

The Formation of the People and the Origin of the State in Japan

By Namio EGAMI

Introduction

In May 1948, I had a discussion with Masao OKA, Ichirō YAWATA and Eiichirō ISHIDA on the subject "The Japanese People—the Origin of its Culture and the Formation of the Japanese State", the record of which later appeared in *Minzokugaku Kenkyū* 民族學研究 XIII-3 (Feb. 1949). The record called forth an unexpectedly loud response in the academic world of that time in Japan. In particular, the theory I proposed therein was widely disseminated as the "horse-riding-race" theory and encountered animated criticisms from many quarters. In 1958, a revised version of this discussion entitled "The Origin of Japanese People" was published in book form by the Heishonsha Publishing Company, a version in which my replies to the criticisms of other scholars and such additions and amendments as were appropriate to the progress in our studies during the intervening ten years were briefly appended in the form of notes. This publication aroused even greater public interest in our views, and my "horse-riders" theory came to be introduced or discussed in an increasing number of books and articles. However, since on both these occasions my views were published in the form of the record of a discussion, the presentation of my theory of the formation of the Japanese people and the origin of the Japanese state could not be made as logically and systematically as could have been done in the form of an article. These publications did not go beyond noting the crucial points of the problem.

Now I have constantly pursued a definite line of policy in tackling this problem. As many complicated riddles are involved in the problem of the origin of the Japanese people and state, a mere elucidation of its minor details or a mere accumulation of such individual elucidations can hardly be expected to bring forth the true solution. Thus, I believed that such an organic problem as this requires us to aim at a synthetic, unified and simultaneous solution covering all its aspects. With this line of policy in mind, I have worked at the problem from various angles with a view to finding out the location and identity of the factors which perform nuclear functions within this so-to-speak

“organic” problem. For I thought that the identification of such nuclei must be followed by a synthetic and unified disclosure of their relations with other crucial points of the problem, which will finally make possible its simultaneous solution in every aspect. As examples of such nuclei “rice agriculture” and “the horse-rider” have come to light in regard to the respective problems of the formation of the Japanese race and the origin of the nation. It was an outline of my discovery of these nuclei and my conception of a solution of the problem in this light that was sketched in the above-mentioned record of our discussion. At that time, however, it was yet far removed from the attainment of my object of bringing about a synthetic, unified and simultaneous solution to the whole problem. Since then I have given it further consideration with reference to the many valuable comments and suggestions offered by other scholars, and I now feel that the main outlines of the solution of the problem have finally come to take concrete form in my mind. In the present paper I propose to set down the essentials of this solution, and to submit it to the criticism of scholars at large.

I

The Formation of the Japanese People

Today the discovery of the Non-ceramic Culture and the discovery of human fossils show indubitably that human settlement in the Japanese Islands took place earlier than was formerly estimated and goes back to the Pleistocene period. Many scholars have also published views to the effect that the Jōmon period which followed that of the Non-ceramic Culture, covered a longer period than was formerly supposed, and had fairly distinct stages of cultural development. It is very doubtful, however, whether the peoples of these periods can be regarded as the so-called Japanese. Their hunting, fishing and food-gathering economy—even if locally it might have included some kind of tuber cultivation—has no relation to the rice cultivation which has for long characterized the economic life of the Japanese. It is hardly necessary for us to demonstrate at length that communities whose economy is based on hunting and food-gathering are essentially different from agricultural communities. Consequently, we are compelled to conclude that there was a considerable difference between the peoples of the Non-ceramic period and the Jōmon period on the one hand and the so-called Japanese people of later times on the other as regards the essentials of their cultures, even if it is admitted that some physical and cultural elements of the former peoples may have been transmitted to the latter. Thus it seems that the former cannot be simply brought under the head of the Japanese people, the members of which were bearers of a particular racial culture.

In the Yayoi period, on the other hand, we have reason to believe that rice cultivations, particularly cultivation of aquatic rice, had become the basis of economic life, and that permanent agricultural communities with a Japa-

nese-speaking population had been developed on the basis of rice production over much of the Japanese archipelago. Therefore, it is certain that the people of this age had features in common with the Japanese of historical times as to the fundamental aspects of their economy, society and culture, both being connected in a direct line of succession. This naturally leads to the view that the origin of the Japanese can be traced back to the Yayoi period, and that this was the formative period of the Japanese.

That the inhabitants of the Japanese Islands in the Yayoi period, who were divided into a large number of primitive states, were viewed by foreigners as forming a single people bearing a common culture is revealed by the name *Wo jen* 倭人 or "people of Wo" applied to them in Chinese histories as distinct from other peoples. Thus, even on the basis of the evidence of Oriental history, it is possible to consider the appearance of the Yayoi period men, namely the "people of Wo" in Chinese histories, as being the first of the Japanese.

Now, what brought about the relatively violent change from the Jōmon Culture based on hunting and food-gathering to the Yayoi Culture established on the basis of the cultivation of aquatic rice? Was it a natural consequence of cultural development? Or was it caused by external influences? Although the first is supported by not a few scholars, this theory seems to me to be hard to substantiate. For even though it is admitted that the hunting and collecting economy of the Jōmon period gradually evolved into a higher form towards the end of the period, there are still many reasons against drawing the conclusion that such a natural development finally brought about a change from the hunting and food-gathering stage to that of food production by the cultivation of aquatic rice in the Yayoi period.

First, in general the development from the hunting and food-gathering economy relying upon nature to the pastoral or agricultural economy is, as Vere Golden CHILDE has rightly pointed out, a revolutionary event, and the development of the former type of economy over a long period of time does not always entail a natural transition to the latter. For such a change-over to take place a revolutionary occasion is absolutely necessary. But was there any such serious environmental change in the Japanese archipelago of the later Jōmon period which might have necessitated a revolutionary change of this kind? It seems highly improbable that there was any environmental change in the Japanese archipelago of that time which would have forced the inhabitants to search for new methods of obtaining food as a result of their encountering difficulties in following their traditional way of subsistence by hunting and food-gathering because of changed conditions in the animal and plant worlds caused by a sudden climatic change.

Second, much higher level of agricultural technology is required by the cultivation of aquatic rice on which the Yayoi Culture was founded than by the tuber cultivation widespread in Oceania and the New World or the cultivation of barnyard grass (*hie*) or foxtail millet (*awa*) and barley or wheat (*mugi*) as commonly found in North East Asia. However, it cannot be taken

as a natural form of independent economic development that before this comparatively easy type of agriculture became universal in the Japanese archipelago—even granting that tuber agriculture existed locally in the Jōmon period—a sudden transition to aquatic rice agriculture should have taken place at the beginning of the Yayoi period, and furthermore that this form of agriculture should have diffused over a wide area at a fairly rapid rate, without first passing through the stage of tuber agriculture or without passing through the full development of that stage.

Third, since the primitive variety of rice does not grow wild in the Japanese archipelago, the selection and cultivation of aquatic or dry land rice in the Yayoi period cannot be considered to have originated in Japan.

On such grounds we may say that the cultivation of aquatic rice in the Yayoi period cannot possibly have evolved from the hunting and food-gathering stage of the Jōmon period; no special environmental change which compelled men to discard hunting and food-gathering for farming is known in the later Jōmon period; and none of the cultivated plants of the Yayoi period had its natural habitat in the Japanese archipelago.

In sum, we must conclude that we cannot find any necessary conditions for the natural emergence of rice cultivation in the Japanese archipelago at this time.

In spite of this, the fact remains that aquatic rice agriculture, which began first in northern Kyūshū, was rapidly disseminated from thence all over western Japan and finally reached as far north as the southern part of the Ōu district, was the matrix from which the Yayoi Culture emerged. The solution of this problem is thus basic to that of the genesis of the Japanese people but as yet no generally accepted theory has been advanced in regard to it. Two types of theory have so far been advanced concerned this problem.

The theory which was first advocated by Dr. Kōsaku HAMADA and has since been held by many of his followers is that the cultivation of aquatic rice which was introduced into Japan originated in the lower reaches of the Huang Ho in north China. Noting that rice was grown in the lower reaches of this river in the Neolithic period (the Yang-shao 仰韶 period) and that stone knives, used as tools for cutting the ears of grain, of the same type as those produced contemporaneously in north China are distributed from south Manchuria through Korea to the Yayoi Culture Zone in Japan. Dr. HAMADA supposed that rice cultivation in the lower reaches of the Huang Ho with the characteristic corn-cutting tools first came to southern Manchuria and Korea and then to northern Kyūshū in Japan. At first sight, the theory appears very plausible but on closer examination it is found not easy to sustain. First of all, it is doubtful whether rice cultivation was the dominant form of agriculture in north China in the Neolithic period or before that of the Han dynasty on a scale sufficient to produce influence on the surrounding areas, or that rice was the staple food of the north Chinese of that time. Furthermore, it is very doubtful whether rice cultivation extended as far north as Hopei and Jehol

Provinces on the southern borders of Manchuria. It is almost certain that barnyard grass or foxtail millet and barley or wheat, rather than rice, represented the common staple crops in north China from the Neolithic period to historical times. Moreover, rice cultivation is not known to be widespread in south Manchuria and north Korea either in prehistoric times or well into historical times. Thus, we must conclude that there is not sufficient evidence to warrant the view that rice cultivation practised in Neolithic north China was introduced into Japan through Manchuria and Korea. Secondly, it is questionable whether the wide distribution of the ear-cropping tools called "stone knives" over north China, south Manchuria, Korea and Japan justifies the view concerning the route of the propagation of the rice agriculture. Attention is called to the fact that one cannot say with certainty if the stone knives were really tools for cutting the ears of rice, not for cropping millet, barley, wheat or kaoliang, in north China and south Manchuria. Stone knives of the same type were equally widely in use in middle and south China and Taiwan. They must have been employed for cropping rice in middle and south China, for there is not the slightest doubt that the main crop in the Yangtze Valley and further south was rice since the oldest times. Thus it would be more logical to trace back the "route of rice" to central and south China rather than to north China even when taking up the stone knives as a clue. Thirdly, the plains extending from north China to south Manchuria are predominantly a zone of dry land farming, and east Manchuria and north Korea were regions where patch agriculture was long in practice. If one is to assume that rice cultivation came to Japan from those dry land farming regions, one would expect it to be that of dry land rice; it is rather incomprehensible that aquatic rice cultivation should have been introduced into Japan from those places.

Now let us turn our eyes to middle and south China and South East Asia. In those places aquatic rice cultivation has always been practiced most widely, side by side with patch agriculture. If the rice cultivation in Japan and south Korea was brought over from that part of Asia, its type would almost inevitably be that of aquatic rice. Thus the rice cultivation in paddy fields of the Yayoi period can be most easily explained by tracing back the "route of rice" to those regions. In sum, we find it difficult because of many weak points to accept the theory that the aquatic rice cultivation in prehistoric Japan had originated in the Huang Ho valley in north China and was introduced by way of south Manchuria and north Korea into northern Kyūshū.

On the other hand, the second theory, that the cultivation of aquatic rice originated in central and south China seems to be fairly well-grounded. Moreover, there are several other theories and facts that appear to afford a support to it.

First of all, there is a theory that the Japanese variety of rice, viz. *Oryza sativa japonica*—to which the rice of the Yayoi period as well as that of present-day Japan belongs—originated on the eastern shores of central and south China. This theory, ardently advocated by Dr. ANDO, has recently

acquired more followers among specialists. If we assume this theory of the origin of *Oryza sativa japonica* to be true, the theory that the original home of aquatic rice cultivation in Japan was in south China will receive the support of the sciences of botany and agriculture.

