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ABSTRACT

Shared narratives of the past form a core component of any peoples’ self-perceived ethno-cultural identity. This dissertation comprises a diachronic survey of popular Korean historiography from the earliest surviving supradynastic treatment through to a sample of current day South Korean popular history works: the focus within these narratives is on the pre-Three Kingdoms period, dealing with the questions of ethnogenesis and state formation.

Part I delineates the premodern conceptualization of ancient Korea, terming it the Orthodox Narrative, and traces its evolution and refinement. The defining characteristic of the Orthodox Narrative is the successful merger and coexistence of both nativist and Sinic elements, popularly symbolized in the Dangun-Gija symbiosis. Through until the 19th century, this narrative underwent minor adjustments but remained largely stable, even under the increased scrutiny of critically minded Silhak scholars. Part II then focuses on premodern treatments of historical geography, an area both of academic interest to contemporary scholars and one which has gone on to become the core area of modern, post-colonial concern, as pertaining in particular to the territory of ancient Joseon and the location and fate of the subsequent Han Commanderies.

The collapse of Chinese hegemony and onset of industrialized modernity, concurrent with colonization and introduction of archaeology by Imperial Japan, led to major reinterpretations of ethno-cultural identity. Part III looks at the contemporary popular history writings of the Colonial Era, broadly terming this new perspective as 'Northern/Altaic' owing to its continental focus and utilization of the then accepted Altaic language hypothesis: seeking to distill and magnify the perceived nativist elements of the Orthodox Narrative, its defining revisionist feature was - and still is - explicit anti-Sinocentrism. Indeed, current day South Korean popular historiography, treated in Part IV is found to be still deeply influenced by the two key architects of the Northern/Altaic paradigm, Sin Chaeoho and Choe Namseon, whose works can be seen as representing two starting points on the same conceptual spectrum under which most subsequent efforts can be classified: an 'Empire' variant imagining ancient Joseon as both a rival and source of classical Sinic civilization, and a 'Pan-Altaic' variant which utilizes long-range theories in the name of pan-Altaic solidarity.

Despite a tradition of rationalist empiricism reaching back to premodern scholarship, the dominant trend in the most visible popular historiography has been towards historicization of mythology: this thesis suggests such a phenomenon can, at least in part, be understood as being both due to the embedding of the foundation myths within the Orthodox Narrative that ensured their survival, and the consequent and continued need for national mythology in the modern era where myth maintains its historical resonance.
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Romanization
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Introduction

The conception of this thesis evolved from two starting points, one premodern, the other contemporary. The first was an initial study and translation I made of the late C18th annotated poetry cycle, NDER KI DODHOEGOSI (二十一都懷古詩 'Nostalgic Reflections of the Twenty-One Capitals'), by poet-historian Yu Deukgong (柳得恭 1749-1807). In seeking to understand the content and motivation of this inspired and erudite work it became apparent that it successfully encapsulates a long established view of Korean history, that is, the narrative of Korea’s past as it was popularly known to educated Koreans prior to the onset of dynastic decline and foreign imposed 'modernity' in the following century. This traditional view I label as the Orthodox Narrative (hereafter ON) and it is the focus of Part I of this study.

On the same theme of understanding Koreans’ own understanding of their history, the second starting point was a desire to examine the contents of the many recently published popular style history books found on the shelves of major South Korean bookstores today. Whilst often dismissed or ignored by academic historians as pseudo history, it seems self-evident that - second only to school textbooks - these books may be more influential on the general Korean public’s understanding of its history than other more academic works, particularly of course, more so than any untranslated works written in English by foreign scholars.

When researching any premodern period it is always both valid and crucial to examine contemporary subjective cultural identity, i.e. what people believed at the time: this, for example is the topic of Breuker (2010) which focuses on the early to mid Goryeo dynasty. If viewed from the future, the present day popular view of Korean history could be understood in the same manner: it constitutes a key source informing Koreans at a given point in time about their own politico-ethno-cultural heritage which in turn forms a core aspect of what it is to be an individual who, by dint of birth and social upbringing, self-identifies with the endonym uri (우리 'we/us') that translates to the ethnonomic designation of 'Korean'.

What is clear and generally known to the Korean Studies discourse is that between the premodern and modern eras there was an apparent shift in worldviews, broadly explained as the shift between premodern Sino-centricism and a modern ethno-nationalism that was accelerated by the ethnic emergency of Japanese colonization (1910-1945) and subsequently contorted with the permanent division of the peninsula in 1945. Two of the best known architects of the early modern discourse are Sin Chae-ho (1880-1936) and Choe Nam-seon (1890-1957)
Popular Korean Historiography in NE Asia

both of whom wrote history for the general public. Whilst being regularly discussed in terms of their contributions to the 1920s cultural enlightenment movement, regarding their historical viewpoints and narratives, they have long been dismissed by the majority of academic historians - and in fact largely were at the time - as both inexpert and defunct. However, in the popular history works found in bookstores today, including new editions of their own writings, their influence, as shown in this study, is proving undiminished.

To reiterate, the primary objective of this thesis is not a study of Korean history, but to examine Koreans' own subjective understanding of their historical experience as a key aspect of their present day ethnic identity.

Defining 'popular history'
As a working definition, the notion of 'popular history' may be defined as history written for a non-expert audience with the following three attributes: 1) stylistic accessibility, 2) physical availability, and 3) popular readership. Popular history in South Korea can also be broadly divided between privately authored books, and officially commissioned, sanctioned or endorsed history such as state text books or information texts of the central and regional national museum network.

For present day privately authored Korean popular history these conditions are broadly similar to other industrially developed, free-market countries: the books are written in a vernacular style, uncensored, and sold in commercial bookshops with the size of readership determined by their sales. In the case of government control of textbooks - a phenomenon reflective of South Korea’s more state centric tendencies - the basic criteria of being designed from non-specialist readership is still similarly fulfilled.

Concerning stylistic accessibility, however, in both cases a more specific Korean feature that in limited part distinguishes popular history from academic works is the usage of hangul script. Whilst remaining a perennial topic of public debate, in present day South Korea exclusive usage of hangul - as opposed to mixed script with Sino-Korean hanja characters - is now standard in non-academic publications and media of any kind. The field of premodern history, however, is a special case as, due to the overwhelming use of Literary Chinese in premodern sources and the large number of Chinese related topics, it naturally has both a strong tradition of, and practical demand for Sino-Korean character usage.

Present day popular Korena history texts are exclusively written with hangul - translating all Chinese language source quotations into Korean - not only to ensure accessibility for a Korean public no longer well trained in Sino-Korean, but also as an implicit statement of ethnic Korean identity which, as already
Introduction

mentioned, is one of the defining aspects of modern popular historiography. *Hanja* is consequently relegated to parenthesis.

Conversely, popular writers may include *hanja* and original Chinese quotes, in spite of their ethnocentric convictions, in order to demonstrate their own erudition as it is impossible to claim to be a serious historian of premodern Korea accessing primary sources if one cannot read Chinese.

The need for hangul accessibility together with its usage as an ethno-political statement becomes more apparent in the recent editions of the early C20th popular history works which were originally written in mixed script but in the process of modernizing the language have been changed to pure hangul with *hanja* in parenthesis: these include the works of Sin Chaeho, Choe Namseon and Jeong Inbo, discussed in Part III. In most cases it is safe to assume the original authors would have approved.

**Early C20th popular Korean history**

Moving back in time, the definition of popular Korean history writing in the early C20th is somewhat different. As noted, these works were written in mixed script but at the time this was almost as bold and democratic as the pure hangul movement is regarded to be by its proponents today: mixed script required literacy but gave expression to vernacular Korean language and was thus more accessible when considered relative to the preexisting alternative practice of writing in Literary Chinese.

In terms of physical availability, in most cases these works were serialized in newspapers and only later published in book format - sometimes not until post-1945. The circulation of newspapers and their readership requires its own study but may be assumed to have reached the literate urban population. The limited contemporary reach of these works might call into question whether they were truly 'popular' or influential in their own time, but in content, spirit and motivation it will be shown that they are undoubtedly the immediate antecedents to present day popular histories and have arguably grown both in indirect influence with the expansion of present day popular history writing, and more directly with their own recent republications.

This study, then, discusses works which even if not perfectly definable as popular history in themselves can be seen to have informed subsequent popular history or are relevant to the discourse. (This pertains e.g. to Kim Gyoheon's [1868-1923] handwritten/mimeographed *Sindanmin-sa*, and two works of Choe Namseon which were written in Japanese and only one of which was published at the time).
Premodern popular history
The key in bringing together the two starting points for this study described above is in the possibility of treating the premodern works discussed as being, to at least some degree, analogous to present day popular history. The strongest candidate for this is, again, Yu Deukgong’s *Isib’ildo-hoeogosi* which on an albeit much more limited scale, is known to have enjoyed popular recognition amongst the literati - Jeong Yak-yong (1762-1836) later mentions it as a well known and appreciated work (Yu 2009:20). In terms of accessibility and readership, the language was Literary Chinese which all *yangban* were literate in: the poetic form, meanwhile, both keeps it short and clearly distinguishes it from Yu’s other more serious prose studies.

Simultaneous to this direct analogy, *Isib’ildo-hoeogosi* and certain of the other earlier premodern works to be discussed, beginning with the first, *Jewang-unji* (帝王譜記 c.1287), can be understood to constitute surviving attestations of a contemporary historical narrative that existed within the popular consciousness of at least the upper strata of society but many aspects of which no doubt reached further down (e.g. through the influence of local literati and village schools). A necessary premise for this suggestion is that in very few cases was the content of the works in question newly created by the immediate authors, who would rather have followed the Classical Chinese principle of *shu-er-buzuo* (遜而不作 ’recount, do not invent’) first attested in *Lunyu* (論語). Certain innovations and inventions inserted into the ON were no doubt at some point authored by someone but those which made it into the surviving survey works treated in this thesis were those which were successful enough to have been popularly adopted. In short, earliest surviving attestation of a given innovation should not necessarily be equated to original authorship as is often presumed.

Official versus unofficial popular history
In present day Korea the clearest examples of official popular history are school textbooks and the explanatory texts of the national museums. Again, projecting the definition backwards, the early modern colonial period is naturally more complex as there existed a mixture of the embers of the premodern ON and the newly imposed - but not necessarily accepted - foreign authored historiography promulgated by the Imperial Japanese Government-General. At least superficially, the premodern era has the clearest distinction between state commissioned dynastic history (正史) and privately authored works.

1) Wilkinson 2012:922 “70.4 Authors & Editors” translates *shu* 遜 as ‘to edit’.
2) For a close analysis - including translations - of the National Museum texts pertaining to early Korea, see my paper, Logie 2014 “The Narrative of Early Korea in the National Museum: Archaeologicalization of the Orthodox Narrative”.
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In all periods, there is interaction between official and unofficial historiography. In the present and premodern eras this has and does occur in both directions. In the present, state promulgated popular history has the widest reach and anyone authoring private history, having been through the state education system and visited museums must be aware of it; in the premodern period this holds true to the extent that those literati who compiled attestations of contemporary history were thoroughly schooled in and generally relied on dynastic history works commissioned by the state or, in the case of the Chinese histories, long regarded as orthodox.

Simultaneously, state-sanctioned history is informed by popular tradition and may acknowledge privately authored works: a premodern example is Jewang-ungi, a privately authored composition - albeit by a high official - that was presented to the royal court and subsequently recognized and remembered, and which would go on to be a core influence on the officially commissioned Dongguk-se’nyeon-ga (東國世年歌). The indigenous Hwan’ung-Dangun foundation myth that contains obvious folkloric content, was itself spectacularly elevated to the pinnacle position of the official ON during the course of late Goryeo and early Joseon.

Present day official historiography has also been shaped by the influence of privately authored history, for example: the ‘Northern and Southern Kingdoms’ period designation incorporating Balhae alongside Silla, which has been widely adopted by textbooks and museums, is attributed to the emotive preface of Yu Deukgong’s Balhae-go (渤海考 1784): anti-Sino-centricism and self-identification with the Altaic hypothesis stems in no small part from Sin Chaeho, whilst semi-rationalized interpretations of the Hwan’ung-Dangun myth directly trace to Choe Namseon and Jeong Inbo. Meanwhile, representation of contentious topics such as the Han Commanderies must take into account nationalist subjectivity and post-colonial sensitivities which are regularly stoked by present day popular history writers such as Lee Deok-il (b.1961) and are in direct opposition to the consensus of academic scholarship.3)

In contrast to present day and premodern periods, only in the intervening colonial era was the influence between official and unofficial popular history apparently more unidirectional as writers such as Sin and Choe were primarily reacting to Japanese historiography and contemporary circumstances, whilst the Government-General did not respond.

3) This can be seen, for example, in the unfortunate decision by NEAHF to terminate funding for the Harvard based Early Korea Project in 2015.
Choice of works and period of focus

The works treated here as the 'data set' for this thesis fall into two sometimes overlapping categories: primary works chosen as representative popular history assumed to match the definitions discussed above, and those which even if not fully popular at the time, have nevertheless been indirectly influential and are therefore informative to the discourse.

A core concern of this study is the structure of historical narratives, and in most cases the works are 'supradynastic' surveys: this initially enables the fullest delineation of the ON. Specific works included which are not themselves so wide in their temporal scope are all - bar the exception of Seo Dong-in’s treatment of Gaya - authored by scholars whose historiographic oeuvres include or accumulatively constitute 'dynasty transcending’ surveys.4)

However, to treat the entirety of every supradynastic survey would be an impossibly large task for a single study: for this reason the thesis primarily focuses on the treatment of early Korean history as found within these works, broadly, from the very beginning of Korean history - invariably the ancient state of Joseon (朝鮮 aka Old Joseon 古朝鲜) - up until the initial establishment of the Three Kingdoms era polities, the latter wherein special attention is given to the Goguryeo foundation discourse because it is currently more politically contentious than Baekje or Silla and so there is greater variation in interpretation. Owing to space limitations, subsequent Three Kingdoms era history and topics such as Balhae are only touched upon in the initial context of discussing the wider scheme of the ON.

It should also be noted that this thesis focuses more on the peninsula’s continental relations than those with Japan as determined by their relative significance accorded in the chosen sources: in most cases the archipelago remains outside the core purview of popular early historiography, particularly so in the premodern era although it has its own niche in current day popular history.

Historiographic lineages

The sources for this study are primarily treated chronologically but at the same time organized into sometimes overlapping parallel threads that may be conceptualized as 'historiographic lineages'. This structure reflects how I currently understand, and have been conceptualizing in my own mind, the works and their relationship to one another.

4) 'Supradynastic' is the term used by Breuker (2010) whilst 'dynasty transcending' has been used by Karlsson (2009). These terms may have a premodern equivalent in the term tongsa (通史).
The broadest division of 'lineages' is between the premodern ON and what I term the modern 'Norther/Altaic' narrative. A more detailed scheme containing the relevant works treated by this study is laid out in Table 1.

### Orthodox Narrative (Part I)

**Archetype 1: Jewang-ungi**

*Eungje-si* 應製詩 1402 Gwon Geun (權近 1352-1409)

*Se'nyeon-ga* 世年歌 c.1436 Gwon Je (權健 aka Gwon Do 權健 b.1387)

*Eungjesi-ju* 應製詩註 1462 Gwon Ram (權巋 1416-65)

**Inflections (Part I)**

*Dongsa* 東事 Heo Mok (許穆 1595-1682)

*Dongguk-yoeokdae-chongmok* 東國歷代總目 (c.1705) Hong Manjong (洪萬宗 1643-1725)

*Dongsa-gangmok* 東史綱目 (c.1756) An Jeongbok (安鼎福 1712-91)

*Dongsa* 東史 and other works, Yi Jonghwi (李鍾徽 1731-97)

**Archetype 2: Yu Deukgong (柳得恭) 1749-1807* Isib'ildo-hoeogosi 二十一都懷古詩 (1792)

Yu Deukgong - *Sagun-ji* 四郡志 (c.1806)

Jeong Yak-yong (丁若镛 1762-1836)

*Abang-gang'yeok-go* 我邦疆域考 (c.1813)

### Historical geography (Part II)

*Dongguk-jeori-ji* 東國地理志 Han Baekgyeom (韓百謙, 1552-1615)

*Seongho-saseol* "Cheonjimun" 星湖儒說「天地門」 Yi Ik (李稷 1681-1763)

### Northern/Altaic Narrative (Early modern (Part III))

**Ancient Empire variant**

Kim Gyoheon (金效獻 1868-1923)

Sin Chaeho (1880-1936)

Jeong Inbo (鄭寅普 1893-1950)

**Pan-Altaic variant**

Choe Namseon (崔南善 1890-1957)

**Present day (Part IV)**

Yun Naehyeon (尹乃鉉 1939)

Lee Deok-il (b.1961)

Kim Unhoe (金雲會 b.1961)

Seo Dong-in (徐東仁 b.?)

### Liaodong-centric variants

Kim Han-gyu (b.1950) - *Yodong-sa* (2004)


Table 1. Conceptual scheme of works discussed.

As can be seen, the ON begins and ends with examination of two works I advocate as archetypes. Within the ON are two parallel sub-lineages, one being what I tentatively term 'inflected' privately authored surveys; the other being studies of historical geography. Whilst the latter are closely associated with the empirical Silhak (實學 'practical learning') scholars, the former is more varied: in particular the works of Yi Jonghwi may be better understood as anticipating the un-empirical trends and northern focused subjectivity of modern popular historiography.
The Northern/Altaic narrative lacks a single archetype - though if forced Sin Chaeho would be the best candidate - and is instead from early on split into two loose lineages of contrasting focal interpretations: the hypothesis of an ethnocentric 'ancient Korean empire' versus the notion of a broader 'pan-Altaic' cultural zone. These, however, share many aspects in common and are not as mutually exclusive as the above schematic may imply.

Similarly, whilst employed for the sake of convenience, the premodern-modern binary periodization also should not be overly emphasized: rather this study demonstrates both many aspects of continuity and how issues of import today have in fact existed since at least the C13th. The ON should not be considered to have disappeared in the C20th and nor should the Northern/Altaic be regarded simply as having been created only to respond to the modern Japanese colonialization although that was clearly the catalyst for its final crystallization. A contrast which should be highlighted, however, is that a complementary dualism between indigenous identity and Classical Chinese heritage/learning which constitutes the core dynamism of the ON throughout the premodern era, is turned into a crude mutually exclusive dichotomy by the modern popular histories.

Structural focus of the study
There are two ways to view this thesis: either as a non-exhaustive diachronic survey of popular history from C13th until the present (2014), or as a study specifically of present day popular historiography (Part IV) wherein the preceding sections provide context for understanding how this contemporary discourse has evolved.

To serve both purposes the thesis summarizes the core content of each work discussed: even when methodologically lacking, I endeavor to give objective representations which serve the basis of my own evaluations and hopefully future research of myself and others.

Popular versus pseudo history
All of the modern and present day works are likely to be referred to as 'pseudo history' by most professional academic historians. From their perspective it is a question of inferior empiricism and the often transparent ethno-nationalist subjectivities expressed within. As much as possible I purposefully avoid this label as, again, my primary concern is not history itself, but to understand the workings of those influencing public consciousness. However, to inform a critical discussion I endeavor to highlight factual errata and interpretive fallacies wherever detected, only hoping not to have made too many of my own.
Omissions
As mentioned, this study is non-exhaustive. Particular areas which would further inform this attempted 'history of ideas' include: works of the mid to late C19th, modern North Korean historiography (particularly Ri Jirin), school textbooks of both the North and South, and finally, an independent examination of both colonial era Japanese and subsequent South Korean academic historiography. Comparisons with the popular historiographic traditions of regions outside of East Asia, meanwhile, would both provide objective perspective for Korea, and contribute to the wider - yet often Eurocentric - discourse on historiography.
Part I The Orthodox Narrative

1. Introduction

As a label the ON refers to the content of Korean authored history contained in all surviving premodern sources beginning with the dynastic Samguk-sagi (SS) but receiving its first consolidated survey treatment in Jewang-ungi. At least within elite literate circles, from Jewang-ungi onwards, this narrative appears to have enjoyed broad consensus both officially and unofficially, so it is appropriate to term it as orthodox. The preceding SS and contemporary Samguk-yusa (SY) are also both broadly complementary: as will be seen in direct comparison to Jewang-ungi below, SS is either slightly aberrant or - principally on the aspect of Dangun - not yet fully formed in the shape that would persist until C20th. SS is therefore better understood as a source for the ON rather than an archetype itself, in the same manner that both Chinese dynastic history and preceding but no longer extant Korean dynastic/elite historiography may also be assumed to have been.

Before entering a detailed discussion of the work itself, some general characteristics of the ON as embodied in Jewang-ungi can be laid out.

2. Periodization

The basic periodization of the ON is laid out in Table 2. Terminology varies slightly according to individual works so the period labels are my own.

Even without consulting premodern sources, this scheme will likely be the same conceptual periodization held by anyone casually familiar with Korean history. To present day academics only the Dangun and Gija periods are fundamentally questioned whilst the orthodox early dating of Baekje and Silla is also considered problematic. By contrast, to Korean scholars and popular history writers of a more subjective disposition, it is the Gija period and Han Commanderies, and to a lesser extent the WiMan period and the Samhan which are problematized. However, whilst the question of geography is much more disputed, it is safe to say that there remains general consensus on the basic periodization.

Returning to the premodern conceptualization, within the scheme of orthodox Korean history runs a 'lineage of Classical Chinese learning/civilization' together with the Confucian notion of legitimate dynastic succession (正統). Legitimacy begins with Dangun whilst the lineage of Classical Chinese learning is introduced by Gija after which they follow the same course. In the Three Kingdoms period, Goguryeo and Baekje are also accorded legitimacy and a degree of Sinic civilization, but Silla as the historical victor enjoyed a definite positive bias. Already present in SS, this Silla bias is itself a characteristic of the ON.
Geographically, the ON was peninsula focused. The site for the capitals of all periods of the ancient Joseon state, the Han Commandery of Lelang, and finally Goguryeo, was that of Pyeongyang on the Daedong-gang river. Meanwhile the continental northern states of Buyeo and Balhae were both physically and historiographically on the periphery.

3. Ethnogenesis

In the ON, Dangun is the founder of the Joseon state but there is no creation myth either of the world or of the Korean people. Dangun’s father, Hwan’ung, descends to an already populated location and becomes ruler.5) The establishment of Joseon marks, then, a political ethnogenesis but not a biological one: Dangun is the ancestor to political royal lines but not a progenitor of the Korean race itself.

4. Articles of civilization

A subconscious or unnamed feature of the ON are aspects that can be taken as indicative of 'civilization formation': these are the core items of national tradition

---

5) Breuker (2010) suggests that there may have been creation myths which have been lost, but if this is so, they were apparently lost entirely and/or not originally widely acknowledged as there is zero attestation in any source including, for example, the 414 Gwanggaeto Stele.
which are both universal in their meaning yet specific to Korean identity and contribute to the consciousness of a shared ethnic identity. In the ON these aspects are personified, that is, they are embodied within a celebrated personage, i.e. a divine, cultural or military hero. As present in *jewang-ungi* they can be identified as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personages</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hwan’in and Hwan’ung:</td>
<td>Benevolent celestial gods</td>
<td><em>hong’ik-igan</em> 弘益人間⁵)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangun:</td>
<td>Founding ancestor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giija:</td>
<td>Bringer of civilization: agriculture and Classical Chinese learning</td>
<td>Hongbeom-guju 洪範九疇: (8 article law code 犯禁八條)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Silla personages</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kim Yusin 金庾信 595-673:</td>
<td>military hero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonhyo 元曉 617-86:</td>
<td>Buddhist master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uisang 擬傷 625-702:</td>
<td>Buddhist master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choe Chiwon 崔致遠 b.857</td>
<td>Confucian literatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seol Chong 薛聰 b.658</td>
<td>Confucian literatus: son of Wonhyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doseon 道詣 827-98</td>
<td>esoteric Buddhist monk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overthrows Baekje and Goguryeo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innovated Korean Buddhism without leaving the peninsula; gained recognition even in China and Japan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studied in Tang China and founded the Flower Garland School (華嚴宗花엄종) in Korea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studied in Tang China, passed the civil service and held office there before returning to Silla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inventor of <em>idu</em> 吏讀 script for writing vernacular Korean.⁷)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>geomancy: (Baekdu-san mountain as the origin of the Goryeo dynasty.)⁸)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Articles of civilization attested in *jewang-ungi*.

As can be observed, it is in this scheme that the ON most clearly demonstrates its Silla bias: in this case *jewang-ungi* may be further exaggerating the bias by entirely omitting military heroes of Goguryeo, namely Eulji Mundeok (乙支文德) and the nameless commander of Ansi-seong fortress, and Baekje’s Gyebaek (階伯), all attested in SS and SY, but regardless, all cultural heroes are from Silla.

⁵) This enigmatic phrase only assumes significance in the modern era.
⁶) This is not explicitly mentioned in the original *Samguk-sagi* biography: only that he interpreted the classics.
⁷) See Breuker 2010:72-3.
Perhaps because of the Silla dominance, a notable feature contrasting to analogous schemes of Chinese tradition (which authors of the ON were fully aware of) is the late dating for these personages. Whilst in the Chinese tradition, articles of civilization - such as agriculture, writing and warfare - are attributed to legendary and semi-mythical figures, in the Korean scheme, after Dangun, they are instead historical personages, and after Gija, all lived during mid to late Silla. This is partly because the Korean articles are not primary inventions, but rather secondary innovations, e.g. Seol Chong is not the inventor of writing, he merely adopts Chinese characters for Korean usage: Kim Yusin is not the first to wage war, he is simply the highest embodiment of Silla’s martial tradition. Thus, in the ON the Korean articles of civilization are not mutually exclusive equivalents to those found in Chinese tradition but complementary.

This last point reflects a core characteristic of the ON: its successful inclusiveness of both Sinic and indigenous aspects. This is reflected in the complementary pairings of Wonhyo and Seol Chong, who both made indigenous contributions, with Uisang and Choe Chiwon respectively, who by contrast had successful careers in China and are more closely associated with Sinic culture than native innovation.

Another feature of the ON’s inclusiveness, at least prior to the Joseon dynasty, is the comfortable inclusion of Buddhism and Confucianism here embodied in the tradition of Seol Chong being Wonhyo’s son.

One final point to note is that, although present and celebrated in the ON, the legendary founders of the Three Kingdoms’ era polities do not themselves represent political progenation as they are in turn subordinated to Dangun. This clear elevation of Dangun despite the Silla bias is remarkable given that Dangun was clearly a tradition indigenous to the northern peninsula, likely centered on Pyeongyang. Whilst there are various speculative hypotheses for how and why the rise of the Dangun myth came about, what is certain is that by the 1280s it was already a fait accompli.
[Chapter 1] First archetype: Yi Seunghyu - Jewang-ungi

帝王韻紀

1. Overview

Jewang-ungi (帝王韻紀 'Rhyming record of emperors and kings') contains the earliest surviving 'dynasty-transcending' survey of Korean history. Composed by Dong'an-geosa Yi Seunghyu (動安居士 李承休 1224-1300) and presented to King Chungnyeol (忠烈王 r.1274-1308) in 1287, it was first published in 1295 and reprinted at least twice again in 1360 and 1417

(Kim 1999:1): thus it could well qualify as 'popular' history in terms of becoming widely read and quoted by the literati.

The work is a long form Sino-Korean poem accompanied by short annotations: it is divided into two halves (上·下巻), the first recounting Chinese history, the second that of Korea. Both begin with their respective mythical progenitors, Pangu (盤古) and Dangun, and trace through subsequent legendary and historical eras up until, in the case of China, the final child ruler of Southern Song, Emperor Bing (宋帝昺: 1271-79 r.1278-9), and Korea, the beginning of Chungnyeol's reign contemporary to Yi Seunghyu. Excluding annotations, each half is (supposed to be) 264 lines long: the Korean half is further divided into two parts: pre-Goryeo (東國君王開國年代 c.102 lines) and contemporary Goryeo (本朝君王世系年代 c.162 lines). In short, there are three sections: China, pre-Goryeo and Goryeo. Both the Chinese half and the pre-Goryeo Korean section are rendered in heptasyllabic verse whilst the Goryeo section is pentasyllabic: the final annotation explains - seemingly ad hoc - that this is because the composition of the poem began with pentasyllabic lines and ended with heptasyllabic, that the work in fact 'begins' with the current Goryeo dynasty and 'ends' with creation in a manner analogous to Confucius's Chunqiu (春秋).

Despite its form and length, in content Jewang-ungi is not a narrative epic and does not describe historical events: it primarily lists the changing dynasties, and the names of prominent rulers and personages whilst the brief annotations typically contain basic biographical details and figures such as the length of the dynasties and number of rulers. Despite the emphasis on dynasties and rulers, there are no explicit subheadings or periodization other than the division of the Chinese, pre-Goryeo and Goryeo sections.

9) The source text used for analysis is Kim (1991) which contains the original text, a facsimile and modern Korean translation.


11) Jewang-ungi "或難曰 子之纂修帝王韻紀皆以七言録事 而至於本朝 則用五言者何也 其有指乎
答 且詩之作始於五言 而終於七言者也 今夫制作之意 始起於本朝 故終之以所起之始 蓋夫子
修春秋之志也"
According to the poem itself, the Chinese section surveys a period of 5,600+ years, covering 34 legitimate states and 252 rulers: this figure must be excluding the mythical era as Pangu alone, for example is accorded a period of existence of some 36,000 years.

Being so dense and brief on historical details, the poem would have had greatest value to readers already familiar with orthodox history and the sources from which it draws: otherwise it is little more than a list of names and numbers.

2. Early Korea according to Jewang-ungi
(In the following discussion of the work, all 'annotations' referred to are Yi's own interlinear insertions.

The introductory paragraph to the Korean half of Jewang-ungi explains that the information was based on the bongi (本紀) basic annals of the 'national history' (國史) - i.e. SS and/or the Gu-Samguk-sa - together with the Su'i-jeon (殊異傳 'Weird tales' compiled by Bak In-ryang 朴寅亮 d.1096 - no longer extent) but disposing of the 'irivolous' (浮辭) and taking only that which is 'rational' (正理 lit. 'correct [normative] principle').

The content of the pre-Goryeo section (東國君王開國年代) of Jewang-ungi is summarized in the following Table 4, with notable points discussed after.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Goryeo 東國君王開國年代</th>
<th>Polity</th>
<th>Founder / personages</th>
<th>Dates and details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseon 朝鮮</td>
<td>Dangun 檀君</td>
<td>• Reign begins same Wuchen (戊辰) year as Emperor Yao (trad. 2333 BCE).&lt;br&gt;• Dangun enters Asadal in 8th year of Yin ruler Wu Ding (武丁 [c.1250–1192 BCE]) - [c.1243 BCE].&lt;br&gt;• Annotation: Dangun’s reign lasts 1,038 years.&lt;br&gt;• In the main body of the poem it also gives the figure 1,028 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Later Joseon 後朝鮮</td>
<td>Gija 良子 (King) Jun 準</td>
<td>• Gija’s rule began 164 years after Dangun.&lt;br&gt;• Introduces Hongbeom-gujú 洪範九疇.&lt;br&gt;• 41st ruler from Gija.&lt;br&gt;• After 928 years of the dynasty, sovereignty usurped.&lt;br&gt;• Moves to Geumma-gun 金馬郡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wi Man 衛滿</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Described as a ‘[Chinese] Han general from</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12) The modern translated edition, Kim Gyeongsu 1999, contains period subheadings but as seen in the accompanying facsimile, they are not original to the text.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Four Han Commanderies | • Arrives c.195 BCE (高帝十二丙午年)  
                       | • Three generation rule lasts 88 years. |
| Zhenfan 貢番     |                                                                      |
| Lintun 臨屯       |                                                                      |
| Lelang 樂浪       |                                                                      |
| Xuantu 玄菟       |                                                                      |
| Buyeo 扶餘       | • Annotation quoting Dongmyeong myth and establishment of East Buyeo. |
| Buru 夫妻       | • Buru’s mother is Biseogap Habak 非西嶋河泊.                        |
| Geumwa 金蛙      | • Grave of Buyeo king Buma 駙馬 at Liaobin (遙瀟)                      |
| Aranbul 阿蘭弗   |                                                                      |
| Biryu 沸流       | Song Yang 松讓                                                         |
| Sira 戶羅       |                                                                      |
| Gorye 高麗       |                                                                      |
| South and North Okjeo | 南北沃沮  
                      | Ye (and)                                                             |
| Maek 總領       |                                                                      |
| Silla 新羅       | Bak Hyeokgeose 朴奕[赫]居世                                         |
| Kim Chunchu 春秋王 (aka King Muyeol 武烈王) | • Established date given as 72 years after the Commanderies (c.37): more explicitly as c.57 BCE (漢宣五鳳元).  
                       | • Summary of progenitor myth.                                        |
| Kim Yusin 庾信金公 | • Early kingship alternated between Seok 昔氏 and Kim 金氏 clans.       |
| Choe Chiwon 清河崔致遠 | • Pacifies Goguryeo and Baekje with aid of Tang army.               |
| Wonhyo and Uisang 无晦[義]相 | • Loyal retainer: outstanding martial skill obtained from mysterious military texts. |
| Seol Chong 弘儒薛聰侯 | • Moved China with his (Chinese) writing.                             |
|                      | • Creator of phonetic idu (史書) writing system: made possible the recording of vernacular and dialects aiding governance and the enlightenment of the people.  
                      | • Silla lasts 902 years with 56 rulers.                             |
| [Later Baekje] | Gyeonhwon [鶏]禽 | • Son of Hae Mosu (解擊激) and Habaek’s (何伯) daughter, Yuhwa (柳花).  
  • After fleeing Buyeo, establishes a new state in 37 BCE (漢元王昭二甲申).  
  • Capital is on the site Mahan’s Wanggeom-seong (王倭城) - present day Pyeongyang.  
  • Subjugates Biryu-guk (沸流國) king Song Yang (松讓).  
  • Jumong frequented heaven (or at least returns at the end of his reign) to participate in celestial governance (天政).  
  • Hoof marks remain on Jocheon-seok (朝天石) boulder. |
|----------------|-----------------|---|
| Goguryeo [高句麗] | Go Jumong  
高朱蒙 (aka King Dongmyeong 東明) | • Son of Jumong, 2nd king.  
• Conceived whilst Jumong was still in Buyeo.  
• Interred Jumong’s jade whip as a tomb: located at Yongsan (龍山). |
| Yuri 類利 | | • Rebel leader. |
| Gaesomun 蓋蘇文 | | • Last king.  
• Defeated by Tang-Silla alliance. |
| King Bojang 高[寶]藏[王] | | • Tang general who leads 668 overthrow of Goguryeo. |
| Li Ji 李稷 [sic.橘] | | • Illegitimate son of Silla king Gyeongmum (景文王 r.861-875).  
• Joins bandits led by Yang Gil (梁吉) in Buk’won (布原), modern Wonju (原州).  
• Declares the state of Later Goguryeo in 890 (唐昭大順元).  
• Originally based as Geum-seong (金城): capital then established at Cholwon (鐵原).  
• Lasts 28 years: driven out by Goryeo Taejo. |
| Later Goguryeo 後高句麗 | Gung-ye 弓裔 | • Son of ‘Emperor Dongmyeong’ (東明聖帝) (aka Jumong).  
• Flees south with mother and brother 18 BCE (漢成靖嘉三) after half-brother Yuri arrives from Buyeo.  
• Brothers establish their state in Byeonhan (弁韓). |
| Baekje 百濟 | Onjo 溫祚 | • Older brother to Onjo.  
• Eunjo establishes state but dies after 5 months. |
| | Eunjo 殷祚 | • Later kings variously named the state as ‘South Buyeo’ (南扶余) and ‘Eungjin’ (應津).  
• Overthrown by Tang-Silla alliance in 660. |
| | Wija 義慈 | • Last king; captured and taken to Tang China.  
• Daewang-po (大王浦), a site enjoyed by Wija; |
2.1 Geography
The poem opens by locating Joseon in or beyond "Liaodong (遼東 'east of the Liao [river]'). That this refers specifically to the Korean peninsula and not continental Liaodong is confirmed by a given description that the land is surrounded by water on three sides and connected to the continent in the north.

2.2 Hwan'ung and Dangun
The 'opening' (i.e. establishment) of Joseon is attributed to Dangun (檀君); the accompanying annotation, whilst still brief, is one of the longest in the work and gives a summary of the Hwan'ung descension and Dangun birth myth.

"According to the Basic Annal (本紀 [perhaps of the Gu-Samguk-sa]) the high emperor, Hwan'in, had a seojja (庶子) son called Hwan'ung. etc. [Hwan'in] told him, "Descend to the Samwi Taebaek (三危太白) and [make] humans widely prosper' (弘益人間)." So [Hwan'ung was given the three 'celestial seals' (天符印) and leading some 3,000 spirits he descended to below the 'divine dan tree' (神檀樹) on the peak of Taebaek-san mountain: [they] called him 'Celestial King Dan-ung' (檀雄天王). etc. Ordering a young girl (孫女) to drink a potion, [she] became a human form, and marrying with the 'god of the dan tree' (檀

---

Table 4. Summary of jewang-ungi pre-Goryeo section.
樹神 [i.e. Hwan'ung] gave birth to a man named Dangun. [who] occupying the territory of Joseon became king. Thus Sira (尸羅 [aka Silla]), Gorye (高禮 [aka Goguryeo]), South and North Okjeo, East and North Buyeo, Ye (織) and Maek, were all descended (裔) from Dangun. Ruling for 1,038 years, [Dangun then] entered Asadal-san mountain and became a god, so he did not die.”

Alongside the 'Wanggeom Joseon' (王儉朝鮮) account contained in the SY, this passage is the earliest surviving account of the Hwan'ung-Dangun myth. At just 125 characters in length, it is significantly briefer than even the modest 440 character SY account (440 including annotations - or 378 excluding the final passage on Gija which is treated separately in jewang-ungi ).

Most notably omitted is the bear and tiger myth. Whilst perhaps the result of Yi Seunghyu’s desire to 'rationalize' the story, this prompts the unexplained question of why a girl needed to be changed into human shape.

Despite this, the Jewang-ungi account contains many of the same core elements of the SY variant such as the distinct hong'ik-ingan phrase (弘益人間 'make humans widely prosper'), the celestial seals and the 'divine dan tree'.

The most significant addition is the passage explicitly identifying subsequent historical Korean polities as all being descendents of Dangun (...皆檀君之裔). A similar passage is subsequently repeated in the body of the poem slightly after. Also of interest, from the same line in the annotation is that the Ye and Maek are explicitly named as two distinct entities, the two characters being usually divided with a the conjunction yeo (與).

Finally, in a second annotation, Yi identifies Asadal-san as contemporary Guwol-san (九月山 - modern South Hwanghae-do), also named Gunghol (弓忽) or Samwi (三危), and notes that an ancestral shrine (祠堂) is "still" located there, significantly implying the shrine was considered old already at the time of writing.

2.3 Gija and 'Later Joseon'
In Jewang-ungi Gija is described as the progenitor of 'Later Joseon' (後朝鮮). This

---
13) Kim 1999 has the character 崇 but this is almost definitely a misreading of the unclear character seen in the facsimile of the woodblock print - see Kim 1999:280.
sub-periodization of Joseon is an apparent C13th Korean innovation absent both from Chinese sources, as well as SS. SY distinguishes between an 'Old Joseon' of Wanggeom Dangun and Gija, and a subsequent 'Wiman Joseon' (魏滿朝鮮) of the usurped polity up to its destruction by Han China. By contrast, Jewang-ungi distinguishes between an implicit 'former/original Joseon' of Dangun and the 'Later Joseon' primarily of Gija but, again implicitly, including the usurper dynasty of Wi Man.

Concerning continuity between Dangun and Gija, a significant difference between the SY and Jewang-ungi accounts is that whilst the former has Gija essentially displacing Dangun, who moves first to Jangdang-gyeong (蔵唐京) and then Asadal becoming a mountain god, Jewang-ungi twice highlights that there was a 164 year space between Dangun’s withdrawal to Asadal-san (no mention of Jangdang-gyeong) and Gija’s arrival during which time there was no formal governance (Annotation: “Thereafter, for 164 years there were fathers and sons, but no lords and vassals” 爾後一百六十四 雖有父子無君臣).

Concerning the autonomy of Gija’s Later Joseon vis-à-vis China, Jewang-ungi describes Gija establishing the state by himself (自立國) whilst the accompanying annotation cites the Shangshu 'subcommentary' (尚書疏 - apparently by Kang Yingda 孔穎達 574-648 - see Wilkinson 2013:375) stating that Gija was only enfeoffed by Zhou king Wu after he had already established Joseon.

[Jewang-ungi 帝王韻紀:下卷: "[Annotation] 尚書疏云 虎王箕子之囚，箕子走之朝鮮立國，虎王聞之，因封焉。箕子受封，不得無臣禮，因謝入觀。虎王問，洪範九疇，在周之十三年也。已下現於傳者，皆不注。"]

By contrast, SY records only that Gija was enfeoffed with Joseon by Zhou king Wu.

[SY "周虎王卽位己卯封箕子於朝鮮 壇君乃移於藏唐京後遷隱於阿斯達為山神壽一千九百八歲... 周以封箕子為朝鮮"]

Wi Man is simply described as a 'Han general from Yan': without further details - such as the Shiji account of him dressing in barbarian clothes - this would seem to imply a Han Chinese ethnicity.

2.4 Dates
The specific year of Gija’s arrival is not explicitly stated but can be estimated from relative information provided. Gija’s 41 generation dynasty is said to last 928 years and comes to an end with Wi Man’s usurpation, dated to 195 BCE, thus giving a starting date of c.1123 which matches orthodox Chinese dating for the end of Shang (given in Wilkinson 2013:673 as 1122 BCE). Counting back another 164 years would put the end of Dangun at c.1287. Dangun’s reign, or
the era of Dangun’s dynasty, is given variously as 1,028 or 1,038 years: taking
the latter figure would bring the date to c.2325 BCE, just eight years shy of the
‘traditional’ date of 2333 BCE which was itself, again, derived from the Chinese
dating for Emperor Yao.14)

2.5 Han Commanderies
The Four Commanderies established in 108 BCE by Han China are mentioned
only briefly with relative locations given "Zhenfan and Lintun in the south and
north: Lelang and Xuantu in the east and west."

[Jewang-ungi 帝王譜紀: 下卷: “四分此地為四郡，各置郡長綏民編。真番、臨屯在南北，
樂浪、玄菟東西偏。胥匡以生理自給，風俗漸頹民未安。”]

In these lines the Four Commanderies are listed in the order given in the
Hanshu whilst the directions are also given in conventionally ordered pairings
‘south and north’ and ‘east and west’. Whilst Lelang and Xuantu would appear to
match, Zhenfan and Lintun would be better understood if their apparent
respective directions were reversed. Consequently no real geographical
information is transmitted.

Yi describes only the waning of the Commanderies stating that the 'customs'
gradually weakened and the people became 'unpeaceful' or 'un-at-ease'. In later
lines he further adds that whilst it may be imagined the Han emperor had
peaceful intentions and sought to bring stability to the people, he in fact caused
harm. (想得漢皇綏遠意，定黎蒸處害黎蒸)

This leads to the 'Samhan' and emergence of historical polities: Buyeo, Biryu,
Sira (尸羅 aka Silla), Gorye (高糧 Goguryeo), Okjeo, Ye and Maek.

2.6 Samhan and historical polities
At times coming together and [then] scattering, [at times] floating and then
sinking,
borders naturally emerged (分 lit. 'divided’) and the Samhan formed.
The Samhan each had a number of provinces and countries
busily scattered between the lakes and mountains.
Each declared (稱) itself to be a state, and attacked one another.
The more than seventy [kingdoms] are not worth attestation (足徵)

14) The 2333 BCE date matches the 25th year, sexagonery Wuchen (戊辰 K. Muijin), of
Emperor Yao; whilst SY gives Muijin as the sexagonery year of Dangun’s ascension, (in
popular historiography) it is not until Hong Manjong’s Dongguk-yeokdae-chongmok
(c.1705) that this is fixed as the 25th year of Yao: An Jeong-bok credits the calibration
to Sin Ik-seong’s (申翊聖 1588-1644) Gyeongseseo-bopyeon (經世書補編) – see Chapter 4.
Yao’s ascension year was fixed as 2357 BCE in Diwangshiji (帝王世紀) by Huangfu Mi (皇
甫謨 215-82 CE), and likely transmitted to Korea via Zhu Xi’s Zhi-tongjian-gangmu (資治
通鑑綱目 – see Wilkinson 2013:673 "56.5 Ancient Chronology").
Amongst [them], which were the large[r] states? earliest named are Buyeo [annotation] and Biryu
Next there was Sira and Gorye, South and North Okjeo, Ye and Maek (鷹?)
Ask who were all these rulers and chieftains descendants of:
they were descended through generations, once more from Dangun.

Yi Seunghyu’s usage of the term Samhan here, is somewhat ambiguous as to whether it refers specifically to the historical Three Han (Mahan, Jinhan and Byeonhan - attested in SGZ and HHS) or is a more general designator for all of the peninsula as was the common conceptualization (à la Breuker 2010). Whilst taking the historical names and number of subordinate statelets as provided by the SGZ/HHS treatises, he goes on to imply that the other larger polities may have emerged amongst them. These he names in order of size and finishes with the reminder that their rulers were all descended from Dangun.

2.6.1 North and East Buyeo
The annotations accompanying mention of Buyeo and Biryu, combined, constitute a rendition of the Dongmyeong progenitor myth.

Buyeo Annotation:
"According to the Dangun-bongi, the daughter of Biseogap Habak (非西岬河泊), married giving birth to a boy named Buru. According to the Dongmyeong-bongi (東明本紀), the Buyeo king, Buru, was old and without a son [so] he held rites [in/for] the mountains and rivers in a bid for an heir. [Thereupon] the king’s horse went to the Gon-yeon (鯨淵) pool and seeing a large stone shed [tears {殘 sic. both SS and Dongmyeong-wangpyeon have 淚 'tears'}]. Thinking this strange the king had men roll the stone and there was a small child in the shape of a golden frog. The king said 'Is this [not] a fine child given to me by heaven?' He made him crown prince naming him Geumwa (金蛙 ‘golden frog’). The minister/soothsayer Aranbul said, 'Recently heaven descended to me and said, [I] will have my grandson establish a country here, you [must] flee. On the east coast there is a land called Gayeop-won (迦葉原); the earth is suitable for the five cereals, [so you] can establish a capital [there].' [Thus Aranbul] persuaded the king to move the capital and the [new state] was named East Buyeo. etc.

When traveling to China (上國) as an emissary, beside the road on the bank
of the Liao [river] was a grave which people said was the grave of Great King Buma (駙馬) of Buyeo.

Also, according to Jia Dan (賈耽 [c.730-805]), the southern great plain and the Yalu (？ 大原南 鴨綠血) were former Buyeo territory, so North Buyeo was in Liaobin (遼濫). The establishment of the state was shortly after Later Joseon.

[《檀君本紀》曰："與非西嶽河泊之女，婚而生男，名夫婁。" 《東明本紀》曰："扶餘王夫婁，老無子，祭山川求嗣。所御馬至臨淵，見大石流殘。王怪而使人轉石，有小兒，金色蛙形。王曰：'天錫我令胤乎?' 立為太子，名曰金蛙。其相阿蘭弗曰：'日者天降我曰：'將使吾子孫，立國於此，汝其避之。東海濫 有地號迦葉原，土宜五穀，可都也。'勤王移都，號東扶餘'云云。臣嘗使於上國，至遼濫路傍有立墓，其人曰：'扶餘駙馬大王墓也。'" 又賈耽曰：'大原南鴨綠血，扶餘舊地，則北扶餘者，宜在遼濫。其開國，蓋自後秦鮮而至此幾矣。]

Biryu Annotation:
"According to the Dongmyeong-bongi, the Biryu king Song Yang (松讚) said [to Dongmyeong/Jumong], 'I am the descendent of seon’in (仙人 'immortals'), and king through successive generations. Now the days are shallow [since] you made your kingdom, [so] should you [not] become a vassal to me?' Thus perhaps [Song Yang] was also a descendent of Dangun.
[... 《東明本紀》曰：'燁流王松讚謂曰：'予以仙人之後，累世為王，今君造國日淺，為我附庸可乎?' 則此亦疑檀君之後也。]

In both annotations the passages attributed to the Dongmyeong-bongi ('Dongmyeong Basic Annal') are closely parallel to those found in Yi Gyubo’s Dongmyeongwang-pyeon (東明王篇) and somewhat variant to the equivalent account in SS: from this it can be deduced that the Dongmyeong-bongi refers to a common no longer extent source, possibly the Gu-Samguk-sa, rather than the SS record of King Dongmyeong (aka Jumong).

2.6.1.1 Seon’in (仙人) = Dangun
Biryu and the episode of King Song Yang’s meeting with Jumong are attested in both the SS and Dongmyeongwang-pyeon – the latter being the fuller version – but are entirely absent from SY. Concerning the line in which Song Yang describes himself as the "descendant of a seon’in (仙人)", interestingly the word seon’in is used in both Dongmyeongwang-pyeon and Jewang-ungi but in SS Song Yang simply claims that he is the "king of accumulated generations" (松贊曰。我累世為王). In SS seon’in only occurs in the appellation Seon’in Wanggeom (仙人王儉) associated with Pyeongyang (it also occurs in the treatise on Goguryeo titles). Whilst the SY names Dangun as 'Dangun Wanggeom' (嚮君王儉), it is in this Jewang-ungi annotation that the term seon’in – as applied to Song Yang – is first directly equated with Dangun.
2.6.2 Contemporary toponyms

Yi Seunghyu observes that the names of smaller states cannot be known from sources but that they are contained in the names of contemporary administrative prefectures.

※ The same assertion is later made by Sin Chaeho.

2.7 The Three Kingdoms

The Three Kingdoms are described as following the Three Han although the parallelism of the two consecutive lines involved is not close enough to deduce direct correspondences.

Yi gives the figure of 72 years between the establishment of the Han Commanderies and the rise of Silla ([新]羅): counting from 108 BCE, this gives a date of c.36 BCE which curiously corresponds more closely to the traditional SS founding date of Goguryeo (c.37 BCE) rather than Silla (c.57 BCE). In subsequent lines, however, Silla’s foundation date is given more explicitly as the 1st Wufeng year of Han emperor Xuan (漢宣五鳳元), c.57 BCE.

2.7.1 Silla
Is positively portrayed.

2.7.1.2 Silla personages

 rotates to the right of Goguryeo and Baekje during the reign of King Muyeol (武烈王 r.654–61), the Silla section names five prominent historical personages of cultural significance: military hero Kim Yusin (金庾信), Confucian literatus Choe Chiwon (崔致遠), Buddhist masters Wonhyo and Uisang (元曉-義相), and finally another literatus, Seol Chong (薛聰), who is attributed with the invention of the phonetic idu writing system. A striking point is that whilst Kim Yusin and Choe Chiwon are accorded two lines each, and Wonhyo and Uisang two lines between them, Seol Chong and idu are treated with four complete lines demonstrating Yi’s high regard for this semi-nativist - or what in modern times might be viewed as proto-nationalist - endeavor.

2.7.1.3 Silla-Goryeo transition
The founders of Later Goguryeo and Later Baekje, Gung-ye (弓裔) and Gyeonhwon (甄萱), are also briefly named but discussed further following the end
of the Goguryeo and Baekje sections respectively.

At the end of the Silla section the rise of Goryeo king Taejo (太祖 aka Wang Geon 王建) is also briefly recounted. In three accompanying annotations it is noted that: 1) the 18th year of Taejo’s reign, c.935, was the 3,288 year since the first year of Dangun (here again, if the 2333 BCE date is used, there is only a 20 year discrepancy); 2) the eldest daughter of Taejo married to King Geumbu (金傅王 aka King Gyeongsun 敬順王 r. 927-935) was titled 'Princess Lelang/Nangang' (樂浪公主); and 3) the Silla vassals were all accorded their original positions and participated in the new royal court. All three of these items can be seen to underline the notion of a continuous lineage, even between dynasties, tracing back to Dangun.

2.7.2 Goguryeo
• In the main text of the poem Goguryeo is referred to only in abbreviated form, as Ryeo (麗).

In two lines Goguryeo’s dynastic governance is positively appraised, likened to a clear river, up until the rebellion of Yeon Gaesomun (箋蓋蘇文 603-66) and final king Bojiang (寶藏王 r.642-68). (枝繁葉茂承承理 時與江水爭澄清)

2.7.2.1 Jumong progenitor myth and Goguryeo foundation
The coverage of the Jumong myth is similar to other sources including SS, Yi Gyubo’s Dongmyeongwang-ryeon (文順公東明詩) and SY: in the Jewang-ungi annotation Yi Seunghyu even directly quotes a line from Dongmyeongwang-ryeon stating that Jumong was the ’grandson of heaven and sheng (甥 lit. ‘nephew/son-in-law’ but by context here should be ‘maternal grandson’) to Habaek’ (‘天孫河伯甥’).

In the account of Jumong’s flight south, the river he crosses with the aid of turtles and fish is given as the Gaesa-su (蓋斯水): this is distinct from other sources including the SY, the Gwanggaeto Stele, or the analogous river in the prototype Buyeo progenitor story recorded in earlier Chinese sources (i.e. C1st Lunheng 論衡 and Weilüe 諭略 quoted in the "Buyeo" section of Sanguozhi [SGZ]). Only SS and Dongmyeongwang-ryeon include Gaesa-su as an additional alternative name: whilst both these sources locate this river northeast of the Yalu, in an accompanying annotation, Yi Seunghyu more explicitly identifies it as the contemporary Daning-jiang (大寧江 {not clear which river this is}).

Jewang-ungi also describes Jumong establishing his new state at the location of ‘Mahan’s Wanggeom-seong’ (王倉城), identified by annotation as the contemporary western capital (西京 i.e. modern Pyeongyang). This starkly contrasts to all other sources including SS, Dongmyeongwang-ryeon (which simply says "a propitious
site” 形勝）and SY, which gives it as Jolbon (卒本): separately though, the description finds agreements with Choe Chiwon’s identification of Mahan with Goguryeo in the SS.

Meanwhile in Jewang-ungi the name of Jumong’s state is said to be taken from Goguryeo-hyeon (高句麗縣) county: no further details are given but this can only refer to Gaogouli-xian county of the Xuantu commandery, and would be orthodox if not for the Pyeongyang location.

Yi also claims that the Wudaishi (五代史) refers to Goguryeo as ‘a separate kind’ from Buyeo (高句麗扶餘別種也): this description in fact originates in the SGZ and Hou Hanshu (HHS) Goguryeo accounts and refers to the question of language.

[SGZ 三國志·魏書三十·高句麗傳: “東夷舊語以為夫餘別種，言語諸事，多與夫餘同”]

2.7.2.2 Habaek (alt. Habak), Buru and Jumong

2.7.2.2.1 Background

In the earliest attested versions of the Goguryeo legend, namely the Gwanggaeto Stele (414) and the Weishu (c.554), Habaek (河伯 ‘river lord’) - originally a Chinese water deity - is named as the maternal grandfather to Jumong. He is absent however from the still earlier Buyeo Dongmyeong foundation myth from which the Goguryeo version is clearly derived. Buru, meanwhile is entirely absent from Chinese sources as well as the Gwanggaeto Stele, being first attested (together with Hae Mosu) in the SS version of the Jumong myth.

In the SS, Jumong is born to Hae Mosu and Habaek’s daughter, Yuhwa; the parents of displaced Buyeo king, Hae Buru, are not named. Consequently there is no direct connection between Buru and Jumong except for Buru having the same surname, Hae (解), as Jumong’s celestial father, Hae Mosu. It cannot be certain if this was the original shape of the story, or if it was edited by the SS compilers; that is, we do not know if the shared surname is a remaining artefact (albeit of a post Gwanggaeto Stele innovation), or carried some coincidental meaning. However, Dongmyeongwang-pyeon also attributes the surname to both Hae Mosu and Hae Buru and likely drew from a source common to SS, namely the Gu-Samguk-sa, and so the former - that it is original - therefore seems more probable. In any event, in SS the relationship between Buru and Jumong is left unclarified, and Jumong himself is never attributed the surname Hae.

The SY is the first source to explicitly highlight a fraternal relationship between Buru and Jumong but does so in a confused manner. Firstly, in the "North Buyeo" section, for the first time in surviving sources, Hae Buru’s surname is explicitly explained as due to Buru being the son of Hae Mosu.
SY then splits a similar version of the SS Jumong myth between consecutive sections titled "East Buyeo" and "Goguryeo". In "East Buyeo" Hae Buru appears as the Buyeo king the same as in SS, without mention of his parents. In "Goguryeo" however, following the account of Yuhwa’s brief liaison with Hae Mosu, an annotation is inserted stating:

"According to the Dangun-gi, [Dan’]gun forced intimacy with the daughter of Seoha Habaek (西河河伯) [who] gave birth to a boy named Buru. Now according to this record [i.e. the SS Jumong myth "國史高麗本記"], Hae Mosu had a secret liaison with Habaek’s daughter [who] later gave birth to Jumong. The Dangun-gi says that [she] gave birth to a boy named Buru. Buru and Jumong were brothers by different mothers."

SY "埴君記云 君與西河河伯之女 要親有產子名曰夫婦 今説此記則解幕徹 私河伯之女而後產朱蒙 壌君記云產子名曰夫婦 夫婦與朱蒙異母兄弟也"

As can be seen, the final statement seems to clearly contradict the immediately preceding information. If taken literally, it could be understood to refer to the shared father being Hae Mosu as elucidated from the North Buyeo section: this leaves the question as to why the annotation cites a source naming Buru’s father as implied Dangun, and why the annotation sources seem to specifically indicate the same mother. Some modern scholars use this contradiction to assert that Dangun and Hae Mosu can be directly equated (with dangun being treated as a title), but this fails to address the question of the mother. An alternative literal interpretation might be that the mothers of Buru and Jumong were different daughters of Habaek as only the mother of Jumong is named. However, in the context of the annotation and cited sources it seems most likely simply to be an error which meant to state the opposite, that they had the same mother (a daughter of Habaek) and different fathers (Dangun and Hae Mosu), although in contextual terms this would still be problematic as it fails to elucidate the relationship between Dangun and Hae Mosu (if regarded as separate beings).

Of course, in absolute terms both then and now the problem is unresolvable because the underlying stories are duplicate: they are the result of a pluralistic mythology that was in an overlapping process of transition (Buyeo to Goguryeo: a pluralistic view to a more linear view) and restructuring (around Dangun).

2.7.2.2.2 Habaek/Habak in Jewang-ungi
Jewang-ungi contains similar basic information to SY but without the problematic annotation: to aid disambiguation, details of both are summarized in Table 5.

Of note is that where Habaek is described as the mother of Buru, she is accompanied by a name/title which varies between SY and Jewang-ungi even
whilst citing potentially the same source. The characters for SY 'Seoha' carry the semantic meaning of 'west river' whilst Jewang-ungi 'Biseogap' contains the semantogram 'west' but otherwise appears to be the phonetic rendering of a non-Sinic name. By contrast, when described as being the grandmother of Jumong, in both works the name is given simply as Habaek as it occurs in all earlier versions of the Jumong myth (Gwanggaeto Stele, Wuishu and SS).

Within Jewang-ungi itself, the second character of the name Habaek/Habak also varies: the name of Buru’s mother is uniquely written with the water-radical bak (泊 MC bak lit. 'to moor') whilst the name of Jumong’s grandmother is written with the conventional person-radical baek (伯 MC paek used in titles of senior rank). This contrasts to SY and is peculiar because in other examples, namely the dan of Dangun, it is SY which has the (perhaps unfair) reputation for variant characters and Jewang-ungi which adheres to orthodoxy.

Whilst the SY annotation explicitly seeks to highlight a relationship between Buru and Jumong - and probably sought to say they shared the same maternal lineage - Jewang-ungi does not, and a very literal reading of the two variant names in Jewang-ungi would potentially even imply that Habak and Habaek were different people. Again, in absolute terms, Habaek, however, cannot itself be an authentic personal name - that is in anyway distantly historical - because it was borrowed from Chinese mythology where it was the descriptive name of a river deity associated with the Yellow River. For that reason too, Habak, is almost certainly nothing more than a variant or error for Habaek.

What the Habak variant in Jewang-ungi does help to substantiate is that there was a preceding source from which Yi Seunghyu drew which was definitely not SY, but which may have been a source common to both. Whilst the single bak variant might be dismissed - however unlikely - as a scribal error introduced by Jewang-ungi, the presence of the unique name/title Biseogap renders such an implication void as the latter in any case also needs to be accounted for.

Concerning the name/title Biseogap, judging by the overall motivation and style of Jewang-ungi, it seems unlikely that Yi Seunghyu would have felt motivated to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progenitors</th>
<th>Jewang-ungi</th>
<th>Samguk-yusa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buru</td>
<td>Daughter of Biseogap Habak</td>
<td>Daughter of Seoha Habaek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>非西岬 河泊</td>
<td>西河 河泊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dangun-bongi</td>
<td>Dangun-gi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>檀君本紀</td>
<td>檀君記</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumong</td>
<td>Yuhwa 柳花, eldest daughter of Habaek 河伯</td>
<td>Yuhwa 柳花, daughter of Habaek 河伯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Goguryeo] Bongi 本紀 (à la SS account)</td>
<td>[SY à la SS]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Disambiguation of Buru and Jumong's maternity.
invent it: especially given that it appears to be non-Sinic. Therefore it is reasonable to posit that the full name Biseogap Habak must be an honest citation from the Dangun-bongi text given as reference.  

The fact that Jewang-ungi chooses to preserve the two variant forms Habak/Habaek according to the different sources cited and without comment or clarification, demonstrates that Yi Seunghyu - and the tradition he was drawing on - did not necessarily consider Buru and Jumong to share the same immediate ancestors, or regarded the question as trivial. This is partly because in Jewang-ungi, the importance of the Buyeo-Goguryeo lineage is diminished by asserting overriding common ancestry to Dangun: from a Korean perspective, by the C13th the original political prestige of Buyeo had been eclipsed by that of Goguryeo (and then Silla), and historiographically displaced by OJ. (Byington 2003:508)

Of course, the opposite might still be argued, that despite the variant character, Habak and Habaek were already understood to be the same deity and so did not require clarification.

A final point, however, which likely tips the weight of evidence towards Yi Seunghyu having made a conscious decision to differentiate two matrilineal deity figures, or rather differentiate both sets of parents entirely, is the fact that in Jewang-ungi mention of Buru’s surname appears to have been actively omitted, conveniently severing the ambiguous connection between Hae Mosu and Hae Buru that originates from the SS - and likely Gu-Samguk-sa - Jumong accounts. The evidence for this is that the version of the Jumong myth quoted in the Jewang-ungi annotation is attributed to the "Dongmyeong-bongi" (東明本紀 Dongmyeong Basic Annal) which, as deduced above, more likely refers to a source such as the Gu-Samguk-sa common to both SS and Dongmyeongwang-pyeon, than to the surviving SS: that is to say, because the SS and Dongmyeongwang-pyeon both attest Hae Buru, their common ancestor source most likely did, too. The SS also lacks any obvious motivation to have invented Buru’s surname if it did not already exist.

The significance of the surname, of course, pertains more immediately to the question of the father, but overall the impression is that Yi sought to reduce the implication of a relationship between Buru and Jumong.

15) No one would compose a work the length of Jewang-ungi - remembering that the greater part of it is devoted to Chinese and Goguryeo dynasty history - simply in order to engineer these rather minor nuances which are then restricted to interlinear annotations!
Thus it may be concluded that whatever source Yi Seunghyu utilized, he **consciously deleted Buru's surname**. Given *jewang-ungi's* central preoccupation with lineage this decision was likely to diminish the independent Buyeo-Goguryeo tradition and thereby enhance Dangun as the single common ancestor. Whilst this hypothesis presumes some 'tampering' with sources, the omission of a character by Yi would not be as great or unlikely as the inventing of new names by Kim Busik.

2.7.3 Baekje

Baekje is described as being founded on former Byeonhan territory with the kingship descended from Goguryeo founder, Jumong.

Similar to Goguryeo, the appraisal of the dynastic lineage is positive with only the last king, Wija (義慈王 r.641-60), named and portrayed as decadent.

(系將蘭正衍芬芳 棄與松竹同苞茂)

2.7.3.1 Baekje foundation story

In *jewang-ungi* the traditional Baekje founder, Onjo son of Jumong, flees south from Goguryeo together with his older brother Eunjo (殷祚) and mother, upon the arrival of their legitimate half-brother, Yuri. This narrative is similar to the first two of three variant foundation accounts included in the SS: the only difference is the name of Eunjo, given in SS as Biryu (沸流), and omission of the associated story of Biryu attempting to establish a state on the coast at Michuhol (彌邨忽) but failing due to environmental conditions.\(^\text{16}\)

3. *jewang-ungi* as an archetype of the Orthodox Narrative

Taken in its entirety, *jewang-ungi* provides a near maximized archetype of the ON: its poetic brevity ensures that only items deemed most important were included, and these can consequently be seen to form the core components of orthodox historiography, including the aforementioned 'articles of civilization' which remained largely unchanged through until the modern era.

The characteristics of the ON distilled in *jewang-ungi* can be summarized as follows:

**Polities**
- Mention of nearly all polities historiographically regarded as 'Korean' including: the pre-state entities of Okjeo, Ye, Maek, and the historical Samhan; the peripheral continental states of Buyeo and Balhae; and the foreign entities of usurper Wi Man and the Han Commanderies.

\(^{16}\) For a discussion of the SS Baekje variants, see Best 2006:11.
Notable omissions are: Jolbon, **Gaya/Garak**, Tamna (Jeju island), and Canghai-jun commandery.

**Three eras of ancient Joseon: Dangun, Gija and Wi Man**
- Equal inclusion of Dangun and Gija without any hint of conflict due to the 164 year space between.

**Balance between continental Sinic and indigenous peninsula cultures.**
- This is apparent both in the larger structure of the work being divided between Chinese and Korean history, and within the Korean section which gives equal mention to Choe Chiwon and Uisang as promoters of continental Sinic culture, and to Seol Chong and Wonhyo as indigenous innovators.

**Neutral treatment of Buddhism and Confucianism**
- Confucian scholar Seol Chong is the son of Buddhist master Wonhyo.
- However, noticeably no mention of Buddhist personages are made in the Goryeo section except for the esoteric monk Doseon (道窟 827–98) who is included in Taejo’s progenitor myth as a servant of the Jiri-san celestial monarch Seongmo (聖母 'divine mother').

**Samhan pluralism**
- All Three Kingdoms are discussed in the same ‘orthodox’ order as found in SS - and presumably Gu-Sanguk-sa - with their respective foundation stories.
- As well as Silla, both the Goguryeo and Baekje dynastic lineages are positively appraised until their final rulers.

**Cultural Silla bias**
- Despite this, there is no mention of Goguryeo or Baekje personages (heroes, Buddhist masters) other than in their foundation stories.

**3.1 Differences to SS**
SS is itself a source text for *Jewang-ungi* and so they are broadly complementary. In contrast to *Jewang-ungi*, SS is an orthodox Chinese style structured prose history and whilst it treats the Three Kingdoms in parallel, it is not a supradynastic survey. Being many times longer than *Jewang-ungi*, it naturally contains detailed narrative events and many additional personages.

Given the title and nature of the work, SS need not be criticized for leaving out

---

17) I use the term ‘Samhan pluralism’ as explicated by Breuker 2010.
detailed treatments of the earlier states such as OJ, Buyeo or the Samhan: these, and lesser polities contemporary to the Three Kingdoms are all at least attested somewhere within the text. In contrast to *jewang-ungi*, Gaya/Garak/Geumgwan (加耶伽落金官) is also included, although it is denied independent chronicle treatment.

Whilst SS attests ancient Joseon, the most pronounced absence - relative to all subsequent histories - is Dangun. Although outside of the temporal scope of the Three Kingdoms, it is notable the name does not appear even once; by contrast Gija is mentioned four times and Wi Man just once in the *Pyo* (表) section.

Balhae, similarly, is attested in SS several times but more summarily even than Gaya, and denied treatment as a successor 'Korean' state to Goguryeo: its ethnic origins are acknowledged only within the Choe Chiwon biography.

[SS:列傳:崔致遠: "The remnants of Goguryeo regrouped and moved north to below Taebaek mountain (太白山 aka Baekdu-san): the name of [their] country became Balhae" 高句麗殘孽類聚, 北依太白山下, 項號為渤海]
The overall Silla cultural bias is also apparent in SS but at the same time several personages of Goguryeo and Baekje are positively portrayed in the biography section including respective military heroes Eulji Mundeok and Gyebae, so arguably SS is not as expressly biased as *jewang-ungi*.

3.2 Differences to SY

Being closely contemporary to *jewang-ungi*, SY is not itself a source but rather would have had access to the same sources, including *Gu-Samguk-sa* and SS. Despite its title, SY is more 'dynasty-transcending' than SS and it contains important attestations of all 'Korean' polities including OJ, Buyeo and Balhae but lacks strict chronology or historical narrative that would make it a consolidated survey.

Concerning the Han Commanderies, SY terms the post 82 BCE consolidation as 'Two Fu' (二府), naming them as Pingzhou-dudufu and Dongbu-duweifu (平州都督府:東部都尉府). Although these terms involve anachronism and conflation, and are absent from both SS and *jewang-ungi*, the notion of the Two Fu became an integral part of the ON, only becoming subject to rejection by late C18th Silhak scholars An Jeongbok and Yu Deukgong.

SY includes the three Joseon eras of Dangun, Gija and Wi Man, distinguishing between 'Old Joseon' - subtitled 'Wanggeom Joseon' - of Dangun, to which Gija is appended, and a subsequent 'Wi Man Joseon'.

Differences in the Dangun account have been discussed already above, the most
important being the bear and tiger story and the differences in dating, such that Gija’s coming appears to displace Dangun.

A superficial difference in SY from Jewang-ungi and all other sources (both earlier Chinese and later Korean), is the use of alternative characters in the rendering of the names of Dangun (檀君 > SY 檜君) and Wi Man (衛滿 > SY 魏滿). Whilst the original form of Wi Man is attested long before in the Chinese SGZ (specifically the Weitüe extracts in the “Han” account), the earliest surviving attestations of Dangun are the Korean SY and Jewang-ungi accounts. Given the example of Wi Man, it may be presumed that Jewang-ungi is more likely to have followed the same ‘spelling’ as their shared source: the Jewang-ungi Dangun dan 檜 (Ch. tan 'Pteroceltis tatarinowii') is also attested as a phonogram in earlier Chinese sources, most notably in the name of Xianbei founder Tanshihui (檀石槐 attested in SGZ and HHS). SY also has 'Wanggeom-seong' (王俊城) instead of 'Wangheom-seong' (王險城) as attested again in Shiji, but in this instance SY is preceded by SS also using 'Wanggeom-seong' reminding us that the SY variations are not necessarily simple ‘mistakes’ but more likely reflect already established variant traditions.

3.3 Continuity between the Samhan and Three Kingdoms
Whilst Jewang-ungi is ambiguous, both SS and SY explicitly correlate Mahan, Byeonhan and Jinhan with Goguryeo, Baekje and Silla respectively.

3.4 Information unique to Jewang-ungi
The only two details present in Jewang-ungi not attested in other surviving sources are both found in the Dangun myth. These are the identification of Asadal-san with Guwol-san and the temporal 164 year gap between Dangun and Gija.

Whilst conflicting with less reliable locations of Asadal suggested by SY (falsely citing the Chinese Shanhaijing 山海經), the Guwol-san location of Hwanghae-do province compliments the SY’s association of Taebaek-san (the mountain to which Hwan’ung descends) with Myohyang-san (妙香山) in Pyeong’an-do, which is otherwise unidentified in Jewang-ungi. Assuming that the SY’s interlinear annotations are original to the time of its compilation, the fact that SY omits the Asadal > Guwol-san identification whilst Jewang-ungi omits the SY’s Taebaek-san > Myohyang-san identification, demonstrates both the textual independence of the two accounts, but that they were equally drawn from contemporary local traditions relating to the Dangun cult that were apparently thriving in the north of the peninsula.
3.5 Evaluation
In terms of content, *Jewang-ungi* is fundamentally conservative and non-revisionist: even the inclusion of the Hwan’ung-Dangun myth can be seen to have been based on already extant sources and established tradition, though not necessarily of any great antiquity.

In modern times, both SY and *Jewang-ungi* - particularly pertaining to the Hwan’ung-Dangun accounts - are typically contextualized against the background contemporary to their authoring, that of the national identity crisis engendered by the Mongol invasions. Whilst this may well have been a subconscious motivation for the compilation and creation of these works respectively, in both cases they clearly drew from earlier textual sources including SS and the *Gu-Samguk-sa*. Not least because it is the only surviving ’supradynastic’ survey, the historical outlook of *Jewang-ungi* may therefore be taken not just as being of the C13th but simultaneously one more broadly representative of *accumulated* mid to late Goryeo historiographic tradition.
[Chapter 2] (Late Goryeo?) Early Joseon innovations to the Orthodox Narrative

As will be demonstrated in later comparison to Yu Deukgong’s *Isib’ildo-hoegosi* (c.1792 二十一都懷古詩), the basic scheme and core components of the ON, as they had been formulated by the late C13th, remained remarkably stable through until the modern era. However, concerning the narrative of Early Korea, certain innovations did occur. The most significant of which pertain to the Dangun story and are first attested in the two C15th works of *Eungje-si* (應製詩 c.1402) by Yangchon Gwon Geun (陽村 權近 1352-1409) and *Eungjesi-ju* (應製詩註 c.1462) by Geun’s grandson, Gwon Ram (權ยาง 1416-65): there is also an intervening poetic work known as the *Dongguk-yeokdae-se’nyeonga* (東國歷代世年歌) authored by Gwon Je (權捷 aka Gwon Do 權蹈 b.1387) who was Geun’s son and Ram’s father. In terms of categorization, at least the first two works are best understood as being semi-official historiography: all three were in any event written by three generations of a clan occupying the highest echelons of government, however, *Eungjesi-ju* can also be seen as marking a transition into a more private ‘auteur’ mode of historical inquiry.

Concerning their historiographic significance, *Eungje-si* potentially contains the first attempt to rationalize Dangun’s supernatural longevity, whilst *Eungjesi-ju* incorporates a newly innovated story of Dangun’s son, Buru (夫樓), participating in the Xia king Yu’s (夏禹) gathering of vassals at Tushan (塗山) mountain. *Eungjesi-ju* also contains some of the first critical comments on historical geography, a topic which emerged as an important area of interest for the subsequent Silhak scholars and has gone on to become central to the modern discoursce on Early Korea up to the present day.

1. *Eungje-si* 應製詩

Famously composed by the literatus statesman-diplomat Yangchon Gwon Geun in 1396 and presented to the first Ming emperor Taizu (明太祖 1368-98), successfully placating a diplomatic stand-off over perceived insult in earlier communications, the 24 octave stanza work *Eungje-si* consists of three parts composed on different days: 8 stanzas, two of which are introductory and six describing the journey to China: 10 stanzas giving a historical overview of Korea, and 6 recording the Chinese hospitality received.\(^\text{18}\) It was first published in Korea in 1402 together with the *Yuzhishi* (御製詩 古. Eoje-si) gifted in return by the

---

18) Source text is found in Gwon Geun’s collected writings, *Yangchon-jip* vol1 (陽村集-陽村先生文集卷之一-應製詩), available online at the Database of Korea Classics <http://db.itkc.or.kr/>.  
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emperor, and published again in 1438, an indication of its popular recognition.

The middle section consists of the following titled stanzas:

[Pentasyllabic octaves]
"Dong’i lord [at] the dawn of time [i.e. Dangun]" 始古觀開東夷主
"View of Japan 相望日本
[Heptasyllabic octaves]
"Geumgang-san” 金剛山
"Geography of the new capital [i.e. Seoul]" 新京地理
[Heptasyllabic octaves]
"Jinhan” 辰韓
"Mahan” 馬韓
"Byeonhan” 升韓
"Silla” 新羅
[Heptasyllabic octaves]
"Tamna” 膽羅 [Jeju island]
"Daedong-gang” 大同江

1.1 Partial rationalization of the Dangun era
Dangun is presented in the boldly titled stanza "Dong’i lord [at] the dawn of time". A brief annotation explains, "In the past, a semi-divine human (神人) descended to below the dan tree, then the county’s people made him [their] ruler, and so he was named Dangun. This was the first Wuchen year of Emperor Yao."

("昔降檀木下，國人立以爲主，因號檀君。時唐堯元年戊辰也")

The eight lines are:

[I have] heard it said that in primeval times
Dangun descended to beside a tree:
Becoming monarch, he ruled the land of the Eastern Country.
[This] was at the time of Emperor Yao-tian:
It is not known how many generations succeeded [him]
In years it surpassed a thousand.
Later came Gija’s dynasty:
It used the same name of Joseon.

Most significant in this brief account is the explicit suggestion that Dangun himself did not rule for more than a millennium, but that there was dynastic succession.\(^{19}\) Thus despite maintaining the initial supernatural descension aspect, and despite lacking further details, the era of Dangun Joseon is, to a certain degree, de-mythologized.

---

1.2 Giija’s capital, Tamna, and the Samhan
Two other separate points of interest in Eungje-si are the inclusion of a stanza devoted to Tamna (Jeju island) and explicit locating of Giija’s capital at Pyeongyang on the Daedong-gang river.

Tamna is first attested in SS but absent from both SY and Jewang-ungi. As above, there is also a stanza on ‘Japan’ but treating it as a foreign country described in derogatory terms owing to the pirate raids the peninsula had suffered since late Goryeo.

Wi Man is not included in Eungje-si so it cannot be known for certain if Gwon Geun would have further located Wanggeom-seong at Pyeongyang but this would be the natural assumption.20) Similarly the preceeding Dangun capital is not made clear.

Finally, in a stanza in the first section of the work titled "[On] the road passing the Western Capital [i.e. Pyeongyang]" (道經西京) the term Samhan is used in a context denoting the entirety of Korean territory ("三韓疆域永爲藩 The Samhan territory, an eternal vassal state"). This is reinforced in the first line of the "Byeonhan" stanza, describing the 'Eastern Country' (i.e. Korea) as having been divided into three parts, by context implying the historical Three Han of which Byeonhan was one ("東國三分際").

1.3 Goryeo
Although detailed analysis is beyond the scope of this study, it should also be noted that as the earliest surviving 'post-Goryeo popular dynasty-transcending work' – however brief it may be – Eungje-si contains the first 'unofficial' coverage of the 'rise and fall' of Goryeo, naturally justifying the establishment of the new Joseon dynasty. The summary treatment occurs at the beginning of the work in the first stanza, "Death of the Wang [dynasty [i.e. Goryeo]] capital" (王京作古) which is both reminiscent to that of the Goguryeo and Baekje passages in Jewang-ungi – namely that the dynasty declined and the Way was eventually lost ("維持五百年 衰微終失道 興廢實關") – and also anticipates the elegiac tone of Yu Deukgong’s Isib’ildo-hoe-gosi with subsequent lines lamenting the ruination of the former capital through which Gwon Geun travelled on the way to China.

The Wang clan established the eastern frontier [state]
Continuing for five hundred years.

20) In the Dongguksa-ryak (東國史略), an orthodox prose history also authored by Gwon subsequent to Eungje-si, Giija’s capital, Wanggeom-seong is indeed identified as Pyeongyang and is captured by Wi Man after crossing the Pae-su, identified as the Daedong-gang river.
They declined and eventually lost the Way.  
The rise and fall [of dynasties] truly depends on heaven.  
The desolated fortress remains  
The [once] thriving state has already relocated  
Coming [here] my sighs deepen  
The tall trees are enveloped in cold smoke  

2. Yeokdae-se’nyeon-ga 歷代世年歌

Yeokdae-se’nyeon-ga is an official, annotated poetic work commissioned by King Sejong in 1436. Similar to Jewang-ungi, Yeokdae-se’nyeon-ga is divided into two sections, the first takes the same title and recounts Chinese history: the second, titled Dongguk-se’nyeon-ga (東國世年歌), narrates Korean history to the end of the Goryeo dynasty.21) The Chinese section is not original, but rather consists of the Lidai-shinian-ge (歷代世年歌) by Song historian Zeng Xianzhi (曾先之 - compiler of 古今歷代十八史略 1297) augmented with annotations by Yun Hoe (尹淮 1380-1436), and appended with verses covering the Yuan period by Linjiang Zhang Meihe (臨江 張美和). The Korean section, meanwhile, was compiled afresh by ijo-panseo Gwon Do (吏曹判書 權蹈) and consists of self-annotated heptasyllabic verse.

Gwon Do had participated in the compilation of the Goryeo-sa and would go on to be one of the chief compilers of Yongbi’eocheon-ga (龍飛御天歌 1447). Like the latter work, Dongguk-se’nyeon-ga is also an official history designed for popular consumption which was consequently distributed to officials: in content the sections detailing ancient history are clearly influenced by Jewang-ungi but demonstrate some minor changes. A summary of key points follows.

- The opening line of Dongguk-se’nyeon-ga is identical to that of Jewang-ungi, "East of the Liao [river] is another sky and land" (遼東別有一乾坤) whilst another two lines describing the Samhan are also directly borrowed, "They each called themselves states and invaded one another: there were around seventy, how could they [all] be verified?" (各自稱國相侵凌 數餘七十何足徵).
- Hwan’inn and Hwan’ung are absent: instead Dangun himself descends to below a dan tree (檀木) and establishes Joseon.
- The capital is Pyeongyang, later moved to Baek’ak: the latter is given no geographical identification (perhaps because it was a toponym still in use?)
- Having ‘enjoyed the state’ (享國) for 1,048 years, in the 8th year of Shang emperor Wuding (商武丁), sexagenary Eulmi (乙未 [c.1225]) year, Dangun enters Asadal becoming a god.
- Asadal is identified as Guwol-san in Munhwa-hyeon (文化縣), Hwanghae-do

21) Source text consulted is a Seoul National University Kyujanggak facsimile dated 1981.
where a shrine (廟) is still located.
• Similar to Jewang-ungi, Gi-ja arrives 164 years later
• A newly attested detail in Korean sources is his personal name given as Seoyeo (Seq Ch. Xuyu - see Chapter 3).
• Includes the Two Fu à la SY.
• North Buyeo named but without further details.
• Biryu (沸流) is named and located in Seongcheon-gun (城川郡), Pyeong’an-do.
• Includes an abridged version of the Goguryeo progenitor legend.
  • Buyeo king Geumwa discovers Habaek’s (河伯) daughter, Yuhwa, south of Taebaek-san.
  • Yuhwa recounts she went with a man who said he was the son of the celestial emperor.
  • She is taken back by Geumwa and conceives through sunlight giving birth to an egg.
  • No mention of Buru or Geumwa’s parentage, or East Buyeo.
• No mention of Balhae.

3. Eungjesi-ju 應製詩註
Compiled by Gwon Geun’s grandson, Gwon Ram (權顯 1416-65), Eungjesi-ju contains lengthier annotations that take lines from the Eungje-si merely as starting points for Gwon Ram’s own treatment of historical topics.\(^{22}\)

3.1.1 Augmented Dangun and Buru account
In his annotation to the "Dong’i lord [at] the dawn of time [i.e. Dangun]" (始古開闢東夷主) stanza, Gwon Ram presents an important redux of the Dangun myth notable for synthesizing elements from both the SY and Jewang-ungi versions, as well as incorporating a new Buru episode.

Beginning with the Hwan’ung descension myth, the wording appears closest to the SY account but is slightly briefer: it similarly cites gogi (古記) ‘ancient records’. The only significant detail omitted is the hong’ik-ingan phrase: as a consequence the corresponding sentence is reformulated to say that Hwan’ung wanted to ‘descend and become human’. In contrast to Jewang-ungi, the bear and tiger story is included and is a close paraphrase to SY. There is also no mention of Dangun as the common ancestor as found in Jewang-ungi.

However, Eungjesi-ju uses the tree-radical dan character (檀) for Dangun’s name following Jewang-ungi convention rather than the SY earth-radical dan (壇) variant. When mentioning the ancient Joseon capital elsewhere, he names it with

---

\(^{22}\) Source text used is a facsimile available from the National Library of Korea website <http://www.nl.go.kr/> titled 《應製詩註》解題, edited by Gwon Tae-eok (權泰植) 1982.
the standard Korean variant of Wanggeom-seong (王險城), first explicitly attested in SY, rather than the Shiji’s Wangheom-seong (王險城).23

Following narrative details that Dangun was born and established the state of Joseon with its capital first at Pyeongyang-seong and later Baek’ak, the following new passage appears:

"[Dangun] married the daughter of Biseogap [and] Habaek, who bore a child named Buru, and who became the East Buyeo king. To the [Xia king] Yu’s gathering of vassals [at] Tushan (塗山), Dangun sent his son Buru there.” 西岬河伯之生子曰夫夫 是為東扶餘王 至禹會諸侯塗山 檀君遣子夫夫朝焉

This same new episode also appears in the contemporary Sejong-Sillok account.

The Eunjesi-ju account then switches back to Dangun withdrawing to Asadal and the arrival of Gija 164 years after.

"Dangun ruled throughout the Yu and Xia (虞·夏). In the 8th year of Shang emperor Wuding (商武丁), Eulmi (乙末 {c.1225}), he entered (八 sic. 入) Asadal-san and changed, becoming a god... He lived/ruled (享 'enjoyed') 1,048 years."

These specific details including the choice of words - that he "entered" (入) Asadal, and "enjoyed" (享) a certain number of years - as well as the 164 year gap before Gija are all similar to the preceding Dongguk-se'n'yeon-ga and in turn closer to lines in Jewang-ungi rather than SY.

[Jewang-ungi] "於殷虎丁八年乙末 入阿斯達山為神 (今九月山也 一名弓忽 又名三祠堂猶在。) 享國一千二十八”

In a similar act of synthesis, Gwon Ram gives Pyeong’an-do Myohyang-san for the Taebaek-san mountain (to which Hwan’ung descends) à la SY, and Hwanghiae-do Gu wol-san for Asadal-san, à la Jewang-ungi and, for the latter, similarly notes there still to be a shrine (廟) there.

3.1.2 Significance of the Buru legend
The new passage on Buru can be understood to serve two important 'linkage' functions: Dangun’s fathering of Buru links the Dangun myth to the longer established Dongmyeong/Jumong ‘legendarium’ of Buyeo-Goguryeo, whilst Buru’s

23) The SS describes Pyeongyang as having formerly been the "capital of seon'ın Wanggeom" (SS "平壤者本仙人王儉之宅也") thus attesting the diety Wanggeom prior to SY, but never explicitly names the Joseon capital itself Wanggeom-seong, though nor does it attest the original Chinese form Wangheom-seong.
participation in Xia king Yu’s gathering of vassals at Tushan (first attested in *Chunqiu-zuozhuan* 春秋左傳:昭公:昭公四年) in turn links ancient Korea to ancient China.

Dangun having a son also contributes to the rationalization of Dangun by implying the establishment of a dynastic lineage, even if Buru becomes the king of East Buyeo rather than Joseon.

Perhaps both at the time, and certainly in the modern era, Buru’s attendance at Tushan is seen as pushing back Korea’s *sadae* (事大 'serving the great') relationship with China to the near earliest epoch. However, it may also be seen to represent a more nativist, pro-active form of engagement with Sinic civilization that predates the Gija legend wherein Korea and the Dangun lineage are merely passive.

3.1.3. Origins for the Dangun-Buru father-son legend
Whilst Buru’s visit to Tushan represents a 'new' innovation unattested in the surviving Goryeo sources, the idea of his fathering by Dangun appears not as invention but rather the crystallization of a tradition already detectable in SY and *Jewang-ungi*. Touched upon already in the discussion of Habaek above, the evidence for Buru’s father is summarized in Table 6 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extant source:</th>
<th>Samguk-yusa</th>
<th>Jewang-ungi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attributed source:</td>
<td>Gogi 古記 'old record'</td>
<td>Dangun-gi 瓊君記</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original text:</td>
<td>&quot;...自稱名解憂嘉生子名解ię以解為氏焉&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;君與西河河伯之女要親有產子名曰夫婦&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buru’s parentage:</td>
<td>Hae Mosu 解憂漱</td>
<td>Implied Dangun and an unspecified daughter of Seoha Habaek 西河 河伯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional information:</td>
<td>Surnamed Hae 解</td>
<td>Half-brother to Jumong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variant of bu character:</td>
<td>Buru 扶餘 Buyeo 扶餘</td>
<td>Buru 夫婦 Buyeo 扶餘</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Disambiguation of Buru’s paternity.

- "Implied Dangun" because in both cases the wording leaves out the explicit subject.
- "Unspecified daughter" because we know from SS and *Dongmyeongwang-pyeon* that Habaek had three daughters of whom Yuhwa (柳花) gave birth to the Jumong egg conceived with Hae Mosu.
- The 'list of sovereigns' (王歷篇) placed at the beginning of SY explicitly...
records Jumong as the son of Dangun but it is not clear that this is original to the SY compilation.

- Hae Mosu and Buru are unattested in both the Gwanggaeto Stele text and all Chinese sources: they first appear in the SS version of the Jumong myth.
- SS and Dongmyeongwang-pyeon contain no mention of Buru’s parentage.

Clearly, at the time of SY and Jewang-ungi there was still some conflict in the disambiguation of Buru and Jumong’s respective parentage arising from: the Jumong Goguryeo myth being a duplicating derivative of the original Buyeo myth, the introduction of the named personages of Hae Mosu and Buru, and finally the need to combine this with Dangun. It is possible that this was already resolved as according to the now lost Dangun-gi/bongi source(s) cited by SY and Jewang-ungi but the first unambiguous attestation surviving today is Eungjesi-ju.

3.2 The Three Joseon capitals all = Pyeongyang

Gwon Ram’s annotation to the Eungje-si stanza "[On] the road passing the Western Capital" (道經西京), identifies Pyeongyang-bu as the capital of all eras of ancient Joseon. Gwon Ram uses the term ‘Three Joseon’ (三朝鮮) referring to ‘Former Joseon’ of Dangun, ‘Later Joseon’ of Gija, and separately ‘Wiman Joseon’. Later Joseon is also named ‘Gi-guk’ (箕國): it might even be a compound ‘Later Joseon-Giguk’.

The historical accounts of Gija and Wi Man follow the ON. Gija is enfeoffed with Joseon by Zhou king Wu before going there: the figures for the Gi dynasty of 928 years and the 41 generations all match Jewang-ungi.

Wi Man’s capital is named as Wanggeom-seong (王倹城) using the nativist spelling as first attested in SY rather than the original Shiji spelling of Wanggeom-seong (王倹城). Following orthodoxy, this capital is replaced by the Lelang-jun commandery and later becomes the Goguryeo capital of Pyeongyang during the reign of King Jangsu (長壽王). This information conflicts however with Gwon’s separate discussion of the Han Commanderies (see below).

Gwon identifies several contemporary sites associated with the ancient period: a ‘Gi-seong’ (箕城) on Noyang-san (魯陽山) ‘mountain’ of Jin-san/Geumsu-san (鎮山·錦繡山) overlooking the Daedong-gang, close to which is supposed to be the layout of the ‘well-field’ (井田 - first attested in Goryeo-sa geography)\(^\text{24}\) type field system Gija introduced: Gija’s grave and a shrine: King Dongmyeong’s grave.

\(^\text{24}\) The well-field system is attested in Mencius and was believed to have been the land ownership system of Western Zhou. 孟子-滕文公上: "卿以下必有井田，圭田五十畝。餘夫二十五畝，死徒無出卿，無田同井，出入相友，守望相助，疾病相扶持，則百姓親睦。方里而井，井九百畝，其中為公田，八家皆私百畝，同養公田，公事畢，然後致治私事，所以別野人也。"
on Yong-san (龍山), colloquially called Jinju-myo (真珠墓 'true pearl tomb'),
together with a shrine which also has shrines for Dangun and Gija beside it:
Yeongmyeong-sa (永明寺) on Geumsu-san (錦繡山) which was King Dongmyeong's
Gujeogung-sa (九極宮寺) temple, below which was the Girin-gul cave (麒麟窟) and
Jocheon-seok (朝天石) boulder, both associated with Dongmyeong’s supernatural
ascension(s) to heaven. However, Gwon rejects the Dongmyeong related sites on
the grounds that the first Goguryeo capitals, Jolbon and Gungnae-seong, were
located a significance distance from Pyeongyang.

3.3 Jumong myth
_Eungjiesi-ju_ contains a version of the Jumong myth included in the annotation to
a line from one of the Ming emperor’s _Yuzhishi_ (御製詩) stanzas: alongside
_Dongmyeongwang-pyeon_ it constitutes one of the longest surviving renditions of
the Jumong story. In its narrative content, it is fully maximized, containing all of
the same elements as _Dongmyeongwang-pyeon_ with the single addition that at
the start, Buyeo king Hae Buru is now explicitly described as the son of Dangun.
Hae Mosu remains as the celestial father of Jumong but there is no comment on
a connection between the shared surname, so Dangun and Hae Mosu are
together treated as separate divine personages, and respective fathers to the
Buyeo and Goguryeo rulers.

In terms of the specific language, the _Eungjiesi-ju_ account represents a synthesis
of all attested sources: whilst primarily closest to _Dongmyeongwang-pyeon_ albeit
slightly condensed, certain occasional variant words and phrases appear to be
variously taken from the SS or potentially even the much earlier _Weishu_ (c.554)
version (although those characters similar to _Weishu_ are the same as SS). To
briefly illustrate this, the following are quotes of the equivalent narrative
passages as found in each of the sources.

_Weishu_: "A Buyeo person, on account of [Jumong's] being born [in a manner
unlike] humans [thought Jumong] would have treacherous intentions and so
beseeched [the king] to get rid of [him]. The king did not listen. He ordered
[Jumong] to look after the horses"

夫餘人以朱蒙非人所生 將有異志 請除之 王不聽 命之養馬...

SS: "The eldest son, Daeso, said to the king, “Jumong was born [in a manner
unlike] humans: as a person he is brave. If we do not quickly devise a plan, I
am afraid there will later be trouble. [I] beseech [your majesty] to get rid of
[him].” The king did not listen. He had [Jumong] look after the horses..."

其長子帶素言於王曰 朱蒙非人所生 其為人也勇 若不早圖 恐有後患 請除之 王不聽 使之養馬...
**Dongmyeongwang-pyeon:**

"Daeso (帶素) said to the king, "Jumong is a divine and valiant man (士) and his countenance (瞻視) is extraordinary. If we do not quickly devise a plan we will certainly have trouble later."

帶素言於王曰朱蒙者神勇之士 瞻視非常若不早圖 必有後患

一君往牧馬 The king ordered [Jumong] to go and look after the horses:
欲以試厥志 he meant to test his intentions.
自思天之孫 [Jumong] thought by himself that for the grandson of heaven
靡牧良可恥 being a horse herder was truly shameful.
捫心常竊導 Caressing his heart he always reproached himself.
吾生不如死 "My life is no better than death."
意將往南土 He intended to go to lands south
入國入城市 [and] establish a country and citadel.
為緣慈母在 [but because] the mother he loved was [here].
難別誠未易 it truly was not easy to separate.

The king had Jumong herd the horses. He meant to test his will. Inside himself Jumong harbored anguish (恨). He said to his mother, "I am the grandson of the Celestial Emperor, herding horses for someone else my life is hardly better than death. I want to go to the southern lands and establish a state (國家) [but because] you are [here] I dare not act as I wish (不敢自專)."

王使朱蒙牧馬 欲試其意 朱蒙內自懊恨 謂母曰 我是天之孫為人牧馬生不如死 欲往南土母在不敢自專...

**Eungjesi-ju:** "Daeso said to the king, "Jumong was born [in a manner unlike] humans: he also divine and brave. If we do not quickly devise a plan, I am afraid there will later be trouble." The king did not listen. He had [Jumong] look after the horses. Jumong was angry and told his mother, "I am the grandson of the Celestial Emperor, herding horses for someone else my life is hardly better than death. I want to go to the southern lands [but because] you are [here] I dare not act as I wish (不敢自專)."

帶素言於王曰朱蒙非人所生且亦神勇若不早圖怨有後患王不聽使之養馬 朱蒙恚謂母曰我是天孫為人牧馬生不如死 欲往南土創立邦家 母在不敢自專...

It is hard to imagine Gwon Ram actively substituting the odd character or phrase from these three surviving sources, so either the common variations are coincidence of paraphrasing, or involved the influence of an additional source: this latter is unlikely to have been the Gu-Samguk-sa because Eungjesi-ju contains differences to Dongmyeongwang-pyeon which is itself usually regarded as directly quoting the Gu-Samguk-sa. Unfortunately Gwon does not give any references.
3.4 Historical Geography
3.4.1 Han Commanderies historical geography

However rudimentary, *Eungjesi-ju* is the earliest surviving privately authored text to contain a discussion on the location of the Han Commanderies which is included in another annotation to the *Yuzhishi* (御製詩) stanzas. Whilst naming all four commanderies, Gwon discusses only Lelang and Xuantu. Even whilst being a product of conflating later sources, the annotation is notable for asserting continental locations.

Lelang

Gwon cites the SS Silla geography treatise, in turn referencing the *Hanshu* and HHS, describing Lelang-jun as located 5,000 *li* northeast of Luoyang (洛陽), belonging to Youzhou (幽州) and formally having been the country of Chaoxian/Joseon. This, he notes, conflicts with the Goguryeo geography treatise which, referencing the *Tangshu*, equates Lelang with Pyeongyang. Rather than support the latter more orthodox peninsula location, Gwon suggests that the *Tangshu* mistakes modern Pyeongyang for the location of the earlier Goguryeo capital of Gungnae-seong (國內城) which he asserts should be located somewhere to the north of the Yalu river.

He then cites three conflicting references to Lelang’s location: the SS Goguryeo Annal account of Prince Hodong (好童) marrying the daughter of Lelang king Choe Ri (崔理) enabling a surprise attack in 32 CE in which Lelang is described as being south of Goguryeo (then centered at Gungnae-seong) and therefore likely to be Pyeongyang: the c.246 account of Youzhou *cishi* Guanqiu Jian’s (幽州刺史母丘儉) invasion of Goguryeo within which, Gwon asserts, Lelang could not have been Pyeongyang; and finally the SS Baekje Annal account of Onjo in which Lelang is described as being to the east of Baekje which would be impossible if it were Pyeongyang.

He also notes that the Silla capital, Gyeongju, was called Lelang but rejects that it was ever a part of the commandery’s territory.

Gwon fails to consider the possibility of there having been more than one location of the Lelang polity over time and limits himself to the explanation that the Han and Tang histories, pertaining to Korean geography, were based on transmitted hearsay (傳聞懸說) accounts and therefore unreliable: he further makes the complaint that in his own contemporary period these conflicting records are simply reproduced (倣) without anyone daring to make an effort at resolving them: such a project would not be fully realized until the endeavour of Jeong Yak-yong (see Chapter 4).
Xuantu
Gwon locates the Xuantu commandery in Fushun (撫順), Guide-zhou (貴德州), 80 li northeast of Shenyang; no reference is given but at the start of the annotation he mentions Liaodong-zhi (遼東誌) gazette which would predate the surviving Liaodong-zhi (遼東志 first completed c.1488).

3.4.2 Goguryeo
Gwon relies on the SS for his discussions of Goguryeo geography, thus making orthodox identifications such as the Pae-su river being the Daedong-gang and the Sal-su river as the Cheongcheon-gang.

3.5 Tamna (Jeju)
The Eungjesi-ju annotation to Tamna contains one of the earliest surviving renditions of the three divine eulna (三乙那) beings who marry Japanese princesses. This story is first attested in the near contemporary Goryeo-sa. Similar to the Jumong account, the Eungjesi-ju version of the Tamna legend contains some variation, either the product of writing, or more likely indicative of a preceding source, however, both the Goryeo-sa and Eungjesi-ju cite only gogi (古記) 'old records'.
[Chapter 3] Mid Joseon innovations to the Orthodox Narrative

Dynastic historiography

Whilst archetypal to the notion of 'official history' (正史) the Goryeo-sa (高麗史 1451) and Joseon dynasty Sillok (實錄 'veritable records') histories contain some of the first attestations of additional details indicative of the status of Korea's legendarium particularly as pertaining to Dangun and Gija which should be briefly reviewed below. Table 7 gives the number of attestations found in each source offering a very cursory overview. (These are the total number of occurrences of the names, rather than the number of separate entries which would therefore be lower.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>source</th>
<th>Dangun</th>
<th>Wanggeom</th>
<th>Gija</th>
<th>Buru</th>
<th>Mosu</th>
<th>Jumong</th>
<th>Onjo</th>
<th>(Bak 朴) Hyeokgeose</th>
<th>Eulna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taejo Sillok</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeongjong Sillok</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taejong Sillok</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sejong Sillok of which:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orye 五禮</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goryeo-sa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goryeosa-jeol'yo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munjong Sillok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danjong Sillok</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sejo Sillok</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Attestations of legendary personages in early Joseon dynastic histories.

1. Taejo Sillok

In the Taejo Sillok two of the three mentions of Dangun are in fact from Gwon Geun's Eungje-si and the accompanying Ming emperor’s Yuzhishi poems. The remaining attestation dates to 1392.8.11. occurring in a memorial to the king presented by the minister of rites urging reform of official sacrifices to guardian spirits and arguing that many should be abolished due to their heterodox/pagan nature: sacrifices to Dangun and Gija held at Pyeongyang, however, are to be maintained. In giving the justification, Dangun is explicitly described as the 'first ruler of the east (i.e. Korea) to have received heaven’s mandate', and Gija as the 'ruler who first enlightened [the nation]'.

[Taejo Sillok 太祖實錄1卷:1年(1392)8月11日(庚申): “朝鮮檀君，東方始受命之主，箕子，
Thus Dangun is described as the first legitimate ruler but no ethnic consciousness is attached.

2. Goryeo-sa (1451) attestations

Whilst otherwise disinterested in the state’s pluralist mythology, the geography treatises of the Goryeo-sa provide new information regarding the development of the Dangun tradition.

2.1 Ganhwa Island

The section on Ganhwa-do island includes the first mention of the Chamseong-dan (星壇) altar site located on the summit of Mani-san (摩利山 southern Ganhwa-do), said to be the site at which Dangun performed sacrifices, and separately a legend of Dangun’s 'three children' - unnamed - having constructed the 'Samnang-seong' (三郎城 'three lad fortress') on Jeondeung-san (傳燈山 also southern Gakhwa-do, c.5km northeast of Mani-san).

[Goryeo-sa 卷五十六:卷第十:地理:楊廣道:江華縣:沿革: “本高句麗句口郡【一云甲比古次】，在海中，直貞州之西南，通津縣之西。新羅景德王，改為海口郡，高麗初，更今名。顯宗九年，置縣令，高宗十九年，避蒙古兵入都，陞為郡，號江都，三十七年，築中城。周回二千九百六十餘間。元宗元年，復遷松都【府東十里松嶺里，有故宮基。】。忠烈王時，倀於仁州，尋復舊。辛闗三年，陞為府。有摩利山【在府南，山頂有七星壇。世傳，檀君 祭天壇。】。傳燈山【一名三郎城，世傳，檀君 使三子，築之。】。有仇音島、巴音島、今音北島，買仍島，屬縣三。”]

2.2 Seohae-do

Here, alongside the now long established tradition of Guwol-san for Asadal, additional information is given for the first time that the site of Jangjiangpyeong (庄莊坪) had become associated with Dangun’s second capital of Dangjyang-gyeon (唐莊京), the name representing a corrupted variant of the original. There is also the attestation of a 'Samseong-sa' shrine (三聖祠 'three sages shrine') dedicated to *Dan'ın, *Dan'un and Dangun: this may or may not be the same shrine first mentioned in Jereun-ungi some 164 years earlier.

[Goryeo-sa 卷五十八:卷第十二:地理三:西海道:三州:儒州: “本高句麗開口。高麗初，改今名。顯宗九年。來屬。睿宗元年，置監務。高宗四十六年，以衛社功臣成均大司成 柳暾內卿。陞為文化縣令官。別號始寧【成廟所定。】。有九月山【世傳。阿斯達山】。庄莊坪【世傳。檀君 所都。即唐莊京之説】三聖祠【有檀因·檀雄·檀君 祠】”]

2.3 Dangun as a title?

Finally, in the Pyeongyang section which identifies Pyeongyang as having been the capital of all Three Joseon, 'Dangun' is potentially interpreted as the title, ho
(號), rather than name of Joseon’s founder. The candidate personal name (myeong 名) Wanggeom, however, is not mentioned so in the context the question remains ambiguous, but as will be seen, in later popular histories, an explicit distinction between ho and myeong was to be introduced.


3. Sejong Sillok

The greater number of mythical attestations in the Sejong Sillok is largely due to the appended geography treatise. Primarily orthodox the following points are noteworthy.

3.1 Guwol-san shrine

Quoted in the main Sillok section (1428.6.14.), a memorial submitted by state councillor (? 右議政仍令致仕) Yu Gwan (柳寬 1346-1433) provides a more detailed description of the shrine on Guwol-san and another identification of a tradition of Dangun’s second capital at a site named Jangjiang (藏壯).

"Munhwa-hyeon county in Hwanghae-do province is my native homeland. It is many years since leaving there before passing the state examination. I have heard from various old people and learnt of that the vestiges [there] are very old. Guwol-san is the main mountain of the county. At the time of Dangun Joseon, it was named Asadal-san. During Silla it was renamed Gwol-san (關山); at that time Munhwa was first named Gwolgu-hyeon. During the previous dynasty (Goryeo) it was elevated to Yuju-gammu (儒州監務), during Gojong (r.1213-59) it was further elevated to Munhwa-hyeon-ryeong (文化縣令). The mountain name character gwol was pronounced loosely becoming Guwol-san. The eastern ridge/pass of the mountain is high, large and long: in a single breath it reaches An'ak-gun (安岳郡) and stops. On the side of the mountain is the Sindang (神堂 ‘divine shrine’); it is not know in what period it was built. The north wall [has] celestial king Dan’ung (檀雄天王), the east wall celestial king Dan’in (檀因天王) and the west wall celestial king Dangun, [so] the people of Munhwa call it Samseong-dang (‘three sages shrine’) and the settlement below the mountain is also called Seongdang-ri (聖堂里 ‘sage shrine village’). Birds avoid perching both in and around the shrine, and deer do not enter. At times of drought they pray for rain and get some result.

It is said that, Dangun entered Asadal-san and changed to a god, so Dangun’s capital must be below this mountain. The Samseong-dang shrine is still there today and can be seen. If one examines the land there today, to
the east of Munhwa there is a place named Jangjiang (藏壯) which old men have transmitted as having been Dangun's capital. The only thing to the east that can be taken as evidence today is West Myo-san (西卯山). It has also be said that Dangun's capital was at Wanggeom-seong and currently Gija's ancestral shrine is also combined there. Thinking about this, Dangun was contemporary to Yao, and it was more than a thousand years until Gija, so how could Gija's shrine be combined below there?!

It is also said that Dangun descended to beside a tree and was born [or 'and [humans] came into existence']. [so] the Samseong (三聖 'three sages' [Hwan'in, Hwan'ung and Dangun]) [story] cannot be believed. Thinking about this further, at the start of ancient [times] there was chaos which then opened [as in 'gave rise to the universe']. First there was heaven, and then earth: once there was heaven and earth, gi (氣 'material force') changed and humans came to life there. Subsequent to humans coming into existence, they all changed in [bodily] form - how is it possible that several hundred thousand years later at the time of Yao, gi could again change and give rise to life? The story of (? Dangun's or human's) coming into existence beside the tree is absurd. I beseech your majesty to send [somebody] to investigate the location of [Dangun's] capital and dispel the doubt."

Sejong Sillok 世宗實錄40卷: 世宗年10年(1428 戌申 / 明 景德(善德) 3年)6月14日: "右議政仍令致仕柳寬上書曰: 黃海道文化縣, 是臣本鄉, 自為幼學, 下去多年, 聞諸父老之言, 乃知事跡久矣。 九月山是縣之主山, 在檀君朝鮮時, 名阿斯達山, 至新羅改稱關山。其時文化始名關口縣, 至前朝為嶺州監務, 至高宗代, 又隸於文化縣令。山名關宇, 緩聲呼為九月山, 山之東嶺, 高大而長, 至一息安岳郡而止。 嶺之腰有神堂焉, 不知創於何代, 北壁檀雄天王, 東壁檀君天王, 西壁檀君天王, 文化之人常稱三聖堂, 其山下居人, 亦稱曰聖堂里, 堂之內外, 烏雀不棲, 磬鹿不入, 當旱暵時之新雨, 稍有得焉。 或云檀君入, 阿斯達山, 化為神, 則檀君之都, 意在此山之下。 三聖堂至今猶存, 其跡可見。 以今地望考之, 文化之東, 有地名藏壯者, 父老傳以為檀君之都, 今只有東、西卯山, 爲可驗耳。 或者以為檀君, 都于王儉城, 今合在箕子廟。臣按檀君與堯為立, 至于箕子千有餘年, 壽宜下合於箕子之廟? 又或以為檀君, 降於樹邊而生, 今之三聖, 固不可信。然臣又按遼古之初, 混沌既開, 先有天而後有地, 既有天地, 則氣化而人生焉, 自後人之生也, 皆以形相繫, 壽宜數十萬年以上至堯時, 復有氣化, 而生之理? 其樹邊之生, 固為荒怪, 伏惟聖鑒裁擇, 命攸司講求所都, 以祛其疑。"

3.2 Sejong Sillok geography treatise: Pyeongyang-bu

- Cites the Tangshu stating that Byeonhan (百韓) was in Lelang territory. This apparently corresponds to a passage in the Xin-Tangshu.

3.2.1 Dangun and Buru

The same "Pyeongyang-bu" section also contains another rendition of the Dangun myth constituting a synthesis of elements but, like Eungjesi-ju, is apparently based on the Jewang-ungi archetype. This Sejong Sillok rendition attributes the story to the Dangun-gogi (檀君古記), presumably another variant name for the source(s) quoted in SY (Dangun-gi 檀君記) and Jewang-ungi (檀君本紀). Following Jewang-ungi, Dangun is described as the *ancestor* (理 'principle') for all states including Joseon, Sira, Gorye South and North Okjeo, East and North Buyeo, Ye, and Maek; he also similarly fathers Buru with the daughter of Biseogap Habaek, and reigns (享國) for 1,038 years. The character used to describe Dangun's commonality to the subsequent Korean states differs: Jewang-ungi uses ye (裔 'descendants') which emphasizes ethnic lineage, whilst the Sejong Sillok uses the more ambiguous *li (理)*, most likely referring to its semantic concept of governing but perhaps also alluding to its function in Neo-Confucian metaphysics as the underlying 'principle' or 'pattern' from which the universe is created.

In the immediately preceding Hwan’ung descent myth, the SY bear and tiger story is replaced with the exact same illogical passage as in Jewang-ungi, however, preceeding that the hong’ik-ingan phrase attested in both SY and Jewang-ungi is missing and rendered the same as it appears in the contemporary Eungjesi-ju.

Also similar to Eungjesi-ju, the Sejong Sillok version contains the innovation of Buru being sent to the Xia king Yu’s gathering at Tushan. Through the linkage of Buru, however, the story continues straight on with the East Buyeo–Jumong myth. In contrast to Eungjesi-ju, then, from his first mention Buru is named without the surname Hae (解); meanwhile Hae Mosu is attested as the father of Jumong but his surname is uniquely rendered with the character hae 海 'sea' instead of the conventional hae 解; this is unlikely to simply be a mistake and therefore might represent another attempt to depart from the confusion associated with the tradition of the shared surname between Buru and Mosu. In the next attestation of Hae Mosu in the Danjong Sillok however the surname is back to the orthodox character (解).
4. Evolution of the Gija legend

The following is a brief overview of developments that occurred in the orthodox Gija (箕子 Ch. Jizi) legend to provide context for its treatment by mid Joseon scholars examined in Chapter 4.25)

The personage of Jizi is first attested in the Shangshu (尚書) which already includes his teaching the Hongbeom-guji (洪範九疇 Ch. Hongfan jiuchou) to Zhou king Wu, but no mention of his departure to Joseon. The first association of Jizi with Joseon, appears in the Shiji (c.87 BCE) where, having taught the Hongbeom-guji to King Wu, the latter enfeoffs Jizi with Chaoxian/Joseon: this passage contains the important qualification that even after the enfeoffment, Jizi was not King Wu’s vassal, however the Shiji still does not explicitly record Jizi going to Joseon.

It is not until the Hanshu (c.76 CE) that a passage in the geography treatise contains the first explicit record of Jizi actually going to Joseon and enlightening the people with ceremonies, agriculture, sericulture and the Eight Article law code: this is the account that forms the core of the legend as it was incorporated into the Korean ON. Somewhat curiously, however, the Hanshu makes no mention of Jizi receiving enfeoffment from King Wu, either before or after.

Shiji 世家:宋微子世家: "Thereupon King Wu enfeoffed Jizi with Joseon, but [Jizi] was not a vassal"

於是武王乃封箕子於朝鮮而不臣也

Hanshu 漢書志:地理志第八:燕地 "Xuantu and Lelang were established by Emperor Wu: [they controlled] all of the Joseon, YeMaek and Guryeo barbarians. [When] the Way in Yin diminished, Jizi went to Joseon. [He]

25) For recent analysis of the Gija legend’s significance to middle and late Goryeo political ideology, see Cha 2014:72-93 and Breuker 2010:98-102.
enlightened the people through ritual, agriculture, sericulture, weaving and building (?作). The people of Lelang Joseon [had] the Eight Article law code."

The first attestation of the 41 generation 'Gi dynasty' that Jizi/Gija founds in Joseon, occurs in the early C3rd Weitiue (魏略) passages that have only survive embedded within the SGZ "Dongyizhuan" chapters. Here the penultimate and final Gi kings, Bu and Jun (否·準) are named but no new details are given about Jizi.

Jizi’s personal name, Xu Yu (胥餘 K. Seo Yeo) is first attested in Zhuangzi (莊子 by 庄周 c.370-301 BCE) but at a time before Jizi is associated with Joseon. Both the Shi ji and Hanshu only use the designation Jizi: the Shi ji ji jie (史記集解 c.425) commentary analyses Jizi, with 'ji' 篝 as the name of a state, and zi 子 a title of the nobility, but it is only with the C8th Shi ji Suoyin (史記索隱) commentary that mention of the personal name is revived.

As a consequence, to peninsular Koreans, Jizi was known primarily as 'Gija' and the dynasty took the name of this title rather than his personal surname. As seen above, the earliest attestations of his personal name in Korean sources appears to be in Dongguk-se’nyeon-ga: it is subsequently attested in Yulgok Yi I’s (栗谷李珥 1536-84) "Gija-silgi" (箕子實記) but is entirely absent from dynastic chronicles.

Meanwhile, rites held for Gija, as one of several deities in Pyeongyang, are early on attested in the Jiu-Tangshu (舊唐書 c.945) account of Goguryeo.

A Gija shrine (箕子祠) is first recorded in the Goryeo-sa being established in Pyeongyang-bu in 1325. The Sejong Sillok geography then describes possibly the same shrine as more specifically being located on To-san mountain ("箕子廬在府城北兔山上”); subsequently a 1488 entry in the Seongjong Sillok, identifies both a shrine (廟) within Pyeongyang’s city walls, and a tomb (墳) some distance outside. (See Cha 2014:79) The mid C17th century works of Heo Mok and Hong Manjong (discussed below) refer only to the To-san tomb (Heo Mok 箕子塚; Hong 墓).

Separately, by the early C17th a new element of the legend had been innovated identifying the post-Gi dynasty descendents having scattered and established three clans named Gi, Han and Seon-u (奇·韓·鮮于). These surnames are
apparently first attested in Yi Jeonggwi’s (李延龜 1564-1635) ‘Gija Shrine Stele Inscription’ (月沙先生集卷之四十五: 碑: 箕子廟碑鈐) and shortly after in Heo Mok’s Dongsa (東事 c.1667).26

Yi Jeonggwi’s stele inscription attributes the three clan reference to Choe Min (鄭旻) pushing back their attestation to at least 1611.

[Gija Shrine Stele Inscription 箕子廟碑銘: “我殿下嗣服之三年萬曆辛亥[1611]，本道士人鄭旻等抗疏言，史稱箕子之後傳四十一，而至準爲衛滿所逐，馬韓未有旌孫三人。曰親。其後爲韓氏。曰平。爲奇氏。曰諱。入龍岡烏石山。以傳辭子，世系錄書曰。鮮于氏。周封箕子于朝鮮。”]

[Yupi Zizhitongjian gangmu (c.1200) 御批資治通鑑綱目: 卷十三: “集賢 鮮于族鮮于複姓風俗通曰武王封箕子於樂浪之朝鮮其子食采於千因氏鮮于髦王靈帝時彪桓大入遼東蘇僕延自稱髦王中央不合大如讖言燕趙之間不相合者其地大如砥礫之堅易地渾郡易縣之易水出縣南安開山東至文安入”]

In historiographical terms the addition of the three surnames did not have a major impact, but a potential function of the new tradition might have been to help counter the statements in SGZ and HHS that the Gi dynasty line was annihilated by a Mahan restoration against Gi Jun (箕準).

4.1 Korea’s nativist claim to Sinic civilization

Yi Jeonggwi’s Gija Shrine Stele Inscription text is a representative panegyric eulogizing Gija as the equal to Confucius and reducing the preceding period of Dangun to an unenlightened dark age. Gija is described not only as the bringer of civilization to Korea, but also credited with ensuring the development of Sinic civilization in China before leaving to Joseon, going so far as to assert that without Gija’s Hongbeom-guju the Hetu and Luoshu (河圖 績書) would never have been developed further into the system of the Eight Gua (八卦) divination trigrams which form the foundation of Chinese philosophy and civilization.

From a modern ethno-nationalist perspective, this elevation of Gija appears merely as an act of self-subordination to the contemporary Sinocentric world order, however, as seen here the notion that Gija established his own dynasty in Korea - and that the lineage survived the last king Jun - enables Korea to make an equal claim on the heritage of the Hongbeom-guju that represent the fundamentals of Sinic civilization.

26) The composition of an earlier ‘Gija shrine stele text’ (箕子廟碑) authored by Byeong Gyeryang (卞季良 1369-1430) is also attested in the Sejong Sillok, 1428, but this does not contain the same content and is conservative in character. (世宗實錄40卷: 世宗10年4月29日)
[Chapter 4] Inflections in the Orthodox Narrative

1. Heo Mok - Dongsa 東事

The first of the privately authored survey histories that survive from the mid Joseon dynasty onwards is the Dongsa (東事 'Matters of the East') by Misu Heo Mok (眉叟 許穆 1595–1682). The structure is as follows.27

| Danun sega | 櫻君世家 |
| Giia sega | 笪子世家 |
| Wiman sega | 衛滿世家 |

- Four Commanderies and Two Fu
- Samhan
- Mahan, Jinhan and Byeonhan

| Silla sega (3 parts) | 新羅世家 上·中·下 |
| Garak | 駕洛 |
| Dae Gaya | 伽倻 |

| Goguryeo sega (2 parts) | 高句麗世家 上·下 |
| YeMaek | 鎮北 |
| Malgal | 驛靼 |

| Baekje sega | 𤲃羅 |
| Tak-ra {jeju} | 地乗 |

| jiseung {geography} | "Black teeth" yeoljeon {Japanese Wae} |

A notable feature of the work is the decision to name the main dynastic periods as sega (世家 Ch. shiija ’hereditary families’) a section type which was previously only employed in the original Shiij, and later in the Xin-Wudai-shi (新五代史 974) (Wilkinson 2013:626).

1.1 Danun sega 櫻君世家

This section includes the Danun myth combined with the North and East Buyeo legends including Jumong’s birth. The account is orthodox with the following points.

- In a summarized account of the descension myth, Hwan’in is included but Hwan’ung is misnamed as ‘Sinsi’ (神市).
- ’Sinsi’ is described as the first to educate and govern the people ("始敎生民之治"), thus representing a pre-Gija stage of indigenous cultural development.
- Dangun is born to ’Sinsi’ without mention of the bear and tiger story.
- Dangun establishes the capital at Pyeongyang in the 15th year of Emperor Yao (陶唐氏立一十五年).

- Hae Buru is born to Dangun and the daughter of Biseogap (非西岬) à la Jewang-unji but without mention of Biseogap being the river deity Habaek.

The same Hae Buru both goes to Tushan and later founds North Buyeo (比 [sic. 北]扶餘)
Dangun moves the capital to Dangjiang (唐藏) and dies in the 8th year of Shang king Wu.
Dangun’s tomb is located west of Song’yang (松壇) in contemporary (to Heo) Gangdong-hyeon (江東縣).
Taebaek (泰伯) is believed to be Asadal: Heo reports there are shrines to Dangun both at Song’yang and Taebaek.
Hae Buru moves to found East Buyeo.
Geumwa finds the 'daughter of Ubal-su’ (優淳水) who gives birth to Jumong after conceiving through the sun (”感日影煥身朱蒙”).
No mention of Hae Mosu.
Hae Buru, Jumong and Onjo (given as Jumong’s younger son) are explicitly described as descendents (後) of Dangun.
※ This noticeably excludes Silla and Gaya.

1.2 Gija *sega* 矢子世家
Heo Mok’s treatment of Gija provides a near 'maximized’ orthodox account synthesizing all previous elements of the story with certain new information. Short of a full translation, these elements can be summarized as follows.

1.2.1 Key elements of the Gija legend
(Points in square parenthesis [] are core elements of the legend not included by Heo Mok.)

* Gija is of the royal house of Yin (殷 aka Shang 商).
  * Analysis of name: Gi/li 矢 was the name of his enfeoffment, Ja/zi (子) is a title (爵); his personal name was Seoyeo/Xuyu (胥餘)
  * Teaches Hongbeom-guju (洪範九疇) to King Wu.
  * Goes to Chaoxian/Joseon.
  * Accompanied by 5,000 Yin followers including: poets, writers, ritualists, musicians, shaman, doctors, divinators, craftsmen and engineers (詩·書·禮·樂·巫·醫·卜筮之流·百工·技藝).
  * King Wu enfeoffs Gija, but he is not a vassal. （武王因以封之而不臣也）
  * Establishes capital at Pyeongyang: the former state of Dangun Joseon becomes Gija Joseon.
  * At first his (Chinese) language cannot be understood so he has to use
interpreters.

- Teaches ritual etiquette, righteousness, agriculture, sericulture and weaving.
- Marks out territorial borders.
- Establishes Eight Article law code (八條之約, attested in *Hanshu* as 犯禁八條) of which three have survived.
  - One who kills another pays with their life.
  - One who injures another pays with grain.
  - Those who steal are made into slaves.
- 'Golden age' commences of a peaceful and moral society: has civilizing influence on neighbouring states.
- [Daedonggang song.] [See Hong Manjong section below]
- [Introduction of the well-field (井田) field system.]
- Gija pays court at Zhou.
  - On the way he passes the ruined Yin palace overgrown with barley (禾黍) prompting him to compose the 'Song of Barley' (麥秀之歌) as attested in *Shiji*.

  [Shiji 世家: 宋微子世: “其後箕子朝周，過故殷墟，感宮室毁壞，生禾黍，箕子傷之，欲哭則不可，欲泣為其近婦人，乃作麥秀之詩以歌詠之。其詩曰：「麥秀漸漸兮，禾黍油油。彼狡僮兮，不與我好兮！」所謂狡童者，紂也。殷民聞之，皆為流涕。”]

Variant details adopted from SGZ *Weilue* and *Shiji* accounts of the period subsequent to Gija.

- At the end of Zhou, the Yan (燕) ruler (伯) declares himself king and [seeks to] invade eastwards: the Joseon lord (侯) plans to attack Yan out of respect for Zhou but *daebu Ye* (大夫禮) counsels against this and is sent instead to negotiate with the Yan king defusing the situation. [*Weilue* has the Joseon lord declaring himself king in response to Yan.]
- During the period of the Six States (六國) Yan invades Jinbeon (晉) and Joseon (高麗) and constructs fortifications.
- Later the Joseon lord declares himself king.
  - In response to his misrule, Yan invade taking 2,000 *li* of Joseon’s western territory up to the Manbanhan (滿潘汗, SGZ 滿番汗).
- Qin unifies China and constructs a Long Wall reaching beyond the outer frontier of Liaodong.
  - Fearful, Joseon king Bu (伯) submits to Qin.
- Bu’s successor, Jun (準) becomes king.
- Qin collapses and many refugees from Yan and Zhao (趙) enter Joseon.
- Upon the rise of Han (漢) China, Lu Wan (盧韜) becomes king of Yan and the Pae-su river (𬇙水 Ch. Peishui) becomes the Yan-Joseon border.
- Account of Yan man Wei Man (衛滿) usurping Joseon causing King Jun to flee southwards.
• Until the usurpation, the Gi dynasty lasts 41 generations over a span of 928 years.
• Gi Jun travels by sea to Geumma (金馬) and establishes himself as the Mahan king.
  • The Gi line continues to rule for a further 200 years.
• Mahan is finally overthrown by founding Baekje king Onjo (溫祚) in his 26th year.
  • The total length of the Gi dynasty is thus 1,120 years.
• The Gi descendants scatter forming the three clans of Gi, Han and Seon’yu (奇氏·韓氏·鮮于氏).
• Gija’s tomb is located at current day Tosan (兔山) in Pyeongyang.
  • The people have established Sung’in-jeon (崇仁殿) hall where ancestral rites are maintained.
• Confucius is said to have praised Gija’s civilizing influence on the ‘eastern state’ (i.e. Joseon).

Two developments in this Gija account are 1) the suggestion that the Gi lineage relocated to Mahan only ended with the annexation of Mahan by Baekje in Onjo’s 26th year; and 2) placing a figure on the period of Gi dynasty rule of Mahan of c.200 years, bringing the total length of the Gi dynasty to c.1,120 years.

1.3 Wiman sega 衛滿世家
Despite being accorded a full sega chapter, the Wi dynasty is negatively judged as having been an illegitimate usurpation followed by corrupt rule. In contrast to the Gi dynasty, Heo notes that sacrifices to the Wi line were discontinued with its own demise.

1.4 Four Commanderies and Two Fu
This brief section names the four commanderies and their capital counties. It notes the subsequent closure only of Zhenlan, together with the establishment of a Liaodong Xuantu-cheng. Thereafter the Two Fu are established, with Pingna (平那) located on the ‘old location of Joseon’ and Xuantu (doesn’t specify which but presumably the Liaodong Xuantu) becoming Pingzhou (平州). Meanwhile Lintun and Lelang commanderies both become the Dongbu (東府). Heo designates all three, Pingna, Pingzhou and Dongbu, as dudutu (都督府)

1.5 Samhan
Another brief section, the limited information for the Samhan states is drawn from the SGZ and HHS accounts. Previously unattested, however, Byeonhan or its people are curiously described as descendents (苗裔) of Lelang.
2. Hong Manjong - *Dongguk-yeokdae-chongmok* 東國歷代總目

The *Dongguk-yeokdae-chongmok* by Uhae Hong Manjong (宇海 洪萬宗 1643-1725), compiled c.1705, contains several further innovations and inflections of the ON, as well as a style of critical analysis not seen in previous works.\(^\text{28}\)

2.1 Line of dynastic legitimacy and brief geography

Concerning ancient Joseon, in the introductory overview (凡例 參例) Hong highlights the following points:

- Dangun was the first 'divine ruler' (神君) whilst Gija was the sage (聖) who established learning, but in later times people believed that Korea’s lineage (東國統系) began only with Gija.
- Although Gi Jun lost the state to Wi Man, the Gi lineage continued in a manner analogous to Zhu Xi’s argument in the *Zizhi-tongjian-gangmu* (資治通鑑綱目) that in China the line of legitimacy passed from the Han dynasty to Shu (蜀), rather than Wei (Wilkinson 2013:618).
- Thus despite Wi Man taking control of Joseon his lineage was illegitimate: the line of legitimacy passed rather to Mahan via Gi Jun.

Hong further provides a diagram (東國歷代傳統之圖) tracing the line of legitimacy (傳統) together with dates and duration for each polity, summarized in the table below. (Duration figures in indented parenthesis [ ] are not in the original table but are taken from the main text).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Korean Dynastic Lineage Diagram 東國歷代傳統之圖</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dangun Joseon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>唐巖 戊辰 - 周武王 己卯 (1,212 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gija Joseon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>周武王己卯 - 漢惠 丁未 (929 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Byeonhan</strong> ? - 漢元帝 壬午</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jihan</strong> ? - 漢宣帝 甲子</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mahan</strong> 漢惠 丁未 - 新弈 己已 (203 years: Gi dynasty total 1,131 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wiman Joseon</strong> 漢惠丁未 - 武帝 喜西 (87 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four Commanderies</strong> 武帝 喜西 - 昭帝 己亥 (27年)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baekje</strong> 漢成帝 克卯 - 唐高宗 戊申 (678年)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goguryeo</strong> 漢元帝 甲申 - 唐高宗 戊辰 (992年)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silla</strong> 漢宣帝 甲子 - 唐高宗 戊辰 (992年)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two Fu</strong> 昭帝 己亥 - 元帝 甲申 [46年]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Schematic of Hong Manjong’s diagram tracing the line of legitimacy.

Whilst certain polities are included as peripheral to the main line, others such as Buyeo, the Gaya states and Balhae are omitted entirely.

\(^{28}\) Source text consulted is a digital scan of a premodern original, available on the Harvard University Library Hollis database titled as *Tongguk yóktae ch'ongmok : pu chijii* (東國歷代總目:附地誌) <http://id.lib.harvard.edu/aleph/005040124/catalog>.
Hong further includes a map of the peninsula (歷代建都之圖) which shows orthodox locations for the Four Commanderies (with Zhenfan just north of the Yalu and Lintun in Gangneun). Maek located in the region of Chuncheon and Ye in Gangneun. In the accompanying text he argues that the Samhan states must all have been located south of the Han river because the territory to the north belonged to Joseon, therefore Han Baekgyeom (see Chapter 6) was correct whilst Gwon Geun was right in associating Mahan with Baekje but wrong to associate Byeonhan with [Go]guryeo and Choe Chiwon was wrong in attempting to match the Samhan with the subsequent Three Kingdoms.

2.2 Dangun Joseon: Dangun

Hong presents an abridged version of the descension myth: Hwan’in and Hwan’ung are left out entirely with only a 'semi-divine being' (神人) descending; the bear is included being changed to a woman but without details or mention of the tiger. Dangun becomes ruler in the 25th year, (Mujin 戊辰), of Emperor Yao.

A new narrative detail highlights that Dangun educates the people in tying their hair, further describing that distinctions between lord and subject, men and women, and food and places of abode all began from this time.

Following this is inserted the historical episode of Pengwu (彭吳 K. Paeng’o) being ordered to govern the interior of the country citing the Pengwu Stele, and a poem by Kim Siseup (金時習 1435-93). Hong’s wording implies that Pengwu/Paeng’o was ordered by Dangun, however, as Pengwu is fully attested as a Han Chinese general contemporary to Emperor Wu who led a campaign against the Maek located at Chuncheon, subsequent scholars including An Jeongbok and Yu Deukgong have all criticized Hong for this anachronism.

Dangun’s son, Buru, meanwhile is included being sent to Tushan: without mention of his surname Hae or who his mother was.

2.2.1. Dating of Dangun

Concerning the end of Dangun, Hong points out conflicting information between the officially commissioned Dongguk-tonggam (東國通鑑 1485), which has Dangun enter Asadal in the 8th year, Eulmi (乙未), of Shang king Wu[wen]ding (商王武[文]丁 乙未) and the Yeoji-seungnam (輿地勝覽 1530 – hereafter YJSR), which describes him moving first to Jangdang-gyeong on Gija’s arrival at the time of Zhou king Wu. Not mentioned by Hong is that the Dongguk-tonggam date follows Jewang-ungi (虎丁八乙未 and subsequent Eungjesi-ju 商武丁八年乙未 and Sejong Sillok 殷武丁八年乙未) whilst the YJSR details are based on the SY account. Hong argues the former to be correct if the sexagenary reckoning of Wuding’s 8th
year, is changed from Eulmi (乙未) to Gapja (甲子) in accordance with the chronology of Shao Yong’s (邵雍) *Huangji-jingshi-shu* (皇極經世書 c.1050).

3.2.2. Dangun’s lifespan

Calculating that his reign lasted for 1,017 years (一千十七年), Hong is the first to explicitly acknowledge the debate concerning Dangun’s supernatural lifespan and whether it should be better interpreted as the length of a dynasty with natural successions à la *Eungje-si*. Unlike Gwon, however, Hong argues that the long lifespan would not be unusual for ‘ancient divine sages’ (上世神聖) giving Chinese Daoist examples of Guangchengzi (廣成子) 1,200 years, and Peng Zu (彭祖) 800 years. Either way, he calculates there is still a c.195 year gap between Dangun and Gija’s coming in the sexagenary Gimyo (己卯) year of Zhou king Wu. Therefore Hong would seem to be proposing both that Dangun had a supernatural lifespan but the remaining 195 years was occupied by his descendants (後孫) and thus the total length of the Dangun ‘dynasty’ was 1,212 (一千二百十二) years.

