

Research Trends in Japan on the Japanese Invasion of Korea in 1592(Imjin War)

Nakano Hitoshi*

Foreword

The Japanese invasion of Korea in the late 16th Century is also called the Chosŏn (Joseon) Campaign or the Bunroku Keicho Offensive in Japan or the Imjin (Jp., Jinshin) War. In Japan, studies of the event have been actively conducted since the Edo period. There is a large amount of academic research also in the early modern period. A historic review of the Bunroku Keicho Offensive that I wrote in regard of Japan in the early modern period appeared in the *Report of the Second Round of the Korea-Japan Commission for the Joint Study of History, Subcommittee-2* (2010). Here, I intend to focus on recent research trends in Japan. Therefore, please refer to that previous article for discussions carried on in the period preceding Shōwa. In the main text, I intend to outline the research trends up to the 1970s, which relates to what I am asked to do, and then review the state of research in the 1980s and thereafter. Part of this will overlap with the contents of the previous article. I will deal with the task in units of a decade, and include explanation where necessary.

* Kyushu University Faculty of Social and Cultural Studies

Research Trend up to the 1970s

In the post-World War II period, a new view was adopted concerning the flow of the post-war study of history, inheriting the demonstrative research of the pre-war period. A typical model is Ryoichi Suzuki's *Toyotomi Hideyoshi*, published by Iwanami Shinsho. In his book, Suzuki shrewdly pointed out that the perspective of "attack and resistance" is missing in research works produced in the pre-war period, and then proceeded to elaborate on Japan's invasion of Chosŏn (Korea) in considerable detail. Some of his statements concern the inner workings of the Chosŏn Dynasty and of Ming China's military.

Research on the invasion of Korea was carried out based on the theory of Hideyoshi's Political Power (豊臣政権論) and the theory of Unified Political Power (統一政権論) in the midst of the Taikenchi controversy, which was triggered by Moriaki Araki in 1953, and also on the discourse concerning the structural attributes of the Bakuhan system.

In the 1960s, Naohiro Asao claimed that the structural self-contradiction of the Hideyoshi regime necessitated "the continental invasion." Junnosuke Sasaki said that the whole political process of the Hideyoshi regime was closely involved with the invasion of Korea. By this time, the dispatch of troops to the Korean Peninsula had come to be clearly recognized as an "invasion," and thus the term "the invasion of Korea" came to be used frequently in Japan. The term was also used in history textbooks and widely adopted by scholars and the general public.

Keiji Yamaguchi pointed to the existence of the Hideyoshi regime as a feudal state ruling the whole of Japan as the most conspicuous factor among its structural characteristics. He said that it was essential to impose "limitless military service" on *daimyo* (feudal lords) in order to maintain power; it was also imperative to launch a foreign invasion after the war for the unification of Japan. Yamaguchi tried to find the essence of the organizational principle of the Bakuhan power in the military campaign. In this regard, Seiichiro Miki did not agree with Sasaki's military campaign theory, which tried to find differences between Hideyoshi and To-

kugawa; in his article “Chōsenekini okeru guneki taikeini tsuite” (About the Military Service System in the Invasion of Korea), he proposed that Toyotomi accomplished a unified feudalistic military campaign system by persuading all feudal lords on the occasion of the invasion of Korea.¹

As studies on the early modern history of Japan were focused on the “structure theory of the Bakuhan” (幕藩制構造論) and then the Bakuhan system nation theory, studies on the Bunroku Keicho Offensive focused on a structural analysis that saw the attack as inevitable. However, what was discussed in these studies was the invasion of Korea as an abstract military service system. As it were, priority was placed on the theoretical side, and therefore the studies were not necessarily carried out in the direction intended by Suzuki.

In the 1970s, a research trend emerged that attempted to see the invasion from a perspective of international relationships, and to assess it in an Asian and global context. As in the 1960s, the research of Keiji Yamaguchi, Junnosuke Sasaki, Naohiro Asao, Seiichiro Miki and others was normative. The hard work of other researchers played a considerable role in the process of reaching this point. Among these were Asian history researchers, such as Takashi Hatada, Michiro Ishihara and Hidetaka Nakamura, who had continued working from before the pre-war period, and Takeo Tanaka², who poured efforts into an analysis of the history of the relationship between Korea and Japan out of the history of medieval Japan’s foreign relations, paying special attention to Tsushima.

In 1975, *Oda-Toyotomi seiken* (The Political Regimes of Oda and Toyotomi) (Shogakukan, 1975), by Hisashi Fujiki, was published in the *Nihon no Rekishi* series. The historical article was written with a focus on questions about *ikkōikki* (Japanese warrior monks), unified governing power, unification, and invasion of foreign countries meant for the general public in East Asia in the rapidly changing situation brought about the expansion of their colonies by Western European. It portrayed the status of Japan’s invasion of Korea in a multifaceted way. Naohiro Asao’s *Sakoku* (National Seclusion), one of the series published in the same year, deals with the Genwa period. This exerted considerable influence on en-

