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Jo Yoong-hee
The Tradition of *Sabaeng* (diplomatic journeys) during the Joseon Dynasty and the Production of *Yeonbaengrokk*

Though the Joseon dynasty (1392-1910) sent diplomatic missions to Japan, its traditional course of diplomacy was centered around China. Therefore, most Korean missions abroad were sent to China. Joseon sent annual missions to the Ming (1368-1644) for the Lunar New Year as well as the birthdays of the Ming emperors and crown princes. There were also missions to the Ming for the winter solstice. After the Qing dynasty (1636-1912) was founded during the late Joseon period, the regular missions to China were consolidated around the mission on winter solstice. Missions to China were also sent if there were unexpected events of great significance, for example, missions to get the approval of the succession to the Korean throne, to report the king’s death, to resolve diplomatic grievances, and to ask for military assistance.

The term *yeonbaengrokk* generally refers to the writings that the Joseon officials who were dispatched to the Qing produced about their experiences during the mission. Because Koreans have a long history of sending missions to China, the tradition of writing about them must also be long. However, most extant records of the missions date from late Goryeo at the earliest. Some of the oldest and the most well-known records in this category are: Yi Seunghyu’s *Binwangrokk* (1273), Jeong Mongju’s *Bunamsi* (1372), Gwon Geun’s *Jeommahaengrokk* (1387) and *Bongsarok* (1389) from late Goryeo (Im 2001).

While men like Gwon Geun used *Bongsarok* as a title, a great number of records dating from late Goryeo and early Joseon periods use terms such as *gwangwang* and *jocheon* for the titles. For example, there are records titled *gwangwangrokk*, *gwangwangjib*, and *jocheonrokk*. While the term *gwangwang* is now used more expansively to describe the observations and experiences of scenery, cultural artifacts and foreign customs outside of one’s place of residence, the term was used in a more restricted sense in late Goryeo and early Joseon to denote records of experiences of the culture(s) of China. There is an example of Jeong Dojeon’s designation of Yi Sungin’s China travel records as *gwangwangrokk* in 1388 (Jeong 1791: gwon 3). In
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early Joseon, Yi Cheom (1345-1405), Seo Geojeong (1420-1488), Seong Hyeon (1439-1504), Kim Heun (1448-?), and Bak Seungim (1517-1586) designated their records of the Ming missions as gwangwangrok. Byeon Gyeryang (1369-1430) also referred to the written records left by those who participated in the missions to China as gwangwangjib (Byeon 1825: gwon 2). Such usage of the term, which means that one experienced the bright and glorious culture of China, reflects the perspective of sadae (serving the great) ideology. That tendency to elevate China through the naming of records from the missions continued into the early seventeenth century. A significant number of records up to this time are named jocheonrok. Literally, jocheonrok refers to a record written after visiting the son of heaven’s land. Until the mid-seventeenth century, when the new Qing dynasty began to rule China, Joseon insisted on voluntary sadae relations with the Ming. As with gwangwangrok, the term jocheonrok symbolizes such diplomatic relations between Joseon Korea and Ming China.

After the second Manchu invasion of Korea (better known as the Byeongja horan in Korea), in terms of the diplomatic relationship between Korea and China, the previous Ming-Joseon relations are clearly replaced by the Qing-Joseon relations. Joseon voluntarily expressed a sense of respect to the Ming dynasty which was established by the Han Chinese. In contrast, however, the Manchu Qing seized Korean subservience through force. Along with the change of Sino-Korean relations, the practice of naming the records from the missions changed. For example, the more neutral term yeonbaengrok replaced jocheonrok as title of the writings from the China missions. While Joseon carried out the protocols of sadae diplomacy to the Qing, the people of Joseon continued to consider the Manchus to be barbarians and did not recognize the Qing dynasty as a bona fide Chinese dynasty. Because the Qing-era Korean missions were not visiting the “legitimate” Chinese dynasty, the term jocheonrok was not used to describe records of their experiences. Instead, the term yeonbaengrok, literally meaning “records of visiting Beijing,” was used to denote their experiences. Although terms such as yeonbaeng ilgi, yeonbaenggi, and yeonbaengga were also used, the term yeonbaengrok is used to describe them all in a collective manner.

