



**An Overview of  
Koguryŏ-Baekje Relations  
With a Quick Peek into the Quicksands of  
Space and Early Korean Standard Time**

Jonathan W. Best, Wesleyan University, USA

**Journal of Northeast Asian History**  
**volume 4, number 1 (June 2007) : 187~202**

*Copyright © 2007 by Northeast Asian History Foundation. All Rights Reserved.  
No portion of the contents may be reproduced in any form without  
written permission of Northeast Asian History Foundation.*

## An Overview of Koguryŏ-Baekje Relations

The text of this article is divided roughly into two halves, the first providing a survey of the course of Koguryŏ-Baekje (Paekche) relations as recorded in the *Samguk sagi* and the second discussing certain chronological problems that the author has identified within that text's account. The image of the two kingdoms' relations that emerges from the pages of the *Samguk sagi* is, in overview, entirely convincing – namely, that the two states remained on hostile terms until almost the very end of their common existence in the middle of the seventh century. Indeed, according to the Korean source, they only established amicable ties in 643, a change that was seemingly only then prompted by their shared antipathy to Silla. When the *Samguk sagi*'s record of Koguryŏ-Baekje relations is examined in detail, however, it is the author's understanding that three chronologically problematic sections of the narrative become evident. These are 1) the two accounts of their purported pre-fourth-century interactions, 2) the thirteen accounts treating warfare between the two kingdoms between 476 and 554, and 3) the single account of a battle between them in 609. Arguing largely from the geography of the sites mentioned in these accounts, the author offers revised datings for these three questionable sections of the narrative that, while accepting the historicity of the events described in the accounts, places them with greater chronological credibility into the flow of peninsular history as it is known from early East Asian written sources and archaeology.



## An Overview of Koguryŏ-Baekje Relations With a Quick Peek into the Quicksands of Space and Early Korean Standard Time

Jonathan W. Best, Wesleyan University, USA

In overview, the history of Koguryŏ-Baekje (Paekche) relations as recorded in the twelfth-century *Samguk sagi* can be summarized as having been antagonistic from start almost to finish. Indeed, the tenor of the relationship between the two kingdoms – which is said to have lasted for more than six centuries – is claimed to have only shifted from hostility to affinity during the final two decades of their coexistence. The *Samguk sagi* makes clear, moreover, that throughout their association, the degree to which either kingdom actively expressed its prevailing stance towards the other, whether hostile or amicable, was determined by self-interest and opportunity – with the latter factor being largely conditioned both by the two kingdoms’ relative military strength and by geography, or to be more specific, by the contemporary positioning of their borders.

Strikingly, the *Samguk sagi* contains only two references pertaining to interactions between Koguryŏ and Baekje that predate the middle of the fourth century – in other words, for the initial three and a half centuries of its recounting of their concurrent histories. The first of these

is dated to 19 CE and the second to the 290s. Since it is commonly accepted, however, that prior to 313 the major Chinese outpost of Lelang was interposed between the domains of the two states, that of Koguryō then being centered in the upper Yalu River valley and that of Baekje far to the south in the lower Han River valley, any contact between them at this time is difficult to credit. A more detailed analysis of these two problematic early accounts will be provided subsequently.

But leaving them aside for the present, the *Samguk sagi*'s next entry concerning relations between the two kingdoms dates to 369 and treats an unsuccessful attack launched by Koguryō's King Gogugwon (Kogugwōn : r. 331-71) against Baekje.<sup>1</sup> From this point onwards until late in the fifth century, at least until 475, the Korean history's record of interactions, all antagonistic, between the two states is entirely believable and is wholly consistent with the evidence contained in various independent sources of much earlier date – Chinese, Japanese, and epigraphic. The *Samguk sagi*'s representation of Koguryō-Baekje relations during this period, although arguably not as complete as it could be, contains unexceptionable accounts of the three most signal events in the long history of their antipathy.

