

**Problems with the ~~Succession of the History~~ could we rephrase this as  
“Historical Succession”? of Goguryeo  
in Northeast Asia**

**Lee Soon Keun Yi Sun-geun**

Lee Soon Keun (Yi, Sun-geun) is Professor of Korean History at Catholic University of Korea. He has published many articles and books on Korean ancient history, including “Malgal-ui jeonJonggajokgye jeongcheseong-e daehan il yeongu” (A Study of the Malgal Tribe’s ReligiousEthnic Identity) (1996).

Abstract (요약문을 원코지 2-2.5 매 정도 부탁드립니다)와 keywords (6-10 개 정도)를 작성해서 보내주시기 바랍니다.

### **Introduction**

When China registered the Capital Cities and Tombs of the Ancient Goguryeo Kingdom as a UNESCO World Heritage, Koreans were shocked to learn that China has been claiming the culture and history of Goguryeo as its own. The history and culture of ~~the~~ Old Joseon and the succeeding Goguryeo and Balhae kingdoms that stretched from the northern Korean peninsula to Manchuria and Liaodong region holds an important place in ancient Korean history. Since 2002, however, China has been ~~reorganizing~~ [not sure this is the best word here. how about “recasting”? or “revising”?] the history and culture of the region through a five-year government-funded project on ancient societies in northeastern China, known as the Northeast Asia Project, drawing attention and doubt as to the intentions that lie behind its sudden interest in the area.

The truth is, however, that China has been claiming Goguryeo as part of Chinese history from as early as the 1980s.<sup>1</sup> This claim has received constant attention since then,

---

<sup>1</sup> Sun (1986). It was this book that first suggested an affiliation between China and Goguryeo, which

and various research projects have been underway concerning this issue. Most recently, all aspects of Goguryeo, including its founders, people, system and culture, are being interpreted ~~ated~~ as belonging to China. China's voluminous research on the history of Goguryeo centers on finding anything Chinese that is directly or indirectly related to the history and culture of Goguryeo. Based on these findings, they claim that the history of China and Goguryeo are the same.<sup>2</sup> China's research can be credited with uncovering various new aspects of Goguryeo's history. At the same time, however, such teleological research faces a number of historiographical problems.

Adherence to specific historical claims through quantitative studies or teleological research is easily criticized as highly illogical. Determining to whom a nation's history belongs involves looking at [it](#) through both a non-academic and a political perspective. However, when this issue becomes a topic of discussion, the most important points should be what kind of historical consciousness the people of the era in question had, as well as who inherited the history of the nation after its fall.

In this regard, this research aims to examine issues concerning the historical consciousness of the Goguryeo people in relation to China, and how their history was passed down after the fall of Goguryeo. I hope that this study will go beyond the great amount of quantitative and teleological research done by China and past the highly emotional response from Korea, and be able to provide a foundation for objective, academic research and debate on both sides.

---

separated Goguryeo from Baekje and Silla.

<sup>2</sup> In almost 70(→126) articles including *The History and Culture of Goguryeo* (Zhū Biān. 2000. 耿鐵??倪軍民 이 부분이 간체로 되어있어 잘 모르겠습니다. 설명을 부탁드립니다.)→(耿鐵華 Geng Tie Hua · 倪軍民 Ni Jun Min ed., 2000) along with about 70 articles presented at the First Academic Forum on Goguryeo held in July 2002, both identify Chinese aspects of Goguryeo culture and relate them to

## Goguryeo's Identity as Seen through Resistance to China

In order to clearly determine where the history of Goguryeo belongs, it is important to understand what kind of historical consciousness the people of Goguryeo had during their time. However, this is not such a simple matter. The only remaining Goguryeo records written by themselves during the era are a few epitaphs, ~~and~~ the *Samguk sagi* (Historical Record of Three Kingdoms) was another record, written by Kim Bu-sik in 1145, during the Goryeo era. ~~and~~ there are also Goguryeo-related records, though not many, found in China's historical books from the *Sanguozhi* (History of the Three Kingdoms) to the *Xin tangshu* (New History of the Tang Dynasty), which facilitate our understanding of the issue. However, the problem is that these records are included in the Biography on the Eastern Barbarians in several Chinese historical works of *Huohanshu* (The History of the Later Han Dynasty) ← in several many chinese historiography 나, 아니면 그냥 ,they called, 가 어떨까요? along with the records on Baekje, Silla and Wa, which are all historical records of the Chinese borderland viewed from China's perspective. It is thus difficult to infer the Goguryeo people's historical consciousness from these records.

These records center on how the surrounding countries were made to subordinate to China; in other words, they focus on how these countries had relations with China in terms of a tribute-investiture system. This is one of the important bases of China's claims that Goguryeo was a "local government of an ethnic minority." However, as has been pointed out from earlier on, this tribute-investiture system existed between all the surrounding countries, including Silla, Baekje and even Japan, and in some cases

---

Chinese culture.

was imposed upon two or more countries at the same time. This shows that the significance of this system differs substantially from China's claims. Therefore, it is difficult to view the surrounding countries of that time as constituting parts of a single governance system, with China at the center. It is all the more doubtful that these countries, even while participating in the tributary-investiture system, regarded themselves as part of "China's"<sup>3</sup> local government. In this chapter, I will examine the Goguryeo people's view towards China as it is presented in the historical records of their resistance to China. Since the term "resistance" implies opposition and conflict, it poses a logical limitation and contradiction in that it presupposes an antagonistic relationship. However, upon examining whether that resistance is simply an internal opposition or a tension between the central and local government, or something more substantial, e.g. a struggle between two separate groups, we will be able to determine some aspects of the Goguryeo people's view of China.

Let us first examine Goguryeo's relationship with and view towards China at the beginning of its formation. According to the *Samguk sagi*, the foundation of Goguryeo traces back to 37 BC, spreading over the upstream of the Hunhe River and the midstream of the Yalu River. The Yemaek people are presumed to have inhabited this region. Before the fall of Old Joseon in 128 BC, this region was included in the region where Namyeo, the ruler of Ye, resided with his 280,000 people. Considering such

---

<sup>3</sup> It is not appropriate to use the name "China" in reference to the pre-Goguryeo(고구려 전체 시기인지 아니면 고구려 이전의 시기인지요? ←전체시기를 말합니다. 그런데 원래의 의미는 한문으로 中國의 의미를 써야 합니다. 의미상 '중심국'이라는 표현인 중국을 사용한 것은 고구려 후기에 극히 한정된 시기이기 때문입니다. 한글 논문에서는 중국(中國)을 썼기 때문에 문제가 되어 주를 달았는데 영문으로 전부 'China'로 된다면 이 '주 3'은 의미가 없어지겠습니다. 제 생각으로는 이 주를 그냥 지우는 것이 문제를 복잡하게 하지 않을 것 같군요.) era, but I have used it for convenience.

circumstances, the Yemaek people who lived in this area were the main population that made up Goguryeo.<sup>4</sup> The most adversarial force against Goguryeo at the time was the Xuantu Commandery of China, one of several Chinese commanderies. The Xuantu Commandery was installed in 107 BC in order to control the area. However, the commandery did once retreat to the Liaodong area in 75 BC in the 32 years following its establishment. The reason for this is recorded in Chinese historical books as being due to “attacks from the barbaric Maek.”<sup>5</sup> It is, however, difficult to consider the barbaric Maek as Eastern Okjeo, because the Dongye or the Eastern Okjeo of the time was a weak and divided force that was subordinate to the Defender of the Eastern Section of the Lelang Commandery. Taking these circumstances into account, it would not be too problematic to regard the “barbaric Maek” as native Yemaek people who resided in the area, as by this time the names Ye, Maek and Yemaek were all used to designate the same people. After the Yemaek people (or Maek people) forced out the Xuantu Commandery, they then established Goguryeo.

