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Introduction

When Silla’s capital is compared with those in other East Asian ancient societies, the fact is always referred to that its position has never been changed since the foundation of the kingdom. In addition to the longevity of its history, this indicates that Silla is definitively differentiated from other capital cities. Nonetheless, evidences show that the kingdom also changed subject to the general development of the capital city system in East Asia. Specifically, Silla’s capital sometimes followed the general trend and was sometimes transformed into its own unique types.

Indeed, the study of the Silla’s capital city system can be traced back to the traditional times prior to the Japanese colonial rule, but it was made difficult to go on with such study due to the limitations in understanding of area in a modern sense at that time. Accordingly, a full-scale study of Silla’s capital could not begin before the completion of the land survey project that caused a creation of the land register, which Fujishima Gaijiro (藤島亥治郎), an engineer of the Korean Governor-General was in charge of. The survey revealed that Silla’s capital was similar to the Chinese and Japanese ancient ones in spite of differences. Thereafter, the studies of capital generated a genealogy centering on the cadastral map
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At the advent of the 1970s, Yoon Moo-byeong presented a new plan to rebuild Silla’s capital city, which led to the directional change in recognition of capitals. According to him, there was a south-north big street like the Jujak Main Street (朱雀大路), which lied in Tang’s capital Changan, in the Unified Silla Kingdom’s capital. This study laid groundwork for getting a full-scale concept of “plan” introduced in the study of Silla’s capital. However, such concept-oriented study included a certain problem, which was whether such plan was practically confirmed by excavation survey etc. Such problem was raised on a full scale on completion of a full excavation survey on the Hwangnyong Temple.
remains conducted according to the same sightseeing development plan. That was because the survey confirmed the road remains built when Gyeongju had been Silla’s capital.³

<Figure 2> The Reconstruction Diagram of Silla Capital (Yoon Moo-byeong)

Thereafter, the capital, understood by means of cadastral map and concept, revealed its realities little by little, as lots of road remains of the same period were found during the excavation surveys for the individual development projects across Gyeongju.⁴

Meanwhile, during such survey and study, an opinion emerged that Silla’s capital was arranged not at a time, but through a long period and several transformations.⁵ Furthermore, Uh Seong-hoon presented a restoration map of the capital based on the then land division by combining the cadastral map and the topographical map worked out in 1917. He considered the capital to have been expanded over time,
dividing the city plan of the capital into three periods: the 1st period between 57 BC-527, the 2nd period between 527 and 765 and the 3rd period between 765 and 935.6

However, it was an excavation survey of the area to the east of the Hwangnyong Temple remains that brought about the greatest change. In 2002, the National Gyeongju Cultural Property Institute published a report titled “Silla’s Capital City” from surveys of more than sixteen years.7 This also showed the birth of a new basic data that would completely change the existing understanding of the Gyeongju as Silla’s capital city, which had been independently grasped by individual researchers even without any spatial material that could play a role as a standard.

Such result laid groundwork for another finding that there were important sub-periods different from each other even the period between 527 AD (King Beopheung) and 765 (King Gyeongdeok) Uh saw as the second one.

Lee Eun-seok confirmed that there are some differences in distance and angle between road divisions, after examining the excavated remains in terms of the development, expansion, construction period, structure etc of Silla’s capital.8

Based on the findings, he came to a conclusion that Silla’s capital had not been subject to a consequent city panning all over the area, but had had new districts built in accordance with the expansion of the area. Specifically, the capital’s construction was based on the street division system centering on Wolseong and Hwangnyong Temple in the middle 6th century, expanded to the west region, to the north and then east of the Northern Stream from the 7th century, and wholly completed in the 8th century. In addition, the oblique land division to the north of the Northern Stream is deeply related to the construction direction that slants toward the north by some 20 degree, which is found around Bunhwang Temple.