The first of these was the slaying of King Gogugwon during a Baekje assault on the Koguryō stronghold of Pyeongyang (P'yōngyang) in 371, just two years after Gogugwon himself had attacked Baekje in 369.<sup>2</sup> Baekje's offensive triumph in this case provides an indication of

---

<sup>1</sup> *Samguk sagi* [Lee Byeongdo ed. 1977; henceforth *SGSG*] 18.165 (Gogugwon 39:9) and *SGSG* 24.221 (Geunchogo 24:9). For an English language translation of the latter passage, see the entry for 369 on pp. 254-55 in Jonathan W. Best, *A History of the Early Korean Kingdom of Baekje – together with an annotated translation of the Baekje Annals of the Samguk* (Harvard East Asian Monographs No. 256; Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2006).

<sup>2</sup> See *SGSG* 18.166 (Gogugwon) and *SGSG* 24.221 (Geunchogo 26:Winter), and the entry for 371 on pp. 255-56 in Best, *A History of the Early Korean Kingdom of Baekje*. It should be recognized that at this time Pyeongyang was not yet the capital of Koguryō, which at this date was located on the northern bank of the Yalu River in the vicinity of the modern city of Ji'an. Pyeongyang was not designated as Koguryō's capital until 427, nearly sixty years later.

the see-saw nature of the initial phase of the struggle between the two kingdoms. The balance of power shifted markedly in Koguryō's favor, however, following the enthronement in 391 of that kingdom's famous martial monarch, King Gwanggaeto (Kwanggaet'o : r. 391-413), whose reign of twenty-two years constitutes the second critical moment in history of the two states' antagonism. In fact, according to the inscription on the memorial stele raised at Gwanggaeto's grave in 414, Koguryō troops overran the Baekje capital of Hanseong (Han-sōng : present-day Seoul vicinity) in 396, and compelled the southern kingdom to make substantial territorial concessions and also to send aristocratic hostages to reside at the northern court.<sup>3</sup> During Gwanggaeto's reign, the southward campaigns of Koguryō's armies were so successful that Baekje was compelled to enter into a close alliance with the Yamato state in Japan, and Silla was forced formally to accept the suzerainty of Koguryō.

After the death of Gwanggaeto, however, Baekje and Silla seemingly experienced a respite from northern aggression and, according to the *Samguk sagi*, by 433 were able to fashion a defensive alliance against Koguryō that for forty years kept that formidable foe effectively at bay.<sup>4</sup> Yet this respite ended in 475 when King Jangsu (Changsu) of Koguryō (r. 413-91) launched a massive offensive against Baekje which, after capturing Hanseong evidently for the second time and slaying the reigning Baekje king, Gaero (Kaero : r. 455-75), succeeded in taking possession of the entire lower Han River valley.<sup>5</sup> This catastrophe for the southern kingdom constitutes the third signal event in the history of the two states' antagonism. Following this debacle, Baekje was forced to

---

<sup>3</sup> Noh Taedon et al. eds., *Hanguk godae geumseongmun*, 3 Vols. (Seoul: Garakguk Sajeok Gaebal Yeonguwon, 1992), 1:10 (f) and 18 (f).

<sup>4</sup> See *SGSG* 3.29 (Nulji 17:7) and *SGSG* 25.226 (Biyu 8:7), and the entry for 433 on p. 280 in Best, *A History of the Early Korean Kingdom of Baekje*.

<sup>5</sup> See *SGSG* 18.171 (Jangsu 63:9) and *SGSG* 25.229-30 (Gaero 21:9), and the entry for 475 on pp. 294-98 in Best, *A History of the Early Korean Kingdom of Baekje*.

remove its capital southward to Ungjin (present-day Gongju), and from this date forward the *Samguk sagi*'s coverage of relations with Koguryō alters markedly in terms of its credibility, its sources, or both. According to the Korean history, between 476 and 554, the armies of the two kingdoms met thirteen times in battle and in ten of these engagements Baekje emerged victorious. As more fully argued subsequently, however, the reported sites of the battles in almost all of these accounts are so overtly problematic as to render the records themselves implausible – at least, as they are dated in the *Samguk sagi*. It is nonetheless clear from information in the Korean history that two critical events occurred during the 550s which would henceforth be decisive in shaping Koguryō-Baekje relations: first, Baekje was able briefly to expel Koguryō from the Han River valley; and second, Baekje itself was almost immediately driven from this strategic locale, never to return again, by its erstwhile ally, Silla.