suing researchers as an article that assessed early modern Japan in the context of East Asia, and further, discussed the establishment of “the Japan-centered world order.” In 1976, Syunsuke Naito’s *Bunroku Keicho no eki ni okeru hiryonin no kenkyū* (A Study of POWs of the Bunroku Keicho Offensive) (Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1976) was published. In a foreword of the book, the author said, “Diverse studies have been made about the essence and influence of the Bunroku Keicho Offensive, but I think that, aside from the political, diplomatic or military problems caused, the most serious agony that the war inflicted on the peoples of the two countries was the destruction of daily lives.” The book portrayed diverse aspects of the lives of Korean and Japanese POWs. It also introduced a diary written by Keinen, a Buddhist monk attached to the Japanese army. Thus, it opened a new page in research of that type. Rekishigaku Kenkyūkai set the theme of its 1977 convention as “Nation and State.” In its plenary meeting, Manji Kitazima and Kosuke Yazawa presented reports entitled respectively, “Hideyoshi’s Invasion of Korea and Establishment of the Bakuhan System State” and “the Imjin (Jinshin) War and Korea.” Kitazima’s report, which referred to articles by Naito et al, said that through the invasion that put pressure on Koreans, Japan’s feudal lord system reinforced its hierarchy and its system of rule over the Japanese. In his report, Yazawa pointed to a drastic change in the structure and class order of Korean society, and said that the experience of the Imjin (Jinshin) War played a significant role in the formation of the sense of self-reliance in the eighteenth century and thereafter. This kind of research, which started in the late 1970s, was similar to the history of invasion and resistance proposed earlier by Ryoichi Suzuki. It also served as a preparation for moving to the next stage of research, focusing on the military campaign.

During this time, the Japanese Fortress Site Research Association made a survey of Japanese fortresses remaining in southern areas of the Korean peninsula, and the results were released in the report entitled *Wajo* (Japanese Fortresses) I in 1979. As regards Japanese fortresses built on the Korean peninsula, certain results had been accomplished by researchers

such as Sho Oda and Michio Ban in the pre-war period. The status of research carried out in the pre-war period and its accompanying problems are set out in Katsuhiko Fukushima's "Senzen no wajo kenkyuni tsuite" (Concerning Research on Japanese Fortresses in the Pre-war Period),³ which appeared in the inaugural issue of *Wajo no kenkyu* (Japanese Fortress Studies) and published by the Fortress Colloquium. In the post-war period, *Kyōngnam ūi waesōngji* (The Sites of Japanese Fortresses in South Kyōngsang Province), produced by the Korea-Japan Culture Institute of Pusan National University in 1961, was known among researchers. As for materials produced in Japan, the report *Wajo* I became the starting point for the relevant research. The onsite survey was never an easy thing to accomplish. In the period following Japan's defeat in WWII, the archaeological method of approaching the subject of an olden-day war through historic sites or relics was inevitably curtailed. In this context, the report *Wajo* I occupies a significant position in the history of research.

Research Trends in the 1980s and 1990s

In the 1980s, Manji Kitajima published *Chōsen nichinichiki, komanikki – Hideyoshi no Chōsen shinryaku to sono rekishideki kokuhatsu* (Korean Diary, Koryō (Goryeo) Diary – Hideyoshi's Invasion of Korea and Historic Disclosure about It) (Societe, 1982). "Korean Diary" refers to the diary of Monk Keinen, introduced by Naito Syunsuke. "Koryō Diary" refers to records left by Akitane Tajiri concerning the first invasion. As the title indicates, Kitajima intended to review the progress of the war based on documents and other records. The Bunroku Keicho Offensive became an essential element in the formation of the theory of "Toyotomi's Political Power" and the "structural theory of the Bakuhan system" through studies carried out in the 1960s and 1970s. Attempts have been made to assign significance to the attack, but historical reviews of the war itself have not been sufficient. Naohiro Asao's theory of "Toyotomi's Political Power"—included in Iwanami Koza's *Nihon*

rekishi kinsei I (Early Modern Japanese History) (Iwanami Shoten, 1963)—for example, is a highly regarded thesis that exerted significant influence on ensuing research, but it made little comment on the Bunroku Keicho Offensive. The Toyotomi regime theory was established, but omitting the element concerning the Bunroku Keicho Offensive, and as such it is representative of the research carried out at that time. To use the expression of Hisashi Fujiki, the Bunroku Keicho Offensive (the Imjin War) had for a long time been put aside as something ancillary to the Toyotomi regime theory. In the late 1980s, Nohiro Asao's *Tenka toitsu* (Unification of Empire) was published (*Taikei Nihon no rekishi* 8, Shogakukan, 1988). It dealt with the era preceding the 75-year-long *Sakoku* (National Seclusion). It pointed out the existence as an idea that displays of military strength supported the Japan-centered world order, and saw the hard line taken by Hideyoshi toward foreign powers in that context.

It can be said that the research on the history of war by Naito or Kitazima opened a new chapter on the research on the Bunroku Keicho Offensive in the post-war period. Under these circumstances, Moriyama Tsuneo published *Toyotomisi Kyushu kurairichi no kenkyu* (A Study of Toyotomi's Feudal Estate in Kyushu) (Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 1983), about how Kyushu served as the foothold for the invasion of the Asian continent. Hisashi Fujiki, for one, in his work *Toyotomi heiwarei to sengoku shakai* (Toyotomi's Peace Edict and Warring Society) (Daigakku Shuppanbu, 1985), pointed to the multilayered structure of the East Asia diplomacy adopted by the Toyotomi regime and attempted to assess the invasion of Korea based on that. Fujiki thought that Hideyoshi viewed China or "southern barbarians" as trading partners of Japan on an equal status, and regarded Korea, Ryukyu, Taiwan, and the Philippines as its vassal states similar to daimyo in Japan. He said that Hideyoshi carried out diplomacy in a dual and multilayered way. There was a time when the objective of Japan's invasion of the Asian continent was interpreted based on one of two theories, the tally trade revival theory and the territorial expansion theory. The reality does not allow us to select one or other of

the two choices, but we can say that what Fujiki pointed out offers a clue to help us out of a sense of closure.

