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Abstract

Cultural Expressions of Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea: an Analysis of the Korean Embassies in the Eighteenth Century

Doctor of Philosophy, November 2008

Jeong Mi Lee

Department of East Asian Studies
University of Toronto, Canada

This doctoral thesis presents a historical study of the diplomatic exchanges between the Japanese and the Korean embassy in the eighteenth century. Neighbourly relationships (J: kōrin, K: kyorin) were maintained between Tokugawa Japan (1603-1868) and Chosŏn Korea (1392-1910) for more than 250 years. The visitations of the Korean embassy, dispatched to congratulate a new Tokugawa shogun, were often seen as the symbol of their amicable and friendly relationship, and it is well known that the Koreans were cordially welcomed by the Tokugawa bakufu. Despite these neighbourly relations, the visitations of the embassy had a more pragmatic purpose. More complex political conditions and nature were immanent within and between the both states. In the diplomatic interaction, the officials in the two states had traditional and obstinately-held perceptions towards the counterpart hidden behind the pleasant gesture.

In this thesis, I attempt to uncover what is associated with these neighbourly relations, by revealing the cultural awareness and consciousness of these two states in East Asia through detailed examinations of the historical sources. To find the notions behind the exchange, my thesis illustrates Japanese and Korean hua-yi awareness that came to light through the
interactions between the Japanese and the Koreans. The Chinese *hua-yi* order, the concept of looking at the Chinese dynasties as the center, was said to dominate the East Asian order. From the Chinese point of view, Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea were barbaric and on the margins, but from the perspectives of the two countries, they certainly recognized themselves as the centers.

On the basis of the dynamism of historical events, thoughts, and notions between Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea in the eighteenth century, this research will examine multi-layered perspectives of the individual Japanese and Koreans who played essential roles in diplomacy. How were those officials representing the two states aware of their peers, and how did these notions affect the modern history of the two countries? This question is consistently engaged in this thesis, and to answer it the research will be further explored.
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Chapter One

Introduction: Beyond the Chinese-Centered Perspective

A peer relationship was the key to diplomatic relations between Tokugawa Japan (1603-1868) and Chosŏn Korea (1392-1910), which lasted more than two hundred fifty years. In most academic descriptions of the early modern relations between the two countries, the visitations of the Korean embassy (J: Chōsen tsūshinshi; K: Chosŏn t’ongshinsa), dispatched to congratulate a new Tokugawa shogun, were often seen as the symbol of their amicable, friendly relationship. It is well known that the Koreans were cordially welcomed by the Tokugawa bakufu.

For the Korean 1711 embassy, the bakufu’s orders to the people in the Edo were announced as follows:

1. Those streets where the Koreans walk must be thoroughly cleaned. Pails of water should also be ready in accordance with the house blocks, and the streets must be watered before the Koreans come.
2. When the Koreans pass the streets, the front gates of the samurai houses must be opened; the golden screen be unfolded and face the outside; the textiles be silk, the outer screen be purple silk, and firearms and swords be decorated; Guards must wear hemp robes, and be gorgeously prepared [to welcome the Koreans.]
3. When they arrive in Edo in the evening, the lanterns must be lit their size be described as in the illustration. ¹

Following these orders, the neatly dressed townspeople watched the foreigners passing along the streets. They stayed calmly in their places even when the Koreans came closer.

However, we need to move beyond the discourse of the ‘neighbourly friendship,’ in order to perceive it as more than a simple friendly relationship in a peaceful environment. It is too simplistic to draw the premature conclusion that their amicable relations, lasting until the beginning of Meiji period (1868-1912), had no complexities after the period of the disastrous Japanese invasions of Chosŏn Korea (1592-1598) by Toyotomi Hideyoshi (1536-1598). The relationship between the two countries was rehabilitated by the *Kiyū yakujō* (articles; K: *yakjo*), or Articles of 1609, the thirteen commercial conditions agreed upon by Chosŏn Korea and the Tsushima domain, which took on full responsibility for Korean issues on behalf of the Tokugawa bakufu. After concluding the *yakujō*, a neighbourly relationship between Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea was maintained. The Tokugawa bakufu invited full-scale diplomatic embassies from the Korean peninsula, and ambassadorial parties of more than four hundred members visited the Edo Castle a total of eleven times throughout the Tokugawa period, though the last embassy’s visitation in 1811 reached only as far as the Tsushima island.

The Korean embassies’ visitations had a pragmatic purpose, and one shaped by the complex political conditions that existed within and between both states. In their diplomatic intercourse, a deliberate obstinacy restrained discourse and strongly influenced the perceptions of both states. My questions are very simple: what is to be understood by these neighbourly

---

2 The name ‘kiyū’ came from the zodiac name of the 46th year out of the cycle of sixty. The term *yakujō* stands for ‘promise’ or ‘assurance,’ in comparison to agreement used between the nations, *jōyaku*.

3 These articles mainly discussed official trade and non official trade agreement between the Tokugawa government and the Tsushima domain, which restricted the number of ship dispatches, the size of trade ships, and the number of days in port, and reduced the number of official trading ports from three to one.

4 The invasions by Hideyoshi are known as *Bunroku-keichō no eki* (K: *Imjin-Jōngyu waeran*); as the name indicates, the war consists of two invasions with an interruption of peace negotiation with Ming China between 1593 and 1596. After this unsuccessful armistice, Hideyoshi dispatched his army to the Korean peninsula again in 1597 and they remained there until 1598, when he died. Although the name signifies two invasions, the aggressive activity was consistently made over the three years; as a matter of fact, Japanese forces were stationed on the coast of Kyōngsang province in southern Korea during the negotiations, so as not to lose control of Chosŏn Korea. Hence, the invasions by Hideyoshi are known as a ‘seven-year war.’ Also, *Imjin War* is widely used as Hideyoshi’s invasions in Korean.
relations? What drove each state to remain on good relations with its neighbour?

In this thesis, I attempt to answer these questions by revealing the cultural awareness and consciousness of these two states in East Asia through detailed examinations of the historical sources in the eighteenth century. I have restricted my timeframe to the eighteenth century during which discourses about each other by the literate elites in both countries were particularly informed by the stabilization of neighbourly relations. I mainly focus on a travelogue, “Haeyurok,” by Shin Yuhan (1681-1752) of the 1719 embassy to explore further analysis of the exchanges between the two states. Shin’s work vividly depicted the interactions between the two states, and offers more straightforward responses and reactions to his Japanese counterpart, in contrast to what other embassies recorded in different periods. In this sense, the record is attentive to exploring how the Japanese and Korean officials recognized each other.

This study also attempts to answer another question: how did this neighbourly relationship in the early modern period shift in the modern period? This shift appears contradictory: a neighbourly relationship from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries becomes a more conflicted relationship in the twentieth century. This discrepancy may be resolved by examining the dynamism of the historical events to further investigate whether aspects of the neighbourly friendship contained the seeds of the emergent rift between the two states in the modern period.

To further understand their mutual recognitions, it is vital to search for that common recognition which existed in East Asia at that time. For centuries the East Asian sphere was physically and mentally constructed within the Chinese-centered view. The Chinese dynasties

---

5 Those travelogues written by the members of the Korean embassies were compiled in Haehaeng ch’ongjae.
conceived of themselves as the cultural and political center of the world. For example, the successive Chinese emperors were represented as ruling by divine right (the ‘Mandate of Heaven’), a belief whose main function was to legitimatize and maintain their regimes. The area where the emperor ruled was often described as *chunghua,* literally the ‘central civilization.’ In this perspective, the Chinese emperor was the one who ruled the world, reigned over the people with benevolence, and enlightened them with the virtues of heaven. Outside of his enlightened states was *yi,* the uncivilized area, in contrast to *hua,* the civilized area. Nevertheless, the countries of *yi* could obtain the virtues of the center if they became tributaries to the great empire. In respect for the Chinese emperor, the tributary countries were able to receive benefits and rewards when they paid a visit to the Chinese capital every few years to show their gratitude as its tribute.

In this historical context of *chunghua,* accounts would have led to the Chinese dynasties’ sole supremacy over East Asia, and the other surrounding states were accommodated with the dominant reign. However, both Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea in the early modern period could also be ‘empires’ or ‘centers’ of the world. I do not intend to deny the origin of the *hua-yi* (civilized center-barbarian) worldview in China; both Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea certainly learned the Chinese model, but I would like to emphasize that the self-centered views did exist in the ‘barbaric,’ ‘eastern’ states; Tokugawa Japan, Chosŏn Korea, and Vietnam also had their own sense of ‘*chunghua.***

---

6 As a representative English monograph, John Fairbank’s *The Chinese World Order,* first introduces diplomacy from the Chinese perspective as well as the tributary relationship between China and Korea as functional system. I will not join the debate on this issue, but his adoption of the western ‘empire’ perspective in Chinese history has long been a center of criticism.


8 Regarding the criticism of the empire view toward the Chinese dynasties, Andre Schmid comments that the center and other areas as the outside continues to be written from the view of China, and points out that “the self-definition of community are precisely what the ‘empire’ view is able to introduce into our understanding of East Asia and may offer some avenues for rethinking of Chosŏn dynastic self-conceptions.” Quoted from
Japanese-Korean relations examined by Japanese, Korean, and western scholars have tended to focus only on the perspective of one country, either Tokugawa Japan or Chosŏn Korea. This study incorporates both visions from the two countries, and I question how the perception of chunghua influenced their acts in establishing their neighbourly relationship. To find such a different dimension, I turn to an examination of the sources of the Korean embassy and historical events in the both countries.

This ‘world-centeredness’ perspective implies that their exclusive values were focused solely on themselves as a single significant being. Both Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea possessed their own criteria for looking at themselves as the center and seeing their counterpart from the ‘center.’ Based upon those rigid perceptions in their societies, different values and cultures were measured and evaluated, and this deliberation certainly underlay the later behaviours of the two states in the modern period.

Tokugawa Japan’s diplomatic tactics aimed at domestic peace and order, one of the most urgent goals for the newly-established regime in 1603. Besides pursuit of Tokugawa social tranquility, there are more interesting reasons why Tokugawa Japan maintained neighbourly relations with Chosŏn Korea and vice versa. The Tokugawa bakufu established a solid domestic control over the people and other powerful factors that would have threatened its political regime. Being praised by an external state such as Chosŏn Korea, would reinforce the Tokugawa bakufu’s domestic power and dominance. The Tokugawa bakufu saw establishing the relationship with Chosŏn Korea, its neighbouring country, as the most powerful tool to legitimatize its own political system and to support its domestic hegemony. Also, diplomacy with Chosŏn Korea

was an indispensable tool to increase awareness of *chunghua*, Japan’s place as a center. With the stabilization of the visitations of the Korean embassy to the Tokugawa bakufu in the eighteenth century, both diplomatic and commercial exchanges took place relatively smoothly under the principle of the neighbourly relationship, which functioned to establish a peaceful international environment and also to sustain the bakufu without threats from the outside world.

Through the neighbourly relations with Chosŏn Korea, what can we see in Tokugawa politics? The bakufu was unenthusiastic about entering the Sino-centric world order, and wished its autonomy from the Chinese empire throughout the Tokugawa period. However, Chosŏn Korea was one of several important windows through which Tokugawa Japan was able to acquire new information and products from the continent. By opening to the outside world through Chosŏn Korea, Tokugawa Japan was not isolated from diplomatic interactions. From this point of view, it is not difficult to imagine that many of the Japanese treated the visitations of the Korean diplomatic parties with the highest respect, seeing them as indispensable transmitters of advanced scholarship, technology, and commodities from the continent for the benefit of progress in the Tokugawa society.

The Tokugawa authority’s endeavour to employ the Korean embassy to elevate its own regime displayed an effective tool for constructing its ideal order domestically. The ideal world was to establish a Japanese centrality, stated as *Nihongata kai ishiki*, or Japan’s *hua-yi* order, which was modeled after the Chinese worldview. How Japan utilized its diplomacy to form itself the ‘heart of the world’ was a crucial process in establishing Japan’s behaviour in

---

9 During the Ashikaga period, the third shogun, Ashikaga Yoshimitsu (1358-1408) entered a tributary relationship with Ming China in 1401, but it did not last long after his death. The relationship was resumed when Ashikaga Yoshinori (1394-1441) reigned as the sixth shogun. This engagement of the tributary relationship brought Japan substantial profits through trade. The import commodities from Ming China were silk, cotton, calligraphy, and ceramic wares, called ‘*karamono,*’ or Chinese goods.
the modern period. Later chapters will examine how the perceptions of the *hua-yi* order were portrayed through the Korean issues.

The Tokugawa authority’s solid diplomatic principle with Chosŏn Korea was *kōrin* (K: *kyorin*). *Kōrin* stands for ‘the relationship on an equal basis,’ and this term had already been the diplomatic protocol between the Ashikaga Japan (1338-1570s) and Chosŏn Korea in the fourteenth century. After the Japanese invasions of the Korean peninsula between 1592 and 1598, diplomatic relations under *kōrin* were reestablished between the Tokugawa bakufu and the Chosŏn court in 1609.

Tokugawa Japan’s cordiality for the Koreans was carried out in a finer manner than for any other foreign ambassadorial parties, from Ryūkyū, Holland, or Britain.¹⁰ Those foreign delegations also visited Edo, called *Edo sanpu*, or the Edo visitation, but there were no magnificent receptions ready for those parties in the Edo Castle. For the Korean embassy, however, the Tokugawa bakufu’s policy made clear distinctions. Upon the bakufu’s regulation, the domains that were located on the travel route of the Korean embassy had to prepare fabulous receptions. The daimyos were responsible for all the expense of providing accommodations and luxurious banquets for the Koreans. A seven-five-three course meal,¹¹ the most formal banquet style in the Tokugawa custom under the diplomatic protocol, was provided for the ambassadors of the Korean embassy after greeting the shogun in the Edo Castle. These friendly and amiable gestures of the Tokugawa bakufu for the Korean embassy lead to several questions: why did they have to entertain the Koreans with fabulous receptions? Why did they spend a great amount of money for the Koreans? More simply, why did the bakufu exhibit such friendly behaviour to Chosŏn Korea?

---

¹⁰ The British farms in Hirado, Nagasaki, were withdrawn from Japan in 1623.

¹¹ The meal for the three high-ranking officials (the chief ambassador, the vice ambassador, and the overseer) included aperitif, seasonal vegetables, soups, fish, meats, fruits, and desserts.
From the standpoint of the Tokugawa bakufu, the engagement of the relations with Chosŏn Korea played an important role in legitimatizing, particularly in the early phase of the Tokugawa regime. In other words, the Chosŏn court’s diplomatic recognition of the Tokugawa polity was a major source of legitimatization for itself. For example, *taikun gaikō*, or the Great Prince Diplomacy\(^{12}\) brought about domestic values essential to constructing the Japanese-centered order and to retaining its independence from the influence of its giant neighbouring state, China.\(^{13}\) By consolidating the diplomatic strategy for its own sake, Tokugawa Japan succeeded in showing its autonomy from Chinese influence.

Accounts particularly by scholars in the eighteenth century provide us with more details of how the Japanese exercised diplomacy with its neighbouring state. As time went by, those scholars often saw Chosŏn Korea as a downgraded state. Where did such a notion come from? One ought to closely examine how the two extreme notions- Chosŏn Korea as a valued and Chosŏn Korea as a lower state- were further developed.

The Japanese historians specializing in early modern East Asia have extensively argued that the Tokugawa’s diplomatic strategy was one of the setting up the Japanese *hua-yi* order to establish the Japanese independence from the tributary system of China.\(^{14}\) A notable

---

\(^{12}\) *Taikun gaikō* was represented as Tokugawa’s successful diplomacy with East Asia to avoid using title of the ‘king of Japan,’ which could have referred to the emperor. The third shogun Tokugawa Iemitsu (r. 1623-1651) decided to use the title after the Yanagawa affair in 1635, which led to the bakufu supervised sovereign message from bakufu to Chosŏn Korea. See Chapter 2 and 3 in this thesis for more details on the Yanagawa affair and dispute on the diplomatic reform between Arai Hakuseki and Amenomori Hōshū.


\(^{14}\) Regarding the Japanese centered view, Etsuko Kang describes “… Japan’s *hua-yi* consciousness could have been constructed as a false consciousness in rivaling with China’s *hua-yi* order… was based on consciousness of the ‘military power’ and ‘an unbroken line of emperors.’ For details see her book of Etsuko, Hae-jin Kang, *Diplomacy and Ideology in Japanese-Korean Relations: From the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Century*. Houndsmill, U.K.: Macmillan Press, 1997. pp.17-18. In a different view, Nakamura Hidetaka argues that the Japan’s ability enabled it alone out of the Qing tributary system in the nineteenth century to escape from the collapse of the Chinese order. See Nakamura’s *Nissen kankeishi no kenkyū*. vol.3., Tokyo: Shibundō, 1966. p.464.
historian, Asao Naohiro, is regarded as the pioneer who presented the Japanese-centered notion in 1975 in his monograph, *sakoku*. He reexamines the long-standing view of the Tokugawa bakufu’s *sakoku* policy that banned interactions with the outside world. By questioning the common view towards *sakoku* policy, he claims that early modern Japan certainly interested with a part of East Asia through its active exchanges intended to legitimatize the Tokugawa dominance. In Asao’s analysis, Japan’s *hua-yi* order was reliant on the bakufu’s military power, not based on the civilized culture such as the Ming and Qing dynasties or Chosŏn Korea. The self-esteem of the Tokugawa bakufu that came from the establishment of the military government strengthened its notion as the center. Arano Yasunori claims that the Japanese *hua-yi* order played a crucial role in considering Chosŏn Korea as a ‘lesser vessel’ to maintain Japan’s superiority. Arano emphasizes Chosŏn Korea’s position as a mythical figure used to constitute a solid foundation of Japan’s self-consciousness in ancient historical records, by quoting such descriptions as rooted from Japan’s conquest of the Three Kingdoms of Korea in Japan’s two oldest historical texts, such as *Kojiki*, or Record of Ancient Matters, (712) and *Nihon shoki*, Chronicle of Japan (720).

As most Japanese historians and scholars have argued, diplomatic relations with Chosŏn Korea became an indispensable tool to enhance Tokugawa’s shogunal legitimacy and to locate itself under the ‘Japanese world order.’ In this historical context, the embassies from

---

15 *Sakoku* is translated as ‘closed country.’ The *sakoku* policy was indicated as ‘the official isolation.’ After Ieyasu seized the power and instituted his military government in 1603, the government enforced the policy in 1637 and exercised throughout the Tokugawa period.

16 See Asao’s *Sakoku* (Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1975). Toby admits that his analysis was inspired by Asano’s work, for the conclusion he reached was the same as Asano’s while he was working on his dissertation. See Toby, *State and Diplomacy in Early Modern Japan*, Preface xvi.


18 ibid., p.54. Arai Hakuseki also pointed out this argument as his validity of the revision for his diplomatic reforms. As for further details, see chapter 2 in this thesis.

19 Toby, p.64.
Chosŏn Korea were somehow reconstituted as tributary missions. How could Tokugawa Japan make its presence so valuable? To strengthen the Tokugawa line in the eyes of its neighbours, the bakufu sought to gain the approval from dynasty seen as its equal. Receiving praise from Chosŏn Korea, the neighbouring country, seemed to satisfy the Tokugawa authority’s wish and to elevate the status of the bakufu.

Among those arguments by Japanese scholars, Tashiro’s work, *Foreign Relations during the Edo Period: Sakoku Reexamined*, has explicitly and meticulously observed the Tokugawa government’s systematic strategy in East Asian relations. In her accounts, the bakufu sanctioned a clear distinction between the Ming/Qing dynasties and Chosŏn Korea. The Tokugawa bakufu did not engage in diplomatic relations with the Ming and Qing dynasties, which were portrayed as a sovereign-vassal relationship (*sakuhō kankei*). In contrast, the bakufu treated Chosŏn Korea as “Unlike the Chinese dynasties, Japan maintained formal diplomatic relations with Chosŏn Korea. Whenever a new shogun was named, the Korean embassy was dispatched to exchange credentials with the Tokugawa bakufu.” She further argues: “…When understood in the context policy of the Northeastern Asian history as a whole, it represents a constructive policy of foreign relations adopted by Japan in an effort to free itself from Chinese control.” Notions of physical and psychological detachments from the Chinese tributary system were a central idea of Tokugawa diplomacy throughout the Tokugawa period.

In contrast to the meticulous research by the Japanese scholars who have examined the relations of Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea, few English language works have depicted the

---

21 ibid., pp.304-305.
22 ibid., p.304.
relationship. Ronald Toby, who pioneers the exploration of the early modern relationship, claims that Tokugawa Japan was inextricably intertwined with East Asian countries, even though the concept of the sakoku as not allowing any interactions with outside world is the common perception in Japanese history. He argues that the Tokugawa bakufu’s strategy in Korean diplomacy effectively functioned to sustain its political system.

In this environment, Toby also argues for a decrease in Chinese influence in Tokugawa society: “Japan was demanding that Korea agree to the removal of China as a referent in Japanese-Korean relations… [T]he bakufu had succeeded in creating an autonomous system of diplomacy, independence of China, and consonant with the demands of Japanese sovereignty and bakufu legitimacy.” As a matter of fact, the bakufu did not accept the Chinese calendar or era names as one way of showing that the state was out of the Chinese centered world. However, no official Japanese records have found cohesive opinions on China that would have regarded it as Tokugawa Japan’s competitor, or attempted to challenge it. The bakufu was well-acquainted with the Chinese influence in East Asia, though the Japanese did not diplomatically engage in the tributary relations with China.

Legitimacy of the Tokugawa came from the acknowledgment if received from Chosŏn Korea. This acceptance from a peer state enabled the regime to heighten its prestige and display the legitimacy to the East Asian community. The diplomatic engagement was a powerful device for the Tokugawa house to claim its rightful political, economic, and social control over the ruled class and other leading daimyos. Toby’s study, though meticulously

---

23 Toby, p.5.
24 ibid., pp.94-95.
25 On the individual level, a number of the scholars in the eighteenth century were trying to argue the matter. See later chapters.
26 Toby, p.301.
27 Toby also mentions the relations with the Ryūkyū Kingdom for Tokugawa’s diplomatic operations.
conducted, lacks an understanding Korean materials and an investigation of the circumstances under which the Korean diplomacy worked. The standpoints of the Korean side are another important factor that would further account for why Chosŏn Korea sustained the neighbourly relationship with their counterpart.

Another English monograph, Etsuko Kang’s *Diplomacy and Ideology in Japanese-Korean Relations*, focuses on the long-term relations of the two countries: “[this book] is concerned with the ethnocentric ideologies of Japan and Korea as manifested in this Chinese world order. With these ideologies of these two countries confronted each other and sometimes reconciled their diplomatic disputes because of political and economic reasons on each part.”

As the title indicates, Kang pays particular attention to Japanese ideology: how the Japanese ideology of ethno-centrality affected the medieval and early modern diplomacy. She argues that political ideology drove diplomatic affairs between the two countries, by seeing Japan as the centrality in its world.

I question how much the ethnocentric ideology heavily influenced their diplomatic policy-makings in Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea. For instance, could such ethnocentrism have solely served as an impelling force to lead foreign affairs and to motivate diplomatic decisions? Needless to say, ideological aspects can be a part of the concerns in diplomacy. In this context, one should not ignore the interpretation of the research from the Neo-Confucian framework that was regarded as the principle doctrine in both the Tokugawa and Chosŏn societies. Kang’s article did not fully touch on this aspect. Perceptions rather than ideologies may have existed for the diplomatic relations; nonetheless, diplomacy in the early modern societies would have been rather affected by political (as well as cultural)

---

28 Kang, p.12.
environments, a more powerful tool to lead to domestic decision-making.

Another historian writing on early modern Korea-Japan relations, James B. Lewis, also shows that Meiji Japan was successfully able to sustain its sovereignty from the West by constructing the *hua-yi* view early in Tokugawa period. Tokugawa Japan’s successful independence came from its remoteness from tributary relationship with the Chinese dynasties.\(^{29}\) For an analysis of the Tokugawa bakufu’s strategy, creating and maintaining its awareness as placing itself as the center of the world is clearly of further account. Behind the neighbouring relationship, Tokugawa Japan constructed a shrewd yet powerful verification to show its distinctiveness towards East Asian countries. In his recent monograph, *Frontier Contact between Chosŏn Korea and Tokugawa Japan* (2003), he displays Tsushima’s leading role in handling entire diplomatic and commercial issues related to Chosŏn Korea. Although his focus is somewhat overly inclined toward Tsushima’s functions in Korean diplomacy, with less emphasis on the bakufu’s role, he reveals the complexity of the relationship between the two states.

English language monographs have frequently described a notion of Japan as a center that effectively functioned within Japan’s domestic world- for legitimization of the Tokugawa regime and enhancement of the Tokugawa family’s significance. With the attempt of Tokugawa Ieyasu (1542-1616) to restore the diplomatic relationship with Chosŏn Korea and the consequent elaborations through the Tsushima domain, Tokugawa Japan was finally able to be readmitted to the East Asian community by reengaging in relations with the Chosŏn dynasty in 1609. The Tokugawa regime’s most notable political enforcement, known as the *sakoku*, or the seclusion policy, which prohibited contact with Western countries and the further domestic

spread of Christianity, may lead us to misunderstand the nature of Tokugawa politics. Tokugawa Japan was certainly ‘open’ as a member of East Asia.

The reengagement of the diplomatic relationship with Chosŏn Korea was significant to the Tokugawa regime. If the bakufu was recognized by both domestic and international societies, the Tokugawa family’s dominance was able to strengthen social stabilization, differentiate the Tokugawa line from other powerful rival families, and keep its autonomy in East Asia. For Tokugawa Japan, Chosŏn Korea was the only independent state with which to engage in a diplomatic relationship throughout the Tokugawa period. In regard to the Tokugawa diplomatic principle, the authority clarified two distinctions: tsūshō no kuni (relations with commercial basis) and tsūshin no kuni (relations with correspondent basis). Tokugawa Japan had commercial relations with Holland and the Ming and Qing dynasties but the Japanese maintained even closer relations with Chosŏn Korea and the Ryūkyū Kingdom.30 Chosŏn Korea was placed under tsūshin no kuni, which regarded Chosŏn Korea as the most important correspondent peer of the Tokugawa bakufu. As shown, the bakufu treated the Korean embassy in the most cordial manner.

As explained earlier, the hua-yi view was the perception signifying one’s place, and it virtually functioned within their domestic societies. Whether or not Chosŏn Korea was Tokugawa Japan’s tributary state is not an indispensable issue here, though the ongoing discussions on this matter are argued in a later chapter.31 How do we define whether Chosŏn Korea was a tributary or not of Tokugawa Japan? Or how do we examine it from historical sources, contexts, and experiences in Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea? It is rather difficult

30 The Ryūkyū Kingdom was said to be established in the fourteenth century, according to the oldest document currently existing in Okinawa. However, the Kingdom was later forced to merge with the Satsuma domain (current Kagoshima prefecture) in 1609.
31 Some of the perspectives made by several scholars will be presented in chapter 7.
to come to a conclusion, as there were no common or standardized perceptions on Chosŏn Korea in Tokugawa society. Attitudes towards different cultures were not universalized, and feelings towards Koreans would also have differed over time and among people. Furthermore, the places in which people resided would also influence their notions on Chosŏn Korea. In this thesis, I do not argue for an extensive search of ancient history to clarify such issues as how Japanese thought of Korea, how Korea was traditionally specified in Kojiki, or other historical sources of Japan. Rather than widening the time frame, which might bring ambiguity to the discussion, my focus is on the eighteenth century as an appropriate time when various discourses concerning Chosŏn Korea frequently appeared in written historical sources.

The Chosŏn court adapted the foreign policy of sadae kyorin (serving the great and treating neighbours on an equal basis). In accordance with this principle, Chosŏn Korea preserved a tributary relationship with its suzerain states, Ming (1368-1644) and Qing (1644-1911) China, and sustained an equal-basis relation with Tokugawa Japan. Looking back to the international circumstances in the sixteenth century, the attitude of Chosŏn Korea towards the two neighbouring states, Qing China and Tokugawa Japan, was somewhat submissive.

Most scholars suggest that the Korean position in East Asia strongly reflected the tributary concept of Korea’s subjugation to a physically more powerful superior higher, China.32 And in the relationship with Tokugawa Japan, Chosŏn Korea would have seen its neighbouring state as a threat to peace after the Japanese invasions of Chosŏn Korea. Rather than seeing Korea’s subsequent acts as an exemplary display of tributary relationship in pursuing an ‘appeasement policy’ to the two neighbouring countries without serious military

---
operations, the Chosŏn court’s desperate tactics that sought peaceful resolutions with the two states is not difficult to comprehend.

The policies of the Chosŏn court obviously attempted to avoid any conflicts with the two states- Qing China and Tokugawa Japan. Apparently, the Chosŏn court did not possess sufficient military strength in reserve after the destructions of the battles fought against the Japanese invasions and the Manchus in 1627 and 1637. In such a situation, making a deferential gesture would have seemed a strategy of survival for Chosŏn Korea. Subservience was indeed an initiative reaction to bring about domestic safety, peace, and order.\textsuperscript{33} The promises of the two ‘barbaric states’- Qing China for tributary engagement and Tokugawa Japan for rehabilitation of the diplomatic relations- also caused no physical harm, and the ‘submissive’ position was always a better outcome for the Korean security.

To further explore these relations, it is necessary to understand the fundamental importance of Chosŏn Korea’s diplomatic principle, \textit{sadae kyorin}. Sadae kyorin was a juxtaposition of the two words: \textit{sadae} (serving the great) and \textit{kyorin} (equal standing with the neighbouring countries). The policy lasted for almost five hundred years until the end of the Chosŏn period in the late nineteenth century as the philosophical foundation of the diplomatic relations.\textsuperscript{34} Under the diplomatic principle of \textit{sadae kyorin}, which was based on the Confucian doctrine, Sino-Korean relations are often interpreted as a superior-inferior relationship, and the Japanese-Korean relationship is seen as one of equal standing throughout the Chosŏn period.

The relationship with Tokugawa Japan, understood as \textit{kyorin}, signified ‘neighbourly relations’ or ‘equal and peer relations with a neighbouring country.’ At the same time, with the relationship with the Ming and Qing dynasties, the Chosŏn court engaged \textit{sadae}, or serving the

\textsuperscript{33} Son, Seung-cheol. “Chŏsen kŏki jitsugaku shisŏ to taigai ninshiki.” Chŏsen Gakuhô [Japan] 1987 (122): 119
\textsuperscript{34} For further details on \textit{sadae kyorin}, see chapter 3.
great, as its diplomatic practice. This relationship with the greater required a few main premises: First, sending periodic tributary missions to China; second, receiving investiture from them; and third, acceptance and use of the Chinese calendar in diplomatic protocol displayed to the dynasties. Failure or refusal of any of the above was regarded as a violation in maintaining an official relationship with its suzerain. Hence, throughout the Chosŏn period, the court sent tributary envoys to the Ming and Qing dynasties and received an imperial sanction when there was a succession to the new throne in the Chosŏn court.

On Chosŏn Korea’s relations of sadae with the Chinese dynasties, Kan Kimura’s Chōsen/Kankoku nashonarizumu to “shōgoku” ishiki: chōkōkoku kara kokumin kokka e (Nationalism in Chosŏn and Modern Korea and Consciousness of Small State: a Tributary State toward Nation State), analyzes further perceptions on the relationship surrounding the Korean peninsula. Kimura argues that the tributary system between the Chinese dynasties and Chosŏn Korea was the most effective strategy for the smaller neighbour, such as Korea, which was geographically attached to the gigantic Chinese empire. When the smaller country began to receive the ‘benefit’ from the empire, in practice, the emperor would have guaranteed protection of the vassal states from the outside threats.35 The vassal states themselves were relieved of the enormous military pressure from the colossal empire. Competition with the empire was physically impossible for smaller neighbouring states, but in return for their submission, they were able to achieve long-lasting relations with the empire and could be protected under its force.36 The tributary relationship was a strategy and a valuable tool to enable a small country to continue to survive. On the one hand, the smaller countries continued to pay tribute to the Chinese dynasties and promised to retain admittance of the emperor; on

36 ibid., p.22.
the other hand, countries in the outside world cherished as notion of themselves as the center; Chosŏn Korea for example, indeed possessed a strong sense of self-esteem.

Kimura also pursues the interrogation of historical contexts between Chinese dominance and Chosŏn Korea. For the Chinese emperor, it was necessary to constitute the tributary world around him to display his legitimacy to rule domestic and outside audiences.\(^{37}\) For a vassal state such as Chosŏn Korea, the Chosŏn court was able to retain its autonomous regime in preserving certain protocols provided by the Chinese emperor. By engaging in tributary relations, Chosŏn Korea benefited from military protection in the name of the Chinese emperor at any critical moment.\(^{38}\) And accordingly, its autonomous environment and tranquility were safeguarded.\(^{39}\)

A Japanese scholar, Watanabe Manabu, in looking at Chosŏn Korea’s diplomatic principle \textit{jidai} (K: \\textit{sadae}) and \textit{kōrin} (K: \textit{kyorin}), analyzes the traditional diplomatic perspective in Chosŏn society.\(^{40}\) After the end of the battles by the Manchus, Watanabe argues that the diplomatic principle of Chosŏn Korea shifted to ‘serving the virtuous barbarians’ in the relations with the Qing dynasty.\(^{41}\) But in the diplomatic principles, Chosŏn Korea should have sought a \textit{kyorin} relationship with the Qing dynasty, in Watanabe’s opinion, since Chosŏn Korea’s suzerain state was the Ming dynasty. On this contradictory manner, he further argues: “As the relations with her barbarian neighbours to the north changed from \textit{kyorin} to \textit{sadae}... The neighbourly relations with the Qing dynasty had now changed to “serving the great (powerful).”\(^{42}\) But for the Chosŏn court, the principle exactly followed the Confucian code,
and the court had a strong belief that the principle brought domestic peace and order.

In the relations with Tokugawa Japan, Chosŏn Korea had to maintain a neighbourly relationship in accordance with the *kyōrin* principle, the other pillar of Chosŏn Korea’s diplomatic policy. To sustain domestic peace and order, *sadae kyorin* necessarily coexisted.43 Starting diplomatic relations with Tokugawa Japan did not mean to submit to the ‘eastern barbarian,’ since the negotiation to rehabilitate the relationship was initiated by the Japanese, not the Korean side.44 Chosŏn Korea’s notion in reestablishing relations with Tokugawa Japan as well had another significant meaning: to observe any offensive acts from the counterpart. The *kyōrin* principle was maintained by the efforts of the two states, but for the sake of the Korean side, it was indeed necessary to sustain the relationship with Tokugawa Japan to avoid further battles and disturbances.45

Korean scholar Park Choon-Seok describes the complexity of the issue surrounding the Korean peninsula. Park emphasizes the *sadae* reflected “the political realism prevailing among the vassal states in the Middle Kingdom.” In its political aspect, the tribute system at a glance seemed to clearly identify ‘subordinate’ or ‘superior,’ ‘lesser’ or ‘greater,’ but it actually stood for the more pragmatic reasons of survival for the smaller states.46 He also mentioned that *sadae* later became a major obstacle to the acceptance of notion of equality between modern nations.47

Son Seung-cheol, another Korean scholar who specializes in the early modern Korean-Japanese relationship, defines Chosŏn Korea’s long-term attitude towards its

---

44 ibid., p.59.
46 For details, see chapter 2 in Kimura’s work, *Chōsen/Kankoku nashonalizumu to shōkoku ishiki*.
47 Park, p.16.
acceptance of the Chinese, namely Confucian culture. Under the influence of Confucian values, the respectful approach to an advanced (namely the Chinese) culture was frequently revealed. Son continues to claim that tribute to the northern barbarians, the Manchus, was intended to bring a peaceful resolution of the Chosŏn court without further battles to surmount the inferiority in military strength. Within the tributary relations with the Qing dynasty, there was no cultural reverence among the Chosŏn administrative officers and scholars, as they revered the cultural respect to the former dynasty.

Chosŏn Korea’s pursuit of sadae, in Park’s statement, lies in an inflexible establishment of exclusivism and isolationism in the Chosŏn society. It was a product of ‘negative response to the Qing dynasty’ to whom Chosŏn Korea had to promise its vassalage and to show cultural reverence. By touching on the differences of Chosŏn Korea’s tributary engagements with the Ming and Qing dynasties, Park points out an obvious characteristic was illustrated by his account: “the former was voluntary and the latter was imposed upon.” The Ming dynasty was regarded as a parent who deserved unconditional allegiance, while the latter was treated as a foe- a military conqueror and morally irrelevant. For Chosŏn Korea, the sadae term with the Qing dynasty was determined by the strength of military force to relieve the Korean territory from inter-state hostility and warring pressure.

As a strong rationale for Chosŏn Korea’s reverence towards the Ming dynasty, Son highlights Ming political and diplomatic principles- motives of peaceful order and anti-invasion corresponded with the values of the Chosŏn court, so Chosŏn Korea felt

---

48 Son, p.118.
49 ibid., pp.118-119.
50 ibid., 118-119.
51 Park., p.19.
52 ibid., p.19. A Korean scholar Son Seung-cheol clarifies the Qing-Chosŏn relationship in a similar context. For Son’s claim see p.117 in his article of “Chôsen kōki jitsugaku shisô to taigai ninshiki.”
53 Son, p.118.
culturally congenial to the Ming dynasty, sharing the common perspective of non-violence.\textsuperscript{54} As for Chosŏn Korea’s long-lasting recognition of the Qing dynasty, “the Ming dynasty is our parental state, but the Qing dynasty is a state who slaughtered our parents.”\textsuperscript{55} In a similar context, Japanese historian Inoue Atsushi describes how both *sadae* and *kyorin* functioned as Chosŏn Korea’s diplomatic tactics for Chosŏn Korea’s territorial security and domestic peace.\textsuperscript{56}

How Chosŏn Koreans acknowledged themselves beyond the Ming and Qing tributary system is an important and interesting question. Given Chosŏn Korea’s geographical proximity to the continent, challenging the Chinese dynasties would result in the immediate ruin of the dynasty. In other words, Chosŏn Korea found an effective way to survive with the *sadae* policy. In relations with the Ming and Qing dynasties, the Chosŏn court admitted suzerain-subordinate relations. Nonetheless, after the demise of the Ming dynasty, some questions were raised especially among the Chosŏn scholars: was Chosŏn Korea’s suzerain Ming China? Was the culture to respect not Ming’s? In addition to those notions, the Tokugawa bakufu was established in 1603 while Chosŏn Korea still possessed a strong resentment over the Japanese invasions. This self-esteem presented the Koreans with the Korean-centered world vision, which originated from the Chinese *hua-yi* order, by claiming itself as the sole remaining civilized country, represented as *sochunghwa*, or the small central civilization.\textsuperscript{57} The Chosŏn scholars perceived their notion that Chosŏn Korea was not as a duplicate version of China.\textsuperscript{58}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{54} ibid., p.119.
\textsuperscript{55} ibid., p.123.
\textsuperscript{57} For further details, see chapter 2.
\textsuperscript{58} ‘Small’ indicates the size of the country.
\end{footnotesize}
Although their state was not big, they proudly acclaimed their country as the central civilization.

Within the shifting relations between the Ming and Qing dynasties, as well as the newly-established Tokugawa Japan, Chosŏn Korea’s cultural self-esteem to protect itself took the form of sochunghwa. The awareness of chunghwa within Chosŏn elite was predominantly articulated as cultural. Yamauchi Kōichi explains further this notion of sochunghwa and political conditions as: “…[Chosŏn Korea’s] chunghwa did not always accompany the political reality of the tribute and vassalage in the history of East Asia.”59 In Chosŏn Korea’s case, political realism such as tributary engagement with the Qing dynasty did not interfere with the development of chunghwa thoughts, since their Chinese dynasties did not participate in internal political affairs of subordinate states.60

In addition to the analysis of this type of neighbourly relations, I examine the voices of scholars in the two countries in the eighteenth century, attempting to investigate their understanding. For the Japanese scholars, who had an opportunity to see and meet with Korean envoys, their perceptions on Chosŏn Korea gradually shifted from admiration to contempt towards the modern period. By quoting their recognitions on how they thought of Korea, the changes in their understanding will be examined. To analyze the Korean scholars, I will focus on those Chosŏn scholars, who are presently recognized as sirhak scholars (the scholars of practical learning). They attempted to find newer viewpoints than maintaining the inflexible features of traditional scholarship and to reform their society by acquiring new knowledge from the outside world in the late Chosŏn period. The sirhak scholars learned about Japan through monographs and records brought home by Korean embassies. Though these scholars

60 ibid., p.16.
were definitely a minority group, it should be emphasized that new progressive phenomena were obviously presented in Chosŏn society. Their scholarly efforts represented a series of attempts to escape the framework of the rigid Confucian thought. By examining their visions from historical sources, different interpretations and new diplomatic concepts towards Japan will also be explored.

On the basis of the historical events, thoughts, and recognitions that would have held between Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea in the eighteenth century, this research will look into multi-layered perspectives of the individual Japanese and Koreans who played an essential role in diplomacy through a close examination of historical sources. The writings of the scholars Arai Hakuseki (1657-1725) and Amenomori Hōshū (1668-1755) are indispensable in discussing this early-modern Japanese-Korean relationship, as are, in addition, the members of the Korean embassy in 1711 as well as 1719, and their Japanese counterparts, such as Shin Yuhan, diarist of the 1719 embassy. How were those officials representing the two states aware of their neighbouring peers, and how did the notions affect the modern history of the two countries? This question is consistently engaged in this thesis, and to answer it the research will be further explored.

In chapter two, the main discussion will focus on the conditions between Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea before and after reestablishing neighbourly relations. The chapter will briefly explain the relationship of the two states during the Ashikaga period (1338-1570s), the Japanese invasions by Hideyoshi, diplomatic efforts to restore neighbourly relations, and the Tsushima domain’s forgery of the sovereign’s message. Chapter three analyses Chosŏn Korea’s diplomatic principle, *sadae kyorin*, which signified the tributary relations between the Ming and Qing dynasties and the neighbourly relationship with Tokugawa Japan. How *sadae kyorin*
influenced Chosŏn Korea’s *sochunghwa* consciousness in the seventeenth century will be examined. Chapter four reveals Arai Hakuseki’s diplomatic reform in Korean diplomacy. His reforms and ambivalent views on Chosŏn Korea, and his dispute with Amenomori Hōshū, a diplomat in the Tsushima domain on the reform, will be analyzed. Chapter five describes Amenomori Hōshū, whose career as a diplomat was devoted to establishing the better relationship with Chosŏn Korea. His preparations for and his experiences in Korean diplomacy, will be examined. Chapter six illustrates the 1719 Korean embassy’s journey to Japan recorded in “Haeyurok,” written by Shin Yuhan, the chief diarist of the embassy, and how he conceived Tokugawa Japan and Japanese culture through the trip will be explored. Chapter seven will portray scholars both in Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea in the eighteenth century, and their various opinions on their counterparts will be studied. Finally, the conclusion will further analyze on the relationship of the two countries in the early modern period, and how the recognitions of the Japanese and Korean counterparts influenced society towards the modern period.
Chapter Two
Reestablishing a Neighbourly Relationship

Japanese and Korean relations before the Japanese invasions of Korea

Japan’s aggression against the Korean peninsula between 1592 and 1598 interrupted the established diplomatic relations, which had become formalized since 1420 in the Ashikaga period (1338-1570s). In the early stage of the Chosŏn period in the fifteenth century, the Chosŏn court made an effort to regain formal diplomatic relations with Japan, which had been cut off for decades due to Japan’s domestic political disunity caused by the dispute between the Northern court, supported by the Ashikaga house, and the Southern court that claimed the imperial throne (1336-1392).

After the political settlement between the Ashikaga family and the imperial court was completed, the Chosŏn court began to send its delegations to Japan in 1413 to reestablish a formal diplomatic relationship. The domestic circumstances of Chosŏn Korea were stable at the zenith of Ming prosperity.¹ The only concern on the Korean side at that time was whether or not their requests to the Ashikaga bakufu to control Japanese traders and pirates would be fulfilled. Chosŏn Korea wanted the bakufu to manage the illegal activities of the Japanese independent traders who frequently ignored the trade and barter restrictions of the Chosŏn court. Another request was to restrain the Japanese pirates, called wakō, (K: waegu) whose destructive raids against the southern Korean coast had posed a serious threat to Chosŏn Korea’s security since the late Koryŏ.² In response to the repeated requests by the Chosŏn

¹ Miyake, Kinsei Nicchō kankei no kenkyū., p.118.
² According to Japanese historian Murai Shōsuke, a group of the sea pirates were constituted with the multinational population.
court, the Ashikaga bakufu attempted to suppress the wakō in the Tsushima and Iki islands, but to no avail. The Chosŏn court also launched a punitive expedition against the two islands in 1419, but failed to thoroughly exterminate them due to strong resistance.

Handling negotiations with Chosŏn Korea had been a vital matter for the Sō family in Tsushima. The Sō house had been a daimyo of Tsushima since the Kamakura period (1192-1333). The founder of the Sō family was Koremune from Kyūshū, who entered the island in the twelfth century. The Sō family came to prominence in the fifteenth century when the clan began to monopolize the Korean trade. By the middle of the sixteenth century after the establishment of the Tokugawa bakufu, all interactions with Chosŏn Korea passed through the Sō family of Tsushima. The lack of arable land meant Tsushima could not cultivate sufficient rice; only two thousand koku of barleys were annually produced and almost no rice generated. However, thanks to the dominance of the Korean trade provided by the Tokugawa bakufu, Tsushima was classified as daimyo domain producing more than ten thousand koku of rice. Moreover, the Sō family was treated as a daimyo family with a status of the one hundred thousand koku, and was seen as a ‘wealthy’ daimyo by fellow daimyos. Under the affluent commercial business with Chosŏn Korea, the Sō family enjoyed its unique status in Korean diplomacy and trade.

King Sejong (r. 1418-1450), the fourth ruler of the Chosŏn court, launched an effort in 1420 to establish a diplomatic relationship with Ashikaga Japan, at the time of the fourth

3 The Tsushima island is situated in the Tsushima Strait, front sea of the northern Kyūshū. The Iki islands are located right of Tsushima island.
4 The unit koku is based on the amount of the rice that a person eats in a year, and is calculated as about 150kg. There is a relation of units in the following equation: one koku = ten to =100 shō =1,000 gō.
6 The daimyos over one hundred thousand koku enjoyed the special treatments in the time of alternative attendance (sankin kōtai) and social circles among the daimyos. For further details, see Tashiro’s Wakan: Sakoku jidai no Nihonjinmachi. pp.91-92.
shogun, Ashikaga Yoshimochi (r.1394-1423). In accordance with the establishment of the diplomatic relations between the Ashikaga bakufu and Chosŏn Korea, several official delegations from the Chosŏn court, called t’ongshinsa, or tsūshinshi in Japanese, were sent to Japan a total of six times. Among all the parties, only three embassies in 1428, 1439, and 1443 went to Kyoto to greet the Ashikaga shogun.

The noteworthy Chosŏn scholar, later promoted to Chief State Councillor (K: yŏngŭijŏng) of the Chosŏn court, Shin Sukchu of the 1428 embassy, compiled a work in 1471 entitled Haedong chegukki, or Notes of Countries in the Sea East. Shin’s written piece became a vital source to understand Japan and a model format for other travelogues written by the officials of the Korean embassy in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. Shin’s document had details of geographical settings of the cities, political conditions, history, language, political, and cultural events in Japan. In particular, the documentation was used as an important source for the Chosŏn court on how to follow the diplomatic protocols for the Japanese envoys. Throughout the Ashikaga period, more than sixty envoys were dispatched to the Korean peninsula, and the Koreans welcomed them for further cultural and commercial interactions.

In contrast to domestic stable circumstances in Chosŏn Korea, the political influence of the Ashikaga family gradually declined. The powerful local daimyos particularly in the

---

7 Three other embassies were disrupted on their way to Kyoto due apparently to the death of the Korean officials and unstable sailing conditions.
8 Shin Sukchu has been regarded as one of the most well-known scholars in the early Chosŏn period. His major publication includes Haedong chegukki in 1471 which recorded the history, geography, customs, and language of Japan and Ryūkyū. It is a valuable resource showing how the diplomats in the Chosŏn court were always able to deal with the two countries, and how Japan and Ryūkyū were seen and understood by the Koreans. He is also noteworthy as a major contributor to the hangŭl enactment in 1443.
9 Shin Sukchu described in his document that the influential daimyos who visited Japan were recorded and showed the procedure of how to hold a reception for them. Some historical facts and maps of Ryūkyū were noted.
western part vigorously exercised commercial trade with Chosŏn Korea. The Chosŏn court willingly permitted those daimyos to trade in exchange for suppressing the wakō. The Ashikaga shogunate possessed no decisive power at that time. Consequently, the leading daimyos were acting largely autonomously in their commercial and diplomatic dealings with Chosŏn Korea. The authoritative daimyos such as the Ōuchi clan in the western region and the Shimazu and Hosokawa families in Kyūshū also sent their private commercial envoys to Chosŏn Korea to import the printed Buddhist scriptures and the ginseng. The bakufu exported silk and other crafts, while the daimyo of Kyūshū and Tsushima exported such products as sulphur, copper and spices such as pepper traded from Southeast Asia via the Ryūkyū islands. Especially for Tsushima, the imports from Chosŏn Korea were vital; without them the small island could not survive. Those daimyos’ vigorous trading activities were expanded as far as Southeast Asia via Japan and Ryūkyū. The Chosŏn court also dispatched envoys to the Ashikaga bakufu. Official and private exchanges were actively exercised between Chosŏn Korea, the western daimyos, and the Ashikaga bakufu. The relations between the two states in the period could be more appropriately described by the term ‘commercial relations’ than the neighbourly relationship.

Chosŏn Korea’s attempt to strengthen relations with Japan was apparent in opening 3 ports in southern Korea, including Pusanp’o, Chep’o and Yŏmp’o for the Japanese merchants. The area for commercial stations and residential districts, called the Japan House

---

10 The Ōuchi clan was once the most influential daimyo from Ashikaga to Sengoku (the Warring State) period in present-day southern Yamaguchi prefecture, around Suō area. The Ōuch house was terminated by his rival daimyo, the Mōri family in 1569.
11 Miyake, Kinsei Nicchō kankei no kenkyū. p.119.
12 ibid., p.119.
13 All ports are located in current Southern Kyŏngsang province. Chep’o (also known as Neip’o) is in present-day Êngehŏn city and Yŏmp’o is in Ulсан.
(J: wakan; K: waegwan), was arranged. The Japanese traders began to reside in one of three local ports for their convenience, and the number of the kökyo wajin (the Japanese residents at the three ports) increased accordingly. In 1466, the 1,200 Japanese in Chep’o, 330 in Pusan’o, and 120 at Yömp’o were inhabited. At the residential areas in the Three Ports, more than ten Buddhist temples were built for the local Japanese to worship; this was a special treatment for them, as Buddhism was already in decline following the rise of Neo-Confucianism as the moral discipline of the Chosŏn society.

Though exchange was more robustly exercised, piracy did keep aggravating both the Korean local people and the Chosŏn court. As mentioned, the previous expedition in 1419 against Tsushima and Iki islands was not successful in putting an end to piracy in the region. By learning from the past and exercising active commercial exchanges with Japan, the court put a policy against the pirates in effect. For those who voluntarily surrendered to Chosŏn troops, the court provided them with the privilege of commercial trade with Japan and offered them places to live. By giving them commercial advantages in Hansŏng and a special seal granting the noble status, the number of Japanese residents increased. Due to such efforts of the Chosŏn court, the raids of the pirates slowly ceased.

