Articles

Volume 15 Number 1
June 2012
The Review of Korean Studies

Articles

An Introductory Study of the "Annals of Koguryŏ" in the *Samguk Sagi*

Kenneth H. J. Gardiner (1932-2011)

The Review of Korean Studies Volume 15 Number 1 (June 2012): 15-58

When the earliest "national" histories appeared in mediaeval Europe, their writers, men such as the Venerable Bede or Paul the Deacon, looked back to the tradition of the late Latin world chronicles and historical epitomes. Similarly in East Asia, the mediaeval literati of Korea, Vietnam, Japan or Okinawa saw themselves as continuing a tradition embodied in the great early Chinese dynastic histories; the language in which they wrote was generally a form of classical Chinese, or at least was heavily sinicised, and the authors themselves had invariably undergone a long training in which they had absorbed both the style and the content of the earlier Chinese works. Yet, not surprisingly, this situation created a serious dilemma for historians in the states surrounding China; they were caught in a tension between classical training and local content, between the need to demonstrate stylistic proficiency in an acquired tongue and the need to give a coherent form to their own growing sense of separate cultural identity.

Nowhere was this more evidently so than in Korea, where those local historians who chose to follow a Chinese model had to come to terms with the fact that the earliest and most prestigious Chinese histories including the *Shiji* (*Historian's Record*), written at the beginning of the first century BCE; the *Hanshu* (*Book of Han*), written two hundred years later; the *Hou Hanshu* (*Book of Later Han*), dating in its present form from the fifth century CE, but based upon much earlier material and, above all, the *Sanguozhi* (*Account of the Three Kingdoms*), written towards the end of the third century CE. All of these contained much information about Korea which contradicted the Korean indigenous traditions patriotism rendered increasingly sacrosanct. The mediaeval historian's dilemma is reflected in the problem of choice facing the modern scholar: whether to base his or her reconstructions upon the entries in the ancient Chinese histories, with their sinocentric bias, or to turn instead to the mediaeval Sino-Korean chroniclers, offering indigenous traditions of dubious provenance. Essentially this means going back to the work of Kim Pu-sik (1075-1151), whose *Samguk sagi* (*Historian's Record of*

---

* Associate editor's note: This paper, written in the late 1980s, was originally intended not as an independent paper but an introduction to the translation of "Annals of Koguryŏ" of the *Samguk sagi*. *The Review of Korean Studies* is pleased to publish this manuscript posthumously to honor the life-long devotion of Dr. Ken Gardiner to the field of Korean Studies. It is also worthy of note that at the advice of the reviewers, the editorial board decided to retain the original McCune-Reischauer romanization used in the manuscript.

the Three Kingdoms), written in 1145, is the first historical work written in Korea to be preserved intact.

The "Three Kingdoms" of this work's title are the early mediaeval Korean states of Silla, in the south-east of the peninsula, Paekche in the south-west, and Koguryŏ in the north (not to be confused with three third century CE Chinese states of the *Sanguozhi*). Kim Pu-sik purports to give a detailed conspectus of the history of these Korean kingdoms from 57 BCE until the first decades of the tenth century CE, offering a superficially tidy and comprehensive chronology which, even today, is still all too often accepted as basically accurate. Since Kim Pu-sik was a native Korean, descended from the royal house of Silla, his *Samguk sagi* has been seen, especially by twentieth century Korean nationalism, as a repository of genuine indigenous tradition which can be used to correct the distortions of the Chinese records. Yet clearly the acceptance of Kim Pu-sik as a trustworthy guide presupposes that he himself had access to detailed and reliable local records stretching back to the earliest times, and presupposes moreover that he relayed such information without omissions or other changes. In fact, without recourse to the Chinese dynastic histories, Korean records themselves provide abundant evidence that these presuppositions are in no way justified.

First of all Kim Pu-sik himself tells us that historical records in the kingdom of Silla began to be compiled in 545.[1] Leaving aside for the moment the question of how far these first records can have been available to Kim Pu-sik writing six hundred years afterwards, it is clear that there can have been no detailed and reliable local annals underlying his account of the first few centuries of Silla history, from 57 BCE onwards. The detailed month by month chronology which he offers for these ancient times is nothing more nor less than a work of creative imagination, comparable to the reign lengths which his contemporary Geoffrey of Monmouth ascribes to Brutus, Lear and other primaeval British kings. Similarly with Silla's neighbour, Paekche, Kim Pu-sik specifically indicates that the first records which were kept in Paekche began in the middle of the fourth century CE.[2]

---

1. See *Samguk Sagi* (hereafter *SGSG*) ch.5, 6a and ch.44, 3b; discussion in Gardiner, "The *Samguk sagi* and its Sources," *Papers on Far Eastern History* 2 (1970), 13-15.
2. See *SGSG* ch.24, 9a. The fabulous character of this early Paekche material is discussed in Gardiner, "Some Problems Concerning the Founding of Paekche," *Archiv Orientalni* 37

If this is so, we can obviously have no confidence in the detailed chronology which he offers for Paekche stretching back to the time of its foundation, which he places in 18 BCE. Genealogy too is plainly untrustworthy in the *Samguk sagi,* as becomes readily apparent when we are told, in the annals of Koguryŏ,[3] that one king not merely reigned for ninety-four years, but then abdicated in favour of his younger brother who, after a reign of twenty years, was succeeded by yet a third brother who went on to reign for fourteen years. Yet a glance at the *Hou Hanshu*, the Chinese dynastic history covering this period and written very much closer to the time, shows that all three of these Koguryŏ kings were real people. Their combined reigns took in most of the second century, but not merely the reign-lengths but their relative proportions are quite different from those in the *Samguk sagi*, with the last in the series having by far the longest reign;[4] moreover they appear not as three brothers but as father, son and grandson respectively. It is clear that the Chinese could and did make mistakes about the genealogical relationships of Korean rulers, but in this case the reconstruction offered by the *Hou Hanshu* is so much more probable that to prefer, as Kim Pu-sik did, the account given in the Korean sources available to him requires the faith of a White Queen.

Thus Kim Pu-sik himself provides evidence to show that no indigenous Korean records were available for the period covering the foundation of the three kingdoms; indeed, it is almost certain that before ca. 300 CE, no such records were kept in Korea. Even where real rulers and real events underlie the stories told in the early pages of the *Samguk sagi*, as in the case of the three Koguryŏ kings mentioned above, we are obliged to recognise that the chronological and genealogical framework provided for them may well be completely arbitrary, the product of much later systematisers trying to bring order out of a chaos of conflicting traditions. As is shown by Kim Pu-sik's comment on the ninety-four year reign of the Koguryŏ King Kung, much of this systematisation antedates his own writing. This fact leads directly to our second question: was Kim Pu-sik a "scissors-and-paste" historian,

---

(1969).

3. See *SGSG* ch.15 and ch.16, *passim*.

4. Approximately sixty years. See *Hou Hanshu* (hereafter *HHS*) 1-ch.36 (Liezhuan 1-ch.26), 2814-15; and *Sanguozhi* (hereafter *SGZ*) ch.30, 29a.

relaying the distortions of the early systematisers as they came to him, or did he in his turn make other changes?

Only one text really allows us a glimpse over Kim Pu-sik's shoulder into his unnamed sources; this is a single chapter of an older *History of the Three Kingdoms* which was discovered by the future statesman Yi Kyu-bo in 1193. Because it seemed important, Yi Kyu-bo rewrote in verse this one chapter, an account of the founding of the kingdom of Koguryŏ; what seems to have been the original text is retained as notes to his poem in Yi Kyu-bo's collected works.[5] One section of the text buried in these notes is almost identical with part of Kim Pu-sik's account of the founding of Koguryŏ, suggesting that he knew this earlier version (as Yi Kyu-bo believed) and took over its wording in this passage. Elsewhere, however, the older text is full of miraculous incidents which have been drastically pruned in the *Samguk sagi*. In the preface to his poem, Yi Kyu-bo suggested that Kim Pu-sik deliberately omitted such material "thinking that when a gentleman writes the history of his state, a book designed to exercise a reforming influence upon the age, he cannot provide (moral) exemplars for men of later times by citing marvels."[6] But other motives too seem to have lain behind Kim Pu-sik's omissions. In 1135 he took the lead in crushing the rebellion of the Buddhist monk Myoch'ŏng, who had tried to get the Koryŏ dynasty to move back north from Kaesŏng to the old Koguryŏ capital at P'yŏngyang. Indeed, the Koryŏ dynasty had once regarded itself as the heir of Koguryŏ (hence its name) and had refortified the old Koguryŏ capital on coming to power. But Kim Pu-sik, as a descendant of the Silla ruling house, took the view that the southern state of Silla was the only truly legitimate predecessor of Koryŏ, and that the Koryŏ founder became the rightful ruler of Korea when he received the abdication of the last Silla king in 935. It was this belief (as well as a generally pro-Confucian and anti-Buddhist stance) which led Kim to oppose Myoch'ŏng's rebellion and later to rewrite the history of the period before 935 from a "southern" viewpoint, reworking the synthesis which earlier Koryŏ historians had achieved, so as to stress the role

5. See the photostatic reproduction of the seventeenth century edition of *Tongguk Yi Sangguk chip* (Seoul: Tongguk Munhwasa, 1958) ch.3. A number of more recent books reprint this text, such as Pak Tubo's translation into modern Korean in *Ulyu mun'go* 160 (1974).
6. *Tongguk Yi Sangguk chip*, ch.52, 1b.

of Silla rather than that of Koguryŏ. He did this in several ways. He established or took over from Silla writers a date for the beginning of Silla as 57 BCE, which would make that kingdom antedate the earliest Chinese reference to Koguryŏ, and in so doing he placed the birth of the founder of Silla clearly before that of the founder of Koguryŏ as the latter appeared in the older *History of the Three Kingdoms*.[7] Then he excised as far as possible the miraculous element in stories associated with the founding of Koguryŏ while retaining numerous miracles linked with early Silla.[8] Even more strikingly, he virtually eliminated from the *Samguk sagi* any mention of Parhae, the kingdom which, from the beginning of the eighth century until its fall in 926, claimed to be the direct successor to Koguryŏ, being throughout this time the principal rival of Silla. There can be little doubt that, as M. C. Rogers has declared, the refutation of the concept that Koryŏ was the lawful heir to Koguryŏ was "one motivation for Kim Pu-sik's composition of the *Samguk sagi*" in which he "emasculated the earlier version, toning down its claims, by presenting them in a hearsay fashion or omitting them altogether."[9]

Thus it appears that Kim Pu-sik had no indigenous sources which would have allowed him to compose a reliable history of Korea for several centuries after his arbitrary initial date of 57 BCE. He was therefore obliged to rely upon the work of systematising historians whose chronological frameworks appear quite arbitrary, and his own political convictions led him to abridge radically or distort even the historical tradition which he received from them. His *Samguk sagi* should nevertheless not be dismissed; like a cutting exposing the vicissitudes of the earth in various strata it displays the impact of changing political circumstances upon the historical tradition. However it should be used with considerably more caution than has usually been the case; in particular, it is a totally unreliable guide to the history of

7. The date 57 BCE had also the merit of being the first year of sixty year cycle, and exactly twelve such cycles before the final elimination of Silla's other rival Paekche in 663 CE.

8.It is clear that Kim Pu-sik felt obliged to retain those miraculous aspects of the Koguryŏ foundation legend which were already familiar to the educated reader from their occurrence in Chinese histories.

9. See Rogers in "P'yŏnnyŏn T'ongnok: The Foundation Legend of the Koryŏ State," *Journal of Korean Studies* 4 (1983), 33, note 53; see also p.16-18 of the same article.

