

## 1.

## THE OBJECTIVE OF THIS STUDY

On the basis of archeological findings, Egami (1964) contends that in the second half of the fourth century Japan [Yamato area] was conquered by continental horseriders that were possibly led by a Chin 辰 King of Mimana 任那. Referring to Nihongi records of the mid-fourth century, Ledyard (1975) has modified Egami's proposition and contends that Puyeo 夫餘 warriors conquered the western part of the Korean peninsula in the middle of the fourth century and then, calling themselves Paekche, immediately crossed over the sea to conquer Japan. Relying heavily on the post-<sup>5</sup> records of Kojiki and Nihongi, however, Hong (1988) contends that it was a group of Paekche 百濟 people who came across the sea, conquered Japan, and established Yamato Wa. That is, Egami's theory of continental horseriders' conquest of Japan has evolved into Ledyard's theory of Puyeo warriors' conquest of Japan which, in turn, has evolved into Hong's model of the conquest of Japan by a group of Paekche people who created Yamato Wa 大和倭.

In early Korea, there were three kingdoms — Koguryeo 高句麗, Silla and Paekche — and a federation of walled-town states, Kaya 伽耶. Ever since Silla unified the Korean peninsula in the late 7th century, it has come to be regarded as the mainline dynasty by Korean historians. Perhaps the most remarkable fact about Korea is the length of the successive ruling dynasties: one thousand years for Silla 新羅 (B.C. 57 - A.D. 935), five hundred years for Koryeo 高麗 (A.D. 918-1392) and five hundred years for Choseon 朝鮮 (A.D. 1392-1910). Hence Fairbank, Reischauer and Craig (1973: 287) note that “in the whole world only China among existing nations can claim a clearly longer history as a unified political entity.” On the other hand, the most remarkable fact about Japan is that, at least formally, the reign of the same imperial family has survived for more than sixteen hundred years. Looking back over the last two thousand years, we see that Korea and Japan seem to have had a very close relationship for their first seven hundred years, devoid of any extreme feeling of animosity or the mutual contempt which is normally expected between neighbouring countries; then came (if the Koreans can forego about Toyotomi Hideyoshi for a moment) a relatively remote

relationship for the following twelve hundred years. This was followed by the latest hundred-year period of stormy but less endearing relations.

Whenever one country invades another, it has been a time-honored tradition for the aggressor to fabricate an excuse that makes the invasion seem just. The excuses usually take the form of claiming a need to redress some non-existing injustices or restore some original status which also may have never existed. In the late 19th century, when Japan was trying fiercely to emulate Western colonialism, its first target of invasion was Korea. For the ritualistic formality of justifying such an object, the newly formed Japanese imperialists invented the story that the southern part of Korea had been a colony of Japan during the fourth and fifth centuries while the northern part of Korea had been occupied by Chinese empires from time immemorial. Korea could not claim an identity as an independent state, and Japan alleged a historical right to take back Korea. Ever since the late 19th century, and even up to the present, the Japanese people have been systematically brainwashed by this kind of story. As a result, most Japanese people, whether learned scholars or laymen, do not know the historical truth (see, for instance, Suematsu 末松保和, 1958). The slightest suggestion that the imperial clan of Japan might have Korean ancestors continues to be regarded as heresy in Japan.

It might take several decades for the ordinary Japanese person to regain an undistorted historical perspective. It might, however, take even more than a hundred years for the Japanese to emancipate themselves from the false perception of their own history. Until that time, the Korean people and the Japanese people can only maintain a very rocky relationship. By reconstructing the true early historical relations between Korea and Japan, this author hopes to make a small contribution to shortening the length of time that seems to be required in order to restore what might be called “a normal relationship” between the Korean people and the Japanese people, one that seems to have existed prior to the Meiji 明治 era.

The most commonly taken view is that the historic age of Japan starts from the late Asuka 飛鳥 period (mid-6th century to A.D. 710). The period extending from the late Yayoi period to the middle of the Kofun 古墳 period is usually regarded as the protohistoric period in Japan, i.e., the transitional period from prehistoric times with no written records to the historical period. The objective of this study is to investigate the origin of Yamato Wa in the protohistoric period of Japan. It is to construct a consistent and viable model concerning where the Yamato rulers came from, how they reached Japan, and what country in Korea they were related to historically. The study of course includes the effort to collect convincing evidence to support my model on the

origin of Yamato Wa. It also includes the collection of historical facts that can better be explained by that model.

