Korea in Proto-Japanese Migration Theories and their Political Implications: The Cases of Kita Sadakichi and Egami Namio

Sekine Hideyuki

Abstract

The “horse-rider theory” succeeded the theory of Kita Sadakichi, a proponent of the common ancestry between the Korean and Japanese peoples. His arguments had helped justify Japan’s colonial annexation and assimilation of Korea from 1910 to 1945. Egami Namio, who put forward the horse-rider theory, was reserved about publishing a theory that seemed influenced by imperialism.

This paper examines how such considerations or reservations were reflected in Egami’s theory by comparing it with Kita’s. Both looked for the origin of the Wa, the rice farmers of ancient Japan, in the southern parts of China. Kita assumed that the Wa’s main route of migration to Japan was a land route that went north across the Shandong and Korean peninsulas, finally reaching Kyūshū. Egami argued that the Wa went directly from China to Kyūshū by sea. Moreover, Kita regarded the Wa and the Han, the rice farmers of ancient Korea, as almost the same ethnicity, while Egami distinguished them and interpreted the influence of the Han on the Wa as cultural diffusion rather than the result of ethnic migration. Both concurred in identifying the Tenson group, which ruled ancient Japan, as a branch of the Puyŏ ethnicity. Egami linked them directly to Central Asia, arguing that they reached the Korean peninsula as “horse-riders.” In this way, he avoided the genealogical theorization of the relationship between the Koreans and the Japanese.

Keywords:

Egami Namio, Kita Sadakichi, ethnogenesis, migration, diffusion

Sekine Hideyuki

Formerly Department for Japanese Culture and Language, Gachon University, Seoul, South Korea

Introduction

The "horse-rider theory" by Tōkyō University professor Egami Namio (1906-2002), also known as the theory of "equestrian conqueror kingship," once enjoyed great popularity in and outside academia but is now almost forgotten. While historians of Korean-Japanese relations in the ancient period still have not reached a consensus on the ethnogenesis of Japan, recent trends in human genetics research promise to shed new light on ethnic migrations in ancient Asia.[1] From this angle, Egami's theory, which linked Japanese state formation to ethnic migration, still contains relevant implications.[2]

Yet, Egami's horse-rider theory has been rightfully criticized from various angles. In addition to problems of historiographic methodology, some critics have accused Egami of being a relic of scholarship under the age of Japanese imperialism. Strangely enough, Egami himself regarded his theory as the contemporary version of Kita Sadakichi's (1871-1939) ideas on the common origin of the Korean and Japanese peoples, which were formulated in the early twentieth century.[3] But why would a scholar of the postwar period regard his work as a successor to the common ancestor theory, which was regarded as highly problematic in these years? Unfortunately, Egami never made it specifically clear in what sense he continued the legacy of Kita.[4]

In a previous article on Egami's search for the origins of the Japanese people, I already noted that Egami arbitrarily ignored groups of Korean Han people that migrated to Japan. When talking about the origins of the Japanese, he would either consider Wa groups that migrated from south-central China, or—rather unconventionally—look further north beyond the Korean peninsula.[5] Tackling the reasons for his interest in certain peoples naturally leads us to a reconsideration of Egami's theories from a political perspective. Therefore, in this study, I compare the theories on ethnic migration of the Korean people by Kita with the theories on Japanese ethnic origins by Egami. In doing so, I will reveal the traces of the common ancestor theory in Egami's model and analyse the resulting problems.

The horse-rider theory is only the first half of Egami's theoretical model, which distinguishes between "Japanese people" and "Japanese nation." The horse-rider theory refers to a large extent only to the origin of the Japanese nation, or more concretely to the "Tenson people"[6] who established the Yamato court. Regarding the Japanese people, Egami proposed the "Wa migration from Jiangnan,"[7] claiming that the Japanese people derived from rice-growing farmers in middle and southern China.

Thus, this paper first considers the political and ideological implications of "ethnic migration" in the study of Japanese ethnogenesis, and then examines the context in which ethnic migration is presented in the theories of Kita and Egami. To this end, their theories are compared in two points, namely, 1) how they defined the identities of the rice-growing farmers and the Tenson people in relation to the Korean people; and 2) how they treated the Korean peninsula as a migration

1
For example, in 2010, a collaborative project between the Korean newspaper *Chosun ilbo* and the Genomic Medicine Institute of Seoul National University called "Asian Genome Road" was initiated, aiming to analyse the genomes of 918 people from nine Asian countries. *Chosun ilbo*, March 26, 2010. (Translator's note: A more recent try is the Genome Asia 100K project)

2
To Ch'ŏn Kwan-u, the significance of the horse-rider theory lay in the fact that it provided an important opportunity to reexamine the speed of ethnic migration, the speed of conquest, the speed of state formation, and the speed of ancient history's progression by offering a wholly new viewpoint on these issues. Ch'ŏn Kwan-u, "Kankokushi kara mita kiba minzoku setsu," in *Kodai Nihon to Kankoku bunka (jō)*, ed. Ch'ŏn Kwan-u and Kim Tong-ŭk (Tōkyō: Gakuseisha, 1980), 20.

3
Ishida Eichirō, ed., *Shinpojiumu Nihon kokka no kigen* (Tōkyō: Kadokawa shoten, 1966), 15.

4
For more information see Sekine Hideyuki, "Oka Masao-ŭi Ilbon minjokmunhwa kiwŏn-ŭi sŏngnip-gwa kŭ tŭkch'ing—Minjŏk idong-ŭi kwanjŏm-esŏ," *Ilbon munhwa yŏn'gu* 37 (Winter 2011): 249-75.

5
Sekine Hideyuki, "Egami Namio Ilbon minjok kiwonronesŏ-ŭi waein-gwa hanin. Waein-gwa hanjok-ŭi minjok idong," *Tongasia kodaehak* 24 (January 2011): 409-39; Sekine Hideyuki, "Han'guk'in-gwa Ilbon'in-ŭi kyetongyŏn'gu-wa perŏdaim," *Minjok munhwa yŏn'gu* 47 (Winter 2007): 418-20.

6
A name for the people that established the Yamato court derived from the so-called *tenson kōrin* 天孫降臨 (lit. descent of the Heavenly Grandchild) myth, according to which the ancestors of the imperial lineage descended from heaven to pacify and rule Japan on orders of Amaterasu Ōmikami. Translator's note: While Kita used *Tenson minzoku* (Tenson people), Sekine prefers to speak of *Tenson-zoku* (Tenson group).

7
This is not a well-established term but was used by Egami in his discourse with Ōbayashi Taryō. Egami Namio, ed., Ronshū Nihon minzoku no kigen. Wa to wajin (Tōkyō: Yamato shobō, 1978), 7-9.

route to Japan. Finally, the impact of common ancestor theories and their afterlife in Egami's theory is scrutinized, discussing the resulting problems and considering the possibilities of revising his theory.

Ethnogenesis and Ethnic Migration

Political Ideology and Identity

When studying the impact of a foreign culture on the formation of an ethnic culture, it is of great significance in terms of the sociology of knowledge whether the researcher regards this impact as "migration" or "diffusion."[8] In the former case, a cultural element is transferred from one culture to another, whereas in the latter, the cultural element travels with its carrier group and stays in the same culture. While both phenomena can be distinguished conceptually, it is not easy to identify them on the basis of the distribution of cultural elements.[9] Therefore, in ethnic genealogical studies, the same cultural phenomenon can yield different interpretations depending on the researcher's perspectives and values. In particular, ethnic migration leaves a stronger psychological impression than diffusion, as it is likely to lead to genetic mixing. When evaluating a scientific theory, this can become a decisive factor. In a political situation, where peoples of two regions are forced to unite and the cultural relation of the two regions is obvious, ethnic migration is likely to be adopted.