For the next forty years, the *Samguk sagi* reports no interactions at all between Koguryō and Baekje. Then in 598, in a close paraphrase of a passage from China's seventh-century *Sui shu*, the Korean history relates that Baekje sent an envoy to the court of the Sui dynasty (581-618) offering to provide guides for the contemporary Chinese offensive against Koguryō. Since the offensive had, in fact, just been terminated, the Sui emperor graciously declined Baekje's offer. Yet both the Chinese and Korean histories assert that Koguryō learned of the offer, and vengefully exacted armed retribution.<sup>6</sup> Nine years later in 607, again both the *Samguk sagi* and the *Sui shu* report that Baekje sent another envoy to the Sui court to urge that the Chinese once more attack Koguryō. This suggestion evidently accorded well with the imperial intentions of the

---

<sup>6</sup> For the *Sui shu* account, see *Sui shu* [Zhonghua Shuju ed., 1973] 81.1819 (Baiji); and for the relevant reports in the *Samguk sagi*, see *SGSG* 20.181 (Yeongyang 9) and *SGSG* 27.239 (Wideok 45:9), and the entry for 598 on pp. 347-48 in Best, *A History of the Early Korean Kingdom of Baekje*.

Sui, and Baekje was ordered to begin gathering military intelligence about its ancient northern foe. The *Samguk sagi* alone reports – and this time with geographical specificity but little credibility – that after this second interchange between the Sui and Baekje governments, Koguryō mounted a punitive incursion into Baekje that culminated in a highly successful attack upon the latter kingdom’s Seokdu (Sōktu) Fortress.<sup>7</sup> Yet, even though shortly thereafter the Sui did launch three major assaults against Koguryō, no Chinese or Korean record survives indicating that Baekje took an active part in any of these.

Following the replacement of the Sui dynasty by the Tang (618–907) in 618, both the *Samguk sagi* and the Tang histories imply that although the antagonism between Koguryō and Baekje persisted, the geographical realities of the day – namely, the interposition of Silla territory – restricted its expression to comparatively minor acts of intimidation. The Korean and Chinese histories record, for instance, that in 626 Baekje sent an envoy to the Tang court to complain that Koguryō was hindering the passage of its tribute missions to China. The Tang emperor seemingly took the accusation seriously because he promptly dispatched a high-ranking official to counsel the rulers of both kingdoms to resolve their differences and live in peace. Surprisingly, this is precisely what they subsequently did. Clearly, however, the motivation for the improvement in their relationship was their common antipathy toward Silla; the *Samguk sagi* reports that in 643 the two kingdoms established amicable relations, and agreed forthwith to mount a joint assault on Danghang (Tanghang) Fortress, Silla’s strategic bastion on the Yellow Sea.<sup>8</sup> The attack was never fully executed, however, because

---

<sup>7</sup> Concerning the *Sui shu*’s and the *Baekje Annals*’ accounts of the events of 607, see nn. 17, 18 and 20 below.

<sup>8</sup> For the relevant entries in the *Samguk sagi*, see *SGSG* 5.47 (Seondeok 11:8), *SGSG* 21.190-91 (Bojang 2:9), and *SGSG* 28.244 (Uija 3:11). For a discussion of the planned assault on Danghangseong and an English translation of the last of the three entries cited above, see the entry for 643 and the appended n. 13 on pp. 373-74 in Best, *A History of the Early Korean Kingdom of Baekje*.

Silla, having learned of the scheme, petitioned the Tang court to intercede – which it did, at first diplomatically and then militarily, initiating three monumental but unsuccessful offensives against Koguryō between 644 and 646.

