

Misrepresentation of the Origins of Sea Drifters from Jeju Island in the Late Joseon Period

ROKUTANDA Yutaka

I. Introduction

Throughout the Joseon 朝鮮 period there are many records in various sources of shipwrecked natives of Jeju 濟州 Island who drifted at sea and were cast ashore in neighbouring countries such as Japan, Ryūkyū 琉球, and China. By carefully analyzing these incidents, we can gain insights into the actual state of the vibrant maritime activities of Jeju islanders during this period.¹⁾ But at the same time we are also made aware of a strange fact, namely, that there were a considerable number of islanders who concealed their origins when being questioned by officials in countries where they had been cast ashore and falsely claimed that they were from some other part of the Korean peninsula.

Needless to say, it was not only Koreans from Jeju Island who drifted at sea and were cast ashore in foreign lands during the Joseon period, and large numbers of Koreans, especially inhabitants of the coastal areas of Gyeongsang 慶尙 and Jeolla 全羅 provinces in the southern part of the Korean peninsula, were also cast ashore in other countries.²⁾ But it has not been possible to identify any examples of sea drifters from places other than Jeju Island who misrepresented their place of origin. The misrepresentation of their origins when cast ashore in another country was a peculiar form of behaviour found only among natives of Jeju Island.

The first example in written sources of the misrepresentation of their origins by drifters from Jeju occurred in the eighth year of the reign of Seongjong 成宗 (1477).³⁾ This was followed by an instance in the fifth year of the reign of Sukjong 肅宗 (1679),⁴⁾ and from the end of the seventeenth century onwards such incidents begin to appear with great frequency, only to eventually disappear in the 1880s. But why would drifters from Jeju have felt compelled to conceal the fact that they were from Jeju and misrepresent their origins when they drifted ashore in other lands?

The first person to evince an interest in this question was Ikeuchi Satoshi.⁵⁾ Ji Myeonggwon had previously argued that the experiences and memories of the invasions of Korea by Toyotomi Hideyoshi 豊臣秀吉 in 1592 and 1597 lay at the core of the formation of Korean nationalism in modern times,⁶⁾ while So Jaeyeong⁷⁾ and others had maintained that Hideyoshi's invasions had an enormous influence on Korean views of Japan during the early modern period. But Ikeuchi criticized these views because they all "failed to take due account both of the fact that society during the Joseon period from Hideyoshi's invasions to the period of enlightenment was a class-based society and of differences in historical stages, and therefore they did not give adequate consideration to distinctions of social stratification and regionality."⁸⁾ He then went on to examine the question of regional variation in the self-perceptions and foreign perceptions of early modern Koreans with reference to drifters from Jeju who adopted the unusual behaviour of misrepresenting their origins, a form of behaviour that was not generally found among other contemporary Koreans.

Ikeuchi focused on statements about the reasons for the misrepresentation of their origins made by drifters themselves in response to questioning upon their return to Korea. By analyzing these statements, Ikeuchi showed that behind the misrepresentation of their origins there lay a fear among Jeju islanders that they were in danger of being killed by others (i.e., foreigners), and he understood this fear as representing a way of thinking that would not have easily found currency among early modern Koreans as a whole and that could be seen as a "self-perception" peculiar to Jeju islanders of the early modern period.

Insofar that Ikeuchi regards the act of misrepresenting their origins by drifters from Jeju as a reflection of their own self-perceptions, his view merits attention. But at the same time there are some points in his thesis that are open to question, and it also seems to me that there remain further points that deserve to be explored in greater depth. In the following, I shall accordingly reconsider the question of the misrepresentation of their origins by drifters from Jeju Island and, taking Ikeuchi's research into account, essay an examination of the character, formation, and vicissitudes of the self-perceptions of Jeju islanders in the second half of the Joseon period.

II. An Examination of Ikeuchi's Thesis

1. A Summary of Ikeuchi's Thesis

As was noted above, the misrepresentation of their origins by drifters from Jeju during the Joseon period has already been taken up in research by Ikeuchi Satoshi in connection with the self-perceptions and foreign perceptions of early modern Koreans.⁹⁾ While some other researchers have also paid attention to the misrepresentation of their origins by drifters from Jeju, they have touched on it only briefly, and theirs cannot be described as full-scale studies.¹⁰⁾ In this sense, Ikeuchi's research is important as a starting point for considering the misrepresentation of their origins by drifters from Jeju. Therefore, I wish to begin by examining Ikeuchi's research in some detail.¹¹⁾

As was mentioned earlier, when discussing this question Ikeuchi focused on the reasons for misrepresentation given by drifters from Jeju in response to questioning upon their repatriation to Korea. The misrepresentation of their origins by drifters from Jeju usually came to light when they were interrogated by officials after having been repatriated to Korea. Once it became evident that they had misrepresented their origins, the Korean officials would question them about the reasons for this misrepresentation. By analyzing the content of statements made by drifters from Jeju in response to this questioning, Ikeuchi attempted to clarify the self-perceptions and foreign perceptions of Jeju islanders that lay behind this peculiar behaviour.

Ikeuchi first classifies the reasons given by Jeju drifters themselves for the misrepresentation of their origins into five types, designated Type *A* and Types *a* to *d*. These five types are defined in the following manner.

In Type *A* [...] it is first stated that the harshness of the natural environment surrounding Jeju Island gives rise to a situation in which accidents at sea frequently occur in the waters around Jeju and that there are some foreigners who mistakenly believe that Jeju islanders kill foreigners who approach the island (first part). For this reason, it has for some time been said that foreigners who encounter Jeju islanders will immediately kill them (second part). It is explained that they therefore misrepresent their origins with the names of areas other than Jeju Island. In Type *a*, they misrepresent their origins because it has for some time been said that if Japanese meet Jeju is-

landers, they will immediately kill them. In Type *b*, it is stated that in Japan they could not identify themselves as Jeju islanders because they had for a long time heard that when Jeju islanders drifted ashore in Japan they were immediately massacred. In Type *c*, Jeju islanders misrepresent their origins whenever they drift ashore in a foreign land, and in Type *d* they claim that they had an aversion for saying that they were from Jeju.¹²⁾

According to Ikeuchi, the first of these five types to appear was Type *A* (the first example appearing in Sukjong 24 [1698]),¹³⁾ and this subsequently changed to Type *a* and then to Types *b* to *d*. He further says that the following points can be made if one pays attention to their content.

In type *a* the second part of Type *A* has become an independent type. A further characteristic can be seen in the fact that whereas in Type *A* it was foreigners in general who killed Jeju islanders, here they are restricted to Japanese. Type *b* would seem to be a further transformation of Type *a*. In Type *a* the place where Japanese encountered Jeju islanders was not specified, but in Type *b* it has been restricted to Japan. [...] In Type *c* it is deemed to be customary for drifters from Jeju Island to misrepresent their origins in foreign lands or to foreigners, and in Type *d*, regardless of whether they are drifters or not, only the notion of a reluctance to call themselves Jeju islanders has survived.¹⁴⁾

In light of these points, Ikeuchi deems Type *A* to be the prototype of these five types and writes: “It represented a consciousness on the part of Jeju islanders that they were in danger of being killed by others. Further, this consciousness represented a way of thinking that did not easily find currency among early modern Koreans as a whole. One would probably be warranted in interpreting this as a self-perception distinctive of early modern Jeju islanders that was formed through comparison with foreign countries.”¹⁵⁾

The geographical range of drifters from Jeju was not, however, limited to Japan, and extended as far as Ryūkyū and China, and according to Ikeuchi, it was this spread that constituted the most fundamental factor underpinning the above “self-perception” of Jeju islanders. Ikeuchi accordingly goes on to examine the spatial and temporal spread of the Jeju islanders’ “self-perception” shown in Type *A* on the basis of examples of

people who were cast ashore in Ryūkyū and China.

According to the cases cited by Ikeuchi, there were thirty instances of people from different parts of Korea drifting ashore in Ryūkyū between Hyeonjong 顯宗 2 (1661) and Gojong 高宗 7 (1870), and it can be ascertained that in ten of these cases Jeju islanders misrepresented their origins.¹⁶⁾ Furthermore, in the five cases between Heonjong 憲宗 14 (1848) and Gojong 7 (1870) in which the reasons for misrepresentation are known, there are two instances of Type *c* and three instances of Type *d*, and according to Ikeuchi this distribution shows roughly the same trend as the temporal distribution of types of reasons for misrepresentation to be seen when people drifted ashore in Japan.

Meanwhile, as regards instances of people drifting ashore in China, sixteen cases of drifters from Jeju are recorded in the *Jeju gyerok* 濟州啓錄¹⁷⁾ for the years between Heonjong 12 (1846) and Gojong 17 (1880), and in all sixteen cases it can be ascertained that the drifters misrepresented their origins. These cases all fall under Types *c* or *d*, and they again tally with cases involving Japan and Ryūkyū with respect to the temporal distribution of reasons for misrepresentation. According to Ikeuchi, this would suggest that in Ryūkyū and China too Jeju islanders felt the need to conceal their origins and accordingly misrepresented them.

On the basis of the case of Kim Biui 金非衣 and seven others who were cast ashore in Ryūkyū in Seongjong 8 (1477),¹⁸⁾ Ikeuchi further ascertains the fact that this desire on the part of Jeju islanders to conceal their origins had existed from before the sixteenth century, and he also points out with reference to the *Konjaku monogatari* 今昔物語集¹⁹⁾ and Choe Bu's 崔溥 *Pyohaerok* 漂海錄²⁰⁾ that prior to the sixteenth century the seas around Jeju Island were perceived by foreigners and by people from other parts of Korea to be a dangerous place where one could lose one's life.

Thus, "it would seem that from a stage prior to the sixteenth century Jeju islanders felt a need to misrepresent their origins when cast ashore in a foreign land, and this was the same regardless of whether they were cast ashore in Japan, Ryūkyū, or mainland China. There were also sufficient objective grounds for Jeju islanders to feel that people from other countries viewed the seas around Jeju Island as dangerous."²¹⁾ Having ascertained the above points, Ikeuchi surmises that the "self-perception" that made Jeju islanders misrepresent their origins was underpinned by this historically cultivated consciousness and took concrete form in the sec-

ond half of the seventeenth century.

Ikeuchi seeks the reason for this in the fact that the types of reasons for misrepresentation change from Type *A* to Type *a* and then to Types *b-d*, with the manner of explanation gradually becoming simpler and less concrete. According to Ikeuchi, a method of explanation more complex than Type *A*, assumed to be the prototype, is inconceivable, and because Type *A* can be first ascertained in written sources in Sukjong 24 (1698), the formulation of Type *A* would not have occurred all that much earlier than this.

The second half of the seventeenth century, when Ikeuchi surmises the formulation of Type *A* to have taken place, saw a succession of maritime disasters involving Chinese ships in the waters around Jeju Island in the years Hyojong 孝宗 3 (1652), Hyeonjong 8 (1667), and Sukjong 14 (1688), with many people being drowned or cast ashore.²²⁾ In addition, in Sukjong 5 (1679) a wrecked ship and twenty-six bodies were washed ashore in Satsuma 薩摩 in Japan, and it was ascertained by the Korean authorities on the basis of the remaining cargo that the ship had left Jeju the previous year.²³⁾ Ikeuchi considers these mishaps to have had a direct influence on the formulation of Type *A*. He further speculates that Type *A*, having evolved in this manner, eventually narrowed its focus to Japan (and the Japanese), as in Types *a* and *b*, because at the time drifters from Jeju were in the overwhelming majority of cases cast ashore in Japan.

The misrepresentation of their origins by drifters from Jeju more or less ended in the 1880s, and Ikeuchi ends his discussion by also touching on the question of why this should have been so: "If the trend for Jeju islanders to no longer misrepresent their origins and the trend to superimpose memories of Hideyoshi's invasions on their own history may both be understood to have emerged in the 1880s, then Jeju islanders may be assumed to have turned during this period towards the acquisition of a unitary self-perception as Koreans. It was the experiences and memories of Hideyoshi's invasions that were at this time assigned the function of unifying regional differences in self-perception."²⁴⁾ Ikeuchi sought to detect here one of the paths taken in the formation of modern nationalism in Korea.

2. Problems with Ikeuchi's Thesis and Other Issues

Ikeuchi's study of the misrepresentation of their origins by Jeju islanders is thought-provoking and instructive. His view that behind the

misrepresentation of their origins when cast ashore in another country there lay a fear among the islanders that they were in danger of being killed, and that this was a way of thinking which did not easily find currency among early modern Koreans as a whole and was a “self-perception” distinctive of early modern Jeju islanders that was formed through comparison with foreign countries, is by and large convincing. But there are also some problematic points in Ikeuchi’s thesis which make it difficult to accept it as it stands.

