

The Legend of the King Tung-ming 東明王 the Founder of Fu-yü-kuo 夫餘國

By

Kurakichi SHIRATORI

In very remote antiquity, a people called Mo 貊 lived in the southern part of Manchukuo 滿洲國 to the north of the mountains along the Great Wall. The *Shih-ching* 詩經 and the *Lun-yü* 論語, the most ancient records in China, contain the phrase 'Man and Mo' 蠻貊. In view of the fact that, while the Man 蠻 represent the savages in the Yang-tse Valley, the Mo 貊 are placed foremost among the savages in the Northern Desert, the tremendous power of this people for a certain period may be imagined. However, as the Mongolians, coming over the Hsing-an-ling 興安嶺 mountains, occupied the desert land in the valley of the Sira-müren 西喇木倫, and the Chinese cultivated the fertile land extending from the basins of the Ta-ling-ho 大凌河 and the Liao-ho 遼河 to the northwestern section of the Korean peninsula, the Mo people were gradually compelled to retire eastward to the forest region from the upper reaches of the Sungari 松花江 and the Ya-lu-chiang 鴨綠江 to the northeastern section of the Korean peninsula. Though this people called themselves Wei 穢, the Chinese regarding them as of the ancient Mo stock, put them down as the Wei-mo 穢貊 in their historical works. By race, they were a Tungus people slightly mixed with the Mongolian. The two earliest states founded by them and whose activities are recorded in history were Fu-yü 夫餘 in the upper reaches of the Sungari 松花江 and Kao-chü-li 高句麗 in the Ya-lu-chiang basin. As to the founders of these two states, opinions have differed since ancient times; the founder of Fu-yü-kuo, according to a record, is the King Tung-ming 東明王, while another record contends that he founded Kao-chü-li-kuo. Of these two views, which is right, and which is wrong? This has been a most difficult problem in

history, never adequately investigated. So I should like in this paper to criticise and investigate the legend of this king and to offer a solution to this problem.

The opening passage of the Annals of the Kao-chü-li dynasty of the *San-goku-shi-ki* (三國史記, 高句麗本紀), the most ancient historical record in Korea, says "The founder was the Holy King Tung-ming 東明聖王. His family name was Kao 高; his personal name Chu-mêng 朱蒙."⁽¹⁾ According to this passage, the founder of Kao-chü-li state was the King Tung-ming 東明; Tung-ming was the honoured title and Chu-mêng 朱蒙 his real name. However, the first account of the King Tung-ming in history occurs in a passage in the *Lun-bêng* 論衡 by WANG CH'UNG 王充. According to it the king is given as the founder of Fu-yü state: "A waiting-maid to the King of T'o-li-kuo 橐離國, a barbarian state in the north, conceived a child. The king wanted to kill her. The maid answered 'A spirit as large as a hen's egg descended from heaven, and it is by this that I have conceived.' Later she gave birth to a child. It was cast away into a pigsty; the pigs breathed upon him to sustain his life with their breath. It was then laid in a stable to be trodden to death; the horses breathed upon him to sustain his life with their breath. The king feared that the child might be a Heaven's son. And he let the mother recover it, and bring it up as a slave. And she named him Tung-ming 東明, and made him tend to cows and horses. Tung-ming was so good at shooting that the king feared that he would take his state. The king desired to kill him. Tung-ming ran away, and came to the River Yen-ti-shui 掩淲水 in the south. He struck the water with a bow. Fishes and mud-turtles floated to form a bridge for him. As soon as Tung-ming crossed the river, the fishes and mud-turtles disbanded. The pursuing soldiers could not go across. So he founded a capital and became King of Fu-yü. This accounts for the existence of Fu-yü-kuo as a savage state in the north."⁽²⁾

(1) 始祖東明聖王, 姓高氏, 諱朱蒙。

(2) 北夷橐離國王侍婢有娠, 王欲殺之, 婢對曰, 有氣大如鷄子, 從天而下, 我故有娠, 後產子, 捐於猪溷中, 猪以口氣噓之, 不死, 後徙置馬欄中, 欲使馬韝殺之, 馬復以口氣噓之, 不死, 王疑以爲天子, 令其母收取奴畜之, 名東明, 令牧牛馬, 東明善射, 王恐奪其國也, 欲殺之, 東明走, 南至掩淲

This legend also occurs in the passage of the *Wei-liao* 魏略 quoted under Fu-yü 夫餘 in *Tung-i-chuan* 東夷傳 of *Wei-shih* 魏志 in the *San-kuo-shih* 三國志 (Bk. 30), where "an ancient record 舊志" is referred to; since the subject-matter there is practically the same as that of the *Lun-hêng* 論衡, the "ancient record" referred to was probably the *Lun-hêng*. From the fact that WANG CH'UNG 王充, the author of this book, was born in the 3rd year of *Chien-wu* 建武 (27 A.D.) of the Emperor Kuang-wu 光武帝 of the Later Han dynasty and died in the *Yung-yüan* 永元 era (89-104 A.D.) of the Emperor Ho-ti 和帝, it is evident that this legend of the King Tung-ming 東明王 was introduced by the Chinese from Fu-yü-kuo in the earlier part of the dynasty. It may be supposed that this had been a popular legend widely circulated among Fu-yü people during the Former Han 前漢 dynasty.

Now, this tradition contains too legendary an element to be taken on the whole as an account of a historical fact. It must be, however, regarded as a fact that the King Tung-ming 東明王, fleeing southward from T'o-li-kuo 濠離國, crossed the Yen-ti-shui 掩滌水 and went to Fu-yü to found a state there. As there is no record which definitely gives the date of this event, it only remains for us to surmise it from the various Chinese records in which the phrase Fu-yü-kuo first appears. In the *Shih-chi* 史記, we find the following passage under Yen-ti 燕地 in *Huo-chi-lieh-chuan* 貨殖列傳 (Bk. 129): "On the north the land is adjacent to Wu-huan 烏桓 and Fu-yü 夫餘. It derives profits from Wei-mo 穢貊, Chao-hsien 朝鮮, and Chên-fan 真番 on the east."⁽³⁾ Thus Fu-yü stands side by side with Wu-huan, Chao-hsien, and Chên-fan. Since Wu-huan is the descendant and successor of the Tung-hu 東胡, the opening of intercourse between this people and the Chinese must date from after the fall of the Tung-hu people. The Tung-hu were overthrown by Mao-tun-shan-yü 冒頓單于 of the Hsiung-nu 匈奴 at the end of the Ch'in 秦 dynasty or at the beginning of the Former Han dynasty, but the

水以弓擊水，魚鼈浮爲橋，東明得渡，魚鼈解散，追兵不得渡，因都王夫餘，故北夷有夫餘國焉。(論衡卷二吉驗篇)

(3) 北隣烏桓夫餘，東結穢貊朝鮮真番之利。

name occurs in the *Sbib-chi* 史記 as late as the earlier years of the Emperor Hui-ti 惠帝 of this dynasty (B.C. 194-188). So we may safely suppose that about the time of the Emperor Hui-ti the Tung-hu people came to be known to the Chinese by the name of Wu-huan. Moreover, according to the *Sbib-chi*, Chên-fan-kuo 眞番國 was invaded together with Chao-hsien 朝鮮 by Yen-kuo 燕國 in the Chan-kuo 戰國 period; when Wei Man 衛滿 later on overthrew the Chao-hsien of the Chi 箕 family and founded Chao-hsien anew, Chên-fan became one of its provinces; and when the Emperor Wu-ti 武帝 of the Han dynasty in the 3rd year of *Yüan-fêng* 元封 (108 B.C.), defeating the Chao-hsien of the Wei 衛 family, established four provinces there, Chên-fan province, one of them, was evidently located in the same place. Putting these facts together, it is clear that the account in *Huo-chi-lieb-chuan* 貨殖列傳 in the *Sbib-chi* 史記 previously quoted is surely a description of the situation between the earliest years of the Emperor Hui-ti 惠帝 and the 3rd year of *Yüan-fêng* 元封 under the reign of the Emperor Wu-ti 武帝. Therefore, the rise of Fu-yü-kuo 夫餘國 recorded collaterally with Wu-huan 烏桓 and Chên-fan 眞番 must have been before the fall of the Chao-hsien-kuo 朝鮮國 of the Wei 衛 family, namely the 3rd year of *Yüan-fêng* 元封.

With its centre near the present Nung-an 農安 and Hsin-ching 新京, Fu-yü-kuo occupied the upper reaches of the Sungari, where the land boasted of abundant products and, being located at the centre of traffic, goods gathered there from every direction. Naturally the state enjoyed prosperity. Kao-chü-li 高句麗, on the other hand, occupying the Ya-lu-chiang 鴨綠江 valley, fairly fertile, but interspersed with woods and rivulets, had so little arable land that, no matter how hard the people toiled, they were miserably poor, without enough to feed themselves. So the Kao-chü-li people, in order to preserve their national existence, were obliged to plunder the Han people inhabiting Liaō-tung 遼東 on the west and to invade Fu-yü 夫餘 on the north. For this reason, Kao-chü-li and Fu-yü, though of the same Mo 貊 race, were irreconcilably antagonistic from the very beginning of their national existence. The founding of Fu-yü state dates, as previously noted, from before the 3rd year of *Yüan-fêng* 元封; but when was Kao-chü-li, its rival,

organized as a full-fledged state? This problem has to be solved before deciding whether the King Tung-ming 東明王 was the founder of Fu-yü or Kao-chü-li.

The Biography of Wang Mang 王莽 in the *Ch'ien-han-shu* 前漢書 (Bk. 96), in recording the despatching of Generals Wu-wei 五威將軍 by Wang Mang 王莽 in the 1st year of *Shih-chien-kuo* 始建國 (9 A.D.) to the rulers of the barbarian peoples in the four directions, says "Those which have arisen in the east are Hsüan-tu 玄菟, Lo-lang 樂浪, Kao-chü-li 高句麗, and Fu-yü 夫餘."⁽⁴⁾ This shows that Fu-yü had by this time founded an independent state by the side of Kao-chü-li. Moreover, the following account is found at the same biography under the 4th year of *Shih-chien-kuo* 始建國 (12 A.D.); "Prior to this, Mang 莽 proposed to mobilize the Kao-chü-li troops for conquering Hu 胡 (Hsiung-nu), but they did not wish to start. As the provincial officials pressed them to go, they ran away from the boundary, and violating the law, invaded the neighbouring land. T'ien T'an 田譚, the Governor of Liao-hsi 遼西, was murdered by them while pursuing the fugitives. Yen Yu 嚴尤 said to the Emperor Mang: 'The Mo 貊 people, violated the law have failed to fight andea their chief Tsou 騶. Treacherous as they are, you had better order your provincial and district officials to appease them. If you too hastily accuse them of treason, they may really revolt against you. Among the tribes of Fu-yü, there must be some who follow them blindly. At present, the Hsiung-nu 匈奴 people have not yet been conquered, so if the Wei-mo 穢貊 people should also rise against us, it would be a serious question.' Mang did not appease the treacherous people and the Wei-mo at last rebelled. But Mang ordered Yu to pacify the rebellion. Then Yu, decoying Marquis Tsou 騶 of Kao-chü-li, slew him; and sent his head to Chang-an 長安."⁽⁵⁾ Here we read how Wang Mang killed Marquis Tsou of Kao-chü-li. King Tsou is here given as Marquis of Kao-chü-li, because Wang Mang had

(4) 其東出者,至玄菟,樂浪,高句麗,夫餘。

(5) 先是莽發高句麗兵,將伐胡,不欲行,郡強迫之,皆亡出塞,因犯法爲寇,遼西大尹田譚追擊之,爲所殺,嚴尤奏言,貉人犯法,不從騶起,正有它心,宜命州郡慰安之,今猥被以大罪,恐其遂畔,夫餘之屬必有和者,匈奴未克,夫餘穢貉復起,此大憂也,莽不慰安,穢貉遂反,詔尤擊之,尤誘高句麗侯騶至,而斬焉,傳首長安。

reduced some of the rulers in the four directions who had previously called themselves kings to the rank of marquis, and deprived them of the title of King; evidently, however, Tsou openly used the title of King in his own state. We can see, therefore, that in Wang Mang's time Kao-chü-li was a state ruled by a king named Tsou.

