

# Ancient Korea-Japan Relations: Dating the Formative Years of the Yamato Kingdom (366-405 CE) by the *Samguk-sagi* Records and Reinterpreting the Related Historical Facts

Wontack Hong\*

Professor Emeritus, Seoul National University

**Abstract:** This paper establishes the dates for some important events that happened during the formative years of the Yamato Kingdom (366-405 CE) on the basis of the *Nihongi* system of dates corrected by the records of *Samguk-sagi*, and reinterprets the related *Nihongi* records as well as the associated historical facts. From 266 CE to 413 CE, the Japanese Islands are never mentioned in the Chinese dynastic chronicles. The main objective of this paper is to provide a plausible model on the origins of Yamato dynasty and the roots of the imperial family, focusing on this gap of 147 years.

## INTRODUCTION

According to the Chinese dynastic chronicle *Sanguozhi* that was compiled sometime between 280-97 CE, there were at least thirty town-states in the Japanese Islands as of 266 CE. The Japanese Islands are never mentioned in the Chinese dynastic chronicles from 266 until they are again mentioned in 413 as an entity of one unified Yamato Kingdom. In order to clean-up the historic record and establish an antiquity for the origins of Yamato Kingdom, the Yamato court compiled the *Kojiki* in 712, and the *Nihongi* (traditionally called the *Nihon-shoki* in Japan) in 720. These are the oldest Japanese chronicles extant. Unlike the *Kojiki*, the *Nihongi* was recorded chronologically, giving the dates for events which are supposed to have happened after the alleged establishment of the Yamato Kingdom in 660 BCE.<sup>1</sup> Some important events that happened between 366-405 can be dated by adding 120 years to the *Nihongi* records that can be corroborated by the oldest Korean dynastic chronicle extant, the *Samguk-sagi*, that was compiled in 1145.<sup>2</sup> This 39-year period constitutes the core formative years of the Yamato Kingdom. The *Kojiki* and *Nihongi* record a massive arrival of the Paekche people from the Korean Peninsula precisely around this period. On the other hand, the foundation myth of Koguryō-Paekche and the Yamato Kingdom reveal surprising similarities in essential motives, and *the Clan Register*

that was compiled by the Yamato court in 815 suggests that the Yamato imperial families originated from Paekche royal families.

The study on history and archeology in Japan seems to have been strongly influenced by the *a priori* assumptions of the uniqueness and homogeneity of Japanese culture, and the Western experts do not seem to have been free from the ideological sentiments prevailing in their host country either. This paper investigates ancient Korea-Japan relations on the basis of well-known documentary sources, without unearthing any new document. With a shift in paradigm, however, the same set of data gives a very different story that may be closer to the reality.

## CORRECTING THE NIHONGI DATES AND REINTERPRETING THE RELATED DOCUMENTS

The Japanese Islands are never mentioned in the Chinese dynastic chronicles from 266 to 413. This lacuna belongs to the period that "has long been considered a dark and puzzling stretch of prehistory" [3]. The most important fact may be that there were, according to the Chinese dynastic chronicles, at least thirty *Wo* town-states in 266, but then there emerged one *Yamato* state by 413. This section establishes the dates for some important events that happened during the formative years of the Yamato Kingdom on the basis of the *Nihongi* system of dates corrected by the records of *Samguk-sagi*, and then endeavors to reconstruct the possible sequence of events occurred between 364-9.

### Lacuna between 266-413

The *Weishu* (Record of Wei, 220-65) forms part of the *Sanguozhi* (History of the Three Kingdoms, 220-80) compiled by Chen Shou (233-97) of Western Jin (265-316). The records on Japanese people (*Wo-zhuan*) in the *Dongyi-zhuan* (Accounts of the Eastern Barbarians) were apparently based on the reports made by Chinese envoys to the northern part of Kyūshū around the nine-year period of 239-48. The records begin with the following statement: "The people of

\*Address correspondence to this author at the 330-272 Sungbuk-2-dong, Sungbuk-ku, Seoul 136-823, Korea, Tel: 82-2-743-1838; Fax: 82-3673-3066; E-mail: wthong2002@hotmail.com

<sup>1</sup> The *Kojiki* was completed by the Yamato court in 712, and translated into English by Basil Hall Chamberlain (1850-1935) in 1882, and also by Donald L. Philippi in 1968. The *Nihongi* was completed by the Yamato court in 720, and translated into English by William George Aston (1841-1911) which was printed by the Japan Society in 1896 [1]. See the sub-section on "the Nature of Distortions in the *Kojiki-Nihongi* Texts" at the end of this paper.

<sup>2</sup> The *Samguk-sagi* (*Histories of the Three Kingdoms*) was completed in 1145 by a group of scholars headed by Kim Pusik (1075-1151). It was organized on the model of Sima Qian's *Shiji*, encompassing nearly a thousand years of the history of Korean Peninsula from 57 BCE until 935 CE [2].

Wo dwell in the middle of the ocean southeast of Daifang [commandery]. Around the mountains and islands, they form town-states, formerly comprising more than one hundred states. During the Han dynasty [Wo] envoys appeared at the court. Today, thirty of their town-states maintain intercourse with us through envoys and interpreters.” There also appears the records on Queen “Pimihu of the Yama-ich town-state” (called “Himiko of the Yama-tai State” by the Japanese historians) for the period of 238-47, and her relative Iyo who became the queen after Pimihu passed away. According to the *Jinshu* (compiled during 646-8), an envoy and interpreters from the Wo people came to the court of Western Jin with a tribute sometime early in the period of 265-74. According to the *Nihongi* record (that quotes a Jin person), it most likely was the year 266. The “queen” recorded in the quotation of *Nihongi* as having sent interpreters with a tribute to the Western Jin court in 266 most likely was Iyo [4].

The Japanese Islands are never mentioned thereafter in the Chinese dynastic chronicles until the *Jinshu* records the envoy of Yamato State presenting local products to the Eastern Jin court in 413.<sup>3</sup> According to the *Songshu*, Wendi (r.424-53) of Liu-Song granted the king called Zhen the title of “General Pacifying the East, King of Yamato” sometime between 425-442 [5].

Historians speculate that the lacuna between 266-413 may imply some sort of chaos having prevailed in the Japanese Islands. This period coincides with the Yayoi-Kofun transition, and the birth of the first unified state in Japanese Islands. The main objective of my study is to provide a plausible model on the origin of Yamato dynasty and the roots of the imperial family, focusing on this gap of 147 years.

### Nihongi-Dating Corrected by the Records of *Samguk-sagi*

The *Nihongi* was recorded chronologically, giving the years, months, and even days for events which are supposed to have happened after the official beginning of the Yamato Kingdom dated 660 BCE until the eleventh year of Jitō’s reign dated 697 CE.

The *Nihongi* records that King Kaero of Paekche sent his younger brother Kon-chi to the Yamato court in 461 CE, and then quotes the record of the no longer extant *Paekche Shin-sen* dated 461 CE containing the same story. Hence Aston stated that: “the first date in the *Nihongi* which is corroborated by external evidence is 461 CE [6].”<sup>4</sup> The *Nihongi* also records that King Mu-nyōng (r.501-23) of Paekche was born in the same year, and named Si-ma. Surprisingly, his tomb was excavated at Kong-ju in 1971, and the funerary inscription confirms that his name was Sa-ma and that he died in

523 at the age of 62.<sup>5</sup> Sixty years after Aston’s death, the date 461 CE in the *Nihongi* was indeed corroborated by irrefutable external evidence.

One may, however, try to establish the years, if not months and dates, for some important events that happened before 461 CE on the basis of the *Nihongi* system of dates corrected by the records of *Samguk-sagi*. The *Nihongi* records that King Keun Chogo of Paekche died in 255, while the *Samguk-sagi* records that he died in 375. The *Nihongi* says that King Keun Kusu died in 264 and King Chim-ryu died in 265, while the *Samguk-sagi* says that these Paekche kings died in 384 and 385, respectively. According to the *Nihongi*, Paekche sent crown prince Chōn-ji to the Yamato court in 277. The *Samguk-sagi* records that the crown prince was sent to the Yamato court in 397. According to the *Nihongi*, Paekche King Asin (Ahwa) died in 285, but the *Samguk-sagi* records that he died in 405. This is the well known 120-year (two sexagenary cycles) difference between the records of *Nihongi* and those of *Samguk-sagi* during the 30-year period of 375-405 [9]. Among the *Nihongi* dating between 660 BCE and 460 CE, this is the one and only period that can be dated accurately by external evidence. The two-cycle correction method may, however, be extended at least nine years backward as to include the 366-374 period. Although the year 461 CE “is noteworthy as being the first in the *Nihongi* which is confirmed by Korean history,” Aston believes that the narrative from the year 246 CE (366 CE with the two cycles correction) down to 265 (385 CE) “contains a solid nucleus of fact [10].”

### Queen Pimihu in *Dongyi-zhuan* Becomes Homuda’s Mother

The 120-year difference between the records of *Nihongi* and those of *Samguk-sagi* during 375-405 apparently resulted from a bold attempt by the *Nihongi* compilers to make the Wo queen Pimihu appearing in the *Dongyi-zhuan* mother of Yamato king Homuda (Ōjin).

The *Wo-zhuan* records that: “Going toward ... one arrives at the country of Yama-ichi, where the Queen holds her court. ... To the south is the country of Kunu, where a king rules. ... This country is not subject to the Queen. ... The country [Yama-ichi] formerly had a man as a ruler. For some seventy or eighty years after that there were disturbances and warfare. Thereupon the people agreed upon a woman for their ruler. Her name was Pimihu. She occupied herself with magic and sorcery, bewitching the people. ... [In 238 CE] the Queen of Wo sent ... to visit the prefecture [of Daifang], where they requested permission to proceed to the Emperor’s Court with tribute. ... [In 247 CE] Pimihu had been at odds with the King of Kunu ... When Pimihu passed away ... a relative of Pimihu..., a girl of thirteen, was made queen...”<sup>6</sup> [11].

<sup>3</sup> The *Kojiki* and *Nihongi* read the Chinese character “Wo” as “Yamato” (*KK*; p. 162 or *NS I*; p. 81). Yamato is one of five provinces of Kinai, comprising ten districts, which form the “Nara Prefecture.” Formerly the name of the Yamato province was written Great Wo (read Great Yamato), but in 737 the characters were changed to Dai Wa (also read Great Yamato).

<sup>4</sup> Aston states that: “But the chronology is not a little vague for some time longer. Perhaps if we take 500 CE as the time when the correctness of the *Nihongi* dates begins to be trustworthy, we shall not be very far wrong [6];” and also that: “Even the large untrue element which it contains is not without its value. Bad history may be good mythology or folk-lore, and statements the most wildly at variance with fact often throw a useful light on the beliefs or institutions of the age when they became current [7].”

<sup>5</sup> The *Nihongi* records that King Kaero gave Kon-chi one of his consorts who was pregnant, instructing him to send back the baby if she delivered on the journey. The pregnant consort indeed gave birth to a child on an island in Kyūshū, and Kon-chi immediately took a ship and sent the baby, named *Si-ma* (island or *Si-eom* in Korean), back to Kaero. The child became King Mu-nyeong [8].

<sup>6</sup> One of the most interesting aspects of Japanese history as written by Japanese historians is the fact that while Chen Shou, the author of *Weishu*, calls Pimihu’s state “Yama-ichi,” almost all Japanese historians have decided to read it “Yama-tai” and understand it to imply “Yama-to.” Indeed Fan Yeh (398-445), the author of *Hou Hanshu*, invigorated those Japanese historians who eagerly want to believe that Pimihu’s state was

The writers of *Nihongi* were apparently inspired by the *Wo-zhuan* records on Pimihi, and decided to create a figure called Empress Jingū (as the Regent during 201-69 on behalf of Homuda). The *Nihongi* came to include the quotations from *Dongyi-zhuan* as footnotes for the 39<sup>th</sup> (239), 40<sup>th</sup> (240), and 43<sup>rd</sup> (243) years of the Jingū's reign. The *Nihongi* notes that the 66<sup>th</sup> year of Jingū's reign corresponds to the second year of Jin Wudi's reign (266) [12]. The writers of *Nihongi* then decided to make Homuda (Ōjin) the second son and crown prince of Empress Jingū, and let him succeed her to the throne in 270 [13].

The writers of *Nihongi* tried to fill the 201-13 period by writing a few paragraphs up to the 5<sup>th</sup> year of Jingū's reign from scratch, and then jumping to the 13<sup>th</sup> year. There are no records for the 31-year period of 214-45 except the seven letters specifying the year 239 and a few sentences quoted from the *Dongyi-zhuan* that were apparently added later as footnotes. Substantial narrative begins to appear only from the year 246 which becomes the year 366 with the two-cycle correction. Aston believes that the narrative between 366-85 contains a solid nucleus of fact.

The writers of *Nihongi* filled up the period between 366-85 (246-65 according to the *Nihongi* dating system) with various stories related to the Korean Peninsula. They made a heroic attempt to transform the third century *Wo-zhuan* figure, Pimihi, into the Regent Empress Jingū, and then link this fictitious figure to the late fourth century real figure by making Homuda the second son and crown prince of Jingū. The so-called two sexagenary cycles difference between the records of *Nihongi* and those of *Samguk-sagi* resulted from their making Jingū die at the age of 100 in 269 CE instead of making her die at the age of 220 in 389 CE. Unfortunately, their effort to manufacture the *Bansei-Ikkei* (an unbroken line of Emperors since 660 BCE) myth came to torture numerous modern Japanese historians who somehow feel obliged to square the fiction with the actual history and archeological findings. Quite a few Japanese scholars were imaginative enough to substantiate the *Nihongi* story of the Jingū's conquest of Silla (in October 200, by the *Nihongi* chronology) and to come up with the Mimana story of colonizing the southern peninsula by the Yamato Kingdom in the fourth century (circa 369, by the ghost of Pimihi), precisely at the very peak of Paekche's military might.

According to the *Samguk-sagi*, King Koguk-won of Koguryō invaded Paekche in September 369 with 20,000 infantry and cavalry soldiers, and then King Keun Ch'ogo of Paekche let his Crown Prince (Keun Kusu) attack the Koguryō army, who could return with 5,000 prisoners after destroying them. Keun Ch'ogo, together with Crown Prince, led 30,000 elite soldiers and invaded Koguryō in Winter 371, and made the Koguryō King Koguk-won get killed in the battle at Pyung-yang. According to the *Jinshu* (in Annals), an envoy from Paekche had arrived at the court of Eastern

Jin in January 372, and then a Jin envoy was sent to the Paekche court in June, granting Keun Ch'ogo the title of "General Stabilizing the East, Governor of Lelang" [16]. The *Samguk-sagi* records that Keun Ch'ogo sent an envoy to the Eastern Jin court in January 372 and also in February 373. The *Jinshu* records the arrival of a Paekche mission in 384. The *Samguk-sagi* records the sending of an envoy and the arrival of a Serindian monk named Marananta from Eastern Jin in September 384, implying the formal introduction of Buddhism to Paekche. The *Jinshu* records that the title of "Commissioner Bearing Credentials, Inspector-General, General Stabilizing the East, King of Paekche" was granted to King Chim-ryu (r.384-5) or Chin-sa (r.385-92) in 386 [17]. Paekche under the reign of the martial kings Keun Ch'ogo and Keun Kusu represents the most dynamic and expansionist era (346-84) for the kingdom. Hong has contended that the conquest of the Japanese Islands by the Paekche people commenced sometime during this period [18].