First, there are some problems relating to the treatment of the records used by Ikeuchi for educing the types of reasons for misrepresentation and to the character of these records as source material.

Ikeuchi utilized the following five sets of records:²⁵⁾ *Pyoin yeongnae deungnok* 漂人領來謄錄,²⁶⁾ *Dongnae-bu gyerok* 東萊府啓錄,²⁷⁾ *Jeolla gamyeong gyerok* 全羅監營啓錄,²⁸⁾ *Jeju gyerok* 濟州啓錄,²⁹⁾ and *Honam gyerok* 湖南啓錄.³⁰⁾ The *Pyoin yeongnae deungnok* is a collection of reports drawn up by the defence command of Dongnae 東萊 and other local government offices when Koreans who had been cast ashore in Japan were repatriated, with the reports being subsequently copied and bound by the Ministry of Rites. The *Dongnae-bu gyerok* is a collection of memorials on administrative affairs submitted to the throne by the defence commissioner of Dongnae, the *Jeolla gamyeong gyerok* and *Honam gyerok* are likewise collections of memorials submitted by the intendant of Jeolla province, and the *Jeju gyerok* is a collection of memorials submitted by the governor of Jeju, and they were all kept by either the Board of Defence or State Council, where they were copied and bound.

A careful examination of these records reveals that there exist reasons for the misrepresentation of origins that are not included in Types *A* and *a-d* as defined by Ikeuchi. It is also possible to ascertain in the manifestation of these various types not only temporal changes, but also variations that would seem to derive from the character of these records. These have not, however, been noticed by Ikeuchi.

First, a reason given for the misrepresentation of origins other than Types *A* and *a-d* is that the drifter had earlier heard that Jeju islanders were not repatriated if they drifted ashore in Japan, and among the records used by Ikeuchi this appears only in the *Pyoin yeongnae deungnok*.³¹⁾ Let us call this Type *e*. Though there are very few examples of this type, there is no mention whatsoever of the danger of being killed. Among the instances in which Type *e* appears, there are some instances in which Type *a* also appears in a different section of the same record describing

the same incident. It was probably for this reason that Ikeuchi overlooked Type *e*.

It is not only in the case of Types *a* and *e* in the *Pyoin yeongnae deungnok* that it is possible to ascertain two different types of reasons for misrepresentation in regard to the same incident, and similar instances can be found in other records as well. While Ikeuchi too is aware of these, he does not consider the question of what this phenomenon might signify.

Setting this question aside for the time being, let us next look at the variations in reasons for misrepresentation that may be assumed to derive from the character of each set of records. Table 1 collates the five records used by Ikeuchi with the types of reasons for misrepresentation that can be ascertained in these records. On examining this table, it will be evident that, depending on the set of records, there is considerable variation in the types of reasons for misrepresentation. That is to say, in the *Pyoin yeongnae deungnok* there appear Types *A*, *a*, *b* and *e*, in the *Dongnae-bu gyerok* only Type *b*, in the *Jeolla gamyeong gyerok* and *Jeju gyerok* Type *c* or *d*, and in the *Honam gyerok* only Type *d*.³²⁾

It is of course possible to look upon these variations as being associated with particular periods. But there are records, as in the case of the *Dongnae-bu gyerok*, which even in the second half of the nineteenth century mention Type *b*, while a different type of reason for misrepresentation may be given in another record for the same incident, or, as was pointed out above in connection with Type *e*, more than one type of reason for misrepresentation may be given for the same incident in the same record. These variations cannot be explained solely in terms of temporal changes, and one needs to consider them on the basis of the character of each set of records.

That several types of reasons for misrepresentation appear in the same record with regard to the same incident is due to the fact that different officials would have questioned the drifters and written up their statements and the final reports. In the case of the *Pyoin yeongnae deungnok*, the reasons for the drifters' misrepresentation of their origins are recorded in reports by the assistant military commander of Busan 釜山 quoted in memorials submitted by the defence commissioner of Dongnae and in reports by the language officers and assistant language officers quoted in the assistant military commander's reports. Needless to say, the former are based on interrogations conducted by the assistant military commander of Busan and the latter on interrogations conducted by the language officers, and the variations in the types of reasons for misrepresentation

Table 1 Reasons for the misrepresentation of origins by sea drifters from Jeju Island and misstated places of origin (on arrival in Japan)

Reference Number ^a	Year and Month of Arrival in Japan	Type of Reason for Misrepresentation ^b	Misstated Place of Origin	Source ^c
G13	1698/12	<i>A</i>	Naju	<i>Pyoin</i>
G16	1699/5	<i>a</i>	Gangjin	<i>Pyoin</i>
G20	1699/11	<i>a</i>	Gwangju	<i>Pyoin</i>
G31	1702/1	<i>A</i>	Muan	<i>Pyoin</i>
G36	1704/1	<i>A</i>	Yeongam	<i>Pyoin</i>
G37	1704/12	<i>A</i>	Naju	<i>Pyoin</i>
H1	1706/2	<i>A</i>	Gangjin	<i>Pyoin</i>
H10	1706/12	<i>a</i>	Haenam	<i>Pyoin</i>
H11	1706/12	<i>d</i>	Gangjin	<i>Pyoin</i>
H39	1715/1	<i>a</i>	Gangjin	<i>Pyoin</i>
I13	1717/1	<i>a</i>	(Yeongam) Godaldo	<i>Pyoin</i>
I28	1720/11	<i>a (e)</i>	Jindo	<i>Pyoin</i>
I29	1720/11	<i>a (e)</i>	Haenam	<i>Pyoin</i>
I36	1723/3	<i>a (b)</i>	Yeonggwang	<i>Pyoin</i>
I37	1723/4	<i>a (b)</i>	Naju	<i>Pyoin</i>
I38	1723/4	<i>a</i>	Naju	<i>Pyoin</i>
I44	1724/2	<i>a (e)</i>	Naju	<i>Pyoin</i>
I46	1724/11	<i>a</i>	Naju	<i>Pyoin</i>
J17	1729/10	<i>a</i>	Naju	<i>Pyoin</i>
K5	1738/2	<i>a</i>	Yeongsan	<i>Pyoin</i>
K20	1744/10	<i>a</i>	Usuyeong	<i>Pyoin</i>
U60	1844/8	<i>c</i>	Haenam	<i>Jeolla</i>
U61	1844/10	<i>c (d)</i>	Gangjin	<i>Jeolla</i>
V1	1846/4	<i>c</i>	Haenam	<i>Jeju</i>
V2	1846/10	<i>c</i>	Haenam	<i>Jeju</i>
V10	1848/1	?	Yeongam	<i>Jeju</i>
V11	1848/1	<i>c</i>	Haenam	<i>Jeju</i>
V22	1850/2	<i>c</i>	Gangjin	<i>Jeju</i>
V23	1850/2	<i>c</i>	Haenam	<i>Jeju</i>
V27	1852/4	<i>c</i>	Haenam	<i>Jeju</i>
V31	1852/10	<i>c/d</i>	Haenam	<i>Jeju/ Jeolla</i>
V34	1853/12	<i>c</i>	Gangjin	<i>Jeju</i>

V36	1854/3	<i>d</i>	Haenam	<i>Jeju</i>
V37	1854/4	<i>d</i>	Haenam	<i>Jeju</i>
V45	1854/12	<i>d</i>	Gangjin	<i>Jeju</i>
W18	1859/11	<i>b</i>	Gangjin	<i>Dongnae</i>
W33	1862/3	<i>b</i>	Haenam	<i>Dongnae</i>
W34	1862/3	<i>b</i>	Haenam	<i>Dongnae</i>
W39	1863/3	<i>b</i>	Haenam	<i>Dongnae</i>
W48	1864/12	<i>d</i>	Yeongam	<i>Jeju</i>
W51	1865/12	<i>b/d</i>	Gangjin	<i>Dongnae/ Jeju</i>
X4	1866/10	<i>d</i>	Gangjin	<i>Jeju</i>
X5	1867/2	<i>b/d</i>	Gangjin	<i>Dongnae/ Jeju</i>
X6	1867/4	<i>b/d</i>	Jindo	<i>Dongnae/ Jeju</i>
X15	1867/12	<i>d</i>	Gangjin	<i>Jeju</i>
X17	1868/1	<i>d</i>	Haenam	<i>Jeju</i>
X19	1868/9	<i>b/d</i>	Yeongam	<i>Dongnae/ Jeju</i>
X20	1868/10	<i>b</i>	Gangjin	<i>Dongnae</i>
X21	1868/12	<i>d</i>	Gangjin	<i>Jeju</i>
X22	1869/3	<i>b/d</i>	Gangjin	<i>Dongnae/ Jeju</i>
X27	1870/2	<i>b</i>	Haenam	<i>Dongnae</i>
X28	1870/3	<i>b/d</i>	Haenam	<i>Dongnae/ Jeju</i>
X33	1870/11	<i>b/d</i>	Haenam	<i>Dongnae/ Jeju</i>
X38	1871/9	<i>b</i>	Haenam	<i>Dongnae</i>
Z17	1878/1	<i>d</i>	Haenam	<i>Honam</i>
Z18	1878/3	<i>d</i>	Gangjin	<i>Honam</i>
Z19	1878/12	<i>d (d)</i>	Haenam	<i>Honam</i>
Z21	1879/7	<i>d</i>	Haenam	<i>Honam</i>

Note: This table is based on Ikeuchi Satoshi, *Kinsei Nihon to Chōsen hyōryūmin*, chap. 8, Table 2.

- ^a Reference numbers follow those used in Ikeuchi, *op. cit.*, “Chronological Table of the Arrival of Korean Sea Drifters in Japan.”
- ^b When more than one reason is given in the same source, all reasons are listed, with the reason thought to be secondary being enclosed in parentheses.
- ^c When the reason(s) for misrepresentation are given in more than one source, all the sources are listed in the order of the corresponding reasons. The abbreviations used for the sources are as follows: *Pyoin*: *Pyoin yeongnae deungnok* 漂人領來騰錄; *Jeolla*: *Jeolla gamyeong gyerok* 全羅監營啓錄; *Jeju*: *Jeju gyerok* 濟州啓錄; *Dongnae*: *Dongnae-bu gyerok* 東萊府啓錄; and *Honam*: *Honam gyerok* 湖南啓錄 (all held in GyuJanggak Library, Seoul National University).

appear in a manner that coincides with this difference between reports by the assistant military commander of Busan and reports by the language officers, with Type *A* or *a* appearing in the former and Type *b* or *e* appearing in the latter.

A similar characteristic can be pointed out with regard to the *Jeolla gamyeong gyerok*. In this case, the reasons for misrepresentation given in reports by the governor of Jeju quoted in memorials submitted by the intendant of Jeolla province are all of Type *c*, while reports from the magistrate of Haenam 海南 county, one of the administrative centres with responsibilities for Jeju, give Type *d*.

In the same way, variations in the types of reasons for misrepresentation to be found in different records of the same incident can also be understood to reflect differences in the officials in charge of the interrogations and those who wrote up the statements and reports. What is more, the correlation between differences in the officials in charge of the interrogations and those who wrote up the statements and reports on the one hand and the manifestation of the types of reasons for misrepresentation on the other can also be ascertained in records from different periods describing different incidents.

For example, as was noted above, in the case of the *Pyoin yeongnae deungnok*, which records incidents that occurred in the late seventeenth century and first half of the eighteenth century, Types *b* or *e* are to be found in reports by the language officers under the defence commissioner of Dongnae. Likewise, in the *Dongnae-bu gyerok*, which records incidents from the latter half of the nineteenth century, the reasons for misrepresentation given in the reports of interrogations conducted by local officials (found in reports by the assistant military commander of Busan quoted in memorials submitted by the defence commissioner of Dongnae) are all of type *b*.

The fact that a strong correlation can thus be seen between differences in the officials in charge of the interrogations and those who wrote up the reports on the one hand and the manifestation of the types of reasons for misrepresentation on the other would suggest there is a possibility that these types of reasons for misrepresentation are not necessarily a faithful reflection of the original content of the statements made by the drifters themselves. This does not, of course, mean that everything was fabricated. But when analyzing the reasons for the misrepresentation of their origins by drifters from Jeju on the basis of these records, one must take into account questions such as the aims and attitudes of the officials

involved in the interrogations and the formalization of accounts given in the reports.

