

From Kaifeng to Kaesŏng: Reappraising the Role of Song Culture in Koryŏ

Sem Vermeersch (Keimyung University)

Xu Jing's *Xuanhe fengshi Gaoli tujing* [Illustrated Account of Koryŏ, presented during the Xuanhe era] is rightly famous as a unique witness account of Koryŏ society in its prime. It is therefore often mined for evidence about Koryŏ society and culture; especially his description and praise of celadon (Gompertz 1963), or his observations on Korean mores and practices (Shultz 2006, Yun 1983) are often quoted as they offer invaluable information that is not available in any other source.

However, while the work has attracted attention for such observations on Koryŏ, they only form part of this work, and the over-emphasis on such parts seems to have been to the detriment of an understanding of the work as a whole, its structure and composition, the sources it uses, its biases, strengths and weaknesses. To see it exclusively as a witness account seriously undermines a correct understanding of it: as Xu Jing himself admits [or laments] in the introduction, he only left his luxurious hostel on five or six occasions, so obviously his direct experience of life in Koryŏ was limited. Although he doesn't explicitly say so (and this wouldn't be needed, as his readers would understand this), a lot of information is drawn from other Chinese sources, especially the 'treatises on Barbarian kingdoms' from Chinese dynastic histories. This information is often comically out of date, and yet Xu Jing hardly seems aware of this. Moreover, when he actually writes down what he witnesses, it is rarely what we expect: what catches his attention more than anything else is any sign of the influence of Song civilization, which he then describes in detail. In this paper, I will try to balance our understanding of Xu Jing's famous travel account by analyzing this particular fixation. How and why Xu Jing saw the reflections of his own home country in the distant kingdom of Koryŏ will be the main goal of this paper. I will start by giving some background information on our state of knowledge of the manuscript, then deal with his use of other sources and finally analyze a few passages that show his selective observation.

The text

As is well known, the received texts of *Gaoli tujing* present us with numerous difficulties. Its authorship is undisputed; Xu Jing (1091-1153) seemed destined for greatness as a child prodigy, but despite gaining access to the Imperial Academy of Learning at the age of eighteen, he never passed the civil service examination.¹ This severely limited his career possibilities, but thanks

¹ Information is drawn from secondary sources, notably Gompertz 1963, Shultz 2006 and Sŏ 1998. These in turn seem to rely mainly on the postscript to *Gaoli tujing* provided by Xu Jing's nephew Xu Chan and

to his abilities he was invited to join the diplomatic mission of Lu Yundi to Korea in 1123: the Korean King Yejong had asked for an expert calligrapher, and it was in this role that Xu Jing joined the mission.² After completing the mission and returning to China in the eighth month of 1123, he set about writing his account, adding illustrations to it, and presented it to the emperor the following year. The emperor was apparently very pleased with this work, and conferred titles and honors on its author; a copy was henceforth stored in the palace library. However, this was likely destroyed, together with Xu Jing's own copy, during the Jin invasion of the Song capital Kaifeng in 1127. Xu Jing managed to escape south, but without the manuscript; fortunately, other people had apparently started copying it, so that his nephew Xu Chan managed to get hold of a copy which he published in Yunnan in 1167.³

This text is known as the Jingjiang edition, and has survived. As the oldest extant edition, one can assume that it is the most reliable one; however, we can certainly not rule out the authority of two other extant editions: the so-called Zhibuzu zhai edition and a copy recently discovered by Kim Chong-yun. The Zhibuzu zhai edition was compiled by the Qing bibliophile Pao Tingbo (1728-1814) on the basis of an otherwise unknown manuscript and a late Ming edition by Zheng Xiuzhong (now lost). Before Pao made this new edition, he had also discovered the Jingjiang edition, and published it in a collection known as Tianlu lilang congshu; it is in this form that it has come down to us. Kim Chong-yun's copy was discovered in a Shanghai bookshop in 1993, but its origins remain obscure. It is highly critical of the Zheng edition, and may be based on the Jingjiang copy, though an alternative cannot be ruled out. Differences between the different editions are all matters of detail. A modern collation of all texts would certainly improve our understanding of the text, but has not yet appeared.⁴

Finally, there is also evidence that copies circulated in Korea: the *Koryōsa* compilers likely had access to it (as I will argue), while Han Chaeryōm (1775-1818) used it to compile his gazetteer of Kaesōng, the *Koryō kodo ching* (Breuker: 84). As far as I know, however, no pre-modern edition of the *Gaoli tujing* has been preserved in Korea.⁵

other secondary sources.