The above evidences prove that, from the last part of the Former Han dynasty to Wang Mang's time, Kao-chü-li was a state, though it is impossible to decide at what particular part of that period the state was founded. When the Emperor Wu-ti 武帝 overthrew the Chao-hsien 朝鮮 of the Wei 衛 family, he established the four provinces, Lo-lang 樂浪, Lin-t'un 臨屯, Hsüan-tu 玄菟, and Chên-fan 真番; and since the province of Chên-fan was established in the basin of the Ya-lu-chiang, where later arose Kao-chü-li-kuo, there could not have been at that time a state called Kao-chü-li. In the 5th year of *Shih-yüan* 始元 under the reign of the Emperor Chao-ti 昭帝 (82 B.C.), the province of Chên-fan was abolished with a view to saving state expenses and because of the difficulty of managing the natives. Accordingly it is an open question whether the other three provinces were preserved in a perfect state. The province of Lo-lang located next to the homeland of the Han people and most thickly inhabited by them may have been different, but the other two provinces Lin-t'un and Hsüan-tu situated in the northeastern part of the Korean peninsula, after their connections with Liao-tung region were lost through the abolition of the province of Chên-fan in the basin of the Ya-lu-chiang, must have found it difficult to exist. Perhaps this led to the transference, to Lo-lang province, of the so-called "seven districts of the east of the Great Mountain" 領東七縣 in the southern part of Hsüan-tu province and in the northern part of Lin-t'un province. Lin-t'un and Hsüan-tu, the names of the two provinces, were lost, it is true; but as their seven districts were preserved, the whole of the two provinces was not abolished. The Annals of the Emperor Chao-ti 昭帝 in the *Han-shu* 漢書, therefore, as Dr. TSUDA has pointed out, says that the province abolished in the 5th year of *Shih-yüan* 始元 was only the province of Chên-fan.

The Han court, while preserving the seven districts in the two provinces Hsüan-

tu and Lin-t'un, established, in order to suppress the Wei-mo people who had formerly belonged to the former province of Chên-fan, a new province in the upper reaches of the present River Hun-ho 渾河 and on the tributary of the River Tung-chia-chiang 修佳江, which included the three districts Hsi-kai-ma 西蓋馬, Shang-yin-t'ai 上殷台, and Kao-chü-li 高句驪, and was called Hsüan-tu 玄菟 province. Therefore, the newly established province of Hsüan-tu had nothing to do with the former Hsüan-tu province so far as its territorial area or its districts were concerned. In view of the fact that Lin-tun and Chên-fan, the names of the two provinces, now disappeared from history, while the name Hsüan-tu still appeared, it was erroneously supposed by later writers that the provinces abolished in the reign of the Emperor Chao-ti 昭帝 were the two provinces of Chên-fan and Lin-t'un, and the province of Hsüan-tu was retained as before. For instance, the following passage under Wei 濊 in *Tung-i-lieb-chuan* 東夷列傳 of the *Hou-han-shu* 後漢書 (Bk. 115) is an hypothesis based on the misunderstanding, and by no means correct account of the situation of the times. "In the 3rd year of *Yüan-fêng* 元封 (B.C. 108), the Emperor (Wu-ti) overthrew Chao-hsien, and established the four provinces Lo-lang, Lin-t'un, Hsüan-tu, and Chên-fan. In the 5th year of *Shih-yüan* 始元, (B.C. 82) the Emperor Chao-ti 昭帝 abolished Lin-t'un and Chên-fan, annexing (part of) them to Lo-lang and Hsüan-tu. Hsüan-tu was again transferred to Chü-li 句驪. The Wu-chu 沃沮 and Wei-mo 濊貊 people of all the east of the great mountain Tan-tan-ta-ling 單單大嶺 belonged to Lo-lang 樂浪. Later, because of the immense size of the province, the seven districts of the east of the Great Mountain were divided and put under the rule of the *Tung-pu Tu-wei* 東部都尉 of Lo-lang province,"⁽⁶⁾

According to this passage in the *Hou-han-shu* 後漢書, it seems that the writer inferred that the two provinces Chên-fan and Lin-t'un were abolished in the 5th year of *Shih-yüan* 始元 under the reign of the Emperor Chao-ti 昭帝, and the province

(6) 至元封三年,滅朝鮮,分置樂浪,臨屯,玄菟,眞番四郡,至昭帝始元五年,罷臨屯·眞番,以并樂浪·玄菟,玄菟復徙居句驪,自單單大嶺已東,沃沮濊貊悉屬樂浪,後以境土廣遠,復分領東七縣,置樂浪東部都尉。

of Hsüan-tu was retained as before, but later transferred from the territory to the land of Kao-chü-li. In other words, Hsi-kai-ma 西蓋馬, Shang-yin-t'ai 上殷臺 and Kao-chü-li 高句驪, the three districts of Hsüan-tu province recorded in *Ti-li-chih* 地理志 of the *Han-shu* 漢書 were inferred to have been transferred from the former Hsüan-tu province. Was this the case? From a study of the names of the three districts in question, I very much doubt the accuracy of this inference. The name Hsi-kai-ma 西蓋馬 must be a name derived from the mountain Kai-ma-ta-shan 蓋馬大山. This mountain in the Han dynasty, formed the boundary between Hsüan-tu province and Chên-fan province, and referred to the backbone mountain range running between the present Hei-an-dô 平安道 and Kan-kyô-dô 咸鏡道. And the name Hsi-kai-ma or Western Kai-ma was obtained from the fact that the district lay to the west of the mountain range. It cannot be supposed that this district was in the province of the later Hsüan-tu which lay to the east of the Kai-ma-ta-shan 蓋馬大山. Again, as the name Kao-chü-li-hsien 高句驪縣 is inferred to have been related to Kao-chü-li-kuo 高句驪國 which rose on the basin of the Ya-lu-chiang, it is highly improbable that it was a district of Hsüan-tu province established in the present Kan-kyô-dô 咸鏡道. If Hsi-kai-ma and Kao-chü-li districts did not belong to the former Hsüan-tu province, we may safely assert that neither was Shang-yin-t'ai 上殷台 located in the province.

If the newly established Hsüan-tu province was not the former Hsüan-tu province transferred, the three districts established therein may also be inferred to have been new ones. If viewed in this light, it is strange from a geographical point of view that Hsi-kai-ma district which was probably located near the upper reaches of the present Hun-ho 渾河 and occupied the basin of the Tung-chia-chiang 佟佳江 should have obtained its name from the Kai-ma-ta-shan 蓋馬大山 to the south of the present Pai-t'ou-shan 白頭山. It is still more strange that Kao-chü-li-hsien 高句驪縣 which was very probably established in the neighbourhood of the present Hsing-ching 興京 should have had a name identical with that of the state which had been quite independent as early as the latter part of the Former Han dynasty. In

the light of this study of the names, Hsi-kai-ma district and Kao-chü-li district suggest themselves as the names of localities in the Ya-lu-chiang basin; and it is quite probable that the three districts of the new Hsüan-tu province were not those of the former Hsüan-tu province, nor were they newly established in the reign of the Emperor Chao-ti, but were simply those of the former Chên-fan province which had been retained.

As we investigate the geography and history of the Ya-lu-chiang basin in which Chên-fan province was established, we can point out three localities pre-eminently important in this territory. One is in the upper reaches of the river, the neighbourhood of Lin-chiang 臨江 to the south of the present Mao-êrh-shan 帽兒山, where Shên-chou Ya-lu-fu 神州鴨綠府, the western capital (Hsi-ching 西京) of P'o-hai 渤海, was founded; another is Wan-tu-ch'êng 丸都城, the second ancient capital of Kao-chü-li-kuo 高句麗國, namely, Chi-an-hsien 輯安縣 celebrated as the site of the monument of the King Hao-t'ai 好太王; and the other is the present Huan-jên-hsien 桓仁縣, known in the last days of the Yüan dynasty and in the Ming dynasty as Wu-la-shan-ch'êng 兀刺山城, which occupies the most strategic point in the Tung-chia-chiang 佟佳江 basin. When thus viewed, because the name Hsi-kai-ma-hsien was surely obtained from its locality to the west of Kai-ma-ta-shan 蓋馬大山, this must be a district of Chên-fan province established near the present Lin-chiang-hsien 臨江縣. Let us now turn to a study of the name Shang-yin-t'ai-hsien 上殷台縣. The character 殷 is now pronounced *in*, but it was **ian* in ancient times; the character 台 had **tui* in addition to **tai* as its ancient pronunciation; hence the phrase 殷台 was pronounced **ian-tui*; this seems to have been a name identical with Wan-tu (**jan-tu*) 丸都 of the Three-Kingdom period. Therefore, Shang-yin-t'ai (Upper Yin-t'ai) must be one of the hsien of Chên-fan province established at the present Chi-an-hsien 輯安縣. Moreover, Kao-chü-li-hsien is identical with the name Ho-pên-ku-ch'êng 紇本骨城, the oldest capital city of Kao-chü-li-kuo 高句麗國, one of the *hsien*s of Chên-fan province established at the present Huan-jên-hsien 桓仁縣. However, as this interpretation of Kao-chü-li 高句麗 as another transcrip-

tion of Ho-pên-ku 紇本骨 is the result of my rather thorough investigation, its processes shall be now discussed in full detail.

A study of the ancient history of Manchuria and Korea will admit no doubt as to the fact that Kao-chü-li-kuo originated in the basin of the Tung-chia-chiang 佟佳江, a tributary of the Ya-lu-chiang. The most strategic point of this basin was the Wu-la-shan-ch'êng 兀刺山城 as recorded in various works of the Ming dynasty. In the reign of the King Kung-min 恭愍王 of Kao-li-kuo 高麗國, this castle was occupied by Li-wu-lu-tieh-mu-erh 李吾魯帖木兒, assistant Governor of Tung-ning-fu 東寧府 of the Yüan court. Then in the 9th year (1370 A.D.) of this king, Li-Chêng-kuei 李成桂 despatching troops from Kan-kô 咸興, the capital in the North eastern section 東北面 of Korea, surmounting the two peaks Kō-sō 黃草 and Setsu-kan 雪塞 of the backbone mountain range, and crossing the Ya-lu-chiang, succeeded in capturing the Yü-lo-shan-ch'êng 于羅山城, namely, Wu-la-shan-ch'êng 兀刺山城; and two years later, the King Kung-min sent troops to the Wu-lao-shan-ch'êng 吾老山城, and laying siege to it, took it, and captured Ha-la-pu-hua 哈刺不花, assistant secretary of the Shu-mi-yüan 樞密院, the War Office of the Yüan court⁽⁷⁾; and again, in the Chêng-t'ung 正統 era of the Ming dynasty (1436-1449 A.D.), Li Man-chu 李滿住, the head of the Jurchins 女真, occupied the Wu-la-shan-ch'êng 兀刺山城 to offer defense against the invasion of the Koreans.⁽⁸⁾ Yü-lo 于羅 and Wu-lao 吾老 here cited are both similar to Wu-la 兀刺. These instances prove that the Wu-la-shan-ch'êng was the most important point in the Tung-chia-chiang basin. As to its locality, the Ryû-hi-gyo-ten-ka 龍飛御天歌 (5 Bk.) says "As you go from O-do-ri-ko-shi 央土里口子, the centre of Hei-an-dô 平安道, and cross the two rivers Ya-lu 鴨綠 and P'o-chu 婆猪 in the north, you will reach the Wu-la-shan-ch'êng. It is located in the centre of a vast plain; it has insurmountable walls of immense height on all sides; it may be only approached from the western side. The

(7) *Manshû-rekishi-chiri* 滿洲歷史地理, Vol. II, pp. 364-365

(8) *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 562-563

distance from Ri-san-gun 理山郡 is two hundred and seventy *li* 里.”⁽⁹⁾ Another passage (in the same chapter) reads “Thirty *li* 里 after crossing the river in the west of I-gen-gun 渭原郡 of Hei-an-dô 平安道, there is a village. The village contains a smooth and level land, named Yeh-tun 也頓 village. Its distance from the Wu-la-(shan)-ch’êng is one day’s journey.”⁽¹⁰⁾ This castle, judging from the distances to Ri-san-gun or the present So-san 楚山 and to I-gen 渭原, and from the account that it was a strong mountain fort looming up at the centre of a vast plain, must be located near the present Huan-jên-hsien 桓仁縣.