Korea prior to the end of the third century CE. For Koguryŏ, which is our main concern in this book, Kim Pu-sik can only be regarded as a late, hostile and untrustworthy witness.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

From what has been said it will be apparent that the foundations of the early history of Koguryŏ are to be sought in archaeological research and in the statements or silences of the first four composite histories of China. However seductive the apparent detail of the *Samguk sagi*'s narrative, we should resist the temptation to use it to fill up the numerous gaps in the accounts of the older sources. Nor can we turn Kim Pu-sik's work into history simply by omitting the miraculous element; fiction does not become truth simply through the elimination of fantasy. It will be safest to recognise that the earlier chapters of the *Samguk sagi* cannot be used until they have been subjected to systematic (if necessarily speculative) analysis. To lay the grounds for this analysis we must turn to what older sources can tell us about the early Koguryŏ state.

Every source, ancient or mediaeval, agrees that Koguryŏ came from Puyŏ, a tribal confederacy which was already settled in the lowlands along the upper course of the Sungari (Songhua) river during the second century BCE. From Puyŏ came the ancestors, not of the entire Koguryŏ population of later times, but at least the greater part of the well-defined ruling elite. The earliest (and indeed virtually the only) account of the social structure of early Koguryŏ comes from the third century Chinese history, the *Sanguozhi*, and it is perhaps unlikely that Koguryŏ society in earlier times was substantially different. We are told in this source that:

> In this realm there are some ten thousand or more from the great families who eat in idleness and do no work in the fields, being supplied by the lower orders (*haho*) who bring them rice, salt and fish from remote regions.[10]

10. *SGZ* ch.30, 26b.

Although the figures given in the *Sanguozhi* are clearly only rough approximations, it may be worthwhile noting that the number of the tribal aristocracy given here represents something less than a third of the estimate in the same text for the total population of Koguryŏ.[11] In this ruling group we may see the nucleus of the five tribes of Koguryŏ; the Yŏnno-bu, the Chŏllo-bu, the Sunno-bu, the Kwanno-bu, and the Kyeru-bu. We can perhaps assume that in most cases their ancestors had moved south from the lands held by the Puyŏ along the upper Sungari. In the upper echelons of this aristocracy were the great nobles (*taega*), who had the privilege of ancestral shrines, and whose tomb chambers, built of massive stones and covered with earth, had already appeared at what seems to be the earliest Koguryŏ site, Gaolimuzi near the junction of the Hun River and Fu'er River, on the eastern borders of the modern Chinese province of Liaoning. The labour for the construction of these tombs would surely have been provided by the "lower households" as refered to in *Sanguozhi*, who seem to have been a group of much more composite origin. While some ancestors of these "lower households" may conceivably have made the trek south with the original Koguryŏ tribal aristocracy,[12] other elements of this subject population were certainly descended from groups of early agriculturalists settled in northern Korea, who were taken over and sometimes resettled by the incoming Koguryŏ tribes. (In the fourth and fifth centuries, as we learn from the King Kwanggaet'o Stele inscription of 414, it was the custom in Koguryŏ, as in Japan, to resettle families of the subject population "from far and near" to serve as tomb guardians for deceased kings, perhaps an echo of an earlier grimmer practice).[13] The version of the Koguryŏ foundation legend found in the older *History of the Three Kingdoms* contains a significant incident when the founder comes south, bringing the seeds of the staple crops with him; the wheat grains were left behind, but the hero's "divine mother" sent a

11. *SGZ* ch.30, 25b.
12. The close connection between the tribal nobility and their dependants in Puyŏ is indicated by the custom recorded in *SGZ* ch.30, 22b/23a of killing large numbers of servants to accompany the deceased to the other world, a practice reminiscent of Shang China.
13. For a discussion of this much debated inscription, see Pak Si-hyŏng, *Kwanggaet'o-wang nŭngbi* (P'yŏngyang: Sahoe Kwahagwŏn Ch'ulp'ansa, 1966). The discussion of tomb guardians is found on the fourth face of the inscription, columns 5 and 6.

pair of doves after him; he shot the doves, opened their crops, and discovered the missing wheat grains.[14] Here agriculture appears as a gift made by the rulers to the peasant cultivators, indeed as a product of the hunting skills of the former: thus it emphasises the dependancy of the subject population upon their rulers.

Surviving source material does not give us any idea when the Koguryŏ tribes moved south into the Hun River valley. However it seems almost certain that the move took place long before 37 BCE, the arbitrary date at which Kim Pu-sik fixes the beginning of Koguryŏ. The great historical change which affected this area in Former Han times was the destruction of the old Chosŏn kingdom by the armies of Han China in 108 BCE, described in the pages of a source contemporary with the event, Sima Qian's *Shiji*.[15] This is not the place to go into the background or affiliations of the old Chosŏn kingdom; for our purposes it is sufficient to note that its territories were taken over and placed under the administration of four Han commanderies (the commandery being the basic unit of administration in Han China). Of these the most important was Lelang, with its headquarters at Wanghŏm, near modern P'yŏngyang, formerly the capital of Chosŏn. Further north, originally centred on the north-eastern angle of the Korean peninsula, was the commandery of Xuantu. By the end of the Former Han period, this commandery shows signs of a very close connection with Koguryŏ, for in the census list of years 1 and 2 CE, preserved in the *Hanshu*, the principal prefecture (*xian*) of Xuantu commandery was named Gaogouli xian, or Koguryŏ prefecture. That this prefecture received its name from its responsibility for dealings with the Koguryŏ tribes appears from the *Sanguozhi*, which tells us:

> During the Han dynasty it was the custom to present (Koguryŏ) with skilled players of the drum or trumpet, and (the tribes-people) always came to receive their court robes and caps from Xuantu commandery, where the

14. *Tongguk Yi Sangguk chip* ch.3, 6b.

15. *Shiji* ch.115, translated in Burton Watson, *Records of the Grand Historian of China* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961), vol.2, 258-63. At the time of the Han conquest of Korea, Sima Qian already held a post at court, and in the following year succeeded his father as Grand Historian.

prefect of Gaogouli kept a register of their names.[16]

While the Chinese sources might naturally be expected to overstress the degree of dependancy of the Koguryŏ tribes on the Han frontier administration, the fact that the *Hanshu* mentions Koguryŏ troops being stationed *within* the Chinese frontier in 12 CE, preparatory to an expedition against China's northern enemies, demonstrates that the client status of Koguryŏ at this period was more than just a piece of official jargon.[17] The only source that gives a clear statement about the origin of Koguryŏ's client status is the *Hou Hanshu*, dating in its present form from the fifth century CE, which declares "When Emperor Wu destroyed Chosŏn, Koguryŏ became a prefecture of Xuantu commandery."[18]

If correct, this would put the establishment of the Han "protectorate" over the nascent Koguryŏ chiefdom in 108 BCE. The lateness of this source however gives some grounds for doubt. The description of Koguryŏ given in the *Hou Hanshu* shows a definite relationship to the similar description in the earlier *Sanguozhi*, witnessed in numerous close verbal parallels and the fact that, although the order of sentences in the two texts is different, the short passage from the *Hou Hanshu* description quoted above is the only one for which no parallel exists in the *Sanguozhi*. Assuming that the descriptions of Koguryŏ in the *Hou Hanshu* and the *Sanguozhi* go back to a common source, this exception could represent a sentence from the source not used in the *Sanguozhi*; on the other hand it could also represent a simple conjecture on the part of Fan Ye, the author of the *Hou Hanshu*.[19]

Certainly when Xuantu commandery was first established in 108 BCE its capital was not situated in Gaogouli prefecture but in what the *Sanguozhi*, which gives the fullest account, calls "the walled town of the Okchŏ."[20] The Okchŏ were a tribal group settled somewhere in the vicinity of the modern city of Hamhŭng around the north-eastern angle of the Korean coast, where

16. *SGZ* ch.30, 26a. Cf. *Hanshu* (hereafter *HS*) ch.28 (B), 1626.
17. *HS* ch.99 (B), p.4130, discussed in Gardiner, "Beyond the Archer and His Son: Koguryŏ and Han China," *Papers on Far Eastern History* 20 (1979), 57-82.
18. *HHS* ch.85, Liezhuan ch.75, 2813.
19. It may be noted that the account in *SGZ* is much more detailed than that in *HHS*, which is presumably epitomising the common source, often somewhat clumsily.
20. *SGZ* ch.30, 30b.

the coastal strip opens out into a small but fertile plain which would have provided a natural focus for Chinese administration. Yet this area did not remain the administrative centre of the new commandery for long; continuing its account, the *Sanguozhi* states that:

> Later the commandery was subject to incursions of the Maek barbarians,[21] and was shifted to the north-west of Koguryŏ, to the place which is now known as the "former headquarters of Xuantu."

By the time this passage was written, the administrative headquarters of Xuantu had suffered a further move, yet the second headquarters of the commandery, established after the move away from Okchŏ, had evidently been occupied for a long time, and was still clearly recognizable in the third century CE. Moreover, since the *Sanguozhi* identifies this second headquarters by its position in regard to the Koguryŏ tribes, we are immediately reminded of what the same text tells us about the dealings between these tribes and the Han prefect of Gaogouli, and the *Hanshu*'s listing of Gaogouli prefecture as the most important amongst those in Xuantu.

While the nature of the threat to Xuantu which forced its first transference remains unclear, it seems evident that the commandery was re-located to an area not only closer to China but also close to the settlements of the Koguryŏ tribes, this being presumably regarded as more secure. Various commentators have suggested, on the basis of notes to the *Hanshu*'s monograph on administrative geography which appear to date from Han times, that the Gaogouli prefecture of the second Xuantu commandery was established in the upper reaches of the Suzi River, a southern tributary of the Hun River. The Suzi valley extends from the Korean-Manchurian border massif: on either side of the valley hills rise for heights of seven hundred

21. Maek is a pre-Qin term for people on the north-eastern borders of China. Intended to be derogative, at least in writing, it could certainly be applied to the Koguryŏ tribes (as in *HS* ch.99 (B), 4130) but was clearly not confined to them. Here the reference is definitely not to Koguryŏ, since the threatened commandery was moved closer to it. Perhaps the Yemaek who lived south of the Okchŏ along the eastern coasts of Korea, are intended. Okchŏ at all events was not abandoned, but placed under the jurisdiction of Lelang, which suggests that the problem was mainly one of maintaining communications with the Okchŏ outpost across the uplands of the Korean-Manchurian border massif.

metres or more, while from the head of the valley a route climbs through the uplands via the modern towns of Yongling and Xinbin, to communicate with the valley of the Fu'er River where, as already noted, the earliest Koguryŏ tombs have been discovered. On the other side, the Suzi River runs into the Hun River which offers easy communication with the valley of the Liao, which was more extensively settled by Chinese colonists; indeed, the Hun River was known in Han times as the Lesser Liao.

From the annals of the *Hanshu* the construction of the new headquarters of Xuantu (outside) Liaodong can be firmly dated to the early spring of 75 BCE.[22] It was part of a number of administrative changes on the Chinese frontiers at this time, when some of the more far flung conquests of Emperor Wu were reconstituted in more manageable units. In no case did this mean taking over more land, therefore the reconstruction of the headquarters of the Xuantu close to the Koguryŏ settlements at this time would imply that the tribes were already under Chinese control, in which case the *Hou Hanshu*'s assertion that Koguryŏ first came under Chinese rule at the time of the destruction of the Chosŏn state in 108 BCE may well be approximately correct. And from the *Hanshu*'s account of the use of Koguryŏ troops in China in 12 CE, it would appear that this period of Han overlordship lasted at least until then.[23]

The picture we have now constructed differs from that given by Kim Pu-sik in the first chapter of the annals of Koguryŏ in several important respects. Firstly, it shows the Koguryŏ tribes originating as an independent group separate from Puyŏ, perhaps before 108 BCE, certainly before 75 BCE. In other words, Kim Pu-sik's date for the founding of Koguryŏ as 37 BCE, is definitely too late. Secondly, the Chinese sources present a convincing picture of a period of a century or more when the Koguryŏ tribes, settled just outside the imperial frontier in the northeast, were nevertheless very definitely under the general control of the Chinese border administrators. All trace of this period of 'proto-Koguryŏ' under Chinese suzerainty has

22. See *HS* ch.7, 232 and ch.26, 1307.

23. Wada Sei in "*Gento-gun Ko*," *Tōyōgaku* 1 (1951) suggested that the original Xuantu commandery formed a chain of outposts stretching from Okchŏ across the mountains towards the valley of the Hun River, one of whose objectives was the isolation of the "protected" Koguryŏ tribes from the parent Puyŏ confederacy.

now disappeared from the Koguryŏ tradition as recorded in the *Samguk sagi*, and this may well be because, as Koguryŏ developed, it was drawn into a natural competition with the Chinese empire for the control of fertile borderlands, notably the Liaodong peninsula. The theme of heroic resistance against Chinese invasion is a recurrent one in the section of the *Samguk sagi* devoted to Koguryŏ, and presumably comes from traditions written down under the Koguryŏ kingdom itself. Naturally enough, the idea of a long period of subjection to the Han empire would have been unpalatable to the rulers of Koguryŏ, and thus dropped out of the tradition.