At any rate, there would not seem to be much meaning in stressing minor differences between the six Types *A* and *a-e*. Broadly speaking, it should be sufficient to posit three groups: (1) Type *A*, representing the prototype; (2) Types *a*, *b* and *e*, which make mention of Japanese; and (3) Types *c* and *d*, in which the reasons for misrepresentation have been simplified.

Further, all that can be said with certainty about temporal changes in these types of reasons for misrepresentation is that Type *A* appeared in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, to be superseded by Type *a* in the first half of the eighteenth century, which then changed to Type *c* or *d* from the mid-nineteenth century onwards. Type *b* can be ascertained from the start of the eighteenth century through to the second half of the nineteenth century, but as was noted above, it is found only in reports by language officers from Dongnae and is somewhat unusual. Likewise, insofar that Type *e* is found only in the reports of language officers, I shall regard it as being similar to Type *b*.

The second point that I wish to make in regard to Ikeuchi's research concerns his understanding of Types *a* and *b*. According to Ikeuchi, the reasons for misrepresentation are connected with Japan (or the Japanese) in Types *a* and *b* because, when Jeju islanders drifted ashore in a foreign land, in the overwhelming majority of cases they drifted ashore in Japan. It is true that when one examines the numbers of incidents listed by Ikeuchi, the number of those involving Japan is considerably larger than the number of those involving Ryūkyū or China. But there would seem to me to be no direct link between this fact and the emergence of Types *a* and *b*.

The incidents on which Ikeuchi relied for classifying the reasons for the misrepresentation of their origins by drifters from Jeju all involved people who had drifted ashore in Japan. That being so, it is only natural that the reasons for misrepresentation in Types *a* and *b* should be linked to Japan (or the Japanese). The emergence of Types *a* and *b* was due not so much to the fact that the number of instances in which Jeju islanders drifted ashore in Japan was overwhelmingly larger than the number of instances involving other countries, but rather to the fact that the instances in which Types *a* and *b* are found all involved Japan. It ought to be considered that the reasons for misrepresentation in these two types were explained with specific reference to Japanese rather than to foreign-

ers in general because the drifters happened to have drifted ashore in Japan.

If the drifters had been cast ashore in Ryūkyū or China, the reasons for misrepresentation may – or rather, most certainly would – have been explained in a different way. In the sources on which Ikeuchi based himself, the reason for the misrepresentation of origins is often not given in instances involving China or Ryūkyū, and all cases in which the reason is known are limited to the latter half of the nineteenth century. Therefore, it is not clear how drifters cast ashore in Ryūkyū and China prior to this explained the reasons for the misrepresentation of their origins, and this remains a question for the future.

A third problematic point in Ikeuchi's research, and one related to this, is the question of how to consider the legend of the murder of a Ryukyuan prince. According to this legend, a Ryukyuan prince cast ashore on Jeju was killed by the governor of Jeju as the latter tried to seize some of the valuable articles in the ship's cargo, and in the second half of the Joseon period there existed the notion that one of the reasons that drifters from Jeju misrepresented their origins lay in the murder of the Ryukyuan prince described in this legend. In regard to this legend, Ikeuchi touches on a reference appearing in the *Haesa ilgi* 海槎日記 by Jo Eom 趙巖³³⁾ and writes: "To the best of my knowledge, this is the only instance in which this legend is cited as an explanation for the background to the misrepresentation of origins. It is probably impossible to explain the background to the misrepresentation of their origins by Jeju islanders solely in connection with this incident."³⁴⁾ But he does not delve any further into this issue.

It is true that, as pointed out by Ikeuchi, the background to the misrepresentation of their origins by drifters from Jeju cannot be explained by this legend alone. But it is in fact possible to ascertain several other instances, apart from the *Haesa ilgi* cited by Ikeuchi, in which the murder of a Ryukyuan prince and the misrepresentation of their origins by drifters from Jeju are interlinked, and this legend thus merits greater attention as one of the reasons for the misrepresentation of their origins by drifters when they were cast ashore in lands other than Japan.

Lastly, in Ikeuchi's research emphasis is placed on the question of regional variation in the self-perceptions and foreign perceptions of early modern Koreans, but at the same time he pays no attention whatsoever to the correlation in temporal changes between the place-names falsely given by drifters from Jeju and the reasons for misrepresentation or to the relationship between reasons for misrepresentation and differences in the drifters' status and social class.

It is, however, possible to detect a certain trend when tracing temporal changes in the place-names falsely given by drifters from Jeju. Further, castaways from Jeju included people of diverse status and from different social classes. Therefore, the relationship between these factors and the manifestation of types of reasons for misrepresentation, as well as its significance, should naturally also be subjected to examination.³⁵⁾

III. The Legend of the Murder of a Ryukyuan Prince and the Misrepresentation of Origins

As was noted above, one of the topics to which Ikeuchi did not attach much importance in his research was the question of the relationship between the legend of the murder of a Ryukyuan prince and the misrepresentation of origins. In this section I wish to consider this question.

One of the accounts of the legend of the murder of a Ryukyuan prince reads as follows:

During the reign of Injo [1623–49], Japan attacked Ryūkyū and took the king prisoner. The prince loaded treasures from that country [onto a ship] with a view to redeeming his father. The ship drifted as far as Jeju, and Governor So-and-so asked about the valuables on board. The prince replied that there was a wine-spring stone and a mountain-covering tent. The wine-spring stone was a square piece of stone, hollowed in the centre, and whenever water was placed in it, it immediately turned into fine wine. The tent had been woven with spider's thread that had been dyed with a medicinal substance; at its smallest it could cover about six feet, but at its largest it could cover even a large mountain, and it did not leak. They were truly outstanding treasures. The governor asked for them, but the prince refused to hand them over. The governor dispatched soldiers, who surrounded the prince and captured him. As soon as he was taken captive, he threw the stone into the sea. The governor confiscated everything on the ship and had the prince whipped to death. When he was about to die, the prince asked for pen and paper and wrote a poem in regulated verse. [...] After he had killed him, [the governor] submitted a memorial to the court falsely claiming that [the Ryukyuans] had been pirates who had violated the border. The truth of the matter later came to light, and [the governor] almost died, but just managed to survive.

仁祖朝，倭攻琉球虜王，其世子載其國寶，欲贖父，舟漂到濟州，牧使

某問舟中寶，世子答以有酒泉石・漫山帳，酒泉石者，方石一塊，中央凹，每以清水貯，則變爲美酒，帳則以蜘蛛絲，染藥織成，小帳則可覆一間，大帳則雖大山可覆，而雨亦不漏，眞絕寶也，牧使請之，世子不許，牧使遣兵，圍捕世子，彼收卽以石投海，牧使盡籍舟中物，因杖殺之，世子臨死，請紙筆，書一律曰，[...] 旣殺之，又誣以犯境之賊啓聞于朝，後事露，幾死僅生，(Yi Junghwan 李重煥, *Taengniji* 擇里志, “Bokkeo chongnon: sansu” 卜居總論, 山水)

The murder of a Ryukyuan prince by the governor of Jeju described here did not of course actually occur. It is a legend that was created on the basis of two separate incidents that took place on Jeju Island.

In the first incident, Mun Huihyeon 文希賢, the governor of Jeju, and Yi Gibin 李箕賓, the magistrate, who had in the seventh month of the third year of the reign of Prince Gwanghae (Gwanghaegun 光海君) (1611) failed to stop a wrecked ship that was drifting in waters near Jeju, parleyed and then joined battle with a vermillion-seal ship of the Shimazu 島津 clan on its way back to Japan from Annam 安南, seized its cargo, and killed the crew in the seventh to eighth months of the same year. In the second incident, which occurred about a year later in the seventh month of Gwanghaegun 4 (1612), a Ryukyuan tribute ship on its way home from China drifted ashore on the island of Mala 麼羅 off Jeju and eight Ryukyuan who went ashore to investigate were apprehended by soldiers from Jeju, but the ship sailed off and those who had been apprehended were taken into custody and eventually repatriated.

It is to be surmised that these two incidents were conflated or else deliberately misconstrued in order to emphasize Prince Gwanghae's misrule, and then came to be understood during Injo's reign as the murder of a Ryukyuan prince or a Ryukyuan envoy.³⁶⁾

This legend of the murder of a Ryukyuan prince is found not only in the *Taengniji* quoted above, but also, with minor variations in content, in numerous works dating from the second half of the eighteenth century through to the nineteenth century, including the *Yeonamjip* 燕岩集 by Bak Jiwon 朴趾源 and the *Gyeseo yadam* 溪西野談 by Yi Huijun 李義準. In particular, the fact that this legend was recorded in the *Taengniji*, a work that was popular among scholar-officials of the latter half of the Joseon period, would indicate that it had circulated quite widely among the literate strata and intellectuals of the second half of the Joseon period.³⁷⁾

Go Changseok has sought the reason for the misrepresentation of their origins by drifters from Jeju in the murder of a Ryukyuan prince de-

scribed in this legend,³⁸⁾ and he pays particular attention to the following passage in the *Tamlaji chobon* 耽羅誌草本 by Yi Wonjo 李源祚 (mid-19th cent.):³⁹⁾

In the cyclic year *sinhae* during the reign of Prince Gwanghae [1611], the crown prince of the Ryūkyū kingdom drifted ashore below Jugseo Tower of the district headquarters [of Jeju]. The governor at the time, desirous of his valuables, seized them and killed the prince. When he was about to die, [the prince] wrote a poem. [...] Gnawing at his fingers, he wrote it with his own blood on one of the ship's planks and set it afloat on the sea. It is for this reason that since then, whenever locals [from Jeju Island] drift ashore in other countries, they invariably conceal the fact that they are from Jeju and falsely state that they are from places such as Gangjin and Haenam.

光海辛亥，琉球國太子，漂白於州城之竹西樓下，其時帥臣利其財寶，掠而殺之，臨死有詩曰，[...] 咋指血書于船板，浮于海，其後土人之漂到他國，必諱濟州，托稱康津・海南等地者以此，(*Tamlaji chobon* 3, “Byeonjeong jo” 邊情條)

It is indeed stated here that, as a direct result of the murder of a Ryukyuan prince, whenever Jeju islanders subsequently drifted ashore in a foreign land, they always concealed the fact that they were from Jeju and falsely stated that they were from places on the Korean peninsula such as the counties of Gangjin 康津 and Haenam in Jeolla province. Furthermore, unlike the *Taengniji* quoted earlier, this account dates the incident not to Injo's reign, but to “the cyclic year *sinhae* during the reign of Prince Gwanghae,” i.e., Gwanghaegun 3 (1611), and in this respect too it is faithful to the original incident.

From Heonjo 7 (1841), Yi Wonjo served for about two and half years as governor of Jeju.⁴⁰⁾ Thus, the fact that the *Tamlaji chobon*, written on the basis of his experiences at this time, contains an account such as this would suggest that in the mid-nineteenth century this legend may have been circulating with a certain degree of persuasiveness among the islanders as an explanation of the reason for the misrepresentation of their origins.

But, as has already been noted, the legend of the murder of a Ryukyuan prince may be assumed to have been quite widely known among the literate strata and intellectuals at the time, and therefore,

rather than Yi Wonjo's account having been based completely on his experiences on Jeju, it should perhaps be considered that after taking up his post on the island he came to understand this legend, of which he had already been cognizant, in connection with the islanders' misrepresentation of their origins. Alternatively, it is also possible that by this time the notion that the misrepresentation of origins and this legend were connected had widely penetrated among the literate strata and intellectuals of Korea. One cannot, however, draw any hasty conclusions as to which of these possibilities is correct.

Be that as it may, Yi Wonjo's understanding that the misrepresentation of their origins by drifters from Jeju was directly triggered by the murder of a Ryukyuan prince is mistaken as far as the facts of the matter are concerned. An incident that had not occurred could not possibly become the cause of the misrepresentation of their origins.

The military engagement with a vermillion-seal ship from Satsuma and the incident involving a tribute ship from Ryūkyū, which occurred in Gwanghaegun 3-4 (1611-12), were transformed into the murder of a Ryukyuan prince by the governor of Jeju in the first years of Injo's reign,⁴¹⁾ but this is considered to have spread among intellectuals and the literate strata in the form of the legend cited earlier only from the mid-eighteenth century onwards.⁴²⁾ But since instances of the misrepresentation of their origins by drifters from Jeju can be ascertained already from the second half of the seventeenth century, it is difficult to imagine that drifters from Jeju began to misrepresent their origins on account of this legend. If, as is pointed out by Ikeuchi, the islanders of Jeju already had the idea of concealing their origins from prior to the sixteenth century, it is also difficult to believe that the two incidents on which the legend is deemed to be based became the cause of the misrepresentation of their origins.

