UCLA
UCLA Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title
An Ancient and Glorious Past: Koguryo in the Collective Memories of the Korean People

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5fs9g3q0

Author
Kim, Hyung-Wook

Publication Date
2012

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

An Ancient and Glorious Past:

Koguryo in the Collective Memories of the Korean People

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy

in East Asian Languages and Cultures

by

Hyung-Wook Kim

2012

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

An Ancient and Glorious Past:

Koguryo in the Collective Memories of the Korean People

by

Hyung-Wook Kim

Doctor of Philosophy in East Asian Languages and Cultures

University of California, Los Angeles, 2012

Professor John B. Duncan, Chair

Scholars generally agree that nationalism first emerged in the late eighteenth century, and that collective memories shared by members of a society contributed to the formation of modern nationalism. It does not mean, however, that collective memories did not exist before the modern period. In contrast to some modernist arguments, long before modern nationalism appeared in Korea, there was distinct evidence of the existence of certain collective memories among literati. Literati's memories of Koguryo throughout the pre-modern period and the influence of Koguryo memories on the formation of Korean nationalism after the late nineteenth century strongly indicate that collective memory should not be tied to the notion of modern nationalism.

It is apparent that since as early as the tenth century, Koryo literati considered Koguryo a part of *Korean* history, and their recognition of Koguryo appeared in political, cultural, and ethnic perspectives. The dynastic change from Koryo to Choson in 1392 did not cast doubt on the literati's affirmation of Koguryo's position in Korean heritage, and elevated the status of Confucianism in Choson, even contributing to consolidation of Koguryo memories among the

literati due to Koguryo's connection to the Kija tradition. Although memories of this ancient kingdom were affected by the political situation of the time, especially during the early years of the Choson-Ming relationship, Koguryo's status in Korean history was not questioned, and it still remained historically viable after the notion of the so-called "last bastion" of Confucian civilization emerged following the Ming's collapse.

Unquestionably, it was since the late nineteenth century when Koguryo memories were arguably embedded in the collective memory of Koreans, as Korean nationalists ardently tried to take advantage of Koguryo memories for their independence movements. In this period, Koguryo memories, which had survived since the tenth century, fit well into the model of collective memory as presented by Maurice Halbwachs. Additionally, its projection in the last few decades, including in the relationship between North and South Korea, as well as Korea and China regarding the ownership of Koguryo history, demonstrates how the collective memory of Koguryo has been maintained and still operates vigorously today.

The dissertation of Hyung-Wook Kim is approved.

George E. Dutton

Burglind Jungmann

Namhee Lee

David C. Schaberg

John B. Duncan, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2012

I dedicate this dissertation

to my parents, to whom I will be always be indebted

for their patience, understanding, and endless love…

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgments	vii
Vita	viii
I. Introduction	1
II. Construction of Koguryŏ Lineages in Historical Memories during Koryŏ	19
III. Sustaining Collectivity in the Conflict of Political Interests	57
IV. The Emergence of Intellectual Trends and the Rise of Interest in "Northern" States	86
V. Koguryŏ in the Modern Reconstruction of Korean Identity	123
VI. Ancient but Still Relevant Today	164
VII. Conclusion	206
Bibliography	222

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor, Professor John B. Duncan, whose encouragement, guidance, and supervision from my very first day of graduate school made it possible for me to develop my research. He certainly widened my vision in the classroom, but he and Mrs. Duncan also have been role models for me outside the classroom. It has been a blessing to have him as my advisor. I am very grateful to him for being my mentor, and I am deeply honored to be one of his pupils.

I am also grateful to the other members of my committee, Professors George E. Dutton, Burglind Jungmann, Namhee Lee, and David C. Schaberg. I also extend my thanks to all of the professors and staffmembers of the Department of Asian Languages and Cultures. They have made me realize how fortunate I have been to be around such wonderful people throughout my years of graduate school. I am especially thankful to Jennifer Jung-Kim, who watched out for me like a sister would. She and her family certainly made my time at UCLA more enjoyable.

Lastly but not least, I am greatly indebted to my family's support in the pursuit of my doctoral degree. Without their understanding and encouragement, I could not even have started my graduate studies. I thank my family for all their love and encouragement. My parents, who instilled in me a love of history and supported me in all my pursuits, truly have been the greatest parents in the world. My sister, brother-in-law, and nephew (who also loves history) helped me concentrate on my own work. Finally, my wife, Eunha, and our daughter, Jiwon, have been encouraging and patient during my years in graduate school, and they keep reminding me of the true joys of life.

VITA

1995	B.A., Western History Korea University Seoul, Republic of Korea
1995-98	Republic of Korea Army
2002	M.A., East Asian Languages and Cultures University of California, Los Angeles
2002-03	Field Work in Seoul, under the Education Abroad Program, University of California, Los Angeles
2003-06	Teaching Assistant Department of Asian Languages and Cultures University of California, Los Angeles

PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

PRESENTATION

"Sustaining Collectivity: in the Conflict of Social Interest," presented at the Biannual UCLA-Yonsei University Graduate Student Workshop at the University of California, Los Angeles (February 2012). Examination of how a certain collective memory was influenced by the social circumstances such as changes in the international politics or in the process of consolidating the sovereignty in the pre-modern Korea.

"Koguryŏ in the Historical Memory during the Koryŏ Dynasty," presented at the UCLA-Harvard-SNU Graduate Students Workshop at the University of California, Los Angeles (February 2010). Analysis on the construction and transmission of Koguryŏ memories in the frame of the *Collective Memory*.

"Koryŏ Literati's View on Koguryŏ," presented at the Biannual UCLA-Yonsei University Graduate Students Workshop at the University of California, Los Angeles (February 2008). Examination of how Koryŏ literati viewed and understood Koguryŏ, especially after the military regime of the late twelfth through thirteenth centuries.

"Change in the Political Structure of Koguryŏ," presented at the Symposium on Historical Perspectives on Governmental Innovation in Korea, Center for Korean Studies of UCLA at the University of California, Los Angeles (December 2006). Examination of Koguryŏ's political structure as recorded in the *Samguk sagi*.

"Appearance and Development of Modern Nationalism in Korean History," presented at the 1st Annual Workshop of Graduate Students in the Pan-Pacific Consortium of Korean Studies Centers at Kyushu

University, Fukuoka, Japan (June 2005). Analysis of Korean *nationalism* in the late nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries.

PUBLICATIONS

"*Memorabilia of the Three Kingdoms* (Samguk yusa): Corrected edition (1)," in *Han'guksa hakpo* (The Journal for the Studies of Korean History), 12 (March 2002): 385-442. Co-authored with Ch'oe Kwang Sik, et al.

FELLOWSHIPS and GRANTS

UCLA Education Abroad Program (2001-2002). To do field work at Korea University.

The Mellon Dissertation Seminar Fellowship (2006), Memory: Remembering and Commemoration, East Asia and Elsewhere. To participate in a seminar on historical memory at Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri.

SERVICE

Translator, *Korea University Museum Prestige Collection* (2008).

Discussant, Koguryŏ and Its Neighbors: International Relations in Early Northeast Asia, Conference on Ancient Korean History at the Korean Cultural Center, Los Angeles (February 2007).

Translator, *The Documentary Paintings of Chosŏn Dynasty* (Chosŏn sidae kirokhwa ŭi segye) on Korea University Museum Home Page, http://museum.korea.ac.kr (2001).

Chapter One

Introduction

An Ancient and Glorious Past: Memories of Koguryŏ (高句麗)

The past survives under two distinct forms:

first, in motor mechanisms; secondly in independent recollections.

Henri Bergson.[1]

Collective memory is a current of continuous thought whose continuity is not at all artificial,

for it retains from the past only what still lives

or is capable of living in the consciousness of the groups keeping the memory alive.

Maurice Halbwachs.[2]

Koreans often claim that their country has a long history of 5,000 years, and most people in Korea often state that they are from common ancestors, and therefore Korea is composed of a unitary ethnicity (*tanil minjok*, 單一民族), the so-called "Han minjok" (韓民族).[3] Needless to say, this is the consequence of *national* history education cautiously guided and supported by government, and this claim to a monolithic identity in ethnicity has been stressed as a symbol of

[1] Henri Bergson, *Matter and Memory*, trans. N. M. Paul and W. Scott Palmer (New York: Zone Books, 1991), 78.

[2] Maurice Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory*, trans. Francis J. Ditter and Vida Yazdi Ditter, intro. Mary Douglas (New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1980), 78.

[3] The term "*minjok*" (民族) in Korean can be translated as various notions such as "nation," "people," or "ethnicity." Introduced by the Japanese after the late nineteenth century in the context of nationalism, the ethnic aspect of *minjok* is often highlighted in discourse in Korea. In this dissertation, different words will be used for *minjok* depending on each context.

uniqueness in Korean history. Among many political entities and dynasties which are considered to play a part in Korean history, it is Koguryŏ, an ancient kingdom that collapsed in 668 CE that Korean people have been most interested in lately, regardless of the fact it fell more than 1,000 years ago when it was defeated by the Silla (新羅)-Tang (唐) alliance. Koguryŏ has now arguably become more important than Silla, the kingdom which managed to complete the first unification in Korean history by defeating Paekche (百濟) and Koguryŏ.

Koreans share surprisingly homogenous memories of Koguryŏ such as defeating *foreign* states repeatedly and maintaining sovereignty for nearly eight centuries, which proves how deeply implanted this particular image of Koguryŏ is among Koreans no matter what their position is in society. By foreign states, they are mainly referring to the Chinese and other northern political entities. Meanwhile, Paekche and Silla are excluded from the category of "foreign" regardless of the fact that they were the main enemies of Koguryŏ throughout its history. What blinds Koreans regarding Koguryŏ's foreign neighbors and enemies is mainly their strong belief that Koguryŏ along with Silla and Paekche comprised the whole Korean history of this period. In spite of their apparent animosity in historical documents, the concept of the Three Kingdoms have never been questioned in terms of its "Koreanness," and this is more interesting in the case of Koguryŏ because its geographical location was somewhat distant from the current state of South Korea. While there is no doubt that the Koreans' firm belief that Koguryŏ was part of Korean history is largely the product of twentieth-century nationalist activism and state educational policies, I believe it is also because there exists a rich trove of historical collective memories about Koguryŏ dating back at least a thousand years. In this dissertation, I will review the formation of these "collective memories" of Koguryŏ in Korean history and also examine how Koguryŏ memories among Koreans survive in the discussion of collective memory within

Korean society. Then, I will argue it is no coincidence that Koguryŏ reemerged along with the rise of nationalism during the colonial period in Korean history, and I will also examine Koguryŏ's role in the recent conflict between Korea and China over its historical identity.

Collective memory, which is shared by members of a certain group, has been discussed and analyzed by scholars since the early twentieth century. While paying attention to the fact that individual memories are strongly influenced by the environment of the group to which these individuals belong, scholars tried to explain how collective memory is constructed and has functioned in history, especially in relationship to the development of nationalism. Maurice Halbwachs, a foremost scholar of collective memory, emphasizes society over individual memory in his analysis of collective memory. According to Halbwachs, "it is in society that people normally acquire their memories, and it is also in society that they recall, recognize and *localize* their memories"[4] [emphasis added]. This is why groups are able to produce various memories of events even though individuals have never experienced those events in any direct sense. His argument that what individuals remember is determined by their group memberships but still takes place in their own minds is well explained in the structure he offers. While developing his theory of collective memory, he tried to distinguish collective memory from history. Although both history and collective memory are publicly available social facts, the latter is very dynamic in contrast to the former, which is stagnant considering the degree of relevance of the past to the present in constructing such memories. In other words, the dormant past contained in history can be transformed into a living factor in the present by the collective memory. Furthermore, Halbwachs introduced a different notion of various forms of the past –

[4] Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, trans. and ed. Lewis A. Coser (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 38.

autobiographical memory, historical memory, history and collective memory. He explains autobiographical memory as the memory of events that we ourselves experience while historical memory is what reaches us only through historical records. Experiences in the latter case are surely constructed by each individual's group memberships. By the same token, history is the remembered past to which people do not have an organic relation any more, while collective memory is the one active past which is still vigorously functioning in the formation of a people's current identity. This is why Halbwachs stressed the importance of society in constructing collective memories. People can choose what they want to immerse themselves in from the past. Because characters of the past cannot be acquainted in person and they were often presented in many different ways depending on the situation, it has to be the society that heavily influences people's recall of the past.[5]

The study of collective memory is also analyzed through the notion of so-called "mnemohistory" which focuses on the past as it is remembered, rather than the past as itself. This approach is, therefore, necessarily tied to the theory of cultural transmission, which addresses history not just as one thing following another or as a series of events, but as an active process of making meaning through time, "the ongoing work of *reconstructive* imagination"[6] [emphasis added]. In his expanded research on mnemohistory, Jan Assmann tries to explain the relation between collective memory and cultural identity. By distinguishing cultural memory from "communicative" or "everyday" memory, he strongly argues that the former is the one that more heavily influences the formation of cultural identity. The basic difference between communicative memory and cultural memory, according to Assmann, is that cultural memory is

[5] Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, 50.

[6] Jan Assmann, *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 9.

characterized by its distance from the everyday, while communicative memory is characterized by its proximity to the everyday. Communicative memory is similar to the exchanges in an oral culture or the memories of collected through oral history. Cultural memory is, however, characteristically materialized and presented as fixed forms in order to stress group members' cultural identity. Besides the concretion of identity, Assmann also takes its capacity to reconstruct as an important function of cultural memory. Citing Halbwachs, Assmann again stresses its reconstructional capacity. He states that no memory can preserve the past, and what remains is only that which the society in each era can reconstruct within its contemporary frame of reference. Therefore, cultural memory works by reconstructing, and it always relates its knowledge to an actual and contemporary situation.[7] Although it is true that a lot of materials recording the past are still available to the people of a later period who are engaged in reconstructing historical memory, the degree to which their contemporary situation affects their selection and usage of those materials cannot be underestimated. Depending on their main arguments about the same historical events, individual historians and authors are able to specifically focus on only partial aspects of those events as recorded in the available material; therefore, many collective memory scholars strongly argue that it is impossible for societies to remember in any other way than through their constituents' memories.[8]

Since the main issue of collective memory is its reflection in real societies, most work on collective memory is closely tied to the discussion of nationalism in modern scholarship. When *nation* first appeared in history has been an issue discussed by many scholars, and they generally

[7] Jan Assmann, "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity," trans. John Czaplicka, *New German Critique*, no. 65. (Spring-Summer 1995): 130.

[8] The notion of "*collected*" memory instead of "collective" memory by Young reflects the awareness of personal influence in building memories. (James E. Young, *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust, Memorials and Meaning* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), XI.

agree that it was in the modern era, more specifically, since the eighteenth century that nationhood began to occupy people's minds. Ernest Gellner indicates that the unity of state with its centralized power and industrial capitalism in Europe led to the formation of nations/nationalism. The reason why Gellner strongly argues that nation is a political unit that emerged in the modern world is that he believed literacy was essential to the citizens who formed the backbone of the rise of nation and nationalism. According to Gellner, only a person possessing literacy is able to claim and exercise his rights and also attain a level of affluence and a lifestyle compatible with current notions of human dignity.[9] Therefore, it is the need of modern societies for cultural homogeneity that creates nationalism rather than the power of ideas that act as a homogenizing force in history. This is why nationalism is sociologically rooted in modernity, Gellner argues. This view of nations/nationalism as a modern product is generally supported by other scholars. By stating that the modern sense of nation did not appear until the eighteenth century, Eric Hobsbawm defines nations/nationalism just like Gellner does, by arguing that it basically requires the unity of a political and a national unit in the discussion. Nation is not a primary or an unchanging social unit here. Rather, he strongly argues that it appears in a historically recent period in a particular situation. Its status as a social entity can be confirmed only insofar as it relates to a certain kind of modern territorial state, the "nation-state." Therefore, it would be meaningless to discuss nations/nationality without relating to them to a nation-state in Hobsbawm's analysis.[10] On the other hand, Benedict Anderson maintains that it is the role of print capitalism that accounts for the formation of modern nationalism. Through the accessibility of printed materials such as newspapers, the masses were finally able to *rethink* their identities in

[9] Ernest Gellner, *Thought and Change* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1964).

[10] Eric J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 3-10.

certain communities.[11] The difference between Anderson and Gellner is that the former puts more emphasis on imagination in the rise of nationalism. Rather than thinking of it as fabricated, Anderson argues, we should understand national distinctiveness in terms of the style of imagination and the institutions that make it possible.

Meanwhile, most scholars generally agree that nation/nationalism is a "modern novelty." Some scholars have explored the possibility that its features can be traced back to the pre-modern period,[12] and some analogies of modern nationalism have been presented to explain precursors they see in the pre-modern era. John Armstrong argues that modern nations should be understood not as something unprecedented but as products of a longer cycle of ethnic resurgence and decline over the *longue durée*. Such ethnic identities should not be regarded in the manner of nationalists as fixed essences, but as mutable and fluctuating.[13] Regarding the perennialists' claim that the nation is a recurrent form of social organization and nationalism is a perennial mode of cultural belonging, Anthony Smith states that the history of earlier epochs must be read in light of the nationalist present. Despite his conviction that the majority of nations and nationalisms emerged in the modern world inaugurated by the French and American Revolutions, Smith also contends that there are pre-modern precursors of modern nations and explains the "ethnic" basis of nations by listing six attributes: 1) an identifying name or emblem; 2) a myth of common ancestry; 3) shared historical memories and traditions; 4) one or more

[11] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (New York: Verso, 1991).

[12] Hobsbawm notes that single criteria such as language or ethnicity or a combination of criteria like language, common territory, common history, and cultural traits have been adopted to establish objective criteria for nationhood. Although he pointed out all the attempts at extracting an objective definition of "nationhood" have failed, Hobsbawm himself is also aware the possible influence of these features on the emergence of the notions of nation and nationalism. See Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*, 5.

[13] John Armstrong, *Nations before Nationalism* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1982).

elements of common culture; 5) a link with an historic territory or "homeland"; and 6) a measure of solidarity, at least among élites.[14] Although these pre-modern communities with collective historical memories, called "ethnic communities" or "ethnies" by Smith are distinguished from modern nations, he himself acknowledges that most nations have been formed around these ethnic communities.

Interestingly enough, the existence of "precursors" of modern nations presented by modernist scholars for East Asian countries such as Korea, China and Japan in the pre-modern period strongly suggest that collective historical memories would be better examined in the histories of these countries, which all have "long" histories, and that those memories have even survived dynastic changes throughout their histories. Partha Chatterjee has shown that cultural national identity already existed in India prior to British colonial rule, and this cultural identity developed into the foundation of the nationalist movement in India without being closely related to the colonial regime.[15] Prasenjit Duara also admits the possibility of existence of a pseudo-nation in pre-modern China even though modern nationalism in China followed a similar track to the Western model.[16] Possibilities of proto-nationalism in Korean history have already been suggested by some scholars as well. John Duncan keenly points out such possibilities in applying models suggested by Hobsbawm. Citing four attributes featured in modern nationalism – language, ethnicity, religion, and a lasting political entity – he argues that the sense of Korean identity with a large collectivity could be confirmed as early as hundreds years ago in Korean

[14] Anthony Smith, *Myths and Memories of the Nation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 12-14.

[15] Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).

[16] Prasenjit Duara, *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

history.[17] In addition, JaHyun Kim Haboush noted that the ritual controversy during the seventeenth century of Chosŏn (朝鮮) was reflective of the formation of new identity among Chosŏn literati following the conquest of Ming (明) China by the "barbarian" Manchus in the mid-seventeenth century. Because they had considered China an ultimate model for their state, it was necessary for them to rearrange their perspectives on the world, including questions about their identity: were they the preservers of Cheng-Zhu orthodoxy or were they products of a mixture of indigenous and Confucian tradition?[18]

In the discussion of collective memory or historical identity in Korean history, Koreans' perception of Koguryŏ specifically offers a lab for further research on pre-modern collective historical memory. Considering the aforementioned six attributes presented by Smith, it is certain that Koguryŏ and its memories should not be neglected in the discussion of collective memories in pre-modern Korean history. Although the name "Korea" is commonly believed to be derived from the Koryŏ (高麗) dynasty, it was Koguryŏ that used Koryŏ as the official title of its kingdom. There is evidence showing that people of Koguryŏ actually called their kingdom Koryŏ instead of Koguryŏ, and officials of the Koryŏ dynasty also stated that they adopted their state name from Koguryŏ.[19] Therefore, the name "Korea" evinces an unquestionable connection to this old kingdom that officially ended in 668. In addition, the name of a historic Koguryŏ figure, Ŭlchi Mundŏk (乙支文德; fl. late sixth-early seventh century), has been adopted for one of the main boulevards in Seoul, the capital of South Korea, and for one of the main national

[17] John Duncan, "Proto-nationalism in Premodern Korea," in *Perspectives on Korea*, ed. Sang-Oak Lee and Duk-Soo Park (Sydney: Wild Peony, 1998), 198-221.

[18] JaHyun Kim Haboush, "Constructing the Center: The Ritual Controversy and the Search for a New Identity in Seventeenth-Century Korea," in *Culture and the State in Late Chosŏn Korea*, ed. Martina Deucler and JaHyun Kim Haboush (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 1999), 87.

[19] *Koryŏsa* (高麗史), 94:4. "…我國卽高句麗之舊也. 故號高麗都平壤…"

defense exercises of the country, while an astronomical chart used by Koguryŏ appears on one of the main bills of Korean currency today. Secondly, the myth of Chumong (朱蒙), the legendary founder of Koguryŏ and his connection to Tan'gun (檀君), the legendary figure with whom Korean history assertedly began, also meets the condition mentioned by Smith. Although only *Samguk yusa* (三國遺事; a thirteen century text) recorded Chumong as a son of Tan'gun, Koguryŏ is considered to have had a close historical tie with Old Chosŏn (Ko Chosŏn, 古朝鮮), which was established by Tan'gun, and most of this connection is probably based on the fact that Koguryŏ's territory overlapped that of Old Chosŏn. No matter whether Chumong was a direct descendant of Tan'gun or not, what is important is that people did not show any serious objection to that belief given that Tan'gun has been unquestionably considered the common ancestor of the Korean people. Therefore, Koguryŏ's historical memory can be even more consolidated through the discourse of a myth of common ancestry for the Korean people in terms of people's belief in the historical connection between Tan'gun and Chumong. The announcement of the excavation of the so-called Tan'gun tomb by the North Korean government in the 1990s demonstrates once again how the myth of Tan'gun can help keep Koguryŏ memories strong today.

The memories most Korean people have about Koguryŏ are arguably about its military strength. In fact, Koguryŏ's victories against foreign forces, especially the Sui (隋) and Tang from China, are often cited by Koreans when they are asked about their knowledge of this ancient kingdom. Their almost unanimous response regarding Koguryŏ's victories is very worthy of discussion in terms of collective memories because it is only possible under the circumstances in which every member of an entity shares historical memories. It is no coincidence that Koguryŏ has been consistently cited whenever military strength is stressed in Korean history. In

other words, Koguryŏ's military success is considered a very proud example of Korean strength by the people of Korea, and this is why the history of Koguryŏ has been recorded in various Korean historical accounts since the twelfth century *Samguk sagi* (三國史記), which was compiled by Kim Pu-sik (金富軾, 1075-1151), a person with a very strong pro-Silla perspective.

Additionally, customs and arts believed to have originated from Koguryŏ are still found in contemporary Korea, and Koguryŏ's cultural legacy has never been questioned or excluded from "Korean" culture since its demise. *Ondol*, a traditional heating system for houses that is still commonly in use in Korea, is believed to have been designed by Koguryŏ people, and *yut*, a traditional game played by Koreans, is also believed to have a Koguryŏ origin. Koguryŏ attributes in Korean culture are also found in food. *Pulgogi*, a Korean style of barbeque, and *ch'ŏnggukchang*, a fast-fermenting bean paste, are two examples widely believed to show Koguryŏ origins. As early as the third century, *ch'ŏnggukchang* appeared in a Chinese document as a "foreign" gourmet food,[20] and its smell was described as the "scent of Koryŏ" by the Chinese author. The claim that *pulgogi* originated from Koguryŏ appeared in the early twentieth century. Although a soaring interest in Koguryŏ under Japanese rule likely helped the argument that *pulgogi* is an example of Koguryŏ culinary culture, it is certain that there were still some features in the Korean people's diet that could still be easily connected to Koguryŏ.

Another important aspect in the discussion of Koguryŏ memories lies in its old territory, which covered both the northern half of the Korean Peninsula and much of Manchuria. Since Koguryŏ was defeated by the Silla-Tang alliance in 668, Manchuria has never been under the

[20] It was recorded as *si* (豉, Ch. chi) in various documents including the *Bo wu zhi* (博物志). Besides the *Bowu zhi*, the *Xin Tang shu* (新唐書) also recorded it as a famous local product of Parhae (渤海). It appeared in the *Samguk sagi* as an item for a royal wedding.

direct control of Korean people.[21] It does not mean, however, that they forgot Koguryŏ's traces in that region by any means. On the contrary, their memories of Koguryŏ's old territory appear consistently throughout Korean history, and their image of Koguryŏ's territory is not limited only to Manchuria. After Chosŏn replaced Koryŏ, the Liaodong (遼東) region emerged as a volatile issue causing serious tension between Chosŏn and Ming. Although both sides somehow managed to avoid a serious clash, the officials of the Chosŏn court expressed the legitimacy of their claim for that region by stating that it was part of the old Koguryŏ territory in their anthologies. As long as Koguryŏ was believed to be one of the kingdoms in Chosŏn's history, Liaodong was necessarily a topic in the memories of Koguryŏ through the Chosŏn dynasty. In addition, it is the region to which Yi Sŏng-gye (李成桂, 1335-1408; r. 1392-1398 as King T'aejo (太祖), the first king of the Chosŏn dynasty), was closely tied, during his process of seizing political power; therefore, Koguryŏ, as the state that had once controlled Liaodong, cannot be neglected in underscoring the legitimacy of the new Chosŏn dynasty. The most obvious image of the old Koguryŏ territory as "homeland" [*koto*, 故土] can be found in the perspective on Manchuria in Korean history. It was from the late nineteenth century through the colonial period that Koguryŏ's territory ascended to the level of "homeland" among the Korean people, even though memories of its control of Manchuria had never been forgotten among Koreans. Facing various imminent threats from outside and colonization by Japan, Manchuria became the first destination for Korean nationalists who tried to organize anti-Japanese movements, and their stay in the old Koguryŏ territory necessarily deepened their Koguryŏ memories, which mostly centered on its military success against foreign oppressions. Both Japanese colonization and the

[21] Although Parhae (698-926) is mentioned by some Korean scholars as the last dynasty in Korean history that controlled Manchuria, its influence in the collective memories of the Korean people is minimal compared to that of Koguryŏ. In addition, there is still ongoing debate regarding Parhae's historical identity among Korean, Chinese and Russian scholars.

newly introduced nationalism resulting from the colonization undoubtedly helped Koguryŏ's old territory acquire a new status in Korean history as a "homeland." What is more important in the discussion of homeland for Koguryŏ memories is that this recognition is not just limited to the physical location of Koguryŏ. Among the Neo-Confucian literati of the Chosŏn dynasty, the true value of Koguryŏ lay at its connection to the Kija (箕子, Ch. Jizi) tradition. They believed that Kija fled to Old Chosŏn at the time of the fall of China's Shang dynasty and that he linked Tan'gun to Chumong in the line of leadership in Manchuria and the northern Korean peninsula. Koguryŏ memories possibly connected to the figure of Kija among the Neo-Confucian literati of Chosŏn, who had bestowed on themselves a holy status as the guardians of the "last bastion of Confucian civilization," should not be ignored by any means, and the Chosŏn kings' regular visits to, and interest in, the shrines for Tan'gun, Kija, and Chumong reveal their strong connection to Koguryŏ memories. In other words, they certainly tried to seek some solidarity with the Neo-Confucian literati by remembering Koguryŏ in terms of the Kija tradition. Considering the examples summarized above, it is apparent that memories of Koguryŏ meet all requirements presented by Smith, and provides fertile ground for further exploration of the role pre-modern collective memories have played in the formation of modern nationalism.

In this dissertation, I will show how Koguryŏ and memories of Koguryŏ have been constructed and reconstructed throughout the past one thousand years. I will examine how later Korean elites and states imagined themselves to have political, cultural, and ethnic lineages that connected them to the ancient kingdom. Each period I analyze here confirms that Koguryŏ memories in all three lineages have survived until now, and they eventually had a deep influence on the emergence of *modern* nationalism in Korea in the twentieth century. In the second chapter,

I will begin with the various traces of Koguryŏ memories during the Koryŏ dynasty. In contrast to the conventional view, which assumes that Koguryŏ was overshadowed by Silla from the Koryŏ period until the Mongol invasions in the thirteenth century, I contend that Koryŏ literati never lost their Koguryŏ memories, and their recognition of their connection to Koguryŏ is confirmed in all three aspects, political, cultural and ethnic. Both Buddhism and the Neo-Confucianism introduced in the late Koryŏ period will be examined to show how they helped preserve Koguryŏ memories through the Koryŏ dynasty. Also, I will examine how Koguryŏ operated within the notion of the *Samhan* (三韓) to represent Korean identity. Whereas Koguryŏ is generally excluded from the *Samhan* today, Koryŏ literati apparently included Koguryŏ in the discourse of the *Samhan*, which arguably accounts for the structure of their collective memories.

The chapter on the early Chosŏn period will show how Koguryŏ memories appeared from the late fourteenth century dynastic transition through the sixteenth century. In spite of the dynastic change from Koryŏ to Chosŏn, there were no significant changes inside the ruling class. Although some traditionally powerful families of the late Koryŏ period did fall during the transition, the Neo-Confucian literati who seized power in early Chosŏn had already acquired quite significant political power well before 1392. What had more influence on the appearance of Koguryŏ memories in this period were the tensions between two new states – Chosŏn and Ming – and the struggles inside the Chosŏn court rather than dynastic change itself. Until Chosŏn and Ming firmly established a peaceful relationship, the Koguryŏ memories held by Chosŏn literati could be viewed by Ming as a possible threat of irredentism. Even after the two sides managed to trust each other somehow, Koguryŏ memories were highlighted in order to support the political reform initiated by the Chosŏn king. With Ming's tacit consent, Koguryŏ memories, especially in terms of military strength, were now more emphasized in Chosŏn. Therefore, this chapter will

mainly examine how Koguryŏ memories were related with both international and domestic political situation.

The fourth chapter deals with Koguryŏ memories during the change in the intellectual circumstances in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Chosŏn. A series of invasions by the Japanese and the Jurchen (Manchus) from the late sixteenth century through the 1630s resulted in significant changes in many aspects of Chosŏn society. Chosŏn was astonished by the weakness of Ming during the Imjin War, and its collapse following the surge of the Manchu Qing (淸) was nothing short of causing serious turmoil among Chosŏn literati. While claiming Chosŏn was the "last bastion of civilization," a group of Neo-Confucian literati in Chosŏn tried hard to emphasize their superiority against Qing. In their perspective, Qing did not contain any true value in spite of its having replaced Ming; Chosŏn, therefore, should preserve the splendid tradition that originated with Kija and remain noble after Ming's demise. As a result, Koguryŏ memories in term of its relationship to Kija had to be stressed by them in the seventeenth century. Meanwhile, a new intellectual trend of focusing more on practicality also appeared gradually among literati from the mid-seventeenth century. Those who were interested in this new trend tried to analyze issues, and they certainly contributed to expanding their knowledge of Koguryŏ through their research. The many new claims regarding Chumong and Koguryŏ itself that they argued have helped various Koguryŏ memories remain vivid among the literati's minds. The appearance of Koguryŏ memories in the discourse of conventional Neo-Confucian literati and in the materials produced by the so-called Practical Learning [實學] scholars will be examined in detail in this chapter.

It was from the late nineteenth century through the colonial period that Koguryŏ memories finally became tied to the notion of nationalism in Korean history. Facing a series of

imminent threats from the outside, Chosŏn was gradually exposed to nationalism, and its resonance was amplified even more by the Japanese colonization. Because most modern nationalisms were based on resistance against suppression by *others*, it was not a coincidence that modern Korean nationalism emerged quickly in the wake of Japanese colonization and Koguryŏ memories attracted more attention from Korean nationalists. Koguryŏ's maintenance of its sovereignty until the end by defeating strong enemies such as the Sui and the Tang offered a perfect model to Korean nationalists for the independence movements, and their experience in Manchuria after they fled helped them discuss Koguryŏ memories more often. Quite interestingly, not just Korean nationalists but also Japanese scholars were interested in this ancient kingdom. Despite the fact that most of the interest from Japanese personnel was stimulated by the need to justify their colonization of Korea, their research on Koguryŏ helped its memories not just to survive but also to be rejuvenated during the colonial period. The way in which Koguryŏ memories were dealt with and cited, by both Korean nationalists and Japanese scholars – plus how those memories were adapted at the dawn of modern Korean nationalism – will be discussed.

Finally, the discussion of Koguryŏ memories has entered a whole new stage in the last few decades. After liberation in 1945, Korea became divided into two different regimes and their confrontation is still ongoing. Obviously, Koguryŏ memories matter in the national division because most of the old Koguryŏ remains and sites belong to North Korea. It is true that Silla was emphasized somewhat more than Koguryŏ (and Paekche) in South Korea in the 1960s, when North Korea tried to utilize their almost complete monopoly on Koguryŏ remains in order to propagandize its regime in the competition with the South. In terms of building collective memories, Koguryŏ memories arguably appeared stronger in the North until the early 1980s.

Since the 1980s, however, the controversies about Koguryŏ and its memories were recentered from between the two Koreas to Korea vs. China. The Chinese concern about the rising interest in Koguryŏ inside both North and South Korea finally resulted in a national project that attempts to incorporate Koguryŏ into Chinese history, and this has drawn a furious response from the Korean people. The almost unanimous reaction of Koreans against the Chinese claim proves how firmly Koguryŏ has been rooted in the collective memories of Korean people. In this final chapter, I will examine the ongoing controversies between Korea and China regarding historical identity of Koguryŏ, and try to analyze their connection to the collective memory while seeking some hidden causes that are making this issue so volatile today.

Arguably, the element of artifact, invention, and other social engineering should be highlighted in the process of the formation of nation, and collective memory is one of the key elements closely tied to it. It operates through people's minds, and it is certain that, as Gellner states,

> …nation as a natural, God-given way of classifying men, as an inherent though long-delayed political destiny, are a myth; nationalism, which sometimes takes pre-existing cultures and turns them into nations, sometimes invents them, and often obliterates pre-existing cultures.[22]

As most scholars generally agree, nations do not make states and nationalism; rather, it is the other way round. It does not mean, however, that no collective memories existed before nations and nationalism appeared in history. Even long before modern notions of nation and nationalism emerged, collective memory already existed and has clearly been functioning throughout history, as shown by the case of Koguryŏ memories in Korean history. As suggested by Halbwachs, society unquestionably plays a main role in the construction of collective

[22] Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983), 48-49.

memory, and it is also true that social aspects produced in the modern era helped collective identity emerge in many occasions. It is not my intention here to deny those relationships between the construction of a sense of collectivity and the characteristics of a modern nation. I do agree with some of the points presented in the claims of modernists like Gellner and Anderson. What I would rather argue is that the memories of Koguryŏ can be analyzed in the modern discourse of collective memory even though its inaugural appearance was long before the emergence of nationalism, which has been discussed since the eighteenth century. In other words, although contributing to the formation of Korean nationalism from the late nineteenth through the twentieth centuries, Koguryŏ memories have been sustained among Korean people, at least among literati and intellectuals, since the tenth century, and they just have emerged differently depending on the social environment at a given point in Korean history. This is why I will try to review the people's perspectives on Koguryŏ in different periods since its memory first appeared in the tenth century. It is apparent that Koguryŏ also fits very well with the six characteristics of the precursors of a modern nation postulated by Smith, and with the uniqueness in Korean history that was also suggested by Hobsbawm in his discussion of nationalism. I strongly believe that this examination of Koguryŏ memories using the approaches set forth by Halbwachs, Smith, and others will help us understand the path from collective memory to the development of nationalism in Korean history and, further understand the current controversies between Korea and China regarding the historical ownership of this ancient kingdom. I hope my research on how Koguryŏ memories have been constructed, re-constructed, and deployed over time will provide a useful model for further discussion of collective memory during the pre-modern period, not only in Korea but also in other countries with long traditions of centralized rule and historical writings such as China and Japan.

Chapter Two

Construction of Koguryŏ Lineages in Historical Memories during Koryŏ

Introduction

Much research has been done on the question of whether Koryŏ saw itself as the successor to Koguryŏ or Silla, and scholars generally agree that both Koguryŏ and Silla had some degree of influence on the formation of historical consciousness during the Koryŏ period. The general consensus has been that Koguryŏ loomed large in early Koryŏ, only to be displaced by Silla once Koryŏ was well established.[23] My purpose in this chapter, however, is not to revisit the issue of Silla versus Koguryŏ succession in the Koryŏ dynasty. Rather I am interested in how Koguryŏ was remembered by Koryŏ literati and how their memories of Koguryŏ developed as part of their collective identity, not just in early Koryŏ, but throughout that dynasty. Although it

[23] Yi U-sŏng argued that Koguryŏ successionship was dominant from the beginning until the mid-twelfth century when the *Samguk sagi* was compiled. See Yi U-sŏng, "*Samguk sagi* ŭi kusŏng kwa Koryŏ wangjo ŭi chŏngt'ong ŭisik," (The Formation of the *Samguk sagi* and the Koryŏ Dynasty's Consciousness of Legitimacy) *Chindan hakpo* 38 (1974): 203-207. Ha Hyŏn-gang introduced the so-called dual succession of both Koguryŏ and Silla, in which the former was emphasized for the purpose of the international relationship while the latter was adopted for domestic issues. See Ha Hyŏn-gang, "Koryŏ sidae ŭi yŏksa kyesŭng ŭisik," (On the Idea of Historical Succession in the Koryŏ Period) *Ewha sahak yŏn'gu* 8 (1975): 12-20. While agreeing with Ha on dual sucession, Kim Ŭi-gyu explains the Koryŏ people's stronger desire toward *chunghwa* (中華, Ch. *zhonghua*), the "civilized sphere," rather than irredentism, was probably the reason for their dual succession. See Kim Ŭi-gyu, "Consciousness of Inheriting History in the Early Koryŏ Period," *Korea Journal* 23:7 (July 1983): 18-26. Meanwhile, Michael Rogers argues that although Silla sucession was obvious from the beginning, the Koguryŏ legacy started appearing gradually as Koryŏ realized the necessity of emphasizing aboriginal features such as Buddhist and Taoist beliefs and practices in order to equalize radical irredentism, particularly after quelling the Myoch'ŏng Rebellion in 1136. See Michael Rogers, "*P'yŏnnyŏn T'ongnok*: The Foundation Legend of the Koryŏ State," *The Journal of Korean Studies* 4 (1982-1983): 3-72 and "National Consciousness in Medieval Korea: The Impact of Liao and Chin on Koryŏ," in *China among Equals*, ed. Morris Rossabi (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), 151-172. I, however, believe that the military regime did not influence the rise of interest in Koguryŏ, and rather Buddhism and Confucianism contributed to expanding the meaning of Koguryŏ. I will explain this in detail in the latter part of this chapter.

is obvious that Koryŏ literati saw Koguryŏ as a part of their history, how their perceptions of Koguryŏ played out in the construction of collective identity has hardly been analyzed.

In this chapter, I will examine how Koryŏ literati linked their kingdom to Koguryŏ by constructing three different lineages – political, cultural, and ethnic. First, I will begin with the issue of the state name "Koryŏ" and discuss how Koguryŏ was incorporated into a "Korean" political lineage during the Koryŏ period. Although Koryŏ directly followed Silla and adapted many old Silla rules and customs in order to attain and maintain stability in the transition, Koryŏ kings and literati were certainly aware that Koguryŏ was also a part of their history like Silla and Paekche. Their recognition of Koguryŏ must have had some ties to their memories of this previous kingdom, and it is certain that memories of Koguryŏ in the realm of Koryŏ politics persisted regardless of whether the ruling class purposefully utilized them or not. Second, I will review Koryŏ literary collections in order to examine literati perspectives on Koguryŏ. It is clear that Koryŏ literati considered Koguryŏ writers as a part of their literary tradition, and this perspective was taken over by Confucian literati in the early Chosŏn period. Therefore, its cultural lineage arguably helped historical memories of Koguryŏ remain strong during the dynastic change between Koryŏ and Chosŏn. Finally, I will discuss the discourse of the Samhan – "Three Han" i.e., Mahan (馬韓), Pyŏnhan (弁韓), and Chinhan (辰韓) – as an effort to construct an ethnic lineage that included Koguryŏ. The notion of the Samhan has recently attracted scholarly attention as an expression of a collective identity in pre-modern Korea. In contrast to conventional scholarship, in which Koguryŏ is thought to have been excluded from the Samhan while Paekche and Silla are undoubtedly considered to be included, there was obvious evidence that makes it possible to discuss Koguryŏ in the Koryŏ discourse of the Samhan as well. My review of the historical evidence showing Koguryŏ's ties to the Samhan will

provide the historical foundation of the construction of Koguryŏ's ethnic lineage in Korean history. Therefore, I will review how Koguryŏ was incorporated into the Samhan and focus on how the ties between Koguryŏ and the Samhan were embodied in the historical memories of the Koryŏ literati.[24]

I. Connecting to the Ancestor Kingdom as the Original Koryŏ

One of the most urgent tasks facing Wang Kŏn (王建, King T'aejo (太祖) of Koryŏ, 877-943; r. 918-943) after he established his new regime was to provide historical legitimacy to his new state. Because Silla surrendered without any major conflict, Wang Kŏn did not have to worry about claiming legitimacy in the line of Silla. He actually treated the last king and the ruling class of Silla very well[25] and allowed them to maintain many of their privileges in the new state. It was not so simple, however, to establish a political lineage that related to Koguryŏ, especially after deposing Kung-ye (弓裔, ?-918), who had publicly proclaimed the resurrection of Koguryŏ, then subsequently changed the name of his kingdom to Majin (摩震) and T'aebong (泰封).[26] Wang Kŏn, however, sought to gain political legitimacy by naming his kingdom Koryŏ, the aforementioned abbreviated name of Koguryŏ. His new kingdom was in the old lands of Koguryŏ, as was his birthplace in Songak (松岳) known today as Kaesŏng (開城). Wang Kŏn had no choice but to lay claim to the political heritage of Koguryŏ for his new state from the beginning, and it is very likely that naming his state Koryŏ was one of his attempts to convince

[24] Remco Breuker sees the notion of Samhan as a supradynastical connotation that helped Koryŏ people hold collective identity. See Remco Breuker, "The Three in One, the One in Three: The Koryŏ Three Han as a Pre-Modern Nation," *Journal of Inner and East Asian Studies* 2, no. 2 (December 2005): 144-167.

[25] *Koryŏsa*, 2:9-10. "…拜金傅爲政丞位太子上歲給祿千碩創神鸞宮, 賜之其從者並收錄優賜田祿…"

[26] *Samguk sagi*, 50:3. "…往者新羅請兵於唐以破高句麗, 故平壤舊都鞠爲茂草. 吾必報其讎…"

the Koryŏ people of the historical continuity of the two states.[27] It is also very possible that people in northern Silla still remembered Koguryŏ in the tenth century, and both Kung-ye and Wang Kŏn probably tried to utilize their remaining memories of the old kingdom in order to gain support in this region. For example, Pak Chig-yun (朴直胤), who helped Wang Kŏn establish the Koryŏ dynasty while residing in P'yŏngju (平州) near Songak, was represented with a Koguryŏ title, Taemodal (大毛達), on his tomb tablet even though he was also represented as a descendant of Pak Hyŏkkŏse (朴赫居世), the first king of Silla.[28] Taemodal had been the highest military position in Koguryŏ, and it is believed that it had been revived by autonomous local strongmen in the northern region during the late Silla period. The use of this title for Pak in P'yŏngju strongly implies that some Koguryŏ features still remained and appealed to the local community in the tenth century.

Since a very effective way to claim political legitimacy is to emphasize a geographical location shared with the previous regime, any lingering memories of Koguryŏ in this area would have made it less difficult for Wang Kŏn to begin building a political lineage from Koguryŏ. This strategy is still often used to emphasize historical ties in consolidating a new regime. As Eviatar Zerubavel has keenly observed, the last Shah of Iran in 1971 managed to connect himself to

---

[27] Recent scholarship argues that the name "Koryŏ" was actually used by people of Koguryŏ, and they even changed the official name of the kingdom to Koryŏ in the fifth century when King Changsu (長壽王, 394-491; r. 412-491) moved the capital to P'yŏngyang. See Chŏng Ku-bok, "Koguryŏ ŭi Koryŏ kukho e taehan ilgo" (Research on State name of Koryŏ for Koguryŏ), *Hosŏ sahak* 19·20 (1992): 43-66; Pu Zhen-shi, "Chungwŏn Koguryŏ pi ŭi kŏllip yŏndae kojŭng" (Research on the Year of Chungwŏn Koguryŏ Stele), *Koguryŏ yŏn'gu* 10 (2000): 315-341. Although it will require further research to confirm this argument, the *Samguk yusa* records that "Koryŏ" was used by Kung-ye for the name of his state when he rose to power in 901. See *Samguk yusa*, 1:27-28. "弓裔…丙辰都鐵圓城…丁巳移都松岳郡. 辛酉稱高麗甲子改國號摩震…" Not only Korean but also various Chinese documents record Koryŏ as the name for Koguryŏ. For details, see Pak Yong-un, *Koryŏ ŭi Koguryŏ kyesŭng e taehan chonghapchŏk kŏmt'o* (A Comprehensive Review on Koryŏ's Awareness of Inheriting Koguryŏ) (Seoul: Ilchisa, 2006), 23-52.

[28] Kim Kwang-su, "Koryŏ cho ŭi Koguryŏ kyesŭng ŭisik kwa Ko Chosŏn insik" (Consciousness of Inheriting Koguryŏ and Awareness of Old Chosŏn in Koryŏ Period), *Yŏksa kyoyuk* 43 (1988): 93. "朴氏之先鷄林人也. 蓋新羅始祖赫居世裔也. 新羅之季…直胤大毛達徙居平州…"

Persia's first king, Cyprus – despite the fact that the Pahlavi dynasty actually extended back only one generation – by staging a public commemoration of the 2500th anniversary of the foundation of the Persian Empire among the ruins of the ancient city of Persepolis.[29] Similarly, in 932, Wang Kŏn traveled to P'yŏngyang (平壤), the old capital of Koguryŏ, and revealed his plan to make it a capital even before unifying Silla and Later Paekche, a plan that was probably designed to link his new state with Koguryŏ.[30] Building a political lineage between Koguryŏ and Koryŏ was not something easily done by just showing geographical identification. Unlike Silla, which was absorbed by Koryŏ peacefully, and thus had its laws and codes, which had been abolished by Kung-ye, reinstated in Koryŏ,[31] the vanished kingdom of Koguryŏ required a more serious effort to revive and use its memories. Some modern scholars have interpreted Wang Kŏn's generous acceptance of people from the fallen Parhae (渤海, Ch. Pohai, 698-926) and his strong animosity against the Khitans as examples of his willingness to link his new state to Koguryŏ. Since Parhae has been seen as a direct successor to Koguryŏ by many Korean scholars, Wang Kŏn's welcoming of the Parhae people is often taken as a vivid instance of justifying Koryŏ's historical status as the heir of Koguryŏ.[32] In addition, Wang granted the royal surname of Koryŏ to Parhae's Crown Prince and allowed him to keep commemorating his own ancestors after he fled

[29] Eviatar Zerubavel, *Time Maps: Collective Memory and Social Shape of the Past* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 40-43.

[30] *Koryŏsa*, 2:2. "…諭群臣曰頃完葺西京徙民實之, 冀憑地力平定三韓將都於此…"

[31] *Ibid*., 1:11. "…今悉從新羅之制…"

[32] Scholars arguing about Wang Kŏn's strong consciousness of having inherited Koguryŏ through Parhae often emphasize the note in the *Zizhi tongjian* (資治通鑑) which stated that Wang Kŏn called Parhae the "relative" state. (*Zizhi tongjian*, 285:4. "…高麗王建…勃海我婚姻也…[…勃海本吾親戚之國…海本吾]") It is, however, questionable whether Wang Kŏn's Koryŏ was actually able to exercise strong anti-Khitan policy consistently out of this psychological tie with Parhae.

to Koryŏ.[33] It is not clear, however, whether Wang Kŏn actually thought of Parhae as a successor state to Koguryŏ. Because it was Silla, the immediate predecessor of Koryŏ, that had actually defeated Koguryŏ and unified the Korean peninsula, it was probably difficult for Koryŏ's ruling class to have a strong sense of "*us*" that was shared with refugees from Parhae based on purported common memories of Koguryŏ. Additionally, Silla's attitude toward Parhae was not always cordial; therefore, we can not assume that the Koryŏ ruling class in the tenth century, which included many with old Silla ties, unanimously saw Parhae as the descendant of Koguryŏ, although the rulers of Parhae are known to have referred to themselves as the successors to Koguryŏ in diplomatic documents sent to Japan. What is certain in Wang Kŏn's claim and behavior toward Parhae is that he was aware there was some room for him to take advantage of it in order to construct a Koguryŏ-Koryŏ political lineage that would help to stabilize his new state, and Koryŏ's strong subsequent attempt to build a bridge between Koguryŏ and itself is confirmed by the consistent policies on this matter that were pursued by later kings.

In fact, Koryŏ kings often showed their interest in commemoration ceremonies and shrines for King Tongmyŏng (東明王, Chumong), the first king of Koguryŏ. For example, King Hyŏnjong (顯宗, 992-1031; r. 1009-1031) added an honorary title to King Tongmyŏng's shrine in P'yŏngyang in 1011,[34] and ordered local magistrates in 1017 to repair shrines for the kings of Koguryŏ, Silla, and Paekche. He even forbade people to pass by on horseback.[35] King Sukchong (肅宗, 1054-1105; r. 1095-1105) sent officials to King Tongmyŏng's shrine in 1105 to perform a

[33] *Koryŏsa*. 2:8. "…渤海國世子大光顯率衆數萬來投, 賜姓名王繼附之宗籍…以奉其祀…"

[34] *Ibid*., 4:9. "…加平壤木覓橋淵道知巖東明王等神勳號…"

[35] *Ibid*., 4:24. "…敎高勾麗新羅百濟王陵廟並令所在州縣修治, 禁樵採, 過者下馬…"

commemoration ceremony,[36] and King Yejong (睿宗, 1079-1122; r. 1105-1122) also sent officials to King Tongmyŏng's shrine to commemorate him and to pray for victory in battle against the Jurchens.[37] For King Tongmyŏng's shrine to be treated as a holy place for prayers before national events such as war indicates that it was considered very important by the Koryŏ kings, who performed ceremonies regularly to pay tribute to King Tongmyŏng.[38]

King Tongmyŏng was not the only figure from Koguryŏ whom Koryŏ people commemorated. According to Xu Jing's (徐兢) *Gaoli tujing* (高麗圖經), there was a shrine in Kaegyŏng (開京) which people believed was built for Lady Yuhwa (柳花夫人), mother of King Tongmyŏng.[39] Xu interestingly introduced the story of Chumong (King Tongmyŏng) and summarized Koguryŏ history before recording the genealogy of the Koryŏ royal household. Even more to the point, Xu added Wang Kŏn's unification of the so-called "Later Three Kingdoms" in the tenth century to the end of his history of Koguryŏ,[40] and Wang Kŏn's family origins were traced back to Koguryŏ in the *Gaoli tujing*. Xu mentioned that the Wang family was from a large clan from Koryŏ (Koguryŏ), and had replaced the fallen Ko family.[41] It is not clear, however, whether Xu linked Wang Kŏn to Koguryŏ just because he misunderstood these two Koryŏ states to be the same state. Although there are many criticisms of the incorrect information

---

[36] *Ibid*., 63:23. "…八月甲申遣使祭東明聖帝祠獻衣幣…"

[37] *Ibid*., 13:3-4. "…遣同知樞密院事許慶, 祭平壤木覓東明神祠…祭昌陵禱兵捷…"

[38] *Ibid*., 58:31. "…東明王墓. […有祠宇. 高麗以時降御押行祭, 朔望亦令其官行祭. 邑人至今有事輒禱, 世傳東明聖帝祠]…"

[39] *Gaoli tujing*, 17:7. 東神祠. "…殿榜曰東神聖母之堂...乃夫餘妻河神女也. 以其生朱蒙爲高麗始祖, 故祀之…"

[40] *Ibid*., 1:1-4. 始封. "…朱蒙…至紇升骨城而居自號曰高句驪因爲高以氏而以高麗爲國…王建權知國事遣使入貢遂受爵以有國云."

[41] *Ibid*., 2:1. 王氏. "王氏之先蓋高麗大族也. 當高氏政衰國人以建賢遂共立爲君長…"

recorded in Xu's *Gaoli tujing*, his inclusion of Chumong in Koryŏ history and his mention of Wang Kŏn's unification as the finale of Koguryŏ are strong indications that, by the mid-twelfth century, the Koryŏ ruling class was clearly aware of the benefits of being perceived as a part of Koguryŏ's political lineage.

The claim of Koguryŏ lineage in the political sphere became more evident in the compilation of the *Samguk sagi* in the mid-twelfth century. Despite being criticized harshly for his Silla-centric historiography,[42] Kim Pu-sik included Koguryŏ as a part of Koryŏ history in his *Samguk sagi*. In its preface, Kim explained that he wrote the *Samguk sagi* because "*our*" history was less familiar to Koryŏ people than Chinese history,[43] and he included not only Silla but also Koguryŏ and Paekche in the Annals. Besides including Koguryŏ in the Annals section, Kim used the first-person ("we/our" [我 or 吾人]) when narrating stories in the Annals of Koguryŏ, Silla, and Paekche.[44] When stating relationships between Koguryŏ and the Chinese dynasties from Han (漢) to Tang, Kim consistently recorded from Koguryŏ's perspective,[45] and used "we" for Koguryŏ even in the situation of conflicts between Koguryŏ and Silla.[46] This frequent use of first-person narration for Koguryŏ by Kim in relationship to others, including Silla, implies that

---

[42] While considering the Myoch'ŏng (妙淸, ?-1135) Rebellion as one of the most crucial incidents in Korean history, Sin Ch'ae-ho strongly lamented its failure and criticized Kim for his Sino-centric attitude in his *Chosŏn sanggosa* (Ancient History of Chosŏn) and *Chosŏnsa yŏn'gu ch'o*. Recent scholarship, however, argues that Kim did not belittle Koguryŏ in his *Samguk sagi* in the comparison with Silla. See Ko Pyŏng-ik, "*Samguk sagi* e itsŏsŏ ŭi yŏksa sŏsul," (Historiography in the *Samguk sagi*) *Han'guk ŭi yŏksa insik* (Seoul: Ch'angjak kwa pip'yŏngsa, 1976), 1: 55-63.

[43] *Tongmunsŏn* (東文選), 44:12-13. 進三國史記表.

[44] Ko Pyŏng-ik, "*Samguk sagi* e itsŏsŏ ŭi yŏksa sŏsul," 1: 59-60.

[45] *Samguk sagi*, 16:2. "…漢玄菟郡太守耿臨來侵, 殺我軍數百人…"; 21:7. "…勣列砲車…吾人積木爲樓…帝遣銳卒…我軍力戰不克…" and 21:8. "…北部褥薩高延壽南部褥薩高惠眞帥我軍乃靺鞨兵…"

[46] *Ibid*., 19:1. "…我軍與新羅人戰於薩水之原…"; 20:2. "…彼衆我寡…"; 20:14. "…侵新羅北邊七重城. 新羅將軍閼川逆之, 戰於七重城外我兵敗衄…"

Koguryŏ's political lineage had been generally accepted by the Koryŏ literati without question, including even those who possessed very strong Silla-centric historical perspectives such as Kim Pu-sik.

Another strong piece of evidence showing Koryŏ's awareness of Koguryŏ's position in Koryŏ's political lineage appears in the *P'yŏnnyŏn t'ongnok* (編年通錄), written by Kim Kwan-ŭi (金寬毅, fl. twelfth century). Although only partially recorded in the *Koryŏsa* (高麗史) and other writings, the *P'yŏnnyŏn t'ongnok* confirmed the Koryŏ literati's consistent effort to link Koguryŏ in order to consolidate its political legitimacy. According to this record, Wang Kŏn's ancestor, Hogyŏng (虎景) came down to the Puso Mountain (扶蘇山) area near Kaesŏng from Paekdu Mountain (白頭山), a locale in the center of the ancient Koguryŏ territory, while his grandfather also claimed to be a Koryŏ (Koguryŏ) person.[47] It is believed that Kim wrote this in order to mollify some disaffected elements in this old Koguryŏ territory after the Myoch'ŏng (妙淸, ?-1135) Rebellion.[48]

There is no doubt that the outbreak of the Myoch'ŏng Rebellion in the old Koguryŏ territory was a crucial incident during the Koryŏ period. It was a warning to the ruling class in the capital who had a strong pro-Silla perspective. They strongly felt the necessity to re-assert their political legitimacy after the rebellion was quelled. What they chose was to articulate their Koguryŏ lineage in the political sphere, instead of downplaying the Koguryŏ legacy. Including

[47] Pak Han-sŏl, "Koryŏ wangsil ŭi kiwŏn" (The Origin of the Koryŏ Royal Family), *Sach'ong* 21·22 (1977): 103-105.

[48] Michael Rogers argued that what Kim Kwan-ŭi intended in writing the *P'yŏnnyŏn t'ongnok* was to reject the irredentism advocated by Myoch'ŏng and provide a rationalilzation for territorial self-sufficiency. According to Rogers, Kim Kwan-ŭi also championed Silla's tradition in Koryŏ like Kim Pu-sik. Through the mid-twelfth century, Koryŏ understood the necessity to provide new national myth to shape its legitimate identity and to neutralize irredentists' propaganda. See Michael Rogers, "P'yŏnnyŏn T'ongnok: The Foundation Legend of Koryŏ State," 3-72. Although Kim Kwan-ŭi basically possessed Silla-centered perspectives, his attempt to link Koguryŏ features to the origin of Koryŏ royal family implies that he also was aware of the importance of Koguryŏ in order to give Koryŏ legitimate status in Korean history.

Koguryŏ in the Annals section of the *Samguk sagi* and tracing the origin of the Koryŏ royal family to the center of Koguryŏ in the *P'yŏnnyŏn t'ongnok* after the Myoch'ŏng Rebellion both proved the Koryŏ literati's determination to establish a political lineage from Koguryŏ. King Tongmyŏng was even referred as "Yejo" (藝祖) in 1190.[49] Since Yejo was used to refer to either an ancestor with excellent virtues or the first king of a dynasty, addressing King Tongmyŏng as Yejo appears to be a sign of the Koryŏ king's acknowledgment of the importance of Koguryŏ in Koryŏ's political heritage.

Sŏ Hŭi's (徐熙, 942-998) famous diplomatic victory over the Khitan invaders in 993 was possible because of this claim of a common political lineage with Koguryŏ which had begun even before Wang Kŏn completed unification. The *Koryŏsa* tells us that Sŏ was able to convince the Khitan general to withdraw during a meeting in which he argued that Koryŏ had a historical claim to the territory in what is now northwestern Korea because it was the successor to Koguryŏ.[50] Some scholars who question the credibility of this episode argue that the anecdote was possibly fabricated later in order to emphasize Koryŏ's historical tie with Koguryŏ.[51] Nonetheless, this episode appears not only in the Annals of the *Koryŏsa*, but also in Sŏ's biography, and considering the long history of consistent attempts of the Koryŏ ruling class to establish a common political lineage from Koguryŏ, the depiction of Sŏ's claim in the meeting

[49] *Koryŏsa*, 63:23. "…遣使西都祭藝祖墓, 西都藝祖之所興也…" Sŏgyŏng (西京, P'yŏngyang) was officially changed to Sŏdo (西都), the Western Capital by King Kwangjong (光宗, 925-975; r. 949-975) in 960. In order to strengthen royal authority, he renamed Kaegyŏng (開京) to Hwangdo (皇都), the imperial city while also changing Sŏgyŏng to Sŏdŏ. Being aware of the historical meaning of P'yŏngyang as the old capital of Koguryŏ, the Koryŏ kings consistently showed their interest in the P'yŏngyang area. Although it is not clear whether "Yejo" means Chumong or Wang Kŏn here, Kim Kwang-su argues that it is more likely to mean Chumong because of the note of Sodŏ. See Kim, "Koryŏ cho ŭi Koguryŏ kyesŭng ŭisik kwa Ko Chosŏn insik," 96.

