A Study of Cultural and Political Relations Between Puyŏ and Koguryŏ

Mark E. Byington, Harvard University Korea Institute

Journal of Inner and East Asian Studies volume 2-1

A Study of Cultural and Political Relations Between Puyŏ and Koguryŏ

Analyses of historical records and archaeological data yield conflicting results concerning the relationship between Puyŏ and Koguryŏ. Based solely upon archaeological data, there are very few cultural elements shared between the two ancient states, while a critical study of historical records hints at numerous commonalities in their non material cultures. The relationship became more complex through time, and continued even after the fall of Puyŏ, as the cultural and historical legacy of that state was adopted not only by Koguryŏ, but also by the northern Mohe people who overran Puyŏ territory in the late fifth century. Such complexities echo the intricacies of ethnic identity, touching upon which this study proposes that the founders of the Parhae state stemmed from a society that identified itself with Mohe ancestry, Puyŏ culture, and Koguryŏ political affiliation.

A Study of Cultural and Political Relations Between Puyŏ and Koguryŏ

Mark E. Byington, Harvard University Korea Institute

This paper will explore the cultural and political relationships between the ancient states of Puyŏ and Koguryŏ, based primarily on a study of historical records and archaeological data. Puyŏ is the earliest archaeologically-attested state to emerge in the Manchuria-Korea region, and it attained a state level of social complexity in the late-third to early second centuries BCE. The Koguryŏ state emerged fully during the first century CE, though its process of development to the state level probably occurred over a period of at least a century. Documentary evidence suggests that a distinct tribal entity known as Koguryŏ had existed from at least the first half of the first century BCE. In geographical terms, Koguryŏ emerged from tribal groups occupying the southernmost fringe of Puyŏ territory, but it is presently unknown to what degree Puyŏ might once have exercised political authority over those pre-state Koguryŏ tribes. The present study will analyze the relationship between these two polities and peoples from the time prior to Koguryŏ's state formation until the seventh century, when the Puyŏ state was only a historical memory, but its legacy was very much alive.

From the archaeological perspective, the cultures of Puyŏ and Koguryŏ could hardly have been more different. The Puyŏ state is represented archaeological by two separate archaeological cultures, referred to in China as the Paoziyan (or Puyŏ) Type Culture 泡子沿類型, centered on the middle reaches of the Songhua River 松花江, and the Liangquan Culture 凉泉文化, centered on Liaoyuan 遼源 and the headwaters of the Dongliao River 東遼河. It

is believed that the center of the Puyŏ state was located at the modern city of Jilin on the Songhua River, while the Liaoyuan region was an important Puyŏ settlement in the southern reaches of that state. The archaeological cultures associated with the Puyŏ state feature earth-pit burials with wooden coffins, two separate but related ceramic assemblages, with both mortuary and non-mortuary assemblages, and a practice of building small-scale earth-walled forts on the tops of hills.[1]

The archaeological culture associated with the formative Koguryŏ state is entirely distinct from those cultures just described. It features a tradition of stone-piled tombs built up from the ground level, an entirely distinct ceramic assemblage that seems more closely associated with earlier traditions in eastern or southern Liaodong, and a practice of building large-scale stone-walled fortresses on the slopes of prominent mountains. When limited to the archaeological cultures, there is therefore little similarity between the cultures of Puyŏ and Koguryŏ, except that they both tended to take in the same sorts of trade items from the Chinese settlements in Liaodong. The distributions of these archaeological cultures can be plotted on a map of eastern Liaoning and southern Jilin, revealing that the Koguryŏ state formed just south of the southernmost extent of Puyŏ's Liangquan Culture, in a zone where the archaeological record is very complex and still incompletely understood.

