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1. Perspectives of Occupational Obligation and Status

During Joseon period, occupational obligation as registered in household register. More precisely, it signified legislative status in the form of occupational obligation of the household registers. Here 'in the form of occupational obligation' indicates source of taxation that original household registers does not include. Legislative status is defined as status determined in official records that differs from socio-economic classes or status. These two perspectives should examine occupational obligation in the household registers. National taxation = occupational obligation as national acquisition system made it principle to levy taxes on individual person, Writing occupational obligation on the household register reflect the principle. In Goryeo period, land distribution was based on the occupational obligation

1) Son Byeong-gyu, “Hojeogdaejang jigyegijae yangsang gwa uimi (Aspects and Significations of Registration of Occupational Obligations in Household Register)”, Yeoksawha Hyeonsil no. 40
2) People began to perform national obligations at 16 as adult and were exempted at sixty as ‘noyeo.’ Local bureaus reported population registered in household registers to the ministry of finance every year. Requisition of military obligation was based on household registers. See History of Goryeo. Book Ji no.33, food and money 2, Section of household registers. In this paper, the term ‘national obligation’ is exchangeable with ‘occupational obligation.’ Sometimes occupational obligation is perceived as occupation and obligation respectively. Because officials can be regarded as one of occupational obligations. Early inquiry on this relation is Kim Seok-hyeong, “Joseon chogi Gungnyeokpyeonseongui
unit household. In other words, as ‘household’ unit arranged population on
the household register, ¹) taxes were imposed on delegate¹).

• This principle of taxation was also true in the definition of making
household registers in the late Joseon dynasty. In 1655, the way to define
household appeared in the Ogajagtongsamog. One of the instances is as
follows.

• Household should be registered serially. Lower class (slaves) should be
recorded one space below the master or his relatives. After names of
obligations recorded on each household, numbers of male, temporal
responsibility, occupation, (whether artisan or no occupation) age and
transference must be registered.¹)

• It was rule in Goryeo period that representative occupation of the household
should be recorded. Rather it was a rule of comprehensive records that prior
to making household registers¹). This rule did not appear in late Joseon.
There were additional records of members of household. Often occupational

---

Gijo” (The Basis of Making Military Obligation in Early Joseon) Jindanhakbo no.14, 1941

³) “The King Chungseon ascended the throne and commanded. Firstly, precedent kings had established
rules on the square land. Every square land should be distributed equally to every occupation for
sources of everyday living of people and national budget. Ownerless land should be provided to
everyone who performed occupational obligations and established household for national obligations.”
We can infer that people were obliged to perform national obligations and imposed each occupational
obligation in return for the rights of cultivation and receipt.

⁴) Jeong Jinyeong, “18—19 segi hojeokdajang Hogu girok ui geomto” (Examination of Registration of
households in household registers in 18th-19th century) Daedongmunhwageunu Yeongu no. 39, 2001, 12; Kim
Geon-tae, “Joseon hugi ui ingupaak silsang gwa geu seonggyeok (The reality and character of counting
population in late Joseon)” Daedongmunhwageunu Yeongu no 39, 2001, 12.

⁵) Sukjongsillok, 1st year 26th September.

⁶) It is regarded as tonggisamok in the legal documents.
obligation was omitted. Sometimes status of commoner or lower class record as shown in household registers in this time.

- However various registrations, more or less, related with system of acquisition of occupational obligation was entitled to be named as occupational obligation. In fact, regulations defined the registrations as jigmyeong, yeogmyeong, or jigyek. What we should notice is these records does not include demarcation of any social classes but status distinctions.

- Land distribution to people occupational obligation ceased in early Joseon period, acquisition on occupational obligation became different from on land. Different from household registers of China, household registers in Joseon period had signs of acquisition on occupational obligation and land acquisition did not appear.

- We can discern non-class character of occupational obligation in this juncture.

- Provision of the land as inriujeon, hanryangjeon, jigy on to Local dominant class such as local officials and bureaucracies was privileges. Extermination of land distribution deprived occupational obligation of privileges and all people who has occupational obligation was targeted as a source of revenue.