2.3 Gija Joseon: Gija

Hong’s account of Gija gives his surname (姓) as Ja (子 Ch. Zi) leaving Gi unexplained, and includes three additional items to that of Heo Mok’s. The first is the first Korean attestation of a variant for Gija’s personal name, Xuyu (須臾 K. Suyu) for which he cites an annotation to a ‘Jizi stele’ (箕子碑誌 recorded in the *Liuzhouji* (柳州集) by Liu Zongyuan (柳宗元 773-819). The second is inclusion of the ‘well-field’ field system (井田) evidencing Gija’s introduction, or at least improvements, in agriculture and sericulture. The last is incorporation of lines from the *Daedonggang* song recorded in the *Goryeo-sa* which, praising Gija’s introduction of civilization, compares the Daedong-gang river and Yeongmyeong-ryeong mountain of Pyeongyang, to China’s Yellow River and Song-shan respectively.

*Goryeo-sa* 卷七十一：志 卷第二十：樂：二：俗樂："大同江．周武王．封殷太師箕子于朝鮮．施八條之教．以興禮俗．朝野無事．人民優渥．以大同江．比黃河．永明嶽，比嵩山．頌賜其君．此入高麗以後所作也.”

2.3.1 Gija’s submission to Zhou

Concerning the episode of Gija presenting himself (朝) at the Zhou court, Hong both provides greater narrative detail than Heo Mok – namely that he rode in a white carriage with a white horse (素車白馬) – and also acknowledges an apparently prevalent counter theory that Gija did not go to Zhou. The evidence for this refutation is based on the *Shangshu-dazhuan* (尚書大傳) attributing the ‘Song of Barley’ (麥秀之歌) Gija is supposed to have composed (according to *Shiji*) instead to Weizi (微子), combined with a broader argument that for Gija to pay homage at the Zhou court would have gone against his famous declaration not...
to become a vassal to another lord (尚書: 微子: "商其論喪，我罔為臣僕").

[Shangshu-dazhuan 尚書大傳: 卷二: "微子將往朝周，過殷之故墟，見麥秀之蔚蔚，曰：
此父商之國，宗廟社稷之所立也志誌動心悲，欲哭則為朝周，俯泣則婦人：推商廣之，作雅
聲音《文選·魏都賦》《絳亡論》下註，歌曰：麥秀蔚蔚兮，黍禾朧々；彼狡童兮，不我好兮《文
選·思舊賦》註！[(註)狡童，謂紛。】《文選·宣德皇后令》註引鄭玄曰”]

※ Hong finishes the passage with the statement to the effect that "this is
doubtful": it is ambiguous or unclear to myself whether this last passage is still
internal to the argument against Gija going to Zhou, or that Hong is declaring
the revisionist argument itself to be in doubt.

"箟子「商其論喪，我罔為臣僕」之語修臣職也事涉可疑"

2.3.2 Gija’s grave
Whilst locating Gija’s grave (墓) at To-san (兔山), Hong also notes that the Shiji
Suoyin, quoting Du Yu (杜預 222-85), gives an alternative location in Liangguo,
Meng-xian (梁國縣 The same Du Yu quote occurs also in the earlier Jijie
commentary), however Hong then cites the DaMing-Yitongzhi which both rejects
this, and under the "Shandong-buzheng Liaodong-si guji" (山東布政遼東司古蹟) section supports the Pyeongyang location.

[Shiji 史記/世家 凡三十卷/卷三十八: 宋微子世家: 第八: "箟子者，紂親戚也。【索隱】
箟，國：子，爵也。司馬彪曰『箟子名胥餘』。馬融、王肅以箟子為紂之諸父。服虔、杜預以
為紂之庶兄。 杜預云「梁國蒙縣有箟子冢」。"

[Shiji 史記: 宋微子世家: 【集解】杜預曰：「梁國蒙縣有箟子冢。」]

2.3.3 The Gi dynasty
Hong includes briefer individual entries for Gi Bu and Gi Jun (箕否·処) which
follow orthodox accounts derived from SGZ.

He calculates the length of the Gi dynasty from its foundation (Gija Gimyo year
己卯) to Wi Man’s usurpation (Gi Jun Jeongmi year 丁未) as 929 years.

2.3.4 Samhan: Mahan
Even whilst being included under the Samhan subheading, Hong presents Mahan
as a direct continuation of the Gi dynasty. Similar to Heo Mok, Hong implies that
Mahan was only unified into a single polity with Gi Jun’s arrival, à la SGZ but
derfering to HHS, but then ignores both the SGZ and HHS by asserting that the
Gi rulers were not overthrown until the rise of Baekje founder Onjo (溫祚). For
the period of Mahan, Hong gives the exact figure of 203 years, bringing the total
length of the Gi dynasty to 1,131 years.

Similar to Heo Mok, Hong finishes the Gi dynasty narrative with mention of the
three descendent clans, explicitly referencing Yi Jeonggwi’s Sung’in-jeon stele text
(箕子崇仁殿碑 - where 'Sung'in-jeon' refers to the Gija-myo shrine as it was renamed in 1612). Additionally, citing Gwon Munhae’s (權文海 1534-91) Daedong-Unbu-gun’ok (大東避府群玉 c.1589 - or the original Chinese 避府群玉?) Hong includes a further theory that one of the three names, Seon-u (鮮于) was originally the surname of Gija’s secondary son (支子).

2.4 Jinhan and Byeonhan

The remaining Samhan sections are broadly orthodox, however Hong rejects the theory that Jinhan was established by Qin refugees on the grounds that the chronology would be impossible (i.e. he considers Jinhan later than the Qin dynasty).

2.5 Wiman Joseon: Wi Man

Hong gives the capital as Wanggeom-seong (王儉城) and calculates the Wi dynasty lasted 87 years.

2.6 The Two Fu 二府

In the 2nd Hongjian (建昭) year (37 BCE) of Han Emperor Yuan (漢元帝) the Two Fu became a part of the newly established Goguryeo state. Total duration of the Two Fu was 46 years.
3. An Jeongbok - *Dongsa-gangmok* 東史綱目

*Dongsa-gangmok* compiled c.1756 by An Jeongbok (安鼎福 1712-91) is one of the most substantial of the privately authored Silhak histories, surveying from the beginning of history through to the end of the Goryeo dynasty. Whilst differing in certain details, the period covering ancient Joseon is clearly both influenced by and builds on topics previously made explicit by Hong, however, An more often refers to the officially commissioned *Dongguk-tonggam* (東國通鑑 1485) as the standard, usually to indicate where his own historiography differs from it. Whilst beyond the scope of this analysis, it should be noted that An’s arguments concerning Korean historiography are invariably supported with Chinese analogies.\(^{29}\)

The structure of *Dongsa-gangmok* is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>(Written in 1778)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preface</td>
<td>序</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>凡例</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagrams 1</td>
<td>東史綱目 圖上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangun and Gija [Joseon]</td>
<td>檀君箕子傳世之圖</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silla</td>
<td>新羅三姓傳世之圖</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garak-guk / Geumgwan</td>
<td>附 駕洛國·金官</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dae-Gaya</td>
<td>附 大伽倻國</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goguryeo</td>
<td>高句麗傳世之圖</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyeo-guk</td>
<td>附 夫餘國</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balhae-guk</td>
<td>附 渤海國</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baekje</td>
<td>百濟傳世之圖</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goryeo</td>
<td>高麗傳世之圖</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagrams 2</td>
<td>東史綱目 圖下</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official ranks by period</td>
<td>官職沿革圖</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dongsa-gangmok</em> Books 1-17</td>
<td>東史綱目</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 1.1</td>
<td>東史綱目 附卷上 上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Go’i</em></td>
<td>考異（140 items around half of which focus on pre and early Three Kingdoms topics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addendum</td>
<td>補遺（1 item）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 1.2</td>
<td>東史綱目 附卷上 中</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wondrous stores [i.e. myths]</td>
<td>怪説辨證</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 2.1</td>
<td>東史綱目 附卷上 下</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Japseol</em> 'miscellaneous theories'</td>
<td>雜說（11 items）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 2.2</td>
<td>東史綱目 附卷下</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Historical] geography</td>
<td>地理考（44 items）</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning the ancient era, pertinent sections of the work include not only the introductory overview (凡例) and main *gangmok* (綱目)\(^{30}\) structured survey text, but also discussions in the "*Go’i*" (考異 ‘examination of inconsistencies’) and "*Japseol*" (雜說 ‘miscellaneous theories’) appendixes around half of which relate to

---


30) For a discussion of the *gangmok* (綱目 Ch. *gangmu*) tradition, see Wilkinson (2013:617) "48.5 Gangmuti 綱目體".
pre and early Three Kingdoms topics.

Whilst the main *gangmok* survey ostensibly begins with Gija, Dangun is mentioned soon after therein: in the preceding genealogical tables, meanwhile, Dangun is included before Gija, and is discussed again in the first ten of the "Go’i" topics.

3.1 Introduction (凡例)
The first subsection of the introduction, titled "Tonggye" (統系), discusses the line of legitimate dynastic lineage (正統). Points concerning the ancient period are summarized below.

- *Dongguk-tonggam* was wrong to relegate Dangun and Gija to an "Outer Annals" (外紀) section.
  - Dangun was the first ruler whilst Gija introduced civilization: each ruled for a millenium.

- The line of *dynastic legitimacy* (正統) was transplanted by Gi Jun to Mahan, which he took control of (à la HHS).
  - Im Sangdeok’s (林象德 1683–1719) *Dongs-a-hoegang* (東史會編) was wrong to exclude Gi Jun in its main *gangmok* section simply on the grounds that his rule was weak.

- The line of 'dynastic legitimacy' (正統), runs through Dangun, Gija and Mahan, but then stops: it resumes from the 9th year (669) of Silla king Munmu (文武王) – i.e. following the unification of the Three Kingdoms. It later continues from the 19th year (936) of Goryeo King Taejo.
  - An intervening period 'without legitimate [dynastic] lineage’ (無統) pertained for the duration that the Three Kingdoms coexisted.
  - Old histories say that this ended with Baekje king Wija (義慈王 r.641–60) but in fact it continued for three more years under King Pung (豐 r.660-3).

- *Wi Man* was a usurper and should not be included alongside Dangun and Gija *Joseon* as occurs in the *Dongguk-tonggam*.

- *Buyeo* is said to have been a descendant (後) [state] of Dangun (à la *jewang-ungi*) but due to its remote northern territory (絕域) cannot be included as an independent polity. However, as the ‘ancestor state’ (祖國) to Goguryeo and Baekje it is included within their foundation narratives.

- *Dongguk-tonggam* relegates the Four Han Commanderies, Two Fu and
Samhan all to the "Outer Annals" section, however, they are here included under Mahan as the Commanderies and Bu occupied former Joseon territory whilst Mahan became the legitimate dynastic state.

- The region of Liaodong originally belonged to the Dong’yi (東夷) but subsequent to Dangun and Gija it was often a part of 'our' Korean territory (我地) so a study of it is included in the historical geography appendix.

- The Samhan are first attested in Chinese records already after the overthrow of Mahan [according to SS dating]; because there is more than one account, they are included in the "Japseol" section [discussed below].

- Balhae is not a part of Korean history, but because its territory originally belonged to Goguryeo and bordered with 'us' (i.e. Silla) and had a close "lips and teeth" relationship concerning 'righteousness' (義爾唇齒), it is included as it also was in Dongguk-tonggam.

- YeMaek, Okjeeo, Garak and Gaya (加那) are included as 'minor states' (小國).

3.2 Dangun
3.2.1 Gangmok section: Rationalization of Dangun: rejection of mythology

In the main gangmok section Dangun is discussed in an embedded annotation. An regards Dangun as the first sage ruler of Korea preceding Gija, however, he rejects the Dangun mythology with the following arguments.

"That which is written in the Eastern [i.e. Korean] gogi (古記 'old records') concerning Dangun is all absurd and does not match with reason. Dangun was the first to appear and because he had holy virtue (神聖之德) the people made him their lord (君). In the past when a holy one was born they would be different to common people, but how could [the Dangun myth] be so against reason?! The [name] Hwan’in-jeseok (桓因帝釋) [as used in Jewang-ungi] originally appears in the Flower Garland Sutra (華嚴經) and the other titles are [similarly] all those used by Buddhist monks. During Silla and Goryeo [Buddhist] heterodoxy was honoured and so the damage [to historical memory] has been to this extent.

In the East there have been various wars and fires (兵火) and so the national histories that were secretly stored have all been lost: that which was written by monks were kept in caves and so they have been transmitted to later generations. Historians have nothing to record and so frustratingly they would incorporate the [Buddhist legends] as official history (正史): through the
generations the stories became fixed and so virtuous wisdom (仁賢) has retrogressed to superstition (怪異). How deplorable!

The reason I do not [formally] include such irrational stories [in the main text] is in an effort to wash away these misleading and outdated practices.

The sacrificial rituals for previous kings are the most serious. Currently on Guwol-san, Munhwa-hyeon (文化縣) county, there is the Samseong-sa (三聖祠 'three sages shrine') [complex]: from the beginning of this dynasty until now, they have been holding sacrifices for Hwan’in, Hwan’ung and Dangun. It is appropriate to hold sacrifices for Dangun, but [the shrines for] Hwan’in and Hwan’ung must be removed as soon as possible. Are these not rituals for demons (鬼)?” (Translation based on the modern Korean translation by Kim Seong-hwan (1977) as provided by the Database of Korean Classics 한국고전번역원 김성환 (역) 1977)

In this way, An is one of the first to put forward the argument that has since become common in the modern era, that a large portion of the Dangun myth was Buddhist invention.31)

An instead seeks a rationalized understanding of Dangun. Similar to Hong, he includes the description of Dangun’s initial civilizing influence and uses the same figures for Dangun’s reign of 1,017 years with a 196-year space before Giya, however he rejects the possibility of a supernatural lifespan and follows instead Gwon Geun’s dynastic succession hypothesis.

A new innovation to the discourse included by An is the suggestion that the Nine Yi tribes (九夷) first listed by name in the HHS (東夷列傳), may all have been related to the ‘Dan[gun] clan’ (檀氏) as they occupied an overlapping region across Liaodong and Shenyang (遼瀋) adjacent to Joseon territory which he describes extending on either side of the Yalu.

This can be seen both as an expansion of the original Jewang-unji notion of Dangun as the common ancestor, and also anticipatory to modern era ‘Dongyi conflationism’ that is a common feature of popularist historiography.

3.2.2 Dangun: "Go’i" section (考異)

The "Go’i" section includes the following relevant points.
• The year of Dangun’s establishing Joseon at Pyeongyang should be the 25th year of Emperor Yao, not the 50th: An cites Sin Il-seong’s (申翊聖 1588–1644)

31) The most sophisticated exposition of this argument to date is Jorgensen (1998) although his hypothesis that the myth was created by Myocheong is unsubstantiable.
Gyeongseseo-bopyeon (經世書補編) on having already corrected this.

- Observes that Hong Manjong did not give a source for the description of Dangun’s civilizing influence but believes it would in any event be true.
- Criticizes Hong for the inclusion of Pengwu (彭呂), arguing Hong did not realise that Pengwu was a Chinese personage.

- In an attempt at further rationalization, An argues that Dangun did not literally become a god, but rather the meaning of the myth is that he was worshipped as a god after his death.

- Even whilst stressing Dangun’s human mortality, An rejects the YJSR’s identification of Dangun’s tomb in Gangdong-hyeon (江東縣古迹) as nothing more than folk theory (説説).

- Rejects the SY explanation that Dangun – or his ruling descendents – moved to Jangdanggyeong to avoid Gija on the grounds that Gija was too righteous to have usurped the kingdom and would only have come after it had diminished.
  ※ An ignores the jeung-ungi 164 year gap which would support his argument.

3.3 Buru disambiguation attempt

In the gangmok treatment of Dangun, the episode of his son Buru (without surname Hae) going to Tushan is included, however, in the "Go'i" section under the subheading "Buru must be two people" (夫妻當有二人). An seeks to disambiguate the SY passages arguing that SY conflates Dangun with Hae Mosu. Together with historical Chinese analogy, An proposes that Hae Mosu was a descendant of the original Dangun and so had the same surname 'Dan' and thus his own son Buru was conflated with that of the original Dangun.

※ This explanation, however, fails to explain the surname Hae (解), or why Mosu was not then named 'Dan Mosu'.

3.4 Gija

An Jeongbok’s treatment of Gija is remarkably close to that of Hong’s, including for example, designating his surname as Ja/Zi (子). Consequently only points of difference/innovation will be further discussed below.

Concerning the Eight Article law code (犯禁四條), in the gangmok narrative, An includes the traditional 'three that have survived' – first attested in the Hanshu – but in an accompanying annotation argues that the law code must rather have corresponded to the 'Eight Articles of Governance' (八政) which in turn constitutes one of the nine articles of the original Hongbeom-guju: both the Hongbeom-guju and Eight Articles of Governance are first attested in the much
earlier Sangshu (尚書 周書:洪範). An then posits that the 'three surviving' laws in fact belonged to the sixth of the Eight Articles of Governance, "Sa’gu" (司寇 'bureau of banditry' > i.e. 'crime').

3.4.2 Gija: "Go’i" section (考異)
The following miscellaneous points are included.

- The alternative personal name of Gija, Xuyu/Suyu (須臾), is just a variant corruption for Xuyu/Seoyeo (胥餘)
- Gija’s enfeoffment was the sexagenary Gimyo (己卯 c.1122 BCE) year of King Wu, à la [Zizhi-tongjian-qianbian (資治通鑑前編 1264) not the Muja year of the succeeding Zhou king Cheng (成王 戊子年) à la Gyeongse-seo (經世書).

- It is not clear if he is referring to the Chinese Huangji-jingshishu 皇極經世書 - which in a Chinese Text Project database search does not appear to attest Gija, or to Sin Ik-seong’s 申翊聖 Gyeongseseso-bopyeong 經世書補編. This point, in any event, agrees with Hong.

- Considers legitimate the remains said to be of Gija’s fortress in Pyeongyang, attested in Goryeo-sa geography.

- Concerning the narrative 'golden age' (originally attested in HHS:東夷列傳) ushered in by Gija’s Eight Article law code. An quotes Bak Sechae’s (南溪 朴世采 1631-95) Beomhak-jeonseo (範學全書) claiming that a certain Ham Heoja (涵虛子 Ch. Han Xuzi) - originally cited by Seo Geoejong 徐居正 1420-88 - refers to a Korean monk, Sui (守伊 德克-.man 觀, who compiled Geumganggyeong-oga-hae (金剛經五家解 mid C15th), rather than the Chinese prince Zhu Quan (寧獻王 朱權 1378-1448) whose style name was also Han-xuzi (涵虛子).

- An supports the tradition of Gija’s 'well-field' field remains first attested in the Goryeo-sa geography. Whilst acknowledging the lack of attestation in Chinese sources An asserts that Korean oral tradition is reliable ("東方相傳之語不可諱矣").

3.4.3 Gija’s enfeoffment and autonomy
Similar to previous Korean historians, An rejects the Shiji account that Gija was enfeoffed before going to Joseon. He quotes two arguments given by Gyegok Jang Yu (谿谷 張維. 1587-1638) that, firstly, if Gija had accepted an enfeoffment it would expressly go against his original determination not to become a vassal to Zhou, and secondly, that at the time Zhou did not have control over Joseon territory so could not have granted it to him.
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An further cites Im Sangdeok making a similar point that if King Wu was seeking to honour Gija, he would have enfeoffed him with better land than the distant Joseon.

Concerning Gija’s visit to the Zhou court, discussed in both the gangmok and "Go’i" sections. An considers the Zhushu-jinian (竹書紀年 ‘Bamboo Annals’ rediscovered 281 CE) in which it is first attested, together with the Shiji account to be authentic. Whilst also acknowledging the counter evidence provided by the Shangshu (尚書), as discussed by Hon. An responds by citing an episode from the Zuozhuan (左傳) dating to the 15th year (c.674) of [Lu] Xi Gong (呂僖公 r.659-27) in which Jizi - or at least a 'lord of Ji' - is retrospectively attested as having been at the Zhou court during the time of Tang Shu (唐叔), Zhou king Wu’s son: this episode must have been later than Gija’s original departure to Joseon because, as An observes, Tang Shu was not yet born.32)  

[竹書紀年:周武王: "十六年，箕子來朝，秋，王師滅蒲姑"

春秋左傳:僖公十五年: "臣而不臣，行將焉入，十一月，晉侯歸，丁丑，殺慶鄭而後入，是歲，晉又饒，秦伯又謀之粟，曰，吾怨其君而矜其民，且吾聞唐叔之封也，箕子曰，其後必大，晉其庸可冀乎，姑樹德焉，以待能者，於是秦始征晉河東，置官司焉。"]

This affirmation of Gija paying court to Zhou, leaves still the apparent contradiction concerning his vow not to become a vassal. In the "japseol" section An therefore attempts to resolve this with a revisionist interpretation of the original passage in the Shanshu, suggesting that the line "I shall not become a vassal [to another dynasty]" (我同為臣僕) should not be interpreted as a first person prohibitive (negative imperative), but rather that Gija was lamenting the fate of the Shang dynasty and should be translated as a rhetorical statement, "[With Shang diminishing] how will we not become vassals [to another state]?!" In this way An asserts that this passage is in fact entirely unrelated to Gija’s personal views on loyalty.

32) Understanding of this argument was greatly aided by discussion on the "Sinologists" Facebook group page with Paul Rouzer, Andrew Meyer and Mark Byington. 2015.07.24.
3.4.4 Reduction of Joseon territory
Concerning the Yan invasion of Gi dynasty Joseon described in the SGZ *Weilüe* account, An argues the figure of more than 2,000 li given for the territory lost to Yan up to the Manbanhan (滿滿汗) must be an exaggeration. He instead supports the figure of 1,000+ li given in the *Zizhi-tongjian* (資治通鑑) and also used in Yulgok’s "Gija-silgi" (箕子實記).

[資治通鑑卷第六: "其後燕將秦開為質於胡，胡甚信之：歸而襲破東胡，東胡卻千餘里；燕亦築長城"]

3.5 "Japseol" - Boyi and Shuqi
The "Japseol" section also includes a brief discussion of the brothers Boyi (K. Baek’i) and Shuqi (K. Sukie) - sons of the lord of Guzhu (孤竹君) originally attested in various early works from the *Analects* and *Mencius* to the Shiji "Boyì" biography (伯夷列傳 - Mencius only has Boyì without Shuqi).

Quoting O Un (吳濬 1540-1617), the brothers are correlated to a claim in the *Suishu* (隋書 636) that Guzhu-guo (孤竹國) later became Goryeo.

[Suishu] 隋書列傳第三十二·裴矩: "矩因奏 狀曰："高麗之地，本孤竹國也。周代以之封于箕子，漢世分為三郡，晉氏亦統遼東。今乃不臣，別為外域，故先帝疾焉，欲征之久矣。"

O Un notes that Guzhu-guo was "later" located in Liaoxi but presumes its territory would have stretched into Liaodong which was subsequently occupied by Goguryeo. He further cites local oral/folk tradition (敘說) that Boyi and Shuqi visited Gija in Pyeongyang, coming themselves from as near as Suyang-san (首陽山) in Hwanghae-do, Haeju (海州).

An notes that counter evidence is found in the *Yitongzhi* which locates their graves in Yongpingfu (永平府) in Liaoxi, however, he at once questions the veracity of Chinese records for this remote time and place.

[DaQing-yitongzhi] 大清一統志·卷一百一·陵墓古風后陵: "按孤竹國在直隸永平府孤竹三塚已經載入新志此地復有伯夷叔齊墓" An may be referring to the DaMing-yitongzhi.

Observing that the *Mencius* account describes Boyi escaping the tyranny of final Shang/Yin king Zhou (纣) and residing on the coast of the Beihai 'north sea', An
argues Beihai to equate with the sea adjacent to Pyeong’an-do and Hwanghae-do provinces: he posits that when Boyi and Shuqi again left China following the establishment of Zhou for similar reasons to Giya, they would have returned to this familiar land and so would have accompanied Giya (東出與箕子相從). Despite already questioning the Yitongzhi, to explain the graves in Yongpingfu, An hypothesizes that whilst living out their days at Suyang-san in Korea, after death they were interred (歸葬) in their former homeland region.

[孟子:難婁上: "孟子曰 伯夷辟耕，居北海之濵"]

The significance of this discussion is in the attempt to incorporate Boyi and Shuqi into Korea’s historiographical jurisdiction which has continued with the works of modern popular historians. It is also notable for An’s emphasis on native tradition: towards the end he reiterates that local tradition cannot simply be rejected (不可以氓俗流傳之言而棄之也).

3.6 Two Fu negation
An is the first historian to point out that whilst the Four Commanderies were reorganized into two commanderies, the specific notion of Two Fu (二府) is absent from Chinese sources and originates in the SY but had since become established tradition in Korean historiography.

3.7 "Japseol" sections on Samhan and southern peninsula
3.7.1 Jinguk (辰國), Samhan, Canghai (震/滄海) and Chinese migration theory
In a discussion titled ‘Theory of Jinguk and Samhan’ (辰國三韓說), An argues that the polity of Jinguk attested in the Hanhu as being blocked by Ugeo of the Wiman Joseon state, equates to the Mahan, the largest of the Samhan polities.

Simultaneously he promotes the orthodox etymological explanation that the early polities of ‘Jinguk’ and the Samhan were established by refugees from the Chinese states of Qin (秦) and Han (韓). Whilst the character jin/chén 辰 of Jinguk differs to Qin 秦, An gives the name of Chen Ying (晨嬴) - daughter to Duke Mu of Qin (秦穆公 d.621 BCE) attested in Zuozhuan - as evidence that it was used as a variant. He further observes that the official Mahan positions of chungnangjiang and dowi (中郎將·都尉 Ch. zhonglangjiang and duwei ) given in the Wenxian-tongkao (文献通考 1319) are adopted from the Qin system.

[文獻通考:卷三百二十四·四裔考一:馬韓: "其官有魏率善、邑君、歸義侯、中郎將、都尉、伯長”]

To support the Han (韓) state migration theory, An cites the Shiji account of Zhang Liang (張良) of Han, travelling east to visit the Canghai lord (滄[sic. 倉]海君) from whom he obtains a ‘strong man’ (力士) to undertake a doomed assassination attempt against Qin emperor Shi Huang. Highlighting the
accompanying *jijie* (集解 c.425) annotation which describes the Canghai lord as the 'chief lord of the Dong’yi peoples’. An argues that **Canghai refers to the peninsula Samhan polities** - as they were located on the far side of the Canghai sea and would have been reached this way from central China - and that it would only have been through a direct ethnic connection that Zhang Liang would have sought out their support in an attempt to restore their ancestral state of Han.

[史記•世家•卷五十五•列侯世家第二十五：”良省德禮淮陽。東見倉海君。[乙]【集解】如淳曰：「秦郡縣無倉海。或曰東夷君長。」]

As further evidence for the usage of Canghai as a term for the peninsula, An cites the SS Choe Chiwon biography doing just that, "For 300 years [since the Silla unification] until today, there has not been a single incident and Changhae/Canghai has been peaceful."

[SS•列傳第6•崔致遠：”至今三百餘年，一方無事，滄海晏然”]

* The Choe Chiwon quote could still be interpreted more literally to mean that the sea was peaceful - i.e. did not require the Chinese navy to cross it since the overthrow of Baekje - but it still identifies the same region.

3.7.2 Late Samhan historiography (雜說•三韓後說)

Limiting the Samhan to the south of the peninsula, An states that Jinhan became Silla to which Byeonhan also surrendered, and that Mahan became Baekje.

He highlights Kim Busik’s own doubt expressed in SS concerning a record of an apparently still existent Mahan being involved in the 121 CE Goguryeo attack on Liaodong some sixty years after the last Mahan general, Maengso (孟召) was supposed to have surrendered to Silla. Ignoring the further problem of geography, An suggests that the transmission of Samhan history was broken during the continuous wars of the Three Kingdoms and that when compiling the SS, Kim had only surviving Silla documents (遺籍) and such texts as the *Haedong-gogi* (海東古記 ‘Old records of Korea’), and that consequently half of the SS necessarily relied instead on vague Chinese accounts of ‘easterners’ (東人). Had Kim Busik or others wished to compile a fuller history of the Samhan, it would have to have been based on Chinese sources and An lists some examples he considers relevant citing HHS, the Korean *Muheonbigo* ([東國] 文獻備考 1770) which itself would reference Chinese sources (including SGZ *Weitūe* ), *Songshi* and *Nanshi* (宋史•南史).

To explain the question of an apparent Mahan–Goguryeo relationship, supported also by Choe Chiwon’s statement claiming that Mahan became Goguryeo, An posits that following its defeat to Baekje, the Gi rulers of Mahan may have sought refuge with Goguryeo and ultimately been incorporated by them.
3.7.3 Early Three Kingdoms and *Samguk-sagi* historiography

An observes that the names of the Three Kingdoms are attested in Chinese sources previous to their orthodox SS dates of establishment: Baekje (伯濟) in HHS (and SGZ) amongst the 78 Samhan states, Silla/Saro (斯盧) in the *Beishi*, and Goguryeo both in the *Hanshu* geography and as Gaogouli-xian in the *Tongdian* (通典 801 - itself citing earlier sources).

* The *Beishi* describes Jinhan becoming Silla/Saro but does not strictly attest to earlier use of the names, rather Saro can in turn be correlated with one of the Byeonhan statelets listed in the SGZ *Weilüe* account.

3.7.3.1 Goguryeo duration

An lists the three conflicting figures given in the SS for the duration of the Goguryeo dynasty: 705 years based on the orthodox 37 BCE foundation date of the Goguryeo annal; 800 years attested in Silla king Munmu’s 670 enfeoffment text for the short-lived Goguryeo royal heir, Anseung (安勝 - Silla annal); and 900 years given by Tang envoy Jia Yanzhong on the eve of Goguryeo’s overthrow in 668 (賈言忠 - Goguryeo annal). Counting back from Goguryeo’s historical end date of 668 CE, An observes that even 800 years would predate Han emperor Wu and the establishment of the Four Commanderies (specifically Xuantu) in 108 BCE.

3.7.3.2. Criticism of SS

As with the Samhan history, An acknowledges that Kim Busik was likely challenged by the lack of surviving source materials but he is nevertheless critical of the effort made, contrasting how the Yuan sent researchers to Goryeo to gather information when compiling the *Liaoshi* and *Jinshi* (遼史·金史 c.1344) histories, an event itself attested in the *Goryeo-sa*.

He further highlights an apparent *Silla bias in the SS*, contrasting the precedence given to Silla with its tertiary treatment in Chinese sources which paid greater attention to Goguryeo and Baekje. Two examples he singles out are, firstly the coverage of Onjo’s overthrow of Mahan, as if it were achieved with a single victory. In this argumentation, An conceives Mahan to have been still composed of many statelets, rather than having been fully consolidated by the Gi rulers, and therefore could not have been conquered in one battle.

His second complaint is that the SS coverage of Goguryeo focuses primarily on the peninsula territory later incorporated by Silla: in particular that the *Goguryeo geography treatise* only covers this limited territory. Even whilst Goguryeo’s continental territory was lost to Malgal and Balhae, An laments that there was no excuse for the historians not to have obtained information during diplomatic visits.
He finally also criticizes the failure not to include Balhae itself observing that it lasted for consecutive generations. This mention of Balhae, significantly, represents the reawakening of interest in the northern state, anticipating the future attempts to reclaim Balhae historiography taken up by Yi Jonghwi and Yu Deukgong.

3.8 Historical geography

The section on historical geography contains more than forty separate subsections and constitutes a comprehensive survey of sources in its own right, however, all topics are covered in a similar manner by Jeong Yak-yong’s even more comprehensive study (see Chapter 9), so only core points of An are summarized below.

3.8.1 Dangun Joseon 檀君疆域考
- No available records but the territory can be assumed to be the same as subsequent Gija Joseon.
- North Buyeo was 1,000 li north of Liaodong; it was likely established by Dangun’s descendents displaced by the arrival of Gija.
- The Chamseongdan (墳城壇) site on Mani-san (摩尼山), Ganghwa-do island, demonstrates Dangun Joseon extended southwards to the Han river.

Taebaek-san 太伯山考
- Discusses the tradition associated with Myohyang-san but considers the mountain to which Hwan’ung descended to have been Baekdu-san.
  ※ This, of course, contradicts his earlier rejection of mythology.

Baeg’ak and Asadal 白岳考 附属斯達
- Cites Gwon Geun’s Eungjesi-ju, associating Baeg’ak with Baeg’a-gang (白牙罔) mentioned in the Goryeo-sa Kim Wije biography (金謂碑傳). This treats Baeg’ak as a secondary location within Pyeongyang.
- An rejects this, and instead considers Baeg’ak to correlate with Jangjiang-pyeong (庄庄坪) attested in Goryeo-sa.
  ※ Fails to account for Jangdanggyeong (唐乾京) unless he considers it to be in the same location as Baeg’ak.
- Accepts orthodox Asadal-san = Guwol-san
- Analyses ‘Asa-dal’ as a "dialect" variation (i.e. implied phonetic rendering) of Gu-wol (九月 ‘nine moon’).

33) This summary may be best read in conjunction with the discussion of historical geography in Part II.
3.8.2 Giya Joseon 箕子疆域考
• Cites Liaoshi, Yitongzhi (一統志) and Shengjiuzhi (盛京志) associating Liaodong with ancient Joseon.
• Maintains the capital was still Pyeongyang.
• Equates the reduced western border of Manbanhan (滿潘汗 Ch. Manpanhan) with Panhan-xian (潘汗縣) attested in the Hanshu geography belonging to the East Section of Liaodong-jun (遼東郡東部)

3.8.3 Samhan 三韓考
• Generally follows Han Baekgyeom’s location of the Samhan being all south of the Han-gang (see Chapter 6).
• Considers associations of Byeonhan with Balhae’s territory attested in the Wenxian-tongkao (文獻通考 1319) and Tonggam (通鑑) as either mistaken, or owing to a northward migration of one group of former Byeonhan people who maintained the name of their old state.

[Wenxian-tongkao 文獻通考卷三百二十六·四裔考三: “徙榮節並比羽之眾，恃荒遠，乃建國，自號震國王，遣使交突厥，地方五千裏，戶十餘萬，勝兵數萬，頗知書契，盡得夫餘、沃沮、弁韓、朝鮮海北諸國。”]

3.8.4 Four Commanderies 四郡考
Lelang-jun = Pyeongyang
Lintun-jun = east coast side (嶺東) of Hamgyeong-do and Gangwon-do
(Original) Xuantu-jun = former location of East Okjeo
Zhenfan = region of Ningguta (寧古塔 - modern region of Ning'an 宁安市 in southern Heilongjiang)
• Zhenfan necessarily further than the Lintun commandery.

※ This point is based on figures given in the Maolingshu (茂陵書) quoted in Chen Zan’s (臣瓘) annotation to the Hanshu geography, which gives the absolute distances of Lintun and Zhenfan from Chang’an as 6,138 li and 7,640 li respectively.34)

3.8.5 Xuantu Gaogouli-xian ≠ Goguryeo state 高句麗縣考
• Includes a quotation by Ban’gye Yu Hyeongwon (磻溪 柳馨遠 1622–73) arguing that the Three Kingdoms were initially very minor polities.
• Distinguishes the Goguryeo state from Gaogouli-xian citing SS record of King Yuri (33rd year) attacking the latter.

3.8.6. Rivers

34) See Byington 2013:315.
Part I - Inflections in the Orthodox Narrative - An Jeongbok

**Pae-su** 潦水考

Presents multiple theories without giving a definite conclusion.

- Cites evidence both for the Jeotan (猪灘) and Daedong-gang rivers being identified as Pae-su.
- Both these rivers are south of Pyeongyang, so the Pae-su crossed by Wi Man is deduced to be a third, the Yunihe/lianyulu (淤泥河·薪里瀆).
- Suggests an alternative hypothesis, namely that the Pae-su crossed by Wi Man was the Daedong-gang but the Pyeongyang capital he usurped from Gi Jun was rather Han’yang (modern Seoul).
- Not mentioned in the Joseon geography sections, this theory posits that with the loss of Joseon’s western territory to Yan, the capital was relocated from modern Pyeongyang to Han’yang.
- Suggests at least two mentions of Pyeongyang in SS refer to the location of Han’yang; Silla annal entry of 825 (Heondeok-wang 17) and the Baekje section of the geography treatise in which Han-seong is referred to as Goguryeo’s 'southern Pyeongyang capital'.

[SS 新羅本紀:第十:憲德王: "十七年，春正月，憲昌子梵文與高達山賊壽神等百餘人，同謀叛，欲立都於平壤。攻北漢州，都督聰明率兵，捕殺之[平壤，今楊州也。太祖製庄義寺齋文有高麗舊壤，平壤名山之句]"]

列水考 **Yeol-su** = Han-gang

帶水考 **Dae-su** = Imjin-gang

馬昔水考 **Maja-su** = Yalu

沸流水考 **Biryu-su** = Pozhujiang (婆猪江) / Tongjiacjiang (佟家江)

薩水考 **Salsu** = Cheongcheon-gang 清川江

3.8.7 Ye 藩考

Follows Korean orthodoxy that Ye was in the region of Gangneung, and was the site of the short-lived Canghai-jun commandery (滄海郡), later becoming the region of Myeongju (溟州) attested in the SS Silla geography. The same SS passage also cites Jia Dan’s *Gujinjunguzhi* (古今郡國志) rejecting the historical association of Ye with Buyeo.

[SS 地理二:新羅·溟州: "溟州卒高句麗 河西良 一作何瑟羅 後屬新羅 賈耽 古今郡國志云今新羅北界 滄州 蓋諸之古國前史以扶餘為藩地蓋誤"]

3.8.8 Maek 銘考

- Locates Maek in the region of Chuncheon (春川府).
- To account for early continental references in Chinese sources, An proposes that prior to the rise of Goguryeo, both Ye and Maek were originally located in the continental Liaodong region (遼地) but were subsequently scattered and relocated to Gangwon-do on the peninsula.
3.8.9 Okjeo 沁州
East Okjeo = Southern Hamgyeong-do
North Okjeo = Northern Hamgyeong-do
4. Yi Jonghwi - *Dongsa* 東史 and other works

In current times, the *Dongsa* ('History of the East') compiled by Susan Yi Jonghwi (修山李鍾徹 1731-97) enjoys a somewhat higher popular profile than the previous histories largely due to its combined emphasis of the Dangun lineage and elevation of Goguryeo as the implicit 'route' of dynastic legitimacy in place of Silla.\(^{35}\)

Whilst far from explicitly revisionist, this 'inflection' of the ON is most apparent in the structure of the work. In terms of content however, despite minor narrative embellishments, there are few major innovations. Neglecting to reference sources, the methodology is grossly inferior to the contemporary empirical works being produced: Yi's *Dongsa* should not be classified as a rationalist "Silhak" history but more of a subjective treatise with its northern emphasis anticipating the direction that popular historiography would take in the early 20th century.\(^{36}\)

The content is as follows.\(^{37}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic annals &quot;Dongsa-bongi&quot;</th>
<th>東史本紀</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dangun</td>
<td>檀君本紀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gija</td>
<td>範子本紀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samhan</td>
<td>三韓本紀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later Joseo</td>
<td>後朝鮮本紀</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hereditary houses &quot;Dongsa-sega&quot;</th>
<th>東史世家</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gija</td>
<td>範子世家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyeo</td>
<td>扶餘世家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balhae</td>
<td>渤海世家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaya</td>
<td>伽倻世家</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biographies/accounts &quot;Dongsa-yeoljeon&quot;</th>
<th>東史列傳</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YeMaek, Okjeo, Biryu and Lelang</td>
<td>減銘沃沮沸流樂浪列傳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goguryeo royal spouses</td>
<td>高句麗家人列傳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goguryeo royal offspring</td>
<td>高句麗宗室列傳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamna (Jeju island)</td>
<td>耽羅列傳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyeopbu (陜父), Bubunno (扶蘇奴), Eulduji (乙豆智) and Song Okgu (松屋句)</td>
<td>陜·扶·乙·松列傳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eulji-mundeok</td>
<td>乙支文德列傳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seolchong and Choe Chiwon</td>
<td>薛聰崔致遠列傳</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronologies &quot;Dongsa-nyeonpyo&quot;</th>
<th>東史年表</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three Joseon</td>
<td>三朝鮮年表</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samhan</td>
<td>三韓年表</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six states (Buyeo, YeMaek, Okjeo, Nangnang and Biryu)</td>
<td>六國年表</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{35}\) Coincidentally this was also the Chinese understanding of Korean historiography, Gija Joseon > Goguryeo > Goryeo > Joseon. (Cha 2014:83)

\(^{36}\) *Dongsa* occupies volumes 11-13 of Yi's collected writings, *Susan-jiip* (修山集), available at the Database of Korean Classics. For a modern Korean translation, see also Yi (2004).
Tables "Dongsa-pyo"
Four Commanderies and Two Fu
Samhan and 78 states
Past and present personages

Treatises "Dongsa-ji"
Ritual music
'Finance'
Divine/supernatural matters
Goguryeo literature
Goguryeo 'harmonics and astronomy' (Silla)
Goguryeo astrology
Goguryeo geography (Silla and Baekje)
Goguryeo 'criminal law'
Goguryeo Five Elements/Phases (Silla and Baekje)

Goryeo Treatises "Goryeosa-ji"
Astrology
Astronomy
Five Elements
Examinations
'Equipage and dress'
Official positions
Ritual

As can be seen, Yi Jonghwi goes further than Heo Mok by including not only 'hereditary house' *sega* sections but by fully adopting all five section types - *benji*, *biao*, *shu*, *shijia* and *liezhuan* - used in the original *Shiji* (and subsequently only again in the *Xin-Wudai-shi*), the only difference being the treatises section in *Dongsa* is named as *ji/zhī* (志 instead of *shu* 書), a term which had early on become convention in Chinese dynastic historiography following the precedent set by the *Hanshu* (Wilkinson 2013:711). In terms of content, however, the *Dongsa* sections are only very loosely similar: for example, the *pyo* 'tables' do not even contain tabulated information but are simply prose text.

Despite the broad sounding title and in contrast to previous surveys discussed, Yi’s *Dongsa* contains Basic Annals only for the ancient Joseon states: although many of the biographies and treatises focus on Goguryeo topics, the Three Kingdoms period itself is not otherwise treated. In many ways *Dongsa* seems an attempt to emphasize nearly every aspect of Korea’s past seemingly neglected in the SS: thus not only the important northern polities of Buyeo, Goguryeo and Balhae, but Gaya and Tamna (Jeju) are also included, even whilst Silla and Baekje are all but absent.

37) Translations of the treatises are informed by Wilkinson 2013:635, particularly those marked with single quotations.
Lacking any preface or introduction, it is not clear if his work was intended to be supplementary to surviving dynastic histories, or to replace them: Yi’s exact historiographical motivations can only be conjectured.

4.1 Dangun "Dangun-bongi" 檀君本紀
- Includes Hwan’in, Hwan'ung and 'divine bear' (神熊之異 reduced).
- Analyzes Dangun as a title (號), Wanggeom as the name (名) and Hwan (桓) as the surname.
- Buru as son of Dangun, but without surname Hae (distinguished from later Hae Buru of Buyeo).
- Dangun treated as a lineage.
- Includes mention of the Dangun-jecheon-dan (檀君祭天壇) altar site on Mani-san (摩尼山), Gwangha-do, associated with Dangun (attested in Goryeo-sa).
- Additional information that to the east of Guwol-san was a site said to be Dangjianggyeong (唐莊京).
- Compares Dangun to Fuxi and Shennong (伏羲·神農之君) as the first 'sage' (首出聖人) even whilst acknowledging Dangun came only at the later time of Yao. (Also à la Sejong Sillok)

4.2 Gija
"Gija-bongi" 箕子本紀
Contains slightly more narrative detail than previous accounts.
- Lists all 9 of the Hongbeom-guju.
- Zhou vassals dare not stop him going to Joseon.
- King Wu, enfeoffs him after fact.
- Displaces Dangun who moves to Baek’ak, rather than to Asadal.
- Describes territory of Gija Joseon as: extending west to the Liaohe, northeast to the Huhan (忽汗), south to the sea (i.e. bottom of the peninsula) and covering 45,000 里.
  西過於遼河，東北至上忽汗，南極於海，地方四五千里。
- Ye, Maek, [Bulyeo and Han subordinate (蠻貊餘韓之屬)]
- After Gi Jun, civilization not restored until current Joseon dynasty.
  我太祖立國南平壤，文物禮樂，絕而復興
- Briefly discusses Boyi and Shuqi (伯夷·叔齊).
- Korea created by heaven for Confucius to flee to.
  其後孔子又欲居九夷，由是觀之，天生東國，為君子避世之所耶

"Gija-sega" 箕子世家
- First history to reproduce the list of Gija’s forty successors first attested in the Gissibo (箕氏譜) genealogy, although the source is not referenced.
• At the time of Dangun and Gija peripheral polities included YeMaek (southeast), Han (韓 southwest), Bulpyeo Malgal (鶴林靺鞨 northeast) and Manyi and Minyue (蠻夷閩粵) in China. Of these the Han were the largest.
  ※ It can be seen he therefore considers Samhan larger than Buyeo.

4.3 Samhan "Samhan-bongi" 三韓本紀
• Wonders why Gi Jun didn't rename Han as Joseon.
• More details on the three surnames taken by Gi scattered lineage: Han (韓氏) from the name of the [Ma]han or [Sam]han states: Gi (奇氏) because the sound is similar to Gi (箕) and Seon-u (鮮于氏 Ch. Xianyu), because the Gi lineage was originally descended from Xianyu-zi (鮮虞子 K. Seon’u-zi) of the Spring and Autumn period.
• Gives more detail about Sung’in-jeon (崇仁殿)
  • Established as the shrine for Gija in Pyeongyang during the current Joseon dynasty: was originally just the Gija-myo (箕子廟) but subsequently named Sung’in-jeon (崇仁殿 [according to Cheoljong Sillok in 1612 - this is the same shrine attested in Goryeo-sa as being first established in 1325]).

4.4 Later Joseon (Wiman Joseon) "Hu-Joseon-bongi" 後朝鮮本紀
• Whilst including the full narrative of events, just as his predecessors, Yi has a strongly negative assessment of the Wi dynasty.

4.5 Buyeo "Buyeo-sega" 扶餘世家
• Distinguishes Hae Buru as a later ruler of Buyeo, to Dangun’s son Buru.

4.6 Seolchong and Choe Chiwon 薛聰·崔致遠 列傳
The only non-Goguryeo personages treated in the biographies are Seolchong and ostensibly Choe Chiwon. Within this section Yi highlights Seolchong’s innovation of the more phonetic idu and hyangchal (樂札) writing systems, both for the explication of the nine Confucian Classics (九經) as well as usage by the government bureaucracy (官府). Describing Seolchong as the first Confucian scholar of Korea (薛聰為東方儒者之始) Yi explicitly elevates him above the more famous Choe Chiwon, lamenting the lack of greater recognition for Seolchong as due to the contemporary strength of Buddhism (even whilst having included the detail that Seolchong’s own father was the Buddhist master Wonhyo).

"To understand this poem, one must be aware of a few facts of geography, history, and mythology." (Frankel 1976:108 referring to "Baidicheng-huaigu" 白帝城懷古 by Chen Ziang 陳子昂 661-702)

Poet-historian-geographer and Bukhak (北學 'Northern Learning') scholar, Yu Deukgong (柳得恭 1749–1807) is a pivotal figure in the evolution of popular Korean historiography. Whilst popularly best known today for his *Balhae-go* (渤海考 'Study of Balhae' 1784), the preface of which famously laments Goryeo's failure to conquer the continental territory and argues for re-incorporation of Balhae into Korean historiography, his poetry cycle *Isib’ildo-hoegosi* (二十一都懷古詩 'Nostalgic Reflections of the Twenty-One Capitals' 1792) is equally - if not more - important, both for its literary value and as a popular archetype survey of the ON representing its 'final form' before the onset of any major revisionism.

Initially completed in 1778, Yu added a preface in 1785 and subsequently revised the work in 1792. In its final shape, *Isib’ildo-hoegosi* comprises a cycle of 43 heptasyllabic quatrains accompanied by some 196 citations taken from around 43 separate sources, 20 of which are Korean and the remainder Chinese.  

Translated here as 'nostalgic reflections', *hoego-si* (懷古詩 Ch. *huaigushi* - lit. a 'poem thinking of/cherishing the old') was originally a genre of verse developed during the Tang dynasty. A Beijing friend and early champion of the work, Pan Tingyun (潘庭筠), is said to have observed that Yu's *hoego-si* incorporated aspects of several related genres of Chinese poem including *yongshishi* (詠史诗 K. *yeongsa-si* 'history recounting poem'), *zhuzhi* (竹枝 K. juk’ji 'bamboo branches') typically discussing local scenery and customs, and *gongci* (宮詞 K. *gung-sa* 'palace lyrics') which take as their subject the intrigues and tales of palace life. (Yu 2009:23)

What distinguishes *Isib’ildo-hoegosi* from preceding poetic works such as *Jewang-ungi*, *Se’nyeon-ga* and even *Yongbi’eocheon-ga*, which all belong to the broad *yeongsa-si* category, is that as a *hoego-si* it does not attempt to recite or

---

38) The source text consulted is a recent, very good publication containing the original text, Korean translation, annotations and facsimile: see Yu 2009.
39) Frankel 1976:108 translates the Chinese *huaigu* (懷古) as 'cherishing the past'. His succinct analysis of the poem "Baidicheng-huaigu" (白帝城懷古) by Chen Ziang (陳子昂 661-702) is closely applicable to *Isib’ildo-hoegosi*, where "the known facts of history combine with the presently visible sights" (Frankel 1976:109).
recount a historical narrative but only *recalls* episodes from such a narrative. Also, in contrast to more official poetic histories, there is no underlying didacticism: Yu neither eulogizes nor overtly moralizes, rather he evokes memories of the past, triggered by a historical landscape of physical ruins, intangible lore and toponymy. For Yu, these vestiges remained embedded both in the contemporary landscape through which he journeyed several times, and in the textual record, from dynastic histories to local compendia, in which he was thoroughly erudite.

The twenty-one *do* 'capitals' (都) in the title refer to the revised work's subdivision into twenty-one separately titled historical polities from Dangun Joseon through to Goryeo, including several smaller and lesser acknowledged states: in the poems themselves, however, though often mentioned, there is no overt emphasis placed on the notion of capitals or urban centres.

During the process of revision, it seems *Isib’ildo-hoegosi* evolved away from an initially stronger concept of structuring the cycle around the motif of capitals: the first edition, consisting of 37 poems, though still covering the same twenty-one polities, was originally subdivided into sixteen sections titled by their contemporary C18th administrative terms, wherein several polities from different periods were grouped according to their shared capital locations. The cycle was thus early on referred to by Jeong Yak-yong (1762–1836) in a letter to his son as the 'Sixteen capital heogo-si' (十六都懷古詩). The locations hosting more than one polity were: Pyeong’yang-bu (平壤府) for Dangun Joseon, Gija Joseon, Wi Man Joseon and Goguryeo; Iksan-gun (益山郡) for Mahan and Bodeok (報德); and Gangneung-bu for Ye and Myeongju (溟洲).

In both versions the term *do* itself, only appears in the main title, and not the subsections, whilst any strict adherence to poetically representing each capital was further diminished in the cases of Goguryeo and Baekje whose capitals were known to have changed location several times but are each treated only as a single *do* : in both cases however, the multiple capitals are fully acknowledged and discussed in the introductory annotations. The ambiguous usage in the title, then, might be better understood as more loosely delineating the polities themselves: it could be speculated that whilst it may have been considered inappropriate to treat all of the twenty-one polities included as equivalent, fully fledged dynastic states, they were at least all assumed to have had a seat of power in the form of a fortification or palace where the ruler was based and which could thus be designated a 'capital,' however minor some of the states may have been themselves.

---

Aside from changing the classification of the capitals, the main difference between the first and revised versions is the greater detail of the quotations taken from historical sources. In the first edition, the quotes following the poems apparently do not always indicate their source and sometimes do not even directly relate to the contents of the poem.\textsuperscript{41} By contrast, the quotations used in the revised version are chosen to explain only specific names, phrases or words in the text and their sources are explicitly stated. Also previously absent, introductions composed of further quotes were added for each of the twenty-one polities inserted at the beginning of each subsection.

The enhanced academic rigour of the revised version no doubt reflects the experience and greater access to sources Yu had subsequently gained working at the Gyujanggak (奎章閣) royal library where he was appointed in 1779, combined with a more fully developed interest in historical research as demonstrated by his Balhae-go, as well as greater appreciation for toponymy derived from his travels, including his first of three visits to China in 1778.\textsuperscript{42}

Whilst the quatrains themselves retain the characteristics of the hoegosi genre, the effect of augmenting the quotations to such a degree is that, taken as a whole, Isib’ildo-hoegosi becomes as much a prose work of historical survey as it does one of poetic rumination.

As most of the poems themselves did not greatly change in content, Yu’s somewhat idiosyncratic choice of historical personages and scenes chosen for the cycle were preserved throughout the revision. The final result is best appreciated then as an 'alternative take' on the ON or even, simply a miscellany of topics which interested Yu most at the initial time of composition set against the framework of the ON.

That the work remained thoroughly in the tradition of the ON as it had evolved by mid Joseon, is mostly clearly demonstrated by the fact that Yu chose not to include a Balhae 'capital' poem, even in the revised version subsequent to his compiling of Balhae-go.

Aside from Balhae, much else could be made of what and who Yu left out of the cycle but the selection process is best understood by considering the content that was included: what becomes apparent is that each poem was composed in

\textsuperscript{41} Yu 2009:20.
\textsuperscript{42} For a more detailed overview of Yu’s life, see Jeong 1998:17-118 in Korean, or for the same information in English, blog post Logie 2012a.
order to reference at least one cultural, anecdotal, literary or archaeological point of interest. The latter often includes the monuments and landscapes Yu observed on his early travels, the others were culled from his extensive reading.

*Isib’ildo-hoegosi* is not a panegyric and so Yu was under no obligation to include names of historic figures and major events, unless they served a further purpose in linking to the other points of lesser known interest: Silla general Kim Yusin, for example, is only very indirectly alluded to in poem 22 through the mention of Songhwa-ok (松花屋 ‘pine flower hermitage’), which in the accompanying annotation is noted to have been located in Jaemae-gok (貢買谷) valley, named after Kim Yusin’s daughter (?宗女), Madam Jaemae (貢買夫人). This seeming disinterest in the traditional focus of history is a powerful literary strategy and effective statement on what may actually remain after the lives of famous personages: in poem 12, Eulji Mundeok’s victory against the 612 Sui invasion of Goguryeo, whilst positively acknowledged, is primarily associated with the Sal-su river and – likely apocryphal – SS story of him sending a penasylabic quatrain to Sui general Yu Zhongwen (于仲文), wherein the unchanging river and continued tradition of poetic form can be understood as having 'bridge[d] the temporal distance' (to borrow another phrase from Frankel 1976:109).

Perhaps all the more so for this emphasis on cultural heritage over dynastic history, *Isib’ildo-hoegosi* successfully incorporates a significant number of ‘articles of civilization’. From this perspective, relative to SS or *Jewang-ungi*, it shares some affinity with SY albeit minus the Buddhist focus.

The three most frequently cited sources are: the encyclopedic geography, *[Sinjeung-Dongguk] Yeoji-seungnam* ([新增東國]輿地勝覽 1530 – YJSR), quoted 46 times: SS quoted 32 times, and the literary compilation *[Dongguk] Munheon-bigo* (東國文獻備考 1770 – hereafter MHBG) 23 times. By contrast, SY is explicitly cited only once (identifying Dangun’s capital as Pyeongyang – poem 1), and implicitly twice further for quotations of the *Garakguk-gi* (駕洛國記 – poem 28), a source which itself survives only as a fragment included within SY. However, more than twenty other topics which Yu references via other compendia such as YJSR or *Dongguk-tonggam*, in fact have their earliest attestations in SY.

Yu’s reluctance to profile SY more is perhaps indicative of the low regard in which it was held by Confucian trained Joseon dynasty literati. Aside from the omission of Balhae, one of the few significant changes in the ON when compared to *Jewang-ungi* is, indeed, the overall diminishment of Buddhism. The Buddhism-Confucianism dichotomy which emerged in the early Joseon dynasty, has since the early modern era been projected further back to a falsely perceived Goryeo era SS-SY rivalry, however, as already noted with *Jewang-ungi*
the ON originally demonstrated a comfortable coexistence of the traditions, albeit with the greater emphasis placed on 'Confucian' - or at least Chinese - style dynastic historiography as dynastic lineage was considered the core concern of history. In any event the Joseon dynasty era diminishment of Buddhism - amongst secular intelligentsia - is demonstrated by the absence of celebrated Buddhist masters such as Wonhyo and Uisang from dynastic and privately authored histories. *Isib’ildo-hoegeosi* is no exception and thus serves well as a representative archetype.

The only mention of a quasi Buddhist personage is that of esoteric geomancer Doseon (道軔 827-98 - poem 43). Whilst in *Jewang-ungi* Doseon is portrayed in a neutral light as the geomancer selecting the location of Goryeo’s capital and bestowing the royal surname Wang (王), in the final annotation of the final poem of *Isib’ildo-hoegeosi* the same event is cast in an implicitly more negative manner, highlighting the inauspicious geomancy of the Goryeo capital owing to Doseon’s failure to notice the Han’yang Samgak-san (漢陽三角山) mountains shrouded in mist to the southeast which cancels the positive geomancy of Song’ak-san (松嶽山). More than a criticism of Buddhism, this is rather indicative of the overall negative depiction of the superstitious Goryeo era contained in the final nine poems of the work, the largest of the subsections: this negative appraisal was a long-term product of the Joseon dynasty and Yu did not seek to revise it, not least because it in any event matches the nostalgic pathos of the cycle.

Alongside Wonhyo and Uisang, one final notable absence from *Isib’ildo-hoegeosi* is the literatus Seol Chong, who - first attested in SS - in *Jewang-ungi* is associated with the creation of idu script. Together with Choe Chiwon (poem 24), Yu by contrast includes the calligrapher Kim Saeng (金生 711-91) and painter Sol Geo (率居), both in poem 25, all similarly attested in the SS biographies. The choice of Kim Saeng and Sol Geo over Seol Chong may simply have been that through the former two Yu was able to reference the ruins of Changnim-sa (昌林寺) temple at Geum’o-san (金鱉山), citing YJSR, and Buddhist paintings said to have remained at Bunhwan-sa (芬皇寺) and Dansok-sa (斷俗寺) temples in Gyeongju and Jinju (晉州) respectively. Here, it can be seen Yu was not averse to Buddhist heritage when it involved ruins or cultural artistic traditions. It may also be speculated that both the significance and knowledge of idu script associated with Seol Chong, had been much diminished following the C15th creation of the vernacular *hunmin-jeong’eum* script, aka hangul.43)

---

43) Whether Yu would have included hangul had he extended the cycle to include the more recent past can only be speculated: linguistically, Yu was a professed Sinophile but he equally had a strong interest in local folk culture as evidenced by his study of the capital, *Gyeongdo-japgi* (京都雜記 ‘Miscellaneous Records of Seoul’). His attitude towards hangul and alternative writing systems is not known to me.
Table 9 below provides a summary of *Isib’ildo-hoegosi*, focusing on the topics and 'articles of civilization'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section and annotations</th>
<th>Items / information</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dangun Joseon</strong> 檀君朝鲜</td>
<td>Dangun</td>
<td>DGTG 東國通鑑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital at Pyeongyang.</td>
<td>SY 三國遺事</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| [1]                     | *With the Daedong River shrouded in mist.*  
*Wang Geom’s spring fortress appears as if [in] a painting.*  
*To the distant Mount To they came with treasure.*  
*We still remember that beautiful child, Hae Buru.* | 大同江濱水煙環  
王俊城外似畫圖  
萬里塗山來執玉  
佳兒尚憶解婁押金 |
| **Daedong-gang 大同江** | geographic description | YJSR 奧地勝覽 |
| **Wanggeom-seong 王儉城** | Pyeongyang = Seon’in Wanggeom’s  
仙人王儉 capital | SS, *Dongsa* 東史⁴⁵ |
|                          | Wi Man’s capital also Pyeongyang. | YJSR |
| **Carrying treasure to Tushan 塗山執玉** | Dangun’s son Buru sent to Tushan. | *Dongsan* |
|                          | Dangun’s son Hae Buru founder of Buyeo. | MHBG 文獻備考 |
| **Gija Joseon 筠子朝鮮** | Hongbom-guju 洪範九疇 | Shiji, *Hanshu*,  
DGTG |
| [2]                     | *The mountain hue of To-san is imbeded with the green forest.*  
*The stone statues’ caps and sleeves are encroached upon by the moss’s dew.*  
*Just as when the Japanese invaders were frightened [from this place] in the year of the Dragon (1592).*  
*The wind in the pines makes the sound of flutes and zithers.* | 筠山山色碧森沈  
翁仲巾袍被霧侵  
狼似龍年奔奔寇  
松風聞作管絃音 |
| **To-san 筠山** | Gija’s grave on To-san north of Pyeongyang. | YJSR |
| **Tomb statues’ caps and robes 翁仲巾規** | Gija’s shrine 筠祠 and grave | Dongyue’s 章越  
(1430–1502)  
*Chaoxian-fu* 朝鮮賦 |
| **Flutes and zithers 管絃音** | During 1592 Japanese attempted to loot  
Gija’s grave but were frightened off by music. | MHBG |
*Who can know that beyond the wide and distant sea of Liao*  
*The people of Yin, [too,] till the same number of seventy fields?* | 耳眼簾斜井字阡  
一村桑柄望芊芊  
誰知遼海茫茫外  
耕種殷人七十田 |
| **Yin people [till] 70 fields 殷人七十田** | Gija’s well-field system field remains. | *Pyeongyangbu-zhi*  
平壤府志 |
| **Wiman Joseon 衛滿朝鮮** | | Shiji, *Shiji-suoyin*  
[史記]索隱, *Guadizhi* 括地志 |

⁴⁴) The eight penultimate poems of the Goryeo section are omitted due to space and relevance. For the original text, facsimiles and modern Korean translation, see Yu 2009.  
For a rough English translation of the complete work, see blog post Logie 2012b.  
⁴⁵) Refers to Hong Manjong’s *Dongguk-yeokdae-chongmok*.  
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**[4]** During the reign of [Han Dynasty] Emperor Gaozu, men arrived with their hair tied in tall topknots. It was at this time, too, that Zhaotuo [self declared Emperor Wu of Nanyue 南越] had been poorly appointed. Lamentably King Gi [Jun, of Joseon] lacked judgement. And conferred the official rank of baksa on an [ambitious] hero.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>baksa 博士</th>
<th>Wi Man usurpation.</th>
<th>Weilüe 魏略</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**[5]** The water beside Lelang-seong leisurely flows by. Who [now] would recognize Lord Chujeo of the Han dynasty? [His legacy] cannot compare to the ferryman’s wife of that same year. [Her] gong-hu melody [remains] beautiful a thousand autumns [after].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lelang 楚浪</th>
<th>Han overthrow of Ugeo 右渠 and establishment of Four Commanderies.</th>
<th>Hanshu.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lelang county seat Chaoxian-xian 朝鮮縣 = Pyeongyang</td>
<td>MHBG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chujeo 萧茡</td>
<td>Defection of Joseon minister Han’eum 韓陰 during Han invasion.</td>
<td>Shiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ferryman’s wife 津吏婦</td>
<td>Harp song said to have been composed at the same time by a ferryman’s wife.</td>
<td>Guyuefu 古樂府</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Han 韓</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gi Jun 簡準 fled to Mahan-gun 金馬都: present day Iksan-gun 烏山郡</td>
<td>DGTG: MHBG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gijun-seong 簡準城 at Yonghwa-san 龍華山, Iksan.</td>
<td>YJSR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**[6]** At that time [Gi Jun] vainly put his trust in those who had fled from Han. Barley ears grow out at the site of the ancient Yin capital [Yinxu], spring has come again. How amusing, that on the day they hurriedly set out to sea He [still made sure to] have on board his second queen [consort/concubine]. Seonhwa [standing at] the ship’s prow!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consort Seonghwa 善花嬪</th>
<th>Gi Jun’s flight including palace attendants.</th>
<th>SGZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gi Jun titled King Mugang 武康王.</td>
<td>Dongsa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graves of King Mugang and is queen close to Ogeum-sa 五金寺.</td>
<td>YJSR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ye 海</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myeongju 明州 on the northern border of Silla was formerly the country of Ye.</td>
<td>Gu Dan’i’s (曹耽 730-805) Gijinjunguozhi 古今郡國志</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remains of Ye fortress in eastern Gangneung-bu.</td>
<td>MHBG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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| An old rustic farmer, ignorant of history [lit. 'not knowing the rise and fall events']
Leisurely picked up an old copper seal [found] in his field.
[Either 桑 is short for 扶桑 or 柏 is an error for 柏 which is also used to write 柏桑] | 田間開拾古銅章 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daegwan-nyeong 大關嶺</td>
<td>45 里 west of Gangneung-bu: quotes poem by Kim Geuk-gi 金克己 (1148-1209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old bronze seal 古銅章</td>
<td>Ye king's seal 警王印 discovered by farmer in north Myeong[ju]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maek 鍾</td>
<td>Peng Wu 彭吳 penetrated YeMaek Joseon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goguryeo King Gung 宮 raids Xuantu altogether with YeMaek</td>
<td>HHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maek capital 13 里 north of Chuncheon-bu, north of the Soyang-gang 昭陽江.</td>
<td>MHBG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The waters of the Soyang River reach the Chang-jin ferry crossing [entrance to the eastern sea].
The stele commemorating the opening of roads is now buried amongst brambles and hazelnut trees.
Korean historians fail to study Ban Gu [i.e. Hanshu 漢書]
To say that in the period of the [legendary] Yao Emperor Dangun could have ordered Peng Wu a vassal of the [much later] Han Dynasty to build the first roads! | 昭陽江水接滄津
通道碑殘沒蘇植
東史未寧班揚志
堯時君命漢時臣 |
| Soyang-gang 昭陽江 | 6 里 north of Chuncheon-bu. | YJSR |
| Tongdo-bi stele 通道碑 | Dangun ordered Paeng’o 彭吳 to govern the interior of the state bringing stability. | Dongsa48) |
| Peng Wu stele 彭吳碑 in Usu-ju 牛首州 | Bongi-tonggam 本紀通覧 (lost Korean text) |
| Peng Wu was a Han Chinese, not a vassal of Dangun. | MHBG |
| Kim Si-seup (梅月堂 金時習, 1435-93) wrote the poetic lines From Peng Wu the roads were opened 通道自彭吳. | 蘇春是錫國
通道自彭吳49) |
| Goguryeo 高句麗 | Jumong foundation myth. | Weishu 魏書 |
| Jumong: Goguryeo capitals Gungnae-seong, Hwando and Pyeongyang. | SS |
| Pyeongyang | Tongdian 通典 |
| For nineteen years the archer [Jumong] went around.
Riding on his fine girin steed, he departed to attend the celestial court.
The vigour [of Goguryeo] that lasted a thousand autumns is [now] as cold as water.
[Only] a white jade handled whip [lies] decaying inside [his] tomb. | 弧矢橫行十九年
麒麟寶馬去朝天
千秋霸氣涼于水
墓裏消沈白玉鞭 |
<p>| fine girin steed 麒麟寶馬 | Girin-gul cave 麒麟窟, Jocheon-seok 朝天石 | YJSR |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| There was once a boy in Buyeo who carried a slingshot. He was the son of King Dongmyeong [Jumong] and called Yuri. Many voices of black-naped orioles sing deep amongst the trees. Just as when Queen Hwa insulted Queen Chi. | 昔日夫餘挾彈兒 東明王子號琉璜 數聲烏鳩嘯深樹 猶似禾姬罵雉姬 | 舊江
| slingshot boy 拈彈兒 | Yuri's 類利 arrival in Goguryeo becoming crown prince. | SS |
| black-naped oriole 黃鳥 | Yuri’s two quarreling wives, and quaran attributed to Yuri. | SS |
| The dust of war spreads before Gyerip-san [where Ondal died fighting in his attempt to invade Silla]. The red banner [of Ondal?] still loves King Pyeongwon’s daughter [lit. ‘spring in the princess’s garden’]. Throughout his life, he was resented as Ondal the Fool. To be sure, his appearance was so gaunt that people would laugh [at him]. | 鏽立山前揮戰塵 丹旌依戀沈園春 平生懷慨愚濤達 自是龍鍾可笑人 | 舊江
| Ondal the Fool 呂溫達 | Ondal account. | SS |
| Banners returning [retreating] across Liaodong [appear] as fragments of red. The churning Sal-su river sweeps along sand and insects [after Eulji Mundeok built a dam and released it as Sui forces were crossing]. Eulji Mundeok was truly a man of talent. Composing a pentasyllabic poem, he was the greatest in the East. [Like the quatrain he sent to the invading Sui general before defeating him in ambush.] | 遼海歸旌數片紅 湯湯諸水捲沙蟲 乙支文德賢才士 倡五言時冠大東 | 舊江
| Sal-su river 薩水 | Salsu = Cheongcheon-gang 清川江 | YJSR |
| Eulji Mundeok 乙支文德 | Eulji Mundeok account. | SS |
| composing pentasyllabic poems 呈五言詩 | Eulji Mundeok’s poem sent to Sui general Yu Zhongwen 于仲文. | Suishu 隨書 |
| 'High' Guryeo was inappropriately referred to as 'base' Guryeo. Ju’pil-san [remains] green but the emperor’s army (六師) has grown old. One [should] question Hongfu-ji of the [Sui] Western Capital [modern day Xian]. For Qiuran-ke [the 'Curly-Bearded Guest'] was a mangniji. | 句麗錯料下句麗 駐蹟山青老六師 爲問西京紅拂妓 螠髯客是莫離支 | 舊江
<p>| low/base-Guryeo 下句麗 | Wang Mang 王莽 | HHS: You Tong’s 尤侗 (1618-1704) Waiguo-zhushici 外國竹枝詞 |
| Ju’pil-san 駐蹟山 | Tang emperor Taizong’s 太宗 failed siege of Ansi-seong 安市城. | Tangshu 唐書 |
| mangniji 莫離支 (막리지) | [Yeon] Gaesumun 蓋蘇文 | Tangshu: Haedong-paeseung 海東稗業 |
| Bodeok 報德 | Protectorate General to Pacify the East 安東都護府: Gyeom Mojām 両牟岑 (aka Geom Mojām 両牟岑) rebellion and king Ansun 安舜 (aka Anseung 安勝) restoration attempt. | Tangshu |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anseung (安勝) eneoffed by Silla as Bodeok king and settled in Geummajeo 金馬渚.</th>
<th>SS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geummajeo = Iksan (former Mahan).</td>
<td>YJSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lush spring grasses grow over Geummajeo. South of the water is the ruined fortress occupied by [the remnants of] Goguryeo [led by Anseung]. Who knows whose kindness [Anseung] wanted to repay. The noble daehyeong Geom [Mo-jam’s end], [murdered by Anseung] was lamentable.</td>
<td>YJSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daehyeong Geom 創大兄 Geom Mojam killed by Anseung.</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biryu 沸流 Zhengzhou 正州 = Biryu-gun 沸流郡 of Balhæ</td>
<td>Liaoshi geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biryu king Song-yang 松讓 and Damuldo 多勿都.</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seongcheon-bu 成川府 site of Biryu's capital.</td>
<td>YJSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelve green mountain peaks in the shape of swords. The water of the Yugeo’i-su flows forcefully. Jumong was not such a perfect hero. He tricked a [humble and] poor king who ate [only] vegetables into [accepting] defeat.</td>
<td>YJSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>green sword shaped peaks 創樣青峰 Heulgol-san 棺骨山 2 li NW of Seongcheon-bu. Cites poem by Bak Won-hyeong 朴元亨 (1411-69).</td>
<td>YJSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugeo’i-su 遊車衣水 = Biryu-gang 沸流江 = Jolbon-cheon 卒本川, tributary to Daedong-gang.</td>
<td>YJSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vegetarian king 奴菜王 Archery contest between Dongmyeong and Song-yang.</td>
<td>SS: gogi 古記 [here taken from Dongmyeongwang-p yeon]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baekje 百濟 Baekje originating in Mahan: royal line related to Goguryeo and Buyeo: capital locations.</td>
<td>Nanshi 南史, Beishi 北史</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onjo: capitals, name change to South Buyeo 南夫餘.</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabi 酒批 = present Buyeo-hyeon 夫餘縣</td>
<td>MHBG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A singing pagoda and dancing palace opens towards the river. The top of Banwol-seong is silhouetted against the moon. The red carpet [mattress] is cold and [the king] cannot sleep. The [last] king [of Baekje, Uija] loved to be on the Ja’on-daе [rock].</td>
<td>YJSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banwol-seong 半月城 Former Baekje capital hugging Buso-san 扶蘇山.</td>
<td>YJSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ja’on-daе 自溫臺 Place enjoyed by last, decadent king Uija: Naktiwa-am 落花巖 nearby.</td>
<td>YJSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun sets [behind] the peaks of Bu[so-san] [the location of the final royal Baekje fortress]. [Beneath] the cold sky, Baekma[-gang] angrily froths.</td>
<td>YJSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buso 扶蘇</td>
<td>Buso-san.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seongchung 成忠</td>
<td>Loyal official who warned King Uija to prepare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kingdom protecting dragon 護國龍</td>
<td>Baekma-gang 白馬江 'white horse river', where invading Tang general, Su Dingfang 蘇定方, is said to have caught a dragon before being able to cross.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rock flowers 巖花</td>
<td>Nakhwa-am 落花巖 said to be from where palace ladies jumped to their deaths in the wake of Baekje's overthrow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquess Guiming 歸命侯</td>
<td>King Uija’s capture and exile to Tang capital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wash basin 浴槃</td>
<td>Relic said to be basin used by palace ladies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>books stored in a stone room 石室藏書</td>
<td>Chaek'am 册巖 (book rock) folk site said to be where Baekje books were stored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tang stele 唐碑</td>
<td>Remnant stele commemorating Tang overthrow of Baekje.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michuhol 彌卿忽</td>
<td>Biryu 潙流 and Onjo 韶祚: Biryu’s failed establishing of kingdom of Michuhol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biryu’s grave south of Incheon-bu 仁川府.</td>
<td>Yeoji-ji 奠地志</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above the Pae [rivers] the brothers parted with a sad song. Climbing the mountain and looking down upon the water [Biryu] became infatuated with the southern road. The land of the Sanhan could not match the bed clothes of Jiangang 江防 [refers to Jianggong of the Eastern Han, who loved his two younger brothers Zhonghai 仲海 and Jiijiang (季江) and would sleep under the same blanket]. [Biryu] should not have [attempted] to build his towering Ebun-seong.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*How could he fail to hark on loyal vassal Seongchung’s advice? Yet he believed the dragon in the river would [be enough to] protect his kingdom!*

*In cold rain and chill wind, it is sad to leave your country. Flowers [palace women] fell from the rock and expired: the water flows gently by. The Otherworld is lonely and dreary, who may accompany him [the last Baekje king, Uija] there? He’ll be together with Sun Hao [Marquess Guiming] on the south bank.*

*The wash basin is old and worn [but] yeonji make-up stains [remain]. [They say that] books were stored in the stone room, but this seems’ doubtful. At times visible in the autumn grasses of the desolate fields, Passersby stop their horses and read the Tang stele.*

*Above the Pae [rivers] the brothers parted with a sad song. Climbing the mountain and looking down upon the water [Biryu] became infatuated with the southern road. The land of the Sanhan could not match the bed clothes of Jiangang 江防 [refers to Jianggong of the Eastern Han, who loved his two younger brothers Zhonghai 仲海 and Jiijiang (季江) and would sleep under the same blanket]. [Biryu] should not have [attempted] to build his towering Ebun-seong.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Silla</strong> 新羅</th>
<th>Biryu’s failed capital = southern Incheon-bu.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Six Bu of Jinhan</strong> 辰韓六部</td>
<td>Hyeokgeose 赫居世 progenitor myth: Silla = Seoyabeol 徐耶伐 / Sara 斯羅 / Saro 斯盧.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Autumn mists drift across the Six Bu of Jinhan.**
- It is sad [now] to think of the prosperity of Seo’ul [Silla’s capital].
- They called it, Manman-papa ([Flute of Multitudinous Waves]): For a thousand years it was blown by the three families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seo’ul 徐莞</strong></td>
<td>Name of the Silla capital. Seobeol 徐伐, derived from the earlier name of the state, Seoyabeol 徐耶伐.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manman-papa 萬萬派派</strong></td>
<td>Mythical magic bamboo flute.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **The three surnames 三姓** Bak 朴, Seok 曙 and Kim 金. |

- **Amongst the many green peaks are many Buddhist temples.** The wild geese and ducks of the desolate [An’ap-ji] pond are unable to find mates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Wild geese and ducks of the desolate pond</strong> 荒池鳧鴨</th>
<th>An’ap-ji pond 延鴨池</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **A spring wind blows across the valley entrance by Songhwa-ok hermitage.** At times one can hear the lonely bark of a short tailed sapsal [삼삼개] dog.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Songhwa-ok 松花屋 ’pine flower hermitage’</strong></th>
<th>Located at Jaemae-gok valley 賈買谷 which was named after Kim Yusin’s 金庾信 daughter(?). 金氏女, Madam Jaemae 賈買夫人.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short tailed sapsal dog</strong> 短尾猿</td>
<td>Local dog breed of Gyeongju.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **The first two weeks of the [lunar] new year are spent amongst a chill wind.**
- Tapping the rhythm with their feet, they sing, anxious and melancholy.
- There is no one to perform the yearly rites of offering glutinous rice.
- A flock of cold crows squawk [far off] in another village.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Anxious and melancholy 倏忽恒恒</strong></th>
<th>Shooting of the geomungo case: Dodan-ga 切怛歌 song</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **In evening Geum’so-san turns a deep green.**
- Gye-rim forest is half dyed in the gradations of frost.
- After [Choe Chi-won] left for the deep [valleys of] Gayaf-san, The leaves are now red at Sangseo-jang villa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Anxious and melancholy 倏忽恒恒</strong></th>
<th>YJSR, Jeompiljae-jip 佔畢齋集</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **In evening Geum’so-san turns a deep green.**
- Gye-rim forest is half dyed in the gradations of frost.
- After [Choe Chi-won] left for the deep [valleys of] Gayaf-san, The leaves are now red at Sangseo-jang villa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Anxious and melancholy 倏忽恒恒</strong></th>
<th>YJSR, Jeompiljae-jip 佔畢齋集</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>Translation/Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geum’o-san 金鬃山 (golden turtle mountain)</strong></td>
<td>Poem sent by Gu Yun 龔雲 to Choe Chiwon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gyerim 魚林 ’chicken forest’</strong></td>
<td>Kim Al-ji 金闕智 progenitor story: Gyerim as alternative name for Silla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gaya 伽倻</strong></td>
<td>Gaya-san 伽倻山</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sangseo-jang 上書莊 ’letter writing villa’</strong></td>
<td>Choe Chiwon 崔致遠</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


City South, before the dawn, the bell sounds at Changnim-sa temple. The books and paintings of the Eastern Capital [Gyeongju] are leisurely restored [and so] passed down. [They remind us of] Kim Saeng’s stone monument and Sol Geo’s pine trees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Authors/Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kim Saeng 金生</strong></td>
<td>Calligrapher Kim Saeng (711-91): Changnim-sa temple 昌林寺</td>
<td>SS, YJSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sol Geo 率居</strong></td>
<td>Painter Sol Geo: Hwangnyong-sa temple 黃龍寺</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In spring [the first ten days of the third lunar month], [King Gyeongae 金明’a] [penultimate king of Silla] was out enjoying the new foliage. By Mun-cheon stream, the flowers and willows are darkly locked together. Whilst playing a game of floating wine cups, they met with sorrow. Do not ascend to Poseok-jeong pavilion when the spring wind blows!

Spring [the first ten days of the third lunar month], [King Gyeongae 金明’a] [penultimate king of Silla] was out enjoying the new foliage. By Mun-cheon stream, the flowers and willows are darkly locked together. Whilst playing a game of floating wine cups, they met with sorrow. Do not ascend to Poseok-jeong pavilion when the spring wind blows!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Authors/Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mun-cheon 蚊川 ’mosquito stream’</strong></td>
<td>Poem by Kim Geuk-gi 金克己 (1148-1209) describes bulgye 被誦 poem contest drinking game.</td>
<td>YJSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poseok-jeong 鮑石亭 ’abalone stone pavilion’</strong></td>
<td>Silla capital attacked by Gyeon Hwon 創億 in 927 when the King Gyeong’e was at Poseok-jeong.</td>
<td>YJSR, SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Myeongju 漸州</strong></td>
<td>Juwon 周元 briefly considered as contender for throne after King Seondeok (r.780–785), but fails and made ‘Myeongju-gun king’: Myeongju = Gangneung-bu 江陵府.</td>
<td>SS, Yeoji-ji, MHBG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Kim Juwon] was a jingol rank of Gyerim and a close relative to the king [Seondeok who died without issue]. Royal food provision was divided and given to [Kim Juwon] beside the sea. [Myeongju] makes one think most of the girl by the lilly pond Who sent a letter faraway by fish to the man she had promised herself to.

[Kim Juwon] was a jingol rank of Gyerim and a close relative to the king [Seondeok who died without issue]. Royal food provision was divided and given to [Kim Juwon] beside the sea. [Myeongju] makes one think most of the girl by the lilly pond Who sent a letter faraway by fish to the man she had promised herself to.

Jingol 靠骨 ’true bone’ | Golpum 骨品 ’bone rank’ hereditary caste system. SS cites Linghu Cheng’s 令狐澄 Xintuoguo-ji 新羅國記. | SS |
| Nine pheasants 九雉 | Silla royal food provision granted also to Juwon. | MHBG |

Sending a letter far by fish 漁書遠寄 | Story behind Myeongju-gok 漸州曲 folk song. Goryeo-sa music treatise 高麗樂志. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[28] Upon visiting Old Gaya [her] throat was dry from [singing the] zhuzhi [竹枝 lit. 'bamboo branch'] songs. The Pasa-tap pagoda casts a shadow on the banks of Ho-gye stream. Looking back the sun sets over the Western Sea: It appears just as when the red flag arrived at the harbour.</td>
<td>訪古伽倻嘗竹枝 娑娑塔影虎溪源 回看落日沈西海 正似紅旗入浦時</td>
<td>Nanqishu 南齊書 (c.537), Beishi, SS, Garakguk-ɡi [in SY], YJSR, Yeoji-ji, Jibong-yuseol, MHBG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visiting Old Gaya 訪古伽倻</td>
<td>Cites poem by Po’eun Jeong Mong-ju (鬱陵 鄭夢周 1338–92) Swallow Pagoda of Gimhae 金海燕子樓.</td>
<td>YJSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasa-tap pagoda 娑娑塔</td>
<td>Pagoda said to have been brought by Empress Heo 許皇后, beside Ho-gye stream.</td>
<td>YJSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho-gye 虎溪 'tiger stream'</td>
<td>Flows through Gimhaebu-seong fortress 金海府城.</td>
<td>YJSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the red flag arriving at the harbour 紅旗入浦</td>
<td>Legend of Empress Heo arriving from Ayodhya 阿羅陀國.</td>
<td>Garakguk-ɡi [SY], YJSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dae-Gaya 大伽倻 [Goryeong]</td>
<td>Isabu’s 異夫 subjugation of Gaya: 16 generations of kings from Jinnado 伊珍阿鼓王, until King Doseolji 道設智王.</td>
<td>SS, Yeoji-ji, MHBG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[29] The sound of flowing water [has been heard] on the high mountain for a thousand years. The clear [sound] of the twelve string zither. No one asks of desolate past events. The red leaves meet with frost and form a forest of silk.</td>
<td>千載高山流水音 吟吟一十二絃琴 慶慶往事無人問 紅葉迎霜作錦林</td>
<td>YJSR, Jibong-yuseol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twelve string zither 一十二絃琴</td>
<td>Gaya-geum 伽倻琴 zither</td>
<td>YJSR, Jibong-yuseol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geum-rim 錫林 'silk forest'</td>
<td>Said to be the location of a royal tomb.</td>
<td>YJSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gammadun 甘文</td>
<td>Minor state conquered by Silla c.231: contemporary Gaeryeong-hyeon 開寧縣.</td>
<td>SS, Yeoji-ji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[30] After Queen Jang’s passing, the meadow flowers are fragrant. The [half] buried and aging memorial stone [is that of] the ancient King Hyo. [It is said] they fielded just thirty manly warriors: For a thousand battles on [a patch of land no larger than the space] between a snail’s tentacles!</td>
<td>猷姬一去野花香 埋沒殘碑古孝王 三十猛士曾大發 蝸牛角上鬱千場</td>
<td>YJSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Jang 猷姬</td>
<td>Tomb located west Gaeryeong-hyeon.</td>
<td>YJSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Hyo 孝王</td>
<td>Tomb located north Gaeryeong-hyeon.</td>
<td>YJSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thirty manly warriors 三十猛士</td>
<td>Extremely small polity.</td>
<td>Dongsa [cited in MHBG], MHBG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usan 于山 [Ulleung-do]</td>
<td>Ulleung-do island 閑陵島.</td>
<td>SS, YJSR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[31] Spring wind blows the o’ryang [wind measuring instrument] on the sails of the patrol ship [visiting Usan Island].</td>
<td>春風五兩運帆舸 海上桃花寂寞開</td>
<td>YJSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peach blossoms [being brought back from the island] open lonely and sad about the sea. Only sea lions lie up on the seashore. No more lions will come to attack the people.</td>
<td>唯見可之登岸臥尫無獅子搗人來</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the sails of the patrol ship 運帆</td>
<td>Usan products exploited by Silla.</td>
<td>MHGB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea lions 可之</td>
<td>Gaji 可之 sea lions</td>
<td>MHGB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions 獅子</td>
<td>Silla subjugation of Usan with trick of wooden lions, led by Isabu 烏斯夫</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humid mist clears over the fortress of the Three Eulna. The tall sail returns to the mouth of the Tamjin-gang river. From the very beginning there was the Moheung-hyeol hole. Why would they have to come out of another person’s trousers? [Refuting a Silla myth that the Eulna emerged from the king’s trousers].</td>
<td>三乙那城登霧開 艊津江口帆船至 始初膝有毛興穴 何必他人裙下來</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamjin 艶津</td>
<td>Contemporary Gangjin-hyeon 康津縣.</td>
<td>MHGB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moheung-hyeol hole 毛興穴</td>
<td>Hole from which Eulna emerged. on jin-san 鎭山.</td>
<td>YISR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later Baejkê 後百濟</td>
<td>Gyeonhwon 頒萱: remains at leonju-bu 全州府</td>
<td>SS, YISR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an old man suffering an abscess on his back 痰背竈</td>
<td>Succession dispute amongst Gyeonhwon’s sons.</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autumn leaves chaotically scatter 繚紅葉</td>
<td>Cites poem by Po’eun Jeong Mong-ju Distance View from the Tower of Jeonju 全州望景樓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluish-white dapple from Jeolyeong-do 絕影聽</td>
<td>Folk tale of Gyeonhwon presenting Wang Geom with a Jeolyeong-do dapple said to precipitate the fall of Baekje.</td>
<td>Goryeo-sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One can tell there was formerly a palace around here by the crows and magpies [circling above.] One can only be reminded of the desolate achievements of conquering east of Heukgeum. The day the bow was hung up [refers to a custom on the day of birth] is rather remembered for having been Dan’o. But [Gung’ye] was unable to become a lord of Gyerim [like] Xue-gong of old [referring to Lord Mengchang 孟憲君 of Qi 齊 who had also been born on the inauspicious day of Dan’o</td>
<td>烏鵝飛遊故宮 漱雪bank黑金魚 設弧誓記顯陽節 未作鵠林老薛公</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and was initially rejected by his father to be brought up in secret by his mother.

| crows and magpies 鳥鳴 | Cités song by Songgang Jeong Cheol (1536-93 松江 鄭澈) *Gwandong-byolgyok* 翁東別曲. |
| east of Heukgeum 黑金東 | Story of cryptic prophecy of Gung’ye’s rise at Cheolwon written on bronze mirror. *Goryeo-sa, SS* |
| hanging up the bow on Dan’o 設弓端陽 | Refers to a custom on the day of birth: Gung’ye’s birth on an inauspicious day (Dan’o – 5th day of 5th lunar month). *SS* |
| Goryeo 高麗 | [omitted] | [omitted] |
| [poems 35-42] | [omitted] | [omitted] |

| iron dogs 鐵犬 | Inauspicious mountain, Han’yang-sangak-san 漢陽 三角山, hidden behind mist to the southeast and so overlooked by Doseon 道鎮 when selecting the location of the Goryeo capital. *Songgyeong-japgi* 松京雜記 |

Table 9. Yu Deukgong’s *Isib’ildo-hoegosi* - content summary and translation.

46) No doubt an illusion to the 'Song of Barley' (麥秀之歌).
47) Either 桑 is short for 扶桑 or 桑 is an error for 桑 which is also used to write 桑桑.
48) As noted, this mistake is attested in Hong Manjong’s *Dongguk-yeokdae-chongmok* 東國御釗台-忠模, not Heo Mok’s *Dongsa* 鄭賢 Yak-yong is said to refer to the former as *Dongsa* (Yu 2009:218). However, it also occurs in Yi Jonghwi’s *Dongsa* contemporary to Yu Deukgong, but it is not certain if Yu would have read this.
49) This line is attested in Hong’s *Dongguk-yeokdae-chongmok* but not in Kim Si-seup’s collected works, *Maewoldang-jip* 梅月堂集 (Yu 2009:191n191).
50) Originally referred to the garden of princess Qinshui (沁水), daughter of Later Han emperor Ming (明帝). (Yu 2009:170n18)
51) Encyclopedia by Jibong Yi Su-gwang (芝峯 李曙光 1563-1628).
52) This is the only mention of Kim Yusin in the work.
54) Compiled by Sin Gyeongjun (申景濤 1712-81)
Part II Historical geography

Historical geography is one of the most contentious issues in both the modern and present day historiography of early Korea: as will be seen in Part III, the most significant difference between the Orthodox and Northern/Altaic narratives precisely pertains to territorial conceptualizations of the ancient past. Modern popular historiography has been strongly impacted by colonial Japanese historiography which negated Dangun and limited the range of Korean history to the peninsula, in particular utilizing archaeology to identify the location of the Lelang commandery in the vicinity of Pyeongyang à la the premodern ON. As a result, topics such as the Han Commanderies and Mimana have since become indelibly associated with the modern colonial experience: to suggest or highlight their historical locations and impact on the peninsula in popular history writing is consequently close to taboo and invites the label of being ‘pro-Japanese’ or promoting the ‘Japanese colonial view of history’. To challenge this zero-sum ethnic nationalism, it is therefore useful to examine how the topic was treated by Korean scholars previous to the modern era.

This section provides then a sample, summarizing the empirical studies made by four scholars: Han Baekgyeom (韓百謙, 1552-1615), Yi Ilk (李濬 1681-1763), Yu Deukgong and Jeong Yak-yong (丁若鏞 1762-1836). Han Baekgyeom’s Dongguk-jiri-ji (東國地理志) is widely known as being the first empirical study focused on historical geography: Yi Ilk’s discussions are less systematic or informed but are necessary to examine because he is championed and mis-cited by popular historians today as being an early proponent for the negation of the commanderies’ peninsula locations. Yu Deukgong meanwhile is popularly known today for his Balhae-go but most who, again, mis-cite the preface as an irredentist call over Balhae’s territory would be less willing to acknowledge one of his final works, a study on the Han Commanderies. Sa’gun-ji (四郡志 c.1806), that demonstrates both his erudition and objective neutrality: having seen how his Isib’ildo-hoegosi represents a popular archetype of the ON it is appropriate to juxtapose this with his more serious historical work. Finally, greater space is given to a summary of Jeong Yak-yong’s Abang-gang’yeok-go (我邦疆域考 c.1813) as it represents one of the most comprehensive, and sophisticated text based studies of historical geography: an additional choice would have been to include An Jeongbok’s earlier treatment of historical geography, but it is largely complementary, and otherwise superceded by Jeong.

Byington (2013:286) has observed the importance of these historical geographies and notes they have been the subject of many discussions in Korean academia: to my knowledge, however, the actual content of these works has yet to be summarized or made available in English so I hope the following will provide a
useful reference. As the works are generally long and wordy, and naturally discuss the same topics and sources, I have endeavored to reduce my summaries to core information (often organized as bullet points) restricted to pre-Three Kingdoms era topics, inclusive of early Goguryeo, except where the question of tracing later developments is informative, namely in the case of Lelang and Daifang, and the YeMaek.
[Chapter 6] Han Baekgyeom (韓百謙, 1552–1615) -

*Dongguk-jiri-ji* 東國地理志

1. **Key features**

- Discusses historical geography from ancient Joseon through to the Goryeo dynasty.
- Primarily peninsula focused but includes Goguryeo’s continental homeland territory.
- Limits Samhan to the southern half of the peninsula rejecting any associations of Mahan or Byeonhan with Goguryeo; this is the theory which pertains in current day Western historiography (à la Byington 2009).55
- Similarly rejects any association of the historical Four Commanderries with the south of the peninsula.
- River identifications slightly different to orthodox traditions (e.g. compared with Yu Deukgong).
- Ignores mythology and legends.
  - Omits discussion of both the Dangun and Gija periods, other than naming them in conjunction with the Three Joseon scheme of the ON, which he attributes to Korean tradition.
  - Maintains Gi as the surname of Joseon king Jun (準).
  - Significantly rejects the Jumong myth as having been borrowed from Buyeo.
- Alongside dynastic Chinese histories, regularly references the *Tongdian* (通典), and Korean YJSR (東國輿地勝覽).

The following is an overview of the contents.56

*Dongguk-jiri-ji* 東國地理志

*Hanshu* "Joseon" account 前漢書朝鮮傳
HHS "Goguryeo" account 後漢書高句麗傳
HHS "East Okjeo" account 後漢書東沃沮傳
HHS "Ye" account 後漢書濊貊
HHS "Buyeo" account 後漢書扶餘傳 {HHS originally has Buyeo 夫餘}
HHS "Eumnu/Yilou" account 後漢書挹婁傳
HHS "Samhan" account 後漢書三韓傳 {Includes discussion of Four Commanderries and Two Fu}

**Four Commanderries** 四郡
**Two Fu** 二府

**Two Commanderies** 二郡 [Xuantu and Lelang]

(New) Xuantu 玄菟, subordinate counties 属縣:
- (New Xuantu) Gaogouli-xian county 高句麗西蓋馬

55) In particular, see Ju Bo Don in Byington (ed.) 2009:115.
56) The source text consulted is a facsimile copy available on the National Library of Korea database <http://www.nl.go.kr/>.
Shangyintai 上殷台
Gaoxian Houcheng and Liaoyang 高縣·候城·遼陽

**Lelang-jun 樂浪郡, subordinate counties:**
Chaoxian 朝鮮
Nanhua 南海
Peishui 彼水 [Includes discussion of Pae-su 彼水]
Hanzi 含資
Nianti 點田 [Includes discussion of Yeol-su 列水]
Suicheng 順城 [Includes discussion of Jieshishan/Galseok-san 磐石山]
Zengdi 增地 [Includes mention of Cheongcheon-gang 清川江]
Daifang 带方 [Includes mention of Dae-su 帶水]
Siwang 馃望
Haiming 海冥
Lieko 列口
Changcen 長岑
Tunyou 屯有
Zhaoming 昭明 (Nambu-dowi-chiso 南部都尉治所) [Chuncheon-bu 麥克谷]
Loufeng 鐘方
Tixi 提奚
Hunmi 漢彌
Tunlie 吞列 [Identifies Yeol-su 列水 as Han-gang 漢江]

Dongyi 東域 {Dongbu-duwei 東部都尉}
Buer 不而
Cantai 蜷台
Huali 華麗
Yatoumei 邪頭昧
Qianmo 前莫
Fuzu 夫租

**Three Kingdoms 三國**
**Goguryeo 高句麗**
Jolbon Buyeo 卒本扶餘
Gungnae-seong 國內城
Hwando-seong 丸都城
Pyeongyang 平壇
Donghwang-seong 東黃城
Jang'an-seong 長安城
South Pyeongyang 南平壤

(Goguryeo) **Enfeoffed territories 封疆**
Liaodong 遼東
**Buyeo-guk 扶餘國**
Gaogouli/Goguryeo 高句麗
West Gaima 西蓋馬 (K. West Gaema)
Shangyintai 上殷台 (K. Sang'eu-n-tae)
Lelang 樂浪 (K. Nangnang)
Zhaoming-duwei 昭明都尉 (K. Somyeong-dowi)
Fu'er-duwei 鬶而都尉 (K. Bui-dowi)
East Okjeo 東沃沮
North Okjeo 北沃沮
(Goguryeo) **Topography and defenses** 形勢·關防
Amnok-gang 鴨綠江 (aka Yalu)
Pae-su 泗水
Sal-su 薩水 {Rejects Chinese identification of Sal-su as the
Cheongcheon-gang, arguing it should be located south of Pyeongyang,
but does not specify any candidate river.}
Chaek-guru 極溝埀
Yodong-seong, Ansi-seong, Baeg’am-seong and Geon’an-seong
遼東城·安市城·白鬳城·建安城
Gaemo-seong 蓋牟城
Bisa-seong 卑著城
Sin-seong 新城
Muruyeora 武麗還

(Goguryeo) **Appendix** 附
• Discusses *Balhae*

**Baekje capitals** 百濟國都
Wirye-seong 慰禮城
Hansan-seong 漢山城
North Hansan-seong 北漢山城
Ungjin 熊津
Sabi 酒溝

(Baekje) **Enfeoffed territories** 封疆
South Daebang 南帶方
Former Mahan 馬韓舊地
Tamna-guk 耽羅國 (Jeju)
• Includes discussion of Juho-guk (州胡國)

(Baekje) **Topography and defense** 形勢·關防

(Baekje) **Appendix** 附
• Gi Jun’s Mahan and its final surrender to Baekje.
• Variant of HHS account: Gi Jun attacks Geumma (金馬) – rather than
Mahan à la HHS – establishing himself as Han king (韓王)

**Silla capitals** 新羅國都
Geum-seong 金城
Wol-seong 月城
Myeongwol-seong 明月城

(Silla) **Enfeoffed territories** 封疆
Former Jinhan 辰韓舊地
Former Byeonhan 弁韓舊地
Daema-do 對馬島 (aka Tsushima)
Usan-do 于山島

(Silla) **Annexation of Baekje and Goguryeo under King Munmu**
文武王以後百濟高句麗統合為一 p76

(Silla) **Superior topography and defense** 形勝·關防

(Silla) **Appendix** 附
Popular Korean Historiography in NE Asia

- Discusses Geumgwan-guk (金官國 - Gimhae 金海) and Gaya-guk (伽倻國 - Goryeong 高靈).
- Taebong-guk 泰封國
- Covers Gung'ye's (弓裔) polity of Taebong (aka Later Goguryeo but not named as such) and Gyeon Hwon (甄萱) Later Baekje (後百濟).

**Goryeo 高麗**

2. Abridged summary of relevant sections

Each section of the work includes quotes from sources together with Han's annotations. Below are summarized some relevant points made in the annotations.

2.1 *Hanshu* "Joseon" account 前漢書朝鮮傳
- Although Goguryeo, Okjeo and YeMaek were/are collectively referred to as Joseon, their territories were not the same as the original Joseon territory.
- From the HHS it can be determined that to the north of Joseon was Goguryeo, to the south Mahan, to the east YeMaek, whilst the west reached to the ocean.

2.2 *Hou Hanshu*

**HHS "Goguryeo" account 後漢書高句麗傳**
- Goguryeo and Sosu-Maek (小水貊) were both originally termed 'Goguryeo' but they were two different clans (宗 'descent groups'). Goguryeo was in the region of present day Gwanseo Gangbyeon (關西江邊), Sosu-Maek occupied the west (i.e. north) bank of the Yalu around Uiju (義州), beyond (Chinese) Liaodong. Examining the (expansionist) exploits of King Gung (宮), the Sosu-Maek were the descendents of Jumong (朱蒙).
  * Jumong is not attested in HHS, so this is Han’s conjecture.

**HHS "East Okjeo" account 後漢書東沃沮傳**
- Okjeo = present Hamgyeong-do
- Eumnu/Yilou (挹婁) located to the north.

**HHS "Ye" account 後漢書肅慎傳**
- Although Ye and Maek are referred to collectively they were two separate clans (宗). The Maek were located north of Chuncheon (春川) and west of Gwanseo mountains (關西山), extending (westwards) to the sea. The Ye were to the east (of Maek) and so referred to as DongYe (東貊 'eastern Ye').

**HHS "Buyeo" account 後漢書扶餘傳 [HHS originally has Buyeo 夫餘]**
- Buyeo stock (種) are collectively referred to as Malgal (靺鞨 Ch. Mohe).
  * This is false because the term did not appear in Chinese historiography until
the mid C7th *Suishu* (隋書 636) and *Beishi* (北史 659).

• From the time of Qi and Liang (齊 梁) Buyeo became a part of Goguryeo: during Tang it became Balhae, during Wuli (五李 Five Li) it became Dongdan-guo (東丹國) of the (Khitan) Liao; during Song it became Shu-Nüzhen (熟女真 'civilized Jurchen'); during Yuan it became Dongzhengu (東真國), and currently it is Lao-Hu (老胡 aka Manchu).

**HHS "Eumnu/Yilou" account 後漢書挹婁傳**

• Although the Yiou were termed as Mohe, during Song they were the Sheng-Nüzhen (生女真 'uncivilized Jurchen').

• Presently they constitute the Fan-Hu border tribes (藩胡諸部落).

**HHS "Samhan" account 後漢書三韓傳**

*Includes Four Commanderies*

• Ancient Korea was divided north and south.
  
  • In the north were: the Three Joseon of Dangun, Gija and Wiman: Four Commanderies, Two Fu, and then Jumong’s Goguryeo.
  
  • In the south were the Samhan.

• Mahan was established by Gi Jun, Jinhan by Qin (秦) refugees, whilst Byeonhan belonged also to Jinhan.

• Byeonhan was located in the south. Jinhan to the east and Mahan to the west.

• During the time of the Wang Mang’s Xin dynasty (新莽元年 9-23 CE) Mahan was overthrown by Onjo and became Baekje.

• In the 1st Wufeng (五鳳) year (57 BCE) of Han emperor Xuan (宣帝) the Six Bu (六部) of Jinhan became Silla.

• Histories do not record what became of Byeonhan, but in the 18th year (31 CE) of Silla king Yuri (儒理王 24-57) the territory south of Silla became King Suro’s (首露王) new state of Garak (駕洛), so this must be the same.

• The border between the northern states and the Samhan was most likely the Han-gang river.

• Choe Chiwon was wrong to correlate Mahan with Goguryeo and Byeonhan with Baekje.

• Gwon Geun understood correctly that Mahan became Baekje, but he was wrong to think that Byeonhan became Goguryeo.

• During the Samhan period, there was no writing in Korea (本國) so the Chinese records are difficult to prove.

(Four Commanderies and Two Fu)

• Identifications of the Four Commanderies and their rearrangement as ‘Two Fu’ as determined by Han are summarized in Table 10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four Commanderies</th>
<th>County seat / location</th>
<th>Present location</th>
<th>Two Fu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lelang 樂浪郡</td>
<td>Chaoxian-xian 朝鮮縣 (former Joseon)</td>
<td>Pyeongyang 平壤</td>
<td>Dongbu-dudufu 東部都督府</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lintun 臨屯郡</td>
<td>Dongyi-xian 東坡 (former Ye)</td>
<td>Gangneung 江陵</td>
<td>Pingzhou-dudufu 平州都督府</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhenfan 真番郡 (Pingna 平那)</td>
<td>Zha-xian 朝縣 (former Maek)</td>
<td>Somewhere northwest, close to Xuantu: Maek territory; perhaps not far from Pyeongsan-bu (平山府)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xuantu 玄菟郡</td>
<td>Wuju-cheng 沃沮城 (former East Okjeo)</td>
<td>Hamheung-bu 咸興府 Hamgyeong-do 咸鏡道</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaogouli-xian 高句麗縣</td>
<td>Goguryeo state</td>
<td>Pyeong'an-do 咸安道 Gangbyeon 平安道江邊</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Han Baekgyeom - Four Commanderies and Two Fu.

- Pingna (平那 K. Pyeongna) associated with the Pingzhou-dudufu was an alternative name for Zhenfan; therefore Pyeongna-san (平那山) mountain was located within Zhenfan.

- Based on the respective number of internal statelets, Mahan, with 54, would have occupied the whole of the Hoseo and Honam (湖西湖南) regions, whilst Jinhan and Byeonhan with only twelve statelets each would have been confined to Yeongnam (嶺南).

- The Samhan territory subsequently became that of Baekje and Silla: it was unrelated to the Four Commanderies and Two Fu to the north.

- The region of Gyeongju came to be known as Lelang/Nangnang (樂浪) due to Chinese refugees entering from the northwest.

2.3 Four Commanderies 四郡

- Zhenfan, together with Lintun, was one of the polities subjugated by Wi Man following his usurpation of Joseon, and was later, together with Jinguk (辰國 aka Mahan), blocked from sending missions to China, so Zhenfan must have been located between Joseon, Lintun and Jinguk, which would correlate to the Maek state (辰國).

2.3.1 Two Fu 二府

- Established in the 5th Shiyuan (始元) year (82 BCE) of Han emperor Zhao (漢昭帝).

2.3.2 Two Commanderies 二郡

The Two Commanderies are (a new) Xuantu in Liaodong, and Lelang.

(New) Xuantu 玄菟  
Subordinate counties:
(New Xuantu) **Gaogouli-xian county** 高句麗
  • Located 'beyond Liaodong [outer frontier]' (遼東外徼)
  • Suggests the Sosu-Maek originally had an expansive domain so West Gaema (西蓋馬 Ch. Xi-Gaima) was divided into two.
  ※ Doesn’t fully explain how this 'new' Gaogouli-xian relates to the previous one located in Pyeong’an-do unless implying it was inhabited by another branch of the Sosu-Maek.

**West Gaima 西蓋馬**

**Shangyintai 上殷台**
  • The character *yin* 殷 correlates with Eun-san (殷山) in Seongcheon (成川 [modern South Pyeong’an-do]) which was the northern border of Zhenfan.
  • Dandae-ryeong (單大嶺) = present day Jabi-ryeong (慈悲嶺)

**Gaoxian Houcheng and Liaoyang 高縣·候城·遼陽**
  • Chinese histories record that in the first Yuanxing year (元興105 CE) of Han emperor He (漢和帝), Goguryeo king Gung, together with YeMaek attacked and overthrew Xuantu.
  • Han China lost control of Gaima and Yintai (蓋馬·殷台), Xuantu became isolated so three (eastern) counties of Liaodong were reapportioned (to Xuantu).
  ※ Unless Xuantu itself is considered to be relocated (which is not explicitly stated) the logic of this description is not perfectly clear. Only when discussing Dongyi 東甌 county of Lelang (see below) does Han explicitly mention the relocation of Xuantu.

**Lelang-jun 檀浪郡**
  Subordinate counties:
  **Chaoxian 朝鮮**
  **Nanhan 論邯**
  **Peishui 湳水**
  • (Historical) Pae-su ≠ Daedong-gang = possibly Cheongcheon-gang (靑川江)
  • Cannot have been the Yalu because this was the Maja-su.
    • Maja-su 馬紫水 = Yalu river (鴨綠江)
  • The Pae-su mentioned in the *Tangshu* as on the southern shore of Pyeongyang was not the historical Pae-su that had formed the northern border of 'Chaoxian-jun' (朝鮮郡 aka Joseon) which was crossed by Wi Man and later the Han armies.
Hanzi 含資
Nianti 點蟬
- The county from which the Yeol-su (列水) enters the sea.
- Located in the region of modern Hwanghae-do, Yeon’an Baekcheon (延安 白千).

Suicheng 遼城
- Rejects the Tongdian (通典) recording both Jieshishan (碣石山 K. Galseok-san) and the start of the Long Wall being located in this county which subsequently became the eastern region of contemporary Yanchang-cheng (驩長城) where ‘Goryeo remains’ still survived.
- Instead suggests that Jieshishan/Galseok-san corresponds to Jabi-ryeong/Dandae-ryeong and that as a county of Lejiang-jun, Suicheng would have been to the east of these mountains.
- Therefore Suicheng also could not correspond to modern Su’an (遼安) which is on the western side.

Zengdi 增地
- Location where the modern Cheongcheon-gang - former Pae-su - enters the sea.

Daifang 帶方
- Tradition has it that Pyeong’an-do Yonggang-hyeon (龍岡縣) county was the location of Daifang (commandery).
- The Daedong-gang enters the sea here, so Daedong-gang = Dae-su (帶水).

Siwang 驕望
Haiming 海冥
Lieko 夷口
Changcen 長岑
Tunyou 屯有
Zhaoming 昭明 (Nambu-dowi-chiso 南部都尉治所)
- Former Maek-guk in the region of Chuncheon-bu (春川府).
- Region of modern Joyang-gang (昭陽江) which forms an upper tributary of the Han-su (漢水 aka Han-gang).

Loufang 龐方
Tixi 提奚
Hunmi 涮彌
Tunlie 垣列
- Yeol-su (列水) = probably Han-gang
Dongyi 東域 (Dongbu-duwei 東部都尉)
[No annotation, but information quoted from Chinese sources.]
• Territory of the original Xuantu commandery on the eastern side of the Dandae-ryeong mountains.
• Dongyi and the six counties below, merged with Lelang but granted semi-autonomy with the local geosa (巢師) rulers enfeoffed as county lords.

Buer 不而
• County seat of the Dongbu-duwei (東部都尉)

Cantai 蠻台
Huali 華麗
Yatoumei 險頭昧
Qianmo 前莫
Fuzu 夫租

2.4 Three Kingdoms 三國

Goguryeo 高句麗

Jolbon Buyeo 卒本扶餘
• The Dongmyeong foundation myth of Goguryeo is borrowed from that of Buyeo: at the time Goguryeo had no writing and could not have accurately recorded its history.
• Goguryeo was originally located at modern Xian-ping (西安平), Liaodong, so Korean tradition locating Jolbon Buyeo at Pyeongyang is wrong.
• Biryu-su (沸流水) = probably Di-jiang (狄江 proper noun?)

Gungnae-seong 國內城
Hwando-seong 丸都城
• That referred to as Hwando-seong today, located at Wina’am-seong 尉那巖城 includes the sites of both Hwando and Gungnae-seong.

Pyeongyang 平壤
• Formerly Wanggeom-seong, and then the Chaoxian county seat of Lelang commandery.

(Goguryeo) Enfeoffed territories 封疆

Liaodong 遼東
Buyeo-guk 扶餘國

Gaogouli/Goguryeo 高句麗
• Originally the Gaogouli-xian county of Xuantu commandery, located in Liaodong.
West Gaima 西盖馬 (K. West Gaema)
Shangyintai 上殷台 (K. Sang'eun-tae)
Lelang 樂浪 (K. Nangnang)
Zhaoming-duwei 昭明都尉 (K. Somyeong-dowi)
Fu'er-duwei 不而都尉 (K. Bui-dowi)
East Okjeo 東沃沮
North Okjeo 北沃沮
[Chapter 7] Yi Ik (李瀣 1681-1763) - Seongho-saseol
"Cheonjimun" 星湖儒說「天地門」

Seongho Yi Ik’s historical geography is only worth examining because he is quoted by modern popular historians who argue for a continental location of the Han Commanderies. Similar to them, Yi’s work relies on Korean authored sources and is less trusting of the earlier Chinese accounts. Despite this, he does not radically deviate from the ON; he locates the Commanderies, for example, across Liaoxi-Liaodong but also extended into the peninsula. Ultimately he fails to resolve ambiguities created by too literal interpretation of sources.

1. *'Ji/Gi' of Jizi/Gija = Korea 策指我東* [57]
   - The 'Ji' of Jizi (箕子 K. Gija) mentioned in Mencius is the name of a land associated with the title of Jizi [à la Shiji 集解 annotation].
   - The territory of Ji/Gi must correspond to Korea otherwise Gija - who came to Korea - would not have kept it in his title.
   ※ This, however, would beg the question as to why he had the title in the first place.

2. Territory of Dangun and Gija Joseon 檀apsulation
   - Gija directly succeeded Dangun (à la ON).
   - Manbanhan (滿潘汗) ≈ Yalu? In the "Joseon jibang" (朝鮮地方) section Yi more definitely equates Manbanhan to the Pae-su/Chwi-su (泊水/溴水).
   - The territory between the Yalu and Shanhaiguan is no more that 1,000 lǐ so the 2,000 lǐ said to have been taken by Yan must have included [northwards and eastwards] beyond Liaoyang and Shenyang (遼濱).
   ※ This is one of the few points which is cited by modern nationalist historians in support of Joseon having possessed an expansive continental empire.

   - The capital of Gija Joseon was at Pyeongyang.
   - Former Joseon territory beyond the Yalu has been permanently lost, but even with its reduced territory Korea maintains ancient customs.
   - Repeats similar information in the "Joseon jibang" (朝鮮地方) section.

3. Guzhu-guo/Gojiuk-guk and Ansi-seong 孤竹安市
   - Guzhu-guo (孤竹國) = Yongping-fu (永平府); contains the graves of the three rulers as well as Boyi and Shuqi (伯夷·叔齊).
   - The Suishu conflates Guzhu-guo for Goguryeo because it later became

57) Source text used is from the "Seongho ginyeomgwang" (기념관 Seongho Memorial Hall) website <http://seongho.iansan.net/>.
Goguryeo territory.

[隋書·列傳·凡五十卷·卷六十七·列傳第三十二·裴矩： "矩因奏 狀曰：「高麗之地，本孤竹國也。周代以之封于箕子，漢世分為三郡，晉氏亦統遼東。」]

- Historical Ansi-seong (安市城) = Fenghuang-cheng (鳳凰城 {modern 凤城市 Liaoning})

我國海州有首陽山按裴矩傳云高麗本孤竹國李詹云首陽山今海州此因裴傳而誤也孤竹國在永平府孤竹三君之墓及夷齊廟亦在焉意者遼東本高麗之地孤竹之地時為高麗所併故矩傳誤以稱焉按嚴史成宗十二年契丹遼遼末侵徐熙奉國書往丹營遼責其侵煮熙曰若論地界則上國之東京皆我境且鵲綠江內外亦我境內何謂侵煮乎遼遼不能答又按安市城即今鳳凰城也鳳凰東挪謂阿市鳥阿市與安市音近故名之也今中和郡有安市城明使陳嘉猷有詩記之即因土人之訛傳而為之不能辨其誤殆可笑矣後人承訛謬譚如此

4. Chuncheon defence 春川保障
- Extols the strategic value of Chuncheon for its natural defenses.
- Chuncheon = former Maek-guk（貊國）

5. Rivers 河流
5.1 Pae-su = Yan-Joseon border = Chwi-su 潮水/溴水
- Tries to distinguish between the Pae-su (HS) and Chwi-su (SGZ) rivers.
- Suggests that the Chwi-su, attested as the Yan-Joseon border in the SGZ Weizhi and Shengjiing-tongzhi (盛京通志) is the authentic name of the river crossed by Wi Man when first coming to Joseon, but that this was elsewhere conflated with the Pae-su.

※ Most problematically this ignores the fact that the earliest account of [Wi] Man in the Shiji records the river as the Pae-su, not Chwi-su.

- Suggests the river crossed by Wi Man, i.e. Yi's Chwi-su, might have been the Yuníhe (淤泥河)

5.2 SS Paesu = Goguryeo-Baekje border = Jeotan 猪灘
- The Pae-su mentioned in several SS entries must have been between the Baekje capital of Han-san (漢山) and the Goguryeo capital of Hwang-seong (黃城) which was east of Pyeongyang.
- The YJSR gives this as the Jeotan (猪灘).

5.3 Yeseong-gang = Yeseong-gang 礼成江
- Cites description in Wenxian-tongkao (文獻通考 {1319}) identifying the site of Byeongnan-jeong (碧瀨亭, 御閨清) with the still existing Byeongnan-do (碧瀨渡 {mouth of the Yeseong river})

[文獻通考·卷三百二十五·四裔考二·高句麗：“至禮成江。江居兩山間，太以石峽，臨瀕而下，號急水門，為最險惡。又三日抵岸，有館曰碧瀨亭”]
5.4 Sal-su 薩水 = Cheongcheon-gang 清川江
• Necessarily a river south of the Yalu to match the description in the SS Eulji Mundeok account.
  [SS 列傳: 乙支文德: "仲文出樂浪道與九軍至 鴨渌水.. 既恃騷勝又逼群議遂進東濟薩水去平壤城三十里因山為營"]

5.5 Yeol-su 刹水 = Daedong-gang 大同江
• Based on the association of Yeol-su with Lelang, and the premise that Lelang was at Pyeongyang.

5.6 Dae-su 帶水 = Han-gang 漢江
• Based on SS references: in particular the account of Onjo’s younger brother, Biryu, crossing the Pae-su and Dae-su to reach Michuhol (modern Incheon).
• In this instance the Pae-su said to have been crossed by Biryu before crossing the Dae-su, must refer to the Imjin-gang as Goguryeo itself (from which Onjo and Biryu emigrate) is "located at the source of the Yeol-su [i.e. Daedong-gang]."
  星湖先生僞說卷之二天地門: 湧潭： "句麗沸流之南勢也渡渦帶二水至彌封忽居焉是時句麗在剎水之源則所可渡大江惟臨津及漢江.."
  [SS 百濟本紀: 第一: 湧潭王: "遂與弟率黨類渡渦帶二水至彌封忽以居之"]

6. Samhan and Geumma 三韓金馬
• Choe Chiwon – who equated Mahan with Goguryeo – could not have been wrong because he was contemporary.
  ※ Choe Chiwon lived in the C9th so was neither contemporary to the Samhan or even the Three Kingdoms: Choe Chiwon’s statement, however, is often discussed in modern popular history.
• Seeks to reconcile the statements by Choe Chiwon and Later Baekje founder Gyeonhwan with HHS.

"Mahan’s capital was at Geumma-gun. Gyeonhwan (甄萱) also said that Baekje was established at Geumma-san (金馬山): how can this be? I say that, in the past, Korea was divided along the middle: north of the royal capital (圻甸 aka Seoul/Gyeonggi-do) was Joseon, to the south was Han (韓). Then Han was divided: the east was Jin[hun] and Byeon[hun]: the west was Mahan. 'Geumma' was the general designation for [all of] Mahan territory. Would not Gi Jun’s Iksan (益山) and Onjo’s Jiaksan (稷山) [then] have been administrative settlements (縣邑) [both] inside of Geumma? In this way, one cannot see any mistake in [either] Choe Chiwon or Gyeonhwan’s words. " (Yi Ik 天地門: 三韓金馬)
7. Lelang and YeMaek 樂浪諸國
- Yi observes that Lelang is variously located in Gyeongju, Pyeongyang and Liaodong.
- YeMaek located in Gangwon.

"The region in the east of Gangwon-do province was YeMaek, the region to the west was Lelang. YeMaek was also [on] the east coast. All of the region east of the mountains and west to Chuncheon was its land. Later Lelang surrendered to [Golguryeo and so the all of the territory of Gangwon became] former borderland of Goguryeo." (Yi Il 天地門: 樂浪諸國)

江原一帶東為樂浪近西為樂浪而諸國者亦東濱海也今之嶺東諸郡西至春川皆其地也後樂浪降於句麗故江原之地皆句麗舊境也

8. Okjeo (and Yilou) 沃沮邑蠻
- Posits a number of geographical identifications.
- Distinguishes three Okjeo as North and South, with East Okjeo in between.
- Bulham-san (不咸山) = Baekdu-san

"Beyond [north of] Musan (茂山) and within [south of] the Tumen was all [North Okjeo [or Suksin?]] territory. All of the districts south of Musan were North Okjeo, so various [Suksin] groups beyond Gyeongwon (慶源 [far northeastern Hamgyeong province]) were able to raid [North Okjeo] by boat. East Okjeo was to the east of Gaema-san (蓋馬山). Gaema-san seems to be a large mountain in the Baekdu range north of Hamheung. East to west the territory was narrow but south to north it was some 1,000 里 long. South Okjeo was the closest [to Seoul/Korea proper], it was south of southern Cheol-ryeong (南鐵嶺 [central Gangwon-do]).

[According to the SS, when Golguryeo king Dongcheon was escaping from Guanqiu Jian (毌丘儉) [SS c.246], he fled to South Okjeo and reached Juk-ryeong (竹嶺). Juk-ryeong is perhaps one of the passes of either Heohanghu-ri (虛頂厚峙) or Seolhan-ryeong (薛罕嶺). It is also recorded that

58) Bulham-san (不咸山 Ch. Buxianshan) is first attested in the Shanhaijing, wherein it is located to the north or northeast, in the territory of the Sushen (肅慎) Shanhaijing 大荒北經: "東海外之東荒之間，有山名曰不咸，有肅慎氏之國，有悲蠻，四翼，有蟲，獸首蛇身，名曰琴蟲。" It is again attested in the Jinshu (646) "Sushen" account which locates it to the south of the Sushen - 晉書: 列傳: 四夷: 東夷: "肅慎氏一名挹婁，在不咸山北，去夫餘可六十日行".
to the north, East Okjeo bordered with Yilou (邑留) and Buyeo, and to the south with YeMaek. [In this case] 'East Okjeo' includes South and North [Okjeo also]." (Yi Ik 天地門: 樂浪滅領)

今之茂山以外豆豩內外皆其他而自茂山以南諸郡即北沃沮故慶祿以外諸種可以乘船來侵也

東沃沮者在蓋馬山東蓋馬山者似是白頭之幹咸興以北大山是也其地東西狭南北長可千里也

南沃沮者最近南鐵嶺以南是也高麗東川王避毌丘僑欲奔南沃沮行至長嶺竹嶺者亦恐是今之

虛頃厚峙薛罕中一嶺也又云東沃沮北接邑留扶餘南接鐵嶺言東則南北二種包之矣

9. Jolbon Buyeo and Early Goguryeo 卒本扶餘

- Interpretation of the Jumong story, that rather than going from north to south, Jumong escapes westwards from East Buyeo back to the original Jolbon Buyeo territory being ruled by his father, Hae Mosu. Rather than founding his own kingdom, therefore, Jumong simply assumed rulership of Jolbon Buyeo from his father.

"Go Jumong escaped westwards from calamity entering Jolbon. Jumong was the son of Hae Mosu: his father had established a capital in the former [Jolbon] Buyeo territory. Why then would [Jumong] pass his father’s kingdom and go somewhere else? During his escape, Jumong prayed 'I am the son of the celestial emperor etc'. The celestial emperor refers to his father, so it is certain that he was going to find his father...

... Hae Buru first moved from Jolbon [to] Seongcheon (成川), then Hae Mosu actually resided in the former Jolbon [Buyeo] territory. Jumong then escaped from Seongcheon to Jolbon and succeeded his father’s rulership. Because [both Jolbon and Seongcheon] had the single name of Buyeo, Seongcheon was conflated with Jolbon by later generations." (Yi Ik 天地門: 卒本扶餘)

高朱蒙遼福西入卒本朱蒙鮮慕遲之子而其父既都扱扶餘舊地則何必越其父國而他走耶

朱蒙之遼福曰我是天帝子云雲天帝子者以其父云也去尋其父必矣...

...蓋鮮夫婦始自卒本移成川而鮮慕遲實居卒本舊地朱蒙又自成川遼入卒本嗣父為君也以其一同扶餘之號故後人錯認以成川為卒本矣

※ This explanation represents another example of trying to rationalize the SY Jumong account.
10. Prophetic texts 高麗秘記

- Acknowledges two examples: the 'Goguryeo Bilgi' (秘記 'secret record') quoted by Jia Yanzhong (賈言忠) in the SS Goguryeo Annal (668 2nd month), and Doseon's "Dapsa-ga" (踏山歌) song and the "Sinji-bisa" (神秘秘記) both quoted in the Goryeo-sa "Kim Wije" (金鎭煥) biography.
- Does not offer interpretations and explicitly rejects them as superstitious nonsense.

※ Despite the negative appraisal, consideration for the Kim Wije text anticipates Sin Chaeho's usage of the same passages and perhaps drew his attention to them.

東方自古多秘記唐之伏高麗賈言忠計事還帝問軍中事對曰必克其秘記曰不及九百年當有八十大將滅高氏自漢有國今九年李劻年八十矣其所謂秘記訨於四郡時逆算九百年而果驗矣

高麗肅宗時金鎭煥上書引道陟踏山歌云松岳後落向何處三冬日出有平壤謂三冬日出異方木竟在松京東南故云然也又引神秘秘記曰如秤鍾極器秤幹扶踴梁鍾者五德地極器百牙岡此以秤論三京也松岳為中木竟為南平壤為西極器者首也鍾者尾也秤幹者繫繩之處也松岳為扶鍾以論秤幹西京為白岡以論秤首三角山南為五德丘以論秤鍾五德者中有面岳為圓形士德北有鉢岳為曲形水德南有冠岳尖銳為火德東有楊州南行山直形為木德西有樹州北岳方積為

金鎭煥

極器者指秤首載物之器而秤之輕重低昂迄今繫之 称今漢大比三京為要所謂神秘秘記者不知誰某之作而亦能逆覈我朝文明之治者可異也 肅宗命於三角山面岳之南主幹中央大殿壬坐丙向營南京西時巡遊未及移至辛卯八年遷都漢陽恭議壬二年又遷都漢陽前夕議雖遷何益近世又有義相南師古之記述者或據以信之此皆不肖男子依妄妄言一無驗可笑

[SS 高句麗本紀:第十:寶藏王:二十七年春二月: "將忠士力臣故曰必克且高句麗秘記曰不及九百年當有八十大將滅高氏自漢有國今九年李劻年八十矣虜仍遞難人常鳴雞地震裂狼狐入城蚯蚓於門人心危駭是行不再矣矣!男建復從兵五萬人救扶餘城與李劻等遇於薛賀水合戰敗者三萬餘人勘進攻大行域"]

[Goryeo-sa 列傳:卷第三十五:方技:金鎭煥: "臣又竊觀道陟踏山歌曰，'松城落得後何處，三冬日出有平壤。' 後代賢士聞大井，漢江魚龍四海通。' 三冬日出者，仲冬節日出異方，木竟在松京東南，故云然也。' 又曰，'松鎭山為辰・馬主，鳴呼誰得知終始，花根細枝葉然，紛百年期何不瞬，爾後欲覓新花勢，出渡陽江空往還。' 四海神魚朝漢江，國奉人安致大平。' 故漢江之陽，基業長遠，四海朝來，王族昌盛，實為大明堂之地也。' 又曰，'後代賢士認人壽，不越漢江萬代風，若渡其江作帝京，一席中裂隔漢江。' 又三角山明堂記曰，'攀目回頭審山貌，背玉在丙是仙竈，陰陽花發三四重，親袒負山臨守護。' 原案承山五六重，姑叔父母山聳聳。' 內外門犬各三爾，常侍龍蛋勿餘心，齊白相登勿是，' 外商客各獻珍，賣名隣客如子來，' 韓國匿君皆一心，壬子年中若開土，丁巳之歲得聖子，' 稱三角山作帝京，第九之年四海朝。' 故此明王盛德之地也。']

又神秘秘記曰，' 如秤鍾・極器・秤幹・扶鍾・樑鍾者五德地，極器百牙岡。朝降七十國，賴德護神，精首尾，均單位，興邦保太平，若廢三論地，王業有衰傾。' 此以秤論三京也，極器者首也，鍾者尾也，秤幹者提綱之處也。松鎭為扶鍾，以論秤幹，西京為白牙岡，以論秤首，三角
11. The Han Commanderies 朝鮮四郡

- The territory of the Han Commanderies included a part of Korea but at the same time extended much further westwards into Liaoxi.
- The seat of Lelang-jun was not Pyeongyang, but Pyeongyang was within Lelang.
- Wangheom-seong = Pyeongyang.
- Jinbeon/Zhenfan was west of the Lia-he, in Liaoxi.

Complete translation of the section:

"Han [China] took the territory of Joseon and made it the Four Commanderies, so the Four Commanderies originally belong to 'our Korea' (我東者). [During the time of] Wei [SGZ c.244, SSC.246], Guanqiu Jian (毌丘儉) invaded Goguryeo and the king fled to Okjeo: the Wei generals pursued and, coming to the southern border of Suksin (肅慎) carved a stone recording their accomplishment. They also crushed Hwando and [left a commemorative] inscription [at] Bulnae-seong (不耐城) before withdrawing from Lelang. Hwando was Gungnare-seong. After experiencing war, Hwando could not be restored so eventually [the Goguryeo capital] was moved to Pyeongyang-seong. Pyeongyang was Wangheom-seong. Hwando was to the west (north) of the Yalu: it emerged from Xuantu and withdrew from Lelang, so it can be known that the two commanderies [Xuantu and Lelang] were in Liaodong.

According to the Tongkao ([文獻]通考). Jinbeon was made subordinate to Joseon [or to the Chaoxian county of Lelang?]. It also says that Ugeo planned to go [to China] to see the celestial son [i.e. the Chinese emperor] but never went [to Jinbeon], so it can be known that Jinbeon was on/within the Han border.

Further, [when] Sui invaded eastwards [in 612]: Yuwen Shu (宇文述) went by the Fuyu-dao (扶餘道 'Buyeo road/route'). Yu Zhongwen (于仲文) by the Lelang-dao (樂浪道), Jing Yuanheng (敬元恒) by the Liaodong-dao (遼東道), Xue Shixiong (薛世雄) by the Woji-dao (沃沮道 'Okjeo road'), Xin Shixiong (辛世雄) by the Xuantu-dao (玄菟道), Zhang Jin (張瑾) by the Xiangping-dao (襄平道).
Zhao Xiaocai (趙孝才) by Jieshi-dao (碣石道), Cui Hongsheng (崔弘昇) by Suicheng-dao (遂城道), and Wei Wensheng (衛文昇) by Zengdi-dao (增地道). They all met at the west [north] of the Yalu. According to the Tongkao, Suicheng and Zengdi were both counties belonging to Lelang whilst Xiangping belonged to Liaodong-jun. None of these were to the east [south] of the Yalu. Only Lintun (which Yi Ik locates also in this region) is not visible [from this list].

通考云朝鮮役屬真番 又云右奚欲入見天子既未嘗入真蕃 則真蕃之在入漢之境可知 且隋之東征宇文逃出扶餘道于仲文出樂浪道刑元恒出遼東道薛世雄出沃沮道辛世雄出玄菟道張瓊出襄平道趙孝才出碣石道崔弘昇出遂城道衛文昇出增地道 皆會於鴨綠水西 按通考遼城增地即樂浪之屬縣 襄平屬遼東郡 此皆無與於鴨綠以東也 但臨屯無所見

In my view it can be deduced, that [if] the Lelang commandery seat was Chaoxian county, then although the settlement [i.e. Chaoxian] was in Liaodong, all of the region to the west [north] of Pyeongyang were subordinate counties. [Meanwhile] the Xuantu seat was Okjeo-seong: the route by which Xue Shixiong [came] certainly had [this same] name but was not the [original] Okjeo in the northeast of Korea. The Zhenfan seat was Zha-xian (遼縣) but it is not amongst the nine routes taken by the Sui army, so it [must have been] to the west of the Liao-he river closest to China.

以意推之樂浪治朝鮮縣 則其邑居雖在遼東 而 平壤以西皆其屬縣也 玄菟治沃沮城 薛世雄所出之路 必有此號 而 非我東北之沃沮也 真蕃治遼縣而不在 隋兵九道之內 則 遼河以西 最近中土者也

At the time of Han emperor Zhao (87-74 BCE), the Four Commanderies were merged into two: there was Pingna (平那 K. Pyeongna) but no Zhenfan, so Zhenfan [must have become] Pingna-jun commandery. The Lintun seat was Dongyi-xian. Koreans say this was present day Gangneung-bu but it is not certain. This one fu [i.e. Pingna] covered all to the southeast of the Pae-gang river, and west of YeMaek within Gangwon-do province. Perhaps at that time the fu was established in Gangneung but it cannot be known.

At the time of Han emperor Zhao, the Four Commanderies became the Two Fu (二府). Lintun was merged to Lelang, so from the time of the Two Fu the territory beyond the Yalu and [former] Lintun was [all] collectively referred to as Lelang. The two present day provinces of Pyeong’an and Gangwon were both within the borders of Lelang.

至于漢昭帝時合四郡為二 有平那 而無真蕃 則真蕃是平那郡矣 惟臨屯治東寧縣 東人指為今江陵府 然未必的 是一府凡濬江東南江原道內 真蕃之西皆是也 或當時開府於江陵未可知 漢昭時變四郡為二府以臨屯合於樂浪則自二府以後鴨綠以外及臨屯之地合稱樂浪 今之平安江原二道皆是樂浪境內也
Coming to the Three Kingdoms period, Pyeong'an-do was occupied by [Goguryeo so the Lelang rulers (主) withdrew to east of Baekje and west of YeMaek [i.e. the Chuncheon region], whilst that [Lelang territory] to the west [north] of the Yalu became part of the Chinese administrative [system]; they were called Taesu 'governors' (太守) but not [autonomous] 'lords' (主). How can this be explained/proven? Early on, the Baekje king said that to the east of the country is Lelang and to the north is Malgal. The territory of the YeMaek extended east to the great sea and west to Lelang; it can be understood to have been between the two countries [of Baekje and Goguryeo (or Chuncheon Lelang to have been in between Baekje and YeMaek?)]. At this time they had already been forced by [Goguryeo] to withdraw and resided in Gangwon.