Further, Hwang In-ho designed the scope and structure of Silla’s capital that varied over time, based on the characteristics of road remains.9 This allowed him to understand that a small planned city was
built around Wolseong, royal castle and Hwangnyong Temple, a national temple, in the 1st stage of early years. In terms of the capital’s 2nd stage arrangement, he estimated that its period corresponded to that of the Northern Palace’s construction immediately prior to the kingdom’s unification, but thereafter paid attention to the accurate investigation of the north palace’s construction period and the possibilities under the reign of King Sinmun who established the national system and royal power of the Unified Silla Kingdom. In short, he thought that a planned city was expanded centering around the Jeollangji (building site) estimated to be the north palace. And he thought that the last 3rd stage arrangement is shown by Bangri (坊里) categorized into the outskirts of the capital since the 8th century which saw a drastic increase in the capital’s population and by the land division adjusted to some topographical conditions.

However, the problem is that the studies presented the various opinions, such as 9 divisions and 16 divisions, according to the existence of Jujak Road or road widths, but could not apply to Silla’s capital. This shows that there is a limitation in determining the capital’s trend or similarity to the Japanese or Chinese capitals in planning by means of the mere comparison with the capital city system in East Asia centering on street division.

Nonetheless, it is also difficult to judge that Silla’s capital was developed 100% independently of the capital city system’s trend in East Asia. Consequently, it seems that the solution of such problem requires reexamining the capital in a direction from the existing ones from the 6th century from which road remains, evidences of city planning, derive. The studies are the same as each other in that they consider the 1st stage arrangement of the capital closely related to the erection of Hwangnyong Temple under the reign of King Jinheung and the capital centering on Wolseong and Hwangnyong Temple. This study will first examine Hwangnyong Temple and its vicinity, an essence of the capital excavation survey, and then reexamine the relationships between the Silla capital’s changes and the East Asia’s capital city system.
Genealogy of East Asian Capital City System and Central Large Temples

Recently, the road remains examined in Silla’s capital are evenly found in nearly all regions, but it is the outer region of the Hwangnyong Temple’s site that played a central role from the beginning of survey. Judging from the remains excavated, it is highly probable that the roads were built or rearranged at a time similar to that of Hwangnyong Temple’s construction. In other words, Hwangnyong Temple was independently built, but located in a space partitioned by roads. Accordingly, Hwangnyong Temple was built, with the plan partially revised, when a certain problem occurred where a palace would be built according to the remodeling plan of the capital, or was built according to the capital plan newly worked out under construction.

*Figure 3* The Road Site of the Area to the East of the Hwangnyong Temple
It is Yongning Temple in Luoyang of Northern Wei that is similar to Hwangnyong Temple. Luoyang was an utterly planned capital in Northern Wei. The capital was transferred from Pingcheng to Luoyang in 494 in connection with Emperor Xiaowendi’s reinforcement of royal power. During this process, Luoyang was built in a new structure which got the palaces, including the royal audience chamber, located in the north, unlike other former capitals. Yongning Temple was rebuilt in the new capital Luoyang in 516, when a considerable time elapsed after the transfer of the capital to Luoyang. However, the historic data below shows that Yongning Temple was associated with the construction of the Luoyang Fortress:

This indicates that Yongning Temple in Luoyang was rebuilt within the capital according to the city plan. Accordingly, it is estimated that the construction of Yongning Temple centered on some edifices when the capital was built, and was later completed when the 9-story wooden tower was erected by Empress Dowager of Ling.
Such relationships between Yongning Temple and capital city system can be seen in the road remains around Yongning Temple, which were found in the Luoyang earth surface survey in 1962 and the follow-up excavation surveys. To sum up, Yongning Temple is a national temple built according to a capital plan of Luoyang.

Though there is a difference in time, such examples are also found in Japan: Fujiwara Capital and Taikantaiji Temple.

Fujiwara Capital was discussed on a full scale by Kishi Toshio in 1969, centering on the capital area and land division. Thereafter, various opinions emerged on the capital area. When the remains in Umehara and Sakurai cities were examined in 1966, some scholars understood them as the road remains by land division that show the capital extremes of Fujiwara Capital located outside the existing restoration plan. The more neighboring regions were excavated, the more Fujiwara Capital’s area was expanded, with the palace location as capital’s middle, not north understood. In addition, a possibility was raised that Fujiwara Capital had its palace area decided from the beginning, as
the capital’s land division was made prior to the construction of the palace. From this point of view, it seems that Fujiwara Capital had its building and road locations divided according to the capital plan, though their construction stages were not the same as each other due to insufficient measuring and construction technologies. According to findings, Taikantaiji Temple occupied 594 acres, the largest of single areas, except Fujiwara Capital. In addition, a survey was made of the facilities in open grounds at the border regions. This indicates that Taikantaiji Temple has to be understood under the capital plan.