- In early Joseon period, official and private slaves students could be

---

7) “Those who change titles of occupation after issuing an identity tag, are punished according to samok of household registers.” (year 1675) Sugyojoimnok.

When wrong title of occupational obligation and name are used in an identity tag, there would be a penalty of 100 times flogging and three year banishment…So far samok of household registers.

8) Miyajima Hiroshi, 1990 Chousen Tochi Chiyousajigyoushino Kenkyu (A Study of History of land investigation in Joseon), Tokyodaigaku Touyou Bunka Kenkyushoukoku, Chap.2 Li choyou Shidain okeru shu senkendekitoroshikeino denkaikahi

9 ) Lee Young-hun, 1993.12."Chousen zenki miyoudai no kosekinitsujeno hikaku teki kento (Comparative study of household register between Early Josen and Ming dynasty). “ Higashi Asia sensei kokaka to shakai keizai hakakashino shiten kara aoki shoten ( Despotic nation in East Asia and
summoned as irregular troops at inevitable accidents. 1) It is possible to record slaves and reserve persons in the household registers.

- Individual status in the household registers standardized in the national acquisition system of occupational obligation. It is another question what was the relation of legislative status with social classes.

- So far most of investigation on occupational obligation tried to figure out changes of status and late Joseon society by classifying occupational obligation. They interpreted records of occupational obligations into social classes such as Yangban, commoner and slaves and produce statistics of household register year. 1)

- Shigata Hiroshi who recognized value of household registers firstly suggested this method. 1)

- Especially, He inferred increase of Yangban and transformation of lower class into commoner after 18th century by classifying people exempted from military obligation ' Yuhak' into Yangban and slaves lower class into lower class.

- Afterwards due to critics that particular names of occupational obligations such as Yuhak, Hyangri does not match social classes, he invented

its society and economics –from the perspective of comparison)

10) Kitamura Akimi “Lichou Shoki kokuyakuseido hokou no seiritsu tsuite (Concerning establishing protective law of system of national obligation in early Joseon)” Chousenshi kenkyukai ronbunshu 30, 1992


additional method to create and specify the classification by referring to a
designation of wives and women, occupational obligations of father,
grandfather, grandfather-in-law, great grand father.1)

- However, Shigata Horoshi's methods14 that equate legislative record of
occupational obligation with socio-economic classes and household register
reflect social reality has been employed.
- Where does this misconception that legislative status
politico-administratively determined such as occupational obligation was
equated with social classes at that tome -vaguely apprehended- come from?
- Did he think the fact that besides occupational obligation various records
were shown household registers exemplified its authenticity as records of
social classes? It has self-contradictory assumption that occupational
obligation was provided to due social classes even though occupational
obligation acquisition system was reflected in the household registers.
- Now we should reconsider how household registers reflect occupational
obligation acquisition system 'legislatively'. For this, we should carefully
examine every title of occupational obligations. Bearing in mind the
differences between legislative statue and social classes, we are going to
examine statistics around occupational obligations as a source of revenue

13) Choe Seung-hui, “Joseon hugi yuhak haksaeng ui sinbunsajeok uimi (Status Significance of Yahak
idonge gwanhan yeongu (sang)-danseongjangjeokeul jungsimeuro, (A Study of Status changes of
“Joseon hugi ui eohyu emmu wa geu jiwi,,” Jindanhakbo no.60, Gye Seung-beum, “Joseon hugi
danseongjibang hyeophcheon ihunam gatyuyeui jingnyeok gwa sinbun,”(Taxation and Status in Lee
Hunam’s genealogy in Danseong prefecture) Gomunseo Yeongu no.3. Im Hak-seong, “Joseon hugi
sanobi ui sinbunbyeondongsange gwanhan iweongu -17-19segi danseonghojeokui saryebunseok,”(A
Pyeongmingamunui junhugureul tonghaeseo bon sinbunbyeondong yangsang,” (Aspect of Status
Changes in family of Commoners in late Joseon), Hangakbak Yeongu, no.8, 1995.