It is perhaps significant that in 75 BCE the Han Chinese commandery of Xuantu 玄菟郡 was established in this zone in such a way as to cut off the pre-state Koguryŏ tribes from the Puyŏ state. It is not known whether this was an effort to remove those tribes from Puyŏ's sphere of influence or to prevent Puyŏ from asserting its authority over those tribes in the first place. Either way, from 75 BCE until the early part of the first century CE, Xuantu effectively separated Koguryŏ from Puyŏ, and the previous cultural distinctions observed in the archaeological record were naturally maintained. It is necessary to point out that such distinctions in material culture do not nec-

1 For a comprehensive survey and analysis of the archaeology of Puyŏ and its antecedents, see Byington 2003.

essarily indicate political or ethnic distinctions or distinctions at other cultural levels—they merely indicate that based on the limited subset of culture that the archaeological record provides, there is no evidence of commonality between Puyŏ and Koguryŏ.

Historical records on Puyŏ-Koguryŏ relations during Koguryŏ's formative period are quite scarce. Chinese records provide little of substance in this regard, though an account from the Wang Mang 王莽 interregnum (9 CE - 23 CE) implies that Puyŏ and Koguryŏ had acted as allies in the past and could potentially join in alliance against Han again. After Wang Mang attempted to conscript Koguryŏ troops to send against the Xiongnu 匈奴, only to have those conscripts flee on their way to battle, Wang decided to punish the Koguryŏ leader for their transgression. Wang's advisor cautioned against this, stressing that such action might cause the Koguryŏ and Puyŏ people to ally themselves against Wang, and his wording implies that such an alliance had in fact occurred at least once before. Wang ignored these warnings and had the Koguryŏ leader executed, after which the Koguryŏ people and their neighbors launched repeated raids against the border commanderies (*Hanshu* 漢書, 4130; *Sanguozhi* 三國志, 844). The records do not explicitly mention Puyŏ's involvement in these actions, but there was at least a clear concern over the possibility of joint Puyŏ-Koguryŏ military raids against the Han commanderies at this time.

The fragments of Koguryŏ's own historical tradition, contained within the first chapters of the Koguryŏ Annals 高句麗本紀 of Kim Pusik's *Samguk sagi* 三國史記, contain more detailed descriptions of Koguryŏ's early relations with Puyŏ, but these records must be used with extreme caution. Such caution is necessary because the early accounts of Puyŏ in this work are closely interwoven with the Koguryŏ foundation myth, and it is typically unclear in such records where the myth ends and history begins. Based on my own research on the foundation myth and the early records of the Koguryŏ Annals, I believe that the tale of Chumong and his flight from Puyŏ is entirely mythical and is not based on historical events pertaining directly to Koguryŏ. However, certain elements of the foundation tale might be based on real events, and among these I believe that the early wars fought

between Koguryŏ and Puyŏ probably reflect actual historical conflict.

Regarding the early records of the Koguryŏ Annals in general, it is likely that the majority of the records were drawn from fragments of Koguryŏ's own historical tradition that had survived until the early Koryo period. I believe that these records were derived directly or indirectly from the *Sinjip* 新集 of Yi Munjin 李文眞 (compiled 600 CE), which was itself a redaction of the earlier *Yugi* 留記, a retrospective account of the early reigns of Koguryŏ, probably compiled in the late fourth century from a surviving oral tradition. Since it derived from an oral tradition relating events of the distant past, it is likely that the records in the *Yugi* were not arranged according to a precise dating system. When these records were later rearranged in an annals format (either by Yi Munjin or Kim Pusik, or by some unknown author in the intervening period), the compiler attempted to create a believable chronology for these events, but failed to provide a perfect chronology. The early records of the Koguryŏ Annals are therefore probably sequentially accurate, but they are not chronologically accurate. I believe, however, that none of the records in these chapters is off by more than a few years from their actual occurrence.

Given this perspective of the Koguryŏ Annals, it is possible to analyze the accounts of Puyŏ in the annals of kings Yuri 琉璃明王 and Taemu 大武神王. Early references to the Puyŏ king Taeso 帶素 might well reflect a historical Puyŏ leader whose relationship with Koguryŏ was antagonistic. After Taeso attacked Koguryŏ, the Koguryŏ leader removed his capital to a more secure location at Winaam 尉那巖 (I believe this refers to the move to the fortress on Wunu Mountain 五女山 in modern Huanren 桓仁). There then follow several accounts of warfare between Koguryŏ and Puyŏ, a contest described usually as a battle between Taeso and King Taemu—a battle that culminated with the death of Taeso. While many elements of these descriptions are undoubtedly fictitious, the core narrative is believably historical.

