

Doubts about the Edition of the <Samguk yusa>

《삼국유사》 판본의 몇 가지 문제점

저자 (Authors)	Park Daejae
출처 (Source)	International Journal of Korean History 13, 2009.2, 17-40(24 pages)
발행처 (Publisher)	고려대학교 한국사연구소 Center for Korean History
URL	http://www.dbpia.co.kr/journal/articleDetail?nodeId=NODE01206006
APA Style	Park Daejae (2009). Doubts about the Edition of the <Samguk yusa> . International Journal of Korean History, 13, 17-40
이용정보 (Accessed)	삼성현역사문화관 183.106.106.*** 2021/08/07 14:50 (KST)

저작권 안내

DBpia에서 제공되는 모든 저작물의 저작권은 원저작자에게 있으며, 누리미디어는 각 저작물의 내용을 보증하거나 책임을 지지 않습니다. 그리고 DBpia에서 제공되는 저작물은 DBpia와 구독계약을 체결한 기관소속 이용자 혹은 해당 저작물의 개별 구매자가 비영리적으로만 이용할 수 있습니다. 그러므로 이에 위반하여 DBpia에서 제공되는 저작물을 복제, 전송 등의 방법으로 무단 이용하는 경우 관련 법령에 따라 민, 형사상의 책임을 질 수 있습니다.

Copyright Information

Copyright of all literary works provided by DBpia belongs to the copyright holder(s) and Nurimedia does not guarantee contents of the literary work or assume responsibility for the same. In addition, the literary works provided by DBpia may only be used by the users affiliated to the institutions which executed a subscription agreement with DBpia or the individual purchasers of the literary work(s) for non-commercial purposes. Therefore, any person who illegally uses the literary works provided by DBpia by means of reproduction or transmission shall assume civil and criminal responsibility according to applicable laws and regulations.

Doubts about the Edition of the <Samguk yusa>

Park Daejae*

Introduction

The <Samguk yusa (Legends and History of the Three Kingdoms of Ancient Korea)> compiled by the Koryŏ era Buddhist monk Ilyŏn (1206-1289) is widely regarded as a classic in which the history and culture of ancient Korea are vividly recorded. However, the <Samguk yusa> was up until the Chosŏn era evaluated as a heretic work filled with untruths and nonsense, and the reliability of its records was denied. As the majority of its stories were based on Buddhism, it was only natural that the <Samguk yusa> was heavily criticized by the Confucian scholars of Chosŏn. However, Yi Nŭnghwa's active use of its pages as historical materials with which to study Buddhism during the early 20th century, and Ch'oe Namsŏn's subsequent high evaluation of its historical value, resulted in the <Samguk yusa> becoming widely recognized after the liberation of the nation in 1945 as one of the two great sources, the other being the <Samguk sagi (History of the Three Kingdoms)> written by Kim Pusik, in terms of the study of the ancient Korean history.

Up until the 1970s, the <Samguk yusa>'s Buddhism-oriented historical perception was regularly compared with the Confucianism-based historical perception found in the <Samguk sagi>. Meanwhile, the

* Assistant Professor, Korean History Department, Korea University

emergence of a more nationalist approach to history that revolved around opposition to the *sadae chu'ui* (serving the great) based historical perception found in the <Samguk sagi> had the effect of further enhancing the value of the <Samguk yusa> in the eyes of such scholars. During the 1980s, these contrasting viewpoints of these two books began to give way to a position in which these two works were regarded as being mutually complementary.

From the 1980s onwards, the study of the <Samguk yusa> at the 'separate' level by researchers in the fields of Korean ancient history or the history of Buddhism was expanded to become a 'comprehensive' approach based on the consilience of history with many other fields such as literature, religion, folklore, art history, archeology, bibliography. As such, the <Samguk yusa> has been studied in a much more comprehensive manner since the 1980s.

The consilience-based approach to the study of the <Samguk yusa> in many ways reflects the complicated nature of this seminal work. More to the point, the <Samguk yusa> is not only a historical book, but also a comprehensive humanistic work that boasts contents related to a wide scope of fields ranging from religion, to folk beliefs, art, music and literature. In a word, the <Samguk yusa> can be evaluated as a cultural history textbook which incorporates elements of history and humanism.

The production of various translated versions and annotations of the <Samguk yusa> in the 2000s has resulted in interest in this unique work being expanded from specialists to the general public. In this regard, the 'soft' cultural history contained in the <Samguk yusa> has proven to be more popular with regular people than the 'hard' history of politics found in the <Samguk sagi>. All in all, the <Samguk yusa> has been regarded as a more significant cultural commodity than the <Samguk sagi>.

Despite the publication of numerous studies on the <Samguk yusa>, the debate surrounding the actual edition of the <Samguk yusa> continues to rage. Under the current situation in which interest in the <Samguk yusa> has risen considerably amongst the general public, the basic issues related to the original edition of the book have yet to be put to rest once and for

all. The issue of to what extent the version of the <Samguk yusa> read by the public today reflects the contents that were included when the first edition of this work was compiled constitutes an important study task. Nevertheless, historians have tended to steer clear of this issue altogether. To this end, the present study raises several questions concerning the original edition of the <Samguk yusa>, which can be regarded as the foundation upon which our understanding of this work should be based, and searches for rational answers to these queries.

Why was Vol. I duplicated?

The current edition of the <Samguk yusa> used today is not one that dates back to the Koryŏ era, but rather a printed version¹ of the Imsin edition² produced in Kyŏngju during the 7th year of King Chungjong (1512) in the Chosŏn era. The Imsin edition of the <Samguk yusa> consists of two books. While Book One can in turn be separated into two volumes featuring chapters entitled *Chronological Table* and *Wonder*, Book Two consists of three volumes composed of the following seven chapters: *Rise of Buddhism, Pagodas and Buddhist Images, Anecdotes of Renowned Monks, Miracles, Tales of Devotion, Seclusion, and Filial Piety*. Thus, the work consists of two books, five volumes, and nine chapters.

