

Korean History Studies in Japan

The 2002 *Shigaku Zasshi* Historiography Review: Korean Ancient History

Hashimoto Shigeru

Last year's research in Korean ancient history produced books one after another, and there is a feeling of prosperity more so than in typical years. In particular, it can be said that 2002 was an epochal year for research in excavated sources bearing written text. First, it can be noted that many sources bearing written text excavated in South Korea were displayed in the National Museum of Japanese History's special exhibition. (1) In South Korea, too, exhibitions of Silla and Paekche written texts were held. (2)

Further, Yi Mungi discussed research on wooden strips in his summary of research trends from the 1990s in this field. The current state of research can thus be known. (3) Fukuda Takeshi's article, too, will become an index of sources and research. (4) Kobayashi Yoshinori showed that as in Japan and China, in Korea, too, text was written with a *kakuhitsu*, or an instrument for indenting the surface of paper, from ancient times until early modern times and that the origin of the Japanese *okoto* notation was in Korea. (5) It goes without saying that comparison with similar texts in Japan and in China is indispensable in the research on these new materials bearing written text. Tōno Haruyuki emphasized his "concern" toward the wooden strips excavated in South Korea, a concern that comes from the differences in their quality. (6) Similarities and differences of course must be considered. However, as Yi Sōngsi suggests, by focusing on commonalities and similarities, the meaning of it having become possible to finely examine the transmission of written text culture in East Asia from the Chinese mainland to the Korean peninsula to the Japanese archipelago through concrete sources is significant. (7) How to place the Korean peninsula's written text culture within East Asia through comparisons with written text cultures in Japan and China is being asked.

From these wooden strips and other new sources accurate readings and criticism beyond that which has been undertaken to date for the *Samguk sagi*, the *Samguk yusa*, Chinese texts, Japanese texts, and other document sources will be necessary. Regarding document sources, volume two of Mishina Shōei's *Nihon shoki Chōsen kankei kiji kōshō* is the long-awaited continuation of volume one, and at the end of volume two is an index covering both volumes. (8) There also are parts of this book that are difficult to accept given the growth of research, but Mishina's close analyses are worthy of reference today, too. Ha Chōngyong demonstrates that there exist later editions of the *Samguk yusa* by people other than Iryōn, and speculates that those editions were prepared by monks who used the *Samguk yusa* in their propagation of Buddhism. (9)

In addition, international symposia were held and their results published last year. The international symposium “The Interaction of Wa and Kaya in Ancient East Asia” sponsored by the National Museum of Japanese History was held, and there interaction between Wa and Kaya through iron and equestrian goods was discussed by researchers from Japan, South Korea, and China. (10) The book *Zenpō kōenfun to Kodai Nitshō kankei*, edited by the Chōsen Gakkai, comes from the Chōsen Gakkai's October 2000 symposium, and the papers that had appeared earlier in the journal *Chōsen gakuhō* were collected together for this book. (11) *Kodai Chōsen no kōko to rekishi*, edited by Yi Sōngsi and Saotome Masahiro, is the outcome of a symposium held in November 2000 at which researchers from South Korea, North Korea, and Japan participated. New findings in archaeology and history in South Korea and North Korea are introduced. (12) The differences in the arguments presented in South Korea and in North Korea are wide, but I hope for the establishment of such opportunities for the exchange of opinion and continued discussion.

Regarding the periods before the Three Kingdoms, Tani Toyonobu indicates the diversity of Lelang culture. (13) Takahisa Kenji believes that Han China culture adopted and adapted in Lelang was transmitted to the Three Han. (14) This kind of reexamination of Lelang culture is not distinct from the excavations and the findings in North Korea that have been reported in recent years. An example of these findings was introduced at the international symposium “Lelang Culture and Ancient Izumo” held in Matsue, Japan, in November 2000.