The most remarkable fact about this Wu-la castle is that it is always recorded as *shan-ch’êng* 山城 or a mountain castle. A mountain in the Tungus language is *urra*, *ura*, and in Mongolian *agbula* or *ūla*. Since the Ya-lu-chiang basin was in the hands of the Jurchins during the Ming dynasty, it may be correct to suppose that *Wu-la* 兀刺 in the phrase Wu-la-shan-ch’êng 兀刺山城 was a transcription of the Tungus *ura*. However, this region then being part of the Yüan territory, 兀刺 may be taken as a transcription of the Mongolian *ūla*. Be this as it may, the native pronunciation of 兀刺山城 would be *Ura Xoto* or *Ūla Xoto*, that is to say, a mountain castle. To call it *shan-ch’êng* 山城 would sound a common noun and be inconvenient. Therefore, the native word *ura* or *ūla* was added to it as a prefix, and the phrase Wu-la-shan-ch’êng 兀刺山城 was thus formed.

It would seem, therefore, that the ancient capital of Kao-chü-li-kuo 高句麗國 which originated in the basin of the Tung-chia-chiang 佟佳江 was the Wu-la-shan-ch’êng of later times. The capital, however, is given in the monument of the King Hao-t’ai 好太王 as the Hu-pên-ch’êng 忽本城 and in *Kao-chü-li-chuan* 高句麗傳 of the *Wei-shu* 魏書 as Ho-shêng-ku-ch’êng 紇升骨城. As 紇升骨城 is written 紇斗骨城 in another book, 升 and 斗 must be both miscopy of 本; 紇本骨城 must be the correct form. Ho-pên 紇本 must be identical with Hu-pên 忽本

(9) 自平安道央土里口子, 北渡鴨綠婆猪二江, 至兀刺山城, 在大野之中, 四面壁立高絕, 唯西可上, 距理山郡二百七十里。

(10) 平安道渭原郡西越江三十里, 有一洞, 洞內平衍, 名曰也頓村, 北距兀刺城一日程。

and the last word, **kuat* 骨 may be another transcription of 忽 or 溝漣 (*lor*) which meant in the Kao-chü-li language, a castle. If this 忽本城 be taken as identical with the Wu-la-shan-ch'êng of the Ming period, the names 忽本 and 紇本 might be a word meaning something like *wu-la* 兀刺. An etymological study shows that, in the Urulginsk dialect of the Tungus language, a hill is *kuwudek*. *Dek*, the ending of this word being probably only a diminutive, the stem *kuwu* or *kuwun* must be a word meaning a mountain. In the Seleginsk dialect of the Buryat Mongolian language, the ridge of a hill is *gube*; this same word is applied to a bare, treeless hill in the Chorinsk dialect.⁽¹¹⁾ Again, in the Mongolian language, a bank or cliff is *kübege*, *kübüge*; for instance, a river bank is *müren kübege* and a small fence on a castle wall is *Xotan-u-kübege*.⁽¹²⁾ Ge the last part of *kübüge* being a diminutive, *kübe*, *kübu*, or *kübuu* must refer to the height of something like a mountain. 忽本 or 紇本 in the Kao-chü-li language was no doubt transcription of this *kübu* or *kübuu* which probably meant a mountain. Since 骨 the character in the phrase 紇本骨 found in the *Wei-shu* is regarded as a transcription of the Kao-chü-li word *lor* which meant a castle 紇本骨 must be a transcription of *kübuu-lor* a mountain castle in this language, namely *shan-ch'êng* 山城 in Chinese. Therefore, the Hu-pên-ch'êng 忽本城 which the King Tsou-mou 鄒牟王, the founder of Kao-chü-li-kuo, built and the Ho-pên-ku-ch'êng 紇本骨城 which Chu-mêng 朱蒙 held have both the meaning exactly similar to that of the Wu-la-shan-ch'êng 兀刺山城 of the Ming period. According to the legend of Chu-mêng 朱蒙, he established his capital at the Ho-pên-ku-ch'êng and named his state Kao-chü-li. However, Kao-chü-li-hsien 高句麗縣 of Chên-fan province established by the Emperor Wu-ti 武帝 of the Han dynasty was the Wu-la-shan-ch'êng 兀刺山城 of the Ming period, and was probably located near the present Huan-jên-hsien 桓仁縣. Thus the identity of both places makes it probable that the name Kao-chü-li 高句麗 is similar to Hu-pên-ku 紇本骨, only another transcription of the same word. I should take 句驪 or 句麗 in 高句驪

(11) CASTREN: Burjatisch-Deutsches Wörterverzeichnis, p. 132

(12) KOWALEVSKI: Dictionnaire Mongol-russe-francais, p. 2775

or 高句麗 to refer to the same thing as 骨 or 溝瀆 which meant *ch'êng* 城 a castle; 高 was pronounced **kou*, and referred to the same thing as *kumu* in the Tungus language and *kübü* in the Mongolian—namely, a mountain. Therefore, the word Kao-chü-li 高句麗 meant *shan-ch'êng* 山城 or a mountain castle, a name quite similar to Ho-pên-kü 紇本骨. The reason why 高句麗國 was pronounced *koma* in Japanese may be traced to this: *kübü* or *kübe* was corrupted to *Koba*, and then to *Koma*.

If originally Hsi-kai-ma-hsien 西蓋馬縣 was the present Lin-chiang 臨江, Shang-yin-t'ai-hsien 上殷台縣, the present Chi-an 輯安, and Kao-chü-li-hsien 高句麗縣, the present Huan-jên 桓仁, these three *hsiens* must have held the most important positions among the fifteen *hsiens* of Chên-fan province. The Han court moved these three *hsiens*, of course these names only, upward to the upper reaches of the present Hun-ho 渾河 and there formed a province named Hsüan-tu. Therefore, the new Hsüan-tu province had nothing to do with the former Hsüan-tu because the *hsiens* included in the new one had belonged to the former Chên-fan province. But the people under this new Hsüan-tu province were mostly the Chinese, which is a different situation in view of the fact that the subjects of the former Chên-fan province were mostly Wei-mo 穢貊. Why was it that the new province thus formed was called Hsüan-tu? The reason is entirely unknown. I am of the opinion that, because the *hsiens* included in the new Hsüan-tu province were the three *hsiens* of the former Chên-fan province transferred, while the sphere of administration and the subjects governed were entirely different from those of Chên-fan province, it was feared that the retention of the same name Chên-fan province would cause much confusion (as to whether it referred to the old or the new). Now the provinces Hsüan-tu and Lin-t'un went out of existence as provinces, but as the seven *hsiens* included in them were retained as before, they cannot be said to have been entirely abolished. Of these two provinces, Hsüan-tu was chosen as a name to be handed down to posterity and was applied to the newly established province. May this not have been the case? If otherwise, of the four provinces founded by the Emperor Wu-ti 武帝 of the Han dynasty when he conquer-

ed Chao-hsien 朝鮮, Lin-t'un and Chên-fan were the two provinces established in the region which had been under the rule of Chao-hsien-kuo; the two provinces Lo-lang 樂浪 and Chên-fan 真番 were those newly established by the Emperor Wu-ti. In the reign of the Emperor Chao-ti 昭帝, the province of Chên-fan was abolished and the seven districts which had been included in the two provinces Lin-t'un and Hsüan-tu were now annexed to the province of Lo-lang 樂浪; when the names of the two provinces consequently passed out of existence, a new province was installed along the northeastern boundary of Liao-tung 遼東. As this new province had no relation or connection with the three previous provinces, it was a time when an entirely new name might be chosen for it. But the conservatism of the Chinese in desiring to retain an ancient name prevailed and the name Hsüan-tu 玄菟 which had been adopted by the Emperor Wu-ti came to be applied to the new province.

Lack of literature on the subject makes it impossible to know clearly the fate of the Hsüan-tu province newly founded at the time of the Emperor Chao-ti 昭帝. However, the transference of the province during the reign of the Emperor Ho-ti 和帝 of the Later Han dynasty to the neighbourhood of Mukden has already been studied and proved beyond question. That the Kao-chü-li-hsien 高句麗縣 as one of the *hsiens* of this province was still retained is also a fact; it is evident, therefore, that at the time of Wang Mang 王莽 this Kao-chü-li-hsien actually existed within Hsüan-tu province which included the present Hsing-ching 興京 and its neighbourhood. According to the Biography of Wang Mang of the *Han-shu*, in the 3rd year of *Shih-chien-kuo* 始建國 (11 A.D.) of Wang Mang, a certain Tsou 騶, assuming the title of King, occupied Kao-chü-li-kuo 高句麗國. This Kao-chü-li-kuo was the name assumed by the powerful state formed by the patriarchs of the Wei-mo 穢貊 people which occupied the Kao-chü-li-hsien in Chên-fan province, not the one which rose in the Kao-chü-li-hsien of the later Hsüan-tu province. The date of the rise of this Kao-chü-li-kuo cannot be known, but the reason why the Emperor Chao-ti 昭帝 abolished Chên-fan province was chiefly because of his inability to suppress the rebellious patriarchs of the Wei-mo people there. However, it would be safe to put the for-

mation of the state by the Kao-chü-li patriarchs who unified the Wei-mo people in the Ya-lu basin to a date some years later than the 5th year of *Shih-yüan* 始元 (83 B. C.) of the Emperor Chao-ti when Chên-fan province was abolished. And it is also a fact that Tsou 騮 was already the King of Kao-chü-li-kuo in the 4th year of *Shih-chien-kuo* 始建國 (12 A.D.) of Wang Mang, though the ascension to the throne of this king did not occur in this year, but some time prior to it. When thus studied from the various circumstances, the rise of Kao-chü-li-kuo may be set as dating from the latter part of the Former Han dynasty; and Tsou was its probable founder.

From the foregoing evidence, it is certain that Tsou, the probable founder of Kao-chü-li-kuo, reigned towards the latter part of the Former Han dynasty. However, as already quoted, the *San-goku-shi-ki* 三國史記 records that the Holy King Tung-ming 東明聖王, the founder of Kao-chü-li-kuo, ascended the throne in the 2nd year of *Chien-chao* 建昭 (37 B.C.) under the reign of the Emperor Yüan-ti 元帝 of the Former Han dynasty. According to the *Lun-hêng* 論衡, the King Tung-ming was the founder of Fu-yü-kuo 夫餘國. Although the date of his ascension to the throne is not given, it was no doubt prior to the 3rd year of *Yüan-fêng* 元封 (108 B.C.) under the reign of the Emperor Wu-ti 武帝. It follows, therefore, that there is a difference of at least one hundred years between the Holy King Tung-ming 東明聖王 of the *San-goku-shi-ki* and the King Tung-ming 東明王 of the *Lun-hêng*. Thus the King Tung-ming cannot be regarded as the founder of Fu-yü and Kao-chü-li at the same time. Why is it then that the official historians of Korea set the founding of Kao-chü-li by the Holy King Tung-ming 東明聖王 as dating from the 2nd year of *Chien-chao* 建昭? I am of the opinion that it was on account of the resemblance between Tsou-mou 鄒牟, the other name of this king, and that of the King Tsou 騮, the Kao-chü-li king, that this fabulous view was invented. Tsou 騮, being a man murdered in the 4th year of *Shih-chien-kuo* (12 A.D.) of Wang Mang, if a man of longevity, it is possible that he was enthroned in the 2nd year of *Chien-chao* (37 B.C.). It would sound quite reasonable for a historian to take Tsou 騮, who actually ruled Kao-chü-li, as a man identical with Tsou-mou 鄒牟 represented on the monument of the King Hao-

t'ai 好太王. But to identify this Tsou 騶 with the King Tung-ming would cause considerable incompatibility, because it would be impossible, as stated before, to put the King Tung-ming 東明王 at a date later than the 3rd year of *Yüan-fêng* 元封 (108 B.C.) of the Emperor Wu-ti 武帝.

