

ISSN 1598-2661

SUNGKYUN JOURNAL OF EAST ASIAN STUDIES

Vol.17 No.1

APR. 2017



Academy of East Asian Studies
Sungkyunkwan University

A Scholar-Soldier in Mourning Robes: The Politics of Remembering Imjin War Hero No In (1566–1622)

Christina HAN
Wilfrid Laurier University

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the postwar commemoration of No In (1566–1622), a scholar and militia leader during the Imjin War, who was captured and taken to Japan, escaped to China, returned home after three years of adventures and hardship, and lived the remainder of his life as a military official and a Neo-Confucian scholar. No's memory was revived in the eighteenth century by his descendants, who appealed to the state to honor him as a hero who had been forgotten due to unfortunate circumstances in his later life. By comparing No's own accounts in his wartime diary with later biographies, this paper reveals that some important details in No's life that contradicted the biographers' visions of the hero were excluded in later commemorative biographies. The evolution and expansion of No In's biographies in post-Imjin War Chosŏn demonstrates the tensions and collaborations between the Hamp'yŏng No lineage, the elites of Honam, and the Chosŏn state, all three of which sought to increase and exercise their power and influence through their claimed connection to No In.

Keywords: Kŭmgye No In (1566–1622), *Kŭmgye ilgi*, Imjin War, War Memoir, Biography, Genealogy, Japan, China

Introduction

This paper examines the history and politics of remembering and memorializing No In (1566–1622, brush name: Kŭmgye), a Neo-Confucian scholar of Chosŏn, who led a group of volunteers during the Imjin War (1592–1598) and fought the invading Japanese forces under the command of General Kwŏn Yul (1537–1599). In 1597, during the siege of Namwŏn Fortress by the Japanese army, No was captured and taken to the Shimazu domain in Satsuma Province. After spending eighteen months in captivity, No successfully escaped to Fujian, China with the help of Chinese envoys. While in Fujian, he interacted with Chinese scholars and even had an opportunity to study at a local Neo-Confucian academy. He then travelled to Beijing, where he met with the Chinese emperor Shenzong (1572–1620), and returned to Chosŏn in the last lunar month of 1599. After his return, No pursued a military career in hopes of contributing to Chosŏn's defense against Japan. He served as the Naval Commander of Hwanghae Province but eventually was demoted after a conflict with Chŏng Inhong (1535–1623), a powerful minister

during the reign of Kwanghaegun (1575–1641). In 1609, he retired from official life, remaining at home until his death in 1622. During his lifetime, No's stories of dramatic adventures in Japan and China attracted attention, but memory of him soon faded after his death mainly due to the declining fortunes of his family.¹ It took over 150 years before his memory was revived by his sixth-generation descendant No Kye-un (n.d.), who, in 1788, presented a petition to the Chosŏn court for his ancestor's official recognition and enshrinement.

Surviving writings by No In include his wartime diary, his report on the geography and customs of Japan, about fifty poems, and petitions and letters he composed in China. A significant portion of his diary, the *Kūmgye ilgi* (錦溪日記, Kūmgye's diary), was lost; what remains covers a period of roughly four months, from the planning of his escape to China to the time shortly before he received Shenzong's approval to return home. Although incomplete, the diary provides a first-person account of No's experiences in Japan and China and became the basis for later biographies about him. In 1823, a collection of No's writings were published in an eight-volume anthology, the *Kūmgye-jip* (錦溪集, The collected works of Kūmgye), by his descendants, the Hamp'yŏng No clan. In addition to No's own works and the writings exchanged with others during his lifetime, the anthology also includes eulogies by important personages, most notably Emperor Shenzong and King Sŏnjo (1552–1608), texts commemorating his enshrinement, and an extensive biography that lays out his impressive genealogy and achievements. In 1955, an expanded and revised anthology was published by No's lineage organization.

No's writings and later anthologies have been studied primarily within the fields of war history and war literature. Much attention has been paid to his experience as a prisoner of war in Japan and to the significance of his intelligence report on that country, which he presented to the Shenzong Emperor and King Sŏnjo (Kim Chin'gyu 1997; No 2004; Kim Misŏn 2010, 2012). More recently, growing scholarly interest has focused on historical investigations of No's accounts of contemporary Japan and China (Pak 2012, 2015; Pang 2013). One shared problem in the studies to date is their heavy reliance on the information found in later biographies, which they have treated as unchanging and reliable sources. Given the significant temporal gap between No's lifetime and the composition of the biographies created well after his death, more accurate scholarship necessitates a study of the history of No's biographies in order to substantiate their credibility.

This paper will therefore investigate the posthumous reconstruction of No In, and, more specifically, the history and politics of reviving his memory by means of discursive constructions. Unlike No's fellow Imjin War captives Kang Hang (1567–1618), Chŏng Kyŏngdŭk (1569–1630), and Chŏng Hoin (b. 1579), who produced autobiographical narratives of their experiences in Japan upon their

* I would like to thank the reviewers for their insightful comments and suggestions on this paper.

¹ No had two sons, and both perished during the war in 1597, which was the same year that he was taken as a captive to Japan. In 1615, No adopted his cousin's son, No Huigyŏng (n.d.), as an heir.

return to Chosŏn in order to justify their survival and prove their loyalty to their native land,² No has left us with an incomplete diary that reveals a person with complex experiences and emotions. His personal reflections present a much more intricate portrait of the man than the image of an uncompromising hero that is imagined in later biographies. Through a close examination and comparison of four biographies produced in 1788, 1799, 1823, and 1955, as well as the anthologies in which they are found, this paper explores the expanding biographical narratives and traces the shifting images of No as a hero. As will be shown, a comparative study of his diary and biographies brings to light strategic exclusions and revisions that were made to biographical narratives in the process of transforming No In into an ancestral, communal, and national hero.

The Man in His Own Words

For a historical assessment of No In and his legacy, it is imperative that later biographies be discussed separately from the writings produced by No himself. In order to do so, this section will examine and reconstruct No's experience in Japan and China based on the information available in his personal records that exist independently of later anthologies: namely, his diary and his memorial in ten points recorded in the *Sŏnjo sillok* (宣祖實錄, Veritable records of King Sŏnjo). While there are other writings that later anthologies attribute to No—such as his report on Japan and many letters and poems—since these texts appear only in the anthologies (with the exception of some of the poetry that he exchanged with others), they will be examined only after the evaluation of his own accounts.

The surviving portion of No In's diary starts on the second day of the second lunar month of 1599 and ends on the twenty-seventh day of the sixth lunar month of the same year. The first few entries in his handwritten diary are short and contain unreadable parts. According to the diary, No was visited by two Chinese diplomats (*chaguan*), Chen Pingshan (n.d.) and Li Yuancheng (n.d.), who tried to help secure his freedom (2/25).³ The three talked about the tightening inspection of Chinese ships by the soldiers of the daimyō Shimazu Yoshihiro (1535–1619) and how, in the past year, Korean captives who had attempted to leave Japan on a Chinese ship were caught and killed (3/7–8). From a nearby fishing village, No recruited three Korean captives—Ki Hyosun, Chŏng Tongji, and P'ungsŏk—to join him on his journey to China (3/10) and presented a detailed plan of action to the three men.⁴ He reassured them that he knew how to speak Chinese and that, upon arrival in China, he would inform the local Chinese authorities of their backgrounds and of the situation in Japan. The local authorities would then report

² Kang Hang's *Kanyangnok* (看羊錄, Record of a shepherd); Chŏng Hŭidŭk's *Haesangnok* (海上錄, Record from the sea); Chŏng Kyŏngdŭk's *Mansarok* (萬死錄, Records of ten thousand deaths); Chŏng Hoin's *Chŏngyu p'iran'gi* (丁酉避亂記, Records of captivity from the Chŏngyu War). *Kanyangnok* has been translated into English by Haboush and Robinson (Haboush and Robinson 2013).

³ 2/25 refers to the date of entry in the diary (the twenty-fourth day of the second lunar month). The source *Kŭmgye ilgi* does not include page numbers.

⁴ Ki Hyosun was a soldier from Hŭngyang Prefecture, Chŏng Tongji a postal station worker from Miryang City, and P'ungsŏk a private slave from Kyŏnggi Province.

the men's case to the court, and the court would eventually transport them back to Chosŏn. He provided his three fellow captives with money to purchase food and other supplies for the trip (3/13).

In order to avoid capture during ship inspection, No devised a plan for the group to leave the island on a small boat and meet the Chinese ship at sea. Both Chen and Li agreed that the plan was a sound one (3/12) and introduced No to a Chinese merchant-spy and a Censor-in-Chief (*duyushi*) for the Fujian military government, Lin Zhenxi (n.d.) (3/15). No was described by Chen and Li as an erudite civil official of Chosŏn who, having had lost over twenty members of his family during the 1597 invasion by Japan, was determined to report the situation in Japan to the Chinese emperor and return home to prepare for revenge. No impressed Lin with his poem at the meeting, and Lin agreed to take No and the other Koreans on his ship. No was later told by Chen about Lin's mission in Satsuma, which was to collect intelligence information about Japan and exert influence on Shimazu Yoshihiro through his Chinese physician Xu Yihou (n.d.) (3/16).⁵ On the seventeenth day of the third lunar month, No successfully carried out his escape plan and headed to Fujian Province on Lin's ship, which was carrying 248 people, including No's Korean compatriots and three Chinese soldiers who had also been captured by the Japanese (3/17–18).

In addition to the description of these events, No's diary entries in Japan include repeated discussions of his dream encounters with his family and the king (2/25–27, 3/6, 9, 12, 16). No describes seeing his parents, wife, sons, and brothers in dreams and states that he would wake up in tears. In one dream, he received a substantial reward from the king (2/27); in another, No was told by his father that he would safely cross the sea, and he woke up feeling reassured (3/9). Discussions of dreams appear far less frequently in No's diary entries in China (3/24; 4/11, 16, 25; 5/7). Another notable feature in his diary of Japan is the recurring and open discussion of his emotional distress. No recorded that he wept on many days (2/26, 29; 3/1) and was even advised by Chen to refrain from excessive crying (3/10). No also candidly expressed his fears about the possible failure of his escape (3/7) and his great joy when his plan succeeded (3/19). He composed poems to express these feelings as well as his gratitude toward the Chinese officials who provided assistance (2/27; 3/15, 23, 25).

After eleven days at sea, the ship reached Wuyu Naval Base (*shuizhai*) in Xiamen. Upon landing, No was interviewed by a military official who verified his identity (3/28). The following day, No and Lin Zhenxi were invited to the office of Naval Squad Leader (*shuijun bazong*) Sun Jijue (n.d.), who expressed great interest in No's story (3/29). In their conversation, it was revealed that No had been observing a Neo-Confucian mourning ritual for his parents—who he believed to

⁵ The Ming empire and Satsuma Province had extensive trade relations before and throughout the Imjin War. Most of the Chinese merchants in Satsuma were from Fujian Province (Xu 2006). Even before the war, the Chinese government gathered intelligence on Japan through merchant-spies and Chinese settlers. Xu Yihou, a settler and physician, attained great success after becoming a private physician of the Shimazu family. He was an important member in the Chinese intelligence network in Satsuma and reported the death of Toyotomi Hideyoshi to the Ming court (Chen 2011, 242).

have perished in 1597—ever since the beginning of his captivity in Japan. No's insistence on a vegetarian diet that followed the stipulations found in the mourning ritual of Neo-Confucian master Zhu Xi (1130–1200) impressed Sun, who presented No with a special white robe. Their conversation also revealed No's special fortune-telling ability. No's Chinese contacts in Japan—Chen, Li, and Lin—were strongly convinced of No's unusual ability and introduced him as an expert face reader to Fujian officials (3/29). Sun Jijue later requested that No tell his sons' fortunes. When No foretold that two among Sun's many sons would serve their father with Confucian filial piety, the delighted Sun replied that another fortune-teller had told him the same thing (3/30). No was later approached by many local literati who wished to learn about their fate (4/11).