As mentioned above, Luoyang in Northern Wei, Gyeongju in the middle ancient period of Silla and Fujiwara Capital in Japan may have been different from each other in terms of construction period and intention, but they were the same as each other in that central large temples were built according to capital plans. This allows us to understand that the horizontal division of the earliest period found around Hwangnyong Temple was in line with those capitals.

<Figure 6> The Map of Fujiwara Capital in Japan
**Dual Taegeukjeon System (二重太極殿制) in the Capital**

The capital’s central large temples showed that their Main Shrines (金堂) were the same as each other in terms of structure and scope.

According to the excavation survey, the rebuilt Main Shrine site in Hwangnyong Temple had a structure of a total of 44 corner stones and 9 kan (room) × 4 kan (11 kan × 4 kan in case of pent roof is included: 55.3 m (east-west) × 30.4 m (north-south); upper base: 49.4 m × 24.5 m). Characteristically, the site had a so-called “inner-outer dual structure” in that there were 18 inner-line columns and 26 outer-line columns; 19 pedestal stones, including Jangnyukjon Buddhist image (丈六尊像)’s pedestal stone, inside the inner-line columns; a wall between inner-line column cornerstone rows. Encircling 19 pedestal stones, the wall had its frontal side alone opened through inner and outer lines.

*<Figure 7> The Map of Main Shrine Site in Hwangnyong Temple*
Such structure was found in Yongning Temple in Luoyang. A total of four excavation surveys till 1994\(^2\) showed that Buddhist altar site was a east-west rectangle plane of 54 m × 25 m, as seen in the vestiges of Panchuk (板築), though they were heavily damaged. The report illustrates a structure restored in a structure of 9 kan (front) × 3 kan (side) in accordance with the South Gate. This enables to consider the structure as possible to set the inner lines.

<Figure 8> The Map of Yongning Temple Site in Luoyang

The Main Shrine with such structure was also found in Taikantaiji Temple in Fujiwara Capital. The Nara National Cultural Property Institute led a planned excavation of Taikantaiji Temple in Fujiwara Capital for about 10 years (1973-1882). The excavation made clear that the building of 9 × 4 kan structure (base platform: 53 m (front) × 28.5 m (side); building: 45.2 m (front) × 20.7 m (side) was Main Shrine. Such form had never been found before.
The problem was that the Main Shrine of Taikantaiji Temple was the same as the *Taegeukjeon* (太極殿, Pavilion) in Fujiwara Capital in terms of plane structure or scope. According to Report on Temples in Luoyang (洛陽伽藍記), Yongning Temple’s Main Shrine behind a wooden pagoda, built in Luoyang, Northern Wei’s capital, is the same as *Taegeukjeon* in terms of form, as seen in ‘浮圖北有佛殿一所 形如太極殿’.

Judging from this, the capital’s *Taegeukjeon* had the same form as the Buddhist altar of Yongning Temple in Luoyang and the Main Shrine of Taikantaiji Temple in Fujiwara Capital, each plane of which had a structure of 9 kan × 4 (3) kan and a rectangular size of over 50 m × over 20 or 30 m. Therefore, though no palace-related ruin has been found in Gyeongju, it seems reasonable to understand that there was already
Taegeukjeon as a royal audience chamber in order to get the middle Main Shrine of Hwangnyong Temple built in a form of Taegeukjeon.

It seems that Luoyang and Yongning Temple in Northern Wei and Fujiwara Capital and Taikantaiji Temple in Japan have been built according to a city plan with outwardly identical features in that all of them had two buildings assuming the form of Taegeukjeon within the capitals. In addition, the middle Main Shrine of Hwangnyong Temple shows that there was a capital plan to accept such form of a Main Shrine.