Another important aspect related to the formation of Goguryeo is the existence of [the](#) Goguryeo prefecture. In the *Houhanshu* (History of the Later Han Dynasty), the Goguryeo prefecture is recorded as one of the three prefectures belonging to the Xuantu Commandery. Although this record does not show when exactly this was the case, there is a great possibility that it ~~was~~ [existed](#) when the Xuantu Commandery was first installed. Just as native names, such as Nangnang, Joseon, Jinbeon and Imdun, were

---

<sup>4</sup> There are minute differences in opinions regarding the people who founded Goguryeo, depending on the varying perspectives regarding ethnic groups such as Ye, Maek, Yemaek, Buyeo, and so on. However, the perspective that [views regards](#) Yemaek as the main population often appears in the Chinese historical records, and until the recent objection from China arose, this was a generally-accepted theory within and outside Korea.

<sup>5</sup> “Dongwoju [東沃沮東沃沮](#)” Biography [on of](#) Eastern Barbarians [東夷傳東夷傳](#), in *Weishu* of *Sanguozhi*.

kept when establishing commanderies or prefectures, the title “Goguryeo” prefecture must have also been maintained. This implies that the geographical or ethnic name Goguryeo (or Guryeo) had already existed in the area. Considering that Goguryeo was founded after the Xuantu Commandery was driven away 32 years after its establishment, the main force of the founding of Goguryeo may have been the people who were already living in the area, which was called Goguryeo.<sup>6</sup>

Stated more simply, in 107 BC, the Yemaek people were spread over the middle of the Yalu River and the upper stream of the Hunhe River, where the Xuantu Commandery of China was installed. However, the commandery soon faced ~~the~~ opposition and resistance ~~of~~ from the natives, and was driven away to the Liaodong area. The people who forced away the commandery then established Goguryeo in that area.

As can be examined, Goguryeo’s foundation was related to the struggle of Yemaek natives against the Xuantu Commandery. This influenced the continuous opposition and conflict that followed between Goguryeo and the Xuantu Commandery. According to the records, the Xuantu Commandery continued to treat Goguryeo as a prefecture, while Goguryeo tried to overcome such interventions and defend its autonomy. The passage of the *Sanguozhi*, “though they were given a drum, a flute, and a court musician through the Xuantu Commandery, and were ordered to receive official robe and clothes and headgear, they did not come,”<sup>7</sup> well reflects the situation of the time. Goguryeo was freeing itself from the Xuantu Commandery and was emerging as a new power in the region.

It seems that China planned to control Goguryeo through the Xuantu

---

<sup>6</sup> Yi B. (1976, 358-359).

<sup>7</sup> “Gaogoli 高句麗,” Biography on the Eastern Barbarians, in *Weishu of Sanguozhi*.

<sup>8</sup> 夫餘別種... 言語諸事 多與夫餘同. “Fuyu 扶餘,” Biography ~~on~~ of Eastern Barbarians, in *Weishu of Sanguozhi*.

Commandery as a governance system. However, by around the dawn of the Christian era, Goguryeo had already grown strong enough to withstand attacks from four other surrounding commandaries, i.e. Liaodong, Lelang, Xuantu and Daifang, using various methods, from appeasement policies to aggressive attacks. However, it mostly chose policies of conflict and resistance rather than obedience and subordination, and the records of Goguryeo's resistance that fill a great part of the *Samguk sagi* and the biographies on Goguryeo in China's historical records well reflect this choice. When we compare the records on Buyeo and Goguryeo in the *Weishu* (Book of Wei) of *Sanguozhi*, it becomes clear how China regarded Goguryeo. Even from this ancient period, China regarded Goguryeo and Buyeo as entities that shared the same ethnic origin as the Yemaek.<sup>8</sup> However, it viewed them differently in temperament, writing in favor of the friendly and amenable Buyeo people while showing its hostility towards the people of Goguryeo, saying that "they were heinous, short-tempered, and prone to invade other regions."<sup>9</sup> No doubt such hostility was based on the fact that Goguryeo never readily accepted China's control, but rather constantly invaded and threatened China.

The main objective of Goguryeo's struggle at this time was to oust the forces of the Lelang and Daifang commanderies because they were a colonizing force just like the Xuantu Commandery, which had been installed after the collapse of Old Joseon. In order to expel the Lelang and Daifang forces, it was strategically important to seize Xianping (presently the Dandong area in the estuary of the Yalu River). Goguryeo fought particularly fiercely against the Liaodong Commandery over this area. The reason Goguryeo repeatedly invaded Liaodong was to also take Xianping, and after repeated losses and recaptures, Goguryeo was finally able to secure the area during

---

<sup>9</sup> “性彊勇謹厚 不寇抄” (Buyeo), “其人性凶急 喜寇抄” (Goguryeo).

King Micheon's rule (AD 311). The Lelang Commandery fell immediately afterwards in AD 313, followed by Daifang in AD 314, which was the reward achieved at the end of ~~the~~ intense battles for the seizure of Xianping that lasted over hundreds of years. Goguryeo then developed into the leading power of the region until the Sui and Tang dynasties, which were to be the new unifying powers of China, entered the scene.<sup>10</sup>

Up to this time, Goguryeo had constantly struggled against Chinese commanderies in the Liaodong area. Such cases of resistance show that Goguryeo was clearly independent from China and had its own identity. At times, it paid tribute to China as Baekje and Silla did in later years in order to maintain peace, but whenever China interfered or invaded, it resisted strongly, reacting to China as a foreign force. Related to this, the use of the term "Han soldiers" (*hanbyeong* 漢兵) in the *Samguk sagi* is noteworthy. When the king and his ministers of Goguryeo gathered to discuss counter-measures for invasions, they addressed the Chinese army as either "Han soldiers" or the "Han army" (*han-gun* 漢軍). As this era lasted from the Former Han to the Later Han in China, "Han soldiers" may have been designated as ~~the~~ soldiers of the Han state. However, another meaning for the term "Han soldiers" must be considered because it is suggestive of ethnic characteristics. In 172, in the eighth year of the reign of King Sindae, while discussing measures to be taken against the invading Chinese army, the king and his ministers used the term "Han soldiers" twice, "Han army" twice and also the term "Han people" (*hanin* 漢人) twice in referring to the Chinese army.<sup>11</sup> The term "Han people" appears many times in other records. King Yuri's second wife Chihui was called "a woman of the Han people", and the first wife Hwahui reprimanded

<sup>10</sup> The Northeastern region is generally divided into ~~the~~ three ethnic groups of Donghu, Yemaek and Malgal (Mohe). Goguryeo ~~had played~~ a central role among these peoples during this time.

<sup>11</sup> "Sindae wang" (King Sindae), in *Samguk sagi*, *gwon* 16.

her by calling her “a concubine from the Han family.” It seems that there is no need to further interpret the terms “Han people” or “Han family” mentioned here as the “Han state,” because the expression “Han people” itself already connotes an ethnic distinction.

There are examples [that demonstrate](#) when the term “Han soldiers” refers to the soldiers of Tang rather than those of Han. In the letter the Silla King Munmu sent to the Tang General Xue Rengui, he used the term “Han soldiers” six times to refer to the Chinese soldiers.<sup>12</sup> Of course, ~~the~~ “Han soldiers” here meant the army of Tang rather than that of Han. In the term “Han soldiers” that Silla used, we can see how Silla viewed the people of Tang of that time; ~~†~~That is, [regarding—they regarded](#) them as belonging to the army of a foreign race or Han Chinese. In this regard, the terms Goguryeo used—Han soldiers, Han army, and Han people--imply the people of the country of Han as well as the Han Chinese. In other words, this term seems to designate a foreign country against which Goguryeo was guarding itself. When Balgi led the Han soldiers from Liaodong to rebel against the throne, an incident that took place between the death of King Gogukcheon and King Sansang’s accession to the throne in 196, King Sansang pointed out that Balgi was a traitor as he “requested troops from a foreign country and invaded (our) country.” As seen in these records, it is clear that although the term “Han people” may sometimes have meant the people of the Han state, Goguryeo considered them to be people from a ~~–~~foreign country.