[50] *Koryŏsa*, 94:4. "我國卽高句麗之舊也, 故號高麗都平壤…"

[51] Michael Rogers, "National Consciousness in Medieval Korea: The Impact of Liao and Chin on Koryŏ," 151-172; "Notes on Koryŏ's Relations with Sung and Liao," *Chindan hakpo* 71·72 (December 1991): 313.

with the Khitan general in 993 is sufficient by itself to prove that the Koryŏ literati had a strong historical consciousness of themselves and their kingdom as being connected to the lineage of Koguryŏ.

The emphasis on King Tongmyŏng and Sŏ Hŭi's staking a claim to Koguryŏ territory in his talk with the Khitans, however, should not be considered examples of Koryŏ literati holding onto a strong historical consciousness of Koryŏ as the exclusive successor of Koguryŏ. The Koryŏ literati never by any means thought that Koguryŏ was the only legitimate preceding kingdom in their political ancestry. They obviously recognized that Silla, Koguryŏ, and Paekche were all parts of their history. This is why Kim Pu-sik included both Koguryŏ and Paekche in the Annals of the *Samguk sagi*. On the other hand, Kim did not record Parhae in his *Samguk sagi*, which implies that Kim had two different perspectives on Koguryŏ and Parhae. To Kim, Koguryŏ was obviously a part of Koryŏ history while Parhae was considered a foreign state that should be separated from the historical lineage of Koryŏ. Therefore, Koguryŏ was considered a part of Koryŏ's history along with Silla and Paekche, even if it was not the dominant kingdom in the Koryŏ literati's historical consciousness.

Koryŏ's claims of deriving its political lineage from Koguryŏ certainly became one of the key factors in its foreign relationships as well. Michael Rogers attributes the relatively trouble-free relationship between Koryŏ and Jin (金, Kor. Kŭm) to their shared memory of Koguryŏ. According to Rogers, Koryŏ and Jin had one important thing in common, which is that the founders of both states claimed a historical tie with ancient Koguryŏ. Because of this possibly shared ancestry, Koryŏ was able to maintain a better relationship with Jin than Liao (遼).[52] It

[52] Michael Rogers, "The Chinese World Order in Its Transmural Extension: The Case of Chin and Koryŏ," *Korean Studies Forum* 4 (Spring-Summer 1978): 5-7. In addition to ties with Koguryŏ, Rogers also adds that suppressing such a strong irredentist movement with anti-Jin propoganda as the Myoch'ŏng Rebellion was another reason for the relatively smooth relationship between Koryŏ and Jin.

seems plausible that Koryŏ took advantage of this psychological closeness to maintain peace with Jin if we recall that the period of Jin's rise overlapped with Koryŏ's suppression of the Myoch'ŏng Rebellion. Later, Yi Sŭng-hyu (李承休, 1224-1300) recorded that the Jin considered Koryŏ a state established by their ancestors.[53] What is more important here is, however, that as late as the mid-twelfth century, Koryŏ's effort to link itself politically to Koguryŏ was an on-going project and possibly functioned as a diplomatic tool in easing tension with Jin at the northern border.

Placing Koryŏ in the line of Koguryŏ descendants is also found in the *Samguk yusa*, by Iryŏn (一然, 1206-1289). Unlike Kim Pu-sik, Iryŏn included various small states that existed before the Three Kingdoms, including Old Chosŏn. What is interesting here is that Iryŏn introduced King Tongmyŏng as a son of Tan'gun (壇君) in a section on royal genealogies.[54] Considering that Iryŏn began his construction of a Koryŏ's political lineage with Old Chosŏn, established by Tan'gun, it seems clear that Koguryŏ, as the successor to Tan'gun's Chosŏn, was a key part of Koryŏ's strategy of political legitimization. Furthermore, he directly connected Koguryŏ to Old Chosŏn by citing Chinese materials. At the end of the Old Chosŏn section, Iryŏn added a note about the origin of Koryŏ (Koguryŏ) through Kija, as stated by a Chinese scholar.[55] Although Iryŏn did not offer any extra explanation as to why he included a note about Koguryŏ there, this certainly indicates that Iryŏn was aware of the link between Tan'gun's Old Chosŏn,

---

[53] *Chewang un'gi* (帝王韻紀), 1:15. "…故應謂我父母鄉[金人詩云蕪地神仙窟三韓父母鄉盖不忘本也]…"

[54] *Samguk yusa*, 王曆:1. "…東明王…姓高名朱蒙, 一作鄒蒙, 壇君之子…" It is not clear when and by whom Tan'gun was first recorded in Korean history. Lev R. Kontsevich argues it is very likely that Myoch'ŏng was the one who reconstructed the text of the Tan'gun myth in order to convince people to follow him during his day. See Lev R. Kontsevich, "Reconstructing the Text of the Tan'gun Myth and its Proper Names," in *Perspectives on Korea*, ed. Sang-Oak Lee and Duk-Soo Park (Sydney: Wild Peony, 1998), 294-319.

[55] *Ibid*., 1:2. "…唐裴矩傳云, 高麗本孤竹國[今海州], 周以封箕子爲朝鮮…"

Kija Chosŏn, and Koguryŏ. In addition, Iryŏn often used "Koryŏ" to refer to Koguryŏ and even to the state of Kung-ye. For example, he stated that Kung-ye named his state Koryŏ in 901,[56] and also introduced the Buddhist monk Podŏk (普德, fl. seventh century) as a person of the "former" Koryŏ.[57] Iryŏn's use of Koryŏ implies that the idea of establishing a common political lineage with Koguryŏ by connecting Koguryŏ to his own kingdom had become completely naturalized by his time.

Yi Sŭng-hyu's *Chewang un'gi* is another example of how the political lineage of Koguryŏ was manifested in late Koryŏ period. The *Chewang un'gi* was composed in two volumes. While volume one records Chinese history, volume two contains exclusively Koryŏ history. Like Iryŏn, Yi also began with Tan'gun. Yi explained that Tan'gun established his state, Chosŏn, at the same time that Emperor Yao (堯帝) was enthroned in China. After being established by Tan'gun, Chosŏn was ruled by Kija and Wiman (衛滿, Ch. Weiman) until Han conquered it in 108 BCE. Wiman was said to be a military general from Han who was born in Yan (燕).[58] What is important here is that Yi recorded them in volume two where Koguryŏ, Silla, and Paekche were all included. This means that Yi thought that (Old) Chosŏn, from Tan'gun to Wiman, was a part of Koryŏ's history. Furthermore, Yi indicated that the establishment of Han's four commanderies caused an unstable situation until the Samhan appeared.[59] Now Tan'gun's Chosŏn provided a historical foundation that not only pushed back Koryŏ's history as early as

---

[56] *Ibid*., 1:27-28. "弓裔…丙辰都鐵圓城…丁巳移都松岳郡. 辛酉稱高麗甲子改國號摩震…"

[57] *Ibid*., 3: 232. "僧傳云釋普德字智法, 前高麗龍岡縣人也.

[58] *Chewang un'gi*, 2:1-2. "…初誰開國…釋帝之孫名檀君[…]並與帝高興戊辰…後朝鮮祖是箕子…漢將衛滿生自燕…來攻逐準乃奪國…"

[59] *Ibid*., 2:2. "…因分此地爲四郡…胥匡以生理自絶風俗漸醜民未安, 隋時合散浮沈際自然分界成三韓…"

that of China but also related Old Chosŏn to Koguryŏ in the political ancestry of Koryŏ.

By the beginning of the fourteenth century, it seems that most Koryŏ literati continued to believe that Koryŏ embodied the political legacy of Koguryŏ. After the *Samguk yusa* and the *Chewang un'gi* were published, Yi Che-hyŏn (李齊賢, 1287-1367) recorded Wang Kŏn's visit to P'yŏngyang. In this note, Yi stated that Wang Kŏn himself often visited P'yŏngyang even before the surrenders of Kyŏn-hwŏn (甄萱, 867-936) of Later Paekche and King Kyŏngsun (敬順王, ?-978; r. 927-935) of Silla. According to Yi, Wang Kŏn did it because he had never forgotten about recovering the territory of Koguryŏ, which he believed was a treasure that was supposed to be transmitted to him through the generations. Although it is not clear how seriously Wang Kŏn considered military action for the purpose of irredentism to the north after becoming the first king of Koryŏ, what is worth noting here is that by the time of Yi Che-hyŏn, the historical awareness of Koguryŏ among the Koryŏ literati was strong enough for Yi to write about Wang Kŏn's trip to P'yŏngyang almost 400 years earlier.[60]

Established through the unification of different kingdoms, Koryŏ faced important issues about how to position its predecessors and it had to be very careful to maintain a balance between its Silla and Koguryŏ heritages. This does not mean, however, that Wang Kŏn ignored and excluded Paekche from his unification project. He communicated early on with Kyŏn-hwŏn before the latter was dethroned by his own son and fled to Koryŏ. Wang Kŏn not only treated Kyŏn-hwŏn well when he surrendered, but he also allowed Kyŏn-hwŏn to accompany to him

[60] *Ikchae chip* (益齋集), 9(2):1. "…我太祖卽位之後, 金溥未賓甄萱未虜而屢幸西都親巡北鄙. 其意亦以東明舊壤爲吾家靑氈, 必席卷而有之…" There is no absolute evidence to argue it was Confucianism that made it possible for Yi to make this comment. Considering that Yi concluded this section by comparing King T'aejo of Koryŏ to Emperor Taizu (太祖) of Song (宋) in Chinese history and Yi's influence on Koryŏ's adaptation of Confucianism, it seems very plausible that Confucian literati were gradually reminded of Koguryŏ more often during the first half of the fourteenth century.

when he marched to attack (Later) Paekche.[61] Wang Kŏn just did not give much importance to Paekche when compared with Silla. He did not trust people from the Paekche territory and even warned his officials not to appoint them to any government position.[62] In other words, Wang Kŏn believed that Paekche was a part of Koryŏ's history even though he was very concerned about the local customs of the former Paekche region, and this is why Wang Kŏn cared more about Silla and Koguryŏ. While the former was Koryŏ's imminent predecessor in history, the latter was thought of as a political ancestor, and that made it possible for Wang Kŏn to rise and gain support from the people in the old Koguryŏ territory. It was not difficult to maintain Silla's legacy in the new state. First of all, Silla surrendered to Koryŏ without any military conflict. Koryŏ happened to have maintained amicable relations with Silla before the unification, and Wang Kŏn himself was even married to a woman from the Silla royal family. As a result, the ruling class of Silla was able to keep their privileged status in Koryŏ. Secondly, Koryŏ continued many Silla customs and codes in order to minimize possible disarray during the transition. To create a good relationship to Koguryŏ, however, was not as easy as with Silla. In spite of the commonality in terms of geographical location, it was not enough to remind people of Koguryŏ by establishing a common political lineage. Koryŏ's ruling class and literati had to look for other means of showing their political ties to Koguryŏ and out of this necessity, they kept bringing up King Tongmyŏng. Paying tributes to King Tongmyŏng's shrine and referring to him as "Yejo" were outcomes of a consistent effort to construct links to Koguryŏ as an integral part of Koryŏ's political heritage.

Koryŏ's keen awareness of Koguryŏ, however, was never exclusive. As mentioned above,

---

[61] *Koryŏsa*, 2:8. "…及至復稱萱爲尙父授館南宮位百官上…" and 2:10. "…王與甄萱觀兵…"

[62] *Ibid*. 2:16. "…車峴以南公州江外山形地勢並趨背逆人心亦然…雖其良民不宜使在位用事其…"

Koguryŏ was remembered as a part of the Three Kingdoms. What made Koguryŏ more unique than Silla and Paekche in terms of its history was its ties to Tan'gun. The inclusion of Tan'gun by both Iryŏn and Yi Sŭng-hyu shows that Koryŏ literati had expanded their perception of Koryŏ history back to the days of Emperor Yao in Chinese history. Although they did not dispute the meaning of the *Samguk sagi*, Koryŏ literati did not hesitate to incorporate the states before the Three Kingdoms into their history, and Tan'gun became a key symbol not only in terms of extending Koryŏ history but also as a historical figure related to Chumong of Koguryŏ. This new understanding of Koryŏ history as originating with Tan'gun's Chosŏn had obviously become natural enough to continue being mentioned by Koryŏ literati in the thirteenth century, and Koryŏ literati had finally established a legitimate political lineage from (Old) Chosŏn to Koryŏ through the Three Kingdoms. In this structure, Koguryŏ played a pivotal role that could not be ignored or discounted.

The Koryŏ literati's establishment of the political lineage from Koguryŏ did not mean that they only viewed Koguryŏ from a political perspective. They revealed their willingness and ease in remembering Koguryŏ from a cultural perspective as well in their understanding of Tan'gun and his heritage. To better illustrate this, it would be good to review how the Koryŏ literati treated Koguryŏ in their individual writings and to show how Koguryŏ's cultural heritage was portrayed and developed during the Koryŏ period by analyzing their writings.

II. Koguryŏ in the Koryŏ Literati's Writings

Does the apparent awareness of Koguryŏ in Koryŏ's political lineage mean, then, that it served only political expediencies and that Koguryŏ was not acknowledged in other perspectives by the Koryŏ literati? Or did it help Koryŏ literati to expand their interest in Koguryŏ? As

mentioned briefly above, the Koryŏ literati did not limit themselves to the political sphere in remembering Koguryŏ; instead, they often found a Koguryŏ ancestry for their cultural traditions as well.

The Koryŏ literati's perspectives on Koguryŏ are also revealed in their individual works. Many Koryŏ literati left personal writings, and we can find some hints that show their views on Koguryŏ. The most well-known such work is the *Tongguk Yi Sangguk chip* (東國李相國集) written by Yi Kyu-bo (李奎報, 1168-1241). Unlike the *Samguk sagi* in which the establishment of Koguryŏ by King Tongmyŏng was recorded briefly without referring to his mythical birth in detail, Yi wrote an epic about King Tongmyŏng's birth, his adventures, and the establishment of Koguryŏ. His poem has been considered one of the strongest pieces of evidence that the Koryŏ literati had a strong historical awareness of Koguryŏ.

It is very clear that Yi had a different attitude toward the legendary story of King Tongmyŏng than did Kim Pu-sik. Yi clearly mentioned in his preface that he had read Kim's *Samguk sagi* and still truly believed King Tongmyŏng's story was worth recording even though he understood Kim's decision not to give it in detail in the *Samguk sagi* because of the extreme absurdity of the story.[63] What is interesting here is that Yi revealed that he had read not only the *Samguk sagi* but also the *Old Samguksa* (舊三國史). According to Yi, the legend of King Tongmyŏng was explained in the *Old Samguksa*, and was so widely known that even commoners talked about it. The fact that Yi, who was familiar with the *Old Samguksa*, realized the necessity of recording King Tongmyŏng's legend, probably implies that Yi wanted to point out a cultural aspect of Koguryŏ that he thought had been largely discounted by Kim Pu-sik in his *Samguk*

[63] *Tongguk Yi Sangguk chip*, 3:1. "…得舊三國史見東明王本紀其神異之迹踰世之所說者然亦初不能信之意以爲鬼幻及三復耽味漸涉其源非幻也乃聖也, 非鬼也乃神也…金公富軾重撰國史頗略其事, 意者公以爲國史矯世之書, 不可以大異之事爲示於後世而略之耶…"

sagi, In other words, the Koryŏ literati were acknowledging Koguryŏ from a cultural perspective by the late twelfth century, if not earlier.[64]

The tendency for Koryŏ literati to view Koguryŏ in terms of cultural aspects grew stronger from the thirteenth century onward, and this is confirmed in various private documents. First, beyond just mentioning that Chumong was Tan'gun's son, in the *Samguk yusa*, Iryŏn introduced Koguryŏ first, before Silla. Although he did not refute Kim Pu-sik's claims on the order in which the Three Kingdoms were established, Iryŏn placed Koguryŏ first out of the Three Kingdoms and placed Silla after Chinhan, one of the Three Han. The *Samguk yusa*'s status as a private writing has often been taken as the explanation for its differences from the *Samguk sagi*. Although it is certain that Iryŏn was able to write the *Samguk yusa* without being bothered by government supervision, I rather believe that the Buddhist nature of the Koryŏ society was in fact what made it possible for him to write it.[65] Iryŏn's perspective in the *Samguk yusa* is a Buddhist worldview.[66] From the beginning, Tan'gun was mentioned as a grandson of Hwanin (桓因) or Chesŏk (帝釋; Indra) and son of Hwanung (桓雄).[67] Chesŏk is one of the most important legendary figures in Korean Buddhism, who was believed to protect Buddhists from evil, and it thus became associated with the Tan'gun lineage. Additionally, Iryŏn implied that

[64] The writing of the epic of King Tongmyŏng is understood as a product for Yi to disseminate King Tongmyŏng's story to the people and give them pride. See T'ak Pong-sim, "Tongmyŏngwang p'yŏn e nat'anan Yi Kyu-bo ŭi yŏksa ŭisik," (Yi Kyu-bo's Historical Consciousness in the Epic of King Tongmyŏng) *Han'guksa yŏn'gu* 44 (March 1984): 92.

[65] Buddhism was also endorsed earlier by Ch'oe Sŭng-no (崔承老, 927-989) as a mean of self-cultivation while Confucianism was regarded as an ideal tool for governing the state. See *Tongmunsŏn*, 52:15. 上時務書. "…行釋敎者修身之本, 行儒敎者理國之源…"

[66] Kim T'ae-yŏng, "*Samguk yusa* e poinŭn Iryŏn ŭi yŏksa insik e taehayŏ," (Iryŏn's Historical Consciousness as it appears in the *Samguk yusa*) in *Han'guk ŭi yŏksa insik*, 1: 138.

[67] *Samguk yusa*, 1:1. "…昔有桓因[謂帝釋也], 庶子桓雄…雄乃假化而婚之, 孕生子號曰壇君王儉…"

Koguryŏ was located within the Buddhist world by listing its Buddhist pagodas and temples,[68] and he also tried to remind his readers of the sacred traditions of Koryŏ. It is also noteworthy that Buddhism was one of the reasons why Myoch'ŏng was so successful at the beginning of his rebellion, and Chŏng Chi-sang (鄭知常, ?-1135), one of the supporters of the rebellion, also emphasized the Buddhist rituals in his writings.[69] Buddhism was favored by many literati including Yi Il-lo (李仁老, 1152-1220), and even its critics endorsed the basic virtues of Buddhism. What they truly criticized were the people who mispracticed and misapplied Buddhist teachings to actual society.[70] Yi Kyu-bo was also very fond of Buddhism and was even able to recite one of the Buddhist sutras.[71] Koguryŏ was the first kingdom out of the three to officially adopt Buddhism and was clearly considered important in terms of the prevailing Buddhist tradition of Koryŏ. In the *Haedong kosŭng chŏn* (海東高僧傳) published in 1215 by the Buddhist monk Kakhun (覺訓, fl. late twelfth-early thirteenth century), even a Buddhist monk with no name from Koguryŏ was introduced second only after Sundo (順道, fl. fourth century), a Buddhist monk from India, who was believed to have first introduced Buddhism to Korea.[72] Additionally, two other Buddhist monks of Koguryŏ were recorded with those from India, China,

[68] *Ibid*., 3:13. 遼東城育王塔 and 3:15. 高麗靈塔寺.

[69] Chŏng Chi-sang was killed by Kim Pu-sik, accused of being connected with the Myoch'ŏng Rebellion. Chŏng explained his views on Buddhism and the importance of its rituals. (*Tongmunsŏn*, 110:18-19. 又.) Despite the accusation, Chŏng was well known for his literary talent and is considered one of the greatest poets of the Koryŏ literary tradition.

[70] Im Ch'un (林椿, fl. twelfth century) pointed out the misbehaviors committed by some Buddhists and used them as the basis for his criticism of Buddhism. Im also wrote that Yi Il-lo, being very much in favor of Buddhism, did not dislike Buddhism without reason. (*Tongmunsŏn*, 83:9-10. 送李眉叟序.)

[71] *Tongguk Yi Sangguk chŏnjip*, 年譜. "…又嗜讀楞嚴, 至背經輒誦…"

[72] *Haedong kosŭng chŏn*, 8-9.

and Silla.[73] Therefore, Iryŏn's emphasis on Koguryŏ was very likely understood as an outcome of thirteenth-century Koryŏ society's being an environment that favored Buddhism.

The trend to pay attention to cultural aspects of Koguryŏ's lineage is also found in the *Chewang un'gi*. Yi Sŭng-hyu recorded the legendary life of King Tongmyŏng of Koguryŏ in detail and consistently linked him to heaven. In fact, the largest part of the Koguryŏ section in the *Chewang un'gi* was devoted to the life of King Tongmyŏng,[74] and it indicates how important Yi Sŭng-hyu considered King Tongmyŏng in Koryŏ's history. By unifying Silla and Later Paekche, Koryŏ now occupied the sole position as the legitimate heir of Koguryŏ culture. Although it was not clear what Yi Sŭng-hyu thought of Buddhism, he apparently followed Iryŏn's understanding of the structure of Koryŏ's history, which began with Tan'gun establishing the Former Chosŏn [前朝鮮, Old Chosŏn] at the same time when Emperor Yao established his regime in China. It indicates that Koryŏ literati saw the legend of King Tongmyŏng as a part of their proud cultural heritage by the late thirteenth century.

Comments on Koguryŏ were found more often in the Confucian literati's writings in the late Koryŏ period. As was briefly mentioned above, Yi Che-hyŏn recorded Wang Kŏn's visit in the early tenth century as a means of suggesting a longer history for the political lineage. It seems that Yi was also aware of the legend of King Tongmyŏng. Yi mentioned the legendary rock [朝天石] where King Tongmyŏng was believed to have ascended to the heavens in one of

[73] It is interesting to note that none from Paekche was recorded. It does not mean, however, they were excluded on purpose. It is plausible that Paekche monks were explained in other volumes that were not transmitted. Even a very famous monk such as Wŏnhyo (元曉, 617-686) is missing in the only volume available now.

[74] Besides King Tongmyŏng, only King Yuri (類利王, ?-18; r. 19 BCE-18 CE), a son of King Tongmyŏng and the second king of Koguryŏ, and King Pojang (寶藏王, ?-682; r. 642-668), the last king of Koguryŏ were mentioned very briefly in the Koguryŏ section of the *Chewang un'gi*.

his poems.[75] Because he did not comment on the *Samguk yusa* or *Chewang un'gi*, it is not clear what Yi Che-hyŏn thought of them, and especially what he thought of the myths of Tan'gun and King Tongmyŏng. Yi is often criticized for having a negative attitude toward native practices and cultural values of Koryŏ. Michael Rogers presents Yi's education in the Yuan (元) empire and exposure to a new world through Yuan as the reason why he had a negative view of the aboriginal culture of Chosŏn. According to Rogers, Yi even considered Yuan a savior who had rescued Koryŏ from the non-Confucian military regime.[76] Yi's comment about the legendary rock, however, implies that he perceived Koguryŏ as a part of the lineage of Koryŏ culture. Moreover, Yi Che-hyŏn was not the only one among Koryŏ's Confucian literati who mentioned this legendary rock in the memory of Koguryŏ. Yi Saek (李穡, 1328-1396) also recorded it in his poems for P'yŏngyang. What is interesting in this poem though, is that he mentioned Tan'gun following the legendary rock of King Tongmyŏng.[77] It is interesting that he does not mention King Tongmyŏng but recalls Tan'gun instead. Yi did not mention King Tongmyŏng directly in his other writings either when the legendary rock appeared. Although there is no sure answer why Yi mentioned Tan'gun following the comment on the rock relating King Tongmyŏng, it is probably because Tan'gun was already considered a historic figure who preceded King Tongmyŏng in the lineage of Koryŏ history. The *Samguk yusa*, the *Chewang un'gi*, and probably the *Old Samguksa* might have helped Koryŏ literati recall Tan'gun. By Yi's time, it was probably not necessary to mention King Tongmyŏng with the legendary rock because everyone was

[75] *Ikchae chip*, 3:16. 西京留守慶宰臣寄凍魚. "朝天石下玉鱗魚…"

[76] Michael Rogers, "National Consciousness in Medieval Korea," in *Papers of the 5th International Conference on Korean Studies: Korean Studies, Its Tasks and Perspectives I* (1988), published by The Academy of Korean Studies, 161.

[77] *Mogŭn sigo* (牧隱詩藁), 3:17. 西京. "…聞說朝天曾有石, 檀君英爽冠群雄."

already aware of the story about the rock and him. The legendary rock was not the only object that made Yi Saek recollect Koguryŏ. The auspicious horse that King Tongmyŏng rode when ascending to heaven was often cited in Yi's poem as well. Instead of mentioning King Tongmyŏng by name, Yi identified him as "the grandson of the Heaven" with the horse.[78] It is unclear whether Yi avoided using the "King Tongmyŏng" or Chumong in his writing on purpose. He, however, recorded these objects relating to King Tongmyŏng in the poems about P'yŏngyang, and there is no doubt about his awareness of the legend of King Tongmyŏng.

Then, what made Koryŏ literati recall Koguryŏ more often during the late Koryŏ period? How was the rise of interest in Koguryŏ related to the social environment in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries? Traditionally, scholars accounted for the new emphasis on Koguryŏ as being due to the experience of foreign invasions and the establishment of a military regime that replaced the old political structure, which had centered on civil officials. According to this argument, a series of foreign invasions by Liao, Jurchens, and Yuan awakened Koryŏ literati and made them recall a glorious past symbolized by a strong Koguryŏ and a Koguryŏ legacy that favored the new military regime because it was well known for its military ability to compete with Chinese empires. Yi Kyu-bo's *Epic of King Tongmyŏng* and Yi Sŭng-hyu's *Chewang un'gi* were considered byproducts of this environment. While it seems very plausible that their writings helped to remind the Koryŏ people of Koguryŏ, it is still questionable, however, that the military regime and the Koryŏ court responded to the new rise of Koguryŏ memories. Interestingly, Yi wrote the *Epic of King Tongmyŏng* before being appointed to a court position at the age of 26, and it was a few years later when Yi was first appointed for a position by Ch'oe Ch'ung-hŏn

[78] *Ibid*., 2:14. 浮碧樓. "…麟馬去不返, 天孫何處遊…" Yi Sŭng-hyu had also recorded previously that King Tongmyŏng was the grand son of heaven and Habaek, the god of water. (*Chewang un'gi*, 2:4-5. "…麗祖姓高…諡東明…以朱蒙名…皇天之孫河伯甥…")

(崔忠獻, 1149-1219). At the time when Yi finished the *Epic of King Tongmyŏng*, he was very disappointed at not having the opportunity to serve in court even though he had passed the civil service examination early with a good score. Furthermore, Yi hardly even mentioned Koguryŏ after he was appointed. Basically, his only writing about Koguryŏ and King Tongmyŏng was written well before his period of serving in the court. In addition, it is a bit strange that Ŭlchi Mundŏk, who saved Koguryŏ from the Sui invasion in the seventh century, was not mentioned while Koryŏ was struggling with foreign invasions.[79] The only mention of Ŭlchi Mundŏk in the late Koryŏ period was found in the preface of Yi Sung-in's (李崇仁, 1347-1392) *Toŭn chip* (陶隱集) written by Chŏng To-jŏn (鄭道傳, 1342-1398). Ŭlchi Mundŏk was admired, however, for his poems, not for his victory against Sui in this record.[80] This implies that the Koryŏ literati probably felt more comfortable with remembering Ŭlchi Mundŏk in terms of their cultural lineage than for his independent military achievement in saving Koguryŏ from foreign invasion.

Coincidently, Yi Sŭng-hyu was also out of a court position like Yi Kyu-bo when he wrote the *Chewang un'gi* in 1287. Interestingly, Yi Sŭng-hyu did not record anything about the failure of the military expedition to Koguryŏ by Sui Yangdi (煬帝, 569-618; r. 604-618) and Tang Taizong (太宗, 598-649; r. 626-649). He just briefly mentioned Yangdi's extravagant spending without particularly criticizing it and praised the latter for his exemplary rule in history.[81] Yi Sŭng-hyu even praised the Yuan empire very highly, comparing its army to that of heaven. To Yi

[79] It is apparent that Yi was aware of the importance of resisting. He wrote that it was Ch'oe Yi (崔怡, ?-1249) who saved Koryŏ from Mongol invasion. Without his masterful leadership, Yi states, Koryŏ would have fallen into Mongol control. See *Tongguk Yi Sangguk chip*, 18:12. 望海因追慶遷都. "遷都自古上天難, 一旦移來似轉丸, 不是淸河謀大早, 三韓曾已化胡蠻…"

[80] *Toŭn chip*, 序:3-4. "…吾東方…文學之儒前後相望. 在句高麗曰乙支文德, 在新羅曰崔致遠. 入本國曰金侍中富軾李學士奎報其尤者也…"

[81] *Chewang un'gi*, 1:11.

Sŭng-hyu, the virtue and benevolence of the Yuan emperor was too magnificent to mention at all.[82] In other words, it is likely that neither Yi Kyu-bo nor Yi Sŭng-hyu wrote with the express intent to preach military resistance against foreign invasions or to remind people of the military strength of Koguryŏ. Although it is apparent both Yi Kyu-bo and Yi Sŭng-hyu tried to emphasize Koguryŏ in their writings, they emphasized in their arguments Koguryŏ's cultural superiority over the Mongols rather than their military strength per se. This is why the long history of Koryŏ, which was believed to be as long as that of China, and Koguryŏ's position in the line of Korean history were emphasized in the *Chewang un'gi*, and why Yi Kyu-bo re-evaluated the legend of King Tongmyŏng, which had not been paid much attention before due to its unrealistic features.

What, then, led Koryŏ literati to remember and write about Koguryŏ more in terms of its cultural aspects starting in the thirteenth century? I think that, ironically, the introduction of Confucianism may have been a factor that contributed to a new view of Koguryŏ during this period. Since it had been introduced to Koryŏ in the late thirteenth century, Confucianism had attracted the Koryŏ literati, and many of them were able to expand their knowledge while traveling in Yuan and meeting with Confucian literati there. Yi Sŭng-hyu, who visited Yuan a few times, was praised by the emperor for his poems, and Yi Che-hyŏn had an opportunity to interact with Chinese literati when he was called back to come to the Yuan capital by King Ch'ungsŏn (忠宣王, 1275-1325; r. 1308-1313) of Koryŏ. Afterward, both Yi Kok (李穀, 1298-1351) and Yi Saek stayed in Yuan for a while and were able to study Confucianism. After passing the civil service examinations not only in Koryŏ but also in Yuan, Yi Kok was able to get acquainted with many Confucian literati there. Later, Yi Saek, following his father's footsteps, also passed the

[82] *Ibid*., 1:15.

civil service examination and got appointed to serve in the Yuan court.[83]

It seems to be during this period when Confucian literati started attacking Buddhism. When King Ch'ungsŏn asked Yi Che-hyŏn how to shift the literati's interest from Buddhism to Confucianism, Yi suggested that the king promote Confucian institutions and teachings.[84] Before the early fourteenth century, Buddhism was not much criticized by Koryŏ literati, and it did contribute to their memory of Koguryŏ. The early rise of Myoch'ŏng, Iryŏn's *Samguk yusa*, and the Buddhist features in Yi Sŭng-hyu's *Chewang un'gi*, were all good examples of how Buddhism was favored by Koryŏ society. When Confucianism was introduced to Koryŏ and Koryŏ literati started studying it through Yuan, the memory of Koguryŏ was gradually linked more to cultural rather than political aspects. This shift explains why Ŭlchi Mundŏk was mentioned in the lineage of a literary tradition instead of being hailed as a national savior like Kang Kam-ch'an (姜邯贊, 948-1031) who defeated Liao in 1018. From this point, Koguryŏ was acquiring its historical meaning in terms of the relationship with the Kija tradition, and Kija began to overshadow Tan'gun.

It is worthwhile to examine how Koryŏ people reacted to the propaganda designed to resurrect Koguryŏ. In contrast to the late Silla period, uprisings calling for the restoration of old kingdoms hardly occurred during the Koryŏ period. Only one such occasion, in 1217, was recorded briefly by Yi Saek in his biography of the Chŏng family, and this restoration attempt was not only unsuccessful but also narrated very negatively by Yi.[85] It does not mean that Yi

---

[83] Yi Kok sent a poem to Yi Saek and advised his son to serve in the Yuan court. (*Kajŏng chip* (稼亭集), 18:4. 用家兄詩韻寄示兒子訥懷. "男兒須宦帝王都…")

[84] *Ikchae chip* 年譜:2-3. "…上王問…先生對畧曰殿下誠能廣手校讎庠序尊六藝明五教以闡先王之道…"

[85] *Mogŭn mun'go* (牧隱文藁), 20:11. 鄭氏家傳.

Saek denied Koguryŏ. He apparently viewed it as a part of Koryŏ history and wrote that he had met a friend from his home when he encountered a person of Koguryŏ background.[86] Yi Saek just thought that an uprising to resurrect Koguryŏ was historically meaningless and only caused unnecessary chaos. Yi Saek's remembrance of Koguryŏ actually developed a little further in that he even recorded Tang Taizong's failure in his military campaign against Koguryŏ.[87]

Compared to the late Silla period, uprisings claiming to restore old states were not only few, but they also occurred during the military rule of the mid-thirteenth century, well before Chosŏn took over Koryŏ.[88] It implies that Koryŏ had succeeded in employing the idea of historical lineage between previous states and itself both politically and culturally. The Koryŏ literati's inclusion of Ŭlchi Mundŏk in their great literary tradition is proof of their awareness of a cultural tie between Koguryŏ and Koryŏ. They remembered him more as a great writer than as a successful military general who had saved the kingdom from a Chinese invasion. Establishing the historical lineage between Koguryŏ and Koryŏ was finalized in the development of the "Samhan" (Three Han) discourse. Under the name of the Samhan, Koryŏ was able to achieve not only the political and cultural, but also the ethnic unification of Korea. I will, therefore, analyze how Koguryŏ was understood and linked to this Three Han discourse by literati through the Koryŏ period.

---

[86] *Mogŭn sigo*, 2:9. 馬上逢鄉人王桂進士. "…征夫忽見高句麗, 故人乃是王氏子…"

[87] *Ibid*., 2:10. 貞觀吟榆林關作. "…那知玄花落白羽…" Although Yi addresses Tang Taizong's campaign here, his failure was recorded indirectly. In addition, Yi did not mention the name of the Koguryŏ general who defeated Tang. This is not the only reference by Yi of Tang Taizong's military campaign against Koguryŏ. He also recorded it briefly in his other poem. Here, no specific name from Koguryŏ appeared regarding Tang Taizong's failure. (*Mogŭn sigo*, 2:15. 讀唐史二首.)

[88] There were uprisings that claimed to restore Silla and Paekche as well. They were not only limited but also unsuccessful. They are regarded as uprisings against the military regime rather than attempts to resurrect an old state. See Pak Yong-un, *Koryŏ sidaesa* (History of Koryŏ Period) (Seoul: Ilchisa, 1987), 2: 470-474.

III. Adaptation and the Use of "Samhan"

The idea of the Samhan, literally meaning the "three Han" – Mahan, Chinhan, and Pyŏnhan, the three ancient polities which existed on the Korean peninsula – has been used and understood in various ways. It is sometimes used not only to define the geographical territory of Korea, but also to refer to the suprapolitical structure, including the culture and ethnic groups who resided in the Korean peninsula. Remco Breuker argues that the Samhan came to be used to signify a supradynastical entity whereas other expressions such as "Tongbang" (東方/東邦), "Tongguk" (東國), "Ch'ŏnggu" (靑丘), and "Haedong" (海東) appeared as terms to distinguish Korea from China. According to Breuker, the "Samhan" as a general designation for Korea became more significant while the identification with the Three Later Kingdoms became less prevalent during mid-Koryŏ. After that, Beuker argues, the "Samhan" came to be used as distinct from Koryŏ in a sense that represented both the country and its people.[89] Although Breuker provides a very useful model for understanding the notion of Samhan, it is still unclear how Koguryŏ was included in Samhan discourse. In the twentieth century, Mahan, Chinhan, and Pyŏnhan have conventionally been matched to Paekche, Silla, and Kaya (伽倻) respectively due to the explanations for the locations of each state recorded in various historical documents. Unlike Paekche and Silla, which were located in the southern part of the Korean peninsula, Koguryŏ was located in the north and, therefore, has been excluded from the conventional modern understanding of the Samhan while Paekche and Silla were generally agreed to represent Mahan and Chinhan. I will now examine how the Samhan appeared in historical documents during the Koryŏ dynasty and how Koguryŏ became engaged with it in the historical context

[89] Breuker, "The Three in One, the One in Three: The Koryŏ Three Han as a Pre-modern Nation," 149-151.

since its appearance in Koryŏ documents.

"Samhan" appears first in the *Han shu* (漢書). In its "Annals for Emperor Kaodi" (高帝, 247-195 BCE; r. 206-195 BCE), the Samhan is mentioned as the tribe composing Mo (貉, Kor. Maek) state in the north.[90] This source does not, however, explain in detail what the Three Han were and where each of them was located. It was the *Hou Han shu* (後漢書) that provided broader information about the Samhan. According to the *Hou Han shu*, the term Samhan referred to the three entities, Mahan, Chinhan, and Pyŏnhan, which composed Han.[91] Meanwhile, Koguryŏ was introduced separately in the *Hou Han shu* and explained in terms of its relationship with its neighboring states such as the Ye-Maek (濊貊), Puyŏ (夫餘), Okchŏ (沃沮), and Chosŏn.[92] Because Koguryŏ was excluded from this notion of Samhan, some modern Chinese scholars argue that Koguryŏ did not belong to Korean history by equating Mahan, Pyŏnhan, and Chinhan to Paekche, Kaya, and Silla, respectively. According to this argument, there is no connection between Koguryŏ and the Samhan, which formed the incubus for Korean history. So, did the Samhan actually exclude Koguryŏ as these scholars claim?

Unlike these Chinese documents, Koguryŏ was included in the Samhan from the beginning in Korean writings. After Ch'oe Ch'i-wŏn (崔致遠, 857-?) first matched Koguryŏ to Mahan in the late ninth century,[93] the notion of linkage between Mahan and Koguryŏ was

---

[90] *Han shu*, 1:46. "…北貉燕人來致梟騎助漢[應劭曰北貉國也. 梟健也. 張晏曰梟勇也. 若六博之梟也. 師古曰貉在東北方. 三韓之屬皆貉類也…]…

[91] *Hou Han shu*, 85:2818-2820. The Samhan was mentioned as a part of Dongyi (東夷), literally meaning "Eastern barbarian," in the Annals for Emperor Guanwudi (光武帝, 6 BCE-57 CE; r. 25-57). Here, "卞" was used instead of "弁" for Pyŏnhan. See *ibid*., 1(2):72. "…東夷韓國人率眾詣樂浪內附[東夷有辰韓卞韓馬韓, 謂之三韓國也]…"

[92] *Ibid*., 85:2813. "…高句麗在遼東之東千里, 南與朝鮮濊貊, 東與沃沮, 北與夫餘接…"

[93] *Ch'oe Munch'anghu chŏnjip* (崔文昌侯全集), 69. 上太師侍中狀 "…東海之外有三國, 其名馬韓卞韓辰韓. 馬韓則高麗卞韓則百濟辰韓則新羅也…"

generally accepted by the Koryŏ literati. Kim Pu-sik cited Ch'oe's statement twice in his *Samguk sagi*,[94] and Iryŏn also mentioned Ch'oe's comment in his *Samguk yusa* with an explanation of why Ch'oe's claim was correct.[95] In the *Chewang un'gi*, Yi Sŭng-hyu stated that Koguryŏ was established at Wanggŏmsŏng (王儉城) in Mahan territory by Chumong. What is more interesting in Yi's record about Mahan is that he thought Wanggŏmsŏng was located at Sŏgyŏng (P'yŏngyang), which was chosen as the first capital of Koguryŏ by Chumong.[96] Although it was historically inaccurate, the Koryŏ literati somehow saw P'yŏngyang as the first capital of Koguryŏ in the legend of Chumong from as early as the twelfth century. For example, in his writing celebrating the royal meeting with officials in P'yŏngyang, Yun In-ch'ŏm (尹鱗瞻, 1110-1176) wrote that it was P'yŏngyang where Chumong settled down first,[97] and Ch'oe Cha (崔滋, 1188-1260) also stated that P'yŏngyang was first built by King Tongmyŏng when he chose the site for his capital.[98] Although it is not clear since when P'yŏngyang was mistaken for Koguryŏ's first capital, it is very likely that the impact left by the Myoch'ŏng Rebellion contributed to the new acknowledgment that Chumong established P'yŏngyang as the first capital of Koguryŏ.

Ch'oe Ch'i-wŏn did not give any explanation of his identification of Koguryŏ, Paekche, and Silla with Mahan, Pyŏnhan, and Chinhan, respectively. In regard to this, there is an argument that Ch'oe fabricated the Koguryŏ=Mahan notion in order to dispute Parhae, which was

---

[94] *Samguk sagi*, 34:1 and 46:4. "…東海之外有三國其名馬韓卞韓辰韓, 馬韓則高麗卞韓則百濟辰韓則新羅也…"

[95] *Samguk yusa*, 1:10. "…致遠云卞韓百濟也…或者濫九龍山亦名卞那山故以高句麗爲卞韓者蓋謬…百濟地自有卞山故云卞韓…"

[96] *Chewang un'gi*, 2:4-5. "麗祖姓高諡東明善射故以朱蒙名…開國馬韓王儉城.[今西京也…]"

[97] *Tongmunsŏn*, 104:6. 西都君臣大宴致語. "…眷平壤之神京, 實朱蒙之舊邑…"

[98] *Ibid*., 2:1. 三都賦. "…西都之創先也, 帝號東明, 降自九玄, 乃眷下土, 此維宅焉…"

competing with Silla for power and prestige in northeast Asia. Among the Three Han, only Mahan had a history of conflict with China while Chinhan, the presumed predecessor of Silla, was generally believed to be composed of people from China. Therefore, Ch'oe tried to relate Mahan to Koguryŏ in order to persuade the Tang to maintain a pro-Silla policy and isolate Parhae, which was believed to have been established by people from Koguryŏ.[99]

Although it is somewhat interesting to view the Mahan-Koguryŏ linkage within the context of Ch'oe's very strong anti-Parhae perspective, it seems implausible that Ch'oe Ch'i-wŏn invented the Koguryŏ=Mahan notion on purpose out of his hostility toward Parhae. Although Ch'oe was the first individual confirmed to have stated a Koguryŏ-Mahan lineage in Korean documents, there was already some evidence presenting the view that Koguryŏ was related to Mahan even before Ch'oe's claim. When Emperor Taizong of Tang invaded Koguryŏ in 655, Ko Yŏn-su (高延壽) and Ko Hye-jin (高惠眞), two Koguryŏ generals, surrendered to him and were given titles by Taizong.[100] These two figures were recorded as "chiefs of Mahan" in a Tang document.[101] In other words, even long before Ch'oe matched Koguryŏ to Mahan, there was already an idea that Koguryŏ was related to Mahan during the Tang Dynasty, and Ch'oe, who had studied in the Tang, was probably aware of that.[102]

Koguryŏ was not the only kingdom to appear in the lineage of Mahan during the Koryŏ

---

[99] Yi To-hak, "Ch'oe Ch'i-wŏn ŭi Koguryŏ insik" (Ch'oe Ch'i-wŏn's Recognition of Koguryŏ), *Han'guk sasangsahak* 24 (2005): 199-224.

[100] *Jiu Tang shu* (舊唐書), 199:5325. *Xin Tang shu*, 220:6193.

[101] *Quan Tangwen* (全唐文), 7:21. "…高麗位頭大兄理大夫後部軍主高延壽大兄前部軍主高惠眞等 幷馬韓酋長…"

[102] Cho Pŏp-chong argues that Koguryŏ started being understood in terms of its relationship with Mahan after Podŏkkuk (報德國) was established by An Sŭng (安勝) near Kŭmma Mountain after Koguryŏ collapsed. See Cho Pŏp-chong, "Koguryŏ ŭi Mahan kyesŭng insiknon e taehan kŏmt'o," (Review on Mahan Successionism of Kogurŏ) *Han'guksa yŏn'gu* 102 (1998): 47-74.

period; Paekche was also said to be linked to Mahan. Kim Pu-sik recorded Kyŏn-hwŏn's comment on the Mahan-Paekche relationship based on the location of Kŭmma Mountain (金馬山) in the *Samguk sagi*.[103] In the *Haedong kosŭng chŏn*, Mahan was clearly listed as Paekche in the text for the Buddhist monk Maranant'a (摩羅難陀) who introduced Buddhism to Paekche.[104] Although it states that two sons of Chumong (the founder of Koguryŏ) built Paekche, Koguryŏ was not mentioned directly with Mahan in this source. It seems very likely that the legendary common origins of the royal families of Koguryŏ and Paekche helped people link Mahan to both Koguryŏ and Paekche.[105] The Koryŏ literati did not seem, however, to have generally agreed on the equation of Mahan to Paekche. In spite of being a Buddhist monk himself, Iryŏn objected to the idea of Kyŏn-hwŏn equating Paekche to Mahan in the *Samguk yusa* and confirmed that Ch'oe Ch'i-wŏn's argument was right. Additionally, Yi Sŭng-hyu not only recorded Wanggŏmsŏng of Mahan in the text of Koguryŏ history for its ties with Chumong, but also stated that Paekche was established in Pyŏnhan territory.[106] Considering that both the *Samguk yusa* and the *Chewang un'gi* were published about seventy years later than the *Haedong kosŭng chŏn*, it is very likely that Koryŏ literati widely consented to the equation of Mahan to Koguryŏ by the late thirteenth century.

Regardless of whether Mahan was linked to Koguryŏ or Paekche, it is obvious that Koguryŏ was understood as a part of the Samhan during the Koryŏ period. There were many

---

[103] *Samguk sagi*, 50:8. "…原三國之始馬韓先起後赫世勃興故辰卞從之而興. 於是百濟開國金馬山…"

[104] *Haedong kosŭng chŏn*, 19. "…夫三韓者馬韓卞韓辰韓…然百濟乃馬韓之謂矣…"

[105] The *Samguk sagi* also records that Onjo (溫祚), the first king of Paekche established Paekche after leaving Chumong, his father, when Chumong reunited with his oldest son from Northern Puyŏ (北扶餘). See *Samguk sagi*, 23:1.

[106] *Chewang un'gi*, 2:6-7. "…百濟始祖名溫祚東明聖帝其皇考…開國弁韓原…"

occasions when the Samhan was used to refer to Koguryŏ, at least as a constitutive element. For example, a tomb tablet for Ko Hyŏn (高玄) reads that Ko Hyŏn was a person from the Samhan.[107] Ko went to Tang with Ch'ŏn Nam-saeng (泉男生) in the seventh century and actively participated in Tang's military campaign to the north. Unlike Ch'ŏn Nam-saeng who was recorded as "a person from P'yŏngyang-sŏng [平壤城人]",[108] Ko Hyŏn was introduced as person from the Samhan [遼東城三韓人]. Although it is not clear whether the Samhan here meant Koguryŏ exclusively or not, it is certain that Chinese documents used the Samhan for Korea(n) in general, and this probably made Ch'oe Ch'i-wŏn try to juxtapose it to the Three Kingdoms rather than limiting it to the three actual Han states in history.

It was Wang Kŏn's unification that helped the Samhan come to embody the Korea(n) in multiple aspects, not only in the political realm, but also in the cultural and ethnical spheres. Just as Silla's annexation of Paekche and Koguryŏ in the seventh century was understood to have unified the Three Han by Kim Pu-sik,[109] Wang Kŏn's unification in the tenth century was also understood within the Samhan discourse. A royal edict written by Wang Yung (王融, fl. tenth century) in 975 stated that the Samhan were truly unified by Wang Kŏn when Silla surrendered and he married the Silla princess.[110] Meanwhile the Samhan in Kim's *Samguk sagi* refers to the Three Kingdoms, which in Wang Yung's writing hardly seems to mean the Three Kingdoms or Three Han. Rather, Wang seemed to use "Samhan" here to mean a single people who were

[107] *Seoul Taehakkyo Pangmulgwan yŏnbo* 10 (1999).

[108] *Yŏkchu Han'guk kodae kŭmsŏkmun*, 1: 491-508. "…公姓泉諱男生字元德, 遼東郡平壤城人也…"

[109] *Samguk sagi*, 43:3. "…三韓爲一家百姓無二心…"

[110] *Tongmunsŏn*, 25:1. 新羅王金傅加尙父都省令官誥敎書. "…我太祖…尋時頒馹馬之烟…家國旣歸於一統, 君臣宛合於三韓…"

finally unified by Koryŏ. In other words, early Koryŏ literati had already started seeing "Samhan" as a term that referred to their people rather than having the literary meaning of the Three Han or Three Kingdoms. It does not mean, however, the Koryŏ literati had forgotten the original meaning of "Samhan." They were still aware of the existence of the Three Han, and Kim Pu-sik mentioned them in the *Samguk sagi*. Moreover, the *Samguk sagi* is not the only example of their awareness of the original meaning of "Samhan." In 1146, Kwak Tong-sun (郭東珣, fl. twelfth century) wrote that Wang Kŏn unified the Samhan, which were Mahan, Chinhan, and Pyŏnhan.[111] It is very unlikely that Kwak meant that Wang Kŏn unified three actual political entities that only existed until the early Three Kingdoms period; rather, he seems to be thinking about what these Three Han originally meant. In fact, the term "Samhan" was used constantly in this text for Wang Kŏn's unification. For example, Ch'oe Hae (崔瀣, 1287-1340) stated that the Samhan was finally unified when Wang Kŏn established Koryŏ,[112] and Yi Saek also implied that the Samhan was first unified by Wang Kŏn.[113] Yun So-jong (尹紹宗, 1345-1393) mentioned unification of the Samhan by Wang Kŏn as well.[114] Here, however, none of them mentioned anything about the three individual Han entities as had been explained by Kwak. Their omission of the three individual Han seems to signify that the Samhan now more generally meant "Korean" while its use for the three individual Han polities had gradually decreased.

The use of "Samhan" to refer to mean a unified entity by Koryŏ literati is also attested to

---

[111] *Ibid*., 31:22. 八關會仙郎賀表. "…故我太祖奮義勇…肇丕基於東明之墟…合辰卞馬以爲一家…"

[112] *Cholgo ch'ŏnbaek* (拙藁千百), 1:24. 大元故征東都鎭撫高麗匡請大夫檢校僉議評理元公墓誌銘. "…佐神聖王定三韓…" and 2:12. 東人之文序. "…神聖開國三韓攸一…"

[113] *Mogŭn mun'go*, 9:11. 周官六翼序. "…我東方國於唐堯戊辰歲, 世理世亂分爲三國, 至于大祖受天明命始克一之, 四百有餘年矣…"

[114] *Tongmunsŏn*, 10:12. 謁惠王眞于錦城. "鐵原方啓聖, 錦里爲儲英. 一統三韓日, 先登百濟城…"

in the title of the *Samhan si kwigam* (三韓詩龜鑑) published in the late fourteenth century by Cho Un-hŭl (趙云仡, 1332-1404). Recording more than 200 poems composed between the ninth century and the early fourteenth century by Korean literati, the *Samhan si kwigam* included Ch'oe Ch'i-wŏn as the earliest poet whose works were recorded in it. All other writers were Koryŏ literati. The Samhan in its title obviously meant "Korea," including both Silla and Koryŏ, and does not refer to specific states in Korean history. Since it was used to refer to a unified entity, the Samhan now came to be used often for Koryŏ exclusively. In a poem in the *Samhan si kwigam*, Hong Kan (洪侃, ?-1304) mentioned the "Veritable Records" of the Koryŏ dynasty as those of the Samhan.[115] Recording the history of the dynasty was a very important project and had never been taken lightly. Although it appeared in literary poems and not in official documents, the use of the Samhan in the phrase for the Annals for the Koryŏ dynasty strongly implies that the literati during the late Koryŏ period understood the Samhan to mean themselves rather than three states or kingdoms in history. This notion of the Samhan continued even after Koryŏ was replaced by the Yi Sŏng-gye's Chosŏn in 1392. Yi Mu-bang (李茂芳, 1319-1398) wrote a poem in 1394 when Yi Pang-wŏn (李芳遠, King T'aejong (太宗), 1367-1422; r. 1400-1418) was sent to Ming as an envoy, and in this poem, he stated that Chosŏn had been Samhan in the past.[116]

It is obvious that by the fourteenth century, the Korean literati felt comfortable about referring to not only previous political entities but also their own state as the Samhan. What is important here is that Koguryŏ was obviously considered as part of Samhan from the very early usages of this term. After its first appearance in Chinese documents as a referent of the northern

[115] *Samhan si kwigam*, 3:11. 送秋玉蟾曬史海印寺. "…遙知三韓二十三代之實錄…"

[116] *Tongmunsŏn*, 5:5. 靖安君餞詩得知字. "…朝鮮古三韓, 遙隔蒼海湄…"

state composed of different ethnic groups during the Han dynasty, the Samhan gradually developed a variety of historical meanings from specific political entities to an ethnic identity for the Korean state and people. For the Chinese, the initial Three Han – Mahan, Chinhan, and Pyŏnhan – were certainly "foreign" matters, and Ch'oe Ch'i-wŏn just matched them to the Three Kingdoms. No matter whether Koguryŏ was actually ever Mahan or not, the Koguryŏ=Mahan notion had been accepted consistently by the Koryŏ literati until the Samhan acquired a new status of the symbol of Korea in the late Koryŏ period.

As Koguryŏ was understood to be a part of it, the Samhan even evolved into a term symbolizing ethnic unification in Korean history. In the *Chewang un'gi*, Yi Sŭng-hyu recorded that not only large kingdoms like Puyŏ, Silla, and Koguryŏ but also other small polities such as Okchŏ and Ye-Maek had all originated from Tan'gun.[117] Tan'gun, who was recorded as the father of Chumong and the first king of Koguryŏ in Iryŏn's *Samguk yusa*, was now clearly considered a common ancestor of the Samhan, which included all previous political entities in Korean history.

As Kija's Chosŏn was said to be the legitimate successor of Tan'gun's Old Chosŏn, the Samhan should be mentioned in its relationship with Kija. Since Kija was listed after Tan'gun in Iryŏn's *Samguk yusa*, Yi Sŭng-hyu emphasized his historical meaning more in the *Chewang un'gi* by placing Tan'gun and Kija in separate sections for the Earlier Chosŏn and the Later Chosŏn [後朝鮮], respectively. Here, Kija was respected and praised for his virtue, which prevailed through Chosŏn,[118] and he became a very important figure who linked the people of the Samhan to Tan'gun, their common ancestor. In the context of this trend of emphasizing Kija

[117] *Chewang un'gi*, 2:2-3. "…成三韓三韓各有幾州縣蚩蚩散在湖山間…於中何者是大國先以扶餘[…]沸流稱…次有尸羅髙禮南北沃沮穢貊膺比諸君長問誰後世系亦自檀君承…" It is interesting for Silla and Koguryŏ were recorded as 尸羅 and 髙禮, respectively, here. They appeared as 新羅 and 麗 later in the records of history of each state.

[118] *Ibid*. 2:2. "…後朝鮮祖是箕子…遺風餘烈傳…"

highly, the Samhan were now recorded as the land of Kija, who was not subject to the Chinese emperor.[119] Consequently, Koguryŏ was able to play another crucial role in Korean history as the region where Kija resided when he was remembered by Confucian literati after the late thirteenth century.

Conclusion

Collective memory is based on historical memory, which can be attained only through written materials, and history, the remembered past as Halbwachs terms it, survives more effectively with the aid of collective memory because it is actively engaged in the formation of a certain identity in a current period. Memories of Koguryŏ throughout Koryŏ period are best understood in this framework. It is usually said that the memories of Koguryŏ, which appeared strong in early Koryŏ and were gradually overshadowed by a Silla-centered prospective, were rejuvenated later under military regimes when Koryŏ was fighting against Mongol invasions. Although these memories of Koguryŏ happened to appear more often after the thirteenth century, the consistent awareness of Koguryŏ and its memory by Koryŏ kings and literati strongly indicate that Koguryŏ had been already embraced in the collective memories of Koryŏ's ruling class. Koryŏ kings often visited the shrine of King Tongmyŏng for various occasions including during the war with Jin, and, more importantly, their visits and interest in King Tongmyŏng occurred frequently throughout the dynasty rather than during specific periods. Although the Myoch'ŏng Rebellion certainly contributed to the revival of Koguryŏ memories, Koryŏ kings had already paid tribute to King Tongmyŏng's shrine before the twelfth century, and their referring to him as Yejo, the founder of the dynasty, should be understood as an outcome of the

[119] *Mogŭn sigo*, 2:9. 貞觀吟楡林關作. "…三韓箕子不臣地…"

persistent awareness of Koguryŏ's past in the Koryŏ period.

The strong Buddhistic tradition that emphasized Koguryŏ is another piece of evidence supporting the importance of Koguryŏ in the collective memory of Koryŏ elites. They frequently recalled the old kingdom in various writings, and as the first kingdom to adopt Buddhism, Koguryŏ could not be downplayed in Koryŏ culture since Buddhism was prevalent. This is why Buddhist monks such as Kakhun and Iryŏn stressed the historical significance of Koguryŏ in their writings. Ironically, it was Confucianism, though, that made it possible for Koguryŏ to attain a very special meaning in Korean history and to eventually consolidate its status in the collective memory of Koreans. The region where Kija resided after leaving China belonged to Koguryŏ during the Three Kingdoms period, and as long as Kija was remembered in Korean history, Koguryŏ was also highlighted by Confucian literati as a sacred area. Once Iryŏn connected Koguryŏ to Old Chosŏn by stating Chumong was a son of Tan'gun, Koguryŏ was now even understood as a bridge between Kija Chosŏn and Koryŏ.

The representation of Koguryŏ in terms of its relationship to Kija was further amplified by the notion of the Samhan. Because Mahan was related to Kija Chosŏn, the Koryŏ literati matched Koguryŏ to Mahan, and the Samhan were eventually understood as referring to Korea as a whole state instead of to three individual political or ethnic entities in Korean history. Koguryŏ was then arguably perceived as a part of not only the political and cultural spheres, but also as their ethnic heritage by the Koryŏ literati since Tan'gun was considered to be a common ancestor of the Samhan.

Koryŏ literati had never doubted Koguryŏ's position as a part of Korean history, and the evidence showing the traces of Koguryŏ in all three spheres – political, cultural, and ethnic – confirms that Koguryŏ had been firmly embedded in the collective memory during the Koryŏ

period. The instance of collective memory in the discourse of memories of Koguryŏ during the Koryŏ period is certainly different from the modern sense of collective memory as discussed in contemporary articles by scholars including Halbwachs because those who maintained the memories of Koguryŏ were strictly limited to the elites, such as kings and literati. Meanwhile, the view of Koguryŏ held by the common Koryŏ people still remains a question to be answered. However, considering that these literati managed to remain at the core of political power throughout most of Korean history until as late as the nineteenth century, the importance of the literati's construction of Koguryŏ memories as part of the collective memory should not be downplayed by any means. Regardless of whether Koryŏ people actually expected that Koguryŏ would develop further in their collective memory, or whether they could have imagined that it would become even more closely related to the rise of nationalism in Korea more than six hundred years later, the images and memories of Koguryŏ they adapted provided a model for later generations, and were continuously maintained by the Confucian literati during the Chosŏn dynasty. Once it was embedded in the collective memory during Koryŏ, Koguryŏ has never been forgotten and has managed to maintain its special status until today. Arguably, Koryŏ literati brought the old kingdom into their collective memory on their own, and they certainly built a solid foundation for Koguryŏ's survival in the subsequent collective memory of Korean history.

Chapter Three

Sustaining Collectivity in the Conflict of Political Interests

Introduction

The international political situation of East Asia in the fourteenth century rapidly changed. While the Yuan dynasty was declining fast in the midst of the chaos caused by competition for political power among the ruling class, constant rebellions by groups such as the Red Turbans, inspired by the White Lotus Society, arose in China, and Zhu Yuanzhang (朱元璋, 1328-1398; r. 1368-1398), the first emperor of the Ming dynasty, was one of the leaders of these rebellions. Dynastic change in China certainly influenced the political situation on the Korean peninsula, which was punctuated by its own dynastic change as well from Koryŏ to Chosŏn.

Because Yi Sŏng-gye, King T'aejo of the Chosŏn dynasty, was able to seize political power after withdrawing his army from the expedition to Liaodong, and the Ming dynasty was established by native Chinese people, the perspectives on Koguryŏ now became more complicated than before. First, since Liaodong was a part of the old territory of Koguryŏ and had been considered very important throughout the history of conflict between Koguryŏ and China, Koguryŏ issues related to Liaodong consequently drew considerable attention from the Ming. This possible tension in the relationship with the Ming emerged as an urgent issue for the ruling class of the newly established Chosŏn. Secondly, the Confucian literati who emerged as important intellectual figures during the Koryŏ-Chosŏn transition were devoted to Confucian teachings on the one hand, but they also needed to find a model of military strength and turned to

Koguryŏ's success in defending itself against Chinese invaders, which had been virtually ignored while authoritarian rulers constructed a centralized political structure. Due to the complexity of the issue, it became inevitable for Koguryŏ to be viewed from many different aspects by Chosŏn, not only to maintain its legitimate position in the history from Old Chosŏn of Tan'gun and Koryŏ, but also to ease the growing tension in the relationship with the Ming dynasty.