Research into protohistoric Japan has to depend on fragmentary written materials and archeological and ethnological data.<sup>1</sup> Any theory for this period, however, should be consistent with the actual societal trends and development that took place in the historic period with written records. Furthermore, in spite of the lack of direct historical sources, the overall structure of any proposition for this period should also be in accord with the development that took place in Korea.

This book presents a model on the relationship between Korea and Japan in the early period from the Korean perspective, but almost entirely on the basis of Japanese sources, such as *Kojiki* 古事記 and *Nihongi* 日本紀.<sup>2</sup> This study attempts to clarify the relationship between Korea and Japan in this early period by examining the myths, folklore and factual records in *Kojiki* and *Nihongi* [also called *Nihon Shoki* 日本書紀], as well as the archeological objects that survive such as those unearthed from kofun, or old burial mounds. In all, the book explores the conditions prevailing in Korea and Japan as they are recorded in Korean and Chinese history,<sup>3</sup> and highlights and critically examines the so-called “Kiba Race Hypothesis” of Egami Namio, which theorizes that the Yamato Court was actually made up of the Kiba (horseriding) race that had come to Japan from the Korean peninsula.<sup>4</sup>

This book is conspicuous in its extensive quotations from *Kojiki* and *Nihongi*, especially from the latter. The accounts of *Kojiki* and *Nihongi*

<sup>1</sup>Gina Lee Barnes (KEJ: 3.160) notes that: “The written materials from this period are fragmentary in nature . . . Contemporary Chinese written records extant today include the late-1st-century chronicle *Han-shu* 漢書, the 3rd-century chronicle *Wei-zhi* 魏志, and the 4th-5th-century chronicle *Hou Han-shu* 後漢書. Other materials concerning the protohistoric period were edited in later ages.”

<sup>2</sup>Aston (NI: xiii) notes that “*Kōnin Shiki* 鑑尿 (commentary on the *Nihongi*, of the period 810-824) informs us that it [*Nihongi*] was completed and laid before the Empress Genshō in A.D. 720 by Prince Toneri 舍人親王 and Yasumaro Futo no Ason 太祖臣 安萬侶.” Yasumaro was the person who took down the *Kojiki* from the lips of Hiyeda no Are 裊田阿禮.

<sup>3</sup>In this book, the conjectural names or dates based on correspondences with events in Korean history are contained in brackets [ ].

<sup>4</sup>Mizuno (1969) notes that: “According to this hypothesis, the race first conquered Kyūshū, then moved to Honshū 本州 and succeeded in gaining control of the Yamato region. Mr. Egami continues to publish his extensive research still in progress in support of this hypothesis, which seems to be gradually taking on the character of an authentic interpretation.”

consist of a compound of origin myths, sheer inventions and facts devised to legitimize the political claims of the Yamato imperial clan, which commissioned their writing (see Tsuda 津田 1948: 671).<sup><1.9></sup> They represent the attempt of the Yamato Court to make an authoritative historical statement about the origin of the imperial clan and other leading families as well as the beginnings of Japan as a nation. In order to forge the Japanese islands into a unified nation, the Yamato Court created an official mythology, collating separate accounts and traditions and weaving the protagonists of local mythologies into a common framework. This newly created mythology-genealogy gave the ancestors of powerful native families proper places in national history and their ancestral deities proper roles.<sup>5</sup> According to Tsuda Sōkichi 津田左右吉, *Kojiki* and *Nihongi* were fabricated by the Yamato Court for the sole purpose of legitimizing and justifying the rule of the imperial clan. Matsumoto (1983) notes that *Kojiki* and *Nihongi* were written with a view to “establishing the foundation of the imperial government as the basis of national administration,” and that “for this reason descriptions [that] are sometimes distorted and one-sided political stories [were] included; anything unfavorable to the imperial household or the central government was omitted. In short, they lack objectivity.” According to Szczesniak (1951), “the oldest Japanese chronicles . . . have really a great amount of first class scientific material; however, they have many intentional deviations and lacunae on essential questions concerning national development and government.” And yet many people may still agree with the view held by Covell and Covell (1984: 111), that “either through oversight or intentionally,” the authors of *Kojiki* and *Nihongi* “did leave in some revealing clues, which added together and put under careful scrutiny reveal a great deal about actual events.”