14 ‘Doisang (consolidated total number) or Dochong refers to total numbers of households and
occupational obligations in the prefectures and counties in the concerned year. Local officials in counties
and prefectures responsible for making household registry were expected to insert Doisang at the end of
collected household registry in the village.
and titles of officials, degree of official rank and titles of studies such as yuhak gyosaeng.

2. Occupational Obligation in the Household registers

1) Occupational Obligation in Consolidated total numbers

- Local administrative bureau made household registers every three years in administrative unit. At the end of the records, the section of 'Doisang' was prepared for statistics of the family units and occupational obligation covering the whole counties and prefectures. National wide statistics of central government was founded on the section consolidated total numbers of the records. 1)

- However, critics suggested that family sum and personal sum in consolidated total numbers were determined relatively 1)(indication of increase and decrease from standard year), and then numbers of household in the main text were determined. Correlations between occupational obligations in military obligation of consolidated total numbers and main text and national military policy and local management of military

---

15) This statistics is recognized total sum of occupational obligation of counties and prefectures reported to the central government. It was reflected in the Yangyeoksilchong and Hoyeokchongsu made in the mid and late 17th century by policies of population and occupational services. .

obligation\(^1\)). That is to say, assessment by central government nothing but being borrowed from consolidated total numbers.

- Records firstly in the consolidated total numbers appeared in late 17 century in the household register. Since 1678, we can discern various titles of occupational obligations and each statistics in the consolidated total numbers of Danseong household registers. As total sum of titles of occupational obligation amounted to personal sum, population registered in the household registers came to have their own occupational titles in the consolidated total numbers. Section of 'consolidated total numbers' was a form of registering occupational obligation in the household registers. It was intended conforming and systemizing scheme for figuring out people by the government.

- Display of titles of occupation and system of record in consolidated total numbers altered a little bit. Let us examine it in terms of governmental policy of military obligation, legal definition of status and occupational obligation’s correspondence to the social class.

- Concerning governmental policy of military obligation, classification of military obligation status that belongs to central troops 'Gyeongsagunmun,' local classification of military obligation status that belongs to gamyeong, su, byeongyeong, jinyeong appeared in the household registers.

- Firstly, numbers of occupational obligation in central and local bureaus increased from late 17th century to early 18th century and afterwards decreased and were stagnant in late 18th century.

- Second, after mid-18th century numbers sharply increases with emergence of "assigned to town."

- Third, during late 17th and early 18th century persons performed additional military obligation and distinction in military obligation between noble

\(^1\) Son Byeong-gyu, "Hojeokdaejang jingnyeongnan ui gunnyeokgijaewa doisang ui tonggye," (Consolidated total numbers of registration of military obligations in the section of military obligation)
class and commoner vanished. It was closely related with policy of military obligation in post 17th century.

- After late 17th century, government attempted to ensure numbers of male person as a source of military obligation (age 15-60) and establish a fixed numbers on the classification of obligation status\(^1\). This policy was put into practice until the publication of yagyeoksilcheong in 1740. This book declared unchanging fixed numbers in the classification of obligation status for preventing decrease in numbers. First things observed in the consolidated total numbers accompanied with unchanging fixed numbers in the classification of military obligation status

- Recorded numbers of classified military obligation in Yagyeoksilcheong and town record 'Gunceong' was almost the same with records in consolidated total numbers. It was also true for household registers of Daegu and Oenyang.\(^1\)

- In the documents on military obligation of counties and prefectures in 19th century, almost numbers of classified military obligation of central troops was equal to that of consolidated total numbers.\(^1\) From mid-18th century to 19th century, the fact that numbers of classified military obligation was fixed was reflected in consolidated total numbers. Again we can understand consolidated total numbers reflected governmental policy of military obligation.

---


• However, numbers belong to the town increased after mid-18th centuries whereas numbers belong to central and local bureau was fixed.

• 'Belonging to the town' implies human resources for managing local budget including Yagbo Jijangbo for purchasing presenting materials.