In this chapter, I will review various tensions between Chosŏn and the Ming surrounding Liaodong and other issues including tribute and exchanges of envoys between the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The changes in the perception of Koguryŏ during those years show how a certain collective memory can be portrayed and altered differently in response to the changes in circumstances caused by both international and domestic policies. Therefore, I will analyze how these issues affected the views of Koguryŏ that were embedded in the collective memories of the literati during the early Chosŏn period, and how the Confucian literati of Chosŏn responded. An examination of the historical documents and the Chosŏn literati's writings published in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries will help us understand the relationship between society and the (re)construction of the collective memories about Koguryŏ. Because these documents were mostly written by Confucian literati who contributed to the establishment of the Chosŏn dynasty, they provide information on how Koguryŏ was positioned and understood in the Confucian historiography, which had to achieve dual tasks: maintaining peace with the Ming, the new regime mandated by Heaven; and keeping the proud past of their Chosŏn as symbolized by many victories against foreign invasions.

Finally, I will address the issue of legitimacy in Korean history. Since Tan'gun was emphasized as a common ancestor of the Korean people, Tan'gun's Old Chosŏn has been generally recorded as the first political entity in Korean history. Thus, constructing hereditary

lineages in Korean history has been a controversial issue throughout Korean historiography, and Chosŏn literati also expressed their awareness of the importance of building historical lineages for their dynasty's claim to historical legitimacy. Furthermore, there were different perspectives expressed on Old Chosŏn and Koguryŏ, depending on the Chosŏn Confucian literati's affiliation. While those who actively engaged in politics by serving in the court seemed to be inclined to emphasize practical aspects such as Koguryŏ's military strength, another group who chose to keep themselves from taking government posts paid more attention to a different aspect by emphasizing the connections to Kija in their memories of Koguryŏ. Additionally, how Koguryŏ should be treated in the Three Kingdoms period and how their legitimacy had been transmitted from Tan'gun's Old Chosŏn to Chosŏn were some questions that the Confucian literati of Chosŏn consistently faced throughout the Chosŏn period. Thus I will examine how Koguryŏ was understood in early Chosŏn and what influenced the projection of Koguryŏ memories.

I. Facing the Dilemma

When the Ming dynasty was established and the Yuan was forced back to the north of China, Koryŏ welcomed the dynastic change in China, and was very hopeful in maintaining a good relationship with the new state. Soon after acknowledging the Ming victory over the Yuan, Koryŏ expressed its intention to the Ming. King Kongmin (恭愍王, 1330-1374; r. 1351-1374) stopped using "Chijŏng" (至正), the Yuan reign title, and replaced it with "Hongmu" (洪武), the reign title for Emperor Taizu (太祖) of the Ming.[120] One of the reasons for Koryŏ's preference for

[120] Interestingly, just a month before a Ming envoy arrived at Koryŏ, Koryŏ and Yuan exchanged envoys with royal letters. In his letter, King Kongmin expressed his appreciation to the Yuan emperor for giving him a high title, and even encouraged Yuan to pacify. (*Koryŏsa*, 41:21-3.) It was only four days after the Ming's envoy's return that Koryŏ decided to stop using the Chijŏng reign title, and just three days after that, Koryŏ sent envoys to Ming with a monograph exalting Emperor Taizu of Ming, comparing him with Emperor Shun (舜) and Tang (湯). See *Ibid*., 41:24. "…皇帝陛下文明邁舜, 勇智躋湯…" In 1370, Koryŏ also sent the imperial seal of Yuan to Ming when

the Ming was the Yuan's heavy pressure in terms of tributary obligations. Since the mid-thirteenth century, the Yuan had strongly interfered in Koryŏ politics, and satisfying the Yuan's demands for tribute had caused ongoing, serious problems in Koryŏ. Because Koryŏ had to take care of their visits to Yuan with their own revenue and also prepare all the tribute items that the Yuan demanded, the resulting series of royal visits to the Yuan and satisfying Yuan tribute demands became a serious issue for Koryŏ. The most notorious of the Yuan's demands was their request for women. Ever since the Mongols had asked for young girls after defeating the Khitan, women were constantly on the list of the Yuan tribute demands,[121] and in order to meet the quota for women, Koryŏ even established a special office to search for women to send as tribute.[122] It is obvious that Koryŏ's Confucian literati were not in favor of the Yuan's demands for Koryŏ women. Yi Kok, who had studied in Yuan, even wrote a memorial to plead with the Yuan emperor to stop bringing Koryŏ women to the Yuan by stating that it was a vicious practice against humanity.[123]

When the Ming replaced the Yuan in China, the Koryŏ Confucian literati were very hopeful about the end of the heavy tribute duty and expected a more humane and virtuous regime that would possibly build a close relationship between their states. As a result, they did not hide

---

informing that they had started using Ming's reign title. See *Ibid*., 42:15 and 17.

[121] Yuan needed women to marry their soldiers. Koryŏ women also became maids or servants to the Yuan royal family and ruling class. Some of the tribute women were able to gain political power in Yuan and managed to exercise their power in Koryŏ court through family ties. The Ki clan gained political power in Koryŏ court when Lady Ki (奇皇后, fl. fourteenth century) sent to the Yuan as a tribute woman, became the Empress of the Yuan. Ki Ch'ŏl (奇轍, ?-1356), her brother enjoyed privilege while serving as a high-ranking official before being murdered in the middle of an anti-Yuan campaign in the Koryŏ court during King Kongmin's reign.

[122] *Ibid*., 27:46. Because Koryŏ women did not want to marry Yuan men, Koryŏ had to find women among widows, wives of rebels, and daughters of Buddhist monks. This brought a change in marriage customs in Koryŏ, as people tried to get their daughters married at a very early age in order to avoid being sent to the Yuan.

[123] *Kajŏng chip*, 8:2-5. 代言官請罷取童女書. In order to convince the Yuan emperor, Yi even mentioned Emperor Shizu's (世祖, 1215-1294; r. 1260-1294) accomplishments.

their support for the Ming and strongly argued Koryŏ should cultivate a relationship with the Ming, not the Yuan. Chŏng To-jŏn was one of the main figures who insisted that his state should maintain a close relationship with the Ming. In 1375, Chŏng argued that Koryŏ should inform the Ming of the death of King Kongmin, and did not sign the letter to the Yuan emperor, saying that it would have been against the late King Kongmin's will. He was even sent into exile when he said that he would kill Yuan envoys and send them to the Ming if he was ordered to welcome them.[124]

Dynastic change in China, however, did not bring as much benefit to their state as the Confucian literati of Koryŏ/Chosŏn had hoped. Although Koryŏ showed its willingness to build a close relationship, the Ming, like the Yuan, constantly asked Koryŏ to send tributes, including women and thousands of horses. Koryŏ even sent Chŏng Mong-ju (鄭夢周, 1337-1392) as an envoy to the Ming in order to appeal for some relief from the Ming's tributary requests.[125] This situation did not change much even after Chosŏn was established. In 1394, the number of horses that the Ming demanded even numbered up to ten thousand, and additionally, eunuchs were also requested.[126] Therefore, it is not surprising that Confucian literati in Chosŏn were deeply disappointed with the Ming's demands and its claim of taking over the Yuan's rights over Korea. This conflict that Chosŏn had with Ming was also revealed in the disputes regarding territorial claims to such areas as the north of Ch'ŏllyŏng (鐵嶺) and Liaodong, and because of the conflict regarding these regions, Koguryŏ memories among Chosŏn literati were affected.

---

[124] *Koryŏsa chŏryo* (高麗史節要), 30:4-5. Interestingly, this incident about Chŏng's expression of strong animosity against Yuan was not recorded in the *Koryŏsa*.

[125] *Koryŏsa*, 136:3-4. Ming agreed to reduce the tributary amount while criticizing Koryŏ's unwillingness to keep its promise. King U of Koryŏ sent another envoy to the Ming in order to thank them for adjusting the tributary amount. *Ibid*., 136:7-10.

[126] *T'aejo sillok* (太祖實錄), 5:17.

Ever since the fall of Koguryŏ, Liaodong had remained under non-Korean control throughout the Liao, Jin and Yuan dynasties. It was in the late fourteenth century that the tension between Koryŏ/Chosŏn and the Ming escalated over this region. After replacing the Yuan, the Ming claimed its right over the area north of Ch'ŏllyŏng where a Yuan regional office had once been located,[127] and Koryŏ responded to that request with a military campaign to retake Liaodong.[128] The exact location of Ch'ŏllyŏng during the Koryŏ period is not clear. While traditional scholarship in Korea assumed that it was located between the current Kangwŏn (江原) and southern Hamgyŏng (咸慶) provinces, a new argument suggests that it more likely existed in Liaodong rather than on the Korean peninsula, and that this is why Koryŏ tried to launch a military campaign to Liaodong in response to the Ming's claim over Ch'ŏllyŏng. Regardless of which view one takes, Ch'ŏllyŏng was inside the old Koguryŏ territory. In addition, it is worthwhile to note Yi Sŏng-gye was able to seize political power and eventually replaced Koryŏ with his Chosŏn dynasty after withdrawing his army from the military campaign toward Liaodong against royal orders. In other words, Liaodong possessed historical meaning in many respects for the Chosŏn literati, and it was hard for Chosŏn to discard any interest in this region. Besides, it was not the first occasion that the Liaodong region had caught the attention of the Koryŏ ruling class. From 1369 through 1370, Yi Sŏng-gye himself had already campaigned

[127] *Koryŏsa*, 137:4. "…鐵嶺迤北屬元朝並, 令歸之遼東…"

[128] It is interesting to note that Yi Cha-ch'un (李子春, 1315-1361), father of Yi Sŏng-gye contributed toward regaining control of the area north of the Ch'ŏllyŏng region during the late Koryŏ period. According to the *Koryŏsa* and *T'aejo sillok*, Yi Cha-ch'un was a local official in this region and responded from within when Koryŏ attacked Yuan to recapture the region. He was rewarded for his role and allowed to stay at the capital after Koryŏ recovered this region. *Koryŏsa*, 38:30 and 39:2; *T'aejo sillok*, 1:4-5. "…桓祖入見王迎謂曰…王進桓祖爲大中大夫司僕卿, 賜京第一區, 因留居之." Because Yi Cha-ch'un was father of King T'aejo of the Chosŏn dynasty, he was recorded as "Hwanjo" (桓祖) in the *Koryŏsa* and the *Annals of the Chosŏn Dynasty*. Considering his father's involvement in recovering this region, it is unlikely that Yi Sŏng-gye consented to the Ming's claims and felt favorably toward the Ming from the beginning in spite of his disagreement with the plan to attack the Ming in order to conquer Liaodong.

successfully there following King Kongmin's order.[129] However, it is not clear how King Kongmin perceived this area, according to the historical documents. The *Koryŏsa* reports the surrender of the people residing in this region to Yi Sŏng-gye as follows:

> …東寧府同知李吾魯帖木兒…吾魯帖木兒來挑戰俄而棄甲再拜曰,
>
> 吾先本高麗人願爲臣僕率三百餘戶降…
>
> … Yi O-ro was Vice Magistrate of Tongnyŏng prefecture… After the first battle against us, Yi disarmed himself and bowed twice. He then surrendered with about three hundreds households while saying that he would like to serve because his ancestors were originally from Koryŏ…[130]

What is interesting here is that the leader of the people in that region identified their ancestors as people of Koryŏ when they surrendered to Yi. Although it was not clear whether Koryŏ here actually meant Koguryŏ or Koryŏ, it is more likely he was referring to Koguryŏ because Liaodong had never been directly controlled by Koryŏ. Additionally, the last name of a chief in that region, who decided not to surrender and eventually escaped during the night after Yi Sŏng-gye's attack, was Ko, which was also the surname of the Koguryŏ kings.[131] Although there is no additional evidence supporting the historical/genealogical tie between people in Liaodong and those from Koguryŏ, it is very plausible that some vivid memories of Koguryŏ remained strong among the residents in Liaodong, considering that they themselves first mentioned their genealogical bond with the Koguryŏ people. In contrast to the obvious trace of

---

[129] *Ibid*., 41:28. "…遣元帥將擊東寧府, 以絶北元."

[130] *Ibid*., 42:1. "帖木兒" is Chinese pronunciation for "Temür."

[131] *Ibid*., 42:1-2. "…其酋高安慰帥麾下嬰城拒守, 我師圍之…安慰棄妻孥縋城夜遁…"

Koguryŏ memories in Liaodong, it is not clear, though, that King Kongmin launched a military campaign to Liaodong with the idea of irredentism in order to recover the old Koguryŏ territory. Although both the north of Ch'ŏllyŏng and Liaodong had belonged to Koguryŏ in the past, it is more likely that what King Kongmin was trying to do was to become independent from the Yuan's interference by taking advantage of the political change in China rather than to realize the irredentism of Koguryŏ memories.[132] In fact, Yi Sŏng-gye went back to Kaegyŏng, the capital of Koryŏ quickly, without implanting any specific methods to solidify control over the Liaodong region, and as a result, Liaodong eventually came under Ming control. What is important in this incident is that the people of Liaodong apparently felt a certain degree of ties with Koryŏ (and Chosŏn) people through Koguryŏ, no matter how King Kongmin perceived this region, and consequently, it is not surprising that the Ming court showed concern about this region.

The Ming had been monitoring what was happening in Liaodong. In 1393, the Regional Military Commissioner of Liaodong reported to the Ming court that Chosŏn was trying to cross the Amnok (鴨綠, Ch. Yalu) River with about 500 Jurchens.[133] *The Annals of the Chosŏn Dynasty* also state that there was a serious discussion about a military campaign to Liaodong in the late fourteenth century. The *T'aejo sillok* reports that Chŏng To-jŏn once asked King T'aejo for permission to bring an army to the northern border, but he was criticized by other officials such as Cho Chun (趙浚, 1346-1405) and his request was eventually declined by King T'aejo.[134] The

[132] King Kongmin had never officially expressed irredentism for Koguryŏ territory regarding his campaign to the north of the Ch'ŏllyŏng and Liaodong regions.

[133] *Ming shi* (明史), 320:8284. "…遼東都指揮使司奏, 朝鮮國招引女直五百餘人, 潛渡鴨綠江, 欲入寇…" Emperor Taizu sent a letter to Yi Sŏng-gye to warn him not to cause any conflict in this region and Yi responded by sending people from Liaodong back to the Ming with other tributes.

[134] *T'aejo sillok*, 11:16.

T'aejong sillok (太宗實錄) more clearly indicates that it was Chŏng To-jŏn who planned it and strongly urged Yi Sŏng-gye to authorize the conquest of Liaodong. It even explains that Chŏng tried to convince Yi to attack the Ming because he was afraid of being sent to the Ming whose emperor was displeased by a memorial authored by Chŏng.[135]

It is worthwhile to examine Chosŏn's response carefully. It is true that Chŏng consistently tried to reform the military structure and was devoted to training soldiers after Chosŏn was established. Chŏng often wrote about military reforms and tactics,[136] and *The Annals of the Chosŏn Dynasty* cites a military project planned by Chŏng as the main reason for the conflict between Chosŏn and the Ming in the late fourteenth century. According to *The Annals of the Chosŏn Dynasty*, Chŏng To-jŏn's personal animosity against Emperor Taizu was implied to be a main factor behind his continual urging for a military campaign to Liaodong. Recent scholarship, however, questions this interpretation while pointing out that Chŏng's military reform had already been launched before the Ming asked Chosŏn to send Chŏng. Scholars who understand Chŏng To-jŏn's dedication to Liaodong as a sign of irredentism for the old Koguryŏ territory explain that it was Chŏng's strong will to conquer Liaodong that resulted in the Ming's insistent summons of Chŏng To-jŏn.[137]

It is doubtful, however, whether Chŏng truly considered conquering Liaodong by force soon after the Ming replaced the Yuan in China. As briefly mentioned before, Chŏng To-jŏn had been insisting Koryŏ/Chosŏn should maintain a close relationship with the newly emerged Ming,

---

[135] *T'aejong sillok*, 9:25. "…道傳時爲判三軍府事, 托疾不行, 乃陰謀以爲擧國而絶則己可免禍…深結南閫, 使閫上書曰士卒已鍊糧餉已備, 可以乘時復東明之舊壤…"

[136] *Ibid*., 5:12-14.

[137] Pak Wŏn-ho, *Myŏngch'o Chosŏn kwan'gyesa yŏn'gu* (Study of the Relationship between Chosŏn and Ming from 1368 through the mid-fifteenth Century) (Seoul: Ilchogak, 2002), 335-336.

and it is very unlikely that he was willing to jeopardize Chosŏn's relationship with the Ming by launching a military campaign to Liaodong during the first few years of Chosŏn.[138] Besides, in his letter to the Ming emperor answering the emperor's questions regarding Chosŏn's attitude toward the Ming, Yi Sŏng-gye tried to clear himself of the accusations by the Ming emperor, saying that Yi had even killed Chŏng Mong-ju because he was planning to attack Liaodong.[139] Therefore, it is hard to believe that Chŏng To-jŏn had seriously planned a military campaign to Liaodong as stated in *The Annals of the Chosŏn Dynasty*.

Although scholars generally agree that Chŏng s military reforms were designed to prepare for a military expedition to Liaodong, it seems more likely that what he really tried to do was to abolish private armies in order to strengthen the national military forces. It was not unusual for high-ranking officials or members of the royal family to retain private armies in this period, and Chŏng strongly believed that the existence of private armies would keep Chosŏn from being a strong state militarily, and that they posed a threat to the state. Coincidently, Yi Pang-wŏn, who became King T'aejong, the third king of the Chosŏn dynasty, was one of those who possessed a strong private army, and Chŏng was murdered later by Yi in the middle of a power struggle over the succession to the throne.[140] It does not seem mere coincidence that the

---

[138] Regarding Chŏng To-jŏn's dedication to a military campaign to Liaodong, Han Yŏng-u argues that Chŏng's pro-Ming attitude was a means of hiding his real interest. To support his argument, Han cites one of Chŏng's poems where he said that Hamju (咸州, Hamhŭng (咸興)) was the original center of their state. *Sambong chip* (三峯集), 2:7. 又赴咸州幕都連浦途中. "…咸州原是國中央." See Han Yŏng-u, *Chosŏn chŏn'gi sahaksa yŏn'gu* (Study of Historiography in Early Chosŏn) (Seoul: Seoul National University Press, 1981), 23. Hamju, however, was located on the northeast coast of the Korean peninsula, and it seems that Chŏng just emphasized the emotional meaning of Hamju as the hometown of the Chosŏn royal family, not provoking a military campaign to Ming.

[139] *T'aejo sillok*, 5:6-9. Actually, Yi Sŏng-gye lamented Chŏng Mong-ju's death as he was afraid of being criticized for murdering a loyal official of Koryŏ. (*Koryŏsa*, 117:19). In the *Sillok*, however, he justified killing Chŏng Mong-ju while linking him to the military campaign to Liaodong.

[140] Although both Yi Pang-wŏn and Chŏng To-jŏn agreed with the larger plan to replace Koryŏ with Chosŏn, there was a fundamental difference in their view about how the new dynasty should be run. While Chŏng tried to maintain a balance between the king and subjects through the bureaucracy, Yi strongly believed that Chosŏn should be an absolute monarchic state where the king held all political power over his subjects. Differences in their views

T'aejo sillok (太祖實錄) compiled during King T'aejong's reign repeatedly accused Chŏng To-jŏn of seriously planning a military campaign to take Liaodong.

The Ming's distrust of Chosŏn persisted until the mid-fifteenth century. Although the Chosŏn-Ming relationship improved a bit once King T'aejong and Emperor Chengzu (成祖, 1360-1424; r. 1402-1424) were enthroned in their respective states, Chosŏn still suffered from Ming tributary demands. Despite suffering from heavy tributary demands including horses, local products, exotic animals, gold, silver, and even young girls, Chosŏn had no choice but to keep complying with the Ming's various requests while trying not to irritate the Ming, and was not able to be aggressive in the matter of their territorial claim to the Liaodong region. Previously, Yi Sŏng-gye had responded to the Ming emperor's inquiries by saying that he would not cause any problems in this region,[141] and during King T'aejong's reign, Chosŏn consistently sent people from Liaodong back to Ming, and even consented to the Ming's control over Liaodong. It is worthwhile to note that the tension between the Ming and Koryŏ/Chosŏn originated from the Ming's claim of control over the area north of Ch'ŏllyŏng. It is true that the Ming expressed its interest in establishing an administrational post to take over sovereignty of that area, but it is not likely that the Ming took the issue very seriously. Rather, the Ming's claim seemed to have been verbal only, and the Ming deliberately raised tension with Koryŏ to intimidate Koryŏ. Koryŏ's inclination toward the Northern Yuan in this period must have bothered the Ming; therefore, they probably felt it necessary to make Koryŏ realize that the Ming was defeating and replacing the Yuan in every aspect.[142] Actually, the Ming did not cause any more problems regarding the issue

---

necessarily caused tension between them, and Chŏng's proposal for military reform was probably very hard for Yi to agree to.

[141] *T'aejo sillok*, 3:10-11.

[142] It is not surprising that Ming did not trust Koryŏ in this period. Although King Kongmin tried to stop the Yuan's interference and maintained a close relationship with the Ming, Koryŏ had been the Yuan's son-in-law state for

of Ch'ollyŏng after Yi Sŏng-gye seized political power in the Koryŏ court. After retreating from the military expedition to Liaodong in 1388 at Wihwa Island (威化島), Yi consistently showed his intention to make peace with the Ming. Yi Sŏng-gye clearly lowered himself in the relationship with the Ming emperor even after establishing his new dynasty and continued to ask for the endorsement of the Ming emperor in spite of the Ming's rejection.[143] Yi even asked the Ming emperor to select the name of his new dynasty when the Ming emperor asked the name of the new dynasty.[144] Not only because the area north of Ch'ŏllyŏng was too far for the Ming to control directly,[145] but also because the area east of the Liao River was conceded to be Ming territory instead, the Ming did not cause any more tensions with Chosŏn regarding these regions.[146]

Probably because of the initial tensions with the Ming, Chosŏn appears to have been careful about emphasizing the history of Koguryŏ until the mid-fifteenth century when Chosŏn-Ming relations had improved, and Liaodong was one of the key factors that kept Chosŏn from affirming Koguryŏ in a positive tone. While looking for peace with the Ming and needing the Ming's endorsement desperately, there were not many choices for Chosŏn to take in recalling

---

several decades. In addition, many high-ranking officials in the Koryŏ court with political power after King Kongmin's death still held a pro-Yuan attitude until Yi Sŏng-gye's military coup in 1388.

[143] *T'aejo sillok*, 1:56. "…使趙琳赴京進表曰, 權知高麗國事臣某言伏惟小邦…至戊辰春,妄興師旅將犯遼東,以臣爲都統使…臣竊自念,小邦不可以犯上國之境…"

[144] *Ibid*., 2:15-16. "…文書到曰, 國更何號星馳來報…聖慈許臣權知國事, 仍問國號. 臣與國人感喜尤切. 臣竊思惟有國立號誠非小臣所敢擅便. 謹將朝鮮和寧等號聞達, 天聰伏望取自聖裁…"

[145] Emperor Taizu once implied already that Koryŏ was too far away to put under direct control of China. *Ming shi*, 324:8283. "…帝以高麗僻處東隅, 非中國所治…"

[146] There is no absolute record that states Chosŏn consented to Ming control over the Liaodong region on the condition that the Ming would not claim its sovereignty over the region north of Ch'ŏllyŏng. But Chosŏn did not reveal any regret that the Ming took the Liaodong region, and coincidently the Ming also did not show any more deep interest in the area north of Ch'ŏllyŏng.

Koguryŏ, which had had a long history of conflict with various Chinese dynasties. It had not been unusual for Koguryŏ to confront Chinese power throughout its history, and it indeed defeated Chinese armies repeatedly in the seventh century, including the one led directly by Emperor Taizong of Tang. Therefore, the history of Koguryŏ in terms of its military success was consequently downplayed and even criticized in favor of China by Chosŏn literati in order not to irritate the Ming through the early fifteenth century. For example, in the *Tongguk saryak* (東國史略), published in 1403 under the supervision of Kwŏn Kŭn (權近, 1352-1409),[147] the Koguryŏ king was harshly criticized for performing a sacrificial ceremony to heaven. According to Kwŏn, those ceremonies should have been performed by the ruler of a large country who had a heavenly mandate, meaning the emperor of China. Because the Koguryŏ king was, however, not qualified to perform this ceremony, it was considered a serious violation of ritual and also proof of his extreme arrogance. Therefore, it is not surprising at all that the ceremony did not go well.[148] Kwŏn was also very critical of King Kwanggaet'o (廣開土王, 374-412; r. 391-412) for his military success against Paekche. Although Koguryŏ and Paekche had a long history of fighting each other, in Kwŏn's perspective, it was not acceptable for King Kwanggaet'o to launch a military attack during the mourning period for his own father's death.[149] Another interesting point is that no comment on Ŭlchi Mundŏk's victory over Sui in 612 can be found in

[147] There are a few other books of the same title, *Tongguk saryak*. One of them was compiled by Pak Sang (朴祥, 1474-1530) in the early sixteenth century. To distinguish these two, Pak's *Tongguk saryak* will be addressed as the *Tongguk saryak (P)* hereafter.

[148] *Yangch'on chip* (陽村集), 34:2-3. When the king of Koguryŏ prepared a sacrificial ceremony to heaven, a hog that was supposed to be sacrificed ran away, and the king executed two people in charge.

[149] *Tongguk saryak*, 3:6 and *Yangch'on chip*, 34:8-9. Here Kwŏn Kŭn mentioned that there were some other opinions about what King Kwanggaet'o had done, which complimented him for getting vengeance for his father. But Kwŏn strongly argued that King Kwanggaet'o should have waited at least three years until the mourning period was over before attacking Paekche.

Kwŏn Kŭn's writings. Although it is not clear what kept him from mentioning one of the most important events in Koguryŏ's history, the political situation between Chosŏn and the Ming during Kwŏn's time suggests that his omission of Ŭlchi Mundŏk's achievement was likely intentional and because Kwŏn probably believed that it would be best not to record that the decline and demise of the Sui was propelled by its unsuccessful military campaign against Koguryŏ.

Chosŏn's possible consent to the Ming's claim over the Liaodong region, however, did not mean that they forgot their ties to Koguryŏ. Even in a text written to blame Chŏng To-jŏn for his potential military campaign against Liaodong, King Tongmyŏng of Koguryŏ was also mentioned.[150] It was just too hard for the Confucian literati of Chosŏn to compete with the Ming over a region that had been out of their direct control for almost 500 years. Perspectives on Koguryŏ, however, were presented differently during the mid-fifteenth century, and the recognition of its military strength was key to this change in understanding of Koguryŏ. I will examine how Koguryŏ was remembered by the Chosŏn literati through the mid-sixteenth century after the tension between Chosŏn and the Ming had eased, resulting in changes in the perception of Koguryŏ.

II. Changing Perspectives and Focus

A new perspective emphasizing Koguryŏ's military strength emerged during King Sejo's (世祖, 1417-1468; r. 1455-1468) reign. King Sejo was especially concerned about finding a way to stabilize society and strengthen the foundation of the state. Because of his dedication to completing this reformation, he appointed supportive literati to important positions to help carry

[150] *T'aejong sillok*, 9:25. "…使閬上書曰士卒已鍊糧餉已備, 可以乘時復東明之舊壤…"

out his reformation policy. Yang Sŏng-ji (梁誠之, 1415-1482) was one of those who strongly supported King Sejo's plan.[151] With King Sejo's trust, Yang made many proposals on various issues. Yang's historical perspective can be found in his proposal on memorial ceremonies for the historic figures of previous dynasties. In contrast to Kwŏn Kŭn, who had criticized Koguryŏ's performing a ritual ceremony to heaven because it should had been done only by the Chinese emperor, Yang strongly argued that Chosŏn should perform its own ceremony to heaven. What is really interesting here is Yang even included King Yŏngyang (嬰陽王, ?-618; r. 590-618) and Ŭlchi Mundŏk of Koguryŏ in the memorial ceremony with the other figures.[152] The only reason why King Yŏngyang was included by Yang was that he happened to be the king of Koguryŏ when Ŭlchi Mundŏk defeated Sui. At this time in Chosŏn, military strength was considered so important that it became a key factor in the recording and remembrance of a specific king in historical documents. Moreover, this was not the only occasion when Yang suggested a memorial ceremony for Ŭlchi Mundŏk. Emphasizing the importance of the military, Yang also argued for the establishment of a shrine for military heroes of previous dynasties, and he mentioned Ŭlchi Mundŏk again with Kim Yu-sin (金庾信, 595-673) and other military officials of the Koryŏ and Chosŏn periods.[153] All of these proposals were accepted by King Sejo, which reveals that Koguryŏ's military strength had become a source of pride in how Chosŏn literati recalled their

[151] King Sejo's trust of Yang Sŏng-ji was so strong that he even referred to Yang as his Zhuge Kongming (諸葛孔明, 181-234), the great strategist and stateman of the state of Shu Han (蜀漢) in the third century. *Nulchae chip* (訥齋集), 6:7. 南原君政案. "…上御思政殿謂金守溫曰梁誠之予之諸葛孔明也…"

[152] *Nulchae chip*, 2:6. 便宜二十四事 [祭前代君相] and *Sejo sillok* (世祖實錄), 3:24-7. Here Yang also listed other military officials in previous dynasties such as Hŭkch'i Sangji (黑齒常之, 630-689) who tried to restore Paekche against the allied Silla-Tang forces in the seventh century and even Ch'oe Yŏng (崔瑩, 1316-1388) who was executed by Yi Sŏng-gye.

[153] *Ibid*., 2:7-8. 便宜二十四事 [武成立廟]. "…而立武成廟祭禮配食略依文廟制度, 又以新羅之金庾信高句麗之乙之文德…配享."; *Sejo sillok*, 3:24-7.

history, and this deserves more attention. Furthermore, King Sejo even stated publicly that Koguryŏ was the most powerful of the Three Kingdoms.[154]

A new historical perspective and attempt to re-illuminate Koguryŏ during this period is also revealed in the text of the *Samguksa chŏryo* (三國史節要).[155] It was completed in 1476 and recorded the period from Tan'gun's Chosŏn to Koryŏ. Instead of including personal comments by its writers, the *Samguksa chŏryo* just introduces commentaries by previous writers such as Kim Pu-sik and Kwŏn Kŭn, who compiled the *Samguk sagi* and the *Tongguk saryak*, respectively. Although the perspectives of the writers of the *Samguksa chŏryo* on Koguryŏ did not appear publicly in its text, it is not difficult to see them from their tone in narrating some incidents relating to Koguryŏ. Compared to Kwŏn's *Tongguk saryak*, the *Samguksa chŏryo* clearly mentions Koguryŏ in a very favorable tone. In the *Samguksa chŏryo*'a preface, Koguryŏ was praised highly for its strong military forces, which were able to keep defeating various foreign states including, Qi (齊), Liang (梁), Sui, and Tang. Additionally, their compliments of Koguryŏ here hardly fall short of their comments on Silla.[156] Furthermore, Silla, Koguryŏ, and Paekche were treated fairly in the *Samguksa chŏryo* in terms of recording events not only in accordance with the Silla kings' reigns. Unlike Kwŏn's *Tongguk saryak* where Koguryŏ and

---

[154] *Sejo sillok*, 22:10. "…上曰三國高句麗莫强焉."

[155] Although the *Samguksa chŏryo* was completed in 1476 during King Sŏngjong's (成宗, 1457-1494; r. 1469-1494) reign, it was King Sejo who first launched the project to write it. During King Sejo's reign, Yang Sŏng-ji proposed to study their own history with that of China while emphasizing the value of "their" (Korean) history. *Nulchae chip*, 1:27. 論君道十二事 [法前代]. "…東方之人徒知有中國之盛而不知考東國之事甚爲不可…", 2:31. 請殿講兼講史學. "…須精擇藝文兼官二十人…三國史記東國史略高麗全史者五人…"; *Sejo sillok*, 1:28 and 33:31. In response to Yang's proposal, King Sejo ordered him to publish a book explaining history since the ancient states. See *Sejo sillok*, 31:11. Although his name did not appear in the preface of the *Samguksa chŏryo*, it is very likely that Yang was involved in publication of the *Samguksa chŏryo*.

[156] *Samguksa chŏryo*, 序:2. "…新羅三姓相傳仁厚爲政歷年幾一千, 高句麗雄據遼東國富兵強敵慕容拒齊梁抗隋唐百萬之師天下稱其強大歷年又踰六百…"

Paekche were discussed under the current Silla kings' reigns, the Three Kingdoms were recorded separately according to the Chinese emperors' reign years in the *Samguksa chŏryo*, and Kwŏn was even criticized for his use of Silla as the standard in his *Tongguk saryak*.[157]

The *Samguksa chŏryo* also treated Koguryŏ's military success against foreign invasions differently than the *Tongguk saryak*. The *Samguksa chŏryo* explained Ŭlchi Mundŏk's victory over Sui in detail, praising him for his talents in both the military and literature. Moreover, it introduced Kim Pu-sik's comment on Ŭlchi Mundŏk in which Kim referred Ŭlchi as a "noble man" [君子].[158] For the account of battle between Koguryŏ and the Tang at Ansi Fortress (安市城), the *Samguksa chŏryo* gives Kim Pu-sik's comment at the very end in which Kim reveals his disappointment in not knowing the name of the Koguryŏ general who had defeated Emperor Taizong of the Tang, one of the greatest emperors in history.[159]

The literati's perspective of seeing Koguryŏ as a proud state in their historical lineage is even more evident in the *Tongguk t'onggam* (東國通鑑), completed in 1485. Since the *Samguksa chŏryo* was the product of the larger project of publishing the *Tongguk t'onggam*, most of their content covering the period up to the beginning of Koryŏ was very similar. What made the *Tongguk t'onggam* different from the *Samguksa chŏryo* was that it gave the writers' commentaries on certain occasions, something that was missing in the *Samguksa chŏryo*. Regarding Ŭlchi Mundŏk's victory, *Tongguk t'onggam*'s writers' own evaluation was also

---

[157] *Ibid*., 序:3. "…權近法綱目作史略…則以新羅先起後滅而爲主…今以先起後滅爲主考之前史而無據揆之事理而不順…"

[158] *Ibid*., 7:17. "…乙支文德資質沉鷙有智數兼解屬文. 金富軾曰…高句麗一偏方小國而能拒之不唯自保而已滅其軍幾盡者文德一人之力也. 傳曰不有君子其何能國乎信哉."

[159] *Ibid*., 10:41. "金富軾曰唐太宗聖明不世出之君…而東征之役敗於安市則其城主可謂豪傑非常者矣而史失其姓名…甚可惜也."

recorded after Kim Pu-sik's comments. In this evaluation, Ŭlchi Mundŏk was not only complimented for his victory, but also understood as one reason why Koguryŏ was considered a powerful state until its demise.[160] In the account of the battle at Ansi Fortress, the *Tongguk t'onggam* writers also added extra comments after Kim Pu-sik's, comparing the Koguryŏ general with a loyal figure in An Lushan's (安祿山, ?-757) Rebellion.[161] Still the *Tongguk t'onggam* introduced Kwŏn's very critical comment on King Kwanggaet'o for his "untimely" military campaign against Paekche without any further explanation, and his military success was hardly recorded. However, unlike the *Samguksa chŏryo*, which was completed about ten years earlier, Koguryŏ's victories over Sui and Tang were presented more proudly in the *Tongguk t'onggam*, and if we compare this new perspective on Koguryŏ with that of Kwŏn Kŭn, who obviously downplayed Koguryŏ's military success against the Sui, it seems very likely that there was a change in the literati's views on Koguryŏ from the late fourteenth century through the sixteenth century, which emphasized the practical aspects in which the literati of the Chosŏn court were very strongly interested.

Positive perspectives on Koguryŏ's military strength were also found in documents written by individuals, including Yu Hŭi-ryŏng's (柳希齡, 1480-1552) *P'yoje ŭmju Tongguk saryak* (標題音註東國史略) published in the 1520s. Unlike previous documents in which Silla was recorded before Koguryŏ and Paekche, Yu recorded histories of the Three Kingdoms in the order of Koguryŏ, Paekche, and Silla, explaining that Silla was directly connected to, and

[160] *Tongguk t'onggam*, 6:8. "…高麗之地偏在一隅…以一平壤孤軍弱卒抗天下之大兵, 卒獲全勝方之謝玄文德優焉…天下後世以吾東方爲強國而不敢輕犯者豈非文德挫強隋立威靈之餘烈乎."

[161] *Ibid*., 6:44. "…其忠義又豈下於巡也哉且巡之所敵者皆梁宋間羣盜率不能守城而死. 城主所抗者乘輿又能守城而全節謂之豪傑非常之才不亦宜乎."

followed by, Koryŏ in history.[162] It is worth noting that Koguryŏ's victories against the Sui and Tang were recorded in length with detailed explanations in Yu's writing.[163] Interestingly, Yu did not mention anything about the poem written by Ŭlchi Mundŏk although he included comments made by authors of previous historical documents, such as Kim Pu-sik. Although it is possible that the poem was not mentioned because Yu was trying to control the size of his volume, he nevertheless recorded the Koguryŏ-Sui war in detail. In addition, the failed military expedition of Tang Emperor Taizong also appeared with a note that he had granted a prize to the Koguryŏ general who defeated the Tang army at Ansi Fortress.[164] There is no strong indication showing that Yu was influenced directly by Yang Sŏng-ji while writing the *P'yoje ŭmju Tongguk saryak*. However, considering that his great-grandfather was listed as a Merit Subject who had helped King Sejo seize political power, and his grandfather had also served during King Sejo's reign,[165] it is likely that his view of Koguryŏ through the prism of its military success led him to write Koguryŏ history in a very positive tone rather than just to evaluate incidents by strict Confucian principles, as Kwŏn Kŭn did in his *Tongguk saryak*.

Re-evaluating Koguryŏ in terms of its military strength was very evident in various documents of those literati who served in main positions in the Chosŏn central court, especially since King Sejo's reign, as shown in the case of Yang Sŏng-ji. Then, what caused the change in the understanding of Koguryŏ during this period, and how did the Ming respond to this new evaluation of Koguryŏ by the Chosŏn court? One of the factors that propelled the new

---

[162] *P'yoje ŭmju Tongguk saryak*, 凡例. "…今易編年爲全紀以羅置末者, 傳授近繼於高麗也."

[163] *Ibid*., 1:69-71.

[164] *Ibid*., 1:74.

[165] Han Yŏng-u, *Chosŏn chŏn'gi sahaksa yŏn'gu*, 250-251.

perspectives on Koguryŏ's military strength was King Sejo's decision to construct a powerful state. King Sejo, a son of King Sejong (世宗, 1397-1450; r. 1418-1450), was an uncle of King Tanjong (端宗, 1441-1457; r. 1452-1455), from whom he had taken the throne and later killed. Since he killed not only many officials but also his own siblings in order to become king, King Sejo was not fully supported by all of the Cheng-zhu Learning literati, and there were even a couple of plots to dethrone him, all of which were exposed and resulted in many executions.[166] Because he was free from the guilt of taking the throne by force, King Sejo tried hard to achieve his goal of strengthening the state, and Koguryŏ had to become a perfect model for his reformation. In order to pursue his plan, it was necessary, however, to maintain a good relationship with the Ming, because the Ming must have been very concerned about its neighbor's "unusual" behaviors. Being aware of the need to quickly dissolve the Ming's suspicions, King Sejo himself volunteered to go to the Ming as an envoy to report King Tanjong's succession before taking the throne,[167] and also later sent to the Ming officials whom he trusted the most in order to explain his own succession and obtain imperial endorsement.[168] Indeed, King Sejo had been vey successful at maintaining a good relationship with the Ming from the beginning. Quite interestingly, it took very little time for the Ming to allow King

[166] Before becoming the seventh king of the Chosŏn Dynasty, King Sejo first killed high-ranking officials who supported King Tanjong in 1453. Once after taking the throne by the abdication of King Tanjong, King Sejo executed the former king, his own nephew, which caused serious protest from some Confucian literati. In spite of his controversial taking of the throne, King Sejo was considered to have helped establish a firm foundation for Chosŏn.

[167] *Tanjong sillok* (端宗實錄), 3:7-8.

[168] It was Sin Suk-chu (申叔舟, 1417-1475) who was sent by King Sejo as an envoy to the Ming. Sin was first appointed by King Sejong and one of the scholars in the Chiphyŏn chŏn (集賢殿, Hall of Worthies). Although criticized for his support of King Sejo, Sin contributed to the publishing of many historical documents and rose to become Prime Minister in his career. King Sejo once compared his relationship with Sin to that between Emperor Taizong of Tang and Wei Zheng (魏徵, 580-643).

Tanjong to yield the throne to King Sejo,[169] and the emperor even informed King Sejo that he did not have to send exotic items to the Ming.[170]

Although King Sejo's individual effort to maintain close ties with the Ming helped construct the new memory of Koguryŏ that emerged during his reign, what was a more important factor in the renewed rise of Koguryŏ was the Ming's situation in terms of its relationship with the Mongols and Jurchens. When the Ming emperor was captured by the Mongols in 1449, the Ming tried to gather military resources from its neighbors and Chosŏn responded in a hurry by sending five hundred horses. Additionally, whenever the regional officials of Liaodong reported a threat from the Jurchens, the Ming often ordered Chosŏn to attack the Jurchens with them, and sometimes even warned Chosŏn not to secretly contact the Jurchens against Ming's will.[171] After that, Chosŏn often formed an alliance with the Ming to attack the Jurchens, and the Ming acted as a mediator between Chosŏn and the Jurchens when any dispute broke out between them. As a result, it became obvious to the Ming that no matter how many armies Chosŏn raised and what Chosŏn remembered of Koguryŏ, Chosŏn would not cause any trouble to the Ming in order to claim the old Koguryŏ territory. The Ming were convinced that Chosŏn's surge of interest in Koguryŏ would never be a threat to the Ming as long as Chosŏn's recalling Koguryŏ was for the purpose of stabilizing its society and completing reforms. All the military reforms and the emphasis on the military strength of Koguryŏ might have been reported to the Ming, but the Ming eventually believed that there was no need to worry about any possible conflict regarding territorial claim over Liaodong and other Chinese-controlled territory because they believed that

[169] *Ming shi*, 320:8286.

[170] *Ibid*. 320:8287.

[171] *Ibid*. 320:8286-8287.

it was mainly done for domestic reasons. To the contrary, the Ming may have believed that Chosŏn's enhanced military power could be useful to itself as seen, for example, in the 1467 Ming-Chosŏn joint campaign against the Jianzhou Nuzhen (建洲女眞).

The emphasis on Koguryŏ's military strength certainly expanded the memories of Koguryŏ. Although it was somehow manipulated and proclaimed under the connivance of the Ming, it helped show Koguryŏ through a positive prism that had been denied previously, and now Koguryŏ came to occupy a new position in the understanding of their history. Once its historical meaning had expanded, the Chosŏn literati did not stop with perceiving Koguryŏ for its political and military aspects. With Cheng-zhu Learning dominating Chosŏn throughout the sixteenth century, the literati of Chosŏn found another important cultural value in the historical meaning of Koguryŏ in terms of the lineage of Cheng-zhu Learning.

III. Confucian Ideology and Positioning Koguryŏ

It is obvious that Koguryŏ's military strength now attracted the Confucian literati in the Chosŏn court, and it was even more emphasized through King Sejo's reign in support of his various reformations and to shield him from harsh criticism by purist Cheng-zhu Learning literati who criticized how he had taken the throne. Although not all of the literati supported King Sejo, the affirmative perspective on Koguryŏ was able to become prevalent among literati along with the emphasis on "ours" and its tie to Kija in Korean history. In opposition to Kwŏn Kŭn who had criticized Koguryŏ's performing the sacrificial ceremony to heaven, the Chosŏn literati now strongly argued that Chosŏn should perform its own sacrificial ceremony to heaven, and Yang Sŏng-ji was the leading official at court who argued in support of this argument. In emphasizing the importance of Chosŏn's "own history," Yang proposed that "our" history should be included

in the civil service examinations alongside Chinese history and the king should discuss Korean history with officials.[172] Furthermore, Yang even insisted that the first kings of Koguryŏ and Paekche be included in the memorial ceremony along with Tan'gun, Kija, and the first king of Silla.

Although Tan'gun appeared first in the *Samguk yusa*, he had been somehow ignored in *Korean* history by the Confucian literati and only was mentioned sporadically in literati writings. Yang, however, claimed that Tan'gun was the very first ruler in the history of Chosŏn, followed by Kija, the Three Kingdoms, Koryŏ, and Chosŏn.[173] Yang consistently placed Tan'gun at the beginning of Chosŏn's history throughout his writings.[174] He even proposed to designate Tan'gun-related places as important sites for the country, pointing to places such as Myohyang Mountain (妙香山), Kuwŏl Mountain (九月山), and T'aebaek Mountain (太白山), where Tan'gun's father had first descended to earth, and where shrines for him were located.[175] The emphasis on Tan'gun in the history of Chosŏn during this period was also confirmed by the change in his title. Whereas he was mentioned just as "Duke of Chosŏn" [朝鮮候檀君] or "Tan'gun of Chosŏn" [朝鮮檀君] previously,[176] he was now recorded as "The Founder of

---

[172] *Nulchae chip*, 2:10; 3:30-2. *Sejo sillok*, 33:31 and 40:12.

[173] *Ibid*., 1:26. 論君道十二事 [得民心]. "…則本朝之業直與檀君箕子三國前朝而並美矣…"

[174] *Ibid*., 1:32. 論君道十二事 [儀從本俗]. "…檀君以來設官置州…"; 4:23. 便宜三十二事 [定服色]. "…檀君朝鮮箕子朝鮮以至新羅俱享千年高句麗享七百年百濟六百年前朝王氏亦五百年…"; 4:26. 便宜四事 [正風俗]. "…大東風俗自檀君箕子以來至于前朝極爲淳美逮…"; *Nuljae chip sokp'yon* (訥齋集續編), 1:10. 北方備禦三疏四策 [論賤隷應券]. "…中國自唐堯至大明凡二十六代, 東國自檀君至今纔七代…"; 1:55. 請罷中國置鎭開州疏. "…自檀君與堯幷立歷箕子新羅皆享千年前朝王氏亦享五百…"

[175] *Nulchae chip*, 2:2. 便宜二十四事 [嶽鎭海瀆]. "…至於妙香山檀君所起, 九月山有檀君祠, 太白山神祠所在…"; *Sejo sillok*, 3:25.

[176] *Sejong sillok* (世宗實錄), 49:13. "…檀君神位板書曰朝鮮候檀君之位…依本朝諸祀儀式改書曰朝鮮檀君削候字及之位二字…"

Chosŏn" [朝鮮開國始祖] during King Sejo's reign.[177]

This emphasis on Tan'gun certainly helped Koguryŏ gain recognition in the positive narratives of its history. Since all the sites related to Tan'gun were located in the former territory of Koguryŏ, Koguryŏ had to be considered a legitimate successor in the history of Chosŏn, which began with Tan'gun. In addition, "King Tongmyŏng" was added to the memorial tablet for the founder of Koguryŏ in the shrine where he appeared as 'King Tongmyŏng, the founder of Koguryŏ."[178] Comparing this change to Kwŏn Kŭn's early criticism for performing a ritual ceremony to the Heaven, it is clear that the historical status of Koguryŏ in the mid-fifteenth century was undoubtedly elevated by Chosŏn literati and that Koguryŏ's position in the political lineage of the Chosŏn state was greatly enhanced.

On the other hand, it is worthwhile to pay attention to the way in which Koguryŏ assumed new importance in Korea's cultural heritage due to ties with Kija. Kija was considered by early Chosŏn literati as one of the earliest legitimate rulers in their history and as the man who brought Confucian civilization to Korea. Coincidently, where Kija resided after migrating from China also belonged to the former Koguryŏ territory, and it was Koguryŏ's geographical location that provided a permanent link between Kija and this old kingdom. As a result, Koguryŏ attained the right to be mentioned consistently with Kija. For example, since the shrines for Tan'gun, Kija, and King Tongmyŏng were all located at P'yŏngyang, the old capital of Koguryŏ, they were often repaired at the same time,[179] and memorial ceremonies for them were also performed

[177] *Sejo sillok*, 4:23. "…更定朝鮮檀君神主爲朝鮮始祖檀君之位…"

[178] *Ibid*., 4:23. "…高句麗始祖爲高句麗始祖東明王之位."

[179] *Ibid*., 3:39.

together.[180] Additionally, when the titles of Tan'gun and King Tongmyŏng were changed, that of Kija was amended as well.[181]

The change in the treatment of Koguryŏ was also found in Pak Sang's (朴祥, 1474-1530) *Tongguk saryak (P)*, compiled in the early sixteenth century.[182] It is clear that Silla was still treated favorably in Pak's writing, and affairs of Koguryŏ were not recorded in as much detail as those of Silla in the *Tongguk saryak (P)*. For instance, the enthronement and death of King Kwanggaet'o were recorded briefly with the comment that he was in favor of Buddhism,[183] and Ŭlchi Mundŏk's victory over the Sui army was recorded under the Silla section with an explanation of Silla's dispatching of an envoy to the Sui in order to ask them to attack Koguryŏ, which led to the failed military campaign by the Sui emperor.[184] Despite his limited explanation about the historical events of Koguryŏ, it is apparent that Pak Sang viewed Koguryŏ differently than Kwŏn Kŭn. Although Pak also still introduced Silla first out of the Three Kingdoms, he recorded the affairs of Koguryŏ under its own section just like Silla, instead of adding them in a note at the end of the explanation of Silla. In Kwŏn's *Tongguk saryak* written about hundred years earlier, Silla was not specified in the text because it was written according to a Silla-centered structure meanwhile the term "Koguryŏ" and "Paekche" appeared only in notes about

[180] *Ibid*., 22:10.

[181] *Ibid*. 4:23. "…後朝鮮始祖箕子爲後朝鮮始祖箕子之位…"

[182] Interestingly, Pak's *Tongguk saryak* was included in the *Siku quanshu* (四庫全書) without his name as an author.

[183] *Tongguk saryak (P)*, 1:10. "…太子談德立 [大元十七年] 是爲廣開土王." ,"王談德薨. 王嘗下令崇佛求福立國社修宗廟 [在位二十二年]…"

[184] *Ibid*., 1:15. "新羅: 遣使如隋 [煬帝大業八年] 請師討高勾麗許之. 帝親御師進至遼東麗兵阻水拒守, 命宇文愷…文德資質沉鷙有智數兼解屬文." Ŭlchi Mundŏk was mentioned one more time in a note on King Yŏngyang's reign at the end volume one where summarizing the genealogy of Koguryŏ kings. (*Ibid*., 1:25. "不有文德之應變…則國之存亡未可知也.")

them. This is evidence that Koguryŏ's historical status had been lifted enough for Pak to treat Silla, Koguryŏ, and Paekche as fairly equal compared to the earlier period when Kwŏn Kŭn compiled the *Tongguk saryak*.

What caused these subtle changes in the perception and treatment of Koguryŏ? It seems that the strong influence of the Cheng-zhu Learning tradition offered room for re-evaluating Koguryŏ in the sixteenth century. As a Cheng-zhu Learning scholar, Pak praised Chŏng Mong-ju for his loyalty to Koryŏ, while criticizing harshly the early Chosŏn literati who had contributed to the establishment of the Chosŏn dynasty, including Chŏng To-jŏn, Cho Chun, and Nam Ŭn (南誾, 1354-1398) for their behavior and origins.[185]

The issue of ethnic lineage also reappears in early Chosŏn in the views on its relationship with Mahan. Disagreeing with Ch'oe Ch'i-wŏn, who had matched Mahan to Koguryŏ in his writings, Kwŏn Kŭn had argued previously that Mahan, a descendant of Kija Chosŏn, had been located in the old Paekche territory, while matching Koguryŏ to Pyŏnhan in his *Tongguk saryak*. Kwŏn's view on the Three Hans reflected his downplaying of Koguryŏ in his Korean history. In the *P'yoje ŭmju Tongguk saryak* by Yu Hŭi-ryŏng, however, Koguryŏ was again matched to Mahan while Pyŏnhan and Chinhan were correlated with Paekche and Silla, respectively.[186] Interestingly, though, Yu recorded it was Pyŏnhan rather than Mahan that related to Kija Chosŏn. According to Yu, Kijun (箕準, Ch. Jizhun), a descendant of Kija moved to the Iksan (益山) area, then formed Pyŏnhan whereas it was not clear who established Mahan, which was located in P'yŏngan province.[187] This is a quite a surprising theory because it possibly limited the historical

[185] *Ibid*., 6:28-30.

[186] *P'yoje ŭmju Tongguk saryak*, 1:53-54.

[187] *Ibid*., 1:53.

importance of Kija Chosŏn by matching it to Pyŏnhan, which is considered inferior to Mahan in Korean history.[188] Although Yu mainly connected Kija to Pyŏnhan, he did not exclude a possible tie between Kija and Koguryŏ by writing that Kija's tomb was located at P'yŏngyang,[189] and Yu also mentioned the tie between Tan'gun and Koguryŏ. Tan'gun's tomb was located in former Koguryŏ territory as well, and the new capital to which Tan'gun Chosŏn moved when facing Kija's immigration was also inside the old Koguryŏ territory.[190] In other words, the connection between Koguryŏ and Tan'gun/Kija was still apparent in terms of its geographical location if Yu linked Kija to Pyŏnhan through the relocation of Kijun. It is not clear how Yu's claim was received among Chosŏn literati after it was published, and it is uncertain either whether his argument about the Samhan was prevalent during this period. His expanded records on Koguryŏ, with those of Tan'gun and Kija, clearly indicate that Koguryŏ was by no means a marginal subject in the history of Chosŏn. What is significant here is that neither Kwŏn nor Yu expressed any doubt Koguryŏ as one of the Samhan entities, a marker that continued to be used as a symbol of a larger collective identity than transcended individual kingdoms or dynasties.

Conclusion

It was not easy for Chosŏn to claim the historical importance of Koguryŏ even though the latter was obviously considered to be a part of the Samhan. As suggested by Halbwachs, it is society that is most influential on the (re)construction of collective memory, and there was not enough room to emphasize Koguryŏ memories in early Chosŏn society, when building a close relationship with the Ming was the most urgent issue. It does not, however, mean that Koguryŏ

[188] Han Yŏng-u, *Chosŏn hugi sahaksa yŏn'gu* (Study of Historiography in Late Chosŏn) (Seoul: Ilchisa, 1989), 245.

[189] *P'yoje ŭmju Tongguk saryak*, 1:51.

[190] *Ibid*., 1:49.

was discarded in Korean history by any means. The literati still considered it a part of Korean history, and their recognition of this had never been challenged. Although various tensions between the Ming dynasty and Chosŏn consistently kept the latter from representing Koguryŏ as a proud predecessor in their history, once Chosŏn was confident of maintaining a peaceful relationship with Ming, and the Ming was convinced that Chosŏn would not cause any serious problems even amidst the surge of new emphasis on Koguryŏ, Koguryŏ's military strength became attractive to not only kings but also the Chosŏn literati throughout the sixteenth century. Now, in light of the changes in the social environment, Koguryŏ was presented very affirmatively in historical documents and other literati writings, and various memorials presented during King Sejo's reign evince the change in dealing with Koguryŏ in the mid-fifteenth century. This change, however, would have not been possible without the normalizing of the relationship with Ming, and Chosŏn inevitably had to give up any possible campaign to reclaim the physical territory of Koguryŏ.

This renaissance of Koguryŏ memory was mainly used to support the internal reformation of Chosŏn rather than stretch outside. King Sejo's lack of knowledge about the first king of Koguryŏ while recalling Koguryŏ's military strength hints at how Koguryŏ's memory played out during the fifteenth century.[191] In contrast to the earlier period when international factors had mostly made influence on the emergence of Koguryŏ memories, some domestic issues such as the series of reformations by King Sejo also contributed to the redirection of Korguryŏ memories, along with other external causes such as the conflicts with the Jurchens who were gaining power in the north. King Sejo's efforts to establish strong control over politics and *society* consequently focused on military policy, which brought Koguryŏ back to the fore so that

[191] *Sejo sillok*, 22:10. "…問承旨洪應曰高(句)麗始祖誰, 應對曰高朱蒙. 上曰三國高句麗莫强焉."

it could not be easily ignored by the Cheng-zhu Learning literati in the sixteenth century.

Chosŏn literati had been consistently aware of Koguryŏ in their history, and were able to find another way to connect Koguryŏ as Cheng-zhu Learning gradually gained a hegemonic position through the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Because the Kija tradition was necessarily emphasized in Cheng-zhu Learning, Koguryŏ, due to its geographical ties with Tan'gun and Kija Chosŏn, was also more often highlighted. Memorial ceremonies for King Tongmyŏng were often performed together with those for Tan'gun and Kija, and their titles were changed, evincing the changed perspectives on Koguryŏ along with different social circumstances. When Chosŏn had to be more concern with building a close relationship with Ming, Chosŏn literati's memory of Koguryŏ mainly appeared in the structure of Confucian frame and this was why they expressed harsh criticism on King Kwangaet'o's achievement. As Chosŏn tried to look for subjectivity in history, they were able to find some features in Koguryŏ which were linkable with Tan'gun and Kija. Although their argument was still limited to Confucian perspective, it certainly helped *so chunghwa* (last bastion of Confucian civilization) discourse emerge as Chosŏn literati pondered over their identity after the seventeenth century.

It is obvious that the views on Koguryŏ and its memories were portrayed differently depending on the political/social situation in Chosŏn from the late-fourteenth through the mid-fifteenth century. Not only international but also domestic issues were closely related to the recollection of this old kingdom. What is most important in terms of Koguryŏ memories is that Koguryŏ was consistently discussed and considered in terms of "*our*" past by the Chosŏn literati regardless of when they lived. Whether the society to which they belonged pushed them to remember it negatively or not, Koguryŏ certainly remained in their memories, and this in turn made it possible for this ancient kingdom to survive even in modern Korean memories.

Chapter Four

The Emergence of New Intellectual Trends and the Rise of Interest in "Northern" States

Introduction

From the late sixteenth century through the mid-seventeenth century, Chosŏn suffered from a series of foreign invasions by Japan from the south and by the Jurchens (Manchus) from the north. The consequence of suffering foreign invasions necessarily caused huge changes in various spheres of Chosŏn society and culture. While the visual damage from the series of wars was apparent, Chosŏn literati had to deal with more fundamental changes that cast serious doubt on their ideology, which was based on Sinocentric Confucianism. Until the early seventeenth century, Chosŏn literati had considered the Ming to be at the center of the civilized world, and Ming's position as the ultimate paragon of the ideal state had not been seriously challenged since it replaced the Yuan in the fourteenth century. Being an adjacent neighbor, Chosŏn was trying hard to maintain a close relationship with the Ming, and Chosŏn literati, despite their reservations about the popularity of Wang Yangming Learning, envisioned it as the home of Cheng-zhu Learning.

The political situation in East Asia, however, changed significantly at the turn of the seventeenth century, and Chosŏn was located at the center of this change. While facing the Imjin War in 1592, Chosŏn urgently asked for help from the Ming, and the Ming became involved in the war between Chosŏn and Japan by sending troops to Chosŏn. The consequence of this long

war, which lasted for six years, was huge, not just in Chosŏn and Japan, but also in Ming China. In Japan, the Tokugawa *bakufu* (幕府) was established after the war, and the Ming's decline on the continent was hastened by its participation in this war. Chosŏn also had to recover from the war, which had severely destroyed the socio-economic infrastructure. Furthermore, Chosŏn literati had to find a new way to perceive the *chunghwa* (中華, Ch. *zhonghua*), meaning the civilized center. After witnessing the weakness of the Ming throughout the war against Japan and its eventual fall followed by the rise of the Manchus, which was symbolized by the Qing's replacement of the Ming in China, the Chosŏn literati began seriously questioning the traditional world order and rethinking their new neighbor to the north.

The realization of the new world order was entwined with the debate regarding *so chunghwa* (小中華), literally meaning "small center of civilization" discourse in which literati argued that Chosŏn should be "the last bastion" of the Confucian world after the Ming were replaced by the barbaric Jurchen (Manchu). Under this complicated political situation, the perspectives of Chosŏn literati on Koguryŏ necessarily appeared more diverse, and the introduction of Yangming Learning also had some influence on the recollection of Koguryŏ and the development of reform Confucian thought (the so-called Practical Learning) in eighteenth-century Chosŏn.