In fact, the major turning point here seems to have been these events of 12 CE, already mentioned briefly of which a rather more detailed account will now have to be given. All extant versions of what happened in this crisis, including that recorded in the *Samguk sagi*, go back to a passage from the *Hanshu* where the usual sinocentric bias is complicated by the writer's intention to demonstrate the blunders of the usurper Wang Mang, who seized the throne from the last of the Former Han in 9 CE, and reigned until year 23.

At Wang Mang's accession some kind of Chinese suzerainty was still acknowledged by most of the neighbouring rulers of East Asia including the king of Puyŏ and the shanyü or supreme khan of the Xiongnu, the great nomad confederacy along China's northern borders. Ban Gu, writing his Han history under the restored Han dynasty late in the first century CE, states that Wang Mang could not bear that foreign rulers should hold a formal title (*wang*, 'king') which was identical with his own surname, and arranged for envoys to be despatched informing all such rulers of their demotion from 'king' to 'marquis' (*hou*). We are specifically told that envoys charged with this mission went to both Puyŏ and Koguryŏ, suggesting that both states must have had their own "kings" at this time. (In contrast to the Xiongnu, it may be noted that, although many native Koguryŏ terms of noble rank are known from the *Sanguozhi*, there is no native Koguryŏ equivalent of '*wang*').[24]

---

24. For the lengthy edict detailing this measure, see *HS* ch.99 (B), 4105-115. In view of the circumscribed powers of the king of Koguryŏ as late as the third century, it is possible that this office was not a native development, and may have originated from Han frontier administrators recognising a prominent chieftain of one of the five tribes as an intermediary in their dealings with the Koguryŏ people in general, as seems to have happened with the

In the *Hanshu* Wang Mang's diplomatic blunders are blamed for the hostilities which soon broke out with the Xiongnu all along the northern borders, hostilities which led to Wang Mang's grandiose plans for a punitive campaign in 12 CE in which both Chinese troops and allied tribes, including Koguryŏ, were to be involved. However, disaffection was apparently widespread, and the Koguryŏ troops stationed within the imperial frontiers in readiness for the coming campaign mutinied and set off, doubtless with the idea of returning to their homes. During the mutiny a senior Chinese administrator who attempted to restrain them was killed. Local authorities in the north-east blamed these disturbances upon Chu, Marquis of Koguryŏ. Chu was presumably the client ruler of Koguryŏ whose rank had been reduced from king to marquis three years before. Interestingly enough, his name does not occur in any of the traditional lists of Koguryŏ rulers, and in the *Samguk sagi* he is replaced by a Koguryŏ general "Yŏn-bi" who is unknown to any other source. Chuang Yu, one of Wang Mang's leading generals,[25] who was serving in the area at the time of the Koguryŏ mutiny, memorialised the throne to the effect that Chu was not responsible for the mutiny and that, rather than antagonising him further, it would be better to conciliate him to avoid the prospect of operations against the Xiongnu being complicated by a widespread outbreak of rebellion amongst Puyŏ and allied groups in the north-east. Wang Mang ignored this advice, and when the anticipated rising broke out, ordered Chuang Yu to repress it. Determining to strike at the most prominent figure, Chuang Yu, in spite of his earlier defence of "Marquis Chu," decoyed the latter to his camp, killed him and sent his head to Wang Mang in Chang-an. Wang Mang was delighted with this facile success, but the revolt did not collapse and indeed border hostilities with Koguryŏ and other neighbouring tribal groups intensified. Eventually it was not Koguryŏ or the Xiongnu but Wang Mang's regime that came to grief, in a series of massive internal revolts between 19 and 23.

In the decade that followed, China was plunged into anarchy as military

---

Han tribes in southern Korea in the third century.

25. This name appears as Yan Yu in *HS* ch.99 (B), 4l30, because Ban Gu was obliged to avoid the taboo on the personal name of Emperor Ming of Later Han (57-75), which was Chuang. For a detailed discussion of this passage, see Gardiner, "Beyond the Archer and His Son," *Papers on Far Eastern History* 20 (1979), 63 and 72-3.

leaders and peasant rebels fought each other. Whatever may have been Koguryŏ's status prior to this, there is no doubt that the tribes were now effectively independent. Never again do we hear of Koguryŏ troops campaigning at the behest of a ruler of China, nor, understandably, of a ruler of Koguryŏ visiting Chinese territory. Although Koguryŏ kings occasionally placated their powerful neighbour by submissive memorials and presents, interpreted by the Chinese as "tribute," from this time on the people of Koguryŏ, as noted by the *Sanguozhi*, "grew prouder" and refused to come to the Koguryŏ prefecture to receive their court robes and caps from the hands of Chinese officials.[26]

Also significant is the fact that the Koguryŏ kingship survived the crisis of Marquis Chu's death. The confederacy did not break up, and in 33, when a measure of stability was beginning to return to China, Koguryŏ sent a mission to the court of the restored Han dynasty, and the unnamed chieftain who despatched it was confirmed by the emperor as "King of Koguryŏ."[27]

The events of 12 CE may thus be seen as marking the change from "proto-Koguryŏ" to "early Koguryŏ," from real client status to effective independence. It is clear that the following hundred years must have been a crucial one in the development of the new state, but unfortunately Chinese sources only contain the merest scraps of information, and even these cease altogether after the middle of the century. During this period a distant relative of the old Han ruling family, Liu Xiu, had made himself master of China (by 36 CE), where he reigned until year 57. Under his posthumous title of Emperor Guang Wu he is regarded as the first ruler of the Later Han dynasty. In the latter part of his reign, divisions amongst the Xiongnu led to the break up of that confederacy and the re-establishment of strong Chinese influence in the steppe and the north-eastern frontier from 49 onwards. Later in 73 CE, during the reign of Guang Wu's son and successor, Emperor Ming (r. 57-75 CE), the Han felt strong enough to move into the offensive and inflicted the first of a series of destructive defeats upon the northern half

---

26. *SGZ* ch.30, 26b.
27. See *HHS* ch.1(B), 54 and Liezhuan ch.75, 2814, as well as *SGZ* ch.30, 28a. Liaodong and the Korean commanderies had come under the control of Emperor Guang Wu in 30 CE, and it was obviously prudent for the Koguryŏ state to regularise relations with such a powerful neighbour.

of the old Xiongnu confederacy (the southerners were by now Chinese clients). It must have appeared that the old Chinese suzerainty in East Asia would be fully restored.

At this time of renewed Chinese strength it was clearly advisable for the newly independent Koguryŏ state to move cautiously and avoid openly antagonising the Han. Probably for this reason we hear little about Koguryŏ frontier raiding in the northeast until the following century. Yet it seems likely that Koguryŏ expansion nevertheless continued in other areas. That this is not spelled out clearly in the Chinese sources is partly owing to the patchy coverage of Korean affairs in the *Hou Hanshu*,[28] and partly because in this period Koguryŏ control was apparently extended into regions where it did not conflict directly with Chinese interests.

In 30 CE, when he gained control of Liaodong, Xuantu and Lelang, Emperor Guang Wu, still in the midst of the civil war, made no attempt to reassert Chinese rule along the eastern coast of Korea, an area which included the Okchŏ lands. Writing just over two centuries later, Chen Shou, the author of the *Sanguozhi*, reports:

> Thereafter the various chieftains living in the prefectures (of eastern Korea) were (recognised as) "prefectural marquises," so that Pullae, Hwaryŏ and Okchŏ[29] all became marquisates (although), since the barbarians fought each other more and more, it is only the Ye Marquis of Pullae who continues to the present to make appointments to (various Chinese prefectural offices). Since (these new) principalities were small, they came under pressure from the largest of the (adjacent) kingdoms, and *eventually became subject to Koguryŏ*. (The men of) Koguryŏ appointed chieftains to control them, and made them responsible one to another; they also appointed *taega* (great nobles) to supervise the collection of tribute consisting of a kind of cloth manufactured by the Maek people, fish, salt

28. In "The Restoration of the Han Dynasty," pt. 1, *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities* 26 (1954), Hans Bielenstein discusses the vicissitudes of the Later Han archives on the fall of the dynasty. He also points out (*op. cit.,* p.25) that over a quarter of the surviving biographies in the *Hou Hanshu* deal primarily with the period of Guang Wu's reign, an era written up by Ban Gu in the *Dongguan Hanji*. It is of some interest that all the surviving references to Koguryŏ in the first century CE also come from this reign.
29. According to *HS* ch.28 (B), 1626, Pullae, Hwaryŏ and Okchŏ were all prefectures of eastern Lelang at the end of Former Han.

> and other sea-foods. And in order to bring this tribute in they have to carry the goods on their backs for a thousand *li*.[30] They also send their beautiful women to be servants and concubines (in Koguryŏ), where they are always treated as slaves.[31]

The *Sanguozhi* gives no indication of when Koguryŏ subjected the Okchŏ and their allies, although clearly this was well before the middle of the third century, when the Okchŏ are found fighting for a ruler of Koguryŏ who had been driven out of his capital. One line of evidence suggests that Koguryŏ intervention in the affairs of the tribal states of eastern Korea could have come quite early. The *Hou Hanshu* records that, late in the year 47, Taesŭng, Koguryŏ *taega* of Chamji, surrendered to the governor of Lelang along with ten thousand of his dependants.[32] Surrender to Lelang rather than to Xuantu, which was still the regular channel for dealings between Koguryŏ and China, surely implies that Taesŭng was based in peninsular Korea. If the settlement of Chamji (Ch. Canzhi) is related to the Former Han prefecture of Cantai (Kor. Chamt'ae), somewhere in eastern Korea, it may well be that Taesŭng was an early example of a Koguryŏ noble in charge of tribute collection amongst the tribal communities of the eastern coast. This in turn would suggest that it was not long after the Han state effectively acknowleged the independence of these groups in 30 CE that Koguryŏ moved into the area.[33]

Unfortunately the scanty notices of Taesŭng's surrender in the *Hou Hanshu* do not suggest any reason for his action, and he is not mentioned elsewhere. This is particularly tantalising since it appears that a major change in the Koguryŏ ruling group could have been underway at just this time. According to the *Sanguozhi* it was the Yŏnno-bu who had originally provided the kings of Koguryŏ, but by the third century they had been

---

30. Over 500 kilometres, a wild exaggeration. The actual distance could scarcely have been as much as half this figure.
31. *SGZ* ch.30, 31a/b.
32. See *HHS* 1(B), 75 and Liezhuan ch.75, 2814, discussed in Gardiner, "The *Hou Hanshu* as a Source for the Early Expansion of Koguryŏ," *Monumenta Serica* 28 (1969), 155 and 163-70.
33. For what it is worth, *SGSG* has a number of entries relating to various Okchŏ groups being subjected by Koguryŏ or offering tribute; all are placed in the early days of the kingdom. See *SGSG* ch.12 p.4b; ch.14, p.4a, and ch.15, p.1b, and notes.