• Local acquisition turned into a sort of military obligation in the process of classification of military obligation. 1)

• We can certify it in the documents on local budget 'Saryeo' in 19th century. Until early 19th century, 'belonging to the town' increased in the consolidated total numbers. This fact implies that central government gradually admits local bureau’s revenue.

• Meanwhile, fixation of numbers in military obligation was comprehensive control of taxation by government by prohibit arbitrary calculation of numbers 'Samosok' and combining obligation 1) Because taxation was effective when each military obligation was imposed on each person. Combining obligations seems disappear in early 18th centuries. But there was still another combining obligation imposed on personal slaves.

• In military obligation of consolidated total numbers, there were marks of commoner and slaves on each military obligation. Military obligation on personal slaves appeared in sorts of obligations of 'belonging to the town' and local counties under local troops 1).

• However, distinction between commoner and slaves disappeared in mid-18th century and number of military obligations on personal slaves was added to statistics of military obligation. In consolidated total numbers of

---

21) Son Byeong-gyu, “Joseon hagi sangjuibang ui yeoksuchwicheje wa geu unnyeong,” (Systems of Calculations and Uses on obligations of Sangju areas in late Joseon), Yeoksa wa hyeonil no.38. 2000

22) “Gakomunbyangikjeonggeumdan samok” Bibyeonsadeungnok book43, Sugjong 15th year, January 22nd.

23) Registration of occupational serviceman as private slaves in the household register cannot be found Sanum household register in 1606 and household register of Ulsan prefecture in 1672.
household registers, principle approved in early Joseon that abolishment of distinctions of commoner and slaves and imposing military obligation on commoners revived.

- But it does not necessarily mean that they did not discern slaves status at all. After mid-18th century, personal slaves not responsible for military obligation were displayed as Sano Yangyeogno Gogongno and had their own statistics.
- It means Sano was no more a class distinction but legislative statue not responsible for military obligation.
- Moreover, various differentiation of Sano defined economic contract legally and various compensation for responsibility such as 'delivering the labor' 'payment the asset'
- Personal subordination and economic relations were legally controlled by government and became a standard to distinguishing legislative status. Personal slaves could not be free from government's control and military obligation.
- Lastly, let us clarify how social classes were reflected in system of occupational obligation in consolidated total numbers of household registers.
- Firstly, officials, donated official, degree of official ranks, students were displayed before title of military obligation. Attached local bureau follows attached central bureau. They were registered before the slaves.
- Second, Women were classified into bunyeo, yangnyeo, gwabu and gwannyeo and registered before female slaves
- Bunyeo and gwanyeo might be endowed on women in Yangban. By this we can infer there was relations between titles of occupational obligation and social class. So far many inquire have assumed this relation is undutiful.
However, titles of occupational obligation per personal sum were around 10 percent in late 17th century. It increased up to 35% in early 19th century and decreased down fewer than 30% afterwards.\(^1\)

We also discover number of Yuma, surely Yang ban class, was fixed to 1000 in late 19th century. Section of consolidated total numbers of titles of occupational obligation does not count titles of occupational obligation in household registers. It permitted and prohibits the number according to the population policy and finally confines itself to a certain number. In conclusion, occupational obligation was not regarded as social class.

Then can main text of household registers that each household has registered and were collected reflect reality of social class?

2) **Type of registration in the main text of household registers**

- Even though titles of occupational obligations in the section of consolidated total numbers was sum of those registered in the main text of household registers (The escaped and death was not counted), there were big differences.) Anyhow, sum of titles of occupational obligation in consolidated total numbers almost matches population in the main text of household registers.

- Numbers of titles of occupational obligations recorded in consolidated total numbers did not do justice to in household registers. And there were a few not registered as title of occupational obligation in main text of household registers\(^*\)

- Concerning this problem, previous research thought that due to avoidance to

\(^1\) See Household register Danseong prefecture of Gyeongsang province. Consolidated total numbers. Comparison with total sum of occupational obligations in main text of household registers was based on the date in 1678, 1717, 1759, 1786, 1825, 1864.
obligations there must be inaccurate registration. They pointed out when they were recorded in consolidated total numbers; there must an arbitrary intervention.1).