However, the fact that “<Samguk yusa, Volume 1: 1>” has been written in the center of the first block of both *Chronological Table* and *Wonder* of the Imsin edition has led many to believe that Volume 1 was in fact duplicated. The inclusion of an inscription reading “<Samguk yusa, Volume 1: 1> ~<Samguk yusa, Volume 1: 15> in *Chronological Table* would seem to indicate that Volume 1 effectively consists of fifteen blocks. However, as mentioned above, “<Samguk yusa, Volume 1:1>” has also been written in the *Wonder* chapter, which continues all the way to “<Samguk yusa, Volume 1: 37>”. If Volume 1 in fact consists of the *Chronological Table* and *Wonder* chapters, then it only stands to reason that the *Wonder* chapter should begin from Block 16. Despite the fact that

each volume contains several chapters, the chapters in Volumes 3–5 of this work are presented in a linear fashion with no overlap found. However, the fact that the inscription “Volume 1 Block 1” appears again in the *Wonder* chapter that follows the *Chronological Table* chapter effectively ensures that the order of the blocks in this second chapter is not based on a continuance of those found in the *Chronological Table* chapter. In other words, Volume 1 starts with an obvious duplication of the *Chronological Table* and *Wonder* chapters.

Moreover, the headings title “<Samguk yusa, *Chronological Table*, 1>” found in the main text of the *Chronological Table* chapter and “<*Wonder*, Volume 1>” visible in the body of the *Wonder* chapter of the Imsin edition are also not consistent. While a ‘volume’ is classified based on the amount of books produced, a ‘chapter’ is classified based on the actual contents. According to the titles found in the main text of the Imsin edition, *Chronological Table* is actually the first chapter of the work, while *Wonder* represents Vol. 1. However, it is not clear whether Vol. 1 starts with *Chronological Table* or *Wonder*. Moreover, also it fails to shed some light on the question of whether *Wonder* should constitute Chapter 2 after *Chronological Table*. If we were to base this decision on the proper order of the titles found in the main text, then Vol.1 should be regarded as beginning with the *Wonder* chapter; meanwhile, the *Chronological Table* should be regarded as an appendix or something that was added out of volume. Thus, the inscription “Volume 1” in the center of block of *Chronological Table* chapter can be perceived as a mistake.

As such, the Imsin edition of the <Samguk yusa> is plagued by the problem that the numbers of the volumes, chapters, and blocks have been mixed up. This problem is closely related to the fact that the Imsin edition does not include a separate table of contents. Meanwhile, existing editions have reorganized the table of contents, with the main focus being on the titles of the main text. Given the fact that the Imsin edition constitutes the original wooden block edition, it becomes necessary to review the records found in the center of the blocks of this edition. In this regard, the records found in the center of the block for each volume, as well as the titles

found in the main text of Imsin edition can be summarized as follows.

<Table 1> Titles in the main text and the records in the center of the blocks of the Imsin edition of the <Samguk yusa>

Titles in the main text	Records in the center of the blocks
三國遺事 王曆第一	三國遺事 卷1, 1 ~ 15
紀異卷第一	三國遺事 卷1, 1 ~ 37
三國遺事卷第二	三國遺事 卷2, 1 ~ 49
三國遺事卷第三 興法第三 塔像	三國遺事 卷3, 1 ~ 12
三國遺事卷第四 義解第五	三國遺事 卷3, 12 ~ 56
三國遺事卷第五 神呪第六	三國遺事 卷4, 1 ~ 31
感通第七	三國遺事 卷5, 1 ~ 5
避隱第八	三國遺事 卷5, 5 ~ 18
孝善第九	三國遺事 卷5, 18 ~ 26
	三國遺事 卷5, 26 ~ 30

Existing studies have tended to reorganize the table of contents of the <Samguk yusa> based on the column found on the left in <Table 1>. First, the conclusion having been reached that “Chapter IV” had been omitted from the title of the ‘Pagodas and Buddhist Images’ chapter, scholars began to rewrite this chapter as “Chapter IV Pagodas and Buddhist Images” in order to ensure consistency with the titles of the other chapters. In addition, scholars have also tended to perceive other problems with the titles such as those of the lack of a volume number in the title of the *Chronological Table* chapter, a missing chapter number in the title of the *Wonder* chapter, and the absence of any chapter title in Volume 2 as having been caused by the inclusion of *Chronological Table* and *Wonder* in Volume 1 and the fact that the *Wonder* chapter continued from Volume 1 to Volume 2. This is the current general understanding within academic circles.³ As such, many scholars have perceived the overall <Samguk yusa> as a consistent structure, by organically connecting *Chronological Table* with the *Wonder* chapter and the following other chapters.

However, a look at the underlined records found in the center of the blocks in the column to the right of <Table 1> reveals that the order of Volume 1 is duplicated, while it proceeds in a consistent fashion from

Volume 2 onwards. Therefore, doubts have been raised as to whether the *Chronological Table*, *Wonder*, and the other seven chapters can rightfully be regarded as an organic structural composition. In other words, the fact that the order of volumes and chapters found in the center of the blocks was duplicated has created doubts as to whether the *Chronological Table*, *Wonder*, and other seven chapters were in reality originally combined in one book, or the *Chronological Table* was simply added in front of the *Wonder* chapter at a later date.

From early onwards, many historians have regarded the inscription ‘Great Song (大宋)’ found in the last page of *Chronological Table* of the <Samguk yusa> as a sign that that Ilyön compiled this particular chapter before the Song dynasty of China was destroyed by the Yuan(元) dynasty in 1279.⁴ Meanwhile, other researchers have maintained that Ilyön and his disciples in fact compiled the *Chronological Table* of the <Samguk yusa> based on the <Yökdae yŏnp yo (歷代年表, Chronological Table)> compiled by them in 1278.⁵ These two opinions share the commonality that they assume that Ilyön wrote the *Chronological Table*, *Wonder*, and other seven chapters of this work himself.