Although the assault on Danghangseong was aborted, the anti-Silla alliance between Koguryō and Baekje remained vital for the next twenty years. Certainly the most striking result of their compact was the mounting of coordinated offensives against Silla in 655 that resulted in the seizure of more than thirty Silla fortifications and all of the land and population that those positions controlled.<sup>9</sup> However, just five years later, in 660, a massive Tang invasion force landed on Baekje's western shore while Silla's army, in a coordinated attack, struck by land from the east. Even though the contemporary Baekje capital of Sabi (present-day Buyeo) soon fell and the reigning monarch, Uija (r. 641-60), was taken captive to China, for three years thereafter a robust loyalist insurgency, abetted by Baekje's remarkably faithful Japanese ally, waged war against the Tang and Silla occupation. The insurgency came to an end, however, when a flotilla of Japanese ships reportedly bearing thousands of reinforcements was destroyed by the Tang navy near the mouth of the Geum (Kūm) River. Following this disaster, the acting Baekje ruler, Pung (P'ung), realized that further resistance was futile and, according to the *Nihon shoki* and the *Zizhi tongjian*, fled to safe-haven in Koguryō.<sup>10</sup>

Such then, in overview, is the history of Koguryō-Baekje relations

-----

<sup>9</sup> *SGSG* 5.53 (Muyeol 2:1), *SGSG* 22.201 (Bojang 14:1), and *SGSG* 28.246 (Uija 15:8). For a discussion of the Chinese sources from which the *Samguk sagi*'s information regarding the Koguryō-Baekje allied campaign of 655 and a translation of the relevant *Baekje Annals*' entry, see p. 384 and the appended n. 38 in Best, *A History of the Early Korean Kingdom of Baekje*.

<sup>10</sup> Concerning the flight of Pung to Koguryō, see *Nihon shoki* [Vols. 67-68 of *Nihon koten bunka taikei*, 100 Vols. (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1965-67) 27.359 (Tenji 2:8) and, for an English language translation of the relevant passage, see William G. Aston, trans., *Nihongi*, 2 Vols. (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1896) 2:280. Also see *Zizhi tongjian* (Zhonghua Shuju ed., 1956) 201.6337 (Longshuo 3:9).

as it is represented in the *Samguk sagi*, although in the present telling it has been occasionally embroidered with additional information derived from other and earlier East Asian sources. At three points in this history however, questions have been raised about the credibility of certain parts of the record that appear in the *Samguk sagi* alone. These questions relate to: 1) the Korean history's two pre-fourth-century accounts concerning Koguryō-Baekje relations; 2) its thirteen accounts relating to the subject dated between 475 and 554; and 3) its report of a Koguryō incursion into Baekje in 607. In all three cases, the questions were raised on geographical grounds and, I want to emphasize, do not dispute the narrative content of the affected accounts, but just the dating ascribed to them in the *Samguk sagi*.

My research on early Korean history, although largely focused on Baekje, has provided me with the opportunity to become more broadly acquainted with the whole of this invaluable twelfth-century text. In so doing, it has become apparent to me that when Kim Busik (Pusik) compiled the *Samguk sagi* nearly half a millennium after the fall of Koguryō and Baekje, little remained of original data from either kingdom. More specifically, very little survived from Koguryō records that related to the period when that state was in regular contact with Baekje, and most of what remained from Baekje records dealt with the kingdom's history prior to the sixth century. Kim's obvious historiographic problem was further compounded by his acceptance of first-century BCE foundation dates for both polities. As a result of the combination of the paucity of original information regarding the two kingdoms, on one hand, and the acceptance of an especially inflated chronology for Baekje, on the other, it is my belief that some of the limited surviving evidence concerning interactions between Koguryō and Baekje was re-dated – that is, moved backward or forward in time – in order both to create a semblance of a comprehensive history of their relationship and to satisfy the chronicle format of the text.

As long recognized and acknowledged by some Korean

archeologists, it is unlikely that a royal polity of Baekje existed before the late third century, and I believe that an early fourth-century date is more probable. Within the context of this brief survey of Koguryō-Baekje relations, only a limited discussion of the *Samguk sagi*'s two problematic, pre-fourth-century accounts of interactions between the kingdoms is possible. The contemporary interposition of the territory of Lelang between their domains constitutes, as has been previously mentioned, a significant consideration in determining the chronological implausibility of both entries. In comparison to the report of the *Koguryō Annals*, the *Baekje Annals* contains a much more detailed account of the earlier of these two events, that dated to 19 CE – and for this reason, it is my belief that the information originated from a Baekje source. In any case, it is reported that due to a famine induced by a summer-long drought in this year, a thousand Baekje households fled to Koguryō from the region between the Pae (P'ae) and Dae (Tae) Rivers, which are likely equivalent to the present Yeseong (Yesōng) and Imjin Rivers respectively.<sup>11</sup> Consequently, for the thousand starving families to have made their way to Koguryō in 19 CE, they would have had to have traveled at least 350 kilometers north, and thus to have either crossed the intervening territory of Lelang or to have skirted it by a longer and more circuitous route up the eastern side of the peninsula. In short, given the implausibility of either of these alternatives, the geographical references in this account indicate that it could only have occurred after the fall of Lelang in 313 – and my research indicates that it should, in fact, be re-dated to ca. 330-35.