The term yeonbaengrok encompasses various content including stories the mission members heard in transit from the Joseon capital Hanyang to the Qing capital Beijing, aspects of culture the members of the mission experienced in the Qing capital, institutions they visited, and
friendships with their Chinese counterparts. Looking at the records of the Korean China missions in the Goryeo and Joseon dynasties, there were those that used both overland and sea routes to get to the Chinese capital as well as others that used only land routes. After the Joseon-Qing relations became official following the second Manchu invasion, most Korean missions to Beijing traveled overland. They typically crossed the Yalu River through Uiju, crossed the Liaodong through Andong, Fenghuangcheng, Liaoayang, and Shenyang, and reached Beijing through Heishan, Jinzhou, Xingcheng, and Shanhaiguan.

A number of different styles of writing can be found in yeonbaengrok. Some of them are recorded as poems (both in classical Chinese and vernacular Korean), some of them are written as diaries, and some of them are written to record important events that the authors experienced. Yeonbaengrok are usually written in classical Chinese prose. The tradition of yeonbaengrok was born out of the specific qualities of Joseon’s diplomacy with Qing China. With the growing diversification of Korean diplomacy with the arrivals of Japanese and Western powers in late nineteenth century, the tradition of yeonbaengrok ended in 1894 with the cessation of Korean mission dispatching to China in the sadae tradition.

**Representative Yeonbaengrok: Works of Kim Changeob, Hong Daeyong, Bak Jiwon, and Yi Giji**

The records of Korean China missions as compiled by Im Gijung (2001), Im Gijung and Bu Majin (2001), Daedong Institute for Korean Studies (1960; 2008) total approximately 380 documents. Among them, approximately 280 were yeonbaengrok written by the Korean missions to the Qing capital after the second Manchu invasion. Out of approximately 250 years of yeonbaengrok history, from the second Manchu invasion to 1894, the eighteenth century is without question the heyday of yeonbaengrok. The eighteenth century not only stands out numerically—some of the most representative or classical works of yeonbaengrok were written in this century.

Already by the nineteenth century, yeonbaengrok author Kim Gyeongseon (1788-1853) refers to the outstanding works from the eighteenth century as the “classics” of yeonbaengrok. Their literary value is also supported by the today’s academic research. Kim Gyeongseon, after visiting Beijing in
the early nineteenth century (1832-1833), wrote *Yeonwon jikji*. It describes important details of Qing China as well as the international situations involving Western powers. In his introduction, Kim points to three important *yeonbaengrok* works that exhibited exceptional literary talent.

Most people who visited Beijing left travelogues. These three are most famous: Kim Changeob, Hong Daeyong, and Bak Jiwon. Speaking of writing history, Kim Changeob wrote in a chronological order and discussed events plainly yet logically. Hong Daeyong's writing is descriptive. He wrote both elegantly and accurately. Bak Jiwon wrote biographically and included a broad range of materials through a colorful style of writing. All three of them exhibited their talents to the fullest extent—what else could their successors add on to what they've accomplished? (Kim 1833, *Yeonwonjikji seo*)

Kim Gyeongseon selected Kim Changeob's *Nogajae yeonbaeng ilgi*, Hong Daeyong's *Yeongi*, and Bak Jiwon's *Yeolba ilgi* as the best and most representative works of the hundreds of *yeonbaengrok* writings that had accumulated up to his time. The three works were considered by Kim Gyeongseon to be not only the best and most representative of the eighteenth-century *yeonbaengrok*, but of the *yeonbaengrok* literature as a whole. Kim's selection also suggests that a number of other Korean officials who participated in the China missions also recognized their preeminence and read them. Contemporary researchers also recognized their symbolic importance. The three works were included in the initial compilation of *yeonbaengrok* writings from the 1960s (Daedong Institute for Korean Studies 1960) and were prioritized in processes of translation into vernacular Korean (Institute for the Translation of Korean Classics 1976). Scholarly discussions of the literary value of *yeonbaengrok* have also centered around the three abovementioned works.

I first want to discuss the significance of the three works Kim Gyeongseon emphasized. Then I want to discuss the importance of the recently-introduced work of Yi Giji, *Ilam yeongi*, in order to arrive at a fuller understanding of the tradition and pedigree of eighteenth-century *yeonbaengrok*.