及三國之際平安道為句麗所據則樂浪主退 而在百濟之東 濃貊之西 而其在鴨綠之西者 既在中國郡縣之中 稱太守 而不稱主 何也以明之 始百濟王云國家 東有樂浪 北有靺鞨 又濃貊之地東窮大海 西至樂浪 其在三國之際 可知而 此乃遂於句麗 退居 江原之時也

Later, at the time of [Goguryeo king Taejo (太祖王; r. 53–146)], [Goguryeo] attacked Han China’s Liaodong [commandery] killing the Daifang commander (帶方令) and capturing the Lelang governor’s wife and child before returning. At the time of King Dongcheon (東川王; 227–48), Guanqiu Jian (毌丘儉) of Wei set out from Xuantu together with Lelang governor Liu Mao (劉茂) and invaded [Goguryeo. This was at a time, when they [had already been] defeated by [Goguryeo and fled to reside on the far side [north/west] of the Yalu. [Also] at the time it is said that Baekje took the opportunity to attack the vacant Lelang [territory] and seize people on the border at which Mao was enraged. But there was probably no reason for Baekje to cross [Goguryeo and attack Liaodong [i.e. they must have been attacking Chuncheon rather than continental Lelang].

後句麗太祖王時 襲漢遼東 殺帶方令 掠樂浪太守妻子而歸 東川王時 魏毌丘儉 與樂浪太守劉茂 出玄菟侵句麗 此乃滅於句麗退居鴨綠以外之時也 但此時百濟乘樂浪虛囊取邊民 茂怒云云 百濟恐無越句麗而襲遼東之理

Thinking about this military campaign (役), Lelang [sought] revenge against [Goguryeo [by having] Guanqiu Jian [lead troops and] attack them, and the [Goguryeo king fled to the coast: thereupon Lelang restored its former territory whilst Baekje took the opportunity to seize people. The usage of 'Lelang' would be due to the [Gogu]ryeo king [fleeing] far away and the former rulers returning to reside there. The [Goguryeo king used Yuyu’s plan (糸由 [recorded in SS biography, Yuyu was sent to feign surrender and assassinate the pursuing Chinese general]) and counterattacked the Wei army; restoring the state [of Goguryeo], Liu Mao then returned to the Liao[dong]
county.

As a further consideration, the time when [Goguryeo] king Taemusin (太武神王) attacked and destroyed Lelang was the 13th Jianwu (建武) year [of Han emperor Wu] (37 CE). In the 20th Jianwu year (44 CE), Han China sent soldiers to [re]conquer Lelang and seize its territory making them into commandery counties. North of the Sal-su [i.e. Cheongcheon-gang] was all subordinate to Han. At this time although [Goguryeo] controlled the Lelang remains [i.e. at Pyeongyang?], its capital [Gungnae-seong/Hwando] was still to the west [north] of the Yalu. Although the Lelang rulers had fled and resided in Liao[dong] and were cut off from the former territory with [Goguryeo blocking in between, Han Chinese soldiers came across the sea and restored the former territory. This campaign, was an invasion of the former Lelang territory [occupied by Goguryeo], not [an invasion against] the Lelang rulers. The invasion of [Goguryeo] was actually long after the destruction of Lelang [proper]. Who would have invaded [Lelang]? If the matters are carefully collated it will become clear. [If] in the future a court historian writes a Lelang shijia 'hereditary house' chronicle (樂浪世家) they must take [account] of these [points]. The Sal-su is the Cheongcheon-gang river." (Yi Ik 天地門:朝鮮四郡)

12. Samhan (三韓)

- Han existed previous to Gi Jun's arrival.
- Jinhan were people of Qin (秦). That Jin (辰 Ch. Chen) can be equated with Qin is demonstrated by the person of Chen Ying (辰嬴) attested in the Chunqiu-zuozhuan (春秋左傳) as being from the state of Qin. [This is the same point made by An Jeongbok above.]
- Whilst Joseon occupied the north of the peninsula north of the Dae-su (帶水 i.e. the Han-gang), the south originally lacked governance and so was referred to by China simply as Canghai (倉海).
- It was subsequently settled by refugees from the Chinese state of Han (韓國 403–230 BCE) and so took the namesake of Han (韓).
- Thus the 'strongman of Canghai' (倉海力士) employed by Zhang Liang (張良 d.186) of the former Han state, to assassinate Qin emperor Shi Huang, was of
the same Warring States’ Han (韓) heritage.

- Mahan took its name from the toponym Geumma (金馬).
- The Canghai-jun commandery (倉海郡) temporarily established under Han emperor Wu in Liaodong [128 BCE], would have extended further south into the peninsula as the YeMaek were at Gangneung.

※ This last point ignores Joseon lying in between.

箕準奪馬韓地而王則箕氏之登有韓矣辰與秦同春秋傳辰嬴是其證也辰韓之為秦誠信矣未知韓之名何從而有哉張良之狙擊東見澹海君說者謂澹海即韓國以今江陵之然漢武時諸君南間內附遼東以其地為倉海郡不應一小邑為郡則其地必遼南及遼也六國之中韓最近秦故韓秦之事韓必先動史云即若大夫誅齊王建曰三晉大夫不便秦在阿遂之間者百數可以為證

良韓人欲負秦必東走海外見倉海君 其人="倉海力士"

又於死袖椎祈有一售非素與心迹同者能然乎不然良何由逆知千萬里外有此等人而亟走疾取如囊中物也

無論倉海之何地要是與中土絕遠良之性還非航海不能其必先泊我邦西海之濱而倉海即其地也意者當時我邦南北分域以帶水為界帶水者今之漢江也今黃海平安西道為三朝鮮之地漢水以外始無統率中國只稱倉海而韓之遐秦者未故自號曰韓也此良所以與圖報秦也漢郊祀志谷永說上曰始皇初并天下遣徐福韓終之屬多豔童男女入海求神仙因逃不還然則福外有終終必韓之後裔而與良同仇者也其弁辰亦必從後至而秦人故名辰也此雖無考可以意度舊韓既為箕氏所逐後馬辰兩國之間別有弁韓亦稱弁辰馬者以金馬得名則見逐而從者宜別有其號而韓之名必不改意者弁韓是也弁者或是因當時地名未可知而別扵馬韓臣屬扵馬韓敗
[Chapter 8] Yu Deukgong - Sagun-ji 四郡志 (c.1806)

One of his final works, Sagun-ji is comprised of the following 12 sections and references some 50 separate sources. In spite of the title, both the geographic and temporal scope - as well as the changing number of the commanderies’ themselves - is broad, giving information on Yu’s understanding of early Korean history based on his own close reading of the sources. The structure of Sagun-ji is as follows.

[1] Pyo 表 (chronology)
"Zhenfan-jun pyo" 臧番郡表
"Lintun-jun pyo" 臨屯郡表
"Old Xuantu-jun pyo" 舊玄菟郡表
"Xuantu-jun pyo" 玄菟郡表
"Lelang-jun pyo" 樂浪郡表


[3] Sancheon 山川 (physical geography) - discussed below

[4] Sasil 事實 (‘facts’)
According to Jeong, "Sasil" is the longest section of Sagun-ji and was likely compiled before the other chapters of the work. It contains around seventy separate entries from Chinese and Korean sources that give reference to the Han Commanderies or the related region in different periods.


[6] Inmul 人物 (persons)

[7] Jeoksa 謫徙 (exilees)

[8] Bongjiak 封爵 (nobles) - Includes rulers of polities including Three Kingdoms’ founders (discussed below).

[9] Bang’eon 方言 (dialect) - Divided into three sections.
"Between northern Yan and Joseon" = modern Liaoxi, Laodong and northern peninsula to the Daedong-gang; gives 4 items.
"Between Joseon and the Yeolsu" = between Daedong-gang and Han-gang; gives 25 items.
"Lelang" - gives 30 items.

[10] Tosan 土産 (local products)
Includes: cloth (布), ‘millipedes’ (馬陸), ‘sandalwood bows’ (檀弓), swords (劍), ‘hyeomgeom beans’ (夾餌豆 詐餌豆), tigers and various fish (including mermaids 鰻漁/海人).
‘Lelang sandalwood bows’ (樂浪檀弓) are mentioned in SGZ "Ye" account. Concerning ‘swords’, Yu notes that 'Lelang swords' (樂浪劍) recorded as tribute to Nanzhao (南詔) in 794, must in fact have been ‘Silla swords’ (新羅劍). (Jeong 1998:313)

Discusses three steles: those of Pengwu (彭吳碑), Su Dingfang (蘇定方碑), and Ren Yuan (劉仁願碑). Of these he only discusses the Su Dingfang stele in any detail.
Concerning the Pengwu stele, terming it the 'stele of Han [dynasty

59) The following discussion of Yu Deukgong’s Sagun-ji (四郡志 ‘Treatise on the Four Commanderies’) relies on the detailed description of the work found in Jeong (1998:261–319): unless specified as 'from the original hanmun,' direct quotations are translated from Jeong’s modern Korean without reference to the original.
general] Pengwu [who] opened [a way] through to the Maek’ (漢彭吳通貊碑), he notes that it was in Chuncheon-bu (春川府) but no longer exists. (Jeong 1998:316)

[12] Jeyeong 鑫誄 (poems) - contains c.20 examples: 16 on Xuantu, 3 on Lelang and one on the latter’s subordinate Nianti county (黏蟬).

The following is a summary of the topics relevant to historical geography.

1. Physical geography - mountains and rivers

"Commanderies and counties regularly move and are not permanent. [By contrast] mountains and rivers will not change for millennia." (四郡志:山川:濬水
From the original hanmun given in Jeong 1998:291n45)

Yu’s discussion of physical geography follows the initial sections on the commanderies’ historical geography but it will perhaps be more useful for general orientation to consider them here first. Working on the principle that mountain and river names were less likely to be 'relocated', he lays emphasis on them in order to determine the location of the commanderies. In the "Sancheon" section, he examines in detail the locations of three mountains and six rivers.

His various identifications are summarized in Table 11 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ancient hydronym</th>
<th>Contemporary/modern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maja-su</td>
<td>馬善水</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal-su</td>
<td>薩水</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pae-su</td>
<td>淵水</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dae-su</td>
<td>帶水</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeol-su</td>
<td>列水</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ung-jin</td>
<td>熊津</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So-Yo-su</td>
<td>小遼水</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dae-Yo-su</td>
<td>大遼水</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ancient orronym

| Gaema-san | 驛馬 (盖馬)山 | Baekdu-san | 白頭山 |
| Bulleyo-san | 分黎山 분리산 | Odae-san | 五嶽山 |
| Dandan-daeryeong | 菱巖大嶺 | Daegwan-ryeong | 大關嶺 |

Table 11. Yu Deukgong - indentifications of hydronym and oronyms.

1.1 Gaema-san (蓋馬山)

In SGZ and HHS, Gaema-[dae]san is a mountain associated with the territory of Goguryeo, with Okjeo located to its east: it may also be associated with the pre-Goguryeo polity of Gaema-guk (蓋馬國) mentioned in the SS as being conquered by King Daemusin in his 9th year (c.26 CE).

Referencing eleven different sources, including HHS, Shanhaijing, Hou-Weishu (後魏書 aka Weishu) [Da-Qingyitongzhi (大清一統志 1743), Munheon-bigo (東國文獻備考 1770) Yu identifies alternative names for Gaema-san as: Gaema-daesan (蓋馬大山 - SGZ, HHS), Bulham-san (不咸山 - 山海經), Dotae-san (徒太山), Taebaek-san
(太白山), Jangbaek-san (長白山) and Go’iminsanggyeon’arin (古爾民尚堅阿臘
Manchu: ‘Golmin Şanggiyan Alin’ - 清統志?)

Yu rejects the opinions of the Da-Ming-yitongzhi (大明一統志 1461) and
Da-Qingyitongzhi that locate Gaema-san to the west of Pyeongyang in
Gaepyeong-hyeon (蓋平縣) and relies instead on Goryeo period tradition locating
it in Jurchen populated territory to the northeast.

"[According to the Goryeo-sa] The Jurchen were originally a tribe (部落)
settled to the east of Gaema-san: across generations they presented tribute.
[Yu’s annotation] To the east of Gaema-san was the Jurchen territory of
Gallajeon (曷懽甸). Later it was called Hamna-ro (合懽路 합라로): the Yuan
called it Hamnan-bu (合蘭府 합란부). Now it is the region of Dancheon (端川
Ch. Duancheuan) and Gilju (吉州 Ch. Jizhou) north of Hamgyeong (咸慶)
[province]." (郡志四:山川:蓋馬山 From the original hanmun given in Jeong
1998:286n31)

于蓋馬山東世修實職..."]

※ Jeong (1998:286-7) asserts that in the process of this analysis, Yu was the first
to explicitly identify the mountains of Gaema-san, Taebaek-san and
Changbaek-san as Baekdu-san, and that his opinion subsequently influenced
that of Han Jinseo(?) and Jeong Yak-yong.

1.2 Bullyeo-san (分黎山) and Dandan-daeryeong (單單大領 [SGZ 單單大領])
Bullyeo-san is originally named in an annotation of the Hanshu geography
treatise and is relevant as a mountain located in Tunlie (吞列縣) county of Lelang
from which the Yeol-su river originates: the Yeol-su in turn identifies the
central location of Lelang downstream. However, as Jeong presents the
information it appears that Yu’s identification of Bullyeo-san is itself premised
already on his identification of the Yeol-su as the Han-gang river.

西至豎蟄入海，行八百二十里"]

Dandan-daeryeong appears in SGZ variously as 單單大領 and 單單大山領 and
generally gives a relative location of both a part of Okjeo and ethnic Ye being
located to its east.

[SGZ 三國志:魏書三十:東沃沮傳: "以沃沮域為玄菟郡，後為夷貊所侵，徙郡句麗西北，今
所謂玄菟故府也。沃沮還屬樂浪，漢以土地廣遠，在單單大領之東，分置東部都尉，治不
耐城"
SGZ 三國志:魏書三十:譚傳: "自單單大山領以西屬樂浪，自領以東七縣，都尉主之，皆以
為治為民"]
Yu: "Bulpyeo-san is the place of *origin of the Yeol-su* (列水) river. The Yeol-su is the Han-su (漢水 {aka Han-gang}) river. It clearly became Odae-san (五臺山). That which the *Weizhi* (魏志) calls Dandan-daeryeong (單單大領), can also be deduced to be referring to the mountains which cross to the East Sea coast."

(郡志四:山川 From the original hanmun given in Jeong 1998:287n34)

1.3 Hydronyms

"There are six large rivers in Korea which flow westwards into the sea. The first is the Amnok-gang [aka Yalu] which used to be the Maja-su (馬訾水). the second is the Cheongcheon-gang (清川江) which used to be the Sai-su (薩水), the third is the Daedong-gang which used to be the Pae-su (漂水), the fourth is the Imjin-gang which used to be the Dae-su (帶水), the fifth is the Han-gang which used to be the Yeol-su (列水) and the sixth is the Geum-gang (錦江) which used to be the Ung-jin (熊津). There are many who distinguish the Amnok-gang and [or 'as the'] Pae-su, however there have been few who spoke of the Dae-su or Yeol-su since the Hanshu geography treatise (漢志). This is because our forebears (先輩) did not dare to identify (지칭) them. (郡志四:山川 in Jeong 1998:287)

**Dae-su** (帶水) = **Imjin-gang**

According to a Hanshu annotation the Dae-su river locates Hanzi and Dafang (含資·帶方) counties of Lelang.

[漢書·志·卷二十八下:地理志第八下:樂浪郡: “含資，帶水西至帶方入海”]

"[Hanshu records] the Dae-su of Hanzi-xian (含資縣) - present day Anbyeon-bu (安邊府) - flows westwards, reaching Daebang - present day Jangdan-bu (長湍府) - and into the sea [Taken from the Hanshu annotation]. Daebang was on the coast of the West Sea, to the south neighboured Baekje, whilst neither Udu-seong fortress (牛頭城) to the east or Pyeongyang to the north were incredibly far. [The Munheon-bigo records] the Dae-su was in between Han-san and Jeo-tan (猪瀟) so seems to have been the Imjin-gang. [The Dongguk] Yeooji-ji (東國)舆地志 (1656) records] the Imjin-gang emerges from Bangjiang-dong cave (防壩洞) in Anbyeon-bu of Hamgyeong-do, former Yeongpung-hyeon (永豐縣); flowing south it enters the border of Icheon-bu (伊川府) in Gangwon-do. Continuing south it enters the border of Sangnyeong-gun (順寧郡界 肖녕군); flowing then southwest it curves around Jangdan-bu (長湍府) before continuing south to Gyoha-gun (交河郡) where it merges with the Han-gang." (In Jeong 1998:288)

**Yeol-su** (列水 {列水}) = **Han-gang** (漢江)

The Yeol-su (列水 Ch. Lieshui) is recorded in the *jijie* annotation of the *Shiji* account as the main river of Joseon, positing even the names of 'Lelang' and
'Joseon' to be derived from it.
[史記·列傳·朝鮮列傳: "【集解】張晏曰:「朝鮮有濰水、洌水、汕水,三水合為洌水,疑樂浪、朝鮮取名於此也”。]

As noted above, it is also mentioned in the *Hanshu* geography as originating from Bullyeo-san in Tunlie-xian (吞列縣), flowing westwards across Lelang and entering the sea from Nianti-xian (黏蟄縣) county:

*Hanshu* 漢書·志:卷二十八下:地理志第八下:樂浪郡: "吞列,分黎山,列水所出,西至黏蟄入海,行八百二十里

The *Shiji* account mentions the Yeolgu (洌口 'Lie mouth') as the place where the Han fleet 'entered' to attack Wangheom-seong (王陵城). A *Hanshu* annotation of the same account explicitly correlates Yeolgu with the Yeol-su in the geography section, and further quotes Shen Qinhan (沈欽韓 1775–1831) stating that a Yeolgu-seong fortress was to the southwest of the contemporary Joseon capital (Seoul).

*Shiji* 史記:朝鮮列傳: "左將軍微至,坐爭功相訌,乖計,棄市。樓船將軍亦坐兵至洌口,當侍左將軍,擅先縱,失亡多,當誅,贖為庶人"

*Hanshu* 漢書·西南夷兩交(chú)朝鮮傳: "樓船將軍亦坐兵至洌口...【補注】志曰: 吞列縣分黎山,列水所出,西至黏蟄入海,然則冽口在黏蟄縣矣。沈欽韓云, 紀要, 列口城,在朝鮮國王京西南"

Having identified the Dae-su as the Imjin-gang, Yu apparently posits the Yeol-su as the Han-gang through deduction, it being the only other large westward flowing river.

"If the *Imjin-gang* is treated as the Dae-su then the position of Daifang-jun (帶方郡) commandery can be located. Aside from this the only large river is the *Han-gang*. Three rivers merge and it forms a curve of 800 li. If this is not the Yeol-su, then what is?!

Also, in the *Shanhaijing* (山海經) it records that the country of Maek (貊國) is to the northeast of the Han-su (漢水). Maek is the present day territory of Gwandong (關東) which is, indeed, to the northeast of the Han-su. It also says that Joseon was in Yeol-yang (列陽) and in the annotation it notes that Yeol (列) was the name of a river in Daebang (帶方). Thus from ancient times the Yeol-su was also called Han-su." (郡志四:山川 in Jeong 1998:287)

**Maja-su** (馬警水) = **Yalu** (Ammok-gang 鴨綠江)
In a *Hanshu* geography section annotation, the Maja-su is associated with Xi-gaima (西蓋馬 K. Seo-gaema 'West Gaema') county of Xuantu-jun commandery
and is described as a tributary to the Yeonma-su (鹽難水 Ch. Yannanshui), flowing southwest and entering the sea from West Anping (西安平).

Yu interprets Xi-gaima as meaning 'west of Gaema-san' mountain, and through the Hanzhu identifies West Anping as contemporary Uiju-bu (義州府) thus all correlating to the Yalu. Below, he begins by citing the Hanzhu annotation adding his own identifications, here in curved parenthesis.

"Xi-gaima-xian (Present day Gapsan-bu 甲山府). The Maja-su [flows] northwest and enters the Yeonma-su, [flowing then] southwest it reaches West Anping (Present day Uiju-bu 義州府: during the Han dynasty it belonged to Liaodong-jun commandery and formed the border with Lelang-jun) and enters the sea. It passes two commanderies (Xiantu and Lelang) and is 1,100 li in length (Hanzhu annotation)."  

(郡志四:山川:馬訾水 From the original hanmun given in Jeong 1998:289)

Yu then continues.

"Concerning the place where the Yalu river flows into the sea [from] Anping-cheng (安平城): the Tang called it Bozhuogou (泊沯口), Liao called it Gesuguan (葛蘇館), Jin called Bosulu (波速路), and Yuan called it Posuofu (婆娑府). This is likely our region of Uiju-bu to the east of Fenghuang-cheng60) (鳳凰城)."  

(郡志四:山川:馬訾水 From the original hanmun given in Jeong 1998:289n38)

According to Jeong, Yu also cites the Tongdian (通典 801) as equating the Maja-su for the Yalu. (Jeong 1998:289)

通典:邊防二:高句麗: "馬訾水則移反一名鴨綠水，水源出東北靺鞨白山，水色似鴨頭，故俗名之。去遼東五百里，經國內城南，又西與一水合，即鹽難水也。二水合流。西南至安平城，入海。高麗之中，此水最"

※ This identification was also made in the Goryeo-sa under the geography section on Uiju (義州).

Pae-su (浿水) = Daedong-gang

The Pae-su river is described in the Shiji account of Joseon as forming the border between Han China’s Liaodong-jun commandery and Joseon proper.

---

60) In Balhae-go Yu identifies Fenghuang-cheng as the site of Balhæ’s Yongwon-bu (龍原府) prefecture, originally having been the location of the Xuantu commandery.
Yu cites the YJSR identifying three Pae-su.

"According to the YJSR there were originally three Pae-su rivers within [our] borders. The first was the Pae-su given in Shiji as the river which Wi Man crossed eastwards: this made it the Amnok (鴨綠 aka Yalu). The second is the Pae-su given in the Tangshu as being the southern edge (南涯) of Pyeongyang-seong: this made it the Daedong-gang. The third, is the Pae-gang (淸江) which in the Goryeo-sa was made the Jeotan (濁濁) of Pyeongsan-bu (平山府). These [the Yalu, Daedong-gang and Jeotan] are what are termed the Three Pae-su." (郡志四:山川:濁水 From the original hanmun given in Jeong 1998:291n42)

※ The Tangshu reference occurs at least in the Xin-Tangshu as:
唐書卷二百二十:列傳第一百四十五:東夷:高麗: “平壤城，亦謂安城，漢樂浪郡也，去京師五千里而鰲，從山屈繹為郭，南涯濁水，王築宮其左”
※ This identification of three Pae-su rivers anticipates Sin Chaeho’s explication that pae-su was a generic hydronymic term used for more than one river.

However, Yu himself rejects the Yalu and Pae-gang theories, and further rejects a fourth continental theory cited from the Liaoshi, consequently leaving the Daedong-gang as sole candidate.

"The Muncheon-bigo demonstrates that the Yalu was the Maja[-su], and that it was not the Pae-su is then already confirmed (得 lit. 'grasped'). The Liaoshi [meanwhile] says, "The Liaoyang Pae-su was the Han [dynasty period] Pae-su." This then is not so. The Liaoshi has that Liaoyang-fu became Pyeongyang, this must indicate another river was also [named] Pae-su [i.e. in addition to the peninsula Pae-su] because before the Liaoshi had been compiled, the Tangshu [had already] clearly stated that the Paesu was the southern border [of Pyeongyang]. The greater part of the Liaoshi geography treatise is fabricated (杜撰). [so] how could it be believed? Neither that which Koreans (東人) call the 'old records' (古記 or the Gogi) nor the Liaoshi geography are to be relied upon. Subsequently the YJSR was able to make it clear that, that which indicated the Jeotan to be the Pae-gang, was [also] nothing but an 'unsustubintated hypothesis' (自足假名) which was not proven. Thus there is only the single Pae-su of Pyeongyang-bu [i.e. the Daedong-gang]. (郡志四:山川:濁水 From the original hanmun given in Jeong 1998:291n43)

[Liaoshi 遼史卷三十八:志第八:地理志二:東京道:東京遼陽府: "本朝鮮之地... 有蒲河; 清河; 濁水，亦曰泥河，又曰幹土濁，水多幹芊之草..."]

Finally, Yu reinforces his argument by citing from the Shuijing-zhu (水經注 early
C6th) which locates the Pae-su south of Pyeongyang.

"Commanderies and counties regularly move and are not permanent. [By contrast] mountains and rivers will not change for millennia. Goguryeo arose during the Han period: its capital was Pyeongyang. Subsequent to Eastern Jin (東晉), Li Daoyuan 郎道元 [author of Shuijing-zhu 水經注]) befriended foreign emissaries [and so] learnt that the Pae-su passes to the south of the [Goguryeo] capital. How could this not be the Daedong-gang?!" (四郡志:山川:渇水 From the original hanmun given in Jeong 1998:291n45)

Yu apparently also accepts Li Daoyuan’s argumentation that whilst the original Shuijing entry explicitly records the Pae-su as flowing east into the sea, it must have actually flowed westwards on the grounds that otherwise it would not have been crossed by the Han troops when attacking Joseon in 108 BCE as recorded in the Shiji account.

[Shuijing-zhu 水經注:卷十四:渇水: "水經曰: 渇水出渇浪鏃方縣, 東南過臨渇縣, 東入于海。

《十三州志》曰: 渇水縣在渇浪東北, 鏃方縣在郡東, 蓋出其縣南逕鏃方也。昔燕人衛滿自渇水西至朝鮮, 朝鮮, 故箕子國也。箕子教民以義, 田間信厚, 約以八法, 而不知禁, 遂成禮俗。戰國時, 滿乃王之, 都王險城, 地方數千里, 至其孫右渠, 漢武帝元封二年, 遣樓船將軍楊僑、左將軍荀彘討右渠, 破渠於渇水, 遂滅之。若渇水東流, 無渡渇之理, 其地今高句麗之國治, 余訪番使, 言城在渇水之陽, 其水西流, 由此渇浪朝鮮縣, 即樂浪郡治, 漢武帝始置, 而西北流。]

※ The logic of identifying the Pae-su as the Daedong-gang means much of the territory of the Four Han Commanderies would have been to the north of the original Joseon territory which they were traditionally meant to have jointly controlled.

Soyo-su (小遼水 Xiao Liao-shui) = Taizihe (太子河)
The Soyo-su river is recorded in the Hou Hanshu geography section on Xuantu-gun, as originating from Yo-san (遼山) of Goguryeo.

[後漢書:志第二十三:郡國五:幽州:玄菟郡: "高句麗遼山, 渇水出"]

Referencing the Hanshu, Tangshu and [Da-]Qingyitongzhi, Yu identifies the Soyo-su as the modern Taizihe (太子河) that runs as an eastern tributary of the Hun river (渇河). (Jeong 1998:288)

Jeong suggests that Yu also discusses the Manbeonhan (滿番汗) river but unfortunately he does not give further details. (Jeong 1998:292)

1.4 Wangheom-seong (王陵城) ≠ Pyeongyang
Having determined the Pae-su to be the Daedong-gang, Yu rejects the orthodox
tradition of associating the Joseon capital with Pyeongyang on the grounds that
Pyeongyang was located on the north (or 'west') side of the Daedong-gang whilst
the Shiji has the Pae-su as being the border which is crossed by Wi [Man] and
later the Han army in order to enter the territory of Joseon. In short, historical
Pyeongyang would have to have been located outside of Joseon's territory and
therefore could not have been its capital. Yu further cites Tang scholar Yan
Shigu (顏師古 581-645) similarly observing that Wangheom-seong was to the
'east' of the Pae-su in Lelang-jun. (Jeong 1998:292) 61)

Yu attributes the orthodox association of Wangheom-seong with Pyeongyang to
what he dismisses as invented associations of Pyeongyang with 'the Seon'in
Wangheom' (仙人王險) and 'Dangun Wanggeom' (檀君王僑) in the SS and SY
respectively; he denounces them as 'lacking historicity' (不成史體). (Jeong
1998:293n50)

* In his discussion of Lelang commandery below, however, he narrates the
Lelang commandery being established on the site of the Joseon capital, and later
becoming Goryeo’s Seogyeong (西京 aka Pyeongyang).

2. The Commanderies

"Let us look at the ancient geography of the east. To the north of Joseon was
Guryeo (句麗), to the northeast Okjeo, to the east Ye (讝), and to the south
Han (韓). To the west was the Liaodong-jun commandery which since the
Warring States period had already been incorporated into the state of Yan.
Han emperor Wu overthrew Ugeo (右渠) and established the Four
Commanderies. Joseon became Lelang [commandery]: its territory extended
from north of the current Han-gan river to Gwanse (關西 [traditional
Pyeong''an provinces up to the Yalu]). Guryeo became Zhenfan (真番),
stretching [northwestwards] from the Yalu to Xingjing (興京 [aka Hetu'ala 赫圖
阿拉城 modern Liaoning, c.120km east of Shenyang]). Okjeo became [Old]
Xuantu-jun, present day Hamgyeong province. Ye became Jintun-jun, present
day Gwandong (關東 [modern Gangwon-do]). Han is the current Samnam
region (三南 [refers to the Chungcheong, Jeolla and Gyeongsang provinces]): it
was not controlled by Han China." (四郡志:建置沿革 in Jeong 1998:317)

61) Although apparently left unstated by Yu, Jeong suggests that, if following the
Shuijing-zhu description above, which gives 'Peishui-xian' (瀟水縣) county as having
been in northeastern Lelang, combined with having determined the Yeolsu as the
Han-gang, then he would have located Wangheom-seong in the vicinity of Toseongni (土
城里) on the south bank of the Daedong-gang, site of the Lelang archaeological
remains. (Jeong 1998:293)
2.1 Periodization and configurations of the commanderies
Yu's narrative scheme of the period of the Chinese commanderies lasting between their initial establishment c.108 BCE and their final overthrow in 313 CE, can be summarized thus.

Four Commanderies → Two Commanderies → Three Commanderies → Three
Kingdoms

The initial period of the Four Han Commanderies - Zhenfan, Lintun, (Old) Xuantu and Lelang - lasts only 26 years: in 82 BCE Lintun is incorporated into Lelang, whilst the original Xuantu commandery is moved to the location of Zhenfan (i.e. Old Xuantu was closed down and Zhenfan was renamed Xuantu). resulting in a 'Two Commanderies period'.

Of note is that Yu explicitly rejects designating the Two Commanderies as 'Two Fu' (二府) administrative centres, as they are termed in the SY, and perpetuated by the Dongguk-tonggam (東國通鑑 1485). The SY narrates that in 82 BCE the former Joseon territory of Pyeongna (平那) and Xuantu-jun became 'Pingzhou-dudu-fu' (平州都督府) whilst Lintun and Lelang commanderies became the 'Dongbu-duwei-fu' (東部都尉府).

[ SY:紀異第一:二府:'前漢書昭帝始元五年己亥置二外府謂朝鮮舊地平那及玄菟郡等為 平州都督府 臨屯 樂浪等兩郡之地置東部都尉府]

In his own words, Yu traces the usage only to the Dongguk-tonggam without mentioning the earlier SY.

"During the reign of Han emperor Zhao (昭帝 r.87-74 BCE), Xuantu-jun moved to [what had been] Zhenfan-jun and Lintun-jun was joined to Lelang-jun: thus there were Two Commanderies. In the Dongguk-tonggam it is written that in the 5th Shiyuan year (82 BCE) former Joseon territory of Pyeongna (平那) and Xuantu-jun became 'Pingzhou-dudu-fu' (平州都督府) whilst Lintun and Lelang commanderies became the 'Dongbu-dudu-fu' (東部都尉府). In this way the hypothesis that the Four Commanderies became the Two Fu became credible history and Pyeongna [was regarded as] another name for Zhenfan. However, if one consults the annals and geography treatises of the Qian-Hanshu [aka Hanshu] and Hou-Hanshu this matter is not recorded, nor is there a 'Pyeongna' even amongst the names of the counties. Thus one can realize there is no evidence. (四郡志:建置沿革 in Jeong 1998:317-8)

Jeong cites a separate essay by Yu, "Mistake of the Two Fu" (二府之誤) included in his collected works, Goundang-pilgi (古堂筆記), in which he more explicitly states the usage of fu (府) to have been anachronistic for the Western Han
period when the reorganization occurred. (Jeong 1998:319 citing Yu’s 古芸堂筆記: 二府之誤)

Yu continues, positing that the Two Commanderies were conflated with two later 'Dongbu-duwei' (東部都尉 Byington 2013:307 translates this term as 'Defender of the Eastern Section [of Lelang]') recorded in the HHS and SGZ, one as the administrative office of the remote eastern section territory of Lelang into which Okjeo was incorporated, and the other, Pingzhou province (平州), established by Gongsun Du (公孫度) in Liaodong.

[SGZ 三國志: 魏書: 東夷傳: 賜: "自單于大山領以西屬樂浪, 自領以東七縣, 都尉主之
[Annotation] 范書: 自單大領已東沃沮諸郡, 悉屬樂浪, 後以境土廣遠, 分復領東七縣, 置樂浪東部都尉"
HHS 後漢書: 東夷列傳: 東沃沮: "武帝滅朝鮮, 以沃沮地為玄菟郡後復為夷貊所侵, 徙郡於高句麗西北, 更以沃沮為縣, 屬樂浪東部都尉"]

In the Goundang-pilgi essay he is more accusing, and asserts that the distortion was wilful invention, but in Sagun-ji - continuing from the quote above - he portrays it as a more neutral error.

It is clear this occurred because the Four Commanderies became Two Commanderies. The seven [eastern] counties of Lelang-jun were [subsequently] separated and subordinated to the 'Dongbu-duwei' (東部都尉), whilst towards the end of the Han period, Gongsun Du established Pingzhou (平州) in Liaodong: during the Wei and Jin periods, Xuantu, Lelang and Daifang were administered [by the Chinese authorities]: [later] during the Tang dynasty, the Andong-duhu-fu (安東都護府 {'Protectorate-General to Pacify the East'}) was established at Pyeongyang which then changed its name to a 'dudufu' (都督府) before subsequently moving [out of the peninsula] to Pingzhou. It is on this account that later compilers of history became confused and made this mistake.” (四郡志: 建置沿革 in Jeong 1998:317-8)

Continuing the narrative, subsequently the southern section of Lelang is partitioned with the newly created commandery named Daifang giving rise to a 'Three Commanderies' period which precedes the Korean Three Kingdoms. He describes the end of the Commanderies period thus.

"During the Yongjiia era (永嘉 307-313) [of Western Jin emperor Huai 晉懷帝], the China Plain became destabilized: thereupon Goguryeo occupied Xuantu and forced Lelang’s surrender; Baekje invaded Daifang to its south, whilst Silla took control of [Lelang’s former] seven counties in the east.” (四郡志: 事實 in Jeong 1998:300)
2.2 Zhenfan-jun commandery (真番郡 K. Jinbeon-gun)

"Most people in Korea are suspicious of the location of Zhenfan-jun. Some say it was Maek (貉) some say Jin (辰). They are all wrong. According to HHS (後漢書) Lintun and Zhenfan were closed down in the 5th Shiyuan (始元) year of Emperor Zhao (昭帝 - [82 BCE]) and [their jurisdictions] were merged with Lelang and Xuantu (臨屯真番 以升樂浪玄菟). This is surely to say that Lintun was merged with Lelang, and Zhenfan with Xuantu. According to the Weizhi (魏志), Xuantu moved to the northwest of Guryeo. This was the territory of Zhenfan. Thus Ying Shao (應劭140-206), in his annotation regarding Xuantu in the geography chapter of the Hanshu wrote "formerly Jinbeon" (古真番). It is not known where the territory of Zha-xian county (雭縣), the seat of Zhenfan, was. However, as it was 7,600 li away from Chang’an it would have been to the east of the current day Songhua river (松花江). Thinking about it, after the Xuantu commandery moved, the territory of Okjeo could have been given over to Lelang, but the various counties (縣) on the eastern border of Zhenfan were [too] expansive and far, so they would simply have been abandoned." (四郡志:建置沿革:真番郡:按 in Jeong 1998:266)

Rejecting alternative theories that it could have been south of Lelang, Yu locates Zhenfan extending from the northeast of the peninsula up into the continent, east of the Songhua river.

Aside from its great distance given from Chang’an, Yu argues for a northern location of Zhenfan on the grounds that it had been the former indigenous polity of Jinbeon subjugated by Wi Man.62)

"Having crossed the Paesu and settling [there on the other side], Wi Man was able to subjugate Jinbeon. Ugeo was also able to block the communications (上書) and missions (朝見) [to the Chinese court] of various neighbouring states. [However] based on these facts it would be a mistake to wonder if Jinbeon was not [actually] located in the south. Jinbeon bordered with Okjeo. Until the time of the WiMan Joseon’s grandson [Ugeo], they [Joseon] resided south of the Paesu [but] mobilized armies in the northeast, subjugating various tribes (部) trying to block the tribute mission routes [to China]. At this time, Han [China] made the Paesu its border, built frontier fortifications (障) and established watch posts (候) under Liaodong [commandery]; consequently it was not easy to control WiMan Joseon’s tyranny in the [far] northeast [beyond their border defenses]. This is the reason also for WiMan

62) Byington acknowledges both 'northern' and 'southern' location theories for Zhenfan but himself chooses the latter (the northern part of which subsequently becomes Daifang). In the case of the northern location theory, in contrast to Yu, he locates it in the middle reaches of the Yalu ‘just east of Liaodong’. (Byington 2013:314)
[being able to] subjugate Jinbeon." (In Jeong 1998:268)

2.3 Lintun-jun (臨屯郡 K. Imdun-gun)
Yu located Lintun broadly in the region of modern Gangneung.

"[Lintun] was originally Ye land (薊地). In the 3rd Yuanfeng year of Emperor Wu (108 BCE), a commandery seat was established at Dong’i (東兗). In the 5th Shiyuan year of Emperor Zhao (82 BCE) it was closed down: merging with Lelang, it continued as the Eastern Duwei (東部都尉)." (四郡志:四郡表:臨屯郡 in Jeong 1998:270)

In the "Geonchi-yeonhyeok" (建置沿革) section, he narrates the subsequent history of the region as follows: contemporary to Wei (魏) it was the territory of Ye king Bulnae (不耐諸王); during the Jin dynasty (晉代) it was a part of Goguryeo named Haseoryang (河西良) or Haseulla (何瑟羅); and during Tang, under Silla it became the ‘lesser capital’ of Myeongju (溟洲小京). (In Jeong 1998:270)

2.4 Canghai-jun (蒼海郡)
In the same "Geonchi-yeonhyeok" (建置沿革), Yu also discusses the earlier short-lived Canghai-jun commandery (蒼海郡) the territory of which he locates as centered on the Han-gang river basin, but stretching to the east coast Gangneung region.

"Lintun-jun was originally Ye land. According to the Hanshu, several years into the reign of [Han] emperor Wu, Pengwu penetrated YeMaek Joseon and established Canghai-jun [whereupon] friction/conflict (?) erupted between Yan and Qi. It also says, in the first Yuanshuo year (元朔 {128–23 BCE}), Dong’i Ye lord, Namnyeo (東夷諸君南閩) and some 280,000 submitted [to Han] and became the Canghai-jun commandery. In spring of the third year [126 BCE] Canghai was closed. At the time, the Wi[Man] clan who [occupied] a part of Joseon were to the north [of Canghai] and the Gi kings (箕王) to the south. There was also a ‘Ye lord’ (薊君) but who was he? Both HHS and Weizhi say that Ye became the territory of Joseon. Thinking about this, [before] Gi Jun’s defeat by Wi Man, the south was originally the state of Han (韓國). The Ye territory remained under the Gi clan [i.e. after they fled south]. Namnyeo was a vassal of the Gi clan, but fearing the military might of Han China, he cleared(?) the border and surrendered (掃境降附): Han then crossed the sea and established a commandery extending from the Han river (漢水) zone to the East Sea. It was called Canghai. It was situated between the two

63) Byington 2013:288 translates 燕齊之間 廛然發動 as "...those among Yan and Qi were placed in straits."
states of Gi and Wi; it was difficult to control and so it was closed. Coming to
the overthrow of Ugeo, [the land] was again divided up: on the Ye territory
was established Lintun-jun commandery; north of the Han river became
Lelang-jun." (四郡志:建置沿革:臨屯郡 Translated from the original hanmun given
in Jeong 1998:270n11)

2.5 The two Xuantu-jun commanderies (玄菟郡 K. Hyeondo-gun)
Yu divides discussion of Xuantu into two sections. ’Old Xuantu-jun’ (舊玄菟郡)
and 'Xuantu-jun.' According to Jeong, the only other person to use this
classification was Yu’s friend Seong Hae-eun (成海應 1760–1839). (Jeong 1998:272)

•Old Xuantu
"[•Old Xuantu-jun] was originally the territory of Okjeo. In the 3rd Yuanfeng
(元封) year of Emperor Wu (武帝) {108 BCE}, its commandery seat was
established at Okjeo-seong (沃沮城). In the 5th Shiyuan year of Emperor Zhao
{82 BCE} it was closed and [the territory] incorporated into Lelang." (四郡表: 舊玄菟郡 in Jeong 1998:273)

Yu narrates the subsequent history of the territory as follows: according to the
Weishu (魏書) [•Old Xuantu] was on the territory of the Okjeo eupsu (邑帥);
subsequently contemporary with the Jin dynasty (晉代) it became a part of
Goguryeo and was named Namhae (南海 'south sea'): during the Tang dynasty it
was the Namhae-bu (南海府) of Balhae’s southern capital (南京); during the Jin
dynasty (金代) it was known as Xielanlu (邪漸路 K. Saranno) and during the Yuan
it was Halan-fu (喀蘭府 合蘭府 K. Hamnan-bu). During the Goryeo period it
became Helandian (曷蘭甸 K. Gallanjeon) where the Jurchen lived, and was also
called Ham-ju (咸州). During the reign of Goryeo king Yejong (睿宗 r.1105–22) it
was fortified but then given to the Jurchen. Later it temporarily went to Yuan
but during the reign of King Gongmin (恭愍 1351–74) Manho-bu (萬戶府) was
established and during the Joseon period it was named Hamheung-bu (咸興府).
(Jeong 1998:273–4)

※ Jeong notes that Yu’s location of Namhae here differs to that of the earlier
Balhae-go when, citing Liaoshi (遼史), he identified Namhae to be modern
Haicheng (海城) in Liaoning. (Jeong 1998:274)

Xuantu
Whilst broadly in the region of Zhenfan which it replaced, Yu more specifically
locates the centre of Xuantu in the region of contemporary - to Yu - Xingjing

64) Byington notes the initial Xuantu commandery to have been established a year after the
other three. in 107 BCE. (Byington 2013:320)
Concerning the administrative counties of Xuantu, he notes first a westward expansion under Later Han followed by contraction during Jin: the latter he attributes to the expansion of the rival Goguryeo state. According to Jeong, Yu arranged the information into a table similar to Table 12 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Former Han (3 counties)</th>
<th>Later Han (6 forts)</th>
<th>Jin (3 counties)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gouli 句麗</td>
<td>Gouli 句麗</td>
<td>Gaogouli 高句麗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangyintai 上殷台 (Xianting 玄菟亭)</td>
<td>Shangyintai 上殷台</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xi-gaima 西蓋馬 (Xuantuming 玄菟亭)</td>
<td>Xi-gaima 西蓋馬</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaoxian 高顯</td>
<td>Gaoxian 高顯</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houcheng 候城</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaoyang 遼陽</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangping 望平</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Yu Deukgong - Xuantu Commandery counties according to period.
(Reproduced from Jeong 1998:277)

"During the Later Han, the three counties of Liaodong-jun commandery, Gaoxian (高縣), Houcheng (候城) and Liaoyang (遼陽) were added [to the original three counties of Xuantu]. Liaoyang is present day Liaoyangzhou (遼陽州). According to the Wuzhi (武志), Gongsun Yuan (公孫瓒) integrated Xuantu-jun [into his territory], which was said to be 200 里 north of Liaodong. Towards the end of Later Han, [Xuantu] surrendered to Goguryeo and was moved again southwest to border with Liaodong. So it would have been some 4,000 里 away from [the Jin capital of] Luoyang (洛陽) which was still much closer than was Lelang. During the Jin (晉) dynasty it moved again and was subordinate to Wangping (望平) in Liaodong, but the old counties of Gaogouli and Gaoxian remained. It can be seen that the Liao[dong] border (遼界) was chaotic. Of the seven counties that were [at one time or another] a part of Xuantu, only the location of Shangyintai is unknown. Perhaps it was located between Gaima (蓋馬) and Gaoli, in the region of present day Ganggye-bu (江界府) and the now abolished Luyan-jun commandery (濱延郡)." (四郡志:建置沿革:按設 in Jeong 1998:276)

In this way Yu identifies two further relocations of the Xuantu seat, that is, in addition to the original move in 82 BCE. Yu apparently did not discuss the question of Goguryeo state formation, but at least towards the end of Later Han, he clearly regards the namesake Xuantu county as distinct from the emergent state.

He narrates the subsequent administrative history as follows: at the end of the
Han dynasty (漢朝) Xuantu was ruled by Gongsun Du (公孫度 d.204): during the 2nd Jingchu (景初 237–?) year [238] of Wei emperor Ming (明帝) Gongsun Yuan (公孫淵 d.238) was defeated and it was subordinated under Pingzhou (平州) before jurisdiction was moved to Youzhou (幽州). During the Jin (晉) it was again subordinated under Pingzhou (平州); then Murong Hui (慕容廆 269–333) bestowed the office of Pingzhou-cishì (平州刺史) [on someone?] subsequently it became a part of Goguryeo. During the Tang dynasty it was occupied by Balhae; during the Jin dynasty (金) it was administered under Huining-fu (會寧府); during the Yuan it became Kaiyuanlu (開元路); during the Ming dynasty it became Jianzhouwei (建州衛) and finally during the Qing dynasty it became Xingjing (興京).

(Jeong 1998:274)

2.6 Lelang-jun (樂浪郡 K. Nangnang-gun 낙랑군) and Daifang-jun (帯方郡 K. Daebang-gun)

Yu locates the seat of Lelang commandery, Chaoxian (朝鮮), in the region of modern Pyeongyang. He presents the historical changes in organization as summarized in the Table 13 below.

Correlating Dongyi (東遼) county to the former seat of Lintun, Yu deduces that of the initial 25 counties listed in Former Han, the last seven were those originally belonging to Lintun-jun before its incorporation into Lelang. Their subsequent disappearance during Later Han, he observes then to indicate Lelang having abandoned the distant east coast territory: the new cheng (城) of Ledu, formerly Tunlie, he suggests consequently became the easternmost part of Lelang's remaining domain which was to the west of Dandan-daeryeong (單丹大嶺 aka Daegwan-ryeong 大關嶺 region of the the Taebaek mountains). During the Jin dynasty, Lelang was partitioned with the southern section becoming the Daifang-jun commandery: but thereafter both Lelang and Daifang were gradually absorbed by the expansion of the Three Kingdoms polities. His own description is as follows.

"Concerning the 25 counties of Lelang-jun. [Of the] eight counties reduced (減) by Later Han, seven were to the east of the Dandan-daeryeong (單丹大嶺) mountains. They were transferred to the [jurisdiction of the] Eastern Duwei (東部都尉). Tunlie county (唐列縣) was located on the western side of the [Dandan-da]ryeong (嶺西); its name was changed to Ledu (樂都). Tunyou county (屯有縣) and Han (韓) were close to one another. Zhaoming county (昭明縣) became the Southern Duwei-zhisuo (南部都尉治所) which was located between the Dae-su (Imjingang) and Yeol-su (Han-gang) rivers (帶列二水). Further, the start and end of the Maja-su, Paesu, Dae-su and Yeolsu (馬訾沮 帶列水) were fixed (?考定): the seven counties of Nanhan, Suicheng, Siwang, Haiming, Changcen, Tixi and Hunmi (酣邯遂城驪望海冥長岑提奚渾彊) were also
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Former Han</th>
<th>Later Han</th>
<th>Jin 晉</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(25 counties 縣)</td>
<td>(18 cheng forts 城)</td>
<td>Lelang-jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaoxian 朝鮮 (Pyeongyang-bu 平壤府)</td>
<td>Chaoxian 朝鮮</td>
<td>Chaoxian 朝鮮</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanhan 吐鴉</td>
<td>Nanhan 吐鴉</td>
<td>Tunyou 屯有</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peishui 淬水 (Yeongwon-bu 宁遠府)</td>
<td>Paeshui 淬水</td>
<td>Hunmi 渾彌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanzi 含資 (Anbyeon-bu 安邊府)</td>
<td>Hanzi 含資</td>
<td>Suicheng 遊城</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nianti 黴漁 (Pungdeok-bu 豐德府)</td>
<td>Nianti 黴漁</td>
<td>Loufang 鍗方</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicheng 遊城</td>
<td>Suicheng 遊城</td>
<td>Siwang 驐望</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zengdi 增地</td>
<td>Zengdi 增地</td>
<td>Daifang-jun 帶方郡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daifang 帯方</td>
<td>Daifang 帯方</td>
<td>Daifang 帯方</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siwang 驐望</td>
<td>Siwang 驐望</td>
<td>Liekou 列口</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiming 海冥 (莽: Haihuan 海桓)</td>
<td>Haiming 海冥</td>
<td>Nanxin 南新</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liekou 列口 (Gangha-bu 江華府)</td>
<td>Liekou 列口</td>
<td>Changcen 長岑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changcen 長岑</td>
<td>Changcen 長岑</td>
<td>Tixi 提奚</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunyou 屯有</td>
<td>Tunyou 屯有</td>
<td>Hanzi 含資</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhaoming 昭明 (Nambu-dowi-chiso 南部都尉治所)</td>
<td>Zhaoming 昭明</td>
<td>Haiming 海冥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loufang 鍗方</td>
<td>Loufang 鍗方</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tixi 提奚</td>
<td>Tixi 提奚</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunmi 渾彌</td>
<td>Hunmi 渾彌</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunlie 吞列 (Jeongseon-gun 旌善郡)</td>
<td>Ledu 樂都 {former Tunlie}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dongyi 東裔 {former Lintun-jun seat}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buer 不而</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantai 閠台</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hualu 華鹿 {sic. 華麗 Huali}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yatoumei 邪頭昧</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qianmo 前莫</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuzu 夫租</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Yu Deukgong - Lelang and Daifang Commandery counties according to period. (Reproduced from Jeong 1998:280)

south of the Maja-su [Yalu] and north of Yeol-su [Han-gang]. After Daifang was partitioned into a commandery, one new county was established. Nanxin (南新) whilst six old counties [of Lelang] were transferred [to Daifang] (革 {or just 'abolished'}). At that time the Three Kingdoms were [constantly] invading and so gradually encroached [upon the remaining territory].

(四郡志:建置沿革: 樂浪郡 translated from the original hanmun given in Jeong 1998:282n26)
Yu then narrates a chronology of the administrative history up to his contemporary era as follows: during the Han dynasty Emperor Wu established Lelang-jun on the site of Joseon’s capital. During the Wei dynasty it came under control of Gongsun Du (公孫度 d.204) but during the 2nd jingchu (景初 237-) year of Wei emperor Ming (明帝). Gongsun Yuan (公孫淵 d.238) was defeated and Lelang-jun was subordinated under Pingzhou (平州) before jurisdiction was moved to Youzhou (幽州) [similar to Xuantu]. Then during the Jin (晉) dynasty together with Xuantu-jun its jurisdiction was moved back to Pingzhou and it was ruled by Murong Hui (慕容廆 269-333) before being annexed by Goguryeo. During the Tang dynasty the Andong-duhufu (安東都護府 "Protectorate General to Pacify the East") was established and subsequently it became a part of Balhae. During the Yuan dynasty, the Dongning-fu (東寧府) was temporarily established before it was returned to Goryeo. During the Goryeo period it was [referred to as] Seogyeong (西京 'western capital') and for a time came under control of Yuan but during the reign of King Chungnyeol (忠烈王 r.1274-1308) it was recovered and from the time of King Gongmin (恭愍王 r.1351-74) onwards, it has been Pyeongyang-bu. (Jeong 1998:279)

※ Here Yu is less particular on the exact location of the Joseon capital relative to Pyeongyang (Seogyeong).

According to Jeong, Yu emphasizes the peninsula location of Lelang, Daifang and Joseon (not clear if he is referring to Joseon or the Chaoxian county but seems the former) and explicitly rejects the Liaoshi (遼史) locating them in Liaodong.

"According to the Liaozhi [aka Liaoshi], Jinde-xian (金德縣) was Han period Peishui-xian (沘水縣), Zimeng-xian (昔夢縣) was Loufang-xian (牢固縣), Xingzhou (興州) was Haiming-xian (海冥縣), and Chongzhou (崇州) was Changcen-xian (長岑縣). Because these [locations] existed during Balhae they will definitely have histories ( 연혁 ) that can be studied, however, that the Liaozhi (Liaoshi geography) treated these all as provinces (州) and counties of Liaodong, was a mistake." (From Jeong’s translation in Jeong 1998:283)

He further criticizes the interpretation given in the Korean Munheon-bigo (東國 文獻備考 1770) that only a portion of Lelang’s territory was on the peninsula and that this later became the autonomous polity of Nangnang-guk (樂浪國).

'According to the Munheon-bigo, "Subsequent to the jianwu reign era (建武) {25-56 CE} [of Han emperor Guangwu 光武], there is no evidence (사실) of Lelang invading [any further] eastwards. The 18 counties recorded in the HHS "Junguo" treatise (郡國志) were all [within] Jimi-zhou (驃糜州). During the Wei and Jin periods, only six counties were on the peninsula. It is not know where
the Lelang governor (太守) resided. After it was no longer possible to travel to China, it [falsely] took the name of a country (屬稱國).” This all originates with the ridiculous statements in the Samguk-sagi. Xuantu was to the north of the Yalu but it gradually became the territory of the Go clan (高氏) [i.e. Goguryeo]. Lelang was always south of the [Yalu] river and continued through Wei until at the beginning of the Jianxing (建興) reign era [313–317 CE] of Jin emperor Min (愍帝), it was finally annexed [병탄] by Goguryeo and came into contact with Baekje.” (From Jeong’s translation in Jeong 1998:284)

Rejecting the notion of a Nangnang-guk state, Yu thus dates the end of the Lelang commandery to c.313 CE, the orthodox date given in SS.

3. Additionally discussed historical geography
In two concluding commentary (按) passages of the "Sasil" (事實 'facts') section of Sagun-ji. Yu gives his opinion on several further matters of historical geography.

Concerning the seven counties of Lelang east of the Dandan–daeryeong mountains that were abandoned, he suggests they were located in the region of southern Hamgyeong-do province and extending to Gangwon-do.

※ This would indicate the region of present day Hamheung and Wonsan cities which is further north than the location of Gangneung he gives for the original Lintun commandery above, however, it accords with Byington’s location of them being between Hamheung in the north and Goseong (Gangwon-do) in the south. (Byington 2013:308)

3.1 Continental Ye (Buyeo) and peninsula Dong'ye (東藏)
Yu distinguishes between the Ye and Dong'ye: the former he locates in modern Liaoning and associates with the early historical state of Buyeo; the latter in Gangneung on the peninsula.

"The capital of Buyeo-guk (扶餘國) is current day Kaiyuan–xian county of Fengtian-fu (奉天府之開原縣). Buyeoguk–seong fortress was called Ye-seong (贊域). The seal inscribed with 'Ye king’ (贊王之印) [is from there].” (四郡志:事實 from the original given in Jeong 1998:295n53)

※ The seal he mentions here is attested in the SGZ "Buyeo" account and should not be confused with the similar seal mentioned in SS he refers to in the Ye canto of Isib'ildo-hoegeosi.

"The Ye capital (贊都) is current day Gangneung–bu. According to the
Munheon-bigo this was the former Dong’i county (東融縣) [of Lelang]. Buyeo (扶餘) was also called Ye. This Ye [in Gangneung] then is the Dong’ye.” (四郡志:事實 from the original given in Jeong 1998:295n54)

3.2 East and North Okjeo (東·北沃沮)
Yu locates East Okjeo in the region of Bukgwan (北關), southern Hamgyeong province: he distinguishes this from the separate territory referred to as North Okjeo. (Jeong 1998:295)

3.3 Goguryeo capitals
Yu lists the three Goguryeo capitals as Gungnae-seong (國內城), Hwando (丸都) and Pyeongyang. He is uncertain as to the exact location of Gungnae-seong but places it in the region of Balhae’s Amnok-bu (鴨綠府): in his earlier Balhae-go (渤海考 1784) he associates Balhae’s ‘west capital’ (西京) with the same area, but was apparently unaware of the tomb site at modern Ji’an to be more specific. The second capital of Hwando he considered to be south of Gungnae-seong and, again in Balhae-go locates it in the region of Ganggye-bu (江界府). (Jeong 1998:296)

3.4 Maek (貊) and Sosu Maek (小水貊)
Similar as with the Ye, Yu distinguishes a northern Maek associated with Goguryeo from a more southerly peninsula Sosu Maek.

"The [Sosu] Maek capital (都) was current day Chuncheon-bu (春川府). Guryeo was also called Maek. [The former] Maek were the Sosu Maek: the So-su river was perhaps the current Soyang-gang (昭陽江).” (四郡志:事實 from the original given in Jeong 1998:297n61)

[Sgz 三國志:魏書三十;高句麗傳: "又有小水貊，句麗作國，依大水而居，西安平縣北有小水，南流入海，句麗別種依小水作國，因名之為小水貊，出好弓，所謂貊弓是也"]

3.5 Han (韓)
Yu’s description of the Samhan and their subsequent development follows the by then convention that they were located within the southern part of the peninsula and evolved into Baekje, Silla and Gara (可羅 aka Gaya).

"Mahan is present day Honam, Jinhan and Byeonhan are present day Yeongnam. Mahan became Baekje, Jinhan became Silla and Byeonhan became Gara (可羅).” (In Jeong 1998:297)

3.6 Gaya (伽倻) = Garak (駱洛) = Guyahan-guk (狗邪韓國) = Gara (可羅)
Yu equates the polity of 'Guyahan-guk' (狗邪韓國) given in the SGZ "Wae" (倭人傳) section, and 'Gara' (可羅) described in the Nanqishu (南齊書), to Gaya/Garak mentioned in Korean sources.
"In the Nanqishu (南齊書) Guyahan-guk (狗邪韓國 [given in 三國志:倭人傳]) is called Gara (駕羅). This is what is referred to in our [Korean] histories as Gaya or Garak (駕洛). Its capital is present day Gimhae-bu. In Korean, we pronounce gu (狗) as ga (加) and so Guya-guk is pronounced as Gara. Ga (加) and ga (駕) are [used] alternatively depending on pronunciation. In the regional dialect na (羅) means guk (國 'state') and nak (洛) is an alternative pronunciation. Daema-guk (對馬國) is present day Daema-do (對馬島 J. Tsushima) whilst Ilji-guk (一支國) is present day Ilgi-do (壹岐島 J. Iki). Both in the past and present these two islands are on the way to Wae." (In Jeong 1998:298)

[SGZ 三國志:魏書三十:倭人傳: "倭人在帝方東南大海之中，依山島為國邑，舊百餘國，漢時有朝見者，今使譜所通三 十國。從郡至倭，循海岸水行，歷韓國，乍南乍東，到其北岸狗邪韓國，七千餘里，始度一 海，千餘里至對馬國"]

4. Early Three Kingdoms formation

Yu rejects the ON chronology for the establishment of the Three Kingdoms and relies primarily instead on evidence from the more contemporaneous SGZ. Consequently he identifies Goguryeo to have been the oldest of the Three Kingdoms, interpreting Jumong (朱蒙) as its founder and Chu (駱) a subsequent ruler. Recognizing that the ON C1st BCE foundation dates for Silla and Baekje are incongruent with the later C3rd SGZ account of the Samhan occupying the same territory, Yu again rejects the former as later invention; whilst identifying Silla and Baekje to have evolved from the subordinate Samhan polities of Baekje-guk (伯濟國) and Saro-guk (斯盧國) respectively, he emphasizes they would have been at a stage of pre-state development.

"Concerning ennoblements (封爵) of the Three Kingdoms, Goguryeo, Baekje and Silla, they all take the names of those lands. Concerning the establishment of [those and other related] polities (割據), it can be seen that some [polities] were large[er] and small[er], whilst some were later or earlier than as recorded in the Chinese histories. In general, the name of Guryeo (句麗) is the oldest. The establishment of [[Go]guryeo by] Jumong occurred during the Former Han period. Consequently the Guryeo lord Chu (駱) existed at the time of Wang Mang (王莽), and in the 8th year of Emperor Guangwu (光武帝 - c.32 CE), they took the title of 'king' and visited the [Han] court. [However records of] Silla and Baekje do not appear during the Han and Wei dynasty periods. Our [Korean] sources [i.e. SS and SY] say that the Baekje founder, Onjo, came to the throne during the early Eastern Han, and that Silla founder, Bak Hyeokgeose, became sovereign in the 1st Wufeng
(五凤) year {57 BCE} of Emperor Xuan (宣帝). This is doubtful. Amongst the 50 states of Mahan recorded in the [SGZ] Weizhi (魏志) was Baekje (百濟) which was [the early state of] Baekje (百濟). Amongst the 24 states of Byeonhan and Jinhan, was Saro (斯盧) which was Silla. At the time they were just tiny villages spread in clusters between the mountains and sea: clearly they would not have had annals (世本) or chronologies (年表) that could have been transmitted to later generations. The descriptions in our history books are absurd and nothing believable is recorded in the Gogi (古記 [cited in the SY - or alternatively just meaning 'old records']). It is not the same as parsing Chinese histories and obtaining evidence.” (四郡志:封爵 in Jeong 1998:309)

5. Criticism of early Korean historiography

As seen in the above quote, throughout Sagun’ji Yu demonstrates a strong skepticism towards Korean sources on early history. These criticisms are made even more explicit in the preface text he wrote for Han Chiyun’s Haedong-yeoksa (海東續史 韓致齋 1765-1814)

"Altogether how many Korean history books (東史) are there? The texts referred to as gogi (古記 'old records') are all fanciful and it is best for sadaebu (史料) literati to ignore them. Concerning Kim Busik’s Samguk-sagi, people complain that [much is] omitted and so it is not worth consulting, but [given at the time of compilation] there were absolutely no [sources] stored in stone chambers of famous mountains, what could he have done? Consequently there is only Jeong Inji’s (鄭麟趾) Goryeo-sa, but what can be consulted for [the time] before Goryeo? Previously I have thought to take the "Dongguo-zhuan" (東國傳) sections of the twenty-one Chinese histories, leave out repeated sections, but keep/add annotations and critical examination; and then precede relying [on these together] with the two [Korean] histories of the Three Kingdoms and Goryeo, then this should be an aid in evaluating [their] reliability. In the end I have not done so, but it has always remained in my mind [lit. 'chest']...

...Koreans will often say that the Korean historical documents in Pyeongyang were burnt by Li [Shi]ji (李世勣 594-669), whilst those at Wansan (完山 [aka Jeonju 全州]) were burnt [during] Gyeon Hwon’s (甄萱) defeat, but this is unsubstantiated talk. How could there have been historical documents in [ancient] Korea (東方)?! The period of the sage Gilja (吉嘉) belongs to the time of [emperors] Yao and Shun before Wi Man: they did not keep histories. For the 400 years of the Han [dynasty, Korea was] incorporated [into Han], how could the Lelang governor have established an independent history office?! Thus former events (佚事) and strange matters [of Korean history] must be
searched for in the Chinese [soures], only then will they be found.

As for the Ye of Yeongdong (嶺東), Han (韓) to the south of the Han [river], and Okjoo east of Gaema-san, if not for [SGZ compiler] Chen Shou (陳壽), how could one know of their [former] existence? And how was it that Chen Shou could have taken up a brush and written about foreign affairs in this much detail? The Gongsun clan [became] hereditary Liaodong governors, they established Daifang-jun to administer the various Han (韓) and Ye groups (部): [when] Sima Yi (司馬懿 [179–251]) destroyed them, [knowledge of] the topography, administration, industry and customs would have been obtained by the [Jin court] historians. Thereafter, [that region] was called the Three [Korean] Kingdoms: [in addition to the three kingdoms] Gara and Tammora (耽繡羅 [Jeju-do island]) were also subordinate [vassal states], and they would all dispatch envoys with tribute to visit the suzerain state (上國). The history of the Southern and Northern dynasties thus record this: these cannot but be historical documents of Korean (東方).” (Yu Deukgong 海東編史:海東緯史序)[65]

海東緯史序: 東史 凡幾種轝 所謂古記 都是流落荒誕之説 士大夫不言 可也 金富軾三國史 人古其略略不足觀 而名山石室 茫無所藏 煞金富軾 亦且奈何 然則唯有鄭麟趾高麗史 而已 高麗以前何從而鏡考乎 余昔欲取二十一史東國備測其重複 以注以辨與三國高麗二史相依而行 則庶或有資於徵信 卒卒未遂 亦未嘗不去來於胸中 吾友韓大潤上舍 性恬靜 喜蓄書 開戶考古 恍然有意於東史 與余不謀而合 又推而廣之 汲汲乎正史之外 我東數十年事實 自經傳以至彙纂在在散見者 幾盡搜剔抄寫 又手刀與糊 離而合 合而離 蓬首流汗 唯忘寢食 用五年之功力始分類立目 勒成一部 凡幾卷 有世紀焉 有列傳焉 天文地理禮樂 兵刑服政文 各有其志 則居然而史矣 名之曰海東緯史 余所有意而未逮者 一朝罔獲之不亦快哉 東人或言東方史籍在平壤者 焚於李勤 其在完山者 又焚於甄萱之敗 此亦無稽之談 東方豈有史籍 範聖之世矣可以斷自唐虞衡齊之前 觀之不修春秋 漢四百年自是內服 樂樂太守焉得立史官哉 此所以俛事異閭 必求諸中國然後可得也 嶺東之義 漢南之韓 盖馬山東之沃沮 狄非陳壽 惡能知其有無哉 彼陳壽者 聲筆而書表之事 能若是之詳者 又何也 公孫氏世襲遼東太守 立帶方郡以統韓諸郡 司馬懿滅之 則其山川道里物產風謠 必為太史氏所得 余是以後曰三國 又有加羅耽繡羅之屬 皆能發使執幣 見於上國 南北諸史 從而記之 此莫非東方史籍也 幸而大瀛之書 今又成矣 富哉無所不有 昔刻子朝魯昭子問少皞氏鳥名今何故也 刻子曰吾祖也吾知之 孔子聞而學之 末談如周 不能對晉之分器 王曰叔氏而忘諸乎 是故不知本國之史者 古之君子恥之 若之何不觀是書也 儒州柳州恭得恭序

His criticism of the Liaoshi geography cited earlier is also noteworthy as this text has similarly been recognized as problematic by current day scholars but is often cited uncritically by popular history writers.[66]

---

65) This translation is based on the original hanmun, informed by a modern Korean translation by Jeong Seong-yong (전선용 1996) available on the Database of Korean Classics, 'Classic Translation Series'.

66) For a useful discussion of the Liaoshi geography see Byington 2003:418.
[Chapter 9] Jeong Yak-yong (丁若镛 1762-1836) -
Abang-gang'yeok-go 我邦疆域考 (c.1813)

Contents overview
Contained in the collected works of Dasan Jeong Yak-yong, (與琉球全書) under the abridged title of Gang'yeok-go (疆域考 'study of territory'). Abang-gang'yeok-go ('study of our country's territory') is a lengthy work surveying the totality of Korea's historical geography.67) Below, first, is an outline of the content.68)

Gang'yeok-go 疆域考
"Joseon-go" 朝鮮考 - Gija and Wiman Joseon
"Sa'gun-chonggo" 四郡總考 - Overview of the Four Commanderies
"Lelang-go" 樂浪考
"Byeol'yu-go" 別有考 (lit. 'separate study') - Conflations of the term 'Lelang'.
"Xuantu-go" 玄菟考
"Lintun-go" 臨屯考
"Zhenfan-go" 真番考
"Lelang-byeolgo" 樂浪別考 - Lelang and indigenous Nangnang disambiguation
"Daifang-go" 帝方考
"Samhan-chonggo" 三韓總考 - Samhan overview
"Mahan-go" 馬韓考
"Jinhan-go" 辰韓考
"Byeonjiin-go" 弁辰考 - Argues against identifying Byeonhan and Mahan with Pyeongyang region

"Byeonjiin-byeolgo" / "Gara-go" 弁辰別考(亦名迦羅考) - Discusses historical Byeonjin (aka Gaya)
"Okjeo-go" 沖淪考
"YeMaek-go" 萬貊考 - Continental YeMaek/WeiMo (à la North Buyeo)
"YeMaek-byeolgo" 萬貊別考 - central peninsula YeMaek
"Malgal-go" 驚貊考
"Balhae-go" 海倭考

"Jolbon-go" 卒本考
"Gungnae-go" 國內考
"Hwando-go" 占都考

[Except for "Paesu-byeon", the subsequent sections below are not further discussed in this chapter]
"Willye-go" 鄭禮考 (위례고)
"Hanseong-go" 漢城考
"Paldo-yenhyeok-chongseo" 八道沿革總敘
"Paldo-yenhyeok-chongseo" 八道沿革總敘
"Paesu-byeon" 洋水辨

67) Jeong’s collected works, Yeoyudang-jeonjiip (與琉球全書), is available on the Database of Korean Classics <http://db.itkc.or.kr/>.
68) Note in the Romanization of these subsections, to avoid confusion I have rendered the names of the Chinese commanderies into Mandarin pinyin, whilst the -go (考 'study') suffix is Sino-Korean.
"Baeksan-bo" 白山譜
"Balhae-songgo" 渤海續考
"Bungno-yeonhyeok-sok" 北路沿革續
"Seobungno-yeonhyeok-sok" 西北路沿革續
"Guseong-ryeongo" 九城速考

The structure of each go (考) section is divided into multiple subsections which follow a pattern of: Jeong’s summary statement, relevant citations from sources, and then a further explanatory 'annotation' (案) by Jeong. My own following summary below translates the majority of Jeong’s initial statements for relevant sections, followed where useful by core points or translations of his 'annotations'.

The summary comprising the rest of this chapter is organized into three parts as follows.

**Part 1: Joseon and the Han Commanderies**
Joseon - "Joseon-go" 朝鮮考
Pae-su - "Paesu-byeon" 漬水辯
"Four Commanderies overview" (四都總考)
Lelang - Includes two sections.
  1. The historical Lelang commandery ("Lelang-go" 樂浪考)
  2. Criticism of Liaodong location theories for the Lelang and Daifang commanderies ("Byeol'yu-go" 別有考)
Xuantu disambiguation ("Xuantu-go" 玄菟考) - Includes diachronic disambiguation.
Lintun 臨屯考
Zhenfan 真番考
Autonomous Lelang/Nangnang - "Lelang-byeolgo" 樂浪別考
Daifang 帶方考

**Part 2: Samhan and Gaya politics**
1. Samhan overview 三韓總考
2. Mahan 马韓考
3. Jinhan 辰韓考
4. Byeonjin 弁辰考 - Argues against identifying Byeonhan and Mahan with Pyeongyang region
5. "Byeonjin-byeolgo" 弁辰別考(亦名迦羅考) - Discusses historical Byeonjin (aka Gaya)

**Part 3: Okjeo, YeMaek, Malgal and early Goguryeo**
1. Okjeo 決沮考
2. YeMaek 畿貊
3. Malgal 马鞨考
4. Early Goguryeo 卒本考
Part 1: Joseon and the Han Commanderies

- Jeong’s conceptualization of the historical geography is reasonably similar to Yu Deukgong, with certain exceptions (e.g. Lintun).
- Jeong is the first(? to, or at least more systematically exposes later conflations by ‘Korean scholars’ caused by relocations and misinformation of the Liaoshi.
- Introduces the notion of namesake (冒名) districts for the relocated commanderies inadvertently anticipating Sin Chaeho’s hypothesis that the initial commanderies were themselves only namesakes of failed campaign objectives.

1. Joseon - "Joseon-go" 朝鮮考

Initial points.
- The capitals of both Gija and Wi Man were at the same location of modern Pyeongyang.
- As this became the Chaoxian county of the Lelang-jun commandery it can be understood that 'Joseon' was the old name for Pyeongyang.
- Pyeongyang also had the name of Wangheom-seong.

1.2 Maximum territory
「箕子當時其疆域，未必遠遠。其後世嗣君，拓地恢廓，西過遼河，以與燕接。」
"At the time of Gija, the territory was not large. It was passed down to hereditary lords: they greatly expanded the territory westwards past the Liao-he river and so came into contact with Yan (燕)."

Citing the Weitiue account of the Yan expansion 2,000 li into Joseon territory, led by Qin Kai, after which the Manban-han (滿漢 Ch. Manpanhan) became the new border between them, Jeong locates the Manban-han in historical Liaodong and thus reasons that Joseon must itself have previously expanded more than 2,000 li westwards for this territory then to have been lost without Yan encroaching as far as the Yalu.

Jeong gives the distance between Uiju and Beijing as 2,100 li and thus the pre-Qin Kai extent of Joseon’s western territory would have included most of Liaoxi. He suggests that a toponymic tradition associated with Chaoxian in this region may have originated in Joseon’s historical occupation.

"According to the Weishu geography, amongst the counties of Beiping-jun (北平郡) there was a Chaoxian-xian (朝鮮縣)... According to the Ming-Yitongzhi Chaoxian-cheng is/was located within the border of Yongping-fu: tradition
states that this was the land enfeoffed to Gija. During Northern Wei [this Chaoxian] county was established under the control of Beiping-jun: during the Northern Yan it was incorporated into Xinchang-xian (新昌縣).

Annotation: Present day Yongpingfu (永平府) is the former location of Beiping-jun. From the Weilüe [account it can be] understood that [a region of] 2,000+ li to the west of the Mancheon [river] was formerly held by the Gi clan. Today going 2,000+ li west from Liaodong, one reaches the border of Yongpingfu.” (Jeong 疆域考:朝鮮考)

魏書地形志。286_230d北平郡領縣，有朝鮮縣。注云，二漢之屬樂浪，後魏，延和元年，徙朝鮮民於肥，如復置縣。○明一統志云，朝鮮城，在永平府境內。相傳箕子受封之地，後魏置縣，屬北平郡，北齊省入新昌縣。○通案今之永平府，古之北平郡也。且據魏略，潘汗以酉一千餘里，在古為箕氏之有，今自遼東而西，行二千餘里。正德永平府境一統志所言異有據也。

※ This contrasts with his other explanations below that continental associations with the Four Commanderies are conflated namesakes.
※ Separately, it anticipates Yun Naehyeon’s historical geography.

「燕之既亡，箕氏雖勉事秦，漢興，漸失其西部，唯以鴨水為界。」
"After Yan collapsed, the Gi clan strove to serve the Qin. [When] Han (漢) flourished [Joseon] lost its western borderlands, [after which] the Yalu became its western border."

2. Pae-su river - "Paesu-byeon" 汴水辯
Based on the original Shuijing (水經) Jeong identifies the 'authentic' Pae-su (潧水 Ch. Peishui) as the Daedong-gang; he regards the river crossed by Wi Man in the Shiji as having been the Yalu, traditionally known as the Maja-su, and therefore considers the Shiji to have been mistaken in recording it as the Pae-su. In addition to the Daedong-gang and Yalu, Jeong discusses two further rivers which have been named Pae-su, the Xuanyulo (軒平瀧 K. Heon’uran) in Liaodong and the Jeotan-su (豬灘水) on the peninsula.

As noted, except for the Daedong-gang, Jeong considers the other three Pae-su rivers inauthentic. Whilst Jeong is more purely concerned with disambiguation of conflations arising from the usage of Pae-su, the reason in modern times for being concerned with discussions of the Pae-su, however, relates to its role in the Shiji as being the river marking the western border of Joseon: the concern is not over authenticity of the name, but over the location of this specific river. Despite this Jeong’s comprehensive parsing and disambiguation greatly aids in understanding potential conflations that have arisen, and where certain modern
Part II - Historical geography - Jeong Yak-yong - Joseon

theories - namely Sin Chaeho’s identification of the Shiji Pae-su as the Xuanyulu - have originated.

「淚水者，平壤之大同江也。桑欽之經，本無差謬。而韓道元枉生疑惑，使後人別求他水。」
"The Pae-su is the Daedong-gang of Pyeongyang. Sang Qin’s [Shuijìng (水經)] was originally correct, but Li Daoyuan’s annotations [i.e. Shuijìng-zhu (水經注)] caused suspicions making later people search for other rivers."

「又史記朝鮮列傳所載泗水，明以今鴨綠江，謂指為泗水。不當以時代之較先，信此疑彼。」
"The Pae-su recorded in the Shiji "Chaoxian" account is clearly the Yalu. It mistakenly designates it as Pae-su. One must not change the order of periods [of the sources] believing this and doubting that."

※ The logic of this statement is based on the traditional attributing of the Shuijìng to Sang Qin (桑欽) c. C3rd BCE meaning that it would predate the Shiji. Wilkinson (2012:200) notes that the Shuijìng is now thought to date to the C3rd CE; however, even if the traditional date were to be taken as correct, it would be very unlikely the work could have contained accurate knowledge about the Korean peninsula.

「至班固撰地志，始正史記之謬。大同曰泗水，鴨綠曰馬曹水。」
Only with Ban Gu’s compiling of the [Hanshu] geography, was the mistake of the Shiji corrected. It has the Daedong as Pae-su and Yalu as Maja-su.

「嗣此以降，史傳所記，皆以大同，為泗水無異論也。」
Hereafter the histories all record the Daedong as Pae-su and there are no alternative theories.

「總之泗水有四。其一其二，前所論者是也。其三，遼東之軒[sic: 軒]芹瀾，亦有泗水之名。」
In summary, there are four Pae-su. The first [Daedong and Yalu] are discussed above. The third is the Xuanyulu (軒芹瀾 K. Heon’uran) in Liaodong which also has the name Peishui (泗水).
※ This point is of note because the Xuanyulu/Heon’uran is the identification used by Sin Chaeho to relocate the Han Commanderies outside of the peninsula.

"According to the Yitongzhi, the Qinghe originates from Fenshuiling (分水嶺) in Gaizhouwei (蓋州衛); flowing southwest, it passes Chengnam (城南 ‘south of the fortress’); flowing west it joins with the Nihe (泥河) and enters the sea. Another name for the Nihe is Peishui. It is also called Xuanyulu; many xuanyu plants can be seen in the Liaodong Dusi (遼東都司). According to the Shenggingzhi (盛京志), the Younihe (遊泥河) [flows] southwestwards 65 li through Haicheng-xian (海城縣); it originates from Shengguoshui-shan (聖過水
山), west of Mizhen-shan (迷真山). [the river] splits: this is the Xuanyuluuo of Liao[dong], it is not the Pae-su of Joseon.” (Jeong 疆域考:淡水辯)

一統志云，清河源出蓋州衛，分水嶺西南流，經城南，又西流，合泥河，入于海，泥河，一名涇水，又曰，鷧芊瀕水，多鷧芊之草，見遼東都司，○盛京志云，涇泥河，在海城縣西南六十五里，源出聖達水山，至迷真山西散漫，郜遼之鷧芊瀕。非朝鮮涇江。

「其四，今平山之豬灘水，亦於東史。或冒涇水之名。」
"The fourth [Pae-su] is the Jeotan-su of present day Pyeongsan. In Korean histories it is also falsely named Pae-su."

3. "Four Commanderies overview" (四郡總考)

「四郡者，衛滿朝鮮之所分也。」
"The Four Commanderies [occupied] Wiman Joseon's divided [territory]."

• In parsing the contradictory distances given in HHS of Lelang and Xuantu from Luoyang (洛陽) = 5,000 and 4,000 里 respectively - which would make Xuantu nearer than Lelang to Luoyang, Jeong asserts this is referring to the later Xuantu located in Liaodong, rather than the original Xuantu located at Okjeo-seong.

「四郡始分之初。惟鴨江以東，入於彜理。鴨江以西，遼東之地，不相混也，惟真番一郡，疑在今江界外也。」
"When the Four Commanderies were first established (lit. 'divided'), their territory was solely to the east [south] of the Yalu: land to the west was Liaodong. The lands did not mix. Only the Zhenfan commandery may have been beyond the present day border of Ganggye (江界)."

"Annotation: today people often suspect that the counties of Lelang were in Liaodong, but the Hanshu geography distinguishes that Lelang and Liaodong were [both] commanderies each administering [their own] counties. It is wrong to place the counties of Lelang in Liaodong. After Emperor Zhao (昭帝 r. 87-74 BCE) many of the names of the Lelang and Xuantu commanderies' counties moved to Liaodong, but they selected empty land and established new settlements (邑落), detailed below. They were not old counties in Liaodong, they were new names [for Liaodong] surreptitiously (蒙) [taken] from [the original] Lelang and Xuantu commanderies.” (Jeong 疆域考:四郡總考)

「案今人多疑樂浪諸縣，或在遼東，然漢書地理志，樂浪遼東，各為一郡，各領其縣，不應樂浪之縣，參錯於遼東也。昭帝以後，樂浪玄菟郡縣之名，多徙遼東，然亦但擇其空地，新建邑落，詳見下，非於遼東之故縣。蒙以浪、菟之新名也。」
"Concerning changes of the Four Commanderies, they subsequently became the
Two Fu: the territories moved and the names became confused. This must be examined.”

- Criticizes *Munheon-bigo*, including a statement that the Two Fu were annexed by Goguryeo during the time of Han Emperor Yuan (漢元帝 r.48–33 BCE); Jeong notes Pyeongyang (former Lelang) was not taken by Goguryeo until the time of Cao Wei (220–265).

4. Lelang

In the sections "Lelang-go", "Byeol’yu-go" and "Lelang-byeol-go" (樂浪考·別有考·樂浪別考) Jeong discusses four geographical identifications of Lelang: the first is the historical Lelang-jun commandery itself which he locates centered on modern Pyeongyang and post 82 BCE incorporating the territories of the initial Xuantu commandery on the east coast and the Lintun commandery to the immediate south: the second is that of local *qushuai* (渠帥 K. geusu) hegemones who having gained autonomous control over the eastern territories c.30 CE go on to establish a Nangnang polity in Chuncheon (春川) coexisting with Pyeongyang Lelang; the third is a continental location north of the Yalu which Jeong attributes to conflations of Lelang with the Liaodong-jun commandery and confusion of later sources; and the fourth is in the Gyeongju region owing to the adoption of Lelang/Nangnang in the title of Silla kings.

"Lelang-go" primarily discusses the historical geography of the Lelang commandery at Pyeongyang; "Byeol’yu-go" parses the various conflations with continental locations, and separately those with Silla; finally "Lelang-byeolgo" then examines the textual accounts of Pyeongyang Lelang and Chuncheon Nangnang seeking to disambiguate their relationship. As in Jeong’s work, the summary here of "Lelang-byeolgo" follows after discussion of the other historical Han Commanderies.

4.1. Historical Lelang commandery ("Lelang-go" 樂浪考)

- The 25 counties of Lelang listed in the *Hanshu* already include the former counties of Xuantu in the east (Hamgyeong province) and Lintun in the south (northwest Gyeonggi).

  Former Xuantu counties were: Buer, Cantai, Huali, Yatoumei, Qianmo and Fuzu ("不而·蠶台·華麗·邪頭 {sic.}·味前 {sic.}·莫夫租 {sic.}.”)\(^{69}\)

  Former Lintun counties were: Tunlie and Dongyi (唐列·東曦)

- According to the HHS, the former Xuantu counties were administered as the

---

69) The punctuation in the passage listing the Xuantu counties is wrong but is correct elsewhere in the text.
Lelang Dongbu Duwei (樂浪東部都尉). Around 30 CE, this was reduced and then abolished, after which the local geosa (渠帥) were enfeoffed as county lords (discussed further below).

- The HS records Lelang governor, Liu Mao (樂浪太守劉茂) and Daifang governor, Gong Zun (帶方大[sic. 太]守弓遵), leading a joint campaign against the DongYe (東嶽) c.245. During this period, the Chinese officials staffing Lelang and Daifang had to travel by ship from China because the overland route was too hazardous.
- During the rule of Gongsun Du, the seven southern counties are partitioned into Daifang-jun commandery.

※ These points are discussed in greater detail in the following sections.

- Table 14 below summarizes various contemporary locations associated with the historical Lelang-jun explicitly identified by Jeong.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ancient</th>
<th>contemporary region</th>
<th>Jeong’s notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chaoxian</td>
<td>Pyeongyang 平壤</td>
<td>Commandery seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peishui 湖水</td>
<td>Daedonggang river region 大同江之沿地</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nianti 點蝟</td>
<td>Yeon'an and Baekcheon 延安·白川地</td>
<td>Korean histories also have this as Haengju [東史或云郡州]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicheng 遂成</td>
<td>Suseong 遂城</td>
<td>The north of present day Changeong, in Uiju, has some remains: Korean scholars say these are Suicheng but they are greatly mistaken. [今義州，昌城之北，或其遺也，東儒謂之遂安大謬矣]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zengdi 增地</td>
<td>Gyoha, Jangdan and Majeon 交河·長湍·麻田</td>
<td>Region of Daesu river [帶水之治]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daifang and Hanzi 帶方合資</td>
<td>Gyangha, Jangdan and Majeon 交河·長湍·麻田</td>
<td>Region of Daesu river [帶水之治]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liekou 列口</td>
<td>Ganghwa 江華</td>
<td>SS has Ganghwa as Hyeolgu-hyeon. 'Hyeol' 畝 and 'ryeol' 膳 have similar pronunciation. Liekou 列口 is the same as Liekou 洹口. [金富軾三國史，以江華為穴口縣。穴列聲相近也。列口者，淽口也]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunlie 館列</td>
<td>Pungdeok and Tongjin 豐德·通津</td>
<td>Where the Lie river enters [the sea?] 溝水之所入也</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieshui river 溝水</td>
<td>Han-su 漢水 [aka Han-gang]</td>
<td>Former Lintun. Tunyou being Lintun is the same as Pei-xian being Linpe. 臨屯之故地，屯有之為臨屯，如溝縣之為臨溝也</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunyou 屯有</td>
<td>Yeongwon Deokcheon 宁遠德川</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Jeong Yak-yong – Contemporary locations of Lelang Commandery counties
4.1.2 Jieshi-shan mountain (碣石山 K. Galseok-san)
Jeong highlights the question of Jieshi-shan mountain (碣石山 K. Galseok-san) which is first recorded in the "Taikang-dilizhi" (太康地理志) geography treatise quoted in the Suoyin annotations to the Shiji, and subsequently in the Tongdian (通典) as being the eastern terminus of the Wall (長城). Both sources locate the mountain in Suicheng-xian county (遂城縣) of Lelang; whilst the "Taikang-dilizhi" gives this simply as a 'Lelang', the Tongdian makes it more specifically the 'Han Lelang-jun commandery'.

Having already identified Suicheng as Suseong (遂城) in contemporary Chang-seong of Uiju (義州昌城), Jeong rejects the Tongdian claim on the grounds that it would place the mountain on - implied within - the border of the Yalu. Instead he suggests that Jieshishan must be 'west' (i.e. north) of the Yalu at the eastern end of the 'tree palisade' (樹障 referring to the Willow Palisade?).

Jeong 疆域考: 樂浪考: 太康地理志云。樂浪遂城縣。有碣石山，長城所起。○通典云。碣石山在漢樂浪郡遂城縣。長城起於此山。今駿長城。東截遼水入高麗。遺址猶存，按古書云，夾石[sic.右]，碣石入於河右，碣石即河赴海處。在今北平郡南二十餘里。則高麗中為左碣石。○舊案若如通典之說。則遂城。當在今義州昌城之地。鴨水之界，不然。或在鴨 вод之西，今樹障東頭之地也。

4.2. Criticism of Liaodong location theories for the Lelang and Daifang commanderies ("Byeol’yu-go" 別有考)
Jeong devotes the greater part of the "Byeol’yu-go" section to refuting the Liaodong misidentifications of Lelang and Daifang commanderies.

4.2.1 HHS and SGZ
The first conflation arises, according to Jeong, from the HHS and SGZ accounts of a Goguryeo attack on Xi-Anping (西安平) in Liaodong wherein it is recorded that the 'Daifang commander' was killed and the 'Lelang governor's wife and child' captured. Jeong notes that "some" scholars explained this by positing that after the original Lelang-Daifang territories were lost to Goguryeo and Baekje, they were reestablished in Liaodong; he attributes this interpretation to the Munheon-bigo but himself rejects it.

"Xi-Anping (西安平) is the region of our present day Okgang-bo (玉江堡). Uiju, a short distance from the river. The Tangshu geography treatise records that to the south of Yingzhou (營州) was the Yalu and 700 li to the north Bozhuo-cheng (泊灼城). Its own annotation records that Bozhuo-cheng was former Anping-xian county. Based on this, Anping belonged to Liaodong but was very close to the Yalu and was not [so] close to present day Liaoyang. At
the time it was Han territory. To the west was Liaodong; to the east was the Yalu which connected like an artery to the Pyeongyang Sal-su (薩水平壤 [Jeong identifies the Sal-su as the Cheongcheon 清川 river]). [Go]ljuryeo King Dongcheon [r.227-48] first took Pyeongyang at the end of the Shu Han (蜀漢 [221-63]). Thereupon the Daifang commander and Lelang governor [and his] wife and child went east from Liaodong to Lelang via Anping. [At] Bozhuo-cheng they were attacked (殺掠 'killed and plundered') by [Go]ljuryeo. That is the logical [sequence of events]. The Munheon-bigo, however, says that Lelang and Daifang [commanderies] were both in Liaodong. How can this not be mistaken?! Hong paneo (洪判書 {maybe referring to Hong Yunseong 洪允成 1425-75}) says [Go]ljuryeo attacked Liaodong to the west and raided (擄) Dai[fang] and Le[lang] to the south. [They] also did not know that Xi-Anping became Bozhuo-cheng." (Jeong 疆域考: 別有考)

疆域考:別有考: "疆案西安平者，今我義州玉江堡隔江之地也。唐書地理志云，營州南至鴨渌江，北泊灼城七百里，自注曰，泊灼城，古之安平縣。由是觀之，安平雖屬遼東，切近鴨江，非今遼陽近地也，當時漢地，西自遼東、東至鴨江，血脈相連，以達於薩水平壤。句麗東川王。始得平壤，在遼漢之末，則帶方令，樂浪太守妻子。本自遼東，東赴樂浪，路由安平，泊灼城，為句麗所殺掠，事理當然，乃文獻備考。却云樂浪帶方，位於遼東，豈不謬哉。洪判書謂句麗西犯遼東，南捨帶樂，亦不知西安平，即泊灼城故也。"

※ This fails still to explain who the Daifang and Lelang officials were, or to which administration they belonged.

※ In the above section, the Hong paneo (洪判書) is attributed to Hong Myeonghan (洪名漢) implying the Munheon-bigo for which he was a compiler. In this case it seems that Jeong agrees with Hong paneo who located Lelang and Daifang to the south, but rejects the Munheon-bigo which locates them in Liaodong.

疆域考:別有考: "或曰，漢光武時，雖以薩水已南屬漢詳別考，此時句麗日強月盛，漢則越濱海而遙制，其勢不能不寢失，故未久漢水以北，復為句麗所得。而漢水以南，百濟得之，樂浪故地，非復漢地。故漢又置樂浪郡於遼東，以存武帝之舊跡也。不然，樂浪太守妻子，安得在遼東平，即文獻備考之意。○洪名漢云，市林洪判書，漢史蓋謂韓邑出兵無常，既犯西安平，又掠樂浪太守妻子也，帶方樂浪，非在遼東。" (This passage is immediately previous to the quote above.)

※ In the "Lelang--byeolgo" (樂浪別考) section below he again rejects the Munheon-bigo Liaodong theory and implies that the event occurred on the peninsula.

4.2.2 jinshu (晉書) geography and Tongdian (通典)

The next conflation occurs due to the records in the jinshu (646) geography treatise and Tongdian of Liaodong-jun commandery c.276 CE being subdivided into five apparently smaller junguo (郡國 'commandary and/or state') regions of Changli (昌黎), Liaodong, Xuantu, Daifang and Lelang, the latter three of which can be seen to have names adopted from or shared by the original Han
commanderies: these five junguo subsequently become subordinate to Pingzhou (平州) province with the seat at Liaodong Xiangping (遼東襄平) and Pingzhou in turn merged into Youzhou (幽州). Jeong asserts that it would be impossible to have five such divisions fitting into the space of the former single Liaodong commandery, and observes that there are no remains of Lelang or Daifang west of the Yalu.

疆域考;別有考: "通典云, 遼東郡, 東通樂浪。魏置東夷校尉居襄平, 而分遼東、昌黎、玄菟、帶方、樂浪五郡, 爲平州。後還合幽州, 及文懿滅後, 有護東校尉居襄平, 晉咸寧二年, 分昌黎、遼東、玄菟、帶方、樂浪等郡國, 以置平州, 本出晉書地理志。以慕容廆。為刺史。○轅案當時五郡。皆臨平州。而平州以遼東襄平為治。五郡之地。皆在遼東之界內乎, 無是理也。鴨水之西。樂浪、帶方之跡, 不可求也。"

※ He fails to explain further, but the implication would seem to be that he considers the three latter jungguo of Xuantu, Daifang and Lelang to refer to the original peninsula territories, but this would ignore the rise of the Three Kingdoms polities on the peninsula.

※ His line of argument is still based on already having premised the location of Lelang, Xuantu and Daifang on the peninsula.

4.2.3 Weishu (魏書) Geography and SS Baekje Annal
The next potential confusions are references to Lelang and Daifang entities from the Weishu geography with those of the SS Baekje annual, albeit the latter being a slightly earlier date.

• In 525 Lelang is restored with its seat at Lian-cheng (連城) controlling two counties of Yongle (永洛) and a restored Daifang.

[Weishu 魏書:地形志二上第五:南營州:樂良郡: "樂良郡前漢武帝置, 二漢。晉曰樂浪, 後改, 罷。正光末[525]復, 治連城, 領縣二 戶二百一十九 口一千八 永洛正光末置。有鳥山, 帶方二漢屬, 晉屬帶方, 後罷, 正光末復屬。"

• Then in 533 both a Yingqiu-jun (營丘郡) and (another) Lelang-jun (樂良郡) commandery are established in Nanying-zhou (南營州) province. Yingqui-jun controlled three counties of Fuping, Yongan and Daifang (富平·永安·帶方) whilst Lelang-jun had a single county of Yeongle (永樂) established in 540.


The *Weishu* geography passages Jeong is referring to are as follows:

[Nanyingzhou 6172] “南營州孝昌中525-8營州陷，永熙二年置，寄治英雄城，領郡五，縣十一，戶一千八百一十三，口九千三十六”

[Yingqiu 537 6176] 魏書：地理志二上第五：南營州：營丘郡：“營丘郡天平四年537置，領縣三，戶五百一十二，口二千七百二十七。富平天平四年置，永安元象538-9中置，帶方元象中置。"

[Lelang 537 6177] 魏書：地理志二上第五：南營州：樂良郡：“樂良郡天平四年537置，領縣一，戶四十九，口二百三十，永樂興和二年540置。"

[Lelang 525 6186] 魏書：地理志二上第五：南營州：樂良郡：“樂良郡前漢武帝置，今漢、晉曰樂浪，改曰樂浪，徙，置，正光末525復，治連城，領縣二，戶二百一十九，口一千八，永洛光末置，有鳥山，帶方二漢屬，晉屬帶方，徙，置。正光未復屬。"

[Yingqiu 525 6188] 魏書：地理志二上第五：南營州：營丘郡：“營丘郡正光末525置，領縣二，戶一百八十二，口七百九十四，富平正光末置，永安正光末置。"

Jeong asserts that in the SS Baejke Annal, the mention of Daifang/Daebang and Lelang/Nangnang in the 18th year (472 CE) entry for King Gaero (蓋鈞王) refer to the territory under Baejke jurisdiction and therefore within the peninsula.

Jeong 疆域考：別有考：“僂案全富軼百濟史云，蓋鈞王十八年527，遣司馬張茂等上表曰。樂浪諸郡，懷首丘之心，詳樂浪別考，此拓跋魏孝文帝延興二年572事也。此時樂浪，帶方之郡。皆在百濟之境，則地形志所云，樂浪，帶方，亦在我邦域之內，魏人越海而遙領，非在鴨水之西也。"

[SS 三國史記：百濟本紀：第三：蓋鈞王：“帶方太守司馬張茂等…且馬族士馬有鳥畜之樂浪諸郡懷首丘之心…”]

4.2.4 *Suishu* (隋書) references

4.2.4.1 *Suishu* geography

"According to the *Suishu* (隋書) geography treatise, Shanggu-jun (上谷郡) commandery controlled six counties. [Of these,] Suicheng (遼城) had Longshan (龍山) mountain whilst Yongle (永樂) used to be called Beiping (北平).

Annotation: Suicheng was originally a county subordinate to Lelang. Under the Northern Wei system, Yongle was also a subordinate county to Lelang. [Concerning] the counties now subordinate to Shanggu, the old territory of Lelang south of the Yalu river was occupied by Goguryeo: Lelang’s old territory was divided into three parts. [If] Suicheng and Yongle were located to the west [north] of the Yalu, they would be unable to extended to [Goguryeo and be subordinate to Lelang. Therefore they moved and became subordinate to Shanggu. That is the general scheme of developments (勢)."

(Jeong 疆域考：別有考)

Jeong 疆域考：別有考：“隋書地理志。上谷郡統縣六，遼城，有龍山。永樂。舊曰北平，○ 僂案漢書地理志，遼城本樂浪屬縣。元魏之制，永樂亦樂良[sic.浪]屬縣。今乃屬之於上谷
4.2.4.2

Jeong cites the passage from the *Suishu* describing the route of the Left and Right armies taken during the 612 Sui invasion attempt against Goguryeo and makes the following observation.

"Annotation: Korean scholars take this passage and presume the 24 *dao* (道) were all west [north] of the Yalu. This is a big mistake. The place names listed all appear in the [earlier] *Hanshu*. Of the 18 Liaodong [commandery] counties given in the *Hanshu*, Houcheng and Xiangping (候城; 襄平) are on the [*Suishu*] list: many of the others are counties belonging to Lelang. Or could it be the Lelang counties were in Liaodong? The edict (詔) of Sui emperor Yang’s 24 armies only tries to exaggerate their brilliance: it was not realized in practice and they are unreliable. If the Sui and Tang invasions of Goguryeo only had the single Liaodong route, how could the 24 armies be divided amongst all the *dao*? It is impossible." (Jeong 疆域考:别有考)

Jeong 疆域考:別有考: "隋書云，左十二軍，出鎭方、長岑、溟[sic. 滄]海、蓋馬、建安、南蘇、遼東、玄菟、扶餘、朝鮮、沃沮、樂浪等道。右十二軍，出鉅漙、含資、澤澤、臨屯、候城、提奚、蹋頓、遼東、碣石、遼河、襄平等道，絡繹引途，皆獻於鴨遼水西。○鎭方東僑或執此文，遂疑二十四道，皆在鴨遼水西，大谬也。其所列地名，皆出漢書，而漢書遼東十八縣、惟襄平候城二縣，列於此目，其餘多是樂浪屬縣，將謂樂浪諸縣，並在遼東乎。隋煬帝二十四軍之詔，但欲夸耀焜煌，全無實效，不可據也。隋唐之伐句麗，惟有遼東一路。安得二十四軍分道各出，大無理矣。"

※ It is not entirely clear to me if he is implying the names of counties recorded in the *Suishu* that match those of the original Lelang commandery, are therefore to be identified with their original peninsula territory, or if this should mean they are continental namesakes, having been either 'relocated' or independently established at a later date. Either way, his view appears to be that they were included as exaggeration. Table 15 below is for comparative reference.
### Table 15. Jeong Yak-yong - Itinerary of Tang army invasion routes of Goguryeo & historical counties of Lelang and Liaodong commanderies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Left army route</th>
<th>Right army route</th>
<th>Hanshu Lelang commanderies</th>
<th>Hanshu Liaodong commanderies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>鐵方 Loufang</td>
<td>黾巢 Nianti</td>
<td>朝鮮 Chaoxian</td>
<td>襄平 Xiangping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>長岑 Changcen</td>
<td>黾營 Hanzi</td>
<td>蟠邸 Nanhan</td>
<td>新昌 Xinchang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>湖[微]Haiming</td>
<td>黾屯 Hunmi</td>
<td>淳水 Peishui</td>
<td>無慮 Wulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>蓋馬 Gema</td>
<td>倫霍 Lintun</td>
<td>含槽 Hanzi</td>
<td>望平 Wangping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>建安 Jianan</td>
<td>倫城 Houcheng</td>
<td>黾驒 Nianti</td>
<td>房 Fang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>南陝 Nansu</td>
<td>提奚 Tixi</td>
<td>達城 Suicheng</td>
<td>候城 Houcheng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>遼東 Liaodong</td>
<td>路頓 Tadun</td>
<td>增地 Zengdi</td>
<td>遼陰 Liaodui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>玄菟 Xuantu</td>
<td>處懸 Sushen</td>
<td>帶方 Daifang</td>
<td>遼陽 Liaoyang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>扶餘 Fuyu</td>
<td>鐵石 Jieshi</td>
<td>猷望 Siwang</td>
<td>險瀋 Xiandu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>朝鮮 Chaoxian</td>
<td>東嶺 Dongyi</td>
<td>海冥 Haiming</td>
<td>居就 Jiju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>沃沮 Woju</td>
<td>帶方 Daifang</td>
<td>列口 Liekou</td>
<td>高麗 Gaoxian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>樂浪 Lelang</td>
<td>襄平 Xiangping</td>
<td>長岑 Changcen</td>
<td>安市 Anshi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>黾方 Loufang</td>
<td>黾營 Nianti</td>
<td>諸方 Tunyou</td>
<td>武次 Wuci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>長岑 Changcen</td>
<td>黾驒 Nianti</td>
<td>昭明 Zhaoming</td>
<td>平郭 Pingguo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>蓋馬 Gema</td>
<td>黾驒 Nianti</td>
<td>遼東 Liaodong</td>
<td>西安平 Xi-anping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>建安 Jianan</td>
<td>路頓 Tadun</td>
<td>處懸 Sushen</td>
<td>文 Wen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>南陝 Nansu</td>
<td>處懸 Sushen</td>
<td>猷望 Siwang</td>
<td>番藩 Panhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>遼東 Liaodong</td>
<td>帶方 Daifang</td>
<td>海冥 Haiming</td>
<td>寅氏 Tashi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.5 Shengji zhi (盛京志) reference

Jeong also rejects information given in the Qing Shengji zhi gazetteer (盛京志 - attested in the *Sillok* c.1706).

"According to the *Shengji zhi*, Haicheng-xian (海城縣) was originally South Okjeo: during Han it was subordinate to the first Xuantu commandery before being transferred to the Lelang duwei (樂浪都尉).

Annotation: Haeseong was [Goguryeo]’s Sabi-seong (沙卑城): it is some 600 li from present day Yongman (龍灣府). How could this be taken as Lelang duwei?! It is mistaken." (Jeong 階城考:別有考)

Jeong 階城考:別有考: "盛京志云，海城縣，本古南沃沮國，漢屬元菟，後改屬樂浪都尉。
○畿內海城者，句麗之沙卑城也，距今龍灣，為六百餘里，安得為樂浪都尉所治乎。亦謬矣。"

4.3 Silla ≠ Lelang

「新羅諸王，或封樂浪郡公。非以慶州為樂浪也。」

"The Silla kings were sometimes enfeoffed as 'dukes' (公) of Lelang-jun, but Gyeongju did not become Lelang."
According to the *Tangshu* Silla Account, the Silla [people] were descendents of Byeonhan. They resided in Lelang which was 1,000 li wide and 3,000 li in length. It also says that in the 4th Wude year (武德) [of Tang emperor Gaozu 高祖] [621], Silla king Jinpyeong (眞平) sent an envoy to the [Tang] court. Gaozu issued an edict enfeoffing [Jinpyeong] as the 'Lelang-jun king' (樂浪郡王). In Kim Busik's SS [it has that] many Silla kings were enfeoffed as 'Lelang-jun duke' (樂浪郡公).

Annotation: China looked at our country as wild, far and unenlightened and so they named the king after the commandery [which they had] entrusted [him with] or which they had historically maintained] but it does not [mean that] its territory could be located here [in Silla]. According to Jeong Inji's [Goryeo-sa] geography, at the time of Sin U (辛輦) the ??Chinese embassy (使節) moved to Gyerim and had the alternative name of Lelang.

Jeong 疆域考: 別有考: "唐書新羅傳云，新羅，弁韓苗裔也。居漢樂浪地，橫千里。縱三千里，〇又云。武德四年，新羅王眞平遣使者入朝，高祖詔封樂浪郡王。金富軾三國史。新羅王多封樂浪郡公。〇屬案中國之謂我邦，荒遠不明，任取一郡，以名其王，不可以此求其疆域也。鄭麟趾地志云。辛輦時，移使節于雞林，別號樂浪。"

5. *Xuantu* disambiguation ("*Xuantu-go" 玄菟考)
- Jeong identifies three separate locations of the Xuantu commandery, which he labels •East, •North and •West.

5.1 Original Xuantu
"玄菟者，本沃沮故地，今咸鏡南道之地也。"
"Xuantu was originally in former Okjeo territory, present day southern Hamgyeong-do."
- When Xuantu was initially established, its seat was Woju-cheng (沃沮城 K. Okjeo-seong): subsequently it was incorporated into Lelang the seat of the Eastern Section was Bunai-cheng (不耐城). Their remains should be found in Hamheung and Yeongheung (咸興·永興).

5.1.1 Original Xuantu > Lelang's Dongbu-duwei (東部都尉)
"在氏尹年，玄菟北徙，以其故地，屬于樂浪，名既隨遷，疆域以晦。"
"In the Shiyuan era (86–80 BCE) Xuantu moved north whilst its old territory became a part of Lelang. Its name moved around and its territory became unclear."
- The six counties of Lelang's Dongbu-duwei (東部都尉 – 不而·蠻台·華麗·邪頭味·前莫·夫租) were on this territory.
- Dandan-daeryeong (單單大嶺) mountains are Seolhan-ryeong (薛罕嶺) in present day Hamgyeong.
5.2 The 2nd Xuantu

"After Xuantu moved it had three counties [Gao]gouli, Shangyintai and Xi-gaima. The one known as Gaogouli [county] (高句驪) should be found 100 li northwest of present day Xingjing."
- Because they know that Xuantu was originally located on the peninsula in Hamgyeong, they think that the three counties can be located there but this is incorrect.

"Xi-gaima [county] was probably the former Zhenfan territory and should be located on either side of the Tongjia river (修家江 [tributary of the Yalu, Hun-he 淮河]) north of the Yalu."
- Goguryeo Gaema-daesan 蓋馬大山 (HHS 'East Okjeo') = Baekdu-san
  - Rejects HHS annotation which says Gaema-daesan was to the west of Pyeongyang.
  - Includes a linguistic hypothesis - discussed between himself and a 'couple of scholars' at Gyujanggak - that gaema 蓋馬 < haemani 呼摩尼 with the meaning 'white head', and thus cognate with the semantic rendering of baekdu 白頭.
- SS Gaema-guk 蓋馬國 = HHS Xi-Gaema 西蓋馬

5.2.1 Huali/Hwaryeo and Bunai/Bulnæ disambiguation

"The original eneoffents [by Han emperor Gwangwu to the autonomous Ye Geosa 羅帥] were of the old [peninsula] counties: Huali (華麗 K. Hwaryeo) and Bunai (不耐 K. Bulnæ) fortresses always had those names."
- As recorded in the SGZ "Ye" section, the local Geosa rulers ennobled as lords
of the Dongbu duwei (東部都尉) by Han emperor Gwangwu were [ethnic] Bulnae Ye (不耐種) people.

- SS records that in 40 CE the people of Hwaryeo and Bulnae counties (華麗·不耐二縣) plotted to attack Silla: this would only make sense if they had been located on the peninsula to the north of Silla. Therefore they were located in the region east of the Seolhan pass (薛罕嶺之東) [i.e. in Hamgyeong province].

- According to the SGZ account of Wei’s c.244 campaign against Goguryeo, led by Youzhou cishi Guanqu, in which the Liaodong Xuantu governor Wang Qi (玄菟太守王頷) pursues Goguryeo king Gung all the way to North Okjeo on the border with the Sushen above, Guanqu leaves a commemorative inscription on Hwando mountain identifying it as Bulnae fortress. As Jeong considers North Okjeo to have been located in northern Hamgyeong province, he regards this Bulnae to be in the region of the Tuman river (豆滿江).

「鴉水之北，儼有二城，又冒不而，華麗之名。」
"The two fortresses of Bu’er and Huali apparently north of the Yalu are both later namesakes [of the original Han commanderies’ counties]."

- Kim Busik conflated Bunai-cheng (不耐城) – recorded in the Guadizhi (拾地志)\(^{70}\) as the location of Goguryeo’s Gungnae-seong (國內城) – with the former Lelang county of Buer (不而) recorded in the Hanshu, thus causing him to think that Gungnae-seong was located in Hamgyeong province on the peninsula.

[SS 高句麗本紀:第一·羅璃王: “二十二年冬十月王遣都於國內築尉那巖城”]

- When the commanderies were reorganized in the Shiyuan era (c.82 BCE) Huali county of the original Xuantu was not moved but came under control of Lelang’s eastern section. In the Eastern Han period, a new Huali county was established north of the Yalu. This later Huali is then recorded in the HHS and SS as being attacked during a campaign against Xuantu by [Go]guryeo and YeMaek in 118 CE (the 5th Yanchu 元初 year of Han emperor An 安帝).

[HHS:東夷列傳: "安帝永初五年，宮遣使貢獻，求屬玄菟。元初五年，復與諸貊寇玄菟，攻華麗城，建光元年春，幽州刺史馮煥、玄菟太守姚光、遼東太守蔡鄭等將兵出塞擊之，捕斬諸貊渠帥，獲兵馬財物。"]

5.3 The 3rd Xuantu
「王莽之時，玄菟郡治已為句麗之所得。及至東漢，玄菟再徙遼東。」
"During the time of Wang Mang, governance of Xuantu ended and it became part of [Go]guryeo. Then in the Eastern Han period, Xuantu [commandery] again

\(^{70}\) According to Wilkinson 2013:739, the Guadizhi is an early Tang geography recovered during the Qing from sources in which it was cited.
moved to [i.e. was reestablished in] Liaodong."

- SS records the expansion of Goguryeo over [2nd] Xuantu territory: under King Yuri, Gaogouli-xian was taken and became the name of the state, under King Taemu (太{sic: 大}武神王) Xi-gaima-xian was taken: only Shangyintai survived.

- Consequently Xuantu was relocated to the region of Liaoshen (遼藩 aka Shenyang), close to the Liao river.

- HHS records that three Liaodong counties were made subordinate to Xuantu: Gaoxian, Houcheng and Liaoyang (高顯·候城·遼陽).

5.3.1 Liaoyang county of 3rd Xuantu ≠ Liaoyang in contemporary Xiangping (襄平)

- Jeong distinguishes this Liaoyang county from contemporary/modern Liaoyang. "Annotation: Present day Liaoyang was former Xiangping (襄平): the old Liaoyang [of Xuantu] was a different county which should be located to the north of the Liao river. In old times the north of a river was called yang (陽)." (Jeong 疆域考: 本考) Jeong 疆域考:玄菟考 "鬻案玄菟。既徙遼東。分此三縣。使之成聚。非明文平。○又按今之遼陽。即古之襄平。古之遼陽。別自有縣。應在遼水之北。古者。水北曰陽”

5.3.2 Gaogouli of Pingzhou Xuantu (平州玄菟郡) ≠ Gaogouli of 2nd Xuantu

- The jinshu geography records the three counties of Pingzhou Xuantu (平州玄菟郡) as Gaogouli, Gaoxian and Wangping (高句麗、望平、高顯). This Gaogouli county was a separate namesake to the previous Gaogouli of the 2nd Xuantu that had long since been overrun by Goguryeo.

5.3.3 Three Xuantu summary: • East, • North and • West

「總之玄菟有三。其一在沃沮故地。今咸興。宜謂之東玄菟也。其二在句麗古縣。(小遼水所出。)宜謂之北玄菟也。其三在遼河東岸。(海城遼隧[sic: 隧]地。)宜謂之西玄菟也。」 "Altogether there were three Xuantu [entities]. The first was the former territory of Okjeo, present day Hamgyeong [province]: this could be termed *East Xuantu*. The second was in the old county of Gouli (句麗). (The Small Liao river originates there): this could be termed *North Xuantu*. The third was on the eastern side of the Liao river. (The territory of Liaodui 遼隧[sic: ? Liaosui 遼隧] of Haicheng). This could be termed *West Xuantu*."  

5.3.4 References to 3rd/•West Xuantu unrelated to Korea

「漢安帝以後。凡史策之稱玄菟者。皆是西玄菟。與我邦無涉。」 "From the reign of Han emperor An (漢安帝 r.106-25), the Xuantu spoken of in all history sources refers to *West Xuantu*: it does not concern our country."

- This is a key point.
• Jeong goes on to cite multiple entries from the HHS, SGZ, Jinsiu, Beishu and SS referring to Xuantu, Lelang and Daifang commanderies, noting only that the Xuantu mentioned is invariably •West Xuantu.

Jeong 疆域考:玄菟考: “後漢書云, 安帝永初五年。句麗王宮, 遣使貢獻。求屬玄菟, 元初五年。復興漢昭, 臣玄菟。攻華麗城, 已見上, 建光元年十二月, 句麗王宮。園玄菟。州郡討破之, 宮死, 0 又云, 建光元年。玄菟太守姚光, 逐東太守蔡鸞等, 將兵出塞, 擊句麗, 句麗王潛遣三千人, 攻玄菟達東。焚城郭, 秋宮又率馬韓礦 [sic: 鐵] 銅千騎。_圍玄菟。三國史亦云。0 又云, 延光元年, 遼東部都尉龔承, 僞詔斬玄菟太守姚光。0 又云, 順帝陽嘉元年, 置玄菟郡屯田六部, 0 又云, 桓帝永康元年春, 夫餘王臣玄菟。玄菟太守公孫域, 擊破之, 又云, 夫餘本屬玄菟, 獻帝時, 其王求屬遼東, 魏志云, 夫餘本屬玄菟。漢末, 公孫度雄張海東, 威服外夷。夫餘王尉仇台, 更屬遼東, 0 又云, 順帝建寧二年。玄菟太守耿臨, 討句麗, 其王伯固降服, 乞屬玄菟。魏志云, 燕平中伯固。乞屬玄菟。0 三國史云, 句麗新大王五年, 王遣大加優居、王築然人等, 將兵助漢, 玄菟太守公孫度。討富山賊, 魏志亦云。0 鎮案此云玄菟[者], 皆西玄菟也。

魏志云，明帝青龍元年，吳主權遣太常張彌，將兵萬人，乘海授燕公孫淵，分散其兵，置遼東諸郡，執中使秦旦等六十人，置玄菟郡，且等皆走，行數日。得達句麗，因宣權詔於其王位宮，此時，句麗東川王都九都。0 又云，魏文帝景初二年，司馬懿克遼東，斬公孫淵。遼東、帶方、樂浪、玄菟四郡，皆平。注云漢帶方縣，屬樂浪郡。公孫氏分立郡，0 又云，正始中，毌丘儼討句麗，遣玄菟太守王頑，詔夫餘，使供軍糧。又云，遣王頑，追王至南沃沮，0 三國史云，句麗美川王三年，晉惠帝大安元年，秋九月，王率兵三萬，侵玄菟郡，獲八千人，移之平壤。十六年春二月，攻破玄菟城，殺獲甚眾0 晉書云，愍帝建興元年，裴駕之將，為玄菟太守。頑，慕容廆之謀主，卒以其家歸。0 又云，成帝康寧四年，趙王虎擊燕，玄菟太守劉侃，請出擊之，0 北史云，晉孝武太元十年，句麗攻遼東，玄菟郡，後燕慕容垂，遣其弟農，伐句麗，復二郡。0 又云，拓拔魏延和元年，魏伐燕，徙營丘、城周、遼東、樂浪、帶方、玄菟六郡民三萬家於幽州，0 鎮案此云。玄菟皆西玄菟也。”

5.3.4
「陳隋之際，西玄菟，竟為句麗所得。」
"During the time of the Jin and Sui (陳·隋) [dynasties], •West Xuantu finally became part of [Go]guryeo."

• The [Ming] Yitongzhi (明一統志) records that the five commanderies of Liaodong [given in Jinsiu as Liaodong, Changli, Xuantu, Daifang and Lelang 遼東·昌黎·玄菟·帶方·樂浪] including Changli (昌黎) were consolidated into Liaodong commandery under Wei and subsequently occupied by Goguryeo at the start of Sui, only to be recovered by Tang with the overthrow of Goguryeo.

[Jinsiu] 晉書:州郡第四:地理上:平州: "魏置東夷校尉，居襄平，而分遼東、昌黎、玄菟、帶方、樂浪五郡為平州，後還合為幽州，及文懿滅後，有護東夷校尉，居襄平。咸寧二年十一月，分昌黎、遼東、玄菟、帶方、樂浪等郡國五置平州。統州二十六，戶一萬八千。一百"

※ This partially undermines the previous point, in terms of wording, in that by temporarily being a part of Goguryeo territory. •West Xuantu did come to be closely concerned with Korean history.
6. **Lintun 臨屯考**

- Jeeong rejects the orthodox tradition locating Lintun in the region of Gangneung, instead associating it with the southern part of Lelang which would later become Daifang.

> 「臨屯之地，雖不可詳。要與瀋浪相接。在洌水以北，今之京畿西郊是也。」
> 
> "Although not exactly certain, the territory of Lintun bordered with Lelang. It was to the north of the Yeol-su (洌水 [i.e. Han-gang]), in present day western Gyeonggi province."

> 「乃東僑忽執江陵，謂之東瞭。謂之臨屯，其俗無稽之言也。」
> 
> "Korean scholars take Lintun to be [modern] Gangneung, saying it was Dongyi (東瞭). This does not match with the facts."

> 「屯有縣。亦必臨屯之所屬，卽今長滿沿水之地也。」
> 
> "Tunyou-xian (屯有縣) definitely belonged to Lintun. This is the riverside region of present day Jangdan (長滿沿水 [western Gyeonggi])."

7. **Zhenfan 臣番考**

- Zhenfan is the only one of the original Four Commanderies Jeong locates extending beyond the Yalu river.

> 「臣番之地，雖不可詳。要在今興京之南，侈家江之左右。」
> 
> "Although [we] cannot be precise, the territory of Zhenfan was south of present day Xingjiing (興京) on either side of the Tongji river (侈家江 [tributary of the Yalu, 洨河])."

※ In the following passage, Jeong examines the figure of 7,640 li given for the distance between Chang'an and Zhenfan from the *Maelingshu* (茂陵書). Whilst left somewhat implicit, his conclusion is to reject this distance as being too far, instead arguing that Zhenfan was closer to Liaodong and Joseon.

> "According to an annotation of the *Hanshu* geography, the Zhenfan-jun county seat of Zha-xian (雹縣) was 7,640 li from Changan - Chenzan (臣瓊) citing the *Maelingshu*.

[Annotation] [The distance from Chang’an - travelling in a straight line across the sea] to south of Pyeongyang, even south to Dongnae (東萊 [far southeast of the peninsula]) cannot be 7,600 li. The topography from the border of Wula (烏喇) north of the Yalu is vast (荒遠) extending eastwards to the ocean:
how could it be only 7,000 里? From Shengjing (盛京) east to the sea is already 4,300 里. Probably this (northern location) is what Chenzan is referring to. That referred to as Zha-xian is definitely south of Xingjing and west of Baishan.

If the distance [from Zha-xian to] Liaodong is 3,000 里, and the distance [from Zha-xian] to Chang’an 7,640 里, then (taking the distance of Chang’an to Liaodong as 4,35071) 里 } the distance [from Zha-xian] to Liaodong would be 3,290 里, and Yan people would not have been able to trade (貢) with Jinbeon, nor would Xuantu have merged with Zhenfan commandery.

[However] Zhenfan [did] merge with Xuantu, so the traces of Zhenfan should be found in Xuantu. Is the Xi-Gaema county referred to in the Hanshu as subordinate to Xuantu, not the former territory of Zhenfan? This has already been examined. If so, then the territory of Zhenfan should be to the south of Xingjing, on either side of the Pozhuijiang (婆豬江), and in close contact with the former Lelang and Xuantu territories.” (Jeong 疆域考:真番考)

漢書地理志注云。真番郡治雲縣。去長安七千六百四十7,640里。臣瓚注引茂陵書。讃滔案平壤以南，雖南至東萊，無可以當七千六百7,600里者。惟鴨水之北烏啼之界，東極濱海[sic:濱]，地勢荒遠，奚但七千7,000里而已。盛京東至海四千三百4,300里，臣瓚所指，蓋此地耳。但所謂雲縣，必在興京之南白山之西，荀在距遼東三千3,000里之地。距長安七千六百40,640里，則距遼東三千二百九十3,290里，則燕人無以通貢於真番，而玄菟無以合郡於真番矣，真番既合玄菟，則真番之跡。宜於玄菟求之，班志所云。玄菟屬縣西蓋馬者，得非真番之故地乎，已見前。若然。真番之地，宜在興京之南，婆豬江之左右。與古樂浪，玄菟之地。密相連接也。

「秦漢之時，真番與遼東朝鮮。每相連，稱以其壤地相接也。」

"During the Qin and Han periods, Zhenfan, Liaodong and Joseon all communicated with one another: this shows that they bordered one another."

- Rejects orthodox Korean location of Zhenfan being north of Hamgyeong (à la Yu Deukgong), on the grounds that the territory north of the Tuman was too mountainous and remote to have been traversed by Yan traders.
- The Zhenfan seat of Zha-xian (郡縣) became Xi-gaema (西蓋馬) county of Xuantu (※ Doesn’t offer evidence for this hypothesis).

鄭克後歷年通考云。漢書曰。燕東贊真番之利，則真番在遼東之東。可知。必是咸鏡以北，藩胡所居之地。讃滔案興京之南，鴨水以北。今鴨河以東，鴨河即狄江。婆豬江之左右，沿江千里之地。沿鴨水，既非遼東，又非朝鮮必古之真番也。東儒謂在咸鏡以北，恐不然也。漢魏之時，滿濱河以北，聲跡不通，蓋以長白山之脈，縱橫千里，阻塞重疊也。燕人安得遠貢此地，玄菟之西蓋馬。必本真番之雲縣。已見玄菟考。其在長白山之西矣。文獻備考云。高句麗二千里地。豈可只為一縣哉。必為真番也。讃滔案此論明確，不可易也。

71) Byington (personal communication) has tentatively suggested this figure to be an error for 4,550 里 which could be derived from the distance of Luoyang (雒陽) from Liaodong given in the HHS, 3,600 里, added to the distance between Luoyang and Chang’an of 950 里.
8. Autonomous Lelang/Nangnang - "Lelang-byeolgo" 樂浪別考

The "Lelang-byeolgo" section is primarily a diachronic survey of the historical Lelang polity centered at Pyeongyang, traced through references in the SS and later Chinese sources, namely the HHS, *Weizhi* and *Songshu*, covering five centuries from 28 BCE until 472 CE. With the growth of Goguryeo, the land route to Pyeongyang was soon cut off, so throughout this period Lelang - combined with Daifang - is administered by China as a pene-enclave reached by sea.

In particular, Jeong seeks to disambiguate the many SS mentions of 'Lelang' which he interprets as in fact referring to the indigenous namesake entity of Nangnang (樂浪 - aka Maekguks 魏國) centered at Chuncheon. This endeavor is complicated by the fact that the Lelang polity itself came under the control of local rulers achieving semi-autonomous status but was periodically 're-subordinated' by governors dispatched from China.

To try to support this disambiguation effort, in the following overview, I employ three renderings of the characters for 'Lelang' (樂浪) into English: 'Lelang' referring to the Pyeongyang polity when under immediate Chinese administration: 'Lelang/Nangnang' referring to the same polity when under local rulership or when ambiguous; and just 'Nangnang' for the indigenous polity based at Chuncheon.

Jeong further discusses the Chuncheon polity separately in the "YeMaek-byeolgo" (驪貊別考) section.

8.1 Overview (from Jeong's concluding summary)

- The overview passage immediately below is from the final passage of "Lelang-byeolgo" whilst subsequent passages all follow the original order.
- Jeong traces the various attestations of Lelang/Nangnang, citing each source: in the summary below, the cited sources and corresponding Western dates of the relevant episodes are given in braced parentheses [:]; the three SS annals are abbreviated to S, G and B, however the citations themselves are omitted.

"[Annotation..] To summarize the traces of Lelang/Nangnang, they first begin during the Shiyuan era of Han emperor Zhao and stop during the Eastern Han. [Following] the end of the Choe clan, they begin again during Cao Wei (曹魏 [220-65]) and continue to the time of the [Northern Wei] Tuoba clan (拓 [sic. 拓] 拔氏). From start to finish it is more than 500 years. Although [there are] traces of the Yi-Ye (夷貊) they have not been sufficiently transmitted {or 'are not worth transmitting'} to later generations, and so the literature does not [fully] attest them. This is worth lamenting." (Jeong 境域考:樂浪別考)
8.1.2

"After the Shiyuan era [82 BCE] consolidation of the commanderies, traces of Lelang cannot be seen in the Hanshu. Only at the time of Kim Busik's SS were they recorded."

8.2 SS 'Lelang' referring to Chuncheon 'Nangnang'

"After 13 years, Baekje and Lelang/Nangnang established friendly relations. 4 years later they collapsed."

The 'Lelang governor' (樂浪太守) described in this SS Baekje Annals’ entry must have been an autonomous chief similar to Gongsun Du (公孫度) of Pingzhounu (平州牧).

"After 3 years, Nangnang invaded Baekje. 2 years later {6 BCE},
Baekje moved its capital south of the Han [river] to avoid the troubles caused by Nangnang."

- Baekje founder Onjo refers to a Nangnang polity being in the east: relative to Baekje, this must be Chuncheon because the Lelang commandery at Pyeongyang would have been to the west [or north].

「後四年。樂浪侵百濟。○越明年。百濟襲樂浪。」
[SS:B 2 BCE] "After 4 years, Nangnang invaded Baekje. The following year Baekje attacked Nangnang."

- SS records Baekje counter attacking Nangnang at Udu-sanseong (牛頭山城). This was located at the confluence of the two Soyang-gang rivers (昭陽江兩水). There is a large village called Udu within which there is what is said to be the old site of Maek-guk: this is actually the remains of Nangnang-guk.

「時[sic.後]四年。樂浪侵新羅。○後十年。樂浪又侵新羅。」
[SS:S 4 CE] "After 4 years Nangnang invaded Silla. After 10 years [14 CE], Nangnang again invaded Silla."

8.2.1 Reassertion of Han Chinese control 1

「後十六年，漢光武遣樂浪太守王遵，殺士曹王諫。」
[HHS 30 CE] "After 16 years, the Han emperor Guangwu [r.25-57] sent Lelang governor Wang Zun (王遵) who killed the local [Nangnang] chief Wang Jo (王諫)."

- Recorded in the HHS both in the Guangwu (光武紀云) and the Wangjin biography (in 循吏列傳).

"...According to the HHS Wangjing biography (王景傳雲), [Wang] Jing’s (王景) father, Hong (閔) became the Lelang sanlao (樂浪郡三老): [when emperor] Gengshi (更始) was defeated [25 CE], the native Wang Jo killed the commandery commander, Liu Xian (劉憲) and declared himself 'great general and Lelang governor'. In the 6th Jianwu year [30 CE] Guangwu sent governor Wang Zun who led troops and attacked Liaodong: [thereupon] Hong and others (郡決曹吏楊邑等) together killed Jo and welcomed Zun." (Jeong 疆域考:樂浪別考)

Jeong 疆域考:樂浪別考: "...又王景傳雲，景父閔為樂浪郡三老 更始敗 士人王諫，殺郡守劉憲，自稱大將軍樂浪太守。建武六年，光武遣太守王遵。將兵擊之，至遼東，閔與郡決曹吏楊邑等。共殺調迎邊，皆封為列侯，閔獨讓爵，帝奇而徵之。道病卒。"

[HHS 後漢書:循吏列傳: "王景字仲通，樂浪偪郡人也。八世祖仲，本琅邪不其人。好道術，明天文，諸呂作亂，齊哀王襄謀發兵，而數問於仲。及濟北王興居反，欲委兵師仲，仲懼禍及，乃浮海東奔樂浪山中，因而家焉。父閔，為郡三老。更始敗，士人王諫殺郡守劉憲，自稱大將軍、樂浪太守。建武六年，光武遣太守王遵將兵擊之。至遼東，閔與郡決曹吏楊邑等共殺調迎邊，皆封為列侯，閔獨讓爵。帝奇而徵之，道病卒。"]
8.2.2 SS 'Lelang' referring to Chuncheon 'Nangnang' 2

"後二年。高句麗侵樂浪下之。"

[SS:G 32 CE] "After 2 years, Goguryeo invaded Nangnang and humbled it."

"後四年。樂浪侵新羅。〇越明年。句麗滅樂浪。"

[SS:S+G 36] "After 4 years, Nangnang invaded Silla; the next year [37 CE] [Go]guryeo destroyed Lelang/Nangnang."

"Annotation: What [Goguryeo] 'destroyed' was the Choe clan. Even after this there are still traces of Nangnang so it can be seen that the Lelang/Nangnang people restored their commandery leader (郡長). Annotation: At the time Goguryeo's capital was Gungnae-seong. located north of the Yalu river." (Jeong 疆域考:樂浪別考)

8.2.3 Reassertion of Han Chinese control 2

"後七年。漢光武伐樂浪取之，以為郡縣。"

[SS:G+HHS 44 CE] "After 7 years Han emperor Guangwu attacked Nangnang and took control making it into a commandery and counties."

- The last paragraph of the longer annotation below serves best as the introductory explanation.

"When Lelang was "destroyed" [by Goguryeo in 38 CE] and the Choe clan ended, Goguryeo took Pyeongyang for the first time and made it its own territory; hearing this news is what caused Han emperor Guangwu to dispatch an army [to restore it]." (Jeong 疆域考:樂浪別考)

"至樂浪既滅，崔氏亡。句麗始取平壤為己地，故漢光武聞而發兵也。"

- The SS quote states that south of the Salsu river (薩水者) was subordinated to Han China.

"Annotation: The Salsu river is the present day Cheongcheon (淸川). In the 13th year of Guangwu [37 CE] Goguryeo [had already] destroyed Lelang/Nangnang(?) and taken its territory. The [re]establishment of Lelang by Han emperor Guangwu [in 44 CE] was because they could not allow to lose that which had been established by their ancestor Emperor Wu, so they crossed the sea and attacked the former Lelang territory. At this time they made [Go]guryeo subordinate and reestablished [Lelang] as a commandery. According to the original Four Commanderies system, the territory connected Lintun to the east [south as Jeong locates Lintun to the south of Lelang] and Liaodong to the west [north]. Not a small space was cut off. However, concerning Han [China]'s control [only being] south of the Salsu river, at this time [Go]guryeo's strength was vigorous and they held the fortress of Wina (尉那) north of the Yalu, the Chinese army could not be moved and so they
were unable to fully restore the Four Commanderies. Thus north of the Salsu was temporarily (姑) shared with [Go]guryeo and only the fortress of Pyeongyang had its original territory restored [to Han Chinese administrative control] and so [only] the territory south of the Salsu was controlled by Han. If this is so, then although the centre of the Nangnang state had moved to Chuncheon its origins were in Pyeongyang and so Pyeongyang and An-ju province (平壤安州) were still administered by Nangnang-guk. [Continues with final lines quoted above.]

Jeong 納域考:樂浪別考: "義秣棄水者。今安州之清川也。建武十三年。句麗滅樂浪而取其地。漢光武以為樂浪者。本無武帝之所開。是不可失也。於是越海伐樂浪故地。此時句麗復以清川為郡。漢帝封之。東自盧屯。西至遼東。壤地相連。不小間斷。而光武反以漢水已南屬漢者。此時句麗強盛。據邶固之城。在鴨水之北。雄視遼海之間。苟非動天下之兵。亦無以盡復四郡。故姑以漢水為北。割與句麗。唯平壤一城。復其舊疆。遂以漢水已南屬漢也。若然。樂浪之域。中雖移於春川。今自平壤而起跡。故平壤安州。猶為樂浪國之所管。至樂浪既滅。崔氏亡。句麗始取平壤為己地。故漢光武聞而發兵也。"

「後三年。高句麗蠶支落部。詔樂浪校領。」
[HHS+SS:G 47] "After 3 years, Goguryeo’s Jamjirakbu (蠶支落) went to Lelang and surrendered to Han China."

- Jamjirakbu might have been the location of the historical Lelang county of Cantai (蠶台) in the east.