Second, the Japanese name for the rice plant, *ine*, has no phonetic relation to the Chinese *tao* 稻. On the other hand, some words signifying "rice plant", such as *nep*, *ni* and *nun*, in the languages spoken by the Indochinese peoples who are supposed to have inhabited south China before the moving in of the Chinese, bear some phonetic similarity to the Japanese *ine*. Besides, as in language as in folklore and religious ceremonies concerning rice cultivation many elements are found which are widespread in South East Asia, south China and Japan. This theory advanced by Dr. Nobuhiro MATSUMOTO in many respects conforms to the "central-south China" theory of the origin of Japanese aquatic rice cultivation.

Third, quite a few farming tools for rice cultivation and rice-cooking vessels were wooden articles in the Yayoi period. The stone implement supposed to have been employed for the production of these wooden articles—which is a kind of hand-axe or chisel called "*kuri-iri nomi-gata sekifu* (gouged chisel-shaped stone axe) 刳入鑿形石斧" in Japan and "*yūdan sekifu* (notched stone axe) 有段石斧" in China and the greatest number of which have been discovered in western Japan—has not been discovered in north China, south Manchuria and north Korea; but it is densely distributed in the regions from central and south China to northern Taiwan, and thence is richly found farther northwards as the artifact that characterizes the polished stone-implement culture of western and north Korea. Thus, its distribution can be reasonably explained only by supposing that the implement was peculiar to the area whose main form of agriculture was the cultivation of aquatic rice, and that it entered western and north Korea and western Japan from central and south China as an implement necessary for making tools, side by side with aquatic rice cultivation and the custom of rice diet. If we assume this to be the case, this theory may be called upon to provide evidence supporting the "central-south China" theory of the origin of Japanese rice cultivation in the Yayoi period.

These theories and facts examined so far further support our hypothesis that the original home of the cultivation of aquatic rice in the Yayoi period was located somewhere in central and south China. The next questions are how the cultivation of aquatic rice was introduced into Japan and how it was accepted there.

Before these questions are inquired into, it must be borne in mind that it was not rice but aquatic rice agriculture which was introduced into Japan. The logical conclusion of this would be that those who introduced aquatic rice cultivation into Japan crossed over from their original home in central and south China to western Japan—either directly or by way of southern Korea—settled down and cultivated aquatic rice in Japan. Nevertheless, there

are some Japanese scholars who do not accept this. They assert that the people of Jōmon period adopted the custom of rice diet and initiated the cultivation of aquatic rice, thus giving rise to the Yayoi culture and transforming themselves into Yayoi period people. Their theory seems to be founded on the view that it was only rice which was introduced into Japan. But in fact it was not merely rice which was introduced into Japan but aquatic rice agriculture, in other words the knowledge, technology, instruments and religious ceremonies necessary for the cultivation of aquatic rice and a rice diet, and these were introduced into Japan as a whole in the form of the aquatic rice agriculture complex. Besides, they overlook another important point, that a change in food, especially of staple food, cannot easily take place. We cannot assume that hunters, fishers or food-gatherers will invariably adopt rice as their staple food after having been served with rice on one or two occasions. Unless they have had opportunities of eating rice continuously over many years they cannot be expected to become habitual rice-eaters.

Thus if we assume that in the Yayoi period the greater part of the inhabitants in the Japanese archipelago abandoned their traditional way of subsistence by hunting and food-gathering, which had been theirs for some thousands of years, for aquatic rice agriculture and started to live on rice—and there is no doubt that this is what actually took place—then we must assume that there was a considerable body of persons who brought about this revolution in their mode of life, who co-existed with them over a considerable period of time, and who exercised a great influence on them. Further, we must assume that these people were cultivators of aquatic rice and habitual rice-eaters who came from somewhere outside Japan. Lastly, it is evident from what I have said above, that their original home must have been somewhere in central and south China.

The next questions to be answered then are why they had to leave their home and come to Japan, and which course they took on their way to Japan.

The non-Chinese aborigines in the littoral zone of central and south China—among whom the Wu, 吳 the Yüeh 越 (or 粵) and the Min 閩 in the Chinese histories are representatives—are thought to have been skilled in sailing ships and to have engaged in coastal trade from an early period. When first the Chinese state of Ch'u 楚 moved into this area and later the Ch'in and Han empires extended their power to the south and exercised political control over these coastal aborigines it seems that a great disturbance arose among them, since they feared for the future of their race. It seems that at this time some of them met with the fate of being pushed out on to the China Sea. As skilled sailors, they followed the tides and reached southern and western Korea, northern Kyūshū and western Honshū, settling down in these various places and introducing their rice-cultivating culture.

This can be easily imagined from what I have said above, namely that a sort of rice-cultivating culture zone was established in these areas, characterized by many cultural elements whose origin can be traced back to central

and south China.

At an early period, however, we can recognize within this cultural zone Japanese and Korean sub-zones, respectively characterized by the Yayoi and the polished-stone cultures. This early divergence may be explained as having resulted from frequent and close contact between the new-comers from central and south China and the aborigines and the early intermingling of their cultures in these areas, from which the two sub-zones with their different local colors were produced, two cultures which we may describe as "cousin rice-cultivating cultures". These cousin cultures may be none other than those of the people of Wo and Han 韓 mentioned in the Chinese histories about the beginning of the Christian era. Being closely related by the circumstances of their formation, there seems to have been frequent human and cultural interchange between them. Thus, the "goban-shiki shisekibo (go-board-shaped dolmen-type tombs) 墓盤式支石墓" centering round west and south Korea are also discovered in northern Kyūshū, while the "gōkō kamekan-bo (coupled urn tombs) 合口甕棺墓" extensively distributed over northern Kyūshū were introduced into part of south Korea. The statements in the Chinese records to the effect that the people of Wo lived on the Kūmhae Bay coast of south Korea and bordered on the people of Han are also to be understood in the light of these circumstances.

It is believed that on the whole there were only slight contacts between Japan and Korea during the Jōmon period, but in the Yayoi period very close contacts were established between western Japan, especially north Kyūshū and the western extremity of Honshū, and Korea, particularly south Korea. The theory that the origin of the Yayoi earthenware is to be found in Korea is also rendered highly probable by these circumstances, while the philological theory of the close affinity of the Japanese and Korean languages and the results of recent research in the physical anthropology of the Japanese people, which show that the Japanese of the Inland Sea coast and the Kinki region of Honshū have a tendency to be brachycephalic like the Koreans and unlike the Japanese of the Kantō, Tōhoku, and Hokuriku regions and of the rest of the outer parts of Japan in Honshu, Shikoku and Kyūshū, cannot be passed over as a fortuitous coincidence when they are viewed in the light of the origins of the Yayoi culture as described above and the relations existing between Japan and Korea at that time. Thus we can see that in the formation of the Japanese people—as we noted at the beginning, this took place during the Yayoi age—a central and south Chinese element and a south Korean element were very prominent, both in cultural and physical terms. At the same time, we must note another fact, the fact that at this period western Japanese became linked to north-east Asia with south Korea acting as a bridge, with the result that what may be called the North East Asia Bronze Culture extending over Jehol, Mongolia, South Manchuria and North Korea, and the iron cultures of Han Dynasty China, Lo-lang in north Korea, and elsewhere, were brought into Japan. Thus the content of the Yayoi culture became extremely complex, for

on top of the amalgam of the aquatic rice culture of central and south China and the tradition of the Jōmon culture there were further added the polished stone culture of south Korea and the metal cultures of North East Asia, and while on the one hand this led to the development of these cultures in uniquely Japanese variations, on the other hand the cultural apparatus of Han Dynasty China was imported into certain parts of Japan. As a result of this the Yayoi cultural area in western Japan was further differentiated into two sub-cultures. These are the so-called bronze dagger and bronze halberd cultural area of north Kyūshū, and the *dōtaku* or "bronze bell" cultural area centered on the Kinji region.

On the other hand the tradition of the Jōmon culture persisted until fairly late in eastern and outer Japan, while the Yayoi culture of western Japan did not spread to other areas, at least as such, and there are indications that it was able to exercise only an indirect influence. The view that the late Jōmon cultures of the northern half of the Tōhoku region—the Kameoka Culture and others—should be understood in these terms has not yet received general recognition, but may well be worthy of the fullest attention.

It is believed that the Yayoi culture began in Kyūshū and other parts of western Japan about 200 BC, and that in eastern Japan it persisted until about 330 AD. This Yayoi period of approximately 500 years is usually divided into three, the early, middle and late Yayoi periods, but as we have noted above the culture is complex in content and also exhibits considerable differences at different periods and in different regions. Such cultures as the bronze dagger and bronze halberd culture are indeed notable examples of such local cultural areas. By origin, however, the Yayoi culture was a culture of simple peasants, based on aquatic rice agriculture, and we cannot regard it as anything other than natural that it should possess a common character throughout its whole extent.

The character common to the whole Yayoi culture was that of a culture which was peaceful, non-military, shamanistic and ceremonially religious. The bronze sword and bronze spear culture is frequently cited as the example which shows this best, but it appears that the bronze daggers and halberds were valued more as religious and shamanistic objects than as weapons, and there is a marked tendency for their size to be increased to ridiculous proportions. The *dōtaku* or bronze bells, too, may be supposed to have originated as musical instruments, but they are very far removed from any practical use and are also considered to be in the nature of religious objects. Again, among the tomb furniture of the Yayoi age mirrors, stones (*tama*), bladed weapons and other precious, religious and shamanistic objects are conspicuous, rather than agricultural implements, earthenware, and other objects used in everyday life. This phenomenon may also be interpreted as being a manifestation of the shamanistic and religious character of the Yayoi period. Further, the fact that it is rare for the Yayoi period settlements to be surrounded by defence works such as moats or walls suggests, conformably with the poverty of usable

weapons at this period, that there were no fierce conflicts between settlements and that in general these were of a remarkably peaceable character. From these circumstances it is inferred regarding the common character of the Yayoi culture that it was peaceful, non-military, shamanistic and ceremonially religious, and in the light of this character it is not difficult to imagine that the Yayoi culture of Japan advanced slowly in the area centered on north Kyūshū, the Inland Sea coast of Honshū, and the Kinki region in conditions of peace and to the accompaniment of considerable shamanistic and ceremonially religious tendencies, at the same time preserving its internal cohesion and unity. We need not be surprised, however, when we find no small number of items of Jōmon culture surviving within the Yayoi culture—this phenomenon is found most notably in the Tōhoku region and the outer parts of Japan—nor will there be any objection to our supposing that in the areas outside north Kyūshū the Inland Sea coast of Honshū, and the Kinki region the Jōmon people were more or less transformed into Yayoi people in situ. As for the power which brought about these changes and thus led to the formation of the Japanese people, it is unassailable that the most basic fact was the crossing into western Japan by a non-Chinese rice-cultivating people from central and south China and the transmission of aquatic rice agriculture to Japan, while undiminished importance attaches to such facts as close relations of cultural and physical interchange between western Japan and south Korea and the establishment of cultural links between Japan and North East Asia. We must therefore recognise that the establishment of the Yayoi culture, and by extension the formation of the Japanese people, did not evolve spontaneously out of the Jōmon culture but were a leap forward occasioned by an external stimulus.