Regarding the Three Kingdoms period, Suzuki Yasutami examines the development of Wa in the fourth and fifth centuries from the international situation in East Asia and from comparisons with the bureaucratic systems in Koguryō and Paekche. (15) Regarding bureaucratic systems, Maenzono Ryōichi considers that in the background to the recording of kings and government officials by single names in Chinese sources were common customs in Wa, Paekche, and Koguryō. (16) Yoshii Hideo shows that the distribution of archaeological artifacts of the first century to the sixth century does not necessarily match the expansion of various groups that are seen in written texts, and that this was due to rivers and other geographical conditions. (17) Kameda Shūichi notes trends in the research on the, what are said to total, approximately 2,000 mountain fortresses in the Korean peninsula and suggests that additions and improvements undertaken in later eras should be considered. (18)

Regarding Koguryō history, articles by Inoue Naoki, Ichikawa Shigeru, and Azuma Ushio will be discussed. Inoue takes up Koguryō's foreign relations from a wide perspective. He suggests that relations held an important meaning because Southern Song constrained Northern Wei, and that those relations were closely lined to Silla's sudden rise to power. (19) Regarding the existence of a particular rubbing made directly from the King Kwanggaet'o stele, a rubbing about which doubt has been expressed, Ichikawa confirmed that the postscript, which is the proof of the rubbing's existence, reflects conditions at the time the project was undertaken. He believes that research based upon rubbings made directly from the stele, discoveries of which continue to appear, should continue. (20) Azuma considered Koguryō royal power and state order from changes in royal tombs and burial mounds. (21)

Regarding Kaya history, publications by Pak Kwangch'un, Hong Posik, Yi Yöngsik, and Yi Yonghyön will be discussed. Pak divided Kaya history broadly into three periods and sees Kaya's establishment in the second century from influences from Lelang culture. (22) Hong sees in the changes in burial systems regional difference within Kaya and relations with peripheral regions. (23) Yi Yöngsik asserts that research on the Imna Nihon-fu should consider activities in the Kaya countries, and believes that the Kaya countries brought the Imna Nihon-fu, which was the diplomat from Wa, to their side and had him engage in diplomatic negotiations with Paekche and Silla. (24) Yi Yonghyön believes that Wa preferred Imna more than Kara based upon the their order of appearance in an entry in a Chinese history. (25)

Regarding Silla history, publications by Hamada Kōsaku, Yi Söngsi, and Yi Hūijun will be discussed. Hamada's book *Shiragi-koku shi no kenkyū* is a compilation of his research in Silla history spanning more than twenty years. In each chapter have been added broad revisions. (26) This is the first book on Silla history in approximately thirty years, since Inoue Hideo's publication. I will leave detailed comments to book reviews. Yi Söngsi took up Silla history and Kaya history through exchange and transportation, and emphasizes the similarities in both countries' ruling systems and the differences in foreign relations in which Kaya linked with Wa and Silla linked with Koguryō upon the collapse of Lelang and Daifang. (27) Yi Hūijun believes that changes occurred in the characteristics of local burial systems due to the development of local rule. (28)

In Paekche history, publications by Monta Seiichi, Yi Taun, and Yoshii Hideo will be discussed. Monta suggests the possibility that, based upon records of the fortress construction technology called “*chūngt'o*,” there were negotiations between Paekche and the Northern dynasties, and Paekche and the Five Barbarians and the Sixteen Kingdoms. (29) Yi Taun searches for the period of roof tile production in Paekche in the influence of Liang seen in written documents and in the assistance from the Five Dynasties that is visible in carved roof tiles. (30) Yoshii points to the complicated aspects of Paekche burial mounds in regional differences and in the influence from peripheral regions. (31)

In Parhae history, Ueda Takeshi gathered basic data regarding Paekche embassies sent to Japan. (32) Tamura Kōichi examined circular roof tiles from Dongjingcheng and sought changes in Sanggyōng Yongch'ōn-bu's structure as a city. (33)

Notes:

(1) 国立歴史民俗博物館『古代日本文字のある風景 - 金印から正倉院文書まで』朝日新聞社、2002年。

(2) 국립경주박물관편『文字로 본 新羅: 新羅人の記録과 筆跡』예맥출판사、2002年; 국립부여박물관편『百濟의 文字』국립부여박물관、2002年。

- (3) 李文基「学界動向最近の韓国学会における韓国古代史研究の動向
- 新羅史関係資料問題を中心に」『(学習院大学東洋文化研究所) 東洋文化研究』第4号
、2002年3月、105 - 136頁。
- (4) 福田武史「資料の現在 - IT 関係 /
朝鮮」『国文学解釈と教材の研究』第47巻第4号、2002年3月、130 - 137
頁。
- (5) 小林芳規「韓国における角筆文献の発見とその意義
- 日本古訓点との関係」『朝鮮学報』第182輯、2002年1月、1 - 82頁。
- (6) 東野治之「巻頭言」『木簡研究』第24号。
- (7) 李成市「古代朝鮮の文字文化と日本」『国文学解釈と教材の研究』第47巻
第4号、2002年3月、13 - 18頁。
- (8) 三品彰英『日本書紀朝鮮関係記事考證』下巻、天山舎、2002年。
- (9) 河延龍
「『三国遺事』の無極記と後註」『朝鮮古代研究』第3号、2002年3月、55 - 68頁
。
- (10) 第五回歴博国際シンポジウム事務局編
『古代東アジアにおける倭と加耶の交流』六一書房、2002年。
- (11) 朝鮮学会編『前方後円墳と古代日朝関係』同成社、2002年。
- (12) 李成市・早乙女雅博編『古代朝鮮の考古と歴史』雄山閣、2002年。
- (13) 谷豊信「楽浪土器の系譜」『東アジアと日本の考古学I V
生業』後藤直・茂木雅博編、同成社、2002年、207 - 234頁。

(14) 高久健二

「楽浪郡と三韓」『韓半島考古学論叢』西谷正編、すずさわ書店、2002年、249 - 280頁。

(15) 鈴木靖民「倭国と東アジア」『日本の時代史2

倭国と東アジア』鈴木靖民編、吉川弘文館、2002年、7 - 88頁。

(16) 前之園亮一「倭の五王・司馬曹達

・百濟府官の単名について」『共立女子短期大学文科紀要』第45号、2002年1月、17 - 58頁。

(17) 吉井秀夫

「朝鮮三国時代における墓制の地域性と被葬者集団」『考古学研究』第49巻第3号、2002年12月、37 - 51頁。

(18) 亀田修一

「朝鮮半島古代山城の見方」『韓半島考古学論叢』西谷正編、すずさわ書店、2002年、545 - 575頁。

(19) 井上直樹

「高句麗と五世紀の東アジア」『東アジアの古代文化』第110号、2002年冬、46 - 55頁。

(20) 市川繁

「任昌淳氏所蔵広開土王碑拓本の跋文について」『東アジアの古代文化』第110号、2002年冬、56 - 63頁。

(21) 東潮

「高句麗の王陵と王権」『韓半島考古学論叢』西谷正編、すずさわ書店、2002年、331 - 354頁。

(22) 朴広春

「加耶の墓制と時期区分」『韓半島考古学論叢』西谷正編、すずさわ書店、2002年、385 - 409頁。

(23) 洪 潜 植「加耶の墳墓」『東アジアと日本の考古学1

墓制1（墳丘）』後藤直・茂木雅博編、同成社、2001年、193 - 218頁。

(24) 李永植

「「任那日本府」を通じてみた六世紀の加耶と倭」『東アジアの古代文化』第110号、2002年冬、20 - 32頁。

(25) 李鎔賢

「任那と日本府の問題」『東アジアの古代文化』第110号、2002年冬、33 - 45頁。

(26) 浜田耕策『新羅国史の研究』吉川弘文館、2002年。

(27) 李成市「新羅の国家形成と加耶」『日本の時代史2

倭国と東アジア』鈴木靖民編、吉川弘文館、2002年、278 - 303頁。

(28) 李 熙 濬「新羅の墳墓」『東アジアと日本の考古学1

墓制1（墳丘）』後藤直・茂木雅博編、同成社、2001年、165 - 191頁。

(29) 門田誠一「『三国史記』百濟本紀所載の築城用語に対する釈義

- 「蒸土」をめぐって」『鷹陵史学』第28号、2002年9月、149 - 164頁。

(30) 李タウン

「百濟の瓦生産」『韓半島考古学論叢』西谷正編、すずさわ書店、2002年、475 - 502頁。

(31) 吉井秀夫「百濟の墳墓」後藤直・茂木雅博編『東アジアと日本の考古学1

墓制1（墳丘）』同成社、2001年、137 - 164頁。

(32) 上田雄『渤海使の研究』明石書店、2002年。

(33) 田村晃一

「渤海瓦当再考」『(早稲田大学大学院早稲田大学大学院文学研究科) 早稲田大学大学院文学研究科紀要 第4分冊』第47号、2001年、159 - 174頁。

Translated by Kenneth R. Robinson

(*Shigaku zasshi* vol. 112 no. 5 (2003:5), 258-261. Translated and uploaded with the permission of the Shigakkai.)