「後四十二年。樂浪郡縣。猶遺漢吏。」
[HHS 89] "After 42 years, Han officials were still being sent to manage counties of Lelang-jun."

- Namely to Changcen and Tunyou (長岑·屯有) in southern Lelang.

「後二十七年。樂浪猶為漢郡。」
[HHS 116] "After 27 years, Lelang was still administered by Han China."

「後三十一年。句麗掠得樂浪太守妻子。」
[SS:G 146] "After 31 years, Goguryeo captured the Lelang governor's wife and son."

※ This event is discussed also in the "Byeol'yu-go" (別有考 3.1) section above.

8.2.4 Subordination to Gongsun Du
「後五十餘年。公孫度雄視遼東。而樂浪諸郡。悉皆服屬。」
[HHS 190] "After more than 50 years, Gongsun Du had control (雄視) over Liaodong and all the various Lelang/Nangnang parts (郡) were made subordinate [to his rule]."

- The Gongsun clan attacked [Go]guryeo and expanded their territory eastwards: they divided Lelang creating Daifang.
8.2.5 Assertion of control by Cao Wei

「後三十餘年。魏明帝密遣樂浪太守鮮于嗣，越海定樂浪郡。」

{SGZ 233} "After more than 30 years. Wei emperor Ming secretly sent Lelang governor Xianyu Xi (鮮于嗣) who crossed the sea to stabilize Lelang-jun commandery."

- He also sent Daifang governor Liu Xin (劉昕) for the same purpose.
- This was to strengthen the local leaders (曾長) of Lelang/Nangnang and Daifang/Daebang as their territories were being invaded by Silla and Baekje.

「後七年。[魏主芳]昨正始元年。]樂浪太守劉茂，與幽州刺史毌丘儉，夾攻句麗。○越明年。復征句麗。」

{SGZ 240} "After 7 years. Lelang governor Liu Mao (劉茂) and Youzhou cishi Guanqiu Jian (毌丘儉) came and attacked [Go]guryeo: the following year they re-conquered [Go]guryeo."

※ description of campaign (also mentioned in Xuantu section)

「是年。百濟襄樂浪。太守劉茂。怒將討之。百濟乞和。」

{SS:B 240} "In the same year. Baekje attacked Lelang; angered Liu Mao (劉茂) was about to punish them before Baekje begged for peace."

"Annotation: since Han emperor Guangwu, north of the Salsu {Chuncheon-gang} was controlled by [Go]guryeo. That referred to as Lelang was the territory south of the Salsu, north of the Daesu (帶水 [Imjin-gang]) and west from Chuncheon. The Lelang governor tramped (盪) from the east {south} and the Youzhou cishi attacked from the west {north}, this is their 'came and attacked [Goguryeo]'. Lelang took its army and went west {north}, so Baekje took advantage of the situation (乘虛) and attacked the [Lelang] border." {Jeong 疆域考:樂浪別考}

Jeong 疆域考:樂浪別考: "鑿案漢光武以來，薩水以北已屬句麗。所謂樂浪，即薩水以南帶水以北，春川以西之地也。樂浪太守，自東罹之，幽州刺史。自西撻之，所謂夾攻也。樂浪舉軍而西赴。故百濟乘虛而襲邊也。

是時。樂浪太守劉茂。又伐辰韓滅之。"

「是時。樂浪太守劉茂。又伐辰韓滅之。」

{SGZ 240} "In the same year. Lelang governor Liu Mao (劉茂) also attacked Jinhan and destroyed it."

"Annotation: According to the Weizhi, in the 6th Zhengshi year [245] Liu Mao and Gong Zun (弓遵) invaded the Ye Bulnae lords to the east of the mountains, they then annihilated the Han (韓) followers (役). This should be during the 7th and 8th years [246–7]."
Annotation: [Weizhi also says that] at this time Lelang/Nangnang and Daifang/Daebang had their own rulers. They communicated with Wei emperor Cao (曹操魏天子) by sea, and so the Wei ruler often sent two taishou (太守) governors to stabilize (鎮撫) the two commanderies. This is not so. [Then] what does the sacking of the eight Jinhan states with Lelang refer to? Baekje took advantage of the situation and attacked the Lelang/Nangnang frontier people. Lelang/Nangnang had its own rulers (君長) and so when they invaded one another Liu Mao originally wanted to pacify Lelang/Nangnang and thus he was angered by the news. The local Lelang/Nangnang chiefs were [like] 'foxes borrowing the tiger’s awe’. Daifang/Daebang was the same.” (Jeong 疆域考: 樂浪別考)

Jeong 疆域考: 樂浪別考: “諸漢時義。劉茂、弓達，以正始六年。伐嶺東諸不侯等，則其避難之始，當在七年八年之間也。○又按此時樂浪、帶方，自有君長，與曹魏天子，越海相通，故魏主每遣二太守，使之鎮撫二郡也。不醉，奪取辰韓八國，以與樂浪者，何謂也，百濟乘虛襲取樂浪邊民，亦以樂浪自有君長，故得相侵掠也。劉茂本欲鎮撫樂浪，故聞而怒[努]之。樂浪之酋，狐假虎威也，帶方亦然，”

「越明年，樂浪竟失平壤，為句麗所得。」
[SS:G 247] "[From] the following year, Lelang gradually lost Pyeongyang as it was taken by [Goguryeo]."

"Pyeongyang was seized by [Goguryeo already at the end of Han (漢). Liu Mao (劉茂) was unable to recover it."

句麗史云，東川王二十一年。句麗築平壤城，遂移廟社，魏正始八年，○諸漢時義正始六年[245]，劉茂伐嶺東。今北道，其八年[247]，不侯等詐闇朝貢，四時詐樂浪、帶方二郡，朝貢。劉茂方強[sic:疆]不應，同年遜失平壤，或私平壤之為句麗所得。已在漢末，而劉茂不能復也。

「後七年。樂浪猶為中國之所管轄。」
[SGZ:Xiahoushangzhuan 夏侯尚傳 254] "After 7 years, Lelang was still controlled by China."

8.2.6 Waning during Jin dynasty
「後十二年。樂浪災祥，猶記中國之史。」
[Songshu:Furuizhi 符瑞志 266] "After 12 years, Lelang [related] omens were still being recorded in Chinese histories."

「後二十七年。亦然。」
[Songshu:Wuxingzhi 五行志 292] "After 27 years it was still the case."

「後八年。樂浪帶方，服屬於新羅。」
[SS:S 300] "After 8 years, Lelang/Nangnang and Daifang/Daebang submitted to
Silla."

Annotation: Before this, during the time of Silla king Nahae, in the 2nd
Zhangwu (章武) year [222] of Shu Han emperor Zhaolie (蜀漢昭烈帝 [aka Liu
Bei]) Baekje troops had entered Udu-seong (牛頭城 [which the SS records as
later being Chunchoon]): Silla ibechan official Chunghwon (忠萱) led soldiers
to resist them but they were defeated at Unggok (熊谷). From this, [it can be
seen that] from the time of Shu Han (蜀漢), Chunchoon had already become
the northern borderland of Silla. The [Silla king’s] tour reached to Anbyeon
(安邊) and then turned to Chunchoon. After the Choe clan had ended,
Udu-seong (牛頭城) was not restored and became a part of Lelang, but since
Liu Mao the territory was divided, it was still not far from Chunchoon. In
short, at the time of [Baekje founder] King Onjo, Lelang/Nangnang was very
small and not the same [as before] so Chunchoon had become an
administrative region of Silla." (Jeong 疆域考:樂浪別考)

新羅史云，基臨王三年晉惠帝永康元年。春，巡幸比列忽。今安邊，至牛頭州，今春川，望
祭太白山，樂浪帝方，兩國歸服于新羅。○羅案前此新羅奈解王時，蜀漢昭烈帝章武二年，
百濟兵入牛頭州，伊伐浪新羅之官名，忠萱，將兵拒之，至熊谷敗還，由是觀之，春川已自
蜀漢之時。為新羅之北郡，至是巡幸。及於安邊而回，至春川，則崔氏既滅之後，牛頭城不
復為樂浪所有；而劉茂以來，其疆域所分，雖不遠於春川，要之與溫祚王時，樂浪微有不
同，故春川為新羅州郡也。

「後四年。百濟襲樂浪。○是年。樂浪太守，遣刺客。殺百濟王，」
[SS:B 304] "After 4 years, Baekje attacked Lelang/Nangnang. In the same year the
Lelang governor sent assassins and killed the Baekje king."

"Annotation: At this time [Go]guryeo’s capital was already Pyeongyang. The
'Baekje whip' could not reach Pyeongyang’s west. Lelang/Nangnang was to
Baekje’s east, so it attacked and took [Baekje’s] western counties. Although
this Lelang/Nangnang was not Chunchoon, it was not far from Chunchoon."
(Jeong 疆域考:樂浪別考)
Jeong 疆域考:樂浪別考: "鎬案此時，句麗已都平壤，平壤以西。非百濟之鞭所能及也。
樂浪在百濟之東，故取其西縣，則所謂樂浪者，雖非春川，去春川不遠矣。"

「後九年。高句麗侵樂浪，」
[SS:G 313] "After 9 years Goguryeo invaded Lelang/Nangnang."

8.2.7 End of Lelang during Northern Wei
「其後百餘年。樂浪竟為高句麗所吞。」
[SS:B 472] "After more than a 100 years, Lelang/Nangnang was finally absorbed
by Goguryeo."
"Annotation: In the 4th Taiyan (太延) year {438} of the Tuoba Wei (拓跋魏) kingdom, Goguryeo king Yeon (燕) killed the Yan king Feng Hong (馮弘). 125 years earlier during the 1st year of Jin emperor Min (晉愍帝), the 14th year of [Goguryeo] king Micheon {313}, Lelang had already finished. Also, at this time [of the SS Baekje Annal citation - 472] concerning the 'Feng clan's' [aka Northern Yan] Lelang' (馮族樂浪) [referred to in] Baekje's memorial [to the Wei court], [the following is a citation from the Weishu] it can be understood as both [the 313 and 438 events]. With the demise of Lelang, local men and women were taken as prisoners to [Goguryeo], and so at that time they longed for the commandery counties, hence [the memorial] say's that 'the commanderies of Lelang were the homeland in their hearts' (樂浪諸郡，懷首丘之心也). This time {472}, it was 34 years since Feng Hong’s killing so the end of Lelang/Nangnang would not have been long after."

箋案拓跋魏太延四年{438}，句麗王璿，殺燕王馮弘。上距晉愍帝元年，美川王十四年{313}，已百二十五年矣。樂浪之亡，亦在此時，故百濟之表，馮族樂浪，得以雙舉也。樂浪新亡，東土士女。被虐至句麗，而當時郡縣，皆有懷舊戀本之心，故曰樂浪諸郡，懷首丘之心也，此時馮弘被殺，不過三十四年。則樂浪之亡，亦當未久。

※ The text of the 472 memorial cited in the SS Baekje annual is originally recorded in the earlier Weishu "Baekje" account (百濟國). See Best 2006:285.

9. Daifang - "Daifang-go" 帶方考

- Treatment of Daifang/Daebang is broadly similar to that of the semi-autonomous Lelang, with Jeong highlighting the same issue of later conflations.
- Unlike the additional Chuncheon Nangnang entity, according to Jeong there was no contemporaneous namesake polity but there was the similar circumstance of the Daifang polity being under autonomous rule, and indeed it was originally partitioned from Lelang into a separate entity by the semi-autonomous ruler Gongsun Kang.

9.1 Pre-polity period

「帶方者，樂浪之屬縣，即今臨津江入海之處也。」

{Hanshu geography} "Daifang was a county of Lelang. It is in the region where the present day Imjin-gang river enters the sea."

「武帝四郡之初，帶方本屬臨屯。至始元合郡，移屬樂浪。」

"When there were initially the Four Commanderies [established by] Emperor Wu, Daifang originally belonged to Lintun. When during Shiyuan {80-86 BCE} the commanderies were combined, it became a part of Lelang."

「至成帝鳯嘉三年，帶方南界，為百濟溫祚所據。」

{Beishu+SS-B} "In the 3rd Hongjia (鴻嘉 20-17 BCE) year {18 BCE} of Emperor..."
Cheng (成帝), it became the abode of Onjo (溫祚) [founder] of Baekje."

「光武之時，伐樂浪，以爲郡縣。則帶方之縣。亦自漢廷遣吏。」
[SS:G] "During the time of Han emperor Guangwu [25-57], [Han] [re-]conquered Lelang and made it a commandery county, then Daifang county also [received] officials sent from the Han court."

「質桓之間，句麗南搶殺帶方令。」
[HHS:Weizhi] "During the time of Han emperor Huan [146-68] [Go]guryeo raided south and killed the Daifang commander (帶方令)."

9.2 Establishment of Daifang-jun
「至獻帝建安年間，公孫康始分樂浪南部，立帶方郡，此帶方郡建置之始也。」
[SGZ+jinshu geo. + Tongdian] "During the Jian’an (建安) era [196-220] of Han emperor Xian (獻帝), Gongsun Kang (公孫康) first partitioned the southern part of Lelang and established Daifang-jun commandery. This was the first establishment of Daifang-jun."

9.2.1 Under Cao Wei
「後三十餘年，魏司馬懿滅公孫氏。而樂浪、帶方，乃屬曹魏。」
[SGZ 238] "30+ years later, Sima Yi (司馬懿) of Wei destroyed the Gongsun clan: Lelang and Daifang were made subordinate to Cao Wei."

「於是魏明帝，密遣帯方太守劉昕。樂浪太守鮮于嗣，越海定二郡，(已見前。)」
[SGZ] "At this time Wei emperor Ming secretly sent Daifang governor Liu Xin and Lelang governor Xianyu Si by sea to stabilize the two commanderies. (This has already been examined [above])."

「曹魏之制，帯方太守。又掌倭人之朝獻。」
[SGZ:Woren-liezhuan 倭人列傳] "Under the Cao Wei system, the Daifang governor also received tribute from the Wae (倭人)"

"According to the Weishu, the shinji (臣智 [local Han 韓 chiefs]) provoked Han’s (韓) anger {??} and attacked Daifang’s Giri-yeong (崎離營). Then Daifang governor Gong Zun (弓邊) and Lelang governor Liu Mao (劉茂) raised armies and attacked them. Zun was killed in battle but the two commanderies eventually destroyed the Han (韓).
Annotation: ...this was in the 6th Zhengshi year (正始年) [245]." (Jeong 疆域考: 樂帶方考)

Jeong 疆域考:樂帶方考: "魏志云，臣智激韓忿。攻帯方郡崎離營。時帯方太守弓邊，樂浪太守劉茂，興兵伐之，邊戰死，二郡遂滅韓。○郷案公孫雖滅，句麗旁犯。故必越海而遣吏
也，□又按弓遵代韓。此是更始七年事也。不然。遵既戰死安得。更始六年，又伐不耐侯哉。"

「劉昕，弓遵之後，名宦無聞，而士曾襲位，如漢時樂浪之事。至晉武帝時，其跡乃顯。」
[SS:B] "After Liu Xin and Gong Zun, the names of officials are no longer recorded, but attacks [by] local chiefs are [recorded] as they are for the events of Lelang in the Han period and until Jin emperor Wu [r.265-90] the proof is clear."

「後十四年，(晉惠帝永康元年。)帶方與樂浪國，歸服于新羅。」
[SS:S 300] "14 years later (1st Yongkang year of Jin emperor Hui [300]) Daifang/ Daebang and Lelang/Nangnang states submitted to Silla."
"Annotation: 'submit' is Silla's exaggeration [in the SS]."

9.2.2 Daifang not located in Liaodong
「後十四年，句麗侵帶方。」
[SS:G 314] "14 years later [Goguryeo attacked Daifang."
"According to the [SS] Goguryeo Annal in 12th year of King Micheon [311] [Goguryeo] attacked and captured Xi-Anping in Liaodong. In the 14th year [313] they invaded Lelang-jun. In the 15th year, the 2nd year of Jin emperor Min (晉愍帝), autumn 9th month, they invaded Daifang-jun to the south. Annotation: At this time, Goguryeo already had its capital at Pyeongyang. In King Micheong’s 21st year [320] the ancestral shrines and population were [also] moved. ‘Invading Daifang to the south’ means the Daifang south of the Pae-su river [aka Daedong-gang]; it specifically says ‘invaded south’ so clearly it was not [referring to] Liaodong. At this time, Daifang/ Daebang was still a separate polity and so it spoke of invading Daifang: if Daifang had already ended then it would definitely have said ‘invaded Baekje’. (Jeong 疆域考:樂帶方考)

Jeong 疆域考:樂帶方考: "句麗史云，美川王十二年。襲取遼東西安平。十四年。侵樂浪郡，十五年晉愍帝二年，秋九月，南侵帶方郡，○錄案此時。句麗國都已在平壤。東川王二十一年。已移廟社民口。南侵帶方者。謂𬇙水之南帶方也。特雲南侵。明非遼東也。此時帶方。猶別自為國。故謂帶方。若已亡矣。則必云侵自濟矣。"

「後七十年。帶方王佐。救燕之遼東。」
[SS:G 385] "71 years later, Daifang king Zuo (佐) rescued Yan's Liaodong."
"According to the Goguryeo Annal, in the 2nd year of King Goguk’yang [385], the 10th Taiyuan (太元) year of Jin emperor Xiaowu, summer 6th month, [the Goguryeo] king dispatched 40,000 soldiers and attacked Liaodong. Before then, Yan king Murong Chui (慕容垂) had ordered Daifang king Zuo – who was probably also of the Murong clan – making him king to guard Long-cheng (龍城) fortress. Upon hearing that our [Goguryeo] army had attacked Liaodong,
Zuo sent Sima Haojing (司馬郝景) to lead troops and rescue it. Our army defeated them and eventually overthrew Liaodong and Xuantu, returning with ten thousand men and women prisoners.

Annotation: Korean scholars again understand this passage to mean that Liaodong also had a Daifang. But if Daifang were in Liaodong then Zuo would have led troops in person to rescue his front yard from bandits. Why would he have sent Sima instead? The Daifang governor[ship] originally had [someone named] Sima so in the Baekje king Gaero’s {472} memorial to the Northern Wei, it also [speaks of] the Daifang governor Sima being dispatched. This is examined in detail below. This is proof that there could not have been a Daifang in Liaodong. However, neither the location of Long-cheng, nor who Zuo was are known. The fake (虛偽) Daifang title was used for the commander of Long-cheng.

Annotation: According to the Beishu, in the 10th Jin Taiyuan year {385}, Murong Chui’s son, Murong Bao (慕容寶) made [Go]guryeo king An ‘Pingzhou mu’ (平州牧) and enfeoffed him as ‘king of both Liaodong and Daifang states’. At the time ‘Daifang’ and ‘Lelang’ etc were just fake titles, like this." (Jeong 彈域考:樂帯方考)

Jeong 彈域考:樂帯方考: "句麗史云，故國壋王二年，晉孝武太元十年, 夏六月, 王出兵四萬，襲遼東。先是，286_243a燕王慕容垂，命營方王佐，佐，疑亦慕容氏也。封建為王，鎮龍城。佐聞吾軍襲遼東，達司馬郝景，將兵救之。我軍擊敗之。遼東一萬口而沒，再論此，將遼東，亦有帶方。然若使帶方，果在遼東佐也。當躬擐甲胄，以救門前之寇，何得替遣其司馬哉。帶方太守，本有司馬。故百濟蓋衝王，上表元魏，亦遣帶方太守司馬，詳見下。未可以此，為遼東有帶方之確證也。但龍城不知何地，或者佐也，虛屬帶方之職名，實作龍城之鎮帥也。又按北史云，晉太元十年，慕容寶慕容垂之子，以句麗王安。為平州牧，封遼東帝方二國王，當時帝方、樂浪之等，虛縻職名，有如是也。"

「後四十餘年，帶方郡為燕王馮弘所轄。至拓跋魏延和元年。(燕馮弘太興二年。)為魏軍所拔。」(晉太元十年之後四十七年。)

[Beishu 432] "40+ years later, Daifang-jun was controlled by Yan king Feng Hong (馮弘); in the 1st Yanhe (延和) year of the Tuoba (拓跋) Wei (2nd Taixing year of Yan Hong Feng) {432}, it was seized by the Wei army. (This was 47 years after 10th Taiyuan year.)"

- This was also the peninsula Daifang-jun as it was long governed by Feng Hong as evidenced in Baekje king Gaero’s (蓋衝王) 472 memorial to Wei.

「後四十年，帯方太守。遼司馬朝魏，百濟王。因亦上表。」

[SS:B 472] "40 years later, the Daifang governor sent the sima to the Wei court [where] the Baekje king’s memorial was presented."
※ The structure of this statement is somewhat unclear, as according to the SS quote, *sima* is another title for the Daifang governor, named Jang Mu (張茂).

"Annotation: The Daifang governor was a Northern Yan official. [Daifang] had friendly relations with Baekje to its south and resisted against [Go]guryeo to its north, so they sent the *sima* [a title of the Daifang Governor] together with the Baekje *buma* (駙馬) [a title of Jang Mu 張茂] to the Wei court. Feng Hong (馮弘) was killed by the [Go]guryeo king in the 4th Wei Taiyuan year (438); his old former remnant people still lived in Daifang, so they are recorded [in the SS Baekje Annal at this later date]. If Daifang were in Liaodong, how would the Baekje king have plotted with them together like this?!!" (Jeong 疆域考:樂帧行方考)

Jeong 疆域考:樂帧行方考: "邇案此時，帶方太守，即元魏之命也。南睦百濟，北拒句麗，故遣其司馬，與百濟駙馬，偕行朝魏也。馮弘既為句麗王所殺，魏太延四年事。其姓名遺民，猶在帶方，故其詞如是。若使帶方，果在遼東，百濟王安得連謀如是哉。

「其後帶方之地，遂入百濟，百濟既亡，又屬新羅，至唐高宗時，為唐兵所侵。」
[SS: Kim Yusin bio, 金庾信傳 671] "Afterwards, the territory of Daifang finally became part of Baekje. When Baekje was overthrown, it became Silla. At the time of Tang [emperor] Gaozong (唐高宗 r.649–83) it was invaded by the Tang army."
• In the SS Kim Yusin biography, the Tang army is recorded as advancing first to Pyeongyang and then invading Daifang.

"Annotation: The [Tang] army invaded Daifang from Pyeongyang, therefore Daifang was to the south of Pyeongyang and north of the Imjin river." (Jeong 疆域考:樂帧行方考)

Jeong 疆域考:樂帧行方考: "新羅史金庾信傳云，初法敏王文武王納高句麗叛衆，又據百濟故地，有之。唐高宗大怒，遣師來討，咸享二年秋九月，唐將軍高侃等。率衆兵四萬，到平壤，深溝高壘。侵帶方。唐軍與靺鞨，營於石門之野，王遣將軍義福、春長等禦之。營於帶方之野。新羅人大敗走，出薊奚巖，文武王十一年，○僣棄軍於平壤，以侵帶方，則帶方者，平壤之南。臨津以北，是其地也。"

9.2.3 Four Daifang entities
「總之帧行方有四，其一上所論者是也，其二遼東云有帧行方，此謬義也。」
"Altogether there were four Daifang [entities]. The first is the one discussed above [i.e. the historical commandery south of Lelang]. The second is the one said to be in Liaodong, but this is mistaken."
• The Daifang mentioned in the Goguryeo invasion route of Sui emperor Yang's right army [in SS Goguryeo Annal], was simply an exaggerated embellishment.
• The Weizhi and Beishi appear to give evidence of a Daifang in Liaodong but as treated above these are all misinterpretations.
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"Annotation: According to the *Suishu* geography, Liucheng-xian (柳城縣) in Liaoxi-jun (遼西郡) had a Daifang-shan mountain. The annotation says that Later Wei established commanderies including Lelang and Yingqu (營丘) with counties including Daifang. [Yongle 永樂 and Liucheng. Later Qi (後齊), kept the counties including Yongle and Daifang. At the beginning of Daye (大業) [era of Sui emperor Yang 隋煬帝] [605-18], Liaoxi-jun was established within which Daifang-shan was located. Since Later Wei and Later Qi the counties in Liaodong and Liaoxi likely borrowed the names of Lelang and Daifang using them for convenience: eventually the mountain name took a false appellation. These [names] were no sooner created than discarded and are not worth describing." (Jeong 境域考: 樂帶方考)

Jeong 境域考: 樂帶方考: 又按隋書地理志, 遼西郡柳城縣。有帶方山, 注云。後魏置營州領樂浪、營丘等郡, 帶方柳城等縣。後齊惟留永樂、帶方等縣, 大業初, 置遼西郡, 有帶方山, 盖後魏後齊以來, 於遼東遼西諸縣, 或借樂浪帶方之名, 權以爲名, 遂於山名。亦或冒稱, 皆乍建乍廢, 不足述也。

[隋書:卷三十:志第二十五:地理中:冀州:遼西郡: "遼西郡(舊置營州, 開皇初置總管府, 大業初府廢, )統縣一, 戶七百五十一。柳城(後魏置營州於和龍城, 領建德、義陽、昌黎、遼東、樂浪、營丘等郡, 龍城、大興、永樂、帶方、定安、石城、廣都、陽武、襄平、新昌、平剛、柳城、富平等縣。後齊惟留建德、義陽二郡, 永樂、帶方、龍城、大興等縣, 其餘並廢, 開皇元年唯留建德一郡, 龍城一縣, 其餘並廢。尋又廢郡, 改縣為龍山, 十八年改為柳城。大業初, 置遼西郡, 有帶方山、禿黎山、雞鳴山、松山。有潢水、白狼水。"

9.2.4 Later namesake in Naju
「其三羅州之會津古縣，嘗以帶方州，擬名也。」
[SS:G 669] "The third is the old Hoejin county of Naju (羅州之會津古縣 [south Jeolla-do]), but this [simply] copied the name from Daifang-zhou (帶方州)."

- Namesakes such as Daifang were used by the Tang generals during their temporary occupation of former Baekje and Goguryeo territory under the so-called 'Protectorate General to Pacify the East' (安東都護府), but were not the original names of the places to which they were applied.

句麗史云, 唐高宗時, 總章二年, 李世勣既平句麗, 與泉男生、蓋蘇文之子。劉仁軌, 商量句麗諸域, 堪置都督府及州郡者, 奉勅便宜, 分割, 總隸安東都護府, 其奏文目錄云, 帶方州本竹軍域, 領縣六, 至留縣、本知留, 重那縣、本屈奈, 徒山縣、本抽山, 半那縣、本那奈夫里, 竹軍縣、本豆郡, 布賢縣, 本巴老彌, O鈔案此云, 帶方州, 即李、劉諸公, 便宜立名, 非因其地之本名而名之也。今考地志, 輯那者, 咸平也。半那者, 潘南也。豆郡者, 會津也, 今皆合屬於羅州, 而豆郡, 為竹軍之本名, 則所謂帶方州者, 今之羅州之會津古縣也。然不過十數年之後。百濟故地，皆改002新羅之郡縣，唐人不復經理，即李英公之奏文，亦空言之。未及施行者耳。

9.2.5 Later namesake in Namwon
「其四，今之南原府，嘗爲帶方州，刺史劉仁軌所駐，遂以南原爲帶方。其實亦冒名也。」
[SS:B] "The fourth is present day Namwon-bu (南原府), [this also] became
Debang-ju. This is where *cishi* Liu Rengui (刺史劉仁軌 [602–85]) stopped [during campaign]: later Namwon became Daebang. This is also a false name.

- **Before moving its capital south, Baekje had originated within the former territory of the historical Daifang commandery:** King Wideok (威德王 r.554–598) received the **title of 'Duke of Daifang-jun'** (帶方郡公) whilst kings Mu (武王 r.600–641) and Wija (義慈王 r.641–60) and Wija’s son. Buyeo Yung (扶餘隆), all received the **title 'King of Daifang-jun'** (帶方郡王).

- **After the overthrow of Baekje, 'Daifang' was also used as an alternative name for former Baekje territory.** Tang general Liu Rengui (劉仁軌 602–85) was titled 'Daifang cishi ' (帶方刺史); when he was given control of Namwon-bu, he maintained the same title and so Namwon became named Daifang and was used as a minor capital during the suppression of the 663 Buyeo Pung (扶餘豐) restoration attempt.

- **The SS and Goryeo-sa geography both mistakenly claim that Namwon was formerly the region of the historical Daifang-jun, conflating the former name of Namwon during Baekje, Yong-gun (龍郡), with the Long-cheng (龍城) fortress that Murong Chui ordered 'Daifang king' Zuo (佐) to garrison. The Goryeo-sa records that c.1309 Namwon was 'restored' as 'Daebang-gun' (帶方郡).**

*[Goryeo-sa 高麗史:地理二:全羅道:南原府:沿革: "本百濟古龍郡。後漢建安中，為 帶方郡。曹魏時，為南帶方郡。新羅并百濟，唐高宗，詔劉仁軌，檢校帶方州刺史。神文王四年，置小京，景德王十六年，改南原小京。太祖二十三年，改爲府，忠宣王二年，復爲 帶方郡。後改爲南原郡。恭愍壬九年，陞爲府。別號龍城。有智異山【一云地理，一云頭流，一云方丈，新羅爲南嶽，躋中祀。高麗仍之】。有鸕子津，屬郡二，縣七."]*
Part 2: Samhan and Gaya polities

- Locates Samhan in the south of the peninsula together with Wae.
- Strongly argues against the northern peninsula location theories of Mahan and Byeonhan/Byeonjin.
- Relies on HHS and SGZ accounts recognizing they were contemporary, but in the case of Mahan at least, he contradicts this by having to rely on the SS for historical information and not attempting to correct the dates.
- Does not discuss Wae or Mimana in any detail.

1. Samhan overview - "Samhan-chonggo" 三韓總考

「秦，漢之際，別為一局，國名亦殊。今稱之為東南諸國。」

"During the Qin and Han periods, to the north of the Yeol-su river was Joseon, the region of Emperor Wu’s [successor] Four Commanderies. To the south of the Yeol-su was Han-guk (韓國). This was also called Jin-guk (辰國). The Three Han (三韓 aka Samhan) of the east [or of Korea]."

「馬韓五十四國，郎今京畿南道(即泗水以南，)及忠清、全羅之地也。其部落通謂之韓國。其隸王通謂之辰王。其後隸於別居者，名曰辰韓。而西韓謂之馬韓。」

"Mahan had 54 states: it was in the region of present day southern Gyeonggi-do (south of the Yeol-su), Chungcheong and Jeolla provinces. Those communities (部落) were collectively referred to as Han-guk: the king was called Jin-wang (辰王). Later those who separately resided in Yeongnam (嶺南) were called Jinhan, whilst western Han was [then] called Mahan."

「嶺南之地，東西阻山，東南際海，別為一局，國名亦殊。今稱之為東南諸國。」

"The region of Yeongnam, had mountains to the north and west and sea to the east and south. It became a separate administration [or had separate circumstances]: its songs and customs were particular and so those that resided there were called Jinhan. Jinhan was divided into two types: those lesser were called Byeonjin (弁辰)."

「若其君長廢立，皆自馬韓主之，馬韓者，三韓之霸國也。」

"Mahan was the hegemonic state of the Samhan."

「秦，漢之際。已有君長，能遠通中國，或為朝鮮人所阻。」

"During Qin and Han periods, there were already lords [of the Samhan] who were able to maintain distant communications with [or travel to] China, but they were suddenly blocked by Joseon people."
• Cites *Hanshu* referring to rise of Wi Man in Joseon blocking the northern land route.

"其後馬韓五十四國，併為百濟所吞。辰韓弁辰，併為新羅所統。"
"Subsequently the 54 Mahan states were absorbed by Baekje. Jinhan and Byeonhan came under the control of Silla."

2. **Mahan - "Mahan-go" 馬韓考**

• Gija was not the founder of Mahan and his usurpation was only temporary.
• Jeong is skeptical of the SS account that Mahan was overthrown by Baekje in 7 CE, but equally considers a c.280’s Chinese reference to a Mahan tribute mission to be conflated with Baekje.
• Despite the skepticism he relies on the SS date of collapse, albeit allowing for a restoration, which goes against his broader argument that the SS is unreliable and the SGZ/HHS accounts contemporary.

2.1

"馬韓者。今之益山郡。是其總王之所都也。"
"Mahan was present day IkSan-gun: this was the capital of the high king (總王)."
• Rejects the orthodox Korean tradition that Mahan was founded by Gija (à la SGZ), rather it already existed with its capital of Mokji-guk (目支國 [SGZ 月支國]) and was attacked by Gi Jun (à la HHS).

"秦漢以前，馬韓之跡。史冊無文。至箕準南遷，馬韓乃顯。"
"Previous to the Qin and Han [periods] there is no trace of Mahan in the histories. [Only] coming to Gi Jun’s flight south does Mahan become visible."
• Mahan originally possessed its own (subordinate) states (國). It was not ruined (破荒) by Gi Jun.

"箕氏既滅，土曾復立為王。馬韓，非箕氏也。"
"The Gi clan subsequently ended and local chiefs made themselves king: Mahan was not the Gi clan."

"Annotation: Gi Jun became the Mahan king, but it stopped with him: it was not passed through hereditary succession for long. Eastern [Korean] histories sometimes have it recorded in the Silla and Baekje histories that the Mahan kingship became [the possession of] the Gi clan: this is big mistake."

Jeong 疆域考:馬韓考

Jeong 疆域考:馬韓考: "邭家箕準之為馬韓王。止於本身，未嘗傳世而歴久也。東史，或以羅濟史所載，馬韓王，為箕氏大非也。"
• Emphasizes that the Gi lineage did not continue.

※ Whilst based on orthodox sources, this anticipates Sin Chaeho.
2.2 SS references

至漢成帝鴻嘉元年，新羅王赫居世。遣使聘於馬韓。
{20 BCE} "In the 1st Hongjia year of Han emperor Cheng [20 BCE], Silla king Hyeokgeose sent a diplomatic mission to Mahan."

越明年，新羅聘于馬韓。
{19 BCE} "The following year Silla sent [another] mission to Mahan."

後十年，百濟王獻鹿于馬韓。○後三年。百濟遷都漢南。告于馬韓○後五年，百濟王獻俘于馬韓。
{9 BCE} "10 years later, the Baekje king presented a [divine] deer to Mahan. 3 years later [6 BCE], Baekje moved its capital south of the Han river and informed Mahan. 5 years later [1 BCE] the Baekje king presented [Malgal] prisoners to Mahan."

後六年百濟王，作熊川柵，馬韓王壞之。
{5 CE} "6 years later the Baekje king made the Ungcheon (熊川) river palisade: the Mahan king destroyed it."

後二年，百濟滅馬韓，唯圓山、錦岘二城，固守不下。○越明年，二城降于百濟，馬韓遂亡。」
{7 CE} "2 years later, Baekje destroyed Mahan. Only the two fortresses of Wonsan and Geumhyeon (圓山·錦岘二城) held firm and did not capitulate. The following year these two fortresses surrendered to Baekje and Mahan finally ended."

百濟史云，溫祚王二十六年王莽年攸三年冬十月，王出師陽言田獵，潛襲馬韓。遂并其國邑，唯圓山、錦岘二城，固守不下。○二十七年。二城降，移其民於漢山之北。馬韓遂滅，○鐵案當時，馬韓幅員最廣，北自熊津，南極海域，而百濟立國不過二十餘年，庶事草創，安得五十四國吞滅若是。史文明有踐略，不可徵也。

• Jeong questions this account on the grounds that Mahan was an expansive domain with 54 states and Baekje had only been established for twenty years, but then he basically still appears to accept it.

後七年，百濟討馬韓舊將周勤。
{c.15} "7 years. Baekje punished the former [Mahan] general Ju-geun (周勤)."
• Suppressed his rebellion.

後二十八年。馬韓人蘇馬諳等。詣樂浪貢獻。
{44} "28 years later, Mahan people including Somasi (蘇馬諳) went to Lelang and presented tribute."
• Account of this is in the HHS which records that Somasi was then made lord of Han China’s Liansi-yi (漢廉斯邑 [or Yeomsa-eup on the Han river?])
2.3 Mahan restoration hypothesis

「後十七年，馬韓將孟召，降于新羅。」

[61] "17 years later, Mahan general Maengso (孟召) surrendered to Silla."

"Annotation: The location of [Maengso’s fortress of] Bok’am-seong (覆巖城) is not known. Perhaps it was in present day Hwangdan of Yeongdong[gun] (黃洞永同 [North Chungcheong-do province]). It was already some 53 years since the end of Mahan. How could [the SS Silla Annal] say a Mahan general surrendered a fortress? From this it can be known that even though Geumma-gun had been destroyed, there were surviving Mahan descendents who had reestablished a polity and were planning a restoration." (Jeong 疆域考:馬韓考)

Jeong 疆域考:馬韓考: "鑿案覆巖城，不知所在。疑今黃洞永同之地也，馬韓之亡。今已五十有三年矣，286_246d乃云馬韓之將，以城降人可平。據此知金馬郡雖滅，而馬韓遺裔，復立國以圖恢復也。"

2.4 Conflation with Baekje

「晉武帝太康年間，韓王遣使入貢，此是百濟非古之馬韓也。」

"During the Taikang era (280-9) of Jin emperor Wu, the Mahan king sent a tribute mission: this refers to Baekje, not Mahan of old."

2.5 Mahan associated with former Baekje territory

至唐高宗之時，顯慶五年。蘇定方既平百濟，析置五都督府，以金馬諸郡。為馬韓都督府，

[660] "In the 5th Xianqing year of Tang emperor Gaozong, Su Dingfang pacified Baekje and divided it up establishing five dudu (都督府): Geummajeo-gun became the 'Mahan-dudu'."

2.6 Explanation of northern Mahan tradition: namesake hypothesis

2.6.1 「箕準既遷，其子姓宗族，猶在平壤，自成一部。此西土之所以有馬韓之名也。」

"[When] Gi Jun moved [south] his children [and members of his] clan still remained in Pyeongyang and formed their own bu community: this western land has the name of Mahan."

"According to the Wei lüe those children and relatives [of Gija] who remained in the [Joseon] state, took the namesake surname of Han (韓). According to the Wei zhi, Jun later perished but amongst the Han (韓) people there are still those who hold ancestor rites...

Annotation: After Gi Jun had fled south, Wi Man had his tiger eyes on Pyeongyang. How could Gi Jun’s children and family have remained [safely] in their old state? Only after Ugeo’s demise and the establishment of the Lelang commandery, members of the Gi clan who had been in hiding first dared to raise their heads and created a bu (部). Gi Jun had become the Han king (韓王), so they took the Han surname as a namesake: eventually they were
bestowed the ancestor shrine clan name of Gi." (Jeong 疆域考:馬韓考)
Jeong 疆域考:馬韓考: "魏略云。撰子及親留在國者。因冒姓韓氏。○魏志云。撰後滅絕。
今韓人。猶有奉其祭祀者。
彥案箕準南奔之初。衛滿虎親平壤。箕準之子姓宗族。安得住留在故國。右渠既亡。樂浪置郡
之初。箕氏之窟伏民閭者。始散出頭。自作一部。而箕準嘗為韓王。故冒姓韓氏。遂奉箕氏
之祭祀也。○又按撰子及親者。謂嗣子及親屬也。崇仁殿碑。以親為房孫之名。其實襲魚豢
之說也。箕準南遷。明云滅絕。安得有房孫三人哉。"

※ Not a very convincing explanation.
※ Inspiration for Sin Chaeho.

2.6.2 「東漢安帝之時。箕氏之在西土者。猶稱馬韓。」
[SS:G 121] "At the time of Eastern Han emperor An [r.106-25], the Gi clan’s
western land was still [also] called Mahan."

"According to the SS Goguryeo Annal, In the 69th year of King Taejo (太祖王).
the 1st Jiaunguang year of Han emperor An [121], the [Goguryeo] king led
10,000 Mahan [and] YeMaek riders and surrounded [continental]
Xuantu-cheng. In the 70th year, together with Mahan [and] YeMaek the king
invaded Liaodong. Kim Busik says Mahan had ended in the 27th year of
Baekje king Onjo, so these [Mahan] soldiers must be those who effected a
restoration.

Annotation: The events are some 114 years after the end of Mahan: it is not
a time still within which Mahan could have [simply] collapsed and revived
again. Also, the Mahan state capital was south of Ungjin (熊津) present day
Iksan. How could [Mahan troops] have crossed through Baekje’s borders and
gone [all the way] to attack the Xuantu [commandery] in Liaodong?! Those of
the Gi clan remaining in the westland [aka Pyeongyang region] called
themselves Mahan. These people the Weilüe says remained in the country and
took the namesake surname of Han (韓)." (Jeong 疆域考:馬韓考)

句麗既亡。馬韓遺族。投託渤海。渤海既衰。別自立國號曰定安。
[When Goguryeo ended, remaining Mahan people entrusted themselves to Baekje.
[When] Balhae declined, they established their own state called Jeong’an.

3. Jinhan - "Jinhan-go" 辰韓考
• Makes the same point that late C3rd attestations of Jinhan and Mahan refer to
  Silla and Baekje.

3.1 辰韓者。秦韓也。秦人之東走者也。
"Jinhan (辰韓) is [the same as] Jinhan (秦韓). The Jin (秦 Ch. Qin) people were
those who went east."

"Annotation: When the Qin/Jin (秦) people first came, rulers were all called Sin-wang (臣王). They were distinct from Chinese lords and kings. At the beginning, the Three Han all used the term Sin-wang, but eventually only the Yeongnam [region] became Sinhan and the Qin/Jin people resided there. Jin (辰) is [the same] as Sin (臣)." (Jeong 繼域考:辰韓考)

Jeong 繼域考:辰韓考: "纖案秦人初來。凡君長皆謂之臣王，謂中國別有君王也。其初三韓通稱臣王，而其終唯嶺南為臣韓者。秦人居之也，辰者臣也。"

右渠之時，臣民逃難。亦至嶺南，故東史謂之朝鮮遺民。
"At the time of Ugeo, Sin people (臣民) fled and came to Yeongnam (嶺南): this is why Korean histories [i.e. SS] called them 'Joseon refugees/remnant people'."

至漢宣帝五鳳元年，楊山村人赫居世。立為君長，未建國號，後為辰韓之總王。
[57 BCE] "In the 1st Wufeng era year of Han emperor Xuan, the people of Yangsan village made Hyeokgeose their lord but did not name the state. He became the high king of Jinhan."

其始臣屬馬韓，受其節制，修其職貢，馬韓既亡，乃能自立。
"At first, the Sin (臣) [i.e. Jinhan] were subordinate to Mahan and adopted their system, maintaining tribute missions. When Mahan ended they were able to become independent."

王莽地皇之時，辰韓右渠帥，廉斯瑤者，詣樂浪降漢。
"At the time of Wang Mang's Dehuang era (20–23) the Right gosu (渠帥) of Jinhan. Chi of Yeomsa(廉斯瑤), went to Lelang and submitted to the Chinese Han."

「曹魏正始之年。樂浪南部從事吳林，割辰韓八國，以與樂浪。」
"During the Cao Wei Zhengshi era [240-9], the southern part of Lelang followed Wulin [who] divided Jinhan into eight states and gave them to Lelang."
• Refers to the region north of the Joryeong (鳥嶺) mountains in (North Chungcheon-do), not Jinhan proper.

「至晉武帝太康元年，辰韓王遣使獻方物，二年，復修朝貢，七年又朝，」
[280] "In the 1st Taikang year of Jin emperor Wu, the Jinhan king sent tribute; in the 2nd and 7th year they again sent tribute missions [to Jin]."
• Such mentions of Jinhan and Mahan in the Jinshu in fact refer to Silla and Baekje as they are already attested in the Beishu.

「梁武帝天監二年。 （篡sic.篡）國之明年。）新羅智護王。定國號曰新羅。（智護王四年。）自此以後，不名辰韓。\"
4. Byeonjin - "Byeonjin-go" 弁辰考

- Jeong asserts that the historical Byeonjin equates to Gaya.
- The greater part of the "Byeonjin-go" section is then devoted to rejecting alternative Korean theories that variously associated Mahan and Byeonhan with the region of Pyeongyang.
- Historical Byeonjin/Gaya is further discussed in the "Byeonjin-byeolgo" section, alternatively named "Gara-go".

4.1 Historical Byeonjin = Garak = Gaya

- Much of this basic information is reiterated in the "Byeonjin-byeolgo".

「弁辰者，金海、巨濟、咸安、固城等沿海之地也。」
"Byeonjin was the region of Gimhae, Geoje, Ham’an and Goseong (金海·巨濟·咸安·固城)."

「其稱弁辰者，或其頂戴之幃，異於辰韓，遂以得名也。」
"The term Byeonjin [was also the term] for the caps they wore: these were different to [customs in] Jinhan and so eventually became used as their name."

- Han Baekgyeom was right to equate Byeonjin with Kim Suro’s Garak-guk/Gaya.
- 'Byeon’ of Byeonjin is a semantic rendering of the phonetic Garak/Gaya carrying the meaning of 'pointed cap'.

"According to Han Baekgyeom (韓百謙): King Suro arose in Gimhae which was Byeonhan territory. Annotation: Byeon (弁) is Garak (駕落), and Garak is Gaya (伽倻). In Korean customs all types of pointed caps (冠幃之尖頂) are termed byeon and also gana (駕那) 兌禁府臘隷，稱羅將及郡縣待奴，稱及唱齒戴尖頂之幃 The name of [these pointed hats] is gana, also geum-gana (金駕那). The transmission of this dialect definitely has a basis. At the time of Silla, Garak-guk was in present day Gimhae-bu: it was also called Gara (加羅) and Gaya. This was the high king of Byeonjin. Definitely they had a system of especially pointed hats and so the country was named Gara-guk (駕羅國) and when the Chinese translated this it became 'Byeonjin’. After the final king, Guhae (仇亥), surrendered to Silla, the country was called Geumgwan (金官). Geumgwan means 'golden crown'. The pronunciation changed and Geumgwan [became]Geum-gana (金駕那). Gana became Byeonjin. Is this still in doubt?"
Historical locations.

"Ham'an (咸安) was Ana Gaya (阿那伽耶): it was also called Asir’yang (阿尸良) in western Gimhae. Goseong (固城) was Lesser Gaya (小伽耶): it was also the name of its own county. Concerning Byeonjin in the south of Byeonhan: that the south bordered with the Wae is not true. Goryeong (高麗) was Greater Gaya (大伽耶). Seongju (星州) was Byeokjin Gaya (碧珍伽耶): it was also called Ilbon (日本 i.e. Japan). Hamchang was Gonyeong/Goryeong Gaya (古寧伽耶): it was also called Godong’ram (古冬攬). Gaya-san (伽耶山) was in Hapcheon (陜川). They were all subordinate to Byeonjin and so their names were Gaya."

The Weizhi has that Byeonjin was Goja-guk (古資國): Goja is the old name for Goseong (固城). Korean histories make it that Byeonjin was not Gaya. Generally, at the time of Han and Wei, Silla and Garak resided together in Yeongnam for four to five centuries. In the 4th Zhongdatong (中通) year [532] of Liang emperor Wu, Guhae first surrendered to Silla. But again, in the 3rd Tianjia (天嘉) year [562] of Chen emperor Wen (陳文帝), Isabu (異斯夫) destroyed Gaya. Garak was a rival state (稽國) to Silla. Silla was Jinhan, so Garak was Byeonjin: there is no use in proving this in a convoluted/complicated (崎嶇然) fashion [because it is already certain]. According to the Han history (i.e. HHS) and Weizhi, Byeonjin and Jinhan resided mixed together. The Silla Annal and Goryeo-sa treatise (羅史麗志) [say that] Garak and Silla resided mixed together: they differed between north and south, and strong and weak. That recorded in the Korean and Chinese histories do not deviate by even a hair, the circumstances completely match. Garak being Byeonjin cannot be doubted. Guam Han Baekgyeom [saying that] Suro arose in Byeonjin: how can this not be brilliant?!.." (Jeong 疆域考:弁辰考)

魏志有弁辰古資國。古資者, 固城之舊名也。東史作古自。弁辰非伽耶乎, 大抵漢、魏之際, 新羅、鶼洛, 同居嶽南四五百年, 至梁武帝中大通四年。仇亥始降新羅。又陳文帝天嘉三年, 異斯夫滅伽耶, 駕洛者, 新羅之稽國也。新羅既為辰韓, 則稽[sic. 駑]洛自為。弁辰無用稽稽, 然辨論也。漢史魏志, 弁辰與辰韓雜居, 羅史麗志, 驚[sic. 橘]洛與新羅雜居, 其差北差南, 差強差弱, 東史所記與華史所載, 毫髮不爽。情形合, 驚[sic. 橘]洛之為弁辰, 無可疑也。韓久薆以舊露所起為弁辰, 豈非卓見乎。如云不然, 弁辰非可食之物, 請一思之。
The 12 Byeonjin states were gradually absorbed by Silla."

"Annotation: According to the Silla Annal, King Jijeung took/seized Lesser Gaya (小伽耶), present day Go-seong (今固域); King Beopheung took Geumgwan Gaya, present day Gimhae; and King Jinhoong took Greater Gaya, present day Goryeong. In this way Silla swallowed up and destroyed [all] traces of Byeonjin. Details are examined in the separate "[Byeongjin]byeolgo" [section below]." (Jeong 疆域考: 卞辰考) 

Jeong 疆域考: 卞辰考: "又按新羅之史，智證王時，取小伽耶，今固域，法興王時，取金官伽耶，今金海。真興王時，取大伽耶，今高麗。此方是新羅吞滅卞辰之宗[sic．實]跡也，佇詳別考。"

4.2 Refutation and disambiguation of alternative location theories

- Jeong’s primary argument is that alternative theories locating Mahan and Byeonhan/Byeonjin further north are wrong because they necessarily contradict information given in the earlier SGZ and HHS accounts which he regards to be the most reliable.

4.2.1 Three Han ≠ Three Kingdoms

Korean theories

"乃東俗蒙昧。忽以三韓配于三國。馬配句麗，弁配百濟。七韓八葛，悉違古典。"

"Korean custom (東俗) has been quite ignorant. They wrongly match the Three Han to the Three Kingdoms, matching Ma[han] to [Go]guryeo and Byeon[han] to Baekje. 七韓八葛，悉違古典"

- Rejects Choe Chiwon’s claim that Mahan was Goguryeo, Byeonhan (卞韓) Baekje, and Jinhan Silla.
- Rejects the SS Gyeonhwon account.
- Rejects Goryeo-sa identifying a Byeonhan (卞韓) in the north alongside Joseon and Suksin.
- Rejects YJSR claim that Anbyeon-san (安邊山 [Gangwon-dol]) was also called Byeon-san (卞山) from which the name of Byeonhan was derived (thus locating it in the north).

"Annotation: In ancient times there was Byeonhan (卞韓), there was never a Byeonhan (卞韓). Korean scholars mistook (離間) the two characters of Byeonjin (卞辰) for Byeonhan (卞韓), then [the location] Byeonjin was able to be shifted northwards and westwards: this is the origin of this disease[ed interpretation]." (Jeong 疆域考: 卞辰考) 

Jeong 疆域考: 卞辰考: "按古有卞辰，未有卞韓。東儒離間卞辰二字，以作卞韓，則卞辰可移於北方，可移於西方。此其受病之源也，"
4.2.2 Xin-Tangshu (Byeonhan ≠ Goguryeo)
"There are also mistakes in the lazy (?) writing of the [Sin-/Tangshu] [causing one] to suspect that Byeonjin might have been in the north."

"According to the Tangshu Bohai account, Dae Joyeong controlled Buyeo, Okjeo, Byeonhan (弁韓), Joseon and all states north of the sea. The Korean histories are the same. According to the Goguryeo Annal, Cheon Namsaeng (泉男生) surrendered to Tang: he was made 'Duke of Byeon-guk' (卞國公 Ch. Bianguo-gong).

[Xin-Tangshu] 新唐書: 列傳第一百四十四: 北狄: 渤海: "震國王, 遣使交突厥, 地方五千 里, 戶十餘萬, 勝兵數萬, 頗知書契, 盡得扶餘、沃沮、弁韓、朝鮮海北諸國。"
[SS {668}卷第四十九: 列傳: 第三: 男建: 男庶: "男生乃免, 授平壤道行軍大撫官, 兼持 節安撫大使, 擊哥勿南蘇倉巖等城以降, 帝又命西臺舍人李慶緝, 結軍慰勞, 賜袍帶金釧 七事, 明年, 召入朝, 遣遂東大都督玄菟郡公, 賜第京師, 因詔還軍, 與李勣攻平壤, 入禽王, 帝詔遣子, 即遂水勞賜, 還, 進右衛大將軍卞國公"

"Annotation: Korean scholars take these passages and [imagine that] the [Gol]guryeo person, Namsaeng, called the north of Balhae. Byeon-guk (卞國), and completely occupied Byeonhan (弁韓), so Goguryeo would also have been Byeonhan (卞韓).

At the time **many false enfeoffments were being made**: this is why the Silla kings were all enfeoffed as dukes of Lelang-jun: how was Gyeongju Lelang?! This is not sufficient evidence. Similarly with Dae Joyeong taking Joseon and Byeonhan (弁韓). They say that Joseon was definitely in the region of present day Pyeong'an-do. This was the former territory of [Goguryeo]. How could Byeonhan (卞韓) also be [Goguryeo]?!" (Jeong 疆域考: 卞辰考)

疆域考: 卞辰考: "錄案東儒又執此文, 以為學生句麗之人。而號曰卜國渤海北蓋之國, 而盡 得弁韓。則句麗亦可為卞韓, 然當時封號, 多不以實。故新羅諸王, 皆封樂浪郡公。豈非慶 州為樂浪平, 此不足為據。又如大祚榮既得朝鮮, 又得弁韓。其云朝鮮, 正是今平安道之 地, 句麗故彌也。豈得復以卞韓。為句麗哉。此皆聞漫不核之筆, 無足據者。"

"又或誤讀唐書。遂疑弁韓苗裔, 實居平壤。"

"The Tangshu is also misread [causing some] to wonder if Byeonhan descendants resided in Pyeongyang."

"According to the Tangshu Silla account, Silla were the descendents of Byeonhan (弁韓) and they resided in Han China’s Lelang...

- Byeonhan was a mistake for Jinhan, and the Lelang referred to was the indigenous Nangnang region of Chuncheon and Hanseong.

[Xin-Tangshu] 新唐書: 列傳第一百四十五: 東夷: 新羅: "新羅, 弁韓苗裔也。居漢樂浪地, 橫千里, 縱三千里, 東拒長人, 東南日本, 西百濟, 南 濱海, 北高麗。"
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4.2.3 Yeoji-seungnam
「至撰興地勝覿，其定馬韓、弁辰之疆域，皆指越為燕，以齊待蜀。而三韓舊界。不可復問，」
"When the YJSR was compiled, it set the territory of Mahan and Byeonjin...皆指越為燕，以齊待蜀。而三韓舊界。[This] cannot be questioned again."

- The YJSR records two alternative theories:
  1) The SS Choe Chiwon statements (as well as SY etc) associating Mahan with Goguryeo.
  2) Another which associates Byeonhan (卞韓) with Pyeongyang.

- They are all wrong because Joseon and Leiang were based at Pyeongyang.

Mahan ≠ Goguryeo - Rejection of 'Choe Chiwon type' locations
"According to the YJSR, the region of Gyeonggi-do, Seoul and Hwanghae-do was old Joseon and Mahan: Chungcheong-do was [also] old Mahan territory: Jeolla-do was originally Byeonhan (卞韓). Mahan became Goguryeo, Jinhan became Silla and Byeonhan became Baekje. Choe Chiwon established this theory (定論) but he did not create it: it was transmitted from the start of the Three Kingdoms. The SS geography also agrees with Choe Chiwon's hypothesis."

興地勝覿云，京都黃海道。古朝鮮，馬韓之城，忠淸道。古馬韓之城，全羅道。本卞韓之地。○又云，臣按馬韓為高句麗，辰韓為新羅，卞韓為百濟。崔致遠已有定論。此非致遠劍為之說，自三國初，相傳之說也。高麗金富軺地理志。亦以致遠之論為是。

4.2.4 Byeonhan ≠ Goguryeo - Rejection of Pyeongna-san (平那山) theory
"During mid-Goryeo [Koreans] first located Geumma-san (金馬山) on/within the Baekje border (à la SS Gyeon Hwon biography) and Pyeongna-san (平那山) on/within the Goguryeo border (à la YJSR). The pronunciation of pyeong 平 is close to byeon 卞, so they thought that Mahan was Baekje, and Byeonhan was Goguryeo, but no one identified them clearly.

4.2.5 Jugwannyuk’ik (周官六翼) contradiction
The "Samhan" description in the Jugwannyuk’ik (周官六翼 주관육익 {lost C14th era work}) compiled by Kim Gyeongsuk (金敏叔) then equates Golgulryeo with 'Lelang Byeonhan' (樂浪卞韓) and Baekje with 'Mahan Daifang' (馬韓帶方): in the "Three Kingdoms" description it has Goguryeo being Mahan, and Baekje being Byeonhan. The words of one person contradict themselves: how can this make sense?

至其中葉，始有以金馬山在百濟之境。平那山在高句麗之境，平與卞，聲相近，遂疑馬韓為百濟。卞韓為高句麗，然未有昌言指之者。○及金敏叔編周官六翼叙三韓，則云高麗，井樂浪卞韓，百濟。井馬韓帶方。至叙三國，則直以高句麗為馬韓，百濟為卞韓，一人之言，自相矛盾，何足道哉。
In the time of our [Joseon] dynasty Gilchanggun Gwon Geun (吉昌君 權近) and Yi Cheom (李詹 [1345-1405]) corrected the Korean histories and put a stop to [the theories that] Mahan was Baekje and Byeonhan Goguryeo.

In the time of our [Joseon] dynasty Gilchanggun Gwon Geun (吉昌君 權近) and Yi Cheom (李詹 [1345-1405]) corrected the Korean histories and put a stop to [the theories that] Mahan was Baekje and Byeonhan Goguryeo.

4.2.6 Rejection of other similar theories

- [Recent Korean scholars [does not specify]] suggest that as Mahan was the largest of the Three Han with 54 states, and because Byeonhan (卞韓) was located to its south, its own territory was extended further north than Iksan and consequently its northeastern territory was absorbed by Goguryeo when Dongmyeong ‘arose’ in Lelang, thus Goguryeo was later referred to as Mahan. (※ This would in any event be wrong because Goguryeo began further north.)

- SS records Byeonhan (卞韓) first surrendering to Silla (Hyeokgeose 19), and that Baekje after overthrowing Mahan then expanded into Silla permanently absorbing the former Byeonhan territory west of Jiri-san (智異山); consequently Baekje was later referred to as Byeonhan.

- [Some recent scholars] misquote the HHS and say that Byeonhan was to the south of Liaodong, when the HHS explicitly has it as to the south of Mahan.

- The Jugwannuyuk’ik (周官六翼) sites Gung’ye (弓裔) saying he wanted to be king of Joseon. Suksin and Byeonhan (卞韓): the annotation posits that Pyeongyang was called (or had a district called) Byeonna (卞那) because it was formerly Byeonhan. However, Byeonhan could not have been Pyeongyang because this was where Joseon was.

- SY has that Goguryeo named itself Mahan because [Ma]eup-san (馬邑山) was located there: Baekje was Byeonhan because of Byeon-san (卞山). Presently there is a Ma’eup-san in Pyeongyang-bu and Byeon-san (邊山) in An-hyeon (安縣). This could be evidence but it is not known who made the book (SY) and it only appeared after mid-Goryeo so is unreliable.

逮于本朝，吉昌君權近，與李詹等，修東國史略。乃斷然以馬韓為百濟，卞韓為高句麗，近乃近世大儒。東人擬之著，而亦為之論，以錯亂千載已定之說。未知何謂也。○臣反覆攬中國及東史，三韓之時，馬韓最大。統五十四國，辰、卞韓。各統十二國，則今益山以南。無地
可容五十四國矣，意者。馬韓王都，其南密近於卞韓，而東北則與樂浪、靺鞨、沃沮等，封疆相接，其後高句麗東明王，起於樂浪，而盡有馬韓東北之地。後人稱麗為馬韓者，蓋以此也。
○後漢書，載弁辰在與韓之南，南與倭接，又曰弁辰與辰韓雜居，衣服居處，言語風俗同，不曰弁韓。而曰弁辰。是雖赣國之稱，亦可以知二韓之相隣附也，新羅雖居世十九年，卞韓在其國來滅其後，後百濟既滅馬韓，兵力強盛，蠶食新羅卞韓舊地，皆異之以西，盡為所并。後人稱蠶為卞韓者，蓋以此也。
○漢書之記岐於金馬平那之說，謂馬韓在百濟封域之中，遂以為百濟平，且唐書所云，卞韓苗裔，在樂浪之地者，蓋言卞韓之系，出自樂浪耳，金富軒謂非實錄。近之論，顧引以爲證，而乃去苗裔二字，直云卞韓在樂浪之地，何也。
○又其言曰。後漢書謂卞韓在南者，蓋自漢界遼東之地，而云爾。非謂卞韓在辰、馬二韓之南，信如是則其所云馬韓在西者，亦可謂在遼東之西乎。○周官六翼，記高麗世祖說弓裔之言，大王若欲王朝鮮、肅慎，卞韓之地，莫如先占松岳，注云，今西京古之卞那京，故曰卞韓。此尤謬妄。以卞韓為西京，則朝鮮更何地，後日裔之用兵，自羅州始，則世祖所謂卞韓，指百濟也。審矣。
○三國遺事，謂麗地自有馬邑山，故名馬韓。麗地自有卞山，故云卞韓。今平壤府，有馬邑山，扶安縣有邊山，則遺事之云，恐或有徵，是書未知誰作，亦出於高麗中葉以後，其所紀載，皆荒誕不經，不足取信，然於辯三韓之說，則證據甚明，欲志東方地理者，宜具參觀。
○臣故謹因致遠故舊，以攻穎忠淸黃海等道，係于馬韓舊域，以全羅道，係于卞韓舊域云。

"Annotation: The Han and Wei histories have that the territory of Emperor Wu’s Four Commanderies did not reach south of the Yeol-su and that Jin-guk (辰國) and the southern Han (韓) were all located beyond: thus it would be impossible for the territory of Joseon to have been Mahan. Now [concerning] the region of Gyeonggi, Seoul and Hwanghae, they write about the territory of Joseon and Mahan making a mess without truth. How did it come to this? They fix Goguryeo as Mahan but Pyeong’an is not treated as Mahan: they fix Jeolla as Byeonhan, but still say Iksan was Mahan. Everything is tangled. How did it come to this?

If the territory south of Iksan was not large enough to accommodate 54 states (國), then [how can] the single province of present day Jeolla be comprised of 53 eup (邑)? In the territory of Gijeon (Gyeonggi) and Chungcheong south of the Yeol-sum a 100 states could be established - why stop at only 53? To speak of 54 states, would they all have been as vast as Jin, Chu, Qi or Qin (晉齊燕)? This is imagining too much.

鑲棄漢魏諸史，武帝四郡之地，不至於沭水以南，而辰國南韓。每在四郡之外，則既爲朝鮮之地。又爲馬韓之地，萬無是理。今乃於京都黃海之地，書之曰朝鮮，馬韓之地，則首鼠兩端，拖泥帶水，其謬義不核。一何至此。既以句麗定爲馬韓，而平安不挈馬韓。既以全羅定爲卞韓，而益山猶謂馬韓。其糾縈縈，一何至此。若云益山以南，無地可容五十四國，則今全羅一道，恰爲五十三邑，何況沭水以南幾何忠清之地，將設百國，奚但五十四而已哉，將謂五十四國，皆如晉、楚、齊、秦之廣大乎。此過慮也。

They also say [Goguryeo’s Dongmyeong arose in Lelang: what explanation is this?] [At that early time] only Jolbon had surrendered to Dongmyeong: it was not until the time of Cao Wei that [Goguryeo first took Pyeongyang, to say nothing of Mahan. Korean scholars mistakenly identify present day Seongcheon (成川 [in South Pyeong’an-do]) as Jolbon, so it seems correct [to
them].
又云，句麗東明，起於樂浪，此又何說也。東明所據，只卒本而已。降及曹魏之時，句麗始得平壌。況其馬韓，東儒誤以今成川，為卒本，故其言如是。只句麗史一通，不曾夢見，徑主大論可乎。

- Rejects theory that Byeonhan was based in Lelang.
  至論十韓之事，既云十韓。降于新羅，卒以百濟，號為十韓。抑何武斷。吾聞百濟先亡，劉府尋撤異山以西南原諸郡，皆入新羅之疆理，終為新羅之罪案。聞新羅獻其所得十韓之地於百濟也。十韓之系，出自樂浪。故有譏也。其書本論新羅世德。出於辰井[sic:卡]。金富軾割去新羅二字。權陽村割去百裔二字於是乎升[sic:卡]韓在樂浪矣。夫唐史一部。本非
  枕中賤寶，何至迷味如此。諸家紛紛。總屬不根。究其病崇。兩韓三國。必欲分配。故
  七韓八韓。百孔千瘡。皆由此而發也。

4.2.7 Unreliability of Korean sources
「總之三韓之訟，亦當以中國史冊。決之。」
"Disputes concerning the Samhan must be settled using the Chinese histories."
- Only the Chinese histories are reliable: Koreans were illiterate at the time and could not record their own history.
- The Chinese historians all knew that Goguryeo had no relation to the Three Han: the Beishu says that Baekje belonged to Mahan whilst the Tongdian says that the Three Han were absorbed by Silla and Baekje.

5. Historical Byeonjin (aka Gaya) - "Byeonjin-byeolgo" or "Gara-go"
弁辰別考(亦名迦羅考)
- Reiterates the historical geographic information given in 4.1 above.
  弁辰明是迦羅，而迦羅之跡，僅見於北史隋書，茲就羅麗史，採取迦羅之事，為弁辰別考，以當弁辰之史。
  "Byeonjin is clearly Gara (迦羅): traces of Gara appear in the Beishi and Suisishu, and then in the Silla and Goguryeo histories. The "Byeonjin-byeolgo" consists of the Gara related affairs which should be [treated] as [authentic] Byeonjin history."

「辰韓、弁辰，初皆六國，後各十二。而迦羅只有六國者，史家失其六也。」
"Jinhan and Byeonjin at first [consisted of] six states but later each had twelve. It is said that Gara only had six states, the historians lost six of its states."

- Detailed relative locations.
  
  "[Annotation]... Gimhae (金海) is Geumgwan-gaya, also called Dae-gara ('Greater Gaya'): Ham'an (咸安) is Ana-gaya (阿那伽耶), also called Asiyang (阿尸良); Goseong (固城) is So-gaya ('Lesser Gaya'), also called Goji-guk (古自國). They are all counties to the south of the Hwang-su (潢水) river. The
Hwang-su originates from Hwang-ji (潢池) pool. Taebaek-san: [from there] it flows southwest for 300+ 里: in east Hamchang-hyeon (咸昌驛) it bends and flows [another] 300+ 里 southwards: in north Ham’an-gun it again bends and flows eastwards for 100+ 里 : at Hwansan-pogu (東北黃山浦口) harbour, northeast Gimhae-bu, it again bends and flows south: at eastern Gimhae-bu it enters the sea. This is the Nakdong-gang (洛東江). 'Nak-dong' (洛東 'east of nak') means that which is east of Garak. Also, [from] southern Hamyang-bu, north of Jiri-san emerges the Nam-su (灊水), commonly called the Cheong-cheon (清川). Flowing east, at southern Jinju-seong (晉州城) it bends and flows northeast: in northern Ham’an-gun (咸安郡), it joins with the Hwang-su. Those [regions] south of the Hwang-su and Nam-su are [as follows], starting from the east, tracing west: Gimhae, Ungcheon (熊川), Changwon (昌原), Chilwon (漆原), Ham’an (咸安), Jinhae (鎮海), Goseong (固城), Sacheon (泗川) and Gon’yang (昆陽). [These latter are] what are referred to in the SS Silla annals as Posang-palguk (浦上八國 'eight Posang states'). These were all former Byeonjin territory. Gyeongju is 200 里 directly north of Gimhae, it is far to the east of the Hwang-su. When the Chinese histories (漢史) [i.e. SGZ and HHS] say Byeonjin is to the south of Jinhan, this is what it is referring to.

Also, Goryeong (高靈) is Dae-gaya (大伽倻), Seongju (星州) is Byeokjin-gaya (碧珍伽倻), and Hamchang is Go’nyeong-gaya (古寧伽倻): they are all to the west of the Hwang-su. In the counties east of the Hwang[-su] there are absolutely no traces of Garak: the [other] name for the Hwang-su, Nakdong-gang ('east of Garak') is [therefore] certainly appropriate. Examining the east-west lateral: Goryeong [extends] directly eastward to Gyeongju. Seongju is 20 里 north of Goryeong, and Hamchang is 140 里 north of Seongju....

Of the eight Posang-palguk states, Golpo (骨浦) is now Hap’won (昌原), and Chil’po (漆浦) is Chilwon (漆原); Gosapo (古史浦) was originally named Gojapo (古自浦): the others cannot be examined...

[Annotation] The Chinese histories [record] Gunmi-guk (軍彌國) and Gamno-guk (甘路國) states of Byeonjin. Present day Gon’yang (昆陽) was originally named Gonmi (昆彌), whilst Gae’nyeong (開寧) was originally Gammun-guk (甘文國): [they] are to the north of Seongju, and are probably changed pronunciations of Gunmi and Gamno. [Another Byeonjin state] Dok’no (禮盧) is [present day] Geoje (巨濟). Though Geumgwan was a little distance from the sea, the south of Dok’nó bordered the Wae (倭), [this?] was probably not another settlement (邑). Gara-san is in Geoje: the YJSR says that Tsushima island (對馬島 K. Daema-do) is visible [from Gara-san, so] it is very near.” (Jeong 疆域考:弁辰別考)
5.1 **Byeonjin = Geumgwan Gaya**

「弁辰十二國，皆隸金官首露之國。金官者，弁辰之總王也，漢光武時，始開其國。」

"The twelve Byeonjin states were all subordinate to the state of Kim Suro. Geumgwan (金官) was the high king (總王) of Byeonjin. The state [of Geumgwan Gaya] was first established during the reign of Han emperor Guangwu (漢光武 [5 BCE - 57 CE])."

- Kim Suro’s state established 42 CE.

5.1.1 **Mahan origins hidden with creation myths**

- The HHS and SGZ record that the kings of Jinhan and Byeonjin were all people of Mahan.
- The Kim Suro and Silla Taehae progenitor myths were created to hide their Mahan-Baekje ancestry.

5.2 **Historical attestations**

「首露王三十五年。發兵侵新羅，自姫以後二十餘年，戰爭不息。辰韓、弁辰之戦然為二。良以此也。」

[SS:S 77, 87] In his 35th year, King Suro dispatched troops to attack Silla. From this time on there was no stop war for more than 20 years. The division of Jinhan and Byeonjin into two was surely because of this.

「其後五六十年，迦羅、新羅。忽有和睦之跡，意者，婆娑王中年。迦羅乞和，而暫相親附也。」

[SS:S 102] Five or six years later, there are signs that there was suddenly peace between Gara and Silla. This means during the reign of [Silla] King Pasa, Gara sued for peace and were temporarily close to one another.
"後四年。新羅、迦羅，復相侵伐者。十餘年，自是厥後。兩國無事者八十年。而首露王薨。」
[SS:S 106, 115] Four years later Silla and Gara again attacked one another for more than 10 years. Subsequently there is no mention of events between the two states for 80 years, and then King Suro dies.

"首露王薨，子居登王立，既立三年。請和於新羅。此漢獻帝建安六年也。」
"King Suro died and his son King Geodeung became monarch. After three years [SS:S 201] he requested peace with Silla. This was the 6th Jian'an year of Han emperor Xiandi."

"建安以後二百六十八年。迦羅之跡，史冊無文，至齊高帝建元元年。迦羅國王荷知。遣使于南齊。」
[Nan-Qi shu 南齊書東南夷傳 compiled c.537] "For the subsequent 268 years from Jianan [reign], there is no trace of Gara in the history books. In the first Jianyuan year [479] of Qi emperor Gao, Gara-guk king Haji sent an emissary to Southern Qi."

"後三年。三韓連和，以拒句麗。此又東方之大事也。」
[c.481] 3 years later the Three Han formed a peace and blocked [Go]guryeo: this was a major event in Korea.

"Baekje was Mahan. Silla was Jinhan and Gara was Byeonjin. [This was] the Three Han alliance."

百濟者，馬韓也，新羅者，辰韓也，迦羅者，弁辰也，三韓會盟。

"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。中國之史，厥有明驗。」
[Beishi, Lianshu, and Suishu 北史新羅傳·梁書新羅傳·隋書] "At this time, even though Silla was crude and illiterate their court sent a mission to China. Probably they joined with either Baekje or Gara: the Chinese histories are not clear."

後五十一年。迦羅竟以其國，降于新羅。此梁武帝篡國之三十一年也，於是平辰韓、弁辰。合而為一。
[SS:S Geumgwan Gaya 532 surrenders] "Gara finally surrendered to Silla. This was the 31st year of Liang emperor Wu’s usurpation. Thereupon Jinhan and Byeonjin became one.

"Annotation: The state of Gara, was established during the reign of Han emperor Guangwu {25–57 CE} and ended during that of Liang emperor Wu {502–49}. The HHS, SGZ and Jinshu all have Three Han account sections. Coming to the Nanshu, Beishi and Tangshu Baekje and Silla are first included and there are no longer Mahan or Byeonjin. Is it not already extremely clear that Gara was Byeonjin? The Weizhi and Beishi all have
Baekje as Mahan: the Beishu has that Silla was former Jinhan: the Tangshu says that they were Byeonhan descendents. From this it can be seen that Mahan eventually became Baekje whilst Jinhan and Byeonjin eventually became Silla. This is certain.

Greater Gaya
「大伽耶者，今之高靈縣，亦弁辰十二國之一也，其始祖阿歧王，實為首露王之同母兄。以故別謂之大伽耶。」
"Greater Gaya is present day Goryeong-hyeon. This was also the one of the 12 statelets of Byeonjin. Its founder was King Asi: he had the same mother and brothers as King Suro, and so it was separately named Greater Gaya."

Lesser Gaya
「小加耶者，即弁辰古資國。今之固城縣也。新羅智證王滅之。」
"Lesser Gara was Byeonjin Goja-guk, present day Goseong-hyeon. Silla king Jijeung destroyed it."73)

72) Although not cited, this must refer to the statelet of Byeonjin Guya-guk (弁辰 狗耶國) attested in the SGZ "Han" account as one of the twelve Byeonjin polities.
73) Again unctited. Goja-guk likely refers to the SGZ attested Byeonjin polity of Gojamidong-guk 古資彌東國.
Ana Gaya

「阿那加耶者。今之咸安郡也。新羅法興王滅之。」
"Ana Gaya was present day Ham'an-gun. Silla king Beopheung destroyed it."

「又加耶嘉悉王。製十二弦琴。至今流傳。」
"Also, Gaya king Gasil created the 12 string zither. It has been passed down to the present."
Part 3: Okjeo, YeMaek, Malgal and early Goguryeo

1. Okjeo - "Okjeo-go" 沃沮考
   • Follows orthodox understanding but is ambiguous on how Okjeo (straddling Hamgyeong) relates to the Gangneung Ye discussed below

East Okjeo = South Okjeo = southern Hamgyeong-do
「東沃沮者。今咸鏡南道之地也。武帝時。為玄菟郡，昭帝時，為樂浪東部，以其在樂浪之東，故謂之東沃沮。以其有北沃沮。故亦謂之南沃沮。」
"East Okjeo was in the territory of present day southern Hamgyeong-do province. During the reign of Emperor Wu it became Xuantu-jun commandery. During the reign of Emperor Zhao it became the eastern part of Lelang. Because it was to the east of Lelang, it was called East Okjeo. There was also a North Okjeo and so [East] Okjeo was also called South Okjeo."

"Gaema-daesan (蓋馬大山 'great Gaema mountain') is present day Baekdu-san. Details are in the "Xuantu-go". That which is to the east of the great mountain is said to be to the east of the main Baekdu-san range (正幹 lit. 'trunk'). As for this main range, travelling south [one encounters] Wanhang-ryeong (緩項嶺), Seol-ryeong (雪嶺), Eungdeok-ryeong (鷹德嶺) and Hwangcho-ryeong (黃草嶺): to the northwest of Hamheung is Cheol'ong-ryeong (鐵盆嶺), west of [or 'in western'] Yeongheung (永興) is Noin-ryeong (老人嶺), Bunsu-ryeong (分水嶺) and Cheol-ryeong (鐵嶺), whilst to the south of [or 'in southern'] Anbyeon is Chuiji-ryeong (棋池嶺) and Heup-gok (敷谷) valley.

In general, which is to 'the east of the mountains' (Yeongdong 嶺東) is [the region] to the east of Gaema-daesan (蓋馬大山). That which is called the Dandan-daeyeong (單單大嶺) is to the northwest of Hwangcho-ryeong (黃草嶺): it is present day Seolhan-ryeong (薛罕嶺). Details are in the "Xuantu-go" section. During the time of the Four Commanderies, Seolhan-ryeong formed the border between Lelang and Xuantu. Eumnu (挹努 을루 Ch. Yilou) is present day O'ra (烏喇 Ch. Wula): to the north of the present day Tuman river is all their land. YeMaek are mistaken names for present day Gangwon-do province: details are in the "YeMaek-go"."

賣案蓋馬大山者。今之白頭山也。詳見玄菟考。在大山之東者。謂在白頭山正幹之東也。白頭山正幹。南馳為緩項嶺。為雪嶺。為鷹德嶺。為黃草嶺。在咸興西北。為鐵盆嶺。永興西。為老人嶺。為分水嶺。為鐵嶺。安邊南。為楸池嶺。敷谷地。凡在嶺東者。即蓋馬大山之東也。其云單單大嶺者。在黃草嶺之西北。今之薛罕嶺也。詳見玄菟考。四郡之時。薛罕嶺為樂浪。玄菟之分界處也。挹努者。今之烏喇。今豆溝江之北。皆其地也。濁瓴者。今江原道之陳名也。詳見淵稾考。
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"In Kim Busik’s history [aka SS], there is both an East Okjeo and South Okjeo, but it is doubtful that there were two."

**North Okjeo = northern Hamgyeong-do**

"North Okjeo was in the region of the Six Jin (六鎮 'defensive strongholds') in present day northern Hamgyeong-do."

"From Han and Wei onwards, North Okjeo was sometimes controlled by Goguryeo and sometimes by Buyeo: its lord/ownership was not fixed."

"All of Okjeo’s territory was on the remote East Sea coast. To the west they served [Goguryeo]. The territory of Liao[dong] and Pae[su] were not Okjeo."

"When Goguryeo declined, South Okjeo’s territory was taken by Silla."

"When Silla collapsed, the territory of South Okjeo was wholly occupied by Balhae."

"When Balhae collapsed, the territory of South Okjeo became occupied by the Jurchen."

"When Goryeo flourished, the territory of South Okjeo was temporarily [re]taken but soon after lost [again]. After that it was overrun by the Yuan."

"The territory of both the Seongjo-yongheung [['from where] the sacred ancestors - the founding Yi lineage - arose'] and the Six Jin was wholly restored and the old territory of North Okjeo became ours."

"According to the YJSR, Taejo [Yi Seonggye] opened [the region] up to the Duman-gang (豆滿江) and established the seven prefectures of Gong, Gyeong, Gil, Dan, Cheong, Hong and Ham (孔・鏡・吉・端・青洪・咸). Sejong also established the four eup (邑) of Hoeryeong, Jongseong, Onseong and Gyeongheung (會寧・鍾城・穗城・慶興). According to the Bogam/Baojian (寶鑑), in the first year of Danjong (端宗) [1452] City Onseong (穗城) [in?] Hamheung (咸興), and they
established Musanbo (茂山堡).
Annotation: Gong-ju is present day Gyeongwon (慶源 [northeastern North Hamgyeong-do]). From the time of Former Han, North Okjeo was already the former territory of Joseon so it was named Okjeo. From the time of Jin emperor Hui (晉惠 [r.290-307]) it became for a long time lost borderland; it was only restored [to Korea] in our [current Joseon] dynasty. Is this not wonderful?! (Jeong 疆域考;沃沮考)

「乃遼史、明一統志、今之盛京志、皆以今遼東之海城縣。謂之沃沮，不亦謬乎。」
"The Liaoshi, Ming-Yitongzhi and present day Shengjingzhi (盛京志) all say that Haecheng-xian (海城縣) in present day Liaodong was Okjeo. Is this not a mistake?"

2. YeMaek 蔘貊
In the sections "YeMaek-go" and "YeMaek-byeoigo" Jeong respectively distinguishes between the continental YeMaek/WeiMo attested in Chinese sources, and the central peninsula YeMaek straddling the regions of Chuncheon and Gangneung. The former he equates with the polity of Buyeo, recorded in Korean sources as 'North Buyeo' whilst the latter he divides between the Chuncheon 'Maek' and Gangneung 'Ye'. According to Jeong, the Chuncheon 'Maek' is simply a derogatory namesake, whilst the Gangneung 'Ye' are identified with the destination of (North) Buyeo king Hae Buru's (解夫婁) 'going east' - although in absolute terms it is south - and thus implicitly identifiable as 'East Buyeo'.

※ This hypothesis fails to explain how this works with Okjeo and Goguryeo both located in between.

2.1 Continental YeMaek/WeiMo - "YeMaek-go" 蔘貊考 (aka North Buyeo)

「薔貊者，本北狄之種，我邦疆域之內，本無此名。」
"The YeMaek (薔貊 Ch. WeiMo) were originally a group of the Beidi (北狄 'Northern Di') [peoples]. [Those YeMaek] in our territory originally did not have this name."
[Cites: Guanzi 管子, Shiji "Xiongnu-zhuan" 史記匈奴傳, Hanshu "Huozhi-zhuan" 貨殖傳 and Erya-shu 爾雅疏]
Part II - Historical geography - Jeong Yak-yong - YeMaek

「識者，地名也。貊者，種類也，東北曰貊，正東非貊也。」
"Ye (識) is a place name. Maek (貊) is a type [of people]. The northeast is Maek. True east {i.e. peninsula Korea} is not Maek."
[Cites: Zhouli 周禮, Mencius 孟子, Shiji "Xiongnu", Hanshu "Chaochu-zhuan" 寫錯傳, Xu Shen’s 許愼 Shuowen-jiezi 說文解字, Yan Shigu's 顏師古 Hanshu annotation, and Dongsa-gangmok.]

- Argues if the Mo attested in Zhouli referred to the Korean (三韓) Maek, as asserted in Yan Shigu's annotation, then it would be unclear who the Yi (夷), under which they are classified refers to.
[Hanshu 高帝紀上: [Annotation] "師古曰 貨在東北方，三韓之屬皆貉種類也，音莫客反。"]
- The description of Mo territory in Mencius as barren does not match the fertile land of Chuncheon.
- Semantic etymological explanation of the Mo/Maek character given in Shuowen-jiezi refers to fur clothing worn by northern (steppe) peoples: the case is the same for Mohe/Malgal (靺鞨).
- Jeong reasons Ye must be a toponym, likely a hydronym because of the 'water' radical in the character.
- Notes that 'Ye' was used in the title of kings (i.e. 'king of Ye'), whereas ethnic signifiers such as Yi (夷) or Maek were not.

「歷考前史，貊貊者，北夫餘之地也。後世謂之豆莫婁。」
"Examining previous histories, YeMaek is the region of North Buyeo. Later generations called it Doumolou (豆莫婁 두막루 K. Dumangnu).
[Cites: HHS, SGZ, Jinshu 晉書, Weishu 魏書 and Shanhaijing-zhu 山海經註]
"Annotation: North Buyeo is present day Kaiyuan-xian (開原縣 {northeast Liaoning}). To the west it bordered with the Xianbei: it was the original location of the YeMaek/WeiMo." (Jeong 當域考:貊貊考)
北夫餘者，今之開原縣也。其地西接鮮卑，此貊貊之本地也。

「前漢之時，北夫餘王解夫婁。東徙江陵，此江陵所以為貊也。」
"During the Former Han period, the North Buyeo king, Hae Buru (解夫婁), went east {aka south} to Gangneung (江陵). This is why Gangneung became Ye (識)."

"Annotation: Concerning the region of North Buyeo, at the time of Hae Buru it was Ye-guk (識國): from Hae Mosu and after it was Buyeo-guk. Consequently the Buyeo accounts in the Han and Wei histories all said that it was 'old Ye' (古識) land and that the fortress was the old Ye fortress. Clearly then, formerly it was Ye. Did the Ye king of old [i.e. Hae Buru] not go to Gangneung? Details are in the "Buyeo-go" {except there isn't one.}" (Jeong 當域考:貊貊考)
按北夫餘之地，其在解夫婁之時，為識國。其自解暮徹之後，為夫餘國，故漢、魏諸史，皆
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以夫餘立傳，而其地曰古遼地，其城曰古遼城。明前此而爲遼也。古之遼王，非徒于江陵乎，又詳夫餘考。

※ Gangeung is, of course, south of any continental location, but it is reasonable to understand that ‘east’ had connotations pertaining to the peninsula, so to move eastwards could imply moving south into the peninsula, in this case specifically the eastern side of the mountains. This is made clearer in the final statement of the "YeMaek–byeol’yu-go" below contrasting Hae Buru’s eastward movement with Jumong’s going south.

"Annotation: The Wei and Jin histories all speak of the Buyeo king’s seal text reading 'Ye king seal'. The people of Gangneung obtained a seal when tilling their fields and it [said] 'Ye king seal’ so this was the old seal of Hae Buru. This is without doubt." (Jeong 縣域考:棗貊考)

「解夫婦既徙而北夫餘之地，仍稱棗貊。」
"After] Hae Buru had already gone [east/south], the territory of North Buyeo was called YeMaek (棗貊)."

「句麗之先，亦出夫餘，故中國諸史，唯以句麗爲貊。」
"Before [Go]guryeo, [the YeMaek had] also given rise to Buyeo and so the Chinese histories equated [Go]guryeo as Maek."

「貊之別種，又有所謂梁貊者，至王莽時，爲句麗所滅。」
"Another kind of Maek were referred to as LiangMaek (梁貊): during the time of Wang Mang they were destroyed by [Go]guryeo."
- The LiangMaek appear in the SS Goguryeo Annal. They were likely located close to Gungnae-seong (國內城), and to the northwest of the present day Tongjiajiang (修蒙江) river.

2.2 Peninsula YeMaek - "YeMaek–byeolgo" 墬貊別考 (Gangneung Ye and Chuncheon Maek)

漢魏諸史，以我江陵謂之ขึ้น貊，名實未允，茲爲別考，以別北方之貊貊焉。
"The Han and Wei histories do not attest the YeMaek (貊貊) associated with our Gangneung so here they are treated as a separate section to the northern YeMaek."
2.2.1 Gangneun Ye

"After Hae Buru had gone to Gangneung. Ye people went from Hamheung (咸興) in the north [of the peninsula] to Gangneung further south, and resided in a disorganized fashion in the region of Yeongdong (嶧東, 'east of the mountain chain'). Hae Buru became the Ye king and so Gangneung became Ye."

"[Annotation] [According to HHS and Weishu] the land to the east of the mountains, from Hamheung in the north to Gangneung in the south, was originally all part of Gija Joseon's territory. It took the name Ye (畿) only from the time of Hae Buru." (Jeong 疆域考:畿碣別考)

○邇案此二文。凡我嶧東之地，北自咸興，南至江陵，本皆箕子朝鮮之域，其得畿名。肇自解夫之時也，據百濟本紀，百濟始祖溫祚王，即優台之子，而優台者，北夫餘王解夫之庶孫也，溫祚王以漢成帝鴻嘉三年，立國於懾禮城，則其曾祖父解夫之東徙江陵，當在漢景帝之末年也。自景帝末年，至鴻嘉三年，百二十餘年。蓋我白頭山之脈，南馳千里，為薛罕嶽，為鐵嶽，安嶽南，又南馳千里，為金剛山，為五臺山，江陵西，為太白山。辰韓北，綿亘三千里。無一誠山斷崖，東人謂之人[sic.]幹龍，凡在大幹龍之東者，皆西負太山，東臨滄海。北自北沃沮之地，南至江陵，別為一局，地勢狹窄，歷考諸史，每以此土之人，指之為畿也。北夫餘之地，與此遼遼，若無以相及，然秦漢之時，薛罕嶽，為西北之大路，故畿碣之人，得自北扶餘，南涉兴句，並涉鴨水，遂自今江界渭原之地。東鎮薛罕，轉轍南徙，遂至江陵耳。自今開原縣，至興京三百六十里，自興京，至滿浦四百四十里，又至江界百二十里，又至薛罕嶽三百里，又至咸興二百八十里，又至安邊二百八十里，又至江陵四百七十里。程道了然，其程道總不過二千餘里。"

"At the beginning of Hae Buru's reign, some Ye also submitted to the Wi clan (衛氏 [aka WiMan Joseon]). After Buru had died, Ye lord Namnyeo (南閔) rebelled against Ugeo [of Joseon], went to Liao[dong] and submitted to the Han; this was in the first Yuanshuo reign year {128 BCE} [of Han emperor Wu]."

"[Annotation] In Kim Busik's history. Hae Buru's son is called Geumwa and his grandson Daeso (帶素); their vestiges are clearly in the north. Namnyeo perhaps was a follower of another son, or a hereditary chieftain. [Annotation] [If] 280,000 {followers of Namnyeo} went to Liaodong, there would have been hardly any Ye left in Gangneung, consequently the [Canghai] commandery was established and abolished [within] a few years. The name of Canghai-jun commandery first [appears] at this time. [The theory held by] Koreans that the Canghai lord whom Zhang Liang travelled east to meet was a Gangneung chieftain is not so." (Jeong 疆域考:畿碣別考)

後漢書云，元朔元年，漢君南閔等，畔右渠，率二十八萬口，詣遼東內屬，武帝以其地為蒼海郡。數年乃罷。前漢書武帝紀。元朔元年，南閔等降。為蒼海郡，三年，罷蒼海郡。
"When the Four Commanderies [were established] during the Yuanfeng [reign era], Gangneung was subordinated to Xuantu. After the commanderies were moved during Shiyan, Gangneung came under the control of the Eastern Section of Lelang."

"Before the commanderies were closed during the Jianwu era [25-56], Gangneung already had neither a Chinese official nor local chiefs."

"After this the people of Gangneung summitted to Silla: they did not have the name 'Ye'."

2.2.2 Chunchon Maek (aka Nangnang)

"Concerning the Maek said to be of Chuncheon, there is no [reliable] evidence. Only Jia Dan’s (賈耽) treatise has this theory."

- A peninsula Maek entity is not attested in the earlier Chinese histories.

[Annotation...] At the time of Han emperor Wu, Peng Wu (彭吳) was sent and invaded Usu-ju (牛頭州). At this time there was no Maek-guk. According to the Goryeo-sa geography, Chuncheon was originally Maek-guk: in the 6th year of Silla queen Seondeok [637] it became Usu-ju, also written as Udu-ju (牛頭州). King Gyeongdeok changed it to Sak-ju (朔州), and later to Gwanghae-ju (光海州). During Goreyo it became Chunchen: other names were Suchun and Bongsan (壽春·鳳山). It was subordinate to Anbyeon-bu (隴安邊府)."

"At the end of Western Han, local chieftains in the east [i.e. Korea] called [themselves] Nangnang and occupied Chuncheon (春川). Perhaps these chieftains were originally descendants of the Maek because they still also called [their polity] Maek-guk (貊國)."
"Taking the Baekje Annal, Udo-seong was clearly the/a fortress of Nangnang, but Koreans take the old ruins of Nangnang and say they are those of Maek-guk. It has already be examined. As for the Maek-guk ruins in Chuncheon, the foundation pillar stones of the palace even now still survive, but they are the old remains of Nangnang. Koreans are wrong to say they were Maek-guk.” (Jeong 疆域考: 蕃貊別考)

今據百濟史，牛頭城，明是樂浪之城，而時代亦無前後。東人之以樂浪古墟，謂之貊國古墟，亦已審矣。春川，有貊國古墟。其宮垣柱礎，至今猶存。此皆樂浪古跡，東人誤謂之貊國也。

※ Does not expand on the original suggestion that they may have been descendants of Maek, but rather negates it.

「貊國之跡，其在羅濟之史，僅見一二。此皆樂浪之別稱。非有二國也。」

"The traces of Maek-guk are in the histories of Silla and Baekje. Just looking at one or two [examples], they are an alternative name to [Chuncheon] Nangnang. They are not two different countries."

- The two SS examples are: Silla Annal, King Yuri 17th year (40 CE), and Baekje Annal, King Chaekgye (貴妃王) 13th year (298).

「總之識貊之本在於夫餘，其以江陵、春川，謂之貊國者，不覈之言也。」

"To summarize, the YeMaek/WeiMo were originally in Buyeo. Those who call Gangneung and Chuncheon 'YeMaek' have not examined the words [on this subject]."

"[Annotation] Hae Buru originally went east from North Buyeo: Go Jumong went south from North Buyeo, so the Ye to the east of the mountains (嶺東) were not the same stock as [Golguryeo. The Gangneung Ye people were originally descendents of the Hae Buru tribe: it can be said with certainty and there is evidence." (Jeong 疆域考: 蕃貊別考)

後漢書西域傳云，其著[番]舊自謂與句麗同種，言語法俗，大抵相類。魏志云，其著老自謂與句麗同種，言語法俗，大抵與句麗同。衣服有異，男女衣皆著曲領，○箋案解夫婦，本自此[sic.北]夫餘，而東徙高句麗。亦自北夫餘而南徙，則嶺東之貊，其非句麗之同種乎。江陵諸人之本係解夫婦之部落，可謂確然有識矣。

3. Malgal - "Malgal-go" 鞍鞨考

In the "Malgal-go" section, Jeong again distinguishes between the continental Mohe referred to in Chinese histories and the peninsula Malgal appearing in the SS. Aside from the familiar question of conflations, Jeong disambiguates anachronistic usage of the term in the early sections of the SS, which predate its usage in Chinese sources, and in doing so highlights the ethnic lineage of the continental Mohe tracing back to the Sushen.
3.2 Ethnic lineage: Xishen → Sushen → Yilou → Wuji → Mohe

"Before the Three Periods (三代 [Han, Wei and Jin]) the name of these people was Sushen (肅慎). Han and Wei called them Yilou (挹婁); there was no Mohe."

- Draws analogy with the changing names of peoples occupying the steppe.

"According to the Shiji, the Xishen (息慎) arose north of Shun (舜); Dadaiyi (大戴禮) also says [this]. According to the Zhushu (竹書), in the 25th year of Shun, the Xishen came and presented tribute of bows and arrows. According to the Luyu (魯語 - in Guoyu 國語), [after Zhou] king Wu (武王) defeated Shang, the Sushen (肅慎) presented 'hu arrows' ( 같습니다): the preface (?) 郑序 says that King Wu had already conquered the Dongyi and the Sushen came to congratulate him. According to the HHS, the Yilou (挹婁) was the old Sushen polity; the SGZ has the same. According to the Weishu the Wuji-guo (勿吉國) was the old Sushen polity.

Annotation: Although these places are the same, they each have particular names. During Yin and Zhou, there could not be Xiongnu; during Han and Wei, there could not be the Tujue (突厥), and during Sui and Tang there could not be Mongols. This is easily understood." (Jeong 疆域考: 筆者別考)

史記云。舜北發息慎。大戴禮亦云。○竹書云。舜二十五年。息慎求來朝。貢弓矢。○魯語云。武王伐商。肅慎賜杼矢。書序云。武王既伐東夷。肅慎來賀。○後漢書云。挹婁。古肅慎之國也。魏志同。○魏書云。勿吉國。舊肅慎國也。○肅 semp其地雖同。其名各殊。殷周不得有匈奴。漢魏不得不有突厥。隋唐不得不有蒙古。此易知之理也。

[Guoyu 魯語下: "仲尼在陳。有半極於陳侯之庭而死。穀氏之子。亦其長尺有咫。陳惠公使以穀如仲尼之館聞之。仲尼日:'穀之死也遠矣! 此仲氏之死。昔武王克殷。通道於九夷。百蠻。使各以其方歸於賢。使無忘職業。于是盡氏之習於穀。穀之，其長尺有咫。先王欲昭其德之致遠也。以示後人。使永監焉。故名其穀曰肅慎氏之穀。以分大姬。配虞胡公之封諸陳。古者。分同姓以珍玉。展貳也。分異姓以遠方之職賢。使無忘服也。故分陳以肅慎氏之賢。若君使有司求諸故府。其可得也。' 使求。得之金柅。如之。"]

"Also, their land was cut off from us {Korea} and Liao; only the Baishan group (島) bordered with northern Okjeo."

- Cites the seven Wuji (勿吉) groups named in the Beishu.
3.3 Disambiguation of SS's anachronistic conflations of Malgal

"In Kim Busik's SS, from the time of Western Han there is already the name Malgal and also the territory of Silla and Baekje was said to adjoin with that of the Malgal. Falsehood was born of vagueness (鹵莽誕妄). The [usage of the] name is certainly an error, but Korean scholars still respect it as credible history."

"Examining these texts now, those referred to as 'Malgal' [in the SS] were Ye of East Okjeo. The Bulnae Ye (不耐藏) of the Chinese Han histories were called Malgal [in the SS]. During the Tang and Song [periods] the Balhae Dae clan occupied our northern provinces for 300 plus years... The Balhae were [also referred to in SS as] Malgal. For a long time people of Silla had used 'Malgal' to refer to the northern provinces and so it became ingrained habit (口懐耳熟). In the old records northern bandit invaders were all called Malgal. Kim Busik compiled [SS] without checking the facts. [The 'Malgal' referred to in SS should be identified] as follows: during former Han they are Bulnae Ye; from Han and Wei they are Okjeo, and during Chen and Sui they are part of [Go]guryeo: only from the time of Tang emperor Ruizong (唐睿宗 r.684-90, 710-12), do they first become [actual] Malgal and Balhae was termed as such."

(Joinc 彼域考: 蘇歸考)

金富軾之史。生於千載之後，追錄千載之前。無怪其荒舛也。金富軾，南史高宗時人也。高麗毅宗時。譬如李綽、追作漢書，而班固、范曄之書，皆無所傳。則以匈奴為蒙古之部，以遼東為夫餘之地，其亦無足怪矣。今詳其文，所謂靺鞨即東沃沮之譜人，漢史所謂不耐藏，是也。其謂之靺鞨者，唐、宋之際，渤海大氏據我北道三百餘年。遼詳渤海考，渤海者，靺鞨也。新羅之人，久以北道指為靺鞨。口懐耳熟，以為本然。凡其古記有北冠來侵者，悉名之曰靺鞨，而富軾不與其實。編錄 如是也。在前漢時，為不耐藏人 漢、魏以降為沃沮。陳、隋之際，專屬句麗。唐睿宗以後。始為譜[sic:靺鞨]。即渤海安得混稱如是。

「其在句麗之史。靺鞨肅憚。錯雜稱之。有若靺鞨之外。別有肅憚。」

"In the Goguryeo Annal the Malgal and Sushen are termed in a mixed fashion: it seems as if a separate Sushen [people] were beyond the [peninsula] Malgal."

- Cites the following six entries from the SS Goguryeo annal.
  - King Dongmyeong (東明王) year 1 (37 BCE) - malgal
  - King Gukjo (國祖王) year 69 (121 CE) - sushen
  - King Dongcheon (東川王) year 20 (246) - sushen
  - King Seocheon (西川王) year 11 (280) - sushen
  - King Jangsul (長壽王) year 56 (468) - malgal
  - King Munja'myeong (文孝明王) year 16 (507) - malgal

句麗史云。東明王元年。漢元帝建昭二年。至卒本川。結廬居之。在鴨綠水北。其地連靺鞨部落。靺鞨畏服。不啟犯。○國祖王六十九年漢安帝建光元年。冬。肅憚使來獻紫狐裘及白
4. Early Goguryeo

4.1 Jolbon - "Jolbon-go" 卒本考

「卒本者，四夫餘之一也，即高句麗建國之初基也。」
"Jolbon is one of the four Buyeo [entities]. It was the first base for the establishment of Goguryeo."

「卒本故地，在今興京界內。魏書所謂秣升骨城是也。」
"The former territory of Jolbon is within the borders of present day Xingjing (興京). In the Weishu it was called Geshenggu-cheng (秣升骨城 K. Heulseunggol-seong)."

[Annotation] The former territory of Jolbon must be to the southeast of {or 'in southeastern'} present day Kaiyuan-xian (開原縣). As for the location of the two rivers crossed [by Jumong] [the river he crosses during his escape, and the Biryu-su close to which he establishes his capital], 10+ 里 to the south of present day Kaiyuan-xian, [where] Kaiyuan was formerly Buyeo, is the Qinghe (清河), the lower waters of the Zhannihe (占泥河) which flow westwards into the Dalinghe (大遼河). When Jumong first fled [Buyeo] and was pursued by soldiers, the place where fish and turtles are said to have formed a bridge, is the present day Chinghe river (清河水); it is also called Pushushui (普遜水 K. Bosul-su) [this name only occurs in the Tongdian and SS; in the latter, the name is accredited to the Weishu account but the extent Weishu has only 'a large river' 一大水]. Crossing the Chinghe and travelling around 200 里 southeastwards, one reaches the northern [extent] of Jiantingshan (尖頂山) which is intersected by a river, the upper waters of present day Hunhe (渾河) [and?] the lower waters of the Naluhe (納綠河). As for the Biryu-su (沸流水) north of present day Xingjing, five rivers join circling Xingjing, they [flow] southwest; also flowing northwards is the Suzihe (蘇子河 [same as the modern Suzihe]), which [flows] west into the Hunhe: this [Suzihe?] is [the
Biryu-su]. As the five rivers are close to one another it is not known which is the Biryu. But Jolbon must be the territory between the rivers to the north of Xingjing; it cannot be sought elsewhere." (Jeong 疆域考:卒本考)

卒本故地，要在今開原縣之東南，涉二水之處。開原古扶餘。今按開原縣南十餘里，有清河，即占泥河之下流。西入大遼河者也。朱蒙始逃，追騎在後，則其所謂魚籠成橋者，今之清河水是也。又其所謂漁澤水者，既渡清河，東南走近二百里，至尖頂山北，有一河中橫，即今涑河之上流。納綠河之下流也，其所謂沸流者，今興京之北。五河合流，繞興京而西南，又北流為蘇子河，西入瀋河者，是也。五河相近，不知何者為沸流。要之卒本者。今興京之北隔水之地。不可以他求也。

"[Annotation] Kim Busik took Jolbon to be [on the border of] the [Gao]gouli-xian county attested in the Hanshu geography [as subordinate to Xuantu], but that Xuantu was to the west of the Great Liao [dynasty]'s eastern capital, so is completely wrong. Kim took •West Xuantu for •North Xuantu: how could he not be wrong. •West Xuantu was originally to the southwest of North Buyeo, but the histories say that Jumong [fled] southeastwards from North Buyeo: how could [this contradiction] be explained?" (Jeong 疆域考:卒本考)

金富軾以卒本。為漢志所謂句麗縣則是矣。其以玄菟謂在大遼東京之西則大非也。金以西玄菟，認之為北玄菟，何得無誤。西玄菟在北扶餘之西南。諸史謂朱蒙。自北扶餘東南。行至卒本者。又何解矣。

「句麗之都卒本。實不過四十年。惟其始祖廟在焉。」
"As [Goguryeo’s capital, Jolbon lasted no longer than 40 years: only the court of the founder [Jumong] was there."

「乃自鄭麟趾之史。忽以今成川。謂之沸流。其後竟以成川。謂之卒本。」
"From Jeong Inji’s history (Goryeo-sa), suddenly present day Seongcheon (成川 [modern South Pyeong’an-do province]) was said to be Biryu (沸流). Subsequently [Seongcheon] was said to be Jolbon."[74]

「今詳沸流諸文。其說立破。不難辨也。」
"Now examining carefully the various references to Biryu, this [Seongcheon location] theory quickly collapses. It is not difficult to demonstrate."

4.2 Gungnae-seong - "Gungnae-go" 國內考

「國內城者。句麗三京之一。即自卒本。始徙之地也。」
"Gungnae-seong is one of the three [Goguryeo capitals [Gungnae-seong, Hwando and Pyeongyang]; it is the first place that followers [went to] from Jolbon."

[74] Goryeo-sa has Seongju (成州) rather than Seongcheon. 巻五十八:志卷第十二:地理三:北界:安北大都護府:寧州: "成州本沸流王松讚之故都。太祖十四年。置剛德鎮。顯宗九年。改今名。為防禦使。後為知郡事。別號松讚【成魅所建。有溫泉。"
"The location is present day Chosan-bu (楚山府) a little to the north of the [Yalu] river. Hwando-seong is no more than 200 li to the northeast."

- Supports this in part through information cited in SS geography that the distance between the Goguryeo fortresses first captured by Li Ji (李勣) to the north of the Yalu, said to include Gungnae-seong, and Pyeongyang was 17 stations (驛); Jeong calculates the distance between stations at 30 li giving the figure of 510 li, and then compares this with an already known distance between Pyeongyang and Chosan (楚山) on the Yalu, of 500 li.

"According to the Tongdian, the Maja-su is another name for the Yalu. It originates from Baek-san and passes to the south of Gungnae-seong; [flowing] westwards it joins with another river, the Yannanshui (鹽駕水 K. Yeomnan-su). The two rivers join and [flow] southwest entering the sea at Anping-cheng... According to the Tongzhi (通志), the Tongji-jiang (修家江) is the former Yannanshui: it originates from Fenshui-ling (分水嶺 K. Bunsu-ryeong) of Changbaishan, flowing south it joins with the Yalu, and travels more than 500 li, circling Fenghuang-cheng (鳳凰城) and entering the sea to the southeast. An Jeongbok said that the Tongjiachian is clearly the Yannanshui.

[Annotation] The Yannanshui is the Tongjiachiang, so Gungnae-seong is clearly on the Yalu before it joins with the Tongjia, this is in Chosan-bu to the north of the river:"

通典云。馬駕水。一名鴨渌水。源出白山。經國內城南。又西與一水合。即鹽駕水也。二水合流。西南至安平城入海。唐書高麗傳亦云。○通志云。修家江。即古鹽駕水。源出長白山之分水嶺。南與鴨渌水會。行五百餘里。繞鳳凰城。東南入海。安慶福云。修家江。明是鹽駕水。○舊案鹽駕水。既是修家江。則國內城。明在鴨水修家江未合之前。其在楚山府北隔江之地。不既明乎。

「乃金氏撰史。忽以國內。為不而故城。」
"Kim Busik’s SS mistakenly has Gungnae being the former site of [Lelang-jun’s eastern county] Bu’er (不而)."

- The SS conflates the Guadizhi (括地志) statement that Bunai-cheng (不耐城) became Gungnae-seong, with the Bu’er (不而) county of Lelang’s eastern section.

※ See above in the Xuantu section.

「至我興地之書。又以鴨綠之南。麟州故城。疑之為國內城。」
"Our [Korean] geography works posit that [Gungnae-seong] was the site of former Rinju-seong (麟州故城) south of the Yalu."

"..Annotation: Rinju is present day Rinsan-bo (麟山堡) in Ujjii. Li Ji’s (李勣 (594-669)) memorial [to the emperor] says clearly that Gungnae-seong was to
the north of the Yalu. Present day Rinsan-bo is clearly to the river’s south. How can this be correct? Further, according to the Tongdian, the Yalu passes Gungnae-seong and then joins with the Tongjiang (Tongjiang), but present day Rinsan-bo is at the mouth of the Yalu where it enters the sea. This theory is a mistake and has been quickly smashed.” (Jeong 疆域考:國內考)

Jeong 疆域考:國內考: “鑲案麟州者。今義州之麟山堡, 李敏奏文。國內城明在鴨水之北, 今麟山堡。明在河南, 安得以此當之乎。況通典, 鴨水經國城, 乃與修江合流。而今麟山堡, 在鴨水入海之口, 其說之謬, 可立破矣。”

「近世東儒, 又任指遼遠之處, 疑其為國內城。」 Recent generations of Korean scholars suggest distant locations in Liao[dong] could be Gungnae-seong.”

"According to the Munheon-big, Yu Gye (俞槃) said that Wula-shancheng (兀剌山城 K. Ollal-sanseong) is the site of ancient Weinayan-cheng (尉那巖城 K. Wina’am-seong [given in the SS as the location of Gungnae-seong]). According to the YJSR, going north from Angto-guja of Cho-san (楚山之央土口子) [if] one crosses both the Yalu and the Pozhu (鴨鶴婆豬) rivers then in the centre of a large plain is a fortress named Wuci-shancheng: it is 270 li from Cho-san... According to An Jeonbok, the Han (漢) pronunciation of wula (兀剌) was the same as weina (尉那)... Jeong Yak-yong Annotation: if Wuci-cheng was 270 li north of the Yalu then how could the Tongdian and Tangshu say that the Yalu passes to the south of Gungnae-seong?! Gungnae-seong was clearly beside the Yalu at a place overlooking the river. Even though the pronunciation of Weina and Wuci are close, [the location] unfortunately does not match with the Tongdian."

According to [Yi lk’s] Seongho Saseol, Gungnae-seong was clearly to the west [north] of the Yalu, close to present day Uiju. According to Bak Jiwon’s Yeolha-ilgi (熱河日記), crossing the Yalu, one heads to Jiulian-cheng (九連城). All around are bright mountains and clear rivers. It also says, during the [Go]guryeo period, there was a capital here called Gungnae-seong.

Jeong Yak-yong Annotation: Gungnae-seong was originally in a remote and perilous location of deep forests and huge valleys, but Jiulian-cheng [is in a place of] bright mountains and clear rivers. How can groundless rumours (道聽塗說) be taken to indicate that [Jiulian-cheng] was Gungnae-seong?! " (Jeong 疆域考:國內考)

Jeong 疆域考:國內考: "文獻備考, 俞槃曰, 兀剌山城, 即古尉那巖城, 興地勝賢云, 自楚山之央土口子, 北渡則鴨鶴婆豬二江。大野之中有城, 名兀剌山城, 距楚山二百七十里。四面壁立。帳[sic: 帳]西可上。高麗恭愍王欲破北元, 以我太祖爲東北面元帥。擊東寧府。同知李兀魯帖木兒, 間太祖至。移保是城。○安隸福雲, 按漢音兀剌, 與尉那同。俞言近是,
○鑑案：兀剌城，在鴨水之北二百七十里，則髙麗、唐書，謂鴨水經國內城南可平。國內城明在鴨水河邊，臨水之地，尉那、兀剌音雖相近，恐與通典不合也。
星湖儒說云，國內城，分明在鴨水之西。近於今義州者，○朴趾源源河日記云，渡鴨江，即向九連城，舉目四望。山明水清，或云句麗時嘗都此，所謂國內城也。○鑑案：住國城，本在深林巨谷幽險之地，而九連城山明水清。安得以道聽途說，指之為國內乎。

「句麗之都國內城，實不過二百七年，而金氏之史，又有謬說。」
"Gungnae-seong was the capital of [Go]guryeo for no more 207 years. but Mr Kim [Busik]'s history was also mistaken about this."

「句麗垂亡，國內城猶為句麗之大都，為精兵所藏。」
"When [Go]guryeo was on the brink of destruction, Gungnae-seong was still one of its major capitals: elite troops were kept there."

4.3 Hwando - "Hwando-go" 丸都考
「丸都者，句麗之暫都也，山上王兄弟不睦，始營此城。」
"Hwando was [Go]guryeo’s temporary capital. Relations between King Sansang (山上王) and his older brother were disharmonious [so] he started to build this fortress."

「其地，在今滿浦堡北鴨綠江隔水之地高山之上。」
"The location is present day Manpobo (滿浦堡) [in Ganggye 江界] north of the Yalu upon a high mountain."

"Annotation: ...Hwando-seong was on the northern borderland of Ganggye. Jeonghyeon (碩峨) was present day Hongsilazi (紅石礦子). This was the location of Hwando: to the left [east?] it controlled the Yalu; to the right [west?] it blocked the Pozhu and Tonggiamjang (婆竭·修家江 K. Pajeo and Dongga-gang ) rivers: behind it was Taebaek and[?] the western base on Baekdu-san. The two rivers crossed in the front, so the location had four places of defence.

鑑案：東川王之東奔也，踵鴨水歷江界。穿薛罕嶺，到咸興府，又折而北走，至豆溝江邊，此所謂過沃沮千餘里，至肅慎南界也者，丸都城之在江界之北，審矣。碩峨者，今之紅石礦子也，蓋此丸都之地，左據鴨水，右阻婆竭，修家江，背負太山，前有山麓，二水交衿于前，誠四塞之地也。
句麗再都丸都，皆被屠滅，故不能久居

「句麗再都丸都，皆被屠滅，故不能久居。」\[In 342]\ "[Go]guryeo made Hwando its capital for the second time, but [in the same year] everyone was slaughtered and it was destroyed, so they could not reside there for long."

"Annotation: After the main move to Pyeongyang in the 15th year of King Jangsu [427], Hwando became an abandoned capital: Juri (朱理) remained to
guard it.”

彫案長壽王十五年，大移平壤之後，九都遂為廢京，朱理，其留守也。

“丸都之在我滿浦之北，確然無疑。而金氏之史，忽以安市為丸都，』
”Hwando was to the north of our Manpo (滿浦); this is certain, however Mr Kim’s history [SS] wrongly took Ansi as Hwando.

“安市者，遼東之古縣也，在今蓋平縣東北七十里，』
Ansi was a former county of Liaodong; it is located 70 li to the northeast of present day Gaiping-xian.

“乃今盛京之續志及我輿地之舊說，忽又異説棼興，』
Currently old theories of from the Shengjing-xuzhi and our YJSR [concerning the location of Ansi] are muddled together.
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Part III. Early modern popular historiography

Introduction
As will become readily apparent in analysis of the following works, from the early C20th with the onset of Japanese ascendancy and the 1910 annexation of Joseon, the popular ON underwent a process of severe *dichotomization* with the long proud claim to Classical Chinese heritage rejected and replaced by assertions of a greatly augmented non-Sinic identity. Whilst the main components of this newly amplified national identity were distilled from the same textual sources that informed the ON, the revisionist project both embraced, and had to contend with, the newly introduced concepts of 'ethnicity' and 'race', and the new sciences of archaeology, linguistics, and ethnography and folkloristics.
[Chapter 10] Kim Gyoheon (金敎獻 1868-1923) -

*Sindanmin-sa* 神檀民史

1. Dating of the work

Kim Gyoheon's *Sindanmin-sa* (神檀民史 'History of the divine Dan people') is said to have been first 'published' - in handwritten format - in 1904 and 'republished' in 1923. If the earlier date is authentic, then *Sindanmin-sa* was likely influential on the early development of the Daejonggyo religion with which Kim Gyoheon was closely involved, becoming its leader in 1916 following the death of founder, Na Cheol (羅喆 1863-1916): if it was only compiled later then it may itself have been informed by the new movement. Either way, given the seniority of Kim Gyoheon, it is clear that *Sindanmin-sa* was an important influence on the subsequently higher profile historiography of Sin Chaeho.

2. Nature of the work

- It is impossible not to regard *Sindanmin-sa* as primarily a pseudo history as no sources are given and no evidence is presented to support new innovations.

- As seen in the content below, the work is ambitious and systematically structured, however, it is relatively short and light on narrative content. A more comprehensive narrative would only be realized with Sin Chaeho's historiography.

- It is one of the first works to use modern notions, most notably *minjok* (民族) - 'ethnie'.

The content of *Sindanmin-sa* is as follows.75)

| Introduction | 神檀民史凡例 |
| Tables       | 神檀民史表  |
| Minjok lineage | 民族系 |
| Unified southern and northern states lineage | 南北統一國系 |
| Northern territory state lineage          | 北疆國系 |
| Southern territory state lineage          | 南疆國系 |
| Timeline of major events                  | 大事系 |

Book One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part one - Ancient era</th>
<th>神檀民史 巻之一目錄</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sinsi period</td>
<td>第一章 神市時代</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Baedal period</td>
<td>第二章 倍達時代</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Buyeo period</td>
<td>第三章 扶餘時代</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Religion</td>
<td>第四章 宗教</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Administrative systems</td>
<td>第五章 制度</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Literature, technology and arts</td>
<td>第六章 文學技藝</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Customs</td>
<td>第七章 風俗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Introductory overview** 神編民史凡例

Amongst other points, Kim describes his work as a dynasty transcending survey focused on the entirety of the Dangun minjok, and that, written in both the *sadam-che* (史談體 'historical discussion') and *gaehwa-sche* (開化史體 'enlightenment history') styles, it seeks to illuminate the value of the 'divine Dan minjok' focusing on their distinct (固有하다) spirit and beautiful customs.

4. **Periodization**

The main body of the work combines modern historiographic era divisions with previously unattested, newly 'innovated' subdivisions apparently reflecting Kim Gyohyeon’s own distinct conceptualization of Korean history. In the 'ancient era' (上古) section these include - in place of the orthodox three Old Joseon - newly coined *Sinsi, *Baedal and Buyeo periods. For the 'medieval period' (中古) he adopts from Chinese historiographic tradition the terms 'multiple states' (列國) and 'southern and northern kingdoms': whilst this latter period label had already been suggested by the preceding Silhak scholars, Kim’s 'northern' designation also includes Khitan Liao together with preceding Balhae. Meanwhile the 'late

---

75) The *Sindanmin-sa* source text used for the following analysis is Kim (1923).
medieval’ and ‘early modern’ (近古·近世) periods correspond to the Goryeo and Joseon dynasties respectively, but include further subdivisions that incorporate the northernmost foreign Chinese dynasties of Liao, Jin and Qing into Korean historiography.

5. •Sinsi period 神市時代
The •Sinsi period corresponds to Hwan'ung's initial period of governance narrated in the orthodox SY myth.

Kim begins by describing the Nine Yi (九夷) tribes - here un referenced but first differentiated by name in HHS - as occupying the territory between the northern border of Heilongzhou (黑龍州) and the southern peninsula; whilst culture first developed in China with the appearance of Fuxi (伏羲氏). Korea (本地) was left behind.

He then relates a reduced version of the Hwan'ung ascension myth which omits mention of Hwan'in or Hwan'ung; instead simply a ‘celestial god’ (天神) transforms himself to human form and descends to the divine dan tree on Taebaek mountain which Kim specifies as Baekdu-san. This divine human (神人) introduces the first civilizing influences and, governing some three thousand core communities who by turn become partly divine (i.e. the future Korean race), rules for 124 years. Kim interpretsinsi according to its semantic meaning of 'divine market' explaining this to have represented a central place in which his subjects congregated and so were termed as the 'Sinsi clan' (神市氏).

6. •Baedral period 倍達時代
This period commences with the inauguration by the people of the same divine human to a position of 'great lord' (大君主) and the state named as Dan (檀) or in local dialect (方言) 'Baedral'. At first the capital is beneath Taebaek-san, but after 22 years, it moves to Pyeongyang and the state is renamed as Joseon. Kim attributes the temporary move of the capital to Dangjianggyeong (唐藏京), which he locates at Guwol-san, to a subsequent flood. The territory of Joseon is defined as stretching from the Heishui (黑水 aka Heilong/Amur) in the north to Usu (牛首 modern Chuncheon) in the south.

During this time 'Divine empress' Biseogap ( bile-Jako) is credited with overseeing spinning and weaving, whilst crown prince Buru (扶餘) manages pottery, and his previously unattested brothers, •Buso, •Bu'u and •Buyeo (扶•蘇{slight variant character used}扶頡•扶餘) manage medicine, hunting and banqueting rites respectively. Amongst other functionaries, he notably terms historians as sinji (神記), a term attested in both SY and Goryeo-sa.
Three of the princes further construct the mountain fortress at Hyeolgu Mani-san (摩尼山) on Ganhwa-do island.

Meanwhile, the dispatch of crown prince Buru to Tushan (塗山) is narrated as a diplomatic process to negotiate the China–Joseon border after Chinese lord Tang Yao (唐堯) enfeoffs the ‘*Joseon person’ of Usun (虞舜 Ch. Yu Shun) with the three *'western provinces of Joseon’, Yuju, Yeongju and Byeonju (幽·營·弁州 Ch. Youzhou, Yingzhou and Binzhou). China dispatches Xia Yu (夏禹), and Tushan is established as marking the border with the two provinces of Yuju and Yeongju belonging to Joseon territory.

At this time, the largest autonomous groups of Joseon are Buyeo, Suksin, Okjeo, Ye, Maek and Han (韓).

The reign of the first Dan lord (桓君 i.e. Dan-gun) lasts 93 years, his time on earth 217 years, before entering Asadal-san - modern Guwol-san - becoming a god.

Kim skips on in time to the 455th year of the Joseon state to describe a "people’s chieftain" (民長) named *Jo-myeong (朝明) who is a local king of the Pyeongyang region and introduces innovations such as thatching for houses: his descendent Haewol (?鲁孫海月) makes boats enabling sea trade and compiles an agricultural calendar.

7. Ye relocations (遷人的遺殖)

During the same period occurs what Kim describes as "the beginning of our minjok’s overseas activities" in the form of a major relocation of Ye people to occupy former Yin (殷) territory in the wake of the latter state’s weakening during the reign of Xiao Yi (小乙). Occupying the region of Xuzhou (徐州) on the banks of the Yangtze river (揚子江), Kim has them establishing the historical state of Xu (徐 K. Seo). At the same time two other Ye migrations occur: one travelling northeast to establish the state of *Han’ye-guk (寒譯國) on the banks of the Heishui, the other southwards into the peninsula forming the states of Bulnae-guk (不耐國) and East Ye (東遺) in the regions of Hamheung and Gangneung respectively.

8. Buyeo period 扶餘時代

Kim narrates that with the exodus of Ye, its former territory in the modern region of Kaiyuan (開原 Liaoning) became vacant and so a Buyeo lord (扶餘君長) took control and established the state of Ye named as such to satisfy the remaining populous. In a slightly unclear process the name of the original Joseon state, after 1,026 years since its foundation, is eventually replaced by that of
Buyeo.

9. Gija and a second Joseon state
Gija then arrives from Zhou and occupies a vacant region between the *Pyeongyang east of the Luan-shui* (瀋水東平壤 'current Yongping' 永平) and the *Pyeongyang west of the Liaoshui* (遼西平壤 'current Guangning' 廣寧); based on the surviving toponym, this polity was named Joseon, which Kim describes as a "general name for Pyeongyang" (平壤總名).

In subsequent generations, the Gija Joseon state expands and moves its capital to a *Pyeongyang east of the Liaoshui* (遼東平壤) a region Kim identifies as modern Liaoyang (遼陽); the previous capital location is not given. The extent of the territory is described as: to the east bordering Suksin and Okjeo, to the west incorporating the regions of Youji and Shuoyi (幽菊朔易), in the northwest (?) connecting with YeMaek, to the north Buyeo, and to the south bordering with Han (韓) at the Jeotan (猪潭) river. Subsequently Joseon loses 2,000 li to Yan (燕).
※ It is not clear why he locates YeMaek to the northwest.

Kim includes the account of Zhangliang (張良) of the Chinese state of Han (韓) seeking out a 'strong man' (力士) for his revenge attempt against the Qin emperor; thus he obtains a *Ryeo Doryeong (黎道令) of Ye.

The subsequent account of Joseon and the peninsula, including Wi Man’s usurpation, Gi Jun’s flight and establishment of the Samhan, the Namnyeo (南閩) defection and establishment of the short-lived Canghai-jun (蒼海郡) commandery, and the final Han overthrow of Ugeo, all follow orthodoxy.

Kim describes the establishment of the Four Commanderies but narrates that due to their distance from China prove difficult to administer and so are reorganized into the Two Fu (à la SY) and relocated to the west of Liaoshui: no dates are given. As a consequence, the former Joseon territory becomes vacant whilst Suksin and Okjeo restore their - previously unmentioned - lost territory.

10. Writing and historiography
In the first section on literature in the 'Ancient era', Kim narrates that secret texts (秘詞) were initially compiled by sinji (神誌) during the 'time of Dangun' but that these were especially cryptic and complex so they were later translated into Chinese by Dae Yeonghong (大英弘) of Goguryeo who added a preface and annotations.
※ This is based on a SY reference.

[SY 卷第三：史法第三：寶藏奉老普德移庵："又按神誌秘詞序云蘇文 大英弘 序并注則" ]
11. Multiple States period 列國時代
Kim describes the Multiple States period as beginning 2,400 years after the establishment of Joseon (開天) and itself lasting 730 years until the subsequent Silla and Balhae period. Geographically he divides the territory between main southern states consisting of Silla, Baekje and Garak, and the main northern states of Buyeo, Eumnu (挹婁 Ch. Yilou), Seonbi (鮮肥 Ch. Xianbei) and Goguryeo: the boundary between them being delineated by the Jeotan river (southern Geumcheon-gun 金川郡南水), Juk-ryeong mountains (竹嶺 northern Punggi-gun 豐基郡) and Niha river (泥河 western 德清郡和 southern Muncheon-gun 文川郡).

12. The Five Buyeo 五扶餘
A feature of Kim's conceptualization is his emphasis of common ancestry from Buyeo, and by extension ancient Joseon. Thus he describes five Buyeo states, including Silla as a previously unattested *Seo’ul Buyeo (徐苑扶餘). The information he gives is summarized in Table 16 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>polity</th>
<th>aka</th>
<th>location</th>
<th>founder</th>
<th>parentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Buyeo</td>
<td>former Buyeo</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ruler] Hae Mosu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Buyeo</td>
<td>Gayeopwon 迦葉原 - modern Emu 額穆 (Jilin province)</td>
<td>Buru 夫妻</td>
<td>(父) Hae Mosu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolbon Buyeo</td>
<td>Goguryeo</td>
<td>Xingjing 興京</td>
<td>Jumong 朱蒙</td>
<td>(父) Hae Mosu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(卒本扶餘)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(母) Yuhiwa</td>
<td>河伯柳花</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Seo’ul Buyeo</td>
<td>Silla</td>
<td>Gyeongju 慶州</td>
<td>Hyeokgeoese 赫居世</td>
<td>(父) Paso 東神聖母 婆蘇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(徐苑扶餘)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Buyeo</td>
<td>Baekje</td>
<td>Jiksan 秫山</td>
<td>Onjo 温祚</td>
<td>(父) Utae 優台</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. Kim Gyoheon - Five Buyeo.

Kim introduces Hae Mosu as "Great Emperor Dongmyeong of Buyeo" (扶餘東明大帝解慕俊) whose title was Dangun (檀君 "Dan lord"). Buru and Jumong, the respective founders of East Buyeo and Goguryeo, are both born to Hae Mosu but of different mothers. This Buru is clearly a different personage from the Buru of ancient Joseon, though both are technically the son of a 'Dangun'; neither are given the surname Hae. Meanwhile, Baekje founder, Onjo, and his brother Biryu (沸流) are born to Utae, described as a member of the Buyeo royal house (扶餘宗室), rather than Jumong. Silla founder, Hyeokgeoese, is born to *Paso, described as an imperial princess (扶餘帝室女), after she enters Seondo-san (仙桃山) and practices "divine art" (神仙術).

13. Evaluation
By emphasizing the common lineage of all historical subjects to Dangun, Kim's conceptualization is in the mode of jiwang-ungi except for being broader in its inclusiveness of northeastern continental peoples. Aside from Sin Chaeho, this
approach further anticipates both the Altaic solidarity narratives beginning with Choe Namseon, and also the 'Manchuria-centric' treatment of the Korean peninsula that was adopted by colonial Japanese historians.
[Chapter 11] Sin Chaeoho (申采浩 1880–1936)

"History is a legend, an invention of the present. It is both a memory and a reflection of our present." (Mudimbe 1988:195)

Sin Chaeoho is a well known figure: in South Korea he is popularly revered both as an independence martyr and the father of modern historiography whilst in Western academia he is invariably discussed in the context of the 1920s Cultural Enlightenment discourse, but amongst establishment historians - both in and outside of Korea - the greater part of his historiography has largely been dismissed as methodologically lax, reductionist, and overtly subjective.

Most scholarly discussions of Sin's work have therefore tended to focus on his ethno-nationalist ideals and spirit as embodied in his early work Doksa-sillon (讀史新論 'A New Reading of History' - serialized in the Daehan-Mae'il-sinbo 大韓每日申報 from August to December 1908) and the first section of the introductory chapter to his opus magnum, joseon-sanggo-sa (朝鮮上古史 [JSS] 'Ancient Joseon History' serialized in the Joseon-ilbo 朝鮮日報 in 103 installments between 10 June ~ 14 October 1931).\(^{76}\)

For the purpose of this study, the focus will instead be on the substance of his historical narrative up to the early Three Kingdoms, as primarily presented in the first six (of eleven) chapters of joseon-sanggo-sa and the immediate follow-up, joseon-sanggo-munhwasa (朝鮮上古文化史 [JSMS] 'History of Ancient Joseon Culture' serialized in Joseon-ilbo in 40 installments between 15 October ~ 3 December 1931, and then 27–31 May 1932).\(^{77}\)

1. Motivation

As is, again, well recognized, Sin's historiography was a product of the times and driven in response to Japanese colonialization. Unlike Choe Namseon (discussed in the next chapter) who attempted to engage Japanese scholarship, Sin's work was a response only to the political circumstances and was written for the Korean public to both explain how Korea had come to be colonized and of course to instill an ethno-national consciousness that would fuel continued resistance and ultimate revival, which indeed it has successfully done. Sin's answer to the former question was to blame Korea's weakness on its long-term cultural subservience to China: he was also highly sensitive to the colonial connotations the notion of the Han Commanderies had come to signify in light of

\(^{76}\) For example, Henry E. Em's "Minjok as a Modern and Democratic Construct: Sin Ch'ae'ho's Historiography" in Shin and Robinson (editors, 1999). Robinson (1984) and Schmid (1997).

\(^{77}\) Source texts used for this chapter are Sin (1988 and 2007). These are modern Korean translations of Sin's original text.
the modern colonial occupation, connotations previously absent from the ON. To
the extent that this perceived ancient colonization by China - both military and
cultural - partly justified the modern Japanese takeover, Sin sought to revise all
aspects of the ON and establish in its place an explicitly anti-Sinocentric
narrative with - as famously proclaimed in the introduction to Joseon-sanggo-sa
- the Korean ego (我) as the subject. Being thus a response to perceived ancient
and actual modern colonization, Sin’s historiography is inevitably an anticolonial
national history.

2. Characteristics and methodology of Sin Chae-ho’s revisionist narrative
Despite the previous attempt of Kim Gyoheon, Sin Chae-ho was the first truly
revisionist historian to reach a popular audience: as will be seen, his historical
narrative has remained extremely influential on popular history writers up until
today. Whilst being itself architectural, it also remains one of the most
comprehensive, cohesive and inspired archetypes of the 'Northern/Altaic
narrative' type.

The core revisionist characteristics are summarized below.

Geographic
- A major territorial enlargement of the 'original' ancient Joseon domain
  including the totality of continental northeastern China (i.e. Manchuria),
  the whole Korean peninsula and much of the eastern Chinese seaboard.
- A large scale migration theory that sees the hypothesized 'continental
  Samhan' regions of Joseon remapped onto the peninsula resulting in the
  more limited configuration attested in sources.

Ethno-cultural
- Identification and incorporation of the ancient continental Dongyi (東夷
  attested in Chinese sources) as ethnic Joseon.
  - To a certain extent this conflation had already occurred under the ON
    enabling Confucius' praise for the Dongyi to be interpreted as referring
    to the Korean peninsula.
  - Sin extends this to include legendary figures such as Shun of Yu (虞
    禹), Xia king Yu (夏禹) and brothers Boyi and Shuqi (伯夷·叔齊 K. Baek’i
    and Sukje).
  - The complete appropriation of ancient Chinese culture reversing the
    assumed flow of initial transmission. This is effected through the Dongyi
    conflation and by attributing the innovation of core articles of Chinese
civilization such as the Five Elements (五行) encoded in the Hongfanjiuchou
(洪範九疇 'Great Plan'. K. Hongbeom-guju) to Joseon.
• Active rediscovery and emphasis of a non-Chinese heritage.
  • Supported by placing Joseon linguistic identity within the broader
  framework of the Ural-Altaic language hypothesis.
  • Realised through deciphering lost meanings in idu script.

• Nativizes the peninsula Lelang polity as Nangnang-guk and distinguishes it
  entirely from the Lelang-jun commandery.

Methodology
• Rejects the objectivity of orthodox dynastic histories, both Chinese and
  Korean.
  • Explicit criticism of Sima Qian and Kim Busik.
  • Accuses all Joseon dynasty historians of Sinocentric sadae-ju’ui (事大主義
    ‘serving-the-great-ism’).
• Attributes new meanings to Chinese characters by arguing their usage as
  idu phonograms rather than semantograms.
• Proposes generic etymologies for toponyms enabling multiple locations and
  relocations of diagnostic toponyms and hydronyms.

Conceptualization
• Reflecting the times, Sin’s ancient history makes use of modern terms
  such as ‘colony’, ‘republic’, sadae-ism and minjok (‘ethnie’).
• Influence from Sindanmin-sa is apparent but the degree and direction of
  influence between Sin and the Daejonggyo religion is less clear.

3. Benefits of Sin’s narrative and methodology
• The original continental location both aggrandizes ancient Joseon whilst
  insulating the surviving peninsula territory from historical Chinese defilement.
  • It also justifies Goguryeo’s own aggressive continental expansion as a
    ‘restoration’ movement.