Conversely, we can assume the following. If political circumstances force one to deny the genealogical relationship between two peoples that are obviously culturally related, it is possible to explain the relationship in terms of cultural diffusion. In particular, researchers in single-ethnic societies may be willing to accept the fact that their own culture adopted a foreign culture in the process of its ethnic formation but will hardly accept the fact that it mixed with other ethnicities.

Therefore, when considering questions of ethnic migration and diffusion, it is necessary to look at the political situation of the times in which Kita and Egami were active. It is needless to mention that political circumstances forced the Japanese and Koreans to unite at the time when Kita published his representative article, "Theory of the Common Origin of the Japanese and Korean People" (1921).[10] In particular, right after the March 1st Independence Movement (1919), the theory of common ancestry served to weaken the Korean quest for independence.

On the other hand, by the time Egami published his horse-rider theory, Japan was reduced to its four main islands and had given up all its colonies. According to Oguma Eiji's analysis of studies on Japanese identity, World War II marked a paradigmatic shift from "mixed nationalism" to "mono-nationalism,"[11] rendering ideologies obsolete that demanded assimilation to the Great East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. Thus, common ancestor theories were now perceived as an abhorrent ideology of aggression. In a situation where political circumstances required the denial of genealogical relations between two peoples, it was normal to deny ethnic migration and presume cultural relations qua diffusion.

Thus, Kita and Egami propounded their theories in very different political situations. Especially for Egami, it must have been particularly difficult to advocate

8 Sekine Hideyuki, "Ilbon munhwa-ŭi wŏllyurosŏ-ŭi nambanggye munhwa yŏn'gu. 'Chŏnp'a wa minjok idong-e daehan sahoehakjŏk chŏpgŭn," *Ilbon munhak yŏn'gu* 31 (Winter 2009): 406-09.

9 Ōbayashi Taryō, "Minzoku idō," in *Bunka jinruigaku jiten*, ed. Ishikawa Eikichi (Tōkyō: Kōbundō, 1994), 751.

10 Kita Sadakichi, "Nissen ryōminzoku dōgenron (1921)," in *Kita Sadakichi chosakushū dai 8 kan minzokushi no kenkyū* (Tōkyō: Heibonsha 1979), 357-419.

11 Oguma Eiji, *Tan'itsu minzoku shinwa no kigen. 'Nihonjin' no jigazō no keifū* (Tōkyō: Shinyōsha, 1995).

ethnic migration. However, the formation of theories is not only driven by political factors, but also by a number of personal motivations of the researchers themselves. Let us therefore take a look at the personal motives that may have influenced Kita's and Egami's perceptions of ethnic migration.

Kita's Discussion of Assimilation

Kita was active as a historian from the Meiji to the Shōwa period, and his fields of study included ethnic history, social history, art history, and the problems of the social outcasts (*buraku*). However, the focal topic of his research, which marked his academic identity, was the study of Japanese ethnic history, aiming to reveal the origins of the Japanese people.

Among postwar historians, Ueda Masaaki (1927-2016) assessed Kita's history of Japanese ethnicity in favourable terms, pointing out that Kita did not regard the Japanese as a monolithic entity, but as a "mixed" or "composite people."[12] However, while Kita's views may have been unusual in the 1970s, when mono-ethnocentrism reigned, mixed ethnocentrism was not at all unusual during the times in which Kita was active.

The idea that the myths of *Kojiki* and *Nihon shoki* reflect historical facts has been proposed by scholars from the Edo period onward. Since then, the idea that ethnic migration existed between ancient Japan and Korea has been raised by various scholars. Such mythological research was supported by the anthropological research of Erwin von Bälz (1849-1913), a scholar invited by the government in the Meiji era, who suggested that the ruling classes of northern China and Korea had spread to Japan via the Korean peninsula.[13]

Under the influence of these views, the Meiji era gave rise to several theories of mixed ethnic origin, including the "theory of Japanese latecomers" (*Nihonjin kōraisetsu*, kor. *Ilbonin huraesŏl*), which states that an ancestral group of the Japanese entered from outside the Japanese archipelago and conquered the indigenous population; the "mixed ethnicity theory," which states that the Japanese people were formed through the intermingling of different ethnic groups; and the "conquering people theory," which states that the conquering people came from the Korean peninsula.[14] However, these views were not directly related to political intentions at the time they originated but became political tools later.[15] After the March 1st Independence Movement, Kita proposed a theory of common ancestry between the Koreans and Japanese as follows.

> The Korean people were the same ethnic group as the Japanese people, but due to political differences since the Middle Ages, there has been a divergence in language, culture, habits, customs, and ideas. Now, the two peoples have returned to their ancient roots and are organizing a unified nation (jp. *tōitsu kokka*, kor. *tong'il kukka*). As the Korean people gradually assimilates into the larger group of the Japanese people, there will be changes in language, customs, habits, and when the ideas become the same, ethnic discrimination will be completely eliminated, and one large, fully harmonized (jp. *konzen yūwa*, kor. *honyŏn yunghwa*) Japanese ethnicity will be formed.[16]

In this way, Kita argued that Koreans should assimilate to the Japanese by returning to ancient times when both peoples shared the same culture. His purpose

12 Ueda Masaaki, "Kaisetsu," in *Nihon minzoku no kigen*, ed. Egami Namio (Tōkyō: Kōdansha 1995), 423.

13 Yamaguchi Bin, *Nihonjin no oitachi* (Tōkyō: Misuzu shobō, 1999), 9-11.

14 Kin Kōrin [Jin Guanglin], "Nissen dōsoron. Sono jittai to rekishiteki tenkai," (PhD diss., Tōkyō University, 1997), 36.

15 Sekine Hideyuki, "Hanil hapbyŏng chŏne chech'ang doen Ilbon injongŭi Hanbando toraesŏl," *Ilbon munhwa yŏn'gu*, 19 (July 2006): 180-83.

16 Kita Sadakichi, "Chōsen minzoku towa nanzo ya," in *Kita Sadakichi chosakushū dai 8 kan minzokushi no kenkyū* (Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1979), 355.

may have been to pacify the independence movement at the time, but his ulterior motive was to eliminate discrimination.

In Japan, outcast (*buraku*) discrimination has been a problem since the Edo period. As a scholar, Kita used all his might to fight this discrimination. It is hard to believe today, but at his time, social outcasts were considered as originating from a different ethnicity. Kita, however, regarded them as people who were to be harmonized with the rest of Japan as one multi-ethnic society.

Kita applied the same logic to the Korean people when it was newly integrated into the "Great Japanese Empire." According to Oguma Eiji, "no other intellectual of the time addressed the issue of discriminated groups as vigorously as Kita. But the more he emphasized such good intentions, the more he advocated the assimilation of Koreans, Taiwanese, Ainu, etc."[17] Thus, Kita discussed the assimilation of colonized peoples and domestically discriminated groups on the same level. In this sense, his logic differed from an ideology of mere territorial expansion.