The accounts of the battles with Puyŏ in the Koguryŏ Annals are interspersed with descriptions of relations with Han and the commandery of Xuantu. The account of Wang Mang's execution of the Koguryŏ leader was drawn (at least in substance) from Chinese records, and it is therefore accu-

rately dated to 12 CE. There are, however, from Koguryŏ's own historical records references to Koguryŏ's attack on the commandery seat of Xuantu (Yuri 23) and, possibly, the district of Xigaima 西蓋馬 (Taemu 9). I believe that all of these events occurred between 12 CE, when Wang Mang's actions prompted a rebellion of the Koguryŏ people and their neighbors, and about 32 CE, when Koguryŏ's relations with Han had been restored. After the initial rebellion, Xuantu must have suffered greatly from the repeated raids, and its lapse of power brought Koguryŏ and Puyŏ into direct confrontation.

Koguryŏ's attack on the commandery seat at modern Yongling 永陵 opened the routes northward, which allowed passage for the Koguryŏ army to march up the Fuer River 富爾江 valley past its headwaters, where they encountered the Puyŏ army, probably in the region around modern Liuhe 柳河. Although the accounts in the Koguryŏ Annals describe these battles as occurring just south of the Puyŏ capital, it is more likely, given the remoteness of the capital city, that they took place in the southern regions of the Puyŏ state. After a military success (though not perhaps as successful as described in the Annals), Koguryŏ's army was sent up the Hun River 渾江 valley, where the Kaema 蓋馬 region around modern Tonghua 通化 was brought under Koguryŏ control. When Xuantu was restored to power around 30 CE, it had lost the Hun River valley, and it no longer completely isolated Koguryŏ from Puyŏ. Later references to Puyŏ in the Koguryŏ Annals indicate peaceful relations between the two until the beginning of the second century.

In the first few years of the second century, Koguryŏ's military organization and capability had developed to the point where it was able by 106 to force the withdrawal of the commandery seat of Xuantu from Yongling to the region of Fushun 撫順 to the northwest. Nearly all of Koguryŏ's northern border was now shared with Puyŏ, with the exception of that region farthest to the northwest, where Xuantu still controlled the strategic passes connecting the Liaodong 遼東 region with Puyŏ. Koguryŏ evidently posed a serious threat to Puyŏ from this time, as illustrated by the Koguryŏ siege of Xuantu in 121, which was broken only by the timely arrival of relief troops from Puyŏ. It is from this time that Puyŏ's relationship with Han was maintained

primarily to drive a wedge between the rising powers of Koguryŏ and the Xianbei 鮮卑. There are no specific records of exchanges between Koguryŏ and Puyŏ during this period, but it seems likely that relations between the two were not entirely amicable, though not directly confrontational either.

One significant point that must be addressed is the fact that most of the detailed information on the societies of Puyŏ and Koguryŏ from this time is to be found in the *Dongyizhuan* 東夷傳 of the *Sanguozhi* 三國志, which reflects data collected by the Wei 魏 expedition that passed through both Koguryŏ and Puyŏ territory in the mid-240s. The Wei observers drew some comparisons between the cultures of Puyŏ and Koguryŏ, noting that in their languages and "other matters" they were quite similar, though their manners of behavior and dress differed. Perhaps more significantly, however, the Wei observers noted that the people of the region had long considered the Koguryŏ people to be of a distinct but related stock of the Puyŏ (*Sanguozhi*, 843).[2] Although there has been some debate over the precise meaning of the Chinese term *biezhong* 別種, in this case it would seem to indicate a distinct ethnic group within a larger multi-ethnic entity. How such ethnic groups were conceptualized at the time is of course unknown, but the use of the term *biezhong* implies that Koguryŏ and Puyŏ were culturally similar enough to be classified together at the high level, but sufficiently distinct to be clearly differentiated at the low level. This kind of perceived relationship can be assumed for the mid-third century, but it is unknown whether it can be accurately applied to earlier historical periods.

