



A Chinese Scholar's View on the Costume of Goguryeo: Achievements and Limitations

Introduction

Costume refers to clothes and accessories. The term encompasses all artificial elements added to the human body, from headwear, clothes, footwear, and accessories to hairstyle and makeup. Unfortunately, elements that can endure the long passage of time and reveal themselves to future generations are mostly accessories made by gold, silver, bronze, iron, and jade. Consequently, research on ancient Korean accessories has been conducted mainly on those of Silla and Baekje due to accessibility of the material and the number of excavated articles.

Apart from accessories, research of ancient Korean costume has focused on Goguryeo because of the abundance of historical documents compared to Baekje and Silla, and the remaining ancient tomb murals vividly depicting the costume. Written documents provide the terminology and give us insight into the overall process of how costume changed, while tomb murals reveal the types and forms of various costumes, differences in costumes depending on social status and region, changes in costumes between the fourth and sixth centuries, and the political, social, and cultural implications behind costumes.

Starting from Yi Yeoseong's *A Study on the Costume of Joseon* (*Joseon boksik go* 朝鮮服飾考) published in 1947, research in Korea on the costume of Goguryeo has continued in the areas of costume studies, history, and archaeology. Although dozens of articles and dissertations have been published, there has never been a full-length monograph looking solely at the costume of Goguryeo. Under such circumstances, it is worth noting that a Chinese scholar has published an in-depth monograph on the costume of Goguryeo. *Research on the Costumes of Goguryeo* (*Gaogouli fushi yanjiu* 高句丽服饰研究) by Zheng Chunying 郑春颖 is one of the best pieces of work on this subject to date in Chinese academic circles. As a fellow researcher writing this review, I will examine the advancements that have been made in the research conducted in China compared to Korea, differences between Chinese and Korean

perspectives, and hopefully gain insight into future research.

Table of Contents and Summary

Research on the Costumes of Goguryeo has been extremely well received in Chinese academic circles. It received the award for the second best book in the social sciences in Changchun in 2016 and Jilin Province in 2017. As a revision of her doctoral dissertation, “Research on Dress from the Remains of Goguryeo” (Gaogouli yicun suojian fushi yanjiu 高句丽遗存所见服饰研究), it comprises total of ten chapters including an introduction, eight main chapters, and a conclusion.

Chapter 1, “Introduction,” reviews previous research and outlines the research material, significance and objectives, research ideas, and methodology.

Chapter 2 to Chapter 6 cover the costumes of Goguryeo. Each of the five chapters examine the types, features of the form such as shape, material, color, pattern, and general terminology. The titles of each chapter are as following: Chapter 2 is “Hairstyle and Makeup,” Chapter 3, “Headwear,” Chapter 4, “Clothes,” Chapter 5, “Footwear,” and Chapter 6, “Other Excavated Accessories.”

Chapter 7, “Social Aspects of Costume,” looks at the social properties of the costume in Goguryeo from four specific aspects: ethnicity, locality, class, and propriety. According to Zheng, the costumes depicted in the murals of Goguryeo can be categorized into four cultural lineages depending on the combination of costume. Zheng also argues that costumes in the murals of the Ji’an and Pyeongyang areas are distinct in terms of cultural variety, class, and propriety.

Chapter 8, “Changes in Costume over Time and Space,” examines the changes seen in the costumes of the murals of the Ji’an and Pyeongyang areas over four distinctive stages. Zheng mentions the formation of the Goguryeo ethnic group, rise of the Murong Xianbei, the spread of the costume of the Southern Dynasties of China, and finally the transmission of Buddhism as possible causes of change in the Ji’an area. As for the Pyeongyang area, Zheng looks to factors such as social changes in the area, differences from the Ji’an costumes, nationality of the person buried in the tomb, and structural aspects of the tombs as factors that could have pushed changes in the costumes.

Chapter 9, “Costume Comparisons and Exchange,” compares the costume of Goguryeo with that of the Han, the Xianbei, Buyeo, Okjeo, Yemaek, the Sushen, the Yilou, the Wuji, the Mohe, Balhae, Baekje, and Silla, and then looks at the similarities and differences. Zheng also examines how political, economical, social, and cultural factors influenced costume exchanges.

Chapter 10, “Conclusion,” summarizes the research and contemplates its limitations, due to the unforeseeable as well as isolated nature of archeological discoveries.

A Comprehensive Collection of Available Materials

The book’s biggest strength is that it compiles all the material on the costume of Goguryeo into a single edition. The range of material listed in the book is so vast that Wei Cuncheng 魏存成, Zheng’s advisor, has reviewed it as being “the best work out of all the research done until now in terms of the collection and organization of the material.”

Before anything, it should be noted that the book looks at all three types of material crucial in understanding the Goguryeo costume: historical documents, tomb murals, and excavated artifacts. Previous research rarely covered all three. Most of them focused on murals and looked at historical documents as supplemental evidence. Excavated artifacts were usually classified under a separate theme, such as accessories, and their archeological characteristics tended to be the focus of study. This book, however, deals with all of the above—historical documents, murals, and artifacts. This is likely related to Zheng’s academic background of having received her master’s degree in historical documents studies and her doctorate in archaeology and museum studies.

