yi Hwŏn did so well, despite having no experience with shooting the bow, as to cause Yŏngjo to express amazement, suggesting that his descent from Li Rusong itself was responsible for his inborn military skill.92 During the reign of Chŏngjo, Yi Hŭijang, a member of the Kŏje branch, which Chŏngjo described as having been abandoned in Kŏje Island since being sired by Li Rusong during the Imjin War, also passed the military examinations, an event which Chŏngjo considered a particular cause for celebration.93

Li Rusong, of course, was one of the key participants in the Imjin War. According to the eighteenth century Nongsŏ Yi genealogy as recorded in the Sources for the Acts of Imperial Subjects (Hwangjoin sajŏk), Yŏngjo particularly requested that they establish as their ancestor Yi Chengliang, Yi Rusong’s father, in order to strengthen the

---

92 Hwangjoin sajŏk, fr. 60-62.
93 Chŏngjo, Kugyŏk Hongjae chŏnsŏ 36:34 a-b, “Kyo” 7.
connection.\textsuperscript{94} The connection with the Imjin War, in other words, allowed the mountain peasants and island dwellers that made up two of the disparate lines that were the Nongsŏ Yi lineage to form one unified military yangban lineage. The formation of the Nongsŏ lineage in Chosŏn was a reassertion of Chosŏn’s Imjin-era connection with the Ming, but one which was enormously beneficial for those claiming Nongsŏ lineage themselves.

A similar process to the formation of the Nongsŏ lineage may be found in the reorganization, under Yongjo and Chŏngjo, of the various Ming migrant lineages in Ōŭidong in Seoul who rose during this period from soldiers in the Military Training Agency to military officials associated with Ming Loyalism. Of course Ming deserters and Liaodongese refugees were already enrolled in the military to a substantial extent during Imjin Period and early seventeenth century. However, their Chineseness itself does not seem to have been the primary reason for their employment. By contrast their skills as soldiers, in the production of gunpowder, perhaps also as Chinese-Korean interpreters, were far more important. In fact, the records for the Chinese-dominated military division under Injo, reveal a division located within the Military Training Agency (Hullyŏn Togam) and composed of a variety of foreigners, including

\textsuperscript{94} Hwangjoin sajŏk, fr. 60.
surrendered Japanese and “Southern Barbarians” (Dutch) and under the control of a Liaodongese and a Netherlander. The division was composed of such foreign soldiers as were seen to have useful skills, not one group of foreign soldiers in particular.95

This division seems to have been reformed by the reign of Hyŏnjong in 1673 as the Chinese Dog Fang Troop (Hanin abyŏng), still under the control of the Military Training Agency.96 The precise function or origin of these troops is somewhat unclear. A semi-canonical description of this community found in the early nineteenth century Record of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Dynasty (Hwangjo yumin rok) by Wang Tŏkku presents the community as coming into existence with the return of Hyojong in 1645 accompanied by the nine righteous literati, namely Wang Feng’gang, Feng Sanshi, Huang Gong, Wang Meicheng, Yang Fuzhi, Wang Wenxiang, Pei Sansheng, Zheng Xianjia and Liu Xishan. For instance, in the biography of Wang Feng’gang (supposedly renamed Imun 以文 or Sangmun 尚文 by Hyojong), Wang describes how the king to be, upon arrival in Hansŏng (or perhaps upon enthronement):

Ordered the building of accommodations south of his childhood home at the

---

95 See section 3.3.
96 Wang Tŏkku, Hwangjo yumin rok National Library # ko 25669, dates the institutionalization of the Ming migrants under the Military Training Agency to 1673, by which I assume he means the formation of the Chinese Dog’s Claw Troops.
Choyang Pavillion – he then gave them substantial provisions of clothes and grains, with the intention of later raising a righteous army. ... the king said (to Wang Feng’gang): “When we were in Mukden we shared our troubles, why should we not enjoy rest and pleasure together as well?” [Wang Feng’gang] replied: “How dare a minister pursue pleasure and forget to revenge his dynasty?”

In 1790 a somewhat more matter-of-fact history of the organization was provided by Chǒngjo as he prepared to engage in the sacrificial ceremonies on behalf of the Ming in the Taebodan. Also describing the Ming migrants in question as having accompanied the Hyojong court to Chosŏn, and as having been ordered to establish themselves at the foot of Ŭ-ui Palace, he describes them as having been organized as Dog Fang Troop under the command of the Military Training Agency, and as having supported themselves through fishing; in fact, Chǒngjo informs us, by the late eighteenth century they wandered about without financial support and were so utterly mistreated as to be cast in martial arts folk-plays in the role of Japanese soldier. Both

97 Wang Tŏkku, Hwangjo yumin rok, fr. 4.
98 Chǒngjo Sillok 29:49a, Chǒngjo 14 (1790).03.19 (kihae), CSW 46:108: “御丹楓亭，召見皇朝人子孫，改漢人牙兵為漢旅，敎曰：‘漢人之陪歸東土者，孝廟朝命使之寄接於宮底，及登寶位，屬之內需司，計口給糧。旋又編管訓局牙兵色，漁業資生，此漢人牙兵設置之顚末也。在其時則流寓屬耳，聊活無策，加之以滄桑初改，秘諱又甚，不惟渠輩得此爲足，人之待之，亦不敢慢忽。以至近日設施已久，而風習不如古，渠所自甘，人之侮之，可謂無餘地。甚至閱武敎場，或作假倭哨。渠輩以中朝薦紳士夫之遺裔，
pieces of information, of course, suggest that, throughout much of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, the Ming migrants were treated by the court and populace as submitting foreigners – indeed, during the reign of Yŏngjo, even as the court worked generally to distinguish submitting foreigners and Chinese descendents, it made no apologies for the provision of nets to the Chinese of Seoul to maintain themselves, treating this as a perfectly legitimate example of the bestowal of grace upon the refugee community. Chŏngjo proposed to rectify the situation by renaming their unit the Chinese Brigade (Hallyŏ 漢旅), removing from them the association of Ivory Troop; this was presumably because of Dog Fang Troop more general association with units of slaves and sŏol, or perhaps because of their subservient role as aids to high officers. Furthermore, to establish clearly that the Ming migrants would be worthy of respect, he granted a number of this newly named military division particular guard positions in the Taebodan ritual.99

Not surprising for the author of a substantially hagiographic work, Wang Tōkku alludes to, but does not directly describe, the formation of the Han Dog Fang Troop, concentrating mainly on a supposed close connection between the nine loyal Ming officials in question and the future monarch Hyojong. Chŏngjo describes considerably more in the way of detail, about the institutional development of the organization (much of it confirmed by Wang Tōkku, also, if indirectly) and confirms the institutional connection to Hyojong. Where Wang Tōkku is at pains to emphasise the romantic and personal aspects, Chŏngjo’s edict is more concerned to contrast the deplorable state of affairs that existed before his reign, in contrast to the establishment of proper moral position of Ming migrants after his reign.

It is really with the reign of Yŏngjo that the presence of the descendents of the nine righteous officials in the Ŭiđong area, and the interest of the state in their presence, is confirmed. In 1741, Yŏngjo expressed particular concern about the taxation of Ming remnant subjects (hwangjo yumin) in Ŭiđong in the capital, and directly described their link with Hyojong in 1749 when he visited the community of Ŭiđong, and said that the “Concerning the descendents of the Chinese (Tangin 唐人) who came...”
East, Hyojong settled them in the village outside of Ōui Palace.”

Again, in 1751, Yongjo and his court took particular interest in the presence of the Chinese Dog Fang Troop within Ōuidong, taking especial notice of the five Ming migrant descendants with formal duties about the palace, listing in this regard five people who were in fact descendents of the nine righteous officials generally listed in the canonical sources, including P’ung Myŏngbok, the descendent of Feng Sanshi, Yang Sŏng-gŏn, the descendent of Yang Fuji, Wang Suhan, the descendent of Wang Wenxiang, Yang Sehŭng, the descendent, another descendent of Yang Fuji, and additionally Pae Ikhwi, the descendent of Pei Yi-sheng. Upon establishing the names and antecedents of the most active members of the Chinese Dog Fang Troop, Yongjo then asked about the numbers within and without the Ōuidong neighbourhood, learning as a result of the presence of more than forty Ming migrant households within the neighbourhood, more than fifty outside, and an overall increase in the population of Ming descendents in Ōuidong from

---

100 Kukcho pogam pyŏlp’yŏn 7:17b, page 264 of Yŏgang ch’ulp’ansa edition.

101 Săngiŏngwon ilgi 1075, Yŏngjo 27(1751).10.08 (sinch’uk): “上曰，作頭者姓名為何姓? 本何處? 今年幾何? 其始來東國者，其名云何? 問之。泰耆問而達曰，問于作頭者，則以為姓則馮，名則命福，本則山東，年則三十六，曾祖三仕，始為出來云矣。上曰，問于居第二者。泰耆問而達曰，問于居第二者，則以為姓名楊成建，姓本西蜀，年則五十六，曾祖福吉，始為出來云矣。上曰，問于居第三者。泰耆問而達曰，問于居第三者，則以為姓名王壽漢，本則山東，今年三十九，曾祖文祥，始為出來云矣。上曰，問于居第四者。泰耆問而達曰，問于居第四者，則以為姓名楊世興，本則西蜀，年則五十六，祖福吉，始為出來云矣。上曰，問于居第五者。泰耆問而達曰，問于居第五者，則以為姓名裵益徽，本則大同堡，年則四十三，曾祖翼聖，始為出來云矣。”
a population of slightly more than a twenty to one exceeding 150— in the end, not a
very substantial number, even though households outside of the Ōūidong
neighbourhood were not, seemingly, being included.102

1751, of course, was the beginning of the general effort on the part of the
Yŏngjo court to clarify the precise identity of the lineages that made up submitting
foreigner communities, and especially to distinguish Jurchen and Japanese lineages
from Chinese ones. A similar process may be observed also within the Ōūidong
community and the Chinese Dog Fang Troop who, during the reign of Yŏngjo, were
increasingly restricted to the agnatic descendants of Ming migrants; efforts were made
to purge the community of those who did not meet this definition. Thus, in 1754 a high
official Kim Sŏngŭng made reference to one man, An Och’ang, who, though enrolled in
the Chinese Dog Fang Troop was in fact originally Korean. The story was that his great-
grandfather An Kich’u, having entered Ming China as a castaway in his early youth, had

102 Sŏnggŏnwŏn ilgi 1075, Yŏngjo 27 (1751).10.08 (sinch’uk): “上曰, 宮之南墻外, 居生者幾戶耶? 問
之. 泰耆曰, 今為四十餘戶云矣. 上曰, 洞口外移居者幾戶耶? 問之. 泰耆曰, 將至五十餘戶云矣. 上曰, 本宮洞內, 皆給復戸, 至今無坊役乎? 問之. 泰耆曰, 本洞爲宮內修掃, 無坊役云矣. 上曰, 以漢人牙兵
之故, 給復戸乎? 爲本宮修掃而給復戸乎? 問之. 泰耆曰, 本以宮內修掃之故, 本洞無坊役, 而又以渠
輩之故, 經有給復之命云矣. 上曰, 既給復戸, 則汝輩, 何為移居他處乎? 問之. 泰耆曰, 地狹人多, 自
然移居他洞云矣. 上曰, 移居他洞者, 亦無坊役乎? 問之. 泰耆曰, 雖或有小小坊役, 而豈謂之身役乎
云矣? 權一衡曰, 於義洞, 本來生利甚薄, 自不無遷移之事矣. 上曰, 承旨之家, 何在? 一衡曰, 小臣生
長於蓮池洞, 距此不遠之地, 故略知物情矣. 上曰, 皇明人出來時, 爲幾人耶? 問之. 泰耆曰, 出來時,
只爲二十餘人, 而今則幾至一百五十餘人云矣. 上曰, 有民弊乎? 問之. 泰耆曰, 命福輩, 以爲自其曾
祖, 世受國恩, 厚篤厚料, 安過平生, 國恩罔極, 峙有弊之可達者云矣?”
grown up there. Upon adulthood he had requested to be returned to Korea, and the Ming emperor answered in the affirmative. Kim argued that, as a consequence, not being really Chinese, An Och’ang should not be enrolled in the Chinese Dog Fang Troop. In response, Yǒngjo argued that, indeed, An should be freed from all duties associated with the Chinese Dog Fang Troop, but, as a former subject of the Ming, also be freed of the same tax or corvée duties as other Ming descendents.103 Despite the general clarifying of lineages that followed the 1750s, in 1771 the Yǒngjo court discovered the presence of a man of uncertain family background who was accused of fraudulently inserting himself into the Han Dog Fang Troop by claiming to be a descendent of one of the Chenam Wang family from Shandong – compounding the difficulty was the fact that the fraudulent Wang in question continued to deny knowing whether his true surname was Kim or Wang, as did the leader of the Chinese Dog Fang Troop who Yǒngjo called in for interrogation. Yǒngjo asked in exasperation how someone could be “a Chosŏn subject, and also be a Ming subject,” but it does not seem that a clear answer was forthcoming.104

103 Yǒngjo Sillok 81, Yǒngjo 30 (1754).06.12 (kyŏngsin), CSW 43:530: “上問向化人安五昌事於金聖應，聖應曰：‘五昌曾祖起秋，本以延日人，幼時唐船泊於所居江邊，登船遊玩之際，仍為載去矣。及其長成，請還本國，則天朝嘉其誠意，因令送還。故依漢人例，入薦漢牙兵，而本非漢人子孫，則屬置漢牙兵，似無意義矣。’ 上曰：‘其祖既長於皇朝，則雖拔於漢牙兵，一依漢人例除役。’”

104 Sŏngjongwŏn ilgi 1316, Yǒngjo 47 (1771).04.03 (kyeyu).
Nor was the association of the Ming descendents with the Han Dog Fang Troop and the military weakened during the remainder of Yŏngjo’s reign or in Chŏngjo’s reign. On the contrary, such mobilization via the military continued well into Chŏngjo’s reign. Under Yŏngjo a number of special exams were offered during which the descendents of Ming migrants resident in Ŭidong were repeatedly given opportunities to test their military ability, sometimes in company with the descendents of Chosŏn ministers particularly rewarded for their loyalty. These special military examinations, each recorded in the *Sources for the Acts of Imperial Subjects*, are generally described as having been preformed within sight of the monarch, and reference is often made to the granting of employment or material awards.\(^{105}\) During the reign of Chŏngjo, even as Ming migrants gained an increasingly ritual role, their involvement in the military branch of the civil service continued to be important.\(^{106}\)

Although a precise history of the Chinese Dog Fang Troop will not be attempted here, the institution is important for this study on account of its role in establishing the pattern of government policy on Ming migrants in later years. If during Yŏngjo’s reign strict distinction between Ming migrants and other submitting foreigners

---

\(^{105}\) For instance, the entry for Yŏngjo 25 (1749).03 states that Yŏngjo called to attendance the descendents of imperial subjects, and had them practice archery in the Sŏch’ong Pavillion. The two winners guard the Taebodan. *Hwangjoin sajŏk* fr. 1.

\(^{106}\) See 4.5 below.
was mandated, in practice, it would seem, this distinction was not clearly enforced outside of the capital. The 1754 event in which several Ming migrants expressed outrage at the fact that their ancestors were recorded in the *Compilation of Submitting Foreigners*, and indeed, the general policy of the Yŏngjo reign, was to distinguish Ming migrants from other submitting foreigners. However, during Chŏngjo’s reign the fact that such change had not occurred generally was remarked upon, and it was ordered that all villages outside of the capital formally referred to in regional documents and gazetteers as submitting foreigner villages (hyanghwainch’on) be transformed to imperial subject villages (hwangjoinch’on). Even allowing for considerable exaggeration on Chŏngjo’s part as to the extent of his institutional innovation in this respect, we can draw from this comment that the reorganization of Ming migrant communities which had already begun under Yŏngjo still had not fully spread to the countryside, even as Chŏngjo attempted to further reorganize the Ming migrant Dog Fang Troop into a more dignified and ritually acceptable Han Brigade.

This militarized function for Ming migrants in the capital may not have brought them into the elite, but it was represented, at least, as raising their status above what it had been formerly. Yŏngjo, as he reorganized submitting foreigner status, clearly saw

---

107 *Chŏngjo Sillok* 49, Chŏngjo 22 (1798).09.01 (sinyu), CSW 47:108.
his reorganization and renaming as righting a serious error in moral definition that he had inherited from earlier reigns. It is inconceivable that he would have agreed with Chŏngjo in treating the term Chinese Dog Fang Troop as unbefitting the dignity of the Ming migrant descendents in question. Yet Chŏngjo did consider the term in this way, to the extent that he had the name changed, even while claiming that the poor name had coexisted with general poor treatment of the Ming descendents in previous reigns.

The control and administration of submitting foreigners of Ming Chinese origin may seem unrelated to the rectification of names described in the previous section. However, for those Ming migrant lineages who lived in the capital, at least, it was the Ming migrant military community in Yŏui-dong was the first community to come to the attention of the monarch, and the model for policy on more distant Ming migrant communities. The Ming migrant military families in the capital, moreover, provide a bridge between the early seventeenth century employment of Ming deserters as soldiers and the eighteenth century ritual role of Ming migrants, to be discussed in the next section, which was often effected through the military units to which Ming migrants belonged. Of course, participation in the military had a direct effect on the lives of Ming migrant descendents, with some, in fact, entering into the military bureaucracy. For instance, Tian Haoqian’s descendent Chŏn Tŭgu gaining a position in the Military
Affairs Commision, Kang Shijue’s descendents, for instance, gaining hereditary positions as sixth-rank military officers under Chǒngjo (they had held the position previously, but not as a hereditary rank). While they do not seem to have been equal to the established military lineages, they were not on the level of Pak Maltong (Horseshit Park) of presumably servile origin who gained a military degree, but who is highly unlikely to have been granted official responsibilities. What is clear is that, with Kang’s descendents, Yi Hùijiang and the members of the Han Dog Fang Troop, in the eighteenth century Ming Chinese origins and supposed hostility to the Qing were given institutional shape through their enrolment in military units, as a result of which a presumably less clearly defined reality was whittled into a shape easily managed by the Chosŏn state.

4.5) Ming Loyalist Ritualism and Ming Migrants

The association of anti-Qing tendencies with Ming Chinese descendents in the

108 Yongjo Sillok 118, Yongjo 48.03.17 (imja), CSW 44:416: “上御隆武堂試射，皇朝人子孫賞賜有差，田得雨特加一資，付中樞。”

109 Chǒngjo Sillok 11, Chǒngjo 05 (1781).05a.12 (gabin), CSW 45:241: “敎曰：‘康世爵子孫，旣付司果。先朝有姜孝元子枝世付五營將官，或將校之受教，而今則長孫姜世重，旣經正職，依康氏子孫例，永付司果，此後各營門錄用。’”

Chosŏn military points to another key trend in the development of the Ming migrant community – the court-sponsored participation of Ming migrants in rituals. This is, for the most part, the aspect of Ming migrant communities that has attracted scholarly literature to date. Thus, Liu has argued for a connection between the traditional “longing for China” among Chosŏn elites and the good treatment of Ming migrants in Chosŏn.\textsuperscript{111} Mason has spoken positively of the Ming migrant willingness to engage in ritual, in contrast to the wicked modern “leftist” tendency among late eighties and early nineties students and “professional radicals” to deny the contribution of American soldiers during the Korean War.\textsuperscript{112} Commonly, their participation in the shrine at Chojongam (Chojong Rock face 朝宗巖) in Kap’yŏng is treated as the defining aspect of the Ming migrant communities.\textsuperscript{113}

The ritual connection is important, but not in the manner described by Liu and Mason. Consider, for instance, the connection with Chojongam. The connection between Chojongam and Ming migrants began when Wang Tŏk-il and Wang Tŏk-ku,  

\textsuperscript{113} See Son Weiguo, “Chaoxian wangzhao zunzhou siming wenzhi yanjiu” (Ph.D. Diss., Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, 2001), 215-259, introduces Ming migrants with his discussion of the Chojongam. In this he follows the narrative established by P’ung Yŏngsŏp’s \textit{Taemyŏng yumin sa} (Seoul: Myŏngŭihoe, 1989).
both formally Taebodan guards, and from the Chenam lineage Ōūidong Han Dog Fang Troop, came to the Chojongam in Kap’yŏng in Kyŏng’gi province, establishing a small shrine of their own nearby. The shrine itself began in the seventeenth century, when a self-rusticated scholar Hŏ Kyŏk, carved Confucian phrases on the rock, for which action he was later rewarded by Yŏngjo. Such public praise gave the shrine in question some public status, as did the presence of discussion of the shrine in the court-sponsored Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou (Chonju hwip’yŏn), although nothing approaching the status of the court-sponsored Taebodan or the Noron-sponsored Mandongmyo.

However, the beginning of the ritual role of Ming lineages began not with Wang Tŏkkŭ and Wang Tŏk-il’s autonomous establishment of a shrine in the Chonjongam, but through their court-sponsored participation in the Taebodan and Mandongmyo; the establishment of independent shrines to the Ming began after such activity had been deliberately encouraged by the court. Chojongam, for instance, is not mentioned in any


115 Yŏngjo Sillok 40:22b, Yŏngjo 11 (1735).03.27 (chongyu), CSW 42:475.

116 Chonju hwip’ŏn II:148-152.

eighteenth century or early nineteenth century biographies of Ming migrants, nor are Ming migrants mentioned in the description of the Chojongam found in the *Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou*, with the first reference of Ming migrants in relation to the Chojongam appearing in the late nineteenth century in the works of Kim P’yŏngmuk, also being quoted in the *Chojongam Gazetteer (Chojongamji)*. The migrants of the Imjin War are recorded as participating and supporting rituals to Guan-yu (Kor. Kwanu), with the first temples to Kwanu, including those in Andong, Sŏngju and Namsan south of the capital, while the most prominent remaining temple to Kwanu, the Tongmyo near the East Gate, was actually established at the orders of the Ming emperor. These temples, which by the late seventeenth century had become clearly integrated into popular Korean religion, seem to have maintained their association with some Ming migrant descendents at least – in the genealogy of Ming migrant descent groups preserved by P’ung Yŏngsŏp, a sheet including reference to rituals to Guan-yu was also preserved.

It is anachronistic, in other words, to explore Ming migrant lineages in Chosŏn

---

118 Chojongamji, especially Kim P’yŏngmuk’s “Kuŭisajŏn,” fr. 32-46.
119 Guan-yu worship in Korea is discussed by Sim Sŭng’gu, “Chosŏn hugi mumyo ŭi ch’ang’gŏn kwa hyangsa ŭi chŏngch’iŏk ŭi – kwangwangyo rŭ chungsimsim ŭro” in Chosŏn sidae chŏngch’i was chedo (Seoul: Chimmundang, 2003).
120 A passage referring to the Chinese hat of Guan-yu within the Kwanwangmyo (presumably the Tongmyo) in Seoul was inserted seemingly between frames 10 and 11 of the Hwangjo yumin segye wŏlyu ko, National Library ko # 2-1817.
beginning with the Chojongam and Ming Loyalist ritual participation, or even to assume that such ritual interest was in any way original to the Ming migrant lineages. In fact, the ritualized image of Ming migrants participating in rites to the Ming emperor developed in the eighteenth century. With the reign of Yŏngjo the Chosŏn court increasingly connected the participation of Ming migrants in Ming Loyalist ritual, a process formalized under Chŏngjo.

Under Yŏngjo, this participation, for the most part, took the form of Yŏngjo having Ming migrants assemble before him during ritually significant occasions – at times, this assembly would also involve a distribution of provisions to these descendents, presumably in nearly all cases migrants from the area of Ŭidong. Ho Tup’il, a descendents of Hu Keji, sought out a position in the Mandongmyo early in the reign of Yŏngjo, well before the extensive concern to redefine the status of Ming migrants on the part of the court, and even before the move to distinguish Chinese lineages from other submitting foreigner lineages. 121 Ritual participation continued to grow

throughout his reign. For instance, in 1771 Yǒngjo, leaving after a lengthy prostration before the altar, called the Ming descendents for review. He similarly formally entered into the Ōuidong neighbourhood on numerous occasions, at times making reference to their connection to Hyojong, at other times making reference to their shared loyalty to the Ming. Such royal visitations continued to occur under Chǒngjo also, with one notable event resulting in the widespread hiring of Ming migrants into the military bureaucracy.

As the case from Chǒngjo’s reign reminds us, this ritual identity was not separate from their military identity; on the contrary, their military identity was reinforced by their ritual identity with their status as Ming loyalists providing them with positions, or promotions, in the military hierarchy. While the two were not identical

"先朝以田會一事, 有大國尚書之孫, 豈不可為衛將之教. 此教蓋爲皇朝也. 今此胡斗弼, 本以皇朝人子孫, 流落我國, 其族屬散在西北云. 使所居官顧恤, 文武間有一技者, 令銓曹調用, 斗弼則付料於相當職.”


123 Hwangjoin sajŏk, fr. 5.

124 Chǒngjo Sillok 25:4a, Chǒngjo 12 (1788).01.12 (ālhae), CSW 45:683: “敟曰: 帝明太祖高皇帝, 以戊申正月乙亥, 建有天下之號, 郊天子位, 改元洪武, 年甲重回, 日干又符, 豈可虛度是日?”遂於春塘臺齋宿, 行禮于大報壇. 召見皇朝人子孫, 各問姓名、世派, 命庠生王尚文五世孫願忠、按察使王楫六世孫道成、侍郞鄭文謙五世孫昌仁、庠生馮三仕六世孫慶文, 令軍門將官調用. 尚書田應揚七世孫世豐, 康世爵五世孫尙堯, 時在鄕里, 待上京, 令兵曹啓稟收用. 有命提督李如松後孫光遇除守令. 錢塘太守黃功曾孫世中, 為五衛將. 二王氏及鄭、馮、黃三姓, 孝宗在瀋陽時, 隨蹕東來者也. 田、康二姓, 崇禎丙子前流寓人也.”
with each other, and while it is primarily the ritual aspect, shorn of its military implications, that is remembered today, the special military examinations offered to Ming migrants generally involved particular reference to Ming ritual, while, well after the ritual role of Ming migrants was fully established at court, Ming migrants continued to participate substantially in the military bureaucracy. Chŏngjo may have transformed the Chinese Dog Fang Troop into the Chinese Brigade because the latter was considered more befitting the ritual dignity of the descendents of Ming soldiers, but, ultimately the Chinese Brigade was also a military position, lower, in status, to positions in the central civil bureaucracy.