In 1985, it is noteworthy that the Saga Prefecture Education Committee compiled a collection of maps of the fortress sites associated with the Bunroku Keicho Offensive, made as part of the cultural heritage survey, as well as a report on the sites of Nagoya Castle and its defensive positions. The collection is a result of detailed analysis of Japanese fortresses remaining in the Korean peninsula, and the defensive positions surrounding Nagoya Castle depicted on a folding screen showing maps of that castle, Iki Katumoto Castle, Tsushima Shimizuyama Castle, and a Japanese-type Castle kept by the Kyūshū Cultural Research Facility of Kyūshū University. It is a collection of very useful materials. In 1989, Uegaito Kenichi published a work, *Kukyonaru shuppei Hideyoshi no Bunroku Keicho no eki* (Hideyoshi's Bunroku Keicho Offensive – a Vain Military Campaign) (Fukutake Shoten, 1989), which throws into question the meaning of the military campaign from a wide-ranging East Asian history perspective.

It was an epoch-making event in 1990 that a number of books were published containing the results of significant studies of the Toyotomi regime carried out in the 1980s. These books include Shosaku Takagi's *Nihon kinsei kokka-shi no kenkyū* (A Study of the History of Early Modern States of Japan) (Iwanami Shoten), Hirobumi Yamamoto's *Nihon kinsei kokka-shi no kenkyū* (Establishment of the Bakuhan System and Early Modern State System) (Azekura Shobo), and Manji Kitazima's *Kitazima's Toyotomi seiken no taigai ninshiki to Chōsen shinryaku* (The Toyotomi Regime's View of Foreign Countries and Invasion of Korea) (Azekura Shobo). Takagi's article discussed Sobujirei (an edict prohibiting daimyos from fighting each other) and Mibunoseirei (the Status Control Edict), which was closely associated with Japan's invasion of the Asian continent, and the status of the early modern military state. The articles by Yamamoto and Kitazima concerned the status of the feudal state of Shimazu under the control of the Toyotomi regime.

In the 1990s, the considerable accomplishments of Manji Kitazima and

others received much attention, and empirical research was carried out on the areas of military supply, negotiations, Japanese fortresses, Japanese and Korean POWs, Korean militias, Korean society, and diverse aspects of the war in addition to the military campaign. Now, research on the Bunroku Keicho Attack was no longer something merely ancillary to the Toyotomi regime theory.

Prominent among articles on the military campaign are Manji Kitazima's *Toyotomi Hideyoshi no Chōsen shinryaku* (Hideyoshi's Invasion of Korea) (Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 1995) and Masayuki Nukui's *Toyotomi seiken no kaigai shinryaku to Chōsen shuppei kenkyū* (A Study of the Toyotomi Regime's Foreign Invasion and Chosŏn Campaign) (Aoki Shoten, 1996). It is noteworthy that Nukui's article took the position that it is essential to consider the status of both sides if we are to get a grasp of the entire war, recognizing that preceding research has been heavily dependent on Japanese materials and a lopsided Japanese viewpoint. Nukui had also written *Hideyoshi to tatakatta Chōsen busho* (Korean Military Leaders Who Fought Hideyoshi) (Rocco Shuppan, 1992) and *Hideyoshi ga katenakatta Chōsen busho* (Korean Military Leaders Whom Hideyoshi Could not Defeat) (Dojidaisha, 1992). Both are excellent articles that portray the entire spectrum of the war from diverse perspectives, including those of Korea and Ming China.

As regards the Toyotomi regime's policies concerning the Bunroku Attack, there have been discussions about *Mibunhorei* (the Status Edict) and *Mibruntoseirei* (the Status Control Edict), issued in August of the 19th year of the Tenshō (1591). In his article, Shosaku Takagi said that the edicts were not really for status control, but rather for conscripting troops for the Chosŏn Campaign. In response to this, Shizuo Katumata said in his article "Hitobararei ni tsuite Toyotomi seiken no kokka koso to kanren shite" (About the Expulsion Edict – In conjunction with the Hideyoshi Regime's State Initiative), that *Mibunhorei* was a form of *Hitobararei* (Head Count Edict).⁴ Noriko Kurushima sided with Takagi, expressing doubt about Katumata's view, even suggesting that *Hitobararei* might have not existed.⁵ In an article "'Toiri' to 'Hitobarai'"

rei,” Nakano and others expressed the view that the “Decree on Social Status” was about the duties to be performed in a local society after the designation of the status of samurai (warriors) as equal to the commoners.⁶

Articles concerning military supply include Nakano et al.’s “Chōsen shinryaku senso ni okeru kaijo yuso no tenkai ni tsuite” (On Sea Transportation during the Chōsen Campaign) (Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 1990); *Kinsei kindai-shi ronshu* (A Collection of Treatises about Early Modern History)—compiled by the Institute of National History Research, Kyūshū University; “Chōsen shinryaku senso ni okeru Toyotomi seiken no hyoro hokyu ni tsuite” (On Hideyoshi Regime’s Military Supply during the Chosōn Campaign) *Kyushu Daigaku Kyushu bunkashi kenkyujyo kiyō* 35 (1990); and Kentai Nakano’s “Hideyoshi no Chosen shinryaku ni okeru hyoromai chotatsu ni tsuite” (On Hideyoshi’s Military Food Supplies during the Chosōn Campaign) *Historia* 165 (1999). In 1999, Nakano produced several treatises on military food supplies and political regime theory in a book entitled *Toyotomi seiken no taigai shinryaku to taiko kenchi* (The Toyotomi Regime’s Foreign Invasions and Taikenchi) (Azekura Shobu, 1999).