It is also easy to imagine that by means of such physical and cultural currents a variety of cultural and physical elements in addition to those we have mentioned should have flowed into western Japan, and that these should have played a great part in the cultural and physical formation of the Japanese race. In particular, it will be most natural for us to think that the so-called southern element in Japanese culture with which many parallels can be found among the peoples of South East Asia (including the original inhabitants of central and south China)—for example, the raised-floor architecture, the poncho-type garment, the *fundoshi*-type breechcloth, the *hachimaki*-type head-covering, the practices of tattooing, painting the body with vermilion, removing teeth or dyeing the teeth black, agricultural rituals connected with rice cultivation, fishing by diving and with cormorants, the Izanagi and Izanami myth, the Amaterasu myth, the Yamata no Orochi myth and the Sukunahikona myth—and the basic elements of the Japanese language, which has close affinities with the Altaic languages, particularly Korean, and cannot be regarded as unrelated to the languages of the peoples of South East Asia through its vocabulary, etc, as well as the Korean-type physique which is so prominent among the Japanese of the Inland Sea coast of Honshū and the Kinki region, were the continental elements which entered Japan at this time.

Lastly, let us say a word about the very close correspondence with what we have said above shown by the contents of *Wo jen Chuan* 倭人傳 in *Wei Chih* 魏志, a work which contains a fairly detailed account of western Japan, particularly Kyūshū, in the late Yayoi period.

As regards the *Wo jen Chuan*, discussion has hitherto been concentrated to an excessive degree on the question of where the state of Yeh-ma-t'ai 耶馬臺 ruled by Pei-mi-hu 卑彌呼 was located, whether in north Kyūshū or in the Kinki region, and it cannot be denied that there has been a tendency for other questions to be neglected in comparison. However, it will be abundantly clear at a single reading that the manners and customs of the Wo jen or people of Wo described in *Wo jen Chuan* are remarkably "southern", as many writers have already pointed out. In particular, the statements, "They all tattoo their faces and decorate their bodies", "The water-men of Wo are fond of diving under the surface of the water to catch fish and clams", "The men all go naked, with a piece of cotton wrapped round their heads", "The women make a garment like a Chinese single-piece garment. A hole is made in the middle and the garment is put on by putting one's head through it," "They all go barefoot", and "They paint their bodies with vermilion", all describe customs which are common to the peoples of South East Asia, and consequently when the compiler of *Wo jen Chuan* has described the manners, products, and objects in use among the people of Wo and says, "In what they have and what they lack they are the same as the people of Tan-erh 儋耳 and Chu-yai 朱崖 (Hainan Island)" his statement will be agreed with. Again, in the account of the people of Wo which appears in *Wei Lüeh* it is said that "in their traditions they call themselves 'the descendants of T'ai Po 太伯'", and we cannot ignore the fact that a tradition was current among the people of Wo to the effect that they were descended from T'ai Po of the state of Wu, that is to say, were descended from the original inhabitants of central China. Again, it appears from *Wo jen Chuan* in *Wei Chih* that the Chinese of these times believed that the land of Wo was an island country which extended far to the south, as far as Hui-chi 會稽 and Tung-yeh 東冶, that is, to a point east of the area south of the Yangtze, and it will be very easily understandable if we interpret this as being a mistake which arose from the fact that the environment and manners of the people of Wo as observed by the Chinese of this time appeared to them to be closely similar to the central and south China area south of the Yangtze, as opposed to the northern part of the continent—Manchuria, Mongolia, North China, etc.

In sum, there is no doubt that the manners of the people of Wo—the people of the late Yayoi period—in western Japan, particularly Kyūshū, as known to the Chinese of the third century, included much that was common to the manners of the peoples of South East Asia, and in particular the original inhabitants of central and south China, and there is even record of a tradition which hints directly at the central and south Chinese origin of the people of Wo, the people of the later Yayoi period. There will probably be no im-

pediment to my interpreting this evidence in the *Wo jen Chuan* regarding the origin of the Yayoi culture and its culture-bearers as constituting powerful support from the point of Oriental History based on Chinese sources for the points which I have set out above, principally from the point of view of archaeology.

II

On the Origins of the Japanese State

The Yayoi period was followed by the tomb-mounds period, and in this period Japanese underwent unification under the Yamato court, came to possess literature and written records, and entered the so-called "proto-historic period." Because of this no one will deny that the tomb-mounds period is one of the most important periods in the whole of the history of Japan, but opinions have been much divided over the question of how this period of Japanese history is to be conceived, and at present there appears to be little prospect of reaching general agreement in this matter. In some matters, however, certain well-established views have attained general currency in regard to parts of this field of study, and these present an aspect of some complexity.

Since the Meiji period three kinds of approach have been made to the study of this period. The first is found in studies of ethnology and history in the broad sense centered on the mythology and traditions recorded in the *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki*, the second in archaeological studies centered on the tomb-mounds and the objects found in them, and the third in historical studies centered on the state of East Asia at this period as recorded in Chinese historical works, and in particular the situation in Japan and Korea. Among these three approaches, the second and third have flourished greatly since the end of the war, when the many taboos attaching to studies of Japanese history were set aside, and not a few individual studies have been published which contain truly remarkable results. As a general trend, however, these three approaches have been carried on separately and individually, and insufficient efforts have been devoted to comprehensive and unifying studies. As a natural result it cannot be denied that there are still a large number of blind spots and dead angles in studies of this field. May it not be that in the case of the most important historical phenomenon in the Japan of the tomb-mounds period, the establishment of a unified state, too, a clue to the solution of the problem will be found only when these blind spots and dead angles have first been detected and then overcome in their entirety? Thinking in this way, I examined as great a number of the published theories and studies as I could, and in particular by contrasting or by fitting together the results of these three approaches, which had hitherto been conducted in virtual isolation from one another, I arrived at a view of this question which others have named "The Theory of the Horse-Riders".

It is not true, however, that such views as mine are completely unprece-

dented, for they coincide in large measure with the main outlines of "The Theory of the Common Origin of the Japanese and Korean Peoples" put forward as early as the Taishō period (1912-1925) by Dr. Teikichi KIDA (published in *Minzoku to Rekishi* 民族と歴史, Vol. 6, No. 1. Issue devoted to studies of Korea and Manchuria). Perhaps it may be more appropriate to say that my views are a modern edition of Dr. KIDA's theory. Below I propose to give some account of my views in accordance with the three approaches above-mentioned, but this is done entirely for reasons of convenience of exposition, and I wish to make it clear that throughout my studies I have always maintained the attitude of synthesising and unifying these three approaches as I progressed, that in particular the basic inter-related problems which I have considered have been the cultural duality apparent in the mythology and traditions preserved in the *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki*, the difference in character observable between the early and late periods of the tomb-mounds culture, the special relation between Japan and south Korea at this time as reflected in the Chinese histories, and doubts as to whether the state of Wo 倭國 and Jih-pen 日本 are identical, and that consequently I have always thought of these questions as problems which must be solved in a comprehensive, unified and simultaneous manner.

First let us draw upon archaeological studies centered on the tomb-mounds and the objects found in them in order to consider how the tomb-mounds period is divided chronologically, and what was the character of the culture of each of these divisions, and then within this material let us follow up the people who were the principal actors in the formation of the state and any reflections of their activities.

Chronologically the tomb-mounds period is sometimes divided into three, early, middle and late, and sometimes into two, early and late, but in practice it is usually divided into three. In the threefold division it is usual to date the early tomb-mounds period as extending from the end of the third century or the beginning of the fourth century, when the high tomb-mounds first appear, down to about the middle of the second half of the fourth century. From this time down to about the middle of the second half of the fifth century is the middle tomb-mounds period, and from then down to the second half of the sixth century, or the end of the seventh century, is the late tomb-mounds period. Although there are small divergences of view among those who use this threefold division, they do not amount to very much. In the case of the twofold division, on the other hand, there are two completely opposed views. The first of these regards the early tomb-mounds period as extending over approximately 200 years from the end of the third century or the beginning of the fourth century down to the end of the fifth century, and the late tomb-mounds period as extending over approximately 200 years from about the end of the fifth century down to the end of the seventh century. That is to say, on the whole this view combines the early and middle periods of the threefold division into a single period, the early tomb-mounds period, and distinguishes

this from the late tomb-mounds period. The second view regards the early tomb-mounds period as extending from the end of the third century or the beginning of the fourth century down to about the middle of the second half of the fourth century, and the late tomb-mounds period as extending from that time down to the second half of the seventh century. That is to say, on the whole this view combines the middle and late periods of the threefold division into a single period, the late period, and distinguishes this from the early period. There are thus two twofold divisions of the chronology, suggesting that there is a basic difference in the views upon which these are based. Among these three ways of dividing up the chronology I think that the last is the most suitable to follow, and my reasons for doing so are that while the cultures of the middle and late tomb-mounds periods in the threefold chronology are essentially similar, so that it is possible for us to regard them as having existed in uninterrupted succession, the culture of the early period in this chronology differs markedly on certain points from those of the middle and late periods, and shows closer connections with the Yayoi culture. Thus even if we feel that Dr. UMEHARA's interpretation, which would include this early tomb-mounds period in the Yayoi period, and the views of the Soviet scholar BARODEFF, who regards the early tomb-mounds culture as the late Yayoi culture, are a little too bold, it is probable that no one can deny that there are close links between the Yayoi culture and the early tomb-mounds culture.

In the early tomb-mounds period some of the tomb-mounds are circular, and not a few are made in "key-hole shape" form 前方後圓墳, a hill being made use of in their construction, but as regards their internal structure it is usual for these tombs to have wooden coffins in the form described as "split-bamboo shaped" 割端形 or "boat-shaped" 舟形, made from large logs split in two and set on a flooring which was thickly plastered over with clay and other substances. The box-type stone coffins 箱式石棺 in use since the Yayoi period were also retained, and massive stone outer coffins 石槨 covering these wooden and stone coffins were made—the so-called "shaft-type stone chambers" 豎穴式石室. Further, in these early period tombs the coffins and outer coffins were placed at a spot near the summit of the mound. As the authorities have already pointed out, the tomb furniture in the early tomb-mounds period comprises objects which may be thought to have had significance as precious, symbolic or shamanistic objects, rather than as articles of practical utility—mirrors, swords, jewelry, stone bangles, "hoe-shaped" stones 鍬形石 and stone whorls 車輪石—and the burying of mirrors, swords, and stones (*tama*) with the dead may certainly be taken to be a continuation of the tradition of the Yayoi period.

From these facts we may imagine that the early tomb-mounds culture was certainly derived from the Yayoi culture and retained within itself considerable elements of the Yayoi culture, that it was a culture of a very markedly shamanistic or religious character, and that the bearers of this culture were in

a condition not very far removed from that of the people of Wo as described in *Wo jen Chuan* in the *Wei Chih*. Further, this is made all the more certain by the fact that there is chronological continuity between the later Yayoi culture and the early tomb-mounds culture, there being no gap in time between them. That is to say, the bearers of the Yayoi culture and the bearers of the early tomb-mounds culture were certainly in the same tradition, and the change which took place in this culture is to be understood as being due principally to internal developments taking place in the earlier culture, and in particular as being due to the appearance of classes. Further, as is shown by the practice of locating burials at the summits of the mounds and that of treating mirrors not as articles of practical utility but as special objects with a shamanistic or authority-conferring significance, the continental cultural elements which we find in these tombs were by no means the results of direct cultural transplantation, but were merely the result of indirect influences, or were part of a tradition continued from the Yayoi period.