The court, of course, in searching out descendents of Ming migrants on account of their connection with the increasingly revered Ming, was acting to burnish its own legitimacy, and using the presence of Ming migrants for that purpose. The connection of the community in Ŭūidong with Hyojong cannot but have been welcome to both Yŏngjo and Chŏngjo, his descendents. The Chosŏn orientation of these Ming migrant rituals can be seen in the institution of rituals to Lin Yin-guan and the Fujianese sailors who became such a subject of controversy during the reign of Hyŏnjong. Under Chŏngjo, they were honoured both in the Taebodan and in Ŭiju, the point at which they were

125 For instance, Hwangjoin sajŏk, fr. 7.
finally sent away from Chosŏn to the Qing. Fascinatingly, though contemporary records suggest that they mostly desired to be sent on to Nagasaki or alternately be allowed to return to Fujian, Chŏngjo describes them as specifically desiring to remain in Chosŏn:

“When they arrived they said that they had nowhere to which they could return. As upholders of the Zhou tradition, we should have accepted them and allowed them to stay with us.” Chŏngjo’s statement suggests an attempt to push the beginning of the transformation of the Ming from a political to a ritual agency to 1667, imagining that Chosŏn had become the one safe return for upholders of the Ming tradition well before the collapse of the Zheng family.

At the same time, Ming migrants themselves emphasised their desire to participate in Ming Loyalist ritual. This was expressed in the petitioning by self-professed members of Ming lineages to be allowed to engage in ritual participation. The Sources for the Acts of Imperial Subjects refers to the possession by the Nongsŏ Yi of Kanghwa Island of a portrait of Li Rusong, and their solicititude in honouring that

126 Chŏngjo Sillok 49:9b, Chongo 22 (1798).07.23 (ûryu), CSW 47:98.

127 For instance, consider the case of the Ch’o family of Myŏngch’ŏng. Chŏn’gaeksa ilgi 9, Chŏngjo 21 (1797).02.02, KSTR 100: “且伏聞皇壇望拜敎是時，中朝人後孫之居在國中者，許令入參是白乎矣。臣等段，不但先祖來歷未顯，千歲臣等之家世孤寒，居地僻遠之故，姓名未入於收錄之中，適入京師，獨漏於參拜之列，瞻望天門，徘徊道路，屢經寒暑於旅邸，抱冤耿結，撫念身老，未免無所歸之窮人，不勝感痛，寧欲無生，茲敢泣訴於天地父母之前爲白乎”
portrait.\textsuperscript{128} It also records Shi Wenyung as having raised a shrine to the Ming in Sŏngju; as no records of this shrine are found before the reign of Chŏngjo, it seems likely that this shrine in fact originates in the eighteenth century, with the descendents of Shi and Xu in Sŏngju.\textsuperscript{129} Furthermore, participation in rituals in the Taebodan evidently became a matter of considerable pride and was and is regularly referred to in genealogies of these descent groups.\textsuperscript{130}

Ming Loyalist ritual participation, although evidently much desired by many migrants, required the conscious transformation on the part of both Ming migrants and the state. Thus, in 1800, near the end of his reign, Chŏngjo oversaw the successful passing of the military examination by Yi Hŭijang of the Kŏje branch of the Nongsŏ Yi lineage.\textsuperscript{131} To celebrate this revival of a long abandoned lineage, Chŏngjo ordered that the “relevant officer” cause Yi Hŭijang to prostrate himself both in the war memorial to the fallen Ming soldiers, the Sŏnmusa, and in the shrine of Yi Rusong. This, Chŏngjo argued, would be following the pattern of Zhong Yi, a prisoner-of-war of the Spring and Autumn period whose filial piety was reaffirmed through providing a performance of

\textsuperscript{128} Hwangjoin sajŏk, fr. 93.
\textsuperscript{129} Hwangjoin sajŏk, fr. 105.
\textsuperscript{130} For instance, see the early twentieth century the P’ungch’ŏn-rok of the Chŏlgang Shi family, National Library # ko 364844-9, and the Hwangjo yumin segye wŏllyu ko, National Library # ko 2-1817 of the descendents of the nine righteous families who accompanied Hyojong.
\textsuperscript{131} See section 4.4.
the music and dance of his native land. Yi Hŭijang acted as requested, and Chŏngjo’s order, to this extent, was followed. However, Chŏngjo’s was not pleased, for Yi, when presenting himself before the ancestral shrine, failed to remove his household tally bearing the Qing era name. As Chŏngjo said:

That Hŭijang should bring such a tally into the shrine! He is really such an ignorant person. I do not know whether there was sweat on Yi Hŭijang’s brow, but how could the commander, whose spirit flows like water, be pleased seeing his descendent! Make one household tally and engrave the Ming era name on it, and give it to Yi Hyosŭng; make sure that the petty officials in the Sŏnmsa bring him over once more today to more engage in sacrifice, and also make him take part in the ceremony in the family shrine right away. In the future let us make sure that people of his sort have household tallies as I have specified.

For Chŏngjo, the household tally, containing as it did the Qing era name, violated the supposed Ming Loyalism of the rituals and indeed of the Ming migrant lineages themselves. However, this was not obvious to such ignorant fellows as Yi Hŭijang. As this example suggests, even in 1800, long after the establishment of the Taebodan, and long after the ritual innovations of Yŏngjo and Chŏngjo, the descendents

---

132 Chŏngjo Sillok 54, Chŏngjo 24 (1800), 04, 08 (kyŏngin), CSW 47:255.
133 Chŏngjo, Kugyŏk Hongjae chŏnsŏ 36:34 a-b, “Kyo” 7.
of Ming migrants, no doubt as proud of their ancestors as any Korean lineage, could
nevertheless be ignorant as to the precise ritual language to be employed. Yi Húijáng’s
home country was not Liaodong but Kóje Island; the music too which Yi was supposed
to accustom himself was not the music of his home country but that of an imaginary
Ming being recreated by the Chosón courts and elites. Ming migrants were not loyalists
abandoned in the countryside, to be rediscovered under Yǒngjo and Chŏngjo, but people
with migrant lineages, the symbolic value of whose ancestors could be manipulated
both by the Chosón court and by the migrant families themselves for different if
intersecting reasons

4.6) Conclusion

The transformation of some submitting foreigner lineages into imperial subject
lineages is an overlooked, but significant, aspect of Late Chosón social history.
Submitting foreigner status had originally been aimed at the settlement of outsiders.
However, to a surprising extent, became entrenched as a hereditary status during the
seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, to be enjoyed – or endured – by the descendents
of Ming Chinese, Jurchen or Japanese migrants long after the original reasons for the
granting of that status had disappeared. Attempts were made during the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries to reform what was by then an anachronistic status, but change happened slowly and against considerable opposition.

True change in submitting foreigner status only began in the eighteenth century with the rise of Ming Loyalist ritualism. Of course, already during the seventeenth century, the Chosŏn court had pursued covert policies favourable to the Ming, but these pro-Ming policies did not result in high status for the descendents of Ming migrants. Following the establishment of a shrine to the Ming in 1704, however, Ming migrants were increasingly treated as symbols of the Chosŏn court’s self-image as loyal supporter of the Ming and heir to the Ming legacy. The terminology used to describe Ming migrants changed, such that it was no longer acceptable to refer to them, along with Jurchen and Japanese lineages, as submitting foreigners; henceforward they were to be distinguished through the term “imperial subject.” At the same time, the Ming military troop in Seoul had its name changed from Chinese Dog Fang Troop to Chinese Brigade, and, increasingly, members of this brigade were encouraged to participate in Ming Loyalist rituals. This ritual participation represented a significant improvement in status for Ming migrant lineages, such that Ming migrants themselves began to pursue Ming loyalist rituals autonomously, without the direct support of the court.
This transformation of Ming migrant lineages is highly informative of both Late Chosŏn Ming Loyalism and Late Chosŏn social change. Sinocentric though Late Chosŏn elites may have been, this Sino-centrism was not directed towards Chinese people in general but towards the official operations of the Ming Dynasty (especially following its demise) and to the imaginary China of the Confucian classics. Well into the eighteenth century, as a result, Ming Chinese lineages were no better placed socially than Jurchen or Japanese lineages or any other group without a clear social status. The eighteenth century discovery of imperial subjects hidden among the submitting foreigners was, in its turn, a reflection of the ideological needs of the Chosŏn monarchy. Ming Loyalism, far from being Sino-Centric, was focussed upon established Chosŏn elites and the preservation of elite privilege; imperial subject status was, for Ming migrant lineages, a fortunate side-effect of these ideological developments within the Chosŏn court.
Chapter 5

Seditious Ming Loyalists

5.1) Introduction

Very little about the early experiences of Ming migrants conformed to the ritualized ideal established during the eighteenth century. They came to Chosŏn in impossibly large numbers, engaged in activities un-conducive to the social order, and exasperated already tense diplomatic relationships with other countries. Their particular areas of employment – geomancy, military, medicine and interpreting – fixed them as prominent non-elites, while, with a few exceptions, their entrance into Chosŏn society was as deserters and refugees, and involved passing outside of the view of elite society and the formal state. When they did pass back into the purview of the state, it was sometimes in cooperation with the state, but more often it involved association with non-elites and sometimes openly seditious activity.

During the eighteenth century, in consort with the ritualization of Ming migrants, numerous official biographies of Ming migrants were written in which Ming migrants were described as motivated primarily by loyalty to the Ming and opposition to the Qing. Within these biographies, certainty that Chosŏn was the proper heir of the
Ming, culturally and politically, motivated them to establish themselves in Chosŏn. This tradition, in particular, has been explored by such scholars as Liu Chunlan,1 David Mason2 and Sun Weiguo,3 all tending, to a greater or lesser extent, to treat the development of Ming migrant biographies primarily from the perspective of the development of Late Chosŏn Confucian Loyalism, encompassing the full range of the Ming migrant experience within a narrative which developed only during the eighteenth century.

However, just as Ming migrants were only slowly removed from the category transforming foreigner and placed in the category Chinese or Imperial Subject, so the tradition of Ming migrant biographies was not originally safely part of an elite tradition. Images of Ming migrants appear in stories contained within treason investigations during the reign of Sukchong (r. 1674-1720), in which we are shown Ming migrants who are described as having fled the Qing for Chosŏn, but whose stories also contain implicit attacks on the state. Indeed, outside of the court sponsored ritual tradition of Ming migrants, there were also Ming migrants who were associated with the illegal

---

3 Son Weiguo, “Chaoxian wangzhao zunzhou siming wenzhi zhi yanjiu” (Ph.D. Diss., Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, 2001), 215-259.
messianic tradition of the Record of Chŏng Kam (Chŏng’gannok). The three narratives to be discussed came to light, respectively, in 1687, 1691, and 1711, and are intertwined in what was considered by the state to be serious acts of sedition, and often were made more dangerous by the assumed association with rival factions. The first involved a man - styling himself Yu Yŏn-li - who was arrested after being caught wandering around the countryside, claiming to be a Ming loyalist fugitive, and collecting alms from the local peasantry. The second, in 1695-7, was much more serious, involving as it did a full anti-dynastic conspiracy, and a plan to establish a new dynasty in Chosŏn under a member of the Chŏng family and a new dynasty in China under the Ch’oe family. The supposed leader of this movement was a monk, much skilled in geomancy, who claimed to be a Ming loyalist fugitive of distinguished lineage. The third was also treated extremely seriously and involved an anti-Qing pamphlet hung in front of the Yŏnŭn Gate in the capital, and purportedly was written by a Ming migrant – despite vigorous attempts to find the culprit, a solution was not forthcoming. In the process of the investigation, however, the false leads – in one of which a criminal awaiting execution attempted to save his own life by providing false testimony concerning a band of stateless bandits in the Yalu River region - provides interesting popular interpretations of the figure of Ming migrants.
While the official, court-sponsored tradition of Ming migrant biographies is also very important, it is vital to first discuss such non-elite, subversive narratives of the reign of Sukchong before considering the late eighteenth century development of a canonical tradition of the sub-genre of Ming migrant biographies. Partly this is because records of this subversive tradition precedes, in some respects, that of the canonical tradition, just as the Ming migrants were submitting foreigners before they were reclassified as Imperial Loyalists. However, even if scholars of the canonical tradition rarely make reference to this subversive tradition of Ming migrant biographies, it was not replaced by the canonical one in the eighteenth century, but, as preserved within geomantic texts, has survived to the present day. Moreover, there are numerous points of similarity between the two traditions, as the subversive tradition also includes considerable reference to the tropes of Ming Loyalism, even while often interpreting those tropes in a manner as to undermine the legitimacy of the Chosŏn monarchy: thus the seditious texts refer to Chosŏn’s gratitude to the Wanli emperor for Ming intervention in the Imjin War, Chosŏn’s failure to repay the grace of the Ming, Chosŏn’s dependence on Zhu Xi’s ethical and philosophical ideas, and other features of official

---

4 The important role of Zhu Xi’s variety of Neo-Confucianism within Chosŏn Dynasty elite society has been much discussed. For this subject consult the various articles published in Wm. Theore d Bary and JaHyun Kim Haboush, ed., The Rise of Neo-Confucianism in Korea (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985).
Ming Loyalism. These subversive narratives, moreover, reveal a great deal about Chosŏn society even as they inform us of Ming migrant lineages within Chosŏn society, suggesting that the tropes of Ming Loyalism may not have begun within court-sponsored ritual, but rather among prominent non-elites, geomancers outside of the ranks of the yangban.

5.2) The Pseudo-Fujianese Incident of 1687

In 1687 a man called Yu Yŏn-li5 traveled about Chi Island in Chŏlla Province using his status as Ming loyalist migrant to beg from the local people. Ultimately arrested, first by the Chŏnju magistrate, and then passed on to the Border Defence Commission, it took very little time before inconsistencies between his various stories were revealed, and doubts about his identity emerged. The hook by which Yu had begged of his victims had been his claim to be a Chinese castaway from an island near Fujian. Upon apprehension by Chosŏn officials, he maintained this claim, dramatically begging for help from the Chosŏn court, calling on Chosŏn to remember its debt of

---

5 In modern standard Chinese he would be Liu Lian-li (劉連里), although, as he was almost certainly a Korean who spoke no or very little Chinese, it is doubtful if he would have used any Chinese pronunciation.
gratitude to Fujian and Zhu Xi, and begging not to be sent back to the Qing. Surprisingly, for a time the Chosŏn court was almost as credulous as the peasants of Chi Island, entertaining Yu’s story for far longer than one would expect, only concluding that Yu was lying much later. Seemingly this fraudster, the peasants of Chi Island, and the Ming officials all shared, to a certain extent, the language of Ming Loyalism and hostility to Qing hegemony.

Twenty years before the discovery of Yu Yŏnli, a group of real Fujianese islanders and partisans of the Zheng clan, Lin Yin-guan and crew, had been shipwrecked in Cheju Island. As they brought with them documentary proof of the Ming Yongli Emperor’s reign date, their eventual return to the Qing caused considerable political controversy.6 This controversy took a popular turn in 1684 when a rumour spread of an impending invasion by the Zheng family. While this rumour was ultimately groundless, it resulted in a widespread panic among yangban within Seoul, and numerous yangban women, perhaps recalling stories of the destruction meted out in Seoul by the Manchu only half a century earlier fled from Seoul to the countryside. Even as yangban were panicking and leaving Seoul, maroon slaves were forming bands and attacking them. Yi Kŭngik’s account is as follows:

---

6 See section 3.5.
After the letter from Japan in the kapcha [1684] year, the panic steadily grew worse and servants carrying palanquins and luggage collected at the town gates, waiting to flee. Ruffians than gathered together and formed associations (kye), including “killing your master associations” (salchugye), riotous associations and knife associations. They climbed up onto Nam Mountain at night, blew trumpets and gathered together as soldiers, robbed the goods of those fleeing, or even killed people.7

The case of the pseudo-Fujianese occurred only twenty years after the original arrival of Lin In-guan in Cheju, and only five years after the panic at the fear of a Zheng family invasion. The Veritable Records (Chosŏn wangjo sillok) mentions this affair very briefly indeed, laconically informing us that, in the second day of the fifth month, a man from Chŏlla Province known as Yu had “falsely styled himself as a castaway from Fujian,” and had invented a language to deceive the people and to beg from them. In response the Chosŏn court had, in every short order, established the truth and brought Yu to justice.8 The image of order and justice suggested in the Veritable Records,

8 Sukchong Sillok 18:23a, Sukchong 13(1687).05.02 (kimyo), CSW 39:101: “湖南民詐稱漂到漢人福 建，劉連里，變幻言語，誑惑人民，行乞村閭，事聞。按治得實，遂置法。”
however, is not reflected in the other source for the story, the *Records of the Border Defence Command* (*Pibyŏnsa tŭngnok*), which reveals a lengthy, uncertain process, throughout the fifth month, coming to a less than final conclusion after a month had passed.

The first report concerning the matter in the *Records of the Border Defence Command* was on the third, after Yu had been brought to Seoul by the Border Defence Commission for closer inspection by “interpreters with a good knowledge of Chinese.” At this time they seem to have been still willing to give him the benefit of the doubt. To the interviewers he claimed that his name was from the Myogûmdo Yu family, that he entered Chosŏn with Gao Ziying, who he described as his relative, and landed in Ch'ŏland Island in Ch'olla Province. When asked why his name was not included in the list of living and dead in Gao Ziying’s ship (who was a real cast-away who arrived in 1681), he merely pointed towards his chest, suggesting, they thought, sickness.\(^9\)

Linguistically they seem to have had doubts. Despite the fact that they had a number of interpreters present who spoke Chinese well, they found him incomprehensible, with definite suggestion that he was, in fact, lying:

---

\(^9\) *Kugyŏk pibyŏnsa tŭngnok* 13:223, Sukchong 13(1687).05.03.
His language is hard to understand, and he mixes [his Chinese] speech with Korean, although we repeatedly tried to understand his comments, in the end we were unable to make his speech out. Therefore we will report only those words which we could understand.” His pronunciation itself seemed rather forced: “We asked him where he had lived and he said Fujian province – but he said this in Korean pronunciation [Pokkón.]. At times he would, weeping, point towards the southern sky and pronounce incomprehensible words.”

Yet they charitably suggested that he:

after being pushed off course arrived on the island and, after wandering about begging in the mountains, seems to have gained the ability to understand our language – but his own speech is unclear. His original language seems to have been an obscure dialect from Fujian, and because his language is different, even the more skilled of our interpreters cannot understand him. We suggest that he be moved to a quiet place to live in one room with two of our officials to observe his actions and listen to his speech and understand the contents of his story.”

Their doubts were only to grow. On the sixteenth, they continued the investigation by bringing Yu himself to be interviewed by a group of castaways who had beached on Cheju Island en route to Nagasaki. Because the cast-away sailors were

---

10 Kugyŏk pibyoungsa tŭngnok 13:223, Sukchung 13 (1687).05.03.
from a wide number of provinces in China, they were considered likely to know a sufficient number of dialects as to understand Yu, should he in fact be using a dialect from some region of Fujian. It was soon established that they did not understand each other. Indeed, Zhang Wenda, the leader of the group of Chinese traders, claimed that he was clearly not speaking a man of China, and most certainly out of his mind. The Chosŏn officials in charge concluded that he was not a man of China, especially when they observed the fear that overwhelmed him when he listened to the speakers of various Chinese dialects in the room.\(^{11}\) They also interrogated Pak Ip, a man from Chi Island with whom Yu claimed he had stayed. Pak Ip and Pak Ip’s father, they seem clearly to have believed him to be Chinese (in fact, they stated that several foreign castaways had stayed with them), but their own description of events seem only to have confirmed part of the story in so far as they did admit to giving shelter and support to several foreigners who had appeared on the island.

Extraordinarily, those investigating him seemed still uncertain as to his origins. Despite considerable evidence that he was not Chinese, the suggestion was made that he had actually sailed from Dengzhou in Shandong province with another castaway.

\(^{11}\) Kugyŏk pipyŏnsa tŭngnok 13: 235-236, Sukchong 13(1687.05.16.)
called Zhang Yunshou. Finally, concerns about the expense of the investigation, and the disruption that would be caused if the ever growing circle of witnesses were brought to the capital for interrogation, meant that matters were not brought to anything like a satisfactory conclusion.

Possibly mad, certainly dishonest, this obscure fraudster from an island of the coast understood, to a surprising extent, that attitudes of the Chosŏn court to Ming castaways, and the tenure of some of the debates concerning the Lin Yin-guan episode. Southern China had changed, of course, considerably, since 1667. Zhang Wenda, on his way to Nagasaki, made no claims to Ming Loyalism, and even seems to have been rather relieved when the Zheng family had been driven from power; the Chosŏn court, while certainly made up of people who made Ming Loyalist claims, were very nervous indeed about the possible survival of the Zheng family in Tsushima, asking Zhang Wenda about any surviving members of the Zheng family in particular.

12 Kugyŏk pibyŏnsa t'ŭngnok 13:241, Sukchong 13(1687). 05.27.
13 Kugyŏk pibyŏnsa t'ŭngnok 13:242-243, Sukchong 13(1687). 06.01.
14 The Border Defense Commission seems most uncertain on this point well into the sixth month: “As for his personality, on the surface he seems rather stupid, but does not seem to be without a fraudulent tendencies.” (且其為人，外而愚蠢，而不無因詐之態.) Kugyŏk Pibyŏnsa t'ŭngnok 13:243, Sukchong 13(1687).06.01.
15 They remark quite positively of the new state of affairs, whereby the putting down of the Wu Sangui and the Zheng family meant that they could engage in commerce without suffering the same restrictions as formerly. The investigators for the Border Defence Commission, by contrast, expressed much concern.
Compared to Lin Yin-guan and Zhang Wenda, Yu provided a performance almost perfectly compatible with Noron images of Ming loyalist castaways. A frequent worry on the part of the numerous petitioners who demanded the protection of Lin Yin-guan and crew was the certainty of their death upon entrance into Qing control. For instance, when Nam Yisŏng demanded, via the section chief of the Board of Taxation Yi Tanha, the protection of Lin Yin-guan’s crew, he described his reasons as follows: “I have heard that the Han castaways were transported to the Hongjewŏn, their weeping and crying was beyond description. A hundred guiltless people are being sent to their death. Although we are not killing them, their death is occurring through our actions. How utterly devastating!”

Yu, similarly, phrased his fear of being sent to Qing China on the basis of what he claimed was the near certainty of execution at Qing hands:

When he heard that he might stay in our country, he became extremely happy.

---

as to the continued activity of the Zheng family in Tsushima, questioning the castaways directly on that point. Kugyŏk pilyŏnsa tŭngnok 13:231, Sukchong 13 (1687). 05.15.

16 Hyŏnjong kaesu sillok 18:18a, Hyŏnjong 8 (1667).10.03 (kapsul), CSW37:568: “慶敎南二星、吏曹正郞李端夏上疏，略曰：聞漂漢等到弘濟院，號哭祈哀萬狀云．百人性命，無罪就死．我雖不殺，其死由我，則是非慘痛之甚乎?” Also, Hyŏnjong Sillok 14:11a, Hyŏnjong 8 (1667).07.2(imsul), CSW35:560: “儒生朴尙一等五人上疏，以漂漢人，執送淸國爲不可．極言君臣之義不可忘，父子之恩不可背，而攻斥廟堂諸臣，以昧義理、怵禍患，使父母之民，投之讎庭，是可忍也，孰不可忍也云，其悲憤激切，有足以激感人心者．留中不報．”
When suggestions were made concerning repatriation to Beijing, he pointed to his head, seemingly suggesting that he feared decapitation.\(^{17}\)

Of course, Lin and his crew had not expressed the desire to remain in Chosŏn, but had wanted to be sent to the major trading centre of Nagasaki. However, Yu by miming fear and expressed desire to remain in Chosŏn, was far closer to the late Chosŏn image of the castaway, rising to a height with Chŏngjo (r. 1776-1800) establishing rituals in their honour in Úiju and declaring that they should have been allowed to remain.\(^{18}\)

Yu also seems to have recognized other aspects of the political obsessions of Chosŏn’s elites. When Song Siyŏl had heard of the arrival of Lin Yin-guan and his crew in Cheju, he had been largely unimpressed by the claim that their arrival represented the establishment of a contact between Ming and Chosŏn, but, when they were forcibly returned to Qing China, he responded with disappointment that he should fail to discuss Zhu Xi with them:

> When our master heard that they had come from Fujian, he lamented, saying: “If I had met the Han people, I would have asked them about surviving traces of Master Zhu.”\(^{19}\)
Begging for sympathy by emphasising connection to Zhu Xi and Fujian, of course, had not occurred to LinYin-guan’s crew in 1667, at least according to the surviving transcripts; whether or not it would have been successful in 1667, outside of Song Siyŏl’s fantasies, may, of course, be doubted. Yu did, however, employ reference to Master Zhu in an attempt to garner sympathy the Chosŏn court.

Also he said that Koryŏ had received great grace from Zhu Fuzi (朱夫子), and begged for this reason to be spared death. At times he would weep, pointing towards the southern sky, and pronouncing incomprehensible worlds.20

Although no direct reference to the event of 1667, an obscure fraudster in Honam was aware enough of court worries concerning the Zheng family, and court debates concerning to the Lin family, as to produce an image of Ming castaway that far more closely approximated the elite fantasy then the reality that had been presented by Lin and his crew. This also accounts, perhaps, partly for the incredible caution with which the Chosŏn court employed when attempting to determine Yu’s origins. While to the

20 Kugyŏk Pyhŏnsa tŭngnok 13:223, Sukchong 13 (1687).05.03: “但聞以留置本國，則甚為喜幸。以入送北京為言，則以手措頭，顯有畏斬頭之狀。且言高麗大受朱夫子之恩，仍乞免死。有時(呉)泣，手措南天，口稱不詳。”
modern reader, it seems extraordinary that the possibility that Yu was telling the truth was left open as long as it was, the Border Defence commission seemed to allow for the possibility of obscure dialects or a hybrid Korean-Chinese language. At times it seems as if the investigation was deliberately avoiding coming to the obvious conclusions.