In this chapter, I will give an overview of the political situation from the late sixteenth century through the eighteenth century and then review the discourse of "the last bastion" based on the claim of *so chunghwa*. Chosŏn suffered from Qing invasions twice and officially surrendered after its second invasion in 1637. Because Qing was originally considered barbarian by the Chosŏn literati and located in former Koguryŏ territory, it is worthwhile to take a look at the role the *so chunghwa* discourse played in the development of memories about Koguryŏ

among Chosŏn literati. I will also analyze the relationship between the development of historical consciousness and the rise of *kukhak* (國學), "national learning," during the eighteenth century. Having been introduced and discussed by some Chosŏn literati, Yangming Learning helped some Chosŏn literati express different views on the Qing, as held by the Jurchen. Literati with better knowledge of the Qing and Practical Learning preferred to discuss Koguryŏ in terms of the verification of statements in historical documents instead of just presenting previous comments about this ancient kingdom, and memories of Koguryŏ were also discussed and illuminated while national learning was flourishing in this period. Therefore, the analysis of the relationship between the new trend and the Chosŏn literati's historical consciousness will help us understand the development of a new perspective on Koguryŏ through the eighteenth century.

I. The Emergence of *Chaejojiŭn* (再造之恩) Discourse and Its Consequences

The Imjin War made a huge impact on every aspect of Chosŏn society. Because Chosŏn managed to keep itself from any serious conflict with neighbors for a couple of centuries after 1392, national defense was not discussed seriously among literati before the Imjin War.[192] Although some struggles with the Jurchen and *wako* [倭寇] from the north and south respectively were reported occasionally, Chosŏn did not have to worry much about foreign relations once they had normalized their relationship with the Ming in the fifteenth century. Facing a massive attack from Japan without solid preparation for war,[193] there was not much that Chosŏn could do

[192] There were some concerns in the Chosŏn court before 1592 about the possibility of Japan's invasion. Chosŏn officials, however, tried not to cause much fear in society by ignoring an envoy's report that predicted a war in the near future. See *Sŏnjo sujŏng sillok* (宣祖修正實錄), 25:2-3.

[193] Chosŏn's unawareness of the imminent war with Japan is also revealed in the response of the first official of Chosŏn who witnessed the Japanese approaching the Chosŏn coast. The assistant surveillance commissioner [僉使] of Pusan (釜山) even thought that Japan was coming to pay tribute when he was informed of their approach. See *Sŏnjo sillok* (宣祖實錄), 26:1.

to defend itself, and one of its first responses was to look for help from the Ming, who they strongly believed would be willing to fight together against a common enemy.

Although there were some small victories by the Chosŏn army, Japan was able to keep marching toward Hanyang (漢陽), the capital of Chosŏn, without facing any serious resistance from Chosŏn. While the king, royal family, and main officials retreated close to the border with the Ming, Chosŏn urgently sought help from the Ming for the fight against Japan on the peninsula. Simultaneously subjected to *wako* raids in the south as well, the Ming carefully monitored how the war between Chosŏn and Japan was developing on the peninsula and sent 3,000 troops in the sixth month of 1592 to help Chosŏn.[194] Chosŏn and the Ming, however, showed a great difference in their views of the Ming's involvement in this war. Chosŏn basically assumed the Ming would participate because Chosŏn believed it was fighting on behalf of the Ming. When Japan ha early requested Chosŏn's participation in an invasion of the Ming in 1591, Chosŏn even sent an envoy to the Ming to inform them of a possible attack from Japan.[195] When the Japanese army finally arrived at Pusan (釜山) a few months later, they first asked Chosŏn for permission to use the road to Liaodong.[196] Chosŏn, however, chose to fight against Japan after declining Japan's proposal that they merely would pass through Chosŏn in order to attack the Ming. Meanwhile, insisting that that they were fighting against Japan for Chosŏn's favor, Ming showed its displeasure toward Chosŏn where the king and officials insisted that Chosŏn had been attacked first and was suffering even though Japan's ultimate target was the Ming.[197] In spite of

[194] *Sŏnjo sujŏng sillok*, 26:25.

[195] *Sŏnjo sillok*, 25:13-14. Although it informed Ming of Japan's plan to attack, Chosŏn did not mention sending its officials to Japan in order to avoid Ming's suspicion.

[196] On their arrival at Pusan, Japan insisted that their goal was to invade Ming, not to attack Chosŏn. *Sŏnjo sillok*, 28:1. "…日本於貴國, 無纖芥之恨. 只要犯中國者也…"

[197] *Ibid*., 34:4.

the Ming's response warning Chosŏn not to take its help for granted, the Chosŏn officials did not change their views on this war. From an early stage of the war, Chosŏn officials had usually compared the relationship between Chosŏn and the Ming to that between son and father. When meeting Japanese generals in the sixth month of 1592, Yi Tŏk-hyŏng (李德馨, 1561-1613) refuted the Japanese argument that they would just have marched to the Ming without causing any trouble if Chosŏn had accepted their proposal, retorting that Chosŏn would choose to perish rather than to allow Japan to invade its father state.[198] As long as Chosŏn believed that they and the Ming were maintaining a son-father relationship and that the son was fighting to protect his father, they felt sure that the father would help his own son.

A fundamental difference of view on the reason for the Ming's involvement necessarily resulted in a conflict between Chosŏn and the Ming, especially regarding the talks with Japan to end the war and resume peace with Chosŏn. Basically, the Ming were very reluctant to keep fighting against Japan and their main concern was to make sure that Japan would not invade the Ming.[199] In contrast to the Ming, Chosŏn was consistently showing its will to fight against Japan until it completely pulled out its armies without conditions. Although Chosŏn was the one that had suffered the most throughout the war, and its territory was the battlefield of this war, there was not much room for Chosŏn to participate in the peace talks to end the war. Chosŏn was heavily dependent on the Ming during the war. King Sŏnjo (宣祖, 1552-1608; r. 1567-1608) and high-ranking officials considered the Ming to be their only hope for survival.[200] In addition to the

---

[198] *Hanŭm mun'go* (漢陰文稿), 附錄, 1:13. "…爾欲犯我父母之邦, 而脅我假道. 國可亡道不可借…"

[199] The Ming's hope to end the war without causing any more tension with Japan was revealed on various occasions. For example, the Ming once talked with Japan directly without Chosŏn's presence, and the Ming also ordered Chosŏn not to attack Japan without the Ming's approval. As Chosŏn did not agree to the Ming's request, a Ming general even threatened to withdraw the Ming armies. *Sŏnjo sillok*, 37:33-34.

[200] *Sŏnjo sillok*, 42:20. "…所恃者天兵而天兵撤回, 國勢岌岌…"

different perspectives on the war, what made King Sŏnjo more concerned about the relationship with the Ming was the Ming's constant doubt about Chosŏn's position and his capability as king. Inside the Ming court, there was serious doubt about King Sŏnjo's ability to hold onto the throne. Some Ming officials officially mentioned the possibility of his abdication and succession by the Crown Prince. Not only the officials inside the Ming court, but also other Ming officials traveling to Chosŏn openly blamed King Sŏnjo and the Chosŏn officials as the main reason for the disaster Chosŏn was undergoing.[201] Although some Ming officials were blaming King Sŏnjo and his fondness of mundane affairs as reasons for the war, he had no choice but to submit tamely to insults and appeal to the Ming, especially after retreating with other officials to Ŭiju (義州), located at the Chosŏn-Ming border.[202]

It is worthwhile to note that Koguryŏ was mentioned in a Ming official's report to the emperor that criticized King Sŏnjo. It stated that Chosŏn, having secretly allied with Japan, planned early to occupy Liaodong because this region was fertile, and most importantly, belonged to the old Koguryŏ territory. It was apparent, according to this report, that Chosŏn

[201] Han Myŏng-gi, *Imjin oeran kwa hanjung kwan'gye* (A Study on the Relations between Korea and China from the Japanese Invasion of Korea in 1592 to the Manchu Invasion of Korea in 1636) (Seoul: Yŏksa pip'yŏngsa, 1999), 57-61.

[202] It is worthwhile to note the Chosŏn people's response to the royal flight. During his flight to Ŭiju, King Sŏnjo witnessed many people criticizing him and other high-ranking officials for the chaos, and they even helped Japanese troops by offering geographical information about their towns. Although various attempts by the Japanese to calm people with promises not to harm them, but rather save them from a harsh burden, were some of the reasons for the Chosŏn people's reaction to the royal flight, it must have been too much of a shock to the ruling class, especially King Sŏnjo himself. Furthermore, it was not just the common people who criticized and turned their backs on King Sŏnjo. When King Sŏnjo was leaving Hanyang, many high-ranking officials did not accompany him, believing Chosŏn would be defeated. Because many officials deserted the royal entourage, the number of officials who had remained with King Sŏnjo by the time they arrived at Yongch'ŏn (龍川) numbered only in the tens. Similarly, only about ten people accompanied the Crown Prince on his flight. (*Sŏnjo sillok*, 27:13. "…初上之出京都也, 不但士庶皆言國勢必不復振有識縉紳輩亦以爲終必滅亡. 朝臣扈從者百無一二…是時扈從通文武不滿數十人, 從世子者亦不滿十餘人云.)

would have attacked the Ming on the basis of irredentism.[203] The Ming's doubt about Chosŏn's interest in Liaodong in the middle of the war increased due to King Sŏnjo's request for permission to escape to that region. Previously, King Sŏnjo had already expressed his willingness to escape to Liaodong if necessary,[204] and it left the Ming concerned that the issue of Liaodong would resurface as it had in the fifteenth century even though Chosŏn had not mentioned Koguryŏ explicitly in its request to flee to this region.

It is also very interesting that King Sŏnjo was changing his view on the Ming's involvement in this war against Japan. As stated above, King Sŏnjo initially seemed to take for granted the aid from the Ming, including military support, because he strongly believed that Chosŏn was fighting Japan on behalf of the Ming. As the war developed though, it became obvious that King Sŏnjo desperately depended on the Ming's force, and especially after seeing that people were turning back on him, King Sŏnjo became more desperate for the Ming's commitment.[205] When he realized that there was serious doubt about him within the Ming court and that he was facing charges launched by Ming officials, King Sŏnjo even tried to boycott his royal duties, stating that he had lost the trust of the Ming emperor, the mediator between him and heaven.[206]

---

[203] *Sŏnjo sillok*, 104:16. "…屬藩奸有據, 賊黨朋謀已彰事…此膏腴地收穫數倍西土. 先年朝鮮與遼民爭訟之, 都事屢經斷案, 鮮人不平, 萬曆二十年遂令彼國世居倭戶, 往招諸島倭奴起兵同犯天朝, 奪取遼河以東恢復高麗舊土…"

[204] King Sŏnjo sent a message to the Ming that he would escape to Liaodong and look for shelter if the situation kept getting worse. The Ming showed its unwillingness to consent to King Sŏnjo's request, limiting the number of people who could accompany King Sŏnjo. (*Sŏnjo sillok*, 28:15. "先是我國以內附之意移咨中朝. 至是兵部咨問遼東都司, 有云…萬一該國危急固奔情難盡拒. 宜俯念恭順有年勅令容納亦須酌量名數無過百人…")

[205] While they were fleeing, people even threw stones at the royal family, and even high-ranking officials were attacked by groups of angry people.

[206] King Sŏnjo was desperate to prove his innocence to the Ming court. In spite of a series of memorials to persuade him to come back in the midst of a national crisis, it took about a week for him to agree to appear at court. Regarding the conflict between Ming officials and King Sŏnjo during the last stage of the war, see Gary Ledyard, "Confucianism and War: The Korean Security Crisis of 1598," *The Journal of Korean Studies* 6 (1988-89): 81-119.

The attitude that King Sŏnjo and Chosŏn officials had toward the Ming during and after the Imjin War is symbolized by a term, *chaejojiŭn* meaning "benevolence of re-securing the monarchy."[207] Yi Tŏk-hyŏng first used this term to explain Chosŏn's situation during the Imjin War. In his report to King Sŏnjo, Yi explained that he tried to persuade the Ming general to keep fighting against Japan all the way to the south by reminding him of their benevolent work to save Chosŏn.[208] In a letter to the Ming envoy, King Sŏnjo and the Chosŏn officials kept saying that they would never forget or ignore what the Ming had done for Chosŏn.[209] Although it is clear that King Sŏnjo and Chosŏn officials mentioned the benevolence of the Ming at this early stage of the war,[210] it was really after the war ended that Chosŏn truly positioned itself as the beneficiary of the relationship with the Ming. In 1599, King Sŏnjo himself wrote *chaejobonbang* (再造蕃邦, "re-secured subject state") on a wooden tablet for the shrine of Xing Jie (邢玠, fl. late sixteenth century),[211] and Chosŏn even performed ritual ceremonies twice a year, in spring and

---

[207] *Chaejojiŭn* does not necessarily mean the re-securing of the monarchy. It is also used between the emperor/king and his subjects. For example, if the king forgives or pardons his subjects, those who were pardoned often showed their appreciation and loyalty by referring to *chaejojiŭn*. Regarding the development of *chaejojiŭn* during the Japanese Invasion, see Han Myŏng-gi, *Imjin waeran kwa Han-Chung kwan'gye*, 67-88.

[208] *Sŏnjo sillok*, 42:13. "…若極陳天朝再造之恩及提督之功德, 其辭若陳謝者然終及南方賊情…"

[209] *Ibid*., 45:33. "…以自趨於覆亡之域辜負再造之恩哉…"

[210] Regardless of their different viewpoints on the war, it is apparent that both King Sŏnjo and the officials of Chosŏn heavily depended on the Ming during the war. King Sŏnjo once claimed that the official who should get the most credit for an early victory against Japan was the one who went to the Ming with a letter of asking for military support. *Sŏnjo sillok*, 42:12. "…及鄭崐壽承命敷奏至誠專對. 今日恢復之功專在於崐壽, 前雖加資不可止此. 予今當退鄭崐壽可授正一品之職…" In addition, the Chosŏn literati also suggested King Sŏnjo express their appreciation to the Ming. After the Ming defeated Japan at P'yŏngyang in the first month of 1593, King Sŏnjo allowed the building of a shrine to remember the Ming general just a month after the victory, even though he was still alive, as a means of attributing Chosŏn's survival to the Ming's engagement. *Sŏnjo sujŏng sillok*, 27:18. "…上命建祠于平壤, 祀石星及如松而以如柏張世爵楊元配, 賜額武烈."; *Sŏnjo sillok*, 35:2. "備邊司請以李提督立碑畫像生祠事, 令都監堂上中專掌爲之. 上允之."

[211] *Ibid*., 118:5. "…以御書再造蕃邦四大字…摹寫以陽字刻板懸于邢軍門生祠堂楣間…"; *Injo sillok* (仁祖實錄), 34:59 - 60. "…宣武祠乃宣祖朝所建也. 宣祖以御筆書再造蕃邦四字揭之祠宇…"

fall, to remember five Ming officials, including Li Rusong (李如松, 1549-1598).[212] Consequently, after the war, King Sŏnjo publicly attributed Chosŏn's victory to the Ming's assistance.[213]

The strong pro-Ming attitude stance of King Sŏnjo and the Chosŏn literati allowed no room for their state to adjust to another dynastic change in China. In 1621, the first emperor of Qing[214] sent a letter to Chosŏn in which he pointed out that Liaodong had originally belonged to Chosŏn, and that the (Chosŏn) people in this region had been discriminated against by the Ming.[215] Although it is likely that the Qing's main goal was to keep Chosŏn from assisting the Ming by building a solid relationship with them before launching a massive attack on the Ming, it is worthwhile to note that Qing mentioned Liaodong in order to persuade Chosŏn. It implies that there was some sense of closeness to Chosŏn among the Jurchen and possible memories of Koguryŏ remaining in that region seemed to be recognized by Qing. Although King Kwanghaegun (光海君, 1575-1641; r. 1608-1623) was certainly aware of the dynamics of political change in China and recognized the necessity of developing a relationship with his "powerful barbaric neighbor state,"[216] many literati officials in Chosŏn were not, however, willing to develop any relationship with the newly rising Qing because the strong legacy of their

---

[212] *Sŏnjo sillok*, 117:2. "…今考李提督[如松]生祠堂節目, 則每年春秋仲月中行祭…"

[213] *Hosŏng sŏnmu ch'ŏngnan kongsin togam ŭigye* (扈聖宣武淸難功臣都監儀軌), 5. "…今次平賊之事專由天兵…"

[214] Later Jin (後金) was the name of the state established by the Jurchen in this period. It was in 1636 that they changed their name to Qing.

[215] *Manwen laodang* (滿文老檔) (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 中華書局, 1990), 1:217. "…又聞遼東之地原屬爾朝鮮, 後爲明奪取之. 賤朝鮮人甚於其漢民養之若家奴也…"

[216] *Kwanghaegun ilgi* (光海君日記), 166:1. "…高談大言能遏滔天之兇鋒乎. 鐵騎蹂躪之日其可以談鋒擊之乎. 筆翰衝之乎…"

pro-Ming policy had become even more consolidated throughout the war. The replacement of King Kwanghaegun who had been carefully straddling the fence between the Ming and the Manchus, by the strongly anti-Manchu King Injo (仁祖, 1595-1649; r. 1623-1649) was a major event, proving Chosŏn literati's strong belief in the "civilized center" during the transition from Ming to the Qing.

Literati who actively participated in the ascendancy of King Injo mostly belonged to the "Westerners" (*sŏin*, 西人) who were the most philosophically conservative on Cheng-zhu Learning,[217] and they hardly agreed with King Kwanghaegun's foreign policy. After seizing political power for King Injo, the Westerners publicly revealed their anti-Qing perspective, and it eventually led to a series of Qing invasions in 1627 and 1636. It was quite a change for the Qing, considering that in 1621 it had expressed a willingness to maintain good relations with Chosŏn by reminding the Chosŏn court of Chosŏn's historical sovereignty over Liaodong. Consequently, the frame for the discussion of Liaodong and the history surrounding this region was quickly transformed again, along with political changes both inside and outside Chosŏn.

Typically, nostalgia for a powerful state tends to be emphasized and brought out when a state faces imminent crisis or is put under outside pressure. Although Chosŏn was devastated by a series of foreign invasions from the late sixteenth century through the 1630s, Koguryŏ, however, did not appear in stereotyped fashion as a proud part of Chosŏn's glorious history. There had been something more important for the Chosŏn literati who favored Cheng-zhu

[217] The mother of King Kwanghaegun was a concubine of King Sŏnjo, not a legitimate queen. King Sŏnjo hurried to designate his successor because of the Japanese Invasion. The situation, however, suddenly changed after the war was over and Prince Yŏngch'ang (永昌大君, 1606-1614) was born to Queen Dowager Inmok (仁穆大妃, 1584-1632), who was officially married to King Sŏnjo. Prince Yŏngch'ang was exiled to Kanghwa Island (江華島) and killed when a plan by some officials to make him the king was revealed. This incident became one of the main excuses for the Westerners to dethrone King Kwanghaegun.

Learning to remember about Koguryŏ, even in the face of external pressure, and the shadow cast by the notion of *chaejojiŭn* (gratitude to the Ming) within the Chosŏn court arguably kept the memories of Koguryŏ from vitalizing due to its military strength, which had just started to be emphasized after Chosŏn normalized its relationship with the Ming, and not any earlier. Certainly, the Sinocentric Confucian perspective intensified throughout Chosŏn's war against Japan and had a great influence on various aspects of Chosŏn society, and this consequently resulted in its claim to be the "last bastion" of Confucianism among the Neo-Confucian literati of Chosŏn. Ironically though, new ideas advocated by some Neo-Confucian literati who had started questioning Cheng-zhu Learning provided a different framework for the discussion of Koguryŏ. Although they also agreed with the prevailing group of Cheng-zhu Learning literati in terms of their state's holy mission as the "last bastion," their arguments indeed expanded the range of discussion of their own history. The most important characteristic in their awakening appears in their perspective on Korean history, especially Koguryŏ. It is worthwhile, therefore, to examine how Chosŏn literati's mindset as the "last bastion" after the seventeenth century influenced the historical consciousness in their writings, and more importantly, how the memories of Koguryŏ developed in the early framework of their *collective memory* as new ideas in Neo-Confucianism came about.

II. The Rise of Questions in the Realm of the "Last Bastion"

Since helping King Injo to take the throne in 1623, literati from the Westerner faction occupied many positions in the Chosŏn court, and Chosŏn's foreign policy was strongly influenced by them in a pro-Ming direction. This shift in Chosŏn politics obviously incited Qing and eventually led to their invasion. Although there were those looking for peace by building

diplomatic ties with the Qing, Chosŏn's atmosphere was strongly imbued with Confucian ideology under the Western faction, which did not leave much room for people who held different views. Despite their determination to fight the northern "barbarians," Chosŏn had no choice but to admit the reality that these barbarians from the north were much stronger and to accept their demands, as a result of which Chosŏn became first a younger-brother state and then a subject state of the Qing.[218] Their view of world order as based on a "civilized center," symbolized as *chunghwa*, did not change much until the eighteenth century. Even after experiencing a harsh defeat, Chosŏn literati were not quite ready to abandon their old perspective. Instead, they were looking for an opportunity to avenge and redeem themselves. It is interesting to see how in this context they thought about Koguryŏ and how they recalled this ancient kingdom, all while a new perspective arose during this period. Because the much of old territory of Koguryŏ had been under Ming control, it was very unlikely for them to argue a historical claim on Koguryŏ until after the Ming's fall in the mid-seventeenth century. After the Ming-Qing transition, when the Qing had become the sole regime in mainland China, Koguryŏ was mentioned more often by Chosŏn literati. As a result of this dynastic transition, the old Koguryŏ territory now belonged to the barbarian regime, and the memories of Koguryŏ then were able to offer Chosŏn literati a useful tool for their argument as the "last bastion" in a world violated by barbarians.

Song Si-yŏl (宋時烈, 1607-1689), one of the most influential figures among the Chosŏn literati in the seventeenth century, most ardently argued Chosŏn's cultural superiority to its neighbors. Since witnessing King Injo's surrender to the Qing in 1637, Song consistently showed

[218] Chosŏn was able to finish the first war with the Manchus in 1627 by agreeing to treat them as its older-brother state. The second invasion of the Manchus in 1636, however, did not end until Chosŏn accepted the Qing's demand to designate Chosŏn as a subject state of the Qing.

an anti-Qing attitude and is believed to have participated in the so-called northern expedition project planned during King Hyojong's (孝宗, 1619-1659; r. 1649-1659) reign.[219] Song was a private tutor of King Hyojong when he was still the crown prince, and was recalled to various positions after King Hyojong became king. It is not hard to find strong feelings against the Qing in Song's writings. He kept arguing that Chosŏn should inherit the noble tradition left by the Ming and quell the barbarians. It was a sacred mission for him to revere the Ming and eliminate the Qing. Pointing out that Ming had once helped Chosŏn during the Japanese Invasion, Song strongly insisted that it should not be acceptable to co-exist with the Qing.[220]

Interestingly though, his comments on Koguryŏ are very limited in his writings, unlike his anti-Qing discourse. Even in his limited comments on Koguryŏ, what he actually tried to do was to point to the moral ethics emphasized in Neo-Confucian propaganda. His thoughts on Koguryŏ are revealed in his response to an official who asked Song's opinion on building a shrine for Ŭlchi Mundŏk in P'yŏngyang.[221] According to Song, Koguryŏ's victory over Sui was very important in history because it exemplified the realization of the Confucian teaching of the virtues mandated by heaven. Song argued that although it would have been very wrong to attack the superior state, Sui was supposed to perish because it had not been virtuous at all and its emperor was a villain who kept violating Confucian values. Therefore, Koguryŏ had

[219] It is questionable if Song completely agreed to King Hyojong's military plan against the Qing. But it is apparent that King Hyojong had a special relationship with Song. Within a week after becoming king, King Hyojong invited key literati to the palace to seek their advice. In his order, King Hyojong specifically mentioned Song, pointing out that Song used be his tutor when he was still the crown prince. (*Hyojong sillok* (孝宗實錄), 1:2. "…況宋時烈舊時師傅惓惓之懷誠切于中…") Additionally, King Hyojong met Song alone to discuss something important, after ordering all the other officials including the royal secretary, the historians and even the eunuchs to leave, which was very unusual in the court. (*Hyojong sillok*, 21:15. "…上謂承旨李慶億曰今日則承旨先出. 上又命史官及宦寺竝退去而時烈獨入侍. 外廷之臣不知所達何事.")

[220] *Songja taejŏn* (宋子大全), 5:27-8. "…日月所照霜露所墜凡有性命之倫莫不有不共戴之義矣…"

[221] *Ibid*., 142:12-14. 平壤府乙支公祠宇記.

accomplished a very important task in punishing the Sui for violating Confucian ethics. In other words, it was more important from Song's perspective to shield and maintain Confucian values than to save his own state from foreign invasion. Evaluation of past history, including Koguryŏ, by Confucian standards seems to have been accepted widely by the Chosŏn literati. A highly educated Cheng-zhu Learning literatus, Cho Hŏn (趙憲, 1544-1592), organized a righteous army (ŭibyŏng, 義兵) during the Imjin War and eventually died while battling the Japanese army in 1592. In his memorial to King Sŏnjo in 1591, Cho stated that unless the Ming realized Japan's plan while Chosŏn did not report their intention, the Ming would charge Chosŏn as the Tang had punished Koguryŏ for the *crime* they committed.[222] Although he wrote this memorial in order to remind King Sŏnjo of a possible disaster caused by the misunderstanding between the Ming and Chosŏn, it would seem that Cho considered Koguryŏ's resistance against Tang a "wrongdoing," at least for rhetorical purpose.[223]

Besides the note above, Song also reminded King Hyojong during their private conversation that Koguryŏ had defeated the Sui and Tang despite the fact that it was only one-third of Chosŏn in terms of size.[224] Song, however, again did not mention anything in detail about how Koguryŏ had managed to defeat the large forces of the Sui and Tang, or who had led these historic victories of Koguryŏ over the two different Chinese empires. This probably reflected Song's dilemma in which his respect for the Confucian empire collided with his pride

---

[222] *Sŏnjo sujŏng sillok*, 25:5 and *Songja taejŏn*, 207:39. "…天朝不悟其姦盛發唐朝之怒, 則當有李勣蘇定方之師來問濟麗之罪矣…"

[223] This was not the only occasion for Cho to mention either Koguryŏ by the Three Kingdom period. He earlier suggested King Sŏnjo recruit persons fairly from different regions as had been done in the Three Kingdoms. (*Songja taejŏn*, 207:16. "…昔三國雖小所以各能保邦者以其用人之無無間也…")

[224] *Songja taejŏn*, 5:31. "…然高句麗以我國三分之一, 摧却隋唐百萬之衆. 且以唐太宗之英雄困於安市…" Song obviously did not share modern notions of the expansive territory controlled by Koguryŏ.

in a glorious past. Between these two aspects, Song certainly granted more importance to the former, and the true pride of Chosŏn's past in the history of Koguryŏ was Koguryŏ's role as a savior of Confucian ethics from such a terrible violator as Emperor Yangdi of Sui.

This kind of view of Koguryŏ through the prism of Confucian discourse was not just limited to Song Si-yŏl. Yun Hyu (尹鑴, 1617-1680) was another very influential literatus who strongly argued for a northern expedition. In his writings, Yun also explained Koguryŏ's victory over Sui and Tang, citing victories over various invasions from China throughout history. Here, Yun mentioned Ŭlchi Mundŏk while also stating that even Emperor Taizong of Tang failed in attacking Koguryŏ and was defeated at Ansi Fortress.[225] Yun Hyu argued more strongly for a northern expedition against the Qing than Song Si-yŏl had. Although Song supported the northern expedition plan publicly, it seemed that he just agreed with it in abstract terms. It is doubtful that he was seriously considering an attack on the Qing. When King Hyojong tried to focus on a military expedition against the Qing, Song and other literati strongly advised King Hyojong to devote himself more to Confucian ideology first before launching a military campaign.[226] Additionally, Song showed his disagreement with King Hyojong's plan to increase the number of troops by arguing that relieving people from hunger was more urgent than expanding the army.[227] It is plausible that Song used the anti-Qing notion and northern expedition plan to solidify his status in Chosŏn and to resurrect the idea of Chosŏn as a model state loyal to Confucian values. This is probably why Song limited himself only to a verbal

[225] *Paekho chip* (白湖集), 12:13. "…隋煬帝嘗以百萬之師伐高句麗爲乙支文德所敗而歸. 唐太宗旣定天下之後親自東征徑至遼東攻安市城不能克而歸…"

[226] *Hyojong sillok*, 20:34-35. "…此修身所以爲政事根本…若眞以爲不先修身而可以有爲則大不然矣…"

[227] *Ibid*., 20:37. "…時烈曰朱子以爲添兵非難養兵爲難. 旣添之後何以繼餉耶. 上曰都監之兵只四千餘人今欲加選以滿五千之數矣…"

commitment in the discussion about a proposed military expedition.

In contrast to Song, Yun was more aggressive and passionate about a military project against the Qing. Yun even said that Chosŏn should launch this project no matter how it might turn out. Although he was confident of success in attacking the Qing, Yun explained that no one could guarantee the success of this project. He, however, stated that Chosŏn would be able to show the world its true righteousness by winning over the Qing, and Chosŏn also would reveal its Confucian loyalty to the world and save itself from shame later.[228] Yun clearly mentioned Koguryŏ more than Song in his writings. In his travel log to Kŭmgang Mountain (金剛山) in the autumn of 1672, Yun introduced three poems recited by his companion, extolling three rulers of the past — Tan'gun, Kija, and King Tongmyŏng.[229] Although these poems were not composed by Yun himself, Yun did not hesitate to include them in his log. In addition, it is worthwhile to remember that King Tongmyŏng was mentioned in the same context as Tan'gun and, more interestingly, Kija. Kija was revered and respected by the Cheng-zhu Learning literati of Chosŏn, and Yun Hyu did not express any discomfort in the way these poems mentioned King Tongmyŏng right after Tan'gun and Kija.

Yun's awareness of Koguryŏ did not stop at just mentioning its historic figures such as King Tongmyŏng and Ŭlchi Mundŏk. When traveling to Liaoyang (遼陽), Yun expressed remorse at not traveling to Tongmo Mountain (東牟山) although he was told that it used to belong to his ancestors.[230] In another poem, he mentioned again that this region was originally

---

[228] *Paekho chip*, 12:12. "…勝敗存亡固不可期. 如其勝也. 因之而申大義於天下, 假曰不成其所摧敗者亦足以暴此忠義之心而無愧於天下後世矣…"; 12:13. "…即今義理形勢固無不可勝之理. 不幸而敗亦足以見我之忠義…今日之與彼戰勝固美矣, 敗亦榮矣…"

[229] *Kugyŏk Paekho chŏnsŏ* (國譯 白湖全書) (Seoul: Minjok munhwa ch'ujinhoe, 1996), 7:229-231.

[230] *Paekho chip*, 2:26. "…聞道遼陽舊城郭, 尺三吾未倚東牟."

Koguryŏ territory although it belonged to a "superior" state in his time.[231] Yun's feeling for the region once occupied by Koguryŏ, however, was not strong enough to overcome his Confucian ideology. While showing his knowledge about the history of that region, Yun also showed quite the opposite view on two separate efforts to conquer the same region at the end of the Koryŏ dynasty. In a discussion with the king, Yun agreed on a positive interpretation of Yi Sŏng-gye's attack on the Superior Prefecture of Tongnyŏng (東寧府) during King Kongmin's reign, and Yi's retreat after disobeying a royal order to attack Liaodong was also praised as preventing rebellions against the Ming.[232] The only difference between these two incidents was who the enemy was on each occasion. While Yi fought the Mongol-established Yuan in the former case, he was ordered to attack the Ming in the latter incident. In other words, the most important factor which decided whether each behavior was right or not was whether their opponents were civilized or not, in terms of Confucian standards. The issue that the region had originally belonged to Koguryŏ did not matter much to Yun. Chosŏn literati certainly identified the Ming as heavenly mandated, and this notion hardly changed during the seventeenth century.[233] Under the circumstances where Confucian loyalty was prevailingly strong enough to pursue a perished Ming, there was not much room for a historical consciousness rooted solely on the glory of past kingdoms, to develop

[231] *Ibid*., 2:3. 登南漢天柱峯. "地是高王宅, 城今大國營…" Tongmo Mountain is also known as Ch'ŏnju Mountain (天柱山), and Ko (高) was the surname of Koguryŏ kings. It is not clear when Yun wrote this poem. It is very likely that he wrote it before 1645 at the age of 29. When hearing that Ming collapsed after the Qing had conquered Yanjing (燕京), the capital of Ming in 1645, he lamented, weeping bitterly, and informed the shrine of Ming's demise. Because "*taeguk*" (大國, Ch. *daguo*) literally meaning "large country" is usually used to refer to a culturally superior state as well a large state in terms of physical size, this region probably still belonged to Ming, considering Yun's consistently anti-Qing perspective throughout his life. I am translating this term as a "large state" here because there is no decisive evidence to reveal when it was written.

[232] *Ibid*., 12:6. "…蒙古以鴨綠以西爲東寧府…太祖將兵攻東寧府以絶之…回遼師以弭逆節者高麗崔瑩等勸辛禑起兵以攻上國, 所謂逆節也. 是以我太祖回軍也…"

[233] *Ibid*., 12:8. "…至事天是賴背天是罪…此所謂事天尊事天朝也. 背天背叛中國也…"

and mature.

Even though Song Si-yŏl and Yun Hyu were both very strong advocates of Cheng-zhu Learning, their relationship was far from smooth. Although he once complimented the depth of Yun's knowledge after spending three days together, Song also criticized Yun harshly, accusing him of being a *samun nanjok* (斯文亂賊), a radical heretic, and in 1680 had him executed by King Sukchong (肅宗, 1661-1720; r. 1674-1720).[234] It is believed that Yun became the target of criticism mainly because he attempted to understand Confucian texts differently from Zhu Xi's (朱熹, 1130-1200) traditional interpretation. It seems that the difference between Song Si-yŏl and Yun Hyu in their reminiscences of Koguryŏ can be attributed to their views on the northern expedition. While Song used the northern expedition plan as a means to support his ultimate goal of making Chosŏn a legitimate, cultural replacement for the Ming in theoretical terms, Yun was more straightforward about using an actual military campaign to seek a new identity for Chosŏn in the middle of a new phase of world order as a result of the Ming's fall after they were defeated by the barbaric Jurchen. This is why notes on Koguryŏ appeared more often and in more detail in Yun's writings than in Song's works.

It is worth noting that their conflict was also discussed in the framework of realizing "self-identity" among the Chosŏn literati. JaHyun Kim Haboush interestingly analyzed the rupture among Neo-Confucian literati groups, as represented by Song and Yun and their two different paths of self-awareness, which emerged in the notion of the "last bastion" after the Ming's fall. According to Haboush, Song paid attention to Korean scholars for their locus of authority in building a new identity for Chosŏn, whereas Yun emphasized the Korean state rather

[234] Although Yun Hyu and Song Si-yŏl became acquainted in their youth, Yun's mother is said to have once warned Yun that Yun was not good at judging whether people were good or bad, and Song did not seem like a noble person. See *Paekho chip purok* (白湖集 附錄), 年譜 4.

than the scholars themselves in the process.[235] Although it is interesting and worthwhile to examine the differences in the Chosŏn literati's focus in the formation of their new identity, I also argue that the main difference between Song and Yun would be better understood through their perspectives on Chosŏn's sacred position as the "last bastion" in the Confucian world. While Song held a "culturalistic" view of Chosŏn's future, Yun held a "nationalistic" perspective in the search of new identity for Chosŏn. In spite of the difference between them, both Song and Yun were literati with a strong Cheng-zhu ideology, and it was just not plausible yet to expect a solid historical consciousness based on Koguryŏ's "subjectivity" from the Cheng-zhu Learning literati in seventeenth-century Chosŏn. Despite that their historical perspective which could have developed further in terms of subjectivity in Koguryŏ history was still closely tied with Kija tradition and the notion of the last bastion, it is still apparent that they had never doubted Koguryŏ's cultural lineage in the history of Chosŏn, and Koguryo's status in the discussion of their past had never been questioned.

Kogruyŏ was debated and reviewed more often in the eighteenth century, and Yi Chong-hwi (李種徽, 1731-1797) was one of the literati who had a substantial interest in Koguryŏ and Korean history. Although he never served as a high-ranking official at court, Yi's historical perspective regarding previous history and Koguryŏ certainly left an impact on the issue of subjectivity in understanding history. In contrast to most historical materials compiled by the sixteenth century in which Silla had been regarded as the primary state over Koguryŏ and Paekche, Yi strongly argued that Koguryŏ should be considered the most legitimate among the

[235] Haboush, "Constructing the Center: The Ritual Controversy and the Search for a New Identity in Seventeenth-Century Korea," 87. Here Haboush also explained Hŏ Mok's (許穆, 1595-1682) view about who put most emphasis on the Korean king in the search for their new identity.

Three Kingdoms because it had followed directly in the tracks of Tan'gun Chosŏn, Kija Chosŏn, and Mahan.[236] This is probably why Yi allowed only Koguryŏ to have its own sections in recording the Three Kingdoms, while articles on Silla and Paekche were recorded under the Koguryŏ section. This is very different from previous historical writings in which Silla was usually listed first before Koguryŏ and Paekche. It is worth noting, though, that Yi's emphasis on Koguryŏ is not primarily based on his awareness of Koguryŏ's military strength, as shown in victories against Chinese dynasties such as Sui and Tang. Yi rather referred sources such as Song Si-yŏl for Koguryŏ's historical importance in terms of the Confucian tradition. When explaining the reason for Koguryŏ's victories against the large forces of Sui and Tang, he argued that because the youths of Koguryŏ had trained themselves not only to be literate gentlemen but also to be skilled soldiers, they were able to remain a powerful state in the area and defend themselves from the Sui and Tang invasions.[237] For the same reason, he even praised the *hwarang* (花郎) group of noble youths in Silla.[238] According to Yi, the key to strengthening the state was to make people good at both production, such as agriculture, and military skills, as had been the practice during the early Yin (殷) and Zhou (周) periods between the seventeenth and eighth century BCE in China.

Yi certainly mentioned Koguryŏ more often than previous Chosŏn literati had. In writing the *Tongsa* (東史), he composed a biography section and among the Three Kingdoms, only Koguryŏ had its own chapters. Among the people of Silla, only Sŏl Ch'ong and Ch'oe Ch'i-wŏn

---

[236] *Susan chip* (修山集), 2:23-24. "…高句麗起朝鮮古地, 禮樂文物頗用華制…高句麗接馬韓新羅次之百濟又次之…"

[237] *Ibid*., 6:31-2. "…昔高勾麗…而無敵於天下…無民而非兵也…而無事則投戈而鋤, 有事則擲耒而劒…言勾麗之俗, 每鄉有局堂聚子弟教授其中而習爲詩書禮樂之事…"

[238] *Ibid*., 6:33. "…新羅之時斯多含官昌竹竹之屬, 皆以貴族子, 從軍戰死…"

were mentioned in the biographies. In contrast, members of the Koguryŏ royal households and officialdom were introduced in the biography sections, and Ŭlchi Mundŏk was explained at length in a separate chapter, while his poem was mentioned in different section as well. As for his awareness of the battles between Koguryŏ and Sui and Tang, Yi strongly argued for recovering the Liaodong region. Yi's argument, however, was not to recover the "lost" territory of his ancestors. The idea of capturing this region was suggested strictly for tactical reasons of national defense. According to Yi, because there was no ideal point for a fortress south of the Yalu River where they could easily defeat enemies, Chosŏn should occupy key places in the Liaodong region such as Ch'ongsŏk Ridge (靑石嶺) where Ansi and Paegam Fortress (白巖城) had been located.[239] Although he was certainly aware that it had belonged to Koguryŏ in the past, Yi was more interested in analyzing this region for practical reasons than in remembering it as a symbol representing the glorious past of Chosŏn's proud ancestor.

Yi's awareness of the old territory of Kija and Koguryŏ appeared in his record of a trip to Hamgyŏng province. After climbing Mach'ŏn Ridge (磨天嶺), he recalled the previous states that had controlled the area and explained that only about fifty to sixty percent of the old territory had been taken over by Chosŏn.[240] Yi's understanding of the previous territory once controlled by Tan'gun and Kija was also revealed in his proposal to revoke barbaric customs. In this proposal, he pointed out that the current Chosŏn's territory was only two-fifths of what it had been under Tan'gun and Kija.[241] What Yi mainly argued here was that the size of territory does

---

[239] *Ibid*., 6:43-4. "…大抵遼水以東嶺如靑石城如金石皆萬夫莫開之地, 此古安市白巖等處而隋唐百攻不拔, 高麗百守不失者. 地利之有以也…"

[240] *Ibid*., 4:13-4. "…三韓時地係北沃沮及東扶餘. 當三國之際高句麗滅北沃沮而置柵城等府…自唐滅高句麗而東國益南徙…東國自漢魏來稍稍失其故土. 高麗之時渤海入契丹而箕高故疆但餘十之五六…"

[241] *Ibid*., 6:29. "…然視檀箕舊國, 全據者三韓也. 於朝鮮故境才得其吾之二…"

not matter in being a civilized center. Although Chosŏn was smaller than the Qing in terms of the physical size of its land, only Chosŏn had retained the features that kept them civilized. Yi stated, therefore, that it was necessary, in order to remain as the civilized center, to prevent the spread of barbaric customs such as marriage by free love, marriage by couples of the same clan, Mohe-style funerals, children of slaves inheriting their mother's status instead of their father's, males and females walking together on the same street, and other customs from the Mohe, Jurchen, and Mongols.[242] In other words, Yi's main concern was how Chosŏn would survive enormous cultural threats from its barbaric neighbors and keep its status as the civilized center after Ming's demise, instead of territorial expansion per se by recovering the Liaodong region that had once belonged to Tan'gun, Kija, and Koguryŏ.

Yi's understanding of Koguryŏ is directly related to its ties with Kija. What made Koguryŏ important in history was that it happened to intersect with Kija tradition in terms of geographical location and culture. First, P'yŏngyang, which later became the Koguryŏ capital, had also been the capital of Kija and Wiman Chosŏn. Koguryŏ was originally located inside Chosŏn territory, not the Samhan, and it remained in the heartland even as it gradually expanded its territory.[243] For the same reason, Yi often mentioned the the large territory in the past as "the territory of Kija and Koguryŏ" [箕高之故疆/箕高之界].[244] Due to its geographical location, Koguryŏ was able to borrow from the developed culture of Kija and was able to maintain

[242] *Ibid*., 6:30. "…民間男女相悅而婚此蠻風也…藁裹死人而揭之木上…久而後葬之此靺鞨之俗…羌胡知母而不知父歸重於母族. 今公私奴婢從母之法此待之以羌胡也…"

[243] *Ibid*., 12:27. "…箕氏之後衛滿據之, 皆以平壤爲都漢之樂浪郡又治此. 高句麗始起漢玄菟界, 中後益東南徙亦都平壤. 大抵高句麗據朝鮮接箕氏而其地不干於三韓, 在中國得其冀豫兗雍青梁之地, 要之東方之大國也…"

[244] *Ibid*., 4:8. "…漢之河西是皆箕高之故疆…" and 12:4. "…遼攻高麗而責渤海舊地, 其時諸臣反以箕高之界責之於遼…"

Confucian values for a long time. Secondly, taking Kija as a model in enacting and enforcing laws, Koguryŏ was able to avoid cruelty in carrying out punishments.[245] The importance of keeping Confucian values in Yi's belief also appeared in his evaluation of Silla. Yi blamed Silla for becoming familiar with barbaric customs, which eventually caused serious cultural deterioration. According to Yi, the proud customs that had originated from Kija began deteriorating during Silla, and this problem was not solved until Chosŏn tried to transform and fix them.[246] He added that there were a few aspects of Silla to be praised, including the custom in which the three different clans had taken turns in succeeding to the throne in the early period. Although Silla should be criticized for its failure in transmitting civilized customs to the later period, early Silla, Yi argued, had some features which could be compared to the Yao-Shun (堯舜) period, and managed to produce important Confucian literati such as Sŏl Ch'ong.[247]

It is not surprising therefore that Yi attributed Koguryŏ's collapse to its negligence of Confucian ethics. Despite its advantage in learning from and following in the Confucian tradition from Kija, Koguryŏ did not focus on spreading these virtues but rather tried to expand its land in competition with China. Yi pointed out that, regardless of how Koguryŏ may have been considered "the last bastion,"[248] their excessive expansion led to their arrogance, and eventually they lost the features of a civilized group.[249] Here, Yi argued that Koguryŏ should have tried to

---

[245] *Ibid*., 12:40. "…箕氏之世雖八條之法, 未必盡用也. 豈非仁聖之國哉. 高勾麗繼之而刑無慘酷…"

[246] *Ibid*., 6:28. "…自箕氏以來天下號爲禮義之邦仁賢之國. 然至於羅麗之際而風俗鄙陋幾純乎夷. 聖祖撥亂變夷爲夏禮樂文物出入漢唐…"

[247] *Ibid*., 6:6. "世以新羅朴昔金相禪爲有唐虞官天下之風…"; 11:47-9. "…而薛聰好讀九經以方言解其義訓導後生新羅之儒自聰始焉…盖薛聰爲東方儒者之始…"

[248] *Ibid*., 12:27-8. "…高勾麗盛時…可謂盛矣然居小中華之地…"

[249] *Ibid*., 12:28. "…然居小中華之地不以中國自治, 而引弓强戰慢大邦自取其亡則高勾麗之盛大乃所以速禍也. 其貽

deepen its virtue instead of seeking a larger territory. The size of the land certainly would not have mattered as long as they had maintained their moral Confucian character. In other words, the true value of Koguryŏ lay rather in its Confucian tradition, stemming from its tie with Tan'gun and Kija, rather than on its geographical location per se. Therefore, to recover old Koguryŏ territory was not the ultimate issue, in Yi Chong-hwi's general perspective. Although Yi Chong-hwi showed more interest in Koguryŏ than had previous Cheng-zhu Learning literati like Song Si-yŏl and Yun Hyu, his interest was still heavily influenced by the Confucian tradition, and this is why Yi frequently argued the continuity of not only the political but also cultural lineage from Kija to Koguryŏ, which was believed to have located their capital in the same area, P'yŏngyang.

The most interesting point in Yi Chong-hwi's historical perspective is revealed in his notion of "subjectivity" in history. Rejecting the traditional historiography in which historical events were basically recorded with some notes and evaluations of historians, Yi emphasized subjectivity in historical consciousness by arguing that history would be more valuable and would better survive in later periods through one's own perspective and analysis.[250] Not only does his emphasis on "subjectivity" certainly remind us of the notion of "independent recollections" in remembering the past as argued by Bergson,[251] but the true meaning of history as presented by Yi also seems surprisingly similar to the difference between history, just-remembered past, and collective memory as presented by Halbwachs.[252] Arguably, there is a

---

患於山河豈小哉. 盖自古爲國務廣德而不務廣地其以是夫其以是夫…"

[250] *Ibid*., 2:23. "…其心亦莫不與我同, 則我安知非古人, 古人亦安知非我也. 今旣見其事蹟…我與古人安得不爲之委曲周章乎. 由我而益傳亦所不計…"

[251] Bergson, *Matter and Memory*, 78.

[252] Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory*, 83-87.

substantial difference between Yi's subjectivity and the notions of Bergson or Halbwachs. Whereas the independence and collectivity in modern discourse apparently represent the individual as an active agent in constructing collective memory, Yi's subjectivity was strictly limited to a small group of Confucian literati who were able to participate in writing history. In spite of the difference, it is worth noticing that Yi's fondness for the new thought of Neo-Confucianism such as Yangming Learning helped him develop his argument about subjectivity in historical awareness, and it led to more discussion of Koguryŏ among the literati who belonged to the so-called Practical Learning group. On the other hand, the literati of Chosŏn who were more inclined to the practical aspects of Neo-Confucianism in the late eighteenth century focused on empirical studies on their interests and tried to verify historical records through analytical research. To these literati, the existing claim to Koguryŏ and its ties with Kija was questionable since it was mainly based on philosophical aspects without any logical explanation to support the argument. Consequently, the recognition of Koguryŏ certainly appeared differently in the late eighteenth century when new academic trends based on empirical studies were gradually emerging.

III. The Rise of the New Intellectual Trends and Changing Perspectives on Koguryŏ

As explained above, there had been a very strong Neo-Confucian tradition among Chosŏn literati in the seventeenth century, in which the Ming was considered to be the ultimate model for the world. Although Chosŏn literati publicly insisted that Chosŏn, the "last bastion" of Confucian tradition, should survive as a savior of the sacred tradition even after this ultimate model had been ended by the Qing, a new analysis about Cheng-zhu Learning also arose within general beliefs. In addition to the rupture between Song Si-yŏl and Yun Hyu regarding their

interpretation of the classics, more new trends among the Neo-Confucian literati emerged as more Chosŏn literati expanded their contacts with the Qing. After witnessing changes in various fields inside the Qing, these Chosŏn literati started to view the Qing differently. It did not take long for them realize that the Qing were not the inhumane barbarians that they had been labeled by previous literati, and there were definitely some things Chosŏn needed to learn from the Qing. Influenced by the new circumstances, the perspectives on Koguryŏ by Chosŏn literati had also changed, and they began to show different approaches in viewing Koguryŏ in their writings.

One of the new concerns about Koguryŏ discussed by Chosŏn literati in this period was the question of the ethnicity of its people. For example, Chŏng Yag-yong (丁若鏞, 1762-1836)[253] mentioned Maek (貊) tribes as a main group comprising the Koguryŏ people.[254] In contrast to previous literati who generally underlined ties with Kija in the discussion of Koguryŏ people, Chŏng instead explained that Maek tribes were nomadic and very underdeveloped. They protected themselves from cold weather with animal skins, which is where the character of the Maek came from. There was no Maek tribe among the aboriginal tribes within the Chosŏn territory. Some of them just came into Chosŏn from time to time seeking grassy fields and animals for food.[255] It is quite surprising because Chŏng clearly separated Maek from the main tribes which composed Chosŏn to the north of the Han River and the Three Han to the south of the Han River.[256] According to Chŏng, it was Kija and the civilized people accompanying him

[253] Chŏng Yag-gyong was arguably the most productive Neo-Confucian literati of Chosŏn in terms of writing. His interest was not merely limited to Confucian classics, politics, or history. Other topics he wrote about included ichthyography, geography, astronomy, and physics.

[254] *Yŏyudang chŏnsŏ* (與猶堂全書), vol. 6. 2:15. "…句麗貊之別種…"

[255] *Ibid*., vol. 6. 2:15-16. "…濊貊者本北狄之種, 我邦疆域之內本無此名…歲貊者天下之賤名也…歲貊之人本不土著逐水草隨鹿豕轉徒無常遂至我邦…以獸皮御寒故其通身如獸貊之得名, 亦以衣貉之皮其形如貉. 故謂之貊也…"

[256] *Ibid*., vol. 6. 2:15. "…朝鮮箕子之遺民也. 南韓中國之流人也…"

who comprised Chosŏn, and they were clearly different from those who primarily comprised Puyŏ and Koguryŏ. His attempt to clarify the ethnic composition in the past led to the separation of Mahan from the Kija lineage. Unlike previous Confucian literati who had explained that Mahan had succeeded the Kija tradition, Chŏng argued that Mahan was not related with Kija because Mahan had already existed before King Chun (準王) of Kija's Chosŏn came down to its territory.[257] His separation of Mahan from Kija, however, did not necessarily mean that Chŏng was free from a historical perspective based on Neo-Confucianism. For example, he claimed Mahan as "China among the Three Hans" when explaining Mahan's geographical advantages which eventually made them superior to Pyŏnjin (弁辰; Pyŏnhan) and Chinhan.[258] In other words, it is more likely that his argument on the ethnic group of Koguryŏ people or the separation of Mahan from Kija appeared due to his devotion to ascertaining historical evidence in detail through comprehensive research rather than to his objection to Neo-Confucianism. Nor does his separation of the Maek from the people who composed Korean ethnicity question the idea that Koguryŏ was part of Chosŏn's ethnic lineage since he consented that it was the people who came to Old Chosŏn in Kija's time who were the ancestors of the people of Koguryŏ.

The other issue worthy of more discussion is Chŏng's view on Liaodong. Previously, Liaodong had been considered by literati as a historical area, as a part of the lost land of Koguryŏ

---

[257] *Ibid*., vol. 6. 1:32. "…馬韓本自有國箕準特來襲取旋復滅絶. 東儒每云箕準南來始開其國, 不亦謬乎...鏞案馬韓本自有國, 非箕準破荒也. 箕氏旣滅, 土酋復立爲王. 馬韓非箕氏也…"

[258] *Ibid*., vol. 6. 1:31. "…我邦之地西北荒寒東道險窄嶺南僻遠京畿北邑亦土瘠民貧. 唯洌水以南馬韓故地風氣溫和土壤肥沃. 此東國之中國也. 故馬韓當時得主霸於三國也…" Chŏng argued that it was incorrect to divide Pyŏnjin into Pyŏnhan and Chinhan. According to Chŏng, Pyŏnjin and Chinhan existed separately, and the former was Karak (駕洛, Kaya). Citing Chinese documents, he also argued that both King Kim Su-ro (金首露王), the first king of Karak, and Sŏk T'al-hae (昔脫解), the second king of Silla, were originally from Mahan. See *ibid*., vol. 6. 2:2-3. " …余謂漢史魏志皆云辰韓弁辰之王皆以馬韓人爲之. 此當時之實聞也. 辰韓之昔脫解弁辰之金首露, 皆係西韓之人…"

and an important place for national defense. Chŏng, however, interestingly argued that it was better for Chosŏn not to recover Liaodong because it would have not only required more attention but also could possibly cause serious tension with its strong neighbors.[259] Liaodong had occupied a very special place in the discourse of historical memory. Because it had once been located inside Koguryŏ territory, Liaodong was often cited by Neo-Confucian literati as a key factor justifying their historical claim over this area. Chŏng, however, obviously questioned the value of this claim. He stated that Chosŏn would be better without that region because Chosŏn was not strong enough to handle all the tensions that could possibly result from the acquisition of Liaodong. Chŏng's argument, however, did not mean that he separated Koguryŏ from the past of Chosŏn. He neither excluded Koguryŏ from his discussion of Korean history nor denied the link between Liaodong and Koguryŏ. Chŏng was clearly aware that the old territory of Koguryŏ included Liaodong.[260] It seems that he just wanted to emphasize the practicality of his argument, because in the end, he agreed that it would be better to keep Liaodong if Chosŏn were strong enough to stretch out of peninsula since it would be impossible to march to the mainland without capturing Liaodong.[261] In other words, Chŏng's view on Liaodong was more likely just a reflection of his thought as a practically oriented scholar interested Qing-style "Evidential Learning" (考證學, kaozheng xue) which had become popular among the Chosŏn literati.

Consequences of the new trend of historical research also appeared in Chŏng's text about P'yŏngyang, the last capital of Koguryŏ. The Cheng-zhu Learning literati consistently linked

[259] *Ibid.*, vol. 1. 12:3. "…遼東之不復國之幸也…得遼東反爲贅也. 何爲恨之哉…"

[260] Chŏng left a piece of writing specifically debating Liaodong, and it began with a statement explaining the northern and southern borders of Koguryŏ's expanded territory. (*Ibid*., vol. 1. 12:3. 遼東論. "高句麗之時疆土遠拓…")

[261] *Ibid*., vol. 1. 12:3. "…雖然苟使國富而兵强, 一朝有抗衡天下之志而欲窺中原一步者, 非先得遼東不可爲也…"

Koguryŏ to Kija with the claim that they shared the location of their capitals. It was believed that Kija had settled down at P'yongyang and Koguryŏ had also moved its capital there from Kungnae Fortress (國內城), following Kija's tradition. Consequently, P'yŏngyang, with sites related to Kija, was frequently mentioned by the Cheng-zhu Learning literati and often appeared in many poems of the literati, who mentioned legendary places related to King Tongmyŏng, such as Choch'ŏnsŏk, the rock where it was believed King Tongmyŏng ascended to heaven. In introducing notes written by earlier literati, Chŏng seriously questioned the validity of the story about King Tongmyŏng's presence in P'yŏngyang, explaining that because King Tongmyŏng was born and passed away in the north, the sites connected to him in P'yŏngyang could not be accurate. He blamed the earlier Cheng-zhu Learning literati for careless research on these notes and transmitting incorrect information to the later period.[262] Chŏng's comment on P'yŏngyang did not stop at pointing out the historical errors cited by previous literati. Unlike their prevailing explanations about Koguryŏ's fall in which the loss of Confucian values was blamed for its demise, Chŏng paid more attention to the physical aspects in his explanation of this issue. According to Chŏng, it was a mistake for Koguryŏ to move its capital south to P'yŏngyang even though P'yŏngyang was certainly protected by a series of strong fortresses and also had the benefit of a large population and various resources. Ironically though, these good conditions for living made the people of Koguryŏ loosen up and become numb even when facing a national crisis. Chŏng argued that Koguryŏ had been gradually losing its militaristic spirit since

[262] *Ibid*., vol. 6. 7:26-30. "…有永明寺卽東明王九梯. 宮內有麟贊窟…有巖出沒朝水名曰朝天…東明王養麒麟馬于窟中…世傳王乘麒麟馬入窟從地中出朝天…然句麗始祖東明王始建國於卒本…至東川王二十一年始徙平壤…則東明未嘗夢到於平壤, 安有所謂舊宮與馬窟乎. 何況麟馬朝天之說, 荒怪妄誕不可傳述而東儒不考史籍不驗實理順口輒言, 認爲故實謬之甚矣…高麗史地志云東明王墓在平壤府東南中和境龍山谷號眞珠墓…有祠宇世傳東明聖帝祠…俱遣使于西京祭東明王祠. 然句麗始祖都於卒本葬於卒本在淥水之北則與平壤毫無所涉. 曰祠曰墓何爲紛紛也. 今時東明之廟曰崇靈殿…"

P'yŏngyang became its capital and this was what eventually made Koguryŏ fall.[263] In contrast to arguments by the earlier Cheng-zhu Learning literati blaming Koguryŏ for allowing its military strength to take precedence over its Confucian tradition, Chŏng instead attributed Koguryŏ's fall to the loss of its military spirit. From Chŏng's perspective, military power was as essential as cultural features in maintaining the sovereignty of a state. To Chŏng Yag-gyong, it did not really matter that Koguryŏ had moved its capital to where Kija settled down before. Although agreeing that Kija was a proud ancestor with an exemplary character, Chŏng also tried to analyze the history of Koguryŏ in terms of practicality, which was quite different from the conventional perspective held by most Neo-Confucian literati who considered Confucian values, including ties to Kija, as the ultimate standard to view Koguryŏ and its history.

It is very likely that many people in P'yŏngyang recalled Koguryŏ throughout the Chosŏn dynasty. Previously, Ko Kyŏng-myŏng (高敬命, 1533-1592), one of the leaders of the righteous armies during the Imjin War in the late sixteenth century, had encouraged people in P'yŏngan province (平安道) to remember Koguryŏ's victories against the Sui and Tang about a thousand years earlier,[264] as well as the many sites linked to Koguryŏ, including Yŏngmyŏng Temple (永明寺) and a legendary cave and rock, which probably helped reinforce Koguryŏ's ties to Kija in people's minds. In other words, a significant part of Koguryŏ's historical importance was supported by its relationship to Kija.[265] Therefore, the Chosŏn king sent his officials to the shrine

[263] *Ibid*., vol. 1. 12:2. "…徙都平壤厥享國二百三十九年而亡, 雖民物殷富城郭鞏固卒莫有補…平壤在二河之南山川秀麗風俗柔軟而堅城鉅鎭之重重外護者…平壤之人豈有懼哉…傳曰無敵國外患者亡, 兵法曰置之死地而後生."

[264] *Taedong yasŭng*, (大東野乘, Collection of Anecdotes and Essays during the Chosŏn Dynasty) trans. and ed. Minjok munhwa ch'ujinhoe, vol 9, *Chaejo pŏnbang chi* (再造藩邦志, Record of Re-secured Subject State) (Seoul: Minjok munhwa ch'ujinhoe, 1983), 三O. "…西土風俗之美遠自仁賢俎豆之餘, 士馬之强曾挫隋唐百萬之衆…"

[265] *Yongjae ch'onghwa* (慵齋叢話), 42. "…平壤箕子所都…又爲高句麗所都…永明寺卽東明王九梯宮, 麒麟窟朝天石在焉…"

at P'yŏngyang to pray for rain during droughts.[266] But it was still very hard for Chŏng Yag-gyong to agree to claims that King Tongmyŏng had been in P'yŏngyang; yet he did believe Koguryŏ was a part of Chosŏn's history.

