

**THE FUTURE OF EARLY KOREA IN THE WEST:  
FOCUSING ON THE CONFLICT BETWEEN NATIONALIST HISTORIOGRAPHY  
AND WESTERN WRITINGS ON EARLY KOREA**

PANKAJ MOHAN

THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

A couple of decades ago Korea was described as a “well-kept secret” in the Western World, but primarily due to the “Miracle of the Han River” the West recognised the existence of Korea, and beginning with the 1990’s started making an earnest effort to understand some aspects of modern and contemporary historical experiences of the Korean people. Today one may find Western libraries stacked with publications on the Korean War, the Chaebol and Seoul- Pyongyang relations. Several important works on Koryo, Choson and the colonial period have also appeared. But early Korea, the root of Korean identity, remains not only the most understudied but also most misunderstood area in the West. Leading historians of modern South Asia, particularly those associated with the cutting edge “subaltern” research have noted and clearly demonstrated how important it is to access classical sources for gaining an incisive understanding of the cultural basis of politico-social phenomena. It is apparent that authentic studies of past societies have contemporary relevance, as they provide contexts to understand links between ideology, religion and politics – paradigms for contemporary consideration in a world where ideology affiliated with religion and to state are increasingly on the rise. If one looks at Western works on early Japan, China, India and Southeast Asia, one is struck by new approaches that they have evolved and broader comparative and conceptual insights for historical research that they have

yielded. Meticulous studies of various aspects of early Korean history will doubtless enable scholars to look at contemporary phenomena with the historical depth of an intellectual well educated in regional and global culture who can see Korea from the inside and from the outside. But unfortunately, early Korea remains almost a barren land, waiting to be explored. In this paper I attempt to understand some of the problems associated with the study of early Korea in the West, focusing on the inherent dichotomy that exists between the tradition of nationalist historiography in Korea, part of the wider project of forging an “imagined community” and the Western writings that are not part of this nation-building process. Indeed, Korea is not unique in establishing a relationship of mutual empowerment between historians and forces of nationalism. As a recent edited volume by Wang Gungwu eloquently illustrates, historians have played seminal role in shaping nationalism in various parts of the world where nation-states originated. (*Nation-building: Five Southeast Asian Histories*). In order to demonstrate the tension between nationalist vision and version of early Korea and Western approaches to early Korea, it is essential to look at the genealogy of nationalist historiography in Korea.

### **The Genealogy of Historiography on Early Korea: Japanese Imperialist Historiography**

Bruce Cumings made an important observation in his book “*Korea's Place in the Sun: A Modern History*” that with the rise of modern Japan in the Meiji era, Korea was deterred from constructing its own past, and was divested of its significance as an actor in history in the Western imagination. The intellectual tradition of Meiji Japan, anchored in the *Kokugaku* (National Learning School), authenticated the popular Shintoistic belief that Japan was a divine land, and the imperial myths found in the *Nihon shoki* and the *Kojiki* were established as an

articulation of Japan's historical consciousness. The popular Japanese mind was overwhelmed with a nostalgia fixated on the myth-historical accounts that Silla was conquered by Empress Jingu and the southern Korean kingdom of Kaya served as Japan's colonial outpost. They cried out for a revival of their so-called lost imperialist glory beyond the border. Yoshida Shoin of the late Tokugawa period, who was hailed as an ideologue of the Meiji restoration, argued passionately that Korea needed to be penalised 'for her long negligence in the observation of her duties towards Japan' and be 'instructed to show obeisance, as she did during the glorious imperial period of ancient Japan'. An echo of similar sentiments can be heard in a number of publications of the time. It was in this charged atmosphere and amidst the slogan of *seikanron* (Conquer Korea Debate) that the Department of History at the Tokyo Imperial University was set up and modern historical scholarship in Japan took root.