From Xiamen, No travelled with Lin to a navy yamen in Zhangzhou to present his report on Japan and his request for return to Chosŏn (4/4). Leaving Zhangzhou, No and Lin travelled to Quanzhou, where the Fujian military government was located. On the way to Quanzhou, in Andong Prefecture, No visited a shrine dedicated to Zhu Xi and paid his respects (4/6). No told the locals that he was a Neo-Confucian scholar-official from Chosŏn who followed Zhu Xi's family rites. After arriving in Quanzhou, No had an audience with Minister of War (*dasima*) Jin Xueceng (*jinsŏ* 1568) (4/11), and submitted his memorial, "An emotional plea for urgent return" 催歸原情疏 (4/15). In this work, he presents himself as the only survivor from his family who was captured during the Japanese raid on his hometown, and expressed his earnest desire to return home, bury his dead, and prepare for revenge (4/14). No's literary skills and his display of loyalty and filial piety attracted the attention of many Chinese officials, and he was allowed to stay in the attendants' quarter (*zuoyingsi*) at the ministry building. In his subsequent three petitions for return, No further explained his circumstances (4/20), describing himself as a dedicated Neo-Confucian scholar, a volunteer soldier for five years in the war against Japan, and a captive who had escaped with the kind help of Chinese officials (4/22). In the last petition, No reminded the Chinese government of the strong historical ties between China and Korea and the Chosŏn government's generous efforts in the past to aid the safe return of Chinese castaways (4/26).

While in Quanzhou, No had lively interactions with a number of local scholars and officials who visited him. Young scholars came to hear his stories and asked him questions about Korean customs (4/10, 13). They inquired about his white robe, and, upon hearing his explanation, they praised his filial piety and commended Chosŏn as a country that adhered to Confucian norms and ritual propriety (4/16). In his conversations with them, No repeatedly reminded the Chinese of the long history of Confucian civilization in Korea, which started with the arrival of the Chinese sage Kija and developed in the subsequent centuries through close connections with China (4/11, 16, 26; 5/13, 15, 16, 25). With his new Chinese friends, No visited local scenic sites (4/22), participated in the celebration of the Duanwu Festival, and explained to the Chinese the Korean way of celebrating the Tano Festival (5/1–2). In Fujian, No was also introduced to lychees, a fruit not found in Korea, and developed a particular love for them. He reiterated

in the diary how much he enjoyed the taste of freshly picked lychees he purchased from a local market (5/6, 11; 6/5).

No received special attention and care from Xu Jideng (ca. 1600), the Right Provincial Administration Commissioner (*youbuzheng*) and a lecturer at the Two Worthies Shrine and Academy (*Liang xian si shuyuan*). Xu was impressed by No's petitions and presented him with gifts of books and money and invited him to attend lectures at the academy (5/10–12). Later, when No fell ill, Xu hired a doctor to treat him (6/4). No felt greatly honored to learn from Xu, a leading Neo-Confucian scholar of the Cheng-Zhu School and a former lecturer at the famous Ziyang Academy (*Ziyang shuyuan*), also known as Wuyi Academy (*Wuyi shuyuan*), founded by Zhu Xi in 1183. Xu, the author of the *Zhou Li Shuo* (周禮說, Explanation of the *Book of Rites*), was a specialist in Neo-Confucian rituals. No and his fellow Chinese students at the academy therefore engaged in discussions about Neo-Confucian rituals in Chosŏn (5/15).

Despite Chinese generosity, No was troubled by his audience's general lack of understanding of Chosŏn and its history. His Chinese hosts were clearly more interested in strange and exotic stories about Chosŏn, and even expressed skepticism about No's assertion that the people of his country abided by the principles of ritual propriety without exception (3/29; 4/6). They showed No an entry in the *Da Ming Yi Tong Zhi* (大明一統志, Records of the unity of the Great Ming) that described Chosŏn as an un-Confucian state where "people bury their dead in valleys and water or in an urn, where people worship the Buddha and revere shamans, and . . . where men and women hold hands and walk together in broad daylight" (5/13).

No defended his case and argued that from time immemorial Korea had been a land of Confucian learning, as was China. He emphasized the cultural link between Korea and China, arguing that Tan'gun, the founder of Old Chosŏn, came to power at about the same time as the Chinese sage-king Yao, and that the Way of the Sages had been known since King Wu of the Zhou sent Kija to the peninsula and introduced civilization to the Koreans (4/26). No tried to prove the independent and Confucian civilization of Korea, citing historical examples:

Although my country is in the remote eastern frontier, since the time of the Three Dynasties (Xia, Shang, and Zhou), it has excellently transformed itself following the Chinese example. Therefore, it was specially granted to Sage Kija, who instructed the country with the law of Eight Prohibitions. Since then, civilization and culture, rites and music, and laws and regulations flourished. The Qin attached it to Liaodong, the Han established commandaries, but from the time of Jin, each state had its own boundaries and independently promulgated civilization. Hence, managing the court with respect and serving China with sincerity, Korea alone became the leader among vassals and has even been called by the title of "Little China" for a long time. It, therefore, is no different from China. (4/26).⁶

⁶ Original text: 弊邦雖偏在東藩。自三代時。善變於華。故特封箕聖。教之以八政而後。衣冠文物。禮樂法度。燦然斐矣。秦屬遼東。漢封郡縣。至自晉時。各分疆域。自爲聲教。然恭修職分。事大以誠。獨居諸侯之首。僭得小中華之名久矣。而與諸夏無異也。

No carefully emphasized the similarities between Korean and Chinese civilizations based on their common (Neo-)Confucian heritage, and suggested that the Chinese review history more closely in order to come to a correct understanding of Korea (4/11).

Despite his disappointment over their lack of knowledge about his home country, No was grateful for the generous hospitality of his Chinese hosts. He expressed how fortunate he was to experience firsthand the great and benevolent civilization of China, and noted how his stay in China had deepened his appreciation for the great empire (4/22). While he was impressed by the sheer size and wealth of China and the congeniality of the Chinese, No nevertheless criticized certain aspects of Ming society. The Chinese laxity in observing Zhu Xi's family rituals disappointed him. At a local funeral in Fujian, No realized that not all the rites were in accordance with Zhu Xi's instructions. When he questioned a fellow student at the academy, No was told that funeral practices had significant regional differences in China, and that Zhu Xi's family rituals were not strictly followed due to ideological corruption by the Lu-Wang school of thought (6/19–20). No also learned that the Ming requirements for the civil service examination were not as rigorous as Chosŏn's. The Chosŏn examination's demand for comprehensive knowledge of Confucian classics and commentaries surprised the Chinese scholars, who assured No that he would pass the Chinese examination without difficulty (6/26–27).

No was perhaps most taken aback by Ming China's religious tolerance. He criticized the Ming literati's leniency toward other religions, especially Buddhism, which was heresy according to the teachings of orthodox Neo-Confucianism. No disapproved of the open interaction between Neo-Confucians and Buddhist clergy in the Ming dynasty, informing his Chinese company that such behavior would not have been condoned in Chosŏn, where Buddhist institutions were kept under tight surveillance and the monks were barred from civil life. Even when his Chinese audience asserted that interactions with Buddhists would do no harm to Neo-Confucians, No spoke with pride about the Chosŏn state's harsh measures against them (5/4).

Yet, in spite of his words of disapproval toward Buddhism, the diary also reveals that No's view of Buddhism and Daoism was not only antagonistic. He did not, for instance, object to being called a Bodhisattva by his fellow Korean escapees (3/10), and he gladly donned a silk Daoist robe that was given to him as a gift by Hong Ernan (n.d.), a wealthy student at the Two Worthies Shrine and Academy (4/16). More importantly, the diary records No's intimate conversation with a Daoist master at the One Ladle Temple (Yidou-an) on Wushi Mountain (6/10). No was intrigued by this religious man with an eccentric appearance who, while only eating pine needles and drinking dew, displayed great vitality. No compared him to an immortal and politely introduced himself as a scholar from Chosŏn acquainted with Daoist texts and seeking enlightenment. In their conversation, No also demonstrated his knowledge of Chan Buddhism, citing the story of the sixth patriarch, Huineng (638–713). "Only today have I met a True One" (今日始逢眞) wrote No in the poem he dedicated to the master. After their meeting, No

and his Chinese company partook in a meal prepared by the Daoist monks at the True Enlightenment Temple (Zhengjue-an). In gratitude, No composed a poem and presented it to them. The first two lines of the quatrain express No's sincere respect toward a religious experience of enlightenment:

悟道年來萬念空 心如秋水照明月	The year you were enlightened, myriad thoughts turned into emptiness. Your heart like an autumn river reflects the bright moon.
--------------------	--

Indeed, No's diary reveals a Neo-Confucian scholar who also possessed a keen interest in religion and spirituality. His commitment to Neo-Confucianism does not appear to have conflicted with his practice of divination. In addition to performing fortune-telling, No also consulted the *Zhou Yi* (周易, Book of changes) as a text to divine the date of his return to Chosŏn (4/29). Regarding the *Zhou Yi* primarily as a divination text, Zhu Xi combined insights from the book with numerology and built the foundation of his moral universe upon it (Song and Cho 2011, 33). He taught his followers to consult the book "as an instrument for the detection of patterns of change" (Adler 2008, 71) to discern the will of Heaven. Following Zhu's lead, later Neo-Confucians came to engage in a complex analysis of celestial bodies and human physiognomy as valid sources of the revelation of the workings of Heaven. The Ming dynasty was a period in which society's interest in and preoccupation with divination was especially pronounced. As Richard J. Smith's study shows, the Ming rulers had a particular fascination for the art of divination and even institutionalized the practice by establishing a Board of Astronomy (*qintianjian*) to determine auspicious dates for state and other special events (1991, 44). In fact, No's interest in divination and popular religions seemed to have allowed him to connect with the Chinese literati. His diary ends with an entry from the twenty-seventh day of the sixth lunar month in which No describes himself as awaiting a response from Beijing approving his return.

A Memorial in Ten Points

A record from the twenty-fifth day of the twelfth lunar month in 1599 in the *Sŏnjo sillok* lists former Chief Clerk (*pyŏlche*) No In's memorial in ten points. In this work, No presents military and intelligence information he had gathered in Japan and China (*Sŏnjo sillok* 120: 12b). He explains the plan for another invasion by Tokugawa Ieyasu (1544–1616), the Japanese military's advantageous use of walled fortifications, and the vulnerable Japanese navy. He also describes the Fujian government's intelligence work by Chinese castaways in the Satsuma domain of the Shimazu clan. More importantly, No unveils the existence of a duplicitous Chinese envoy who had been working closely with Japanese authorities. Regarding the last point, No writes that he was warned by Fujian military officials not to disclose this confidential information in Beijing.

The story about the duplicitous Chinese envoy may have referred to Shen Weijing (d. 1597) who was sent to Japan in 1593 by Minister of Defense (*bingbu shangshu*) Shi Xing (1538–1597) to negotiate for peace with Konishi Yukinaga (1555–1600), a daimyō fighting in Korea for Hideyoshi. Hoping for a peace deal, Shen

and Konishi conspired to produce and submit false diplomatic documents to each other's sovereign (Haboush 2016, 98–99). In the end, their plot was exposed, and Shen was executed. Shen was also accused of spying for the Japanese. Alternatively, the Fujian officials could have been referring to Shi Shiyong (n.d.), a Ming spy who had been meeting with Shimazu in secret to discuss Satsuma's withdrawal from the war. Shi Shiyong, who had been working closely with the Chosŏn government was later accused of being a double agent (Zheng 2010, 116–17). No had met Shi Shiyong in Fujian, and Emperor Shenzong assigned Shi's son, Shi Rumei (n.d.), to escort No to the border on his journey home (No In 1823, 2: 5b–6a).

No's memorial met considerable backlash from the Chinese officials in Chosŏn. Four days after its submission, Chinese diplomat and Assistant Prefect (*tongpan*) Shen Sixian (n.d.) visited King Sŏnjo at his temporary palace. Shen Sixian told the king that No In was a treacherous person who knew about Ming spy Shi Shiyong's meetings with Shimazu and warned him of the movement among Chinese military generals in Chosŏn to seek peace with Japan (*Sŏnjo sillok* 120: 14b). Approximately one week later, Chinese general Sun Bangxi (n.d.) met with the king to discuss the possibility of making peace with Japan and inquire into the details of No's report (121: 2b). A few days after that meeting, on the seventh day of the first lunar month in 1600, Ming military general Jia Weiyao (n.d.) consulted with the king about the need to verify No's report and prepare for a possible invasion by Japan (121: 4b). These immediate responses demonstrate that No's memorial contained politically sensitive information. In the end, Tokugawa Japan signed a peace treaty with Ming China and Chosŏn Korea, and the invasion that No feared did not take place.