On the subject of peace negotiations, there are a number of articles. There is Akiko Sashima’s “Jinshinwaran kowa no hatan o megutte” (On the Failure of Peace Negotiation during the Chosōn Campaign) *Nenbo Chōsen Gaku* 4 (1994), which followed her article “Toyotomi seiken no johō dentatsu ni tsuite Bunroku ni-nen shoto no zensen kotai o megutte” (The Toyotomi Regime’s Information Delivery – On the Japanese Troops’ Retreat in 1593), *Kyūshū shigaku* 96, (1989), and “Nichi-Min kowa kosho ni okeru Chōsen tettai mondai sappo seishi no dasshutsu o megutte” (The Issue of Japanese Troops’ Withdrawal Associated with Peace Negotiation between Japan and Ming China – Korean Envoy’s Escape from Japanese Camp), and *Sakoku to kokusai kanke* (National Seclusion and International Relations) (Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 1997), which was compiled by Nakamura Tadashi, and Munja Kim’s “Toyotomi seiken-ki no Nichi-Min wagi kosho to Chōsen” (Peace Negotiations be-

tween Japan and Ming China during the Toyotomi Regime and Korea), *Ochanomisu shigaku* 37 (1993).

As for research on Korean POWs, there are reports made with the support of a science research fund awarded by Kanazawa University, including Yutaka Shiruzono's *Nihon kinsei shoki ni okeru torai Chōsenjin no kenkyu Kaga-han o chushin ni* (A Study of Koreans Visiting Japan in the Early Modern Period – with a focus on Kaga-han) (1991). These are outstanding materials. There are articles about Koreans staying in Kaga-han, including one written by Wakita (Kim) Kisatesu. Articles on the subject include *Jusha kyo ko to Nihon jukyo o Nihon ni tsutaeta Chōsenjin* (Confucian scholar Kang Hang and Japan – A Korean who Introduced Confucianism to Japan) (Akashi Shoten, 1991), which was co-authored by Shin Gisu and Tsuneo Murayama, Tadashi Nakamura's "Jinshin teiyu waran no hiryonin no kiseki Nagasaki kyoju-sha no baai" (The Fate of POWs Taken during the Japanese Invasion in 1592~1598 – Concerning Those Ending up in Nagasaki) *Kankoku siron* 22, (1992), which attempted an analysis based on villagers registered in Hirado, Nagasaki Prefecture, and Komei Takahashi's "I minzoku no jinshin baibai hito no ryutsu" (Human Trafficking – Those Taken from Other Countries) *Ajia no naka no nipponshi III kaijo no michi* (Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1992). Other works include, Hiroshi Nakao's "Jinshin teiyu waran no Chōsenjin hiryo to sono teiju kikoku" (Korean POWs Taken during the Japanese Invasion 1592–1598, Their Settlement in Japan, and Return Home) *Uryū* 19, (1996); Manji Kitazima's "Ri cho no yakimono to Satsuma no yakimono" (Pottery of the Chōsen Dynasty and Satsuma) *Rekishi heiron* 592, (1999); Kin Yoneya's "Kinsei nitchokankei ni okeru senso horyo no sokan" (Return Home of POWs Taken from Korea during the Early Modern Period) *Rekishi heiron* 592, (1999); and Kazuaki Kibe's "Hagihan ni okeru Chōsen hito horyo to bushi shakai" (Korean POWs in Hagi-han and Samurai Society), *Rekishi heiron* 593 (1999).

Perhaps the most significant achievement made in the 1990s was *Wajo no kenkyu* (Research on Japanese Fortresses) compiled and published by the Fortress Colloquium. Its inaugural issue was published in 1997, and

issue No.5 was published in 2002. Articles carried in it have included onsite surveys of sites of Japanese Fortresses and relics, Makoto Atobe's "Kannppaku Hidetsugu no Chōsen shuppei - Osaka jo Tenshukakku shojo siryō no shōkai wo tsusite" (Kanpaku Shuzi's Chōsen Campaign – Through the Introduction of Historic Materials kept by Osaka Castle), and other materials relating to of the theory of Toyotomi's Political Power.⁷ Also concerning Japanese Fortresses, there are reports such as Kesao Ihara's "Uesugi Kagekatsu no Chōsen shuppei to Kuma-gawa wajō" (Kagekatsu Uesugi's Chōsen Campaign and Kumakawa Castle), *Nagano kenritu rekishikan - kenkyū kiyō* 35 (1997). In 1998, The College of Literature, Kobe University, published a report on an onsite survey of the site of Japanese Fortresses in South Kyōngsang Province, Korea.