In this and the following sections, I endeavor to reconstruct the possible sequence of events occurred between 364-405 on the basis of the passages in *Nihongi* and *Kojiki*, taking the freedom of selecting and weaving the recorded materials into a coherent story. All the statements "between quotation marks" are the records of the *Nihongi* translated by Aston or of the *Kojiki* translated by Philippi. Those words inserted between the [square] brackets represent my own efforts to correct the distortions in the original texts.

#### ***Nihongi* Records the Paekche Army Moving South in 369**

The *Nihongi* gives the dates for the events which most likely had happened between 364 and 369 CE (between 244-49, without the two-cycle correction). The record of *Nihongi* for the year 366 (246, without the two-cycle correction) contains the following statements made by the King of a Kaya state, Tak-sun: "In the course of the year 364, three men of Paekche named Ku-zō ... came up to my country and said; - 'The King of Paekche (Keun Ch'ogo), hearing that in the Eastern quarter there is an honorable country (the Japanese Islands), has sent thy servants to this honorable country's court. Therefore, we beg of thee a passage so that we may go to that Land. If you wilt be good enough to instruct thy servants and cause us to pass along the roads, our King will certainly show profound kindness to my Lord the King.' I (the King of Tak-sun) then said to Ku-zō and his followers: - '... there is an honorable country in the East ... There is ... but far seas and towering billows, so that in a large ship, one can hardly communicate. Even if there were a regular crossing-place, how could you arrive there?' Hereupon Ku-zō and the others said: - 'Well, then for the present we cannot communicate. Our best plan will be to go back again, and prepare ships with which to communicate later'" [19].

What the *Nihongi* tells us is that the King of a Kaya state suggested the need for large ships to the Paekche envoys. Apparently, the King of Tak-sun wanted to know what he would get in return for his cooperation and preparation of large ships for King Keun Ch'ogo of Paekche.

The *Nihongi* continues: "Hereupon [the King of Tak-sun] sent a man [in company with the returning Paekche envoys] to the Land of Paekche. ... King Keun Ch'ogo of Paekche was profoundly pleased, and received [the man from Tak-sun] cordially. The King presented to him a roll each of five

---

located in the Kinai-Yamato area by referring to Pimihi's state as Yama-tai. Perhaps the development in the Japanese Islands during the late fourth century and the early fifth century had influenced the author of the *History of Later Han* and led him to make this "innocent" error. Fan Yeh even used such an expression like "the King of Great Wa." In spite of the compelling facts presented by Furuta Takehiko, the speculation over the location of the so-called "Yama-tai Koku" continues to serve as a sort of public entertainment in Japan [14, 15].

kinds of dyed silk, a horn-bow and arrows, together with forty bars of iron. Thereafter he opened his treasure-house, and pointing to his various rare objects, said: --'In my country there is great store of these rare treasures. ... I shall now entrust them to envoys, who will visit your country in order to offer them.' [The man from Tak-sun] took charge of this message, and on his return informed King." In April 367, "the King of Paekche sent Ku-zō ... with tribute. Hereupon the [King of Tak-sun was] greatly delighted" [20].

According to the *Nihongi*, King Keun Ch'ogo of Paekche dispatched scouts to a Kaya state (Tak-sun) in July 364 in order to collect information about the passages to the Japanese Islands.<sup>7</sup> Tak-sun seems to have been located in an area along the Nak-tong River which, flowing south to the modern Pusan area, constituted the shortest route from Paekche to the Japanese Islands. What are we able to understand from these *Nihongi* records?

As of 364, Wi-rye in the south of the Han River was the capital of Paekche, and Ma-han was still occupying the southwestern corner of the Korean Peninsula. Hence it was natural that the Paekche people would lack detailed information about passages to the Japanese Islands. At that time, the Paekche court seems to have been planning not only the conquest of the Japanese Islands by sending an expeditionary force, but also the conquest of the Mahan states in the southwestern part of the Korean Peninsula by an army led by King Keun Ch'ogo himself together with the expeditionary force on its way to the Japanese Islands. The movement of the expeditionary force to the Japanese Islands seems to have occurred not long after 364. In the ensuing narration, however, the *Nihongi* records a large-scale Wa (*Wo* in Chinese) invasion of the Korean Peninsula with "Paekche generals." According to the *Nihongi*, it was Jingū who dispatched an army to the Korean Peninsula in March 369 to invade "Silla." It is said that, when the Wa army arrived at Tak-sun, they discovered that the size of their army was too small and hence had to ask for reinforcements. They were soon joined by troops led by "Paekche generals." They then all together invaded and conquered "Silla," and pacified Tak-sun and six other places. From here the armies turned west, conquered the southern savages, and then "granted" the conquered lands to Paekche. At this point they were joined by the "Paekche King Keun Ch'ogo and his Crown Prince," whereupon four more localities spontaneously surrendered. The King and the Crown Prince of Paekche offered their congratulations, and sent the Wa soldiers off with cordial courtesy.

If one tries to understand these military activities described quite confusingly in the *Nihongi* as the work of Wa, then there is no way to understand the "Paekche generals" associating with Wa troops. Neither can we understand, as pointed out by Ledyard, the story that the Wa armies somehow got to Tak-sun first without passing through the areas they later conquered, nor the story that Wa armies then turned around and conquered the areas from north to south.

<sup>7</sup> The *Nihongi* records the statement made by King Seong-myung (r.523-54) of Paekche: "In former times, during the reign of my ancestors, King Sok-ko [Keun Chogo] and King Kwi-su [Keun Kusu], the Kanki of Ara, Kara and Tak-sun first sent envoys and entered into communication. We became knitted together by cordial friendship, and they were treated as children or younger brothers" [21].

But once we take those series of military activities as the work of Paekche, these *Nihongi* records become quite coherent. By crosschecking the records of *Samguk-sagi*, Ledyard logically deduces that all those stories recorded in the *Nihongi* represent the historical records of Paekche armies moving south [22]. At this point, however, Ledyard commits an altogether unnecessary and surprising error, calling the Paekche king and his followers "Puyeo warriors." In the *Nihongi*, the above story ends with the Paekche King and the "Wa soldiers," who are heading to the Japanese Islands, pledging eternal friendship and bidding farewell. If we take the departing "Wa soldiers" as a contingent of Paekche warriors led by a Paekche prince, without invoking Puyeo warriors out of the blue, then the entire story becomes coherent as follows.

The *Nihongi* records that, in March 369 (249, without the two-cycle correction), "... were made generals. Along with ... Ku-zō and the others they prepared a [spearhead] force with which they crossed over [the Sae-Jae Pass] and came to Tak-sun. They were accordingly about to invade [Mahan] when someone said:--'Your troops are too few. You cannot defeat [Mahan].' They respectfully sent back ... Sa-baek and Kae-ro to ask for reinforcements. Mong-na Keun-ja, Sa-sa, and No-kwe were forthwith ordered to take command of choice troops which were sent along with Sa-baek and Kae-ro. (At this point, the *Nihongi* notes that 'the surnames of Sa-sa and No-kwe are unknown, but Mongna Keun-ja was a Paekche general.') They all assembled at Tak-sun, invaded [Mahan states], and conquered them. Seven provinces were accordingly subdued. Then they moved their forces, and turning westward, arrived at ... where they slaughtered the southern savages of ... Hereupon, their King Ch'ogo [Keun Ch'ogo], together with [Crown] Prince Kuisu [Keun Kusu], came to meet them with more troops. Then four villages spontaneously surrendered. Thereupon the Kings of Paekche, father and son, met [the leader of the expeditionary force] ... Mong-na Keun-ja, and the rest at the village ... and at an interview offered their congratulations and dismissed them with cordial courtesy. ... [Before the farewell] they ascended Mount ... where ... the King of Paekche made a solemn declaration, saying:--'I make this solemn declaration of alliance to show that it will remain undecayed to distant ages' " [23].

### 369 CE---The Year Paekche Conquered Mahan vs. The Year Yamato Conquered Southern Korean Peninsula

The records of *Samguk-sagi* for the years 366 and 368 CE only note that King Keun Ch'ogo sent envoys bearing gifts to the Silla court. The record for the year 369 CE simply states that Keun Ch'ogo held a grand review of his army at the southern bank of the Han River, fluttering the yellow flags [like the Han Chinese emperors]. The *Samguk-sagi* records for 366-9 themselves barely allude to the event of sending envoys and Paekche army moving south. According to the *Samguk-sagi*, the Paekche's conquest of Mahan occurred in 9 CE, instead of 369 CE. Ledyard suggests that the *Samguk-sagi* transferred the story backward by six cycles in order to lend antiquity to the date of Paekche's conquest of Mahan. Lee Byung-do also gives an identical interpretation [22, 24].

The *Samguk-sagi* records that the king of Mahan sent an envoy to the Paekche court in 6 CE; a diviner told the king

of Paekche in 7 CE that he would annex a neighboring state; the king declared in 8 CE his intention to occupy Mahan before some other state seizing its territory; the king of Paekche left the capital with an army in winter, 10<sup>th</sup> month, in 8 CE, launching a surprise attack on Mahan, and occupying all the fortresses except two; and that the two remaining fortresses surrendered in 9 CE, extinguishing the Mahan state [25]. If we transfer these *Samguk-sagi* records forward by 360 years, both the *Nihongi* and *Samguk-sagi* indeed corroborate each other's story.

Most Japanese historians dealing with this period, however, make the records of *Nihongi* for the year 369 CE the very foundation of their well-publicized claim that there existed a powerful Yamato state already by the mid-fourth century, and that the Yamato army conquered Silla and Kaya in 369, starting the administration of the colony called Mimana in the southern Korean Peninsula. Most Western experts habitually echo the Japanese contentions. Jonathan W. Best may be regarded as representing the great majority of Japanese and Western historians when he states, as recently as 2006 CE (through the publication by the Harvard University Asia Center), that "it is clear that neither Paekche nor Silla ceased to function as independent states," but "it is evident that the Yamato exercised significant influence in southern Korea from late in the fourth century to the end of the fifth" [26].

## THE FOUNDER AND FOUNDING DATE OF THE YAMATO KINGDOM

According to the *Nihongi*, the Yamato Kingdom was established by Ihare (Jimmu) in 660 BCE. Neither the Japanese historians nor the general public believe that the recorded date is correct. This raises, of course, the question of when the Yamato Kingdom was established. This section identifies the founder of the Yamato dynasty, traces the events occurred between 369-90, and then establishes the founding date of the Yamato Kingdom.

### The Founder of the Yamato Kingdom

According to the *Nihongi*, Homuda (Ōjin) became the king of Yamato state in 270 CE. Quite a few Japanese historians believe that the Yamato Kingdom began with Ōjin, despite the fact that, according to the *Kojiki* and *Nihongi*, Ōjin was the fifteenth, not the first, king of Yamato Kingdom. Tsuda Sōkichi (1873-1961) contended that the records of *Kojiki* and *Nihongi* on the Yamato kings prior to Ōjin were nothing but a simple fabrication for the purpose of making the Yamato royal family the rulers of Japanese archipelago since ancient times [27].

The first evidence advanced by Tsuda to support his thesis is as follows. In the original text of *Kojiki* and *Nihongi*, all thirteen kings between Jimmu the Founder and the fifteenth king Ōjin were recorded in traditional Japanese style posthumous formulaic titles, none of them individual or unique. From this, Tsuda reasons that posterity manufactured the titles, rendering them uniform. Beginning with Ōjin, however, the unique name that was actually used since the time of the principedom was recorded as the posthumous title of each king. From this, Tsuda reasons that the name of each king was authentic. For example, the name of Ōjin when he was a prince is Homuda, and the latter became his traditional

Japanese style posthumous title [28]. The Chinese-style titles, such as Jimmu or Ōjin, though most familiar to the general public these days, are not the ones we see in the original *Kojiki* and *Nihongi*. These are the titles that are believed to have been manufactured later by a scholar called Oumi Mihune (722-85).

The second evidence presented by Tsuda is as follows. According to the *Kojiki* and *Nihongi*, from Jimmu to the fifteenth king Ōjin, the pattern of succession was strictly lineal, from father to son. Between Ōjin and Tenji, however, the pattern of succession was mostly fraternal, with kingship passing from brother to brother. The practice of father-to-son succession was not firmly established even after Tenji in the late seventh century. Tsuda therefore contended that the records of *Kojiki* and *Nihongi* on all kings prior to Ōjin were fictitious.<sup>8</sup>

Hong finds four additional pieces of evidence to support the thesis that the Yamato Kingdom began with Ōjin<sup>9</sup> [29]. The first supporting piece of evidence is as follows. Tsuda had focused on the fact that both *Kojiki* and *Nihongi* record strict father-to-son successions prior to Ōjin. More importantly, however, is the fact that the credibility of them is cast into doubt by the peaceful nature of the transitions ascribed to them, so unlike other transitions. There was a bloody feud among brothers when Nintoku succeeded Ōjin. There was another bloody feud when the Richiu-Hanzei brothers succeeded Nintoku. Peculiar circumstances developed when Ingyō succeeded Hanzei. There was another bloody feud when the Ankau-Yūriaku brothers succeeded Ingyō. More peculiar circumstances occurred when the Kenzou-Ninken brothers succeeded Yūriaku-Seinei, and when Keitai succeeded Ninken-Buretsu. In other words, conflict and bloodshed, mostly between brothers, characterize post-Ōjin successions, giving us no reason to suppose that pre-Ōjin successions were peaceful.

Second, according to the *Nihongi*, the 70-year interval between the death of the so-called fourteenth king Chiuai (in 200) and the enthronement of the fifteenth king Ōjin (in 270) was ruled by Empress Jingū as regent (201-69). Yet Jingū is commonly acknowledged to be a fictitious figure apparently inspired by the third century Pimihu. The story of Jingū's regency makes the thesis that only the post-Ōjin kings did actually exist sound more reasonable.

Third, immediately after the compilation of *Kojiki* in 712, the Yamato court ordered the governors of all provinces to compile surveys of products, animals, plants, and land conditions, etymologies of place names, and written versions of oral traditions. The *Harima Fudoki*, one of the few such records extant, is believed to have been compiled between 713 and 715. The *Harima Fudoki* includes so many anecdotes related to Homuda (Ōjin) that one may readily believe Homuda to have been the founder of the Yamato Kingdom. It is

<sup>8</sup> The logic of Tsuda's proposition is very persuasive. There is, indeed, scarcely any substance in the records of *Kojiki* and *Nihongi* from the second king up to the ninth king, nor about the thirteenth king. The section on the fourteenth king, Chiuai, in the *Kojiki* and *Nihongi* consists almost entirely of accounts by the fictitious entity called Empress Jingū.

<sup>9</sup> The *Nihongi* often uses the expression "since the days of Homuda," but never uses the expression "since the days of Ihare (Jimmu)." See, for instance, *NS II*, pp. 37, 43 (Keitai 23:4, 24:2), and Aston *Nihongi 2*, pp. 19, 21.

blanketed with a myriad of accounts about Homuda's activities such as visiting villages and people, going on hunting expeditions, and the naming of places after his trifling words and deeds. Other kings are scarcely mentioned.

According to Aoki, the *Harima Fudoki* is full of accounts of Homuda's "fighting career and aggressive profile," and yet "it is interesting to note that neither *Kojiki* nor *Nihon shoki* speak much of the belligerent activities of Homuda, while other provincial accounts are full of such episodes. . . . This must be an indication of some effort made to cover up Homuda's undesirable aspects for records. In fact, the compilers of the *Kojiki* and *Nihon shoki* seem to have taken pains to conceal his belligerence before and after his emergence as the ruler of Yamato state . . . Compilers' mention of his birthmark of an archery arm-piece seems to imply that he was a man of martial strength. . . . The silence of both *Kojiki* and *Nihon shoki* regarding Homuda's aggressiveness seems intentional" [30]. Whatever the cover-up, until this very day, as many as 25,000 Hachiman Shrines all over the Japanese Islands continue to worship the deified spirit of Homuda, not Jimmu, as the god of war.