Materials collected under the aforementioned three categories are also quite extensive. First of all, for the historical documents she covers a variety of material including several *Biographies of Goguryeo* (*Gaogouli chuan* 高句丽传) from the official Chinese histories, *Literati Garden* (*Hanyuan* 翰苑), *Encyclopedia of Rites* (*Tongdian* 通典), *Comprehensive History of Institutions* (*Tongzhi* 通志), *Imperial Readings of the Taiping Era* (*Taiping yulan* 太平御览), *Outstanding Models from the Storehouse of Literature* (*Cefu yuangui* 册府元龟), *Universal Geography of the Taiping Era* (*Taiping huanyu ji* 太平寰宇记), and *History of the Three Kingdoms* (*Samguk sagi* 三国史记). With the exception of the *Literati*

Garden and Encyclopedia of Rites, most of the records come from contents of *Biographies of Goguryeo*, but it is nevertheless significant that Zheng reviewed the relationship among various historical materials. Next, Zheng analyzes the costumes of a total of 996 figures depicted in twelve mural tombs in the Ji'an area and twenty-five mural tombs in the Pyeongyang area. Unlike the majority of previous research which only dealt with mural figures portraying the everyday life, this book includes figures of other worlds including gods 神, immortal beings 仙人, and divine beings 飛天. Zheng accordingly attempts to read the religion and culture of Goguryeo from the costumes of otherworldly figures. It is slightly unfortunate, however, that the research only looks at helmets, when the murals have many figures wearing both armor and helmets. Finally, for the excavated artifacts she deals with various kinds of actual objects excavated from China and North Korea. The author classifies them into categories such as golden crowns, hat decorations, hairpins, earrings, rings, bracelets, belt decorations, and metal footwear, and then examines details of their features such as their form, size, and material. Because previous studies did not actively utilize actual objects, the aggregation of these materials has always been an issue. After gathering information of over 400 artifacts excavated from 120 historic sites, Zheng presents specific information of each individual artifact along with the source of the material, thereby laying the groundwork for a comprehensive study of excavated artifacts.

The book has a total of 461 pages, among which 173 pages are tables of the research materials. Instead of simply narrating the results of her analyses, Zheng chose to organize the information on costumes contained in each individual material into tables and include them as appendix. Her book truly is a comprehensive all-in-one gift set on the materials for the costume of Goguryeo.

Variety and Systematicity of Analytic Perspective

Another strength of this book is how it expands our understanding of the costume of Goguryeo by incrementally applying various perspectives of research. In the introduction, Zheng clarifies that she will analyze the Goguryeo costumes from three certain angles (or layers): dots, lines, and surfaces. "Dot" refers to the microscopic examination that gathers and arranges the material

and analyzes their forms. "Line" includes both horizontal and vertical lines. Horizontally, Zheng examines the synchronic social properties inherent in Goguryeo costume. Virtically, Zheng looks at the diachronic changes appearing in the costumes of the murals of the Ji'an and Pyeongyang areas and investigates their causes. Finally, 'surface' refers to comparative research. By comparing the costume of Goguryeo with the costume of other countries and ethnicities, Zheng seeks to understand both the universality and particularity of the costume of Goguryeo and uncover the specific causes as well as routes of the exchange of costume. The expansion of perspective, from dots to lines, and again from lines to surfaces, is an effective methodology in understanding the external features and sociocultural significance of the costume of Goguryeo.

Insufficient Review of Korean Research Trends

Beginning with this section, I will look at some of the drawbacks of the book.

First of all, Zheng does not seem to have properly reviewed the work done in this field by Korean scholars. In her literature review, Zheng looks at previous research done in China, South Korea, North Korea, and Japan. As for the research done in China, Zheng divides the field into costume studies, history, archaeology, ethnic studies and folk studies, and carefully examines the research starting from the 1960s up to 2011. This indicates that this book, which was published in 2015, includes the most recent work by Chinese scholars as of 2011, when Zheng had finished her doctoral dissertation. In contrast, she only presents a limited review of the research done by South Korean, North Korean, and Japanese scholars. In terms of research done in South Korea, for example, Zheng focuses on introductory books and articles published from 1947 to the early 2000s. It is difficult to say that Zheng properly reviewed previous material when she does not look at certain recent research or other doctoral dissertations on the same subject as her own. Although Yi Gyeonghui's doctoral dissertation (2012) is the most recent work published to date, the dissertation written by myself (Jung 2003) should have been among the previous studies reviewed by Zheng given the timeline of her research.

After summarizing the current research trends of South Korea, North Korea, and Japan, Zheng points out four limitations. I do not find them persuasive, however, considering she has not included recent research or work

done by specialists in this field in her literature review. In the following, I will use my own dissertation to point out where she is wrong in her observations of foreign studies. Both myself (Jung) and Zheng are referred to by their names to prevent any unnecessary confusion.