If the King Tung-ming 東明王 and Tsou-mou 鄒牟 or the King Chu-mêng 朱蒙王 had been one and the same character, he must have reigned at the same time over Fu-yü and Kao-chü-li with a century's interval between the dates of their founding. Therefore, Dr. NAKA 那珂, offering the following reason, assumed that the King Tsou-mou 鄒牟王 or the King Tung-ming 東明王 was the founder of Kao-chü-li-kuo, but was erroneously given by the *Lun-hêng* as the founder of Fu-yü-kuo :

"The ancient capital of Kao-chü-li is in the upper reaches of the Ya-lu-chiang. not far from Fu-yü; and the country is represented in the annals of Pai-chi 百濟 (of *San-goku-shi-ki* as Tsu-pên-fu-yü 卒本夫餘, the former ruler of the region as King Fu-yü 夫餘王, and the country from which Chu-mêng came as North Fu-yü 北夫餘. Moreover, the reports by Tsu-no-Muraji Mamichi 津連眞道 and others also say 'Uniting all Fu-yü, he founded the state',⁽¹³⁾ Tsu-pên 卒本 must be originally one of the tribes of Fu-yü. The note on the *San-goku-i-ji* 三國遺事 says 'This Tsu, pên-fu-yü 卒本扶餘 was another tribe of North Fu-yü.'⁽¹⁴⁾ Therefore, the passage "He became King of Fu-yü" means that he became the ruler of Tsu-pên-fu-yü 卒本扶餘, a part of Fu-yü; the name T'o-li-kuo 橐離國 may be only another name of North Fu-yü. Again, the character t'o 橐 is given as kao 橐 in the *Wei-liao* 魏略 which may be taken as a miscopy of the two characters 高句. It may be that the tradition of Kao-chü-li originating from Fu-yü being reversed, Fu-yü was mistaken to have originated from Kao-chü-li."⁽¹⁵⁾

Assigning Tsu-pên-fu-yü 卒本扶餘 as a section of North Fu-yü by the *San-goku-i-ji* is only an erroneous view of a writer who had no geographical knowledge of this part of the continent in ancient times. Tsu-pên 卒本 in the Korean histories

(13) 奄扶餘,而開國.

(14) 此卒本扶餘,亦是北扶餘之別部.

(15) M. NAKA : Naka-michiyo-isho, *Gaijō-eki-shi*, Bk. II, Kō-ku-ri-kō, p. 801

is nothing but a corruption of Hu-pên 忽本 on the monument of the King Hao-t'ai 好太王. In Korean, as in the Tungus and Manchurian languages, *s* and *b* sounds are often interchangeable. To cite a remarkable instance in modern Korean, tongue is *bye* or *sye*; *ban* 干, the suffix of the titles of Silla officials in the Three-Kingdom period of ancient Korea, is given *san* 淹 in the Silla period. Therefore, it would not be so extravagant to suppose Sot-pon 卒本 to be the corruption of Hot-pon 忽本. Seeing that the Hu-pên-ch'êng 忽本城 of the King Hao-t'ai monument, as the writer has already proved definitely, is identical with the Ho-pên-kuch'êng 紇本骨城 of the *Wei-shu* and also with the Kao-chü-li-hsien 高句驪縣 of the *Han-shu*, it would be as ridiculous to regard Tsu-pên 卒本 as a part of Fu-yü as to regard Kao-chü-li as part of Fu-yü.

According to the *Lun-hêng* 論衡, almost the only historical material concerning the legend of the King Tung-ming, this king moved south from T'o-li-kuo 濠離國 and became king of Fu-yü; and there could be no reason to doubt this statement. However, most later historians make no scruple in assigning this king as the founder of Kao-chü-li-kuo. It is extremely regrettable that such a scholar with deep insight as Dr. NAKA should have fallen into this fallacy and never have realized it. The reason why such a mistaken view swept the academic world is because the monument of the King Hao-t'ai, the great ruler of Kao-chü-li-kuo, has the following inscription.:

“It is believed that the King Tsou-mou 鄒牟王 founded this state in remote antiquity. He came from North Fu-yü as the son of Heaven-God; his mother was the daughter of Ho-po 河伯 the River-God, who, breaking an egg, came down to give birth to a child. The great king . . . ordering a carriage, travelled about the provinces. Across his way lay the great river Yen-li 奄利大水 of Fu-yü. The king addressing the ferry, demanded ‘I am King Tsou-mou, the son of Heaven-God; my mother is the daughter of the River-God. Let there be floating turtles.’ No sooner had he finished than there appeared floating turtles. Thus he succeeded in crossing the river. Building a castle on a mountain to the west of Hu-pên in the

valley of the River Fei-liu 沸流, he made this his capital."⁽¹⁶⁾ This is the legend of the King Tsou-mou, the founder of Kao-chü-li-kuo, which, after much expansion and colouring, has come down as the following legend of the King Chu-mêng 朱蒙王 recorded under Kao-chü-li-kuo in *Tung-i-chuan* 東夷傳 of the *Wei-shu* 魏書 (Bk. 100):

"Kao-chü-li came from Fu-yü. The people themselves claim Chu-mêng as their ancestor. Chu-mêng's mother was the daughter of the River-God. She was confined in a room by the king of Fu-yü. As the sunbeams came upon her, she withdrew to avoid them. The sunbeams again pursued her. Presently she conceived and gave birth to an egg as large as the five *shêng* 升 measure. The king of Fu-yü threw it away to the dogs. But the dogs would not eat it. He threw it away to the pigs, but the pigs would not eat it. He threw it away on the road, but the oxen and horses would step aside. Later he threw it away in the field where various birds warmed it with their feathers. Though the king of Fu-yü tried to cut it open, he could not break it; so he returned it to its mother. She wrapped it up with various things and as she kept it in a warm place, a boy, breaking the shell, came out of it. As he grew up, she called him Chu-mêng 朱蒙. In the native language, Chu-mêng meant a good marksman. Because Chu-mêng was not a man born of a human being, the people of Fu-yü, doubting this sincerity, advised the king to expel him. The king would not listen to them. He ordered Chu-mêng to attend to his horses. Chu-mêng, secretly trying the horses, could tell the good animals from the poor. He underfed the former so as to make them lean, and overfed the latter so as to make them fat. The king of Fu-yü himself rode the fat horses, while he gave the lean ones to Chu-mêng. Later they hunted in the field; Chu-mêng being a good marksman, was allowed to shoot only one arrow. Though with a few arrows, he shot a number of animals. The subjects of the king of Fu-yü conspired to kill him. His mother suspected it and said to Chu-mêng 'Your countrymen intend to kill you.

(16) 惟昔始祖鄒牟王創基也,出自北夫餘,天帝之子,母河伯女郎,剖卵降生子,有墜□□□□□□命駕巡車南下,路由夫餘奄利大水,王臨津言曰,我是皇天之子,母河伯女郎,鄒牟王,爲我連葢浮龜,應聲卽爲連葢浮龜,然後造渡,於沸流谷忽本西,城山上,而建都焉。

Such a talented youngman as you should seek his fortune in the wide world. Thereupon, Chu-mêng taking with him the two men, Wu-yin 烏引 and Wu-ta 烏達, deserted the state of Fu-yü and fled in a southeastern direction. On the way they came to a large river which they had to go across, but there was no bridge. The pursuers of Fu-yü were close upon them. Chu-mêng, addressing the water, said 'I am the son of the Sun-God and grandson of the River-God; I am now fleeing from my enemy who is almost overtaking me. How can I go across the river?' Thereupon, fishes and turtles floated in a line and made a bridge for him. As Chu-mêng and his men went across, the turtles scattered away. The pursuing soldiers could not go across. Chu-mêng came to the P'u-shu-shui 普述水 river and met three men: one in clothes of hemp, another in priestly clothes, and the other in sea-weed clothes. Accompanied by them, he came to the Ho-shêng-ku-ch'êng 紇升骨城 where he settled down at length. He assumed the title Kao-chü-li 高句麗. Hence Kao became his family name."⁽¹⁷⁾

If the legends of the king Tsou-mou 鄒牟王 and the King Chu-mêng here given are studied and compared, the accounts, though one is longer than the other, are identical in the point of composition and subject-matter; the King Tsou-mou and the King Chu-mêng appear to be an identical character; which would arouse no protest as to their being both the founders of Kao-chü-li-kuo. And when these legends are compared with that of the King Tung-ming 東明王, they resemble one another in construction so much that later historians, taking the name Tung-

(17) 高句麗者出於夫餘，自言先祖朱蒙，朱蒙母河伯女，爲夫餘王閉於室中，爲日所照，引身避之，日影又逐，既而有孕，生一卵，大如五升，夫餘王棄之與犬，犬不食，棄之與豕，豕又不食，棄之於路，牛馬避之，後棄之野，衆鳥以毛茹之，夫餘王割剖之，不能破，遂還其母，其母以物裹之，置於暖處，有一男破殼而出，及其長也，字之曰朱蒙，其俗言朱蒙者善射也，夫餘人以朱蒙非人所生，將有異志，謂除之，王不聽，命之養馬，朱蒙每私試知有善惡，駿者減食令瘦，騖者善養令肥，夫餘王以肥者自乘，以瘦者給朱蒙，後狩于田，以朱蒙善射，限之一矢，朱蒙雖矢少，殪獸甚多，夫餘之臣，又謀殺之，朱蒙母陰知，告朱蒙曰，國將害汝，以汝才略，宜遠適四方，朱蒙乃與烏引烏達等二人，棄夫餘，東南走，中道遇一大水，欲濟無梁，夫餘人追之甚急，朱蒙告水曰，我是日子，河伯外孫，今日逃走，追兵垂及，如何得濟，於是魚鼈並浮爲之成橋，朱蒙得濟，魚鼈乃解，追騎不得渡，朱蒙遂至普述水，遇見三人，一人著麻衣，一人著緇衣，一人著水藻衣，與朱蒙至於紇升骨城，遂居焉，號曰高句麗，因以(高)爲氏焉。

ming as another title of the King Tsou-mou or Chu-mêng, had no doubt as to their identity. However, as I have already stated, the King Tung-ming and the King Tsou-mou are characters of different periods; therefore, to take them as two different characters would cause no difficulty, but to take them as an identical character would give rise to a grave incompatibility. In settling this question, therefore, the first necessary step would be the investigation as to whether the King Tung-ming is identical with the King Tsou-mou. Since Tsou-mou and Chu-mêng resemble each other in their pronunciation, they might be taken as only different transliterations of the same word. But the name Tung-ming differs a good deal in pronunciation from the other two names and the two characters 東明 by themselves make an independent meaning as a Chinese phrase; so the *San-goku-shi-ki* 三國史記 regards Tung-ming 東明 as the honorific title of the founder and Chu-mêng 朱蒙 as his real name. A phonetic study of the three names for the purpose of determining their identity or difference would lead to nothing but empty conjectures and surmises. However, the *Wei-shu* 魏書 very fortunately interprets the name Chu-mêng as meaning a good marksman, which offers the very key to the solution of this abstruse problem. Thereupon, the *Man-chou-yüan-liu-ke'ao* 滿洲源流考 under *Pu-tsu* 部族 dwells upon the interpretation of the *Wei-shu* and says: "Our opinion is that in modern Manchurian a good marksman is called *cho-lin-mang-a* 卓琳莽阿. *Cho* 卓 resembles *Chu* 朱 in pronunciation. *Lin* 琳 is an attenuation of the sound coming between the teeth and the tongue. The two characters *Mang-a* 莽阿, when pronounced rapidly, sound somewhat like 蒙 (mêng). This serves to show that, though the characters may indicate a corruption, the pronunciation may be relied upon."⁽¹⁸⁾ In the Manchurian language, the verb "to point out, to hit the mark" is *jori*; and the noun "object, target for shooting" *jorin*; so *cho-lin* 卓琳 in the *Man-chou-yüan-liu-ke'ao* must refer to this word *jorin*. Again, in this language, "to be strong; hard, sturdy valuable, skilful in shooting" is *mangga*. *Mang-a* 莽阿 is a transliteration

