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Introduction


11. For instance, Pak Kihyŏn, Uri yŏksa rŭl pakkun kwibwah sŏngsi: Uri itang úl t’aekhan kwibwain tŭl úi palch’ab’wi (Seoul: Yŏksa úi ach’im, 2007); Saramüro ingnŭn Han guksa kihoek wiwonhoe, ed., Imi uri-ga toen ibangin tŭl (P’aju: Tongnyŏk, 2007).


18. Em, The Great Enterprise, 78, quoting Carter Eckert, Off-spring of Empire: The Köch’ang Kim and the Colonial Origins of Korean Capitalism, 1876–1945 (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1991), 226–227. However, it is a minor point in Eckert but central to Em’s discussion of changing attitudes to sovereignty between the “premodern Korea” and the twentieth century.


24. Pae Usŏng, Chosŏn kwa Chungwha, 93–123.


42. Schmid, *Korea between Empires*, 5.
43. For a discussion on these lines of early modern identities, with a focus however on Venice and the Ottoman Empire, see Eric Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople: Nation, Identity, and Coexistence in the Early Modern Mediterranean* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008), 11–22.


56. I adapt a comment made to me by Pamela Kyle Crossley.


58. An example of a scholar who sees changes in Ming migrant status primarily through the lens of Ming loyalist ideology is U Kyŏngsŏp, “Chosŏn hugi kwihwa Hanin kwa Hwangjo yumin ŭisik,” *Han'gukhak yŏn'gu* 27 (June 2012): 335–365.


60. Adam Bohnet, “Ruling Ideology and Marginal Subjects: Ming Loyalism and Foreign Lineages in Late Chosŏn Korea,” *Journal of Early Modern History* 15, no. 6 (2011):
This article, based on my 2008 dissertation, anticipates Kimura in seeing the creation of imperial subject status in terms of the general growth of royal power. One key difference is that it explores these changes in a broader international context.


63. U Kyŏngsŏp, *Chosŏn Chungbuajuŭi sŏngnip: Yu Ch’ullan [Liu Chunlan], “Myŏng-Ch’ŏng kyoch’egi Hanjok ŭi Chosŏn imin” (master’s thesis: Han’guk chŏngsin munhwa yŏng’guwŏn, 1997).*


67. Online glossary, provided by the Academy of Korean Studies, is available at http://digerati.aks.ac.kr:94/.

68. Sun Joo Kim’s “Korean History Glossary” is available at https://projects.iq.harvard.edu/gpks/resources-0.


---

**Chapter 1: Foreign Communities in Early Chosŏn**


4. Robinson, *Empire's Twilight*. Hamgyŏng Province has gone through several name changes. Between 1392 and 1416, it was called Yŏnggil Province, then had its name changed to Hamgil Province in 1416, and to Yŏngan Province in 1470, until finally gaining the name Hamgyŏng Province in 1509. Currently, North Korea has divided it into several administrative districts including North Hamgyŏng and South Hamgyŏng. For clarity, I will generally refer to it simply as Hamgyŏng or the Northeast, except in those cases where some reference to the name then in use is necessary. Also see the map of northern Korea in chapter 2.


11. Literally, “people of various categories,” *semuren* referred to those officials who were not classifiable as Mongols, northern Chinese, or southern Chinese.


Notes to Pages 30–36

23. T'aejong sillok 25:34b–35a, T'aejong 13 (1413)/11/3 (*kimyo*).
24. The above officials, from Yi Hyŏn down, are discussed by Im Sŏnbin, “Chosŏn ch’og’i kwihwa,” 68–80.
25. T'aejong sillok 8:4b–5b, T'aejong 4 (1404)/8/20 (*kib’uk*).
26. Sejong sillok 93:21a, Sejong 23 (1441)/8/11 (*árbae*).
34. Kenneth R. Robinson, “Centering the King of Chosŏn.”
38. *Koryŏsa* 43, Kongmin wang 20 (1371)/2/20 (*kapsul*).