Studying the Diary: History and the Problem of Evidence

No's diary, the *Kŭmgye ilgi*, has been studied by scholars across East Asia from a variety of perspectives. The initial wave of academic investigations into the diary took place in Japan, starting with historian Osa Setsuko's 1967 critical study, which explored the Ming dynasty Fujian military government's espionage operation targeting the Shimazu based on the information found in the diary. Three years later, she published a synopsis and images of the full text of the diary (Osa 1970). The first annotated Japanese translation of the diary was produced by Naitō Shunpo between 1972 and 1974 in three parts. Naitō's expanded annotated translation was published in 1976 as part of his book, *Bunroku Keichō no eki ni okeru hiryonin no kenkyū* (文禄・慶長役における被擄人の研究, A study of captives during the Bunroku and Keichō Wars). In 1992, Wakamatsu Minoru published his annotated translation of the diary in a single volume. On the whole, these scholarly works from Japan provided valuable translations of the diary, complete with detailed annotations.

The first Korean translation of the *Kŭmgye ilgi* was published in 1977 by the National Culture Promotion Society (Minjok munhwa ch'ujinhoe) as part of a multi-volume series *Haehaeng ch'ongjae* (海行摠載, Records of sea voyages), a compilation of travelogues of Koryō and Chosŏn dynasty Koreans who visited Japan. In Korea, No's diary was regarded as an example of an Imjin War memoir and was examined together with other literature of that genre (So Chaeyōng

1985; Kim Misŏn 2010; Yu Ch'aeyŏn 2012). Independent studies of the diary also appeared (Kim Chin'gyu 1997), exploring a range of topics, including No's understanding of East Asia (Kim Misŏn 2012a), and in particular, of Japan (Pang Kichŏl 2013); his identity as a volunteer soldier and his plans for revenge against Japan (No Kiuk 2004); and the narrative features and authorial consciousness reflected in the diary (Kim Misŏn 2012b).

No In's diary was first introduced to Chinese academia through Korean scholar Pak Yŏnghwan's Chinese-language publications on the subject (2012a, 2012b, 2015). Pak's studies have focused on examining No In's poetry and assessing the historical information about late sixteenth-century Fujian that is found in his diary. A growing interest in No In in Chinese scholarship was particularly visible in 2016, with the publication of four studies that investigated No's diary in the context of Imjin War literature (Li 2016; Wang 2016), as well as the cultural exchanges between No and Chinese scholars and officials in Fujian (Du 2016; Shuai 2016).

On the whole, due to the limited and fragmentary biographical information available in the *Kŭmgye ilgi*, studies on the diary to date have relied heavily on later biographies. Moreover, finding additional textual evidence of No's activities in Japan and China proved to be particularly challenging, creating greater dependence on later biographies. However, as will be shown in the sections that follow, the different versions of No's biographies that later came to shape his image in post-Imjin War Chosŏn need to be evaluated critically as products of narrative constructions that reflect the particular social and political conditions of the times of their creation.

Remembering No In in Post-Imjin War Chosŏn

The records pertaining to No In after his return to Chosŏn paint a picture of a man whose career suffered and whose fortunes quickly declined. A memorial presented to King Sŏnjo on the twenty-third day in the sixth lunar month in 1604 by Min Yŏim (1559–1627), Fourth Inspector (*chip'yŏng*) at the Office of Inspector General (*sahŏnbu*), protested the demotion of No In, former Navy Subarea Commander (*sugun manho*) at Yŏdo Garrison. According to Min, No possessed an exemplary career and a great reputation (*Sŏnjo sillok* 188:16b). No's demotion by Left Naval Commander (*chwasusa*) Yi Chŏngp'yo (b. 1562) in the previous year was resented by No's subordinates, who submitted a petition for the restoration of his rank. In this memorial, Min offered his resignation, arguing that if an excellent official like No could be reduced in rank, he no longer felt qualified to serve the court. Min submitted multiple memorials, but the case was suspended for further review.

The unfortunate turn in No's life was lamented by Cho Hŭi-il (1575–1638), who composed a eulogic poem to honor the man who, in his opinion, had become a victim of political strife. The long preface to the poem states:

No Kongsik⁷ faced trouble and was demoted, and now no one knows his name. During the *chŏngyu* year, he was captured and taken to Japan. He escaped, sailed the sea, and landed

⁷ Kongsik 公讖 was No In's style name.

in the Jiangzhe region. In writing, he told the Chinese his name. The locals heard about him from the Provincial Administration Commissioner (*buzheng*). He was given provisions and travelled to Beijing. Passing Wuyi Academy, he discussed with the students books such as the *Xiaoxue* (小學 Elementary learning) and the *Jiali* (家禮 Family rites), and all clearly showed appreciation for his understanding. He then explained to them the history of Korea since Tangun and the great advancement of government, education, and customs there. In great surprise, the Chinese scholars time and again honored him. . . . Ah! When No lived in his own country, unable to integrate, he had to restrain himself. Only when he left his country, was he able to integrate and prove himself. . . . Now that he returned to his country, he attained an office but [his career] ended in failure. He faced many troubles worse than what he had experienced as a captive. I often sympathize with those who could not integrate and had to restrain themselves. I dedicate this poem to expressing his will. (Cho 1681, 1: 48b–49a)⁸

In the preface, Cho draws particular attention to No's interactions with Chinese literati and commends him for acting as an excellent witness to Korea's admirable Confucian civilization. At the same time, Cho describes No as a social and political outcast who, despite his virtues, could not realize his potential in his homeland. In this way, Cho indirectly criticizes Chosŏn society for its inability to embrace a worthy man whose value had been recognized abroad.

One particularly important detail in Cho's preface is the reference to Wuyi Academy. While the diary states that No attended Two Worthies Shrine and Academy in Fujian, Cho's preface suggests that No stayed instead at the famous Wuyi Academy. An account by No's contemporary Hō Kyun (1569–1618) explains that, when the two met in 1601, No himself had told Hō that he had visited it. Hō writes that he was inspired by the stories of No's great adventures and expressed envy for No's exchanges with scholars at Wuyi Academy. Hō was also informed of No's visit to Qufu, Confucius's hometown, where he paid tribute to the great sage (Hō 1982, 15: 5b–6a). Another contemporary, Ryu Sŏngnyong (1542–1607), records what he had heard from An Sunggŏm (1554–1619) about No In: that No, a former captive in Japan, escaped to Fujian, entered Wuyi Academy, and witnessed firsthand the continuing teaching of Zhu Xi's ideas in Ming China despite the popularity of the rival teachings of Lu Jiuyuan (1139–1193) (Ryu 1894, 16: 40a–b).

The change from No's visiting the Two Worthies Shrine and Academy to the Wuyi Academy is a significant one. The later accounts of No that describe his stay at the famed Wuyi Academy, the cradle of Neo-Confucianism, presents it as the height of his life's achievements. While many who have studied No In's diary had assumed that the Two Worthies Shrine and Academy was another name for Wuyi Academy, in his recent study, Pak Yŏnghwan has suggested that the two were in fact different institutions (2015). According to Pak, Two Worthies Shrine and Academy,

⁸ Original text: 魯君公識。困而在下。無所知名。歲丁酉。陷賊庭。脫身而浮于海。泊于江浙。作字道姓名。縣人聞于布政。傳食詣京師。仍過武夷書院。與學徒論辨小學。家禮書。無不詳曉其義意。且瞭瞭說盡吾東方自檀君以來歷代事跡。政教風俗甚博。學者大異之。亟加獎飾焉。 . . . 噫。公識居其鄉則不合而諛。去其鄉則能合而伸。 . . . 今反其鄉土。得一官而顛頓。狼狽又甚矣。反不若以浮見。余復有感於不合而諛者。贈以辭而申其意云。

which venerated Zhu Xi and his father Zhu Song (1097–1143), was located near Wu Mountain, close to the military ministry building in Quanzhou. Wuyi Academy, on the other hand, was situated on the Wuyi Mountain in Nanping. These accounts from No's contemporaries reveal that even during No's lifetime, the narratives of his life and legacy were far from consistent. No passed away in 1622, and it would take over 150 years for his memory to be revived.

The 1788 Biography of No In

The first biographical narrative of No In is found in a petition for his enshrinement written by his sixth-generation descendant No Kye-un, which was submitted to King Chǒngjo (1752–1800) in 1788. The court document from the eighth day of the ninth lunar month in 1788 records that No Kye-un, a scholar from Naju, No In's hometown, presented a memorial requesting the court to reward his ancestor No In for his acts of loyalty (*Ilsongnok* 277: 40a). The petition included in the 1823 anthology presents additional biographical information on No In as well as No Kye-un's reasons for requesting official recognition of his ancestor. The petition starts with a call for justice for No In:

Your servant's sixth-generation ancestor, former Defense Command Magistrate (*pusa*) No In, lived during the reign of King Sǒnjo. In scholarship and literature, loyalty and filial piety, and honor and righteousness, he indeed was not inferior to contemporary meritorious officials. Yet only your servant's ancestor No In did not receive commendation during his lifetime and eventually died without recognition. The spirit of your servant's ancestor therefore must be in distress. (No 1823, 7: 1a–6b)⁹

The rest of the text sets out evidence for No In's academic distinction and meritorious virtues.

According to No Kye-un's account, No In joined the military camp of General Kwǒn Yul (1537–1599) when the Imjin War broke out in 1592. Leading a group of militia, No achieved impressive military accomplishments. In 1592, during a battle in Namwǒn, No was separated from his unit and was surrounded by Japanese forces. After many days of single-handed resistance, No was captured, taken to Japan, and spent over ten days in prison. When he demanded death, the Japanese guard replied that the young and the educated among the captives would be spared. With death thus denied, No defended his honor and integrity by his defiant refusal to submit to the Japanese authority. Believing that his parents had been put to death by the Japanese, No refused to eat meat—following the Neo-Confucian mourning ritual—and wept while eating. No's display of loyalty and integrity impressed the Japanese monk Kian, who had studied in China and was versed in the classics.¹⁰ Kian especially valued No's literary skills, and the two

⁹ Original text: 臣矣身六代祖故府使臣魯認。在宣祖廟朝。經術文學。忠孝節義。實不下於當時勳德諸臣。而獨臣矣身先祖故府使臣認。生而不得蒙褒揚。歿而竟未有彰顯。則臣矣身先祖臣精靈。亦必有煩冤者矣。

¹⁰ Naitō Shunpo has suggested that Kian might be another name of Keitetsu Genso (1537–1611), a monk and advisor to Shimazu Yoshihiro (1976, 354–55).

became close. No Kye-un writes that while No In appeared to be friendly to Kian, he was devising a plan for revenge and gathered enemy intelligence from the monk, including obtaining a book on Japanese customs as well as a map of Japan.

Eventually, with the help of Lin Zhenxi, No escaped to China, where he impressed the Chinese scholars with his display of loyalty and filial piety. The scholar at Two Worthies Shrine and Academy praised No as a “Confucius of the East” 海東夫子 and compared him to historical worthies. When he arrived in Beijing, the Shenzong Emperor issued a memorial that said, “How very precious is No In’s life! In loyalty, he is like Wen Tianxiang, in integrity like Su Wu.”¹¹ The emperor then provided No with a horse and an escort to accompany him to the border. Chinese scholars travelled long distances to bid him farewell, some as far as to the Shanhai Pass, located at the eastern end of the Great Wall. No’s arrival at the Chosŏn court surprised all. King Sŏnjo personally invited No to the court and issued a memorial that said, “From Japan through China, you returned alive, preserving perfect integrity and pure conscience. The emperor recognized it clearly and sent you back on a post-horse.”¹² After his return, No faithfully completed a three-year mourning period for his deceased parents. Opposing the Japanese call for peace, No submitted a plan for revenge, which King Sŏnjo commended. No eventually became a military official and served in Suwŏn and Ongjin. At that time, minister Chŏng Inhong tried to seize No’s post-horse, the one given to him by the Shenzong Emperor, but when No refused to hand it over, a furious Chŏng obstructed his career.