This study will understand that the capital plan with such characteristics had the same intention as the “故都城制” in 释老志 of Weiseo (魏書, Book of Wei). This is because all of them clearly had the same capital plan in that the Main Shrine was constructed in a form of Taegeukjeon, a building referable to as royal authority itself, though it varied in several respects due to the differences in space and time. This study will approach the capitals with such features in a genealogy of the dual Taegeukjeon system (二重太極殿制) within the capital.

Genealogy of the Capital System in Wei, Chin and South and North Dynasties: Taegeukjeon (太極殿) and East and West Vice-Pavilions (東西堂)

On the other hand, Yongning Temple in Luoyang and Taikantaiji Temple in Fujiwara Capital were different from Hwangnyong Temple in some respects. Hwangnyong Temple had accessory buildings called East and West Vice-Shrine Buildings to the left and right of the Main Shrine in a form of Taegeukjeon. Since its excavation, Hwangnyong Temple has been understood as a so-called Silla-style temple with one pagoda and three Main Shrine Buildings, which occurred, as a form of one pagoda and three Main Shrine Buildings, as seen in Goguryeo’s Cheongamri Temple remains, varied in the process of taking root in Silla. Divided into founded and rebuilt ones, temples have been also approached in terms of change. The founded temples were built, with a new palace transformed...
into a Buddhist temple; the rebuilt temples were built, with a Jangnyukjon Buddhist image and a nine-story wooden pagoda erected. A rebuilt temple was understood to have been constructed not at a time: first, the middle Main Shrine Building, where a Jangnyukjon Buddhist image was enshrined and then East and West Main Shrine Buildings were built, completing three Main Shrine Buildings; the rebuilt middle gate and the South corridor as a dual corridor were built at the nearly same time as the nine-story pagoda was erected.  

Figure 10: The Map of Hwangnyong Temple Site

However, the review of reports showed that there were buildings of considerable sizes to the left and right of the Main Shrine Building of a founded temple, though it was difficult to accurately distinguish between new-palace and foundation stages. Accordingly, it has been determined that the buildings were divided by the corridor before the Main Building was constructed in the reconstruction period. According to the findings, the corridor, which divided buildings in a row, was abolished, while a temple was rebuilt to enshrine a Jangnyukjon Buddhist image, which expanded the Main Shrine Building in the center, while East and West Shrine Buildings were reduced from 9 kan to 7 kan at a similar period. Accordingly, it was considered to have a different meaning from the emergence of a Silla-style three Main Shrine Buildings that the corridor
disappeared and East and West Buildings were reduced, as the middle Main Building was constructed in a rebuilt temple.

Meanwhile, attention is drawn by a structure, which arranges accessory buildings of 7 kan to the left and right of a building that assumes the form of *Taegeukjeon*, in a completely different place: Anhak Palace of Goguryeo, the palace of Pyeongyangseong in the earlier period.\(^{32}\)

The South palace, located in the main area of Anhak Palace, shows that there are accessory buildings to the left and right between the first, second and third palace buildings. The first building in the South palace has a size of 11 kan (49 m) (front) × 4 kan (16.3 m) (side) on a rectangular site of 57.1 m (front) × 27.3 m (side). On the other hand, the second building in the South palace was located 50 m to the east of the first building. The building had a size of 7 kan (28.5 m) (front) × 4 kan (12.4 m) (side) on a site of 34 m (front) × 18.5 m (side). Located 50 m to the west of the first building, the third building forms symmetry with the second building. The building had a size of 7 kan (28.5 m) (front) × 4 kan (12.4 m) (side) on a site of 33 m (front) × 19 m (side).

Such plane arrangement structure, not found in the capital city system after Sui and Tang dynasties, is similar to the East-West Vice-Pavilions
system (東西堂制) in Wei, Chin, South and North Dynasties in which there were buildings to the left and right of *Taegeukjeon* (太極殿, Pavilion), As Emperor Wen (文帝) of CaoWei (曹魏) moved his capital from Ye (鄴) to Luoyang (洛陽) in the three kingdom era, *Taegeukjeon* and East and West Vice-Pavilions were built. Thereafter, East and West Vice-Pavilions were continuously constructed in Wei, Chin, South and North Dynasties. The East and West Vice-Pavilions were used for audience and emperor’s residence respectively in the Wei and West Chin ages in which the system of *Taegeukjeon* and East and West Vice-Pavilions came into existence. The basic form also survived in East Chin whose capital moved to Jiankang (建康), but greatly changed in character at the advent of the Song (宋) dynasty. Specifically, regular audiences also took place in the west building and emperor’s regular residence was separately built. Accordingly, the East and West Buildings lost their residential functions, changing into an arena for ceremony and audience, which survived in the South Dynasties, too.