In 1712, after accompanying Kim Changjib, his brother and the head of the China mission, Kim Changeob wrote his *Nogajae yeonbaeng ilgi*. This mission was dispatched as an expression of Korean gratitude to the Qing over matters such as the delineation of the national border between the two countries in the Baekdu mountains, and the reduction of the
items of tribute to be presented to the Qing court as well as the number of missions themselves. As Kim Gyeongseon noted above, *Nogajae yeonhaeng ilgi* was organized chronologically; Kim Changeob indeed wrote about his experience chronologically and in great detail. His work starts with eleven sections (excluding the journal-like entries that make up the main portion) that include the list of persons participating in the mission, rituals to be carried out in relation to the mission, and the officially prepared gifts to the Qing court. The last two sections, *sancheon pungsok chongrok* and *wanglae chongrok* summarize the Qing landscape and culture, specific qualities of the Qing institutions, memorable places visited during travel, books and other things purchased during the trip, and the list of personal gifts that the author took with him on the mission. Such records reflect Kim Changeob's personal perspective on the China mission.

Kim Sangheon (1570-1652), the grandfather of Kim Changeob, was once taken as a hostage by the Qing and held for six years in Shenyang for arguing against amity with the Qing. Although some seventy years had passed since that time, and the mission itself was sent due to a significant improvement in Joseon-Qing relations, Kim Changeob's *yeonhaengrok* sometimes characterize the Qing as essentially barbaric. They therefore needed to be overcome in the future. Such expressions perhaps have to do with anti-Qing sentiments and the experience of his grandfather in the Qing hands. However, Kim Changeob sometimes also evaluates the talents and knowledge of Qing officials he met with in an objective light. This attitude must have somewhat contributed to the rise of the so-called *Bukhakron* (Northern learning discourse) after the mid-eighteenth century, which replaced *Bukbeolron* (Northern invasion discourse) and emphasized the need to learn from the Qing culture and institutions (Kim Taejun 2003:105).

*Yeonggi* is a record of Hong Daeyong's experience participating in the 1765 China mission headed by his uncle Hong Eok, who was the official recorder of the mission. Hong recorded what he saw and heard from November 1765 to the spring of 1766, and categorized them into different sections according to content. As Hong typically recorded whatever he found interesting, Kim Gyeongseon calls his style of writing "descriptive." Hong wrote of his experiences under seventy-six headings including *Opaeng mundab* (a question-and-answer session with Mr. O [Wu in Chinese] and Mr. Paeng [Peng in Chinese]), *Yupo mundab* (a question-and-answer session with Mr. Yu [Liu in Chinese] and Mr. Po [Bao in Chinese]),
Gyeongseong giryak (A brief description of Beijing), Fenghuangshan, Wulongting, Eumsik (food), and Akgi (instrument). His records are clearly and well-written, allowing the reader to see his experiences in full. Hong also included the written records of conversations with Han Chinese scholars he met such as Yan Cheng, Pan Tingjun, and Lu Fei. Such records reveal an intensification of the interaction with Han Chinese scholars following Kim Changeob’s mission.

Yeolha ilgi is an extensive record written by Bak Jiwon based on his experience going to the Qing, along with his third cousin Bak Myeongwon, on the occasion of the Qianlong emperor’s seventieth birthday. It contains stories from Beijing as well as Jehol, which was the summer palace of the Qing emperor. Under twenty-seven different headings based on the names of the places such as Dogangrok (The record from Abrokgang, or the Yalu river, to Liaoyang), Seongggyeong jabji (Records on the Chengjing region), Makbuk haengjeongrok (The record from Beijing to Jehol), Piseorok (Records of the Bishu shanzhuang), and Hwangdo giryak (A brief record of the Beijing area), Hong wrote, with an outstanding writing skill, of his experiences of the Qing culture and institutions, their customs, and his interactions with Qing elites. Bak Jiwon uses substantial chronological and descriptive writing styles (Kim Taejun 2003:97). However, as Kim Gyeongseon notes, Bak Jiwon differs from Kim Changeob and Hong Daeyong in his use of biographical writing style. While his individuality and dynamic style of writing gained positive appraisals from others, certain conservative scholars including King Jeongjo also criticized Bak’s work as being unorthodox in terms of writing.