While the exchanges between Ashikaga Japan and Chosŏn Korea increased, more troubles followed. The Korean commercial administration failed to manage an increasing contraband trade. To constrict those illegal activities, the Chosŏn officials began to apply more pressure to the Japanese residents in the Three Ports in order to foil any illegitimate commercial activities. Under these tighter controls, the Japanese dissatisfaction erupted in 1510.

---

14 The exact date of the establishment of the Japan House and the Samp’o is unknown, but it was said to be in the early fifteenth century.
16 Those people were called köwa (the surrendered Japanese).
17 Present-day Seoul.
About 45,000 Japanese rioted in the Three Ports. With the military assistance of the Tsushima troops, the Pusan’o and Chep’o were surrendered after the riots. The Chosŏn court suppressed the insurrection, and expelled the participants to Tsushima. In 1512, commercial exchanges resumed with the establishment of a new agreement, the Jinshin (K: Imjin) Agreement.\(^{18}\) But under the conditions of this agreement, only one port was opened for the Japanese traders. Moreover, the residential districts in the three local ports were closed down. As a more restricted operation, the Japanese commercial ships decreased from fifty to twenty five.\(^{19}\) Despite the restrictions of illegal activities, the commercial exchanges between the two states were reasonably developed.

**Hideyoshi’s invasions of the Korean peninsula**

At the end of the fifteenth century, the exchange of official and private envoys between Chosŏn Korea and Japan became intermittent once again. At that time, the two countries experienced domestic turmoil that resulted from the difficulty in dealing with diplomatic issues; the Chosŏn court faced political struggle marked by factional strife, and Japan also entered a hundred-year civil war period, the *sengoku jidai* (1467-1568), without a politically unified government. In the disorder of the political power competition in Japan, Toyotomi Hideyoshi (1537-1598), a new military leader in the period, eventually unified Japan in 1590 by claiming himself to be *kanpaku*, or the imperial regent.\(^{20}\)

Born in a family of farmers and a part-time lower-ranking *samurai* in Owari

---

\(^{18}\) *Jinshin* is the 9th year of the zodiac years out of 60 cycles.

\(^{19}\) Chōsenshi Kenkyūkai ed., *Chōsen no rekishi*. pp.159-160.

\(^{20}\) *Kanpaku* is a title of a ‘regent’ that assists an emperor and executes internal affairs of the country. Hideyoshi did not claim himself as the shogun due to his poor pedigree and his ineligibility for a post that members of the Minamoto clan alone had held. (Quoted from Berry, Elizabeth Mary. *Hideyoshi*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982. p.170.)
province, Hideyoshi joined a military circle led by Oda Nobunaga (1534-1582). Hideyoshi’s talent was soon recognized. After Nobunaga’s assassination in 1582 by Akechi Mitsuhide (1526-1582), who was a deputy of Nobunaga but possessed a personal grudge against his superior, Hideyoshi immediately killed Mitsuhide. Unlike Nobunaga, Hideyoshi was able to unify the country in 1590. Soon after this accomplishment, the new unifier’s ambitious action surprised even his followers. Hideyoshi decided to invade Chosŏn Korea in 1592 and 1598 as a stepping-stone to conquer the Ming dynasty, which was said to be his ultimate goal.

The Chosŏn court failed to fully understand the Japanese political situation. The two Korean envoys had met Hideyoshi once in 1591 to recognize his successful unification of the islands, just a year before the invasions. An ambassador of the mission, Hwang Yungil, warned the Chosŏn court of Hideyoshi’s intention to invade Chosŏn Korea, but a vice-ambassador, Kim Sŏngil, thought the Japanese ruler harmless. Kim’s optimistic opinion was eventually accepted by the court, as the Koreans believed Japan incapable of invading given its need for more political consolidation right after unification. The Japanese troops proceeded to the far north from the southern edge of the Korean peninsula, without any major battles against Korean forces. The Korean king fled from the capital city, and the royal palace Kyŏngpok, was burned to ashes. Kitajima Manji indicates that Hideyoshi even had a grand plan to invite

---

21 Current Western Aichi Prefecture in the western-central Honshū of Japan.
22 Nobunaga was born in a family of local daimyo near Nagoya. When young, his bizarre acts to distract others embarrassed his vassals and even his father. However, his talent as a leader of the clan came out when he defeated his powerful rival, Imagawa Yoshimoto (1519-1560) at the battle of Okehazama in 1560, and the victory decided Nobunaga as the best man to unify Japan. He was assassinated by Akechi Mitsuhide at Honnōji, Kyoto, in 1582.
23 Nobunaga was short-tempered and often behaved violently to his vassals.
24 The Chosŏn court accepted Kim’s opinion, for his political strife was influential among the court at that time. Hwang belonged to the sŏin, or the Westerner faction, and Kim to tong’in, the Easterner.
emperor Gōyōzei (r. 1586-1611) to Beijing for his inauguration as a ruler of China.²⁵

It is still a controversial issue among scholars as to why Hideyoshi invaded Chosŏn Korea even though the structure of unified Japan was not yet firmly set, only a few years after his unification process. However, many suggest that the first invasion was meted out as punishment for Chosŏn Korea’s refusal to let Hideyoshi invade the Ming dynasty.²⁶ The second invasion sought to distribute Korean territory as rewards to his vassal daimyos, who participated in the first war. Hideyoshi’s invasions were said to be his long-cherished wish after his achievement in unifying Japan.

In the latter case, Hideyoshi sought new land to distribute to his powerful daimyos, such as the Maeda, Date, Shimazu, and Mōri houses. By offering the territory in the continent, he would be able to suppress any possible uprising against his regime and prevent the struggle of one great daimyo against another. As a result of the instability of the unification process, Hideyoshi needed some incentive to reward these daimyos. His motivation for the invasion remains unclear, however and no historians have been able to uncover anything more definite. They are not able to exactly prove on his motivation of the progress to the continent. In contrast to Hideyoshi’s zealous intention to invade the continent, other daimyos around Hideyoshi, such as Konishi Yukinaga (birth date unknown- 1600) and Tokugawa Ieyasu, were apparently not eager to support Hideyoshi, as the invasion of Chosŏn Korea did not bring them any positive rationale at all.

The resistance of many Koreans to the invasions had not been anticipated by the Japanese armies. Known as the ŭibyŏng, or Righteous Armies, these locally based soldiers proved more valiant than the Korean regular troops, and their strong resistance to the abrupt

aggression halted the Japanese force. The ṭubyŏng in Hamgyŏng province confronted Katō Kiyomasa (1562-1611), known for his fearless battles with the Korean soldiers during the invasions, successfully encircling Kiyomasa’s battalions so that they were unable to assist his other troops in different locations. The Korean force in other regions motivated the local people to further battle against the Japanese, particularly in the southern coastal area in Chŏlla province, where Japanese ships were almost completely scattered and exterminated. After the Japanese invasions, Ming forces were dispatched to the Korean peninsula in 1593, as they acquired several disquieting facts on Japan’s act in advance. On Ming China’s participation into the war, Cho Wŏl-lae points out that the participation of Ming armies against the invasions was aimed to prevent invasions of its territory, and consequently, the Korean peninsula became a frontline of their battle field.

Immediately before the Japanese invasions of Chosŏn Korea, Tsushima attempted to persuade the Koreans to provide smooth passage for Hideyoshi’s troops to Ming China, but the Chosŏn court simply refused Hideyoshi’s demand owing to Chosŏn Korea’s engagement in tributary relations with the Ming dynasty. Tsushima stood between two positions: on the one hand, Hideyoshi commanded Tsushima to cooperate with the invasion; on the other hand, Chosŏn Korea harshly reproached Tsushima for assisting Hideyoshi’s expedition. The Sŏ house in Tsushima was in severe difficulty bridging the gap between Hideyoshi and Chosŏn Korea. More seriously, Tsushima’s special status for commercial trade with the Chosŏn dynasty was threatened by the war. Ultimately, negotiations between Chosŏn Korea and Tsushima failed. During the war, the Tsushima island ironically played an important role in leading the Japanese

---

27 ibid., p.69.
troops as the vanguard, and became a supply base for the Japanese soldiers.

The Japanese at last retreated from the Korean peninsula in 1598. The reason for Japan’s withdrawal was Hideyoshi’s death, but the abandonment of the war arose from several factors. First, there was no convincing reason for Japanese soldiers to invade the continent. Hideyoshi definitely possessed the purpose of further advancement, but many others could not discover the clear aim of the war or lacked any firm determination on victory over Chosŏn Korea. Japanese deaths were about 75,000, almost 1/4 of the entire combatants.\(^{29}\) More than ten thousand Japanese soldiers surrendered to Chosŏn Korea because of poor supply lines for food and military supplies. Some of the Japanese soldiers even joined the Korean force to resist the Japanese troops, and began new lives in a new place as Chosŏn subjects.\(^{30}\) Second, the Ming-Chosŏn troops severely damaged the Japanese force. In particular, the Koreans’ fortitude to protect their country made themselves different from the spirits of the Japanese warriors; prominent anti-Japanese figures in the war such as Yi Sunshin (1548-1598), a noteworthy Korean naval commander, and Kwak Chaeu (1552-1617), a leader of Korean ŭïbyŏng, led many people to resist the Japanese aggression to Chosŏn Korea.

Hideyoshi’s actions were a deathblow to parts of the Korean peninsula. The southern provinces especially were reduced to ashes, and the destroyed agricultural land would not recover for several generations. Koreans suffered greatly: over fifty thousand farmers, scholars, and potters were taken captive to Japan. Significantly, one of the invasions led to the complete aggravation of the diplomatic relationship with the Chosŏn court. Due to the war, the relationship was seriously attenuated and the long-standing exchanges of envoys, commerce,

\(^{29}\) This data is distributed from Prof. Matsubara Takatoshi’s laboratory, Research Center for Korean Studies, Kyushu University.
Emergence of Tokugawa Ieyasu

The rise of the new Japanese military icon Tokugawa Ieyasu marked a turning point. A cunning man, Ieyasu survived numerous battles with the powerful local daimyos such as Takeda Shingen (1521-1573) and Hōjō Ujinao (1562-1591). In 1598, Ieyasu was soon named as the first daimyo among the Five Elders of Hideyoshi’s cabinet. After Hideyoshi’s death in 1598, Ieyasu entered in a conflict with Hideyoshi’s deputy, Ishida Mitsunari (1560-1600) and defeated him and his troops in the great battle of Sekigahara in 1600. Following this victory, he was appointed as the shogun by the imperial court and established his government, the Tokugawa bakufu, in 1603. The foundation of his bakufu was further consolidated after the Osaka Castle Siege in 1615, when Ieyasu defeated his apparent opponents, Toyotomi’s heir, Hideyori (1593-1615) and his military alliances.

Gaining power shortly after the withdrawal of Japanese troops from the Korean peninsula, Ieyasu sought to reestablish diplomatic relations with Chosŏn Korea. From his perspective, Japan’s urgent diplomatic agenda was to recover relations with other East Asian countries. Hideyoshi’s seven-year war against the Ming-Chosŏn military alliance had left Japan isolated from the East Asian world, so Japan’s urgent diplomatic issue in the early seventeenth century was to begin by normalizing the relations with Chosŏn Korea. From Ieyasu’s point of view, the diplomatic disorder in East Asia that was inherited from his predecessor, Hideyoshi, had to be remedied, but it was not a simple task to fit all the scattered pieces back on the table again.

31 The Five Elders were Tokugawa Ieyasu, Maeda Toshiie (1537-1599), Ukita Hideie (1573-1655), Mōri Terumoto (1553-1625), and Kobayakawa Takakage (1533-1597).
Ieyasu’s most important task was to maintain domestic peace and stabilize his regime. In order to do so, his bakufu needed to be recognized by the outside world to show his people and other rival daimyos its legitimacy as the unifier of Japan under the Tokugawa reign. In other words, the Tokugawa bakufu sought to use foreign diplomacy for domestic legitimatization and to consolidate its political dominance, authority, and peace. Ieyasu was keenly aware of the importance of strengthening his regime. If the Tokugawa bakufu was recognized by both domestic and international societies, the regime would be able to fortify military unification, differentiate the Tokugawa line from other powerful daimyo families, and keep its sovereignty in East Asia. As its neighbour, receiving authorization from Chosŏn Korea seemed to fully satisfy Ieyasu’s strongest wish and the recognition would further elevate the status of the Tokugawa family at the same time.

Rehabilitation of the diplomatic relations with Chosŏn Korea was a desperate issue to Tsushima as well. During the war, the island seemed ready to lose its privilege of monopolizing the Korean trade. Termination of the commercial relations meant an end of Tsushima itself. To survive, the Tsushima domain once again faced the tough task of rehabilitating the diplomatic relations with Chosŏn Korea. The diplomatic reengagement was a strong demand, rather than a request, of Tokugawa Ieyasu, as the first shogun of the Tokugawa bakufu.

The Korean side, on the one hand, was not eager to restore diplomatic relations with Japan because of its understandable resentment over the invasions. On the other hand, Chosŏn Korea was also in need of reestablishing the relationship to concentrate on reconstruction of its devastated homeland. After Hideyoshi’s invasions, Chosŏn Korea suffered domestic financial difficulties resulting from the shortage of rice and other agricultural products caused by the destruction of farm land. Moreover, the Chosŏn court had difficulties collecting taxes caused
by the loss of land and census registers during the war. On the northern border of the Korean peninsula, the rise of the Manchus began to be a threat. The existence of the eastern ‘barbarians’ affected both the Ming dynasty as well as Chosŏn Korea.\textsuperscript{32}

In order to recover from the damage and avoid possible dangers in the north, the Chosŏn court also began to seek peace and order with Tokugawa Japan. Accordingly, the Koreans began to delve into the prospects of reforming the relationship with the new bakufu under a new leader. The court began to collect information on the political circumstances of Japan through released captives. Kang Hang (1567-1618), a notable Neo-Confucian (Chu Hsi) scholar as well as an official of the Chosŏn court taken to Japan during the Japanese invasions of Chosŏn Korea, reported that the newly-established bakufu by the Tokugawa house seemed to have no intention of conducting another war against Chosŏn Korea.

The Chosŏn court was vigilant with Japan’s offer in engaging in diplomatic relations. Among Ieyasu’s special missions to Chosŏn Korea to seek the feasibility of reengagement between 1601 and 1603, some were killed or did not return home.\textsuperscript{33} However, Tsushima persistently kept dispatching the envoys. Chosŏn Korea wanted to see if Japan had no ambition for another invasion, and set up two preconditions to negotiate the engagement of diplomatic relations in 1606: (i) extraditing criminals who desecrated the royal tombs of Queen Jŏnghyŏn of the ninth King, Sŏngjong (r. 1469-1494), and King, Chungjong (r. 1506-1544), of the Chosŏn court (ii) bestowing the official diplomatic invitation (J: kokusho, K: kuksŏ) from Ieyasu entitled as ‘King of Japan (Nihon kokuō).’

Chosŏn Korea’s prerequisites were difficult to fulfill for Tsushima. Finding the criminals was impossible to accomplish the first condition, since no Japanese military generals

\textsuperscript{32} For more details, see the latter half of chapter 2.

\textsuperscript{33} Nakamura, \textit{Nissen kankeishi no kenkyū}. vol.2., pp.257-260.
were aware of the royal tomb vandalism committed by the Japanese soldiers.\textsuperscript{34} As for the second condition, Ieyasu did not claim the title ‘King of Japan.’ The title of *Nihon kokuō* once indicated the Ashikaga shoguns, and the title of the *kokuō* was strongly attached to the *sakuhō* relations, or tributary relationship, once engaged in between the Ming dynasty and the Ashikaga bakufu.\textsuperscript{35} The Ming emperor provided the title of *Nihon kokuō* to Ashikaga Yoshimitsu (1358-1408), the third shogun of the government in 1403. Therefore, the ‘king of Japan’ represented the suzerain and vassal term between the Chinese dynasty and Japan. In his not claiming this title, we can see Ieyasu’s attempt to free Japan from the Chinese world order, declaring himself independent in East Asia in order to keep a distance from the Chinese-centered map.

The Tsushima domain, seeking to renormalize relations, acted to regain the relationship and mediated the negotiation between the political authorities of the two countries. It was vitally important that these negotiations succeed, as the island’s life was maintained by the Korean trade. Ieyasu’s assignment to the daimyo of Tsushima, Sō Yoshitoshi (1568-1615), to seek the diplomatic relations, gave the local daimyo the necessary pressure. At the same time, Tsushima’s role as the moderator was a chance in a lifetime to rehabilitate the relations with Chosŏn Korea, and the Sō house was more than willing to take action as diplomatic agent for the bakufu At the same time, Tsushima’s role as the moderator was a precious chance to rehabilitate relations with the neighbouring state. The Sō house was more than willing to take action as diplomatic agent for the bakufu.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{35} In accordance with the engagement of a tributary relationship between Ming China and Ashikaga Japan, they also engaged in an official trade called *kangō bōeki*, or tally trade. The tallies were used as evidence of official trade between the ships from the two countries.
\textsuperscript{36} Uyenaka, p.91.
Tsushima authorities, desperate to restart trade, chose a risky strategy. To appease the two demands of the Chosŏn Korea, the island domain substituted criminals for the tomb vandals and falsified a diplomatic document in which the shogun addressed himself the ‘King of Japan.’ This manoeuvre was not difficult for Tsushima, as these letters came from the bakufu first to the hands of the Tsushima officials. In this sense, the Tsushima administrators were very tactful in ‘rewriting’ the documents. It was obvious to the Koreans that the criminals were too young to be soldiers during the war, and the official document was likely a forgery; the Chosŏn court, however, finally decided to send an envoy to Edo to reopen its relations with Japan, in response to numerous requests by the Tokugawa bakufu.

As stated, restoration of the diplomatic relations was key for the stabilization of Ieyasu’s rule. He firmly expressed his hope of restoring the relationship in front of the Korean envoys in 1605 and clarified the importance of Korean issues with Japan:

I was in the eastern part of Japan when the invasions broke out and thus, had no connection with any military assistance regarding the battle. I personally have no grudge or vengeful thoughts on Korea. I pursue peace with Korea… Korea is the closest country to Japan, and it is reasonable for us to maintain neighbourly friendship. The bakufu is surely placed in a critical moment if Korea and Ming China take revenge for our invasion… By close relations with Korea, we will be able to understand the political situation on the Korean side as well.

Tokugawa Ieyasu understood the numerous benefits that would be brought by renewing

---

37 It is regarded as Tsushima’s first forgery in the sovereign’s message from the Tokugawa bakufu.
38 Chosŏn wangjo shillok, Sŏnjo 39 (1606), December 11, or the twelfth day of the eleventh month. Sŏ Yoshitoshī sent the two substitute criminals caught in the island by robbery, but they were punishable by death. For details, see Nakamura Nissen kankeishi no kenkyū, vol.3., pp.266-267.
39 The details of the forgery made by Tsushima will follow in the later part of the chapter.
diplomatic relations with Chosŏn Korea. The rehabilitation of the relationship was significant since the reengagement would provide evidence of the bakufu’s prestige abroad, serve to enhance the domestic authority of the Tokugawa house, and bring about more domestic development through the numerous exchanges with Chosŏn Korea. Peaceful settlement with other East Asian countries would strengthen his rule. He had a significant understanding of diplomacy and understood fully the dynamics of Japan’s relations with its neighbours.\textsuperscript{41}

Ieyasu’s expression of peace in East Asia was continually conducted even after his own retirement from the shogunal office in 1605: he retained his authority as ōgosho, a retired shogun, or shogun’s father, as the most powerful among men of influence. Tokugawa Hidetada (r. 1605-1623), Ieyasu’s son and his immediate successor as the second shogun, inherited his father’s wish to strengthen the regime and renormalize diplomatic issues. As Ieyasu’s last responsibility in Korean diplomacy as the retired shogun, he set up a formal banquet in 1605 at the Castle of Fushimi in Kyoto for the Korean envoys, whose aim was to receive captives taken to Japan, investigate Japan’s domestic situation, and seek possibilities to restore the relations with the Chosŏn court.\textsuperscript{42} At the banquet, Ieyasu introduced his son Hidetada in order to impress the Koreans with the unremitting authority and the perpetual inheritance of the shogunal position from the Tokugawa line. At that time, Hidetada had already become the second shogun, and the ascendance of Hidetada as the new authority of his bakufu also enabled the Koreans to recognize the stability of the Tokugawa realm.

Under Tokugawa Hidetada in 1609, the Kiyū Agreement was established between Chosŏn and Japan, resulting in the reestablishment of diplomatic ties. This agreement also functioned as the commercial arrangement between Chosŏn Korea and the Tsushima domain.

\textsuperscript{41} Miyake, Kinsei Nicchō kankei no kenkyū. p.152.
\textsuperscript{42} Chosón wangjo shillok., Sŏnjo 38 (1605), June 28, or the twelfth day of the fifth month.
Even after the death of Ieyasu in 1616, Hidetada’s promise to pursue the kōrin policy with Chosŏn Korea in conformity with the wishes of his deceased father did not change. During the 1617 embassy’s visitation, Hidetada personally held the reception to congratulate the Korean embassy, serving them meals with his own hands and guaranteed the continuous return of captives to Chosŏn Korea. The visitation was significant enough for the Koreans to ease their alarm over the Tokugawa regime after Ieyasu’s death. The Koreans saw the second shogun Hidetada was against an offensive attitude and recognized the solid foundation of the bakufu under the Tokugawa house. Hidetada’s achievement during his shogunal tenure was meaningful; the long-standing visits of the embassy and full-scale cultural exchanges between the two countries were reinitiated.

Although Hidetada’s impact on Korean issues was meaningful and affected the policy of the neighbourly relations in the later period, the solid background founded by Ieyasu for reestablishing the neighbourly relations with Chosŏn Korea was significant despite the difficult situation of breakdown after the war. Fundamental issues in Korean diplomacy were successfully resolved in Ieyasu’s lifetime, and therefore, it can easily be imagined that Ieyasu, as ōgosho, played a crucial role as an indispensable as well as powerful consultant of Hidetada’s principle in Korean diplomacy. For those shoguns, engagement of diplomatic relations with Chosŏn Korea meant the survival of Japan itself, to bring about an environment free from possible threats from the Ming-Chosŏn military alliance. Furthermore, in order to enhance prestige and bring about longevity of the Tokugawa regime, legitimization by Chosŏn Korea increased the regime’s value.

The diplomatic policies towards Chosŏn Korea of Hideyoshi and Ieyasu were clearly distinct. Hideyoshi sought the legitimacy of his regime by expansionism to the continent and
by consecutive offensive acts; he attempted to proclaim his authority, in attempting to conquer East Asia. His lunatic ambition desired to control the two neighbouring countries, Chosón Korea and Ming China, where he sought more wealth and territory overseas. Japan obviously did not have sufficient force or strength to conquer them; consequently, his defeat in the Korean peninsula came from a natural cause.

Tokugawa Ieyasu, however, was more realistic in seeing the environment in East Asia around Japan, for his ultimate interest was further consolidation and peace in his regime, and therefore tranquility with the outside world was a crucial issue, rather than the pursuit of expansionism of Hideyoshi. Rehabilitating the diplomatic relations with Chosón Korea meant being readmitted into the East Asian sphere once again so that the Tokugawa bakufu was able to concentrate more on domestic issues without worries of threats from the continent. After Ieyasu’ retirement from the political arena, Hidetada strengthened the relations with Chosŏn Korea by restoring the official diplomatic relations. From this time, the full-scale cultural and commercial exchanges were sustained. As mentioned in chapter one, Tokugawa Japan never intended to seclude itself from foreign intercourse and did certainly attempt to open itself to the East Asian environment. The Tokugawa bakufu’s most notable political enforcement, known as the seclusion policy, or sakoku, leads us to a misunderstanding of the nature of Tokugawa polity. The authority was certainly eager to be a member of East Asia by restoring the relations with Chosŏn Korea.

Forgery of the sovereign’s message

Based upon the Chosŏn court’s requirement of Japan’s initial bestowal of the official diplomatic invitation, a serious issue originated from a forged diplomatic invitation writing Ieyasu’s title as ‘King of Japan (Nihon kokūō).’ Sending an official invitation letter to the
Chosŏn court from Ieyasu could also contain a problematic matter, besides the definition of the *Nihon kokuô* that once referred to the Ashikaga shoguns. Submission of the initial letter implied subservience to the other party, and it was most unlikely the Tokugawa shogun was willing to do this. The anxious Tsushima domain, knowing the shogun’s aim, forged a letter titled *hōsho*, although the real heading sent from the bakufu was *hōfuku*, the return letter. At the same time, the daimyo of Tsushima, Sō Yoshitoshi, also knew that the Chosŏn court would never accept Ieyasu’s letter if the shogun’s official title was not specified. With the aid of his retainer, Yanagawa Toshinaga forged Ieyasu’s letter to appear as if Ieyasu signed ‘*Nihon kokuô*’ as his official title in the letter and sent it to Tachibana Tomomasa, a vassal of Tsushima, who carried the letter with two war criminals, to perform an important mission to Chosŏn Korea.

What was more important, as mentioned, the court accepted the letter as an official one and later decided to send the ‘*Hoetap kyŏm soehwansa,*’ (Embassy of replying Japan’s state letter and returning the prisoners taken to Japan during the invasions) in 1607, although the Korean officials raised a critical question about the authenticity of Ieyasu’s message.

When the 1607 Korean embassy stopped off in Tsushima on the way to Edo, the ambassadors were invited for a banquet hosted by Sō Yoshitoshi and Genso (1537-1611). Kyŏng Sŏm, the vice ambassador of the embassy, held an odd conversation regarding the state letter sent in the previous year from Ieyasu. Kyŏng’s travelogue “Haesarok,” or the “Record of the Sea Raft,” described their exchange at the gathering. The conversations between the Japanese and Korean officials in the embassy were conducted in Chinese writing without mediation of the interpreters:

---

43 *Hōsho* implies ‘an initial letter (to the counterpart).’

44 Genso was from Fukuoka, Kyūshū, and later asked to serve for Tsushima in 1580. He launched the Iteian, where he himself and his descendants composed documents and letters to the Chosŏn court. This place in Tsushima was a place to compile them throughout the Tokugawa period.
[Kyŏng:] Kanpaku\textsuperscript{45} never uses the king as his title. Is that true?
[Genso:] Yes, that is true.
[Kyŏng:] Then, was the past state message truthfully complied by Ieyasu?
[Genso:] Why do you ask about it?
[Kyŏng:] You just said that kanpaku did not use a letter ‘king,’ but why does he use the seal inscribed ‘King of Japan?’
[Genso:] That seal was bestowed by an envoy from Ming emperor in the past. Kanpaku\textsuperscript{46} at that time did not receive tributary engagement [with the Ming dynasty], and the [Chinese] envoy left the seal. So we usually use this [for the sovereign’s message].
[Kyŏng:] Why do you utilize the seal although you do not have the [tributary] relations [with the Ming dynasty?]
[Genso:] [He smiled wryly but no answer]\textsuperscript{47}

Kyŏng’s doubt about the state message was reasonable, and he was brave enough to ask Genso if the letter was authentic. The Ming seal seemed to have been brought in the time of the Japanese invasions of Chosŏn Korea, when Japan and Ming China negotiated a peace agreement.\textsuperscript{48} Sŏ Yoshitoshi and Konishi Yukinaga arranged the Chinese envoy to come to Japan early for an armistice pact.\textsuperscript{49} The peace negotiation with Ming China was unsuccessful and the frustrated Hideyoshi advanced again to the Korean peninsula in 1597. In the awkward conversation with Kyŏng, Genso’s aim was to emphasize to the Korean official the Ming seal authenticity and venerability. Kyŏng, although noting that the seal could be a reproduction or otherwise inauthentic, did not further pursue this matter, as Kyŏng was at an informal banquet to welcome himself, and he might have recognized that pushing for further answers was

\textsuperscript{45} Kanpaku was a manner of the Chosŏn court in the official documents to indicate the Tokugawa shoguns.

\textsuperscript{46} Indicated Hideyoshi.


\textsuperscript{49} ibid., pp.24-25.
improper in that place.\textsuperscript{50}

While Tsushima forged state letters, the Kiyū Agreement in 1609 was engaged by the two parties, Chosŏn Korea and the Tsushima domain. Those Tsushima officials made every effort to maintain Tsushima’s exclusive right for this business engagement with Chosŏn Korea, and Tsushima had to continue their deception of the shogun’s reply letters by adding the term ‘ō’ after ‘Nihonkoku’ in that bakufu’s denial of the term ‘ō’ would cause another controversial issue.

To write the official sovereign’s message between the two countries, the regulated format was already set, and the two countries followed exactly the systematic rules; for instance, names of the shogun and the king had to be the same height in the state letter. The honorific addresses for the two leaders were written with denka (K: chônna) that indicated the reciprocal terms between the two authorities of Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea. The Chosŏn court was rigid in terms of pursuing its own diplomatic policy under sadae kyorin. With Tokugawa Japan, Chosŏn Korea engaged its relations based upon parity, equal-footing. So the relations between the Korean king and the Tokugawa shogun reflected the equivalence that had no implications of hierarchy.\textsuperscript{51}

The chief ambassador of the 1617 Korean embassy, O Yungyŏm, also found that the title ‘ō’ (king) as an official shogunal title was missing in the reply letter from Tokugawa Hidetada addressed to the Korean king, Kwanghaegun (r. 1608-1623).\textsuperscript{52} Hidetada’s message to the Chosŏn king opened with, “Minamoto no Hidetada of Japan addresses a reply letter to His

\textsuperscript{50} ibid., p.26.
\textsuperscript{52} The 1617 embassy was the second party after the rehabilitation of the diplomatic relations in 1607.
Majesty, the King of Korea.”53 O urged the bakufu officials to change the shogun’s sovereign’s message, stating “Nothing is more important than the correct usage of terminology in diplomatic documents between states. If your shogun is just addressed as ‘Minamoto no Hidetada of Japan’ [not as the title of ‘King of Japan’ in the sovereign’s message], how dare he maintain relations with his neighbouring country on an equal basis?”54

In response to this, the Buddhist priest Ishin Sūden, in charge of productions for the bakufu’s diplomatic documentations, rejected the use of the title of the Nihon kokuō, in the presence of the Korean embassy, despite the chief ambassador’s persistent request for the revision of the title in the shogun’s letter, in replying:

> It is an old custom for Japan not to use the term ‘ō’ [as the shogunal title]. Nothing harmful can be done in the protocol [between the two countries] by shogun’s lowering his position [than the Korean king] without the term ‘ō.’ Since the shogun is not a king, how he can use the term ‘king’ for his state letters?55

However, the Korean official strongly insisted on the revision of the shogun’s reply to Tsushima, responding,

> In the days of Tokugawa Ieyasu, all the Japan’s diplomatic documents delivered by officials of Tsushima used the term ‘ō’ as a shogunal title between Japan and Korea. Why only this time does the shogun reject the term in his state message?56

53 Yi, Kyōngjik, “Pusanrok.,” Haehaeng ch’ongjae., vol.3., Seoul: Mimungo, 1989, September 29 (1617), or the thirtieth day of the eighth month, p.12. The title of the sovereign’s message was begun with ‘Minamoto,’ as Ieyasu was the Elder of the Minamoto clan. In other words, his genealogical identity as a member of the Minamoto family was officially confirmed by the imperial court and the emperor. (Quoted from Chang, Yu. “Identity and Hegemony in Mid-Tokugawa Japan: A Study of the Kyōhō Reforms.” Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 2003. p.87.
54 Yi, Kyōngjik, “Pusanrok.,” September 29 (1617), or the thirtieth day of the eighth month, p.12.
55 ibid., October 1 (1617), or the second day of the ninth month, p.12.
56 ibid., October 4 (1617), or the fifth day of the ninth month, p.13.
Discussion between Süden and O ended without decisive solution. A few days later a surprise occurred. In accordance with the chief ambassador’s protest, the Korean embassy successfully received a newly revised sovereign’s message delivered by Yanagawa Shigeoki (1602-1684), an influential retainer of the daimyo of Tsushima, in which the shogun addressed himself as ‘Nihon kokuō,’ the King of Japan. However in fact, the Tokugawa bakufu never accepted the Korean embassy’s request for the revision of the shogun’s title as ‘ō’. A question was whether the Korean embassy did receive the sovereign’s message stating Hidetada himself as Nihon kokuō.

To fulfill O’s demand, Tsushima again forged the state letter. The Tsushima officials who were involved in the forgery were Sō Yoshinari (1602-1656), who succeeded the daimyo of Tsushima after his father, Yoshitoshi, and an influential retainer of the Sō family, Yanagawa Shigeoki, who had long served the Sō family, and a Buddhist priest, Kihaku Genpō (1588-1661), in charge of diplomatic affairs between Tsushima and Chosŏn Korea. The relations of the three parties were multifarious, but they all shared the same rationale: an amicable settlement with the Korean side for the sake of Ieyasu’s wish. Another vital reason for their first deception of the sovereign’s message was that the economic survival of the island domain was solely dependent on their exclusive trade with Chosŏn Korea. Survival of the island was only possible by restoration of the formal relations between the two countries. The island of Tsushima, heavily reliant on Korean trade, lost all economic benefits after the Japanese invasions of Chosŏn Korea and desperately sought to regain the relationship. In the meanwhile, the Tokugawa bakufu, which placed a high value on the rehabilitation of the

57 Genpō was Genso’s successor at Tsushima’s Itelian coming from the Fukuoka domain, and became a successor of Genso in charge of drafting documentation in Korean diplomacy in the Tsushima domain.
relations with Chosŏn Korea, gave a special order to the daimyo of Tsushima to act as an intermediary to restore the relations.

Tsushima’s priest, Genpō, was the first Japanese to go to Chosŏn Korea’s capital after the Japanese invasions. He indeed led the eighteen members to visit Hansŏng and to meet the Korean king Injo (r. 1623-1649) in 1629 as a bakufu mission. The bakufu provided Genpō with a question whether or not the Korean side needed military assistance from the bakufu against the Manchus. Injo, antagonistic towards the Japanese on account of the Japanese invasions, refused to permit them into the capital city. Nevertheless, the situation was rather desperate at that moment; the northern territory of Korea was seriously threatened by the Manchus. In the circumstances, Injo was urged to accept the Japanese envoy for this time only in order to avoid further annoyance with the Japanese. This was the first and last Japanese mission to go beyond the wakan. After a five month journey, Genpō reported to the bakufu in 1630 the reply of the Chosŏn court that there was no need of reinforcements to Chosŏn Korea from Tokugawa Japan on the basis of peaceful engagement established with the Manchus.

Sō Yoshinari gained success in sending Genpō’s mission to Hansŏng: no other mission succeeded in gaining access to the capital city. And indeed the bakufu’s reliance on the Tsushima daimyo in Korean diplomacy seemed more confirmed. The mission also brought the reply of the bakufu’s questions to the Chosŏn court. Yoshinari seemed very satisfied with what he had done without any assistance of his retainer, the Yanagawa family. However, Genpō’s successful mission to Hansŏng meant a further split between the daimyo and the vassal.

In the twelfth month of 1624 the third Korean embassy led by Chŏng Ip, a chief

---

58 Chosŏn wangjo shillok., Injo 7 (1629), April 25, May 6, and May 17 (1629) or the third, fourteenth, and twenty fifth day of the fourth month. Genpō also aimed to search the Korean domestic situation by the bakufu’s order.

59 There was a strong sentiment against the entrance of the Japanese troops to the capital city as well.
ambassador, went to Edo to receive the Koreans taken captive during the Japanese invasions of Chosŏn Korea and congratulate Tokugawa Iemitsu (r. 1623-1651) as the newly ascended third shogun. The officials of the Korean embassy were surprised when they also found that the shogun addressed himself as “Nihonkoku Minamoto no Iemitsu” (Minamoto no Iemitsu of Japan) in the state letter to the Korean King Injo. There was no title stated as the ‘king.’ In the travelogue of the 1624 Korean embassy entitled “Tongsarok,” or the “Record of East Raft,” written by Kang Hongjung, the chief diarist of the embassy, Kang described the situation as follows: “When the chief ambassador together with other officials sat and opened a state letter of the shogun, they could not help but feel shocked since they found the letter lacked the shogunal title ‘ō’… They soon called upon Genpō, and returned the letter, requesting that the letter should be revised.”60 As in the former Korean embassy of 1617, the falsified letter of Tokugawa Iemitsu to the Korean king was again made by Tsushima. The situations over the sovereign’s message seemed to be chaotic, and the Tsushima domain had to deal with wholesale manipulations on the messages from the Tokugawa bakufu and the Chosŏn court. To correspond to the bakufu’s satisfaction, Tsushima continued forgeries on the sovereign’s message from the Chosŏn court as well. The Chosŏn court’s seal, portrayed as “the government exercises by means of the virtue” was precisely falsified by artisans in Tsushima, and put on the forged letter.61 Thus, in order to have consistency with Tsushima’s first forgery, they had to do multiple alterations for the letters until 1633, when the incident was finally reported by Yanagawa Shigeoki.

Sô vs Yanagawa: the aftermath

61 In Japanese translation, ‘toku o motte sei to nasu’
From Ieyasu’s time, the Tokugawa shoguns were not eager to assert themselves as the ‘King of Japan,’ a title that would have recalled the Ashikaga period when the bakufu at that time once entered the tributary map of Ming China, which meant lower vassal of China. After the reengagement in 1609, Hidetada, followed by his father’s will, left his signature as ‘Nihonkoku Minamoto no Hidetada,’ avoiding the use of title the ‘king.’ The Tokugawa shoguns used their names, not their titles. In the state letters, the Tokugawa bakufu was not concerned with the Chosŏn court’s usage of the title ‘king’ as the shogun’s title; nevertheless, the Tokugawa shogun only wrote their names, not their title, on the letter. This became conventional diplomatic practice between the two countries when exchanging the letters.

The perspective of the Chosŏn court on the shogun’s title Nihon kokuō was that Tokugawa Japan, as a peer of Chosŏn Korea, should adopt the title in order to maintain an equal relationship. For Chosŏn officials, Tokugawa Japan’s adoption of the title ‘kokuō’ meant that Tokugawa Japan officially confirmed the parity between the Korean king and the Tokugawa shogun. The Korean embassy had to keep the principle that the diplomatic relationship between the two countries must be based on this equal standing, which was only possible by the shogun’s acceptance of the title ‘kokuō.’

What was the benefit to Tokugawa Japan in not using the title kokuō? For the bakufu, adoption of the title ‘kokuō’ meant Tokugawa Japan’s acceptance of the Chinese-centered order in East Asia, which conflicted with an autonomous Tokugawa bakufu. The bakufu rejected using the title king, claiming that Tokugawa Japan was not a part of tributary relations under the Chinese dynasty. In this sense, the Tokugawa diplomacy was able to retain its independence.

---

62 Tashiro, Kakikaerareta kokusho. p.159.
63 See the illustration of the sovereign’s letter from Tokugawa shogun Hidetada at Tashiro, Kakikaerareta kokusho. p.40.
64 Tashiro, Kakikaerareta kokusho. p.39.
from the Chinese influence. However, Chosŏn Korea as a peer was indispensable, as the relations also functioned as maintaining ‘not attached or apart’ from the continent.

Tsushima’s secret forgeries did not last long. The Sō family’s influential retainer, Yanagawa Shigeoki, disclosed the fact that Tsushima had long forged state messages from the Tokugawa shogun in 1633, though he was also deeply involved into the events. It is said that Shigeoki, who was a rival of the Sō family on the Korean trade monopoly, attempted to outdo in influence the Sō family in Tsushima. He believed that he would have won the dispute with the support of his powerful companions in the Edo Castle, such as tairō Doi Toshikatsu (1573-1644), the head of the rōjū, and Hotta Masamori (1609-1651), a member of the rōjū at that time. Also, Shigeoki’s position as a mediator between the bakufu and Tsushima was another advantage for him. The Yanagawa family had been in charge of difficult negotiations in Korean diplomacy, and he was proud of his family’s background. The Sō family, a daimyo of Tsushima domain, was also accused of the deception. Sō Yoshinari was frustrated by Shigeoki’s behaviour, but he could not do anything, as he knew Shigeoki’s strong connection with the political executives in the bakufu.

After the forgeries were revealed, the Tsushima daimyo Sō Yoshinari and Shigeoki confronted each other at the Edo Castle in 1635. For this time only, the shogun Iemitsu himself attended the open court to become the judge and to conclude the issue. In the beginning, Shigeoki’s accusation seemed just an inner disturbance (oie sōdō), but the incident became more serious and began to undermine the country’s diplomatic policy. On the second day, the

---

65 In addition to Doi Toshikatsu, most of the high ranking officials in the Edo Castle seemed to be Shigeoki’s acquaintances. They were called ‘Shigeoki tō (the Shigeoki faction).’ Tashiro, Kakikaereta kokusho, p.164 and p.172.
66 Tashiro, Kakikaereta kokusho. p.129.
shogun asked them several questions conceiving the forgery, and an immediate action to punish Shigeoki followed: he was sent to the remote Tsugaru domain, the current Hirosaki city in Aomori prefecture. Genpō, the Sō family’s trustworthy diplomat-monk, was also forced into exile to the Morioka domain (current Morioka city near Aomori prefecture). Sō Yoshinari, a daimyo of Tsushima, was not accused for anything by Iemitsu, although his forgeries were largely responsible for his lineage of the Tsushima domain.

The main actor who accused his lord, Yanagawa Shigeoki lost in the dispute and the judgment, although he was confident of winning over the Sō family. Shigeoki was forced into exile to the distant area from Edo, where he spent fifty five years until his death. The Sō family’s victory came from the strong will of the shogun; he definitely needed the Sō family who had taken the whole responsibility for and had long-term experience in Korean diplomacy. The Sō family’s history in charge of the diplomacy from the medieval period was so extensive that the bakufu could not ignore the knowledge of the Tsushima’s daimyo lineage that had lasted for centuries. Shigeoki was indeed another influential expert in Korean diplomacy as well, but he was deficient in perceiving the precise circumstance on the issue. He did not directly touch on the actual Korean affairs, and did not understand the real situation in the Tsushima island due to his long life in Edo. His experiences of handling the diplomatic issues with Chosŏn Korea were lacking, as he never resided in the Tsushima island or in Korea for a long period. The decision of the bakufu was streamlined and this final judgment proclaimed that the Sō family was solely responsible for Korean diplomacy, in lieu of the

---

68 Shigeoki was not sentenced to seppuku, samurai’s honorary suicide, thanks to his connections with the bakufu officials. See more details in Nakao’s Chōsen tsūshinshi: Edo Nihon eno zenrin shisetu. p.66
69 Tashiro, Kakikaerreta kokusho. pp.174-175.
70 ibid., pp.179-180.
Tokugawa bakufu, the ultimate political authority.

Along with the settlement, Tokugawa Iemitsu demanded two conditions for the Tsushima domain in handling Korean diplomacy. The bakufu’s decisions were as follows. First, three monks from Kyoto temples were responsible for composing the sovereign’s letters to the Chosŏn court, instead of those officials in Tsushima. The bakufu narrowed down the three monks who were capable of managing the state documents from the Kyoto Gozan, or the Kyoto Five Mountains, prominent five temples.\(^71\) The selected monks went down to Tsushima every alternative year to draft the sovereign’s message in lieu of the bakufu to further circumvent forgery by Tsushima personnel.\(^72\) Second, the new title taikun, or the Great Prince, was used to indicate the shogun.\(^73\) The Tokugawa family tried to avoid claiming him the ‘King of Tokugawa Japan’ in the sovereign’s letters, which would refer to one of the rulers around the Chinese empire and the engagement of the tributary relations with the Chinese emperor.

It is not clearly known from what historical sources the bakufu originated the term ‘taikun.’ Nevertheless, it is assumed that Hayashi Razan (1583-1657), who had succeeded to Ishin Sūden’s position as a chief bakufu advisor, was the initiator who used the title of taikun in Tokugawa Japan’s diplomatic protocol for the 1636 embassy, which was officially called the Korean embassy, Chosŏn tongshinsa, or Chōsen tsūshinshī, led by the chief ambassador, Im Kwang (1579-1644).\(^74\) In the Japanese diplomatic document to the embassy, Razan wrote on behalf of the two influential political executives, Ii Naotaka (1590-1659), tairō, and Matsudaira Nobutsuna (1596-1662), a member of rōjū, in response to the letter of Pak Myōngbu

\(^{71}\) The five temples are as follows: Nanzenji (head of the five following temple), Tenryōji, Sōkokuji, Ken’ninji, Tōfukuji, and Manjuji.
\(^{72}\) This is called Iteian rinbansei. Rinban stands for “alternative charge.”
\(^{73}\) However, Arai Hakuseki claimed that taikun was appointed as heir of the King in the Chosŏn court.
\(^{74}\) Tashiro argues that the title taikun was created by the Hayashi party, Hayashi Razan, who served for the first three Tokugawa shoguns, and Nagayoshi, Razan’s brother (Tashiro, Kakikaerareta kokusho, p.159.)
(1571-1639), a vice minister of the Board of Rites (K: Yejo), a division in charge of diplomacy; he used taikun as an official title of the Tokugawa shogun.

After the verdict of the Yanagawa affair, the Chosŏn court accepted Japan’s change of the shogun’s official title as ‘taikun,’ What the Tokugawa bakufu did was to omit the title, and just simply sign his name on their diplomatic letters as ‘Minamoto no Iemitsu.’ From the 1643 embassy, the Korean king began to officially address the shogun as the ‘Nihonkoku taikun’ in the state letters. The same format of Chosŏn court’s diplomatic letters continued in the embassies of 1655 and 1682. By entitling himself ‘taikun,’ the Tokugawa shogun did not indicate subjugation to the Chinese-centered world, and this view proved that Tokugawa Japan itself was keeping a certain distance from the Chinese tributary system.

In spite of the bakufu’s adoption of the title, taikun, the shogun still refused acceptance of any official title in his state letter to the Korean king. The shogun’s title in the diplomatic letter created a major issue among the embassy officials in 1636 as well. A dispute over the shogun’s title occurred between Im Kwang, a chief ambassador, and Doi Toshikatsu, a shogun’s council member, as follows:

Toshikatsu: Villainous vassal, [Yanagawa] Shigeoki, deceived the two countries, committing high treason by forging our sovereign’s message and stamps. That is, he added the term, ‘ō,’ after ‘Nihonkoku’ in our state letters…

Im: …Though [we admit] your shogun has denied the term ‘ō,’ what is the reason that he cannot use the taikun in his state letter?

Toshikatsu: Taikun is a designated term to informally show respect towards the shogun [in the imperial court]. Thus, it is proper to use the term in the reply letter of a member of the shogun’s council [to your minister], but how dare we use the informal term in our state letter

---

75 Yejo was responsible for dealing with the foreign affairs.
[addressed to your king]?... Even though your ambassador’s request is correct, I cannot return the letter [to the shogun]... Everyone knows that our ‘taikun’ [in the shogun’s state letter], but the reason for our rejection of the title is that we respect your country.\(^\text{77}\)

Doi Toshikatsu apparently attempted not to offend Im. To show his sincerity, he actually brought a number of gifts and said that those were from the shogun Iemitsu.\(^\text{78}\) Im kindly rejected his cordiality, but Toshikatsu did not accept Im’s word, saying that those were commemorative gifts for parting.\(^\text{79}\) Im and other ambassadorial members kept denying the acceptance, so Toshikatsu reluctantly had to bring them back.

Through this occurrence, it can be assumed that the members of the embassy understood Toshikatsu’s manner positively; the Japanese had not yet lost their respect for the Koreans, and Im saw Iemitsu’s appreciation for the honourable guests from across the ocean. After a dialogue among the embassy officials, the chief ambassador decided to accept the shogun’s reply letter at its face value, emphasizing:

\[
\text{It is unpleasant to accept Japan’s state letter in which they [even] denied the term } taikun, \text{ but they say that they cannot use the informal term [in their state letter] in that they respect our country. To receive a revised letter [in which the term } taikun \text{ is used] would be no good to our national dignity, either It would be more unpleasant if they wrote the } shogun sadaijin \text{ [instead of } taikun \text{ as a shogun’s title] in their state letter.}\(^\text{80}\)
\]

After the verdict, the Tokugawa bakufu chose the title ‘Nihonkoku taikun’ with its standard forms of protocol in a sovereign’s message. The new shogun’s title from the seventeenth

\(^\text{77}\) Im, Kwang. “Pyŏngja ilbon ilgi.,” *Haehaeng ch’ongjae.*, vol.3., Seoul: Mimungo, 1989. January 23 (1637) or the twenty eighth day of the twelfth month (1636), p.61.

\(^\text{78}\) ibid., January 23 (1637), or the twenty eighth day of the twelfth month (1638), p.61.

\(^\text{79}\) Those gifts were silver coins and several commodities.

\(^\text{80}\) Im, “Pyŏngja ilbon ilgi.,” *Haehaeng ch’ongjae.*, vol.3., January 23 (1637) or the twenty eighth day of the twelfth month (1636), p.61.
century was a beginning of an establishment of the Taikun gaikō, or the Great Prince Diplomacy. To exchange the state letters with Chosŏn Korea, Tokugawa Japan requested Chosŏn Korea to modify the shogunal title from ‘Nihonkoku kokuō’ to ‘Nihonkoku taikun’ in its diplomatic message. From the letter of the bakufu to the Chosŏn court, however, no title for the shogun was indicated, who only appeared as ‘Minamoto no so-and so’ (the first name of the shogun).’ This practice became diplomatic protocol between the two states after 1635 until 1711. Along with the visitations of the Korean embassy, the active commercial exchange between the two countries was also exercised through the Tsushima domain that handled the Korean issues.

The neighbourly relations were restored between Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea after the numerous efforts of the Tsushima domain in accordance with Tokugawa Ieyasu’s demand. Tsushima had to negotiate all the matters with the Korean side after the decisive breakdown of the Japanese invasions. To reengage the relations, Tsushima forged the sovereign’s letter to fulfill Chosŏn Korea’s preconditions, and the multiple forgeries were exercised for coherency before and after. After the falsifications were being revealed, the Ŝo family, the daimyo of the domain, was placed in a difficult situation, but the bakufu’s decision was to allow the daimyo to deal with the Korean issues. The bakufu indeed needed Tsushima’s expertise in Korean diplomacy and showed its reliance on the island. By the reengagement of the diplomatic relations with Chosŏn Korea, the bakufu could depict the hua-yi awareness so that Tokugawa Japan was able to show its autonomy out of the Chinese influence. Moreover, the Tokugawa family successfully presented its political legitimacy to bear the shoguns and to distinguish the political rivals. The restoration of the diplomatic relations with Chosŏn Korea provided further
consolidation of the domestic authority of the Tokugawa house and domestic peace under the Tokugawa realm.
Chapter Three

Chosŏn Korea as sochunghwa: through the sadae kyorin policy

Relationship between Chosŏn Korea and the Tsushima domain

The notions of the Koreans towards Japan and the Japanese culture frequently contained a certain degree of bias, in contrast to their emotions towards China, which were expressed as mohwa, or emulation of China, that arose at the end of the Koryŏ period (918-1392).¹ The Koreans’ perspective towards the Japanese was explicitly illustrated in the use of the term ‘uncivilized people.’ In the various records of the Chosŏn court and travelogues in the Korean embassies in different periods, the secretaries and diarists used the term ‘waeguk’ or ‘waein,’ to indicate Japan or Japanese; waeguk meant ‘outlandish country’ and ‘waein’ stood for ‘strange, peculiar people.’ Another possible reason for Korea to call Japan ‘waeguk’ was Japan’s sporadic recognition of the tributary relationship with the Chinese dynasties in an unusual manner, as Ashikaga Japan was a member of the tributary relations, but not in the Tokugawa period. For the Koreans, Japan’s flexible position was unimaginable, and Japan seemed outside the ‘universal’ East Asian order.