The first limitation (of non-Chinese studies, supposedly) Zheng notes is that research done outside of China either do not sufficiently make use of the records in Chinese history books or fail to analyze the records properly. With this limitation in mind, Zheng collects various documents containing records of the costume of Goguryeo, meticulously studies the transmission of these historical records, and accordingly collects the *Biographies of Goguryeo* from eleven official histories of China and puts them into four groups. Jung (2003, 136-78) has also divided the *Biographies of Goguryeo* from the Chinese official histories into four groups based on the transmission of the historical records and the period the contents refer to. Additionally, Jung spends over forty pages analyzing the characteristics of the costumes of Goguryeo featured in the records. Although Zheng covers a larger range of documents, there is ultimately not much difference in the way both scholars group and discuss the records surrounding the *Biographies of Goguryeo* from the official histories.

The second limitation Zheng points to is the large gap between scholars inside and outside of China in terms of the periodization and how they view the characteristics of the mural tombs of Goguryeo. This, she argues, leads to differences in how the changes in the costume of Goguryeo are viewed. Given the rarity of any mural tomb whose date of construction can be determined, however, suggested years will inevitably vary. Moreover, which periodization is ultimately selected for analysis does not change the overall flows seen in costume in terms of the big picture. The studies of Zheng and Jung, as a case in point, differ in how they count the construction years of the tombs, but their analysis of the changes in costume are basically along the same lines. Both agree that while the Ji'an area maintained the traditions of the unique costume of Goguryeo from beginning to end, the Pyeongyang area first showed strong features of the costume of the Han, that is, the traditional costume of the Han that was popular around the Zhongyuan 中原 area, before unique elements of the Goguryeo costume gradually increased and ultimately became dominant. Meanwhile, Zheng and Jung completely differ in their interpretation of the process of change in the Pyeongyang area and its causes. This derives from the different stances between China and Korea in how they see the history of

Goguryeo rather than differences in how they judge the tombs' construction dates. I will look into this issue in more detail later in this review.

The third limitation Zheng points out is how errors in the terminology are common among scholars outside of China due to insufficient understanding of ancient Chinese costume. Of course, it is only natural that Chinese scholars are at an advantage in investigating accurate terms referring to Han-style costume seen in the tomb murals of Goguryeo. However, the errors Zheng points to mainly appear in early studies or studies lacking expertise. They are hard to find in more specialized non-Chinese studies starting from the 2000s. At the same time, it is possible for the same costume to be called by several different names or for terms of a costume to vary because of the different ways each researcher perceives the structure of the costume depicted on murals. For example, the official headwear that Zheng calls *longguan* 笼冠, *jinxianguan* 进贤冠, and *pingjinze* 平巾幘 are referred to as *mugwan* 武冠, *gaechaek* 介幘, and *pyeongsangchaek* 平上幘, respectively, by Jung.

Finally, the fourth limitation Zheng notes is that many researchers lack sufficient or accurate knowledge of various ethnic traits seen in the costume of Goguryeo and instead vaguely assume that all costume seen in the historic sites or artifacts of Goguryeo are all traditional costume of Goguryeo. According to Zheng, the costume depicted in the murals of Goguryeo include traditional costumes of Goguryeo, costumes of the Han, Northern-style costumes mainly of the Xianbei, and costumes showing a mixture of all three. But Jung also does not deny that there are various cultural traditions in the costume of Goguryeo, and argues that the costume of Goguryeo constitutes a unique style, a foreign style, and a combination of both.

Korean scholars have long recognized these limitations Zheng notes in the research done outside of China. As Jung's work shows, they are in the process of overcoming them. I cannot stress more how necessary it is to conduct a meticulous review of the research by Korean academic circles in advance. Jung's study, in particular, shows considerable similarities with Zheng's work in that it classifies possible combinations of Goguryeo costume, in the way it traces the genealogy of the combinations of costume, and the way it accordingly uses the resulting lineage to look at differences and changes in costume depicted in murals between regions. It would have been more interesting if Zheng had analyzed Jung's work and explained how her own work was distinct. The book also does not take into account any research of Korean historians in looking at

the context behind the emergence and decline of the Han costume, nor does it include any research of Korean archeologists in discussing the structure of the mural tombs of Goguryeo or the features of the artifacts of Baekje and Silla.