On the other hand, in the late tomb-mounds period there are at first many "key-hole shaped" tomb-mounds of some height in which the two parts of the ground-plan of the mound are roughly equal in size, as represented in the tombs of the Emperors Ōjin and Nintoku, and among these some are on a very grand scale. It seems that the practice of burying the coffin directly in the earth was general, but it is worthy of note that certain types of wooden and stone coffin had come into use which appear to be in the continental or Chinese tradition, such as the fitted-type wooden coffin 組合式木棺 and the trunk-shaped stone coffin 長持形石棺, and as a result the shaft-type stone chambers have a broader ground-plan than in the early tomb-mounds period. Later the horizontal-type stone chambers 横穴式石室, which are clearly in the continental tradition, were adopted on a wide scale, and among them we find some which are decorated with wall-paintings. The tomb furniture at first comprised weapons, horse accoutrements, and the so-called "stone model objects" 石製模造品 made in the forms of a variety of objects used in daily life, but later, besides eating vessels and decorative articles of apparel, there were added to these a remarkable variety of realistic clay models (*haniwa* 埴輪) representing male and female figures, accoutered horses, birds, beasts, houses, weapons, garments and head-coverings, boats, etc, so that funerary rituals having the same significance as the tomb furniture and funerary vessels 明器 of the tombs on the continent had come into use. Further, it is to be noted that the greater part of the weapons, horse accoutrements and decorative articles of apparel—and this is also true of the objects represented by the realistic clay models—are practically of exactly the same kind as those of the horse-riding race of North East Asia, the so-called "Hu barbarians" 胡族 who were active in Manchuria, Mongolia, and north China areas in the times of the Wei and Chin Dynasties and the Northern and Southern Courts, that is, from about the third to the fifth century. The culture of these Hu barbarians had been produced by a synthesis of the culture of the horse-riding people of northern Asia

and the culture of the Han race in China, a synthesis which had resulted from contacts and intersettlement among these two peoples in the north China and Manchuria area, and it might well be described as the culture of the sinified horse-riders. However, its special character of course consisted in the fact that it was the culture of a horse-riding people, and our attention is particularly drawn to the development and importance in use of horse accoutrements and, bows and arrows made for the purposes of firing with the bow from horse-back, as well as to the diffusion among them of forms of dress and armour which were convenient for horse-riding, while in general their culture was characterised by the military, the practical and the showy, rather than the peaceful, the religious, or the simple. For example the male dress diffused among them consisted of a tube-sleeved jacket and wide, baggy trousers, a form of dress designed for horse-riding, and to this they added a leather belt with buckle, and ornaments of the neck-pendant type. Their footgear consisted of high boots made of leather. The armour they used was confined to the upper half of the body, and a form appeared which protected the chest only, while piece-mail, made by stitching many small plates together, was also diffused among them. Their sword hilts were decorated with representations of the heads of birds or beasts, and for use with the bow they had the so-called "whistling arrow 鳴鏑". an arrow fitted with a whistle made of bone. Among their horse accoutrements magnificently ornate reins and saddles were the fashion, and stirrups also became general. The fact that between the third and fifth centuries this culture, which we may call the culture of the sinified horse-riding people, was on the one hand flourishing in north China among the Hsien-pei 鮮卑 and Hsiung-nu 匈奴 who had migrated into China from the north, and on the other was transmitted to Korea by such peoples as those of Kao-chü-li 高句麗 and Fu-yü 夫餘, can easily be inferred from the archaeological and literary evidence. A cultural apparatus which was practically the same as that current among these peoples characterised the later tomb-mounds period culture in Japan, and the fact that there have been frequent finds of weapons, horse accoutrements, etc, in the tombs of the late tomb-mound period is proof that at this time horse-riding warriors were active all over Japan, in addition to which there is the fact that at this period the weapons ceased to be precious or shamanistic objects, and weapons which were usable in daily life came to be buried with the dead. As Dr. YAWATA and others have pointed out, this not only suggests that there was a marked difference between actual ways of living in the Yayoi period and the early tomb-mounds period on the one hand and the late tomb-mounds period on the other, but also that there was a basic difference in men's ideas about the life after death. Thus in the culture of the late tomb-mounds period the religious, peaceful, South East Asian characteristics which had been continued from the Yayoi and early tomb-mounds periods—the characteristics which we may call those of a people of agriculturalists—receded catastrophically, and a realistic, aggressive, princely, aristocratic, North Asian character—a character which we may call that

of a horse-riding people—because conspicuous. Thus we have the impression that there is an essential difference in character between the culture of the Yayoi period and the early tomb-mounds periods on the one hand and the culture of the late tomb-mounds period on the other, and that the transition from the one to the other would seem to have been abrupt and sudden, and lacking in continuity. But while in the case of China in the time of the Wei and Chin and the Northern and Southern Courts and of Korea at the time of the Three Kingdoms (Kao-chü-li, Paekche and Silla) it is more or less clear from the historical records who were the people who brought in this kind of North Asian horse-riders' culture and caused a sudden change in the previously established culture, and who they were who constituted the sovereign body of its princely culture, in the case of Japan these facts are not known to us. May we, however, interpret the fact that this alien culture from the continent crossed the sea, a more formidable barrier than any land frontier, and was suddenly, and dominantly, transmitted to Japan as meaning that the people of Wo, who possessed the culture of the Yayoi and early tomb-mounds periods, undertook on their own initiative to import this culture in a positive manner, and to cause it to be diffused? For this to have been done on their own initiative we would seem to be obliged to presuppose the existence of some internal cause of considerable importance, if a people who were so much a group of agriculturalists as the people of Wo were to adopt the character of the horse-riders to such an extent as this. Can we, then think of any such internal causes? I, for one, cannot find the slightest trace of evidence of any such internal causes having matured in the early tomb-mounds period. On the other hand there is also the interpretation that since the work of building the Japanese state centered on the Kinki region had more or less reached completion at this time the surplus energies of the Japanese were directed to extending their power on to the Korean peninsula, and resulted in encouraging the large-scale importation into Japan of the cultural apparatus of the North East Asian culture which by this time had made its way into Korea. However, I also find such views difficult to accept as they stand. My reason is that unless Japan, under the Yamato court, and Korea were in some sort of special relation, it is unthinkable that there would be sufficient necessity for the Yamato court of this time to embark on activities for the subjugation of Korea. Moreover, not only are there extremely few instances of agriculturalist peoples undertaking activities for the subjugation of territories overseas in general, but in the light of the content of the early tomb-mounds period culture the bearers of this culture also lack the military element required in carrying out subjugatory activities, and the idea that these people of the early tomb-mounds period should have landed in south Korea, the inhabitants of which were better armed, should have succeeded in subjugatory activities and should have returned home after fostering their horse-riders' culture is clearly contrary to the universal laws of history.

To me, on the other hand, the following seem relevant. 1) The fact

that the early tomb-mounds culture and the late tomb-mounds culture are basically different in nature. 2) The fact that the change was fairly sudden, and that we cannot find signs of a natural transition from one to the other. 3) The fact that in general agriculturalist peoples have a strong propensity to adhere firmly to their own traditional cultures and are very little characterised by a tendency to import suddenly the alien culture of another country or another people with the intention of causing a change in the character of their own traditional cultures. 4) The fact that the North Asian horse-riding race cultural complex in the Japanese culture of the late tomb-mounds period corresponds in all respects with that of the continent and the Korea peninsula, and the absence of evidence that certain elements in this complex were imported into Japan piecemeal, or in a selective manner; in other words, we interpret the evidence as meaning that the North Asian horse-riders' cultural complex was brought into Japan in its entirety, without undergoing any change. 5) The fact that the Japanese had few horses during the period of the Yayoi and early tomb-mounds cultures but came to keep large numbers of horses in the late tomb-mounds period, that it is difficult to interpret this as meaning that the horses alone had crossed from the continent, unaccompanied by human beings, and that however we view the matter it must seem unnatural to us unless we take it that a habitually horse-riding people, accompanied by its horses, crossed into Japan in considerable numbers. 6) The fact that the culture of the late tomb-mounds period was princely and aristocratic, the culture of a horse-riding people, and that its wide distribution hints at the subjugation and control of Japan by military force. 7) The fact that the areas in which the later tomb-mounds are thickly distributed can in many cases be regarded as areas of strategic importance from a military point of view. 8) The fact that in general there are not a few instances of horse-riding peoples seeking to satisfy their desire for conquest not only by undertaking subjugatory activities on the continent, but also by sending expeditions overseas—consider, for example, such peoples as the Arabs, the Normans, and the Mongols—and that consequently if and when the subjugatory activities of the horse-riders had extended as far as south Korea it would not be beyond the bounds of possibility that they should also invade Japan. For the above eight reasons, more or less, I believe that it is the more natural interpretation if one takes it that the people of Wo, the bearers of the early tomb-mounds culture, did not import the horse-riders' culture of North Asia on their own independent initiative and with it cause changes in the nature of their culture, the culture of an agriculturalist people, but that there was a certain powerful horse-riding people which directly invaded Japan from the continent through the Korean peninsula, and which subjugated and ruled over the people of Wo, and further, that the subjugated people studied this North Asian cultural complex and then caused it to be diffused throughout Japan. It is of course true that no small number of arguments can be brought against this interpretation, for example, the argument that the keyhole-shaped tomb-

mounds are a form of high tomb peculiar to Japan, and that the fact that the tombs are found without interruption throughout the early and late periods is proof that the builders of these tombs remained unchanged. Again, it is argued that if we assume that the horse-riders over-ran Japan and became chiefs over the Japanese this must have been done with the help of "the art of war" 武, and whereas we would expect that the arms convenient for mounted warfare, and the cross-bow habitually used by the North Asians, would have had to be employed for this purpose, the fact that these are not found in Japan in the tomb-mounds period provides strong grounds for rejecting a belief in an invasion of Japan by the horse-riding people. Yet again there is the view that the rearing of horses for military purposes in Japan dates from after the middle of the fifth century, a view based on the chronology of the earliest finds of horse accoutrements in the tomb-mounds, the references to horses in *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki*, and other evidence, and the supporters of this view would deny the existence of any horse-riding people in Japan before this time. All these views, however, direct their attention to only one part of the tomb-mounds culture, and neglect the whole, added to which they consist, without exception, of arguments which set out from mistaken assumptions, and since I have already shown elsewhere that they cannot be regarded as serious refutations of my interpretation I shall not repeat my criticism of them here.

In sum, if we centre our observations on the tomb-mounds and the objects found in them we can perceive in them a reflection of the fact that the horse-riding people invaded Japan via the Korean peninsula and undertook the work of subjugating Japan with its horse-riding culture, and further, the fact that this is directly connected with the establishment of a unified state in Japan would seem to be demonstrated not only by the coincidence in time but also by the fact that the representative relics of the earliest phase of the late tomb-mounds period are the tombs of the Emperors Ōjin and Nintoku. However, the tombs of the Emperors Ōjin and Nintoku are monumental structures of a size which rivals the pyramids, a fact which clearly indicates the existence in its supreme form of a Yamato court which could already boast of immense powers, and the establishment of the basis for a unified state in Japan, as well as suggesting that the primitive period of this court lay some considerable time in the past. Reason then requires us to locate this primitive period of the Yamato court in the early tomb-mounds period, and we must next consider whether there is any concrete archaeological evidence from the early tomb-mounds period which reflects an invasion of the Japanese archipelago by the horse-riders. It appears that no evidence has yet been discovered which would provide positive proof of such a thing. However, I believe that this is precisely the missing link, and that such evidence will certainly be discovered in the future. Further, as a general line to be followed in looking for this missing link I think that it would be worth while considering whether some of the tomb-mounds in the area extending from north Kyūshū to the Kinki

region which are considered to belong to the late period because of their form might not in fact date from the early period, in other words, whether there might not have been a period in which the early tomb-mounds and the late tomb-mounds co-existed in the same areas, it being granted that the two belong to different traditions, although of course they are not wholly unrelated, and whether there might not be evidence of tombs in the continental tradition, such as those of the middle Kao-chü-li period and the early Paekche (Kudara 百濟) period, having been made in the early tomb-mounds period, either in north Kyūshū or western Honshū, particularly in the coastal areas. Again, as regards the latter, we might do well to carry out some investigation to see whether the wall-painting tombs of north Kyūshū might not be identified as belonging to the continental tradition of tomb building. A re-examination of the stone enclosures called *kōgoishi* 神護石 which are distributed over north Kyūshū and western Honshū would also seem to be required. It need hardly be said that the theory was early put forward that these *kōgoishi* were of the same kind as the stone enclosures of the hill forts of Kao-chü-li and elsewhere, but there is still no established opinion as to their date, and this must be left to future research. In sum, as matters stand at present the archaeological studies centered on the tomb-mounds do not go beyond such conjectures as we have set out above as regards the question of the people who played the principal part in the formation of the Japanese state and the activities which they carried on, but the fact that the horse-riding people of North Asia, armed with the horse and the latest weapons, invaded Japan via the Korean peninsula, landing in north Kyūshū or western Honshū, and at the end of the fourth century advanced into the Kinki region to establish the powerful Yamato court and to succeed in accomplishing in essentials the establishment of a unified state in Japan is, even as matters stand at present, hinted at by the evidence. Further, since we may suppose the establishment of the Yamato court to correspond with the opening of the late tomb-mounds period, as represented by the tombs of the Emperors Ōjin and Nintoku, it follows that we must carry back the origin of the Japanese state to an earlier period, to the period of the invasion of western Japan by the horse-riding people.