However, the assimilation he is referring to is centred on the Japanese people deriving from the Tenson. According to Kita, "under the leadership of the Emperor from the unbroken imperial line (jp. *bansei ikkei*, kor. *manse ilgye*), who ruled over the Tenson people as his subjects, a united people came into being, which formed a strong united state."[18] In this way, the Tenson did not conquer the other peoples by force, but by harmoniously assimilating them, building a solid unity.

Such views were certainly shaped by the emperor system of the time. Yet, regardless whether they were historically correct or logically consistent, it was only natural that Kita, who reconstructed ancient Japanese-Korean relations in order to create a theoretical basis for "assimilation," did not stop at diffusion but took ethnic migration as a premise.

Egami's Historical Theory of Eurasian Civilization

Egami's "horse-rider theory" as well as his "Wa migration from south-central China thesis" are also historical constructions built upon the premise of ethnic migration. For someone of his generation, born in 1906, these theories seem very unorthodox. At least when he started his research, ideas of a "late-coming Japanese people," "Japanese as mixed ethnicity," or "invading-people entering from the Korean peninsula" were very uncommon. On the other hand, in addition to Kita, prewar scholars such Sano Manabu (socialist activist and Waseda professor, 1892-1953) and Yamaji Anzan (critic and historian, 1865-1917) can also be regarded as predecessors of Egami's horse-rider theory.[19] One of the special characteristics of Egami is that he sticks to constructions based on migration even after the end of World War II. About this, he writes in 1965:

> People of a rice-growing agriculture in middle to southern China left their homes and went to western Japan (either directly from China or via the Korean peninsula). There they settled down and practised the first rice growing [in Japan]. While such an idea is logical, there are only a few scholars in Japan who think like this. They think that rice-consuming customs were introduced by the Japanese in the late Jōmon period and that the Japanese themselves started to grow rice, thus creating Yayoi culture.[20]

Thus, Egami complains that most scholars discuss the introduction of rice

17 Oguma, *Tan'itsu minzoku shinwa no kigen*, 128.

18 Kita, "Chōsen minzoku towa nanzo ya," 399.

19 Yamaji Aizan's texts "Nihonkokuminshi sōkō" and "Jōkoshi sōron" are collected in: Tomio Hora, ed., *Ronshū Paleo kibaminzoku-setsu* (Tōkyō: Yamato shobō, 1976); Yamaji Aizan, Kirisutokyō hyōron, *Nihon jinminshi* (Tōkyō: Iwanami bunko, 1966); Sano Manabu, *Nihon kodaishiron* (Tōkyō: Kokuminsha, 1946).

20 Egami, *Ronshū Nihon minzoku no kigen*, 23.

farming only in terms of diffusion. Since the single-ethnic paradigm had already been established in Japanese academia at that time, it was only natural that his theory of Japanese origins in middle or southern China was not accepted.

Why, then, did he go against the grain and adhere to ideas of a mixed ethnicity? With the abandonment of the colonies, national politics no longer provided an incentive to expand Japanese identity to assimilate immigrant peoples. Was it Egami's personal nationalism or nostalgia for imperialism?

Egami's ideas were probably backed by numerous field surveys in Eurasia. Egami made comprehensive historical surveys of agrarian and equestrian peoples in Eurasia and related them to the history of ancient Japan.[21] That is, he characterized the urban civilizations of Mesopotamia, Egypt, the Eastern Mediterranean, the Indus and Ganges river basins, and the Yellow and Yangtze river basins as follows:

> In most cases, indigenous peoples were agrarian, and since their wealth was accumulated through agriculture, they probably had many clans. When a horseback-riding people entered the country, they cooperated with the clans to rule over the people, as they do everywhere. In the case of Japan, a unified state was formed in this way.[22]

Thus, urban civilizations of Eurasia derived from agricultural clans that cooperated with horse-riding people, who ruled over the other agrarian people, and this could be applied to Japan as well.

This concludes my overview of the political ideologies concerning ethnic migration and of the contexts in which Kita and Egami discussed this topic. Although the two scholars were both pioneers of the research on Japanese ethnic origins, their political and ideological contexts were diametrically opposed. Thus, their research objectives and directions were also different.

As is always the case with scholars, there are times when they are forced to compromise with the status quo in order to get their theory accepted. After the war, Kita was stigmatized as a theoretician of common ancestry. If Egami wanted to avoid this stigma, he had to circumvent Kita's common ancestry position. In order to think about the restraints existing for Egami, I will now turn to questions of "identity" and "routes of ethnic migration," as well as to the role of the Korean Han people (kor. *Han minjok*) and the Korean peninsula in his theories.

Ethnic Migration of Rice-growing Farmers

Kita's Hayato People

Kita's ideas about the various ethnicities who were assimilated into the Tenson group were based on accounts in the *Kojiki* and *Nihon shoki*. These he combined with archaeological findings, even though his opinions varied in the course of time. First, in the 1910s, he classified the different ethnicities according to the old classics, drawing a distinction between the "Western ethnicities" of Hayato,[23] Kumaso,[24] and Komahato[25] and "Eastern ethnicities" of Ezo,[26] Tsuchikumo,[27] and Ainu.[28] In 1938, however, he classified the "Western ethnicities" as those with Yayoi earthenware, and "Eastern ethnicities" as those with Jōmon earthenware.

21 Egami Namio, *Kiba minzoku kokka. Nihon kodaishi heno apurōchi* (Tōkyō: Chūōkōron, 1967), viii.

22 Egami Namio, *Egami Namio chosakushū 7. Nihonjin to wa nanika* (Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1985) 76.

23 People who lived in ancient Japan in the prefectures of Satsuma, Osumi, and Kagoshima. They often rebelled against the Yamato, but soon came under the control of the Yamato kingship.

24 A group based in southern Kyūshū who resisted the Yamato kingship.

25 People who lived in the Kuma region of the Higo Kingdom (now Kumamoto Prefecture) in ancient times.

26 A title for people who lived to the east or north of the Japanese archipelago and were considered as different from the Yamato people.

27 Lit. "ground crouchers"; today, this is understood as a derogatory term for all kinds of people considered ethnically different.

28 Kita Sadakichi, "Wajinkō (1916)," in *Kita Sadakichi chosakushū dai 8 kan minzokushi no kenkyū* (Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1979), 159-63.

He believed that the "Western ethnicities" were part of the Yamato, Kii, and Izumo powers (modern Nara, Wakayama, and Shimane prefectures), before they became assimilated into the Tenson, and that all of these groups, including the Tenson themselves, had moved to Japan from the Korean peninsula.[29]

The Chinese called the inhabitants of Japan Wo (jp. Wa, kor. Wae), but Kita maintained that this appellation referred to the Hayato, Kumaso, and Komahato.[30] Based on the special features of the Wa as described in the "Dongyichuan" of the *Weizhi*—red facial makeup, tattooing, the custom of carrying objects on the head, etc.—Kita classified them as South Asian people (南洋人). Even though they no longer existed, Kita thought that the Wa had become more and more homogeneous and called them Hayato.[31]

These Hayato belonged to the "Malay race." They came to southern China from Taiwan, the Philippines, and Malaysia, further proceeded to Korea and Manchuria, and became the first "Japanese people" after assimilating into the Tenson. Later, Han Chinese and Ainu were also assimilated according to Kita's conception,[32] but among all ethnicities who merged into the Japanese people, the Hayato seem to be the second most important ethnic group after the Tenson. If this is the case, which route did the Wa/Hayato take to migrate to the Japanese peninsula?