The second of the *Samguk sagi*'s pre-fourth-century accounts relating to Koguryō-Baekje relations is a report that only appears in the

---

<sup>11</sup> See *SGSG* 14.137 (Taemusin 2:1) and *SGSG* 23.210 (Onjo 37:4), and the entry for 19 CE on pp. 219-20 in Best, *A History of the Early Korean Kingdom of Baekje*. For a discussion of the identification of the Pae and Dae Rivers, see Appendix II on pp. 426-27 also in *A History of the Early Korean Kingdom of Baekje*.

*Baekje Annals* and that lacks a specific date, being only dated to sometime during the reign of Baekje's King Chaekgye (Ch'aekkye: trad. r. 286-98).<sup>12</sup> In this entry it is stated that Koguryō attacked Daifang, at this date still a Chinese commandery incorporating at least the western third of the territory of present Hwanghae Province. It is further recorded that since Chaekgye was married to the daughter of the "king" of Daifang, he felt obligated to send troops to the aid of his father-in-law. There is not only again the problem of the contemporary interposition of Lelang between Koguryō and Daifang, but also the additional problem that at this date in the late third century Daifang was yet a viable commandery under Chinese control. Hence, at this time, there could not have been even a nominal or self-appointed local "king" of Daifang for Chaekgye' to marry. In this case, I again believe that the narrative of the account is both historical and based upon a bona fide Baekje record, but that it has been antedated by approximately one sexagenary cycle and consequently should be re-dated to the 350s, a time when Koguryō was aggressively advancing southward, and having encompassed the former territory of Lelang, shortly would be directly challenging Baekje in battle.

The *Samguk sagi*'s record of Koguryō-Baekje relations between 369 and 475 is entirely credible, if not necessarily complete. Thereafter, however, the Korean history's account of interactions between the two kingdoms becomes patently problematic. As mentioned previously, between 476 and 554 the *Samguk sagi* contains reports of thirteen armed confrontations between the two kingdoms in which the forces of Baekje are said to have prevailed ten times. Yet, as was also previously noted, the geographical referents included in these thirteen accounts make

---

<sup>12</sup> See *SGSG* 24.219 (Chaekgye: Introduction) and the translation of the relevant passage on pp. 246-47 in Best, *A History of the Early Korean Kingdom of Baekje*. Neither the Chinese historical record nor the *Koguryō Annals* of the *Samguk sagi*, however, contains any mention of a Koguryō attack on Daifang in the late third century.

suspect their dating as recorded in the *Samguk sagi*. Rather than treating all thirteen of these chronologically questionable records, in the present context I shall discuss only two, the first being an entry dated to 501 and the second an entry dated to 523. This does not mean, however, that within this group of thirteen entries, these two are distinctive in their geographical incongruity. On the contrary, it may be fairly said that they are fully representative examples from the first and second halves of the seventy-five-year period under consideration. I can add that, based on my research, I am convinced that many, indeed most, of the *Samguk sagi*'s entries relating not only to Koguryō-Baekje relations, but also to Silla-Baekje relations, during this period have been postdated by two sexagenary cycles, or 120 years.