The Koreans’ visions were firmly constrained within the traditional values of the Chosŏn society. How did the Korean ambassadorial members form such a biased view towards the Japanese counterpart? Their perspective seemed to be constructed in the change in East Asia in the seventeenth century, and their persistent standpoint was sustained in the eighteenth century and beyond. The different feelings of the Japanese to their Korean counterparts and vice versa were exclusively based on what they were familiar with in their cultures. In this

regard, the Japanese possessed their own manner in which to behave and to see the Korean counterpart, and without a doubt, the Korean officials evaluated Japan from their standpoint of the rigid Confucian discipline.²

The diplomatic and commercial exchanges between Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea were conducted through Tsushima as an intermediary. The Tokugawa bakufu was unable to deal with the Korean issues without the island domain that was fully responsible for Korean diplomacy. Smooth interactions seemed to be exercised between Chosŏn Korea and Tsushima, but there were several facts, promises, and protocols needed for Tsushima to adjust to the Korean culture and customs. In those circumstances, Tsushima played the key role to bridge the gap between the two different countries, Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea. To maintain the neighbourly relations between the two countries, what did the Tsushima domain do to sustain the neighbourly relations, and what kind of notions did Chosŏn Korea posses towards Tsushima?

The Korean side regarded the Tsushima domain as its tributary island to the Chosŏn court, and the Tsushima officials’ attendance at the ceremonies to honour the Korean king was mandatory. Those rituals for the court were frequently held in Ch’oryang, where the wakan was located, and those ceremonial services to revere the Korean king were strictly followed in the Korean manner. The Tsushima officials had to show their admiration to the wooden figure that was taken as a symbol of the Korean king. On these occasions, the Tsushima officials were sitting in the garden kneeling and bending down toward the front, but the Korean officials and interpreters were standing close to the wooden figure. In the circumstance, the Tsushima officials seemed to pay obeisance to the mob of the Korean officials. The Tsushima officials

appealed to the Koreans that ‘our ritual submission is aimed only for the Korean king, not the Korean officials. So do not stand by the figure.’ But Tsushima’s request was not fulfilled until the end.³ Tsushima was definitely regarded as the submissive domain of Chosŏn Korea.

The reality of the relationships between the Korean and Tsushima officials was the ‘superior-inferior’ relationship. As a matter of fact, the ambassadorial members did show that they saw Tsushima as a part of the Korean province of Kyŏngsang.⁴ When the Korean members of the embassy were invited to the banquet of the Tsushima daimyo, a Korean official claimed that his Korean fellows did not have to follow the Japanese manner.⁵ Tsushima’s dual positions between Chosŏn Korea and Tokugawa Japan would provide an awkward situation; the island domain was indeed one of more than the two hundred domains of the bakufu. As a domain of Tokugawa Japan, there were no necessities for Tsushima, namely the Japanese officials, to attend the ceremonies for the Chosŏn court. With some reluctance, however, Tsushima attended the ritual ceremonies in accordance with the praxis in Korean convention.

To further develop diplomatic and commercial practices, Tsushima was forced to adjust to the Korean customs and traditions as its life solely depended on the exercise of the Korean trade. The island needed to defend its exclusive right in dealing with the Korean issues, which was promised by Tokugawa Ieyasu. By the bakufu founder’s strong wish, no domains could interfere or challenge the privileges of the island. In the elaborate negotiations between the island and Chosŏn Korea, the bakufu could exert very little control over Tsushima in Korean diplomacy.⁶ In this sense, the bakufu could not censor Tsushima’s acceptance of the Korean ceremonial services, as the island was the only one that knew how to maintain the

³ Tashiro, Wakan: Sakoku jidai no Nihonjin machi, p.129
⁵ ibid., p.46.
⁶ See Chapter 2 for further details on iteian rinbansei.
neighbourly relationship and to handle the Korean issues.

Tsushima’s ‘efforts’ to maintain a pleasant interaction with Chosŏn Korea were carried out, for termination of the ceremony for the Korean king meant a decisive breakdown of the diplomatic and commercial relations.\(^7\) For the bakufu, Tsushima’s attendance at the Chosŏn court’s traditional ceremonies did not directly weaken the authoritarian influence of the Tokugawa polity.\(^8\) Each domain was autonomously operated by the local daimyos and administrators, and Tsushima, without exception, had to control internal issues for its own sake. The political executives in Edo did not intervene in what the Tsushima officials did, as long as the practical issues with its neighbouring state were smoothly operated by the island.\(^9\) In this situation, the Tsushima officials’ presence may have provided the Koreans with a sense of superiority over the Japanese counterparts. How was the awareness of Chosŏn Korea’s superiority constructed? To answer the question and to comprehend the tangled threads of the historical phenomena, an understanding of the historical backgrounds of the Korean side is vital.

**Sadae kyorin based on the Confucian principle**

Chosŏn Korea’s initial adoption of Confucianism began in the fourteenth century. The founder of Chosŏn Korea, Yi Sŏng’gye (r. 1392-1398) who overthrew Koryŏ, sought a sanction from Ming China as a new legitimate ruler. He also pledged his allegiance to the Ming court; this meant a commencement of the tributary relations between the Ming dynasty and his new dynasty. By engaging in the tributary relations, Yi entrusted Korea’s new dynastic name to the Ming court to decide: Chosŏn or Hwanyŏng. The Ming court preferred Chosŏn, based on the

\(^7\) Tashiro, *Wakan: Sakoku jidai no Nihonjin machi*., pp.126-127.
\(^8\) Tashiro, *Kakikaerareta kokusho*., pp.178-179.
\(^9\) ibid., p.178.
The endeavours of the Neo-Confucian infiltration into the newly-established Chosŏn society were vigorous. The advisor of the new king, Chŏng Tochŏn (1342-1398) attempted to establish the Neo-Confucian discipline as a social doctrine. After Chong was slaughtered by his political opponent, Kwŏn Kŭn (1353-1409) inherited Chŏng’s aim and devoted himself to further penetration of the Neo-Confucian principle into the society. Through the process, Neo-Confucianism as the unyielding moral conduct was consolidated in the Chosŏn society. Buddhism, the state religion of the former dynasty, was disdained as heterodoxy by the Neo-Confucianists in the Chosŏn scholars and soon eradicated. The transmissions of the Neo-Confucian doctrine in public were also strongly connected to the respect for Ming China, which adapted Neo-Confucianism as its official study. In addition, the Ming military alliance during the invasions against the Japanese armies impressed the Koreans as the actions of a savior, represented as chaejo chiŭn (benevolence of the saver of the state), which was also deeply rooted in the society.

From the unbending perspective of the Confucian manner in viewing the East Asian sphere, how did Chosŏn Korea see the tributary relationship? To answer the question, the definition of tributary relationship ought to be understood. William Rockhill gives a brief explanation of the tribute system between Ming China and Chosŏn Korea as follows:

As to the custom of Korean kings submitting to the Emperor of China for his approval the name of the heirs to their throne, of their consorts, of informing him of deaths in the Royal Family these again are strictly

---

10 Kija was a name of the Chinese official and prince of the In dynasty (1600 B.C.-1046 B.C.). He fled to the Korean peninsula after the end of In and it is said that he established Kija Chosŏn, which was seen as the first dynasty in Korea.

ceremonial relations bearing with them no idea of subordination, other than that of respect and deference on the part of a younger member of a family to its recognized head…. During Ming dynasty of China, the people of Korea chose their sovereign without consulting China, and the latter power only entered a mild protest… There is no case recorded in which the Emperor of China disapproved of the choice the King of Korea has made of his successor or his consort.¹²

Engaging tributary relations may give us a notion of the stringent top-bottom hierarchical order and the Chinese coercive dominance over the Chosŏn court. As seen in Rockhill’s account above, Ming China provided Chosŏn Korea with political autonomy. Under the system, China was discouraged from intervening in both internal and external affairs of Chosŏn Korea as long as the tributary premises with the Chinese court were guaranteed.¹³ After the establishment of the Qing court in 1644, most institutions and cultural manners were transferred from the Ming dynasty to the Qing dynasty. In accordance with this comportment, the tributary systems that were maintained between the Ming dynasty and Chosŏn Korea also remained intact with the Qing court.¹⁴

*Sadae kyorin*, a mainstay of Chosŏn Korea’s diplomatic policy, should also be analyzed with the tributary relationship. The concept of *sadae* initially came from the Chinese monograph entitled the *Shunjū sashiden* “the great nourishes the lesser, the lesser serves the great.”¹⁵ *Sadae* as a preliminary diplomatic concept emerged in the Warring Spring-Autumn

---


¹³ Kim, Bong-jin. “Rethinking of the Pre-Modern East Asian Region Order.” Journal of East Asian Studies [Korea] 2 (2): 71. However, at any critical moment of the vassal state, such as the Japanese invasions of Chosŏn Korea, the greater state sent its reinforcement to save the subject.


period (770 B.C.-443 B.C.) when Confucius (551 B.C.-479 B.C.) encountered domestic turmoil in his country. During the chaotic conditions, his emphasis lay in the fact that morality should be the basis of the representation of solid order between human beings and society, and this would disallow the forcible dominance of the smaller by the greater states. To establish the peaceful political institution, retaining the proprieties was highlighted and to avoid the further meaningless battles, the relationship between the greater and the smaller countries had to be articulated by the proprieties, much like that between the sovereign and subject, and it appeared as the nature of the tributary relationship.

In acceptance of the Confucian doctrine into Chosŏn Korea, the diplomatic principle was firmly established as sadae kyorin. In the eyes of Chosŏn Korea in the seventeenth century, sadae indicated Chosŏn Korea’s relations with the Ming and Qing dynasties. The other, the kyorin relationship, was constituted with Tokugawa Japan.¹⁶ Kyorin is another vital pillar of Chosŏn Korea’s diplomatic conviction in maintaining friendship with its surrounding states. Unlike sadae, the principle of kyorin meant the neighbouring friendship based on an equal-footing. By the coexistence of the policies of sadae kyorin, Chosŏn Korea was able to ease militaristic tension with the greater and smaller states that surrounded it.¹⁷

Chosŏn Korea’s dilemma: between the two neighbouring states

¹⁶ A Korean scholar Kim Bong-jin sees the kyorin relationship as actually based on the saso of kyorin. Saso contains the opposite meaning from sadae, that is, voluntary submission to the smaller state and people. Kim’s argument comes from the historical fact that Tsushima had long been treated as a semi-tributary state of Chosŏn Korea. Since every matter in Korean diplomacy was exercised through the Tsushima officials, the bakufu did not directly touch on the issues between the two states in mentioning: “in this aspect, the relationship between the Chosŏn government and the bakufu was limited in scope and mostly ceremonial in nature and practice” (p.88). His claim is true; however, Tsushima just functioned as an agent of the Tokugawa bakufu, the most powerful political authority. The bakufu had ultimate power to influence Tsushima’s acts. For censorship of the bakufu in the Korean affairs, see the description in chapter two on the Yanagawa Affair.

Chosŏn Korea encountered significant transformations in the seventeenth century. The Chosŏn court no longer ignored the presence of the ‘two lesser civilized,’ yet newly-risen neighbouring states: Qing China and Tokugawa Japan. Those states were regarded as uncivilized and barbaric by Chosŏn Korea, but their influences on the East Asian environment were not minor or trivial. The Chosŏn court had to adapt to the change— the emergences of the two states. Though the people in the two states were vulgar to the Koreans, those uncivilized people already seemed to seize more militaristic power and to begin threatening the security of the Korean peninsula.

How did Chosŏn Korea react to these conditions? In Chosŏn Korea’s diplomatic tactics, the Chosŏn court maintained _sadae_ with Qing China and the _kyorin_ with Tokugawa Japan. The Manchu’s Qing dynasty became Chosŏn Korea’s new suzerain power, and the Chosŏn court showed the Qing emperor its uninterrupted tributary acknowledgement after the defeats in the two battles, known as _chŏngyu horan_ (1627) and _pyŏngja horan_ (1636).¹⁸ A year prior to the second battle in 1637, the Manchus demanded Chosŏn Korea to become a vassal of the Qing dynasty. This use of force enormously increased, the negative sentiments among the Koreans. Chosŏn Korea’s only suzerain state was the Ming dynasty, and the Chosŏn court’s refusal to submit to Qing China showed its loyalty to the overthrown dynasty. The Qing force soon threatened the Korean peninsula; consequently, King Injo (r. 1623-1649) was forced to swear renunciation of all allegiance to the Ming court.

The two battles against the Manchus left the Korean peninsula with massive damage, and the Koreans had no power to resist them. Chosŏn Korea could not ignore the rise of the ‘northern barbarians,’ and those people were not an object of contempt after Chosŏn Korea’s

¹⁸ Both _chŏngyu_ and _pyŏngja_ came from the names of the zodiac year. _Chŏngyu_ (J: teiyū) is the 4th year and _pyŏngja_ (J: heishi) is the 13th year.
defeat. However, Chosŏn Korea’s feelings of cultural superiority over the Manchus emerged at the same time, as they were the northern barbarians who were not civilized- in other words, the Koreans did have to follow the civilized Ming culture. Such Korean attachments to the Ming dynasty were unyielding, and the strong sense on this sentiment continued even after the demise of the Ming court. Among the Chosŏn scholars who continued to greatly admire the Ming dynasty, notions of the pukpŏlron, or the retribution against the northern barbarians, had prevailed for the Ming court. Nevertheless, paying tribute to an ‘antagonist’ was more rational for Chosŏn Korea, as the three battles, two against the Manchus, one against the Japanese, immensely damaged the Korean land.19

Qing China’s prosperity indeed provided Chosŏn Korea with complex emotions. The tributary relations with the Qing dynasty was often linked with Chosŏn Korea’s economic merit, nevertheless, the Chosŏn court actually suffered the financial difficulty to maintain the tributary relationship with the Qing dynasty.20 In contrast to decreased commodities from Qing China to Chosŏn Korea, the Chosŏn court needed to send more supplies under tributary correspondence and trade.21

In addition, the Manchus were the very people who overthrew the Ming dynasty, but the Chosŏn court’s promise of tribute to the Qing dynasty was confirmed. Despite the engagement, for Chosŏn Korea, Ming China was the only state to admire in the cultural aspect. The Chosŏn court officials were obligated to unremitting utilization of the Qing calendar after the engagement of the tributary relations. However, the resistance of the Korean scholars who disliked the prompt submission to the northern barbarians came into view. Some of the private documents of those Chosŏn scholars were still written using the last few years of the Ming

19 ‘Barbarians’ in Manchu were often disdained as ‘oragnke.’
21 ibid., pp.350-352.
calendar, and it was favoured for use among the scholars until the end of the nineteenth century.\(^{22}\) Several ritual places to worship Ming emperors were established in Hansŏng under the protection of the Chosŏn court.\(^{23}\)

From the point of view of the political context, as introduced in chapter one, the Chosŏn Korea’s diplomatic principle, *sadae kyorin*, fitted into the Chosŏn court’s realistic strategy. Justification for the tributary engagement with the Qing dynasty was based on the Confucian discipline for the smaller state to submit to the greater. As long as the premise was kept, Chosŏn Korea could preserve itself and the people at peace without warfare.\(^{24}\) Seemingly, *sadae kyorin* appeared a passive action, but for the Chosŏn court, the diplomatic principle followed the Confucian doctrine that certainly brought Chosŏn Korea domestic peace and order.

What did the *kyorin* relations with Tokugawa Japan mean for Chosŏn Korea? Retaining the friendly relationship with Tokugawa Japan was a significant part of Korean diplomacy to keep the Korean land secure. The Chosŏn court always seemed to select the best possible way for its own survival; reengagement of the neighbourly relations with Tokugawa bakufu was the court’s strategy to keep peace with the outside world. Yet the Japanese invasions of Chosŏn Korea were still a vivid memory at the time of the Manchus’ invasions and even after that. Hideyoshi’s aggressions provided a sufficient rationale for the Koreans to become alarmed about the possibility of reinvasion from Japan. Indeed, Chosŏn Korea’s pursuit of the attitude of ‘friendly relations while remaining cautious’ functioned until the last embassy in 1811, though the alarm against the Japanese political conditions were gradually

\(^{22}\) Yamauchi, p.42.  
\(^{23}\) ibid., p.44  
\(^{24}\) Watanabe, p.420.
loosened. The Japanese invasions left a stronger resentment among the Chosŏn society than the bakufu executives imagined. The Tokugawa bakufu, however, showed Chosŏn Korea its friendly gesture and seemed harmless. To sustain the kyorin policy, Chosŏn Korea restored the neighbourly relations with Japan, and the relationship guaranteed the peace and order between the two states. The diplomatic policy of the Chosŏn court in the seventeenth century was always aimed at how to survive between the new powers.

In any circumstances, the newly rising states across the northern border and the eastern sea already became a great risk to the Korean security. The Chosŏn court was required to convert its attitude regarding the relations with the Qing court and Tokugawa Japan: from antagonism to the Manchus and the Japanese to a positive attitude. Through the diplomatic engagements with those new states, Chosŏn Korea was able to peacefully maintain the relations with the ‘two barbarians,’ to keep the state and the people at peace, which was the most vital endeavour to protect Korea itself.

**Chosŏn Korea as sochunghwa**

Chosŏn Korea, which encountered the subsequent demise and rise of its neighbouring states in the seventeenth century, the Qing court after Ming China, the Tokugawa bakufu after Hideyoshi’s reign, had to consolidate and confirm its own standing in East Asia. These conditions surrounding the Korean peninsula led the Chosŏn society to confirm its own cultural awareness as a distinctive being that did not belong to any other ‘unusual,’ ‘uncivilized,’ and ‘barbaric’ cultures of the Qing dynasty or Tokugawa Japan.

From the foundation of Chosŏn Korea in 1392, ‘serving the great’ turned into ‘serving

---

26 Watanabe, p.420.
the Ming dynasty’ that strengthened into an inflexible value in Chosŏn society for more than a century. Under the Korean hua-yi diagram which was based on the Confucian doctrine, the relationship between the Ming China and Chosŏn Korea never became equivalent, but was comparable to the relationship between as sovereign and subject, father and son, or elder and younger brother.\footnote{27} The sadae relations towards the Ming dynasty were regarded as an absolute criterion for Chosŏn Korea. However, after the demise of the Ming court, engaging the tributary relations with the Ming and Qing dynasties, gave Chosŏn Korea a great anxiety, as ‘serving the two dynasties’ meant violation of the Confucian principle. In the apprehensions, the affliction seemed to bring about a consciousness of ‘what is Korea,’ especially among the Chosŏn scholars. Although Qing China was a suzerain state, cultural veneration to the Ming dynasty among the scholars was still unchanging. How could Chosŏn Korea bury the gap between the Ming and Qing dynasties? In this situation, Chosŏn Korea seemed to find a way to resolve the issue: Chosŏn Korea was the only state to succeed the Ming civilization. This self-respect of Chosŏn Korea led to claiming itself as sochunghwa, or small central civilization.\footnote{28}

Under the climate of Chosŏn Korea’s tribute to the Qing dynasty, the Korean scholars’ search for ‘who we were’ resulted in an enhancement of self-centrality. This sense of Korea’s cultural expression was represented as sochunghwa, which provided those scholars with the strong sentiment of their cultural superiority over Qing China and Tokugawa Japan. Chunghwa had long signified China, a place of flourishing civilization and culture, as well as a center of the world.\footnote{29} Such a view of sochunghwa was treating Chosŏn Korea as the last fort to protect

\footnote{27} Son, pp.122-123.  
\footnote{28} In Korean monographs, sochunghwa is used as ‘Chosŏn chunghwa.’ However, this thesis uses a term of sochunghwa, in accordance with an old usage of the historical sources.  
\footnote{29} For details, see chapter 1 in relation between hua and i.
the Ming culture, and the recognition had influenced the Chosŏn scholars. Chosŏn Korea’s consciousness as sochunghwa seemed the innate development within the Chosŏn society that came from a search of self-awareness during the external turmoil in the seventeenth century. Consequently, the Korean scholars possessed a feeling that the highly-civilized culture only flourished in Chosŏn Korea, for the Manchus, as barbarians, did not succeed to the Ming civilization.

Between the medium of the barbaric states of the Qing dynasty and Tokugawa Japan, Chosŏn Korea was the only country who preserved the right-minded and highly-civilized culture. How one can determine whether the state was highly civilized or not? The answer is simple: how deeply had Confucianism developed and infiltrated into society.30 Chosŏn Korea also claimed itself as the ‘last place to protect the Confucianism’ after the rise of the Qing dynasty.

In this perspective, some of the scholars would speculate on Chosŏn Korea’s long-term behaviour as a model of the ‘perfected Chinese pattern,’31 and the circumstance surrounding Chosŏn Korea has been focused on the tribute system with the Chinese dynasties. However, Chosŏn Korea was not always left out of the interactions of other states in East Asia, though the engagement of the tributary relations significantly influenced Chosŏn society. Schmid also criticizes the scholarship on Korea for often tending to look at a Sino-centered relationship in regard to Korean’s diplomatic policy until the modern period. In seeing a different direction, Korea’s own ‘proclamation’ was expressed as “Now the center was in the East.”32 This account would also provide more extensive discussions on Korea’s cultural

30 Yamauchi, p.13.
31 ibid., p.12.
32 ibid., p.12.
Before the establishment of Chosón Korea, the primary concept of Korea’s existence as a distinguished and unique state already existed. When the officials from the Southern Song dynasty (1127-1279) were impressed by Koryŏ’s political system that had a more advanced administrative organization than their state, they named a lodge for the Koryŏ envoys in the capital city, Pin’in (current Hangzhou), as a ‘house of a small civilization.’ In a similar period, the two envoys from Song were struck by the literary works of the two Koryŏ bureaucrats and after their return to their country, those Song envoys published the anthology of their works entitled ‘Sohwajip,’ a collection of the small civilization. These facts serve to show that the background of sochunghwa, indicating an infiltration of the Chinese civilization in Koryŏ society, was widely acknowledged. From the Koryŏ period, a perception of ‘sochunghwa,’ which the scholars of the late Chosŏn period proudly used, seemed to emerge. Nonetheless, Koryŏ did not distinguish itself as a unique being, as the state was ‘civilized’ next to the Chinese culture.

To further analyze Chosón Korea’s perspective on the ‘center,’ the Chosón scholars seemed to have a contradictory sentiment towards the Ming dynasty as well. By possessing a cultural reverence to the Ming dynasty admitting it as a middle kingdom, some of the Chosón scholars found a more veritable and an ideal figure of a middle kingdom in Chosón Korea, as they saw that Ming China failed to become an ideal figure. The Chosón scholars and the administrative bureaucrats who visited Ming China recognized that the superlative model of a

---

33 ibid., p.12.
34 Hangzhou (J: Kōshū) is located in the Zhejiang province in the southern China, near Shanghai.
35 Yamauchi, p.25.
36 ibid., p.25
middle kingdom did not exist in the Ming society due to the spread of immoral manners. Bribery grew to be the evil practice. If the *yonhaengsa*\(^{38}\) envoys did not give enticements to the Chinese officials to pass the gate to Beijing, they were offensively denied entrance.\(^{39}\) The old and ruined institutions for the Confucian learning were not comparable to those in Chosŏn Korea. A Chosŏn official Cho Hŏn showed his disappointment at the lack of scholastic weightiness in Ming China in 1574. At the *Guouzugan*, the most prominent Confucian institution in Beijing, he saw the wall of the building had miserably collapsed and not been repaired and the valuable collections of books in the library had been buried in dust.\(^{40}\) Teachers did not lecture in the classroom, as most of the students abandoned their studies and left the school to return to their home villages. The Ming people, who were living in a location of the central civilization, did not actually respect or advocate Confucianism. By looking at the facts, the Korean scholars realized that they had a much more enthusiastic attitude in learning the Confucian discipline that was embedded as the principle of social conduct in their country. In other words, Chosŏn Korea excelled the ‘originator.’ Although Chosŏn Korea was an eastern barbaric state, there was something that could be acclaimed.

On a different aspect of Ming loyalism, Han Myŏng-gi questions *chaejo chiŭn*, which was seen as solid notion during and after the Japanese invasions of Chosŏn Korea. He introduces that Chosŏn Korea was seen as a different state, and Chosŏn Korea was born as a will of heaven as Chinese dynasty, not as a duplication of China.\(^{41}\) Although the relations between Chosŏn Korea and the Ming dynasty were relatively pleasant until the sixteenth

---

38 *Yonhaengsa* (the embassy to Yon) was tributary missions from Chosŏn Korea to Beijing, Qing China’s capital. Yon (literally meaning is swallows) indicated the area of Beijing. The Chosŏn court dispatched the embassies 494 times, in contrast to 12 times to Japan.
39 Yamauchi, pp.57-58.
40 ibid., pp.57-58.
century, Ming China’s interference to domestic politics in the Chosŏn court appeared during the invasions. The local people suffered from having to furnish enormous military provisions to Ming soldiers, and the illegal dealings in food were exercised among them.\(^{42}\) Those supplies to Ming China caused the Korean soldiers to lose their fighting strength from lack of food.\(^{43}\) In the historical context, relations with the Ming dynasty was often seen under *chaejo chiŭn*; in fact, the Koreans also suffered from the frequent vandalism of Ming soldiers, and their acts brought consequential damage to the locals.\(^{44}\)

After the establishment of the Qing dynasty, the Korean scholars questioned the definition of a middle kingdom. Chosŏn scholar Hwang Kyŏngwŏn (1709-1787) examined the characterization of the center as: “What is the middle kingdom? It is only shown by the proprieties. If the proprieties do exist, the barbarians can be the central civilization, and China could be a barbaric state [if propriety does not exist.] In [a case of] individuals, as well, whether or not the one owns propriety determines [whether one is] a savage or not.”\(^{45}\) Another Korean scholar, Hong Taeyong (1731-1783), who was an envoy of the *yŏnhaengnsa* to Qing China in 1765, also acquired a similar notion to Hwang. Hong clarified that the distinction of *hua* and *yi* depended on ‘possession of civilization,’ and continued “if Confucius were born in Korea, an ideal middle kingdom would have been established outside of his country [China], namely in the Korean peninsula.”\(^{46}\) He also continues: “Korea indeed is an eastern barbarian. It is certainly so in seeing [us] from geographical location. But why should we conceal the truth [that Korea is a barbarian.]?”\(^{47}\)

\(^{42}\) ibid., pp.136-137.
\(^{43}\) ibid., p.141.
\(^{44}\) ibid., pp.131-132.
\(^{45}\) ibid., pp.66-67.
\(^{47}\) ibid., pp.127-128.
In regard to the relations with Tokugawa Japan, the Korean embassy frequently saw the Japanese with a somewhat biased view, as the Korean officials measured the Japanese and their culture based solely on their long-standing Confucian traditions and self Esteem of ‘highly civilized’ state.\(^4\) While in the exchange of the Japanese scholars, Sŏng Taejung, the second diarist of the 1763 embassy, claimed his country as: “Our state [Korea] is indeed a home place of the civilization.”\(^4\) In fact, the Korean officials’ sense of cultural superiority over the Japanese was often revealed in their travelogues. Chosŏn Korea’s own expression of distinctiveness as ‘small central civilization’ functioned as the solid standard for the members of the Korean embassy to measure the difference and foreignness, and the consciousness may have somewhat shifted to the superior Inferior view towards the Japanese counterpart. On this condition, Hur indicates, “… civilization should be gauged by the yardstick of poetry, (Chinese poems), calligraphy, social etiquette, paintings, and music- the means through which the feeble human mind could be cultivated toward the Neo Confucian ideals. In terms of achieving authentic (i.e., Confucian) civilization, Tokugawa Japan was placed far behind the society of Chosŏn Korea.”\(^5\) In this aspect, the Korean officials in the embassy saw the Japanese culture as far inferior to the Korean culture. Under this circumstance, the kyorin relations with Japan were less emphasized in the Chosŏn court.\(^6\) Chang reveals the nature of the kyorin policy as “in fact, kyorin contained certain prejudice, self-supremacy, and an attempt to place the counterpart in a lower position.”\(^7\)

\(^5\) Yamauchi, p.72. Sŏng’s work was entitled “Ch’ŏngsŏngjip,” or the “Collection of the Blue Castle.”
\(^6\) Hur, p.70.
Sadae kyorin was a diplomatic characteristic of Chosŏn Korea towards the Chinese dynasties and its surrounding state. Although the relationship was an effective tool for a small country’s survival, the attitude also cast a negative aspect. As seen previously, the critical decisions of Chosŏn Korea were reliant on the greater. At the time of the Japanese invasions of Chosŏn Korea, the envoy of the Ming court went to Chosŏn Korea to negotiate an armistice with Japan. Chosŏn Korea did not seem to influence the talk of the two parties between Ming China and Tokugawa Japan, and was treated as a mere onlooker.

Through the rise of the barbarian states of Qing China and Tokugawa Japan in the seventeenth century, the Chosŏn scholars seemed to consolidate a solid sense of self-esteem based on Chosŏn Korea as the only place where the highly-civilized culture flourished. Although those scholars had long encountered a quandary as an eastern barbarian state that could never become a middle kingdom, they began to claim their country as sochunghwa, a small center of civilized culture. In embracing the ironic belief- barbaric but culturally civilized, the Chosŏn scholars pursued an ‘ideal’ posture of the middle kingdom, and developed itself as the perfect model to become the true central civilization.\(^{53}\)

This perception of the esteem of sochunghwa, however, was limited to a small segment of the populace, the scholars and some of the bureaucrats in the Chosŏn court. The commoners who were in the majority did not recognize such a perception. Sochunghwa did not develop as a driving force to change the rigid Chosŏn society itself towards the modern period, as the awareness as sochunghwa functioned to maintain Chosŏn Korea as a ‘highly-civilized state,’ and to protect the Korean peninsula from turmoil of the outside world in the seventeenth century. Such a closed view in the Chosŏn society not accepting new ideas seemed to increase

\(^{53}\) Yamauchi, p.58.
over time.

Chosŏn Korea faced a series of difficulties in the end of the sixteenth century to the seventeenth century— the invasions by the Japanese and the two battles with Manchus. When each battle occurred, the Korean peninsula turned to a battlefield and suffered much from the aftereffects of the severe wars. After facing rises of the new regimes in the Qing dynasty and Tokugawa Japan, Chosŏn Korea fostered a sense of sochunghwa, a notion of Korea as a civilized center, distinguishing itself from the two ‘barbaric’ states. Chosŏn Korea’s pursuit of the diplomatic principle, sadae kyorin, which was based on Confucian discipline, was confirmed, and the policy indeed provided Chosŏn Korea with the domestic peace and order. Also, sadae kyorin was Chosŏn Korea’s best possible effort to protect its homeland from the two barbaric countries surrounding the Korean peninsula.

Under the neighbourly relationship, Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea were able to enjoy diplomatic and commercial exchanges for more than the two centuries. The Korean embassy was seen as the symbol of the mutual friendship between the Japanese and Koreans, and the bakufu welcomed the Korean delegation. Through the records of the embassy, the Chosŏn court was able to directly observe Japan’s political and economic conditions and to closely examine the Japanese society as well. The visitation of the embassy also enabled the Tokugawa bakufu to increase its domestic legitimatization to prove its authority. In this sense, the dispatches and invitations of the Korean embassies were necessary for the sakes of the two countries.
Chapter Four

Arai Hakuseki: His Reform and the 1711 Korean Embassy

Arai Hakuseki’s background

In the 1711 embassy, as in the other embassies in the different periods, the cultural correspondence with the Japanese literati and locals was one of the most significant missions to deepen the neighbourly friendship between Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea. The chief and assistant diarists, usually four scholars and one or two ink painters in the embassy, were responsible for literary interactions and spent most of their time on the exchange. The Koreans passed along their writings to the local people who were eager to meet the foreigners for as long as possible. The written pieces and paintings produced by the members of the embassy were said to be approximately two thousand works during their journey, and those attracted a great deal of public attention in the Japanese society.¹

However, there was an unusual circumstance in this embassy. Arai Hakuseki’s reform of diplomatic protocol delayed the embassy’s departure for the bakufu and caused disputes in the two countries. In the turmoil caused by the reform, the arguments of the two Japanese officials between Hakuseki himself and the Tsushima official Amenomori Hōshū represented the two different perspectives of the central and local governments. In addition, the Chosŏn court had an intense discussion as to whether or not they should have accepted Hakuseki’s revision in the diplomatic protocol. Despite this reluctance, the Korean embassy consisting of five hundred officials traveled to Japan, and they vigorously exchanged information with the

Japanese officials and even the local scholars in the cities and small villages, to carry out their prime mission, to maintain a neighbourly friendship with its nearest country.

A main actor of the reform, Hakuseki is probably the one of the most prominent scholastic figures in the Tokugawa history. He was well-acquainted with various sources from Chosŏn Korea, Ryūkyū, China, and the West. He also encountered and communicated directly with those foreign people, recorded the conversations, and later published them. Hakuseki’s knowledge of the outside world was astonishingly extensive. He was much privileged as a politician and his position as shogun’s advisor made it possible for him to come across those foreign delegations and to be able to deepen his knowledge.

Hakuseki was born in Edo and raised in the Kururi domain in 1657, the current city of Kimizu, Chiba prefecture. Following his father, Hakuseki also began to serve his domain, a later tairō Hotta Masatoshi (1634-1684), and subsequently spent several years as rōnin. Hakuseki eventually found a place to set himself in by joining the school of Kinoshita Jun’an (1621-1698), to further his studies in Edo. Jun’an, a noteworthy Confucian scholar, recognized Hakuseki’s scholarly ability, and recommended him to serve for the Tokugawa Tsunatoyo, the daimyo in the Kōfu domain (current Yamanashi prefecture), who later reigned as the sixth shogun, named Ienobu (r. 1709-1712). Hakuseki was promoted, as were many of Ienobu’s vassals in the Kōfu domain to be a councillor of the shogun. The new shogun Ienobu provided Hakuseki with a high status in the bakufu, and he was eager to support Hakuseki as his loyal vassal.

The origins of the Arai pedigree are not clearly understood even in the present day, yet in Hakuseki’s own essay written after his retirement from the position of bakufu adviser, he

---

2 Rōnin meant a samurai without a lord. Rōnin became a lordless from fall/death of his lord or the loss of his superior’s favour.
mentioned on his ancestry as “…moved to another provinces… And died in unknown place.”

The only details he knew about his ancestor was of his own grandfather. Arai Kageyu (birth date unknown- 1609) was awarded a pair of chopsticks from his master for the distinguished services on the battle field and used the reward every time he ate. His father, Arai Masanari, a rōnin for decades, roamed around several places, and eventually found his position to serve Tsuchiya Toshinao (1607-1675), a daimyo of the small Kururi domain. Overall, the Arai lineage did not receive social high-ranking status; nevertheless, Hakuseki seemed to be proud of being born in a samurai family.

An English monograph, Wildman Nakai’s *Shogunal Politics: Arai Hakuseki and the Premises of the Tokugawa Rule*, provides more information on Hakuseki himself and his political views and pursuits. Along with detailed research on Hakuseki’s political and private backgrounds, Wildman Nakai explores his personal developments that would have affected the establishment of his policy-making during his tenure as the Tokugawa bakufu’s advisor. Regarding Hakuseki’s personal aspect, she touches on his principles as shown in his politics “Rather than in speculative writings, Hakuseki manifested his character as a Confucianist in the concrete political measures he advocated and in the historical works that provided a justification for his political program. In short, he was a Confucian ‘actor’ rather than a Confucian ‘thinker.’” Hakuseki did exactly what he wanted while taking his office in the Edo Castle. Due to his forceful character and rigid political discipline, he frequently confronted several objections and difficulties. What he saw of the reform in Korean diplomacy seemed somewhat illogical; however, he added his scholarship and theory to support his own point of

---


Hakuseki indeed possessed inflexible political aspiration. At the same time, he seemed strongly motivated to resolve the ambiguity in the role of the shogun and justification of the shogun’s title. In this circumstance, the two points clarifying the existence of the shogun can be understood. One was to overcome the indefinite position in the shogun’s legitimacy as a true monarch, and the other was to clarify the shogun’s status as a national monarch. His emphasis through the diplomatic reform was aimed at how the shogun was seen from the outside world, yet still in assumption, his ultimate goal seemed to expose his wish- enhancement of Tokugawa Japan’s existence over East Asia and the world. The interaction with the Korean embassy and exchange of the sovereign’s message were the best opportunity for him to demonstrate his own wish and desire. To create his grand diagram in placing Tokugawa Japan in a higher position than Chosŏn Korea, the diplomatic reform became his essential project.

Dispute between Arai Hakuseki and Amenomori Hōshū

The exchange of the sovereign’s messages was an indispensable icon of the neighbourly friendship between Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea through the Korean embassy. The two names of the political leaders, the Tokugawa shogun and the Korean king, on the sovereign’s message, represented the parity of the two leaders as well. As shown in the previous chapter, the letter from Chosŏn Korea to the shogun was addressed as ‘Nihonkoku taikun denka’ (His Majesty, Great Prince of Japan), and the letter from the bakufu was addressed to ‘Chōsen kokuō denka’ (His Majesty, the King of Korea). This diplomatic protocol of the title taikun had been determined by the two states since the dispatch of the 1636 embassy, after the Yanagawa
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5 ibid., p.173.
6 ibid., pp.190-191
In 1635. From this point of view, Tokugawa Japan again attempted to ruin an exercise that lasted for decades.

From the Korean perspective, it was more than the demise of the precedent engagement. When the diplomatic relations with Tokugawa Japan were restored in 1609, Tsushima forged the sovereign’s message from Tokugawa Ieyasu several times by revising his title as the ‘King of Japan,’ though the authentic signature of the name was revealed as ‘Minamoto so-and-so’ in the message. Titles such as ‘Minamoto no Hidetada’ or ‘Minamoto no Iemitsu’ were addressed on the message for the second and the third Tokugawa shoguns. Taikun gaikō, or Great Prince Diplomacy, was exercised without claiming the Tokugawa shoguns the ‘king.’

Though the taikun system was stabilized, Hakuseki, once again, attempted to revise the diplomatic protocol in the shogun’s title from taikun to kokuō. A total of ten revisions was proposed by Hakuseki: more simplified receptions for reduction of the bakufu expenditure, termination of exchanges of the gifts and documents with the rōjū, and the embassy’s audience with the heir of the shogun in the banquet place. Those three points were reasonably necessary for the bakufu, as the expenses for the embassy’s journey were a considerable financial burden for the bakufu and all the affected local domains on the travel route of the Korean embassy.

Furthermore, Hakuseki further referred to the revised manners of salutation to the Korean embassy in the Edo castle: the kōke should greet the Koreans at the lodge in Edo, instead of the rōjū, who were obviously higher ranking officials than the kōke, and the sovereign’s message should be bestowed to the kōke, not the shogun; the chief ambassador of the Korean embassy had to kneel down to the kōke when submitting the letter. Apparently, his
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7 Tashiro, Kakikaereta kokusho., p.39.
8 Kōke was responsible for ritual manner in relation with the imperial court. Kōke was normally selected from descendants of prestigious families, and their official ranking were as equivalent as daimyo.
aim for the several reforms was to upgrade the Tokugawa officials as “…Regarding this [revision’s] purpose and motive, the reform was thoroughly made for outside state.” In other words, Hakuseki’s new policy was aimed at Chosŏn Korea, Tokugawa Japan’s ‘peer’ who engaged with the formal diplomatic relations. Through the revision, according to his indication, what Hakuseki sought was a certain change in Korean diplomacy: to seek peace, simplicity, and parity. As an advocator of the bakufu structure as well as the dominance of the Tokugawa family, his solid principle in Korean diplomacy was crucial in retaining his reforms within the framework of the ‘neighbouring friendship.’ This notion of his strategy was derived from a seemingly necessary reason- for the stabilization of the Tokugawa bakufu.

However, Hakuseki’s reform of the diplomatic protocol was not much appreciated by other bakufu officials. The record of Im Sugan (1665-1721), a vice ambassador of the 1711 embassy, entitled “Tongsa ilgi,” illustrated that there were not a few bakufu officials who possessed a certain resentment against Hakuseki, and they did not fully accept his reform, which they felt would tarnish the Great Prince Diplomacy, and the abrupt change would also be seen in a negative light by the Koreans. Under such circumstances, a Tsushima official, Amenomori Hōshū, Hakuseki’s old-time acquaintance, opposed his rationale for the reform in Korean diplomacy. Extensive discussions between the two officials were exercised through the personal letters as well as their private publications.

Hakuseki brought two major assertions against Hōshū’s objections to uphold his argument. First, the title of taikun implied a ‘prince,’ which was a lower position than the crown prince in the Chosŏn court. His theory is that, by using the taikun, the title of the shogun would refer to a subordinate in Korean terms. Second, certain precedence for the use of
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kokuō already existed in the Ashikaga period, and thus, there were no obstacles to ‘restore the traditional title.’ To legitimate the reason by referring back to the age of Ashikaga Yoshimitsu, the third shogun of the Ashikaga bakufu, who once declared Japan as Ming China’s vassalage, was unusual. Under the Ming tributary system, the ‘emperor’ referred to the Chinese monarch who was ‘the son who brought mandate of heaven’ as well as the head of the tributary states at that time. Nonetheless, from Hakuseki’s point of view, Japan was not supposed to be subject to China at any time, as Japan kept its sovereignty from the ancient time on.

Amenomori Hōshū began to present his argument against Hakuseki by sending him a long letter beginning from May 1, or the fourteenth day of the third month in 1711. He strongly objected to Hakuseki’s assertions over the diplomatic revisions, along with his reasons. First of all, the title the ‘king’ was inappropriate to be used for the shogun, as he was not a monarch of Japan; the emperor was the one who was the most appropriately referred to as the ‘King of Japan.’ Even if the shogun entitled himself the king, the Koreans would not respect him by the change of the title. In the case that the shogun continued to address himself as the Great Prince, the Koreans would not be prejudiced against the Tokugawa shoguns at all, because the practice of this title after the Yanagawa affair was entirely accepted by the Chosŏn court. The title of the Great Prince did not affect the neighbourly relations between Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea. Thus, changing the shogun’s title to the ‘king’ was absolutely meaningless. Finally, the distraction of the diplomatic protocol would eventually cause disrespect for the imperial court in Kyoto.

For Hōshū, the term kokuō was an unsuitable title for the shogun, as it was a title which could be used for the emperor. He insisted that the term ‘ō (king)’ in ‘Nihon kokuō’

11 Hakuseki claimed the restoration of the title as ‘fukugō.’
meant the sovereign power of Japan. The emperor was supposed to be the highest royalty, and
the imperial authority should not be yielded to a certain subject, the Tokugawa shogun.
Therefore, he claimed that the term ō itself should be fitted into use by the imperial court. In
the argument, Hōshū gave an example for the practice of the imperial court that only sons and
grandsons of the emperor were entitled to use the terms sinnō and shoō, and it was out of the
question for the subjects and people of the emperor to use the term ‘ō.’ By stating so, he also
expressed the absurdity of using the title ‘ō’ with the name of one area of Japan, claiming that
the shogun referred to himself as the ‘King of Musashi’ [of Japan], or the ‘King of Kantō
Area’ [Kantō ō], since it was also against the subject’s obligation of loyalty towards the
imperial court. He added that if the term ‘ō’ was placed after the name of the country such as
‘Nihon kokuō,’ that ‘ō’ would mean the supreme authority of the country which could be
exercised by the ‘tennō,’ or the emperor. The shogun’s adoption of the name of the country
would as well violate the sovereignty of the emperor.

To preserve the use of taikun as a shogun’s title, Hōshū clarified that while the term
kokuō had only one meaning, the ‘sovereign authority’ of the country, the title taikun had
various meanings. So it could be used in different situations especially in the unique condition
in which Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea had maintained their diplomatic relations.
Though taikun, as a title of the subjects of the Korean king, had a lower status in the king of
Chosŏn court, the title in forms of diplomatic documents between the two countries was the
proper one that indicated a ‘national’ ruler of Japan; the sovereigns’ names of the two countries

---

14 ibid., p.254.
15 ‘Musashi’ indicated the Kantō area, the eastern part of Japan, current Tokyo and the neighbouring
  prefectures.
16 Tanaka., Taigai kankei to bunka käryū. p.255.
were preceded by denka, or ‘His Majesty,’ in sharing common honorific title.\textsuperscript{17} That was, the Korean king had treated the shogun not as his subject but as his peer in the diplomatic messages addressed to the shogun, and the shogun’s dignity as a political leader of Japan was never ruined by the use of taikun.

As a result of Hôshû’s strong objection to the shogunal title as kokuô, Hakuseki was driven to publicize his grievances with the officials in the small domain, in stating “Tsushima’s rustic scholars (indicating Amenomori Hôshû and another Tsushima scholar, Matsuura Kashõ)\textsuperscript{18} did not know the facts and expressed various opinions, and I heard that those retainers refused to use the title of kokuô.”\textsuperscript{19} Hakuseki also refuted Hôshû’s persistence in the shogunal title of the taikun, in illustrating, “I have heard that even now there is some argument about this matter of the taikun. I think that people who disregard our national disgrace and suggest that it was a mistake do not understand human righteousness.”\textsuperscript{20} Hakuseki not only severely criticized Hôshû’s arguments but also demanded he go to Korea and persuade the Chosôn court officials to accept the bakufu’s revised title in the sovereign message in which the Korean king, Sukchong (r. 1674-1720), should address shogun Tokugawa Ienobu as the ‘King of Japan.’

What is the critical difference between Hakuseki and Hôshû? Both officials became renowned scholars with high scholastic aptitude. After their completion of their studies, they served the central and local governments. Their positions in the offices were indispensable and

\textsuperscript{17} Nakao, Hiroshi. *NHK ningen kôza: Chôsen tsûshinshi: Edo Nihon eno zenrin shisetsu*. p.84.
\textsuperscript{18} Matsuura Kashô (1676-1728) was born in Himeji prefecture and learned Confucian studies under Kinoshita Jun’am, and was also serving for Tsushima domain. His authorship includes *Chôsen tsûkô taiki* (1725).
\textsuperscript{19} Arai, Hakuseki. “Otitaku shiba no ki (1716).” *Arai Hakuseki zenshû*, vol.3., Tokyo: Kokusho Kankôkai, 1976. p.82. This Hakuseki’s autobiography was also translated in English by Joyce Ackroyd, as *Told Round a Brushwood Fire*. Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1989. p.132.
\textsuperscript{20} ibid., p.82. Ackroyd, p.139.
their responsibilities were crucial. The decisive differentiation between the two officials was their statuses in their offices; one was the high-ranking bureaucrat of the Tokugawa bakufu, and the other was an administrator at the small, local domain in Tsushima.

Those different positions led to the clear distinction of their thoughts over the revision in Korean diplomacy. Hakuseki’s recognition on how Japan was placed in the world and how the bakufu’s prestige should be more elevated was an essential part of his perception, and he acted according to his view. His keen consciousness to raise Japan’s position and the bakufu’s place was clearly reflected through the reform; however, what he lacked here was to see the actual circumstances surrounding Japan. The revision of the diplomatic protocol certainly began to cause serious troubles between the two states, as the negative notions of the Koreans towards Tokugawa Japan were handed down to later years, much like the resentment caused by the Japanese invasions of Chosŏn Korea.

By Hakuseki’s own governmental position, he was able to acquire abundant knowledge from the foreigners and foreign materials; nonetheless, he did not encounter actual scenes and negotiations with the foreigners. Ironically, what he learned was on the basis of armchair study. Over the issue of the diplomatic reform, most of the Tokugawa officials including the Tsushima officials dealing with the Korean issue did not welcome his revisions. He did not understand the real nature of diplomacy, unlike Hōshū who always confronted and struggled with actual problems.

In contrast to Hakuseki’s impractical acts, Hōshū learned and encountered the diplomatic issues through the actualities. In the course of his experiences, he learned how negotiations had to be made to reach an agreement from the difficulties between the people from different countries. Harmonizing consent by saving each face was painstaking procedure
to lead, but by respecting other cultures and customs, he often found a better way to solve the issues. Due to Hakuseki’s lack of experience in facing actual diplomatic issues, he failed to see the elaborations that the Tsushima attendants had taken during the journey, or how to appreciate the Tsushima officials who frequently spent much time negotiating issues with the Koreans. Hakuseki’s policy seemed to be deficient in looking at real situations and somewhat unworldly.

The difference between the two officials also came across on the argument of the Japanese invasions of Chosŏn Korea. Hakuseki’s attitude on the war did not particularly express any sympathy or apology for Japan’s military operations in the Korean peninsula or Chosŏn Korea’s painful damage because of the war. In one of his works depicting the post-war era, he insisted that Chosŏn Korea suffered from the oppression of the Ming garrisons and wished peaceful resolution with Tokugawa Japan. In other words, Japan was the liberator. During the painstaking occupation when robberies often took place by the Ming soldiers, fortunately Ieyasu was generous enough to offer Chosŏn Korea reestablished diplomatic relations, so the Chosŏn court was the one who should have appreciate Japan’s charitable thoughtfulness. He added that the Japanese scholars were fond of Chosŏn Korea as a ‘country of the proprieties,’ but Chosŏn Korea was not the state that they admired. What he claimed was that Chosŏn Korea did not send the troops to assist the Ming dynasty against Qing China’s consecutive attacks, and this fact proved that Chosŏn Korea’s fidelity to the Ming court, as a tributary state was in vain, and the Koreans had already lost its gratitude. It is not the appropriate behaviour of a ‘country of the proprieties’ at all. Hakuseki’s personal sentiments
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surely seemed opposed to Chosŏn Korea, and such logic might have led to the reform of the diplomatic protocol toward the Korean embassy.\textsuperscript{23} From his perspective, cordial receptions for the Korean embassy were not worthwhile, as Chosŏn Korea did not deserve amiable manners, had lost the proprieties.

Hōshū was the one who certainly possessed a grudge against Hideyoshi’s mischief, and stated that the war was nothing more than slaughter in vain.\textsuperscript{24} The Japanese officials tended to overemphasize the military achievements in Chosŏn Korea,\textsuperscript{25} but when it comes to the ultimate consequence of the war, Japan was forced into a complete withdrawal from the Korean peninsula. Hōshū’s attitude on the war remained unperturbed, and he implied that Hideyoshi’s invasions of Chosŏn Korea obtained no victory. In his essay entitled “Kōrin teisei (1728),” or “Sober Advice on Relations with Korea,” he clarified his position on the war as “Taikō brought about the war with no honours [to Japan].”\textsuperscript{26} Also, in another essay, “Rinkō shimatsu monogatari (1731),” or “Collections on Affairs with the Neighbour,” he mentioned “for seven years, both countries began the battles. The dead bodies filled the country [Korea], and the children and elderly people were starved by the aftereffects of the war.”\textsuperscript{27} He knew that Chosŏn Korea’s devastated land did not recover for several decades. When considering the suffering of the Koreans, he never looked at the war as a victory for Japan. After the war, Hideyoshi’s successor Ieyasu did not seek further aggression against Chosŏn Korea, and was eager to reengage the diplomatic relationship. The withdrawal from the Korean peninsula was

\textsuperscript{24} ibid., p.130.
\textsuperscript{25} ibid., p.133. As one of the typical examples in the war triumphs of Japan, the courageous battles by Katō Kiyomasa (1562-1611), who played an active role at the Japanese invasions to Korea. His acts were named as \textit{Chōsen no tora taiji} (The hunt of the tigers of Korea). The tigers were indicated as the Korean soldiers.
\textsuperscript{27} ibid., p.271.
not Japan’s almsgiving to the inferior being, but the act originating with the new military leader Ieyasu’s strong wish for diplomatic restoration with Chosŏn Korea.

Despite Hōshū’s objection, the diplomatic reform was accepted by the bakufu. Hakuseki succeeded in replacing the title of *Nihon kokuō denka*, or His Highness, King of Japan, in the sovereign’s message in 1711. And accordingly, the change of the shogun’s title was promptly reported to the Chosŏn court. Under these conditions, the court had to deal with the complicated issue in Japanese diplomacy.