As Kim Gyeongseon mentions, there is a clear scholarly consensus that works of Kim Changeob, Hong Daeyong and Bak Jiwon are the best yeonbaengrok works of the eighteenth century. While other pieces also have been discussed, Ilam yeongi of Yi Giji (1690-1722) should also be included among the best and most representative works of the eighteenth century. Hoping that Yi Giji’s Ilam yeongi will attract the further research it deserves due to its complexity, I want to make a mention of it here. Yi Giji wrote Ilam yeongi after following the China mission led by his father Yi Imyeong (1658-1722). The mission was organized in order to report the death of King Sukjong to the Qing. Upon returning, due to a factional dispute at the court, he was killed at a young age (in his early thirties) along with his father, who was a leading figure of the Noron faction. Ilam
yeongi has just been recently introduced and researched (Jo Seonyeong 2003; Shin 2005; Jo Yoong-hee 2006; Kim 2008), and was included in Yeonbaengrokseonjib boyu (2008).

Yi Giji stayed in Beijing for about two months, from September 1720 to November 1720. He must have acquired knowledge of Beijing, including which people to see, through the writings of his predecessors such as Kim Changeob. Like Kim Changeob’s Nogajae yeonbaeng ilgi, Yi Giji’s piece is, as Kim Gyeongseon notes, also written chronologically. While the existence of exceptional prior work such as that of Kim Changeob made the production of Yi Giji’s work possible, Yi Giji’s curiosity and thorough observations of Beijing are noteworthy. While his yeonbaengrok also includes his experiences during his trip to and from Beijing, his experience in Beijing is most noteworthy.

Yi Giji, who was relatively young at the time, extensively explored Beijing, meeting new people and stopping by foreign-related sites such as the Catholic sanctuary thereby experiencing Western culture and institutions. Yi Giji opened the door for his father Yi Imyeong, the head of the mission, to make contact with Western missionaries (Yi 1759: gwon 19). Yi Giji wrote extensively of what he encountered, including the Catholic creed, Western painting, the Western calendar, the alarm bell, and a telescope.

There also are important mentions of Yi Giji by Hong Daeyong and Bak Jiwon. From such records, Yi Giji’s experience must have influenced future writers of yeonbaengrok.

My friend Hong Daeyong spoke of the technical skills of Westerners:

‘Of our predecessors from my country, men such as Kim Gajae (Kim Changeob) and Yi Ilam (Yi Giji) were all exceptional in intelligence. What they have observed in China cannot be replicated by their future successors. However, their descriptions of the Catholic sanctuary are a bit disappointing…. Gajae (Kim Changeob) wrote thoroughly of the building and painting. Ilam (Yi Giji) wrote of the painting and astronomical instruments with even greater detail. However, they did not speak of the pipe organ.’ (Bak 1901: Dongran seopil)

The quote is a written record of a conversation between representative late eighteenth-century yeonbaengrok writers Hong Daeyong and Bak Jiwon on early eighteenth-century works authored by Kim Changeob and Yi Giji about the Catholic Church. More specifically, it concerns Kim Changeob and Yi Giji’s unfortunate failure to discuss the pipe organ due to their lack
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of knowledge of it. In the case of Yi Giji, however, Hong and Bak give high praise to Yi Giji’s thorough description and observation of paintings in the Catholic sanctuary and its astronomical instruments. Hong Daeyong, after reading Yi Giji’s yeonhaengrok, stopped by the famous “tiger rock” in Yongpingfu. Bak Jiwon confirms the story of the unknown nation of Heizhenguo by mentioning it to Qing elites with whom he conversed. Such examples show the influence of Yi Giji’s Ilam yeongi.

Overview of Yeonhaengrok Research and Tasks for the Future

Compilation of Data and Translation into Modern Korean

Due to the widespread recognition of the value of yeonhaengrok writings, an effort to compile them began early in the 1960s. First, Sungkyunkwan University’s Daedong Institute of Korean Studies published Yeonhaengrok seonjib in 1960. An updated edition was published in the 2000s. Im Gijung edited Yeonhaengrok jeonjib (2001) and Im Gijung and Bu Majin edited Yeonhaengrok jeonjib: ilbon sojangpyeon (2001). Daedong Institute of Korean Studies added heretofore uncompiled works and published Yeonhaengrok seonjib boyu (Daedong 2008). Approximately 280 documents are from the Qing era. With compilation of yeonhaengrok, there are also parallel efforts to annotate them. A project team led by Im Gijung published Gukhak gojeon yeonhaengrok baeje, complete with bibliographic annotations, in two installments in 2003 (948 pages) and 2005 (636 pages) with funding from the National Research Foundation of Korea. While more materials are expected to be discovered and further compiled, the works collected thus far will certainly allow diverse research.