Subdivisions of Costume Based on Microscopic Features

The second shortcoming of this book lies in the subdivisions Zheng creates in classifying costume. Zheng first divides the material she collected into the five categories of hairstyle and makeup, headwear, clothes, footwear, and accessories, each of which she then divides into subcategories based on specific differences in form. The material she uses in analyzing the form of the four categories besides accessories—hairstyle and makeup, headwear, clothes, footwear—are tomb murals. This raises the question of whether costume should be subdivided based on detailed features depicted in wall paintings and not observed in the actual artifacts. The tomb murals of Goguryeo were not painted to convey information on costumes. Certain specific forms may have been omitted depending on the artist's judgment, while some details may have been distorted due to lack of knowledge or interest. It is also difficult in many cases to distinguish the forms due to severe damage of the mural. Zheng's book attempts to excessively categorize the forms into subdivisions based on microscopic features such as how pointy or round the headwear is, how compact the pleats of the skirts are, how high the footwear come up to, and what the toe portion of the footwear is shaped like. Likewise, hairstyle, for instance, is divided into fifteen styles: hair let down naturally, braided hair, hair tied up, hair put up in a single bun, hair put up in two buns on each side of the head, hair shaved all over, hair partly shaved, hair decorated in this way, hair decorated in that way, and so on. In reality, it is difficult to even distinguish the most basic hairstyles—such as whether they are braided or tied up—just by looking at murals. In subdividing the hairstyles, Zheng writes that she will use the classification and terminology of ancient Chinese hairstyles as reference due to the absence of any relevant material regarding Goguryeo. This, however, gives the impression that Zheng has lined up all the various hairstyles of ancient Chinese dynasties and then somehow forced the hairstyles seen in murals of Goguryeo into those slots. As for the pants, Zheng divides them based on how wide the pants legs are. The difference between the

resulting categories, however—very wide pants, moderately wide pants, narrow pants—are not clear, particularly between the moderately wide and narrow pants. Then there is the footwear, which the majority of researchers currently divide into footwear that wrap around the ankles, such as present-day boots, and footwear that do not, such as common shoes. Zheng, on the other hand, divides them into three types: footwear that come to below the malleolus, or the bony prominence on each side of the ankle, footwear that come to between the malleolus and the ankle, and footwear that reach somewhere from the ankle to below the knee, and then divides each category again depending on the shape of the toe portion. In many murals, however, it is hard to accurately determine how high the footwear come up to because of the skirts or pants covering them, nor are the shape of the toe portions clear. Zheng's study would have been more objective if she had used broader categories that the majority of other researchers could agree with rather than use subdivisions based on her own subjective judgment.

If the subdivisions themselves are to be the main significance of the study, then Zheng's classifications should be respected. In this case, however, I cannot help but express my concern in the way she relates the forms of the costumes with a certain ethnicity. A case in point is the queue (*kunfa* 髻发), a hairstyle in which part of the hair is shaved off, which mainly appears in northern nomadic people. The Deokheungni tomb mural depicts a hairstyle in which it appears that part of the hair is missing. Zheng judges this to be a queue and presents the possibility that Jin 镇, to whom the tomb belonged to, or his wife, was a member of the Xianbei. However, the depiction of the figures as well as their costume in the Deokheungni tomb mural are not detailed. Not only is it problematic to argue that a hairstyle is a queue based on a painting which is so simplified that it is hard to even know the specific structure of the clothes, but it is also quite a leap in logic to connect it with the husband and wife buried there and conclude—as if it is an established fact—that hairstyles of the Xianbei existed in the society of Goguryeo.

Based on her classifications, Zheng then moves on to classify possible combinations of costume based on how the basic structure of hairstyle or headwear + clothes + footwear is comprised. For instance, one type may be made up by a combination of a type A hairstyle with a type B upper garment, type C pants, and type D footwear. But because she uses the aforementioned subdivisions of hairstyle, headwear, clothes, and footwear,

the resulting ten combinations are not easy to visually distinguish at a glance. As a result, considering the discussion of Chapters 7, 8 and 9, the analyses based on these subdivisions are only meaningful in regard to hairstyle and headwear. It would have been enough to simply divide clothes into short upper garment, long upper garment, pants, skirts, and robes. Subtypes such as wide pants and narrow pants, type A and B skirts, and type A, B, and C robes are less relevant or even irrelevant in Zheng's argument. In addition, because she does not use footwear in developing her argument later, it would have been enough to simplify the combination structure as hairstyle or headwear + clothes.

One more aspect that has room for further improvement is regarding the ambiguity of the criteria in her classifications. Zheng divides the basic clothes of Goguryeo into upper garment, pants, skirt, and robe. The division between upper garment and robe, however, is not clear. In my doctoral dissertation (Jung 2003, 11), I defined upper garment as any upper garment that did not fall below the knees and robe as any upper garment that fell below the knees or was connected with the lower garment 上下連續衣. In following studies, however, I modified this by dividing upper garment and robe based on their fundamental function rather than their length. In other words, I defined all upper garment used as part of a two-piece attire that required pants or a skirt as upper garment, and all clothes that included both the upper and lower garment as a single piece of clothing, such as dresses, as robes (Jung 2006, 327-31). However, Zheng's classification of clothes is a mixture of several different perspectives, making it difficult to pinpoint the defining feature of an upper garment or robe. Zheng divides upper garment into short upper garment, which comes down to the buttocks, and long upper garment, which comes down to the calves; as for robes, she defines it as any clothes falling below the knees. Hence, the difference between long upper garment and robe is not clear. Zheng subdivides robes into types A, B, and C, where type C is a kind of clothing that comes down to about the knees and is worn with a skirt. If type C is defined as a robe because it comes down to the knees, long upper garment should be defined as a robe. But if all robes are clothes that resemble dresses, type C robes, given how it is worn with skirts, should fall under the category of long upper garment. Zheng's study thus needs a clearer way of systematizing upper garments and robes.