It is also interesting to note that Shigeno Yasutsugu, Kume Kunitake and Hoshino Hisashi, the three pioneer scholars assigned to the newly founded department, were previously employed in the government's Bureau of Historiography. Kume Kunitake (1839-1931) and Hoino Hisashi (1839-1971) specialised in the ancient history of Japan, and because of the question of ethnicity and identity that their field involved, they had to delve into some aspects of ancient Korean history as well. Kume's *Nihon no fukuin no enkaku* (A History of the Periphery of Japan) and Hoshino's *Honpo no jinshu ni tsuki hiko wo nobete yo no shinshin aikokusha ni tadasu* (Some Questions to True Patriots Regarding the Ethnology of the Japanese Race), published in the 1890s, deal with ancient Korean history. Some other Japanese scholars of the early Meiji era wrote on Korea, and what is striking is the fact that they adopted singularly political topics such as Imna (Japanese 'Mimana') or Kaya, the Kwanggaet'o stele, and the origin of Samhan, which were relevant to the contemporary political climate of the 'restoration' of Japan's hegemonic

politics in Korea. The *Nihon shoki*-based history of the Kaya league and the famous 'sinyu year' passage in the Kwanggaet'o stele were widely used as indubitable evidence of Korea having been a Japanese colonial outpost in ancient times. No attempt was made to rigorously interrogate the contextual bias of the sources, and those subjects which did not help define Japan with 'contrasting image, idea, personality, experience' (as Edward Said has noted in the context of Europe) did not figure in the academic agendas of the new Japan.

The early Japanese historians of Korea combined training in *Kosho-gaku* (an empirical and inductive methodology of textual study) with tools of Western historical research. Their research was doubtless significant as a methodological breakthrough. Nonetheless, since Meiji Japan's historical practice was integrated closely within the matrix of the contemporary political imperatives of Japan, it involved a binary opposition in which Japan as 'self' or 'privileged signifier' wielded power, and the role of Korea, the 'other', was mostly to authenticate Japanese superiority over Korean backwardness. This all limited its value as objective scholarship.

An important theory which governed the Japanese reconstruction of Korea's past was *taritsusei* which Ch'oe Yong-ho translates as 'heteronomous determination', implying that Korea lacked innate dynamism so that the course of its history was shaped by external factors and forces. Other influential theories in relation to Korea which the Meiji scholars of Korean history propounded were those of geographical determinism, historical changelessness (stagnation) and the common origin of Korea and Japan (*nissen dosoron*). The theory of geographical determinism asserted that due to the peninsular character (*hantosei*) of Korea its historical development was inevitably manipulated by external forces and factors. Shiratori Kurakichi, for

instance, specified that the influence emanating from the continental lands of China proper and Manchuria constituted two of these forces, and Japan was the third such force. The political implications of these Orientalist myths were obvious - Korea could not shape its own destiny, and Japan as a 'superior' nation had to bring 'backward' Korea under its control and lead it forward on the path of enlightenment and modernisation.

### **Korean Works on Early Korea: Establishment of Nationalist Paradigm**

Modern Korean historiography was a radically nationalist inversion of Japan's Orientalist historiography, a counter-discourse of the assumptions implicit in Japan's historical practice during the Meiji period. Korean intellectuals in the early twentieth century engaged in an impassioned quest for an alternative historiography in such a way as to 'allow memory to usurp the estate of history', as Ranajit Guha has noted in the context of Indian historiography. Guha further points out that nostalgia in itself does not constitute a sufficient condition for the production of historiography for a nation in the same way as it does not produce an autobiography for an individual, but what is common in the nostalgic urges in the life of a nation and an individual is that they are 'informed by a notion of the Other'.