Significant efforts to translate yeonhaengrok works into modern Korean have been made as most originals are in classical Chinese. First, the Institute for the Translation of Korean Classics carried out a translation project using Yeonhaengrok seonjib as the original, publishing a twelve-volume translation edition in the 1970s (Institute for the Translation of Korean Classics 1976). A number of other translation projects were carried out by individual researchers. Hong Daeyong’s medieval Korean Eulbyeong yeonhaengrok is a representative example. So Jaeyeong and his colleagues published their team’s translation work of Eulbyeong yeonhaengrok into
modern vernacular Korean in *Eulbyeong yeonbaengrok* (1997) and Kim Taejun and Bak Seongsun did the same in *Sanhaegwan jamgin muneul ban soneuro milchidoda* (2001). Jo Myeonhui translated what Jo Jeub (1568-1632) wrote in medieval Korean and classical Chinese from his trip to the Ming in *Hangeul jocheon ilseung and hanmun yeonbaengrok mit suchangsii* (2002). Jo Gyuik translated what Seo Yumun wrote in medieval Korean in late eighteenth century, *Muo yeonbaengrok*, into modern Korean (2002). While a number of significant translation projects have been completed, more translations are necessary considering the vastness of *yeonbaengrok*.

**An Overview of the Field**

*Yeonbaengrok* writings often contained diverse topics as they are, by nature, free writings produced over an extended period of time (generally around six months) while in a foreign land. The diversity of *yeonbaengrok* is one of the reasons why researchers from fields as diverse as literature, history, art, and science have all paid attention to *yeonbaengrok*. Notable research of an earlier period includes that of Kim Seongchil (1960), which analyzed *yeonbaengrok* as a part of the history of Sino-Korean negotiations, and that of Min Dugi (1963), which took note of *Yeolha ilgi* as an important historical source. Research on *yeonbaengrok* literature burgeoned from the 1980s, and results of such research were published in all possible ways—as academic articles, M.A. theses and Ph.D. dissertations, and monographs. *Yeonbaengrok* works of the eighteenth century, particularly those of the abovementioned Kim Changeob, Hong Daeyong, and Bak Jiwon, occupy a major portion of the research.

*Yeonbaengrok*-related doctoral dissertations include works of Kim Myeongho (1990), Bak Jiseon (1995b), Kim Dongseok (2002), Kim Hyeonmi (2004), and Jeong Hunsik (2007). Kim Hyeonmi focused on the methods of composition of major writers and the style of writing in the eighteenth century. Kim Myeongho made a comprehensive analysis of structural specifics and the philosophical and cultural background of *Yeolba ilgi*. Kim Dongseok focused on No Ijeom’s *Susarok* (1780) while comparing it to *Yeolba ilgi*. Jeong Hunsik focused on the structure, rhetorical characteristics, and perception of China in Hong Daeyong’s piece.

A number of M.A. theses have focused on major *yeonbaengrok* works.

Looking simply at academic journal articles, Bak Jiwon’s Yeolba ilgi has received the most attention of all yeonhaengrok writings. Its extensive length, the diversity of its contents, and the unique style of writing caused Yeolba ilgi to receive broad scholarly attention. The structure of its content and literary expression (Gang Dongyeob 1983; Yi Dongsan 1985; Jin Gabgon 1990; Jeon Jaegang 1992; U Changho 1994; Choe Cheonjib 1997; Yi Jiho 1997; Kim Taejun 2000; Sin Yeonu 2000; Kim Myeongho 2001; Go Misuk 2001; Jeong Min 2001; Seo Hyeongyeong 2002; Yi Gangyeob 2003; Kim Dongseok 2003; Kim Hyeoljo 2003; Jeong Ilam 2005; Kim Dongseok 2005; Go Misuk 2006; Bak Sangyeong 2006), comparisons with material from other missions to China (Kim Taejun 1984; Choe Soja 1997; Kim Myeongho 1988; Gang Dongyeob 1994; Bak Giseok 1997; Kim Dongseok 2001; Jeong Hongjun 2002) have been major topics and themes of research. There are also significant and growing bodies of research on Kim Changeob and Hong Daeyong’s yeonhaengrok writings as well (Yi Gyeongja 1984; Bak Jiseon 1995a; Jo Gyuik 1997; Kim Ari 2000; Jang Gyeongnam 2001; Jeon Mija 2002; Kim Taejun 2003; Jeong Hunsik 2005; Han Dongsu 2006). There are also works that analyzed specifics of eighteenth-century yeonhaengrok through works such as Yi Deokmu’s Ibyeongi and Seo Yumun’s Mute yeonhaengrok (Bak Munyeol 1996; Yi Hyesun 1999b; So Jaeyeong 1999; Jang Gyeongnam 2002; Jo Gyuik 2002).