However, the Chosŏn court was not the first victim of his deception; for quite some time, the people in an island near Chŏnju had also fallen into his trap. Far from standing out bravely against a potential foreign oppressor, Pak Ip and his father had actually supported him, feeling sympathy for him and a number of other un-named foreigners who had appeared in the island. It is impossible, of course, to determine with certainty how much of what Yu said about his interaction with Pak’s family was true, nor how much of Pak’s version of events was motivated primarily by a desire to avoid the most serious of accusations. Pak Ip, however, did not deny that he and his father had given succour to a number of people whom they believed to be foreigners who arrived on the island. One might guess that, islands of Chŏlla being well recognized locations from submitting foreigner settlement during this period, openness to foreign castaways was greater than is sometimes imagined to be the case. At the very least, however, Yu, as with Yi Maktong during the Imjin War, or the fraudulent

---

21 See section 3.4.
Chenam Wang during the reign of Yŏngjo (r. 1724-1776),\(^{22}\) was exploiting a tolerance for ambiguity and fellow feeling between Chosŏn subjects and subjects of other regions which was antipathetic to the interests of the state.

Did Pak and the Chi islanders take part in the more ostentatiously Ming Loyalist aspects of Yu’s swindle? The Records of the Border Defence Command does not provide sufficient evidence. Yu claimed that Gao had originally given a sword to Pak’s father as a gift in exchange for caring for him while the rest went to the capital.\(^{23}\) In itself it is a rather improbably detail, recalling perhaps a military romance, but also perfectly in keeping with the image of Ming loyalist migrant concealing himself in the country, such as appears in the eighteenth century military romance, the “Story of General Yi (Yi chang’gunchŏn),” in which a famous Ming soldier from Hebei, though widely known in Northeast China and Liaodong, languished, on account of official negligence, unknown in P’yŏngan Province.\(^{24}\) The gift of the sword, however, was strenuously denied by Pak even as he confessed to having once provided succour to

\(^{22}\) See section 4.4.

\(^{23}\) Kugyŏk Pihyŏnsa t'ŏngnak 13:224, Sukchong 13 (1687).05.09: “島中居人朴立為名者, 憐而留之，遂為救活，子英以寶劍一把，謝其主人云，所謂朴立，不畏國法，私自接置異國之人，不告官家，至受賂物，事極痛駭，不可不重究，而其間曲折，為先査問，知其情僞，然後此漢可以處置，令本道監司，捉囚朴立於營下，嚴加推問，得其實狀，急速啓聞之意，分付何如，答曰，允.”

\(^{24}\) Yi Anjung (1752-1791) “Yi chang’gun chŏn,” in Pak Hŭib'yŏng ed., Han’guk hanmun sosŏl kyohap kuhae (Seoul: Somyŏng ch’ulp’an, 2005), 793-798.
some foreigners.\textsuperscript{25}

The case of Yu Yŏn-li, in other words, while a criminal case of fairly mild importance, provides us a window into the place that Ming Loyalism played outside of the Chosŏn court. 1687 was well before the establishment of shrine in Mandongmyo and Taebodan, but was well within the climate of ritual controversy and disputed concerning orthodoxy that characterized seventeenth century court discussion. Although the Lin Yin-guan incident had been primarily a court controversy, it had clearly gained sufficient currency to appear as part of the bag of tricks of a rural swindler, and to be reflected, to a limited extent at least, in the actions of isolated peasants as well.

5.3) The Ming Loyalist Prophet

The extent to which stories of Ming remnant subjects in Chosŏn could attract subversive elements became clear only four years later, related to rumours of a large scale anti-dynastic conspiracy. In 1697 the Chosŏn court investigated a serious

\textsuperscript{25} Kugyŏk Pihyŏnsa tŭngnok 13:244, Sukchong 13 (1687).06.01: “又問，汝言子英相別時，子英以劍一把，贈於主人，使之救活云，而我等得聞於朴立隣人之言，則全無贈劍之事云，汝之所言，無乃荒説耶。答曰，私與之物，朴也必當隱諱，萬無直説之理，雖是隣居，夷知其詳云云，為白臥乎所，陳朴兩人事段，雖未能詳知，而大槪此漢之前後說話，變幻相左者，不止一二，其真相狀，有難的知矣.”
accusation against a Seoul geomancer of prominent non-elite lineage, Yi Yŏngch’ang. Yi’s accusers, claimed that Yi Yŏngch’ang had been following the commands of a Ming migrant monk and skilled geomancer known as Grand Preceptor Unbu (Unbu Taesa) who had begun preparations for an uprising against first Chosŏn and then Qing. As recorded in the transcripts of court confessions, they claimed that a successful uprising in Chosŏn would be followed by an overthrowing the Qing and the establishment of a new dynasty in China as well. The conspiracy sought nothing less than the establishment of the Chŏng family – Chŏng The Authentic One (chŏng Chinin 鄭眞人) of the Record of Chŏng Kam tradition - on the throne in Chosŏn and the Ch’oe family on the throne in China. The story of the Unbu conspiracy – set in Seoul and the Kŭmgang Mountains – brought together a series of sŏol, slaves, prominent non-elites, monks and geomancers into a grand conspiracy oriented to establishing a legitimate authority against both Chosŏn and Qing; the ideology which drove the conspiracy was a mix of Ming Loyalism and geomantic messianism, with a Ming migrant playing the role of chief conspirator. While this is not surprising considering the social origins of many Ming migrant families, it certainly provides a different view of Ming Loyalism than has hitherto been discussed, with prominent non-elites in the capital being the prime proponents of Ming Loyalism, and the Chosŏn court being as much of a target as the
Qing empire.

As with the Yu Yŏn-li incident, the Unbu Conspiracy was focussed around an image of Ming migrant who was specifically Ming Loyalist, and like the Yu Yŏn-li incident, Grand Preceptor Unbu along with much of the conspiracy, was entirely fictional\textsuperscript{26} – extensive efforts to discover Unbu were unsuccessful, and nobody other than the chief conspirators had heard of him. The fiction, seemingly, began already with Yi Yŏngch’ang himself, as Yi never completely denied the stories of consorting with mystical monks, although it was possibly fleshed out to avoid the repeated bouts of torture to which he was exposed.\textsuperscript{27} Thus, by the end of the accusation, Yi Yŏngch’ang informed the primarily Soron officials\textsuperscript{28} that, indeed, his original accusation had been

\textsuperscript{26} Chŏng Sŏchkong, in Chosŏn hugi sahoe pyŏndong yŏn’gu, treats this as a real conspiracy combining Chang Kilsan’s brigands in Hwanghae Province, ginseng traders (who he sees as a sign of the economic changes occurring during that period, a force of island slaves represented by the “Chŏng, the Authentic One” and an army of monks lead by Unbu. However, as Han Hûisuk points out in “17segi huban chang kilsan ūi kundo hwandong” (in Chosŏn sidae sahoe ūi mosŭp, edited by Kim Hyŏnyŏng & Yi Yŏngch’un, 277-308. Seoul: Chimmundang, 2003), much of the original narrative was revealed to be fiction during the process of the investigation, with very few little of the rest of the narrative being confirmed.

\textsuperscript{27} The main primary source for this conspiracy are the interrogation documents, now found in Kang Man’gi, Chŏng Sŏchkong and Chŏng Ch’angnyŏl ed., Ch’uan kŭp Kugan (henceforth CKK) 11 (Sukchong 4), 723-916 (Seoul: Asea munhwasa, 1983). This document describes Yi Yŏngch’ang as being tortured repeatedly, ultimately dying as a result of the torture.

\textsuperscript{28} The list of officials involved in the interrogation include such established members of the Soron faction as Nam Kuman, Yu Sang’un, Sin Iksang, and Ch’oe Kyusŏ. For instance, see the list of officials in “Yi Yŏngch’ang tŭng ch’uăn” 01.11, CKK11: 733-735.
false, inventing a new accusation which implicated both the Namin official Yi Hyŏngjing and the Noron official Kim Ch’unt’aek (1670-1717).\textsuperscript{29} Certainly, factional links can hardly be excluded – Yi Yŏngch’ang, seemingly unprompted, described himself denying in his earlier confessions that he was a spy for the Namin faction (南人譏察), and Yi Yŏngch’ang’s two accusers, Yu Sŏn’gi and Yi Chŏl both are described by Yi Yŏngch’ang as the lower ranked members in factional turf wars, having, however, failed during the Kapsul coup.\textsuperscript{30} However, Yi Yŏngch’ang’s confession of ties to Yi Hyŏngjing which was made at the end of the investigation should be seen as originating more with the political aims of the Soron officials investigating him then with Yi Yŏngch’ang himself.

The original accusation made by Yu Sŏn’gi, Yi Chŏl, Kim Kyŏngham and Kim Chŏnyŏl to the Right and Left Agencies for the Arrest of Thieves and the State Tribunal is found in the summary at the beginning of the “Interrogation of Yi Yŏngch’ang’s Group” (Yi Yŏngch’ang tung ch’uan), and fleshed out slightly differently in the four interrogations that follow the summary. Within it, Yi Chŏl and Yu Sŏng’gi describe themselves as having met with Yi Yŏngch’ang during the fall of 1696, originally with

\textsuperscript{29} Sukchong Sillok 31:3a, Sukchong 23 (1697).01. 10 (imsul), CSW 39:446; “Yi Yŏngch’ang tung ch’uan” 02.16, CKK 878-882.

\textsuperscript{30} “Yi Yŏngch’ang tung ch’uan” 01.11, CKK 757-758.
the intention of consulting with Yi Yŏngch’ang, a skilled geomancer, concerning grave sites. The discussion, however, soon moved in a subversive direction. In the tenth month of 1696, Yi Yŏngch’ang was staying with Yi Chŏl; in the midst of leisured discussion, suddenly Yi Yŏngch’ang said:

If you want to find a correct grave site, you need to visit my teacher in the Kŭmgang mountains. My master is a monk called Unbu. He is 70 years of age and the descendents of Song Dynasty official Wang Zao. He fled to our country after the fall of the Ming, and after shaving his head, he entered the Kŭmgang Mountains. Above, he penetrates the heavens, below he investigates the earth and in between he observes human affairs. In skill he does not fall behind Kongming or Liu Ji. He instructed monks in the Buddhist canons, choosing from among them the most superior, including Ogyŏ, Iryŏ, Myojŏng, Taesŏng and Pŏpchu, and about a hundred others. He passed on his geomantic skills and united in alliance the monks of all eight provinces [of Chosŏn], also forming an alliance with Chang Kilsan’s group [of brigands]. He also has obtained the so-called Authentic Ones, both Chŏng and Ch’oe. Having first conquered our country, he will place Chŏng as the leader, and after that he will attack the central plain, and raise up Ch’oe as emperor.”

---

31 “Yi Yŏngch’ang tong ch’uan” 01.10, CKK 11:725: “大槪兪選基段與榮昌始逢於上年九月日不記念間是白遺，李梲段十月日不記初生而矣身等俱有求山之計，相如交結之際。”
32 “Yi Yŏngch’ang tong ch’uan” 01.10, CKK 11:725-6: “自致同月晦間為白有如乎日，李榮昌來宿於李梲家，相對懈談不過山論而已，榮昌猝然問曰：‘君欲得葬地明堂，則往見吾師可也。師僧卽云浮，
Yi Chŏl passed this story to his nephew Yu Sŏn’gi, who also heard it separately from Yi Yongch’ang outside of the Sosŏmun in Seoul. In response, Yi Chŏl and Yu Sŏn’gi claim that they agreed to remain within the conspiracy solely for the purpose of later reporting all to the authorities; As Yu Sŏn’gi said: “today’s world is not like ancient times. Since we can not now clean our ears, we must investigate the evidence for the conspiracy in detail, and after that look for ways to bring it under control.”

As self-appointed secret agents, they describe themselves as enduring no end of inconvenience at the hands of Yi Yongch’ang and his faction, maintaining their cover even when Yi Yongch’ang had them agree to blood brotherhood with two of Yi Chŏl’s maroon slaves, Ch’oe Sangjung and Ch’oe Sangsŏng. Yi Chŏl, Yi Yongch’ang claimed, should arrange for their emancipation in moral preparation for great deeds to come. This violation of morality Yi Chŏl and Yu Sŏn’gi justified as it allowed them to receive a

而時年七十，宋朝名臣汪藻之後也。大明亡後，自中原飄到我國，削髮入金剛，而其人上通天文，下察地理，中觀人事，才不減於古之孔明、劉基者也。以佛經教僧輩而得其中拔萃者玉如、一如、卯定、大聖、法主等百餘人，傳其術業，締結八道之僧。且結張吉山之輩，又得所謂真人鄭、崔兩人，先平我國，立鄭姓為帝云云。’

33 “Yi Yongch’ang tung ch’uan,” 01.10, CCK 11:726: “李梲曰：... 人聞此言，將何以處之。兪選基曰：‘當今之世，異於上古，其不能洗耳，逢遇則事，當詳探形迹，然後自有處置之道云。’” The Veritable Records puts nearly identical words in the mouth of Yi Chŏl, perhaps because of Yi Chŏl greater age and responsibility; the interrogation transcript is quite clear, however, that Yu Sŏn’gi made the comment.
documentary evidence. This document being still insufficient, they brought in to friends connected to the Board of War, Kim Kyŏngham and Kim Chŏnyŏl, sending Kim Chŏnyŏl to the Board of War while they themselves continued their independent investigation. By doing so they claim they were able to witness another bout of prophetic utterances concerning Unbu, when Yi Ikhwa, another associate of Yi Yŏngch’ang, asked Yi Yŏngch’ang to tell him the year, month, and hour of birth (四柱) for both Unbu and the True and Genuine one:

Yi Yŏngch’ang said: “Unbu was born in the Chŏngmyo year (丁卯), and the True and Genuine one was born on the mujin (戊辰) hour of the kisa (己巳) day of the mujin month of the kisa year.” Ikhwa responded “According to the secret prophecy (秘訣), the Tang General (唐將) will be born in the rabbit year (myo) year. He will come from China, and having established himself in the eight provinces, will rise up!” This is clearly referring to Unbu.” Furthermore, he said: “according to the secret prophecy, his birth during the mujin hour of the kisa day of the mujin month of the kisa year; this is the very point at which the snake becomes the dragon. The Chongzhen emperor’s birth date and hour also included that of a snake turning into a dragon, and he became emperor; yet he only had one, while this man has two! This is truly a birth hour of extremely good fortune!” Then clasping his hands together and prostrating himself, he considered the the

---

birth time carefully. He said: “according to the secret prophecy, the sage is born in the Chin (辰) and Sa (巳) years, while the O (午) and Mi (未) years there will be great joy!” This was also referring to the True and Genuine One.”35

Then, the four self-appointed secret agents claimed, after hearing of grand plots to attack Kanghwa Island by dressing soldiers in Qing clothes, sending armies of women in mourning against the capital, organizing monks and Chang Kilsan’s brigands, obtaining ginseng to fund their revolt, and concealing Chŏng the Authentic One while moving him about the countryside, eventually Yi Chŏl and Yu Sŏn’gi fearing that the plans had come to a head, had Yi Yŏngch’ang and several other members of the conspiracy imprisoned, with they themselves gave a full confession to the Board of War.36

How should this story be interpreted? Fictional though it was, Yi Yŏngch’ang, like Yu Sŏn’gi, Yi Chŏl, Kim Kyŏngham and Kim Chŏnyŏl, seems to have been familiar with the narrative to a limited extent at least, although also claiming to have had a


36 CKK 730-32.
relatively minor role, barely knowing what was actually happening, and acting as a spy and agent provocateur. In the official description of the trial in the *Veritable Records*, the court considered it likely that Yu Sŏn’gi and Yi Chŏl had been part of a conspiracy with Yi Yŏngch’ang, but had been frightened into leaving by fear of possible detection. One fairly minor figure, the mendicant Hyech’al, claimed that he was tricked by Yi Yŏngch’ang into letting go hints to the other conspirators to make the conspiracy more credible. Only the two soldier-slaves, Ch’oe Sangjung and Ch’oe Sangsŏng, denied all knowledge or connection to any of the events, maintaining their denial despite repeated, and ultimately fatal, torture. The conspiracy thus seems to have had some limited existence, and Yi Yŏngch’ang does seem to have spun the fascinating yarn on his own volition, although it is now unclear whether it was merely an embezzlement scheme by Yi Yŏngch’ang, a collective fantasy among the various

---

37 Yi Yŏngch’ang’s first confession is found CKK11:747-761.
38 Sukchong Sillok 31:33a, Sukchong 23 (1697) 01.10 (imsul), CSW 39: 446: “鞫廳啓言: “悅，選基等，與榮昌同心結腹，日夜聚會，同盟之書，逆節已著，而與慶咸合而為一，今此上變，亦不過初因醞釀而成，後恐敗露而發，此三人決不可解枷.”
39 Yi Yŏngch’ang tung ch’uan” 01.11, CKK 762-3.
40 The deaths of Ch’oe Sangjung and Ch’oe Sangsŏng are reported 01.22, CKK11:864. Repeated requests were made before that to increase the torture on the two brothers as they did not surrender to the confession. For instance, “Yi Yŏngch’ang tung ch’uan” 01.17, CKK11:847: “崔尙晟崔尙仲忍不服請倂加刑.”
41 If the fingering of Yi Hyŏngjing should be seen as largely designed to please his interrogators, the argument he had had Yi Hyŏngjing make sounds like a plausible argument that he might have made to
participants, or, if Yi Yongch’ang’s final confessions, made after repeated torture, are to be believed, a plot by Namin officials to discredit associates of the Noron Kim Chun’taek.42

Though Unbu did not exist, and though we may never understand the actual purpose of Yi Yongch’ang’s story, it is fascinating, if not surprising, that, well before the transformation of Ming migrant lineages into imperial subject lineages, the imaginary Ming migrant monk is described as leading a group who were of generally of marginal status themselves. According to Chong Sokchong’s analysis, Yi Chol and Yu Son’gi, and the other key conspirators were sool or slaves,43 while Yi Yongch’ang made a living from geomancy. Yet while they were certainly not of the rank to be confused as yangban by capital officials in Seoul or even prominent lineages in the countryside, Hyech’al described Yi Yongch’ang as Yi Saengwŏn (生員), and his associates Yu Son’gi, Yi Chol, and Ch’oe Sangjung and Ch’oe Sangsŏng as yangban.44 The two runaway slaves, Ch’oe Sangjung and Ch’oe Sangsŏng, were described by Yi himself: “though you may want to seem that you have achieved spirituality (以接神行世), people will definitely not believe your empty talk. … I have one plan. You should let it be known that you have studied under a spiritual monk, then people will believe you. … the actions of monks are like floating clouds (僧跡如雲浮), you should make the monk’s name Unbu (雲浮, “floating cloud”) and falsely claim to have studied under him.” “Yi Yongch’ang tung ch’uan” 02.16, CKK 11:877.

42 “Yi Yongch’ang tung ch’uan” 02.16, CKK 11:877.
43 Chong Sokchong, Chosŏn hugi sahoe pyŏndong yŏn’gu, 154-6.
44 “Yi Yongch’ang tung ch’uan” 01.11, CKK 11: 762-3.
Yôngch’ang in his counter-accusation as two soldiers, also expressing amazement that the two should bow before Yu Sŏn’gi and Yi Chŏl. Although we may well wish to avoid Chŏng’s description of this as a genuine class war or of social change fuelled by changing economic conditions, all participants were simultaneously asserted yangban status when dealing with commoners or worse, but were by no means yangban in the sense of access to official position or prominent positions within village associations.

Interestingly, although no actual Ming migrant lineage is mentioned, Hyech’al describes his first meeting with Yi Yôngch’ang in Yŏnjidong, immediately adjacent to the Ming military enclave of Ōŭidong. If actual Ming migrant lineages do not present themselves, the social context of the conspiracy is very much in accord with Ming migrant communities as they had existed in Chosŏn during the seventeenth century. Most especially, as the above quotation suggests, Grand Preceptor Unbu is described as a geomancer of unusual capabilities, rivalling both Zhuge Liang and Liu Ji. This was very much in accord with the reputation of Ming migrants in general during the seventeenth and even eighteenth centuries. Famously, in many versions of the Record of the Imjin War (Imjin-rok), the Ming general Li Rusong, is supposed, in some cases

45 “Yi Yôngch’ang tung ch’uan” 01.11, CKK 11: 753-4.
46 Chŏng Sŏkchong, Chosŏn hugi sahoe pyŏndong yŏn’gu, 145-164.
47 “Yi Yôngch’ang tung ch’uan” 01.11, CKK 11: 763.
independently, in some cases at the suggestion of the Ming emperor, to have wandered
about Chosŏn severing the mountain ranges to prevent heroes from appearing again in
Chosŏn.\textsuperscript{48} Real Ming migrants were also associated with geomancy including several,
who according to Ma Pengzhi’s \textit{Record of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Dynasty}
(\textit{Hwangjo yumin rok}), established themselves in the region of the Kŭmgang mountains,
including “Fortune Teller Ryu” (Ryu Poksul 柳卜術) who is listed immediately beside
Chinese Wang (Wang Tangin 王唐人)\textsuperscript{49} both of whom settled in Kŭmhwa and are
known today only by their profession and ethnicity; one of Li Rusong’s descendents, for
that matter, settled north of the Kŭmgang mountains in Hwiyang, although no reference
is made to skill in geomancy.\textsuperscript{50} A prophecy concerning the Imjin War preserved by Yi
Sugwang, while often attributed to a Korean prophet, is in other versions attributed to
Ming geomancer.\textsuperscript{51} These were also a number of Ming geomancers, including Shi

\textsuperscript{48} This particular story has been translated into English by Peter H. Lee, \textit{Record of the Black Dragon Year}, 94-6, with the original text on 146-8 (Seoul & Honolulu: Institute of Korean Culture, Korea University Center for Korean Studies) .

\textsuperscript{49} These two figures are recorded in the \textit{Sohwa oesa} 2:281 as living in Kŭmhwa, in Kangwon Province
near the Kŭmgang Mountains along with the also a xiangsheng with the rather geomantic name of PanTengyun (潘騰雲). The source given is the \textit{Massi kasūng}, and so the names quite possibly originate
with Mang Pengzhi’s \textit{Hwangjo yumin rok}, which is an acknowledged source of this section of the \textit{Sohwa oesa}. See section 6.2.

\textsuperscript{50} See section 4.4.

\textsuperscript{51} See \textit{Yŏllyŏsil kisul} 17 kwŏn. “sŏnjojo kosa ponmal” “Nanjung sisa ch’ongnok,” \textit{Kukyŏk} IV:338. After
the description of the prophecy, a note records the theory that a Ming Chinese fortune-teller had made the
Wenyong and Xie Jing’guo, who gained prominent positions in court, and presumably a
great many others, such as Du Sizhong, gained positions outside of court.\textsuperscript{52} In general,
biographies of Ming migrants frequently mention their abilities in geomancy and
fortune telling, with Nam Kuman’s biography of Kang Shijue, perhaps reflecting the
somewhat raffish reputation of Ming migrants as geomancers, describing Kang as an
excellent fortune teller who nevertheless honourably refused to receive money for his
services.\textsuperscript{53}

Of course, what disturbed the court, and caused it to investigate the conspiracy
so thoroughly, was the fact that Yi Yŏngch’ang was referring, specifically, to the
tradition of banned geomantic writings which predicted the imminent fall of the dynasty.

In the tradition of prophecies which would later be referred to under the title Record of
\textit{Chŏng Kam}, Yi Yŏngch’ang referred to the establishment of a new monarchy in Chosŏn
under the Chŏng the Authentic One (眞人鄭姓) family, replacing the Yi family that had

\textsuperscript{52} See chapter 3.

\textsuperscript{53} For instance, in Nam Kuman’s “Kang Sejak chŏn,” in Chapchŏ,” \textit{Yakeh’ŏnjip2}:18, HMC132: 474-476, Kang is described as being effective at telling fortunes, but not attempting to profit from this ability. “蓋
略解占相推命,而未嘗鬻技.” See also Hu Keji in the Hwangjoin sajŏk, fr. 42, in which he is described as
being skilled at astrology, geomancy, medicine and fortune telling. (好文章曉天文地理醫藥卜筮之術).
passed its 300 year life-span.\textsuperscript{54} This theory was at least as old as the Chŏng Yŏrip uprising during the reign of Sŏnjo,\textsuperscript{55} and characterized, notably, the 1688 Yŏhwan uprising, and numerous other uprisings during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, including the Hong Kyŏngnae rebellion. The social class associated with it was what Paek Sŭngjong describes as the wandering learned – that is to say, those people who were literate but whose lineages made any assertion of yangban status inconceivable, and who were often associated with geomancy.\textsuperscript{56} As Sunjoo Kim points out, geomancers, possessing knowledge that was closely associated with the elite tradition of the Book of Changes, but also for economic reasons necessarily accessible to non-elites, and thus potentially subversive.\textsuperscript{57} This tradition, beginning, perhaps, in the late seventeenth century, this prophecy gained regular textual form with the compilation of various versions of the Record of Chŏng Kam, first heard of in 1739 and mentioned

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{54} “Yŏngch’ang túng ch’u’an” 01.10, CKK 11:725-6: “又得所謂眞人鄭、崔兩人，先平我國，立鄭姓後，攻中原，立崔姓為帝云云.”


\textsuperscript{57} Sun Joo Kim, Marginality and Subversions in Korea: The Hong Kyŏngnae Rebellion of 1812 (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2007), 91-95.
\end{footnotesize}
numerous times afterwards.58

The story revealed within the “Interrogation Records of Yi Yŏngch’ang’s Group” places it within the mainstream of the geomantic tradition. To a substantial extent, Yi Yŏngch’ang’s self-description accords with that of the wandering literate described by Paek Sŭngjong. Thus, he describes himself as having married a woman from Kŭmhwă in Kangwŏn Province, just south, as it happens of the Kŭmgang Mountains where the conspiracy was supposedly based, and as having established himself in the empty house of a more usual resident of Seoul in order to ply his trade as geomancer.59 These interrogation documents hint at an early era in the development of the textual tradition of the Record of Chŏng Kam, with some of the prophecies referred to during the interrogation, notably the comment that Yi Chŏl and Yu Sŏn’gi attribute to Yi Ikhwa, that the Chinese general was born in the rabbit year (唐將卯生人), would establish himself in the eight directions, that the sage would be born under the Dragon and Snake and that good fortune would occur under the horse and the sheep (辰巳聖人

58 Paek Sŭngjong, *Han’guk ÿi yeŏn munhwasa* (Seoul: P’urŭn yŏksa, 2006), 77-106. Paek argues that, because there was an actual figure Chŏng Kam during the early and mid seventeenth century, an anti-dynastic text written in his name cannot have been compiled in his lifetime without attracting attention. Of course, as the Record of Chŏng Kam and texts of that sort were banned, it was distributed entirely in the form of a hand-written copies, and the contents of these copies can be shown to have changed considerably over time – in particular, while the oldest texts are described as written in the vernacular (ŏnmun 諺文), most of the copies currently extent were written in Classical Chinese.