replaced in this role by another of the five tribes, the Kyeru-bu.[34] As with the conquest of Okchŏ, no indication of a date is given for this change, although careful consideration shows that it is likely to have taken place before the beginning of the second century. Various expressions used in the *Sanguozhi*, such as "those great nobles who belong to the same ancestral tribe as the king"[35] show that certainly in the third century (and presumably earlier) the five Koguryŏ tribes were envisaged, not as cantons, as some later commentators believed, but as kinship groups.[36] When this conclusion is taken together with the fact that all later Koguryŏ kings appear in the Chinese sources as descendants of Kung, who reigned at the beginning of the second century, we are bound to conclude that the change in the ruling line must have taken place before his day. Kung is the first ruler of Koguryŏ who appears both in the early Chinese sources (*Hou Hanshu* and *Sanguozhi*), and in the *Samguk sagi*. In the latter he is an important king, credited with an unlikely reign of 94 years and given the posthumous titles of King Kukjo "Ancestor of the Realm," and King T'aejo Tae "Grand Ancestral King." These titles are all the more remarkable in that, in the *Samguk sagi*, Kung's descendants do not reign and he is succeeded by his younger brother.[37] But his story abounds in contradictions, as for example, when we are told that he came to the throne as a child, necessitating a regency,[38] and then that the throne had first been offered to his father, who had declined it on the grounds of extreme old age.[39] These contradictions probably reflect the late and somewhat arbitrary character of Kung's accommodation in the royal genealogy. He is made a cousin of the preceding ruler (a wicked tyrant who had been assassinated), and the son of a certain *koch'uga* Chaesa, himself stated to have been a son of the second king, Yuri Myŏng.[40] But Chaesa is not mentioned

34. See *SGZ* ch.30, 26b.
35. *SGZ* ch.30, 26b.
36. See the lengthy discussion by H. Ikeuchi, "*Kokuri go-zoku oyobi go-bu*," in his *Mansen shi kenkyu Josei-hen* (Kyoto: Tōyō Bunko, 1951), pt.1, 325-387.
37. *SGSG* ch.15, *passim*
38. *SGSG* ch.15, 1a.
39. *SGSG* ch.15, 4b.
40. *SGSG* ch.15, 1a. Koch'uga, written in *SGZ* ch.30, 26b , appears in the latter text as an exalted title which, in third century Koguryŏ was bestowed not only upon the great nobles of the Kyeru-bu but also upon "successive chieftains in direct descent" of both the Yŏnno-bu and the Chŏllo-bu, the latter tribe being those "who provide a wife for the king in each successive

earlier in the chapters dealing with the reign of Yuri Myŏng and his descendants, and he bears the same name as one of three ancestor figures who are said to have been the first to greet the founder ancestor when he came to Koguryŏ.[41] If the two Chaesa are identical, as is strongly suggested by the fact that this is the only name which is repeated in all the ten chapters of Koguryŏ annals, then it could be supposed that Chaesa had at one time been regarded as the ancestor of the Kyeru-bu, from whom Kung, as a Kyeru-bu chieftain, was ultimately descended. Presumably the genealogy connecting Kung, through Chaesa, with the earlier kings, was concocted later when it was felt desirable to conceal the break in the dynastic line, a point to which we must revert later. Such a break would explain the image of the preceding ruler in the *Samguk sagi*, King Mobon, who appears as a stereotypical tyrant.[42] It could equally well explain the curious piece of information found in both the *Hou Hanshu* and the *Sanguozhi*, to the effect that "Kung was able to open his eyes and focus as soon as he was born," which sounds like a fragment of a miraculous birth story, the sort commonly associated with founder of dynastic lines.[43]

Thus several lines of reasoning suggest that the dynastic change from Yŏnno-bu to Kyeru-bu must have come about with the accession of Kung in the opening years of the second century or just before.[44] Yet the *Sanguozhi* makes it clear that this change was neither a sudden nor a complete break. We are told that "The Yŏnno-bu grew gradually weaker, and now the Kyeru-

---

generation."

41. See *SGSG* ch.13, 3a.
42. The phenomenon of the "wicked last ruler" of a dynasty is familiar from Richard III and other western examples. The traditional Chinese past as portrayed in the *Shiji* and other early texts included Jie, the wicked last ruler of the Xia dynasty, and Zhou Xin, the wicked last ruler of the Shang, while even Japanese history as retold in the *Kojiki* and the *Nihon-shoki* could provide the image of Buretsu, another stereotypical tyrant said to have ended the rule of one branch of the lineage. It is noticeable that the actions ascribed to these tyrants become historical clichés which can be transferred from one ruler to another. Koguryŏ history includes three such figures, after each of whom the dynastic line changes.
43. *HHS* Liezhuan 1-ch.25, 2814 and, rather differently, *SGZ* ch.30, 29b. Here again it is clear that *HHS* does not derive directly from *SGZ*, but perhaps from one of the sources of the latter.
44. After several undated raids on the Chinese frontier, Kung made a further incursion in the spring of 105 (*HHS*, *loc. cit.*) This suggests an accession date not much later than 100.

bu have succeeded them."[45] The impression given is of a fairly long period of declining Yŏnno-bu leadership before the Kyeru-bu actually took over. Such a period of weakened leadership might be reflected in the absence of any Chinese reference to Koguryŏ from 49 until after the turn of the century, although there could equally well be other explanations for this.[46]

It is also clear that, even after the Kyeru-bu gained a monopoly over the office of king, the chieftains of the Yŏnno-bu continued to enjoy a privileged position, with the right to set up shrines to their (royal?) ancestors and to worship the gods of the land, normally the function of the king.[47] Presumably the Yŏnno-bu retained these privileges at least until early in the third century when they supported an unsuccessful candidate for the kingship, after which their chieftain is said to have gone over to the Chinese of Liaodong along with several tens of thousands of his dependants.[48]

Thus by the early second century the Koguryŏ state, now long effectively independent of Chinese control, had succeeded in extending its own rule over the agricultural settlements of native communities in northern Korea, where people such as the Okchŏ were forced into the role of dependants, eventually to swell the ranks of "lower households." At the same time a new and vigourous leadership had taken over from the declining Yŏnno-bu, perhaps as a result of an alliance between the Kyeru-bu and the Chŏllo-bu who, according to the *Sanguozhi*, "provided a wife for the king at each successive reign,"[49] and whose leaders also bore the exalted title *koch'uga*.

---

45. *SGZ* ch.30, 26b.
46. Cf. above, note 28. There are no references to Koguryŏ, Puyŏ or the tribal communities of peninsular Korea during the second half of the first century in any Chinese source. This contrasts with the situation in the late third century, when the *Jinshu* says nothing about Koguryŏ, but contains several references to Puyŏ or the Han tribes of southern Korea. The *Hou Hanshu's* silence on the subject of Koguryŏ is almost certainly because that state was then in eclipse, but a similar explanation can hardly cover all the peoples of the area in the first century. Thus the *Hou Hanshu*'s silence begins to look more like the result of an early loss in documentation. However it should be noted that the *Samguk sagi* shows a similar gap at this point, containing only the merest scraps of tradition for the greater part of Kung's enormous reign. Indeed it would seem that, perhaps thanks to Kim Pu-sik's bias, the text is more concerned with the misdeeds of Kung's eventual successor than with the positive achievements of the first Kyeru-bu monarch.
47. *SGZ* ch.30, 26b.
48. *SGZ* ch.30, 29b.
49. *SGZ* ch.30, 26b.

The emergence of the Kyeru-bu leadership coincided with the beginning of a long decline in the power of the Later Han dynasty, culminating in the collapse of the empire into military anarchy in 189. The Kyeru-bu kings were quick to seize this opportunity. Like the Yŏnno-bu rulers before them, they sought to extend the control of the Koguryŏ tribal elite over a wider subject population, but this time the object of their expansion was not the native agricultural communities of northern Korea, but the Chinese-settled lowlands of Liaodong. This is not the place to discuss the details of this struggle, which was waged with fluctuating success throughout the second century. For the present we shall confine ourselves to the observation that although the Chinese population in the border commanderies seems to have dwindled during the century, by the time of the Han dynasty's collapse, the situation along this frontier was still indecisive.

It does not appear that this long conflict had hitherto affected the internal order of Koguryŏ, but with the fall of the Han, East Asia entered a new era of international relations, which was to present Koguryŏ with the most serious threat to its continued independence since the time of Wang Mang. Initially this threat came from the semi-independent governors of Liaodong, the warlord house of Gongsun Du and his descendants.[50] Though merely local in character, their power was enough to survive for three generations in the maelstrom of third century politics. The Gongsun gained considerable influence along the frontier through judicious alliances with powerful tribal groups further north, and an equally judicious abstention from the rivalries within China proper (when this policy was abandoned by the last ruler, their state collapsed). Soon after 207, when Koguryŏ was in the thrones of a struggle between two rival brothers for the Kyeru-bu kingship, Gongsun Kang, then ruling in Liaodong, seized the opportunity to punish the descendants of King Kung for a whole series of frontier raids. Successfully invading Koguryŏ he destroyed the capital and laid the country to waste with fire and sword. Palgi, the unsuccessful contender for the kingship of Koguryŏ, went over to the Chinese along with

50. See Gardiner, "The Kung-sun Warlords of Liao-tong (189-238)," pt. 1, *Papers on Far Eastern History* 5 (1972); and "The Kung-sun Warlords of Liao-tong (189-238)," pt. 2, *Papers on Far Eastern History* 6 (1972).

the chieftain of the Yŏnno-bu, each bringing with him several thousand dependants drawn from the "lower households."[51] Meanwhile Iimo, Palgi's hitherto successful rival, withdrew southeastwards towards the valley of the Yalü. Here, where a small stream flows into the Yalü from the north, he established a new capital, known as Hwando from the name of a nearby hill, on the top of which a fort was built to defend the approaches to the new city. Hwando was to be the capital of Koguryŏ for the next two centuries, and remains of both the city itself and the mountain fort still exist.[52] Iimo's move from the valley of the Hun River, or Piryu, as it was then called, to the Yalü, brought him closer to the tributary communities of eastern Korea, and doubtless this was one reason why the new capital was retained after the Chinese armies had retired. On the other hand, Palgi, who established himself (or was perhaps set up by Gongsun Kang) as ruler in the devastated Piryu valley, was denied the resources of these subject tribes and, finding his position untenable, took shelter in Liaodong. The Yŏnno-bu were also perhaps reincorporated into the Koguryŏ state, since the *Sanguozhi* speaks of their chieftains as still enjoying their special privileges "now"; i.e. shortly before the middle of the third century.[53]

As the power of the Gongsun house declined, the reorganised Koguryŏ kingdom was able to benefit, extending its power westward as far as the Yalü estuary by soon after 230, and in 238, when the Wei dynasty general Sima Yi reconquered Liaodong and the Korean commanderies, King Wigung, then reigning in Koguryŏ, sent troops to assist him against the last of the Gongsun.[54] Unfortunately very soon afterwards he resumed his probing

---

51. In *SGZ* ch.30, 29b, both Palgi and the chieftain of the Yŏnno-bu are alleged to have brought thirty thousand people drawn from the lower households with them, which is surely a great exaggeration if we are to believe the same text's earlier assessment of the total population of Koguryŏ. Cf. above, note 10.
52. These sites were surveyed by S. Umehara and H. Ikeuchi, who published the results in two lavishly illustrated volumes, *T'ung-kou,* vol. 1 (Tokyo: Nichiman Bunka Kyokai, 1940) The text is accompanied by a lengthy English resume.
53. *SGZ* ch.30, 26b. The unparalleled mass of informative detail on Koguryŏ life and customs in the *Sanguozhi* is almost certainly derived from reports brought back by the expeditions of Guanqiu Jian and Wang Ji with which the account of Koguryŏ in this history concludes.
54. For Koguryŏ at the mouth of the Yalü, see Gardiner, "The Kung-sun Warlords of Liao-tong (189-238)," pt. 2, *Papers on Far Eastern History* 6 (1972), 162-63. For Wigung's aid to Sima Yi, see *SGZ* ch.30, 30a.