That both Silla and Goguryeo used the terms “Han soldiers” or “Han people” in relation to China may be due to the fact that they had a similar awareness of Chinese ethnic identity. Present-day Chinese academicians do not regard Silla as part of China’s local government simply because Silla paid tributes to and received investitures from

---

<sup>12</sup> “Munmu wang” 2 (King Munmu), in *Samguk sagi, gwon 7*.

China. In this regard, to argue that Goguryeo, who had possessed an even stronger sense of autonomy than Silla, considered itself as having been a part of China's local government is unreasonable. If Goguryeo indeed viewed itself as part of China's local government, they would have called both Han soldiers and the Han army "government soldiers" or a "government army" when referring to the Goguryeo army. Using the name of a country or race shows that they were aware of China as an alien identity.

During the great development of Goguryeo that began with King Gwanggaeto the Great and continued through King Jangsu and King Munjamyong, the expansion of territory was mostly the result of conquering (←defeating 이 좋을 것 같은데요 /conquering 이 더 좋음) Buyeo, Khitan, Malgal, Baekje, Silla, Gaya, and Wa. Goguryeo's will to expand, which is inscribed on the Monument of King Gwanggaeto the Great, was mostly aimed at the south, and when King Jangsu moved the capital to Pyongyang, it raised alarm and tension in Baekje and Silla. On the other hand, Goguryeo was able to maintain a relatively peaceful relationship with Northern Wei, which lasted the longest of the Northern Dynasties. Goguryeo was emerging as a leading power over Liaodong, the Manchu and the Korean peninsula with its-its unique worldview of their country as the "center of the world" (‘세계의 중심국이라는 관념’ 이라는 내용이 이 부분에 첨가되었으면 좋겠습니다) on the one hand, while maintaining a friendly relationship with China on the other.<sup>13</sup> At the tomb of Moduru, an official during the reign of King Jangsu, it is written, "the entire universe knows that this country is the most sacred." It also names Jumong and Gwanggaeto as "sacred kings," which reflects the high degree of self-esteem and independent identity that Goguryeo possessed as a center of the Northeast region during this time.<sup>14</sup> However, it

<sup>13</sup> No (1988).

<sup>14</sup> 河伯之孫 日月之子 鄒牟聖王 元出北夫餘 天下四方知此國郡最聖 ……國강上大開土地好太聖王…

is important to note that it was also during this period that Goguryeo was strengthening the policy of tribute and investiture to China. This shows that the tribute-investiture system signified the existence of inevitable diplomatic and strategic actions that had to be taken in order to secure peace with China and to develop into a leading power within the region.

Such development at the height of Goguryeo history was cut short when the Khitan and the Turks (Tujue) prevailed in the Liaodong and Liaoxi region in the North and with Silla and Baekje's resurgence in the South, which eventually caused the international isolation of Goguryeo. With the appearance of unified power in China, Goguryeo faced a critical situation.

The conflict between unified China and Goguryeo was a process of restructuring power relations in the Northeast region as well as the outcome of the confrontation upon which the fate of Goguryeo depended. The effort the Sui Dynasty, who unified the continent, put into gaining control over Goguryeo was unprecedented. In the last battle of the four major expeditions, it is recorded that "1,133,800 soldiers, though counted as two million, were mobilized" and "the number of those who were in charge of provisions and supplies numbered twice as many." The record also writes, "there has never been such a large-scale mobilization in Chinese history."<sup>15</sup> The failure of such massive expeditions were clearly the cause of Sui's collapse, and the Tang Dynasty that came after the Sui also prepared for the conquest of Goguryeo.

After consolidating the internal system of the new dynasty, Emperor Taizong began his history of ~~the conquest of~~ conquering Goguryeo, and sent massive expeditions to Goguryeo, few of which he himself participated in. However, Goguryeo always

---

<sup>15</sup> "Yeongyang wang" (King Yeongyang), in *Samguk sagi, gwon* 20; Annals ~~on~~ of the Emperor Yangdi 楊

managed to defend itself from these attacks. In the later period, Dae Mu-ye of Balhae praised the strength of Goguryeo, saying, ~~that~~ “there were 300,000 men at the height of Goguryeo’s power who resisted and fought against Tang.”<sup>16</sup> Dae Mu-ye is the Balhae King Mu who launched a preemptive attack on Dengzhou of Tang in the year 732. From his remark, we can see that he had inherited the history of Goguryeo’s struggle against Tang. From the way Goguryeo kept an appeasement policy and paid numerous tributes,<sup>17</sup> it appears that Goguryeo did not want to have a full-scale battle against a strong, unified China. However, it certainly rose against the Chinese attacks and successfully defended itself in most cases. Subsequently, China decided that it could not destroy Goguryeo on its own and formed an alliance with Silla to launch a dual attack on Goguryeo, which finally brought an end to Goguryeo. However, one cannot regard Goguryeo as a vassal state or a local government of China based simply upon the existence of a series of appeasement policies carried out by the Goguryeo state.

I have so far examined some aspects of the struggle between Goguryeo and China. As seen above, resistance against China for survival is an ongoing element of Goguryeo history, from its formation to downfall. Goguryeo founded itself by resisting ~~against~~ domination by the alien people of China, or by driving dominant power (Xuantu Commandery) away from its territory. In the times that followed, Goguryeo developed through struggles against colonizing powers (Lelang and Daifang commanderies), regional powers of China (Liaodong Commandery) and powers from the inland (Han, Sui and Tang), and later fell as a result of these struggles. Resistance against China was

---

帝本紀, in *Suishu* (History of the Sui Dynasty).

<sup>16</sup> “Goguryeo,” in *Samguk sagi, gwon* 37.

<sup>17</sup> Goguryeo strengthened the tributary relationships with Sui and Tang and tried to ~~take-make~~ many appeasement policies, such as sending them the map of Goguryeo, *Bongyeokdo*, as well as dispatching the Crown Prince to the royal court of China. This was an extemporaneous diplomatic action taken to defend the country in a critical situation. Therefore, it would not be appropriate to overly emphasize this aspect

almost an inevitable part of Goguryeo history.

The historical consciousness the people of Goguryeo had throughout their struggle makes it clear that they identified China as a foreign state or an alien race. China also thought of Goguryeo in terms of the Maek or Yemaek people, and considered it to be a country of barbarians similar to the Xianbei tribe.<sup>18</sup> Furthermore, Goguryeo maintained its view of China as a country to fight against and never lost its individuality and sense of difference from China, basing its own worldview on the “consciousness of the Great King.” Such an attitude is not typical of a group that regards itself as a mere “local government.” It is also doubtful that the people of Goguryeo, who were possessed of a strong sense of identity, had a powerful historical consciousness that saw its history as a local one. Although the remaining records are scarce and in many cases [had](#) either been embellished or distorted, a thorough examination of the relationship between Goguryeo and China shows that the people of Goguryeo had a distinctly different historical consciousness from China’s.

### **China’s View of Goguryeo after Its Fall**

How the history of Goguryeo has been dealt with and recognized after its fall, as well as by whom, is another important issue in discussing the succession of Goguryeo’s history. In this chapter, I will examine the position China took toward the people and history of Goguryeo after its downfall, along with how Tang addressed the issue surrounding the succession of Goguryeo’s history.

After the fall of Pyeongyangseong, Li Ji, Tang general, took the king and the

---

and use it to prove that Goguryeo was China’s local government. Quan (2003, 68).