- That is to say, even though there was a downside in registering the main text of household registers, it was possible to infer changes of social classes to household registers.

- We can find some regulations on wrong registration and real punishment in the document. However, is it true to consider main text was a result of wrong registration? 

- It has been widely accepted that actual population were not recorded but selective numbers of households were recorded in household registers.1)

- Main text of household register was composed according to its own rule legitimated in the local level, which differed from regulation of consolidated total numbers by central government. Let us trace the significance by comparing statistics of titles of occupational obligations in consolidated total numbers with in main text of household registers.

- Considering general differences between main text of household registers and consolidated total numbers, we must also think degree of differences may depends on date of registering of household register and sort of occupational obligation. In some cases, differences were rarely found.

- Firstly, classifications of military obligation that belongs to central and local bureaus were similar in numbers in total statistic and main text of household registers. But in 18th century registrations in the main text decreased. Afterwards military obligation decreased more. In 19th century numbers in


26) Gwon Nae-hyeon, “Joseon hugi hojeok ui jakseong gwajeong e daehan bunseok,” (An Analysis of
consolidated total numbers also decreased down to those in main text of household registers.

But after mid-19th century, in consolidated total numbers numbers of military obligation return to members of mid 18th century. Meanwhile, numbers of 'belonging to the town' matched those in main text or were short. (Diagram 1)

Changes in numbers of military obligation correlated with policy of military obligation in the section of consolidated total numbers closely

From late 17th century to mid-18th century, policies of ensuring good sources and fixation of number of military obligation reflected in the main text.

In late 18th century, whereas numbers of military obligations maintain level of mid-18th century in consolidated total numbers, they fell short in main text.

This fact was due to fixation of numbers of central and local troops to be bounded to total sum of counties and prefectures. That is to say, by any means local bureaus could delivered total sum of military obligations to the upper bureaus. It became unnecessary to identify numbers of military obligation in main text of household registers. This tendency became more evident after mid-19th century.

But there was another case in 'belonging to the town.' 'Belonging to the town' closely related with budget revenue of local bureau in consolidated total numbers amounted to in main text. Registration in main text in reference with local budget seemed to play an important role.

However, in early 19th century, there was a rule that numbers in classifications of titles of occupational obligation should match those in main text of household registers. Instead admitting losing character of military obligation in household registers, a rule had been maintained.

It means after late 18th century decrease in number of military obligation in main text of household registers was rationalized. And there was another rule in registering of household registers that differed from total sum of numbers of military obligation in counties and prefectures.

Next. Officials, degree of official ranks and Yuhak as students increased throughout whole period. From late 17th century to early 18th century, there were little differences between two. The gap became widen until late 18th century. Numbers in consolidated total numbers outnumbered those in main text. In early 19th century like military obligation, numbers in consolidated total numbers were repressed and matched. In mid 19th century, numbers in main text outnumbered those in consolidated total numbers. (Diagram 2)

The fact that total sum of registered person such as officials, degree of
official ranks, Yuhak matched with statistics in consolidated total numbers from late 17th century to early 18 century prove that intention of central government policy on population were practiced in the main text of household registers in this period. If government tried to impose title of occupational obligation to perceived Yangban, it was party successful.

- What we should notice is that, however, whereas there was increase titles of occupational obligation in consolidated total numbers, main text could not outnumbered to consolidated total numbers. Until late 18th century, finally the gap grew.

- It means if increase of titles of occupational obligation in the main text reflected real increase of Yangban, central government admitted more increases. In fact, institutional condition for registers occupational obligation besides Yangban were mature and deepened.

- There can be an argument that less registration in main text than consolidated total numbers was caused by the rule that titles of occupational obligation under age 15 were not recorded.

- This argument seems to gain the strength from the fact that in 1786, biggest discrepancies found, only 10 children were recorded in consolidated total numbers among young people around 330. But Among unregistered young people, children and brothers of occupational obligation persons were 100. Where can we get 200 remains?