The most detailed version of the 501 account is again found in the *Baekje Annals* – which again suggests that it was originally derived from a Baekje record. The entry states that in this year Baekje dispatched a force of 5,000 men to attack Koguryō's Sugok Fortress. Evidence in the geographical treatise of the *Samguk sagi* itself, however, reveals that the Sugok Fortress was located in the vicinity of modern Singye (Sin'gye) in Hwanghae Province.<sup>13</sup> This, in turn, means that because in 501 Koguryō had been in control of the Han River valley for a quarter of a century after having forcefully annexed it in 475, Baekje's army of 5,000 would have had to traverse about 180 kilometers of hostile Koguryō territory to attack a position that was of no conceivable strategic value to Baekje at that time. According to the *Samguk sagi*, moreover, Sugok Fortress was originally an important Baekje northern border fortification that Koguryō had captured in 375, and that Baekje's troops had apparently

---

<sup>13</sup> Concerning the report of the alleged Baekje attack on Sugok Fortress in 501, see *SGSG* 19.174 (Munja 12:11) and *SGSG* 26.235 (Muryeong 1:11), and the entry for this year and the appended n. 62 on p. 318 in Best, *A History of the Early Korean Kingdom of Baekje*. For the location of Sugok Fortress, see *SGSG* 37.352 (Chiri 4, Koguryō) and Chōng Kubok et al., trans. *Yeokju – Samguk sagi*, 5 Vols. (Seongnam: Hanguk Jeongsin Munhwa Yeonguwon, 1997-98), 4:363, n. 97.

unsuccessfully tried to retake in 394.<sup>14</sup> Redating the geographically anachronistic entry of 501 by two sexagenary cycles to 381, however, places the reported Baekje assault upon the position into a perfectly coherent geo-political, chronological, and narrative sequence.

The *Samguk sagi*'s entry dated to 523 entails a similar geographical dilemma, the second of the chronologically problematic entries concerned with Koguryō-Baekje relations between 476 and 554 to be considered in this paper. In this instance, it is alleged that a large Koguryō army, having advanced as far as the Pae River, was confronted by a Baekje force of 10,000 soldiers and compelled to retreat.<sup>15</sup> Yet by the putative date of this entry, the entire course of the Pae River – that is, I believe, the present-day Yeseong River – had been under Koguryō's control since, at least, 475. Again, the re-dating of this 523 entry by two sexagenary cycles to 403 – or right in the middle of Gwanggaeto's reign – makes perfect sense in terms of peninsular geo-political history.

Two reasons can be offered for the postdating by 120 years of these accounts that the *Samguk sagi* dates to 501 and 523. First, as previously mentioned, it is apparent that when the Korean history was compiled in the middle of the twelfth-century, very little survived of either Koguryō's or Baekje's own records concerning the late fifth and early sixth centuries. Second, it is stated in a passage from the seventh-century Liang shu, which is closely paraphrased in the *Samguk sagi*'s Baekje Annals, that in 521 a Baekje envoy reported to the court of southern China's Liang dynasty (502-57) that although his country had earlier

---

<sup>14</sup> Concerning Baekje's loss of Sugok Fortress to Koguryō in 375, see *SGSG* 18.166 (Sosurim 5:7) and *SGSG* 24.221 (Geunchogo 30:7), and the entry for this year on pp. 257-58 in Best, *A History of the Early Korean Kingdom of Baekje*. For the kingdom's failed evident effort to retake the fortification in 394, see *SGSG* 18.167-68 (Gwanggaeto 3:7) and *SGSG* 25.224 (Asin 3:7), and the entry for this year and the appended n. 16 on p. 269 in Best, *A History of the Early Korean Kingdom of Baekje*.

<sup>15</sup> See *SGSG* 19.176 (Anjang 5:8) and *SGSG* 26.235 (Seong 1:8), and the entry for 523 on pp. 325-26 in Best, *A History of the Early Korean Kingdom of Baekje*. Regarding the identification of the Pae River, see n. 11 above.

been seriously weakened by Koguryō's aggression, in recent years the kingdom's armies had scored major victories against that inveterate northern foe.<sup>16</sup> Lacking original data to substantiate the claim made in the *Baekje Annals'* paraphrase from the *Liang shu*, however, a selection of entries was apparently appropriated from the relatively substantial body of surviving Baekje-originated evidence treating the late fourth and early fifth centuries and then postdated by two sexagenary cycles to help fill the evidentiary void concerning the two kingdoms' relations in the late fifth and early sixth centuries. In other words, I do not believe that the content of the entries was fabricated or even significantly altered, just that their dates were changed.