59 “Yi Yŏngch’ang tung ch’uan” 02.16, CKK 11:877.
find almost precise echoes in the currently extant “Samhan saillim pigi” (三韓山林秘記) which speaks of a Chinese general born in the rabbit year who would lead 100,000 soldiers and establish himself on the Yalu River for ten years, (唐將卯生人，率十萬兵，住鴨綠江十年), and also that the good fortune would occur during the horse and sheep years (午未樂堂堂).\textsuperscript{61}

The interrogation documents also accord with an aspect of the Record of Chŏng Kam tradition less frequently referred to in scholarship: the many texts attributed to Ming migrant geomancers. Especially notable here is the Secret Prophecy of Tu Sach’ong (Tusach’ong pigyŏl), attributed directly to Du Sizhong himself, and in which Du is explicitly described as an outsider, “touring the mountains and rivers of Chosŏn looking for a place to hide during times of crisis;” in the preface to the presumably nineteenth or early twentieth century Kyujang’gak edition of the Secret Prophecy of Tu Sach’ong, Du is described clearly as Chinese (China-in 支那人), who had entered Chosŏn and who travelled through all eight provinces investigating it geomantically,\textsuperscript{61}


\textsuperscript{61} An Ch’un’gün ed. Chŏng’gamnok chipsŏng (Seoul: Asea munhwasa, 1981), 729-744, esp. 733. The text quoted above originates in what appears to be, from the brief quotation in Japanese, to be an undated colonial era collection.
also choosing appropriate graves for Chosŏn people. (師聰一作思忠世傳明末支那人
轉入朝鮮以相地術編歷八道，多占朝鮮人墓地云). The corpus of Du’s prophecies
has continued to grow into the present day, with Du’s descendents publishing a text
purporting to be the work of Du Sizhong, the Secret Prophecy of Master Mommyŏng
(Momyŏng sŏnsaeng yugyŏl; Momyŏng means “to long for the Ming.”) which has Du
clearly describing Chosŏn as “our country” (adong 我東), contrasting it with China,
(Chung’guk 中國). Du, along with his student known as Luo Hetian (Na Hakch’ŏn),
who supposedly entered Chosŏn from the Ming at the very fall of the Ming, is also
preserved within the writings of Yi Kyugyŏng (1788-?).

Grand Preceptor Unbu, as Ming castaway, geomancer and strategist, would have
made excellent sense during the late seventeenth century, when so many Ming migrants
– Liaodongese or Ming deserters – had established themselves as geomancers. Yi

62 Tusach’ung pigyŏl, Kyujang’gak # 2377, fr. 2. Texts with this title are found in several different
versions in the Chöng’gammok Chipsŏng, including the “Tasach’ung yogyŏl,” 177-179, within the late
Chosŏn hand-written text, the “Ch’uch’ang’gyŏl,” and various versions in Japanese colonial collections,
including the “Tusach’ong pigyŏl” (430) in the “Piran Chöng’gammok chipsŏng.” The “Tusach’ong
yogyŏl,” which is entirely unrelated to the other texts, and provides no clue of Du Sizhong’s Chinese
origin. Of course, none of these text should be seen as necessarily descending from Du’s hand directly, as
they are part of the notoriously unstable Chöng’gammok textual tradition.

63 Kumar’s sŏnsaeng yugyŏl (Seoul: Hongik ch’ulp’ansa, 2004). The preface
by Pae Tonghwan on pages 7-9 is dated to 1977. The passage referred to above is on pages 12-13.
64 A brief description of Luo Hetian may be found in the “Na Hakch’ŏn pyŏnjungsŏl,” in Yi Kugyŏng,
Ojuyŏn munjang chŏnsan’go, ed. Kojŏn Kanghaenghoe (Seoul: Tong’guk munhwasa, 1959) 1:45. I have
not found any secret prophecies attributed to him.
Yŏngch’ang, in claiming to have received instruction from mysterious Ming migrant geomancer, was conforming to, and developing, an already established stereotype. In fact, an off-shore context for the Chŏng the Authentic One became a standard part of the geomantic narrative during the eighteenth century, when it was often assumed that he, or his conspirators, had established themselves in an island of the coast, such as the Musŏk-kuk (無石國) of a geomantic conspiracy of 1787.65

On the other hand, Unbu is not only a Ming geomancer, he is also supposedly a Ming loyalist. A fascinating element of the narrative revealed during the interrogation is the seamless combination of what became the primarily elite tradition of Ming Loyalism and the subversive tradition of geomantic messianism. This aspect is most clearly apparent in a confession made by Yi Yŏngch’ang after he had already endured two sessions of torture, but otherwise largely consistent with earlier statements. There he described Unbu as having plotted out his grand plan to restore the Ming:

Unbu said: “I, as the descendents of Wang Zao, official in the Board of Rites of China, often think back on the Imjin year, when Chosŏn suffered from the Japanese invasion. Then the Great Ming Emperor moved the armies of the entire world, ultimately bringing the war to an end. However, that the Great Ming has

---

65 Paek Sŏngjong, Han’guk ŭi yeŏn munhwasa, 137-144, describes an island off the coast which formed as state called Musŏk, in which the descendents of the Soron rebels of 1728 were supposedly hiding while waiting to invade Chosŏn.
become barbarian territory always makes me extremely angry. Even though I die, I will be buried on the other side of the Yalu River.”

For three days the many monks did not speak; on the fourth day all the monks said: “We all say that when the four monks attack China, Chosŏn must also suffer hardship. Chosŏn is our parent country; what should we do about that?”

Unbu said: “If you want to pursue this great action with me, how can you concern yourself with other matters? Chosŏn has survived for more than three hundred years; if a great task is to be achieved, it will need to be ruled by someone with a different surname.”

Despite the somewhat suspect origin of this text, it is very much in accord with other early statements provided by Yi Yongch’ang and other people caught in the investigation. Ultimately, as with General Li and Yu Yŏn-li described in the previous section, Unbu is described as a military man, concealing himself in Chosŏn, waiting for the day to restore the Ming. This is, moreover, clearly a subversive version of the Northern expedition – the plan during the reigns of both Hyojong (r. 1649-1659) and, in

---

66 “Yi Yongch’ang tung ch’uan” 01.13, CKK 796-7: “雲浮曰：吾以中原禮部尚書汪潮之姪，每恨壬辰之年朝鮮被倭亂，則大明皇帝動天下兵，終至平正，而大明今為胡地心常憤慨。雖死吾當埋骨於鴨綠越邊耳。四僧曰：東國所稱兵強只擧東國之病可以長驅中原而俚未得人心耳。雲浮曰：吾和尚只以得八道僧人之心，以入中原之路，實難是如為白乎可。諸僧三日合口不言。第四日諸僧曰：‘雲浮四僧入中原之際，朝鮮必被害朝鮮吾父母之國，將若之何？’雲浮曰：若欲與我舉大事，則何可顧他事乎。朝鮮安過三百年，若成大事則當易以他姓云。”
some quarters, Sukchong (r. 1674-1720), whereby Chosŏn would lead the attack against the Qing to restore the Ming. As with the Northern Expedition, a key reason for the invasion was the kindness of the Wanli emperor in saving Chosŏn from Japan during the Imjin War (每恨壬辰之年朝鮮被倭亂，則大明皇帝動天下兵，終至平正). The emphasis on transformation within Chosŏn as the necessary first step to invading the Qing empire was also shared with elite versions. Song Siyŏl argued, in his secret discussion with Hyojong, for a general moral transformation of Chosŏn as necessarily preceding the invasion of the Qing empire. It differed with the official Northern Expedition plan primarily in that it called for an actual changing of the ruling family, not satisfying itself with simple moral transformation.

In many respects, the story of Grand Preceptor Unbu corresponds to the stereotype of Ming migrant geomancer very closely indeed – he is evidently from southern China, he is loyal to the Ming and hostile to the Qing, and, more importantly, he is concealed in the countryside among the common people. Noticeably, Yi Yŏngch’ang claimed that Unbu, like the castaways with Lin Yin-guan, and much like the Fujianese castaway of Yu Yŏn’li’s self-representation, sailed in from south China via an island in the sea. While this confession was made well into the investigation, and was

---

67 See Chŏng Tuhŭi, Chosŏn sidae innul üi chaebalgŏn (Seoul: Ilchogak, 1997), 92-104.
quite probably coerced, at the very least it reveals that, still in 1697, at least the interrogators still considered the possibility of a Ming loyalist from the south concealing themselves in Chosŏn. Only a decade before the establishment of the Taebodan and Mandongmyo, the image of the Ming migrant geomancer continue to have power to either inspire or frighten.

At a time when the Noron were attempting to strengthen their political hold by establishing rituals to the Wanli emperor in Ch’ŏngju, marginalized elites in the capital were employing Ming Loyalism to further their own power, in methods related to, but different from, the Noron. The key image which brought the sedition of prominent non-elites into the elite world of Ming Loyalism was that of the Ming migrant geomancer – a figure clearly part of the world of the wandering literate, but also an apt leader for a grand, Ming Loyalist, anti-dynastic conspiracy.

5.4) Ming Loyalist Outrage at the Capital’s Gates

In the early summer of 1711 there was a third subversive appearance of the Ming loyalist migrant narrative, this time attached to the Yŏnŭn Gate in Seoul. During a period of tense negotiations with the Qing concerning the shared border in the north, a
pamphlet was posted to the Yŏnŭn Gate, speaking on behalf of a fictional Ming loyalist outpost under a fictional Ming emperor with a fictional era name, to attack Chosŏn passivity vis-à-vis the Qing empire. This was taken very seriously by the court – with some imagining even that it might be a message from a real Ming outpost – and an extensive but futile investigation was launched. The investigation brought out a number of false leads which linked this fictional Ming outpost with a Late Chosŏn rogue’s gallery of malcontents, real and imaginary – swindlers, Yalu River pirates and geomancers. As with the previous two examples, the idea of Ming restoration and remnant subjects was bound up, not with the Chosŏn court and elites, but with non-elites and trouble-makers. The rejection of Qing time inscription that the pamphleteers pursued in the use of a fictional era name was similar to standard Chosŏn elite practice but also a challenge to it, while the island outpost hinted at in the pamphlet may have been modelled on the Zheng family outpost in Taiwan, but was compatible with the various island outposts discussed within the Record of Ch'ŏng Kam tradition.

The pamphleteers wrote under the name of a high official of “the Celestial Dynasty” (ch’ŏnjo 天朝) and dated the pamphlet to the third year, second month of the Later Hongwu reign (Hongmu samnyŏn iwŏl il 後洪武三年二月日). They used a style of calligraphy which originated in the Hongwu era, and wrote on high quality Chinese
paper. The text – which is liberally sprinkled with references to current affairs and Chinese history – begins by berating the Chosŏn court for forgetting that “driving off barbarians and eliminating evil men is a great royal duty, and not one which can be declined; no monarch may omit the divine responsibility of first declaring war and then leading the troops into battle;” furthermore, the authors of the pamphlet described the Qing as having passed their 100 years of luck, of having in any case only briefly “borrowed the strength of cows and sheep” to attack a country with cultural achievements stretching through 100 generations. The authors of the pamphlet praised the Zheng family of Taiwan for being the equals of Zhuge Liang, attacked the Chosŏn court for being insufficiently vigorous in their opposition to the Qing but praised it for remembering the Ming with the Taebodan. They then called upon the Chosŏn court to establish alliances from across the seas so as to drive the Qing from

---


70 Sukchong Sillok 50: 22b, Sukchong 37 (1711).04.30 (muja), CSW 40:394: 繕今胡命，值百年之窮，皇綱屬再昌之運，譬如日月暫蝕而旋明，節序有剝而必復。彼淸胡者，負一時牛羊之力，闖百代文物之邦，夷我宗祊，〔簒〕我皇統.”

71 “鄭軍師之神機，往時管、葛；張元帥之雄略.” The identity of the Chŏng the Military Leader is not, of course, immediately clear, and a connection to the Chŏng the Authentic One of messianic geomancy should not be ruled out.
power.  

Only fifteen years after the botched investigation of the Grand Preceptor Unbu conspiracy, and only seven years after the establishment of the Taebodan, the Sukchong court was faced with another pretender to Ming Loyalism, although in this case the pretender did not call directly for the overthrow of the Chosŏn Dynasty. If the element of the *Record of Chŏng Kam* was not very strong, it was also not entirely absent, as the prediction that the Qing had almost finished their century of power (繄今胡命，值百年之窮) makes clear. As with the Grand Preceptor Unbu conspiracy, the plotters behind the pamphlet were people with some education; indeed, at least one person involved in putting up the pamphlet must have had the ability to use rare calligraphy styles, cite obscure historical references and purchase Chinese paper, all suggesting someone with considerable education and resources. 

Initially disturbing the Chosŏn court was the possibility that the pamphlet had

---

72 Sukchong Sillok 50:22b, Sukchong 37 (1711).04.30 (muja), CSW 40:394: “賢君六七作以来，靈祚三百祀之久，彗于天子，侯度之恪勤無愆。眷玆藩邦，皇朝之禮待不薄，念我萬曆皇帝，命將輦財，惠此東方，恩澤罔極。宜爾三韓君臣，銘骨鐫心，至於後昆，感戴無疆。若曰強呑弱肉，不得已降附，容或然耳，至於助攻天朝，忍為此凶逆，於汝安乎？且夫降虜元帥，罪浮於陵，而竟貸鈇鉞之誅，賣主謀臣，惡過於檜，而反侈旂常之寵，其曰懲惡之有截，可見討罪之不嚴。噫！屈指而數其罪，则宜服王誅，拭目而觀其政，則罔逭天討。然而祖訓猶存，敢忘容物之德義；大報新建，可質尊周之素忱。姑停問罪之師，先飛諭意之檄，惟其徑捷醜虜之二京，道均蠻海之諸國，萬頃溟渤，全仗鷁首之風；三枝旗幟，方借鰲岑之路。且夫降虜，掃腥羶於寰宇，桑溟解纜，衝劍氣而落旄頭；桂水開帆，罄府庫而犒戰士。”

73 Yi Sangbae, *Chosŏn hugi chŏngch’i wa kwaesŏ* (Seoul: Kukhak charyŏwŏn, 1999), 64.
some external link with a remnant band of Ming loyalists – almost thirty years after the fall of the Zheng family stronghold in Taiwan, the possibility of such a connection seemed to disturb the court immensely. In the initial discussion following the uncovering of the pamphlet, the concern of a possible connection was discussed immediately, to be generally dismissed. It was pointed out early in the discussion that should there be any considerable stronghold of Ming loyalists, it was most unlikely that they would have passed through the southwest coast of the country, evading detection, only to hang a pamphlet on a gate in Seoul. The opinion of the majority of the state council, and of Sukchong himself, was that the extent of knowledge of the Chosŏn’s internal affairs (for instance, of the recent construction of the Taebodan) all suggested a local troublemaker. If any one considered the possibility that someone from the Ming migrant community in Ŏŭidong had been involved, they did not express this opinion

---

While Sukchong was no doubt correct to discount the possibility of a real Ming outpost hiding behind this pamphlet, it is quite clear that the authors of the pamphlet were writing as if they did represent such an outpost, also hinting strongly that they were some revival of the Zheng Jin outpost, and one which was preparing, once more, for an invasion of Qing in which Chosŏn was also supposed to assist. They were reminded of the Wanli emperor’s assistance to Chosŏn during the Imjin War, and told not to miss this opportunity to take revenge against the Qing empire. The comment in the pamphlet that “General Zheng’s strategy is equal to Guan Zhong and Zhuge Liang, while General Zhang’s strategy is like that of a present day Han Xin or Peng Yue” was interpreted, no doubt correctly by one official, as referring to someone associated with the descendents of late Ming strongmen Zheng Jing and Zhang Feihu.

Beyond merely asserting a rival island claimant to Ming Loyalism, they also asserted, through time inscription, an alternate legitimacy that rivalled both Chosŏn and

---

75 However, Yi Sangbae, Chosŏn hugi chŏngch’i wa kwaesŏ, 65, does suggest this possibility.
76 Sukchong Sillok 50:22b, Sukchong 37 (1711).04.30(muja), CSW 40:394: “眷玆藩邦，皇朝之禮待不薄，念我萬曆皇帝，命將輦財，惠此東方，恩澤罔極。宜爾三韓君臣，銘骨鐫心，至于後昆，感戴無疆，而夫何屈膝於凶奴之庭，甘心於臣妾之辱?”
77 It should be noted that at the time Left state councillor Kim Ch’angjip himself interpreted the document as referring to Zheng Jin. Sukchong Sillok 50:22b, Sukchong 37 (1711).04.30(muja), CSW 40:394: “左議政金昌集曰: “鄭、張云者，似是假托於鄭錦、張飛虎之子孫也.”
Qing. If the expression of a connection with the Zheng family, some thirty years after
the capital had been driven into a panic by rumours of a Zheng family invasion, was not
challenge enough, in their use of the artificial era name, Later Hongwu reign,78 they
were claiming to represent a state with an independent and rival time inscription to both
Chosŏn and Qing.79 This should also be seen in the context of historical memory of Lin
Yin-guan’s crew, who, as a key aspect of their fame, had brought with them the Yongli
calendar. In 1667, when Lin had been shipwrecked off Cheju Island, the Yongli emperor
had already been dead, and, as the court had suggested, the outpost had always had very
little to do with the Yongli emperor in the first place. The idea of a calendrical

78 As Yi Sangbae, Chosŏn Hugh ch'ongch'i wa kwaesŏ, 64, correctly argues, the reign date Hongwu 3
corresponds to no known date except 1370, which is self-evidently incorrect. A further possibility he
suggests, and then dismisses, is that Later Hongwu refers to a dynasty assumed to come into existence
after the fall of the Yongli emperor in 1662, which would also be 50 years earlier than the time in
question. Certainly no attempt on my part at clever calculation along the sexigisimal scale has uncovered
any likely seeming dates. Yi Sangbae suggests that the likely reason is that “the date is an error caused in
the process of the appropriation of Hongwu’s title by the pamphleteers.” As the ensuing discussion will
reveal, my own position in close to Yi’s but different to the extent that I see the pamphleteers are quite
deliberately claiming the existence of a pretender to Ming legitimacy as a propaganda tactic, and the
spurious reign date is not an error but a deliberate fabrication.

79 JaHyun Kim Haboush, “Contesting Chinese Time, Nationalizing Temporal Space: Temporal
Inscription in Late Chosŏn Korea” in Time, Temporality and Imperial Transition, ed. Lynn Struve
(Honolulu: Association for Asian Studies and University of Hawai’i Press, 2005), 115-141, engages in a
thoughtful discussion of the diverse uses to which Ming time-inscription could be put by the Chosŏn
court. Ming reign dates, however, are a highly complicated matter, coming in numerous variations. See
Kim Yunsu, “T’aen pan’gakpon Sangsŏl komun chimbo taejŏn kwa Soyoch’wisŏn,” Sŏjihak yŏn’gu 5.6:
355-401.
reconnection between Chosŏn (which had been unofficially been using the Chongzhen calendar despite the rise of the Qing empire) was rejected by Song Siyŏl, who had scoffed at the suggestion that such an informal connection could equal the formal exchange of envoys.80

At the same time, even as the pamphleteers employment of alternate time-inscription the use of the alternate time inscription linked them with Lin Yin-guan and the Zheng family, it also provided a rival to a Chosŏn court which had been, unofficially, using the Chongzhen calendar. Because the Chosŏn court rejected, at least formally, Qing legitimacy, in many informal and some formal documents they dated according the Chongzhen emperor – this practice, which was general during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, especially among Noron officials, in any document unlikely to be seen by the Qing court, was still practiced into the twentieth century by those who emphasised Ming Loyalism, such as the descendents of Ming remnant subjects.81 The

---

80 “Ch’oe Sinrok” in “Ŏrok,” Songja taejeon purok 17, HMC 115:539a: “丁未.耽羅獲一漂流.即漢人也. 傳言中原消息曰.今年為永曆二十一年也.宋子愼曰.用永曆何如.先生曰.彼言何可信.就使可信.曾無頒布於我國者.莫如因用崇禎也.”

81 I have found family documents for the early twentieth century which still use Ming era names. An example is the P’ungsŏn’ónjip (National Library # 3648-44-9) a collection of texts concerning Shi Wenyong (施文用) published in 1917). By the late 1980s, only organizations with a particular connection with Ming loyalist ritual - such as the Myŏngŭihoe association of the descendents of Ming migrant families - still used Ming era names. Even in the ostensibly Ming loyalist Taemyŏng yūmsa (Seoul:
cold welcome which Song Siyŏl gave the rival Yongli calendar can, perhaps, be understood as originating in a desire on his part to keep time inscription safely under the control of his philosophical and political faction.

Not surprisingly, considering the disturbing nature of the documents, the Chosŏn court demanded a thorough investigation to discover the authors of the pamphlet, also attempting to establish the source of the Chinese paper, and offering large awards for information, as well as amnesty or emancipation for informants with criminal or servile backgrounds.82 The rewards certainly encouraged informants, but brought them no closer to discovering the original author. Instead it resulted in a series of false accusations, in each case linking the Ming loyalist interlopers represented in the pamphlet with a subversive world of geomancers and smugglers. Yi Sangbae refers to five different false accusations, that of Chang Ch’öllyŏn, a forger, who fingered a prisoner of his acquaintance known for his skill in writing,83 Yi Un of Yangju, who claimed yangban status, fingered a relative with whom he was feuding,84 and Sŏ Chongch’ŏl, a resident of the capital who accused a rival and fellow resident of Seoul of

---

engaging in wild geomantic fantasies related to this pamphlet, by which, when a pamphlet is posted on the Yŏnŭn Gate in Seoul, the survival of the dynasty would be in peril.\textsuperscript{85} Not discussed in detail is the case of Chŏng Yŏm, a man of Kanghwa Island, who accused a fellow prisoner and geomancer from P'yŏngan Province.\textsuperscript{86}

The false accusations by Yi Un and Sŏ Chongch’ŏl both bring to mind the previous case of Unbu, in that both immediately connected a supposed Ming Loyalist conspiracy with the world of geomancy and sedition. Sŏ Chongch’ŏl’s accusation against Yu Ŭnim – later found to have originated in Yu denying Sŏ’s yangban status during a drinking bout – claimed that Yu Ŭnim had expressed knowledge, even before the posting of the pamphlet, that a pamphlet would be posted by a known criminal, Kwŏn Sŏl in accord with a philosophy which claimed that when a pamphlet was posted on Yŏnŭn Gate, the luck of the country would be at great risk indeed.\textsuperscript{87} Another false accusation was made by Yi Un, a fallen yangban of Yangju, in which he accused his neighbour, a man by the name of Paek Sangbok, of boasting of attaching the pamphlet to Yŏnŭn Gate himself, “for fun.” This accusation was mixed in with numerous other

\textsuperscript{85} “Sŏ Chongch’ŏl ch’u’an” CKK13:243-298; Yi Sangbae, \textit{Chosŏn hugi chŏngch’i wa kwaesŏ}, 75-77.

\textsuperscript{86} “Chŏng Yŏm tŭng ch’u’an,” CKK81-116. It is briefly mentioned by Yi Sangbae, \textit{Chosŏn hugi chŏngch’i wa kwaesŏ}, in footnote 114 on page 74.

\textsuperscript{87} The original accusation is found in CKK13: 245-247; for Yun Ŭnim’s counter-accusation that Sŏ Chongch’ŏl had been angry about Yun’s denial of Sŏ’s yangban status, see CKK 13: 262.
charges in a vernacular transcript submitted directly by Yi Un to a very surprised Yi Kihwa, minister of Agency for the Arrest of Thieves, then languishing ill at home. In a text which the officials themselves described as a nearly incomprehensible mix of vernacular and classical Chinese, Yi Un accused a relative, Paek Sangbok, or referring to himself as the Red Emperor (Chŏkche), his younger brother as the White Emperor (Paekche), his two sons as the two dragons, and his house as the palace, even while claiming to have received imperial ki (氣), and that he would soon claim his patrimony. Somewhat of a magician, he and his family engaged in various magical practices and word games, also worshiping heaven in their own role as emperor. In pursuit of their many vile adulteries, Paek had suggested to a slave girl known as Okhwa that she should allow herself to be embraced by his Imperial Body (玉體 Okch’e). More seriously, Yi Un suggested that Paek Sangbok had gathered to himself an army of market guards, and had accused Hyojong, Sukchong’s ancestor, of having Injo’s original crown prince, Sohyŏn Seja, killed, also accusing Sukchong of being a sŏol (in the perspective agreeing with Song Siyŏl). Additionally, Yi accused Paek

---

88 KSTR 79:342.
89 KSTR 79:342: “上變人之書，則眞諺書相雜，語言胡亂，多不可解見.”
90 KSTR 79:343-344.
91 KSTR 79:344: “자기 딸 의 일홈이 육재니，玉體의 놀기라.”
Sangbok of having admitted association with Yŏhwan’s rebels.93

While the other accusations merely confirm that, in 1711, Ming Loyalism was still associated with anti-dynastic conspiracies, the Chŏng Yŏm accusation, brought out most clearly the relationship of the accusation to pirate strongholds of Ming remnants.

In 1712 a convicted felon Chŏng Yŏm of Kanghwa Island informed the court that the culprits were known to a fellow prisoner called Kim Yŏngsŏng, a geomancer from North P’yŏngan Province who, as the Veritable Records informs us, “claimed to be have a good understanding of geomancy,” but who, having set out from Kanghwa and vicinity, he regularly “shouted out bizarre phrases and froze in a trance.”94 According to Chŏng Yŏm’s representation of the conversation he had with Kim, Kim had spent three years on the other side of the Yalu River in a community of outlaws from both Qing and Chosŏn; according to the story passed down to the court, these outlaws had extensive contacts in Chosŏn and also with the “sea wolves” – a community of pirates outside of the authority of both Qing and Chosŏn.95 The writing style of the Yŏnŭn Gate pamphlet
was similar, Chŏng accused Kim of saying, to that of the outlaws in P’algosan, also suggesting to Chŏng that he make contact with the outlaws in the area as they “valued people who were literate and can tell fortunes,” a suggestion which Chŏng said he righteously refused.