(18) 按今滿洲語稱善射者，謂之卓琳莽阿，卓與朱音相近，琳即齒舌之餘韻也，莽阿二字急呼之，音近蒙，是傳寫雖訛，音解猶可考也。

of this word *mangga*. There is no objection in ascribing *mêng* 蒙 in the phrase Chu-mêng 朱蒙 to this *mangga*. But how about ascribing 朱 *chu* to *cho-lin* 卓琳 (*jin*)? In the Gold dialect of the Tungus language, *ču*, *čū* or *šū* is an adverb meaning very or right.⁽¹⁹⁾ As to shoot an arrow skilfully in Manchurian is *mangga*, it may be supposed that to shoot an arrow skilfully in the Tungus language was *ču mangga*. *Chu* 朱 in the phrase 朱蒙 might be a Kao-chü-li word corresponding to this word *ču*. In the historical works of the T'ang dynasty, we see many personal names of many P'o-hai 渤海 people, ending in *mang* 蒙 which must be a transliteration of this *mangga*. This shows that the word had probably become a kind of personal proper noun by this time. The name Chu-mêng 朱蒙 is written, besides Tsou-mou 鄒牟, 蒙牟, 仲牟, 都慕,—all different transliterations of the same name.⁽²⁰⁾ Again, the Gold language has *tong*, *teng*, *tyng*, as a synonym of *ču*, *šū*.⁽²¹⁾ The ancient pronunciation of the two words Tung-ming may be supposed to have been **tong-mang*; 東 is probably a transliteration of this *tong* and 明 that of *mangga*. If this interpretation be acceptable, 朱蒙 and 鄒牟 must be taken as a transliteration of *ču-mangga* and 東明 that of *tong-mangga*,—namely, one and the same name.

When viewed in this light, the legend of the King Tung-ming and that of Chu-mêng or the King Tsou-mou, it may be seen that they are completely similar in the names of their heroes as well as their construction and subject-matter. However, there being an interval of more than a century between the founding of Fu-yü and that of Kao-chü-li, as previously stated, it goes without saying that the King Tung-ming could not have been the founder of both states at the same time. Then of the two legends, one must be true and the other false. To reconcile this inconsistency, one may advocate that, seeing that both Fu-yü and Kao-chü-li were both of the Wei-mo 穢貊 stock, the King Tung-ming had been a character revered as their common ancestor by the people when they lived together before they separated

(19) W. GRUBE: *Goldisch-Deutsches Wörterverzeichnis*. (Anhang z. III. Bande d. Reisen u. Forschungen im Amur-Lande.) p. 60

(20) M. NAKA: *Naka-Michiyo-isho, Gaijō-ekishi*, Vol. I, Kôkuri-kô, p. 101

(21) GRUBE: *op. cit.*, p. 77.

to form two independent states; thus the king could have been the founder of Fu-yü-kuo as well as that of Kao-chü-li-kuo. Should this be a fact, the native country of the founder should necessarily be the same in both legends. However, the legend of the King Tung-ming mentions the king's fleeing from T'o-li-kuo to Fu-yü-kuo, while the legend of the King Tsou-mou mentions the King's moving from Fu-yü to Kao-chü-li-kuo. This sounds very strange indeed. I am of the opinion that, of the two legends, one must be true and the other false.

Since the legend of the King Tung-ming is recorded in the *Lun-hêng* 論衡 by WANG CH'UNG 王充, a writer of the earlier part of the Later Han dynasty, it is evident that at that time Tung-ming was believed to have been the founder of Fu-yü-kuo. In view of the fact that this legend is quoted in the *Wei-liao* 魏略, a work by YÜ HUAN 魚豢 of the Three-Kingdom period, it may be seen that there was no dissension at that time as to the ancestry of Fu-yü-kuo. But the following passage is found under Kao-chü-li in *Tung-i-chuan* 東夷傳 of the *Wei-chih* 魏志 (Bk. 30): "In the tenth month a religious ceremony is held for worshipping Heaven, for which the whole people assemble. This is called *Tung-ming* 東盟."⁽²²⁾ Concerning this phrase *Tung-ming* 東盟, DR. NAKA asserts that the ceremony for worshipping Heaven as a means of revering the King Tung-ming 東明, the founder, was misunderstood by the Chinese as the name of a religious ceremony.⁽²³⁾ If we follow this view and take *Tung-ming* 東盟 in the *Wei-chih* as Tung-ming 東明, the name of the king, it means that at the Three-Kingdom period the King was regarded as the founder of Kao-chü-li-kuo. But can *Tung-ming* 東盟 be regarded as Tung-ming 東明, the name of the king? I should rather take it as the name of the religious ceremony, as the phrase 東盟 signifies. Examples of a similar kind may be found in the various accounts of other states in the same book. For instance, under Fu-yü a passage reads "In the first month of the Yin 殷 calendar, a religious ceremony is held for worshipping Heaven, for which the whole people assemble. For many days

(22) 以十月祭天,國中大會,名曰東盟。

(23) *Gaiō-ekishi*, Vol. II, p. 100

they eat, drink, sing, and dance. This is called *Ying-ku* 迎鼓.⁽²⁴⁾ *Ying-ku* or literally "receiving drum" should be a name given because of the drums beaten by the *wu-chu* 巫祝 or *shamans* in the service of the temple in receiving the spirits. Another passage under *Wei* 濊 in the same book reads "It is a custom to hold a religious ceremony for worshipping Heaven at the tenth month festival. Day and night the people drink wine, sing, and dance. This is called *Wu-t'ien* 舞天."⁽²⁵⁾ *Wu-t'ien* meaning literally "dancing heaven" probably implies dancing in honour of Heaven. Still another under *Han* 韓 reads "It is a custom in the fifth month to worship Spiritual powers on the completion of seeding, when the people sing and dance day and night without rest. Several scores of dancers stand up together and move in unison, stepping along the ground high and low, moving their hands and feet together, the movement and the music resembling the folk-dance named *Tst-wu* 鐸舞. When farming is over in October, the thing is repeated. Spiritual powers are worshipped. The state and the estate each chose a person to act as a head official in worshipping Heaven-God. He is called *T'ien-chün* 天君."⁽²⁶⁾ Thus *T'ien-chün* 天君, literally "heaven-lords", was an honorific title for persons in religious service adopted out of respect for their sacred mission of conveying the will of Heaven-God. In the light of these instances, the *Tung-ming* 東盟 of Kao-chü-li, like the *Ying-ku* 迎鼓 of Fu-yü, the *Wu-t'ien* 舞天 of *Wei* 濊, and the *T'ien-chün* 天君 of *Han* must be a Chinese phrase, the name of a religious ceremony derived from the meaning "covenant made at a gathering in the east" or "a covenant made on addressing eastern heaven," and by no means the name of the King *Tung-ming* 東明王.

The legend of the King *Tung-ming* first appears in history in the beginning of the Later Han dynasty, (24-220 A.D.), while that of the King *Tsou-mou* appears in literature towards the latter part of the Western Chin 西晋 dynasty (265-316 A.D.);

(24) 以殷正月祭天，國中大會，連日飲食歌舞，名曰迎鼓。

(25) 常用十月節祭天，晝夜飲酒歌舞，名之爲舞天。

(26) 常以五月下種訖，祭鬼神，群聚歌舞飲酒，晝夜無休，其舞數十人，俱起相隨，踏地低昂，手足相應，節奏有似鐸舞，十月農功畢，亦復如之，信鬼神，國邑各立一人，主祭天神，名之曰天君。

therefore, should priority settle the question, the King Tung-ming legend would be accepted as the true one, while the King Tsou-mou legend would be rejected as a plagiarism, an adaptation of the former. Still it may be supposed that, despite its later appearance in history, it was a legend handed down among the people since the founding of Kao-chü-li. As a means of choosing between the true one and the false, the original and the imitation, it may be necessary to investigate the geographical terms involved in the legends and find out the ones which better suit the actual geography and history of the place and time.

According to the legend of the King Tung-ming, he came from T'o-li-kuo 濠離國 and crossing the Yen-ti-shui 掩澗水 river in the south reached Fu-yü to become the king. Because Fu-yü was a state which occupied the upper reaches of the River Sungari 松花江 with its centre near the present Nung-an 農安 or Hsin-ching 新京, the great river in the north of the state must have been the main stream of the present Sungari river or the Amur 黑龍江. According to *Tung-i-chuan* 東夷傳 of the *Wei-chih* 魏志 (Bk. 30), the Jo-shui 弱水 river ran to the north of Fu-yü, and according to *Tung-i-chuan* of the *Chin-shu* 晉書 (Bk. 39), the Jo-shui 弱水 river ran to the north of the territory of the Su-shên 肅慎 tribe which occupied the former Chi-lin 吉林 province; therefore, the then Jo-shui 弱水 river must have been the main course of the present Sungari 松花江. The present River Nonni 嫩江 was called by the Chinese the Na-shui 捺水 or the Nan-shui 難水 during the North-and-South-Dynasty period; the Na-shui 那水 during the T'ang dynasty and the Na-wu 納兀, the Na-wu 納兀, and the Nao-shui 惱水 during the Yüan dynasty. The ancient pronunciation of the character 弱 in 弱水 being *nziak or *niak, the name has a phonetic resemblance to the above-mentioned names. At the present time, this river is a tributary of the Sungari; we call it the Sungari up to the point where it, combined with the River Nonni, feeds into the Amur. In ancient times, however, the Nonni was looked upon as the main stream, and it seems probable that people called it the Nonni (down) to the point where it, joined by the Sungari, feeds into the Amur. In the Tungus language blue is *nunga*, *nōgzo*, *nukda*; in Manchurian *nioho*,

niobon, nogon; in the Manegir-Solon language, *nabun*; green in Mongolian is *nogon* or *nogogon*. It may be noticed that the name **niak* 弱 resembles the above-mentioned words, especially the Manegir-Solon word *nabun* (*nabu*). If the Sungari running east, that is, the Nonni of former periods, during the Three-Kingdom period and the Chin 晉 dynasty was called the Niak-shui 弱水 or 碧水 (the Blue River), we might safely say that it was known by the same name during the Han dynasty. If so, the Yen-ti-shui 掩澗水 which the King Tung-ming went across could not have been the present Sungari.