However, others have opposed the inclusion of the *Chronological Table* in Volume 1, asserting that Volume 1 should in fact begin with the *Wonder* chapter. In this regard, they have perceived the *Chronological Table* as an appendix to the <Samguk yusa>, and have as such distinguished it from the other chapters of the text.⁶ In addition, the presence of numerous differences between the records found in the *Chronological Table* and those in the *Wonder* and other seven chapters, and the fact that the *Chronological Table* makes references to place names that were not used after 1310, such as Kümju(金州) and Tongju(東州), has led some researchers to believe that the *Chronological Table* was in fact compiled by another author prior to 1310 and subsequently included as an appendix to the <Samguk yusa> by Ilyön.⁷

By the way, one has countered the assertion that the *Chronological Table* was written prior to 1310 by introducing proof which he believes shows that the chapter in question was actually compiled after 1310 when

Ilyŏn had already been dead. The crux of his argument has revolved around the fact that mention is made in the *Chronological Table* to a place named ‘Ch’ŏlwŏn(鐵原)’, which constitutes the new name which was given to ‘Tongju(東州)’ in 1310.⁸ In the main text and annotations to the *Chronological Table*, one finds the present-day city of Ch’ŏlwŏn in Kangwŏn Province referred to as ‘Ch’ŏlwŏn (鐵園)’, ‘Tongju (東州)’, or ‘Ch’ŏlwŏn (鐵原)’. According to the geography sections of the <*Samguk sagi*> and <*Koryŏsa* (History of Koryŏ)>, the name ‘Ch’ŏlwŏn (鐵園)’ was used up until 919 when it was changed to ‘Tongju (東州)’. Thereafter, it was once again changed in 1310, this time to ‘Ch’ŏlwŏn (鐵原)’. As such, proponents of this position have asserted that the *Chronological Table* was in fact compiled after 1310 when the name ‘Ch’ŏlwŏn (鐵原)’ started to be used.

However, a clear distinction of when a place name was actually changed is not always as evident as it appears in geographical books. Furthermore, there are many cases where different characters were used to render the same place name. For instance, while the above records would seem to indicate that the place name ‘Ch’ŏlwŏn (鐵原)’ only appeared after 1310, clear reference is made to it in Ch’oe Cha(崔滋)’s <*Samdobu* (三都賦)> written prior to the author’s death sometime before 1260.⁹ Therefore, the estimation of the period in which the *Chronological Table* was compiled based on changes in place names is not as convincing as it might on the surface appear.

A more logical exercise is that of analyzing the location and characteristics of the *Chronological Table* vis-à-vis the overall structure of the <*Samguk yusa*>. Let us go back to the issue of the structure of the <*Samguk yusa*> found in <Table 1> and attempt once again to answer the question of why the entry “Volume 1 Block 1” found in the center of the block for the *Chronological Table* and *Wonder* was duplicated. Simply put, this kind of mistake could not have occurred if the *Chronological Table*, *Wonder* and other seven chapters were originally bound together in one book. As such, it is estimated that the reason why the records found in the center of the block for Volume 1 were duplicated lays in the fact that the

binding of the *Chronological Table* to the current structure did not occur at the same time as that of *Wonder* and the other seven chapters.

Why was the prologue in front of the Wonder chapter?

The likelihood that the *Chronological Table*, *Wonder* and other seven chapters of the <Samguk yusa> were not originally bound together is also enhanced by a look at the prologue found in the *Wonder* chapter. While a prologue is generally placed on the front page of a book, in the Imsin edition of the <Samguk yusa>, the prologue is actually located in front of the second chapter *Wonder* and not the first chapter *Chronological Table*. In addition, the problem becomes even more complex when we look at the actual contents of the prologue itself as pertains to the reason why the *Wonder* chapter was placed at the front of the book. To this end, the following entry can be found in the prologue:

The ancient sages founded states by use of ritual and music, and fostered culture with humanity and justice, not claiming marvelous strength or the aid of treacherous gods. However when emperor and king appeared, they received a symbol of heaven mandate and a sign of prophecy setting them apart from others. After that they were able to ride the changing tide, seize the treasured regalia and accomplish the great work. (ellipsis) Therefore no pen can describe all the wonders attending the births of the founders of the three kingdoms. For this reason, Wonder is set down here as precedents for the other chapters.

As this prologue is situated in front of the *Wonder* chapter and its contents for the most revolve around that particular chapter, the general consensus has been that this in fact constitutes the prologue solely to the *Wonder* chapter, and not the <Samguk yusa> as a whole. However,

attention must here be drawn to the last underlined sentence. This sentence makes it amply clear that the prologue was written from a standpoint that linked it not only to the *Wonder* chapter, but also to all of the other chapters that ensue, beginning with *Rise of Buddhism*. If this prologue had in fact been written solely for the *Wonder* chapter, then it would stand to reason that the other chapters would also each have their own such prologue to explain the significance of their contents. However, the only prologue is the one found in front of the *Wonder* chapter, and the actual text of the prologue revolves around the significance of placing the *Wonder* chapter at the beginning of this work. Therefore, this prologue should be regarded as the prologue for all eight chapters after *Wonder*, namely from the first chapter *Wonder* to the last one *Filial Piety*.

However, if the *Chronological Table* had in fact been located in front of *Wonder* at the time this prologue was written, as is the case in the Imsin edition, then the expression “*Wonder is set down here as precedents for the other chapters*” would not have been used. Thus, the conclusion can be reached that the prologue was in fact written under circumstances in which the *Wonder* chapter was combined with the other seven chapters, but the *Chronological Table* had yet to be added. Putting this reality together with the above-mentioned duplicity in terms of the records found in the center of the block for Volume 1 makes it amply evident why the prologue was located in front of the *Wonder* chapter rather than the one named *Chronological Table*. In other words, the prologue was written at a time when the structure of the <*Samguk yusa*> began with the *Wonder* chapter; thus, implying that the *Chronological Table* was subsequently placed in front of *Wonder*. This can be regarded as the reason why the prologue in the Imsin edition of the <*Samguk yusa*> is placed in front of the second chapter *Wonder* rather than the first one *Chronological Table*.

Thus, based on the line of reasoning developed above, it becomes evident that the original version of the <*Samguk yusa*> featured a prologue and eight chapters, which spanned from *Wonder* to *Filial Piety*, and that the *Chronological Table* was added later on. That being the case, it now becomes necessary to ascertain when the *Chronological Table* was

added.

The oldest printed edition of the <Samguk yusa> is the so-called “elder edition” published in about 1394 during early Chosŏn,¹⁰ or approximately 100 years before the Imsin edition. Of the remaining printed copies of the elder edition, the only one from which clear deductions can be made with regards to the relationship between the *Chronological Table* and *Wonder* is the “anonymous edition” introduced by Professor Kim Sanghyŏn. However, as this anonymous edition has yet to be released to the general public, the actual structure of the volumes cannot be ascertained.