Kim Yŏngsŏng made short work of the accusation, in the meantime confessing a far too intimate knowledge of the other side of the Yalu, and so not escaping punishment completely. He admitted that the barbarians (Qing subjects) on the river side included many who spoke Korean well, suggesting that they most likely existed as a result of Chosŏn lawbreakers who fled across the from Chosŏn authorities and submitted to Qing authority;\(^\text{96}\) while admitting of a culturally ambiguous community north of the river, he dismissed the possibility of pirate involvement, suggesting that pirates who travel by sea would have no reason to sneak into Seoul, and that if Qing subjects had been involved with the pamphlet, it must have been with the support of

\(^{96}\) “Choein Chŏng Yŏm tŭng Ch’uan” 12:24, CKK 13:92 “利萬坪賊黨屯聚事段近來江邊往來胡人多有為朝鮮語者，意以為朝鮮有犯罪逃亡者，投託於彼而然也.”
Chosŏn subjects. 97 Ultimately, Chŏng recanted under torture, saying that their statements had only been a desperate attempt to save themselves in the midst of certain death.”

Chŏng Yŏm, in other words, had seen within the Yŏnŭn Gate pamphlet what a fair number of Suckhong’s officials also saw – a hint at a revival of the culturally ambiguous pirate strong-holds of the early seventeenth century. Where the Yŏnŭn Gate pamphlet seemed to hint at Zheng Jin, Chŏng Yŏm’s thoughts were turned to Mao Wenlung’s stronghold in Ka island, and the pirate bands which he had controlled. That he had hit a nerve is suggested partly by the very fact that the accusation was taken as seriously as it was, and also by the fact that Kim Yŏngsŏng, despite being shown to be innocent of the original accusation, was found guilty of a far too extensive knowledge of the north bank of the Yalu, and thus considered better left in prison than released. 99

Just as during the Ming-Qing transition, the main link to the border-crossing world of Ming migrants was not through the elites but through the non-elites, especially within such literate non-elites as geomancers. Kim Yŏngsŏng, among his many other

97 “Choein Chŏng Yŏm tong Ch’uan” 12:24, CKK 13:95.
characteristics, was a geomancer and a literate man yet what he most certainly was not was in anyway a member of the yangban elite; Chŏng Yŏm, evidently, well after the establishment of the Taebodan, considered Ming Loyalism, angry scolding about Chosŏn’s betrayal of the Wanli emperor’s grace, and Ming migrant loyalists, more closely associated with pirates, smugglers and geomancers than with the elites. In this he agreed with Yi Un (of evident fallen yangban status and with the undistinguished title of yuhak or Confucian Student), and with Sŏ Chongch’ŏl – somewhat of a false claimant to yangban status himself who tried to pin the blame on a slightly more distinguished rival in the capital. Just as Ming migrant lineages had not yet been raised from the invidious status of submitting foreigner to the distinguished status of imperial subject, so the stories surrounding Ming migrants were clearly placed outside of elite and legitimate contexts.

5.5) Conclusion: Disloyal Ming Loyalism

In all three incidents described above, a fictitious story of a Ming Loyalist migrant was crafted by swindlers or malcontents who were literate but otherwise disempowered. The figure of the Ming migrant, and especially Ming geomancer, was a
subversive one, one which fit easily into the world-view of these prominent non-elites. This suggests a different aspect to Ming Loyalism than that normally considered. Generally, it is seen as serving the purposes of the Noron elites and of the court, not the interests of those liable to stage a revolt – continued protestations of loyalty to the Ming are usually seen as a response to Qing hegemony, one in which Chosŏn independence, indeed superiority, was confirmed. The three cases above confirm that Chosŏn superiority to the Qing was accepted by these prominent non-elites – Yu Yŏn-li imitated a persecuted Ming loyalist refugee while Yi Yŏngch’ang prophesized the establishment of a descendent of Korean general Ch’oe Yŏng on the Chinese throne following the establishment of a descendent of the Chŏng Mongju on the Korean.

Late Chosŏn Ming Loyalism – especially to the extent that it is understood as an aspect of the toadying tendency of late Chosŏn elite culture – is often treated as a particular characteristic of the elites, imposed from either the court or the dominant Noron faction. Beginning in the late nineteenth century, criticisms of Sino-centric toadyism have generally been accompanied by attacks on the yangban as a group. For instance, Sin Ch’aeho traced the origins of such Sino-centrism to what he saw as the intellectual forbearers of Sino-centrism, the pro-Silla civil officials of tenth century Koryŏ, and traced opposition to such Sino-centric understandings to the defeated
popular religion of Myoch’ông of Pyŏngyang.\textsuperscript{100} More notably Yi Sangbae, in the context of a treasonous pamphlet of 1711, argues that while Ming Loyalism set down roots only among officials and scholars, the ground for this intellectual position is ultimately to be traced to the “universal hostility to the Qing among the common people” on account of the destruction caused by the Ming in Chosŏn. Thus while the “majority of the masses had no great understanding of the Sino-centric morality or world order they all agreed in their hatred of the Qing, which had destroyed Chosŏn and caused great damage.”\textsuperscript{101}

Implicit in Yi’s claim is the suggestion of the presence of a resisting populace, free of the toadying tendencies of the ruling class but possessed of the spirit of a national resistance. Of course, his claim as to a universal held hostility to the Qing is unproven and un-provable, lacking, as we do, any means of reliably investigating the opinions of all but a small proportion of those whom we might consider as “the Chosŏn populace.” Considering the destruction that was caused in the two Manchu invasions, it is also not inconceivable that hostility to the Qing would be widespread for Kyŏnggi Province and provinces further north, although elsewhere its presence is somewhat


\textsuperscript{101} Yi Sangbae, \textit{Chosŏn hugi chŏngch’i wa kwaesŏ}, 62-3.
questionable. Seemingly, his claim in this regard would assume a general unity among the masses (minjung 民衆), perhaps also reflecting the general concern with foreign exploitation which, on account of Japanese colonization and American domination, inevitably has been emphasised by many South Korean scholars.102

The three cases above, however, suggest a very different development to Late Chosŏn Ming Loyalism. The peasants on Chi Island did, seemingly, have a world-view that encompassed castaways, although it is not certain whether it encompassed Ming Loyalist remnants. The prominent non-elites brought to light by the investigations of Yi Yŏngch’ang and the Yŏnŭn Gate Pamphlet seem to have understood elite demands for gratitude for the Wanli Emperor’s intervention during the Imjin War, the importance of time inscription, and even much of the excitement concerning Lin Yin-guan’s crew in 1667. Of course, just as elite Ming Loyalism was more concerned with Chosŏn’s legitimacy then with any deep seated submissiveness to China, so Yi Yŏngch’ang and his fellow conspirators imagined Chosŏn armies, not Chinese, overthrowing the Qing. Yet even while the narratives produced were focussed on Chosŏn, they encompassed a wider world both in time and in space. It is not, of course, surprising that this should

---

102 Discussions of the minjung tradition include the various articles in Kenneth M. Wells, ed., South Korea’s Minjung Movement: The Culture and Politics of Dissidence (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1995).
have been the case. During the Imjin War and early seventeenth century, it had been partly the ease with which Ming migrants had crossed the cultural barrier into the world of Chosŏn’s prominent non-elites which had caused the court to worry about Ming migrants. The Chosŏn populace was not undifferentiated, homogenous mass of resisting subjects, but a group diverse both in family connections and in world-view.
Chapter 6

A Genealogy of Ming Migrant Narratives

6.1) Introduction

The first respectable biographies by prominent civil officials of Ming migrants began to be composed even as Ming migrants were gaining a place within seditious, anti-dynastic narratives associated with geomantic messianism. In a process parallel to the increasing formalization of the role of these migrants within official ritual, these generally Sukchong-era (r. 1674-1720) biographies became, under Chŏngjo (r. 1776-1800), increasingly assimilated into histories associated with the growing rituals of Ming Loyalism. Older biographies became key tools for establishing the cultural status of the Ming migrant descendents, while newer, often highly hagiographic biographies were also written; thus the politically contentious castaways of 1667 became, in later literature, confirmation of Chosŏn’s status as inheritor of the Confucian tradition. The refugees and deserters which had so disturbed the Chosŏn court in the early seventeenth century became, in the biographical tradition of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth, clear cultural descendents of Kija and Confucius, not only bringing Confucian culture to Chosŏn, but also confirming that Chosŏn was the proper home of Confucianism. The
historiographic tradition, as a vital participant to the ritual tradition, aided in their transformation from vagabonds and thieves to Ming Loyalist ministers, even as their descendents were being brought into a more formal relationship with court ritual to the Ming. Not only was the terminology by which they were addressed changed from submitting foreigner to imperial subject, but their biographies were also reworked, to present lives worthy of their new imperial status.

Partly as a result of the Ming Loyalist biographies written during this period, either under court sponsorship or privately, we have a rich textual tradition on Ming migrants and their descendents. Biographies written by prominent civil officials in the seventeenth to early eighteenth centuries were reworked and preserved under Chŏngjo in the late eighteenth; these official court-sponsored biographies influenced privately-written texts, often by descendents of the Ming migrants themselves, up to the early twentieth century. Although these new texts produced by Ming migrant lineages themselves clearly draw on information from earlier ones, commonly these nineteenth and early twentieth century genealogies and family histories treat the ritual function of the Ming migrants as the primary matter of concern, in this reflecting Chŏngjo-era historiography, but becoming a part of the approved history of Ming migrant lineages extending into the present day through the anthologizing labours of such family
These anthologies had a further important result of uniting disparate Ming migrants into a unified category of Ming migrant lineages.

As with the creation of the category of Imperial Loyalist, the creation of Ming migrant biographies was a collaborative process, being shaped by the ideological demands of the Chosŏn court, the goals of particular Chosŏn officials, and the social ambitions of the Ming migrants themselves. The biographies so produced are heterogeneous in origin, development and content. Broadly speaking, however, by the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the biographies had become increasingly sanitized and Ming Loyalist in their goals – emphasising (or inventing) ancestors who participated during the Imjin War, and who refused to submit to the Qing. This emphasis was to the benefit, of course, of the migrant lineages themselves: The very fact of one’s ancestor being noticed and praised by the Chosŏn court could transform the descendents of migrants from being marginal and locally-important families to lineages with access – if limited – to the capital, and claims, no doubt partly accepted, to quasi-elite status. However, as with the very status imperial loyalist, these new narratives were useful to the state by reshaping their relationship to the Chosŏn court, from marginal people who

---

1 P’ung Yŏngsŏp, himself the descendent of Ming migrants, is the author of the Taemyŏng yumin sa (Seoul: Myŏngŭihoe, 1989), among other texts. The Taemyŏng yumin sa is a collection of photocopied sources, including many of the sources which I have used in this study.
could easily be imagined, as in the seditious narratives discussed in chapter five, to a bureaucratically-defined community understood in terms of their support for the legitimacy of the Chosŏn monarchy and their opposition to the illegitimate Qing.

In the following chapter, after outlining the development of Ming migrants biographical anthologies during the late Chosŏn, I will consider one especially richly documented example, that of Kang Shijue. Following that, I will consider a number of less well-documented but otherwise more explicitly Ming Loyalist bibliographic traditions, including that of the Shi Wenyung, Du Shizhong and the Nine Righteous officials. Although these are only a small portion of the Ming migrant narratives present in the sources, through them it is possible to glimpse the process by which the mixed goals of the state, various officials and the migrants themselves produced the sub-genre of the Ming migrant biography.

6.2) The Development of Anthologies of Ming Migrant Biographies

The recreation of Ming Migrant biographies as a sub-genre during the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries owes a great deal to the increasing emphasis of the Chosŏn court on the ritual role of Ming migrants. While some Ming migrants
biographies exist for the seventeenth and early eighteenth century, they were generally scattered within texts oriented towards other aims and were not treated as a unified category. In the late eighteenth century, even as the Chosŏn court was searching for new migrant lineages to take the vital ritual role, it was also searching for new biographical sources which would provide textual support for the new roles in which it was placing migrants. In response, Ming migrants themselves attempted to establish biographies which would preserve their own status within Chosŏn. As with the very status of Imperial Subject itself, the biographies of Imperial Subjects were a collaborative process, resulting, by the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, in the creation of a new and often anthologized sub-genre of Ming Loyalist Migrant biographies. In contrast to earlier biographical materials, these anthologies of Ming migrant biographies brought together as one category the diverse elements that made up the Ming migrant community in Chosŏn, treating them as one unified group of people.

In 1776, Chŏngjo moved the Kyujang’gak Library near the Ch’angdŏk-kung, and encouraged scholars, often the “sŏŏl” descendents of yangban and concubines, to pursue scholarship under royal sponsorship. Partly in rivalry with the evidential scholarship of the Yangzi River and the Four Treasuries project of the Qianlong court,²

² The Four Treasuries project is surveyed by Kent Guy, *The Emperor’s Four Treasuries: Scholars and the*
the Chŏngjo court sent book collectors (kŏmsŏgwan 檢書官) to collect texts – whether banned or officially-produced - from the Beijing book-market, bringing the Chosŏn court into tune with the most up-to-date trends in Chinese scholarship.3

At the same time, the Chosŏn court and scholars generally shied away from the post-Zhu Xi tendency of much Chinese evidential scholarship,4 emphasising the continued importance of Zhu Xi even as they participated in the careful textual scholarship of their Qing colleagues.5 Moreover, while the wider participation in Qing scholarship had, as one effect, a declining hostility to the Qing,6 the scholarship of Kyujang’gak centered scholars was very often bound up with belief in Qing’s illegitimacy and Chosŏn’s exclusive inheritance of Confucian civilization. One

---

3 Discussions of Kyujang’gak scholarship include Kim Munsik, Chosŏn hugi kyŏnghak sasang yŏn’gu (Seoul: Ilchogak, 1996); Chŏng Okcha, Chosŏn hugi munhwa undongsa (Seoul: Seoul Taehakkyo ch’ulp’anbu, 1990).
4 Qing scholarship was not quite as vigorously hostile to Zhu Xi as some Chosŏn scholars may have chosen to imagine. Especially by the 1790s there was a trend towards reconsidering Zhu Xi scholarship and statecraft oriented scholarship, a trend which was strengthened by the Taiping rebellion. See Elman, 232-256.
5 Kim Munsik, Chosŏn hugi kyŏnghak sasang yŏn’gu, 51-58.
6 Within this category are included such so-called Northern Learning scholars as Hong Taeyong, Pak Chiwon and Pak Chega. They are discussed by Yu Ponghak in Yŏnam ilp’a pukhak sasang yŏn’gu (Seoul: Ilchisa, 1995), with their revision of attitudes towards the Qing being discussed on 124-143.
representative Kyujang’gak scholar, Sŏng Haeŭng (1760-1839), produced a considerable body of work emphasising Chosŏn’s inheritance of the Ming mantel and calling for better defences in Chosŏn’s northern border in preparation for the turmoil of the last gaps of the Qing.7 In general, much of the scholarly work sponsored by Chŏngjo, such as the Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou, was explicit in denying the legitimacy of the Qing. Nevertheless, even within such work Qianlong-era historiography often played a vital role in their composition, including those histories, such as the Record of the Dynastic Foundation (Kaiguo fanglue) which attempted to formulate a history of the Manchu that was both venerable and free of Chinese control.8 For instance, Sŏng Haeŭng compiled his biographies of the Late Ming, the Biographies of the Remnant Subjects of Imperial Ming (Hwangmyŏng yumin chŏn), partly through reference to Qianlong era texts, including some simply listed as authored by “many officials of the Qianlong era” (清乾隆諸臣), as well such Ming Loyalist works as those by Huang Zongxi (黃宗羲 1610-1694) which presumably had been obtained through the Beijing book-trade and interaction with Qing officials by Chosŏn legations.9

---

7 Sŏng Haeŭng’s scholarship is discussed by Kim Munsik, Chosŏn hugi kyŏnghak sasang yŏn’gu, 74-115.
8 For instance, see the Chonju hwip’yŏn 1:22, where the Record of the Dynastic Foundation (Kaiguo fanglue) is quoted, if only to contradict it.
9 Sŏng Haeŭng, Hwangmyŏng yumin chŏn, in Yŏn’gyŏngjae chŏnsŏ 37, HMC274:303-4. Concerning Sŏng Haeŭng see Son Weiguo, “Chaoxian wangzhao zunzhou siming wenzhi zhi yanjiu,” (Ph.D. Diss.,
In fact, the uncompromising Ming Loyalism of the Chosŏn court was not necessarily at odds with Qia nglong histories of the Ming-Qing transition, which aimed generally, to “sanitize and dignify the Ming versus Qing armed conflict,” “defend monarchical control and proper institutional balance,” and “encourage loyalty unto death for the ruling dynasty,” and which consequently tended to demonize those historically indispensable Chinese who left the Ming to serve the Qing; a tendency fully shared by Sŏng Haeŭng, who both attacked those “twice-serving ministers” who had served under “dogs and sheep” such as the Manchu. Sŏng’s Biographies of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Ming was an anthology of biographies praising those who had refused, in some manner, to “serve two surnames” or to “shave their heads;” refusal could take the form of courting death, of retreating to the countryside, or of fleeing to other countries including Chosŏn. In his attack on disloyalty he agreed nearly exactly with the Qianlong emperor, although not in Sŏng’s insistence on the

Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, 2001), 3303-361. Huang Zongxi’s work were listed as extant in the Four Treasuries catalogues but not included in the project, possibly because of philosophical tendencies towards Wang Yangming, but more probably because of the anti-Manchu tendency in his writing. See Kent Guy, The Emperor’s Four Treasuries, 111.


11 “Tok hwangjo isin chŏn” in P’ungch’ŏn-rok 4, Yŏn’gyŏngjae chŏnji[p 2:34, HMC 274:256c-d.

12 Hwangmyŏng yumin chŏn, Yŏn’gyŏngjae chŏnji[p 37-43, HMC 274:303a-434d; an introduction to the Biographies of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Ming, the Hwangjo yumin chŏnsŏ may be found within the P’ungch’ŏnrok 1, Yŏn’gyŏngjae chŏnji[p 31, HMC274:186d-187d.
distinction between civilized Chinese and barbarous Inner Asians. In the same vein, histories of Chosŏn, such as the great court-sponsored Ming Loyalist history of the late Chosŏn, the *Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou*, were written to emphasise Chosŏn’s status as Ming Loyalist and Confucian country.\(^{13}\)

Of course, even as this new scholarship re-explored Ming-Qing transition and Qing legitimacy, they also reconsidered Chosŏn’s own history. Among the aspects of Chosŏn’s history reconsidered was the Imjin War. In particular, the publication of the *Complete Works of Ch’ungmu-gong Yi Sunsin* (*Yi ch’ungmugong chŏnso*), began the long apotheosis of the highly successful commander of the Imjin War. While Yi Sunsin, for all his undoubted abilities, had been a controversial figure during his life and in the early seventeenth century, under Ch’ŏngjo he was raised, through court scholarship, to an emblem of all that was praiseworthy in military matters. Both the rethinking of the Imjin War and the new emphasis on scholarly reconsideration of the Ming-Qing transition were deeply involved with the Chosŏn’s court’s reassertion of its inheritance to the status of chief heir to the Ming emperors.\(^{14}\)

These two trends, the reconsideration of the Ming-Qing transition and the

\(^{13}\) A discussion of the composition of the *Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou* may be found in Chŏng Okcha, *Chosŏn hugi chosŏn chunghwa sasang yŏn’gu* (Seoul: Ilchisa, 1998), 129-154.

reconsideration of the Imjin War, had, as an additional result, the court sponsorship of Ming migrant biographies, a process which was also connected with the push, during the reign of Chŏngjo, to identify and classify subjects with Ming migrant lineages. For instance, the last few pages of the *Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou* contain a series of bibliographies of Ming loyalist migrants at the end of a long section of biographies of loyal Chosŏn subjects; a very similar series of bibliographies was also contained in Sŏng Haeŭng’s broader series of biographies of Ming Loyalists in China, Southeast Asia and Korea, the *Biographies of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Ming*, and also in collection of sources gathered possibly, as a preparatory text for the *Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou*, called the *Sources for the Acts of Imperial Subjects*. As with much of Kyujang’gak scholarship, following Chŏngjo’s death in 1800, anthologies of Ming migrant loyalists were produced outside of the purview of the court. Examples of this include the *Record of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Dynasty*, written by Wang Tŏkku (1788-1863), a Taebodan guard (sujikkwan) and member of the Chenam Wang lineage of Ming migrant descendents, the “Biography of the Eight Surnames” (*P’alsŏngjŏn*) written by Sŏng Haeŭng in response to what he saw as the

---

16 The life of Wang Tŏkku, as well as his brother, Wang Tŏk-il, is outlined in the “Ch’anghae Wang sŏnsaeng chŏn” in the supplement to the *Ch’anghaejip*, Kyujanggak # 3424-5, fr. 3:18-24.
inaccuracies of Wang Tŏkkŭ’s account, and in 1830, the eclectic and clearly sourced *Informal History of Sohwa*,\(^{17}\) by O Kyŏngwŏn (1868-?) produced under the auspices of the Mandongmyo and also bringing in a great deal of new information from new sources, some rather heterogeneous to the hagiographic tradition of the *Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou*.

Numerous factors – the entrance of new sources, the particular goals of the text in question, and the presence of earlier texts to borrow from or criticize, affected the shape of the biography. The overwhelming result of the Ming migrant biography, whatever the form, was to create in textual form the ritual category of Imperial Subject. For instance, consider the biographies of Ma Shunshang of the Sang’gok Ma family. As discussed in chapter 3, Ma Shunshang was first mentioned shortly after his migration to Chosŏn during the first half of the seventeenth century, by Kim Yuk (1580-1658) in his *Chamgok’s Brush Talk (Chamgok p’ildam)*, a miscellany recording Kim’s conversations with diverse people in Chosŏn. Kim Yuk’s description of Ma is extremely simple, describing Ma’s escape, but concentrating, not surprisingly for an official so concerned with institutional reform, on Kim’s conversation with Ma, then living in Kwangju in Chŏlla Province, concerning sericulture. Notably, Kim makes no claims of Ma’s grand

\(^{17}\) Information about the above text is outlined in the bibliographic supplement, below.
loyalty or hostility to the Qing, nor does he consider him within a broader category of Ming migrants in general.\(^{18}\) However, it was ultimately this text that guaranteed the Sang’gok Ma lineage’s status within Chosŏn, allowing Chŏngjo to call for a general search for their descendent.\(^{19}\) It was thus quoted in *Sources for the Acts of Imperial Subjects*, although with the discussion of sericulture to one line: “Shunshang was good at sericulture – his techniques have spread widely throughout the Honam region;”\(^{20}\) identical wording was used in the *Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou* and the *Biographies of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Ming*.\(^{21}\)

The search for descendents of Ma Shunshang under Chŏngjo, however, appears to have turned up claimants to the status. They, however, traced their ancestry not to Ma Shunshang but to a Ma Pengzhi (Kor. Ma Pongjik). The story of Ma Pengzhi is much more exciting than that of Ma Shunshang. Wang Tŏkku describes Ma Pengzhi as both settling in Chosŏn and then returning to wage war against the Manchu invaders, being forced out into Chosŏn again after the failure of the Ming defenders in Nanjing. Rather than quietly residing in Kwangju practicing sericulture, Ma Pengzhi established himself

\(^{18}\) Kim Yuk, *Chamgok sŏnsaeng p’iltam*, Kyujang’gak # 6685, fr. 696.

\(^{19}\) See section 4:3.

\(^{20}\) *Hwangjoin sajŏk* fr. 57: “麻舜裳.遵化總兵里光子, 都督貴孫.世襲指揮同知, 父死於深河之戰. 舜裳被俘在虜中六年, 逃入中國. 丁卯, 督粮登州.遇風於廟島, 三日抵豊川, 同舟二十九人, 皆溺死, 舜裳獨生, 流寓湖南之光州以終. 舜裳善治蚕綿, 其訣多傳於湖."

\(^{21}\) *Chonju hwip’yŏn* 2j (762); *Yŏn’gyŏngjae chŏnjip* 43, HMC274:432a.
in Ch’ungeh’ŏng Province, regularly rose up on a hill to lament the fall of the Ming and eventually, heart-broken, wandered off into Kangwon Province, never to be seen again; before doing so he was well known to members of the Ming migrant lineages in Seoul. This story was not completely incompatible with that of Ma Shunshang, who he had, after all, arrived in Chosŏn by 1627, leaving enough time to sire a son old enough to engage in anti-Qing activities in 1644. At the same time, the story was also no a terribly good match. Faced with this far more interesting story, Wang Tŏkku, simply dropped the story of Ma Shunshang and restricted himself completely to the story of Ma Pengzhi – resulting in a somewhat confusing narrative by which Ma Pengzhi returns to Chosŏn without first being described as having once been there.

This was the opposite approach from the Informal History of Sohwa, which overcame the contradiction by describing Ma Pengzhi as the son of Ma Shunshang – thus including both stories, although also preserving more of Kim Yuk’s lengthy discussion of sericulture technique than had the Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou. The Informal History of Sohwa brought in an additional variation to the story of Ma Pengzhi in that they also established him as an author. Referring to him in the post-script as an author of his own Record of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Dynasty,

---

22 Hwangjo yumin rok, fr. 7.
23 Sohwa oesa 2:278-279.
which they seemingly quoted via the Sang’gok Ma genealogy, they brought in through him a series of figures who had been largely unrecorded in the earlier accounts. Whatever the origin of this text, it along with a number of other new sources, had clearly not existed for the compilers of the *Sources for the Acts of Imperial Subjects*, who had otherwise been quite willing to include genealogies in its list of sources. The text, whatever its origin, brought in a series of figures who had come to the Chosŏn court’s attention during the reigns of Chŏngjo and Sunjo, including Shi Jizu, Pan Tengyun and Tian Wanli, even while introducing such intriguing names as Liu the Fortune Teller and Chinese Wang (who, by their address in Kŭmhwa, may possibly have been associated with Pan Tengyun.) Additionally, even as the text introduced these names, it also brought in fantastic stories to accompany them and even well established historical figures, not all of them seemingly in accord with the purposes of the Chosŏn state. Thus, it is a text attributed to Ma Pengzhi which made such interesting observations on the large number of Imjin era soldiers who stayed behind in Chosŏn on

---

24 For instance, consider its treatment of the Nongsŏ Yi family, both Li Delung (elsewhere Li Chenglung) and Li Yingren, where the compilers of the *Sources for the Acts of Imperial Subjects* make extensive reference to the Nongsŏ Yi genealogy. *Hwangjoin sajŏk* fr. 58-96.