In fact it is the concept of the 'notion of the Other' in nationalist historiographical urges which is relevant to our discussion of the Korean historiography, particularly as represented by Sin Ch'ae-ho (1880-1937) and Ch'oe Nam-son (1890-1957). Sin was the most representative nationalist historian of the early twentieth century, whose historical writings can be described as explorations of the interpretive 'otherness' about the Korean past. They were particularistic histories charged with an intense realisation of Korea's unique racial identity and a sense of

community. They were, furthermore, specifically addressed to the challenges of Japanese theories about Korean history, and were intended as a means to promote the national self-strengthening and enlightenment movement. For instance, Sin's emphases on Manchuria as an integral part of Korea's geographical self-identity and on Tangun as the symbol of racial uniqueness were an articulation of a nationalist historical consciousness and represented a response to the challenges of the imperialist historiography. The Japanese emphasis on the migration of Kija, a sage-prince of the Yin Dynasty of China, as a basis of state-formation implied that the beginning of the Korean state was not an autonomous enterprise which in turn meant that the contemporary reality of Korea's subjugation by an external power was not an aberration but formed part of a historical pattern. In contrast, the nationalist historians laid emphasis on Tangun, believed to have been born out of the union of the Son of Heaven and a bear-turned-woman and to have founded the first state of Choson on the Korean peninsula in 2333 B.C.

Sin's theory of history identified the conflict between self (*a*) and non-self/other (*pi-a*) as the major stimulus of the development of history, which implied that the early history of Korea was characterised by spatial dichotomies between Korea (self) and China (non-self), so that the indigenous culture of Korea had to wrestle with the imported Chinese civilization (non self/other) in order to retain its independent identity. This explains why Ulchi Mundok of Koguryo, who fought the Sui army, emerged as an archetypal moral icon in Sin's historiography, and why Silla's reliance on external force for the accomplishment of so-called national unification is portrayed as 'a dark chapter in Korean history'. It also explains why Sin mounted a vitriolic assault on the Sinicisation/Confucianisation of Korean society, believing it to have led to

a gradual erosion of the indigenous values of the Korean people and the concomitant subjugation of the pattern of the Korean past to Sinocentric moral interpretations. Sin's historiographical framework magnified the significance of Tangun Choson, which he believed to be evidence of the indigenous origin of the Korean race, and whose territorial boundaries embracing Manchuria were emblematic of a vast theatre of early Korean history.

Ch'oe Nam-son, another major historian of the Japanese colonial era, seems to have been influenced by Sin's vision of history which defined pre-Buddhist Tangun civilisation as a representation of the true identity of Korean history. Ch'oe Nam-son wrote *Tangunnon* (On Tangun) in which he criticised Japanese scholars for a lack of anthropological insight into the Tangun myth and their prejudice against Korean sources, because they never questioned the credibility of their own ancient texts. He wrote several other detailed theses to refute the claims of Japanese historians who argued that the Tangun legend was an invention of the monk Iryon, the author of *Samguk yusa* in the 13th century. According to several Japanese historians, such Buddhist elements in the legend as Hwanin, a deity of the Buddhist pantheon and the word *Tan* in Tangun meaning sandalwood (Sanskrit *candana*) were evidence that Tangun was just an imaginary creation of a Buddhist monk of the 13th century and did not have any basis in history. Choe sought to affirm the validity of this folklore as a core of historical data by arguing that *Tan* should be written with the earth radical (meaning 'a sacred altar'), not the tree radical meaning sandalwood and clarifying that many terms and terms appearing in the myth could be reconstructed as archaic Korean. He demonstrated, for instance, that 'Hwanin' was a corruption of the Korean word *hanul nara*, meaning heaven.

