

The Kuji Hongi 舊事本紀

Volumes 7, 8 and 9 considered as a draft of the Nihon Shoki.

By G. W. ROBINSON

Introduction

The purpose of this article is to draw attention to some evidence, hitherto overlooked, which suggests that at least volumes 7, 8 and 9 (frequently referred to below as the Chronicle of the Emperors) were a draft of the corresponding portions of the Nihon Shoki. This evidence is afforded, principally, by the nature of the numerous discrepancies between the two works. These discrepancies frequently involve the Kuji Hongi in error or inconsistency, and are generally such as could not have been produced by anyone copying from the Shoki, unless created deliberately. If we examine such works as the 日本紀略 or 天書, which undoubtedly were based on the Shoki, we find no similar discrepancies.

It has been asserted so frequently and by such eminent scholars in the course of the last two and a half centuries that the bulk of the Kuji Hongi was copied almost word for word from the Shoki, Kojiki and Kogo Shūi, that there seems to be a widespread impression that this is a proven fact. So far from this being the case, the grounds for the assertion have never even been investigated.

There is only one valid test of the relative antiquity of two such closely similar texts as those of the Chronicle of the Emperors and the Shoki, and that involves a detailed comparison of the texts and an examination of all the discrepancies which may exist. Such comparisons have been made, but only for the purpose of textual editing. Critics have generally been content to argue that, since the Kuji Hongi is manifestly not the work of Prince Shōtoku and Soga no Umako, as alleged in its preface, and since it contains

references to events later than the date of the compilation of the Shoki, the close verbal resemblance between its text and other works is due to its having been copied, with only trivial alterations, from those works. Almost every reference to the Kuji Hongi in critical works contains a perfunctory statement to this effect. Even those who have most vigorously defended the author of the Kuji Hongi against the charge of forgery have seldom denied that the work was largely copied from the Shoki etc.⁽¹⁾ The little attention that the Kuji Hongi has received in the present century has been largely devoted to the small unique portions (i.e. principally the Tenson Hongi 天孫本紀 and the

(1) Defenders of the Kuji Hongi have been few. Only two large scale works, attacking the conventional theory of forgery, have appeared. These are (a.) Tachibana Moribe 橘守部 Kujiki Naobi 舊事紀直日 (1812), included in vol. 2 of Tachibana Moribe Zenshū 全集 (Tokyo, 1921). In this work, the Chronicle of the Emperors is regarded as parts of an early epitome, based on the Shoki. The work is generally dismissed as being largely the product of its author's perverse desire to contradict Motoori. (b.) Mikanagi Kiyonao 御巫清直 Sendai Kuji Hongi Sekigi 先代舊事本紀析疑 (1883). This writer also regarded the Chronicle of the Emperors as largely an epitome of the Shoki. The view that the Kuji Hongi was basically the work of Prince Shōtoku and Soga no Umako and, consequently, earlier than the Shoki, has never been defended at great length. The few works, in which this view is advocated are: (a.) Kuriyama Gen 栗山愿 Kuji Hongi Gi 舊事本紀議 (c. 1700) (contained in Kuriyama's posthumous collection, Heisōshū 弊箚集, most accessible in Kan'utei Sōsho, 甘雨亭叢書 vol. 5.) This brief essay was written in answer to the criticism of Tokugawa Mitsukuni 德川光圀, whose Kuji Hongi ni bassu 跋舊事本紀 (1691. Included in Mitsukuni's collection Jōzan Bunshū 常山文集, published 1724.) is the earliest condemnation of the Kuji Hongi, of which the date and authorship are known. Kuriyama deplors the hasty and fallacious reasoning used to condemn the Kuji Hongi, but his mild protest seems to have been disregarded. (b.) Numata Jungi 沼田順義, Shinado no Kaze 級長戸の風 (1829) and Kokui Kō Bemmō 國意考辨妄 (1832). This eccentric and despised scholar asserted that the Kuji Hongi was authentic and the Kojiki a forgery. His views were not taken seriously by his more eminent contemporaries, Hirata Atsutane 平田篤胤 etc. (c.) Kujiki Hi Gisho Kō 舊事紀非偽書考. The only known copy of this anonymous, undated pamphlet is a MS in the possession of Professor Kōno Seizō 河野省三, who kindly permitted me to inspect and photograph it. It appears to be an answer to the well known Kuji Hongi Gisho Meishō Kō 舊事本紀偽書明證考 (1731) of Tada Gishun 多田義俊. Although its arguments are ingenious, it appears never to have become widely known. (d.) W.G. Aston, in an addendum note to his Nihongi (London, 1896) vol. 2, pp. 431-2, expresses his inclination to the view that the Kuji Hongi is authentic. Although the note is marred by some inaccuracies and a certain lack of caution, it is unique in its appreciation that the question is one to be decided on internal evidence. See also, addendum note.

Kokuzō Hongi 國造本紀) or to the problem of dating the work, as a whole, by consideration of the latest references contained in it and the earliest citations from it in other works.⁽¹⁾ These studies fail to take into account the heterogeneity of the work. Anachronisms in the Kokuzō Hongi can do little more than tell us how late the work reached its final form; they are not sufficient, as has been acknowledged,⁽²⁾ to establish the date of the entire text of the Kokuzō Hongi itself, let alone that of other parts of the book.

The Kuji Hongi falls, for critical purposes, into four main divisions, as follows:

A. Volumes 1 to 4 and 6. These volumes contain an account of the Divine Age. The account consists, almost entirely, of a complex and clumsy

(1) e.g. (a.) Professor Sakamoto Tarō 坂本太郎 *Taika Kaishin no Kenkyū* 大化改新の研究 (Tokyo, June 1938) pp. 56-66. In this, probably the most authoritative recent study, most space is devoted to establishing the date of the composition; the conclusion is between 823 and 936. The bulk of the work is dismissed with the assertion that it goes without saying that it consists largely of citations from the Shoki etc., with some additions and omissions. Some space is then devoted to the unique portions, for which some antiquity is conjectured. (b.) Professor Saeki Ariyoshi 佐伯有義, *Kojiki Nihon Shoki oyobi Kuji Hongi no Hikaku Kenkyū* 古事記日本書紀及舊事本紀の比較研究 (in *Meiji Seitoku Kinen Gakkai Kiyō* 明治聖徳記念學會紀要, vol. 50, autumn, 1938). The first part of the article, only, is concerned with the Kuji Hongi, and consists of a survey of previous criticism, some discussion of MSS, and consideration of the purely external evidence for the early existence of the Kuji Hongi. (c.) Mr. Kōno Kunio 河野國雄, *Kujiki no seiritsu ni tsuite* 舊事紀の成立に就いて (in *Shirin* 史林 vol. 28, no. 4, 1943). Mr. Kōno expresses high regard for the value of the Kuji Hongi, but believes it to be an early Heian production. His article contains a valuable discussion of the problem presented by the seeming quotation from the Kuji Hongi which appears in the Ryō no Shūge. (d.) Mr. Iida Sueharu 飯田季治, *Hyōchū Kujiki Kōhon* 標註舊事紀校本 (Tokyo, 1947.). This edition is based on the Gōtō Kujiki 鰐頭舊事紀 (Ise, 1678) of Deguchi Nobuyoshi 出口延佳. (The value of the Gōtō edition is not great, since, on the admission of its editor, many of the textual discrepancies between the Kuji Hongi and other works have been 'corrected.')

In his introductory section of nine pages, Mr. Iida considers some previous criticisms of the Kuji Hongi, and, maintaining, that the Preface was a later addition, rejects the notion of forgery, but he accepts, like Tachibana Moribe and Mikanagi Kiyonao, the view that the Shoki is the earlier text. It is much to be regretted that the draft of this author's *Kujiki Ronkō* 舊事紀論考 was destroyed in a fire in 1945, with the result that we are deprived of what would have been the only full length study of the present century.

(2) Sakamoto, *op. cit.*, loc. cit., where this seems to be acknowledged by implication.

patchwork of nearly all the relevant portions of the Nihon Shoki (i.e. Shoki vols. 1 and 2) Kojiki (i.e. vol. 1.) and Kogo Shūi. The attempt is made, with little success, to make a single narrative of these miscellaneous materials. Throughout most of this section, only some twenty characters at a time (often only two or three) are taken from any one of the apparent sources. As a result, the phrases and grammatical usages of the Kojiki are found mixed up with those of the Shoki, while the numerous alternative versions of stories, kept distinct in the Shoki, are woven into one another in a bewildering fashion. The assumption that this section of the Kuji Hongi was copied from the works named, rather than vice versa, seems well founded, since it is certainly inconceivable that the works named could have been produced from this part of the Kuji Hongi. At the same time, however, it is not impossible that this section of the Kuji Hongi was based, not on the Shoki etc. themselves, but on their basic materials, and, subsequently, for motives with which we can readily sympathise, rejected. It might have been produced between the Nihon Shoki and the Kojiki, the finished product being used as source in the latter case only. This conjecture is at least consonant with the marked tendency for the extracts from the Kojiki to be longer than those which resemble the Shoki. The comparatively small portions, which appear to have come from the Kogo Shūi, may well have come from the sources of that work. In any case, this section of the Kuji Hongi is so unlike the others, that no conclusion about its date and sources is necessarily applicable to the other sections.