Next let us approach the questions of the road which led to the establishment of the Japanese state and the antecedents of the principal actors concerned, using studies in ethnology and history in the broad sense centered on the mythology and traditions preserved in *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki*. In the past many attempts to reconstruct historical fact from the mythology and traditions preserved in *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki* have been made by numerous scholars, and a wide variety of methods has been employed. On the one hand, however, it was for some time very fashionable to regard the myths and traditions of the ancients as being fictitious and idealistic, and to stress their unhistorical character. However, it has now been proved by archaeological and ethnological survey work that in general there is more often than not a kernel of historical fact in the myths and traditions of the ancients, and it is unlikely

that *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki* should be exceptions to this rule. Indeed it would rather appear that majority opinion now holds that the contents of these works are probably extraordinarily rich in historicity. I also am of this opinion, and while I intend to subject this material to the fullest criticism I now propose to consider the question of the establishment of the Japanese state, in other words, the establishment of the Yamato court, as far as possible basing my account on the mythology and traditions of *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki*.

First, it is common knowledge that the mythology of *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki* includes the division of the gods into the two groups Ama-tsu-kami (the gods of heaven) and Kuni-tsu-kami (the gods of the land), and it is said that the gods of heaven descended on to the land of Japan and overcame and ruled the gods of the land who were its original inhabitants. The two areas where these gods of heaven are said to have descended are Izumo and Tsukushi, and among those who descended at the former place were, first of all, Susanowo no mikoto, and later Futsunushi no kami, Takemikazuchi no kami and others, while those who descended at the latter place were Ninigi no mikoto and his followers, the chiefs of five settlements headed by Ameno koyane no mikoto, or according to another account, Ameno shihi no mikoto, Amatsu kume no mikoto and others. We need hardly say that the conquest of Izumo by the two gods Futsunushi and Takemikazuchi took the form of a "yielding up of the land" (*kuni yuzuri*) and that the act performed by Ninigi no mikoto in the latter instance took the form of "the descent of the Children of Heaven" (*tenson kōrin*), and these myths suggest that an invading race called the gods of heaven first conquered or won over and then ruled the gods of the land, who were the original inhabitants of the Japanese archipelago—probably the people of Wo—at Izumo and Tsukushi. It is problematical whether the first of these descents by the gods of heaven took place at Izumo, as the accounts in *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki* say, or at Tsukushi, but the fact that it appears that the invading race called the gods of heaven came to Izumo or Tsukushi from Korea may be learned not only from the facts of geography but also from the accounts in *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki* themselves. Thus, as regards Susanowo no mikoto, who is said to have been the first to descend at Izumo, one of the sources quoted by *Nihon Shoki* states, "At this time Susanowo no mikoto, leading his son Isotakeru no kami, came down to the land of Shiragi (Silla 新羅), and stayed at the place Soshimori. He then lifted up his voice and said, 'I do not wish to stay in this place', whereupon he made a boat out of clay, and getting into it crossed to the east and came to the peak of Shimanoué at the upper reaches of the river Hinokawa in the province of Izumo", showing that before Susanowo no mikoto crossed to Izumo, leading his son or his followers, he stayed for a time in Silla, that is to say, in south Korea. Again, in the passage from *Kojiki* which describes the descent of Ninigi no mikoto on to the peak of Takachiho at Himuka in the Tsukushi area it is said, "Hereupon he said, 'This place faces towards Kara kuni (Korea

韓國) and communicates directly (?) with the cape Kasasa no misaki. It is a land which receives the direct rays of the morning sun and is illumined by the evening sun, and therefore this place is a very good place' ". Here, too we find that special mention is made of 'Kara kuni' or south Korea, and we have the impression that the import of the passage would be naturally clear to us if we were to regard Korea as the original home of the gods of heaven. But it is the story of the descent of Ninigi no mikoto on to the peak Takachiho which shows most clearly that the invaders called the gods of heaven had close connections with south Korea, especially the Mimana 任那 Kayas 六伽耶 area, and probably crossed from there to north Kyūshū. Dr. MISHINA has proved in detail that this tradition in *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki* coincides on all important points with the tradition regarding the foundation of the six states of Kaya in south Korea as recorded in *Karak Kukki* 駕洛國記, and in particular it is quite impossible to believe that it is accidental that in these sources 1) the gods descend after receiving the order 神勅 of the heavenly deity to "rule the land", 2) that they descend wrapped in some form of cloth, either the *matoko ou fusuma* 眞床覆衾 ("the quilt which covers the true bed") of *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki*, or the *hong-pok* 紅幅 ("red width of cloth") of *Karak Kukki* 駕洛國記, and 3) that they descend at a place which has more or less the same name, Kushifuru 楸觸, Kushihi 楸日 or Kushifuru 久士布流 in *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki*, and Kui-chi 龜旨 in *Karak Kukki*. It is impossible for us to interpret this in any way other than to suppose that the story of the founding of the Japanese state by the descent of the Children of Heaven as recorded in *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki* is none other than the story of the foundation of their state which the alien race—the gods of heaven—brought with them from south Korea, particularly from the Mimana (任那, i.e. Six Kayas) area, when they crossed over to north Kyūshū, and which they had connected with the high range of mountains in the new territory over which they now ruled (the peak of Takachiho). Further, we can corroborate this by the fact that the word 'furu' (*pul*) as in Kushifuru means 'village' in Korean, so that Kushifuru means nothing other than 'the village of Kui-chi', while again one of the sources quoted in *Nihon Shoki* refers to the place Kushifuru (or Kushihi) by the name Sohori 添, and this word 'sohori' (*soful*) is the Korean word for 'the capital', as in the case of the capital of Paekche, So-pu-ri 所夫里, the capital of Silla, So-pöl 蘇伐, and the modern Seoul. In all these cases words which are difficult to understand as Japanese are readily and rationally understandable as Korean.

The next question relates to the place Himuka 日向 where the Children of Heaven descended, a place which the traditions equate with the peak of Takachiho and which is generally believed to mean the Province of Hyūga (日向). We feel that this place may be thought geographically unsuitable when considered as the place to which the alien people crossed from south Korea. I feel that the generally accepted view is very questionable. Regarding 'the peak of Takachiho at Humuka' mentioned in the traditions as the place where

the Children of Heaven descended, the *Kojiki* has “the mountain of Kushifuru of Takachiho at Himuka in Tsukushi”, which informs us that the place was in Tsukushi, that is, north Kyūshū, but in *Nihon Shoki* we find two traditions, one describing the place as “the peak of Kushifuru of Takachiho at Himuka in Tsukushi” and the other as “the peak of Takachiho in the land of So in Himuka”, the former suggesting the Tsukushi theory in the same way as the tradition in *Kojiki*, and the latter suggesting ‘the land of So’, that is, the Hyūga theory. The Province of Hyūga was early connected with the tradition of the descent of the Children of Heaven because of the existence of large groups of tomb-mounds at Saitobaru and other places in that Province, and this view attained general acceptance in the academic world, but surely we cannot disregard the fact that both *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki* contain traditions supporting the Tsukushi theory. What is more, there are some more pieces of evidence which may be regarded as lending powerful support to this view. The first is the fact that *Nihon Shoki* records a tradition to the effect that Ninigi no mikoto, the chief figure in the descent of the Children of Heaven, was buried in the Shie hills at Himuka in Tsukushi. The second is the passage in *Hsin T'ang-shu* 新唐書 where the author gives a brief account of the history of Japan and says, “The first ruler was named Ame-no-mi-nakanushi 天御中主 and from his time down to Hiko-nagisa-take-ugaya-fukiaezu no mikoto 彦瀲 over the space of 32 generations all the rulers styled themselves ‘mikoto’ 尊 and had their seat in the castle of Tsukushi. When Jimmu 神武, the son of Hiko-nagisa-take-ugaya-fukiaezu no mikoto, ascended the throne he added ‘*Tennō*’ 天皇 or Heavenly Emperor to his title, and moving his capital he exercised his rule from the Province of Yamato...” From this we see that the traditions that the rulers of Japan previous to Jimmu had had their seat, at Tsukushi had been transmitted to China in the time of the T'ang dynasty or during the early years of the Sung dynasty. When we consider this evidence in support of the Tsukushi theory from *Kojiki*, *Nihon Shoki*, and *Hsin T'ang-shu* in conjunction with such things as the circumstances of the transmission of the foundation legend of the states of Six Kayas 六加耶, it will become quite clear to us that the place to which the alien race (the gods of heaven) crossed from south Korea was not in any so remote a part of Kyūshū as the Province of Hyūga, but was definitely in Tsukushi in north Kyūshū, an area which had had close relations with south Korea since the Yayoi period.