25 See bibliographic supplement for page numbers. The recovery of the lineages of Shi Jizu, Pan Tengyun and Tian Wanli is discussed in 4.3. Liu the Fortune Teller and Chinese Wang are mentioned briefly, along with other Ming migrant geomancers, in 5.3.
account of marriage with Chosŏn women. Other stories included by O Kyŏngwŏn are simply fantastic, such as the claim, in this case not drawn from Ma Pengzhi, that Madame Cui had seen, in the run-up to the troubles of the Ming-Qing transition, man-faced dogs prophesying destruction, and flying adolescent immortals descending from above. With the rather more obscure figure Shi Jizu, O Kyŏngwŏn quoted a passage from Ma Pengzhi’s “Travel to the East of the Chao and Shi Lineages” (Chossi Sŏkssi Tongne ki) presumably from his Records of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Dynasty (Hwangjo yumin rok), in which Ma describes how, after the fall of Beijing, Shi Jizu had fled to Liyin Hermitage in Liaodong, where, with the help of a mysterious Liaodongese Daoist, Grand Preceptor Daoguang, he spent six years and then, fearing disaster, had fled from Liaodong to Kang’gye, P’yŏngan Province. Establishing himself in northern Kangwon Province partly through the aid of Li Yingren, he also was able to engage in regular interaction with Ma Pengzhi, in addition to the magical visitation from Grand Preceptor Daoguang.

Where O Kyŏngwŏn seems to have sought out to accumulate sources, however

---


28 Sohwa oesa 2:281.
fantastic, Sŏng Haeŭng in the “Biography of Eight Surnames” chose to take a cautious approach to sources, responding especially to what he saw were the exaggerations of Wang Tŏkku’s text. Presumably writing after his retirement, following the death of Chŏngjo, from the Kyujang’gak, he took, as independent scholar, a seemingly much more critical approach to what he himself had taken when editing the Biographies of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Ming. For instance, the biography of Wen Keshang, as found in the Biographies of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Ming and Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou, had described Wen as travelling from the Yangzi River in 1635 to Yijin in Hwanghae Province. Wang Tŏkku’s Record of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Dynasty, however, expanded upon this description, claiming that Wen had been a retiring scholar who had been forced by the advance of the Manchu (presumably in 1644-5) to set out from Shamen (沙門) for Chosŏn, where he had engaged in regular conversation with another Ming migrant Zheng Xianjia. Pointing out the extreme unlikelihood that Wen Keshang could have travelled directly from the Yangzi river to

29 Sŏng Haeŭng expresses his doubts on this subject cautiously in the preface to the Biography of Eight Surnames, but the over-all tenor of his criticisms suggests considerable doubt as to the scholarly value of Wang Tŏkku’s collection. See “P’alsŏngjŏn,” HMC279:178b: “王鳳岡之後孫德九, 編八姓事, 爲皇朝遺民錄, 多與余所記不同. 然俱出於斷爛之中, 未知失得何居. 概錄之, 以俟他日之考據.”
30 Kim Munsik, Chosŏn hugi kyŏnghak sasang yŏn’gu, 74-5.
31 HMC 274:432c-d: “文可尙宋信國公天祥六世孫, 父榮光居楊子江. 崇禎乙亥漂之朝鮮之殷栗縣, 寻遭丙子之亂, 移居恩津.嘗手錄華語三卷進於朝.授通政階.”
32 Hwangjo yumin rok, fr. 18.
Chosŏn following 1644, and also the fact that official records revealed Wen as having arrived in 1635, he suggested that it was far more likely that Wen Keshang had passed, as with many Ming migrants, into Chosŏn via Mao Wenlung’s satrapy in Ka Island. 33

He raised similar doubts about the story of Ma Pengzhi as related by Wang Tŏkkŭ, pointing out the contradiction of having two different ancestors for the same lineage, and also the unreliability of Ma Pengzhi’s story, involving as it did Pengzhi travelling from the Yangzi to Chosŏn after the fall of Nanjing; travel by land was clearly to be ruled out, and even travel by sea rather unlikely. 34

Despite the considerable variation in the treatment of Ma Shunshang (or Pengzhi) in the anthologies described above, all were in agreement that, as a group, Ming migrants belonged together. The *Sources for the Acts of Imperial Subjects*, especially, made the connection between the biographies and the new category of Imperial Subject explicit by beginning the biographies with several pages of discussion of the royal utterances on Ming migrant lineage participation in military exams and

---

33 HMC380a-b: “案通文館志云: 可尙崇禎乙亥, 漂至我殷栗縣, 尋遭丙子之亂, 移居恩津。與遺民錄不同。竊意通文館志為得, 崇禎乙亥, 椿島尚為皇朝守之, 中國人往往因楨島通我, 可尙必由是路也。”

34 HMC 379d-380a: “麻舜裳, 一名蓬直, 大同人, 都督貴曾孫。崇禎甲申, 清人據北京, 舜裳痛之, 駕扁舟, 往來海濱。及南都陷, 東出朝鮮, 客于湖西之泰安郡, 轉之石城縣。縣中人為置田宅居之, 常登高西望燕都而哭, 晚遊關東, 不知所終。按野史, 鄭舜裳父遵化, 總兵里光, 死於深河, 舜裳被俘於虜六年, 逃入中國, 丁卯督糧登州, 遇風漂至豐川, 遂流寓湖南之光州。與此錄不同。竊意南都陷後, 舜裳察無東來之路, 岂或從海路歟。”
ritual activities,\textsuperscript{35} as did Sŏng Haeŭng, who describes the evolution of the Chinese Brigades in the preface to the “Biography of Eight Surnames.”\textsuperscript{36} The biographies contained within the \textit{Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou} and the \textit{Biographies of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Ming} also treated them as a single unified category by listing the Ming migrants together. Furthermore, they brought them together with a wider category of loyalist, in the case of the former, including them with the biographies of Chosŏn Ming loyalists such as Hong Ikhan or O Talchae and so binding them with the anti-Qing tradition of Chosŏn, and in the case of the later, including them with other Chinese Ming Loyalists whether active in China or Southeast Asia. Even Sŏng Haeŭng in his “Biography of Eight Surnames,” while casting a jaundiced eye on the sources used to prove the historicity of certain lineages, accepted that, as a group, they belonged together, creating lists of the dwellings of the various Ming migrant lineages.

Clearest, and probably involving the greatest distortion, of the attempts to unite Ming migrant families were those by Wang Tŏkkŭ and O Kyŏngwŏn. Within the writings of Wang Tŏkkŭ and the various texts quoted by O Kyŏngwŏn it is clear that the process by which Ming migrant lineages were united by the court under the category of

\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Hwangjoin sajŏk} fr. 1-5.

\textsuperscript{36} HMC 278b: “八姓者，皆在委巷，或深藏峽野，或浪跡江湖，其浪跡江湖者，常網魚，獻上供，其始卽芹曝之誠耳。久而責役甚苦，又肄陣，日斥為倭哨，卑之甚矣。正宗朝始別之為漢旅，又差皇壇守直官。然人之擯棄自如也。”
Imperial Subject had taken a life of its own, going quite a bit beyond the original classifying goals of the court. As was described above, Wang’s accounts of Ma Pengzhi and Wen Keshang has both visit the Ming migrants in Seoul, while O’s discussion of Ma Pengzhi, supposedly quoted from a writing of Ma Pengzhi himself, had Ma engage in friendly discussions with Shi Jizu. The doubtful historicity of Ma Pengzhi and the rather incredible nature of the story of Shi Jizu aside, both Wang and O’s accounts should be seen as attempts to anachronistically read the category imperial subject into the mid seventeenth century, treating Ming migrants scattered about the countryside as if they were one unified community already at that time.

Chŏngjo’s attempts to discover Ming migrant lineages, and his support for the anthologizing of their biographies, had, as one result, a greatly expanded list of Ming migrant lineages and biographies. On the one hand, the labours of scholars working under his direction in the Kyujang’gak, such as Sŏng Haeŭng and Yi Tŏngmu, allowed for the collection and rewriting of already extant documents. On the other hand, just as Yŏngjo and Chŏngjo’s push to find Ming migrant lineages resulted in many lineages in isolated regions requesting court approval for their claim of Ming migrant descent, so court support for the establishment of Ming migrant biographical anthologies had, as one result, the proliferation of accounts, some of them highly improbable, as produced
by the Ming migrant lineages themselves. Ming migrant biographies were part of the classifying activity of the state, but were also produced by Ming migrant lineages themselves who sought to secure their new status.

6.3) Frontier Transformations: The Chosŏn State and Biographies of Kang Shijue

One key biographical tradition within the category of Ming migrant biographies is that of Kang Shijue and the T'ongju Kang lineage. Kang Shijue’s biographies are distinguished from other biographical traditions, including that of Ma Shunshang (himself a rather extraordinarily well attested example), by the quantity and diversity of early biographies available. Although Kang Shijue established himself in the isolated northeast province of Hamgyŏng, where his descendents also stayed, and although able to claim an ostensibly less distinguished ancestry than Ma Shunshang, he came to the attention of the court earlier than any lineages except perhaps that of the Nongsŏ Yi. Beginning with early biographies written during the late seventeenth century when Kang Shijue was still alive, continuing through the reworking of Kang Shijue’s biographies in official anthologies and twentieth century genealogical collections, through the biographical tradition of Kang Shijue it is possible to trace development of
the sub-genre of the Ming migrant biography, and its relationship with both the changing priorities of the Chosŏn court.

Kang Shijue is known to English language scholarship because he wrote a self-account, the “Self-Account of Master Ch’ogwan-dang”(*Ch’ogwanddang-gong chasul)*, describing his experiences as a Ming soldier during the Manchu invasion of Liaodong. This autobiography, which was discovered in the possession of one of his descendents in China’s Jilin Province, is now regularly used as a source for discussing the Ming –Qing transition, notably by Wakeman. Struve, notably, uses it to explore conquest generations memoirs, demonstrating that it, along with other Chinese conquest memoirs, fails to reveal “any exploration of multiple, changing roles such as we find in modern memoirs or, in the frustrated role-performances of the authors, any sense that ‘theatre’ is their own, human-making.” This lack, in the case of Kang, she sees in the fact that the purpose of his autobiography was Kang Shijue’s desire to impress upon his

---

37 Struve, *The Ming-Qing Conflict, 1619-1683: A Historiography and Source Guide*, 180-1, renders the title into pinyin: thus “Chugantang gong zishu.” This is a mistake, as the ensuing discussion will show. The earliest extant versions of this self-account are preserved within the general context of Late Chosŏn Ming migrant biographies, with this title, especially, being no older than the mid-nineteenth century at the earliest.

38 Frederick Wakeman Jr., *The Great Enterprise*, 1:63. Concerning the value of this text as a historical source, see Lynn Struve, *The Ming-Qing Conflict, 1619-1683*, 180-1.
children his desire to have a deliberately perfunctory burial as punishment for his failure
to provide his own father, who fell during the Battle of Sarhu, a proper burial.39

It is a mistake, however, to explore Kang Shijue within the context of the
Chinese autobiographic tradition. Kang was entirely unknown in China until the early
twentieth century when his genealogy first entered Manchuria along with the migration
of a member of his lineage from Hamgyŏng Province into what is now Jilin Province,
and was not part of Chinese historical scholarship until the publication, in the 1980s, of
a 1901 genealogy.40 The composition, preservation, and historiographic influence of his
self-account occurred, until the twentieth century, exclusively within the context of
Chosŏn scholarship and Chosŏn lineages, where, moreover, his position was important
and widely discussed.

For instance, biographical material on Kang Shijue appears first in sequence in
both the Sources for the Acts of Imperial Subjects and the Collected Texts on Honouring

39 Lynn Struve, “Chimerical Early Modernity: the Case of ‘Conquest Generation’ Memoirs” in The Qing
Formation in World-Historical Time, ed. Lynn Struve (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asian
Center & Harvard University Press, 2004), 351-2.

40 Wu Xinli ed, Mingqing xijian shiji xulu, (Nanjing: Jiangshu guji chubanshe, 2000); “Chaoxian zu
unknown to Wu and to Struve, in addition to the hand-copied edition of this was found in the possession
of a descendent of the T’ongju Kang family in Jilin Province in China, another version, minus genealogy,
is also available in in the Koryŏ University rare-books library, but under the title Genealogical Records of
the T’ongju Kang Family (T’ongju Kangssi sejôk).
the Zhou, and first in the subsection on “those who took refuge in the East” in the Informal History of Sohwa.\textsuperscript{41} Already in the 1660s Pak Sedang referred to him in poems, also later writing a short biography,\textsuperscript{42} with Nam Kuman writing another biography in the 1680s.\textsuperscript{43} He was one of only three post-Imjin Ming migrants included in Yi Kŭngik’s descriptions of Chinese dwelling in Chosŏn (the other two are Shi Wenyung and Yi Yingren) in the Narrative of Yŏllyŏsil (Yŏllyŏsil kisul),\textsuperscript{44} and was mentioned by Pak Chiwon in the Yŏrha Journal (Yŏrha Ilgi).\textsuperscript{45} In terms of writings more closely associated with Ming Loyalism, Noron historian Hwang Kyŏngwon wrote the “Record of Chu Hat Hall” (Ch’ogwandang ‘gi), a discussion of Kang within the context of Late

\textsuperscript{41} See Table 1.

\textsuperscript{42} Pak Sedang wrote poems concerning Kang Shijue when he was Army Aid (pyŏngma p’yŏngsa) in the North Hamgyŏng Province region from 1666-1667; they are combined in his poetic travelogue, the “Record of Rectifying the North” (Pukchŏngnok), notably within the “three verses to Mr. Kang (Ch'ŏng Kang Sejak samsu). Pak’s biography of Kang Shijue is undated, but claims to have been based on an encounter with Kang when Pak was involved in military matters, so presumably should be dated to the same period. “When I travelled north following the military tents, I met with Shijue. He was then more than sixty years of age, and his hair had gone completely white.” (余隨幕留北, 世爵適至, 時年六十餘, 鬚髮盡白) If Kang was, as he claims born in 1602, then he would have been in his mid-sixties when Pak travelled to Hamgyŏng Province.


\textsuperscript{44} Yi Kungik, “Chung’guk in,” in Yollyosil kisul 18, Kugyŏk Yollyosil kisul 11:765-766 (Seoul: Minjok munhwa ch’unjinhoe, 1976).

\textsuperscript{45} Pak Chiwon, ”Togangnok” 06.26 in Yorha ilgi, Yonamjip 11:67 (Seoul: Inmunhwasa, 1973), 144.
Ming history, during the eighteenth century. Evidently, by the late eighteenth century Kang Shijue had become a representative image of the Ming migrant, even within works less invested in late Ming Loyalist ideology. While, for obvious reasons, Wang Tŏkkū gave his ancestor Wang Feng’gang priority in his *Record of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Dynasty*, Hwang Ilch’ŏn, in his postscript to the *Record of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Dynasty*, recognized the far better historiography situation for Kang Shijue, “concerning whom earlier scholars have written many biographies.” The point of the post-script is, of course, that Seoul based families should also emulate the T’ongju Kang in this respect, so that “traces of regent Huang and all the licentiates shall exist forever without fading.”

By his own account and the accounts of his two early biographers, Nam Kuman (1627-1711), and Pak Sedang (1629-1703), Kang Shijue was a vigorous soldier who fought the rising Manchu state after the collapse of Liaodong. One of the first prominent Ming migrants following the Imjin War, Kang claimed that his great-grandfather, a grandfather and father had all died in battle in service of the Ming, with his great-

46 “Ch’ogwan’dang’gi,” in “ki,” *Kanghanjip* 17, HMC 224:205c.
47 *Hwangjo yumin rok* fr.21, afterward by Hwang Ich’ŏn: “嗟夫, 皇朝遺民之遯於左海者, 或有後人所聞知者, 或有後人所未聞知者, 而其事則二十三代史所無也. 豈不奇哉. 留守及諸庠生實跡賴此錄, 可以永不泯晦, 然余嘗聞我邦北邊有 荊楚 康世爵間關逃難來居老死. 先輩多作傳. 又有胡文定子孫來居北關, 如此者, 想指不勝屈而荒佚無聞, 甚可恨也. 如得其時東來人姓名無一遺漏, 彙成一卷. 傳之永世, 則當為文獻.”
grandfather falling in battle against the Mongols, and his grandfather dying in Hwanghae Province during the Imjin War. Kang’s father, in particular, had even succeeded in achieving civil appointments, but was arrested for corruption and exiled to Liaoyang, and was accompanied there by Kang Shijue himself. They arrived in time to participate in the war against Nurhaci. Kang Shijue’s father fell in the Battle of Sarhu (1619) but Kang Shijue succeeded in providing his father with a make-ship burial and otherwise escaping execution at the hands of the Jurchen through concealing himself as a Chosŏn soldier. He then continued the war as low ranking officer, in a series of battles between the rising Later Jin state under Nurhaci and the Ming army in Liaodong – the final stage of his military activities was as part of a volunteer ‘righteous militia’ based in a hold out against the Later Jin state in Fenghuang. After the failure of that episode, Kang was captured by the Later Jin, but succeeded in escaping to Chosŏn in 1625 – where, after much initial wandering about, he eventually settled in Hoeryŏng near the border with the Qing, in 1661. However, settlement in Chosŏn inevitably resulted in considerable decline in status, and Shijue himself married a Chosŏn kisaeng or female entertainer, such that his descendents were only granted commoner status by special intervention of the court. Residing in distant frontier, and without distinguished in-laws, his post-arrival life revealed a much less stirring vision than the family background he
painted for himself, or the military activities he described himself as pursuing.\textsuperscript{48}

How did such a marginal figure – both in social status and in geographic location – rise to such significance? In the case of Kang, the process by which Kang became established as minor yangban can best be seen through the development of his biography. The early biographies of Pak Se dang and Nam Kuman, for instance, were extraordinarily effective in improving Kang’s social status, also in the very aspects of Kang which they emphasised, suggesting that their own interest in Kang was influenced by a diversity of political concerns of their own. On the one hand, their biographies are less hagiographic than those produced during the late eighteenth century. For instance, they treat Kang as a local character, telling us of Kang’s drinking habits, his quarrels with corrupt officials, his comments on history, an argument with wife concerning a mudang, his language problems and some sly fishing techniques practiced by him (involving filling the stream with leaves so as to destroy the nets of fisherman further down-stream.) On the other hand, the interest of Nam, especially, in Kang, should be seen as a reflection of his general interest in the defence of Chosôn’s northern frontier.\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{48} This brief biography is a reworking of his self-account and various other biographies.

\textsuperscript{49} Kang Sŏkhwa, \textit{Chosôn hugi hamgён̄gdo wa puksang yón̂gt’o úisik} (Seoul: Kyŏngsewŏn, 2000), 48-54. Also see section 2:2 of this thesis.
Both Nam and Pak were from the Soron branch of the Sŏin faction,\textsuperscript{50} and had views of the Qing which were noticeably less strident than those of prominent Noron such as Song Siyŏl.\textsuperscript{51} They were writing thirty to seventy years after the Manchu invasion and the refugee conflicts engendered by it, and shortly after the fall of the last Ming stronghold in the conclusion to the War of the Three Feudatories.

The very material for the Kang Shijue biographies was collected by Nam and Pak when they were on official business in North Hamgyŏng Province; in the case of Pak, he first met Kang in 1667 when he was Military Aid for North Hamgyŏng Province. In the case of Nam Kuman, not only did he meet Kang when he was governor of North Hamgyŏng in 1671, he also wrote his biography of Kang is 1688 – the very year, as it happens, that the Chosŏn court ordered the emancipation of Kang’s wife and descendents.\textsuperscript{52} In fact, Nam and Pak’s biographies were successful in raising the status of Kang’s family. In 1727 a call was made to provide Kang Shijue’s descendents with a pension and accelerated enrolment in the \textit{ch’in’giwi} (親騎衛), an elite military corps organized in North Hamgyŏng Province. When making this suggestion (which was, 

\textsuperscript{50} The Noron-Soron split was not yet irremediable, at this time. For a discussion of the problem of timing the Noron-Soron split, see Yi Hŭihwan \textit{Chosŏn hugi tangjaeng yŏn’gu} (Seoul: Kukhak charyowŏn, 48-79).

\textsuperscript{51} A notable attempt to view the Noron-Soron split in terms of intellectual differences and attitudes towards the Qing may be found in Yi Ŭnsun, \textit{Chosŏn hugi tangjaengsa yŏn’gu} (Seoul: Ilchogak, 1988).

\textsuperscript{52} See below.
ultimately, approved by the court) the official made direct reference to the biographies of Nam Kuman and Pak Sedang by arguing that the collected works of both established a series of reliable biographical facts concerning Kang. Thus the early biographies of Kang gained political meaning by defining him as worthy of the concern of the state. The very fact that important officials chose to place their stamp of approval on Kang by writing his biography had a vital effect on the social status of Kang’s descendents.

These biographies, which both Nam and Kang deployed so effectively as political tools, inevitably were written differently from later bibliographies. Writing as they were before the establishment of the category Imperial Subject, they had to be convinced that Kang was a valuable subject to an audience who might automatically assume that Kang and Ming migrants of his sort were a source of worry, or at least not from a status-bracket comparable to that of yangban from prominent civil official families. This was, after all, still an era when subversive groups could assume that the narrative of the Ming Loyalist migrant presented a challenge to the Chosŏn state, and

---

53 Sāngjongwŏn ilgi 649. Yŏngjo 3 (1727) 11.13 (ülch’uk): “益寬曰：‘康世爵者，大明荊州人也。其祖當壬辰天兵征倭時，以將校，戰亡於平山，其父國泰，當己未，亦以將校，戰亡於深河，世爵，脫身東來，客居于會寧地，蓋中國已左衽，父讎無處可復，托迹我國，其意甚悲，故相臣南九萬，故判書臣朴世堂文集中，皆立傳以紀其實，今可按覆也。世爵生時，朝家未嘗有褒錄之舉，已是欠典，今其子孫，亦多有有勇力善騎射者，而家貧無以辦戰馬，且聞其世讎淸人，不肯與淸人互市，故淸差開市時，所賣獺馬，一不買取云，其意尤可尙也。今若奨拔其材勇者，令該曹各別錄用，其中可合親騎衛者，令北兵使，許其入屬，則似乎得宜矣。” 上曰：“依爲之。其志槪可尙，各別錄用事，申飭，可也。””
not long after the potentially divided loyalties of Ming migrants made them a possible source of discord with the Qing. For instance, both Nam and Pak feel the need to characterize Kang as being unlike other Chinese migrants. Most explicitly, Nam informs us that: “I have seen that of those Chinese (中國人) who have come East, many are haughty and greedy, and beg shamelessly. Only Shijue did not engage in vain boasting, only he did not take that which was not his due. He did not speak duplicitously or engage in suspicious activities. His reputation spread throughout the village, and he taught his good habits to his sons. That is why he is worth writing about.”54 Pak does not compare him directly with Chinese, but does suggest that Kang is exceptional: “Shijue is not cruel or petty, and is not a common person.”55 Both Pak and Nam assume that their audience would have a negative impression of Ming migrants, within the category of “Chinese who came to the East (中國人來東者);” unlike later biographies of other Ming migrants, he is not yet categorized as one other example within the already positive category of imperial subject (皇朝人). In Nam’s account especially, there is a suggestion that Ming migrants were still seen as an economic burden, in this, perhaps, also reflecting the difficulties that overwhelmed P’yŏngan Province when large

---

54 “余見中國人來東者，類多浮誕好利求丐人不厭，世爵獨能不虛誇不妄取，無二言無疑行，信孚於鄉里，教行於諸子，此皆可書者也。”
55 “世爵為人不齷齪，類非庸人。”
numbers of Liaodongese fled war in their homeland. Elsewhere, Nam, responding, perhaps, to the stereotype of Ming migrants, felt the need to emphasise that Kang, although skilled in fortune telling, did not charge money for his fortunes, and though skilled in military arts, did not seek out quarrels.56

A further likely source of concern for the state was the possible ambiguity of Kang’s loyalty, combined with the fact that Kang resided in an impoverished border region, susceptible both to international conflict and domestic unrest. In his biography of Kang, Nam, thinking of the widespread prejudice that Hamgyŏng pukto was especially prone to spirit-worship, devoted a substantial section to describing the righteous refusal of Kang to allow his wife to employ a mudang to assist in curing their son from disease.57 In this context, it is interesting that the officials considering Kang’s enrolment in the chin’giwi made specific reference to Kang’s righteous refusal to use any Qing products, even though dwelling close to an important border market.58 This, in

---

56 “世爵居北土幾五十年, 人多稱之. 蔚略解占相推命, 未嘗鬻技. 拳勇絕人, 未嘗鬪競. 能力農畜穀. 以其餘周貧濟飢, 未嘗有吝情.”


58 Sŏngjongwŏn Ilgi 649, Yongjo 3 (1727) 11.13 (ûlch’uk): “其意甚悲, 故相臣南九萬·故判書臣朴世堂文集中, 皆立傳以紀其實, 今可按覆也. .... 且聞其世讎淸人, 不肯與淸人互市, 故淸差開市時, 所賣獺馬, 一不買取云, 其意尤可尙也.”
fact, refers to Nam’s biography, which describes Kang’s refusal to “to allow one hair of (Qing products) to come near his body or enter his family,” although they are “widely distributed among the people,” and also of the complete certainty, despite the suspicions of others, that Kang would never cross the Tumen river into Qing territory. 59 Notably, one line from Pak’s biography that was repeatedly quoted in later biographies was his claim that Kang’s reason for departing for Hamgyŏng Province has been his worry about living in such close proximity to the Jurchen (虜) 60 – this phrase is also picked up in the Ch’oe Ch’angdae’s “Inscription for the Grave of Kang Shijue” (Kanggun sejak myojimyŏng), the biography of Kang Shijue in the Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou, in Hwang Kyŏngwŏn’s “Record of Chu Hat Hall” and in the biography in O Kyŏngwŏn’s Informal History of Sohwa, despite the improbability that Kang relocated to a border town merely for the pleasure of righteously refusing to purchase Qing produces. 61 Yet, through Nam and Pak, Chosŏn officials were assured that Kang’s loyalties were not, in any way inclining towards the Qing. This allowed the court later to decided to enrol Kang’s sons in a military capacity; the very fact that he needed to

59 “所居乃淸人開市地.貨物徧民間.而世爵自以戴天爲痛.未嘗一毫近諸身畜諸家.家居江水之瀕.苫蓋悉以藁.未嘗以草.日人或以越江疑我.何以自解也.北來官吏聞其名.多招延之.能知其賢否高下.不可意者.雖請未嘗往也.”