B. Volume 5. This volume, entitled Tenson Hongi 天孫本紀, is largely devoted to an account of the divine origin of the Owari and Mononobe clans and to their genealogies. Since it contains information not found in other works, it has been the object of some serious study. It contains a few references to periods subsequent to the reign of Suiko (the latest involves the reign of Temmū). It is principally this volume that has given rise to the common view that a scion of the Mononobe was the author of the entire work.

C. Volumes 7, 8 and 9. These three volumes, the subject of the present study, cover the reigns of the 34 rulers (including the Empress Jingō) from Jimmu to Suiko (as far as the death of Prince Shōtoku). In contrast to A. above, the text of this section generally resembles, both in wording and arrangement, that of the Nihon Shoki alone. The only conspicuous difference between the two works lies in the relative quantity of material; the Kuji Hongi is far shorter. Apart from some use of the Chinese style posthumous names of the Emperors and a single appearance of the term 和歌, this section contains nothing which, on grounds of anachronism, suggests a date of composition later than that of the Shoki.

D. Volume 10. This volume, entitled Kokuzō Hongi 國造本紀, lists the *kuni no miyatsuko*, giving in each case the first holder of the position. Since this volume, like volume 5, is unique, it, also, has been the object of serious study. Although it contains gross anachronisms (the latest of which involves the date 823 A.D.), grounds have been found for regarding it as basically ancient with late interpolations.

Before any conclusion can be reached as to the nature of the Kuji Hongi as a whole, all of the above heterogeneous sections require equally minute study. Until this has been done, we cannot be sure that these sections came into being simultaneously, simply because they now appear between the covers of the same book.

Although the weight of past and present opinion makes the view here advanced seem highly controversial, there is nothing inherently improbable about it. In the course of the four decades, which elapsed between the institution of some kind of an historical commission under the Emperor Temmu and the appearance of the Shoki in 720 A.D., we may justly suppose that numerous notes, rough copies, drafts and, even perhaps, completed, but subsequently rejected, histories were produced. That a fragment or fragments of these should have survived is surely not an outrageous conjecture. Further,

it is not impossible that, a century or so later, a scion of the Mononobé, finding himself in possession of such a fragment, might have genuinely supposed it to have been the work of Prince Shōtoku and Soga no Umako; he might have thought it worth his while to add some information about his own clan together with some other ancient fragments, and then to make the resultant document public; he might at the same time have made a few annotations and interpolations, unconscious that some anachronisms, involved in them, would one day be held to disprove the authenticity of a document, which he knew to have genuine antiquity. Such an explanation for the circumstances, in which the Kuji Hongi came into existence, is, admittedly, purely conjectural and incapable of proof. Other explanations, on similar lines, would be equally acceptable. But current explanations, based on the unproven assumption that the Kuji Hongi was copied from the Shoki etc., are not only equally incapable of proof but are riddled with implausibilities, even absurdities. It is commonly held that a Mononobe wrote the Kuji Hongi sometime between 823 and 936 (the date of the earliest external evidence for its existence) and that his motive was similar to those of the authors of the Kogo Shūi and Takahashi Ujibumi 高橋氏文, namely clan propaganda. But these works in no way resemble the Kuji Hongi, for the element of propaganda, which informs them, is confined, in the Kuji Hongi, to one of the ten volumes. It is true that the Chronicle of the Emperors contains a number of references to the Mononobé, which do not appear in the corresponding portions of the Shoki, but these, as shown elsewhere in this article, cannot be held to constitute the *raison d'être* of the Chronicle of the Emperors. We are seriously asked to believe that, sometime in the early Heian period, a scion of the Mononobe thought it possible to pass off copies of large tracts of the most famous monument of Japanese letters as the work of Prince Shōtoku. It is alleged that he took steps to prevent suspicion touching the nature of his enterprise by altering the text of the

Shoki for the worse in certain minute particulars. Yet, if this was indeed the case, his effort miscarried. For many of the minute discrepancies between the two works do not seem to have been noticed until now, long after the work has been dismissed as a copy. The further allegation that some of these discrepancies, deliberately introduced as archaisms, were in fact modernisms is too fantastic to merit serious consideration. Moreover, it is hard to believe that anyone ingenious enough to take such measures to establish the verisimilitude of his work, would have been wholly unaware of the dangers of ordinary anachronism, such as the Kuji Hongi now contains.

Not all critics regard the Kjuj Hongi as a forgery. Some attempt to clear up the muddle surrounding the work by holding that the Preface was not written by the author of the rest of the work, or that some or all of the anachronisms are interpolations. But, once either of these simple possibilities is admitted, the slight ground for the assumption that the Kuji Hongi was copied from the Shoki etc. vanishes, and it remains to determine, by detailed textual comparison, whether that assumption has any basis.

For convenience, and at the risk of repetition, it may be well to summarise here the evidence or arguments offered in the following pages:

I. Dating. The chronology of the Shoki involves few inherent contradictions, while that of the Kuji Hongi involves several. These contradictions in the Kuji Hongi arise from spasmodic departures from the chronology followed in the Shoki. The examples clearly demonstrate that these departures could not have arisen through the inadvertence of anyone copying from the Shoki. Since these departures result in the inferiority of the chronology of the Kuji Hongi to that of the Shoki, in point of consistency, they cannot be regarded as attempts to improve on the chronology of the Shoki. They are, however readily, explicable, if the Shoki is held to be the later work, in which such errors would have been corrected.

II. Formulae. In the phrasing of certain recurrent items, such as the

appointment of Heirs Apparent, the styles or appellations of Emperors, etc. etc., the Kuji Honji is less systematic than the Shoki. The discrepancies under this head usually involve only one or two characters at a time in passages otherwise identical in the two works. In these circumstances, the explanation, which attributes these discrepancies to the influence of, e.g., the Kojiki, is unconvincing, unless it is at the same time admitted that the Kuji Hongi was being compiled from materials, including the Kojiki, at a time when the Shoki did not exist. Other discrepancies under this head involve the Kuji Hongi in grammatical errors. These errors are allegedly typical of the decadent Chinese prose written in Japan during the early Heian period. Unable to find such errors in the prose of that period (generally noted for the excellence, not the decadence, of its Chinese prose), and noting, further, that such errors do not, in practice, creep into epitomes of the Shoki, made at an even later date, I attribute the errors to early ignorance of Chinese grammar, and suppose that they were later corrected by the compilers of the Shoki.

III. Language. In this section, a few of the numerous linguistic differences between the two works are cursorily noticed. The conclusion is that these differences are the result of correction on the part of the compilers of the Shoki, since there is no convincing explanation for them on any other hypothesis. (Again, they do not appear in other epitomes of the Shoki.)

IV. Arrangement. This section contains a few examples of parallel passages where the same, or nearly the same, material is arranged slightly differently in the two works. It usually appears either that the arrangement of the Kuji Hongi is the more clumsy and that it could not have been adopted by anyone copying from the Shoki, or that the arrangement of the Shoki has been distorted by the insertion of extra material.

V. Expansion in the Shoki. While there is generally no a priori reason to regard the additional matter in the Shoki as having been inserted in that

of the Kuji Hongi rather than omitted from the Kuji Hongi, there are certain passages where the appearance of the Shoki suggests that it is, in fact, an expansion of the Kuji Hongi. The argument of this section cannot be usefully summarised.

VI. Comments. A few examples of the way in which the Kuji Hongi treats material, which appears in the 'original commentary' in the Shoki, suggest that the Kuji Hongi was not copied from the Shoki. Again, no useful summary of the argument can be offered.

VII. Contents. The contents of the Kuji Hongi (vols. 7, 8 and 9) and of the corresponding volumes of the Shoki are compared. It is noticeable that much of the additional information in the Shoki has been shown by recent criticism to have been derived from distinct sources (e.g. material relating to Korea or material which consists of extensive quotations from Chinese history and literature). The absence of these and some other specific categories of material from the Kuji Hongi is so consistent and so nearly complete, that it is hard to believe they can have been deliberately omitted by one copying from the Shoki, who would have had no knowledge of the sources of the Shoki, as such. Rather, the Kuji Hongi appears to have been a framework into which the additional material was inserted by the compilers of the Shoki.