In one of the sources quoted in *Nihon Shoki* it is said that “The Sun goddess Ama-terasu Ōmikami caused her three daughters Ichiki-shima-hime no mikoto 市杵島姫命, Tagori-hime no mikoto 田心姫命, and Tagitsu-hime no mikoto 湍津姫命 to descend from heaven to Tsukushi 筑紫, instructing them, ‘Descend on to the land, assist the Children of Heaven, and receive the worship of the Children of Heaven’”. Another source quoted in *Nihon Shoki* states, “The place where the three daughters of the Sun goddess descended, the island of Usa 宇佐島 in the land of Ashihara no Naka-tsu-kuni 葦原中津國

is now in a place to the north of the sea, and is called Michinushi no Muchi", 道主貴", showing that there was a tradition that the Sun goddess, in order to assist the descent of the Children of Heaven, sent down her three daughters to a place somewhere between 'the place to the north of the sea' (south Korea) and Tsukushi, this place being denoted in the text by the word *dōchū* (道中), 'the land' or 'the midst of the way'. This tradition forms the foundation legend of the Munakata shrines, which are at present found on Oki no Shima and Ōshima in the Genkai Gulf and at Munakata in north Kyūshū, and from this, too, we may learn that what is called 'the descent of the Children of Heaven' was in fact a progress from 'the place to the north of the sea' (south Korea) to Tsukushi. From these traditions in *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki* it may be inferred that the Children of Heaven, who are considered to be the ancestors of the Emperors of the Yamato court, crossed from south Korea to north Kyūshū and established their first settlement at Tsukushi, and after the lapse of some generations migrated in the direction of the Kinki region. As need hardly be said, this is reflected in the legend of the easterly migration of the of the first Emperor, Jimmu, but there is appended to this legend a tradition which is even older and which hints at the origins of the Imperial House. This is the tradition recorded in the *Kojiki* according to which Kamu-yamato Iware-biko no mikoto (the Emperor Jimmu), while on his way eastwards from Tsukushi to the Kinki region to found the Yamato court, was met at Hayasui-no-to 速吸門 in the Inland Sea by 'the god of the country' (*kuni-tsu kami* 國神), who appeared riding on the back of a turtle, and that since this god was well acquainted with the sea-ways the Emperor was able to continue his voyage eastwards with him as his guide or *michibiki* 海導者. However, stories comparable to this are found in the foundation legend of the state of Fu-yü 扶餘 and in that of the state of Kao-chü-li 高句麗, which is said to be an offshoot of Fu-yü. Thus, the founder of the state of Fu-yü, Tung-ming 東明, when fleeing from his native place, came to a river called Shih-yen Shui 施掩水 and was unable to cross it. Accordingly he took his bow and struck at the water, whereupon a turtle appeared, and by using its back as a bridge Tung-ming was able to cross the river and become king in the land of Fu-yü. (See the fragments of *Wei Lüeh*, and the accounts of the Tung-yi and Fu-yü in *Hou Han-shu* 後漢書. Again, there is a practically identical tradition regarding the founder of the state of Kao-chü-li Chu-meng 朱蒙 or Tsou-mou 鄒牟. The elements contained in these legends regarding the founding of the states of Fu-yü and Kao-chü-li are 1) that the founder of the state leaves his former country or native place and crosses a river to found a state in a new country, 2) that he is able to cross safely to the other side of the river with the help of a turtle, and 3) that the founder of the state is 'the child of heaven', sometimes having Heaven as his father and the daughter of a river-god as his mother, and if we compare these legends with the traditions of the easterly migration of the Emperor Jimmu we find that whereas in the continental legends the founders cross rivers in the Jimmu legend the founder crosses the sea, that whereas turtles appear in the

continental legends, a man riding on a turtle appears in the Jimmu legend, and that whereas in the continental legends the founder has Heaven as his father and the daughter of a river-goddess as his mother the Emperor Jimmu is one of the Children of Heaven, and further, his mother is a daughter of the sea-goddess. Thus we observe that these legends differ only in minor respects. In sum, the main part of the story is the same in all cases, the only difference being that the river in the Fu-yü, Kao-chü-li, and so we would seem to be called upon to believe that this has been due to a legend which originated on the continent being transmitted to Japan and there transformed into a new variant suitable to the new insular environment. If, then, it is asked why these foundation legends from Fu-yü and Kao-chü-li were transformed into the legend of the easterly migration of the Emperor Jimmu, we would understand their history as being that foundation legends derived from the same sources as those of Fu-yü and Kao-chü-li were brought into Japan by an alien race, 'the gods of heaven'—and in particular by the Children of Heaven or Imperial line among them—and that when they moved from Tsukushi along the Inland Sea coast to the Kinki region there occurred the historic event of their founding the state of Japan 日本, and as a result of this event taking place the old foundation legends were adapted to it. If we assume this to have been the case it will lead us to suppose that the alien race known as the gods of heaven, and in particular the Children of Heaven or Imperial line, possessed traditions derived from the same sources as those of Fu-yü and Kao-chü-li, (even granting, as we have seen above, that they crossed directly from the Mimana area in south Korea), and that their original home may have been in eastern Manchuria or north Korea.

From the traditions recorded in *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki* we would suppose that the route followed by the alien race called the gods of heaven, particularly the Children of Heaven or Imperial line among them, could be represented thus: Eastern Manchuria or north Korea (Fu-yü, Kao-chü-li) → south Korea (Kara 加羅 or Mimana 任那) → north Kyūshū (Tsukushi) → Kinki Region. Next let us consider who would have played the principal parts in these events. As we have seen above, in the accounts given in *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki* the principal actor in the migration of the Children of Heaven from south Korea (Kara or Mimana) to north Kyūshū (Tsukushi) was Ninigi no mikoto, while the chief actor in the easterly migration from north Kyūshū to the Kinki region was Kamu-yamato Iware-biko no mikoto (the Emperor Jimmu). Are we to believe that this is what actually occurred?

First of all, the Emperor Jimmu is referred to by the name Hatsu-kuni-shirasu-sumera-mikoto, meaning 'The Emperor-Who-First-Ruled-The-Country', but we must note that there is another Emperor who is also called Hatsu-kuni-shirasu-sumera-mikoto. This is the Emperor Sujin, who is styled Hatsu-kuni-shirasu-sumera-mikoto 御肇國天皇 in *Nihon Shoki*, Hatsu-kuni-shirasu-mimaki-no-sumera-mikoto 所知初國之御眞木天皇 in *Kojiki*, and Hatsu-kuni-shirasu-mimaki-no-sumera-mikoto 初國所知美麻貴天皇 in *Hitachi Fudoki* 常陸風土記.

the word *mimaki* in these names being the same as *Mimaki* 御間城, the name of the Emperor Sujin's palace. Thus we learn that an appellation literally signifying 'The Founding Emperor of Japan' was applied to the Emperor Sujin, but on the other hand the appellation *Hatsu-kuni-shirasu-sumera-mikoto* as applied to the Emperor Jimmu appears only in *Nihon Shoki* and not in *Kojiki*, and furthermore in *Nihon Shoki* it is written with the characters 始馭天下天皇 signifying simply 'the first ruling Emperor', without any concrete implication of being the founder of the state of Japan. Thus on the evidence of this appellation *Hatsu-kuni-shirasu-sumera-mikoto* alone we would seem to be called upon to recognise that the true founding Emperor was not the Emperor Jimmu, but the Emperor Sujin, and this view has already been advanced by many scholars with the support of evidence from other spheres. Is then the Emperor Sujin, the founder of the Japanese state, to be considered the chief figure in the move from south Korea to north Kyūshū (the first establishment of the Japanese state), or in the migration from north Kyūshū to the Kinki region (the second establishment of the Japanese state)? This would appear to be a very difficult question indeed, but a key to it would seem to be provided by the names of the Emperor Sujin—*Mimaki-iri-biko* 御間城入彦 and *Mimaki-no-sumera-mikoto* 御間城天皇. The title *Mimaki-no-sumera-mikoto* clearly means "The Emperor who lives in the palace, or castle, of Mima", since it was the custom to refer to the ancient Emperors by names incorporating the name of the place at which the Emperor had his palace, as is shown by such names as *Ikenobe-no-Ōmiya-no-ame-no-shita-wo-shiroshimesu-sumera-mikoto* 池邊大宮治天下天皇 *Osada-no-miya-no-ame-no-shita-wo-shiroshimesu-sumera-mikoto* 乎婆陀宮治天下天皇, *Toyura-no-miya-no-ame-no-shita-wo-shiroshimesu-sumera-mikoto* 等由等宮治天下天皇, *Asuka-no-miya-no-ame-no-shita-wo-shiroshimesu-sumera-mikoto* 阿須迦宮治天下天皇, etc. Consequently, from the fact that the Emperor Sujin is called *Mimaki-iri-biko* we can infer that he lived in a palace located at a place known as Mima. It then becomes impossible for us to ignore the tradition preserved in the *Nihon Shoki* to the effect that the element *mima* in the name of the place *Mimana* in south Korea is derived from the element *mima* in *Mimaki-iri-biko*, the name of the Emperor Sujin. It is more probable, however, that the derivation is in the opposite direction, and that the element *mima* in the name of the Emperor Sujin is derived from the word *Mimana*. It is a matter of common knowledge that *Mimana* was also written "Mimana-kara" 任那加羅 and that it was one of the P'ien-han 弁韓 or P'ien-chen 弁辰 states in south Korea, but in Japan the characters were read "Mimana" and this no doubt represents the original Korean pronunciation or a modified Japanese version of it. Mr. Fusanoshin AYUGAI considered the name *Mimana* to be derived from the Korean *nim*, meaning 'lord' or 'king', and *ya*, meaning 'country', and Dr. SHIRATORI also considered that *Mimana* meant *nim-ra*, a word formed by adding the particle *-ra* to *nim*, meaning 'king' or 'ancient ruler'. In sum, the root of the word *Mimana* is *mima*, and this is derived from *nim*, meaning 'lord' or 'king'. It would thus seem possible for us to interpret

the evidence as meaning that the place called *mima* where the Emperor Sujin had his palace was Mimana, the *mima* of south Korea. Further, this interpretation at once disposes of the tradition that the word Mimana is derived from the name of the Japanese seat of government in that area, known as Miyake (官家), or land directly under the control of the Emperor. We hold that this tradition is disposed of because if we take Mimana to be the site of the palace of the founding Emperor of Japan, and his main stronghold, then we must take it as natural that there would be in that place 'lands directly under the control of the Emperor' (Miyake), while it need not surprise us that the seat of government in that place was called 'the Japanese seat of government' 日本府, since that place was the place from which the Japanese state was ultimately derived. In other words, it would seem that Mimana is the place from which the Japanese state set out, that the gods of heaven (the alien race) who were based on this area and headed by the figure of the Emperor Sujin attacked north Kyūshū and occupied it, thus accomplishing the first establishment of the Japanese state, the so-called Descent of the Children of Heaven, and that as a result the Emperor Sujin was known both as Mimaki-no-sumera-mikoto, 'the Emperor who lived in the palace, or castle, of Mima(na)', and as Hatsu-kuni-shirasu-sumera-mikoto, 'the Emperor who first ruled the country'. Further, there can be little doubt that the statement which appears in the account of Japan in *Chiu T'ang Shu* 舊唐書, "Jih-pen 日本 was formerly a small state, and has annexed the territory of the state of Wo 倭國" refers to these events.

Who, then, may be supposed to have played the principal part in the second establishment of the Japanese state at the time of the migration from north Kyūshū to the Kinki region? It would seem most probable that it was the Emperor Ōjin. That the Emperor Ōjin came from Tsukushi is known to us from *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki* and his immense tomb-mound is in the Province of Kawachi in the Kinki region, so that his importance is undeniable. This being so, the supposition put forward by Mr. Yū MIZUNO, Mr. Mitsusada INOUE and others, that in all probability the Emperor Ōjin was the great man who migrated from north Kyūshū to the Kinki region and there founded the Yamato court, appears to be very reasonable. Further, the time of the Emperor Ōjin corresponds with the beginning of the late tomb-mounds period in the archaeological chronology. Again, we have the impression that it is no accident that the principal actor in the first establishment of the Japanese state, the Emperor Sujin 崇神 and the principal actor in the second establishment of the Japanese state, the Emperor Ōjin 應神 both have the character for 'god', 神 (read *shin* or *jin*) in their posthumous titles. The only other occupants of the Japanese throne who have this character in their posthumous titles are the performers of fictitious feats of conquest, the Emperor Jimmu 神武 and the Empress Jingū 神功. These special posthumous names containing the character 神 are therefore to be understood as distinguishing personalities who played an especially important role in the activities of the race descended from

the Children of Heaven, in particular the founders and conquerors, and this fits well with the supposition we mentioned above—that the Emperors Sujin and Ōjin were responsible for the first and second establishments of the Japanese state. It has thus become clear that the establishment of Japan took place in two stages, and that the central figures in this great work were the Emperors Sujin and Ōjin, but, we may ask, what manner of people were they who were led by them, or who cooperated with them, in the work of establishing the Japanese state?