After the detailed biographical summary, No Kye-un lists eulogies dedicated to No In by worthy individuals. In the conclusion, he reminds the king that while Kang Hang,¹³ an official who was captured by the Japanese at the same time as No In, was awarded a prominent position and praised as the Su Wu of the East, his own ancestor was neglected by the state, although he was not inferior to Kang in any virtue. On the whole, No Kye-un presents a well-constructed biographical narrative to portray his ancestor as a commendable yet wronged and forgotten official whose memory deserved redemption.

The post-Imjin War Chosŏn state endeavored to recognize and reward wartime heroes as a way to promote patriotism. In 1601, King Sŏnjo released the first list of heroes, which he expanded in 1604 and 1605. In the decision-making process, the state gave greater honor to those who sacrificed their lives in the war (Kim Kangsik 2012, 8). In this postwar context, the Korean captives who lived through their time in Japan and returned to Chosŏn had to justify their survival and prove their loyalty. The biography presented by No Kye-un provides information about No In’s circumstances of captivity and life in Japan that is absent

¹¹ Original text: 魯認之命。貴得緊。忠如文山。節同蘇武。 Su Wu (140–60 BCE) and Wen Tianxiang (1236–1283) were Chinese cultural heroes commemorated for their unyielding loyalty.

¹² Original text: 自日本至中華而生還。得全素節。皎然本心。天監所燭。乘驛而歸。

¹³ Kang Hang played a seminal role in disseminating Neo-Confucian ideas and texts under the patronage of Akamatsu Hiromichi and taught many Japanese intellectuals, including Fujiwara Seika (1561–1619), a former monk who became a pioneer of Neo-Confucian learning in Japan (Haboush and Robinson 2013; Ha Woo Bong 2015).

in the diary in order to justify his decision to continue living in Japan rather than honorably ending his life. In order to confirm No's worthiness, No Kye-un cites filial piety and loyalty—burying his parents and seeking revenge for the state—as No In's reasons for choosing life over death. No Kye-un describes his ancestor's stay in Japan as an opportunity for showcasing his virtues and gathering intelligence on the enemy. The Japanese are clearly portrayed as enemies, and No In's interactions with Japanese monk Kian are justified on the grounds that Kian was educated in China and appreciated ritual propriety. Nevertheless, No Kye-un negates any possibility of genuine friendship between the two men and portrays Kian as a means by which No collected confidential information.

No In's experiences in China are also seen through a similar lens that turns every hardship into an occasion to display “loyalty, filial piety, integrity, and righteousness” (*ch'ung hyo ch'ol ūi* 忠孝節義), the virtues that were reiterated throughout the entire document. No Kye-un focuses on highlighting the recognition No In received from the Chinese, and, in particular, the comparisons to Chinese cultural heroes such as Confucius, Su Wu, and Wen Tianxiang. As the ultimate proof of No's merit, he quotes the memorials by the Shenzong Emperor and King Sōnjo in which the two rulers testify to No's unblemished dedication to the state and Neo-Confucian principles. However, these memorials cannot be found in the major annals of Ming and Chosōn.¹⁴ Finally, the biographer attributes the downturn in No's career to a corrupt official's greed and pleads for justice for his worthy ancestor.

Unfortunately for No Kye-un, the answer he received from the court was not an affirmative one. The court agreed that No's loyalty was admirable, but as many years had passed since his death, suddenly rewarding him based on a petition from a descendant would not be appropriate (*Ilsōngnok* 277: 40a). Eleven months later, in the second lunar month of 1789, a group of scholars from Chōlla Province, headed by Na Sōkcho (n.d.), submitted a memorial requesting the court to honor No In following the precedence of Kang Hang to promote loyalty and filial piety throughout the country (*Ilsōngnok* 294: 21). The court answered negatively once again, stating that granting a monetary reward long after No's death would not be proper since he received a salary for his official service during his lifetime. Later that year, however, in response to these petitions, the government permitted the establishment of the Kūmgye Shrine to commemorate No In's achievements in his hometown of Naju.

The production of the first biography, its connection to the No family's attempt to obtain official recognition of their ancestor, and the resulting establishment of the shrine, reflect a widespread social and political development at the time—namely, the strengthening of Neo-Confucian ideology and the struggle to re-establish a socio-political order in post-Imjin War Chosōn. Across the region, there were various

¹⁴ I have searched the *Wanli qijuzhu* (萬歷起居注, The *Wanli* record of the emperor's daily activities), *Wanli chao shishi* (萬歷朝史事, The historical records of the *Wanli* reign), *Wanli dichao* (萬歷邸鈔, *Wanli* excerpts from the Capital Gazette), and *Wanli dazheng leibian* (萬歷大政類編, The classified edition of the Ming *Wanli* reign) from Ming and the *Sōnjo sillok* 宣祖實錄 and *Ilsōngnok* 日省錄 from Chosōn and was unable to find any such memorials.

efforts by families and communities to revive the memories of their righteous heroes to bolster their own prestige. By the late 1700s, numerous shrines were set up throughout the peninsula, thanks to vigorous lobbying by the descendants and communities of the former war heroes such as No In, whose memories were revived (Kim Ch'anggyu 2011, 349–52). As in the case of No In, long-forgotten documents were rediscovered and commemorative biographies were written during this process (Haboush 2003; Haboush and Robinson 2013; Pettid 2015).

The 1799 Biography in *Honam Ch'ŏrŭrok*

The second biography of No In, produced eleven years after No Kye-un's petition, appears in the book *Honam ch'ŏrŭrok* (湖南節義錄, The records of the honorable and righteous from Honam), which was published in 1799 by Ko Ch'ŏnghŏn (b. 1735), a seventh-generation descendant of Imjin War militia leader Ko Kyŏngmyŏng (1533–1592). This book includes the biographies of over 1,400 people from the Honam region known for the honor and righteousness they displayed in battle, including during the Imjin War. In the preface, the compiler Ko Ch'ŏnghŏn explained that the book was written to commemorate the great loyalty of the people of Honam and to inspire in its readers a greater devotion to the state in times of national crisis (Kim Tongsu 2011, 38–41). The Honam region, which included the Ch'ŏlla Province of No In's birth, suffered greater human and material losses during the Imjin War than the rest of the country. The war devastated regional elites and undermined their political influence in the central government (Kim Ch'anggyu 2011, 332). As was the case with a number of similar examples of literature published between 1760 and 1799, the publication of the *Honam Ch'ŏrŭrok* was a deliberate attempt by Ko to strengthen Honam's position in late Chosŏn politics, which were riddled with regionalism and factionalism (Kim Tongsu 2011, 42).

No In's biography in the *Honam ch'ŏrŭrok*, though brief, provides valuable information on his pedigree, both familial and academic (No 1823, 7: 12b–14a). It begins with an introduction of No's lineage (the No of Hamp'yŏng) and lists the accomplished members of the family—namely, his fifth-generation ancestor Superintendent (*p'ansŏ*) No Hŭiju (n.d.) and his father Councillor (*ch'amŭi*) No Sajŭng (n.d.). The biography also illuminates No's upbringing; his particular dedication to filial piety as a youth; his study of Neo-Confucianism under Na Hang (n.d.); his passing of the licentiate (*chinsa*) examination; and his work as a chief clerk. In regard to No's activities during the war, Ko's biography explains that he was captured by the Japanese after he fell from his horse when it was shot by enemy arrows. It also describes No's earlier escape attempt and its failure. Ko writes that not long after No's arrival in Japan, he and a few dozen Korean captives boarded a boat at night and sailed down a river, hoping to reach the sea, but were spotted by a Japanese guard. The biography claims that a recaptured No defiantly yelled at the Japanese guard, “Kill me quickly! Kill me quickly! How can I seek life without my king and parents in this shameful land?”¹⁵ The readers are told that the Japanese

¹⁵ Original text: 速殺我速殺我。我何求活於無君親醜域乎。

guard, who could not make No submit to Japanese authority, pulled back his sword. Echoing No Kye-un's biography, Ko focuses on No's interaction with Kian in Satsuma and the Chinese scholars of Wuyi Academy—not the Two Worthies Shrine and Academy—in Fujian. It is stated that the farewell poems that No received from the Wuyi scholars exist as an album, the *Hwangmyöng yuüm* (皇明遺韻, The lingering melodies from imperial Ming). Ko concludes the biography with a list of contemporary publications where the story of No In appears, including the *Haedongji* (海東誌, Records from Korea), *Samgangnok* (三綱錄, Records of the three bonds), *Chibong-jip* (芝峯集, Collected works of Chibong), and *Kyowa kyorok* (僑窩教錄, Instructive records of Kyowa).¹⁶

On the whole, compared with the 1788 biography by No Kye-un, Ko's rendition features greater dramatization as well as a more pronounced emphasis on No's academic distinction. Ko stresses No's connection with Xu Jideng and gives special meaning to Xu's gift to No of Neo-Confucian publications—"the books that communicate the Transmission of the Way by Confucius and Mencius"¹⁷—underlining No's symbolic role in connecting the Chinese and Korean Neo-Confucian worlds. Nevertheless, as has been pointed out by Kim Ch'anggyu (2011, 349), given the fact that the *Honam Chörüirok* was published over 150 years after the actual events it narrates, the information recorded within must be treated with historical discretion. Rather than faithful representations of the heroes, the accounts in the *Honam Chörüirok* are at best late eighteenth-century memories of events recalled with the specific purpose of raising the status of the elites of the Honam region. In this context, the 1799 biography of No In celebrates him as an example of an honorable and righteous member of the Honam elite who was shown to be a worthy descendent of his illustrious ancestors through his courageous demonstrations of loyalty.

The Biography in the 1823 *Kümgye-jip* (The Collected Works of Kümgye)

The surviving writings by No In were first compiled in 1798 by Kim Igye (*chinsa* 1768). According to Kim's preface, he was first introduced to No In's writings at the Kümgye Shrine by No's sixth-generation descendant, No Chaerin (n.d.). Kim hired a scribe to transcribe all available documents; he also made a separate poetry album, the *Hwangmyöng yuüm*, containing the poems No In received from Chinese scholars in Fujian. These early compilations—namely, the *Chuhwannok* (周還錄, A Record of wandering and return, later known as *Kümgye ilgi*) in two volumes and the album *Hwangmyöng yuüm*—were circulated by No In's descendant, No Suguk (n.d.), among his friends and acquaintances, who contributed their eulogies to the anthology. In 1823, the Hamp'yöng No lineage, under the leadership of No Taesin (n.d.), published the first anthology of writings by and about No In, entitled

¹⁶ The *Haedongji* and *Samgangnok* have not survived. The *Chibong-jip* was published in 1634 by Yi Sugwang (1563–1628), but no reference to No In can be found in that book. The *Kyowa kyorok* was written by Söng Söp (1718–1788) but is no longer extant.

¹⁷ Original text: 孔孟道統傳授之書也。Xu Jideng presented the following books to No In: the *Min zhong da wen* (閩中答問, Answers from Fujian), *Ming zong lu* (明宗錄, A record of Ming dynasty schools), and *Xinxing zhice* (心性制策, A document on mind and nature).

Kŭmgye-jip, in two volumes comprising eight chapters in total. The anthology's compilation and publication therefore developed incrementally and involved the input of many individuals over time. The book was printed in Naju, which was No In's hometown as well as an important printing center in late Chosŏn where many Confucian books and family genealogies were produced (An 2012).