> Perhaps due to the Han Chinese migration, who kept moving their capital always further east, the ancestors of this ethnicity had to pass the Chinese continent, leaving their native place and passing remote territories widely, such as Wuyuan, Shandong, Liaodong, including the Korean peninsula and its many small islands. In this way, most of the Yayoi-style ethnicities moved from the Korean peninsula to the San'in Region [Translator's note: area in the southwest of Honshū, Japan] and to northern Kyūshū. A considerable number of people from the same ethnicity probably also immigrated from Wuyue and Nanyang (Henan). […] The existence of anything resembling a southern culture among the indigenous Japanese can only be understood in this way.[33]

Thus, Kita regards the Chinese continent as the native place of the Wa/Hayato ethnicity. With the advance of the Han Chinese, the same people immigrated from the Wuyue area south of the Yangtze delta, and on to around the middle reaches of the Yangtze River. Note that Kita imagined two routes to Japan, one by land through the Shandong peninsula, Liaodong peninsula, and Korean peninsula to Kyūshū, and the other directly to Japan by sea from the direction of Wuyue or Nanyang. The former is considered mainstream.

However, on the Korean peninsula during the same period, there was also a "Korean people" (kor. Han), who were rice-growing farmers. On the relationship between the Han and the Wa, Kita has the following to say:

> Presumably, the Han and the Wa are of the same ethnicity. Northern ethnicities continuously went down south, then entered the southern part of the Korean peninsula before finally going on to the Japanese islands. The people living at the coast or in the eastern parts, pursuing fishing as their means of sustainment, were called Wa. They became different from those who lived in the inner areas and used agriculture as main means to sustain themselves. […] Thus, sometimes the Wa are called Han, and in the *Weizhi*, the fishing people among the Wa were called "sweating people" (Han 汗) and their country "sweat land."[34]

29 Kita Sadakichi, "Nihon minzoku no kōsei (1938)," in *Kita Sadakichi chosakushū dai 8 kan minzokushi no kenkyū* (Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1979), 60-70.

30 Kita, "Wajinkō (1916)," 162.

31 Kita Sadakichi, "Nihon taiko no minzoku ni tsuite (1916)," in *Kita Sadakichi chosakushū dai 8 kan minzokushi no kenkyū* (Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1979), 27.

32 Kita Sadakichi, "Nihon minzoku gairon (1918)," in *Kita Sadakichi chosakushū dai 8 kan minzokushi no kenkyū* (Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1979), 44-50.

33 Kita, "Nissen ryōminzoku dōgenron (1921)," 388.

34 Kita Sadakichi, "Nihon minzoku-shi gaisetsu (1929)," in Ueda Masaaki, *Nihon minsoku bunka taikei 5 Kita Sadakichi* (Tōkyō: Kōdansha, 1978), 311-12. (Translator's note: The name *Han* is written here with the character for "sweat" 汗, not with the character denoting "Korea" 韓.)

Here, Kita understands both the Wa and the Han as northern ethnicities which went from the Korean peninsula on south and either pursued fishing or rice farming. The difference between the two ethnicities is seen as a difference in livelihood and therefore residence. But in essence they are the same ethnicity. This may seem contradictory, since the homeland of the Wa was defined as southern China, but this contradiction is explained by the assimilation (intermixing) of southerners and northerners on the Korean peninsula.

Egami's Proto-Japanese (Wa)

Egami's first mention of the horse-riding rice farmers was in a 1948 workshop.[35] In 1965, he summarized his theory as follows:

> The so-called Japanese of the Yayoi period and the Japanese of the historical period share basic economic, social, and cultural similarities, and are obviously ethnically linked. The starting point of the Japanese ethnicity is the Yayoi period, and it was its formative period. Japan in the Yayoi period appeared in the eyes of foreigners as a country with one common culture, even though it was divided originally into many small states. This is evidenced by the fact that in Chinese historical books, the Japanese of the time were distinguished from other ethnic groups by the ethnic name of Wa.[36]

In this way, Egami suggests that the Yayoi culture, with the Wa as its main carrier, was a key element of Japanese culture at large. In its narrow meaning, "Wa" refers to the inhabitants of the Japanese archipelago, while in its broader meaning Wa refers to southern peoples who inhabited various parts of East Asia. Egami was the leading proponent of an understanding of the Wa in this broader sense.[37] He believed that the Wa migrated to Japan and immediately became an integral part of the Japanese ethnicity. But what route did the Wa take to reach the Japanese archipelago?

> A rice-growing ethnicity different from the Han Chinese residing in the south-central marginal sea region of China was […] from early on active in coastal trade and skilled in piloting ships. The Chu state was the first to enter the region, followed by the Qin and Han empires. Expanding southward, they put pressure on the indigenous peoples of the coastal regions of south-central China. This caused great agitation and led to ethnic migrations. Certain groups of coastal natives were pushed out to the sea in southeastern China. Skilled at manoeuvring boats, they travelled by tide to reach the southwestern part of the Korean peninsula, northern Kyūshū, and the western tip of Honshū, and then migrated to other areas, transplanting their rice-farming culture.[38]

Thus, rice-growing farmers who originally lived in south-central China migrated to the southwestern part of the Korean peninsula and to the western tip of Kyūshū and Honshū in Japan after the Qin and Han dynasties moved south. What did Egami think of the relationship between the Wa and the Korean Han?

> From early on, two secondary culture circles can be identified in the southwestern coastal areas of the Korean peninsula and in Western Japan, resulting from frequent

35 Ishida Eiichirō et al., "Nihon minzoku bunka no genryū to Nihon kokka no keisei. Taiwa to furon," *Minzokugaku kenkyū* 13, no. 3 (Autumn 1949): 234-38.

36 Egami Namio, "Nihon ni okeru minzoku no keisei to kokka no kigen (1965)," in: *Egami Namio chosakushū 8 Wajin no kuni kara Yamato chōtei e* (Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1984), 16.

37 Sekine, "Egami Namio Ilbon minjok kiwŏnnon-esŏ-ŭi waein-gwa hanin," 418-19.

38 Egami, "Nihon ni okeru minzoku no keisei to kokka no kigen (1965)," 24-25.

> and close contacts between migrants from south-central China and the indigenous people of the two regions, and the blending of the cultures of the new and old inhabitants. Different rice-growing cultures with different local colour developed in the two regions, which were related to each other like cousins, so to speak. Seen from the perspective of oriental history, this was probably the basis from which the Han and Wa cultures developed. Since Han and Wa "cousin-cultures" developed in close relation, cultural exchanges were frequent, and people were coming and going between the two.[39]

In this way, Korean "Han" and Japanese "Wa" created similar cultures based on the contacts between migrants from south-central China and indigenous people, and even after the establishment of these cultures, there was a lively exchange between them.

Japanese – Korean Relations under the Premise of Cultural Diffusion

In the above, we have examined the views of Kita and Egami on the identity and migration routes of the rice-growing farmers who migrated to Japan. There is a basic consensus that after an invasion of the Han Chinese, the rice-growing farmers left their native places and migrated widely throughout East Asia, arriving on the Korean peninsula and the Japanese archipelago. This may have been Egami's version of Kita's view and was probably indeed the most widespread interpretation at that time.

However, there is a difference of opinion concerning the route taken to Japan. Kita basically assumed an overland route via the Shandong peninsula and the Korean peninsula. Of course, he also said that there were groups who travelled directly to Japan by sea, but the mainstream migration route was via the Korean peninsula according to Kita's view. In fact, this idea was already advocated by Bälz. Kita does not mention the relationship between his view and Bälz's, but this view may also have been widespread at the time.