• Undermines the orthodox significance of Gija and the Han Commanderies in
  terms of cultural transmission.
  • The polities of Gija and Wi Man, and the Han Commanderies all occur on
    the periphery, enabling the provincialization of these historical events.
  • In turn, this effects the decolonization of Korea’s ancient past, as
    perceived necessary by Sin.

• Based on the premise that orthodox history was actively distorted, Sin is
  free to project his own interpretations and turn the perceived
  ethno-historical bias of sources inside out: e.g. he asserts that the 108
  BCE Han invasion of Joseon was in fact a failure which never reached
further than the periphery.

- The Altaic language hypothesis and associated ethno-cultural implications provide an antithesis to orthodox Sinocentricism and the later attested dominance of Chinese culture.

4. Weaknesses
- The more the continental expanse of ancient Joseon is extended, the harder it is to claim exclusive Korean heritage: the more the level of civilization is exaggerated, the less explanation there is for why it disappeared without a trace.
- Sin sidesteps the latter as he does not discuss material culture or archaeology.

- Sin's portrayal of Joseon as an ancient civilization and the appropriation of Chinese culture to achieve this, means that his history never fully frees itself of orthodox Chinese tradition. He works with the same articles of civilization and in many ways his narrative is just a maximized version of the 'little China' exceptionalism already present in the Korean ON.

- Linguistically, Sin - and all popular historians since - were untrained in the Comparative Method so his etymologies are unreliable, to say the least.
  - However, the etymologies are usually given as secondary rather than primary evidence so they do not fundamentally undermine his hypothesis.
  - Whilst in currency at the time, the Altaic language hypothesis has since been disproven (to the extent that it has not been proven) which does present a more fundamental problem to the assumption of shared ethnic identity between speakers of typological Altai type languages.

- Calling into question the reliability of dynastic sources whilst still relying on them for any information results in a pick-and-mix approach which can no longer be internally proven by the textual sources alone.

- As a professional historian, Sin's work is discredited most by his regular failure to cite sources.
  - He, in fact, rarely invents any facts but simply gives subjective interpretations, but this aspect becomes further obscured by the lack of references.
  - It may have been both his own familiarity with the sources, but also his extreme personal circumstances - being self-exiled in China without any money and active in the resistance movement - that forced him to rely on memory.
• He was also writing in the popular newspaper format rather than for academic journals.

• The academic negligence may also have been encouraged by his negative disposition towards orthodox historiography: even whilst relying on dynastic sources, Sin was attempting to present a new anti-Sinic history and may not have wished to highlight the sources.

5. Periodization
A broad periodization of Sin’s narrative is shown in the Table 17 below and explicated in the narrative summary which follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dangun Joseon 樓君朝鮮  (with three *wanggeomseong capitals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aseura/Asadal = modern Harbin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•Three Joseon 三朝鮮</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•Sin Joseon 貞/辰韓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple States period 列國時代</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•Three Buyeo 三扶餘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Buyeo 北扶餘 Capital at Asadal (Harbin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Buyeo 東扶餘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Buyeo 南扶餘</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four Han Commanderies (Former •Bul Joseon)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goguryeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nangnang-Buk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byeonhan Six Gaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinhan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samhan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three Kingdoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goguryeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baekje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silla</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17. Sin Chaeho - Periodization of ancient history.
6. Sin Chaeho’s narrative of ancient Korea

The following presents an annotated summary of Sin’s narrative of ancient history, primarily drawn from Joseon-sanggo-sa [JSS] but supplemented with additional details given in Joseon-sanggo-munhwa-sa [JSMS]. It is followed by a similar but briefer narrative on the development of writing and early historiography that synthesizes information given in JSMS and the earlier Joseonsa-yeongu-cho (朝鮮史研究草 [JSYC] ’Research notes on Joseon History’), the latter first serialized in the Dong’a-ilbo between 20 October 1924 - 16 March 1925, and then published as a book in 1926.

The *Sudu* Age

Foundation

The Joseon people originally migrated from either the Pamir plateau and/or the region of Mongolia. Their language belonged to the Uralic language family which was divided between a Xiongnu (Göktürk 突厥, Hungarian, Turkish and Finnish) branch and a Joseon branch. In turn, the Joseon branch split between the languages of Joseon (i.e. Korean), Xianbei, Jurchen, Mongol and Tungus peoples.

Reaching Bulham-san mountain (不咸山) - modern Baekdu-san - they named the region ’Joseon’ (朝鮮) which is a later idu rendering of the word for ’light’, reflecting their worship of the sun. This religion is also evident in the royal surname being ’Hae’ (解 idu for hae ’sun’) and the term for king bulgurae (弗矩內 cognate to modern balkda 빛다 ’bright’).

The Joseon people settled beside large rivers called *ari* which became the etymology both to many hydronyms and also the Korean word for ’country’, *nara < *rara < *ari*. The river names include: Arae-gang (阿禮江), Arisu (阿利水), Uk-ri-ha (郁利河), Oyeol-ha (烏列河), Yeol-su (列水), Muyeol-ha (武列河) and the Ap-ja-ha (鴨子河). These are old names corresponding to modern rivers including, on the Korean peninsula: the Amnok-gang, Daedong-gang, Duman-gang, Han-gang and Nakdong-gang, and in Manchuria the Songhua (松花江), Liao-he (遼河) and Luan-he (瀋河).

* Sin is not more precise on specific correspondences.

The first and primary region of settlement by the Joseon people was on the Songhua river around modern Harbin. The etymology of the Manchu name ’Harbin’ is cognate to the Korean word for ’fire’ bul. The Joseon people at first practiced slash-and-burn methods to bring virgin land under cultivation and so these open fields (野地) were termed *bul. Thus the etymology also of many Korean polities and toponyms can be identified as idu renderings of *bul.
including: buyeo (夫餘), buri (夫里), bul-nae (不耐), buri (不而), guk-nae (國內), bul (弗), beol (伐) and bal (發). Thus the Songhua was the first *ari, Harbin the first *bul.

The belief system of the Joseon people was that of Dangun or *Sudu. Based on the belief that the god of light dwelt in the forest of Taebaek-san mountain, in each new region of settlement they established sacred forests called *sudu which has the meaning of ‘sacred dan tree’ (神櫟), rendered in SGZ as sodo (蘇塚)

※ This is the source for the term, however the SGZ account describes these sodo as 'separate settlements' 別邑 rather than forests.

*Dangun (樓君) carries the meaning of 'god of sodo'. Amongst the 54 Mahan statelets recorded in the "Han" (韓) section of SGZ is Sin-sodo (臣蘇塚) which corresponds to *Sin-sudu 'great sodo'. Each *sudu had a dangun [chief]; Sin-sudu had the 'great dangun' whilst the other *sudu had 'lesser dangun'.

At times of war or crisis, a cow would be sacrificed at the *sudu and divinations made from its hoof: this was to be the origin of the Chinese system of the eight gua (八卦) divination trigrams.

The Dangun myth recorded in the SY is largely later invention evidenced by its patriarchal elements and usage of Buddhist terms such as Jeseok (帝釋), Ung (雄) and cheonbu (天符). However, the name of the capital, Wanggeom-seong (王儉城), can be corroborated from other sources:

SS: "Pyeongyang was the abode of Seon’in Wanggeom fortress"

高句麗本紀:東川王:21年: "平壤者仙人王儉城之宅"78)

SY: "2,000 years ago there was Dangun Wanggeom: he established a state [at] Asadal, naming it Joseon."

乃往二千載前 有壤君王儉 立國阿斯達 國號朝鮮

‘Wanggeom’ 王儉 is the idu rendering for imageum (임금 'sovereign/ruler') the title taken by the founder of Joseon later adopted as the name of the capital. ‘Seon’in’ 仙人/先人 is idu for *seonbae (선배)79) which was the term for 'groups of *sudu followers'. (JSS Sin 1988:55)

---

78) The original passage should read "Pyeongyang was originally the abode of Seon’in Wanggeom/平壤者仙人王儉之宅也."

79) Sin’s word is apparently unrelated to the usual Sino-Korean term seonbae 先輩 meaning someone senior by age.
Administrative system

The 'Three Yi gods (三一神) and Five Emperors (五帝)' described in the Shiji "Fengshanshu" (史記·封禪書) originated in an ancient Joseon myth created by the Great Dangun to explain the organization of the universe and applied to the administrative structure of Joseon. The Three Yi of the "Fengshanshu" were named in Joseon language as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>semantographic Chinese</th>
<th>Joseon language</th>
<th>later idu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheon’il 天一 &lt;</td>
<td>*Malhan &gt;</td>
<td>Mahan 馬韓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ji’il 地一 &lt;</td>
<td>*Bulhan &gt;</td>
<td>Byeonhan 卞韓 [also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tae’il 太一 &lt;</td>
<td>*Sinhan &gt;</td>
<td>Jinhan 辰韓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Malhan = 'high sovereign' (上帝)
*Sinhan = 'only one, both above and below heaven' ("天上天下獨一無二" source?)

The Five Emperors were derived from the five gods representing the cardinal directions and the centre.

※ These are delineated in the SGZ "Buyeo" account.

Idu renderings were preserved in the Korean folk game of yut-nori (육놀이).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idu used in yut-nori</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>east 듣가 pig 豬[加] do 刀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>west 개가 dog 犬[加] gae 介</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>south 소가 cow 牛[加] yu 儀 (from the old word for 'cow')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>north 말가 horse 馬[加] mo 毛</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centre 신가 geol 乞 (乞 &gt; gyeon 犬, where 犬使 was used as an official term in the Buyeo period)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus Joseon was arranged into a dual system of Three Capitals and Five Bu (三京·五都). The Three Capitals came to be named after the title of their rulers: Sinhan was the primary capital ruled by a *sin-han 'great king' (大王) or 'great Dangun' whilst Mahan and Byeonhan were secondary capitals ruled by 'secondary kings' (副王).

The location and names of the Three Capitals were as summarized in Table 18.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three Han capitals</th>
<th>modern locations</th>
<th>idu and Sino-Korean attestations</th>
<th>reconstructed original name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Sinhan</td>
<td>Harbin</td>
<td>Busoryang 扶餘梁, Busogap 扶蘇atatype, Biseogap 非西買って, Asadal 阿斯達達</td>
<td>*Aseu *우스 / *Useu-dal 우스달</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bulhan</td>
<td>Haicheng 海城, Gaiping 菜平 (Liaoning)</td>
<td>Odeokjo 五德地, Anjihol 安地忽, Ansi-seong 安市城</td>
<td>*Ari *아리</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Malhan</td>
<td>Pyeongyang</td>
<td>Baek’agang 百牙圃, Nangnang 樂浪, Pyeongwon 平原, Pyeongyang 平壤</td>
<td>*Pyeora *따라</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Simultaneously, the same Joseon territory was also demarcated into five bu ‘regions’ which were ruled by the Three Han kings (or dangun ).

* Sin does not detail which of the five regions was ruled by which of the Three Han.

The organizational structure of the Five Bu pertained also to the military which consisted of five armies: memory of this system has been preserved in the board for the yut-nori folk game.

Joseon was a republican system of government (共和政府 JSMS Sin 2007:89) wherein the lesser jeonggwon (政權) administration changed every three years and the greater jeongguk (政局) every twelve. (JSMS Sin 2007:86)

* No source is given for this.

"For the next thousand years following Dangun, the political system of Joseon was the greatest in the ancient [world] and its cultural development was such that it was imitated by various neighbouring peoples: if those who became [Oj] descendants had protected and expanded its culture militarily, then truly Joseon not only would have occupied the forefront position within the history of Oriental civilization, but would have sole dominance (獨占) over the land of the entire world.” (JSMS Sin 2007:89)

Toponymy

The names of later Korean polities were all originally the names of internal bu regions of Oj. The name Goguryeo/Goryeo carries the meaning of 'middle bu' (中部). Pre-Goguryeo usage is attested in the following examples: ‘gori’ (業離) from the name of North Buyeo king *Yeonggori (寧黃[sic.黃]離玉) attested in SY ( * the character in SY is pung 黃, giving Yeongpung’ri): 'Gori’ (業離) in Weiliüe (魏略 "Buyeo account"), and Gori (古離國) as one of the 70 Samhan statelets [SGZ specifically one of Mahan’s]. The meaning of 'middle' can be derived from
another cognate, Gyeru (桂韜) attested in the *jiu-Tangshu* (舊唐書 "渤海南捷") as the title of the Balhae king. Dae Muye (大武襲), in which it refers to Balhae's 'middle capital' (中京). The original word can be reconstructed as *gauri* (가울이) and is cognate to *gaunda* ( 가운데 'middle') and *gau* (가우 middle of the 8th lunar month). Balhae’s administrative system of five capitals is based on that of ancient Joseon. (JSMS Sin 2007:21-3)

'Joseon' equates to 'Jusin' (州慎[慎] Ch. Zhoushen) attested in *WuYue-chunqiu* (吳越春秋 [compiled Later Han]) and 'Suksin' (肅慎 Ch. Sushen) in *Zuozhuan* (左傳 C3rd) as well as *Shanhai-jing* (山海經). (JSMS Sin 2007:34) It is the original name of Dangun’s state: all orthodox etymologies are false.

During this time, the Liaodong and Shandong peninsulas were connected by land and Bohai sea was a lake. (JSS Sin 1988:65)

**Transmission of civilization to ancient China**

The knowledge with which Xia king Yu (夏禹) controlled flooding on the central China plain originated in OJ, therefore it can be deduced that Joseon must also have had to manage flooding. The person who first developed the knowledge for this in Joseon was named *Maul* (마울); in later times his name was rendered into idu as Paeng’o (彭吳) which gave rise to subsequent conflation with the Chinese Han emissary, Pengwu (彭吳) who is recorded in the *Hanshu* as leading the campaign against YeMaek Joseon and establishing Canghai-jun commandery. (漢書:食貨志下:彭吳穿積矯、朝鮮、置滄海郡). This anachronistic conflation was made in An Jeongbok’s *Dongsa-gangmok* (東史編目 1756) and criticized by Yu Deukgong in *Isip’ildo-hoegosi*. The name *Maul* is deduced from the fact that whilst later people’s veneration of Paeng’o for controlling flooding is recorded in the *Seogwak-jannok* (西郭雜錄 existant?), no such folk tradition is found today but rather in the northwest (of Korea) there was a shrine called *Maul*. (JSS Sin 1988:52)

The tenets of the Sudu religion/philosophy, OJ’s system of governance and knowledge of flood control were all directly transmitted to Xia king Yu, by Dangun’s son Buru (夫婁) when they met on Tushan mountain (塗山).

* Sin does not make entirely clear here which *dangun*, but the strong implication is it refers to the founder of Joseon.

The Chinese legend of how Yu came to obtain the knowledge is recorded in the *Wu-Yue Chunqiu* (吳越春秋:越王无余外傳). In this fantastical account, Buru is not mentioned by name but Yu is instructed on how to obtain a

---

80) As seen above, the conflation was made by Hong Manjong, not An.
jinjian-zhi-shu book (金簡之書 'golden bamboo book') by the self-styled 'Xuan yi Cangshui emissary' (玄夷蒼水使) who appears to him in a dream he has after having sacrificed a white horse. Following his instructions, Yu discovers the jinjian-zhi-shu and from it gains the knowledge to manage the floods as well as introduce other innovations including the well-field field system (井), standardized measures (döe and mal) and seals (印).

※ In the wider context of the passage this is less convincing as he also creates 邑 and 門！

《吳越春秋·越王无余外傳》：“...其德彰彰若斯，豈可忘乎？”乃納言聽諫，安民治室：居衡山伐木，為邑畫作印，橫木為門，調權衡，平斗斛，造井示民，以為法度。鳳凰棲於樹，鸞鳥巢於側，麒麟步於庭，百鳥佃於澤。”

※ Sin refers to the book Yu obtains from Buru as the Huangdi-zhongjing (黃帝中經), but in the Wu-Yue Chunqiu account, the Huangdi-zhongjing is rather the book Yu first consults which tells him of the existence of another book, the jinjian-zhi-shu (金簡之書). e.g. JSMS (Sin 2007:70)

Elements of this legend can be analysed as historical matter. The 'Xuan yi Cangshui emissary' (玄夷蒼水使) refers to Buru: xuan yi/hyeon'i (玄夷 'black yi barbarian') denotes the Hyeon-bu (玄部) administrative region of Joseon which later became the historically attested Hyeonto/Xuantu (玄免) province: Cangshui (蒼水) denotes the region of Changhae: and additionally the Cangshui emissary is described as wearing red embroidered clothing which accords with HHS {※ sic SGZ } description of Buyeo people, that whilst wearing white at home they wore embroidered clothing when visiting foreign countries.

Importantly, from the phrase “內美釜山州慎之功，外演聖德以應天心。” zhoushen (州慎) is an early rendering for 'Joseon', and "the merit of Zhoushen" refers to Buru’s transmission of knowledge.

Finally, the names for various mountains mentioned in the story are all alternative onyms for Tushan, the historic place of meeting between Yu and Buru:

Wanwei-shan 宛委山 refers to obtaining the divine book.
Fufu-shan 覆釜山 refers to meeting Buru (釜=Bu) there.
Mao-shan 茅山 is the original name and a cognate of 塗山 Tushan.
Huiji-shan 會稽山 refers to learning the 'divine way' 神道 there.

※ These seems wholly unconvincing; in the originally text at least two other mountains are also mentioned, Huo-shan 霍山 and Mi-shan 廚山.
Also of note in the Xia king Yu legend is that Yu (禹) was initially tasked with managing the floods by Shun of Yu (虞舜) who was at the time the prime minister (虞舜) under 'Emperor' Yao (堯). In Mencius (孟子·離婁下), Shun is described as being a Dongyi, from which it can be deduced his fiefdom of Yu was part of OJ’s colony (殖民地) of east coast China: Yu 虞 refers to the •U bu (干部) region of the colony corresponding to modern Shandong. (JSMS Sin 2007:59).

※ Sin provides no sources for this hypothesis.

The fundamentals of the Joseon •Sudu knowledge transmitted by Buru were encapsulated in the system of the Five Elements (五行) which went on to become the basis for much of Chinese civilization: Mao Qiling (毛奇齡 1623–1716) later observed that the system of describing all things in groups of 5 or 9 (五行, 五音, 五服, 九歌, 九功, 九山, 九州 etc) did not exist before the time of Xia king Yu. (JSMS Sin 2007:57)

Of particular note, the origin for the Chinese legendary Five Emperors (五帝) represents the application of the Joseon Five Bu system. Here the Chinese word for 'emperor', di, is a borrowing from the Joseon term for a non-hereditary regional 'lord' ga/jie 加:

Chinese 'emperor' 帝 < •ji (支/齊) = Joseon 'lord' ga/jie (大)加

The Joseon term •ji is attested in the titles of various later descendents to OJ:

| Goguryeo (馬加) | Maknii | 莫離支 麥拉支 |
| Silla (5 大臣)   | Jabunhanji | 子黃支 聖泫支 |
|                 | Jehanji  | 聚黃支 親泫支 |
|                 | Alhanji | 調黃支 派泫支 |
|                 | Ilgii     | 壹吉支 伊吉支 |
| Mongol (牧馬)    | Gipaehanji | 奇貝支 奇泫支 |
| (牧羊)            | molizhi | 摩哩支 馬里支 |
|                   | helaoqi | 和老齊 車羅齊 |

Thus the term Huangdi (黃帝 'yellow emperor') was derived from the senior administrative title of the central bu in the Joseon Five Bu system. Whilst the title was originally non-hereditary, this subsequently changed under the autocratic nature of Chinese rule and it came to take on the meaning of 'emperor'. By contrast, in Korea the meaning of ji 支 was eventually forgotten: today its form is chi and it carries a depreciative meaning attested in words such as Namdo-chi, Bukdo-chi, Seoul-chi and sigol-chi. (JSMS Sin 2007:89)
Continental territory
At Joseon’s zenith during C10th-5th BCE areas of the Chinese mainland were colonized by Joseon people who established states including Gojuk-guk (孤竹國 Ch. Guzhuguo) Seo (徐 Ch. Xu). Around the C6th-5th BCE, a Joseon man named Bulliji (弗離支) conquered a swathe of territory in the modern day regions of Zhili (直隸 (Beijing)) Shanxi (山西) and Shandong (山東): close to Daixian (代縣 in Shanxi) he established the self-named state of Bulliji-guk (弗離支) which is attested in Zhoushu as Bullyeogji (令支 Ch. Fulingzhi) and in the Shiji as Liji (離支 Ch. Lizhi). (JSS Sin 1988:64)

Joseon support for the Chinese Han 漢
Prior to the emergence of the Chinese Han, the territory of China was broadly divided between colonial possessions (서민지) of Joseon in the northeast and the Miao people (苗族) to the southwest. The rise of the Chinese Han began with Xuanyuan’s (軒轅氏) defeat of the Miao which was effected only through military support from Joseon: the land made available to the China Han was regarded as their own centre, and so Xuanyuan assumed the equivalent administrative title of huang-di. (JSMS Sin 2007:87)

Decline
After more than a thousand years at its zenith, Joseon inevitably fell into decline leading to internal strife and the gradual loss of its expansive continental territories including the colony of east coast China. As a consequence of this weakening, the gogi (고기 'old records') account quoted in the Samguk-yusa records that the dangun sovereign removed the capital to Asadal in 1286 BCE, that is the 1048th year of Joseon (calculated from the 2333 BCE foundation date). Later tradition associates Asadal (阿斯達) with Guwol-san mountain (九月山) in Hwanghae province of the Korean peninsula: whilst the etymology is correct (discussed below) the original Guwol-san/Asadal was in what became Buyeo, the vicinity of modern Harbin. This location of Asadal is supported by the gogi account that "the descendent of Dangun moved to Buyeo" (JSMS Sin 2007:94).

※ The problem with this is: was 'the vicinity of Harbin' not where the Sinhan and Joseon capital already were? If not, then Sin does not give an alternative location from where the capital was removed: it was moved from a Pyeongyang, but where this Pyeongyang was, if not Harbin, is unclear.

In the Samguk-yusa the move to Asadal is attributed to the arrival of Giija, however, Giija’s coming did not occur until more than a century later in 1122 BCE and so in reality had no bearing on this earlier event.
Gija / Jizi 箕子
The context to the legend of Gija coming east to Joseon was the climax of a long running 'religious war' in China between adherents to the Sudu-based Five Elements introduced by Xia king Yu, and a native Chinese tradition which later became encoded as the Sixty-Four Hexagrams (六十四卦). Early on, King Yu's son, Qi (啓), faced a rebellion by Youhushi (有扈氏) based in Henan which was in part motivated by resistance to the Five Elements 'religion of Yu': the uprising was suppressed only with support from Joseon's colonial territory of China's east coast.

Under these circumstances King Qi compiled the Gangshu (甘書 aka Shangshu 尚書) which denounces Youhu and implicitly advocates the *Sudu system in the passage where the Xia king Qi is recorded as saying, "Youhushi insults the Five Elements and has abandoned the Three Zheng (三正)."

[Shanshu 尚書:夏書:甘書: "有扈氏威侮五行，怠棄三正，天用剿絶其命"]

From another section of Shangshu the Three Zheng can be identified as:
zhengde 正德 = The way of the Three Gods (三神의道 referring to the Three Han?).
liyong 利用 = The Five Elements (五行: 水火金木土)
housheng 厚生 = Field system (井田)

※ The context of the passage does not in any way identify these as the Three Zheng.

[Shanshu 尚書:虞書:大禹謨: "禹曰：「於！帝念哉！德惟善政，政在養民。水、火、金、木、土、穀，惟修：正德、利用、厚生、惟和"]

Much later in 1834 BCE, a now despotic Xia was overthrown by Yin (殷 aka the Shang dynasty 商) with the support of Joseon, and the Three Zheng were maintained. Several centuries on again, however, the emergent Western Zhou king, Ji Chang (姬昌 aka King Wen 周文王), created the Sixty-Four Hexagrams as an indigenous 'Chinese' religio-philosophical system to rival the Five Elements of Joseon and Yin. His son, Ji Fa (姬發 aka King Wu 周武王), then defeated Yin which had suffered under its last king, the despot Zhou (纣). During this time, royal scion Gija, had been imprisoned by King Zhou and was subsequently released by King Wu.

Gija had the possibility of serving under the new Zhou dynasty but on the principle of only serving one lord chose to go to OI, the spiritual homeland of his Five Elements religion. Although King Wu had become the religious leader of the Sixty-Four Hexagrams, before Gija left he asked him about the
Five Elements and so Gija explained the basic tenets of *Sudu summarizing them through the analogy of the flood control method as the Hongbeom-guju (洪範九疇 [explicated in the “Zhoushu” book of the Shangshu 尚書:周書:洪範])

Accompanied by some 5,000 followers, Gija went to Joseon where he was enfeoffed by the *Sinhan dangun with the region of *Bulhan centered on the capital of Odeokji (aka *North Pyeongyang) in modern Liaoning: this was to become a hereditary dynasty of some forty generations. However, the claim in the Shiji that Gija was enfeoffed with seemingly all of Joseon by Zhou king Wu is false: the enfeoffment was by Joseon and in reality he became only a lord of the westernmost *Bulhan territory.

[Shiji 史記:世家:宋微子世家:“於是武王乃封箕子於朝鮮而不臣也”]

**Baek’i and Sukje 伯夷·叔齊**

Contemporary to the events of Gija were the brothers Baek’i (Ch. Boyi) and Sukje (Ch. Shuqi) who were princes of Gojuk-guk (孤竹國 Ch. Guzhuguo) then a part of Joseon’s colonial territory in eastern China. Whilst Gija was ethnic Chinese, the brothers were ethnic Joseon. However, both their ethnicity and the fact that they were princess of Gojuk-guk was purposefully omitted from Chinese records.

In contrast to the Chinese accounts that Baek’i and Sukje spontaneously left Yin because their late father had designated the younger Sukje as heir and neither could accept this unnatural order, it was in fact due to the tyranny of King Zhou (封) that they sought escape. Similarly, they did not simply respond to a summons by Zhou king Wen or go there on a whim: rather it was actually after his death that they risked their lives in meeting with the subsequent Zhou king Wu in order to remonstrate him against his preparations to attack and overthrow the Yin dynasty, however, their efforts were to no avail and they were only spared due to intervention by Jiang Taigong (姜太公).

Being of Joseon ethnicity, Baek’i and Sukje’s actions were not motivated merely for the benefit of Yin to which they owed no immediate loyalty, but rather they were seeking to avert the impending clash of civilizations they foresaw between Joseon and China. As Joseon fell into decline and disunity, it was unable to respond to the challenges faced in its colonial territories. Baek’i and Sukje’s song recorded in the Shiji was composed upon their returning to Gujuk-guk: this was a last attempt to help warn the people, before they themselves succumbed to starvation.

(史記:伯夷列傳: ”登彼西山兮，采其薇矣。以暴易暴兮，不知其非矣。神農，虞，夏忽焉沒
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The Three Joseon 三朝鮮 or continental 'Northern Samhan' 北三韓

period

The original unified Joseon at first split into the territories of the Three Han (Samhan) rulers of *Sinhan, *Bulhan and *Malhan, rendered into idu as Jinhan (辰韓), Byeonhan (卞韓) and Mahan (馬韓) respectively, and referred to in the Chinese records as Jin (真), Beon/Bal (番/發) and Mak (莫). These then, are the original 'Three Joseon' (三朝鮮) which were contemporaneous to one another, however, later during the medieval Joseon dynasty, the term 'Three Joseon' was misapplied to a diachronic conceptualization of Dangun, Gija and Wi Man Joseon periodizations: this latter usage is false.

The former Three Capitals of unified Joseon continued as the *wanggeom-seong capitals of the Three Han: *Sinhan at Busoryang (扶餘梁 modern Harbin), *Bulhan at Odeokji (五德地 near modern Ansi-seong in Liaoning) and Mahan at Baek'agang (百牙岡 modern Pyeongyang).

Colonial states

The colonial territory of Joseon fragmented into autonomous ethnic Joseon states. Amongst those in the modern Shandong region the three strongest were Rae (莱 Ch. Lai), Eom (廬 Yan) and U (嵎 Yu). Eom and U were overthrown by Zhou king Cheng (周成王, King Wu’s son) whilst Rae survived several centuries longer until being overthrown by the Qi (齊) state. Ethnic Joseon states in the region of Yanji (燕蓟 aka modern Beijing) included Gojuk-guk (孤竹國 Guzhuoguo) in modern Yongping-fu (永平府) and Yeongji (令支 Lingzhi) in Shuntian-fu (順天府) whilst in Shanxi (山西) there were states composed of Joseon and Mongol groups such as Jeokguk (赤國 Chiguo aka 赤狄) and Baekguk (白國 Baiguo aka 白狄). (JSMS Sin 2007:120-4)

The territory of the states of Seo/Xu (徐國 aka 徐戎) and Hoe/Huai (淮國 aka 淮夷) were also a part of former colonial Joseon. Seo/Xu king Eon/Yan (偃) was a righteous king maintaining Joseon customs: he had the opportunity to overthrow Zhou when under corrupt king Mu (穆王) but failed to even try, and Xu was later overthrown by a combined Zhou-Chu (楚) alliance. (JSMS Sin 2007:127-35)

※ It is not clear why Sin describes this territory as 'colonial' if it had belonged to Joseon since earlier than the existence of ethnic Han China and was populated by ethnic Joseon/Buyeo people.
**Sinhan/Jinhan resurgence**

Something is clearly wrong with the following chronology based on the conflicting dates given by Sin in the JSMS (Sin 2007:138-41).

In 634 BCE (Dangun 1700) King Jin (辰王 – here used as a personal title JSMS Sin 2007:139) of *Sinhan led a temporary alliance of former Joseon states including Gojuk-guk, Dongdo (東度 Ch. Dongtu, aka 'Tungus'), the Xianbei and Yeongji to confront the Chinese state of Qi (齊) which had itself become the new hegemon in northern China.

In 706 BCE (Dangun 1628 – only 72 years later!) King Jin first defeated Yan before going on to subjugate Qi and be recognized as suzerain by the Chinese multiple states of Zhou (周) Lu (魯), Wei (衛), Cao (曹) Song (宋) and Xu (許). When submitting tribute Qi referred to King Jin as 'Xuan-di' (玄帝 'black emperor'); this term was derived from the northern administrative region of *Sinhan/Jinhan being the 'Hyeon bu' (玄部), later termed Hyeonto/Xuantu (玄兖). (JSMS Sin 2007:140)

* Sin gives the location for this region as modern Fengtian (奉天 aka Shenyang) and Xingjing (興京) which seem rather far south compared to Harbin.

The Chinese sources, namely *Shiji*, recorded this event referring to the *Sinhan led alliance as the Shanrong (山戎).

[Shiji 史記:齊太公世家: 
二十三年，山戎伐燕，燕告急於齊，齊桓公救燕，遂伐山戎，至於孤竹而還。燕莊公遂送桓公入齊境。桓公曰:「非天子，諸侯相送不出境，吾不可以無禮於燕。」於是分封割燕君所至與燕，命燕君復修召公之政，納貢於周，如成康之時。諸侯聞之，皆從齊。"

史記:匈奴列傳: “秦襄公伐戎至岐，始列為諸侯。是後六十有五年，而山戎越燕而伐齊，齊釐公與戰于齊郊。其後四十四年，而山戎伐燕，燕告急於齊，齊桓公北伐山戎，山戎走。”]

* In these accounts there is no mention of King Jin, nor of Qi being made suzerain.

**Gi dynasty 畿朝 expansion and the *Sin-Bulhan alliance**

In 434 BCE (Dangun 1900), the 35th descendant of Giia came to power and he expanded the Gi dynasty fiefdom over *Bulhan before taking control of its capital, conquering the Xianbei and overthrowing Gojuk-guk to the west. At its zenith, the Gi dynasty’s borders reached to the Han-gang river in the south, Buyeo to the north, Yan (燕) to the west and Jinhan’s southern region of the Dandan-daeryeong (單單大領) mountains to the east. It maintained three 'Pyeongyang' capitals of which the southernmost was the location of modern
Pyeongyang.

The original Gi dynasty territory occupied what had been the former *Ryang Bu (良部) administrative region of southwest Joseon and hence it acquired the name of Nangnang (樂浪 Ch. Lelang); this is what is referred to in the *Hanshu as 'Nangnang Joseon' (漢書:地理志下:樂浪朝鮮).

※ Sin fails to explain, if the Gi dynasty territory expanded to the Han-gang river on the Korean peninsula, what had happened to *Malhan/Mahan.

As the Gi dynasty expanded, internally the ethnic Joseon population was weakened. Externally, meanwhile, both *Sinhan and *Bulhan came under increasing pressure from the Chinese and Xiongnu powers, and so the two *han amalgamated into a close alliance, for which reason Chinese sources record them as Jinbeon (真番 Ch. Zhenfan). Thus the original 'Three Joseon' became 'Two Joseon' (jinbeon and Mal Joseon) plus the Gi dynasty.

Failure to attack Yan 燕

At its height, early 4th century BCE, the Gi dynasty would have been strong enough to defeat neighbouring Yan: that *Daebu minister Ye (大夫禮) counseled against preemptive action led to the terminal weakening of the Joseon peoples vis-à-vis the ascendency of an increasingly unified China.

※ This refers to the *Weilüe account cited in the SGZ "Mahan" section.

"Even if we supposed that Joseon’s strength was weaker than Yan’s (燕), at the time Yan and the Gi dynasty (箕朝) were two alpha males (雄 or 'heroes') who could not accept the other; Joseon and China were two minjok unable to live together: if [there were] 'true men of noble principle' (志士) then it would have been right, of course, to spill blood, hasten the citizens' awakening, and determine the fate (宿命) [of their country] upon the blades of swords by which to establish a model for future generations. In addition, at that time, Joseon was big and Yan small: Joseon was strong and Yan weak: need it be said, even if Yan did not rise up [first] it was the best (갈만하다?) time for Joseon to arise [against Yan]?

Ignorant of this, *Daebu Ye (大夫禮) preferred the temporary poor man's (구처스럽다) peace and idleness, and so avoiding war obtained peace which allowed the enemy state’s circumstances to develop: consequently [the Gi dynasty] lost Gojuk (孤竹) and had the Xianbei snatched from them: it can be said that the threat of Qin Shi Huang (秦始皇), the tyranny of Xiongnu Maodun (冒頓) and the invasions of Wi Man (衛滿) and Han emperor Wu (漢
武帝) all led on from Daebu Ye’s actions. Consequently Daebu Ye should not be described as a ‘meritorious subject’ (功臣) but as a criminal. [He] can be said to be a criminal of the Gi dynasty, a criminal of Buru (夫妻) and an eternal ( 언제) criminal of Joseon." (JSMS Sin 2007:156)

Yan invasion of Jinbeon Joseon

Not long after, *Sinhan was led by a powerful though unnamed king under whom it expanded northwards into Yan occupying the territories of Youbeiping (右北平 K. Ubukpyeong, modern Yongpingfu 永平府), Yuyang (漁陽 Eoyang, modern Beijing) and Shanggu (上谷 Sanggok, modern Datongfu 大同府 of Shanxi province) in effect temporarily restoring the former Joseon polity of Bulliji (弗離支).

Weakened, the Yan king sent the crown prince as a hostage to *Sinhan. However, when this powerful *Sinhan king died, the prince returned to Yan; after becoming king himself he then sent general Qin Kai as a fake hostage. This event is recorded in the Shi ji but only stating that Qin Kai went to the hu (胡) who excessively trusted him. (JSS Sin 1988:74)

※ There is no evidence of Yan having sent hostages, and reading hu for Joseon is Sin’s interpretation.

Upon his return, Qin Kai then led an invasion of the allied *Sinhan and •Bulhan territories. This successful campaign retook from •Sinhan the northwestern territories Youbeiping, Yuyang and Shanggu, and from •Bulhan the historical regions of Liaoxi (modern Lulong county of eastern Hebei 盧龍 縣) and Liaodong (modern Liaoyang 遼陽).

The Weilüe records [contained in SGZ] that Yan took more than 2,000 li (里) of territory, but this is likely an exaggeration because Shi ji records only half that, and the Weilüe is an unreliable source. (JSMS Sin 2007:158)

※ Sin narrates this war without reference to the Gi dynasty although, according to his own account, at least most of the •Bulhan territory would have belonged to Gi, and the Weilüe account also describes the ruler of Joseon belonging to the Gi lineage.

In the JSMS he mis-attributes the 1,000 li figure to the Yan shijiia 世家, but in JSS had it correctly being from the Xiongnu biography section.

[Shi ji 史記: 朝鮮列傳: "全燕時嘗略屬真番朝鮮"]
[Shi ji 史記: 匈奴列傳: "燕有賢將秦開，為質於胡，胡甚信之，歸而襲破走東胡，東胡卻千餘里。與匈奴刺秦王舞陽者，聞之孫也。燕亦筑長城，自遼陽至襄平，置上谷、漁陽、右北平、遼西、遼東郡以拒胡"]
Qin unification, the first mass migration and assassination attempts

Following the 254 BCE unification of China under the despot Qin Shi Huang (秦始皇), the Qin long wall was constructed to guard primarily against the Xiongnu to the immediate north.

※ The 254 BCE date is from JSMS (Sin 2007:160).

Being built across former Joseon territory however, it employed the forced labour of many ethnic Joseon people: subjected to such exploitation and hardship, this triggered the first large migration of former *Sihan and *Bulhan peoples eastwards into *Malhan. This migration is evidenced in the SS's description of 'the remnant people of Jinhan’ establishing Silla.

[SS:新羅本紀: "辰韓遺民”]

Because Qin had established the no-go zone of depopulated land between itself and the Gi dynasty, across the region of Liaodong the routes of migration had to be by sea or across the mountains in order to go around it. 

(JSMS Sin 2007:167)

Chinese sources record two failed assassination attempts against Qin Shi Huang. The first was by Jing Ke 荊軻 of Yan. The second was orchestrated by Zhang Liang (張良) of the Chinese state of Han (韓). The Shiji account records that Zhang carried out his attempted ambush of Qin Shi Huang with a strongman (力士) he obtained from the Canghai lord (倉海君) in the east.

[Shiji 史記·留侯世家: "良嘗學緱淮陽。東見倉海君。得力士。為鐵椎重百二十斤。秦皇帝東遊，良與客狙擊秦皇帝博浪沙中，誤中副車。秦皇帝大怒，大索天下，求賊甚急，為張良故也。良乃更名姓，亡匿下邳”]

In the Shiji account 'Canghai lord' (倉海君) refers to the Changhaee king. Although omitted from the Shiji the 'strongman' he introduced to Zhang was popularly known to be named Yeo (黎氏 Ch. Li) as this is found in the old novel Chenyu (塵餘). The name Yeo (黎) was an alternative Chinese rendering of Ye (遞 Ch. Hui/Wei) underlining his Joseon ethnicity. Although the ambush failed, it had the effect of weakening Qin Shi Huang’s authority. (JSMS Sin 2007:174)
Multiple States 列國 period

Term apparently borrowed from Sindanmin-sa periodization.

There is no clear demarcation for the end of the Three Joseon and beginning of the Multiple States periods as it was a gradual transition occurring between the beginning of migration from the continental territory lost to Qin China and the 108 BCE Han invasion (narrated below).

During this period the notion of the Three Joseon lost currency and through a process of further fragmentation the historical Korean polities emerged as independent states, including (not in strict order) those of Buyeo, the Wi dynasty (traditionally known as 'WiMan Joseon'), Nangnang-guk, the peninsula Three Han (Samhan), East Buyeo, Goguryeo, Baekje, *Gara (aka Gaya) and Silla.

Establishment of Han and rise of the Xiongnu

Shortly following the 202 BCE establishment of the Chinese Han (漢) dynasty, the Xiongnu arose to the north. The Xiongnu spoke a language related to Joseon and had originally belonged to the unified Joseon state: the term for the Xiongnu 'belief system' of hyudo (休屠 Ch. xiu tu) was a translation of *sudu whilst the notions of the hyudo-wang (休屠王 Ch. xiu tu-wang) and •Three Dragons (三龍 source?) were equivalent to dangun and the Three Gods (三神) respectively. (JSS Sin 1988:60)

Before the expansion of the Xiongnu under Maodun (冒頓), •Sinhan enjoyed a final resurgence during which it once more regained the territories of Yuyang (漁陽 modern Beijing) and Shanggu (上谷). (JSS Sin 1988:77) Coming to power, Maodun at first feigned subordination to •Sinhan but after being ordered to relinquish territory he led a devastating campaign eastwards which brought the border up to the core surviving •Sinhan territory of Buyeo. In the Shiji this episode is recorded as a conflict between Maodun and the Donghu (東胡) bringing the Xiongnu border up to YeMaek Joseon (稜絡朝鮮).

[Shiji 史記:匈奴列傳: "冒頓上馬，令國中有後者斬，遂東襲擊東胡。東胡初輕冒頓，不為備，及冒頓以兵至，擊，大破滅東胡王，而虜其民人及畜產，既歸，西擊走月氏，南並樓煩、白羊河南王。[侵燕代] 悉復收秦所使蒙恬所奪匈奴地者，與漢闗故河南塞，至朝那、膲候，遂侵燕、代，是時漢兵與項羽相距，中國罷於兵革，以故冒頓得自彊，控弦之士三十餘萬，置左右賢王，左右谷蠡王，左右大將，左右大都尉，左右大都尉，左右大都尉，左右都尉。匈奴謂賢曰「屠者」，故常以太子為左屠耆王，自如左右賢王以下至當戶，大者萬騎，小者數千，凡二十四長，立號曰「萬騎。」諸大臣皆世官。呼衍氏，韓氏，其後有須卜氏，此三姓其貴種也。諸左方王將居東方，直上谷以往者，東接穣絡、朝鮮."
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The region which Maodun conquered in fact belonged to the •Dongtu (東屠 K. Dongdo) state, a relatively autonomous polity under •Sinhana which had originally been the •Baek Bu (白部 'white section') administrative region of OJ, and now incorporated the Loufan (樓煥 K. Nubeon) and Wuhuan (烏桓 K. Ohwan) peoples.

* JSS (Sin 1988:77) describes this purely in terms of •Sinhana/Sin Joseon: JSMS describes the •Dongtu as a more autonomous border polity subordinate to •Sinhana.

Wi Man 衛滿

Following Han China’s military defeat to Maodun during which Liu Bang (劉邦 aka Emperor Gaozu) was captured, Yan king Luwan (盧範) defected to the Xiongnu by whom he was enfeoffed as the •'Dongtu king' (東屠王 JSMS Sin 2007:184)

(史記: 高祖本紀: "盧範聞高祖崩, 遂亡入匈奴")

Wi Man (衛滿) was one of Luwan’s followers from Yan: he subsequently crossed the Pei-su border river and settled in the western frontier region of the Gi dynasty’s Nangnang polity, in the area which had previously been the 'empty zone' during the Qin dynasty (秦故空地).

Presently Wi Man launched an attack on the Gi capital usurping the kingship and putting Gi king Jun (準) to flight. This attack was only possible because Wi Man had support from the Xiongnu. (JSMS Sin 2007:184) Although explicit mention of Xiongnu participation is omitted from the Chinese records, Wi Man’s close alliance with the Xiongnu can be inferred from the later description of the short-lived dynasty as having been the 'right shoulder' of the Xiongnu.

(漢書: 韋賢傳: "裂匈奴之右肩")

Wi Man’s capital of Wangheom (王險 Ch. Wangxian) was in the same location as both the former Gi dynasty’s northern capital and the original •Bulhan capital which had been known as Pyeongyang: this led to the later conflation of Wangheom with modern Pyeongyang although Chinese sources never equated Wangheom with Pyeongyang. (JSMS Sin 2007:187)

Migrations, Nangnang-guk 樂浪國 and relocation of the Three Han

The expansion of the Xiongnu and overthrow of the Gi dynasty caused further migration of the Joseon people from the former continental territories of •Sinhana and •Bulhan eastwards and south into the Korean peninsula.
Meanwhile *Malhan/Mal Joseon, in order to avoid the foreign incursions had already moved its own capital further south on the peninsula to its subordinate territory of Woji-guk (月支國): this was in the region of modern Gongju, not Iksan as became associated in later tradition. (JSS Sin 1988:82)
With the original term for a king *Mal-han adopted as the name of the state itself - rendered into idu as Mahan (馬韓) - the sovereign was then termed *sinhan recorded in Chinese sources as *jin-wang (辰王 'jin king' - [attested in SGZ]).

In the region of the former *Malhan capital, modern Pyeongyang, there now arose a new authority under the Choe clan (崔氏) which controlled 25 statelets: this was named Nangnang-guk (樂浪國) and was distinct from the continental Nangnang territory of the Gi dynasty.
※ Sin does not explain the origins of Choe: it might be inferred that he had roots in continental Nangnang but it is not discussed.

The border between Nangnang-guk and Mahan was the Imjin-gang river.

With refugees pouring in from former *Sinhan and Bulhan, Mahan allowed them to resettle in the region of the Nakdong-gang river in the southeast of the peninsula designating the autonomous regions of *Jinhan-bu (辰韓部) and *Byeonhan-bu (卞韓部) respectively (Sin 1988:83).

※ Jinhan and Byeonhan are never attested in sources with the bu suffix. JSS describes both Jinhan-bu and Byeonhan-bu as established in 'the coastal region right [aka east] of the Nakdong-gang', it seems one of these is an error as the phrasing would imply a contrast in their locations, with Byeonhan most likely located to the 'left' of the Nakdong-gang.

The rulers of Jinhan and Byeonhan also assumed the title of *sinhan. As a result of the continental upheavals, Mahan went from being the weakest of the northern Three Han to the strongest of the peninsula Three Han.

Upon the loss of continental Nangnang to Wi Man, Gi king Jun fled south by ship to Woljiguk and there usurped the kingdom of Mahan but within a few generations was finally overthrown, ending the Gi dynasty. (JSS Sin 1988:81)

※ Whilst JSS is keen to emphasize that the Gi dynasty did not continue for long, JSMS seems more sympathetic to the Gi dynasty omitting the later demise of the Gi house and lamenting rather that its 1,000 year rule of continental Nangnang only came to an end because of Maodun's support for Wi Man. (JSMS Sin 2007:188)
North and East Buyeo

North Buyeo, East Buyeo and Goguryeo were all established within the former territory of continental *Sinhan (*Sin Joseon): the term 'Buyeo' was derived from *bul meaning a capital fortress or city and was used as another name for *Sin Joseon. Following the rise of Maodun, the notion of Dangun and *Sinhan began to wane and eventually lost legitimacy to the point that the state’s name was changed to 'Buyeo'.

* This builds on the vagueness of the Joseon to Buyeo name change narrated in Sindanmin-sa.

The division of Buyeo into 'North' and 'East' is alluded to in the Buyeo foundation story when Buyeo king Hae Buru, heeding the advice of his *sangga (相加) Aranbul (阿蘭弗) moved his polity to Gaseopwon (加葉原) in the east, there establishing East Buyeo. This region was called *Gasira, rendered into idu as Galsana (葛思那) and later under Buddhist influence as Gaseopwon (加葉原). In historical reality, Hae Buru’s move to the east was likely precipitated by the loss of legitimacy as a 'Great Dangun' ruler in the wake of the defeats to Maodun. (JSS Sin 1988:94)

Two other historical facts that can be deduced from the foundation story are that Hae Buru made his adopted son, Geumwa (金娃), crown prince, and that after the move east a new ruler, Hae Mosu (解摹漱), established himself in the old capital of Buyeo proclaiming himself the son of heaven: Hae Mosu’s polity took on the name North Buyeo. Hae Mosu subsequently fathered Chumo/Jumong, but was of no immediate relation to Hae Buru.

* This interpretation contrasts to SY and later that of Yun Naehyeon.

The capital location of North Buyeo remained that of former *Sin Joseon’s *Aseura81) in the vicinity of modern Harbin. North Buyeo is also the state briefly referred to once in the SS (高句麗本紀: 琉璃王) as Hwang’ryong-guk (黃龍國 'yellow dragon state'). At its zenith, North Buyeo briefly subjugated the Ye and Xianbei peoples but its power subsequently waned and it was ultimately absorbed by Goguryeo. (JSS Sin 1988:97)

East Buyeo aka Galsana / Okjeo

The East Buyeo capital was established in the region of Galsana, modern Hunchun (珲春 - now in Yanbian Korean Autonomous Prefecture, Jilin province). The original name of this region was *Gasi-ra where gasi has the

81) Sin also suggest that *Aseura is preserved in the hydronym Ussuri, despite the Ussuri river being a great distance from the region of Harbin (JSS Sin 1988:96).
meaning of 'forest' as attested in old Korean words *gat* (가) and *gasi* (가시); thus the name meant 'forest kingdom' (森林國). *Gasira* was variously rendered into idu as Galsa-guk (가思葛國 SS:大武神5th "葛思王"), Gaseulla (*加瑟羅 SS"何瑟羅"), Gaseora (*迦西羅). Aseoryang (*阿西良) and later under Buddhist influence, as Gaseopwon (*加葉原). (JSS Sin 1988:95)

* The source for these names is unclear.82)

In Chinese histories this same polity was recorded as Woju/Okjeo (沃沮) which, according to the *Manzhou Yuanliu-kao* (滿洲源流考), was a translation of the word *waji* (라지) meaning 'forest' in Manchu. This name was likely created by the Yilou/Eumnu (挹婁) people who were ethnic Ye with a language distinct from the other multiple states.

* Source for language is SGZ 三國志：挹婁傳："其人形似夫餘，言語不與夫餘、句麗同".

*Gasira* was divided in the middle by the Tuman river: thus there was *North Galsa* (北葛思) / North Okjeo, and *South Galsa* (南葛思) / Okjeo.

* North and South Okjeo 北南沃沮 are attested in SGZ and HHS.

During the reign of Geumwa’s son, Daeso (大素) East Buyeo was defeated by Goguryeo king Dae-Musin and lost its southern territory (JSS Sin 1988:91). Daeso’s two sons then fought over the land and it became divided: the younger son (apparently won) and stayed in the original capital, after which it was referred to as *North Galsa*, or *'Southern East Buyeo’* (南東扶餘 source?). (JSS Sin 1988:96)

* Although not made explicit, it seems in Sin’s narrative the originally southern half of Galsa/Okjeo/East Buyeo would have been lost to Goguryeo, so it is the northern half which became termed *'Southern [East] Buyeo’* distinguishing it from North Buyeo.

**Establishment of Goguryeo**

Chumo (aka Jumong) was the son of Hae Mosu and a contemporary of Wi Man, born c.200 BCE and not 58 BCE as is wrongly recorded in the SS. Chumo was conceived out of wedlock between Hae Mosu and the daughter of a local chief in the vicinity of the *Ari* river (the modern Songhua). When Yuhwa’s illicit union with Hae Mosu was discovered she was thrown into the Ubal-su (優勃水) river and left for dead but was discovered by the East Buyeo king. Hae Geumwa (解金蛙) and taken back to the palace where she subsequently gave birth to Chumo. (JSS Sin 1988:98)

* The following narrative is primarily based on the second of three variant

---

82) Despite having searched for them in Chinese sources, and both SS and SY.
accounts of the Baekje foundation story given in the SS Baekje Annal. The events of Chumo’s early life largely follow those recorded in Yi Gyubo’s *Dongmyeongwang-pyeon* but without the supernatural elements. (Sin historicizes the myth but does not attempt to rationalize it.)

Before fleeing south he married a daughter of the Ye clan (禮氏) and left her pregnant.

After reaching Jolbon Buyeo (卒本扶餘) he started a new relationship with the widow Soseono (召西奴), the daughter of Yeontabal (延陀渤); Soseono had previously been married to an illegitimate descendent of Hae Buru, Utae (優台), with whom she had had two sons, Biryu (沸流) and Onjo (溫祚). Using her wealth, Chumo established a new capital at Heulseunggol (絳升骨) and named the new kingdom *Gauri* which was rendered into idu as Goguryeo (高句麗) with the meaning of ‘middle capital’ (中京) or ‘middle kingdom’ (中國). Led by general Bubunno (扶芬奴), Goguryeo subjugated Jolbon Buyeo forcing King Song Yang (松讓) to submit. *Dongmyeongwang-pyeon* names Song Yang as the king of Biryu (沸流) which can be understood as the Buyeo term for Jolbon Buyeo; other sources misinterpret ‘Song’yang' as the name of a polity, but this is wrong. Goguryeo further overthrew the state of Haeng’in-guk (彊人國) to the southeast of Taebaek-san mountain (太白山 aka Mt Baekdu) and took a part of the territory of ‘North Gasira’; this last campaign is alluded to in the Gwanggaeto Stele inscription where ‘North Gasira’ is referred to as East Buyeo.

(廣開土大王碑： "東扶餘 舊是 鄰牟王 屬民")

King Song Yang’s daughter was married to Chumo’s son, Yuryu (儒流 aka Yuri), not to Chumo as is recorded in some sources. When Song Yang died without an heir Jolbon Buyeo was fully absorbed into Goguryeo. (JSS Sin 1988:100)

三國志:魏書:高句麗傳: "其國有王，其官有相加、對慮、沛者、古羅加、主簿、優台丞、使者、卓衣先人，尊卑各有等級”
SS:高句麗本紀:太祖大王: "十六年秋八月易思王孫都頭以國來降以都頭爲于台"(recorded as 優台 in *SGZ*)
SS:百濟本紀:溫祚王: "一云始祖沸流王其父 優台 北扶餘王解扶婁度孫母召西奴 卒卒人延陵勃之女始歸於 優台 生子二人長曰沸流次曰溫祚 優台 死寡居于卒本後朱蒙不容於扶餘以前漢建昭二年春二月南奔至卒卒立部號高句麗娶召西奴為妃其於問 墓帝築有內助故朱蒙寵接之特厚侍沸流等如己子及朱蒙在扶餘所生禮氏子優留來立之爲大 子以至嗣位馬是於沸流謂第 溫祚曰始大王避扶餘之難遂歸至此我母氏頓家財助成邦業其助成邦業其勤 功校 功多矣及大王興世國家屬於樓留吾等徒在此簿簿書如尤賢不如奉母氏南遊卜地別立國都遂與弟率黨盡渡漢 帶二水至樓留忽以居之北史及隋書皆云東明之後有仇台築於仁信初立國于帶方故地漢 遼東大 功校 守公孫度以女妻之遂為東夷強國未知孰是"
Antiquity of Goguryeoo

Goguryeo’s foundation by Chumo occurred previous to the Han overthrow of the Wi dynasty: the orthodox date of 37 BCE given in the SS is false. Following its 668 CE overthrow, the SS quotes a no longer extant bigi ‘secret record’ text (the Goguryeo-bigi 高句麗秘記) as stating Goguryeo had existed for 900 years.

Another piece of evidence is that whilst the SS records Gwanggaeto as having been a 13th generation ruler the Gwanggaeto Stele has him as the 17th showing that several generations were missed out and that the SS dates cannot be trusted.83)

The Beishu "Gaoli" (高麗傳) account records that Mak’nae (莫來) led an attack against Buyeo: this Mak’nae was in fact Goguryeo king Dae-Juryu (aka Dae-Musin), and ‘Mak’nae’ is an alternative rendering of his personal name Muhyul (撫恤) with the etymology:

{Mak’nae = Muhyul (撫恤)} < •muroe meaning ‘hail’ and by extension ‘god’

The SS record of Dae-Juryu conquering East Buyeo {in CE 22} describes the same event.

Final proof for the antiquity of Goguryeoo is that one of the counties of the Han Xuantu Commandery was named Gaogouli-xian 高句麗縣 (Hanshu 高句驤) from which it can be understood that Goguryeo was already in existence at the time of the Han invasion.

Namnyeo’s 南開 rebellion and the Canghai-jun commandery 滄海郡

During the reign of Han emperor Wu, two separate invasion attempts were made against two separate entities of former Joseon: the first was supporting the rebellion of Namnyeo against Goguryeoo or East Buyeo (* depending on

83) The stele records Gwanggaeto as a 17th generation (十七世孫) descendent. Sin’s figure of the nineteenth ruler, Gwanggaeto, being the 13th generation descendent of Jumong is based on SS, in which the 4th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 10th and 18th rulers are recorded as having been siblings to their respective preceding kings. In the case of the 7th and 8th kings, Chadae (次大王, Suseong 遠成) and Sindae (新大王, Baekgo 伯固), this information differs to that found in the earlier Chinese sources: Suseong is recorded in HHS as the son of the preceding 6th king, Gung (宮, aka Taeto 太祖大王); Sindae is recorded in SGZ as the son (子) of Gung - which would make him a brother or half-brother to Suseong - whilst HHS records him as Suseong’s son. Additionally the SY king list, records (as an annotation) Sindae as having murdered the ‘siblings’ Taecho and Chadae, without mentioning his own relationship to them, thus potentially making him a non-related usurper.
variant interpretations - see below) and associated with the Canghai-jun commandery, the second was against the Wi Man dynasty, then under the rule of his grandson Ugeo and culminating in the establishment of the Four Han Commanderies. Chinese sources record both invasions as being against 'Wi Man Joseon' - implying the whole of Joseon - under Ugeo, but this is false.

Broadly there were two inter-ethnic conflicts: the first between Joseon people (Namnyeo vs Goguryeo/East Buyeo) and the second between Han Chinese (Han dynasty vs Ugeo).

[Variant 1] Namnyeo’s rebellion - according to JSS:

The first invasion attempt occurred in the context of a rebellion led by Namnyeo (南閔) against Goguryeo. Namnyeo was the •Galsa king (曷思王) of southern East Buyeo; he married his daughter to the Ye king, Bulnae (不耐識王), - attested in the "Ye" chapter of SGZ - but by this time, East Buyeo had been subjugated by Goguryeo. (JSS Sin 1988:111 check p119)

※ There is no attestation of this marriage event.

Forming an alliance of the Nangnang statelets with similar grievances against Goguryeo, Namnyeo sought the support of Ugeo but Ugeo refused knowing that they could not match the strength of Goguryeo; Ugeo further blocked the passage of Namnyeo to Han China to request support as he was afraid Namnyeo might betray secrets of his kingdom to China.

Namnyeo instead reached China by ship and gained support from Han emperor Wu who dispatched an army led by Pengwu (彭吳) tasked with the plan of defeating Goguryeo and making the former territory of East Buyeo into the Canghai-jun commandery. However, the campaign was unsuccessful and after a protracted nine year war with Goguryeo the Chinese withdrew. During this time Canghai-jun was temporarily established for eight years between 134-126 BCE.

Because this was a military defeat for China, details were omitted from the Shiji with only the false claim that "Pengwu destroyed Joseon": this exaggeration was at least revised in the Hanshu to read only that "Pengwu penetrated YeMaek Joseon." (JSS Sin 1988:113)

Alternative version(s) of events according to JSMS:

{2nd variant}
The grandson of former Yan king Luwan (盧範). Tuozhi (佗之) led the Dongtu (東屠) in surrender to Han emperor Jin (漢景帝). This broke the
communication channel between the Xiongnu and Wi Man weakening the latter; thereupon the various former Joseon states began planning restorations, the term for which was *damul* (多勿). Han China, however, was distracted by its own internal rebellions of Wu (吳) and Chu (楚) and so was unable to offer support and instead paid Wi Man off with silks to maintain stability. (JSMS Sin 2007:190 sources?)

Later, around 134 BCE (Dangun 2200) Wi Man’s grandson, Ugeo became the •Lelang king and in his arrogance invaded the multiple states of Joseon. In response •Changhae king Namnyeo led 280,000 followers to Liaodong and whilst engaging with Ugeo sent messengers to China requesting an alliance with Han emperor Wu; thereupon Wu dispatched an army led by Pengwu-jia (彭吳賈). However, Han China soon began to treat Changhae as a vassal state rather than an ally, causing relations to turn hostile and for several years Changhae was at war with both China and Ugeo simultaneously. (JSMS Sin 2007:191)

* This fails to explain the relationship between China and Ugeo at this time: one would assume they were hostile or were they allied against Changhae?

{3rd variant}

In 128 BCE (Dangun 2206) Ye king Namnyeo requested help from Han China to lead a campaign against East Buyeo; in response Pengwu-jia led a campaign against East Buyeo with the aim of establishing the Canghai-jun commandery on the land of Ye, however after a three year war, the Chinese retreated in defeat. HHS records that Namnyeo led a rebellion against Ugeo but this is wrong; Namnyeo was ethnically Ye and had no relationship with Ugeo’s predominantly Chinese state. (JSMS Sin 2007:198)

* This variant fails to explain the position of Ugeo during the campaign.

[Shiji 史記:平準書: "彭吳賈滅朝鮮，置濤海之郡，則燕齊之間靡然發動"]
[Hanshu 漢書:食貨志下: "彭吳穿纖賈、朝鮮，置濤海郡，則燕齊之間靡然發動"]
[HHS 後漢書:東夷列傳: "元朔元年，濤君南闢等畔右渠，率二十八萬口詣遼東屬國，武帝以其地為濤海郡，數年乃罷"]

**Han overthrew of Ugeo**

In 109 BCE Han emperor Wu intended to begin a new military campaign against East Buyeo and so dispatched the emissary She He (涉何) to Ugeo to demand passage of the Han military. Meeting with refusal, on the return journey, just before reaching the Paesu border river, She He killed Ugeo’s 'messenger', Biwang Chang (裨王長) who had been sent to see them off.

* JSS (Sin 1988:114) describes the messenger as a 'secondary Joseon king' (副王)
whilst JSMS omits this.

Both this event and the 109-8 BCE campaign which overthrew Ugeo unfolded as described in the Shiji account including: two initial defeats to Ugeo suffered by Han generals Yang Pu (楊僕) and Sunzhi (荀彘) at the mouth of the Yeol river (洌口 Ch. Lie) and west of the Paesu river respectively, and the further blunder of general Wei Shan (衛山): the war culminated in the siege of Wangheom-seong, Ugeo’s capital, resulting in the defections to Han of Ro In (路人), Han Eum (韓隴) and Wang Gyeop (王狗), and finally the assassination of Ugeo ordered by the *Ye daesin minister* (滅의大臣) Sam (叡).*84*

* The Shiji terms Sam as Nigye-sang (尼谿相叡) which distinguishes him from Ro In and Han Eum who are termed as ‘Joseon sang ministers’ (朝鮮相: Sin does not mention Sam’s title of Nigye-sang but in JSMS (Sin 2007:193) describes him as the Ye daesin minister which is apparently his interpretation of the term.

That which is missing from the Shiji - the only surviving account of the war - is the role played by the former multiple states of Joseon. Undoubtedly it was significant, but was omitted from the Shiji in the same way that the jiu Tangshu (舊唐書) and Xin Tangshu (新唐書) both reduced the central role of Silla in their accounts of the overthrow of Goguryeo. (JSMS Sin 2007:201)

Thus ended the three generation rule of the ‘Wi Man’ dynasty. This dynasty was similar to the three generation dynasty founded by Gongsun Du (公孫度). Both were ethnic Han Chinese and occupied border territories which had been former Joseon land, however, Chinese histories treated Wi Man as a historical era of Joseon similar to Gija: this is incorrect as Gija was somebody originally welcomed to Joseon, whereas Wi Man was a foreign invader. (JSMS Sin 2007:194)

* Here Sin emphasizes Wi Man’s Chinese ethnicity as making him foreign (異族) to Joseon and implying an ethnic contrast with Gija, however, earlier on he had already stated that Gija was also ethnic Chinese - in contrast to Baek’i and Sukje - so the core point seems to be rather that Wi Man was an aggressive invader, and it can be remembered Gija supposedly shared the same *Sudu* based culture to Joseon.

**The Han Commanderies and war with Goguryeo**

In place of the conquered territory of Wi Man, Han China established the Four Commanderies all within the region of the Liaodong peninsula. (JSMS Sin

---

84) For a full translation of the original Shiji "Chaoxian" (朝鮮列傳) account, see blog post Logie 2016.
2007:199)

The names of the commanderies represented only their originally envisioned but failed campaign objectives further east:

- Zhenfan-jun (真番郡) Goguryeo
- Xuantu-jun (玄菟郡) northern East Buyeo / North Okjeo
- Lintun-jun (臨屯郡) southern East Buyeo / South Okjeo
- Lelang-jun (樂浪郡) Nangnang-guk

In reality the commanderies came under immediate pressure from Goguryeo and in 82 BCE, after 26 years of war, Zhenfan and Lintun were abolished, and Xuantu and Lelang incorporated into Liaodong-jun commandery to the west. This fact was not fully recorded in the Chinese histories: *Hanshu* mentions only the closing of Zhenfan whilst *HHS* describes the closing of both Zhenfan and Lintun and the merger of Xuantu and Lelang, but not their incorporation into Liaodong-jun: no sources record the continued warfare against Goguryeo. (JSS Sin 1988:119)

**Nangnang-guk and its conflation with Lelang-jun** (JSMS Sin 2007:207)

Nangnang-guk was a confederation of smaller states led by the Choe house 崔氏, including Namhan (諤邯), Jeomseon (黏蠟), Daebang (帶方), Yeolsu (列水) and Hamja (含資). It was established c.204 BCE, contemporary to Wi Man, emerging in the former Mahan territory centered around modern Pyeongyang, after Mahan had moved its capital south to modern Iksan (益山).

※ This contradicts his earlier insistence in JSS that Mahan moved to modern Gongju not Iksan. Another question left unanswered is the ethnic identity of Choe: in JSS he asserts that the designation of Bulnae-ye-wang originally referred to the Nangnang king, and northern and southern East Buyeo kings (JSS Sin 1988:119), which would imply Nangnang was ethnic Ye, but not explain the Chinese surname.

’Nangnang’ (樂浪) had been the previous name of the Daedong-gang river and was one of three idu renderings for *Pyeora*, the capital of *Mal Joseon, the other two being ’Pyeongyang’ (平壤) and ’Baek’a’gang’ (百牙岡).

SS records that Nangnang-guk surrendered to Goguryeo in 44 CE whereupon Han emperor Guangwu (漢光武帝), sent troops to the peninsula to support it. This event was later conflated by historians with the original 108 BCE invasion and establishment of Lelang-jun.
Foundation of Baekje 百濟 and overthrow of Mahan

The founder of Baekje, was not Onjo (溫祚) as is traditionally recorded, but rather his mother, 'Great Queen' Soseono (召西奴 女大王). The father of both Onjo and his brother Biryu (沸流), was not the Goguryeo founder, Chumo (aka Jumong) but rather U'tae (優台) of Buyeo, to whom Soseono had first been married (ISS Sin 1988:99)

※ Again, this version of events is based on the second variant foundation story given in the SS Baekje Annal.

Onjo and Biryu were brought up in the palace of Jumong, but after Jumong's son, Yuryu (儒留), arrived from East Buyeo together with Jumong's first wife of the Ye clan (禮氏) and were made crown prince and main queen respectively. Soseono became a lesser queen. Consequently Soseono left Goguryeo together with her sons and travelled south, through Nangnang-guk to Mahan. There she bribed the Mahan king, grandson of Gi Jun, and acquired 100 li of land in the northwest encompassing Michuhol (modern Incheon) and Wirye-hol (modern Seoul north of the Han river) which she named Baekje. (ISS Sin 1988:106)

Early on Baekje came into conflict with Nangnang-guk to its north and the Ye people who were employed as mercenaries by Nangnang; in the SS these Ye people are recorded as Malgal (靺鞨) but that is an anachronistic term borrowed later from Tang China.

※ The anachronistic usage of Malgal was observed by Jeong Yak-yong and remains establishment consensus.

Following their mother's death, the brothers knew they could not hold their position against the Nangnang and Ye attacks so decided to move the capital but disagreed on the location causing a split with Biryu choosing Michuhol in the west and Onjo moving to Wirye-hol south of the modern Han river. The Michuhol project was unsuccessful and following the death of Biryu, Baekje was reunified.

On the pretext of defending against Nangnang and the Ye, Onjo required permission from the Mahan king to extend his domain all the way north to the Paeha river (𤊨河 modern Daedong - clearly not the same as the Paesu river forming the border between Han China and the former Gi and Wi dynasties) and south to Ungcheon (熊川 modern Gongju). Onjo had long feigned subordination to Mahan but sensing its weaknesses, he eventually led a surprising attack and overthrew the kingdom. *Ju Reuk (周勤 [sic. Ju Geun 周勤]) was a man of Mahan who raised auibyeong 'righteous army' to resist
but following defeat his entire family was put to death by Onjo.

[SS:百濟本紀:溫祚王 "三十四年。冬十月。馬韓舊將周勤。據牛谷城叛。王躬帥兵五千討之。周勤自經。腰斬其尸。并誅其妻子"]

Onjo’s overthrow of Mahan is wrongly described in SGZ as a local Mahan revival against the Gi dynasty rule. (JSS Sin 1988:108)

Gara 加羅 and Silla 新羅
※ Sin uses the Chinese term for Gaya/Garak. Gara, as attested in Songshu (宋書 c.488) and Nan-Qishu (南齊書 537).

During the upheavals across the continent and north of the peninsula, the southeast of the peninsula remained relatively isolated and unscathed by events. However, after Baekje overthrew Mahan, it abolished *Sudu customs and the title of *sinhan causing the autonomous regions of Jinhan and Byeonhan to fully break away and form the independent polities of Silla and Gara respectively.

The Six Gara (aka Gaya confederacy)
Gara was a confederacy of statelets most of which already had the suffixal identifier -gara, which had the meaning of a 'large pool' (大沼). Gara was variously rendered into idu as gara (加羅), garak (駕洛), gaya (加耶), guya (狗邪 'gusa'), gaya (伽倻), and finally also as 'Gwan-guk' (官國) where gwan 官 was used for its initial sound representing the first syllable of ga-ra, and guk (國 'state/country') semantically translated •ra. (JSS Sin 1988:122)

Around the year 42 CE, the leaders of the self-governing statelets gathered at the site of modern Gwii-bong (龜旨峰) in Gimhae and there appointed Kim Suro (金首露) and his five brothers to become kings of the six Gara, identifiable as in Table 19 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six Gara</th>
<th>attested idu names</th>
<th>modern location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Sin-gara</td>
<td>Geumgwan-guk</td>
<td>Gimhae 金海</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mim’ra-gara</td>
<td>Mimana 彌摩那: Imna 任那: Dae-gara 大加羅: Dae-gaya 大加耶</td>
<td>Goryeong 高麗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*An’ra-gara</td>
<td>An’ra 安羅: Anira 阿尼羅: Ara 阿羅 &lt; Asira 阿尸羅 &lt; Aniryang 阿尼良</td>
<td>Ham’an 咸安</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Goring-gara</td>
<td>Goryeong 古寧</td>
<td>Gonggal-mot lilly pond (Gonggeomji 恭棟池 in Sangju-gun of Hamchang 咸昌:尚州郡)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Silla

'Silla' was not the general name for all of the Six bu (部) villages of Jinhan recorded as merging into the new polity of Silla: rather the name was derived from just that of Saryang-bu (沙粱部) the chief of which adopted and raised the founder of Silla, Hyeokgeose. ([JSS Sin 1988:127])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samguk-sagi Silla Annals</th>
<th>Bu villages (from SY)</th>
<th>Six surnames (from SY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcheon-ysangsan 關川楊山</td>
<td>Yang-bu 梁部</td>
<td>Yi 李</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolsan-goheo 突山高墟</td>
<td>Saryang-bu 沙粱部</td>
<td>Choe 崔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musan-daeus 茂山大樹</td>
<td>Jeomi’rang-bu 漱梁部 / Byeon’rang-bu 弁梁部</td>
<td>Son 孫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasan-jinji 萬山珍支村</td>
<td>Bonpi-bu 本彼部</td>
<td>Jeong 譙</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geumsan-gari 金山加利</td>
<td>Hangi-bu 漏祗部</td>
<td>Bae 袋</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myeonghwalsan-goya 明活山高地</td>
<td>Seupbi-bu 興庇部</td>
<td>Seol 薛</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20. Sin Chaeho - Six Bu and surnames of early Silla.

[SY 三國遺事:卷第一:卷第二:新羅 시조 赫居世王: 1) 辰韓之地古有六村一日 關川 楊山村南今彌巖寺長日調平初降于僞高峯是為及梁部李氏祖 奴 礼王九年置名及梁部李朝大 祖天福五年庚子改名中興部波澄 校勘 東山 彼上 東村屬未三曰突山高墟村長曰蘇伐都利初降于兄山思想為沙梁部 樂讀云道或作潘亦音道 蕭氏祖曰南山部仇良伐 麻等鳥 道北 道徳等南村屬未 齊今曰者太祖所置也下列 三曰茂山大樹村長曰俱 一作仇 禮馬初降于伊山 一作皆比山 是為漸梁 一作滹 部又率梁部孫氏之祖今云長諫 部朴谷村等西村屬未曰肜山環支村 一作演之又黃子又水 校勘 之 長日智伯虎初降于花山是為李彼部崔氏祖今日通仙部柴巴等東南村屬未致達乃李彼部人也今皇龍寺南味寺南有古墟云是崔侯古宅也始明矣 五曰金山加里村 今金剛山槻栗寺之北山也 長曰賁沱 一作他初降于明活山是為漢岐部又作韓岐部裴氏祖今云加德部上下 西知 乃兒等東村屬未曰明侖山 高耶村長曰虎屠初降于金剛山是為聰部裴氏祖今臨川部勿伊村 仍仇諸村 閔谷 一作葛谷 等東北村屬未]

Saryang-bu (沙粱部) < *Saera 세라 meaning ‘the name of a stream’

*Saera was also recorded as *Sahwe (沙唯 사휘) on the Jinheung Stele(s).

85) There are four known 'jinheung steles' (Changnyeong 昌寧真興王巡狩碑 561, and Bukhan-san 北漢山真興王巡狩碑 Hwangcho-ryeong 黃草嶺真興王巡狩碑 and Maun-ryeong 磯雲嶺真興王巡狩碑 all 568). Alongside several other Silla steles and inscriptions, all four
The etymology of Sahwe can be reconstructed as:
Sahwe (沙海) < *Saebul < *Saera-bul

*Saera-bul was also rendered into idu as Seorabeol (徐羅伐). The chief of Goheo village (高墟村長) who adopted Hyeokgeose was also named Sobeol-gong (蘇伏公 - in SS): Goheo village was Saryang-bu and so Sobeol is another rendering of *Saebul. (JSS Sin 1988:127)

*Saera was later variously rendered into idu as Silla (新羅), Saro (斯盧), Sara (斯羅) and Seora (徐羅).

Thus the etymology of Silla can be expressed in short:
[Silla (新羅) = Saro (斯盧), Sara (斯羅) and Seora (徐羅)] < *Saera ('name of a stream')

Bak, Seok and Kim, the three royal surnames of Silla were elite clans that were all originally a part of Saryang-bu and governed jointly. After the merger of the Six Bu communities they each established hereditary royal lines which survived into the beginning of Silla. (JSS Sin 1988:128)

The Silla progenitor myths are later invention.

Jinheung steles attest Sahwe (沙海), with two of them, in the form of Sahwe-bu (沙海部 - Hwangcho-ryeong and Maun-ryeong).

* Modern annotations in the SS which also record Sarang-bu being recorded as Sahwe-bu on metal and stone inscriptions. "양부(梁部)와 함께 신라의 6부(部)를 주도하였던 부이며, 충고기(中古期) 금석문(金石文)에는 '사해부(沙海部)'로 기록되었다. 지금의 경상북도 경주시 남천 이북 시천 이동 그리고 북한 이남 일대로 그 근거지로 추정하거나 또한 남천 이남의 남산 서 북쪽 일대로 비정하기도 한다 (정구복 외, 《역주 삼국사기》3 주석편(상), 한국정신문화연구원, 36쪽). 940년(태조 23)에 남산부(南山部)로 개칭되었다. 신라 6부의 위치와 그 시대별 변동에 대한 연구 성과는 전덕재, 《신라 왕검의 역사》, 세운사, 2009 초조.

충고기(中古期) 금석문에는 사해부(沙海部)로도 표현되고 있는 신라의 6부(六部) 중 하나
이다(정구복 외, 《역주 삼국사기》4 주석편(하), 한국정신문화연구원, 1997 510쪽)

김유신의 기계 註 002
왕정인이란 지방인과 구별하는 뜻으로 왕도에 살고 있는 경주 사람을 지칭한 말이다. 丹
陽赤城碑 에 따르면 김유신의 할아버지 김무력은 사해부에 소속되어 있었으므로, 김유
신 가문은 6부 가운데 사해부(사랑부)에 소속되어 있었던 것으로 보인다. 왕정인은 京位
를 가질 수 있었고 곡물제에 편입될 수 있었던 일종의 특권층이라고 할 수 있다 (이문기,
「금석문자료를 통하여 본 신라의 族部」, 《역사교육논집》2, 1981 , 120~122쪽 | 武田
幸男, 「新羅の普品體制社會」, 《역사학연구》299, 1965, 10~12쪽 | 정구복 외, 《역주
삼국사기》4 주석편(하), 한국정신문화연구원, 642쪽)."
7. *Seonbi / Samnang > Jo’ui / Hwarang order lineage

In the second chapter of JSMS, titled "The Samnang (三郎) tour (巡遊) and transmission of Seon-gyo (仙敎)", Sin seeks to establish the lost lineage of a patriotic martial tradition both inclusive and broadly in the mold of the Silla Hwarang but present too, he argues, in Goguryeo, where he identifies them as the Jo’ui Seon’in (自衣仙人: JSMS Sin 2007:62-69). The shared origins of these two institutions he then projects back to ancient Joseon, supported by the popular association of the Samnang-seong (三郎城) ruins on Ganghwa island with Dangun.

The first step to this is premising that the shared rang/nang 郎 character of Samnang and Hwarang denotes the same thing: for this Sin finds support in the historical attestation of a Samnang-sa temple (三郎寺) constructed in the Silla capital of Gyeongju in 597. The key then to linking the Samnang/Hwarang with the Jo’ui Seon’in of Goguryeo is by equating Hwarang with the term seon’in, a hypothesis supported by the SS attestation - itself citing the Choe Chiwon’s Nallang Stele text (鶴郎碑序) - of a work titled Seon-sa (仙史 'history of the Seon').

Sin then traces the social decline of the Hwarang and Jo’ui, attributing this to Kim Busik’s active omitting of details and general diminishment of Hwarang/Jo’ui exploits from the SS, and subsequent actions of Confucian iconoclasts. Sin posits that the continuance of the Jo’ui can be identified during the Goryeo dynasty in the form of the Jaega-hwasang (在家和尚) attested in the contemporary Gaoli-tujing (高麗圖經 - still extant first hand account of Goryeo by Xu Jing 徐兢 1091-1153 who visited in 1123)) and notably absent from SS compiled only twenty years after.

To explain, meanwhile, the Chinese Daoist connotations in the character seon (仙) of seon’in, Sin posits it to be a later corruption of seon’in (先人 'forbear'), which was itself an idu rendering of an original non-Sinic term *seonbi (선비): the current day meaning and association of seonbi as 'scholar' in turn represents the misappropriation of the word by Confucians.

The self-contained chapter follows below in full translation as it is both insightful and representative of Sin’s writing and methodology, being both inspired but flawed in equal measure. The endeavour to delineate a continuous native

---

86) Interestingly the English translation of the SS Silla Annals, also translates the term, not as a specific title but, still, as "history of the Hwarang" - see Shultz & Kang (translators. 2012:131). The Nallang Stele text, as cited in SS (Jinheung, year 37), however, does not itself mention Hwarang; rather it is inferred from the context of the SS entry which is discussing Hwarang.
tradition is found, too, in Choe Namseon’s Bulham hypothesis (see Chapter 12). It can be noted, too, that Sin presents a formative version of his hypothesis in JSS: there, however he only goes as far as equating Silla Hwarang to Goguryeo Seon’in and makes his pure Korean reconstruction of the latter as *seonbae, without mention of Jo’ui, seonbi, Samnang or Jaega-hwasang. (Sin 1988:206-212)

"The Samnang tour and transmission of Seon-gyo (仙敍)
According to legend, Samnang-seong (三郎城 'three lad fortress') on {sic} Mani-san (摩尼山) mountain, Ganghwa-do island, was constructed by three sons of Dangun: the Jecheon-dan (祭天壇 'celestial rites altar') is where Dangun performed sacrificial rites to heaven. It is truly wondrous (가하하다) that the small fortress and [its tradition] have been transmitted over four millennia.
[* As seen in the Goryeo-sa and still today, Samnang-seong is located on Jeondeung-san (傳燈山), not Mani-san.]

The poem Samnang-seong by Yi Sukcheom (李叔詹) of the Goryeo dynasty [contains the line] "Fishermen and firewood collecting children still call it the Old Celestial Capital" (漁樵猶說舊天京); that they referred to this lonely and remote place as a 'celestial capital', holding it in such regard is still more wondrous.

All that remains of the Samnang's history is the construction of this fortress, however, during Silla and Goryeo, they erected Samnang-sa (三郎寺) temples and worshipped them: this too is still more wondrous.

(SS attests a Samnang-sa 三郎寺 temple being constructed in Gyeongju in 597: SY also records it as the residence of the 'national elder' (國老) - equivalent to national preceptor (國師) - Gyeongheung-useong 懸興遇聖 in 681, indicating it was

87) In this earlier version Sin includes a SY citation which more explicitly supports the correlation of Hwarang to Seon, by describing Hwarang as 'national Seon' (國仙). SY 卷第三:"[After] several years, king [jinheung 致興王] again thought that in order for the country to flourish, they must first [follow] the Way of Pungwol, [so] he again ordered that boys possessing virtuous behaviour be selected from good families and renamed as Hwanang (花娘). Seol Won-nang (薛原卿) was the first to be revered as a gukseon (國仙 national Seon) and this was the beginning of the Hwarang-gukseon. On account of this they erected a stele in Myeongju." [SY 塔像第四: 引勒仙花-未尸卿-暴慈師: "崇年王又念欲興邦國瀆先風月道, 更下令選良家男子有德行者改爲花娘, 始命薛原卿爲國仙, 此花郎國仙之始, 故堅碑於漢州.]

Again, in this earlier version, Sin also highlights the reference to pung-ryu (鸞流) as attested on Choe Chiwon’s Nallang stele in the corresponding SS entry, as the national Seon’s doctrine (敍), and pungwol-do 鳳月道 from SY as their Way (ISS Sin 188:211). He also lays stress on the Hwarang/Seon’s musical proclivities and attributes them the vernacular Silla hyangga (樂歌).
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a principal temple.}

However, it is not simply because of the fortress that the name of the Samnang was transmitted. If it had been only because of the fortress, how would they have come to be worshipped and held aloft in this way? Although it is not recorded in previous histories, it must be because the Hwarang (花郎) of Silla and Seon’in (仙人) of Goguryeo all traced their origins to the Samnang. There is also no one of recent times who knows the origins of the Jo’ui (皂衣): only the circumstances ( 사실) of the Hwarang are recorded in the SS as follows.

"In Silla they were concerned that it was not possible to identify men of talent, so they organized them into groups for recreation. After observing their behaviour and righteousness, they would select them for employment. Choosing boys of beautiful appearance, they adorned them and called them Hwarang (花郎 'flower lad')... By these means they could distinguish between good and bad persons."  [SS "Kim Heum-un" 金敤運 account, final commentary]

{The full SS passage is as follows.

"Commentary: The people of Silla were worried that there was no way to recognize people [of talent] so they wanted to have [people] play as a group so that they could observe their behaviour and righteousness, and afterwards choose which ones to use. Finally they selected boys of beautiful appearance, adorned them, and naming them Hwarang, revered them. Groups of follows formed [like] clouds. Some [sought to] cultivate the Way and righteousness amongst themselves: some entertained one another with songs and music: they enjoyed going on excursions to the mountains [such that] there was nowhere even far away they did not reach. On account of this, they [could] identify the bad and good, and recommend those selected to the court. Thus [Kim] Daemun’s "Wise advisers and loyal subjects followed them and thrived: good generals and brave soldiers from this were born" [as quoted in his Hwarang-segi text] [refers to] this. During the three periods of Silla, the Hwarang numbered as many as two hundred: their fragrant names and beautiful deeds were all as found in their accounts [presumably recorded in Kim Daemun’s Hwarang-segi ]. We can speak without shame the names of those such as Heum-un who were Hwarang followers and able to sacrifice their lives for the king."  [SS "Kim Heun-un” account]

巻第四十七:列傳第七:金敤運: "[論曰.] 羅人患無以知人, 欲使類聚乘遊, 以觀其行義然後舉用之, 選取美貌男子, 繪飾之, 名花郎以奉之, 往行雲集, 或相磨以道義, 或相悅以歌舞, 遊娛山水, 無遠不至, 因此知其正, 擇而薦之於朝, 故大問曰, 賢佐忠臣從此而秀, 良將勇卒由是而生者, 此也, 三代花郎, 無慮二百餘人, 而名各美事, 具如傳記, 若敤運者, 亦郎徒也, 能致命於王事, 可謂不辱其名者也]
On account of this passage, people are led to believe that the Hwarang were [the product] of a Silla [Confucian style] civil service examination (科舉法), but this is because we have been deceived by Kim Busik and so do not know the true nature/identity (朧모습) of the Hwarang.

The Hwarang [tradition] had [in fact] been both the soul of religion and the heart of national purity (國粹) passed down from the time of Dangun, but despite this, around the end of Silla and beginning of Goryeo they were obliterated by Confucians and even their history was lost.

According to the YJSR, "The stele of the Sa-rang (四郎 'four lads') was smashed to pieces by Ho Jongdan (胡宗旦) and only the turtle support stone (龜趺) remains." Through this the obliteration of the Hwarang by Confucians can be openly (正面) observed. According to the Goryeo-sa, because Seongjong (成 宗 r.981-997) liked Chinese customs (華風) and hated worship, Yi Jibaek (李知白) sought to revive Hwarang groups/gatherings (花郎會). Through this the obliteration of the Hwarang by Confucians can be indirectly (反面) observed.[Sin is apparently referring to an entry in the Goryeo-sa "Seo Hui" account, when during 993 (成宗 12) in the face of the first Khitan invasions, ministers Seo Hui and Yi Jibaek both counsel the king not to cede northern territory to the Khitan. The relevant passage is as follows.

"Former Min'gwan-eosa Yi Jibaek said [to the king], "...I beseech you, give gold, silver and jewels as a [Danegeld type] bribe to [Khitan general] So Sonnyeong (蕎邏寧) to see his intentions. Further, rather than thoughtlessly dividing [Goryeo] land and throwing it away to an enemy state, how about also holding [the festival] events of previous kings, such as the Yeondeung (燃燭), Palgwan (八關) and Seonrang (仙郞), and not following the heterodox ways of other places, and so arrive at a great peace by protecting the nation? If [you] agree, first tell the Sinmyeong (神明) [gods of heaven and earth], then, as to whether to go to war or [sue for] peace, only your majesty can judge." Seongjong agreed with this. At the time, the people of Goryeo did not like Seongjong’s enjoyment and admiration for Chinese customs, that is why Jibaek spoke thus."
(Goryeo-sa "Seo Hui" account)

In the case of SS compiler, Kim Busik, we can know that his extreme [anti-Hwarang] bias was even stronger than that of Seongjong or Ho Jongdan.
At the time of compiling the so-called 'History of the Three Kingdoms', he [actively] omitted facts concerning the Hwarang and their origins. In the Goryeo-sa (written a hundred years after Kim Busik’s SS), Yeong-rang, An-rang, Nam-rang and Sul-rang (永郎·安郎·南郎·述郎) [who comprised] the Sa-rang (四郎 'four lads'), were elevated as the 'Four Sages' (四聖), however, Kim did not even transmit this fact [of their existence]. The fact that whenever the 'way of the Hwarang' (花郎의 道) was lectured upon, there would be several thousand listeners is recorded in the Joseon dynasty Jeompiljae-jip (佔畢齋集 [collected works of Kim Jongjik 金宗直 1431-92]) which was compiled three hundred years after Kim, however, Kim wrote nothing about the influence exerted by the Hwarang. Throwing away the Seon-sa (仙史 'history of the Seon' or generic 'Seon histories') in which the origin of the Hwarang was recorded, he barely quoted a few opening lines from Choe Goun’s (崔俊雲 [Choe Chiwon 崔致遠]) Nallang-bi (鶴郎碑序) stele text: omitting the holy vestiges (聖蹟) of two hundred Hwarang, he described only the military achievements of four or five such as Sadaham (斯多含 [general who effected the military subjugation of Dae Gaya in 562]). This is sufficient to see his inner hatred of the Hwarang.

[* The figure of two hundred Hwarang is taken from an uncited section of the same Kim Heum’un commentary passage quoted from above. However, that the history of the Hwarang was recorded in the Seon-sa remains Sin’s speculation. In the SS Silla Annal entry for 576 (Jinheung 37), the Nallang-bi stele is cited immediately after a quote from Kim Daemun’s Hwarang-segi, potentially aiding this conflation.88]

[* Neither the term Sa-rang nor Sa-seong 'four sages' are attested in the Goryeo-sa. Rather, the closest term used - and which Sin would have regarded as synonymous - is Sa-seon (四仙). Sa-seon is also attested in the two well known earlier Goryeo period works, Pahan-jip (破閲集) by Yi In-ro (李仁老 1152-1220) and Bohan-jip (補閲集) by Choe Ja 崔滋 1188-1260) demonstrating that there was an authentic tradition. Pahan-jip explicitly associates the Sa-seon with the Silla Hwarang, as well as the Goryeo Paigwan festival. Bohan-jip similarly links the Sa-seon with Silla, but describes them primarily as musicians. A Goryeo-sa entry for the first year of King Taejo (918), in which he orders the Paigwan-hoe to be held, again attests the Sa-seon as a musical troupe – albeit in what would have been a semi-ritual context.

Pahan-jip 破閲集: 卷下: "雞林舊俗，擇男子美風姿者，以珠翠飾之，名曰花郎，國人皆奉之。其徒至三千餘人，若原始奉命之養士，取其顚脫不群者，爵之朝，唯四仙門徒最盛，得立碑。我太祖龍興，以爲古國遺風，尚不替矣。冬月設八閤盛會，選良家子四人..."

88) For an English translation see Shultz & Kang (2012:130-1)
Bohan-jip 補闕集: 卷上："東都本新羅，古有四仙，各領徒千餘人，歌法盛行，又有玉府仙人，始制曲調數百。"

Goryeo-sa 卷六十九: 志卷第二十三: 禮十一："太祖元年十一月，有司言："前主，每歲仲冬，大設八關會，以祈福，乞遺其制。"王從之。遂於毷庭，置輪燈一座。列香燈於四旁。又結二茅棚，各高五丈餘。呈百戲歌舞於前，其四仙樂部龍鳯象馬車舎，皆新羅故事。百官袍笏，行禮，觀者傾都，王御威鳳樓，觀之，歲以爲常。"

※ The given names cited by Sin of the Sa-seon do not appear to be attested as a single group until YJSR, then in connection with the Saseon-bong (四仙峯) peaks of the Chongseok-jeong (叢石亭) natural rock formation on the east coast, Gangwon-do.

Of the four names given by Sin, only Sul-rang is earlier attested as 'Sulnang Saseon’ (遜遲四仙): this occurs in an annotation of the Sejong Sillok geography entry for Goseong-gun, Gangwon-do, wherein Sam’il-po is described as a place previously visited by Sul-rang Saseon.

Sejong Sillok 地理志 江原道 杆城郡 高城郡: 三日浦【在郡東，昔遜遲四仙所遊之地。】

※ Kim Jongiiik’s Jeompilae-jip contains at least two mentions of the Hwarang, one of which, a description of an autumn trip to Duryu mountain (頭流 aka Jiri-san), appears to be the source of Sin’s reference. The relevant passage is as follows.

"[When] looking from Hamyang this peak [appears] as the tallest, [but] arriving there we were then looking up at Cheonwang-bong (‘celestial king’) peak. Yeong-rang was a leader of the Silla Hwarang who led three thousand followers on an excursion to the mountains, where they climbed this peak, and so that is where its name comes from." (Jeompilae-jip "Yu Duryu-rok" Record of a trip to Duryu mountain)

Jeompilae-jip 佔畢齋集:佔畢齋文集卷之二:遊頭流錄: "自咸陽望，此峯最爲峻絕，到此，則更仰視天王峯也，永郞者，新羅花郎之魁，領三千徒，遨遊山水，普登此峯，故以名焉。"

Why is it, then, that Kim recorded even a few lines in the SS? It is for no other reason than that at the time, foreigners (Chinese) [already] knew many stories of the Hwarang and Tang Chinese recorded them in such works as Dazhong-yishi (大中通事) and Xinluo-guoj (新羅國記 ‘record of Silla’) [both by Ling Hucheng 令狐澄], inside of Korea the Hwarang stelai could be smashed and works such as Hwarang-segi and Seon-sa [both attested in the same SS entry] could be destroyed, but that which was transmitted in foreign lands was beyond Kim’s control {능력 lit. 'ability'}: Also the Hwarang history which had been recorded by foreigners was rough and the words close to ridicule, so even if they were transmitted they would not be a match for Confucians’ [historiography] so Kim considered there to have been no necessity [to include]
these matters and omitted all facts concerning the Hwarang. For this reason, the Korean records (역사 'history') of the Hwarang were not included and only those in foreign counties were included in an abridged fashion, and this is what we read today.

Ah, how sad! The stories of the Hwarang appearing in the SS which are read by us Hwarang descendents today, is that which was contemptuously recorded by the brushes of Chinese. How can we know the true identity of the Hwarang from this?

Concerning the Jo'ui (侏衣) of Goguryeo, Kim Busik quoted the Suishu (隨書) and simply observed that there were Jo'ui seon'in (侏衣仙人 - also called Yeseok seon’in 頂屬仙人) in Goguryeo: the [SS] "Myeong’rimdapbu-jeon" (明臨答夫傳) account speaks of Yeonna-jo’ui Myeong’rim-dapbu (侏衣明臨答夫), but it does not say what the Jo’ui were.

[* Myeong’rim-dapbu is attested with the title of Jo’ui, not in his biographical account, but in the Goguryeo Annal entry for King Chadae (次大王) year 20 (165 CE), where he is recorded as assassinating the tyrant king on behalf of the people.

[* Yeseok seon’in, meanwhile, is attested in the SS treatise for Goguryeo titles, however, there it is treated as two distinct titles, yeseok and seon’in. In the same treatise, citing the Xin-Tangshu, the term jo’ui, occurring in the longer title jo’ui-dudaehyeong (侏衣頭大兄), is equated to seon’in (仙人), whilst seon’in (先人 'forebear') is recorded as a separate title.

In a another citation immediately following, this time from the Song dynasty Cefu Yuangui (冊府元龜), both jo’ui seon’in (侏衣 仙人) and yeseok seon’in (頂屬 仙人) are attested.89)

[SS 卷第四十:雜志:第九:外官: "隋書云，高句麗官有太大兄, 次大兄, 次小兄, 次對盧, 次義侯, 次烏拙, 次太大使者, 次大使者, 次小使者, 次禰胥, 次翳屬, 次仙人, 凡十二等, 復有內評, 外評, 五部禰薩
新唐書云，高句麗官凡十二級，曰大對盧，或曰吐搏，曰鬱析，主圖簿者，曰太大使者，曰侏衣頭大兄，所謂侏衣者，仙人也，秉國政三歲一易，善職則否，凡代日，有不服則相攻，王為

89) Previous to the SS, the title jo’ui seon’in (侏衣先人) is originally attested in the SGZ "Goguryeo" account 三國志:魏書三十:高句麗傳: "相加，對盧、沛者、古難加，主簿、僕合丞、使者、侏衣先人，尊卑各有等級." An intermediary Tang dynasty work, Hanyuan (顯苑 by Zhang Chujin 張楚金) meanwhile equates jo’ui-dudaehyeong (侏衣頭大兄) with jo’ui seon’in (侏衣先人), and separately attests yeseok (頂屬). Hanyuan: "高麗記曰其國建官有九...次侏衣頭大兄比從三品一名中裹侏衣頭大兄東夷相傳所謂侏衣先人者也...七品一名頂屬一名伊紹一名河紹還".
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閉宮守，勝者彼得之。曰大使者，曰大兄，曰上位使者，曰諸兄，曰小使者，曰過節，曰先人。曰古郡大加，又云，莫嫉支，大莫嫉支，中裏小兄，中裏大兄。

冊府元龜云，高句麗，後漢時其國罷官，有相加，對盧，沛者。古郡大加。【古郡大加，高句麗掌賓客之官，如大鶴臘也】。主簿，優【一作玄于】使者，皂衣，先人，一說，大官有大對盧，次有太大兄，大兄，小兄，意侯著，烏卒，太大使者，小使者，褥著，襲屬，仙人，拜薜薩，凡十三等，復有內評，外評，分掌內外事焉】

Cefu Yuangui冊府元龜:卷九百六十二: “高句麗國後漢時其國罷官有相加對盧沛者古郡大加。【古郡大加高句麗掌賓客之官如大鶴臘也。】主簿優台使者帛衣先人一說大官有大對盧次有太大大兄小兄意侯著烏卒太大使者小使者褥著襲屬仙人並薜薩凡十三等”}

However, the Gaoli-tujing (高麗圖經 c.1123) records, "The Jaega-hwasang (在家和尚) [lit. 'at home monks' i.e. who have not left their families for a temple]) neither wear gasa (袈裟) Buddhist robes, nor maintain Buddhist precepts (佛戒); wearing white ramie clothes, they bind their wastes with black silk. [...] Residing in common houses (민가, original just has 'home/room' 室) they have families. They always put their energies into public projects, such as cleaning the roads, or repairing drainage systems. If war occurs they take their own rations and form units: in war they are all brave and always lead the van. In actuality they are former convicts and so have shaven heads: because this is similar to Buddhists they are called Hwasang (和尚)."

[Original passage from Gaoli-tujing:
"Jaega-hwasang do not wear gasa and do not maintain precepts. Wearing white ramie clothes, they bind their waists with black silk. They walk barefooted, though some wear shoes. Constructing their own homes, they take a wife and raise children. They devote themselves to such public tasks as carrying items for the authorities, sweeping the roads, repairing the drains, and fixing and building the city walls and homes. If there is a nearby alert, they form groups and set out: although they are not familiar with galloping [a horse] they are quite strong and brave. When they go on military expeditions, they prepare their own rations so they are able to go to war without being a cost to the state. I have heard that the Khitan's defeat by Goryeo people was precisely thanks [lit. 'reliant'] to this group. They are actually convicted criminals. The Koreans [lit. 夷人 'Yi barbarian people'] shave their beards and heads and call them Hwasang."

Gaoli-tujing 宣和奉使高麗圖經卷第十八: "在家和尚。不服袈裟。不持戒律。白紈窄衣。束腰帛幘。徒步以行。間有剪履者。自為居室。娶婦織子。其於宮上。負載器用。掃除道路。開治溝洫。修築城室。悉以事從。邊陲有警。則囘集而出。雖不關於駱併。然頗壯勇。其趨軍旅之事。則人自裁糾。故國用不費。而能戰也。聞中間契丹。為麗人所敗。正賴此輩。其實刑餘之役人。夷人。以其髪削鬚髮。而名和尚耳"

These are the remaining tradition (遺風) of the Goguryeo Jo'ui (皂衣 'black clothing'). They were called Jo'ui because they wore [the same] black silk
around their waists: in Chinese histories (*Cefu Yuangui* above) they are also referred to as Baek’i (帛衣 Ch. Boyi ‘silk clothing’). And because Seon’in believed in a different doctrine (教) to Buddhism, they were referred to as Jaega-hwasang.

Thus the Jo’ui of Goguryeo were the martial soul (武魂), no less so than the Hwarang of Silla. With a firm belief in the state (国家) they regarded life and death lightly: they sacrificed their bodies for the common good (公舉) without concern for worldly matters or renown. During peace time they trained their bodies through labour: because their bodies were in oil (?? 몽을 기름에 있어서 는) they prioritized (位主) health and bravery and so were brave when at war. Because Myeong’rim-dapbu led such a group, he was easily successful in [his] regional revolution.

After visiting Goryeo and observing and hearing of these such matters, *[Gaoli-tuiing* author] Xu Jing recorded them: how is it possible that during the same time Kim Busik could not have read or heard of the Hwarang’s history?! In order to [force] citizens to wear the tinted glasses of Confucians, he omitted all of Silla’s Hwarang history except a few lines recorded by a foreigner: concerning the Jo’ui he merely cited the *Suishu* and recorded just the name.

If we first look at research concerning this, in Goguryeo history, seon’in (先人 ‘forebears’) were referred to as seon’in (仙人 ‘Daoist immortal’): both terms are phonetic [Sinic] renderings for the pure Korean (우리말) term seonbi (선비 [conventionally a word for ‘scholar’]). In the [SS] Silla music treatise (樂志), Hwarang are termed as Do’ryeong (徒領), which is a phonetic rendering of the Korean term doryeong (도령 ‘young man’). In later times the social status of Seon’in (先人) sunk and so the term for them was changed to Jaega-hwasang, whilst the name seonbi was taken by Confucians [to refer to themselves with the common meaning of ‘scholar’].

(SS: "Doryeong-ga (‘Song of Doryeong’) was composed at the time of King Jinheung [r.540-576]”90)

SS 卷第三十二: 雜志: 第一: 樂: "徒領歌，真興王時作也"

90) Interestingly, a footnote to the modern annotated edition of the SS attributed to Jeong Gubok, as available on the Korean History Database and published by Academy of Korean Studies, similarly draws connection between the ‘pure Korean’ word doryeong (respectful term for a young, unmarried man) and the Hwarang, consequently speculating Doryeong-ga to have been a song praising the contemporary Hwarang leaders who were termed doryeong (徒領 ‘leader of followers’). "진흥왕 때 지은 신라 향악 (靑樂)의 하나. 양주동은 도령가(徒領歌)도 두솔가(兜素歌)와 마찬가지로 농악 두례의 ‘두리노래’라고 하였다(양주동, 《古歌研究》, 15쪽). 그러나 장가 안 듣 쓰기 두대 다양으로 인한 순우리말로 ‘도령이 라는 말이 있으나, 도령가는 도령을 노래한 것이라고 하겠다. 특히 진흥왕 때는 화방도(花郞道)가 창설된 시기이다, 도령가는 郎徒들 중에서 훠어난 우두머리급의 사람들을 칭송하는 노래가 아닐까 한다(정구복 외, 《역주 삼국사기》4 주석편(下). 한국정신문화연구원, 79-80쪽)."
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Also, in later times, the Hwarang became officials (벼슬아지) responsible for all
genres of music and thus were [merely] in charge of one giye (技藝 'artistic
skill') of gamu (歌舞 'song and dance' - [original annotation] giye was a
subdiscipline (科) of gamu or hak’ye 學藝). The term doryeong-nim (도령님) was
stolen by the [Confucian] yangban literati [as the respectful term for address
of an unmarried yangban]. The social status of Jo’ui sank earlier than Hwarang
and so at the time of Xu Jing, it was already a figurative term for formerly
convicted criminals.

Concerning both the Hwarang (i.e. gwangdae 廣大 a non-reverential term for
'public entertainer' such as pansori performers) who remain in the Eight
Provinces [of Korea] today, and the Jaega-hwasang who remain in North
Hamgyeong-do province, not only are their roots not known to others, but
even they have forgotten the fact that they were once the heart (중심) of the
state: for these circumstances the crime of the ruling classes including the
monarchy, and of historians is great.

How could we in times subsequent to Kim Busik discover the facts about the
Hwarang and Jo’ui that he failed to record? [How can we] find their origins? If
we gather the remaining fragmentary accounts from the 'old records' (古記)
and search between the lines (反面) of the SS, then we can [at least] obtain
something similar.

The line recorded in the Goguryeo history [SS Goguryeo annal] "Pyeongyang
was the home of Seon’in Wanggeom” (平壤者仙人王儁之宅) would have been the
first line of the Silla’s Seon-sa (仙史). Idu (吏讀文) script which uses Chinese
characters for their phonetic value, was first created during the time of Buyeo
and Goguryeo: at that time, a character would be used either for its beginning
or end sound value, and two or three characters would be combined to create
a single [syllable] sound. Both seon’in (先人) and seon’in (仙人) use two
characters to form the seon [syllable] in seonbi.

During Silla, [phonetic] idu developed to a relative degree, however, it was only
fully used for [verbal] endings, e.g. wi-ni 爲尼 → hani (하니), wi-ya 爲也 →
haya/hayeo (하야/하여), but nouns most often used Chinese characters for their
semantic value. As a result Saro (斯盧) was changed to Silla (新羅 ‘new net’?),
whilst monarchical titles geoseogon (居西干) and nisageum (尼師今) were changed
to dae-wang (大王 'great king'). The Hwarang also developed at this time,
and Seon-sa was written.

In later times, the [rendering of the] noun seon’in (先人 'forebear’) was
dropped and only seon’in (仙人 ‘immortal/faerie’) was used: thus Seon’in
Wanggeom (仙人王値 'faerie Wanggeom') is the same as [●]Seon’in Wanggeom (先人王値 'forebear Wanggeom') who was Dangun (檀君), none other than the founding ancestor (始祖) of the Jo’ui Seon’in (皂衣先人).

The name Hwarang, too, was originally not hwarang: [rather], because it was seon’in (先人 'forebear') the history of their origin was named Seon-sa (仙史 'faerie history'). As a result, even the "Hwarang-gi" (花郎記) record in the SY says Great King Jinheung (真興王 {r.540–576}) worshipped sinseon (神仙 'holy faeries') and created the Hwarang, but this misunderstood that the creation of the Hwarang was [itself an act of] venerating the sinseon.

However, subsequently due to concern for terms [phonetically rendered] such as seon’in and sinseon being confused with Chinese Xianjiao (仙教: 道教 Dao-jiao [i.e. Daoism]), specific nouns such as gukseon (國仙 'nation faerie') and hwarang (花郎 'flower lad') were created, where the seon of gukseon is the phonetic rendering of the seon (先) of seon’in (先人 'forebear'), whilst the rang of Hwarang is a semantic rendering of seon’in.

However, those reading history in later generations have always confused this distinction. Thus in entries in YISR for Gangneung (江陵) and Yang’yang (襄陽) which include poems and such by literati composed after observing the remains associated with the Four Hwarang Sages (四聖), they conflate them with Daoist notions of alchemy (金丹) or 'the soul’s liberation from a corpse [to become a Daoist immortal]' (尸解), and gukseon are understood as a school of Daoism.

Even if one explains that the seon (仙) of Seon’in Wanggeom is the seon of gukseon, of seonbi, and our Seon-gyo (仙敎 'seon religion'), and not the xian of Chinese Xianjiao (仙敎), who today would believe this?! Ah, that the downfall of the nation (國祚) has come to this!

Samnang (三郞), too, previous to Goguryeo would definitely have been called the Sam-seon (三仙) or Sam-seon’in (三仙人), and not Samnang, but in Silla with seon’in being called rang (郞) they were changed to Samnang, and the Samnang-sa temple was constructed in which they were worshipped.

Consequently, Dangun was the first seonbi appearing in the Seon-sa (仙史), whilst the Samnang are the first doryeong. Samnang-seong was a fortification constructed by the Goguryeo Jo’ui who, during a ceremonial tour/pilgrimage (巡禮) of the country (國道) found the site suitably strategic for the nation’s defence."
8. Sin Chaeho’s narrative of writing and early historiography

Writing systems

The ancient unified state of Joseon originally had its own script which was later lost. This script must have existed in order to have been used by Buru when transmitting knowledge of *Sudu to Xia king Yu, as well as by *Jabu (紫府) of Cheonggu (靑久) when showing the *Samhwangnaesa-mun (三皇內敎文) to the Yellow Emperor. (JSMS Sin 2007:70)

※ The latter incident is recorded in the Baobuzi 抱朴子 by Ge Hong (葛洪 283-343))

[抱朴子·內篇·地真： "昔黃帝東到青丘，過風山，見紫府先生，受三皇內文，以劾召萬神，南到圖藪陰建木，觀百靈之所登，採若乾之華，飲丹巖之水；西見中黃子，受九加之道，過崆峒，從廣成子受自然之經；北到洪隴，上具茨，見大隗君黃蓋童子，受神芝圖，遭陰王屋，得神仙丹訣記"]

※ A question this raises is, how did the Chinese read these texts written in the Joseon script? Although not discussed by Sin, one implication of his hypothesis would be that Chinese writing itself was derived from the Joseon script. The reason Sin cannot make this otherwise tempting assertion is because he next seeks to portray supposedly pictographic Chinese characters as being inferior to the subsequent Korean developed phonographic idu script. He comes close by noting that both Balhae and the Jurchen – Joseon descendents – had their own scripts, but he does not discuss in any detail and so avoids the acknowledging the point that these scripts are clearly 'Sinitic' in style (Jahnhunen 1994).

Later on, by the Korean *'Multiple States’ period, the idu writing system was developed; although using Chinese characters, it was superior for being a phonetic rather than pictographic system which is a circumstance analogous to the Phoenician script having been based on [supposedly] pictographic Egyptian hieroglyphs. (JSMS Sin 2007:72) However, idu was never fully systematized. (JSYC Sin 2007:298)

Idu writing is attested from all Three Kingdoms as well as in the "Han" (韓) treatises of SGZ and HHS, so its creation must have been earlier than these sources. The word 'idu' is a later term for the writing system after it became primarily used by lower level officials: in Silla it was called *hyangseo (郷書 ‘native writing’) [※ this term is not attested until the Sillok: likely Sin means to refer to hyangchal 郷札 whilst in Baekje it was likely termed *gamyeong (假名) and from there introduced to Japan bequeathing the name kana (假名). (SR Sin 2007:545)

※ This last point contrasts with the arguments of present day scholars that Japanese kana evolved, rather, from Korean gu’gyeol (口訣) script.91)
Sinji 神誌

※ Sinji is attested as the name of the text Sinji-bisa (神誌秘詞) mentioned both in the Samguk-yusa and the Goryeo-sa biography of Kim Wije. [SY 卷第三:興法第三:寶藏奉老 普德移庵 “神誌秘詞序云蘇文大英弘序並注則蘇文乃職名有文 證而傳云文人蘇英弘序未詳孰是”]

・Sinji is a term denoting both the ancient histories written in idu script and the people who authored them. (JSMS Sin 2007:70) In SGZ and HHS, it is attested as sinji 臣智. Its etymology is:

\[\text{[sinji 神誌} = \text{sinji 臣智}] < \bullet \text{sinchi} < \bullet \text{sinkeuchi} \quad \text{신크치} = \bullet \text{singa 신가}\]

(JSS Sin 1988:63)

After the loss of the original Joseon script, history and customs were preserved as oral literature. The *singa were originally bard story tellers but later their songs were written down in idu. These sinji texts were largely lost to the ravages of time: such that only two short fragments have survived. The most substantial are the ten lines preserved in the Goryeo-sa biography of Kim Wije (金謂礪) from which the names of the Joseon Three Capitals can be deduced.

(Goryeo-sa 高麗史列傳:方技:金謂礪)

"如秤鍾極器 秤幹扶疊樑 鍾者五德地 極器百牙岡 朝降七十國

賴德護神精 首尾均平位 興邦保太平 若廢三論地 王業有衰傾"

The following is a non-direct translation of the cryptic passage [based on Sin's interpretation].

"Like the beam (幹), weights (鐘) and base [or central pillar 極] of weighing scales: the scale beam is Busoryang (扶熔梁 Harbin), the weights are Odeokji (五德地 Ansi-seong) and the base/pillar is Baek’agang (百牙岡 Pyeongyang). 70 states came and surrendered: relying on their strength, the spirit of Dangun was protected. Those at the very front and very back achieved a balanced position and so the country flourished and enjoyed peace. However, if any one of those three capitals were abolished, the king’s efforts would weaken and slowly collapse (傾 lit. 'lean')." (JSMS Sin 2007:71)

The second fragment is "辰巳聖人出 午未樂堂堂" recorded in the Seo’gwak-jannok (西郭雜錄). Here the sexagenary year dates 'jinsa' (辰巳) and "Omi" (午未 = Eulmi 乙未) respectively correspond to the year in which Dangun first became sovereign and the year in which he moved the capital to Dangjang

91) For example see Vovin "Is Japanese Katakana Derived from Korean Kwukye?" in Fouser (ed.) 2010:379.
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(唐藏 [SY 'Jangdang' 藏唐}). According to the YJSR, Danjiang 唐藏 was later termed Jangjiang-pyeong (庄庄坪) so dangdang (堂堂) can be considered an alternative rendering for this.

※ This seems very weak reasoning. It is not clear from where Sin derives the year correspondences because the SY account of Dangun gives differing years. The YJSR reference is likely based on the Goryeo-sa as follows:

[高麗史:地理三:西海道: "本高句麗開口. 高麗初. 改今名. 顯宗九年. 來屬. 睿宗元年. 置監務. 高宗四十六年. 以衛社功臣成均大司成柳職內郎. 隆為文化縣令官. 別號始寧【成廟所定】. 有九月山【世傳. 阿斯達山】庄庄坪【世傳. 橫君所都. 即唐莊京之訛】三聖祠【有檀因·檀雄·檀君祠"]]

With many of the idu sinji texts being lost, the knowledge was once more maintained as oral literature before being written down again, this time in Sino-Korean hanmun (漢文): these texts include the earliest histories mentioned in the Sanguk-sagi, such as Baekje’s Seogi (書記 by Go Heung 高興 375) and Goguryeo’s Yugi (留記 redacted by Yi Munjin 李文真 as the Sinji 新籍 in 600). (JSMS Sin 2007:73)

However, these poetic oral texts were too brief so were subsequently rewritten as longer prose accounts such as Samhan-gogi (三韓古記 [attested in SS]), Dangun-gogi (檀君古記 [cited in Jewayang-ungi and Sejong-sillok-geography ]) and Haedong-gogi (海東古記 [in SS]). In turn, these texts were compiled into the Seonsa (仙史 [attested in SS:新羅本紀 576]) by Geochilbu (居査夫).

※ Here Sin conflates two passages from the SS Silla Annals as the Seonsa is not directly attributed to Geochilbu, and is not necessarily even the title of a book.
In 545, SS records Geochilbu being ordered to compile a national history: a 576 entry, meanwhile cites the Nallang Stele text attributed to Choe Chiwon in which he claims details of Silla’s pung-ryu (風流) tradition are found in the (or a) Seonsa.

[SS:新羅本紀:真興王:六年秋七月(545) "六年秋七月乙巳日王錫枚於後世惑之命大阿渕 居査夫 等廣集文士俾之修撰"
SS:新羅本紀:真興王:三十七年 (576) "崔致遠 鴻郎碑序曰國有玄妙之道曰風流設教之源 備詳仙史實乃包含千載接代"]

These early gogi texts (古記) were also available to the compilers of SGZ and HHS evidenced by the authentic idu terms they included in the "Han" (韓) treatises. (JSMS Sin 2007:74)

After the completion of Kim Busik’s SS, however, the older texts were banned from public circulation and stored in the palace and government archives: these old histories thus became bisa 'secret histories' (秘史) whilst the SS was
the sole 'official history' (官史). The *Gu-samguk-sa* (舊三國史 'Old Three Kingdoms History') also became a *bisa*. Thereafter only a few people gained access to the *bisa* texts: amongst them were Yi Gyubo who referred to *Gu-samguk-sa* when composing *Dongmyeongwang-pyeon* and Kim Wije who was able to transmit the ten lines of the *sinji*. During the period of Mongol rule the *bisa* were kept hidden whilst the *Samguk-sagi* was allowed because it promoted a *sadae-ju'ui* 'serving the great' mentality.

With the establishment of the Joseon dynasty founded on Sinocentric ideology of Neo-Confucianism, the *bisa* were moved from Gaegyeong to Han’yang (Seoul) but remained restricted in the same manner as before: Yi Su-gwang (李睍光 1563-1628 - author of the *Jibong-yuseol* 芝峰類說 encyclopedial) managed to view them, but subsequently during the Imjin-waeraen war, the palace was destroyed and all surviving *bisa* were lost to fire. (JSMS Sin 2007:75-6 and JSYC Sin 2007:472)

* In JSS (Sin 1988:15). Sin posits that during the Mongol occupation, books giving expression to any kind of independent spirit were destroyed and so only the Sinocentric (*sadae-ju’ui* 救大主義) SS and SY, which he claims was based on SS, were allowed.

**Sinji** prophecies

Aside from history, the *sinji* texts also contained prophecies some of which were popularly known during the Goryeo and early Joseon dynasties. One collection is a book of diagrams, the *[sic.] jindan-gubyeon-gukdo (震壇九變局圖)* and an associated commentary, *Joseon-birok* (朝鮮秘錄 'Joseon secret record') which is said to have been read by general Choe Yeong (崔瑩 1316-88 source?). Separately, annotations in *Yongbi’eocheon-ga* (龍飛御天歌 1447) make reference to the prophecy that the Yi house (李氏) would come to rule the nation, however Taejong objected to an accompanying prophecy that the Joseon clan would only last 500 years and so had Ha Yun (河崑) change it to 8,000 years before burning the original books. (JSMS Sin 2007:77)

* A work by the title of *Gubyeon-jindan-ji-do* (九變震壇之圖) is attested in the Geonwon-reung stele (健元陵碑 Taejo tomb stele, erected 1408) inscription composed by Gwon Geun, itself recorded in the *Taejo Sillok*. According to Gwon’s stele text, the *Gubyeon-jindan-ji-do* was stored as a secret text in the Seoun-gwan (‘Astronomical and Meteorological Observatory’) and contained the Yi prophecy based on the character elements of 'tree’ and 'child' (建木得子). The same prophecy is previously mentioned in the *Taejo Sillok*, but there without mentioning the title of the secret text.

92) Choi (2014:106) translates this as "One who sets up a tree begets a son."
The 'Joseon-birok', meanwhile is unattested as a work by that specific title or description, but seems derived or inspired from references to other non-specified birok ('secret texts') stored at Seoun-gwan: texts which Ha Yun is recorded consulting in the Taejo Sillok in relation to choosing a new capital location.

※ Taejong’s burning of heretical texts is also mentioned in JSS (Sin 1988:13). This Bücherverbrennung incident is recorded in the Taejong Sillok although it is not Ha Yun who does the burning.

※ In the Sillok, discussion of the prophecy is, however, mentioned five years earlier. Here there is no explicit mention of a 500 year prophecy, only that Taejong did not like the Sujeongbu (受貞符) text offered by Ha Yun because it was a book of prophecies, whereupon Kim Yeoji (金汝知) remonstrated him quoting Yun’s prophecy that Joseon would last 8,000 years.

[ Taejong Sillok 太宗;23卷;12年;(1412)1月29日(甲寅): "領議政府事河崙獻《保東方》、《受貞符》二篇，初，崙請為太祖篤盛德之歌，以代《受寶録》，上許之，故至是進二篇。上曰："《保東方》善矣，《受貞符》乃讖謎之說，未恊予心，宜下議政府六曹議之，咸曰可則予從之，’知申事金汝知，以嵩之言，陳於上曰：’有一秘記云：‘高麗都松岳四百八十，朝鮮都漢陽八千歲，’ 高麗氏歷年之數果驗， 由此觀之，秘記之言可信也。’ 因言太祖開國之時，有夢金之受寶録之異，上曰：’昔漢武之時，趙人江充，縵武帝怪夢，穀及無辜；西漢之末，王莽、公孫述之輩，惑信符讖之言，殃民禍己。 迹此觀之，讖文夢怪，不足信也。 我太祖創業，實基於天命人心，縱無金之寶錄之異， 其能創業乎？卿等皆儒臣也， 何論說之至此乎？’ 羣臣皆俛首唯唯而已。 崙親啓曰：’臣前日所獻《受貞符》一篇，上以為不可， 臣以為受寶錄，雖出讖記，實天命之先定也， 其闔巷歌詠，請勿禁，’ 上曰：’置之樂府則不可，闔巷歌詠則何必禁之!’"]
Kim Busik and the rise of *sadae-ju'ui* (*Samguk-sagi* 'conspiracy theory')

In later times, the shortcomings of the *Samguk-sagi* were blamed on the dearth of sources available to Kim Busik, but this is blatantly not the case as SS references various contemporary sources (namely 海東古記, 三韓古記, 高句麗古記, 新羅古事, 仙史 and 花郎世紀) and at the time many more stele inscriptions and oral legends would also have been extant. Having defeated Myocheong’s uprising in Pyeongyang and in the process purged those who held an alternative view of history (e.g. Yun Eon-i and Jeong Jisang), Kim Busik was free to write his own history. The reason he did not make better use of these sources is because the information they contained did not match his ideal vision of Joseon history which consisted of the following: to limit Joseon’s historical territory to south of the Daedong or even Han rivers; to ‘Confucianize’ Joseon’s customs and artefacts of civilization, and finally to restrict Joseon’s foreign policy to a passive diplomacy, all in order to maintain Korea’s image as a ‘gentleman’s land of the east’ (東方君子國) in the eyes of China. In reality the contemporary sources available to Kim all demonstrated that Joseon’s territory stretched to Inner Mongolia, that its society was based on the religious martial tradition of the Hwarang and that it had been militarily active in the defence of its continental frontiers. (JSYC Sin 2007:469)

[The following is a direct quote from the conclusion to the last chapter of *Joseonsa-yeongucho*, titled "The greatest event for a thousand years of Joseon’s history" 조선 역사상 1천년 이래 최대 사건]

"To summarize that which has been written above, Joseon history was originally divided between the independent ideology of the hwarang houses (郎家) and the *sadae-ju'ui* Sinocentricism of the Confucian houses, however the Buddhist practitioner Myocheong suddenly tried to realize the ideals of the hwarang but his acts were those of a madman and self wanton and so ended in defeat, as a result of which the *sadae-ju'ui* faction rose to complete dominance.

Hwarang advocates such as Yun Eon-i (尹彥麟) barely managed to stay alive under the oppression of the Confucians: in the wake of the Mongol invasions the Confucians’ *sadae-ju'ui* 'serving the great' [mentality] became still more advantageous.

The [subsequent] establishment of the Yi dynasty was itself the achievement of this [same] *sadae-ju'ui* [ideology] and so the hwarang faction were entirely obliterated.
With politics in this state, all other aspects [of life] such as religion and scholarship also became slaves to sadae-ju’ui. [For those] believing in Buddhism, it was [only] possible to produce [monks such as] Taego (太古) and Bou (普愚) who all practiced the bonggal (棒喝 [enlightenment through physical shock]) method in exactly the same way, but it was impossible for there [to be another as enlightened as] Wonhyo (元曉) who seemed to suddenly arise from the flat/horizon (평지): [for those] following Confucianism, there would be [scholars such as] Toegye (退溪) and Yulgok (栗谷) who strictly (각별히) followed the way and scholarship of Cheng Yi ([程頤] 程子) and Zhu Xi ([朱熹] 朱子) but there was no place for [one such as] Jeong Juk-do (鄭竹島 [aka Jeong Yeorip 鄭汝立 1546-89]) who tried to establish his own path (門路).” (JSYC Sin 2007:475)

9. The Three Capitals of Joseon

The primary idu names of the Three Capitals are found in the cryptic prophecy *sinji text recorded in the Goryeo-sa Kim Wije (金謂礎) biography: they are Busoryang (扶餘梁 Harbin), Odeokji (五德地 Ansi-seong) and Baek’agang (百牙岡 Pyeongyang). In the Goryeo-sa Kim Wije associates the names with the ‘three capitals’ of the contemporary Goryeo dynasty but the *sinji text was rather referring to the original continental Three Capitals of ancient Joseon. This can be summarized as Table 21 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three Capitals</th>
<th>original locations</th>
<th>Goryeo dynasty period</th>
<th>peninsula interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Busoryang (扶餘梁)</td>
<td>Harbin</td>
<td>Pyeongyang</td>
<td>modern locations: Pyeongyang 平壤; ‘Western capital’ 西京</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odeokji (五德地 Ansi-seong)</td>
<td>Gaegyeong (Gaeseong)</td>
<td>Song’ak 松嶽; ‘middle capital’ 中京</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baek’agang (百牙岡)</td>
<td>Pyeongyang</td>
<td>Seoul</td>
<td>Mok’myeok’yang 木見壤; ‘southern capital’ 側京</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21. Sin Chaeho - Continental and false peninsula locations of the *Three Capitals.

10. Sin’s etymology for hydronym root *ra

One of the key etymologies Sin proposes in his scheme of ancient Korea is *ra or *lla with the meaning of ‘river: state/country’ (國) and supposedly cognate to his reconstructed term for river *ari. He derives *ra from nara ‘country’ < rara (a form, he claims, to be attested by Bak Jiwon 朴趾源 and Han Chiyun 韓致澣) and treats it as cognate to naru ‘ford’ based on the notion that the earlier states developed from riverside communities. He posits then that *ra (‘state’) can be found as a suffix to many ancient toponyms variously rendered into phonetic idu as: na 那, ra 罗, no 奴, ru 妻, nu 穀, yang 良, yang [rang] 浪, yang 種, yang 壩, gang 廠, yang 陽, a 牙, and ya {sa} 雖; and semantically as: cheon ‘river’ 川, won ‘plain’ 原, gyeong ‘capital’ 京 and guk ‘state/kingdom’ 國. (JSS Sin 1988:51)
Another idu attestation is in Garak (驪洛 aka Gaya confederation) where he suggests the character 洛 was used only for its initial and medial sounds. (JSMS Sin 2007:30)

Explicit evidence for the important idu rendering 墟, found in Pyeongyang (平壤), Sin cites from the SS which records 구국천 (國川 'state river') as also being rendered 구국 (國壤). (JSMS Sin 2007:150) (The SS reference is in the context of the name of 9th Goguryeo king Gogukcheon-wang. SS:高句麗本紀: "故國 川王 吾云國対." The character here is the variant 墟. The name of 18th Goguryeo king, Goguk’yang-wang 故國壤王, contains the identical character to that of Pyeongyang, but in this case there is no mention of an alternative name. This complication does not greatly detract from Sin’s reasoning as he would treat 墟/壤 as close variants, which clearly they are).

He also cites the Hunminjeong’eum (訓民正音 1446) in which the double liquid cluster 라 is described as sounding similar but not identical to the initial sound of Sino-Korean 墟: thus he posits *illa as an alternative reconstruction to *ra 라. (JSMS Sin 2007:149)

Sin acknowledges that modern Korean lacks an initial liquid /r/ but believes the form *rara demonstrates that it originally did: he further suggests Manchu ?rai 라이 ('region' 地方) as a genetic cognate and therefore evidence of this. (JSMS Sin 2007:31)

10.1 Janhunen’s discussion of Liao etymologies and Amuric-Tungusic root *la

Sin’s hypothesis that various hydronyms and toponyms of settlements close to rivers were based on an original root *ra or *illa finds support in a paper by historical linguist Janhunen (2008) discussing the possible etymological origins of the hydronym Liao (遼). Similar to Sin’s interpretation of toponyms as phonogrammatic idu renderings, Janhunen (2008) treats the Sinitic Liao as a secondary rendering of the local Manchurian hydronym and so looks for potential cognates in the locally attested language families of Mongolic, Tungusic and Amuric. He explicitly leaves out consideration of Koreanic - as well as Japonic - both on the contextual grounds that he believes they were unlikely to have been spoken in the region of the modern Liao basin, and linguistically because they lack an initial liquid, lateral /l/, in their reconstructed phonologies. As Sin was working within the genetic Altaic paradigm he was willing to accept any non-Sinitic, continental Manchurian language (i.e. preferably not Japanese) as directly related to ancient Joseon and Korean, and indeed cites several Manchu cognates including in the case of *ra. (JSMS Sin 2007:31)
Janhunen’s discussion concludes that the etymological origin of *Liao* was likely from the root *la* attested in the Amuric isolate Ghilyak (Nivkh) as *La* (the Nivkh term for the Amur river) and *la-ms* 'easterly wind’, and in Proto-Tungusic as *laamo* ‘sea’ (with attestations used in Ewenki dialects also for Lake Baikal and Samoyedic *yām* ‘sea, large river: the Ob’) and *laamos* 'wind’. Between Amuric and Tungusic, he suggests the root *la* more likely originated in Amuric as the Nivkh language possesses other water related words also potentially containing the same root (namely *lar* ‘wave’, *lat* ‘cliff’, *langr* a type of seal, and *lasq* a type of fish).

An additional correlation between Sin and Janhunen’s ideas is that, although Janhunen rejects any genetic relation to Korean language, he proposes rather that Buyeo itself was Amuric or 'Para-Amuric' speaking.

Whilst Janhunen’s analysis is more technically advanced in the application of the Comparative Method, his broader premise on hydronyms, that a given name may be applied to more that one river and that there would be variations in its forms, agrees with Sin’s own reasoning.

"Irrespective of what this language was, it is possible that the same hydronym or hydrological term also survives in the names of other rivers in the region. In that case, of course, there can also be variation in the form of the names." (Janhunen 2008:92)

"The fact that Ghilyak *la* 'Amur' is the name of a specific river does not mean that it cannot have denoted other rivers in the past. For one thing, river names are often transferred from place to place, partly because the distinction between hydronyms and hydrological terms ('river') is often vague." (Janhunen 2008:97)
[Chapter 12] Choe Namseon (崔南善 1890–1957)

Choe Namseon was a contemporary to Sin Chae-ho but ten years his junior. Like Sin, Choe is well known as a literary and cultural enlightenment figure but his historical works are dismissed for their perceived pseudo nature.

Despite being largely preoccupied with the same questions relating to Korea’s historical and modern identity, their careers and writings represent a clear study in contrasts. Concerning their historiography of ancient Korea, the key difference between them is that whilst Sin sought to write history as a narrative focused on human actors, Choe instead wrote on particular topics emphasizing such phenomena as found through a - relatively speaking - more objective and 'modern’ analytical approach employing the new methodologies and theories of anthropology, folkloristics and mythography.

In at least one core aspect, however, there was also commonality: Sin and Choe both sought to define ancient Korea’s ethnic identity in opposition to that of China whilst at the same time they would claim a large part of Chinese civilization as having, in fact, originated in the non–Sinic Dangyí (東夷) culture with which they associated the ancient Koreans of Joseon (hereafter 'Old Joseon' O]). In both cases their conceptualization of the Dangyí 'other' was situated within the framework of the Ural-Altaic hypothesis, but thereafter their interpretations again differed, particularly on the treatment of ancient Japan, which Choe included and Sin ignored.

The approach and evolution of Choe Namseon’s ideas on ethno-cultural identity can be grasped through his treatment of two interrelated topics, that of the Dangun progenitor myth and, separately 'culture zones' (文化圈), the latter being divided between his early •Bulham culture hypothesis and his later lectures on the 'ManMong' (滿蒙 Manchuria–Mongolia) cultural zone.

Choe authored three main treatises on Dangun: Dangun-non (壇君論 [DN]) serialized in the Dong’a-ilbo newspaper between 3 March and 25 July 1926; Dangun-geupgi-yeongu (壇君及其研究 [DGY]), published in the 1928 May edition of the magazine Byeolgeongon (別乾坤), and Dangun-gogi-jeonseok (壇君古記箋釋 [DG]), published in the 1954 February edition of Sasanggye.93) Written in Korean and published in the 'mass media' of the day, they can be regarded as a direct contribution to the popular discourse on history and identity. By contrast his two main works on culture zones were both written in Japanese: "Purukan-bunka-

93) Details of these works are given in the summary explanation chapter of the modern Korean translation by Jeon Songgon and Heo Yongho in Choe 2013a:311–323
ron” (不咸文化論 - hereafter referred to by the Sino-Korean pronunciation 'Bulham-munhwra-ron' [BMR]) was printed in Chôsen oyobi Chôsen-minzoku (朝鮮及朝鮮民族 第1集 1927 published in Seoul)94 whilst ManMô-bunka (滿蒙文化 - hereafter 'ManMong-munhwra' [MM]) is comprised of a series of written lectures delivered early on during his tenure at Kenkoku-daigaku university in Manchukuo and completed in June 1941, but apparently not published until being included in his posthumous collected works of 1974.95)

The circulation of his "Bulham-munhwra-ron" is unknown: the fact of being written in Japanese language would not itself have presented any significant barrier to contemporary educated Koreans. It would seem, however, that both "Bulham-munhwra-ron" and ManMong-munhwra would have exerted influence on popular history writing more indirectly, perhaps only following the publication of Choe’s collected works: significantly this continues today with the recent (2013) republication of his complete works translated into contemporary Korean in a twenty-four volume series "Choe Namseon’s complete collection of Korean Studies [works]" published by Gyeong’in-munhwra-sa (최남선 한국학 총서: 경인문화 사).

ManMong-munhwra carries an additional significance as being one of the first Korean authored works to synthesize and engage with the emergent Western academic discourse and so represents an early meeting point between the Korean authored Northern/Altai narrative and the Western 'zonal/frontier' discourse (for which, see Chapter 19).

1. Dangun-non 壇君論 (1926)

Dangun-non is broadly divided into two sections: the first containing a critical summary of the contemporary Japanese scholarship that sought to negate the Dangun myth, the second part comprising a further rebuttal by way of presenting Choe’s own counter interpretation. Before these, Choe begins the work by first presenting the original SY version of the Dangun myth followed by supporting references found in the SS, Goryeo-sa, Gwon Geun’s Dongguk-saryak (東國史略) and Eungjesi (應製詩), and finally from the geography section of the Sejong Sillok (世宗實錄).

This is followed by a brief discussion justifying the study of mythology which he acknowledges cannot be directly treated as factual history.