46. For Mŏngke Timur and Li Manchu, see Pak Wŏnho, *Myŏngch’o Chosŏn kwangyesa yŏng’gu*, 169–232, and Clark, “Sino-Korean Tributary Relations under the Ming,” 286–289. Clark, however, largely restricts his discussion of the Chosŏn-Ming-Jurchen relationship to the period before 1467, and thus, perhaps unwittingly, exaggerates the extent to which Chosŏn influence over the Jurchen reeded during the sixteenth centuries.


51. Chŏng Taham, “Chosŏn ch’ogyi yain kwa Taeamdo e tachan pŏlli pŏnbyŏng insik.”


57. For instance, Munjong sillok 10:2a, Munjong 1 (1451)/10/3 (mujin); Sejong sillok 3:1a, Sejong 1 (1419)/11/1 (pyŏng).


60. T’aecho sillok 2:17a, T’aecho 1 (1392)/12/16 (imsul).

61. Sejo sillok 8:25a, Sejo 3 (1457)/7/29 (kyŏngin).


64. See Kuwano Eiji, “Chosŏn seisodai no girei.”


68. Kyŏngguk taejŏn chubae, entry for “hyanghwa” within the “Suse” [taxation] section in the *Hojŏn* [regulations concerning finance] chapter, in the “hujip” (second volume).


70. Yŏnsang-gun ilgi 24:11a, Yŏnsan 3 (1497)/6/1 (sinmi).


72. Kyŏngguk taejŏn, entry for “hyanghwa” within the “Suse” [taxation] section in the *Hojŏn* [regulations concerning finance] chapter.


74. Sŏngjong sillok 207:4a–4b, Sŏngjong 18 (1487)/9/7 (kyemi).
75. Paek Okkyŏng, “Chosŏn chŏn’gi e hwaldonghan Chunggugin ijinmin e tachan koch’al,” Han’guk munhwa yŏng’gu 16 (June 2009), 201–203; Paek uses for evidence the fact that during the early seventeenth century Liaodongese refugees were not classed as submitting-foreigners. Kyung-koo Han and No Hyegyŏng use as their evidence the fact that during the mid-eighteenth century the Chosŏn court specifically forbade the use of the term. See Han, “The Archaeology of the Ethnically Homogeneous Nation-State”; No Hyegyŏng, “Yangjodae hwangjoin.” Kimura Takao differs in his discussion of later periods, but otherwise follows the above arguments for the early Chosŏn. See Kimura, “Chosŏn o ch’o Yonjo niyoru kajin shison sŏshutsu no hakei,” 31–32.

76. For instance, Sejong sillok 150: 9a.

77. Sŏngjong sillok 282:9b–10a, Sŏngjong 24 (1493)/9/11 (immin).


79. T’aejong Sillok 12:36b, T’aejong 6 (1406)/12/9 (kabo).


81. Sejong sillok 84:21b, Sejong 21 (1439)/yun’2/2 (kyŏngjin).

82. T’aejo sillok 13:5a, T’aejo 7 (1398)/2/16 (kyesa).


86. T’aejong sillok 13:3a, T’aejong 7 (1407)/11/17 (imin); T’aejong sillok 23:14b, T’aejong 12 (1412)/2/24 (kimyo); T’aejong sillok 23:21a, T’aejong 12 (1412)/3/29 (kyech’uk); T’aejong sillok 26:4b, T’aejong 13 (1413)/7/16 (kyesa).


88. Lewis, Frontier Contact, 195–196.

89. Sejong sillok 82:2b, Sejong 20 (1438)/7/7 (kich’uk). At this point, Hamgyŏng was referred to as Hamgil.

90. Han Sŏngju, Chosŏn sidea pŏnho yŏng’gu (Seoul: Kyŏng’in munhwasa, 2018), 66–67.


92. Wŏn Ch’angae, “Hyanghwain ŭi Chosŏn chŏngch’ak sarye yŏng’gu—Yŏjin hyanghwain ŭl chungsim ŭro,” Tongyang kojŏn yŏng’gu 37 (December 2009), 46–52.