The fact that one copy of a manuscript of Volume 1 of the elder edition of the <Samguk yusa> which includes the *Chronological Table* is presently housed in the Korea University Library makes it possible to draw some indirect conclusions in terms of the actual state of the elder edition.¹¹ This particular manuscript mirrors the mother edition in terms of the number of lines (*haeng*) and letters (*cha*) rendered; the use of blank spaces; and even in the mimicking of crushed letters caused in the original by damage occasioned by repeated printing of the blocks. This has led it to be perceived by many as a work whose historical value is on a par with the original edition.¹²

Analysis of this manuscript reveals that the elder edition of the <Samguk yusa> exhibits the same style of bookbinding as the one found in the Imsin edition of the <Samguk yusa>. The number of lines and letters used in the elder and Imsin editions are also identical. Moreover, in both editions, the prologue is located in the same position. Although the fact that it is a manuscript rather than one produced from the original wood blocks means that there is no way of knowing whether the records found in the center of the relevant block were faithfully rendered, it is believed that the order of Volume 1 including both *Chronological Table* and *Wonder* also duplicated in the elder edition such as the one found in the Imsin edition.

This theory is further supported by the fact that the Imsin edition of the <Samguk yusa> produced during the mid Chosŏn era was a complementary engraving meant to supplement damaged wooden blocks

from the elder edition of the <Samguk yusa> produced during early Chosŏn that served as the mother edition. In this regard, one study of the various editions found that of the 49 wooden blocks used to create Volume 2 of the Imsin edition, 24 emanated from the elder engraving wooden blocks used in to produce the elder edition created during early Chosŏn; meanwhile, the other 25 wooden blocks were new engravings produced in 1592.¹³ As such, many of the actual blocks used in conjunction with the elder edition of <Samguk yusa> produced during early Chosŏn were also employed in the *Imsin* edition produced during mid Chosŏn.

Therefore, the obvious overlap between the two editions and the same location of the prologue in both editions makes it highly possible that from the elder edition the *Chronological Table* was added in front of *Wonder* in much the same manner as was the case in the Imsin edition as mentioned above.

When was the first edition published?

No edition of the <Samguk yusa> produced during the Koryŏ era has yet to be uncovered. However, the claim that a wooden block edition of the <Samguk yusa> was printed during the later Koryŏ has been widely accepted. In this regard, it is generally believed that the first edition of the <Samguk yusa> was printed by Ilyŏn's disciple Mugŭk (1251-1322) in the 1310s.¹⁴ While the epitaph erected in Ilyŏn's honor in 1295, or six years after his death, includes a detailed list of the books compiled by Ilyŏn, no mention is made therein of the <Samguk yusa>. Moreover, the fact that two records in Volumes 4 and 5 of the <Samguk yusa> were written by Mugŭk would seem to indicate that the first edition of the <Samguk yusa> was in reality published by Mugŭk rather than Ilyŏn.

However, other scholars have recently advanced the notion that the elder edition of the <Samguk yusa> printed in Kyŏngju along with the <Samguk sagi> during early Chosŏn (circa 1394) was in fact the first

edition of the <Samguk yusa> ever produced.¹⁵ Thus, according to this line of reasoning, the <Samguk yusa> was first printed during the Chosŏn rather than Koryŏ era. Those who hold this position have asserted that a thorough analysis of the printed edition (Volume 3- Volume 5) of the elder edition of the <Samguk yusa> reveals the characteristics of a full-scale new engraving, and not that of a complementary engraving based on existing wooden blocks. Thus, this should be considered as a pristine rather than a secondary edition.

However, several issues can be raised with regards to this identification of the elder edition produced during early Chosŏn as the first edition of the <Samguk yusa>.

Above all, if this elder edition were in fact the first edition of the <Samguk yusa> ever published, then the dissemination of this work would have been quite limited prior to its appearance. More to the point, knowledge of the existence of <Samguk yusa> should have been limited to Ilyŏn's disciples and the few Buddhist temples whose denizens had seen it in manuscript form. Based on other works references to the <Samguk yusa>, previous studies have generally concurred that <Samguk yusa> first began to be disseminated during the 15th century. To this end, the first confirmed reference to the <Samguk yusa> can be found in the <Koryŏsa> compiled in 1451.¹⁶

However, there is ample evidence that the <Samguk yusa> had already begun to be disseminated during the final period of Koryŏ, or before the elder edition of <Samguk yusa> was printed during early Chosŏn (circa 1394).

First, the <Samguk yusa> is referred to in the <Kyŏngjusa suhochang haengan sŏ (慶州司首戶長行案序, Prologue of the List of Local Officials in Kyŏngju)> prepared during the 10th year of King Kongmin (1361). This material is a prologue to the <List of Local Officials in Kyŏngju>, which represents the oldest source found to date with which to confirm the onset of the dissemination of the <Samguk yusa>.¹⁷

As part of its description of the history of Kyŏngju, the prologue quotes from the records of Pak Hyŏkkŏse of Silla included in the *Wonder* chapter

of the <Samguk yusa>:

至正二十一年辛丑 正月日 慶州司首戶長行案
 州叱段 三國遺事內 開闢以來 辰韓之地 古有六部 一
日中興 二日南山 三日長福 四日通仙 五日加德 六日臨川
等叱 六部祖 前漢宣帝地節元年壬子 三月朔 各率子
弟 俱會闕川岸上 議曰 我輩上無君主 民皆放逸 盍
覓有德人爲君主 建邦設都 時有一紫卵 從天垂地 剖
其卵 得童男 形儀端正 卵如瓢 故姓朴 卵生之時 日月
清明 故因名赫居世 年至十三 以五鳳元年甲子 立國爲
王 國號徐羅 或斯羅 或鷄林 或新羅¹⁸

The underlined parts of the above sentences are quotes directly taken from the records of Pak Hyökköse of Silla found in the <Samguk yusa> Wonder chapter. Thus, we can see that <Samguk yusa> had already begun to be widely disseminated in the Kyōngju area by 1361.