Another new claim about the history of Koguryŏ as argued by literati during this period was the explanation about King Tongmyŏng and Chumong. In contrast to the conventional view in which Chumong was believed to be King Tongmyŏng's name, literati who were dedicated to historical research based on logical explanations argued that Chumong and King Tongmyŏng were two different men in the ancient period of Chosŏn's history. Chŏng Yag-gyong stated that Tongmyŏng referred only to the founder of Northern Puyŏ and that he had nothing to do with Chumong.[267] Among the literati of the late eighteenth century, Chŏng was not the only scholar to argue King Tongmyŏng and Chumong were two different figures. In the *Haedong yŏksa*, written by Han Ch'i-yun (韓致奫, 1765-1814),[268] Koguryŏ was recorded in more detail than Paekche and Silla. Han also stated that there were two different Koguryŏ in history, and King Tongmyŏng and Chumong were not same person, as had been stated by earlier literati. Han explained that Tongmyŏng was the king of Puyŏ, and Chumong, a descendant of King Tongmyŏng, fled to the region that was the former territory of "Kuryŏ," then established his kingdom, "Koguryŏ."[269] It is

[266] Tan'gun was also enshrined with Kija and King Tongmyŏng in this shrine. (*Chaejo pŏnbang chi*, 二四. "…分遣宰臣, 禱雨于檀君箕子東明王廟…")

[267] *Yŏyudang chŏnsŏ*, vol. 6. 3:2. "…東明二字明是北夫餘始祖之名, 與朱蒙無涉也…"

[268] Although Han Ch'i-yun wrote most of the *Haedong yŏksa*, Han Chin-sŏ, his nephew added the geography section later after Han Ch'i-yun died.

[269] *Haedong yŏksa*, 6:1. "…朱蒙始建國於故句驪地仍號爲高句驪, 然則東方前後知有兩句驪國也…" The *Haedong yŏksa* was not the first book which argued that there were two Koguryŏ states in history. Sin Kyŏng-jun (申景濬, 1712-1781) argued in his *Kanggyego* (疆界考) that the first Koguryŏ was the one which was controlled under the Hyŏnt'o (Ch. Xuantu) Commandery (玄菟郡) of Han (漢); meanwhile, the Sosumaek (小水貊) that appeared in the *Han shu* was the Koguryŏ established by Chumong.

not clear if either Chŏng or Han was the first to distinguish Chumong from King Tongmyŏng in the ancient history of Chosŏn because there was an indication that someone earlier had mentioned this issue briefly before.[270] No matter who had argued it first, it is obvious that the newly emerging academic trend stressing practical aspects in analysis led to a discussion about Koguryŏ, including King Tongmyŏng and Chumong.

Although both Chŏng's writing and Han's *Haedong yŏksa* showed different historical perspectives than the earlier literati's views, neither Chŏng nor Han were completely free from Neo-Confucian historiography. Han's detailed documentation of Koguryŏ's history, relative to the other Three Kingdoms, in his *Haedong yŏksa* was likely because Koguryŏ had more contacts with China than Paekche and Silla did, due to its location,[271] and Han also criticized Buddhism harshly for its irrational stories, stating that the official history of Chosŏn as it was known in China included many unrealistic stories because Silla and Koryŏ were fond of Buddhism.[272] Furthermore, in the explanation of Tang Taizong's plan to attack Koguryŏ, Han commented on Taizong's will as a sign demonstrating his greatness.[273] Chŏng Yag-yong's statement on Paekche's superiority over Silla also reflected his Neo-Confucian perspective. According to

[270] Although it was not recorded in previous materials, the possibility of Tongmyŏng and Chumong being two different figures was acknowledged by some literati as early as the late fifteenth century because Han mentioned Kim Ch'ŏl-lyŏng's (金千齡, 1469-1503) prose about Koguryŏ. (*Haedong yŏksa*, 6:4. "…我成宗朝試士金千齡高句麗賦曰東明啓其赫業朱蒙承其餘波, 是說明確矣.")

[271] Han Ch'i-yun tried to write a history of Chosŏn while citing as many as five hundred forty-four foreign documents, not only Chinese but also Japanese. Of the documents to which Han referred, all but the twenty-four Japanese documents were Chinese.

[272] *Ibid*., 2:1-2. "…東史所言檀君事皆荒誕不經…其所稱桓因帝釋等語出於法華經羅麗之代尊尙異教其弊至此…以至流傳中國遂使一隅仁賢之邦歸於語怪之科可勝歎哉."

[273] *Ibid*., 8:3. "…[觀此則知帝之雄心未嘗一日不在高麗也.]"

Chŏng, Paekche's annexation of Mahan, the most developed entity among the Three Hans, was the main reason why Paekche was superior to its neighboring kingdom. What is interesting in Chŏng's claim is the example he presented in order to prove Silla's backwardness. He explained that the three clans' rotation of the throne in early Silla was evidence of Silla's inferiority. According to Chŏng, it just happened because Silla people did not know the proper way to select a king, not because they tried to maintain Confucian virtues by yielding the throne, as assumed by earlier literati.[274] Considering that Silla had been praised earlier for demonstrating Confucian virtues in how they rotated the kingship, it is probable that the new trend of paying more attention to practical matters directly related to the actual life of people, rather than mainly focusing on an interpretation of Neo-Confucian classics in historical research that resulted in changes.

In spite of their belief in Neo-Confucianism, both Chŏng Yag-gyong and Han Ch'i-yun clearly demonstrated a new perspective on the history of Koguryŏ, and it is obvious that the Chosŏn literati's deepened interest in Qing and new thoughts introduced through it contributed to this change. Chŏng Yag-yong's research was one of the products of this situation, and it arguably revitalized historical consciousness from the memories of Koguryŏ in late Chosŏn. Consequently, an expanded perspective of Koguryŏ had a profound influence on nationalist activists in the late nineteenth century and through the colonial period as Chosŏn was forced to expose itself to the world in the middle of clashes between imperial powers.

---

[274] *Yŏyudang chŏnsŏ*, vol. 1. 12:1. "…朴昔金三姓迭入爲王…論者謂其有禪受之遺意而其事度越百王, 丁子曰不然. 此夷狄之陋也…未嘗以宗廟昭穆之制而存諸心置諸論議. 庸詎非夷狄之陋哉…" In his comment on Silla, Chŏng consistently criticized Silla by pointing out the disarray of the royal lineage throughout its history. Negative descriptions of Silla by Chŏng were also revealed in his statement about early Silla when, he argued, Silla had been subjugated to both Paekche and Kaya. (*Ibid*., vol. 6. 2:5. "…此時三韓之中新羅猶荒昧無文, 其朝聘中國或附庸於百濟或附庸於迦羅…")

Conclusion

It is interesting to see how one dominant ideology in society can influence various aspects of society, and Cheng-zhu Learning had arguably enjoyed a dominant status since the fifteenth century in Chosŏn. Ironically, the Ming's collapse even solidified its status while Chosŏn literati claimed themselves to be *so chunghwa* or "the last bastion" of Neo-Confucianism. This is why Koguryŏ was remembered mostly in the context of the Neo-Confucian tradition rather than as a symbol of national resistance during and after a series of foreign invasions. Although Chosŏn literati clearly preferred to view Koguryŏ and its history through the prism of Confucian tradition, it does not imply that they separated this ancient kingdom from their history by any means, and they were aware their Chosŏn certainly possessed not only political but also cultural lineage of Koguryŏ which was specifically underlined by its tie to Tan'gun and Kija. Meanwhile Chosŏn literati repeatedly demonstrated their interest in the old Koguryŏ territory, and they were also well aware that it would be very unlikely for Chosŏn to recapture this region by force. Therefore, the memories of Koguryŏ basically were being played to sustain anti-Qing propaganda and support their discourse on the last bastion. The strengthened tradition of Cheng-zhu Learning did not allow much room for Koguryŏ to emerge as a proud model of Chosŏn's past, which is what might have happened under different circumstances. In most occasions when a state is forced to fight an enemy, its own history often tends to be recalled and brought out in order to encourage resistance against foreign invaders. It should have been Koguryŏ that Chosŏn would have considered as its model. In reality, however, Koguryŏ was hardly mentioned by the literati of Chosŏn during and after these foreign invasions, and there were some specific reasons for that.

Koguryŏ did not have an easy relationship with China throughout its history and their military success was generally highlighted by victories against the Chinese empires such as Sui and Tang. When the Imjin War broke out in 1592, Chosŏn was gradually developing their relationship with Ming after managing to normalize relations with them, following repeated attempts since its establishment. Additionally, the Ming was the only hope for Chosŏn through the war against Japan, and the ruling class of Chosŏn showed their reckless faith in the Ming as their savior. Therefore it must have been hard for Chosŏn to emphasize Koguryŏ as a model as long as they tried to maintain a close relationship with the Ming at the same time. Although Ŭlchi Mundŏk appeared again in one publication in the early eighteenth century, he was still recorded in the literary tradition as a hero who had saved his state from a foreign invasion.[275] More importantly, Chosŏn's ardent following of the Ming was based on Neo-Confucianism. As Cheng-zhu Learning became dominant in Chosŏn, it was hard for Chosŏn literati to analyze issues without any intervention from their Neo-Confucian beliefs. This is probably why, on the limited occasions when Koguryŏ appeared in documents, it was usually perceived through the prism of Neo-Confucianism rather than evaluated on its own achievements.

The rise of new thoughts such as Yangming Learning and reform Confucianism in the eighteenth century, however, helped Koguryŏ to be viewed in a different prospective. Emphasis on practical necessity and historical research through evidence was taken over and developed further by literati belonged to the so-called "Practical Learning" group, which tried to analyze

[275] Ŭlchi Mundŏk was mentioned at the very first part of the *Paegun sosŏl* (白雲小說) written by Yi Kyu-bo. Interestingly though, it was not found in the collections of Yi's original writings. It was in the 1710s when Yi's comment about Ŭlchi Mundŏk first appeared in Hong Man-jong's (洪萬宗, 1643-1725) *Sihwa ch'ongnim* (詩話叢林). Because it also mentioned the *Yaoshantang waiji* (堯山堂外紀) which was published in the Ming period, it is not likely that Yi Kyu-bo himself made this comment about Ŭlchi Mundŏk in the *Paegun sosŏl*. Rather, it seems Ŭlchi Mundŏk was added later by Hong (or another literatus) in order to remind readers of Koguryŏ's victory against China.

history through careful research and cautious review of earlier texts. The perception of Koguryŏ's old territory and re-examination of its historical characters also reflect the change in the literati's perspective of Koguryŏ. Although Koguryŏ's geographical location tied it with Tan'gun and Kija and still appeared in texts about Koguryŏ because of a strong Cheng-zhu Learning convention,[276] literati exposed to new thoughts were willing to expand their interests to practical issues instead of limiting them to philosophical discussion based on Neo-Confucian classics, and both their claims, about the two different Koguryŏ in history and two different figures of King Tongmyŏng[277] and Chumong, were the products of their new research style, using references from various records, including foreign materials. Because they generally focused on practical aspects, Liaodong was less emphasized[278] and the myth surrounding Tan'gun was criticized as a created fable rather than history. Although they were still Cheng-zhu Learning literati and Neo-Confucian perspectives still appeared in their writings, their new attitude of viewing history was certainly different from the previous one. They took references not only from Chinese materials but also other sources, including Japanese materials, for their research. This arguably implies that they were able to expand their historical perspective outside

[276] It is interesting to note that people from P'yŏngan province had been discriminated against throughout Chosŏn dynasty. Yi Chung-hwan (李重煥, 1690-1756) stated that it had been very rare for people from these provinces to be appointed to high-ranking positions because many military personal who had helped Yi Sŏng-gye to establish the Chosŏn dynasty were from these regions. After becoming king, Yi was admonished not to pick people from there and eventually, even powerful families in the capital avoided getting acquainted with families from P'yŏngan and Hamgyŏng provinces. (*T'aengni chi* (擇里志), 平安道·咸鏡道.)

[277] Regarding King Tongmyŏng's origin, *Yongjae ch'onghwa* introduced another interesting incident. A Ming official coming to Chosŏn as an envoy visited a shrine for Tan'gun where King Tongmyŏng's mortuary tablet was also kept. Interestingly, he stated King Tongmyŏng was Chinese when he saw the tablet for him. (*Yongjae ch'onghwa*, 69. "…又至檀君廟見東明王位版曰, 此漢人也...")

[278] Han Ch'i-yun included a Tang emperor's claim over Liaodong in the *Haedong yŏksa*. According to Emperor Taizong, Liaodong had actually been under Chinese control. It is not clear whether Han Ch'i-yun agreed to this claim or not. However, Han added extra information clarifying Tang's argument. (*Haedong yŏksa*, 8:4. "…至於遼東諸城本皆中國郡縣. [高麗之地漢魏皆爲郡縣, 晉氏之亂始與中國絶.]…")

Neo-Confucianism while new academic trends arose in Neo-Confucianism, and their arguments such as Yi Chong-hwi's emphasis on "subjectivity" in historical consciousness certainly provided a foundation for the further discussion of historical consciousness from the late nineteenth century through the Japanese colonial period. Despite the variety of views and the appearance of new interpretation in the eighteenth century, it is clear that Chosŏn literati still considered Koguryŏ to be part of their political, cultural, and ethnic heritage.

Chapter Five

Koguryŏ in the Modern Reconstruction of Korean Identity

Introduction

After the opening of the ports in 1876 as a result of the Kanghwa Treaty with Japan, Chosŏn became a political battlefield for imperial powers. The Qing had no interest in losing its influence on Chosŏn while Japan was seeking to expand its power in northeast Asia. Russia was also paying cautious attention to the political situation in Chosŏn, and other Western countries such as England, France, and United States showed interest in Chosŏn as well. Eventually, this change in northeast Asia made Chosŏn adjust in order to survive in the midst of the clashes of these imperial nations. Although opened to the Western world by force, Chosŏn tried to respond to the changes with a series of reforms in the late nineteenth century. As a result of these reforms, Chosŏn claimed it was an imperial state after changing its name to the Taehan Empire (大韓帝國, Great Han Empire) and attempted to balance the major powers surrounding the Korean peninsula. In spite of Chosŏn's effort to transform into a modern nation and remain an independent state, Japan colonized Chosŏn from 1910 until 1945.

The memories of Koguryŏ re-emerged significantly during this period. Because it had survived a series of foreign invasions through its history, Koguryŏ became more emphasized and discussed by the Korean people[279] in order to encourage resistance against aggression by foreign

[279] Technically, the official name was still Chosŏn and the Taehan Empire (after 1897) until it was colonized by Japan in 1910. It was 1948 when the Republic of Korea (Taehan min'guk) was adopted as the official name of South Korea. I, however, will use the name Korea more often hereafter because Korea started appearing as a "modern nation" during this period. For the same reason, I use the term "Korean people: instead of "Neo-Confucian literati"

nations and ultimately the Japanese colonial regime. Ironically, Koguryŏ became a very sensitive issue to Japan as well because it was planning to expand its territory to Manchuria, the area that Koguryŏ had controlled until its demise in 668, when it was defeated by the Silla-Tang allied forces. Therefore, Japanese scholars researched Koguryŏ history as early as the 1890s, and their scholarship on Koguryŏ tended to reflect Japanese imperialist ambitions throughout the colonial period. As long as Japan was looking for every possible method to help in its control of Korea after 1910, Koguryŏ was too valuable an asset to bypass in the colonial scholarship on Korean history.

Japanese colonial scholars encountered a dilemma in projecting Koguryŏ in their scholarship. First, scholars arguing for a shared ancestry between Koreans and Japanese had to deal with the Korean belief that Tan'gun was the original ancestor of the Korean people, as well as assertions about Tan'gun's having certain ties with Koguryŏ. However, Japan also had to separate Koguryŏ from the collective memory of the Koreans as their independence movements were propelled by memories of Koguryŏ and emerged as a serious concern for the colonial regime. Therefore, Japanese scholars argued that Korean people were hardly related to Koguryŏ because the people of Koguryŏ were closer to those in Manchuria than to those on the peninsula. Furthermore, they justified their colonization by insisting that Chosŏn had had a long history of dependency as confirmed by its relationship with various Chinese dynasties. Regardless of whether Japanese colonial scholarship tried to illuminate the historical ties between Korea and Japan, or if they separated Koguryŏ from the main discussion of Korean history under their Manchuria-focused historical perspective, it was inevitable for them to address Koguryŏ more often during the colonial period.

---

in the context of their discussion of Koguryŏ because common people were among those who remembered and discussed Koguryŏ, having read newspaper articles and textbooks.

Koguryŏ appeared in various materials, not only in historical books but also in newspapers, journals, and textbooks from the late nineteenth century throughout the colonial period. While attempting to transform itself into a modern nation, Chosŏn adopted some governmental renovations. The publication of textbooks for young students and the emergence of various newspapers were some examples that show the formation of a modern nation, and these changes certainly helped to spread conventional Koguryŏ memories previously limited only to literati so they finally become embedded in the *collective memory* of most, in not all, Koreans. Although every historical aspect of Koguryŏ was examined for its legitimacy in Korean history, the cultural and ethnic lineages of Koguryŏ specifically were quickly emerging as points of discussion, and consequently Koguryŏ ethnicity emerged as a center of controversy among Korean nationalists and Japanese scholars, even while its political lineage was generally accepted in Korean history.

In this chapter, I will review various historical materials dealing with Koguryŏ and analyze how Koguryŏ was perceived during the late Chosŏn period and the Taehan Empire throughout Japanese colonial period until 1945. Although three aspects - political, cultural, and ethnical - were still mentioned consistently in discourses on Koguryŏ, there were also some changes in the projection of each lineage, and the intervention of the colonial perspective on Korean history caused more complications in the emergence of Koguryŏ memories. I will discuss the conditions in which three historical lineages of Koguryŏ developed and how they matured throughout this period by analyzing the early Japanese research on Korean history and the Korean nationalists' response to the Japanese claim.

I. Koguryŏ on the Verge of Nationalism in Chosŏn

Emerging interest in Koguryŏ among Koreans during the late nineteenth century was related closely to Japanese expansion following the Meiji Restoration (明治維新) in 1868. Chosŏn became the first target of Japanese imperialism, and Japan did not hide their intentions of using Chosŏn as a base camp for their further expansion into Manchuria. While Japan was gradually raising its interest in Manchuria, the discovery of King Kwanggaet'o stele in 1883 ignited a boom in research on Koguryŏ and Manchuria by Japanese scholars.[280] Since the stele was rediscovered, not only Japanese scholars but also Koreans published many articles about the stele and the ancient kingdom. In the following section, I will analyze how they perceived Koguryŏ in political, cultural, and ethnic lineages in Korean history from the 1880s until 1910, through a review of textbooks, newspapers, and other writings.

One of the Main Axes in Ancient Korean History

It is obvious that Japan had a tremendous impact on Chosŏn society since the late nineteenth century. Facing unprecedented threat from the outside, Chosŏn searched for a model for its own reformation, and Japan was one of sources upon which Chosŏn heavily relied. In addition, because it was Japan that forced Chosŏn to open, Japan happened to possess a huge advantage in solidifying its status as a "patron" of Chosŏn until colonizing it officially in 1910.[281] Therefore, many of the reforms instituted by Chosŏn were obviously influenced by Japan. Education was one of the fields in which Chosŏn launched reforms, and the first modern

[280] The text of the stele was first published by Yokoi Tadanao (横井忠直, 1857-1928) in the *Kaiyoroku* (会余錄) 5: *Kōkuri Kōtaiō hibun* (高勾麗好太王碑文) in 1889. Yokoi argued that the text on the stele proved Japanese control over the southern part of the Korean peninsula in the fifth century, and his argument became representative of Japanese historiography on ancient Korean history.

[281] Japan's exclusive status with Chosŏn was solidified by the Japanese victory in the Russo-Japanese War and internationally endorsed by the 1905 Protectorate Treaty between Chosŏn and Japan.

textbooks appeared in 1895 when the Ministry of Education (Hakpu, 學部) published a series of books for reading and history. According to *Kwanbo* (官報), the official gazette, the ultimate goal of education during this period was to inform the people about their nation and instill a virtuous spirit among them, and the education of history was taken as a main means to foster national pride and unite people.[282] It was no surprise that Koguryŏ often appeared during this period in many educational materials, including textbooks.

Since the *Kungmin sohak tokbon* (國民小學讀本, Elementary Readings for Citizens; a Korean language primer), arguably the very first textbook for young students, was published in 1895, Koguryŏ has never been excluded from Korean history in any historical materials, both state-sponsored and individually written documents. Among the great heroes in the history of mankind introduced in the *Kungmin sohak tokbon*, there were only two Koreans, and one of them was Ŭlchi Mundŏk.[283] It said that the *Chosŏn* people in the Koguryŏ period were able to defeat the Sui army despite being hugely outnumbered and Ŭlchi Mundŏk was hailed as the greatest man in four thousand years of Korean history. Every textbook published in this period said that Koguryŏ was unquestionably considered a part of the ancient history of Chosŏn. In the *Chosŏn yaksa* (朝鮮略史, A Brief History of Chosŏn), one of the very first history textbooks published by the Ministry of Education in 1895, Koguryŏ appeared in the list of kingdoms/dynasties that had once existed in Korean history. Of its ten chapters, beginning with Tan'gun Chosŏn, the *Chosŏn yaksa* listed Koguryŏ in the seventh chapter after introducing Silla

[282] Kim Hŭng-su, "Hanmal kuksa kyoyuk mit kyokwasŏ e kwanhan yŏn'gu" (A Study of the History Education and Textbooks in the Late Nineteenth Century of Chosŏn) *Yŏksa kyoyuk* 29 (1981): 49.

[283] The other Korean was King Sejong. Interestingly, the *Kungmin sohak tokbon* also introduced foreigners such as James A. Garfield, the twentieth president of the United States, and Genghis Khan. Besides short biographies of historic figures, it also contained various information on industries and topics such as chemistry.

in chapter six.[284] Although it connected Kija directly to Mahan instead of to Koguryŏ, the *Chosŏn yaksa* still related Koguryŏ with Kija and Tan'gun by stating that all of them chose P'yŏngyang as their capital. Using geographical location to stress historical legitimacy was common in the texts that dealt with Koguryŏ history during this period. In the *Tongguk yŏksa* (東國歷史, History of Korea), also published by the Ministry of Education in 1899, Koguryŏ appeared right after Kija and Wiman Chosŏn in the section on the capitals of previous states in Korean history, although Silla followed Tan'gun and Kija in a general overview section before Koguryŏ.[285] More importantly, it is worthwhile to note that all the historical incidents of the Three Kingdoms were recorded under a Three Kingdoms section in chronological order, because it implies that the Three Kingdoms were dealt with quite evenly even if Silla was mentioned before Koguryŏ and Paekche in the general overview in the *Tongguk yŏksa*. The *Yŏksa chimnyak* (歷史輯略, Brief History), another history textbook published in 1905 by Kim T'aeg-yŏng (金澤榮, 1850-1927)[286] also stated historical incidents chronologically. Kim listed the first kings of each of the Three Kingdoms in his *Yŏksa chimnyak*, and interestingly, he even introduced the second kings of Silla and Koguryŏ in his writings. Although he still addressed Wiman in the text of the Mahan section and positioned Silla before Koguryŏ and Paekche, introducing the first and even second kings of Koguryŏ while explaining about the founders of the Three Kingdoms clearly reflected the authors' attempts to get students and readers to acknowledge Koguryŏ as

[284] The ten chapters of *Chosŏn yaksa* are: 1) Tan'gun Chosŏn, 2) Kija Chosŏn, 3) Samhan, 4) Wiman Chosŏn, 5) Sagun ibu (四郡二部, the Four Commaderies and Two Prefectures), 6) Silla, 7) Koguryŏ, 8) Paekche, 9) Koryŏ and 10) Ponjo (本朝) Chosŏn.

[285] The *Tongguk yŏksa* stated that Mahan was absorbed by Paekche, while Chinhan and Pyŏnhan were annexed by Silla and Kaya, respectively.

[286] Kim T'aeg-yŏng was very much involved in the textbook publishing project during this period when he served in the Ministry of Education. His books became the models for history textbooks until Hyŏn Ch'ae (玄采, 1886-1925) wrote a thematic history that also covered topics such as culture and political structure.

much as Silla in understanding the political lineage of their history.[287]

Inclusion of Koguryŏ in the political lineage of Korean history became even more obvious when Hyŏn Ch'ae (玄采, 1886-1925) wrote the *Chungdŭng kyokwa Tongguk saryak* (中等敎科 東國史略, Basic History of Korea – for Middle School) in 1907. Hyŏn claimed Koguryŏ was the strongest state in Korean history since Old Chosŏn had fallen in the first century BCE as a result of the Han (漢) invasion.[288] It was not used as a history textbook for long because the Japanese colonial regime banned this book along with Hyŏn's other books, from being used as history textbooks after Chosŏn was officially annexed in 1910.[289] It does not seem, however, that including Koguryŏ in Korean history was what made Hyŏn's books banned as textbooks because not only Korean authors, but also Japanese scholars, in 1890 publicly recognized Koguryŏ as a legitimate regime comprising ancient Korean history during the Three Kingdoms period. In the 1890s, both Tsuboni Kumezō (坪井九馬三, 1858-1936) and Yoshida Tōgo (吉田東伍, 1864-1918) consistently addressed Koguryŏ in their articles about the ancient history of Chosŏn.[290]

---

[287] Although there is no doubt that Koguryŏ and Paekche were believed to have retained their political lineages in Korean history along with Silla, it was still Silla that was considered as the main state of the three. For example, Koguryŏ and Paekche were recorded under the Silla section in the *Taedong yŏksaryak* (大東歷史略), which was published written by Yu Sŏng-jun in 1908.

[288] *Chungdŭng kyokwa Tongguk saryak*, 1:7. Hyŏn Ch'ae published another book titled *Tongguk saryak* in 1908. Hyŏn again praised the military strength of Koguryŏ in his *Panmannyŏn Chosŏn yŏksa* (半萬年 朝鮮歷史, History of Chosŏn: Five Thousand Years) in 1923. In this book, he included pictures of important people in history, and the very first figure in the list was Tan'gun, followed by Kija and Yi Sŏng-gye. Interestingly, the first non-king listed was Ŭlchi Mundŏk, given just after Yi Sŏng-gye.

[289] This censorship by colonial authorities caused anger among Korean nationalists. For example, Sin Ch'ae-ho (申采浩, 1880-1936) accused the Bureau of Education of censorship. See "Kukka rŭl myŏlmangk'e hanŭn Hakpu," (國家를 滅亡케 하는 學部, The Bureau of Education is Destroying the Nation) *Taehan maeil sinbo* (大韓每日申報), March 16, 1909.

[290] Tsuboni Kumezō "Ko Chosēn sangoku teiritsu keiseiku," 1-4 (古朝鮮三國鼎立形勢考, Study on the Formation of Three Kingdoms in Ancient Chōsen) *Shigakkai zasshi* (史學會雜誌) 35, 36, 37 and 38 (October 1892-January 1893); Yoshida Togo, *Nikkan koshidan* (日韓古史斷, Ancient History of Japan and Korea) (Tokyo: Fuzanbo, 1893).

It is no surprise that Japanese scholars agreed to include Koguryŏ in the ancient Korean history considering that Japan was likely planning to march into Manchuria. As long as Manchuria remained in their strong interest, there was no reason for Japan to deny Koguryŏ's position in Korean history. Because Japan realized that it would be beneficial to link Koguryŏ in the history of Chosŏn to justify its future expansion beyond the peninsula, Koguryŏ consistently appeared even in Korean history textbooks that had passed Japanese censorship. In the *Ch'odŭng pon'guk yŏksa* (初等 本國歷史, Korean History – for Elementary School) which was published in 1909 and passed Japanese censorship for use as a history textbook, Koguryŏ was stated to be the first kingdom established out of three. Although Silla was explained before Koguryŏ in the fifth chapter, the years in which Silla and Koguryŏ were founded was given as 26 BCE and 36 BCE respectively. This is worth noting because most previous materials presented to Silla as having been founded before Koguryŏ, providing one of the main reasons why they addressed Silla first before Koguryŏ in their texts. As interest in Koguryŏ and research about this ancient kingdom quickly increased in this period, Koguryŏ was not only understood to share political legitimacy in Korean history, but also started being endorsed as the first kingdom among the three, in terms of the order of establishment. Although there was no further explanation from the author as to why he explained Silla to have been first before Koguryŏ in the main text of the *Ch'odŭng pon'guk yŏksa*, although he stated that the latter preceded the former by about ten years. The specification, however specious, of the year of each kingdom's founding certainly proved that Koguryŏ was recognized as much as Silla in the discussion of Korean history even in materials endorsed by the colonial regime.

Although history textbooks were one type of material evidencing the elevated status of

---

Shigakkai zasshi changed its title to the *Shigaku zasshi* (史學雜誌) from no. 37 in December 1892.

Koguryŏ in the discourse on Korean history, they were not the only documents reflecting people's perspectives on Koguryŏ. After his books were banned from the textbooks on Korean history, Hyŏn Ch'ae kept publishing articles about Korean history in a journal. From the fifth issue in October 1908 to the last issue in 1909, the *Honam hakpo* (湖南學報, The Journal of Honam) posted a series of Hyŏn's articles in which he again claimed that Koguryŏ was the strongest of the many states throughout Korean history since Tan'gun Chosŏn.[291] It does not seem coincidental that Hyŏn started contributing his writing to the journal right after the Japanese regime censored his book for textbook use,[292] and in the end, his *Tongguk saryak* was not only banned as a textbook, but Japanese authorities even prohibited it from being read in May 1909.[293]

Regarding the political lineage of Koguryŏ in Korean history, the *Sinjŏng Tongguk yŏksa* (新訂東國歷史, New History of Korea) published in 1906 showed an interesting change in the explanation of ties among Kija, Mahan, and Koguryŏ. In contrast to the conventional claim that Mahan had solely inherited Kija Chosŏn, there were two different groups that followed Kija; one was Wiman, and the other was Mahan. In a diagram of the *Sinjŏng Tongguk yŏksa* that explained the political lineage of Korean history, Koguryŏ descended Wiman while Paekche was listed in

---

[291] *Honam hakpo* 6 (1908): 19-21. 國家學 (續) – 國家之歷史 (續) – 政治及風化.

[292] "學部令 16號," *Kwanbo*, September 1, 1908.

[293] *Kyōkayō tosho ichiran* (敎科用圖書一覽). 5th ed. (Keijō: Chosēn sōtofuku gakubu, 1910), 30 and 33. It is not surprising that Hyŏn's *Tongguk saryak* was banned because in its preface he had made it very clear that Korea had been superior to Japan in various aspects since the Three Kingdom period. See *Tongguk saryak*, (自序). Interestingly, Hyŏn's *Tongguk saryak* followed the Japanese perspective regarding ancient Korean history. For example, it recorded Japanese control over the southern part of the Korean peninsula in the fifth century. Basically, the *Tongguk saryak* was very similar to the *Chosēn shi* (朝鮮史) written by Hayashi Taisuke (林泰輔, 1854-1922) in 1892. Hyŏn just added Tan'gun to Hayashi's book, thus showing his dissatisfaction with "Korean" history being written by a foreigner. It is also worth noting that Hyŏn Ch'ae used "my" or "our" to refer Chosŏn/Korea in his preface to the *Tongguk saryak*, using terms such as *aguk* (我國), *amunmul* (我文物), and *a-Hansa* (我韓史).

the line from Mahan.[294] This is very interesting because Koguryŏ was separated from Mahan, which had been generally believed to retain the most Kija tradition. In the circumstances in which conservative Confucian scholars were criticizing Japan and China for adopting aspects of Western (barbarian) culture and re-emphasizing Chosŏn's status as the "last bastion of civilization," any possible linkage to Kija was very crucial in its historical claim of political legitimacy. Within the model of "dual lineage" presented in the *Sinjŏng Tongguk yŏksa*, it could be argued that Chosŏn had succeeded and maintained two distinctive natures, a "Southern" one transmitted through Unified Silla and a "Northern" one taken over by Parhae. It is obvious that some historical documents arguing for a so-called "Southern-Northern States Period" [南北國時代] rather than calling it Unified Silla influenced the analysis appearing in the *Sinjŏng Tongguk yŏksa*.[295] No matter what affected the separation of Koguryŏ from Mahan, its consequence certainly made it easier for people to recall Koguryŏ in terms of its military triumphs against *foreign* states, and Koguryŏ's militaristic spirit was discussed more often in the cultural aspect.

The inclusion of Koguryŏ in the political lineage of Korean history culminated with Sin Ch'ae-ho (申采浩, 1880-1936), arguably one of the most prominent historians in this period. In his *Toksa sillon* (讀史新論, New Historical Perspective) published in the *Taehan maeil sinbo* (大韓每日申報, Korea Daily News) in 1908, Sin stated that he felt deep sorrow for the

[294] *Sinjŏng Tongguk yŏksa*, 歷代帝王圖.

[295] Yu Tŭk-kong (柳得恭, 1749-1807) was the first to suggest the term "Southern-Northern State Period" in Korean historiography. In his *Parhae ko* (渤海考) written in 1784, Yu lamented that Koryŏ did not include Parhae in its official historiography despite Parhae's co-existence with Silla from the seventh century till the tenth century. It is very likely that increased interest in Practical Learning and Parhae's appearance in writings such as Han Paek-gyŏm's (韓百謙, 1552-1615) *Tongguk chiriji* (東國地理誌), Sin Kyŏng-jun's (申景濬, 1712-1781) *Kanggye ko* (江界考), and Yi Chong-hwi's *Tongsa* contributed to Yu's suggestion of the "Southern-Northern State" in the discussion of Korean history during the late Chosŏn period.

tremendous downfall in *our* history when Koguryŏ perished in the seventh century.[296] Furthermore, Sin assumed that many records about Tan'gun would have been kept by Koguryŏ if it, instead of Silla, had united the Three Kingdoms because Tan'gun was the direct ancestor of Koguryŏ's royal family by blood [血統直祖]. Since Tan'gun was considered the common ancestor of the Korean people, Sin said Koguryŏ should not be denied its rightful place in the political lineage of Korean history, and therefore of the various founding kings of Korean history, King Tongmyŏng should be most credited with building a foundation upon which Korea could flourish.[297]

Sin's various articles dealing with Manchuria in this period also accounted for a new trend in which Koguryŏ emerged as a very intimidating topic. In articles about Manchuria published between 1908 and 1910, Sin analyzed this region's importance not only for Koreans,[298] but he also argued that Japanese fate would depend on whether they could control Manchuria or not.[299] It is worth noting that the geopolitical importance recognized by Sin may have propelled the emergence of the so-called "Man-Sen" historical perspective [滿鮮史觀] in Japanese scholarship after 1910. Ironically, Sin's intention to stress the political lineage of Koguryŏ in Korean history through various research on Manchuria helped the Japanese scholars using Koguryŏ as a convenient tool to support Japanese colonial policy in Chosŏn.

A Symbol of Militaristic Spirit in Korean Culture

[296] Sin Ch'ae-ho, "Toksa sillon," *Taehan maeil sinbo*, September 2, 1908.

[297] *Ibid*., November 3, 1908. Here, Sin listed all three kingdoms and their first kings for his evaluation.

[298] Sin Ch'ae-ho, "Han'guk kwa Manju," (Korea and Manchuria) *Taehan mail sinbo*, July 15, 1908.

[299] Sin Ch'ae-ho, "Manju wa Ilbon," (Manchuria and Japan) *Taehan mail sinbo*, January 12, 1910.

The illumination of Koguryŏ in Korean history as it was on the verge of being colonized did not stop at the realm of political lineage, and it was the cultural aspect in which memories of Koguryŏ remained vivid among people of the time. The awareness of Koguryŏ's military strength was arguably the most common topic in the discussion of Koguryŏ culture after the late nineteenth century. Not only textbooks, but also journals, newspapers and even historical novels included Koguryŏ's victories and historic figures in order to stress Koguryŏ's superiority. Since they were first introduced in 1895's *Chosŏn yaksa*, Ŭlchi Mundŏk and Yang Man-ch'un appeared in most history textbooks. In both his *Ch'odŭng taedong yŏksa* (初等 大東歷史, Great History of Korea – for Elementary School), just like An Chong-hwa's (安鐘和, 1860-1924) *Ch'odŭng pon'guk yŏksa* published in 1909, Pak Chŏng-dong (朴晶東, fl. late nineteenth-early twentieth century) delivered Koguryŏ's battle with Sui and Tang in two separate chapters, and the only difference between these two books was that the names of Ŭlchi Mundŏk and Yang Man-ch'un did not appear in the title of each chapter in the *Ch'odŭng taedong yŏksa*, whereas the *Ch'odŭng pon'guk yŏksa* mentioned their names in the titles for each chapter.[300]

Another piece of evidence showing a favorable perspective on Koguryŏ and military strength in general was the publication of the *Tongguk myŏngjang chŏn* (東國名將傳, Stories of Great Military Leaders in Korean History) in 1907.[301] Among the greatest military leaders in Korean history listed in this book were three figures from Koguryŏ, Pubunno (扶芬奴, fl. first century BCE), Ŭlchi Mundŏk, and Yang Man-ch'un. Unlike the latter two men, only a few

[300] Of the 41 chapters of *Chodŭng Taedong yŏksa*, Koguryŏ's wars against Sui and Tang were recorded in the ninth and tenth chapters respectively, and they were the only chapters on the Three Kingdoms before Silla's unification except for mentions of their establishments and early kings. Kim Yu-sin was also discussed in a separate chapter right after the chapter on unification.

[301] It was originally written by Hong Yang-ho (洪良浩, 1724-1802) in 1794 with the title *Haedong myŏngjang chŏn* (海東名將傳, Stories of Great Korean Military Leaders).

materials included Pubunno in the history of Koguryŏ, and a short reference about him in the *Samguk sagi* only stated that he had contributed to Koguryŏ's territorial expansion by defeating the Sŏnbi (鮮卑, Ch. Xianbei) tribes during the early years of Koguryŏ. It is very likely that the political situation of Chosŏn encouraged the publication of the *Tongguk myŏngjang chŏn*. As people were more concerned about their nation's ability to maintain independence, it was inevitable that they would refer the glorious days of Koguryŏ and its military power, and Pubunno's rare appearance in the *Tongguk myŏngjang chŏn* seemed to reflect the illumination of Koguryŏ culture as symbolized by its strong military spirit.

Remembering Koguryŏ's cultural legacy in terms of its militaristic spirit also appeared in the texts of journals. *Sŏu* (西友, Friends from P'yŏngan and Hwanghae (黃海) Provinces) published between 1906 and 1908, introduced many important figures of Korean history in each issue, and it included many Koguryŏ people for their achievements in military affairs, including Ŭlchi Mundŏk, Yang Man-ch'un, and Pubunno. In addition to those who had often appeared in other historical documents, Hyŏppu (陜父, fl. first century BCE) was also introduced in *Sŏu*. In spite of the brief explanation about him in the *Samguk sagi*, Hyŏppu was considered so important in the history of Koguryŏ that the author introduced him first among people of Koguryŏ in an article in the inaugural edition of *Sŏu* as one of the most important figures in Korean history.[302] It is also worth noting that Hyŏppu headed to Han (韓) in the south after leaving Koguryŏ, because it implies that there was some connection between Koguryŏ in the north and Han in the south. In other words, it is possible to interpret Hyŏppu's flight to Han as evidence for a linkage between

[302] *Sŏu* 1 (December 1906): 34-35. 人物考. In its inaugural edition, *Sŏu* introduced nine figures in Korean history, and four out of them were people of Koguryŏ. Besides Hyŏppu, Pubunno, Songokgu (松屋句, fl. first century), Miru (密友, fl. third century), and Yuyu (紐由, fl. thrid century) all appeared in the first issue of *Sŏu*. In subsequent issues, Ŭlchi Mundŏk (in no. 2), Yang Man-ch'un (in no. 3), and Ondal (溫達, ?-590) (in no. 9) also appeared.

north and south as represented by Koguryŏ and Han, respectively.

It is likely that the backgrounds of the people who participated in publishing the *Sŏu* played a particular role in Koguryŏ's relatively frequent appearance in the journal because most of the people involved with this journal were from P'yŏngan and Hwanghae provinces, which were located in former Koguryŏ territory. It is possible that the editors of the *Sŏu* wanted to include various records about Koguryŏ since they had emotional bonds with their geographical origins.[303] Emphasis of the militaristic spirit of Koguryŏ did not appear only in that one specific journal from that region. *Honam hakpo* also proved the strong trend of Koguryŏ's increasing prominence. Although it ceased publication after only nine issues, *Honam hakpo* consistently dealt with Koguryŏ in its texts. In its inaugural issue, Ŭlchi Mundŏk and Yang Man-ch'un were the only two figures in the section on important characters in Korean history, while other characters who had had military successes followed in subsequent issues.[304]

The discovery of King Kwanggaet'o stele further raised people's interest in Koguryŏ and its culture. As briefly mentioned before, Japanese scholars presented it as a proof confirming its control of southern Korean peninsular in the fifth century as stated in the *Nihon shoki* (日本書紀) by interpreting a line from its text.[305] Unlike Japanese scholars mainly focused on convincing

---

[303] Strong Koguryŏ support by people from the P'yŏngan region was also revealed in An Ch'ang-ho's (安昌浩, 1878-1938) preface to Sin Ch'ae-ho's *Ŭlchi Mundŏk chŏn*. In addition to the geographical ties between Koguryŏ and the publisher of *Sŏu*, it has also been argued that this region's unique emphasis on military spirit was another reason for the high frequency of Koguryŏ's appearance. See Yang Chŏng-hyŏn, "Taehan chegukki 'chŏn' nyu yŏksasŏ wa kŭ yŏksagwan" (Biography and Its Historical Perspective in the Great Han Empire), *Yŏksa kyoyuk* 72 (1999): 53.

[304] *Honam hakpo* 1 (June 1908): 47-54. 名人言行. Other characters such as Kim Yu-sin and Kang Kam-ch'an were introduced in subsequent issues.

[305] It reads "…百殘新羅舊是屬民由來朝貢而倭以辛卯年來渡□破百殘□□新羅以爲臣民…" Wheras Japanese colonial scholarship interpreted it as Japan subjugated Silla in 391, most both South and North Korean scholars read this text that Koguryŏ subjugated Silla. As presenting this stele as a historical proof justifying Japanese colonization of Chosŏn, Shiratori Kurakichi (白鳥庫吉, 1865-1942) even claimed that it was the earliest monument commemorating Japanese colonization on the continent fifteen hundred years ago. See Pai Hyung-il, *Constructing "Korean" Origins: A Critical Review of Archaeology, Historiography, and Racial Myth in Korean State-Formation*

Japanese control of southern Korea in order to provide historical justification in favor of their colonialization of Korea, Korean nationalists took it as a symbol of the "Great Koguryŏ" which they ardently kept trying to rejuvenate in the middle of foreign, specifically Japanese aggression. After introducing the stele for six consecutive days from October 31 through November 6, 1905,[306] the *Hwangsŏng sinmun* (皇城新聞, Capital Gazette) praised Koguryŏ's expansion over the Liao River (遼河) by King Kwanggaet'o,[307] and even argued that the most urgent issues in revising history textbooks were including the King Kwanggaet'o stele and giving Parhae history to clarify its succession of Koguryŏ.[308] In addressing various topics about Koguryŏ, the *Hwangsŏng sinmun* presented some convincing evidence claiming Koguryŏ's cultural lineage in Korean history. In its editorial on June 4, 1909, the *Hwangsŏng sinmun* stressed the long history of Korean literature by showing that a Koguryŏ poem was found in Chinese material,[309] and this article even reappeared in a journal about a month later.[310] Although this editorial tried to say that

---

Theories (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2000): 27. Lately, Pankaj N. Mohan understands its construction as a byproduct resulted from the influence of Buddhism in the fourth and fifth century in China and northeast Asia. See Pankaj N. Mohan, "Rescuing a Stone from Nationalism: A Fresh Perspective on the King Kwanggaet'o Stele of Koguryŏ," *Journal of Inner and East Asian Studies* 1 (2004): 104-109.

[306] "Koguryŏ Kwanggaet'o wang pimyŏng sŏgi" (高句麗廣開土王碑銘敍記, Texts on the King Kwanggaet'o Stele), *Hwangsŏng sinmun*, October 31, 1905 and "Koguryŏ Kwanggaet'o wang pimyŏng pujuhae" (高句麗廣開土王碑銘附註解, Annotation of Texts on the King Kwanggaet'o Stele), *Hwangsŏng sinmun*, November 1-6, 1905.

[307] "Tok Koguryŏ Yŏngnak taewang (Kwanggaet'o wang) myobi tŭngbon" (讀高句麗永樂大王 (廣開土王) 墓碑謄本, Reading the Records on the (King Kwanggaet'o) Stele), *Hwangsŏng sinmun*, January 6, 1909. This article also appeared in the *Sŏbuk hakhoe wŏlbo* (西北學會月報) in February 1909. The only difference is that there was an additional note from editor of the *Sŏbuk hakhoe wŏlbo* at the end of the article. Interestingly, editor pointed out that Koguryŏ had geographical advantage for adapting Chinese culture, which helped Koguryŏ develop as an ancient state during the Three Kingdom period. See *Sŏbuk hakhoe wŏlbo* 1, no. 9 (February 1909): 21-24.

[308] "Yŏksa kyokwa ŭi kŭpsok kaejŏngkŏn" (歷史敎科의 急速改正件, Emergency Reform of History Subject), *Hwangsŏng sinmun*, February 10, 1909.

[309] "Koguryŏ sisa" (高句麗詩史, History of Koguryŏ Poetry), *Hwangsŏng sinmun*, June 4, 1909.

[310] *Sŏbuk hakhoe wŏlbo* 1, no. 14 (July 1909): 22-24.

Korean literary history was as long as that of China, it is worthwhile to note people chose a Koguryŏ poem as evidence of the long literary history of Korea, and it arguably implies that people were aware of Koguryŏ's legitimacy in Korean history, not only in terms of political but also in cultural aspects as well.

Discussions on Koguryŏ Ethnicity

One of the issues scholars have scrutinized between the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century was ethnicity. In contrast to its political lineage, Japanese scholars often questioned Koguryŏ's ethnic lineage in Korean history from the early years of their Koguryŏ studies. In 1894, Naka Michiyo (那珂通世, 1851-1908) argued that the ethnic background of the Koguryŏ people was different from that of the Samhan people residing in the southern part of the peninsula. According to Naka, the so-called Baku (貊, Kor. Maek; Ch. Mo) tribe which mainly comprised Koguryŏ had never been clearly explained in historical texts and was also obviously different from the Samhan, which he implied formed the main group of Korean people.[311] While generally agreeing with Naka, Shiratori Kurakichi (白鳥庫吉, 1865-1942) also stated that the Koguryŏ people belonged to the Tunggus group, which were not related to the contemporary Chosŏn people.[312]

Instead of directly refuting the Japanese scholars' denial of ethnic ties between Koguryŏ and contemporary Chosŏn, Korean historians developed a Koguryŏ ethnic lineage within Korean history that was descended from Tan'gun starting with the first textbooks published in the late

[311] Naka Michiyo, "Chōsen koshikō" (朝鮮古史考, Study of Ancient History of Chōsen), *Shigaku zasshi* 5, no. 5 (May 1894): 34-41.

[312] Shiratori Kurakichi, "Manshū minzoku no kako" (滿洲民族の過去, The Past of the Manchurian People), *Tōyō jihō* (東洋時報) 132 (September 1909): 39-44.

nineteenth century. Since he was introduced first at the beginning of Korean history in the *Chosŏn yaksa* published in 1895, Tan'gun Chosŏn always appeared first in history textbooks. Whether or not Silla was favorably presented in these texts or not, Tan'gun Chosŏn had been universally considered as the beginning of Korean history, and Koguryŏ appeared clearly in his lineage. Historical documents published from the late nineteenth through the early twentieth century showed a similar historical perspective with the so-called the Practical Learning literati from eighteenth-century Chosŏn. Kim T'aeg-yŏng's *Tongsa chimnyak* (東史輯略) in 1902 and the *Yŏksa chimnyak* were two sources which revealed the influence of the Practical Learning's historical perspective with scholars such as An Chŏng-bok (安鼎福, 1712-1791), who acknowledged Tan'gun as the common ancestor of Korean people in his *Tongsa kangmok* (東史綱目) in the eighteenth century.[313] It is interesting that Kim still located Silla at the center among the Three Kingdoms in his writings in saying that (Unified) Silla succeeded Tan'gun eventually through Kija and Mahan. This does not mean, however, that Kim T'aeg-yŏng excluded Koguryŏ from the Korean historical lineage originating from Tan'gun, and Kim's inclusion of Koguryŏ history in his writing suggested that he also believed Koguryŏ certainly shared ties with Tan'gun, which just eventually merged into Unified Silla when Koguryŏ and Paekche were defeated by Silla. In the *Taedong yŏksa* (大東歷史) written by Chŏng Kyo (鄭喬, 1856-1925) in 1905, Koguryŏ's position in the Tan'gun lineage was reinforced since Chŏng indicated that Koguryŏ succeeded Tan'gun through Puyŏ while Silla took over Kija through Mahan.

[313] Kim Hŭng-su has argued that the most-often cited material for Kim T'aeg-yŏng's work was written by the Practical Learning literati, and this proved their influence on history textbooks published in late Chosŏn. Kim also explained that their influence was the reason why most historical books during this period stopped recording at the end of the Koryŏ period. See Kim, "Hanmal kuksa kyoyuk mit kyokwasŏ e kwanhan yŏn'gu," 74. Their influence is, however, revealed in the explanation of the linkage between Samhan, especially Mahan, and contemporary Chosŏn. From then on, Koguryŏ's historical role was understood as being free of ties to Mahan.

It is worthwhile to note that Chŏng joined the Tongnip hyŏphoe (獨立協會, Independence Club) in asking for a reformation of the government but still strongly agreed with the idea of Chosŏn as the "last bastion," simultaneously acknowledging the Kija tradition. Although it is clear that Kim and Chŏng, who both held strong Neo-Confucian perspectives, tried to emphasize the historical importance of the Three Hans, especially Mahan in terms of retaining the value of Kija, which had been lost in China since the Qing replaced the Ming in the seventeenth century, they did not deny but rather reinforced Koguryŏ's ethnic connection to contemporary Koreans by presenting Tan'gun as a common ancestor of Koreans. In other words, no Korean literati doubted Koguryŏ's position in Korean history in ethnic terms from the late nineteenth century through the early twentieth century although Koguryŏ's ties to Mahan still remained somewhat controversial in Korean historiography.

Apparently, the so-called dual lineage in Korean history also helped establish a foundation for the ethnic lineage of Koguryŏ. Following the structure depicted in the *Sinjŏng tongguk yŏksa*, the *Ch'odŭng pon'guk yŏksa* connected Koguryŏ to Wiman through the Four Commanderies while Paekche, Silla, and Karak were linked to Mahan, Chinhan, and Pyŏnhan, respectively.[314] Again, because Kija Chosŏn was succeeded by two different regimes – Koguryŏ in the north and Three Hans in the south, the ethnicity of Koguryŏ's people as descendants of Tan'gun should not be questioned regardless of uncertainty regarding its ties to Kija, as long as Tan'gun is accepted as common ancestor of Korean people. Considering that neither Wiman Chosŏn nor the Four Commanderies were mentioned in the *Ch'odŭng pon'guk yaksa* (初等本國略史, Brief History of Korea – for Elementary School), which was published in the same year as *Ch'odŭng pon'guk yŏksa*, people in this period hardly doubted Koguryŏ as being

[314] *Ch'odŭng pon'guk yŏksa*, 本國歷代圖.

ethnically Korean because it was very clear that Koguryŏ was understood as being of Korean history.

Emphasis on Koguryŏ's highly militaristic spirit also contributed to the consolidation of the claims about its ethnicity as seen in Korean history. As mentioned before, the *Hwangsŏng sinmun* introduced Ŭlchi Mundŏk quite often in its editorials between 1909 and 1910, and he was discussed in the text in terms of "our/us" in most instances. Since mentioned in April 20, 1909, Ŭlchi Mundŏk appeared at least five more times up to May 20, 1910, and the titles of three of the six editorials mentioning Ŭlchi Mundŏk contained a reference to "we" or "us".[315] The frequency of these editorials extolling Ŭlchi Mundŏk as the greatest hero in Korean history seemed to be related to the publication of Sin Ch'ae-ho's *Ŭlchi Mundŏk* in 1908.[316] Sin joined the *Hwangsŏng sinmun* as a member of its editorial committee in 1905, and his admiration of Ŭlchi Mundŏk likely influenced the tone of the newspaper during this period. As early as 1908, Sin wrote a piece in the *Taehan maeil sinbo*, in which he cited Ŭlchi Mundŏk as a hero of Korean history comparable with Europe's Julius Caesar (100-44 BCE) and Hannibal (247-183 BCE).[317] It is not uncommon to emphasize the role of an individual in times of national crisis, and Sin in this

[315] The articles and editorials dealing with Ŭlchi Mundŏk during this period are: "Ŭlchi kong san" (乙支公山, Mountain of Lord Ŭlchi) (April 20, 1909), "Ŭlchi kong kasa e taehaya u ilkwannyŏm" (乙支公家史에 대하야 又 一觀念, Additional Thoughts on the Family History of Lord Ŭlchi) (May 14, 1909), "A Han yŏksa ŭi kach'i" (我韓歷史의 價値, The Value of Our Korean History) (November 26, 1909), "Ap'o nakkwanjŏk sasang" (我抱 樂觀的思想, Have an Optimistic View) (January 21-23, 1910), "A minjok ŭi sinsŏng yŏksa" (我民族의 神聖歷史, The Sacred History of Our Nation) (April 21, 1910) and "Pae Ŭlchi Mundŏk sang kŭp pi" (拜乙支文德像及碑, Bowing to the Portrait and Stele for Ŭlchi Mundŏk) (May 20, 1910).

[316] The original full title of Sin's book on Ŭlchi Mundŏk was *Taedong sach'ŏnjae cheil tae wiin Ŭlchi Mundŏk*. (大東四千載第一大偉人 乙支文德, Ŭlchi Mundŏk: The Greatest Hero in Four Thousands Years of Korean History)

[317] Sin Ch'ae-ho, "Yŏngung kwa segye" (Heroes and the World), *Taehan maeil sinbo*, January 4-5, 1908. Here, the First Emperor of Qin (秦始皇, 259-210 BCE; r. 247-210 BCE), Xiang Yu (項羽, 232-202 BCE) and Toyotomi Hideyoshi (豊臣秀吉, 1537-1598) were mentioned as heroes of Chinese and Japanese history.

article urged people to become informed about, and admire their hero, while abandoning their jealousy.[318] Sin himself also strongly believed that a hero could decide the fate of a nation, and his writings on heroes in history consistently reflected his historical perspective that one individual could make a huge difference in *national* history. No one fit better than Ŭlchi Mundŏk into Sin's view on history, as he was an example of a hero with an unparalleled role in Korean history. Sin's *Ŭlchi Mundŏk* was a sustained work of historical interpretation rather than a standard biography of an important figure in history. Sin was very cautious not to include any kind of myths or unrealistic stories, and this might be because Sin himself was strongly convinced that this format would be better to express his argument against Japanese imperialism in the early twentieth century. In order to account for the importance of the existence of heroes, Sin even presented "Ŭlchi Mundŏk-ism" (Ŭlchi Mundŏk *chuŭi*, -主義).[319] The loss of Manchuria seems to make him realize the need for a hero who could save his nation and make it flourish, just as Ŭlchi Mundŏk had done in the seventh century. What is worthwhile to note in Sin's comment on Ŭlchi Mundŏk was that Sin claimed Ŭlchi Mundŏk as an all-time hero of *Korea* instead of a specific period and kingdom.[320] Sin's promotion of Ŭlchi Mundŏk to "Korean Hero" instead of a hero of a specific period or state contrasted with Kim Ch'un-ch'u (金春秋, 604-661; r. 654-661), who had allied with the Tang to "unite" the Three Kingdoms. Because Sin believed strongly that the Koguryŏ people also belonged ethnically to all Koreans, Sin was willing to present Koguryŏ's Ŭlchi Mundŏk as a symbol of Korean heroism.

---

[318] Sin Ch'ae-ho, "Yŏngung ŭl chujohanŭn kyegi" (How to Produce a Hero?), *Taehan maeil sinbo*, August 18, 1908. George Washington, Napoleon and Garibaldi were also often mentioned for their achievements and roles in the histories of the U.S.A., France and Italy.

[319] Sin Ch'ae-ho, *Ŭlchi Mundŏk*, 31. Interestingly, Sin also identified "Ŭlchi Mundŏk *chuŭi*" with imperialism in terms of a strong mentality of self-defense.

[320] Sin, *Ŭlchi Mundŏk*, 62.

In addition to his inclusion of Koguryŏ in Korean ethnic history by positioning Ŭlchi Mundŏk as the greatest Korean hero, Sin Ch'ae-ho more directly claimed that Koguryŏ's ethnicity fell within Korean history by listing the main groups that he believed comprised contemporary Koreans. After Naka Michiyo argued in 1894 that Koguryŏ did not belong ethnically to Korea, Sin wrote an article about the ethnic composition of Koreans in which he stated that there were six groups comprising the Korean nation: 1) Sŏnbi; 2) China (支那); 3) Mohe; 4) Jurchen; 5) Locals [土族]; and 6) Puyŏ.[321] According to Sin, Puyŏ, as the only group having direct ties to Tan'gun, remained the main group and gradually absorbed the other five groups. Therefore, it was no surprise that Koguyŏ, having been established by the Puyŏ tribe, had a huge impact on Korean history,[322] and Sin's choice of Ŭlchi Mundŏk of Koguryŏ in symbolizing the glory of the *Korean* nation rather than just Koguryŏ was anything but a surprise.

Although it was not clear whether Sin wrote this piece in order to answer the question of the validity of Koguryŏ's position in Korea's ethnic lineage as raised by Naka more than ten years earlier, it was very obvious that Koguryŏ's ethnicity had emerged as a very serious subject by the late 1900s when Japan apparently revealed its deep interest in Manchuria following the Russo-Japanese War. At that time, the Southern Manchuria Railroad Company was established by Japan, and Shiratori Kurakichi published an article denying ethnic ties between Koguryŏ and contemporary Chosŏn.[323] In Sin's series of articles about Manchuria published in early 1910, he stated that it was the Puyŏ tribe who first controlled Manchuria in the ancient period, and

[321] "Toksa sillon," *Taehan maeil sinbo*, August 29, 1908.

[322] Interestingly, Sin argued that Silla was also developed by the Puyŏ group. According to Sin, there were similarities in vocabulary, architecture, food and other customs of Koguryŏ and Silla while no such similarities were found in the case of Silla and China. See "Toksa sillon," *Taehan maeil sinbo*, November 3, 1908.

[323] While serving as the head of the Bureau for the Geographical and Historical Survey of Manchuria, Shiratori made it clear that the main goal of his research on Manchuria was to support Japanese control of southern Manchuria.

therefore, Koreans had a legitimate historical claim over Manchuria even though many nations had revealed their strong interest in this region. Furthermore, while pointing out that Manchuria would be a likely center of the Korean independence movement against Japan due to the large Korean population in the region, Sin specifically asked Koreans in Manchuria to maintain their national spirit [國粹] while enriching their political capacity.[324] At this point, Sin certainly realized the importance of the ethnicity issue in executing the independence movement efficiently. This was why he published pieces regarding ethnicity in ancient Korean history, and kept mentioning Tan'gun, whom Sin believed was not just the first ruler in Korean history but served as a symbol of Korean *minjok* (ethnic nation).[325] Koguryŏ, whose people had remained vividly in collective memories as being of Korean ethnicity, had to be emphasized in nationalist historiography in Korea, and arguably, Sin was the very first person in Korean historiography to publicly assert Koguryŏ's Korean ethnicity in the discourses of nationalism amidst Japanese expansion. As Andre Schmid perceptively points out, Sin Ch'ae-ho truly granted Koguryŏ a new sacred status on the central stage of Korean history rather than just treating it as a region that had once been occupied by Koreans. Through this transition suggested by Sin, the old land of Koguryŏ finally acquired a sacred position as the birthplace of the Korean *minjok* and the realm of Tan'gun.[326]

Awareness of Koguryŏ in Korean history appeared consistently in various materials from history textbooks and journals to newspapers. Although Chosŏn had to go through unprecedented

[324] Sin Ch'ae-ho, "Manju munje e ch'uihaya chaeronham" (Review of the Manchurian Issue), *Taehan maeil sinbo*, January 19-22, 1910. Sin Ch'ae-ho kept using *Hanin* (韓人) or *Hanminjok* (韓民族) to refer to Koreans in this series.

[325] Andre Schmid, "Rediscovering Manchuria: Sin Ch'aeho and the Politics of Territorial History in Korea," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 56, no. 1 (February 1997): 33-35.

[326] Andre Schmid, "Looking North toward Manchuria," *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 99, no. 1 (Winter 2000): 233-237.

changes from the late nineteenth century through the early twentieth century, Koguryŏ's position in the political, cultural, and ethnic lineages of Korean history was never questioned by Korean writers. Debates about Koguryŏ gradually increased as colonization by Japanese became imminent, and it was no surprise that Korean nationalists addressed Koguryŏ more often during the colonial period. In following section, I will examine how Japanese colonization influenced the projection of Koguryŏ memories between 1910 and 1945 in all three aspects – political, cultural and ethnic – as seen by both Japanese scholars and Korean nationalists.