95) Source texts used for the following analyses are the recent Korean translations are Choe (2013a, b and c).
"Because it is something that people reading now would not believe, it becomes clear rather that it was something believed by people in the past: because it was something believed by people in the past, [we] may expect [to discover] from within [an analysis of the myth] one type of historical 'residual pearl' (遺珠), or, if not as much as that, [at least] a 'new light' for the fields of humanities and minjok studies. [However], if by chance, [the content of] this slight myth - an ancient poem of the people (民중) - did not restrict itself to primitive philosophy, but was [in fact] set against a definite historical background and so helped even to a small degree in sweeping away the historical dark, then this would be a gain beyond expectations." (DN Choe 2013a:16)

Name-checking Euhemerus (fl. 300BCE) and Max Müller (1823–1900), Choe argues a multidisciplinary approach is required to fully interpret a myth and laments that Dangun has been dismissed by Japanese scholars.

Deconstruction of the Japanese anti-Dangun discourse

In his critical overview, Choe summarizes the views on Dangun of six prominent Japanese scholars: Naka Michio (那珂通世 1851–1908), Shiratori Kurakichi (白鳥庫吉 1865–1942), Imanishi Ryū (今西龍 1875–1932), Miura Hiroyuki (三浦周行 1871–1931), Inaba Iwakichi (稲葉巌吉 1876–1940) and Oda Shōgo (小田省吾 1871–1953). Their core argument is that the Dangun myth was a late Buddhist invention, derived from local Pyeongyang folklore which was developed in response to the crisis of the Mongol invasion. The following points are according to Choe.

Concerning Buddhist influence, Shiratori made the strongest case in his paper "Chōsen no Koden-ko" (朝鮮の古傳考), asserting that the Dangun myth originated in a 'Goguryeo tree spirit worshipping practice' which was later embellished by Buddhist monks. He identified Myohyang-san (妙香山 'subtle fragrance mountain') - to which Hwan’ung descends - as named in reference to Mallikā (末利山 Malli-san) in Indic tradition from the Gwanbul Samādhi-ocean sutra (觀佛三昧海経): from this mountain grows a kind of fragrant sandalwood tree udu-jeondan (牛頭旃檀) which he equates to the sindan-su (神壇樹 'divine dan tree') from the SY myth. The name of Hwan’in (桓因) he claimed to have been taken from the name of Śakra, the heavenly lord 'Seokje-hwan’in-tara' (釋提桓因陀羅 석제환인타라 Śakra devānām indrah) in Buddhism. (DN Choe 2013a:21–22)

96) This is identified in the modern annotation as Mount Malaya (摩羅耶山).
97) SY writes the dan of Dangun and sin-dan-su with the character 壇 [土 'earth'] radical on the left whilst Jewang-ungi and all other sources use 樓 [木 'tree'] radical. In his first two Dangun studies Choe uses the SY character, but in his final work he adopts the Jewang-ungi variant.
Citing Heo Mok’s linkage of Hae Buru – founder of Buyeo – being the son of Dangun, Shiratori further argued that Dangun was thus only the progenitor myth of Goguryeo, not Oj.

Naka and Imanishi, meanwhile, both emphasized the theory that the name of Dangun ‘Wanggeon’ (王倉）as recorded in the SY, was simply a corruption derived from the name of Wangheom-seong (王衡城), the Oj capital of Wi Man that both the Orthodox Narrative and the Japanese located at Pyeongyang: Imanishi argued that, in short, Wanggeon was the personified seon’im (仙人) deity of Wangheom-seong, and Dangun was an honorific title. Interestingly, he traced the notion of seon’im to a residue shaman substrate, an idea which forms a core aspect of Choe’s counter theory.

※ The argument of the Japanese scholars would in fact support the antiquity and authenticity of the Dangun myth, at least back to the C2nd BCE attestation of Wangheom-seong in the Shiji.

However, Imanishi further highlighted the point that the term Dangun itself was notably absent from the names of the ‘eight sage shrines’ recorded in the Goryeo-sa as having been established in Pyeongyang by Myocheong during his 1135 rebellion and so reasoned that it must have been of a later coinage. In fact the name Wanggeon/heom is missing from the eight shrines, too, but Imanishi is willing to allow that the same seon’im deity may been known by one of the other names that was included such as the Pyeongyang-seon’im (平壤仙人) or Taebaek-seon’im (太白仙人).

Both Miura and Inaba further argued that the more Sinic Gija legend, whether strictly historical or not, predated the Dangun myth and that Dangun emerged as a secondary nativist reaction which gained official recognition to satisfy the will of the people and function as a unifying ethnic progenitor. Oda, further emphasized that the Dangun myth was elevated as an ethnic unifier in response to the Mongol invasion.

Choe also cites additional evidence against Dangun’s authenticity found in a 1923 publication of the Government-General ‘teaching reference materials for Korean history school teachers’ (普通學校 國史敎授 參考書朝鮮史歴教材): this contained the point that there were no references to Dangun prior to the SY. It gives two examples: the 40 volume long Gaoli-tuijing (高麗圖經 'Illustrated [description] of Goryeo’ 1124 - compiled by Song scholar Xu Jing’s (徐兢) a year after visiting Goryeo in 1123) which contains a ‘foundation’ (建國) chapter at the beginning recording Gija, Wi Man and Jumong, but not Dangun; and the Myohyangsan-Bohyeonsa-ipgi (妙香山普賢寺立記 ‘Record of the Construction of

**Rebuttal and counter theory**

Choe’s immediate criticism of the Japanese arguments is that they focus exclusively on the SY version, taking it at face value and interpreting it too literally whilst ignoring the wider context. Choe readily acknowledges that the SY version has been influenced by Buddhism but only on the surface level: he makes the point that the story itself is not at all Buddhist and arguably contains clearer elements of Taoism and early Confucianism. He also criticizes their at once contradictory attempts to dismiss the story as primitive folklore: Choe argues the poor condition of the myth is rather evidence of its great antiquity and that it had survived until SY only as oral tradition. He asserts then, that the original story must be based on some actual past reality and that the original non-Buddhist version of the story needs to be rediscovered and restored.

Thus Choe’s counter-strategy to the Japanese arguments was to prove that the Dangun legend was much older than the 13th century SY version and that it predated Buddhism: to this end, he sought to demonstrate **underlying shamanistic roots**, and in turn bolster these with his own speculative hypothesis of an early sun worshipping religion - at this stage unoriginally termed *sal* - as evidence of an ancient civilization ancestral to OJ. This second half of *Dangun-non* focusing on *sal* is augmented by some 198 endnotes which include many premodern literary references and, combined, are more substantial than the main text (no doubt reflecting in part the limitation of the original newspaper format in which he published).

Choe argues that key terms from the Dangun legend which the Japanese had identified in Buddhist texts, and in the case of 'Wanggeom’ (王陰) also the *I-Ching* (易經 Book of Changes ”王公設陰”).98) reflected not pure borrowings, but only a Buddhist influenced choice in selecting Sinic characters to represent long established indigenous words: nor was the particular choice of characters purely artificial as Korea’s ancient *sal/n religion both had analogies in pre-Buddhist Indic religion, and had diffused from OJ to the Chinese continent giving rise to Taoism.

Thus in response to the case of Hwan’in (桓因), for example, he proposes the etymology: *hwan* < *han‘ul* (天 ‘sky/heaven’) noting that in the Yeongnam dialect /a/ vowels are often pronounced as *wa*, and that the Indo-Sinic *Hwan’in* 桓因

---

98) In Note 54, Choe highlights Shiratori’s claim that many OJ toponyms such as Wanggeom and the counties of the Han Commanderies were derived from the *I-ching*, see DN Choe 2013a:123).
was chosen because it also translated the Indic term for 'heavenly lord' (天主).
(DN Choe 2013a:57)

Choe then identifies many mountains whose names begin with /s/ (ㅅ) which he
therefore posits were derived from *sal. e.g.
Suri (修理), So’rae (蘇來), Sora (所羅), Sara (沙羅), Seollye (薛例), Suro (首露).
Suyong (首龍), Sana (舍那), Surak (水落), Sujeong (水精), Sudo (修道), Songni
(俗離 森理), Sillyu (神留 신류), Sillim (神林 신림), Sinheung (神興) and Silleuk (神
勤 신륙). (DN Choe 2013a:87)

Such mountains, he hypothesizes, being the first places to receive the morning
sun, were used as sacred dan altars (聖壇) for sun rituals.

He suggests the root of *sal is *sa (サ) 'life' and lists Korean words beginning
with /s/ in the semantic fields of 'life' (sal- 살다), 'dawn' (sae- 새벽) and
'water-spring' (saem 생). (DN Choe 2013a:93-4)

He further proposes the etymology *sal > *san as the origin to the use of the
Sinic characters for seon (仙 and 僧 'mountain spirit/holy one') hypothesizing
that *sal/n spread from northern Korea to the Shandong peninsula in China
where it was rendered as 僧 (僧道) and developed further into the Taoist religion
during the Warring states and Han dynasty periods. (DN Choe 2013a:94-6)

In Korea *sal/n was subsequently written with the characters sin 神
('god/divine/supernatural'), seong 聖 ('holy/sacred'), and seon (仙). In China, the
character seon 仙 (Chinese xian) was chosen because it also translated the term
for pre-Buddhist Indian 'Rishi' (ṛṣi ) the holy Rgvedic poets. (DN Choe 2013a:96)
This idea helps to associate Dangun with more ancient - non-Buddhist,
non-Chinese - traditions.

Choe further suggests that: *sal was also related to the various words for
'shaman' found in Manchurian, Mongolian and Japanese languages (which again
tend to begin with /s/): a social class of priests emerged named *sal’an (which
became seon’in 仙人) whose theory developed into an ascetic spiritual practice on
mountains, predating Buddhist Seon (禪); and that these mountain sites were
later replaced by Buddhist temples and/or remained sacred to locals, for which
reason Buddhist temples often have foundation legends of expelling dragons or
driving away robbers, which symbolize the Buddhist takeover of these sites.

Evaluation
The elucidation of shamanistic elements in the Dangun myth is more concretely
realised in his subsequent works on the topic. The *sāl hypothesis meanwhile was an immediate prototype to his Bulham hypothesis into which much of the omnicomparative ‘methodology’ and sky-mountain conceptualization were carried forward, but the term *sāl itself - clearly borrowed from equivalent solar cult diffusion hypotheses in the West - was to be dropped in favour of *pārk.
2. *Dangun-geupgi-yeongu* 壇君及其研究 (1928)

"If Dangun is removed, then the bottom of the spring [that feeds] the long river named Joseon is blocked. Consequently, as a question concerning the entirety of Joseon culture, the import that would have been accorded to Dangun is truly both essential and natural." (DGY Choe 2013a:239)

Choe's second work on Dangun attempts a systematic analysis following a more scientific approach through which he sought to demonstrate that no aspect of the myth was trivial or falsified. He presents short analyses of the myth from each of the following paradigms: as mythology, religion, and history: from the perspective of anthropology and economic history, and finally linguistically. Under this folkloristic methodology he advocates for the establishment of 'Dangunology' (壇君學) as its own area of academic study. An outline of his analysis is as follows.

**As mythology**

Universal mythical elements of the Dangun story, identified through comparative mythology, prove that Dangun is authentic and not a later fabrication. Motifs in the Dangun story that are evident both in Mongol and Japanese mythology, as well as the other historical Korean polities, include the following.

1) Celestial son sent down from heaven to earth in order to rescue humanity.
2) Descent to the tallest mountain which becomes the centre of the new theocracy.
3) Marriage between a god and human.
4) This marriage results in a semi-divine progenitor.
5) Thus a divine lineage is created for the ruling family.

**As religion**

Myths reflect the ancient beliefs of the people in the supernatural and holy aspects. The Dangun myth contains the following elements.

1) Belief in a ruler who supervises both ritual and politics, and has the power and divine authority to govern not only the affairs of humans but also natural phenomena such as wind, clouds and rain.
2) Elements of primitive religion: fetish (符印), prayer, magic power, taboo (忌), sanctuary (神社), altar (神壇), sacred tree (神壇樹), cereal grains, disease, punishment, and good and evil.

※ A more systematic analysis of these elements is found in *Dangun-gogi-jeonseok* (1954) below.
3) Objects of worship: sky, sun, mountains, animals, plants, ancestors and shaman lords (巫君).
4) Explanation for the origin of Joseon’s religion suggesting that it was a divine teaching (以神設教).
5) Even the apparently non-religious elements of the myth can be taken as describing the religion: thus the foundation of the state represents the establishment of the religion, and the moving of the capitals signifies the movement of the centre of the religion.

As history
In the primeval era, there was no greater objective truth than in beliefs: myths are the record of those beliefs and in turn they preserve aspects of ‘proto-historical’ facts. From Dangun, the following can be learnt.

1) The proto-state of *Hwan-guk (桓國) was based in the mountains. This is reflected in the *ji/gi (支) ending of various Korean polities such as Wolji (月支) and the Japanese name for Silla, Siragi. This *ji/gi is cognate to the old Korean word for ‘fortress 城 / mountain peak 狀’ *jae (結).
   ※ This point is entirely different to the interpretation of the same character given by Sin Chaeho.

2) The ruler’s title was ‘celestial king’ (天王).
3) The centre of Hwan-guk moved south from the mountain location of Taebaek (aka Baekdu) to the plain of Pyeongyang.
   ※ In some respects this point anticipates the archaeological ‘movement hypothesis’ (이동설) of Oj in currency today, as promoted by Song Hojeong although in the latter case - based on bronze daggers - the movement is from Liaodong to Pyeongyang.99)

4) Being recorded in the Dangun myth, ‘Joseon’ is thus the oldest name of the eastern polities. The other old name known to the Chinese, Suksin (肅慎) is cognate to Joseon.
   ※ This point anticipates Kim Unhoe’s pan-Altaic etymologies and, separately, has been examined by Janhunen (2004).

5) Pyeongyang is the oldest region of civilization on the Korean peninsula.

As anthropology (社會學)
The Dangun myth can be read for understanding stages of social development

99) See Seong’s (Song Ho Jung) chapter "Old Chosön - Its History and Archaeology" in Byington (ed.) 2013.
reached by ancient Joseon.

1) Bear and tiger as evidence of totemic practice in society: the bear continued to be a totem for the dominant Buyeo peoples.
2) Avoidance of sunlight for a certain number of days in order to become human is an example of a taboo (忌) required to be observed.
3) The bear-turned-woman’s coupling with Hwan’ung can be interpreted as exogamous marriage practice, more advanced than incest or endogamy. That the objective of this ‘marriage’ was purely to conceive a child rather than establish a family life together reflects the still primitive stage of society.
4) That it was the woman who actively sought the pregnancy is evidence of matriarchal (母權 ‘mother right’) and matrilineal kinship (母系) practice: that Hwan’ung is only temporarily present raises suspicion (假) of the relation between Dangun and Hwan’ung.
5) The birth and rise to power of Dangun symbolizes the emergences of a ‘chieftain system’ (酋長制) and the transition of society from a tribal to political organization.

Vying for land with other groups, adopting agriculture and animal husbandry the Dangun polity gradually developed into a political state, but these societal developments were underpinned by the primitive notion of the magical origins of the shaman-lord (巫君) Dangun Wanggeom.

As economic history
Analyzed according to the work of Wilhelm Wundt (1832–1920), the Dangun myth contains evidence of the establishment of cities and law, and in particular the development of sedentary agriculture. These can be deduced from the following elements.

1) The ‘earl of wind’ (風伯) and ‘masters of rain and cloud’ (雨師·雲師) personify the importance of weather for an agricultural society.

※ The Hong’ik-ingen (弘益人間) phrase is mentioned in this passage but not expounded upon.

2) Cereal (穀) is placed first in the list of 360 human matters that Hwan’ung commanded the wind, rain and cloud to oversee.
3) The usage of mugwort and garlic in the process of achieving human form, also reflects concern for plants and agriculture.

※ This seems an obviously weak point as such herbs would have been known to hunter-gatherers prior to sedentary agriculture.

4) That there are ‘360 human matters’ over which Hwan’ung governs and cultivates reflects the import of the solar year, and by extension the import
of the sun for farming.
5) The difficulty of the 'taboo' for the bear and tiger to avoid sunlight for 100 days, again reflects the importance of sunlight.

※ Choe further posits that one of the three 'celestial tokens' (天符) would have been cereal grain: this is based on an episode in Dongmyeongwang-pyeon when Jumong's divine mother, Yuhwa, sends him cereal grains, however, in the following Dangun work, Choe has dropped this highly tenuous idea.

The history of the Hwan people (桓族) is that of an agricultural society developing out of hunter-gatherers and so sun worship became the central aspect of the ancient religion of Korea.

**Linguistically**

Aside from the content of the story, its authenticity can be independently established by analyzing the name Dangun Wanggeom (壇君王儉).

1) Contemporary to the creation of the myth, society was at a 'magico-religious' stage ruled by 'medicine men' or shaman-lords (巫君), thus we can expect the name to be related to this concept. It can be deduced then, that 'Dangun' is cognate to the modern colloquial term danggul (卭卭 'shaman'), as well as dangol (卭卭 'shaman').

※ This differs to the etymology he previously suggested in Dangun-non. (See DN Choe 2013a:42–3)

2) These terms are also cognate to Mongol teonggeol (延葛) with the meaning both of 'sky' (天) and 'shaman' (巫). This term was recorded in the Hanshu phonetically as taeng-ri (撻梨). Another cognate is found in SGG "Mahan" account as cheongun (天君 'celestial lord') which combines both a semantic and phonetic approximation.

3) 'Wanggeom' is an honorific title derived from honorific prefix *al/am (암 /般) and ending *ga/gam (가 /柵 *great/holy one); thus Wanggeom < *amgam carrying the semantic meaning of 'celestial-human sage-lord' (天人聖君), i.e. a 'shaman lord' (巫君).

It can be considered cognate to the Garak (鴉洛 aka Gaya) title of hangi (早岐 [attested in Nihon-shogi ref.] or a'rijilii 阿利叱智 [in Nihon-shogi annotation?]) and the Baekje title of eora-ha (於羅瑕 - [given in Zhou shu:異域列傳]).

4) Titles used by other polities such as Baekje eora (於羅), Garak ari (阿利) and Goguryeo gochu (高齺) all carry the semantic etymology of 'divine shaman' (神巫).

5) The term seon'in of 'Seon'in Wanggeom' (仙人王儉 [SS Goguryeo annal])
is a semantic variant derived from $*\text{s}an'i/\text{seon}'i$ which also carries the meaning of 'shaman'. another variant being $*\text{seon}'\text{angdang}/\text{seon}'\text{ang}$. This is also seen in the term seong’in-jihu (神仙之後 'seon’in descendant' [given in Dongmyeongwang-pyeon referring to Jumong]).

※ Needless to say, the above is all pure speculation.

Further evidence of the semantic meaning is provided by the neighbouring states: in Japan the term for the 'divine sovereign' mikoto (天皇 'celestial emperor'), is also related to the term for 'shaman' miko. The Xiongnu term tenri-godo (撑犁孤屠) translates as 'celestial son' (天子); Northern Yan (北燕) have the term 'celestial king' (天王), the Khitan have 'celestial emperor' (天皇帝), and Ryūkyū ganaji (伽倻志) means 'heaven' (天). Within Korea one finds: Hae Mosu as 'celestial king boy' (天王郎), Jumong as 'celestial emperor child' (天帝子), Hyeokgeose as 'celestial child' (天子), Garak’s cheon-han (天干) 'celestial han,' and Hwan’ung as 'celestial king' (天王). (DGY Choe 2013a:262)

Conclusion
Choe finishes the work reiterating the following core points.

1) Ancient Korea was a consolidated society.
2) Ancient Korea was an agriculture economy.
3) The surviving Dangun story is a proto-history spanning from an age of totemism to an age of heroes and gods.
4) The terms and historical geography described in the Dangun account are all based on historical truth.
5) Dangun Wanggeom was the title of an ancient chieftain who established a theocracy as the son of heaven: as an individual he was the progenitor of the Korean people and civilization.

3. Bulham-munhwa-ron 不咸文化論 (1927)
Choe Namseon’s 'Bulham culture' hypothesis is a quintessential hyperdiffusion theory which posits an expansive ethnolinguistic cultural zone representing a 'third source' of ancient Asian civilization rivalling those of India and China, identified by Choe primarily through the distribution of certain ononyms that stretch in a pan-Asian arc from Japan, across the steppe and silk road routes through to the Balkans and eastern Europe. These cognate ononyms are all derived from two proto 'reconstructions,' that of $*pârk$ (*p, balg ) / $*pârkân$ (*p은은 balg-eun) / $*pârkân\text{-ai}$ (p, 은은 balk-eun-ae) and $*\text{taigâr}$ (대갈 daegal ) / $*\text{taigâr}(i)$ (대가리 daegari ).100)
According to Choe, *Pārk* is immediately cognate to - and indeed he has derived it from - the Korean word for 'bright' *balg-da* (밝다) and is attested as such in Middle Korean. It has been variously rendered into Chinese including, more semantically as *bai* 'white' (白 K. *baek*, MC. *baek*), and phonetically as *buxian* (不咸 K. *bulham*, MC. *pjuw-heam*), the latter being used by Choe as a temporary Sinic designation. *Taigār*, meanwhile, carries the meaning of 'sky' and is cognate with Turkish *tangri* and Mongol *tengri*.

According to his hypothesis, *Pārk* and *Taigār* in turn denote an ancient religio-philosophy based on sky and mountain worship which is the defining feature of the Bulham culture: sacred mountains and peaks were associated with celestial descent myths: personifying the sky they became objects of worship in their own right and so were named as *Pārk* or *Taigār*.

Choe observes that Korea has a high density of *Pārk* type mountains including: Baekdu-san (白頭山), Jangbaek (長白), Jobaek (祖白), Taebaek (太白), Sobaek (小白), Bibaek (鼻白), Gibaek (旗白), Bubaek (浮白), Baek’un (白雲), Baek’wol (白月), Baek’am (白巖), Baek-ma (白馬), Baekhak (白鶴) and Baekhwa (白華). (BMR Choe 2013b:5) As Korea became a unified state certain mountains took on significance at the national level, namely Baekdu-san, the archetype *Pārk* mountain, and Geumgang-san (金剛山 'diamond mountain').

The etymology of Geumgang indirectly derives from *Taigār*, where Geumgang (金剛) is a Chinese semantic rendering of the Sanskrit term Vajra (嗡日羅 'diamond') which was also rendered phonetically as Jakgara (新迦羅 ?) and carries a similar meaning to *Taigār*. Choe also posits Toham-san (吐含山) in Gyeongju as another *Taigār* type mountain with the name being derived from the 'personified form' he determines as *daegam* (대감). To Choe it is no coincidence that the name of the famous Bulguk-sa (佛國寺 'Buddha country') monastery on the slopes of Toham-san can thus also be considered derived from *pārk*.

When identifying variant cognates of *pārk*, Choe allows for the following sound changes.

\[ *balk \xrightarrow{\text{Korean}} \text{Pārk} \rightarrow [p/h + a/ö/u/eu + r/k] \]

※ Of theses, P > h is at least a well known development in northeast Asian languages, though Koreanic is notably aberrant to this trend for preserving the /p/.

---

100) The primary Romanization here is that found in the modern translation and original text.
In Japan, amongst several tens of supposedly cognate ononyms that he lists, Choe identifies the two main *Pārk mountains as Hiko-san (彦山) of Fuzen (豊前 current day Fukuoka prefecture of northern Kyūshū), and Hakone (箱根) < 豊前のPārk-an-ai) of Kanagawa prefecture. Meanwhile *Taigār type mountains are chiefly identified as those ononyms containing *taka, *taki or *take (often rendered as 嶍 'high/sacred peak' or 嶍 'tall mountain'). He further notes that Japanese *Pārk and *Taigār mountains often have associations with the tengu (天狗) folk spirit creature, the name of which, he posits, is also derived from *Taigār.

Whilst treating Japan as a fully constituent part of the Bulham culture, an equally, if not more important, thrust of Choe's hypothesis is targeted at demonstrating the influence of Bulham inside ancient China. Concerning toponyms, Choe focuses on establishing Taishan (泰山) mountain in western Shandong as an archetype *Taigār mountain. Towards this end, he claims that the characters tai (泰) and dai (岱 an older name for the mountain) are not found in other parts of China and so must be renderings of a Dongyi word derived from *taigār. Meanwhile, the name of Fujiun (府君 K. Bugun, MC. pjiux-kjun, aka Dongyue-dadi 東嶽大帝), a deity closely associated with Taishan, is again to be derived from *pārkān. (BMR Choe 2013b:32)

Aside from Taishan, Choe suggests several other *Pārk type toponyms on Shandong including the mountains Bo-shan 博山, Bai-shan 白山 and Fushan 福山, and administrative districts of Boping 博平, Boxing 博興 and Boxian 博縣. He further posits that both the Boxie sea (*渤澥 K. Balhae: source unknown but perhaps referring to 海 - in any event he equates it to Bohai/Balhae 海海) adjacent to Taishan, and the region of land between the mountain and sea, named Penglai (蓬萊), are also of *pārk etymologies. Despite Taishan being significantly inland, Choe draws a parallel between Taishan and Geumgang-san and their 'adjacent' *Pārk type seas: whilst Taishan has Boxie, Geumgang has 'Byeok-hae' (碧海 - he is not entirely clear if he is referring to the East Sea itself), both carrying the meaning of 'blue sea' (滄海) evoking the blue tengri sky. (BMR Choe 2013b:38).

These toponyms form the basis of Choe’s wider assertion of Bulham influence on Chinese culture. He identifies various 'Daoist’ terms this time employing the character bi (碧 綠' cyan' K. byeok, MC. pjaek < *pārk) beginning with a 'Taishan girl' (泰山女) named Bixia-yuan-jun (碧霞元君 K. Byeokha-won-gun) and including: terms for ‘sky’, bila (碧落), bihan (碧漢), bixu (碧虛) and bicheng (碧城): 'east sea' as bihai (碧海), and xiántao (仙桃 'xian peach') as bitao (碧桃).

※ Needless to say, there is little hope of convincing anyone over such semantically transparent etymologies.
In an endnote to *Bulham-munhwa-ron*, Choe describes that the penultimate four chapters were added at a later date to add further evidence to the original chapters after they had been serialized in the newspaper versions. In the first two of these, chapters 14 and 15, he begins to develop better his argument for the influence of Bulham culture on China; here, still focusing on the role of the Dongyi (東夷) centered around Shandong as practitioners of the *Pârk* religion, there is much in common with the *Sudu-gyo* hypothesis of Sin Chaeho’s narrative.

Choe argues that Chinese sources and tradition fail to explain the origins for the celestial conceptualization of Chinese rulers: instead, notions of the 'celestial mandate' (天命) and 'celestial son' (天子) descending from heaven are better represented in the mythologies of the non-Sinic peoples of the *Bulham* culture, the prime example being the Dangun myth, but also those of Jumong and Hyeokgeose, as well as the Mongol Buryat myths of Ata-Ulan-tengeri and Gesil Bogdo, and the Japanese deity Ama-waka-hiko (天若日子). (BMR Choe 2013b:70-1)

He associates the Chinese word *tian* (天 'heaven' K. cheon MC. *then*) with the Xiongnu term *chengli* (撐犁 K. taeng-ri MC. *traengleï*), and the Mongol and Turkic *tangri/tangeri*, all ultimately derived from *taigär*. Separately, he also cites a *Suoyin* (索隱) annotation in the *Shiji* "Xiongnu" chapter noting that the Qilian mountains (祁連山 bordering Gansu and Qinghai provinces) were variously referred to as Tianshan (天山) and Baishan (白山). (BMR Choe 2013b:60)

Concerning mythology, he posits that the names both of Fu Xi (伏羲 K. Bokhwi, MC. Bjuwk-xje) and creator Pangu (盤古 K. Bango, MC. ban-kux) are from *pârk*. He further asserts affinity between Pangu and Indian Purusha (푸르사), as well as the Norse god Wodan (보단 aka Odin). (BMR Choe 2013b:76) Meanwhile the title associated both with Fu Xi and other legendary Chinese sovereigns, Taihao (太昊 K. Taeho), is from *taigär*.

Similar to Sin Chaeho, Choe highlights emperor Shun (舜) as a 'hero of the Dongyi' arguing that an early form of the character for *shun* indicates that its original meaning was 'light' and thus semantically cognate to *pârk*.

Of the two primary terms for 'sovereign' in Chinese, *huang* (皇 K. *hwang*) and *di* (帝 K. je), Choe argues that older forms of *huang* were ideograms showing the sun rising above the earth, whilst *di* was an alternative phonetic rendering of *tangri* < *taigär*. Finally, he posits that the Chinese sun deity Dongjun (東君 K. Donggun, MC tuwang-kjun), too, is cognate both to *tangri* and Dangun. In this

---

101) 漢書:匈奴傳上：“其國稱之曰‘撑犁孤塢單干’，匈奴謂天為‘撑犁’，謂子為‘孤塢’.
way he asserts the legendary sovereigns and emperors of China were all deities of the •Pârk religion. (BMR Choe 2013b:82)

Aside from the distribution of oronyms and shared mythology, Choe tries to strengthen the tangible evidence for the Bulham cultural zone by discussing Mongolian ovoo cairns and Manchurian sacred poles/pillars; concerning the latter he equates Manchurian suomogan/ saemakgan (索莫杆 or shengan/singan 神杆) to Korean sotdae (쏘대) and Japanese torii (鳥居), and he in turn traces these all back to the poles erected in the sacred sodo (蘇塗) districts of Mahan described in the "Han" account section of SGZ. (BMR Choe 2013b:87)

Concerning the content of the •Pârk religion, Choe identifies the surviving remnants synchronically in the practice of northeast Asian shamanism: in the penultimate chapter, he equates the Japanese Shintō purification ceremony termed harai (祓) to the Korean term pur’i (품이 ’group release: exorcism’) both in terms of religious function as well as linguistic etymology. (Choe BMR 94)

Diachronically, he traces the •Pârk cultural lineage only through Korean tradition on the explanatory premise that it was within Korea that •Pârk was best preserved. After the Dangun myth, the earliest historical evidence of •Pârk is in the hwarang tradition of Silla which encompassed mountain worship associated with seon (仙) asceticism and was termed by famed Silla literatus Choe Chiwon as pung-ryu (風流 < •pârk ). Choe speculates that ritual specialists were themselves termed •bak (朴) as evidenced through the early royal Silla surname, Bak, while priests were known as paksu a word which survived into the modern era as the term for a male shaman.

Choe narrates how •Pârk synthesized with early Buddhism but at the higher end of society was gradually marginalized with Buddhist temples replacing •Pârk ritual sites on sacred mountains: owing to its popularity amongst the people, however, during the Goryeo dynasty •Pârk still received some official patronage and •Pârkân rituals were practiced under the name of the paalgwanhoe (八關會) festival. This ended with the establishment of the Neo-Confucian Joseon dynasty and consequently •Pârk was relegated to local practice and disguised itself under the personified Confucian appellation of Bu’gun (부군) enshrined as village tutelary gods for which shamanist Bu’gun gut (부군굿) rituals were held; the precepts of •Pârk were preserved amongst the Korean people and, Choe asserts, they had consequently resurfaced in the modern era with modern popular religious movements such as those which grew out of late 19th century Donghak (東學 'Eastern Learning). (Choe BGM p49–52)

At the same time, Choe narrates how during the Goryeo and Joseon dynasties,
other social and cultural aspects of *Pârk were increasingly secularized such
that the origin of village *gye (契 'cooperative pact') and *sang’yeo (喪興 'bier':
sangdu) organizations surviving into the modern era could be traced back to
the diminished hwarang groups of Silla. In support of this, Choe cites an entry
from Yi Sugwang’s encyclopedia, jibong-yuseol (芝峰類説 1614), explicitly stating
that *gye were also termed *hyangdo (香徒) and itself drawing the connection to
the legendary hwarang group led by Kim Yusin called the Yonghwa-hyangdo (龍
華香徒). Choe posits that *sangdu, the colloquial term for *sang’yeo biers, could
also be derived from *hyangdo whilst he equates the physical aspect of the
funeral biers to Japanese mikoshi (神嶴) portable shrines. (BMR Choe 2013b:90-3)

Outside of East Asia, Choe identifies *Pârk type toponyms and mythological
associations wherever he looks, stark examples being ‘Balkan’ of the Balkans and
the Roman god of fire, Vulcan. According to Choe, such an expansive cultural
zone as Bulham, came about through regular migrations. The origin of *Pârk he
situates "in the vicinity of the Caspian and Black seas," a region which he
regards as the cradle of human civilization; however, he asserts that it was still
Joseon which ultimately developed and then maintained itself as the strongest
archetype region of the Bulham culture. (BMR Choe 2013b:62)

Evaluation

Many of the key weaknesses of Choe’s Bulham hypothesis have been pointed out
by Allen (1990). These include: relying almost solely on linguistic speculation -
both synchronic toponym terms and the diachronic *Pârk → pung-ryu (風流) →
palgwanhoe (八閩會) → Bu’gun (附君) lineage: ignoring particular circumstances of
local beliefs and customs across the zone: describing *Pârk only in terms of
universal concepts such as sun and sky worship: religion not being the only
aspect to define a culture, and, finally, that *Pârk might be expected to have
been better preserved amongst the "tribal societies" of Manchuria or Mongolia, or
within Japanese Shintô than in Korea where it had to contend with state
sponsored Buddhism and Neo-Confucianism.

Certainly it can be argued that Choe fails to give much detail to the concept of
*Pârk, but equally, if what he was trying to describe had a more definite form
already, it would not need to be ‘rediscovered’ in the way that he was
advocating. Although core to the thesis, the specifics of Choe’s linguistic
speculation are almost irrelevant as the larger premise is that of the Altaic
language hypothesis which, in its maximal form, broadly covers the same aerial
distribution. Allen’s question of whether a religion could be used to identify a
cultural zone is more complex: whilst no one feature can define a 'culture',
religious beliefs and mythology undoubtedly do constitute a core intangible
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aspect.

The real question is what Choe meant by 'cultural zone' (文化圈). Clearly it is something broader than ethnicity and consequently does not need to be as self-aware or self-identifying. The more 'concrete' cultures - as they are popularly identified or imagined - tend to be constructs of state formation; thus, similar to Sin, Choe sought to define Bulham as an equivalent and rival to Sinic and Indic cultures. The difficulty is that these cultures have been defined in large part through their consolidated ethnocentric nation states of China and India where they have had influence beyond their political or ethnic borders - e.g. Southeast Asia for Indic culture, Korea-Japan for Sinic culture - it has been most detectably through language and religion. 'The West', when spoken of as a culture, similarly transcends national boundaries but is still primarily identified through certain dominant languages, and a shared religious heritage which owes its spread to an ancient political unity under the Romans.

Contemporary influences

Jeon Seonggon (2008) - who happens also to be the modern translator of several volumes in the recent editions of Choe Namseon's works - identifies the immediate influences on Choe’s hypothesis as Shiratori Kurakichi (白鳥庫吉) and Torii Ryūzo (鳥居隆蔵). In 1911 Shiratori, posited that Bulham-san (不咸山) could have been an old name referring to Changbai-san (長白山 aka Baekdu-san - Jeon 2008:122): in an earlier paper of 1900, he had already pointed out that 'god' in Mongol was termed as tāγri or burkhan (quoted in Laufer 1916) and so he concluded that Bulham-san carried the meaning of 'holy' or 'celestial' mountain (神山·天山 - in Jeon 2008:141) He also equated the Xiongnu word chengli (撈犁 K. taeng-ri MC. traenglei) meaning 'heaven' (天) with cognates from Mongolic and Turkic languages such as tangri, tengri and tangara (in Jeon 2008:145). It seems, however, he did not go so far as considering Chinese tian 天 itself as cognate.

Torii (1925)103 meanwhile had postulated along similar lines to Choe, that the ancient Japanese had been in possession of a single, great culture but that this was part of a wider northeast Asian cultural domain (Jeon 2008:130-1) which could be identified through the shared outlook of shamanism, such as preserved amongst the Koryak and Yakut (Jeon 2008:135): he further noted that a sun god - termed by the Yakut as Urun-Aiy-Toyon 'the white god' - was worshipped by north Asian peoples and associated this with Japan’s own sun god, Amaterasu.

102) For example Byington’s discussion of the "político-historical dimension" and "invented mytho-historical narrative" which accompany the "purely social process" of state formation. (Byington 2003:465)
103) All Torii quotes cited in Jeon are from 人類学より見たる我が上代の文化（第一） (著文閣 1925).
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Alongside Torii, Nishimura Shinji (西村真次 1879-1943) had also postulated Japanese and Joseon *kofun* cultures to be related and part of an ancient 'complex sun culture' of the Transbaikalian region that ultimately originated in the defusion of dolmen culture from Egypt c.800 BCE.\textsuperscript{104)}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{104}]
\end{itemize}
4. Manchuria-Mongol Culture 滿蒙文化 (1941)

ManMong-munhwaw (1941 'Manchuria-Mongol Culture' [MM]) represents the culmination of Choe's research and ideas on northeast Asian ethno-historical identity and can be seen as both a development and revision of the earlier Bulham hypothesis. Aside from methodology, the fundamental weakness of Bulham-munhwaw-ron had been the very question of what it was attempting to identify: an ancient religion but not necessarily a state. Sin Chaeho had solved a similar problem of potential 'vagueness' through postulating an ancient Joseon empire: by contrast, for Choe an enabling paradigm was finally created with the establishment of the Manchukuo (1932) and Mengjiang (1939) states under the expansion of the Japanese Empire. These modern states allowed for an ethnic centered conceptualization of a 'ManMong' pan-Manchuria-Mongolia culture zone and in this way his lectures at the newly established Kenkoku University of Manchukuo can be see as a direct contribution to the ethno-cultural secondary phase of modern 'state formation'.

Overview

A translation of the chapter titles with subheadings from which an overview of the main themes can be seen is as follows.

1. Introduction
Examining the geographic, historical and ethnic distribution of Manchuria and Mongolia.
Presenting the concept of historical 'culture'.

2. The line of cultural movement and Manchuria-Mongolia
Searching for the origin and connected relationships, focusing on primitive culture.

3. Continental Old Shintō (古神道)
Comparing folk beliefs and examining [them] through a religious studies [approach].

4. The idea/philosophy of the nation state expressed in the mythologies [of peoples] beyond the wall (塞外)
Illuminating the relationship of shared origins of myths signifying the actual founding of [ancient] nations.

5. The north-south wars and intertwining of cultures
Investigating the aspect of contact between the northern peoples and southern culture.

6. [Developmental] progress of [tangible] cultural forms in Manchuria-Mongolia
Observing the facts of cultural exchange focusing on Manchuria-Mongolia.

Concerning ethnicity, Choe identifies the three main minjok living 'beyond the wall' as the Turks, Mongols and Tungus. The ancient Tungus were divided between the Suksin (肃慎) and YeMaek (葉鞴); the YeMaek, in turn, were the same Buyeo people who moved south to found Goguryeo and Baekje.
Choe defines the ManMong ethno-culture as follows:

"Over several thousand years, with the [geographical] region [just] discussed as their [main] stage, the [various northern] peoples recorded [in the Chinese histories] developed a manner of living (생활양식) as a single lineage rich in commonality even whilst [maintaining individual] peculiarities...

What we are referring to as 'culture' is the 'life mode' (생활양식 'manner of living') of humans. It includes all manmade aspects of living ranging from tools, clothing, food and housing, to language, literature, art, religious beliefs and politics. If one examines human life styles, the distinction between race and life mode in each instance is peculiar. The region populated by a [certain] group of people (민중) with a common 'life mode' is called a 'life style zone' (생활권).. the ManMong region is representative as being the most expansive 'life style zone.' " (MM Choe 2013c:46)

Generally the ManMong 'lectures' are comprised of discussions of Western and Japanese scholarship integrating various aspects of Choe’s own previous research. Chapter 2 discusses contemporary ideas on the development of early neolithic cultures together with the question of migration and cultural diffusion: here Choe highlights the 'hyperdiffusion' theories of Grafton Elliot Smith (1871-1937) and William James Perry (1887-1949) who comprised the so-called 'Manchester School' of diffusion, and which was adopted and advocated by Nishimura Shinji (in the process revealing the inspiration also for Bulham-munhwa-ron ). According to Choe, Nishimura postulated three eastward migratory routes of cultural diffusion: the northernmost across Siberia, a central route as the 'silk road', and a southern route into India. Apparently building on this, Choe argues that the northern and central routes met together in Manchuria and there created the new cultures which then re-expanded westwards such as the Scythians and Xiongnu. (※ It is not clear if he really meant to imply that the Scythians were part of the re-expansion 'out of Manchuria'.) (MM Choe 2013c:77)

Chapters 3 and 4 primarily discuss shamanism and comparative northeast Asian mythology in which he argues Dangun to be the most archetypal of a common proto-myth of heavenly descension. (MM Choe 2013c:163)

In Chapter 5, Choe turns to the question of China and presents a 'non-Sinocentric' overview of Chinese cultural history outlined below.
Choe’s non-Sinocentric discussion of Chinese history

He begins this survey on the premise that, historically, China proper was confined to the Central Plain and that its development was characterized by two processes: latitudinally by cultural exchange and trade, and longitudinally by near continuous warfare between the sedentary Han Chinese to the south and pastoralist nomads ‘beyond the wall’ to the north. In contrast to the east-west cultural exchange, the north-south conflict was so incessant and intense that throughout history it was the defining feature of China’s relations with other peoples, to the extent, Choe contends, it is possible to explain "the entirety of Oriental history" through this relationship; on this point, and likely his immediate source, Choe cites a paper by Shiratori "The north-south confrontation arising in Oriental history" (‘東洋史における南北の對立’) which, he notes, extends the paradigm into the modern era with Russia replacing the Mongols to the north and Britain in the south.105) (MM Choe 2013c:67)

Choe goes further than either Sin or himself before in asserting that the Chinese and their culture - so dominant a notion to Koreans throughout the premodern era - has in fact been nothing more than the accumulative product of outside, non-Sinic influences:

"Put simply, the Chinese consist not only of the Han (漢) people, and Chinese culture consists not only of the Han [culture]; even speaking with reserve, actual Chinese people and Chinese culture is the composite of all Oriental people and their culture. Just as a lake in the mountains is made up of the water collected from valley streams [flowing in] from all directions, all of the various surrounding peoples and their varied cultures have headed towards the so-called Central Plain, and [there] ceaselessly collected, accumulating [in the form of] the Chinese people and culture."
(MM Choe 2013c:68)

Choe acknowledges that the longevity of 'Chinese' civilization, when compared to Egypt or the Inca (but ignoring India), has been a 'miracle of history'. He attributes this to China being so large that it has, at once been a world in itself but, crucially, one receiving constant infusions of new blood from incoming 'barbarians' throughout history. These influxes he lists chronologically as: the Quanrong (犬戎) during Zhou (周), the Xiongnu during Qin and Han: the Five Hu (五胡) from the time of the Three Kingdoms that represented particularly large migrations: the Huihu (回鶻), Tujue (突厥) and Tufan 吐藩 during Tang; and the

105) Shiratori’s paper presents a tripolar model with Japan becoming the equivalent ‘Manchurian’ entity: important for Ledyard, Janhunen and Wontack Hong models (see Chapter 19).
Khitan and Western Xia (西夏) during Song; and subsequently the foreign
dynasties of the Khitan Liao and Jurchen Jin, culminating in the Mongol Yuan
and Manchu Qing. (MM Choe 2013c:169)

This constant influx and renewal, however, has simultaneously been balanced by
the inescapable power of Chinese assimilation. Choe characterizes Chinese
civilization as having been 'extremely inclusive', willingly adopting, for example,
the philosophy and art of Buddhism, and the astronomy and calendrical sciences
of Islam. In all cases, though, the incoming peoples and culture have inevitably
become 'Sinicized'. (MM Choe 2013c:170)

Beginning with the ethnogenesis of the Chinese Han, Choe lists their three
traditional ancestors as being: the Xia of Shanxi province, the Yin/Shang spread
between the Yellow and Huai rivers, centered on Taishan mountain, and the
Zhou to the west located around Qi Shan (岐山): of these Yin was closely related
to the Dongyi people and Zhou to the Xirong (西戎): the Yin practiced agriculture
whilst the Zhou were initially pastoralist. He regards the Xia, Yin and Zhou not
purely as a succession of early dynasties, but as three ethnic groups. At the
time of the Qin unification, the Han ethnicity was formed from an amalgamation
of these and other peoples including the Di (狄), Rong (戎), Shanrong (山戎),
Dongyi (東夷) and Man (蠻).

Of these groups, the Dongyi had a particularly strong influence on early Chinese
culture. Again, according to Choe, most notably the concept of 'heaven' tian (天
MC. then) and 'emperor' di (帝 MC. teH) were both cognate and derived from
a non-Sinic, Dongyi word for 'sky/heaven' related to other Ural-Altaic languages:
he thus posits tian 天 < t’eneri and di 帝 < tegeri.

Choe then continues with the themes previously found in Bulham-munhw-a-ron,
that Shun (舜) was Dongyi and deified by the Chinese as a god, and that the
Dongyi practiced mountain worship focused on Taishan (泰山), the oronym of
which was another cognate to tegeri. Reduced to a single paragraph, Choe
attributes this sky—mountain religion of *Parkhan/Burkhan to the Dongyi and
Northern Di (北狄), noting again that modern Changbai/Beakdu-san was named
Bulham (不咸), whilst the name of the derived Chinese deity associated with
Taishan was Fujun (府君 K. Bu’gun). (MM Choe 2013c:176)

Choe lists further recorded examples of early influences of the non-Sinic peoples
taken from sources 'such as' the Chunqiu-zuozhan (春秋左傳), including:
Song-jun (宋君) 'serving a Dongyi god' on the banks of the Sishui (泗水 in
Shandong), and Zhou king Ping (平王) adopting Rong ritual practice whilst equally
being criticized (by Xi-gong 僖公?) for his speech and clothing being those of the
Dongyi. Giving examples, too, of intermarriage he posits the mixing of both blood and customs in the make-up of the early Chinese. (MM Choe 2013c:178)

The non-Sinic Rong and Di (戎狄) were instrumental in trade along the Silk Road introducing Western material culture to the east. The Scythian double-bladed (broneze?) sword, for example, was first associated with the Xiongnu, termed jinglu-dao (徑路刀 [in 漢書: 匈奴傳下]), and adopted by Zhou, where King Wu used a qingtù (輕呂) to cut up the corpse of Yin king Zhou (紂王): Choe posits these terms to be cognate with the Turkic word for 'sword' which he gives as king-luk.

Choe makes the point that in most cases intangible cultural influence, as must have been transmitted early on also from the Dongyi and Di (狄) to the east and north respectively, is likely impossible to identify either through written sources or archaeology. (MM Choe 2013c:179 – ※ This point agrees with Saarikivi & Lavento (2009) more recently)

Subsequent to the formative Spring and Autumn Period, Choe proposes three major stages of cultural 'mixing' between Chinese and non-Sinic northern peoples to have occurred in the historical era, namely under the Xiongnu, the Xianbei and, finally, the Mongols. (MM Choe 2013c:179)

Equated with the broader ethnic designation of Hu (胡), the Xiongnu are credited with the use of iron weapons earlier than the Chinese: in support of this Choe highlights that an older form of the Chinese character for 'iron’ yì (鎚 K. cheol) itself contains the character for 'Yi barbarian’ (夷). Xiongnu articles of battle were first adopted by Chinese Zhao king Wuling (趙武靈王), these include: the use of cavalry in place of chariots, mounted archery (enabled by iron stirrups, although Choe is not explicit) and light armour. (MM Choe 2013c:183)

Alongside military innovations, Choe suggests that later during the period of Han and Wei, the Chinese adopted various cultural artifacts from the Xiongnu, identifiable through their being prefixed by hu (胡), including furniture such as tables and beds, food and drink, music and theatre. Charging that the Chinese dynastic histories negatively portrayed the Xiongnu, Choe gives two positive examples of cultured Xiongnu: the philosopher Qinguli (禽滑釐) a prominent disciple of Mozi (墨子 c.470–391 BCE), and Jin Midi (金日磾) the former Xiongnu prince and trusted advisor to Han emperor Wu. (MM Choe 2013c:189)

Following the Xiongnu, the Xianbei arose in their place who, together with the Wuhuan (烏丸), were termed as Donghu (東胡 'eastern Hu'). Northern China was effectively unified by the Tuoba Xianbei (拓跋鮮卑) who established the Northern
Wei dynasty. According to Choe, Buddhism, music, Taoism and Confucianism were all promoted more by the northern Wei than southern Chinese dynasties; thus, much which has come to be considered as Chinese 'high culture' was introduced and/or promoted by the Xianbei. This trend culminated in the celebrated high culture of the Tang dynasty which represents a synthesis of Hu (胡 used in its broadest sense) and Han (漢). (MM Choe 2013c:192)

The scattered peoples north of the Tang soon reconstituted themselves as the Khitan Liao, to be then followed by the Jurchen Jin who Choe credits with completing the "unfinished task of Goguryeo" in unifying Manchuria and, further, conquering northern China. (MM Choe 2013c:193)

Finally, it is under the Mongol Yuan empire that he accredits the non-Sinic northern peoples with fully accomplishing the self-proclaimed Chinese ideal of 'unifying all under heaven', both geographically and politically, to a far greater extent than any Chinese ruler had done before. Choe further asserts that the Yuan, again, came closer to achieving both the meritocratic ideals of Confucius and the 'kingly way' (王道) described by Mencius than any previous Chinese dynasty.

Concerning Confucian learning itself - a fundamental core of Chinese identity - he argues that throughout much of history, Confucius was more actively revered by the northern peoples than by the Han. He highlights posthumous titles given to Confucius such as: 'Baochengxuan-nigon' (褒成宣尼公) by Wang Mang (王莽 45BCE-23CE who he thus implies was a non-Sinic northerner), 'Wensheng-nifu' (文聖尼父) by Northern Wei emperor Gaozu (高祖 r.471-499), 'Zhishengwenshan-wang' (至聖文善王) under the Tang, and 'Dacheng-zhishengwenshan-wang' (大成至聖文善王) during the Yuan. He relates the story of the famed Jurchen Jin general Nianhan (粘罕 1080-1137) who, on the advice of a former ethnic Balhae general, Gao Qingxu (高慶緒), punished ethnic Han Chinese soldiers for desecrating the tomb of Confucius in Qufu (曲阜) as he drove the Song southward out of Shandong.106) And finally, he notes that upon the establishment of each of the later northern dynasties - Liao, Jin, Yuan and Qing - Confucius shrines were established (or re-established) in each and every county. (MM Choe 2013c:195-7)

Choe asserts, that for some 1,516 years of China’s 2,200 year history dating back to 246 BCE, the beginning of the Qin dynasty, China has been ruled by 'non-Chinese' peoples.

106) This story he references is from Songmo-jiwen (松漠紀聞) by Hong Hao (洪皓1088-1155) although it is not in the Chinese Text Project version.
Finally, Chapter 6 returns to the notion of the 'cultural zone.' Premising that the culture of an ethnic group is the product of shared geography and historical interactions, Choe attempts to provide examples of a shared tangible cultural heritage across Manchuria-Mongolia through discussions of the northern queue type hairstyle, underfloor heating, and the cultural influences between the Mongol Yuan and Goryeo.

Evaluation
- *ManMong-munhwa* was the first Korean authored synthesis of the contemporary Japanese-English language discourse on Chinese ethno-cultural history.
- As a development from *Bulham-munhwa-ron* it relies less on linguistic speculation and long-range migration theories.
- Compared to the emergent Western discourse, namely Lattimore (1932 and 1962 [1940]), it is restricted by its own defining paradigm and so fails to distinguish geographical diversity within Manchuria itself.
- Therefore ‘ManMong culture’ doesn’t accurately describe the greater region of Manchuria, or the totality of the Manchukuo territory.
- The framework leaves ambiguous the relationship of Korea to Manchuria: Goguryeo and Baekje are described as Tungusic YeMaek.
- This ambiguity reflects the contemporary geopolitical configuration wherein Korean territory had already been fully integrated as a part of Japan.
- In spite of these weaknesses, the structure and approach of *ManMong-munhwa* appears as a forerunner to more recent surveys of Manchuria or YeMaek focused histories, a staple of popular historiography (see Chapter 18).

Published towards the very end of Choe’s career, *Dangun-gogi-jeonseok* (‘Annotations of the Dangun Gogi’ [DGJ]) constitutes the culmination of his research on Dangun and Northeast Asia. Continuing in the direction of his previous folkloristic analysis, a major development is a new structural analysis of the SY account which he divides into two distinct halves: the ‘Hwan’ung myth’, and a ‘Dangun proto-history’ section. The first half, the Hwan’ung myth, is then subdivided between the Hwan’ung ‘heavenly descension’ myth, and the bear, tiger and sun ‘totemic origin’ myths.

The greater part of the study is devoted to Choe’s analyses of these two ‘Hwan’ung myth’ sections from which he highlights and explicates twenty-five distinct elements according to a folkloristic methodology. A brief summary of his
main points are as follows.

1) descent from heaven 天降\(^{107}\)
   • Gives same explanation of Hwan’in < haneul ‘sky’.
   • The hwan 桓 of Hwan’in and Hwan’ung is cognate to the Korean word hwan- ‘bright’.
   • Claims the descent from heaven to earth is evidence of a shamanist three layered world view.
   ※: The myth makes no refers to an underworld except, at a stretch, the cave used by the tiger and bear.

2) seojia 庶子
   • Is a term to imply that Hwan’ung was one of several sons, not that he was a secondary son as is the later interpretation of the term.
   • Similar comparison to the protagonist of the Mongol Buryat myth, Gesil Bogdo, being one of nine sons.

3) 'looking down' 下視 and 'humans' 人間
   • Evidence of a three level worldview in which the heavenly lord sends down his son to protect humans.
   • Seen in Mongol and Japanese mythology.

4) Samwi 三危 and Taebaek 太白
   • In Jewang-ungi Asadal-san is said to be Guwol-san, also known as Gungwol and Samwi.
   • Therefore, whilst Taebaek is the first mountain to which Hwan’ung descends, Samwi refers to Asadal-san, the last place to which Dangun went.  
   ※: Albeit they are listed in reverse order.

5) cheonbu’in 天符印 [celestial token seals]
   • Discusses amulets and holy jewels referencing Grafton Elliot Smith’s *The Evolution of the Dragon* (1919) and *The Givers of Life* (?) and William James Perry’s *Children of the Sun* (1923).
   • Suggests in the case of the SY myth, the three cheonbu’in could have been a mirror, sword and crown: the former two items being common still as shaman paraphernalia, whilst he reasons crowns were popular with Buyeo people.

6) 'three thousand followers' 徒三千

\(^{107}\) In the SY text the exact phrase cheon-gang (天降) does not appear: just gang ‘descend’ is used as a verb.
• Indicates large scale of the initial theocracy established by Hwan’ung.

7) 'descended to... the mountain top’ 降於......山頂 {※ Choe only abbreviates the oronym Taebaek.}
• Mountains seen as linking heaven and earth.
  • Examples holy mountains in other religious traditions.
  • In particular, in northeast Asia, historically: the Wuhuan (鳥丸) had Chishan (赤山), the Khitan had Heishan (黑山), and the Xianbei had Baidengshan (白登山). In still surviving traditions, mythical progenitors of the following nations descended to mountains: Mongol to Burkhan–san (不兒罕山), Japan to Takachiho (高千穂), and Jurchen to Changbai–shàn (長白山 aka Baekdu–san).
  • In Korea, the following mountain descent stories are found: Hae Mosu of Buyeo to Ungsim–san (熊心山), Bak Hyeokgeose (朴赫居世) of Silla to Yang–san (楊山), Seok Talhae (昔脫解) of Silla to Toham–san (吐含山), Suro of Garak to Guji–bong (龜旨峰), and Cheonsin Ibiga (天神 [天君]夷毗诃 {source – probably Sinjeung–dongguk–yeojei–seungnam 新増東國興地勝覽108}) of Dae–Gaya to Gaya–san (伽倻山).

8) Taebaek–san 太白山
※ Reiteration of points from Bulham–munhwâ–ron exegesis.
• Examples Korean oronyms containing the character baek 白 which he traces back to *balk (白) glossed as 'divine light' (神明).
• Taebaek–san can refer either to Baekdu–san or in later tradition Myohyang–san. The original mountain associated with Hwan’ung must be considered as Baekdu–san as this was the largest in Manchuria; it was also variously referred to in Chinese sources as: Buxian–shàn (不咸山 K. Bulham–san) in Shanhaijing and Jinshu (晉書) and Tutaishan (徒太山 K. Dotae–san) in Suishu (隨書) and Weishu (魏書), and Congtaishan (從太山 K. Jongtae–san) in Beishi (北史).
• Myohyang–san referred to in SY, became associated by peninsula Koreans with the Dangun myth after the territory of Baekdu–san was lost and remained outside of Goryeo dynasty territory.

9) sindan–su ‘divine altar tree’ 神壇樹
• Comparable to Mongolian ovoo (鄂博) and Japanese iwazaka (磐壇) cairns.
• Discusses tree worship in world religions: in northeast Asia he highlights Khitan junshu (君樹) and Manchu shengan (神杆).
• Korea has both sacred altar sites and forests: Chamseong–dan (堅聖壇) altar

on Mani-san, Ganthwa-do island: Jeonseong-dan (齋城壇) altar in Yeon’an (延安 - Hwanghae-do): and Gyerim (驪林). Cheon’gyeong-nim (天鏡林) and Sin’yu-rim (神遊林) forest sites around Gyeongju.

- The sindan-su survives in Korean folk practice as the village seonang shrines set around sacred trees or cairns.

10) *sinsi* 神市
- Not clear whether the word is semantic or phonetically rendered.
- Implies an abode of the gods at the top of the mountain, as found in world religions, such as the Greek Olympus, the Anavatapta in the Himalayas (阿耨達池), and the peak of the mythical Buddhist Mount Meru (須彌山).

11) *heavenly king* 天王
- Reiterates points made before that northeast Asian rulers claimed divine lineage from heaven.

12) *wind earl* 風伯 and *rain and cloud masters* 雨師・雲師
- Discusses importance of rain for agricultural societies, and their belief in a ruler’s divine power to control the weather.
- References James Frazer’s *The Golden Bough* (1915).

13) *overseeing cereals, life, disease, punishments, and good and evil* 主穀・主命・主病・主刑・主善惡
- In early primitive (미개화) theocratic society, these were all matters directly overseen by the ruler.
- References Perry’s *The Origin of Magic and Religion* (1923) in discussing the role of a shaman ruler.

14) *360 matters* 三百六十[餘事]
- Reiterates points previously made relating to the solar calendar.
- Examples a Mexico temple which has 360 steps, consciously leaving out five extra steps as the Nemontemi extra days between calendar cycles, with the implication that something similar maybe implied in the yeo (餘 'extra') character in the SY text.
- References Theodor Wilhelm Danzel’s *Magic und Geheimwissenschaft* (c.1924)

15) bear and tiger 熊・虎
- Discusses totemism and the prominence of the bear in northeast Asia, citing the bear ceremonies of the Ainu and Ghilyak (Nivkh).

16) *[lived in] the same hole* 同穴
- Shows that the bear and tiger had the same origins.
17) 'prayed [to be made human]' 請
• Prayer as the only means to achieve things beyond human ability or magic.

18) 'wanted to become human' 願化為人
• The primitive mind assumed interrelatedness (融通) between all things so it would not have been considered difficult to metamorphose.
• Cites Lucien Lévy-Bruhl's (1857-1939) 'law of participation'.

19) mugwort and garlic 艾·蒜
• Mugwort and garlic are both used as medicinal herbs in modern folk medicine.

20) '[do] not see light for 100 days' 不見日光百日 = taboo 禁
• Reiterates discussion of taboo.

21) [attain] human form 人身
• That the bear attains human form after 37 days whilst the tiger fails demonstrates the principle of observing a taboo.
• 37 days is a 'normal' length for praying. [※ Fails to elaborate further]

22) bear-woman 熊女
• Represents the origin of the bear totem clan.

23) 'had no one to marry' 無人為婚
• Reflects principle that one could not marry within their own clan and so practiced exogamy.

24) 'prayed [to become pregnant]' 呪願
• Same discussion as 17 on the import of prayer in a theocracy.

25) '[Hwan'ung] changed form and married [her]' 假化而婚
• Discusses 'theogamy' myths, marriage between a god and human.
• Examples Indian myth of the sun deity and Kunti, Zeus and Europa and the Silla folk myth that Later Baekje leader, Gyeonhwon (甄萱) was born to a coupling of a worm god changed to male form and a local girl of Bukchon village.

Choe asserts that the notion of a celestial sovereign was evidence of sun totem worship. The birth of Dangun to Hwan'ung and the bear-woman was thus symbolic of the creation of ancient Joseon from the union of sun and bear totems respectively. Here Choe again reference’s Perry’s Children of the Sun claiming that the sun totem originated in Egypt and was transmitted by
agricultural societies "especially" in northeast Asia. (DGJ Choe 2013a:297)

By focusing on the heavenly descent and totemic sections rather than the 'proto-historical' Dangun story, Choe emphasizes the universalism of the myth as a northeast Asian archetype. For this reason, to enhance the northeast Asian shamanistic associations, he adopts the tree-radical dan 樵 character of 'Dangun' used by all sources other than SY, in place of the original earth-radical dan 壘 he had used in his previous works: the earlier preference had been a way both to emphasize the authenticity of the SY account and undermine Shiratori's tree cult hypothesis but now he argued they were in any event simple variants both equally cognate with cheon 天.109) (DGJ Choe 2013a:298)

**Comparative mythology**

To further support the Hwan'ung myth’s archetypal quality, Choe lays out explicit examples of related northeast Asian myths, briefly summarized below.

[Heavenly descent myths]110

**Outer Mongolia Buryat** - Gesil Bogdo
Source: Jeremiah Curtin *A Journey in Southern Siberia* (1909)
- One of nine brothers, sent by his father Khirmas Tengri to rid the earth of evil.

**Japan** - Ninigi (瓊/thumb)
Source: *Nihon-shoki*
- Grandson of Amaterasu, descends to Takachiho-no-mine (高千穂峰): marries two daughters of the mountain god; his own grandson, Hikohohodemi (彦火火出見) establishes Yamato.

**Ryūkyū** - Amamikiyo and Shinerikiyo
Sources: *Chūzanseikan* (中山世鑑 c.1650) and *Omorosaushi* (※ Seems to be referring to *Omorosiyaku* おもろ新釈, 1957, by Nakahara Zenchū 仲原善忠 1890–1964)
- Sent by sun god: descends to Amami peak.

[Totem origin myths]

**Göktürk** (突厥) peoples - wolf

---

109) According to the translator’s discussion in the modern translation, Choe first switched to the tree-radical character in his 1936 paper "Joseon’s distinct beliefs". (DGJ Choe 2013a:322)

110) These subheadings are given in the modern translation but were not in Choe’s original text.
Sources: *Weishu* (魏書: 高車列傳), and *Suishu* and *Beishi* (隋書·北史: 突厥外傳)
- Two daughters of the Xiongnu king are left on an altar for the sky: after four years a wolf comes and the younger daughter marries it creating the Göktürk lineage.

**Mongols** - blue wolf and white deer
Source: *Yuanchao-bishi* (元朝秘史)
- Pairing gives birth to Mongol progenitor, Borjigin (巴塔赤罕), at Burkhan mountain (不咸山).

**Paleo-Siberian peoples** - crow named Quikinnaqu
Sources: Vladimir Bogoras *The Chukchi* (1904-09) and Waldemar Jochelson *The Koryak* (1908).

**Ainu** - bear
Source: John Batchelor *Ainu Life and Lore* [*apparently referring to The Ainu and Their Folk-lore 1901]*.
- No specific myth, but totemic belief inferred from the bear ceremony.

**Korean Dangun accounts**
In the final section, Choe again presents for reference surviving premodern records of the Dangun myth, as below.

*Sanguku-yusa*
- "Old Joseon" Account of Hwan'ung and Dangun.
- "North Buyeo" 北夫餘
- "Goguryeo"

*Jewang-ungi* (帝王韻紀)

*Eungjesi-ju* (應製詩詁)

*Sejong Sillok* [世宗實錄] 'Pyeongyang' entry geography section.

*Goryeo-sa* 'Pyeongyang’ entry of the geography treatise.

*Sinjeung-dongguk-yeoji-seungnam* (新增東國舆地勝覽)
- "Book 51: Pyeong’an-do: Pyeongyang-bu"
  - Condensed account in which it is already Dangun who descends from heaven and establishes his capital at Pyeongyang.
- "Book 54: Yeongbyeondae-do: Taebaek-san"
  - Slightly fuller version of the Hwan’un-Dangun myth adding Buru’s going to Tushan (塗山) and the Geumwa myth.
- "Book 12: Ganghwa-do shrine"
  - Record of the Chamseongdan (幷域壇) altar on Mani-san. Ganghwa-do, mentioning local tradition that Dangun performed sacrificial rites for the sky there.
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"Book 12: Ganhwa-do ruins"

- Record of Samnang-seong (三郞城 'three lad fortress') on Jeondeung-san, Ganhwa-do, said to have been built by Dangun’s three sons.

*Dongguk-tonggam* (東國通鑑)

"Oegi outer annals: Dangun Joseon" (外紀：檀君朝鮮)

- Condensed account, where it is Dangun descending, although he is only referred to as *sin’in* (神人 'divine person')

In the final paragraph Choe asserts that the Dangun section of the myth reflects the dim memory of actual historical events, namely: the establishment of the country, varying locations of the capital, rites held to heaven and Dangun’s children.

**Evaluation**

The *Dangun-gogi-jeonseok* can be seen to have laid the seeds for all future Korean authored discussions of the Hwan’ung-Dangun story. However, owing to his cooperation with the Japanese, Choe’s name, has been indelibly tainted as that of a ‘collaborationist’ and so he is rarely credited by current day popular nationalist historians for his seminal work.

In particular, the three part structural analysis provides the strongest counterargument against the common negationists’ mantra - past and present - that the story was invented during the 13th century within a particular ideological framework and for a specific purpose.

As a Dangun ‘believer’, however, Choe goes too far in trying to exaggerate the myth’s antiquity which almost certainly has no relation to the historical ancient Joseon polity.

Widang Jeong Inbo’s (恆堂 鄭寅普 1893-1950) history writing constitutes an influential link between Sin Chaeho and current day popular historiography. His representative work on ancient history was first serialized in the Dong’a-ilbo newspaper under the title O’cheon-nyeongan Joseon-ui eol (五千年間 朝鮮의「열」 ‘Five thousand years of the Joseon spirit/soul’) as 283 installments between 1931.1.1 and 1935.8.27. It was subsequently edited into two volumes published by Seoul-sinmun in 1946.9.20 and 1947.7.20 respectively under the more prosaic title of Joseonsa-yeongu (朝鮮史研究 'Research [on] Korean history') (Jeong 2012:13 and 17).111

Jeong Inbo’s view of history is strongly in the mould of Sin Chaeho - who he met in Shanghai in 1915 (Jeong 2012:14) - and likely influenced, too, by Choe Namseon, but compared to both, his scholarship is transparently inferior.

As seen in the original title, Jeong uses the concept of eol (열) 'spirit/soul' to advocate for an emotively subjective ethno-national history.

"The past is merely the past. Who would argue that the past is not the past?!! However, this past is not the past of others, but our past. Consequently at times, that which has radiantly existed [already] for a long time was [both] the past and also us: [it has sustained itself] like an oath steeped in loyalty [or] a fire transmitted even when the firewood has run out. And at [other] times, the sudden flash of lightening and clap of thunder when there was neither smoke nor clouds, [this] too was both the past and us......" (Jeong 2012:103)

"If we know even the smallest amount about ourselves, then even if we fall into desperate circumstances we would not have come to this [current] situation [i.e. Korea’s annexation to Japan]. This is because all people possess an emotion (감정) called feeling (감격). This feeling is the same as the bloodline that transmits the eol: when we read a certain passage of ancient works we may frown, or at another passage we may shed tears, [this] is due to the bloodline that utilizes the feeling’s emotion." (Jeong 2012:106)

Jeong asserts that Dangun was both a historical personage and dynasty that marks the beginning of Korean history. Like Sin and Choe, Jeong imagines

111) Source text used is the modern Korean translation Jeong (2012).
Joseon as an expansive continental ethnic polity constituting all Dongyi peoples mentioned in Chinese sources.

Alongside premodern Korean and Chinese dynastic histories, Jeong often refers to An Jeongbok: Joseonsa-yeongu is also notable as one of the first Korean authored works to explicitly address and challenge the results of contemporary Japanese archaeology.

With his conceptualization of the historical narrative so close to Sin’s - including peninsula relocations of continental Samhan - and his pseudo rationalizations of Dangun better explicated by Choe Namseon and subsequently Yun Naehyeon (see Chapter 14), only a few specific points of his work will be further summarized below.

1. Dangun
"The founder of [ancient] Joseon, Dangun, was not a god but a human."
(Jeong 2012:111)

Jeong’s discussion of the Hwan’ung-Dangun myth is somewhat reminiscent to Choe Namseon’s attempts to distinguish the mythical sections from presumed ‘proto-history’, and more directly anticipates the present day ‘subjective rationalization’ attempts of Yun Naehyeon.

The Dangun story has been transmitted to the present having passed through all manner of vicissitudes. Over that period, false (허구적) imaginings have [been used to] bolster [the original] true events: even whilst being false, they have followed concrete periods and regions [??], and many stories have been added. In addition to this, in the process of rendering our ancient language into Chinese characters: [the content] has been arbitrarily embellished by Confucian, Daoist and Buddhist religious styles: even so, the core [of the myth] has firmly survived like pure gold produced from a hundred temperings: mythical elements have been added, but Taoist and Buddhist elements cannot be [fully] incorporated, and so the more [the story] has been transmitted, the more it has come closer to the original source of true (진실 해지는) history. This is not due to divine aid (천지신명의 가호), but due to the action (작용) of immutable truth [which states that] even if the outer wrapping of a false explanation (가설) is changed, the true form will never change.
(Jeong 2012:154)

* What this 'core' being referred to by Jeong exactly is remains entirely unclear.

In addition Jeong:
- Suggests the Weishu (魏書) cited in the SY OJ account, was the now lost
Weishu compiled by Wang Shen (王沈 fl.250s) of Western Jin. (Jeong 2012:119)
• Identifies the Taebaek-san to which Hwan'ung descends as Taibaishan (太白山) located in southern Manchuria and associated with Balhae. (Jeong 2012:134)
• Asadal-san = Baekdu-san.
• Allows for multiple Pyeongyang capitals, the first being located on the Songhua river (松花江). (Jeong 2012:137)
• Similar to An Jeongbok, he suggests that Dangun was worshipped as a god after his death.

• Posits that many ancient records were lost during the 244 Guanqiu Jian (毌丘儉 d.255) invasion of Goguryeo: some of these sources were taken by the Chinese and that is how the Dangun myth came to be recorded in Wang Shen’s Weishu as well as the information for the SGZ “Dongyi-zhuan” chapters obtained.
※ At least for the SGZ, this is in agreement with Byington (2003:218).

2. Gija
• Jeong’s treatment of Gija is somewhat ambiguous: whilst expending much energy on arguing Gija’s autonomy from Zhou, asserting that the Shiji account of Gija was based on fabricated Chinese tradition, he still implicitly accepts that Gija established some kind of Joseon related polity. (Jeong 2012:178)

• Jeong seeks to indigenize Gija by hypothesizing that the gi (箕) of Gija was cognate to the geom of Wanggeom, carrying the meaning of ‘celestial king’ (天王). He further posits that gi/geom are cognate with the gae (蓋) of Seo-gaema (西蓋馬 Ch. Xi-gaima) and hae (海) of Balhae (渤海). (Jeong 2012:180–2)
※ Such linguistic speculation is entirely unsubstantiable.

• He then obfuscates this by noting the conflicting records of Gija’s grave location and abstains from making a final judgement on whether he came to Joseon or not. (Jeong 2012:189)
• Regardless of Gija, Jeong is more explicit that the final attested kings, Gi Bi (奚 sic. Bu) and Gi Jun (準), were direct descendents of the Dangun lineage (계보). (Jeong 2012:185)

• He identifies Xiandu (險濁 K. Heomdok - a district of Liaodong) as the ‘original’ Pyeongyang capital, and location of ‘continental Jinhan’ (辰韓). This site would subsequently become the seat of the Lelang-jun commandery, after which Jinhan relocates to the peninsula. (Jeong 2012:213)
• To support his assertion that the original Joseon territory - pre Qin Kai invasion - included much of the Chinese continent, Jeong highlights the similarity between the egg birth motif found in the Xu (徐) foundation story of Xu king Yan (徐偃王) and that of the Goguryeo Jumong saga. (Jeong 2012:216)

[Shijing-zhu 水經注:卷八: 洪水: 又東南過徐縣北: "《徐州地理志》云徐偃王之異, 言: 徐君宮人娠而生卵, 以為不祥, 棄之于水濵。孤獨母有犬, 名曰鷹倉, 獵于水側, 得棄卵, 養以育歸。孤獨母以為異, 養之之遂成, 生時偃, 故以為名。徐君宮中聞之, 乃更錄取。長而仁智, 襲君徐國。後鷹倉臨死, 生角而九尾, 獻黃龍也。偃王葬之徐中, 今見有狗鬽焉。偃王治國, 仁義著聞, 欲舟行上國, 乃通漢陳、蔡之間。得朱弓矢, 以得天瑞, 遂因名為號, 自稱徐偃王。江、淮諸侯服從者三十六國。周王聞之, 遣使至楚, 令伐之。偃王愛民不鬭, 逐為楚敗, 北走彭城武原縣東山下, 百姓隨者萬數, 因名其山為徐山"]

※ The broader similarity between the two myths is also discussed by Gardiner (1982:35n15)

• Observing that the Jurchen Jin regarded themselves as directly related to preceding Balhae, Jeong argues that although Balhae is an integral part of Korean history, Jin and the later Qing dynasty cannot be considered as such. (Jeong 2012:221)

Hydronyms:
Manbanhan 滿潘汗 = Dalinghe 大凌河
Paesu 淮水 = Yunhe 淮泥河 (Jeong 2012:264-5, cf p276)
• Distinguishes Pae 沛 from Pae 淮 (Jeong 2012:266)

[Hanshu 地理志下: 遼東郡 "戶五萬五千九百七十二, 口二十七萬二千五百三十九, 縣十八: 襄平, 新昌, 無慮, 望平, 房, 候城, 遼隧, 遼陽, 隱灊, 居就, 高顯, 安市, 武次, 平郭, 西安平, 文, 番汗 (沛水出塞外, 西南入海。), 杞氏。"]

• Asserts the Qin Wall terminated at modern Shanhaiguan (山海關) in the region of Jieshisian (碣石山).
Ancient Liaoshui 遼水 = modern Luanha 潮河 (Jeong 2012:270)
• Ancient Liaodong 遼東 = modern Liaoxi 遼西 (Jeong 2012:273)

2.1 Gi Jun’s suicide hypothesis
• Jeong posits that in the wake of Wi Man’s usurpation, the last king of Dangun Joseon, Gi Jun (箕準) would have committed suicide and that this is the meaning of the phrase ’enter the sea’ (入海) found in the SGZ conventionally understood to refer to his flight by ship. (Jeong 2012:292)
※ Aside from lack of evidence, a problem with this interpretation is that it fails to match the context of the passage which, with Gi Jun as the implied grammatical subject immediately continues with "[and] settled the Han (韓) lands calling himself the Han king."
[S:Z 三國志:魏書:東夷:韓: "[Weiüe quotation]...準與滿載，不敵也，留將其左右宮人走出海，居韓地，自號韓王"]

- Jeong asserts that the Wi Man usurpation was not the only cause for *Malhan to relocate from the continent so far south into the peninsula, but that Dangun Joseon was in any event under pressure from newly emerging polities in the north.
- These include the peninsula polities of Nangnang-guk (樂浪國) around Pyeong’an-do province, and Daebang-guk (帶方國) in the Imjin river basin. (Jeong 2012:320

- Meanwhile Buyeo emerges in the former Dangun Joseon core continental region between Baekdu-san and the Songhua river.

- **Hae Mosu** is one king of Buyeo, but not necessarily the first.
- Both the *hae* (解) of Hae Mosu and Hae Buru, and *geum* (金) of Geumwa (金蛙), are again cognate with *gi* (箕) of Gija, demonstrating continuity from Joseon to Buyeo. (Jeong 2012:327
- Hae Mosu’s conflation with Dangun is because *dangun*, together with *wanggeom* and ‘celestial son’ (天帝子) were used as interchangeable appellations. (Jeong 2012:328)

- 'North Buyeo' and 'East Buyeo' refer to different regions of the same polity. (Jeong 2012:352)
- The first Goguryeo capital of Jolbon (卒本) established by Jumong was in the same location as Hae Mosu’s preceding Buyeo capital.

  - Northern Buyeo capital Jolbon > Balhae era Solbin-bu (率賓府) > Jin era Xupinlu (恤品路) > modern Suifenhe* (綏芬河 - Heilongjiang Russian border) (Jeong 2012:348)

  - Eastern Buyeo capital Gaseopwon (迦葉原 番郡) > modern Mudanjiang (牡丹江) (Jeong 2012:355)

※ A problem with these identifications is that Suifenhe is further east and south than Mudanjiang.
3. Han Commanderies

Mixing historical geography with linguistic speculation, Jeong argues for locations as summarized in Table 22, with none of the commanderies located further east than Liaodong.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Han Commanderies</th>
<th>Jeong’s hypothesized modern locations</th>
<th>Attempted reasoning (reference)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zhenfan-jun 真番都</td>
<td>Dalinghe 大凌河 (western Liaoning).</td>
<td>Posits <em>za</em> of Zhaxian 嘉縣 cognate with <em>ge</em> 合 and <em>ha</em> 哈 found in local toponyms e.g. 哈打板, 東哈拉勿索. (Jeong 2012:404)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lintun-jun 临屯郡</td>
<td>Shaozihe 喂子河 (northern Liaodong peninsula).</td>
<td>Premises <em>tun</em> 屯 of Lintun as a hydronym. Former name of Shaozihe was Tunhe 屯河. (Jeong 2012:405)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lelang-jun 樂浪郡</td>
<td>Xiandu 隆濮 (Liaodong).</td>
<td>(Jeong 2012:424)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaoxian 朝鮮</td>
<td>Gaiping Lianyundao Qinghokou 蓋平連雲島 清河口 (Liaoning Gezhou).</td>
<td>(Jeong 2012:426)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zengdi 增地</td>
<td>Coastal region of Daliaoshui 大遼水</td>
<td>(Jeong 2012:433)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liekou 列口</td>
<td>Chaoyang-xian 朝陽縣 (Liaoning).</td>
<td>(Jeong 2012:434)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loufang 鎬方</td>
<td>Youbeiping Licheng 右北平 蓮城</td>
<td>(Jeong 2012:437)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicheng 遂成</td>
<td>Region of Yangle-xian 陽樂縣 and Haiyang-xian 海陽縣; close to Fengrun-xian 豐潤縣.</td>
<td>(Jeong 2012:437,440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanzi 含置</td>
<td>Coastal region north of Baihekou 白河口 (Said to be Hebei Chengde-xian 承德縣 although this is not coastal).</td>
<td>(Jeong 2012:440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dafang 帶方</td>
<td>Former Khitan Shangjing 上京 (present day Chifeng-shi Balinyouqi 赤峰市巴林右旗)</td>
<td>Former Liaodong Xianping 西平. (Jeong 2012:442)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunyou 屯有</td>
<td>Goguryeo's Sabi-seong 沙卑城, former Okjeo 藩耶.</td>
<td>Fuzu 夫租 is a corruption for Okjeo 沃沮. (Jeong 2012:442)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuzu 夫租</td>
<td>Goguryeo's Junji 蠕支</td>
<td>(Jeong 2012:443)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantai 蠕台</td>
<td>East of Cantai.</td>
<td>(Jeong 2012:444)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huali 華麗</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>(Jeong 2012:444)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yatoumei 鞂頭昧</td>
<td>Rejests traditional association with Balhae’s Jangneung-bu 長嶺府. (Jeong 2012:444)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qianmo 前莫</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tixi 提奚</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunmi 滴彌</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Haining 海冥 | Gemou 蓋牟 [modern Fushun east of Shenyang] | (Jeong 2012:445)
Siwang 即望 | Shandong peninsula. | (Jeong 2012:445)
Nanhan 鄉邯 | Guangning Beizhen 廣寧北鎮 [Liaoning], former Liaodong-jun Xibu-duwei 西都尉 | Identifiable in HHS as 鄡邯 of Liaodong’s Xibu-duwei 西部都尉, which in HS was previously named as Wulu 無廬 (Jeong 2012:445)
Zhaoxing 昭明 (南部都尉治所) | South of Xiongyue Gaiping 熊岳蓋平 [Gaizhou 蓋州 NW Liaodong peninsula] | (Jeong 2012:446)

Table 22. Jeong Inbo - Locations of the Han Commanderies and Lelang counties.

- Without any attempt at substantiation, Jeong asserts:
  Nangnang/Lelang < *bul-nae = 'country-river' (나라-하천)

- Nangnang/Lelang was thus another term for 'capital' whilst Paesu (漬水) refers to the river on which a capital is located. (Jeong 2012:424)

3.1 Han Commanderies' archaeology

Jeong is one of the first scholars to discuss the finds made by colonial Japanese archaeologists and attempts to disprove their authenticity and/or refute the conclusions premised on them.

**Jeomje-hyeon (Ch. Nianti-xian) Spirit Shrine Stele (黏蟬縣神祠碑)**

Jeong accepts the authenticity of the stele but offers his own interpretation of the text and significance, including the following assertions.

- The first line of the text includes the appellation 'Nianti/Jeomje chief' (黏蟬長): if the stele had been erected in Jeomje-hyeon/Nianti-xian, it would not have specified the name but simply have written 'chief'.
- Similarly, if the stele were located in Nianti-xian, the passage 'protect Nianti..' (佑黏蟬) would not have needed the name (i.e. it would rather have written "this place").
- The object addressed by the stele text is Pyeongsan-gun (平山君[郡]) identified in the fourth line (平山君德配代崇..)
- Thus it can be deduced that Pyeongsan-gun was a sansin (山神) mountain god, and the stele was erected by a newly appointed chief of Nianti-xian/Jeomje-hyeon.
- The second line (建丞屬國會) indicates that this chief was one of various subordinate lords who had attended a gathering in Pyeongyang; he erected the stele to pray for the fortune of his fiefdom and those journeying. (Jeong 2012:474)
  - This is comparable to the Huanglingmiaobei (黃陵廟碑) stele erected by Han Yu (韓愈 786-824) of the Tang dynasty.
- There is no precedent of any other stele being erected in its home county in
order to pray for the fortune of that one place. (Jeong 2012:484)
• Pyeongsan-gun was the sansin of Baekdu-san.

Clay seals and roof end tiles excavated at Pyeongyang
In contrast to the Nianti stele, Jeong forcefully argues that the clay seals excavated by Japanese archaeologists are forgeries: supporting this he makes the following points.

• (1) No other site in the whole of China has produced as many clay seals in such concentration. (Jeong 2012:487)
• If the seals were supposed to be used for documents sent outwards, it is unclear why there are so many seals also marked as coming from the Lelang governor (樂浪太守章·樂浪大尹章) himself.
• Some have suggested Pyeongyang may have been an archival centre, but then why are there no seals from Liaodong or Xuantu?
• Further, only 18 of Lelang’s 25 counties are represented amongst the seals.
• They are in suspiciously good condition.

• (2) The seals typically have four characters: in many cases either the first and third characters, or second and fourth characters are missing, making it conveniently easy to match two seals and deduce the desired readings. In all cases some clue is made available to a county name demonstrating that they were consciously fabricated. (Jeong 2012:488)

• (3) The titles recorded on the seals do not match those recorded in the Hanshu. E.g. a seal of Dongyi-xian (東甌縣) has the title chang (長) whilst the Hanshu attests Dongyi ling (令): Suicheng 逐城 has seals both with chang and wei (尉).

• (4) Han officials took great pains in individualizing their names and seals by using variant characters, as attested in a memorandum by Ma Yuan (馬援 14 BCE – 49 CE) recorded in Dongguanhanji (東觀漢記 compiled gradually between 62–c.225). However, the Pyeongyang seals demonstrate no variation in characters. (Jeong 2012:491)

• (5) The seal stamps were not made locally but distributed by the central government, so the depth of the seals should be consistent, however, those from the Pyeongyang assemblages have varying depths and look like they have been altered. (Jeong 2012:492)
• (6) The Pyeongyang seals include minor officials’ titles such as chengshi (丞使) but there is no reason for such officials to have been granted a seal. (Jeong
2012:493)

- (7) The title Lelang-dayin (樂浪大尹) found on one of the seals is anachronistic: dayin was a title introduced by Wang Mang, but at the same time Lelang-jun was renamed as Lexian-jun (樂縣郡). (Jeong 2012:494)

- Two roof end tiles contain even more glaring anachronisms.
  - 'Lelang-liguan' (樂浪禮官 'Lelang office of rites') - where liguan was not used until early Goryeo. ※ Jeong seems only to be referring to Korean usage of the office, it is therefore not clear if it was used earlier in China.
  - 'Da-Jin Yuankang' (大晉元康) - the Yankang reign era (c.291-99) of Jin emperor Hui (惠帝 r.290-306) began some 45 years after Goguryeo had moved its capital to the site of Pyeongyang (247). (Jeong 2012:496)

- The clay seal and roof tiles were first fabricated during the Goryeo dynasty by those who were against the policy of reclaiming Goguryeo’s former continental territory: by locating Lelang at Pyeongyang they made it appear that Goguryeo’s expansion into the continent had been an invasion rather than restoration of ancient Joseon territory [as Jeong imagines it to have been]. (Jeong 2012:507)
  ※ Provides no evidence for this claim.

**Bongsan grave stones (墓埜)**

Jeong similarly rejects the authenticity of grave stones excavated at Bongsan (鳳山), Hwanghae-do, that were being associated with the location of the Daifang commandery through their inscriptions attesting the name of the first Daifang commander Zhang Fuyi (張撫夷).

- Zhang subsequently surrendered to Joseon and resettled in the region of Bongsan.
- The inscribed stones were created by his followers: they mark his grave rather than the location of the commandery. (Jeong 2012:497-9)

**Other 'Lelang' artefacts**

Jeong argues that other artefacts unearthed at Pyeongyang had all been designated as relics of the Lelang commandery when in fact they could have reached Goguryeo through trade routes or as spoils of war. (Jeong 2012:508)

- Examples the inscribed Xiaowen-miao bronze bell (孝文廟銅鐘 K. Hyomunmyo-dongjong) which he in any event regards as fake on the grounds that it uses only the posthumous title (諡號) of Han emperor Wen (r.202-157 BCE) rather than his temple name (廟號). Taizong (太宗). (Jeong 2012:515)
4. Two Fu
Jeong posits that c.82 BCE Buyeo won two large - but unattested - victories against the Han Commanderies causing China to temporarily reconsolidate the commanderies into the two duwei (都尉府) of Pingzhou (Pingna and Xuantu) and Dongbu (Lelang and Lintun), the latter being based at Buer (不爾) in the region of the Luan river, Changli-xian (昌黎縣). However, Buyeo then suffered defeats and Lelang and Xuantu were reestablished, after three and six years respectively. (Jeong 2012:521-2)

5. Nangnang 燕浪 = Bulnae 不耐 = *Beolnae 별내
- Jeong posits an indigenous state based at Pyeongyang extending across the middle of the peninsula with Buyeo to the north and Mahan to the south. (Jeong 2012:523-4)
  - Established by refugees from Dangun Joseon’s Wanggeom-seong (Liaodong).

6. Three Kingdoms
- For the establishment of the Three Kingdoms, Jeong follows the orthodox dating of the SS.
- Jeong tries to narrate the emergence and consolidation of the Three Kingdoms as part of an Old Joseon restoration movement.

Goguryeo foundation
- Historicizes SS version of the Jumong myth, accordingly:
  - Habaek (河伯) is a local lord in the region of the Jolbon-cheon (卒本川), present day Suifenhe river (樞芬河 ※ Location of this river is problematic).
  - Jumong is born to Hae Mosu and Habaek’s daughter, Yuhwa. (Jeong 2012:532)

- The Buyeo capital had moved from the region of the Suifenhe to beyond the Songhua river.
※ Jeong describes this move as a westwards relocation which is the opposite direction to the orthodox account of Buru moving east. (Jeong 2012:533)

- The account of Jumong’s childhood and escape is historical.
- The orthodox date of Jumong’s birth (c.59 BCE), however, corresponds to the date at which he joined the royal court.
- The fish and turtles forming a bridge to enable his escape is symbolic of the difficulty of fording the Eomni-daesu (奄利大水 - name taken from Gwanggaeto Stele variant) river.
  Eomni-daesu = Songhua river (松花江).
  Modun-gok 毛屯谷 = Maodan river (毛丹江)
• Jumong established his capital back in the region of Jolbon-cheon, being accepted by the local Buyeo populous as king. (Jeong 2012:536)

Silla
• Silla, as former Jinhan, was established by Old Joseon refugees (SS 朝鮮遺民). (Jeong 2012:541)
  • The SGZ account that Jinhan people were migrants from Qin (秦) is wrong. (Jeong 2012:549)
  • Accepts the Hyeokgeose foundation story without any overt attempt at rationalization. (Jeong 2012:544)
• Variant rendered names of the Silla capital Geum-seong (金城 - SS) and Geonmo-ra （健牟羅 – Liangshu 梁書·新羅傳）are both cognate to Wanggeom-seong.
  Geum-seong 金城 < *Geom-jae 경제 = [Wang]geom-seong
  Geonmo-ra 健牟羅 < *geom

Baekje
Jeong follows the interpretation of the SS annotation that describes the brothers Biryu and Onjo as sons of Utae (優台), himself the secondary son of Buyeo king Hae Buru (son of Hae Mosu) and Soseono (召西奴). Following the death of Utae, Jumong arrives and takes Soseono as his queen, becoming stepfather to the two brothers; later Jumong’s son Yuri arrives and so the brothers leave with their mother and go onto to establish Baekje. (Jeong 2012:551)
• Embellishes that Biryu’s ‘dying of resentment’ on the failure of establishing a capital at Michuhol was suicide. (Jeong 2012:555)

7. Evaluation
Despite the poor quality of scholarship Jeong’s work has been embraced by current day popular historians including Lee Deok-il (see Chapter 15).
Part IV - Present day popular historiography

The two variants of the Northern/Altaic narrative: Ancient Empire and pan-Altaic

Present day popular Korean history writing on ancient Korea can be broadly divided into two interpretative trends. I label 'ancient empire' and 'pan-Altaic'. Both share the core characteristic, or motive even, of anti-Sinocentrism and as a result they primarily focus on historiographic claims to continental territory: both have the potential, and sometimes do, also incorporate treatment of the Japanese archipelago - either by treating ancient Japan as a subordinate territory to the Korean empire, or as a misguided ancient 'Altaic cousin' - but generally choose to neglect the topic. The variants both also have a tendency to lay ethnic claim to all peoples exonymically labeled 'Dongyi' (東夷) by Chinese sources, in the process conflating the 'original' ancient Dongyi of the Shandong peninsula contemporaneous to Western Zhou with the peoples of the greater Manchuria region, including Korea, who were labeled as Dongyi only subsequent to the Han dynasty expansion.

The distinguishing feature between the two 'schools' is the relative emphasis placed on the ancient state of OJ: in the empire narrative Old Joseon is invariably the name given to the empire in question: in the pan-Altaic conceptualization, OJ is less core although often still upheld as the paradigm state within a broader cultural sphere of northern Asiatic peoples, either as an imagined 'first among equals' or by virtue of being the 'sole survivor' in the wake of Chinese Han ascendancy on the mainland.

Being authored by Koreans for a Korean readership, both interpretations are naturally grounded to an ethnocentric 'Korean' perspective: the empire narrative actively embraces this subjectivity whilst the pan-Altaic discourse is more an unwitting victim to it and suffers associated internal contradictions.\(^{112}\)

In terms of sources, the empire narrative displays a greater tendency towards methodological xenophobia, placing emphasis on historically Korean authored works irrespective of their reliability or provenance: this is one area where Sin Chaeho’s influence on the 'empire school' has diminished most as his denunciatory criticisms of the SS have been tempered by continued reliance on its content and early dating. By contrast the pan-Altaic narrative is more

\(^{112}\) Against the risk of seeming to be overly critical, it should be remembered that ethnocentrism is hardly unique to Korean historiography but exists in all nation states and minority ethnic groups within, as observed by Smith (1986:2).
neutral: it tends to favour the 'foreign Chinese' dynastic sources such as Liaoshi and, more quietly, even modern Japanese scholarship.

The Altaic language hypothesis is maintained as a premise for both narratives but especially so the pan-Altaic which makes greater use of contrived etymologies and the associated inferences of pan-Asiatic ethnolinguistic affinities that invariably exclude the Chinese Han majority.\(^{113}\)

Concerning ethnogenesis, the empire narrative sees the formation of the Korean ethnie as having occurred concurrently with the formation of OJ; history begins with a golden age, the OJ founder - Dangun - is also the ethnic progenitor and thus the basic conceptualization remains the same as the ON going back to Jewang-un. By contrast, the pan-Altaic variant could be characterized as a deeper 'quest for origins' type narrative that is willing to look for more distant origins, both spatially and temporally. Consequently, concerning historical development, the empire narrative stresses indigenous innovation and outward expansions whilst the pan-Altaic narrative favours long-range migration theories accompanied by inter-ethnic cultural diffusion.

---

\(^{113}\) For a critical overview of the Altaic hypothesis from a Korean perspective, see Song 2003:82-112. Of interest, Song observes that with the establishment of diplomatic relations with countries of the Communist block in the late 1980s, South Korean journalists and professors began visiting Mongolia and Central Asian states, and would publish emotive articles describing as though they had visited some kind of 'ethnic homeland' (Song 2003:85).
[Chapter 14] Yun Naehyeon (尹乃銓 b.1939)

"History must be narrated according to facts. However, which facts to select amongst many, and which content to place emphasis on depends on the historical consciousness (역사의식) of the historian authoring the book. When evaluating the periods during which our minjok was divided amongst several states, whether to place weight on the division itself, or to view as [more] important the coming period of unification, and so view [the division] as a process of transition, is a question of historical consciousness." (Yun 2003:223)

In the recent era Yun Naehyeon has been the single most influential scholar within popular South Korean historiography on ancient Korea.

Yun’s historiography primarily continues the ‘empire variant’ of Sin Chaeho. His main contribution is a more scholarly explication of Sin’s narrative where, in place of linguistic speculations, he actively parses the premodern source material whilst incorporating recent archaeological interpretations.

Whilst failing to acknowledge him, Yun’s work is also undeniably influenced by Choe Namseon: both in terms of asserting ethnic ‘culture zone’ theories, and in particular both his strong emphasis and specific interpretations of Dangun. In short, Yun takes Choe’s folkloristic interpretation of Dangun and re-infuses it with the emotive subjectivity of Sin’s ethno-nationalism.

The following overview and discussion of Yun is based on three recent books: Uri godae-sa (우리 고대사: 상상에서 현실로 'Our Ancient History: from imagination to reality' 2003, reprinted 2014), Go-Joseon-ui gang’yeok-eul balginda (고조선의 강역을 밝한다 'Illuminating the territory of Old Joseon’ 2006, 2014) and Saryo-ro boneun uri godae-sa (사료로 보는 우리 고대사 'Looking at our ancient history through sources' 2007, 2013). In contrast to some of his previous more academic works, these books are explicitly written for the general public and so effectively summarize his core ideas: written in the latter stage of his career and recently republished they can also be considered to best represent both the culmination and most recent iterations of his research. Particularly interesting is that they demonstrate a self-awareness of his own subjectivities and at the same time seek to respond to the range of criticisms levied against him.
1. Yun Naehyeon’s narrative of modern historiography on Old Joseon

Concerning the core question of Oj’s territory, in *Go-Joseon-ui gang’yeok-eul balginda*, Yun presents a short overview of the development of opinions from the late Joseon dynasty up until the present which serves to situate his own research, summarized below.¹¹⁴

According to Yun, in the Joseon dynasty, whilst mainstream tradition located the centre of Oj at Pyeongyang there were some exceptions: Gwon Ram (權楨 1416–65) viewed it as 'Manchuria' (*sic* as Manchuria is an anachronism), Bak Jiwon (朴趾源) and Yi Gyubo (李奎煜) - Yun’s given order - as Liaodong, whilst Yi Ik (李漢) and An Jeongbok (安鼎福) proposed that it moved from Liaodong to Pyeongyang. By contrast, both Han Baekgyeom and Jeong Yak-yong located it at Pyeongyang and limited its territory to between the Han-gang to the south, and the Cheongcheon-gang (Han) or Yalu (Jeong) bordering China to the north. Yun stresses, however, at this time, the primary notion of Oj, was that of Gija Joseon rather than Dangun Joseon. (Yun 2006:21)

During the Japanese colonial era, Yun cites the ideas of ‘ethno-nationalist historians’ (인족주의 역사학자) Sin Chaeho, Jang Dobin (張道斌, 1888–1963) and Jeong Inbo (鄭寅博 1893–1950) who variously located the Oj border with China as the Xuanyuluan (軒芸澗), the Luan-he (瀋河) and Gaoli-he (高麗河) respectively. Thus by 1945 two schools had emerged: one headed by [establishment historian] Yi Byeongdo (李丙燦 1896–1989 hereafter YBD) locating Pyeongyang as the centre and the Cheoncheon-gang the border, and the other advocating a continental location. In South Korea the Pyeongyang school came to dominance for the following reasons: it was supported by the SY account and had been already mainstream orthodoxy throughout the Joseon dynasty: YBD presented his arguments and evidence in a credible academic format; and during his long tenure as the chair of history at Seoul National University, he taught the next generation of establishment historians who ensured the continuation of his ideas. By contrast, the continental school suffered for the following reasons: Oj had been actively negated and under-researched during the colonial era and so few were willing to imagine it might have had an expansive Manchurian territory: the writings of Sin, Jang and Jeong were not in an academic format and failed to cite sources so lacked credibility: finally, in contrast to YBD, they were unable to teach a second generation as Sin died before 1945, Jeong was taken to the North during the Korean War and Jang only held tenure at a private university for a short time. (Yun 2006:23)

---

¹¹⁴ I indent the summary but it is still written as a third person description.
As a result the continental OJ advocates were unable to gain a position inside of the major universities and thus were labelled as *jaeya* (在野 lit. 'in the wild') historians. With roots in the independence movement they became associated with ethno-nationalism rather than objective scholarship.

In North Korea, meanwhile, the Pyeongyang location was similarly assumed by historians until Ri Jirin’s 1963 *Gojoseon Yeongu* ('OJ research') which advocated a Manchurian location with the western border initially as the Luan river and shrinking to the Daling-he (大凌河) in the wake of Yan’s expansion under Qin Kai. Consequently the Pyeongyang location of Lelang commandery was also revised on the grounds that the Japanese archaeology had largely been fabricated, a claim that had been made at the time by Jeong Inbo.

In a 1987 article, Bak Jin-uk sought to correlate OJ’s territory to the distribution of Misongi type pottery found in northwestern Korea and Liaoning, whilst he associated the distribution of *bipa* (琵琶 mandolin) type bronze daggers to a much broader ‘ancient ethnic Korean cultural zone’. In 1993 with the declared ‘discovery’ of Dangun’s tomb, Pyeongyang was reestablished as the centre of OJ but, as of a 1996 published source, the territory remained similar.

In the South, from the late 1980s, after discovering at Harvard’s Yenching Library a map in Zeng Xianzhi’s (曾先之) *Shiba-shilüe* (十八史略 1297) which located OJ in Manchuria, Yun’s own research began to challenge the establishment view. Based on further research of Chinese sources, he proposed an expansive Manchuria centered territory whilst limiting Wiman Joseon and the Han Commanderies to a limited western location between the Luan and Daling rivers. (Yun 2006:26)

"The opposition to this from a portion of the establishment historians (강당사학자들) was extremely big. They mistook my assertions as representing the so-called jaeya historians with whom they were in confrontation. At the time, there was an extreme conflict between the establishment and jaeya historians which went beyond academic dimensions and was emotional. Thus I became caught between this confrontation and discord. In spite of the fact that I was clearly an establishment historian myself, a portion of the establishment historians classified me as a jaeya historian... However, my assertions were the result of absolute empiricism (실증) based on ancient Korea and Chinese

---

written records, and archaeological sources." (Yun 2006:27)

According to Yun there are now four broad theories on Oj:
1) Pyeongyang centered with the northern border as the Cheongcheon-gang: still asserted but losing ground to modern research.
2) Spread across Manchuria and the Korean peninsula: various opinions on the historical border with China.
3) Same territory as 2 but having expanded from Pyeongyang: this is Yun’s own hypothesis [citing his own work, Gojoseon yeongu 1994].
4) The center moved from Manchuria to Pyeongyang: this is the hypothesis of No Taedon (1990).116) Within this theory there are two variants: that Oj originated first in China, the other that it simply moved from Manchuria, but in the latter case "there is no explanation for where Oj was before it was in Manchuria". (Yun 2006:29)

Within 4, the first variant Yun is due to outdated preconceptions that the Yellow River culture was more advanced than Manchuria or Korea and links it to the Gija legend. The second variant Yun asserts, citing Song Hojeong (1999) as an example, is tied to correlating earthenware types to territory: Yun argues that in the Bronze Age, earthenware was easily made and so there could be regional variation within polities. Rather it was bronze items that reflected political power and prestige and whose production was therefore controlled by a central authority and so it is the distribution of bronze that would reflect political territory.

Evaluation
The above narrative can be seen as an immediate prototype to Lee Deok-il’s ‘collaborator narrative’ discussed in Chapter 15. Whilst acknowledging the academic shortcomings of Sin Chaeho, it fails to include mention of Choe Namseon, however, Yun’s usage of the term ‘Manchuria’ is anachronistic and likely borrowed from Choe.

2. Yun’s interpretation of archaeology
"[Physical] culture is one of the basic elements constituting the characteristics of a minjok. The basic elements generally used to define a minjok include: self-identification (귀족의식), bloodlines, language, religion, regions of abode, and culture: the reason culture is amongst these basic elements is because it is the product of a minjok’s joint labour. Against this background, when we consider that bronze daggers were a prestige

116) No Taedon 「古朝鮮 중심지의 변천에 대한 연구」 in Hanguksa-ron 韓國史論 23.
117) Song Hojeong 「古朝鮮 國家形成 過程 研究」 Seoul National University PhD dissertation.
item (독점물) of the ruling class, we can understand that the *bipa* shape bronze dagger culture was made by people of one race (거려) and one country." (Yun 2006:67)

Yun’s five subheadings used in Yun (2006) provide a summation of his core arguments:

1. OJ’s territory must be based on the distribution of the ruling class
2. Distribution of *bipa* shaped bronze daggers is the basic criterion for determining OJ’s territory
3. Stone tombs are the basic grave type of OJ’s ruling class
4. OJ’s territory must be wider than the distribution of archaeological remains
5. From its earli[est] period OJ occupied the Korean peninsula and Manchuria (Yun 2006:61-86)

Whilst textual sources identify the basic location of OJ and its western border with China, Yun utilizes archaeology to support this evidence and further define the territory of OJ both spatially and over a greater time frame.

Yun posits that the OJ territory corresponds primarily to the distribution of ‘*bipa* shaped bronze daggers’ (琵琶形銅劍 hereafter BSBD) and secondarily to various stone built tomb types, but rejects direct correspondences to more limited earthenware cultures. As seen above, his reasoning is that bronze daggers and tombs represent artefacts of elite physical culture and so correspond to political control, whereas earthenware production would have been less regulated and so was more likely to vary on a regional basis: he supports this with the argument that ancient Chinese polities such as Shang (商) are identified through their bronzes rather than earthenware cultures. (Yun 2006:62)

Yun thus treats the distribution of BSBD at once as a ‘culture zone’ but also as a physical archaeological culture originating in the Lower Xiajiadian culture (夏家店下層文化) which he dates to 2410 BCE. Yun cites Han Changgyun (1992) in dating BSBD to c.C16-14th BCE which he acknowledges is earlier than the conventional dating of C10th BCE, but relative to the SY foundation date of 2333 BCE corresponds to the ’mid OJ’ period!118) (Yun 2006:63)

In describing the BSBD, Yun emphasizes that they are fundamentally different both from the Chinese ‘Eastern Zhou’ (東周式) as well as the northern ‘Ordos type’ bronze dagger cultures. Aside from their distinctive ‘*bipa* shaped’ blades, BSBD were constructed with two separately cast parts for the blade and hilt.

whilst both Chinese and northern [complex type] daggers were cast as a single piece. (Yun 2006:64–5)

According to Yun, tomb types where bronze daggers are typically found, as well as associated earthenware also differ between the three regions: China has wooden framed or buried earth tombs with grey li (鬲) earthenware cauldrons; Ordos has pit tombs with occasional grey plain earthenware but elsewhere, including on the dagger hilts, incorporates animal motifs: by contrast, the BSBD culture zone has both stone piled and stone sarcophagus tombs, and dolmen type graves with brown earthenware and additionally bronze mirrors whose hooks are off-centre.

In a sentence reiterating that the BSBD culture was distinct from China or Ordos, Yun references North Korean scholar Bak Jin-uk (1987) and also cites Chinese scholar Lin Yun (林沬, 1980) who defined the BSBD culture as a distinct 'culture zone' belonging to the Ye, Maek, Goguryeo, Buyeo, Jinbeon and Joseon, which according to Yun were all subordinate states of OJ.119) (Yun 2006:67)

According to the distribution of currently discovered BSBD, the territory of OJ appears centered on Liaoning, stretching westwards into Hebei, southwards through the Korean peninsula to its southern coast, and north to the region of Changchun and Jilin cities, China. However, Yun argues that BSBD mostly come from elite tombs which would have been located safely inside of OJ, the actual borders would thus have been further still: in particular he posits that to the north and northeast they would have reached the Sungari (aka Songhua) and Ussuri rivers respectively. Yun gives the following arguments for including such an expansive northeastern region: it later became the territory of East Buyeo which was descended from OJ: the reason BSBD have yet to be found in northeastern Manchuria is because there have not been many excavations: the topography is suitable for agriculture and connected by rivers; and finally, whilst BSBD have yet to be found, the later 'slender bronze daggers' have been.120) (Yun 2006:69)

Yun further argues that whilst the greatest number of BSBD have been found in Liaoning, to the point that Kim Won-ryong (1974) had referred to them as 'Liaoning type' daggers, this reflects only that the largest number of excavations have been carried out in this region.121) Meanwhile the oldest and most

---

119) Lin Yun 林沬「中國東北系銅劍初論」 in Gogo-hakbo 考古學報 1980年 第2期.
archetypal BSBD have rather been found in modern neighbouring Liaodong. Yun further suggests, alongside the fewer number of excavations, across Liaodong and Heilongjiang province, the ground is lower and regularly flooded by rivers so that items may have been buried several meters deep, as is the case with Shang remains in the Yellow river basin. (Yun 2006:70)

Diachronically, Yun emphasizes a linear process of indigenous development reaching back to the Neolithic: thus he posits that the Luan river may have been the original western border of OJ. Referencing Chang (1986), he highlights that in the Neolithic period, the Luan formed the western border of a broad culture zone centered on the mid reaches of the Liao river and stretching fully across Manchuria and the Korean peninsula; characterized by comb patterned earthenware, this zone was distinct from the Yellow River culture to the west of the Luan.122) From the late Neolithic, dolmen and various stone built tomb types spread across this same region that were once again different to Yellow River pit tombs.

Then c.2500 BCE the Lower Xiajiadian bronze culture appeared in the ‘eastern part’ of the Luan river: here Yun again asserts that this culture has ‘only’ been excavated in the modern Liaoxi region and so its original centre and full distribution cannot be confirmed, strongly implying that it would have been spread across the greater region of Korea–Manchuria. (Yun 2006:71)

3. Yun's historical geography of Old Joseon
Yun’s historical geography of OJ can be seen to build on the foundation of Sin Chaeoho, taking as a key premise the hypothesis that Wiman Joseon was situated on the western edge of the original OJ territory and that its capital of Wangheom/Wanggeom-seong (王險城/王僉城) was therefore in a separate location west of the main OJ capital. As a consequence, rather than seeking to deduce the site of the OJ capital through the location of the presumed subsequent Lelang commandery - as is conventional for archaeologists and establishment historians - Yun builds an independent hypothesis based on his own textual source analysis, laid out below.

3.1 Interpretation of the SY account
Based on the SY Dangun account, Yun first identifies that the OJ capital moved four times between four separate locations with the first and last being the same place. According to his reading, the first capital was Asadal which he locates in the Daedong-gang basin, modern Pyeongyang.

This capital was the ethnic homeland of the original *Asadal or *Hwan (桓族) people prior to the formal establishment of the Joseon state. [* This corresponds to Kim Gyoheon’s *Sinsi period]. As their pre-state social confederation developed, their territory expanded across Manchuria; the second capital, Pyeongyang-seong, established by Dangun c.2333 BCE was thus located somewhere inside continental Manchuria and marked the foundation of the ancient Joseon state. As OJ continued to expand the capital moved significantly westwards to the Luan basin in the region of modern Changli-xian county (昌黎县), Hebei: this third capital was that of Baeg’aksan-Asadal (百岳山阿斯達). After Gija’s arrival c.1100 BCE, the OJ capital withdrew to the eastern side of the Daling river; this fourth capital was Jangdanggyeong (藏唐京). Finally, following the overthrow of Wiman Joseon, Han China established the first three of its Four Commanderies in the former Wiman territory: the subsequent Xuantu commandery, however, extended eastwards from the Daling to the Liao river and in the process absorbed the location of Jangdanggyeong. Thus in the wake of this Han encroachment, the OJ capital withdrew all the way back to its first location of Asadal in the Daedong-gang basin. (Yun 2006:93)

※ This narrative represents a not impossible historical interpretation of the SY account: the only immediate inconceivability is why the third capital would have been located on the far western border at OJ’s most vulnerable location. It also ignores the impact of the proceeding Qin Kai campaign.

Yun posits the modern Pyeongyang location of Asadal with the following arguments: first, and most dubiously, its earliest pre-state period is supported by the 3107 BCE date determined by North Korea scholars from the "Dangun skeleton" of the 1993 Dangun tomb "discovered" close to Pyeongyang; secondly, aside from this highly problematic evidence, Yun emphasizes there was already a premodern tradition of Dangun’s tomb being located in Pyeongyang evidenced in sources beginning with the 1530 YJSR and subsequently the Sukjong, Yeongjo and Jeongjo sillok records. (Yoon 2006:107). Finally, Yun suggests that Myohyang-san’s traditional association with Dangun is also relevant: citing the HHS "Goguryeo" account that Joseon was "to the south of Goguryeo" and the SGZ "Ye" account that lands to the east of an apparently still "present Joseon" had once belonged to the Ye, Yun posits that this surviving Joseon territory referred to a region around Myohyang-san which had been given to descendents of the former OJ rulers by the subsequent ruling power (i.e. Goguryeo) in a manner seen throughout East Asian history following dynastic transitions. (Yun 2006:105–9)

Concerning Yun’s proposed locations of the other three OJ capitals in Manchuria
he supports them with evidence from Chinese sources premised on the hypothesis that they can be correlated to the toponym Heomdok (陰徬 Ch. Xiandu): this premise is derived from the fact that the group of Suoyin (索陰 c.730) and Jiie (集解 c.425) annotations to 'Wangheom-seong' in the Joseon account of the Shiji associated it - or according to Yun conflated it - with Heomdok. (Yun 2006:97) For reference in the following discussion, these annotations for 'Wangheom' in the Shiji are translated in their entirety below.

\[Shiji\ (史記:朝鮮列傳):\quad \text{"[Wi] Man fled... established the capital of Wangheom."}\]

\[Xu\ Guo\ said,\ "Changli has a Heomdok county."\]

\[Wi\ Zhao\ said,\ "[Wangheom] is the name of an old district."\]

\[Ying\ Shao\ wrote,\ "The [Hanshu] geography treatise [identifies] Heomdok- italiane in Liaodong as the old royal capital of Joseon."\]

\[Chen\ Zan\ said,\ "Wangheom-seong was in Lelang commandery, east of the Paesu river."\]

Asserting Heomdok to be a uniquely Manchurian toponym, Yun identifies four references to Heomdok, two of which he deduces to be the same. His correlations are summarized in the Table 23 below (with Wiman Joseon also appended for reference in the following discussion).

- Yun's identification of the first two Heomdok references, which he equates to one another as Baeg'aksan-Asadal, are both from the same group of 'Wangheom' (王險) annotations in the Shiji "Joseon" account as above: they were thus already equated from the time of their compilations.
- Within this same group of annotations, Yun distinguishes these two Xu Guo and Ying Shao quotes from that of Chen Zan (臣瓚) highlighting that whilst the former two both mention Heomdok, Chen Zan does not: by contrast Chen mentions Lelang which the former do not.
- By means of this distinction, Yun correlates the two 'Heomdok' annotations to the same OJ capital (Baeg'aksan-Asadal), and the 'Lelang' annotation separately to Wangheom-seong (the original subject of the annotations).
- Yun locates both capitals in ancient Liaodong, but by different methodologies and at separate locations. The OJ capital is located in the lower reaches of the Luan river through the annotations and historical-geography of

---

123) This refers to Ying Shao's own annotation in the Hanshu geography treatise.
124) Shiji 史記:朝鮮列傳 annotation to "滿人命...朝鮮蠻夷及故燕、齊亡命者王之。都 王險 【集解】徐嘉曰：「昌黎有陰陽縣也。」【索陰】崔昭雲「古邑名也。徐嘉曰「昌黎有陰陽縣，應劭注「地理志遼東陰陽縣，朝鮮王國都」。臣瓚云「王險城在燕浪郡遼水之東」也。"
4. Guanbing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four 'Heomdok' 險濱</th>
<th>original source</th>
<th>located from</th>
<th>modern location</th>
<th>Correspond-ing OJ capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Changli 昌黎 險濱</td>
<td>Xu Guang 徐廣 in <em>jijie</em> 史記集解</td>
<td>晉書:地理志:上:平州:昌黎郡</td>
<td>Luan river basin</td>
<td>Baeg’aksan-Asadal (白岳山阿斯達)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Liaodong 遼東郡 險濱</td>
<td>Ying Shao 應劭 in <em>Suoyin</em> 諧音量注</td>
<td>漢書:地理志</td>
<td>Luan river basin</td>
<td>Baeg’aksan-Asadal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wiman Joseon**

| Liaodong | 史記索隿 referencing the Ying Shao annotation to *Hanshu* in 2 above. | Beidaihe (北戴江) | Wangheom-seong (王陵城) |

Table 23. Yun Naehyeon – Disambiguation of Heomdeok county references.

Changli-xian: Yun asserts that this region only came under Chinese control from the Warring States period and so previous to that it was occupied by OJ (Yun 2006:100). Wangheom-seong, meanwhile, is located at modern Baidehe, adjacent to Beijing through the historical-geography of Lelang laid out below.

### 3.2 Determining the location of the Gija-Wiman Joseon capital and subsequent Lelang commandery

There are two stages to his process of deduction, laid out below.

First stage:

- In a Ying Shao annotation to the Lelang-jun article of the *Hanshu* geography treatise, Joseon county (朝鮮縣) is associated with the location of Gija’s fiefdom, and by extension - according to Sin and Yun’s narrative - the subsequent Wiman Joseon capital.
- Meanwhile in a *Suoyin* annotation quoting the "Taikang-dilizhi" (太康地理志), Suicheng-xian county (遂城縣) of Lelang is said to be the location of Jieshi-shan (碣石山) as well as the start of the Great Wall.

[Shiji 史記: 夏本紀: “夏禹治水，入于海。【索隿】地理志云‘碣石山在北平遼城縣西南’。”
太康地理志云「樂浪遂城縣有碣石山，長城所起。’]
Yun’s premise is that this latter Lelang refers to the site of the Lelang-jun commandery and by extension the Gija and Wiman Joseon capital. If this is the case then the site of Wanggeom-seong can be roughly identified through locating Jieshi-shan.

Second stage: locating Jieshi-shan

- In the Tongdian (通典 801), Jieshi-shan is said to be located in Lulong-xian (盧龍縣).
  
  "碣石，海邊山名，在今北平郡盧龍縣也。"

- Referencing the 1982 ‘Historical Atlas of China’ (中國歷史地圖集 Zhongguo-lishi-dituji, vol.5 pp33-5), Yun locates Lulong-xian in the lower reaches of the Luan river basin, adjacent to current day Jieshi-shan which is to the east of the Luan.

- Having located Jieshi-shan, Yun posits that the Lelang commandery must have been on the east of the mountain as it was necessarily just beyond the far northeast of Han China’s territory. This also puts it to the east of the Luan river which he equates to the ancient Paesu (泜水) and so matches the Suoyin Chen Zan quote.

- This geography is further corroborated in the Daming-yitong-zhi (大明一統志 1461) entry for Yongping-fu (永平府) which records under ‘ancient remains’ (古蹟) that Gija's 'Joseon-seong' (朝鮮城) was located there.

- Referencing the Mingshi and modern Historical Atlas of China (1987 vol.7 p46), Yun highlights that Yongping-fu contained the following counties: Luanzhou 澧州, Lulong (盧龍縣), Qinan (遷安縣), Funing (撫寧縣), Changli (昌黎縣), and Leting (樂亭縣). (Yun 2006:101-3)

The final position of modern Beidaihe is based on his reading of the description of Wanggeom-seong in the Shiji "Joseon" account, namely that it would have been by the sea as it was attacked by the Chinese navy. Based on his own exploration, Yun asserts that there is indeed the site of an ancient 'palace' (궁궐터) at Beidaihe which Chinese archaeologists have interpreted as built by Qin, but that he argues was outside of Qin’s territory and so could be a candidate for Wanggeom-seong. (Yun 2006:103-4)

3.3 Etymology of Wanggeom/Wanggeom

Finally, concerning the pronunciation, Sin argues that the SY rendering of Wanggeom (王儉) is closer to the original than the Shiji Wanggeom-seong (王險城) on the grounds that geom can be internally explained as a royal title with the meaning of 'god' and is cognate to the geum (今) found in the early Silla title of Isageum (尼師今). On this shaky premise he asserts that Heomdok should be
*Geomdok (僑濮) with the meaning of 'royal abode', although he does not offer an etymology for *dok*. (Yun 2006:98)

※ In this way Yun reverses the Japanese colonial argument that *heom* 隗 was the 'original' toponymic character and *geom* 僑 created by the SY as the personification of a local deity.

3.4 Evaluation of historical geography

In contrast to his interpretation of archaeology, Yun’s historical geography is the better argued and more scholarly aspect of his work: as a consequence it makes the greatest contribution to substantiating Sin Chaeho’s OJ hypothesis. In particular, identifying the significance of jieshi–shan for locating Wangheom–seong provides the strongest counter-theory against the Pyeongyang location of Lelang–jun commandery, and has continued to be promoted by other popular historians, namely Lee Deok-il.

Whilst differing to Sin, by locating the first and final capital of Asadal at the site of modern Pyeongyang, Yun is able to incorporate the 'Pyeongyang centered' line of official North Korean historiography (since 1993) within a still broadly continental Manchuria focused paradigm.

3.5 Inspired by Sin?

It can also be noted, that not just the hypothesis, but the line of evidence, too, is directly inspired by Sin’s "Study of Pyeongyang–Paesu" in *joseon-sa yeongu–cho* (朝鮮史研究草: 第4篇 鋼鐵水考 1924-5)\(^\ast\). Here, instead of the *Shiji*, Sin discusses a similar group of annotations for 'Heomdok county' (僑濮縣) in the Liaodong–jun section of the *Hanshu* geography treatise.

[Hanshu: Geography: Liaodong–jun: "...

Ying, Shao said, "[It was] the capital of Joseon king [Wi] Man. Relying on the dangerous waters, it was called 'Heomdok' (dangerous channel).

Chen Zan said, "Wangheom–seong was to the east of the Lelang–jun Paesu river, this was the original Heomdok.

[Yan] Shigu said, "Zan’s explanation is correct..."

In this case Sin seeks to make the argument that there were two Heomdok counties: one located within the contemporary Liaodong–jun commandery (the object of the annotations); the other, spoken of by Chen Zan, associated with the

\(^{125}\) See JSYC in Danjae (2007:345).
Wiman capital of Wangheom-seong located east of the 'Lelang-jun Paesu' river, that is, outside of either the Liaodong or Lelang commandery locations. Sin argues that in the context of the geography treatises, however, Chen’s Heomdok was conflated with the Liaodong Heomdok.

Sin further argues that Chen’s quote was misread by later scholars, including the Japanese, reading the demonstrative pronoun ci (此) as referring to Wangheom-seong rather than 'Liaodong-jun Heomdok'. However, he asserts that multiple annotations were typically only juxtaposed when their content disagreed and so the former interpretation would have made the quote superfluous and there would be no need for the third quote by Yan Shigu (顏師古) explicitly supporting Chen. (JSYC in Danjae 2007:354-7)

Separately, it could be noted, in Saron "Study of the Great Wall" (史論:萬里長城考 c.1920s) Sin also suggests the need for inquiry on the location of Jieshi-shan (碣石山) whilst highlighting the "Taikang-dilizhi" (太康地理志) quotation (which he attributes to the Jinshu (晉書); here, however, the significance of Jieshi-shan is related only to the location of the Great Wall rather than Wangheom-seong. (Saron in Danjae 2007:505)

3.6 Yun's periodization

An important innovation of Yun’s historiography is in explicitly rejecting a linear chronology for the ancient Joseon of Dangun, and the Gija and Wiman Joseon polities. Based on the numbers given in the SY account, Yun highlights that Gija is said to have arrived 1,500 years since the foundation of OJ, but that Dangun ruled in total for 1,908 years thus giving an overlap of some 400 years. Yun takes this as evidence that OJ proper continued to exist occupying the greater part of its territory until its natural break-up. Meanwhile, the much smaller domain of Gija Joseon coexisted to the west before being replaced by Wiman Joseon and then the Han Commanderies. (Yun 2007:255-6) Yun rejects the particulars of the Jewang-ungi account, which has Gija establishing Later Joseon 164 years after the end of Dangun’s 1028 year rule in the same location. (Yun 2007:249)

Yun further rejects the conventional interpretation of current day South Korean textbooks which arbitrarily negate Gija because of his Chinese associations, but still accept the historicity of King Jun (準王) making him not the last king of Gija Joseon, but of OJ proper, in the process allowing for a linear transition from OJ to Wi Man Joseon and the Han Commanderies with the location of Wangheom-seong/Lelang-jun retrospectively conflated as the capital of OJ. (Yun 2007:158)
3.7 Historical geography of Goguryeo

Yun distinguishes Gaogouli-xian county (高句麗縣) of the Xuantu commandery from the Goguryeo state (高句麗國) proper, locating the former in the region of modern Liaoxi and the latter in modern Liaodong. Thus he rejects the theory that the state evolved from the commandery county. He justifies this on the grounds that both are separately mentioned in HHS - the county in the "Junguozi" (郡國志) treatise dealing with administrative districts within Han territory, and the state in the "Dongyi-liezhuang" (東夷列傳) dealing with foreign polities to the east. The HHS "Ye" (譯) entry explicitly states Goguryeo to have been former Joseon territory whilst the SS Goguryeo Annal and the Gwanggaeto Stele have Goguryeo established in the former location of Jolbon (卒本) and Biryu-gok Holbon-seoseong (沸流谷 忽本西城) respectively. (Yun 2007:215-6)

Yun suggests the reason for Gaogouli-xian county to the west was that this region was also former OJ land where a separate population of ‘Goguryeo’ Koreans resided, but that they were unrelated to the followers of Go Jumong who went on to establish the Goguryeo state. (Yun 2007:217)

4. Yun’s interpretation of Dangun

Although unacknowledged, Yun’s interpretation of the Dangun myth is closely based on Choe Namseon’s. Yun makes the same initial distinction between the mythical and ‘historical’ sections but goes further, by suggesting that all parts of the myth can be taken as reflecting supposedly proto-historical events equivalent to archaeological periodization. According to this scheme, the heavenly descent of Hwan’ung corresponds to the migration of a Paleolithic •Hwan’ung tribe’ that worshipped a sky-god (Hwan’in < *Haneu-nim): Hwan’ung’s initial rule corresponds to the early Neolithic period which saw the introduction of agriculture: and finally the period under Dangun corresponds to the Bronze Age, supported by the SY 2333 BCE date "roughly matching" a c.2550 BCE date for the introduction of bronze. (Yoon 2003:48)

Yun similarly seeks to further historicize Choe’s totemism interpretation by correlating the sky/sun •Hwan’ung tribe to the Han (韓/桓) ethnic group, the •bear tribe to Goguryeo and the •tiger tribe to the Ye (譯). These latter two, Yun bases on HHS and SGZ accounts which record a holy cave in Goguryeo and, more explicitly, a Ye tiger god ceremony.126) Concerning the Hwan’ung tribe, Yun posits it may also have been termed Asadal as this is the name of the first settlement: linguistically he suggests they have the same semantic etymology

---

126) SGZ 三國志:魏書三十:高句麗傳: "其國東有大穴，名陵穴，十月國中大會，迎陵神還於國東上祭之，置木陵於神坐" and SGZ 三國志:魏書三十:譯傳: "常用十月節祭天，晝夜飲酒歌舞，名之為舞天，又祭虎以為神"
borrowing Choe's \[hwan\] 桓 = \(hwan\) 'bright'] whilst Asadal = 'morning/bright land'.

Reminiscent of Choe's (1954) methodology, Yun posits that the historical myth can at once also be read for an understanding of OJ religio-philosophy, by which he identifies the following eight points.

1) Ancient Koreans (우리 민족) believed themselves to be descendants of heaven.
2) They had a heaven-man-earth 'three jae thought structure' (三才思想).

※ This reworks the 'three level world' shamanistic world view Choe attempted to identify from the myth but failed because no underworld is mentioned.
3) They possessed an intense humanism (人本主義): the notion of \(hong’ik-ingan\) sought only to benefit humans.
4) They pursued co-prosperity (共榮共生) amongst themselves.
5) They stressed unity rather than aggression.
6) They strove for 'rational solutions': even whilst they considered themselves descendants of heaven, they also considered themselves evolved from animals as evidenced from totemism.
7) 'Three' was a sacred number: contrasting to the Yin-Yan dualism and Five Elements of Chinese philosophy.

- Yun identifies various triads from the Dangun myth and further cites both the Christian holy trinity and Hegelian and Marxist dialectics as evidence that using three as a sacred numerical concept was superior, or at least different, to Chinese dualism and the Five Elements.
8) They had a strong interest in medicinal foods and asceticism as evidenced in the bear and tiger eating garlic and mugwort before entering the cave to become human. (Yun 2003:51-4)

From amongst these generally vague conjectures, the aspect that Yun most expounds upon from Choe is \(Hong’ik-ingan\) (弘益人間) which he emphasizes as the core of Korea’s Dangun derived philosophy. In many ways this usage of \(Hong’ik-ingan\) serves as a more clearly attested replacement to Sin’s *Sudu and Choe’s *Pārk hypotheses.

5. Yun’s ethno-nationalism

"The concept of 'minjok' differs slightly according to the opinion of each scholar, but [they] basically agree that it is 'the largest [social] unit of a community formed through a consciousness of group belonging (집단귀속의식) which shares various types of cultural content including religion, language, customs, politics and economics, on account of sharing a common lifestyle over a long period of time."
within a defined region.’ Here [under this definition], our [own] minjok has even more of a consciousness of being a single [i.e. homogeneous] minjok. A minjok is not necessarily formed from the same bloodline, but our minjok [also] thinks that it is [of] a single bloodline. This has the function of further strengthening our ethnic [minjok] consciousness.” (Yun 2003:112)

Like most historians focused on a single nation to which they themselves belong, Yun’s motivation for writing history and the specific interpretations he advocates are strongly underpinned by his own ethnocentric worldview which, whilst undoubtedly inspired most immediately by Sin Chaeho’s ethno-nationalist historiography, has evolved its own distinct nuances and characteristics. The two core elements of Yun’s ethno-nationalism are: first the premise of an inferiority complex molded by both the premodern influence of China, starting with the Silla-Tang alliance, and the modern Japanese colonial era and subsequent division of the nation (Yun 2003:174); and second, the need to counteract this by emphasizing exclusive indigenous development in the processes of ethnogenesis and early state formation.

It may be argued that in current day South Korea, this inferiority complex is increasingly anachronistic: having experienced little to none of the 20th century, many of the younger generations of South Koreans cannot identify so directly with the primarily post-colonial ‘wounded pride’ which Yun diagnoses as the Korean psychosis and nor do they necessarily feel the same strength of ethnic bonds to North Korea. (Yun 2003:174) For this reason, Yun has to first emphatically remind his popular readership that they are inferior before encouraging them to take ethnic pride in Dangun and ancient history. (Yun 2003:185)

5.1 Peeling back cultural layers

Yun argues that Korea’s ‘original unique culture’ has been buried under multiple layers of ‘foreign culture’, namely Buddhism, Confucianism and Western Christianity.

"...each time we adopted a new foreign culture it was used as the ruling [legitimizing] ideology (지배논리 lit. 'logic') and so it came to form the culture of the upper class whilst our [own] culture was put below it. The culture and relationship of Buddhism during the Four Kingdoms (사국시대 i.e. Three Kingdoms + Gaya) period was thus, and the culture and relationship of Confucianism during the Joseon dynasty was [also] thus: in the modern era the culture and relationship [to] the West has
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[also] been thus. As a result, our [own] unique culture (우리 고유 문화) with which our [Korean] race (족어 gyeore) lived before the influx of the foreign cultures has ended up at the very bottom of our society.

Only the commoners (서민) of low social status who struggle economically have held on to it (lit. 'live maintaining it'). As a result, we ourselves also regard it with disdain. Consequently our culture and foreign culture have been unable to stimulate and influence one another from an equal position. That is why it has been difficult for us to create [anything] new and [our] development has inevitably been retarded (더디다)." (Yun 2003:189)

Thus Yun’s emphasis on ancient history and Dangun throughout his research has not been for the sake of pure academic inquiry but because he regards this as a golden age when 'pure Korean culture' existed in a state unadulterated by foreign influence and was therefore more invigorated than anytime since: he is advocating for a neo-traditionalist revival for which Dangun is the primary surviving element.

※ The fundamental weakness of this argument is the lack of archaeological evidence for any such ancient civilization.

5.2 China

Whilst defining the Korean people and culture as distinct from China, Yun differs from both Sin Chaeho and Choe Namseon by simultaneously expressing positive acknowledgment and even admiration for China’s long term success as a nation. This he attributes first and foremost to the strength of its historiography beginning with Sima Qian’s Shi ji which he credits with both establishing a unified sense of Chinese history centered on the Yellow River, and supposedly explicating on the religio-philosophy of tiandaot (天道) as an ideal moral system. (Yun 2003:154) In his description of Sima Qian’s life and the disgrace he endured, choosing to live on after the punishment of castration in order to complete his history, Yun also implicitly identifies his own experience of ostracism by the academic establishment. (Yun 2003:152)

Separately, he argues that Korea needs to follow China’s model in proving the indigenous identity and antiquity of its early culture: he narrates how, beginning with Wu Jinding (吳金錘 1901-48) and Liang Siyong (梁思永 1904-54) Chinese archaeologists overturned Andersson’s hypothesized Mediterranean origin for colored pottery of the neolithic Yangshao culture (仰韶文化), and further linked it to the subsequent Longshan culture (龍山文化) blackware. Yun thus advocates the historicization of Dangun supported by archaeological interpretation. (Yun
Like the official line of modern Chinese historiography, Yun regards both ancient and modern China as a multiethnic composition. Importantly, he distinguishes the Dongyi (東夷) of pre Qin eastern China, from the Manchurian Dongyi that became known only after the Han expansion. Together with the Xia (夏) people centered on the Yellow River, he regards the nine pre-Qin Dongyi groups (citing HHS 東夷列傳: 鬥・干・方・黃・白・赤・玄・風・陽夷) as subsequently being amalgamated into the Chinese Han (漢) ethnicity. Thus he emphasizes that whilst the Korean minjok are also of Dongyi identity, they do not represent its entirety and should not be conflated with the Chinese Dongyi: this view notably differs to Kim Gyoheon, Sin ChaeHo, as well as Lee Deok-il.127 (Yun 2003:120-1)

Analogous to his understanding of Han (漢) ethnogenesis, Yun conjectures that the pre OJ Korean minjok (우리 민족) were composed from the following 25 indigenous tribes (種族) that would bequeath their names to later attested peoples and polities of the same territory: Buyeo, Gojuk (孤竹), Goguryeo, Ye, MaeK, Chu (遼), Jinbeon, Nangnang, Imdun, Hyeondo (玄菟), Suksin (肅慎) Cheonggu (青丘), Yang’i (良夷), Yangju (楊州), Bal (發), Okjeo, Jin (辰), Biryu, Haeng’in (荇人), Haedu (海頭), Gaema (蓋馬), Guda (句茶), Jona (藺那), Juna (朱那) and Han (韓). (Yun 2003:122)

5.3 Korean control of eastern China

Despite limiting Koreans’ ethnogenesis to the Manchurian Dongyi, Yun still identifies a later expansion of the Korean minjok into eastern China beginning with a 320 year rule by Baekje, followed by the 55 year Chicheong-beonjin (畝青藩鎮 Ch. Ziqing-fanzhen) of former Goguryeo General Yi Jeonggi, and finally the nineteen year control under the merchant warlord Jang Bo-go (張保皋). Offering no references, the details are summarized in the following directly translated section.