93. Sejong sillok 78:27a, Sejong 19 (1437)/8/7 (kapch’a).


96. Wŏn Ch’angae, “Hyanghwain ŭi Chosŏn chŏngch’ak,” 45–49. At this point, Hamgyŏng was called Hamgil.

97. Han Munjong, Chosŏn chŏn’gi hyanghwu sujik Waein, 91–102.

98. Han Munjong, Chosŏn chŏn’gi hyanghwu sujik Waein, 105–132.

100. Yŏnsan-gun ilgi 16:15a, Yŏnsan 2 (1496)/7/23 (mujsin).
104. Sejong sillek 36:1a, Sejong 9 (1427)/4/4 (imsul).
105. Sejong sillek 61:42a, Sejong 15 (1433)/yun8/18 (mujsin).
106. Sejong sillek 65:31a, Sejong 16 (1434)/5/20 (chongyu); Sejong sillek 65:31a, Sejong 16 (1434)/9/26 (kyongja); Tanjong sillek 6:39a, Tanjong 1 (1435)/6/8 (kysa).
107. Sejong sillek 70:42a, Sejong 17 (1435)/10/24 (imsul)
108. Sejong sillek 80:18a, Sejong 20 (1438)/1/28 (kyech’uk). Yattaec also be romanized Yajiltæ, however, the chil here likely represents the sai siot.
110. Lewis, Frontier Contact, 194. Sejong sillek 41:13a–13b, Sejong 10 (1428)/9/3 (imja).
111. Sejong sillek 81:25b, Sejong 20 (1438)/6/29 (sinsa).
118. Chungjong sillek 52:44b, Chungjong 19 (1524)/12/18 (mujsin).
120. Han Munjong, Chosŏn chon’gi hyanghwaj sujik, 58–60.
Chapter 2: Civilizing Barbarians and Rebellious Allies


3. Book-length surveys of the war include Kenneth M. Swope, A Dragon’s Head and a Serpent’s Tail; and Samuel Hawley, The Imjin War: Japan’s Sixteenth-Century Invasion of Korea and Attempt to Conquer China (Seoul: Royal Asiatic Society, Korea Branch, 2005). While both may be consulted for the broad outline of the war, they both are limited in their selection of primary sources. See Nam-lin Hur, “Works in English on the Imjin War and the Challenge of Research,” International Journal of Korean History 18, no. 2 (2013): 53–80.

4. See Ch’oe Yonghŭi, Imjin waeran chung ŭi saboe tongt’ae—ūibyŏngul chungsim ŭro (Seoul: Han’guk yŏn’guwŏn, 1975), 82–105.


6. See Swope, A Dragon’s Head and a Serpent’s Tail, 4–5 and 381.

7. A discussion of traders in Chosŏn may be found in Han Myŏnggi, Imjin waeran kwa Han-Jung kwan’gye, 98–105. For more recent work, see Masato Hasegawa “War, Supply Lines, and Society in the Sino-Korean Borderland of the Late Sixteenth Century,” Late Imperial China 37, no. 1 (June 2016): 109–152.

8. Such is the population estimate made by Tony Michell, “Fact and Hypothesis in Yi Dynasty Economic History: The Demographic Dimension,” Korean Studies Forum, no. 6 (Winter–Spring 1979–80): 77–79. Also see table on 71–72. An alternate figure is suggested by Kwŏn T’ae’chwŏn and Sin Yongha, “Chosŏn wangoj sidae ŭi in’gu ch’u’inn ŭi kwanhan il siron,” Tonga munhwa 14 (1977): 289–330, who see the population as peaking at 14,095,000 in 1591, declining to 11,791,000 by 1599, and continuing to fall during the early seventeenth century (especially see table on 32.4–32.8).