Other historical references of this time period indicate cultural similarities between Koguryŏ and Puyŏ. Both are known to have practiced the levirate, where the wife of a deceased brother would become the wife of a surviving brother. There are commonalities in some official titles, such as *taesa* 大使 and *taega* 大加, and both used the term *ka* 加 to indicate a regional or ministerial official. There are some indications that a rudimentary form of the five-capital system seen in later periods was employed in both states, though this cannot be demonstrated conclusively. In other respects the two states can be viewed as very different in their cultural composition.

2 東夷舊語以爲夫餘別種, 言語諸事, 多與夫餘同, 其性氣衣服有異.

After the first Murong Xianbei 慕容鮮卑 attack on the Puyŏ capital in 285, the Puyŏ state was severely crippled and survived only with the intervention of the Western Jin 西晉 court. From 290, however, Jin became increasingly incapable of influencing the course of events in and around Liaodong. From the beginning of the fourth century Koguryŏ authority was once more on the rise after a half-century of eclipse, and the territory of the Puyŏ state became the target of both Koguryŏ and Xianbei designs. The Xianbei succession struggle in 333 resulted in the total abandonment of Xuantu Commandery at modern Fushun, and within two years Koguryŏ had occupied this strategic region and constructed the fortress of Sin-sŏng 新城. In 336 the Murong Xianbei regained control over Liaodong, and in 339 they were sending their armies against Koguryŏ's position at Sin-sŏng. The contest for control over the Fushun region is significant in that whoever commanded the Hunhe River 渾河 valley also controlled access to the primary route into the Puyŏ heartland. In 342 the Xianbei launched a devastating assault on the Koguryŏ capital and rendered it temporarily subject to Xianbei control. This left Puyŏ exposed to Xianbei attack, which came in 346 and finished off what was left of the independent Puyŏ state.

The most detailed descriptions of these events appear in the *Jinshu* 晉書 and the *Zizhi tongjian* 資治通鑑 (3069). The latter work reveals that prior to the Xianbei attack on Puyŏ in 346, the Puyŏ capital had already fallen before the assaults of a third party, whom the Chinese source names as Paekche. While this is certainly an error, it is most likely that the actual attackers were either the Mohe 靺鞨 or, more likely, Koguryŏ. After 346, however, the Murong Xianbei seem to have been content to carry off the Puyŏ populations and leave the majority of their territory unclaimed. Within a few years those former Puyŏ territories had in part become incorporated into Koguryŏ territory, and a Puyŏ "king" and a Koguryŏ governor had been installed to govern this territory.

The placement of a Koguryŏ governor of the Puyŏ territories can be derived from the fragmentary inscription on the wall of the tomb of Moduru 牟頭婁, a Koguryŏ official who lived in the late fourth and early fifth centuries, and whose tomb is located on the Yalu River to the northeast of modern Ji'an 集安. Moduru had been appointed as the Director of Government

Affairs of Northern Puyŏ 令北夫餘守事 sometime before the death of King Kwanggaet'o in 413, and the contents of the inscription seem to indicate that Moduru's father and perhaps his grandfather had served in the same or a similar post.[3] The existence of a Puyŏ king at this time can be confirmed by the account in the Koguryŏ Annals dated to 494, which describes the flight of the Puyŏ king to Koguryŏ. The tribute mission sent by Puyŏ to the Northern Wei 北魏 court in 458 probably indicates an attempt by the dependent Puyŏ king to gain a measure of autonomy—the fact that no further missions are recorded to have come from Puyŏ may indicate that Koguryŏ had blocked any movements toward Puyŏ independence.