<Figure 12> The Map of Jiankang (建康) Palace of South Dynasties
This was mostly case with North Dynasties: Northern Wei introduced the system of *Taegeukjeon* and East and West Vice-Pavilions, a basic Chinese palace form, as a Chinization policy of Northern Wei’s Emperor Xiaowendi (孝文帝), and East Wei (東魏) and North Qi (北齊) adopted the system, too. It seems that the East and West Vice-Pavilions in North Dynasties played similar roles to those in South Dynasties. This enables to know that the East and West Vice-Pavilions played supplementary roles of getting events as well as political activities occur to the left and right of *Taegeukjeon*.

However, it is known that the remains of the east or west building have never been investigated, as it has not yet determined the location of the palace in Jiankang, capital of South Dynasties since East Chin, an example of the capital city system during Wei, Chin, South and North Dynasties. Regrettably, there is nothing but a study saying that each of the East and West Vice-Pavilion Buildings was 7 kan to the left and right of *Taegeukjeon* at the palace in Jiankang.\(^{35}\)

In Goguryeo, there were supplementary buildings to the left and right of *Taegeukjeon*, which is not to be seen in the capitals of Sui and Tang dynasties. According to the existing studies, their size was 7 kan, corresponding to that of the East and West Vice-Pavilion Buildings, which showed that Goguryeo’s palace adopted the system of East and West Buildings which had disappeared in the Sui and Tang periods. This front’s 7 kan area is the same as that of a building to the left or right of the Main Building, which was reduced in the reconstruction process of Hwangnyong Temple. Therefore, Hwangnyong Temple’s rebuilt buildings except a wooden pagoda are the same as the palaces in the South and North Dynasties in terms of structure.

Then, the question is raised whether there were East and West Vice-Pavilions in Silla’s palaces:

敬順王立···爲甄萱所舉即位 舉前王屍 殲於西堂 與群下懽見\(^{36}\)

Though it is about a funeral held in a very urgent situation at a later
age, the above passage indicates that the palace as a specific space had a hall which played a certain role in Wei, Chin, South and North Dynasties, the East and West Vice-Pavilions served as places for emperor’s death as well as audience, banquet, funeral etc in place of Taegeukjeon. To the left and right of Taegeukjeon, the East and West Vice-Pavilions were used to hold various events as well as to perform daily political affairs.\(^{37}\) In the Chin dynasty, Empress Yungan installed a hut in the west building, which is comparable to the funeral held at the west building in Silla.\(^{38}\)

Accordingly, it will be possible to refer to the “West Vice-Pavilion” in a Silla’s palace as a hall that played a supplementary role beside Taegeukjeon.

In China, the west building disappeared completely from palaces after Sui and Tang. Nevertheless, it existed in a Silla’s palace till the kingdom’s end. This makes it possible to understand the system of East and West Buildings in a genealogy from Wei, Chin and South and North Dynasties over Goguryeo to Silla. Such system is closely related to the fact that Silla’s palaces were operated without great change after receiving the capital plan of Wei, Chin, South and North Dynasties.

**Changes in Silla’s Capital and Structure of Fujiwara Capital in Japan**

As mentioned above, Silla’s capital should be understood on the basis of the capital city system in East Asia prior to the introduction of Sui’s and Tang’s capital city system into Silla.\(^{39}\) Viewed from the genealogy of the capital city system in East Asia, the capital city system stylized in Northern Wei was received to build Anhak Palace, a palace in Pyeongyangseong in the earlier period of Goguryeo\(^ {40}\) and the system in Goguryeo was also received to build Silla’s capital.\(^ {41}\) Further, the Silla’s capital city system had much influence on Fujiwara Capital which had been built prior to Heijo Capital built after Sue’s and Tang’s capital city system.\(^ {42}\) Therefore, as mentioned above, Silla’s capital and Japan’s
Fujiwara Capital have the same genealogy in that they had the dual 
Taegeukjeon system within the capital.