Not Recognizing the Indigeneity of Goguryeo Costume Enough (1): Classification of the Lineage of the Combinations of Costume

The area this book falls particularly short is in Zheng's view of the history of Goguryeo. The book uses the term "the ethnic group of Goguryeo" or "the Goguryeo regime." In other words, it plainly reveals how Chinese academic circles perceive Goguryeo as a mere ethnic minority that once held local power and was located in northeast China and the western region of North Korea. Zheng received her bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree all from Jilin University, the leading institution in the history of Goguryeo in China. Her understanding of the history of Goguryeo is strictly China-centric, and much of the material on the costume of Goguryeo is judged to be material left by the Han. As a result, Zheng's argument develops in a direction that reduces the uniqueness of the costume of Goguryeo. This tendency is markedly apparent in the classification of the cultural lineage of the combinations of costume and the way she examines the changes of the costumes depicted in the murals of the Pyeongyang area.

First of all, Zheng's determination of the lineage of costume spotted from the murals of Goguryeo goes as follows. The combinations of costume seen in the tomb murals of Goguryeo are categorized into ten types, from type A to type J. These types are then grouped into larger categories of the traditional costume of Goguryeo, the costume of the Han, Northern-style costume, mainly the Xianbei, and costumes showing a mixture of all three, all of which, for the sake of this review, I will hereafter refer to as the indigenous type, the Han type, the Xianbei type, and the mixed type, respectively. There are two scenarios in which Zheng judges a costume depicted in a mural of Goguryeo to be the indigenous type: first, when there are textual records. Examples of this are *ze* 幘, *zhéfēng* 折风, the combination of short upper garment and pants, and the combination of long upper garment and skirt. Second, when there are no textual records, the costume is judged to be the indigenous type only if it is clearly distinct from the costume of the Han and Xianbei in terms of form. *Chuji* 垂髻 is such an example. *Chuji* is a common noun that means hair tied into a low ponytail. It is a common hairstyle seen across all ages and all cultures. However, tying the hair so that the end of it is pointing upwards is a unique style mainly seen in the murals of Goguryeo. Despite being strongly suggestive of Goguryeo, however, we do not know what this hairstyle was called by the

people of Goguryeo. In such cases like this where the accurate terminology is unavailable, Zheng deploys terms used in the research of ancient Chinese costume and tries to explain its form within the framework of Chinese costume. Although she briefly describes the form seen in the murals, she restrains from any kind of reference to indigeneity.

Unless there are textual records or they have a distinctive form, Zheng tries hard to explain the costume in relation to the costume of the Han. Of course, costumes that are clearly characteristic of the Han such as *longguan*, *jinxianguan*, *pingjinze*, and *pao* 袍 should be classified into the Han type. In this book, however, even when the forms are ambiguous, Zheng employs her subjective judgment to classify them as being of the Han lineage. If the basic structure of the costume differs but similarities exist in terms of detail, Zheng nevertheless explains it using elements of the Han. Even the smallest similarities in form seems to motivate Zheng to use that material—even material from later generations—as comparative evidence. In this process, she does not even check whether the costume in that material is that of the Han. Consequently, although Zheng attempts to be strict in terms of ethnic distinction when it comes to the relevant material of Goguryeo, she simply judges some Chinese material to be that of the Han without much analysis. Simply put, a double standard is applied in Zheng's work: nationalistic standards are used when it comes to the costume of Goguryeo, while territory-centered criteria determine Chinese costume.

In the case where Zheng finds it difficult to connect the costume with that of the Han, she connects it with the Xianbei, particularly with the Murong people. In fact, Zheng goes to great lengths to find elements of the Xianbei among the costumes in the murals of Goguryeo. As a result, a queue (*kunfa* 髡发), a wind hat (*fengmao* 风帽), and a rounded-top-hat-with-upward-wings (*yuanding qiaojiao mao* 圆顶翘脚帽) are all found to be the Xianbei style. As mentioned earlier, Zheng argues that she sees a queue in the Deokheungni tomb mural. Added to this is her hypotheses that the husband and wife buried there are of the Murong people and that the Murong did a queue, which results in the conclusion that the queue in the mural was a hairstyle of the Xianbei. However, it is unclear whether or not the Xianbei at that time even did a queue, and stylistic differences existed in the queue among ethnic groups. Which parts were shaved, which were left, and how the remaining hair was styled were all important indications of specific ethnicity. It is difficult to presume that the hairstyle shown in the murals of Goguryeo was a Xianbei type when we do