Fourth, according to the *Kojiki* and *Nihongi*, among all Yamato kings, only Jimmu the official Founder and the so-called fifteenth king Ōjin were born in Kyūshū: Jimmu shortly after the imperial ancestor deity Ninigi descended to Kyūshū from heaven, and Homuda immediately after his mother (Empress Jingū) landed on Kyūshū, crossing the sea from Korea [31]. From Kyūshū, Jimmu makes an epic Eastward Expedition, while Ōjin makes a miniature expedition eastward with his mother [32]. The fact that only Jimmu the official founder and Ōjin the fifteenth king were recorded to have been born in Kyūshū (only to conquer unruly elements in the Yamato area) implies that both Jimmu and Ōjin represent the one and only founder of the Yamato Kingdom.

### Embarking on the Expedition to the Japanese Islands

Leaving the southeastern shore of the Korean Peninsula, crossing the Korea Strait, and passing the islands of Tsushima and Iki, the expeditionary force led by Homuda lands on Kyūshū, not on the northern plain area crowded by the Yayoi aborigine but, passing the Kammon Strait (at the modern-day Shimonoseki City), on the secluded southeastern shore of Kyūshū Island, the modern Hyūga. In the Age of Gods, however, the *Kojiki* and *Nihongi* specify the Peak of Kuji-furu of Taka-chiho in the Hyūga area as the very spot where the godly founder of Yamato Kingdom descended from "Heaven" [33].

According to the *Kojiki*, immediately after Ninigi descended from heaven to the peak of Kuji-furu, he made the following statement: "This place faces towards Kara Kuni (Korea); it is... a land where the morning sun shines directly, a land where the rays of the evening sun are brilliant" [34]. According to Egami, this conspicuous mention of Korea at the very starting point of the foundation myth leads us "to regard Korea as the original home of the gods of heaven" [35]. Chamberlain, who had translated the *Kojiki* into English, notes the attempt by Motowori Norinaga (1730-1801), the leader of the so-called *Kokugaku* (National Learning) tradition that supposedly takes words and phrases in the *Kojiki* and *Nihongi* "literally" and then interprets their meaning in the most nationalistic way, to delete the word *Korea*:

"though not daring actually to alter the characters (of the original text), assumes that they are corrupt and in his Kana rendering" omits the sentence mentioning *Korea*. Chamberlain further notes that: "His evident reason for wishing to alter the reading is simply and solely to conceal the fact that Korea is mentioned in a not unfriendly manner, in the traditional account of the divine age. . . . [There] is no excuse for so dishonest a treatment of the text he undertakes to commentate" [36].

### The Seven-Branched Sword Delivered to Homuda in 372

According to the *Nihongi*, Ku-zō and the others again came to the Yamato court (in the reign of Crown Prince Homuda and Regent Empress Jingū) and presented a seven-branched sword in 372 [37]. Quite surprisingly, this Seven-Branched Sword is still preserved at the Ison-kami Shrine.

The full translation of the inscription on the Seven-Branched Sword may be read as follow: "On May 16<sup>th</sup>, the 4<sup>th</sup> year of *Tai-he* [the year 369], the day of Byung-O at noon, this seven-branched sword was manufactured with hundred-times-wrought iron. As this sword has a magical power to rout the enemy, it is sent [bestowed] to the king of a vassal state. Manufactured by □□□□. Never has there been such a sword. The Crown Prince of Paekche, who owes his life to the august King, had this sword made for the king of Yamato [or the king of vassal state]. Hope that it be transmitted and shown to posterity."<sup>10</sup>

Apparently as a symbolic gesture of well-wishing for Homuda's endeavor and solidarity with his new kingdom, King Keun Ch'ogo of Paekche seems to have bestowed the Seven-Branched Sword upon Homuda, who was undertaking the conquest of the Japanese Islands. The inscription on the Seven-Branched Sword says that the sword was manufactured in May 369, and the *Nihongi* says that the sword was delivered in September 372, most likely soon after Homuda landed on the Japanese Islands. Taking account of the fact that so many people from the Korean Peninsula had already gone across the sea to settle in the Japanese Islands, official evidence to testify visually to the mandate of the Paekche court bestowed upon Homuda as the ruler of the new kingdom was presumably expected to increase the cooperation of the old settlers and hence facilitate the conquest.

### Founding Date of the Yamato Kingdom

The epic Eastern Conquest had commenced from the Hyūga base. On a day, numerous battles later, Homuda (Ōjin) proclaimed:--"During the six years that our expedition against the East has lasted, . . . the wicked bands have met death. It is true that the frontier lands are still unpurified, and that a remnant of evil is still refractory. But in the region of the Central Land there is no more wind and dust. Truly we should make a vast and spacious capital, and plan it great

<sup>10</sup> Naturally, most Japanese scholars have tried to turn the inscription around and cast Paekche as the "vassal state" by reading the inscription "respectively presenting the sword to the Emperor by the Paekche King." Ueda Masaaki is rather an exception among Japanese historians because he "has maintained that the Seven-Branched Sword was 'bestowed' on the Wa ruler by the king of Paekche." Ueda "based his interpretation on the argument that the term 'koo' [*hou-wang*] appearing in the inscription is written in the commanding tone of a superior addressing an inferior, exemplified by the sentence reading 'Hand down [this sword] to [your] posterity' " [38].

and strong. At present things are in a crude and obscure condition, and the people's minds are unsophisticated. ... Their manners are simply what is customary. Now if a great man were to establish laws, justice could not fail to flourish. When I observe the Kashihabara plain, which lies southwest of Mount Unebi, it seems the Center of the Land. I must set it in order." Two years later, Spring, 1st month, 1st day, Homuda "assumed the Imperial Dignity in the Palace of Kashihabara" [39].

According to the *Nihongi*, Paekche sent crown prince Chōn-ji to the Yamato court in "the eighth year of Ōjin's reign." The *Samguk-sagi* records that the crown prince was sent to the Yamato court in 397. According to the *Nihongi*, Paekche King Asin died in "the sixteenth year of Ōjin's reign," and the *Samguk-sagi* records that Asin died in 405. According to the *Nihongi*, the Crown Prince Homuda ascended the throne in 270. All these records imply that Ōjin founded the Yamato Kingdom in 390 and it was the first year of Ōjin's reign.

### JIMMU-ŌJIN(HOMUDA)-NINIGI: THE TRINITY

Ninigi, the scion of the Sun Goddess recorded in Book One of the *Kojiki*, and Ihare (Jimmu) the earthly founder, and Homuda (Ōjin) the fifteenth king recorded in Book Two (at the beginning and at the end, respectively) of the *Kojiki* portray three different aspects of the real founder of the Yamato Kingdom. In the *Kojiki* as well as in the *Nihongi*, the mythological aspect was covered in the Ninigi section, the records of battles and conquest were covered in the Ihare section, and the massive arrival of the Paekche people was covered in the Homuda section. This section contends that Ihare, Homuda, and Ninigi constitute the trinity in the foundation legend of the Yamato Kingdom, and then investigates the events occurred between 390-405 [46].

### Foundation Myth

The foundation myth of Koguryō as recorded in the *Samguk-sagi* and *Old Samguk-sa*, on the one hand, and the foundation myth of the Yamato Kingdom as recorded in the *Kojiki* and *Nihongi*, on the other, reveal surprising similarities in essential motives.<sup>11</sup> In both myths, a son of the heavenly god or sun goddess descends to earth from heaven and marries a daughter of the river god or sea god after being tested for godliness by the bride's father. Their romance terminates with the birth of a founding forefather of the earthly kingdom (being destined to be separated from each other), and the earthly founder leaves the initial settlement, crossing the river or sea, getting the help of turtles or of a man riding on a turtle [42].

In the finale, the foundation myth of *Kojiki* and *Nihongi* also matches the legend of Paekche itself: the elder brother Biryu went to the seashore and failed while the younger

brother Onjo stayed inland in a mountain area and succeeded in founding a kingdom in the new world. In the *Kojiki* and *Nihongi*, Jimmu's grandfather was a second child who was partial to mountains; the elder brother was partial to the sea and failed, subsequently submitting to his younger brother. Jimmu himself was the younger child, and the elder brother was killed during the first land battle. Ōjin was a second child, and the elder brother did not merit so much as a single word of description in the *Kojiki* and *Nihongi* [43]. A historical event in the formation of Paekche might well have been an additional source of inspiration for the writers of the *Kojiki-Nihongi* myth.

The Age of the God narrated in Book One of the *Kojiki* introduces the mythical founder Ninigi, the grandson of the Sun Goddess. Book Two of the *Kojiki* begins the Age of Man with the earthly founder Ihare (Jimmu) and ends with the fifteenth king Homuda (Ōjin). In the preface of *Kojiki*, one reads that "Ninigi first descended to the peak of ... and Ihare (Jimmu) passed through the island of ..." in one breath [44]. The Sun Goddess orders Ninigi to descend from heaven to rule the Japanese Islands, while the earthly mother Jingū accompanies her child and herself sees Homuda through to become the king at the capital city named "Ihare" in the Yamato area.<sup>12</sup> According to the *Kojiki*, the divine oracle tells Homuda's mother (Jingū) that "it is the intention of the Sun Goddess to bestow the country upon her unborn child and let him rule it ... and hence if the country is really desired ... cross the sea!"<sup>13</sup> The *Kojiki* and *Nihongi* first created Jimmu, the Conqueror, out of the early exploits of Homuda and then created Ōjin, the Man of Peace, out of Homuda's later exploits.<sup>14</sup> If we put Ninigi, Ihare (Jimmu) and Homuda (Ōjin) together, however, we can immediately visualize the conqueror and founder of the Yamato Kingdom, after which we can make sense out of all those provincial accounts of the aggressive military activities of Homuda [46].

### Massive Arrival of the Paekche People

The *Nihongi* records the official arrival of horses in the Japanese archipelago from Paekche. The King of Paekche sent A-chik-ki with two quiet horses (one stallion and one mare, specifies the *Kojiki*) in 404 CE, the fifteenth year of Ōjin's reign. Because A-chik-ki was well-read in the classics, the Heir Apparent made him his teacher. Ōjin (Homuda) asked A-chik-ki whether there were other learned men superior to him, and he answered that there was such a man named Wang-in. Wang-in arrived from Paekche in 405 CE, and the Heir Apparent learned various books from him.

<sup>11</sup> Ōbayashi states that the "striking correspondence in structure between the Japanese myths and the kingdom-foundation legends of Koguryō and Paekche...provides a clue to the origins of the ruling-class culture in Japan," and also states that "the monarchical culture...came to Japan from Korea...in the fifth century" and "the people who were responsible for this monarchical culture had absorbed the Altaic pastoral culture to a substantial degree and it had become an integral part of their culture" [40]. According to Egami, the foundation myth derived from the same source as Puyō and Koguryō was brought to the Japanese Islands by an alien race and, with minor adaptations, became the foundation myth of the Yamato Kingdom [35, 41].

<sup>12</sup> In *Kojiki*, *Iha-re* is written *Ipa-re* while the first capital of Paekche was *Wi-rye*. The third character with which *Ipa-re* is written is also the second character of *Wi-rye*, suggesting a connection between *Ipa-re* and *Wi-rye*. Ledyard notes that the Korean variant of *Iha-re* is *I-par*, and is written as *Keo-bal*. According to the *Beishi*, *Suishu* and *Tong-dian*, *Keo-bal* was the name for the capital of Paekche. Since the Korean *kun* reading of *Keo* is *I*, *Keo-bal* yields the reading of *I-bal* or *I-par* [22]. We may hence hypothesize that Homuda called his first capital *Iha-re* (*Ipa-re*) after the name of the first capital of Paekche, *Wi-rye* (*I-bal*). The official title of Jimmu, "Kami Yamato Ihare," implies "Divine Yamato of Ihare" that lacks the personal name. Only by adding Homuda, we get the full title for the founder of Yamato Kingdom.

<sup>13</sup> The *Kojiki* makes the "country bestowed upon Homuda by Amaterasu" Silla in the west instead of the "Japanese Islands in the east" [45].

<sup>14</sup> Obviously, the compilers of *Kojiki* and *Nihongi* attributed all the military activities of Homuda, recorded in the provincial accounts, to Jimmu instead of Ōjin. In the Jingū's section of *Nihongi*, Homuda appears as the second son of Okinaga Tarashi-hime, masquerading as a shadowy crown prince.

A-chik-ki became the ancestor of the Scribes, and Wang-in became the ancestor of the Chief Writers. The *Kojiki* adds that the King of Paekche also sent a blacksmith, a weaver, and a man who knew how to brew wine. The latter brewed a good wine and Ōjin greatly rejoiced in that wine [47].

The *Nihongi* records the construction of a reservoir in 396 CE, the seventh year of Ōjin's reign, by a group of people from the Korean Peninsula. The *Kojiki* apparently records the same event, saying that there came some people from Silla, who constructed a reservoir under the command of Take-uchi which was called "Paekche Reservoir." The *Nihongi* records that the King of Paekche sent a seamstress named Chin-mo-chin in 403 CE, who became the ancestress of the seamstresses of Kume [48].

According to the *Nihongi*, Kung-wol, the progenitor of the Hata clan, arrived at Yamato in 403 CE, the fourteenth year of Ōjin, from "Paekche," leading the people of 120 provinces, and in 409 CE (twentieth year of Ōjin), Achi, the progenitor of the Yamato Aya clan, also arrived with the people of 17 provinces [49]. The records of both *Samguk-sagi* (for the year 399 CE) and King Kwang-gae-to epitaph (for the year 400 CE) corroborate the possible sequence of the massive movement of people from Paekche to the Japanese Islands precisely at about this time.<sup>15</sup>

According to the *Shinsen Shōjiroku*, the Hata people were dispersed into various provinces during the reign of Nintoku where they undertook sericulture and silk manufacturing for the court. It is recorded that, by the late fifth century (in the reign of Yūriaku), the size of the Hata clan amounted to 18,670 persons consisting of 92 *Be* [51]. According to the *Shoku-Nihongi*, the province of Takechi, which was the very center of the Yamato Kingdom, was so full of Aya people that the people of other clans accounted for only one or two out of ten [52]. According to the *Shinsen Shōjiroku*, Achi obtained permission of Ōjin to establish the Province of Imaki (the Newly Arrived) that was later renamed Takechi, but the place came to be so crowded with the Aya people that they had to be dispersed into various other provinces [53]. The *Harima Fudoki* records that: "In the reign of Homuda, Paekche people arrived at this place and built a castle as they used to do in their homeland, making it their dwelling. Hence the place is called *Ki Mure Mountain*," i.e., walled mountain fortress<sup>16</sup> [54].

The massive movement of Paekche people clearly establishes a place for the Paekche in the formation of the Yamato Kingdom. Ishida states: "Detailed research by historians has made clear that the greatest wave of immigration took place immediately after the unification of Japan by the Yamato court. If the Yamato court was established without any relation to Korea, how can these facts be explained?" [56].

<sup>15</sup> According to the *Samguk-sagi*, in 399, King Asin of Paekche "wanted to attack Koguryō and carried out an extensive levy of men and horses. The people had become bitter about the war, however, so many fled to Silla, causing the population to decline seriously" [50]. The King Kwang-gae-to's stele records that, in 400, Koguryō dispatched 50,000 cavalry and foot soldiers to rescue Silla, and they chased the Wa down to the Chong-bal Fortress in Imna-Kara. The Wa bandits were annihilated, but nine out of the ten populace in the castle refused to follow the Wa [to the Japanese Islands].