VIII. The threefold division of the Chronicle of the Emperors. The hitherto unexplained division of the Emperors into 天皇, 神皇 and 帝皇 is conjecturally interpreted as a formal trace of breaks in the Imperial line, which it would have been the policy of the compilers of the Shoki to obliterate.

IX. Mononobe. The view that a scion of the Mononobe clan, whose genealogies largely occupy the Tenson Hongi, was responsible for producing the whole of the Kuji Hongi, is briefly considered in relation to the Chronicle of the Emperors. It is argued that the Chronicle of the Emperors contains so small and so apparently haphazard a selection of the entries concerning

the Mononobe, contained in the Tenson Hongi, that it does not positively suggest Mononobe authorship, so much as Mononobe interpolation.

X. Kojiki. The only items for which the Chronicle of the Emperors appears to be directly indebted to the Kojiki concern the ages, dates of death or places of burial of six successive Emperors. These are listed. This paucity of directly discernible connection between the texts of the Chronicle of the Emperors and the Kojiki seriously weakens the case for attributing to the influence of the Kojiki many of the slight deviations from the Shoki, alluded to above.

XI. Objections. The appearance of the Chinese posthumous names of the Emperors in the Kuji Hongi, together with two other possible objections to the view advanced in this article, are discussed.

This study is narrow in scope, dealing, as it does, only with volumes 7, 8 and 9, and touching on certain aspects of the problem only briefly. But it is hoped that a *prima facie* case has been established. If it has been, it will not be sufficient, in refutation, to offer various alternative explanations, of varying plausibility, for some or, even, all of the items of evidence here adduced. The evidence must be seen and weighed as a whole and not only item by item. Whether the interpretation here offered proves to be right or wrong, it will remain true that no useful study of the Kuji Hongi can be undertaken, without this evidence being taken into account. If the interpretation gains acceptance, the Kuji Hongi should provide valuable assistance in any future work on the constituents and methods of compilation of the Shoki. But even if the interpretation proves unacceptable, this article may still have served some purpose, if it stimulates a comprehensive study of this neglected but important work.

References to the texts of the Kuji Hongi and the Shoki are made to the page and column of the following editions:

Kuji Hongi: Shintei Zōho Kokushi Taikēi 新訂増補國史大系 volume 7

(Tokyo, 1936)

Nihon Shoki: same, Part I, volumes 1 and 2 (Tokyo, 1951-52)

I. Dating⁽¹⁾

Among the rules to which the composition of the Shoki adheres, is that of Chinese histories, by which the first year of an Emperor's reign is that following the year in which his predecessor died (with the inevitable exception of cases of interregna). This rule holds irrespective of the date assigned to the actual accession of the Emperor, which is sometimes recorded in the year of the predecessor's death. The Kuji Hongi, however, does not adhere rigidly to this rule, and the resultant inconsistencies with the Shoki are interesting and suggestive.

(a.) Kaika

Nihon Shoki I 150-8: 冬十一月辛未朔壬午太子即天皇位元年春正月庚午朔癸酉尊皇后 etc.

The year of accession is the 57th year of Kōgen (i.e. 癸未) and 元年 is the following year (甲申).

But Kuji Hongi 100-15 says: 元年癸未春二月皇太子尊即天皇位二年春正月尊皇后 etc.

Clearly the Kuji Hongi is self-contradictory here, since it agrees with the Shoki in assigning the death of Kōgen to the 9th month of his 57th year (which must be reckoned as 癸未 since the Kuji Hongi agrees with the Shoki on the 干支—丁亥—for Kōgen 1.) Nevertheless, the discrepancy between the two works persists in the dating of Kaika 6, i.e. Kuji Hongi dates this as

(1) Andō Arimasu 安藤有盆, Kuji Hongi Reki Kō 舊事本紀曆考 (1697), consists of a list of the dates given in the Chronicle of the Emperors, which are amplified and corrected according to the Shoki. The author does not remark on any of the coincidences with the dating of the Kojiki. The author does not doubt the authenticity of the Kuji Hongi. This is the only work in which the dating of the Kuji Hongi receives special treatment.

七年, and, perhaps more significantly in the dating of the burial of Kōgen: this is given by the Shoki, in accordance with its normal practice in cases of late burial, under Kaika 5; the Kuji Hongi does not refer to it in its chronicle of Kaika, but adds to its record of the death of Kōgen: 後帝六年葬...etc. Finally, however, the dating in the Kuji Hongi falls into line again with that of the Shoki, since both works date the death of Kaika in the 60th year of his reign and Sujin 1 as the year 甲申. Since the Kuji Hongi does not give days for any events in this reign, no inconsistency in this connection is involved. (see f. below)

(b.) Senka (This example is introduced here for convenience in considering that of the next reign; obviously, it is not a parallel to the foregoing.)

Shoki II 44 and Kuji Hongi 130 (Senka pre-accession) both have the following: 二年十二月勾大兄廣國押武金日(安閑)天皇崩無嗣。群臣奏上劍鏡於武小廣國押盾(宣化)尊

Then the Kuji Hongi continues from this point: 元年丁巳使即天皇之位爲元年。天皇爲人 etc. etc.

But the Shoki has simply 使即天皇之位天皇爲人 etc. etc.

Since both works date the death of Ankan as 乙卯, the 元年 given by the Kuji Hongi implies an interregnum of a whole year. The Shoki naturally gives 元年 as 丙辰, the first entry under which is 正月遷都 etc., given by the Kuji Hongi under 二年正月. But the Kuji Hongi proceeds with 三月壬寅朔 i.e. a date which properly belongs, as the Shoki has it, in the year 丙辰. The next dates given by the Kuji Hongi are, however, both selfconsistent and in line with those of the Shoki, i.e., the death and burial of the Emperor are dated by the Kuji Hongi in his 3rd year and by the Shoki in his 4th, in either case the year 己未. (Note that the Gōtō edition reads 四年 for 三年, and the Kokushi Taikei editor recommends acceptance of this reading. If, as we may suspect, such editing as this of Deguchi Nobuyoshi, has affected the sound

transmission of the text of the Kuji Hongi, such anomalies as that mentioned above (Kuji Hongi 宣化二年三月壬寅朔) may perhaps be due to past attempts to make the Kuji Hongi more consistent with the Shoki.)

(c.) Kimmei. This case is similar to that of Kaika, (a.) above. Both works date the accession of Kimmei as 冬十二月庚辰朔甲申 of the year of the death of Senka (己未), but, immediately before this the Kuji Hongi has 元年歲次己未. Consistently thereafter, where the Shoki has 元年 (i.e. 庚申) and 二年, the Kuji Hongi has 二年 and 三年 respectively. After this the Shoki alone has entries for each of the years up to Kimmei 14. The Kuji Hongi rejoins the Shoki at Kimmei 15, from which point such dates (with days) as it gives are identical with the corresponding ones of the Shoki, and are consequently inconsistent with its dating of the first three years of the reign. It may be convenient to display the discrepancies between the two works in the reigns of Senka and Kimmei as follows:

Shoki:	乙卯 Ankan 2 death	丙辰 Senka 1	丁巳 2	戊午 3	己未 4 death	庚申 Kimmei 1	辛酉 2甲戌15
Kuji Hongi:	Ankan 2 death		Senka 1	2 (干支 of one day consistent with year 丙辰)	3 Senka death Kimmei 1	2	315

(d.) Yūryaku and Buretsu. In each of these two cases the Kuji Hongi makes 元年 the year of the death of the previous Emperor. But, unlike the cases of (a.) Kaika and (c.) Kimmei above, the 干支 are not given for 元年 but for 二年, where, of course, they are those given by the Shoki for 元年. Subsequent dates in both reigns correspond, as in the other cases, to those of the Shoki, and are, consequently, again inconsistent.

(e.) Ankō. Again the Kuji Hongi makes 元年 the year of the death of the previous Emperor, but this time no 干支 are given for any year of the

reign. The Kuji Hongi omits all the information given in the Shoki under 元年, but rejoins the Shoki at 二年, and is thus inconsistent.

Several pertinent observations might be made on the above examples, but, in the context of the present article, the most essential is that such departures from the practice of the Shoki (and other Japanese histories) are not such as would be expected in a work based on the Shoki. Moreover, the detailed discrepancies, confusions and anomalies involved, suggest that the writer of the Kuji Hongi made, albeit incompetently, his own chronological calculations. It would be far-fetched indeed to suppose that, with the Shoki before him, he would have fallen into such confusion. At the same time it may well be that some of the inconsistencies arose, as suggested above, in the course of the transmission of the text, as a result of attempts at emendation rather than of scribal errors.