² Gompertz 1963: 34. Apart from his predilection for inscribed boards, there is no evidence in the text that Xu Jing was actually asked to demonstrate his skills.

³ Xu Chan's account is rather laconic: he describes finding two chapters with a family member, and also quotes his uncle as saying that his work was well known and that the text had survived, but without the illustrations; but he does not say where he obtained the manuscript that formed the basis of his edition. Given the publication date it is possible that he obtained it only after his father's death, so that he had no way of checking its accuracy.

⁴ A new edition is being prepared by Prof. Hō Hūng-sik of AKS. For this paper I have relied mainly on my own manuscript translation, based on the Jingjiang edition but also taking into account variants from the Kim Chong-yun copy.

⁵ The introduction to the Asea Munhwasa mentions a copy preserved in the Kyujanggak archives, but it is no longer found in the modern Kyujanggak archives at Seoul National University. Sō 1972: 5.

Through a prism, darkly

Xu Jing starts off his book with two chapters on the history of Korea: the first chapter deals with the pre-Koryŏ period, and the second one with the successive kings of the Koryŏ dynasty. Two things are immediately evident here: first, Koryŏ is not merely seen as a restoration of Koguryŏ, it is almost as if Koguryŏ never disappeared; second, Xu Jing's knowledge of Koryŏ kings is very erroneous. Let us start with the second point, as this question has already been addressed by Michael C. Rogers: in a number of articles he has convincingly shown that for various reasons, the Koreans decided to misinform their suzerain country (be it Song or Liao) about the identity and succession of their kings. A case in point is Hyŏjong (1009-1031), who apparently announced his own death ten years before it happened. Although the Chinese were sometimes suspicious about the information provided by Koryŏ envoys, even detailed interrogation failed to convince the Koreans to reveal the truth. While some of the discrepancies have already been explained by Rogers, others remain: for example, why is Wang Kŏn's accession given as 931 rather than 918? Was this to create the impression of a Koguryŏ ruler surnamed Ko who reigned before him, as some other Chinese sources suggest? Given that Chinese sources all repeat the same mistake, it seems to have been a deliberate mis-feeding of information by Koryŏ.

The same is likely true for the continuity between Koguryŏ and Koryŏ. Although Xu Jing writes that Koguryŏ was pacified by Tang Gaozong, he is very ambiguous about what happened after – concluding a muddled paragraph by stating that “The Ko clan was thus cut off for a long time, but slightly revived towards the end of the Tang so that they could again act as kings to their country.” In other places as well, he suggests that Koguryŏ somehow went in hiding. He further strengthens this impression by confusing Koguryŏ and Koryŏ institutions: in chapter 7, he gives a detailed description of the twelve bureaucratic ranks of Koguryŏ, as if they were still relevant; only towards the end does he suggest that ‘recently, the Tang system has become prevalent.’

Of course all this was probably exactly how the Koryŏ dynasty wanted to portray itself, so that we have here what is probably a better example of Koryŏ's early self-image than what we find in the *Koryŏsa*. I cannot say for sure whether Xu Jing was the first to spread this image, as previous Chinese works such as the History of the Five Kingdoms and Sima Guang's *Zizhi tongjian* also mentioned the emergence of Wang Kŏn's Koryŏ, but they do this obliquely, in the context of China's relations with Korea. Xu Jing seems to be one of the first to put this into a coherent story, and there is evidence that later Chinese turned to this work for reference about Koryŏ (Rogers 1961: 415-6); it may even have influenced the chapters on Koryŏ in the History of the Song (*Songshi*), which also presents a seamless transition from Koguryŏ to Koryŏ.⁶

⁶ *Songshi* 487. There were other accounts of Koryŏ written by Chinese travelers, such as Wang Yun's *Jilin zhi*, Sun Mu's *Jilin leishi* and Wu Shi's *Jilin ji*, but only the second one seems to have come down to

Song culture everywhere.