36. As Im Ch’ŏr’ho points out in Sŏrhwa wa minjung ūi yŏksa āisik—Imjin waeran sŏrhwa chungsim ūro (Seoul: Chimmundang, 1989), 79–113, descriptions of Li Rusong in the Record of the Imjin War vary quite widely, with some describing him uncomplicatedly as a hero, others suggesting doubt through description of his family background or his geomatical wanderlust, and some oral traditions collected during the twentieth century suggesting extreme sexual misdeeds on his part.


38. Discussed in detail by Han Myŏnggi, Imjin Waeran kwa Han-Jung Kwang’ye, 152–155. Hwang Paekkang, Imjin waeran kwa silgi munhak (Seoul: Ilchisa, 1992), 60–61 and 107, includes hostile descriptions of Ming soldiers and deserters recorded in diaries by Chosŏn officials.


40. The process by which righteous guerrillas became rebels or brigands is discussed by Ch’oe Yŏnghŭi, Imjin waeran chung ūi saboe tongt’ae, 128–164, esp. 154–157, while Yi Changhŭi, Imjin waeransa yŏn’gu, 315–361, discusses general popular unrest during this period.


42. Sŏnjo sillok 142:10a–b, Sŏnjo 34 (1601)/10/19 (kyemi).

43. Han Myŏnggi, Imjin waeran kwa Han-Jung kwang’ye, 152–156. In general, my selection of primary sources for this section owes a great deal to Han Myŏnggi’s work.


45. Sŏnjo sillok 133:20a–b, Sŏnjo 34/6/21 (kabo).


49. Sŏnjo sillok 56:11a–b, Sŏnjo 27 (1594)/10/8 (imja).

50. Sŏnjo sillok 54:31a, Sŏnjo 27 (1594)/8/25 (kyŏng).

51. Sŏnjo sillok 109:16a, Sŏnjo 32 (1599)/2/8 (muo).

52. Sŏnjo sillok 136:12a–b, Sŏnjo 34 (1601)/4/14 (sinsa).


55. Cho Kyŏngnam, Nanjung chamnok, book 6, fr. 16, Kyujanggak # kyu 6586-v.1–16 [1594 (kabo)/8/2].

56. Sŏnjo sillok 41:13a–b, Sŏnjo 26 (1593)/8/6 (chŏngbæ).
57. Sŏnjo sillok 147:13a–b, Sŏnjo 35 (1602)/yun2/23 (pyŏngjin); Kwangbae-gun ilgi chungch’obon 6:50a, Kwanghae 1 (1609)/4/5 (pyŏngjin). It is not clear that either order was carried out—certainly, the fact that the order was made more than once suggests that the first was not successfully carried out.
58. Sŏnjo sillok 109:2a, Sŏnjo 32 (1599)/2/1 (sinsae).
60. Yi Hwang is often known by his sobriquet T’oege.
62. Sŏnjo sillok 71:47a, Sŏnjo 29 (1595)/1/30 (chŏngyu).
63. Sŏnjo sillok 92:9a–9b, Sŏnjo 30 (1597)/9/8 (ûlmi).
64. The compilers of The Revised Veritable Records of Sŏnjo specifically note that this memorial was left out of the original Veritable Records of Sŏnjo by its Kwanghae-gun-era editors.
65. Sŏnjo sujŏng sillok 36:2b, Sŏnjo 35 (1602)/yun2/1 (kabo).
67. Sŏnjo sujŏng sillok 34:2a, Sŏnjo 36 (1603)/5/1 (pyŏngjin).
70. For other examples of political score settling in the Kwangbae-gun ilgi, as well as the elimination of evidence exculpatory to Kwanghae-gun and his supporters, see Han Myŏnggi, Imjin waeran kwa Han-Jung kwang’ye, 310–311; Han Myŏnggi, Kwangbae-gun: T’agwŏrban oegyo chŏngba’ek ul p’yŏlch’in kunju (Seoul: Yŏksa pip’yŏngsa, 2000), 20–26.
71. Kwangbae-gun ilgi, chungch’obon 34:5a, Kwanghae 7 (1615)/10/5 (musin). Note also that Shi Wenyong is written Shi Wenlong in this text.
72. For instance, Kwangbae-gun ilgi 39:67b, Kwanghae 9 (1617)/3/19 (kapsin) and Kwangbae-gun ilgi 40:60a, Kwanghae 9 (1617)/6/21 (kabin).
73. Kwangbae-gun ilgi 64:64a, Kwanghae 15 (1623)/3/14 (kapchin).
74. Lewis, Frontier Contact.