In the 1980s and thereafter, empirical studies of the military campaign became more active than before, but there were no studies at all about the end of the campaign. In these circumstances, studies by Yi Kyehwang (Yi Gyehwang) had pioneering significance. These were contained in a book entitled *Bunroku Keicho no eki to Higashi Ajia* (The Bunroku Keicho Offensive and East Asia) (Rinsen Shoten, 1997); they shed light on international relationships after the war, and can be said to be an invaluable accomplishment. Another book written by a Korean researcher in Japanese is Ch'oe Kwan (Choe Kwan)'s *Bunroku Keicho no eki - mojini kijamareta sensō* (The Bunroku Keicho Offensive – The War Depicted in Literature) (Kodansha Metier, 1994). As its sub-title indicates, it discussed the status of the military campaign portrayed in plays, literature, and art. The second part "Toyotomi Hideyoshi no Chōsen shinryaku to sono sisō" (Toyotomi Hideyoshi's Invasion of Korea and the Related Philosophy) of Kim Ch'ōlgwang (Kim Cheolgwang)'s *Chū kinnseini okeru Chōsen kan no sōshutsu* (Creation of Views of Korea in the Early Modern Period) (Azekura Shobo, 1999) took an approach to the historical consciousness contained in the Chosōn Campaign from diverse perspectives.

Finally, concerning the relationship between Korea and Ryukyu, *Henntona Chōyū's Ryūkyū no chōkō bōeki* (Ryukyu's Trade Based on Tributary Relationships) (Azekura Shobo, 1998) contains articles about

the military campaign and the peace negotiation process based on Chinese historic materials, such as *Ming shilu* (Veritable Records of the Ming Dynasty). It sets forth an important argument to be considered.

Status of Research in the 2000s onwards

The analysis of the theory of Toyotomi's Political Power by Jiyōji Fujii, Akira Ike, Hirobumi Yamamoto, Shin Hori, Makoto Atobe, and others continued, and points of argument deepened considerably. In the 2000s, Manji Kitazima continued to lead in research on the Chosŏn Campaign (Bunroku Keicho Offensive). His works included *Jinshinwaran to Hideyoshi - Shimazu - Ri Syun Shin* (The Chōsen Campaign and Hideyoshi, Shimazu, and Yi Sunsin) (Azekura Shobo, 2002), *Hideyoshi no Chōsen shinryaku* (Hideyoshi's Invasion of Korea) (Yamakawa Shuppansha, Japanese History Leaflet, 2002), *Katō Kiyomasa - Chōsen shinryaku no jitsujō* (Kato Kiyomasa – The Real Status of the Invasion of Korea) (Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 2007), and *Hideyoshi no Chōsen shinryaku to minshū* (Hideyoshi's Invasion of Korea and General Public) (Iwanami Sinsho, 2012). As for basic historic materials, Yi Sunsin's *Nanjung ilgi* (War Diary) was also published. Kitajima's research attempted a multifaceted analysis through the positive use of materials available in Korea, including *Nanjung ilgi*.

Works that demand attention in terms of general history include *Hideyoshi no yabō to gosan - Bunroku Keicho no eki to Sekigahara kassen* (Hideyoshi's Ambition and Miscalculation – the Bunroku Keicho Offensive and the Battle of Sekigahara) (Buneido, 2000), co-authored by Kazuhiko Kasatani and Keiichi Kuroda. The article attempted to find in detail a motive for the Battle of Sekigahara and the confrontation between military leaders taking part in the Chosŏn Campaign, and to shed light on features of the campaign, including Korean militias and Japanese fortresses. Another example is *Tenka toitu to Chōsen shinryaku* (The Unification of Japan and the Invasion of Korea) (Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 2003),

compiled by Akihira Ike and part of the *Nihon no jindaishi* series. Please refer also to Makoto Atobe's book review in *Onyutakaki Kenkyū* 5. *Chosen gisousho Shouun Taishi to Tokugawa Ieyasu* (Korean Voluntary Monk Troop Leader Songun and Tokugawa Ieyasu), (Akashi Shoten, 2002) compiled by Hiroshi Nakao and Cho Yōngrok, was a co-authored work of a Korean and a Japanese researcher focused on Monk Songun (also called Yujōng), who had become a pioneer of Korean royal diplomacy dispatched regularly to Japan, based on the results of an international symposium held in Kyoto in 2001. Another is *Toyotomi - Tokugawa zidai to Chōsen sensō soshite tsūshin no jidai e* (The Toyotomi/Tokugawa Period and Korea – Toward the Period of Communication Following the War) (Akashi Shoten, 2010) by Masayuki Nukui, an authority on the Korean militias. The book covers the period between the war and the restoration of relations between the two countries.

For research work with historic contents featuring an astute sense of the issues based on diverse historic materials, Shosuke Murai should be pointed out. He wrote “Higashi Ajia to kinsei Nihon” (East Asia and Early Modern Japan) *Nihonshi koza* 5 (2004), which contains a general overview. “Shimazu siryō kara mita Shisen no tataikai” (The Sach'ōn Battle Viewed from Materials Kept by the Shimazu Family) *Rekishigak kenkyū* 736 (2000) is a work drawing attention to the records of the Shimazu Family. Studies distinguished by their positive use of historic materials kept in Korea include “Chōsen siryō kara mita 'wajō” (Japanese Fortresses Viewed from Korean Historic Materials) *Tōyoshi kenkyū* 6612 (2007) and Kato Kiyomasa's “Keicho no eki kaisen senngo no Katō Kiyomasa hōimō” (The Encircling Net Right Before and After the Keicho Invasion) *Kankoku/Chōsen bunka kenkyū* 10 (2007). It is expected that these works will exert considerable influence the way young researchers carry out their work.