As a comprehensive discursive representation of No In, the 1823 anthology is significant on many levels. First, in its organization, the anthology displays the compilers' conscious effort to categorize and arrange different types of texts based on their role in the larger narrative scheme. Beginning with two prefaces by No Suguk's associates, Yi Naksu (b. 1755) and O Hanwŏn (b. 1750), Chapter 1 presents No's surviving poetic works, and Chapter 2 includes the poems and other writings he received from Chinese scholars and officials. Chapter 3 is a biography in fourteen subchapters: five regarding his time in Japan and nine recounting his time in China (with only a few sentences on his life after his return from China). Chapter 4 includes petitions and memorials that No presented to the authorities in China, and Chapter 5 contains eulogies to No composed by Korean literati. Chapter 6 features his report on Japan in eight subchapters,¹⁸ and Chapter 7 includes petitions by later descendants for No's enshrinement, congratulatory remarks, and the biography of No that was included in the *Honam chŏrŭrok*. Finally, Chapter 8 comprises a biography and eulogy of No Hong (1566–1622), another prominent figure in the Hamp'yŏng No lineage who died in battle during the Imjin War, and then concludes with a postscript by No Chongyŏn (n.d.). The anthology focuses on highlighting No In's achievements in China, his recognition by Chinese and Korean elites, and the excellence of the Hamp'yŏng No lineage.

From the point of view of historical study, the poems by the Chinese literati hold special significance as valuable contemporary textual sources. The chapter *Hwangmyŏng yuŏm* lists the farewell poems by nineteen Fujian scholars that were presented to No In in the twelfth lunar month of 1599 before he embarked on his journey to Beijing.¹⁹ Of the nineteen poems, it was possible to find three in the Chinese sources. The collection of writings of Xu Tong (1561–1599), the *Aofengji* (鼇峰集, The collected works of Aofeng), includes two poems recorded in No's *Hwangmyŏng yuŏm*. Xu's preface to the poems states:

Sending off No Kongsik on his return journey to Chosŏn. In the jiawu year of the Wanli reign (1594), when Japan invaded Korea, No raised a militia to serve the king. His whole family perished, and he alone was taken to Japan. When Hideyoshi died, he escaped via a merchant ship and arrived in Fujian. I send him off on his journey back to his native land.

¹⁸ The report is titled "Record of Japanese customs" (*Waesok rok*, 倭俗錄) in the 1823 version and "Jottings on Life in Japan" (*Kŏwae surok*, 居倭隨錄) in the 1956 version. The report is in nine parts—an introduction and eight sections that briefly describe the geography, customs, society, and politics in eight different districts in Japan.

¹⁹ The nineteen Chinese scholars were Wang Jiwen (n.d.), Wang Jigao (n.d.), Sun Changji (n.d.), Sun Changyi (*jinshi* 1610), Zhu Tianqiu (1528–1610), Wang Jiwu (n.d.), Yuan Jingjie (n.d.), Hong Rurang (n.d.), Wu Zhizai (n.d.), Li Rugui (b. 1563), Jin Xueceng (*jinshi* 1568), Xu Tong (1561–1599), Chen Jianfu (1560–1611), Wang Yude (n.d.), Hong Runa (n.d.), Ma Chua (n.d.), Kang Yandeng (n.d.), Zhang Xiuying (n.d.), and Huang Dajin (n.d.).

No, who is good at poetry and calligraphy, is an official of the sixth rank. (Xu 1625, 14: 34a–b)²⁰

However, in the *Kŭmgye-jip*, one of the two poems by Xu is attributed to Minister of War Jin Xueceng.²¹ The *Hwangmyŏng yuŭm* chapter in No In's anthology also contains a poem by Fujian scholar Chen Jianfu (1560–1611). In his own anthology, the *Shuiming louji* (水明樓集, Collected writings from Shuiming Pavilion), however, Chen lists two poems that he presented to No In (Chen 1573–1620, 5: 34a–b). Chen's poems are accompanied by a preface that closely resembles the one by Xu. These comparisons suggest that the *Hwangmyŏng yuŭm* chapter in No In's anthology contained incomplete and inaccurate information. Nevertheless, the three poems found in the Chinese sources verify that No indeed exchanged poetry with the Fujian scholars he claimed to have met.

Another significance of the *Kŭmgye-jip* lies in its extensive biographical chapter on No In. As in earlier biographies, the 1823 biography tells the story of No's heroism. It builds on previous biographical narratives by supplying important additional details, particularly about No's interactions with the Japanese. For instance, the biography records that a few months before No's capture in 1597, when his family was surrounded by Japanese soldiers during a raid on his hometown, No bravely covered his aged parents with his body like a bird protecting its young. It is said that his filial action moved the Japanese to leave them unharmed (No 1823, 3: 2a).

The biographer also provides more information on No's time in Japan. The readers are told that No initially settled at a prisoner-of-war camp on a small island in Iyo Province. There he was frequently visited by a local Japanese monk named Eishuza (n.d.),²² who appreciated No's literary talent and asked for poems and calligraphy. The news of No's abilities soon spread, and local officials paid him to write poems on their fans. With that money No was able to hire a Japanese interpreter to provide him with information about Japan's geography, society, and politics (No In 1823, 3:4).²³ Later, after a failed escape attempt, No was transferred to Satsuma Province and lived under the jurisdiction of the Shimazu. When asked by the Shimazu daimyo to introduce himself, No declared that he was a

²⁰ Original text: 送魯公識還朝鮮。萬曆甲午。倭奴破朝鮮。公識起兵勤王。全家死之。孤身見執至日本。會平倭死得亡命。附商舶至閩。守臣送歸本國。公識能詩善書。仕六品官。

²¹ Xu Tong's poem attributed to Jin Xueceng: 風掃舟師百萬兵。轉憑商舶托殘生。心懷箕子封時國。身陷倭奴破後城。天盡路歸蠻徼遠。月高帆掛鴨江平。累臣九死干戈地。不似當年李少卿。

²² Eishuza was a religious name of Shunei Shūei, a monk at the Tenju Temple (Oka and Iwama 1998, 238).

²³ Writing was the main source of income for Korean literati captives in Japan. Kang Hang, Chŏng Hŭidŭk, and Chŏng Hoch'e all resorted to copying books for a living (Kang 2005, 437; Chŏng 1982, 1:22a; Yi 1973, 148). The literati captives also received support from local Japanese intellectuals with whom they exchanged poems written in literary Chinese. Poetic networking, "using poetry to befriend important people and to seek patronage," was an established cultural practice among sixteenth-century intellectuals of East Asia (Huang 2007, 30). Poetic exchanges in this form, as Murai Shōsuke noted, became "spectacle[s] of harmony" among participants, creating "solidarity beyond political discrimination and conflict" (Murai 2009, 50–51). Poetic exchanges facilitated communication between Korean literati captives and Japanese intellectuals, mediating and cultivating friendship between the two parties, and were often followed by the presentation of gifts to the captives in the form of food and other daily necessities (Cho 2014).

Confucian scholar who, “before age twenty studied the Way of the Duke of Zhou and Confucius and when the Imjin War broke out served as an advisor in General Kwōn’s camp” (No In 1823, 3: 5a).²⁴ It is stated that Shimazu treated No with ritual propriety and provided him with provisions of which No refused to partake.

The biographer also narrates the conversation between No and the Japanese monk Kian in which Kian reveals the news of Toyotomi Hideyoshi’s death and Japan’s plan to invade Chosŏn again. Kian is quoted as giving the following reasons for Japan’s aggression:

For hundreds of years, Japan possessed neither weapons nor military knowledge. Moreover, in the appointment of officials and hiring of the talented, and in laws and regulations and rewards and punishments, Japan was no different from China, and considered itself a paradise. Fifty years ago, the ocean-going vessels of Southern Barbarians (Westerners), full of cannons, arrows, and the like, arrived in Japan. The people of Japan, from that point on, studied them industriously, and all became highly skilled. The habit of conquest naturally developed, and [Japan] became a place of beasts. (No 1823, 3: 5b–6a)²⁵

The quote is highly unlikely to have been Kian’s actual words, because Kian, a monk serving Shimazu’s administration, would not have referred to Japan as a country of “beasts.” Moreover, the quote’s representation of Japan prior to the arrival of Europeans is historically inaccurate and ideologically naïve. In attributing Japan’s aggression to Westerners (most likely the Portuguese, who arrived in Japan in 1543), Kian’s quote places Japan in the Sinocentric and Confucian universe of East Asia and identifies the Europeans as barbarians who threaten and disrupt the region’s peaceful common civilization.

In fact, in reading the biography’s discussion of No’s time in Japan, one notices strong influences from Kang Hang’s *Kanyangnok* (看羊錄, Record of a shepherd). For one, No In’s response to a Japanese monk who brings him food is almost identical to the one Kang gives to his Japanese captor in his memoir.²⁶ For another, the compiler of the *Kūmgye-jip* reproduced Kang’s map of Japan in No’s 1823 anthology as a substitute for the map that had been lost. If No Kye-un’s 1788 petition underscores No’s worthiness by comparison with Kang Hang, the biographer of the 1823 anthology goes even further by plagiarizing components

²⁴ Original text: 余二十前。學周公，孔子之道。壬辰亂。參謀權元帥陣。

²⁵ Original text: 日本數百年來。未有干戈。不知師旅。而百官之改替。科目之取才及法令賞罰。與中國無異。自爲一樂國矣。五十年前。南蠻海舶。滿載炮矢等物。漂到日本。日本之人。從此力學。皆爲妙手。自成戰國之習。而使作禽獸之域。

²⁶ No In’s response in *Kūmgye-jip* was “When the Qin discarded propriety, Lu Zhonglian attempted to drown himself in the Eastern Sea; though King Wu subjugated the tyrant, Bo Yi went to the Western Mountain and starved himself to death. Such ugly rascals are these enemies! Such unforgivable foes!” Original text: 嬴秦棄禮。仲連欲蹈東海。武王伐暴。伯夷遂餓西山。況此賊何等醜奴。何等驕敵也。(No 1823, 3:3a–b). Similarly, Kang Hang states in the *Kanyangnok*, “When the Qin discarded propriety, Lu Zhonglian attempted to drown himself in the Eastern Sea; though King Wu subjugated the tyrant, Bo Yi went to the Western Mountain and starved himself to death. These thieves are the most despicable and ugly of barbarians, unforgivable enemies of my people” (Haboush and Robinson 2013, 4). 嗚呼嬴秦棄禮。仲連尚欲蹈東海。武王伐暴。伯夷猶且餓西山。況此賊百蠻之醜種也。我國臣民不共戴天之讎也。(Kang 1656, 429).

of Kang's memoir. The plagiarized text and the dubious quote by Kian raise the question of just how much of the information about No's time in Japan in the 1823 biography was based on facts.

The biography's coverage of No's escape to and activities in China draws its information from No's diary and is therefore much more thorough than the rest of the work. The biography quotes extensively from the diary but strategically excludes certain information. For example, while No expresses his longing for his family (including his wife and two sons) in the diary, the biography only discusses his longing for his elderly parents, in order to underline his filial piety (No 1823, 3: 6a–10a). Moreover, the biography excludes stories of No's fortune-telling activities in China (Ibid., 3: 10a–13b), his knowledge of Buddhism and Daoism, and his personal and profound conversations with a Daoist monk (Ibid., 3: 39a–44b). All in all, while the diary paints a more honest picture of a man with emotions, struggles, and a variety of abilities and interests, the biography portrays him simply as a heroic figure whose life demonstrated commitment to Confucian orthodoxy and devotion to the state. In the brief section on No's military career after his return, the biography supplements the official recognition of his contribution in the Battle of Tangp'o (1592) before his capture by the Japanese. The biographer notes that No In was mentioned as one of the twenty-eight key military leaders—along with No Hong—in the commemorative scroll painting produced by the state in 1604, “The painting of the victorious battle at Tangp'o” 唐浦勝戰圖 (No 1823, 3: 44b).