In contrast, Egami believed that rice-growing farmers travelled directly to the Korean peninsula or the Japanese archipelago via sea routes and saw mainland routes as secondary. If Bälz's and Kita's views were the most accepted theory before the war, Egami can be understood as offering a new perspective after the war. In this regard, Egami also differs from Torii Ryūzō (1870-1953), who identified the core of the Japanese people as Tungusic ethnicities who came from the Korean peninsula, and called these "native Japanese."[40] Egami, however, regarded the Wa who migrated by sea as the core of the "Japanese people." His theory of the origins of the Japanese people was therefore fundamentally different from existing theories.

Egami was reluctant to acknowledge the influence of the Korean peninsula on migrations of rice-growing agricultural ethnicities, or in other words refused to acknowledge that the core groups that made up the Japanese people had kinship ties with the Korean people. This perception is also manifested in the relationship between the Korean Han and the Wa. While Kita perceived the Han and the Wa as different merely in terms of livelihood and residence, Egami described them as cousin-like. He also separated the two peoples by attributing them to different "secondary culture circles" (*a-bunkaken* 亞文化圈), using a concept of the Vienna School of Historical Ethnology. This way, he drew a line between the two peoples,

39 Egami, "Nihon ni okeru minzoku no keisei to kokka no kigen (1965)," 25.

40 "In my opinion, those who are called Wa were only living in one corner of Kyūshū and are therefore unrelated to the general Japanese people. I believe that the original Japanese who ruled over them have relations to the north." Torii Ryūzō, "Yūshi izen no Nihon (1926)," in *Torii Ryūzō zenshū dai 1 kan* (Tōkyō: Asahi shinbunsha 1975), 411.

limiting their relationship to cultural exchanges or very narrow local movements. This stands in contrast with Kita, who in order to eliminate discrimination made ethnic differences appear smaller than they actually were.

Egami's description of cultural exchanges and local movements fits with the above pattern: if political circumstances make it necessary to deny the genealogical relationship between two peoples, cultural similarity can be explained in terms of cultural transmission instead of ethnic migration.

The Ethnic Migration of the Tenson People

Kita's Tenson People

About the Tenson people, Kita wrote as follows:

> The ethnicity of the Tenson people is an important question. […] An examination of their language, customs, mythology, etc. suggests that their origins point to the direction of Korea, Manchuria, and Mongolia. They probably have a relatively close relation to the Puyŏ people. […] These ethnicities came primarily from Primorje to the northeastern and eastern part of the Korean peninsula, where they became the Paru, Okchŏ, Ye, Maek, etc. In the northern region, they founded Koguryŏ. Then they went down and mixed with the original inhabitants—the Han, that is the Wa and other eastern ethnicities—founding Mahan. And finally, they founded Paekche. This is what I think.[41]

Thus, the Tenson ethnicity has connections to people from what is now Korea, Manchuria, and Mongolia. In terms of the ancient period, these were the Puyŏ people. The Puyŏ people can be divided into Paru, Okchŏ, Ye, Maek, Koguryŏ, and Paekche people; it is the latter that Kita associated with the Tenson people by their foundation myth. The relationship between Paekche and Koguryŏ is in his view a father-son relationship, as suggested by the myths of Chumong and Onjo.[42] There is no need to look at them as separate countries.[43] Kita describes the Koguryŏ-Paekche relationship with the Tenson as "more than a very close relationship, a family relationship from the beginning."[44]

If that is so, how did the Tenson people get to Japan? On this question, Kita stated that "the ancestor countries of the Tenson and the Izumo peoples as well as issues such as their time of arrival need future research, so I reserve them for future publications,"[45] thus avoiding the subject. The same can be said for the present time, where exploring the origins of the imperial family in relation to the Korean dynasties comes with its own set of constraints. However, just as the Paekche people founded their state by mixing with the native population, it can only be assumed that in Kita's view the Tenson people, who founded their state further south, did the same: go south.

41 Kita, "Nissen ryōminzoku dōgenron (1921)," 407, 409. (Translator's note: Here *Han* again refers to those written with the character "sweat.")

42 Translator's note: Chumong is considered the founding king of Koguryŏ, and Onjo, his third son, the founder of Paekche.

43 Kita, "Nihon minzoku-shi gaisetsu (1929)," 309.

44 Kita, "Nihon minzoku-shi gaisetsu (1929)," 313-14.

45 Kita, "Nissen ryōminzoku dōgenron (1921)," 415.

Egami's Tenson People

As is widely known, the horse-rider theory was first suggested at the above-mentioned workshop in 1948 and elaborated in 1967 in a paper contained in the book *Kiba minzoku kokka*.[46] Here, before going into an explanation about the Tenson, Egami dedicates about one third of his space to descriptions of the Scythians, the Xiongnu, Göktürks, Wuhuan, and Xianbei cultures and explanations of their social structures,[47] claiming that horse-riders were not rare among the Puyŏ, Koguryŏ, Mohe (kor. Malgal), Parhae, Jurchen, and Manchu, since in Northeast Asia there were mainly-farming-with-partial-nomadism or half-farming-half-hunting cultures.[48] About the identity of the Tenson people, he wrote as follows:

> The Tenson were a Northeast Asian people related by their myths, traditions, and social structures to Puyŏ and Koguryŏ. It can be speculated that they were based in the Imna area of the Korean peninsula before entering Japan. […] Horse-riders of Northeast Asian descent, equipped with new weaponry and horses, entered Japan via the Korean peninsula, perhaps in northern Kyūshū or eastern Honshū, and finally, from the fourth century onward, went to the Kinai region, where they established a strong power that was to become the Yamato court.[49]

Thus, Egami, like Kita, considered the Tenson ethnicity to be of Puyŏ origin. It is this part about the identity of the Tenson where his view can be called a modernized version of Kita's theory. In support of this theory, he points out similarities between founding myths and social structures.[50]

It is important to note that as a migratory route for the Tenson, Egami mentioned that they established a base of operations in the southern part of the Korean peninsula before advancing to Japan. As the central figure of this force, Egami and Kita pointed to King Chin, who appears in the "Dongyichuan" of the *Weizhi* and the *Book of the Later Han*.[51] Egami's interpretation can be summarized as follows.

The Korean Peninsula in the second and third centuries was a so-called "Dolmen grave society." In the third century, King Chin and his people, a Puyŏ tribe, entered the southern to central region of the Korean peninsula and established its capital at Wolssiguk. With the approval of the people in the region, King Chin succeeded to the throne. Although his descendants did not control all the Three Han states, they ruled as the most powerful political dynasty in the southern part of the Korean peninsula. Later, in the early fourth century, King Chin's polity, with the cooperation of the Wa, took Kaya in Imna as its base and went on to attack Kyūshū. From the first century to the middle of the fourth, it established the "Wa-Han confederated kingdom," and from the end of the fourth to the beginning of the fifth century, it commanded the Koguryŏ campaign, while at the same time it went on eastward from Kyūshū to conquer the Kinai region and finally to establish the Yamato court.[52]

In other words, Egami's hypothetical stations of the Tenson people are northern Manchuria, the northern Korean peninsula (Puyŏ, Koguryŏ), the southern Korean peninsula (Kaya, Imna), northern Kyūshū, and finally Kinai.[53] However, Egami offers an unusual interpretation of the relationship between the Tenson and Paekche:

46 Egami, *Kiba minzoku kokka. Nihon kodaishi heno apurōchi*, 154-98, 325-43.

47 Egami, *Kiba minzoku kokka. Nihon kodaishi heno apurōchi*, 26-151.

48 Egami, *Kiba minzoku kokka. Nihon kodaishi heno apurōchi*, 25.

49 Egami, "Nihon ni okeru minzoku no keisei to kokka no kigen (1965)," 56-57.

50 Egami, "Nihon ni okeru minzoku no keisei to kokka no kigen (1965)," 48-50, 55-56.

51 King Chin (辰王) is considered the founder of the Chin state in southern-central Korea. It is estimated to have existed from 200 BC to 200 AD. The Chin state developed into the Three Han states (Mahan, Chinhan, Pyŏnhan). According to the *Book of the Later Han*, all of them understood themselves as successor states.