As for research monographs, an easy-to-read interpretation of Yeolba ilgi by Go Misuk (2003) and an analysis of the content and significance of twenty major yeonhaengrok writings based on the organized list of Yeonhaengrok jeonjib (2001) in Im Gijung’s Yeonhangrok yeongu (2002b) are the most attention-grabbing. Uri hanmunbaksu eui baeoe cbebeom (Yi Hyesun 2006) includes several articles of literary analysis on yeonhaengrok writings. The ten-volume Yeonhaengrok yeongu chongseo (2006) edited by Jo Gyuik and others constitutes a good example of how much Korean academia has accomplished in terms of researching on
yeonbaengrok materials. This collection discusses literature (volumes one to five), history (volume six), politics, economy and diplomacy (volume seven), thought and ceremony (volume eight), clothing, architecture, painting, and geography (volumes nine and ten): 134 articles in all. As researchers primarily emphasize the nature of yeonbaengrok as travelogue, around half of all compiled articles (sixty-seven articles) are on the topic of literature.

Suggestions for Future Research

Despite the diversity and depth of accumulated research, the sheer vastness of yeonbaengrok collected and compiled so far still leaves us with much to work on. The research that has been completed so far nonetheless provides a firm foundation for future research. While works such as Yeolba ilgi have been researched from various angles, other yeonbaengrok works have not been discussed much beyond the preliminary level. There are still a number of yeonbaengrok writings that have been compiled but have not been analyzed at all. Some of them have yet to be verified—sometimes even the dates and the authors remain unknown.

It is not realistic to expect simultaneous, multifaceted research on the all compiled yeonbaengrok pieces. While it is unavoidable that researchers emphasize and focus on different areas or specific individual works of yeonbaengrok according to their research interests, a collaborative effort to discover common aspects of yeonbaengrok literature as a whole is also necessary. Such collaboration would also serve to locate individual yeonbaengrok writings vis-à-vis the whole.

First, considering the long tradition as well as the vastness of yeonbaengrok literature, it is important to reveal the system of discourse specific to yeonbaengrok. In this sense, works that have interpreted yeonbaengrok within the framework of “travelogue,” such as Yi Hyesun (1999a), Choe Sukin (2002), and Kim Hyeonmi (2004), are significant. As Yi, Choe, and Kim mention, interpreting yeonbaengrok within the “travelogue” framework also provides the possibility for comparative analysis with travel writings from other parts of the world. More specifically, if yeonbaengrok literature can be analyzed along with the writings left by the Korean missions to Japan or writings left by the members of Chinese and Japanese missions, the larger portrait of East Asian travelogue discourses as well as its development
could be revealed.

As *yeonbaengrok* writings reveal how intellectual contacts occurred across international borders, a comprehensive study of *yeonbaengrok* that can reveal the larger structure of how knowledge, culture and information were produced and consumed in premodern East Asia is called for. In the process, light could also be shed on the Korean perception of the “other” as produced in *yeonbaengrok*. A body of research on Korean cultural and philosophical perception of the Qing is rapidly growing (Sin Taesu 1989; Im Gijung 1993; Yi Dongchan 2002; Kim Hyeoljo 2003; Kim Hyeonmi 2005; Yi Yeongchun 2006; Jo Seongeul 2006). Furthermore, Korean perception of Westerners and Western culture in Beijing is also noteworthy (Shin Ik-Cheol 2006; Jo Yoong-hee 2006; Yi Hyeongdae 2006). Such works reveal what interested both Koreans and Westerners in a third place—Beijing.