This claim is given more credence by the fact that, as mentioned above, two other editions of the <Samguk yusa> were printed in Kyōngju, namely in 1394 and 1512. Why did the author of this prologue choose to quote from the <Samguk yusa> rather than the government-sponsored <Samguk sagi>, which was at that time already in wide distribution and featured similar records. In fact, the use of quotes from the <Samguk yusa> shows that the latter was already widely disseminated in the Kyōngju area by 1361, and also heightens the possibility that an earlier edition of the <Samguk yusa> may actually have been printed in Kyōngju.

Records found in the <Samguk yusa> were also referred to in the collection of Yi Ch'ōm(1345-1405)'s works, an intellectual who lived during the final period of Koryō and the early years of Chosōn. Although Yi did not make direct reference to the <Samguk yusa> such as the <Prologue of the List of Local Officials in Kyōngju>, he nevertheless quoted a record from the *Wei shu* that was included in Volume 1, *Old Chosōn* (Kojosōn) of *Wonder*. As such, it is evident that Yi read the <Samguk yusa> during his own lifetime.¹⁹

While the possibility that the version of the <Samguk yusa> read by Yi Ch'öm, who died in 1405, was the elder edition printed in 1394 in Kyöngju cannot be ruled out, there is an even greater likelihood, when the situation is approached from a chronological manner, that Yi in fact read an edition that was printed during the late Koryö era. The likelihood that Yi referred to an edition of the <Samguk yusa> other than the elder edition printed during early Chosön is given further credence by the fact that Yi used the inscription “註云(*chuun*)” when quoting from an annotation of the *Wei shu* found in *Old Chosön (Kojosön)* in the *Wonder* chapter (Volume 1) of the <Samguk yusa>. However, the elder edition of the <Samguk yusa> makes no references to “註云(*chuun*)” but rather “經云(*kyöngun*)”. In fact, questions have been raised as to the true identity of the book—the *kyöng* in 經云(*kyöngun*)—to which the <Samguk yusa> refers. Although some have advanced that the work in question was the <Sanhaegyöng (山海經, Classic of Mountains and Seas)>, this remains somewhat of a mystery as the existing version of the <Sanhaegyöng> contains no records which could confirm this fact. Thus, the source of the “經云(*kyöngun*)” referred to in the <Samguk yusa> has been perceived as unknown. However, a look at the relevant quotation contained in Yi Ch'öm's works raises the very distinct possibility that this entry was in fact originally written as “註云(*chuun*)” in the edition of <Samguk yusa> printed during the Koryö era, but subsequently changed to “經云(*kyöngun*)” from the elder edition printed during early Chosön onwards. There are many instances in which errors crop up during the process of engraving the wooden blocks used for a new edition of an existing work. Given this fact, it becomes conceivable that Yi Ch'öm did not in actuality read the elder edition of the <Samguk yusa> printed during the early Chosön but rather the edition printed during the Koryö era.

There is also a very high likelihood that the edition of the <Samguk yusa> quoted in the <Tongguk yöji süngnam (東國輿地勝覽, Augmented Survey of the Geography of Korea)> compiled in 1484 was not the elder edition printed during early Chosön. The <Tongguk yöji süngnam> quoted

the <*Samguk yusa*> on seven occasions, namely in connection with the 京畿 (Kyōnggi), 扶餘縣 (Puyō hyōn), 慶州府 (Kyōngju pu), 永川郡 (Yōngch'ōn kun), 迎日縣 (Yōngil hyōn), 星州牧 (Sōngju mok), and 開寧縣 (Kaeryōng hyōn) sections. In this regard, the quotes found in the 京畿 (Kyōnggi) and 迎日縣 (Yōngil hyōn) sections exhibit marked differences with those found in the elder edition of the <*Samguk yusa*> printed during early Chosōn.

First, the 京畿 (Kyōnggi) section of the <*Tongguk yōji sūngnam*> (Vol. 6) quotes from the *Mahan* section of the <*Samguk yusa*>'s *Wonder* chapter as follows: “三國遺事謂 麗地自有馬邑山 故名馬韓”. However, the relevant record in the elder edition of the <*Samguk yusa*> refers to “麗地自有邑山 故名馬韓.” As we can see, the 馬 in front of 邑山 has been omitted. As 馬 is also omitted in the relevant entry from the Imsin edition of the <*Samguk yusa*>, it becomes evident that the entry in question was engraved as 邑山 on the pertinent wooden block from the elder edition of the <*Samguk yusa*>.

Reference is also made to the name 馬邑山 (Maüpsan) in the *T'aejong Ch'unch'ugong* (King Muryōl) section of the *Wonder* chapter: “When General Su Tingfang of the Tang dynasty attacked Koguryō in 622, he established his military camp on 馬邑山 (Maüpsan) so as to be able to surround P'yōngyang Fortress. However, the Chinese troops were forced to scatter and flee due to a snowstorm.” In this regard, many scholars have argued that, based on this entry in the *T'aejong Ch'unch'ugong* (King Muryōl) section of the *Wonder* chapter, the character 馬 should be added in front of the 邑山 found in the *Mahan* section mentioned above.

However, if the compilers of the <*Tongguk yōji sūngnam*> had in fact seen a reference to 邑山 in the <*Samguk yusa*>, he would have made mention of the difference between 邑山 and 馬邑山. Instead, the compilers in actuality wrote, “The existence of a mountain named 馬邑山 (Maüpsan) in P'yōngyang adds credence to the entry found in the <*Samguk yusa*>”. Thus, unlike the *Mahan* section of the *Wonder* chapter of the elder edition of <*Samguk yusa*> printed during early Chosōn, the edition of the <*Samguk yusa*> referred to by the compilers of the

<Tongguk yōji sūngnam> must have been one which originally included the characters 馬邑山 in the *Mahan* section of the *Wonder* chapter.

In addition to the entry about 馬邑山(Maüpsan), the <Tongguk yōji sūngnam> also directly added that, “the author of this book(*Samguk yusa*) is unknown.” This entry would also not have been included if the compilers of the <Tongguk yōji sūngnam> had referred to the elder edition of the <Samguk yusa>. This is because, much like the Imsin edition, Volume 5 of the elder edition includes the following passage clearly identifying Ilyōn as the author of this book: “國尊曹溪宗迦智山下麟角寺住持圓徑冲照大禪師一然撰”. Of course, the fact that the identity of the author is only revealed in Volume 5 has also led to much debate.