<sup>16</sup> The Paekche people used the word "ki" to imply the fortress/castle, and hence the Yamato people read the character 城 as *ki* [55]. The ancient Korean word for the mountain was "mō" (山), and hence was written in the *Harima Fudoki* as "mure".

The *Shinsen Shōjiroku* (New Compilation of the Clan Register) was compiled by the Yamato court under the auspices of Saga (r.809-23), and finished in 815 CE. The *Shinsen Shōjiroku* records the progenitors for the 1,182 Yamato ruling clans (*uji*) living in the capital and five surrounding provinces. The preface of the Register states that since the *Ma-hito* is the sovereign one among the imperial clans, the *Ma-hito* clans in the capital region are presented at the very beginning of the imperial group in Book One. The first four *Ma-hito* imperial clans were recorded as descendants of Homuda, the fifth clan as descendants of Keitai, the seven following *Ma-hito* clans as descendants of Bidatsu; then the following eight *Ma-hito* imperial clans (i.e., thirteenth to twentieth) were recorded as the descendants of "the Prince of Paekche." However, the twelfth, that is, the *Ma-hito* clan immediately preceding those recorded as the descendants of the Prince of Paekche, was recorded as the descendant of Bidatsu and also as the offspring of the King of Paekche. In other words, "the descendants of Bidatsu" are equivalent to "the offspring of the King of Paekche" [57]. According to the *Nihongi*, Bidatsu was the second child of Kimmei, who was the rightful heir of Keitai, who in turn was "a descendant in the fifth generation" of Ōjin (Homuda). Thus, the Register is in effect recording that the entire *Ma-hito* imperial clan, from the first to the twentieth, were the offspring of "the King of Paekche." This implies that the entire Ōjin line of Yamato imperial families originated from Paekche royal families.

Immediately after recording the Paek-chon River debacle and the fall of fortress Chu-yu in 663, the *Nihongi* records the following dialogue: "Then the people of the country said to one another; Chu-yu has fallen; nothing more to be done now; this day the name of Paekche has become extinct; how can we pay visits to the place where the tombs of our ancestors are?"<sup>17</sup> [58].

## Two-Way Flows of Manpower

Paekche came under continuous battering from King Kwang-gae-to (r.391-413) of Koguryō, and the help from the newly born Yamato Kingdom was badly needed for their survival. The Paekche court at first seems to have treated Homuda as the king of a vassal state, as was inscribed on the Seven-Branched Sword. King Chinsa (r.385-92), a son of Keun Kusu, in particular, seems to have treated Homuda as inferior to himself. According to the *Nihongi*, Homuda dispatched four generals to Paekche and severely reprimanded Chinsa in 392 for such unwarranted treatment. Homuda also reproved severely the new king Asin (392-405), a grandson of Keun Kusu, for such an attitude [59].

Paekche had managed to maintain the upper hand militarily against Koguryō until September 390 (when King Chinsa let General Jin Kamo capture a Koguryō castle and 200 prisoners), but the appearance of King Kwang-gae-to completely reversed Paekche's fortunes in the battlefield. King Asin belatedly recognized the urgent necessity, for the very survi-

<sup>17</sup> According to the *Nihongi*, those who had lamented the situation as such were supposedly the Paekche people departing from their country for the Japanese Islands. But the specific phrase adopted in the sentence seems to suggest that the exclamation in fact has been conveying the sentiment of the Yamato rulers.



val of Paekche, of the help from the new Yamato Kingdom still fresh in its conqueror's vigor. King Asin decided to send his crown prince Chōnji to the Yamato court in 397 in order to transform the unnecessarily created ill will between the two courts into an active alliance. The Kwang-gae-to epitaph suggests that the efforts by Asin and Chōnji were apparently successful. The Koguryō army devastated Paekche in 392 and 396, but later saw as valiant warriors the Yamato soldiers fighting alongside the Paekche soldiers in 400 and also in 404 [60].

The belief that Japan had a unified and powerful state as early as the third or fourth century, possessed a colony called Mimana on the southern peninsula, and controlled Paekche and Silla used to be based on the anachronistic and incoherent bits and pieces of episodes and fantasies recorded in the *Kojiki* and *Nihongi*. The Japanese, however, made a discovery in 1882 which could be viewed as an objective support for their claim. This is the famous *Sin-myō* (391) *Record* on the epitaph of King Kwang-gae-to. Japanese historians interpret the line of inscription in the following fashion: "Since the year of *Sin-myō*, Wa came and crossed over the sea, and conquered Paekche, Imna and Silla, and thereby made them [Wa's] subject." This translation constitutes the so-called unshakable "evidence" in support of the dogma of almost every Japanese historian working on this period that the Yamato Kingdom had already existed in the fourth century as a unified and powerful state, and furthermore had militarily controlled (or even colonized) southern peninsula.<sup>18</sup>

The Kwang-gae-to's stele was erected in 414 by his son, Chang-su (r.413-91), in commemoration of his predecessor. The Koguryō could have felt contempt on the Paekche's frequent reliance on Yamato soldiers, and therefore could have decided to inscribe the *Sin-myō* Record that the Yamato conquered the Paekche and made them Yamato's subjects. But there are alternative ways to interpret the *Sin-myō* Record. For instance, Cho interprets it in the following fashion: "Paekche and Silla were formerly [Koguryō's] subjects. They have been paying tributes. The Wa came in the year *Sin-myō*. [The King Kwang-geo-to] crossed over the sea and destroyed Paekche, [Imna and Ka]ra to make them his subjects." According to Cho, the "sea" in the inscription must refer to the "Yellow Sea" along the western coastline of the Korean Peninsula, given that it was the most convenient expeditionary route to the southwestern and southern parts from the northwestern coast [62]. Indeed, the inscription immediately following the *Sin-myō* record reads: "King himself led a naval force in the sixth year, Byung-shin (396), and smashed Paekche." It subsequently records the acquisition of 58 Paekche castles, but never records that Paekche was conquered. In any case, the only way for the Koguryō to attack Paekche with its naval force was to sail the "Yellow Sea." If the Koguryō force crossed the Yellow Sea in 396, there is no reason why they should not have crossed the Yellow Sea before (in 391).

<sup>18</sup> According to Hatada: "Prewar [Japanese] history textbooks were based on the records of the *Nihon shoki* and said that Japan had controlled ancient Korea, whereas postwar texts were based on the King Kwang-gae-to stele inscription, but still accepted Japan's control of Korea. Thus the basis for the view that Japan had controlled Korea moved from an unreliable ancient chronicle to the reliable stele inscription. Though the history texts written after the surrender were vastly different from their prewar counterparts, in this one respect there was no change, and King Kwang-gae-to's stele was the basis of the argument" [61].

The flow of manpower between Paekche and Yamato was not a one-way phenomenon. According to the *Nihongi*, the practice of Paekche using Yamato soldiers in intramural armed conflicts continued well into the sixth century. The *Nihongi* records the statement made by King Seong-myung of Paekche in 544 who intended to request from Kimmei "an army with which to succor the Land of Imna," and also 3,000 troops to construct six fortresses along the frontier between Silla and a Kaya state. The *Nihongi* further records that Paekche sent envoys to Yamato "to ask for auxiliaries" in 547, and "three hundred and seventy men were sent to Paekche to assist in constructing a fortress at Toki-sin" in 548<sup>19</sup> [63].

### The Two-Cycle Correction Method Becomes Ineffective After 405

According to the *Nihongi*, Wang-in arrived in the 16<sup>th</sup> year of Ōjin's reign, and in that year King Asin of Paekche (r.392-405) died. It was 285 CE according to the *Nihongi* system of dating, and becomes 405 CE when corrected by the *Samguk-sagi* record. According to the *Nihongi*, Ōjin "then sent for Prince Chōnji, and addressed him, saying:-- 'Do thou return to thy country and succeed to the (royal) Dignity'" [64]. The *Samguk-sagi*, corroborates the *Nihongi* record with further detail, saying that: Chōnji "was the eldest son of Asin, and in the third year of Asin's reign he was appointed crown prince. In the sixth year of Asin's rule [397, Chōnji] had been sent as a hostage to the Yamato court. When Asin died during his fourteenth year on the throne, Hunhae, the late king's younger brother, took charge of the government until [his nephew] the crown prince should return to the kingdom. However, [the deceased monarch's] younger brother, Chōmnye, killed Hunhae and made himself king. When Chōnji heard in Japan of his royal father's death and tearfully requested permission to return home, the Yamato king provided him with an armed escort of one hundred soldiers. Upon reaching the borders of the kingdom, however, Hae Ch'ung, a resident of Hansōng, came out and warned him, saying, 'The great king has passed away and his youngest brother, Chōmnye, has now slain his elder brother and made himself king. I trust that the Crown Prince will only approach with due caution.' Chōnji therefore retained the Yamato soldiers to guard him and withdrew to an island in the sea to await the developments. The populace of the kingdom then killed Chōmnye and welcomed Chōnji, who ascended the throne as king" (r.405-20)<sup>20</sup> [65].

The *Nihongi* compilers had maintained the exact 120-year difference for the 30-year period of 375-405, but then

<sup>19</sup> The *Nihongi* records that, in 553, "...was sent on a mission to Paekche with...an Imperial message, saying, 'As to the troops asked for by the King, his wishes shall be complied with.'" In 553, King Sōng-myung sent a memorial to Kimmei, saying that "the lands beyond the sea are very scarce of bows and horses. From old times until now, they have received them from the Emperor, and have therewith defended themselves against their powerful enemies. I humbly pray the Celestial bounty to bestow on us a large supply of bows and horses." In 554, "Paekche sent...to communicate with... 'We have just heard that thou, by command of the August Emperor, hast arrived in Tsukushi in charge of the troops bestowed on us by him... and we beg that the force granted to us may not be allowed to be later than the first month.' Hereupon...answered... 'Accordingly there is being sent an auxiliary force numbering 1,000 men, 100 horses, and 40 ships.'"

<sup>20</sup> The *Nihongi* quotes the no longer extant *Paekche Record* saying that: "Prince Chōnji was sent to the Celestial Court in order to restore the friendship of former kings." Kim Pusik, whose hatred against the Paekche is well-known, uses the disparaging term "hostage" instead of the *Nihongi* term "sent."

decided to eliminate the difference to zero by 461, by making Homuda (Ōjin) to die at the age of 110 (after 40 years of reign) and his son Nintoku to die at the age of 142 (after 56 years of reign), producing a chaotically converging chronology for the 54-year period from 406 until 460. The *Nihongi* records that Chōnji died in the 25<sup>th</sup> year of Ōjin's reign which would make the year 414 (or 294, according to the *Nihongi* system). According to the *Samguk-sagi*, however, Chōnji died in 420. The two-cycle correction method becomes ineffective soon after 405 CE.

## EARLY PAEKCHE HISTORY

According to the *Dongyi-zhuan* (in the *Weishu* of *San-guozhi*), Paekche was one of the 55 Mahan states, and Silla was one of the 24 Chinhan-Pyōnhan states. Almost all Japanese historians who happen to touch on the subject therefore contend that the kingdoms of Paekche and Silla were founded in the fourth century, and most Western specialists also echo such contentions.<sup>21</sup>

The Ledyard's postulation (in 1975) of Paekche being established by the Puyō refugees sometime in the twenty-year period between 352 and 372 (on the basis of a single historical fact that Puyō was destroyed by Murong Huang in 346) echoes the contentions of Japanese scholars, completely ignoring the extant Korean chronicles [22]. The Best's postulation (in 2006) of Paekche being established by the Puyō refugees sometime during the 82-year period between 290 and 372 (on the basis of a historical fact that Puyō was destroyed by Huang's father, Murong Hui, in 285) seems to be a rather simple extension on the theme of Ledyard [67].

## Pre-Fourth-Century Kingship Chronology of Paekche

The Japanese historians contend, first of all, that the pre-fourth-century kingship chronology of Paekche and Silla recorded in the *Samguk-sagi* is a simple fabrication by Kim Pusik. The recent publication of *A History of the Early Korean Kingdom of Paekche* by Jonathan W. Best, who claims that the *Samguk-sagi* "places the foundations of Silla and Paekche at preposterously early dates," by the Harvard University Asia Center seems to have elevated such traditional contentions to the rank of an unchallengeable version of history [68]. In 1994, I have contended that the early royal lineage of Paekche has to be shifted from a mere legend to history on the basis of *Shoku Nihongi* and *Shinsen Shōjiroku*<sup>22</sup> [69].

The *Shoku Nihongi* (*Nihongi Continued*) began to be compiled under the auspices of Kōnin (r.770-81), covering nine reigns from 697 CE to 791 CE, and completed in 797 CE during the reign of Kammu (r.781-806 CE). The record of *Shoku Nihongi* for the ninth year of the Kammu's reign states that Kammu's mother Takano-no-niigasa was the

Queen to Kōnin and a descendant of Paekche King Munyōng. The record also tells that the Paekche's Great Ancestor, Tomo (Chumong, the founder of Koguryeo who was the father of the Paekche's founder, Onjo), was born to the daughter of River God (*Habaek*). It further declares that Kammu's mother was therefore a descendant of Tomo [71]. The records of *Shoku Nihongi* on the following year state that King Keun Kusu (r.375-84 CE) was the "sixteenth" king of Paekche when counted from Tomo. The *Samguk-sagi* records that Keun Kusu was the 14<sup>th</sup> king of Paekche when counted from Onjo.

The *Shinsen Shōjiroku* records that Mun-ju was the 24<sup>th</sup> king of Paekche when counted from Tomo while *Samguk-sagi* places him as the 22<sup>nd</sup> king counted from Onjo. It also records that Hye was the 30<sup>th</sup> king of Paekche when counted from Tomo while *Samguk-sagi* records him as the 28<sup>th</sup> king counted from Onjo [72].

Since the *Samguk-sagi* regards Onjo (the third son of Chumong) as the official founder of Paekche, Keun Kusu should be the "fifteenth" king if counted from Chumong (Tomo, the symbolic founder of Paekche). The *Chewang-un'gi*, a Korean chronicle compiled by Yi Seung-hyu in 1287 CE, states, however, that Onjo's elder brother (Chumong's second son) was the first king of Paekche, who died five months after enthronement. That is, there was an ephemeral king between Chumong and his third son Onjo who should have been recorded as the official founder of Paekche. Such a possibility was indeed acknowledged by Kim Pusik himself in a footnote. According to the *Chewang-un'gi* (1287), however, the *Samguk-sagi* should have recorded Onjo as the second king and his elder brother as the official founder of Paekche in the main text instead of suggesting such a possibility in the footnote as a mere conflicting story. Then the kingship chronology of the *Samguk-sagi* (1145) would have been exactly identical to that of the *Shoku Nihongi* (797) and *Shinsen Shōjiroku* (815)<sup>23</sup> [73].

The *Shinsen Shōjiroku* records a clan that has the seventh King of Paekche, Saban (r.234) as its progenitor. It further records two clans that have King Biryu [the eleventh king of Paekche, r.304-44] as their progenitor, who was, according to the *Shinsen Shōjiroku*, the descendent of King Ch'ogo [, the fifth King of Paekche, r.166-214]. It also records a clan that has a descendant of the thirteenth King of Paekche, Keun Ch'ogo, as its progenitor. We can see that the *Shinsen Shōjiroku* records the Paekche kings who, according to the *Samguk-sagi*, ruled during 166-214 CE (Ch'ogo) and in 234 CE (Saban) as the progenitor of some Yamato ruling clans. Furthermore, we can see that the *Shinsen Shōjiroku* clearly distinguishes King Keun Ch'ogo (the thirteenth king) from King Ch'ogo (the fifth king) by recording that the eleventh King Biryu was descendant from the latter [74].