Meanwhile, there is an ongoing research project that delves into what kinds of books, calligraphy, and paintings the Korean China-mission members were interested in. This work will also contribute to discovering the paradigm of knowledge production in late Joseon. Using the extant eighteenth-century *yeonbaengrok* writings, five professors of the Academy of Korean Studies, led by Professor Shin Ik-cheol, are delving into all texts that the Korean China mission brought to Beijing as well as books, calligraphies, and paintings the Korean mission purchased and brought back to Korea. This will reveal how these materials moved from one country to another. The project commenced in 2009 with a three-year plan.

Lastly, while most *yeonbaengrok* were written in classical Chinese, there also was a relatively small-but-steady stream of *yeonbaengrok* written in vernacular Korean. Its significance in the history of literature also must be concretely examined in full. Just speaking of the eighteenth-century *yeonbaengrok* written in vernacular Korean these include (but are not limited to): the three most representative eighteenth-century works of Kim Changeob’s *Yeonbaeng ilgi*, Hong Daeyong’s *Eulbyeong yeonbaengrok*, and Bak Jiwon’s *Yeolba ilgi*; Gang Hobu’s *Sangbongrok* (1727); Yi Sangbong’s *Seowonrok* (1760); Yi Nochun’s *Bukyeon ilgi* (1783); Hwang Injeom’s *Seungsarok* (1790); Yi Bangik’s *Pyobaegi* (1796); and Seo Yumun’s *Muo yeonbaengrok* (1797). The specifics and significance of vernacular Korean *yeonbaengrok* have been preliminarily discussed by Kim Taejun (2001) and Jo Gyuik (2003). They have argued that expansion of the readership and change in worldview must have influenced the
appearance of vernacular Korean yeonbaengrok. From now, researchers should focus on the differences in style and content between the classical Chinese and vernacular Korean versions of yeonbaengrok, while analyzing the works that have not been thoroughly touched upon in order to discover the common aesthetic qualities that the vernacular Korean yeonbaengrok works share.
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Abstract

The tradition of yeonhaengrok is enmeshed with the tradition of Korean missions to China. Korean literati from the late Goryeo wrote of their experiences in Ming China using the titles Jocheonrok and Gwangwangrok. It is well-known that the term jocheon has a connotation of experiencing the land of the son of heaven. Gwanwang, which has an equally strong connotation of experiencing the superior culture of the Ming, was also widely used in early Joseon as the title of such records. After establishing the involuntary diplomatic relationship with the Manchu Qing after the fall of the Ming, such records were titled yeonhaeng (going to Beijing) in order to erase the connotation of sadae (serving the great).

Out of the approximately 380 extant records from Korean missions to China, approximately 280 were written during the Qing period. Approximately 120 were written during the eighteenth century, making the eighteenth century the “peak” of yeonhaengrok. Among the eighteenth-century yeonhaengrok, Kim Changeob’s Nogajae yeonbaeng ilgi, Hong Daeyong’s Yeongi, and Bak Jiwon’s Yeolha ilgi have been extensively researched as paragons of yeonhaengrok literature. Yi Giji’s Ilam yeongi, recently discovered to have great significance, includes extensive descriptions of the cultures, institutions, and technologies of China and the West. It also deserves a multifaceted examination and analysis as one of the representative yeonhaengrok works of the eighteenth century.

From the yeonhaengrok writings that have been collected and compiled so far, works of translation and annotation have centered around the works of Bak Jiwon, Hong Daeyong, and Kim Changeob. Academic research from disciplines such as literature, history, philosophy and arts on yeonhaengrok have also centered around the aforementioned works. There is a clear need for translation and research activities to expand and cover other yeonhaengrok writings. From here, I believe systematic and collaborative research on the yeonhaengrok-specific system of discourse, specific modes of production and circulation of knowledge, culture, and information in premodern East Asia, and the significance of yeonhaengrok written in vernacular Korean vis-à-vis pieces written in classical Chinese, would allow a systematic understanding of the common aesthetic foundation of the yeonhaengrok writings in their entirety.
Keywords: yeonbaengrok, Nogajae yeonbaeng ilgi, Yeongi, Yeolba ilgi, Ilam yeongi, discourse, knowledge