From around the mid-fourth century until the closing years of the fifth century, Puyŏ continued to exist nominally as a dependency of Koguryŏ. Although detailed records are lacking, it seems likely that the remnant Puyŏ populations had been reorganized under a new government system headed by a Koguryŏ-appointed garrison governor and a Puyŏ king, whose title and position were maintained at the forbearance of the Koguryŏ king. The political center was almost certainly located at the former site of the Puyŏ capital at Dongtuanshan 東團山 in the eastern suburbs of Jilin 吉林 on the eastern bank of the Songhua River 松花江. Abundant finds of Koguryŏ construction materials and some tombs in this region attest to Koguryŏ's occupation of the old Puyŏ capital site, though it is as yet unclear whether these remains date to the fourth and fifth centuries or to a later period. This phase of the relationship between Koguryŏ and Puyŏ came to an abrupt end in 494, when an invasion by the Wuji 勿吉, or Mohe 靺鞨, people sent the Puyŏ king fleeing to Koguryŏ (*Samguk sagi* 19, Munja 3). A historical passage dated to 504 confirms that Koguryŏ had indeed lost the old Puyŏ core region to these northern invaders (*Weishu* 魏書, 2216; *Samguk sagi* 19, Munja 13).

The invaders who overran the Puyŏ region in 494 are referred to in earlier records as the Wuji 勿吉 (K. Mulgil), and in later records as the Mohe 靺鞨 (K. Malgal). These were a northern people who occupied the valleys of the east-flowing Songhua River and its tributaries, including the Mudan River

3 This is based on the reading of the inscription in Takeda 1981.

牡丹江 in eastern Jilin and southern Heilongjiang 黑龍江. Those who occupied the Puyŏ core region were later known as the Sumo Mohe 速末靺鞨 (K. Songmal Malgal), after the Sumo River 速末水, the present north-flowing Songhua River. Their center of population was located on the middle reaches of the Songhua, near the old Puyŏ capital at Jilin, with the densest known concentration of sites at modern Wulajie 烏拉街 some 35 kilometers to the north of Jilin. The archaeological record of this region reveals the stratigraphic relationship among the various cultures that occupied the Songhua, with the Puyŏ culture overlaying the preceding Xituanshan bronze culture 西團山文化, and being in turn superceded by the Mohe culture.

Analysis of sites indicates that the Mohe intruders in this region mixed with the indigenous populations, as elements of Puyŏ culture are seen to continue alongside the more dominant intrusive Mohe elements. Later historical references, in fact, suggest that the Sumo Mohe people had internalized the Puyŏ legacy as part of their own identity, as will be discussed below. It should be pointed out, however, that these references are associated with Sumo Mohe populations who were later displaced by Koguryŏ, so the nature of any such internalization of the Puyŏ legacy might have been based primarily on political expediency rather than on cultural and ethnic self-perception - this is an area that should be explored in more detail. For present purposes it will suffice to note that the Puyŏ region fell in 494 to a group that would come to be known as the Sumo Mohe, and that this group would maintain control over this region until about a century later, when Koguryŏ retook the region and purged it of the Sumo Mohe leadership.

Koguryŏ's efforts to retrieve the old Puyŏ core region were directly related to the unification of the Chinese mainland under the Sui 隋 dynasty in 589. Although both Koguryŏ and Mohe sent missions to the Sui court from the early 580s, there is a conspicuous lapse in such missions between 584 and 591. A passage in the *Suishu* 隋書 dated to 590 suggests that Koguryŏ had ceased to send missions to Sui and had moreover prevented the Mohe from sending their own missions (*Suishu* 隋書, 1815).[4] In that year the Sui

4 For proof that the Mohe in question are in fact the Sumo Mohe, see Byington 2003, 360 66.

emperor Wen 文帝 reprimanded the Koguryŏ king P'yŏngwŏn 平原王 for having obstructed the Mohe missions, and openly threatened Koguryŏ with military force. It is likely that King P'yŏngwŏn had from the early 580s perceived that Sui would become a threat to Koguryŏ, and that he accordingly broke relations with Sui and forced the Mohe to do likewise, in order to prevent a possible Sui-Mohe alliance against Koguryŏ.