52 Egami raised three reasons for this: "First, they were looking for a way out of their declining power because their control was limited to the region where the power was changing. Second, they were interested in Japan because Pyŏnhan, the land where they originated from, was also inhabited by the Wa. Third, the Wa, who traded with Nakrang'gun, were looking for a breakthrough after the fall of Nakrang'gun." Egami, "Nihon ni okeru minzoku no keisei to kokka no kigen (1965)," 60-65.

53 Egami, "Nihon ni okeru minzoku no keisei to kokka no kigen (1965)," 50.

> The dynasty of King Chin, which ruled most of the Han states in the southern peninsula during the Three Kingdoms period, was of Puyŏ ethnicity, sharing the ethnicity with Koguryŏ. As the Three Kingdoms period unfolded, the main house (*sōke*) became the royal family of Imna (Kaya) and stayed there. Thus, we can infer that another family line became the Paekche ruling family.[54]

In other words, both the Paekche royal family and the Tenson people were King Chin's descendants. The main Tenson line stayed in Imna (Kaya) before advancing to Japan, while the Paekche royal family, a side lineage of the Tenson, established its kingdom on Mahan soil. For this interpretation, Egami gives the two reasons. First, the fact that the Liu Song dynasty of China (420-479) endorsed Wa suzerainty over Mahan. From this Egami inferred that the Tenson were successors to the legitimate royal lineage of King Chin. The second point is that among horse-riding peoples, the troops that go out to conquer are called "main house" (*sōke*), and the troops that stay at home and protect the country are called "branch house" (*bunke*).[55] Thus, Egami surmised that in the Battle of Paekkang-gu (663),[56] the Wa sent reinforcements to Paekche, because the royal family of the Wa "main house" had kinship ties to the "branch house," i.e., the brother state Paekche. Therefore, they felt a responsibility to protect and aid Paeckche.[57]

The Tenson People Beyond the Korean Peninsula

In the above sections, we examined the views of Kita and Egami on the identity and migration routes of the Tenson people. First of all, there are similarities in that both scholars regard them as a people related to the Puyŏ ethnicity, which is close to the people of the Puyŏ kingship and Koguryŏ. But there are also differences that can be summarized as follows.

First, Egami in his "horse-rider people" theory traced Tenson ethnic identity beyond Puyŏ and Koguryŏ, highlighting relations with the nomadic horse-riding peoples of Central Asia. Among these horse-riding peoples, there are the "nomadic horsemen" of the arid inner-continental regions of Eurasia, and the "non-nomadic horsemen" in areas of forests and agriculture, living from livestock farming, agriculture, and hunting.[58] According to Egami, the Tenson belong to the latter. Nevertheless, in *Kiba minzoku kokka*, Egami puts a lot of emphasis on the former and his treatment of Puyŏ and Koguryŏ is very short.

Egami's Tenson are not a horse-riding people *per se*, but rather a Tungus ethnicity influenced by horse-riding people. Nevertheless, it is questionable whether this is in line with Egami's description of the Tenson as "a mounted people of Northeast Asian descent, accompanied by new weapons and horses, invading northern Kyūshū or Honshū via the Korean peninsula," reminiscent of a Scythian invasion.[59] If we consider carefully the name "theory of equestrian conqueror kingship" as proposed by Egami himself, this should rather be called a "theory of Puyŏ as conqueror kingship."

Of course, Egami's concept of horse-riders deserves credit for the fact that it introduced a new interpretation in Central Asian studies. However, since he neglected the examination of Puyŏ and Koguryŏ, which should be conducted in much more detail, it is doubtful whether he really succeeded in establishing the identity of his horse-rider ethnicity. It has been pointed out that there are 17 different names for the Tenson people, which he all interpreted in the same way.[60]

54 Egami, "Nihon minzoku no seiritsu katei to tōitsu kokka no shutsugen," in *Nihon minzoku to Nihon bunka*, ed. Egami Namio (Tōkyō: Yamakawa shuppansha, 1985), 296.

55 In order to express his historical basis and potential right to rule over the entire southern part of the Korean peninsula, the King of Wa listed several countries in the southern part of the Korean peninsula from the past to the present and requested their recognition. Egami Namio, "Sono ato no Kiba minzoku ōchōsetsu no hatten (1982)," in *Egami Namio chosakushū 8. Wajin no kuni kara Yamato chōtei e* (Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1984), 342-43.

56 A last attempt by Paekche with massive support from the Yamato court to prevent Silla (supported by the Tang) from taking full control of the entire Korean peninsula, which ended in a crushing defeat of the Paekche-Yamato coalition.

57 Egami, "Sono ato no Kiba minzoku ōchōsetsu no hatten (1982)," 343.

58 The former included the Scythians, Sarmatians, Parthia, Avars, Khazars, Xiongnu, Göktürks, Rouran, Uigurs, Khitan, Mongolian, and Dzungar groups. The latter includes the Wuhuan, Xianbei, Puyŏ, Koguryŏ, Jurchen, and Manchurian groups. See *Nihon daihyakka zensho Nipponica, Shōgakkan*, 1984.

59 Ch'ŏn Kwan-u speculated that if there were horse-riding peoples in the central and southern part of the Korean peninsula around 250 AD, they were either "farming societies owning cavalry" or "the cavalry was recruited by the farming societies." Ch'ŏn, "Kankokushi kara mita kibaminzokusetsu," 31.

60 Just to name a few: 1) the people (cultures) of the continental north, 2) the horse-riding people of Northeast Asia, 3) the Puyŏ-Koguryŏ horse-riding peoples (the offshoots of the horse-riding people of Northeast Asia), 4) the people of eastern Manchuria and northern Korea (Puyŏ-Koguryŏ), and 5) the peoples of the Eurasian region from Mongolia in the east to Eastern Europe in the west. Egami Namio, *Ronshū Nihon minzoku no kigen*, 101-237; Ch'oe Chae-sŏk, Ilbon kodaesa yŏn'gu pip'an (Seoul: Ilchisa 1990), 192-93.