Until now, the world has heard only the Japanese version of the stories. However, the world, especially the Japanese themselves, would benefit from listening to the stories told by Koreans. This book represents one of these stories. It also shows that there are many different ways to read and interpret the materials contained in *Kojiki* and *Nihongi*. This book may help to open a way to study Japanese history in a more objective and balanced manner.

Section 2 of this chapter presents the beliefs entertained by ordinary Japanese people as revealed by the casual statements of a distinguished Japanese economist, Morishima (1982). The following section presents the

<sup>5</sup>Philippi (KP: 78 n.) notes that: “by relating the ancestors of all these families directly to Ama-terasu-opo-mi-kami 天照大神, the *Kojiki* hopes to secure their loyalty to the Yamato ruling family, which claimed descent from the elder brother of Ame-no-po-pi-no-mikoto and Ama-tu-pikono-no-mikoto.”

writings of what Koreans often call the “pro-Japanese” Western scholars. Chapter 2 presents various theories on the formation of Yamato Wa that can be forged into one consistent model. The first section introduces Egami’s theory of the horseriders’ invasion of Japan that is based on his archeological observation of a sudden influx of continental culture in the late fourth century. Section 2 presents the Tsuda 津田 type of textual approaches that arrive at the conclusion that Homuda-wake (倭祖 應神) was the founder of Yamato Wa. Section 3 takes the cultural anthropological approach by highlighting the massive inflow of Paekche people to Wa in the fifth century following the logic of Ishida 石田: If Yamato Wa was established without any relation to Paekche, then there is no way to explain such a massive movement. Section 4 examines the evolution of the Egami-Ledyard-Hong propositions that postulate Mimaki-Iri-Biko (Sujin), Puyeo warriors, or the Paekche royal families were the leaders of the invasion force. Section 5 examines the register of imperial clans and traces the origin of the Yamato imperial clan to the Paekche royal family. The last section sketches the process of the conquest of Japan and the creation of Yamato Wa 大和倭 by the Paekche people using recorded materials.

Chapter 3 checks the consistency of the model built in Chapter 2 against various distinct observations. Section 1 examines the Japanese mythologies on the Yamato imperial clan. Section 2 appeals to the emotive records that reveal close kinship between the Paekche royal family and the Yamato imperial clan. Section 3 focuses on the continued inflows of culture and technology from Paekche to Wa in the sixth and seventh centuries. Section 4 examines the Paekche systems of government adopted in Yamato Wa, such as the *Uji-Kabane* 氏姓 and *Be* 部 systems. Section 5 delves into the most visible and dominating culture in Asuka Japan. The last two sections sketch contemporary Korean history during the age of Sosa-no-wo, Mimaki-Iri-Biko, and Himiko, and that during the age of the Yamato imperial clan itself.

Chapter 4 attempts to interpret various controversial historical facts within the framework of the new model. Section 1 reads King Kwanggaet’o’s stele as an account of the Paekche getting help from their brother country, Wa. Section 2 addresses the Mimana 任那 question from the viewpoint of Paekche-Kaya-Wa alliances and the port of passage linking them. Section 3 traces the divinity of the imperial family to the defensive actions taken by Yamato rulers after the fall of the Paekche in Korea.

Chapter 5 adds various background materials to elucidate the Paekche-Yamato-Wa relationship as delineated in the model. Sections 1 and 2 present the non-historic Yayoi rulers, Sosa-no-wo from Silla and Mimaki-Iri-Biko

from Kaya 伽耶. Section 3 presents the historic Yayoi ruler, Queen Himiko, who was impersonated by Jingū. Section 4 examines the seven-branched sword that was a gift from a Paekche king to a king of Wa. Section 5 examines the five kings of Wa 倭五王 recorded in Chinese chronicles. Section 6 observes the possible interruptions in the 倭王 line of the Paekche royal family in the Yamato court. The final chapter gives a summary and conclusions.