<sup>18</sup> 夫餘在二虜之間 妻以宗女, “Fuyu,” Biography on Eastern Barbarians, in *Weishu of Sanguozhi*.

aristocracy as prisoners and brought them to Emperor Gaozong in Chang'an. From here the king of Goguryeo was presented [~~“offered”~~ might be a better term to use here] (바쳐 졌다는 의미가 무엇인지요?) ~~←offered~~ 가 낫다고 생각합니다. to the Zhaoqing mausoleum of Tang and then to the Daimiao temple, before being confined to the Hanyuandian pavilion. Tang then took 28,000 noble families and spread them throughout the wastelands of inland China, such as the south of Jianghuai, Shannan and Jingxi.<sup>19</sup> Of some 150,000 people from Goguryeo who were relocated in China, some seem to have fled to Silla, while a large number assimilated into Han Chinese. Those who were forcibly relocated at this time were those who were considered likely to defect.<sup>20</sup> Indeed, a number of aristocrats and people of Goguryeo, who had surrendered in Liaodong and in the northern part of the Korean peninsula, were running away to Silla in an effort to escape Tang's control. For example, a great number of Goguryeo migrants fled to Silla when the rebellion by the last Goguryeo King Bojang, who was appointed as the commander-in-chief of the military prefecture of Liaodong, was discovered.<sup>21</sup> When Geommojam and Anseung, who were based at Ansiseong, rose in revolt and failed, Anseung was exiled to Silla and people who had participated in the revolt also fled there. These facts show how the migrants of Goguryeo escaped to Silla, Malgal, and Khitan when their rebellions failed.<sup>22</sup> The cause for such resistance may have been Tang's harsh suppression and the extermination policy imposed upon the migrants from Goguryeo.

As it is highly possible that Tang's policy was aimed at destroying Goguryeo

<sup>19</sup> “Gaogouli,” in *Jiu tangshu*; “Goguryeo,” in *Samguk sagi*, *gwon* 20.

<sup>20</sup> “Emperor Gaozong,” in *Zizhi tongjian*, *juan* 201. ~~It~~ These records note that forced relocation was carried out under an imperial order due to the increasing number of Goguryeo people who were defecting.

<sup>21</sup> “Gaogouli,” in *Tangshu*.

<sup>22</sup> “Gaogouli,” in *Xin tangshu*; “Bojang wang” 1 (King Bojang), in *Samguk sagi*, *gwon* 21.

identity, it is thus difficult to think that the migrants in this area were able to maintain their identity as Goguryeo people.

Tang's attempt to cut off Goguryeo's history can be found first of all in the *Tangshu* (History of the Tang Dynasty), one of the records of Goguryeo's former territory. Of particular interest is the fact that, when recording the ethnic structure and distribution in the areas of Balhae and Manchu in the biography on Balhae of *Tangshu*, the residents are only recorded as Malgal (Ch.: Mohe). The *Tangshu* reported that seven Malgal tribes—the Sokmal, Baekdol, Anchagol, Bulnyeol, Hosil, Heuksu, and Baeksan—constituted the population of Balhae,<sup>23</sup> and that the Manchu area, which excluded Pyeongan-do province and the middle area of the Yalu River, was the residence of the Malgal tribes. According to this record, the area where the Yemaek--the main race that constituted Goguryeo--used to live, disappears from historical memory. However, the main areas of the Sokmal, Baekdol and Baeksan Malgal tribes were, at least, former territories of Buyeo, Ye, or Okjeo. Although these areas ~~were constituted~~ Yemaek's central sphere of action during Goguryeo's time, Tang only recorded them as Malgal's main area after the fall of Goguryeo.<sup>24</sup> According to *Tangshu*, the Goguryeo people were active in the limited areas of Pyeongan-do and from the middle of the Yalu River to Pyeongyang. ~~Such a~~This perspective also applied to the census of the Goguryeo population. After the fall of Goguryeo, *Tangshu* reported that there were 176 *seong* (fortresses) and 690,000 households in the Goguryeo territory, which, when compared to the 200 *seong* and 760,000 households of Baekje recorded after its seizure, seemed relatively small and thus falsified. Tang established only one protectorate at Ungjin of Baekje, but installed nine protectorates, including the Andong Protectorate in Goguryeo.

---

<sup>23</sup> “Bohai 勃海,” in *Jiu tangshu*; “Bohai Mohe 靺鞨,” in *Xin tangshu*.

<sup>24</sup> Refer to Yi Sun-geun (1996).

This fact shows that Goguryeo and Baekje were comparable neither in terms of population nor in territorial size.

Concerning its population, the numbers in the reinforcement army that the central government of Goguryeo sent to ~~the~~ battle in Ansiseong against Emperor Taizong's 500,000 soldiers reached 150,000, whereas Baekje lost against 130,000 Tang soldiers without much resistance. Furthermore, Baekje was able to defend itself with only 5,000 soldiers led by General Gyebaek against 50,000 Silla soldiers. These numbers may not reflect the exact population of the time but it makes certain deductions possible. What is also noteworthy is that out of 150,000 in the reinforcement army, only 3,300 were Malgal people.<sup>25</sup> The number of Malgal soldiers in the allied army may not entirely reflect the composition of ~~the~~ Goguryeo population at the time. However, it is true that the people of Goguryeo made up most of the Goguryeo army. Under such circumstances, the facts that the Goguryeo army is described sometimes as 300,000 (Dae Mu-ye of Balhae) ~~or~~ and sometimes as one million (Choe Chi-won)<sup>26</sup> makes it possible to estimate that the number of Goguryeo people from ~~the~~ Yemaek tribe must have been quite high.

*Tangshu* reported that Balhae's population had only been composed of Malgal people and were distributed throughout the area ~~that a few central areas in Goguryeo were excluded [this is unclear; I'm not sure how to reword it. Maybe "were distributed throughout the area (중복으로 들어갔음) from which a few central areas in Goguryeo were excluded" or "were distributed throughout the area from which Goguryeo people were excluded"?~~. This is a clear indication that a policy to eliminate or suppress the

<sup>25</sup> According to *Tangshu*, the reinforcement army of Goguryeo dispatched to Ansiseong was destroyed, and 3,300 Malgal soldiers were all captured and buried.

<sup>26</sup> 高麗百濟 全盛之時 強兵百萬 南侵吳越 北撓幽燕齊魯 爲中國巨擘. "Choe Chi-won," in *Samguk sagi, gwon* 46.

people of Goguryeo and Goguryeo itself was already in effect. Whereas *Jiutangshu* recorded Dae Jo-yeong's ethnic lineage as "a general who came from Goguryeo," *Xintangshu* changed it to "a Sokmal-Malgal person submitted to Goguryeo," which again shows how the anti- Goguryeo extermination policy was being reinforced during the Tang Dynasty.

It is clear that the strengthening of such a policy must have made it very difficult for the people of Goguryeo to admit their ethnic origin or to maintain their historical consciousness. It is also not difficult to assume that this policy erased the existence of not only the people, but also the history of Goguryeo. Consequently, a large number of Goguryeo descendents must have had to either assimilate their origin and lineage to the Han Chinese or take exile in Silla. Those who remained in the region, however, had to face the fate of being considered Malgal, as recorded in *Tangshu*.<sup>27</sup>

Tang's policy must have made it impossible for the people living in the regions under its control to maintain the historical consciousness required to continue the history of Goguryeo. When we examine how Chinese history has dealt with the history of Goguryeo after Tang, it becomes easier to understand how China acknowledged Goguryeo. That is, the "history of Goguryeo" is recorded as part of Korean history, not Chinese. Below is a list of the records on the history of Goguryeo contained in the biographies on Goryeo or Joseon in China's historical books.

1. In the late years of Tang, ~~amid a great number of political confusions~~ (정치적인

---

<sup>27</sup> Quan Hexiu takes Go Seon-ji or Wang Mo-jung, who appear in *Jiu tangshu*, as examples of Goguryeo people who were active in Tang (2003, 72-73). However, as they ~~were had been~~ assimilated in to the Tang, it is difficult to deem them as ~~actively acting on behalf of~~ continuing the history of Goguryeo. Therefore, it would not be correct to argue that Tang had been continuing their historical consciousness of Goguryeo based on their activities.