Then, why and how did the compilers of the <Tongguk yōji sūngnam> fail to see the name of the author of the <Samguk yusa> when it is in fact clearly written on the first page of Volume 5? As mentioned above, the <Tongguk yōji sūngnam> quoted from seven different entries contained in the <Samguk yusa>: five quotes from Volume 1, two quotes each from Volume 2 and Volume 4. In Volume 29 of the <Tongguk yōji sūngnam>, and more specifically in the section dealing with Kalhang Temple in Kaeryōng-hyōn, reference is made to the *Monk Sūngjōn Preaches to Stone Skeletons* (勝詮觸髓) section found in Volume 4 of the <Samguk yusa>. In this regards, the location of this entry in the <Samguk yusa> is very close to that of the first page of Volume 5 in which the author is introduced. How could the compilers of the <Tongguk yōji sūngnam> see the entry pertaining to the *Monk Sūngjōn Preaches to Stone Skeletons* (勝詮觸髓) section located at the end of Volume 4 but fail to see the record “一然撰 (Ilyōn ch'an)”, clearly identifying Ilyōn as the author, found on the front page of Volume 5.

As the <Tongguk yōji sūngnam> was compiled in 1484, it is highly possible that the compilers did in fact refer to the elder edition of the <Samguk yusa> printed circa 1394. However, much like the Imsin edition, Volume 5 of the elder edition, which can still be found to this day, clearly includes an entry in which the words “一然撰 (Ilyōn ch'an)” can be read.

That being the case, the possibility grows that the compilers of the <*Tongguk yöji süngnam*> in fact had access to the other edition of the <*Samguk yusa*> in which no entry bearing the words 一然撰 (Ilyön ch'an) appeared in Volume 5.

In addition, the section of the <*Tongguk yöji süngnam*> (Volume 23) that dealt with Kojök in Yöngil hyön also quoted from the *Yönorang and Seonyö* section of the *Wonder* chapter of the <*Samguk yusa*> (Volume 1). In this particular entry reference is made to “迎烏郎 (Yöngorang)”, which once again differs from the reference to “延烏郎 (Yönorang)” found in the elder edition of the <*Samguk yusa*>. As the compilers of the <*Tongguk yöji süngnam*> himself declared, the story of Yönorang and Seonyö can only be found in the <*Samguk yusa*>, and not in Kim Pusik's <*Samguk sagi*> or Kwön Kün's <*Tongguk saryak* (東國史略, An Abridged History of the Eastern Kingdom)>. That being the case, there would appear to be no other sources from which the compilers of the <*Tongguk yöji süngnam*> could have taken the term “迎烏郎 (Yöngorang)”.

Meanwhile, a look at the poem, “送僧敬敏還五臺山 山在江陵” written by Kim Chongjik (1431-1492), who actively participated in the compilation of the <*Tongguk yöji süngnam*>, includes the following passage “The Ch'ölyön (鐵蓮) referred to in this poem was taken from an ancient story found in the <*Samguk yusa*>.”²⁰ While Ch'ölyön means iron lotus, the story referred to in the above quote cannot be found in either the elder or Imsin editions of the <*Samguk yusa*>. The iron lotus referred to in Kim Chongjik's poem is actually taken from the *Fifty Thousand Images of Buddha on Mt. Odae* section found in Volume 3 of the <*Samguk yusa*>, in which a story that involves a blue lotus (青蓮, Ch'öngyön) is told. Although this “青蓮 (Ch'öngyön) of Mt. Odae” is included in both the elder and Imsin editions of the <*Samguk yusa*>, no mention is made therein of Kim Chongjik's “鐵蓮 (Ch'ölyön).” In addition, the poem at the end of the *Yönhoe and Munsujöm* section found in Volume 5 of the <*Samguk yusa*> contains the phrase “自緣庭下青蓮誤”. Here again, this stands in contrast with the “應知林下鐵蓮開” referred to in Kim's poem, as one refers to a blue lotus and the other to an iron one.

What edition of the <Samguk yusa> did Kim read that motivated him to include this story of an iron lotus? From what we have seen above, it would appear that this was not the elder edition of the <Samguk yusa> which was printed during early Chosŏn and is still extant today. That being the case, it becomes highly probable that the compilers of the <Tongguk yŏji sŭngnam>, including Kim Chongjik, referred to a different edition of the <Samguk yusa> other than the elder edition.

It is highly possible that the compilers of the <Tongguk yŏji sŭngnam> referred to an edition of the <Samguk yusa> which was printed during the Koryŏ era. This is because it is difficult to believe that another edition of the <Samguk yusa> was printed during the 80 years that separated the printing of the elder edition in 1394 and the compilation of the <Tongguk yŏji sŭngnam> in 1484. As the Insin edition was printed in 1512, it is again difficult to believe that another wooden block edition of the <Samguk yusa> was printed just prior to 1484.

Scholars in the field of bibliographic studies have advanced the theory that two wooden block editions of the <Samguk yusa> were created during the Chosŏn era, namely in 1394 and 1512. That being the case, if the compilers of the <Tongguk yŏji sŭngnam> published in 1484 did in fact see a different edition of the <Samguk yusa> than the elder edition produced in 1394, then the conclusion must be reached that the work they perused was actually an edition printed during the late Koryŏ era. In other words, the edition of the <Samguk yusa> printed during late Koryŏ not only continued to be disseminated after the publication of the elder edition in 1394, but was used to compile the <Tongguk yŏji sŭngnam>.

As such, the nature of the references made to the <Samguk yusa> in the <Kyŏngjusa suhochanghaengan sŏ (慶州司首戶長行案序, Prologue of the List of Local Officials in Kyŏngju)> prepared in 1361, the works of Yi Ch'ŏm, a scholar who died in 1405, and in the poems of Kim Chongjik, who was one of the compilers of the <Tongguk yŏji sŭngnam> in 1484, raise the possibility that the <Samguk yusa> had already been printed and disseminated to the general public during the late Koryŏ era, that is, before the publication of the elder edition of 1394. Furthermore, given the

gap between the publication of the elder edition (1394) and the Imsin edition (1512), it can be surmised that the first edition of the <*Samguk yusa*> produced during late Koryŏ was published sometime around the 1310s, as some previous studies had already assumed.