attacks upon the Chinese frontier, provoking massive retaliation from another Wei general, Guanqiu Jian. At the head of an invasion force of some twenty thousand infantry and cavalry, including auxiliaries drawn from the surrounding Xianbei tribes, Guanqiu Jian entered the Piryu valley and then fought his way across the passes to Hwando, which he took and sacked in 245. Hundreds of Koguryŏ families were carried off to be resettled in China. Moreover, in the following year, after Wigung had returned to his ruined capital, Guanqiu Jian despatched Wang Ji, the governor of Xuantu, to hunt him down. Wigung withdrew before Wang Ji to the lands of the Eastern Okchŏ, where he made another stand; but once again the Chinese were victorious, some three thousand of the Okchŏ being killed or captured while fighting in defence of their suzerain. Wigung himself however eluded capture, escaping to the lands of the so-called Northern Okchŏ, who seem to have been settled on the coast beyond the Tumen estuary, in what is now Russian territory. Even here the Koguryŏ king was pursued by Wang Ji, who did not return to Xuantu until he himself or his lieutenants had made a reconnaissance of Inner Manchuria, establishing contact with Puyŏ and the other tribal states.[55]

The silence of the *Sanguozhi* shows clearly that, despite these achievements, which amounted to the most striking affirmation of Chinese power in the further east since the original conquest of 108 BCE, Wigung himself was never captured. Yet, whether or not he actually survived the invasions, his descendants certainly did, since his great-great grandson Ŭlbul or Ŭlbulli appears in the *Zizhi tongjian* as king of Koguryŏ early in the following century.[56] But effectively the invasion of Guanqiu Jian closes the history of early Koguryŏ; Wang Ji and his fellow generals had shattered the tributary system which provided the economic basis for the old Koguryŏ

55. Guanqiu Jian's campaigns in Manchuria and Korea are described in his own biography, *SGZ* ch.28, 10a-11d and in the accounts of the Puyŏ and the Eastern Okchŏ, in *SGZ* ch.30, 23b and 32a. He has also left a now fragmentary inscription. All this evidence is discussed in H. Ikeuchi, "The Chinese Expeditions to Manchuria under the Wei Dynasty," *Mem. Tōyō Bunko* 4 (1929).

56. See *Zizhi tongjian* 1-ch.38, 2799. For this period Sima Guang, the author of the *Zizhi tongjian* (hereafter *ZZ TJ*), is known to have had access to works which have since disappeared, such as the *Yanshu*, and includes a good deal of information not included in the dynastic history of the period, the *Jinshu* (hereafter *JS*).

warrior aristocracy. In the wake of their conquests, petty chieftains like the Ye Marquis of Pullae were encouraged to visit the imperial court, and the marquis himself was raised to the rank of king in 247. In reality, however, he had merely passed from an age of Koguryŏ suzerainty into one of Chinese suzerainty, and:

> Wherever the two commanderies (of Lelang and Daifang) found themselves at war, his people were taxed and required to provide supplies and military corvée, just as if they had been under direct Chinese rule.[57]

Based heavily on the *Weilüe*, which covered the history of the third century only down to the death of Emperor Ming in 239, the *Sanguozhi* has nothing to say about Korea or Koguryŏ after 247. From 265 on is the domain of the succeeding dynastic history, the *Jinshu*, which assumed its present form only in the seventh century, although based upon earlier material. The *Jinshu*, although it mentions the Han tribes of southern Korea and Puyŏ in the north, is completely silent on Koguryŏ until after the turn of the century. Thus a long gap of more than sixty years separates the period of early Koguryŏ from its successor state, middle Koguryŏ, giving clear and eloquent testimony to the disasterous effects of Guanqiu Jian's invasions. Even as late as 285 it is evident that, even if the royal house of Koguryŏ had survived the catastrophe, it no longer had the slightest power in those areas where it once was suzerain, since in that year a number of princes from Puyŏ, long the traditional rival of Koguryŏ, made their way through what had once been Koguryŏ territory and established themselves as rulers amongst the Okchŏ.[58]

It is most unlikely that the Guanqiu Jian invasions, striking such a severe blow at the economic foundations of Wigung's state, could have left its old tribal structure unchanged. Wigung's very accession suggests that changes were underway after the earlier invasion by Gongsun Kang, since

---

57. *SGZ* ch.30, 36b. The southernmost prefectures of Lelang commandery were combined into a new administrative unit, Daifang commandery, by Gongsun Kang.
58. *JS* ch.97, 2532. These Puyŏ princes, in flight from the invading Murong Xianbei, established the state later known as Eastern Puyŏ which, it has been suggested, gave rise to the southern kingdom of Paekche through a further migration. See K. Shiratori's posthumously published paper, "*Kudara no kigen ni tsuite*," *Shigaku* (1947), republished in *Shiratori Kurakichi Zenshi* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1969-71), vol. 3, 485-99.

Wigung was not the son of Iimo's Chŏllo-bu queen, but the offspring of a liason with a woman of the Kwanno-bu, a tribe of apparently lower status.[59] There is no information about the status of the tribal nobility in the middle Koguryŏ state, which first came to the attention of the Chinese with the attacks of King Ŭlbul upon Lelang commandery some years before 313,[60] but by the time of the King Kwanggaet'o Stele, a century later, we are in a very different world. Where the third century king was merely *primus inter pares*, hedged about by the rights of the chieftains of the other clans, now the king is seen as in a class apart.

> In ancient times it was King Ch'u-mo, the first ancestor, who established the foundations (of the state). He came from Northern Puyŏ, the son of the Ruler of Heaven, and his mother was the daughter of a river god. He ascended into Heaven, leaving his mandate to his eldest son Yuryu, in order that the ways of good government should prosper. (Then) King Tae Churyu inherited the throne. Coming to (King Ch'u-mo's) descendant in the seventeenth generation, King Kugang Kwanggaet'ogyŏng Hot'ae, who came to the throne at the age of eighteen...[61]

Here it is not merely divine descent that is being claimed, but an unbroken succession from the remote divine ancestor. The dynastic change from Yŏnno-bu to Kyeru-bu, recorded in the *Sanguozhi* and the *Hou Hanshu*, has become

---

59. *SGZ* ch.30, 29b.
60. *ZZ TJ* 1.ch.38, 2799. Koguryŏ here appears for the first time as attacking Lelang, perhaps because the power of the Murong Xianbei blocked its old expansion route towards Liaodong.
61. See the stele of King Kwanggaet'o (as he is more usually known), face one, col.1-3. The *Samguk sagi* gives King Kwanggaet'o as the eighteenth ruler of Koguryŏ, but in the thirteenth generation from the founder ancestor, from which one might be tempted to take the stele as referring to successive reigns rather than generations here. However the language of the stele text is quite clear, and it should be remembered that the number of generations in the *Samguk sagi* is certainly distorted, as is shown by the way in which Kung and his two successors are made brothers. It is likely that the stele makes no real distinction between generations and reigns, and derives its figure of 17 from the known number of royal tombs, the succession being presumed to have passed from father to son with the exception of Kings Sosurim and Kogugyang, King Kwanggaet'o's uncle and father respectively. (They were so recent that their genealogical relationship would have been well-known.) With this exception the number of generations on the stele tallies with the number of reigns in the *Samguk sagi*.

a non-fact. Indeed, the magnificent inscribed stele is itself a symbol of the king's exalted status, which is again shown clearly towards the end of the inscription, where the late monarch is supposed to have declared:

> The royal ancestor and the other former kings simply instructed that people from the old (kingdom), taken from far and near, should be used to look after the tombs, to cleanse them and sweep them out. But I am afraid that nowadays people of the old (kingdom) have become deficient and inadequate, so that if, after my allotted span is over, there is anyone prepared to see to the proper upkeep of my tomb, they should only take the Han and Ye (families) whom I myself carried off and brought here, and have them do the cleansing and sweeping.[62]

The "olden people" or "people of the old kingdom" mentioned here as being used as tomb guardians by earlier rulers, came doubtless from the ranks of the "lower households" described in the *Sanguozhi.* King Kwanggaet'o, on the other hand, emphasizes that his tomb guardians should be taken from "the Han and Ye families whom I myself carried off and brought here," i.e. people who had been assimilated into the Koguryŏ social structure only through their personal dependency upon the monarch. Inoue Hideo, who makes this point, believes that this shows how the king used his new conquests to increase the number of his direct dependants, and hence bolster his power.[63]

Presumably the destruction caused by the repeated Chinese invasions of the third and fourth centuries had impoverished some of the old tribal nobility by dislocating them from the sources of their wealth and power. The royal house, on the other hand, having somehow survived these invasions, was able to capitalise on its leadership role and gain enhanced status.

Another factor supervened, revealed in the simple fact that the Kwanggaet'o Stele is written in Chinese. Prior to this, there is no evidence of any kind of literacy in Koguryŏ, rather evidence is to the contrary.[64] The change is

---

62. Stele, face four, cols. 5-6.
63. Inoue Hideo, *Kodai Chōsen* (Tokyo: Nihon Hōsō Shuppan Kyōkai, 1972), 76-80.
64. The deceit which the envoys of Sun Quan of Wu practised upon the people of Koguryŏ and their king Wigung in 233 [see Gardiner, "The Kung-sun Warlords of Liao-tong (189-238)," pt. 2, *Papers on Far Eastern History* 6 (1972), 159-60] is more believable if we

unlikely to have taken place during the obscure half century 250-300, and can indeed be safely attributed to the fourth century when, after the collapse of the Western Jin dynasty, North China was taken over by competing non-Han dynasties; Xiongnu, Xianbei and Qiang. There were plenty of refugees from the old Chinese gentry families who fled, as in the third century, to take shelter in Liaodong; some, as we know from the *Jinshu* and the *Zizhi tongjian*, went further and sought asylum in Koguryŏ.[65] These men, and perhaps some of the Chinese colonists from the old commandery of Lelang, were absorbed into Koguryŏ society, and will naturally have gravitated towards the royal court, where their administrative expertise must have made them invaluable. As with the Han and Ye families mentioned on the stele, the kings of Koguryŏ are likely to have seized the chance to patronise these foreigners and their foreign learning, accelerating a process of partial sinicization which must have helped to set the king apart from the surviving and presumably less sinicized tribal nobles. On the other hand the Han immigrants lacked an obvious position in Koguryŏ society, and must surely have been dependant upon royal patronage. Their cultural influence is evident from such a monument as the King Kwanggaet'o Stele, and from many of the decorative designs in the great tombs of the same area. And, just as in Japan in the seventh century a similar process culminated in the composition of national histories whose most important aim was to emphasise the unique status of the ruling house, so the evidence of the stele shows that history-writing, one of the most characteristic features of traditional Chinese culture, was used to create a reordering of the Koguryŏ past, intended once again to emphasise the ruler's divine descent and specially pre-eminent status. Moreover it is likely that these or similar concerns were also reflected in Koguryŏ's first literary texts.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

The only account we have of the origins of Koguryŏ historiography comes

---

assume that it was based upon the fact that no one in Koguryŏ had a practical familiarity with written Chinese.