A collection of theses *Ni-Chō kōryū to sōkoku no rekishi* (Korea-Japan Exchanges and History of Antipathy) (Azekura Shobo, 2009), which set out the findings of the International Symposium Commemorating the 400th Anniversary of the invasion – The History of the Korea-Japan Rela-

tionship – held in 2007 at the Kyūshū National Museum, carried articles concerning the Chosŏn Campaign, although it was not specifically focused on it. *8-17 Seiki no Higashi Ajia chiiki ni okeru hito-mono-jōhōno kōryū* (Exchanges of People, Goods, and Information in East Asia in the 8th~17th Centuries) written by researchers, including Murai, was not focused on a particular subject, but was a report on the results of a project carried out with the support of a science research fund. It also carried articles on the Chosŏn Campaign and contained some useful historic materials.

As for articles noteworthy in terms of the influence they exerted on subsequent research, *Jinshin sensō* (The Imjin War) (Akashi Shoten) co-compiled in Japanese by Chōng Tuhūi (Jeong Duhui) and Yi Kyōngsun (Yi Gyeongsun) and translated into Japanese by Michihiro Obata and supervised by Kim Munja was one that merits attention. In a way, the work can be said to indicate the current point reached in the research concerning the Bunroku Keicho Invasion. It needs to be pointed out that a desire to achieve an understanding of the war from the perspective of a single country's history lies at the bottom of their work. The book sets out the results of the international symposium intended to review the war from a perspective of “a tripartite war waged in East Asia.” The title of the book, “The Imjin War” followed the opinions of numerous researchers.

As research has expanded internationally, it has become clearer that the war had the aspect of “a multipartite war.” A proposal that the name of the war should be reconsidered, and that efforts should be made to collect more research materials in Korea and China as well as in Japan is a direct consequence of the deepening of the research. In his previously mentioned work, *Toyotomi seiken no kaigai shinryaku to Chōsen gihei kenkyū* (A Study of the Toyotomi Regime's Foreign Invasion and Korean Militias), Masayuki Nukui uses the expression “foreign invasion” in the title in the light of Toyotomi Hideyoshi's overall intention of foreign conquest. Yi Kyehwang's book says that the war was an “international war” waged in East Asia, although it does not propose a definitive name for the cam-

paign. It appears that some researchers have proposed that a name common to Korea, Japan, and China should be used from such a perspective. It will not be easy to reach an agreement on that, as the name of Japan's military campaign will reflect the historic consciousness.

According to Nakano et al, the name of the war should be the Invasion of the Asian Continent (including the Korean Peninsula), as the purpose of the military campaign was ultimately the conquest of Ming China. They attempted to systematize the Toyotomi Regime's strategy by analyzing Hideyoshi's red-sealed letters of enforcement with a fixed point observation.⁸ They also recounted the general history. They also recounted the general history *Bunroku Keicho no eki* (The Bunroku Keicho Invasion).⁹ based on what is stated in the foregoing sentence

Individual research works have dealt with diverse points concerning the Chosŏn Campaign, and they have continued to make developments and to deepen their contents. Noteworthy are Kin Yoneya's numerous infrastructural studies concerning the history of the relationship between Korea and Japan, and the work of Takashi Hisayoshi, who has studied the history of relationship with a focus on weapons and POWs. Results of studies by Hisayoshi are contained in his book *Higashi Ajia no heiki kakumei - jūroku seiki Chūkoku ni watatta Nihon no Teppō* (Arms Revolution in East Asia – Japanese-made Iron Cannons Deployed in China in the 16th Century) (Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 2010). Examples of research carried out from quite a new perspective are Hideharu Ota's *Chōsen no eki to Ni-Chō jōkakushi no kenkyū* (A Study of the Chōsen Campaign and the History of Fortress Walls in Korea and Japan) (Seibunsha, 2005) and *Kindai no koseki kūkan to Ni-Chō kankei* (Historic Sites Dating Back to the Early Modern Period and the Relationship between Korea and Japan) (Seibunsha, 2008). The former is focused on a view of fortress walls in Korea and Japan and exchanges between Korean society and Japanese military factions, and the latter on historic consciousness during the colonial period.

As for materials relating to the Japanese Fortresses that occupy an important position in Ota's research works, there is Jun Shiramine's

Shiramine's *Toyotomi no siro, Tokugawa no siro—sensō-seiji to jōkaku* (Castles of Toyotomi and Tokugawa – War, Politics and Castle Walls) (Azekura Shobo, 2003) and Keiichi Kuroda's *Kankoku no wajō to Jinshinwaran* (Japanese Fortresses in Korea and the Imjin War) (Iwada Shoin, 2004). As regards the journal *Wajo no kenkyu* (A Study of Japanese Fortresses), the No. 6 issue was published in 2010, at some considerable interval of time after the publication of the issue five in 2002. In the meantime, an international symposium entitled Japanese Fortresses in Korea and Osaka Castle was held in 2005 and the Second Japanese Fortress Symposium in 2011. Ongoing research has been conducted, including a project undertaken by the Saga Prefectural Nagoya Castle Museum led by Tetsuro Takase et al. Takase also wrote *Nagoya jōseki - Bunroku Keicho no eki no gunji kyo* (The Site of Nagoya Castle - the Military Foothold of the Bunroku Keicho Offensive) (Doseisha, 2008) as part of *Nihon no iseki* (Historic Sites in Japan) Series No. 26. It contains easy-to-understand details of the main Nagoya Castle and the sites of many daimyo encampments.