A number of more miscellaneous differences in the dating of the two works should next be noted.

(f.) In the reigns of the eight Emperors, from Suizei to Kaika inclusive, which are so barely recorded both in the Kojiki and the Shoki, it is worth noting that the Kuji Hongi does not profess to offer such precise dating as the Shoki. The Shoki, indeed, omits the days, and, in one case, the month, of certain events usually more precisely dated, but in the Kuji Hongi this tendency is still more conspicuous. To be more precise, the Kuji Hongi assigns days to only 5 events in the course of these reigns, these events comprising three accessions, one death of an Emperor and one appointment of an Heir Apparent. In the same period, it assigns a month, only, to 21 events fully dated by the Shoki, and to 8 events not recorded in the Shoki; and a year only to 5 events fully dated by the Shoki and to one event assigned a month by the Shoki.

(g.) The same tendency not to date so precisely as the Shoki is also evident in the Kuji Hongi's account of the reigns of Keikō and Chūai. In

these reigns a month only is assigned to 9 events fully dated by the Shoki, and a year only to 5 such events, while only 6 events are fully dated by the Kuji Hongi. In these reigns a further and probably connected tendency of the Kuji Hongi is to give very brief accounts of events extensively and circumstantially treated by the Shoki and to bring together under one date items separately dated in the Shoki. (See below, 'Expansion' e. & f.)

It might be argued that the compiler of the Kuji Hongi was attempting, in such cases, to condense the Shoki. But then why is this condensation only sporadic and not a consistent policy throughout the work? It is admittedly difficult to account for these sporadic imprecisions and apparent condensations on any hypothesis about the compilation of the Kuji Hongi. They are simply mentioned here as a conspicuous difference between that work and the Shoki.

(h.) Possibly connected with the above dating tendencies in (f.) & (g.) are at least four omissions by the Kuji Hongi of the season (Annei 38, 冬 is omitted; Kōan 2, 冬 and 3 秋, Chūai 2, 秋).

(i.) Further slight imprecisions of dating are found as follows:

Shoki: 崇神六十年秋七月丙申朔己酉詔 etc.

Kuji Hongi: " 春二月詔 etc.

(Note that the 北野イ本 of the Shoki agrees with the Kuji Hongi here. There are a striking number of examples of agreement between 北野イ本 and the Kuji Hongi, when all other MSS of the Shoki disagree. This needs investigation.)

Shoki: 應神卅年正月辛丑朔戊申...甲子

Kuji Hongi: " ...即

In Yūryaku 1 and Kenzō 1, the Shoki has a 是月 not found in the Kuji Hongi. In Kenzō pre-accession, the Shoki has 是月 where the Kuji Hongi has 于時.

The examples in (f.) to (i.) above, though not necessarily incompatible with the view that the Kuji Hongi was based on the Shoki, are surely highly

consistent with the opposite view?

Some other differences in the dating of the two works may be noted:

(j.) The accession of Hanzei.

Nihon Shoki: 元年春正月丁丑朔戊寅

Kuji Hongi: 元年歲次丙子夏四月丁丑朔戊寅

First of all, 子 of 丙子 is a corruption of 午 (a common corruption.) The month given by the Kuji Hongi, however, is naturally incompatible with 丁丑朔. It is difficult to explain this error, but it may perhaps be connected with the death of Richū being assigned (in both works) to the 3rd month of the previous year; in this case it might represent a vestige of a further example of the feature shown in examples (a.) (c.) (d.) and (e.) above.

(k.) The first year of Jingō.

Shoki (1 254-9): 冬十月癸亥朔甲子群臣尊皇后曰皇太后是年也太歲辛巳則爲攝政元年

Kuji Hongi (110-8): 元年冬十月丁巳朔甲子群臣...太后太歲辛巳改爲攝政元年物部...爲大連

丁巳 are the correct 干支 for 二年十月朔, 甲子, being the 8th day. Since the first entry, in either work, under 二年 is for 十一月, it is not impossible that this dating by the Kuji Hongi is connected with that fact. Depending on the view taken about the nature of the numerous records of Mononobe appointments (see 'Mononobe' section, below), it may or may not be appropriate to regard 太歲辛巳...etc. etc. as a later interpolation. (The only other uses of 太歲 in the Kuji Hongi, appear in the reigns of Jimmu and Suizei—once in each.) At least it seems clear that we should not follow the Kokushi Taikēi editor in emending 丁巳 to 癸亥. (Note: 前田本 reads 癸巳, a conflation of the two readings.)

(l.) The death of Nintoku and connected dates.

Shoki (1 316-4): 八十七年春正月戊子朔癸卯天皇崩冬十月癸未朔己丑葬 etc.

Kuji Hongi (115-8): 八十三年歲次丁卯秋八月十五日天皇崩冬十月 etc.
as Shoki.

Inevitably, the Gōtō edition has 'corrected' the Kuji Hongi to bring it into line with the Shoki and the subsequent reference to the event in Richū pre-accession, not omitting to alter 十五日 to 十六日, and the Kokushi Taikēi editor recommends acceptance of these 'corrections.' Nevertheless, it seems likely that the original text was as above, particularly as the introduction of 干支 for any year other than one connected with an accession is paralleled only once elsewhere in the Kuji Hongi (see m. below.). Since the 干支 of the year and the day of the month are those given by the Kojiki 'original commentary' (see 'Kojiki' section, below.), it is possible that 八十三 is a confused reference to the *age* of the Emperor (83 years) given in the Kojiki, though a simple error of transmission is also possible.

The date of burial is of course incompatible with the year 丁卯, and should almost certainly be regarded as resulting from the use of an entirely different chronology (i.e. that followed by the Shoki), although other explanations are perhaps just possible.

In connection with the above date, we should note the entry peculiar to the Kuji Hongi: 八十二年春二月乙巳朔。詔侍臣物部 etc. In the year 丁卯, corresponding to 427 A.D., the 干支 for the first day of the 2nd month were 乙巳; they were also 乙巳 in Nintoku 84, according to the chronology of the Shoki. In either case 八十二 is erroneous, but it seems likely that one of the two dates suggested, probably the latter, was intended.

(m.) The death of Yūryaku.

As in the preceding example, we find a confusion between the chronologies of the Shoki and the Kojiki. The Kuji Hongi dates the Emperor's death as: 廿三年己巳秋八月庚午朔丙子, the 干支 of the year being those given by the Kojiki, and those of the day, by the Shoki. (The Shoki's 干支 for the year are 己未, to which the Kuji Hongi is emended, as usual, by the Gōtō

and Kokushi Taikei editors.) We should note that the Kuji Hongi here includes the age and place of burial of the Emperor, as given in the Kojiki, the wording and spelling of the place of burial being identical.

(n.) The death of Richū.

Kuji Hongi 116-4. The Kojiki 'original commentary' date is given in a comment in the Kuji Hongi. The age given in this comment, however, is the same as that already given (70), and differs from that of the Kojiki (64).

(o.) Some differences in the dating of Jimmu's reign.

己未年春二月 辛卯朔庚辰 (Kuji Hongi)
壬辰朔辛亥 (Shoki)

Note that 辛卯 and 壬辰 are adjacent 干支. 庚辰 is inconsistent with 辛卯朔, but among the possible simple corruptions is 庚戌 which would give the same day (20th.) as the Shoki.

The Kuji Hongi has 于時, where the Shoki gives a full date (year, month and day—31st year). In contrast to this, the Kuji Hongi assigns a day to an event merely assigned to 是月 in the Shoki. This is the only instance of the Kuji Hongi dating more precisely than the Shoki; numerous instances of the reverse have been referred to above.

A few even more trivial discrepancies exist, which are omitted here.

Although the chronology of the Shoki is not entirely consistent within itself, that it is much more nearly so than that of the Kuji Hongi is surely demonstrated by many of the above examples. Those who maintain that the Kuji Hongi is the later work must explain how and why an often chaotic chronology came to be substituted for a comparatively orderly one. They must explain why, with the Shoki already in existence, the compilers of the Kuji Hongi felt it necessary to make their own chronological calculations and why they made them so incompetently. On the other hand, the above examples, taken in conjunction with other kinds of difference between the two works, afford to those who believe that the Kuji Hongi was the earlier

work, more material for investigating the way in which the chronology of the Shoki was constructed.