Thus, it was certainly not the case that the misrepresentation of their origins by drifters from Jeju began as a direct consequence of the murder of a Ryukyuan prince, nor is it reasonable to suppose that this legend or the incidents on which it was based became the cause of the misrepresentation of their origins. But at the same time it is also true that one can ascertain a number of instances in which drifters either mentioned the murder of a Ryukyuan prince as a reason for the misrepresentation of their origins or, while making no mention of the incident itself, acted in a manner that would lead one to suppose that they were aware of this incident. The notion that the murder of a Ryukyuan prince and the misrep-

resentation of origins were connected did really exist. Next, I wish to examine a number of actual examples.

The first example I wish to consider concerns a party headed by the Jeju islander Kim Cheoljung 金喆重, which drifted ashore on the island of Tiancan 田蠶 in Linhai 臨海 county, Taizhou 臺州 prefecture, China, in Yeongjo 英祖 7 (1741). After they had been safely repatriated, they answered questions put to them by the Board of Defence as follows:

We are all underlings of the district office of Jeju. On the 29th day of the second month of this year [1741], we loaded eighteen saddles requested by the Court of the Imperial Stud onto a ship and set sail. While at sea, we suddenly encountered violent winds and were unable to control the ship, and after the rudder had been damaged, we did not know in which direction we were heading, going either eastwards or westwards for forty-two days in all. During that time, as all hope vanished, we thought that if we drifted ashore in the Ryūkyū kingdom there was a possibility that we might be killed since the people of that country are usually ill-disposed towards the people of Jeju, and so we threw all our identity tags, any documents inscribed with the two characters “Jeju,” and more than forty taels of money into the sea. On the 21st day of the third month, at the hour of the horse [11.00 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.], we drifted ashore at a deserted place on a small island. We pitched tents in a spot with a good view, whereupon people saw us, and during the night more than forty people came on board two boats, having cooked rice, drawn water, and loaded provisions, which they showed to us while asking us in writing, “From what country are you?” We replied in writing, “We are residents of Soan Island in Yeongam district, Jeolla province, in the Joseon kingdom, and because of a poor harvest we boarded a ship in order to buy grain and headed for Dosi Bay in Yeongam district, but we were blown by the wind as far as here.” They immediately gave us food. After the meal, when we had calmed down somewhat, we again asked them in writing, “Whereabouts is your country?” They again replied in writing, “It is Tiancan Island in Linhai county, Taizhou prefecture, Zhejiang province, in the Greater Tang.”

矣徒等，俱以濟州牧官下人，今年二月二十九日，司僕寺求請馬鞍十八部，載舡出來是白如可，行到洋中，猝遇狂風，不能制舡，尾木折傷之後，莫適所向，或東或西者，凡四十二日，其間萬念消盡之中，猶慮漂

泊於琉球國，則該國素嫉濟州之人，不無殺害之患，所持號牌濟州二字，所書之文書及錢文四十餘兩，竝爲投諸海中是白如乎，三月二十一日午時量，漂泊小島無人處矣，相望之地結幕處，人見矣徒等夜中四十餘名，乘二隻舡，作飯汲水，糧米載來見之，以書字問之曰，何國人乎，矣徒等以文字書示曰，以朝鮮國全羅道靈巖郡所安島居生之人，因年事凶歉，貿穀次乘舡，向本郡都市浦矣，漂風到此云爾，則仍卽賜飯是白去乙，得食之後，神精稍定，又書問，貴國卽何地方耶，彼又書之曰，卽大唐浙江臺州府臨海縣地方田蠶島云云，(*Bibyeonsa deungnok* 備邊司謄錄 109, entry for 11.23 in cyclic year *sinyu* 辛酉 [Yeongjo 17 = 1741], “Jeju pyohwan inbyeol jeongbyeol dan” 濟州漂還人別情別單; underlined words to be read in accordance with *idu* 吏讀 system)

In this case, there is no direct mention of the murder of a Ryukyuan prince, but there can be no doubt that the drifters' statement that Ryukyuans were ill-disposed towards Jeju islanders was informed with a strong awareness of this incident. In this instance it is not known whether or not they actually concealed their origins, but their discarding of their identity tags and anything else that might reveal their domicile of origin and status was clearly an action taken for the purpose of concealing their origins.

According to the account quoted above, Kim Cheoljung and his companions were “underlings of the district office of Jeju,” and they were shipwrecked in the course of official duties, transporting saddles requested by the Court of the Imperial Stud. In another section of the same report, it is stated in regard to those on board the same ship that Kim Cheoljung was attached to the district office of Jeju and was thirty-two years old, his attendant An Ik 安益 was fifty, the shipmaster Mun Yungjang 文隆章 was thirty-six, the seaman Han Suban 韓守返 was thirty-one, and the oarsman Mun Uiman 文義萬 was thirty-two, and there was also a merchant from Naju 羅州 by the name of Yi Geukjung 李克中, who was thirty-four.⁴³⁾ It is thus evident that the party of drifters consisted of an official attached to the district office of Jeju and his attendants, and the ship's passengers also included a merchant from Naju. Setting aside the ship's master and his crew, responsible for operating the ship, Kim Cheoljung, An Ik, and Yi Geukjung would have belonged to the literate strata.

Next, I wish to consider the case of twelve Jeju islanders who drifted ashore on Tsushima 對馬 in Yeongjo 40 (1746). The following account is taken from Jo Eom's *Haesa ilgi*, and it was also taken up by Ikeuchi.⁴⁴⁾

Having heard that some drifters from my country were staying here, I summoned them, and they turned out to be four able-bodied men, three women, and five children. I heard the circumstances [of their misadventure] in detail. They were Jeju islanders engaged in fishing, and they had been taking family members by boat to Jido, but after the full moon in the third month they had been carried by the wind, their rudder damaged and their oars lost, and had thrown miscellaneous things into the sea. After having been carried by the wind for more than ten days, both food and water ran out. They wet their clothes with rain and wrung out drops of water to drink, and for five days, without any food, they hovered between life and death, but fortunately they landed near Fuchū [on Tsushima]. They said that, from start to finish, they drifted for sixteen days. [...] I heard that the drifters lied to the people [where they came ashore], saying that they were inhabitants of Gangjin. I have heard it said that once there was an affair that caused ill feeling between the people of Jeju and the Ryūkyū kingdom, and that therefore, fearing revenge, drifters from Jeju all lie [about their origins] in Japan, but since this is not the Ryūkyū kingdom, what is there to fear?

聞我國漂民，來此留在云，故招見之，則壯丁四人・女人三人・童穉五口，詳聞其委折，則以濟州人爲漁採，載其家屬往地島，三月望後漂風，折鴟失櫓，盡投雜物，從風周回十餘日後，糧水俱盡，得雨沾衣，取汙而飲，不得食者五日，幾至死境，幸泊於府中近處，漂流首尾爲十六日云，[...] 聞漂民輩以康津居民，詭言於彼人云，蓋以濟州人與琉球國，曾有結怨之事，故或慮報復，濟州漂民，輒皆詭言於日本云，而既非琉球國，則何慮之有也，(Jo Eom, *Haesa ilgi*, entry for 6.14 in cyclic year *gapsin* 甲申 [Yeongjo 40 = 1746])

At the time, Jo Eom was residing in Fuchū 府中 (Izuhara 巖原) as the chief envoy of a Korean mission, and hearing that there were some drifters from Korea, he went to see them. But he was puzzled to discover that although they were from the island of Jeju, they had claimed that they were from Gangjin county in Jeolla province.⁴⁵⁾

Here too there is no direct mention of the murder of a Ryukyuan prince, but it is almost certain that the ill feeling between Jeju islanders and the Ryūkyū kingdom mentioned by Jo Eom referred to this incident. I would also like to draw attention to the fact that it is not the drifters but Jo Eom, an intellectual from mainland Korea, who is reminded of the

murder of a Ryukyuan prince.

Lastly, I shall cite two passages from the *Pyohaerok* 漂海錄⁴⁶) by Jang Hancheol 張漢喆 regarding two incidents that occurred in Yeongjo 46 (1770) after a ship bearing Jeju islanders, including Jang Hancheol, set sail from Jeju and was drifting at sea following a mishap.

At this, feigning surprised understanding, I said to the other people, “If our party should reach Ryūkyū, then there will certainly be no chance of our returning alive. Alas! What is to be done?” They were all dejected and asked in surprise, “What do you mean?” I said, “Long ago, Ryūkyū was on friendly terms with our country, and whenever envoys from Ryūkyū came, they would stay at the Seongpyeongwan, which was in Suncheon in Jeolla province. Because it was a long way across the sea, it was not possible to send envoys frequently, but three envoys came within a short time of each other. I have forgotten the names of two of them, but in the cyclic year *sinhae* [1611] during the reign of Prince Gwanghae the crown prince of Ryūkyū drifted ashore on Jeju. The governor at the time, falsely claiming that they were pirates, attacked them in full force, killed the prince, and seized their valuables. Ever since then, Ryūkyū is said to have broken off relations. When they see people from Jeju, how could they not have thoughts of revenge?” Everyone turned deadly pale and did not know what to do.

於是，佯若驚悟而謂衆人曰，吾行若入琉球，則必無生還之理，奈何，衆皆落膽，驚問曰，何謂也，餘曰，在昔琉球與我國通好，而琉球使臣至之，泊舟昇平館，乃全羅道順天府也，海路隔遠，雖不得頻通使价，前後琉球使之至者三其二，忘其名也，逮至光海朝辛亥年間，琉球太子，飄船到濟州，其時牧使，誣以寇邊，大攻殺之，奪其貨貝，自此琉球絕和云矣，彼見濟州人，則豈無復讐之心乎，衆皆失色罔知攸措，(Jang Hancheol, *Pyohaerok*, entry for 12.26 in cyclic year *gyeongin* 庚寅 [Yeongjo 46 = 1770])

I took out the compass to have a look, and the star was situated in the south-southwest part of the heavens. It was the same as what I had once observed from Mount Halla. Judging from this, I knew that the boat was due south of Mount Halla, and it was also evident that we were approaching the border with Ryūkyū. I made all the passengers throw their identity tags into the sea because I wanted to get rid

of any evidence that we were from Tamla [= Jeju] once we reached Ryūkyū.

又取指南鐵見之，星在丁方之天，與漢拏山所見同，其方推此，而可知船在漢拏之正南，而近於琉球之境，亦可知矣，舟人所佩號牌，皆令投之海中者，到琉球後，欲諱其耽羅蹤跡也，(*Ibid.*, entry for 12.27 in cyclic year *gyeongin* [Yeongjo 46 = 1770])

What merits attention in this case is the fact that Jang Hancheol was the only person on board who knew about the legend of the murder of a Ryukyuan prince and perceived there to be a danger that Ryukyuan might take revenge on people from Jeju. The other passengers, meanwhile, on being apprised of this, “turned deadly pale and did not know what to do.” Jang Hancheol had been on his way to Hanseong 漢城 (Seoul) to sit the civil service examinations when the ship he was traveling on met with a mishap, and among Jeju islanders he would have been an intellectual of some standing.

It is to be surmised that the legend of the murder of a Ryukyuan prince had by about the mid-eighteenth century initially spread and taken root among intellectuals and members of the literate strata living in mainland Korea as a tale known from written sources. As was noted earlier, this legend was based on two incidents, i.e., a military engagement with a vermillion-seal ship of the Shimazu clan and the arrival of a Ryukyuan tribute ship. It could therefore also be supposed that they were remembered by residents of Jeju, where the incidents occurred, and evolved into a legend. But instances of foreign ships being shipwrecked were not limited to these two incidents, and it is difficult to imagine that only these two incidents in particular would have been vividly remembered. An examination of relevant passages in the dynastic records shows that these incidents were much talked about among members of the central government,⁴⁷⁾ and it seems more likely that their transformation into a legend would have occurred on the mainland.⁴⁸⁾

If that was indeed the case, then it may be possible to infer from the three incidents considered in the above a situation in which the legend of the murder of a Ryukyuan prince, which had evolved on the mainland and circulated among mainland intellectuals and literate strata, gradually spread among some of the officials and intellectuals on Jeju Island, and at the same time there was also born the idea that the murder of a Ryukyuan prince might be linked to the misrepresentation of origins.