**Dispute in the Chosŏn court in 1711**

The 1711 embassy was indeed placed in a convoluted position. The Tokugawa shogun’s title in the Korean sovereign’s message in accordance with the request from the Tokugawa side was altered by the Korean officials. For the diplomatic revision, the Chosŏn court was split and held a heated debate on the fifth month of 1711, only two months before the embassy’s departure to the Tsushima island. After the discussion among the court officials, Sukchong, the nineteenth king of the Chosŏn court, finally decided to accept the title change on the sovereign’s message, the shogun as ‘King of Japan.’ Through the discussion, Sukchong favoured the comments of the former members of the embassy: an ambassador Yun Chiwan (1635-1718) and a vice ambassador Yi Ŭngang (1648-1716), who were the members of the last 1682 embassy to Tokugawa Japan.

When the Koreans received the Tokugawa authority’s sudden wish to be readdressed as ‘king’ in the sovereign’s message, the court officials were bewildered. In their definition of
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the title, they were well aware that sounded higher than the *taikun.* In the past, the Koreans were definitely in favour of using ‘king,’ as the shogun (*taikun*) could not be entitled a monarch of Japan due to the presence of the emperor in the imperial court. The shogun indicated the title for the principle political leader of the government that the emperor sanctioned and bestowed. Following the precedents from Iemitsu’s time the Chosŏn court accepted the title of *taikun* in lieu of the ‘king.’ They now had to choose whether the revised sovereign’s message would be accepted.

In this revision, the Second and Third Councillors of the State Council (K: ŭijŏngbu), Kim Ch’angjip and Cho Sang’u, both argued that the diplomatic precedence was important, and the revised letter from the Tokugawa side was unacceptable. The Chief Councillor Sŏ Chongt’ae also followed their opinion, in claiming that the revision was too abrupt for them to receive or revise the title. However, at the same time, he also feared that the embassy might be placed in a difficult position if the court rejected the dispatch of the embassy. Although the ambassadorial party was able to leave for Japan, the members of the embassy may have endangered their safety during the journey in case the court did not accept the revised letter.

The former ambassador of the 1682 embassy, Yun Chiwan, however, insisted that the court should admit the revision, as the Korean side was powerless to affect the change made by the Japanese; there was therefore no harm in the Chosŏn court’s receiving the revision. His opinion was candid yet persuasive enough to impress King Sukchong. Based upon his
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30. *Chosŏn wangjo shillok*, Sukchong 37 (1711), July 12, or the twenty seventh day of the fifth month.
31. The Chosŏn court did not receive anything on the revision of the diplomatic protocol, though Hakuseki meticulously prepared for it a year before. See Miyazaki *Arai Hakuseki no kenkyū,* p.817
33. *Chosŏn wangjo shillok*, Sukchong 37 (1711), July 12, or the twenty seventh day of the fifth month.
experience of visiting Tokugawa Japan and traveling with the Japanese, he remembered the friendly gestures of the ordinary Japanese, as well as the Tokugawa high-ranking officials. In addition, Yun revealed that Tokugawa’s request of the embassy’s visit to Japan functioned for the subjugation of powerful daimyos who might rebel against the bakufu; and therefore, the Japanese never regarded the Koreans as inferior.\(^{34}\) Yi Ōngang, the vice ambassador in 1682, supported his superior colleague in the embassy.\(^{35}\)

To further support this position, the second minister of the Board of Works (K: Kongjo), Kwŏn Sang’yu, raised several points. One of his biggest concerns on this issue was that the revision of the letter seemed to make light of the Korean side, but acceptance would better preserve the neighbourly relations with the ‘barbarians’ who sometimes behaved unpredictably.\(^{36}\) In Kwŏn’s eyes, Chosŏn Korea was more advanced and civilized, and his country should treat Japan in a more mature manner. His second reason was that as Chosŏn Korea no longer had military strength in reserve against another invasion from Japan, the revision should be received although the concession looked like submission to Tokugawa Japan’s request.\(^{37}\) Although Yun, Yi and Kwŏng’s views had different perspectives, they shared the same belief that Tokugawa Japan was harmless to Chosŏn Korea, and they saw the neighbourly relations as more important than troubles between the Japanese. The long discussion in the court finally reached a decision. The revised letter using the title *Nihon kokuō* should be prepared and sent out to the *waegwan*, in Pusan, where the 1711 embassy waited for the judgment from the court.


\(^{35}\) In Toby’s account, “…Yun and Yi represented an alliance of the court’s “Japan hands” may also have given their advice the color of “expert opinions.” Quoted from Toby, “Korean-Japanese Diplomacy in 1711,” p.17


\(^{37}\) *Chosŏn wangjo shillok*, Sukchong 37 ‘(1711), July 12, or the twenty seventh day of the fifth month.
The Chosŏn court seemed to face a deep dilemma over the issue of the diplomatic reform. The court regarded the relations with Tokugawa Japan as an important issue. At the same time, Koreans’ suspicion over the Japanese invasions still left a great deal of antagonism and careful scrutiny. The feelings about the Japanese did not seem to be removed even centuries later, because of Koreans’ concern on this aftereffect of the invasions. There was still a strong view of the Japanese as barbarians, and the ill-feelings over the invasions among the court officials vividly remained. However, the court attempted to avoid further disturbance by the revision that would cause a long-term argument between the two countries and the disagreement on the matter might have forced another battle. Contradictory emotions existed on Japan, though the court selected the more pragmatic alternative that brought a smooth exchange of the state letters between the embassy and the Japanese.

Based upon the consequence of the discussion, the Chosŏn court made a shrewd judgment. Japan was once an enemy ‘with whom we are unable to share the same sky.’ The revision of the sovereign’s message was an unacceptable matter for the Chosŏn court, as the change seemed to deny all the precedents of diplomatic protocol under the kyorin, a neighbourly relationship. Nonetheless, one of the most indispensable reasons for subsequent endeavours to evade further disputes came from the particular nature of the court officials- elite bureaucrats who were selected by the civil service examination. They possessed a calm nature and definitely tried to circumvent further militaristic involvement in Chosŏn Korea: as Kwŏn urged, there was not enough military strength to confront against the Japanese troops once again. The invisible tension between the Qing dynasty and Chosŏn Korea was also an
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38 As shown the previous chapter, the embassy’s one of the crucial aims was a careful observation of Japan’s political situation.
40 Miyake, Kinsei Nicchō kankei no kenkyū., pp.426-427.
imperative reason to avoid the further dispute. Once Chosŏn Korea was at war, the court would have asked the Qing court for military support. The public and private loyalty to the Ming dynasty existing among the court officials militated against any request for further reinforcements from the new dynasty.\(^{41}\)

Much more importantly, the court’s decision for a peaceful consequence to the revision brought a short-term resolution of this complex issue. The judgment also guaranteed avoidance of hardships and safety of the officials of the embassy who were going to travel to Japan to exchange the sovereign’s message.\(^{42}\) The complexity of the issue also revealed Chosŏn Korea’s position between the Qing dynasty and Tokugawa Japan that necessitated dealing with countless endeavours for its own survival. In the end, the action of the court was promptly carried out, and in accordance with the order, the embassy was able to be dispatched and began to travel to Edo, in the seventh month of 1711.

**Hakuseki’s conversation with the 1711 Korean embassy**

“Kōkan Hitsudan (K: Kanggwan P’iltam),” or “the Conversation through Pen at the Riverbank,” represents a harmonious dialogue between the Korean ambassadors and Hakuseki. In the record, the scholastic discussion consisted of several topics on history, world map, piracy, culture, over food and alcohol. Curiously enough, Hakuseki participated in the conversation with the Korean officials, though he was the one whose reforms caused such problems. Direct expressions on the diplomatic revision were not directly revealed from the words of the Koreans, so their exchanges seemed to proceed smoothly. Hakusaki and the Korean officials both maintained a careful, diplomatic stance.

\(^{41}\) ibid., p.417.
\(^{42}\) ibid., p.427.
The Koreans in fact recognized Hakuseki’s literary talent at an early stage. The young twenty-six year old Hakuseki presented the 1682 embassy with a booklet of Tōjō shishū, the collections of his poems, and the official in the embassy Hong Set’ae acknowledged his poems as “He indeed has an authentic talent... But his personality is far more distinguished than his verses.” Following is Hakuseki’s Chinese poem entitled “The Top of the Mountain” written on Mount Fuji in the first page of Tōjō shishū:

[I] Promptly see the mountain whose name is unknown  
[The mountain is seen] Far-off and seems as if it looks up the clouds  
Reaching near the sky Very highly stood out  
The ground is pulled out Divided by the eight lands

Spring snowflakes are bourn to draw  
Manuscript by a long fume composes texts  
After a while  
A miracle wizard on the crane from the heaven reaches

[And I] Listen [his melody of] the bamboo flute

It is probably that his eminent reputation among the embassy benefited him when he wanted better governmental employment later on. As a matter of fact, after the exchange with the Koreans and following the publication of the collection of his literary pieces, his appointment to serve the Tokugawa Tsunatoyo at the Kōfu domain was guaranteed.

The ambassadorial members highly evaluated Hakuseki’s aptitude as a scholar. The vice ambassador Im Sugan particularly acknowledged Hakuseki’s ability in the preface to his record. His preface is noted as follows:
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44 A definition that Japan was divided by the eight lands in the end of the twelfth to early fourteenth century: Awaji island, Shikoku, Okinoshima, Kyūshū, Iki island, Tsushima, Sado island, and Honshū.
45 Arai, Hakuseki. Tōjō shishū. unpublished manuscript owned at Keio University Library.
When I went [out], Amenomori brought a poem booklet,\textsuperscript{46} and asked us to write preface [of the book.] We realized that the book was written by the Lord of Chikugo [Chikugonokami], Minamoto \textit{kō}.\textsuperscript{47} Since his poems are extraordinary noble and attractive, we (the ambassadors) composed some sentences to contribute [his book]. When we were about three \textit{ri}\textsuperscript{48} closer to Edo, Minamoto \textit{kō} came to see and cordially greeted us. While we were at the lodge [in Edo,] he often came to us. To represent our courteous exchange between the two countries, we had conversation through pen that sometimes took in badinages and laughs. The note [for the conversation] consists of several hundred pages long. Although writings were just as running pens, it would be worth keeping. On our return [to Korea,] we had to stay for several days in Shimonoseki, I am very board. So [I started to] organize these conversation notes, entitled \textit{Conversation through Pen at Riverside}.\textsuperscript{49}

Hakuseki’s interest in the Korean embassy was understandable, as their visitation to Edo was not frequent, and he did not want to miss the rare chance of a direct encounter with them. As one of the highest political officials in the bakufu, he wanted to learn about Chosŏn Korea’s domestic situation as well. In front of the ambassador and other Korean officials, Hakuseki impressed them as an amiable man at least. Besides political apprehension about the diplomatic revision, the Koreans attempted to fairly evaluate him, and undeniably his literary aptitude was greatly recognized. The conversation began with a harmonious atmosphere between the ambassadors, diarists, and Hakuseki:

\textsuperscript{46} The booklet was entitled \textit{Hakuseki shisō}.

\textsuperscript{47} Minamoto \textit{kō} indicates Arai Hakuseki. Hakuseki himself often signed his name as ‘Minamoto’ (Gen is Chinese pronunciation of Minamoto). “…It is suggested that he shared the same surname with the supposed Minamoto ancestors of the Tokugawa family. Even the rational Hakuseki seems to have attached great prestige to genealogical identity.” Quoted from Chang, “Identity and Hegemony in Mid-Tokugawa Japan: A Study of the Kyōhō Reform.” p.57. \textit{kō} indicates an honorific title after surname.

\textsuperscript{48} One \textit{ri} is about four hundred meters in Korea, and four kilometres in Japan. Three \textit{ri} here means 1.2km, as the Korean official recorded it.

\textsuperscript{49} Im, Sugan, “Tongsa ilgi.” \textit{Haehaeng ch’ongjae.}, vol.9., Seoul: Minumungo, 1989, p.76. The written date was unknown, but it can be assumed in the first month of 1712. Even though his diary did not record the days spent in Shimonoseki, he mentioned that the embassy arrived in Ainoshima, a small island near Hakata, on the first of the second month.
Sukchong 37 [1711]  The fifth day of the eleventh month.\(^{50}\)
When we were in Edo, Arai Kimmi\(^ {51}\) visited our lodge. I exchanged seasonal greetings with him, P’yŏngch’ŏn asked:
[P’yŏngch’ŏn asked:] \(^{52}\) We have tongue at the edge of pen through which we are able to talk, so why do we bother an interpreter?
[Hakuseki:] I respectably follow your words.
Hakuseki asked Cho: Why you do not like cigarettes?
[P’yŏngch’ŏn said:] I do not usually have them.
And Hakuseki [asked:] Ancient people said a person [who does not drink alcohol] does not possess intestines to pass it, and you seem not to have intestines to pass the smoke.
P’yŏngch’ŏn answers: My intestines, that is, my mind, are [made of] pure silk, so why can I make them polluted by the smoke of the cigarettes?
Finally we burst into laughter.\(^ {53}\)

While the Korean ambassadors and Hakuseki continued conversation, Hakuseki touched on Shin Sukchu, the most celebrated scholar in the early Chosŏn period. By discussing Shin’s achievement, Hakuseki candidly expressed his concerns on Chosŏn Korea’s responses to his country by raising the issue if the neighbourly relations would perpetually have carried on in the future:

[Hakuseki said:] In the old time, Shin Sukchu in your country, discussed the Japanese with the king of the Chosŏn court.\(^ {54}\) The king asked “what do you want for this state [of policy with Tokugawa Japan]? And [Shin] answered: I humbly plead you not to lose the friendship with Japan.” His word indeed came from his worries as a minister of his country. [And I hope] if you have the same mind [as Shin did], it is certainly significant for the two states.

---

\(^{50}\) The date is equivalent to December 14 (1711) in Gregorian calendar.  
\(^{51}\) Hakuseki’s real name. “Hakuseki” is his pseudonym.  
\(^{52}\) The chief ambassador Cho T’aeŏk’s pseudonym.  
\(^{53}\) Im, “Tongsa ilgi.” *Haehaeng ch’ongjae.*, vol.9., p.76.  
\(^{54}\) The ninth king Sŏngjong (r. 1469-1494).
[P’yŏngch’ŏn asked:] Shin Sukchu is indeed my maternal relative. Your last word came out of your friendship with the neighbouring country and alarm against other regions. The wise men [such as Hakuseki and Shin] have recognized that using force causes a negative sign for each other. [By realizing that using force is not wise,] This should be appreciative fact [that we share an abhorrence of the war] to cultivate the closeness [between the two countries.] It is very cerebrating. [Hakuseki answered:] It is not easy to express my feeling by hearing an unusually touching and admiring word. You have become an ambassador and came here over the road of thousands of miles. My lord is without a doubt, a sacred being [whose benevolence lasts for a long time]. When can we talk about the establishment of the cordial relations [between Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea] except this moment? That is why I said like this. [P’yŏngch’ŏn said:] Yes, it is accurate. [And Hakuseki said:] To discuss the friendship, both countries just [need to] watch propriety and customs [to be familiar with]. The regards should not be lost through all eternity, as Tsushima is under the eaves of your country. [P’yŏngch’ŏn answered:] Yes, indeed. What my little concern is whether or not your country carries out sincerity and faith, as my country does own. [Hakuseki said]: Though it may unnecessary to think now, the later generations might fabricate the issues [that would cause the relationship to ruin.] You worry that the younger generations would lose favours of the two countries by arguing a trifling matter. [I kindly ask] Each of you would discuss this issue with the royal court after your return. All of you here are already chief retainers [of the country], so I do not suppose that you would despise my distress. [Ch’ŏngp’yŏng 55 answered:] The trifling matter 56 is not discussed [between the two countries.] but why do you possess your excessive anxiety? Nonetheless, if each of us here accomplishes what we should do, our neighbourly relations can be exercised through all eternity.

55 Im Sugan’s pseudonym.
56 Im’s belief is the trivial issues cannot prevent the neighbourly friendship.
[When I said, Hakuseki said:] This is just a humor of an elderly person’s excessive nervousness.
[And he said:] Pitiful myself am a descendent of this family name in my own country, and I have received a special treatment as a schoolmate [of the shogun] until the ascendant to the [current] king, so I beg that you must not question my unnecessary apprehension.
[Ch’ŏngp’yŏng said:] Today’s gathering indeed conveys the active communications between the two countries, and this should be recorded in our history today. 

The dialogue was unquestionably exercised in a peaceful atmosphere. The Korean ambassadors were certainly anxious about Hakuseki’s revision, as their departure was delayed until the revised state letter with the title of kokuō came from the capital city. In other words, Hakuseki was the one solely responsible for this irregular diplomatic procedure. The ambassadors, though they may have had some unenthusiastic sentiment on his diplomatic revision, never attempted to show their fretfulness. Not expressing displeasure was common sense for highly cultured and well-educated officials of the Korean embassy. Rather than quarrel over the diplomatic protocol, showing warm-heartedness would be more an appropriate manner for a literary exchange and they were able to enjoy the conversation.

Hakuseki himself also seemed to admit the Koreans’ literary superiority, and encouragement from the Korean officials would have become a strong moral support for him as well. In particular, Cho T’aeŏk, the chief ambassador of the 1711 embassy, acknowledged Hakuseki’s competence as “Your ability can be compared the rising spring” through the exchange. 

57 The ‘King’ that Hakuseki indicated is the sixth shogun Ienobu.
58 Im, “Tongsa ilgi.” Haehaeng ch’ongjae., vol.9., pp.78-82.
60 Im, “Tongsa ilgi.” Haehaeng ch’ongjae., vol.9., p.80.
pieces and their acknowledgements for his own publications. Yi Won-sik’s opinion, “Hakuseki’s misbehaviour was often overlooked by his high position in the bakufu” was not exaggerated.61

At any rate, the Koreans gladly wrote a preface on a book of Hakuseki’s poetical works containing admiring compliments. Cho T’aeŏk provided his comments on Hakuseki’s book as follows:

Since my entry into Tsushima, I have heard about [prestige of] disciples of school under Kinoshita Jun’an. Among so many brightest literati of the circle [in the country,] Hakuseki Minamoto kō is the most prominent… One day I find a volume of [his] verses and read them. His learning is extensive, and ability is abundant. [We] have discussed [on his works as] elegant but spirited, noble and attractively graceful, virile but not rough, stylish but not overly covered with sensibility, vivacious and [maintain] purely the Chinese way… When I see the works, it reminds me of pondering how he is. [Through his works, I can understand that] the respect of literature is flourishing in the country.62

Hakuseki must have been satisfied with the comments from the Koreans. As a matter of fact, his numerous visitations to the Koreans’ guesthouse were usually accompanied with souvenirs to show his gratitude.

By evaluating Hakuseki, the Korean officials attempted to understand his political background at the same time. Im Sugan came to understand Hakuseki’s political career via rumors among the Japanese attendants. He knew that Hakuseki’s involvement in politics came from a close association with the new sixth shogun Ienobu before his time in power in Kōfu,

---

and the intimacy between them was still unbreakable in Edo. Through Im’s correspondence with the bakufu’s high-ranking official,\(^{63}\) he also recognized that the revision of the diplomatic protocol was solely arranged by Hakuseki, who obstinately insisted on it to his superior, Ienobu, who finally approved it. In discussing the several matters with the Japanese official, he also learned that Hakuseki was the shogun’s most favourite vassal, and noticed that some officials in the bakufu and the Tsushima domain did not necessarily welcome Hakuseki’s reform. In fact, one of the ᅭҗṳ members, Tsuchiya Masanao (1641-1722), in charge of the visitation of the Korean embassy,\(^{64}\) felt a deep hatred emotion towards Hakuseki and wished him dead because of selfish handling of the bakufu and the shogun over the issues of the reform.\(^{65}\)

Hakuseki’s perspective on Chosŏn Korea’s lack of status vis-à-vis Japan is shown by his reform of diplomatic protocol and his expectation that the Koreans would accept them. Though the peer and even his fellows in the bafuku disliked the reform, his aim was somewhat accomplished, as he behaved exactly as he wished.

**Hakuseki’s views on Chosŏn Korea**

Hakuseki apparently had ambivalent views on Chosŏn Korea. One was the positive recognition of the Koreans as scholars, and the other was that of a bakufu bureaucrat who recognized Chosŏn Korea as a downgraded state. His direct exchanges with the 1682 Korean embassy as a younger scholar and with the 1711 embassy as a noteworthy scholar unquestionably raised his self-esteem. The Koreans who admitted his literary talent acted as benefactors for his own promotion as a politician. In this regard, he fully understood the Koreans’ literary excellence

---

\(^{63}\) Im did not mention from whom he had knowledge of relationship between Hakuseki and Ienobu, but the official could be Tsuchiya Masanao.

\(^{64}\) In Japanese, it referred as ‘Chosen shinshi raihei goyō gakari.’

\(^{65}\) Im, “Tongsil ilgi.” Haehaeng ch’ongjae., vol.9., December 26 (1711) or the seventeenth day of the eleventh month, p.74.
over the Japanese scholars through his own experiences of literary exchange. As a matter of fact, his gesture to the 1711 embassy was undeniably obedient and sociable. In his dialogue with the chief ambassador Cho T’aë̄ök, he emphasized that peaceful relations with Chosŏn Korea were essential for the bakufu, and he would have been proud of receiving the Koreans’ praise for his extensive knowledge.66

Hakuseki showed great interest in Korean culture through his frequent visits to the Korean embassy’s lodge in Edo. Hardently asked the Koreans for a preface to his own Chinese poetic work and a postscript for his own poetic works. After he received comments from the Koreans, his gratification was recorded in his record. In Hakuseki nikki, it is expressed as:

(1) The twenty seventh day of the ninth month67 Hakuseki shisō was complete.
(2) The fifth day of the tenth month68 Arrived at the office at the fourth hour.69 Four copies of Hakuseki shisō were complete. From now on, when the embassy reaches at Tsushima island, the shisō was given and asked remarks by Cho T’aë̄ök and others. [Asking them to write] depends on their arrival.
(3) The ninth day70 Preface of the shisō was returned
(4) The tenth day71 Hakuseki shisō was bestowed [to the shogun.]72

Im Sugan wrote that the purpose of Hŏshū’s visit to him in Shimonoseki was to bring Hakuseki’s work, Hakuseki shisō, and Hŏshū asked the Koreans to write remarks for Hakuseki’s booklet. Hŏshū must have arranged something special for Hakuseki, as they had

67 The date is equivalent to November 7 (1711) in Gregorian calendar.
68 The date is equivalent to November 14 (1711) in Gregorian calendar.
69 Around ten to eleven in the morning.
70 The date is equivalent to November 18 (1711) in Gregorian calendar.
71 The date is equivalent to November 19 (1711) in Gregorian calendar.
72 “Hakuseki nikki.” unpublished manuscript owned at Keio University Library.
once studied in the same school. In this sense, Hakuseki must have asked Hōshū for a personal favour to acquire the preface from the Koreans.

Ironically, he behaved in an equivalent manner to the scholars who were eager to receive writings and paintings from the Koreans in the streets and villages. Naitō Konan (1866-1934), a historian and professor at Kyōto Imperial University, pointed out Hakuseki’s behaviour as: “He abused the Tokugawa shogun’s name to seek his own interests to question [the Koreans] whatever he wanted, and was shameless enough to do so even on very trivial matters.”73 In any event, his experiences with the Koreans provided him with a high regard in himself.

By so doing, Hakuseki’s position in Korean diplomacy was to take advantage of Chosŏn Korea, for his advocacy of the shogunal placement that should be more authoritative than the Korean king had to be emphasized. From this context in Korean diplomacy based on his grand map, the embassy must be a tributary mission to Tokugawa Japan. Hakuseki, who also proudly acknowledged himself equal or even superior to his literary counterparts with the Korean officials, could not endure that those Japanese scholars repeatedly pleaded for comments on their poems or ink drawings. The high ability of the Koreans indeed astonished the Japanese, and their admiration led them to behave with respect towards Chosŏn Korea as the ‘heart of the scholars.’74 Under those situations of the Japanese enthusiasm over the Koreans, Hakuseki might have felt anxious that the Japanese themselves would spoil the Japanese culture, which Hakuseki regarded as a superior one.

In contrast to Japanese adoration of the Koreans and Korean culture, Hakuseki was aware of their sentiments on their Japanese counterparts through the Korean monographs. The

Koreans did not necessarily possess positive ideas about Japan. He recorded his disgust on the matter:

[Koreans denigrated that fact that] a number of achievements in our country were accomplished by a ‘barbaric chief,’ Tokugawa Ieyasu and other [Tokugawa shoguns]. The [Korean] people are saying that the friendly relations [with Tokugawa Japan] should be retained in the name of courtesy and sincerity… However, they humiliated [Japan] and doubted the sincere correspondence with the barbarians… At the time of the invasions, after the sea battle was begun, our battleships were on the ocean with our distinguishing combat tactics year after year [during the war], but the [Korean] force was feeble enough and understood that they did not deserve to be our enemy. They are now trying to compensate for the loss of the war with their literary excellence [through their exchanges].

Through the exchanges with the Koreans, Hakuseki discovered that the Koreans possessed a sense of superiority over the Japanese in literature. The Japanese literati indeed found it difficult to challenge the Koreans, since the high-ranking officials in the Chosŏn court were usually selected as a member of the embassy to satisfy the needs of the exchange with the Japanese scholars. Those outstanding personnel of the court had to pass the high-level civil service examination, (K: kwagŏ; J: kachyo) and thus the Japanese scholars discovered they could not overwhelm the Koreans in the competition in literature. The competition to keep up with the neighbour would have motivated Hakuseki to be aware of Japan’s superior sense over the Koreans and thus Hakuseki could have sought to add something valuable to Japan to subdue Chosŏn Korea: why Japan was more special and distinguished. In Hakuseki’s other work, Kokusho fukugŏ kiji, or Record of Restoration on the Sovereign’s Message, he wrote

76 Kojima, pp.28-29.
“Korea is artful and [full of] liars. Always seeking for profits, and disregard for faithfulness. Their [the Korean] manners and customs are the same as animals and so are their natures.”

Hakuseki’s political experiences can be divided into two stages: before he became an advisor of the bakufu and after. In the beginning, his naïve adoration for the Koreans encouraged him to further practice his study. At this time, the acknowledgement (or support by an influential party) was crucial to increase his confidence as a young scholar. As he learned more about Korean issues, he became biased against the Koreans and began to possess a strong belief in Japan’s superiority. As seen, his proposal for the diplomatic revision implied downgrading the Korean embassy. It seems as though Hakuseki did have confidence in the legitimacy of his reform. He based it on ancient precedents, in asserting that “the Korean states of Silla, Paekche, Koryŏ, and Kaya and other dynasties had been tributaries of the [imperial] court for four hundred sixty years.” Hakuseki possessed the opinion that Chosŏn Korea was not worth engaging in a neighbourly relationship as follows:

Looking at Korean historical writings, most of them mentioned that our country was a tributary state [of Chosŏn Korea], and as a more outrageous fact, they continuously used [to indicate the Japanese] as washū (barbarians), wado (burglars), wazoku (pirates); shŭ meant for bizarre and outside group. [Their expressions on the Japanese are] Very despicable and dishonourable by using such words.

The proposals of the reform also indicated that Japan’s superiority over the Korean culture was a long tradition that had continued from the ancient times. In Hakuseki’s view, the Korean monographs written on Japan still seemed full of distress, though the neighbourly relations

---

were reestablished a century before.

Another issue arises here. If Hakuseki’s reform was to solidify the shogun’s position domestically and internationally, how did he treat the imperial court in relation to the bakufu? Hakuseki needed to explain further the tradition of bifurcated sovereign ‘monarchs’ in the domestic sphere: the emperor and the shogun. The sole aim of his political program was articulated with the elevation of the shogunal authority in the diplomatic relations with Chosŏn Korea. His political aim for enhancement of the shogunal position provided arguments on the emperor’s deficiency of political dominance in order for the bakufu to dominate any authorities, including the imperial court. However, his attempt did not come from demotion of the emperor’s position. To explain his somewhat illogical sense, borrowing from Nakai’s words, “much like a juggler endeavouring to keep numerous balls aloft at the same time, created an intricate, multi-layered argument… We need to sort out what was fundamental to Hakuseki’s position from what was secondary, distinguish the red herring and forensic parry from the main thrust, identify the interplay of concerns and premises that underlay these various dimensions of what he wrote. Through this process we should attain a fuller understanding of Hakuseki’s aims and methods.”

Hakuseki’s attitudes on the imperial court did not provide his solid philosophy or rationale, such as whether the bakufu should be superior to the imperial court. As an advocator of the bakufu system, his aim was to retain the bakufu’s solid standing. Through the revision of the shogun’s title, his emphasis of the argument was to heighten the bakufu’s place, how the Tokugawa Japan was seen and treated by another country, namely Chosŏn Korea. In Hakuseki’s intention, Nakai points out: “Hakuseki’s endeavour was an attempt to centralize power and authoritative influence in the hands of the bakufu. His undertaking indeed

---

81 ibid., p.258.
82 ibid., Preface, xv.
led to correct Japan’s political dichotomy of power (the bakufu) and authority (the imperial court).” The problem here was that he could not provide a sufficient explanation for it. As Hakuseki’s elaborations in the reform in Korean diplomacy continued, they revealed how he regarded the relationship as important in placing Japan in the same position as Chosŏn Korea. In this sense, his illogical disrespect of Chosŏn Korea as ‘not worth as our country’s peer’ seemed a total contradiction.

How did Hakuseki’s efforts over the diplomatic revision turn out? The Tokugawa bakufu no longer sanctioned his revision in Korean diplomacy after the 1711 embassy. The official title of the shogun reverted to the Great Prince, and this diplomatic practice continued until the end of the visitation of the Korean embassy in 1811. Hakuseki was eventually excused from his office as an advisor, along with the accession of the new eighth shogun, Tokugawa Yoshimune (r. 1716-1745). Hakuseki’s resignation indeed showed his complete loss over the discussion on diplomatic reform. The scholarly exchanges with the Korean embassy provided him with increase of his own prestige as a scholar. However, as the political revisionist, Hakuseki caused the Koreans to distrust Japan. His rigid manner made the even bakufu executives and the Tsushima officials, including Hōshū, perplexed.

In contrast to Hakuseki’s somewhat irrational argument, Hōshū’s opinion over the diplomatic reform eventually appealed to the bakufu, since his perspective on the Korean affairs stood on more pragmatic and persuasive rationales than Hakuseki’s. Hōshū was indeed a proficient negotiator. In the debate against Hakuseki’s reform, he argued that the change might generate consequential disruption of the neighbourly relations with Chosŏn Korea. Once the

---

83 ibid., p.203.
intercourse was interrupted, the Japanese side, namely Tsushima, suffered much from the disturbance. To circumvent such a worst-case scenario, Hōshū’s careful commentaries against Hakuseki made it possible to engage the bakufu’s attention and eventually led it to restore the title of the Great Prince. Rather than Hakuseki’s pursuit of the title change, Hōshū’s attempt provided a solution enabling the two countries to facilitate what the two states needed—upholding the neighbourly relations. The arguments made by Hōshū came from calm yet powerful statement, as his constant encounters with the Koreans turned him into a more mature, trained diplomat. For Hōshū, the meetings with the Koreans were not special occasions; it was the most crucial part of his duty for the Tsushima domain. As a definitive point of difference between Hakuseki and Hōshū, experiences in Korean diplomacy were a vital factor; one totally lacked experience with diplomatic issues, and the other had the considerable skill, understanding, and patience needed to handle the issues of a different country.

As Tsushima’s efficient diplomat, what Hōshū sought to protect was Tsushima’s continuing profits from the Korean trades by providing the bakufu with his own expertise. At the same time, he showed a deep understanding of the Koreans and Korean culture and possessed an extensive outlook on the Korean-related issues. How did Hōshū develop such a background as an efficient diplomat? Hōshū’s life many interactions with the Koreans and Korean culture made him an expert in Korean diplomacy.
Chapter Five

Amenomori Hōshū: for a Better Relationship with Chosŏn Korea

Amenomori Hōshū’s background

Amenomori Hōshū was certainly Tsushima’s important figure in Korean diplomacy. The three main ambassadors and the diarists in the 1711 embassy highly appraised the two other Japanese officials accompanying Hakuseki including Hoshū, who will be discussed here, and Kinoshita Jun’an, who had taught both Hakuseki and Hōshu. Chosŏn officials were consistent in describing of Hōshū as a capable diplomat, Hakuseki as a versatile scholar, and Jun’an as an enormously admirable scholar. Hōshū and Hakuseki both studied under the same master, and appeared together at the centre of diplomatic and political controversies, although they had sharply opposing views of the diplomatic issue. In contrast to Hakuseki’s attitude on the neighbouring state, Hōshū showed deep understanding of the Korean culture and people and strived to establish better relations with Chosŏn Korea throughout his career as a diplomat in Tsushima. His contributions to the Korean issues were considerable; among them, Hōshū’s position in the dispute over the diplomatic reform with Hakuseki in 1711 received much attention from both the bakufu and the Chosŏn court. Tsushima did not present Hakuseki’s counterargument over the diplomatic reform without reference to Hōshū’s position.

Hōshū’s ability received much attention from the members of the Korean embassy. The chief ambassador Cho T’aeŏk and the chief diarist Yi Hyŏn of the 1711 embassy highly praised the Tshushima diplomat in front of Hōshū himself:

[P’yŏngch’ŏng said:] Amenomori is the one not easily obtained [to work with] and has tremendous ability, and why is he left out [from the central government] and living in obscurity? Even The ancients regretted
throwing the treasure away to the roadside, and why is he not serving at a higher [and more prestigious] position?

[Hakuseki answered:] Amonomori is the best disciple of my master [Kinoshita Jun’an,] and for me, he is a respected friend who transcends a gap of age. As for men of old times, succeeding in later periods was common, but in this bright era we now live in, how can we bury the talented person [such as Hōshū]? All of you [the three ambassadors] are too much concerned with it.

[Dongkwak said:]¹ If this man [Hōshū] was born in our country, he would not be treated so coldly [as in Japan.] It is one of your defective policies that your country does not regard him as precious gift.²

Yi Hyŏn’s straightforward statement in the conversation undoubtedly expressed what he thought.³ This positive evaluation of Hōshū was a common view among the Korean officials, and his ability was acknowledged by a number of officials both in the bakufu and Chosŏn Korea. Hakuseki even praised Hōshū to the Korean ambassadorial members as: “He is talented in all his studies and will soon become a leader of our generation as my master [Jun’an] indicates.”⁴ Although Hōshū did not play any crucial role in the bakufu, such as Hakuseki did, what he had achieved in the Korean affairs was unquestionably vital in Tokugawa diplomacy.

In addition to Hōshū’s capability as a diplomat, the appraisal of the Korean embassy towards him also came from his position over the diplomatic reform in 1711, as represented by the use of *taikun* rather than *kokuō*, to protect the diplomatic precedence.

Hōshū’s abundant experiences in Korean diplomacy were a vital factor differentiating him from other Japanese officials who participated in the Korean issues. He had numerous skills, understanding, and patience necessary to handle subjects of a different country. How did

¹ Tongkwak indicated Yi Hyŏn, the chief diarist’s pseudonym.
² Im, “Kanggwan p’iljam.,” *Haehaeng ch’ongjae.*, vol.9., p.82.
³ Hakuseki seemed to admit Hōshū’s efficiency as a scholar and diplomat necessary for Tsushima through the conversation with the embassy above.
he acquire such a background as an efficient diplomat? Hōshū’s environment, constantly filled with interactions between the Koreans, made him an expert in Korean diplomacy. His multiple experiences of dealing with Korean affairs and his many contacts with Koreans both officially and personally made him more considerate of Korean culture than the other Japanese officials. In this sense, his character was very exceptional at that time, and his role standing on the frontline of the different cultures made him indispensable for Tsushima as well as for the Tokugawa bakufu.

Hōshū was born in the western part, the current Shiga prefecture in 1668. His father Amenomori Kiyokatsu (birth date unknown-1676) owned a medical clinic in Kyoto as a physician. His family voluntarily withdrew the status of samurai in Oda Nobunaga’s time to become civilian. Furthermore, the domain Kiyokatsu resided in was forced to receive kaieki, territorial confiscation or transfer by the Tokugawa bakufu, in the third shogun Iemitsu’s era. To save the Amenomori lineage, he left his native place to seek a new living in Kyoto. Kiyokatsu and his family’s life in the new place was well-established, and Hōshū lived in comfort as a son of a medical doctor.

Kyoto was where the imperial court was located, and the feelings of the local dwellers toward the east, Edo, were not necessarily always positive. In 1615, the bakufu enacted kinchū narabini kuge shohatto, a set of regulations that applied to the emperor and the Kyoto court nobilities, and was dispatched to restrict their political involvements against Edo. Under the rule, the imperial court and nobles were only allowed to undertake studies, traditional arts, and ceremonials. By the bakufu’s behavioural restrictions, the imperial household and the court nobles had a difficult time protesting the bakufu authority in Edo. Under such a frail anti-bakufu sentiment, Kiyokatsu might have been comfortable in Kyoto, and Hōshū did not
particularly mention his self-esteem as a member of the *samurai* family.

**Hōshū’s days of studies and struggles**

When Hōshū was seventeen years old, he began to pursue Neo-Confucian studies at the school of Kinoshita Jun’an in Edo. Kinoshita Jun’an had already established himself as a distinguished scholar in his native place, Kyoto, and later he was invited to serve the bakufu in 1682 by his outstanding expertise of Neo-Confucianism. Jun’an had personal associations with the members of the 1682 Korean embassy during his tenure as an adviser of the fifth shogun, Tokugawa Tsunayoshi (r. 1680-1709). The chief diarist of the 1682 embassy, Sŏng Wan, exchanged literary pieces with Jun’an in Edo. Sŏng’s favour to Jun’an was recorded in his writing: “I feel like I have met a friend with whom I never met for a decade.”^5^ As a distinguished scholar Jun’an’s name left positive feelings among the embassy. After his retirement, Jun’an established a private school to raise scholars of the next generation. Hōshū was the one of his most able disciples in Edo.\(^6\) After Hōshū spent seven years studying in Edo, Jun’an suggested Hōshū serve the Tsushima domain and then he would be ready to work at the bakufu.

In accordance with Jun’an’s direction, Hōshū began to serve the Tsushima domain in 1689. Beneficially enough, he was given with a ‘learning period’ before his involvement of the actual Korean affairs. During this preparatory time, Hōshū exercised his studies in three places: Edo to deepen his Neo-Confucian studies, Nagasaki to gain Chinese language skills, and

---

^5^ ibid., p.36.

^6^ Jun’an’s disciples, including Arai Hakuseki, Amenomori Hōshū, Matsuura Kashō, Gion Nankai, and Muro Kyūsō, became prominent scholastic figures at that time and were called the ‘Seven Wise Men under the Kinoshita School.’
Ch’oryang where the *wakan*, Tsushima’s office in the Korean peninsula, was located, to learn the fundamental diplomatic and commercial issues between Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea. Thanks to Tsushima’s exclusive commercial business with the Korean trade, the local government was in need of talented personnel who were especially good at written Chinese, the minimum and the most necessary ability to issue the official documents between the two states.

As a single domain, Tsushima earned outstanding revenue especially from the end of seventeenth to the early eighteenth century, when the commercial exchange with Chosŏn Korea was reaching its peak. Tsushima’s lucrative trading profits with its neighbouring state eventually enabled it to employ a brilliant official such as Hōshū, and the local office could afford to wait until his education was complete. With this generous provision of sufficient remuneration, benefits, and time to learn the language and diplomatic issues, Hoshu spent another three years at Tsushima’s branch house in Edo and was able to continue his studies under Jun’an’s instruction.

After Hōshū’s studies in Edo, he aimed at further improving his Chinese and Korean languages. Acquiring these foreign languages was one of the most crucial obligations for him to be able to play a central role in Tsushima. After leaving Edo, he stayed in Nagasaki in 1692 and 1696 to seek more advanced Chinese language practice. Conveniently enough, he could continue the Chinese study, for the Tsushima branch house in Nagasaki made it possible for him to stay for a comparatively longer period of time. Nagasaki was the best place to learn Chinese at that time, for a number of merchants from China resided in or near the Nagasaki

---

8 The profit Tsushima earned in the early Genroku era (1688-1703) was sixty thousand ryō, in contrast to the bakufu’s total income of seven hundred thousand ryō during the period (source from Ueno, p.59)
port. The bakufu established the *tōjin yashiki*, or the Chinese Guesthouse, to allow the Chinese merchants to station themselves there in 1689. Unfortunately, he did not have opportunities for close personal contacts with the Chinese in Nagasaki under the bakufu regulation, so he needed to learn Chinese by himself, which took longer.

Hōshū found it difficult to master Chinese and mentioned his days of Chinese lessons after his retirement: “I was able to acquire Chinese after spending more than twenty years... It is better to learn a language at a younger age.” He realized that his Chinese pronunciation contained certain Japanese sounds, though he had spent many years in learning it. Hōshū’s diligence in dealing with the diplomatic affairs probably came from the tireless process of his studies. The astonishing fact was that he had continued his Chinese language practice for more than fifty years after coming back from Nagasaki, almost his entire life. However, his Chinese was not as poor as he thought. Due to his efforts his remarkable fluency in three languages (Korean, Chinese, and Japanese) was praised by the 1711 embassy. Hōshū acquired several languages that were absolutely necessary as a negotiator of foreign affairs; this also showed his vigorous and constant hard work and his firm willpower to complete anything that he once determined to do.

Hōshū’s Korean language study took about three years at the *wakan*, after his Chinese discipline in Nagasaki. The new *wakan*, which was constructed in Ch’oryang in 1678, occupied a wide area in the current city of Pusan, about one hundred thousand *tsubo*,

---

10 However, the Chinese tradesmen were prohibited access to the central Nagasaki area until 1692.
13 One *tsubo* is about 3.3 square meters.
equivalent to 330 square kilometers. The size was vast, in contrast to the Tōjin yashiki in Nagasaki which was about ten thousand tsubo.\textsuperscript{14} In the area, about four to five hundred Japanese officials and merchants resided with numerous warehouses stored full of silver, agricultural products, medical articles; ginseng, firearms, silk and other craft products. He found studying Korean language easier than Chinese, because he was able to pick the Korean vocabulary relatively easily. In his own words, karakotoba wa hanahada yasushi (Korean language is less tiresome to learn for the Japanese);\textsuperscript{15} as he indicated, Japanese and Korean languages are similar in their grammars.\textsuperscript{16} Nevertheless, mastering a different language took time; he later stressed the hard process of learning Korean in his essay: “I desperately studied Korean there [in Ch’oryang] as though the toughness [of study] would shorten my life at least five years, but even so I wanted to complete my language study.”\textsuperscript{17} Hōshū studied Korean under the instructions of the interpreters, but they were not accustomed to language teaching. Hōshū had a hard time practicing Korean conversation, in that the new wakan was somewhat secluded from the central area of the city. There were few chances for him to meet the Koreans in the wakan, and he, again, had to learn it by himself. Hōshū’s years in the wakan were productive and also provided him with encounters of the actual diplomatic and commercial handlings.

After the completion of language and practical training in Edo, Nagasaki, and the wakan, the thirty-one year old Hōshū finally went to Tsushima in 1698 to carry out the

\textsuperscript{14} Tashiro, Wakan: Sakoku jidai no Nihonjinmachi. p.64.
\textsuperscript{15} Amenomori, “Kitsusō sawa.,” pp.157-158.
\textsuperscript{17} Izumi, ed. p.68.
diplomatic duties. He was immediately appointed as an official of *shinbunyaku*,\(^{18}\) the second important role in the Korean issues of the local domain. It meant that he stood on a real starting point for the development of his career in facing a number of challenging issues in Korean diplomacy. His responsibilities on the Korean issues were not simple tasks and often took him away from his own duties. However, his indefatigable management of those tough issues made him a more experienced diplomat.

The Tsushima domain had looked forward to the completion of Hōshū’s studies, and now the island had to collect on the investment in the period of his education. After his return to the island, the local government made him responsible for most of the Korean related issues. His first mission was to deal with the export of silver to Korea. But a certain issue had caused difficulties between the Tsushima administration and the Korean officials. The domain attempted to export a certain quality of silver products, but Chosŏn Korea was eager to receive the better products than Tsushima endeavoured to export.\(^{19}\) In the first place, Hōshū opposed simply complying with Chosŏn Korea’s commands without any negotiation. His anxiety was reasonable; had Tsushima accepted unquestionably Chosŏn’s demands at this point, they would have been forced to continue obeying Chosŏn in other matters as well. It may have aggravated the customary trade between them, and it was not at all equitable. He was eager to avoid such complex commercial issues but not negotiating the matter would have caused a more deleterious outcome for Tsushima. His unyielding attitude in establishing fair business with the Korean counterpart was essential, and Tsushima needed to safeguard its earnings under an

---

\(^{18}\) *Shinbunyaku* is the name of the office position dealing with the documents on Korean diplomacy as well as attending to the Korean ambassadors during their visit to Japan.

\(^{19}\) Izumi, ed. pp.160-161. The exchange rate worked for the disadvantage of Tsushima. In short, Tsushima’s loss was 2 *ryō* when being paid 100 *ryō*. 
equal basis of trade.

Nonetheless, this issue caused trouble for Hōshū himself with the Korean side as well as with long-cherished customs in Tsushima. Other officials in the domain were uncomfortable in working with an obstinate newcomer from Edo, whom they viewed as just a young apprentice who did not understand anything about actual diplomatic tactics. They treated him as a stranger who knew just a bit of Chinese and Korean languages, and they were probably jealous of his scholarly background.\(^{20}\) Tsushima’s decision on the silver export was made, and after all the island accepted Chosŏn Korea’s requirement to export the better products. Denial of the appeal greatly disappointed Hōshū, and he decided to leave Tsushima, only twenty days after he became Chōsengata sayaku, in charge of the Korean affairs.\(^{21}\) The gap between his ideal and the reality made him anxious to reside in a remote place. The frustrated Hōshū sent a letter to his colleague Hakuseki about his dissatisfaction over the silver trade. He complained that his uneasiness about not being able to reside in a distant, remote area was such a painful matter.\(^{22}\) His days in Tsushima were a series of struggles and complications, as he stood in the ‘battlefield’ of diplomacy.

**Hōshū’s principles and endeavours for a better relationship with Chosŏn Korea**

Hōshū’s primary aim certainly came from the protection of Tsushima’s rights. He was a shrewd diplomat in placing Tsushima’s profit as his main concern. The Tsushima domain, as well as two hundred other domains, was practically an independent and autonomous state without any fiscal assistance from the bakufu. Commercial relations with Chosŏn Korea were

---

\(^{20}\) Kamigaito, pp.85-86.  
\(^{21}\) However, Hōshū’s request to resign was rejected by the Tsushima domain.  
\(^{22}\) Kamigaito, p.105.
an absolute lifeline for Tsushima. Without these relations, the island could not have survived. As part of Hōshū’s tactics for peaceful negotiations with the Koreans, he sailed to the *wakan* in 1729 to settle several commercial issues dispatching more special envoys from Tsushima to the *wakan*. In order to do so, he obtained cooperation from the Korean interpreters, such as Hyŏn Dŏkyun and his brother, Hyŏn Dŏkyŏn. Hōshū was able to receive assistances of the negotiation from those officials who were fluent in Japanese in the *wakan* and the capital city, Hansŏng, where his acquaintances resided and served the court.

Hōshū regarded those Koreans as crucial for Tsushima, and mentioned that Tsushima had urgently to provide the Korean interpreters with ‘special treats,’ in other words, financial compliments to them had to be paid to further Tsushima’s negotiations. In addition to the assistance from the Korean interpreters, Hōshū found that further and more powerful supports from the Korean high-ranking officials were crucial. Hong Chijung (1667-1732), the chief ambassador of the 1719 Korean embassy, was promoted to *yŏngŭijŏng*, or the Chief State Councillor in 1729. The highest-ranking official of the Chosŏn court knew Hōshū as an attendant of their journey. It was not difficult to imagine that the Korean interpreters in Hansŏng approached Hong and worked to further Hōshū’s request. Possessing personal yet strong ties with the court high-ranking officials was Hōshū’s most powerful advantage for the successful discussions. Hōshū’s face always looked at the four directions: to the bakufu, Chosŏn Korea, Tsushima, and private life. Each aspect of his face was slightly different, and

---

24 ibid., 13-14.
25 ibid., p.13.
26 No particular written records have been found as the Tsushima’s support to the Korean officials was exercised in secret. But it might be probable that some economic back-up from Tsushima could have been brought to Hong.
we cannot understand him if we look at only one of his faces. When Hōshū exchanged a poem with the Koreans, he seemed open and honest, but once he stood in the frontline of the negotiations with the Koreans, he changed to a tough, experienced tactician.

Hōshū was indeed a tireless negotiator of Tsushima. In addition to the dispute over the diplomatic reform, Hōshū also confronted another dispute with Hakuseki on economic matters in 1714, on silver exports from Tsushima to Chosŏn Korea. Hakuseki wanted to prevent Japan’s silver items from an excessive outflow overseas and to utilize the silver for more domestic distribution to bring further economic growth. Hōshū, however, was eager to protect Tsushima’s interests, an exclusive right of the Korean trade. By reason of their high quality, Japan’s silver products were always the main objects for export. Acceptance of Hakukseki’s idea meant that Tsushima would seriously have been damaged by a loss of major merchandise, and consequently, the island could have lost its ability to survive. Commercial trade with Chosŏn Korea dominated Tsushima’s fate. From their different points of view, in Tashiro’s article, while Hakuseki’s eyes were focused on the national economic interest, Hōshū’s perspective on the economy put more emphasis on the local economy where he served.

Through several direct interviews and exchanges of documents between the two officials, Hōshū’s emphasis on Tsushima’s advantage as a place of defence [from its proximity to the foreign state] and Korean trade [for the bakufu] was persuasive. Hōshū compiled a letter to the bakufu entitled “Rinkō shimatsu monogatari (1731),” or “The Accounts of the Neighbourly Settlement,” describing Tsushima as a blessed land in the age of the first shogun,
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28 In Tashiro’s analysis, more than 90% of Japan-made silver was exported for foreign trade. See more details at Tashiro, Kazui. “Hakuseki Hōshū ronsō to Tsushima han.” Shigaku [Japan] 2000 (69): 337-339.

29 Ibid., p.333.
Tokugawa Ieyasu. His quotation of Ieyasu’s words from the Tsushima’s historical source caused the bakufu councillors to reconsider Tsushima’s status and importance over the Korean issues. What Tsushima had always done for the bakufu was instructed by Tokugawa Ieyasu who had promised an exclusive right of trade. As long as Ieyasu’s benevolence on Tsushima was valid, the island was able to enjoy its right of commercial trade with Chosŏn Korea. \(^{31}\)

In this protection of Tsushima’s interests, Hōshū’s ability was fully demonstrated. To pass the petition, he quickly found the bakufu officials who listened to his argument. Hōshū consecutively drew out his theory why Tsushima was important, in order for the negotiation to achieve the utmost effect. Until the moment of the last argument, he obstinately repeated the debate. He was not necessarily a gentle diplomat at all times; he often devised a stratagem for his own merits so that he might stand in a dominant place to bring in the more profits for Tsushima. As a result, he successfully defended Tsushima’s role and interests to the bakufu. \(^{32}\)

At this point, Hōshū understood how to negotiate with the bakufu officials and his careful selections of the language in the letter came from his efficiency as well as a sharp sense as a negotiator. Through Hōshū’s tough experiences encountering the bakufu and the Korean officials, his thoughts on the relationship with Chosŏn Korea were slowly, but surely growing towards the need to maintain a neighbourly relationship.

At the same time, Hōshū questioned how the Tsushima people could best retain the pleasant relations with Chosŏn Korea. Through those experiences, Hōshū played a crucial role in writing “Kōrin shuchi”, described as a method of learning the Korean language, in 1705.