II. Resurrection during the Colonial Period

Since aggression from outside, specifically by Japanese imperialists, played a key role in remembering Koguryŏ, it was impossible not to address Koguryŏ after Chosŏn officially became a Japanese colony in 1910. It is no surprise that many Korean nationalists mentioned Koguryŏ more often in order to protest the colonial regime, and the fact that many Korean nationalists escaped to Manchuria from the colony to avoid arrest certainly helped Koguryŏ appear in many discourses of the independence movement. It was common for Koreans to encounter many traces of Koguryŏ in Manchuria, and they easily found that Koguryŏ memories became a very useful tool in building a foundation for their independence movement. Koguryŏ had not only occupied the Manchurian region during its time but also had defeated *foreign* states repeatedly throughout its history, thus amounting to nothing short of being an ideal model for Korean people living under Japanese occupation to remember and strengthen their nationalistic spirit.

The nationalistic perspective of Koreans, however, was not the only trend in reviewing Koguryŏ during this period. In order to justify their possible expansion to Manchuria, Japanese historians presented the so-called "Man-Sen" perspective. According to this perspective, it was

impossible to separate Korean history from Manchuria because: 1) most rulers of various states and regimes in Korean history had come from either Manchuria or northern China; 2) many regimes in Korean history actually were able to control both sides of the Amnok River; and 3) even while the Qing survived in China, Koreans near the border with the Qing participated in agricultural activity in Manchuria.[327] In spite of some similarities in the positions taken by Korean nationalists and Japanese scholars about Manchuria's role in Korean history, there were profound differences in their claims – Japanese scholars also tried to argue Korea's historical dependency on China, specifically Manchuria in their "Man-Sen" perspective in order to justify their colonization of Korea whereas Korean nationalists kept mentioning Manchuria in their glorious past as represented by Koguryŏ. As long as both Korean and Japanese historians attached a great deal of historical importance to Manchuria, Koguryŏ remained an inspiring subject in the scholarship of both groups.

The Center of Korean Ancient History

Although Japanese scholarship generally took issue with the historical reality of Tan'gun, Koguryŏ was not involved in any controversy regarding its political role in the history of Korea. While stating that Wiman Chosŏn was the first regime in Korean history, the *Chōsenshi kōza* (朝鮮史講座) – *Ippanshi* (一般史) published by the *Chōsenshi hensan iinkai* (朝鮮史編纂委員會) introduced Koguryŏ before Silla and explained in detail its development as one of the Three Kingdoms in ancient Korean history.[328] Considering that many records about Silla and Paekche

[327] Inaba Iwakichi (稻葉岩吉, 1876-1940), "Man-Sen fukabun no shiteki kōsatsu" (滿鮮不可分の史的考察, Historical Research on the Inseparable Relationship between Manchuria and Korea), *Tōyō* (東洋) 5 (1922): 25-33.

[328] As the Japanese colonial government planned to propagandize its version of Korean history in order to keep the Korean nationalists' historiography from expanding, the *Chōsenshi hensan iinkai* first hosted public lectures on Korean history for Korean people. The *Chōsenshi kōza* was a collection of lecture notes spanning a year. The part of

in the *Chōsenshi kōza – Ippanshi* explained their relationship with Japan, it is likely that they wanted to include Koguryŏ in Korean history in order to support Japanese expansion to the north of the peninsula, where Koguryŏ had been located.

Not surprisingly, materials published by Koreans also dealt with Koguryŏ in their discussion of ancient Korean history. In his *Sinp'yŏn Chosŏn yŏksa* (新編朝鮮歷史) published in 1923, Hwang Ŭi-don (黃義敦, 1890-1964) located Koguryŏ at the center in explaining the histories of the Three Kingdoms. Although it followed the *Samguk sagi* regarding the years of establishment for each of the Three Kingdoms, the *Sinp'yŏn Chosŏn yŏksa* took Koguryŏ's battles against foreign regimes as its main topics during the Three Kingdoms period, and Hwang even adopted the notion of "Southern and Northern States" in his explanation of Korean history after Silla's unification to emphasize Koguryŏ's legacy in Korean history even after its fall.[329] Chang To-bin's (張道斌, 1888-1963) *Chosŏn yŏksa yoryŏng* (朝鮮歷史要領, Major Incidents in Korean history) was another example indicating the rise of Koguryŏ in Korean historiography during the 1920s. It is very similar to the *Sinp'yŏn Chosŏn yŏksa* in terms of the dating of the Three Kingdoms and in the order of its content, with Koguryŏ preceding Silla. What showed Koguryŏ's elevated status in writing Korean history was that Chang divided the Three Kingdoms period in two with the reign of Koguryŏ's King Sosurim (小獸林王, ?-384; r. 371-384),[330] who

---

its *ippanshi*, general history, was republished in 1927 under the title of *Chōsenshi taikei* (朝鮮史大系) in five volumes. The *Chōsenshi hensan iinkai* changed its name to *Chōsenshi henshūkai* (朝鮮史編修會) in 1925 and more actively propagandized the Japanese colonial regime by hosting many lectures and publishing materials about Korean history.

[329] While addressing the mid-ancient history of Korea covering from the Three Kingdom period until Koryŏ's establishment, Hwang divided this period into two different stages – 1) the Three Kingdom period and 2) the Dual (Southern and Northern) States Period. He also used the term "Palla" (渤羅) to refer this period, which implied his strong historical consciousness of Koguryŏ and Parhae.

[330] Chang To-bin, *Chosŏn yŏksa yoryŏng* (Kyŏngsŏng: Koryŏgwan, 1923).

consolidated his regime by importing Buddhism and establishing the national academy. It is a very interesting change in historical perspective because Silla had set the standard in writing historical events and periodization. No matter whether its founding was earlier than Koguryŏ or not, Silla had generally held superior status in Korean historiography until the early twentieth century, when some events concerning Koguryŏ were discussed more than before. It became obvious that the historical evaluation of the Three Kingdoms had shifted quickly during the colonial period in favor of Koguryŏ. Along with the social trend emphasizing the militaristic spirit of Korean history and the Man-Sen perspective of Japanese scholars, Koguryŏ was be able to compete for a leading role in some historiographies of the Three Kingdoms period.

In a series of articles about Korean history, Sin Ch'ae-ho specifically stated that Koguryŏ occupied a key part in Korean political history by mentioning the *Sinjip* (新集), published in the seventh century to record Koguryŏ history.[331] In this series, Sin analyzed ancient Korean history by mainly discussing Koguryŏ. Not only did he place Koguryŏ in the middle of the political lineage of Korean history, Sin argued that Koguryŏ was the first kingdom of the three to appear in Korean history. Ever since the *Samguk sagi* had listed Silla before Koguryŏ, Silla was generally considered to have been established before Koguryŏ, and this was a main reason why literati and historians emphasized Silla in Korean historiography.[332] In the 1920s, however, Sin Ch'ae-ho argued in a newspaper column that it was Koguryŏ, not Silla that had appeared first in Korean history among the Three Kingdoms, and Sin criticized Kim Pu-sik for his biased historical perspective in the compilation of the *Samguk sagi*.[333] Although Sin's claim about the

[331] Sin Ch'ae-ho, "Chosŏnsa," *Chosŏn ilbo* (朝鮮日報), June 12, 1931.

[332] *Panmannyŏn Chosŏn yŏksa* (半萬年 朝鮮歷史, Five Thousands Years of Chosŏn History) written by Hyŏn Ch'ae is an example that states that Koguryŏ was established about twenty years after Silla first appeared.

[333] Sin Ch'ae-ho, "Koguryŏ wa Silla kŏn'guk yŏndae e taehayŏ" (高句麗와 新羅 建國年代에 對하여, On the Year of

order of the Three Kingdoms' founding was not strong enough to overcome the conventional view, as some documents in 1930s still listed Silla as the first kingdom among the Three Kingdoms,[334] Sin's arguments undoubtedly consolidated Koguryŏ's importance in the discussion of the political lineage in Korean history. [335]

As a result of the ascending political status of Koguryŏ, historians re-visited the historical meaning of the seventh-century unification by Silla as perceived in the 1920s and 30s. For example, Mun Il-P'yŏng cautiously used the term of "Silla in the Unification Period" instead of Unified Silla in his writings, and he minimized Silla's unification by addressing it as a "half-unification" because of Parhae in the former Koguryŏ territory. Mun therefore argued that Koryŏ, instead of Silla, was the state that had truly unified Koreans first because it clearly possessed Koguryŏ heritage.[336] Influenced by the claims of former Southern and Northern states (or dynasties) from the previous period, Korean nationalists and historians addressed in their writings the "dual lineage" in the political aspect of Korean history, and it influenced the discussion on the cultural and ethnic aspects of Koguryŏ in Korean history.

Various Aspects of Splendid Koguryŏ Culture

One of the most apparent changes in Koguryŏ memory during the colonial period appeared in the evaluation of Yŏn Kaesomun (淵蓋蘇文, fl. seventh century). As the highly

---

the Establishment of Koguryŏ and Silla), *Sidae ilbo* (時代日報), May 20-25, 1926.

[334] Yi Ch'ang-hwan, *Chosŏn yŏksa* (朝鮮歷史) (Kyŏngsŏng: Puksŏngsa, 1934), 23-24.

[335] Sin's recognition of Koguryŏ's political lineage in Korean history is also hinted at by the title of his previous article, "Han'guk ŭi cheil hogŏl taewang" (韓國의 第一豪傑大王, The Greatest King in Korean History) in which he calls King Kwanggaet'o the greatest king in *Korean* history. See *Taehan maeil sinbo*, February 25-26, 1909.

[336] Mun Il-p'yŏng (文一平,1888-1939), "Koryŏ kaesa," (高麗槪史), in *Hoam Mun Il-p'yŏng chŏnjip* (The Complete Works of Hoam Mun Il-p'yŏng), (Seoul: Minsogwŏn, 2001), 4:235-236.

militaristic spirit of Koguryŏ's culture was emphasized, Yŏn's name appeared more often in various discourses about Koguryŏ. After Sin Ch'ae-ho publicly praised Yŏn Kaesomun, who had been routinely condemned by Confucian historians as a power-hungry hegemon, as early as 1908, Pak Un-sik (朴殷植, 1859-1925) joined Sin in the re-evaluation of Yŏn in the colonial period. In his biography of Yŏn Kaesomun, Pak explained that Yŏn was the main reason for Koguryŏ's triumph against the Tang, and that is why he should be respected even though he had committed a *minor* crime pertaining to morality. According to Pak, it was Yŏn's steadfast dedication that helped Koguryŏ remain independent in the seventh century, therefore, Yŏn's personality became a symbol of strong leadership rather than the cruelty of a tyrant.[337] In Pak's perspective, no one in Korean history had ever possessed as independent a mind as Yŏn Kaesomun had. Contrasting previous records where literati and historians depicted him as a villain, the change in the historical evaluation of Yŏn Kaesomun from the early twentieth century throughout the colonial period was quite substantial.

It is very important to note Yŏn Kaesomun's emergence in the re-illumination of Koguryŏ because it confirmed the foundational shift in historical memories of Koguryŏ. Until the late nineteenth century, it was Koguryŏ's relationship with Kija that gave Koguryŏ the most meaning in Korean history. The Kija-related perspective remained and was further stressed in the "last bastion" discourse. From the early twentieth century when Japan expanded its power following its victories in the Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese Wars, throughout the colonial period, Koguryŏ's military strength arguably emerged as one of the most prevalent topics in Korean history.

---

[337] Pak Ŭn-sik, "Ch'ŏn Kaesomun chŏn," (泉蓋蘇文傳), in *Paegam Pak Ŭn-sik chŏnjip* (The Complete Works of Paegam Pak Ŭn-sik), ed. Compilation Committee for the Complete Works of Paegam Pak Ŭn-sik (Seoul: Tongbang Media, 2002), 4:330-335.

The re-evaluation of Yŏn Kaesomun continued in the 1930s when Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931. From June 1-4, 1933, Mun Il-p'yŏng (文一平, 1888-1939) addressed Yŏn Kaesomun in a series of columns in the *Chosŏn ilbo* (朝鮮日報). In these columns, Mun argued that it was not fair to label Yŏn as a notorious rebel. According to Mun, the geopolitical situation of Koguryŏ had left no other choice but for Yŏn to respond in Koguryŏ's favor, and he simply did what he had to do. Therefore, Yŏn Kaesomun was to be praised for his keen insight about the international politics of his period, and this was why the meaning of the treachery tied to Yŏn was definitely different than conventional treachery.[338] Increased interest in Yŏn Kaesomun caused even more research on his name, and Mun clarified the issue about Yŏn Kaesomun's name, which had also appeared as Ch'ŏn Kaesomun previously in a critical historical novel on his life.[339]

The *Myŏngnimdappu chŏn* (明臨答夫傳) written by Pak Ŭn-sik also expressed the new trend of remembering Koguryŏ more in terms of its anti-foreign spirit rather than its tie with Neo-Confucianism. In its preface, Pak argued that Koguryŏ retained a sacred value in Korean history by maintaining ultimate independence until its demise. In order to be proud of Koguryŏ, it is inevitable, Pak insisted, to remember the great Koguryŏ people, including kings and many other officials. Among the seventeen Koguryŏ figures mentioned in the preface, Pak explained that he wrote specifically about Myŏngnimdappu (67-179) because he was related to the religious belief in Tan'gun. Myŏngnimdappu, the first prime minister of Koguryŏ, had

[338] Mun Il-p'yŏng, "Ch'ŏn'go yŏnggŏl Kaesomun," (千古英傑蓋蘇文, Kaesomun: A Great Hero in Thousands Years) *Chosŏn ilbo*, June 1-4, 1933.

[339] Mun Il-p'yŏng, "Yŏn Kaesomun (淵蓋蘇文)," *Chosŏn ilbo*, October 15, 1933. Although Mun did not mention the historical novel by Pak Ŭn-sik, it is likely that Mun believed Yŏn Kaesomun, instead of Chŏn Kaesomun, should have been used for the title of Pak's novel. Mun also referred to the *Nihon shoki* where his name was recorded as "伊犁柯須彌."

contributed to stabilizing Koguryŏ by replacing the king. In *Myŏngnimdappu chŏn*, Pak praised him very highly because he had not hesitated to risk his own reputation in order to realize true virtue - the salvation of the people.[340] His dethroning of King Ch'adae (次大王, 71-165; r. 146-165) was not only accepted but even praised for helping Koguryŏ develop without chaos.[341] Considering that Myŏngnimdappu defeated the Han (漢) army in 172 and led his military forces to survive among the neighboring strong states, the publication of Pak's *Myŏngnimdappu chŏn* was another example showing that military strength emerged as the proudest asset of Koguryŏ during the colonial period.

It was not just a highly militaristic spirit that Korean nationalists presented as an example of Koguryŏ culture to be remembered and preserved. In his historical novel, *Mong pae Kŭm T'aejo* (夢拜金太祖) written in 1911, Pak Ŭn-sik created imaginary schools for Koreans which the main character happened to visit and where many important figures in Korean history were serving as teachers in different subjects. In addition to King Kwanggaet'o, Ŭlchi Mundŏk, and Yŏn Kaesomun who were respectively a principal, a teacher at a military academy, and a teacher of physical education, Pak listed other Koguryŏ figures as instructors in various fields such as Yi Mun-jin (李文眞, fl. sixth-early seventh century), Tamjing (曇徵, 579-631), Moch'i (毛治), and Sundo (順道) as teachers of history, painting, medicine, and Indian philosophy, respectively.[342] Yi Mun-jin appeared in the *Samguk sagi* as the compiler of the *Sinjip* about the history of Koguryŏ in 600, and Tamjing was a Buddhist monk who left a picture on the wall at Hōryūji (法

[340] Pak Ŭn-sik, "Myŏngnimdappu chŏn," in *Paegam Pak Ŭn-sik chŏnjip*, 4:218-222. Here, Pak compared Myŏngnimdappu with Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658) of England.

[341] So harshly criticized for his cruelty and misconducts King Ch'adae appeared in texts as King Susŏng (遂成王), which was his given name.

[342] Pak Ŭn-sik, "Mong pae Kŭm T'aejo," in *Paegam Pak Ŭn-sik chŏnjip*, 4:148-153.

隆寺) and also helped the Japanese people produce Chinese ink. Moch'i is hardly mentioned in other materials but appeared here as a person who introduced medical knowledge to Japan. Besides the people of Koguryŏ who had substantial influence in each field, Pak also mentioned that Koguryŏ's highly developed leather industry was a subject at a specialized school. These characters of Koguryŏ, with the exception of a few such as King Kwanggaet'o, Ŭlchi Mundŏk, and Yŏn Kaesomun, had hardly appeared in historical documents before Pak introduced them in the *Mong pae Kŭm T'aejo*, and their appearance in published materials was likely an outcome of increased interest in Koguryŏ.

Not only Korean nationalists, but also Japanese scholars paid attention to Koguryŏ culture in the 1930s. While introducing Korean art in *Chōsen bijutsushi* (朝鮮美術史, Chōsen Art History), Sekino Tadashi (關野貞, 1867-1935) explained various Koguryŏ arts such as tombs, brick/roof tiles, sculptures, and paintings. What amazed him the most among Koguryŏ arts were the mural paintings found in tomb chambers. While introducing the techniques and contents of Koguryŏ paintings, Sekino argued that these mural paintings were the best in Asia except for those in India and that Koguryŏ paintings were so unique that neither Chinese nor Japanese paintings provided similar patterns.[343] Harada Yoshito (原田淑人, 1885-1974) also complimented the uniqueness of Koguryŏ. In his article "Manmō no bunka" (滿蒙の文化, Manchurian and Mongolian Culture), Harada stated that the lotus motifs on Koguryŏ roof tiles and the architectural techniques adapted to build tomb chambers proved that Koguryŏ culture was different from Chinese culture, as revealed in southern Manchuria and Rakurō (樂浪).[344] Japanese expansion into Manchuria likely affected the boom in increased interest in Koguryŏ

[343] Sekino Tadashi, *Chōsen bijutsushi* (Keijō: Chōsen shigakkai, 1932), 39 and 55.

[344] Harada Yoshito, "Manmo no bunka" (滿蒙の文化, Manchurian and Mongolian Culture), *Tōyō shichō* (東洋思潮) 11, no. 4 (1935): 1-73.

culture and in the research of Sekino and Harada. It is worthwhile to note that their major interest in Koguryŏ culture was in its arts whereas Korean nationalists mainly focused on subjects relating to its military spirit.[345] In other words, the cultural aspect of Koguryŏ gradually expanded its boundary in the collective memories among Korean people, and ironically, Japanese scholars contributed to consolidating Koguryŏ's position in the collective memory of Koreans. Koguryŏ culture was apparently more often discussed and illuminated than before by both Korean and Japanese scholars, regardless of the substantial difference in the areas where they specifically focused, and Ikeuchi Hiroshi (池內宏, 1878-1952) once again claimed that Koguryŏ was certainly entrenched in Korean culture.[346]

Ethnic Claims about Koguryŏ and the Expansion of the *Korean* Nation

One of the apparent changes in the discussion of Koguryŏ during the colonial period was the expanded interest in the ethnicity of Koguryŏ people. In contrast to the previous discourse on Koguryŏ, where ethnicity was subordinate to political and cultural aspects, question of the Koguryŏ people's ethnicity emerged as a central issue in Koguryŏ discourse throughout the colonial period. Similar to Sin Ch'ae-ho's claim about the ethnic composition of the Koguryŏ people, Pak Ŭn-sik also argued that Koguryŏ was composed of multiple ethnic groups. In his *Tanjosa ko* (檀祖事攷), he stated that both the Chosŏn tribes and Manchurian tribes were descendants of Tan'gun, and together formed a *Korean* ethnic group, the so-called Paedal Tribe

[345] Although its military spirit was the main topic of Koguryŏ culture in most documents produced by Koreans, there were occurrences that mentioned other aspects of Koguryŏ culture. In the *Kuksa* (國史) written in 1916, Chang To-bin expressed the fineness of Koguryŏ culture as revealed in Buddhism, paintings, architecture, and roof tile/bricks in the 1910s. Later, Chang added astronomy and music of Koguryŏ in his explanation of Koguryŏ culture in the *Chosŏn yŏksa yoryŏng*, and claimed that the collapse of Koguryŏ (and Paekche) was a great misfortune for the Korean people in terms of the cultural aspect of *Chosŏn yŏksa taejŏn* (朝鮮歷史大全) in 1928.

[346] Ikeuchi Hiroshi, "Chōsen no bunka," (朝鮮の文化, Korean Culture) *Tōyō shichō* 15, no. 2 (1936): 1-127.

(倍達族). According to Pak, the Tan'gun lineage was divided into six different groups – Chosŏn, Ye, Maek, Northern Puyŏ, Okchŏ, and Suksin (肅愼) – and the people of Silla formed the Chosŏn tribe. Meanwhile, the people from Northern Puyŏ were succeeded by Koguryŏ, and Parhae and the Jurchen produced the Manchurian tribes in the north.[347] In this diagram, Koguryŏ was more directly connected to Manchuria than the "Chosŏn" tribe that ultimately formed Silla. His classification of Korean ethnicity did not, however, downplay the role of Koguryŏ in Korean history by any means because he presented both Chosŏn and Northern Puyŏ as parts of an expanded "Korean" ethnicity. His recognition of Manchuria provides us the best understanding of his historical perspective on the ethnicity of the Korean people and its relationship to Koguryŏ. Pak strongly believed that Manchuria and Korea should be one country, as their people originally began from the same ethnic group symbolized by Tan'gun. As a result, he consistently emphasized in his various writings that Tan'gun was the common ancestor of the Korean people.

In the *Taedong kodaesa ron* (大東古代史論), Pak again claimed that Manchuria and Korea (i.e., Chosŏn) originally comprised one state and their people came from a common sacred ancestor, Tan'gun.[348] Considering this perspective, it was not surprising that he often mentioned Manchuria and Korea together. It is worthwhile to note that Pak even addressed the first of king of the Jurchen Jin (金, Kor. Kŭm) as being in the sphere of Korean ethnicity. In *Mong pae Kŭm T'aejo*, Pak praised him for making his state strong and categorized him as a proud descendant of Tan'gun,[349] and a poem appearing at the end of the *Myŏngnimdappu chŏn* punctuated Pak's

[347] Pak Ŭn-sik, "Tanjosa ko," in *Paegam Pak Ŭn-sik chŏnjip*, 4:494. 倍達族源流-檀君血統.

[348] Pak, "Taedong kodaesa ron," in *Paegam Pak Ŭn-sik chŏnjip*, 4:364. "…滿韓原是一國其民原是同族, 皆均檀祖神聖之裔也…" Pak used "Man-Han" in his writing in order to emphasize their common origin. Furthermore, Pak even mentioned nationalism as presenting the reason why Korean people (including Manchurian) should remain united. (*Ibid*., 4:364. "…今日乃民族主義之時代也. 吾人亦當講明其同族之誼發揮其神聖歷史求以自立於天下…")

[349] Pak, "Mong pae Kŭm T'aejo," 4:53-54.

claim on the ethnicity of the first king of Jin.

Our Dear Youths, This is Our Land.
Where Tan'gun Descendants of Northern Puyŏ have stayed for two thousand years.
The countless places of our Sacred Ancestor will last forever.
In the affluent Hon River (渾江) Basin where King Tongmyŏng arrived,
Koguryŏ was established. What a Great Insight of the Tiger.
Inside the Old Town of Hwando (丸都古城), the King Kwanggaet'o stele Stood.
Marching south and north, he shook the whole Eastern Continent.
(Yŏn) Kaesomun, the All-Time Hero, left his Tomb at Sanhae (Shanhai) Pass (山海關).
Wandering the Yongch'ŏn Prefecture (龍泉府),
Impressed by what the first King of Parhae did.
Controlling 400,000 People with His Leadership,
He made his Kingdom (=Parhae) a Flourishing State in the East.
The First King of Jin, *Our People** rooted on Mountain Paekdu (白頭山),
[He] marched every direction with his 2,500 fine troops.
What we have endured until now was destined by God,
We should inherit and develop our proud history by refining our spirit.

[*Emphasis added]

This poem addresses many glorious incidents in the history of Koguryŏ, which had occupied a large territory covering Manchuria. While mentioning some historically important characters of Koguryŏ, Pak referred to Yŏn Kaesomun as a timeless hero in Korean history,[350] and here, Pak again categorized the founder of Jin as a Korean by calling him "our people."[351] It

[350] "…蓋世英雄 蓋蘇文…"

[351] "…우리同族 金太祖…" Pak was not the first one who claimed that the first king of Jin was Korean. In his article

certainly reflects Pak's strong belief that the people in Manchuria, including the Jurchen, should be considered "Korean" because they were also descended from Tan'gun, the common ancestor of Koreans. He stated that all the characters in the poem belonged to the Northern Puyŏ group that originated from Tan'gun, and connected its lineage to kings of Parhae. Therefore, Pak argued that Parhae should be emphasized in Korean history as well because it was built by the Koguryŏ people and Koguryŏ's legacy, including its territory, still pertained in Parhae, even after its fall in 668. Obviously, both Pak's view of the Korean people and the claim of dual lineage in Korean history affected his endorsement of Parhae as shown by the fact that he mentioned the first king of Parhae in the poem after Yŏn Kaesomun, and praised King Sŏn (宣王, ?-830; r. 818-830), the tenth king of Parhae for making his state flourish in northeast Asia.[352]

What is more interesting in the context of the *Mong pae Kŭm T'aejo* was that Pak harshly criticized the conventional claim of the "last bastion" for its hypocrisy whereas he regarded the Jurchen as "our" people. According to Pak, the founder of Jin/Kŭm, who should have been complimented, and those who argued for the "last bastion" should have been ashamed of themselves for abandoning their self-esteem. This is important because Pak's claim signaled Koguryŏ's independence from the Neo-Confucian historiography, which solely emphasized its tie to Kija tradition. In other words, developing further from dual lineage of the political aspect regarding Koguryŏ in Korean history, which literati and historians had adhered to previously, nationalistic historiography emerging rapidly in the early twentieth century made it possible to

---

about the Manchu issue, Sin Ch'ae-ho also stated that Kim Chun (金俊) was the name of the first king of Jin, who had been a Buddhist monk from P'yŏngan province. See Sin Ch'ae-ho, "Manju munje e ch'uihaya chaeronham," *Taehan maeil sinbo*, January 19, 1910.

[352] The *Parhae T'aejo kŏn'guk chi* (渤海太祖建國誌) which Pak wrote in 1911 also included this poem.

link Koguryŏ directly to ethnic lineage in the discussion of Korean history.

It is very obvious for Pak to include Manchuria in Korean history in terms of its ethnic ties to Tan'gun, whom Korean people considered their common ancestor. To Pak Ŭn-sik, the founder of Jin/Kŭm also belonged to the Koreans, and thus Manchuria should be understood to be part of Korean history. Relating Koguryŏ directly to Manchuria did not mean excluding it from Korean history by any means because Koguryŏ has been related with Tan'gun throughout Korean history. Pak certainly considered Koguryŏ the proudest state in Korean history and just took it as an example of glory in Korean history. Indeed, Koguryŏ had to compete with various Chinese regimes from the beginning but maintained its independence until its demise in the seventh century. It is inevitable, Pak asserted, for the Korean people to remember and revitalize the spirit of Koguryŏ.[353]

In contrast to the Korean nationalists' claim about Koguryŏ's ethnicity, Japanese scholars generally argued the difference between the Koguryŏ people and the contemporary Koreans. Imanishi Ryū (今西龍, 1875-1932) was one of those denying the ethnic ties between the people of Koguryŏ and modern Koreans. According to Imanishi, the people of Koguryŏ belonging to the Tunggus (=Manchurian) tribes were not related to contemporary Koreans, who were instead closely related to the Japanese in terms of ethnicity.[354] It is obvious that Imanishi's argument was rooted in the so-called "common ancestor" claim between Japan and Korea [內鮮一體], stating that Japanese and Korean people were originated from same ancestors, which had been presented earlier to justify the Japanese colonization of Korea. When identifying Tan'gun as a brother of the ultimate ancestor of Japanese people before, Japanese scholars arguing the "Man-Sen"

[353] Pak, "Myŏngnimdappu chŏn," 4:220-222.

[354] Imanishi Ryū, *Dankun kō* (檀君考, Study of Dankun) (Keijō: Chikazawa insatsubu, 1929).

perspective in the 1920s explained Tan'gun as a fictional figure in Korean history who ha been fabricated in the thirteenth century.

Controversy regarding Tan'gun was deeply related to the issue of Koguryŏ's ethnicity in Korean history because Tan'gun was the key figure linking Koguryŏ to the discourse on Korean history, and the debate among members of the Chōsenshi hensan iinkai about the publication of Korean history in the 1920s proved the complexity of the issue about Tan'gun. During its inaugural meetings for the project, Koreans showed their interest in addressing Tan'gun, while Japanese scholars were more reluctant to include him in official Korean history.[355] The Korean nationalists were certainly displeased with the Japanese claims about Tan'gun. Responding to the Japanese claim about the reality issues surrounding Tan'gun, Ch'oe Nam-sŏn (崔南善, 1890-1957) published articles in *Tonga ilbo* (東亞日報) between February and July of 1926 in order to dispute Japanese scholars who took the Buddhistic features of the Tan'gun myth as a proof of its fabrication by Iryŏn, and he even addressed the similarities between Old Chosŏn and China in ancient times in other articles.[356] Ch'oe's emphasis on Tan'gun's status in Korean history led to his analysis of Korean ethnicity. In the *Chosŏn yŏksa* (朝鮮歷史) published in 1936, Ch'oe Nam-sŏn listed five main states surrounding the Four Han Commanderies – Han (韓), Ye, Okchŏ, Koguryŏ, and Puyŏ – while explaining how Korean states developed after Wiman Chosŏn's collapse.[357] Although Ch'oe Nam-sŏn did not directly connect Tan'gun to Koguryŏ here, it was

[355] *Chōsen shi henshūkai jigyō gaiyō* (朝鮮史編修会事業概要) (Keijō: Chōsen shi henshūkai, 1938), 19-24. In contrast to the issue of Tan'gun, Parhae did not draw much attention during this meeting, and was asked about only a few times by the members.

[356] Ch'oe Nam-sŏn, "Tan'gun kwa Samhwang oje, sindorŭl t'onghaesŏ ponŭn Ko Chosŏn kŭp China ŭi wŏnsi kyubŏmjŏk ryudong" (檀君과 三皇五帝, 神道를 通해서 보는 古朝鮮及 支那의 原始規範的 類同, Tan'gun and Three Augusts, Five Emperors: Similarities in primitive norms of Old Chosŏn and China through Sindo), *Tonga ilbo*, August 1-December 16, 1928.

[357] Ch'oe Nam-sŏn, *Chosŏn yŏksa* (Kyŏngsŏng: Tongmyŏngsa, 1936), 4.

very likely that his strong belief in Tan'gun helped Koguryŏ to be included in Korean ethnicity in the *Chosŏn yŏksa* as a response to the Japanese demotion of Tan'gun.[358]

Koguryŏ's influence on Manchuria throughout Korean history was not questioned in either the Korean nationalists or the Japanese scholars. While elaborating on Koguryŏ's status in Manchuria, Oshibuchi Hajime (鴛淵一, 1896-1983) considered Koguryŏ's victories against Sui and Tang the expression of the Manchurian people's everlasting spirit.[359] Although this claim was made to underline the position of Koguryŏ in Manchurian history, other Japanese scholars such as Inaba Iwakichi (稻葉岩吉, 1876-1940) had previously admitted that Koguryŏ people had played an important role in developing Korean culture which contained both features of Chosŏn and Manchuria.[360] Despite the emphasis of the Manchurian features of Koguryŏ ethnicity, colonial scholarship about Koguryŏ ironically presented another possibility for connecting Koguryŏ to the ethnic lineage of Korean history at the same time because various groups of people, instead of just one specific group, manufactured and transmitted *Korean* culture throughout *Korean* history. As long as multi-ethnicity in the formation of the Korean nation was agreed upon, as had been argued by Korean nationalists such as Sin Ch'ae-ho and Pak Ŭn-sik, the Manchurian features of Koguryŏ ethnicity did not discount its position in the discourse of Korean history. Therefore, the attempt to separate Koguryŏ from the *Korean nation* by the Japanese colonial scholars was not as successful as they expected, and the ethnic lineage of

[358] Ch'oe also mentioned briefly that *ondol*, the traditional heating system of Korea originated in Koguryŏ in his book (*Chosŏn yŏksa*, 19).

[359] Oshibuchi Hajime, "Manshū shi" (滿洲史, A History of Manchuria), in *Sekai rekishi taikei: Chōsen·Manshū shi* (世界歷史大系: 朝鮮·滿洲史, An Overview of World History: The History of Korea and Manchuria) (Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1935), 11: 240-244.

[360] *Chōsenshi kōza-bunruishi* (朝鮮史講座-分類史). Inaba also included Koguryŏ in his "Chōsen shi" (朝鮮史), published in the same volume with Yano's "Manshū shi" in the *Sekai rekishi taikei*. See Inaba Iwakichi, "Chōsen shi," in *Sekai rekishi taikei: Chōsen·Manshū shi*, 11:27-36.

Koguryŏ in Korean history was illuminated again as long as *Koreans* believed that the people of Manchuria were part of the *Korean people*, regardless of whether Japanese scholars agreed or not.

Conclusion

Although Koguryŏ had been consistently discussed in the Korean history, there were some profound differences in the historical perspective on Koguryŏ from the late nineteenth century throughout the colonial period in the comparison with the views that the Neo-Confucian literati and historians had expressed before. Responding to Japanese colonialism and their scholarship analyzing Koguryŏ in order to support colonial policies, many Korean nationalists strongly claimed the legitimacy of the Koguryŏ lineage in the political, cultural, and ethnic history of Korea, and arguably, Tan'gun and Manchuria were two key features that boosted their Koguryŏ research during this period.

The emergence of Manchuria for geo-political reasons since the late nineteenth century propelled Koguryŏ studies not only among Korean nationalists but also Japanese scholars. By presenting the so-called "Man-Sen" perspective, the Japanese colonial regime tried to separate Koguryŏ from the discourse of *Korean* history, hoping that it would weaken the Korean nationalist movements that were mainly rooted in memories of Koguryŏ. Ironically though, the Japanese colonial scholarship on Koguryŏ helped Koreans consolidate their collective memories of Koguryŏ. Once the notion of dual lineages in Korean history had been suggested, Koguryŏ's position in the political and cultural aspects of Korean history was reconfirmed, and the new understanding of Tan'gun as the origin of Korean *minjok* was crucial in the formation of collective memory among Koreans, especially as their *nation* was being lost. Consequently,

Manchuria was considered not just the old territory of Koguryŏ but rather the birthplace of Korean *minjok*, and Silla's unification was discounted as "incomplete" due to Parhae's existence in the northern peninsula.

Various fields of Koguryŏ culture besides its high military spirit, including paintings and architecture, were discussed more often than before. Although it is likely that Japanese scholarship attempted to attenuate the militaristic character of Koguryŏ by stressing other features in Koguryŏ culture, and their illumination of Koguryŏ arts was related to their project of Manchurian expansion, it is obvious that the increased interest in Koguryŏ in general had a great deal to do with the expansion of the subject of its culture. Notes and explanation about Koguryŏ people who had hardly appeared in the conventional materials on Korean history, such as Ŭlp'aso (乙巴素, ?-203) and Talga (達賈, ?-292), provided more evidence of the process of formulating new collective memories of this ancient kingdom among Koreans.[361]

Defining Tan'gun as the common ancestor of both the Korean and Manchurian peoples was a sign indicating that Koreans also realized the importance of ethnicity in the discussion of Koguryŏ itself, and perhaps of Korean nationalism as well. By acknowledging him to be the forefather of Koreans and labeling Manchuria as the birthplace of Korean *minjok*, Koreans certainly considered the people of Koguryŏ as the main group in the composition of Korean ethnicity, regardless of the colonial scholarship that kept trying to separate them from the discussion of Korean ethnicity. Because Koguryŏ inherited its legitimacy from Tan'gun and encompassed the birthplace of Koreans until its fall, it became impossible for Koreans to ignore Koguryŏ in their historical consciousness.

[361] Both Ŭlp'aso and Talga were introduced along with other Koguryŏ figures, including Ŭlchi Mundŏk and Yang Man-ch'un, in the *Chosŏn yaksa*, which was published in 1895. Considering that Ŭlp'aso contributed to saving people from famine and Talga was related with territorial expansion into Manchuria, it is very likely that both of them were cautiously chosen to include in the historical materials of this period. Ŭlp'aso was highlighted again when Chang To-bin wrote his biography, *Tae chŏngch'iga Ŭlp'aso ssi* (Ŭlp'aso: A Great Official) in 1919.

It is obvious that social circumstances during the colonial period heavily influenced the Koguryŏ discourse in many ways. The reality of being a Japanese colony indeed made people hold Yŏn Kaesomun in high esteem for his resistance against the Tang, in contrast to his previous image as a cruel tyrant in traditional Chosŏn historiography, and many publications dealing with Koguryŏ arguably reflected how this ancient kingdom finally came out the text of history and transformed into a vibrant presence in the realm of collective memory of the *Korean nation*. Indeed, nationalism thrives on crisis, and the unprecedented situation Chosŏn went through after the late nineteenth century was not an insignificant factor in the formation of Korean nationalism. All the features emerging in the discourse of the Korean *minjok*, such as Tan'gun and Manchuria, had undeniable connections with Koguryŏ throughout Korean history; therefore, it became proper to argue that Koguryŏ was finally able to reach the collective memory of Koreans by the mid-twentieth century.

Chapter Six

Ancient but Still Relevant Today

Introduction

Although Koguryŏ had never been excluded from national histories by Koreans, and Koguryŏ's position in Korean history had not been questioned regardless of its status among the Three Kingdoms, it was during the late nineteenth century and throughout the colonial period that Koguryŏ became illuminated and consequently became successfully embedded in the collective memory of Koreans of all walks of life. Unquestionably, it was the rise of nationalism under Japanese colonialism that contributed to consolidating Koguryŏ's status in the historical consciousness of Koreans instead of remaining only in historical texts and among discussions of literate elites.

Liberation from Japan in 1945 and the establishment of two different *Korean* regimes in 1948 arguably provided new ground for the discussion of Koguryŏ in Korean history. The difference between the Republic of Korea (hereafter South Korea) and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (hereafter North Korea) in their political situations intensified the tension between them, and it eventually led to the Korean War less than five years after the Korean people finally recovered their independence from Japan. The result of this "unresolved" war[362] and competition between the two Koreas since 1953 necessarily affected the development of

[362] Only an armistice agreement was signed bewteen the United Nations and North Korea in July 1953, but that was a "ceasefire," not a peace treaty officially ending the war. Therefore, the Korean War has not yet officially ended, and North and South Korea are still technically at war.

Koguryŏ discourses on both sides of the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ). Because they have direct ties with Koguryŏ in terms of territory, North Korea has had some advantages in claiming their legitimacy and legacy from Koguryŏ while South Korea has had only limited access to Koguryŏ remains. In this chapter, I will review how memories of Koguryŏ have appeared and been projected in both North and South Korea since their establishment. Because it was generally agreed that the people of Koguryŏ were among the ancestors of cotemporary Koreans, it would be interesting how the current political situation has influenced the issue of "Korean-ness" in the discourse of Koguryŏ even as its ethnicity has been questioned again in terms of the identity of the Ye (穢), Maek (貊), and Malgal (靺鞨, Ch. Mohe) in contemporary scholarship, not only in Korea, but also in Japan and Taiwan.

I. Koguryŏ Legacy in the Politics of North and South Korea

Liberation in 1945 certainly brought changes in various fields of Korea, and the most important outcome following independence was the division of Korea. Although opposition has persisted since their establishments, both North and South Korea have recorded and addressed Koguryŏ in their version of Korean history, and its political lineage has been especially stressed while the two Koreas are competing to gain historical legitimacy. In the following section, I will compare and analyze how Koguryŏ memories have been reconstructed and used politically by North and South Korea.

Political Circumstances after Liberation

It was the U.S. Military Government that immediately took over from Japanese regime in the southern half of the peninsula when the colonial period ended in 1945. Because the main goal

of the Military Government was maintaining order in Korea after liberation, they adopted many old Japanese rules, and the influence of educational practices from the colonial period also remained strong during the Military Government period although the United States attempted to create a new, more democratic educational system. In particular, many history textbooks in Japanese were still used after 1945, and the very first textbooks of Korean history for elementary and middle school students were published in 1946 from the Chindan hakhoe (震檀學會). It was no surprise that the Chindan hakhoe was first contacted by the U.S. Military government to publish history textbooks when the Japanese left Korea. It had been the main source of research about Korean history since it was established in 1934, but also many of its inaugural members had a modern education under the Japanese and even studied in Japanese universities.[363]

Kuksa kyobon (國史敎本) published by the Chindan hakhoe in 1946 was one of the very first history textbooks after liberation. Being designed for middle school students, *Kuksa kyobon* addressed all Three Kingdoms including their establishment, development, and cultures in its coverage of the ancient period. Here, Koguryŏ still appeared first out of the Three Kingdoms, while Silla was explained in detail, particularly after its unification in the seventh century. It is worthwhile to note that Koguryŏ's military strength was the main subject in the new textbook, as it had been during the colonial period. Under the title of "Flourishing Silla and Strong Koguryŏ," it presented Koguryŏ's triumphs against the Sui and the Tang as evidence of martial glory in Korean history. What was even more noteworthy is that the Koguryŏ army was called "*our*"

[363] Yi Pyŏng-do (李丙燾, 1896-1989) is the best known example. After graduating from Waseda University in 1919, Yi once participated in the Korean History Compilation Committee in the 1920s. Although it is not clear how seriously he was involved in projects of this committee, Yi was obviously influenced by Japanese scholars including Yoshida Tōgo, Tsuda Sōkichi (津田左右吉, 1873-1961), and Ikeuchi Hiroshi. He is considered an authority on Korean history.

troops instead of Koguryŏ troops in describing the battle between Koguryŏ and the Tang.[364] This is the only instance of a textbook using the first-person perspective in recording battles relating any of the Three Kingdoms in this textbook. It was not clear whether the authors were using "our" on purpose or not, but it obviously implied that the historical consciousness of Koguryŏ among the people involved in the compilation of the *Kuksa kyobon* was so strong that they could refer to Koguryŏ as "we" in the text.

Views on unification also verified the solid status of Koguryŏ in ancient Korean history because the chapter was titled "Unification of the Three Kingdoms" instead of "Silla's Unification." Although the first subtitle under this chapter was Silla's annexation of Koguryŏ and Paekche,[365] it is very clear that the emphasis in the text lay on the "unification" per se, instead of the agent fulfilling the task. In other words, it described the unification in the seventh century as *unification of the Korea nation* rather than the more expansion of Silla's territory, and it is even more obvious in its claim that Silla united Koguryŏ and Paekche in "the fulfillment of the peninsula" to explain the process of repelling Tang forces after defeating Paekche and Koguryŏ.[366] Although it introduced Parhae briefly, the historical meaning of the political unification of the Korean nation including Koguryŏ was hardly questioned through the text of the *Kuksa kyobon*.

The political legacy of Koguryŏ (and Parhae) appeared stronger in other history textbooks published after 1945. The *Ch'odŭng Kuksa kyobon* (初等 國史敎本) was another history textbook in use soon after liberation.[367] Being designed for fifth- and sixth-grade

[364] *Kuksa kyobon* (Kyŏngsŏng: Kunjŏngch'ŏng mun'gyobu, 1946), 14-15.

[365] *Ibid*., 15.

[366] *Ibid*., 17.

[367] The Compilation Office of the U.S. Military Government started the publishing project in September of 1945 and

students, the *Ch'odŭng kuksa kyobon* revealed a very strong Koguryŏ-centered historical perspective throughout. Focusing on the ancient period in Korean history, it assigned nine of its fifteen chapters to the periods before Koryŏ's establishment in the early tenth century. Considering that the Koryŏ dynasty was explained in just two chapters, and only King Sejong, Yi Sun-sin (李舜臣, 1545-1598), and the Imjin War were addressed in the sections on the Chosŏn dynasty, the ancient period of Korean history was arguably the main subject of the *Ch'odŭng Kuksa kyobon*.[368] It is apparent that the *Ch'odŭng Kuksa kyobon* treated Koguryŏ as the main kingdom in the material on the Three Kingdoms period. It not only introduced Koguryŏ first before Paekche and Silla in the chapter on the establishment of the Three Kingdoms, but also addressed Koguryŏ's military strength (and not those of the other kingdoms) in a separate chapter.[369] In contrast to most of the previous materials mentioning Koguryŏ's victories against the Sui and the Tang in the seventh century as an example of its military strength, the *Ch'odŭng Kuksa kyobon* started with Koguryŏ's early victories over the Han (漢) and territorial expansion during the fifth century under King Kwanggaet'o and Changsu.

Ironically though, the strongest evidence of acknowledgment of the political lineage of Korguryŏ was confirmed in the text on the period after its collapse in 678. Instead of Silla, it was Parhae that the *Ch'odŭng Kuksa kyobon* addressed right after the Three Kingdoms period. In its seventh chapter titled "Parhae - The Rise of the Northern Dynasty," it explained Koguryŏ's demise and Parhae's establishment while (Unified) Silla appeared after Parhae.[370] More

---

completed it in December of the same year. By January 1946, a couple of copies were distributed to local offices in each province of South Korea.

[368] The last two chapters covered from the eighteenth century through 1910, and the independence movement during the colonial period, respectively.

[369] This chapter was even titled, "It was Koguryŏ that was large and strong."

[370] This refers to the final days of Paekche, also in this chapter.

importantly, the chapter on Silla was titled "Culture of the Southern Dynasty, Silla" and addressed only cultural aspects of this period. In contrast, political changes in history, including Koguryŏ's collapse, were explained in the Parhae chapter, while the two chapters on (Unified) Silla mainly focused on culture and economy. Arguably, it implies that the Koguryŏ-centered historical perspective prevalent during the colonial period was still vivid after liberation as shown in the *Ch'odŭng Kuksa kyobon* in which Koguryŏ was specifically stressed among the Three Kingdoms.[371] It suggests that Koguryŏ occurred first in people's minds when they thought of political lineages in Korean history while the culture of Silla and its unification were also acknowledged as important in history. The similarities in the format and structure between the *Sinp'yŏn Chosŏn yŏksa* of the 1920s and the *Ch'odŭng kuksa kyobon* strongly indicated that the tradition of Koguryŏ-centered historiography remained after liberation.[372]

Although it is difficult to find history textbooks used in North Korea after liberation, it is likely that the Soviets influenced some education projects in the north just as the U.S. Military Government was involved in education in the south after 1945. The *Chosŏn yŏksa* (朝鮮歷史), written by Mun Sŏk-chun (文錫俊, 1895-1944), was one of the few history textbooks published in the north after liberation,[373] and the *Chosŏn yŏksa* presents some interesting perspectives. Mun applied a Stalinist model of historical development in his writing. Contrasting most history books that narrate historical events chronologically and mainly focus on each period from Old Chosŏn

[371] Three chapters from the rise of the Three Kingdoms and Parhae were titled respectively as 4) Beginning of the Three Kingdoms; 5) It was Koguryŏ that was large and strong; and 6) Cultures of the Three Kingdoms.

[372] Because of the similarities between the two books, Hwang Ŭi-don was assumed to be the author of the *Ch'odŭng kuksa kyobon*. See Kim Pong-sŏk, "Ch'odŭng kuksa kyobon ŭi t'ŭkjing kwa yŏksa insik" (Historical Awareness and Characteristics of the *Ch'odŭng kuksa kyobon*), *Sahoekwa kyoyuk* 47, no. 1 (March 2008): 171-200.

[373] Although there is no documentation that it was used as a history textbook in the north, the appearance of the Department of Education and Culture in South Hamgyŏng province as its publisher strongly suggests it was a textbook in the north. Being a journalist of the *Chosŏn ilbo*, Mun was arrested by the Japanese police in 1943 while delivering messages for independence movement activists.

on, Mun adopted Marxism in his discussion of historical development in Korea by matching old states/dynasties to each stage as proposed by Stalin. According to Mun, pristine communism was seen in ancient tribal states such as Puyŏ, and the Three Kingdoms period was considered a slave society in Korean history. While explaining the emergence of so-called conquering states in the formation of a slave society, he also analyzed Koguryŏ first before Silla and Paekche.[374] In the social structure of Koguryŏ, he matched large privileged families (*taega*, 大家), common people (*haho*, 下戶), and slaves to the three social classes of the Stalinist model.[375] Additionally, he listed Koguyŏ first in the discussion on each kingdom's foreign relations as well.[376] While explaining Koguryŏ's victories in the series of wars with neighboring states, the *Chosŏn yŏksa* attributed Koguryŏ's success to its ability to mobilize labor with commoners and slaves, and even stated that commoners of the Three Kingdoms were forced to fight against each other in order to satisfy those at the highest level of social class. Within the Stalinists' interpretation of history, the construction of a large capital at P'yŏngyang was proof of Koguryŏ's slave-based society.[377] Interestingly, the *Chosŏn yŏksa* rarely mentioned Silla in the periodization of Korean history. Although Mun briefly stated in *Chosŏn yŏksa* that feudalism in Korean history appeared after Silla's unification and the rise of Parhae, and lasted through the Chosŏn dynasty,[378] the fourth chapter, "Establishment and Development of the Feudal State" started with the Koryŏ dynasty instead of Unified Silla and Parhae. In other words, Koguryŏ was also the key to

[374] Mun Sŏk-chun, *Chosŏn yŏksa* (Hamgyŏng: Hmgyŏng namdo kyoyuk munhwabu, 1945), 6 and 15.

[375] Mun, *Chosŏn yŏksa*, 6.

[376] Mun, *Chosŏn yŏksa*, 23-25.

[377] Mun mentioned the rise of Kyŏngju as Silla's capital along with P'yŏngyang to justify his claims of a slave society in the Three Kingdom period. (Mun, *Chosŏn yŏksa*, 21.)

[378] Mun, *Chosŏn yŏksa*, 6-7.

analyzing Korean history in the Stalinist model of historical development theory as representing a slave society whereas Unified Silla was relatively less addressed in the Marxist analysis of social structure.

Both North and South Korea commonly expressed Koguryŏ's political lineage in history textbooks published after liberation. In the south, it was mainly because the strong nationalist perspective from the colonial period still remained while Koguryŏ's military success as a conquering state made it easy for historians in North Korea to fit Koguryŏ into the historical stage of slave society. Although Koguryŏ appeared in the political aspect of Korean history even after the two different Korean regimes appeared on the peninsula three years after the colonial regime ended, the escalated tensions between the two Koreas following the Korean War and changes in political circumstances of each side after the early 1960s resulted in new discourses on Koguryŏ's political lineage.

Ideological Conflict and International Politics on Discussion of Koguryŏ

The changed perspectives in Korean historiography on Koguryŏ's lineage started to appear subtly from the late 1950s through the 1960s in both North and South Korea. Although Koguryŏ still appeared first in the texts on the Three Kingdoms period, it became obvious that the main focus gradually shifted to Silla in South Korea. In textbooks for middle school students in 1956, Silla's growth was explained under the title of "Silla's Rapid Development" and its *hwarangdo* (花郎道) was presented as one of the unique traditions of Korean history,[379] while the text on Parhae also confirmed the shift in historical importance from Koguryŏ to Silla.

In contrast to books of the 1940s which treated Parhae equally with Silla by referring to

[379] Yi Pyŏng-do, *Chungdŭng sahoe saenghwal kwa chungdŭng kuksa* (Social Life and National History for Middle School Levels) (Seoul: Ŭryu munhwasa, 1956), 42-43.

Parhae as Koguryŏ's successor in the north, most documents after the 1950s obviously addressed "*Unified* Silla" as the main kingdom in Korean history after the Three Kingdoms period. Unified Silla occupied the most space in the discussion of ancient Korean history in the official government guide on Korean history education, and many materials acknowledged Unified Silla as the sole Korean kingdom between its unification in the seventh century and Koryŏ's establishment in the tenth century, whereas mention of Parhae and the northern part of the peninsula diminished. In 1955, the Department of Education finally suggested that Silla should be addressed in detail in a separate chapter while Parhae was to be briefly mentioned in textbooks. Following this guideline, textbooks for middle school students in 1956 mentioned Parhae partly in the Unified Silla chapter,[380] and furthermore, there was no clear explanation about Parhae in the revised guidelines announced in 1956.[381] During the colonial period through the late 1940s, it had been common to consider Parhae as a legitimate successor of Koguryŏ after the latter's collapse, and most historical materials including textbooks included Parhae. The use in those years of the term "period of northern and southern dynasties" instead of "Unified Silla" for the period between Silla's annexation of Koguryŏ and the fall of Parhae indicates the persistence of Koguryŏ-centered historiography. In the new South Korean views in which Silla prevailed in the historical discourses over Parhae, it was inevitable for Koguryŏ's position to decline even though Koreans still considered it a part of their history.

The rise of Silla as a main state during the Three Kingdom period did not solely happen in South Korea. Somewhat surprisingly, North Korean textbooks also stressed Silla's

[380] Yi, *Chungdŭng sahoe saenghwal kwa chungdŭng kuksa*, 53-55.

[381] Although it advised that Parhae should be addressed in textbooks for high school students, mention of Parhae was still very limited and only recorded in a subsection on the Unified Silla period. As a result, Parhae's establishment and culture were included under the section on politics and economy of Unified Silla.

development and unification in the seventh century. The *Uri nara ryŏksa iyagi* (Our National History), published in 1956, introduced the process of Silla's development in detail and also attributed its fast development to its contacts with various states in China, explaining that advanced societies in China helped Silla to make progress in various fields.[382] It even stated that Silla's alliance with Tang was a necessary strategy to accomplish unification, which was the most urgent and important task in that period. *Uri nara ryŏksa iyagi* evaluated Silla's unification very highly, emphasizing its historical development and resplendent culture while highlighting Silla's successful campaign to expel Tang forces from the Korean peninsula after annexing Koguryŏ.[383]

It is interesting to note that North Korean materials narrated Silla and its unification favorably in the 1950s because their historical perspectives changed dramatically entering the 1960s through the 1970s. In contrast to South Korean documents which insistently located Silla at the center of historical discussion about the Three Kingdoms period, materials used in North Korea from the 1960s criticized Silla harshly for its alliance with Tang, and downplayed its unification by labeling it as "incomplete" because of the existence of Parhae in the former Koguryŏ territory. It was the *Chosŏn t'ongsa* (朝鮮通史, Korean History) published in 1962 that first confirmed the change in historical perspective. Unlike its first edition in 1956 which still evaluated Silla's unification highly and emphasized its expulsion of Tang forces just like in the *Uri nara ryŏksa iyagi*, the second edition of the *Chosŏn t'ongsa* paid more attention to the establishment of Parhae, therefore, the historical meaning of Silla's unification diminished in this edition. Here, Silla's unification was limited only to the southern half of the peninsula, and

[382] *Uri nara ryŏksa iyagi* (P'yŏngyang: Chosŏn rodongdang, 1956), 14-16.

[383] *Ibid*., 45-51.

Parhae appeared as a legitimate successor of Koguryŏ in the north.[384]

The change in tone on Silla's unification and the shift in historical perspective from Silla to Koguryŏ in North Korean historiography became more prominent and official in the 1970s. In the third edition of the *Chosŏn t'ongsa* in 1977, they again criticized Silla very harshly for its alliance with the Tang, a *foreign* force, in order to conquer Paekche and Koguryŏ, which belonged to the same group as Silla, i.e., *Korean*.[385] The *Chosŏn chŏnsa* (朝鮮全史, History of Korea) published from late 1979 through 1983 explained not only Silla's own struggle in its relationship with the Tang, but also the devastation of people in former Paekche and Koguryŏ territories as a consequence of Silla's dependency on a foreign force. Furthermore, it clearly stated that Silla weakened the strong spirit of resistance among Koreans by giving up on a complete expulsion of the Tang, resulting in a delay of more than twenty years for people in the northern part of the peninsula to establish Parhae, another *Korean* state succeeding Koguryŏ. Nevertheless Silla prevailed over the Tang, Silla's ruling class turned their backs on those same people in favor of their own interests by being satisfied with the "incomplete" unification that was only limited to the southern part of the peninsula. The order of appearance of Parhae and Silla in the *Chosŏn chŏnsa* also confirmed the change in the historical status between Koguryŏ/Parhae and Silla from the late 1970s through the 1980s. In contrast to the *Chosŏn t'ongsa*, which addressed Silla before Parhae while still criticizing the former as being harsh, Parhae appeared ahead of "Later Silla" in the *Chosŏn chŏnsa* and North Korea granted Parhae

[384] The title of the sixth chapter in the second edition of the *Chosŏn t'ongsa* was "Unification in the South by Silla and Establishment of Parhae in Former Koguryŏ Territory." It strongly implies that not only was Silla's unification reevaluated, but Parhae's status in Korean history rose even more because its establishment was recorded in a section of a chapter on Silla in the previous edition.

[385] While blaming Silla for forming an alliance with Tang, the third edition of the *Chosŏn t'ongsa* ignored the conflicts between Silla and the Tang, and did not mention that Silla eventually expelled the Tang in 678.

historical legitimacy over Silla. And speaking of the term "Late Silla" in the *Chosŏn chŏnsa*, it is interesting to note that "Early Silla" appeared first in the *Chosŏn chŏnsa* in 1979. The term "Early Silla" was evidence of a new perspective in the official historiography of North Korea. Although "Later Silla" had been used in order to emphasize historical meaning of Parhae's establishment in previous materials, it was in 1979 when "Early Silla" was adapted for periodization in North Korea.

In addition to emphasizing Parhae's emergence and the denouncement of Silla, the text insistently stressed Koguryŏ's "independent spirit" and also proved that Koguryŏ had replaced Silla as the main focus of the Three Kingdoms period in North Korean historiography. One of the most interesting features in the third edition of the *Chosŏn t'ongsa* in 1977 was the emphasis on its "independence spirit" rooted on *chuch'e* (henceforth *Juch'e*, as it is Romanized in North Korea) ideology [主體思想] advocated by the North Korean regime. Compared to the conventional historical perspective argued by Stalin, which focused on class conflict in historical development, a new perspective propelled by *Juch'e* ideology underlined the individual's mind in maintaining a self-reliant spirit. Therefore, Koguryŏ's defeat of the Sui and Tang forces was a perfect example in propagandizing their claim of its long history and importance of existence among Koreans. The structure of the *Chosŏn t'ongsa* and the *Chosŏn chŏnsa* also verified Koguryŏ's status in the official historiography of North Korea. Meanwhile, in the third edition of the *Chosŏn t'ongsa* in 1977, the chapter on the Three Kingdoms period had been titled "Strong Koguryŏ and Relationships among the Three Kingdoms" but the fourth edition in 1991 changed the title of the chapter on the Three Kingdoms period after the fifth century to "Koguryŏ's Unifying Policy and Relationships among the Three Kingdoms." Although emphasis on Koguryŏ in unification discourse developed consistently in North Korea since the late 1970s when they

interpreted the movement of Koguryŏ's capital to P'yŏngyang as a sign of its tendency toward unification in the first edition of the *Chosŏn chŏnsa*, clarifying it in the title of the chapter on the Three Kingdoms period was a strong indication of the Koguryŏ-centered perspective of North Korean historiography.

Unquestionably, the surge of *Juch'e* ideology was related to its depiction of Koguryŏ as a leading agent in the unification, and the second edition of the *Chosŏn chŏnsa* detailed the move of Koguryŏ's capital to P'yŏngyang in the chapter titled, "Koguryŏ People's Fight to Unify the Nation" in 1991 as they stressed the Koguryŏ people's spirit of resistance. Connecting Koguryŏ with *Juch'e* ideology in the historical discourse of unification was very crucial in terms of Koguryŏ's political legitimacy in Korean history because it was the unification that had in earlier times allowed Silla to be positioned at the center of discussion about the Three Kingdoms period. Combining the newly emphasized Koguryŏ in the structure of *Juch'e* ideology with the previously emphasized Parhae, North Korea was then able to argue strongly that history during the Three Kingdoms period actually developed within a Koguryŏ-centered history rather than a Silla-centered history,[386] also implying that political legitimacy in contemporary Korea lies in North Korea, not in South Korea.