not even know whether the Xianbei actually did a queue or what specific form it took. The next example, a wind hat, was a type of headwear regularly used by the Xianbei. Although Zheng writes that a wind hat existed in the murals of Goguryeo, it is difficult to clearly make out the form of a wind hat by looking at the murals. The Xianbei usually wore a wind hat with a long upper garment and pants. Meanwhile, the figures in the murals of Goguryeo wear short upper garments instead of long upper garments, showing a difference in the combination of costume. Finally, a rounded-top-hat-with-upward-wings is a type of headwear that constitutes a black cloth wrapped around the head and gathered in the back into a sort of ponytail. In Korean academic circles, it is usually called a black bandana 黑巾. Zheng reasons that because a similar headwear was found in a tomb mural related to the Murong Xianbei, the black bandana was a headwear worn by them. There has only been one tomb related to the Xianbei where a black bandana was depicted—the Yuantaizi Tomb 袁台子墓. In comparison, a black bandana has been discovered in the tombs of Goguryeo across a wider variety of periods and regions and could be said to have been a headwear more regularly used by the people of Goguryeo than by the Xianbei. Regardless, Zheng infers that the costume is a Xianbei style based on the slightest resemblance without any consideration of universality or continuity. The costume of Goguryeo is basically of the northern type based on pants and an upper garment. Whether or not the resemblance it shows with that of the Xianbei is a genealogical similarity or the result of direct influence must be carefully deliberated. Zheng reasons that because Former Yan 前燕, a country of the Murong Xianbei during the mid-fourth century, was strong and won several battles it fought with Goguryeo, its culture was transmitted in a downward fashion following the gradient of power. Moreover, under the assumption that there was a considerable number of Murong Xianbei that fled to Goguryeo during the transitional period of Former Yan, Later Yan, and Northern Yan, Zheng reads the influences of the costume of the Xianbei within the Goguryeo area, which I find to be a stretch.

Finally, if Zheng finds it hard to connect the costume with the Han or the Xianbei, she categorizes it as being mixed. For instance, Zheng judges that the type J combination of costume, which is made up of a short upper garment and skirt with the hairstyles such as the double-topknot (*shuangji* 双髻), a bun (*yunji* 云髻), and hair done up with hairpins (*huachai daji* 花钗大髻), is mixed because the hairstyle comes from the Han, the form of the upper garment and skirt are

elements of Goguryeo, and the way the upper garment and skirt are worn come from the Xianbei. Let us take a look at the hairstyle first. Although the hair done up with hairpins can be seen as being a style of the Han, the double-topknot and the bun appear to be a folded bun (*panji* 盘髻), the common hairstyle of the women of Goguryeo. If the hair done up with hairpins is moved to the type G combination, where the hairstyles of Han women are, then the hairstyle in the type J combination can actually be seen as an indigenous style. As for the skirt and upper garment, Zheng only sees the combination of a long upper garment and skirt to be an indigenous style. She does not include the combination of a short upper garment and skirt in this style simply because it was not discovered in any tomb mural of the Ji'an area. But although they were not depicted together in any mural of Ji'an, the individual items themselves can be found. Apparently, in the Ji'an area, short upper garment was worn with pants while the long upper garment was worn with skirts. In the Pyeongyang area, however, the new combination of a short upper garment with skirt appeared in addition to these basic combinations. Since the combination of a short upper garment and skirt was thus only a change in the combination of the unique costume of Goguryeo, it should have been seen as an indigenous style. But Zheng, probably in order not to classify this combination of short upper garment and skirt into an indigenous style, obsesses over hairstyle. For instance, queue + short upper garment + skirt is classified as being of the Xianbei lineage. Most women of the Xianbei, however, wore long upper garments and skirts. Instead of classifying the costume in the mural as the Xianbei style based on an ambiguously depicted queue, it would have been more reasonable had she judged it to be the Goguryeo style based on more clearly distinguishable elements or simply reserved her judgment. Zheng even categorizes the top-bun (*dingji* 顶髻) + short upper garment + skirt as the Xianbei style just because it appears next to a figure sporting a queue. A top-bun, however, was a common type of bun that cannot be attributed to only one ethnicity. It should instead be classified as an indigenous style based on the clothes. Zheng resorts to a rather flimsy explanation that although the upper garment and skirt combination in type J show features of Goguryeo, the way the upper garment is worn on top of the skirt is also seen in costume of the Xianbei. Her conclusion is thus that the form of the clothes is in the style of Goguryeo while they are worn are in the style of Xianbei. But with the exception of hair done up with hairpins, all the hairstyles and clothes of the type J combination can be included in the indigenous style.

In short, in determining cultural lineage, Zheng is quite restrictive in classifying something as an indigenous style while she is more generous in applying the label of a foreign style, thus highlighting the “foreignness” of the Goguryeo costume.