Since the Sungari flowing east which was known, during the Three-Kingdom period, by the name Niak-shui 弱水 or the original name of the Nonni 嫩江 cannot be assumed to have been the Yen-ti-shui 掩澗水, we shall investigate as to whether the upper reaches of the Sungari which flows north were known by this name. Literature is lacking as to the name this part of the Sungari was known by during the Han and Wei dynasties. The river was called the Su-mo-shui 粟末水 during the Sui and T'ang dynasties. A paragraph in *Wu-chi-chuan* 勿吉傳 of the *Wei-shu* (Bk. 100) reads "The country has a large river more than three *li* 里 broad named Su-mo-shui 速末水."⁽²⁷⁾ 勿吉 is pronounced 畝俱理 (*mo-ku-ri*), a name identical with Mo-ho 靺鞨 of the Sui and T'ang dynasties.⁽²⁸⁾ As this people occupied the lower course of the Sungari flowing north, the Su-mo-shui 速末水 of the *Wei-shu* is surely the Su-mo-shui 粟末水 of the Sui and T'ang dynasties. This river during the Liao 遼 dynasty is recorded the Su-mo-shui 東沫水, the Tsu-mu-li-ho 卒沒里河, or the Su-mu-ho 疎木河,—all identical with the Su-mo-shui 粟末水 of the Sui and T'ang dynasties.⁽²⁹⁾ However, the same river for the first time appears

(27) 國有大水，濶三里餘，名速末水。

(28) *Bongo-Zō-myō*. 梵語雜名 or the *Glossary of Sino-Sanskrit Names*, compiled by LI YEN 禮言 in 839 A. D. and proved by SHIN-GEN 眞源. *Taishō-shinshū Dizōkyō*, Vol. LIII, p. 12 36). *Mo-ku-ri* here indicates P'o-hai 渤海. According to my investigation, the ruling class of P'o-hai was of Kao-chü-li race and the ruled were *Mo-ku-ri* or 勿吉, 靺鞨. LI YEN rightly identifies *Mo-ku-ri* with Kao-li 高麗, namely Kao-chü-li. As for the social organization of P'o-hai, see my brief note in *Shigaku-Zasshi* 史學雜誌 Vol. XLVI. pp. 1155-1156, 1522. *Mo-ku-ri* may be identical with *μοκρη* of Theophrastus SIMOCATTA.

(29) S. TSUDA: *Ta-lu-ku-kaō* 達盧古考, *Man-sen-Rekishi-chiri Kenkyū Hōkoku*, Vol. II. pp. 50-51

in the Chin 金 dynasty as 宋瓦江. 宋瓦江, namely, 松花江 is each a transcription of the Sungari River. How long the upper course of the Sungari was known by the name Su-mo 粟末, it is hard to decide; but inferring from the fact that this name was used for six or seven centuries from the North-and-South-Dynasty period to the Chin 金 dynasty, it may be safely supposed that the name was also used during the Han dynasty. Thus this river cannot be assumed to be the Yen-ti-shui 掩澗水 in question.

If neither the present Nonni 嫩江 nor the Sungari running along the northern boundary of Fu-yü-kuo proves to be the Yen-ti-shui 掩澗水 in question, there is no river left except the Amur 黑龍江 that can be taken. Hêi-lung-chiang 黑龍江 is called Amur by the Tungus people of its upper reaches and the lower course is called Mangu,—both names mean river. The Manchurians call it Sahaliyan Ula or the Black River. As the river is combined with the Nonni 嫩江, the water looks black for several dozen *li* 里 because of the inter-reflection of the clear water and the muddy; probably this accounts for the name Hêi-lung-chiang 黑龍江 (Black Dragon River). In the Sui and T'ang dynasties, the river was called Hêi-shui 黑水 (Black River), and the Tungus people who occupied this region Hêi-shui-mo-ho 黑水靺鞨, as is well-known in history. The river Yen-ti-shui 掩澗水 in the Han and Wei dynasties no doubt referred to this Hêi-shui 黑水. The Yen-ti-shui 掩澗水 is given as Shih-yen-shui 施掩水 in the *Wei-liao* 魏略, Yen-ti-shui 掩澗水 in the *Pei-shih* 北史, Yen-ti-shui 淹澗水 in the *Liang-shu* 梁書, Yen-shui 淹水 in the *Sui-shu* 隋書, and Yen-li-ta-shui 奄利大水 in the monument of the King Hao-t'ai 好太王. The Shih-yen-shui 施掩水 in the *Wei-liao* is, as Dr. NAKA has pointed out, a transposition of Yen-shih-shui 掩施水. In Tungus dialects, a lake or a large river is *amut, amût, amutt, amic, amac, amunzi, amuci, omo*; and the Oročono-Solon for river is *amur*.⁽³⁰⁾ The present name Amur for the Hêi-lung-chiang 黑龍江 simply means a river; but because of the immense size of the river this name has become a

(30) GRUBE: *Goldisch-Deutsches Wörterverzeichnis*, p. 9. A. O. IVANOVSKI; *Mandjurica*. I. p. 91

kind of proper name. This being the case, I should think that the Yen-ti-shui 掩澗水, Yen-ti-shui 淹滯水, and Yen-shih-shui 掩施水 which appear in the legend of the King Tung-ming must be transliterations of the Tungus word *amut*, *amuci*, and the Yen-li-ta-shui 奄利大水 which appears in the monument of the King Hao-t'ai 好太王 a transliteration of the Solon word *amur*.⁽³¹⁾ Should this view be accepted, the Yen-ti-shui 掩澗水 which appears in the King Tung-ming legend, we might assert, should be the present Amur even from a nomenclatural study.

The King Tung-ming is said to have fled south from T'o-li-kuo 橐離國 and gone across the Yen-ti-shui 掩澗水; so that state T'o-li 橐離 must have been a country lying to the north of the river. The name of the state is given as So-li 索離 in the *Hou-han-shu* 後漢書 and the *Pei-shih* 北史, Pao-li 褒離 in the *Hsin-lun* 新論 by LIU SAI 劉勰 of the Liang dynasty, Kao-li 橐離 in the *Wei-liao* and Chiu-li 麴離 in the *Liang-shu* 梁書.⁽³²⁾ Dr. NAKA, choosing from among these various names as original and right form interpreted it as a miscopy of Kao-li 高麗. This view of Kao-li 橐離 I could not support. As the *Lun-hêng* 論衡 which first introduced into history the legend of the King Tung-ming gives the name as T'o-li 橐離, and the note under So-li 索離 in the *Hou-han-shu* 後漢書 says "So 索 is sometimes written t'o 橐. The pronunciation is the combination of the initial sound of to 度 and the final sound of lo 洛."⁽³³⁾ I should think it reasonable to consider the original name something like 橐離 or 索離. During the Sui and T'ang dynasties, the Tungus people who occupied the basin of the Amur between the point where it meets the Sungari and Xabarovsk in the east was called Hei-shui-mo-ho 黑水靺鞨; in the *Kai-yüan* 開元 (713-741 A.D.) of the T'ang dynasty, it was a state as powerful as P'o-hai 渤海 of the south. Seeing that Hei-shui 黑水 is, as the name explains, derived from the Black River or the Amur, may it not be

(31) The ancient pronunciation of yen 淹, 掩 is **iəm*, *iəp* and **ivp*. Here the **iəm* settles the case. For detail, see my articles; *Saku-minzoku Kō* 塞民族考 or *Study of the Saka Tribes*, *Tōyō-Gakuhō*, Vol. VII, pp. 389-390 and *Futsu-rin-mondai no Shinkai-shaku* 拂菻問題の新解釋 or *A New Interpretation of the Fou-lin Problems*. Ibid. Vol. XX, pp. 34-37.

(32) *Gaiō-ekishi* 外交釋史 Vol. II, P. 99

(33) 索或作橐, 音度洛反。

supposed that 索離國 or 橐離國 was also so named for the same reason? Black in Tungusic dialects is *saxar*, *saxarin*, *čakarín*; and in Manchurian *sahaliyan*.⁽³⁴⁾ 橐離 (**Tak-li*) or 索離 (**Sak-li*) may be the transliteration of one of these words both derived from the Amur or the Black River. During the Han dynasty, the Hei-lung-chiang 黑龍江 was probably called *Čakari Amut* (Black River) in full, and from this *Čakari* the name *Tak-li-kuo* 橐離國 was coined. The Hei-shui 黑水 of the Sui and T'ang dynasties is a typical example; we may also refer to the fact that in the beginning of the Ch'ing 清 dynasty a people called *Sa-ha-lien-pu* 薩哈連部 inhabited the basin of this river and it originated from *Sahaliyan ula*, a Manchurian name for the Hei-lung-chiang 黑龍江 the Amur; the island of *Karafuto* 樺太島 is also called *Sahaliyan* as a derivative of the name of this river.

The routes followed by the Tungus peoples who occupied the basin of the Amur in emigrating south to Manchuria have been various, but the principal one has probably been that of travelling along the Sungari to its upper course. For instance, the upper course of the Sungari up to the present Harbin, in the Han and Wei dynasties, is considered to have been included in the territory of the *Fu-yü* people; but as the power of *Fu-yü* weakened in the North-and-South-Dynasty period, the *Mokuri* 勿吉 people who had come south probably from the direction of the Amur occupied the lower course of the Sungari flowing north from either side of the region including the present Harbin. When the *Khitans* 契丹 or *Liao* 遼 who overthrew *P'o-hai* 渤海 during the Five-Dynasty period weakened, *Wan-yen* 完顏, a Jurchin tribe, occupying the present *Alchuka* 阿勒楚喀 re-established the foundation of the *Chin* 金 dynasty. This people were no doubt descendants of the *Hei-shui-mo-ho* 黑水靺鞨 who had emigrated south from a region in the Amur basin. So it may be supposed that a tribe of *T'o-li-kuo* 橐離國 which, during the Former Han dynasty, occupied the region on the northern side of the *Yen-ti-shui* 掩淜水—namely, the present Amur River, came down under the leadership of the King *Tung-ming*, along the *Niak-shui* 弱水, and defeating the land of *Fu-yü*, finally

(34) GRUBE: *Gold. Wörter.* p. 89

founded this state. When viewed in this light, the legend of the King Tung-ming reads only as a page of the oft-repeated history of a northern tribe migrating south.

The legend of the King Tung-ming is developed almost like a fairy tale; still it serves to tell of the historicity of a Tungus tribe of the Amur basin migrating south and establishing Fu-yü-kuo. Since the legend says that the King Tung-ming, coming to Fu-yü, became the king, Fu-yü was probably the name of the region which the Wei 魏 people had occupied even before that time. Under the Emperor Hsiao-tsung 孝宗 in the Annals of the Chin 晉 dynasty in the *Tzu-chih-t'ung-chien* 資治通鑑 (Bk. 97), there is a passage which reads "January, the 2nd year of *Yung-bo* 永和 (346 A.D.). In the beginning, the Fu-yü people inhabited Lu-shan 鹿山; they were defeated by Pai-chi 百濟; the tribes were weakened and scattered, but they migrated west to a region near Yen 燕 where they made no military preparation."⁽³⁵⁾ According to this paragraph, the home of Fu-yü-kuo must have been a region around a mountain named Lu-shan 鹿山. Though the exact location of this mountain is not clear, the region near the present Nung-an 農安 and Hsin-ching 新京 being a plain, the name probably referred to the mountain to the east and running north and south. The Tungus word for deer is *bu-yu, bu-yum*⁽³⁶⁾; so the native word for Lu-shan 鹿山 was probably Mt. *Bu-yu*; hence, 夫餘 Fu-yü (*Bu-yu*) must be a transliteration of it. Deer abound in any forest mountain in Manchuria, but deer of a more excellent species seem to have thrived in Fu-yü forests, for *P'o-hai-chuan* 渤海傳 in the *T'ang-shu* 唐書 (Bk. 220) mentions Fu-yü deer among the noted produces of P'o-hai; the land was no doubt noted for producing deer in the ancient times. Therefore, as the name Kao-chü-li 高句麗 was derived from the Wu-lashan-ch'êng 兀刺山城, so the name Fu-yü was derived from Lu-shan 鹿山 (Deer-mountain). Many such instances might be cited, but the most suitable examples for the present purpose would be Hsien-pei 鮮卑, derived from Mt. Hsien-pei 鮮