There are two traditions regarding those who followed Ninigi no mikoto, the Child of Heaven par excellence, at the time of the first establishment of the Japanese state, the so-called Descent of the Children of Heaven. The first, which is found in *Kojiki* and in one of the sources quoted in *Nihon Shoki*, mentions Ame no oshihi no mikoto 天忍日命 the ancestor of the Ōtomo no Muraji 大伴連, Ame no kushitsu ōkume no mikoto 天國津大來目 or Ama tsu kume no mikoto 天津久米命 the ancestor of the Kumebe 來目部 or Kume no Atae 久米直, while the other, which is found in one of the sources quoted in *Nihon Shoki*, mentions the so-called 'gods of the five companies' (*itsu no tomonowo no kami*), Ame no koyane no mikoto 天兒屋命, the ancestor of the Nakatomi, Futodama no mikoto 太玉命, the ancestor of the Imbe, Ame no uzume no mikoto 天鈿女命, the ancestor of the Sarume, Ishikoritome no mikoto 石凝姥命, the ancestor of the Kagamizukuribe or mirror-makers, and Tamaya no mikoto 玉屋命, the ancestor of the Tamazukuribe or jewel-makers. On the other hand, in the case of the Emperor Jimmu's easterly migration the names of Hinoomi no mikoto 日臣命, the ancestor of the Ōtomo no Muraji and others, or of the two gods Michinomi no mikoto 道臣命 and Ōkume no mikoto 大久米命, the ancestor of the Kumebe, are particularly mentioned by *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki* as generals in the service of the Emperor Jimmu, and it is to be noted that there are thus traditions which state that throughout the first and second establishments of the Japanese states the ancestors of the Ōtomo no Muraji and the Kume no Atae were the most powerful of the military cooperators with the Children of Heaven. This may be understood as a reflection of the fact that in later times the Ōtomo no Muraji and Kume no Atae were very powerful as military families near to the throne, but it seems that there existed no special situation of a kind which would require us to reject the idea that they had been military cooperators with the Imperial family since the south Korea period, and played a great part in the establishment of Japanese state.

On the other hand, the 'gods of the five companies' (*itsu no tomonowo*) who attended Ninigi no mikoto on the occasion of the descent of the Children of Heaven each had their own specialised functions and were the heads of companies or corporations (*be* 部) directly serving the chief of the Children of Heaven, a fact which is apparent from their names. Mr. Masao OKA has supposed in connection with the gods of the five companies that the social structure of the ruling class in Japan at this time was divided laterally into

five tribal or clan divisions, and was in fact a tribal confederation. He holds that the five companies may be regarded as having been five clans, that the fact that the Mononobe 物部 were attended by five Miyatsuko 造 and twenty-five Ama mononobe 天物部 is another example of this, and further, that a five-fold organisation of some kind or other was found in the ancient Korean state, or at least among the ruling class. Quoting the cases of the five companies or settlements 五部 of Kao-chü-li and Paekche, he considers it probable that such a form of social organisation would have originated in a pastoral society. These views are worthy of our sympathetic attention. Again, Mr. Oka holds that the society of ancient Japan as known to us through *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki* was a "paternalistic society", and cites as one of its special characteristics the exogamous social organisation called *hala*. "The element *kara* in the Japanese words *ukara*, *yakara*, *takara*, and *tomogara* is derived from *hala*, the exogamous paternal kinship group among the Tungus races, while if we consider the word *Kara* as a name for south Korea in ancient times as being the name of a tribe it is probable that this, too, is derived from *hala*, and I think that the fact that in ancient Ch'i-tan 契丹 documents the tribe is referred to by the name *ukara* 溥固部 and the people by the name *takara* 韃珂洛 indicates the existence of a race extending from the Korean peninsula to Manchuria and Mongolia which regarded the *hala* as one of the forms of organisation present in its society". Mr. Oka goes on to point out that besides the five-fold type of social organisation the society of the ancient Japanese ruling class had other elements in common with the society of the tribes extending from Korea to Manchuria and considers that this suggests that the Japanese ruling class of this time may itself have originated in the Manchuria-Korea area. We are obliged to state that this fits in perfectly with the theory which we set out in the earlier part of this paper.

We may summarise the results of our investigations centered on the mythology and traditions preserved in *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki* by saying that we interpret the evidence as indicating that the conquest of the autochthonous people, the gods of the land, by the alien race called the gods of heaven—that is, the creation of the Japanese state—took place in two stages, the first being the incursion from Mimana (or Kara) in south Korea into north Kyūshū (Tsukushi) and the second being the migration from north Kyūshū to the Kinki region, that the former stage was carried out in the first half of the fourth century by a confederation of the 'gods of heaven' consisting of the Children of Heaven, headed by the Emperor Sujin, and a number of companies or corporations such as those of the Ōtomo and Kume, while the latter stage was carried out in the last years of the fourth century or the first years of the fifth century, also by a confederation of the 'gods of heaven', this time centered on the Emperor Ōjin. Further, we conclude that the alien people called the gods of heaven—and in particular the Children of Heaven—was a North East Asian people related to the peoples of Fu-yü and Kao-chü-li, as is shown by their social structure and the myths and traditions which they

brought with them, and that immediately prior to their invasion of Japan they were based on the Mimana area in south Korea. Such a reconstruction of the history of the gods of heaven fits in well with the conclusions which we have already elicited from the archaeological studies centered on the tomb-mounds—that horse-riders of North East Asian provenance, armed with the horse and the Kyūshū or western Honshū, and at the end of the fourth century moved into the Kinki area to found the powerful Yamato court. What is more, the evidence from archaeology and that from *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki* supplement one another, and lend all the greater support to the view that the founders of the Japanese state entered the country from outside, that they were a horse-riding race of North East Asian provenance who overran and subdued Japan. In order to understand these matters the better, however, it is necessary that we should investigate the Japan of this period from the point of view of the people of the continent, and in particular that we should carry out a historical examination of this period as reflected in the Chinese histories, centering our attention on the configuration of forces in East Asia and relations between Japan and Korea.

First, an extremely important problem is raised by the fact that the Emperor Yūryaku and several of his immediate predecessors, who are known as Kings of the state of Wo 倭國王, sent embassies to the Southern Court in China and either as a result of this or on their own initiative styled themselves “Commissioned Governor, Commander on Military Affairs in the Six States of Wo, Paekche, Silla, Mimana, Ch’in-han and Mu-han, Great General for the Pacification of the East, King of Wo” 使持節都督·倭·百濟·新羅·任那·秦韓·慕韓六國諸軍事·安東大將軍·倭國王, or again, “Commissioned Governor, Commander in Military Affairs in the Seven States of Wo, Paekche, Silla, Mimana, Kara, Ch’in-han and Mu-han, Great General for the Pacification of the East, King of Wo” 使持節都督·倭·百濟·新羅·任那·加羅·秦韓·慕韓七國諸軍事·安東大將軍·倭國王. This notable fact, clearly recorded in the chapter on the state of Wo in *Sung Shu*, *Wo kuo Chuan* 宋書·倭國傳 and elsewhere, not only suggests the important fact that the state of Wo was actually a confederation of six or seven states, a confederated kingdom covering Japan and south Korea, but also raises many extremely important problems in throwing light on the contentions of Japanese diplomacy at this time and relations between Japan and Korea.

The first thing which strikes us as being very strange is that the six or seven states which are listed titles as the constituent elements of the state of Wo include Ch’in-han 秦韓 (that is, Ch’en-han 辰韓), and Mu-han 慕韓, (that is, Ma-han 馬韓), two of the three Korean states called the three Han 韓 states which preceded, respectively, the states of Silla and Paekche, but which had completely ceased to exist by the time the state of Wo sent its embassies to China in the fifth century. Further, we are led to wonder why it was found necessary to add the names of states which no longer existed, considering that

the names of the states occupying the same territory, Silla and Paekche, were included. Some have interpreted this as meaning no more than that the King of Wo include the names of non-existent states in his title merely in order to boast of the extent of his rule, but the question is not so simple as this. For although the states of Ch'in-han 秦韓 and Mu-han 慕韓 were included every time the King of Wo applied to the Chinese court for the confirmation of his titles, for some reason the state of P'ien-han 弁韓, which together with these formed the three Han 韓 states, was never included among the constituent elements of the state of Wo. If the Kings of Wo were merely desirous of having high-sounding titles it would have been natural for them to include the state of P'ien-han, and since they did not do so some other interpretation would seem to be required.

Next we must turn our attention to Paekche. The Kings of Paekche had been tributaries of China for longer than the Kings of Wo, and they had already been appointed to the title of "Commissioned Governor, Commander in Military Affairs in Paekche, Great General for the Garrisoning of the East, king of Paekche" 使持節都督·百濟諸軍事·鎮東大將軍·百濟王 by the Sung court, and since it was quite impossible for the Sung court, as overlord of Paekche, to give recognition to the inclusion of Paekche in the state of Wo matters were patched up by excising the name of Paekche from the titles proposed by the kings of Wo and adding that of Kara to make up the total of six states, but from first to last the kings of Wo were firm in their attitude of adding Paekche to the state of Wo, while on the other hand the Sung court never granted recognition to this claim. We must regard this as a natural attitude on the part of Sung, the overlord state, considering that Paekche was an independent state with its King presenting tribute to the Sung court, and we are faced with the question of why the state of Wo deliberately disregarded these facts and repeatedly made these unacceptable proposals to the Sung court.

We have now raised two great doubts regarding the titles of the kings of Wo, and we hope to resolve these doubts at a stroke with the help of the following interpretation of the evidence. May it not have been that at this time the kings of Wo had direct control over only one state in Korea, namely Mimana (or Kara), but that on the basis of the fact that in former times their rule had extended over all three Han states in the time of the states of Ma-han 馬韓, P'ien-han 弁韓 and Ch'en-han 辰韓, or on the basis of a tradition to that effect, they had adopted the position that the kings of Wo still retained a historical basis for ruling, or a latent right to rule, the whole of south Korea? And may it not be that in order to make this position clear they included in their titles the names of all the states of south Korea past and present, including Silla and Paekche as well as their predecessors Ch'en-han and Ma-han, but excepting P'ien-han, and attempted to get the Sung court to give retrospective recognition to their right to rule in south Korea? Their strong demands in regard to Paekche would seem to have proceeded from the same reasons, and although Paekche was at that time an independent state they appear to have

attempted to get the Sung court to recognise that as a matter of tradition Paekche, like all the other states of south Korea, should be considered a dependency of the state of Wo. If we adopt this interpretation not only is the question of Ch'en-han, P'ien-han and Paekche solved, but our doubts as to why the state of P'ien-han was never put forward as one of the constituents of the state of Wo are also easily explained. That is to say, since Mimana was the territory over which the kings of Wo actually had control, there was no need for them to get the Sung court to recognize their right to rule P'ien-han, the state formerly located in the territory of Mimana. However, this interpretation presupposes that in the period of the three Han states the ancestors of the kings of Wo actually ruled south Korea or that there is some powerful tradition which bespeaks such a thing, and only when this presupposition has been shown to be correct can our interpretation have decisive validity.

Were there, then, any Kings who ruled over an extensive area of south Korea in the period of the three Han states? Further, can we relate such any such kings to the kings of the Japanese and south Korean confederation with which we are concerned here, the so-called kings of Wo? These are the questions which I propose to consider next.