The second point on which Egami differed from Kita's view of the Tenson people is their connection to Paekche. Kita cited Koguryŏ and Paekche as concrete examples for the relationship of the Tenson with the Puyŏ, stating that "they have been related from the beginning" with the Tenson. Egami, on the other hand, always excluded Paekche, just writing about Puyŏ-Koguryŏ. Kita's description makes it conceivable that the Tenson originated from the royal dynasty of Paekche, while Egami simply reversed their hierarchy by postulating a main-branch relation. Unlike Kita, who viewed Koguryŏ and Paekche as the same ethnicity based on their founding myths, Egami, while recognizing Paekche as part of the Puyŏ ethnicity, was reluctant to recognize Paekche's genealogical relationship with Koguryŏ.[61]

His view may have succeeded in explaining why the Paekche-Wa relationship was a community of destiny, but his "main house/branch house" argument seems to lack a valid basis. With his degree of evidence, it would be equally plausible to regard Paekche as the main house and the Tenson as the branch.[62] Most importantly, this hypothesis is built on the premise of a "Japanese outpost at Imna" (*Imba Ilbonbu*), which needs much more careful and detailed examination.[63]

Concerning migration routes, the following points of criticism can be brought forward. Similar to Kita, Egami did not mention how the Tenson came to the southern part of the Korean peninsula. The sentence "accompanied by new weapons and horses, they invaded the Korean peninsula, probably entering via northern Kyūshū or western Honshū," gives the impression that the crossing of the Korean peninsula was over in a short period of time. But contrary to expectation, in a paper from 1973, Egami denied that a horse-rider army from northern China, Manchuria, or Mongolia would just run across the Korean peninsula from north to south, cross the Korean strait, and land in northern Kyūshū in no time. Rather, he estimated this process to have taken at least 100 years.[64]

If a powerful military force had entered the Korean peninsula in a short period without a fight, it is unlikely that Koguryŏ would have stood by and watched, and there would have been multiple factions between Koguryŏ and the regions under change. Still, there is no record of any conflict or resistance at the time. On the other hand, if it had taken 100 years for them to travel south, they would have already emerged as a national power in the centre of the Korean peninsula, but there is no record of that either. In short, the hypothesis that a powerful military force caused ethnic migration from northern China or Manchuria to the southern tip of the Korean peninsula, whether it was short-term or long-term, is unlikely to stand up to scrutiny.

So, what impression does Egami's forced hypothesis give us? Certainly, it is ultimately a cognitive delusion, but it evokes the impression that the Tenson came from Central Asia and were therefore different from the royal lineage of the Korean Han. Even if they shared a common descent with the Koguryŏ people, who were themselves former horse-riders, the Tenson can hardly be considered a Korean dynasty. Thus, Egami did not echo a straightforward common ancestor theory. Rather, his ideas can be seen as a reflection of the ethnocentric mood of his time.

In any case, Egami's theory aims to downplay the genealogical relation between the Tenson and the ancient Korean kingdoms, both in terms of identity and in terms of migration routes. This was already recognized by the eminent sociologist Ch'oe Chae-sŏk (1926-2016), who regarded Egami's horse-rider theory as an attempt to conceal the relations between the Japanese imperial family and the Korean Han, of course including the royal family of Paekche.[65]

61 In 538 King Songwang named his country "South Puyŏ." It is stated in the *Book of Sui* that "Paekche's ancestors came from a state called Koguryŏ. Here Silla, Koguryŏ, and Wa people lived together; there also were Chinese." And in the *Book of Yang*, it says, "Language and clothes are very similar to those of Koguryŏ."

62 For example, Hong Won-taek believed that it was the royalty of Paekche and its followers, represented by Homuda, who conquered the centre of Japan via Kyūshū, with the blessing of King Kŏnchogo (r. 346-375) of Paekche. Hong Won-taek, *Paekche-ŭi Yamato Ilbon-ŭi kiwŏn* (Seoul: Kudara International 1994).

63 Ch'ŏn Kwan-u criticizes the relationship between Pyeonhan, King Chin, and the Puyŏ clan, and the identity of the Japanese "outpost" (*Imna Ilbonbu*, jp. *Mimana Nihonfu*) by contrasting it with Korean history. Ch'ŏn, "Kankokushi kara mita kibaminzokusetsu," 17-70.

64 Egami Namio, "Higashi Ajia-shi kara mita kiba minzoku no Nihon tōitsu (1973)," in *Egami Namio chosakushū 8. Wajin no kuni kara Yamato chōtei e* (Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1984), 281.

65 Ch'oe, *Ilbon kodaesa yŏn'gu pip'an*, 192-93.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to compare the views of Kita and Egami on the ethnic migration of the Korean people as they appear in their theories on the origin of the Japanese people. More specifically, I tried to identify the after-effects of the common ancestor theories, which inspired, according to Egami, his own theory of the horse-riders. Kita's theory of the common ancestry between Korea and Japan, however, was blamed for supporting Japan's imperialist expansion that led to the Pacific War. In order to avoid the stigma of imperialism, Egami had to change these ideological implications. Thus, his theory needed to downplay the lineage relationship between the Korean people and the Japanese people. Korean groups should be eliminated from the various ethnic groups that migrated to Japan in the process of its ethnic formation.

Kita and Egami both divided prehistoric migrations from outside the Japanese archipelago into "rice-growing farmers" from central and southern China and "Tenson people" from the north, the former becoming the non-ruling people in Japan, the latter the ruling people. Differences between the two theorists can be summarized as follows.

Concerning the migration of the rice farmers, Kita assumed two routes: the main one would lead northward through the Shandong peninsula to the Korean peninsula, and the second, minor route by sea would lead directly from central and southern China to Kyūshū. Egami, on the other hand, hypothesized only a sea route from south-central China to the southwestern Korean peninsula, northern Kyūshū, and western Honshū, virtually excluding all land routes via the Shandong peninsula and the Korean peninsula from his analysis.

Differences can also be confirmed in the relationship between the Han rice farmers on the Korean peninsula and the Wa rice farmers in Japan. Kita did not claim essential ethnic differences between the two peoples except for their different residences and occupations. Egami, however, drew a difference between the two in terms of culture circles and limited the influence of Koreans on Japan to the level of cultural diffusion. Thus, ethnic migration was clearly downplayed. Egami's interpretation was therefore based on the premise that the farmers who form the foundation of the Japanese people are not genetically related to the Korean people.

As for the origins of the Tenson people, Kita and Egami both considered them to be part of the Puyŏ ethnicity. However, Egami neglected a detailed analysis of the Puyŏ people and introduced the vague concept of a horse-riding people, thereby shifting their identity beyond the Korean peninsula toward Central Asia. Here, Egami seems to avoid the discussion of a dynastic relationship with ancient Korea by directing his attention to a more distant region.

Kita, on the other hand, not only identified the Tenson people with the Puyŏ, but also suggested kinship relations with Koguryŏ and Paekche. Egami followed Kita in this point but suggested several different ideas with insufficient evidence, claiming that the Tenson tribe was the main house and Paekche a branch family. It would be difficult to explain such a distorted perception of Paekche solely as the after-effects of the common ancestry theory. Other reasons are probable as well, but proving these has to remain a future task.

In short, Kita, as a proponent of the common ancestor theory, claimed ethnic migrations between Korea and Japan and based his ideas about the origins of the Koreans and Japanese on the premise of a close relationship. Egami followed

Kita's ideas but, considering the political situation and trends of his time, removed the genetic relationships between the two peoples by cleverly manipulating the concepts of cultural diffusion and ethnic migration. In other words, Egami's theory seems to explain the origins of the Japanese people in a more balanced way, since he adopted the perspective of cultural diffusion on the one hand but did not deny migration on the other. In this way, he succeeded in attracting the attention of the world by presenting a dynamic hypothesis on ethnic formation and nation building. And indeed, Egami's hypothetical model of the history of Eurasian civilization, that is, the hypothesis that urban civilization was formed through the interaction between horse-riding and farming peoples, can be applied to Japan and remains an important proposition. I therefore think that Egami's ideas can provide some useful guidance to human genetics research in the process of uncovering ethnic migration in ancient Asia.