With the Sui emperor's threat and the death of King P'yŏngwŏn in 590, the new king Yŏngyang 嬰陽王 adopted a new more aggressive policy. He first allowed the Mohe missions to resume in 591, but between 593 and 598 he sent his armies northward and recaptured the Puyŏ region (*Taiping huanyu ji* 太平寰宇記 69, 8a-8b; 71, 12a-12b). The Sumo Mohe chieftain Tudiji 突地稽 and others then fled the area and sought refuge with the Sui court, which allowed them to settle at Liucheng 柳城 (modern Chaoyang 朝陽 in Liaoning Province) and to the north of Yanjun 燕郡 (modern Yixian 義縣). Shortly afterward King Yŏngyang sent an army of Mohe troops westward in an assault on the Liaoxi 遼西 region, which was precisely that area where Tudiji and the displaced Sumo Mohe groups had been resettled. This attack was repelled, and the Sui emperor responded later in the year with the first of several large-scale campaigns against Koguryŏ.

The open hostilities between Koguryŏ and Sui were therefore directly related to Koguryŏ's need to control the Puyŏ region. The reassertion of Koguryŏ authority over this region was probably based on the necessity of obstructing an alliance between Sui and the Sumo Mohe. The Puyŏ region had become a key strategic zone for Koguryŏ's western and northern defenses. It is not a coincidence that the earliest references to Koguryŏ's Puyŏ-sŏng 扶餘城 fortress date to the end of the sixth century. Although such a fortress might have existed in earlier periods, its importance as a major frontier defense site dates from Koguryŏ's reoccupation of the old Puyŏ core region. The fortress is to be identified with remains at Longtanshan mountain fortress 龍潭山山城 at Jilin, located in the eastern bank of the Songhua River immediately to the north of the old Puyŏ capital city site at Dongtuanshan 東團山. The center of Sumo Mohe populations had been located at Wulajie 烏拉街 to the northwest of this site, and in fact the account of Koguryŏ's reclamation of the region states that the Mohe villages

to the northwest of Puyŏ-song had fled before Koguryŏ's armies.

The possibility that the Sumo Mohe had internalized the Puyŏ legacy as part of their own self-identity has already been suggested. Indications of this might be seen in the fact that shortly after the failed Sui campaign against Koguryŏ in 612, the Sui emperor conferred upon the displaced chieftain Tudiji the title Marquis of Puyŏ 扶餘候 (*Cefu yuangui* 册府元龜 970, 3B-4A).[5] While it may be argued that this title is more a reflection of Sui's designs against Koguryŏ than one of Sumo Mohe identity, it should be noted that seventh century records refer to the displaced Sumo Mohe populations in Liaoxi alternately as the Sumo Mohe and the Fuyu (=Puyŏ) Mohe 浮渝靺鞨.[6] Such references suggest the possibility that the Mohe who settled in the old Puyŏ core region and mixed with the remnant Puyŏ populations there had adopted the historical memory of Puyŏ and made it part of their own identity.

After Koguryŏ's reclamation of the Puyŏ core region at the end of the sixth century, the Sumo Mohe populations remaining there fell under Koguryŏ control, and it is likely that their descendents likewise had come to consider themselves as part of the greater Koguryŏ culture. While their genetic ancestors had come to the region as invaders from the northeast, the Sumo Mohe of the seventh century also defined themselves in terms of the Puyŏ legacy of the territory in which they lived, and also in terms of the Koguryŏ affiliation that had come to be the political norm by this time. The founders of the Parhae state probably rose from the descendents of these Sumo Mohe groups subordinate to Koguryŏ, or possibly from those who fled to Liaoxi in the 590s. When the Tang histories describe the Parhae founder alternately as a Koguryŏ *biezhong* 別種 (*Jiu Tangshu* 舊唐書, 5360) or as a Sumo Mohe subject to Koguryŏ (*Xin Tangshu* 新唐書, 6179), the question of whether he was a Koguryŏ man or a Mohe man becomes less a matter of distinction than one of inclusion (i.e., he could have been both).