This legend was probably introduced to Jeju by local officials such as the governors and magistrates of Jeju, bureaucrats from the central government who had been sent in exile to Jeju, or merchants and so on who travelled back and forth between the island and the mainland. The misrepresentation of their origins by drifters from Jeju had been taking place prior to this, and it is to be surmised that the idea that this was linked to the legend of the murder of a Ryukyuan prince would initially have been formed by intellectuals on the mainland. Once it had been introduced to Jeju, some of the islanders also began to share this idea, and they could be said to have included Kim Cheoljung and Jang Hancheol. In a sense, the way in which people in mainland Korea regarded the island of Jeju defined the islanders' own self-perceptions. But as can be inferred from the case of Jang Hancheol and his companions, this was confined to certain intellectuals and members of the literate strata, and one must assume that it did not manage to become a perception shared by Jeju islanders in general.

IV. The Relationship of Misstated Place-Names and Sea Drifters' Status and Social Class to the Misrepresentation of Origins

It is also possible to detect a certain correlation in at least some cases between the place-names falsely given by Jeju islanders when they drifted ashore in a foreign land or their status and social class on the one hand and the types of reasons for the misrepresentation of their origins. Next, I wish to consider this issue on the basis of instances involving Japan, cited by Ikeuchi.

First, in order to examine the connections between falsely given place-names and the types of reasons for misrepresentation, I wish to return to Table 1. It will be immediately evident that the falsely given place-names are Korean place-names and are, moreover, confined to Jeolla province. Further, owing to the limitations of the sources used in this table, there are no instances for the one hundred-odd years from the mid-eighteenth century to the first half of the nineteenth century, but for the preceding period, spanning the second half of the seventeenth century and first half of the eighteenth century, a great variety of place-names were falsely given by Jeju islanders as their place of origin, including not only the towns of Naju, Gangjin, Muan 務安, Haenam, Jindo 珍島, Yeongam 靈巖, Yeonggwang 靈光, and Gwangju 光州, but also Yeongsan 榮山 Bay, Godaldo 古達島, and Usuyeong 右水營. In contrast, after the

period for which sources are missing, from the mid-nineteenth century onwards, this diversity of falsely given place-names is no longer in evidence, and they become more or less fixed, being restricted to the three towns of Gangjin, Yeongam, and Haenam.

Among these tendencies regarding place-names falsely given by Jeju islanders as their place of origin, what is the significance of the fact that they are confined to localities in Korea and there have been found no instances in which Jeju islanders claimed to be of some other nationality? This would suggest that the self-perceptions of drifters from Jeju that lay behind the misrepresentation of their origins were premised on the perception that they were nationals of Korea or that the island of Jeju formed part of Korea. I am not, of course, positing anything like the nationalism or territorial consciousness of modern times. It is simply to be surmised that there already existed a vague awareness of themselves as being somehow different from people from other countries and as living in a region under the rule of the Korean king.

How, then, should one understand the fact that the falsely given place-names came to be restricted to Gangjin, Yeongam, and Haenam? These three towns were all situated on the southern coast of Jeolla province across the sea from Jeju. It was probably for this reason that they were designated as administrative centres in charge of the execution of various kinds of official business involving Jeju and the mainland and the supervision of the comings and goings of commoners between the two regions, and they took turns to perform these duties for one year at a time.⁴⁹⁾ This means that they would have been quite familiar place-names for Jeju islanders.

The entrenchment of certain falsely given place-names roughly coincided with the emergence of Types *c* and *d* among the types of reasons for misrepresentation, and there is a certain correlation between the two. As was also pointed out by Ikeuchi, the emergence of Types *c* and *d* signified a simplification and loss of concreteness in the reasons for misrepresentation. If that is so, then it is probably possible to explain the entrenchment of certain falsely given place-names in the same way. After the mid-nineteenth century, the original reason for the misrepresentation of origins had been forgotten and only the act of misrepresentation itself was being repeated in accordance with precedent. It is to be surmised that in such circumstances special consideration was no longer given to the falsely given place-name and the names of administrative centres, comparatively familiar to the islanders, came to be used, and this then

became customary practice and was followed by everyone. One must assume that by the second half of the nineteenth century the misrepresentation of their origins by drifters from Jeju had to a large extent turned into a mere formality.

Next, let us examine the relationship between the status and social class of sea drifters from Jeju and the types of reasons for misrepresentation. I wish to focus in particular on Type *A*. Type *A* is considered to represent the prototype of the various types of reasons for misrepresentation, and it is distinguished by its quite detailed explanation of the reason for misrepresentation. One reason for this detailed explanation would have been that the misrepresentation of origins began in earnest around this time and the reasons for misrepresentation would have been clear to those who were misrepresenting their origins. It is also likely that, because of the peculiarity of the act of misrepresentation of origins, the recording officials in charge of the interrogations felt a need to write down the reasons in particular detail. However, it is to be supposed that it was probably only intellectuals and literate people of a certain level who possessed the detailed geographical knowledge about the seas around Jeju evident in Type *A* and were able to formulate ideas linking this to the killing of Jeju islanders by foreigners.

Table 2 was drawn up in order to ascertain this point. From among the instances of drifters who landed in Japan listed by Ikeuchi, I have selected those corresponding to Type *A* and given the names of those on board the ships and the reasons for their voyages on the basis of the original sources. It will be seen that in the four cases apart from H1 the passengers included officials from Jeju district and mainland residents, and they were travelling on official business such as the delivery of tribute. For example, in the case of G13, which also happens to be the first instantiation of Type *A*, the passengers included an army officer from Namwon 南原 in Jeolla province and a number of officials from Jeju district and Daejeong 大靜 county on Jeju Island, and they had set sail from Jeju for the purpose of delivering tribute goods and procuring army provisions. In the case of G31, those on board included a member of the warrior class from Jeju and officials from Daejeong, and the latter were travelling in order to deliver tribute and meet a newly appointed magistrate for Daejeong county.

While one may safely assume, as stated by Ikeuchi, that the misrepresentation of their origins by Jeju islanders began against the background of a fear that they were in danger of being killed by foreigners, it is to be

Table 2 Passengers and reasons for voyages in examples of Type A of reasons for misrepresentation

Reference Number ^a	Passengers	Reason for Voyage (according to statements by crew)
G13	<p>Yang Seongu 梁聖遇, resident of Namwon 南原 and army officer attached to governor of Jeju, Jeolla province; Gang Duchu 姜斗樞, resident of Jeju district and regular soldier in charge of delivering tribute goods; regular soldiers Kim Seon 金善, Yi Seyun 李世允, Go Seungdeuk 高承得, also residents of Jeju district; Choe Saengik 崔生益, temple slave in charge of delivering local administrator's tribute goods; Yi Sijong 李時宗, private slave in charge of delivering tribute goods of magistrate of Daejeong 大靜 county; Kim Uik 金宇益, temple slave in charge of collecting prescribed goods from mainland slaves obligated to supply them to Jeju district office; temple slave Go Sugyeong 高守敬; seaman and temple slave Kim Igeun 金以斤; oarsmen and temple slaves Bak Cheol 朴哲, Go Geunnam 高斤男, Kim Hongi 金弘伊, Yi Deokkim 李德金, Go Wonil 高元日, Mun Chwijun 文就俊, and Bak Cheolung 朴哲雄; regular soldier Go Heunggim 高興金; temple slaves Kim Ingon 金仁昆, Mun Jinseon 文振善, Jeong Ibi 鄭立伊, Yun Busuk 尹部淑, Kim Seonil 金善日, and Kim Seonsu 金善守; private slaves Im Daeseok 林大碩, Bak Huil 朴厚日, and Im Seoni 林善伊; temple slaves Kim Cheoni 金天伊, Go Ili 高日伊, and Kim Geunil 金斤日; regular soldiers Gang Ibi 康立伊, An Deugin 安得進, and Kim Igse 金益世; temple slaves Kim Chullip 金春立, Kim Seog-eulgang 金石乙江, Kim Yungang 金允江, Im Mansik 林萬植, and Bak Taeho 朴太好; private slaves Jeon Ili 全日伊, Jeong Jongi 鄭宗伊, Kim Bongjang 金奉長, and Jo Norip 曹老立; temple slaves Go Inam 高以男, Go Songnim 高松林, Yi Ijun 李以俊, Kim Giseon 金起善, and Ju Daeseon 朱大善; private slave Jeong Gyeongsang 鄭景生; temple slave Han Innam 韓日男; Kim Deuksang 金得商, free commoner resident in the capital; Choe Sangjun 崔尚俊, financial sponsor of people in military service; private slave Choe Gapsaeng 崔甲生.</p>	<p>We were initially fifty-four in number, and in order to transport tribute goods and purchase army provisions, we loaded money, seaweed, etc., boarded the ship of the seaman Kim Igeun of Jeju district, and set sail around the hour of the monkey [3.00–5.00 p.m.] on the 29th day of the eleventh month of the cyclic year <i>muin</i> 戊寅 [1698].</p>

G31	<p>O Sesang 吳世相, member of the warrior class without office; Kim Yebo 金禮甫, slave attached to provincial school; temple slave Yi Ip 李翌; free commoner Yi Sigeon 李時建 (in charge of delivering tribute goods from Daejeong county); temple slave Gang Seongsu 姜成壽 (in charge of delivering tribute goods from local officials to central government ministries); regular soldier Gang Sangik 姜尚益 (seaman and oarsman); Kim Myeongnip 金命立; private slave An Il 安逸; An Ijeok 安伊迪; regular soldier Choe Seungmyeong 崔承命; private slave Im Jigim 林止金; Gang Biobok 姜非於卜; temple slave An Bok 安福; private slave Yi Deokseon 李德先; Jeon Ip 全立; Kim Seokji 金石只; temple slave Kim Allip 金安立; private slave An Bokho 安福好; private slave Jwa Il 左一; temple slave Kim Iran 金已亂; Yi Cheon 李千; Yi I 李已, official in Office of Court Finances; Kim Wonseok 金元錫; Kim Gyeyun 金繼閏; Go Buyeol 高夫悅; slave Chungnam 忠男; Gang Iseon 姜已善; private slave Gang Haechun 姜海春; Yi Dong 李同; Go Chulman 高出葛; Kim Sallip 金山立; Kim Gil 金吉; slave Kim Wanseok 金完石; private slave Won Shinbong 元信奉; Kim Deukbo 金得甫; Yu Deukyong 柳得用; Go Seokeulil 高石乙一; Yi Hyojang 李孝章; Yu Mansam 柳萬森; Kim Sangjeol 金尚節; Yi Sangnip 李尚立; Hong Yeongwon 洪永元.</p>	<p>We are all from Jeju. O Sesang is a member of the warrior class without office in Jeju district, and in order to make an excursion and an inspection he boarded, together with two attendants, a ship that happened to be at Daejeong. Yi Sigeon, an official in charge of delivering tribute goods from Daejeong county, Gang Seongsu, an official in charge of delivering tribute goods from local officials to central government ministries, Yi I, an official in the Office of Imperial Finances, and the seaman and oarsmen, nineteen in all, loaded a ship from Daejeong county engaged in trade along the Han River 漢江 with five kinds of articles — mushrooms, citrons, planks, torrey nuts, dried abalone, tortoiseshell, etc. — to be delivered from Daejeong county to the Court of Imperial Sacrifices and other central government ministries for the cyclic year <i>gyeongjin</i> 庚辰 [1700], five kinds of articles — mushrooms, cow hair, seaweed, torrey nuts, and mother-of-pearl — to be delivered by temple slaves to the Court of Imperial Provisions, four kinds of articles — seaweed, grass mats, mushrooms, and dried abalone — to be delivered to the Office of Imperial Finances for those of the imperial family bearing the title <i>daegun</i> 大君, and articles used as a source of revenue for the purchase of supplies by government departments. Fifteen people comprising Kim Wonseok, etc., and five people comprising Yi Hyojang, etc., are underlings on their way to meet the new county magistrate and also boarded the ship. At the hour of the hare [5.00–7.00 a.m.] on the 26th day of the twelfth month last year [1701] we set sail from Byeoldo 別刀 Bay...</p>
-----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