(35) 永和二年正月,初夫餘居于鹿山,爲百濟所侵,部落衰散,西徙近燕,而不設備。

(36) GRUBE, *op. cit.*, p. 113

卑山, and Wu-huan 烏桓, from Mt. Wu-huan 烏桓山.⁽³⁷⁾

The legend of the King Tung-ming, when viewed both geographically and historically, presents a very natural and plausible story, while it has to be investigated whether that of the King Tsou-mou 鄒牟王 or that of Chu-mêng 朱蒙 is of a similar nature. Now the inscription of the monument of the King Hao-t'ai says, at the beginning, that the King Tsou-mou, coming from North Fu-yü 北夫餘 to Kao-chü-li-kuo to found this state. If there was a state named North Fu-yü, there should be another also named Fu-yü. From the Han 漢 period down to the Chin 晉 dynasty, the historians mentioned the existence of a state called simply Fu-yü to the north of Kao-chü-li is but no other of that name. However, towards the last of the inscription on the monument, a passage reads "In the 20th year. (kêng-chsü 庚戌), Eastern Fuyü 東夫餘, originally a tribe under the King Tsou-mou, rebelled at the middle of the reign and failed to pay tribute. The king by himself leading his own troops went forth to the castle of Fu-yü."⁽³⁸⁾ This proves the existence of a state called Eastern Fu-yü 東夫餘 at the time of the King Tsou-mou; and the name North Fu-yü was adopted for the purpose of distinguishing it from Eastern Fu-yü 東夫餘. This Eastern Fu-yü was, as discussed in full later, a state which came into being during the sixty-five years between the overthrow of Fu-yü-kuo by Mu-jung-k'uei 慕容廆 and the 20th year of the reign of the King Hao-t'ai (410 A.D.), and which had not appeared in history at the time of the King Tsou-mou. In the light of this instance alone, the legend of the King Tsou-mou lacks historicity.

According to the inscription on this monument, the King Tsou-mou running away in a southeastern direction from North Fu-yü,—namely, the province around the present Nung-an 農安 and Hsin-ching 新京, and going across the great river called Yen-li-ta-shui 奄利大水, arrived in Kao-chü-li-kuo. The route of this migration is not known; but there being no great river named Yen-li-ta-shui 奄利

(37) *Hou-han-shu*, Bk. 120 and *Wei-shi*, Bk. 30. For the meaning of these names, see my article *Tô-ko-minzoku-kô* 東胡民族考 or *Study of Tung-hu tribes*, *Shigaku-Zasshi*, Vol. XXI, pp. 741-749, 1021-1023.

(38) 廿年庚戌,東夫餘舊是鄒牟王屬民,中叛不貢,王躬率諸軍,到餘城。

大水 on the way from the region near the present I-t'ung-ho 伊通河 to the basin of the Tung-chia-chiang 佟佳江; and the name Yen-li-shui 奄利水 being, as stated previously, similar to Yen-liu-shui 掩流水, referring to the present Amur, here is another topographical error which suggests the fabulousness of the legend of the King Tsou-mou. Now, the legend of the King Chu-mêng also gives the stages of the migration. It only mentions a great river, but not the name Yen-li-ta-shui 奄利大水; instead, it mentions a river named P'u-shu-shui 普述水 which does not appear in the legend of the King Tsou-mou. I am of the opinion that, the compiler of this legend may not have forgotten the name Yen-li-ta-shui, but there being no river on the way from Fu-yü to Kao-chü-li, he mentions a great river simply for form's sake, and gives the name P'u-shu-shui 普述水, a river well-known to the Kao-chü-li people. This river identical with the Ma-t'zū-shui 馬嘗水 given in the note on Hsüan-tu 玄菟 province in *Ti-li-chih* 地理志 of the *Han-shu*, and the river P'o-chu-chiang 婆豬江, 婆豬江, or Po-chu-chiang 潑豬江 in the later records refers to the present Tung-chia-chiang 佟佳江.

When the legend of the King Tung-ming and that of the King Tsou-mou are compared and studied, the form and the subject-matter are almost identical; the only difference being that in the former the hero comes from T'o-li-kuo 橐離國 and founds Fu-yü-kuo, while in the latter the hero comes from North Fu-yü and founds Kao-chü-li-kuo. In short, the difference lies in the hero's theatre of activity. As already stated, the legend of the King Tung-ming is one handed down among the Fu-yü people even before the state of Kao-chü-li appeared, while the legend of the King Tsou-mou is one originating after the Fu-yü people divided themselves into two,—Eastern Fu-yü and North Fu-yü. The former legend reads natural, agreeing with geography and history, while the latter disagrees with both. In view of these circumstances, the legend of the King Tsou-mou may be regarded as a revision of the legend of the King Tung-ming by a later Kao-chü-li writer. The date and the reason of this revision would require further investigation.

The opening passage of the inscription on the monument of the King Hao-t'ai

reads: "It is believed that King Tsou-mou 鄒牟王 founded this state in the remote antiquity. He came from North Fu-yü." (See note 16, p. 18). This offers the very key of settling the date of the revision of the legend. The name North Fu-yü 北夫餘 is not derived from the locality of the state to the north of Kao-chü-li, but a name coined from the necessity of differentiating it from another state bearing the name Fu-yü. The inscription goes on to say that, in the 20th year of his reign, the king in person attacked Eastern Fu-yü 東夫餘; so it seems that this name North Fu-yü was one specially coined over against Eastern Fu-yü. The founding of Fu-yü-kuo took place prior to the Emperor Wu-ti 武帝 of the Han dynasty, as has been stated previously, but the first appearance of the name Eastern Fu-yü in history dates from the monument of the King Hào-t'ai. The date of the founding of the state may be roughly known, though not quite definitely, if we study the rise and fall of the Fu-yü people.

Fu-yü occupying the fertile land of North Manchuria around Nung-an 農安 and Hsin-ching 新京 was a very wealthy state from an economic point of view. However, being adjacent on the west to the nomadic Hsien-pei 鮮卑 people who made a living out of plundering and on the southeast to Kao-chü-li, a warlike nation lacking in natural resources, the Fu-yü people found themselves in an unfortunate situation ever threatened by an invasion by either enemy. For this reason, the state attempted to maintain its independence through an alliance with the Chinese and to secure assistance from its two provinces in the basin of the Liaō-ho 遼河, —Hsüan-tu 玄菟 and Liao-tung 遼東. Therefore, while Fu-yü maintained its independence, there was no need or room for a part of the nation to form another state apart from it. Moreover, Fu-yü and Kao-chü-li being always hostile to each other during this time, it was impossible that the royal family of Kao-chü-li should have stolen the ancestor of the Fu-yü people and adopted him as the founder of their own state. Fu-yü-kuo was at the climax of its power and strength during the Later Han dynasty, and began to decline towards the last stage of the same dynasty, but managed to maintain its independence until the beginning of the

Western Chin 西晉 dynasty. However, the Hsien-pei 鮮卑 people waxed powerful under the reign of Mu-jung K'uei 慕容廆 and in the 6th year of T'ai-k'ang 太康 (285 A.D.), he attacked Fu-yü-kuo and overthrew it. The affair is recorded under Fu-yü in *Ssu-i-chuan* 四夷傳 of the *Chin-shu* 晉書 (Bk. 97) as follows: "In the 6th year of T'ai-k'ang 太康, the state was attacked and defeated by Mu-jung K'uei 慕容廆, and captured it. I-lü 依慮 the king killed himself, and his family fled to Wu-chü 沃沮. Thereupon, the Emperor said 'The Fu-yü family have always been faithful so far as the virtue of loyalty and filial piety is concerned. We feel very sorry that they have been overthrown by a wicked enemy. Should any one of the bereaved be found worthy of restoring the state, we shall advise and assist him so that he may maintain it.' The officials answered 'Hsien-yü Ying 鮮于嬰 in charge of the frontier defences has failed to rescue Fu-yü and has proved deficient in tact.' The Emperor removed Ying 嬰 from office, putting Ho K'an 何龕 in his place. The following year I-lo 依羅, a later king of Fu-yü, despatching a messenger to K'an 龕, to seek help from him in leading his people back to his former state and restoring it, K'an reported to the Emperor. Thereupon the Emperor sent Governor Chia-Chên 都督賈沉 with his troops. K'uei 廆 attacked them on the way. Chên 沉 fought and gained a signal victory. The soldiers under K'uei 廆 fled. Lo 羅 succeeded in restoring the state. Since then, however, every time the state was invaded by K'uei 廆 and the prisoners were on sale in China, the Emperor had compassion on them and declared that the prisoners should be redeemed with state goods. He sent a decree to the two provinces Ssü 司 and Chi 冀, prohibiting the sale of Fu-yü prisoners."⁽³⁹⁾ According to this account, when Fu-yü was once overthrown in the 6th year of T'ai-k'ang, some of the royal family fled to Wu-chü. The name Wu-chü appears in history since the time of Wu-ti 武帝 of the Han dynasty, when

(39) 至太康六年，為慕容廆所襲破，其王依慮自殺，子弟走保沃沮，帝為下詔曰，夫餘王世守忠孝，為惡虜所滅，甚愍念之，若其遺類足以復國者，當為之方計，使得存立，有司奏，護東夷校尉鮮于嬰不救夫餘，失於機略，詔免嬰，以何龕代之，明年夫餘後王依羅遣詣龕，求率見人還復舊國，仍請援，龕上，列(則?)遣都督賈沉，以兵送之，廆又要之於路，沉與戰大破之，廆衆退，羅得復國，爾後每為廆掠其種人，賣於中國，帝愍之，又發詔以官物贖還，下司冀二州，禁市夫餘之口。

the Emperor overthrew Chao-hsien and established four provinces there, the Wu-chü-ch'êng 沃沮城 was chosen as the seat of the province of Hsüan-tu 玄菟. The castle is now ascribed to a locality near Kan-kô 咸興 of Kan-kyô-nan-dô 咸鏡南道. As it was thus in the 6th year of *T'ai-k'ang* 太康 (285 A.D.) that a branch of the royal family of Fu-yü occupied the northeastern part of Korea, the rise of Eastern Fu-yü state as recorded on the monument of the King Hao-t'ai must date from a time somewhat later than this.

Fu-yü was now overthrown by the attack of Mu-jung Kuei 慕容廆, but with the protection of the Chin 晉 dynasty, it barely managed to restore the state, as is seen from the above-given record. How this state fared after that time is not clearly known, but a passage under the 2nd year of *Yung-bo* 永和 (346 A.D.) of the Emperor Mu-ti 穆帝 in the Annals of the Chin 晉 dynasty in the *Tzu-chih-t'ung-chien* 資治通鑑 (Bk. 97) reads "In the beginning the Fu-yü people inhabited Lu-shan 鹿山; they were defeated by Pai-chi 百濟; the tribes were scattered, but they migrated west to a region near Yen 燕 where they made no military preparation. Huang 皝 the Yen king sent his crown prince Chün 儁 to wage a war upon them. Leading his three generals, Mu-jung Chün 慕容軍, Mu-jung ko 慕容恪, and Mu-jung Kên 慕容根, with over 17,000 cavalry-men, he assailed Fu-yü. Chün 儁 did not go out to the field, leaving command of all military affairs in the hands of Ko 恪. They at length defeated Fu-yü and returned home, bringing Hsüan 玄, the king, and more than 50,000 tribesmen whom they had captured. Huang 皝 appointed Hsüan 玄 Chên-tung Chiang-chün 鎮東將軍 (Commander of the Eastern Garrison) and gave his daughter to be his wife."⁽⁴⁰⁾ According to this record, Fu-yü-kuo disappeared as an independent state in the 2nd year of *Yung-bo* 永和 (346 A.D.). Literature is lacking as to the fate of the proper land of Fu-yü after Yen 燕 occupied it. It is true, Fu-yü was defeated in the war with Yen, and, as the result, the

(40) 初夫餘居于鹿山,爲百濟所侵,部落衰散,西徙近燕,而不設備,燕王慕遣世子儁,帥慕容軍、慕容恪、慕容根三將軍萬七千騎,襲夫餘,儁居中,指授軍事皆以任恪,遂拔夫餘,虜其王玄及部落五萬餘口而還,皝以玄爲鎮東將軍,妻以女。

king and over 50,000 tribesmen were carried away as prisoners; its national existence came to an end. However, it cannot be thought that the whole land of Fu-yü became uninhabited and the race became extinct forever. I believe the remnants of the Fu-yü people continued to inhabit the homeland just as before, though placed under the yoke of the Former Yen dynasty.