Not Recognizing the Indigeneity of Goguryeo Costume Enough (2): Changes in Costume in Murals of the Pyeongyang Area

Zheng examines the changes seen in costumes of the Goguryeo murals based on her classification of the lineage of costume combinations, and then analyzes the causes of such changes by relating them to political and social shifts. Zheng finds that costume in the Ji'an area murals maintained the indigenous type from beginning to end without any large transformations. However, when it comes to the Han type and the Xianbei type, she carries her interpretations to excess. For example, she stretches her imagination somewhat by arguing that the figure donning a black bandana in the mural of the Tomb of the Dancers (Muyongchong) is an indication of how the people of Goguryeo desired to win the war with the Murong Xianbei. She also interprets the appearance of immortal beings dressed in the style of the Southern Dynasties of China in the mural of mid-sixth century to early seventh century as proof that the popular costumes of the Southern Dynasties had penetrated Goguryeo. However, the shift in costumes—as seen in the Pyeongyang area murals from the sixth century onward—into the indigenous style indirectly shows that the style of the Southern Dynasties was not able to influence the actual costume in the Ji'an area at all.

Zheng explains the changes in the costume in the murals of the Pyeongyang area by dividing it into three stages. Her overall conclusion is that initially the more dominant Han type coexisted with the Xianbei type, onto which was added the indigenous type. Ultimately, the costumes shifted to the stage in which the Han type and the Xianbei type declined while the indigenous type became mainstream. According to Zheng, the first stage falls between the middle of the fourth century to early fifth century. During the early fourth century, Goguryeo had defeated the forces of Lelang and Daifang Commanderies but was not yet able to effectively rule the region. As a result, both the preexisting Han and the newly migrated Han would have

had a considerable amount of independence during when the culture of Han flourished. The fact that the indigenous type is not seen in the costume during this period and while the Han type is mainstream suggests that the owner of the tomb was of the Han. Additionally, the Xianbei type seen along with the Han type is related to the influx of Xianbei, who were gradually assimilated into the Han culture. The second stage is from the late fifth century to the early sixth century. During this period, Goguryeo grows stronger after it moves its capital to Pyeongyang in 427, thus gaining power in this region. The Han, finding it harder to maintain independency, gradually disintegrated and adopted cultural features suggestive of Goguryeo, accordingly wearing the indigenous-style costume. Zheng writes that the prevalence of the indigenous-style costume differed from region to region. In the A district, which corresponds to the west of Pyeongyang, the costumes in the murals are more dominantly the Han type than the indigenous type. The Han of this area seem to have gone through a slower process of becoming like the people of Goguryeo due to their strong ethnic identity and their tendency to reject the culture of Goguryeo. The costumes in the murals of the B district, which correspond to Pyeongyang and east of Pyeongyang, only show the indigenous type. The Han who lived near Pyeongyang, the then capital, would have been strongly influenced politically and culturally by Goguryeo. They would have identified with the culture of Goguryeo more strongly than the A district and slowly but surely would have transitioned into becoming part of the Goguryeo culture. The Dongamni tomb of the B district, judging from its location between Ji'an and Pyeongyang, may have been the tomb of someone who had settled there in the middle of migrating to Pyeongyang. The way its structure follows the form of the Han when all the tombs of the B district were of the indigenous type suggests that it is likely a tomb of a person from Goguryeo who had adopted the way of the Han. Finally, the third stage is from the early sixth century to the late sixth century. Most of the Han type disappeared from costume, leaving only the indigenous type. Zheng writes that this shows how the Han, after going through a transitional period of over 200 years, completely assimilated into the society of Goguryeo.

The summary I have just given demonstrates how Zheng understands the changes in the costumes in the murals of the Pyeongyang area as a process of transformation in the ethnic identity of the Han in the region. Depending on the prevalence of the Han-type and the indigenous-type costumes that appear

in the tomb murals, Zheng places the Han along a spectrum indicating the level of assimilation into the culture Goguryeo: fully Han, in the middle of being assimilated (into the Goguryeo culture) and completely assimilated. She then argues that most of the tomb murals of the Pyeongyang are from the tombs of the Han. The concept of a Han person that has completely assimilated into becoming a person of Goguryeo is created in order to explain the tomb of the B district of the second stage, where only indigenous-type costumes are found. Zheng even argues that it is the tomb of a person of Goguryeo who has adopted the culture of the Han.

It is difficult to accept Zheng's argument that the Pyeongyang area was not effectively ruled until early fifth century and that a number of groups of the Han rejecting the culture of Goguryeo existed late into the fifth century. It is true that after the collapse of the Lelang and Daifang Commanderies, there were local powers that adopted the culture of the Han. However, Goguryeo had already started to control the Pyeongyang area starting from mid fourth century at the latest and continued to tighten its grasp. It would have thus been impossible for these local forces to maintain a semi-independent, self-governing state. Goguryeo carried out a ruling policy that made use of Chinese migrants while it changed the makeup of local members by making its residents move, thus slowly taking apart preexisting local powers and solidifying its own power over the Pyeongyang area. During this process, costume also gradually changed from the Han type to the indigenous type. The mural tombs of the Pyeongyang area where the Han-type costume appear show only the Han type in the fourth century but change to the indigenous type during the beginning of the fifth century starting from men and women who were ruled, then women of the ruling class, and finally men of the ruling class. By the end of the fifth century, the majority of figures except the person buried were wearing the indigenous-type costume. The forces that led such changes may well be the owners of the mural tombs of the Pyeongyang that only show the indigenous-type costume—that is, the people living in Goguryeo that had moved from the Ji'an area to the Pyeongyang area. By the sixth century, there are no more Han-type costumes appearing in the murals. We can see that the Han-type costume disappeared from the Pyeongyang area and that all the costumes across Goguryeo have become homogeneously of the indigenous type. However, one point should be made clear: the characteristics of the Han-type costume of the people buried in the tombs. The costumes of the people buried in the tombs in the Pyeongyang