65. See *JS* ch.108, 2807; and *ZZ TJ* ch.91, 2874 and ch.95, 3005-06.

from the *Samguk sagi* where an entry in the annals of Koguryŏ for the year 600 states:

> By royal decree, Yi Mun-jin, a doctor in the royal university, put together the ancient history (of the kingdom) to make the *Sinjip* in five chapters. In the early days of the realm, when characters first came into use, there was a man who recorded events in one hundred chapters, called the *Yugi* (*The Record Handed Down*); it was this which was now re-edited.[66]

The language of this notice strongly suggests that the original *Yugi*, the book "in one hundred chapters," was not available to Kim Pu-sik and perhaps did not survive its re-editing as a work of five chapters in 600. It is surely significant that Kim Pu-sik is unable to give the name of the original author, although elsewhere he mentions the name of Paekche's first historian who must have flourished at about the same time, i.e. in the fourth century.[67]

With the five chapter edition, the *Yugi-sinjip*, we are on safer ground. Although it is impossible to be sure whether Kim Pu-sik himself consulted this work, a close examination of his narrative shows that one of his major sources (perhaps the unknown author of the older *History of the Three Kingdoms*) must have done so. Perhaps the clearest indication of this lies in the fact that we are told that the *Yugi-sinjip* had five chapters while, in Kim Pu-sik's book, the first five chapters of the annals of Koguryŏ are unlike anything else. Whereas the later chapters dealing with Koguryŏ rely heavily upon material taken over from the Chinese dynastic histories, and contain little in the way of narrative beyond such transcribed passages, in the first five chapters of the Koguryŏ annals there are long passages of narrative which do not appear to be derived directly from any Chinese source.[68] In this way the early chapters of the Koguryŏ annals show a marked contrast with those in the annals of Paekche or Silla, for whereas the latter begin with sporadic and sketchy entries (often taken over from Chinese sources), and only gradually become fuller after the fourth century, in the Koguryŏ annals

66. *SGSG* ch.20, 2a.
67. *SGSG* ch.24, 9a.
68. They do however show the *stylistic* influence of such Chinese texts as the *Shiji*, Mencius, the *Book of Documents*, and even the *Soushenji*.

this situation is virtually reversed, since it is the later chapters, from the reign of King Ŭlbul onwards (i.e. from the beginning of the fourth century) which are sketchy, while the first five chapters are full of detailed narratives. Moreover, these chapters contain numerous place names which Kim Pu-sik admits elsewhere that he was unable to identify, a clear indication that the material comes from a much older source. Indeed, the handiest explanation of why these names were unknown to Kim Pu-sik is that they were current during the days of the Koguryŏ kingdom and, even without Kim Pu-sik's well attested southern bias, would have been unfamiliar to him since the Koryŏ dynasty no longer ruled the old heartland of Koguryŏ in the Yalü valley and further north.[69]

Returning now to Kim Pu-sik's notice on Koguryŏ historiography we can see that, while the *Yugi-sinjip* probably underlies the first five chapters of the annals of Koguryŏ in the *Samguk sagi* (unless we are prepared to posit the existence of an unknown history of the Koguryŏ period which happened to break off at this point), the *Yugi-sinjip* itself was simply a recasting of much earlier material, of "ancient history" in fact; there is no suggestion that Yi Mun-jin made use of his opportunity to bring the history of Koguryŏ down to his own day. Interpreting Kim Pu-sik's phrase about "the early days of the realm, when characters first came into use" to refer to the fourth century, as seems most likely, it then becomes possible to see why the last piece of extended narrative in the Koguryŏ annals from a non-Chinese source deals with the accession of King Ŭlbul and the reign of his predecessor, one of the three wicked tyrants of early Koguryŏ. With Ŭlbul's accession a cadet branch of the royal family came to the throne; the careful handling of this transition reads like a defence of the change of line, the sort of document that could well go back to an original written under one of Ŭlbul's immediate descendants, such as a grandson or a great-grandson.

With this in mind it is easier to accept the possibility that the *Yugi* did have a real existence before the appearance of Yi Mun-jin's revised version, even though the idea of a book in one hundred chapters which was later reduced to five does not sound very plausible. The figure of a hundred

69. These place names have been analysed by H. Inoue, who makes this very point in his article "Sangoku-shiki no genten wo motomete," *Chōsen Gakuho* 48 (1968).

chapters need be no more than a later systematiser's guess: if we are correct in suggesting that neither Kim Pu-sik nor the early Koryŏ writer from whom he derived his information could have seen the original *Yugi*, then the round figure of one hundred chapters could well have been developed for the sake of some sort of parallelism with early Chinese historical writing.[70]

Accepting then that Yi Mun-jin had before him some sort of compilation of early Koguryŏ tradition which went down to the reign of King Ŭlbul at the beginning of the fourth century, we can imagine that he would have drastically abridged and rewritten this work, polishing its style. Some of the stylistic echoes of the *Shiji* and other Chinese works now found in the first five chapters of the Koguryŏ annals in the *Samguk sagi* could go back to Yi Mun-jin. However, it is important to note that Yi Mun-jin does not seem to have made any attempt to extend the scope of the *Yugi* to cover the later history of Koguryŏ. Essentially he will have recompiled a collection of early traditions: when Kim Pu-sik states that Yi Mun-jin "put together the *ancient* history," this does not mean that he composed a work which we would recognise as a history, still less that he wrote an early annals of Koguryŏ along the same lines as the present Koguryŏ chapters in the *Samguk sagi*. Unlike the word *sagi* (lit. 'historical records'), *yugi* (lit. 'extant records') does not imply an annalistic record (cf. the useful contrast between the *Nihon shoki*, which is annalistic, and the *Kojiki*, which is not). A closer analogy to the lost *Yugi-sinjip* may have been the *Shiyiji* (*Record of Collected Traditions*), a Chinese work of the fourth century which sought to "fill in the gaps" in the account of the past by bringing together stories and detailed (if imaginary) information concerning the legendary sage rulers of antiquity.[71] This sort of thing parallels the type of content in the first five chapters of the annals of Koguryŏ in the *Samguk sagi* where, as already noticed, we find a series of extended anecdotes spaced several years apart, with comparatively few of the terse annalistic entries which make up, for example the bulk of the record for early Paekche. Given the evidently arbitrary nature of the chronological framework (which in one place results in a king being born

70. The earliest Chinese dynastic history, the *Hanshu*, has exactly one hundred chapters.
71. See L. C. Foster, "Wang Jia's *Shiyi Ji*," *Monumenta Serica* 33 (1977-78).

twenty years after his mother's death!),[72] it seems quite likely that the collection of anecdotes came first, and that the chronological framework in which these are now found was the work of a later systematiser (cf. again the difference between the earlier, virtually undated, *Kojiki*, and the later *Nihon shoki* with its detailed and for the most part totally incredible system of dates).

Another point which needs to be made about the *Yugi-sinjip* is that, perhaps like the earlier *Yugi*, it was a royally commissioned work, a book which must have been presented to the throne when completed. As such, it is bound to have offered a view of the Koguryŏ past which was that of the royal house itself. Thus, given a past which was characterised by recurrent struggles with China (of which the most severe was, in 600, about to commence) it would be quite natural for all suggestion of the period of 'proto-Koguryŏ' under Chinese supervision to have disappeared from the record. Then again, the divine origin of the royal line, which is stressed in the Kwanggaet'o Stele inscription and in the older *History of the Three Kingdoms*, must have figured largely in the *Yugi-sinjip* with, as a corollary, the assertion of an unbroken line of descent between King Ŭlbul and the founder ancestor. To judge from the *Samguk sagi*, this was achieved in a somewhat more sophisticated way than by the long line of father to son successions which is implied on the stele. Instead, the figure of Chaesa, once presumably regarded as ancestor of the Kyeru-bu, and traditionally one of the companions of the founder ancestor, was now duplicated; one Chaesa was still treated as a companion of the founder ancestor, but another of the same name was created and made a grandson of the founder and the father of King Kung, whom we have seen there is reason to believe was the first of the Kyeru-bu kings. This marked a genealogical link tying in the Kyeru-bu kings to the earlier heroic image.

In dealing with the divine origin of the Koguryŏ royal house, both the *Yugi-sinjip* and the earlier work on which it was based must have taken over a remarkable innovation which appears for the first time in 414, in the opening sentences of the Kwanggaet'o Stele inscription. This names the founder of the state as Ch'u-mo who "in ancient times" came south "from

72. *SGSG* ch.8, 6a and ch.14, la.

Northern Puyŏ" to establish Koguryŏ. Ch'u-mo is described as being born from an egg, and founds his kingdom after a remarkable river crossing on the backs of turtles. Now, the story of an egg-born hero who crosses a river on the backs of turtles occurs much earlier than this, appearing for the first time in the *Lunheng*, a philosophical work written in China towards the end of the first century CE. In this book, and in both the *Hou Hanshu* and the *Sanguozhi* (where the legend is repeated with minor variations) the hero is named Tong-myŏng, a name which is stated to refer to his prowess in archery.[73] Furthermore, he does not come from Puyŏ to found Koguryŏ, but from an obscure and variously named kingdom in the far north to found Puyŏ itself. In fact, in no Chinese text before the sixth century is this archer hero associated with Koguryŏ.

The legends of Ch'u-mo and Tong-myŏng are virtually identical; moreover, according to K. Shiratori, the names Ch'u-mo and Tong-myŏng are etymologically related through the intermediate form Chu-mong, which appears for the first time as the name of the Koguryŏ founder in the sixth century dynastic history of the Tuoba Wei dynasty of North China.[74] Nevertheless, the Kwanggaet'o Stele is not simply claiming that the Koguryŏ kings were descended from the divine ancestor of Puyŏ; a more radical operation has taken place, in which the Puyŏ legend has been appropriated and "corrected" with Koguryŏ replacing Puyŏ. After the disappearance of Puyŏ as an independent political entity in the fourth century CE, this "corrected" version of the old Puyŏ foundation legend may have been easier to accept. Certainly earlier Chinese writers can hardly have been mistaken in connecting the legend with Puyŏ rather than with Koguryŏ, since from the middle of the first century CE to the close of the third, relations between China and Puyŏ were close and friendly, with numerous exchanges of embassies, and there would have been every opportunity of finding out the correct version. The third century *Sanguozhi*, which contains more detailed information about Koguryŏ and its neighbours than any other Chinese text,

---

73. See Wang Chong, *Lunheng*, republished in *Lunheng Jiaoshi,* comment. Huang Hui. (Taipei: Shangwu Yinshuguan, 1964) ch.2, 81. Cf. also *HHS*, Liezhuan ch.75, 2810-11 and *SGZ* ch.30, 24a.

74. K. Shiratori, "The Legend of King Dongming, the Founder of Fuyü Guo," *Mem. Tōyō Bunko* 10 (1938), 20-21.

firmly connects the story with Puyŏ, although it also mentions an annual ceremony held in the early autumn in Koguryŏ which was called Tong-maeng.[75] Although Shiratori is reluctant to interpret the phrase in this way, it is quite possible, as Naka Michiyo originally suggested, that Tong-maeng is a corruption of Tong-myŏng, indicating that the cult of the founder of the parent confederacy of Puyŏ was still popular in third century Koguryŏ.[76] Indeed, unless the legend of Tong-myŏng was still current in Koguryŏ in the late fourth and early fifth century, when the Kwanggaet'o Stele text was written, it is difficult to see why the kings of Koguryŏ would have gone to the trouble of claiming descent from such an ancestor, whatever other political reasons they may have had.

In the *Samguk sagi*, as in the older *History of the Three Kingdoms*, Tong-myŏng and Chu-mong are treated as alternative names of the founder ancestor of Koguryŏ, and this identification presumably went back at least to the *Yugi-sinjip*. Indeed, in the *Samguk sagi*, Ch'u-mo, the form which occurs upon the Kwanggaet'o Stele (which Kim Pu-sik could not have known) and Chunghae, otherwise unknown, appear as alternative names of the Koguryŏ founder. Given that this legend certainly originated in Puyŏ, we need to ask why it should have been appropriated by the kings of Koguryŏ in the late fourth century or soon after. Shiratori believed that the modification of the legend was the work of Kwanggaet'o's successor, King Changsu (r. 413-492), and was intended to reconcile descendants of the Puyŏ to Koguryŏ rule, which had recently been imposed upon them.[77] (In this case, it is hardly likely to have been the work of King Changsu himself, who must clearly have been a mere child at the time of his accession, but could conceiveably have been the work of his advisors.)

Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that, although the Kwanggaet'o Stele text is the first documented occurence of the Puyŏ story having been transferred to Koguryŏ, the actual modification could easily have taken place

---

75. *SGZ* ch.30, 27a.
76. See Shiratori, *op. cit.*, 22-3, where Naka Michiyo's much earlier study is cited. Shiratori was unwilling to interpret Tong-maeng in the way followed by Naka because he thought that this would imply that Tong-myŏng had already been regarded as the founder ancestor of Koguryŏ in the third century. However this does not seem to follow.
77. Shiratori, *op. cit.,* 38-9.

somewhat earlier. It is a development which must certainly be connected with the greatly increased prestige and authority which the royal house was claiming, which itself (as we have already suggested) is linked to the influx of Chinese gentry refugees from the old border commanderies, and the days when "characters first came into use," that is to say, roughly the time of the composition of the original *Yugi*. The rulers of this period seem to have had a considerable interest in promulgating a new and definitive account of Koguryŏ's origin which would bolster their own authority, and which presumably replaced an earlier and perhaps less amenable tradition.

So far little scholarly attention has been directed towards the question of what kind of Koguryŏ foundation legend could have preceded the appropriation of the Koguryŏ story in the late fourth or early fifth century. We might however conclude that, in the words of Sir Thomas Browne, although a "puzzling question" it is not "beyond all conjecture,"[78] since both the narrative of the *Samguk sagi* and the older *History of the Three Kingdoms* offer pertinent clues. Both texts show a curious parallelism between the careers of Chu-mong and his son Yuri. Both heroes possess supernatural skills in archery and other areas; both are great hunters; both escape from Puyŏ with a handful of followers and make their way to Koguryŏ; both conquer a neighbouring country immediately after capturing a white deer, and finally each one, although not in all versions of the legend, marries the daughter of a local ruler, and perhaps gains power thereby. It may be noted that, according to the *Sanguozhi*, uxorilocal marriage was the custom in Koguryŏ, which might explain why both of these legendary heroes seem to have resided in the territory of their father-in-law.[79]

In spite of these numerous similarities, it is significant that in no version do the deeds of Yuri duplicate those of his father with respect to material taken over from the old Puyŏ foundation legend. Yuri is never said to have been born from an egg, to have been protected by animals at birth or to have spent part of his youth looking after animals in a stable, nor is he ever credited with Chu-mong/Tong-myŏng's feat of crossing a river on the

78. Sir Thomas Browne in "Hydriotaphia," in *Everyman's Library: Religio Medici and Other Writings* (London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1906), 132.
79. *SGZ* ch.30, 27a.

backs of turtles. It is only in those elements of the story which are peculiar to the "revised version" that careers of father and son seem to run parallel, elements which were evidently specifically linked with Koguryŏ and were not taken over from the Puyŏ story, such as the journey from Puyŏ to Koguryŏ, or marriage with the daughter of a local ruler in Koguryŏ. Indeed, from the narrative in the *Samguk sagi*, one has the uneasy impression that some legendary feats have been awkwardly divided between Chu-mong and Yuri. Thus, in the *Samguk sagi*, Chu-mong defeats Song-yang "King of Piryu" in an archery contest (and various other trials of cunning). But although Song-yang surrenders to Chu-mong, his daughter marries not Chu-mong but Yuri who, according to the *Samguk sagi*'s chronology, only arrived in Koguryŏ about eighteen years later.[80] This seems to be an arbitrary disjunction of what must once have formed a continuous narrative; just as in the Greek legend Pelops defeats Oenomaus in a contest and then marries his daughter, so in the original version of the Koguryŏ story it is likely to have been the same hero who both defeated the local ruler and subsequently married that ruler's daughter. In fact, Kim Pu-sik knew another version of the Koguryŏ foundation legend in which Chu-mong married one of the daughters of the ruler of "Cholbon Puyŏ," and *by virtue of this* succeeded to the throne when the old king died.[81] Cholbon is clearly to be identified with "Holbon in the valley of the Piryu" mentioned on the Kwanggaet'o Stele, which again brings us back to Song-yang, King of Piryu, Yuri's father in-law in the *Samguk sagi*.

It is clear that legends about Ch'u-mo/Tong-myŏng's doings in Koguryŏ can never have formed part of the original Puyŏ story, being essentially concerned with purely local issues, such as the development of agriculture in the Piryu valley. Once we rule out Ch'u-mo/Tong-myŏng as the original protagonist of these stories, the only likely alternative is Yuri: as soon as we take Yuri as the original Koguryŏ ancestor a lot of other pieces of evidence fall into place. The doubling of motifs such as the flight from Puyŏ to Koguryŏ, or the marriage with the daughter of a ruler in the Piryu valley, have clearly come about because the Puyŏ origin legend was deliberately appropriated and superimposed upon some already extant story, very probably

80. *SGSG* ch.13, 36-4a and 5b; *Tongguk Yi-sangguk chip* ch.3, 6b-7b.
81. *SGSG* ch.13, 3b.

that of Yuri, which nevertheless continued ambiguously to figure in the texts while many of its elements were transferred to the appropriated legend. Some Japanese scholars have connected the name Yuri with a word which appears in fragments of the old Silla language as *nuri* or *nuric*, which seems to have meant 'heir.'[82] It is indeed the essence of the story of Yuri as it appears in the *Samguk sagi* and the older *History of the Three Kingdoms*, that he appears as the rightful heir of Chu-mong, although the contrived incident with a broken sword whereby this is demonstrated seems to be not a legend but a late elaboration based upon a Chinese model.[83] However, the idea that Yuri was always regarded as the heir of Ch'u-mo/Tong-myŏng does not invalidate the theory that he was the original Koguryŏ ancestor hero; on the contrary, since we know that the Koguryŏ tribes sprang from Puyŏ, there is nothing unusual in their continuing to venerate the legendary founder of the parent confederacy, and in attaching their own founder-ancestor to him by a spurious and chronologically improbable filiation. (Legends are strangers to chronology and not uncommonly link together real figures who cannot possibly have been contemporaries, as in the case of the *Nibelungenlied*.) This supposition would then also explain the apparently continuing cult of Tong-myŏng (*recte*, for Tong-maeng) in third century Koguryŏ, as simply another case of the veneration of the old Puyŏ ancestor to whom the original Koguryŏ ancestor hero stood in the relationship of a son.

It is only to be expected that changes in the composition or the strength of the ruling group in Koguryŏ would, if they were lasting modifications, have had repercussions upon the official cults connected with the state's origins. The unanimity of earlier Chinese sources about the Tong-myŏng legend shows that, as late as the third century, it was connected with Puyŏ and not Koguryŏ. By the late fourth or early fifth century, it had been appropriated and adapted by the Koguryŏ court; whatever the earlier version of the Koguryŏ foundation legend, there was evidently some reason why it

82. See T. Mizutani in the special number of *Shūhin* 100 (1959) devoted to the Kwanggaet'o Stele, p.15. See also Y. Suematsu in *Shiragi-shi no sho mondai* (Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko, 1954), 66-7.

83. See Gardiner, "Aspects of the Legend of King Yuri Myŏng," in *Austrina: Essays in Commemoration of the 25th Anniversary of the Founding of the Oriental Society of Australia*, ed. A. R. Davis and A. D. Stefanowska (Sydney: Oriental Society of Australia, 1982).

was no longer seen as adequate. The reason for such a radical transformation of earlier beliefs is likely to have been more profound than a simple desire on the part of the king to conciliate newly acquired subjects of Puyŏ descent, as suggested by Shiratori. Following up the suggestion that the original Koguryŏ foundation legend centred upon Yuri rather than his father (which, as already seen, explains the curious duplication of motifs between father and son observable in the *Samguk sagi*), we come to see that the new picture of Koguryŏ origins proclaimed on the Kwanggaet'o Stele is only the culmination of a long process.

On this supposition, Tong-myŏng or Ch'u-mo had always been the object of a cult in Koguryŏ, as the remote parent of both Koguryŏ and Puyŏ. As to Yuri, it is noteworthy that in the *Samguk sagi*, as on the Kwanggaet'o Stele and in the *Weishu*, he or his equivalent appears as the ancestor of the immediately succeeding kings, including Tae Churyu, who is mentioned in the *Samguk sagi* and on the stele, and Mobon or Morae, who appears in both the *Samguk sagi* and the *Weishu*. Then in all texts there is a break (admittedly disguised on the stele) until we come to the line of Kyeru-bu kings starting with Kung. This surely suggests that Yuri was regarded primarily as the ancestor of the Yŏnno-bu kings who preceded Kung. During the early Koguryŏ period, when the Yŏnno-bu remained powerful (the *Sanguozhi* notes that their "successive chieftains in direct descent" still had the right to set up shrines to their ancestors and worship the national gods a century and a half after Kung),[84] the most that the Kyeru-bu kings could do was perhaps to attach their ancestor Chaesa to the line of Yuri by a spurious filiation, making him the son of the founder rather than his companion. But once the old tribal structure had been seriously damaged by the devastating invasions of the third and fourth centuries, which came close to destroying the state altogether, the royal house, which somehow managed to survive, succeeded in strengthening itself through taking in various Chinese gentry refugees, and eventually through the conquest of the old Puyŏ lands as well as much of peninsular Korea. In these changed circumstances the kings were able to upstage the ambiguous figure of Yuri altogether by appropriating the Puyŏ ancestor as founder of Koguryŏ, and

84. *SGZ* ch.30, 26b.

emphasizing their own succession to him "in direct line of descent"; in the process, many of the deeds once connected with Yuri will have been transferred to Ch'u-mo/Tong-myŏng. This new assertion of direct divine descent will have served to elevate the monarchy forever above the claims of the old tribal nobility, then in a state of collapse.

Thus we may posit three stages in the formation of the legend: the first, which may perhaps be equated with the period of Yŏnno-bu kingship, saw the continued cult of Tong-myŏng in Koguryŏ as ancestor of both Puyŏ and Koguryŏ, but the assertion by the Yŏnno-bu kings that they were descended from Yuri, the rightful heir of Tong-myŏng, who had come to Koguryŏ. The ancestors of the other tribes were doubtless seen, as with Chaesa in the case of the Kyeru-bu, as companions of Yuri the founder. In the second stage, after the Kyeru-bu had replaced the Yŏnno-bu in the kingship, the worship of Tong-myŏng continued, but the Kyeru-bu kings upgraded their ancestry by asserting that Chaesa was in fact a *son* of Yuri; this gave them the chance to claim descent from the great founder, albeit somewhat indirectly.

In the third stage, when the kingdom of middle Koguryŏ arose in the midst of the vastly changed circumstances of the fourth century CE, the royal house had the chance to bypass altogether the figure of Yuri with its irrelevant associations; they could elevate their own status and conciliate many of their new subjects by claiming descent from Yuri's father Tong-myŏng and transferring to him the important role of founder of the state. Only in this final stage were the earliest historical texts, the Kwanggaet'o Stele and the *Yugi*, first composed, although clearly it must have been impossible to eliminate all traces of the earlier beliefs. (Even in the *Samguk sagi* such traces continue, as for example in the numerous sons described to Yuri, indicating his one time importance as an ancestor.)

To what extent the corpus of legends underwent further change in the two centuries separating the *Yugi* from the *Yugi-sinjip*, it is not possible to say. It is clear at least that the structure of the ruling group did not remain static in late Koguryŏ, after the capital had been transferred to P'yŏngyang in 427. Royal power and prestige seems to have reached its climax under King Changsu (r. 413-491), whose enormous reign is the longest in all East Asian history. Little more than half a century after his time we read of armed clashes between rival court factions ending in the enthronement of a child ruler. There is, however, nothing to connect these factions with the old

tribes, nor do their names, or the incident, even occur in the *Samguk sagi*.[85]

Certainly, when the *Yugi-sinjip* was composed in 600, perhaps as an assertion of national identity in the face of the threat posed by a newly united and expansionist China, there seems to have been no attempt to bring the story down to a later period. To judge from the traces of this book which subsist in the *Samguk sagi,* it was concerned almost entirely with early Koguryŏ, even though it was written at such a removed time from that period, it is clear the old tribal system was no longer understood. Yi Munjin's main work was probably to polish and abbreviate a prolix and somewhat rustic original; perhaps, given the political circumstances of his day, he paid special attention to the old heroic struggles against Chinese imperialism.