\(^{31}\) ibid., p.277.

\(^{32}\) However, Hōshū did not especially mention from which historical text he quoted Ieyasu’s view on Tsushima. In this sense, Hōshū’s tactics to effectively bring in the name of Ieyasu on the letter moved the bakufu officials.
The purpose of the written work was to seek active exchange between Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea by educating Tsushima’s younger generations who would determine the future of the island. In the article, he highly regarded the interpreters’ role for the better relations with Chosŏn Korea, and defined ideal interpreters as possessing high administrative and scholastic abilities, as well as a good personality.\(^{33}\) The last element was emphasized, as it was what the interpreters handling the Korean issues should possess. Those interpreters served language exchange and needed to deal with diplomatic issues; thus, well-trained and experienced officials fluent in the Korean language were indispensable to carry on the fruitful negotiations.

In the writing, Hōshū also introduced the significance and obligation of interpreters. The roles of the interpreters were not only translating dialogue or speech, but they also should have an extensive knowledge, imagination [to think like the Korean counterparts,] and sincerity.\(^{34}\) He emphasized the principle of personal contact with the Koreans: “Regardless of how much one has a right intention to make better relations with Korea, one’s ideal will be meaningless without any further understanding on Korea.”\(^{35}\)

Hōshū’s painstaking endeavour was continued even after his retirement. Another significant project for him was to institute a school to raise proficient interpreters who were fluent in Korean. If no one understood Korean in Tsushima, how would they accompany the next Korean ambassadors to Japan? How would the Tsushima people protect the exclusive trading right with Chosŏn Korea? Hōshū voiced this fear to the Tsushima local government. As a vital and only way to survive, Tsushima needed to continue having the professional talents in

\(^{33}\) Amenomori, “Kōrin teisei (1728).”\(^{34}\) Amenomori Hōshū zensho., p.82.
\(^{35}\) ibid., pp.82-83.
Korean diplomacy and trade and capable negotiators were essential. Termination of the relations with Chosŏn Korea was the loss of everything, and the Korean trade was the sole lifeline that the small island relied on. If the island had lost the privilege of the business with Chosŏn Korea, no one in Tsushima could be optimistic, and everyone foresaw a pessimistic fate for the domain.

In 1727, the Tsushima local government established a Korean language school in response to Hōshū’s zealous demands. In the beginning of the year, the school accepted 39 students from the families of the merchant class to raise interpreters who had to support the Tsushima island in the future.\textsuperscript{36} The comprehensive three-year-curriculum was incorporated with great emphasis on Korean reading and composition.\textsuperscript{37} In addition to the practical language classes, moral studies were added to the subjects. Hōshū emphasized the understanding of foreign culture that was an unavoidable aspect of being an efficient interpreter.\textsuperscript{38} He talked to the students about his countless experiences of the exchange with the Koreans, and urged the students to learn the results of misunderstandings that often originated from cultural differences. The selected students in the school were allowed to experience practical training at the wakan and further language study, and awarded fellowships for stipend.\textsuperscript{39} Hōshū’s school ran throughout the Tokugawa period and kept providing the Tsushima government with a number of proficient interpreters. Among those students, Oda Ikugorō (1755-1832) became one of the most excellent interpreters in being placed as daitsūji (a chief interpreter) and devoted his

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}[\textsuperscript{36}]
\item Hōshū knew that even trained interpreters had trouble with reading and writing skills in Korean.
\item Besides the language training, students were also encouraged to take distribution subjects in order to increase self-awareness as a diplomat official.
\item Kamigaito, p.131.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
entire life to pursuing his career in Korean diplomacy.footnote[40]{Quoted from “Tsuyaku shūsaku” (unpublished manuscript at Keio University). This work had numerous topics on differences in the daily life of the two countries. Ikugoro’s conversations on meals with the Korean interpreter gave a glimpse of dissimilarities of favourite food. In the record, he once mentioned sake, his word, as the world’s finest beverage and asked the Korean if he also favoured it. The counterpart agreed him, but the sake was not the same strong spirit as the Korean alcoholic drink.}\n
Ikugoro later recorded a collection of records on Chosŏn Korea entitled “Shōsho kibun” (1794), which described detailed accounts on situations and cultures in Korean society, and “Tsuyaku Shūsaku,” a record of his experiences in exchanging dialogue between himself and the Korean interpreters complied by his son, Oda Kansakufootnote[41]{Oda Ikugoro’s son, Oda Kansaku, also became a Korean interpreter.} in 1834. Ikugoro’s numerous instructions on how to deal with the Koreans became an invaluable source for other local administrators as well to handle the Korean affairs.

Among Hōshū’s several articles on Chosŏn Korea, “Kōrin teisei” was regarded as the best work to introduce essential aspects in Korean diplomacy to all officials involved in Korean affairs in the Tsushima domain. In this piece of writing, Hōshū explained the frequent misunderstandings that would come from cultural differences between the two countries. He emphasized that prejudice against the Koreans was surely based on Japanese ignorance and their lack of understanding of different cultures. In order to remove such bias towards Koreans, one must make an effort to study more about their culture and tradition that differed from the Japanese, and the most importantly, he noted that the Japanese must revere the individual customs.footnote[42]{Amenomori, “Kōrin teisei.” Amenomori Hōshū zensho., p.59.} As one of the major misapprehensions in the Korean monographs, he clarified that the Koreans often referred to Japan apparently as ‘enemy state’ (J: tekikoku; K: chōkkuk); the Koreans used the word to indicate its neighbouring state or peer country.footnote[43]{ibid., p.58} In the misinterpretation of the true meaning, even the prominent Japanese scholars were very
antagonistic to the Koreans’ use of that word. They emphasized that Chosŏn Korea still did remember the past grudge at the time of the Japanese invasions of Chosŏn Korea, though Japan sincerely showed the most amiable attitude to a diplomatic peer.\footnote{44 Even Arai Hakuseki misinterpreted the meaning.} Hōshū emphasized possessing fundamental comprehension of the foreign counterpart. In the first paragraph of his work, he wrote:

For interactions with Korea, understanding on the people and the circumstances are necessary. To deal efficiently with the [Korean] administrative authorities, [you need] to be familiar with the entire rationale [on the Korean trade.] One of the most influential authorities is the policy from the Chosŏn government, the second is the thoughts of the interpreters, and the other is [the Korean] merchants’ way to act. By the authorities [with whom you are handling], [You ought to deal] discretely with each issue to counter in response to the matters… When dealing with the domestic disputes, we are properly able to divide the issues [to claim] for the merchant, for the magistrates [machibugyō], and for the senior councillors [rōjū.] However, when handling the Korean affairs, we tend to make [the issues] worse [by putting them altogether.] This is what we need to keep in mind for the respect.\footnote{45 Amenomori, “Kōrin teisei.” Amenomori Hōshū zensho., p.58.}

Hōshū’s comment above was to urge further understanding the ways of the Koreans’ response, and taking action only after recognizing the difference was very effective way to resolve the problems. Hōshū particularly touched on these fundamental principles that he already acknowledged through his long-term activities as a diplomat official.\footnote{46 Miyake, Hidetoshi. Kinsei Ajia no Nihon to Chōsen hantō, Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1993. p.180.} The administrators involved with the Korean affairs in the bakufu, other domains, and even the Tsushima officials were often deficient in dealing with negotiations with the Korean officials because they lacked such knowledge.
Hōshū’s strongest wish was Tsushima’s long-lasting prosperity by means of Korean diplomacy. In order to continue this, all the officials who were involved into the Korean issues needed to recognize the difficulties in order to find a better solution for Tsushima. It was indeed a tough challenge for the Tsushima officials who negotiated with the foreigners. Hōshū encouraged them that Tsushima was the sole domain that could manage the Korean affairs. No other domains could challenge the small island as long as the officials maintained their understanding of Korean diplomacy. In this regard, Hōshū left a note to the Tsushima officials as follows:

Sincerity defines the mutual respect without ruining actual profit [with Korea.] And sincerity comes from the attitude of not deceiving and not excessively fighting. Veracity carries sincerity.47

Hōshū’s message was to respect Chosŏn Korea, and this is what the people in the island should never forget- sincerity to the Koreans. In another meaning of ‘sincerity’ in his note, Tsushima should not entirely rely on preferential privilege by Chosŏn Korea. From his perspective, too much dependence on Korea’s indulgence over the island did not bear true impartiality. If the practice was difficult to alter immediately, the island domain at least ought to keep the ‘sincere manner’ not downgrading the merits between the island domain and Chosŏn Korea.48 Through his experiences in dealing with a number of the Korean affairs, although he sometimes stumbled upon difficulties, showing the Koreans his sincere stance frequently made it possible to come across a solution. The processes of finding a way in the complicated circumstances were the most needed performance for Tsushima officials. What Hōshū wanted was to send them his unyielding principle as an experienced diplomat.

47 Amenomori, “Kōrin teisei.” Amenomori Hōshū zensho., p.82.
In Hōshū’s other essay entitled *Tawaregusa* (1732), or the Countless Chatting, written at the age of sixty-five, he described his own interpretations of what the ‘culture’ was. For those Neo-Confucian scholars, China seemed an ideal place full of philosophical materials and documents. Thus, the scholars of Hōshū’s generation tended to consider China as the highly civilized state and the sole country of the sages. A noticeable scholar in Chinese studies in his time, Ogyū Sorai (1666-1728) was an enthusiastic advocate of interpreting the Neo-Confucian doctrine based upon the ancient Chinese studies.

While the Chinese-oriented scholars vigorously pursued their principles, Hōshū had a different perspective. No ethnic groups or any cultures should be considered as superior or inferior. By giving an existing example of commercial relationship in East Asia, the central civilization and the barbarian states were undoubtedly interdependent partners by the trade. Even if China were the center, the middle kingdom could not exist without the outlying states, either. He also pointed out that it was absurd thinking that China was always the best in every way, and other countries were inferior. 

His attempt here was not to construct stereotypes but to see things accurately:

[On the distinctions of] whether the country is respectful or barbaric, it depends on the number of the admirable characters, and the quality of moral customs. If born in China, [one] should not be proud; if born in barbarian states, [one] should not be ashamed.

No better or poorer cultures existed in the world, and each culture had distinctiveness that was neither more honourable nor less. The distinctions, which were different from the Chinese value, were not a cause of indignity, as their presences could be seen far back in the formation

50 ibid., pp.46-47.
of China, and the outlying states also possessed their own cultures. Hōshū’s perspective in looking at a thing without bias emphasized that only one standard cannot measure every matter, and nothing is eternal. Though China currently influenced East Asia, no one was sure if the state would continue dominant.

Hōshū’s visions were also directed to the relationship with Chosŏn Korea. As one of his detailed observations indicated, the Koreans tended to behave in a silent and subservient manner. From their point of view, arguments or comments on a trivial matter seemed unnecessary. In other words, the Koreans knew how to endure while things did not proceed as they wished, as complaints did not help. During the journey to Edo, Hōshū indeed saw that several times the Japanese impeded the Korean’s departure. The Japanese were often the cause of the delay, needing to wash their hands, wear the underwear, and carry the small swords, wallets, and pillboxes. Though the inconsequential behaviours delayed the departures significantly, the Koreans, including the chief ambassador, did not criticize the Japanese manner.

The Japanese saw such Koreans’ deeds as blunt and unsophisticated. By experiencing their submissiveness during the journey, the Japanese often regarded them as nuruki mono, or dull ones. Hōshū criticized making the Koreans a laughingstock. His analysis suggested that their behaviour probably came from the aftereffects of Hideyoshi’s invasion. A degree of cautiousness against the Japanese made them circumvent and evade the minor troubles that may have led to major issues. He emphasized the Korean discreetness as: “…Not saying so many words probably comes from the depth of the consideration in thinking of the

52 ibid., p.82.
consequences before and after. For that reason [of their calmness], do not treat them as dull.”

In contrast to the Koreans’ decent manner, Hōshū’s descriptions of the Japanese were critical. On the reception, a Japanese official asked the Korean official what kind of plants the Korean king raised in the garden. The Korean answered that the king cultivated only wheat. In response to this, the Japanese official laughed and said “Well, [Korea is really] a low-graded state (sate sate gekoku ni sōrō).” The Japanese wondered why he planted the wheat that did not look colourful and fabulous in the garden. From the Japanese view, planting the wheat was not appropriate as the king’s act.

By providing this conversation with an instance of misunderstandings between the two cultures, Hōshū remarked that the Korean official thought the Japanese would be impressed by the Korean king, since his taking thought for farming was regarded as an honourable virtue in a true monarch. The wheat was a representation of agriculture, and planting it also reminded him the farmers who cultivated the homeland. The Japanese official, without knowing the tradition, sneered at the Korean official. Hōshū cautioned that the lack of knowledge on Chosŏn Korea could cause mutual disappointments. If one knew such differences in advance, the frustrations would ease and the laughter would cease. More importantly, what he urged was that the Japanese must respect their customs.

As a result of the cultural difference, Hōshū indicated that the ‘unusual’ manners that the Japanese themselves took for granted brought gibes from the Koran side as well. While marching, the Japanese attendants usually rolled the *kimono* up to their waist, and their

---

53 ibid., p.83.
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55 ibid., p.59.
backsides were sometimes naked. The bottoms of the *kimono* were too long, and the shortened bottoms allowed them to keep in step with the others and move fast. In the eyes of the Japanese, their brave and powerful performance of marching would impress the Koreans. But from the Korean perspective, showing backsides was disgraceful behaviour. Hōshū’s portrayal on different perspectives was to describe that what the Japanese saw as customary often became the unusual conduct for the Koreans.

Hōshū continued that everyone claims the home country as good, but the Japanese habitually tend to boast of their own homeland. In contrast to the Japanese, the Koreans were humble and did not exaggeratedly honour their country. In so doing, they tried to avoid further debates or quarrels from the incautious words and trifling subjects with the Japanese counterpart. For instance, the Japanese official proudly asserted that the *sake*, the Japanese alcoholic drink, was the best in the world. Accordingly, the Korean interpreter agreed saying, *naruhodo sayō ni zonji sōrō*, or ‘I surely agree with you.’ The Japanese was satisfied with the concurrence of the Korean official, and received his word as it was. But the Japanese official did not see that the Korean was actually appalled. Hōshū stressed that the *sake* was suitable for the Japanese mouths, the Koreans favoured the Korean drink, the Chinese appreciated their alcohols, and the Dutch adored their liquors. Hōshū’s detailed examples showed that the Japanese had a naïve sense of pride and this attitude led them to lack respect for different cultures resulting in ultimate prejudice.

Hōshū’s biggest advantage was that he never saw Chosŏn Korea in an exclusively
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favourable light. His attempts were to look at the country as it was without bias, and to advise mutual understanding. The consciousness he possessed did not arise all at once. His perceptions grew keener and more insightful by his repeated encounters with the Koreans. His other essay, “Chōsen fūzokukō” in 1720, gave details on his outlook on Korean culture. The written piece was provided for Hayashi Nobuatsu (1644-1732), who served the fourth to eighth Tokugawa shoguns as a Neo-Confucian advisor, and requested Hōshū to summarize the history of the Chosŏn court and culture. Hōshū’s beliefs about Chosŏn Korea given to Nobuatsu are as follows:

[From the Japanese eyes,] Korea is seen as the country of the proprieties or country of powerlessness [by the Japanese.] Both notions are unreasonable as stated. [But] there are no countries without the proprieties or courteousness in the world… Korea is not the one and only country excelled in proprieties. The reason why Korea was said to be a country of the proprieties was that the country has long kept tribute to China, and especially in the Ming era, Korea continued to pay an honour [to the Ming court,] therefore, China complimented Korea [as a country of proprieties.] Regardless of the social status, Korea adopts the Confucian manner on ceremonial occasions, favours studies and literature. In this aspect [in seeing them important,] Korea surpasses other countries. Nevertheless, it does not mean that the customs and values [in Korea] are more outstanding than other countries. As for [pointing out Korea as] the country of powerlessness, rumor has it that a number of the Koreans were murdered in the taikō Toyotomi’s time of attacking Korea. However, at that time [of the Japanese invasions,] Korea was enjoying the blessings of peace without warfare. [The Japanese] aggression was successful due to our country’s abrupt invasive acts [over Korea], because under the
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58 Hōshū wrote China as chūgoku in his manuscript.
59 Taikō is a title indicating a retired kampaku who handed over the position to the heir. A position of kampaku was originally an adjunct of the emperor in charge of political decisions.
disturbance [in the civil war period,] the military leaders were accustomed to fighting. [Korea was] once defeated by battles [against Japan] as [Japan was] overrunning as far as the uninhabited boundary, but the number of the Japanese and Korean fallen soldiers and casualties was almost the same [in the end of the war.] On the return to Japan [after the war,] the Japanese [soldiers] also had a difficult time [facing the resistance of the Koreans.]

Hōshū’s observation to look at Chosŏn Korea as well as China was discerning. Although he kept insisting on acquiring more understanding of the Koreans and Korean culture to deal with the Koreans, his arguments were not overly biased toward them. His perception on Chosŏn Korea seemed to point Nobuatsu to the truth, but advised him that the nature of Korean culture was not the very best in the world.

As Hōshū previously argued, China was not always placed in the center of the world. Every different culture should respected, yet thoughts and views of what was the most valuable culture might lead to misunderstandings as well. The Culture in each country was appropriately shaped in accordance with the historical background and geographical setting, so there could not be a distinction between superior or inferior. His manner of reasoning derives from the ‘reasons (J. ri) for nature;’ Hōshū’s principle of understanding diverse cultures, based on the Neo-Confucian discipline that everything exists in the world by reason.

Amenomori Hōshū was disciplined to take an unambiguous stance in Korean diplomacy; sincerity played a key role in his long career as a Tsushima official in dealing with the numerous Korean issues. As mentioned, Hōshū did not conciliate the Korean officials when

---

handling the diplomatic and commercial issues. He did exactly what he aimed - to protect the rights of the Tsushima domain. In this sense, his discipline was very solid; he meticulously elaborated to raise the younger personnel who carried out the Korean issues even after his retirement. To raise the efficient officials who were able to deal with Korean diplomacy, understanding the Korean culture was crucial to evade bias or misapprehension on the counterparts.

To keep the Korean affairs right on the track, his elaborations were made for the 1719 embassy. After the visitation of the 1711 embassy, which was dispatched under the unusual circumstance of ‘restoration of the proper title to the Tokugawa shogun’ by Arai Hakuseki, the Tokugawa bakufu again stood in an awkward position in Korean diplomacy. How could the bakufu manage the difficult situation? As Hōshū constantly indicated in his written works, expressing a manner of sincerity to the Korean counterpart could be an answer. The shogun’s title taikun was restored in the sovereign’s message after the 1711 embassy, and Hōshū again attended the journey of the 1719 Korean embassy from Tsushima, and it became his last trip with the Koreans to Edo. Hōshū’s presence impressed the embassy once again, and his dialogues with one of the ambassadorial members, Shin Yuhan, the chief diarist of the 1719 embassy, provided an exceptional record of their exchange of candid opinions on their historical facts and cultures.
Chapter Six
Shin Yuhan’s “Haeyurok”: the 1719 Korean Embassy

Shin Yuhan’s travelogue
The record of the 1719 Korean embassy, “Haeyurok,” or the “Record of Oceanic Journey,” was written by the Korean official Shin Yuhan, a chief diarist of the 1719 embassy. While he was serving as a secretary in the kyosogwan, or Office of the Editorial Review, and as an official at the Pongsansa, a temple charged with conducting religious ceremonies and recording posthumous names, he was selected to be official diarist. Shin’s record “Haeyurok” enables us to examine the perception of the Koreans towards their Japanese counterparts by illustrating the Japanese political environment and culture in the early eighteenth century. This record has long attracted the attention of scholars of the early modern Japanese-Korean relations for its detailed descriptions and comparisons of the two states. Shin’s rigid visions and thoughts of Japan were solely based on his subjective response which obviously included a bias against the foreign country and culture. However, his observations were well incorporated into historical events and conditions such as the Japanese political environment, the imperial court, and a detailed geography of Japan.

Shin’s critical insights on Japan also became a useful resource for the Choson court to investigate Japan’s political stability under the Tokugawa regime. From his point of view, the Tokugawa foundation seemed to be stable enough, yet he saw the numerous particularities of Japanese culture that were different from his conventional values. He often mentioned the political environment as well as perceiving innumerable points on Japanese culture and life,

though his thoughts on foreignness repeatedly contained a certain bias. In this sense, his perspective often lost the objectivity and tolerance for the other culture. Nevertheless, he shared much time with the Japanese officials, scholars, and local people who somewhat enlightened and softened his rigid visions.

**Background of the 1719 embassy**

Tokugawa Yoshimune ascended as the eighth shogun of the Tokugawa bakufu in 1716, and restored the protocol of Korean diplomacy to the precedents of the sixteenth century. Arai Hakuseki’s reform in diplomatic practice met denial from the new man of power, who attempted to model the structure of the bakufu on the first shogun Tokugawa Ieyasu’s age. Yoshimune abolished the title of kokuō from the sovereign’s message to the Chosŏn court, and the title was no longer in use throughout the Tokugawa period. The title of the sovereign’s letter returned to the ‘Great Prince of Japan,’ or Nihonkoku taikun. In accordance with the restoration of the preceding diplomatic protocol, the Chosŏn court accepted it with relief, though some of the court officials held rather dishonest sentiments toward the Japanese dating back to the Japanese invasions of Chosŏn Korea. The visitation of the 1719 embassy was carried out to reconsolidate the neighbourly relations between Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea, while the Koreans’ distrust of Japan may have been heightened once again by the reform of Hakuseki.

Tokugawa Yoshimune and his political authorities shared the same aim in Korean diplomacy. Displaying a sincere attitude toward Chosŏn Korea was their crucial task. Reengagement of diplomatic relations under the 1609 Kiyū Agreement was achieved after the numerous painstaking efforts of the Japanese side, and the bakufu was not ignorant of the

---

2 The diplomatic protocol of the 1719 embassy was modeled after the 1682 embassy.
impossibility of eliminating the distrust all at once. Maintaining the neighbourly relations with Chosŏn Korea had been the most urgent task since the establishment of the bakufu. More importantly, losing the relationship with Chosŏn Korea meant that Japan would forfeit its self-legitimatization as the ‘center of the world.’ Legitimatizing the existence of the bakufu to the domestic society was one of the most significant befits Tokugawa Japan sought from the relationship with Chosŏn Korea. Returning the diplomatic practice was an effort of the bakufu in order to avoid further difficulties. In this historical context, the 1719 embassy was placed as one of the most crucial delegations among the twelve Korean missions in the Tokugawa period, whether or not Japan was able to fully compensate for the disturbance and distrust in 1711.

In this initial stage of Yoshimune’s reign as shogun, the dispatch of the 1719 embassy was put into effect under a relatively peaceful atmosphere. At that moment, the Tokugawa regime still appeared authoritative, and the successive shogun’s inheritance from the Tokugawa house was more consolidated. After about seven shogunal generations from the time of Ieyasu, the dominance of social and political stability was promised under the Tokugawa regime, and in these circumstances, the bakufu rejoiced in economic prosperity that provided further cultural developments. By seeing the dominant power of the new eighth shogun, the Korean embassy also saw the Tokugawa polity’s influential and stable authority.

Besides those historical conditions, the 1719 embassy was made more illustrious by the presence of the two individuals, Amenomori Hōshū and his Korean counterpart, Shin Yuhan, an able thirty-eight year old chief diarist. As an efficient Tshushima diplomat, Hōshū received much attention over his dispute with Hakuseki in 1711 about pursuing neighbourly relations with Chosŏn Korea. The other character, Shin, was the court official from Chosŏn Korea, who was a consistent advocator of the social traditions and values of his country. Shin’s
evaluations of Japanese culture were keen and critical, but he revealed his candid sentiments and the conversations with Hōshū during the journey. Their dialogues sometimes contained some tension, but through the exchange of straightforward opinions, they certainly achieved a positive companionship.

**Selection of the 1719 ambassadorial members**

The Chosŏn court appointed the three ambassadors after the court received a request for the dispatch of the embassy from the Tokugawa bakufu. First of all, the chief ambassador was selected from among the third ministers (K: *chamūi*) of the court officials. Consecutively, the two other ambassadors, the vice ambassador and the overseer, were chosen from the high-ranking and promising officials. Following the selections of the three ambassadors, the other attendants were called to organize the ambassadorial mission. About twenty interpreters were singled out to attend the three ambassadors: three upper-level interpreters who passed the government language examination[^3] to serve the ambassadors, and the other interpreters who worked at the *waegwan* (J: *wakan*) in Ch’oryang.

In the 1719 embassy, Hong Chijung was named as chief ambassador, and the vice ambassador Hwang Hyŏp (1682-1728) and the overseer Yi Myŏng’ŏn were appointed among the political administrators. Hong was the third minister of the Board of Taxation (K: *Hojo*). The vice ambassador Hwang served as the First Tutor (K: *podŏk*: junior third grade) of the Crown Prince Tutorial Office (K: *Seja singanwŏn*), and the overseer Yi was the Section Chief (K: *chŏngnang*: senior fifth grade) of the Board of War (K: *Pyŏgio*). In particular, chief ambassador Hong’s career was the most outstanding among other officials in the 1719 embassy.

[^3]: The language examinations of Chinese, Japanese, Mongolian, and Manchurian were exercised by the Chosŏn court.
He was later promoted to the Third State Councillor (우정: senior first grade) of the State Council (K: 우정부) in 1726, later became the second state councillor (청우정: senior first grade), and finally became the top ranking official, the Chief State Councillor (K: 영우정) in 1729. Hong received the most promising position of the Chosŏn court after his duty in Japan.

The role of the chief diarist was to draft the travelogue and to exchange literary works with the Japanese. The position was designated as a temporary government post. In the process of selection, the three ambassadors’ recommendations had a substantial influence. In other words, the ambassadors could be involved in the direct selection to pick the official for the post. Some of the diarists were buried despite their talents, as their social status as illegitimate sons made them unable to serve the central government despite their achievements in passing the examination. The ambassadors had a free hand to fulfill the position of the diarists, and the Chosŏn court may have provided such ‘misfortunate’ talented literati with an opportunity to present their literary ability as members of the embassy.

Along with the chief diarist, the first, second, and third diarists were also named by the ambassadors. Their roles were closely attached to the three ambassadors, and they were appointed from among the literate talents of the chinsa, who passed an initial civil service examination. The military officers were designated as well, and they were frequently chosen from the relatives of the ambassadors. After the embassy’s departure from Hansŏng, the journey of the diplomatic party would last between six months to almost a year long. If the ambassadors sought a harmonious atmosphere within the members during this long-term travel

---

4 Shin Yuhan was said to be an illegitimate son who could not be recognized in the family tree. According to James B. Lewis’ detailed account of Shin, “His mother was a female companion and her children were technically barred from the civil service examinations, but Shin received special dispensation.” (quoted from Lewis, James B. “Eighteenth-century Korean and Japanese images of each other: A look at Shin Yu-Han and Amenomori Hōshū.” p.90.)
in a foreign country, they would have favoured the people well used to each other’s ways, rather than strangers.

The 1719 embassy, numbering 492, was one of the biggest delegations among the twelve embassies in the Tokugawa period. Right after the Hakuseki’s reform and restoration of sovereign’s title as the Great Prince, the bakufu’s treatment of the embassy was a certain measure of how Japan thought of its neighbouring state. In addition, Chosŏn Korea’s investigation of the newly reigning shogun was an essential mission for the embassy, to ascertain whether or not he thought about the reinvasion of the Korean peninsula. Analyzing Japan’s political situation meant a great deal for the Chosŏn court; as long as the Tokugawa house that made genial gestures to the court retained political dominance, no aggressive act would be expected.

The caution of the court unveiled the other side of the neighbourly friendship. One of the most central purposes of their trip to Japan was to look into the stability of the Tokugawa regime. Otherwise, the Koreans needed to take immediate procedures to prepare for its military defence in case of Japan’s offensive action. In addition, another different aim for the Korean embassy was to discuss the commercial issues between the Chosŏn court and Tsushima. Thus, the Koreans were undoubtedly willing to maintain the friendly relations with Tokugawa Japan. Although the aim was to retain the neighbourly relations, Chosŏn Korea’s kyorin policy was exercised under ‘keeping neighbourly relations with vigilance,’ though the alarm of the Korean side towards the Japanese seemed to be relieved as time went on.

Before the departure to Japan, Shin Yuhan attempted to familiarize himself with his duty, and was advised what he would do in Japan. At the end of the third month in 1719, Shin went to Hansŏng to greet the three ambassadors- his superiors. At that time, he also met the
Chosŏn court literati Chŏe Ch’angtae who advised Shin to hold himself in readiness for the literary exchange with the Japanese:

…I assume that the State of East is vast, and landscape is graceful. And people with high aptitude and a connoisseur of literature surely exist [even in the barbarian country] although some people [who excelled in the literary competence] cannot attend the exchange session. They will be critical when seeing your works. You should not be disdainful. Do not think, and so despise them, that the pine or oak trees do not grow in the low mountains. You need to write thousands of literary pieces like thunderstorms and impress many Japanese literati.

Chŏe also cautioned Shin not to show too much conceit in his literary ability in front of the Japanese, as some of them surely understood how to write poems and evaluate the written pieces of the Koreans. Also, Chŏe’s instruction provided Shin with a solid determination to carry out his duty- to deepen the neighbourly relations with the Japan through the literary interactions.

The 1719 embassy’s journey of Japan

The 1719 Korean embassy departed Pusan in the early morning of the twentieth day of the sixth month, and arrived in Tsushima on the same day before the sunset. The Arrival in Tsushima was Shin’s first experience ever to land a foreign country. In the beginning, Shin depicted his first sight of the island in a somewhat critical and biased way. In his travelogue, Tsushima’s customs were recorded as follows:

---

5 Japan was often described as tōi (the eastern barbarian) in Korean records, but Shin told Hōshū as the ‘State of East.’ (tōgoku)
7 The date is equivalent to August 5 (1719) in Gregorian calendar.
...[L]ie and lightheartedness exist in their customs, and deceit is a value. In other words, if they found profits, they run to the land of death [to persuade them], like hungry eagles. [The nature of the people is not decent, as] the land is unsuitable to farming, and no plants are grown [there.] No arable land on the mountains, no footpaths in the field or the residents... Bureaucrats and commoners do not know how to read and write, but those upper and lower classes take the profit [of trade.] No morals indeed.  

Shin recalled the time of the Japanese invasions of Chosŏn Korea. Although the island once engaged in close relations with Chosŏn Korea, people here participated in the invasions at that time. Tsushima’s betrayal to support the blood-spattered battle under Toyotomi Hideyoshi would certainly have provided him with a reason to detest Tsushima.

Upon the embassy’s arrival in Tsushima on the twenty eighth day of the sixth month, Shin at last met Hōshū, an official of the Tsushima domain. He already knew Hōshū’s noteworthiness as an efficient diplomat. He could have been curious about Hōshū and may have obtained one of Hōshū’s publications:

[Shin asked:] Your name is also well-known [in Korea.] How many publications have you had so far?
Amenomori was surprised and humble to say:
[Amenomori:] My ability did not reach others [who are well acquainted with Chinese poems,] when I was young. And I have already attained the old age. How could I answer your question [at this moment]?
... When I looked on him [Amenomori], his face is pale. Silent, and never presenting his mind. He has no magnanimity as the literati have. [His age is] fifty two, and his hair has turned to greyish.

---

8 Shin, “Haeyunok.” August 12 (1719), or the twenty-seventh day of the sixth month, pp.35-36.
9 ibid., August 13, or the twenty eighth day of the sixth month, p.40.
10 ibid., August 13, or the twenty eighth day of the sixth month, p.40.
11 ibid., p.41.
Shin’s first impression of Hōshū was neither necessarily friendly nor exaggeratedly full of positive emotions. Hōshū seemed to hesitate to answer Shin about the number of his own literary publications, though he actually left several articles on the Korean issues, particularly on his comments over Hakuseki’s diplomatic reform in 1711.

Shin and Hōshū faced a conflict soon after their first encounter. The next day, Shin was invited to the private reception hosted by Sō Yoshinobu, (1692-1730), the daimyo of Tsushima. The gathering was especially arranged for the chief and assistant diarists in the embassy to exchange the Chinese poems with the local scholars in Tsushima. In the reception, however, Shin refused to bow to Yoshinobu while he was standing, thus claiming his position and Yoshinobu’s place as the equivalent hierarchal ranking. Shin’s refusal caused the first argument between himself and Hōshū:

When finishing the meal, a person with a red cloth came and said that the lord is coming. My fellows attempted to stand, but I told them with dignity, “I kindly ask you to sit down.”

Amenomori said “What do you say that?” after hearing my word. I answered him, “Would you like me to proceed [to the lord] and greet [him], and the lord answers the salutation sitting?” He said “It is the diplomatic protocol.”

I was furious and said “No. The island is one of the provinces in our country. The lord receives a seal [from the king of the Chosŏn court for permission of trade], eats our rice products, and pleads for the big and small lives [to survive.] That is the righteousness of the local governors in our country.12 The second minister in the Board of Rites and the minister of Tongnae13 correspond in documents on an equal basis, as their standings [in the social rankings] are equivalent. In the law of our country, when the administrative officers of the central government were out of Hansŏng to visit outside areas for the state issues, no matter how [his

12 ibid., pp.44-45.
13 Tongnae was a division in charge of supervising the waegwan (J. wakan).
ranking is] high or low, he sits together and talk with the local governors. I am, at this moment, placed in suchan [of the sixth counsellor] at Hongmungwan [Office of the Special Counsellors.] Although I am a follower of the ambassadors, I have discretion in seeing the lord… If [you still insist that] I bow to the lord of Tsushima as taking precedence, it means that the lord loses status as a vassalage [of the Chosôn court.]¹⁴

A Korean interpreter was afraid to translate what Shin said right by the Tsushima daimyo. It was obvious for the interpreter that Shin’s language would have caused further disturbance between the officials of the two states. Nevertheless, Shin pressed the interpreter to translate his own words: “The moment is critical. This is a critical instance for our court. Translate my word well and [tell them] not to disgrace the court.”¹⁵ Among the Tsushima attendants, only Hōshū understood Shin’s language, and told him:

I also belong to the lord [of Tsushima] and there is vassal-retainer’s chivalrous relation. The propriety cannot be altered despite your assertion. It has been protocol since our diplomatic engagement of the two countries. In case you are willing to demolish this, you mean to disregard us. I [Shin] said: the proprieties are born from respect, and abolished by smugness. I am not despising your country. You are despising our state.¹⁶

After this, Yoshinobu left the reception. Hōshū and other Tsushima officials glared fiercely at Shin who caused the problem. Shin stated on Yoshinobu as follows:

His [Yoshinobu’s] eyes contain no brilliance, idly sitting and placed in the position [of the lord of Tsushima], but [attempting to] let me bow in asking my writings and poetries. Suppose if my writing pieces were worth praising, the lord would receive respect and compare the reverence with

¹⁴ Shin, “Haeyurok.” August 15 (1719), or the thirtieth day of the sixth month, pp.45-46.
¹⁵ ibid., p.46.
¹⁶ ibid., pp.46-47.
the king. And he would be a favourite of the Japanese officials as our court administrator [by having the works.] Consequently, my shame and spitefulness would reach to the court. Do you mean to sell my writings for a bundle of silver gold?\textsuperscript{17}

From Shin’s perspective, Sō Yoshinobu did not deserve the daimyo in the island. He did not even provide his own written works to Yoshinobu, for the daimyo did not seem to understand literature.\textsuperscript{18} Shin was proud of being a member of the literati, but his immovable spirit sometimes created some degree of minor complication between the Japanese officials and Shin himself. As a matter of fact, he kept refusing gifts from the Tsushima officials that were part of diplomatic protocol between Tsushima and the embassy, calling them ‘inessential items.’\textsuperscript{19} From his subsequent behaviour, this steadiness in his personality can be habitually seen through the journey.

Tribute to the Chosŏn court had been Tsushima’s long-term ‘nominal’ practice, though the island was part of the bakufu domains. As seen in chapter two, when the envoy of the Korean king came to the wakan to attend periodical ceremonies and receptions, the Japanese officials bowed to the Korean with a certain manner by engaging in ‘tributary relations’ with the Chosŏn court. In return for the worship of the foreign king and acceptance of the Korean manner, the island was able to receive enormous commercial benefits and agricultural products to supply food for the people in the island.

The Tsushima officials learned how to survive in the relation with Chosŏn Korea. They had to accept the Korean customs in order to go through their diplomatic issues without troubles, but the efforts seemed to put them under heavier pressure. The bakufu exclusively

\textsuperscript{17} ibid., August 15, or the thirtieth day of the sixth month, p.48.  
\textsuperscript{18} ibid., p.48.  
\textsuperscript{19} ibid., p.53.
provided the island with its entire business in Korean diplomacy and commercial trade. However, in exchange for the lucrative benefits, Tsushima often encountered obstacles while negotiating with the Korean counterpart. Shin’s refusal to bow to Sō Yoshinobu, the daimyo of Tsushima, was typical of innumerable such matters. The Tsushima officials were necessary to deal with such claims from the Korean side. The Tsushima domain was able to link the two different polities, the Tokugawa bakufu and the Chosŏn court, and the two different leaders, the Tokugawa shogun and the Korean king.²⁰ Tsushima functioned as a shock absorber between the two governments and acted as a crucial device to create accord between the two different cultures at the same time.

Although Shin seemed to be placed in the center of a conflict at the reception, he was not always involved in annoyances with the Japanese counterpart. His positive perspective on the Japanese culture sometimes appeared. In particular, he admired the beauty of nature in Tsushima; ivory chrysanthemums, orchids as well as purple flowers of paulownia that were given to decorate his lodge became his favourite plants.²¹ Shin was also astonished by the craftsmanship of the Japanese artisans, and impressed with the perfection of artificial flowers, that imitated the Japanese apricots, peonies, and chrysanthemums. From those flowers, he stated “[Japan’s value of] reverence of skilfulness exists here [on the flowers.].”²²

In addition, Shin had a private opportunity to meet Hōshū’s three sons, rather than the Japanese officials. Hōshū’s youngest son Gennojō seemed Shin’s favourite among them, and found potential aptitude as a scholar in him. Shin wrote on Gennojō in his record; “He is personable, and reads well. He deserves taking up his father’s duty [in the future]. I smiled at him [Hōshū] and said “Your family has delightfulfulness and fortune. This is indeed the precious

²¹ Shin, “Haeyurok.” August 18 (1719), or the third day of the seventh month, p.54.
²² ibid., p.54.
gold.” I gave comments on all of his sons’ writings." Though the two officials sometimes argued for their own sake in the diplomatic front line, their relations seemed to be maintained without hostility or anger. Diplomacy cannot be constituted by impatience, for consistency and endurance were necessary to negotiate. Conflicts could have occasionally or frequently happened during the travel, but more efforts to remedy the difficulties were a key to associating with a different culture.

When the embassy arrived in the Iki island, Shin had a conversation with Matsuura Kashō, another important figure of the Tsushima diplomacy at this time. Kashō did not understand the Korean language, and the two officials enjoyed their conversation through writing. In their exchange, Shin asked Kashō about Hakuseki. He seemed curious about Hakuseki who enjoyed conversations with the previous embassy in 1711, and the former chief ambassador Cho T’aeŏk greatly praised his literary competence:

[I asked Matsuura:] You must be a scholar Kashō. I have already known your name for a longer period. We have not had a chance to talk to each other since the departure from Pusan by putting up the sail, going across the ocean, and staying in Tsushima a while. Isn’t it too late that you have finally come up to me at this moment?

Matsuura did not comprehend the Korean language, and Amenomori translated [what I said.] Matsuura seemed embarrassed and said: I did not imagine that you have acknowledged me. I have been ill, and my legs could not move any farther to walk. The wound still exists on the surface of the skin and has not healed yet, but I come here for affaires of state. We exchanged the poetries and had conversation by writing.

I said: I wonder how Hakuseki kō is.

Matsuura said: How do you know about him [Hakuseki]?

I said: P’yōngchŏn in the 1711 embassy brought back his Shisŏ and

---

23 ibid., p.54.
24 P’yōngchŏn was the 1711 chief ambassador Cho T’acŏk’s pseudonym.
showed it to me and praised his ability in writing. Matsuura looked at Amenomori and said: I appreciate his [Cho’s] considerations.

And asked me again: How do you evaluate his [Hakuseki’s] works? I said: Striking and merry. And has the Chinese atmosphere. Matsuura put his hand on his head and apologized, and said: [I used to study] under Master Kinoshita, and we [Hakuseki and Matsuura] were friends in the same school each other. I am really grateful for your acclamation of him. It is truly gracious, gracious [katajikenai, katajikenai.] Unfortunately, he left political affairs, and I have heard nothing from him since his retirement. Even if you reach Edo, you may not be able to see him.

After our conversation, [I] took purple liquor and drank by adding honey [into the liquor.] Matsuura likes drinking, but stops after two glasses, and said: “the Korean spirits taste so strong that I cannot have anymore.” [Age of] Matsuura is about forty, and [his height is] short. Energetic and full of talent, his verses are excellently composed and very striking.25

In the conversation, Shin might have expected to see Hakuseki in Edo and attempted to exchange conversation with him. Shin also mentioned Kinoshita Jun’an:

The deceased Minamoto no Ienobu, who had little knowledge in literature, reigned as the [sixth] shogun. He used to study with Minamoto kō [Hakuseki] as his private mentor, and [in relation to this,] he selected Minamoto kō for an exceptional position [as an advisor of the shogun.] Minamoto kō was so bright that he understood the Chinese language well. His verses were extraordinary and later published as Hakuseki shū in public. His master Kinoshita Jun’an was also a well-known scholar with extensive knowledge. Those Confucian scholars were appointed as the governmental officials, and their works frequently became an object of admiration [in the Japanese society].26

25 Shin, “Haeyurok.” September 3 (1719), or the nineteenth day of the seventh month, pp.63-64.
26 ibid., p.305.
Shin Yuhan positively admitted that the scholars who accomplished the Neo-Confucian studies were often revered in society. However, Shin evaluated the sixth shogun Tokugawa Ienobu in a partly negative way. He saw Hakuseki in two ways, as a scholar with literary ability and as an egocentric politician.

Did the passions of the Japanese who eagerly wanted the Koreans’ writings disturb Shin? The strong enthusiasm of the Japanese for literary learning even among the commoners might have suggested they had the potential to catch up with the literary competence of the Koreans, and even excel them in the future. The Korean ambassadorial members, including Shin himself, viewed the Japanese proficiency in literature as still under development. If the Koreans had promptly understood the necessities to learn something from Japan through the exchanges, their strong sense of supremacy over Japan might have been altered, and they might not have treated the Japanese as the *waein*, the eastern barbarians. Were there any different perspectives in seeing the Japanese as worthy of respect? If so, the Koreans’ attitudes might have been positive. Their traditional perspective on Japan seemed unchanged as time went by, and there was no attempt to view Japan as an equal partner. In the early eighteenth century, the Korean officials seemed far from regarding the Japanese as their scholastic rival or as a threat against Chosŏn Korea.

The long journey had just begun. In the Iki island, Shin was excused from a literary exchange with the local literati as he was temporarily suffering from haemorrhoids— an adversity that left him unruffled.27 After that Shin boarded the ship that brought him and the embassy to Ainoshima. Since the departure of Tsushima, the embassy had traveled across the provinces, and in all the locations, they were welcomed by the local daimyos and invited to the

27 *ibid.*, pp.64-65.
fabulous receptions. In Ainoshima, Shin was amazed by the meal supplied from the local
domain. In his diary, about three hundred chickens, two thousand eggs, and other food were
arranged for the meals of the Koreans. Shin depicted his own thought as: “Every meal was
provided by the local domains, not taken from neighbouring farmers. Expenditure [of the
government for us] must be very costly, and [from those supplies] shows abundance of
[Japan’s] wealth.”

Before leaving Iki, the embassy directly went to Fukuoka but did not stop
in Nagasaki, which Shin saw was a wealthy city, where an active trade with the Chinese took
place. He felt regretful at being unable to look at the place. “Nagasaki is where the Chinese
trade ships anchor, and the name with splendour, is recognized as the most famous place [for
commercial traffic]. It is unfortunate that the direction is out of the route [to Edo,] so that I
cannot visit.”

Shin was especially enchanted by the scenery of western Japan where mountainous
go geography and the sea coast can be seen together. Among those locations, the Korean members
of the embassy praised Tomonoura (currently Fukuyama city near Hiroshima city), as ‘Japan’s
most picturesque site.’ Shin also described the place “as if a mountain wizard is living
nearby.”

Tomonoura belongs to the province of Bingo, and our temple lodge is
called the Fukuzen temple [Fukuzenji]. The place is located beneath of
the mountains in the coast. The building is wide, and folding screens are
luxuriously created. It takes about six to seven ri from the mouth of a

---

28. ibid, pp.71-72. Shin’s thought on the meal provided by the local governments, however, was not fully
correct. The burdens of the expenses actually pressed on the local farmers. They needed to present horses,
food, and themselves as manpower to enable the march of the embassy to proceed smoothly.
30. ibid., p.100.
31. Fukuzenji was established around 950 and affiliated with the Shingon Buddhism. The temple is currently
appointed as the National Historic Property of Japan.
32. Distance of one ri differs in Korea and Japan. Korean one ri is about four hundred meters, and Japanese is
bay to the lodge. There are mats on the paths that are dustless. The poles every five steps are planted on the left and right sidewalk with big lanterns on them. Seemed [as bright as] noon though it was evening… The coastal area is mountainous and the bay is surrounded by the mountains facing the ocean. The place where the root of the mountain is soaked by the sea looks like a steep embankment. Several kinds of trees such as pine, cedar, and citrus trees have grown in abundance, and their appearances reflect on the surface of the water. When every man reaches here, he would say that here is the best scenic place among all other locations. 

The view of Tomonoura seemed to strike every Korean. The previous and following embassies of the 1719 party also mentioned the beautiful scenery and called it “Japan’s most beautiful landscape.” The Tomonoura bay is facing the Inland Sea, or Setonaikai, with a mild climate all year around. Shin as well as other members of the embassies in different periods may have been delighted with the harmony of the warm weather and the landscape with ocean and mountains that they seemed to be unable to enjoy in their home country.

The course of the trip to Edo showed the Tokugawa bakufu’s tactics. Arano Yasunori analyzes the route of the embassy to Edo as being carefully scrutinized by the bakufu, particularly to please the Koreans with the picturesque landscapes. The bakufu’s intention to impress the Koreans with the beauty of Japan seemed successful, as the members of the embassy at different times emphasized the overwhelming nature. In addition to showing them the landscapes, the neatness of streets as well amazed the Koreans. During the journey, Shin repeatedly described the spotless cities and villages:

---

about four kilometres. Shin’s measurement should be based on Korean measurement, about 2.4 to 2.8 kilometers.

33 Shin, “Haeyurok.” October 11 (1719) or the twenty eighth day of the eighth month, p.100.
34 ibid., p.100.
In summer, the flies are rarely seen, it is because the rooms are kept clean and they never become filthy. Decayed fishes and meat are immediately buried in the ground and excretions that cause odour from the lavatories are delivered to the farms. Thus, there is no time at which the flies come up to the streets. When the mosquitoes increase, the net is created by thin threads and fabrics, covered over the wooden frame, and made as tall as the height of men. After setting up, one is put into the net to sleep inside.  

The cleanness surprised Shin and might have been uncommon in Chosŏn Korea. Hōshū once touched on the Korean behaviour of spitting to the wall and placing the urine bins in public sight. Some Japanese officials claimed that doing this was not appropriate behaviour of people from ‘the country of the proprieties,’ but Hōshū analyzed that those deeds were deeply adapted into the Korean conventions. From the Koreans’ point of view, illiteracy was far more shameful and peculiar than those hygienic issues. Neatness may predominantly exist as an emphasis in the Japanese culture.

Shin acknowledged the fabulousness of the large cities such as Kyoto and Osaka. When the Korean embassy arrived in Osaka, the members were divided into small groups to board the several ships to go up to Kyoto along the Naniwa River. In Shin’s record, the chief ambassador, Hong Chijung, asked one of the Tsushima officials if the decorative ships were exclusively ready for the shogun, and questioned if the Koreans were able to board them. In “Haeyurok,” Shin depicted those fabulous ships on the river:

The ships were brilliantly and skilfully built, and the decorations, small

---

38 Shin, “Haeyurok.” p.111. Those ships were indeed arranged for the Korean embassy, according to the Tsushima official, and told him not to worry about boarding the ships.
tower on the top, the wooden roofs, are curved as house tiles painted with green lacquer, and the other sides are black; they shine like a mirror. Each pillar of the ships was covered with gold; so were window eaves and roof, the gold brightens the sleeves of those sitting there… The ship bearing the sovereign’s message was placed in front, and the chief ambassador, the vice ambassador, the overseer, and the senior interpreters, and each officer boarded on the nine following ships. Each ship has a particular sign, but there is no distinctiveness of the decorations [of the ships]… Sets for tea ceremony, rice wine jars, as well as bedclothes stitched with golden threads were placed in our guest rooms of those ships.  

The Tokugawa authority and the local domains offered the government ships, or kōgisen, and the river ships, or kawagozasen, for surface transportation to carry the Koreans. The 150 ships were ready for the Korean embassy, and the scene would have been magnificent when the decorative fleet was massed on the river.

From Kyoto to Hikone (in current Shiga Prefecture located on the bank of the Lake Biwa), the embassy went by the street named Tōjin kaidō, or the Chinese Highway. It is because they could not make a clear distinction between the Chinese and the Koreans, and the letters and poems that the embassy left in the region were written in Chinese. It is very likely that the local speculators perceived the Korean embassy as tōjin, the Chinese. The 40 kilometre-road was a part of Nakasendō that separated Yasu (in current Shiga prefecture),

\[\text{39 ibid., October 16 (1719) or the fourth day of the ninth month, p.111.} \]
\[\text{40 Daimyos used those ships to pass rivers and to enjoy the cruise. Those ships were possessions of Hachisuga, Möri, Date, Ogasawara, Abe, Yamauchi, Asano, and Inaba families.} \]
\[\text{41 The name of street was renamed as the Chōsenjin kaidō by efforts of the zainichi (modern Japanese born Korean) scholars.} \]
\[\text{42 Nakasendō was one of the five highways where Edo was made a starting point conjunct to Tökaidō via Kusatsu (current Gunma prefecture) to connect to Kyoto. The five highways were used for the sankin kōtai, or alternate attendance to Edo, as passages of the daimyos. In particular, Tökaidō and Nakasendō Highways were connected with major commercial cities in the west, Sakai, Kyoto, and Osaka. Those routes accelerated further commercial activities between the east and west. The completion of extended network increased the spread of commodities, currency, and local culture and people into the urban cities. Rural areas along these} \]
and rejoined the route at Torii Honchō. The street was regarded as auspicious, by reason of Tokugawa Ieyasu’s triumphant route to Edo after the victory of the Battle of Sekigahara. The traffic was only allowed for the Korean embassy and the Tokugawa shogun’s visit to Kyoto in the early time of the Tokugawa period. Before the embassy’s passage, the road was cleaned and repair works were arranged, as also for other streets. The local officials exercised preliminary inspection of streets, lodges and rest houses before the passage of the Korean embassy.