There is a passage in the account of the Tung-yi in *Wei Chih* 魏志東夷傳 which states that there were kings in south Korea called the kings of Ch'en 辰王, that they ruled the state of Yüeh-shih 月氏國 in Ma-han, and had brought under their sway twelve out of a total of twenty-four states, of which twelve were Ch'en-han states, and twelve were P'ien-han (or P'ien-ch'en) states 辰韓十二國·弁韓(弁辰)十二國. The kings of Ch'en, however, were not men of Ch'en-han or P'ien-han, but were always drawn from among the men of Ma-han, and although their succession to the throne was hereditary they could not set themselves up as Kings at their own will. The accompanying commentary to this passage quotes the following from *Wei Lüeh* 魏略: "This shows that they were wanderers. For this reason they were brought under the control of Ma-han". Again we find the referred to in the account of the Tung-yi in *Hou Han Shu* 後漢書·東夷傳 in the following terms. "Ma-han is the greatest of them, and they chose one from among their tribes whom they set up as king of Ch'en. He has his capital in the state of Yüeh-shih 月氏國 and is King over all the land of the three Han states."

Dr. HASHIMOTO, Dr. SUEMATSU, Professor MIKAMI and others have already published studies of the question of these kings of Ch'en, but since the matter is one of extreme difficulty the opinions of these various authorities do not coincide on all points. However, it is no mistake to hold that the question of the kings of Ch'en must be elucidated if we are to throw light on the configuration of forces in south Korea in the earlier half of the third century. If I may summarise my own interpretation of this question, I believe that the kings of Ch'en were people who had "wandered" into south Korea from outside and so could not set themselves up as kings without the consent of the Ma-han states, but in fact their succession to the throne was hereditary. Did not these

Kings of Chen rule the whole of the land of the three Han states, as is recorded in the account of these states in *Hou Han-shu*? It is probable that with their capital at 'the state of Yüeh shih' they were the most powerful rulers in south Korea at that time, and they may well have been strong Kings of the nature of a conquering dynasty ruling Ma-han and many of the states of P'ien-han and Ch'en-han—the so-called land of P'ien-ch'en 弁辰之地. As a whole, however, the society of south Korea in the second and third centuries was what Professor MIKAMI has called "a dolmen-type tomb society" consisting of seventy or more small 'states' which were merely local settlements—according to *Wei Chih* the larger of these 'states' comprised 10,000 families and the smaller ones no more than six or seven hundred—and was not a society of a kind which could make possible the appearance of a power-holder or king who could bring these small settlements under his united sway. We are thus forced to recognize that under these circumstances the kings of Ch'en who wielded ruling powers over Ma-han and 'the land of P'ien-ch'en' were of a very special character. As Professor MIKAMI has pointed out, it seems that these kings had under them officers with such Chinese-sounding titles as 卒善邑君 · 歸義侯 · 中郎將 · 都尉 · 伯長, etc. and this fact suggests that the regime of the kings of Ch'en was a fairly strong one, and that Chinese forms of governmental organisation had had a strong influence on it. Again, it is recorded as a tradition of the elders of Ch'en-han that Chinese living under the Ch'in 秦 dynasty had fled to south Korea and that the state of Ma-han had given them some land on its eastern frontiers, while it is also recorded that the people of Ch'en-han and Ma-han did not have the same language, that the people of Ch'en-han were like the [Chinese] people of Ch'in 秦, and that accordingly some people called Ch'en-han 辰韓 by the name Ch'in-han 秦韓, written with the Chinese character Ch'in. These traditions, of course, cannot be taken at their face value, but they hint that foreigners with a Chinese culture called 'people of Ch'in' had moved into the Ch'en-han and P'ien-han areas in considerable numbers. What is more, we can infer from the usages of the Chinese historical documents that these 'people of Ch'in' were not true Chinese, but people from outside the frontiers of China who had acquired a Chinese culture. Again, we learn from the account of Ma-han in *Wei Chih* that from an early date no small number of foreigners from the Lo-lang area had also come into Ma-han, and we conclude that the kings of Ch'en were among them. To this we would add that the kings of Paekche, who later united Ma-han and established the state of Paekche, were also foreigners, as is clearly shown by the passage in the address of the king of Paekche to the Emperor Hsiao-wen of the Northern Wei dynasty, 'Your subject's people, like those of the state of Kao-chü-li, originated from among the people of Fu-yü'. It is thus readily apparent from the state of south Korea around that time that the entry into south Korea by a foreign race and the establishment of their rule over south Korea had taken place at the beginning of the third century in the form of the rule of the kings of Ch'en.

However, the rule of the kings of Ch'en over south Korea clashed with

the Wei dynasty's policy of moving into the Korean peninsula, and it appears that their rule declined in the second half of the third century. In the first half of the fourth century the state of Paekche was established in Ma-han, and in the second half of the same century the state of Shiragi was established in Ch'en-han. Yet while there was this trend towards unification in south Korea in the fourth century, the state of P'ien-han alone—albeit with its name changed to Mimana-Kara—persisted in its pristine form as a collection of ten 'states', and it seems possible that this may have been the result of the rule of the kings of Ch'en having been continued in some form in Mimana-Kara, and having prevented the unification of south Korea. However that may be, the kings of Ch'en were the only rulers who exercised their powers over a large part of south Korea in the time of the three Han states, and if the kings of Wo maintained that they had exercised ruling powers in south Korea as far back as this time we would seem to be required to conclude that they were posing as successors to the rights of the Kings of Ch'en. Further, this would imply that the kings of Wo originated directly from south Korea, and that they had come from south Korea—probably from P'ien-han (Mimana)—to the land of Wo and had become kings of a confederation of Japanese and Korean states, styling themselves kings of Wo. This fits well with the statement in the passage concerning Japan in the account of the Tung-yi in *Chiu T'ang-shu* 舊唐書, "Some say that Jih-pen 日本 was formerly a small state, and has annexed the territory of the state of Wo", as well as with the attack on Tsukushi from Mimana by the gods of heaven, headed by the Emperor Sujin, which we have reconstructed above, and we can readily accept all these notices as referring to the same series of events. According to Dr. HASHIMOTO—and I agree with this view—the Emperor Sujin reigned at the beginning of the fourth century, and thus it may be proper for us to regard the establishment of the confederation of Japanese and Korean states under the Emperor Sujin as having taken place at this time, granting nevertheless that at this time it was actually no more than a confederation of Mimana and Tsukushi, and it will probably be no great error to place the origin of the *miyake* or Japanese seat of government in Mimana at about this time also. Why, then, did the Children of Heaven headed by the Emperor Sujin, regarded by some as the descendants of, or successors to, the kings of Ch'en, embark on their invasion of the state of Wo from Mimana, and where was their expedition based? We may suppose there to have been three probable motivations for their invasion of the state of Wo. The first is that when the power of the kings of Ch'en declined in the second half of the third century and thereafter, and when their right to rule became restricted to the territory of P'ien-han, a movement towards unification began among the settlements of Ma-han and Ch'en-han, and the rulers of P'ien-han (Mimana) who were heirs to the kings of Ch'en found themselves pressed by the necessity of contriving some break-through in the political situation which would open the way to the restoration of their power and influence. The second is that a part of the territory of P'ien-han (Mimana)

under their rule, called Kou-yeh 狗邪 or Kara 加羅, had been the territory of the people of Wo since the Yayoi period, and indeed had been called 'the northern tip of the state of Wo', and it would have been most natural for those who had become the rulers of this area to be interested in the main stronghold of the people of Wo, the islands of Japan, and directly, in the north Kyūshū area. The third is that the people of Wo in the state of Kou-yeh or Kara had been actively involved in relations with the Chinese during the Lo-lang period, particularly through the medium of sea-borne trade, but had been forced to give up these activities by the changes in the situation inside and outside Korea which took place after the destruction of the Chinese colony at Lo-lang, so that they, too, would have wished for a change of front in the political situation. We believe that these three motivations combined to prompt the rulers of P'ien-han (Mimana), the heirs to the kings of Ch'en, to plan the invasion of the state of Wo with the assistance of the people of Wo living in that area, and to carry that plan into effect. Further, it is not difficult to imagine that on this occasion Kara, the base of the people of Wo living in Mimana, should have been the operational base for the invasion of the state of Wo, and the fact that Kara was the centre of Mimana, as becomes clear from later history, may be thought to have been due to such a circumstance as this. If we interpret the evidence in this way it will be easy for us to understand the import of the first sentence in the following passage from the account of the Tung-yi in *Chiu T'ang-shu*: "The people of the state of Jih-pen 日本國 are a separate race of the state of Wo. Because their country is near the place where the sun is they style themselves Japan, 'the root of the sun'". There is no doubt that the word 'a separate race of the state of Wo' refer to the people of wo living in Kara in P'ien-han or Mimana in south Korea, and we may hold that the fact that this suggests that these people became the foundation of the Japanese state can be understood in its true sense only when one has grasped such hidden facts of history as those we have mentioned above.

In sum, we may suppose that the invasion of Tsukushi by the kings of Mimana, the heirs to the kings of Ch'en, from the operational base of Kara and with the cooperation of the people of Wo living in that area, is synonymous with the founding labours of the Emperor Sujin and the Descent of the Children of Heaven under Ninigi no mikoto, and represents nothing other than the first establishment of the Japanese state. Further, when that invasion succeeded the first development which came about was the establishment of a confederated Japanese-Korean state comprising Mimana and Tsukushi, and the kings of this confederated state, the kings of Wo, had their capital, for the meantime, in Tsukushi. We may suppose this that took place about the beginning of the fourth century, but the new state gradually became more flourishing, and from the inscription on the stone monument erected by King Hot'ae of Kao-chü-li 高句麗好太王碑 we can perceive that by the middle of the fourth century it had become a great power in south Korea, along with the state of Paekche, and that from the end of the fourth century to the begin-

ning of the fifth, that is to say, in the time of the Emperor Ōjin, it was the leading spirit in operations against the state of Kao-chü-li by the other states of south Korea. At times the armies of Wo penetrated deeply into the interior of the Korean peninsula, as far as the boundaries of Tai-fang 帶方. Further, the fact that while these continental campaigns were being carried on there occurred the conquest of the Kinki region by the Emperor Ōjin and the establishment of the Yamato court, resulting in the second establishment of the Japanese state and the transfer of the capital to the east, is undoubtedly connected with the military operations and configuration of forces in the Korean peninsula. It seems probable that the aim was to penetrate more deeply into Japan, to secure the rear, and thus to provide for all eventualities in the operations on the continent. In the nature of the case, however, this second establishment of the Japanese state—the establishment of a state centered on the Kinki region—necessitated a war on three fronts. The court was obliged to keep up military operations against the so-called Ebisu 蝦夷 or 'hairy people' 毛人 of eastern Japan, against large numbers of aborigines in western Japan who had not yet been brought to obedience, and against the enemy states of the Korean peninsula. This state of affairs is best revealed by the passage in the address to the Sung court by King Wu of Wo 倭王武, the Emperor Yūryaku, "From aforesaid my predecessors have gone over mountains and rivers without rest, clad in helmet and armour, making war against fifty-five states among the hairy people of the east, subduing sixty-six states among the multitude of barbarians in the west, and, crossing over to the north of the lake, subjugating ninety-five states there". Moreover, such a state of affairs continued until the T'ang dynasty sent its forces into the peninsula and Japan finally give up all hope of holding on to south Korea. Until that time the Emperors of Japan were kings of Wo ruling a Japanese-Korean confederation, and it would seem that they became Emperors of Japan in the true sense only after the Yamato court had severed all connections with the peninsula, that is, from the time of the Emperor Tenchi, in whose reign the Emperors of Japan finally became sovereigns over the islands of Japan alone. Further, from this time onwards Japan's ideas about history also changed.