Unlike the tradition of *Samguk-sagi*, the tradition of both *Shoku Nihongi* and *Shinsen Shōjiroku* that were compiled by the Yamato court was to have Chumong stand for the symbolic founder of Paekche. Furthermore, the latter two records apparently do not regard Onjo as the de facto founder of

<sup>21</sup> Brown, seemingly representing the Japanese historiography, even declares (in 1993) that Koguryeo was "the first of the three independent Korean kingdoms to emerge during the fourth century" to be followed by Paekche and Silla. Brown states that Keun Ch'ogo (r.346-75) was "Paekche's first king" [66].

<sup>22</sup> Best, who had reviewed my 1988 book, simply presents (in 2006) what I have already written (in 1994) without giving any credit for my original findings, and then states that "the concoction of Paekche's fabulously expanded king list had occurred long before the *Samguk sagi* was compiled" [70].

<sup>23</sup> I have presented my own answer for the "missing-one-king" problem in my *Korea and Japan in East Asian History* (2006). Apparently it was too late to be included in Best's *History of Paekche* (2006).

Paekche, or as the second king of Paekche when counted from Chumong but regard him, just like the *Chewang-un'gi*, as the third king of Paekche. In any case, these records of the extant Japanese chronicles clearly contradict the arguments of modern Japanese historians that Paekche was established in the fourth century.

Best, representing the great majority of Japanese and Western historians, apparently has no alternative but to admit the fact that the Japanese sources dating to 791 CE and 815 CE do contain evidence revealing the contemporary existence of a king list for Paekche that would place the kingdom's foundation at an early time, and yet Best jumps to a conclusion on the theme of the long cherished belief among the Japanese and Western scholars that: "Since such a distorted chronological perspective was evidently credited in early-ninth-century Japan, it may be assumed that it was current and accepted much earlier on the Korean Peninsula" [75].

### Territorial Sphere of Paekche

Quoting the *Jinshu* and *Zizhi Tongjian*, Best contends that: "the Murong Xianbei overran the Puyō capital and carried off thousands of captives. It is recorded, moreover, that after the Murong attack of 285, a group of the Puyō, including some members of the royal family, fled southwards into the territory of Okchō. It has been theorized that these Puyō refugees subsequently continued their southward flight and, after evidently making a turn to the west, penetrated the Han River valley and founded the kingdom of Paekche" [76]. Stating that "the writing of history is always a disciplined act of creative imagination," Best further contends that "the evidence from Chinese sources delineates" the period between 290 and 372 "as the interval when the kingdom of Paekche must have emerged"<sup>24</sup> [77]. Now we may well examine the Chinese sources for this period other than the 17-year old Murong Hui's attack on Puyō in 285 CE [79].

There appears in the *Samguk-sagi*, a record of the King Mi-cheon of Koguryō (r.309-31), in alliance with two Xianbei tribes (Duan and Yuwen), attacking another Xianbei tribe led by Murong Hui (r.285-333) in 319. The records of *Jinshu* on Murong Huang (r.333-49) include a statement that the allied forces of Koguryō, "Paekche" and two Xianbei tribes (again, the Duan and Yuwen) took military action [80]. The *Zizhi Tongjian*, compiled by Sima Guang (1019-86) of the Song Dynasty (960-1279), states that in 346 "Paekche" invaded Puyeo that was located at Lushan, and as a result the people of the country were scattered in defeat westward toward Yan. Murong Huang dispatched the Crown Prince and 17,000 cavalymen to attack the defenseless Puyō [81]. According to the *Samguk-sagi*, 346 CE was the first year of the King Keun Ch'ogo's reign (r.346-75) in Paekche.

According to the *Songshu*, "Koguryō came to conquer and occupy Liaodong, and Paekche came to occupy Liaoxi; the place that came to be governed by Paekche was called the Jinping district, Jinping province" [82]. According to the *Liangshu*, "during the time of Jin dynasty (317-420), Koguryō conquered Liaodong, and Paekche also occupied

Liaoxi and Jinping, and established the Paekche provinces" [83]. We now present the record of an eighteenth century Chinese chronicle that delineates the Paekche territory, corroborating all these records.

The *Manzhou Yuanliu-gao* (Researches on Manchu Origins) began to be compiled by an imperial edict dated September 20, 1777, and was completed six years later in 1783 under the reign of Emperor Qianlong (r.1736-96) of the Manchu Qing dynasty. The *Territory Section* gives a fairly coherent and a rather surprising summary of the Paekche territory as following [84].

The boundary of Paekche begins from the present-day *Guangning* and *Jin-Yi* provinces in the northwest and then crosses the sea in an easterly direction to arrive at the Chosōn's Hwang-hae, Chung-chōng, Jōn-ra, etc. provinces. Running east to west, the Paekche's territory is narrow; running north to south, it is long. Thus it occurs that if one looks at the Paekche's territory from the *Liucheng* and *Beiping* area, Silla is located in the southeast of Paekche, but if one looks from the Kyung-sang and Ung-jin area of Paekche, Silla is located in the northeast. Paekche also borders Mohe in the north. Its royal capital has two castles at two different places in the east and west. Both castles are called "Koma." The *Songshu* says that the place governed by Paekche was called the *Jinping* district of the *Jinping* province. *Tong'gao* says that the *Jinping* province was located between *Liucheng* and *Beiping* of the Tang period. Hence one of the nation's capitals was located in "Liaoxi," and the other inside the Chosun provinces. It was during the reign of Liang Wudi [r.502-49] that Paekche relocated its capital [in 538?] to a castle in South Korea (South *Han*). When the Tang conquered Paekche in 660, they established five commanderies including Tong-myung Commandery. Tong-myung is the name of the Paekche's founder who originally came across the river from Kori. Hence Tong-myung seems to indicate the name of a place not far from Kori. According to the *History of Liao*, Kori represents *Fengzhou* and *Hanzhou*, all of which were located at the present-day *Kaiyuan* area. Therefore, the Tong-myung Commandery must have been located not far from the *Kaiyuan* area. The *Tangshu* says that the Paekche territory was eventually divided up between Silla and Parhae-Mohe, and Paekche henceforth came to an end<sup>25</sup>

<sup>25</sup> The eleventh-century *Zizhi Tongjian* as well as the nearly contemporary record of the *Nan Qishu* state that a Northern Wei (386-534) army, comprised of 100,000 cavalry, attacked Paekche but were defeated by the Paekche army (led by four generals) in 488. This account is confirmed by the *Samguk-sagi* records on the tenth year of Tong-sōng's reign (488). In addition, the *Nan Qishu* records that in 495 the Paekche king Tong-sōng sent an embassy that requested honorary titles for the heroic generals who had repulsed the Wei attack. Since it is highly unlikely that a cavalry force of such magnitude as recorded in these chronicles could have made its way from northern China to find defeat in the southwestern corner of the Korean Peninsula without having passed through Koguryō (in the reign of King Chang-su, r.413-91), and also without being recorded in contemporary chronicles, the "Paekche" appearing in the *Zizhi Tongjian* and the *Nan Qishu* must have referred to the Paekche province in Liaoxi. The titles conferred on Paekche generals by the Southern Qi court indeed carried the names of their titular domains that sounded conspicuously like some Liaoxi areas such as Guang'ling, Qing'he, Chengyang, etc. According to all of these records, Paekche must have held the Liaoxi province for more than a hundred years, withstanding the animated Murong-Xianbei Yan, the ever-expanding Koguryō, and the fierce Tuoba-Xianbei Wei. Both the Old and the New *History of Tang* say that the old Paekche territories were divided up and taken by Silla and Parhae-Mohe. If there were no Paekche territory in Liaoxi, and if the Paekche territory existed only at the southwestern corner of the Korean Peninsula, then it would have been impossible for the Parhae-Mohe to occupy any of the old Paekche territories. For those Koreans who believe in modesty as a virtue, the statement of Choi Chi-won (857-?), a great Silla scholar, that "Koguryō and Paekche at the height of their strength maintained strong armies numbering one million soldiers, and invaded Wu and Yue in the south and You, Yan, Qi, and

<sup>24</sup> It is no wonder that the Best's book was so enthusiastically reviewed by Ledyard [78].

[85]. This is almost a literal translation of the *Manzhou Yuanliugao*.

All those extant records suggest that the Kingdom of Paekche was at the very peak of its military might during the fourth century. The *Zizhi Tongjian* suggests that, in 346, Paekche invaded Puyō apparently from its Liaoxi territory. The records of *Jinshu* on Murong Huang (r.333-49) also suggest that Paekche (in alliance with the Koguryō and two Xianbei tribes) took military action from its Liaoxi territory. And yet, Best alludes that Paekche almost ceased to function as an independent state by the late fourth century. Very few events that have ever occurred in Korea proper were corroborated so repeatedly by so many separate records in such diverse dynastic histories of China as the Paekche's colonization of a Liaoxi area. Also, very few events in Korean history were subject to such a fanatical refutation by the Japanese scholars as the records of these events. Faithful to such a tradition, Best simply maintains his conclusion that: "Neither the written nor the archeological record has yet provided definitive evidence that permits a significantly more precise dating for the establishment of the royal state of Paekche than that deduced from Chinese histories which places the kingdom's founding to the period between 290 and 372" [87].

### The Latest Archeological Discovery in the Korean Peninsula

According to the *Samguk-sagi*, Onjo had established the capital at Wirye-sōng in the north of the Han River in 18 BCE, which was moved to Wirye-sōng in the south of the Han River in 5 BCE, to Hansan in 371 CE during the reign of Keun Ch'ogo, to Han-sōng in 391, and then to Kong-ju in 475. That is, Paekche had maintained its capital around the Han River for a period of 494 years (between 18 BCE and 475 CE) before moving down to the Keum River area in the south.

The latest archeological evidence suggests that the P'ungnap Earthen Wall in modern-day Seoul at the southern bank of Han River was constructed sometime before 23 CE. According to Choi, the plain hard *Mu-mun* pottery excavated at the site must have been used by the people inhabited around the area in the first century BCE, and the carbon-dating of the construction materials found in the wall shows that the earthen wall (t'osōng) was constructed sometime around that period. Examining the nature of various artifacts excavated from the site, Choi concludes that the wall was likely to have been constructed in 23 CE (as suggested by the records of the *Samguk-sagi*) for the Paekche's second capital of the period between 5 BCE-371 CE. Among the enormous amount of early period potteries excavated from one small sample site within the wall, a pottery piece incised with *Grandee* characters was found, and also excavated were the seven sets of horse jaw bones that were apparently used for the royal sacrificial rites<sup>26</sup> [88].

Lu in North China, making grave nuisances to the Middle Kingdom" has been a co-nundrum [86].

<sup>26</sup> The record of *Samguk-sagi* for the year 23 CE states that the king of Paekche mobilized all men aged fifteen years and older from the villages northeast of the Han River to repair and fortify the Wirye-sōng.

Just like the Qin Long Wall constructed by Meng Tian between 215-10 BCE, the building material of the P'ungnap Earthen Wall was the light brown earth [89]. The building material of outer walls constructed for the Sui capital, Chang'an, was also the light brown earth. The earth of the walls' base seems to have been first tamped down hard to make a foundation, and then earth was brought in baskets to be mixed with water and laid down in thin layers of mud which was tamped down and dried in the sun, to have a thickness of about 10 centimeters. Some of the earth could have been excavated to form a moat that surrounded the southern portion of the wall. Layer followed layer until the wall reached its full height. The whole length of the wall amounts to 3.5 km, only about one-tenth of the outer wall of Chang'an. The wall, however, is about 40 meters thick at the base, being almost ten times thicker than the outer walls of Chang'an, and the estimated height is about 15 meters, almost 1.5 times higher than that of Chang'an, suggesting an enormous amount of manpower that must have been mobilized for the construction of the P'ungnap-t'osōng.<sup>27</sup>

Among the five stone-mounded tombs excavated south of Han River at Sōkchon-dong, near the P'ungnap-t'osōng, the largest one (Tomb No. 3) may be the grave of King Keun Ch'ogo. The step-pyramid design of these tumuli compares closely to the stone tombs of Koguryō in the Tong'gou region including the one (the Tomb of General) believed to be the grave of King Kwang-gae-to [91]. Before the appearance of King Kwang-gae-to the Great in 391, Koguryō had constantly been battered by Paekche. Paekche under the reign of the warrior kings Keun Ch'ogo and Keun Kusu represents the most expansionist era (346-84) for the kingdom [92]. This was precisely the period that the conquest of the Japanese Islands and the founding of the Yamato Kingdom by the Paekche people seem to have commenced.

### ARCHEOLOGY IN JAPAN

This section suggests that the study on history and archeology in the Japanese Islands has been strongly influenced by the *a priori* assumptions of the uniqueness and homogeneity of Japanese culture. Though it is not suggested that the Western experts as a whole have consciously supported the emperor-centered nationalism, their study does not seem to have been free from the ideological sentiments prevailing in their host country either.

In 1983, Walter Edwards, then a Cornell University graduate student, has contended that the archeological evidence for horse trappings occurs in the "late fifth" century rather than the "late fourth or early fifth." He has further insisted that the changes were all gradual, and never abrupt, accusing Egami of having created a false sense of discontinuity between the Early (300s) and the Middle Tomb materials. Edwards has argued that changes in the contents of the tombs can be explained in terms of "process" rather than as the product of a discrete "event" of a conquest. He has further insisted that the classic early 5th century Middle period tombs of Ōjin and Nintoku precede the presence of "hors-

<sup>27</sup> The core structure of Chang'an, including the outer wall, was finished after nine months of construction [90].

erider materials” because their influx into the Japanese Islands occurred “no earlier than the middle of the fifth century,” and therefore “the political power they represent cannot be seen as deriving from it”<sup>28</sup> [93].

### Event vs. Process

Barnes states that the Middle Kofun period [400-75 CE] “coincides with the Ōjin line of kings in the *Nihon Shoki*,” but also states that: “One of the more infamous examples of manipulating the periodization scheme is Egami Namio’s conflation of the Middle [400s] and Late [500-700] periods into one single Late period [400-700] in order to associate horse-riding equipment and the very large early 5th-century keyhole tombs built on the Osaka Plains. This sleight of hand has never been accepted by the Japanese archeological community, and Edwards carefully analysed the appearance of horse-riding equipment in Yamato tombs to reject this fanciful theory once and for all in English” [96]. Barnes further states that: “Egami’s Horserider Theory has promoted one particular cause of state formation in Japan: by horserider conquest at the turn of the 5th century. Edwards’ rejection of the theory on technical grounds invalidates the timing” [97].

I have postulated that the conquest of the Japanese Islands by the Paekche people occurred sometime around 370-390, Ōjin (Homuda) ascended the throne in 390, and there would be some time lag between the commencement of conquest and the burial of the conquerors in gigantic tombs with horse trappings [18]. In her review of my book, Barnes asserts that: “this adherence to the Horserider Theory of Japanese state formation, promulgated by Egami Namio in 1948 and enhanced by Gari Ledyard in 1975, is simply flogging a dead horse,” though my (*Kudara Yamato*) thesis has evolved quite a distance from those of Egami and Ledyard<sup>29</sup> [98]. Barnes declares that “there is no archeological evidence for conquest at any time in the Kofun period” [97].