One of the purposes of writing this work was to compare Koryŏ to Song China; and while there are many parts where Xu Jing's feelings of cultural superiority shine through, it is also obvious that he thought that in many areas Koryŏ approximated China, especially Song China. He does this either directly, by comparing a building to what you would find in China, or indirectly, by zooming in on something in the landscape that is connected to Song. Two examples suffice to illustrate this: the description of Anhwa-sa and the Pogwŏn-kwan Taoist temple, and the verbatim transcription of a building record.

a. Images of Song temples?

If we are to believe Xu Jing, the most prestigious temple in Kaesŏng was Anhwa-sa, or Chŏngguk Anhwa-sa as he calls it. Altogether he mentions the names of about thirty Kaesŏng temples, but only for Anhwa-sa does he provide a detailed description of various features of the temple, especially the road leading up to it, the general layout of the temple, the names of the buildings, their name boards etc. As to why this temple outranks all the others, Xu simply states

Among the temples, Anhwa-sa crowns them all, because it honors the imperial signature. (k. 17)

So regardless of the function of these temples for Koreans, to Xu Jing this criterion overrides everything else. Probably this is also how his Korean hosts wanted him to see things, perhaps taking him there especially to show off the plaque with Emperor Huizong's calligraphy. This was provided in 1118 upon the request of King Yejong (*Koryŏsa* 14: 27a); another plaque, carrying the name of the temple itself, had been inscribed by grand tutor Cai Jing. Perhaps no expert in temple architecture (he did however ensure that goods were offered for Buddhist services), he does not mention how the temple compares to Chinese examples; however, on the pavilion behind the temple he offers the following comments:

A spring emerges halfway up the mountain, with sweet, pure and delicious water. A pavilion was built around it, with a board bearing the name "Anhwa spring." Flowers, plants, bamboo, trees and strange rocks have been planted here to make this a place for relaxation and amusement. The skill of adorning local trees was not so much in evidence, but I stealthily observed that they used the Chinese system [of landscaping]; the scenery was clear and beautiful as if one was in a screen. The Koryŏ people keep the imperial writings in this place [Anhwa-sa], and uphold them with special solemnity. Now the envoys, having come here lead their military escorts and clerks in paying respects to the imperial writings in the hall. Food is offered to monks to pray for

us; as for their respective authority, I have not found anything yet. Xu Jing himself writes somewhat disparagingly on the *Jilin zhi*, often correcting this work.

blessings.(k. 17)

Thus his admiration for the beauty of this place is clearly inspired by its resemblance to a Chinese setting and the symbolic presence of the emperor. He further offers short descriptions of three other temples in the capital, noting especially the opulence of Kwangt'ong Poje-sa, where the Chinese envoys also make donations. At Hūngguk-sa he notes that a bronze flagpole is one hundred feet high, covered in gold, with a phoenix head holding a brocade flag in its mouth on top. But rather than admitting he is impressed, he sniffs

Some other temples also have these [flagpoles]. But only the one at Anhwa[-sa] has an inscription reading “Long live the emperor of Song.” Looking at such devoted praise, it must have come from a sincere mind. Thus it is only natural that they encountered the favors and affection of the imperial court

This encapsulates the spirit of his account: what is different from Song China is noted very briefly with disdain, but when the Koreans display their humble admiration for the middle kingdom, either by imitating it or basking in the imperial munificence (preferably by combining these two), they win his praise. And on the whole, the praise outweighs the blame: the *Gaoli tujing* presents a picture of a country single-minded in its devotion to the Song emperor. In how far this corresponds with reality is difficult to gauge, but ultimately beside the point: what matters is that this is the picture that suited everyone: the Koreans, for they wanted to assuage the Chinese and keep them convinced of their loyalty; Xu Jing, because he could show the emperor evidence of the success his cultural policy had;⁷ and the Chinese [and perhaps Korean] audience who read his work.

Also interesting to note is how Xu Jing was struck by the resemblance with edifices in his own capital: he quotes King Sukchong quoting a Chinese envoy as saying that paintings in Hūngwang-sa were modeled after Xiangguo-si in Kaifeng (Bianjing, the capital of the Northern Song). But even more than Buddhist shrines, it were the Taoist shrines that reflect this; before Emperor Huizong dispatched envoys to disseminate Taoist teachings, there is no evidence for any Taoist temple in Kaesōng. To accommodate the emperor's wishes, King Yejong built the Pogwōn-gwan temple, and though he apparently has not seen them with his own eyes Xu Jing is keen to note that the Taoist paintings there closely resemble those at the imperial court. The fact that Kaifeng was invaded and looted by the Jurches barely two years after he wrote this down, probably made this very poignant for Chinese readers pining for their lost capital, as it suggested the existence of a copy of that lost capital existing in a far and yet familiar country.