Interestingly, the changes in political circumstances in South Korea were also partially responsible for the surge of historical importance of Koguryŏ in North Korea since the 1970s. After seizing political power through a military coup d'état in 1961, Park Chung-hee (Pak Chŏng-hŭi, 朴正熙, 1917-1979) had to deal with various issues threatening his authoritarian regime. In order to consolidate his regime, Pak insistently stressed the importance of national unity while facing a hostile *enemy* in the north, and he presented Silla's unification as an

[386] Son Yŏng-jong, *Koguryŏsa* (P'yŏngyang: Kwahak paekkwasajŏn chonghap ch'ulp'ansa, 1990), 10.

example of a *national* unified history. Furthermore, Park's narrow victory in the presidential election of 1971 made him institute the new Yusin (維新) Constitution in 1972 to remain in power, which interestingly occurred at the same time when North Korea promulgated their new constitution to consolidate Kim Il Sung's (Kim Il-sŏng, 金日成, 1912-1994) regime.[387] In other words, Koguryŏ and Silla emerged as main factors in the construction of collective memories in both North and South Korea, respectively. Regardless, Koreans all generally agreed that both Silla and Koguryŏ were part of their histories, although the unique situation in the two Koreas necessarily presented different paths to express their collective memories.[388] It was not surprising that South Korea addressed Silla's unification affirmatively during this period, and North Korea highlighted Koguryŏ history in the 1970s, not only as the outcome of their political agenda, but also in response to their enemy in the south. Considering Koguryŏ's battle against China as Koguryŏ people's irredentism while viewing its conflicts with Silla and Paekche as expressions of Koguryŏ's desire for unification in the *Chosŏn chŏnsa* was apparently reflective of Koguryŏ-centered historical perspectives in North Korea and was propelled by various changes in their political situation.

Although both North and South Korea consistently addressed Koguryŏ in their versions of Korean history, there are, however, some differences in explaining this ancient kingdom in the

[387] Both North and South Korea officialized their new constitutions on December 27, 1972 when Kim and Park were re-elected as presidents in both halves of the Korean peninsula. Considering that the two sides were having secret meetings between late 1971 through June 1972 until they published a joint statement on July 4, 1972, it is very likely that Park and Kim acknowledged each other's plans to seize political power on their sides.

[388] Dramatic changes in international politics during the early 1970s also influenced Park Chung-hee's political decision. In July 1971, President Nixon announced that he would visit China in February 1972, and Japan established diplomatic relations with China in 1972. It is very plausible that these changes led to Park's opening dialogue with North Korea while consolidating his regime in South Korea. The collapse of South Vietnam in 1975 also resulted in a strong wave of national unity within South Korea.

two Koreas after the 1960s. These differences were mainly caused by political conflicts that had been growing since the establishment of two different Korean regimes in 1948. The outcome of ideological confrontations was so strong that even research on Koguryŏ appeared differently depending on which side they were rooted. The controversy about the beginning of Koguryŏ is one of the best examples showing the complexity of the discussion of Koguryŏ in the twentieth century. I will now review how this specific issue on Koguryŏ's origins developed after liberation in 1945.[389]

II. The Dating of Koguryŏ: Heritage of Early Korean *Nationalists'* Thought

Although both North and South Korean scholars agree now that Koguryŏ appeared first among the Three Kingdoms, there is still controversy about when exactly Koguryŏ was established. Since the *Samguk sagi*, the oldest extant record today, gives 57 BCE and 37 BCE as the dates of the founding of Silla and Koguryŏ, respectively, many South Korean historical materials from later periods until the late 1950s generally accepted those as the inaugural years of the two kingdoms. Even a book with one of the strongest Koguryŏ-centered historical perspectives also followed the dates of the *Samguk sagi* for the founding of Koguryŏ and Silla. In the *Taehan yŏksa* (大韓歷史, Great Korean History) published in 1959, Chang To-bin stated that Korean history would have been worthless without Koguryŏ because it certainly had the most important role in Korean history,[390] and he said Koguryŏ was established in 37 BCE, twenty years later than Silla. Unquestionably, Koguryŏ appeared as the main kingdom in Chang's historiography. He not only introduced Koguryŏ first before Paekche and Silla in his

[389] *Chosŏn chŏnsa*, vol. 3, 3:33-4 and 151.

[390] Chang To-bin, *Tae Koguryŏsa*, vol. 2, *Taehan yŏksa* (Seoul: Kuksawŏn, 1959), 1.

book, he also assigned more pages in narrating events of Koguryŏ than those of Paekche and Silla combined.[391] Furthermore, Chang specifically used "History of the Great Koguryŏ" for the title of the second volume of his *Taehan Yŏksa* that states Koguryŏ history. But it is interesting that he accepted the *Samguk sagi*'s year of Koguryŏ's establishment despite his Koguryŏ-centered historical perspective.

It was in the 1960s when South Korean scholars generally agreed that Koguryŏ preceded Silla in terms of its establishment in Korean history. History textbooks since the 1960s have insistently stated that Koguryŏ was established first among the Three Kingdoms in the first century BCE. Instead of indicating a certain year for the establishment of the Three Kingdoms, South Korean materials have rather focused on when each kingdom appeared as an organized state in ancient Korean history, and as a result of this shift in focus on how to address the early years of the Three Kingdoms, they explained that Chumong established Koguryŏ in the first century BCE, and Paekche and Silla developed after Koguryŏ.

In contrast to South Korean documents, North Korean materials as early as the mid-1950s presented Koguryŏ as the first kingdom among the Three Kingdoms.[392] What is more noteworthy in North Korean historiography about Koguryŏ's beginning is when it was established, rather than whether it was the first kingdom and if it had appeared before Silla. Whereas South Korean scholarship generally agrees that Koguryŏ was established in the first century BCE, North Korean scholars since the 1950s have presented different years for the beginning of Koguryŏ. The first change regarding Koguryŏ's early dating appeared in the mid-1970s. Whereas the

[391] Histories of Koguryŏ, Paekche, and Silla were recorded in volumes 2, 3, and 4, respectively, and the number of pages devoted to each are 210, 60, and 70, respectively. Chang also stated history of Parhae in volume 5 of the *Taehan yŏksa* in 52 pages.

[392] *Urinara yŏksa iyagi*, 12-16.

Koguryŏ munhwa (Koguryŏ Culture, 1975) mentioned the first century BCE for the founding of Koguryŏ,[393] the late-second century BCE was presented in the *Koguryŏsa yŏn'gu* (Koguryŏ Studies, 1976). According to this argument, what happened in the first century BCE was a shift of political power between two different groups resulting in the accession of Chumong to the throne of Koguryŏ. In other words, nobles belonging to the Sono (消奴) group, one of the five main groups possessing political power in early Koguryŏ, established Koguryŏ at Cholbon (currently Huanren (桓仁), Liaoning (遼寧) Province) in the second century BCE, and Chumong became king about a century later.[394] Since the 1990s, however, it has again been traced further back by more than a century in North Korean scholarship. In 1990, Son Yŏng-jong argued in the *Koguryŏsa* that Koguryŏ had remained the main state throughout the Three Kingdoms period, since it was established by King Tongmyŏng in 277 BCE.[395] It is obvious that the re-dating of Koguryŏ's beginning was a consequence of the new emphasis on the North Korean government's political legitimacy, and it eventually led to the revision of the *Chosŏn chŏnsa* in 1991, which adopted Son's argument regarding the early history of Koguryŏ.

What is interesting here is that North Korean scholarship on the issue of dating Koguryŏ reflects a surprisingly similar perspective to the nationalists of the colonial period, such as Sin Ch'ae-ho. Like Sin's questioning of some notes about Koguryŏ's royal lineage, Son also pointed out that King Kwanggaet'o appeared as the seventeenth-generation descendant of King Tongmyŏng on his stele, contrasting the *Samguk sagi* which listed him in the twelfth generation. Whereas nationalist historians during the colonial period brought out the long history of Koguryŏ

[393] *Koguryŏ munhwa* (P'yŏngyang: Sahoe kwahak ch'ulp'ansa, 1975), 4.

[394] Ri Chi-rin and Kang In-suk, *Koguryŏsa yŏn'gu* (P'yŏngyang: Sahoe kwahak ch'ulp'ansa, 1976), 53-59.

[395] Son, *Koguryŏsa*, 10, 13-15, and 20-22.

in order to provide more evidence of the greatness of Koguryŏ itself, its re-emergence in the late twentieth century in North Korean scholarship is more properly understood as an effective means to underline Koguryŏ's central position in the political lineage of Korean history in an attempt to argue North Korea's political legitimacy in the contemporary period, and a series of revisions of Koguryŏ's long history is an example of the ongoing process of rooting Koguryŏ in their collective memory.

III. Re-appropriating Koguryŏ Culture

Koguryŏ's military spirit has arguably been the main topic in the discussion of that kingdom since the colonial period. Compared to the previous appreciation of its culture with the focus on militarism, documents since the 1950s generally expanded their interest in Koguryŏ culture to other aspects including the arts. Although Koguryŏ's military strength still appeared in the main context of its culture in many materials including textbooks, Koguryŏ tombs, mural paintings inside tombs, and customs were also often addressed in both North and South Korea. Since Japanese scholars expressed their interest in Koguryŏ tomb paintings in the 1930s, the division of Korea, and competition between North and South Korea following the division contributed to an expansion of the field of Koguryŏ culture. While North Korea took advantage of its geographical location in excavating many sites relating to Koguryŏ, South Korea developed its own discourse on Koguryŏ by granting itself a historical role as preserver of *Korean* culture. In the following section, I will analyze how Koguryŏ culture appeared in various materials in the two Koreas and what contributed to the emergence of new aspects of Koguryŏ culture since the late 1940s.

Perception of Koguryŏ Culture

In contrast to the discussion on political aspects, textbooks of South Korea usually introduced and explained the cultures of the Three Kingdoms together, rather than separately, grouping them together as "ancient *Korean* culture." For example, textbooks introduced the establishment of T'aehak (太學) in Koguryŏ as an example showing a common characteristic of Koreans who were aware of the importance of national teaching, and also built Kukhak (國學) in Silla. Although it is more proper to understand the establishment of national institutions as a common phenomenon appearing in the process of becoming a centralized state, many materials including history textbooks for middle and high school students tried to interpret them as evidence showing Koguryŏ and Silla had something in common in terms of their "Korean" culture. Assessment of Buddhist arts of the Three Kingdoms, including Tamjing's painting at Hōryūji, Japan, is another example taken by scholars to claim cultural similarities in the Three Kingdoms. In the same vein, Koguryŏ's Tongmaeng (東盟) was presented with ceremonies performed in other ancient Korean states as a feature of Koguryŏ culture.[396] In other words, although cited to explain Koguryŏ culture, these features were taken in order to confirm Koguryŏ's position in ancient Korean culture rather than to emphasize its own uniqueness within Korean culture. Whether people paid more attention to its unique characteristics or not, it is clear that many documents of both North and South Korea addressed Koguryŏ culture within the larger frame of *Korean* culture until the 1970s.

The trend to appreciate Koguryŏ culture has changed since the 1970s. In contrast to previous discourses that addressed it as a part of Three Kingdoms culture, North Korean

[396] According to the document, people of Koguryŏ gathered in the tenth month of the year to celebrate the harvest and thank heaven with songs and dances. Since Puyŏ and Ye had similar ceremonies of their own, this type of ceremony was not rare in states during the ancient period, and textbooks often referred to them together in the text of a common tradition of Koreans in ancient states.

materials started to recognize Koguryŏ culture in its own right, and brought it out of the context of Three Kingdoms culture by addressing it separately. The *Koguryŏ munhwa* introduced various aspects of its culture exclusively, including architecture, music, dance, and the arts. It is likely that the political situation affected the publication of the *Koguryŏ munhwa*. While (Unified) Silla gradually occupied the center of the discussion on ancient Korean history in South Korea, it was no surprise that North Korea intensified the research on Koguryŏ in its attempt to argue their historical legitimacy from Old Chosŏn and Koguryŏ. Texts of the *Koguryŏ munhwa* also revealed that there was a strong political influence on the analysis of Koguryŏ culture. In its explanation of palaces and fortresses, the *Koguryŏ munhwa* deliberately pointed out the exploitation by the ruling class for these projects, and even Koguryŏ tomb paintings were not exempted from criticisms of exploitation. Although they are hailed as true masterpieces that enrich world culture, the *Koguryŏ munhwa* also cited many paintings inside Koguryŏ tombs as evidence to show the lavish lives of the ruling class, made possible only at the expense and sacrifice of the common people.[397]

It is worthwhile to note that South Korean materials mentioned Koguryŏ's artistic value only in the assessment of its mural paintings. Since praised highly by Japanese scholars in the 1930s, discussions of paintings on the walls of chambers of Koguryŏ tombs remained relatively quiet in South Korea until the 1990s. Obviously, the limited research on Koguryŏ in South Korean scholarship was partly due to the difficulty of getting the latest information on Koguryŏ. Since most sites relating to Koguryŏ are located either in China or North Korea, it had been very hard for South Koreans to gain access to them, which is a secondary reason why Silla was discussed more than Koguryŏ in South Korea. In spite of some opportunities for South Korean

[397] *Koguryŏ munhwa*, 211-213.

scholars to research Koguryŏ culture at sites in North Korea during the 1970s, the extent of the knowledge they obtained was too limited for academic discussion.[398] Koguryŏ research in South Korea faced a turning point in 1981 when the South Korean government officially asked North Korea to begin exchanges of cultural resources between the two Koreas. In the statement, South Korean government suggested that the South would have an exhibition of Koguryŏ resources while North Korea also had one for items from Silla and Paekche. In addition to exhibitions, joint research projects on ancient Korean history were also suggested by South Korea.[399] Although there was no immediate answer from North Korea, it was obvious that the interest in Koguyrŏ among South Korean society gradually increased even though Silla still remained the center of the discussion on the Three Kingdoms in South Korea. It is not clear what was behind South Korea's suggestion. One possible cause was that regime in South Korea during this period was closely tied to military persons who may have had a nostalgic recollection of Manchuria beyond the Yalu River.[400] It is also possible that the strong confidence that the South Korean government had in its competition with the North Korean regime also likely emboldened the former to publicly approach the latter. While North Korea had advantages in the competition between the two Koreas from the late 1940s through the 1960s, most references about North Korea available in South Korea displayed only negative aspects of the North, and the research on Koguryŏ that the North Korean government was ardently using for their claims of historical

[398] In 1972, North and South Korean scholars met with Japanese scholars in Nara, Japan, to discuss a tomb with paintings found in Japan. In this meeting, both North and South Korean scholars generally agreed that this tomb and painting inside it were influenced by Koguryŏ. See *Tonga ilbo*, October 5, 1972. In 1973, North and South Korean scholars again had a chance to exchange their works at the 29th International Congress of Orientalists in Paris. Koguryŏ culture was one of four topics on which North Korean scholars presented at this conference. See *Kyŏnghyang sinmun*, August 8, 1973.

[399] *Maeil kyŏngje sinmun*, November 17, 1981.

[400] Recovering Manchuria was cited as a *national* task in a training text published by the South Korean Army Headquarters.

legitimacy was not welcomed in the South. The reversal of the two Koreas' positions since the 1970s, however, offered a new opportunity for research on Koguryŏ in South Korea. Once it became confident in its competition with North Korea, the South Korean government tried to express its superiority over its counterpart in the North, and reaching out for academic research on Koguryŏ was a method adopted by South Korea. Consequently, quite a few books and articles about Koguryŏ were published in 1982, including the *Han'guk ŭi pyŏkhwa kobun* (Tombs with Murals in Korea) and the *Koguryŏ Parhae munhwa* (Culture of Koguryŏ and Parhae).[401]

The *Koguryŏ Parhae munhwa* was a collection of articles about Koguryŏ and Parhae written by Chinese scholars in the 1970s, and obviously, changes in South Korean society made it possible for Chinese articles to be available among Koreans. It was very clear that Koguryŏ culture and arts raised interest among Chinese scholars who examined not only tombs and its murals in general, but also Koguryŏ dances appearing in the paintings.[402] Whereas the *Koguryŏ Parhae munhwa* is a collection of Chinese articles on Koguryŏ research, the *Han'guk ŭi pyŏkhwa kobun* was a book by South Korean scholar that focuses on Koguryŏ paintings specifically.[403] It was the very first book since liberation to introduce Koguryŏ tombs to South Korea. Regardless, most research and references about Koguryŏ tombs in the *Han'guk ŭi pyŏkhwa kobun* were cited from Chinese and North Korean materials, and its publication in South Korea did not encounter any controversy after the South Korean government publicly announced its willingness to expand Koguryŏ research.

---

[401] Besides these two books, a book about the King Kwanggaet'o stele was also published, and various articles on Koguryŏ were published in journals.

[402] One Chinese scholar reported that there are 12,206 Koguryo tombs in the Jian region.

[403] It also introduced some murals of Paekche, Silla, and Kaya tombs. While twenty-one Koguryŏ tombs were introduced, just two Paekche tombs, one Silla tomb, and one Kaya tomb were included. Although about fifty Koguryŏ tombs were known, *Han'guk ŭi pyŏkhwa kobun* only introduced twenty-one of them.

After being convinced that North Korea would not pose a serious competition, the South Korean government even managed to normalize diplomatic relationships with countries such as China, which had once been considered an enemy, and there was no reason for South Korea to keep Koguryŏ from the collective memory of Koreans. Arguably, the establishment of diplomatic ties between South Korea and China in 1992 resulted in an increased interest in Koguryŏ among South Koreans, and more South Koreans were able to travel China and see many sites in Manchuria relating to Koguryŏ. In 1993, after visiting Koguryŏ sites in China, a former South Korean Minister of Culture and Information reported that various Koguryŏ sites including tombs and walled towns in the old capital had been maintained poorly and serious damages had already befallen on murals. Following this report, the South Korean government sought to appeal to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (hereafter, UNESCO) to preserve Koguryŏ sites in China.[404] Furthermore, a leading newspaper company and an association in South Korea sponsored a special exhibition of Koguryŏ murals at the British Museum in London in 1997. Being the very first exhibition of Koguryŏ arts in a Western country, it was organized in order to help Koguryŏ murals become recognized by the UNESCO committee. Interestingly, the North Korean government also showed its own interest in registering Koguryŏ mural tombs near P'yŏngyang as a UNESCO World Cultural Heritage Site in 1997. It made an offer to South Korea to investigate Koguryŏ sites together,[405] and UNESCO listed the Koguryŏ tombs in North Korea as a World Cultural Heritage Site in 2004.

Listing the North Korean Koguryŏ sites with UNESCO with the support of South Korea indicates that Koguryŏ has finally attained a solid foundation for its embedment in the collective

[404] *Tonga ilbo*, June 24, 1993.

[405] *Ibid*., October 15, 1997.

memory of *Koreans* as overcoming the ideological split that had made it difficult for this ancient kingdom to be rooted firmly in the collective memory of Korean people, and memories of Koguryŏ were displayed in various ways in both North and South Korea.

Flourishing Public Interest in Koguryŏ Culture

As Koguryŏ was firmly positioned in the collective memory of people in South Korea since the 1980s, the claim by pseudo-history scholars emphasizing a so-called "continental" perspective in history [大陸史觀] quickly emerged as well. Accusing mainstream academic scholars in Korean history of holding a "colonial perspective" [植民史觀], this new group of people strongly argued for the glory days of ancient Korean history by stressing the historical importance of Old Chosŏn. They maintained that Tan'gun was a real historical person rather than just a mythical figure, and Old Chosŏn's territory stretched deep into the Chinese mainland. Although most of their claims mainly addressed Old Chosŏn, they also addressed the Three Kingdoms period in their arguments, and Koguryŏ, often linked with Old Chosŏn, became a subject in their discussion as well.

The rise of interest in the so-called *chaeya sahak* (在野史學, non-academic history) scholars' works certainly put more attention on Koguryŏ memories. Because their claims were based on their attempt to criticize colonial historiography, the history of Koguryŏ was a very attractive subject of discussion just as the nationalists had used Koguryŏ memories as a means to incite a spirit of resistance among Koreans during the colonial period. As they gained more acknowledgement from people who supported their claims of a "continental" perspective, the non-academic scholars organized an association[406] and even called for the revision of history

[406] Kuksa ch'atgi hyŏpŭihoe (Association to Recover National History) was formed by these scholars, and their main claim was to abandon the so-called colonial historiography. They also requested the inclusion of Tan'gun in history

textbooks for middle and high school students in the early 1980s. Quite surprisingly, a new textbook published in 1983 indeed reflected some of their requests[407] although most of their claims were based on historically questionable materials such as the *Kyuwŏn sahwa* (揆園史話, Historical Anecdotes of Old Chosŏn) and the *Hwandan kogi* (桓檀古記, Ancient Record of Hwanin and Tan'gun).[408]

As arguments by non-academic scholars emphasizing the greatness of ancient Korean history gradually gained some support among ordinary people in South Korea since the 1980s,[409] mainstream historians and scholars started to dispute the claims of non-academic scholars. Academic scholars had earlier ignored the latter's claims in order to avoid any controversy. But after witnessing that pseudo-history by non-academic historians had become more popular among people and was even debated by an unorthodox group in the National Assembly in 1981, mainstream scholars started approaching ordinary people in order to explain the conventional claims of their scholarship, and the publication of the *Han'guksa simin kangjwa* (韓國史市民講座, Public Lectures on Korean History), a journal for non-academic readers in

---

and argued for an expanded territory of Old Chosŏn with a new theory on the location of ancient kingdoms including Paekche and Nangnang (樂浪, Ch. Lelang). See *Kyŏnghyang sinmun*, November 3, 1975.

[407] The Tan'gun myth was included in a Korean history textbook for middle school students and Parhae's control of Manchuria was also mentioned.

[408] The *Kyuwŏn sahwa*, assumed to be written in 1675, introduced ancient Korean history until Tan'gun Chosŏn period. Although it gave the ancient history of Chosŏn, it was a religious record rather than a historical document. Throughout its texts, *Kyuwŏn sahwa* criticized Confucianism for the origin of Chosŏn's toadyism toward China. The *Kyuwŏn sahwa* also suggested that Choson should *re*-occupy Manchuria in order to become a strong state. The *Hwandan kogi* also listed kings of Tan'gun Chosŏn and gave the aniceint history of Chosŏn. Regardless, its author calimed that he published the *Hwandan kogi* in 1911 by compiling primary sources introducing the ancient period, and it is generally believed to be fabricated after 1940s as an attempt to inspire "national spirit" among people.

[409] Those arguing for the revision of ancient Korean history petitioned to the National Assembly to discuss issues, and a public hearing was held at the National Assembly with scholars from both sides as participants. It attracted attention from public, and influenced eventually for academic scholars' group to approach to the public as a response to revisionists.

1987, was the outcome of this project.[410]

Obviously, the expansion of academic exchanges between North and South Korean scholars about the Koguryŏ issue led more people to think about Koguryŏ, and the conflict between academic scholars and *chaeya* historians in the 1980s resulted in more research on Koguryŏ. For example, a newspaper column following the discussion on national historiography at the National Assembly suggested that Korean academics should focus on Manchuria for ancient Korean history while reminding them that most work on this region was carried out by Chinese or Russian scholars although the region contained many traces of a glorious period in Korean history.[411] What is interesting here is that this column also stated the legacy of the colonial perspective had remained in modern historiography, and suggested research on Koguryŏ history as a means of overcoming the colonial perspective on Korean historiography. In other words, newspaper columns also demanded more Koguryŏ research while somewhat agreeing to non-academic historians' criticism on conventional scholarship of Korean history in terms of its "peninsular" perspective on history.

It is important to note that both academic and non-academic scholarship apparently addressed Koguryŏ in the discussion of Korean history. In contrast to controversies between the two groups regarding Old Chosŏn and Tan'gun, there is no difference in their acknowledgment of Koguryŏ in Korean history. Stating that both the *Kyuwŏn sahwa* and the *Hwandan kogi* were fabrications rather than historical documents, the second issue of the *Han'guksa simin kangjwa* was a special edition on the discussion of Old Chosŏn and refutes the claims of non-academic

[410] *Kyŏnghyang sinmun*, August 31, 1987.

[411] "Koguryŏ yŏksa ŏdi kanna" (Where is Koguryŏ History), *Kyŏnghyang sinmun*, October 26, 1984.

historians[412] in that academic scholars insistently introduced Koguryŏ's political structure and culture, including paintings from tombs, in the *Han'guksa simin kangjwa*. Additionally, none of the articles addressing Koguryŏ in this journal questioned its identity as *Korean*. Its third issue in 1988 included articles about Koguryŏ people's worldview and research on the King Kwanggaet'o stele, and Koguryŏ arts were examined with arts of Silla and Paekche in its twenty-third issue in 1998, which addressed exclusively *Korean* national treasures from various states in Korean history.

Arguably, the most efficient method to construct collective memory is to take advantage of the power of mass media and popular culture, including the production of movies, dramas, books, and exhibitions containing certain messages in their content. The emergence of Koguryŏ-themed dramas in the last decade in South Korea shows well how the formation of the collective memory has benefitted from popular culture. Since 2004, many dramas about Koguryŏ were produced after various special exhibitions on Koguryŏ met with huge success. *Chumong*, a historical TV drama depicting the early years of Koguryŏ posted an astonishing number of viewers throughout its run from May 2006 until March 2007, and led to more dramas dealing with Koguryŏ such as *T'aewang sasin'gi* (Legend, 2007) and *Yŏn Kaesomun* (2006-2007). It is obvious that so-called "Northeast Project" (The Northeast Borderland History and Related Phenomena Research Project) launched officially in 2002 by the Chinese government influenced the rising importance of Koguryŏ memories in Korean society because the Northeast Project claims Koguryŏ as a part of Chinese history. In order to dispute the Chinese claim, South Korea has had to confirm Koguryŏ's status in Korean identity, and the projection of Koguryŏ in the collective memory through mass media and popular culture has been very successful. Basically,

[412] Cho In-sŏng, "*Kyuwŏn sahwa* wa *Hwandan kogi*," *Han'guksa simin kangjwa* 2 (1988): 71-88.

the mass media is duplicating what mass printing did a few hundred years ago when *nationalism* emerged and spread in Korea.[413]

The rise of interest in Koguryŏ during the late twentieth century also appeared in North Korea. *Tamjing* by Ri Sŏng-dŏk and *Chumong* by Kim Ho-sŏng, two historical novels narrating Koguryŏ history, were published in 1997 and 1998. It was not the first time, however, that Koguryŏ was used as a main subject for novels. As early as 1949, Yi Kwang-su (李光洙, 1892-?) wrote the *Sarang ŭi Tongmyŏng wang* (King Tongmyŏng's Love) in which Yi narrated mystical features of the birth of Chumong while emphasizing his leadership based on humanism.[414] Compared to Yi's novel, Kim Ho-sŏng's *Chumong* put more emphasis on Koguryŏ's historical relationship with Old Chosŏn. Chumong's ultimate goal in Kim's novel was to establish a unified state like the one Tan'gun supposedly once ruled in the past. In contrast to South Korean scholarship in which controversies about Tan'gun and Old Chosŏn remain between non-academic historians and academic scholars, the ties between Old Chosŏn and Koguryŏ have been consistently emphasized in North Korea.[415] More interestingly, Ri's *Tamjing* even linked Koguryŏ arts to its military spirit. Although the main story of this novel was about the completion of the wall painting by Tamjing at Hōryūji, Ri pointed out what made it possible for

[413] Because these dramas were produced to emphasize Koguryŏ's "Koreanness" and glory, many portrayed some historical incidents incorrectly and with considerable artistic license. Certainly, the difference between historical documents and these dramas caused concern since dramas sway people's perception of history because not all of its content is based on historical accuracy. See Sŏ Kil-su, "Yŏksa wa Koguryŏ drama Chumong" (Historical Facts and Koguryŏ Drama Chu-mong) *Koguryŏ yŏn'gu* 28 (2007): 9-48. As this concern grows among academic scholars, the *Han'guksa simin kangjwa* 41 (2007) specifically dealt with the success of historical dramas and problems following that success.

[414] It is obvious that Yi Kwang-su was very much interested in writing historical novels. Besides this, he also wrote about many historical figures including Yi Sun-sin and King Sejong of Chosŏn. Yi seemed to put more historical meaning in Koguryŏ than Silla. In 1926, he wrote an introduction to the Koguryŏ Annals of the *Samguk sagi* in *Tonggwang*. His depiction of Kungye, in *Maŭi t'aeja* published serially in the *Tonga ilbo* from May 1926 to January 1927, was not as negative as presented in conventional texts.

[415] North Korean scholars argued that Tongmaeng, a ritual ceremony of Koguryŏ, originated from Old Chosŏn's Much'ŏn (舞天).

him to achieve his mission was Koguryŏ's victory against the Sui. In order to convince readers of how much Koguryŏ's spirit influenced the splendid arts of Koguryŏ, as exemplified by Tamjing's painting, Ri fictionalized that Tamjing and Ŭlchi Mundŏk had known each other since Tamjing was young. In this novel, it was Ŭlchi Mundŏk's personal letter to Tamjing that eventually led him to complete the painting and inspire respect for Koguryŏ art among Japanese people. It is very likely that the registration of Koguryŏ sites with UNESCO and the high level of Koguryŏ legacy in their collective memory inspired the publication of these novels.[416]

Historical novels are not the only material reflecting Koguryŏ legacy in the culture of North Korea. The *Koguryŏ iyagi* explained that three customs – *ondol*, preference for octagonal features, and game of *yut* – originated from Koguryŏ.[417] Specific features or leisurely pursuits from Koguryŏ have rarely been mentioned while general characteristics such as high military spirit have been discussed often in terms of Koguryŏ culture. A colonial-period newspaper article introducing games played in the first month of the new year mentioned *sŏkchŏn* (石戰, rock-throwing contest) briefly as a custom of Koguryŏ origin,[418] and Ch'oe Nam-sŏn explained that *ondol* had been used since Koguryŏ. Otherwise, Koguryŏ customs were rarely introduced in materials whereas its history, as symbolized by military strength and spirit, has appeared repeatedly in various documents. Obviously, escalated interest in Koguryŏ history and its successful implantation to the collective memory contributed to the re-emergence/reconstruction of various cultural customs originating from Koguryŏ since the late twentieth century, and the

[416] Both Kim and Ri stated in their preface that the refreshed memories of Koguryŏ enabled them to realize national pride while they wrote novels.

[417] *Koguryŏ iyagi* (Story of Koguryŏ) (P'yŏngyang: Sahoe kwahak ch'ulp'ansa, 2007), 222-254. Terms used in playing *yut* symbolized five different animals that were also used for official titles in the ancient kingdom.

[418] "Koguryŏ sidae put'ŏ kiwŏnhan sŏkchŏn" (Sŏkchŏn - Originated from Koguryŏ) *Tonga ilbo*, January 5, 1938.

South Korean government even used an astronomical map from Koguryŏ in the newly designed 10,000-won bill in 2007.[419]

IV. Koguryŏ and the Ethnic Origins of *Koreanness*

Many scholars, not only Koreans but also Japanese and Chinese, have examined the ethnic origin of Koreans, and Koguryŏ has been discussed with this issue because the Ye (濊) and Maek (貊) tribes, which are generally regarded as aboriginally Korean, also appeared in many historical documents as an ethnic group comprising Koguryŏ. Needless to say, the ethnic identity of Koguryŏ emerged as a key subject in the discussion about the implantation of Koguryŏ in the collective memory of Koreans. I will review different recent arguments about the ethnicity of Koguryŏ people as presented by some scholars, and analyze how the ethnic lineage of Koguryŏ has been deployed lately in the discourse on Koguryŏ memories in both North and South Korea while Koguryŏ is emerging rapidly within the notion of the collective memory of both North and South Korean societies.

Ye-Maek, Koguryŏ, and *Korean*

Since the *Hou Han shu* stated the Maek were the main ethnic group of Koguryŏ, the Maek have been considered as an ancestor of the Korean people, and consequently, Koguryŏ's relationship with the Maek became an important issue in Koguryŏ's ethnic lineage within Korean history. Interestingly though, not only Maek but also the Ye and Ye-Maek often appear as a distinct group forming early *Korean* identity in historical documents. Meanwhile the *Han shu*

[419] Although the use of this map was also intended in order to show the high level of astronomical knowledge by Koreans, it is another strong indication that the South Korean government has tried to implant Koguryŏ in the collective memory of Koreans amidst the controversy over Koguryŏ's historical identity.

used both Ye and Ye-Maek to refer to Koguryŏ people in its discussion of Wang Mang's (王莽, 45 BCE-23 CE) chase of the *Hu* tribe (胡族),[420] and the *Sanguo zhi* referred to the Ye and Ye-Maek for the explanation of Puyŏ,[421] which was believed to share a common ancestor with Koguryŏ.

It is worthwhile to note that Japanese scholars first offered an explanation on the usage of these terms as early as the 1930s. Shiratori Kurakishi stated that the Ye-Maek, formed of a mixed race of Mongols and Tunggus, resided between Sushen (肅愼) and Donghu (東胡) tribal territories.[422] According to Shiratori, the Maek tribe changed its name to Ye after moving east as a result of pressure from Donghu and Han tribes (漢族). Because Chinese people still called them the Ye-Maek, Shiratori argued, the Maek tribe living upstream of the Songhua (松花, Eng. Sunggari) River became associated with Puyŏ, while the Ye often referred to people of Koguryŏ along the Yalu River and those in present-day Kangwŏn province, according to many documents.[423] In agreement with Shiratori's argument, Mishina Shōei (三品彰英, 1902-1971) also stated that all tribes residing in northern China were called Ye-Maek, which was just a redundancy because the Maek were also widely known as the Ye.[424] South Korean scholars

[420] *Han shu*, 99:6.

[421] *Sanguo zhi* (三國志) *Wei zhi* (魏志) 30:842.

[422] Shiratori Kurakishi, "Waibaku o hatashite nani minzoku to minasubekika" (濊貊を果して何民族と見做すべきか, What Ethnic Group was Considered the Wai-Bak Tribes?), *Shigaku zasshi* (史學雜誌) 44, no. 7 (1932): 103-105.

[423] Shiratori Kurakishi, "Waibaku minzoku no yurai o nobete Fuyo Kōkuri oyobi Kudara no kigen ni oyobu" (濊貊民族の由來を述べて夫餘高句麗及び百濟の起源に及ぶ, The Roots of Waibaku Tribes: The Origin of Fuyo, Kōkuri and Kudara), *Shigaku zasshi* 45, no. 12 (1933): 110-112.

[424] Mishina Shōei, "Waibaku shōkō" (濊貊小考, Some Consideration on the Wai-Bak [i.e. Wai-Baku] Tribes), *Chōsen Gakuhō* (朝鮮學報) 4 (October 1952): 8.

generally agree that the Ye-Maek were aboriginal Koreans comprising Puyŏ and Koguryŏ.[425] The argument, does not, however, limit Ye-Maek only to the northern states in ancient Korean history. Stating that characters for both the Ye and Maek were just used to address the state of the Ye tribe residing east of China, Yang Chu-dong (梁柱東, 1903-1977), using a phonetic analysis of the two characters, insisted that there were linkages between the characters of Ye, Maek, and places for Silla. According to Yang, Ye-Maek can be read as *tongmyŏng* (東明), literally meaning "bright east" and even deciphered as "Kyerim" (鷄林), an old name for Silla's capital.[426]

North Korean scholarship also presented Koguryŏ's ethnic Korean identity through a discussion of the Ye and Maek. Explaining that Chinese people used both characters interchangeably when they first encountered *Koreans* because Chinese historians did not distinguish between the two names,[427] Ri Chi-rin argued in the *Koguryŏsa yŏn'gu* that Puyŏ and Koguryŏ were established by the Maek tribe while the Ye tribe built Old Chosŏn, the first slave state in Korean history. What is more interesting in Ri's argument is that the Ye and Maek tribes were related not only through their geographical location but also by blood.[428] Considering that North Korea labeled Koguryŏ as a feudal state which followed Old Chosŏn, a slave state, in the Marxian model of historical progress, it is no surprise that North Korea stressed the ties between

[425] Kim Chŏng-hak, "Han'guk minjok hyŏngsŏngsa" (History of the Formation of Korean Nation), in *Han'guk munhwasa taegye* (韓國文化史大系, Overview of Korean Cultural History) (Seoul: Koryŏ taehakkyo ch'ulp'anbu, 1970), 1:422-429. Kim argued that Ye and Maek actually referred to the same tribe that belonged to the Altai group in anthropological terms.

[426] Yang Chu-dong, *Yang Chu-dong chŏnjip – 1 Koga yon'gu* (梁柱東全集 – 1. 古歌研究) (Seoul: Tongguk taehakkyo ch'ulp'anbu, 1983), 1:38.

[427] Ri Chi-rin, *Ko Chosŏn yŏn'gu* (Studies of Old Chosŏn) (P'yŏngyang: Kwahakwŏn ch'ulp'ansa, 1963), 140. Because North Korea consistently agues the historical legitimacy of Old Chosŏn was directly succeeded by Koguryŏ, discussion of the ethnic group of Old Chosŏn was closely related with that of Koguryŏ.

[428] Ri Chi-rin and Kang In-suk, *Koguryŏsa yŏn'gu*, 15-16.

Old Chosŏn and Koguryŏ in terms of their ethnicity as they were strongly arguing for their political legitimacy by underlining the historical lineage from Old Chosŏn to themselves through Koguryŏ and Parhae, discounting Silla's role in the flow of Korean history.

Besides the claims about the Ye-Maek, some scholars insist instead that they were two different branches with the same origin. Rui Yi-fu (芮逸夫) distinguished the Ye and Maek by arguing that the former resided over the northern part of the Korean peninsula along Songhua River and Jilin area, meanwhile the latter mainly was in the Liaodong, Shandong (山東), and Hebei (河北) regions.[429] Wen Chong-yi (文崇一) also insisted that both the Ye and Maek were two different groups from the same tribe, Wuyi (烏夷), who interacted with Yin (殷).[430] What is interesting in Wen's claim is that he included Paekche and Silla in the discussion of the Ye-Maek.[431] It is a a very important claim in terms of consolidating Koguryŏ's ethnic lineage in Korean history because the ethnic identity of Koguryŏ as defined by the Ye-Maek can be stretched further to the southern part of the Korean peninsula as long as the Ye-Maek were the main ethnic group comprising all of the Three Kingdoms. In other words, Koguryŏ's ethnicity as represented by the Ye-Maek certainly helped it remain strong in the collective memory of Koreans. Whether it was historically true or not that the ethnic origin of all Three Kingdoms lay with the Ye-Maek, Koguryŏ's ties with them, at least, have never been doubted regardless of how we perceive the Ye and Maek.[432] And the rise of perception that the Ye-Maek were the common

[429] Rui Yi-fu, "Hanguo gudai minzukaolue," (韓國古代民族考略, Summary of Ethnic Groups in Ancient Korea) in *Zhong Han Wenhua lunji* (Taipei: Zhonghua wenhua chupan shiye weiyunhui, 1955), 1:40-47. Here, Rui understood Ye and Maek to be the eastern and western branches of Old Chosŏn, respectively.

[430] Wen Chong-yi, "Wei-Mo minzu wenhua ji qi chiliao," (濊貊民族文化及其史料, A Study of the Culture and Tribe of Wei-Mo), *Bulletin of The Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica* 5 (1958): 115.

[431] Wen, "Wei-Mo minzu wenhua ji qi chiliao," 127-30.

[432] Some scholars also argue that the Maek moved east after being pushed by Xingnu (匈奴, Kor. Hyngno) tribes and gradually absorbed Ye, who had already settled down in the east into agricultural life. See Kim Chae-bung, "Wai

ethnic origin of Koreans has caused no trouble in the Korean people's collective memory.

Issues of Identifying *Malgal* (靺鞨, Ch. *Mohe*)

The identity of the Malgal has been a key factor as well in analyzing Koguryŏ's ethnic composition. Since mentioned mostly with Koguryŏ in the *Samguk sagi*, the Malgal have been seen mostly in relations with the Ye or Ye-Maek. Yi Pyŏng-do stated that the Malgal in the *Samguk sagi* actually referred to the Ye-Maek tribes in Eastern Ye (東濊),[433] and Kim Ch'ŏl-chun also argued that they were people belonging to the Ye or Eastern Okchŏ (東沃沮).[434] Although some Chinese scholars explained that the Malgal were the Mo-Mo (貊貉, Kor. Maek-Maek) people from the intermingling of the two tribes,[435] the Malgal usually appeared with Sushen, Yilou (挹婁. Kor. Ŭmnu), and Wuji (勿吉, Kor. Mulkil) in pre-modern documents.

The texts of both Chinese and Korean historical documents support the conventional scholarship, which distinguishes the Malgal from Koguryŏ people. Many Chinese documents often explained the Malgal in different sections than the Eastern Barbarian (東夷) where Koguryŏ and other ancient Korean states appeared, and even in the *Samguk sagi*, there were some examples implying that the Malgal were treated differently relative to the Koguryŏ people. The treatment of the Tang in accepting the surrender of the Koguryŏ army in 645 portrayed

---

Baku kō" (A Study on Ye-Mag [i.e. Wai-Baku]), *Chōsen Gakuhō* 71 (October 1974): 1-19. Basically agreeing with Kim's argument, Yi Ok even claimed that "Koguryŏ minjok" was formed by the combination of two different ethnic groups, the Maek from the west and the Ye from the east. See Yi Ok, *Koguryŏ minjok hyŏngsŏng kwa sahoe* (The Formation of Koguryŏ People and Its Society) (Seoul: Kyobo mun'go, 1984).

[433] Yi Pyŏng-do, *Kugyŏk Samguk sagi* (Seoul: Ŭryu munhwasa, 1977) 19, 354-355.

[434] Kim Ch'ŏl-chun, "Han'guk kodae kukka paltalsa" (Development of Ancient Korean State), in *Han'guk munhwasa taegye*, 1:501. Ch'ŏn Kwan-u also agreed with Kim's argument about Malgal identity as recorded in *Samguk sagi*.

[435] Fu Langyun and Yang Yang, *Dongbei minzu shilue* (東北民族史略, A Summary of People in the Northeast) (Jilin: Jilin renmin chupanshi, 1983), 82.

certain distinctions between the Koguryŏ people and the Malgal. According to the *Samguk sagi*, the Tang emperor ordered troops to bury the Malgal people alive whereas the Koguryŏ people were either to be taken to the Tang or sent back to Koguryŏ depending on their ranks.[436] Besides this, the Malgal also appeared frequently in the conflict with Paekche in the *Samguk sagi*, which addressed the Malgal's consistent attacks on Paekche since the first century BCE. Interestingly, the *Samguk sagi* stated the Malgal were located along the northern border of Paekche and Silla. Because Koguryŏ was also adjacent to Paekche and Silla during the Three Kingdoms period, many notes regarding conflicts between Paekche and the Malgal made it possible to assume that there were a least some Malgal communities inside Koguryŏ territory.

Research on Koguryŏ's ethnicity has contributed to a new analysis of the Malgal as well. In contrast to the conventional understanding of the Malgal which positioned them in the lineage of the Jurchen and originating from Sushen, recent scholarship emphasizing Koguryŏ's Korean ethnicity argues that the Malgal were just an opprobrious term for common people and specifically used to refer to people outside of capital throughout Koguryŏ history.[437] Scholars arguing that the Malgal was a pejorative term used to refer to the ruled also stated that Chinese people also used the Ye and Maek as a derogative terms to refer to *foreign* groups. Therefore, the usage of "Malgal," they argue, can be understood in the same way as "Ye" and "Maek."

It is worthwhile to note that the Malgal were discussed in the discourse of the Ye-Maek in terms of Koguryŏ ethnicity in recent South Korean scholarship, which argues that at least two groups of the Malgal – the Paeksan (白山) and the Songmal (粟末) – were descendants of the Ye-Maek. According to this argument, it is very likely that both the Paeksan and Songmal Malgal

[436] *Samguk sagi*, 21:11.

[437] Han Kyu-ch'ŏl, "Koguryŏ sidae ui Malgal yŏn'gu" (Research on Malgal of Koguryŏ), *Pusan sahak* (釜山史學) 14·15 (1988): 47.

actually referred to Koguryŏ people residing in the region over the years, which overlapped the area that the Ye-Maek had settled earlier, therefore, the relationship between Koguryŏ and them should be understood as being subordinate to the authority of Koguryŏ. In other words, "Malgal" did not refer to states of different ethnic communities exclusively, and extremely harsh punishment of the Malgal people by the Tang explained the split between Koguryŏ people in capital and those in local areas, rather than warning the Malgal not to join with Koguryŏ.[438]

Then, is it proper to believe that the Malgal people thought of themselves as "Koguryŏ" people and held a collective identity of Koguryŏ? Although it is possible to trace some similarities between some Malgal groups and previous Ye-Maek records, there are some examples in historical documents that question the strong consciousness of Koguryŏ among the Malgal themselves. The *Samguk sagi* recorded that a Malgal chief offered ten fine horses to the Paekche king in the third century and the king of Paekche gave horses to a Malgal envoy on the latter's visit.[439] Although the Malgal mostly posed a serious concern for Paekche, they also tried to maintain peace with Paekche at times while Koguryŏ was still hostile with Paekche. More interestingly, the *Samguk sagi* also states that one Koguryŏ official conspired with the Malgal to attack Paekche.[440] It is strange that the Koguryŏ official secretly made a plan against Paekche if the Malgal truly held a strong consciousness of being a part of Koguryŏ. In other words, it is doubtful that the Malgal had a strong sense of belonging to Koguryŏ, even if they were actually referring to Koguryŏ people in local areas far from the capital or different ethnic communities inside Koguryŏ.

---

[438] Han, "Koguryŏ sidae ŭi Malgal yŏn'gu," 32, 39-40 and 43-45.

[439] *Samguk sagi*, 24:4. "…靺鞨長羅渴獻良馬十匹, 王優勞使者以還之."

[440] *Ibid*., 26:7. "…高句麗將高老與靺鞨謀, 欲攻漢城進屯於橫岳下…"

It seems that the new environment emphasizing Koguryŏ's Korean ethnicity since the late twentieth century has propelled new analysis on the Malgal, which was also very closely related with the historical identity of Parhae, now generally considered by Koreans as a direct descendant of the fallen Koguryŏ. Because the *Xin Tang shu* identified the founder of Parhae as Malgal,[441] the interpretation of Malgal identity emerged as a key issue in positioning Koguryŏ's ethnic identity as well. Considering Parhae's position in Korean historiography, specifically in North Korea, it is not surprising to see the interpretation of the Malgal as a marginalized people in recent South Korean scholarship,[442] and it can be understood in the process of consolidating Koguryŏ in the collective memory of both North and South Koreans.

Reflections of Koguryŏ's Ethnic Lineage in Popular Culture

A review of the depiction of Koguryŏ in popular culture also helps us understand how its ethnicity has been dealt with in the formation of *Korean* identity. Historical fiction is one of the forms appearing widely in North Korea as an attempt to underline Koguryŏ's ethnic lineage in Korean history. In the *Tamjing*, the author consistently stated that Koguryŏ, Paekche, and Silla immigrants in Japan were getting along well and remained very close to each other, which left a deep impression on the Japanese Crown Prince. The brief summary of the international situation surrounding Paekche, Koguryŏ, and the Sui in this fictional work provides the best evidence of the emphasis on the collective identity rooted in ethnic homogeneity. It says that what kept

[441] *Xin Tang shu*, 219:6179. "…粟末靺鞨附高麗者…"

[442] In the *Jiu Tang shu* though, "Koguryŏ's different group" [高麗別種] without any Malgal comment was used to explain the first king of Parhae. See *Jiu Tang shu*, 199:5360. Scholars not agreeing with the "Malgal=marginalized people" interpretation argue that "different group" means Koguryŏ people living near the border in Malgal-majority villages who gradually adjusted their lifestyle to follow their habitants. See No T'ae-don, "Tae Cho-yŏng, Koguryŏin in'ga Malgarin in'ga" (Tae Cho-yŏng, Did he belong to Koguryŏ or Malgal?), *Yŏksa pip'yŏng* 9 (November 1989): 308-319.

Paekche from attacking Koguryŏ in spite of the Sui's proposal was their strong consciousness of being "us" with Koguryŏ.[443] It seems that author referred to the *Sui shu* for the creation of this scene. According to the *Sui shu*, Paekche did not engage in any military operation against Koguryŏ although the king of Paekche placed troops along the Koguryŏ border when the Sui crossed the Liao River.[444] Although it was true that Paekche was able to avoid any military conflict with Koguryŏ during the Sui expedition, it is very unlikely that their belief in the same ethnicity with Koguryŏ was the reason of their behavior. It is more likely that Paekche's ongoing confrontation with Silla kept them from attacking Koguryŏ during the Sui expedition. In other words, Paekche took advantage of the tension between the Sui and Koguryŏ in order to check a possible threat from Koguryŏ while focusing on Silla for their main concern, and it is very doubtful for the Three Kingdoms to hold a collective identity consciousness.

The emphasis on Korean ethnicity in Koguryŏ discourse was also confirmed in *Kwanggaet'o t'aewang* (廣開土太王),[445] a historical drama currently airing in South Korea since June 2011. Following the success of previous dramas dealing with Koguryŏ, such as *Chumong* (2006), *Yŏn Kaesomun* (2006), and *T'aewang sasin'gi* (Legend, 2007), *Kwanggaet'o t'aewang* also focuses on the achievements of the historical king of Koguryŏ.[446] In depicting how King Kwanggaet'o gained the reputation among the people of Koguryŏ, *Kwanggaet'o t'aewang*

[443] Ri Sŏng-dŏk, *Tamjing* (P'yŏngyang: Munhwa yesul chonghap ch'ulp'ansa, 1998), 174-175.

[444] *Sui shu* (隋書), 81:1819.

[445] Kwanggaet'o *t'aewang* (-太王), instead of commonly known Kwanggaet'o *taewang* (-大王), was chosen for the title of this series. Although Kwanggaet'o t'aewang appeared on the King Kwanggaet'o stele, it is obvious that the replacement of tae with t'ae was the outcome of the increased emphasisis on the historical pride of Koguryŏ.

[446] It is very interesting to note that all three major broadcasting company of South Korea – KBS (*Kwanggaet'o t'aewang*), MBC (*Chumong* and *T'aewang sasin'gi*), and SBS (*Yŏn Kaesomun*) – aired historical dramas on Koguryŏ. It is very likely that they just answered popular demands for Koguryŏ discourse in the middle of the controversy on Koguryŏ history between Korea and China.

explains that his achievements in Koguryŏ's victories against the Later Yan [後燕] helped his emergence on the Koguryŏ court. The credibility of this claim is, however, very questionable. He was only ten years old when Koguryŏ fought the Later Yan between 384 and 385. More importantly, Paekche replaced the Later Yan as Koguryŏ's main enemy in 385, and he was chosen as the Crown Prince of Koguryŏ in 386. Therefore, it is more likely that the battles in which King Kwangget'o contributed to Koguryŏ's victories were against Paekche, not the Later Yan, and the *Samguk sagi* also indicates that Koguryŏ took quite a bit of territory from Paekche in 391 when Kwanggaet'o became king.[447] Certainly, his leadership was well known to Paekche,[448] and he kept attacking Paekche over the next ten years, which resulted in an expansion of Koguryŏ territory to the south. All these accounts strongly suggested that his early success in military affairs came from defeating Paekche rather than the Later Yan. Unquestionably, it is the strong sense and common belief of Koguryŏ's belonging to a Korean ethnicity among Koreans that portrayed the Later Yan as the foundation for King Kwanggaet'o to use to build his leadership in this drama. Because Koguryŏ was already planted firmly in the collective memory of Koreans with Paekche and Silla, it must have been easier to present the Later Yan, a *foreign* state, instead of Paekche, as evidence of King Kwanggae'to's early military successes.

It is worthwhile to note the great success of historical dramas dealing with Koguryŏ in spite of historically incorrect information in their content, and *Chumong* (2006) was even labeled as *national* drama throughout its broadcast due to its popularity among Koreans. It is obvious

[447] There is a controversy regarding whether these battles between Koguryŏ and Paekche occurred before or after he was enthroned. In fact, Koguryŏ's victories against Paekche were recorded during King Kwanggaet'o's reign in the *Samguk sagi* while the *Chosŏn sanggosa* by Sin Ch'ae-ho listed it under King Kogugyang (故國壤王, ?-391; r. 384-391).

[448] *Samguk sagi*, 25:2.

that Koreans' recognition of Koguryŏ in their collective identity propelled their success, and its position in the consciousness of Koreans is also placed firmly. Portrayal of Yŏn Kaesomun as a guardian of Koguryŏ instead of as a cruel dictator in the drama of the same name clearly indicates that notions of Koguryŏ's Korean ethnicity have been the reason for the depiction of this ancient kingdom and its implantation in the collective memory of Koreans.

Conclusion

Mentions in Korean history of Koguryŏ's political, cultural, and ethnic links to modern Korea can be found in various sources published since 1945, and the complexity in their references have even been furthered by many factors such as the establishment of two different regimes in Korea, rise of pseudo-historiography, and controversy between Korea and China regarding Koguryŏ's historical identity. While South Korean scholarship has located Silla at the center of discussion for the Three Kingdoms period from the 1960s to the 1990s and beyond, Koguryŏ has occupied the superior position among the Three Kingdoms in North Korea. Efforts to implant Koguryŏ in the collective memory of Koreans appear in many ways in both North and South Korea.

North Korea has consistently underlined Koguryŏ in Korean history in order to argue its political legitimacy over South Korea. By placing Koguryŏ at the feudal stage in the historical development model presented by Marx, they emphasized Koguryŏ's historical significance over Silla's.[449] Moreover, with their *Juch'e* ideology growing since its appearance in the 1970s, Koguryŏ remains strong in various North Korean discourses as they try to construct Korean

[449] Interestingly though, people's protests against the ruling class of Koguryŏ were not mentioned as often as in Paekche or Silla contexts in North Korean historiography. Although Koguryŏ has consistently been called a feudal state, its military success facing foreign invasions are the main subjects in Koguryŏ history in North Korean documents.

identity through the lineage from Old Chosŏn to themselves through Koguryŏ and Parhae. And Koguryŏ's strong military strength supports North Korea's independence and self-reliance, which, they insist has emerged as an ideal model for their Military First (先軍, *sŏn'gun*) policy and is also closely tied with *Juch'e* ideology.

Although North Korea has apparently tried to take advantage of its ties with Koguryŏ in order to argue its political legitimacy over South Korea, South Korea also consistently presents traces of Koguryŏ legacy in their society. Naming one of the main boulevards in Seoul and an important military exercise "Ŭlchi" after the *Korean national* hero of seventh-century Koguryŏ implies that the South Korean government is also aware of Koguryŏ in the formation of the collective memory of Koreans, and an astronomical chart made in Koguryŏ replaced a pavilion built in the Chosŏn period on the newly redesigned 10,000-won bill in 2007. Considering that any affair related to currency is a very important project of any government, this change of design confirms that the South Korean government was not idle in deploying Koguryŏ in their political lineage and collective memory.

Since "modern" *nationalism* started appearing in the late nineteenth century and throughout the colonial period, issues on Koguryŏ's ethnicity emerged as one of the main subjects in Koguryŏ research in the twentieth century. In contrast to the colonial period when people were mostly interested in Koguryŏ's military strength and independent spirit, Koguryŏ discourse after liberation in 1945 developed within the subject of *Korean* unity, and which consequently resulted in prolific research on its ethnic lineage in Korean history. Being even further stimulated in the middle of controversy on its historical identity between Korea and China, Koguryŏ ethnicity is overshadowing other issues about Koguryŏ and has led to the expansion of public interest in Koguryŏ. Newly produced TV dramas, movies, and historical

novels are outcomes of the inquiry into Koguryŏ ethnicity. Likely influenced by an increase in Koguryŏ-related materials, about 78 percent of high school students believe that Koguryŏ left the most influence on modern Korea, and more than 70 percent think people of Koguryŏ, Paekche, and Silla as belonging to the same ethnic group.[450] Undeniably, these dramas and movies helped the public welcome Koguryŏ into their collective consciousness even though some of the portrayals of this ancient kingdom were far from the historical truth. Embellished stories focusing on Koguryŏ's *Korean* ethnicity are indeed more effective in their implantation in the collective memory of Koreans. These dramas have helped not only ordinary people remember Koguryŏ but also have contributed to expanding academic research on Koguryŏ because some of these dramas have delivered historically incorrect information while mainly focusing on Koguryŏ's *Korean* ethnicity in history.

Arguably, memories of Koguryŏ after liberation appeared within the most complicated circumstances, and it is worthwhile to note that the different groups producing Koguryŏ discourse all acknowledge the ancient kingdom's legacy in their arguments. No matter which political regimes they serve, or whether they belong to academic circles or non-academic historians, scholars remember Koguryŏ as always having been a part of Korean history, and its memories have not been erased while remaining in people's minds as the savior and symbol of a great *Korean* history that has survived many threats from *foreigners*.

[450] Kim Sang-hun, "Han'gugin ŭi kiwŏn e kwanhan chung·kodŭng haksaeng tŭl ŭi ŭisik kwa kuksa kyokwasŏ ŭi kwan'gye" (The Relationship between Korean History Textbook and Middle-High School Students' Thought on the Origin of the Korean People), *Han'guk kodaesa t'amgu* 5 (August 2010): 5-61. Although Kim attributed the result to the contents of textbooks which guided students to hold a somewhat fabricated view of Koguryŏ, it is very likely that the huge success of Koguryŏ dramas such as *Chumong* and *Yŏn Kaesomun* two years before this survey also contributed to the results of this survey.

Chapter Seven

Conclusion

Koguryŏ: Ancient Kingdom Surviving in Modern Memories

Collective memory appears most prominently under external pressure or threat, or at times when internal circumstances produce a crisis of legitimacy. The emergence of Koguryŏ memories among Koreans here is analyzed in the context of changes wrought by specific situations in Korean history. Most recently, it has been the competition between North and South Korea, each seeking to present itself as the sole legitimate government of Korea and the controversy regarding Koguryŏ's historical identity between Korea and China that has contributed to the prominence of Koguryŏ in the Korean collective memory. It is significant indeed that a state that disappeared more than 1300 years ago still has such a lasting influence on events in the twenty-first century, and is still vigorously debated and discussed today. Although Koguryŏ always has been considered a part of Korean history, people's strong interest in this ancient kingdom in the present is arguably unprecedented and it is far from coincidence that these rejuvenated Koguryŏ memories are deeply related to Chinese claims on Koguryŏ's historical identity.

Until the Chinese government gradually expressed its interest in Koguryŏ in the 1980s, official Chinese historiography never questioned the ancient kingdom's position in Korean history. The atmosphere, however, has changed quickly and ironically since the 1990s,

specifically, after South Korea established diplomatic relations with China in 1992. After witnessing the huge success of a series of special exhibitions on Koguryŏ following the establishment of diplomatic ties between the two countries, Chinese scholars started claiming historical ownership of Koguryŏ by arguing that the Koguryŏ people were assimilated into China after Koguryŏ's demise in the seventh century CE. An example of the changed Chinese perspective is Sun Jinji's (孫進己) argument that only the history of Silla belongs to Korean history, whereas not only Manchuria but even the northern Korean peninsula were Chinese territory.[451] This is certainly a step further from earlier Chinese claims that Koguryŏ, from its establishment in the first century BCE until 427 when Koguryŏ moved its capital to P'yŏngyang, belonged to Chinese history, while the later years can be considered Koguryŏ's own history.[452]

What makes this more interesting is that both Korean and Chinese claims over Koguryŏ are strongly related with *nationalism* in each country. It is worthwhile to note that emerging interest in Koguryŏ among South Koreans first became apparent during the 1980s when South Korea was gaining more confidence in the competition with North Korea. After the 1980s, in contrast to the past when their main concern was just to catch up with North Korea, South Korea did not have to worry about the threat from the north as much, and is now looking toward eventual re-unification on its own terms. Furthermore, because South Korean administrations have been very confident of themselves in the middle of the competition against North Korea, they have started to look for something beyond the potential unification of the two Koreas in order to provide people emotional satisfaction about a glorious future. In other words, Silla's

[451] Sun Jinji, *Dongbei min zu shi yan jiu* (東北民族史研究, Research on Ethnic Groups in Northeastern China) (Zhongzhou: Zhongzhou guji chubanshe, 1994), 1:286-292.

[452] Chinese scholars present the notion of the so-called "dual lineage of one history" [一史兩用] in order to make this argument. Although they reluctantly agree that Koguryŏ partly belonged to Korean history, it is obvious that what they truly intend is to refute Korean's claim of Koguryŏ's historical identity as Korean.

historical importance, symbolized by the unification, was replaced by the expansion of Koguryŏ as the main discourse in Korean history, and consequently, the Koguryŏ model of frontierism seems to be valued more highly and fits better than the internal unification achieved by Silla as a guidepost for the future.