Since first-generation states like Puyŏ and Koguryŏ extended their terri-

5 [唐武德二年] 十月, 靺鞨首帥突地稽, 遣使朝貢. 突[地]稽者, 靺鞨之渠長也. 隋大業中, 與兄瞞率其部, 內屬於營州. 瞞咄死, 代總其衆, 拜遼西太守, 封扶餘侯. 朝煬帝於江都, 屬化及之亂, 以其徒數百間, 行歸柳城, 至是通使焉.

6 Compare *Jiu Tangshu* 舊唐書, 1522 and 1524, the accounts of Shenzhou 愼州 and Lizhou 黎州 Fuyu 浮渝 is a known variant of Fuyu 夫餘 (Puyŏ), and is attested in other historical sources.

torial scopes by taking in ever greater numbers of populations, some of which were not ethnically akin to the state builders themselves, it is a matter of course that previously "foreign" peoples came to adopt the culture of their new sovereigns, and even internalized that culture as part of their own identities. The Sumo Mohe are a curious case in point, as they appear to have linked the cultures and legacies of both Puyŏ and Koguryŏ into their own multivalent identities and to have projected this forward in refined form in the self identity of the ruling stratum of the Parhae state.

Conclusion

This study of the relationships between Puyŏ and Koguryŏ has explored various facets of such relationships, including those of the genetic, cultural, and political dimensions, and has suggested that such relationships are complex and always changing. On the genetic level, it is presently impossible to say whether the Koguryŏ ruling house really descended from members of the ruling house of Puyŏ, though it is possible that they derived from one of the many groups that were once part of the Puyŏ state. Certain passages in the Koguryŏ Annals claim that some Koguryŏ kings married women of Puyŏ lineage, and while there are no clear reasons for doubting these claims, it is unclear whether these Puyŏ women were members of the ruling clan. Archaeological records reveal far more distinctions than similarities between the material cultures of Koguryŏ and Puyŏ, but this tells us little about the non-material aspects of those cultures, which were very complex and not so easily reduced to simple archaeological cultures.[7]

In contrast to the archaeological record, historical descriptions of Koguryŏ and Puyŏ societies indicate some similarities. There are occasional lexical correspondences (such as the use of *ka* titles) and the general observation that their languages were by and large similar. Perhaps more important is the common myth that serves as the foundation tale of both states. I believe that this myth should not be understood as elaborated history—the fact that the two tales are identical in both form and content shows that at least one of them fails to reflect any historical truth regarding the state's foundation. And if one of them is certainly inaccurate, it is quite possible

that the other is likewise ahistorical. It is more likely that both societies invoked the same myth, which was not to be understood as literal history, but served instead a very specific social function as part of those states' self-identities. The fact that Puyŏ and Koguryŏ shared the same foundation myth argues quite strongly for their having shared a common set of social values and views of their world.

The mid-third century description of Koguryŏ as having been long regarded as a distinct stock of Puyŏ-a *biezhong*- similarly suggests commonality in certain non-material aspects of their cultures. Whether this indicates that Koguryŏ had once fallen under the direct political influence of Puyŏ remains unknown, but it suggests that the people of the region (rather than the Wei observers from the outside) viewed Koguryŏ and Puyŏ as in some sense kindred, and yet distinct. How and when these cultural commonalities came to be shared is unclear - it is possible that the pre-state Koguryŏ people came to adopt certain elements of Puyŏ culture as that state expanded, or the similarities might echo an ancient movement of peoples between the two.

It is important to stress that such cultural affinities were probably far from complete, by which I mean that Puyŏ and Koguryŏ were expansive states that absorbed large numbers of unrelated peoples, and therefore did not themselves, as polities, represent monolithic cultural continua. They were pluralistic in origin and in composition, which allowed for a wide variety of identity associations to be shared within and among themselves. Such a robustness certainly facilitated the absorption of conquered peoples and also made it possible for outside groups such as the Mohe to affiliate them-