G36	<p>An Seho 安世好, free commoner and official of Jeju district; regular soldier Hong Sinsang 洪信祥; free commoner Go Yeojun 高如俊; regular soldier O Seon 吳先; temple slave Go Suhui 高壽禧; government slave Sanhae 山海; temple slave Chullip 春立; Chwiseon 取先; Kim Taehwa 金太化; regular soldier Go Ikshin 高益信; temple slave Sangsuk 尙淑; Jongseon 從先; Maleuljong 末乙終; Yeonil 連一; seaman and private slave Sangjun 尙俊; oarsman and temple slave Kimnam 金男; private slave Yuwolnam 六月男; Goil 古一; Bosan 甫山; Imnip 任立; Jiun 之銀; Munseon 文先; Sideuk 時得; Sangmin 尙民; Chajeok 次赤; temple slave Huirip 希立; Oeuldong 吾乙同; Sangnip 尙立; Ingon 仁昆; Gillip 吉立; Sangdong 尙同; Jeongik 丁益; Jiseong 之成; Irim 以林; Choe Wunhoe 崔雲會 and Seo Pilryang 徐必良, members of warrior class without office, and slaves Ma Eumseon 馬音先, Gaeji 介之 (drowned), and Sayong 士用 (drowned), all residents of Yeongam.</p>	<p>Among the thirty-nine people in our party, Choe Wunhoe and Seo Pilryang, both members of the warrior class without office, and their three slaves are residents of Yeongam who came to Jeju Island in order to fetch some slaves who had absconded, and because there happened to be a ship available, they boarded it. An Seho and the other thirty-four people, acting as messengers for the delivery of a tribute of citrons from Jeju and goods used in religious ceremonies, as well as for the purpose of delivering documents to the office of the intendant of Jeolla province, collecting prescribed goods from mainland temple slaves obligated to supply them to Jeju district office, and purchasing goods for official and private use by the Office for the Requisitioning of Horses and the Office of Ceremony, loaded money, 57,000 bundles of seaweed, 28 rolls of cotton for army use, 35 pieces of abalone, 130 wooden combs (?), 20 hats, 30 deer hides, and 29 visors for men's caps onto the ship and set sail from Jeju at the hour of the ox [1.00–3.00 a.m.] on the 4th day of the first month of this year [1704]...</p>
G37	<p>Yi Suman 李壽萬, military guard attached to Jeju district; Go Mangon 高萬昆, free commoner and official in charge of delivering tribute goods; Jang Deungman 張得萬; Kim Jijeong 金之正; temple slave Go Junggwon 高重寬; Kim Chwiwun 金就云; Go Il 高日; Im Seondae 任善碓; private slave Kim Bongil 金本吉; Kim Bongim 金本金; temple slave Gang Sinseok 康信碩; Heo Taegi 許太己; Heo Hunam 許厚男; Go Deugyeol 高得悅; seaman Yi Inbong 李仁奉; oarsmen and temple slaves Kim Nonbong 金論奉, Heo Heungseok 許興碩, Yi Inseon 李仁先, An Gyeheung 安戒興, Ju Seborg 周世奉, Go Seongnip 高成立, Kim Suhae 金守海, Go Mansong 高萬松, Jangeop 張業, Kim Ginam 金記男, Yun Sangwon 尹尙原, Yun Sangun 尹尙殷, and Han Baek 韓白; private slaves Go Yeonggil 高永吉, Go Jinheung 高進興, Bak Semin 朴世民, Han Jeongwun 韓丁云, Han Mugim 韓武金, Go ?dong 高?同, Kim Haerip 金海立, Mun Deongnyong 文德龍, and Kim Sejeok 金世迪.</p>	<p>Among the thirty-seven people in our party, the military guard Yi Suman is a resident of the capital who had come to the island as a staff officer of the governor of Jeju, and in order to return home on leave he boarded a ship that happened to be available and was blown off course by the wind. The Jeju islanders Go Mangon and the other thirty-six people loaded money, seaweed, abalone, and other goods onto the ship for the purpose of delivering the annual tribute of citrus fruits from the governor and local administrator of Jeju and from Daejeong and Jeongui counties and for the purpose of purchasing goods for official and private use by the Office for the Requisitioning of Horses, and at the hour of the dragon [7.00–9.00 a.m.] on the 12th day of the twelfth month of last year we set sail from Jeju...</p>
H1	<p>Seaman and temple slave Kim Iwun 金以云, free commoner and oarsman Yi Gyemin 李繼敏, temple slave Yi Yudong 李有同, free commoner Kim Si'ik 金時益, private slave Go Ini 高仁伊, and temple slaves Yi Manjeok 李萬迪 and Kim Hwabok 金化卜.</p>	<p>All seven of us are residents of Jeju, and in order to buy grain to earn a living we loaded money, 40 bundles of seaweed, and other goods onto the ship, and on the 25th day of the first month of this year we set sail from Jeju district...</p>

Note: This table is based on *Pyoin yeongnae deungnok*

^a Reference numbers follow those used in Ikeuchi, *Kinsei Nihon to Chōsen Hyōryūmin*, “Chronological Table of the Arrival of Korean Sea Drifters in Japan.”

surmised that initially those who acted in this way would have been confined to intellectuals and literate people of a certain level. Furthermore, the sense that they were in danger of being killed by foreigners, which underpinned this behaviour, was not necessarily generated on Jeju Island alone, and it is possible that intellectuals and members of the literate strata on the mainland were also involved to some degree in its formation. The correlation between the drifters' social class and Type *A* that can be ascertained from Table 2 could be seen to hint at this possibility. The fact that this type of correlation cannot be found in the types of reasons for misrepresentation other than Type *A* provides converse corroboration of this assumption.

V. Concluding Remarks

Ikeuchi interpreted the misrepresentation of their origins by sea drifters from Jeju Island in the second half of the Joseon period as a pattern of behaviour based on the islanders' own self-perceptions, and he traced the establishment and vicissitudes of this self-perception. According to Ikeuchi, the misrepresentation of their origins by drifters from Jeju developed as the result of a consciousness that they were in danger of being killed by foreigners, and this consciousness was formed through comparison with other countries, that is to say, it evolved in the context of Jeju's relations with Japan, Ryūkyū, and China from the sixteenth century onwards. In this fashion, Ikeuchi attempted to demonstrate with reference to the case of Jeju Island that in the period from the seventeenth century to the second half of the nineteenth century there had not yet been established a self-perception shared by all Koreans and that diverse forms of self-perception existed in different regions.

One can, I think, basically accept Ikeuchi's view that behind the misrepresentation of their origins when cast ashore in a foreign land there lay a distinctive self-perception peculiar to Jeju islanders. But in light of our above findings a number of provisos must be attached to his conclusions.

The first is that a certain degree of class difference can be recognized in the reasons for misrepresentation. Secondly, rather than the self-perceptions of Jeju islanders that manifest in the misrepresentation of their origins having been moulded through comparison with other countries, they would seem to have been determined to a considerable extent by mainlanders' views of Jeju or by the way in which they regarded Jeju.

The third point is that the islanders' self-perceptions were predicated on a vague sense of oneness as nationals of Korea, and the fourth point is that after the mid-nineteenth century the original reasons for the misrepresentation of their origins had been forgotten and it had turned into a mere formality.

Bearing these four points in mind, I now wish to summarize briefly my own current understanding of the misrepresentation of their origins by Jeju islanders and the establishment and vicissitudes of their self-perceptions that lay behind this misrepresentation, while also reviewing the results of the investigations undertaken in the present article.

First, as regards the emergence of the act of misrepresentation of origins, there is the question of how to situate the first recorded case, namely, that involving Kim Biui and his companions, who drifted ashore in Ryūkyū in Seongjong 8 (1477).⁵⁰⁾ In this instance, Kim Biui and two others who were rescued are said to have falsely claimed in response to questioning by Ryukyuan that they were "people from Haenam in the land of Korea."⁵¹⁾

It is possible to identify in the Joseon dynastic records fifteen instances of Jeju islanders having drifted ashore in other countries during the fifteenth century.⁵²⁾ But, apart from the case of Kim Biui and his companions, there is no evidence of their having misrepresented their origins. From the sixteenth century onwards one can find fourteen cases of drifting up until Sukjong 5 (1679),⁵³⁾ but in none of these is it possible to confirm the misrepresentation of origins. This being so, the case of Kim Biui and his companions must be considered to have been rather exceptional, and it remains open to question whether or not Jeju islanders at that time generally felt a need to misrepresent their origins.

From the mid-fifteenth century onwards Jeju Island was fully incorporated under the rule of the Joseon dynasty, and it is to be surmised that there was consequently a dramatic rise in official comings and goings between the mainland and Jeju. In such circumstances, there can be little doubt that the interest of the mainland ruling class and literate strata regarding Jeju would have also grown and the perception that the seas around Jeju were dangerous would have taken root amongst them. It could perhaps even be surmised that some of the perceptions about Jeju espoused by the mainland ruling class and literate strata came to be shared by some Jeju islanders too.

The misrepresentation of origins became commonplace from the late seventeenth century onwards. As was pointed out by Ikeuchi, the

reason for this can be sought in a succession of maritime disasters involving Chinese ships and mass drownings of islanders in the seas around Jeju in the second half of the seventeenth century. The two incidents on which the legend of the murder of a Ryukyuan prince was based may also have played a part in this.

It is to be surmised, however, that rather than having directly triggered the formation of the Jeju islanders' self-perceptions and made them misrepresent their origins, these incidents probably first had a major impact on the perceptions of Jeju espoused by people on the mainland. Once these were introduced to Jeju as well, they would then have gone on to define the islanders' own self-perceptions. Type *A* among the reasons for misrepresentation, which appeared in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, hints at such a situation.

Thereafter, in the first half of the eighteenth century, the act of misrepresenting their origins became more or less the norm. At the same time, detailed explanations of the reasons for misrepresentation, as in Type *A*, disappeared and localized explanations specific to the place of landfall, as in Types *a*, *b* and *e*, were given instead.

Further, in the mid-eighteenth century the legend of the murder of a Ryukyuan prince began to circulate among intellectuals and literate strata on the mainland, and there was born the idea that this legend was linked to the misrepresentation of their origins by drifters from Jeju. This notion soon spread to Jeju as well, and there began to appear instances of drifters who used the murder of a Ryukyuan prince as the reason for the misrepresentation of their origins when they were cast ashore in Ryūkyū or China. This was, however, limited to certain social strata and does not appear to have become general practice.

At the end of this process, the misrepresentation of their origins by drifters from Jeju had by about the middle of the nineteenth century turned into a mere formality. This is also evident from the fact that the types of reasons for misrepresentation at this time had become more or less confined to Types *c* and *d* and that, in conjunction with this, the falsely given place-names had also come to be restricted to three administrative centres. By this time, the fear of being killed by foreigners, which had been behind the misrepresentation of origins, had been completely forgotten and only the act of misrepresentation itself was being repeated in a way that conformed with precedent.

Then, in the 1880s the very act of misrepresentation disappeared. The question of why this should have occurred in the 1880s needs to be

examined, and to begin with it could be supposed in light of the above circumstances that the act of misrepresentation, which had already turned into a mere formality, came to be perceived at this time as being completely meaningless. The 1880s were a time when Korea was building up modern diplomatic relations with Japan and Western powers, and while one cannot deny the possibility that these circumstances might have also had an influence, this is not certain at the present point in time. To say the least, I cannot agree with Ikeuchi, in whose view Jeju islanders stopped misrepresenting their origins because “at this time Jeju islanders turned towards the acquisition of a unitary self-perception as Koreans.”⁵⁴⁾

The misrepresentation of their origins by drifters from Jeju in the second half of the Joseon period and the establishment and vicissitudes of their self-perceptions that lay behind this misrepresentation can, I believe, be understood in the above manner. This is, of course, no more than a hypothesis. Nor is it by any means the case that all the relevant issues have been exhaustively discussed in this article.

For instance, I have here taken a position that attaches particular importance to the perceptions of Jeju espoused by intellectuals and literate strata on the mainland as constituting one of the elements that determined the self-perceptions of Jeju islanders. But apart from the legend of the murder of a Ryukyuan prince, I have hardly touched on questions pertaining to the actual content of these intellectuals’ perceptions of Jeju and the formation and vicissitudes of these perceptions. In this sense, this article is still at the level of an interim report. Further, when considering their views of Jeju, one cannot avoid dealing with the mainlanders’ discriminatory attitudes towards and contempt for Jeju. This too remains an important issue for future consideration.

Another question that has not been addressed in the above is that of how the self-perceptions of Jeju islanders appearing in the misrepresentation of their origins were shared by the islanders as a whole. This too is a question that cannot be ignored.