~~혼란을 틈타~~, Goryeo ~~took advantage for “made good use”~~ of the political ~~confusion to~~ established a country and appointed a king(이 뜻이 맞는지 확인바랍니다. ←의미는 맞는 것 같습니다.). The family name of the previous king is Go.

They paid their tribute in the years of Tongguang and Tiancheng of Tang Dynasty, and in the sixth year of Xiande of Zhou Dynasty (“Gaoli,” Waiguo Liezhuan 2, *Jiuwudaishi*, juan 138).

2. Wang Geon, the head of the state, succeeded Go and dispatched an envoy to pay tribute. Wang Geon was appointed commander-in-chief of the military prefecture of Xuantu, and ~~was taken into the Great High Rank in Army Status~~(대의군사에 넣는다는 것이 무슨 뜻입니까? ←신분서열을 지칭하는 명칭중의 하나임. 위와 비슷하면 되겠습니다.) and made him the king of Goryeo (“Goryeo,” Waiguo 3, Liezhuan 246, *Songshi*, juan 487).

3-1. In ~~Goguryeo~~(고구려가 맞나요? ←맞습니다), when ~~[Wang]~~ Sun killed his brother king ~~[Wang]~~(←이 두 단어는 지워야 합니다) Song and appointed himself king, Liao raised an army to punish him (“Lun,” Liezhuan 18, *Liaoshi*, juan 88).

3-2. Liao General Xiao Xunning, sent to attack Goryeo, demanded the return of Goguryeo’s former territory at the negotiation table, asserting that Liao was a descendent of Goguryeo. However, Seo Hui from Goryeo contended that Goryeo was the true descendent of Goguryeo and claimed the areas around the Yalu River and Jurchen’s territory, which were former territories of Goguryeo. Following Goryeo’s claim, the Emperor of Liao gave a few hundred *li* of land around Jurchen and the Yalu River to Goryeo (“Seo Hui,” *Goryeosa*, gwon 94; “Gaoli,” Liezhuan 45, *Liaoshi*,

juan 105).<sup>28</sup>

4. Jurchen submitted to Goryeo before, but the two had no relationships for a while. After submitting to Liao, Jurchen is now under Jin's rule ("Gaoli," Liezhuan 73, *Jinshi*, juan 135).

5. (After recording the history of Goguryeo briefly) The king's family name was Go. His country fell during the Ganfeng era of the Tang. After the Chuigong era, his descendents were again appointed [this word seems okay, or you could say "posted"] to the area(그 곳에 봉해졌다는 의미는?→원 기록에 이렇게만 표현되어 있어서 확실하지 않습니다. 한문의 표현으로 보자면 왕으로 임명되었다는 뜻일 것 같긴한데 확실하지 않으니 그냥둘 수 있으면 그냥 두고 싶습니다.), who gradually became independent. In Five Dynasties, they moved the country to Songak and raised a king, whose family name is Wang and first name is Geon ("Gaoli," Waiguo 1, Liezhuan 95, *Yuanshi*, juan 208).

6. Go, from the Buyeo people, founded a country in the land at the end of the Han Dynasty and named it Goryeo or Goguryeo, and lived in Pyeongyang . . . but was later defeated and forced to move to the east. During the Later Tang, Wang Geon succeeded Go, absorbed Silla and Baekje and moved the capital to Songak ("Zhaoxian," Waiguo 1, Liezhuan 208, *Mingshi*, juan 320).

The *Wudaishi* was written in 973, the *Songshi*, *Liaoshi* and *Jinshi* in 1344, while the *Mingshi* was finished in 1739. The attack by Khitan, which led to the above-mentioned negotiation, took place in 993 (12<sup>th</sup> year of King Seongjong of Goryeo). The above

---

<sup>28</sup> Following Seo Hui's claim, the Emperor of Liao gave these areas to Bak Yang-yu, who was dispatched as an envoy from Goryeo the following year. It seems that Liao was more interested in subordinating Goryeo rather than continuing the history of Goguryeo ("Gaoli," Shengzong 4, in *Liaoshi*).

records all acknowledge that Goryeo had succeeded Goguryeo. In 3-1), all the names are recorded as Goryeo except in the last instance, where it was written as Goguryeo, as in the examples mentioned above, (위 예문에서 처럼 이라는 표현이 첨가되었으면 합니다), which again shows that there was no distinction between Goryeo and Goguryeo. In other words, it is confirmed throughout China's official historical documents written after Tang that China had viewed Goguryeo's history as having been carried on by Goryeo. Despite some of their confusion between Goryeo and Goguryeo, the fact that they were not interested at all in continuing the history of Goguryeo cannot be denied.

Finally, in the history of the Northeast, modern China also viewed the formation and lineage of Goguryeo as marking the foundation of a state by Yemaek people, and they held similar views regarding Buyeo. Needless to say, the history of Yemaek people is considered a part of the history of Korea. *Dongbei tongshi* (A General History of the Northeast China), written by Chinese historian Jin Yufu in 1941, seems to best represent the views China has had on the history of the Northeast.<sup>29</sup> Zhou Enlai, father of modern China, also officially recognized the uniqueness of Goguryeo history, and China's official history textbooks have not included Goguryeo within China's territory.

It seems that China only began to claim the history of Goguryeo as Chinese history in earnest with the publication of *Dongbei minzu yuanliu* (The Ethnic Origin of the Northeast)<sup>30</sup> by Sun Jinji in the 1980s. Sun treated the link from Buyeo-Goguryeo to the present-day Korean people as a misunderstanding. He argued that the people of

<sup>29</sup> Sun (1986, 3) comments that Jin Yufu made a comprehensive study on modern China's views regarding the history of the Northeast in his book *Dongbei tongshi* (1941).

<sup>30</sup> Sun Jinji. 1989. *The Origin of Northeastern Race*. 2nd Edition. Northern History and Geography Series. Heilongjiang People's Publishing. (이 주석을 잘 이해할 수 없습니다. 설명을 부탁드립니다→이 책에 1986년에 쓴 前言을 참고 있는데 여기서 이때에 원고가 되었음을 밝히고 있다.)

Buyeo and Goguryeo had the same lineage as the Chinese in the Northeast region, and that Korean people were a part of the Silla lineage. It was the first time the Silla and Goguryeo lineages were clearly presented as separate.<sup>31</sup> His view was later developed into various directions.<sup>32</sup>

However, from the records so far mentioned, it is clear that, rather than recognize them, China tried to completely extinguish the existence of the Goguryeo people after conquering Goguryeo. China continued to be indifferent and instead of reviving the history of Goguryeo themselves, they have accepted the continuation of history from Goguryeo to Goryeo. In this regard at least, it is difficult to say that China's succession to the history of Goguryeo is historically valid.

## **Succession of the History how about "Historical Succession"? of Goguryeo in Korean History**

Unlike Tang, whose efforts were focused on suppressing ~~the~~ Goguryeo identity and cutting off its historical roots, Silla employed a policy to embrace and integrate the Goguryeo people and their culture. First of all, Silla had prepared in advance principles and criteria to treat the ruling class from Goguryeo and Baekje. In the 13<sup>th</sup> year of King Munmu of Silla (663→673), and the 6<sup>th</sup> year of King Sinmun (686), regulations were established to give the nobility of Baekje and Goguryeo central government posts

<sup>31</sup> Sun (1989, 232-237).