"There are often people who speak as though our minjok [displayed only] a passive stance having only ever defended [itself] against invasions of other minjok, but this is not at all the case....

..Before the establishing of Sui country [i.e. Sui dynasty], at the time when Goguryeo had restored the present day region of Liaoxi which was the former land of Old Joseon and made it its own territory, Baekje [people] were crossing the ocean and occupying the eastern coastline region of China. In 246 during the period of the Chinese Three Kingdoms (Wei 魏,
Shu 蜀 and Wu 吳), the governor of You province (幽州刺史) Guanqiu Jian (毌丘儉) of Wei country invaded Goguryeo and reached the capital of Hwando-seong (丸都城). At this time, taking advantage of the empty You province, Baekje had *jawjang* ‘general of the left’ *jin Chung* (左將 唐忠) attack it and establish the Baekje commandery (百濟郡) in the [modern] region of Beijing and Tianjin (天津). Subsequently Baekje widened its power southwards advancing not only into the regions of Shandong (山東), Gansu (江蘇省) and Zhejiang (浙江省) provinces, but also the region of the Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Prefecture (廣西壯族自治區).

Baekje’s rule over the east coast region of China continued for more than *340 years* lasting until just before Sui unified China. Rule over the east coast region of China continued even while the Baekje capital moved [first] from Hanseong (modern Seoul) to Ungjin (modern Gongju), and then to Sabi (modern Buyeo). There is the possibility that rather than wasting the country’s strength confronting Goguryeo in the Han-gang river basin [of Seoul] Baekje perhaps judged it to be more advantageous to abandon (포기) that place and [instead] expand [its control over] the ‘rice bowl’ region (곡창지대) of China’s eastern coast. These facts tell us that Baekje was a powerful thalassocracy (해양국가 lit. ‘maritime state’).

As Sui country unified China, Baekje was pushed out of the east coast region of China, but subsequently during the Tang (唐) period *descendants of our minjok* established an independent regime (정권) there. This was the Chicheong-beonjin (震青藩鎭 Ch. Ziqing-fanzhen) of General Yi Jeonggi (李正己). With its territory [covering] the present day Shandong province (山東省) [of China], Chicheong-beonjin was ruled for *55 years* by a single house with General Yi Jeonggi’s son, Yi Nap (李納), succeeding him, and then continuing with Yi Nab’s son, Yi Sa-go (李師古), and Yi Sago’s younger brother Yi Sado (李師道).

After Tang country {dynasty} overthrew Goguryeo and Baekje in alliance with Silla, more than 200,000 Goguryeo people were dispersed and moved to regions of China; General Yi Jeonggi’s clan seems to have moved to Shandong province at that time. General Yi Jeonggi achieved military recognition and made a name for himself at the time of the An Lushan (安祿山) rebellion [c.755–63]: later he gained the trust of people around him and became the *jiedushi* (節度使 ‘provincial military commander’) of the Chicheong-beonjin. Although he became *jiedushi* through the power of Tang, in Chicheong-beonjin he implemented unique laws and systems and behaved independently whilst opposing the Tang country imperial house ( 항실). It was an independent regime established in China by remnant
people of Goguryeo.

Even whilst having hostile relations with the Tang country imperial house, the Chicheong-beonjin formed friendly relations with Balhae: [both] political exchanges and economic trade were frequent. [Both] Chicheong-beonjin and Balhae were established by remnant [survivors] (유인) of Goguryeo. Yi Jeonggi and Dae Joyeong [respectively]: if they had maintained friendly relations with one another whilst opposing the Tang imperial house, what thoughts must they have had? Perhaps they intended to combine their strength and restore the great climate (기상) and philosophy (사상) of Goguryeo. Chicheong-beonjin existed for 55 years before being destroyed by a Tang attack that mobilized the entirety of [Tang’s] national strength during the reign of Tang [emperor] Xianzong (x

19 years later, Commander (大使 daesa) Jang Bo-go (張保皋) of Silla advanced once more into this [same] region. Commander Jang Bogo had originally crossed to China from his home on present day Wan-do island and risen to the rank of xiaojiang 'lesser general' [in the] Wuning army (武寧軍의 軍中小將), however seeing that Silla people were being caught and sold by Chinese pirates, in 828 he established the Cheonghaejin [base] (淸海鎭) on Wan-do island in order to stop this.

Making Cheonghaejin his main base, Commander Jang Bogo controlled the southern Japanese archipelago and the east coast region of China: he established a thalassocracy (해상왕국 lit. 'kingdom on the sea') centered on our country [aka Korea] connecting the Japanese archipelago and China. Not only did Commander Jang Bogo rule this region, he utilized it as a route for international trade. Using this [infrastructure], trade was conducted even with faraway Arab regions. Activities [constituting] world trade (종합무역) were begun.

The east coast region of China that Commander Jang Bogo controlled extended from Shandong province in the north to Zhejiang (浙江省) province in the south, but the central region was Shandong and so it was the [same] place that had been General Yi Jeonggi’s Chicheong-beonjin and, previous to that, the region ruled by Baekje. That General Yi Jeonggi had been able to cultivate the Chicheong-beonjin as an independent force opposing Tang, and that subsequently Commander Jang Bogo had been able to control this region was [only] possible because of the historical background that it had [previously] been ruled by Baekje." (Yun 2003:131-5)
※ Needless to say, this fantastical narrative ignores all counter evidence of Chinese history.

5.4 Japan and Mimana
Turning to the east, Yun posits that all stages of early state formation in Japan occurred under the influence of O.J. He succinctly lays out the argument in the following section which continues from the same chapter quoted above.

"The advancing of our minjok into the Wae [aka Japanese] archipelago also began at an extremely early period. Many elements of our neolithic culture have been discovered in the Jōmon culture (縄文文化), the neolithic culture of Japan, and so it tells us that at the period of the Jōmon culture, our neolithic culture had already been transmitted to Japan. In particular, the Yayoi culture (縄生文化) that continued from C3rd BCE to C3rd CE was formed [as a result of] the transmission of our bronze age culture, iron age culture and rice farming [technology].

In any region of the world which undergoes a normal process of development, it is common for there to first be a bronze [age] culture and [only] after a quite long time has passed does the iron [age] culture appear. In our country and Manchuria bronze age culture appeared around 2500~2600 BCE, and advanced (진입) into iron age culture around 800 BCE. However, in the Wae archipelago, bronze age culture and iron age culture appeared simultaneously with the Yayoi culture.

This is because, due to our country and the Wae archipelago being divided by the sea, our culture was not transmitted to the Wae archipelago regularly, [instead] during one period the culture which had been attained up until then was transmitted all in one go. The result was the occurrence of the phenomenon of bronze age culture, iron age culture and rice agriculture, which had [all] been attained by our minjok up until that time, being transmitted all in one ago [to Japan from] around 300 BCE.

The fact that their culture was transmitted from our country can be understood from the point [of fact] that bronze and iron implements/vessels of the early Yayoi culture being unearthed on the Wae archipelago are the same as those unearthed in our [own] country. These were not made on the Wae archipelago but imported from the Korean peninsula. Japanese term these artefacts as ‘shipped bronze items’ (船載銅器) and ‘shipped iron items’ (船載鐵器). [Both] dolmen [megaliths], and
stone implements and clay vessels unearthed at dolmen sites which [all constitute] important elements of Yayoi culture are the same as those unearthed in Korea. This tells us that the Yayoi culture of the Wae archipelago was realized through transmission of our bronze age and iron age cultures.

In our [own] history [the period] from 300 BCE to 300 CE [corresponds] to the late Old Joseon, its collapse and the formation of the Multiple States period (열국시대 [term borrowed from Kim Gyoheon and Sin Chaeho]), and so was an era of political turmoil. Consequently it is thought that people from our country advanced into (진출) the Wae archipelago in order to avoid the political turmoil of this period and open up (개척) a new region. The region of early penetration was Kyūshū (九州) in the southern region, and in the later era they gradually expanded northwards. Recently a Japanese research team has discovered (발현) that people of the Yayoi culture had the same genes as people from our country.

Until that time there had been no state (국가) on the Wae archipelago. However, in our country Old Joseon had already been founded in 2333 BCE and so the people who advanced into Japan from our country already had the knowledge about states because they had lived for a long time in a structure called a state. Based on their own political experience, these people formed groups in each region [of Japan] and established countries [there]. In this way small states (소국) [began] appearing here and there throughout the Wae archipelago. Using the names of their motherlands (모국) they named their own countries [established in Japan] Goguryeo, Baekje, Silla and Imna (Gaya).

Subsequently around the C4th CE, a new [wave] of migrants entered [Japan coming] from our country and created the Kofun culture (古墳文化); through a process of unification (통합) between the small [Yayoi] states that had previously existed and the newly arrived groups, the state called Japan emerged around the C7th CE. Thus it can be said that the appearance of political powers (세력) and emergence of states on the Wae archipelago was the result of our minjok migrating [there]." (Yun 2003:135-7)

※ One could question why if Oj had possessed bronze from c.2500 BCE it did not reach the archipelago sooner.
※ Yun ignores the question of language but the only assumption which would work is for Korean and Japanese to be genetically related which is both problematic for nationalist sensitivities and also, linguistically, very unlikely to be
true.

Concerning the question of the Mimana Japan Office (任那日本府), Yun advocates the counter theories of North Korean scholars Kim Seok-hyeong and Jo Hwiseung: according to Yun, citing Godae-jo’il-gwan’gye-sa (History of ancient Korea-Japan relations), during the 1960s Kim argued that both Mimana and expansions of the Korean Three Kingdoms polities all existed in Japan and so it was interactions between these that are referred to in the Nihon-shoki rather than those of the peninsula polities: More recently, in Gaya-sa yeongu (Research on Gaya history) Jo has highlighted the similarities between graves types and artefacts discovered in Japan and those of the peninsula, in particular Gaya. Whether taken from these North Korean sources is unclear, but Yun further asserts that based on descriptions in the Nihon-shoki Mimana can be located in present day Okayama (岡山) prefecture of Japan: he points out Mimana is described as having a sea to its north which is obviously impossible for the southern peninsula location of Gaya to which it has been equated. He also argues the discrepancy between the SS dates of Gaya which finish with its collapse in 562 and the Nihon-shoki records of Mimana which continue until 646. (Yun 2003:95-9)

6. Evaluation
To summarize some key aspects, Yun defines OJ’s territory according to the distribution of archaeological finds. He equates ‘culture zones’ to physical archaeological cultures: in this sense his conceptualization is the successor to Choe’s culture zone discourse, but differs by emphasizing indigenous innovation over migratory (demic) diffusion. To support the notion of an ancient consolidated state, Yun presumes a centralized authority existed which regulated bronze and tomb production: he fails to considers that bronze daggers may have travelled outside of the centralized polities by alternative processual means such as exchange or trade, or that there could have been cultural diffusion independent of political control.

An apparent innovation of Yun is to emphasize the Lower Xiajiadian culture as the origin of non-Sinic northeastern/OJ civilization. His conceptualization of ancient Korea as a part of ‘Manchuria’ is in the mode of Choe Namseon: it is also similar to present day YeMaek/Liaodong centric variants (discussed in Chapter 18) but maintains a more explicit Korean ethnocentric subjectivity through attempted rationalization of the Hwan’ung-Dangun myth.
[Chapter 15] Lee Deok-il (b.1961)

National traitor / collaborator narrative

The arguments contained in two recent books by Lee Deok-il, *Hanguk-sa geud-eut-i sumgín jinsii* (한국사 그들이 숨긴 진실 'Korean history: the truth they have hidden' 2009) and *Uri an-ui singmin-sa’gwan* (우리 안의 식민사관 'The colonial view of history inside of us' 2014), may be broadly understood as a continuation of Sin Chaeho’s polemic against Korean historiographic tradition created in order to explain Korea’s apparent defects in the modern era. For Sin the question was focused on explaining how Korea could have come to be colonized by the culturally inferior Japanese: the root cause he attributed to a deeply engrained Sinocentricism promoted early on in Korea’s historiography by Kim Busik’s SS.

Meanwhile, Lee Deok-il is today writing under the circumstances of early 21st century Korea in which the peninsula remains violently divided and South Korean society politically polarized over the postcolonial legacy of the recent past and current social inequalities. Lee is an advocate of Sin’s line of ethno-nationalist historiography: already satisfied with the answers he finds in Sin’s work - and as promoted subsequently by Yun Naehyeon - for Lee the primary task has become to explain why this modern nationalist historiography has not been more fully accepted or adopted by establishment historians.

1. The 'colonial view of history' 植民史觀

Lee asserts that a country only 'invades' another country's history as a precursor to invading its territory, thus he defines the 'colonial view of history' *singmin-sa’gwan* (植民史觀 hereafter SMSG) as being the Japanese historiography on ancient Korea created for the purpose of establishing and thereafter perpetuating its rule over the Korean peninsula. (Lee 2014:49-50) Just as with colonial Japan, he fears the Chinese Northeast Project as a similar 'attack,' albeit ignoring the reverse logic of his own historiographic claims over northeastern China.

The essence of the SMSG, he reduces to two fundamental components: locating the Han Commanderies (漢四郡) within modern Korean territory across the north of the peninsula, and asserting the existence of the Mimana Japan Office (任那日本府) in the south. Both these foreign outposts - the Commanderies in particular - are directly equated to modern colonialism and so, combined with the negation of Dangun, the SMSG would have Korean history proper 'begin' with an ancient colonial era. An additional element of the SMSG highlighted by Lee is the 'hypothesis that the early records of the SS are false' which he posits was
required to explain why the SS contains no mention of Mimana.

1.1 The narrative
Lee’s ‘national traitor / collaborator narrative’ discusses actors across three chronological periods: the ultra-conservative Noron (老論) faction dominant during the mid to late Joseon dynasty, imperial Japanese scholars during the colonial era, and former collaborator historians (and their subsequent students) within the South Korean academic establishment from its founding up until the present. Under this scheme, the Noron were responsible for continued promotion of regressive Sinocentricism, failing to enact social or economic reforms, and ultimately cooperating with Japan in the 1910 annexation, selling out the country for their own advantage: in turn, Japanese scholars negated Dangun, advocated the Mimana Japan Office hypothesis and employed fabricated archaeology to locate the Han Commanderies on the Korean peninsula in order to portray ancient Korea as having been born out of Chinese and Japanese colonies respectively: then in the final most recent stage, former collaborators turned South Korean establishment historians have since worked to maintain the ‘Japanese colonial view of history’ (SMG) to protect their own positions, and have sought to revise the negative appraisal of the Noron faction from whom they are at least spiritually descended.

2. The Noron
Lee’s discussion of the Noron faction is the part of his thesis which most immediately builds on Sin Chaeho’s charges against sadae-ju’ui Sinocentricism having been responsible for Joseon’s decline. Whilst Sin, living through the calamity of annexation which he considered an event in need of a cause, sought to identify and expose the origins of sadae-ju’ui – in his view promulgated by the SS – Lee, focuses instead on the end result of sadae-ju’ui, annexation by Japan, which in turn he treats as the immediate origin for all current day problems including both societal (domestic politics) and historiographic (the dispute with China).

By targeting Joseon factionalism, Lee is able to draw a more direct and explicit link than Sin was between premodern sadae-ju’ui and the modern Japanese colonization: at the same time, there is implicit analogy to current politics.128)
This direct connection is reinforced through highlighting two cases of what he portrays as both long term and current day establishment revisionism.

128) In the introduction to Lee 2014, he in fact makes it explicit by blaming the Sewol tragedy on the pro-Japanese political elite and contemporary administration of Park Geun-hye. (Lee 2014:14).
2.1

The first case concerns the famous warning by 'Westerner' Yukgok Yi I (栗谷 李珥 1536-84), that if Joseon did not develop its army they would face disaster within a decade, and the opposition to this by Southerner Seo’ae Yu Seong-ryong (西匯 柳成龍 1542-1607). Lee argues that the episode was created by Yulgok’s student, Kim Jangsaeng (金長生 1548-1631) who compiled his posthumous works and subsequently promoted by Song Siyeol (宋時烈 1607-89) who added a date. Lee’s evidence is: it is not recorded in the main text of the original Seonjo Sillok but only as a commentary in the Seonjo-sujeong-sillok (‘revised Seonjo Sillok’) compiled by Westerners in 1657: the famous lamentation by Yu Seong-ryong after the Japanese invaded that Yulgok was "truly a sage" for his foresight was in fact a direct quotation lifted by Kim Jangsaeng from the Songsshi (宋史 “李文靖 真聖人也”129) where the Chinese name Li Wenjing (李文靖) was deemed similar enough to Yulgok’s style name Munseon (文成) and finally changed in the 1814 edition of his works, however this was in any event an anachronism because Yulgok only adopted the style name in 1622 after Yu Seong-ryong was already dead. (Lee 2009:246-9) Despite this, the anecdote was promoted by supposedly pro-Noron Yi Byeongdo (1896-1989) in order to besmirch the Southerner, Yu Seong-ryong, and consequently it has since been included in textbooks.

Lee argues that the rivalry between Yulgok and Seo’ae was from the beginning exaggerated as, in spite of their differing factional alliances, they both sought to support admiral Yi Sunsin and communicated politely with one another (Lee 2009:250). Lee highlights that Kim Jangsaeng created at least one other story negatively portraying Yu Seong-ryong, namely the execution of Yi Bai’s (李槝 1544-89) elderly mother and young child (Lee 2009:251-4), as well as, separately, against Northerner Nammyeong Jo Sik (南冥 邑植 1501-72).

According to Lee, two further pro-Noron revisionist claims found in a recent highschool textbook, Guksa Gyogwaseo (‘Korean history textbook’), are: that Song Siyeol actively supported King Hyojong’s ambition to lead a northward military campaign against the Manchu Qing, the bukbeol-ron (北伐論 ‘debate on invading the north’), after initially opposing it; and separately that the Noron were later the main advocates of commercial and social reform. In the former, based on his previous research and books, Lee demonstrates that Song Siyeol continued to counsel against military action and made no effort towards military preparation: concerning the latter, he charges that the blatantly false claim was created to counter the positive association of the disenfranchised Southerner faction with

'practical learning' Silhak agricultural reformers such as Ban'gye Yu Hyeongwon (碩溪 柳馨遠), Seongho Yi Ik (星湖 李漢) and Dasan Jeong Yak-yong (茶山 丁若鏞), however, in the case of commercial reformers too, one of the most prominent, Yu Suwon (柳壽垣 1694-1755), belonged to the Soron faction and was in fact executed with his immediate family in a large scale Noron led purge, whilst other progressive intellectuals such as Hong Daeyong (洪大容 1731-83) and Bak Jega (朴齊家 1750-1815) were associated with the non-political 'Northern Learning school' (北學派) and experienced similar oppression at the hands of the ultra-conservative Noron establishment. (Lee 2009:255-75) Lee notes that in a 2007 revision of the textbook, the false claim that most commercial reformers belonged to the Noron was removed but in the process they also removed the previously stated fact that the agricultural reformers had been Southerners. (Lee 2009:274).

2.2
Lee discusses another recent pro-Noron revisionist conspiracy which had sought to revise the well known suspicion that King Jeongjo was likely poisoned in a plot orchestrated by Noron member Sim Hwanji (沈煥之 1730-1802) and Dowager Jeongsun (貞純王后 1745-1805). According to Lee, in 2009, a letter sent from Jeongjo to Sim Hwanji thirteen days prior to his death, the Jeongjo eo’chal-cheop (正祖御札帖) was publicized together with an academic volume titled "Comprehensive examination of the newly excavated Jeongjo letter" (새로 발굴한 정조여찰의 종합적 검토) containing articles by five supposedly pro-Noron establishment historians. (Lee 2009:277) According to Lee’s summary, they argue the letter disproves the established poison theory on the grounds that Jeongjo and Sim Hwanji must have had friendly relations to be writing letters to one another, and that in the letter Jeongjo commented on his already deteriorating health proving that it was not the result of a sudden poisoning.

Lee counters that the articles focus only on the letter rather than the broader context which, based on the Jeongjo Sillok, he convincingly demonstrates undermine the pro-Noron revisionist claims. His main points are: throughout his career Sim Hwanji was a troublemaker and always worked to actively promote the interests of the Noron against the Southerners; the Noron had supported the execution of Jeongjo’s father, Prince Sado, and opposed the construction of Hwaseong fortress; Jeongjo only kept Sim in office because of the nationwide power of the Noron but he clearly did not trust him; the letter therefore should be understood as a 'hotline' for communication; the symptoms Jeongjo described in the letter he had had from three years previous and so were not the immediate cause of death; at the time of his death Sim Hwanji held the position of Naewon’in-jejo (內醫院提調) responsible for overseeing Jeongjo’s medicine; at the moment of his death Jeongjo was alone with Dowager Jeongsun who had
already begun making appointments - illegally - and the following day promoted Sim who went on to heavily purge the Southerner faction: a standard investigation of the royal doctors was at first blocked but following rising suspicion of foul play, the doctors were summarily executed: and lastly, the Sunjo Sillok contains a strongly negative assessment of Sim after Jeongjo’s death, that he only worked for the interests of the Noron and achieved nothing for the country. (Lee 2009:281–313)

Through the examples above, having established the detrimental dominance of the Noron faction in the late Joseon dynasty, Lee attempts to demonstrate how the Noron then became active collaborators - traitors - in the annexation of Korea. To support this, he makes the claim that from a list of 76 Koreans who were given Japanese peerage titles following the annexation, 64 belonged to factions of whom fully 56 were Noron members whilst none were Southerners. Alongside this claim, he includes a composite list based on the 1910 ‘Biographical histories of the Joseon aristocracy’ (朝鮮貴族列傳) compiled by the Japanese Chōsen kenkyūkai (朝鮮研究會 ‘Joseon research society’) and the 1929 ‘Summary account of the Joseon aristocracy’ (「朝鮮貴族略歷」 in Saitō Makoto Bunsho 斎藤實文書 recently reproduced in the (진말진상사료집 - 제4권 - 부제 조선귀족과 종추원). This list contains 77 names of whom 58 are identified as Noron, but of these 58, ten are listed as having 'refused' the peerage and four as having been later stripped of it, three explicitly for independence activities. Thus, according to his own data, 48 of 77 peers can be said to have been Noron. (Lee 2009:318-21)

3 Japanese colonial era and the construction of the 'colonial view of history'

According to Lee’s narrative, Japanese historiography on Korea is broadly divided between the pre-annexation writings which sought to build the general argument for colonization, and then the post-annexation imperial historiography which worked both to justify and ensure permanent integration of the Korean peninsula into the Japanese Empire both ancient and modern.

Lee supports the traditional historian’s bias that archaeology should be treated as secondary to textual sources: he charges that the Japanese made use of archaeology precisely because the primary sources, when actually examined, do not provide the evidence for the SMSG as they claimed. Lee thus considers the archaeological results produced both by the Japanese during the colonial era and establishment academics since as either distorted or entirely fabricated.

3.1 Pre-annexation historiography

Beginning with Sugawara Tatsukichi’s Keimō Chōsen-saryaku (菅原龍吉 啓蒙朝鮮史
略 1875) which argued for the invasion of Korea (征韓論). Lee places the construction of Japanese imperialist historiography on Korea in the context of its continental expansionist ambitions.

Significantly, he charges that Japan had no premodern historiographic tradition comparable to that of China or Korea, rather it imported the ‘positivist’ *siljeung-ju’ui* (실증주의) primary source based historical method of Leopold von Ranke (1795–1866) via his student, Ludwig Riess (1861–1928) who at the mere age of twenty-six, from 1887 spent fifteen years at Tokyo Imperial University helping to establish its history department. (Lee 2014:54) Lee further argues that this European tradition was itself shallow compared to China and Korea as during the medieval era European thought was subordinate to Christian church dogma.

According to Lee, around 1889, Tokyo Imperial University, Keiō University and the Army War College (陸軍大學) jointly created the Shigakkai (史學會 ‘academic history society’), in the journal of which the majority of articles on Korea sought to justify the need for its occupation. (Lee 2014:57)

Against the backdrop of escalating Sino-Korean rivalry, three books on Korean history were then published: Hayashi Taisuke’s general survey *Chōsen-shi* (林泰輔 朝鮮史 1892) and two on ancient Korea–Japan relations: Yoshida Tōgo’s *Nikkkan-koshidan* (吉田東伍 日韓古史斷 1893) and Nishimura Yutaka’s *Chōsen-shikō* (西村豊 朝鮮史綱 1895), the former of which, Lee notes, later South Korean collaborator historian, Yi Byeongdo, claimed to have inspired him to research ‘national history’ (國史) whilst a first year student of Waseda University.

Lee terms the next three books as the ‘three invasion books’ (侵略三書) owing to the authors all having directly participated in the Japanese takeover of Korea. Kikuchi Kenjō (菊池謙謙) was involved in the 1895 murder of Empress Myeongseong and his *Chōsen-ókoku* (朝鮮王国 1896) premised Mimana as fact whilst arguing Korea had become independent from China as a result of Qing’s defeat in the recent Sino-Japanese War. Tsuneyu Seifuku’s *Chōsen-kaika-shi* (恒屋盛服 朝鮮開化史 1901) is notable for locating Gija Joseon on the Liaoch river rather than Pyeongyang as later became colonial orthodoxy; in this case Lee suggests it was in order to reduce the perceived Sinic influence over the peninsula thus emphasizing the influence of Mimana instead. The final work, Shinobu Junpei’s *Kan-hantō* (信夫淳平 韓半島 1901) was more of a factbook about Korea to encourage Japanese investment. (Lee 2014:59)

130) Although not referenced, the term *chimnyak-samseo* (侵略三書) appears to be borrowed from the writings on modern Korean historiography of Jo Donggeol (趙東杰). (Identified through a search on the Korean History Database)
In 1901 Hayashi Taisuke published *Chōsen-kindai-shi* (朝鮮近代史 1901) as a sequel to his previous work. In 1906, the Korean Hyeon Chae (玄采 1886-1925) authored *Jungdeung-gyogwa Dongguk-saryak* (中等教科東國史略 1906) which Lee claims is alleged to have been largely a copy of Hayashi’s *Chōsen-shi*, whilst Hyeon reinserted the Dangun story that had been negated by Hayashi, and deleted Wiman Joseon and the Han Commanderies, he still included Mimana as well as the theory of Empress Jingū’s conquest of Silla.

Lee identifies three well known key themes emergent in the Japanese portrayal of Korea as: the sadae 'serving the great' mentality, economic 'stagnation,' and contrastingly - the theory of a common origin between Korea and Japan (日鮮同祖論). (Lee 2014:59)

### 3.2 Colonial era historiography and the 'colonial view of history' (SMRG)

Lee then describes the emergence of the Tokyo and Kyoto Imperial University schools of history led by Shiratori Kurakichi (白鳥庫吉 1865-1942) and Naitō Konan (內藤湖南 1866-1934) respectively: it was, in turn, under their respective students, Tsuda Sōkichi (津田左右吉 1873-1961) and Inaba Iwakichi (稲葉岩吉 1876-1940) that core components of the SMSG were put in place: in particular Tsuda espoused both the 'peninsular location of the Han Commanderies,' and the 'falsification of the early SS records,' whilst Inaba identified the historical Suicheng-xian county (旌城縣 K. Suseong-hyeon) of Lelang Commandery as being Suan-gun district (善安郡) in Hwanghae-do province thus lending support to the 'peninsular location of the Han Commanderies'.

According to Lee, Japanese colonial historiography came to its zenith following the annexation of Korea, first with the *Hantō-shi* (半島史 1915) compilation project which he criticizes for deleting Korea’s continental history, then the establishment of the Chōsen-shi Henshū-iinkai (朝鮮史編纂委員會 'Joseon History Compilation Committee') in 1922, and culminating in the six year, 37 volume *Chōsen-shi* compilation project completed in 1938. Lee notes that *Chōsen-shi* was in the form of a sourcebook and so has generally not been recognized as strongly promoting the SMSG: without giving examples, he argues, however, it was through the choice of selecting what to and what not to include that the SMSG was embedded.

### 3.3 Japanese archaeology

Lee asserts that the Japanese had to rely on fabricated archaeology as their main evidence for locating the commanderies on the peninsula because primary textual sources failed to support their hypotheses. (Lee 2014:73) The two main cases he highlights are the excavations of Lelang and Daifang Commandery sites,
and the discovery of the 'Spirit Shrine Stele of Nianti-xian county' (粘蟬縣 神祠碑).

Concerning Lelang and Daifang, Lee narrates how Sekino Tadashi (関野貞 1868-1935) claimed to find Chinese Han remains through excavating Daedong-gang river sites close to Pyeongyang and Hwanghae-do province, and thus the ancient commanderies of Lelang and Daifang were declared 'discovered' in 1910 and 1911 respectively, that is, immediately in the wake of the annexation, and apparently just where the Japanese wanted them to be.

He notes, however, that when Sekino had first begun investigating the Pyeongyang sites in 1906, they were assumed to represent Goguryeo remains and it was only when Torii Ryūzo (鳥居龍蔵 1870-1953), affiliated with the South Manchurian Railway Company, appeared in 1909 that the research project was re-defined as investigating the 'Chinese Han Lelang period’ and thereafter any Chinese style artefacts such as tiles, were interpreted as evidence for the Lelang commandery. (Lee 2009:41)

However, Lee quotes from the Government-General’s own 1927 publication 'Lelang period remains’ (樂浪郡時代ノ遺蹟) that, by their own admission, the earthen fortress site Sekino identified on the Daedong-gang as the seat of the Lelang commandery was relatively small and lacked any natural defences such that it would be hard pressed to withstand an enemy attack. (Lee 2009:42)

Lee argues that the Chinese Han style artefacts unearthed during excavations, when not simply fabricated, could have belonged to ethnic Chinese living inside Goguryeo and therefore do not provide the definite proof of the commanderies they were presented as. He suggests that had Anak-gu Tomb No.3 not contained an inscription explicitly identifying the occupant as Tong Shou (修壽), a refugee from Former Yan, the Japanese would likely have interpreted its Chinese style as further evidence for the commanderies. (Lee 2009:141)

3.3.1
Potentially more problematic for Lee are the large number of clay seals bearing names of Lelang and its known counties. In this case he questions their authenticity on the following grounds: that they were discovered in surprisingly large quantity - more than 200 between 1918-37; they all date only to the Han period, despite Lelang continuing until 313 CE (he ignores the notion that this could demonstrate Lelang’s later autonomy); they are in surprisingly good condition; and finally, it would not make sense for so many seals, for example marked 'Lelang' to be found in their place of origin when they were stamped for sending out communications and should therefore be found in their place of
destination. These points all follow Jeong Inbo, and indeed he attributes the last two to him. (Lee 2009:152)

Lee further cites North Korea scholars Bak Jin-uk and Ri Sunjin claiming that in subsequent large scale excavations of the same sites by North Korea during the 1960s, not a single seal was found. Quotes from Bak Jin-uk highlight also: that the seals were not exactly the same size as silver and bronze seal stamps found in Lelang tumuli: that in some cases two of the same clay seal differ in size (by one millimetre), and, Lee considers most crucial, that the titles on the seals do not match the contemporary system. (Lee 2009:153–5) On the latter point, Bak gives two examples: in the first the reasoning is somewhat unclear, but between two seals, one marked jangjam-jang’in (장잠장인) the other jangjam-ryeong’in (장잠령인), the former indicates the grave of Wang Jing (王卿) to be associated with Jangjam-hyeon (長岑縣) of Daifang commandery and so the latter must be considered fake (※ this implies equally, however, that one is therefore authentic). The second example - again, previously highlighted by Jeong - is a seal marked rak-rang-daeyun-jang (락랑대운장): here the term daeyun/dayin (大尹) was created by Wang Mang (王莽) during his short lived ‘Xin dynasty’ replacing the term taesu/taisbou (太守), however at the same time, Lelang was also renamed as ‘Rak-seon’ (락선 ?樂縣郡 - according to an annotation in Hanshu ‘geography’) and so the authentic title should have been rak-seon-daeyun-jang (락선대운장) (Lee 2009:153–5).

3.3.2
In 1913, Imanishi Ryū (今西龍 1875–1932) ‘discovered’ the Nianti-xian Spirit Shrine Stele (桔縣 神祠碑) in Yonggang-gun (龍岡郡) South Pyeong’an-do thus locating one of the known administrative divisions of Lelang. In response to this Lee cites a 2011 episode of SBS Special (SBS 스페셜) which made the claim that the iconic photograph of the stele in situ with a boy standing beside it, was in fact a different stone. (Lee 2014:73)

Lee argues that the Nianti Stele was fabricated based on the following suspicions:

1. The stele was found erect and in an open plain in a populous part of the country which Lee claims was also a famous hot spa resort: if it was

131) These suspicions are also highlighted by Jung In-seung in Byington (ed.) 2013:161, who acknowledges that at least some of the seals were forgeries but rejects the idea that they all were.
132) Wang Jing’s grave is Tomb 1 at Bonghwang-ni, Sincheon-gun and dates to 245 CE — see Oh Youngchan in Byington (ed.) 2016:131–2.
133) Hanshu 漢書, 諸帝元封三年間，命曰樂縣，屬幽州，
135) For a high quality reproduction of this photo see Byington (ed.) 2013:299.
known to locals who are said to have shown it to the Japanese, why had it not been 'discovered' or mentioned previously in any written document during the intervening 2,000 years?

2. The Japanese account of its discovery claims there was a legend told to them that anyone who could read the text would be able to discover gold under the stele: if this were true why had no one attempted to dig up the stele already? And again, why had this legend not been recorded elsewhere?

3. Why did the Japanese account not give the name of the local myeon-jang head (면장) who is said to have told them about the stele?

4. Why do the myeon-jang and other locals not appear in the photograph of the stone? If the stele had been in situ, their presence would also have better authenticated the photo.

Added to these circumstantial questions, Lee cites more recent research by North Korean scholars including chemical analysis. They note that the foundation of the stone was made with cement and seemed to have been erected in a hurry.

※ They fail to describe, however, whether they are referring to ancient or modern cement and it is not clear if they are taking into account Japanese restoration, as another Government-General photograph (reproduced in Byington 2014:15) clearly shows the stele on a modern purpose built pedestal and enclosed in a small housing structure.

The results of their chemical analysis, meanwhile, apparently showed the stele to be different from the local granite and they concluded it was similar to granite found in the Liao river basin. (Lee 2009:48 citing North Korean journal Joseon-gogo-yeongu 조선고고연구 (1995)‘물성 분석을 통하여 본 점제비와 봉니의 진면 모,’)

Finally, Lee cites two claims by South Korean scholar Son Bo-gi (1922-2010), firstly that the location of the stele would have been underwater 2,000 years ago (doesn’t say whether he means permanently or regularly flooded) and secondly that there are supposedly remains on jieshi-shan mountain, Hebei, from where a rock the same size as the Nianti Stele was cut away by the Japanese. (Lee 2009:49 citing 한배달9월호 1991)

The other example of imperial Japanese archaeology, in this case pre-colonial era, that Lee touches on is the Gwanggaeto Stele, however, he makes no explicit case other than twice mentioning the 1972 article by Lee Jinhu (李進熙 d.2012) which argued that a portion of the text was early on altered by the Japanese. Although apparently approving of this hypothesis, Lee does not discuss the
question and elsewhere in his own writings makes use of the stele’s version of the Chumong myth without questioning its authenticity.

3.4 Independence activist historians and Daejong-gyo
Lee portrays the independence activist historians (독립운동가 [역사학자]) as the heroic antithesis to the Japanese colonial and collaborator scholars. (Lee 2014:79-102) In particular, he seeks to debunk the Japanese instilled claim that there were few educated people amongst the activists and that the quality of their history writing was low. He goes about this by linking the intellectual tradition of the independence activist historians to premodern Korean historiographic practice which, as mentioned above, he argues to have been infinitely more developed and objective than the SMSG methodology shallowly imported from Europe. In the same process he seeks also to highlight and elevate the role of the neo-religious Daejong-gyo (大倧敎) movement which was outlawed and, again, denigrated by the Japanese.\(^{136}\)

Embodying all these arguments, Lee begins with the example of Muwon Kim Gyoheon (茂園 金敟獻 1868-1923) who, according to Lee’s account, passed the jeongsigun’gwa (庭試文科) examination aged just twenty-three and was employed as an official historian (春秋館撰記事官) before going on to hold the positions of daesaseong (大司成) at Seonggyun’gwan academy and bujebak (副提學) at the Gyujanggak royal library; Lee’s point being, to attain such positions Kim Gyoheon would have been one of the most talented and best trained scholars in Korea.

According to Lee, in 1910, following annexation, Kim joined the Daejong-gyo religion founded by Na Cheol (羅喆 1863-1916) and they soon after moved into Manchuria where they participated in the armed resistance movement. Na Cheol, too, had passed the mun’gwa examination and held positions of Seungjejong’wongajuseo (承政院 假注書 ‘Records of the Royal Secretariat’) and Seungmunwon gwonjibujeongja (承文院 權知副正字).

In the order Lee introduces them, Kim authored Sindan-minsa (神檀民史 ?1923), Sindan-silgi (神檀實記 ?1914) and Baedaljok-yeoksa (倍達族歷史), earlier he also co-authored Danjo-sago (檀祖事敎 ?1911) together with Bak Eunsik (朴殷植 1859-1925) and Yu Geun (柳瑾 1861-1921).\(^{137}\) Lee unfortunately does not discuss the content of these works.

\(^{136}\) Anecdotally it is certainly true that still today Daejong-gyo is often mentioned by establishment historians in order to delegitimize independence activist historians as pseudo scholars.

\(^{137}\) The dates of these books is not clearly stated, and there seems to be some confusion. On Wikipedia, for example, Na Cheol is given as the coauthor of Danjo-sago rather than Kim Gyoheon.
Before his death Kim would become the second leader of Daejonggyo. Other well-known independence activists whom Lee associates with Daejong-gyo include the guerrilla leaders Seo Il (徐一 1881-1921) and Gang U (姜廬 1862-1932), and intellectuals: Bak Eunsik, Yi Siyeong, Sin Chaeho, Yi Sang-ryong, Kim Jwajin, Yu Dong-yeol, Yi Beomseol, Hong Beomdo, Kim Seunghak, Bak Chan-ik, Kim Dubong, An Huije and Seo Sang-il. (Lee 2014:87)

※ Again, no real details are given other than circumstantial context, though he may have elaborated some of this in his earlier work Yi Hoeeyeong-gwa jeolmeun geudeul 이희영과 점은 그들 2009 which this study has not consulted.

Lee narrates how - contrary to Japanese claims - various organized groups of educated yangban from across the peninsula moved north to Manchuria to participate in the independence movement. They did not come alone, but often with immediate family and friends: many settling in the village of Hengdaochuan (恒道川 with unexplained variations of the name being Hengdaochuan 横道川 and Xingdaochuan 興道川). (Lee 2014:94)

Lee contrasts these principled literati-turned-independence activists with the traitorous Noron faction responsible for selling Korea to the Japanese. Accordingly he highlights that some of the first to leave for Manchuria were those associated with the then heterodox Yangming school (陽明學 K. Yangmyeong-hak) of Neo-Confucianism including Jeong Wonha (鄭元夏 1855-1925), Hong Seungheon (洪承憲 1854-1914) and Yi Geonseung (李建昇 1858-1924): the Yangming school was based on Ganghwa-do island and, according to Lee, they were members of the Soron (少論) faction. Yi Hoeeyeong (李會榮 1867-1932) and his five brothers including Yi Siyeong (李始榮 1868-1953 - future vice president to Syngman Rhee) also belonged to the Soron, whilst Kim Daerak (金大洛 1845-1914) and Yi Sang-ryong (李相龍 1858-1932) both originated from Andong in Gyeongsang-do province and so belonged to the Southerner faction.

※ Lee’s awareness of the Yangming school is undoubtedly informed by Jeong Inbo who promoted this topic (e.g. Yangmyeonghak’yeon-ron 陽明學演論 1933).

Yi Hoeeyeong and his brothers, together with Yi Sang-ryong subsequently moved to a location near Sanyuanbao (三源堡) in Liuhe county (柳河), Jilin province, there establishing the Gyeonhak-sa commune (耕學社) and the Sinheung military officer academy (新興武官學校) for which Yi Sang-ryong’s Daedong-yeoksa (大東歷史) was used as a textbook.\(^{138}\)

\(^{138}\) Interesting to note, in a quote from Yi Sang-ryong’s “Seosarok”(西遊錄), whilst claiming the land south of Shenyang to have formally been Korean territory and both the location of the Samhan 三韓 and subsequently the Han Commanderies: in order to
In 1934 Yi Siyeong published his *Gamsiman’eo* (感時漫語) in which he claimed Oj’s territory originally extended to far western Manchuria before being reduced as a result of the Yan expansion led by Qin Kai (秦開); according to Yi the 2,000 li of territory lost at this time included Youzhou (幽州), Jizhou (蓟州), Shuozhou (朔州) and Yizhou (易州), regions which Lee identifies as being in the vicinity of Beijing, Tianjin, Shanxi province and Hebei province respectively. (Lee 2014:97) According to Lee, this theory is in contrast to the SMRSG which claims the Qin Kai campaign to have pushed Oj to the south of the Yalu. Lee emphasizes that, similar to his colleagues, Yi Siyeong had also previously passed the lower *samasi* (司馬試 also known as *saeng’won-gwa* 生員科) examination and served in the posts of *Hongmun gwan’gyori* (弘文館校理) and *Seungjeong’won bu-seungji* (承政院副丞旨) and so would have known the primary sources better than the colonial Japanese scholars.

Perhaps because he is well enough known, Lee does not discuss any details of Sin Chaeho’s life or works.

Reminiscent to Yun Naehyeon’s implicit self-identification with Sima Qian, Lee utilizes the narrative of the independence activist historians’ struggle during the Japanese colonial era as an explicit analogy for his own present day fight against establishment historians.

4. Former collaborators and the modern establishment

In the same manner that the Noron are used by Lee to provide linkage from Joseon to the colonial era, Yi Byeongdo is portrayed as embodying the continuity from the colonial era to present day South Korea.

According to Lee’s argumentation, the reason for the current day pro-Noron revisionism is this continuity into the modern era. In short, the Noron made possible the Japanese annexation whilst the ‘former collaborator, current day establishment historians – and political elite in general – benefitted from it, both directly at the time, and indirectly still today.

"To emphasize once more, the Noron were a political party (정당) that went against the flow of history [i.e. were regressive], froze the social caste system, and increased discrimination against secondary wives and children, and between the sexes; at the same time they oppressed ideologies different

make his point that therefore the Commanderies were located north of the Yalu, rather that referring to ‘south’ of the river, he uses ‘west’. (Lee 2014:95) However if the Samhan had been north of the Yalu as implied, it wouldn’t explain the relationship to Wiman Joseon immediately prior to the Commanderies.
to the Zhu Xi [school of thought] and when the country was at crisis point and on the verge of collapse they worked [only] for their individual and family interests.

A part of the Noron faction’s descendents joined the Joseon History Compilation Committee, they changed [their] pro-Ming sadae-ju’ui for pro-Japanese sadae-ju’ui and adopted the imperial Japanese SMSG. Both during the colonial era and even after liberation, they never had the slightest thought that the imperial Japanese colonial control had been a tragedy for the [Korean] minjok’s history. When they took sole control of academic authority after liberation, it was natural that they continued the imperial Japanese SMSG.” (Lee 2009:324)

4.1 Lee’s case against Yi Byeongdo

"Amongst the [2009 meeting of the] Committee [for the Examination of the Truth into Pro-Japanese and Anti-{Korean} Minjok Behaviour {천일반민족행위위원회}], [I] heard there was considerable debate whether to include Yi Byeongdo and Sin Seok-ho [on the list they published in 2009 of 704 Japanese collaborators]. This makes [me] guess that an unspoken cartel formed of Yi Byeongdo and Sinseok-ho’s disciples, that is ‘spies’ (history mafia), were operating even in the project of [compiling] a list of pro-Japanese (천일) scholars.” (Lee 2014:12)

Fundamental to Lee’s argument, that the SMSG has continued to be promoted as orthodoxy in South Korean academia, is the perceived role of Yi Byeongdo (YBD). Given YBD’s apparent dominance of the field at Seoul National University and influence on the subsequent generation of scholars, the persuasiveness of Lee’s thesis largely rests on discrediting him. To this end he portrays him as a second rate scholar and archetypal Japanese collaborator.

"Was Yi Byeongdo whom the SMSG historians judged to be "of a character (인격자) extremely worthy of respect" able to produce [objective] 'high quality text-based (고등문헌) criticism’ about their [i.e. Japanese] academia? If, far from 'high quality text-based criticism' he [in fact] only had the ability for ‘low quality text-based criticism’ [as Lee charges], he must have wondered why the Japanese treated him as being of such [good] character and included him in the Joseon History Compilation Committee. He must have wondered too, whilst he was receiving the love of Japanese and researching Korean history to his heart’s content, why the Joseon Government-General rattled its teeth so much [in anger] at Bak Eunsik’s historical research, and why Sin Chaeho had to die inside the freezing cold Lushun prison. However, to Yi Byeongdo who even after
liberation boasted of the fact of having received Tsuda Sôkichi’s love, he lacked even such an awareness. Receiving the love of the Japanese was simply an honour for his family (가운). The problem is, that family honour is continuing into the 21st century. Whilst Yi Byeongdo’s grandchildren work [in such appointments as] dean of Seoul National University and head of the Cultural Heritage Administration, and continue their family honour, by contrast the descendents of the independence activists cannot even receive a proper education and are afflicted (시달리다) by the curse of families preoccupied with hand-to-mouth survival.”

(Lee 2014:195)

According to Lee, YBD studied at Waseda going on to become a favourite of Tsuda Sôkichi and so from Tsuda his academic lineage traces directly back to Shiratori and Riess. In this way, his academic credentials are negatively contrasted to the independence activist historians who had full classical educations.

YBD's primary historiographic contribution to the MSG concerns locating the terminus of the Qin Great Wall inside of Korea: first proposed by Inaba who claimed the evidence was in the geography treatise (地理志) of the Hanshu. YBD supported Inaba’s hypothesis drawing his own evidence from the "Taikang-dilizhi" (太康地理志) geography treatise quoted in the Suoyin annotations to the Shi ji in which the Wall’s eastern terminus is recorded as Jieshi-shan mountain (碣石山 K. Galseok-san) located in Suicheng-xian county (遼城縣) of Lelang-jun [遼東郡] (見《史記-夏本紀》: "碣石山，入于海【索隠】地理志云「碣石山在北平遼城縣西南」，太康地理志云「樂浪遼城縣有碣石山，長城所起」); he then posited that Yodong-san (遼東山) in Suan-gun (遼安郡 North Hwanghae-do province), could be Jieshi-shan. 139 Lee quotes YBD also citing the geography treatise (地理志) of the jinshu (晉書) repeating the claim that the Wall’s terminus was in Suicheng-xian [jinshu 晉書-地理志-平州: "樂浪郡【設置，統縣六，戶三千七百】朝鮮【周封箕子地】。屯有 渾彌 遼城【秦築長城之所起】鐵方騐望"], however no further evidence is given for linking this to Yodong-san other than Inaba’s underlying hypothesis that Suicheng-xian was modern Suan-gun in which the mountain Yodong-san is to be found. Lee seeks to further undermine YBD’s speculative claim, by asserting that the Suicheng-xian discussed in the jinshu is there said to belong to Lelang-jun of Pingzhou (平州) which Lee says was recorded in turn as having been a part of Youzhou (幽州) during Later Han and was therefore in the vicinity of Beijing, which rather supports his own argument for locating Lelang-jun in Hebei. (Lee 2014:310)

139 Inaba’s paper cited by Lee is "Sin-chôjô-totan oyobi okenjô-kô”「秦長城東端及王險城考」 ('Study of the eastern terminus of the Qin wall and Wangheom-seong'). Lee 2014:307
To Lee, YBD both personifies the SMSG and is directly responsible for its continuation into the post liberation era until today. Thus alongside his colonial Japanese origins and training, Lee highlights how YBD maintained close connections - and in Lee’s view, loyalty - to Japan even after 1945. His most explicit example is anecdotal evidence from Kim Yongseop’s (金容燮 1931) memoire, that when visiting Japan YBD was known to be actively participating in religious ceremonies of the Tenri-kyō sect at Tenri University. (Lee 2014:224)\(^1\)

Another account by YBD’s student, Lee Gidong - famous for accusing Yu Naehyeon of plagiarism - also recalls YBD travelling to Japan for a meeting of the Chōsen-gakkai (朝鮮學會).\(^2\)

Alongside YBD, Lee regularly mentions Sin Seok-ho (申奭錫 1904-1981) who was the head of history at Korea University; however, aside from his participation in the Cheonggu-hakhoe (青丘學會) and Joseon History Compilation Committee, Lee makes no explicit case against him or his historiography post 1945.

4.1.2
To further undermine YBD’s credibility as an objective historian, Lee recounts the well known 1977 controversy over the Sayuksin ‘Six Martyred Ministers’ (死六臣) incident (the 1456 failed coup attempt against King Sejo), in which a special committee of the National Institute of Korean History (국사편찬위원회) attempted to replace one of the six, Yu Eungbu (俞應孚), with another official, Kim Mun-gi (金文起. 1399-1456) who was in any event one of many purged at the time and already counted amongst the Samjung-sin ‘Three esteemed ministers’ (三重臣). According to Lee, such a revision was both unnecessary and went against the well known tradition of the Sayuksin who names trace back to Nam Hyo-on’s (南孝溫. 1454-92 - one of the ‘six living ministers’ 生六臣) contemporary account *Yuksin-jeon* (六臣傳 'Biography of the six [martyred] ministers’); it also went against the later *Sillok* record of 1791 (Jeongjo 15) in which the Samjung-sin and Sayuk-sin are clearly distinguished.\(^3\) Based on his communication with Lee Jaeho (李載浩 b.1920), who was amongst the most vocal critics of the 1977 revision, Lee alleges that the decision to include Kim Mun-gi was made at the behest of none other than the head of the KCIA, Kim Jaegyu (1926-80), who happened to belong to the Kim-nyeong Kim clan (金寧 金氏) and counted Kim Mun-gi as a direct ancestor. (Lee 2014:105)

---


\(^2\) Citing Lee Gidong’s article ‘Dugye sahak-ui ilmyeon’ 「두께 사학의 일면」 in *Jindan-hakhoe* 칸단학회. *Yeoksaga-ui yuhyang* 역사가의 유향.

\(^3\) See *Jeongjo Sillok* 正祖實錄:正祖15年2月21日.
Citing Lee Jaeho, Lee gives the names of those on the special committee which included the head of the Institute, Choe Yeonghwi (崔榮熙 1921-2006), YBD, Sin Seok-ho, Lee Kibaik (이기백), Kim Won-ryong (金元龍 1922-1993) and Yi Seon-geun (李瑄根 1905-83). Lee claims YBD had been confident they could make the revision and consequently failed to anticipate the public reaction led by scholars such as Lee Jaeho. (Lee 2014:108) Through this case, Lee seeks to demonstrate that the scholars led by YBD dominating the South Korean academic establishment both came from collaborator backgrounds (or were their students) and continued to willfully distort even well known history in order to serve the interests of the South Korean military regimes.

4.2 South Korean establishment archaeology

Lee’s most substantial case concerning archaeology is made against the excavations of Pungnap-toseong (風納土城) fortress site associated with the first Baekje capital and the question of its construction date. According to Lee, the first excavation of Pungnap-toseong was carried out in 1964 by Kim Won-ryong (金元龍 1922-1993) and produced the conclusion that it was first constructed around the C1st BCE, which would have supported the early dates of the Samguk-sagi, but supposedly under pressure from YBD who asserted a late C3rd CE date for Baekje, Kim withdrew the results and subsequently created the 'Proto Three Kingdoms' (原三國時代) term to avoid the problem. A subsequent excavation was carried out by the National Research Institute of Cultural Heritage (國立文化財研究所) between 1997-2000, which produced carbon dates from thirteen separate items spanning 199BCE-231CE, however, the site was re-excavated in 2010, the motive of which Lee charges was to overturn this previous early dating. Sure enough, items sent to the US and UK for ‘absolute dating’ produced late 3rd and early 4th century CE dates whilst the onsite explanatory literature emphasized the influence of Lelang and Daifang commanderies. (Lee 2014:365)

"Thus the 2000 [excavation of Pungnap-toseong] ended the same as the [first] 1964 [excavation] with a 'happening' [the dating results being changed through the 2010 re-excavation] and it became [orthodox theory] that Pungnap-toseong earthen fortress was constructed in the second half of the 3rd century or later. All that remains [in the eyes of establishment scholars] is the [lesser] question of whether to accept the late 3rd century date supported by Yi Byeongdo’s 'advanced textual criticism' (고등문학 비판), or to assert a late 4th century date in line with [his] teacher Tsuda Sōkichi, the founder of colonial historiography, or, whilst they’re at it to assert an early 5th century date.

Up until now, has this kind of thing only occurred with Pungnap-
toseong? Could there have been [other] cases of hiding or secretly discarding excavated materials? However, now the situation is different. It is greatly different. Now, the members of the National Assembly know, officials at the Ministry of Education know, CEOs know, and most importantly a large number of ordinary citizens know about this situation. The world has changed but only the SMGS historians to not realize it has changed. Short of boarding a time machine, returning to the year 2000 and discarding [excavated material] samples it is impossible [어림없다] [to change it back]. [Our recent] ancestors who strove for independence and became lonely souls are [now] rising from their graves [in the positive sense of returning to strength].” (Lee 2014:368-9)

Asserting that the SMGS has had to rely on archaeology because primary sources fail to support their theories, on the perennial topic of the Commanderies’ locations Lee expresses both disappointment and incredulity that North Korea in 2005 published the results of the wooden tablets (목간) recently discovered in Pyeongyang containing census information on the twenty-five counties of Lelang from the year 45CE: he notes with bitter irony how the establishment SMGS scholars have consistently dismissed North Korean archaeology but suddenly embraced it when it seems to support their theories. (Lee 2014:136) Lee rejects the tablets as the ‘absolute proof’ SMGS scholars have taken them for arguing they are something that could have been carried from another location as spoils of war or brought by Chinese refugees, and he offers the counterexample of the Silla-jangjeok (新羅帳籍 [aka 新羅村落文書 ‘Silla village documents’]) dating to 755CE found at Tōdai-ji temple (東大寺) in Nara, Japan, similarly containing census data from Silla, arguing this could not be used to locate Silla in Nara.143 (Lee 2014:138)

Lee’s own appraisal of North Korean historiography on OJ is that it was correct in the 1960-70s when they asserted the Manpanhan river (滿潘汗) - the post-Qin Kai reduced western border of OJ - to have been the modern Daling-he river (大凌河) in western Liaoning province, but that the switch in the early 1990s to promoting modern Pyeongyang as the centre of OJ through¬out - and in Lee’s mind, by extension the location of the Commanderies - was a purely political decision. (Lee 2014:147)144 Given North Korea rejects the Han Commanderies in its own historiography, even if the tablets actually are authentic evidence, Lee

---

143) For an independent discussion of this document see Yoon Seon Tae’s “Village Society and the System of Local Governance in the Unified Silla Period: based on analysis of the Silla Village Documents” in McBride II (ed.) 2010:57.

144) It would be relevant to know where North Korean scholars currently locate the commanderies and in particular, how they explain the Lelang census, i.e. whether as pertaining to the commandery or to an indigenous Nangnang state.
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finds it hard to understand why the North would have published them, unless, he speculates, in a bid to actively retard South Korean academia!

"South Korea inherited the Imperial Japanese colonial historiographic tradition as it was and adhered to the 'Han Commanderies peninsula [location] theory' until they were put on the defensive [by Lee’s charge that there is no primary source evidence] and are [still now] continuing to survive through the transformation argumentation (변형 논리) of the 'Old Joseon centre movement theory'. Seeing North Korea make public the Lelang [census] tablets. I wondered, "Maybe in North Korea [they] wish that South Korea’s colonial historiography will be maintained." If the historiography of people like myself becomes the mainstream historiography of South Korea, then North Korea will lose one of the [few] fields in which they are absolutely superior to South Korea." (Lee 2014:147)

4.3 Lee’s case against the Northeast Asian History Foundation (NEAHF)
Just as the SMSG was transplanted within the South Korean academic establishment through the tutelage of YBD and Sin Seok-ho, Lee argues that government organs promoting history are analogous to the former Joseon Government-General of the colonial era. Aside from Seoul National University, Lee’s principal target is the Northeast Asian History Foundation145) (동북아역사재단 hereafter NEAHF) against which he portrays his own private institute, the Hangaram Yeokska Munhwa Yeongu-so ('Hangaram research centre for history and culture”), as continuing the lineage of the independence activist historians. Whilst the NEAHF, initially named Koguryo Research Foundation, was ostensibly established to counter the claims of China’s 'Northeast Project' (K. 동북공정),146) Lee charges that in reality it actively promotes the SMSG which, through locating the Han Commanderies on the peninsula, ultimately supports the Northeast Project.

In support of his argument, Lee cites one chapter from a NEAHF publication. "Iron items and [iron] production of Nangnang-toseong earthen fortress” (낙량 토성의 철기와 제작) in Nangnang-munhwa-yeongu (낙랑문화연구 'Research [on] Nangnang/Lelang culture’ 2006) concerning which he charges it relies only on the results of the Japanese era excavations even whilst explicitly acknowledging

145) The NEAHF was established in 2006, previously named Koguryo Research Foundation which had initially been established in 2004.
146) The Northeast Project (东北工程) was conducted under the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences from 2002–2007. Its full name has been translated by Byington (2004) as 'Serial Research Project on the History and Current State of the Northeast Borderland’ (东北边疆历史与现状系列研究工程).
both the authenticity questions surrounding some of the artefacts such as the seals and inscribed roof end tiles, as well as that the Japanese excavations failed to identify the site as having been the former WiMan Joseon capital of Wanggeom-seong (*sic* Wangheom-seong). In spite of this the chapter ignores all North Korea research and highlights instead further work by Tani Toyonobu (谷豊信) during the 1980s on the same Japanese excavated articles stored at Tokyo University. Thus Lee portrays the NEAHF book as continuing the Japanese research on Lelang. (Lee 2009:156-9)

### 4.3.1

A longer example Lee discusses is the 2012 case of the NEAHF’s censoring of a school resource book produced by Gyeonggi-do provincial Education Office (경기도교육청). *Dongbuk-a pyeonghwa-reul ggum-gguda* (동북아 평화를 꿈꾸다! ‘Dreaming of Northeast Asia[n] peace’) which had been compiled with the focus on refuting the claims of the Northeast Project. According to Lee, the NEAHF then headed by Seok Dong-yeon took issue with the book and sent an official letter (공문) to the Ministry of Education telling them to revise the text as the issues involved were sensitive to relations with China. The Ministry refused to accept the letter whereupon an article appeared in the *Joongang Ilbo* newspaper detailing the NEAHF’s complaints against the book, the publicity of which forced the Ministry of Education to send its own official letter to Gyeonggi-do Education Office telling them to revise it.

Lee includes an illustration of the table found in the *Joongang Ilbo* article, translated as Table 24 below. As can be seen, the topics cover the full gamut of issues disputed between Korea and the Northeast Project: from Lee’s perspective the NEAHF appears to argue in a manner favouring China.

Lee focuses his suspicions on the then NEAHF director, Seok Dong-yeon, highlighting that he had previously worked in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and spent some eight years at various postings in China: Lee alleges Seok had the Joongang Ilbo journalist who wrote the article informed via friends at the Ministry, and goes so far as suggesting those involved should be investigated under the National Security Law as Chinese spies. (Lee 2014:125)

Lee discusses several topics from the table, thankfully leaving aside the questions of Dangun, Gija and Hongshan (紅山). Firstly, concerning dolmen, he asserts they are the unique identifier of OJ and associated Dongyi people and that if they are found in eastern China, this should rather be taken as evidence of the expansive territory of OJ. (Lee 2014:150)

"With dolmen being representative bronze age grave sites, even the SMSG
scholars acknowledge that Old Joseon was established during the Bronze Age and so there is no problem (미상 없다) with explaining them as being the distinct grave sites of Old Joseon. However, viewing Korean history [both] through the perspective of the Japanese far right and Chinese Northeast Project, the NEAHF wants to distinguish dolmen and Old Joseon. The viewpoint of Old Joseon from the NEAHF is exactly the same as that of the [former] Joseon Government-General.” (Lee 2014:150–1)

Concerning Balhae founder Dae Joyeong’s appellation, Lee acknowledges the NEAHF are technically correct but says their motivation should not be taken at face value and although no source has “yet” been discovered titling Dae Joyeong as ‘Goguryeo king’, he stresses it to be common sense to regard him as a man of Goguryeo.

The mistaken date of the Jeonggye-bi (定界碑) border stone, he defends as a mere typographical error, but strongly supports the validity of the stone itself and Korea’s claim over Gando (関島). Maintaining that Gando was previously Korean territory illegally given away by the Japanese to Qing China in the 1909 Gando Convention (關島協約). Lee discusses 18th century maps drawn by foreigners which show the Qing-Joseon border significantly further north of the Yalu and Tumen rivers: namely the maps of J.B. Regis (1718 皇輿全覽圖

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Gyeonggi Education Office book</th>
<th>NEAHF’s instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dangun myth (p28)</td>
<td>• Historical fact.</td>
<td>• Not historical fact but myth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gan’do (p87)</td>
<td>• If the Gan’do Convention is void, then there is the possibility to reclaim the territory.</td>
<td>• Even before the Gan’do Convention, it was not a part of our territory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolmen (p27)</td>
<td>• Unique graves of Oj.</td>
<td>• Have also been discovered in eastern China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baekdu-san Jeonggye-bi (p88)</td>
<td>• A border treaty valid under international law. • Erected in 1792 by verbal agreement (구두합의) between Qing and Joseon.</td>
<td>• Before the introduction of international law, so difficult to apply. • Erected in 1712 without verbal agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hongshan Culture (p24)</td>
<td>• Began 3500 BCE.</td>
<td>• Lasted between 5000–3000 BCE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dae Joyeong (p55)</td>
<td>• Was called ‘Goguryeo king’.</td>
<td>• Was called ‘jīn-guk king’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy prohibiting settlement in Manchuria (封禁政策) (p82)</td>
<td>• Joseon stopped it in 1883.</td>
<td>• Qing China stopped it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Gija (p23)</td>
<td>• 1100 BCE.</td>
<td>• Late 11th century BCE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Huang’yuquanlantu*, Halde (1735), D’Anville (1737) and Bonne (1771), the last attributing vastly more territory extending beyond Liaodong.⑩ In their ‘analysis’ (apparently referring to the official letter sent to the Ministry of Education) the NEAHF argued that the so-called ‘Regis’ and ‘Bonne lines’ are not academically recognized terms and so cannot be employed; Lee contrasts this position with the previous vice minister of the Ministry of Education and activist scholar of Manchuria, Kim Deuk-hwang (金得樑 1915–2011), who actively collected such foreign maps for the very purpose of asserting Korea’s claim. (Lee 2014:156)

Lee further challenges the NEAHF’s contention that the 1712 Jeongguye-bi boundary stone is invalid because it was erected before the introduction of international law, noting that the first Russia–Qing Treaty of Nerchinsk was already concluded in 1689. In response to their claim that Gando had never been administered as Joseon territory, he cites a 1903 entry from the *Gojong Sillok* when future independence fighter Yi Beom-yun (李範允 1863–1940) was made an official of ‘North Gando’ and the need to tax the region was consequently discussed.

※ Aside from the late date, however, what Lee fails to mention from the same *Sillok* passage is explicit acknowledgment that the Koreans inhabiting the region had entered only ‘several decades’ previous and had been living beyond Korean administrative control, and that before then the region had been ‘empty’ for several centuries.⑩

Meanwhile in response to the NEAHF’s charge that the territory of Gando remains undefined by scholars, Lee accuses them of obfuscation for failing to distinguish between ‘east (aka north) Gando’ the region currently disputed, and ‘west Gando’:

"Gando (關島 Ch. Jiandao) [can be] distinguished as West Gando and East Gando: East Gando north of the Tumen river is also called North Gando. West Gando refers to [the region] north of the Yalu river (K. Amnok-gang). East Gando basically refers to the current Yanbian Korean Autonomous Prefecture [including] the regions of Hunchun (珲春), Wangqing (汪清), Yanji (延吉) and Helong (和龍). In the West Gando region the Seoro-gunjeongchi (西路軍政署 ‘West route military administration’) was primarily composed of [resistance groups led by] Seokju Lee Sang-ryong and Seongjae Lee Siyeong; in the East Gando (North Gando) region, Seo Il and Kim Jwajin made the Bungno-gunjeongseo (北路軍政署 ‘North road military

⑩ At least the Bonne map is positively cited elsewhere by the NEAHF and its subsidiary, the Dokdo Research Institute (독도연구소).
⑩ *Gojong Sillok* 高宗 43巻, 40年(1903 共卯 / 大韓光武(光武) 7年) 8月 11日(陽曆).
administration’). The terms 'west route' and 'north route' themselves are derived from West and North Gando. Seeing as [the NEAHF] have the [same] view of history as the Japanese far right, they will not even want to know these facts, but as [we] are in the unfortunate circumstance (처저) where [they] are receiving South Korean citizens’ tax money, should they not at least pretend to understand the true feelings (심정) of those taxpayers paying taxes through money earned sweating [from hard work]? The region currently under dispute is East (North) Gando. By only using the term 'jurisdiction [over] Gando' (간도 영유권) [i.e. not distinguishing East and West], the NEAHF revealed its hostility." (Lee 2014:161)

* Again, the weakness of this argument is that the 'West' and 'North' terms trace back only to the early 20th century and do not appear in any earlier sources.

4.4 Other establishment SMSG cases
Aside from his allegations against the NEAHF, Lee discusses several other cases of what he regards as institutionalized pro-SMSG bias: one is a government funded project his own Hangaram research institute undertook, titled 'Research into the view of history and state construction theories of the [Korean] minjok leaders during the era of the Imperial Japanese forced occupation’ (일제 강점기 민족 지도자들의 역사관 및 국가 건설론 연구). Beginning in May 2013, they planned to publish 15 volumes over three years: in February 2014 they published the first three volumes including one by Lee titled Joseonsa-pyeonsu-hoe Singmin-sagwan i’ron bipan (조선사변화회 식민사관 이론 비판 'Critique on the theory of the Joseon History Compilation Committee’s SMSG’) which contained similar descriptions of the SMSG as in Lee’s 2014 book. Contrary to expectations this book was criticized by an anonymous external review board which seemed sympathetic to the SMSG and took issue with Lee’s stance against a peninsula location of the Commanderies complaining he had not referred to archaeology, in particular the Lelang census tablets! They also expressed displeasure at his focus on the Joseon History Compilation Committee. In response Lee notes that the anonymous reviews fail to provide any primary source evidence to support their contentions because they are themselves only following the SMSG.

"In short, the appraisal of the [external] review group (평가단) did nothing more than, from a viewpoint of supporting colonial historiography, show [their] intention that colonial historiography must be eternally maintained. The problem is the point that this is happening not [under] the [former] Government-General system but within the [current] system of the South Korean government." (Lee 2014:144)
The fate of his book is not made clear, but as a result of the review, the project’s budget was initially reduced by 10%, though on appeal this was softened to only 5%. (Lee 2014:148)

As further examples, Lee also names two Japanese scholars who have been supported by the establishment whilst, in his view, promoting the SMSG. Fujimoto Yukio (藤本幸夫) and Takeda Yukio (武田幸男 b. 1934). He describes Fujimoto as having claimed both that hangul was copied from another country’s script and that old Korean books surviving in Japan were willingly donated to the Japanese either during the Hideyoshi invasions or the colonial era, and that whilst the South Korean government awarded him the Bogwan Order of Cultural Merit (보관문화훈장) for his 2006 Nihon gensen Chōsen-pon kenkyū (日本現存朝鮮本研究), he is known to have an original example of national arch traitor Yi Wan-yong’s calligraphy hanging on his wall at home. (Lee 2014:234)

Takeda, meanwhile, he portrays as the successor to Suematsu Yasukazu (末松保和 1904-1992) a former member of the Joseon History Compilation Committee who both contributed to Tsuda’s negation of the early SS records and promoted the Mimana hypothesis.¹⁴⁹ In turn Takeda vigorously refuted the 1972 paper of Lee Jinhui which questioned the authenticity of the Gwanggaeto Stele text, and in the early 1980s he was instrumental in revising Japanese history textbooks describing the Japanese invasion of Korea as an ‘advance’ (進出) and the 1919 March 1st Movement as a ‘riot’ (暴動). Despite this, in 2012 Takeda was invited by the NEAHF to participate in an international conference commemorating the 1600th anniversary of the Gwanggaeto Stele: although he was unable to come due to health – which Lee attributes to the rage of King Gwanggaeto from beyond the grave – he submitted a paper concerning the contentious Sinmyo year (391) passage of the Stele that recounts a campaign crossing the sea to subjugate the people of possibly Silla – several characters of which are undecipherable – which was used as evidence for Japan’s ancient conquest of the Korean kingdom. Takeda further criticized North Korean scholar Kim Seok-hyeon’s interpretation that the grammatical subject of the sentence could be Goguryeo rather than the Wae (倭). (Lee 2014:236-7)

4.5. Lee’s case against the Early Korea Project
Lee’s understanding and portrayal of the Early Korea Project (hereafter EKP) is purely as a ‘foreign branch’ of the NEAHF and his accusations against it are a

---

¹⁴⁹ This appraisal of Suematsu is supported by Moon Chang Rho’s article “Research on Kaya History and Issues of Academic Debate” in Byington (ed.). 2012:56.
natural continuation, namely that South Korean tax payers money has been spent on promoting the SMSG abroad.\textsuperscript{150} Clearly having not read the English language books, he builds his case by quoting from the Korean language promotional material (보도자료) and drawing conclusions largely from the titles of four of the six EKP publications to date together with the names of their contributing scholars.

Based only on the titles, Lee’s reductionist assumptions are as follows:

- Promotes the ‘Samhan hypothesis’ in place of the early history of the Three Kingdoms.

\textit{State and Society in Middle and Late Silla} (2011)
- Similarly, by explicitly omitting discussion of early Silla, the book supports the ‘theory that the early records of the SS are false’.

\textit{Early Korea Volume 3: The Rediscovery of Kaya in History and Archaeology} (2012)
- Discusses Gaya as a covert way to refer to the Mimana Japan Office.

\textit{* This is a certain mischaracterization of its content.\textsuperscript{151}}

\textit{The Han Commanderies in Early Korean History} (2013)
- Makes it so that Korean history starts with the colonial Han Commanderies.

Lee further assumes that because there are, as of yet, no volumes on OJ, Baekje or Goguryeo, these topics have been intentionally ‘deleted’ from the project.

\textit{* In this he ignores that topics pertaining to Baekje and Goguryeo were included in the EKP’s first publication, \textit{Reconsidering Early Korean History through Archaeology} (Byington ed. 2008) whilst the Han Commanderies volume has a full chapter on Old Joseon, which Lee in any event goes on to take issue with: a volume devoted to Goguryeo history and archaeology, meanwhile, is due for publication in 2016.

He reserves most of his criticism for the \textit{Han Commanderies in Early Korean

\textsuperscript{150} The Early Korean Project was established under the directorship of Mark Byington in 2006 at the Korea Institute, Harvard University; initially funded by the Academy of Korean Studies and the Korea Foundation, it has subsequently be funded by the Northeast Asian History Foundation.

\textsuperscript{151} The closest positive reference of Mimana is in Moon Chang Ryo’s article. (Byington ed. 2012:77) but even here there is plenty of qualification and the broader thrust is opposed to the colonial era interpretations.
History volume which starting with the title, he finds provocative, his main complaint being that it exclusively argues for the peninsula location of the Commanderies based on archaeology, and does not offer space to competing theories. In this way, the book both continues the SMSG and supports the recent assertions of China’s Northeast Project. In Lee’s view, aside from Byington, the authors are all establishment SMSG scholars and so the volume fails to represent views of other Korean scholars.

Arguably his most valid criticism of the book concerns, rather, the NEAHF’s Korean language promotional material in which, particularly on the key topic of the location of the Commanderies, it claimed that the book presents the results of Korean scholars’ research for the benefit of Western readers with the strong implication that these would contrast both with the views of the former Japanese and current Chinese. (Lee 2014:220) On this point Lee’s dismay is justified in that this does indeed mischaracterize the book’s broad acceptance of Japanese colonial scholarship and thus it can only enhance Lee’s suspicion that the NEAHF is trying to deceive Korean taxpayers whilst promoting the SMSG.

4.5.1 Refuting Byington’s historical geography
Concerning Byington’s own chapter in the same volume, "Historical Geography of the Han Commanderies in Korea," in which the Lieshui (列水 K. Yeol-su) river is identified as the modern Daedong-gang, somewhat predictably Lee accuses Byington of promoting Japanese colonial scholarship without having consulted the primary sources himself on the grounds that this hypothesis was first suggested by Tsuda Sōkichi and adopted by YBD. In spite of such woefully uninformed ad hominem, Lee is at least correct that Byington’s identification of the Lieshui depends on the Nianti-xian Spirit Shrine Stele which Byington correlates to the Hanshu description of the Lieshui flowing westwards into the sea at Nianti-xian county (Byington 2013:300). Having already questioned the authenticity of the Japanese-discovered stele, in order to further undermine this hypothesis, Lee cites the “junguo-zhi” treatise (君國志) of HHS locating the Lieshui (列水) in Liaodong.152) (Lee 2014:257)

4.5.2 Song Hojeong’s description of OJ
Lee’s other chief target of criticism is the chapter "Old Chosŏn - Its History and Archeology" authored by Song Hojeong who he accuses of distinguishing the Donghu (東胡) and Shanrong (山戎) peoples from OJ proper in order to shrink its territory. He also objects to Song’s hypothesis that the centre of Joseon relocated from Liaodong to Pyeongyang as this still results in the subsequent

---

152) According to Lee’s quote, HHS is in turn citing an annotation by Guo Pu (郭璞) of the Shantaijing (山海經). (Lee 2014:257)
Commanderies being located on the peninsula. Finally he takes issue with Song's theory that Oj acquired iron technology from China, first via Yan and then explicitly through Wi Man's takeover. Concerning the latter, Lee charges that Song fails to offer any textual evidence of Wi Man being the "first" to bring iron to Oj. (Lee 2014:279)
※ In fact, Song does not describe Wi Man as being the first, so this is a clear mischaracterization.

"It can be said that the early iron culture extending from Liaodong to the Ch'ŏngch'ŏn River was centered on the Warring States iron culture introduced by immigrants and was formed through the merging of both indigenous and immigrant groups." (Song in Byington 2014:75)

Whilst Song’s description of Wi Man is based on the Shiji account, directly cited as a footnote, Lee is correct that this passage does not explicitly describe iron weapons as Song’s paraphrasing implies.

"According to the "Account of Chosŏn" in the Shiji, Han charged Wei Man (Wiman) with the duty of defending the border from intrusion by neighboring barbarian tribes. He was enfeoffed as an "outer vassal" (waichên 外臣) of Han and supplied with iron weapons on condition that he refrain from blocking the passage of those tribes who wished an audience with the emperor." (Song in Byington 2014:78)

※ In place of 'iron weapons' the original Shiji text has bingwei-caiwu (兵威財物 'military awe material items') which may well have been iron.

5. Lee’s own historiography

5.1 Lee Deok-il’s conceptualization of Old Joseon: Gojoseon-eun daeryuk-ui jibaeja-yeotda (2006 'Old Joseon were the rulers of the continent')

Lee Deok-il’s conceptualization of OJ is largely derivative of Yun Naehyeon. The following is a summary of his core points, organized under the relevant chapter headings of his earlier 2006 work, Gojoseon-eun daeryuk-ui jibaeja-yeotda.

Part I "Rewriting Old Joseon history"

Chapter 1 "How do Korean history textbooks teach about Old Joseon"
[section title] 'OJ was an empire that ruled over vassal states'
  • Based on the Hanshu figure that the Ye lord Namnyeo (南閔) led as many as 280,000 in rebellion against Ugeo, and that the Ye were only one of
many former vassal states of OJ, OJ itself must have been a large empire. (Lee 2006:35)

• If Dangun Joseon did not exist, there would be nothing with which to counter the assertions of the Colonial Japanese and Chinese Northeast Project which would have Korean history begin with Gija or Wiman Joseon. (Lee 2006:36)

Chapter 2 "Was Dangun myth or history?"

• 'Dangun' was a title used by OJ rulers equivalent to king; the SY account describes the OJ founder, Dangun Wanggeom. (Lee 2006:52)

※ Without commenting on the question of its authenticity, Lee cites the Hwandan-gogi (桓檀古記) for giving the names of 47 subsequent dangun rulers of OJ.

• OJ began in Manchuria rather than the Korean peninsula and can be matched to (any and all) bronze age finds: these currently date to c.2000-1700 BCE, but future excavations will surely push this date back further, so the SY date of 2300 BCE can be considered historically accurate. (Lee 2006:54-5)

Chapter 2 "Did Gija Joseon actually exist?"

• Assuming Gija is historical, he came to rule only a tiny portion of the great Dangun Joseon territory which continued to exist; Chinese historiography distorted this fact to make his domain seem to be the entirety of OJ. (Lee 2006:67)

• Concerning the ethnicity of Wi Man: Choe Namseon considered him to be of Yan, while Yi Byeongdo proposed that he was OJ and this latter interpretation has become orthodox in South Korea.

• YBD’s evidence is based on the description of Wi Man assuming barbarian style, but this cannot be considered specific to OJ. (Lee 2006:72)

※ This is a rare instance in which Lee cites Choe Namseon by name and even seems to agree with him. YBD’s hypothesis would likely be attractive to Lee if not for the association with YBD.

• The location of the 'final OJ capital' of King Jun, usurped by Wi Man, was not Pyeongyang, because if it had been, there would have been no need for Jun to have escaped to Han (韓) by sea as is described.

• Rather therefore, the OJ capital was in the region of Liaoxi, and Jun escaped by ship to modern Pyeongyang.

• That modern Pyeongyang was the region of Mahan is supported by the statements made by Choe Chiwon. (Lee 2006:73-4)
• The capitals of Oj were thus always in Manchuria, not the Korean peninsula. (Lee 2006:76)
• The Chinese finds from Pyeongyang date to the Later Han period, not the Former Han when the Han Commanderies were established.

• The Oj generals who surrendered to Han Chinese in 108 BCE were all enfeoffed with domains in the region of northern Shandong and the Bohai Bay.
  • This demonstrates Han China’s failure to occupy the Oj territory. (Lee 2006:82-4)
  • The Chinese generals who led the 108 BCE invasion attempt were all punished after, demonstrating the fact that the campaign had failed.
※ Despite his claim that the greater part of Oj had not been defeated by China, Lee then discusses restoration attempts - against the illegitimate Wi dynasty - and the fate of the Oj remnant population.

Chapter 5 "Where did Oj people all go to?"
• All subsequent historical states of Manchuria and the Korean peninsula were established by Oj remnants. (Lee 2006:93)

Chapter 6 "Where were the Han Commanderies located?"
※ Argumentation is based on Yun Naehyeon’s Jieshi-shan hypothesis: Lee does not go into detail of the individual commanderies but devotes most of the chapter to criticism of Yi Byeongdo’s peninsula locations.
  • The Han Lelang commandery was located in the region of Liaodong. (Lee 2006:111)
  • Nangnang-guk was located in the Daedong-gang river basin and overthrown by Goguryeo in 32 CE. (Lee 2006:117)

Chapter 7 "How large was the Oj territory?"
• Concerning Oj territory.
"To summarize, from the Chinese Warring States period until the Western Han, the border between Oj and China was the present day Luan–he river and the region of Jieshi–shan; this region was ancient Liaodong. That is to say, contemporary to Sima Qian, the eastern terminus of the Great Wall {referring to Shanhaiguan} was the region of the Luan–he called Liaodong, but in present day geographical conceptionalization this is the region to the west of the Liao river {i.e. Liaoxi}.” (Lee 2006:136)

• Pae-su river = present day Luan river (Lee 2006:141)
• Cites Yun Naehyeon.
Part II "Old Joseon lives again"

Chapter 9 "Examining OJ through excavated artefacts"

- The Hongshan culture corresponds to the OJ Neolithic and dates to c.3500 BCE. (Lee 2006:188)
- On the same page, Lee includes a picture of the C15th CE Inca Machu Picchu remains in Peru as evidence for the potential of a pre-bronze consolidated ancient state.
- The glaring question this raises is why such remains do not exist for OJ.153
  - OJ pottery and bronze (dagger) culture is different to that of China. (Lee 2006:190-95)
  - Chinese style bronze ritual items which might be associated with Gija are found in the region of Shandong and Liaoning, but not on the Korean peninsula. (Lee 2006:198)
  - The distribution of dolmen - as tombs of the OJ elite - are indicative of the core OJ territory.
  - The finely incised OJ bronze mirrors (多絞細文鏡) are distinct from Chinese bronze mirrors and the most technically advanced in the world. (Lee 2006:203)
  - Myeong (明 Ch. Ming) knife coins associated with the state of Yan were actually OJ money.
  - A greater number have been found in the OJ territory [as defined by Lee] than in the region of Beijing which was Yan’s capital.
  - Yan only lasted 100 years. (Lee 2006:204)

- The Lelang commandery lasted until 313: if Lelang had been located at Pyeongyang, then Goguryeo would have attacked it before attacking Liaodong in 311 as otherwise it would have been exposed. (Lee 2006:210)
- Therefore the Chinese artefacts from modern Pyeongyang - those which are not fabricated - are indicative rather of a local ethnic Chinese community allowed to reside long term within Goguryeo’s territory. (Lee 2006:212)

Chapter 10 "Symbol of the red devils [South Korean football supporters], was Chi’u the ancestor of the Dongyi people?"

* Alongside the Shiji and associated commentaries, Lee again cites the

---

153) A potential solution would be to argue for alternative forms of state complexity à la Honeychurch’s (2014) treatment of the Xiongnu, but this has not occurred to Lee.
Hwandan-gogi and Gyuwon-sahwa (撲園史話 1675) without discussing their authenticity.

- Chi’u (蚩尤 Ch. Chiyou) was the founding ancestor of the non-Sinic Dongyi. (Lee 2006:233)
- Since the 1990s, in preparation for their Northeast Project, the Chinese have sought to treat Chiyou as one of three founding ancestors alongside Yandi Shennong (炎帝神農) and the Yellow Emperor Xuanyuan (黃帝軒轅). (Lee 2006:234)

※ Lee implicitly argues that modern China has no jurisdiction over Dongyi heritage. This has two major flaws: 1) the greater part of Dongyi territory has been inside of China throughout history; 2) the greater number of Dongyi descendents will today be residing inside of mainland China which, in any event, defines itself as a multiethnic state.

※ Unlike Yun Naehyeon, Lee fails to distinguish between the ancient Dongyi of the Chinese continent and the later usage of the same term to describe the people of Manchuria and Korea subsequent to the Han dynasty expansion.

5.2 Lee Deok-il’s conceptualization of early Goguryeo:

Goguryeo-neun cheonja-ui jeguk-i’eotda (2007 ‘Goguryeo was the empire of the celestial son’)

5.2.1 Goguryeo as an Old Joseon restoration movement

In all but name, Lee asserts that early Goguryeo regarded itself as the surviving or reemergent successor to OJ. His two arguments for ethnic continuity are that Jumong was the son of Dangun or a dangun, and that Goguryeo had previously been a part of OJ.

The Dangun claim is based on the SY king list which explicitly states the founder of Goguryeo, Go Jumong (aka King Dongmyeong), to have been the son of Dangun. Lee further argues that not just Goguryeo, but in fact the royal lines of nearly all polities across Manchuria were descended from the OJ lineage of Dangun. For this he presents as evidence both the Dangun-gi (壇君記) reference in the ‘Goguryeo’ section of SY describing Buru (夫婁) as the son of Dangun, and separately the Dongmyeongwang-pyeon account of Biryu king Song Yang (松讓) describing himself as a descendant of a seon’in (仙人) which Lee - à la the unmentionable Choe Namseon - infers to be Dangun/dangun. (Lee 2007:18)

Lee also argues that depictions of a bear and tigers found in the Goguryeo tomb
murals of Changchuan Tomb No.1 (長川一號塚) and Gakjeo-chong 'Tomb of the Wrestlers' (角軀塚) - both in Ji’an, China - are proof that the Dangun myth was known to Goguryeo. (Lee 2007:21)
※ This line of inquiry unfortunately remains wholly unconvincing.

Citing in particular HHS (後漢書東夷列傳), Lee reasons that Goguryeo had previously existed as a part of OJ because it was incorporated as one of the three counties of the Xuantu commandery.154) He argues then that Goguryeo’s reemergence and gradual expansion and absorption of polities such as Biryu represents a restoration of OJ: this, too, further explains the enmity Han China felt towards it as evidenced in HHS’s negative description of Goguryeo people. (Lee 2007:22)

5.2.2 The three Buyeo and question of Jumong’s homeland
Lee parses the variations of the Dongmyeong/Jumong myth pertaining to Goguryeo in a bid to explain the disparate references to Buyeo, North Buyeo and East Buyeo. The relevant details as presented by Lee are summarized in Table 25 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources in the order discussed by Lee 2007</th>
<th>protagonist</th>
<th>homeland</th>
<th>kingdom founded</th>
<th>river crossed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Samguk-sagi</em></td>
<td>Jumong</td>
<td>East Buyeo</td>
<td>Goguryeo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dongmyeongwang-pyeon</em> derived from earlier <em>Gu-samguk-sa</em></td>
<td>Jumong</td>
<td>East Buyeo</td>
<td>Goguryeo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Liangshu</em> (梁書) C6th</td>
<td>Dongmyeon g</td>
<td>Beiyi Tuoli (北夷 業離)</td>
<td>Buyeo – a branch of which became the Guyo (句鑑) people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Weishu</em> (魏書)</td>
<td>Jumong</td>
<td>Buyeo</td>
<td>Goguryeo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gwanggaeto Stele</em></td>
<td>Chumo 鄭牟王</td>
<td>North Buyeo</td>
<td>Goguryeo</td>
<td>Eomni-daesu 奄利大水 located in Buyeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Moduru tomb inscription</em> (牟頭墓誌)</td>
<td>Chumo 鄭牟聖王</td>
<td>North Buyeo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lunheng</em> (論衡)</td>
<td>Dongmyeon g</td>
<td>Beiyi Tuoli</td>
<td>Buyeo</td>
<td>Eomsa-su 掩灞水</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


From this, Lee concludes that as ‘primary sources’ the Gwanggaeto Stele and Moduru tomb inscription must be correct in identifying Chumo’s (aka Jumong’s) homeland as North Buyeo, which he insists must be distinguished from just

154) Contrasts with Yun.
'Buyeo' because the latter is mentioned as a 'separate place' through which Chumo passes on his flight south.

Lee does not have a definite explanation for East Buyeo but only notes there are broadly three interpretations: that it was just the eastern part of Buyeo, that it was a later revision made after the collapse of Goguryeo, or that 'Buyeo' and North Buyeo refer to the same entity and East Buyeo was a remnant region that survived and came into contention with Goguryeo; of the three Lee explicitly rejects only this last one, again on the grounds that the Stele distinguishes North Buyeo from 'Buyeo'. (Lee 2014:32)

Lee explains the differences in the Chinese sources as essentially due to them confusing Goguryeo for Buyeo, owing to large numbers of Buyeo people migrating into Goguryeo of which he examples five major instances:

37 BCE Those accompanying Jumong.
22 CE The surrender of some 10,000 followers of Buyeo king Daeso (帶素) following the 'destruction' of East Buyeo by Goguryeo.
68 The surrender of 10,000 more followers led by King Galsa (曷思王).
410 The final subjugation of East Buyeo by King Gwanggaeto.
494 The surrender of the Buyeo king. (Lee 2007:34)

As a consequence, Lee suggests Tuoli must refer to North Buyeo.

5.2.3 Goguryeo or Buyeo: the provenance of Dongmyeong

It is interesting to observe that Lee’s analysis of the Jumong/Dongmyeong foundation story has inadvertently strong echoes to the 1938 Shiratori Kurakichi paper “The Legend of King Tung-ming 東明王 the Founder of Fu-yü-kuo 夫餘國". Whilst Lee’s Goguryeo centered subjectivity on the topic of Jumong discussed above is entirely at odds with Shiratori’s more chronological approach, his interpretation of the reasons for Goguryeo and Buyeo sharing near identical foundation stories finds itself in surprisingly close agreement with Shiratori.

In short, Lee concludes that the Dongmyeong foundation myth of 'Buyeo’ was brought to Goguryeo and adapted for Jumong.

On the Gwanggaeto Stele erected at the time of King Jangsu when Goguryeo had almost entirely absorbed Buyeo, the historical tale (사화) of Buyeo appearing in the Lunheng is used as reverence to King Chumo [of Goguryeo]. This became the official position of the Goguryeo royal house. The Goguryeo foundation legend (사화) of King Chumo shows that Goguryeo had absorbed the Buyeo foundation legend, just as Goguryeo consolidated
its hegemony over the region of Manchuria, it even incorporated the foundation legend of Buyeo king Dongmyeong. At around the time of this process and the erection of the Gwanggaeto Stele, the King Chumo foundation story became the official historical understanding (역사인식) of the Goguryeo royal house and it was able to be recorded in detail in the 'Goguryeo' section of the Weishu, [the latter] the result of a Northern Wei (北魏) emissary who visited Goguryeo c.430 saw this foundation story and related it on his return. (Lee 2007:57)

Unlike Shiratori, Lee regards Dongmyeong and Jumong as two separate personages mistakenly confused as one by the Chinese sources: as a result, however, Lee’s above conclusion that Chumo (aka Jumong) was from North Buyeo and that this was the same place as Tuoli become self-negated if, separately, Tuoli is where Dongmyeong is from in the Buyeo story.

Lee explicitly concludes the Goguryeo foundation myth to have been borrowed from Buyeo and so for Goguryeo we are left with no more historical facts or memory than the name Chumo/Jumong. He posits, however, that Buyeo must also have started out similarly to Goguryeo as a feudality of OJ and that it must be considered the second kingdom in Koreans’ history. (Lee 2007:57)

※ It could be noted, however, if Buyeo was also an immediate successor to OJ, it fails then to explain its significantly better relationship with Han China, in contrast to Goguryeo.

※ The contradictions in Lee’s interpretation of the Goguryeo Jumong myth stem from his unwillingness to admit the more logical wholesale adoption of the Buyeo legend. Whilst we should be grateful Lee does not dabble with linguistics, here he misses Shiratori’s analysis and willingness to argue that the Chumo/Jumong name is likely an alternative, more authentic phonetic rendering of the Sinicized name 'Dongmyeong', albeit with the etymology 'good archer' ultimately derived from a Tungusic language ancestral to Manchu (Jurchenic). (Shiratori 1938:20-21)

5.2.4 Explaining Ye, Maek and YeMaek

Lee argues that whilst the Chinese sources variously refer to Ye (蔵), Maek (貊) and sometimes YeMaek, they never state Ye and Maek to be the same people and thus he concludes they must originally have been two separate groups that eventually amalgamated. Citing the mention of a 'Ye king' (蔵王) seal in the "Buyeo" section of SGZ (三國志:魏書東夷傳), Lee reasons there must have been a Ye kingdom which in turn would have been a feudality of OJ; he cites further mention of the Ye in the "Ye" section of HHS in which in 128 BCE the Ye lord Namnyeo (蔵君南閔) leads 280,000 followers out of Joseon, then under the rule of
Ugeo (右渠), to Liaodong which caused the temporary establishment of the Canghai-jun commandery (蒼海郡).

Meanwhile, he identifies the first mention of Maek as being in the Shijing (詩經) recounting mid C9th BCE events. Examining HHS he observes that Chinese sources refer to Goguryeo as Maek or YeMaek, but never Ye alone; thus he concludes the original core ethnic group of Goguryeo to have been Maek and as Goguryeo expanded they absorbed another regionally dominant people, the Ye, and so became also termed as YeMaek. (Lee 2007:47)

※ It is interesting to note that here, too, Lee’s interpretation is broadly in agreement with Shiratori who also believed ancient references to the Maek in the Shijing and Lunyu (論語) to have referred to the ancestors of Buyeo and Goguryeo.

"In very remote antiquity, a people called Mo 蒙 [Maek] lived in the southern part of Manchukuo... the Mo 蒙 are placed foremost among the savages in the Northern Desert, the tremendous power of this people for a certain period may be imagined... the Mo people were gradually compelled to retire eastward to the forest region from the upper reaches of the Sungari 松花江 and the Ya-lu-chiang 鴨綠江 to the northeastern section of the Korean peninsula. Though this people called themselves Wei 楊 [Ye], the Chinese regarding them as of the ancient Mo stock, put them down as the Wei-mo 楊蒙 in their historical works." (Shiratori 1938:1)

※ Byington by contrast, whilst agreeing on the Ye as having been a distinct people considered ancestral to Buyeo, rejects the idea of any ethnic Maek lineage, interpreting it rather as a label.

"The Hui [Ye], therefore, do not seem to have been known in China until after Yan’s occupation of Liaodong around 282 B.C. had brought Yan people into proximity of the Korean peninsula and central Manchuria. The Mo people before the Han period seem to have been northern groups to the west and south of Yan, while those who would later be associated with Koguryó were a different group entirely." (Byington 2003:57)

5.2.5 The question of Goguryeo’s antiquity

Lee both argues for an earlier date to Goguryeo’s foundation whilst still offering an interpretation for the traditional 37 BCE date given in the SS in the following manner. Starting with Chinese sources, in the Hanshu and HHS Goguryeo is seen to already have existed in some form prior to 107 BCE when it was recorded as being subdued under the Xuantu commandery. He cites the references in SGZ
(Weilue) and HHS descriptions of the Goguryeo royal line having originally been controlled by the Yeonno-bu (涓奴部/ HHS Sono-bu 涓奴部) tribe but later switching to the Gyeru-bu (桂奴部): from this he posits the Gyeru-bu to have been the followers of Jumong who after taking control chose not to include details of Yeonno-bu period kings in their histories which led in part to the improbable longevity attributed in the SS to the 6th Goguryeo king Taejo (r. 53-146). (Lee 2007:33, 61)

Referencing Sin Chaeho, he cites two separate passages from the SS attributing greater antiquity to Goguryeo than 37 BCE: the Goguryeo Annals' 668 entry citing the no longer extent Goguryeo-bigi (高句麗秘記) giving the duration of Goguryeo’s existence (albeit under Jumong's Go clan) as 900 years, and the Silla Annals' 670 entry stating it to have been 800 years. These certainly demonstrate discrepancies in dates though do not provide explicit support for Lee’s hypothesis associating Jumong with the Gyerubu clan and date of 37 BCE.

His final argument for an extended dating of Goguryeo is based on the Gwanggaeto Stele and again references Sin Chaeho. Sin argued that whilst King Gwanggaeto was recorded as a 13th generation Goguryeo king in the SS, the Stele records him as 17th and thus the former may be suspected to have omitted four early monarchs in order to bring forward the foundation of Goguryeo so that it would appear as having been later than that of Silla.

"...on the Stele, 17 generations [starting with Jumong as the 1st] are recorded up to [and including] King Gwanggaeto. However the Goguryeo Annals of the Samguk-sagi record King Gwanggaeto as the 19th king; as the 12th generation descendent of Jumong there is a difference of five generations [to the Gwanggaeto Stele]. If a 30 year [reign] is given for each generation then there is a difference of 150 years." (Lee 2007:60-1)

6. Evaluation of Lee Deok-il and the questions he raises

In order to understand the influence and relative efficaciously of Lee’s emotive 'colonial view of history' (SMGH) hypothesis it is important to distinguish between the low quality of his own writings and methodology, and the wider postcolonial discourse he exploits.

All other questions aside - e.g. pertaining to his expertise, competence, subjectivity, use of *ad hominem* and personal motivation - the fundament of Lee's basic premise, that Japanese colonial era scholarship has continued to have a direct influence on contemporary South Korean and English language academia, is almost certainly correct. On the Korean side, Lee’s writings tap into
the wider anti-establishment, left-wing political discourse which is an authentic product of South Korea’s historical experience: the concerns of this discourse are genuine though more complex than Lee would acknowledge, with the importance of historiography as a political battleground being recently demonstrated by the 2015 government textbook dispute in which the Park Geun-hye administration has pushed for a single national textbook.

Meanwhile, independent of Lee, it is also true that in the international field of Korean Studies - particularly early history - English language scholarship regularly references Japanese colonial era works with limited critical discussion of their methodology or the colonial context that may - or may not - have led to distortions. By contrast, writings of colonial era Koreans, e.g. Sin Chaeho and Choe Namseon, are regarded only as objects of study of their time, relative to the Cultural Enlightenment movement, but are otherwise dismissed from treatment as serious academic contributions due to their methodological shortcomings: meanwhile the empirical work of the earlier Silhak scholars such as An Jeongbok and Jeong Yak-yong are relegated to the 'premodern' era despite their rigorous methodology that even colonial Japanese scholars were informed by. As a result colonial Japanese töyō (東洋 'Oriental') scholarship is treated as the beginning of modern Korean Studies.155)

There are, of course, justifiable reasons for this reality: some of the Japanese scholarship, including Shiratori, is potentially - though not unquestionably - objective and insightful enough that it can inform the discourse, and the very fact that it in any event has informed the discourse means that it should be referenced: at the same time Korean language scholarship is divided between that which itself builds on Japanese work (Lee's 'collaborators') and that which opposes it with roots in the work of Sin Chaeho, but as demonstrated in this study and discussed by Pai (2000:137) both of these branches, have been unable to distance themselves from the subjective nationalisms present in both the North and South and so fail to offer objective alternatives.

Textual sources, of course, can and have been re-analyzed so current day English language academia now rarely references Japanese historical interpretations other than to demonstrate awareness of research tradition: the situation of archaeology - particularly that associated with the Lelang Commandery at Pyeongyang - however, is different for two well known reasons: the current inaccessibility of the sites and the consequent reliance on data produced by Japanese colonial era excavations. The two scholars who have

worked most on this topic, Pai (2000) and Byington (2013), both express full awareness of the colonial context and distorting influence of contemporary Japanese imperial ideology. They both, however, consider the material data produced to be authentic; importantly, they appraise Japanese methodology extremely highly and so consider only the interpretations to have been compromised. In short, they consider the Japanese excavations to have definitively confirmed the location of the Lelang commandery on the Daedong-gang river, and reject only the colonial era utilization of this fact, which emphasized ancient 'colonial' origins of Korean state formation to justify Japan’s imperial expansion (à la Lee’s MSG). Consequently, Japanese archaeological data forms the core of their own studies, as it must for most 'establishment' academic Korean scholars willing to work on this sensitive period. However, because Lee fundamentally rejects the peninsula location of the Han Commanderies, he is unwilling to recognize this distinction between using Japanese produced data and accepting their biased interpretations; as seen in his narrative, it is in fact key to equate them.

Transparency populist in style and derivative of Yun Naehyeon, Lee’s work on early Korea is not widely accepted inside of Korean academic circles, and even in public forums he is largely viewed as a pseudo scholar. As a relatively prolific writer of popular history and polemics, however, Lee has achieved a high profile and contributed to the continued politicization of academic work. As much as Lee’s arguments are flawed by ‘greedy reductionism’ he equally benefits from the fact that few of his Korean readers will either have access to, or the motivation to read, the works of the scholars he attacks, or for that matter those which he promotes: this is particularly the case of English language works which even he himself clearly has not read.
[Chapter 16] Kim Unhoe (金雲會 b.1961)

"Both the unofficial and conservative schools have the point in common that their awareness of Old Joseon's history is incomplete. The perspective of the Jaeya school (재야사학) has the fatal weak point that it is impossible to prove [their hypotheses] through historical facts [whilst] the perspective of the conservative school [i.e. academic establishment] has the problem that it takes only a part of Old Joseon’s long and expansive history and tries to claim this history on the Korean peninsula as Old Joseon’s entire history. In particular, the Jaeya school has a tendency to focus only on unearthing sources which demonstrate the wide reach of Old Joseon’s strength in order to conceal [their] methodology which is deficient in historical reality (역사적 실체). They do not hesitate to make the historical distortion [claiming] that ‘[the people of] Old Joseon were the rulers of the continent’ [but] only peninsula Koreans are [now] their descendants. On the other hand, the conservative school, ignoring the historical reality of Old Joseon arm themselves with the logic that peninsula Koreans were the only group [of other people] to resemble Chinese whilst the rest were barbarians of no relation to us [Koreans]; they comprehend as Korean history only a half fragment excluding the northern peoples who [also] existed expansively in the central and southern part of the Korean peninsula. It is time to sift through and arrange what is correct and wrong [from these arguments]. This book has been written with this objective.” (Kim 2012:15-6)

Kim Unhoe is an archetypal popular historian whose conceptualization of ancient Korea and Northeast Asia is based on pan-Altaic long-range migration theories. Within this scheme, both geographically and temporally, he assigns a relatively modest role to the state of OJ proper, situating it as one chapter in a greater Dongyi history. His original long range theories are laid out in his 'ethnic origins' work Dae-Jyun-eul chaj’a-seo (대원신을 찾아서 'In search of the great Jusin' volumes 1 and 2, 2006) in which he collectively labels the non-Sinic Dongyi (東夷) peoples as •Jusin. More recently he has attempted a thesis on OJ, titled Uri-ga bae’un Go-Joseon-eun gajja-da ('The OJ we have learnt [about] is fake' 우리가 배운 고조선은 가짜다 2012) which posits OJ to have been a state founded at the meeting point of two eastward •Jusin migration routes in the region of modern Liaodong, and that upon its collapse the remnant OJ population split into two main ethnic lineages, one forming the continental Xianbei and the other merging with a branch of Buyeo to form Goguryeo-Balhae and Baekje.

Kim’s methodology is a combination of historical geography and omnicomparative
pseudolinguistic speculation: his only conceptual explanation for the transmission of cultural phenomena is ethnic migration. Kim is a synthesizer of others' research: whilst readily quoting from South Korean establishment historians and being ostensibly critical of the jaeya camp he will cite any research that fits his theories including, for example, North Korean Ri Jirin. Due to his attraction to long-range theories, Kim's ideas and topics are inevitably reminiscent to - if not directly influenced by - those of Choe Namseon.

His basic chronology for the *Jūisin Dongyi lineage as it appears in Chinese history is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yin (殷)</th>
<th>Gu-guk (箕國)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oj and Suksin (肅慎)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donghu (東胡) and Xianbei</td>
<td>Buyeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Yan (前燕) and Northern Wei (北魏)</td>
<td>Goguryeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khitian Liao</td>
<td>Goryeo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26. Kim Unhoe - *Jūisin Dongyi lineage. (Kim 2012:64)

1. Yin

Quoting from the Shiji that "the Yin are called Yi 夷, Zhou are [Chinese] Hwa 華" ("殷曰夷周曰華"), and from HHS that "the east is called Yi" (後漢書:東夷列傳: "東方曰夷"), Kim asserts that the state of Yin (aka Shang) was ethnically Dongyi (東夷). (Kim 2012:46-7)

※: The Shiji quote, unfortunately does not appear in any database searches and so would seem to be wrong or non-existent.

Kim further supports his hypothesis arguing that the Yin progenitor myth recorded in the Shiji Yin Basic Annals (殷本紀) in which Qi (契) is born after his mother jian (簡狄) conceives from swallowing a crow's egg, shares similarities to the progenitor myth of the Manchu who also regarded crows as sacred 'totem' gods. (Kim 2012:46)

2. Dangun

Kim rejects any historical interpretation of the Dangun myth regarding its appearance in SY and Jewang-ungi purely as a late 13th century development stimulated by the cause of ethnic solidarity in the face of the Mongol invasions. Whilst such arguments against Dangun are reminiscent to those of the colonial Japanese which were effectively disproven by Choe Namseon, Kim cites rather earlier Korean sources, namely An Jeongbok's (安鼎福 1712–91) Dongsa-gangmok (東史編目) dismissing the myth as Buddhist invention, and Jeong Yak-yong's Abang-gang'yeesok-ge (我邦疆域考) similarly rejecting Dangun for lack of credibility. (Kim 2012:35)
Kim suggests that the earlier SS reference to a Seon’in Wanggeom (仙人王儉) – if equatable at all – shows that Dangun was originally a local Pyeongyang deity. He attributes the subsequent widespread adoption of Dangun to the elements of bear totemism found in the myth towards which he reasons the Korean population was naturally predisposed on account of their bronze age Tungusic ancestry. (Kim 2012:33–39)

3. Gija

Coming from Yin, Kim regards Gija as ethnic Dongyi, but associates the location of the polity he established after ‘going east’ not with OJ proper – which was yet to exist – but with Gojuk-guk (孤竹國): Kim posits that Gija’s polity is the Gi-guk (箕國) later recorded in the Chunqiu-zuoshi-zhuan (春秋左氏傳) as, by then, being a feudality of Zhou. Whilst acknowledging that the Shangshu-dachuan (尚書大傳), Shi ji and Hanshu all record that Gija went east to Joseon, Kim highlights that the earlier Dialects (論語) and Zhushu-jinian (竹書紀年 ‘Bamboo Annals’) mention Gija but make no reference to Joseon. (Kim 2012:59–61)

Quoting from the Shiji-zhengyi (史記正義 737), the geography treatises of the Hanshu and Liaodongzhi (遼東志), Qinding-shengjing-tongzhi (欽定盛京通志), Shuijingzhu (水經注「瀋水」) and Rehezhi (熱河志), Kim locates Gojukguk in the region of the Luan river basin. (Kim 2012:62)

In Kim’s scheme, this Gija polity thus predates OJ, but is located in the same core homeland territory from which both OJ and Goguryeo would subsequently arise: this he attributes as the origin for the mistaken notion of ‘Gija Joseon’ which he stresses, either way, was never located on the Korean peninsula. (Kim 2012:64)

4. Old Joseon proper

Having negated Dangun and marginalized Gija, Kim identifies what he regards as the OJ polity proper being formed of the YeMaek (穎貊) peoples – first mentioned in compound form in Guanzi (管子) – and first appearing under the name of Bal–Joseon (發朝鮮), attested again in Guanzi which he dates in its entirety to the C7th BCE. He locates this Bal–Joseon in the region between Beijing and the Liao–he river, attributing to it: a metal culture including the bipa shaped bronze daggers originating in central Asia (i.e. independent of and older than Chinese metallurgy); ondol hypocausts; and a mixed farming and herding economy, together with the meeting point between northern ‘celestial descent’ and southern ‘egg birth’ mythological traditions. (Kim 2012:73)

Referencing the Starostin Database of ‘ Altaic etymologies’, Kim considers the bal of Bal–Joseon to be cognate to Maek (貊) carrying the meaning of ‘bright/white’
as attested in modern Korean *balk*- and *malk*- (받다/닫다). He similarly treats *dan* (檀) of Dangun to be a semantic rendering of *bakdal* (박달 'a type of birch tree') and so also cognate, thus concluding that Bal-Joseon, Maek-Joseon and Dangun-Joseon all refer to the same entity. (Kim 2012:254n91)

5. **Suksin 罡愷 = Joseon**

At the same time, Kim further asserts that 'Suksin' and several variants are also cognate terms for 'Joseon'.

He cites three examples where he believes references to Suksin can either be equated with Korea or in any event located on the peninsula. The first is from the description of the Northern Wei invasion of Goguryeo in the 240s recorded in SGZ: when Goguryeo king Gung (宮) fled to Maegu (買溝), the Xuantu governor is sent in pursuit and "passing Okjeo by a 1,000 li, arrives at the southern boundary of the Suksin." Locating Okjeo across the modern Hamheung provinces, Kim reasons that Maegu must be in the region of modern Wonsan and postulates the southern boundary of the Suksin would have been "at least" as south as Geumgang-san. (Kim 2012:83)

[三國志·魏書二十八·毌丘儉: "正始中...宮遂奔買溝，儉遣玄菟太守王頑追之，過沃沮千有餘里，至肅慎氏南界..."]

He does not make it explicit, but this interpretation necessarily assumes that Okjeo is within the Suksin territory, which would indeed be Kim's point.

※ Because a direction of the pursuit is not given, it could equally be that the Suksin southern border is north of Okjeo, especially if they were distinct polities which is the conventional assumption.

The second example is from the *Goryeo-sa* when Wang Yung (王隆) in 896 recommends to Gung'ye that in order to become king of Joseon, Suksin and Byeonhan, he should make Yung's son, Wang Geon, lord of Song'ak (aka Gaeseong).

[高麗史·卷一世家: "乾寧三年丙辰，以郡歸于裔，裔大喜，以爲金城太守。世祖說之曰，大王若欲王朝鮮·肅慎·卞韓之地，莫如先城 松嶽，以吾長子爲其主。裔從之，使太祖築勃嶔墅城，仍爲城主。時太祖年二十."]

Here Kim suggests that Joseon refers to the original OJ region of Liaodong, Suksin refers to Manchuria and/or the central Korean peninsula (한반도 중부), and Byeonhan refers either to the whole of the Korean peninsula or just the south. (Kim 2012:84)

His third example quotes from the *Qinding-Manzhouyuanliukao* (欽定滿洲源流考 c.1783) in which, citing the *Jinshi-shiji* (金史世紀) it apparently records that
during the Han dynasty, Suksin were referred to as 'Samhan' (三韓). (Kim 2012:84)

Kim identifies the earliest variant reference to the Suksin as 'Bal-Siksin' (發息慎) recorded in the Shi ji at the time of Xia king Yu (禹), which he places at c.2000 BCE. He also highlights the associated jii annotation that 'Siksin' is another name for Suksin referring to the northeastern Yi (夷).

[史記:五帝本紀: "南撿交趾 北發 西戎 歌技 楊氏 羌 北山戎 發息慎 【集解】鄭玄曰: "息慎，或謂之肅慎，東北夷。"]

Naturally Kim himself considers Bal-Siksin as cognate with Bal-Joseon.

Kim further cites the Yi zhoushu (逸周書「王會解篇」[late Warring States period]) which he claims also has a statement equating 'jiksin' (稷慎) to Suksin, however such a reference is not apparent in the original text. (Kim 2012:85)156

In any event, his assertion is that the terms 'Siksin,' 'Suksin,' and 'Jiksin' are all variant phonographic renderings of 'Joseon'. Importantly he highlights that in no single early source do both 'Suksin' and 'Joseon' appear together: only one or the other is used. Thus, in spite of having rejected the Dangun myth, he seeks still to demonstrate ethnic longevity of an almost similar antiquity to the SY account. More specifically, he suggests that Suksin represent the early aspect of OJ which developed further after absorbing remnants from Dongyi Yin (殷).

Concerning geography, Kim observes that in pre-Han sources, the Suksin are located around Hebei and southern Manchuria, whilst in post-Han sources they are located along the Heilong-jiang river and Primorsky Krai; this he interprets as evidence of northeastward migration matching that of OJ. (Kim 2012:89)

6. (Wi) Man and Post-OJ split

Kim accepts the historicity of (Wi) Man as an OJ king but questions whether he ever came from Yan (燕) and rejects any associated Chinese ethnicity. In support of this, Kim highlights that: the Shi ji recorded his name simply as Man (滿) and that he did not acquire the Chinese surname of Wi (衛) until post Han sources; Shi ji describes him dressed as an archetypal Dongyi: he was entrusted by OJ king Jun with border defense, and even after he usurped power he maintained the name of Joseon. (Kim 2012:112-3)

※: The questions of his name and clothing would only prove that he was not Chinese, but not distinguish whether he was Dongyi or actually of OJ: Kim is not

156) The only Yi zhoushu passage containing 'jiksin' is 逸周書「王會解」: "周公旦主東方所之青馬黑駿，謂之母兄，其守營壇者，衣青操弓執矛，西面者正北方，稷慎大僃，穎人前，前後既僃立行，聲似小兒，良夷在子，在子 Parcelable。”
completely clear on whether he regards the Yan state as Dongyi or Chinese, but from the context of this discussion it appears to be the latter.  

Kim posits that around the early 2nd BCE in the wake of the Warring States and Qin–Han transition, OJ expanded westwards into the former territory of Yan - ancient Gojuk-guk - and as a consequence he locates Man's capital of Wanggeom-seong in between the Yongding-he (永定河) and Daling-he rivers. This westward position is what brings OJ into inevitable conflict with Han, leading to its 108 BCE overthrow. (Kim 2012:116)

7. Goguryeo foundation, comparative mythology and *Proto-Korea
A core aspect of Kim's thesis is that, after its collapse, the former OJ people split into two distinct ethnic lineages: one forming Goguryeo, the other the continental Xianbei.

In stark contrast to Sin, Yun or Lee, Kim traces the origin of Goguryeo to the Gaogouli–xian county of the Xuantu Han commandery which, based on the Hanshu geography treatise, he locates in the Beijing–Liaoning region (i.e. Liaoxi), rejecting the notion that it could ever have been any further east or on the peninsula. (Kim 2012:134)

[漢書地理志下: “玄菟郡，武帝元封四年開。高句麗，莽曰下句麗，屬幽州，戶四萬五千六，口二十二萬一千八百四十五，縣三：高句麗，遼山，遼水所出，西南至遼陽入大遼水，又有南蘇水，西北經塞外。上殷台，莽曰下殷，西蓋馬”]
Thus, in his scheme, Goguryeo arises in the former Gojuk-guk-OJ homeland.

Ethnically, Kim sees Goguryeo emerging from an amalgamation of a former OJ core together with a portion of the coexisting Buyeo people whom he regards as OJ YeMaek brethren; this ethnic mix is reflected in the Jumong foundation story.

On explicating the myth, Kim first historically identifies Jumong as the personage of Chu (驪) recorded in the Hanshu as the Goguryeo lord who is killed in battle leading the YeMaek in rebellion against Wang Mang (王莽). (Kim 2012:136)

[漢書王莽傳中: “先是，莽發高句麗兵，當伐胡，不欲行，郡強迫之，皆亡出塞，因犯法為寇，遼西大尹田謨追擊之，為所殺，州郡歸咎於高句麗諸侯，畿尤遼言：「絡人犯法，不從驪起，正有它心，宜令州郡且尉安之。今猥被以大罪，恐其遂畔，夫餘之屬必有和者。匈奴未克，夫餘、貉貉復起，此大憂也。」莽不尉安，貉貉遂反，詔尤遼擊之。尤遼誘高句麗諸侯至而斬焉，傳首長安。”]

Citing No Taedon, Kim suggests that the Goguryeo myth was created later on around the time of King Sosurim (r.371–84) as Goguryeo was emerging as a consolidated state. The historical character of Chu (Jumong) - an early

157) Byington 2003:69 describes Yan as multiethnic.
celebrated Goguryeo hero - was thus attributed a miraculous birth by conception through sunlight, a motif cognate to the 'Donghu' myth of Tanshihu (檀石槐) maintained by the parallel Xianbei lineage of O) recorded in SGZ. (Kim 2012:138)

[三國志·鮮卑傳]: "魏書曰：...投鹿侯從匈奴軍三年，其妻在家，有子，投鹿侯歸，怪欲殺之。妻曰：「嘗嘗將行間雷震，仰天視而雷入其口，因呑之，遂狂身，十月而產，此子必有奇異，且長長。」投鹿侯固不信。妻乃語家，令收養焉，號檀石槐，長大勇健，智勇絕衆。年十四五，異部大卜貴邑詣取其外家牛羊，檀石槐策騎追擊，所向無前，悉獲得所亡。由是部落畏服，施法禁，平曲直，莫敢犯者，遂推以為大單。檀石槐既立，乃為庭於高柳北三百餘里彈汗山嘯仇水，東西部大人皆歸焉。兵馬甚盛，南抄漢邊。北拒丁令，東卻夫餘，西擊烏孫，盡據匈奴故地，東西萬二千餘里，南北七千餘里，問羅山川，水澤、鹽池甚廣。漢患之，桓帝時使夷中郎將張奐征之，不克。乃更遣使者齋印綬，即封檀石槐為王，欲與和親]

※ This interpretation is notably reminiscent of Shiratori (1938), perhaps because it is quite logical, but also No Taedon is likely to have been influenced by Shiratori.

Fused to this myth is the Buyeo progenitor story of Dongmyeong’s flight south from ᅣGori (橐離 {sic ※ Kim consistently uses one variant of the first character not found in any version of the Buyeo myth and so will be marked as unattested: the closest is go 恣 found in the Jigugeben汲古閣本 edition of the same SGZ passage below.}) (Kim 2012:139)

[SGZ 三國志·夫餘傳]: "魏書曰：舊志又言，昔北方有高離之國者，其王者狩狐有身，王欲殺之，狐云：「有狐如貴子來下，我故有身。」後生子，王惡之於揚中，狐以喙嘗之，徙至馬國，馬以氣嘗之，不死。王疑以為天子也，乃令其母收畜之，名曰東明，常令牧馬。東明善射，王恐其奪其國也，欲殺之。東明走，南至施掩水，以弓擊水，魚鱗浮為橋，東明得渡，魚鱗乃解散，追兵不得渡。東明因往留王夫餘之地。"

Kim asserts that Jumong’s mother, the river deity Habaek’s daughter Yuhwa (柳花 'willow flower'), is the same person as Alan Go’a from Mongol mythology, whose name Kim reconstructs in Middle Mongol as ᅣUda-čhecheg 'willow flower'. He further speculates on the importance of willow trees to shamanism and suggests they are found in great profusion in the region of the Amur river. Of passing interest he notes the C12th Gaoli-tuing records that Goryeo maintained a shrine to Jumong's holy mother. (Kim 2012:241)

[宣和使奉高麗圖經卷第十七·東神祠]: "東神祠，在宣仁門內。地積平廣，殿宇卑陋。廡廡三十間，荒涼不葺。正殿榜曰東神聖母之堂。以俚勸之，不令人見，神儀，蓋刻木作女人狀。或云乃夫餘妻河神女也。以其生朱蒙，為高麗始祖，故祀之，昔例。使者至則遣官設奠，其牲牢獻，如禮秩山神式"

A final element Kim identifies from the Goguryeo Jumong myth is the name of King Geumwa (金蛙 'golden frog') which he associates with the Altai story of Taniagang ('frog king') in which an old man by that name rescues a white frog fighting with a red frog and is consequently rewarded and marries the youngest
daughter of the sky god Gurburstan (구르부르스탄).

Linguistically, Kim interprets the toponym Gori, and all variants (論衡 Tak-ri 磚碓, 裏漢書 Sak-ri 莳黍) as cognate to Goryeo 高麗, Guryeo (句麗) and Goguryeo (高句麗), the proto form he suggests as *Gaoli (가오리 Ggaori). (Kim 2012:140) Thus he terms the legendary state of *Gori as *'Proto-Korea'.

Concerning the name of 'Jumong', Kim considers it linguistically cognate only to Chu and Chumo (鉟牟) but not Dongmyeong. (Kim 2012:259n171)

Finally, it should be noted, Kim locates the central homeland of the OJ state permanently in the continental Liaoxi region with its maximum territory extending only just into the far northwest of the Korean peninsula, with no relationship to Pyeongyang. He further locates the Goguryeo political homeland as being the same as OJ: although not fully explicaded, he thus rejects the eastward 'movement theory' (이동설) into the peninsula often suggested for OJ applying it instead to Goguryeo. (※ This direct correlation of Goguryeo with OJ fails to explain the location of Goguryeo's first historical capital of Gungnaeseong in modern Ji'an.)

Based on the Buyeo foundation story in which Dongmyeong escapes south from *Gaoli, and locating Buyeo in the region centered on Nong'an (農安 廈安縣 Nong’an county c.60km north of Changchun) but extending to Harbin in the north, Kim posits *Gaoli therefore to have been in the region of the upper Amur, eastern Mongolia, or even Lake Baikal! (Kim 2012:228-9)

8. Continental Xianbei lineage

Kim describes the continental Donghu lineage of OJ beginning with the Xianbei Wuhuan (鮮卑烏桓) founded by Tanshihuai (檀石槐). 'Wuhuan' he speculates as linguistically cognate to YeMaek. (Kim 2012:144) Tracing through the various Xianbei polities - the Murong (慕容) states of Former and Later Yan, the Tuoba (拓跋) state of Northern Wei, and the Sui and Tang dynasties which he considers having been formed of a Sinicized Xianbei core - Kim narrates the continental OJ lineage culminating with the C10th Khitan Liao dynasty. Whilst the previous Xianbei states were invariably Sinicized to increasing degrees, Kim argues that the Khitan, descendents of the Yuwen (宇文) Xianbei who had been previously marginalanized to the region of Songmo (松漠 - he locates as Inner Mongolia),

159) Although not discussed, this implicitly rejects the more inspired interpretation of Shiratori which proposes rather the Lunheng and HHS forms as cognate to Manchurian sahaliyan 'black' to be associated with the Amur river thus rejecting the *Gaoli/Goryeo/Goguryeo etymology. (Shiratori 1938:27-8)
better preserved the "unique traits" (고유성) of OJ's ethnic heritage and identity, as had the Goguryeo-Balhae lineage.

[通典：邊防十六：庫莫奚："庫莫奚，聞於後魏及後周。其先，東部鮮卑字文之別種也，初為慕容晃所破，遺落者窟匿松漠之間" and 通典：邊防十六：契丹："契丹之先與庫莫奚異種而同類，並為慕容氏所破，俱窟於松漠之間。其俗頗與靺鞨同"]

He cites the Liaoshi identifying Liao as former territory of Joseon and preserving both the Eight Article teaching of Gija and other remaining customs.

[遼史：禮志一："遼本朝鮮故壤，箕子八條之教，流風遺俗，蓋有存者"]
[遼史：地理志二：東京道："東京遼陽府，本朝鮮之地，周武王釋箕子囚，去之。朝鮮，因以封之"]

Kim's broad scheme for the OJ ethnic lineage is summarized in the following paragraph.

"Old Joseon existed from the legendary period of China, it was maintained in the form of such states as the Five ba Hegemons (春秋五霸) of the 7th century BC Spring and Autumn period and the Seven xiong of the Warring States period (戰國七雄). From around the 4th century BC it became more of an independent ancient state and competed with the Yan: from the end of the 3rd century BC its borders faced the Qin (秦) dynasty [but it maintained peace. In the 2nd century BC, it thrived between the rivalry of the Xiongnu and Han dynasty: after its collapse, it was [both] succeeded and continuously revived by Goguryeo and Silla in the south and Xianbei Wuhuan (鮮卑烏桓) in the north. After the 4th century Murong, the descendants of Old Joseon showed a serious propensity (특성) for ruling China and they began to move southwards into the Chinese continent. Subsequently the vast majority of non-Han Chinese dynasties were established by these people. However, in the process of ruling over China, they lost their unique cultural traits (固有性) of Old Joseon. These traits were largely maintained by Goguryeo, the Khitan (Liao), the Jin, Goryeo and the Qing." (Kim 2012:152)

9. Tracing the Malgal as the ethnic continuation of the YeMaek and Suksin

Similar to 'Suksin-Joseon', Kim posits a direct ethnic continuity from the YeMaek to the Malgal (靺鞨). His first argument is based on unreferenced linguistic speculation, as follows.

"...in modern Korean language, 'Malgal' who were the predecessors of the Jurchen and 'YeMaek' who were predecessors of Koreans, appear as greatly different words but it is thought that because they were words
expressed by borrowing [characters for their] phonetic values, they in fact denote the same [original] word. This is thought to be a word meaning Bal-jok (發族), Maek-jok (貊族) etc which precisely **symbolized the brightness of the sun**.

That is to say, the deduced pronunciation of the 'Maek' of YeMaek is *mò* or *hé* whilst the pronunciation of Malgal is *môhé* meaning there is a high probability that 'Malgal' and 'YeMaek' express the same thing or that they are variant pronunciations. When YeMaek is written backwards as Maeg'ye (貊滅), it is thought that this pronunciation, too, would have been *môhé* and so the relationship that *YeMaek = Maeg'ye = Malgal* etc is established...

...According to Mencius, the *maek* of Maek-jok was the same as *baek* (白), *bak* (毫) and *bak* (簿) which were **vocabulary native to the region of northeastern China**, and it could be deciphered as *bakgo* (簿姑) 'bright' (명:밝다 or *bakggo* (밝고). Also in the *Shanhaijing* it states, "The character *maek* originally meant 'to be chief' or 'to make something white' (i.e. bright 밝게)" [*There is no such statement]. This is something that can be easily comprehended by Mongolians, Manchus, Koreans or Japanese but for Han Chinese is hard to appreciate." (Kim 2012:102-3)

Kim continues with further source based arguments.

"Something still more important is that around the time 'Malgal' began to appear [as a term], the word 'YeMaek' became hidden. Coming to the period of the *jinshu* (晉書), the YeMaek became hidden from Chinese history books. Considering it is not possible for the numerous YeMaek to have suddenly evaporated, this people must have changed their name. Consequently **Malgal can be seen as a term [denoting] not only OI, Buyeo and Goguryeo but also most of the peoples [inhabiting] the northern half of the Korean peninsula.** Just for reference, they later reappear under the name of Jurchen.

Fourthly, the *Hanshu* records that whilst being in northeastern China the Maek-jok were also in the region of the Samhan. This means that **Maek was used as a general term for all peoples included within the Korean peninsula** and so the Malgal were naturally [considered] a part of the Maek. As a concrete example, in the commentary of the *Hanshu* passage, "The Maek and Yan (燕) sent valiant mounted warriors to help the Han," it states, "The Maek are in the northeast (of Han), all classed as Samhan are Maek: the pronunciation is *balk* ( 밧) or *mak* (in the original text
makgaek 莫客)." This 'Makgaek' [referred to] here concerns the pronunciation of 'Maek' in Chinese characters, in modern [Mandarin] pronunciation it basically becomes mòkè, and so it can be thought of as a variation of mòkè [meaning] Malgal and is considered to be in between the pronunciation of balk (발) and maek (맥)." (Kim 2012:105)

[漢書·高帝紀上: "北絡、燕人來致栗助漢。[四]應劭曰: 「北絡, 國也, 楮, 健也。」 張晏曰: 「柤, 勇也, 若六博之柤也。」師古曰: 「絡在東北方, 三韓之屬皆絡類也, 音莫客反。」"]

※ The original text only gives the word makgaek 莫客: *balk/mak are Kim’s interpretation.

"Fifthly, in the SS Goguryeo mostly mobilizes Malgal soldiers to attack Baekje (peninsula Buyeo) but in the Chinese histories Goguryeo [is recorded] as mostly mobilizing YeMaek. If one has the preconception that the YeMaek were on the Korean peninsula and Malgal in Liaoxi and Liaodong then this makes no sense at all. Further, the SS records that whilst attacking the [lower central peninsula] region of modern Chungju (North Chungcheong province), some 6,000 YeMaek were mobilized. This could be further proof that 'Malgal = YeMaek'." (Kim 2012:105)

[三國史記·高句麗本紀·高祖王: "四年, 原正月, 以諦兵六千攻百濟獨山城"]

※ The SS entry which Kim fully cites in fact uses only 'Ye' rather than 'YeMaek'.

"For example, the HHS (後漢書) records, "Leading armies of YeMaek and Mahan, Goguryeo king Gung surrounded Hyeondo-seong fortress [aka Xuantu Han Commandery]. The Buyeo king sent his son Wigutae and more than twenty-thousand men who, together with the regional (州郡) armies, smashed [the Goguryeo army]... Later on Goguryeo king Gung’s son died and his grandson, Baekgo (伯固) became king, whereupon the YeMaek were subjugated [or became submissive]." Looking at this, we can learn that Goguryeo was originally [composed of] YeMaek and that they conducted warfare together. SGZ (三國志) too records, "Gongsun Yuan (公孫灑) once dared to disobey a royal command... Together with Goguryeo and the YeMaek, Gongsun Yuan engaged in banditry and pillaging."

[In endnote 143, Kim cites the following passage:

SGZ 魏書二八:公孫度傳: "公孫租年星敢違王命, 廢絕計貢者, 実柄不一。既恃阻險, 又怙強權, 故敢肆意, 忍犯海外。宿親親見貶權軍衆府庫, 知其弱少不足憑恃, 是以決計斬殺之使, 又高句麗、遼貊與濱為仇, 並為寇車。今外失吳援, 內有胡寇, 心知國家能從陸道, 勢不得不懼惶懷之心。因斯之時, 宜遣使示以福繫..."]

Here too, Goguryeo and YeMaek are depicted as trying to attack Wei (魏).
Thus in the records above, it is made apparent that YeMaek = Goguryeo people and Malgal = Goguryeo people: 'YeMaek' and 'Malgal' are words which, as general terms for Dong'i-jok (東夷族), appear to be used interchangeably. Of course these words appear differently according to different periods and books.

If we examine the above contents, there is absolutely no reason for the Malgal to have been excluded from an active historical identity (주체 juche) in Korean history. The largest and most central problem concerning the Malgal and Goguryeo is the complete absence of sources [that could] concretely explain the relationship between the two. This [might] allow us to interpret the Malgal as the main class of Goguryeo people. This is because, if 'Malgal' itself has the same meaning as 'YeMaek' then there would be no need to [further] explain it." (Kim 2012:105-6)

10. Peninsula Malgal
One of the more unique and innovative aspects of Kim's interpretation is in highlighting the peninsula Malgal about whom multiple references appear in the SS. Kim accuses the academic establishment (specifically Mun Ansik) of excluding the Malgal from Korean history proper and also of distinguishing peninsula Malgal from their continental namesakes: he argues that the peninsula Malgal should be regarded as subjects of Korean history regardless of ethnic identity but also asserts them to have been directly related to the continental Malgal (Ch. Mohe).

Kim presents three tables listing the most significant references to Malgal found in the three Basic Annals of the SS: they are here consolidated into Table 27.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SS Annal</th>
<th>Monarchical year</th>
<th>Details [according to Kim – not necessarily accurate]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 BCE</td>
<td>Baekje</td>
<td>Onjo 8</td>
<td>A Malgal army of 3,000 invades and lays siege to Wirye-seong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 BCE</td>
<td>Baekje</td>
<td>Onjo 13</td>
<td>To the east of Baekje is Nangnang: to the north are the Malgal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 CE</td>
<td>Baekje</td>
<td>Onjo 40</td>
<td>The Malgal attack Sulcheon-seong (Yeoju) and Buhyeon-seong (Pyeonggang?), killing more than 100 and pillaging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Baekje</td>
<td>Daru 3</td>
<td>To the west of Masu-san (Geumhwa?) the Dongbu Heur’u wins a victory against the Malgal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Baekje</td>
<td>Daru 4</td>
<td>The Gomok-seong (Yeoncheon?) Gon’u wins a large victory against the Malgal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Baekje</td>
<td>Daru 7</td>
<td>Malgal attack Masu-eong (Geumhwa?) forcing its</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Baekje</td>
<td>Daru 29</td>
<td>Together with the Malgal, Baekje attacks the Khitan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Baekje</td>
<td>Giru 32</td>
<td>Malgal raid the local populous at U'gok.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Silla</td>
<td>Ilseong 4</td>
<td>Malgal attack the region of Jangnyeong burning down 5 defensive structures (방어책).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Baekje</td>
<td>Chogo 45</td>
<td>Malgal attack Sado-seong (Sak’ryeong / eastern Baekje), start a fire and flee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Baekje</td>
<td>Chogo 49</td>
<td>Baekje attacks the Malgal fortress of Seok’mun-seong (?) thereupon the Malgal invade reaching Usulcheon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Baekje</td>
<td>Gusu 3</td>
<td>Malgal lay siege Jeokhyeon-seong fortress but it is well defended so they withdraw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>Baekje</td>
<td>Jinsa 3</td>
<td>Baekje fights a battle against the Malgal at Gwanmireyong, (?) but are unable to win a victory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>Baekje</td>
<td>Jinsa 7</td>
<td>Malgal attack Jeokhyeon-seong on the northern border of Baekje forcing its surrender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>Silla</td>
<td>Naemul 40</td>
<td>In response to a Malgal incursion, Silla sends troops defeating them at Silik plain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>Silla</td>
<td>Jabi 11</td>
<td>Together with the Malgal, Goguryeo attacks Silik-seong fortress (Samcheok) inside the northern border of Silla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>Goguryeo</td>
<td>Jangsu 56</td>
<td>Leading an army of 10,000 Malgal, Goguryeo overthrows Silla’s Silikju-seong fortress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>Silla</td>
<td>Soji 3</td>
<td>Goguryeo and Malgal invade from the north capturing 7 fortresses including Honyeong (Cheongsong).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>482</td>
<td>Baekje</td>
<td>Dongseong 4</td>
<td>Malgal attack Hansan-seong forcing its surrender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Baekje</td>
<td>Munyeong 3</td>
<td>Malgal burn down Masuchaek and overthrew Gomok-seong fortress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>Baekje</td>
<td>Munyeong 6</td>
<td>Malgal attack Gomok-seong killing and capturing more than 600.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>Baekje</td>
<td>Munyeong 7</td>
<td>Baekje prepares against the Malgal with Gomok-seong and Jangnyeong-seong fortresses. The Malgal camp at Hoeng’ak (close to Gwangju in Gyeonggi-do).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>Goguryeo</td>
<td>Munja-myong 16</td>
<td>Planning to attack Baekje’s Han-seong fortress, the Goguryeo army including Malgal camps at Hoeng’ak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>598</td>
<td>Goguryeo</td>
<td>Yeong-yang 9</td>
<td>Leading 10,000 Malgal the Goguryeo king attacks Liaoxi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>Goguryeo</td>
<td>Yeong-yang 23</td>
<td>Joining forces with the Khitan they kill the [Chinese] maritime forces (해군); being close with the Malgal the attack Liaoxi (Sui Emperor Yang’s letter).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>645</td>
<td>Goguryeo</td>
<td>Bojang 4</td>
<td>Tang emperor Taizong attacks Goguryeo and buries 3,300 Malgal alive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654</td>
<td>Goguryeo</td>
<td>Bojang 13</td>
<td>Together with Malgal Goguryeo attacks the Khitan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655</td>
<td>Silla</td>
<td>Muyeol 2</td>
<td>Goguryeo, Baekje and Malgal combine forces and capture 33 Silla fortresses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655</td>
<td>Goguryeo</td>
<td>Bojang 14</td>
<td>Together with Baekje and Malgal, Goguryeo attacks Silla’s northern border and occupies some 33 fortresses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655</td>
<td>Baekje</td>
<td>Wija 15</td>
<td>Together with Goguryeo and the Malgal, Baekje overthrows more than 30 Silla fortresses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661</td>
<td>Silla</td>
<td>Muyeol 8</td>
<td>Together with Malgal general Saenghae, Goguryeo general No’eumsin attack Sulcheon-seong (Yeoju) fortress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the case of the Goguryeo Annal, Kim highlights that aside from the entry for the semi-mythical Jumong, over the course of some two centuries, 468-661, the Malgal appear throughout the Goguryeo territory, forming a core component of its military strength; on these grounds he reasons the Malgal should be considered an integral, if not the main constituent, of Goguryeo, rather than as a subordinate non-Goguryeo element employed only as military mercenaries, as he claims has been the conventional interpretation. (Kim 2012:96)

Kim rejects Mun Ansik’s attempt to distinguish the Malgal appearing in the Baekje Annal as ‘Maek type’ (貊系) and the Silla Annal as ‘Ye type’ (讜系).¹⁶⁰ He further rejects the notion that the central peninsula Malgal were in fact Dong’ye (東讜), citing Jeong Yak-yong’s Malgal-go as an example of this.