Up to the 1990s, there were few research works on the Keicho Offensive (1596-1598), compared to the Bunroku Offensive (1593-1596). Through *Chōsen nichinichiki o yomu Sinshusō ga mita Hideyoshi no Chōsen shinryak* (Chōsen nichinichiki, You Can See Monk Keinen - Hideyoshi's Invasion of Korea) (Hozokan, 2000) was published as a result of research on "Chōsen ni chinichiki" (Diary Written in Korea) kept by Monk Keinen, who as we saw, was attached to the Japanese military during the Keicho Offensive. This contained a portrait of the monk from perspectives of the history of literature, Buddhism and philosophy as well as that of the Chosŏn Campaign. Also, the research on the Keicho Offensive made substantial progress thanks to Tonoaki Tsuno's steadfast efforts. To list major works in their order of publication, they are "Keicho no eki ni okeru gunmetsuke no jitsumei ni tsuite (About Real names of Military Inspection in Keicho Offensive)," *Gunsho* 54 (2001); "Bunroku Keicho no eki ni okeru Mōri Yoshinari no dōkō" (Movements of Yoshinari Mori in the Bunroku Keicho Offensive), *Jinbun kagaku*

kenkyū 9 (2002); “Keicho no eki ni okeru Chōsokabe Motochika no dōkō” (Movement of Chōsokabe Motochika in the Keicho Attack), in *Kan koku no wajō to Jinshinwara* (Iwada Shoten, 2004); “Keicho no eki ni okeru Kuroda Nagamasa no dōkō” (Movements of Kuroda Nagamasa in the Keicho Attack), *Kainan shigaku* 42 (2004); “Chōsen shuppei no jai ban taisei ni kan suru - Shū injō utsushi (About Jaiban System in Chosōn Campaign – A Copy of the General’s Official Document)” *Nihon rekishi* 687 (2005); “Keicho no eki ni okeru Nabeshima shi no dōkō” (Movement of Nabeshima in the Keicho Attack), *Onyutakaki kenkyū* 8 (2006); and “Chōsen shuppei ni okeru Nabesima Naoshige no ichiji kikoku ni tsuite” (On Nabeshima Naoshige’s Temporary Return Home during the Chōsen Campaign) *Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyū* 13 (2006).

Finally, let us deal with the issue of historical consciousness. The book *Shinchō kōki wo yomu* (Reading on Shinchokoki), compiled by Sin Hori as part the of *Rekishi to kote* (History and Classics) Series covers “*Taikōki*” (太閤記) and *Bukō yawa* (武功夜話), in addition to “Shinchokoki”. An article covering a similar subject is Masaki Yanagisawa’s “Shinchō kōki to Shinchōki, Taikōki”. There is another earlier work, Yanagisawa’s “*Taikōki Chosen kanren kiji no kyokō - Hizuke kaihen no yōsō wo megutte,*” *Kinse bunge* 65 (1997) which makes considerable criticisms about historical materials. Concerning literary and arts materials, the following are thought to be works well done include Kim Sidōk (Sideok), “Chōsen seibatsuki,” in *Ikoku seibatu senki no sekai - Kan hantō, Ryukyū rettō, Ezochi* (Kasama Shoin, 2010); and Yasushi Inoue, and Kim Sidōk, *Hideyoshi no taigai sensō - Henyō suru katari to ime-ji* (Kasama Shoin, 2011), for their positive interpretation of military records. Nakano and others are also carrying out positive review of history or analysis of military records from a perspective of the need for distinction between statements of the war and how the social and individual memories or records were made in the ensuing period and the process of formation that has followed it. Such thinking was reflected in the following: “Soko yamagani okeru bunroku keicho no eki no monogarare kata” *Global jidai no Chosen tsushinshi kenkyū*, (Hana sho in, 2010); “Kinsei

kōki ni okeru 'Kara iri' no katarare kata,” *Rekishi Gaku Kenkyū* 882 (2011); and Naonaga Yamazaki, “Ryōkoku Jinshin Jitki' to kanpon 'Seijitsu Chōsen seitō simatsuki,” *Kyūshū Bunkashi Kenkyūsho kiyo* 55 (2012).

Conclusion

As the subject of the discussion is confined to research on the Chosŏn Campaign (the Bunroku Keicho Offensive or the Imjin War) that was carried out in the 1980s or thereafter, there are things that this article could not deal with sufficiently; however, during that period, study of the history of exchanges in East Asia and of the relationship between Korea and Japan in the early modern period, including the time of the Chosŏn Campaign, made considerable progress, thanks to which it was possible to carry out research on Japan's Chosŏn Campaign in earnest. International symposia are actively held continually on Japanese Fortresses and on the Korean royal envoys who were periodically dispatched to Japan. Efforts should be made to come up with further results out of such meetings.