Superficially there would seem to have been little reason for the *Yugi-sinjip* to have been copied or studied after the fall of Koguryŏ in 668. Yet since, as we have seen, there are strong reasons for suspecting its presence as a source, at least at secondhand, behind part of the *Samguk sagi*, there seems every likelihood that it somehow survived until the early Koryŏ period, when its contents would have offered renewed interest. After the capture of P'yŏngyang, no less than 38,000 of the Koguryŏ nobility are said to have been deported to China, yet there were enough left to start a revolt in the old territory, and put forward Ansŭng, son of a daughter of the last Koguryŏ monarch, as ruler. Tang China moved quickly to crush this rebellion, but Ansŭng found a refuge in Silla, whose policy was now to prevent the Chinese becoming too powerful in Korea. Ansŭng was recognised as titular king of Koguryŏ and married into the Silla royal house;[86] at his court in exile there might have been every reason to feel nostalgia for the great days of Koguryŏ's past, and one can imagine such a work as the *Yugi-sinjip* attracting attention. Once in Silla, the book could have been handed down until the final collapse of that state at the beginning of the ninth century,

---

85. We owe the preservation of this scrap of information to a lost Paekche chronicle which was consulted by the Japanese compilers of the eighth-century *Nihon shoki*. See W. G. Aston, transl., *Nihongi* (London: Paragon Book Reprint Corporation, 1956), pt. 2, 60-61 (ch.19, 28-29). Evidently Kim Pu-sik knew neither the Japanese chronicle itself nor the Paekche sources it utilised.

86. For details and sources, see Joseph Wong, *The Korean Wars and East Asia in the Seventh Century* (Canberra: Australia National University, 1984), 185-204, 215-16.

although one can hardly guess at how it managed to survive the upheavals of the last three and a half decades of Silla's existence when most of the Silla records themselves seem to have disappeared. The only other obvious alternative, that the book was transmitted to Koryŏ via Parhae, suffers from the serious difficulty that Parhae did not come into existence until some thirty or more years after the fall of P'yŏngyang.

Mention of the Koryŏ dynasty brings us again to the older *History of the Three Kingdoms*, the first work in this series of texts which survives as anything more than a name and a conjecture. Although only one chapter of the work survives, it is clear that its unknown author placed great emphasis upon the history of Koguryŏ and regarded that state as the source of Koryŏ's legitimacy; Koryŏ was to be Koguryŏ *redivivus*.[87] Given these views it is likely that he would have sought out and used the *Yugi-sinjip*, indeed it is very possible that Kim Pu-Sik's knowledge of the *Yugi-sinjip* derives from its use in the older *History of the Three Kingdoms*; his southern sympathies would hardly have encouraged him to look for the book himself. It would seem that it is also to this unknown predecessor of Kim Pu-sik that we have to ascribe the imposition of a very arbitrary chronology upon the Koguryŏ legends; at least, from the one surviving chapter we can see that the older *History of the Three Kingdoms* must have been provided with dates.[88]

From this perspective the *Samguk sagi* can be seen as a further stage in a whole series of works, each of which, beginning with the *Yugi*, was the product of a new attitude towards the traditional past, and represented an attempt to reshape or distort that past to accommodate political realities of the time of composition. The *Yugi-sinjip* will have abridged and refined the *Yugi*; then the older *History of the Three Kingdoms* seems to have imposed upon the stories an elaborate chronological framework. The role of Kim Pu-sik's work in the long process of transformation has already been outlined;

87. See Y. Suematsu, "*Sangoku-shi to Sangoku-shiki*," *Chōsen Gakuho* 39/40 (1966), 1-9, esp. 5-9. Koguryŏ already appears under the name Koryŏ in the *Nan Qishu*, the *Zhoushu* and other Chinese histories of the seventh century, and from the recently discovered monument in Chungwŏn; see Chŏng Yŏng-ho, "Two Recently Discovered Epigraphs," *Korea Journal* 20, no. 11 (1980): 57-59, it appears that the term Koryŏ was already used in the time of King Changsu.

88. Cf. *Tongguk Yi Sangguk chip* ch.3, 2b, 5a and 8d.

intent on shifting the centre of interest from Koguryŏ to Silla, he downplayed the Koguryŏ traditions and pruned them drastically. Perhaps, too, it was Kim Pu-sik, whose interest in Chinese history writing is evident throughout his work, who excerpted the notices on Koguryŏ from Chinese dynastic histories and the *Zizhi tongjian*, and combined them with the older more traditional narrative, but this is only a guess.

References (Compiled by Duncan DeAeth)

Aston, W.G. transl. (1896) 1956. *Nihongi* 日本紀. London: Paragon Book Reprint Corporation.

Ban, Gu 班固. (ca. 111 CE) 1930. *Hanshu* 漢書 (abbrev. *HS*). Shanghai: Shangwu Yinshuguan.

____. (ca. 3 CCE) 1965. *Dongguan Hanji* 東觀漢記. Taibei: Taiwan Shangwu Yinshuguan.

Bielenstein, Hans. 1954. "The Restoration of the Han Dynasty." pt. 1. *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities* 26: 5-209.

Browne, Thomas. 1906. "Hydriotaphia." In *Everyman's Library*: *Religio Medici and Other Writings.* London: J. M. Dent & Sons.

Chen, Shou 陳壽. (ca. 280 CE) 1957. *Sanguozhi jijie* 三國志集解 (abbrev. *SGZ*). Edited by Lu, Bi 盧弼. Beijing: Guji Chubanshe.

Chŏng, Yŏng-ho. 1980. "Two Recently Discovered Epigraphs." *Korea Journal* 20 (11): 57-59.

Fan, Ye 范曄. (ca. 4 CCE) 1958. *Hou Hanshu* 後漢書 (abbrev. *HHS*). Ed. Li, Xian 李賢. Beijing: Shangwu Yinshuguan.

Foster, Larry C. 1977-78. "Wang Chia's *Shiyi Ji*" 拾遺記. *Monumenta Serica* 33: 379-402.

Gardiner, Kenneth. 1969a. "Some Problems concerning the Founding of Paekche." *Archiv Orientalni* 37 (4): 562-588.

____. 1969b. "The *Hou Hanshu* 後漢書 as a Source for the Early Expansion of Koguryŏ." *Monumenta Serica* 28: 148-187.

____. 1970. "The *Samguk sagi* and its sources," *Papers on Far Eastern History* 2: 1-41.

____. 1972. "The Kung-sun Warlords of Liao-tong (189-238)." pt. 1. *Papers on Far Eastern History* 5: 59-107.

____. 1972. "The Kung-sun Warlords of Liao-tong (189-238)." pt. 2. *Papers on Far Eastern History* 6: 141-201.

____. 1979. "Beyond the Archer and His Son: Koguryŏ and Han China." *Papers on Far Eastern History* 20: 57-82.

____. 1982. "Aspects of the Legend of King Yuri Myŏng." In *Austrina: Essays in Commemoration of the 25th Anniversary of the Founding of the Oriental Society of Australia*, edited by A. R. Davis and A. D. Stefanowska. Sydney: Oriental Society of Australia.

Ikeuchi, Hiroshi 池内宏. 1929. "The Chinese Expeditions to Manchuria under the Wei Dynasty." *Memorial of the Research Department of the Tōyō Bunko* 4: 71-120.

____. 1951. "Kōkuri no go-zoku oyobi go-bu" 高句麗の五族及び五部. In *Mansen shi kenkyu Josei-hen* 滿鮮史研究 助成編, pt. 1, 325-387. Kyoto: Tōyō Bunko.

Inoue, Hideo 井上秀雄. 1968. "Sangoku-shiki no genten o motomete" 三国史記の原典を求めて. *Chōsen Gakuho* 朝鮮学報 [Journal of the Academic Association of Koreanology in Japan] 48: 71-92.

____. 1972. *Kodai Chōsen* 古代朝鮮. Tokyo: Nihon Hōsō Shuppan Kyōkai.

Kim, Pu-sik 金富軾. (ca. 1145) 1931. *Samguk sagi* 三國史記 (abbrev. *SGSG*). Kyŏngsŏng: Kojŏn Kanhaenghoe.

Mizutani, Teijiro 水谷悌二郎. 1959. Inscriptions of the *Kōtai Ōhi* 好太王碑考 (Kwanggaet'o Stele). *Shūhin* 書品 100.

Pak, Si-hyŏng. 1966. *Kwanggaet'o-wang nŭngbi*. P'yŏngyang: Sahoe Kwahagwŏn Ch'ulp'ansa.

Rogers, Michael. 1983. "Pyŏnnyŏn Tongnok: the Foundation Legend of the Koryŏ State." *Journal of Korean Studies* 4: 3-72.

Shiratori, Kurakichi 白鳥倉吉. 1938. "The Legend of King Dong-ming, the Founder of Fuyü Guo." *Memorial of the Research Department of the Tōyō Bunko* 10: 1-39.

____. (1947) 1970. "Kudara no kigen ni tsuite" 百済の起源について *Shigaku* 史学. In Vol. 3 of *Shiratori Kurakichi Zenshu* 白鳥庫吉全集, 485-99. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Sima, Qian 司馬遷. (ca. 91 BCE) 1961. *Shiji: Records of the Grand Historian of China* 史記. Translated by Watson, Burton. New York: Columbia University Press.

Sima, Guang 司馬光. (1084) 1956. *Zizhi tongjian* 資治通鑑 (abbrev. *ZZ TJ*).

Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.

Suematsu, Yasukazu 末松保和. 1954. *Shiragi-shi no sho mondai* 新羅史の諸問題. Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko.

____. 1966. "*Sangoku-shi to Sangoku-shiki*" 旧三国史と三国史記. *Chōsen Gakuho* 朝鮮学報 [Journal of the Academic Association of Koreanology in Japan] 39/40.

Umehara, Sueji 梅原末治 and Ikeuchi Hiroshi 池内宏. 1940. *T'ung-kou: Vol. I. The Ancient Site of Kao-kou-li in Chi-an District, Tung-hua Province, Manchoukuo* (満州国通化省輯安県に於ける高句麗の壁画墳). Tokyo: Nichiman Bunka Kyokai.

Wada, Sei 和田清. 1951. "Gento-gun Ko" 玄菟群考 [On Han China's Xüan-tu Commandery in Korea: It's Location Reexamined]. *Tōyōgaku* 東洋学 1.

Wang, Chong 王充. (ca. 80 CE) 1964. *Lunheng jiaoshi* 論衡校釋. Comment by Huang, Hui 黃暉. Taipei: Shangwu Yinshuguan.

Wong, Joseph. 1984 "The Korean Wars and East Asia in the Seventh Century." PhD diss., Australia National University.

Yi, Kyu-bo 李奎報. (ca. 1200) 1958. (reproduction of 17th C. edition) *Tongguk Yi Sangguk chip* 東國李相國集. Seoul: Tongguk Munhwasa.

____. 1974. *Tongguk Yi Sangguk chip.* In *Tongmyŏng Wang p'yŏn: Chewang un'gi*. Trans. Pak, Tubo. *Ulyu mun'go* 160. Seoul: Ulyu Munhwasa.

Fang, Xuanling 房玄齡, comp. (648) 1937. *Jinshu* 晉書 (abbrev. *JS*). Shanghai: Shangwu Yinshuguan.

Keywords: Koguryŏ, *Samguk sagi*, Kim Pu-sik, ancient Korean history, historiography

Submission: 2012. 02. 24. Referee/Revision: 2012. 04. 03. Confirm: 2012. 04. 03