- Occupational obligation in that main text of household register might have another principle from consolidated total numbers. One of them was occupational obligations were imposed by the unit of household.1)

- Moreover many records of temporal exemption such as Yuhak should pay price.

In fact, those not Yangban were allowed to get title occupational obligation. But there were also difficulties and institutional limitation on this. However, why did records of occupational obligation increase? Occupational obligations of Yangban that had benefit in return were unobtainable. Whereas later times it becomes formal records of Yangban, other classes got this formalism as a sign of Yangban. Changes in total sum showed this way of records was encouraged until late 18th century but some measures were taken against to do this in 19th century.

3. Does status change?

- Records of occupational obligation showed us additional registration of name of woman and occupational obligation of sajo in the household registers.
- Women appeared in the household registers were slaves and children. Otherwise, terms ssi, seong, sosa were employed after surname. The title ssi that often employed in the title of married woman of Yangban could be a sign of distinction with title of lower class.1)
- It is the same case that in consolidated total numbers titles bunyeo, gwabu


In household registers, wives whose husband had same title of occupational obligation often had different names. Lee Jun-gu sees this case expresses status difference of same title of occupational obligation. That is to say, it is an attempt to distinguish man’s status by wife’s status with an assumption that woman’s name normally takes after her father’s status. (Occupational obligation in sajo) But this way of registration could be fakes as a ladder to higher status. But if so, it is invalid to assume that woman’s name takes after father’s status. Moreover, we cannot know man’s social class and status.
are distinguished from yangnyeo, gwanyeol in their status. Bunyeo in consolidated total numbers could not be found in the household registers. Instead title ssi was employed in the household registers.

- Examining changes of numbers of Bunyeo and Ssi, we can see similar results from students.

- So to speak, there was gradual increase in numbers of women who employed ssi. However, from late 17th to early 18th century, consolidated total numbers and household registers shared almost common in numbers. Afterwards bunyeo outnumbered. But in 19th century, reversed in 18th century, number of bunyeo decreased.

- There are resulted from gradual convergence of officials, degree of official ranks and title of male occupational obligation 'Yuhak', title of wife and woman and many occupational obligations simultaneously or spasmodically.

1) Form of records meant to apply only to Yangban spread to other classes.

- Increase of slaves in 19th century can be explained by maintenance of the record form. Record form in early Joseon period as a prototype of Yangban household registers, had title of husband, wife, children and slaves.

1) Equipped with record of occupational obligation, titles of woman and slaves, increase of this type of household registers explain increase of slaves. Far from reality of social class, legisprative records established legal status.

- Yangban was often implied not one of social class but more legisprative status.

1) In late 18th century. Documents showed that magistrate reported

---


30) Gyeonggukdaejeon, Hogusik

'without household of Yangban and slaves, there are few responsible for military obligation.' It had background of fixed sum of military obligation in the counties and prefectures after mid 18th century.

- ‘Here 'household of Yangban did not mean privileged class but had the form of Yangban household registers. In 19th century decreases of occupational obligation in consolidated total numbers were resulted from measure of central government. But in main text of household registers, local bureaus might take advantage of increase of household of Yangban

- Increase of household of Yangban was recognized in late 19th centuries. Magistrate of Sangju in 1880 who tried to levy taxes on dry good for military obligation Yangban household and commoner household separately, complained that lower people pretended to be household of yangban by borrowing the title of yuhak.\textsuperscript{1)} Therefore he differentiates responsibility according to time they pretended to be Yuhak. It was actual recognition of transformation into household of Yangban.

- Before asking above question, we firstly clarify what kind of idea of status we have. When it comes to legislative statues, there were continuity in members with changes in numbers and real contents. But it was possible to make various statues for the purpose of legislative level. When it comes status as social stratification, it is hard to trace changes in the household registers.

- Some might notice changes in the interminglement between status in the household register and social class. However, this assertion should assume homogeneity of static social class.

- Firstly we distinguish legislative with social class status. Then we should examine correlations and reality between two. Furthermore basing on this, we can infer self-diffusion and changes of perception. The question 'does

\textsuperscript{32)} Sangju Sarye 1885.
status changes' must be pursued in this way.