

Discussion

KWAK Jino*

ISOLDE HAUSNER:

TOPONYMS AND CULTURAL HERITAGE: A PEACEFUL PARTNERSHIP OR FORCED ALLIANCE?

In the paper, you discuss the importance of toponyms. I believe the main idea of this paper is that toponyms are of significant meaning to the natives. I especially found this sentence interesting. "the ability to remember a specific place, a toponym grows with one's own language culture and declines by using(translated) foreign language toponyms, which lack the power of remembrance(and cannot awaken memories)." This sentence emphasizes that it is natural for indigenous people to use their language to refer to mountains, rivers and specific places. Towards the end, you mention, "In this context the sample of Donghae and Nihonkai could be successfully solved by regarding the name *East Sea* as unpolitical 'brand', and *Sea of Japan* as historical abiding memory." The sentence that I just quoted from the paper is an interesting idea that can be applied to the issue of the *East Sea* naming issue. And I think it can serve as a good way to solve the east sea naming issue. I would like to ask Professor. Isolde, 'Was there a case in the past where a naming issue was solved like this? If there was, please let us know.' Also, if there was an attempt but did not succeed, please tell us about it and why it failed. I thank you again for sharing such an interesting topic with us.

LEE YOUNG CHOON:

SOME PERSPECTIVES ON THE HISTORY OF THE EAST SEA

This paper discusses geographical and historical aspects of the *East Sea*. In particular, it discusses the geological creation and growth of the East Sea and the geological features of it.

As to the history of the East Sea, you explain that unlike the Yellow Sea, the East Sea has been very peaceful since the ancient times. On the other hand, you explain that the current status of the East Sea is not peaceful due to the North Korean missiles and the

* Research Fellow, Northeast Asian History Foundation, Korea.

conflicts between Korea and Japan on naming issues. Still, the paper emphasizes that the current East Sea naming issue must be solved.

It seems that Professor Lee is suggesting that the current conflict over naming issue is not suitable for a sea that is so peaceful compared to European seas. I totally agree. Then how should we approach this issue and solve it? In the paper, there seems to be no detailed discussion on how to solve the issue and I wonder if you are willing to hear opinions from the other discussants.

LEE SANG-TAE:

CHŌSEN-KAI (SEA OF JOSEON) APPEARING IN THE PUBLIC DOCUMENTS IN JAPAN

Your paper mentions that the name *East Sea* has been used by people living on the Korean Peninsula since long ago, and even 70 million people living on the peninsula today are still using the name, and thus using the name *Sea of Japan* should be reconsidered.

As proof of this, the paper displays photos of documents from Ancient times up to today, that includes the name *East Sea*. For example, "It was B.C. 59 before Silla Kingdom was not yet established. It meant that the name of the *East Sea* had been officially used well before the era of three kingdoms took place. So the name of *East Sea* has been used longer than 2,000 years.

Another historical record of *East Sea* appeared in the tombstone of Great King Gwanggaeto that is still standing in Manchuria. That was erected in 414 by King Jangsu in Goguryo. In the 8th row of the third section of the tombstone made it clear that three people living near the East Sea were enlisted for keeping the tome of King Gwanggaeto. As such, the *East Sea* was used in epitaph even in the 5th century.

Furthermore, not only in Korea, but also in Japan, from the Middle Ages to the modern times, the *East Sea* is named *Sea of Korea* in many historical documents. This also proves that it is not suitable to call the *East Sea* and the *Sea of Japan*. I also agree. However, interestingly, the East Sea has always been called the *Sea of Korea* not *East Sea* in the past Korean, Western, and Japanese ancient maps. If there is a reason why the water should be called *East Sea* instead of *Sea of Korea* as it was called in the past, what would it be?