Edwards has presented the archeological data of 137 tombs in order to refute Egami’s thesis, but somehow the data as staged by Edwards himself look more consistent with Egami’s two-fold division of the Tomb Period. Although the archeological data prepared by Edwards himself show the appearance of a few tombs that contain continental materials at around the “beginning of the fifth century,” Edwards has simply contended that the content of burials became distinctly continental only “after the middle decades of the fifth century;” and therefore the tombs of Ōjin and Nintoku can-

not be classified as those of the horseriders. Edwards admits the possibility that the continental influx he places in the mid-fifth century may actually belong to the fourth, which would relate it to historical contexts of the fourth century. But he contends that the traditional Middle period tombs, including the tombs of Ōjin and Nintoku, still precede the continental influx, and hence these tombs could not contain any equestrian paraphernalia or anything conspicuously continental [93].

Since 1988, I have taken various evidences to show why the “evolutionary” thesis of Edwards is inadequate, and also to show that the tombs of Ōjin and Nintoku can not precede the continental influx (of such grave goods as *sue* stoneware and horse trappings) [18].

First, the *Dongyi-zhuan* of the *Weishu* states that there were no horses on the Japanese Islands. Indeed, horse bones or any artifacts related to horses are never found in the Early Kofun period tombs. Kidder states: “So far no horse bones have been discovered in any Early Kofun period [300s] sites” [100].

Second, the *Nihongi* records the official arrival of horses from Korea in the 15th year of Ōjin [404 CE]. The *Harima Fudoki* records the story that, while Homuda (Ōjin) was hunting, he noticed a horse running away. He asked attendants whose horse that was, and was told that it was Homuda’s own horse. In this way, the *Harima Fudoki* notes, the name of the place became “my-horse-plain” [101]. Still in the *Nihongi*, a story of the time of Yuryaku refers to *haniwa* horses on the tomb of Ōjin. That is, a person called Hiakuson rode past Ōjin’s tomb one night on his return from visiting his daughter who had given birth to a child; a red courser dashed alongside his piebald horse and its rider offered an exchange of horses. Hiakuson greatly rejoiced at obtaining such a steed; he put this courser in the stable when he arrived home and went to sleep. The next morning, to his surprise, he found that the red courser had changed into a *haniwa* horse. Retracing his route, he found his own piebald horse standing among the *haniwa* horses on the tomb of Ōjin [102].

Third, Barnes notes the fact that, in 1872, part of the front mound of the Nintoku Mausoleum collapsed in a small landslide, exposing a pit-style stone burial chamber. She further notes that some iron armor and weapons, gilt-bronze ornaments, a mirror, a ring-pommeled sword, and a horse bell that were recorded as having been recovered from the tomb of Nintoku are preserved in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts [103]. Kidder thinks their preservation is indeed a fortuitous occurrence, considering the strict prohibition of excavating any imperial tomb. According to Kidder, the small bronze bells and a *haniwa* horse head (with simulated metal strap joints at the bit and throatlatch) that are said to come from the tomb of Nintoku constitute the archeological evidence for equestrianism [100].

Fourth, Kidder lists a specific collection of archeological evidence for equestrianism from tombs believed to be connected with the “early fifth century” Ōjin-Nintoku stage of the Yamato Kingdom: a gold saddle bow from the Maruyama tomb, a bronze horse bell and a *haniwa* horse head from Nintoku tomb, two wooden (front and back) saddle bows and a dumpy *haniwa* horse from the Ryōnan site, and

<sup>28</sup> For those scholars who hate the Theory of Horseriding People, the Edwards’ article seems to constitute sufficient evidence to discredit the entire lifetime studies of Egami Namio. His argument has been all too uncritically seized and enthusiastically echoed ever since, witness for example the work of Brown who states that the “weaknesses of the Egami thesis were revealed in Walter Edwards...” and also the work of Farris who reiterates Edwards’ claims: the horse “trappings appeared too late to have been associated with an invasion in the mid- or late fourth century; moreover, their spread across Japan was too gradual” [94]. Unger states: “I began to change my mind ... a few years ago because of criticisms of the so-called horserider theory by Walter Edwards and Gina Barnes” [95].

<sup>29</sup> Barnes states that: “It is my contention that it was the development of relations with Paekche that allowed a new faction, probably led by the Kazuraki clan, to take control and build a new polity, possibly integrating continental figures into their ruling structure” [98]. Barnes has stated that, “from the late 4th century, the pendulum swung away...to a focus on the Korean Peninsula,” and that “the center of power shifted westwards towards Ōsaka Bay and links to the Korean Peninsula [and] resulted in a new era of peer relations between Paekche and the Kinai core” [99].

remains of a saddle, bit, stirrups and bronze ring from a satellite tomb of Richiu<sup>30</sup> [100].

Edwards has classified both “equestrian goods and *sueki*” as “precisely those items which are closely linked with the continent”<sup>31</sup> [93]. In the Table (1.1) showing the tripartite division of the Kofun period, Barnes specifies that the Middle Kofun period [400-75] “coincides with the Ōjin line of kings in the *Nihon Shoki*,” and then tabulates to let *sue* stoneware appear simultaneously together with the horse trappings in her Middle Kofun period<sup>32</sup> [105]. Allowing a little bit of inconsistency between the table and the text, however, Barnes simply declares that “tombs begin to yield horse trappings” by “the mid-5th century,” providing at the same time the “adjusted reign dates” for Ōjin (346-95) and his son Nintoku (395-427), apparently because Edwards has declared that “the influx” of those items “begins well after Ōjin-ryo, hence no earlier than the mid-fifth century” [106].

Allowing a lapse of exactly 20 years after 1983, we may return to Edwards himself as of 2003, now a professor at the Tenri University. Edwards states that: “In the fifth century, the keyhole tombs reached their greatest size in the 425m long mound regarded as the mausoleum of the legendary Emperor Ōjin, and the even longer mound attributed to his son, Nintoku. At 486m, the latter tomb is estimated to have required 6.8 million man-days for building the mound and the surrounding moats, and for surfacing these structures with a paving of stone. Clearly the rulers who made these monuments were in command of extraordinary economic resources. ... This process began with the appearance of Korean style stoneware in the **late fourth or early fifth century**, followed by continental style weaponry and equestrian goods, richly ornamented crowns and jewelry together with horizontal style burial chambers, which are ... learned through Korean examples. Active cultural borrowing continued through the sixth and seventh centuries with the importation of Buddhism and temple structure, the adoption of the Chinese script, and emulation of Korean and especially Chinese systems of administration” [107]. Barnes’ reference to Edwards’ writings has, unfortunately, not gone beyond the year 2000 [96].

Barnes’ 1988 work was confined geographically to the Nara Basin and focused on Late Yayoi and Early-Middle Kofun period *settlement* data in order to trace the social and economic processes that led to the emergence of the Yamato State [108]. Barnes’ 2007 work deals with *burial* data from Middle Yayoi through early Kofun across the whole of the western archipelago in order to trace the processes of “social stratification” that enabled the emergence of that state. According to Barnes, the assumptions that (1) Himiko’s country Yama-tai [Yama-ichi] was one and the same as the

later documented Yama-to; (2) Himiko [Pimihu] mentioned in the *Dongyi-zhuan* can be identified as a personage connected to the Sujin line of sovereigns as portrayed in the *Kojiki* and *Nihongi*; and (3) Himiko’s tomb can be equated with one of the monumental keyhole tombs in the southeastern Nara Basin “reflect the currently held judgment of most Japanese archeologists. ... If these assumptions are ever found wanting, then the interpretations developed herein will have to be thoroughly rethought” [109].

As of 2005, Edwards calls our attention to the fact that the Imperial Household Agency (“retaining much of its former [prewar] autonomy within the government”) denies access to “the sites designated as imperial tombs” which “include the largest and most important tombs of the Kofun period” that is “vital to the study of Japan’s ancient history,” and also to the fact that the “contemporary Japanese archeology” is not “free of political constraints in its investigation of the past,” and consequently “many Japanese archeologists’ presentations and interpretations of data are influenced by their *a priori* assumptions of the uniqueness and homogeneity of Japanese culture”<sup>33</sup> [110].

The phrase *bansei ikkei* (the line of emperors unbroken for ages eternal) was used early on by the emperor-centered Meiji government to proclaim the unique nature and the inherent superiority of the Japanese monarchy to the Western world. “Documenting the unbroken continuity of the ruling line thus became a priority that affected policies toward the ancient imperial tombs, and, by extension, materials of the [proto-historic] Kofun period as a whole” [114]. The program of identification and repairs was implemented in earnest by the Meiji government, and the designation of a tomb for each member of the imperial line could be finalized in 1889, just in time for the promulgation of the Meiji Constitution.

When the emperor had to renounce publicly under the Allied occupation his claims to divinity in January 1946, the Japanese people, including Egami Namio, suddenly found themselves groping for new understanding of their past history that would be consistent with the democratic ideals, and also for new ways to define who and what they were. But it did not take long before the emperor-centered ideology struck back the Japanese society.<sup>34</sup> Numerous Japanese historians began to present and still continue to present many and richly imagined variations on the theme of the *bansei ikkei*.

<sup>30</sup> The oldest saddle with gilt bronze bows that were fitted over and decorated with a wooden frame was excavated from the Maruyama tomb that is, according to Kidder, also likely a satellite tomb (or a retainer’s tomb) of the Ōjin Mausoleum [100].

<sup>31</sup> Kidder notes that the *sue* pottery was a Korean product initially and coincided in the Japanese Islands with the appearance of horse-trappings in the tombs [100].

<sup>32</sup> According to Barnes, *sueki* was known as *Chosun* (Korean) pottery until the 1950s, when the word *sue* (derived from a reference to the vessels in the 8th-century anthology *Manyōshū*) was adopted. It seems to have been an unbearable burden for the contemporary Japanese to keep calling the representative artifact marking the 300-year Middle and Late tomb periods “Korean pottery” [104].

<sup>33</sup> “Nearly 900 locations in Japan are currently treated as imperial tombs...containing the remains of an imperial family member. Roughly 250 of these are archeological sites predating the start of written history” [111]. Kidder has indeed mentioned the “Japanese unwillingness to dig such tombs [as Fujinoki] for fear of finding a Korean buried inside or evidence proving that the imperial line had Korean origins” [112]. Diamond has pointed out that “there is much archeological evidence that people and material objects passed between Japan and Korea in the period 300 to 700 CE. Japanese interpret this to mean that Japan conquered Korea and brought Korean slaves and artisans to Japan; Koreans believe instead that Korea conquered Japan and that the founders of the Japanese imperial family were Korean” [113].

<sup>34</sup> I may make an allusion to the PRC (People’s Republic of China). On February 27, 1957, Mao Zedong let “one hundred flowers bloom, and one hundred schools of thought contend,” urging leaders of the democratic parties to overcome their hesitations and speak out. The open criticisms against the PRC regime reached a zenith by May. Mao was shocked. Immediately began his campaign against the rightists. The ephemeral “era of blooming and contending” in the PRC society was as abruptly over as it had appeared.

The Japanese archeological community has been ardently pushing back the beginning of Early Tomb Period by discovering “new dating evidence” in order to close the “temporal hiatus between mention of Himiko’s tomb and the beginning of mound-tomb construction in Nara” [115]. Apparently reflecting the dominant sentiment of the Japanese archeological community, Barnes states that the beginning of Early Kofun Period “has already been pushed back from its post-war standard of 300 CE to 250 CE to coincide with Himiko’s ostensible death date, and it is likely to be soon pushed back again in recognition of keyhole-shaped mound building in the early 3rd century” [116]. The Early Kofun Period would then include the entire reign of Jingū (201-69 CE) as recorded in the *Nohongi*. With a few more efforts by the Japanese archeological community, almost the entire post-war standard of Late Yayoi Period (100-300 CE), covering the entire life time of Jingū (170-269 CE) as recorded in the *Nihongi*, may well be included in the Early Kofun Period in the near future.<sup>35</sup> One may now observe a concerted effort exerted in another closely related front.

### “The Presence of Slag is Sufficient for Confirmation of Iron Production”

Yayoi and even the Early Tomb period had been an era of wood, stone, and bronze. Farris states that: “In the fifth century...the quantity of iron from sites of all types in Japan grew dramatically. ... What is more, the source for almost all this iron must have been continental, and most likely Korea ... Recently scientists have discovered Enjo site north of Kyoto where craftsmen smelted into tools and ingots Japanese iron sand collected from river bottoms. ... At present Enjo is considered the oldest iron-smelting site in Japan ... The implication is clear: nearly all the iron to make the first Japanese weapons and tools came from Korea...at least until iron sand was discovered in Japan in the sixth century”<sup>36</sup> [118].

Seven Paekche sites of various iron-making furnaces were excavated in 1994-5 at Sök-jang-ri (Jin-chön, Chungbuk), and dated third to fourth centuries.<sup>37</sup> Iron ax-head mold pieces and remains of slag were found around the melting furnaces, while forged iron pieces were found around the forging hearths. The fact that furnaces for iron-making and processing (smelting, melting, and refining) as well as the

forging hearths are all found at the same sites suggests that a sort of proto-integrated-steel-mills existed at Sök-jang-ri, and that the iron-making, processing, and forging were well established as an industry in Paekche as early as the third and fourth centuries. The so-called “uniquely Japanese” iron-making technology adopted later in the Japanese Islands is in fact identical to the old Paekche method discovered at these sites.

Prior to the sixth century, bloomery iron had been imported from Paekche and Kaya states that could be refined through hammering (to expel the slag impurities), and fashioned into weapons and implements. Barnes notes that: “The introduction of forging technology is attested mainly in Western Seto, where several well-constructed forging hearths have been excavated. Most have forging slag, so that both blooms and ingots of iron are thought to have been imported and refined of their impurities on site” [121].

Until very recently, traces of the bloomery furnace had to be found for the proof of iron-smelting. The ever ardent Japanese archeologists, however, have decided that the presence of slag is “sufficient for confirmation of local production” declaring that “iron dross does not appear except in the smelting process.” Since numerous iron workshop sites with “some slag” could be identified, they now contend that the “local production started in Middle Yayoi”<sup>38</sup> [122]. Their contention is endorsed by Kidder (in 2007) who states that: “Adding iron tips to wooden spades and hoes was a Japanese device, an invention of necessity to compensate for the relative shortage of iron. The straight-edged sickle and the striking hoe are Japanese. It has long been thought that the Wa imported iron bars, ingots, or plates from Korea for their use until their own smelting processes were of a sufficient proficiency to provide for their own needs. ... Then, when did the Japanese start to make their own iron? ... It is now generally believed that local production started in Middle Yayoi. ... [B]y the Kofun period iron tools had replaced stone tools, and it is inconceivable that every lowly farmer in the country was tapped into the network of foreign exchange. Artifacts or their lack, it is evident that local production had by the early Kofun period reached the point where supply could meet the demand” [122].

The Japanese archeologists have decided to believe that the iron-working places with small forging hearths that left some traces of “slag” were the iron smelting sites even when they cannot find any traces of bloomery furnaces. By introducing such an “ingenuous” method of identification, they are now contending that the Japanese Islands began to produce their own iron in Middle Yayoi [200 BCE-0], and were self-sufficient in iron by the early Kofun period [250-400 CE].

<sup>35</sup> The irony may be the fact that Egami has already contended that there was chronological continuity between the Late Yayoi culture and the Early Tomb culture (300-375), and that the change which took place can be understood as a result of the increasing “social stratification” [117].

<sup>36</sup> Farris states that “the implications of early Japan’s near-total reliance on the southern Korean states for iron, iron tools and weapons, and iron workers are profound,” and also that “nomads did not gallop through Korea and Japan founding kingdoms, but inhabitants of Korea did play an essential role in transferring horseriding technology to Japan” [119].