<sup>32</sup> In China today, theories that interpret Goguryeo people as Chinese are presented from various standpoints. Recently, there have even been views that place the lineage of Jumong, founder of Goguryeo, under that of Emperor Yan(염 황제인가요?→炎帝와 黃帝를 모두 말한 것입니다). The problems associated with ~~on~~ these views ~~have~~ will not be dealt with here, as they do not conform to the theme of this article.

corresponding to the ones they had held in their own countries.<sup>33</sup> Though it is not clear how strictly Silla abided by these regulations after unification, it must have ~~had~~held great significance ~~to~~for the nobility who were seeking exile in Silla. These measures not only encouraged the ruling class of Goguryeo and Baekje to surrender to Silla, but also prevented treason and facilitated the integrations of these figures into Silla's system.

Secondly, it is important to look at the “nine military units system” of Silla. The so-called *seodang* system was the special military system, which was implemented whenever necessary from the reign of King Jinpyeong, when the war between the three kingdoms began intensifying, all the way through the reigns of King Munmu and King Sinmun. Two of these units consisted of Baekje people, one of Malgal people and three mainly of Goguryeo people. Some aspects ~~as~~to how this system functioned as a central or local military system during the unified era are not yet clear. However, the reason for the establishment of such a system around the time of unification is related to ~~has relation with~~ the need for a special military system in Silla. Names such as *nangdang* or *jangchangdang* reflect the system's peculiarity.(이 명칭이 갖고 있는

뜻이 무엇인지 알 수 없습니다→낭당은 화랑의 부대, 장창당은 긴창을 쓰는

부대라는 뜻을 가지고 있습니다. 당은 요즘 말로 하자면 부대, 군단 등에 해

당되는 말입니다..) The other units, i.e. *dang*, which were made up of Baekje, Malgal

and Goguryeo people, also seem appropriate to the name of the system, *seodangje*.(이

부분을 설명해주시기 바랍니다→구서당은이라는 군제는 삼국통일무렵 좀 특

수한 형태로 조직된 왕에 충성을 맹서한 군조직입니다. 신라인에 의한 3 개

<sup>33</sup> “Jikgwan” 3 (Official posts and ranks), in *Samguk sagi*, *gwon* 40.

서당, 고구려인에 의해 3 개서당이, 백제 2, 말갈 1 개로 구성되었습니다.)

Such regulations that accepted people from other countries must have been very meaningful to ordinary people from Goguryeo and Baekje.

The above two policies show Silla's traditional stance as a tolerant conqueror with a comprehensive policy for dealing with the defeated.<sup>34</sup> These policies appear to have helped the inflow of Goguryeo people to Silla, particularly after the fall of Goguryeo. According to the records of the time, many migrants from Goguryeo seem to have fled to Silla when their revival movement for Goguryeo in the Manchuria and Liaodong area failed. One example of the official surrender of the royal family to Silla was when Anseung ran away to Silla with 4,000 households after his revolt with Geommojam against Tang failed, ~~which marked an example of the official surrender of the royal family to Silla~~. Also, when the Ansiseong-based revolt was being suppressed, its residents fled to Silla, and when Go Jang (King Bojang) was a commander-in-chief in the military prefecture of Liaodong, he communicated secretly with Malgal, during which time Goguryeo migrants were able to cross to Silla more freely. These accounts ~~suggested~~/suggest that the number of Goguryeo migrants who entered Silla at the time must have been significant. Under these circumstances, Silla was not only battling ~~against~~ the Tang who had revealed their desire to conquer Silla after Goguryeo's downfall, but were also attacking the Tang army by helping the revolts of Goguryeo migrants deployed in the Liaodong area. Furthermore, the area from north of Hangang river to Pyeongyang was Goguryeo territory, where most of its residents were Goguryeo people. Considering that even the migrants in Liaodong region, where Ansiseong and

<sup>34</sup> Concerning these two policies, 未松保和 ← Suematsu Yasukazu 未松保和 (발음을 적어주시기 바랍니다 1954, 358) points out that Silla had a systematic tradition of accepting and integrating the defeated country

Sinseong (Ch.: Xincheng) were situated, were fleeing to Silla,<sup>35</sup> these conditions suggest that the number of Goguryeo people who had been incorporated into Silla was bigger than what had been previously assumed. These conditions may also have created a sense of solidarity between the Goryeo → Goguryeo migrants and Silla. The regulations Silla established for people of Goguryeo or Baekje origin, such as the granting of central government posts and the special military system, can be understood to have provided solidarity between the two parties and were also useful in encouraging a great deal of support from the migrants.<sup>36</sup>

That the migrants of Goguryeo voluntarily took refuge in Silla indicated that something was very different from the way they were forcibly relocated into China's wastelands<sup>37</sup> by the Tang. In Silla, there were also the former territories of Goguryeo and its residents. As they were dealt with in terms of a policy of integration from Silla, they were able to have the regional and cultural space to continue their lives as descendents of Goguryeo. In this regard, it is worth noting the footnote attached to the tale of Jakjegeon in "Goryeo segye":

When Kim Yang-jeong was dispatched to the Tang as an envoy, he traveled on a merchant ship. He had a dream in which an old man with white hair came and said, "you will have fair wind when you let off a Goryeo person(고려인을 내리면이

---

into its own system, without strictly establishing the relationship between the conqueror and the conquered.

<sup>35</sup> Regarding the fall of Goguryeo, refer to "Gaogouli zhuan" of *Jiu tangshu* and *Xin tangshu*, and "Goguryeo bongi" of *Samguk sagi*.

<sup>36</sup> From Silla's position, it was a time when there was a dire need for human resources capable of manual labor ~~were in dire need, therefore and~~ the migrants were a welcome arrival ~~had arrived just in time.(the existence/arrival of the migrant must be most opportune 반가운 존재였을 것이다)~~. In order to expand its control over Goguryeo's former territory and at the same time defend itself from Malgal and Khitan in the North, unlike Tang, Silla had no reason to deny Goguryeo migrants who came voluntarily to become Silla citizens.

<sup>37</sup> "Goguryeo 10," in *Samguk sagi, gwon 22*.

란 무슨 뜻인지?←배에서 내리게 하면).”<sup>38</sup>

This tale was taken from the tale of Geotaji in the *Samguk yusa*. Geotaji’s tale took place during the reign of Queen Jinseong of Silla, when Jakjegeon, Wang Geon’s grandfather, was young. That the envoy on the ship called and introduced himself as a “Goryeo person” reflects the fact that there was a large number of people who considered themselves of Go(gu)ryeo people/lineage.

The Silla policy that made it possible for migrants to maintain their identity as descendents of Goguryeo after its fall is of great significance in the development of Korean history. In the later years of Silla, the central government had lost its control and the local powers were reforming into two major powers, eventually leading to the establishment of two new countries. This period is called the Later Three Kingdoms period in Korean history. The new countries were based on the former territories of Baekje and Goguryeo. One of these countries was Later Goguryeo, whose territory was mainly comprised of the northern areas of Unified Silla, north of Gyeonggi-do, Hwanghae-do, Gangwon-do, and Chungcheongbuk-do. The first person to call the new country Later Goguryeo was Monk Gungye from the ruined royal family of Silla. He changed the name to Majin and then to Taebong. Wang Geon, who came from the Gaeseong (Songak) area, overthrew the Gungye regime and renamed the country “Go(gu)ryeo.”

Recently, China has been denying that Goryeo succeeded Goguryeo, while claiming that the history of Goguryeo belongs to that of China. The basis of their claim

<sup>38</sup> “Goryeo segye(고려사 몇 권에 있는 것인가요?←그냥그대로 두십시오 권에 포함되지 않고 권두에 독립해서 들어있는 부분입니다.)” in *Goryeosa* (History of Goryeo). I quoted this passage from Min Ji’s *Pyeonnyeon gangmok* (어떻게 번역해야 하나요?)

is that “Wang Geon, who founded Goryeo, was not a descendent of Goguryeo.”<sup>39</sup> The Chinese also argue that the historical records mentioned in the previous chapter were incorrect ones based on misunderstandings.<sup>40</sup> It is generally agreed that Gungye was not a descendent of Goguryeo’s royal family. However, to deny Goguryeo’s historical succession into Goryeo simply because there is no direct evidence that proves Wang Geon’s lineage to the royal family of Goguryeo is absurd at best. How can this be the basis to deny that Goryeo succeeded the history of Goguryeo? The Qing Dynasty of China was founded in Beijing by the Jurchen (Manchu) people. The non-Han ethnic groups had established their own capitals and countries all over China well before the Qing. In this sense, upon which ethnic lineage is China’s claim that they are continuing the histories of Qin, Han, and even Xia, Yin, and Zhou (and even retracing back to the time of Three Sovereigns and Five Emperors) based?