Shin met an enormous turnout of the Japanese crowds in Osaka when he boarded the ship:

Spectators, men and women, stood like walls on both sides and wore the silk cloths. Women had black hair with ornamental hairpins, tortoiseshell combs, and white powder on their faces. And they wore bright coloured fabrics and sashes. Their waists were slim and long. Looked like the Buddhist paintings. Graceful boys about their age of eight were more alluring [in wearing the gorgeous outfits.] A little baby wore jade jewels that were spread out on his knees and back and it looked like millions of tree and flowers, of red, blue, yellow, and purple. Those nearby were occupied with boats anchored on both banks, spreading out their mats so closely that the sleeves of their clothes touched each other. Those who were shoved away from the boats crowded the banks. They climbed walls of houses and railings of bridges. Some sat on brilliant silk mats, enjoying wine, meals, and drinks… Sometimes babies cried, the girls laughed. When laughing, they always cover their mouths with the printed handkerchief. Their voices sounded bright and thin, like birds’ song. No one acted haughty or uproarious. Since the fall sunlight fell on the people, people covered the brightness with multicoloured cloths or white hats made of braided sedge on their tops, and wordlessly sat upright [on the mats.] When looking at people standing far, [I could see] high and low spots in accordance with geographical features. By passing twenty ri, everywhere my eyesight reached, the number of people increased, and

streets considerably developed as hatogomachi, or station towns for travelers.
spectators’ noises became gradually active like woods. My annoyance was getting unbearable. [Seeing] the giant mountains and rivers, the stylish people, bamboos and beautiful flowers [that were competing and proud of their existences one another,] the right landscape was jealous when I glanced at left. After I took a look at right, [the scenery on the] left became dazzling. While I boarded the ship for a half of a day, my eyes flashed red. It seems as if the gluttonous man is having the delicacies and never stops eating despite his full stomach.

In addition to the beauty of nature around the river, Shin seemed to be surprised at the large number of the Japanese crowds gathering the riverside to ‘watch’ him and his other fellows of the embassy. From the Japanese speculators, curiosity to see foreignness would have drawn their attention, rather than wishing to welcome the Koreans. Gathering numberless people in one place might usually have caused destruction or chaos, but the Japanese stayed calm and obedient under the bakufu’s strict regulations. In this condition, however, the Japanese crowds certainly enjoyed watching the march of the Koreans as some sort of entertainment and foreign exoticism. The Japanese seemed to be interested in an infrequent opportunity- the encounter of unusualness. They gathered to see the foreigners for an ‘unusual moment’ in their daily life. While sailing on the river, the Korean musicians played the instruments on the ships. It is easy to imagine that the Japanese were fascinated by the foreign music. From the sidewalks, the crowds were able to see the foreigners with unfamiliar yet extraordinary outfits. Those people, who were still eager to meet the Koreans ran after the Koreans’ lodge, waited for their arrival and eagerly sought their writings and paintings.

The members of the embassy were also amazed watching the silent crowds and their politeness from the ships. Shin’s impressions of the Japanese were more than surprise. He was

---

43 Shin, “Haeyurok.” October 16 (1719) or the fourth day of the ninth month, pp.112-114.
astounded at the elegant features of the people with fabulous dresses and accessories, both men and women. In particular, he was impressed by the appearance of the women. For the Koreans, women were rarely seen on the streets in their homeland. The Koreans must have been surprised that a myriad of women with beautiful ornaments and the silk *kimono* came into view to see themselves at the banks. A little child with the clothes spangled with jewels drew Shin’s eyes as well.

The Tokugawa bakufu’s restriction on the speculators was as well effectively successful. The bakufu expected the commoners to watch the march of the Korean embassy, and the local administrations charged them for better seats to view the foreigners. They needed to wear graceful costumes when they came to see the Koreans. In the largely populated cities such as Osaka, Kyoto, and Edo, the bakufu’s careful instructions to clean up the streets and houses functioned as an imperative to the local populace. With the cleanliness, the Koreans were again impressed with the stylish atmosphere of the local people. The bakufu’s meticulous elaborations to give the Koreans a positive sense on the Japanese seemed to work well. The beautiful presentation to the Koreans was also effective to show a positive sense of Tokugawa authority. Num-lim Hur also points out that through bearing the heavy cost for the Korean embassy, the local daimyos in the western Japan “which had traditionally shown independent tendencies, were painfully reminded of the diplomatic sovereignty of the shogunate.” All the affected domains on the route of the embassy needed to financially support the trip of the Koreans. By so doing, the bakufu was able to show those daimyos its authority, and the invitation of the Korean embassy was an important political event.

Especially in Osaka, the population of the *chōnin*, the townspeople, was more than

---

ninety per cent, much greater than the number of the samurai.\textsuperscript{45} As a center of domestic economy and commerce, Osaka was called as tenka no daidokoro, or the kitchen of a whole country. This western city thrived as the base of commodities sent to the east, Edo, after the establishment of the Tokugawa bakufu. As the populations of the chōnin increased in Edo, Osaka also became a back-up market to supply the merchandises to Edo. The chōnin, who directly handled business and money, were certainly placed in the most luxurious and well-off class, though they were not placed in high social status in the Tokugawa society.

The classification did not allow the samurai, the highest group of the social hierarchy, to engage in any commercial activities. Instead, only the chōnin class was permitted commercial activities. A well-known term, the Osaka akindo, or the Osaka merchants who played a vital role in the commercial markets, was also a synonym for shrewd business people who gained profits and wealth. Under such an urban and affluent ambiance of Osaka, Shin’s candid surprise can be easily assumed as he would not probably have experienced this ambiance in his country. In Osaka, about one hundred Korean officials, who were chiefly involved in the ship operations, remained in the city and waited the return of other officials from Edo. The reminder, about three hundred and sixty Koreans, kept heading to the east. Shin described this: “[T]he people who left and who stayed encouraged one another to value health when we separated on the river.”\textsuperscript{46}

From Osaka, the Koreans reached Kyoto. They were aware of the city where the emperor and the court nobles resided. The Korean embassy approached the temple lodge, Honnōji. When the 1624 embassy came to Kyoto, a member of the court nobles, who

\textsuperscript{45} Population in Osaka was about 350,000 in the early eighteenth century.
\textsuperscript{46} Shin, “Haeyurok.” p.129
introduced himself as the emperor’s younger brother, visited the embassy’s lodge, Daitokuji, with his attendants and guards. They enjoyed watching the Koreans and the Korean music until sunset, experiencing the foreign ambience. The Korean musicians were especially paid great attention to by the both aristocrats and the commoners, who were attracted to the Korean instruments. The spectators were twice as fabulous as those in Osaka; in Shin’s words, the silk cloths that the locals wore were even more brilliant.

After leaving Korea about three months previously, Shin was familiar with some Japanese words. He sometimes asked for pipes and a cup of tea from the Japanese officials, and “their reactions [on my Japanese speaking] were very pleasant, and they immediately responded [what I required.] Shin seemed to enjoy talking with the Japanese. On their return to Korea from Edo, the Japanese attendants often broke the branches laden with fruits of the tangerines that were grown on the streets and brought them to Shin. The Japanese knew that he adored the fruit that was only produced in the southern part of the Korean peninsula.

At the reception in Kyoto, Shin inquired about the location of the imperial palace from the Japanese attendant. But the Japanese official was hesitant to answer in detail:

The palace of the emperor is located southwest of the lodge. The Japanese attendants were afraid of saying this. And they [the Japanese] do not let us [the Koreans] see the building of the palace. The emperor does not know about us.

Why did the Japanese officials not want the Koreans to know of the site? From the Japanese

47 In 1624, Gomizunoo, the 108th emperor, reigned between 1611 and 1629.
48 Kang, Hongjung. “Tongsarok.” Haehaeng ch’ongjae., vol.3., January 1 (1625), or the twenty third day of the eleventh month, p.33.
50 ibid., October 23 (1719), or the eleventh day of the ninth month, p.136.
51 ibid., October 29, or the seventeenth day of the tenth month, pp.221-222.
52 ibid., October 22, or the tenth day of the ninth month, p.139.
point of view, the emperor and his kin were untouchable, and some of the Japanese officials saw the imperial household as awe-inspiring. In the appendix of Shin’s travelogue, he gave some information on the relationship between the imperial court and the bakufu:

The title of the *kanpaku* is granted from the emperor [to the Tokugawa shoguns]. The shogun is placed on a senior second ranking official within the court. On the higher ranking officials than the shogun, their titles are named as *dainagon* (the Grand Counsellor), *daijō daijin* (the Grand Minister), and the Right and Left Ministers. The Japanese ranking is determined by high or low social lineage. [In this social standing,] the shogun is the vassal of the emperor.

And in another statement on the imperial court, Shin’s precise description on the historical emperors was noted:

The Current emperor is Nakamikado (r. 1709-1735). He is the former emperor Higashiyama’s third son, and his name is Yasuhito. He began to reign as emperor in 1709 and turned to age of twenty six. Four years ago he changed the name of the era to Kyōhō. [The emperor has] no surname but his first name, as he was treated as a divinity [among the general public].

Shin precisely understood the function of the imperial court: that the emperor no longer had any political supremacy before the bakufu and the shogun. Nonetheless, the emperor was still a sacred being for the bakufu officials, and even the *samurai* class did certainly possess some

---

53 The Tokugawa shoguns were granted as the senior first ranking official from the imperial court. Shin probably misunderstood the fact.
54 In Shin’s manuscript, written as *wa*.
56 Nakamikado was the one hundred fourteenth emperor.
57 Shin, “Haeyurok.” the eleventh day of the ninth month, p.144.
sort of reverence towards the imperial court. Shin’s obscure uneasiness on the dual system of the imperial court and the bakufu in relations with the Korean king, the Chosŏn court’s strong attachment to political authority (the shogun and the bakufu executives), and a contempt for the existence of an imperial court that did not have political influence could have been unjust. Shin was somewhat uneasy about the shogun who never equaled the emperor in his hierarchical standing, even though he was a victor in seizing the entire rights to govern Japan.

Shin’s unease came from a crucial question- who was the actual ruler of Japan? His simple yet deep concern would have directed the matter: with whom should the Korean king have exchanged the sovereign’s letter: the shogun or the emperor? It could be said that, from the view of the bakufu officials at least, the Chosŏn court could not be treated in an equal position with the sacred imperial court. The sovereign’s signature on the official diplomatic invitation appeared as ‘Nihonkoku Minamoto no Yoshimune,’ that is, the historical Tokugawa shoguns did not acclaim themselves as ruler of Japan to the outside world. Shin’s insight might have keenly shaped on the ambiguous relationship between the Korean king and the Japanese emperor. Even so, the exchange between the Tokugawa bakufu and the Chosŏn court in this period was unwavering on the surface at least, though these peaceful circumstances were not always maintained below the surface. Rather than discord, efforts to cover the gap

---

59 ibid., p.408.
60 ibid., p.408.
61 ibid., p.408. Regarding the relations between the shogun and the emperor, it is still controversial how the imperial court functioned and what was the meaning of the court during the Tokugawa period. Miyake Hidetoshi quotes a remark of Inoue Yasushi (1907-1991), a novelist, on the relations of the emperor and the bakufu as: “it may have been an equivalent alliance to that between the Roman Pope and the kings in European countries. For the bakufu, the imperial court was a necessary being to function as a centripetal force to unify one domain and another.” Quoted from Miyake, Hidetoshi. “Kinsei Ch'ŏsen kanjin no Nihon tennŏkan.” p.398.
seemed much more needed to retain a neighbourly relationship. Nevertheless, Shin’s concern about the correlation of the two powers in Kyoto and Edo gradually became a solid apprehension among the Korean scholars in the later period.62

The Tōkaidō Highway, which connects the route between Edo in the east and Osaka in the west, is filled with pictorial landscapes even today. The sight of Lake Biwa was one of the highlights that the Koreans were looking forward to, as there was no such large lake in the Korean peninsula. Shin was reminded by the lake view of Dongtinghu63 in Hunan province of Southern China. He once seemed to read a booklet describing the beautiful nature of the Chinese lake written by Du Pu (712-770), who is still regarded today as the most renowned Chinese poet:

Light rains. [We] departed in the early morning. I put an incense burner and works of poetry in the palanquin. Heard the sound of fall rain over the reed screen. Very graceful. When going on about six to seven ri, the Japanese said “Here is Lake Biwa.” I scrolled up the screen and saw the lake. The figure is bracing and very wide, and no shores can be seen. The mountains over the lake flow [along the lake contour,] and the curves constitute the bays, the fishing boats appear between the reeds and withered bamboos. Hazes and wild ducks move up and down with the waves. The surroundings of the lake are about four hundred ri, a similar size as Dongtinghu…[The name of] Lake Biwa originates from the shape of a lute that looks like the lake. And because the place belongs to the Ōmi provinces, it is also called Lake Ōmi.64

As a Choson scholar well acquainted with Chinese literature, Shin seemed to duplicate the view of the Chinese lake by seeing Lake Biwa. The geographic features of gently undulating

---

62 I will discuss further on this matter in the conclusion.
63 Dongtinghu in Funan province is the second largest freshwater lake in China. The size of the lake is 2,820km² (as of 2007). As a reference, Lake Biwa’s size is 670 km².
64 Shin, “Haeyurok,” October 25 (1719), or the thirteenth day of the ninth month, pp.146-148.
hills, plain, and lake along the Tōkaidō Highway seemed to keep striking his sense of beauty.

The embassy’s lodge was Sōanji at the lakeside. Mt. Hikone was right behind their guesthouse. The Location of the lodge was surrounded with a beautiful setting. When he exchanged conversation with the local scholars at the lodge, Shin said:

We have already been across the Ōmi region more than hundred ri. When I look at the bright and clear scenery here, very picturesque, the lands in other regions cannot come first. I guess that a number of talented scholars have been born here, as the airs here are special. [And the locals said:] there are so many literati and monks born around the province. Literary exchanges went on until late at night.  

Shin might not have known the fact that Hōshū was born in the Ōmi region, current Shiga prefecture. For the foreigner such as Shin, it might be difficult to be familiar with the names of renowned literati in this local area. But the literary competence of the people seemed to satisfy Shin, to acknowledge the region as the place of sages in his travelogue. What Shin perceived in the local literati here was indeed uncommon.

Through the exchange, the members of the Korean embassy were aware of less qualified writings composed by the Japanese, in contrast to their refined literary pieces produced in their homeland. When the Korean embassy arrived in Tsushima, Hōshū once pleaded with Shin to evaluate those poems by the Japanese without any bias, though their immaturity meant that the Koreans did not view them as excellent pieces. Hōshū emphasized

65 Shin, “Haeyurok,” October 26 (1719), or the fourteenth day of the ninth month, pp.150-151.
66 ibid., pp.150-151.
67 Kojima, Yasunori. “Edo jidai ni okeru Chōsenzō no suii.” Kagami no naka no Nihon to Kankoku. pp.29-30. Kojima explains that the superior level of the Koreans’ writing capability came from the civil service examination, by which the Chosôn court enabled the successful candidates who passed the test to be appointed as the high-ranking officials.
for Shin the difficulty for the Japanese to achieve the study of the Chinese writings, and their premature works were somehow come to light only as a result of their long-term study. From Shin’s point of view, most of the writings by the Japanese had “no sense of grace or impressiveness.”  

Before the departure to Edo, Hōshū reminded Shin to comment on those works of the local Japanese in a generous manner. As a crucial mission of the embassy, the literary interactions with the Japanese were inevitable as a representation of the neighbourly relations. The Koreans knew that their comments on the verses provided the Japanese literati with enormous encouragement and hopes of further efforts to polish their literary pieces. The enthusiastic needs of the Japanese, and his duty to meet them frequently made Shin restless for a whole day, but his patience outweighed the pressure, and his self-esteem as the chief diarist made him diligent to show Chosŏn Korea’s literary preeminence to the Japanese.

The embassy reached the bank of the Ōi river, in Shizuoka. The bakufu’s special treatment for the Koreans was presented when they crossed wide watercourses such as Ōi river. There were no bridges at most of the rivers to protect Edo from outside attacks. In this circumstance, the local domains set up the funahasi, or the ‘ship bridge,’ for the safe and dry passage of the Koreans. However, when the rivers were not calm, the ship bridges dispersed before the arrival of the embassy, and the bridge had to be reconstructed. In case the river stream was not stable, a number of the stream-cutters (mizukiri ninpu) were called from the nearby villages to let the Koreans cross the rivers. The stream-cutters came into the river and lined up the two sides to the upper and the lower currents, and the embassy on the palanquins walked in the middle of the lines.

The funahashi and the call for the stream-cutters were only exercised for the

---

69 ibid., p.306.
messengers of the imperial court or of the shogun. In this sense, the bakufu’s treatment of the Korean embassy was the highest manner. Unlike other embassy of the Dutch or Ryūkyū, the funahashi was established only for the Korean embassy. Shin crossed the funahashi several times to go to Edo and on his return, but his record did not particularly write on it. At any situation, Shin understood that the cordial treatment by the bakufu was arranged for only the Korean embassy.

When the embassy was at the Ōi River, the funahashi was impossible to set up in the middle of the river. Shin mentioned the condition as follows:

…We reach the Ōi River. The river is separated with three streams; the depth of water is just as high as the knees, but the currents are very fast like an arrow, and thus, setting funahashi is impossible. Therefore, more than ten white-wooden stands with handrails were ready. A dragon palanquin71 and each person [of the embassy] are taken on each stand carried by dozens of people; more than one thousand people are carrying saddles and the wicker trunks [to cross the river.]. The Japanese officials supervise [the transportations] from the up the river, and [their voice to instruct the direction of the ships are] very loud. The 1711 embassy stayed two days here to cross this river, due to the swollen water.72

After passing the Ōi river, the embassy soon reached Hakone. In Hakone, the Checkpoint, or sekisho, was situated to control traffic of people and loads between other provinces and Edo.73 The sekisho established in 1619 also functioned to prevent any martial attacks against Edo during the Tokugawa period. The sekisho was one of the largest in scale and known for rigorous inspections for ‘incoming firearms (irideppō) and outgoing women (deonna),’ which

---

71 The palanquin for the sovereign’s message.
72 Shin, “Haeyurok.” November 2 and 3 (1719), or the twenty first and twenty second day of the ninth month, pp.161-162.
73 Hakone sekisho site has been designated as the National Historic Property of Japan since 1922.
were considered signs of conspiracy against the bakufu.\textsuperscript{74} For the ordinary people to pass the point, all of their belongings and luggage were enforced to be monitored by the checkpoint officials. Nevertheless, for the Korean embassy, their privilege provided smooth passage of the point. No personal effects of the Koreans were investigated.

The members of the Korean embassy at last arrived in Edo on the twenty seventh day of the ninth month in 1719.\textsuperscript{75} Similar to Osaka, Kyoto and other cities, the local spectators filled the all the streets. Before the entry to Edo, the three ambassadors and other high-ranking officials wore the red robes and the black crown hats that were symbols of their semi-formal dress. The military officials held quivers and other armoured accessories on their shoulders. The musicians on the horses with the trumpets (K: nap’al), the violins (K: haegūm), the drums (K: ch’anggo), the gongs (K: chin), and the flutes (K: p’iri) played music while marching. The crowds were as neatly organized as those in the other cities. When walking along the streets, Shin described “The gorgeousness [of the Edo people] was three more times striking than those in Osaka or Kyoto.”\textsuperscript{76}

The Higashi Honganji was offered as the guesthouse of the embassy for their eighteen day’s stay in Edo. The tatami mats were newly prepared for the foreign guests. The vast site of the temple was divided into several houses: the annex for the chief ambassador in the east wing, the west wing for the vice ambassador, and the overseer’s room was right behind the vice ambassador’s. Shin’s room was located at the back of the overseer’s.\textsuperscript{77} In the garden of the temple, there was a pond surrounded by the flowers. Shin noted that the decorations of the

\textsuperscript{74} Ingoing weapons were a serious issue for the Tokugawa government, since they might have been used in an attack to the city. Outgoing women were women of the daimyō family in Edo who attempted to leave Edo to go back to their home provinces.

\textsuperscript{75} The date is equivalent to November 8 (1719) in Gregorian calendar.

\textsuperscript{76} Shin, “Haeyurok.” p.177.

\textsuperscript{77} ibid., p.178.
interior rooms were the simplest among the other lodges he had stayed. Shin heard about personality of the newly reigning eighth shogun Tokugawa Yoshimune and his principle:

According to the Japanese official, the kanpaku’s principle was thrift. During the 1711 embassy visit to Edo, he [Yoshimune], as the shogun, managed and considered every matter, and said: customs of the states vary. Thus, even if the Japanese clothes and others were dazzingly fabricated, they were soberer than Korean products. Do not manufacture the futile things or worthless literature [when the Korean embassy comes into Edo.] Therefore, by mentioning the new shogun’s policy, the Tsushima magistrate had cut down the excessive fabulousness [at the lodge].

After settling down and resting for a few days in Edo, the embassy left for the castle to encounter the new shogun. On the first day of the tenth month, the three ambassadors put on the formal costumes for the encounter with the shogun. With the formal attire, the gold crowns, ornamental jewels around their waists, and the black thin sceptres with their hands. The ambassadors took the Korean palanquins to enter the castle. Before the ambassadors’ palanquins, the sovereign’s message of the Korean king was preceding on the dragon wagon. Hundreds of the Koreans were followed by the state letter and the three ambassadors. The march to the Edo Castle began. With the spectators, the streets in Edo were seemingly occupied with the atmosphere of a fabulous celebration.

When the embassy arrived in the Edo Castle, the senior councillors welcomed and invited the ambassadors to enter the reception room where the shogun waited to see them. Shin recorded impressions of Yoshimune and described his character:

78 ibid., p.178.
79 ibid., January 6 (1720), or the twenty seventh day of the eleventh month, p.179
80 The date is equivalent to November 12 (1719) in Gregorian calendar.
Yoshimune’s character is dauntless, superior and wise, and this year, he turns age thirty-five. He is of sturdy spirit and a dignified bearing. He is a lover of the martial arts but finds no joy in literature. He respects economy and rejects extravagance. In general he says, “Japanese think highly of Korean letters. But the style is unique for each. Although we study it, since we cannot become skilful, for us, it is best to write in Japanese. When the Korean embassy came to Japan, there are ceremonies to display our military force and to provide music, but these have no meaning, either. The military demonstration is the way to defend ourselves, but if they see it and it scares them, we lose the meaning of our desire for contact, or if they despise it we have not achieved out scheme of displaying force. When it comes to musical skills, we have our mutual customs. Why should foreign instruments gladden the ear: what is the purpose of this ceremony? In the way of our friendly relations, the value lies in sincerity… We must send them [the Koreans] home pleased. We shall pare away and remove all extreme rhetorical flourishes and details,” and so forth. When practicing governance, he puts honesty and humility first. He aids the poor and reduces their tax. Those who commit capital crimes have their noses severed instead of being executed. All sing his praises.81

Shin’s evaluation of Tokugawa Yoshimune was relatively high, though the shogun seemed to lack appreciation of literary pieces in contrast to his active hobbies such as falconry. While meeting with the three ambassadors of the embassy, the shogun was impressive enough for the Koreans, particularly with regard to his personality. Yoshimune was the one who determined to return diplomatic protocol to the periods before the reform. Shin as well as other Koreans seemed to favour the new shogun, and they understood that his political influence were strong enough over the other powerful political leaders and daimyos. But at the same time, Shin’s

critical view appeared on Yoshimune’s wardrobe as: “…Crude cotton clothing is good in the usual manner, but why did he put on the same costumes even when he met with the guests from the neighbouring state at the formal site? He [Yoshimune] seems to favour strangeness or peculiarity, and by his behaviour, [I could see that] the evil customs\textsuperscript{82} cannot be reformed.”\textsuperscript{83}

On the whole, the new shogun Tokugawa Yoshimune seemed to receive positive appraisal from the Koreans. Yoshimune’s approach for the Korean embassy shared the same manner as Ieyasu did. Indeed, the first shogun saw the Korean diplomacy as essential for Japan to be readmitted to the East Asian environment, and after the consequent painstaking efforts, the invitation of the Korean embassy was successfully exercised and became an icon of peaceful relationship between the two states. The eighth shogun also appreciated the visitation of the Korean delegation to the Edo Castle. His priority was certainly placed on the retention of the friendly relationship with his neighbouring country, as Ieyasu wished.

In contrast to Yoshimune’s overall evaluation, Shin’s comments on the rōjū, a group of the political executives under the shogun and the Neo-Confucian advisor, Hayashi Nobuatsu (1645-1732) and his two sons, Nobumitsu and Nobutomo, were harsh:

Four members of the rōjū, [are as follows:] first, Inoue Kawachi-no-kami Masamine (1653-1722); second, Kuze Yamato-no-kami Shigeyuki (1659-1720); third, Mizuno Izumi-no-kami Tadayuki (1669-1731); and fourth, Toda Yamashiro-no-kami Tadazane (1651-1729). Each has residence [in the castle and the local domain]. The biggest stipend among them was several hundred thousand koku. The least one is no less than sixty or seventy thousand koku… All of the members insist on discussing all the matters in state, but they remain sitting and receiving wealth, superficial and brainless, like varnished puppets. Parent and sons of the Hayashi family [indicated as Nobuatsu and his sons] were in the position

\textsuperscript{82} ‘The evil customs’ indicates Japan’s cultural practice.
\textsuperscript{83} Shin, “Haeyurok.” p.204.
of Confucian advisor of the *kanpaku*, but they exist at the spot without any ability.\(^8^4\)

The heirs or disciples of the selected family were always placed in the central position of the government regardless of their actual competence. The Hayashi family, going back to Hayashi Razan (1583-1657), had generated the successive Neo-Confucian advisors for the bakufu. Shin’s straightforward remark on the Hayashi family again was “their [literary] pieces were dull, unsophisticated, and not in good shape at all.”\(^8^5\) And he continued, “Supposed that the one has high ability, he without any connections with the Hayashi school was never allowed to serve for the bakufu. Very funny.”\(^8^6\)

Shin’s critical view on the Japanese politics was accurate and also clearly shows how Shin measured Japanese culture as inferior to the Korean. From his eyes, Chosŏn Korea’s Neo-Confucian model was the sole principle. His vision as a Neo-Confucianist to look at Japan was very rigid, and his attitude to the Japanese culture was frequently critical. Hur observes Shin’s criteria to evaluate Japanese custom as: “In terms of achieving authentic (i.e., Confucian) civilization, Tokugawa Japan was, as Shin was convinced, far behind Chosŏn Korea, as Shin failed to discover any solid evidence of Confucian civilization in Tokugawa Japan.”\(^8^7\) However, he found that Japan was a state of peace and full of richness and mentioned in his record, “There have been no better days in Japan than now in terms of the abundance of population and wealth.”\(^8^8\) He frankly admitted that Tokugawa Japan was more prosperous than he thought.

\(^8^4\) ibid., the first day of the twelfth month, pp.203-204.  
\(^8^5\) ibid., p.192.  
\(^8^6\) ibid., p.192.  
\(^8^8\) Shin, “Haeyurok.” p.89.
Conversations between Hōshū and Shin

In Shin’s travelogue “Haeyurok,” the conversations between Shin himself and Hōshū represented their positions in their countries. The dialogue included a myriad of confessions on the two different histories and cultures, and this kind of active communications has never been seen in any records written by any other Korean ambassadorial members in different periods. Both Shin and Hōshū attempted to ask awkward questions that may have led to further misapprehensions, but both officials candidly voiced answers and explanations to the counterpart. Through the intercourse during the journey, Hōshū’s exchanges with Shin might have delivered some degree of familiarity. Shin, although being biased against Japan to some extent, loosened while interacting with Hōshū and other Japanese officials.

The receptions in the different locations may have provided Shin with the warm hospitality of the Japanese. Shin recorded his dialogue with Hōshū as follows:

When we relaxed at the lodge on the return from Edo, Amenomori once told me:
[Hōshū:] I wanted to say something if I had a chance. Japan and your country are neighbouring states that were separated by sea, but we have been corresponding with each other with trustworthiness. Our people all know that the Korean king and you [officials] exchange [us] with sincere diplomatic invitations, so we show our greatest respect [to the Koreans] through the official and private documents. However, when I look at monographs in your country, in the topic touching on our state, you express wazoku or banshū (uncivilized and barbarians) [to indicate Japan], discriminating against and reproaching us. This is unbearable for us. When our Bunshōō (indicated as Tokugawa Ienobu) had taken a look at Korean essays, he told his vassals: “This is the truth. It is the solid proof that Korea discriminates against Japan.” And he deeply regretted this for the rest of his life. Today, you all know this [or not]…. Amenomori complained, and gradually showed his anger. I told him;
[Shin:] What you mean is easily understandable, but your country lacks learning [of us]. I do not know whose essay [of Korean scholars] you have read, nevertheless, I suppose that was published right after the Japanese invasions to Korea. Hideyoshi is indeed our wrathful enemy… If the expressions reflect on the document, it comes from a natural sense. However, we all know that our sacred court favours [your] people by benignancy, trades through the market,\(^8^9\) and we see no inheritance of [evilness of] Hideyoshi in the State of East. Thus, we dispatch the diplomatic embassy, deepen the harmonious relationship, exchange the sovereign’s letter, and thus all of our people respect the virtue [of Japan]. How can you open up the grudge [against Japan]? And as I [Shin] examine his reaction, we arrived in Osaka. When I look at the remains of the Toyotomi family [in the city], I still feel furious.\(^9^0\)

Ienobu’s reading of the Korean monograph was probably urged by Arai Hakuseki, a Neo-Confucian advisor of the bakufu at that time. Hakuseki may have taught Ienobu on views of Japan in Chosŏn Korea while he was tutoring Ienobu. And Hōshū might have noticed Ienobu’s disappointment from Hakuseki, and his simple question went to Shin.

As Shin indicated, the name and behaviour of Hideyoshi left outraged feelings among the Koreans. On their return journey to Korea, when the embassy passed through Kyoto, the Japanese side intended the Koreans to visit Hōkōji,\(^9^1\) where the mimizuka, or Mound of Ears, locates. This temple was established by Hidehoshi, and is also known as the temple for his prayer. During the military campaign by Hideyoshi, the Japanese troops took the ears and noses of the local Koreans as proof of their merits in lieu of their heads, and placed them at the mound. The repulsion of the embassy was justified and they opposed stopping at the temple. Hōshū told the Koreans that he denied the fact of the temple’s close association with Hideyoshi,

\(^8^9\) Shin used ‘trades and market’ to specify the weagwan (the Japan House).
\(^9^1\) The Hōkōji was called ‘Daibutsuji’ at that time.
and showed them a book entitled *Nihon nendaiki*, or *the Chronological Record of Japan*, insisting that the temple concerned was founded in the age of the third shogun, Tokugawa Iemitsu, not by “Korea’s hundred-year foe.” The Japanese side kept persuading the Korean officials that any heir of Hideyoshi did not exist at the age of Iemitsu.

After the persistent persuasion of the Japanese officials, the chief and vice ambassadors, Hong Chijung and Hwang Hyŏp, agreed to pay a visit to the site for further avoidance of trouble during the journey. However, the overseer, Yi Myŏng’ŏn, refused by reason of his sickness. Hŏshū was very furious at his absence and argued the circumstance with Shin:

I [Shin] said: “You [indicated as Amenomori] are not a scholar. Why are you mad and against the rationale?” Amenomori immediately brought a copy of the Chronological Record of Japan, and looked up the sky and down the ground, by showing his anger and said:

[Amenomori said] “In the very beginning, [by claiming that] your fellows misunderstood the fact of establishment of the prayer’s temple, and that righteousness does not allow you to foot on the enemy’s place, it is very surprising. Our lord [the shogun] sees the importance of the neighbourly relationship [with Chosŏn Korea], and never let the recipient of the embassy cease; so he clarifies the truth as Genji’s temple. Therefore, it is obvious that our state makes every effort and rendered great service for your embassy. If you do not even believe the history and appreciate the current situation, you despise and weaken us. The Only fate that you will face is the death.”

I [Shin] said: “The two ambassadors already told you they would visit there. It is unreasonable for us to impose the attendance of the overseer in spite of his sickness. Even if the things do not go right as you wish, this should not be mediated by the interpreter. You are fighting one of the

---

92 Kang Jae-ŏn, a translator of “Haeyurok,” emphasizes that Hŏkŏji was established by Hideyoshi in 1588. Tokugawa family identified itself as ‘the Minamoto clan,’ the family of renowned aristocracy back to the Heian period (794-1192).
interpreters with outrage; I suppose that this is totally [your] misdirection.” Amenomori finally apologized and left.94

The bakufu’s aim was probably the wish of giving comfort to the deceased Koreans by the prayers of the Korean embassy. Hōshū’s act against Shin may have come from natural cause, as the stopover at the temple was already scheduled in the itinerary. Although Hōshū had ill-feeling against the temple, the smooth procedure of the journey was more important to him. After that, the embassy reached the Hōkōji, and the banquet followed for the Koreans. The priests’ cordial manner and greeting speech at the temple impressed the ambassadorial members and Shin, and they exchanged some conversations on Buddhist philosophy.95 Shin’s record did not particularly point out the ill-feelings on visitation of the Hideyoshi’s temple, yet his record showed that he dropped by the lodge of the absent overseer.96

Shin’s further questions on Hideyoshi did carry on. One day he asked Hōshū about the man who aggressively ruined Chosŏn Korea:

I asked Amenomori: Hideyoshi was once a military leader of your country. Are you, too, unwilling or reluctant to disclose evilness when you talk about him?

[Amenomori answered]: Not at all. He was born with the nature of a beast in response to the misfortune of Heaven. Thus, the tragedy of massacre is not applied only to your country. The Japanese also suffered from the bloodbath…

And I asked: Hideyoshi, however, did he have any eminence or virtue?

[Amenomori answered]: None. Before Hideyoshi’s era, Japan’s sixty-six provinces were divided, each leader reigned, and one region offended another. From this reason, in the Ming era, a number of Japanese went to

95 ibid., pp.235-236.
96 ibid, p.237.
the continent to create a disturbance. You would have known the facts through reading the Ming History. Hideyoshi, by providing distress and destruction of the military force, somehow subjugated the state. If we discuss his virtue, that is it... The Amenomori family used to be bureaucrats but they were ruined. A few Amenomori ran away from home and were fortunately able to survive as civilians. When I think of him [Hideyoshi], my heart is aching with a grudge.

Indeed, the Amenomori house as a samurai lineage was terminated by Oda Nobunaga, a superior of Hideyoshi at that time. Although Hōshū stated Hideyoshi’s positive aspect in reunification of the political power, his pain on the extinction of the Amenomori blood left suffering. Shin, of course, carried a strong antagonism against the Japanese invasions of Chosŏn Korea. Shin’s attention in the conversation was especially directed to Katō Kiyomasa, one of the leaders who showed great courage in rushing into the battle field in the Korean peninsula. Shin asked Hōshū if he had a chance to exchange the letters with one of Kiyomasa’s offspring, and requested him to identify one of his younger relatives. Nonetheless, Hōshū had no positive interest in Kiyomasa:

The Way of heaven is very clearly depicted in this world. The warriors who slaughtered [the Korean] people in the field at that time did not bear children. And Kiyomasa, without any exception, where in the earth are his children alive?

Both Shin and Hōshū shared the same opinion of the Japanese invasions. They did possess the antagonism against the past military leader who made the Korean land impoverished and

---

97 Hōshū implied on wakō, a group of pirates who threatened the safety of the southern Korea and Chinese coastal area.
99 ibid., p.319.
100 ibid., p.319.
101 ibid., p.320.
slaughtered the local people in war.

Shin’s experience in the embassy did not entirely remove his somewhat biased manner towards the Japanese, but he began to think about the importance of correspondence with the Japanese attendants, especially with Hōshū. The exchange between him and Shin was sometimes confrontational, but their last greeting in Tsushima was filled with their sincere attitude on the night before the embassy left for Pusan from Tsushima on twenty eighth day of the twelfth month.\(^\text{102}\) On the last day, Hōshū visited Shin’s ship where he stayed at night:

I [Shin] sent him a poem: “While you bid farewell to me tonight with solicitude, we will never again meet each other.”

Amenomori saw it with tears, and said “I am old enough. I will soon be excused from my all administrative duties, and the day of my burial in the island [of Tsushima] is approaching. No more desires at this late age. But my wish is that special promotion will honour you at the court after you return home.” After the word, his tears began to wet his cheek.

I said: “I know that your mind is originally firm set like an iron stone. Why are you acting like an infant girl at this moment?”

[Amenomori said:] “I also feel my sense of closeness to the 1711 embassy like this time of the embassy, but I had no tears when I separated from them. In this decade, my spirit and hair are in senile decay. In ancient saying “exceeding mercifulness in the twilight years” would indicate what I now face. When I analyzed him [Hōshū], his personality is stern and not honest. He is talented, but contains grimace inside. If he takes full charge in politics with authority, he may threaten our state. But such an honour is impossible to be granted to him by the rule of his country. He needs to stay in the island until his death. His tears upon our farewell were to grieve for himself.\(^\text{103}\)

By giving the written piece, Hōshū also wished for Shin’s further promotion in the Chosŏn

\(^{102}\) The date is equivalent to February 6 (1720) in Gregorian calendar.

\(^{103}\) Shin “Haeyurok.” p.267.
court.\footnote{Shin did not receive further promotion in Korea after coming back from Japan due to his status of illegitimate son.} Hōshū’s enormous respect for Shin as a competent diarist was revealed at the end of their journey. Shin’s evaluation of Hōshū varied over time, and he sometimes criticized Hōshū as ‘roared like a wolf,’ such as when they quarrelled about the visitation at the Mound of Ears in Kyoto. But overall, despite several harsh disputes between the two officials, Shin highly evaluated Hōshū’s ability as a diplomat-scholar: “…The most outstanding personnel among the Japanese officials… He speaks three languages (Japanese, Korean, and Chinese) fluently, understands thousands of books, and has a significant talent to sense right or wrong… He deserves enough to be further promoted to a higher post in the government. What a pitiful man!”\footnote{Shin, “Haeyurok.” the twenty eighth day of the twelfth month, p.268, pp.306-307.}

Shin’s sympathy towards Hōshū also came from the Japanese patrimonial system that was totally foreign to him. Shin left a critical view on the odd policy of the bakufu, cast a question on Hōshū who was buried in the local place, and sought a reason why he just remained as an attendant of the embassy: “In Japan, there are no ways to select the government officials by the official examinations. Thus, [capable] one [indicated Hōshū] remains just a secretary of the small province.”\footnote{ibid., p.300.} From Shin’s view, Hōshū was able enough to work at the bakufu.

Shin asked Hōshū if he had an opportunity to serve the bakufu after attending the 1719 embassy:

[Hōshū answered:] What if Hakuseki were serving the new shogun [Yoshimune], I may have had a chance to occupy a position in the central government.
And I asked: Why was Hakuseki out of the office?
He answered: Too old to work. 
And I asked again: Where is he now? 
He [Hōshū] answered: His residence is in Edo, but he is excused from a whole activity [of politics.]
Amenomori was reluctant in touching on the issues of the government. 
His face is not peaceful. 107

It is Shin’s simple inquiry as to why Hōshū was unable to serve in the central government. From their conversation above, Hōshū likely did possess some degree of expectation of receiving a recommendation from Hakuseki so that he was able to seek a position in the bakufu to work as a Neo-Confucian advisor. Nevertheless, Hōshū may have fully recognized that a chance to serve the bakufu was unattainable, because of his age (fifty-one) at that time.

Shin Yuhan’s record “Haeyurok” is filled with detailed conditions of Tokugawa Japan and his straightforward opinions on the neighbouring state. Though his view contained bias towards the Japanese, the perspectives of how the Chosŏn official perceived Japan and the Japanese were revealed through the travelogue, and Shin’s detailed observation on Japan is still regarded as the important source in the eighteenth century.

While diplomats frequently tended to interact with superficial greetings and utilize shrewd tactics, both Hōshū and Shin held several straightforward discussions that sometimes turned harsh and even made the counterpart resentful. At their first encounter in Tsushima, both officials seemed to possess unfriendliness or even some hostility, especially at the banquet hosted by the daimyo of Tsushima. The quarrel came from their rightful responsibility; both of them served their countries and as the representatives in diplomacy, they certainly carried the pride of their respective states.

107 ibid., p.321.
However, Hōshū and Shin were somehow able to foster friendship during the journey. In Shin’s view, Hōshū was the only Japanese who deeply understood the Korean culture in various ways and could handle effortful negotiations. In addition to Hōshū’s expertise in dealing with the Korean issues, his fluency both in Korean and Chinese also made his existence more valuable. Hōshū’s intelligence and position impressed the Korean officials, and he was competent enough to strike those Korean elites in the embassy. From the Korean side, the Korean members were fortunate enough to work with efficient personnel such as Hōshū. Indeed, the two largest embassies in 1711 and 1719 did not encounter hardships on their trip, and those two parties were able to safely head to Korea. Though Hōshū did not obtain bakufu’s position, his roles in Korean diplomacy were, without any doubt, significant. Hōshū’s endeavours to develop the personnel to serve Korean diplomacy were fruitful and increased the number of efficient interpreters in the Tsushima island after his retirement.

The cultural gap between the Japanese and Korean officials still seemed to remain. In the conversation between the two officials, Hōshū mentioned that the Korean monographs expressed the Japanese as uncivilized barbarians. The Japanese officials also increased the bias towards the Koreans at the same time, as Hōshū warned that lack of cultural understanding may cause further cracks. In particular, the Japanese scholars gained their bias towards the Koreans through the exchanges with the Korean embassy. Ironically, as the neighbourly relations went on, the discriminations seemed to deepen. The next chapter will look at the view of the Japanese and Korean counterparts among the scholars in Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea.
Chapter Seven
Views of the Counterparts: the Japanese and Korean Scholars

Sentiments of the Tokugawa scholars towards the Chosŏn scholars

Admiration towards the Chosŏn scholars among the Japanese scholars inspired the further development of the Neo-Confucian (Chu Hsi) studies in Tokugawa society. The Japanese scholars saw Chosŏn Korea as a country that refined the Neo-Confucian principle, as the interpretations of the Neo-Confucian theory by the Korean scholars were regarded as much more distinguished than the Chinese scholars. Along with the social and political stability after the establishment of the Tokugawa bakufu in 1603, the activities of the scholars became more vigorous. When the Korean embassy came to Japan, the Japanese scholars and even the commoners enthusiastically sought autographs, comments on their written works, calligraphy, and paintings from the embassy. Through the visitations of the embassy, the Japanese were able to experience the infrequent but enticing opportunity—encounters with foreign culture and scholarship.

However, it is also crucial to explore a different face of their positive sentiments in order to deepen the analysis of those Japanese scholars. The positive and negative feelings had long coexisted among the Japanese scholars towards their Korean counterparts, and the transformation of their attitudes was delineated more conspicuously in the eighteenth century. How did such a change occur? Those scholars seemed gradually to take a more negative view of the Korean scholars and culture as they began to acknowledge the excellence of Japan’s own culture. In the early stage of the Tokugawa period, the attachment of the Japanese scholars to Chosŏn Korea was strong but ironically, as the neighbourly relations were maintained for a
longer period, this attachment weakened.

The Japanese scholars who especially pursued the Neo-Confucian study included Fujiwara Seika (1561-1619), Hayashi Razan, a student of Seika, Kinoshita Jun’an, and Yamasaki Ansai (1618-1682). Among those scholars, Fujiwara Seika and Yamasaki Ansai are the best figures to show how they caught up with their studies and the Korean scholars. They accumulated their scholastic achievements through the exchanges with the Koreans and the Korean monographs.

The scholastic exchanges between the Japanese and Korean scholars started in the last years of the Japanese invasions of Chosŏn Korea. A prominent Neo-Confucianist in Chosŏn Korea, Kang Hang became an important figure in the development of Neo-Confucianism in Japan through his active exchanges with the Japanese scholars. He was a leading disciple of Yi T’oege (1501-70),¹ one of the most outstanding Neo-Confucian scholars in Chosŏn Korea, and was brought to Japan as a captive in 1597 during the Japanese invasions of Chosŏn Korea. He spent a relatively free life despite his captivity due to his status as a well known scholar in his country. His daily unyielding attitude never changed- neatly dressed, and practicing writing letters and reading the monographs.² During his life in Kyoto until his return to the Korean peninsula in 1600, his Neo-Confucian interpretations were spread by Fujiwara Seika.

Fujiwara Seika was directly associated with Kang in Kyoto. Seika’s early career was as a Buddhist zen monk of the Shōkokuji in Kyoto. When he was thirty, the interaction with the Korean embassy before the Japanese invasions, inspired him to further deepen the

¹ Yi T’oege interpreted his perception of the world based on the Neo-Confucian principle. The world of matter was constituted with dual matters, li and chi. Lacking either term the world could not be illustrated. The li is a character of the person and the chi (nature and essence), means the material and existence. His statement included the belief that correctness was a will of heaven, and making an effort was correct behaviour as a person.

Neo-Confucian studies in 1591. The ultimate impact that Seika received was a meeting with Kang Hang in Kyoto. The experience encouraged him to devote his whole life to the Neo-Confucian discipline. He soon left the zen temple to be a Neo-Confucian scholar.

The interactions with Kang provided Seika with a significant moment to further expand the Neo-Confucian knowledge. Kang Hang highly praised Seika’s enthusiastic study and his extensive knowledge. After his return to Chosŏn Korea, he acknowledged Seika in his record “Kanyangnok,” or the “Record of Recalling Time,” as: “…a very bright man full of competence in understanding the old Chinese literature, and no letters cannot be understood by him. Ieyasu heard his sagaciousness and created an office for him [in Edo] by offering a stipend of the two thousand koku of rice, but he never accepted the bakufu’s post.”

Seika’s role in consolidating the Neo-Confucian theory in Japan was significant, and his scholastic inspiration owed much to Kang and his written works. Seika analyzed how the Confucian ideals should have been incorporated into the real society and how they could apply to the Tokugawa political discipline. Upon Tokugawa Ieyasu’s request in 1600, Seika went to the Nijō Castle in Kyoto to lecture him on the Neo-Confucian doctrine, which would become a new philosophical principle for the Tokugawa polity. Seika appeared wearing Confucian costume, showing his unyielding determination to devote himself to being a Neo-Confucian scholar. The Neo-Confucian principle already became Seika’s solid code of behaviour. As Kang wrote in his record, Seika was later invited to be the Neo-Confucian advisor of the bakufu, but he refused the position. Hayashi Razan was named to fill the position instead. Seika became an indispensable scholar to influence Ieyasu and the early political system of the Tokugawa regime.

Seika also had an opportunity to exchange his literary pieces with the Korean officials in the time of the 1607 embassy. He composed literary works on Yi T’oegye and presented them to the Korean officials as: “T’oegye, a stupendous jewel, everyone knows his striking name in my country.” “His elaboration [on his study] reached everywhere [in Japan] but needs more transmission of his study [throughout the country.] [Theory of] truth has no bounds as the knowledge of T’oegye.” 6 Seika’s works illustrated his high appreciation of T’oegye’s achievements and his contribution to the Neo-Confucian studies.

Acknowledgement of Yi T’oegye was maintained among the Neo-Confucian scholars throughout the Tokugawa period. The Japanese scholars revered the Korean scholars who developed Confucianism in more theoretical way and added more logical explanation to the Chinese Confucian works. According to Abe Yoshio this was because the dynastic change from the Ming dynasty to the Qing dynasty provided Chosŏn Korea with further growth and more detailed interpretations of Neo-Confucianism. Chosŏn Korea did prevent modifications or misinterpretations of the Neo-Confucian studies from Qing China, though the new dynasty admitted the Neo-Confucian principle as the official study. 7 The Chosŏn court’s cultural detachment from Qing China might also have accelerated the development of the Neo-Confucian theory in the Korean domestic society. The Japanese scholars generally saw that China was a parental state, and Korea was a brotherly country, toward which Japan had more approachable sentiments than to a ‘parent.’ 8 In contrast to Japan’s great appreciation of T’oegye’s, his works were not much recognized by the Chinese scholars, as the ‘state of son’ seemed to excel the father. 9

---

7 ibid., p.453.
8 ibid., p.453.
9 ibid., p.453.
Yamazaki Ansai also showed his reverence for Yi T’oegye. His personal belief in T’oegye as a mediator between Chu Hsi and himself, inspired his own interpretation of Neo-Confucianism: “…By learning study of Chu Hsi, if it is an incorrect code, I am wrong with Chu Hsi; [although I was also wrong,] I never regretted it.”\(^{10}\) He greatly admired the two Neo-Confucianists; Chu Hsi made Confucian thought more sophisticated, and the Korean scholar Yi T’oegye then developed the Chinese-born Neo-Confucianism into an immovable philosophy.\(^{11}\)

Indeed, Ansai’s passion to pursue the Neo-Confucian study was inspired by T’oegye’s works. His high evaluation of T’oegye was immeasurable, and showed his appreciation: “T’oegye was indeed placed on the same crucial position as Chu Hsi, his other leading disciples, and the Chinese scholars in the same period… He interpreted the Neo-Confucian doctrine that other scholars could not find… It is the most distinguishing phenomenon of Neo-Confucianism.”\(^{12}\) Ansai’s contribution to the Neo-Confucian studies was certainly from his own admiration of T’oegye, and his articles on the Neo-Confucian doctrines were pervaded the whole country.\(^{13}\)

Following Yamazaki Ansai, his disciples who acquired the Neo-Confucian studies from their master Ansai also played an important role in the further infiltration of the Neo-Confucian studies into society and their students. Satō Naokata (1650-1719), a disciple of Anzai, and Naokata’s student, Inaba Usai (1684-1760) and his son Mokusai (1732-1799) also studied T’oegye’s works. Naokata took T’oegye’s belief as the moral principle for his students, and encouraged them to continue reading his scholarly documents throughout their life. Usai

---


\(^{11}\) Abe, p.251.

\(^{12}\) ibid., p.454.

\(^{13}\) ibid., p.454.
later opened a *terakoya*, or private educational school, to the public, instructing the local students on T’oegye as “a great scholar next to Chu Hsi.”\(^{14}\) Mokusai, in following Naokata’s volition, became familiar with T’oegye’s study. At the winter solstice, he held an early-morning workshop for T’oegye to deepen the understanding of his written works. Before reading his articles, his students must wash, clean their rooms, and sit properly and formally dressed; after that they began to read the preface of his works.\(^{15}\)

Another scholar, Nishikawa Nyoken (1648-1724),\(^{16}\) showed his attitude that the Neo-Confucian studies were accomplished by Yi T’oegye. He was already an eminent scholar in Nagasaki, his native place. He acknowledged Chosŏn Korea as: “[Korea] excelled China in regard to the study of the Neo-Confucian doctrine. The [development of the Confucian] discipline was already terminated in the continent [Qing China], but continues to grow in the country [Korea] where the humble and modest people reside.”\(^{17}\) He looked to Korea as the center of Neo-Confucianism. A Neo-Confucianist in Kumamoto,\(^{18}\) Ōtsuka Taino (1677-1750) learned the depth of the Neo-Confucian theory by reading T’oegye’s articles when he was twenty-eight. T’oegye’s dominance in the Japanese Neo-Confucian scholarship seemed unbreakable at that time.