### **Some Western Writings on Early Korea and Attack by Nationalist Historians**

The political establishment of the post-liberation Korea from 1948 to 1988 sought to further consolidate the legacy of nationalist historiography, but some pioneer historians of this period, notably Professor Yi Ki Baik and Prof. Kim Ch'ol-jun broke new ground with their focus on historical processes or an 'attempt to locate distinctive social and political forms and on understanding the transitions that lead to changes in social and political forms. But the landscape of early Korean history was not yet receptive to ideas that conflicted sharply with the 'received wisdom'. For instance In his review of Dr Gardiner's short book "*An Early History of Korea*, Professor Kim Won-yong of Seoul National University wrote that his ambivalent attitude towards the two Korean records, *Samguk sagi* and *Samguk yusa*, was derived from his "full acceptance of the traditional Japanese view of the two works." He further emphasized the need for the two works to be "reconsidered from a new point of view without undue prejudice from Japanese days." Dr Gardiner correctly retorted that a critical study of Korean history by a Western scholar and Japanese studies of Korean history, are not identical, and must not be misconstrued as influenced by Japan's imperialist historiography. He further noted: "If a foreign scholar fails to accept the authority of the Korean chronicles as — to use Prof. Kim's word- "absolute," if he indulges in criticism, then he is obviously accepting "the traditional Japanese view." which is to say that he is in error. Statements such as these do honour to the spirit of sacred nationalism that beats strongly in the hearts of some Korean historians, but I am tempted to recall the words of Dr. Samuel Johnson on the subject of patriotism, and to reflect that patriotism is all too often the first resort of poor scholarship".



Dr Gardiner also pointed out that Kim Pu-sik either arbitrarily fixed or borrowed from Silla writers a date for the foundation of Silla – 57BC. This manipulation of historical chronology made Silla antedate the earliest Chinese reference to Goguryeo, and also placed the birth of Park Hyokkose clearly before that of Chumong. It is important to note that ‘the date 57 BC as the foundation date of Silla also has the merit of being the first year of a sixty year cycle, and exactly twelve such cycles before the final elimination of Silla’s older rival in AD 663’. It is also remarkable that 18 B. C., the foundation date of Paekche in the *Samguk sagi* is in conflict with the Chinese accounts. In the 3<sup>rd</sup> Century A.D. Paekche was one of the 54 ‘guo’ or kingdoms of Mahan and Mahan did not possess a clearly articulated structure of kingship. Moreover, according to Kim Pu-sik’s own text, Paekche did not establish its bureau of history until 375 and Silla until the reign of King Chinhung., It is obvious, therefore, that one can’t pose confidence in Kim Pu-sik’s chronological details of the beginning of these two kingdoms in the 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE. Though Dr Gardiner put forward a persuasive argument, and a younger scholar, Yi Kang-nae took note of this fact in his book on the *Samguk Sagi*, a majority of research works, history textbooks and museums in South Korea still accept the chronology of the *Samguk sagi* as an authentic guide to the early Korean history. It is also important to note that Hyung-Il Pai ‘s study on the process of state-formation in Korea has also not been given due recognition in South Korea. For the sustained growth of early Korean history in the West it is important to establish a channel of dialogue between Korean and Western scholars so that both groups forge a commonality of purpose.

In the new millennium some important developments took place in the study of early Korea. Doctoral researches on the tomb murals of Koguryo were written at Columbia and UPenn. Mark Byington wrote his dissertation on Puyo at Harvard. He also organised an international conference on Koguryo History and Archaeology in 2005 in which six South Koreans, three Chinese, three Japanese, Ken Gardiner from Australia and two scholars each from the U.S. and France participated. Recently the Korea Foundation and the Academy of Korean Studies financed Mark Byington's project on Early Korea, but for the successful implementation and sustained development of this project it is necessary that the host institutions create a tenure-track position in the field of early Korean history which does not appear to be forthcoming. Jonathan Best's translation of the *Paekche Pongi* section of the *Samguk sagi* is an extremely important step in the elevation of the profile of Early Korea in the West. The above-noted studies doubtless redress major lacuna in our understanding of early Korea, but for an integrated perspective of the field and its growth as an academic program in the West, monographs and/or edited volumes on the following important topics