The reason Goryeo was recognized ~~to have succeeded~~ as succeeding Goguryeo was that the people who founded Goryeo clearly advocated that they were continuing Goguryeo. These people were residents of the former territory of Goguryeo and, as mentioned above, were the people-ones who were able to maintain their identity as people of Goguryeo. The reason that even Gungye, who is assumed to have come from Silla’s royal family, once named the country Later Goguryeo was because he was able to receive the support of the Goguryeo people. In the same context, it is clear that Wang

<sup>39</sup> Sun (1989, p.236); Geng Tie Hua and Sun Ren Jie. 1993. *Studies on Goguryeo*. Yanbian University. p. 240. (간체라서 잘 모르겠습니다)

<sup>40</sup> Liu Zi Min. 1999. ?于高句?政?及其?域的?史????之我?→고구려정권과 그 영역의 역사귀속문제에 관한 나의 견해 > \_《全?首?高句???研???文集→전국 첫 고구려 학술연구토론회 논문집》. Based on research on Goguryeo by the Jilin Social Science Institute. Here they interpret the records in Chinese historical books concerning the continuation from Goguryeo to Goryeo as a “misunderstanding,” and therefore refuse to recognize their value as historical documents (p. 20). Quan Hexiu goes on to say that the Chinese historical books have “made an error due to their lack of understanding of the history of Goguryeo” (2003, 59). However, this remark itself confirms China’s lack of historical consciousness of regarding Goguryeo.

Geon, who was in fact from a powerful local family, wanted to gather Goguryeo people's strength by asserting his descent from Goguryeo,<sup>41</sup> ~~[this sounds fine]~~ after he seized power. This is the result of Silla's policy to integrate people from all three countries after unification, and to promote their cultural acceptance and integration without severely oppressing or cutting off the historical identity of Goguryeo and Baekje. Consequently, it has ~~brought~~ contributed diverse aspects to Korean history that have empowered historical development in ~~the~~ subsequent years. [이 부분이 정확하게 무슨 뜻인지 이해가 되지 않습니다](이후의 한국사는 다양한 역사계통의 식을 가지게 되어, 보다 폭넓은 역사발전의 힘을 가지게 되었다고 볼 수 있다 라는 의미로 쓴 것입니다)

Strong anti-Khitan and pro-Balhae policies in the early years of Goryeo may have been implemented in the same spirit,<sup>42</sup> and the requirement ~~making sure~~ that all ~~the~~ kings ~~had to~~ spend at least one hundred days in the western capital of Pyeongyang<sup>43</sup> must have also been based on the will to continue the history of Goguryeo. Such a will on the part of Goryeo to continue the history of Goguryeo is also seen in the *Gu samguksa* (Old History of the Three Kingdoms), supposedly ~~to have been~~ written in the early years of Goguryeo, in which the narration of the history of the Three Kingdoms is centered on the history of Goguryeo, beginning with the foundation myth of King Dongmyeong of Goguryeo.<sup>44</sup> Seo Hui's assertion about the succession of Goguryeo

<sup>41</sup> In the tale of Kim Yang-jeong quoted from *Pyeonnyeon gangmok*, the "Goryeo person traveling on the ship" symbolizes Jakjegeon, who is the father of Wang Geon. ("Goryeo segye," in *Goryeosa*)

<sup>42</sup> Examples that reflect this policy include the time such as when King Taejo of Goryeo starved ~~all~~ the camels sent by Khitan to death, when the time he wrote in the *Ten Injunctions* (*hunyo sip jo*) not to follow the examples of Khitan, and when the time he accepted a great number of migrants from Balhae ~~all reflect this policy~~.

<sup>43</sup> "Taejo 2," in *Goryeosa, gwon 2*. (고려사 2 권의 태조 2 가 맞나요? 아니면 고려사 1 권의 태조 1 이 맞나요? → 고려사 권 2 세가 2 태조 26 년 이 좋겠습니다.)

<sup>44</sup> Yi Gu-bo, *Dongmyeongwang pyeon* (The Lay of King Dongmyeong).

history mentioned earlier is a confirmation of such historical consciousness of Goryeo's external relationships. Even if the record may reflect an expedient response in a time of state crisis, the Emperor of Liao recognized the claim and gave to Goryeo Jurchen and hundreds of *li* of land east of the Yalu River. What is yet more significant is the fact that the Chinese emperor officially and externally acknowledged Goryeo's claim to the succession of Goguryeo. The *Samguk sagi*, which was re-edited during the Goryeo period, also placed Goguryeo, along with Baekje and Silla, into one framework of Korean history. This historical text is representative of the records that view Unified Silla and Goryeo as the heirs to the history of [the](#) Three Kingdoms: Goguryeo, Baekje, and Silla. Although this historical document failed to include Old Joseon, Buyeo, Okjeo, Ye, Three Han, and Balhae in the ancient history of Korea, they show no doubt in narrating the history of Goguryeo as a part of Korean history.

The historical consciousness of Goryeo's ~~succeeding suecession of~~ Goguryeo continued in terms of the history of [the](#) Three Kingdoms—Goguryeo, Baekje, and Silla. In *Mingshi* and *Qingshi*, the succession between Goguryeo and Goryeo was clearly described, and in the Korean historical books compiled after Joseon Dynasty, Goguryeo ~~had~~ always [held had](#) a place in the history of the Three Kingdoms. From the *Samguksa jeoryo* (Essentials of the History of the Three Kingdoms) as well as other comprehensive historical texts such as the *Dongsa gangmok* (Annotated Account of Korean History) and *Haedong yeoksa* (History of Korea), to documents published in modern days, the history of Goguryeo has been, without doubt and quite naturally, narrated as Korea's history, with the appropriate historical consciousness having been accordingly maintained. ~~[sounds fine]~~

Under Japanese colonial rule, Danjae Sin Chae-ho took a step further and sought

the driving force behind the anti-Japanese historical movement from the history of Goguryeo; similarly, the notion of a national spirit in the *Hanguk tongsa* (The Tragic History of Korea) written by Bak Eun-sik has its root in the history of Goguryeo. As such, ~~the~~ efforts to maintain the history of Goguryeo have continued ~~been continuing~~ throughout Korean history; and have greatly influenced the formation of Korean historical consciousness.

## Conclusion

I have so far examined how the history of Goguryeo, which ~~has~~ holds an important place in the history of Northeast Asia, should be understood, and how its historical course should be determined. I have approached these issues from two perspectives. One was focused on ~~the examination of~~ examining the type of historical consciousness the people of Goguryeo possessed, and the second was ~~(?) analyzed on~~ analyzing exactly who ~~and how~~ continued and developed the history of Goguryeo after its fall and how they accomplished this.