60 Pak Sedang, “Kang Sejak chŏn”: “遊關西諸郡懸數月.以近虜懼難去之.歸客咸與端川間八九年.”

61 See section 3:4 and 3:5.
make this comment, however, suggests that to the court the loyalty of Kang Shijue was in doubt.

Such reticence concerning Kang Shijue’s loyalties was not present in later discussions, as Kang Shijue’s descendents, along with other Ming migrant lineages, were reclassified as an Imperial subject. Increasingly in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the very form of accounts of Kang Shijue were reoriented to define his loyalty to the Ming as his essential characteristic. This may be seen in the titles of Kang Shijue’s self-account. The oldest extant edition of Kang Shijue’s self-account, contained within the Sources for the Acts of Imperial Subjects, is referred to as the “Self Account of Kang Shijue.” Even a rewriting this text found in the Informal History of Sohwa is known as the “True Facts of Master Kang” (Kang’gong sasil), while the source-list included within the front-matter of Sŏng Haeŭng’s Biographies of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Ming titles the text simply as “Self Account” (chasul) with the author’s name immediately below. However, the later version contained within the early twentieth century T’ongju Kang genealogy refer instead to the “Self Account of Master Ch’ogwandang” (Ch’ogwandang’gong chasul), referring to him by a style literally translatable as “Chu Hat Hall,” and thus clearly referring to his origins in Huguang.

63 Sŏng Haeŭng, Hwangmyŏng yumin chŏn, in Yŏn’gyŏngjae chŏnsŏ 37, HMC274:304a.
While this it is hardly unheard of to refer to an ancestor in such a fashion, the emphasis on the “Chu hat” was hardly present in earlier biographies. Nam Kuman, for instance, mentions Kang’s “Chu Hat,” only to refer to the court decision by which it was declared improper for “those who wore cap and gown” in Ming China to be treated as servile in Chosŏn.\(^{64}\) The author of the presumably nineteenth century gazetteer of Hamgyŏng Province, the *Brief Record of the Northern Road* (*Pungo kirjak*), was completely unaware of such a term, despite the regional focus of the history (he is aware of the continuing military tradition of the Kang family), does not seem to know this detail.\(^{65}\)

While it may be impossible to know the point at which Kang’s descendents started referring to the house as Ch’ogwandang and Kang as Ch’ogwandang-gong, probably the first reference to this term is Hwang Kyŏngwŏn’s “Record of Chu Hat Hall,” a historical reflection on Kang which subsumed Kang Shijue entirely into the category Ming Loyalist migrant. Hwang, a prominent Noron historian, wrote the *History of the Southern Ming* (*Nammyŏngsŏ*), and the *Biographies of Secondary Officials of the Ming* (*Myŏngbaesinjŏn*), a series of hagiographic biographies of Chosŏn officials who had served well against the Manchu and for the Ming; he was also involved in the production of the *Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou* (*Chonju 64* 

> “道臣以上國衣冠之裔，論賤籍為可傷，上聞朝廷，許贖從良.”

65 *Pungno kirjak* (Seoul: Asea Munhwasa, 1974), 235-236.
Elements of Hwang’s scholarship are evident in the “Record of Chu Hat Hall.” On the one hand, the biography is overtly hagiographical, on the other hand, specific reference is made to the later history of the Yongli emperor and refugee Ming princes in Siam. In an otherwise substantially inaccurate account (Hwang claims that Kang entered Chosŏn via Ŭiju, for instance), Hwang describes how Kang built his house on the Tumen River (遂避地入會寧府, 作堂于豆江之口以居之), and how, after his death, the people of Hoeryŏng “who all felt close to him” named Kang’s hall the “Chu Hat Hall” (康氏既死, 會寧之人, 皆憐之. 因以楚冠.名其堂). This very much suited Kang’s life in general, as Kang, Hwang tells us, even though “more than ten-thousand li from Xingmen” in Huguang, kept his mind in Huguang by wearing the the Chu Hat. Hwang contrasts Kang with the court of the Yongli emperor, who, though they fled to Burma, could not protect their lives, and the many Ming princes who fled to Siam and ended up tattooing their bodies in the manner of the locals – if only, Hwang laments, they could have come to Chosŏn, where Kang Shijue was proof that Ming migrants could come and preserve both their lives and their culture. To Hwang, then, Kang Shijue is additional evidence that Chosŏn, and Chosŏn alone, preserved the Ming

66 “Ch’ogwan’dang’gi,” in “ki,” Kanghanjip 17, HMC 224:205c.
The process by which Kang Shijue was made respectable began already within Kang’s self-account. The self-account, does not seem to have been widely available until its inclusion in the Sources for the Acts of Imperial Subjects; while Kang’s motive in writing the account may have been to provide instructions to his descendents, the motive of his descendents in preserving the self-account was presumably to establish that their family was of a good lineage and had come to Chosŏn under worthy circumstances. Aspects of the self-account are somewhat unbelievable (and perhaps self-serving), and in key areas where it is possible to check, serious falsehoods have been uncovered. Kang goes into great detail on some subjects – his ancestry, including his grandfather who fell during the Imjin War, his desire to have his father properly buried, his filial desire to follow his father into exile, and the loyal anti-Qing motive for his eventual flight to Chosŏn. On other subjects, however, he is much less forthcoming. Thus, the editor of Kang’s self-account in the Qingshi Shiliao notes that Kang Shijue’s account of his ancestors cannot be properly confirmed, and suggests that his memory may have been at fault. The locations described in his account as the family seat, to

---

67 The Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou, presumably quoting Hwang, briefly mentions that Kang’s hall was called the Ch’ogwandang. Chonju hwip’yŏn 2:757 (j): “扁室曰楚冠堂.起居其中.” This comment is also quoted in Kang’s biography in the Sohwa oesa. Sohwa oesa 2:278.
which his ancestor moved eight generations previous (that is, Shida 石塔, stone pagoda) 40 li north of Zhuangzhu (荊州) cannot be confirmed in the gazetteers of Jingju-fu (荊州府), nor are the various relatives who he describes as exam passers recorded elsewhere.68

It is, of course, perfectly possible that some of this information may be recoverable elsewhere – perhaps in a slightly different form or for a slightly different period, or perhaps in an as yet unutilized source. It should certainly be remembered that Kang was writing this narrative years after the events in question, without family members or neighbours who could assist him with dates, names, locations and degrees. Family exaggerations (which as a young man he may have taken at face value) and the use of popular or regional place names (which may not have existed on maps or gazetteers of that era) all may have resulted in the production of untraceable or false information. It seems more like, however, that either Kang Shijue, or his descendents, invented some of the information in the autobiography. In fact, this pedigree was extremely useful in Chosŏn. The fact that his ancestors fought against the Mongols, the Japanese and the Manchu was mentioned by Nam Kuman,69 although the act by which

68 Wu Xinli, “Chaoxian zu Tongzhou Kangshi shipu zhongde Ming-Man guanxi shiliao,” 179.

69 "曾祖祐以金州參將, 戰死蒙古, 祖霖從楊鎬東征死平山.... 國泰在劉綎軍 ... 軍過牛毛嶺, 敵兵從隕中突出, 矢如雨下, 大軍前後不相救, 敗績, 都督自燒死, 國泰亦中箭死.”
his descendents were enrolled in the ch’in’giwi only mentioned his grandfather’s death in battle against the Japanese and his father’s death in battle against the Manchu at Sarhu.\(^{70}\) If, as seems likely, Kang Shijue was merely of literate Liaodongese military antecedents who saw fit to transform his identity in Chosŏn, then he seems to have succeeded: The creation of a distinguished Southern Chinese and literate lineage, which had also participated in the Imjin War, put Kang Shijue and his descendents in much better stead in Chosŏn.

A more potentially socially damaging stain on Kang’s descendents class-background than mere Liaodongese ancestry was his marriage to a North Hamgyŏng kisaeng. His status as Ming migrant, no doubt partly established thanks to the interest in him shown by Nam Kuman and Pak Sedang, allowed his descendents, after his death, to be emancipated from this servile status; without this vital political event, the formation of Kang’s descendents in the relatively respectable T’ongju Kang lineage would, of course, have bee impossible. As such, this event is quite often recorded within his biographies, but, providing as it did a potential social problem in so status-conscious a society as late Chosŏn, the more hagiographic biographies generally eliminate it.

The first reference to Kang in the Veritable Records is sometime after his death,

\(^{70}\) Sŭngjongwŏn ilgi 649, Yŏngjo 3 (1727) 11.13 (ûlch’uk): “益寬曰: “康世爵者, 大明荊州人也. 其祖當壬辰天兵征倭時, 以將校, 戰亡於平山. 其父國泰, 常己未, 亦以將校, 戰亡於深河.””
and describes the emancipation of his children. Kang is described as having had an affair with a kisaeng of Kyŏngwon (通慶原府妓). The children born to Kang Shijue and this kisaeng would, according to usual principles, inherit their mother’s lowborn, servile status; either according to the matrilineal rule (chongmobŏp從母法) which had recently been brought into effect by the Sŏin during this period, or according to the default convention by which a base parent on either side resulted in servile status for the descendents, Kang’s children should have inherited their mother’s base status.  

Conventions by which the children of yangban and their base-born concubines were treated as commoners, and the convention by which the children of a kisaeng and yangban often were treated as commoners, did not, evidently, apply immediately in Kang’s case; it took a special act in the Chosŏn court to grant his descendents commoner status:

[The King] ordered that Imperial Ming subject Kang Shijue’s children be emancipated. Shijue was a man of the Central Kingdom (中朝). He wandered into the northern regions of our country, and had an affair with a kisaeng of Kyŏngwŏn, giving birth to many children. The governor of that province

71 For a discussion of court debates and legal controversies concerning the inheritance of servile status during the Chosŏn dynasty, see James Palais, Confucian Statecraft and Korean Institutions (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1996), 208-270.

72 Palais, Confucian Statecraft and Korean Institutions, 222 and 226.
requested that [his children] be emancipated.\textsuperscript{73}

Within the passage in the \textit{Veritable Records} itself, the influence of Pak’s biography of Kang Shijue would seem to be apparent; the specific context provided for Kang descendant’s emancipation is placed in the military service of his ancestors to the Ming and his Ming loyalist background, both subjects that were mentioned explicitly by Pak’s biography, and later by Nam’s biography as well. Nam’s biography, on the other hand, was published the same year as the emancipation of Kang’s descendents, and so would seem to be related to, in some fashion, to the act of emancipation itself. Nam’s reference to Kang’s marriage is also somewhat different from the reference in the \textit{Veritable Records} in that he refers to Kang as taking “a post-station servant to be his wife and siring two sons (with her).” He also provides a reason for the emancipation as the fact that the officials of that province were concerned about the implications of associating a descendent of Ming “men of the cap and the gown” with a “base household.”\textsuperscript{74} The belief, possibly spurious, that Kang was of an elite “cap and gown” household, was one that Nam and Pak themselves had established. The early biographies, in other words, by establishing Kang as a Chinese elite and as a war hero,

\textsuperscript{73} \textit{Sukchong Sillok} 19: 14, Sukchong 14 (1688).03.08 (sin’gi): “命贖皇明人康世爵子女, 世爵, 中朝人也。流落於我國北地, 通慶源府妓, 多生子女, 道臣狀請許贖。”

\textsuperscript{74} “世爵以驛婢為妻生二子。道臣以上國衣冠之裔, 淫賤籍為可傷, 上聞朝廷, 許贖從良。”
played a vital role in allowing for the emancipation of his children.

Yet, if the early biographies provided vital support for the emancipation of Kang’s descendents and their elevation to the status of minor yangban, they also contained information that was, in the highly status conscious society of Late Chosŏn, embarrassing to them. Indeed, already in the seventeenth century biographies, one can identify some tendency to alter the context of the misalliance. Pak Sedang, possibly because he is writing before the emancipation itself, or perhaps because he did not know or care about Kang’s status, makes no mention of any marriage on Kang’s part. It is notable, already here, that Nam already seems to desire to change somewhat the context of the emancipation, by treating the affair with a kisaeng as a ‘marriage’ with a ‘post-station servant.’ What was mentioned with seemingly few reservations in the seventeenth century became seemingly more controversial in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Nam quotes the officials worried about connecting a Ming literatus with ‘baseness;’ by the late eighteenth century, that expression of concern seems to have been in need of suppression. As an official and public act it was not, of course, completely suppressed – in fact, the original act as described in the Veritable Records is preserved in the Supplement to the Mirror of the Chosŏn Dynasty (Kukcho pogam
While Yi Kŭngik, perhaps because he, as Soron official, was relatively unconcerned with bolstering the status of Chosŏn Ming Loyalism, included reference to the event.

However, there was evidently also considerable desire to suppress knowledge of this event. This resistance, of course, was present on the part of the T’ongju Kang family themselves. In the version of Nam’s biography, as quoted in the *Genealogy of the T’ongju Kang Family*, reference to the emancipation is completely suppressed – the passage in question is simply removed. Notably, while a passage from the *Supplement to the Mirror of the Chosŏn Dynasty* is quoted, it is not a passage that refers to the emancipation, but one which quotes Chŏngjo’s comments on Ming ‘loyalists’ in general without making any specific reference at all to either Kang Shiju or the T’ongju Kang family. By the twentieth century, then, the burden of having a servile ancestor was clearly unwelcome to the T’ongju Kang lineage. It is not at all surprising that such a reference would be eliminated from a clan record. What is somewhat more noteworthy is the tendency of other authors to expunge such references also. Thus, neither the *Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou* nor the *Informal History of Sohwa* make any

---

75 Kukcho pogam pyŏlp’yŏn 06:12 a-b, Yŏgang ch’ulp’ansa ed., 205-6 (Seoul:1985).
76 Yi Kungik, “Chung’guk in,” in *Yollyosil kisul* 18, Kugyŏk 11:765-766.
77 *T’ongju kangssi sejŏk*, Koryŏ University edition, folio 17 and 23.
reference at all to this event. For the editors of *Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou, the Biographies of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Ming* or the *Informal History of Sohwa*, Kang as Ming loyalist could not be reconciled with Kang cohabitating with a kisaeng.

The bibliographic tradition of Kang Shijue’s biography is part of the general tradition of Late Chosŏn Ming migrant biographies. It contrasts with the general tradition of Ming migrant biographies mostly by the wealth of the materials available, an aspect that was recognized by later compilers of migrant biographies. More significantly, in the case of Kang Shijue’s biographical tradition, the political role of the biography is obvious in ways that it is not for other biographies. The biographies written by Nam Kuman and Pak Sedang, especially, played a key role in raising Kang Shijue’s descendents from marginal people with a servile ancestor to minor military yangban in Northern Hamgyŏng Province; an improvement in status that Kang Shijue’s self-account attempted to reinforce. The later development of the biographical tradition, in accord with the general rise in status of Ming migrant lineages in the eighteenth century, established Kang Shijue’s descendents as representative Ming loyalist migrants. However, because the political goals of the earlier biographies written by Pak Sedang and Nam Kuman were different from later biographies written by Hwang Kyŏngwŏn,
certain details, such as Kang’s marriage to a *kisaeng*, were seen as unacceptable and not included in later biographies, even while other, previously absent details, such as the supposed importance that Kang placed on his Chu Hat, were emphasised.

6.4) Ming Loyalism and Migrant Biographies

The transformation of Ming migrant narratives which occurred in the case of Kang Shijue actually happened quite generally, with individual features of early narratives being transformed and rewritten as they were integrated into the Ming Loyalist ritual tradition. Through a process already beginning in seventeenth century biographies, and involving active collusion on the part of both the Chosŏn state and the Ming lineages themselves, Ming migrant biographies were rewritten to emphasise the Ming Loyalism of the original migrant. In the process, disturbing features – expertise in geomancy, or connection to the wrong factions or kings – were generally erased or deemphasised, even as their connection with Kija, a Shang migrant who later tradition established as arriving in Chosŏn during the Shang-Zhou transition, was emphasised.

Whether in Late Imperial China or Chosŏn Korea, lineages needed to establish an appropriately respectable history to establish their position within local society, Michael Szonyi’s discussion of the importance of an acceptable North Chinese myth of
origin being one example.78 Another example, very much relevant to this thesis, is Kim Hyŏnyŏng’s study on the T’amjin Ch’oe family of Ch’ŏn’gok, Kwangju. The T’amjin Ch’oe of Ch’ŏn’gok were the descendents of Ch’oe Sarip, a general who had died fighting the Qing during the Pyŏngga War of 1636-7. Following, especially, the recognition of Ch’oe Sarip’s sacrifice by Yŏngjo in 1766, this politically and economically marginal lineage had produced texts through which they established the fact that their ancestor had been declared a merit subject and demanded that they no longer be exposed to tax or corvée. While this document, along with two other documents – one describing the suffering of one ancestor during the Kimyo Literati Purge of 1519, and the other describing the military activities of Ch’oe Sarip – could hardly rival the extensive collection of records held by established yangban families, and although such documents as did exist still contained numerous obvious inaccuracies, it did succeed in protecting them from tax and corvée, and in thus gave them marginal, but still valuable, yangban status. This, Kim argues, is an excellent example of the “Invention of Tradition.”79

---


The reinvention of the Ch’oe Sarip’s lineage as a loyalist, yangban family bears a fair number of similarities with the Ming migrant lineages discussed in this study. Kang’s grandfather’s Imjin War participation is one example, perhaps, of the reinvention of the lineage to improve the position of its members within Chosŏn society. Similarly, the fact that, in O Kyŏngwŏn and Wang Tŏkku’s accounts Wen Keshang and Ma Fengzhi were described as fleeing Chosŏn after the fall of Beijing, also more clearly established the migrants as anti-Qing, pro-Ming heroes than the more likely reality of escape from the chaos of Mao Wenlung’s satrapy. For Wang Tŏkku, only recently established as Taebodan guard, the emphasis of these features was both a response to the state’s reclassification of him and his lineage as Ming loyalists, and also, as, no doubt, with the T’amjin Ch’oe, part of the need of his lineage to protect their otherwise very weak claim on yangban status.

Indeed, within writing produced by the lineages themselves, all identities other than Ming Loyalist have been expelled. Many lineages, especially put great emphasis on their ancestors similarities to the great Shang migrant to Chosŏn, Kija (Chin: Jizi). The very name Chosŏn was adopted because of a reference to Kija. Kija, supposedly was a loyal official who, although opposed to the misrule of the last years of the Shang

80 See section 6.2.
dynasty, also refused to serve under the new Zhou dynasty, establishing himself as ruler
of the state of Chosŏn (Chin: Chaoxian) in southern Manchuria and northern Korea
1122 B.C.E. Within Chosŏn, moreover, he was seen to have established sage Confucian
rule, with many Chosŏn scholars tracing Chosŏn Confucianism not to China but to
Kija’s early development of it within Chosŏn soil. He was a representative loyal official
who refused to serve two surnames despite the misrule of the Shang monarchs under
which he had been serving, and so became part of the historiographic tradition
emphasizing the impropriety of serving two dynasties.  

Not surprisingly, reference was made, especially in later biographies, to Kija.
The earliest case was that of geomancer and Ming deserter Du Sizhong. When Du was
still alive and active in Chosŏn, prominent Sŏin minister Yi Sibal (1569-1626) wrote a
poem in his honour, in which he compared Du’s decision to remain in Chosŏn to
Confucius’s expressed desire to life among the Nine Yi (often interpreted as Chosŏn);
Yi ends the poem by suggesting that, since the heritage of Kija’s enfeoffment is good,
there is no reason to leave Chosŏn. Although Yi died before the fall of the Ming, he

81 Han Young-woo, “Kija Worship in the Koryŏ and Early Yi Dynasties: A Cultural Symbol in the
Relationship Between Koryŏ and Chosŏn,” in The Rise of Neo-Confucianism in Korea, ed. Wm. Theodore
described Ming migrants in terms that were echoed in many later reflections on Ming migrants residing in Chosŏn. For instance, O, in the post-script to his “Record of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Dynasty” in the Informal History of Sohwa, suggests Chosŏn’s exclusive preservation of Confucian clothing and culture, as well as the remnants of Kija’s sagely rule, made it worthy of the residence of Ming migrants.83

Additionally, Hwang Kich’ŏn, in his post-script to the Record of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Dynasty, argues that the preservation of Yin culture in Chosŏn by Yin migrants following Kija after Yin’s fall to the Zhou was comparable to the preservation of Ming culture in Chosŏn by Ming migrants; if anything it was a far more desperate affair, as Chinese (中夏) civilization was maintained falling the rise of the Zhou, but was obliterated following the rise of the Qing.84

Wang Tŏkku, as Taebodan guard, can, with some justice, be referred to as a professional Ming Loyalist. That certainly is the impression that one receives from his remaining writings. Consider, for instance, the narratives of the Nine Righteous Officials described in Wang Tŏkku’s Record of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Dynasty. The nine biographies contained within monotonously describe the heroic

83 2:295.
84 Hwangjo yumin rok fr. 38: “從箕子來者倚仰箕子遯跡於周室疆域之外，反不愈於洛邑之頑民哉。然殷之遺民持國亡之悲，而中夏禮樂衣裳則不淪，猶至抱恨終身而況國既亡矣，兼以變華為夷者乎，其爲悲也，豈殷遺民之所可同也。”
“refusal to submit” (不屈) of each of the heroes to the Qing,\textsuperscript{85} their plots with Hyojong and their lamentation after Hyojong’s death\textsuperscript{86}—yet, while certainly Hyojong did for a time, pursue a policy of military preparation against the Ming, it is also true that the nine righteous officials were in all cases returned to Chosŏn with Qing permission and probably after careful negotiations, during which a certain amount of submission can be suspected.\textsuperscript{87} Other writings by Wang Tŏkku similarly describe Wang and his lineage solely as Ming migrant and in relation to the Ming Loyalist tradition as a whole, even bringing himself into connection with the anti-Catholic “defending orthodoxy and resisting heterodoxy” (衛正斥邪) movement. For instance, Wang Tŏkku’s collected works (titled \textit{Ch’anghaejip})\textsuperscript{88} is provided with a preface by Kim P’yŏmuk (1819-1891), a prominent member of that movement; within the supplement of the text are a series of discussions of texts concerned with Ming Loyalism, including the \textit{Record of Shipwreck of Lin and Chen (Imjin p’yohaerok)}, evidently an account of the Lin Yin-guan incident

\begin{footnotes}
\item[85] For instance, \textit{Hwangjo yumin rok} fr. 4: “丁丑叛賊孔有德陷皮島, 公舉家被獲, 公時年三十, 賊憐其少壯其人以甘言誘之, 終不屈賊, 義之不可害, 併夫人黃氏因之.”
\item[86] For instance, \textit{Hwangjo yumin rok} fr. 5: “永曆己亥夏, 王薨公感先王之恩禮, 慟大義之未伸.”
\item[87] See section 3:5.
\item[88] \textit{Ch’anghaejip}, Kyujang’gak # 3424. The preface, by Kim P’yŏngmuk, a prominent member of the “defend orthodoxy and drive heterodoxy” movement, is dated to 1888 (the fifth muja year of the Yongli reign).
\end{footnotes}
of 1667. There is also a discussion of a text, seemingly written by Wang Tŏkkŭ himself, titled the *Record of Honouring the Zhou (Chonjurok)* and seemingly beginning and ending entirely with discussion of Ming Loyalist migrants with copious comparisons to Shang migrants such as Kija. Other texts written by him include discussions of the Chojongam and the shrine to the Nine Righteous Officials established therein and poems in honour of the new Yongli calendar.

Lineages less closely associated with professional Ming Loyalism than the Chenam Wang also strove to establish themselves as exclusively part of the category Ming loyalist. Perhaps because of his prominence in the tradition of messianic geomancy, Du Shizhong was hardly mentioned in the four Confucian Loyalist texts mentioned above, only rating a brief mention by O Kyŏngwŏn in the *Informal History of Sohwa*, and by Sŏng in the “Biography of Eight Surnames.” Nevertheless his descendents of the Turŭng Tu lineage of Taegu seem to have been no less devoted to Ming Revivalism and Confucian Loyalism: the region in which they settled became

---

89 *Ch’anghajejip*, fr. 3.17-3.18, Named after the two leaders among the castaways of 1667, Lin Yin-guan and Chen De, this seems to be another name for the *Chŏngmi chŏnsin rok*, Kyujang’gak # 4239.
90 *Ch’anghajejip* fr. 3.15-3.16.
91 *Ch’anghajejip* fr. 3.23.
92 *Ch’anghajejip* fr. 1.18.
93 O Kyŏngwŏn informs us only that Du Sizhong settled in Taegu. *Sohwa oesa* 2:275.
94 HMC 279:381: “大邱之杜,謂杜師中後.”
95 HMC 279:381: “大邱之杜,謂杜師中後.”
Taemyŏng-dong (Great Ming Village, now a neighbourhood in Taegu), an early twentieth century genealogy and history refers to him as Master Momyŏng (Momyŏng sŏnsaeng; literally Master Longing for the Ming). This lineage makes no reference at all to Du Shizhong’s true claim to fame as author of secret prophecies, although the preface does make reference to Du’s extraordinary foresight in remaining in Chosŏn to avoid the Qing. They do, however, bring Du clearly into the context of Ming Loyalism, including within the text lists of Ming soldiers who fought within Chosŏn and also of those who remained after the withdrawal of Ming armies. This emphasis on Du as primarily Ming loyalist is also found in a collection of geomantic texts purportedly preserved by his lineage and recently published under the title *Secret Prophecy of Master Momyŏng (Momyŏng sŏnsaeng pigyŏl).*

The status implications of such a move are most noticeable in the case of the Shi Wenyung’s descendents. Shi Wenyung is clearly recorded in the *Veritable Records* as having been executed after the Injo restoration, and he was most definitely connected

---

95 *Momyŏng silgi*, Kyujang’gak # 11632. The Tu family of Taegu, however, was still of preface is dates to the 21st Kwangmu year. Kwangmu being a reign date established by Kojong along with his founding of the Great Han Empire in 1897, but having been formally abolished 11 years later in 1907 with Kojong’s forced abdication. The use by the Turŭng Tu lineage of Taegu of this reign date in what must be 1917, seven years after the Korea’s annexation by the Japanese, suggests that they, at least, made the leap from Ming Loyalist to Chosŏn loyalist.