The chief diarist of the 1719 embassy, Shin Yuhan, was also impressed with the wide distribution of T’oegye’s written collections in Osaka and the great popularity of his written pieces in public as follows:

\(^{14}\) Ibid., pp.458-459.
\(^{15}\) Ibid., p.459.
\(^{16}\) Nishikawa Nyoken was born in Nagasaki and author of the two-volume *Kai Tsushōkō* that was regarded as the first book recorded in topography and foreign trade under sakoku rule. He was invited to Tokugawa Yoshimune to lecture on astronomy and geography and presented his written works in 1719. Also known by the pseudonym of *Kurinsai*.
\(^{18}\) Current Kumamoto prefecture in Kyūshū.
[The numbers of] published texts in Osaka were indeed a spectacular view of the world. Among the numerous monographs by our [the Korean] scholars, the high regard of the Japanese populace concentrated on A Collection of T’oegye. [According to rumour that I heard,] each house has the copy [of T’oegye] and enjoys reading of his works… The members of the former embassies always mentioned that T’oegye’s renowned reputation was everywhere [in Japan] without any exception. Indeed, the Japanese people often asked me the location of his worship site.\(^{19}\) Another frequent inquiry was on any tidings of offspring of the Neo-Confucian master and his favourites and hobbies as well. Their endless appreciation [of T’oegye] was so enthusiastic that I never wrote down a whole story that I heard from them.\(^{20}\)

As Shin mentioned, T’oegye was one of the central themes of the conversation between the Japanese and Korean embassy. Some of the Japanese scholars asked the members of the embassy if the original texts of T’oegye’s works were safely restored somewhere in the Korean peninsula.\(^{21}\) The texts in Chosŏn Korea were already lost due to the Japanese invasions, but far from Chosŏn Korea, his publications were available. A number of editions of the Korean scholarly manuscripts and monographs after the invasions were sent to Japan, and those texts brought more recognizable subjects among the Japanese scholars and commoners.\(^{22}\) In Shin’s record, he also mentioned an encounter with the local scholar in Osaka who orally presented Shin with his faultless recitations on the worshiped historical Korean sages in the Shilla (57 B.C.-935), Koryŏ, and Chosŏn periods. With amazement, Shin questioned him on how many ancient Japanese scholars he knew, but he only knew little about them.\(^{23}\) Shin’s cynicism about

---
\(^{19}\) Indicated as susan sowŏn, established in 1574. The site is in Andong county, Kyŏnggsang (north) province.


\(^{21}\) ibid., p.467.

\(^{22}\) ibid., p.453.

\(^{23}\) Shin, “Haeyurok.” p.244. Shin asked the local scholar about offspring of Abe no Nakamaro (698-770), who went to Tang China selected as kentôshi. He spent fifty-four years in Tang and elevated his political
the understanding of the Japanese was: “they are ignorant of the ancestral masters of their own country.”

Similar to Kang Hang, other Korean captives in Japan also contributed to the further development of the Neo-Confucian principle in the newly-established Tokugawa society. The Korean scholars in local domains received prominence and were also worshipped by the people in the communities. The Koreans became a role model of the Japanese locals in their provinces such as Hong Ho-yŏn (1582-1657), Yi Chinyŏng, Yi Maegye, a son of Yi Chinyŏng, who spent their lives in the domains where they were taken from the Korean peninsula during the Japanese invasions. Each of them served the domains where they were moved to, later married local women, and had children. Those scholars became the noteworthy Neo-Confucian scholars in the regions and showed their long-lasting loyalty for the local daimyos. Those Koreans did not experience any prejudice in those domains. Rather they were welcomed as eminent scholars and respected as distinguished scholars.

Among those scholars, Hong Hoyŏn’s name could be more distinguished in the Saga domain, one of the major domains in Kyūshū, the current Saga prefecture. He was captured by the Japanese army when he was twelve years old and brought to Japan. Nabeshima Katsushige (1580-1657), the first daimyo of the domain, treated Hong as his own younger brother. While he was studying with Katsushige, his scholarly aptitude was already apparent. After studying in Kyoto, Hong went back to the domain to serve the Nabeshima family as a Neo-Confucian advisor and a loyal vassal of his master. Katsushige once allowed Hong’s return to his home country; however, Katsushige’s messenger reached the port before his departure, and

career as official of the junior third ranking in serving for the sixth emperor Gensō (r. 712-756). He never returned home again. After his death, the senior second ranking was granted.

24 ibid., p. 244.
persuaded him not to leave his lord. The impressed Hong went back to Katsushige and decided to stay with him for the rest of his life. When Katsushige died in Edo at seventy-eight, Hong followed his master by *seppuku* at his age of seventy-six, in accordance with the trend that the truly loyal vassal pursued his master to another world, a practice called ‘*junshi.*’ His behaviour made a deep impression on other retainers of the Nabeshima family, and Hong’s deed became a model of how the vassal should behave.\(^{26}\)

As seen in the previous chapters, crowds of local people gathered at the Korean embassy’s lodge to receive the writings from the Koreans when the embassy visited Japan. Shin Yuhan recognized such Japanese manners:

> The Japanese’ enthusiasm of seeking our writings, without distinction of social rankings or positions, they respect them if they were gods or benevolent wizards, and treasure them like jewels. The Japanese even sought handshaking and writings from our carriers of the palanquin and the servants who did not know much about writings… The local scholars who came to visit us from a thousand miles away looked delighted when they receive our comments… In my perception, they do not usually experience seeing our formal costume and accessories [such as crowns] because of [Japan’s] remoteness from the central civilization, so they admire Korea.\(^{27}\)

Shin must have felt some satisfaction on the behaviour of the Japanese who admired the Korean ‘civilized and refined’ culture. In this sense, the Koreans seemed relieved that the Japanese were not a competitor of the Koreans in the cultural aspect. Under the Tokugawa realm, from Shin’s point of view, the antagonism of the Japanese against Chosŏn Korea was an invisible matter, though their bias towards the Korean counterpart may not yet have been

---


\(^{27}\) Shin, “*Haeyurok.*” pp.302-303.
reflected on the surface level.

The exchange with the Koreans was significant for the Japanese scholars. To establish themselves as the scholars, the exchanges of their written works with the Korean embassy were an extraordinary opportunity to show their pieces, and the tendency became more extensive. Meeting with the Koreans could turn into a stepping stone to further promotion of oneself. The Koreans were well-acquainted with the fact that good comments from themselves would have provided the scholars with a high honour. Some of the Japanese traveled to meet the embassy from the remote area to get evaluations on their writings. Knowing this, the Koreans tried to offer a literary exchange for as long as possible with those Japanese. Once the local scholars received fine remarks from the Koreans, their reputation attracted a number of students to learn the Chinese writings, and after that they were able to make a living more easily. If they were more fortunate, they might be called to serve the local domain or even the bakufu such as Arai Hakuseki. Maeda Yōan (1677-1752) was not an exception. After he received an excellent comment from Yi Hyŏn, the chief diarist of the 1711 embassy, he was later called to serve the Fukui domain as a medical doctor. Yi gave a remark on his written piece as: “… your mind is very clear… Do not lament your hardships for achieving your studies far from your hometown. You will soon receive an honour [in the future.]”

Yi Hyŏn, also showed his thoughtfulness to a young scholar who presented an inaccurate rhyme in his work to the Koreans:

When you speak out The language is refreshing
When I read your works They are excellently composed

---

29 ibid., p.6.
30 ibid., p.6.
It is harmless at all Though you had a mistake with a rhyme
Enjoy this moment and toast a glass

Yi’s return comment was filled with his consideration and attempted to encourage the scholar who faultily composed the rhymes. For the Japanese scholars, exchanging their works with the Korean embassy was honorific and was regarded as their great achievement of their career. It is easy to imagine that the scholar, who showed an insufficient work to Yi, must have felt bewildered. For those scholars, the exchange of the Korean embassy may have determined their life. To some extent, they practiced the writings to receive good evaluations from the Korean officials.

The somewhat fanatic attitudes of the Japanese towards the Korean monographs and the embassy reflected their enthusiasm to absorb new matters, including scholastic stimulations that the Japanese society did not possess. The Japanese enjoyed learning the new issues and scholarship from the Koreans. Such a Japanese manner to the Koreans showed positive attitudes and friendliness to the Korean culture as well.

Gradual change of view in Korean evaluation among the Japanese scholars

While the correspondence between Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea were continuing, some of the Japanese scholars began to question the close relations between Japan and its neighbouring country. They did not see Chosŏn Korea as equal to Japan, as the Korean culture was nothing compared with the Japanese excellent culture.

Even in the seventeenth century, some Japanese scholars looked at Chosŏn Korea subjectively. As introduced previously, Arai Hakuseki was one who had a biased eye to Chosŏn Korea. Yamaga Sokō (1622-1685) also refused to maintain the neighbourly relations with

---

31 ibid., p.6.
Chosŏn Korea. His perception was as follows:

What is the neighbour? It means possessing an opposite character… I perceive that the tributary missions from Koryŏ, Peakche, and Shilla to Japan were not aimed to establish their friendship with our country [from the ancient time.] … The foreign states [including Korea] belong to the Center [Japan.] So Korea does not deserve engaging in the neighbourly relations.32

Sokō’s denial of the neighbourly friendship with Chosŏn Korea was unambiguous. He continued as “… the Korean personality was malicious and did not comprehend any Confucian materials. Korea is inferior to any aspects in scholarship and martial arts, so the small state always embarrasses in its behaviour to Japan.”33 For him, Chosŏn Korea’s pursuit of Neo-Confucianism was not a proper attitude. Sokō’s central research was on kogaku, or the orthodox study of the Confucianism, which confronted the theoretical Neo-Confucian principle. Sokō’s ill-feeling toward Chosŏn Korea might have come from the friction between the two studies, but he never admitted the neighbourly relationship between the two states.

The prejudiced perspectives on Chosŏn Korea frequently came to light in eighteenth-century Japan. After the enthusiasm for the Korean scholarship and culture, the Chinese materials seemed to arouse greater interest among the Japanese scholars. Inoue Atsushi argued that the Chinese scholastic documents brought by the Korean embassy were also regarded as the important materials among the Japanese scholars, along with the Korean document.34 Some scholars recognized that the mediation of the Korean documentations to

---

33 Yazawa, p.20.
deepen the Chinese scholarship was no longer necessary. Those scholars may have begun to see the Korean scholarship as duplicating the Chinese studies. This change could be the very initial edge of the negative view of Chosŏn Korea, though it was not a sole reason in seeing the Koreans in a contemptuous manner.

Some Japanese scholars felt the acts of the Korean embassy were just to ‘show-off’ their literary talents. The urban scholars predominantly tended to think this. They criticized the verses with an unsystematic order composed by the members of the Korean embassy, and blamed the Korean writers for producing such poor pieces which were no longer models for the Japanese scholars. They also felt anxious about the enthusiastic manners of the Japanese crowds who were waiting for the Korean embassy’s visitation, as they seemed to humiliate the Japanese culture. To some extent, those scholars could have been as jealous as Arai Hakuseki who complained of the unfair competition between the Japanese scholars’ immature ability and Koreans’ high competence in literature.

As the Korean culture became more familiar to the populace, it lost its uniqueness. Discriminatory discourse towards the Koreans was intensively produced even among the commoners. Tokugawa Japan’s subsequent encounters with the Koreans as well as with other foreigners, such as Ryūkyūans through their march to Edo, gave the ordinary people more opportunities to see them, and some products brought from Holland, toys and accessories, were also distributed more widely in the society. As time went by, Chosŏn Korea was often described as the literati’s central subjects both in positive and negative aspects. In such an environment, Chosŏn Korea became the theme of the writings by the literati, and the topics often turned into mockery and criticism.

35 ibid., p.209.
Ōta Nampo (1749-1823), a popular essayist in the late eighteenth century, often wrote on the Korean subject on his writings. His article “Sō Tsushima no kami kerai tora o utsu (Vassals of Tsushima hunted the tigers)” was based on an actual happening in 1771 when the two tigers appeared around the site of the wakan, and the five brave Tsushima officials eventually caught the animals. In Nampo’s language, the hunting was “a distinguished and glorious achievement next to Hideyoshi’s war, and it shows the illustrious courage of the Japanese.” In the essay, some indications were also included. The awful tigers that damaged the Japanese warehouses and yards were described as the ‘Korean-born animal,’ which seemed a symbol of Korea. He continued: “the fearlessness [of the five Japanese] provided those tigers with unlimited impression,” and the men who stroked the animals demonstrated extraordinary deed as kidai no chinji (uncommon and unexpected event once in centuries). On Nampo’s essay, Tashiro comments: “[Although Nampo’s writing was based upon a non-fictional matter,] it became much more an exaggerated heroic narrative.”

Another Nampo’s short essay, “Ichiwa ichigon, “ or “One Story, one Word,” was filled with a sense of satire, entitled “waka (the Japanese traditional poet) made by a Korean visited in 1719.” This piece attempted to make the readers laugh by a row of meaningless letters of the kana, or the Japanese alphabets; the Koreans never comprehended how to write the waka, and they had no ability to compose it. His cynical expressions seemed to reveal a fact that the Koreans showed no enthusiasm to learn Japanese language or the culture. But more ironically,

---

37 Ōta, Nanpo. Ōta Nanpo zenshū. vol 11., Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1987., pp.347-348. After the capture of the tigers, the inhabitants of the Wakan tasted the flesh. “The flavour was like chicken. Very appetizing.” (Ōta Nanpo zenshū vol 11., p.348.) Oda Ikugorō, an interpreter of Tsushima domain, later recalled in his record of “Tsuyaku shūsaku” that he once tasted a piece of the tiger’s flesh. According to his writing, the taste was “no grease like an old ox. We (people taking them in) do not know how good it is for the health, but it is said to be very nutritional and we seem more energetic after having it.”

38 Ōta, p.348.


40 Wrote as “toratenannonnsentonchatorasunnbaneikiruneirachannpatinnpira”
Nampo himself did not understand the Korean culture.

The Japanese scholars’ view of Chosŏn Korea was becoming more critical and less respectful and this gradually influenced the society and even the political authority - the bakufu. Matsudaira Sadanobu (1758-1829), a rojū at a time, asked Nakai Chikuzan (1730-1804), a Confucian scholar in Osaka, how the bakufu should behave toward Korean diplomacy and the embassy in the future. Although his primary aim lay in the termination of the luxurious reception for the Korean embassy due to financial difficulty of the bakufu and the all affected local domains on the route of the embassy, some of his explanations were somewhat illogical and devoid of some solid rationale. His point of view contained a certain ill-feeling towards Chosŏn Korea, as the country attempted to downgrade Japan as a culturally inferior state.

In “Sōbō kigen” (1788), or the “Bold Words of a Burgher,” Nakai Chikuzan recorded a series of answers and suggestions to Sadanobu: (i) the Korean peninsula had long been a tributary of Japan; therefore, the bakufu should not treat the embassy in a gorgeous manner; (ii) as Arai Hakuseki insists, the Koreans attempt to overwhelm the Japanese through literary exchanges, just as they cannot beat us by force; (iii) regarding the literary competence, the Koreans often look down on Japan, and see it as Chosŏn Korea’s tributary. To verify these notions, when marching the streets, they carry the flags of junshi (a tour of inspection) and seidō (a road of purification) during their journey. Those signs signify their brazenness towards the Japanese, as junshi stands for the scrutiny of their own territory, and seidō orders the people to clean the streets when the embassy passes; (iv) the Korean behaviour is arrogant, for they do not use paperweight when writing to us; stretching foot on a paper was their practice in writing. The Japanese gladly receive such writing. The writings under such a bad manner should not be admitted; (v) the diarists of the Korean embassy were selected from the outstanding members
through the royal court. To compete with the Koreans, the Japanese side also had to select more experienced scholars to exchange with them; (vi) the ceremony of the sovereign’s message should be carried out in Tsushima, not in Edo. By exercising the ceremony in Tsushima, the financial anxiety could be lessened.\(^4^1\)

Nakai Chikuzan’s suggestion of cutting down the banquets for the embassy was a very pragmatic concern financially. He mentioned that the bakufu should demonstrate its wealth and power to the Korean embassy through the gorgeous receptions, but the costly feasts were inappropriate for all affected local domains on the route of the embassy, as the burdens of each daimyo in the domains were already financially weighty.\(^4^2\) Self-enhancement of the Tokugawa regime towards overseas was important, but the bakufu also needed to assist the domains by cutting down their budgets for the banquets of the embassy.\(^4^3\) In this sense, his argument was understandable, as the economic issue became more serious in Japan. To tighten the expenditure, based upon his explanation, simplifying the diplomatic protocol for the Korean embassy was the most effective way to financially save the domains as well as the bakufu.

As Chikuzan indicated, enormous costs were shouldered by the local people in those affected domains upon the Korean embassy’s visitations. Repairs of the streets and lodges were started about six months prior to the arrival of the embassy. Maintenance was the responsibility of the local domains, and the horses and foods for the ambassadorial party were provided by the domains as well.\(^4^4\) In total, 107,951 labourers and 36,411 horses were needed for the Koreans both from the local domains and the bakufu for the journey of the 1711 embassy.\(^4^5\)

---

\(^4^2\) There were no monetary aids from the bakufu towards the local domains to host the embassy.
The residents in Kamagari (currently in Hiroshima prefecture) feared that their domain might have gone bankrupt if the Korean embassy came to the domain in two successive years.\(^46\) The economic issue was responsible for the discontinuation of the embassy’s visitation to Edo.

Chikuzan also specified that the journey from Chosŏn Korea to Edo was a waste of money; to circumvent the excessive spending of the bakufu, *ekichi heirei*, or visitation of a remote place, was a more apposite resolution. In his intention, though reduction of costs for the embassy was given primary attention, his thought also showed negative sentiments towards the Korean counterparts and could lead to the termination of the visitation of the Korean embassy.

In the last part of Chikuzan’s answer to Sadanobu, he stated the historical facts on the relationship between Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea, and it could be his authentic feeling towards the neighbouring state:

> In general, the Koreans’ tribute to the Japanese has to show their admiring expression of the imperial court [as a sovereign of Japan]; need to admit Japan’s [honourable] position under the emperor. The sovereign’s message [from the emperor] ought to be practiced between the retainers [of the imperial court and the Korean king.] This is an original protocol in the ancient period [between the two states,] and this is a whole structure of the state.\(^47\)

From Chikuzan’s point of view, the emperor was a sovereign of Japan. He clarified that Chosŏn Korea should have been positioned as a vassal of the imperial court; therefore, the Japanese emperor was historically far superior to the Korean king. On his subjective argument, Nakamura Hidetaka explicitly reveals his opinion: “On such an opinion, needless to say, his idea came from his own interpretation that Korea was originally a tributary country of


Japan.\textsuperscript{48}

The positive view of the imperial court was further developed into \textit{kokugaku}, or national learning or national studies.\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Kokugaku} would have inspired the Japanese scholars to focus on ‘Japan’s world-centeredness’ which could be traced back to its origin in the concept of the \textit{hua-yi} order. The \textit{kokugaku} study encouraged the Japanese scholars to further examine ‘Japan’s originalities.’ Those scholars were challenged to present Japan as an extraordinary state- to place Japan as an advanced civilization. They defined the search for Japan’s ancientness as the discovery of \textit{kodō}, or the ancient way. \textit{Kodō} was fully explained by Motoori Norinaga (1730-1801), an important influence on the \textit{kokugaku} scholar. In his expression, the ancient way was the path initially created and supported by the ancestral deity of the imperial court, the axis of the world. Reading ancient and medieval texts was an important area of research into Japan’s uniqueness.

The development of \textit{kokugaku} seemed to symbolize Tokugawa Japan’s pessimistic future. The \textit{kokugaku} scholars shed new light on the Japanese scholarship that had long been overshadowed by the Chinese-influenced studies, such as Neo-Confucianism, the political doctrine of the Tokugawa rule. Those scholars also regarded the emperor as the sole sovereign of the state, not the shogun. Consequently, \textit{kokugaku} was later extended to political ideology as an extreme form of the ‘Japanese world order.’ After Norinaga, Hirata Atsutane (1766-1843) formed \textit{kokugaku} as an extremely biased dogma. He valued Japan as \textit{kōkoku}, or a state of divinity, and worshipped the emperor as \textit{arahitogami}, or the manifest god. \textit{Kokugaku} gradually

\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Kokugaku} literally means ‘studies of ancient Japan,’ and it was widely in use from the eighteenth century. Motoori Norinaga is regarded as one of the most influential \textit{kokugaku} scholars who theorized his pursuit and examined at ancient texts to find out what ancient Japanese possessed spiritually at that time. Through the texts based on literature pieces and classic texts in ancient and medieval times such as \textit{Kojiki} (712) and \textit{Nihongi} (720), Norinaga attempted to search and to revive Japan’s ancient spirit.
became part of the political principles and began to influence the political thinking.

The rise of *kokugaku* study paralleled Japan’s encounters with the foreign powers. In the nineteenth century, the bakufu had to settle a crucial matter: *gaiatsu*, or pressure from the western countries. The West compelled Japan to open the state by approaching Japanese territory. In the middle of the nineteenth century, passages of the westerners near Japan increased, and an alert to protect Japan from the external intimidations brought up a crucial question—how Japan should deal with those foreigners. At the same time, the protection from the outside world became the first and foremost concern of the bakufu polity.

A disturbance of the structure of the East Asian world that had existed for centuries had just begun. Whether Japan wished it or not, the long-term policy on the foreign affairs of Tokugawa Japan—the diplomatic relations with Chosŏn Korea and commercial relations with China and Holland—encountered fundamental reconsideration. In this environment, the attitudes of the keen Japanese scholars developed further. Those scholars and some *samurai* were alarmed at the threats of the western force towards the modern period, and they began to be aware of how Japan should respond to the crisis.

**The perspective of the *sirhak* scholars towards Japan**

Eighteenth-century Chosŏn Korea still remained under the rigid Neo-Confucian principle, and the constant lack of flexibility caused by the traditional view often interrupted acceptance of a new culture, approach, and development. Although the diplomatic engagement in 1609 was rehabilitated between Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea, most of the Chôson scholars often tended to perceive the Japanese as the barbarians and Japan as an inferior state.

In some social strata, however, a circle of the Korean scholars learned about various
social affairs in Japan, treated their neighbouring country as an equal partner, criticized Chosŏn Korea’s political and economic stagnation, and respected the Japanese policies that did not exist in their homeland. Through the Japanese documents brought by the embassy, those scholars in the Chosŏn traditional society brought a new perspective and approach to Korean’s neighbourly relationship with Tokugawa Japan. Those scholars are presently acknowledged as the sirhak scholars, who had more extensive outlook on Japan. Ha Woo-bong, who is one of the pioneers in research into the sirhak scholars, indicates if the ‘sirhak scholars (sirhakcha)’ were inappropriately named, they could more suitably be called ‘the scholars who had impartial knowledge and exercised objective scrutiny on the foreign states.’

The definition of sirhak originally is ‘learning for practical use,’ or ‘scholarship for living up to one’s faith.’ In general, the term sirhak has been accepted as naming a movement for reform born in the end of the seventeenth century during Yongjo’s reign. Yongjo attempted to relieve the factional strife to maintain a political balance called t’angp’yŏngch’ae, (policy of impartiality) to consolidate the royal prerogative and to aim at the stability of the state administration by fairly selecting the high-ranking officials to ease the harsh political struggle. Under such an attempt to ease political stringency, the sirhak was grown, and by the time under discussion, the sirhak scholars represented a group possessing a new vision that the conventional Chosŏn scholars did not have.

One of the most critical differences between the sirhak scholars and the traditional Chosŏn scholars was whether or not their interests leaned to the outside world and external affairs, including conditions of Japan. A significance of their new eyes was to regard Japan and
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50 It is rather difficult to discuss the exact definition of the sirhak scholars in the Chosŏn period. However, in this thesis I will introduce the sirhak scholars as the scholars who acquired deep knowledge on the foreign states, including Japan. Ha Woo-bong also acknowledges the obscurity to define the sirhak scholars. For more details, see Ha, Chōsen jitsugakusha no mita kinsei Nihon., Trans. Atsushi Inoue, pp.16-17.
the Japanese without any bias in treating them as an ‘odd country and strange people.’ Unconstrained within the conservative universalism in Chosŏn society, the *sirhak* scholars fostered their own perspective. Song sees the vital factors of the *sirhak* movement as: “Notion of *sochunghwa* gradually became impractical given the historical realities in the near eighteenth century, and transformations from such (traditional) thoughts were intensively pursued by the pragmatists (indicated as the *sirhak* scholars) to overcome the ideological and realistic gaps.”

In the present Korean scholarship, many scholars have questioned the historical significance of the *sirhak* scholars in the Chosŏn society, as their studies were not accepted by the majority of the Chosŏn scholars. The thoughts that the *sirhak* scholars produced were mainly discussed within the small circle of the scholars, who agreed and shared ideas in common. In other words, their ideas did not influence the politics of the Chosŏn court at all. Nevertheless, the change to look at the outside world was an essential phenomenon at least in the traditional Chosŏn society. In the history of the late Chosŏn period, those scholars’ endeavour to change a prejudiced image of Japan ought to be given more emphasis, as their existence provides us with the opportunity to see different angle of Chosŏn society as well. The *sirhak* scholars’ outlook only turned into an inconsequential opinion that did not develop the Chosŏn politics, but the dynamism of a new approach was definitely seen as a little sprout that germinated in the new era and changed the traditional perception.

Another vital issue on the *sirhak* scholars is the question of the limits of their detailed research on Japan, given their lack of experiences in seeing, visiting, and living in the country. The main sources of their research and analysis were solely based on the monographs that the
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51 Son, “Chŏsen kŏki jitsugaku shishō to taigai ninshiki.” p.2.
Korean embassy brought back to their home country and the travelogues of the embassy. Nevertheless, the sirhak scholars were different from the other traditional scholars. They attempted to understand Japan as precisely as possible from those documents published in Japan. As a result, they were well-acquainted with its history and culture. Their certain distance from the central academic currents also made it possible for them to construct their freer visions, and their open-minded observations on Japan became more objective. By having a more nondiscriminatory view, the sirhak scholars were not restricted within an inferior-superior perspective.

Among the sirhak scholars in the eighteenth century, Yi Ik (1681-1763) showed a deep understanding of Japan. His work Sŏngho sasŏl (date unknown but approximately completed in 1760) compiled by his student An Chŏngbok (1712-1791) contained various facts and data about Japan, and the information with his candid opinions on the neighbouring state. Yi’s records on Japan were extended to geography, history, custom, culture, and politics. Yi also had wide-ranging knowledge on astronomy and world geography. By possessing such extensive understanding, he was probably able to research details on his neighbouring state from a relatively unprejudiced perspective.

Yi Ik pursued the circumstances in Japan by comparing those in Chosŏn Korea. His suggestions included further development of militaristic defence in his country, and indicated the solid foundation of force in Chosŏn Korea:

[Building up] armed force should be more emphasized [in Korea], though the soldiers may not be necessary in hundred years [if peace is maintained]. Possessing force means to own firm preparation against

---

52 The Sŏngho sasŏl is consisted of ten fascicles each in two volumes and is an encyclopedic collection of essays on Japan.
53 Son, p.138.
offensive acts from the enemies. If the armoured soldiers were not used for one thousand and hundred years, it would indeed be the attainment of my wish. My concern is that the barbarians may not share my wish [for peace.] 54

Yi Ik expressed the significance of the military force, as the circumstance might not be what he truthfully wished- people eternally live in peace. Although Chosŏn Korea’s diplomatic principle, sadae kyorin, was aimed at non-violence with its surrounding states, his suggestion led to the consolidation of the sufficient defensive force and more disciplined soldiers. His alarm would be a precaution against further conflict, by looking at the tough experiences of the past wars that severely damaged the Korean land. Chosŏn Korea should acquire something from the war, though it was a painful process learning from the drawbacks.

Peace may be maintained under the solid background of the military force. Yi Ik’s criticism on Chosŏn Korea’s lack of defence continued:

Our country is not wide, surrounded by three seas, consisting of five thousand ri; therefore, coastal protection is the urgent matter [to prepare against the attack], in the light of the past experiences from the end of Koryŏ to immediately before the Imjin war. Korea in the present days has fortunately thrived in peace, [therefore,] the discipline [of soldiers] and facilities [for the militaristic defence] are unskilful… The deficiencies [in the domestic society] at the time of Imjin war are still unimproved today. 55

Yi Ik urged more consolidation of the force against the oceanic threats. In seeing Chosŏn Korea’s incapability to establish a solid defence, he discovered that the Korean troops totally lacked latest firearms. In contrast to the deficient Korean arms, the Japanese military strength

during the Japanese invasions of Chosŏn Korea was demonstrated with the use of the *hinawa-ju* (matchlock rifles). Those weapons were brought by the commercial trade with the West.\(^{56}\) By adding the Chosŏn court’s failure in not acknowledging the new arms, he analyzed that the Korean armaments were far behind in comparison to the Japanese and criticized the stagnation of technological improvement. His alarm came from Chosŏn Korea’s necessity to adapt the new skills and weapons that would create the more powerful troops so as not to fall behind the military strength of the neighbouring state.

Yi Ik also attempted to discover Chosŏn Korea’s militaristic weakness by comparison with the advantages of the Japanese troops. He mentioned the skilled Japanese technique to fortify the castle and the defensive moat during the invasions:

> Japan excelled at how to defend their castles. Once they were built, the lower skirt [of the building] was widely extended, but [the wall of] the upper part [and the roof] was steeply sliced off. It made it impossible for the soldiers to approach the castle easily. Even though the collision occurs with the castle fences, no collapse happened. In contrast to the sturdiness of the Japanese castle, the Korean castles were fragile and weak. Attacking the Japanese castle was undeniably hard. Few [Japanese] soldiers had been lost [by the burly structure].\(^ {57}\)

Yi Ik brought up the fact that the Japanese army made effective moats, hampering the retreat of the Ming-Chosŏn military alliance, as those soldiers did not know how to conquer the Japanese positions.\(^ {58}\) Yi Ik’s attention to the Japanese expertise led to the further development of fortification in his country. He also specified the constructors’ inadequate skills that eventually

---

\(^{56}\) Ha, p.81.
\(^{58}\) Ha, p.82.
caused the deficient Korean forts during the Japanese invasions.\(^{59}\)

Yi pointed out such insufficient military force might originate from an inveterate conflict between the two elite classes in the Chosŏn society:

In my thought, the achievements of the munban [the literary class] were too overrated, and [the too much praises for them] may undermine politics. The defence by the muban [the martial class] would certainly be of assistance for the country at any time. But the situation [to prepare the defensive force against outside threat] is thin and poor, as the literary class undervalue the military class. How can we need that [the force] in time of disturbance?\(^{60}\)

In the Chosŏn court, the well-educated ruling class was called the yangban.\(^{61}\) The yangban officials were separated into the two divisions: the munban and muban. The munban were the group of the policy-making bureaucrats in the court. The high-ranking officials in the court were selected by those munban members. The muban, the military officers, were somewhat despised by those munban officials, and the military elite did not get along with the munban officials. Seeing the social circumstance, Yi also indicated: “scholarship and the martial arts should steadfastly be stood side by side. That is, our country is alienated from strengthening the force.”\(^{62}\)

Unsatisfactory armaments, untrained troops, the poor performance of the fortifications, an inconsistent view between the two elite classes: what was taking place in the Japanese invasions of Chosŏn Korea?

\(^{59}\) Based upon the Confucian value, the scholars were the most cerebrated, but laborers such as civil constructors or technical specialists were regarded as the lower-ranking populace.

\(^{60}\) Yi, Sŏngho sosŏl, “Insamun: Sŏbukmusa.” vol.4., p.88., vol.3., p.20.

\(^{61}\) The munban and muban were called yangban, literally as the ‘both classes.’

\(^{62}\) Ha, p.109.
At the time of the Imjin war, the military leaders could not estimate the number of the [Korean] soldiers in the south. The three provinces in the northwestern region had no defence force. In the battle in the north, those [ineffective soldiers] caught princes and ministers [of the court] and passed them to the [Japanese] enemy. Mounted corps ran to the west [to evacuate] in the turmoil. People who did not plot to kill the king and his lineal ascendants were right-minded.\(^{63}\)

By introducing a chaotic situation during the Japanese invasions of the Korean peninsula, Yi Ik emphasized the ignorance of the real diplomatic conditions of the court. As a matter of fact, there was a final chance to understand the veiled intention of the Japanese before the Japanese invasions. The Korean envoys went to Japan to see Hideyoshi as a new ruler in 1591, but the Chosŏn court failed to see his intention over the Korean peninsula.\(^{64}\) Yi also pointed out that the court had long been unable to grasp the international circumstance. After all, the invasions caused social disruption and countrywide devastation.

The Tokugawa shogun showed a different nature from Hideyoshi, and Chosŏn Korea engaged in the neighbourly relationship with the newly-established bakufu in 1609. Nonetheless, there was still strong resentment of the Japanese until Yi Ik’s time. After reestablishing the neighbourly relations with Japan, how should Chosŏn Korea react? Yi attempted to eliminate the grudge of the Japanese invasions and suggested bringing the new phase of the relationship between the two states as follows:

… During the Imjin war, the desecration of the royal tombs [by the Japanese troops] indeed brought us resentment and the sense of revenge. Ming reinforcements [to the Korean peninsula] throughout the wanli period [1573-1620]\(^{65}\) are virtuous benevolence that can never be

---

\(^{63}\) Yi, Sŏngho sasŏl, “Insamun: Sŏbukmusa.” vol.4., p.88.  
\(^{64}\) For details, see chapter 2.  
\(^{65}\) Wanli was Ming China’s era calendar.
disregarded. However, the ruins [of the Japanese invasion] left no vestiges [on the current land] and no methods to recompense Ming China [for the munificence] were found… There is much to say about the invasion; however, the ringleader\textsuperscript{66} was dead and the remainder already regretted the past misconception. Time has passed; it is time to think of letting our people disarm and rest… Overall, the neighbourly relations weigh to enhance the mutual friendship, control feelings in mind, and show sincerity [of each other]. In so doing, perpetuation of the royal court, social structure, and people should be achieved and maintained in peace and in comfort.\textsuperscript{67}

The perception of Japan as the ‘unforgiving enemy’ was reasonable enough, but Chosŏn Korea had already reestablished the diplomatic relations with Tokugawa Japan more than a century before his time. Despite the engagement of the friendly relations, Chosŏn Korea’s view towards Tokugawa Japan still included resentment Yi Ik also looked into the sentiments of the scholars in his time, and criticized them for continuing opinion of Japan as yi, the barbaric state. Seeing Tokugawa Japan under such a negative point of view did not contribute to further strengthening the neighbourly friendship, and the true relations should be accomplished without any prejudice. He attempted to precisely see Tokugawa Japan and to gain a more realistic perspective on the outside world, surrounding the Korean peninsula.

Yi Ik’s knowledge of Japan was extended to the social circumstances. He seemed astounded by the extensive distribution of printed matter and monographs in the Japanese society. This was what amazed Shin Yuhan of the 1719 embassy; in Edo, Osaka and other populous cities- that numerous printed documents were widely issued, and the ordinary people had the benefit of reading them. In other words, those commoners understood how to read. The literacy rate was high especially in those big cities; for instance, at least sixty per cent of Edo

\textsuperscript{66} The ringleader was indicated as Toyotomi Hideyoshi.
\textsuperscript{67} Yi, \textit{Sŏngho sasŏl}, “Insamun: Manryŏkun.” vol.5., p.23.
population understood how to read, and seventy to eighty per cent of children in Edo studied at the *terakoya*, which taught the youth writing and reading throughout the Tokugawa period.\textsuperscript{68} Although those fortunate children who were able to learn were limited to the urban areas and a relatively affluent class, studying at the schools was not a rare opportunity.

The Korean embassies did not particularly describe the high rate of school attendance in their records, but it was surely something that impressed the Koreans. In fact, Shin Yuhan quoted the book-worms in the cities as: “…on the people who appreciated study like bookworms biting the printings, they learned deep enough and became familiar with their expertise [through reading the documents,] and had discerning eyes on what to read.”\textsuperscript{69} He also saw that the volumes of the Chinese and Korean monographs were more extensively published than the books written by the Japanese. Among the Korean scholars, as shown, Yi T’oegye’s works were the most popular among the Japanese scholars. The Korean members in the embassy mentioned that diligence of the Japanese for learning was a result of the wide distribution of the books in public.

Yi Ik paid much attention to the complexity of the Japanese imperial institution, by introducing the imperial system and the chronological emperors. He also touched on the equal relations that should be engaged between the emperor and the king of Chosŏn court. His article on the matter could have been taken from the record of Shin Yuhan and other written travelogues by the Korean officials in the different periods. Through such information, he

\textsuperscript{68} Prior to the Tokugawa period, private educational schools were dedicated to the children of the *samurai* and ruling class. After the rise of the merchant class in the middle of the Tokugawa period, the popularity of the *terakoya* in large cities such as Edo and Osaka immensely increased, and those schools were also spread out to rural and coastal regions. Ishikawa, Matsutarō, *Hankō to terakoya*. Kyōikusha rekishi shinsho vol.87., Tokyo: Kyōikusha, 1978. pp.143-145. Isoda Michifumi, associate professor at the Ibaragi University, also discusses the diffusion of the *terakoya* in the Tokugawa society to learn how to write, read, and calculate. Isoda, Michifumi. “Mukashi no imamo.” (Old and Current times) *Asahi Shinbun*, Be (Entertainment), 18 June 2005. late ed.: 5.

\textsuperscript{69} Shin, “Haeyurok.” p.306.
accurately foresaw that the relations between the imperial court and the Tokugawa shogun were to become the potential issue of the neighbourly relationship.

Yi ik revealed his perplexity on an underlying conflict if the political situation in Tokugawa Japan might change, and wondered how the administrative transformation would affect the neighbourly relations:

Since the Japanese emperor lost his political power, it had been only for six to seven hundred years. It was not a wish of the people [of Japan]. Among the populations loyal to the imperial court, [the emperor’s] name was still right and those will obey what he says. Something [related to the imperial court] will possibly happen later on. If the young populace would assemble, and [they] succeed in persuading the emperor to reign over the political authority, they call for others [to overthrow the current Tokugawa bakufu] and their righteousness [for the emperor to rule the country] could have results. It is feasible that the daimyos of the domains might join [to support the emperor]. If this happening occurs, [the two authorities may claim] “He is the emperor, and I represent the king [indicated as Tokugawa shogun].” How would we manage it?  

Japan’s ‘dual authorities’ between the emperor and the Tokugawa shogun might cause further anxiety of the relations between the two states. The corresponding partner of the Korean king was the Tokugawa shogun as a sovereign of the state. When the emperor was reinstated a political power, who would the Korean king exchange a sovereign’s message with, the emperor or the shogun? He obviously predicted that such an issue may cause the serious consequence of the neighbourly friendship, when the change occurred His apprehension on the matter indeed came to light in reality a century later. After the Meiji Restoration in 1868, the diplomatic protocol in the Tokugawa period was totally collapsed by the reemergence of the emperor in a

70 Yi, Sŏngho sasŏl, “Insamun: Ilbonch’ungūi.” vol.6., p.86.
political arena, as a sovereign of the state.\textsuperscript{71}

Yi Ik’s virtually precise and objective perceptions on the Japanese society were certainly out of the perspective on the rigid \textit{hua-yi} vision. The conventional Chosŏn scholars would never have admitted Japan as Chosŏn Korea’s peer in fact. Even though those traditional scholars knew the advantages of Japan, their views of the Japanese as \textit{waein} were never changed. In contrast to their stringency, Yi’s critical view of his country made a clear distinction. He persistently denounced the Chosŏn court’s incompetence in handling diplomatic issues, and insisted that the deficiency came from the ignorance of the international environment around the Korean peninsula.\textsuperscript{72} He saw the neighbourly relationship with Tokugawa Japan as necessary to retain a peaceful ambience, but his suggestion of ‘maintaining the neighbourly relationship and building a firm armament in case of the reinvasion’ remained a realistic issue.

The new approach to look at Japan was taken over by a disciple. Yi Ik’s student, An Chŏngbok was another significant influence on the eighteenth century \textit{sirhak} scholars who compiled detailed information on Japan. His emphasis was put more on pragmatic matters: strengthening the commercial trade, strengthening the armed troops, and developing technology in Chosŏn Korea. An was mainly interested in the Japanese commercial relationship:

As far as I understand [the condition of Japan,] the Japanese are strongly pursuing martial arts that are skilful and advanced. To absorb new equipment and technology, they actively exchange with the Dutch [from

---

\textsuperscript{71} The new Meiji government utilized certain \textit{kanji} letters (\textit{choku} and \textit{kō}) to point out the Meiji emperor in a correspondence document to the Chosŏn court to engage in the diplomatic relationship. Those letters were in exclusive use to signify the Chinese emperor. Regarding this as an impertinent act, the Chosŏn court refused to engage in the diplomatic relations with Japan’s new government.

\textsuperscript{72} Ha, p.111.
the West] to obtain the highly-developed technological items… The Japanese sustain their life through commercial trades. [As a result of their intercourse with Holland and other countries,] full of the treasures, and trading ships are regularly anchored [at many ports.] By Japan’s direct trade with China, the commercial dealings between Korea and China are decreased. The distribution of the commodities [through the Chinese trade] does not develop or proceed smoothly.\(^{73}\)

From An’s point of view, the extensive commercial trade between China and Japan seemed an obstacle to the increase between the Korean and Chinese trade. In his article, Japan’s economic prosperity through profit-making activities was contrasted with the inactive Korean commercial situation. As a symbol of the economic wealth in Japan, he also pointed out the port of Nagasaki that had been opened as the base for the commercial Dutch and Chinese ships.\(^{74}\) As a matter of fact, Nagasaki’s affluent commodities as well as a number of trading ships were often become an object of the Koreans’ attention, and Shin Yuhan of the 1719 embassy felt disappointed with the route that could not pass the prosperous city.\(^{75}\)

An criticized the deficiency of the Korean trade with other countries. By examining close statistics of the trading items between Japan and the other foreign countries, he pointed out the talents of the Japanese in expanding commercial markets with the Chinese merchants. The Chinese commodities were distributed into the Japanese society via Nagasaki.\(^{76}\) He might have felt envious towards the Japanese trading activities, as those Chinese items were not carried into the Korean society. The Korean market was only open in the mornings and evenings just to deal in the vegetables, after the Chinese trade was started with Japan in


\(^{74}\) Ha, p.152.


The Affluence of Nagasaki seemed to represent his wish that the Korean ports were also as prosperous as the port of Japan.

Another sirhak scholar, Yi Tŏngmu (1741-1793), had an extensive knowledge of the neighbouring state and left several articles. He was able to visit Qing China as a tributary envoy from the Chosŏn court in 1778. After his return from Beijing, he served as one of the overseers at the kyujanggak, the royal library of Korean historical documents and writings of the historical Chosŏn kings. While he was in the post, his scholastic interests were extended to the associations of the scholars such as Pak Chiwŏn (1737-1805) and Hong Taeyong, known as the pukhak sirhakcha, or the sirhak scholars pursuing the northern studies. Those sirhak scholars saw Qing China and the Manchus as a more respectable and advanced state and people, not as the barbaric state or barbarians. Yi shared those scholars’ opinions, based on his own experience of visiting Qing China.

Yi Tŏngmu was also acquainted with the officials of the former embassy to Japan. Wong Junggŏ and Sŏng Taejung, the first and second diarists of the 1764 embassy, became his close companions and were supportive of Yi’s works. In this sense, Yi received much benefit from his governmental position that allowed him to see those various officials. He was fortunately able to hear several matters from them on Japan. After he heard the literary exchange between Wong and a scholar named Taki Yahachi, he recorded: “when my acquaintance Wŏng Hyŏngchŏn had a writing exchange with Yahachi, a Japanese local scholar. [According to Wŏng’s impression on the local scholar Yahachi], he was knowledgeable, gentle-mannered… He was bright and talented at literary works. Indeed Tang

---

77 ibid., p.60.
78 Literal meaning of pukhak is ‘study of north.’ ‘North’ indicates Qing China, located in northern part of the Korean peninsula.
79 Wŏng Junggŏ’s pseudonym, the second secretary of 1764 embassy.
Chung’ŏn overseas.”\textsuperscript{80} Among the sirhak scholar, Yi Tŏngmu’s special interest seemed to lie with the Japanese scholars. This was what other sirhak scholars did not further investigate. Given the Chosŏn tradition of perceiving the Japanese scholarship as inferior or sub-central, most of the Korean scholars did not pay much attention to their works. However, Yi admitted that some of the works were worth seeing. He also introduced the lives and achievements of the Japanese scholars who promoted the development of the Neo-Confucian studies such as Fujiwara Seika, Kinoshita Jun’an, and his disciples, Arai Hakuseki and Amenomori Hōshū. He evaluated them as the “eminent scholars overseas.”\textsuperscript{81}

Along with understanding those printed documents, Yi also obtained a variety of Japanese articles from Wŏng and Sŏng such as a folding fan, paper pads, and ink paintings. The high quality of the Japanese paper pads (J: washi) surprised Yi, and the refined black-ink paintings looked skilful. Yi remarked on those pieces “both drawings and calligraphic works are exquisite masterpieces such as embroidery.”\textsuperscript{82} Among those several poems and paintings, he acclaimed some works as “the pieces of the writings and paintings [by the Japanese] were like gems.”\textsuperscript{83}

Yi’s research became more enthusiastic; he sought not only from the travelogues and the records of the conversations between the Korean ambassadorial members and the Japanese, but also from interviews with the Korean castaways, who were rescued by the Japanese and stayed in Nagasaki to recover their health, to update his knowledge on Japan.\textsuperscript{84} His questions to those castaways extended to the full feature of Nagasaki and the appearance of the

\textsuperscript{80} Yi, Tŏngmu. “Ch’ŏngbirok: Ilbon Nanchŏngjip.” Ch’ŏngchanggwan chŏnsŏ. vol.7., Seoul: Minjok Munhwa Ch’ujinhoe, 1989. p.5. Tang Chungŏn was a poet in the Qing dynasty.

\textsuperscript{81} Yi, “Ang’yŏpki: Ilbon munŏn.” Ch’ŏngchanggwan chŏnsŏ. vol.10., pp.18-19

\textsuperscript{82} Yi, “Ch’ŏngbirok: Ilbon nanchŏngjip.” Ch’ŏngchanggwan chŏnsŏ. vol.7., p.5.

\textsuperscript{83} Yi, “Ang’yŏpki: Ilbon munŏn.” Ch’ŏngchanggwan chŏnsŏ. vol.10., pp.18-19

\textsuperscript{84} Yi, “Ang’yŏpki: Hǔkpang.” Ch’ŏngchanggwan chŏnsŏ. vol.10., p.11.
westerners (the Dutch). One of the Korean castaways asked Yi if he had visited Nagasaki, and Yi answered: “although I have not been there yet, I can obviously understand the situation [through our conversation].”85 After accumulating the knowledge of Japan, he later compiled collections of his written articles entitled “Ch’ôngryŏng kukchi” (1778),86 or “A collection of information on Japan,” recording various details of Japanese culture, history, scholarship, custom, and religions such as Buddhism and Shinto.

Access to those Japanese monographs became relatively easy in late eighteenth century Chosŏn Korea in response to increasing interest in its neighbouring state. This enabled the sirhak scholars to obtain those documents more easily.87 In the twelve visitations to Japan of the Korean embassies throughout the Tokugawa period, two or three travelogues were usually produced per visitation. In the 1764 embassy, however, the nine travelogues were written by the different officials. The contents of the nine texts in 1764 varied in style and contained diverse features of the Japanese culture and Japan. The Koreans’ main interests in the Japanese politics and military affairs gradually shifted to the culture and customs, which were regarded as substandard and deplorable to the Koreans. In this aspect, the perspective towards Japan seemed to turn to a new stage: from an unrealistic and prescriptive image to a life-sized figure.

As the last quote, Yi Tŏngmu criticized Korea’s intolerance of another culture, namely Japanese, as follows:

Alas, Korea’s custom tends to be narrow-minded and irritates others. The cause originates in our arrogant attitude, as Korea has been called a place

---

85 ibid., p.11.
86 Ch’ôngryŏng indicated ‘Japan.’ Yi Tŏngmu attempted to call Japan as Ch’ôngryŏngkuk, the State of the Dragonfly, not waeguk. The word Ch’ôngryŏng came from the limited usage to point out the Japanese in Korea. Some of the Japanese also called Japan as Akizu Kuni.
87 Ha, pp.216-217.
of civilization [by the scholars]. Therefore, [cultural] elegance and
gracefulness can be in hand of the open-minded Japanese, for Korea does
not own any modishness, and remains vilifying other countries [as
barbarians.] It was my greatest grief... Most Japanese have a nature of
diligence, intelligence, and powers of concentration; and they are honest,
respect literature and studies; they never abandon learning. Our people
despise them as barbarians; without careful observation of their behaviour,
the Koreans are predisposed to malign the Japanese. I once agreed with
what our people thought. However, while I am deepening what they learn,
despite not thoroughly agreeable [to the Japanese], my sentiments are
friendly to the neighbouring state.\textsuperscript{88}

Yi Tŏngmu’s perspective was undoubtedly seeing Japan’s positive aspects, and he urged
Koreans to learn something from the Japanese, who owned something that the Koreans did not
possess.

The perspectives of the \textit{sirhak} scholars towards Tokugawa Japan, however, were not
completely affirmative; for example, in Yi Tŏngmu’s articles on the Japanese politics, he
pointed out the emperor as the ‘false sovereign,’ Japan’s original era name as the ‘bogus year,’
and the land of Japan as ‘dwarfing island.’\textsuperscript{89} In a broader historical context, Japan might still
be an object of disrespect. Those scholars did not forget the consolidation of defensive force
against a feasible reinvasion from Japan. Such a notion was shared among the \textit{sirhak} scholars:
to maintain an ‘alarm at time of peace,’ and Chosŏn Korea needed to respond any changes of
the surrounding states.

Chosŏn Korea’s new perspective, as the \textit{sirhak} scholars perceived, did not bring a
major social change. The Chosŏn society preferred the firmer and steadier manner under the
traditional value by denying drastic social reforms and transformations. The Chosŏn scholars

\textsuperscript{88} Yi, “Ch’ŏngbirok: Kyŏmkadang.” \textit{Ch’ŏngchanggwan chŏnsŏ}. vol.7., p.6.
\textsuperscript{89} Yi, “P’yŏnsŏ chapko: Pyŏngchi piwaeron.” \textit{Ch’ŏngchanggwan chŏnsŏ}. vol.5., p.53.
believed that sustaining their country as a highly-civilized state was important, without receiving any influence from the outside ‘barbaric’ world. This unyielding position can be interpreted in two ways: one was to retain Chosŏn Korea as an unchanging being possessing highly-civilized culture. The other was a solid denial of any inner or outer alteration. Which attitude did Chosŏn Korea choose towards the modern period? The East Asian world was drastically changing towards the twentieth century, and the waves were coming to Chosŏn Korea.

The Japanese scholars’ attention shifted to research on Japan itself, from the foreign monographs, such as Yi T’oegye’s writings. Simply speaking, the more exchanges with Chosŏn Korea were accelerated, the more subjective the view that followed. After the visitation of the Korean embassy to Japan was exercised, the Japanese scholars were able to increase their knowledge due to the numerous monographs of Chosŏn Korea and China. Thanks to the exchanges, the acquaintance of these materials among the Japanese scholars was much greater than those who lived in a century before. While absorbing the new matters, they seemed to search for more stimulating subjects, and slowly changed their vision so that Chosŏn Korea was no longer inspirational to them at all.

The perspective towards the Koreans and the Korean culture among the Japanese scholars certainly developed in a negative direction, and the prejudiced view of their Korean counterparts seemed to occupy the central discussion in public. The development of kokugaku became visible among such a trend. There was no tolerance and understanding of the other party, as they were the centrality of the world. The interpretations of the historical events by the kokugaku scholars contained an extremely subjective view especially towards Chosŏn Korea,
seeing it as ‘Japan’s vassal state.’

The Korean scholars still maintained their view within the rigid Neo-Confucian discipline, though the scholars with a different point of view such as the sirhak scholars emerged in public. If those sirhak scholars’ perspective had been shared with more scholars and bureaucrats in the Chosŏn court, the Chosŏn society might have moved to a different way towards the modern period. The sirhak scholars attempted to show some positive dimension of the society, but their views were limited to a few scholars of the small academic sphere.