⁷ For more on the cultural donations with which Emperor Huizong sought to woo the Koreans, see Pratt 1976.

b. more ritual obeisance...or not?

Of course the political situation was very different from these idealistic cultural fantasies. Koryŏ had become disappointed at Song's naïve attempts at forging an alliance first against Liao and then against Jin. In fact, when Xu Jing visited Kaesŏng, the Koreans were already negotiating with the Jin on the terms of transferring their tribute relation to Jin. It is not certain how much Xu Jing knew about this; as a kind of cultural attaché, he was probably not involved in any negotiations, and though his fellow envoys must have appraised him of the desperateness of their attempts at getting the Koreans on board (Rogers 1961b: 61-2), nothing of this transpires in his account.

As said earlier, perhaps he chose to ignore these, and kept hoping with his emperor that cultural affinity would win out over Realpolitik. Perhaps he was also taken in by the Koreans. Besides the biased reporting of Song influence as seen above, there is another kind of 'padding up' evident in his work. Chapter six is the second of two devoted to the buildings of the royal palace compound. As usual, descriptions are limited to the names of buildings, their relative location, their size and sometimes how they compare with China. But he also includes verbatim copies of couplets related to, for example, the new year, or the king's birthday. And when he comes to the Pomun-gak and the Ch'ŏngyŏn-gak, both institutions devoted to Chinese letters, he casually mentions that he managed to obtain the record of said Ch'ŏngyŏn-gak, and proceeds to quote this text in full.

As far as I could ascertain, this is the only Korean text that Xu Jing quotes so extensively. To the modern reader, this long paean to enlightened Confucian monarchy, replete with titles and empty phrases, is frustrating and useless, apparently just serving to fill up empty space. To Xu Jing, however, this may have seemed like an ideal text to illustrate the Korean's devotion to the Son of Heaven. A few passages should suffice to illustrate why this was grist to his mill:

....grateful for the upper country's rare graciousness, he [King Yejong] completely absorbs the sun's power so as to pass on its heat, and thus does not consider it extravagant. With his mind full of praise for the worthy and estimation of rituals, abounding in love of goodness and forgetful of power, he can truly be called loftier than a hundred kings!....

Now our ruler has received the grace of the son of Heaven, so his mind is completely devoted to treating his subjects as those next to him. Therefore all the ministers and officers of state harbor the Heaven-protected intention of repaying the ruler. (k. 6)

At first sight there is nothing here that is improbable. King Yejong did establish the Pomun-gak and Ch'ŏngyŏn-gak around 1116, and they fitted in with his policy of promoting Confucian learning. The former was intended to store Imperial edicts, the second to house Confucian books

and classics, and also to provide a venue for lectures, some attended by the king himself. All of this is attested by the *Koryŏsa* annals for Yejong's reign.

What is remarkable, however, is that the same text can be found in the biography of Kim Injon in the *Koryŏsa* (96: 6a-9b). As Kim Injon (d. 1127) is the author of the text, perhaps it should not surprise us, but it is rather unusual to quote so extensively in the biographies section of the *Koryŏsa*. Comparing the texts from *Gaoli tujing* and *Koryŏsa* shows them to be identical, except for one small detail: Xu Jing includes an exact date (second day of the fourth month, 1117), which is omitted in *Koryŏsa*. Comparison with the annals section of *Koryŏsa* also shows no evidence that the king on that day called all the eminent officials to the Ch'ŏngyŏn-gak to inspect the gifts brought back from China by envoy Yi Cha-ryang, as the text claims – the event that prompted the writing of this record. Normally one would imagine such an event to have been recorded.