1. Sources of early Korea: Accounts of Korea in the Chinese dynastic annals and non-Chinese tradition: tensions between imported data and native historical writings, both literary and epigraphic,
2. Archaeology, pseudo-history and prehistory
3. Tangun: Shaman-King or an 'Invented Tradition'
4. The Four Han Commanderies : Impact of Han Colonial rule
5. Chinese and Korean perception of Koguryo as a state
6. Indigenous Belief-system of Korea

7. Koguryo's relations with Gongsun (Kung-sun) Warlords, Puyo, Wei and Murong Yan
8. Formation of state in the Southern part of the Korean peninsula: Paekche
9. Paekche's relationship with Japan, Paekche culture and Tradition
10. The Golden Age of Koguryo: King Kwanggaet'o and King Changsu
11. Introduction of Buddhism to the Korean peninsula;< Buddhism and State; Buddhism and Art and Culture
12. Silla's relations with Koguryo and paekche and the war of peninsular conquest
13. Hwarang and Silla Society
14. 'Silla's Solution' or why the Tang Army withdrew
15. Unified Silla: Political structure, Social organization (Kor'um), Buddhist art
16. Parhae
17. The Disintegration of Silla, the rise of Three later Kingdoms and transition to Koryo

As Korea's strategic and economic significance for the West and its role in East Asia become increasingly prominent, and Korean communities form an inalienable part of a cosmopolitan future for many cities, including Hawaii and Sydney, it is advantageous for politicians, civic institutions and business personnel in the West to understand the significance of Korean cultural heritage and its impact on the East Asian region. The West can expand its role in the geopolitical environment of East Asia and the Pacific and further diversify and consolidate its economic and social linkages with Korea by building expertise and research capability on the roots of Korean culture, belief-system and its place in East Asian historical development. It is not coincidental that Korea's dispute with its two neighbors is rooted in the dichotomous or divergent memories of history. Early Korea is a particularly difficult field, because early Korea-related research

requires one to make sense of a process on which there is not a great deal of information, and much of that dates from centuries after the events it covered. One has to approach the subject by taking a wide and comparative view of the historical development and draw on one's ability to read Classical Chinese, Japanese and Korean. Knowledge of archaeology is also necessary, because as Romila Thapar says, 'it questions what might be called the monopoly of the text', and 'introducing archaeological data into historical studies forces historians to think along interdisciplinary lines'. A scholar properly trained in the craft of a historian, able to read primary sources with ease and draw on insights from anthropology and cultural studies, can detect the contextual biases of both primary sources and secondary material and provide a much-needed dispassionate objectivity to the field.

## Appendix 1.

### 호주속의 한국학

호주는 한국전쟁 당시 8047명의 군인을 파견하여 혈맹국으로서의 우호관계를 맺었다.

그러나 한국의 정치적인 혼란으로 말미암아 1980년대 말까지 호주의 지식인들은 한국에 대하여 무관심하거나 비판적인 태도를 갖고 있었다. 1978년 호주의 저명한

동양사학자인 개번 매클랙(Gavan McCormack) 교수가 ‘날로 심화되어가는 위기의 나라 한국’이라는 제목으로 책 한권을 출간했는데, 그것은 유신시대의 비극을 다룬

내용이었다. 그러나 80년대 후반기에 접어들어 한국이 높은 경제 성장을 보이고

민주화를 이루면서 한국에 대한 인식이 변화하기 시작했다. 한국과 호주 두 나라간의

관계도 1980년대 후반부터 긴밀하게 유지되었고 정치·경제·안보협력 등 제반 분야로

우호 협력관계가 확대됐다. 80년대말 즈음 노동당이 집권하면서 호주는 서양의

일원으로서보다는 지리적으로 근접 지역인 아시아의 일원으로 국가운영 방향을

바꾸어갔다. 이에 따라 한국에 대한 관심도 급격히 높아졌다.