It may be relevant to add a note on the method of stating the 干支 of the year in the Kuji Hongi. Excluding the exceptional case of Jimmu and the dubious reference to 神功元年 (see k. above) three methods are used:

(i) 元年
(=etc.) 歲次 甲子 16 times.

(ii) 元年
(=etc.) 甲子 14 times.

(iii) 元年 (no 干支) 5 times.

The distribution of these formulae is interesting. The first use of (i) appears under Sujin, while for 7 of the 8 preceding reigns (so exceptional in other ways, also) formula (ii) is used. The other seven occurrences of formula (ii) include the four abnormal cases of Kaika, Senka, Yūryaku and Buretsu (examples a., b. and d. above) together with the reigns of Seinei, Kenzō and Sushun. The practice of the Shoki, of appending to the account of the 1st year 是年也太歲甲子 is never followed. Parallels to (i) and (ii) can be seen in 7th century inscriptions, though the normal practice at that time did not link the date with the reign of the Emperor. In the 8th century, (i) became the common practice in inscriptions etc., but in the Nara and Heian histories formula (iii) is used.

II. Formulae

By formulae is meant those standardized phrasings of certain recurrent items, such as the accession of the Emperors, the appointments of Heirs Apparent or Empresses, the changes of capital or palace, the styles or appellations of Emperors, etc. etc. As a general observation on the difference between the Shoki and the Kuji Hongi in this connection, it may be said that the latter work is, on the whole, less systematic than the former. This would seem to be the reverse of what might be expected, on the assumption that the latter work is the later, but precisely what might be expected on the opposite

assumption. (It is true that, where comparable, the usage of the Kojiki is more uniform than either of the two works under consideration; but this would seem to be due merely to the greater simplicity of the Kojiki, both in detail and in general design; that is to say, for example, it neither distinguishes two classes of 'mikoto' nor does it employ a chronology.) Most of the following examples, moreover, individually as well as collectively, suggest that the Kuji Hongi is the earlier compilation.

(a.) The mode of referring to the Emperor at the beginning of each reign. With three exceptions (Jimmu, Jingō and Ninken. See below.), the Shoki begins its account of every reign simply: 某天皇, (某姬天皇 in the case of an Empress) followed in most cases (i.e. where applicable) by 某天皇第○子也 or 太子也 etc.

The Kuji Hongi is less uniform and its usage normally differs from the above.

Of the 34 reigns included in the Kuji Hongi, 20 are introduced as follows: 諱某尊者, then much like the Shoki, though small differences sometimes appear (e.g. 太子 for 子 etc.).

5 more are variations of this, namely,

諱某皇太子尊者 (2)

諱某皇子尊者 (2)

諱某姬尊者 (Suiko)

The remaining 9 are, more or less, different from the above and from one another.

Jingō is virtually the same in both works, the Kuji Hongi omitting 諱 and only differing from the Shoki by inserting 者 after 諱氣長足姬尊.

Ninken is virtually the same in both works and is of exceptional interest, as follows: both works begin 億計天皇諱大脚. Then the Kuji Hongi continues 更名大爲字嶋郎雄計天皇同母兄也

The Shoki is the same, except that 更名大爲 appears as a comment in

small characters, followed by 自餘諸天皇不言譜字而至此天皇獨自書者據舊本耳

Compare the way in which the two works open their accounts of the reign of Jimmu.

Shoki: 神日本磐余彥天皇諱彥火火出見彥波瀲武鸕鷀草葺不合尊第四子也

Kuji Hongi (天皇本紀): 彥波瀲武鸕鷀草不葺合尊第四子也。諱神日本磐余彥天皇亦云彥火火出見尊卽少年時號狹野尊也

Compare also Kuji Hongi 皇孫本紀 (80-7): 磐余彥尊。天孫彥波瀲武鸕鷀草葺不合尊第四子也

The above are the only two examples in the Shoki of the use of 諱 with reference to an Emperor.

The 通釋 rejects the six characters 諱 to 見 (in the Jimmu citation), supporting his arguments partly by the comment on the character 諱 in the case of Ninken above. This comment itself is rejected by the 集解 as an interpolation. Rejection of the comment would slightly favour the argument for the antiquity of the Kuji Hongi, but its retention is by no means damning. Without going deeply into the matter here, it may be observed that the normal usage of the Kuji Hongi would be to place 諱 before 億計, which usage is followed in the case of Jimmu.

The remaining variations exhibited by the Kuji Hongi are as follows: (The corresponding entry in the Shoki conforms to the normal pattern in each case.) Suizei: 神日本磐彥天皇第三子諱神淳名川耳天皇諡曰綏靖天皇 etc.

(In common with other occasional appearances of the 諡號, the above 諡 etc. must be regarded as an interpolation. See "objections" below.)

Annei: 神淳名川耳天皇太子...尊

Itoku: 磯城津彥玉手看天皇太子日本彥耜友尊第二子

(Note: Shoki has 大日本; Kuji Hongi elsewhere as above. Note also the error in the reign of the next Emperor, Kōshō, whose father is given as Annei in mistake for Itoku. This error probably arose from the unusual way in which Itoku—as well as the two preceding Emperors—is introduced, his father, Annei, being mentioned before him. The writer of the Kuji Hongi seems to have referred for Kōshō's father not to his sources but to his own text, a casual glance at which brings Annei's name first to the eye. The process here conjectured is analogous to that which probably led to the errors in the dating of the first years of certain Emperors' reigns—see 'dating.')

Chūai: 大足彥天皇第二皇子童名小碓命日本武尊第二王子足仲彥王尊
諱名也

(compare Shoki: 足仲彥天皇日本武尊第二子也)

Keitai: 諱男大迹天皇更名彥太尊者...

(Shoki also gives 更名彥太尊 at this point as comment.)

Sushun: The standard Kuji Hongi formula with 天皇 for 尊.

It has been suggested to me that the reason for this erroneous use of 諱 in the Kuji Hongi is that the anachronistic Chinese posthumous name (諡), which appears in the heading of each reign, was in the original compilation and not, as I hold, an interpolation or alteration; and, therefore, the compilers of the Kuji Hongi inserted 諱 before the Japanese 諡 to distinguish it from the Chinese one; this argument at the same time is held to account for the use of 尊 instead of 天皇 at this point; 天皇 having already appeared in the heading. If this feature is considered in isolation, this is, doubtless, a plausible explanation. But it is not the only possible one. Not only are there no features in the Nara and Heian histories which might be thought to have led the compilers of the Kuji Hongi into making such an error (whether deliberately or inadvertently), but the explanation also fails to take into account the variations exhibited by the Kuji Hongi in this context, some of which, as shown above, involve the omission of 諱 or the use of 天皇 for 尊, and one of which (Jimmu) involves the assumption that the compiler deliberately ignored the Shoki's correct use of 諱. Some of these might perhaps be attributed to the inadvertence of the compiler or to later correction, but this would still not

account for the way in which, e.g., Suizei or Chūai are introduced, or for the use of 尊 for 天皇 in other contexts (see b. below). Is it not more natural to regard this erroneous use of 諱, taken in conjunction with the other variations, as one of many errors, which were subsequently corrected in the Shoki? (See, also, 'objections' below.)

(b.) The usage of 命 and 尊 (mikoto).

It is well known that the first occurrence of the character 尊 in the Shoki (I 1-5) is followed by the comment: 至貴曰尊。自餘曰命。並訓美舉等。下皆倣此

The Kuji Hongi exhibits noticeably more exceptions to this rule than does the Shoki, while not disregarding it completely (as does the Kojiki). The Kojiki usually introduces the Emperors as 某命; the similar practice of the Kuji Hongi (using 尊) has been described above. There are however some examples of the Kuji Hongi using 命 where the corresponding Shoki has 天皇. (see table.)

The Kuji Hongi (105) also uses 命 when referring to 大碓 and 小碓, while, in the parallel passage, the Shoki (I 198) refers to them as 皇子 and 尊 respectively. Once only does 尊 appear after 小碓 in the Kuji Hongi (105-4), 命 being used in all other references, including that in the parentage of Chūai cited in (a.) above. On the other hand, the Kuji Hongi uses 尊 (as does the Shoki) when referring to the prince by his later name, 日本武.

The usage of the two works when referring to Emperors may best be displayed in tabular form. It will be noticed that, though neither usage is wholly systematic, that of the Shoki is the more nearly so. In particular, the Shoki never uses 命 of an Emperor, while the Kuji Hongi does so 10 times. Is it unreasonable to suppose that the more nearly systematic work in such a matter is likely to be the later one? (The virtual uniformity of the usage in the progeny lists, which the Kuji Hongi provides at the end of many reigns, is interesting. See arrangement, below.)