<sup>37</sup> A (6.4 meters long and 6.0 meters wide) hole was dug underground, the bottom was layered with clay and charcoal, and then two furnaces (the large one for the first stage of iron-making and the small one for the next stage) were installed on top of the layers. The round-shaped clay furnace measures about one meter in diameter, and a tap to deliver slag was installed at the lower side. Both iron ore and iron sand were used in iron-making, and limestone (or calcific material such as animal bones and clamshell) was used as a solvent to reduce melting point. The *Dongyi-zhuan* records that the Pyön-han people in the southeastern corner of Korean Peninsula had been supplying iron to the Japanese Islands. The *Nihongi* records the discovery of an iron mountain by the Paekche people in the late fourth century, and their promise to the Yamato rulers to supply the iron acquired from that mountain [120].

<sup>38</sup> According to Kidder, the Japanese archeologists could find some thirty iron-working places (including eight that are dated Middle Yayoi) by 1994 with one or more of the following evidence: “pits that were clearly not fireplaces, often elongated shallow holes; some slag; stone tools or fragments thereof [allegedly] used in the smelting process; and pieces of iron chisels.” They could further find “almost forty [iron] workshop sites located along the banks of rivers feeding into Osaka Bay [dated] fourth through the early decades of the sixth century,” and they are now contending that the region was the center of iron industry that “should have brought in” the raw material “by boat,” and “met the demands for farm and industrial tools and weapons” [123].

### The Product of a System

One may recall the incident of the Mainichi newspaper breaking the news on Sunday morning, November 5, 2000, saying that: “an archaeologist, Fujimura Shin’ichi, had been caught on video planting stone artifacts at the Kami-Takamori site in northern Miyagi Prefecture.” Fujimura’s findings had appeared to push back the earliest human habitation of Japan from 30,000 to 600,000 years ago. Books on archaeology and Japanese history came to include descriptions of the Early/Middle Paleolithic Period based on Fujimura’s discoveries, which appeared to overturn the belief that Japan’s earliest inhabitants migrated approximately 30,000 years ago [124]. Keally states: “Fujimura is the one taking all of the blame for planting artifacts on the site, but I feel all of Japanese society, especially academia, and most particularly archaeology, is ultimately responsible. Japanese academia is famous for its closed system. Students cannot pass teachers. Lower ranking teachers and students must agree with the ideas of the higher ranking teachers and the leader, or be expelled from the group. Many academics spend their whole career in the same university system, from student to teacher to retiree. It is this system that has a lot of the responsibility for both Fujimura’s acts and for the fact that no one caught it earlier. Fujimura deserves criticism for his actions. But he also deserves our sympathy, for he is ultimately a product of a system” [125]. Charles T. Keally has been working professionally on Japanese archeology for 30 years at Sophia University in Tokyo. Professor Keally questions whether “the Japanese archaeological community or the Japanese historians community is up to the task.” What Keally says may have been taken as a serious warning to the modern Western exegesis that often endorses blindly the claustrophobic narrowness of the Japanese academic tradition.

### The Nature of *Kojiki-Nihongi* Distortions

The Preface to *Kojiki* states that Temmu (r.673-86) had profound knowledge of ancient histories and was able to comprehend the previous age thoroughly. As Paekche and Koguryō were conquered one by one by their archenemy Silla that drew the Tang forces onto the Korean Peninsula, the sense of crisis and anxiety of the Yamato rulers regarding the fate of their kingdom on the Japanese archipelago was heightened far beyond imagination.<sup>39</sup> The disappearance of the Paekche Kingdom and the unification of the Korean Peninsula in the hands of the Silla people caused an unprecedented identity crisis for the Yamato rulers. Should they continue to identify themselves with the Paekche, they feared their days on the Japanese Islands would be numbered. They did not want to cast their fate with the Paekche. In order to establish an entirely new identity as a native polity disconnected from the Paekche, and to secure a permanent future in

the Japanese Islands, Tenji (r.662-71) had notified the Silla court in December 670 that Yamato changed its name to Nippon, and Temmu decided to create a new history of the Yamato dynasty on March 17, 681.<sup>40</sup>

Temmu’s own words, quoted in the Preface of *Kojiki*, offer a glimpse of the sense of crisis and of the necessity, therefore, to create a new history: “Those chronicles handed down and kept by the head family of each clan contain records which differ greatly from the facts. Unless we correct those false records at this very moment, the foundation of our kingdom and royal family will be lost in a few years. I now intend to scrutinize all those records with great care, eliminate the falsehoods, correct the errors, and hand down the true version of our history to posterity” [128]. On an appointed day before Temmu died in 686, the outline of the new history of the Yamato Kingdom (called the *History of Royal Mandate* in the Preface) was at last finalized, and was memorized by Hieda Are, then 28 years old, who had extraordinary powers of memory. On September 18, 711, Gemmei (r.707-15) ordered Yasumaro to write down the new *History of Royal Mandate* that had been memorized by Hieda Are, who must have been more than 54 years old by that time. Hieda Are dictated and Yasumaro wrote. Four months later on January 28, 712, Yasumaro presented the *Kojiki* to Gemmei. On the basis of *Kojiki*, the Yamato court immediately commenced the compilation of official annals called the *Nihongi* (or *Nihon-shoki*) that was completed by 720.

The Yamato rulers compiled the *Kojiki* and *Nihongi* with definite objectives in mind. They wanted to eradicate any original connection with the Paekche Kingdom; they wanted to make the origin of ruling clans as ancient and as native as the Yayoi aborigines; and they wanted to make the Yamato Kingdom a dominant regional force. In the new history, the Yamato Kingdom is said to have been established in time immemorial (660 BCE) without any connection with Paekche; the imperial family became a truly native force without any relation to the Paekche people; and all Korean and Chinese kingdoms were under the suzerainty of the Yamato court. The ruling clans were postulated to have come down to the Japanese Islands, not from the Korean Peninsula but directly from heaven. An entirely new identity as an ancient native polity was thus created for the Yamato Kingdom. Ever since the appearance of *Kojiki* and *Nihongi*, their ideology was instilled into the mind of the Yamato ruling class, and eventually evolved into the semi-religious emperor worship on the Japanese Islands.<sup>41</sup>

For a proper interpretation of the records of *Kojiki* and *Nihongi*, the historians have to understand the very nature of their distortions. The *Kojiki-Nihongi* literalism has turned the Japanese history, borrowing the Hudson’s expression, into “tales told in a dream” [129]. Many English-speaking scholars, whether historians, linguists, anthropologists, or arche-

<sup>39</sup> The Yamato court intensified its preparation for a possible war against the Tang invasion forces. In 664, the Yamato court reinforced the garrison forces stationed at the islands of Tsushima, Iki, and northern Kyūshū, constructed beacons, and surrounded the fortresses in Kyūshū with moats. In 665, the Yamato court sent Paekche generals to construct one rampart in Nagato and two ramparts in Kyūshū. In 667, a rampart was constructed in the Yamato region, another at Sanuki, and another at Tsushima Island. One finds the expression “Tsukusi (Northern Kyūshū) Commandery” appearing in the *Nihongi* record for the year 667 [126].

<sup>40</sup> On March 17, 681, Temmu ordered six princes and six ministers to compile the histories of the Yamato Kingdom [127].

<sup>41</sup> As a result, even after the traditional ruling class of Paekche origin lost all their powers to the samurai warriors of peasant origin, the emperor has continued to reign as the nominal head of the Japanese state until today. The result seems to have been far beyond anything possibly wished for by Temmu, who was not only a self-made but also a truly farsighted monarch.



logists, are still working (or rather torturing themselves) under handicaps imposed by the distorted history of the ancient Korea-Japan relations, wasting enormous amounts of precious research time, and unintentionally impeding the progress in every related academic field. Even a simple mental exercise with Korean perspective may well lead to academic enlightenment of an entirely different dimension.<sup>42</sup>

## REFERENCES

- [1] (a) Yasumaro O. Kojiki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1958. (b) Chamberlain BH, Transl. The Kojiki: records of ancient matters. Tokyo: Tuttle 1981. (c) Philippi DL, Transl. Kojiki. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press 1968. (d) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami. 1967, Vol. I-II. (e) Aston WG. Nihongi: chronicles of Japan from the earliest times to A.D. 697. Tokyo: Tuttle. 1972, Vol. 1. Vol. 2.
- [2] Kim P. Samguk-sagi. Lee BD, Transl. Seoul: Eulyu 1983, Vol. 1-2.
- [3] Brown DM. Ed. The Cambridge history of Japan: ancient Japan. New York: Cambridge University Press 1993, Vol. I; p. 108.
- [4] (a) Chen S. Sanguozhi. Seoul: KM 1980, Book 30. Weishu 30. Dongyi-zhuan 30; pp. 854-5. (b) Fang X. Jinshu. Seoul: KM 1980, Book 97. Liezhuan 67; p. 2536. (c) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; p. 361.
- [5] (a) Fang X. Jinshu. Seoul: KM 1980, Book 10. Diji 10; p. 265. (b) Shen Y. Songshu. Seoul: KM 1980, Book 97. Liezhuan; p. 2395.
- [6] Aston WG. Nihongi: chronicles of Japan from the earliest times to A.D. 697. Tokyo: Tuttle 1972, Vol. 1; p. xviii.
- [7] Aston WG. Nihongi: chronicles of Japan from the earliest times to A.D. 697. Tokyo: Tuttle 1972, Vol. 1; pp. xv-xviii.
- [8] Aston WG. Nihongi: chronicles of Japan from the earliest times to A.D. 697. Tokyo: Tuttle 1972, Vol. 1; pp. 345-6.
- [9] (a) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; p. 359. (b) Aston WG. Nihongi: chronicles of Japan from the earliest times to A.D. 697. Tokyo: Tuttle 1972, Vol. 1; p. 251. (c) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; p. 361. (d) Aston WG. Nihongi: chronicles of Japan from the earliest times to A.D. 697. Tokyo: Tuttle 1972, Vol. 1; p. 253.
- [10] Aston WG. Nihongi: chronicles of Japan from the earliest times to A.D. 697. Tokyo: Tuttle 1972, Vol. 1; pp. 253 ff., 346 ff.
- [11] Ryusaku T, Goodrich L, Transl. Japan in the Chinese dynastic histories: later Han through Ming dynasties. South Pasadena: P. D. Ione Pekins 1951; pp. 9-16.
- [12] (a) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; pp. 351-61. (b) Aston WG. Nihongi: chronicles of Japan from the earliest times to A.D. 697. Tokyo: Tuttle 1972, Vol. 1; pp. 245-6, 253.
- [13] (a) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; p. 349. (b) Aston WG. Nihongi: chronicles of Japan from the earliest times to A.D. 697. Tokyo: Tuttle 1972, Vol. 1; p. 241.
- [14] Tōru T. The Kyūshū dynasty: Furuta's theory on ancient Japan. Japan Quarterly 1983; 30(4).
- [15] Furuta T. Yamaichi state. Ōsaka: Chin-chin-do 1983.
- [16] Fang X. Jinshu. Seoul: KM 1980, Book 9. Diji 9; p. 222.
- [17] Fang X. Jinshu. Seoul: KM 1980, Book 9. Diji 9; p. 235.
- [18] (a) Hong WT. The relationship between Korea and Japan in the early period: Paekche and Yamato Wa. Seoul, Ilimsa 1988. (b) Nelson SM. Review. J Asian Stud 1989; 48(2): 636-37. (c) Best JW. Review. J Japn Stud 1990; 16(2): 437-442. (d) Hong WT. Paekche of Korea and the origin of Yamato Japan. Seoul: Kudara 1994. (e) Nelson SM. Review. J Asian Stud 1995; 54(3): 850-51. (f) Serafim L. Review. Korean Studies 1995; 19: 193-196. (g) Hong WT. Kudara Yamato: history of ancient Korea-Japan relations. In Korean. Seoul: Iljisa 2003. (h) Hong WT. Korea and Japan in east Asian history. Seoul: Kudara 2006. (i) Hong WT. Yayoi wave, Kofun wave and timing: the formation of Japanese people and Japanese language. Korean Studies 2005; 29: 1-29.
- [19] (a) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; p. 353. (b) Aston WG. Nihongi: chronicles of Japan from the earliest times to A.D. 697. Tokyo: Tuttle 1972, Vol. 1; p. 246.
- [20] (a) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; p. 353. (b) Aston WG. Nihongi: chronicles of Japan from the earliest times to A.D. 697. Tokyo: Tuttle 1972, Vol. 1; p. 247.
- [21] (a) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1965, Vol. II; p. 71. (b) Aston WG. Nihongi: chronicles of Japan from the earliest times to A.D. 697. Tokyo: Tuttle 1972, Vol. 2; p. 43.
- [22] Ledyard G. Galloping along with the horseriders: looking for the founders of Japan. J Japn Studies 1975; 1(2): 217-54.
- [23] (a) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; pp. 355-7. (b) Aston WG. Nihongi: chronicles of Japan from the earliest times to A.D. 697. Tokyo: Tuttle 1972, Vol. 1; pp. 248-50.
- [24] Kim P. Samguk-sagi. Lee BD, Transl. Seoul: Eulyu 1983, Vol. 2; pp. 24-34.
- [25] Kim P. Samguk-sagi. Lee BD, Transl. Seoul: Eulyu 1983, Vol. 2; p. 16.
- [26] Best JW. A history of the early Korean kingdom of Paekche. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center 2006; pp. 68, 88.
- [27] Inoue. et al. An outline of the Japanese history: primitive and ancient times (Nihon rekishi taikai: genshi-kodai). Tokyo: Sansen 1984; pp. 271-3.
- [28] (a) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; p. 363. (b) Aston WG. Nihongi: chronicles of Japan from the earliest times to A.D. 697. Tokyo: Tuttle 1972, Vol. 1; p. 254.
- [29] (a) Hong WT. Korea and Japan in east Asian history. Seoul: Kudara 2006; pp. 109-112. (b) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; pp. 349, 361. (c) Aston WG. Nihongi: chronicles of Japan from the earliest times to A.D. 697. Tokyo: Tuttle 1972, Vol. 1; pp. 241-53.
- [30] Aoki MY. Ancient myths and early history of Japan: a cultural foundation. New York: Exposition Press 1974; pp. 35-9.
- [31] (a) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; pp. 149, 155, 341. (b) Yasumaro O. Kojiki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1958; pp. 130-46, 230-2.
- [32] (a) Yasumaro O. Kojiki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1958; pp. 232-4. (b) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; pp. 343-49.
- [33] (a) Yasumaro O. Kojiki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1958; p. 128. (b) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; pp. 141, 149, 161.
- [34] (a) Yasumaro O. Kojiki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1958; p. 128. (b) Philippi DL, Transl. Kojiki. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press 1968; p. 141.
- [35] Egami N. The formation of people and the origin of the state of Japan. Memoirs of Tōyō Bunko 23. Tokyo: Toyo Bunko 1964; pp. 35-70.
- [36] Chamberlain BH, Transl. The Kojiki: records of ancient matters. Tokyo: Tuttle 1981; pp.137-8.
- [37] (a) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; p. 359. (b) Aston WG. Nihongi: chronicles of Japan from the earliest times to A.D. 697. Tokyo: Tuttle 1972, Vol. 1; p. 251. (c) Philippi DL, Transl. Kojiki. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press 1968; p. 248.
- [38] Saeki A. Studies of ancient Japanese history: past and present. Acta Asiatica 1977; 31(1): 113-29.
- [39] (a) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; p. 213. (b) Aston WG. Nihongi: chronicles of Japan from the earliest times to A.D. 697. Tokyo: Tuttle 1972, Vol. 1; pp. 131-2.
- [40] Ōbayashi T. The origin of Japanese mythology," Acta Asiatica 1977; 31(1): 1-23.
- [41] (a) Gardiner KHJ. The Samguk-sagi and its sources. Papers of Far Eastern History 1970; 2(September): 1-42. (b) Gardiner KHJ. Tradition Betrayed? Kim Pusik and the Founding of Koguryō. Papers of Far Eastern History 1988; 37(March): 149-93.
- [42] (a) Kim P. Samguk-sagi. Lee BD, Transl. Seoul: Eulyu 1983, Vol. 1; pp. 260-1. (b) Yi S. Dong-guk Yi-sang-guk-jip. Seoul: Minmun-go 1967; pp. 127-43. (c) Lim TS. Transl. King Kwangaet'o Epitaph. Seoul: Yōk-min-sa 1985; pp. 307-10. (c) Chen S. Sanguozhi. Seoul: KM 1980. (d) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; pp. 87-193. (e) Yasumaro O. Kojiki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1958; p. 148-50.
- [43] (a) Kim P. Samguk-sagi. Lee BD, Transl. Seoul: Eulyu 1983, Vol. 2; p. 15. (b) Yasumaro O. Kojiki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1958; pp. 124-126, 130-146, 226. (c) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; pp. 151, 163, 165, 171, 175, 178-181, 183, 185, 187.
- [44] Yasumaro O. Kojiki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1958; p. 42.
- [45] Yasumaro O. Kojiki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1958; pp. 228-30.
- [46] Hong WT. Korea and Japan in east Asian history. Seoul: Kudara 2006; pp. 128-31.