According to recent research by cultural anthropologists on people from Jeju living today in Japan, even in the modern era many of the people living in coastal villages on Jeju had no experience of having lived anywhere other than their own village and most had not even visited other parts of Jeju. These people came to perceive themselves as “Koreans” only after they came to Japan and were treated as such by Japanese.⁵⁵⁾

It is not wrong to assume that behind the unusual behaviour of mis-

representing their origins there existed a self-perception peculiar to drifters from Jeju. But in light of the findings of the above research in the area of cultural anthropology, there would seem to be some scope for re-considering whether this self-perception was directly linked to the Jeju islanders' identity and whether it was shared by all islanders. This is one of the reasons that I find myself unable to accept outright Ikeuchi's understanding of the disappearance of the act of misrepresentation of origins.

Though historical sources are extremely limited, making it difficult to tackle these questions, it may be possible to gain some leads by clarifying, for example, the percentage of drifters (or those engaged in seafaring activities, who accounted for most of the drifters) among Jeju islanders as a whole and their distribution and also the relationship between drifters and other islanders. To begin with, there is probably a need to proceed with the task of carefully categorizing and analyzing in a case-by-case fashion the places of residence, social classes, occupations, and so on of Jeju islanders who drifted at sea and were cast ashore in foreign lands.

NOTES

- 1) Rokutanda Yutaka 六反田豊, "Jūkyū seiki Saishū tōmin no kainan to hyōryū — *Saishū keiroku no bunseki* —" 十九世紀濟州島民の海難と漂流 — 『濟州啓録』の分析 — [Accidents at sea and drifting involving Jeju islanders in the 19th century: An analysis of the *Jeju gyerok*], *Nenpō Chōsengaku* 年報朝鮮學 7 (1999).
- 2) In order to gain a grasp of overall trends regarding Korean sea drifters during the Joseon period, reference may be made to the following chronological tables. On the arrival of drifters in Japan, see Seki Shūichi, 關周一, "15 seiki ni okeru Chōsenjin hyōryūjin sōkan taisei no keisei" 15世紀における朝鮮人漂流人送還体制の形成 [The development of a system for repatriating Korean sea drifters in the 15th century], *Rekishigaku kenkyū* 歴史學研究 617 (1991), "Table 1: The repatriation of Korean sea drifters from Japan" (pp. 2-3); Ikeuchi Satoshi 池内敏, *Kinsei Chōsenjin hyōchaku nenpyō (kō) 1599-1872nen* 近世朝鮮人漂着年表 (稿) 1599-1872年 [Chronological table (draft) of the arrival of Korean sea drifters in the early modern period: 1599-1872] (private edition, 1996); *id.*, *Kinsei Nihon to Chōsen hyōryūmin* 近世日本と朝鮮漂流民 [Early modern Japan and Korean sea drifters] (Rinsen Shoten 臨川書店, 1998), Appendix: "Chronological Table of the Arrival of Korean Sea Drifters in Japan" (supp. pp. 4-142). On the arrival of drifters in Ryūkyū, see Kobayashi Shigeru 小林茂, Matsubara Takatoshi 松原孝俊 and Rokutanda Yutaka, "Chōsen kara Ryūkyū e, Ryūkyū kara Chōsen e no hyōryū nenpyō" 朝鮮から琉球へ, 琉球から朝鮮への漂流年表

[Chronological table of drifters from Korea to Ryūkyū and from Ryūkyū to Korea], *Rekidai hōan kenkyū* 歴代寶案研究 9 (1998). On the arrival of drifters in China, see Arano Yasunori 荒野泰典, *Kinsei Nihon to Higashi Ajia* 近世日本と東アジア [Early modern Japan and East Asia] (Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai 東京大學出版會, 1988), chap. 4: “Kinsei Nihon no hyōryūmin sōkan taisei to Higashi Ajia” 近世日本の漂流民送還體制と東アジア [The system for repatriating drifters in early modern Japan and East Asia], “Table 6: Number of repatriations of Chinese and Korean drifters” (p. 146); Ikeuchi Satoshi, *Kinsei Nihon to Chōsen hyōryūmin*, chap. 8: “Shushshinchi o sashō suru hyōryūmin” 出身地を詐稱する漂流民 [Sea drifters who misrepresented their origins], “Table 3: Drifting to Jeju Island and drifting by Jeju islanders” (p. 232).

- 3) *Seongjong sillok* 成宗實錄 105, entry for 10.6.10 (cyclic day *eulmi* 乙未). For further details, see n. 18.
- 4) According to the *Pyoin yeongnae deungnok* 漂人領來謄錄 3 (entry for first 9th day of 2nd month, cyclic year *gyeongsin* 庚申 [Sukjong 6 = 1680]), on Sukjong 5.12.4 (1679) forty-one Jeju islanders who had drifted ashore at Tsutsu 豆酸 Bay on Tsushima 對馬 falsely stated that they were from Gangjin 康津 county, Jeolla province. The *Pyoin yeongnae deungnok*, in 7 volumes, is held in the Gyujanggak 奎章閣 Library at Seoul National University (call no. Gyu 奎 12956). The Gyujanggak Library also has another work bearing the title *Pyoin yeongnae chawae deungnok* 漂人領來差倭謄錄 (12 vols., call no. Gyu 12954), which is identical to the *Pyoin yeongnae deungnok*, differing only in its date of composition (and therefore in the date of its content). A photofacsimile reproduction of both works has been published: Seoul Daehakgyo Gyujanggak 서울大學校奎章閣, ed., *Pyoin yeongnae deungnok* 漂人領來謄錄 (Seoul: Bogyong Munhwasa 保景文化社, 1993), in 7 vols. and accompanied by a table of contents and index; the content of the two works has been rearranged in chronological order, they have been given the common title *Pyoin yeongnae deungnok*, and serial volume numbers have been added throughout. All quotations from these two works in the present article are based on this publication.
- 5) Ikeuchi Satoshi, “Kinsei Chōsenjin no tai-Nichi ninshiki nōto” 近世朝鮮人の對日認識ノート [Notes on Korean perceptions of Japan in the early modern period], *Rekishigaku kenkyū* 678 (1995); *id.*, *Kinsei Nihon to Chōsen hyōryūmin*, chap. 8.
- 6) Ji Myeonggwon 池明觀, “Jinshin waran to kindai Chōsen no nashonarizumu” 壬辰倭亂と近代朝鮮のナショナリズム [Hideyoshi’s invasions of Korea and modern Korean nationalism], *Shakai kagaku tōkyū* 社會科學討究 24-2 (1979).
- 7) So Jaeyeong 蘇在英, *Imbyeong yangnan gwa munhak uisik* 壬丙兩亂과文學意識 [The two invasions of Korea by Hideyoshi and literary consciousness] (Seoul: Hanguk Yeonguwon 韓國研究院, 1980); *id.*, “Imjin waeran gwa soseol munhak” 壬辰倭亂과小説文學 [Hideyoshi’s invasions of Korea and fictional literature], in Kim Taejun 金泰俊 *et al.*, *Imjin waeran gwa Hanguk*

munhak 壬辰倭亂과韓國文學 [Hideyoshi's invasions of Korea and Korean literature] (Seoul: Mineomsa 民音社, 1992).

- 8) Ikeuchi, *Kinsei Nihon to Chōsen hyōryūmin*, p. 218.
- 9) See note 5.
- 10) Go Changseok 高昌錫, “19 segi Jejuin ui pyoryu siltae” 19세기濟州人の漂流實態 [The actual state of drifting among people of Jeju in the 19th century], in Gang Changryong 姜昌龍 *et al.*, *19 segi Jeju sahoe yeongu* 19세기濟州社會研究 [Studies in 19th-century Jeju society] (Seoul: Iljisa 一志社, 1998); Min Deokki 閔德基, “Pyoryumin eul tonghan jeongbo ui gyoryu” 漂民을 통한 정보의 교류 [The exchange of information through drifters], in Han-Il Gwangyesa Yeonguhoe 韓日關係史研究會, ed., *Joseon sidae pyoryumin yeongu* 조선시대漂民연구 [A study of sea drifters in the Joseon period] (Seoul: Gukhak Jaryowon 國學資料院, 2001).
- 11) Ikeuchi's views presented and quoted below are all based on Ikeuchi, *op. cit.*, chap. 8.
- 12) Ikeuchi, *op. cit.*, p. 225.
- 13) *Pyoin yeongnae deungnok* 6, entry for first 3rd day of 6th month, cyclic year *gimyo* 己卯 (Sukjong 38 = 1699).
- 14) Ikeuchi, *op. cit.*, p. 229.
- 15) *Loc. cit.*
- 16) This figure was reached by Ikeuchi on the basis of instances given in Yi Hun 李薰, “Joseon hugi pyomin ui songhwan eul tonghaeseo bon Joseon, Yugu gwangye” 朝鮮後期漂民의 송환을 통해서 본 朝鮮·琉球關係 [Korea-Ryukyu relations seen through the repatriation of drifters in the second half of the Joseon period], *Sahakji* 史學志 27 (1994), and Akamine Seiki 赤嶺誠記, *Daikōkai jidai no Ryūkyū* 大航海時代の琉球 [Ryūkyū during the age of great voyages] (Okinawa Taimususha 沖縄タイムス社, 1988), supplemented with other historical sources. For details of the sources used, reference can be made to Ikeuchi, “Kinsei Chōsenjin no tai-Nichi ninshiki nōto,” “Table 3: Koreans who drifted ashore in Ryūkyū (1590s to 1860s)” (p. 31), and *id.*, *Kinsei Nihon to Chōsen hyōryūmin*, “Table 4: Koreans who drifted ashore in Ryūkyū” (pp. 233–234). These thirty instances of people from different parts of Korea having drifted to Ryūkyū may include other instances involving Jeju islanders apart from the ten confirmed by Ikeuchi, since, because of the misrepresentation of their origins, one cannot deny the existence of cases that were recorded as involving people from other parts of Korea.
- 17) Held in Gyujanggak Library at Seoul National University (call no. Gyu 15099). Included in Hanguk Guksa Pyeonchan Wiwonhoe 韓國國史編纂委員會, ed., *Gaksa deungnok* 各司謄錄 19: *Jeolla-do pyeon* 全羅道篇 2 (Seoul: Hanguk Guksa Pyeonchan Wiwonhoe, 1986). For further details, see Rokutanda, *op. cit.*, pp. 57–59.
- 18) Only three of the eight were rescued in Ryūkyū, and in the course of their interrogation after repatriation they described their questioning while in custody in Ryūkyū in the following manner:

Nationals [of Ryūkyū] and an interpreter came and asked us, “What nationality are you?” We replied, “We are Koreans.” They then asked, “Did you drift here while fishing?” We discussed the matter amongst ourselves and replied, “We are all people from Haenam in the land of Korea. We were on our way to the capital, transporting tribute rice, when we encountered winds and were carried here.”

國人及通事來問俺等，你是何國人，俺等答曰，朝鮮人，又問曰，你釣魚漂流至此乎，俺等共議答曰，俱係朝鮮國海南人，輸運進上米，向京都，遭風至此，(*Seongjong sillok* 105, entry for 10.6.10 [cyclic day *eulmi*])

In other words, they claimed that they were “from Haenam in the land of Korea,” and Ikeuchi took this to mean that they had misrepresented their origins by claiming to be from Haenam county in Jeolla province.

- 19) Ikeuchi quotes the following passage:

[An old man said,] “That must be a place called Tora 度羅 Island. [...] I have heard that if anyone goes unwittingly to that island, the islanders will gather, seize him, and kill and eat him. [...] If you had drawn near, you would not have been able to defend yourselves even with hundreds and thousands of bows and arrows, and you would have all been killed.” (*Konjaku monogatari shū* 31.12: “The Tale of How People from Chinzei 鎮西 Went to Tora Island”)

- 20) The *Pyohaerok* is an account of the experiences of Choe Bu, who was shipwrecked in the intercalary first month of Seongjong 19 (1488) and carried all the way to China while returning to Naju from Jeju Island, where he had held an official post. Ikeuchi quotes the following passage from this work:

People of our country go back and forth to Jeju on both official business and private business, and untold numbers encounter winds and go missing. Only one or two out of ten or a hundred return alive. How could all of these have drowned in the sea? Those who drift to countries like Siam and Champa, inhabited by island barbarians, would have had no hope of returning.

我國人爲公爲私往來濟州，或遭風無去處者不可枚悉，能生還者十百僅一二，是豈盡沈於海波乎，其漂入島夷若暹羅·占城之國者，無復望還，(*Ibid.*, entry for i1.11)

- 21) Ikeuchi, *op. cit.*, p. 236.