7 Recent archaeological work at a site called the Wangjianglou 望江楼 cemetery, on a high bluff overlooking the town of Huanren 桓仁, the center of early Koguryŏ populations, has yielded some possible indications of very early contacts between Puyŏ and a formative Koguryŏ. The six stone piled tombs comprising this cemetery date to the first century BCE and appear to be early specimens of the typical Koguryŏ cairn burial. Excavations, however, revealed them to be decidedly atypical in content. Of special interest are several bead necklaces, which had never before been discovered in Koguryŏ context, but are identical to necklaces found at the northern Pu yŏ cemetery of Laoheshen 老河深, also dating to the first century BCE. It is tempting to interpret this find as evidence of a Puyŏ migration reflecting the Koguryŏ foundation myth, though there are problems with viewing these as the tombs of Chumong and his followers. The pottery found in the tombs, for example, are not indigenous types, but neither are they Puyŏ types. Much more work will be necessary before the nature of these burials can be known, but they do seem to indicate some form of early contact between Puyŏ and Koguryŏ.

selves culturally with Puyŏ and politically with Koguryŏ.

On the political level, Puyŏ and Koguryŏ were sometimes allies but most often foes, and the nature of that relationship seems to have been predicated primarily upon Koguryŏ's potential as a threat to Puyŏ's southern borders. While the Han agency of Xuantu remained interposed between Puyŏ and Koguryŏ, there was little conflict between the two. Once that intermediary was removed, however, conflict immediately followed. In the mid-fourth century Puyŏ had been reduced to a dependency of Koguryŏ, yet Koguryŏ saw fit to preserve the institution of the Puyŏ kingship. When the Mohe overran the Puyŏ heartland in 494, however, the last vestiges of the Puyŏ polity vanished, and the Puyŏ legacy came to be taken up by various different peoples and states in turn. The Sumo Mohe, who had occupied the Puyŏ core region, intermixed with the remnant Puyŏ populations and adopted the Puyŏ legacy as part of their own self-identity. When they threatened to ally themselves with Sui against Koguryŏ in the late sixth century, Koguryŏ purged the Sumo Mohe leadership and reclaimed the Puyŏ core region. The Puyŏ legacy came to be shared by Koguryŏ and the Sumo Mohe, including those who had been forced to remove to Liaoxi as well as those who remained on the Songhua River.

With such a broad range of perspectives on the relationship between two ancient states, only a sampling of which are presented in this study, it becomes clear that such inter-regional and inter-cultural relationships cannot be reduced to a simple formula. We may choose to explore a single aspect of this complex matrix of cultural and political associations, such as that revealed by the archaeological record or the political relations described in historical texts, but none of these reveals to us anything more than a partial view of the whole. When we consider the complexities of self-identity and avoid insisting upon simplistic and monolithic definitions of ethnicity, polity, and culture, a broader range of interpretive possibilities will open before us.

Works Cited

- Primary Sources

Cefu yuangui 冊府元龜. Wang Qinruo 王欽若, ed. 12 vols. Hong Kong: Zhonghua shuju. 1960.

Hanshu 漢書. Ban Gu 班固, ed. 12 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju. 1992.

Jiu Tangshu 舊唐書. Liu Xu 劉煦, ed. 16 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju. 1975.

Samguk sagi 三國史記. Kim Pusik 金富軾, ed. Yi Pyongdo edition. 2 vols. Seoul:Ŭryu munhwasa. 1977.

Sanguozhi 三國志. Chen Shou 陳壽, ed. 5 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju. 1992.

Taiping huanyu ji. 太平寰宇記. Yue Shi 樂史, ed. 2 vols. Taibei: Wenhai chubanshe. 1963.

Weishu 魏書. Wei Shou 魏收, ed. 8 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju. 1984.

Xin Tangshu 新唐書. Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修 and Song Qi 宋祁, eds. 20 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju. 1975.

Zizhi tongjian 資治通鑑. Sima Guang 司馬光, ed. 20 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju. 1992.

- Modern Sources

Byington, Mark E., 2003. "A History of the Puyŏ State, its People, and its Legacy," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.

Takeda Yukio 武田幸男. 1981. "Mutōru ichizoku to Kōkuri ōken" 牟頭婁一族と 高句麗王權. *Chŏsen gakuhŏ* 朝鮮學報 99-100: 143-184.