As I have already stated, despite the fact that Fu-yü and Liao-tung were situated in the region where they were from time to time invaded by the Hsien-pei 鮮卑 people on the west and by the Kao-chü-li people on the east, the Former Yen troops of the Mu-jung 慕容 family with their capital castle near the present Chao-yang 朝陽, when they were to send an expedition to conquer the distant Fu-yü state, stood in danger of having their facilities of communication cut off by the Liao-tung army on the south. In order to conquer Fu-yü and secure it as a territory, therefore, the Former Yen state had to take Liao-tung first. We might just as well say that the mountainous region between Fu-yü and Kao-chü-li offering almost no facilities of communication, it was very difficult for Kao-chü-li to conquer Fu-yü without first annexing Liao-tung. Mu-jung K'uei 慕容廆 of the Former Yen dynasty who once defeated Fu-yü had to give it up simply because Liao-tung on the south assisted Fu-yü. The reason why Mu-jung Huang 慕容皝 succeeded in overthrowing Fu-yü was because he had taken Liao-tung before it. After this, Liao-tung fell in the hands of the Former Ch'in 前秦 as the Former Yen fell; and became a territory of the Later Yen 後燕 as the power of the Former Ch'in declined. How it fared with Fu-yü during all this time is not clear, but it may be supposed that Fu-yü probably shared the destiny of Liao-tung. Since the death of Mu-jung Ch'ui 慕容垂 of the Later Yen dynasty in the 20th year of *Ta-yüan* 大元 (395 A.D.) of the Eastern Chin 東晉 dynasty, this state suddenly declined, and the brilliant and courageous King Kuang-k'ai-t'u 廣開土王 who then reigned over Kao-chü-li seized this opportunity to take Liao-tung from the Later Yen, thus achieving the age-long desire of the state. The record does not say that this king, taking advantage of his conquest of Liao-tung, moved an army to Fu-yü; but could the remnants of the

Fu-yü people enjoy peace with Liao-tung, a newly acquired territory of Kao-chü-li, on the other side of the boundary? Let us investigate this question concerning the state in the light of later historical records.

There is no record definitely saying that Fu-yü became a territory of Kao-chü-li at the time of the King Kuang-k'ai-t'u 廣開土王. But a passage under Kao-chü-li in *Tung-i-chuan* 東夷傳 of the *Wei-shu* 魏書 (Bk. 100), in connection with the messenger Li Ao 李敖 whom the Emperor T'ai-wu 太武, the founder of the Later Wei 後魏 dynasty, in the 1st year of T'ai-yen 大延 (435 A.D.) had sent to the King Chang-shou 長壽王 of Kao-chü-li, says "Ao 敖, going to the P'ing-jang castle 平壤城 where the king lived, inquired about the situation; and the king said 'It lies more than a thousand *li* 里 to the southeast of Liao-tung; adjoining to the Cha-ch'êng 柵城 on the east, and to the small sea on the south, to the country of the Former Fu-yü 舊夫餘 on the north; the population has now trebled over that at the time of the Former Wei dynasty."⁽⁴¹⁾ According to this passage, both the Cha-ch'êng 柵城 and Fu-yü seem to have been the foreign countries adjoining to the frontiers of Kao-chü-li. However, when viewed in the light of the fragmentary passage of the *Ku-chün-chün-kuo-chih* 古今郡國志 by CHIA TAN 賈耽 quoted in the last part of *Ti-li-chih* 地理志 of the *San-goku-shi-ki* 三國史記 (Bk. 37) which says "Nan-hai 南海, Ya-lu 鴨綠, Fu-yü 夫餘, and Cha-ch'êng 柵城,—these four provinces of P'o-hai-kuo 渤海 were all former territories of Kao-chü-li;"⁽⁴²⁾ the Cha-ch'êng 柵城 and the Former Fu-yü 舊夫餘 recorded in the *Wei-shu*, had been included in the Kao-chü-li territory in the 23rd year of the reign of the King Chang-shou 長壽王. Again, a paragraph under the 3rd year of T'ai-an 太安 (457 A.D.) under the reign of the Emperor Kao-tsung Wên-ch'êng-ti 高宗文成帝 in the *Wei-shu* (Bk. 5), reads "More than fifty states including Yü-ch'ên 于闐 and Fu-yü all sent envoys to pay tribute to the court."⁽⁴³⁾ The fact that Fu-yü state sent an envoy to the Wei court shows that the

(41) 敖至其所居平壤城，訪其方事，云，遼東南一千餘里，東至柵城，南至小海，北至舊夫餘，民戶參倍於前魏時。

(42) 渤海國南海·鴨綠·扶餘·柵城四府，並是高句麗舊地也。

(43) 于闐扶餘等五十餘國，各遣使朝獻。

state, though a protectorate of Kao-chü-li, was allowed some freedom in her foreign relations. Another passage under Kao-chü-li in *Tung-i-chuan* of the *Wei-shu* reads "In the era of *Chêng-shih* 正始 (504-506 A.D.), Shih-tsu 世祖 (Shih-tsong 世宗?) received at Tung-t'ang 東堂 Jui-hsi-fu 芮悉弗, the Kao-chü-li envoy. Hsi-fu went forward and said "We, Kao-chü-li people, have pledged our utmost faithfulness to your court. We have been genuinely sincere from generation to generation, never neglecting to pay tribute with our native products and farm crops. Unfortunately, gold is found only in Fu-yü, and jade only in Shê-lo 涉羅. Now that the Fu-yü are driven away by Mo-ku-ri 勿吉 and Shê-lo is annexed by Pai-chi 百濟, Yün 雲, King of Kao-chü-li and your humble subject, being aware of the solemn duty of reinstating the usurped rulers has moved their peoples into his land. The reason why the two commodities have failed to arrive at your court is because of the rebellion of the two peoples (Mokuri and Pai-chi)."⁽⁴⁴⁾ The "humble subject" here refers to the King Wên-tzŭ 文咨王 of Kao-chü-li, because the *Chêng-shih* 正始 era of the Wei dynasty corresponds to the period between the 13th year and the 16th year of this king. According to this record, the Fu-yü people had occupied Fu-yü land as a territory of Kao-chü-li until the middle of the reign of the King Wên-tzŭ 文咨王, when his military forces weakened and the Mokuri 勿吉 people waxed powerful more and more till the whole land of Fu-yü was annexed by them in the *Chêng-shih* 正始 era of the Wei dynasty.

From the foregoing, it may be seen that, from the 1st year of *T'ai-yen* 太延 or the 23rd year of the King Chang-shou 長壽王 to the *Chêng-shih* 正始 era or the middle of the reign of the King Wên-tzŭ 文咨王, Fu-yü existed as a tributary state of Kao-chü-li on the northern borderland of Liao-tung. There is no historical record which tells definitely when this connection was established. However, the main policy of Kao-chü-li-kuo to conquer the whole Korean peninsula was adopted by the King Kuang-k'ai-t'u 廣開土王, and in order to carry out this policy, it was

(44) 正始中,世祖(世宗?)於東堂引見其使芮悉弗,悉弗進曰,高麗係誠天極,累葉純誠,地產土毛,無愆王貢,但黃金出自夫餘,珂則涉羅所產,今夫餘爲勿吉所逐,涉羅爲百濟所併,國王臣雲惟繼絕之義,悉遷于境內,二品所以不登王府,實兩賊是爲。

a necessary step to take measures against an invasion of the Chinese on the west and of Fu-yü on the north. For this reason the King Kuang-k'ai-t'u 廣開土王, sending an envoy to the Northern Yen court in the 4th year of *I-hsi* 義熙 (408 A.D.) of the Emperor An-ti 安帝 of the Eastern Chin 東晉 dynasty negotiated peace with him, as a result of which the king was appointed a member of the North Yen 北燕 family. The king also sent a present of rare goods to the Southern Yen court to win its favour. The reason for adopting such a peaceful and compromising policy with the states of Central China was that there was no chance for victory even if he should wage a war against these states. With the Fu-yü people in the north, however, there was no necessity to take the same attitude. This was only a minor state so weak that it had been a protectorate of the Yen court. Now that Kao-chü-li had displaced Yen as the mistress of Liao-tung, Fu-yü must have come forward, calling themselves humble subjects of Kao-chü-li; or Kao-chü-li must have occupied the country, taking advantage of the conquest of Liao-tung. When the situation of the time is thus considered, the date at which Northern Fu-yü became a tributary state of Kao-chü-li might be set as in the reign of the King Kuang-k'ai-t'u 廣開土王.

When the King Chang-shou 長壽王 succeeded his father, the King Kuang-k'ai-t'u, as King of Kao-chü-li, his state was practically surrounded by Fu-yü people—Northern Fu-yü 北夫餘 in the north of Liao-tung, Eastern Fu-yü 東夫餘 in the northeastern section of the Korean peninsula, and Pai-chi 百濟 ruled by Fu-yü 夫餘 in the northwestern part of the peninsula. Of these three states, the two Fu-yüs of the northeast had been conquered by the King Kuang-k'ai-t'u and were now Kao-chü-li subjects; but as it was not very long since and the people had no confidence in him, pacification was necessary. As to Pai-chi 百濟, there was a sign of rebellion against Kao-chü-li, depending upon the assistance from Wo-kuo 倭國 (Japan); it was necessary to oppress her with military force and at the same time pacify her with a subtle policy. The King Chang-shou 長壽王, a better politician than his father, knew how to win over the confidence of the people; and so making the best of the legend of the King Tung-ming 東明王 whom the Fu-yü people had

always adored as the founder of the state, he adapted the legend so that it might read that the King Tung-ming came down south to found Kao-chü-li state, and thus he attempted to gain the privilege of boasting that he was a member of the Fu-yü family. Kao-chü-li was of the Wei-mo 穢貊 stock like Fu-yü, but not a stock identical with Fu-yü. Such an idea could not have come into the minds of the Kao-chü-li people when Fu-yü stood as a powerful state as independent as Kao-chü-li, but now that the two Fu-yü states had already become subjects of Kao-chü-li and it was necessary to pacify them, the Kao-chü-li people probably did not regard it as a shame to share the founder Fu-yü-kuo. If Kao-chü-li-kuo was proved to be the original family of the Fu-yü people, it would relieve the newly annexed Fu-yü people and furnish a righteous cause for attacking Pai-chi 百濟. When the legend of the King Tsou-mou 鄒牟王 is thus interpreted, it will serve to explain the reason why this legend is given especially in the opening passage of the inscription on the King Hao-t'ai monument, the reason why Eastern Fu-yü 東夫餘 is given as a former tributary territory of the King Tsou-mou 鄒牟王, the reason why both Pai-chi 百濟 and Silla 新羅 are given as former tributary states which had always paid tribute, and also the reason why the war between the west and the north during the reign of the King Hao-t'ai is studiously omitted. Therefore, the monument which the King Chang-shou 長壽王 built for the King Hao-t'ai should be regarded, not as an ordinary *shên-tao* monument 神道碑 for singing the praise of the exploit of his father, but as a great bulletin for the purpose of publicly announcing the fundamental policy of Kao-chü-li-kuo.