[與猶堂全書:疆域考:靺鞨考: “所謂靺鞨即東沃沮之讜人。漢史所謂不耐讜”]

Repeating himself, Kim again notes, in contrast to the multiple references to Malgal, there is only one reference in SS to Goguryeo mobilizing Ye troops and that therefore it is more likely the latter is a mistaken reference for Malgal (SS: 高句麗本紀:陽原王4年). Despite this, Kim is not entirely clear on whether he considers the Ye to be distinct from the peninsula Malgal as he still asserts that Malgal and YeMaek should be considered as the same. (Lee 2012:99)

A final piece of evidence Kim presents is the account in the SY of Silla constructing the nine story pagoda in Hwangnyong-sa temple with each level representing one of the nearby states against which Silla felt threatened, in ascending order: Japan, China, Wuyue (吳越), Tak-ra (托羅), Eung’yu (鷹遊), Malgal, Khitan (丹國), Nüdi (女狄) and YeMaek. Noticeably absent are Baekje and Goguryeo which Kim takes as license to interpret the Eung’yu as Baekje, and

¹⁶⁰ Citing Mun Ansik 문안식. 2003 한국고대사와 말갈 (‘Ancient Korean history and the Malgal’) 해양.
both the Malgal and YeMaek as Goguryeo. (Kim 2012:100-1)

※ One issue with this SY passage is that it is dated to 533, some twenty years before the construction of Hwangnyeong-sa even began, though in any event it was completed in 645 before the overthrow of Baekje and Goguryeo.

[三國遺事·巻第三·塔像第四·皇龍寺九層塔：“又海東名賢安弘撰東都成立記云，新羅第二十七代，女王主，雖有道無戒，九韓伎勞，若龍宮南皇龍寺建九層塔，則隋國之災可鎮，第一層日本、第二層中華、第三層吳越、第四層托羅，第五層鷄遊，第六層臘臘，第七層丹國，第八層女狄，第九層矮師．”]

11. Long range migration

Kim incorporates his relatively conservative conceptualization of the Oj state proper into his much wider pan-Altai (i.e. non-Sinic) *Jūsin migration hypothesis previously presented in his two volume popular ‘ethnic origins’ work Dae-Jyusin-eul ch’aj’a-seo (대주신을 찾아서 ‘In search of the great Jūsin’ volumes 1 and 2, 2006). The core premise of this is an original eastward migration of the proto-Dongyi/Oj ancestors starting from the actual Altai mountains – speaking *proto-Altai – and dividing into two main routes at a point southwest of Lake Baikal, one continuing across Mongolia (the *Gaoli route), the other down into central China (C7th BCE) and back up again (the *Jūsin route – identified in Chinese sources as the Maek 貓); these meet together again in Manchuria c.C3rd BCE. The route terms themselves *Gaoli and *Jūsin are only introduced in Kim (2012); previously he had suggested that the *Jūsin ethnicity (역사 공동체) was formed as a consequence of the fusion. (Kim 2006 vol.1:160)

※ There is also some discrepancy in the geographic location of the *Gaoli–*Jūsin meeting point. In Kim (2006) he suggests it to be on the Songhua river, in Kim (2012:234) he places it on the Liao-he river (i.e. the Oj homeland), although the map he uses shows it still to be the region of the unmarked Songhua. (Kim 2012:224)

The following translated passage describing migratory Korean ethnogenensis is from the more recent work.

"In the first half of 2000, Professor Go Gi-seok of the anatomy department of Konkuk University presented research results [concluding], "The people who bear most similarity to Koreans are Kazakhs" [source unreferenced]. Although these results are extremely important there was no [further] discussion. The structure of human craniums are not only an important object [of study] for the purpose of distinguishing human origins and whether they are the same relation [to one another] but also, they do not easily change according to period. [There are] more than sixty research items related to the structure of craniums: for example,
[researching] the suture lines (봉합선) can indicate the presence or not of a hole at the joining part, and amongst Koreans it comes out at 75% [having a hole].

Taking into account this research, the closest peoples to Koreans come out as Kazakhs (of Kazakhstan), Mongols, Buryat (Mongols residing in the region of Lake Baikal) etc. As a branch of the Turks and physically as Mongols (몽골인), the Kazakh people reside in Altai, Kazakhstan and western China; the Buryat are also a part of [the] Mongols and ultimately, from a large perspective, appear [in research results] as Mongols. As for the region which actually has the closest impression (인상) on modern Koreans [in being closest to themselves], as Kazakhs of the central eastern region (or Kyrgyzs) the people of ᄭlifetime Jüz are archetypal Mongols. Consequently, Mongol Kazakhs are, overall, the closest thing to Koreans....

Thus the origin of Koreans we are able to trace through written and medical [evidence] goes back to Altai. That is to say, Altai appears to be the central region from which the history of Koreans began. Broadly speaking, they are thought to have entered [the Korean peninsula] either through a route across the grass plains from Altai (the Gaoli 캐오리 route), 'Mongolia - eastern Mongolia - Amur River - northern Manchuria - Yalu River - Korean peninsula,' or from Altai across northern China (the Jüsın 주신 route), 'Shandong - Beijing region - Liaodong peninsula - Yalu River - Korean peninsula.' Here, the southern lineage (남방계) [of Korean ancestry] (the Wa route) is thought to have entered the Korean peninsula travelling via 'southern India - southeastern Asia - Southeast China Sea - Liaodong Peninsula.' The Gaoli [people] subsequently continuously revived and resurrected [themselves in] 'northern Manchuria ([as] Buyeo) - southern Manchuria and the northern Korean peninsula ([as] Goguryeo, Balhae) - the central Korean peninsula ([as] Goryeo),' Consequently, the Gaoli who were the root of Buyeo can be classified as 'Proto-Korea' (?-3rd century BC?): the Gaoli of Go Jumong (Goguryeo, Goryeo, and Guryeo) as 'Old Korea' (1st century BC?-668AD); Balhae established by Dae Jo-yeong (大祚聰) as 'Great Korea' (689-926) and medieval Goryeo established by Wang Geon (王建) as 'Medieval Korea' (918-1392). This nomenclature can be transcribed in international languages as Korea (코리아), Corée (프레), Корей (카레이) etc.

Alongside ᄄ (Beijing and Liao River region), Proto Korea (原始 코리아) can be said to have been the closest country to Koreans' original form (원형). [Coming across] from Altai, Baikal and Mongolia, it is thought that one
group of Koreans came south to Chang’an (長安 [modern Xi’an]) and Luoyang (洛陽) before going north again from the vicinity of Beijing (the Jūsin route), whilst another group crossed Mongolia and the Greater Khingan mountains (大興安嶺), and came south through Manchuria via the Amur River (the Gaoli route): under pressure from the Chinese Han, the place where these [two groups] met again was ironically the Liao River region. Of course, even before pressure from the Han, the Liao River region was one of the places where they were already concentrated. However, the Liao River region is thought to be the place where the cultural territories of the Gaoli state (가오리국) and Old Joseon overlapped, and is precisely the centre of the Hongshan culture (紅山文化) which today has become the subject of great interest.” (Kim 2012:231-3)

* This interpretation of western Manchuria being a great meeting point is again reminiscent to Choe’s ManMong thesis.

12. *Hongshan = Asadal = Joseon*

Despite rejecting the historicity of the SY Dangun myth, Kim posits that the name of the first OJ capital, Asadal (阿斯達) may have been the original name of the state with the meaning *asa* ‘morning/bright’ – *dal* ‘mountain,’ and that ‘Joseon’ is consequently a semantic rendering of *asa*. Premising an *Altaic* etymology, referencing the omnicomparative Starostin Database, Kim asserts that the name of the modern Kazakhstan capital, Astana, is also cognate, thus supporting the close Korean–Kazakhstan capital, Astana, is also cognate, thus supporting the close Korean–Kazakhstan ethnic claim above. (Kim 2012:156) He at once posits that Mongol Burkhan-san (불칸산/부르칸산/부르항산) carries a meaning of ‘red mountain’ phonetically cognate to Korean *bulg’eun-san* (불은산) and semantically rendered into Chinese as 'Hongshan' (紅山), 'Chishan' (赤山) or 'Chifeng' (赤峰); with the meaning of the ‘red glow of the morning sun’. Burkhan-san and Hongshan are similar semantic cognates to *Asadal*, and ultimately all are semantically cognate to *Altai* with the meaning ‘gold’ which he again interprets as evoking the brightness of the sun. (Kim 2012:156-8)

* In this pseudolinguistic manner he seeks to associate the arbitrarily named archaeological neolithic culture of Hongshan with a hypothesis of sacred mountains closely reminiscent to Choe Namseon’s *Bulham* culture hypothesis.

To complete the omnicomparison the concept of 'bright mountain' is naturally extended also to include Taebaek-san (太白山 ‘great white mountain’) which he designates the 'second birthplace' of the non–Sinic *Jūsin* after the original Altai mountains.

"Concerning holy mountains (聖山) the strongest object of worship is the
second birth place of the pan-Korean people (범한국인의 제2발상지).

Taebaek-san (太白山 [also known as] Changbaishan 長白山 and Baekdusan 白頭山). Here we can confirm a common identity with no distinction between YeMaek, Suksin or Dongho. According to the history of the Jin dynasty [i.e. the jinshi 金史], which was [ethnically] Suksin, Changbai mountain was revered (_Height) as the 'land where kings arise' (興王之地), enfeoffed as king, and an ancestral shrine built on it whilst the Liao dynasty, which was [ethnically] Dongho, made the mountain the protective god of the imperial family (皇室).\(^\text{161}\) That is to say, Taebaek-san (Baekdu-san) was the holy mountain of the Mongols who established the Liao dynasty and Manchus who established the Jin (金) - i.e. the people who Koreans [collectively] refer to as Dongyi (東夷族) - and of course [it was also the holy mountain] of the Koreans: this is the second birthplace of the Dongyi.


In conclusion, the name 'Joseon' appears to be derived from such names as Suksin, Jusin (주신), Asadal and Astara (아스타라 {<Asadal}) and its meaning can be viewed as 'mountain cradling the sun' or 'shining mountain (red shining mountain).' Further, this name 'Joseon' stores the belief in Altai mountain worship of northern nomads." (Kim 2012:161)

13. The meaning(s) of *Gaoli/Goryeo/Korea

Kim speculates on two broad meanings of the term *Gaoli which he ultimately tries to tie together.

The first immediate meaning he suggests is gol/hol 'valley' (골/홀) and by extension of valleys being places of settlement, 'village'. Thus it is cognate to Korean golliagi (골까기 'valley') and the term Guru (溝壑) recorded in SGZ as the Guryeo term for 'fortress'.

[三國志:魏書三十:高句麗傳: "後稍騷逸, 不復治郡, 於東界築小城, 置朝服衣幃其中, 歲時來取之, 今胡猶名此城為橫溝溝, 溝溝者, 句麗名城也"]

He suggests that *Altai cognates to gol/hol may be found in Mongol khori (금호


리) and Japanese *koori* with meanings of 'country/village'. Citing Yang Minjong of Busan University, he further asserts that the second syllable of (Lake) Baikal is also cognate.162

By extension he also suggests *Gaoli* to carry the meaning of 'all' cognate to *gyeore* (거래 ['Korean] people/ethnic'). (Kim 2012:238-40)

The second semantic field he posits is relating to metal with an immediate look-alike cognate in *guri* (銅 'copper'). This notion he tries to correlate with the legendary figure of Chi’u (蚩尤 Ch. Chiyou) described in the Shiji annotations as having a copper head and iron forehead, and being the lord of the 'Guryeo' (九黎 Ch. Jiuli) people. (Kim 2012:243)

[史記:五帝本紀： "軒轅之時... 而蚩尤最為暴，莫能伐。【集解】應劭曰： "蚩尤，古天子。", 管子： "孔子三朝紀曰蚩尤，庶人之貪者。" 諸侯相侵伐，蚩尤最受暴。, 芑代之王為天子也。] 蔡子曰： "蚩尤受盧山之金而作五兵。, 明非庶人，蓋諸侯號也。劉向別錄 云 "孔子見魯哀公問政，比三朝，退而為此記，故曰三朝，凡七篇，並入大戴記。" 今此注見用兵篇也。【正義】龍魚河圖云： "黃帝攝政，有蚩尤兄弟八十一人，並執兵人語，銅頭鐵顔，食沙石子...孔安國曰 "九黎君號蚩尤是也"]

Kim broadens the discussion highlighting how amongst Buryat Mongols, blacksmiths are held in nearly as high a regard as shamans and that their function as workers of earth and fire was originally closely overlapping to that of shamans.

Three additional meanings he suggests are 'sky', 'the cawing sound of a crow' and 'deer'. Concerning 'sky' he highlights the notion of sun worship and posits the following two pseudo etymologies for 'Goryeo' and 'Buyeo.' (Kim 2012:245)

Goryeo < Go (高 ‘sky’ or ‘sun’) + ryeo (黎 ‘group/people’)
Buyeo < Bul (‘sun’) + yeo (黎 ‘group/people’)

For 'crow' he highlights their mythical function amongst northeast Asian peoples symbolizing the sun and asserts the following *Altaic cognates for 'crow'* as: *Altaic* garo (가로), Manchu/Tungus gori (꼬리), Mongol georyeo (거려) and *Old Korean* gal (갈). He also asserts that the birds represented on 'Manchu’ sotdae (송대) poles are crows. (Kim 2012:246).

The final etymology of ‘deer’ he takes from the exonymic term for the 'Koryak' people but laments there are no early records to substantiate it. (Kim 2012:247)

※ Here it could be said he misses a potential trick with the C11th *Zizhi-tongjian* (自治通鑑) recording the original Buyeo homeland as 'deer mountain'. (自治通鑑: "初夫餘居鹿山...").163

14. Jūsin metallurgy

Reminiscent to Choe Namson’s mention of iron in ManMong-munhwahwa, Kim argues that the Jūsin had advanced Scythian iron technology before the Chinese who possessed only a very primitive iron, and that iron weapons were only transmitted to China via Yan after they had expanded into the former Jūsin territory of modern Liaodong during the Warring States period. (Kim 2006:vol1:393-4)

Kim posits that one of four etymologies for 'Maek' (鎚) and/or 'Ye' (鈷) is 'iron' soe (쇠). He derives this from the Chinese pronunciation of 'Maek' as [mó < *hào or *hê ] and 'Ye' as huò or hui, which he then combines with the unreferenced premise that in *Altaic /h/ can alternate with /s/, thus resulting in *sai (소 endorse). *soe (쇠) or *seo (서). The other three cognate etymologies he posits are 'bird' sae (새), 'east' from 'east wind' sae-param (새파람 [새파람]) and 'sun' hae (해). (Kim 2012:91)

Alongside Maek/Ye 'iron' and *Gaoli 'copper', Kim cites Altai researcher Bak Sin-in (1994) in asserting that the later historical Jūsin polities of the Khitan, Jin (金), Mongols, and Qing (as 'Later Jin' 後金) all had metallurgic appellations: Khitan *'iron' (賓鐵), Jin 'gold', and Mongol 'silver'. (Kim 2006:vol1:97 and 399)

Kim finishes the first volume of Dae-Jyusin-eul chaj’a-seo ('In search of the great Jūsin') with the claim that the 'morning sun' and 'iron' were the two representative "totems" of the Jūsin peoples. (Kim 2006:vol1:399) In Kim (2012) he modifies this to the following formula.

"[•]Gaoli can be thought (추정) to have the meanings of 'village' (고을), 'cave' (굴), 'country' (나라), 'bronze' (구리), 'crow' (까마귀), and 'celestial descendent' (天孫族), but within these variations, there is no fundamental difference in the [underlying notion of] 'a country of celestial descendants who worship the sun.' Ultimately, however one interprets *Gaoli, the meanings converge as 'a sparkling minjok skilful at metalworking who worship the sun (sky).’" (Kim 2012:247)

15. Historical geography of Oj

15.1 Yeol-su 沛水/列水

Citing North Korean scholar Ri Jirin (1963) who Kim describes as the "representative modern historian of ancient history," Kim identifies the Yeol-su river as either the modern Luan-he or a tributary such as the Wulieshui (武列

15.2 Pae-su 漱水

Kim discusses the various theories on locating the Pae-su river, however, in parsing the sources references to the river itself prove to be inconclusive and it is rather through the identification of historical Loufang-xian (樓方縣) and Xiandu-xian (險渡縣 K. Heomdok-hyeon) counties that he concludes the Pae-su to be either the modern Luan-he or the Daling-he. (Kim 2012:206)

Kim attributes the premodern association of the Pae-su with the Daedong-gang both to the SS but primarily to Li Daoyuan’s (酈道元) Shuijing-zhu. The original Shuijing passage states that the Paesu flowed southeast and east into the sea, eliminating the possibility of it being the Daedong-gang or Yalu rivers. However, according to Kim, Li Daoyuan rejected this arguing that if the river flowed east there would have been no reason for Wi Man to have crossed it.

※ The actual Shuijing-zhu passage Kim is referring to makes little sense, however, as it states that Wi Man originally went west from the Pae-su to reach Joseon and concludes that the Pae-su flows northwards!

水). This is based on equating the Shishui (瀬水 K. Seup-su) - originally mentioned in Shiji as one of Joseon’s three rivers - to the Shiyushui (瀬餘水 K. Heub’yeo-su) mentioned in the Shuijing-zhu (水經注). Kim and Ri then claim that according to the Shuijing-zhu the Heub’yeo-su joins with the Ruishui (瀬水 K. Yu-su) which is another name for the Luan.165 (Kim 2012:88)

※ Unfortunately the Shuijing-zhu 'Ruishui' section referenced by Kim (水經注:瀬水) does not contain any reference to the Shiyushui, and nor does the 'Shiyushi' section mention the Ruishui. The Shiji attestation of Shishui, meanwhile is from the later jijie (c.425) commentary.

[Shiji 朝鮮列傳第五十五： "[集解]張晏曰：朝鮮有瀬水、淒水、汕水，三水合為泗水，疑樂浪、朝鮮取名於此也."]

[水經："水出貝水出緣浪鎭方縣。東南，過於臨水貝縣。東，入於海。"]

水經注·卷十四·瀬水： "瀬水出緣浪鎭方縣，東南過臨水縣，東入於海

《十三州志》曰：瀬水在緣浪東北，鎭方縣在郡東。蓋出其縣南逹鎭方也。昔燕人衛滿自瀬水西至朝鮮，朝鮮，故箕子國也。箕子教民以義，田織信厚，約以八法，而不知禁，遂成禮俗。燕國時，滿乃王之，都王險域，地方數千里，至其孫右渠，漢武帝元封二年，遣樓船將軍楊僑、左將軍荀彘討右渠，破孫於瀬水，遂滅之。若瀬水東流，無漢瀬之理，其地今高句

165) Citing Ri Jirin 리진 1963 Gojoseon-e gwan-han toron nonmun-jip 고조선에 관한 도론 논문집 「고조선의 위치에 대하여」과학원 출판사 24-7쪽 - Kim 2012:255n119. It is interesting to note that in Kim 2012 he spells Ri Jirin’s surname according to South Korean convention as Lee 이 and omits mention that he is/was a North Korean scholar: by contrast in Kim 2006, he uses the North Korean spelling Ri 리 and acknowledges him as such (Kim 2006vol1:157).
麗之國治，余訪番使，言城在瀍水之陽。其水西流遙故宋漢朝鮮縣，即漢漢郡治，漢武帝置，而西北流”]

The original Shuijing passage also states that the source of the Paesu is Loufang-xian county of Lelang (遼方縣). Citing the Liaoshi, Kim identifies Loufang as Zimeng-xian (紫蒙縣). He further cites both: a jinshu passage associating Zimeng-xian with the Donghu (東胡), and Gu Yanwu’s (顧炎武 1613-82) Yingping-erzhouji (營平二州記) - itself referencing the Xin-Tangshu (新唐書) - locating Zimeng-xian in Pingzhou (平州) together with Changli (昌黎).

※ The same Yingping-erzhouji passage also quotes the previous Jinshu reference so it is unclear why in the latter case Kim chooses to quote from it rather than the original Xin-Tangshu. (Kim 2012:273n313)

[Liaoshi 遼史:卷三十八志第八:地理志二·東京道:“紫蒙縣，本漢遼方縣地，後領涿郡置東平府，領蒙州紫蒙縣，後徙遼城，並入高嶺縣，渤海後為紫蒙縣。戶一千”

Jinshu 晉書:載記第八:“慕容廆，字弈洛瑰，昌黎棘城鮮卑人也。其先有燕氏之苗裔，世居北夷，邑於紫蒙之野，號曰東胡。其後與匈奴並盛，控弦之士二十餘萬，風俗習號與匈奴略同。秦漢之際為匈奴所敗，分保鮮卑山，因以為號。曾祖慕容廆，魏初率其部入居遼西，從宣帝伐公孫氏有功，拜率義王，始建國於棘城之北，時燕代多冠步搖冠，莫護見而好之，乃敘髮裹冠，諸部因呼之為步搖，其後音訛，遂為慕容焉。或云慕容之德，繼三光之容，遂以慕容為氏。祖木延，左賢王。父涉歸，以全柳城之功，進拜鮮卑單于，遷邑於遼東北，於是漸慕諸夏之風矣”

Xin-Tangshu 新唐書:志第二十九地理三:“平州北平郡，有溫溝、白望、西狭石、東狭石、綠疇、米磚、長楊、黃花、紫蒙、白狼、昌黎”]

In a separate line of argumentation against the Daedong-gang or Yalu rivers, Kim cites the Shanhaijing describing the ‘Baesu’ (濊水) having its source in a desert like region and flowing south into ‘Lietu’ (列塡) which he interprets as referring to a region of mudflats. (Kim 2012:200-1)

※ Whilst he acknowledges both that Shanhaijing is not necessarily reliable and the variant character used in the hydronym, Kim omits the more problematic fact that the quoted passage appears in the chapter on the south (南山經) of ancient China and not the north or east which the book separately contains.

山海経:南山經:“又東五百里，曰夷山，無草木，多沙石，溴水出焉，而南流注于列塡”

In addition to the Loufang-xian (遼方縣) line of enquiry, Kim ultimately locates the region of the Paesu through the historical geography of Xiandu-xian (陝陵縣) associated with Lelang-jun and Wanggehom-seong found in the Shiji, Hanshu and their annotations, in a manner similar to, though less sophisticated than Yun Naehyeon. (Kim 2012:205)
15.3 Wanggeom-seong - additional evidence?
Kim locates Wanggeom-seong somewhere between the modern Dalinghe and Liao rivers. (Kim 2012:218) He uses the same line of deduction based on locating Xiandu-xian and Changli (昌黎) "in the vicinity of Beijing" à la Yun - although without reference to Jieshi-shan - but adds to it evidence from the *Jinshu* describing a place or region called Pingguo (平郭) as being to the east of Xiandu.
Cross referencing with the earlier *Hanshu*, he identifies Pingguo as having belonged to the Liaodong-jun commandery, a region of which would subsequently become Xiangping (襄平), modern Liaoyang (遼陽), just east of the Liaohе. Thus he suggests the Liaohe as the eastern limit.

[Jinshu] 晉書·載記第十九·慕容廆： "初，廆庶兄建威翰駙武有雄才，素為廆所忌，母弟征虜仁、廣武昭並有寵于廆，廆亦不平之。及廆卒，並懼不自容。至此，翰出奔段遼，仁勸昭舉兵廢廆。廆殺昭，遣使按検仁之虛實，遇仁於險慟。仁知事發，殺廆使，東歸平郭。廆遣其弟建武幼、司馬休壽等討之。仁盡力拒難，幼等大敗，皆沒於仁"]

※ Two flaws with this argument are: firstly, that the Dalinghe is not at all in the vicinity of Beijing, and secondly the passage he attributes to the *Hanshu* 'geography treatise' does not appear in any database searches of the *Hanshu* or other histories.

“平郭縣屬遼東郡，晉省。晉東夷校尉治襄平，崔毖之敗，慕容廆以屯鎭遼東，治平郭。” (Kim 2012:278n365)

16. Silla and Gaya ethnic connections to the Xiongnu
Returning to his earlier work, as part of his long-range *jūsin* hypothesis, Kim posits that the elite Kim clans of Silla and Gaya were direct ethnic descendents of the continental Xiongnu, and thus constituted a lineage originally distinct from and less Sinicized than that of Ol-Buyeo-Goguryeo-Baekje (Kim 2006vol2:329). To support this, he attempts to combine two main lines of argument: one explicating an apparent claim made in the C7th stele inscription from Silla king Munmu’s tomb, that 13th Silla monarch, Michu Isageum (米菊尼師今 gota 262~84), was the seventh generation descendent of ethnic Xiongnu Jin Ridi (金日磾166) 134~86 BCE K. Kim Ijie), and matching this to rationalized interpretations of the Silla foundation myths of Bak Hyeokgeose and Kim Alji: the other a 'horserider' theory emphasizing the similarity of C4th Silla-Gaya material culture - gold crowns and tomb construction - to pan-Altaic nomadic cultures. Obviously there is an issue with dating so Kim posits two principal stages of migration combined with a gradual gestation period of the incoming peninsula Xiongnu - and subsequent Xianbei - elite.

166) It has become convention to pronounce the name in Chinese as Jin Midi (金日磾) but there is no evidence this is an authentic tradition older than post-Tang, and both Korean and Japanese pronounce the 夷 character with standard Sino-Korean and Sino-Japanese readings.
16.1 Jin Ridi as ancestor to the Gyeongju and Gimhae Kim clans

Kim’s starting premise is to take literally the apparent claim inferred from the Munmu tomb stele inscription fragment (文武王陵碑) first discovered and attested in 1796 and rediscovered 1961167) identifying Jin Ridi by his appellation of ‘Lord Du’ (紇侯 attested in HANSHU) as a 7th generation ancestor (“紇侯祭天之胤傳七葉” - {or perhaps alternatively that Ridi was himself a 7th generation descendant of heaven}). (Kim 2006vol2:349) Kim interprets Ridi as the 7th generation ancestor to Michu Isageum, Silla’s 13th monarch and first ruler from the emergent Kim clan. (Kim 2006vol2:355)

Jin Ridi’s biography is recorded in the HANSHU (漢書:霍光金日磾傳). According to Kim Unhoe’s interpretation, the relevant points are: he was a Xiongnu prince; his mother was named ‘Yanshi’ (闋氏); after his father, King Xiutu (休屠王 - or the xiutu king), was killed Ridi was taken prisoner by Han China together with his mother and brother: Ridi became a favourite of Han emperor Wu and was consequently bestowed the title of ‘Lord Du’ (紇侯): he was also given the surname Jin (金 K. Kim 'gold') on account that Xiutu used to make 'gold people' (金人) to sacrifice to heaven. According to Kim, both Ridi’s great-grandson, Jin Dang (金當) and Dang’s son, *Jin Xing (金星), were also granted the title of Lord Du. (Kim 2006vol2:351-2)

※ Before going further several potential weaknesses should be highlighted. Kim treats ‘Yanshi’ 闋氏 as a personal name but it appears rather to have been a Xiongnu title (the same is true of Xiutu 休屠 but not directly relevant here). The personage of *Jin Xing (金星) does not appear in the Jin Ridi biography as Kim claims: it is too generic to identify in database searches but in any event does not appear to show up in any combined searches with duhou (紇侯).168

In the same context as 'Lord Du,' the Munmu stele lists five other legendary figures as ancestors: coming before Jin Ridi are Huoguan-zhi-hou (火官之后), Qin Ba (秦伯) and Paijing-jinshi (派鯨津氏): coming after are Jia Zhumeng (駕朱蒙) and Xing Han-wang (星漢王). Kim cites Kim Daeseong (1999) in attributing dates and identifying them with the following historical personages.169

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Huoguan-zhi-hou (火官之后)</th>
<th>2300 BCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qin Ba (秦伯)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qin duke Mu (秦穆公)</td>
<td>c.650 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20th generation descendent to Qin emperor Shi Huang)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paijing-jinshi (派鯨津氏)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xuantu king</td>
<td>c.200 BCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

168) Seo 2011:94 makes it more explicit that *Jin Xing (金星) is an unattested interpretation of Xin Han-wang (星漢王).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lord Du (竇侯)</td>
<td>c.100 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jia Zhumeng (駕朱蒙)</td>
<td>c.50 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xing Han-wang (星漢王)</td>
<td>c.20 CE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The key identification is - without any supporting evidence - in correlating Xing Han-wang to •Jin Xing and in turn to Silla Kim clan progenitor Kim Alji (金閏智). The only immediate 'evidence' for the latter connection is the surname Jin/Kim and the similarity between Alji (閏智) and Ridi's mother's name/title of Yanshi (閏氏) which Kim proposes should be read also as a phonetic rendering of •Alji. (Kim 2006vol6:353) Kim inevitably posits that the name Alji can be derived from the •Altaic word for gold (알트, 알타이 > 아르치 > 알지). (Kim 2006vol6:355)

As an explanation for the hypothesized migration to the southeast of the Korean peninsula, Kim suggests that the Jin clan was forced into exodus from China in the wake of Wang Mang's (王莽) brief usurpation as they had become related to his family with Jin Dang (金當) having married Wang Mang's aunt. (Kim 2006vol2:353 - Seo 2011:126 identifies the aunt as Empress Xiaoyuan (孝元皇后) but then revises this with his own hypothesis.)

He posits then that the Silla Kim clan progenitor myth of Kim Alji recorded in the SS can be given a rationalized interpretation of •Jin Xing arriving in Silla with a golden chest of the likes that had not before been seen there. Kim argues the basic elements of the myth - gold, •birch trees (associated with shamanism) and birds - are all strongly 'Altaic'. (Kim 2006vol2:354-6)

※ This interpretation, however, ignores that in the story: the horse belongs to the local native king, the forest is not specified as birch and the type of bird after which the country is renamed 'Gyerim' (鶉林) is explicitly a chicken which, being unable to 'fly to heaven' is arguably the least 'Altaic' bird.

[SS 三國史記:新羅本紀:脫解尼師今: "九年, 春三月, 王夜聞金城西始林樹間有鶉鳴聲. 道明遣孤公親之. 有金色小煩掛樹枝, 白鶉鳴於其下. 孤公還告. 王使人取煩開之. 有小男兒在其中, 姿容奇偉, 上喜謂左右曰. 此豈非天遺我以令胤平, 乃收養之, 及長, 聰明多智, 乃名閏智. 以其出於金煩, 姓金氏, 改始林名煩林, 因以爲國號"]

Either muddling or ignoring the detail that it is the chicken which is described as white, and not the trees, Kim suggests the etymology for the Japanese name of Silla, 'Shiragi', as possessing the meaning 'white tree' (白木) alluding to silver birch trees which are not found on the peninsula but are native to the northern regions of the Altaic peoples. (Kim 2006vol2:355)

※ He actually suggests, paradoxically, that birch trees grow on the northern steppe! Albeit from a later period, a 'Silla birch' connection he overlooks is that the picture of the 'celestial horse' (天馬圖) in Cheonna-chong tomb of King Jijeung (智證王 r.500-14 - 天馬塚) is painted onto a birch bark horse trapping.
He makes a similar argument for the initial Silla progenitor myth of Bak Hyeokgeose highlighting the horse, egg and birch tree as indicative of a northern origin. (Kim 2006vol2:329-30)

* Again, in the SS no birch tree is mentioned.

Kim adopts the SS description of Silla’s origins, that the proceeding population of the Korean southeast, represented in the SS as the Six Villages or Bu (部) of Jinhan (辰韓), were primarily composed of OJ refugees and thus of a similar lineage to Goguryeo and Baekje: consequently he proposes that Silla was formed by a Xiongnu elite over an OJ substrate. (Kim 2006vol2:358 and 363)

At the same time he acknowledges the references in SGZ, HHS and SS also to C3rd Qin (秦) refugees entering Jinhan (辰韓). Whilst not rejecting this migration, he points out that it would have been both earlier and unrelated to the Kim Alji migration, and emphasizes the Shiji referring to Qin as non-Sinic 'barbarians.' (Kim 2006vol2:360)

[史記:秦本紀: "楚自漢中, 南有巴、黔中。周室微, 諸侯力政, 爭相併, 秦僻在雍州, 不與中國諸侯之會盟, 夷翟遇之。"]

Whilst discounting the impact of Qin refugees, he highlights that there may have been an earlier relationship between the Xiongnu and Qin, and alludes to an unreferenced hypothesis that Qin Shi Huang's son, Fusu (扶蘇), may have been the Xuantu king. More significantly he asserts that both Qin and Silla, as well as also Geumgwan Gaya, all claimed the mythical Shaohao Jintianshi (少昊金天氏) as their ancestor. In addition to sharing the same royal clan name, Kim, it is on this basis that Kim asserts the shared ancestry of Silla and Gaya. (Kim 2006vol2:361)

[Silla - SS 百濟本紀:義慈王: "論曰, 新羅古事云, 天降金樓, 故姓金氏, 其言可信而不可信, 臣修史, 以其傳之舊, 不得刪落其辭, 然而又聞, 新羅人自以少昊金天氏之後, 故姓金氏"]

Gaya - SS 列傳:金庚信上: "羅人自謂少昊金天氏之後, 故姓庚信信碑亦云, 軒轅之裔, 少昊之胤, 則南加耶始祖聖露與新羅同姓也"]

* The passage Kim attributes for Qin’s claim to Shaohao he says is in the Chunqi-zuozhuang (春秋左傳) but again, appears not to exist.

Citing the Shanhaijing Kim claims that Shaohao’s domain is described as being beyond the east sea and *“governed by all kinds of birds” which he uses to explain the egg motif being common to "most Jüsin progenitor myths." (Kim 2006vol2:361)

* Again, the Shanhaijing bird reference appears not to exist.

[西山經: "又西二百里，曰長留之山，其神白帝少昊居之，其獸皆文尾，其鳥皆文首。是多文玉石。實惟員神魄氏之宮。是神也，主司反景"]

411
In terms of physical evidence for the early northern origin of the southeast peninsula, Kim alludes to an unreferenced paper given by metallurgist Bak Jangsik in 2000 at a commemorative conference for the 1973-5 excavation of Hwangnam-daechong tomb (皇南大墳). According to Kim, Bak claims that there were broadly two methods of producing iron, the 'European' type cast iron and 'Chinese' type wrought iron: uniquely both occur on the peninsula: Silla iron is of the European type, whilst Baekje is of the Chinese. Goguryeo is not mentioned. (Kim 2006vol2:363)

Separately, Kim cites Lee Jongho (2003) in turn referencing a 1995 German documentary "Todesreiter aus der Steppe - Die Hunnen stürmen Europa" by filmmaker Jens-Peter Behrend and academic Eike Schmitz, arguing that the C4th European Hun were Xiongnu closely related to Koreans. One piece of evidence they suggest are Hun/Xiongnu type bronze cauldrons which they compare to similar examples found in Kaya as well as the cauldron shaped funnel on the back of the well known Silla earthenware horserider figurines.170) (Kim 2006vol2:348)

Finally, a shared Xiongnu-Silla-Gaya cultural practice Kim seeks to highlight is cranial deformation which, citing Kim Jeongbae (1970), he claims is a nomadic custom.171) From the Korean side he presents four strands of evidence: SGZ record explicitly describing the practice amongst the people of Jinhan to achieve narrow heads termed pyeondu (備頭): the narrow shape of the heads of the same Silla horserider figurines: the small size of the Silla gold crowns: and finally a supposed reference to pyeondu (備頭) on the 924 Jieung-daesa stele inscription at Bong'amu-sa temple (鳳巖寺 智証大師塔碑) composed by Choe Chiwon. (Kim 2006vol2:364-5)

[三國志:魏書三十·弁辰傳: "兒生, 便以石壓其頭, 欲其福。今辰韓人皆備頭"
鳳巖寺 智証大師塔碑: "隱上古之化, 加以姓, 勝釋種, 遍頭, 居 rencontrer之尊..."]

※ SGZ account specifically refers to Jinhan rather than Silla and so would contradict the chronology of his broader hypothesis.
※ The Jieung-daesa inscription, meanwhile, is cited out of context and the term pyeondu (備頭) is conventionally interpreted to refer to Buddhist tonsuring.

17. 4th century horseriders

Kim’s hypothesis of a second Altaic influx into the Silla-Gaya region primarily focuses on the appearance of the gold crowns in Silla and Gaya tombs. Kim contrasts the statement in SGZ ‘[Sam]Han’ account that the people did not value gold, silver or silk to a passage in the _Nihon-shoki_ purportedly describing the subsequent state of Silla as dazzling with gold and silver.\(^{172}\) (Kim 2006vol2:334)

* Although not entirely detracting from his point, it should be noted that the context of SGZ passage is more specifically referring to Mahan rather than Jinhan or Byeonhan.

\[SGZ 三國志·魏書三十·韓傳: “不以金銀錦繡為珍”\]

\[ _{Nihon-shoki} 日本書紀卷第八·足仲彦天皇·仲哀天皇: “愈茲國而有寶國、皆知處女之暇、有向津國廕、此云難用弭枌、眼炎之金・銀・彩色、多在其國、是謂桴衾新羅國焉”\]

Kim references Jo Yujin and Lee Gihwan (2004) with the assertion that Silla gold crowns broadly correlate to the period of Marippgan (麁立干) which, according to SS dating, occurs between the 18th and 22nd monarcks. 417–514 (and according to SY beginning with the previous 17th monarch of Naemul 奈勿 r.356–402).\(^{173}\) He also notes that this same period roughly correlates to the Xianbei Northern Wei (北魏 386–543) who, together with Goguryeo would have facilitated contact and transit with the steppe. (Kim 2006vol2:357)

Kim acknowledges that, as attested on the Gwanggaeto Stele, during at least the C4th Silla had a close relationship to Goguryeo, but whilst Silla might have received some political influence, he argues its gold culture was both more advanced and more Altaic than Goguryeo. (Kim 2006vol2:335)

Comparing the Silla crowns to those of Sarmatia (c.0 CE) and Afghanistan (c.C1st–2nd), Kim highlights the iconographic features of *birch tree, deer and antlers, and birds which he asserts to be indicative of a northern Altaic origin.

* It should be noted that the central Asian Scythian culture is not related to the hypothesized Altaic culture in the ethno-linguistic sense.

* Based as it is on preexisting popular and academic theories, this comparative analysis of the crowns is largely similar to a more scholarly treatment by Joo Kyeongmi (2013) in the _Early Korea Project_ series the only minor difference being that she avoids the term ‘Altaic’ referring instead to a less ethno-specific

---

\(^{172}\) This and further references are independently highlighted by Joo Kyeongmi (2013) "The Gold Jewelry of Ancient Silla: Syncretism of Northern and Southern Asian Cultures" in Kim Youn-mi ed. 2013:246.

"northern Eurasian nomadic culture" whilst maintaining an explicit connection to the Xianbei.\(^{174}\) (Joo in Kim Youn-mi ed. 2013:257 and 269)


**However, whilst the discussion of gold crowns is near identical, it should be noted that in contrast to Kim, Joo also posits the influence of 'South Asian maritime cultures' for the thick-type Silla gold earrings and examples of turtle iconography including on a gilt-bronze horse trapping from the same Cheonma-chong tomb. (Joo in Kim Youn-mi ed. 2013:295 and 298)**

Kim notes that Silla 'stone piled wooden coffin' type tombs (積石木槨墳) such as Cheonma-chong (天馬冢) of Michu Isageum (味釗尼師今 r.262–84), as well as Hwangnam-daechong (皇南大墳) resemble Xiongnu style tombs and that it has been exclusively from this type of tomb that the 'pure gold' crowns have been discovered. (Kim 2006vol2:347) Additionally it is only from these C4-5th 'Scythian type' tombs that Roman glassware - exclusive on the peninsula to Silla - has been found indicating that it travelled across the steppe by horse. (Kim 2006vol2:368) He of course also highlights the notable horse trappings of Silla and Gaya artefacts, as well as both human and horse sacrificial burials specific to Gaya tombs. (Kim 2006vol2:328) Finally, Kim associates the curved jadeite beads with similar items said to be found in the Altay Pazyryk tombs, and more broadly jade itself to the Hongshan culture. (Kim 2006vol2:342)

The disappearance of Silla gold crowns by the C6th, along with the maripgan title, Kim attributes to Silla's increased contact to China with official relations beginning with Liang (梁 502–57) during the reign of Silla king Beopheung (法興王 514–40). (Kim 2006vol2:357)

**18. Gradualist horserider migration**

Whilst speaking of 'horseriders' and noting the sudden appearance of gold crowns c.C5th, Kim rejects the hypothesis of a blitzkrieg Xianbei influx positing instead a process of gradual 'horserider' consolidation spanning between the Xiongnu and Xianbei, who in this context he regards broadly as being of the same ethnic lineage. (Kim 2006vol2:348 and 357) He thus gives the following three reasons to explain the lapse of several centuries between •Xiongnu Kim Alji initially arriving in the C1st and the Kim clan maripgan rulers rising to dominance only in the C5th: Silla itself was a weaker and less developed state than Goguryeo or Baekje (i.e. time was still required for the process of general state formation); the initial Kim Alji migration was that of a single clan - not comparable to the scale of the Buyeo migrations (which he asserts elsewhere for Baekje and Japan); and the proceeding Six Bu polity of Jinhan formed from OJ
descendants was already itself well consolidated and took a long time to challenge. (Kim 2006vol2:358)

19. Northward Silla re-migration?
On the basis of the Kim/Jin (金) name as well as literal interpretations of the - [likely retrospectively self-constructed] - Manchu lineages, Kim suggests that the Jurchen Jin dynasty (金) and Later Jin (aka Manchu Qing dynasty) were ethnic descendents of the Silla Kim. As evidence he cites an 1117 entry from the Goryeosa quoting a letter from Jin dynasty founder Aguda (阿骨打) in which he describes himself both as emperor of the 'great Jurchen Jin' and older brother to the Goryeo king, going on to mention their shared ancestry, albeit with the focus on their continental territory and no mention of Silla. (Kim 2006vol2:370)

[高麗史：睿宗12年：“癸丑 金主阿骨打遣阿只等五人，寄書曰，’兄大女真金國皇帝，致書于弟高麗國王。自我祖考，介在一方，謂契丹為大國，高麗為父母之邦，小心事之。契丹無道，陵轘我疆域，奴隸我人民，屢加無名之師。我不得已拒之，蒙天之祐，獲殄滅之，惟王許我和親，結為兄弟，以成世世無窮之好。’仍遣良馬一匹。”]

He references too the Qinding-Manzhouruyanliukao (欽定滿洲源流考) but without citation.

20. Evaluation
It hardly needs to be reiterated that Kim’s own hypotheses are heavily predicated on the defunct Altaic language hypothesis and that he relies on 'migration' as the sole explanatory process contributing to ethnic formation. He further commits crude 'ethnic reductionism' by labelling all non-Sinic NE Asian peoples as •Jùsin, again, based on the premise of a shared proto-Altaic linguistic ancestry.

A positive aspect that may be salvaged from Kim’s writings is that they are less ethno-nationalistic or politically motivated than Yun Naehyeon or Lee Deok-il. Whilst ostensibly opposing China’s Northeast Project and maintaining the anti-Sinic paradigm of modern Korean identity, Kim gives the impression of being more interested in exploring the alternatives, and seems to ruminate on ethnic origins for their own sake.

If Kim is to be condemned as a 'pseudo historian', as he must, it is at least in a more neutral sense of simply being methodologically flawed and imprecise. As an amateur historian he at least transmits a sense of interest in the past that can entertain the popular imagination.
[Chapter 17] Seo Dong-in (徐東仁)

A more recent iteration of the 'Silla-Gaya Xiongnu ancestry' hypothesis is Seo Dong-in’s *Hyungno-in Gimsi-ui nara Gaya* ('Gaya, country of the Xiongnu Kim clan: rulers of the Silk Road establish[ed] Gaya' 2011). Broadly similar to Kim Unhoe’s version, as seen from the title, Seo places the emphasis on Gaya and the associated Kim Suro progenitor story. In short he argues that the initial Xiongnu Jin/Kim (金) to enter the southeast of the peninsula was Kim Suro (金首露) and that the Silla Kim clan progenitor, Kim Alji (aka *Kim Seong 金星*), was a descendent from Suro. Seo’s evidence is a combination of the standard pseudolinguistic reasoning, long-range speculations, selective parsing of texts and historicization of legends: in addition he devotes much attention also to archaeology, and finally his own idiosyncratic decipherment of the SY *hyangchal* song text *Guigiya* (龜旨歌).

As the basic hypothesis is now familiar, only newer aspects and specific differences to Kim Unhoe will be discussed below.

1. Shaohao Jintianshi = King Xiutu (休屠王)

Concerning *Shaohao Jintianshi* (少昊金天氏 - referred to is SS as 小昊金天氏) Seo posits that he was the historical Xiongnu king Xiutu (休屠王 used as a name) who held the Xiongnu hereditary title of 'Youxianwang' (右賢王). (Seo 2011:95) He interprets Shaohao as carrying the meaning 'young sun', indicative of sun worship, and Jintian as an abbreviation for *jecheon-geum’in* (祭天金人 'sacrifice heaven gold person') a term for Xiutu attested in *Shiji* referring to Buddhism (see below - Seo 2011:92n21, 97n36).

Seo also acknowledges the *Shiji* annotation claims - although he accredits them to the *Shiji* itself - that the original progenitor of the Xiongnu Shaohao clan was one of the Five Emperors and twenty-five sons of the Yellow Emperor, identified as Xuan Xiao (玄僊). (Seo 2011:97)

[Shiji 史記:五帝本紀第一："..【正義】鄭玄注中候勛省圖云：「徳合五 帝坐星者，稱帝」。又坤靈圖云：「德配天地，在正在不自私，曰帝。」案：太史公依世本、大戴禮，以黃帝、顓頊、帝嚳、 唐堯、虞舜為五帝，謹周、應劭、宋均皆同。而孔安國尚書序，謂諸譔帝王世紀，孫氏注世本，並以伏犧、神農、黃帝為三皇，少昊、顓頊、高辛、唐，虞為五帝"

五帝本紀："黃帝居軒轅之丘，而娶於西陵之女，是為嫘祖。嫘祖為黃帝正妃，生二子，其後皆有天下：其一曰玄扈，是為青陽。【索隠】玄扈，帝嚳之祖。案：皇甫謐及宋衷皆云玄扈青陽即少昊也。今此紀下云「玄扈不得在帝位」，則太史公意青陽非少昊明矣。而此又云「玄扈是為青陽」，當是誤也。謂二人皆黃帝子，並列其名，所以前史因誤以玄扈青陽為一人耳。宋衷又云：「玄扈青陽是為少昊，繼黃帝立者，而史不載，蓋少昊金德王，非五德之次，故紋五帝不數之也。」"]
He rejects the speculative hypothesis that Fusu (扶蘇) of Qin could have been King Xiutu. (Seo 2011:109)

2. Wang Mang = •Jin Mang (金莽)

Seo premises that the person named in the Hanshu as Wang Mang’s father, Man (曼), was the son of Jin Dang (金當) and thus Wang Mang was in fact a direct descendant - the great-great-grandson - of Jin Ridi. Citing then the Hanshu statement that Empress Xiaoyuan (孝元皇后) was Wang Mang’s paternal aunt, he deduces she was a younger sister, or half-sister, to Jin Dang. (Seo 2011:129) He charges that the father of Empress Xiaoyuan named in the Hanshu and HHS, as Wang Jin (王禁 aka Wang Zhijun 王稚君), son of Wang Wengru (王翁孺), was a fabrication. (Seo 2011:127) He argues that the fabrication becomes transparent when the Hanshu states that Mang’s mother, Gongxianjun (功顯君), was the younger sister of - according to Seo his own grandfather - Jin Dang’s mother, Nan (南). (Seo 2011:129)

[漢書:王莽傳上: "唯莽父曼蚤死，不侯”
王莽傳上: "九月，莽母功顯君死”
霍光金日磾傳: "當母南即莽母功顯君同產弟也”]

※ It should be noted the only identification of Dang’s mother, is that same passage. He further never considers the possibility that the same name may have belonged to more than one person.

Thus he hypothesizes that Mang’s surname Wang (王) was fabricated by the Hanshu to hide his true identity - and that of Empress Xiaoyuan - as being of direct Xiongnu Jin (金) lineage.

Xing Han-wang (星漢王) = •Jin Xing (金星) = Sehan (勢漢) = Kim Alji

In explicating the Xiongnu Jin/Kim (金) lineage, similar to Kim Unhoe, Seo primarily relies on the Munmu tomb stele inscription fragment (文武王陵碑), again deducing that Xing Han-wang (星漢王 K. Seong Han-wang, or 'King Seonghan') can be referred to as •Jin Xing (金星 K. Kim Seong). Seo posits that the name 'Sehan' (勢漢), recorded in the SS as being the son of Kim Alji, was an alternative rendering of 'Xing Han[-wang]' and that the SS was therefore wrong in making him Alji’s son: he suggests that Sehan (aka Xing Han-wang) and Alji refer either to the same person, or to brothers. (Seo 2011:94)

Seo cites some additional supporting evidence including another stele fragment, this time from the tomb of King Heungdeok dating to 836 (興德王陵碑片) in which the same name appears in the form of 'Taejo Seong Han[-wang]' (太祖星漢(王)) showing that the tradition was maintained during Silla despite being omitted from the SS. Seo also references Yu Deukgong and Kim Jeonghwi (金正喜 1786-1856)
with Yu (sic 高恆曰記 古云此篇記) tracing the Silla Kim clan to the lineage of Jin Ridi, and Kim (Haedongbi-go 海東碑古 equating Seong Han-wang to Kim Alji. (海東碑古: "星漢王者金氏之始祖金鬱智也") (Seo 2011:94)

Kim Suro (金首露) as the founding Kim peninsula ancestor = Somasi (蘇馬謨) =
•Kim Si (金謨)

Seo cites the undated genealogical jokbo record of the Gimhae Kim clan, Gimhae Kim-sssi Seonwon-tonghap-daedong-sebo (金海金氏蕉源統合大同世譜) that references both 'an old Silla gazette' claiming Kim Alji as a descendant of Kim Suro (金首露), together with the SS in tracing this lineage to Jin Dang and ultimately Xiaohao fintianshi (小昊金氏). (Seo 2011:95)

Seo also supports the close relationship between the Gaya and Silla Kim clans with the observation that when Kim Yusin’s immediate ancestors - the royal Kim line of Geumgwan Gaya - submitted to Silla, they were accorded the jingol 'true bone' (真骨) hereditary status. (Seo 2011:95)

In a bid to substantiate the historicity of Kim Suro - and the first Korean peninsula Kim ancestor - Seo posits that he may be equated to the personage of 'Somasi (蘇馬謨) of Yeomsa' (庸斯) recorded in HHS as an ethnic Han (韓) who in 44 CE visits Leelang on a tribute mission for which he was granted the title of 'Yeomsa fief lord'175)

[HHS 後漢書:東夷列傳: "初，朝鮮王準為衛滿所破，乃將其餘眾數千人走入海，攻馬韓，破之，自立為韓王。準後滅絕，馬韓人自立為辰王。建武二十年 [44 CE].韓人庸斯人蘇馬謨等詣樂浪貢獻，光武封蘇馬謨為漢庸斯邑君，使屬樂浪郡，四時朝覲。靈帝末，韓、漢並盛，郡縣不能制，百姓苦亂，多流亡入韓者"]

Seo supports this hypothesis with two arguments, one contextual and the other pseudolinguistic. The contextual argument is that Somasi and Suro were powerful contemporaries in the same region: if they were separate people, they would have been rivals but there is no record of such a conflict. (Seo 2011:141) The date of Somasi’s mission to Leelang comes just two years after the SY date of Suro’s founding of Gaya and therefore would correlate. (Seo 2011:140)

Linguistically. Seo posits that ‘Somasi’ is a phonetic hyanchal rendering of
•Kim-wang Si (金王謨) in turn reduced to •Kim Si (金謨). he analyzes it in the following manner. (Seo 2011:142)

1. so 蘇 = kim 金 surname Kim 'metal/gold'
2. ma 馬 = wang 王 'king/ruler'
3. si 謨 = si 謨 name 'Si'

175) 鄣君 translated à la Byington 2009:151.
1. **so 蘇 < soe 'iron' = 'metal' 金**  
Supporting evidence:  
- SS - C7th Sona 素那 in SS also named Kim Cheon 金川, therefore so 素 = 'metal' (金)  
  列傳第七:素那 "素那 [或云金川], 白城郡蛇山人也, 其父沈那 [或云煌川]"
- *Nihon-shoki* records an emissary from Imna named Sona-‘galji 蘇那曷叱智 (Sona-galjilji) which shows so 蘇 and so 素 to be variant renderings of the same name.
  日本書紀·卷第五·崇神天皇紀： "六十五年秋七月、任那國、遣蘇那曷叱智、令朝貢也"
- This etymology is also notably given by Nam Pung-hyun in Tanter (2012:23) as 蘇/素 su 'iron' for "Goguryeo dialect" and 素/省 su 'metal/iron' for "Silla dialect." [176]

2. **ma 馬 < *mari 'horse' = *'king' 王**  
- 'Suro’ 首露 of Kim Suro is also a rendering of mari - Suro < *maro < *mari
  ※ Seo gives no explanation as to why 'horse' should be equated to the title of a king or chieftain, but based on his decipherment of Guijiga (龜笛歌 see below) he means for it to carry the meaning of 'chieftain' derived from udumeori (우두머리). (Seo 2011:26) One may speculate he means to relate it phonetically to the Silla royal title maripgan (麻立干) although this is not made explicit. The 1997 Lee Jaeho modern Korean translation of SY also suggests Suro to be a hyangchadal rendering of *mara with the meaning of 'a supreme one'. (Il’yeon 1997:344n8).

3. Seo maintains *si 謝 as the given name of *Kim Si (金謙).

To explain the unusual form of the reconstructed name, *Kim-wang Si (金王謙), with the title of wang 'king' placed between the family and given names, Seo posits an even more tenuous explanation based on a legend given in the Gimhae Kim clan genealogy, that seven of ten sons of a later C2nd Kim Suro (see below) and Empress Heo, following their maternal uncle Book-seonsa (寶玉禪師 aka Jang’yu-hwasang 長遊和尚), entered the monkhood and established a hermitage on Jirisan, Unsong-won (雲上院), which subsequently became the still surviving Chilbul-sa (七佛寺) temple, where they gained enlightenment before departing to Japan. In the genealogy their names are given as Hyejin, Gakcho, Jigam, Deung’yeon. Dumu, Jeonghong and Gyejang (懸真·覺初·智鑑·等演·杜武·淨洪·戒莊), however, citing Kim Byeongmo (1994), Seo highlights that at an
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undated but relatively recent sounding ‘meeting for the rebuilding of Chilbul-sa’, the names of the same seven bodhisattva princes were presented as: Geum/Kim-wang Gwang-bul, Kim-wang Dong-bul, Kim-wang Sang-bul, Kim-wang Haeng-bul, Kim-wang Hyang-bul, Kim-wang Seong-bul and Kim-wang Gong-bul (金王光佛·金王朝佛·金王相佛·金王行佛·金王香佛·金王成佛·金王空佛). Seo thus supposes his reconstructed *'Kim-wang Si’ to match this otherwise historically unattested pattern of naming. (Seo 2011:149)

Returning to HHS account of Somasi, on the premise that Yeomsa-eup (廉斯里) was in Byeonhan (modern Gimhae and Changwon), Seo proposes that Somasi’s 44 CE visit to Lelang was not purely a tribute mission, but rather to create an alliance between Byeonhan - where he had just assumed power - and Lelang allowing Byeonhan (future Gaya) to throw off the control of Jinhan and Mahan. (Seo 2011:137)

※ It should be noted, the only attested reference to Yeomsa-eup (廉斯里) as a toponym is in SGZ where, although ambiguous, it appears to be more associated with Jinhan. (Seo 2011:136, 140)

[Sgz 三國志·韓傳: "魏略曰：初，右渠未破時，朝鮮相歷窘囂以諫右渠不用，東之辰國，時民隨出居者二千餘戶，亦與朝鮮費蕃不相往來。至王莽地皇時，廉斯羅為辰韓右渠廝，聞樂浪土地美，人民饒樂，亡欲來降。出其邑落，見田中驅雀男子一人，其語非韓人"]

3. Hypothesis of more than one Kim Suro

In the SY Garakguk-gi (駕洛國記) account, the establishment of Gaya under Kim Suro is dated 42 CE and his marriage to Empress Heo 48 CE, however, in the same account their deaths are given as 189 CE (Heo) and 199 CE (Suro). To rationalize this, Seo posits that there were at least two Kim Suros, the initial founding Kim ancestor, and a strong C2nd leader who consolidated the Gaya state; Empress Heo married the latter, and the date of their marriage recorded in the Garakguk-gi is mistaken. He suggests that the name of Suryu (首留) given in both the SY and SS as the great-grandson of Kim Alji, could refer to the C2nd Suro. (Seo 2011:163)

He also quotes from an alternative Pyeonnyeon Garakguk-gi - apparently in the Gimhae Kim genealogy - which includes the inscription of an ‘old stele from King Suro’s tomb’ describing him being bestowed the title of Tae-wang Won-gun (太王元君) in 162 CE. (Seo 2011:164)

[=首留王陵의舊碑: “東漢桓帝延熙五年尊王為太王元君”]

4. Historicizing Empress Heo 許皇后

Seo regards Empress Heo Hwang'ok (許黃玉 Ch. Xu Huangyu) as a historical personage but devotes considerable space to refuting the two premodern theories that she was either from Ayodhya (阿踰陀國) in India (南天竺國), or from Puzhou (普州) in modern Sichuan province. Instead he posits that she was a highborn lady of the Xu/Heo clan descended from the feudality of Xu-guo (許國), modern central Henan province, who was sent to the Korean peninsula c.150-60 CE to fulfill a strategic marriage alliance between Western Han and the emergent state of Gaya ruled by the later Kim Suro, against the threat of the Xianbei. (Seo 2011:263)

※ Empress Heo Hwang'ok and her association with Ayodhya are attested both in the Garakguk-gi (駕洛國記) passages contained in SY, as well as the Geumgwan-seong Pasa stone pagoda (金官城婆娑石塔) text separately recorded in SY. However the tradition associating Empress Heo explicitly with India (南天竺國), and/or southern China (普州), appear to be only attested today in the later YJSR (1530).

[異地勝覽:慶尚道:金海郡護府 "許皇后, 或云南天竺國王女, 姓許, 名黃玉, 號普州太后"]

To account for the India and southern China traditions, Seo identifies two aspects of accumulated embellishment that he posits came to distort the original historical episode: in the earlier SY Garakguk-gi account, these are the mention of Ayodhya, and Heo’s action of taking off her trousers. Whilst Ayodhya had an obvious traditional Indic association, the association of the 'trouser sacrifice' appears based on a modern hypothesis - unreferenced - claiming there to have been a custom in southern China of similar ritual behavior concerning the clothing of girls upon experiencing their first menstrual period: this custom is then matched to the title of 'Puzhou Empress dowager' (普州太后) given in the YJSR, where Puzhou is an old name for Sichuan. (Seo 2011:267)

Seo explains the Ayodya reference as a later embellishment arising from the 'fact' - Seo’s hypothesis (see below) - that Buddhism was introduced to the peninsula both by the original Kim Suro lineage and Empress Heo, and so a legend developed associating Heo with the original Buddhist homeland. (Seo 2011:265) Seo argues that the southern China ‘clothing custom’, meanwhile, was something known to the c.C12-13th compilers of the Garakguk-gi and SY due to the contemporary high volume of trade and cultural exchange between Goryeo and southern China, and so it was similarly included as an anachronistic embellishment, however, he fails to suggest a definite motivation as to why. (Seo 2011:267)
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5. First transmission of Buddhism from Xiongnu

Kim argues that the Xiongnu were practicing Buddhism at least as early as 121 BCE before it was known to the Chinese. His hypothesis is that the 'golden people' to, or with, which the Xiongnu made sacrifices to heaven (祭天金人) were in fact gilt Buddha statues, but because the Chinese did not understand this they described them as being for celestial rites. (Seo 2011:426) The first attestation of the gold statues is the Shiji record of the campaign led by Huo Qubing (霍去病) against the Xiongnu in 121 BCE when he took one as booty: upon the death of the Xiongnu king Xiutu (休屠王) and capture/submission of his family in the same year, a gold statue was brought with them to Chang'an.

* Seo does not mention, but a Suoyin annotation to the Shiji passage he cites, quotes Zhang Ying (張嬰) making a similar speculation.

[Shijì 史記:衛將軍騫列傳: "冠軍侯去病既侯三歲，元狩二年 {121 BCE} 春，以冠軍侯去病為騫將軍，將萬騎出陇西，有功。天子曰：'騫將軍率戎土餉烏盤，討遐蠻，涉狐奴，歷五王國，輦重人眾躬集者弗取，冀獲單于子。轉戰六日，過焉支山千有餘里，合短兵，殺折蘭王，斬盧胡王，誅全甲，斬禿邪王子及相國、都尉，首虜八千餘級，收休屠祭天金人。"

[[索隱]案:張嬰云'佛徒祠金人也', 盡封於病二千戶。]

Shiji 史記:匈奴列傳: "其明年春，漢使騫將軍去病將萬騎出陇西，過焉支山千餘里，擊匈奴，得胡首虜 (騫) 萬八千餘級，破得休屠祭天金人。"]

He further cites the Weishu similarly describing how the same c.120 BCE western campaigns against the Xiongnu led to the beginnings of Buddhism (此佛道流之漸). (Seo 2011:432)

* The long passage he quotes in full, referenced as 魏書:卷114:釋老志1:釋老10, does not completely match the versions available on databases.

Thus when Xiongnu •Kim Si (金誕 aka the first Kim Suro) first arrived in Korea, he was already Buddhist. Seo then argues that the native Sodo (蘇塗) ritual practice described in the early C3rd SGZ "Han" (韓) account as 'resembling Buddhism' (浮層) was indeed an early form of Buddhism. (Seo 2011:436) Linguistically he explains sodo as: phonogram so (蘇) 'metal+gold' + semantogram do (塗) 'gilt'. Thus he interprets sodo to be some form of gilded Buddha statue. (Seo 2011:438)

* In the SGZ account, Sodo is specifically associated with Mahan rather than
Byeonjin (aka Byeonhan) or Jinhan, and sodo refers both to the sacred community space (邑) and the wooden pole/logs erected there.

Whilst this primitive form of Buddhism had taken root, Seo asserts that the religion was further strengthened with the arrival of Empress Heo who, as both the legend of her brother and seven sons mentioned above and her own traditional associations suggest, was an active practitioner. A final piece of evidence he highlights to demonstrate the C2nd existence of Buddhism in the southeast - long prior to the SS dates of its official adoption - is the 1708 [sic? 1706] Myeongwol-sa (明月寺) temple stele (明月山興國寺事蹟碑) text which states that during the rebuilding of the temple in 1706 a tile was discovered with an inscription in turn recording that Buddhism was adopted by the king in 144 CE following the arrival of Jang’yu-hwasang (長遊和尚 aka Empress Heo’s brother) from the west. Seo equates this king to Kim Suro. (Seo 2011:447) Myeongwol-sa was on the site of modern Heungguk-sa (興國寺) south of Gimhae in Busan (Gangseo-gu, Jisa-dong) where the stele stands today.

* Whilst it reinforces tradition, there is nothing to prove that the tile date was not a later fabrication matched to the legend.

6. Migration and early Garak-guk state formation

According to Seo’s hypothesis, whilst *Kim Si (Kim Suro) was the founding peninsula Kim ancestor, he was not the first of his people or other continental northerners to arrive in the southeast: rather he followed an already established migration route down through the peninsula eventually settling in the region of modern Yangdong-ri on the western outskirts of Gimhae city. Seo stresses that this particular migration began only with the 108 BCE overthrow of OJ and not earlier. (Seo 2011:205)

* Seo fails to explain clearly his conceptualization of the relationship between the state of OJ, the YeMaek and the Xiongnu. (For further confusion, see page 38 where he states Goguryeo and Buyeo to have been ’Xianbei’).

Previous to that, he posits the population of the Gimhae region associated with dolmen construction, to have been composed of a mix of original indigences and an earlier wave of southward migration from OJ c.C2nd BCE triggered by the Wi Man usurpation. (Seo 2011:212)

Similar to Kim Unhoe’s ‘gradualist horseriders’ Seo describes - somewhat unclearly - the ethnic migration anticipating the arrival of *Kim Si, as a gradual process down through the peninsula. He posits that they first settled across the northwest of the peninsula, centered on the region of Pyeongyang: this people he associates with the polity of Nangnang-guk. Apparently under pressure then from the southward expansion of Goguryeo, they began migrating further south
settling in Gimhae Yangdong-ri. The 37 CE overthrow of Nangnang-guk by Goguryeo then matches the arrival of •Kim Si shortly afterwards in Gimhae. (Seo 2011:212)

Seo suggests that the slow migration can be correlated to toponyms: he equates both Gara-eup (加羅邑) of 'Hwanghae-do and Pyeong'an-do', and Garahol (加羅忽) on the east coast (modern Ganseong, Gangwon-do) to {Gagok-ma’eul (歌谷마을) <•Gara-gol} of Yangdong-ri. (Seo 2011:203, 211)

Returning to the progenitor myth, he posits that the Nine Gan (九干)178 chieftains described in the SY Garaguk-gi as proceeding Kim Suro, can be distinguished according to their titles. Whilst all nine names finish with the title gan (干), four of these are dogan (刀干). According to Seo, the other five gan are names of indigenous rulers, whilst the four dogan were the more immediate forbears to Kim. Linguistically, Seo analyses do (刀) as the semantic rendering of {gal 갈 'sword'179} < •gari }. He similarly posits that byeon (弁) of Byeonhan was the semantogram for {go’ggal 고갈 'pointed hat' < •gotgal 곡갈}. Left unstated, the implication is that {gal < •gari } correlates to Garak-guk. (Seo 2011:213)

7. Early Gimhae Gaya archaeology
Seo positsthe, then, that the well known archaeological tomb site of Yangdong-ri was the location of Yeomsa-eup (廉斯邑), the original place of settlement for •Kim Si (aka Kim Suro): whilst Yangdong-ri was maintained through to the early C5th, from the late C2nd the centre of power gradually moved - albeit a mere 7 km - to the tomb site of Daeseong-dong (modern Gimhae) just south of Gujibong peak (龜旨峯) and it was here that the state of Garak-guk (aka Geumghan Gaya - Seo terms also as •Gimhae Gaya) became fully formed.180 (Seo 2011:213)
※ There is some inconsistency in his dating of the move to Daeseong-dong as in a later chapter he puts it as the latter half of the C3rd. (Seo 2011:328)

Seo associates the initial arrival of •Kim Si with the c.C1st-2nd appearance in Yangdong-ri of 'wood-coffin' and 'wood-frame' type tombs (木棺墓·木椁墓) which continue until the C5th. Paradoxically he associates 'pit-style stone' tombs (竪穴式 石槨墓 'vertical shaft style stone cist tombs') which appeared and coexisted from the C3rd, with the more indigenous Han population. at the same time however, he suggests these stone pit tombs could also be linked to the much earlier Bronze Age Xituanshan (西團山) culture of Jirin province, China, which

178) 我刀干·汝刀干·彼刀干·五刀干·留刀干·留刀干·神刀千·五刀干·神鬼干.
179) Attested in Yongbi-eo-cheonga 龍飛御天歌.
following the introduction of iron in the C4th BCE also had stone built tombs (石椁), associated with the YeMaek people. (Seo 2011:201n2) In short he seeks to imply that both the wood type and stone pit tombs had a northern origin, but the wood-coffin and frame tombs were more specifically aristocratic. (Seo 2011:201n3)

※ Again, without explicating the relationship between YeMaek and Oj, the mention of Xituanshan – conventionally associated with Buyeo – only further obfuscates his discussion.

Concerning earthenware, Seo asserts that the most characteristic pottery of the southeast, ‘pedestalled long-necked jars’ (臺附長頸壺), are found only(?) in the stone built tombs, and the earliest, he claims, are from Yangdong-ri mid C3rd. He cannot decide, however, whether they are indicative of indigenous innovation or newly introduced. By contrast he considers earthenware cups with handles to be more definitely of northern origin. (Seo 2011:202) Iron weapons and armour, he notes are found in the larger wood frame tombs. (Seo 2011:209-11)

In contrast to most ‘pan-Altaiic’ (anti-Sinic) origin theories that would treat the presence of Chinese artefacts as potentially detracting from their arguments, Seo is able to more positively incorporate such anomalies both through the original Jin Ridi story, and his own particular hypothesis that Han usurper Wang Mang was himself a part of the Xiongnu Jin/Kim lineage. Thus he explains a bronze ding (鼎) tripod vessel unearthed from the C3rd wood-frame tomb No.322 at Yangdong-ri as a 200 year old heirloom from Chang’an carried by Xiongnu refugee descendents of Wang Mang. (Seo 2011:216-23)

8. Jinhan–Silla state formation
Through a discussion of the Joyang-dong tomb site located c.9km southeast of Gyeongju city, Seo applies the same model of incoming migrants from the north leading to the formation of Jinhan, and subsequently Saro-guk (early Silla), a process he describes occurring parallel to that of Yangdong-ri and involving broadly the same ethnic groups identified by the same ‘wood-coffin’ and ‘wood-frame’ type tombs, covering a period between c.0 and mid C3rd before the power centre shifted to Gyeongju under Silla king Michu-wang (r.262–84 the first Silla Kim sovereign). (Seo 2011:419) Thus the earliest arrivals are from Nangnang and Oj (given in Seo’s order!)

Concerning the well known SS passage - derived from HHS - describing Jinhan being established by refugees from Qin (秦), Seo cites a quotation by Choe Chiwon in SY describing Jinhan as composed rather of people from Yan (燕) and naming their new settlement after the toponymic ‘Tak’ (涿 Ch. Zhuo) which in Korea later because rendered as do (道).
[SY 辰韓： "又崔致遠云辰韓率燕人遊之者故取涿水之名稱所居之邑里云 濟渾 漢渾等 羅人方言譴涿音為道今或作沙梁 梁亦譴道" 
HHS 東夷列傳： "辰韓，耆老自言秦之亡人"]

Seo locates the original Tak as modern Zhuolu county (涿鹿县) northwest of Beijing in Hebei province: he also (mis?)cites the Shiji highlighting two places associated with Chiyou (蚩尤 K. Chi’u) in Zhuolu-xian county in the region of Panshan-zhen (? 盤山鎮), Chiyou-cheng fortress (蚩尤城) and Chiyou-quan spring (蚩尤泉). (Seo 2011:420)

※ Whilst the Shiji has Zhuolu as the site of the legendary battle in which Chiyou was defeated, the specific places given by Seo seem not to be attested. The closest reference is perhaps an annotation in HHS.181)

[後漢書·志第二十三·郡國五： "涿鹿 帝王世記曰：「黃帝所都，有蚩尤城、阪泉地、黃帝祠，」]

世本云在（敟）(敟)城南，張晏曰在上谷，于頔案義五帝位云黃帝與赤帝戰于阪泉之野，不在涿鹿，是伐蚩尤之地]

They are, however also referenced by Lee Deok-il who includes a photograph of the current 'Chiyou-quan' well located in Sanbao-cun village (三堡村), Zhuolu county, Hebei. (Lee 2006:233-7) For Panshan-zhen – otherwise unattested – Lee uses pan 盤, rather than pan 盤.

Thus based on the location, Seo posits that the incoming 'Yan people' referred to by Choe Chiwon were first Xiongnu and later Wuhuan Xianbei (烏桓鮮卑), rather than Qin Chinese.

Analogous to the bronze ding of Yangdong-ri, Seo highlights prestige mortuary items including inscribed bronze mirrors and glass beads as being again indicative of a (Xiongnu) connection to Chang'an. (Seo 2011:417-8)

9. Imna and the hyangga Gujiga 龜旨歌

Analyzing Imna as (semantogram im 'entrusted' (任) + phonogram na 'country' (那)), Seo posits that this refers to the former territory of 'Byeonjin Guya-guk' (弁辰 狗耶國) after it was absorbed/subjugated by the state of Garak-guk (aka Geumgwan Gaya or *Gimhae Gaya), led by the later Kim Suro in the C3rd. (Seo 2011:327)

Based on his own interpretation, Seo suggests then that the hyangchal song text recorded in the SY Garaguk-gi was composed as if a nursery rhyme but containing the threat to local chieftains to surrender. (Seo 2011:28) A translation

181) They are, however also referenced by Lee Deok-il who includes a photograph of the current 'Chiyou-quan' well located in Sanbao-cun village (三堡村), Zhuolu county, Hebei. (Lee 2006:233-7) For Panshan-zhen – otherwise unattested – Lee uses the character pan 盤, rather than pan 盤.
of his own Korean translation is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>龜何亱何 What was it the god said? What was it the god said?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>首其現也 [Your] *mari ('ruler') right now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>若不現也 if [he] does not appear [before us to surrender].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>燃灼而喫也 [we] will cook and eat him!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When Seo discusses the song text in the first chapter, he refers it to the original SY context in which it is sung by the Nine Gan leaders, implying the circumstances of the C1st Kim Suro; however, when later discussing it in the context of Imna, he explicitly refers to the C3rd expansion of Geumgwan Gaya under the later Kim Suro. (Seo 2011:28, 328) To resolve this, we can only speculate that he means that the origin of the term 'Imna' came from the original C1st submission of the Nine Gan to Kim Suro, and this continued to be used as Geumgwan Gaya later expanded in the C3rd.

10. Goryeong and •North and South Gara
Discussing the early C5th to mid C6th Jisan-ri tomb site at Goryeong (aka the location of Dae Gaya), Seo associates ‘wood-framed’ tombs with the elite Kim lineage of Geumgwan Gaya who, he posits, were forced to move their power base after the "near total scorching" of their former territory by the Goguryeo-Silla attacks. At the same time, he interprets a gradual shift towards stone-pit and stone-room type tombs at Jisan-ri as indicative of the Kim’s waning power. (Seo 2011:356)

* Seo neglects to mention that the late C4th Goguryeo-Silla alliance is attested as formed against the Wae (倭): Seo is thus implicitly, or inadvertently, interpreting Wae to refer to Gimhae Gaya.

Separately, he suggests that with the emergence of Goryeong (Dae-Gaya) in the early C5th, the polities could be termed •South and •North Gara with both seeking to restore the original territory of ‘Imna Gara’ (任那加羅 - as historically attested on the Gwanggaeto Stele and Chinese Nanshu 南書 and Songshu 宋書), the former territory of Byeonjin Guyaguk. (Seo 2011:327)

11. Xiongnu origins and ethnogenesis
Like Kim Unhoe, Seo presumes that the Xiongnu migrated from the west originating in Central Asia and that this is consequently the ultimate ethnic homeland of Koreans.

"In this way, various minjok have [contributed] to the formation of the Korean minjok including the Xiongnu, Xianbei, Wuhuan Xianbei, Göktürks and Suksin (Malgal). Until C1st-2nd CE there was a great influx [to the Korean peninsula] of Xiongnu: [then] until the C3rd-5th many Xianbei came down [into the

427
peninsula]. The Xiongnu are people who came from Central Asia. In current day Kazakhstan there reside more than a hundred [different] minjok: in places such as Kazakhstan’s Almaty, or the ‘narrow Silk Road street’ (길목) of Samarkand, or Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan or Turkmenistan, one can easily see people exactly resembling us [Koreans]... Close to 2,000 years ago they were cut off from us, [and so] came to live with a different culture and language [to us], but they are of the same bloodline (혈통) as us. From c.3000 BCE [they/we] crossed into the Chinese continent and initiated the pre- and historical periods of China. Meanwhile groups that moved westwards crossed the Danube river and changed Western history [forever].” (Seo 2011:509-10)

* The same fundamental criticism applies as it does to Kim Unhoe: the migration of groups associated with Altaic type languages occurred from northeastern China and traveled eastwards: there has been consensus on this since Ramstedt (1947:16).

12. Evaluation

Seo’s writing appears even less politically or ethnically motivated than Kim Unhoe. At the same it is also even more of a true ’psuedo history’ in that it is predicated on certain purely speculative hypotheses which might be better applied to historical fiction.

Seo’s methodology remains amateur where, like Kim, everything is explained through ethnic lineages and migrations, to the extent that a single bronze ding (鼎) vessel can be taken as evidence of a migration without consideration of alternative explanations.

Conceptually, a specific problem with the work is the significance of the core hypothesis, which is still not clear given Seo’s inclination to lump Buyeo and Goguryeo as Xianbei, and to view the Xianbei as a continuation of the Xiongnu. What is the significance of these being related peoples if they were in any event in conflict with one another (e.g. the Goguryeo overthrow of Nangnang-guk)? At best, the entire work simply attempts to highlight one particular lineage within a wider southern migratory framework.

From an anti-Sinocentric perspective, an innovation of Seo’s hypothesis is that identification of Jin Ridi and Wang Mang as part of the Xiongnu Jin/Kim lineage, enables the premise of 'Sinicized Xiongnu’ by which Chinese influences can be explained without referring to the Lelang commandery.

A final characteristic aberrant to most other popular history works worth noting is the positive treatment of Buddhism.
[Chapter 18] Appraisal of current popular historiography

1. Empire variant

The strength of the empire narrative has been its perceived ability to enhance the notion of Korea as a consolidated state entity prior to the otherwise late, but historically attested Silla and/or Goryeo unification(s) of the peninsula. By asserting the premise of an expansive continental territory it naturally aggrandizes early Korean history at the immediate expense of 'China' and, indirectly, relative to ancient Japan. This large continental territory functions as a cushion to blunt the perceived impact of historical events such as Gija, Wiman and the Han Commanderies, provincializing them from Korean history proper: whilst it necessarily has to acknowledge that Korea has been left with 'only' the peninsula, this remaining territory is undefiled by ancient invasions, which helps in delegitimizing both the modern Japanese annexation as well as the present day historiographic claims of mainland China. Although not expressed in these terms, the empire narrative presents OJ as a 'pristine' rather than 'secondary' state.

The major flaws of the narrative are both methodological and conceptual. Concerning the former, the empire interpretation suffers from the crucial absence of textual or material evidence: any consolidated state requires a capital, but to date no archaeological site has been identified even for the final capital of Wiman Joseon which had significant enough fortifications to withstand a year long siege by Han China. Dolmen megalith burials attest to organized, potentially complex, hierarchical societies but not to any centralized polity. Advocates of an OJ empire are thus reduced to explaining the lack of evidence through ad hoc hypotheses such as Sin's narrative of historiography, and/or exaggerating the significance of what remains from the desired time period, namely bronze daggers and dolmen, and tenuous linking to the Hongshan culture remains of Niuheliang (牛河梁) in western Liaoning.

Aside from lack of evidence, the fundamental conceptual weakness is that the more a continental location and extent of territory is emphasized for OJ, the less relevant connection there can be to the peoples of the Korean peninsula and the less continuity there is between this ancient period and the emergence of the historical Three Kingdoms' polities. In narrative terms, Sin's solution - involving mass migration and a remapping of the 'continental Samhan' onto the peninsula - offers the best sense of continuity, in particular by having Pyeongyang function as the pivot from being the southernmost 'continental' capital to the capital of historical Goguryeo. Subsequent proponents, however, even whilst promoting the same notion of a continental OJ empire, have apparently considered the specific 'continental Samhan' explanation as the least tenable aspect of Sin's hypothesis and so it has been quietly dropped: the result,
however, only further exposes the original lack of continuity.

2. Pan-Altaic variant
By contrast, the strength of the pan–Altaic interpretations is in their ability to make up for the lack of textual and monumental evidence by emphasizing the more intangible aspects of ethnic identity such as language and religion. Whilst the empire school tends to present itself as source-based positivistic history in which archaeology is secondarily matched to orthodox dates and labels, the pan–Altaic school has the potential to build a more eclectic model based on a (relatively speaking) more multi-disciplinary approach that draws from historical-linguistics and folkloristics alongside archaeology and history. As there is no invented empire, pan–Altaic interpretations contain (again, relatively speaking) more nuance and less self-conceit.

The weaknesses, however, are once more both methodological and conceptual. The former is the tendency towards long-range migration and hyperdiffusion models inherited from Choe Namseon, perhaps to compensate for the lack of in situ empire: the linguistic etymologies employed, meanwhile, are typically amateur and neither follow the Comparative Method nor demonstrate awareness of relevant or recent research.

Conceptually, reliance on the premise of the Altaic language hypothesis is problematic because the hypothesis has not been proven and current day consensus is that the constituent language groups associated with it - Turkic, Mongolic and Tungusic being core, and Koreanic and Japonic peripheral - are distinct genetic language families. Even were the Altaic language family still tenable, relying on it as a premise assumes that ethnocultural identity directly correlates with linguistic identity which is also highly questionable.\(^{182}\)

From an ethnonationalist perspective, a final conceptual weakness is that even accepting the Altaic framework, the effect of stressing the intangible also becomes pan–Altaicism’s greatest weakness as ultimately the significance of what is being delineated is not clear: how does an expansive ‘culture zone’ relate to Korean history or the modern nation state(s) of Korea? The empire narrative contains strong irredentist implications which at the very least can be employed defensively against further encroachment – real or perceived – from China: the pan–Altaic, however, is ambiguous, positing ethnic homelands outside of the peninsula but making no claim to ownership. At best it asserts fraternal affinity with other *Altaic peoples in the name of an unfulfilled anti–Sinic solidarity.

\(^{182}\) For a critical discussion on the tenuous links between language, ethnicity and archaeological cultures, see Saarikivi and Lavento (2009).
From a non-ethnocentric perspective, this is not a problem and even welcome, but the present day authors themselves invariably situate their hypotheses within the confines of ethnocentricism and the history dispute with China, thus inducing the unnecessary self-contradiction of stressing national exceptionalism within a supra-national framework: this contradiction has been present since Choe Namseon’s *Bulham-munhwa-ron*, but was also best suppressed in his *ManMong-munhwa* which uniquely benefitted from the contemporary absence of a Korean state, a circumstance which has not prevailed.

3. Anti-Sinocentricism

The anti-Sinocentricism present in both variants of popular Korean historiography warrants closer consideration. Superficially it appears to be the most efficacious aspect of Sin Chaeho’s continued popular influence. For Sin, Sinocentricism explained the weakness of medieval Korea that had resulted in the 1910 annexation to Japan; today his anti-Sinocentric ‘spirit’ is re-invigorated to respond to China’s Northeast Project.

This explicit anti-Sinocentricism is what distinguishes modern Korean historiography from the premodern ON which had been able to support both ethnic peninsula exceptionalism alongside the positive embrace of ancient Sinic civilization. Ironically, the revisionist charge of Sinocentricism having retarded Korea’s development was itself introduced by the Japanese who in the late C19th are understood to have encouraged Korean ‘independence’ from China in order to gain more influence over the peninsula themselves. Of course, Korean intellectual history is not a passive agent and the early modern anti-Sinocentricism may also have tapped into premodern anti-Manchu Qing prejudice that had existed since the overthrow of the mid C17th Ming dynasty and Manchu invasions of the peninsula: by late Joseon, the Manchu Qing were *de facto* synonymous to China, and with the diminishing of the ON which celebrated ancient Sinic heritage, there would have been little to stop long held anti-Qing sentiment being redefined simply as anti-China.

Today, the two variants differ in the form of their anti-Sinocentricism. The empire narrative imagines OJ simply as an equivalent to what the orthodox understanding of China itself had been: a centralized ‘empire’ and source of East Asian civilization. By contrast, rather than inverting the Chinese model, the pan-Altaic interpretation maintains the original configuration but instead sides with - and seeks to enhance - the orthodox ‘enemy’ of China: the barbarians to the north and northeast. Thus, whilst the empire narrative involves complete revisionism, turning the ON inside-out à la Sin Chaeho, the pan-Altaic simply changes the perspective: rather than being the ‘last bastion’ of Sinic civilization as the Joseon dynasty had come to regard itself vis-à-vis the Manchu Qing, the
pan-Altaic presents Korea as the last 'pure', or at least self-professed most successful, non-Sinic state within the mainland East Asian world order (itself defined by Chinese history).
[Chapter 19] Situating popular Korean historiography in wider discourses

1.1 China 'frontier/culture-zone' discourse

Parallel to the modern Northern/Altaic narrative of Korean historiography, there has separately evolved an English language discourse which similarly undermines the 'central China plain centricism' of orthodox and Chinese historiography by, again, emphasizing the role of the non-Han (漢) peoples attested in dynastic history. This narrative seeks to explain the perceived cyclical nature of dynastic Chinese history focusing on the interaction between Han and non-Han peoples on the frontiers of specific ethno-geographic zones, including the Mongol steppe to the north and Manchuria to the northeast. Core works contributing to this increasingly sophisticated frontier discourse include Lattimore (1962 [1940]), Barfield (1989) and Di Cosmo (1999, 2002): whilst authored in English, these works draw on contemporary German, Russian and Chinese language scholarship.\(^{183}\) This primarily historical model has been further developed by archaeologists such as Rogers (2012) and Honeychurch (2014).

Korea has typically been omitted from this culture-zone discourse for the justified reason that it has never established a Chinese dynasty, or interacted as closely with China as those steppe polities which also did not establish dynasties (e.g. the Xiongnu). Korea is also geographically off the radar of steppe specialists. One notable attempt to explicitly include Korea, however, is Ledyard (1983), which reconfigures the triangle of cyclical interactions from 'central plain - steppe - Manchuria' to 'central plain - Manchuria - Korea', in which relevant aspects of the steppe (i.e. the Mongols) are collapsed into Manchuria. An alternative culture-zone approach, as adopted by Janhunen (1996), is to treat the Korean peninsula as a constituent part of Manchuria. Both these conceptualizations inevitably echo the framework of colonial Japanese scholarship; though unacknowledged, and perhaps inadvertently, Ledyard's linkage of western Manchuria with the steppe is à la the Japanese Man-Mô (滿蒙 'Manchuria-Mongolia') conceptualization, whilst Janhunen's treatment of Korea more consciously follows Japanese Man-Sen (滿鮮 'Manchuria-Korea') precedent.\(^{184}\)

\(^{183}\) A secondary offshoot of this discourse is the New Qing History school which focuses on the Manchu ethnic identity of the Qing dynasty.

\(^{184}\) For Janhunen, this is demonstrated in the bibliography reference to the Manshū rekishi chiri (滿洲歷史地理) edited by Shiratori Kurakichi (1913 - German edition 1914) funded and published by the research bureau (est. 1907) of the Minami Manshū Tetsudō Kabushiki-gaisha (南滿洲鐵道株式會社 South Manchuria Railway Company); for the context and history of this work, see Tanaka (1993:241-253).
1.2 Meeting points

This foreign language discourse (Japanese > English) is restricted to academic scholarship rather than popular history as genuinely popular, non-Korean authored, English language historiography on early Korea does not yet exist. Although contemporary popular Korean historians are themselves on the edge of Korean academia they interact with the same broad discourses. Premising then a potential relation between the popular Northern/Altaic narrative and scholarly foreign frontier/zonal discourse, at least two unequivocal 'meeting points' can be identified as having occurred: the first is that of Choe Namseon’s *ManMong-munhw*, already discussed; the second is the English language work of late amateur historian Wontack Hong (1940-2012), in particular his *East Asian History: A Tripolar Approach* (2010).

1.3 Wontack Hong

Hong’s work shares much in common with the Northern/Altaic narrative, particularly the pan-Altaic variant but is aberrant in two core aspects: being written in English for a foreign readership, and making extensive use of Western language scholarship. Whilst the English language works are fully referenced, only a couple of Korean books are mentioned: in light of this current dissertation, however, influence of the underlying Korean discourse in Hong’s narrative becomes clear. As a consequence his work can be understood as borrowing aspects of both the empire and pan-Altaic variants, in turn synthesized with Western sources.

Conceptually, Hong’s 'tripolar’ narrative is most immediately a reworking of Barfield’s bipolar model of interaction between the China plain and Mongolian steppe, augmented by Janhunen’s treatment of Manchuria as an equally productive region inclusive of Korea. A brief summary follows.

Hong ignores Dangun entirely but is highly critical of Sinocentric historiography and denounces Gija’s enfeoffment with Joseon as a fabrication of Sima Qian (Hong 2010b:115). He posits that Wi Man and the state of Yan are ethnic 'Donghu Xianbei’ with whom the 'Yemaek Joseon' maintained an "intimate relationship". Citing Yun Naehyeon (Yoon 1986 - in Korean), Hong identifies the ancient Liao river as the modern Luan enabling him to shift ancient Liaodong westwards to the region of modern Liaoxi (Hong 2010b:129).

---

185) It is notable he was a professor of Seoul National University’s economics department from which Kim Unhoe also graduated.
Aberrant to the Oj empire proponents, however, and in apparent acknowledgement of archaeological evidence, he locates the Han Commanderies inside the Korean peninsula with Lelang on the Daedong-gang river: no second indigenous Nangnang polity is discussed but instead he questions the level of Sinicization that occurred noting for example that "the so-called Han Chinese style observed at Lelang sites finds no directly corresponding counterparts in mainland China" (Hong 2010b:139 referencing Oh 2006:86).

Hong is also somewhat singular in discussing the post Han dynasty status of Lelang and Daifang, narrating the inheritance of their jurisdiction by Cao Wei (魏 220-265) and Western Jin (西晋 265-316) before finally succumbing to Goguryeo in 313. Later mention of Lelang and Daifang in the region of Liaodong he explains as administrative districts, unrelated in all but name, established by the Xianbei leader Murong Hui (慕容廆 269-333) to receive Chinese refugees escaping eastwards from the Xiongnu (Hong 2010b:150 quoting Schreiber 1949:406-9).

Hong designates Oj, Buyeo and Goguryeo as ethnically Yemaek Tungus which he identifies through the broad and narrow leafed styles of bronze daggers and northern and southern dolmen types associated with the Liaodong-northern Korean peninsula, and southern Korean peninsula regions respectively; like Kim Unhoe, he also highlights the similarity in foundation myths between Goguryeo, Buyeo and the Xianbei.

He meanwhile describes the population in the southern half of the Korean peninsula constituting Jinguk (辰國) and Samhan (三韓), as "rice-cultivating Yemaek cousins." In contrast to Janhunen and earlier Japanese scholarship. he is unwilling to more clearly distinguish a southern Koreanic element ethnolinguistically unrelated to the northern Tungusic lineage of Korean historiography though he at once, somewhat contradictorily, posits rice cultivation to have been introduced by ancient southern Chinese crossing the Yellow Sea. Quoting Nelson (1995:10), he gives the earliest carbon dates for rice found on the Korean peninsula as 2400-2100BCE which, although left unmentioned, is an exact match for the orthodox Dangun dates: in this sense he is still seeking to historicize the traditional periodization (Hong 2010b:112).

Similar again to the Northern/Altaic narrative, Hong postulates that both the Donghu Xianbei and Yemaek Tungus belong to a "proto-Altaic speech community" sharing comb-patterned pottery (橈文土器) and broad bronze dagger cultures with common origins in the Upper Xiajiadian (c.1200-600 BCE [Hong’s dates]) archaeological culture, tracing back through the Lower Xiajiadian (c.2200-1600 BCE) ultimately to the neolithic Hongshan (5000-3000
BCE) culture which was spread between modern Chifeng city (赤峰市) in the west, the Liao river to the east and the Xar Moron river (西拉木倫) to the north, concomitant that is with the Northern/Altaiic narrative's continental location of OJ (Hong 2010b:62–6, 135). Following the pan-Altaiic interpretation, rather than designate this all as OJ, Hong shares the lineage from the very beginning with the ancient Xianbei/Donghu Yan187).

Hong hypothesizes that the Korean language originates from Goguryeo, Buyeo and Silla whilst Manchu evolves through the Sushen-Mohe-Jurchen complex: unlike Kim Unhoe he fails to address the presence of indigenous Mohe (Malgal) on the Korean peninsula. He labels Balhae 'macro Tungusic' claiming that, "only by uniting with the Yemaek people, could the Mohe-Núzhens (Jurchen) establish a full-fledged dynasty" (Hong 2010b:241). Balhae is thus a mixed state after which the Jurchen dominate Manchuria whilst "pure-blooded" Yemaek survive and prosper as the peninsula Koreans.

Perhaps only because their narratives tend to focus on the ancient period and/or territorial history dispute with China (over Goguryeo and Balhae), Hong also stands out from the recent popular historians for his more active inclusion and positive assessment of Silla emphasizing how it absorbed Goguryeo remnants and went on to successfully drive the Tang out of the peninsula. In contrast to both Joseon dynasty scholars and Sin Chaeho, he is similarly keen to highlight Goryeo's success in defending the peninsula against Khitan and Jurchen invasion attempts rather than lament its internal weaknesses and failure to retake continental territory. He treats the 1135 Myo Cheong rebellion with surprising impartiality observing that Kim Busik likely had a more "realistic perception of the international power balance at that time" (Hong 2010b:315). In fact, by the medieval period, Hong has turned his back on continental pan-Altaiicism viewing it rather as good fortune that any irredentist 'northern policy' ambitions failed:

"The irony of history seems to be that, had the Koreans identified themselves with their Manchurian cousins and were they actively supportive of the Manchu cause, they could have been a partner with the Manchus, as were the Mongols of Inner Mongolia, only to be buried in oblivion as inhabitants of one of those PRC Autonomous Regions." (Hong 2010b:390)

It could also be noted that Hong is aberrant in having focused attention on the Baekje–Yamato relationship, both in Korean (Hong 1994) and English (Hong 2010a) publications.

187) This conceptualization is also present in the Liaodong-centric variants discussed below.
2.1 Liaodong-centric variants

A final Korean authored variant of note might be termed as 'Liaodong-centric': like the pan-Altaiic variant, this seeks to avoid the extreme subjectivity of the empire narratives, but at the same time focuses on the continental territory immediately adjacent to the peninsula, ignoring or down playing (to varying degrees) long-range Altaiic migration theories. Whilst remaining anti-Sinocentric, it is also (again to varying degrees) anti-Korea-centric, and thus takes a more neutral position vis-à-vis the history dispute. The origins of this school lie more directly in Japanese colonial historiography built around the notion of an independent Manchuria polity: this is reflected in the bibliographies. At the same time there is also some influence from Chinese scholarship of the late Republican period, which was grappling with the same questions and responding to Japanese encroachment.188)

Both for its perceived neutrality in the history dispute, and its Japanese origins, under current circumstances this variant cannot be successful as commercial popular history: the representative works are therefore more academic leaning, but still available on the same shelves in bookstores alongside Lee Deok-il and Kim Unhoe and so will be briefly discussed.

The works profiled below are Kim Han-gyu's Yodong-sa (2004 'History of Liaodong'), Mun Ansik's Yoha-munmyeong-gwa YeMaek (2012 'Liao river civilization and the YeMaek') and U Silha's Dongbuk-gongjeong neomeo: yoha-munmyeong-non (2007 'Transcending the Northeast Project: an argument [to establish the] Liao river civilization'). These can be located on a rough continuum between academic and popular styles, with the historical based Japanese framework on one end, and an archaeological emphasis centered on the Hongshan culture overlapping with pan-Altaiic interpretations at the other.

2.2 Kim Han-gyu (b.1950) - Yodong-sa (2004 'History of Liaodong')

Kim Han-gyu's Yodong-sa is the most scholarly of these works: primarily a positivist history it makes only minor usage of archaeology. Rather than minjok or culture zone, Kim terms his main unit of historical inquiry as yeoksa-gongdongche (歴史共同體 'shared historical body') and asserts Liaodong as a third yeoksa-gongdongche alongside and distinct from 'China' and 'Korea'. (Kim 2004:7) In short, similar to Janhunen (1996) he has written a Manchuria centric history in an age when there is no longer a Manchurian polity: he argues for the name 'Liaodong' over Manchuria on the grounds that it has a much longer historical pedigree and no doubt also to distance his framework from

188) For an overview of Chinese historiography on Northeast China, see Byington 2004.
colonial Japanese connotations with which the notion of 'Manchuria' has become indelibly associated.\(^{189}\)

In content, however, his history is most immediately reminiscent to colonial Japanese and Chinese Republic era historiography, a key aspect of both being the treatment of Goguryeo (and Buyeo) as a central part of Liaodong/Manchurian/Dongbei history distinct from Korea which is restricted to the Samhan polities of the southern peninsula.\(^{190}\)

Kim describes the core ethnicity of OJ as Maek and correlates this with 'Liaodong type' (i.e. bipa shaped) bronze daggers: during early and middle periods, OJ is centered in the Liao basin and moves to the northwest of the peninsula only in a later period. Under the Wi Man regime, OJ expands over Ye peoples to the east leading to the YeMaek designation. (Kim 2004:179)

\* Alongside its antiquity, the positioning of OJ is one area in which Kim differs to colonial Japanese historiography which located OJ primarily in the north of the Korean peninsula, centered at Pyeongyang and without correlation to bronze daggers or eastward relocation theories.

Kim accepts both orthodox locations of the Han Commanderies, as well as colonial era Pyeongyang archaeology in support of this, but at the same time argues Chinese influence to have been largely ephemeral and that the term used by Han China, 'outer commandery' (as opposed to 'inner'), demonstrates that Liaodong was never fully incorporated into China proper (Kim 2004:184).

Post-Han, Liaodong consequently comes under control of the fully autonomous Gongsun rulers in the west and emergent YeMaek Goguryeo to the east with Chinese Lelang surviving as a small enclave on the peninsula (Kim 2004:214,218). The Gongsun rulers are replaced by the Murong Xianbei, and subsequent Northern Wei, whilst Goguryeo continues as the core Liaodong polity distinct from both China and Xianbei to the west, and also from emergent peninsula polities to the south (Kim 2004:345). Whilst acknowledging that Goguryeo expanded into the Korean peninsula eventually moving its 'political capital' to Pyeongyang, Kim stresses that its underlying

\(^{189}\) For a contemporary Japanese survey treatment of Manchurian history in English, see Manchoukuo Year Book 1934 pp34-53.

\(^{190}\) This is present in all Japanese interpretations: in Chinese historiography, this model was first adopted by Fu Sinian’s (傅斯年 1896–1950) Dongbei-shigang (1932 東北史綱) and maintained by Jin Yufu’s (金毓黻 1887–1962) Dongbei-tongshi (1941 東北通史). For a critical discussion of these Chinese works in English see Byington 2004, and in Korean, Gang Seongbong’s chapter in NEAHF 2009.
Liaodong identity never diminishes (Kim 2004:344).

Rather than tracing the continuance of the Oj-Goguryeo YeMaek lineage amongst the peninsula states, as is customary amongst most Korean histories, Kim keeps to his Liaodong-centric historical focus chronologically tracing through Malgal Balhae, Khitan, Jurchen and Mongols to the Manchu Qing. He explicitly rejects Yu Deukgong’s call for including Balhae as a ‘northern kingdom’ in Korean historiography arguing that at the time there was no sense of a shared yeoksa-gongdongche between itself and Silla (Kim 2004:400-2).

* There was also no sense of a yeoksa-gongdongche between Baekje and Silla, but he still groups them as 'Korean'. [191]

Kim’s Yodong-sa finishes with the Manchu Qing and explicitly rejects the possibility that Manchukuo was anything more than a Japanese puppet state (Kim 2004:604). This however, is the elephant in the room: outside of the bibliography, Kim ignores colonial Japanese scholarship and claims his framework as if a new concept. He further argues adopting this third yeoksa-gongdongche as a means through which the history dispute between China and Korea could be resolved, observing that if Oj, Goguryeo, Liao, Jin, Yuan and Qing are treated as ‘Liaodong’ polities, then nearly all historical conflicts have either been between China and Liaodong, or between Liaodong and Korea, but never between China and Korea proper.

Needless to say, however, in the absence of an independent Manchurian polity, China is not going to voluntarily abandon orthodox dynastic treatment for territory over which it has near total jurisdiction, sovereignty and control (aside from far eastern Russian territory), and nor are either of the Korean states going to relinquish Oj or Goguryeo (and by extension Balhae), certainly not North Korea. Thus, despite being a good scholarly history, the question remains for whom it is written: if an independent yeoksa-gongdongche is successfully demonstrated, the only logical conclusion would be to call for the reestablishment of an independent Liaodong/Manchuria, but the core ethnic group required to do this, the Manchu, are close to extinct. Short of this, the content of Yodong-sa already works well enough simply as a regional history of modern Chinese Dongbei, which in current reality is what it is.

**Tentative evaluation**

It is also questionable as to what degree Liaodong/Manchuria can indeed be

---

191) This question of Baekje’s ambiguity has similarly been identified by Byington (2004) as a flaw in Jin Yufu’s model which has continued to inform more recent Chinese scholars, such as Zhang Boquan (张博泉 1926-2000) whose work is also referenced by Kim.
treated as a unit of 'shared historical experience': Manchuria is geographically and ethno-linguistically diverse: without modern political boundaries and an "imagined community" construction process, the definitions and potential range of overlapping 'shared historical experience' remain vague and arbitrary. Premodern diachronic 'shared historical' identities relied on claims of descent from preceding polities and tribes: modern interpretations primarily correlate these to ethno-linguistic lineages. In both instances, Manchuria has been divided between peripheral western groups such as the Xianbei and Khitan, and central and eastern groups represented by the Jurchen-Manchu. Within this framework, Oj, Buyeo and Goguryeo have all remained independently enigmatic and regularly contested. Byington (2004) observes that in the Qing, Manzhou-yuanliu-kao (满洲源流考), Goguryeo (and Khitan?) are absent from the Manchu's genealogical claims when they otherwise "saw themselves as the descendents of nearly every historical group that ever occupied the eastern two-thirds of Manchuria": Kim by contrast relies on the premise that Oj and Goguryeo were ethno-linguistic forebears to the Tungusic Jurchen because otherwise there is no pan-Liaodong/Manchuria continuity from antiquity, or between west and east. Manchuria as a historical unit seems best defined when viewed from the outside, whether by China, Korea or Japan, but the notion of a yeoksa-gongdong-che, for example between Khitan and Balhae seems no more, or less, justified than between Goguryeo and Baejkje, or Amuric (ancestral to Nivkh) speaking peoples marginalised by the Tungusic expansion.

In the absence of a modern political state, the strongest argument for recognizing Manchuria as a discrete region remains linguistic: whilst for most Korean historians this generally relies on the Altaic hypothesis, it is actually from the main result of the early Altaic linguistic work of Ramstedt most often ignored by Koreans, that is, the locating of a proto-Altaic homeland in Manchuria.192) Today the consensus of historical linguists is that whilst the Altaic type languages do not constitute a genetic family, their constituent proto-languages were all located in relative proximity in Manchuria giving rise to extensive areal contacts. Thus there is an 'out of Manchuria' model, involving, amongst others, the ancestral speakers of Mongolic and Tungusic, the linguistic

192) This eastward relocation was determined by Ramstedt’s rejection of any genetic affiliation of the Uralic languages to the Altaic group (Turkic, Mongolic and Tungusic), and inclusion of Korean and (tentatively) Japanese in the latter. As early as 1928, Ramstedt asserts, “The result of etymological researches will, as far as I can see, once [and] for all fix the Korean language in its proper place as an old branch of a large East-Asiatic group, from which the Mongoloturcicum separated earlier, while another group, the Tungusian, remained closer to the Korean, from which it also Chinese loanwords. The traditional and unconvincing «Uraloaltaic» theory must be removed farther away, as the center of the Altaic world locates itself on the Western and Eastern slopes of the Hingan mountain range.” (Ramstedt 1928:259)
descendents of which formed most of the historical groups of Manchuria; reflective of their intertwined histories. Manchuria has continued to function as a sprachbund of post-proto level areal contacts inclusive, of course, also of Chinese. The initial linguistic expansions, however, must have occurred before the appearance of these peoples in the early Chinese histories and so the shared areal linguistic origin still does not entirely support the argument for subsequent shared historical experience.

2.3 Mun Ansik - *Yoha-munmyeong-gwa YeMaek* (2012 'Liao river civilization and the YeMaek')

In contrast to *Yodong-sa*, Mun Ansik’s *Yoha-munmyeong-gwa YeMaek* is structured around units of archaeological culture labels. Seemingly reflective of late C20th archaeological trends, Mun’s narrative employs limited migration and cultural diffusion whilst invariably stressing indigenous innovation.

Ostensibly academic in style, Mun’s work gives no explicit indication of his personal motivation and, uniquely (for the books discussed in this dissertation), makes no mention of the China history dispute.

Similar to Wontack Hong, Mun traces the emergence of the YeMaek from the neolithic Hongshan and bronze age Lower Xiajiadian cultures, the latter of which, centered on the Luan river, becomes the source also for Shang and Yan (cf map in Mun 2012:59).

"The Linghe river culture [凌河文化] appeared during the middle of the C9th BC and continued (영위하다) until the transmission of Central Plain iron culture around the C4th BC. Linghe culture was not the same material form (유형) as the [contemporary] Upper Xiajiadian culture, but was a unique (고유하다) culture in the region of Liaoxi; it developed whilst absorbing the Weiyingszi (魏營子文化) and other nearby cultures.

The group who produced (영위하다) the Linghe culture in Liaoxi were none other than the YeMaek, the record of whose actions are [those] recorded in pre-Qin literature. The YeMaek were not a people who migrated from Siberia or the north: their roots were [rather] in the [earlier] group who produced the early bronze culture of southeastern Liaoxi and Inner Mongolia. These were a single lineage (갈래) who, since the [neolithic Lia basin] Xioahexi culture (小河西文化 [c.7000-6500 BCE]) produced the Chahai (查海文化), Xinglongwa (興隆窪文化), Hongshan and Lower Xiajiadian cultures. The group that produced the Lower Xiajiadian culture were not only the origin of the YeMaek: Central Plain [groups] such as Shang, Yan, Guzhu (孤竹), Lingzhi (令支) and Shanrong (山戎)
also split from here. Amongst the group which had produced the Lower Xiajiadian culture, the power which resided in the region of Liaoxi and southeast Inner Mongolia were [in Korean] called Bak (巴 Ch. Bo).

After the Lower Xiajiadian culture became extinct c.15th BCE, Bak (巴) divided into the Shanrong and [Korean] Bal (發). The Bal resided in the region of the Linghe river basin and Liaoxi Bohai bay, and produced the Linghe culture. Bal subsequently split into Maek (貊) and Ye (靺鞨). These were a group distinct in lineage (家族) from OJ. YeMaek and OJ produced individual cultures in the Linghe basin and Liaodong respectively." (Mun 2012:366-7)

As can be seen, in contrast to the pan-Altaic variant, Mun explicitly rejects any direct connection between Lower Xiajiadian and northern steppe bronze cultures, arguing the presence of the latter to be primarily the result of diffusion through long distance exchange (Mun 2012:62).

Similar to others, in Mun’s scheme OJ emerges as a state associated with the bipa shape bronze dagger culture formed by descendents of the Lower Xiajiadian culture moving east and closely associated with pre-Qin Suksin (肃慎 - who he asserts are unrelated to the Yilou 押娄) (Mun 2012:368). Mun then follows the OJ movement hypothesis, such that with the expansion of Yan, OJ relocates to the Daedong river basin, Pyeongyang.

Whilst attributing Shang and Yan with Lower Xiajiadian roots, Mun distinguishes the other pre-Qin Dongyi as having separately arisen from their own archaeological cultures in Gansu and Shandong province, the latter consequently moving south to form the Miao (苗族). (Mun 2012:369)

Mun describes the establishment of Buyeo as achieved by ethnic Ye from Liaoxi who, displaced by the Yan expansion, first migrated northwards establishing Goriguk (高麗)193) which he equates to the Wanghaitun culture (望海屯文化) at the confluence of the Nen (嫩江) and northward flowing Songhua rivers, after which a group moves south to establish Buyeo over the indigenous pre-state Xituanshan bronze culture (西圖山文化) (Mun 2012:371).

---

193) Mun does not provide the Chinese characters but the name Gori (高麗 Ch. Gaoli) is clearly taken from the name of the state which Buyeo progenitor, Dongmyeong, flees south from in the Buyeo foundation story given in the Weilüe 威略 passages of the SGZ "Buyeo” account: annotations to this account note that the first character, gao 高, has variants of gao 藥, suo 素, tuo 薄 and gao 藥. The earliest attestation of the Dongmyeong story is in the Lunheng (論衡) where the same state is rendered as Tuoli-guo (藥國). As noted earlier, Shiratori (1938:27-28) prefers the suo/tuo variants to establish a Tungusic etymology 'black' found in the hydronymy of the Amur river (Manchu 'Sahaliyan ula’ > Chinese 'Heilong-jiang').
The establishment of Goguryeo similarly occurs with ethnic Maek displaced from Liaoxi moving eastwards. According to Mun, Goguryeo is initially founded by the Sono group (濊奴) before being subjugated by the Xuantu Commandery, in turn overthrown by Jumong c.37 BCE; under King Taejo (太祖王) the royal line switches from the *‘Sono Hae’ (解氏) clan to the Gyerubu (桂婁部) who are a branch of Ye migrated from Buyeo (Mun 2012:375).

Mun, meanwhile, treats ethnogenesis of the Korean Han in the south of the peninsula as primarily an indigenous process stimulated by the arrival of migrants by sea directly from the Dalinghe river basin and Shenyang (presumably via the Hun river basin) who introduce narrow bladed bronze daggers.

"The main constituent (주체) of the [Korean] Han (韓族) people was the indigenous group that produced the Songgungni-hyeong culture (松菊里型文化 송궁리형문화) and constructed dolmen tombs (支石墓). The [YeMaek] group that migrated from Liaoning were unable to suppress them and were [instead] themselves absorbed and assimilated. State formation of the centre and southern part of the Korean peninsula shows a different aspect to that of Buyeo and Goguryeo which were established by YeMaek who migrated from the Linghe basin by crossing the Liao river.

The YeMaek who established Buyeo and Goguryeo did so whilst subjugating the native powers, however, those [YeMaek] people who migrated to the centre and south of the Korean peninsula [directly from Liaoning, by contrast] acted as a stepping stone for the [indigenous] formation of Samhan society." (Mun 2012:383-4)

Following orthodox historiography, Mun identifies peninsula Malgal as ethnic Ye who had migrated south from the Tumen river basin down the east coast establishing South Okjeo and Dong Ye before expanding westwards to the Han river basin and becoming ambiguously associated with Lelang/Nangnang; meanwhile a branch of Goguryeo Maek establish the Chuncheon Maek-guk polity. With the rise of Baekje, the Ye Malgal in the South Han river basin associated with Lelang/Nangnang are displaced and a group of these relocate to the region of Gyeongju becoming the royal Kim clan of Silla (Mun 2012:385-7).

In this way Mun incorporates aspects of the pan-Altaic migrations but reduces the scale to western Manchuria. Rejecting long range migration, his model appears to be informed by Lee Hyeonggu who has emphasized an indigenous Bohai bay culture zone and is well represented in Mun’s bibliography. Conceptually it remains a form of Dongyi – specifically Maek – conflations.
that links YeMaek Goguryeo to the ancient Mo (貊) mentioned in the *Shijing* (詩經): this was commonly accepted by both colonial Japanese (e.g. Shiratori 1938) and Republican era Chinese scholars.


A final, more explicitly popular style history work that focuses on western Manchuria is U Silha's *Dongbuk-gongjeong neomeo: yohara-munmyeong-non*. Perhaps both for its enigmatic value and high profile recognition in China, this work strongly emphasizes the Hongshan culture (4500–3000 BCE) whilst making only passing mention of the Lower Xiajiadian (2000–1500 BCE) (U 2007:104).

On the basis of the Niuheliang (牛河樑) 'goddess' statue and carved jades, U seeks to present the Hongshan culture as the source of a civilization rivalling the monumental civilizations of the ancient world. Reminiscent to Choe Namseon’s *ManMong munhwa*, U describes the Hongshan culture as a product of synthesis between paleo-Asiatic peoples associated with the indigenous Xinglongwa culture (興隆洼文化 6200–5200 BCE), and incoming Tungusic groups from the Baikal region to the north, together with groups associated with the colored pottery Yangshao culture (仰韶文化) of the Central Plain to the south (U 2007:333). Based on re-classification of the zoomorphic Hongshan 'dragon jades' as 'boar' and 'bear' dragon types respectively (熊玉龍), Mun attributes boar totemism to the indigenous peoples (represented also by comb tooth style earthenware 빗살문니토끼) and bear totemism to the Tungusic groups¹⁹⁵ (U 2007:317–9). In order to link the Hongshan culture to Korea, Mun then adopts archetypal pan-Altaic diffusion and migration explanations drawing heavily on popular history works – analogous to Kim Unhoe – by Jeong Hyeongjin in which Buyeo is founded by Hitites and Silla by Sycthians¹⁹⁶

U positions himself against China's Northeast Project but does not seek to negate Chinese claims entirely. Like Kim Han-gyu he sees the emphasis of a northeastern zone/civilization as providing a solution to the history dispute, but

---

¹⁹⁴ For example, Lee Hyeonggu 1989 and 2004 (the latter cited in U Silha 2007:393).
¹⁹⁵ U attributes this classification originally to Xue Zhiqiang (薛志強) whilst presenting Guo Dashun (郭大順) as emphasizing only bear forms, at least as specific to the Goddess Temple site (U 2007:314): by contrast, Barnes and Guo attribute Guo with distinguishing bear and boar types but inclusive of additional Hongshan sites (Barnes and Guo 1996:214).
¹⁹⁶ U cites Jeong Hyeongjin 2003 and 2005 respectively. A more recent work is Jeong Hyeongjin 2014: other than alternative labeling, Jeong’s narrative contains little that is significantly different to Kim Unhoe, although he more explicitly acknowledges Choe Namseon and Dangun mythology (e.g. Jeong 2014:190 and 262).
rather than attempting to separate it from China and Korea as Kim does, he instead argues it should be used for establishing a sense of common ancestry and, ideally, greater political integration between the modern states.

"As examined above, in terms of scale the neolithic culture areas of the Liao river region are not inferior to the origin sites of the four great civilizations [Egypt, Mesopotamia, Indus and Yellow River]. These [Liao culture areas] could be bound together as a new civilization zone. The concrete name should be debated, but both 'Liao river civilization' as has already begun to be used in China, or 'Northeast Asian civilization' (동북아문명) are fine. However, what I am proposing is that the 'Liao river' or 'Northeast Asian' civilization of this region is adopted as 'the shared source of civilization for all the states of Northeast Asia' (동북아시아 여러 국가들의 공통의 시원 문명).

Because it is the earliest culture in 'present day Chinese territory', it is fine to regard it as the origin of Chinese civilization (중화문화). However, the logic [of China’s Northeast Project] stating that all the ancient minjok who originated from this region are descendent of the Yellow Emperor inevitably has many problems...

...[Those who constructed the Liao river civilization] were people living on that land from before Korea, China, Japan or Mongolia even existed: they were the shared ancestors of Korea, China, Japan and Mongolia. One part of them are Chinese ancestors who moved south and established Shang; another part were the main body (주체) that, as ancestors of the YeMaek established O], Buyeo, Goguryeo and Balhae: they were also the ancestors of Mongols in present day Mongolia. Ultimately, the protagonists who constructed the Liao river civilization and Hongshan culture cannot but be the common ancestors of Korea, China and Mongolia." (U 2007:393-4)
Conclusion

Part I of this thesis has examined and sought to delineate the premodern understanding of Korea’s ancient past, at least as it was known to the educated elite, from the late C13th through to the early C19th, and which I have labelled the Orthodox Narrative. The poetic surveys Jewang-ungi and Isib’ildo-hoegosi provide archetypes of the ON, in its earliest attested and finalized forms respectively: their own differing poetic forms provide distillations of essentially the same body of a more complex historiographic tradition, in what was throughout the premodern era a highly consumable format, through which we can draw analogy to modern popular historiography.

The intermediary chapters of Part I traced the relatively minor changes that the ON underwent between the C13th and late C18th: these changes included certain innovations, omissions, rationalizations and overall efforts at greater precision towards dating and geography. Probably the most important innovation was the insertion of the episode of Dangun’s son, Buru, participating in the Xia king Yu’s gathering of vassals at Tushan mountain, which functions to push back the perceived antiquity of Korea’s interactions with China to the very earliest historical era.

The endeavor of those writing history was the transmission and perceived refinement of ‘received tradition’: in all of the premodern histories, I believe the maxim shu-er-buzuo (述而不作 ‘recount, do not invent’) prevails, and consequently even when new ‘innovations’ were incorporated, we are not observing creative authorship, or cynical invention, but a reflection of prevailing traditions of the time.

Both due to relative neglect in other English language studies and to mirror the focus of the modern era sections of the thesis, this overview of premodern historiography has primarily focused on individually authored works. However, from Jewang-ungi up to and including the works of the Gwon family (Eunje-si, Yeokdae-se’nyeon-ga and Eunje-si-ju) the distinction between official and unofficial historiography is blurred by the fact that the authors were in any event high ranking officials who themselves participated in official history compilation.

From Chapter 4 onwards, however, the survey turned to mid Joseon dynasty works which are more definitely unofficial and auteur in nature. Through examination of these privately authored prose works we can see how individuals with a personal interest and enthusiasm for history conceptualized and analyzed the ON on their own terms: through their brushes the ON underwent continued
refinement and elaboration

Concern for accuracy and clarity was heightened with the empirical approach adopted by Silhak type scholars culminating in the detailed studies of Yu Deukgong (Sagun-ji) and Jeong Yak-yong, presented in Part II. The main focus of these works was historical geography, a discipline which already reached back both to Han Baek-gyeom and earlier treatments in dynastic compilations, and which would subsequently go on to become the major battleground of modern nationalist historiography. In the premodern era, however, there is limited evidence that it was a controversial topic. Primarily it was an area of history which had suffered most in clarity for the confusion found in sources and local tradition, but equally had the best potential to be untangled through vigorous parsing of texts which could satisfy the scholarly desire for better accuracy. In many ways this historical geography anticipated one of the core functions of modern archaeology - at least as utilized by historians - confirming the location of historical places.

The historiographic oeuvre of Yu Deukgong is particularly noteworthy as it spans both treatment of the ON in its most popular form, and careful research into the then less 'mainstream' topics of Balhae and the Han Commanderies: Yu combined erudition with inspired poetic sensibility and a keen appreciation of geography and the historical landscapes he traveled through. Both fortuitous and telling is that the two topics he chose as objects of specific research have become two of the most contentious in the modern era, yet occupying opposite ends of concern for nationalist historiography: in the case of Balhae that of irredentism, and the Han Commanderies, conscious diminishment. In contrast to these modern and specifically post-colonial issues, Yu may have lamented the loss of Balhae from Korean history and territory but there was no further political motivation in either of his works. To the degree that there was an ethnic component involved, it was the perceived loss of Balhae to Jurchen barbarians that irked Yu over the ancient Chinese Han invasion.

This leads us to the defining characteristic of the ON vis-à-vis modern historiography, that had been present from earliest attestation and no doubt much longer before, that is: the non-contentious inclusion of both Classical Sinic heritage and more indigenous peninsula and southern Manchurian traditions symbolized in the Dangun-Gija symbiosis. How this circumstance came about is an important topic of inquiry and has been addressed in recent works such as Breuker (2010) and Cha (2014): these focus on evolution of state ideology during the mid Goryeo dynasty when 'Samhan unification ideology' of early Goryeo was merged with newly introduced neo-classicism, the latter ultimately resulting in the establishment of the Joseon dynasty. However, as also acknowledged in both
these works, Sinic traditions including the important Gija legend traced back potentially to Goguryeo, and as Yu Deukgong and Jeong Yak-yong would have been fully aware, ultimately to the Lelang commandery - based on the orthodox premise of its location on the peninsula.

Aside from the balanced representation of Korea’s inherent Sino-Korean cultural identity, one other enduring aspect of the ON is the self-assumed notion of Dongyi identity. As is well known, original 'Dongyi conflationism' traces to Chinese historiography in which, following the Han expansion, the label of Dongyi 'eastern barbarian' which had previously referred to peoples on the eastern periphery of the central plain, namely the Shandong peninsula region, was reused to refer to the newly encountered peoples of the Manchuria and Korean peninsula regions. This conflation was utilized in adapting the ancient account of Gija 'going east' to mean that he went to ancient Korea: in the ON this was fully embraced and we see embellishments such as Confucius’ high appraisal of the ancient Dongyi, taken by Koreans as referring to their direct in situ ancestors. Dongyi conflationism is one core aspect of premodern historiography that has been maintained even by modern nationalist historians to bolster anti-Sinicist and make sweeping, self-conceited territorial claims over much of China’s east coast.

Part III has then presented the early C20th works that have come to constitute much of the foundation of present day popular historiography which I have labeled Northern/Altaic. If there is a core finding in this thesis concerning current day popular historiography it has been in confirming the differing but undiminished influences of Sin Chaeho and Choe Namseon.

Sin’s work was anticipated by the northern focus of Kim Yonghwi’s Dongsa, and more immediately built on - or was perhaps even mutually influential to - Kim Gyoheon’s Sindanmin-sa. Sin sought to fundamentally revise the ON to negate the long assumed cultural superiority of Classical China. In form, however, his narrative remains largely based on the same 'received tradition' - the dynastic histories - simply inverting and embellishing motivations.

A clearer paradigm shift occurs rather with Choe Namseon who adopted new long range theories linking Korea with perceived Altaic peoples - formerly regarded as northern barbarians - as an alternative to Sinocentricism. Sin, too had adopted the Ural-Altaic hypothesis but in his case it is mainly as a starting point, replacing the previous function of the foundation myths, after which he

197) This thesis skipped over most of the C19th but there are likely intermediate works further bridging the temporal divide.
continues his historical narrative. Like premodern historians, Sin took the existence of a Korean ethnie as self-evident and sought to reshape the associated received tradition. By contrast, Choe’s focus (in the works here discussed) was on ethnogenesis, the process of which he sought to discover through a more interdisciplinary approach informed by folkloristics and ethnography. A core aspect of Choe’s work is the ‘search for origins’ to explain who the Koreans are and why they are different to China: Sin’s historiography is a more orthodox ‘rise and fall’ narrative in which he premises a golden age and narrates the decline.

Part IV has then examined a sample of present day, privately authored popular history works which I have characterized as ‘Empire’, ‘Pan-Altaic’ and finally ‘Liaodong-centric’ variants. Reminiscent to the Joseon dynasty historians’ treatment of the ON, Yun Naehyeon’s work has attempted to provide greater precision and evidence to Sin’s empire conceptualization of ancient Joseon whilst tacitly borrowing from Choe: Lee Deok-il similarly adopts this altered ‘received tradition’ and builds on Sin and Yun’s polemical discourses concerning historiographic tradition itself. By contrast Kim Unhoe and Seo Dong-in concern themselves with the question of ethnogenesis ‘search for origins’ utilizing long range migration theories. All, however, are bound by anti-Sinocentrism and to varying degrees exploit traditional Dongyi conflationism, itself conflated with pan-Altaicism premised on the defunct Altaic language hypothesis.

Whilst I believe the broad scheme and labels employed in this thesis have some potential value in conceptualizing the course of Korean historiography, these generalizations inevitably risk a degree of distortion and misrepresentation of the works in question, something which happens far too easily in any ‘history of ideas’. Poorly compiled as it is, I hope that the summaries comprising the bulk of this thesis will provide a useful source of reference.

Archaeologicalization

One of the longer term processes evident in this survey has been that of rationalization, most evident in the evolving treatment of Dangun, from the appellation of a demigod, to human ruler, and in the modern era variously as a monarchal title or totemistic abstraction, or else entirely replaced with archaeological findings, but even in this latter case, whether implicitly or explicitly, the significance of those findings is typically correlated to the orthodox dating of Dangun, namely c.2333 BCE. Thus even in negation, Dangun is retrospectively re-interpreted as a symbol of ancient Korean civilization, transformed into what might be termed the ‘Dangun fact’.

During the C20th nearly all aspects of the ON have undergone a transformative
process of 'archaeologicalization' wherein their historicity has been either confirmed or replaced by material artefacts and culture. With archaeology having been initiated by Imperial Japan, this began with the identification and excavation of the Lelang Commandery at Pyeongyang; ever since archaeology has been viewed with suspicion by nationalists but gradually its perceived objective positivism has been embraced to support the modern Northern/Altaic counter narratives. Giya, for example, is associated with bronzes inscribed with Gi (箕) found in the Daling-he river basin of the Liaoxi region, outside of the peninsula, and simultaneously negated from peninsula history for the explicit lack of associated archaeology.\footnote{198} particularly interesting in the case of Giya is that his historicity had long been confirmed in the ON specifically through the perceived material remains of the well-field (井田) field system outside of Pyeongyang. Meanwhile Old Joseon proper has been identified and \textit{archaeologicalized} through association with bronze daggers, pottery cultures, dolmen and - both most boldly yet problematically - the distant Hongshan culture: paradoxically, its capital has yet to be physically identified.

As noted, historical geography is now substantiated through archaeology, but with the important exceptions of hydronymy and oronymy such that proponents of the Empire variant can continue to argue for continental locations of the Han Commanderies based on relative locations of rivers (Peishui and Liao) and mountains (Jieshi-shan). Polities attested in dynastic history, are correlated to archaeological cultures matched to the temporal timeframe provided by historical records: the peninsula Samhan, for example, attested in SGZ are matched to cultures in the southernmost third of the peninsula: those such as Lee Deok-il who reject the historicity of the peninsula Samhan argue the same archaeology to belong instead to the early Three Kingdoms as attested in the later SS.

Additionally the 'articles of civilization' found in the ON, which were usually represented by individual personages, whether progenitors, heroes or men of talent, have since been re-conceptualized as intangible articles such as 'agriculture', 'social stratification' or 'writing', in turn represented by excavated artefacts or sites which are interpreted according to generic Neo-evolutionist schemes of social development.\footnote{199}

\textbf{Historiography as national mythology}  
Tension between myth and history has not just been a modern phenomenon but is found in discussions such as those pre-facing Yi Gyubo’s \textit{Dongmyeongwang-pyeon} and Yi Seunghyu’s \textit{Jewang-ungi}. Today, the surest way

\footnote{198} Song 2004:160.  
\footnote{199} For a detailed explication of this process see Logie 2014.
to be dismissed as a pseudo historian is to relate the Dangun myth to ancient Joseon, but just as with, for example, the King Arthur tradition in Britain, the idea of Dangun remains deeply evocative in the public imagination, fueled by the continued need for, or at least interest in, national mythology.

In the premodern era - or at any time when believed in - mythology functioned as 'early history' occupying an authentic primeval period when supernatural events were regarded as possible: it only becomes mythology when no longer believed, displaced either by religion or science, or both. Under these processes the content of mythology may be preserved as secular literature, whether oral and/or ultimately written down. In the modern era, the previous temporal domain of mythology became prehistory and its investigation was rationalized primarily by means of archaeology. Ever since, the content of mythology has usually been disregarded by early historians and archaeologists, deeming it to say more about the time in which it was attested than of which it speaks. In the early modern National Romantic era which saw the codification of nation states, mythology as epic narrative literature, meanwhile often found a new, autonomous position and prestige as 'national mythology' providing a source of inspiration to secular arts helping to enhance a sense of authentic national identity: one of the clearest examples of its utilization in modern 'nation state formation' is the case of Finland and its national epic, **Kalevala.** (Pentikäinen 1999:221) Even secularized as literature, a defining attribute of mythology remains its perceived authenticity as being both authorless and of relative antiquity: in this it maintains a function of 'received tradition' parallel to that of national history.

Korea's transition to modern nation state(s) has had to contend with confrontation with industrialized powers, colonization and permanent division: because of this the very question of national identity has been acute throughout the C20th and there is every reason to assume that a national mythology might have emerged as a process of modern state formation, whether with the 1897 declaration of the Daehan-jeguk empire, in response to colonization, or post 1945.  

Not every modern nation state has been endowed with enough surviving mythology to establish a national epic and alternative strategies emerged such as greater emphasis of 'civil religion', borrowing from nearby mythologies or reviving medieval culture (e.g. Pre-Raphaelites in England); alternatively, national cultural identity has been created or enhanced through national(ist) archaeology.

---

200) This thesis has focused on South Korean popular historiography but North Korea has demonstrated an equal, if not stronger need for national mythology, particularly since the 1990s which saw the increasing mythologization of the rule Kim lineage accompanied by the reestablishment of Pyeongyang centered Dangun worship.
The case of Korea, I believe, is ambiguous.

Paradoxically, Korea has long attested surviving mythology in the form of the foundation myths but when isolated from their functional context in the ON they contain very limited narrative material. The one potential exception is the Jumong story, as a longer rendition survives in the form of Dongmyeongwang-pyeon, however, to elevate Jumong would cause the diminishment of Dangun, and Dongmyeong/Jumong is also inextricably bound to the northern Buyeo-Goguryeo polities and so fails to provide a unifying 'national' myth or one of immediate relevance to any Seoul based polity (particularly to one whose political roots were in Gyeongsang-do province). Korea separately has a rich tradition of oral epic narratives in the form of ritualistic mu-ga (巫歌 'mudang shaman songs') and the more secular, highly refined pansori canon originating in the southwest but these have never been regarded as national myth: mu-ga have long suffered social stigma limiting both their appeal and development, whilst pansori, despite containing some supernatural elements, is primarily a theatrical tradition and too clearly the product of late Joseon dynasty sensibilities - i.e. not of authentic antiquity.

Other strategies for substituting indigenous mythology, for example, by drawing on classicism is impossible for Korea as rejection of perceived Sinocentricism and Neo-Classical Confucianism has been the core motivation of the modern cultural enlightenment movement to which Sin Chaeho and Choe Namseon belong.

At the same time, Korea has been reluctant to embrace archaeology as a national project owing to the historical circumstances of it having been introduced by the Japanese as a colonialisaty strategy specifically motivated to undermine Korean national identity, and equally because it failed to uncover any obvious monumental civilization which the colonized could later reclaim (e.g. Zimbabwe or Cambodia). Throughout the C20th peninsular archaeology has been valuable in the actual study of the past, but less so to the nation building process. Thus it may be posited that the power of mythology has remained compelling and the limited potential of the Hwan'ung-Dangun myth has been quite literally mined for all its worth.

Again, Korea has mythologies, but any one of the foundation myths alone is limited in scope: aside from the extremely ambiguous connection between Dangun and Jumong, they are also basically unrelated in content. Crucially, the only way in which they combine, and tie in to any longer narrative structure, is in the context of the ON, divorced from which they are merely unworkable fragments.
Thus for all the reasons above, Korean mythology has remained more closely intertwined with history: even with the assumed rationalization of modern historiography there has been a greater reluctance to discard the foundation myths, particularly in national and popular contexts. Instead they are themselves rationalized to varying degrees and that result is maintained nested within popular historical narratives.

Here I will finish by suggesting that the ON itself could be viewed as national mythology. If so, the greatest potential value in distinguishing and delineating the ON should be in order to recognize it not just as inaccurate history to be discarded and relegated to the past, but understood as an invaluable component of Korea’s cultural heritage which can exist parallel to the scientific investigation of early Korea. Whilst far from impossible, the biggest immediate challenge for the Korean public imagination would be to re-embrace the early Sinic aspect of its rich and authentic ethno-cultural identity: with the economic rise of mainland China and relative decline of American hegemony, the conditions for such a shift may soon be realized.
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