area are the Han type from mid fourth century to late fifth century. Considering how Pyeongyang was ruled between the fourth and fifth centuries, their costume seems to have been permitted by the central court, that is, as type of official attire. But textual records show that Goguryeo maintained a system of official attire made up mainly by the indigenous costume from the third century to its decline. The Liao Dynasty's case is worth examining as a point of reference. Liao, built by the Khitan, maintained a dual official attire system in which the Khitan officials wore costumes of the Khitan and the Han officials wore the costumes of the Han. Likewise, there is a high possibility that Goguryeo created a separate organization of Chinese migrants during the process of making use of them in ruling of Pyeongyang. Thus, those who were organized into a separate group from the central administration wore the Han-type official attire, while the officials who were part of the central court wore the indigenous-type official attire. This dual official attire system is presumed to have been maintained for a certain period of time.

Within Korean academic circles, various conversations besides my own opinion, which I have just outlined above, are taking place regarding the process of change in the costumes in the murals of Pyeongyang area as well as the characteristics of the Han-type costume of the people buried in the tombs (Yi 2012). However, Zheng does not even address these discussions and simply explains the changes in the politics of the Pyeongyang area and the process of the changes in the cultural lineage strictly from the perspective of the Han. As a result, research on the costume in the murals of the Pyeongyang area metamorphosize into the history of the changes in the costume of the Han, not the history of change of costume of Goguryeo. It is quite possible that underneath the exaggerated—and factually incorrect—interpretation of the Han-style characteristics of the costume in the murals of the Pyeongyang area lies the intention to incorporate the history of Goguryeo in the western region of North Korea within the boundaries of ancient Chinese history.

Conclusion

Zheng's research background as provided on the website of Jilin University shows that she has been involved in a variety of individual and comprehensive research on the costume of Goguryeo from 2006 up until the present. She has

also introduced her work to international symposiums held in South Korea, North Korea, and Japan, thus increasing the international awareness and respect of the Goguryeo studies in China. In 2016, she also published a book that briefly summarized the contents of *Research on the Costumes of Goguryeo* for the general public.

The author Zheng is whom we could call a diligent chef, proverbially speaking. She dishes out both hotel-class cuisine and common meals while providing set menus as well as a la carte. She ceaselessly cooks, and even willingly caters for places overseas. *Research on the Costumes of Goguryeo* could be seen as an excellent dish that added a variety of masterful techniques to rich ingredients. It may be as delicious as can be to Chinese people, but the food covered with Chinese sauces does not exactly suit the taste of Koreans. I hope that in the future a plain but delicious dish that did not use any spices—a study on the costume of Goguryeo unswayed by any politics but objectively written purely from the stance of a scholar, would be made available for us.

References

- Jung, Wanjin. 2003. "Goguryeo gobun byeokwa boksik ui jiyeok jeok teukseong gwa byeoncheon" [A Study on Regional Feature and Transition of the Costume on the Wall Paintings of Goguryeo Tombs]. PhD diss., Seoul National University.
- . 2006. "Gobun byeokwa ro bon Goguryeo boksik munhwa" [Costume of Goguryeo Seen Through Tomb Murals]. In *Hanguk ui boksik munhwasa* [The History of Costume of Korea], edited by Nansa Seokjuseon gwanjang 10-jugi ginyeom nonchong ganhaeng wiwonhoe, 321-44. Seoul: Hakyeon munhwasa.
- Yi, Gyeonghui. 2012. "4-5-segi Goguryeo gwanbok yeongu" [A Study on the Official Attire of Goguryeo Between the Fourth and Fifth Centuries]. PhD diss., Inha University.
- Yi, Yeoseong. 1947. *Joseon boksik go* [A Study on the Costume of Joseon]. Seoul: Baekyangdang.
- Zheng, Chunying. 2011. "Gaogouli yicun suojian fushi yanjiu" [Research on the Costumes Found in the Remains of Goguryeo]. PhD diss., Jilin University.

- _____. 2015. *Gaogouli fushi yanjiu* [Research on the Costumes of Goguryeo]. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe.
- _____. 2016. *Youming li de huali—Gaogouli bihua fushi de shidu, pouxi yu yanyi* [Gorgeous in the Darkness: Recognition, Analysis and Deduction of Goguryeo Mural Costumes]. Beijing: Shangwuyin shuguan.

JUNG Wanjin (jwanjin@hanmail.net)

Seoul National University

Translated by Jong Woo PARK and Boram SEO