What raises further suspicion is the figure of Kim Injon: it was he who reported in 1112 to King Yejong, following his mission to the Song court, that the Chinese were deluding themselves with grand ceremonies that were too lavish considering the situation of the time (*Koryŏsa* 96: 5b; Rogers 1991: 333) How ironic then that the same person would write such an ode to the success of Song ceremonial diplomacy! Perhaps this is why the *Koryŏsa* compilers left out a precise date; for they could not find a date for the event that inspired this ode in the veritable annals for Yejong. There seems to be a distinct possibility that the record was simply made up to please Xu Jing and the Chinese envoys! In that case, it is also very likely that the *Koryŏsa* compilers simply copied the text from the *Gaoli tujing*. We know that they were aware of the *Gaoli tujing*, as it is mentioned in the biography of Kim Pusik, and it is entirely possible that copies circulated in Koryŏ.⁸ The *Koryŏsa* compilers do not appear to have been suspicious of the text, but they were puzzled as to where to insert this; ironically they inserted it right after Kim Injon's role in reclaiming the Baozhou fortress from Liao in the third month of 1117, perhaps assuming that the favor of writing this record was granted because of his role in this event. This increases the irony, as the date for this ode to the Song emperor corresponds to the conclusion of the first successful diplomatic overture between Koryŏ and Jin! That the compilers of Kim Injon's biography were not fully aware of the context is also proven by the fact that they give Yi Cha-gyŏm as the person who brought back the ritual implements, rather than Yi Cha-ryang, who, according to the annals section, departed in 1116 (*Koryŏsa* 14: 16b); not only that, but he also returned only in the fifth month of 1117, i.e. after the purported event at which King Yejong supposedly displayed the goods received from China through this

⁸ *Koryŏsa* 98: 19a. It is said that Kim Pu-sik became famous after the *Gaoli tujing* was printed. This means that the Koreans were aware of the text, and probably also obtained copies.

mission!⁹

Conclusion

Of course, in this short presentation I have not even come close to drawing a comprehensive picture of the *Gaoli tujing*. It is a complex and fascinating work that demands much more study. In particular, it needs to be more contextualized, in terms of its reception history in China, for example; a lot of my conclusions are very tentative, as I have not been able to study the abundant Chinese writings of the Song period in any detail.

But I hope that the following tentative conclusions will help us in understanding the work better, and by extension, the society it purports to describe.

While I do not want to cast unfounded doubt on Xu Jing's capacities as a witness, it is first of all important to distinguish his personal observations from his extensive copying of previous Chinese documents: for example, a lot of what he says about Koryŏ's religious gatherings in chapter 17 seems to be copied from earlier dynastic histories.

What he does describe in his own right is always done from the perspective of how it relates to Chinese culture: in order for him to note something, it has already got to be familiar in some sense: thus he is reliable when writing down the names of buildings, but perhaps less so when describing customs; while he may have been genuinely shocked at seeing men and women bath together naked in streams, it is also possible that this is just hearsay, helping to fit Koryŏ into the general category of Barbarian country to which it, despite all their efforts at entering the sinic order, still belonged. Still, there are many observations that seem direct and truthful, although one just wishes there were many more, and that they were more detailed.

Despite his stated purpose of 'mapping' a foreign country, it seems that he mainly intended to portray a loyal satellite state of Song China, and find as much evidence as possible for that. Although this reduces the value of the book as a witness account, it gives it another, added meaning: that of a political testimony. His eagerness to find evidence of the Koryŏ need for Song civilization made him liable to Koryŏ manipulation. Thus his historic accounts seem to accept uncritically the Koryŏ viewpoint, and the Koguryŏ connection was certainly important in the face of Liao and Jin claims to the cloak of Koguryŏ legitimacy. While the work of course failed to influence the political process, it helped to feed a nostalgic feeling for the old order in Southern Song; and while perhaps not intended for Korean consumption, ultimately the Koreans too would have wished to remain in Song's orbit, and thus probably saw in this work a grateful reflection of their efforts.

⁹ *Koryŏsa* 14: 22a. According to Keith Pratt (1976: 213), the ritual vessels were sent in advance, i.e. before Yi Cha-ryang returned, in April 1117. Even so, it would have been impossible for these to arrive by the beginning of the fourth month. Also, I could find no evidence for this separate dispatching of envoy and presents in the sources.