In the drastic change towards the modern period due to pressure from the western powers, the long-standing view of the hua-yi order continuously functioned in the Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea. In the transformations, Chosŏn Korea retained itself as a state of the high civilization that was influenced both in the positive and negative ways. Japan seemed to adjust to the conditions of the outside world, by seeing itself as a ‘unique being’ in East Asia. In the conclusion, how the two countries perceived the changes surrounding their countries will also be examined.
Chapter Eight
Conclusion: towards the Modern Period

The reasons for the termination of the Korean embassy

As seen in the previous chapters, the exchange between the Japanese and Koreans certainly contained biased views towards their counterparts, and although the exchange continued, further cracks appeared in the apparently amicable relationship. Shin Yuhan in the 1719 Korean embassy frequently depicted the Japanese in a contemptuous manner based solely on his subjective opinion. Similar expressions were also seen in the travelogues of the embassy in the different periods. Furthermore, the Japanese officials did not respect the Korean culture, the Tsushima diplomat Amenomori Hōshū pointing out that cultural misunderstanding may increase the lack of trust of the Korean counterparts in his work. Incongruously, the long-term neighbourly relations between the two states were constructed despite the prejudiced views, and not all officials were affected by their negative visions.

In addition to the financial difficulties in the bakufu, previously mentioned, maintaining the neighbourly relationship with Chosŏn Korea was downgraded by the Japanese as time went on. The Korean counterparts, however, attempted to retain the relationship under sadae kyorin, which was Chosŏn Korea’s solid diplomatic principle based on the Confucian doctrine. Through the exchanges, both Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea cherished a sense of being at the center of the world- the Japanese and Korean versions of the hua-yi order, which influenced the successive historical events towards the modern period. How did the awareness of the centers influence their attitude? This conclusion will discuss how the notion affected the two countries.
The fiscal issue was one of the primary concerns regarding the invitations of the Korean embassy on the Tokugawa side. The bakufu faced a crucial financial problem that did not find any effective solution by the end of the eighteenth century. If the Korean embassy came to Japan again, how did the bakufu and the affected domains on the route of the embassy handle it? The grand amount that the bakufu and those domains along the route of the embassy shouldered was about one million ryō, which was said to be the annual budget of the bakufu.\(^1\) At the time of the 1711 embassy, the cost was reduced to six hundred thousand ryō, by the diplomatic reform of Arai Hakuseki.\(^2\) Since the previous diplomatic protocol was restored after 1711, the cost became about one million ryō again. In these circumstances, the monetary difficulty made the bakufu reluctant to invite the embassy.

Chosŏn Korea also encountered several obstacles to sustaining the neighbourly relationship. The financial problem of maintaining the wakan became more complex. The Chosŏn court was burdened with full economic responsibilities for the wakan. The whole expense of reconstruction, reforms, and repairs for the buildings and warehouses, food and fuel supplies were all compensated by the Korean side. When the commercial exchanges of the official, private, and special envoys from the Tsushima domain were carried out via the wakan, the Koreans provided the Japanese counterparts with the items of the ‘appreciations,’ in addition to the regular commodities. The Korean officials needed to take the items, such as ginseng (J: Chōsen ninjin; K: insam), rice, and other agricultural products, from the local provinces to supply to the wakan and Tsushima.\(^3\)

---


Ginseng became the focal point of the financial burdens- Chosŏn Korea encountered in continuing the dispatch of the Korean embassy. When the embassy left for Japan, the court had to supply a number of the ginseng roots for the Tsushima domain as well as for the bakufu. Ginseng was what Tsushima sought in response to the increasing demand of the Japanese society. Finding the ginseng became a difficult challenge and heavy burden for the local Koreans in the ginseng-growing regions such as the P’yŏng’an, Hamgyŏng, and Kangwŏn provinces. In the year of the Korean embassy’s dispatch to Japan, the local people had to find about four times as much ginseng than in regular years.

In 1787, Yi Sŏksang, the official of the Kang’gye magistracy in the P’yŏng’an province, wrote a letter to the Chosŏn court describing the locals suffering to seek the ginseng roots. The inhabitants of the province moved into other regions to abscond from the stringent encumbrance to collect the roots. According to Yi’s statement, between 1751 and 1787, the houses in Kang’gye were reduced from more than 20,000 down to only 4,500. The local people were in a wretched condition after fulfilling one quota every year. However, despite the difficulties, the Chosŏn court attempted to provide the sufficient numbers to Japan, probably because the court put more emphasis on maintaining the neighbourly relations, at the expense of those locals.

In addition, increased smuggling made it more difficult to find ginseng roots. The contrabandists even picked the immature ginseng, causing poor harvests in the successive years. When the illegal exchanges were exposed, the leaders of the banned dealings were executed,

4 ibid., p.11.
5 ibid., pp.11-12.
6 Pibyŏnsa t'ungnok. Chŏngjo 11 (1787), October 14, or the fourth day of the ninth month.
7 ibid., Palmi, the seventh month.
the household properties were confiscated, and their families were demoted to the slave class.\textsuperscript{8} The Tsushima domain also established the customs office at the \textit{wakan} to control those issues. Nonetheless, those activities were not completely eradicated despite the ruthless punishments by the Chosŏn court and the thorough supervision by the Tsushima officials.

Furthermore, Tsushima’s sole dependence on the Korean rice products was another major intricacy. The delay of rice supply to the \textit{wakan} was frequent at the end of the eighteenth to the early nineteenth centuries, and the Japanese officials in the \textit{wakan} repeatedly asked for the implementation of the delivery within the time limit.\textsuperscript{9} The delay was caused by lack of rice products in the main rice-producing region in the Kyŏngsang province, in the southeastern part of the Korean peninsula. In spite of the difficulty in supplying enough rice even to the domestic provinces, regular loads of rice were conveyed to the \textit{wakan}.\textsuperscript{10} The domestic instability, shown by the frequency of insurrections among the peasant groups, also affected further social disturbances at this time, and caused extra pressure on the Chosŏn court. In the multiple-layered complexities in the court and in the affected provinces, the preparations for the embassy’s dispatch became more unmanageable. Those domestic conditions in Chosŏn Korea eventually resulted in the termination of the Korean embassy.

**Were Chosŏn Korea and the Korean embassy submissive to Tokugawa Japan?**

The question above is indeed part of the ongoing debate between the scholars who research the early modern relations between Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea. These current scholars attempt to decide ‘which state had an initiative in the neighbourly relations.’ which in turn leads to the question whether or not Chosŏn Korea was submissive to Tokugawa Japan. As

\textsuperscript{8} Tashiro, “Nicchō kōryū to wakan.” \textit{Nihon no kinsei} vol.6., p.124.

\textsuperscript{9} Chosŏn wangjo shillok. Chŏljung 1 (1862), January 29 (1863), or the thirtieth day of the twelfth month.

\textsuperscript{10} Kasuya, p.17.
mentioned, the *hua-yi* order was one of the crucial factors in delineating the relations. Then, another question will follow: how did the *hua-yi* order affect Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea?

The facts can be seen from the perspective of either- Tokugawa Japan or Chosŏn Korea. On the Tokugawa side, the notion of the ‘world-centeredness’ emerged in the avoidance of the use of the term ‘king’ (*kokuō*) on the sovereign’s message to Chosŏn Korea, thus showing Japan independent from the Chinese-centered world map. The bakufu did not engage in the tributary relations with the Ming or Qing dynasty throughout the Tokugawa period. Arai Hakuseki attempted to elevate the bakufu’s position to the Korean counterparts and to demonstrate the prestige of the Tokugawa shogun by situating his position as a solid political authority through the diplomatic revision in 1711. Hakuseki’s reform may have correlated with the ‘Japanese centeredness,’ but it is not yet certain if he clearly depicted the Japanese *hua-yi* order in his mind, though his motivation for the reform came from the wish to place Japan in a higher position than Chosŏn Korea.

There are no explicit records that Tokugawa Ieyasu, the successive shoguns, or the bakufu executives in the different periods explicitly stated the connection between Japan’s *hua-yi* diagram and the political principle. In this circumstance, the Japanese as the center did not appear as the solid political ideology in the Tokugawa period.11 As touched on earlier, Tsushima and all other domains in Japan were autonomously operated, but strictly supervised by the bakufu. Each domain independently had to handle political, economic, and social issues. The daimyos of the domains did possess sole authority over their territory and vassals. The direct loyalty and the adherence of the vassals was given to the daimyo of the domain, rather

---

than the shogun. As Hōshū showed in his position, his faithfulness to the Tsushima domain was firm, and his priority was always placed on the profits of the island domain. Hōshū’s debate with Hakuseki in 1711 was a representation of his attempt to protect the advantages of his domain from the diplomatic intervention of the central government, as Hakuseki insisted. In other words, the majority of the Japanese did not really see Japan as a whole country since people showed their allegiance primarily to their domains. Those people did not have a particular sense of Japan as the center of the world.

Through a series of discussions on ‘who seized the diplomatic initiative’ between Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea, the Japanese historians tend to argue that Japan showed sole dominance over the Korean affairs. As previously seen, the Korean authority unenthusiastically accepted Tokugawa Japan’s change of the title from taikun to kokuō on the sovereign’s message through the 1711 diplomatic reform. Furthermore, the final destination of the 1811 embassy, the last embassy to Japan, was determined by the Tokugawa side; the final embassy only reached as far as Tsushima, as ekichi heirei, the visitation to the remote place. Those historians continue to claim that these facts illustrate the leadership of the Tokugawa bakufu. With regard to the diplomatic condition, Arano Yasunori indicates that the Tokugawa shogun always embraced the initial diplomatic actions over Chosŏn Korea. Miyake Hidetoshi argues that the submissive acceptances of the Chosŏn court of the Japanese demands were most likely caused by the exercise of the peaceful principle of evading more intricate issues with its neighbouring state, but the passive tactics of the court could imply a partial acceptance of Tokugawa Japan’s arbitrary acts by Chosŏn Korea, and these customs would lead to an acknowledgement of its dominance in the neighbourly relations.

What did the neighbourly relationship mean to Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea?
Reestablishing the diplomatic relations would bring concrete merits and profits for the two states and satisfy the Japanese and the Koreans. In the opinion of the Koreans, the Chosŏn court would have shown its tolerance as well as mercifulness for the obsessive wishes of the Japanese counterpart to seek the rehabilitation of the relations. An initial action for the restoration of the diplomatic engagement after the Korean invasions was made by the new military leader, Ieyasu, who sought the peaceful relationship with Chosŏn Korea. The first response of the Chosŏn court to Ieyasu’s pacific gesture was reluctant, but the court was finally moved to accept it in accordance with the frequent requests of Tsushima. However, Tokugawa Japan’s persistent actions were not the sole factor causing the Chosŏn court to eliminate its disinclination. The growing tension on the northern border between Chosŏn Korea and Qing China was another essential factor that led the Chosŏn court to restore the diplomatic relations with newly-established Tokugawa bakufu. Achieving neighbourly relations meant a face-saving concession between the two countries. By reengaging the diplomatic relationship, the Tokugawa bakufu was successfully able to achieve a show of influence over other powerful rival daimyos and strengthen the Tokugawa regime acknowledged by the foreign authority, Chosŏn Korea. For the Chosŏn court, the exercise of the Korean embassy’s visitation was also based on the strong desire of the Tokugawa side, and the court accepted the official invitation from the bakufu and finalized the dispatch of the embassy. The court would see the bakufu’s submissive manner through their invitation of the Korean embassy.

During their journey, the competent Korean officials in the embassy increased their sense of superiority over the Japanese, especially through their literary exchanges. Through their interactions, the Koreans maintained their bias against the Japanese. The Koreans saw the Japanese as \textit{waein}, and called Tokugawa Ieyasu \textit{waesu}, a head of the barbarians, and \textit{waedo},
which indicated Kyoto, meant barbarous capital. An interaction between Amenomori Hōshū and Shin Yuhan is an excellent example of the differences: both officials took a leading part in the governmental missions and sometimes were confrontational in order to protect their interests, but their understanding and reliance on each other brought a straightforward dialogue. During the journey, Hōshū once asked Shin why the Koreans kept specifying Japan’s name as ‘wa’ (K: wae), and pointing out the Japanese as ‘waein.’ While Shin was perplexed by Hōshū’s query, he answered that it was his country’s traditional practice in saying so. Hōshū suggested to Shin that the Koreans should use Nihon and Nihonjin instead of wae and waein. Shin then asked Hōshū why the Japanese called the Koreans tōjin, the Chinese. He also claimed that the Japanese mentioned the Korean writings as the ‘Chinese piece.’ Hōshū replied that the Korean writings were equivalent to the valuable Chinese productions, so the Japanese referred to the Koreans as the Chinese, implying the Japanese respectful manner towards the Koreans and Korean culture.

The traditional Koreans’ vision of Japan frequently annoyed the Japanese scholars such as Hakuseki, who was able to read the writings and was familiar with the conditions in the Korean peninsula at that time. In fact, such discriminatory expressions of the Koreans often appeared in the travelogues of the Korean embassy. The Korean attitudes to the Japanese officials were not always companionable during the trip. The Koreans’ view of Japan as a culturally inferior state persisted despite the friendly exchange.

In a similar context, the question whether the Korean embassy was a submissive delegation to Japan remains. Not a few scholars in the eighteenth century perceived that the Korean embassy

13 ibid., p.317.
was a tributary mission, as an envoy of submission to the greater Japan, named \textit{raichō shisetsu}. Even the current scholars misunderstand the usage of the word, \textit{raichō}, that seemed to indicate the tributary condition from Chosŏn Korea to Japan. The term \textit{raichō} was often used in public in the Tokugawa society; however, the expression contained no vital meaning in relations to Chosŏn Korea. The term \textit{honchō} was used to mean the ‘home country,’ Japan.\textsuperscript{14} Indeed, the words \textit{raichō shisetsu} was frequently displayed in the paintings, essays, and documents particularly within urban populace at that time. The noteworthy Edo painters such as Katsushika Hokusai (1760-1849) and Hanegawa Tōei who depicted the Korean embassy’s march called it \textit{Chōsen tsūshinshi raichō no zu} (1748), or an Illustration of the Korean Visitation to Japan.

Was the Korean embassy subservient to Japan? In the eyes of the Japanese \textit{hua-yi} consciousness, the embassy was the submissive delegation. However, from another point of view, how do scholars see it? Tashiro Kazui argues that the Korean embassy is not a tributary mission. She states that the implications or vocabulary of submission from Chosŏn Korea to Tokugawa Japan were not utilized by the bakufu. The invitation to the embassy was articulated using the expression \textit{raihei},\textsuperscript{15} a humble phrase of invitation, which was written on the official documentation both by the bakufu and the Tsushima domain to the Chosŏn court. Along with the term \textit{raichō}, paintings also depicted the Koreans entitled \textit{Chōsenjin raihei no zu} (paintings of the Koreans’ visitation). \textit{Raihei} was as well as commonly used expression upon the embassy’s visitation. In contrast to the cordial invitation of the Korean embassy, the bakufu clearly differentiated the standing of the Ryūkyū envoys. For the Ryūkyū party, the bakufu

\textsuperscript{14} An expression of \textit{honchō} existed in the Heian period (794-1192).
\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Raihei} is an expression of ‘\textit{kite itadaku}’ in Japanese.
officially used the term *raikō*, or the tributary mission.\textsuperscript{16} In this sense, the bakufu had a clear criterion on the relationship between the envoys from Chosŏn Korea and Ryūkyū. The invitation of the Korean embassy contained an aspect of the crucial state project for the bakufu, in order to retain and enhance the Tokugawa polity.\textsuperscript{17} For the bakufu, the invitation of the embassy brought enormous merit as the solid manifestation of peaceful engagement with Chosŏn Korea. Under these peaceful circumstances, the Tokugawa family’s longevity seemed promised, and the regime thrived for centuries.

According to the arguments of some historians, the usages of the two Japanese creations in Korean diplomacy, the title of *taikun* and the Japanese era name (*nengō*) in the sovereign’s message of Japan, can be seen as one of the most conspicuous illustrations of Japan’s superiority over Chosŏn Korea. Prior to the Meiji period, the new era name of Japan was usually proclaimed within a year or two after the ascendance of the new emperor, and was also renewed upon natural disasters in attempting to clear away the evilness.\textsuperscript{18} Those Japanese scholars have indicated that the usage of the era name showed Tokugawa Japan’s originality and its solid initiative in the Korean affairs. Arano Yasunori even relates the use of the era name to the divinity of the imperial court, as the name showed the emperor’s influential authority in Korean diplomacy.\textsuperscript{19} In the use of *taikun*, the Chosŏn court’s admittance of the 1711 diplomatic reform reflected the bakufu’s success as well as the hard line taken over diplomacy with Chosŏn Korea. As a comparable paradigm of seeing the Korean embassy as a submissive party to Japan, the diplomatic protocol in the Edo Castle was also pertinent. When

\textsuperscript{16} The Tokugawa bakufu’s official documents on the foreign relations, *Tsūkō ichiran* shows Ryūkyū shisetsu *raikō*.

\textsuperscript{17} Toby, Ronald P. “Kinsei Nihon no shomin bunka ni arawareru Chosen tsūshinshi: Sezoku, shūkyōjō no hyōgen.” The Han Sepcial Issue: Korean Envoys to Japan in the Edo Period [Japan] 1988 (110): 111.

\textsuperscript{18} The era name in Japan was adapted in the seventh century, the Asuka period (531-710). The practice to change era names was exercised only upon the new imperial succession after the Meiji period.

\textsuperscript{19} Arano, pp.12-15.
the embassy exchanged the sovereign’s message with the shogun in the Castle, the ambassador bowed four times to the shogun. The procedure of the diplomatic protocol was similar to the exercise in the Ming court when the emperor saluted the kings or their envoys of the vassal states.  

20

The practice of the title taikun, however, should not be overemphasized to indicate Japan’s supremacy over Chosŏn Korea. As seen in chapter two, the title taikun was closely associated with the Japan’s self-satisfaction as a major center. It was not officially intended to place Korean in an inferior position, as there are no records to indicate such notions. The title taikun was also used as part of Tokugawa Japan’s constant pursuit of an impartial hierarchy between itself and Chosŏn Korea.  

21

Regarding the bakufu’s usage of taikun, any bias towards Chosŏn Korea was not articulated as inferior-superior. The bukufu’s exercise of the era name did not lead to a clear implication, either. The name was used by the bakufu for its own sake, not by the Chosŏn court. The explicit records show in the present day that Tokugawa Japan had never obliged the Chosŏn court to write Japan’s era name in the sovereign’s message of the Korean king, as the Ming and Qing dynasties sought their vassal states as a solid representation of the tributary engagement.  

22

From the beginning of the exchange of the letters in the seventeenth century, the Chosŏn court used the shogun’s title as kokuō and specified the calendar of the Ming court or the zodiac year in its own message to the bakufu. In the era name, what the bakufu attempted was to keep a certain distance from Chinese world map, and the usage itself did not straightforwardly signify Japan’s superiority over Chosŏn Korea.

The practices of the diplomatic protocol in the Edo Castle had been shared under the

20 Kojima, “Edo jidai ni okeru Chōsen zō no suii.” p.27.
21 Ikeuchi, pp.55-56.
22 ibid., p.186.
common recognition between the Tokugawa bakufu and Chosŏn Korea. From the Korean embassy’s eyes, the protocol of their bowing was exercised to the sovereign’s message from the Chosŏn court, and there was no intimidation against the shogun. For the shogun, the Koreans’ protocol seemed to be carried out for the shogun himself. The protocol was not developed into the controversial issue between the two states. Diplomacy frequently contains certain manners that are not clearly highlighted, and the neighbourly relations were maintained by coexistence of the clear and the ambiguous manners. Tsushima officials’ obedient conduct to show their respect to the Korean king in the wakan was a part of the ambiguity in Korean diplomacy as well, in showing their adjustment to the Korean customs.

How about the Korean side? Was the Chosŏn court in actual fact weak-kneed when dealing with the Tokugawa side? To look further into the attitude of the Chosŏn court, Miyake Hidetoshi examines an essential factor in the Chosŏn court over the Japanese affairs. His emphasis lies on the court’s consistency in the diplomatic issues which was loyal to the fundamental principle of sadae kyorin; circumvention of further dispute was a more suitable way to retain the neighbourly friendship with Japan.²³ The court consistently followed this principle in their diplomatic convention, and the manner towards Tokugawa Japan was never altered until the end of the Tokugawa regime. In contrast to the bakufu’s instability shown in the revision of the shogun’s diplomatic protocol towards the Korean counterparts, the Chosŏn court did not make any modification from its discipline. The Korean side always stood in an unyielding position in Japanese diplomacy. From some of the Japanese scholars’ point of view, the Korean behaviour towards the bakufu may have contained an excessive compromise, but to maintain a nonviolent diplomatic environment surrounding Chosŏn Korea, the court

²³ Miyake, Kinsei Nicchō Kankei no kenkyū. pp.426-427.
manipulated the pacification in a positive way under the *sadae kyorin* principle.

Discussions of the relationship between Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea are prone to center on the issue of superiority-inferiority, and in this context, the Korean embassy was seen as a submissive party to Japan. However, the deliberation on such a notion was not obviously portrayed among the bakufu leaders or the ordinary people throughout the Tokugawa period. In other words, finding such conspicuous historical sources in seeing Chosŏn Korea as Tokugawa Japan’s tributary was difficult. Ikeuchi Satoshi clarifies that Tokugawa Ieyasu’s unification is placed in more significant influence over the Korean issues. The recognition of centrality in the early modern Japan was based upon self-esteem as the *samurai* polity.\(^{24}\) Japan’s political unification was achieved by the *samurai* class after the suffrage of the civil war disturbance, and political unity under the Tokugawa regime indeed brought a promise of the long-term peace and order. This self-respect is reflected in Korean diplomacy as well. To keep its distance from the Chinese-centered portrait, the Tokugawa bakufu esteemed its military government. Ikeuchi’s explanation points up that the creations, the usage of the title *taikun* and the era name, did not contain any bias towards Chosŏn Korea. The Tokugawa bakufu would not engage in the neighbourly relations with Chosŏn Korea if there were no equality between the two states. The neighbourly friendship implied no superior-inferior positions, and accordingly, the bakufu attempted to put more emphasis on restoring and sustaining the diplomatic relations with Chosŏn Korea.

**The imperial court and Korean diplomacy**

How did the imperial court affect Korean diplomacy? In relation to the era name, the Japanese historians frequently see the existence of the imperial court as bringing about a sense of

---

\(^{24}\) Ikeuchi, *Taikun gaikō to “bui.”* p.60.
superiority over Chosŏn Korea. My aim in this discussion is not to provide a complete diagram of the relations between the imperial court and the bakufu, so I do not open more extensive arguments here. A clear analysis of the issue shows that the leaders of the Tokugawa bakufu did not regard the imperial court as their apparent political opponent, although the court might have certain sentiments against the bakufu. Rather than seeing the court as a political competitor, the bakufu conveniently utilized the court as a tool to heighten the bakufu’s authority. The imperial court, although in fact useless in practices of political operation, intermittently seemed to supply some sort of the ‘spiritual strength’ to the Japanese. The successive military leaders mentioned their proper titles of the shogun given from the emperor, and the interpretation of the imperial court indeed increased their prestige as political rulers.

Toyotomi Hideyoshi efficiently employed the imperial authority on his acts in Chosŏn Korea. Kitajima Manji specifies that Hideyoshi attempted to legitimatize the Korean invasions from the myth of Empress Jingū’s conquest of Shilla in the fourth century as “a perception of Korea as submissive to Japan was brought when his troops were ready to advance on the Korean peninsula. This was to increase the awareness of shinkoku (the land of deities), and eventually provided his soldiers with a legitimate consciousness of territorial expansion.” Before Hideyoshi’s departure to Chosŏn Korea, it was said that he visited Kyoto’s Gokōnomiya Shrine, which worshipped the virtue and accomplishments of Empress Jingū in the Korean peninsula. Hideyoshi’s action at the shrine manifested his pursuit of proper reasoning to the continent on the basis of the Jingū expedition. From this point, Hideyoshi may have sought some moral support for his behaviour from the imperial court, and to enhance his.

---

26 ibid., p.29
27 Kim, Kwang-cheol. Chūkinsei ni okeru Chōsenkan no sōshitsu., Tokyo: Azekura Shobō, 1999. p.327. The shrine is currently worshipped by expectant women for their easy deliveries. This is because Jingū’s expedition was exercised in her pregnancy, and she later gave a safe birth after the battle over Shilla.
authority as *tenkabito*, or a unifier of Japan, he could have necessitated more powerful back-up legitimacy so that there would be no strong objections to his acts in Chosŏn Korea.  

In contrast to Hideyoshi’s dependency on the imperial legends to lend authenticity to his behaviour, the Tokugawa bakufu did not look for any legitimate sanctions of the imperial court in Korean diplomacy, as the imperial court did not possess any influence on the Tokugawa politics. The Korean embassy also acknowledged that the emperor was not involved in politics under the Tokugawa realm, though they did have some sense of uneasiness on the shogun’s title on the sovereign’s message— which authority, the shogun or the emperor, deserved a title ‘king of Japan?’ Shin Yuhan in the 1719 embassy interrogated himself on the position of the emperor in the bakufu. Shin as well as the other officials in the embassies in the different periods was concerned with the emperor’s position in the Tokugawa regime. Nonetheless, the writings of the Korean embassy shared the common perception; the emperor did not intervene in the political sphere, but the shogun, as a political authority, corresponded with the Korean king.

How did the Tokugawa authority show the Koreans a clear difference between itself and the imperial court? When the bakufu officials determined a place for overnight stay in Kyoto for the 1636 embassy on their way to Edo, Sō Yoshinari, a daimyo of Tsushima, requested Sakai Tadakatsu (1587-1662), a *rōjū* (a senior councillor), to change the lodge for the Korean embassy from Daitokuji to Hongokuji. Tadakatsu asked Yoshinari to present some reasons for the change. Upon his request, Yoshinari had three relevant answers. First, Daitokuji was suited in an inconvenient location away from the main street, and the remoteness from downtown would cause hardships in guiding the several hundred Koreans. Second, passing

---

28 Since Hideyoshi was a man of humble origin from peasantry class, it has been said that he might have sought a guarantee on his action from the most prestigious authority, the imperial court.

29 See previous chapter how the Koreans recognized the imperial court.
near the imperial palace meant that the Koreans were able to see the neighbours around the palace, and the court nobles could also observe the Korean’s march. And third, if the court nobles demanded of the Tsushima officials that they see the Koreans’ march as they did for the previous embassy in 1624, those officials might have faced some discomfort over whether or not they should ask the bakufu to allow the court nobles to do so.\textsuperscript{30} After this, Tadakatsu permitted Yoshinari’s request to change the lodge, and Hongokuji became the guesthouse for the Koreans in Kyoto. In this sense, the bakufu sought a certain distance between the embassy and the imperial court.\textsuperscript{31}

Arano Yasunori and Ikeuchi Satoshi take different positions in relations to the imperial court in Korean diplomacy. Ikeuchi states that the imperial court had no authority at all by its political position in the Tokugawa regime. However, Arano argues that the change of the lodge results from the bakufu’s apprehension that the Koreans might have insulted authority of the imperial court. Honkokuji, the guesthouse of the Korean embassy, was located farther from the imperial palace, and the dignity of the court was able to be maintained by a physical distance between the Koreans and the imperial court.\textsuperscript{32} The Koreans could not ruin the divinity of the imperial court due to their removal, and the bakufu showed its attitude that the Koreans were not allowed to pass near the imperial palace.

If Arano’s argument is true, solid evidence of the Tokugawa bakufu’s respect towards the imperial court should exist. In the early stage of the bakufu, \textit{kinchū narabi ni kuge shohatto}, a set of regulations which applied to the imperial court and the court nobles in Kyoto, to restrict and control their political involvement against the bakufu, was enacted in 1615. Those

\textsuperscript{30} “Chōsen ōfuku shokei,” unpublished manuscript at University of Tokyo. Further analysis was also mentioned in Ikeuchi’s \textit{Taikun gaikō to “bui.”} pp.33-35.
\textsuperscript{31} Ikeuchi, p.35.
circumscriptions showed the bakufu’s influence over the aristocratic class, including the emperor, to maintain peace and stability by restricting their political freedom under the Tokugawa rule. The law also depicted certain behavioural and moral constraints against the court nobles, and more importantly, it made a clear distinction between the dominant political authority, the Tokugawa bakufu and a symbolic figure, the imperial court.

It is more appropriate to make a clear differentiation between the influence of the imperial court and the Korean issues throughout the Tokugawa period. Ikeuchi mentions that the bakufu wanted to show its authority over the imperial court so the visitation of the Koreans was exercised by the political events of the bakufu through the change of the guesthouse. As stated, the exercise of Japan’s era name did not signify the existence or influence of the emperor in the bakufu.\(^{33}\) The change of the guesthouse for the Korean embassy shows that the Tokugawa side was not obviously willing to have any contacts between the court nobles and the Koreans.\(^{34}\)

The imperial court was nothing to do with Korean diplomacy under the political control of the Tokugawa bakufu. In the leadership of the bakufu, the third (1636), fourth (1643), and fifth (1655) Korean embassies in the seventeenth century spent several days at Tōshōgū, Ieyasu’s mausoleum in Nikkō (the current Tochigi prefecture) upon the invitation of the bakufu.\(^{35}\) Through visit to Nikkō, the bakufu would have wanted to emphasize to the Koreans Ieyasu’s rightful conduct engaging in the neighbourly relationship with its country. As the political stability of the bakufu was more consolidated, the worship of Nikkō by the embassy was ceased.

\(^{33}\) Ikeuchi, p.38.
\(^{34}\) ibid., p.38.
\(^{35}\) The visit of Nikko was terminated after the 1655 embassy due to the financial overload and long distance from Edo.
The imperial court had been conveniently utilized by the military leaders of the bakufu in the different periods to support their legitimacy and receive a proper title for their regime. Nevertheless, the existence of the imperial court might also function as a symbolic figure of Japan, though the reverence towards the court was not apparently featured throughout the Tokugawa period. The kokugaku scholars admired the court for its unbreakable line and longevity despite the changing political conditions. In this circumstance, the court was also seen as a positive image by the Japanese, as the emperor was bound up with the origin of the state.

**The end of the neighbourly relationship**

This thesis has attempted to explore how the Japanese and Korean hua-yi order was illustrated through the exchanges between the Japanese and the Korean embassy. In fact, thinking of Tokugawa Japan or Chosŏn Korea as a middle kingdom functioned only within the limited space- the self-satisfaction in their domestic societies. The notion of Japan’s hua-yi order was only recognized by the Japanese society, and such awareness was not an appealing notion to the Korean counterpart who regarded the Japanese culture as ‘barbarous.’ As time went by, the Japanese awareness of superiority seemed to spread out from its own country. Consciousness of sochunghwa in Chosŏn Korea, in contrast, was firmly embraced within the domestic society and tended to reject the outside changes.

What did the center mean for Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea? The approaches towards the ‘center’ between the two countries were different. The members of the Korean embassy expressed cultural superiority over the Japanese through their literary exchange. Possessing literary competence was the sole device to prove the Korean culture as the center; in other words, the evidence of the center for the Koreans was its support for high civilization.
In the case of Japan, the bakufu’s a notion as the center signified the enriching influence of the military background.\textsuperscript{36} Asao Naohiro mentioned that the bakufu’s \textit{hua-yi} order was based on the consolidation of the military power, not on the high civilization or culture.\textsuperscript{37} In this sense, the deficient literary ability on the Tokugawa side did not much harm its self-esteem, since the bakufu would want to show the dignity of the military government to the Korean embassy.\textsuperscript{38}

However, the Tokugawa bakufu did not actually demonstrate the militaristic activities to Chosŏn Korea after the Korean invasions, though the bakufu had the military sources to offend the outside world.\textsuperscript{39} Why did the bakufu stay away from the use of force? These reasons are obvious: first, Tokugawa Ieyasu, the founder of the bakufu, sought a peaceful environment both in domestic and international arenas. Second, the military background that the bakufu depended on was self-respect as \textit{samurai}, which appeared as a solid authority of the Tokugawa regime.\textsuperscript{40} In addition, the rationale of the bakufu’s abandonment of the armed force came from the excruciating defeat of the Korean invasions, as Ieyasu recognized that power diplomacy did not bring any magnificent consequences to Japan after all. Understanding the situation, he did not attempt to reinvoke Chosŏn Korea or use any offensive action overseas.\textsuperscript{41}

In contrast to the bakufu’s attitude, the Japanese scholars posed questions on the unfair literary competition between the talented Korean officials and the less competent Japanese. Those scholars also cast uncertainty on the neighbourly relationship between their states and the neighbouring country. Among those Japanese scholars, Arai Hakuseki showed an immanent

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{36} Ikeuchi, p.5.
\item \textsuperscript{37} ibid., p.4.
\item \textsuperscript{38} Not a few Japanese historians such as Asao Naohiro and Nishijima Sadao indicate the close connections between the nature of the bakufu as a military government and the modern militarism in Japan. (Quoted from Ikeuchi, \textit{Taikun gaikō to “bui,”} pp.5-6.)
\item \textsuperscript{39} Ha, \textit{Chosŏn jitsugakusha no mita kinsei Nihon.} pp.243-245.
\item \textsuperscript{40} Ikeuchi, p.5.
\item \textsuperscript{41} ibid., p.16.
\end{itemize}
ambivalence towards Chosŏn Korea, as he seemed to understand the values as the ‘center’ in both Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea. He did esteem his ancestry from the samurai family, and this drove him to elevate the status of the bakufu through the diplomatic reform in 1711. His reform would indeed provide a powerful demonstration of the bakufu as a samurai polity to Chosŏn Korea. At the same time, he was a scholar and the Neo-Confucian adviser of the bakufu. He understood that the Korean ambassadorial members were far more competent in literature and the Japanese scholars could not easily overwhelm the Korean counterparts through their literary exchange. Despite possessing ill-sentiments towards Chosŏn Korea, he never lost his interest in Korean issues even after his retirement, writing about his efforts for diplomatic revision in his biography, Oritaku shiba no ki, or Told Round a Brushwood Fire, written in 1716.

Through the literary exchange between the Japanese and Koreans, Arai Hakuseki never concealed his doubt whether the neighbourly relations could be eternally sustained in his conversations with the ambassadors of the 1711 embassy. But the reply of the Korean officials was frequently optimistic and superficial. They always concluded with the hackneyed expression: keep our neighbourly relationship. Hakuseki was the one who clearly showed his distrust of the Koreans. Through the monographs published in the Chosŏn society, he knew that the Koreans still harboured resentment over Hideyoshi’s war, and the Koreans also saw the Japanese as culturally backward. The acknowledgment of the popularity of the Korean scholars was not pleasant for him either. His suspicions of the Koreans and the neighbourly friendship were demonstrated through the 1711 diplomatic reform. Why did the Tokugawa bakufu treat the embassy as the most cordial foreign guest? His publications constantly pointed out the meaning. From his point of view, the Koreans could simply be untrustworthy.
What was the consequential difference between Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea through the neighbourly relationship? The bakufu utilized the visitations of the Korean embassy as its demonstration of the shogunal legitimacy of the Tokugawa family. To some extent, the exchange of the Koreans was a more politically involved issue for the bakufu. From the Korean side, the main aim of the embassy was transformed to a cultural interaction from a careful observation of the Japanese political situation. The scrutiny of Japan’s condition was also the embassy’s crucial task, but few serious concerns about the Japanese force were shown from the records in the eighteenth century.

In contrast to some insecurity of the Japanese side on the neighbourly relations, why were the attitudes of the Korean officials optimistic? The idea of center relied on the cultural superiority for the Korean embassy. The Koreans did not perceive a serious concern from the Japanese counterparts who did not seem to threaten their literary competence through the literary exchange between the Japanese and Koreans. By the literary competence, a certain cultural hierarchy existed, and the Korean officials were indeed placed in higher positions than the Japanese. On this relationship of the ‘evaluating-evaluated’ on their literary exchanges, the Korean superiority over the Japanese emerged, as the Korean officials were certainly able to produce much better pieces than the Japanese. The reverence of the Japanese towards the Koreans also fulfilled their satisfaction of cultural superiority. The humble Japanese manner also made the Koreans possess the cultural incomparability over the Japanese. The Koreans’ superciliousness to the Japanese counterparts was firmly fixed and did not alter for a long period.

Most of the Chosŏn scholars especially possessed a strong sense of their cultural

---

superiority over Qing China and Tokugawa Japan, represented as sochunghwa. Those scholars firmly believed that the Korean culture was the central civilization, and consequently such deliberation seemed to gradually direct the indifference to the outside world.\(^{43}\) In this sense, the Koreans did not have a particular attention or motive to catch up with the outside world, in contrast to the Japanese sentiment, such as catching up with the industrialized western countries in the later period. The majority of the Koreans certainly expressed little interest in the foreigners or external affairs. The modern Korean historian Bruce Cumings mentions the response of the Koreans who encountered the westerners, in quoting the British captain, Basil Hall, when his ship anchored off an island on the west coast of the Korean peninsula in 1816: “the islanders expressed some surprise on examining our clothes, but after that took very little interest in anything belonging to us. Their chief anxiety was to get rid of us as soon as possible.”\(^{44}\) And in the statement of Charles Gutzlaff, another early nineteenth century traveler to Chosŏn Korea, he at first had found the local people as “the most misanthropical people in the world,” importuning every intruder with the stock question “What time do you think to depart?”\(^{45}\) If those westerners came to Japan, the Japanese would have reacted differently and been very inquisitive on the unfamiliar matters.\(^{46}\) As previously seen, the attendance of a number of street spectators to see the Korean embassy’s march, which was represented as ‘unusualness’ or ‘foreignness’ to the Japanese commoners, indicates their strong motivation to observe the unfamiliarity. In this circumstance, the Japanese nature could have been more accessible to the foreigners.

---


\(^{45}\) ibid., p.88.

\(^{46}\) When the black ships from the United States approached the Uraga port (in the current Yokosuka city, Kanagawa prefecture) in 1853, the ordinary populace gathered to see those foreign ships with curiosity.
By possessing the sense of *sochunghwa*, the self-esteem among the Chosŏn scholars, the Korean embassy seemed to fix the vision towards the Japanese. In seeing the Japanese with the biased manner, the Koreans failed to see them as true peers. As the visitations to Japan went on, the embassy’s watchfulness over the bakufu was gradually relieved under the long-term political tranquility in its neighbouring state, unlike the first Korean embassy in 1607. The Japanese enthusiastic behaviour of seeking their writings was another crucial factor in their loss of caution. The Koreans might not have recognized Japan’s self-esteem seeing itself as a center, which was similar to *sochunghwa* consciousness. Did the Koreans think the Japanese also owned the ‘center of the world’ view? If they did, the Koreans would have absolutely denied it. The awareness of the Japan-centered view was never explicitly revealed in the literary exchange with the Korean embassy, in contrast to the embassy’s writings to the Japanese.\(^{47}\) The Koreans considered the Japanese could not challenge themselves in the cultural aspect.

The literary and cultural exchanges became a primary aim for the Korean embassy in Japan as time went by. If the Korean officials put so much emphasis on the interactions, they might be able to understand the development of the Japanese through the literary pieces. Did the ambassadorial members recognize the progress of the Japanese literati through their direct and frequent exchanges? Were the Korean officials aware of those Japanese as talented as they were? The works by the previous members of the embassy in the different times were accessible in the royal archives in Hansŏng, so the court officials, such as Yi Tŏkmu, were able to read the written pieces by the Japanese in the travelogues recorded by the different embassy. Through the comparisons of the past and the latest works, certain developments could have

\(^{47}\) See chapter 2 for more details.
been manifested. Some of the ambassadorial members may have seen the intensification of the Japanese literary competence that was equivalent to the brilliant Korean scholars. If the Koreans found them so, were they threatened by the rapid literary progress of the Japanese? The cultural (or literary) superiority provided the Koreans’ superior sense over the Japanese, and their view of the Japanese could have changed.

The members of the embassy could have been aware of drastic progress of the Japanese literati. Those Japanese began to produce far better writings and paintings than a century or centuries before. It could be said that the efforts of the Japanese to catch up with the Koreans might have provided the driving force to produce better literary pieces. The sirhak scholar Yi Tŏkmu recognized the growth. His appraisal of the Japanese fine arts as well as literate works was relatively high. Through examining those pieces, he was able to learn that the Japanese literary sense had escalated.

The Korean officials did not excessively honour the Japanese or its culture in the travelogues; their expressions on the Japanese and culture showed a less than excellent appraisal. Shin Yuhan of the 1719 embassy only touched on some of Hōshū’s abilities in foreign languages as a diplomat. Shin may have also been struck by Hōshū’s farewell poem which was given to him the night before his departure to the Korean peninsula, but only a restrained description was seen in the record. Shin might have attempted to avoid overemphasizing the Japanese ‘virtue’ in the official record. Writing in a positive sense on Japan may have been something that should not be stated in the official records. Similar to Yi Tŏkmu’s vision, the Korean embassy would also have faced the impressive development of the literary works by the Japanese. Since the Korean ambassadorial officials were the selected officials by the Chosŏn court, it is not difficult to imagine that those Koreans could have
noticed the development of the Japanese competence.

The accumulations of cultural misunderstandings seemed a ‘silent bomb’ before the final blast on the Japanese side. The preliminary explosions were made in the discourse of the eighteenth-century scholars as seen in chapter six. Those Japanese scholars gradually found the Korean attitudes less respectful to the Japanese customs and traditions. As Amenomori Hōshū in the Tsushima domain worried in his essay, such Korean attitudes to the Japanese came from seeing itself as the small central civilization, the last fort to protect civilization after the Ming dynasty, and the self-esteem was what they were to be proud of, and the Japanese should understand their cultural condition. Hōshū’s numerous experiences and written articles should have been treated as a more important device and a useful resource to understand the exchange with the different country. However, the association of the foreign countries was only allowed to the limited populace under the sakoku policy. Almost all the Japanese populace at that time was banned from encounters with the different culture and the people at the private level. After all, learning tolerance for difference did not become a frequent practice to them.

Tokugawa Japan could not benefit from a distinguished diplomat after Amenomori Hōshū, who could competently deal with the Korean issues. With the deep understanding on the Korean culture, Hōshū always sought the impartial diplomatic and commercial relationship between the two states. In addition to his high aptitude, his schooling period in Edo enabled himself to increase his strength and advantage. He received an excellent education and constructed the personal connection between himself and the bakufu through Hakuseki, who was Hōshū’s classmate and served as the Neo-Confucian advisor of the shogun. There were a number of issues that came to settlement while Hōshū was taking charge of the Korean affairs, and those complicated predicaments between the bakufu, Tsushima, and the Chosŏn court were
not carried through without his presence. Unfortunately, the efficient personnel in Tsushima were unable to offer their ability directly to the bakufu due to the termination of the embassy’s visitation after 1811. Although the Tsushima domain succeeded to have the talented officials and interpreters to handle the Korean issues, such as Oda Ikugorō and Kansaku, Ikugorō’s son, their activities were limited only within the island and the wakan.

In the rigid Chosŏn society, the eve of social transformation to look at the outside world was presented through the examinations of the sirhak scholars. Though their approaches to their neighbouring state were not much highlighted by the Chosŏn authority, the vision became a solid evidence to free themselves from the constrained social discipline. They endeavoured to acknowledge Japan as an equal peer and to illustrate the neighbouring state as a full-figured image through understanding the written materials. The analysis of those sirhak scholars on the Japanese counterparts was relatively precise, as they were also the Chosŏn scholars who were able to read, write, and evaluate the literary works published in their country, Tokugawa Japan, and Qing China.

Nevertheless, those progressive sirhak scholars did not interpret the rise of the Japanese militaristic menace through the monographs. The nineteenth-century sirhak scholar Chŏng Yakyŏng (1762-1836) noted his optimism on the impracticality of Japan’s reinvasion as: “the correct proprieties have begun to dominate in the Japanese society [which was similar to our state,] so they are no longer threatening our territory.”48 As to the impossibility of the reaggression, Chŏng specified that Japan would lose its advantage and prosperity of commercial trade with Chosŏn Korea and the Qing dynasty, if the warfare occurred. Rather than the reinvasion from Japan, Chŏng’s suspicions were centered on the offensive act from

Qing China. Lack of understanding of external affairs as well as the sufficient military force was not ultimately modified by the Chosŏn court even a century after from the time of Yi Ik, the eighteenth-century sirhak scholar, who urged the court to correct the deficient defensive force in Chosŏn Korea.

The inflexible views of others remained after all. Sochunghwa was a driving force to retain their ‘cultural supremacy,’ but this value functioned in the negative aspect at the same time, not admitting the different culture and principles. The blindness of the majority of the Chosŏn scholars and bureaucrats in not appraising the Japanese development seemed to direct their gaze away from the external world. The visitations of the Korean embassy provided the Korean ambassadorial members and the Chosŏn court with opportunities to observe the Japanese political situation. In spite of such advantages, the members of the embassy could not much express the precise conditions in the records, such as the literary development in Japan. The Koreans’ eyes were constrained in seeing the Japanese as ‘wae’ barbarians who ought to be placed in a lower position than more civilized Koreans. Looking at the neighbouring state their visions repeatedly included intolerance to the Japanese counterparts. The progressive sirhak scholars did not even avoid the bias against Japan as a state. Looking at Japan and the Japanese on the whole, the perception resulted in distorted emotions, in comparison to the thoughtful and personal interactions between the Korean ambassadorial members and the Japanese locals.

In the increase of the Japan-centered perspective in the eighteenth century, the Japanese scholars criticized the foreign influences such as the Chinese dominance in culture, literature, and religion in the domestic society. Those scholars began to treat Chosŏn Korea as

49 ibid., “Chirich’aek.” vol.1., p.626.
just a cultural replication and subordination of China. Respect for the Korean embassy was rarely depicted in those scholars’ writings. Such opinions in the Japanese society gradually formed the mainstream and excluded the outsiders. Admiration of Chosŏn Korea as a peer state no longer functioned as time went by. Japan began to hustle to catch up with the western countries by adapting their systems for nation-building.

The imperial court became a driving force to overthrow the bakufu and to create the new Meiji government. The position of the emperor rapidly became the sole sovereignty of Japan. Ironically, this was what Shin Yuhan and the sirhak scholars were concerned about; if the imperial political reinstatement was carried out, how were the neighbourly relations treated? In the political change, when the question against the bakufu was once produced, everything that the Tokugawa bakufu had generated turned into the negative matters. The bakufu’s policy of the neighbourly friendship with Chosŏn Korea was denied, in accordance with the anti-bakufu sentiments in the new government. The relationship with Chosŏn Korea went in an opposite direction after the Meiji period. Japan’s war victories over China and Russia in the early twentieth century were a confirmation of its existence as the new-rising power in East Asia, and showed a powerful demonstration to the western powers that Japan was capable enough to hold supremacy in Asia.

In the forcible intervention from the western states in East Asia, Tokugawa Japan and Chosŏn Korea pursued the different goals. Japan’s notion as a centrality of the world strongly engaged with the political ideology and resulted in further militaristic actions in East Asia, as the west did. Chosŏn Korea attempted to protect itself from the outside world by the rigid social discipline. After the long-term neighbourly relations, both counties departed to the extreme edges; one had resources to martial activity and the other was alienated from the
changes of East Asia.
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Sekigahara 関が原
sengoku jidai 戦国時代
seppuku 切腹
Setonaikai 瀬戸内海
Shigeoki tō 調興党
Shilla 新羅 신라
Shimazu-ke 島津家
Shimonoseki 下関
Shin Sukchu 申叔舟 申숙주
Shin Yuhan 申維翰 申유한
shinbunyaku 真文役
shinkoku 神国
Shinto 神道
shōgun sadaijin 将軍左大臣
Shōkokuji 相国寺
shō 諸王
Shōsho kibun 象胥紀聞
Shunjū sashiden 春秋左氏伝
shushigaku 朱子学
sinnō 親王
sirhak (cha) 実学（者）실학(자)
Sō Chongt’ae 徐宗泰 帝종태
Sō Koremune 宗惟宗
Sō Tsushima no kami kerai tora o utsu 宗対馬守家来、虎を討つ
Sō Yoshinari 宗義成
Sō Yoshinobu 宗義誠
Sō Yoshitoshi 宗義智
Sō Yoshizane 宗義真
Sōanji 宗安寺
Sōbō kigen 草茅危言
Sōbuksusa 西北武士 서북무사
sochunghwa 小中華 소중화
Sohwajip 小華集 소화집
sōin 西人 서인
the Song dynasty 宋王朝 송나라
Sŏng Taejung 成大中 성대중
Sŏng Wan 成琬 성완
Sŏngho sasŏl 星湖倭説 성호사설
suchan 修撰 수찬
sugun 水軍 수군
Sukchong 肅宗 숙종
Sunamjip  順菴集  聖庵集

taikō 太閤
taikun 大君
Takeda Shingen 武田信玄
Taki Yahachi 瀧弥八
Tamhōnsō 湛軒書 辭公席
Tang Chung‘on 唐仲言
t’angp’yōngch’aek 蕃平策 唐平策
tatami 畳
Tawaregusa たはれ草
tekikoku 敵国 陥国
tenka no daidokoro 天下の台所
tenkabito 天下人
tennō 天皇
terakoya 寺子屋
Toda Tadazane 戸田忠真
tōjin 唐人
tōjin yashiki 唐人屋敷
Tōjō shishū 陶情詩集
Tōkaidō 東海道
Tokugawa Hidetada 徳川秀忠
Tokugawa Iemitsu 徳川家光
Tokugawa Ienobu 徳川家宣
Tokugawa Ieyasu 徳川家康
Tokugawa Tsunatoyo 徳川綱豊
Tokugawa Tsunayoshi 徳川綱吉
Tokugawa Yoshimune 徳川吉宗
Tomonoura 鞆の浦
tong’in 東人  通人
Tongnae 東萊  東內
Tongsai ilgi 東槎日記  通さし日記
Tongsamuntap 東史問答  通史問答
Tongsarok 東槎録  通著録
Torii Honchō 鳥居本町
Tōshōgū 東照宮
Toyotomi Hideyori 豊臣秀頼
Toyotomi Hideyoshi 豊臣秀吉
Tsuchiya Masanao 土屋政直
Tsuchiya Toshinao 土屋利直
Tsugaru han 津軽藩
tsūji 通詞
Tsushima han 対馬藩
tsūshin no kuni 通信の国
tsūshō no kuni 通商の国
Tsūyaku shūsaku 通訳酬酢

ūijōngbu 議政府 의정부
Ukita Hideie 宇喜多秀家
Uraga 浦賀
ūijōng 右議政 우의정

Waeji susōng 倭知守城 왜지수성
wajin 倭人 왜인
wakan 倭館 왜관
wakō 倭寇 왜구
wakoku 倭国 왜국
wanli 万暦 만력
washi 和紙
washū 倭酋 왜수
wato 倭都 왜도
wazoku 倭族 왜족
Wōng Junggō 元重挙 원중거

Yakkan 訳官 역관
Yamaga Sokō 山鹿素行
Yamazaki Ansei 山崎闇斎
Yanagawa Shigeoki 柳川調興
yangban 両班 양반
Yasu 野洲
Yejo 禮 (礼) 曹 예조
Yi Chinyŏng 李真栄 이진영
Yeju Chungmyŏng e ponen p’yŏnji: pyŏlchi 問李仲命 別紙 이중명에 보낸 편지 별지
Yi hyŏn 李礥 (東郭) 이현(동곽)
Yi Ik 李漢 이익
Yi Kyŏngjik 李景稷 이경직
Yi Maegye 李梅溪 이매계
Yi Myŏng’ŏn 李明彦 이명언
Yi Ōngang 李彥綱 이언강
Yi Sŏksang 李碩祥 이석상
Yi Sŏng’gye 李成桂 이성계
Yi Sunshin 李舜臣 이순신
Yi T’oege 李退溪 이퇴계
Yi Tŏngmu 李德懋 이덕무
Yŏmp’o 塩浦 염포
Yŏn 燕 연
Yŏngjo 英祖 영조
yŏnguijŏng 領議政 영의정
yŏnhaengsa 燕行使 연행사
Yŏyudang chŏnsŏ 与猶堂全書 여우당전서
Yun Chiwan 尹趾完 윤지완

zen 禪