The 1823 anthology places No In's extended biography in the genealogical context of the Hamp'yōng No lineage. The “Biographical Sketch” (行狀 *haengjang*) written by Yi Kyowōn (b. 1777) traces the family's lineage from its originator down to No In. The family's progenitor is identified as No Kye (thirteenth century), a remote descendant of Chinese noble Lu Zhonglian (c. 305–245 BCE), who migrated to the Korean peninsula during the reign of Kija and settled in Kanghwa. Yi notes that No Kye's descendants during Silla went to Tang China and served in the Chinese court. He also underscores No's fifteenth-generation ancestor No Mok (twelfth century), governor of Hamp'yōng Province during the Koryō dynasty, from whom the Hamp'yōng No lineage inherited its geographical identity as it branched out from the three other No lineages.²⁷ Stressing the family's historical connection to China, Yi presents No In as an exemplary member of the lineage who lived up to the distinguished legacy of his ancestors:

Ah! His faithful loyalty and great integrity shone brightly like the sun and moon and astounded both China and Korea. Besides the merits of sincere cultivation through the ages, isn't there also the long family tradition of martial accomplishments! Truly, he is

²⁷ The three bases of the other No lineages include Kanghwa, Kwangju, and Miryang. All four No clans traced their origin to Lu Zhonglian. The Kanghwa clan commemorated their ancestors and Imjin War volunteer soldiers No Sinson (n.d.) and his son No Ch'un'gūn (n.d.), while the Miryang clan venerated No Hyōnggwōn (fourteenth century) who contributed to the suppression of the Red Turban bandits during the Koryō dynasty.

an example for posterity and glory for ancestors. (No 1823, 4: 11b)²⁸

The same message is repeated in the postscript by No Chongyŏn that highlights the lineage's connections to China and No In's contribution as a bridge between the Chinese and Korean civilizations (8: 8a–b).

As Robinson's study has shown, however, since the seventeenth century, genealogical narratives that draw upon connections with ancient Chinese worthies or Silla and Koryŏ elites were widely produced by various descent groups of less significant social prestige and political prominence as a means to display and elevate their genealogical distinction (2008). The Hamp'yŏng No clan, which was small and unexceptional, decided to trace their origin to the Chinese worthy Lu Zhonglian, a loyal official of the State of Qi, who protested the brutal reign of Emperor Qin Shi Huang (259–210 BCE). While the Chinese records claim that Lu ended his own life in defiance of Qin rule, the Korean genealogical records of the No clans insist that Lu moved to the Korean peninsula. It appears that the Hamp'yŏng No lineage, which had not yet produced its genealogy in print form, saw No In's anthology as an opportunity to construct a more impressive genealogical history. In this process of narrative construction, No In became a "bridge between historical and legendary past" (90).

The 1828 Abbreviated *Kūngye-jip*

In 1828, five years after the publication of the first anthology, No In's seventh-generation successor No Kye* (n.d.)²⁹ published an abbreviated edition and added a chronology. This new chapter identifies the family's progenitor as No Kye and traces the lineage from the first generation No Mok down to the twenty-fourth generation—with No In in the sixteenth and No Kye* himself in the twenty-third generation (No 1828, 4: 1–3). The publication appears to have been inspired by the compiler's conscious effort to include his immediate forebears in the Hamp'yŏng No genealogy that had recently come into being due to the rediscovery of No In.

No Kye* also makes an important change to the presentation of the *Hwangmyŏng yuŏm*. While the poems by Fujian scholars in the 1832 version were printed using the same style of characters as the rest of the anthology, in the 1828 version, each poem is in a different calligraphic form and is accompanied by the two personal seal stamps of the respective authors.³⁰ The compiler states that the poems were copied from their original handwritten versions. The poems in the 1828 version indeed imitate the calligraphic forms of the original poems and the seal stamps in the album *Hwangmyŏng yuŏm*, which was compiled by Kim Igye in 1798. Yet in transferring the text from the unlined paper of the album to the lined

²⁸ Original text: 噫。先生之貞忠大節。炳乎日月。振於華夷者。此誠列聖朝休養之功。而亦豈非武烈古家之風耶。信乎于孫貽謨。于祖有光也已。

²⁹ * was used to differentiate his name from a previously mentioned individual by the same name. Their names in Chinese characters are different.

³⁰ The poems that do not have the writers' seal stamps have signatures instead.

paper of the printed anthology, the presentation format as well as the alignment of the text had to be altered. Moreover, the poem by Xu Tong, which was attributed to Jin Xueceng in the 1823 anthology, is reattributed to Xu in the abbreviated anthology, while another poem by Xu³¹ is attributed to Xie Zhaoshen (d. 1629), a scholar at the Two Worthies Shrine and Academy. By providing an up-to-date chronology and a carved and printed copy of the original text, No Kye* strove to prove the relevance and historicity of No In's accounts. Yet the discrepancy between the Chinese poem by Xu and the record in the *Hwangmyōng yuim* casts doubts on the authenticity of the supposedly original copies of the poems in the Korean album, especially when it incorrectly provides Xie's name.³²

Impact of the 1823 and 1828 *Kūmgye-jip*

The 1823 anthology and the 1828 abbreviated anthology seem to have attracted a significant readership and kindled interest in No In among the literati. For example, in his encyclopedic collection of writings *Yōn'gyōngjae chōnjip* (研經齋全集, The collected works of Yōn'gyōngjae), the author Sōng Haeūng (1760–1839) devoted three sections to No In's biography based on the 1823 *Kūmgye-jip*'s account (Sōng 1840, 35: 135a–138a; 57: 48a–50a; 12: 27b–31a). However, the rise of No In was neither smooth nor uncomplicated. In 1868, his shrine—which was renamed Kōp'yōngsa in 1814 when the descendants co-enshrined his ninth-generation ancestor No Sin (b. 1336), a Koryō military official who contributed to the defeat of the Red Turban bandits—was demolished following the policy of King Kojong (1852–1919) to abolish private regional academies and shrines. Through the successful implementation of this policy, the king hoped to undermine regional elites and bolster the power of the state.

Later on, however, Kojong's priority shifted to a focus on addressing the problem of the growing foreign imperialist presence in late nineteenth-century Chosŏn. In 1883, in the context of this new political reality, No In was awarded the honorary titles of Minister of War (*pyōngjo p'ansō*) and Chief Minister of State (*chōnggyōng taebu*) (*Sūngjōngwŏn ilgi* 2919: 19a and 36a) as a way to promote patriotism. The stories of No's defiant struggle against Japanese aggression and honorable interactions with Chinese elites resounded strongly in the Chosŏn of the 1880s that was unsettled by mounting pressures from Japan and China. The new official honors bestowed upon No In led to the reprinting of the 1823 anthology with additional images and a tomb stele inscription by Im Hōnhoe (1811–1876) (*Kosan-jip* 12: 27b–31a). The shrine was reinstated in 1934, destroyed in January 1951 during the Korean War, and then quickly rebuilt in December of that year. In 1953, the shrine was expanded, and No Hong was enshrined alongside No In and No Sin.³³

³¹ Original poem: 平壤城空戰血枯。艱危臨賊效捐軀。包胥誓在終存楚。李廣亡歸竟破胡。絕島風波過對馬。隔江煙火辨玄菟。帛書好寄高麗齒。莫道遼陽隻雁無。

³² The *Hwang Myōng yuim* records Xie Zhaoshen's 謝兆申 name as Xie Tiaoshen 謝佻伸. In Korean, both versions of the name are pronounced Sa Chosin.

³³ http://www.doopedia.co.kr/doopedia/master/master.do?_method=view&MAS_IDX=101013000987315. Accessed on March 18, 2017.

The Biography in the 1955 *Kŭmgye-jip*

Following the rebuilding of the Kōp'yōng Shrine, a new and expanded version of the *Kŭmgye-jip* was published by the Hamp'yōng No lineage in 1955 under the leadership of No Minp'yo (1892–1950), this time in two volumes comprised of six chapters. The two new prefaces by Im Hōnhoe and Chōn U (1841–1922) emphasize No's international accomplishments, particularly in China. No's poetic works in Chapter 1 are followed by a long list of worthies offering official recognition and praise in Chapter 2. While the 1823 version classifies the memorials from Emperor Shenzong and King Sōnjo as appendices in Chapter 4 under the titles, “After an emotional plea for urgent return” 催歸原情疏後 and “After returning to Chosōn” 東還本朝後, the 1955 version places them in Chapter 2 under the titles, “The Shenzong Emperor's decree of honor” 神皇褒詔 and “King Sōnjong's declaration” 宣廟下教.

Chapter 3 of the updated anthology includes No's biography, his report on Japan, and maps and illustrations. One important difference between the two editions is that the 1823 version was written in the third-person, whereas the 1955 biography uses a first-person voice without changing the earlier biographical content. In so doing, the 1955 biography creates an impression of veracity, turning the text into an authoritative first-person account as opposed to a third-person narration. Chapter 4 features the *Hwangmyōng yuūm* chapter from No Kye's* 1828 abbreviated anthology, which presented the poems from Chinese scholars in calligraphic forms, as well as other historical documents pertaining to No In's military achievements and eulogies written by Chosōn literati.

Another significant change to the earlier anthology is found in the expanded chronology in Chapter 5, which provides more information on No's academic activities before and after the Imjin War. The chronology records that after four years of study under Na Hang between the ages of ten and fourteen, No In continued his studies under Kim Kwang'un (n.d.), a disciple of the renowned Neo-Confucian scholar Yi I (1536–1584) (No 1955, 5: 2a). Between 1581 and 1582, No had the opportunity to learn Zhu Xi's family rituals from Yi I and corresponded with him in further academic discussions. It is said that No mourned when Yi died in 1583 (5: 2a–b). In 1582, at the age of seventeen, No became a literary licentiate (*chinsa*) and continued his studies (5: 2a). In 1585, he was appointed a Chief Clerk (*pyōlche*), but he resigned the following year to focus on studying and teaching (5: 2b). During those years, No befriended Yi Chōnggu (1564–1635), an official and one of the Four Literary Masters of Chosōn, and corresponded with him about scholarly subjects (5: 2b). In 1587, in his hometown, Kūm Village, No built the Kūmgye Pavilion and made it the center of his teaching activities (5: 2b). The chronology also states that in 1609, in the midst of the political unrest following the rise of Kwanghaegun (1575–1641), No retired from official life, citing illness, and returned to his hometown (5: 10b). There, he rebuilt the Kūmgye Pavilion, taught Zhu Xi's Neo-Confucianism to students, and, in 1612, completed a book on Zhu's family rituals, the *Sarye chipsōl* (四禮集說, Collected sayings on the four rituals) (5: 11a). When the Shenzong Emperor died in 1620, No mourned his loss and built an altar near the pavilion to offer sacrifices to him (5: 11b). These new additions to the chronology emphasize No's academic connections and

accomplishments, transforming the image of his later life from a victim of political discord to a successful scholar. The discussion of his friendships and his faithful dedication to deceased benefactors likewise changes him into a more well-rounded hero who manifested his greatness not only during the war years but also before and after.

Taken as a whole, the 1955 anthology successfully establishes No In as a true ancestral and national hero with both civil and military achievements. Yet in the late Chosŏn society, where civil authority prevailed over military authority, the literati remembered him primarily for his civil merits. The new eulogic poems incorporated into the 1955 anthology offer high praise for his contribution to Chosŏn's Neo-Confucian civilization. The poem by Yun Haengwŏn (b. 1732), "A rhapsody on Korea's Confucius" 海東夫子賦, compares No to Confucius and Mencius and applauds him for transmitting the true teaching of Confucianism from the Wuyi Mountain to Korea (4: 1b–2a). Despite the fact that all versions of the biographies gave the name of the academy in Fujian where No studied at as Two Worthies Shrine and Academy, most eulogies that were composed later memorialize it as Wuyi Academy. Many believed that for a scholar from Chosŏn to be given an opportunity to study at Zhu Xi's legendary academy was a truly remarkable event. Due to the diplomatic policies at the time, which imposed travel restrictions on foreigners in China, the birthplace of Neo-Confucianism remained out of reach of the Chosŏn literati, making Wuyi Mountain and the academy a sacred site that they could only behold in paintings and dreams. No In's entry into the famed academy, and the stories of his impressive performance, gave the Chosŏn literati great pride. The poem by Yi Ikho (1878–1843) in the 1955 anthology praises No for informing China that Chosŏn was a land of sages and gentlemen (4: 3a). In another eulogic poem, O Kyesu (1843–1915) writes in the voice of a scholar at Wuyi Academy who expresses great admiration for a scholar from Chosŏn who had shown the Chinese true loyalty and integrity (4: 1b). Indeed, as the biographical narratives of No In evolved, the real and imagined accounts weave together in an intricate fashion that has become impossible to separate.