<sup>42</sup> I do not imply that "all" western scholars are dependent on Japan for their perspectives; witness, for instance, the work of Sarah M. Nelson that acknowledges both points of view, and leans toward a Korean interpretation [130].

- [47] (a) Yasumaro O. Kojiki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1958; p. 248. (b) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; pp. 371-373.
- [48] (a) Yasumaro O. Kojiki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1958; p. 248. (b) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; pp. 367, 371.
- [49] (a) Yasumaro O. Kojiki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1958; p. 248. (b) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; pp. 371-5. (c) Choi K. Transl. Nihon Sandai-jitsuroku. Seoul: Karak 1994; pp. 216-7.
- [50] (a) Kim P. Samguk-sagi. Lee BD, Transl. Seoul: Eulyu 1983, Vol. 2; p. 46. (b) Best JW. A history of the early Korean kingdom of Paekche. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center 2006; p. 271.
- [51] Arikiyo S. Shinsen Shōjiroku no Kenkyu (A study of the new compilation of the register of families: main text). Tokyo: Yoshikawa 1962; pp. 279, 307.
- [52] Aoki K. Transl. Shoku-Nihongi. Tokyo: Iwanami 1989-98; p. 380.
- [53] Arikiyo S. Shinsen Shōjiroku no Kenkyu (A study of the new compilation of the register of families: main text). Tokyo: Yoshikawa 1962; p. 358.
- [54] Akimoto K. Transl. Fudoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1958; pp.328-30.
- [55] Yi KM. Outline of the history of Korean language (Kugeosa Kae-seol). In Korean. Seoul: Tap 1972; pp. 37-8.
- [56] Ishida E. Japanese culture: a study of origins and characteristics. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press 1974; p. 85.
- [57] Arikiyo S. Shinsen Shōjiroku no Kenkyu (A study of the new compilation of the register of families: main text). Tokyo: Yoshikawa 1962; pp. 146-7, 149-52.
- [58] (a) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. II; p. 361. (b) Aston WG. Nihongi: chronicles of Japan from the earliest times to A.D. 697. Tokyo: Tuttle 1972, Vol. 2; p. 280.
- [59] Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; pp. 365, 367.
- [60] Roh T. Transl. Hanguk-Kodae-Keum-Seok-Mun. Seoul: Karak 1992; pp. 3-35.
- [61] Hatada T. An interpretation of the king Kwanggaet'o inscription. Korean Studies 1979; 3: 1-17.
- [62] Cho SB. The Chinese language in archaic Korea. Linguistica Et Philologica 1984; 35-64.
- [63] (a) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. II; pp. 19-109. (b) Aston WG. Nihongi: chronicles of Japan from the earliest times to A.D. 697. Tokyo: Tuttle 1972, Vol. 2; pp. 49-71.
- [64] Aston WG. Nihongi: chronicles of Japan from the earliest times to A.D. 697. Vol. 1. Tokyo: Tuttle 1972; p. 263.
- [65] Best JW. A history of the early Korean kingdom of Paekche. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center 2006; pp. 273-4.
- [66] Brown DM. Ed. The Cambridge history of Japan Vol. I: ancient Japan. New York: Cambridge University Press 1993; pp. 111, 303.
- [67] Best JW. A history of the early Korean kingdom of Paekche. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center 2006; p. 26-7.
- [68] Best JW. A history of the early Korean kingdom of Paekche. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center 2006; p. 8.
- [69] Hong WT. Paekche of Korea and the origin of Yamato Japan. Seoul: Kudara 1994; pp. 201-3.
- [70] Best JW. A history of the early Korean kingdom of Paekche. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center 2006; pp.17-20.
- [71] Aoki K. Transl. Shoku-Nihongi. Tokyo: Iwanami 1989-98; pp. 448-52, 468-72.
- [72] Arikiyo S. Shinsen Shōjiroku no Kenkyu (A study of the new compilation of the register of families: main text). Tokyo: Yoshikawa 1962; pp. 286-7.
- [73] (a) Yi SH. Songs of emperors and kings (Chewang un'gi, Kim KS, Ed.) Seoul: Yōk-rak 1999; p. 270. (b) Kim P. Samguk-sagi. Lee BD, Transl. Seoul: Eulyu 1983, Vol. 2; p. 15. (c) Best JW. A history of the early Korean kingdom of Paekche. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center 2006; pp. 209-10.
- [74] Arikiyo S. Shinsen Shōjiroku no Kenkyu. Tokyo: Yoshikawa 1962; pp. 301-394.
- [75] Best JW. A history of the early Korean kingdom of Paekche. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center 2006; p. 10.
- [76] Best JW. A history of the early Korean kingdom of Paekche. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center 2006; p. 26.
- [77] Best JW. A history of the early Korean kingdom of Paekche. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center 2006; p. 27.
- [78] Ledyard G. Review. Best. History of Paekche. J of Korean Studies 2007; 12(1):143-53.
- [79] Schreiber G. The history of former Yen dynasty," Monumenta Serica 1949-55; 14: 394-5, 398.
- [80] (a) Kim P. Samguk-sagi. Lee BD, Transl. Seoul: Eulyu 1983, Vol. 2; pp. 316-7. (b) Fang X. Jinshu. Seoul: KM 1980, Book 109. Zaiji 9; p. 2824.
- [81] Sima G. Zizhi Tongjian. Tokyo: Kyuko 1973, Book 97. Jinji 19; p. 830.
- [82] Shen Y. Songshu. Seoul: KM 1980, Book 97. Liezhuan 57; p. 2393.
- [83] Wei Z. Liangshu. Seoul: KM 1980, Book 54. Liezhuan 48; p. 804.
- [84] Au G. Manzhou Yuanliu-gao. Taipei: Wenhai 1966.
- [85] Au G. Manzhou Yuanliu-gao. Taipei: Wenhai 1966, Book 3. Tribes.
- [86] (a) Sima G. Zizhi Tongjian. Tokyo: Kyuko 1973; 1158. (b) Xiao Z. Nan Qishu. Seoul: KM 1980, Book 58. Liezhuan 39. (c) Kim P. Samguk-sagi. Lee BD, Transl. Seoul: Eulyu 1983, Vol. 2; p. 60. (d) Xiao Z. Nan Qishu. Seoul: KM 1980, Book 58. Liezhuan 39; p. 804. (e) Liu X. Jiu Tangshu. Seoul: KM 1980, Book 199. Liezhuan 149; p. 5334. (f) Kim P. Samguk-sagi. Lee BD, Transl. Seoul: Eulyu 1983, Vol. 2; p. 359. (g) Hong WT. Korea and Japan in east Asian history. Seoul: Kudara 2006; pp. 104-6.
- [87] Best JW. A history of the early Korean kingdom of Paekche. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center 2006; pp. 30-31.
- [88] (a) Choi ML. Korean archeology: a new study of ancient history. In Korean. Seoul: Ju-ryu-sōng 2006; pp. 326, 336, 352-3. (b) Best JW. A history of the early Korean kingdom of Paekche. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center 2006; pp. 216, 220.
- [89] (a) Sima Q. Shiji. Seoul: KM 1980, Book 88. Liezhuan 28; p. 2565. (b) Sima Q. Shiji. Seoul: KM 1980, Book 6. Qin Shihuang-pon'gi 6; p. 252.
- [90] (a) Wright AF. The Sui dynasty: the unification of China, A.D. 581-617. New York: Alfred A. Knof 1978; pp. 84-8. (b) Lee HG. Castles of Paekche. In Korean. Seoul: Ju-ryu-sōng 2004; p. 65. (c) Choi ML. Korean archeology: a new study of ancient history. In Korean. Seoul: Ju-ryu-sōng 2006; pp. 324-55. (d) Kim P. Samguk-sagi. Lee BD, Transl. Seoul: Eulyu 1983, Vol. 2; p. 233.
- [91] Best JW. Buddhism and polity in early sixth-century Paekche. Korean Stud 2002; 26(2): 165-215.
- [92] (a) Best JW. A history of the early Korean kingdom of Paekche. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center 2006; pp. 254-6, 260, 265. (b) Kim P. Samguk-sagi. Lee BD, Transl. Seoul: Eulyu 1983, Vol. 2; pp. 31-2, 45. (c) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967; p. 357.
- [93] Edwards W. Events and process in the founding of Japan: the horse-rider theory in archeological perspective. J Japn Stud 1983; 9(2): 265-295.
- [94] (a) Brown DM, Ed. The Cambridge history of Japan: ancient Japan. New York: Cambridge University Press 1993; p. 109. (b) Farris WW. Sacred texts and buried treasures: issues in the historical archaeology of ancient Japan. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press 1998; pp. 78-79.
- [95] Unger JM. Layers of words and volcanic ash in Japan and Korea. J Japn Stud 2001; 27(1): 84-85.
- [96] Barnes GL. State formation in Japan: emergence of a 4th century ruling elite. London: Routledge 2007; pp. 9, 10.
- [97] Barnes GL. State formation in Japan: emergence of a 4th century ruling elite. London: Routledge 2007; p. 18.
- [98] Barnes GL. Review. Hong WT. Korea and Japan in east Asian history. Korean Studies 2007; 31: 79-82.
- [99] Barnes GL. State formation in Japan: emergence of a 4th century ruling elite. London: Routledge 2007; p. 194.
- [100] Kidder JE Jr. The archaeology of the early horseriders in Japan. Transactions of Asiatic Society of Japan 1985; 20: 89-123.
- [101] (a) Yasumaro O. Kojiki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1958; p. 248. (b) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; p. 371. (c) Akimoto K. Transl. Fudoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1958; p. 278.
- [102] Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; p. 485.
- [103] Barnes GL. Emperor Nintoku. Kodansha Encyclopedia of Japan. Vol. 6. Tokyo: Kodansha 1983; p. 8.
- [104] Barnes GL. Sue Ware. Kodansha Encyclopedia of Japan, Vol. 7. Tokyo: Kodansha 1983; p. 256.
- [105] Barnes GL. State formation in Japan: emergence of a 4th century ruling elite. London: Routledge 2007; pp. 10, 17.
- [106] Barnes GL. State formation in Japan: emergence of a 4th century ruling elite. London: Routledge 2007; pp. 18, 22.
- [107] Edwards W. Monuments to an unbroken line: the imperial tombs and the emergence of modern Japanese nationalism. In: Kane S,

- Ed. The politics of archeology and identity in a global context. Boston: Archeological Institute of America 2003; pp. 13-14.
- [108] Barnes GL. Protohistoric Yamato: archaeology of the first Japanese state. Ann Arbor: Museum of Anthropology and Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan 1988; p. 195.
- [109] Barnes GL. State formation in Japan: emergence of a 4th century ruling elite. London: Routledge 2007; pp.9, 103, 195.
- [110] Edwards W. Japanese archeology and cultural properties management: prewar ideology and postwar legacies. In: Robertson J. Ed. A companion to the anthropology of Japan. Oxford: Blackwell 2005; pp. 46-47.
- [111] Edwards W. Monuments to an unbroken line: the imperial tombs and the emergence of modern Japanese nationalism. In: Kane S, Ed. The politics of archeology and identity in a global context. Boston: Archeological Institute of America 2003; p. 11.
- [112] Kidder JE Jr. The Fujinoki sarcophagus. *Monumenta Nipponica* 1989; 44 (Winter): 415-460.
- [113] Diamond J. Japanese roots. *Discover* 1998; June:1-12.
- [114] Edwards W. Japanese archeology and cultural properties management: prewar ideology and postwar legacies. In: Robertson J. Ed. A companion to the anthropology of Japan. Oxford: Blackwell 2005; pp. 40-41.
- [115] Barnes GL. State formation in Japan: emergence of a 4th century ruling elite. London: Routledge 2007; p. 103.
- [116] Barnes GL. State formation in Japan: emergence of a 4th century ruling elite. London: Routledge 2007; p. 9.
- [117] Egami N. The formation of people and the origin of the state of Japan. *The Memoirs of the Tōyō Bunko* 1964; (23): 35-70.
- [118] Farris WW. Sacred Texts and Buried Treasures: Issues in the Historical Archaeology of Ancient Japan. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press 1998; pp. 71-3.
- [119] Farris WW. Sacred Texts and Buried Treasures: Issues in the Historical Archaeology of Ancient Japan. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press 1998; pp. 73, 79.
- [120] (a) National Research Institute of Cultural Properties, Dictionary of Korean Archaeology. In Korean. Seoul: NRICP 2001; pp. 641-2. (b) Chen S. Weishu. Seoul: KM 1980, Book 30. Dongyi-zhuan 30; p. 852. (c) Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. I; p. 359.
- [121] Barnes GL. State formation in Japan: emergence of a 4th century ruling elite. London: Routledge 2007; pp. 66-7.
- [122] Kidder JE Jr. Himiko and Japan's elusive chiefdom of Yamatai: archeology, history and mythology. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press 2007; p. 88.
- [123] Kidder JE Jr. Himiko and Japan's elusive chiefdom of Yamatai: archeology, history and mythology. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press 2007; p. 89.
- [124] French H. Meet a stone age man so original, he's a hoax. *New York Times*; December 7, 2000.
- [125] Keally CT. Japanese scandals - this time it's archaeology [Online]. *Ancient East Asia*. 2000 Nov 17. Available from: <http://www.ancienteastasia.org/special/japanarchscandal.htm>.
- [126] Yasumaro O. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. II; pp. 363, 367, 435, 461, 463.
- [127] (a) Kim P. Samguk-sagi. Lee BD, Transl. Seoul: Eulyu 1983, Vol. I; p. 128. (b) Aoki K. Transl. Nihon-shoki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1967, Vol. II; p. 447.
- [128] Yasumaro O. Kojiki. Tokyo: Iwanami 1958; pp. 44-6.
- [129] Hudson MJ. Ruins of identity: ethnogenesis in the Japanese islands. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press 1999; p. 23.
- [130] Nelson SM. The archeology of Korea. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1993.

---

Received: December 29, 2008

Revised: February 5, 2009

Accepted: March 17, 2009

© Wontack Hong; Licensee *Bentham Open*.

This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>) which permits unrestricted, non-commercial use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.