Chapter 3: Border Peoples and Flexible Loyalties in Chosŏn during the Seventeenth Century


3. Han Myŏnggi, Imjin waeran kwa Han-Jung kwan’gye, 244–304.
4. Han Myŏnggi, Imjin waeran kwa Han-Jung kwan’gye, 353–373.
5. There are currently two excellent works concerning the Pyŏngja invasion in Korea. There is a narrative history, namely Han Myŏnggi, Pyŏngja horan (Seoul: P’urŭn yŏksa, 2013), and a close analysis of the invasion from the Qing perspective, namely Ku Pŏmjin, Pyŏngja horan—Hong Taiji ŭi chŏnjaeng (Seoul: Kkach’i kŭlbang, 2019). The only extensive discussion of the war in English is in Evelyn S. Rawksi, Early Modern China and Northeast Asia.
13. For a survey of these developments, see Gertraude Roth Li, “State Building before 1644,” 9–72.

21. Sŏnjo sillok 71:46b, Sŏnjo 29 (1596)/1/30 (chŏngyu).


24. Sŏnjo suı̇ng sillok 29–3b, Sŏnjo 28 (1595)/7/1 (imsin).

25. For the location of Fio-hoton, I follow Koryŏ Tachakkyo, Minjok Munhwa Yŏnguwwŏn, and Manju sillok Yŏkchuhoc, eds., Manju sillok yŏkch’u (Seoul: Somyŏng Ch’ulp’’an, 2014), 138.


32. Chang Chŏngsu, during discussion at the AAS in Asia conference in Korea University in June 2017, suggested that such an exchange could have occurred between Nurhaci and Ming officials, only to have records of it lost in the political chaos of late Ming Liaodong. I suspect, however, that any such exchange would have looked very different in a Ming or Chosŏn document compared to the surviving Manchu documents.