Conclusion

Based on a review of existing studies, this study attempted to introduce a new method of approaching the doubts that surround the edition of the <*Samguk yusa*>. In this regard, the following can be regarded as a summary of the main findings of this study.

1. The current edition of the <*Samguk yusa*>, namely the Imsin edition printed in 1512, is one in which duplicate entries for Volume 1 can be found. More to the point, while in the record of center of block for *Chronological Table* begins with Volume 1: Block 1, the ensuing *Wonder* chapter also begins with Volume 1: Block 1. The analysis conducted herein of this problem from the standpoint of the overall structure of the <*Samguk yusa*> wielded the hypothesis that the book's nine chapters were in reality not originally bound together into the same book. Rather, while *Wonder* and the other seven chapters were bound together first, the *Chronological Table* was affixed to the front at a later date.

2. The oldest edition of the <*Samguk yusa*> which is still extant is the elder edition published in 1394. In this regard, a comparison of the elder (1394) and Imsin editions (1512) of the <*Samguk yusa*> revealed that the *Chronological Table* and *Wonder* chapter were bound in an identical fashion. Here, special attention should be paid to the fact that the prologue was positioned in front of *Wonder* rather than the *Chronological Table* in both of these editions. Thus, we can surmise that the *Chronological Table*, *Wonder*, and other seven chapters were first bound in this manner in the elder edition prepared during early Chosŏn. In other

words, much as is the case with the Imsin edition of 1512, the duplication of Volume 1 was not corrected in the elder edition of the <Samguk yusa> as *Chronological Table* was also placed in front of the *Wonder* chapter. In addition, based on the fact that the prologue is located on the front page of the *Wonder* chapter rather *Chronological Table*, the conclusion can be reached that Volume 1 of the book consisted solely of the *Wonder* chapter when the prologue was written.

3. Although no edition of the <Samguk yusa> printed during the Koryŏ era has yet to be found, claims that a wooden block edition of the <Samguk yusa> was printed during the late Koryŏ era have widely been accepted. However, the recently introduced hypothesis that the elder edition of the <Samguk yusa> printed during early Chosŏn (about 1394) in Kyŏngju was actually the first edition of the <Samguk yusa> has also gained steam within academic circles. However, a look at the evidence that the <Samguk yusa> had already been widely disseminated during late Koryŏ, that is well before the publication of the elder edition during early Chosŏn, helps to increase the possibility that the first edition of the <Samguk yusa> was in fact printed during later Koryŏ. Previous studies have identified an entry found in the <Koryŏsa (History of Koryŏ)> compiled in 1451 as the first reference to the <Samguk yusa>. The fact that the existence of such a reference proves that the <Samguk yusa> had already been widely disseminated by the 15th century has subsequently become the foundation upon which those who argue that the 1394 edition represents the first edition of the <Samguk yusa> have rested their case. However, a look at the references to the <Samguk yusa> contained in such works as the <Kyŏngjusa suhochanghaengan sŏ (慶州司首戶長行案序, Prologue of the List of Local Officials in Kyŏngju)> prepared in 1361, the works of Yi Ch'ŏm, a scholar who died in 1405, and in the poems of Kim Chongjik, who was one of the compilers of the <Tongguk yŏji sŏngnam> in 1484, raise the possibility that the <Samguk yusa> had already been published and disseminated to the general public during the late Koryŏ era, that is, before the publication of the elder edition of 1394.

Key Word : Samguk yusa, Imsin edition, elder edition, first edition

Notes :

- 1 The 7th year of the reign of King Chungjong (1512) coincides with the 7th year of Ming's Zhengde (Chōngdōk) era, and falls under the year of Imsin according to the Ganzhi method of recording dates. For this reason, the wooden block edition of the <Samguk yusa> printed in 1512 in Kyōngju has been referred to as the Chōngdōk or Imsin edition. In this study, it is referred to as the Imsin edition.
- 2 Printed versions of the Imsin edition of the <Samguk yusa> are currently housed in the Seoul National University Library, Korea University Library's *Mansong mun'go* and *Yuktang mun'go*, and Japan's Tenri University Library. While the edition housed in Seoul National University and Tenri University Library are complete, the edition housed in the *Mansong mun'go* of Korean University does not contain Block 49 of Volume 2, Block 1 and the front part of Block 2 of Volume 3, Block 30 of Volume 5, or the epilogue. Meanwhile, the edition housed in the *Yuktang mun'go* of Korea University Library has only Volumes 3-5. Moreover, Block 1-10 of Volume 3 and the latter part of Block 18 of Volume 5 until the end of that particular volume are also missing.
- 3 Ch'oe Namsōn, 1943, *Sinjōng Samguk yusa*, Samjungdang; Yi Kibaek, 1987, The structure of the volumes and chapters of the Samguk yusa (*Samguk yusaüi p'yōnmok kusōng*), *Buddhism and General Studies (Pulgyōwa chegwahak)*, Tongguk University
- 4 Ch'oe Namsōn, 1927, "Samguk yusa", *Kyemyōng*, Vol. 18
- 5 Ch'ae Sangsik, 1986, "The Chronological Table of Inhūngsa published in 1278 and the Samguk yusa (*Chiwōn 15 nyōn (1278) inhūngsagan yōkdae yōnp'yowa Samguk yusa*)", *Problems associated with the <History of Koryō> (Koryōsaiüi chemunje)*, Samyōngsa
- 6 Murakami Yoshio, 1981, "Sangoku iji kosho (Textual research on the Samguk yusa)", *Journal of Korean History Studies (朝鮮學報)*, Vol. 99 and 100
- 7 Kim Sanghyōn, 1987, "A bibliographical study of the Samguk yusa (*Samguk yusaüi sōjihakchōk koch'al*)", *Comprehensive Analysis of the Samguk yusa*