Emperor	Birth		Progeny List	Appointment as Heir		Other significant references	
	Shoki	KujiHongi	Kuji Hongi	Shoki	Kuji Hongi	Shoki	Kuji Hongi
綏靖	尊	omits birth	尊	尊	尊		
安寧	天皇	天皇	"	"	"		
懿德	"	尊	"	"	皇子		
孝昭	"	命	"	"	尊		
孝安	"	尊*	"	"	命		*天皇 in 天孫本紀
孝靈	"	命	"	"	尊		
孝元	"	皇子命	"	"	皇子		
開化	"	尊	"	"	命		
崇神	"	命	"	"	"		
垂仁	"	天皇	"	"	尊		
景行	尊	尊	"	"	命		
成務	天皇	no style	"	"	"		
仲哀	"	尊	一	"	"		
應神	"	天皇	(別) 尊	一	一		
仁德	"	尊	"	一	一	Referred to as 尊 through- out pre-accession, in both works, and at accession.	
履中	"	"	"	尊	尊		
反正	"	? "	"	皇子	皇子		
允恭	"	"	"	一	一	Referred to as 皇子 throughout pre-accession in both works	
安康	"	天皇	皇子尊	一	一	as above	
雄略	"	"	"	一	一	Referred to as 天皇 throughout pre-accession in both works	
清寧	"	皇子尊	"	皇子	皇子		
顯宗	王 in both works, only in citation from 譜第		一	一	一	Referred to as 天皇 throughout pre-accession in both works	
仁賢	(as above)		一	(王)	(王)	"	"
繼體	一	一	一	一	一	"	"
安閑 to 用明 (6 reigns)	尊	尊	尊	一	一	欽明 皇子...天皇	皇子尊
崇峻	皇子	皇子	一	一	一		
(推古)	姬尊	姬尊	一	一	一		

天皇本紀

神皇本紀

帝皇本紀

Probably the only breach of the 命:尊 rule in the Shoki is the reference to Prince Shōtoku (II 159-9): 厩戸豊聰耳皇子命 where the Kuji Hongi (137-16) has 皇太子上宮厩戸豊聰耳尊. The above seems also to be the only example in the Shoki of the style 'miko no mikoto' which with 'hitsugi no miko no mikoto,' is fairly common in the Kuji Hongi. (See c. 'accession' below.)

As a refutation of the argument here advanced, it has been suggested to me that the occasional misuse of 命 by the Kuji Hongi is due to the influence of the Kojiki. This may well be the case. But the point at issue is the relative antiquity of the Shoki and Kuji Hongi, not that of the Kojiki and Kuji Hongi. This objection would probably not be raised, if the great difference between the Chronicle of the Emperors and the account of the Divine Age were not ignored. This difference has already been referred to above (introduction). Undoubtedly the Kojiki or its materials were directly used for the account of the Divine Age, where the wording and the spelling of the Kojiki are so extensively used. But this is not the case in the Chronicle of the Emperors, where the only directly detectable apparent borrowings from the Kojiki are some details connected with the deaths of six successive Emperors (see 'Kojiki' below). It seems possible (even probable) that the Chronicle of the Emperors was written between the Kojiki and the Shoki. What seems improbable is that in a work allegedly copied almost word for word from the Shoki, the influence of the Kojiki should make itself felt one word at a time in such ways alone. On the other hand, a work, in which the distinction between 命 and 尊 was being made for the first time and which was being drawn up from materials in which only 命 (or a kana rendering) was used, might reasonably be supposed sometimes to copy its sources without making the necessary corrections.

(c.) Accession.

The formulae used most often by each work are, respectively,

Shoki: (皇)太子即天皇位 (15 times, including slight variations)

Kuji Hongi: (皇)太子尊即天皇位 (" " " ")

There are slight variations involving the omission of 皇 or 天皇, and exceptional cases, such as the use of 儲君 for 皇太子 (Hanzei), etc.

The most interesting exception is that of Nintoku, alluded to in the table; i.e. in both works, 大鷦鷯尊即天皇位, which may be considered in conjunction with the exceptional use of the style 尊 throughout the pre-accession.

(d.) The usage of 姬 and 媛 (hime).

To summarize briefly, there are 9 examples of the use of 姬 by the Kuji Hongi, where 媛 is used in the Shoki. (It may or may not be significant that all but one of these appear before the reign of Jingō, i.e. in vol. 7, 天皇本紀) There is one example of the reverse, three examples of 娘 in the Kuji Hongi for 姬 in the Shoki, and two examples of the reverse. (Some of the above are doubtless corruptions, but probably not all.)

(e.) The formula for stating the mother of the Emperor.

The most common formula in the Shoki is:

母曰某媛 or 姬 (命) 18 times, out of which the Kuji Hongi is the same 8 times.

The most common formula in the Kuji Hongi is:

母曰皇后某媛 or 姬 (命) 13 times, of which the first 9 occur in consecutive reigns (Itoku to Keikō; the series probably extends to Chūai, assuming that under Seimu the omission of 曰 was inadvertent.). This formula never appears in the Shoki; instead the Shoki 4 times says, 母皇后曰某媛 or 姬 (命), which occurs, interestingly enough, in the consecutive reigns of Suinin, Keikō, Seimu and Chūai.

Further variations occur in both works, but they do not merit detailed description.

(f.) Methods of listing progeny.

It is difficult to say which of the two works is the more systematic in its usage, but some differences should be noted. Sometimes the Shoki is the more precise, sometimes the Kuji Hongi. For example, in

Shoki, Sushun 1st year (II 129-7)...是生某與某

Kuji Hongi, " (135-1)...生一男一女某次某

or Shoki, Bidatsu 4 (II 105-9)...生某與某

Kuji Hongi, " (133-8)...生二女長曰某少曰某,

the Kuji Hongi is the more precise.

On the other hand, in Shoki, Keitai 1st year (II 16-1 and 16-3) 生三女長曰某仲曰某少曰某

Kuji Hongi (same year) (128-15 & 16) 生三女某次某次某 the opposite is the case. Other examples of both kinds occur.

The Kuji Hongi tends to use only 次 in long lists where the Shoki uses 第一, 第二 etc. Again, where the Shoki lists 其一, 其二 etc., the Kuji Hongi always omits all, or all but the first, 其, but either retains the numerals or substitutes 次 for them.

For 生 or 後生 in the Shoki, the Kuji Hongi usually writes 誕生. (But once the Kuji Hongi-95-16-writes 皇后生 for 后生 in the Shoki.)

Before leaving this formula, it should be noted that the use of 次 in progeny lists, more frequent in the Kuji Hongi than in the Shoki, is in fact the normal practice of the Kojiki. This again, like the use of 命 referred to in (b.), is more suggestive of an intermediate work, compiled from materials like those of the Kojiki, than of a work copied from the Shoki.

The remaining two formulae are matters of grammatical usage, but they are treated here because they concern recurrent items; it is clear in each case that the Shoki is correct.

(g.) Change of capital or palace.

The principal point of difference here is the expression 都遷 used by the Kuji Hongi where 遷都 is used by the Shoki. This occurs 9 times. Only

once (Annei 2) does the Kuji Hongi conform to the Shoki usage, though it also twice agrees with the Shoki in saying 更都.

There is also a difference in the way of recording the name of the capital or palace, e.g.:

Shoki, Keitai 5 (II 17-4) 遷都山背筒城

Kuji Hongi, " (129-5) 都遷山背謂筒城宮

or Shoki, Senka 1 (II 44-5) 遷都于檜隈廬入野因爲宮號也

Kuji Hongi, " (130-15) 都遷檜前謂廬入野宮

and several similar instances. Other variations and differences occur. With the doubtful exception of the case of the capital of Suizei, the two works never employ identical phrasing in this context.

(h.) Appointment of Heir Apparent, Empress etc.

Where the Shoki correctly has 立某爲皇后 (皇太子 etc.) the Kuji Hongi frequently writes 某立爲皇后 etc. In its pure form this solecism is made, certainly, 31 times, while conformity with the usage of the Shoki occurs, certainly, only 14 times. There are 9 more passages where we may justly suppose that the same solecism has been committed; and these are particularly interesting, in that they confirm the suspicion, frequently aroused by a comparison of the Kuji Hongi and the Shoki, that the faithful transmission of the former has been impeded by early attempts to bring it into conformity with the latter. To be specific, there are three passages where, for 立某爲 in the Shoki, we find 立某立爲 in the Kuji Hongi. In one of these cases, two MSS lack the first 立, and one lacks the second. In each case the Kokushi Taikei editor proposes, surely wrongly, to reject the *second* 立. There are also four cases of 以 (once a variant reading, 尊, is possible) 某立爲 for 立某爲 (3 times) and 以某爲 (once) of the Shoki.