Chinese claims over Koguryŏ also strongly reflect some remnants of nationalism. In opposition to the South Korean situation, China realizes the necessity of providing a common ground for Chinese unity while appearing as a superpower in international politics and economy. As a fast-growing international power, China now has to monitor domestic affairs even more cautiously, and issues regarding Koguryŏ history are approached in terms of their potential threat weakening the *collective* identity of the Chinese people. In order to stress Chinese collective identity, China presents a notion of a "unitary multi-national state created jointly by the people of all its nationalities" [統一的 多民族國家論]. According to this argument, Chinese history proves that China has been composed of multinational groups controlled by one civilization, Han (漢) China. Therefore, they maintain that every ethnic group currently residing in the Chinese territory should be considered Chinese and their histories are also a part of Chinese history. Because Chinese concern about Koguryŏ is basically rooted on an analysis of nationalism, the Chinese government understands that all surging interest in Koguryŏ among Koreans since the 1990s is a very serious issue that can easily threaten their national propaganda. Chinese criticism of Korean scholarship as unprofessional and politically and economically motivated offers insight into how China is dealing with the Koguryŏ issue.[453]

[453] In *Gu dai Zhongguo Gaogouli li shi xu lun* (古代中国高句丽历史续论, Expanded Studies on Gaogouli History in Ancient China) published in 2003, Chinese scholars blame both South and North Korean scholarship on Koguryŏ. They point out the irredentism in a text published by the headquarters of the Republic of Korea army and argue that the popularity of non-academic scholarship appealing to chauvinism was behind the rise of irredentism espoused by the military leadership that seized political power in South Korea. North Korea's registry of Koguryŏ's mural paintings was also downplayed by Chinese scholars, who presented it as a symbolic gesture arising from political

It is therefore worthwhile to review some theories about nationalism in terms of their applicability to discussing the role of Koguryŏ in the discourse of *nationalism* because such re-imaging of the past is often considered nothing more than a simple byproduct of modern nation-building. Although nations and nationalisms were once believed to have existed since the ancient period, and history was the process of political unification and fighting against Others and Otherness in primordial perspectives, recent scholarship has argued that nations and nationalism did not appear until the eighteenth century when some Western states became independent by opposing old regimes, as seen in Ernest Gellner's argument that nationalism was produced in the process of forming a modern centralized state and commercial capitalism. Eric J. Hobsbawm also does not regard the nation as a primary or unchanging social entity, and he further underlines the elements of artifact, invention, and social engineering as entering into the making of nations.[454] Although he shows a different view on the nation by arguing for "imagined communities," Benedict Anderson, too, agrees that the nation first appeared in the modern period, specifically after the late eighteenth century. Anthony Smith, however, shows a somewhat compromising perspective on nation-formation. Although he considers the nation as a new product of the modern period, Smith also stresses that it does not come from a total break with the past. Rather, he points to the ethnic origins of the nation in the pre-modern period. According to Smith, common myths, historical memories, and symbols are central to the formation of nation-state in the modern period.

Even though most of these arguments seek the origins of nationalism in the modern

---

and diplomatic reasons rather than as the result of academic or cultural research. For the same reason, Chinese scholars attributed the success of a special exhibition on Koguryŏ in South Korea to a nationalism-centered social phenomenon, and they are even cynical of the collaborated efforts of the two Koreas on Koguryŏ issues. (*Ibid*., 8-10.)

[454] Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*, 10-11.

period, it is surprisingly easy to see that memories of Koguryŏ dating back as much as a thousand years or more fit the model of nationalist discourse in many aspects. First of all, the myth of Chumong and many memories of Koguryŏ held by Koreans since as early as the tenth century explain the role of myths and historical memories according to Smith's argument.[455] Although many documents and rituals relating to Koguryŏ were only accessible to a limited segment of Korean society until the nineteenth century, this does not deny the applicability of Koguryŏ in the discussion of collective identity in Korean history. To the contrary, what is important here is how memories constructed and maintained by pre-modern elites were used with great effect by nineteenth- and twentieth-century elites to construct a modern national identity.

There are scholars who doubt that people of the Three Kingdoms had possessed a "collective" consciousness of "us" as Korean.[456] Basically agreeing with Hobsbawm's argument on nationality, they explain that there were no fundamental differences in their perception of their neighboring kingdoms, relative to China or Japan. Therefore, they argue it is incorrect to label Silla's unification as "national" unification. This may be true, but the reality is that we have no way of knowing whether the peoples of the Three Kingdoms shared some sort of common collective identity. What we can say, however, is that Koguryŏ, Paekche, and Silla, were considered to be a part of a common historical heritage by rulers and literati from at least Koryŏ times on. Whether or not common people of Koryŏ and Chosŏn were aware of Koguryŏ, it seems certain that the ruling elites of both periods never questioned that they derived a significant portion of their political, cultural and perhaps even ethnic legitimacy from the ancient kingdom.

[455] Although Tan'gun is more appropriate as a symbolic example of a myth in the case of nationalism in Korea, Chumong of Koguryŏ also has remained through history and, moreover, Koguryŏ is often regarded as maintaining the historical lineage of Tan'gun's Old Chosŏn.

[456] Im Chi-hyŏn, *Mijok chuŭi nŭn panyŏk ida*. (Nationalism is Treason) (Seoul: Sonamu, 1999), 58-63.

Hobsbawm, of course, draws an important distinction between pre-modern "political nations" and modern nation-states, but he fails to recognize the importance of historical memories constructed and perpetuated by political elites, at least in the case of countries with a long tradition of centralized rule such as those of East Asia, including Korea. Long before it became widely known among a broader swath of the population in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Koguryŏ had been consistently cited and remembered by literati. It was those memories that were propagated, albeit selectively, among the commoners.

It is interesting to note how the literati referenced Koguryŏ in the pre-modern period, arguing, as in the case of Sin Ch'ae-ho, that Neo-Confucianism was a reason why nationalism was not able to develop earlier in Korea. Sin and others, however, were focusing primarily on the issue of what Andre Schmid calls "decentering China," and they overlooked how political unity had been maintained in Korea for much of recorded history, how Confucianism – along with Buddhism and shamanism – became part of a widely shared culture, and how at least some Koreans had developed a sense of themselves as constituting a distinct ethnicity that transcended individual kingdoms or dynasties. Nationalism, as explained by such modernists as Gellner, Hobsbawm, or Anderson, requires the creation of a degree of homogeneity in these spheres that had never existed before. Korea, however, may be an example of a non-Western country where a relatively high degree of homogeneity, at least among the literate elites, was already attained before the introduction of the notions of nation and nationalism from the West. Nevertheless, many scholars generally agree that it was not until the twentieth century when nationalism appeared in Korean society, and concur that Neo-Confucian orthodoxy was a major factor that hindered the earlier development of nationalism. Although criticized by some literati since the eighteenth century, Neo-Confucianism was arguably a dominant ideology throughout Chosŏn

society, and its dominance became even stronger after the Ming perished in the seventeenth century. Since then, Chosŏn voluntarily upheld itself as a beacon and considered itself to be the "last bastion" of Neo-Confucianism. This change certainly altered Chosŏn's perspective on China after the Manchu takeover.

Nationalism is basically rooted in its awareness of an "us" that is distinguished from an "other." Chosŏn literati since the seventeenth century, however, adopted Neo-Confucianism as the ultimate model for Chosŏn as well, and their blind following of it left little room for people in Chosŏn to devise a framework of native nationalism. Ironically though, positioning their state as the "last bastion" after Ming's demise certainly provided an opportunity for Chosŏn literati to view themselves differently vis-a-vis their new neighbor, the Qing, established by the Manchus who had formerly been the Jurchens. What is more important regarding Koguryŏ memories within the Neo-Confucian-dominated period is that Koguryŏ was still remembered and recorded by Neo-Confucian literati. Kings of Chosŏn often paid their respects at the shrine of Chumong, and various historical materials never questioned Koguryŏ's position in Korean history. Although most of the Chosŏn literati's respect for and pride in Koguryŏ was indeed based on its ties with Kija, an important figure in their Neo-Confucian ideology, Koguryŏ remained in people's memories regardless of the validity in applying nationalism to that period.

More proof strongly indicative of Koguryŏ's special status in terms of its place in people's memories was that Koguryŏ was referenced repeatedly by both colonialists and Korean nationalists during the Japanese colonial period as well. While early Japanese colonial scholarship tried to separate Koguryŏ from the main ethnic group comprising *Koreans* in order to stress a common origin between the Koreans and Japanese, Korean nationalists used the ancient kingdom to encourage an independent spirit against colonial rule. By this time, it became

apparent that Koguryŏ was adapted to helping "modern" nationalism to develop in Korea.[457] More notably, even Japanese colonial scholarship, the Man-Sen school, addressed Korean ties with Koguryŏ because Japan needed to justify its invasion of Manchuria during the late stage of their imperial period, and their interest in Koguryŏ apparently appeared as well in their publications on Koguryŏ arts, including mural paintings in Koguryŏ tombs. In other words, Koguryŏ was too important for both Korean nationalists and Japanese colonialists to disregard, and this is why the colonial period turned out to be a critical period in inciting Koguryŏ memories among people.

Proof of a strong awareness of Koguryŏ memories is also supported in North Korea. What makes this more noteworthy is that their reverence for Koguryŏ memories was not impeded by Marxism, which usually hinders the development of nationalism. There is no doubt that North Korea's devotion to Koguryŏ memories are mainly sustained by their claims of historical legitimacy in the midst of competition with South Korea since the 1950s. Even though the unique political situation on the Korean peninsula indeed contributed to preserving Koguryŏ memories in the North, it is also very apparent that much of their scholarship on Koguryŏ followed arguments of Korean nationalists from the early twentieth century, and it did not emerge abruptly out of nowhere while North Korea has been competing with South Korea since the 1950s. In other words, it is more appropriate to say that the extended interest in Koguryŏ has been propelled, rather than created by, the political situation on the Korean peninsula.

As explained before, it is apparent that the Chinese Northeast Project is behind the recent rejuvenation of Koguryŏ memories in Korea, and collective memories of Koguryŏ are factoring

[457] Sin Ch'ae-ho lamented the lack of nationalism in Korea and attributed it the deficiency to Korea's strong tendencies toward exclusivity. Sin's strong Koguryŏ-centered historical perspective implies that Koguryŏ occupied a very important place in Korean nationalist discourse through the colonial period.

into the dispute regarding Koguryŏ's historical identity between Korean and Chinese scholarship. Unquestionably, what added more controversy to the discussion of Koguryŏ memories since the 1990s is that China started to realize that the rise of Koguryŏ memories inside Korea could possibly impact Korean-Chinese societies located mainly in northeast China. Because the focus of the so-called "continental" perspective in history [大陸史觀], as opposed to a "peninsular" perspective [半島史觀] is strongly related to Manchuria, the Chinese government has been concerned about the rapidly rising interest in Koguryŏ among Koreans, and is cautiously monitoring the situation surrounding Koguryŏ issues. Obviously, the Northeast Project is a response from the Chinese government to what is growing in both North and South Korea, and Koguryŏ has become a key subject in this whole project from the very beginning. The registration of Kogruyŏ sites with UNESCO helps us understand how much China is concerned with the issues of Koguryŏ's identity. Although North Korea ratified the World Heritage Convention in 1998 to register its Koguryŏ sites with UNESCO's World Heritage list, its initial attempt in 2002 was denied by UNESCO, which asked North Korea to revise its application. It was in 2004 when North Korean Koguryŏ sites were finally listed as a World Heritage Site by UNESCO. What is noteworthy here is that North Korea was not alone in registering Koguryŏ sites in 2004, as China also listed Koguryŏ-related sites in their territory with UNESCO. While North Korean sites were listed as "Complex of Koguryŏ Tombs," the Chinese government registered theirs as "Capital Cities and Tombs of the Ancient *Gaogouli* Kingdom" in the World Heritage List.

Chinese intervention in the emergence Koguryŏ-related issues in the 2000s can possibly be explained in two ways. First, since normalization of relations with South Korea in 1992, China has financially benefitted from the booming Koguryŏ interest in South Korea. As it

became possible for Koreans to travel to China, Koguryŏ sites in northeast China near its border with North Korea emerged as one of the most popular spots among South Korean tourists. It is not hard to assume that listing Koguryŏ sites in this area with UNESCO would bring more travelers not only from South Korea, but also worldwide. The more fundamental reason why Chinese cares about Koguryŏ sites in the northeast region is understood in their concern about a possible dispute regarding identities/national orientations among the people in that region. As briefly mentioned before, many Korean-Chinese reside in this area, and the similarities between them and the people of Korea certainly hold the possibility that the Korean-Chinese people may question their roots and pose a serious social problem for the Chinese government. Nostalgic memories of Koguryŏ among South Korean travelers were strong enough to make China ponder the situation in this region, and eventually led the Chinese government to claim some of the Koguryŏ sites as their own, as a means of keeping Koguryŏ sites from being solely recognized as Korean by UNESCO.

This is why, in contrast to their conventional views, Chinese scholars have now started to argue that the history of Koguryŏ belongs to Chinese history, as just one of the many border regimes that made up the greater multi-ethnic Chinese empire. It is no surprise that both North and South Korea fiercely responded to Chinese claims of Koguryŏ as being a part of Chinese history. The Northeast Project resulted in a huge boost in terms of Koguryŏ memories among Koreans, and it was well reflected by the social phenomena that propelled the production of popular culture pertaining to Koguryŏ. The unprecedented success of South Korean historical dramas and fiction dealing with Koguryŏ amidst the current conflict between South Korea and China regarding Koguryŏ‘s historical identity is a good example showing how collective memory can be enhanced and transformed through controversy.

Just as Maurice Halbwachs acknowledged that the importance of social arrangements in individual memories are adapted and reflected, social circumstances in both Korea and China since the late twentieth century should be blamed or credited for the late-soaring Koguryŏ memories in both countries. Following Halbwachs's classification, it is the dispute between Korea and China that finally welcomed Koguryŏ into the sphere of collective memories from the boundary of historical memories and history. Koguryŏ's only historical memories have been formed and compiled through historical records by people who did not directly experience Koguryŏ, making this a main factor in preserving *history,* because history is the remembered past to which people no longer have "organic" relations. What distinguishes collective memory from historical memory is that the former involves the active formation of identities whereas the latter only remains in historical materials. As examination of how Koguryŏ has been brought up in Korean discourse, including the recent production of popular culture, certainly shows how much Koreans value this issue in terms of their historical identities.

Cultural approaches of Koguryŏ memories among Korean are also well explained by Jan Assman's theorization of collective memory. By distinguishing cultural memory from communicative memory, which is very similar to Halbwachs's autobiographical memory,[458] Assman pointed out the functions of the former in the creation of identity and its capacity to reconstruct. According to Assman, it is cultural memory that actually influences people in the process of forming a common identity, and communicative memory only lasts at most three or

[458] Halbwachs referred to four different types of memory – autobiographical memory, historical memory, history, and collective memory. According to Halbwachs, autobiographical memory is the memory of those events that we experience ourselves, while historical memory reaches us only through historical records. History is the remembered past to which we no longer have an "organic" relation, while collective memory is the active past that actually forms our identities.

four generations.[459] This is why cultural memory should be monitored more carefully in order to examine the formation of collective identity. Here is the biggest difference between Korean and Chinese discourses on Koguryŏ memories.

In Korea, it has been more than 1,000 years since Koguryŏ was projected retroactively as a part of Korean heritage in various fields – politics, culture, and ethnicity – regardless of whether this projection was actually accepted by the vast majority of people. Among the consistent reflections of Koguryŏ memories in these aspects, the cultural heritage that both Halbwachs and Assman credit for the formation of collective memory, apparently survives in Korean society. In other words, because of its long history of acknowledgment, Koguryŏ-originated customs such as *ondol*, *yut*, and *pulgogi* (Korean-style barbequed meat) still remain in contemporary Korea.[460] In contrast to the case of Korea, Chinese scholarship mainly focuses on political aspects to support its argument on the historical identity of Koguryŏ. Their claim of Koguryŏ as a local Chinese regime proves that Chinese scholars mainly adhere to political bases for their arguments in the debate about Koguryŏ's historical identity. This is why Koguryŏ has been approached more convincingly in Korea than in China although China possesses a big advantage in researching Koguryŏ due to its geographical placement. The main reason why Koguryŏ is much better preserved in the collective memories of Koreans than the Chinese is that China has been not successful in emphasizing cultural memory when dealing with Koguryŏ – there is no long history of constructing cultural memory of Koguryŏ in China. Although most remaining Koguryŏ sites are currently located inside Chinese territory, it is most certain that

[459] Assman, "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity," 125-133.

[460] It is Ch'oe Nam-sŏn who first traced the origin of *pulgogi* to Koguryŏ. By citing a note from the *Soushenji* (搜神記) in 1906, he stated that Chinese people served this *foreign* food from Koguryŏ at important banquets. Ch'oe also pointed out in his *Chosŏn yŏksa*, published in 1946, that *ondol* originated from Koguryŏ.

cultural memories of Koguryŏ thrive better among Koreans than among the Chinese people.

It is obvious that collective memory reflected in cultural identity is closely related to the formation of nationalism. There is no individual memory without special experience, and there is no collective memory without individuals participating in communal life. Both Anderson's "*imagined community*" and Hobsbawm's "*invented tradition*"[461] explain the function of collective memory among members of the nations doing the constructing. Therefore, Chinese claims over Koguryŏ's historical identity can be analyzed as an outcome of their concerns about possible unrest based on developing ethno-nationalism in their northeast territory adjacent to the Korean peninsula. Specifically, the collapse of the old Soviet Union and establishment of new *nations* out of its former "Republics" have made China ponder the situation in their territory, and the surging Koguryŏ interest in both North and South Korea must have been threatening to the Chinese government. The Chinese government certainly worries about the possibility of wide spread of "irredentist nationalism"[462] in Korea as symbolized by Koguryŏ among the Korean-Chinese community in that region. As William Callahan perceptively points out, ethnic nationalism is seen as a threat by the Chinese government whereas patriotic nationalism is certainly encouraged by the state in order to uphold the "multinational nation-state."[463] Ironically, however, it is the Chinese response to preventing a possible Korean identity from emerging

[461] Eric J. Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, eds., *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge, U.K. and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

[462] Michael Hechter classified nationalism as four different types - state-building nationalism, peripheral nationalism, irredentist nationalism, and unification nationalism. According to his typology, irredentist nationalism appears with the attempt to extend the existing boundaries of a state by incorporating territories of an adjacent state that is occupied principally by co-nationals. See Michael Hechter, *Containing Nationalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 15-17. Rather than the current situation, Hechter's typology fits better with the explanation of the rise of Koguryŏ discourses during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as found in Sin Ch'ae-ho's argument.

[463] William A. Callahan, *China: The Pessoptimist Nation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 127. Although Callahan takes Uyghurs and Tibetans as examples of his explanation of ethnic nationalisms that concern the Chinese government most, it is certain that they see Koguryŏ's potential to ignite another ethnic nationalism in northeast China where much of the Korean-Chinese population resides.

among people in its northeast region that has helped Koguryŏ memories surge in Korea. Because Koreans have felt that the Chinese claim is not only denying their ties to Koguryŏ but also will eventually damage their *Korean* identity, it is therefore, very hard for them to agree with China regarding the controversy over the historical identity of Koguryŏ.

Nationalism does thrive on crisis. The new illumination on Koguryŏ in the public eye since the late nineteenth century through the colonial period and beyond, as well as Sin Ch'ae-ho's strong lament for the lack of nationalism in Korea, indeed prove that. Arguably, the Chinese claim over Koguryŏ also reflects the relationship between nationalism and crisis, and interestingly, their approach is again accepted as a crisis by Koreans. Although both Korea and China actively emphasize Koguryŏ's identity in their history, the goals they pursue are opposite. What China aims to do in this dispute is to prevent any potential instability from arising due to the notion of nationalism in certain areas and to maintain a unified order in their society, but Korea tries to adapt Koguryŏ memories as a productive energy and model for ascending nationhood. In other words, in contrast to China's preference to dilute Koguryŏ characteristics by absorbing it into the Greater (Han) China discourse, Korea has to preserve this old kingdom as a psychological and historical model in terms of motivation for the future. It will be interesting, therefore, to see how this controversy about Koguryŏ's historical identity will develop if two Koreas are united, or how collective memory of this ancient kingdom will operate in the complex and changing relationship between North and South Korea. No one knows if it will bring a productive result or cause so more tension among *nations* that we will be forced to recall George Eliot's (1819-1880) remark that the happiest nations have no history.[464]

[464] Her original statement appearing in *The Mill on the Floss* is "The happiest women, like the happiest nations, have no history." It seems though that Eliot rephrased Montesquieu's (1689-1755) "Happy the people whose annals

As Prasenjit Duara has argued, history and the modern nation are virtually inseparable,[465] and there is no doubt that collective memory commonly shared by members of community did help form modern nationalism. These communities, however, are not all imagined or newly invented. As seen in the case of Koguryŏ memories among Koreans, there are some examples of collective memories with a long history. These memories, including that of Koguryŏ, can be understood as examples of myths, memories, and symbols, as stressed by Anthony Smith, and have been constantly renewed and continually re-told in order to ensure survival.[466]

Indeed, Koguryŏ memories arguably have survived more than a thousand years, since at least the early tenth century, and traces of those memories are widely found in various aspects such as discussions about political, cultural, and ethnic heritage. In other words, no matter which period and sphere of Korean history is examined, Koguryŏ memories are apparent although there may be some changes in how they are represented/reconstructed, depending on the particular needs of each situation. For instance, its appearance from the late nineteenth century through the colonial period is inseparable from the notion of nationalism, and an on-going debate with China regarding its historical identity also offers solid proof of the unquestionable status of Koguryŏ memories. Because Koguryŏ's identity as a part of Koran history has been consolidated through the preservation of its collective memories, Korea is able to dispute the Chinese claim, which focuses on political causes of this issue. History is the consequence of a collective memory, and collective memory is formed by written history, as suggested by most theories on collective memory. Contrasting Pierre Nora's claim that that we spend so much time thinking about the

---

are blank in history-books!" in her novel.

[465] Prasenjit Duara, *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

[466] Anthony Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (New York: Blackwell, 1991).

past because there is so little of it left,[467] Koguryŏ memories throughout Korean history have never been at the risk of demise and memories of this ancient kingdom will survive as a collective memory in the minds of the Korean people. Certainly, the past never dead, it's not even past.

[467] Pierre Nora, "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire," trans. Marc Roudebush, *Representation* 26 (Spring 1989): 7-25.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An Chong-hwa. *Ch'odŭng pon'guk yŏksa*. (Korean History – for Elementary School) Kyŏngsŏng: Kwangdŏk sŏgwan, 1909.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso, 1991.

Armstrong, John. *Nations before Nationalism*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.

Assmann, Jan. *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.

———. "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity." Translated by John Czaplicka. *New German Critique* 65 (Spring-Summer 1995): 125-133.

Ban Gu. *Han shu*. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975.

Bergson, Henri. *Matter and Memory*. Translated by N. M. Paul and W. Scott Palmer. New York: Zone Books, 1991.

Breuker, Remco. "The Three in One, the One in Three: The Koryŏ Three Han as a Pre-Modern Nation." *Journal of Inner and East Asian Studies* 2, no. 2 (December 2005): 144-167.

Callahan, William A. *China: The Pessoptimist Nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Chang To-bin. *Tae Koguryŏsa*. Vol. 2 of *Taehan yŏksa*. Seoul: Kuksawŏn, 1959.

———. *Chosŏn yŏksa taejŏn*. Kyŏngsŏng: Pangmun sŏgwan, 1928.

———. *Chosŏn yŏksa yoryŏng*. Kyŏngsŏng: Koryŏgwan, 1923.

———. "Tae chŏngch'iga Ŭlp'aso ssi." (Ŭlp'aso: A Great Official) *Seoul* 1(December 1919): 48-75.

Chatterjee, Partha. *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*.

Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Chen Shou. *Sanguo zhi*. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990.

Chindan hakhoe. *Kuksa kyobon*. Kyŏngsŏng: Kunjŏngch'ŏng mun'gyobu, 1946.

Cho Hŭi-sŭng. *Koguryŏ iyagi*. (Story of Koguryŏ) P'yŏngyang: Sahoe kwahak ch'ulp'ansa, 2007.

Cho In-sŏng. "*Kyuwŏn sahwa* wa *Hwandan kogi*." *Han'guksa simin kangjwa* 2 (1988): 71-88.

Cho Pŏp-chong. "Koguryŏ ŭi Mahan kyesŭng insik non e taehan kŏmt'o." (Review on Mahan Successionism of Kogurŏ) *Han'guksa yŏn'gu* 102 (1998): 47-74.

Cho Un-hŭl, ed. *Samhan si kwigam*. Seoul: Iu ch'ulp'ansa, 1983.

Ch'oe Ch'i-wŏn. *Ch'oe Munch'anghu chŏnjip*. Seoul: Sŏnggyun'gwan taehakkyo ch'ulp'anbu, 1982.

Ch'oe Hae. *Cholgo ch'ŏnbaek*. In Vol. 3 of *Han'guk munjip ch'onggan*. (Comprehensive Edition of Korean Literary Collections) Edited by Minjok munhwa ch'ujinhoe. Seoul: Kyŏngin munhwasa, 1990.

Ch'oe Mu-jang, trans. *Koguryŏ Parhae munhwa*. (Culture of Koguryŏ and Parhae) Seoul: Chimmundang, 1982.

Ch'oe Nam-sŏn. *Chosŏn yŏksa*. Kyŏngsŏng: Tongmyŏngsa, 1936.

———. "Tan'gun kwa Samhwang oje, sindorŭl t'onghaesŏ ponŭn Ko Chosŏn kŭp China ŭi wŏnsi kyubŏmjŏk ryudong." (Tan'gun and Three Augusts, Five Emperors: Similarities in primitive norms of Old Chosŏn and China through Sindo) *Tonga ilbo*, August 1-December 16, 1928.

Chŏng In-ji et al. *Koryŏsa*. Seoul: Yŏnhŭi taehakkyo tongbanghak yŏn'guso, 1955.

Chŏng Ku-bok. "Koguryŏ ŭi Koryŏ kukho e taehan ilgo." (Research on State name of Koryŏ for

Koguryŏ) *Hosŏ sahak* 19·20 (1992): 43-66.

Chŏng To-jŏn. *Sambong chip*. In Vol. 5 of *Han'guk munjip ch'onggan*. Edited by Minjok munhwa ch'ujinhoe. Seoul: Kyŏngin munhwasa, 1990.

Chŏng Yag-yong. *Yŏyudang chŏnsŏ*. In Vols. 281-286 of *Han'guk munjip ch'onggan*. Edited by Minjok munhwa ch'ujinhoe. Seoul: Kyŏngin munhwasa, 1990.

Chosēn sōtokufu. *Chōsen shi henshūkai jigyō gaiyō*. (Overview of Project of the Committee for Compiling History of Chosēn) Keijō: Chōsen shi henshūkai, 1938.

———. *Kyōkayō tosho ichiran* (List of Endorsed and Censored Textbooks). 5th ed. Keijō: Chosēn sōtokufu gakubu, 1910.

Chosēnshi gakkai, ed. *Chōsenshi taikei*. 5 vols. Keijō: Chosēnshi gakkai, 1927.

Chosŏn rodongdang. *Uri nara ryŏksa iyagi*. P'yŏngyang: Chosŏn rodongdang, 1956.

Dong Hao. *Quan Tangwen*. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987.

Duara, Prasenjit. *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Duncan, John. "Proto-nationalism in Premodern Korea." In *Perspectives on Korea*, edited by Sang-Oak Lee and Duk-Soo Park, 198-221. Sydney: Wild Peony, 1998.

Fan Ye. *Hou Han shu*. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1973.

Fu Langyun and Yang Yang. *Dongbei minzu shilue*. (A Summary of People in the Northeast) Jilin: Jilin renmin chubanshe, 1983.

Gan Bao. *Soushenji*. (Anecdotes about Spirits and Immortals) Translated and edited by Huang Diming and Ding Wangdao. Beijing: Foreign Languages Press, 2004.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.

———. *Thought and Change*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1964.

Ha Hyŏn-gang. “Koryŏ sidae ŭi yŏksa kyesŭng ŭisik.” (On the Idea of Historical Succession in the Koryŏ Period) *Ewha sahak yŏn'gu* 8 (1975): 12-20.

Haboush, JaHyun Kim. “Constructing the Center: The Ritual Controversy and the Search for a New Identity in Seventeenth-Century Korea.” In *Culture and the State in Late Chosŏn Korea*, edited by Martina Deucler and JaHyun Kim Haboush, 46-90. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 1999.

Halbwachs, Maurice. *The Collective Memory*. Translated by Francis J. Ditter and Vida Yazdi Ditter. Intro. Mary Douglas. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1980.

———. *On Collective Memory*. Translated and edited by Lewis A. Coser. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Han Ch'i-yun. *Haedong yŏksa*. Vol. 3 and 4 of *Han'guk sasŏ ch'onggan*. (Comprehensive Edition of Korean Historical Writings) Edited by Yi Ki-baek, Han Yŏng-u, and Chŏng Ku-bok. Seoul: Yŏgang ch'ulp'ansa, 1987.

Han Kyu-ch'ŏl. “Koguryŏ sidae ui Malgal yŏn'gu.” (Research on Malgal of Koguryŏ) *Pusan sahak* 14·15 (1988): 1-52.

Han Myŏng-gi. *Imjin oeran kwa hanjung kwan'gye*. (A Study on the Relations between Korea and China from the Japanese Invasion of Korea in 1592 to the Manchu Invasion of Korea in 1636) Seoul: Yŏksa pip'yŏngsa, 1999.

Han Paek-gyŏm. *Tongguk chiriji*. Seoul: Ilchogak, 1987.

Han Yŏng-u. *Chosŏn hugi sahaksa yŏn'gu*. (Study of Historiography in Late Chosŏn) Seoul: Ilchisa, 1989.

———. *Chosŏn chŏn'gi sahaksa yŏn'gu*. (Study of Historiography in Early Chosŏn) Seoul: Seoul taehakkyo ch'ulp'anbu, 1981.

Han'guk kodae sahoe yŏn'guso, ed. *Koguryŏ, Paekche, Naknang p'yŏn*. Vol. 1 of *Yŏkchu Han'guk kodae kŭmsŏkmun*. Seoul: Karakguk sajŏk kaebal yŏn'guwŏn, 1992.

Harada Yoshito. "Manmo no bunka." (Manchurian and Mongolian Culture) *Tōyō shichō* 11, no. 4 (1935): 1-73.

Hechter, Michael. *Containing Nationalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. and Terence Ranger, eds. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge, U.K. and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Honam hakhoe. *Honam hakpo*. Vol. 17 of *Han'guk kaehwagi haksulji*. (Academic Journals in Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century of Korea) Edited by Han'gukhak munhŏn yŏn'guso. Seoul: Asea munhwasa, 1978.

Hong Man-jong, ed. *Sihwa ch'ongnim*. Seoul: Asea munhwasa, 1973.

Hong Yang-ho. *Tongguk myŏngjang chŏn*. Kyŏngsŏng: T'abinsa, 1907.

Hwang Ŭi-don. *Sinp'yŏn Chosŏn yŏksa*. Kyŏngsŏng: Imundang, 1923.

Hwangsŏng sinmun. "Pae Ŭlchi Mundŏk sang kŭp pi." (Bowing to the Portrait and Stele for Ŭlchi Mundŏk) May 20, 1910.

———. "A minjok ŭi sinsŏng yŏksa." (The Sacred History of Our Nation) April 21, 1910.

———. "Ap'o nakkwanjŏk sasang." (Have an Optimistic View) January 21-23, 1910.

———. "A Han yŏksa ŭi kach'i." (The Value of Our Korean History) November 26, 1909.

———. "Koguryŏ sisa." (History of Koguryŏ Poetry) June 4, 1909.

———. "Ŭlchi kong kasa e taehaya u ilkwannyŏm." (Additional Thoughts on the Family History of Lord Ŭlchi) May 14, 1909.

———. “Ŭlchi kong san.” (Mountain of Lord Ŭlchi) *Hwangsŏng sinmun*, April 20, 1909.

———. “Yŏksa kyokwa ŭi kŭpsok kaejŏngkŏn.” (Emergency Reform of History Subject) February 10, 1909.

———. “Tok Koguryŏ Yŏngnak taewang (Kwanggaet’o wang) myobi tŭngbon.” (Reading the Records on the (King Kwanggaet’o) Stele) January 6, 1909.

———. “Koguryŏ Kwanggaet’owang pimyŏng pujuhae.” (Annotation of Texts on the King Kwanggaet’o Stele) November 1-6, 1905.

———. “Koguryŏ Kwanggaet’owang pimyŏng sŏgi.” (Texts on the King Kwanggaet’o Stele) October 31, 1905.

Hyŏn Ch’ae. *Panmannyŏn Chosŏn yŏksa*. (Five Thousands Years of Chosŏn History) Kyŏngsŏng: Tŏkhŭng sŏrim, 1923.

———. *Tongguk saryak*. Kyŏngsŏng: Ilhan insoae chusik hoesa, 1908.

———. *Chungdŭng kyokwa Tongguk saryak*. Hansŏng: 1907.

Ikeuchi Hiroshi. “Chōsen no bunka.” (Korean Culture) *Tōyō shichō* 15, no. 2 (1936): 1-127.

Im Chi-hyŏn. *Minjok chuŭi nŭn panyŏk ida*. (Nationalism is Treason) Seoul: Sonamu, 1999.

Imanishi Ryū. *Dankun kō*. (Study of Dankun) Keijō: Chikazawa insatsubu, 1929.

Inaba Iwakichi. “Chōsen shi.” In Vol. 11 of *Sekai rekishi taikei: Chōsen･Manshū shi*, (An Overview of World History: The History of Korea and Manchuria) 1-201. Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1935.

———. “Man-Sen fukabun no shiteki kōsatsu.” (Historical Research on the Inseparable Relationship between Manchuria and Korea) *Tōyō* 5 (1922): 25-33.

Iryŏn. *Samguk yusa*. Edited by Han’guk chŏngsin munhwa yŏn’guwŏn. Seoul: Ihwa munhwasa, 2002.

Kakhun. *Haedong kosŭng chŏn*. Seoul: Ŭryu munhwasa, 1983.

Kim Chae-bung. "Wai Baku kō." (A Study on Ye-Mag [i.e. Wai-Baku]) *Chōsen Gakuhō* 71 (October 1974): 1-19.

Kim Ch'ŏl-chun. "Han'guk kodae kukka paltalsa." (Development of Ancient Korean State) In Vol. 1 of *Han'guk munhwasa taegye*, (Overview of Korean Cultural History) 453-546. Seoul: Koryŏ taehakkyo ch'ulp'anbu, 1970.

Kim Chŏng-hak. "Han'guk minjok hyŏngsŏngsa." (History of the Formation of Korean Nation) In Vol. 1 of *Han'guk munhwasa taegye*, 315-452. Seoul: Koryŏ taehakkyo ch'ulp'anbu, 1970.

Kim Chong-sŏ et al. *Koryŏsa chŏryo*. Edited by Han'gukhak munhŏn yŏn'guso. Seoul: Asea munhwasa, 1973.

Kim Ho-sŏng. *Chumong*. P'yŏngyang: P'yŏngyang ch'ulp'ansa, 1997.

Kim Hŭng-su. "Hanmal kuksa kyoyuk mit kyokwasŏ e kwanhan yŏn'gu." (A Study of the History Education and Textbooks in the Late Nineteenth Century of Chosŏn) *Yŏksa kyoyuk* 29 (1981): 43-81.

Kim Kwang-su. "Koryŏ cho ŭi Koguryŏ kyesŭng ŭisik kwa Ko Chosŏn insik." (Consciousness of Inheriting Koguryŏ and Awareness of Old Chosŏn in Koryŏ Period) *Yŏksa kyoyuk* 43 (1988): 91-107.

Kim Pong-sŏk. "Ch'odŭng kuksa kyobon ŭi t'ŭkjing kwa yŏksa insik." (Historical Awareness and Characteristics of the *Ch'odŭng kuksa kyobon*), *Sahoekwa kyoyuk* 47, no. 1 (March 2008): 171-200.

Kim Pu-sik. *Samguk sagi*. Edited by Cho Pyŏng-sun. Seoul: Sŏnggam kosŏ pangmulgwan, 1984.

Kim Sang-hun. "Han'gugin ŭi kiwŏn e kwanhan chung·kodŭng haksaeng tŭl ŭi ŭisik kwa kuksa

kyokwasŏ ŭi kwan'gye." (The Relationship between Korean History Textbook and Middle-High School Students' Thought on the Origin of the Korean People) *Han'guk kodaesa t'amgu* 5 (August 2010): 5-61.

Kim Sang-gi. *Han'guk ŭi pyŏkhwa kobun*. (Tombs with Murals in Korea) Seoul: Tonghwa ch'ulp'an kongsa, 1982.

Kim T'ae-yŏng. "*Samguk yusa* e poinŭn Iryŏn ŭi yŏksa insik e taehayŏ." (Iryŏn's Historical Consciousness as it appears in the *Samguk yusa*) In Vol. 1 of *Han'guk ŭi yŏksa insik*. (Historical Perspective throughout Korean History) Edited by Yi U-song and Kang Man-gil, 124-147. Seoul: Ch'angjak kwa pip'yŏngsa, 1976.

Kim T'aeg-gyŏng. *Yŏksa chimnyak*. Hansŏng: Hakpu p'yŏnjipguk, 1905.

Kim Ŭi-gyu. "Consciousness of Inheriting History in the Early Koryŏ Period." *Korea Journal* 23, no. 7 (July 1983): 18-26.

Ko Pyŏng-ik. "*Samguk sagi* e issŏsŏ ŭi yŏksa sŏsul." (Historiography in the *Samguk sagi*) In Vol. 1 of *Han'guk ŭi yŏksa insik*. Edited by Yi U-song and Kang Man-gil, 31-63. Seoul: Ch'angjak kwa pip'yŏngsa, 1976.

Kontsevich, Lev R. "Reconstructing the Text of the Tan'gun Myth and its Proper Names" In *Perspectives on Korea*, edited by Sang-Oak Lee and Duk-Soo Park, 294-319. Sydney: Wild Peony, 1998.

Kuksa p'yŏnch'an wiwŏnhoe. *Hyojong sillok*. In Vols. 35 and 36 of *Chosŏn Wangjo sillok*. (The Annals of The Chosŏn Dynasty) Seoul: Kuksa p'yŏnch'an wiwŏnhoe, 1968.

———. *Kwanghaegun ilgi*. In Vols. 26-33 of *Chosŏn Wangjo sillok*. Seoul: Kuksa p'yŏnch'an wiwŏnhoe, 1968.

———. *Sejo sillok*. In Vols. 7 and 8 of *Chosŏn Wangjo sillok*. Seoul: Kuksa p'yŏnch'an

wiwŏnhoe, 1968.

———. *Sejong sillok*. In Vols. 2-6 of *Chosŏn Wangjo sillok*. Seoul: Kuksa p'yŏnch'an wiwŏnhoe, 1968.

———. *Sŏnjo sillok*. In Vols. 21-25 of *Chosŏn Wangjo sillok*. Seoul: Kuksa p'yŏnch'an wiwŏnhoe, 1968.

———. *Sŏnjo sujŏng sillok*. In Vol. 25 of *Chosŏn Wangjo sillok*. Seoul: Kuksa p'yŏnch'an wiwŏnhoe, 1968.

———. *T'aejo sillok*. In Vol. 1 of *Chosŏn wangjo sillok*. Seoul: Kuksa p'yŏnch'an wiwŏnhoe, 1968.

———. *T'aejong sillok*. In Vols. 1 and 2 of *Chosŏn Wangjo sillok*. Seoul: Kuksa p'yŏnch'an wiwŏnhoe, 1968.

———. *Tanjong sillok*. In Vols. 6 and 7 of *Chosŏn Wangjo sillok*. Seoul: Kuksa p'yŏnch'an wiwŏnhoe, 1968.

Kwŏn Kŭn. *Tongguk saryak*. In Vol. 1 of *Han'guk sasŏ ch'onggan*. Edited by Yi Ki-baek, Han Yŏng-u, and Chŏng Ku-bok. Seoul: Yŏgang ch'ulp'ansa, 1986.

———. *Yangch'on chip*. In Vol. 7 of *Han'guk munjip ch'onggan*. Edited by Minjok munhwa ch'ujinhoe. Seoul: Kyŏngin munhwasa, 1990.

Kye Yŏn-su. *Hwandan kogi*. (Ancient Record of Hwanin and Tan'gun) Translated and edited by Yi Min-su. Seoul: Chayu mun'go, 1986.

Kyŏnghyang sinmun. "Sahakgye e yŏksa taejunghwa undong." (Historians are approaching to the public) August 31, 1987.

———. "Koguryŏ yŏksa ŏdi kanna." (Where is Koguryŏ History), October 26, 1984.

———. "Sadae · singmin chuŭi sagwan puri popcha." (To discard toadying and colonial

historiography) November 3, 1975.

———. “Tŭrŏnan nambukan hangmun kyŏkch’a.” (Difference in Academic Level between South and North Korea) August 8, 1973.

Ledyard, Gary. “Confucianism and War: The Korean Security Crisis of 1598.” *The Journal of Korean Studies* 6 (1988-89): 81-119.

Liu Xu. *Jiu Tang shu*. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975.

Ma Dazheng, Li Dalong, Geng Tiehua, and Quan Hexiu. *Gu dai Zhongguo Gaogouli li shi xu lun*. (Expanded Studies on Gaogouli History in Ancient China) Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2003.

Maeil kyŏngje sinmun. “Uriga polkŏt, poyŏjul kŏttŭl.” (What we should see and show) November 17, 1981.

Mishina Shōei. “Wai-Baku shōkō.” (Some Consideration on the Wai-Bak [i.e. Wai-Baku] Tribes) *Chōsen Gakuhō* 4 (October 1952): 1-28.

Mohan, Pankaj N. “Rescuing a Stone from Nationalism: A Fresh Perspective on the King Kwanggaet’o Stele of Koguryŏ.” *Journal of Inner and East Asian Studies* 1 (2004): 89-115.

Mun Il-p’yŏng. *Koryŏ Kaesa*. In Vol. 4 of *Hoam Mun Il-p’yŏng chŏnjip*. (The Complete Works of Hoam Mun Il-p’yŏng) Seoul: Minsogwŏn, 2001.

———. “Ch’ŏn’go yŏnggŏl Kaesomun.” (Kaesomun: A Great Hero in Thousands Years) *Chosŏn ilbo*, June 1-4, 1933.

Mun Sŏk-chun. *Chosŏn yŏksa*. Hamgyŏng: Hamgyŏng namdo kyoyuk munhwabu, 1945.

Naka Michiyo. “Chōsen koshikō.” (Study of Ancient History of Chōsen) *Shigaku zasshi* 5, no. 5 (May 1894): 34-41.

No T'ae-don. "Tae Cho-yŏng, Koguryŏin in'ga Malgarin in'ga." (Tae Cho-yŏng, Did he belong to Koguryŏ or Malgal?) *Yŏksa pip'yŏng* 9 (November 1989): 308-319.

No Sa-sin et al. *Samguksa chŏryo*. Seoul: Asea munhwasa, 1973.

Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire." Translated by Marc Roudebush. *Representation* 26 (Spring 1989): 7-25.

Oshibuchi Hajime and Yano Jin'ichi et al. "Manshū shi." (A History of Manchuria) In Vol. 11 of *Sekai rekishi taikei: Chōsen･Manshū shi*, 203-609. Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1935.

Ouyang Xiu. *Xin Tang shu*. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975.

Pai Hyung-il. *Constructing "Korean" Origins: A Critical Review of Archaeology, Historiography, and Racial Myth in Korean State-Formation Theories*, Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2000.

Pak Chŏng-dong. *Ch'odŭng Taedong yŏksa* (Great History of Korea – for Elementary School) Kyŏngsŏng: Tongmunsa, 1909.

Pak Han-sŏl. "Koryŏ wangsil ŭi kiwŏn." (The Origin of the Koryŏ Royal Family) *Sach'ong* 21･22 (1977): 93-111.

Pak Sang. *Tongguk saryak (P)*. In Vol. 1 of *Han'guk sasŏ ch'onggan*. Edited by Yi Ki-baek, Han Yŏng-u, and Chŏng Ku-bok. Seoul: Yŏgang ch'ulp'ansa, 1986.

Pak Ŭn-sik. "Ch'ŏn Kaesomun chŏn." In Vol. 4 of *Paegam Pak Ŭn-sik chŏnjip*, (The Complete Works of Paegam Pak Ŭn-sik) edited by Compilation Committee for the Complete Works of Paegam Pak Ŭn-sik, 285-358. Seoul: Tongbang Media, 2002.

———. "Mong pae Kŭm T'aejo." In Vol. 4 of *Paegam Pak Ŭn-sik chŏnjip*, edited by Compilation Committee for the Complete Works of Paegam Pak Ŭn-sik, 37-214. Seoul: Tongbang Media, 2002.

———. “Myŏngnimdappu chon.” In Vol. 4 of *Paegam Pak Ŭn-sik chŏnjip*, edited by Compilation Committee for the Complete Works of Paegam Pak Ŭn-sik, 215-284. Seoul: Tongbang Media, 2002.

———. “Taedong kodaesa ron.” In Vol. 4 of *Paegam Pak Ŭn-sik chŏnjip*, edited by Compilation Committee for the Complete Works of Paegam Pak Ŭn-sik, 361-393. Seoul: Tongbang Media, 2002.

———. “Tanjosa ko.” In Vol. 4 of *Paegam Pak Ŭn-sik chŏnjip*, edited by Compilation Committee for the Complete Works of Paegam Pak Ŭn-sik, 491-619. Seoul: Tongbang Media, 2002.

Pak Wŏn-ho. *Myŏngch’o Chosŏn kwan’gyesa yŏn’gu*. (Study of the Relationship between Chosŏn and Ming from 1368 through the mid-fifteenth Century) Seoul: Ilchogak, 2002.

Pak Yong-un. *Koryŏ ŭi Koguryŏ kyesŭng e taehan chonghapchŏk kŏmt’o*. (A Comprehensive Review on Koryŏ’s Awareness of Inheriting Koguryŏ) Seoul: Ilchisa, 2006.

———. *Koryŏ sidaesa*. (History of Koryŏ Period) 2 vols. Seoul: Ilchisa, 1987.

Pu Zhen-shi. “Chungwŏn Koguryŏ pi ŭi kŏllip yŏndae kojŭng.” (Research on the Year of Chungwŏn Koguryŏ Stele) *Koguryŏ yŏn’gu* 10 (2000): 315-341.

Pugae. *Kyuwŏn sahwa*. (Historical Anecdotes of Old Chosŏn) Seoul: Asea munhwasa, 1976.

Ri Chi-rin and Kang In-suk. *Koguryŏsa yŏn’gu*. P’yŏngyang: Sahoe kwahak ch’ulp’ansa, 1976.

Ri Chi-rin. *Ko Chosŏn yŏn’gu*. (Studies of Old Chosŏn) P’yŏngyang: Kwahakwŏn ch’ulp’ansa, 1963.

Ri Sŏng-dŏk. *Tamjing*. P’yongyang: Munhwa yesul chonghap ch’ulpansa, 1998.

Rogers, Michael. “Notes on Koryŏ’s Relations with Sung and Liao.” *Chindan hakpo* 71·72 (December 1991): 310-335.

———. “National Consciousness in Medieval Korea.” In *Papers of the 5th International Conference on Korean Studies: Korean Studies, Its Tasks and Perspectives I*, 152-168. Sŏngnam: The Academy of Korean Studies, 1988.

———. “National Consciousness in Medieval Korea: The Impact of Liao and Chin on Koryŏ.” In *China among Equals*, edited by Morris Rossabi, 151-172. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.

———. “*P’yŏnnyŏn T’ongnok*: The Foundation Legend of the Koryŏ State.” *The Journal of Korean Studies* 4 (1982-1983): 3-72.

———. “The Chinese World Order in Its Transmural Extension: The Case of Chin and Koryŏ.” *Korean Studies Forum* 4 (Spring-Summer 1978): 1-22.

Rui Yi-fu. “Hanguo gudai minzukaolue.” (Summary of Ethnic Groups in Ancient Korea) In Vol. 1 of *Zhong Han Wenhua lunji*, 39-50. Taipei: Zhonghua wenhua chupan shiye weiyunhui, 1955.

Sahoe kwahakwŏn kogohak yŏn’guso. *Koguryŏ munhwa*. P’yŏngyang: Sahoe kwahak ch’ulp’ansa, 1975.

Sahoe kwahakwŏn yŏksa yŏn’guso. *Chosŏn chŏnsa*. P’yŏngyang: Kwahak paekkwa sajŏn chonghap ch’ulp’ansa, 1979.

Sekino Tadashi. *Chōsen bijutsushi*. Keijō: Chōsen shigakkai, 1932.

Seoul taehakkyo Kyujanggak. *Hosŏng sŏnmu ch’ŏngnan kongsin togam ŭigye*. Seoul: Seoul taehakkyo Kyujanggak, 1999.

Seoul taehakkyo pangmulgwan. *Seoul Taehakkyo Pangmulgwan yŏnbo* 10 (1999).

Schmid, Andre. “Looking North toward Manchuria.” *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 99, no. 1 (Winter 2000): 219-240.

———. “Rediscovering Manchuria: Sin Ch’aeho and the Politics of Territorial History in Korea.” *The Journal of Asian Studies* 56, no. 1 (February 1997): 26-46.

Shiratori Kurakishi. “Wai-Baku minzoku no yurai o nobete Fuyo-Kōkuri oyobi Kudara no kigen ni oyobu.” (The Roots of Wai-Baku Tribes: The Origin of Fuyo-Kōkuri and Kudara) *Shigaku zasshi* 45, no. 12 (1933): 110-112.

———. “Wai-Baku wa hatashite nani minzoku to minasubekika.” (What Ethnic Group was considered the Wai-Baku Tribes?) *Shigaku zasshi* 44, no. 7 (1932): 103-105.

———. “Manshū minzoku no kako.” (The Past of the Manchurian People) *Tōyō jiho* 132 (September 1909): 39-44.

Sin Ch’ae-ho. “Chosŏnsa.” *Chosŏn ilbo*, June 10-October 14, 1931.

———. “Koguryŏ wa Silla kŏn’guk yŏndae e taehayŏ.” (On the Year of the Establishment of Koguryŏ and Silla) *Sidae ilbo*, May 20, 22, and 25, 1926.

———. “Manju munje e ch’uihaya chaeronham.” (Review of the Manchurian Issue) *Taehan maeil sinbo*, January 19-22, 1910.

———. “Manju wa Ilbon.” (Manchuria and Japan) *Taehan mail sinbo*, January 12, 1910.

———. “Kukka rŭl myŏlmangk’e hanŭn Hakpu.” (The Bureau of Education is Destroying the Nation) *Taehan maeil sinbo*, March 16, 1909.

———. “Han’guk ŭi cheil hogŏl taewang.” (The Greatest King in Korean History) *Taehan maeil sinbo*, February 25-26, 1909.

———. “Toksa sillon.” (New Historical Perspective) *Taehan maeil sinbo*, August 27-December 13, 1908.

———. “Han’guk kwa Manju.” (Korea and Manchuria) *Taehan mail sinbo*, July 25, 1908.

———. “Yŏngung kwa segye.” (Heroes and the World) *Taehan maeil sinbo*, January 5 and 7,

1908.

———. “Yŏngung ŭl chujohanŭn kyegi.” (How to Produce a Hero?) *Taehan maeil sinbo*, August 18, 1908.

———. *Ŭlchi Mundŏk*. Hangsŏng: Kwanghak sŏp’o, 1908.

Sin Kyŏng. *Chaejo pŏnbang chi*. In Vol. 9 of *Taedong yasŭng*. (Collection of Anecdotes and Essays during the Chosŏn Dynasty) Translated and edited by Minjok munhwa chujinhoe. Seoul: Minjok munhwa ch’ujinhoe, 1983.

Smith, Anthony. *Myths and Memories of the Nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press,1999.

———. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. New York: Blackwell, 1991.

Sŏ Kil-su. “Yŏksa wa Koguryŏ drama Chumong.” (Historical Facts and Koguryŏ Drama Chumong) *Koguryŏ yŏn’gu* 28 (2007): 9-48.

Sŏ Kŏ-jŏng et al. *Tongmunsŏn*. Seoul: Hyŏpsŏng munhwasa, 1985.

———. *Tongguk t’onggam*. 2 vols. Seoul: Kyŏngin munhwasa, 1989.

Sŏbuk hakhoe. *Sŏbuk hakhoe wŏlbo*. Vols. 7-9 of *Han’guk kaehawgi haksulji*. Edited by Han’gukhak munhŏn yŏn’guso. Seoul: Asea munhwasa, 1978.

Sŏu hakhoe. *Sŏu*. Vols. 5 and 6 of *Han’guk kaehawgi haksulji*. Edited by Han’gukhak munhŏn yŏn’guso. Seoul: Asea munhwasa, 1978.

Son Yŏng-jong. *Koguryŏsa*. P’yŏngyang: Kwahak paekkwasajŏn chonghap ch’ulp’ansa, 1990.

Son Yŏng-jong, Pak Yŏng-hae and Kim Yong-gan. *Chosŏn t’ongsa*. P’yŏngyang: Sahoe kwahak ch’ulp’ansa, 1991.

Sŏng Hyŏn. *Yongjae ch’onghwa*. Translated by Nam Man-sŏng. Seoul: Taeyang sŏjŏk, 1973.

Song Si-yŏl. *Songja taejŏn*. Vols. 108-116 of *Han’guk munjip ch’onggan*. Edited by Minjok munhwa ch’ujinhoe. Seoul: Kyŏngin munhwasa, 1990.

Sun Jinji. *Dongbei min zu shi yan jiu*. (Research on Ethnic Groups in Northeastern China) Zhongzhou: Zhongzhou guji chubanshe, 1994.

Taehan cheguk hakpu. *Chosŏn yaksa*. Hansŏng: Hakpu p'yŏnjipguk, 1895.

———. *Kungmin sohak tokbon*. Hansŏng: Hakpu p'yŏnjipguk, 1895

———. *Tongguk yŏksa*. Hansŏng: Hakpu p'yŏnjipguk, 1899.

———. "Bulletin No. 16." *Kwanbo*, September 1, 1908.

T'ak Pong-sim. "Tongmyŏngwang p'yŏn e nat'anan Yi Kyu-bo ŭi yŏksa ŭisik." (Yi Kyu-bo's Historical Consciousness in the Epic of King Tongmyŏng) *Han'guksa yŏn'gu* 44 (March 1984): 75-106.

Tonga ilbo. "Koguryŏ kobun kongdong chosa Pukhan cheŭi Han'guk e chŏndal." (North Korea suggests joint research on Koguryo tombs) October 15, 1997.

———. "Chungguk Chiban pangch'idoen Han minjok munhwa." (Abandoned sites of Korean culture in Jilin, China) June 24, 1993.

———. "Koguryŏ yŏnghyang hyŏnjŏ." (Profound Influence of Koguryŏ) October 5, 1972.

———. "Koguryŏ sidae put'ŏ kiwŏnhan *sŏkchŏn*." (*Sŏkchŏn* - Originated from Koguryŏ) January 5, 1938.

Tsuboni Kumezō. "Ko Chosēn sangoku teiritsu keiseiku." 1-4 (Study on the Formation of Three Kingdoms in Ancient Chōsen) *Shigakkai zasshi* 35 (October 1892): 27-45, 36 (November 1892): 29-44, *Shigaku zasshi* 37 (December 1892) 17-34, and 38 (January 1893): 28-41.

Wei Zheng. *Sui shu*. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1973.

Wen Chong-yi. "Wei-Mo minzu wenhua ji qi chiliao." (A Study of the Culture and Tribe of Wei-Mo) *Bulletin of The Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica* 5 (1958): 211-214.

Wŏn Yŏng-ŭi and Yu Kŭn. *Sinjŏng Tongguk yŏksa*. Hansŏng: Hwimun ŭisuk, 1906.

Xu Jing. *Gaoli tujing*. Seoul: Asea munhwasa, 1981.

Yang Chŏng-hyŏn. "Taehan chegukki 'chŏn'-nyu yŏksasŏ wa kŭ yŏksagwan." (Biography and Its Historical Perspective in the Great Han Empire) *Yŏksa kyoyuk* 72 (1999): 43-78.

Yang Chu-dong. *Koga yŏn'gu*. Vol. 1 of *Yang Chu-dong chŏnjip*. (The Complete Works of Yang Chu-dong) Seoul: Tongguk taehakkyo ch'ulp'anbu, 1983.

Yang Sŏng-ji. *Nulchae chip*. In Vol. 9 of *Han'guk munjip ch'onggan*. Edited by Minjok munhwa ch'ujinhoe. Seoul: Kyŏngin munhwasa, 1990.

Yi Ch'ang-hwan. *Chosŏn yŏksa*. Kyŏngsŏng: Puksŏngsa, 1934.

Yi Che-hyŏn. *Ikchae chip*. In Vol. 2 of Han'guk munjip ch'onggan. Edited by Minjok munhwa ch'ujinhoe. Seoul: Kyŏngin munhwasa, 1990.

Yi Chong-hwi. *Susan chip*. In Vol. 247 of *Han'guk munjip ch'onggan*. Edited by Minjok munhwa ch'ujinhoe. Seoul: Kyŏngin munhwasa, 1990.

Yi Chung-hwan. *T'aengni chi*. Translated by No To-yang. Seoul: Taeyang sŏjŏk, 1972.

Yi Kok. *Kajŏng chip*. In Vol. 3 of *Han'guk munjip ch'onggan*. Edited by Minjok munhwa ch'ujinhoe. Seoul: Kyŏngin munhwasa, 1990.

Yi Kwang-su, *Sarang ŭi Tongmyŏng wang*. (King Tongmyŏng's Love) Seoul: Munsŏnsa, 1955.

Yi Kyu-bo. *Tongguk Yi Sangguk chip*. In Vols. 1 and 2 of *Han'guk munjip ch'onggan*. Edited by Minjok munhwa ch'ujinhoe. Seoul: Kyŏngin munhwasa, 1990.

Yi Ok. *Koguryŏ minjok hyŏngsŏng kwa sahoe*. (The Formation of Koguryŏ People and Its Society) Seoul: Kyobo mun'go, 1984.

Yi Pyŏng-do, ed. and trans. *Kugyŏk Samguk sagi*. Seoul: Ŭryu munhwasa, 1977.

Yi Pyŏng-do. *Chungdŭng sahoe saenghwal kwa chungdŭng kuksa*. (Social Life and National

History for Middle School Levels) Seoul: Ŭryu munhwasa, 1956.

Yi Saek. *Mogŭn sigo*. In Vols. 3-4 of *Han'guk munjip ch'onggan*. Edited by Minjok munhwa ch'ujinhoe. Seoul: Kyŏngin munhwasa, 1990.

———. *Mogŭn mun'go*. In Vol. 5 of *Han'guk munjip ch'onggan*. Edited by Minjok munhwa ch'ujinhoe. Seoul: Kyŏngin munhwasa, 1990.

Yi Sŭng-hyu. *Chewang un'gi*. Seoul: Ŭryu munhwasa, 1974.

Yi Sung-in. *Toŭn chip*. In Vol. 6 of *Han'guk munjip ch'onggan*. Edited by Minjok munhwa ch'ujinhoe. Seoul: Kyŏngin munhwasa, 1990.

Yi To-hak. "Ch'oe Ch'i-wŏn ŭi Koguryŏ insik." (Ch'oe Ch'i-wŏn's Recognition of Koguryŏ) *Han'guk sasangsahak* 24 (2005): 199-224.

Yi Tŏk-hyŏng. *Hanŭm mun'go*. In Vol. 65 of *Han'guk munjip ch'onggan*. Edited by Minjok munhwa ch'ujinhoe. Seoul: Kyŏngin munhwasa, 1990.

Yi U-sŏng. "*Samguk sagi* ŭi kusŏng kwa Koryŏ wangjo ŭi chŏngt'ong ŭisik." (The Formation of the *Samguk sagi* and the Koryŏ Dynasty's Consciousness of Legitimacy) *Chindan hakpo* 38 (1974): 203-207.

Yoshida Togo, *Nikkan koshidan*. (Ancient History of Japan and Korea) Tōkyō: Fuzanbo, 1893.

Young, James E. *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust, Memorials and Meaning*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

Yu Hŭi-ryŏng. *P'yoje ŭmju Tongguk saryak*. Seoul: Han'guk chŏngsin munhwa yŏn'guwŏn, 1985.

Yu Sŏng-jun. *Taedong yŏksaryak*. Kyŏngsŏng: Pakhak sŏgwan, 1908.

Yu Tŭk-kong. *Parhae ko*. Translated and edited by Song Ki-ho. Seoul: Hongik ch'ulp'ansa, 2000.

Yun Hyu. *Kugyŏk Paekho chŏnsŏ*. Translated and edited by Minjok munhwa ch'ujinhoe. Seoul: Minjok munhwa ch'ujinhoe, 1995.

———. *Paekho chip*. Vol. 123 of *Han'guk munjip ch'onggan*. Edited by Minjok munhwa ch'ujinhoe. Seoul: Kyŏngin munhwasa, 1990.

Zerubavel, Eviatar. *Time Maps: Collective Memory and Social Shape of the Past.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Zhang Hua. *Bowu zhi*. Taibei: Taiwan zhonghua shuju, 1965.

Zhang Tingyu. *Ming shi*. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974.

Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan lishi yanjiusuo, ed. and trans. *Manwen laodang*. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990.