Yet, it is also true that the persuasiveness of Egami's theory waned as theoretical loopholes were revealed here and there. In particular, Egami always avoided dealing with the genetic relationships between the Japanese and Korean peoples. Since genetic relationships did exist between the Korean dynasties and the Tenson people, it does not matter how many new versions of Egami's theory are proposed. As long as the issue of genetic relationships is ignored, any improvement will lack persuasive power.

Literature

Ch'oe, Chae-sŏk. *Ilbon kodaesa yŏn'gu pip'an*. Seoul: Ilchisa, 1990.

Ch'ŏn, Kwan-u. "Kankokushi kara mita kibaminzokusetsu." In *(Hikaku) Kodai Nihon to Kankoku bunka (jō)*, edited by Ch'ŏn Kwan-u and Kim Tong-ŭk, 17-70. Tōkyō: Gakuseisha, 1980.

Egami, Namio. *Ronshū Nihon minzoku no kigen. Wa to wajin*. Tōkyō: Yamato shobō, 1978.

Egami, Namio. *Kiba minzoku kokka. Nihon kodaishi heno apurōchi*. Tōkyō: Chūōkōronsha, 1967.

Egami, Namio. *Egami Namio chosakushū 7. Nihonjin to wa nanika*. Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1985.

Egami, Namio. *Egami Namio chosakushū 8. Wajin no kuni kara Yamato chōtei e*. Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1984.

Egami, Namio. "Nihon ni okeru minzoku no keisei to kokka no kigen (1965)." In *Egami Namio chosakushū. 8 Wajin no kuni kara Yamato chōtei e*, 13-166. Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1984.

Egami, Namio. "Sono ato no Kiba minzoku ōchōsetsu no hatten (1982)." In *Egami Namio chosakushū 8. Wajin no kuni kara Yamato chōtei e*, 299-351. Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1984.

Egami, Namio. "Nihon minzoku no seiritsu katei to tōitsu kokka no shutsugen." In *Nihon minzoku to Nihon bunka*, edited by Egami Namio. Tōkyō: Yamakawa shuppansha, 1985.

Egami, Namio. "Higashi ajiashi kara mita kibaminzoku no Nihon tōitsu (1973)." In *Egami Namio chosakushū 8. Wajin no kuni kara Yamato chōtei e*, 265-98. Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1984.

Hong, Won-taek. *Paekche-ŭi Yamato Ilbon-ŭi kiwŏn*. Seoul: Kudara International,

1994.
Hora, Tomio, ed. *Ronshū Paleo kibaminzoku-setsu*. Tōkyō: Yamato shobō, 1976.
Ishida, Eichirō, ed. *Shinpojiumu Nihon kokka no kigen*. Tōkyō: Kadokawa shoten, 1966.
Ishida, Eichirō, Oka Masao, Yawata Ichirō, and Egami Namio. "Nihon minzoku bunka no genryū to Nihon kokka no keisei. Taiwa to furon." *Minzokugaku kenkyū* 13, no. 3 (Autumn 1949).
Kin, Kōrin [Jin, Guanglin]. "Nissen dōsoron. Sono jittai to rekishiteki tenkai." PhD dissertation, Tōkyō University, 1997.
Kita, Sadakichi. "Nissen ryōminzoku dōgenron (1921)." In *Kita Sadakichi chosakushū dai 8 kan minzokushi no kenkyū*, 357-415. Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1979.
Kita, Sadakichi. "Chōsen minzoku towa nanzo ya (1919)." In *Kita Sadakichi chosakushū dai 8 kan minzokushi no kenkyū*, 345-55. Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1979.
Kita, Sadakichi. "Wajinkō (1916)." In *Kita Sadakichi chosakushū dai 8 kan minzokushi no kenkyū*, 159-253. Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1979.
Kita, Sadakichi. "Nihon minzoku no kōsei (1938)." In *Kita Sadakichi chosakushū dai 8 kan minzokushi no kenkyū*, 52-77. Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1979.
Kita, Sadakichi. "Nihon taiko no minzoku ni tsuite (1916)." In *Kita Sadakichi chosakushū dai 8 kan minzokushi no kenkyū*, 5-30. Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1979.
Kita, Sadakichi. "Nihon minzoku gairon (1918)." In *Kita Sadakichi chosakushū dai 8 kan minzokushi no kenkyū*, 31-51. Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1979.
Kita, Sadakichi. "Nihon minzoku-shi gaisetsu (1929)." In *Nihon minzoku bunka taikei 5 Kita Sadakichi*, edited by Ueda Masaaki. Tōkyō: Kōdansha, 1978.
Ōbayashi, Taryō. "Minzoku idō." In *Bunka jinruigaku jiten*, edited by Ishida Eichirō. Tōkyō: Kōbundō, 1994.
Oguma, Eiji. *Tan'itsu minzoku shinwa no kigen. 'Nihonjin' no jigazō no keifū*. Tōkyō: Shinyōsha, 1995.
Sano, Manabu. *Nihon kodaishiron*. Tōkyō: Kokuminsha, 1946.
Sekine, Hideyuki. "Oka Masao-ŭi Ilbon minjokmunhwa kiwŏn-ŭi sŏngnip-gwa kŭ tŭkch'ing—Minjŏk idong-ŭi kwanjŏm-esŏ." In *Ilbon munhwa yŏn'gu* 37 (Winter 2011): 249-75.
Sekine, Hideyuki. "Egami Namio Ilbon minjok kiwonronesŏ-ŭi waein-gwa hanin. Waein-gwa hanjok-ŭi minjokidong." In *Tongasia kodaehak* 24 (January 2011): 409-39.
Sekine, Hideyuki. "Hanil hapbyŏng chŏn-e chech'ang doen Ilbon injong-ŭi Hanbando toraesŏl." In *Ilbon munhwa yŏn'gu* 19 (July 2006): 163-86.
Sekine, Hideyuki. "Han'guk'in-gwa Ilbon'in-ŭi kyetongyŏn'gu-wa perŏdaim." In *Minjok munhwa yŏn'gu* 47 (Winter 2007): 389-435.
Sekine, Hideyuki. "Ilbon munhwa-ŭi wŏllyurosŏ-ŭi nambanggye munhwa yŏn'gu. 'Chŏnp'a'-wa 'minjok idong'-e daehan sahoehakjŏk chŏpgŭn." In *Ilbon munhak yŏn'gu* 31 (Winter 2009): 403-29.
Torii, Ryūzō. "Yūshi izen no Nihon (1926)." In *Torii Ryūzō zenshū dai 1 kan*. Tōkyō: Asahi shinbunsha, 1975.
Ueda, Masaaki. "Kaisetsu." In *Nihon minzoku no kigen*, edited by Egami Namio. Tōkyō: Kōdansha, 1995.
Yamaguchi, Bin. *Nihonjin no oitachi*. Tōkyō: Misuzu shobō, 1999.
Yamaji, Katsuhiko. *Kindai Nihon no kaigai gakujutsu chōsa*. Tōkyō: Yamakawa shuppan, 2006.

Yamaji, Aizan. *Kirisutokyō hyōron, Nihon jinminshi*. Tōkyō: Iwanami bunko, 1966.