I have been told that these last two examples, together with the usage of particles and other linguistic features, mentioned in the next section, are to be regarded as typical examples of the decadent Chinese prose, with a

Japanese flavour, which characterized the period (early Heian), in which the Kuji Hongi is presumed to have been compiled. On the other hand, there seems to be a widely held view that, in the early Heian period, Japanese composition in Chinese reached its height. For instance, Okada Masayuki 岡田正之 calls the early Heian period “漢文學隆盛時代” and he defines his period as from 782 to 930⁽¹⁾. (The lower limit suggested for the compilation of the Kuji Hongi is 936. See note 2.) Moreover, my own search of early Heian prose has failed to disclose any parallels for the Kuji Hongi's idiom, while it discloses an abundance for that of the Shoki. While, therefore, it must be presumed that early Heian literature abounds in parallels to the Kuji Hongi's idiom, (otherwise no such suggestion could have been made), the existence of contradictory examples weakens the argument. It is true that I can find no parallels for the Kuji Hongi's idiom in pre-Shoki prose. But the surviving quantity of pre-Shoki prose is very small compared with that of the early Heian period, while such as has survived (in inscriptions and in the Jōkū Hōō Teisetsu and the Fudoki) may be supposed to have been as highly polished as possible; if the Chronicle of the Emperors was only intended as a draft, lack of polish need not surprise us.

Further, in this connection, it has been suggested to me that these solecisms (allegedly modernisms) were introduced by the forger of the Kuji Hongi as deliberate archaisms! A theory defended by so arbitrary a statement is impregnable against rational attack.

III. Language

At the end of the the preceding section, attention was drawn to the view that the linguistic inferiority of the Kuji Hongi is characteristic of the presumed late date of its composition. But in case this is not the general view, the

(1) Nihon Kambun Gaku Shi 日本漢文學史 (supplemented by Yamagishi 山岸 and Nagasawa 長澤, Tokyo, 1954) p. 111.

following brief summary of the position is offered.

Between the Chronicle of the Emperors and the Shoki there are very numerous discrepancies of a purely linguistic nature. In the case of some of these it can be stated with some certitude that the Shoki is correct and the Kuji Hongi incorrect. (Two such examples were dealt with above; see 'formulae' g. & h.) But in the majority of cases, while one may suspect that the Shoki is superior, it would doubtless be possible to adduce some parallels for the Kuji Hongi from Chinese (or, alternatively, early Heian) literature. This is a large question and will not be treated in detail here, but it may be worth drawing attention to a few items. The most conspicuous linguistic difference between the two works lies in the tendency of the Kuji Hongi to use more (? too many) final particles than the Shoki and to use them less idiomatically, especially the particle 矣. In the Chronicle of the Emperors alone, the particle 矣 is used three times as often as in the corresponding portions of the Shoki, appearing approximately 95 times compared with approximately 30 times. In 17 of these cases, 矣 is found substituted, for 也 (12 times) and for 焉 (5 times), in each case apparently wrongly or at least abnormally. This same tendency is evident in the Divine Age portions also, though the figures are not quite so remarkable (about 140 times to about 90 times, including 14 substitutions for 也 and 4 for 焉.) One or two examples may be given:

- (a.) Shoki I 115-2 (Jimmu pre-accession, year 戊午.)
今云蓼津訛也... 今云飫悶奇訛也
Kuji Hongi 81-14 has 矣 for the second 也.
- (b.) Shoki I 293-6 (Nintoku pre-accession) 故諺曰... 其是之緣也
Kuji Hongi 114-4 omits 之 and has 矣 for 也.
- (c.) Shoki II 12-7 (Keitai 1.) 賢者唯男大迹王也
Kuji Hongi 127-8 has 矣 for 也.
- (d.) Shoki I 71-3 (Divine Age, Chapter 2.) 發顯我者汝也

Kuji Hongi 73-10 has 矣 for 也.

- (e.) Shoki I 403-8 (Kenzō pre-accession) following a remark by the Emperor, 小楯由是深奇異焉

Kuji Hongi 123-8 has 矣 for 焉.

- (f.) Shoki II 136-2 (Suiko 1.) 立厩戸豐聰耳皇子爲皇太子仍錄攝政以萬機悉委焉

Kuji Hongi 135-14 has 矣 for 焉.

(Note that b. above is a common formula which always concludes with 也 in the Shoki, but there are several other instances of 矣 in this formula in the Kuji Hongi, which also sometimes follows the usage of the Shoki.)

Again, at least once in the Chronicle of the Emperors (Jimmu pre-accession, Shoki I 111-5) and several times in the Divine Age, the Kuji Hongi has...之時...where the Shoki has...於(于)...時...or...時...(Such trivial discrepancies might be merely the result of corruption, but, according to the Kokushi Taikei, there is manuscript agreement in the respective texts.) It is also conspicuous that the Kuji Hongi usually uses 復 where the Shoki uses 又. It would probably be impossible to prove which was the older usage in this case a priori, but it should be noted that this occurs three times in the Chronicle of the Emperors and 30 times in the Divine Age. This again, together with the items already mentioned, seems to link the two parts of the work linguistically. It is further worth noting in this connection that 復 is also used by the Kuji Hongi in the Divine Age, when introducing a new version of a story (i.e. instead of the 一書曰 of the Shoki) and there are a number of instances of what seems to be this particular usage, where the Shoki has 又 and not 一書曰.

Further, there are a number of differences between the two works in the kana used for various names etc., which, with further investigation, might illuminate the question of the relative antiquity of the texts.

There are also numerous recurrent differences between the parallel portions

of the Kojiki and the Kuji Hongi in the Divine Age, of the significance of which I would not presume to judge, but at least they should provide a clue to the question of the relative antiquity of these two works. (For example, what is the significance of the invariable use of 寄 in the Kuji Hongi where 依 appears in the Kojiki? This occurs at least 8 times.) Other clues to this problem should be provided by a study of the spelling and use of kana in the two works. For example, in parallel passages the Kuji Hongi normally uses the characters 彦 and 姫, while the Kojiki always uses kana (毗古 or 日古, and 比賣) for these words. But there are two cases where the Kuji Hongi follows the spelling of the Kojiki precisely, and three cases where it uses slightly different kana spellings (比古, 比女, twice.). This feature, of occasional agreement and occasional disagreement is found in connection with numerous other words etc. It would seem likely at first sight that the Kuji Hongi is indeed copying the Kojiki, with occasional alterations and 'improvements', but the problem requires minute research. It may be added that the Kuji Hongi (like the Shoki) does not always distinguish the nigori, whereas, of course, the Kojiki is notable for its strict preservation of the distinction.

These differences, unparalleled as they are in works known to have been based on the Shoki etc., are not easy to explain on the hypothesis that the Kuji Hongi was taken from the Shoki etc. They are too numerous (and, in some cases, too regular) to be regarded as the result of mere inadvertency in copying or of casual re-wording. They would have to be accepted as deliberate alterations, a plausible reason for which is scarcely possible to conjecture. On the other hand, on the opposite hypothesis, they scarcely present any difficulty at all.

IV. Arrangement

There are a number of passages, great and small, where the Kuji Hongi

and the Shoki arrange the same, or nearly the same, material in different ways. When the two arrangements are compared, it usually appears either that the Kuji Hongi is the more clumsy or that the arrangement of the Shoki, originally the same as that of the Kuji Hongi, has become distorted by the insertion of extra material. There are further cases, where the arrangement of both books seems equally logical, but they simply happen to represent different practices. Some examples are given below:

(a.) Ankan 1.

Shoki II 38-2. 有司爲天皇納采億計天皇女春日山田皇女爲皇后更名山田
赤見皇女
別立...etc.

Kuji Hongi 130-5. 有司即天皇位納采春日山田皇女立爲皇后更名山田
赤見皇女億計天皇之皇女也。別立...etc.

It is easily possible to imagine the arrangement used by the Shoki as a modification of that of the Kuji Hongi, but much more difficult to imagine the reverse having taken place. (The curious corruption exhibited by the text of the Kuji Hongi at the beginning of this passage is not strictly relevant here, but a word may be said. The Gōtō edition emends by reading 爲 for 郎 and omitting 位, i.e. following the Shoki, and the Kokushi Taikēi editor recommends acceptance of this. But it seems possible that this is a trace of the usual accession formula, which might reasonably be expected to appear in this reign, in spite of the unusual circumstances. In fact, a form of haplography seems to have occurred.)