- 22) In the third month of Hyojong 3 (1652) a Chinese merchant vessel was carried ashore on Jeju Island, and 185 of the 213 people on board drowned (*Hyojong sillok* 孝宗實錄 8, 3.3.30 [cyclic day *sinchuk* 辛丑]). In Sukjong 14 (1688) there was a similar incident involving a Chinese ship in which 48 of the 63 people on board drowned (*Tongmungwanji* 通文館志 9, entry for Sukjong 14 [cyclic year *mujin* 戊辰]). There were further incidents in Hyeonjong 8 (1667) and Sukjong 14 when 95 and 75 Chinese drifted ashore on Jeju Island (*ibid.* 9, entries for Hyeonjong 8 [cyclic year *jeongmi* 丁未] and Sukjong 14 [cyclic year *mujin*]).

- 23) *Pyoin yeongnae deungnok* 3, entry for 10.21 of cyclic year *gimi* 己未 (Sukjong 5

- = 1679).
- 24) Ikeuchi, *op. cit.*, p. 240.
 - 25) Ikeuchi, *op. cit.*, pp. 226–228, “Table 2: Reasons for misrepresentation of origins (in the case of arrival in Japan).”
 - 26) For details, see note 4.
 - 27) Held in Gyujeonggak Library at Seoul National University, 9 vols. (call no. Gyu 15105). Included in Hanguk Guksa Pyeonchan Wiwonhoe, ed., *Gaksa deungnok* 12: *Gyeongsang-do pyeon* 慶尙道篇 2 (Seoul: Hanguk Guksa Pyeonchan Wiwonhoe, 1984).
 - 28) Held in Gyujeonggak Library at Seoul National University, 7 vols. (call no. Gyu 15095). Included in Hanguk Guksa Pyeonchan Wiwonhoe, ed., *Gaksa deungnok* 18: *Jeolla-do pyeon* 1 (Seoul: Hanguk Guksa Pyeonchan Wiwonhoe, 1985).
 - 29) For details, see note 17.
 - 30) Held in Gyujeonggak Library at Seoul National University, 4 vols. (call no. Gu 古 4255·5-12). Included in Hanguk Guksa Pyeonchan Wiwonhoe, ed., *Gaksa deungnok* 18: *Jeolla-do pyeon* 1 (Seoul: Hanguk Guksa Pyeonchan Wiwonhoe, 1985).
 - 31) An example is the following passage:
 Again, he said, “I once heard it said that when people from Jeju drift ashore in Japan, they are not repatriated. Therefore, I made a false statement to the Japanese, saying that I was from Jindo.” This is being reported in haste on the basis of a written statement.
 又言濟州人物漂着日本，則不爲放還是如，曾聞此說，故果以珍島人樣，虛稱言說於倭人處云々是如，手本據馳通是白齊，(*Pyoin yeongnae deungnok* 13, entry for 5.17 in cyclic year *sinchuk* [Gyeongjong 景宗 1 = 1721]; underlined words to be read in accordance with *idu* system)
 - 32) Ikeuchi, *op. cit.*, pp. 226–228, “Table 2: Reasons for misrepresentation of origins (in the case of arrival in Japan),” gives the source of the four incidents Z17–Z21 as the *Honam gyerok*, but I have been unable to find any corresponding incidents in this work. There would appear to be some mistake, but here I have provisionally followed Ikeuchi.
 - 33) *Haesa ilgi*, entry for 6.14 in cyclic year *gapsin* 甲申 (Yeongjo 40 = 1746).
 - 34) Ikeuchi, *op. cit.*, p. 293.
 - 35) In addition, although not directly related to my present arguments, the terms and concepts “self-perception” and “self-consciousness” used by Ikeuchi are also somewhat problematic. In this regard, see Rokutanda, *op. cit.*, p. 79.
 - 36) Fujita Akiyoshi 藤田明良, “‘Ryūkyū ōji satsugai jiken’ to Satsuma Annan tsūkō ni kansuru shinshiryō – *Zōho Tanrashi* shozō no 1611nen hyōchakusen kōsen kiji –” 「琉球王子殺害事件」と薩摩安南通交に関する新史料 – 『増補耽羅誌』所蔵の一六一一年漂着船交戦記事 – [The “murder of a Ryukyuan prince” and new material on contacts between Satsuma and Annam: The account of a military engagement with a drifting ship in 1611 in the *Jeungbo Tamlaji*] (summary of paper presented at meeting of Circle for the Study of

- Maritime Asian History, 2001).
- 37) Matsubara Takatoshi, “Chōsen ni okeru densetsu seisei mekanizumu ni tsuite — shu ni Ryūkyū ōji hyōchakutan o chūshin to shite —” 朝鮮における傳説生成メカニズムについて — 主に琉球王子漂着譚を中心として — [On the mechanism of legend generation in Korea: With a focus on the tale of a castaway Ryukyuan prince], *Chōsen gakuho* 137 (1990), pp. 120–121.
 - 38) Go, *op. cit.*
 - 39) Private collection, 4 vols. Included in Jeju Daehakgyo Tamla Munhwa Yeonguso 濟州大學校耽羅文化研究所, ed., *Tamla munhwa chongseo (4) Tamlaji chobon oe* 耽羅文化叢書 (4) 耽羅誌草本外 (Jeju: Jeju Daehakgyo Tamla Munhwa Yeonguso, 1989).
 - 40) Yang Sunpil 梁淳琬, “Yi Wonjo moksa: Jeju gwangye munheon chokje” 李源祚牧使 濟州關係文獻解題 [Governor Yi Wonjo: Explanatory remarks on works related to Jeju], in Jeju Daehakgyo Tamla Munhwa Yeonguso, ed., *Tamla munhwa chongseo (3) Tamlarok* 耽羅文化叢書 (3) 耽羅錄 (Jeju: Jeju Daehakgyo Tamla Munhwa Yeonguso, 1989).
 - 41) *Injo sillok* 仁祖實錄 1, entry for 1.4.14 (cyclic day *gyeyu* 癸酉).
 - 42) Matsubara, *op. cit.*, p. 120.
 - 43) *Bibyeonsa deungnok* 備邊司謄錄 109, opening section of “Jeju pyohwanin byeoljeong byeoldan” 濟州漂還人別情別單, entry for 11.23 in cyclic year *sinyu* 辛酉 (Yeongjo 17 = 1741). It should be noted that the characters 詰 and 哲 are both pronounced *cheol*.
 - 44) Ikeuchi, *op. cit.*, pp. 293–294.
 - 45) In regard to this passage, Ikeuchi writes, “When Jo Eom, the chief envoy of a Korean mission who happened to be in Fuchū on Tsushima, asked the reason for their misrepresentation, they are said to have replied, ‘蓋以濟州人與琉球國，曾有結怨之事，故或慮報復，濟州漂民，輒皆詭言於日本云’” (Ikeuchi, *op. cit.*, p. 293). But this is a misreading, for the passage “蓋...” represents not the drifters’ testimony but Jo Eom’s own comment (“I have heard....”).
 - 46) The *Pyohaerok* came to light after the manuscript, which had been preserved by descendants of the author Jang Hancheol, was discovered by Jeong Byeonguk 鄭炳昱, a professor in the Department of Korean Language and Literature at Seoul National University who was visiting Jeju Island as a member of the Jeju Island Comprehensive Scientific Investigation Team (Jang Hancheol [tr. Song Changbin 宋昌彬], *Hyōkairoku* 漂海錄 [*Pyohaerok*; Tokyo: Shinkansha 新幹社, 1990], “Foreword,” p. 3). Because of the circumstances of its discovery, and also because the incident it describes cannot be confirmed in any other records, some would regard it as a fictional work of later times. But Jang Hancheol was a real person, and there is no reason to suppose that it is not his own work. That he was a real person is evident from the fact that, according to the “Daejeong-hyeon seonsaeng an” 大靜縣先生案 in the *Jeju Daejeong Jeongui eupji* 濟州大靜旌義邑誌 (dating from the reign of Jeongjo 正祖; held in Gyujeongguk Library, Seoul National University; 1 vol.; call no. Gyu 17436; included in Hangeuk Munheon

Yeonguso 韓國文獻研究所, ed., *Eupji 6: Jeju-do* 邑誌六 濟州道 [Seoul: Asea Munhwasa 亞細亞文化社, 1983]), he served as magistrate of Daejeong county from the second month of Jeongjo 13 (1788) to the fifth month of the following year (張漢喆戊申二月到任己酉正月遞歸). Even supposing that it was a work of fiction not based on real experiences, there can be little doubt that it would have been underpinned by the conventional knowledge of contemporary intellectuals and members of the literate strata. As is noted elsewhere in this article, it was because Jang Hancheol subscribed to the view linking the murder of a Ryukyuan prince to the misrepresentation of their origins by drifters from Jeju that this work contains an account of the murder of a Ryukyuan prince.

- 47) See, for example, *Gwanghaegun ilgi* 光海君日記 (Jeongjoksan 鼎足山 edition) 44, 3.8.26 (cyclic day *gisa* 癸巳); *ibid.* 50, 4.2.10 (cyclic day *eulhae* 乙亥); *Injo sillok* 1, 1.4.14 (cyclic day *giyu* 癸酉); *ibid.* 8, 3.1.8 (cyclic day *jeongsa* 丁巳).
- 48) Matsubara, *op. cit.*, p. 121.
- 49) Rokutanda, *op. cit.*, pp. 74–75.
- 50) See note 18.
- 51) It is not impossible to interpret the phrase used by Kim Biui and his companions to describe themselves (朝鮮國海南人) as “people from the south of the seas of the land of Korea,” in which case they cannot be said to have misrepresented their origins, but I wish to reserve judgement on this point for the time being.
- 52) This figure is based on Takahashi Kimiaki 高橋公明, “Chūsei no kaiiki sekai to Saishūtō” 忠清の海域世界と濟州島 [Chungcheong’s maritime world and Jeju Island], in Amino Yoshihiko 網野善彦 *et al.*, *Higashi Shinakai to saikai bunka* 東シナ海と西海文化 [The East China Sea and the culture of the seas to the west], vol. 4 of *Umi to rettō bunka* 海と列島文化 [The sea and the culture of the Japanese archipelago] (Shōgakukan 小學館, 1992), “Table: Chronological table of driftings related to Jeju Island” (p. 189); Seki, *op. cit.*, “Table 1: The repatriation of Korean sea drifters from Japan”; Jeju-do Gyoyuk Yeonguwon 濟州道教育研究院, ed., *Hyangto gyoyuk jaryo* 郷土教育資料 [Material on local education] (Jeju: Jeju-do Gyoyuk Yeonguwon, 1996), chap. 3: “Joseon jeongi ui Jeju” 조선 전기의 제주 [Jeju in the first half of the Joseon period], pp. 205–206 (table).
- 53) This is based on the table in Jeju-do Gyoyuk Yeonguwon, *op. cit.*, pp. 205–206.
- 54) Ikeuchi, *op. cit.*, p. 240.
- 55) Harajiri Hideki 原尻英樹, “Nihon haisengo no zai-Nichi Chōsenjin — Saishūtōjin no seikatsushi” 日本敗戦後の在日朝鮮人 — 濟州島人の生活史 [Korean residents in Japan after Japan’s defeat in World War II: The life histories of Jeju islanders], in Harajiri Hideki and Rokutanda Yutaka, eds., *Hantō to rettō no kuniguni* 半島と列島のくにぐに [Lands of the Korean peninsula and the Japanese archipelago] (Shinkansha, 1996); *id.*, “Kokkyō o koeru ‘minzoku’ — Saishūtōjin no nettowāku komyunitī —” 國境をこえる「民族」 — 濟州島人のネットワークコミュニティ — [A transborder “peo-

ple”: The network community of Jeju islanders], in Harajiri Hideki, ed., *Sekai no minzoku — “minzoku” keisei to kindai* — 世界の民族 — 「民族」形成と近代 — [Peoples of the world: “Ethnic” formation and the modern age] (Hōsō Daigaku Kyōiku Shinkōkai 放送大學教育振興會, 1998). In the latter article, Harajiri writes as follows:

Not only had the inhabitants of villages along the coast of Jeju Island had, almost without exception, no experience of having lived anywhere other than in the village to which they belonged, but they had also seldom gone to other places on Jeju Island. People like these suddenly headed for the Japanese archipelago and there worked as labourers. Their dealings with other people there began first of all with their being called “Koreans” by “Japanese.” It is to be surmised that in this context it is virtually meaningless to ask how villagers from Jeju Island did or did not perceive themselves before coming to Japan. (p. 62)