Much the same circumstances underlie the *Samguk sagi's* anachronistic account of 607, the sole member of the third and last of the three previously identified problem areas in the text's recounting of Koguryō-Baekje relations. It will be recollected that according to this report, in 607 Baekje for a second time sent an embassy to the Sui court urging Chinese military action against Koguryō, and that in reprisal, Koguryō mounted a major offensive against Baekje. In this case, the *Samguk sagi* further reports, once more appearing to derive its information from an earlier Baekje record, that the Koguryō troops successfully attacked Baekje's Seokdu Fortress and bore off some 3,000 Baekje captives.<sup>17</sup> This account is manifestly problematic on several geographic grounds. To begin by citing the most obvious of these, Baekje at this time was surrounded on all its land frontiers by Silla which half a

---

<sup>16</sup> See *SGSG* 26.235 (Muryeong 21:11), and the entry for 521 on p. 323 in Best, *A History of the Early Korean Kingdom of Baekje*. The initial sentence of the *Baekje Annals'* entry for the eleventh lunar month of 521 is a paraphrase from the annals section of the *Liang shu*. The remainder of the entry, the portion concerned with the improvement of Baekje's position vis-à-vis Koguryō, is a close paraphrase of a passage appearing in the *Liang shu's* treatise on Baekje. See *Liang shu* [Zhonghua Shuju ed., 1973] 3.65 (Putong 2:11) and 54.804 (Baiji), respectively.

<sup>17</sup> See *SGSG* 20.182 (Yeongyang 18:5) and *SGSG* 27.240 (Mu 8:3 and 8:5), and the entry for 607 on pp. 352–53 in Best, *A History of the Early Korean Kingdom of Baekje*.

century earlier had seized the Han River valley for itself. Accordingly, the account implausibly implies that Silla, which at this time was also on hostile terms with Koguryŏ, twice condoned the passage of an armed Koguryŏ force of sufficient size to guard 3,000 captives through more than one hundred kilometers of its territory.

Although the *Samguk sagi*'s record of the 607 Baekje embassy to the Sui court is a paraphrase from the early-seventh-century Sui shu, in this instance – and unlike the case of the also paraphrased Sui shu report of the Baekje mission of 598 – the Chinese history says nothing of a Koguryŏ reprisal against Baekje.<sup>18</sup> Such a retaliation was seemingly added to the *Samguk sagi*'s 607 narrative, however, for the sake of symmetry with the account of 598, and consequently yet another of the surviving earlier records of Baekje came to be postdated. But in the case of the putative report of 607, I believe that it is actually a Baekje record concerning a Koguryŏ attack of ca. 367 that was postdated by four sexagenary cycles, or 240 years. In support of this contention, it can be noted that the *Samguk sagi*'s only other dated reference to Seokdu Fortress concerns its construction and appears in a *Baekje Annals*' entry of 4 CE that my research indicates ought to be re-dated to ca. 310–15.<sup>19</sup> This Seokdu Fortress, moreover, is understood to have been located in present-day Sangnyeong, or about forty-five kilometers to the northeast of Gaeseong (Kaesŏng), and thus would have long, long been lost to Baekje in 607.<sup>20</sup>

In closing, it is both appropriate and necessary to re-emphasize that the *Samguk sagi*'s representation of the overall course and tenor of Koguryŏ-Baekje relations is fully supported by earlier, non-Korean

---

<sup>18</sup> *Sui shu* 81.1819 (Baiji).

<sup>19</sup> See *SGSG* 23.209 (Onjo 22:9) and the entry for 4 CE on p. 216 in Best, *A History of the Early Korean Kingdom of Baekje*.

<sup>20</sup> Concerning the location of the Seokdu Fortress, see Jeong Kubok et al., *Yeokju Samguk sagi*, 4:413, n. 451.

sources. It is also appropriate to add, however, that my research both into these other sources and into the historical geography of the two states has convinced me that the dating of many of the events concerned with their relationship was manipulated in order to compensate for the significant lacunae in the evidence still available at the time of the *Samguk sagi*'s composition in the middle of the twelfth century – or, again, nearly half a millennium after the fall of those two kingdoms.