가너(R. Garnaut) 교수는 1989년 호주 연방정부의 프로젝트로 ‘호주와 동북아시아의

흥기’(Australia and the Northeast Asian Ascendancy)라는 제목으로 보고서를

작성했는데 호주 정부의 한국 인식에 크게 영향을 미쳤다. 이 가너 보고서에 힘입어 호주에서 한국어가 아시아 4개 핵심언어 중 하나로 지정되기도 했다. 한국은 호주가 중시한 아시아 4개 국가에 포함됐기 때문에 1992년도에는 호·한재단(Australia-Korea Foundation)이 설립되기도 했다. 호·한재단은 호주 외무부 산하 재단으로서 교육, 예술, 문화, 언론 등의 여러 분야에 걸쳐 한국과 호주간의 인적 교류를 통하여 두 나라의 관계 개선 및 강화 목적으로 하고 있다. 이 무렵 호주국립대, 시드니대, 뉴사우스 웨일즈대(NSW), 모내시대 등 호주의 주요 대학에 한국어 프로그램이 설치되었다. 초·중·고등학교에서도 한국어 교육이 시작되었다. 한국학의 이러한 팽창을 기반으로 1994년에는 호주·뉴질랜드 한국학연구회가 설립되었다. 2000년 뉴사우스 웨일즈대는 한국학과 한국어에 대한 보다 체계적인 연구를 목적으로 한다는 취지에서 한·호연구소를 설립하였다.

그러나 아쉽게도 양국간의 교역 규모를 감안할 때 호주 내 한국학의 위치는 튼튼하지 않은 실정이다. 현재 호주의 대학에서 한국어를 배우는 학생 가운데 대다수는 한류에 매료된 중국계 학생이다. 뉴사우스 웨일즈대의 대입수능시험인 HSC에서 비(非)한국인들이 응시하는 ‘외국어로서의 한국어 초급과정(beginners course)’에 매년

겨우 한두명 정도가 지원하는 것도 호주내 한국어 교육의 건강상태를 우려하게 하는 일이다.

한편 호주 속의 한국, 또는 한국학을 얘기할 때 호주에 건너온 한국교민의 존재를 간과할 수 없다. 한국인의 호주 이민 역사는 베트남 패망 직전인 1974년부터 시작된다. 1976년 호주내 한국인 거주자 수는 1460명에 불과했다. 그러나 1986년에는 9285명으로 6배나 증가했다. 호주 통계국이 발표한 '2001년 인구센서스 종합 자료'에 따르면 호주 내 한인인구는 4만2564명이나 된다. 2006년 통계에 의하면 9만4000명에 달한다. 이들 한국교민 가운데 약 6만5000명이 시드니지역에서 거주하고 있다. 현재 이스트우드, 어번, 캠시 등 한국인 인구가 많은 지역에 있는 경찰서에는 동포출신 소수민족사회 연락관(Ethnic Community Liaison Officer)들이 배치되어 있다.

한국과 호주 간의 관계 증진을 위해서는 인적 교류가 매우 중요하다. 2006년 2만5000명의 한국인 관광객이 호주를 방문했다. 호주 대학에 유학 와서 공부하고 있는 한국인은 3만2000명에 달한다. 호주 유학이 미국과 유럽보다 싸고 시드니대, 호주국립대, 멜버른대, 뉴사우스 웨일즈대, 모내시대 등이 세계 100위권 안에 랭크될 정도로

유명하기 때문이다. 또한 호주의 40여개 대학은 한국의 100여 개 대학과 자매결연을 맺고 교환프로그램을 운영하고 있다.