Conclusion: Commemorating No In

In her recent book, *The Great East Asian War and the Birth of the Korean Nation*, Jahyun Kim Haboush illuminates how the Imjin War offered a canvas onto which Koreans could "project visions of uncompromised heroism and patriotism," a task that became more vital after the fall of the Ming to the Manchu in 1644 (2016, 17). Under the Manchu Qing dynasty, Korean nationalism and Ming loyalism began to exert significant influence on the political and cultural discourse of late Chosŏn. In an effort to promote both, the state supported the nationalization of memories of the Imjin War. In this process, two types of war memories—namely, "multiple and fragmentary" ones that were "produced and circulated by individuals and groups in different localities" and "unified and systematized" memories that were produced and circulated by the state—came together and transformed "disparate and personal memories into the collective and public memory" (20).

Haboush's observation of the construction of war memories in postwar

Chosŏn aptly describes the series of narrative transformations that led to the construction of the collective and public memory of No In. In the span of two hundred years, No In came to be remembered quite differently than in the years immediately following his death. Despite having been the catalyst for later narrative constructions, the diary of No In did not receive as much attention as the commemorative biographies in post-Imjin War Chosŏn. The diary was not included in the 28-volume Chosŏn dynasty collection, the *Haehaeng ch'ongjae* (海行摠載, Collection of sea voyages), which features travel writings of Korean envoys and captives who experienced Japan from the thirteenth through the eighteenth centuries,³⁴ and it was not reproduced as a separate printed edition. The various subsequent biographical productions of No In as a hero “render[ed] the illusive self as the allusive self,” following an “intriguing spiralling journey between the unique experience of the individual and the general experience of groups” (Erben 1993, 23). Thus, the themes of loyalty and filial piety (common to post-Imjin War memoirs) were accentuated (Park 2014; Choi 2015), the Two Worthies Shrine and Academy was transformed into Wuyi Academy, and a Neo-Confucian scholar versed in Buddhist and Daoist texts was turned into an orthodox Neo-Confucian scholar of the Zhu Xi and Yi I schools. Behind these transformations were the Hamp'yŏng No lineage, the local elites of Honam, and the state which, through negotiations and collaborations, created the interactive and multilayered narrative trajectory of No In, making him a hero that all could take pride in.

In 1963, No In's diary was designated as National Treasure No. 311, and it has since joined the collection of the Jinju National Museum. In 2008, No Kiuk, another member of the Hamp'yŏng No clan, published the first Korean translation of the 1955 edition of *Kŭmgye-jip*. Instead of a faithful translation, No Kiuk freely adds to and deletes from the original text to further magnify the narrative of heroic patriotism (2008). The Kŏp'yŏng Shrine is now an important tourist attraction in Naju where local volunteers provide guided tours to visitors. The portrait of No in the shrine shows a poised and dignified official in the white robe that, according to the picture's label, he had worn in China. Nevertheless, it is important to remember that behind that staid heroic image lies a man who, in his fragmented memory, recalled with great fondness a day trip to a mountain temple and a bowl of freshly picked lychees.

³⁴ The diary was later included in supplemental volumes compiled by the Korean Classics Research Institute between 1974 and 1981.

GLOSSARY

An Sungöm	安崇儉	Kim Kwang'un	金光運
<i>bingbu shangshu</i>	兵部尚書	Ko Chönghön	高廷憲
<i>chaguan</i>	差官	Ko Kyöngmyöng	高敬命
Chen Jianfu	陳薦夫	Kojong	高宗
Chen Pingshan	陳屏山	Konishi Yukinaga	小西行長
<i>chinsa</i>	進士	Köp'yöng Shrine	居平祠
<i>chip'yöng</i>	持平	Kwanghaegun	光海君
Chöng Hoch'è	鄭好體	Kwön Yul	權慄
Chöng Hoin	鄭好仁	Kyönggi	京畿
Chöng Hüidük	鄭希得	Li Rugui	李汝圭
Chöng Inhong	鄭仁弘	Li Yuancheng	李源澄
Chöng Kyöngdük	鄭慶得	Liang xian si shuyuan	兩賢祠書院
Chöng Tongji	鄭東之	Lin Zhenxi	林震鏞
<i>chönggyöng taebu</i>	正卿大夫	Lu Jiuyuan	陸九淵
<i>chwasusa</i>	左水使	Lu Zhonglian	魯仲連
<i>ch'amüi</i>	參議	Ma Xu	馬欵
<i>dasima</i>	大司馬	Min Yöim	閔汝任
<i>duyushi</i>	都御史	Miryang	密陽
Eishuza	永首佐	Nanping	南平
Hong Ernan	洪二難	Na Hang	羅恒
Hong Runa	洪汝訥	Na Sökcho	羅錫祚
Hong Rurang	洪汝讓	No Chaerin	魯再麟
Hö Kyun	許筠	No Chong'yön	魯宗淵
Huang Dajin	黃大晉	No Ch'un'gün	魯春根
Hüngyang	興陽	No Huigyöng	魯希慶
Im Hönhoe	任憲晦	No Hüiju	魯希周
Jia Weiyao	賈維鏞	No Hyönggwön	魯衡權
Jin Xueceng	金學會	No In	魯認
Kang Hang	姜沆	No Kye	魯啓
Kang Yandeng	康彥登	No Kye*	魯銜
Keitetsu Genso	景轍玄蘇	No Kye-un	魯繼運
Ki Hyosun	奇孝淳	No Minp'yo	魯玟杓
Kian	希安	No Mok	魯穆
Kim Igye	金履銜	No Sajüng	魯師曾

No Sin	魯慎	Toyotomi Hideyoshi	豊臣秀吉
No Sinson	魯仲遜	Wang Jigao	王繼皋
No Suguk	魯守國	Wang Jiwen	王繼文
No T'aesin	魯泰臣	Wang Jiwu	王繼武
O Hanwŏn	吳翰源	Wang Yude	王毓德
O Kyesu	吳繼洙	Wen Tianxiang	文天祥
Lu Zhonglian	魯仲連	Wu Zhizai	吳志在
<i>pusa</i>	府使	Wushi Mountain	烏石山
<i>pyŏlche</i>	別提	Wuyi shuyuan	武夷書院
<i>pyŏngjo p'ansŏ</i>	兵曹判書	Wuyu shuizhai	浯嶼水寨
<i>p'ansŏ</i>	判書	Xiamen	廈門
P'ungsŏk	風石	Xie Zhaoshen	謝兆申
qintianjian	欽天監	Xu Jideng	徐即登
Quanzhou	泉州	Xu Tong	徐燿
Ryu Sŏngnyong	柳成龍	Xu Yihou	許義厚
<i>sahŏnbu</i>	司憲府	Yi Chŏnggu	李廷龜
Shen Sixian	沈思賢	Yi Chŏngp'yo	李廷彪
Shen Weijing	沈惟敬	Yi I	李珥
Shenzong	神宗	Yi Ikho	李翊會
Shi Rumei	史汝梅	Yi Kyowŏn	李教源
Shi Shiyong	史世用	Yi Naksu	李洛秀
Shi Xing	石星	<i>Yidou an</i>	一斗庵
<i>shuijun bazong</i>	水軍把總	<i>youbuzheng</i>	右布政
Shunei Shūei	雋英周永	Yōdo	呂島
Sŏng Haeūng	成海應	Yuan Jinglie	袁敬烈
Sŏnjo	宣祖	Yun Haengwŏn	尹行元
Su Wu	蘇武	Zhang Xiuying	張秀英
<i>sugun manho</i>	水軍萬戶	Zhangzhou	漳州
Sun Changji	孫昌基	Zhengjue-an	正覺庵
Sun Changyi	孫昌裔	Zhu Song	朱松
Sun Jijue	孫繼爵	Zhu Tianqiu	朱天球
Tenju Temple	天授庵	Zhu Xi	朱熹
Tokugawa Ieyasu	德川家康	Ziyang shuyuan	紫陽書院
<i>tongpan</i>	通判	<i>zuoyingsi</i>	坐營司

REFERENCES

Data Bases

Doopedia. <http://www.doopedia.co.kr/>.

Primary Sources

- Chen, Jianfu. *Shuiming louji* 水明樓集 [Collected writings from Shuiming Pavilion].
- Chöng, Hüidük. 1982. *Haesangnok* 海上錄 [Records from the sea]. Database of Korean Classics.
- Hö, Kyun. 1982. *Söngso pubugo* 惺所覆瓿藁 [Söngso's humble draft]. Database of Korean Classics.
- Ilsöngnok* 日省錄 [Record of daily reflection]. Database of Korean Classics.
- Im, Hönhoe. Nineteenth century. *Kosan-jip* 鼓山集 [The collected works of Kosan]. Database of Korean Classics.
- Kang, Hang. 1656. *Kanyangnok* 看羊錄 [The record of a shepherd]. Database of Korean Classics.
- No, In. 1823. *Kümgye-jip* 錦溪集 [The collected works of Kümgye]. Database of Korean Classics.
- _____. 1828. *Kümgye-jip* 錦溪集 [The collected works of Kümgye]. Yonsei University Library Collection.
- Ryu, Söngnyong. 1894. *Söae-jip* 西厓集 [The collected works of Söae]. Database of Korean Classics.
- Söng, Haeüng. 1840. *Yön'gyöngjae chönjip* 研經齋全集 [The collected works of Yön'gyöngjae]. Database of Korean Classics.
- Sönjo Sillok* 宣祖實錄 [Veritable records of the reign of King Sönjo]. Database of Korean classics.
- Süngjöngwön Ilgi* 承政院日記 [Daily record of the Royal Secretariat]. Database of Korean classics.

Secondary Sources

- Adler, Joseph A. 2008. "Divination and Sacrifice in Song Neo-Confucianism." In *Teaching Confucianism*, edited by Jeffrey L. Richey, 55-84. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- An, Hyönju. 2012. "Chosön sidae Naju üi inswae munhwa e kwanhan yön'gu" 조선시대 羅州의 인쇄문화에 관한 연구 [A study of print culture in Chosön-dynasty Naju]. *Chöngbo hakhoeji* 43, no. 1: 417-38.
- Chen, Zhigang. 2011. "Ming chao zai Chaoxian zhi yi qianhou de junshi qingbao huodong lunxi" 明朝在朝鮮之役前后的军事情报活动论析 [An analysis of Ming military intelligence activities before the Imjin War]. *Xuexi yu tansuo* 4: 240-48.
- Cho, Hüi-il. 1681. *Chug'üm-jip* 竹陰集 [The collected works of Chug'üm]. Database of Korean Classics.
- Cho, Hyön-u. 2014. "P'oro silgi e nat'anan chöllan üi kiök kwa chagi chöngdanghwa: *Kanyangnok*, *Wölbong Haesangnok*, *Chöngyu P'iran'gi rül chungsim üro*" 포로실기에 나타난 전란의 기억과 자기 정당화: 『간양록』, 『월봉해상록』, 『정유피란기』