96 Fr. 1-2.

97 See section 5.3.
with Chŏng Inhong, Kwanghaegun and the Pugin faction. However, in the *P’ungch’ŏn Record* (*P’ungch’ŏn-rok*), an early twentieth century genealogical record of the Chŏlgang Shi lineage, his descendants argued that he had, in fact, escaped execution (having always been on extremely bad terms with Kwanghae-gun) and had lived out his remaining days in Sŏngju, where he established a shrine to the Ming, the Taemyŏngdan.98

In the case of Shi, our records suggest that this process began at least by the mid-eighteenth century. Perhaps connected with the general “Noronization” of former Pugin within this region in the eighteenth century,99 already by Chŏngjo’s reign Shi Wenyung’s descendents had been rewritten as Ming Loyalists and respectable people. Although Shi’s biography is not included in the *Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou*, it is in both the *Informal History of Sohwa*, were he is the first migrant listed,100 and the *Sources for the Acts of Imperial Subjects* where he finishes the list;101 in both cases, it is the eighteenth century re-imagination of Shi as closet Sŏin who is described “honouring

---

98 National Library # ko 364844-9. This preface is dated to the fifth chŏngsa year of the Chongzhen era, or 1917. The most detailed declaration of Shi Wenyung’s lack of involvement may be found in the Myŏngch’on-gong silgi [*明村公實記*], *P’ungch’ŏnroks* 1:9-15.


100 *Sohwa oesa* 2:274.

101 *Hwangjoin sajŏk* fr. 105.
the Ming every morning at his shrine in Sŏngju,” although, in the *Informal History of Sohwa*, his controversial contribution to designing the foundations of the Kyŏngbok palace is also mentioned. A similar biography is preserved by Yi Kŭngik in the *Narratives of Yŏllyŏsil*, although amusingly, while in his “Annals for Kwanghae-gun,” Shi Wenyung is clearly described as a prime mover in the wasteful building projects of that period, the “Chinese” (Chung’ugin) section describes Shi exclusively as a Ming migrant.¹⁰²

The case of Shi Wenyung’s descendents is especially noteworthy because the Chosŏn court itself can hardly have been ignorant of Shi’s actual historical role. Evidently, for the state, the transformation of Ming Chinese lineages into Ming Loyalist lineages was sufficiently important as to allow it strategically forget the controversial nature of many of these migrants at the time. For Ming migrants themselves, the advantages to recognized Ming Loyalist status, especially for farmers in impoverished Hamgyŏng province, or geomancers in Kyŏngsang Province, must have been very great indeed, granting, as it did, yangban status and access to the capital. Not surprisingly, members of the migrant lineages, whether, as with Wang Tŏkku, they were officially employed as Ming migrant loyalists, or whether, as with the Tu family of Taegu, they

were only marginally associate with the tradition, tended to place heavy emphasis on their Ming loyalist antecedents, removing inconvenient details and placing heavy emphasis on the often spurious Ming loyalist antecedents. The tradition of Ming Loyalist migrants is an invented one, developing through the interaction of Ming migrant lineages with the state during the eighteenth century, and continuing on its own volition through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

6.5) Conclusion

Ming migrant biographies, like the seditious narratives discussed in chapter 5, depict their subjects as consumed with hatred for the Qing and love of the Ming. Unlike the seditious narratives of the seventeenth century, the officially-sponsored narratives of the late eighteenth century were established under court support and generally supportive of the goals of the court. Some migrants, such as Du Shizhong, have to this day a lively role in both types of narrative, and some narratives seemingly belong to the seditious school – such as the story of Shi Jizu – wormed their way into the canonical tradition. Sharing though they do many features with the seditious tradition, canonical Ming migrant narratives also represent a break from the earlier tradition, just as the
creation of the category Imperial Subject represented a break from the earlier location of Ming migrants within the category transforming subject.

We are not, of course, blessed with the presence of eighteenth century biographies of Jurchen lineages. The presence of Ming migrant biographies is a boon to historians studying the entrance of Chinese into the Korean peninsula during the Chosŏn dynasty. However, Ming migrant biographies, whether produced under the auspices of the state or by the lineages themselves, are political texts; they distort the lives of the migrants themselves even as they transform them into Ming Loyalists.

A careful discussion of the history of Ming migrant biographies is thus vital for the understanding of Ming migrants as a whole and of the rise of Late Chosŏn Ming Loyalism. First, very simply, to treat the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth century versions of Ming migrant biographies at face value is to distort the history of the Ming migrants. These biographies are the product of a long period of development occurring in association with the ritual and administrative activities of the state. Anthologies of Ming migrant biographies, for instance, owe their existence to Chŏngjo’s cultural policy and the Kyujang’gak library, but continued to be produced after the decline of this library through the work of the lineages themselves and through privately produced texts such as the Informal History of Sohwa. The very category,
moreover, is inconceivable without the creation of imperial subject status under Yŏngjo
and Chŏngjo. While the biographical tradition of Kang Shijue was well-established
already during the late seventeenth century, most migrant biographies originate during
the late eighteenth century, and were put together through state-sponsorship. Even Kang
Shijue’s biographies, composed though they were before the development of this
biographical tradition, show the influence of state policy. The biographies themselves
later also influenced state policy by assisting in Kang’s rise in status. Indeed, in
numerous other cases, state sponsored biographies played a vital role in the efforts of
the lineages themselves to establish their respectability.
Bibliographic Supplement to Chapter 6

Below are listed biographies of Ming loyalist migrants according to their inclusion in the various Chŏngjo and Sunjo era anthologies. Those whose names have been indented are those mentioned briefly along with other figures without a separate entry. They are generally not paginated separately.

Chinese characters are provided the first time a name appears only.

1. *Sources for the Acts of Imperial Subjects* (*Hwangjoin sajŏk 皇朝人事蹟*)

   The text used is the Kyujang’gak edition, #2542.

   This text lacks a preface or a stated author. By the fact that Chŏngjo is referred to as “current ruler” (tangjŏ 當君), with the last reference (fr. 8) dated to the second year of Chŏngo or 1778, it must clearly have been completed, at the earliest, in the very late 1770s. The first few frames referring to a series of royal commands related to Ming migrants, and the remainder of the text gathering together sources related to Ming migrants, each organized according to the person being discussed. Many of the sources quoted have been slightly edited.

   The migrants discussed are as follows:

   Kang Shijue fr. 10-35  
   Feng Sanshi fr. 35-36  
   Chen Fengyi (陳鳳儀) fr. 36-37  
   Zheng Xianjia fr. 37-40  
   Wang Junye fr. 40  
   Han Dengke, etc. fr. 40  
   Hu Keji fr. 41  
   Tian Haoqian fr. 43-51  
   Daoist Zhang Yunqi fr. 51  
   Wang Ponggang fr. 52-57  
   Ma Shunchang fr. 57  
   Li Yingren fr. 58-80  
   Li Delong (李得龍) 80-96  
   Pei Sansheng 96-97  
   Wen Keshang 97  
   Madame Qiu 98-102  
   Cui Huizhe 102-104  
   Huang Gong 104-5.

2. *The Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou* (*Chonju hwip’yŏn 尊周彙編*)


   The *Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou* was compiled by the court during the reign of Chŏngjo (1776-1800), with the goal of providing a record for later generations of the praiseworthy activities of loyal officials. However, Chŏngjo died before it was completed, and it was never formally printed. Among the editors listed in the introduction is Sŏng Haeung, the author of the *Biographies of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Ming* and “Biographies of the Eight Surnames,” discussed below. A discussion of the composition of the *Collected Texts* may be found in Chŏng Okcha, *Chosŏn hugi chosŏn chunghwa sasang yŏn’gu* (Seoul: Ichisa, 1998), 129-154.

   The first half of the *Collected Texts* is structured as a Basic Annals beginning in Wanli 23 (1592), and ending during the reign of Chŏngjo (1776-1800). Each year being dated according to Ming era names until the death of the Yongli emperor, after which the reigns of Chosŏn kings are used. These Basic Annals are followed by a series of descriptions of Ming Loyalist ritual activities.

   The biographies of Ming migrants are included in the final section of the Compiled chapters, the *Acts of the Officials* (*諸臣事案*), biographies of a long series of biographies of figures who had shown exemplary courage against the Qing. The Three Loyal Scholars (Samhaksa) Hong Ikhan, Yun Chip and O Talchae
have the honour of the first biographies, and the biographies of Ming migrants account for only the last few pages.

The text being used for this study is the Yŏng ch’ulp’ansa edition. Unfortunately, the biographies of Ming migrants was bound and paginated out of sequence. To avoid confusion, in this thesis they have been repaginated according to the Roman alphabet. Thus, the pages are, in proper order: 755(a), 756(b), 757(c), 758(d), 763(e), 764(f), 759(g), 760(h), 761(i), 762(j), 765(k), 766(l), 767(m), 768(n), 769(o).

Kang Shijue (康世爵): a-d.
Huang Gong (黃功): g-o.
Wen Keshang (文可尚): k.

Tian Haoqian (田好謙): d-e.
Wang Ponggang (王鳯岡): h.
Hu Keji (胡克己): k.

Li Yingren (李應仁): e-g.
Feng Sanshi (馮三什): i.
Zhang Yunqi (張雲起): k-l.
Zheng Xianjia (鄭先甲): i.
Han Dengke et.al. (韓登科).

Pei Sansheng (裵三生): i-j.
Kong Zhixiu (孔枝秀): j.
m. Madame Qiu (屈氏).
Ma Shunchang (馬舜裳): j-k.
Lady Cui Hui (崔回媪).

3. Biographies of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Ming (Hwangmyŏng yumin chŏn 皇明遺民傳).

Edition used is that included in Sŏng Hae’ŭng’s Complete Works (Yŏn’gyŏngjae chŏnjip), Han’guk Munjip Ch’ŏng’gan edition (HMC 274:303-434).

As Sŏng Hae’ŭng (1760-1839) explains in his preface, found in his P’ungch’ŏn Record (P’ungch’ŏnrok 1, Yŏn’gyŏngjae chŏnjip 31, HMC274:186d-187d), his Biographies of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Ming (Hwangmyŏng yumin chŏnsŏ) are based on an earlier text by fellow Kyujang’gak scholar Yi Tŏngmu (1741-1793), the “Oenoe nangnak” (磊磊落落). Many of the biographies in the Biographies of Remnant Subjects are similar to those in the Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou (discussed above), for which Sŏng Hae’ŭng is listed as an editor. Most of the biographies are of Ming remnant subjects who lived their entire lives in China or who fled to South East Asia, but the final few (HMC 274:430-434) discuss Ming migrants to Chosŏn, who are, in order:

Kang Shijue 430c-431e
Tian Haoqian 431c-432a
Li Yingren 432a-b
Ma Shunchang 432c
Daoist Zhang Yunqi (道士張雲起) 432c

Wen Keshang 432e-d
Hu Keji 432d
Wang Ponggang 433a-b
Huang Gong 433b-c
Feng Sanshi 433c
Chen Fengyi 433c
Zheng Xianjia 433e

Pei Sansheng 433c-d
Kong Zhixiu 433d
Wang Junye (王俊業) 433d
Han Dengke et.al. 434a
Madame Qiu 434a-c
Lady Cui Hui 434 c-d.
4. “Record of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Dynasty” (Hwangjo yumin rok 皇朝遺民錄) in the Informal History of Sohwa (Sohwa oesa 小華外史) by O Kyŏngwŏn (1868-?)

The text used is a colonial era reprint and translation, the Sohwa oesa: genbu Wayaku taishō. Keijō: Chōsen Kenkyūkai, 1914.

The prefaces in this edition begin in 1830 ("the fourth kyŏngin year of the Yongli era") and continue to 1868 ("the fifth mujin year of the Chongzhen era"). The Informal History of Sohwa is, like the Collected Texts on Honouring the Zhou, concerned with providing a history of Chosŏn from a Ming Loyalist perspective. It differs from the Collected Texts in that it was compiled later than the Collected Texts (which it, in fact, quotes) and was also produced privately. As with the Collected Texts, O Kyŏngwŏn writes Informal History annalistically, starting with, however, the first king of Korea, T’aejo (1392-98) and ending during the reign of Sunjo (1800-34). Contrasting with the Collected Texts, however, O is generally explicit as to his sources. The “Record of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Dynasty” (kwŏn 10, 2:273-295 of colonial era edition) is one of three supplementary texts appended to the end, including a series of documents related to the Imjin War (kwŏn 9) and a description of Ming Loyalist rituals in the Taebodan (kwŏn 11).

The colonial era reprinting which I am using seems to be nearly identical to Sohwa oesa, Kyujang’gak # 5026, Kyujang’gak # 7021 and Kyujang’gak # 7023.

| Shi Wenyung 274 | Wen Keshang 280-1 | Feng Sanshi 284 |
| Xu Xue (書鶴) 274-5 | Kong Zhizhu 281 | Wang Wenshang 284-5 |
| Tian Wanli 275 | Daoist Zhang Yunqi 281 | Pei Sansheng 285 |
| Zhang Lung (張龍) | Liu the fortune teller | Huang Gong 286-91 |
| Ma Shunshang 278-279 | Pan Dengyun | Zheng Xianjia 292-3 |
| Ma Fengzhi (龐風直) 279 | Liu Zhichen | Madame Qiu 293-4 |
| Tian Haoqian 279 | Shi Jizu (石繼祖) 281-2 | Lady Cui Hui. |
| Li Yingren 279-280 | Wang Yiwen (王以文) 282-3 | |
| Hu Keji 280 | Yang Fuji 283-4 | |
5. “Biography of the Eight Surnames” (P’alsŏngjŏn 八姓傳)

This text is also by Sŏng Haeŭng, contained within his P’ungch’ŏn Record (P’ungch’ŏn-rok 風 泉錄) in supplementary volumes (sokchip) 15 of the Yŏn’gyŏngjae chŏnjip, HMC 279: 378-381. He refers to Wang Tŏkku’s writing, of which he is very critical. The first eight surnames discussed are indeed all the focus of Wang Tŏkku’s Record of Remnant Subjects. At the end, he lists a long series of names.

The biographies are organized as follows:

**The Eight Surnames**

- Wang Yiwen 378b-c, Yang Fuji 378c,
- Feng Sanshi 378d
- Wang Wenshang 378d
- Pei Sansheng 378d-9a
- Wang Meicheng 379a
- Zheng Xianjia 379b
- Huang Gong 379b-c

**In brief – 380d-381a**

- Li Yingren
- Kang Shijue
- Hu Keji
- Tian Haoqian
- Zhang Yunqi
- Kong Zhishu
- Han Dengke
- Liu Taishan

**Additional Full Biographies**

- Liu Jishan 379c-d
- Ma Shunchang 379d-380a
- Wen Keshang 380a-b

- Li Zhicheng (劉自成)
- Shi Kyu (石奎)
- Wang Chengzhou (王承祖)
- Cha Dashou (查大受)
- Song Yingchang (宋應昌)
- Chai Dengke (宋應昌)
- Wan Shide (萬世德)
- Qian Zhizhong (千志中)
- Lan Fangwei (藍芳威)
- Peng Youde (彭友德)
- Zhang Haibin (張海濱)
- Du Shizhong
- Qin Suide (秦綏德)

6. *Record of Remnant Subjects of the Imperial Dynasty (Hwangjo yumin rok 皇朝遺民錄)*

Text used is National Library # ko 25669.

Wang Tŏkku (1788-1863), the author of this text, was a member of the Chenam Wang Ming migrant lineage and also a Taebodan guard during the reign of Chŏngjo. His *Record of Remnant*
Subjects is focussed on describing, in generally highly hagiographic terms, only the nine migrants associated with the Ōŭidong neighbourhood in Seoul, with heavy emphasis being placed on the connection with Hyojong (1649-59). Indeed, the text is organized according to these nine figures. However, in the process other migrants are mentioned as well.

The preface is dated to the third muin year of the Yongli emperor (永曆三戊寅) or 1818. According to the Kyujang’gak bibliographic outline, there is an earlier, 1800 edition of the same text extant. I have not been able to consult that edition.

The biographies are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wang Yiwen</td>
<td>4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madame Cui</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma Fengzhi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang Fuji</td>
<td>8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feng Sanshi</td>
<td>10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Wenshang</td>
<td>13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pei Sansheng</td>
<td>14-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Meicheng</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zheng Xianjia</td>
<td>16-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wen Keshang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang Gong</td>
<td>18-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu Jishan</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 7

Conclusion

This dissertation has explored the interaction of two migrant and border communities in the Late Chosŏn, Jurchen from the Tumen and Ming Chinese, beginning in the late sixteenth century and continuing into the eighteenth, also considering the historiographic tradition into the nineteenth. This has involved a consideration of the sixteenth and seventeenth century Chosŏn state’s support for the pŏnho, a community with ambiguous cultural and political loyalties. It also involved discussion of the Chosŏn state’s suspicion of the large number of Ming deserters and Liaodongese refugees who entered Chosŏn during the Imjin War and the early seventeenth century. Additionally, the dissertation has explored the institutional and ritual changes by which Ming migrant lineages were privileged over Jurchen lineages in the seventeenth and eighteenth, and the corresponding development of a Ming migrant biographical tradition, including the subversive tradition of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and a canonical one of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Through this the dissertation has attempted to explore the changing understanding of subjecthood and
Ming Loyalism during the late Chosŏn.

During the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, court policies to divided loyalties among Chosŏn subjects were influenced by diverse political and administrative considerations. In the case of the pŏnho, the ambiguity of their political and cultural position was considered valuable because of the role that they played as conduits of information and trade. The very ambiguity of their loyalty was precisely what made them valuable as subjects to the Chosŏn court, and the elimination of this ambiguous community was the result, not of hostility from Chosŏn’s elites, but of the militarization of the Jurchen by Nurhaci and Hong Taiji. Nevertheless, the absorption of many pŏnho into the new Manchu state allowed the Chosŏn state to make much clearer territorial distinctions during the eighteenth century.

The case of Ming migrants was different. Unlike the pŏnho, they were not established Chosŏn subjects, and were, moreover, subjects of Chosŏn’s hegemon, Ming China. Their settlement in Chosŏn occurred within the context of war, and brought with it considerable political risk made worse by their association with powerful, and sometimes nearly autonomous, Ming military figures such as Mao Wenlung. Despite the general hostility of the Chosŏn court to these migrants, non-elites in Chosŏn seem to have passed, with relative ease, across cultural boundaries. Efforts on the part of the
Chosŏn court to prevent such a carefree attitudes towards tax and loyalty obligations were largely futile. Even the demand by the Qing, during the period 1637-45, for the return of all Liaodongese migrants did not succeed in removing these lineages, many of whom had intermarried with Chosŏn women and disappeared from view.

The subject-obligations of both Jurchen and Ming Chinese were transformed during the mid-seventeenth century in tandem with other administrative reforms during this period. Both Jurchen and Ming Chinese lineages were treated similarly during the seventeenth century in the category “transforming foreigner,” a hereditary category which permanently defined those within it as foreigners in need of settlement. While this category had originally been designed to settle migrant and border communities on Chosŏn soil, such communities had largely ceased to exist in Chosŏn following the consolidation of the Tokugawa shogunate in Japan and the Qing Empire in Manchuria and China. However, transforming foreigner status persisted as a hereditary tax category through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries despite intermittent attempts at reform. From this category developed the ritually defined status of imperial subject, a status which inscribed Ming Loyalism as the primary characteristic of the Ming Chinese lineages so categorized. This redefinition did not isolate Ming Chinese lineages from Chosŏn society, but integrated them firmly within the narrative by which Chosŏn was
seen as heir to the Ming; Imperial subject lineages were officials in service of Ming emperors to whom the Chosŏn king was chief heir, and as such, were established as loyal subjects of the Chosŏn king but with higher status than they had previously enjoyed.

Ming migrant biographies followed a similar development. The subversive biographies of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, for instance, had clearly described Ming migrants as both loyal to the fallen Ming and subversive to both the Chosŏn and Qing courts. The Chosŏn court took these narratives very seriously indeed, searching vigorously for the perpetrators and, often, partly believing the claims of a conspiracy of Ming Loyalist migrants. Beginning with the late eighteenth century, especially, the Chosŏn court itself began to sponsor Ming migrant biographies, which like the subversive narratives of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries emphasised the unbreakable loyalty of the migrants to the fallen Ming. Unlike the subversive biographies the court-sponsored biographies treated the presence of Ming Loyalist migrants on Chosŏn soil as additional proof that Chosŏn was the last refuge for Confucianism since the barbarian Qing had conquered Ming China. This image of Ming migrant which dominates in the limited amount of scholarship on this subject was, in fact, one that developed during the late eighteenth century and represented a significant
break with earlier narratives.

The introduction to this dissertation suggested three themes which could be profitably reconsidered through the investigation of migrant and border subjects: Sino-Korean relations, Late Chosŏn social status, and Ming Loyalism. As for the theme of Sino-Korean relations, this dissertation has built on earlier research on Ming-Chosŏn and Ming-Qing relations. Chosŏn policy towards migrants, for instance, was influenced, seemingly, less by its favourable attitude towards the Ming than by the practical exigencies of administration and international politics. Jurchen were established subjects of the Chosŏn and Chosŏn, for this reason, sought to defend them against Nurhaci. Liaodongese migrants, by contrast, were guests who owed loyalty not to the Chosŏn court but to the Ming; the fact that they were connected to a state possessing as much authority and influence as the Ming made them, if anything, more unwelcome as they brought with them considerable political risk.

Of course, the picture changes once more if Sino-Korean relations are understood as relations between people instead of states. The Chosŏn state did attempt to maintain clear boundaries between its subjects and Ming Chinese even as it encouraged considerable ambiguity in the case its Jurchen subjects. However, the maintenance of such boundaries was very difficult indeed in the face of Ming Chinese
and Chosŏn Koreans who became very adapt at crossing those boundaries. Jurchen, of course, were masters at such border-crossing, leading to considerable difficulties for the Chosŏn when attempting to fulfil Qing demands for the repatriation of Jurchen. In the case of Liaodongese, such cultural border crossing, often described in the sources as “changing clothes,” allowed Liaodongese migrants to escape Nurhaci by passing into P’yŏngan Province, and Koreans to depart with Ming soldiers into Liaodong. The Chosŏn court worried that it would encourage a general collapse in social order, and some Koreans did, in fact, use association with the Ming army to commit crimes within Chosŏn. Other Ming Chinese seem to have pursued far more humble goals, marrying Chosŏn subjects and establishing themselves in isolated regions of the state. The border between China and Chosŏn did, in fact, matter relatively little to non-elites, who had the cultural flexibility and often the need to cross over such cultural, geographical and political boundaries. For the Chosŏn court and yangban elites, by contrast, such cultural and political borders were very important, much as were the distinctions between yangban, commoner and slave.

As for the second point, this dissertation agrees with scholars who argue that Chosŏn had a closed elite and immobile status system, but does so only by rejecting the “cosmopolitan civilization centered on China.” On the one hand, whatever may be said
of a “Korean identity,” the Chosŏn court was, in fact, concerned to distinguish its subjects from the subjects of other states, even to the extent of classifying migrants of Jurchen or Ming origin as submitting foreigners long after the original migration to Chosŏn. Ming migrants, moreover, were by no means welcome into the ranks of Korean yangban. During their initial migration, for instance, Ming migrants became associated with such non-elite activities as geomancy, medicine and interpreting, and seem to have passed into Chosŏn often with relatively little contact from elites. After the end of the wars which brought Ming migrants to Chosŏn, they were classified, along with Jurchen, as submitting foreigners. The ritualized Ming Loyalism of the eighteenth century did result in the improvement of status of those who could claim Ming origins, but only to the extent of giving Ming migrants special positions in Ming Loyalist ritual; it did not provide them with unfettered access to positions in the civil bureaucracy. Yangban status continued to be monopolized by people with unimpeachable genealogies as Korean yangban and as such was no more open to Ming Chinese than it was to non-elite Koreans.

As for Ming Loyalism, it was indeed primarily oriented towards the interests of Chosŏn’s court and elites, as is suggested by the general lack of welcome for Ming lineages within the ranks of Chosŏn elites. This dissertation, however, adds to our
understanding of Ming Loyalism in a number of respects. In chapters 4 and 6, for instance, it demonstrated the extent to which the ritualized Ming Loyalism of the eighteenth century was not a continuation with the anti-Qing military preparation of the seventeenth, despite official historiography during the Chosŏn dynasty which saw Yŏngjo and Chŏngjo’s reigns as ritual extensions of the practical military preparation of Injo and Hyojong. At least in the response of the court to Ming migrant lineages, however, Yŏngjo and Chŏngjo were not so much continuing the mid-seventeenth century as breaking with it; Ming migrants were not generally considered representatives of the Ming during the seventeenth century, but were given official ritual roles as representatives of the Ming in the eighteenth century. This dissertation also suggests that Ming Loyalism was not only an affair of the court and elites, but had a substantial non-elite component. There was a seditious tradition in the seventeenth century focussed on the symbol of the Ming migrant, and Ming migrants themselves, though by no means elites, took an active role in shaping the Ming Loyalist narratives constructed by the courts concerning their ancestors.

Sŏ Pongnyong, the mid-seventeenth century Jurchen chieftain from Ch’ungch’ŏng Province whose complaint to the Board of Rites contributes to both chapters 2 and 4, provides the readers of the twenty-first century with a rare glimpse of
the history of the rise of Nurhaci written from the perspective of Jurchen who refused to participate in this rise.¹ Even making allowances for the fact that Sŏ was speaking to an audience of Chosŏn officials, it is fascinating to hear through him that it was perfectly possible, even in the mid-seventeenth century, for a leader of the Trans-Tumen pŏnho community to rate loyalty to the Chosŏn state higher than Jurchen affiliation, and also that it was entirely conceivable for the anti-Qing Chosŏn state to value the loyalty of its Jurchen subjects. It is further interesting to reflect that, a century and a half later, people, like Sŏ Pongnyong, who traced their origins to the Amur River, largely disappeared from the record, while those who claim descent from Ming migrants – at one point part of the same category of submitting foreigner as Sŏ Pongnyong - became more prominent, such that some Koreans still claim Ming migrant ancestors. Sŏ Pongnyong and the many other migrant and border subjects mentioned in this text remind us that the categories into which the states of Northeast Asia divided their subjects during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries – including Manchu, submitting foreigner or imperial subject – often had very limited antiquity; rather, they were categories recently created by the state and manipulated by the subjects themselves. Furthermore, the disappearance of Jurchen submitting foreigner subjects during the late eighteenth

¹ See section 4.2.
century reminds us that these state-sanctioned categories were in constant flux, being regularly altered according to the administrative and ideological needs of the state.
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