The first approach was difficult to fulfill, as the existing historical records on the people of Goguryeo are scarce. Therefore, I took an indirect approach and examined how the people of Goguryeo saw China and the Chinese, and how the Chinese regarded Goguryeo and its people. This approach was based on the history of struggle between Goguryeo and China, which constituted the most-largest number of cases in the records. As a result, it was confirmed that Goguryeo viewed China as an equal but was still a country against which to resist when necessary, treating it as a “foreign” country or a “foreign” people. China also viewed Goguryeo with strong hostility, as a “country of the

Yemaek people” or “barbarians” who ~~were posed~~ a constant threat to China and who needed to be eliminated whenever possible. Such heterogeneity ~~[heterogeneity against? Is this the right word?]~~ and hostility ~~towards one another~~ caused incessant conflict between the two, and it is thus impossible to think that the people of Goguryeo might have regarded Goguryeo as China’s local government. ~~[this is fine]~~

I have also examined the historical continuation of Goguryeo from the perspectives of Chinese and Korean history. As Tang ~~was had been~~ the nation that destroyed Goguryeo, it had to judge the people of Goguryeo as dangerous, with ~~the potential to possibilities of~~ revolt. The fact that the reason they were forcibly relocated was due to “the danger of revolt,” as written in the *Zizhi tongjian* (Comprehensive Mirror for Aid in Government), proves this point. Tang made systematic efforts to sever the historical continuation of Goguryeo and wipe out the people of Goguryeo altogether. Tang also assimilated a large number of Goguryeo people into China by forcibly relocating them, while treating the remaining Goguryeo people as Malgal, thereby trying to erase their very existences. As a result, there was no space left in Chinese history for the history of Goguryeo to be ~~included considered as part of Chinese history~~ after Tang.

However, Silla, which had unified the three kingdoms, actively implemented policies to integrate Goguryeo migrants. Some of Goguryeo territory and a large number of Goguryeo migrants had already constituted parts of Silla, and Silla prepared regulations for ~~the~~ political and military integration of the migrants. ~~Giving Granting~~ government positions according to their original status, or admitting them into the military system were but two examples of Silla’s policy of integration. These policies promoted the influx of Goguryeo people ~~in from~~ the Liaodong area and Manchuria into

Silla. What is more significant was that these Goguryeo (and Baekje) migrants, who had been incorporated into Silla, were able to maintain their identity as ~~the~~ Goguryeo people, and ~~thus~~ continue to maintain their historical consciousness, ~~and~~ consequently establishing a “history of Goryeo,” ~~a history~~ that lived on past Goguryeo itself ~~and linked it to the next era.~~ ~~(that links Goguryeo to next era 다음 시대에 고구려를 잇는)~~

The main subjects ~~for~~ in the foundation of Goryeo were people of Silla, as well as the descendents of Goguryeo, who continued the history of Goguryeo simultaneously. Goryeo, in this regard, was a country that succeeded Goguryeo; the historical consciousness they advocated had a strong basis in their will to continue the history of Goguryeo. The history of Goguryeo has been rooted in Korean history as one part of the history of the Three Kingdoms, and as a main element of Koreans’ historical consciousness that has endured from the Joseon to the modern era.

It is clear from these analyses how important the identity of Goguryeo is, along with the scope of its historical significance in Northeast Asia. ~~/Seen from these two perspectives, the identity of Goguryeo and its historical position in Northeast Asia are clearly revealed. Some of the questions one can ask in~~ In order to better understand the identity of the history of Goguryeo, ~~one must ask: are as follows: Who~~ who was the founder, who were its residents, what was its ethnic group, and what were the characteristics of its culture? Answers to these questions are, of course, as important. ~~as any physical or documentary evidence [The meaning here is unclear. It seems repetitive. Does he mean from a political viewpoint?] (?)~~ However, perspectives regarding ~~the interpretations of such questions of~~ such “evidence” (?) can vary greatly

according to who finds them and which of their aspects are emphasized for what purpose. Therefore, such research may be meaningful in the quantitative accumulation of the material, but runs the risk of running a parallel in drawing conclusions.

Historical research that sets out to determine to whom a certain history belongs is usually confined to teleological methodology. It is thus a non-academic and highly political stance. It is also difficult to understand how a state that has been severing and suppressing the people and history of Goguryeo can suddenly claim its ownership.

~~History cannot be owned at will nor can anyone claim its ownership/History cannot be owned by those who own it at will nor by those who want to own it~~[How about:

~~“History does not belong to those who say they own it nor to those who say they wish to own it.”?]~~ (역사는 소유하고자 한다고 그의 것이 되는 것이 아니고, 소유하고

~~싶은 자의 것이 될 수 없다).~~ History exists for those who love it. Those who have

cared for it will always be with it. In this regard, the history of Goguryeo belongs to

those who have cared for and ~~continued~~ maintained it, as well as those who will

continue to maintain it, rather than to those who simply claim it. If anyone should ~~be~~

~~proud in~~ feel pride in having inherited the history of Goguryeo, that person should

accumulate more in-depth academic research through scientific and objective

approaches, and try to further develop it in the future.

## References

No, Tae-don. 1988. “O segi geumseongmun-e boineun goguryeoin-ui cheonhagwan”

~~(Goguryeo’s World View as Shown on the Inscription of the 5<sup>th</sup> Century)~~ [“(Goguryeo’s World   
 ~~View as Shown on a 5<sup>th</sup> Century Inscription)~~”]. *Hanguksa ron* (Treatises on Korean History)

19.

Quan, Hexiu. 2003. 《Contineous Study Onn the History of Goguryeo during Ancient China》의 2. The Belonging of the National Identity of Goguryeo 에 실린 <재론고구려역사연구중상관문제→고구려역사연구에 관련된 문제를 다시 논함>이라는 논문—2. The Belonging of the National Identity of Goguryeo,

Sun, Jinji. 1986. *Dongbei minzu yuanliu* (The Ethnic Origin of the Northeast). Heilongjiang Renmin Chubanshe.

Yi, Byeong-do. 1976. “Goguryeo geon-guk go” (On the Formation of Goguryeo). In *Hanguk godaesa yeongu* (A Study of the History of Ancient Korea). Seoul: Park Young Publishing Co.

Yi, Sun-geun. 1996. “Malgal-ui jongjok jeongcheseong-e daehan il yeongu” (A Study on Malgal’s Ethnic Identity). *Gatolik daehakgyo nonmunjip* (Collection of Papers of Catholic University of Korea).

末松保和. 末松保和(일어 발음을 부탁드립니다)→Suemat su Yasukasu). 1954. 『新羅幢停放』新羅幢停放—(무슨 뜻인지요?→신라 군단 ‘幢·停’ 에 관한 연구라는 의미입니다.) 『新羅史の諸問題』(Issues on the History of Silla). 출판사(?→《신라사의 제문제》 동양 문고)

#### 논문초록문

본 연구는 고구려 역사의 귀속성을 알아보기 위하여 두가지 측면에서 접근하였다. 먼저 당대의 고구려와 중국이 서로 상대를 어떻게 인식하고 있었는가를 살펴보았다. 그 결과 고구려는 언제나 중국을 ‘이국’ 또는 ‘이민족’으로 여기며, 대부분의 경우 대등한 상대국으로 인식하였다. 중국 역시 고구려를 ‘오랑캐의 나라’로 인식하고 있음이 드러났다. 다음 고구려의 멸망 후 그 역사를 누가 이어왔는가를 살펴보았다. 고구려 멸망 후 그 역사를 수용하며 이어 온 것은 신라였다. 신라는 고구려인과 백제인을 포용하였고 그들의 역사의식을 존중하였다. 이러한 노력은 이후 한국사 전개에 다양성과 역동성을 갖게 하였다. 그 결과 통일신라→고려→조선→현대에 이르기까지 한국사에서 이러한 삼국의 역사는 한국고대사의 한 장으로 부동의 위치를 갖게 되었다. 반면 중국의 경우는 고구려가 멸망하자 고구려 단절의 정책을 취하였다. 그 결과 고구려역사는 이후 중국사에서 배제되었으며 오히려 고려를 고구려의 후예로 인정해 온 것이 사실이었다. 1980년대 중반에 들어 갑자기 중국이 고구려 역사를 그들의 역사로 주장하고 나온 것은 학문적인 측면에서 인정하기 어렵다.

주제어: 고구려역사 귀속, 고구려 계승, 고구려인, 한족, 역사귀속, 역사계승