- 를 중심으로 [The Representation of the memories of war and self-justification in war captive literature: Focusing on *Record of a shepherd*, *Record from the sea*, and *Records of captivity from the Chōngyu War*]. *Minjok munhwasa yŏn'gu* 54: 185–214.
- Choi, Gwan. 2015. “The Imjin Waeran in Korean and Japanese Literature.” In *The East Asian War, 1592–1598: International Relations, Violence, and Memory*, edited by James B. Lewis, 340–56. London: Routledge.
- Du, Huiyue. 2016. “Yi ‘xiaohua’ guan ‘zhonghua’—Renchen woluan hou Chaoxian zhanfu Lu Ren de Zhongguo zhi xing” 以“小华”观“中华”—壬辰倭乱后朝鲜战俘鲁仁的中国之行 [Seeing the “Middle Kingdom” through “Little China”: Imjin War Korean captive No In’s travel in China]. *Gudai wenming* 10, no. 3: 101–11.
- Erben, Michael. 1993. “The Problem of Other Lives: Social Perspectives on Written Biography.” *Sociology* 27.1: 15–25.
- Ha, Woo Bong. 2015. “War and Cultural Exchange.” In *The East Asian War, 1592–1598: International Relations, Violence, and Memory*, edited by James B. Lewis, 323–39. London: Routledge.
- Haboush, Jahyun Kim. 2003. “Dead Bodies in the Postwar Discourse of Identity in Seventeenth-Century Korea: Subversion and Literary Production in the Private Sector.” *The Journal of Asian Studies* 62, no. 2: 415–42.
- _____. 2016. *The Great East Asian War and the Birth of the Korean Nation*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Haboush, Jahyun Kim and Kenneth R. Robinson. 2013. *A Korean War Captive in Japan, 1597–1600: The Writings of Kang Hang*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Huang, Martin W. 2007. “Male Friendship in Ming China: An Introduction.” In *Male Friendship in Ming China*, edited by Martin W. Huang, 2–33. Leiden: Brill.
- Kim, Chin’gyu. 1997. “Imnan p’oro ilgi yŏn’gu: Kūmgye ilgi rül chungsim ūro” 임란 포로 일기 연구: 「금계일기」를 중심으로 [A study of the records of the prisoners of war during the Imjin War: Focusing on *Kūmgye’s diary*]. *Saeöro munnonjip* 10: 93–122.
- Kim, Ch’anggyu. 2011. “Honam kamsŏng ūrosŏ chŏrui ūi chuch’e wa kiök” 호남 감성으로서 ‘절의’의 주체와 기억 [The identity and memory of honor and righteousness as a matter of Honam provincial sensibility]. *Honam munhwa yŏn’gu* 49: 331–70.
- Kim, Kangsik. 2012. “Chosŏn hugi ūi Imjin Waeran kiök kwa ūimi 조선후기의 임진왜란 기억과 의미 [The memory of the Imjin War in late Chosŏn and its meaning]. *Chiyök kwa yöksa* 31: 5–40.
- Kim, Misŏn. 2010. “Imjin Waeran p’oro ūi Ilbon ch’ehŏm silgi koch’al” 임진왜란 포로의 일본 체험 실기 고찰 [A study on the records of Imjin War captives’ experience in Japan]. *Hanguk kosiga munhwa yŏn’gu* 25 (February): 25–53.
- _____. 2012a. “Imjin Waeran haewoe ch’ehŏm p’oro silgi ūi tong Asia insik” 임진왜란기 해외체험 포로실기의 동아시아 인식 [The understanding of East Asia in the records of overseas experience by Imjin War captives]. *Hanmun hakpo* (December) 27: 71–99.
- _____. 2012b. “Kūmgye Ilgi ūi sŏsul t’üksŏng kwa chakka ūisik” 錦溪日記의 서술 특성과 작자 의식 [The narrative features and author’s consciousness in

- Kūmgye's diary*]. *Toegyehak kwa yugyo munhwa* 51: 259–92.
- Kim, Sun Joo. 2010. “Culture of Remembrance in Late Chosŏn Korea: Bringing an Unknown War Hero Back into History.” *Journal of Social History* 44, no. 2: 563–85.
- Kim, Tongsu. 2011. “*Honam chŏrŭirok* ūi saryo kach'i kŏmt'o 1” 호남철의록의 사료가치 검토 1 [The evaluation of *Honam chŏrŭirok's* value as a historical document 1]. *Yŏksahak yŏn'gu* 44: 31–104.
- Li, Yan. 2016. “Ming Wanli nianjian Chaoxianren Lu Ren de *Jinxi Riji yanjiu*” 明万历年间朝鲜人鲁认的《锦溪日记》研究 [A study of the Korean No In's *Kūmgye diary* during the Wanli years of the Ming]. Master's thesis, Zhejiang Gongshang Daxue.
- Murai, Shōsuke. 2009. “Poetry in Chinese as a Diplomatic Art in Premodern East Asia.” In *Tools of Culture: Japan's Cultural, Intellectual, Medical, and Technological Contacts in East Asia, 1000-1500s*, edited by Andrew E. Goble, et al., 49–70. Ann Arbor: Association for Asian Studies.
- Naitō, Shunpo, tr. 1972. “*Kinkei Nikki* shakudoku (Dai 2 ji Chōsen eki hiryonin no zainich nikki)” 「錦溪日記」釈読 [第2次朝鮮役被虜人の在日日記] [Translation of the *Kūmgye diary*: A second Chosŏn war captive's diary in Japan] 1. *Notre Dame Seishin joshi daigaku kiyō* 7: 174–50.
- _____. 1973. “*Kinkei Nikki* shakudoku (Dai 2 ji Chōsen eki hiryonin no zainich nikki)” 「錦溪日記」釈読 [第2次朝鮮役被虜人の在日日記] [Translation of the *Kūmgye diary*: A second Chosŏn War captive's diary in Japan] 2.” *Notre Dame Seishin joshi daigaku kiyō* 8: 113–58.
- _____. 1974. “*Kinkei Nikki* shakudoku (Dai 2 ji Chōsen eki hiryonin no zainich nikki)” 「錦溪日記」釈読 [第2次朝鮮役被虜人の在日日記] [Translation of the *Kūmgye diary*: A second Chosŏn War captive's diary in Japan] 3.” *Notre Dame Seishin joshi daigaku kiyō* 9: 192–34.
- _____. 1976. *Bunroku Keichō no eki ni okeru hiryonin no kenkyū* 文禄・慶長役における被擄人の研究 [A study of captives during the Bunroku and Keichō Wars]. Tōkyō: Tōkyō daigaku shuppankai.
- No, Kiuk. 2004. “Imnan ūibyŏngjang No In ūi Ilchung p'yŏn'yŏk kwa taewoe pusuch'aek” 임난의병장 노인의 일중편역과 대왜부수책 [The Imjin righteous soldier No In's travel and his plans for revenge against Japan]. *Han'guk inmulsa yŏn'gu* 2: 303–50.
- _____. 2008. *Imjin ūibyŏngjang No In ūi Kūmgye-jip kug'yŏkpon* 임진 의병장 노인의 금계집 국역본 [The Korean translation of the *Collected Works of Kūmgye* by the Imjin righteous soldier No In]. Kwangju: Chōnnam National University Press.
- Oka, Yoshiko, and Iwama, Kaori, eds. 1998. *Kan'ei bunka no nettowāku*: “*Kakumeiki*” no sekai 寛永文化のネットワーク: 「隔莫記」の世界 [The Kan'ei culture's network: The world of the *Kakumeiki*]. Kyōto: Shibunkaku.
- Osa, Setsuko. 1967. “Chōsen-yaku ni okeru Mei Fukken gunmon no Shimazushi kōsaku: *Kinkei Nikki* yori” 朝鮮役における明福建軍門の島津氏工作—「錦溪日記」より [The Ming Fujian military's sabotage of Shimazu according to a Chosŏn captive: From *Kūmgye's diary*]. *Chōsen gaku* 42: 105–12.
- _____. 1970. “*Kinkei Nikki*: (Teiyū-yaku (Keichō no eki) Nippongun hironin Ro Nin (1566–1622) no zainichi nikki no ein to kaisetsu” 錦溪日記 [丁酉役(慶長の役)

- 日本軍被虜魯認 (1566–1622)の在日日記(1599.2–6月分)の影印と解説 [Kümgye's diary: The image and explanation of Chōngyu War (Keichō War) Japanese captive No In's diary of his life in Japan]. *Chōsen gaku* 56: 63–202.
- Pak, Yōnghwan. 2012a. “Lu Ren Jinxi Riji li jizai de Min wenhua: Yi xueshu sixiang, shuyuan wenhua, yi ji keju zhidu wei zhongxin” 魯認《錦溪日記》裏記載的閩文化—以學術思想、書院文化以及科舉制度為中心 [The Min culture recorded in No In's Kümgye's diary: Focusing on academic thought, academy culture, and the civil service examination]. *Chungguk ōmunhak* 61: 207–28.
- _____. 2012b. “Lu Ren Jinxi Riji li de shige yanjiu” 魯認《錦溪日記》里的诗歌研究 [A study of poems in No In's Kümgye's Diary]. *Han'gukhak nonmunjip*: 149–64.
- _____. 2015. “Chaoxianren bi xia de shiliu shiji mo Fujian mianmao: Yi Lu Ren Jinxi Riji luxian kaozheng wei zhongxin” 十六世紀末朝鮮與閩地學術思想比較研究—以魯認《錦溪日記》記錄為中心 [The images of late sixteenth-century Fujian under the brush of a Korean: Verifying No In's itinerary in the Kümgye diary]. *Tong'a inmunhak* 9: 205–34.
- Pang, Kich'ol. 2013. “Han'guk sasang sahak: Kümgye No In üi chōnjaeng ch'ehöm kwa Ilbon insik” 한국사상(韓國思想) 사학(史學): 금계(錦溪) 노인(魯認)의 전쟁체험과 일본인식 [Korean intellectual history: Kümgye No In's war experience and his views on Japan]. *Hanguk sasang kwa munhwa* 70: 239–63.
- Park, Saeyoung. 2014. “Memory, Counternarrative, and the Body Politics in Post-Imjin War Chosŏn Korea.” *Journal of Korean Studies* 19, no. 1: 153–78.
- Pettid, Michael J. 2015. “Fashioning Womanly Confucian Virtue: The Virtuous Woman in Post-War Literary Discourse.” In *The East Asian War, 1592-1598: International Relations, Violence, and Memory*, edited by James B. Lewis, 357–77. London: Routledge.
- Robinson, Kenneth R. 2008. “The Chinese Ancestors in a Korean Descent Group's Genealogies.” *The Journal of Korean Studies* 13, no. 1: 89–114.
- Shuai, Qian. 2016. Yi wei bei furu Wo de Chaoxianren yu Ming dai Fujian guanyuan xueren zhi jiaowang: Yi Lu Ren Jinxi Riji, Jinxiji wei zhongxin” 一位被俘入倭的朝鮮人与明代福建官员学人之交往—以魯認《錦溪日記》、《錦溪集》為中心 [The communication between a former Korean captive in Japan and the Ming dynasty officials and scholars in Fujian: Focusing on No In's Kümgye diary and the *Collected works of Kümgye*]. *Haijiaoshi yanjiu* 1: 80–92.
- Smith, Richard J. 1991. *Fortune-tellers and Philosophers: Divination in Traditional Chinese Society*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- So, Chaeyōng. 1985. “Imnan p'irodül üi haeoe ch'ehöm: Kümgye Ilgi, Kanyangnok, Haesang Illok ül chungsim üro” 임란피로(壬亂被虜)들의 해외체험 - 금계일기, 간양록, 해상일록을 중심으로 [The Imjin war captives' overseas experience: Focusing on Kümgye's diary, *The record of a shepherd*, and *A record of sea crossing*]. *Kyōreō munhakhoe* 10: 235–52.
- Song, Inch'ang, and Cho Kiwōn. 2011. “Chuja üi poksō yōkhak e taehan yōn'gu” 주자의 복서역학에 대한연구 [A study of Zhu Xi's divinational investigation of the *Book of Changes*]. *Tongsō ch'ōrhak yōn'gu* 62: 33–58.
- Xu, Xiaowang. 2006. *Fujian tongshi* 福建通史 [General history of Fujian]. Vol. 4. Fuzhou: Fujian renmin chubanshe.

- Wakamatsu, Minoru. 1992. *Kinkei Nikki: Keichō-yaku ni okeru hiryojin no Chūgoku Keiyū dasshutsu seikan no kiroku* 錦溪日記：慶長役に於ける被擄人の中國經由脱出生還の記録 [*Kūmgye's diary: A record of a Keichō War captive who escaped and returned through China*]. Nagoya: Nitchō kyōkai Aichi-ken rengōkai.
- Wang, Yanan. 2016. “Renchen Woluan shiqi fulu tixian wenxue yanjiu” 壬辰倭乱时期俘虏体验文学研究 [A study of Imjin War captives' literature]. Master's thesis, Nanjing shifan daxue.
- Yi, Ūrho. 1973. “Chōngyu p'iran'gi haeje” 정유피란기 해제 [An explanation of the *Records of Captivity from the Chōngyu War*]. *Honam munhwa yōn'gu* 5: 129–50.
- Yu, Ch'aeyōn. 2012. “Imjin Waeran ki p'iroindül kwa küdül üi kirok: Kang Hang, Chōng Hüdük, No In ül chungsim üro” 임진왜란기 피로인들과 그들의 기록: 강항, 정희득, 노인을 중심으로 [The Imjin War captives and their records: Focusing on Kang Hang, Chōng Hüdük, and No In]. *Inmun kwahak yōn'gu* 33: 291–321.