References,

- Anon. Draft translation of *Kao-li t'u-ching*.
- Breuker, Remco E. "History with a Capital H: Kaesŏng's Forgotten Claim to Capital History," *Acta Koreana*, vol. 7 no. 2 (2004): 65-102.
- Gompertz, G. St. G. M. "Hsü Ching's Visit to Korea in 1123," *Transactions of the Oriental Ceramic Society*, vol. 33 (1960-2): ? ?
- _____. "Hsü Ching's Record of Koryŏ Ceramic Wares" in *Korean Celadon, and other Wares of the Koryŏ Period*. London: Faber and Faber, 1963, pp. 33-48.
- Kim Tong-uk. "Koryŏ togyŏng ūi poksiksajŏk yŏn'gu" *Yŏnse nonch'ong* 7 (1970): 67-95.
- Merwin, Douglas L. "A Translation of the Sea Route *chuan* of the *Kao-li t'u-ching*." Thesis: Columbia University, 1969 (?)
- Pratt Keith. "Music as a Factor in Sung-Koryŏ Diplomatic Relations, 1069-1126." *T'oung-pao* 62 no. 4-5 (1976): 199-218.
- _____. "Some Aspects of Diplomatic and Cultural Exchange Between Korea and Northern Song China," *Tongyang ūmhak nonch'ong*. Seoul: Korean Musicology Society 1977.
- _____. "Politics and Culture Within the Sinic Zone: Chinese Influences on Medieval Korea," *Korea Journal*, Vol.20. No.6 (June, 1980)
- Rogers, Michael C. "Sung-Koryŏ Relations: Some Inhibiting Factors," *Oriens* 11 -1/2 (1958): 194-202.
- _____. "Studies in Korean History I: Sukchong of Koryŏ: His Accession and his Relations with Liao," *T'oung-pao* 47-1/2 (1959): 30-42.
- _____. "Factionalism and Koryŏ Policy under the Northern Sung," *JAOS* 79-1 (1959): 16-25.
- _____. "Some Kings of Koryŏ as Registered in Chinese Works," *JAOS* 81: 415-422 (1961).
- _____. "The Regularization of Koryŏ-Chin Relations (1116-1131)," *Central Asiatic Journal* 6-1 (1961b): 404-418.
- _____. "The Chinese World Order in Its Transmural Extension: The Case of Chin and Koryŏ," *Korea Studies Forum* 4 (1978, Spring-Summer): 1-22.
- _____. "National Consciousness in Medieval Korea," Morris Rossabi ed., *China among Equals*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983, pp. 151-72.
- _____. "Notes on Koryŏ's Relation with Sung and Liao," *Chindan hakpo* 71-72 (1991): 310-335.
- Shultz, Edward J. "A Song Chinese Excursion into Korea: Xu Jing and the Gaoli tujing" unpublished paper, 2006.
- Sŏ Kŭng (Xu Jing). *Sŏnhwa pongsa Koryŏ togyŏng*. Keijŏ: Kinteki shoten 近澤書店, showa 7 (1932). [edition by Imanishi Ryū, setting the Zhibuzu edition in new fonts]

- Sō Kǔng (Xu Jīng). *Sōnhwa pongsa Koryō togyōng*. Seoul: Chunghwa sōgok, ?? (4 vols.)
- Sō Kǔng (Xu Jīng). *Koryō Togyōng* (Gaoli tujīng). Seoul: Asea munhwasa, 1972.
- Sō Kǔng (Xu Jīng). *Kugyōk Koryō Togyōng*. Seoul: Minjok munhwa ch’ujinhoe, 1977.
- Sō Kǔng (Xu Jīng). *Koryō Togyōng*. Seoul: Hongik chae, 1997.
- Sō Kǔng (Xu Jīng), Chōng Yong-sōk, Kim Chong-yun tr. *Sōnhwa pongsa Koryō togyōng*. Seoul: Umjiginūn ch’aek, 1998.
- Sō Kǔng (Xu Jīng), Cho Tong-wōn et al. tr. and ed. *Koryō togyōng*. Seoul: Hwangso chari, 2005.
- Xu Jīng, Pao Tingbo ed. *Xuanhe fengshi Gaoli tujīng*. In *Zhibuzu zhai congshu*. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju ed., 1999.
- Yun I-hūm. “Koryō togyōng e nat’anān chonggyo sasang.” *Towōn Yu Sǔng-guk paksa hwagap kinyōm nonmunjip* (1983): 757-776.
- Yun Tōk-in. “Koryō sidae ūi sik saenghwal e kwanhan yōn’gu – Koryō togyōng ūl chungsim ūro” *Kwandae nonmunjip* 18 (1990): 19-33