However, the discussion on Fujiwara Capital in the context of the East 
Asian capital city system was nullified from the beginning by the new 
understanding of Fujiwara Capital’s construction that can be referred to as “a theory of spontaneous generation”, which has been discussed by 
Japanese scholars since 1996. Furthermore, this theory is gradually 
accepted among scholars, as early critical perspectives disappear. Such 
change in recognition has escaped the mere Japanese capital city system, 
making the development of East Asian capital system understood in a 
completely different direction. In other words, it is not necessary any 
longer to build Fujiwara Capital based on the comparison with East Asian 
three countries’ capitals, especially Silla’s capital of Korean ancient 
capitals.

The restoration plans have been continuously worked out, since Kishi 
Toshio presented an opinion that the basic model was not 
Tang’s Changan Capital, but Northern Wei’s Luoyang Capital. The key 
point of the restoration plan was that palaces were extremely located in 
the north. Based on the fact, Kishi said that Heijo Capital was nothing but 
the expansion and remodeling of Fujiwara Capital. Such opinion has 
been attacked several times, but understood as an established theory in 
Japan. The more neighboring regions were excavated, the more Fujiwara 
Capital’s area was expanded, with the palace location as capital’s middle, 
not north understood. This signifies that there was a capital plan 
altogether different from the existing prevailing opinion, which served as 
a momentum to present a restoration plan altogether different from the 
existing restoration one. The new restoration plan basically sees the 
Fujiwara Capital area set in a rectangular form of 10 jo (條) × 10 bang 
(坊, 10 ri (里) to all directions) from the beginning and its southernmost 
and northernmost areas established in equal distances to all directions 
from the palace.

In terms of form, this is greatly contrasted to the capitals since Heijo 
Capital that have their palaces located in their northernmost areas,
reminding us of the 封人營國條, 考工記, <Zhouli (周禮, Rites of the Zhou)> where the palace lies in the middle of the capital. In conclusion, the relevant studies argue that Fujiwara Capital was designed not after the model of a certain real capital in China, but based on the Chinese capital’s ideal type as seen in <Zhouli>, i.e. that Fujiwara Capital was a so-called ideology-led capital.

<Figure 13> The <Zhouli> Key Map of Capital System

They attributed such argument to the fact that Japan had no sufficient information on the capitals in China at that time. Specifically, it was difficult to get any information directly from China, as no envoy was dispatched to Tang for a long period from 669 (Tenji 8) to 702 (Taiho 2). In addition, they maintained that Fujiwara Capital was altogether different from Heijo Capital, saying that the Jujak Main Street in Fujiwara Capital did not correspond to its name, as it was no more than 1/3 as long as that in Heijo Capital, and could not easily function as a central Main Street due to hills and Asoka Stream and that there was topographically no Lashyomon Gate (羅城門) in the southernmost area of Fujiwara Capital. Like this, “the theory of spontaneous generation” is currently emerging as
a new theory in Japan that Fujiwara Capital was built according to a Japan’s independent capital plan.\textsuperscript{49}

However, Fujiwara-studies pay no attention to the fact that Japan had the extremely close relations with Silla, when the relations with Tang were cut off, which is referred to as a historic background against which the above independent capital city system came into being. \textit{Nihon shoki (日本書紀)} says that Japan sent envoys to Silla in 668, 670, 675 and 676 and that Silla sent envoys to Japan in 668, 669, 671, 672 and 673. Such exchanges could not have been made without close relations between Silla and Japan.\textsuperscript{50}

It is highly meaningful that the \textit{Taegeukjeon}-form building in the Asuka Palace, understood as one of very great changes in the Japanese ancient capital city system, was also built for the first time in the very Tenbu age in which Japan cut off the relations with China and had frequent exchanges with Silla. Then, the \textit{Taegeukjeon} was adopted as a royal audience chamber on a full scale in Fujiwara Capital, a new capital planned and built by Emperor Tenbu. Specifically, such change occurred, when it was difficult to get any information directly from China, as no envoy was dispatched to Tang for a long period from 669 (Tenji 8) to 702 (Taiho 2).