- (*Samguk yusaüi chonghapchöck kömt'ö*), Academy of Korean Studies
- 8 Yi Künjik, 1998, “The characteristics of the Chronological Table of the Samguk yusa and the timeframe for its compilation (*Samguk yusa wangnyökküi p'yönoch'an sönggyökkwa sigi*)”, *Journal of Korean History (Han'guksa yön'gu)*, Vol. 101
 - 9 *Tongmunso* (東文選), Vol. 2, 賦 三都賦 “...先有崔孤雲者嘗曰 聖人之氣 醞醞山陽 鶴嶺松青 鷄林葉黃 紫雲未起 預識興亡 鐵原寶鏡 墮自上蒼 先雞後鳴 斯言孔彰...”
 - 10 Printed versions of the elder edition of 1394 include an incomplete edition possessed by Kwak Yöngdae (Volumes 3-5), an incomplete anonymous edition introduced by Professor Kim Sanghyön (Chronological Table – Volume 2), incomplete edition possessed by Cho Chongöp (Volume 2), incomplete edition introduced by Nam Kwönhüi (Volume 2), and the incomplete edition possessed by Pömösa (Volumes 4-5).
 - 11 This edition, an incomplete one that featured solely the *Chronological Table* and Volume 1, was owned by Song Sökha until the 1940s. However, its whereabouts are unknown since the Korean War. A manuscript of this incomplete edition copied by Son Chint'ae is currently housed in the Korea University Library.
 - 12 Ryu Puhyön, 2007, *Textual bibliography of the Samguk yusa (Samguk yusaüi kyogamhakchöck yön'gu)*, Korean Studies Information
 - 13 Yu T'akil, 1983, “Literary change evident in the Samguk yusa and the causes thereof (*Samguk yusaüi munhön pyönhwa yangsanggwa pyönin*)”, *Study of the Samguk yusa (Samguk yusa yön'gu)* I, Yöngnam University Press
 - 14 Takahashi Toru, 1955, The development of the Tan'gun myth in the Samguk yusa (三國遺事の註及檀君傳説の發展), *Journal of Korean History Studies (朝鮮學報)*, Vol. 7; Kim Sanghyön, 1982, “The publication and dissemination of the Samguk yusa (*Samguk yusaüi kanhaenggwa yut'ong*)”, *Journal of Korean Studies (Han'guksa yön'gu)*, Vol. 38
 - 15 Ha Chöngryong, 2002, *The Compilation and Publication of the Samguk yusa (Samguk yusaüi p'yönoch'an'gwa kanhaenge taehan yön'gu)*, PhD dissertation, Korea University; Ch'ön Hyebyong, 2002, “The timeframe and location in which the wooden blocks of the Samguk yusa were engraved (*Samguk yusa p'an'gaküi sigiwa changso*)”, *Collection of Essays for the Second Academic Conference on National Preceptor Ilyön (Che 2hoe Ilyön pogak kuksa haksuk taehoe charyojip)*, In'gaksa, Institute of Ilyön School

- 16 Kim Sanghyŏn, 1982, *ibid*
- 17 Park Daejae, 2002, “Revision of the *Samguk yusa* – a bibliographical introduction (*Samguk yusa chŏmggyo-haeje*)”, *Han ’guksa Hakpo*, Vol. 12
- 18 This follows the manner in which the characters were arranged in the original edition. For more on the translation and annotations of the original copy, please refer to Rho Myŏnggho et al., 2000, *Study of Documents from the Korean Ancient and Middle Ages (Han ’guk kodae chungse komunsŏ yŏn ’gu) I*, Seoul National University Press
- 19 Park Daejae, 2001, “Essay on the Wei Shu quoted in the Kojosŏn section of the <*Samguk yusa*> (*Samguk yusa kojosŏnjo inyong wisŏron*)”, *Journal of Korean Studies (Han ’guksa yŏn ’gu)*, Vol. 112
- 20 Kim Chongjik, Chŏmp’iljajip (佔畢齋集, Collection of the works of Chŏmp’iljae), poetry, Vol. 11

Submission date: 2008.12.1 completion date of review: 2009.1.30

〈국문초록〉

《삼국유사》 판본의 몇 가지 문제점

박대재(고려대 한국사학과 조교수)

「삼국유사」는 고려시대 승려 일연(1206~1289)에 의해 편찬된 고대 한국의 역사와 문화에 대해 기록한 고전으로 알려져 있다. 김부식의 「삼국사기」와 함께 한국 고대사 연구의 2대 원전으로 넓게 인정받고 있다. 그런데 그동안 「삼국유사」에 대해 많은 연구가 진행되었음에도 불구하고, 「삼국유사」의 판본 문제에 대해서는 아직까지도 학계의 논란이 정리되지 않고 있다. 「삼국유사」의 판본 문제는 현재 우리가 보고 있는 「삼국유사」가 과연 얼마나 고려시대의 원형을 유지하고 있는가의 문제와 직결된 매우 중요한 연구 과제이다. 그러나 그동안 역사학 쪽에서는 이에 대한 검토가 적었다.

현재의 통행본인 1512년에 간행된 임신본 「삼국유사」의 판심 기록에서 권1이 중복해서 나오는 문제점을 검토해 본 결과, 왕력과 기이 이하 8편은 통행본과 같이 원래부터 한 책으로 제본되어 있었던 것이 아니라, 기이 이하의 8편이 먼저 제본되고 그 뒤에 왕력이 그 앞에 첨부되었던 것으로 판단된다. 또한 1394년 무렵에 간행된 고판본과 임신본을 비교해 보면, 두 판본에서 모두 서문이 왕력이 아니라 기이편의 서두에 붙어있다는 점이 주목된다. 이를 통해서 기이편 앞에 왕력이 첨부되어 간행된 것은 조선 초기 고판본 단계부터라는 것을 확인할 수 있다. 최근에 1394년 무렵 경주에서 간행된 고판본이 「삼국유사」의 초간본이라는 견해가 점차 학계의 공감을 얻어가고 있는 추세다. 그러나 이미 고려 후기부터 조선 초기까지 고판본과는 다른 계통의 판본이 유통되고 있었던 새로운 근거들을 통해 볼 때, 「삼국유사」의 초간본은 고려 후기에 간행되었을 가능성이 여전히 더 높다고 판단된다.

주제어: 삼국유사, 임신본, 고판본, 초간본