33. Sŏnjo sillok 56:26b, Sŏnjo 27 (1594)/10/11 (ülmyo).

34. Sŏnjo sillok 169:11a–1b, Sŏnjo 36 (1603)/12/30 (sinhac).


36. Kwangbaceous ilgi, chungch’ŏbun 56a–57a, Kwanghae-gun 1(1609)/4/10 (sinyu).


40. See Kyujanggak bibliographic note (baeye) for Kyŏngsangdo Ulsanbu kiyusik changjŏk (kyu # 14986).
41. Kyŏngsangdo Ulsanbu kiyusik changjŏk (kyu # 14986), 25. I consulted the digitized version made available online by the Kyujanggak.
42. Kyŏngsangdo Ulsanbu kiyusik changjŏk, 37.
43. Kyŏngsangdo Ulsanbu kiyusik changjŏk, 62.
44. Kyŏngsangdo Ulsanbu kiyusik changjŏk, 65.
45. Kyŏngsangdo Ulsanbu kiyusik changjŏk, 66, 71, 73, and 74.
46. Kyŏngsangdo Ulsanbu kiyusik changjŏk, 10, 26, and 78.
50. According to a 1618 report, many Jurchen suffered poor treatment within Chosŏn from their magistrates, which may have encouraged their departure. See Kwanghae-gun ilgi chuňch’obon 46:110b, Kwanghae-gun 10 (1618)/7/9 (uλmi).
52. Kwanghae-gun ilgi, chuńch’obon 51:123a, Kwanghae-gun 11(1619)/12/17 (pyŏngin).
55. “Liaodongese” is here used, as by Crossley, A Translucent Mirror, 57–88, to represent the border-crossing community of Jurchen, Chinese, and Koreans within the Ming region of Liaodong.
57. For this subject, see Crossley, A Translucent Mirror, 53–128, and “The Tong in Two Worlds: Cultural Identity in Liaodong and Nurgan during the Thirteenth through Seventeenth Centuries,” Ch’ing-shib wen-t’i 53, no. 1 (June 1993): 21–46.
61. For Mao Wenlong, see Chŏng Pyŏngch’ŏl, “Myŏngmal Yodong iltae,” and Han Myŏnggi, Imjin waeran kwa Han-Jung kwan’gye, 374–406.
62. This rebellion is discussed by Agnew, in “Migrants and Mutineers.”
64. For instance, see Pak Yŏngok, “Pyŏngjoran p’iroin sokhwan’go,” Sach’ong 9 (1964): 51–67; Kim Chongwŏn, “Ch’ogi Cho-Ch’ŏng kwang’gye e taehan ilkoch’al.”
66. Han Myŏnggi, Imjin Waeraen kwa Han-Jung kwang’gye, 281. I became aware of many primary sources for this section through Han’s work.
67. Ming Xizando Zhehuangdi shilu 10:15, Tianqi 1 (1621)/5/12 (guichou), entry 4.
68. Ming Xizando Zhehuangdi shilu 2:145a, Tianqi 2 (1622)/7/16 (gengshu), entry 5.
69. Ming Xizando Zhehuangdi shilu, Tianqi 6 (1626)/10/22 (xinyu), entry 2.
70. See chapter 2, page 76, for a discussion of population figures.
73. Ming Xizando Zhehuangdi shilu, Tianqi 6 (1626)/10/22 (xinyu), entry 2.
76. See Wakeman, The Great Enterprise, 429–430.
77. I follow the printed text of the “Story of Ch’oe Ch’ŏk” as found in Pak Hŭibyŏng, ed., Han’guk hunmun sosŏl kyohap kuhae (Seoul: Somyŏng ch’up’ansa, 2005), 421–451. The event described above may be found on pages 441–442. Scholarship on the text includes Mŏn Yongdaek, Cho Wihan kwa Cb’oech’ŏkkhŏn (Seoul: Asca munhwasa, 1993).
79. Injo sillok 23:25a, Injo 8 (1630)/10/22 (chŏngmyo).
80. The story of Ma Shunshang originates in Kim Yuk’s Chamgok sŏnsaeng p’ildam (Kyujanggak # 6685, fr. 18). A modified version is also recorded in the Hwangjoin sajŏk (Kyujanggak # 2542), fr. 57.
81. The self-account can be found in a number of editions, but here I follow that preserved in Hwangjoin sajŏk, fr. 10–25, where it is called the “Kangsejak chasul.” At the very earliest, the text would have been written in the 1680s. For bibliographic details concerning the text, see Adam Bohnet, “From the Chu-Hat-Hall Duke to Kang Shijue, and Back Again: Biography and State Control in Northern Hamgyŏng,” Korean Histories 3, no. 1 (2012): 3–22.
83. Hwangjoin sajŏk, fr. 23–24. The self-account describes him as setting out into the wilderness on the eighth month of the fifth year of Tianqi (1626) and arriving in Mamp’o after thirteen days.
84. Hwangjoin sajŏk, fr. 23–24.
85. Ming Xizando Zhehuangdi shilu, Tianqi 6 (1626)/10/22 (xinyu), entry 2.
86. For instance, Yi Sangbae, Chosŏn hugi chŏngch’i wa kuwaesŏ (Seoul: Kukhak charyowŏn, 1999), 62–63. This point of view was also held by the late Jahyun Kim
Haboush and is especially visible in her posthumously published book, *The Great East Asian War*.