In addition to the interruption of diplomatic relations with Tang, the Jujak Main Street in Fujiwara Capital is said not to correspond to its own name, since it is no more than 1/3 as long as that in Heijo Capital. In addition to the palace location, the problem is seen as the greatest difference between Fujiwara Capital and Heijo Capital.

As regards Silla, an opinion was raised that there must have been no Jujak Main Street in Silla’s capital with the progress of the capital city’s excavation.\textsuperscript{51} While a street, partially found by the excavation of Seondeok Girls Commercial High School’s planned extension work site, an area where the Jujak Main Street is presumed to have existed, had a not so large breadth, a South-North Main Street of 23 m breadth, found by the excavation of the Gyeongju National Museum’s building for exhibition and storage, called the Central South-North Main Street by
Fujishima Gaijiro, allows one to estimate that it may have played a central role.\textsuperscript{53}

Besides, according to the theory of spontaneous generation, Fujiwara Capital is most different from other capitals in East Asia in that its palace area lies in the capital area’s middle, not north. The restoration similar to such form has been already presented in one of the plans on the restoration of Silla’s capital.

\textless Figure 14\textgreater The Diagram of Japan Fujiwara Capital

The existing many scholars, including Park Bang-ryong, proposed the opinions of putting Wolseong in the middle of the capital by adding new data, including road remains, to Fujishima’s plan on the restoration of Silla’s capital.\textsuperscript{54} In addition, it reminds us of Fujiwara Capital’s similarity with Silla’s capital altogether different from Heijo Capital in landscape\textsuperscript{55} that Fujiwara Capital had a Jujak Main Street difficult to function as a central Main Street due to hills and Asuka Stream or had no Lashyomon Gate in its southernmost area.\textsuperscript{56}

However, it is not sure whether such capital structure was designed when a city plan led by street division was worked out with respect to
Silla’s capital. The hitherto findings reveal that the initial street division was made in the area around Hwangnyong Temple. This allows one to estimate that the site of Hwangnyong Temple was planned to be that of a new palace and that the capital plan was worked out according to the site plan.

However, as the capital plan was changed, with the palace unfinished, the site was used to construct a temple and Wolseong was sued as a palace. Given the position a palace has in the capital of a pre-modern society, this means that the focus of the capital plan was changed from Hwangnyong Temple site to Wolseong. Therefore, it seems that the capital was gradually expanded from the originally set range centering on Wolseong to its neighboring areas. In this process, the Silla’s palace seems to have been naturally located in the middle of the capital. But in the practical process of construction, it is highly possible that there was any zone which changed in a way a bit different from the original plan due to the topographical conditions or the expansion of residential scopes. It seems such change was made with the extremely magnificent remodeling of the palace and the creation of an east palace building in 679, the 19th year under the reign of King Munmu.

Consequently, it is probable that the palace in the middle of Fujiwara Capital was designed after the model of Silla’s capital in change. This shows a genealogical similarity along the fact that the dual Taegeukjeon system was implemented in Fujiwara Capital.

**Conclusion**

Though several plans were worked out to move it, the capital city of Silla was developed, centering on the current Gyeongju, without change for a long period after the kingdom’s foundation. As pointed out above, the capital continued to change and develop internally, though its location did not change. However, the greatest change occurred in the 6th century around when Hwangnyong Temple was built. It may be that such change
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was basically derived from internal causes such as political circumstances. However, it is clear that the change was made based on the various kinds of new information from the outside world.

Accordingly, efforts were also made to seek the new outer factors by the existing relevant studies. Of them, the representative effort was to confirm the street division within the capital, which is referred to as the bangri system (坊里制). However, it is clear that this alone has a limitation in grasping the meaning of the capital city system. In order to understand the fundamental features of Silla’s capital, it is required to examine the genealogy of the capital city system, i.e. to determine where and how the new capital city system introduced into Silla was created and what the system was transformed into in the kingdom and what influence the transformed system had on other regions.

