APPENDIX 2

Interaction between Koguryŏ, Palhae and Inner Asia

Although Koreans and the peoples of Inner Asia of today are widely separated geographically and have distinctly different ways of life, in ancient times there was a considerable degree of direct interaction. The primary background for the development of such an interchange among these peoples at an early stage, as opposed to subsequent periods, was what was then their close proximity.

The vast grasslands of Inner Asia extend eastward as far as the Liaosong Plains of the central part of Manchuria, generally delineating a region of farming and forestry straddling the basins of the Dongliao and lower reaches of the northern Songhua rivers. Naturally, from an early time, there was contact among the nomadic groups and the agrarian Yemaek tribe of this region which also occasionally intermixed, hence the ongoing debate on the ethnic identity of some of the tomb clusters discovered in this region. In particular, the tombs found at Xichagou in the Liaonign county of Xifeng are thought to be either Xiongnu¹ or Wuhuan,² and there is also a theory that they could be of Puyŏ origin.³ The Xichagou region adjoins the Hun River Basin from which Koguryŏ arose. And there are also theories that the Laoheshen relics in Yūshu County, northeast of the Puyŏ area of Nong’an, could be either Xianbei or Puyŏ.⁴

Mutual contacts have long since been documented. They adjoined Yemaek and Chosŏn on the eastern Xiongnu frontier.⁵ And one of the main effects of the Han Chinese invasion of Wiman Chosŏn was to sever the left arm of the Xiongnu,⁶ indicating the probability of interaction between Chosŏn and Xiongnu. And then, in the time around BCE-CE, contact between Koguryŏ and nomadic groups took the form of conflicts, with one group of Xianbei being subjugated by Koguryŏ, as recorded in Korean and Chinese histories.⁷

---

¹ Sun Shoudao, Xiongnu·Xichagou wenhua gufenqünde faxian, Wenwu No. 8–9, 1960.
² Zeng Yong, Liaoning Xifeng Xichagou gufenqün wei Wuhuan wenhua yijilun, Kaogu.
³ Tian Yun, Xichagou gufen zushu wenti, Heilongjiang Wenwu Congkan, 1984, No. 1.
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⁸ Samguk Sagi Vol. 13, the entry for Yuri Myŏngwang Year 3; Houhanshu Vol. 20, Jitong Zhuan.
Subsequently, there was continuous interaction among Koguryŏ, Puyŏ and the nomadic groups. Particularly with an ebb in Chinese power after the fourth century there was active contact, alternating between war and peace. Koguryŏ delegations stepped onto the Mongolian Plains and in the seventh century reached as far as Samarkand in Central Asia.

Mutual contacts such as these have been researched through fragmentary Chinese and Korean records as well as the relics and ruins of the Three Kingdoms Period. There are also extremely cursory comments by Inner Asians and third-country peoples with whom they had relations as well as extant materials in which Palhæ is mentioned. With these various sources, we propose to examine the interaction between Proto-Korean and Inner Asian peoples.

The Name Muglig in Dunhuang Manuscript PT#1283

As for records by the peoples of Inner Asia on ancient Korea, the first item of interest is *Pelliot Tibétain 1283*, or simply *PT#1283*. Written in Tibetan, it is one of the Dunhuang Manuscripts that Paul Pelliot took to Paris in 1908 where it remains in the National Library of France. This document is valued for its account of North Asia at the time of the Uyghur ascendency.8 The first part and the part related to Korea are quoted as follows:

This is an account of the kings and royal lines of the north. (Illegible) It had transpired that the king of Hor did decree that five of his people should be dispatched to inquire as to the number of kings in the northern lands. This is a copy of the record of their report, which is in a repository....The west of their country (the twelve Tujüe tribes of Mochuo Khan),9 is a tribe called He by the Tibetans, Hetse (Xi) by the Chinese,