87. Crossly, “Tong in Two Worlds.”


89. Roth Li, “State Building before 1644,” 65–79.


94. *Sŏnjo sillok* 145:2a, Sŏnjo 35 (1602)/1/8(sinch’uk); Yi Sŏnhŭi, “Kilsang sa gon ul tonghae pon 17 segi ch’o hyanghwain sil’tae wa han’gye.” Nuwŏn is in fact within the city limits of present-day Seoul, on the west bank of the Chungnang-ch’ŏn, in the district of Dobong-gu. Currently, one can walk from Nuwŏn to the city walls in about three and a half hours.


98. Han Munjong, *Chosŏn ch’ong’gi hyangbwu*, 179.


100. *Kwanghae-gun ilgi* chŏngch’obon 177:1a–1b, Kwanghae-gun 14 (1622)/5/1 (pyŏngsin).


102. *Injo sillok* 4:15b, Injo 2 (1624)/2/4 (muja).


105. Yang Hŭngsuk, “Chosŏn hugi Hangwae ŭi chonjae yangsang,” 7–11. Although by far the best-known defector, Kim Ch’ungsŏn’s history is so colored by later myth-making that I have largely relegated discussion of Kim Ch’ungsŏn to chapter 4, where I discuss the formation of a village made up of Japanese defectors under his direction, and to chapter 6, where I discuss the development of the biographical tradition concerning Kim Ch’ungsŏn.


110. Manbun Rōtō 4:39; Jiu Manzhou dang 6:2617. The same document also complains about Chosŏn’s support for Ming and for Mao Wenlong.

111. Injo Sillok 18:30a, Injo 6 (1628)/2/22 (kabin). At Hoeryŏng, however, the Manchu were on the western not eastern bank of the Tumen. It would see what the Border Defense Command must have been thinking of the stretch of the Tumen River downstream from Onsong when they used this phrase. Similar texts are found in Qing sources, although there the Pŏnchos are called Warka. See Taizong Wenhuangdi shilu, Tiancong 2 (1628)/3/8 (jisi); Jiu Manzhou dang 6:243; Manbun Rōtō 4:125–126.

112. Sŏngjŏngwŏn ilgi 54:137b, Injo 14 (1636)/12/26 (pyŏngsin).
113. Sŏngjŏngwŏn ilgi 55:39a–40b, Injo 15 (1637)/1/7 (chŏngmi).

114. Injo sillok 37:37a, Injo 16 (1638)/12/30 (muo).

115. For instance, Sŏngjŏngwŏn ilgi 72:25a, Injo 17 (1639)/11/16 (kisa).


117. Simyang changgye 8:40b, 1642 (imo)/11/25 [Yi Kangsu, trans., 818].

118. Simyang changgye, 2:8b–9a, 1638 (muin)/3/18 [Yi Kangsu, trans., 142].

119. Simyang changgye 2:9a, 1638 (muin)/3/18.

120. Simyang changgye 32b–32b, 1638 (muin)/7/8 [Yi Kangsu, trans., 179–180].

121. Taizong wenhuangdi shilu 46, Chongde 4 (1630)/5/4 (genghun).

122. Simyang changgye 37b, 1637 (chŏngch’uk)/9/6 [Yi Kangsu, trans., 104].

123. Simyang changgye 7:8a, 1642 (imo)/1/28 [Yi Kangsu, trans., 638–640].

124. This issue recurred in Simyang changgye 64b–65a, 1642 (imo)/6/26 [Yi Kangsu, trans., 511–512]; Simyang changgye 70b–71a, 1642 (imo)/7/24 [Yi Kangsu, trans., 520–521].

125. Sŏngjŏngwŏn ilgi 66:14a, Injo 16 (1638)/8/5 (ulmi).

126. Simyang changgye 7:8a, 1642 (imo)/1/28 [Yi Kangsu, trans., 638–640].

127. Simyang changgye 36a, 1641 (sinsa)/11/13 [Yi Kangsu, trans., 590–591].

128. Simyang changgye 8a, 1642 (imo)/1/28 [Yi Kangsu, trans., 640].

129. Simyang changgye 7:65a, 1642 (imo)/6/26 [Yi Kangsu trans., 732].
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