This study looked into only some of such genealogical problems. Based on the present findings, the future studies will have to determine the character of Silla’s capital that continuously changed and developed.

Keywords: capital system in East Asia, dual taegeukjeon system, east and west vice-pavilions system, Silla’s capital, Luoyang capital in Northern Wei, Fujiwara capital in Japan
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동아시아 도성제의 계보와 신라 왕정

양정석(수원대 사학과 교수)

신라의 왕정은 몇 번의 천도계획에도 불구하고 국가의 성립 이후 오랜 기간 변함없이 현재의 정주를 중심으로 발전하여 왔다. 그러나 위에서 살펴본 바와 같이 신라 왕정은 위치의 변화는 없었지만 내부적으로는 지속적으로 변화하고 발전하였음을 알 수 있다. 그중에서도 가장 큰 변화를 가져온 시기는 향토사가 조영되던 시기를 전후한 6세기대라고 할 수 있다. 이러한 변화는 기본적으로 당시 정치적 상황 등 내부적인 원인에서 출발하였음 것이다. 그러나 변화의 모습은 외부세계에서 새롭게 들어온 다양한 정보를 바탕으로 하여 이루어졌다는 점도 분명하다.

따라서 신라 왕정에 대한 기존의 연구에서도 새롭게 들어온 외부적 요소를 찾기 위해 노력하였다. 그 중 대표적인 것이 방리제(坊里制)로 이야기되는 도성내 가로구획, 즉 도로(道路)의 확인이다. 그러나 이것은만으로는 당시 도성제가 가지고 있는 의미를 파악하는데 한계가 있는 것도 분명하다. 신라 왕정의 보다 근본적인 특징을 이해하기 위해서는 당시 신라에 도입된 새로운 도성제가 어디에서 어떠한 성격을 갖고 만들어진 것이고 이것이 신라로 들어와 어떻게 변화하여 다른 지역에 어떠한 영향을 미쳤는가 하는 계보라는 부분을 검토할 필요가 있는 것이다.

본고에서는 5~7세기 동아시아 도성제의 계보와 관련하여 가장 핵심적인 상징적 요소를 2가지로 설정하였다. 하나는 북위식 도성제에 있어서 가장 핵심적인 부분으로 궁궐의 태극전(太極殿)과 중심대사(中心大寺)의 태극전 형태의 금당(金堂)이 동시에 조영되던 시스템으로 이러한 건축물을 조영하였던 북위, 신라, 그리고 일본의 도성제를 검토하였다. 본고에서는 이러한 특징을 도성내 이중태극전제(都城內二重太極殿制)로 이해하였다. 다른 하나는 정천과 위진남북조제의 태극전과 동서당제(東西堂制)의 채용문제를 중심으로 그 발생부터 남북조, 고
구려, 그리고 신라에 이르는 또 다른 계보를 살펴보았다. 이는 수당대 도성제(隋唐代 都城制)와는 구별되는 위진남북조 도성제(魏晉南北朝 都城制)의 전형적인 특징이라고 할 수 있다. 이를 통해 신라의 왕경에는 위 두 가지 특징이 모두 존재하였음을 확인할 수 있었다. 이는 신라의 왕경이 기존의 연구에서 이해하였던 것처럼 수당대 도성제와 연결되는 것이 아니라 전혀 다른 계보를 가지고 있음을 의미하는 것이다. 그리고 신라 왕경의 조영과정에서 수용한 도성내 이중대극전제와 전국 이래로 천도(遷都)없이 확대 발전되었던 신라 왕경이 가지고 있는 원성(月城)이 중앙에 위치하는 공간구조(空間構造)라는 특징은 기존 일본학자들에 의해 독자적으로 탄생하였다고 이해되었던 일본 후지와라경(藤原京)의 조성과 정에서도 확인할 수 있었다. 이러한 특징을 가지고 있는 신라 왕경의 보다 구체적인 성격을 밝히는 것은 향후의 과제라고 할 수 있다.

주제어: 동아시아 도성제(東亞細亞 都城制), 이중대극전제(二重大極殿制), 동서당제(東西堂制), 신라 왕경(新羅 王京), 북위 낙양성(北魏 洛陽城), 일본 후지와라경(日本 藤原京)