20년 전만 해도 일반적으로 한국인에게 호주는 너무나 먼 곳에 있었다. ‘백호주의’로 대표되는 인종차별의 나라로 비취졌다. 그러나 그동안의 경제협력관계 강화를 비롯한 여러 분야에 걸친 활발한 교류 덕분에 현재 양국은 국제 무대에서 서로 손을 잡고 동반자 관계를 유지하고 있다. 호주 내에 한국인이 만든 단체들이 많은데 다같이 한국인 2세의 가슴 속에 한국에 대한 애정을 심으려 꾸준히 노력하고 있다. 예를 들면 재호 한인상공인연합회는 매년 장학생 몇명을 선발해 한국 교육부 산하 국제교류진흥원이 주관하는 ‘동포학생 동계학교’를 다닐 수 있는 기회를 마련하여 한국인 부모에게서 태어난 2세들이 한국을 더욱 가깝게 느낄 수 있게 하고 있다. 호주인들도 한국이란 나라에 대해서 호감을 갖고 있으며 계속해서 한국과의 밀접한 관계를 이어가길 희망한다.



## Appendix 2.

### 호주에 한국학 첫 소개 켄 가디너

켄 가디너(Ken Gardiner:1932~) 박사는 호주에 한국학을 소개한 선구자이다. 그는 1964년 런던대에서 고구려를 주제로 박사논문을 쓴 최초의 서구학자이다. 1966년 호주로 건너와 호주대 아시아문화학과에서 교편을 잡으면서 초기 한국사에 대한 강의를 시작함으로써 호주에서 한국학 연구의 시대를 열었다. 그가 1969년 펴낸 저서 ‘초기 한국사(Early Korea)’는 서구 학계에 있어 한국의 역사를 영문으로 체계화하려는 최초의 시도였다. 이후 가디너 박사는 고구려에 관한 다양한 저술활동을 펼쳤다.

한국학중앙연구원에서 발행하는 ‘한국학평론(Review of Korean Studies)’을 위한 인터뷰 자리에서 필자는 고구려가 중국 왕조(중원의 왕조)에 대한 예속관계를 지속했으며 고구려의 왕들이 중국의 통치를 받는 신하에 불과했다는 중국 측 주장에 대해 가디너 박사의 고견을 청한바 있다. 당시 그는 다음과 같이 답변했다.

“후한(後漢) 시대 대부분의 기간 동안 고구려는 전한 시대에 유지했던 종속적 동맹국 지위에서 결별한 양상을 보였으며 동북아시아에 있어 중국의 패권에 도전하는 주요 세력으로 점차 부상했다. 더불어 고구려가 늘 중국의 세가 약해진 시기를 이용했다는 사실도 특기할 만하다. 중국이 강성하고 통일상태에 있을 때에는 저자세를 견지했다. 이런 점에서 볼 때 고구려 왕들도 중국 변방의 여느 국가의 왕들과 별반 다르지 않았다. 기실 북부 베트남은 여전히 중화제국의 일부분으로 남았으며 9세기 당 왕조가 몰락할 때까지 그 상태를 유지했다.

고구려의 왕들은 국내에서 자신들의 권위를 높이기 위해 중국 조정의 책봉을 받아들였다. 전기 고구려의 왕위는 부족 간에 오고 갔으며 특정 부족(예를 들면 계루부) 출신의 왕이 책봉을 받은 경우 이는 그 부족의 권위를 높이는 데에 보탬이 됐다.”

가드너 교수는 수많은 학자를 배출했는데 유명한 영문학자 최재서(1908~1964) 선생의 딸 최양희 교수도 그의 지도 하에 조선조 여류시인 허난설헌의 문학세계를 연구하여 박사학위를 받았다. 최교수 역시 호주대에서 교편을 잡고 한국 고전문학 연구에 몰두해왔으며 호주에서 한국학 발전에 큰 공헌을 하였다. 최교수가 영역한 허난설헌

시집 'Vision of a Phoenix'(불사조의 비전)란 제목으로 2003년 미국 코넬대출판사에서  
출간됐다. 이 책은 지난해 한국문학번역원이 시상하는 제7회 한국문학번역상  
수상작으로 선정됐다. 이에 앞서 최교수는 1985년 영국 런던에서 혜경궁 홍씨의  
'한중록'을 영역한 'Memoirs of a Korean Queen'(한중록)을 출간한 바 있다.