It is time to make new efforts for the systematization of research through supplementation of historic materials, diversification of periods dealt with by the research, and more efforts for empirical research. Some people may think that it is self-opinionated to view the Chosŏn Campaign from an integrated perspective. However, as Hideyoshi was envisioning a diplomacy encompassing even the Philippines or India, we will need to think how we should assess the Imjin War as part of the historic development of East Asia, including Southeast Asia. One more thing that should be remembered: the analysis of the war itself should not be confused with the memory, records, or with the way people see it. It is a significant thing for researchers from different countries to work together to compile collections of basic historic materials.

Concerning the need to acknowledge researchers outside of Japan, I did my best to introduce as more relevant literature as possible. I am aware

there are other materials that should have been included, and I ask for readers' generous understanding about in the matter.

Notes :

- 1 Seiichiro Miki, "Chōsenekini okeru guneki taikeini tsuite" (About the Military Service System in the Invasion of Korea), *Shigagku zatsi* 75, #2 (1966).
- 2 Takeo Tanaka, *Chusei kaigai koshō-shi no kenkyū* (A Study of the Medieval History of Foreign Diplomacy) (Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigakku Shuppanbu, 1959); and _____, *Chusei taigai kankei-shi* (Medieval History of Relations) (Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigakku Shuppanbu, 1975).
- 3 Katsuhiko Fukushima, "Senzen no Wajō kenkyūni tsuite" (Concerning Research on Japanese Fortresses in the Pre-war Period), *Wajō no kenkyū* 1 (1997).
- 4 Shizuo Katumata, "Hitobarairai ni tsuite Toyotomi seiken no kokka koso to kanren shite" (About the Expulsion Edict – In conjunction with the Hideyoshi Regime's State Initiative), *Rekishi to bunka* 17 (1990).
- 5 Noriko Kurushima, "Hitobarairai Noto Katsumata Shizuo-shi no shoron ni yosete" (Hitobarairai Note - About Shizuo Katumata's View), in *Daimyo ryō goku o aruku* (Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 1993).
- 6 Nakao et al, "'Toiri' to 'Hitobarai' rei," *Atarashii Kinseishi* 2 (1996).
- 7 Makoto Atobe's "Kannppaku Hidetsugu no Chōsen shuppei - Osaka jo Tenshukakku shōjō siryō no shōkai wo tsusite" (Kanpaku Shuzi's Chōsen Campaign – Through the Introduction of Historic Materials kept by Osaka Castle) *Wajō no kenkyū* 1 (1997).
- 8 Nakano et al, 秀吉の軍令と大陸侵攻 (Hideyoshi's Military Edicts and the Invasion of the Asian Continent) (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 2006).
- 9 *Sensō no Nihonsi* 16 (The War History of Japan) (Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 2008).

Submission Date: 2013. 7. 11.

Completion Date of Review: 2013. 9. 3.

Accepted: 2013. 9. 4.

〈Abstract〉

Research Trends in Japan on the Japanese Invasion of Korea in 1592(Imjin War)

Nakano Hitoshi

Studies on the Japanese invasion of Korea in the late 16th century (known as “The Japanese Disturbance of Imjin” in Korea and “The Korean Campaign” or “The Bunroku Keicho Attack” in Japan) have been carried out actively since the Edo Period. However, it was not until the 1970s that demonstrative studies had been sufficiently carried out. Most of the studies were carried out in connection with the need for a theoretical supplementation of the history as part of the Theory of Toyotomi Political Power. In the 1980s, historians, including by Manji Kitajima, started demonstrative studies. The demonstrative studies were expanded in the 1990s and included factors such as military supply, negotiations, Japanese fortresses, Japanese POWs, Korean militias/POWs, and matters concerning Korean society, in addition to the military campaign. The studies continued to deepen from diverse perspectives in the 2000s. This focuses on the research about the research that was carried out over the course of a decade, starting in the 1980s and thereafter, after dealing with the period until the 1970s separately.

Keywords: The Korean Campaign, The Bunroku Keicho Attack, The Japanese Disturbance of Imjin, Toyotomi Political Power, Research Trends

〈국문초록〉

일본에 있어서의 「임진왜란」 연구동향과 그 전망

나카노 히토시 (규슈대학 대학원 비교사회문화연구원 교수)

「朝鮮出兵」, 「文祿・慶長の 役」 또는 「壬辰倭乱」에 대한 연구는 에도(江戸) 시대로부터 활발하게 진행되었으며, 근대에 한하여도 극히 방대한 학술·연구사를 보유하고 있다. 그러나 1970년대까지는 반드시 충분한 실증연구가 진행되지 않았다. 豊臣政權論의 일환으로서 이론적인 요청에 대응하는 연구가 중심이었다. 80년대에 들어가면 北島万次氏 등에 의해 실증적인 연구가 개척되어, 90년대에는 관심 또한 다양화되고, 戰役に 대한 추이는 물론 兵站補給, 講和交渉, 「倭城」, 降倭・義兵・被擄와 같은 조선사회에 관한 여러 문제 등, 전쟁이 가지는 여러 측면에 대해 실증적인 연구가 진행되었다. 다양한 시점에 의한 연구의 심화는 2000년대 이후에도 계속되었다. 본론에서는 70년대까지의 연구를 살펴보고, 80년대 이후에 대해서는 대략 10년마다 시간을 구분하여 연구동향을 서술하였다.

주제어: 朝鮮出兵, 文祿・慶長の 役, 임진왜란, 豊臣政權, 연구동향