(b.) Kimmei 2. List of concubines and their children.

Shoki II 52-8. 次蘇我大臣稻目宿禰女曰堅鹽媛...生七男 etc....

Kuji Hongi 132-5. 次妃堅鹽媛生七男六女蘇我大臣稻目宿禰女也。一曰

A precisely parallel example, *mutatis mutandis*, appears under Bidatsu 4 (Shoki II 105-5, Kuji Hongi 133-5). In this case, the Kokushi Taikēi editor suggests that the order of the text is wrong and should be emended. But in view of the existence of the other example quoted (ignored by the

Kokushi Taikē editor), we must probably accept the text, as it stands, as original.

In these two examples, the arrangement of the Kuji Hongi appears even clumsier than in (a.) above. It is scarcely possible to imagine this arrangement being adopted by a compiler with the present text of the Shoki before him. That none of these three examples was a mere error of copying is suggested by the appearance of 也 after the parent in each case. It is possible, however, that the Kuji Hongi originally lacked the misplaced information, in both (a.) and (b.), and that it was later interpolated from the Shoki into the most convenient space available.

(c.) When listing the progeny of an Emperor, the Shoki frequently gives some information as to whose ancestors they were, etc., usually in the form of small character comments. This information does not appear in the corresponding passages in the Kuji Hongi but is given in the lists of progeny which appear at the end of most reigns. These lists in the Kuji Hongi are really superfluous, except on those (numerous) occasions when the above information is given. The arrangement of the Shoki is the more economical, and so seems the more reasonable, and it is again difficult to imagine the arrangement of the Kuji Hongi being developed from that of the Shoki, rather than vice versa.

Once more, it has been suggested to me, by way of refutation, that these lists in the Kuji Hongi are to be regarded as the result of the influence of the Kojiki. But there seems to be no relevance or point in a suggestion which attributes to the forger of the Kuji Hongi the following procedure: (i) When, in the course of his account of a reign, he enumerates the children of an Emperor, he copies from the Shoki but deliberately omits certain information supplied by the Shoki. (It must be deliberate since it happens so regularly, yet a plausible motive would be hard to conjecture.) (ii) Under the influence of the Kojiki, which enumerates offspring at the beginning of

each reign, he repeats his enumeration at the end of each reign, supplying, this time, the information previously omitted.

Indeed, these lists may have been adapted from the Kojiki (although the wording and spelling generally resemble the Shoki), but surely not by a man copying from the Shoki. Would it occur to anyone that such a proceeding would in any way help to confirm the authenticity of his forgery? What then would the explanation be? Some of the remarks made on formulae (b.) above are relevant here.

There is a further possibility, which deserves serious consideration. As suggested in connection with examples (a.) and (b.), the Kuji Hongi may originally have lacked entirely the additional information contained in these lists; and the lists may have been methodically added from the Shoki. This conjecture receives some support from the striking uniformity of usage of 尊 in the lists, remarked above ('formulae', b.). If this supposition is correct, it is not easy to reconcile with the conventional view that the Kuji Hongi was originally taken from the Shoki, since two successive stages of copying would be implied.

(d.) Burial of Suizei, Annei, Itoku, Kōshō, Kōan, Kōrei, Kōgen and Keikō.

In each of these cases the Kuji Hongi records the burial at the end of the reign, while the Shoki records it either in the pre-accession of the next reign, or, in the cases of Suizei, Kōshō, Kōrei, Kōgen and Keikō, in the 1st, 38th (or 3rd ?), 6th, 5th and 2nd years respectively of the following reign. It should be noted that these last five cases represent the normal practice of the Shoki, when burial does not take place in the year of death; this practice is followed by the Kuji Hongi also in the case of Buretsu. The other three cases, however, are contrary to the normal practice of the Shoki. It may therefore be dangerous to draw any conclusions from these examples, but the difference of arrangement should be noted.

V. Expansion in the Shoki

While in general there may be no a priori reason to regard the additional matter in the Shoki as added to that of the Kuji Hongi, rather than omitted by the Kuji Hongi, there are certain specific passages where the appearance of the Shoki suggests that it is in fact an expansion of the Kuji Hongi. A few examples may be given:

(a.) Kenzō 1. Amnesty.

Shoki I 407-3. 立皇后難波小野王赦天下難波小野
王雄朝津間 etc.

Kuji Hongi 124-12 has the same text but for the omission of 赦天下. (The comment on the Empress appears as the main text in the Kuji Hongi, as usual.)

Such separation of a comment from its subject is most unusual in the Shoki, and it looks rather as if 赦天下 has been carelessly inserted in a draft originally like the Kuji Hongi.

(b.) Bidatsu 4.

Shoki II 106-4, Kuji Hongi 133-8. Both works have an entry headed 是歲. As is well known, the heading 是歲 (or 是月) in the Shoki is seldom followed by a further entry for the year (or month) concerned, and a special interest attaches to the cases where this rule is broken, implying as they do something about the sources etc. used. In the present instance, the Shoki has a final entry for the year: 冬十一月皇后廣姬薨, which is not found in the Kuji Hongi. Both works then start the following year with a petition for the appointment of an Empress. It would seem possible that the death of the Empress was inserted in the Shoki as an afterthought to explain the next entry, the event having been for some reason omitted from the sources which normally provided the Kuji Hongi (and the Shoki) with such information.

(c.) Seinei 2.

Shoki I 398-9, Kuji Hongi 121-12.

Both works conclude the entry for 二年十一月 with 語在雄計天皇紀 (Kuji Hongi, 記). This clearly refers to the long passage in Kenzō pre-accession, beginning, in both works, 白髮天皇二年冬十一月播磨國司 etc. (Shoki I 401-6, Kuji Hongi 122-11), which gives a detailed account of the dealings of 小楯 with 億計 and 雄計, briefly stated in Seinei 2. Yet, in the Shoki, but not in the Kuji Hongi, immediately before 語在 etc., we find the entry 是月使小楯...至赤石奉迎. This circumstance is, indeed, also mentioned in Kenzō pre-accession, but without such expansion as the rest of the story receives. It seems in fact that this has been inserted in the Shoki to explain the next entry, which, in both works, is the arrival of 小楯, with the princes, in Settsu; but its insertion causes a misplacement of 語在 etc., which, in the Kuji Hongi, is in a natural position.

In this same passage we may note two points where the Shoki appears to improve on the text of the Kuji Hongi, one of which is also a case of expansion. For 國司 of the Shoki, the Kuji Hongi has 國使者. Instead of the Shoki's elegant phrase, 畏敬兼抱, we find in the Kuji Hongi 於; we may suppose that 是 has dropped out, perhaps by haplography, 是 and 思 (the next character) having a certain similarity. (For the comparative scarcity of Chinese elegances in the Kuji Hongi, see 'contents', c., below.)

(d.) The death of Prince Yamatodake.

The death of Prince Yamatodake is related with much detail in the Shoki under Keikō 40, but briefly in the Kuji Hongi under Keikō 51. Both works, however, list the prince's consorts and offspring in Keikō 51. (This list appears again in the Kuji Hongi, with additional details, under Seimu 48, after the entry recording the appointment as Heir Apparent of one of the sons of Prince Yamatodake.) This is natural enough in the case of the Kuji Hongi, but it seems a curious misplacement in the Shoki. The chronology of the Shoki is further complicated by the last words of the long entry for Keikō 40: 是歲

天皇踐祚冊三焉; it is not clear to how much of the preceding passage this unusual entry is intended to refer. It is true that the brief reference to the death of the prince in the Kuji Hongi reads like a summary of something longer (日本武尊平東夷還參未參薨於尾張國矣), but the separation by the Shoki of the death from the list of children by 11 years (or even 8 years) remains unnatural and strongly suggests that the compilers forgot to move the list when altering the date of the prince's death and treating it in such great detail.

(e.) Other points in the reign of Keikō.

If it is agreed that the Shoki's treatment of the death of Prince Yamatodake suggests some chronological expansion in the Shoki rather than contraction in the Kuji Hongi, it may be held that some further points in this reign carry similar implications, although in themselves they point with equal validity in either direction. It has already been remarked in 'dating' (g.) that in this reign the Kuji Hongi gives few days to events fully dated in the Shoki. As a result it is possible for the Kuji Hongi, without chronological (干支) inconsistency to date the expedition of Prince Yamatodake against the Kumaso as 20th year 10th month, whereas the Shoki places this under 27th year 10th month and adds the day; both works give the prince's age on this occasion as 16, which is inconsistent with the entry, in both works, under Keikō 4, recording the seduction of certain ladies by the twin brother of prince Yamatodake.

We may also note the entries under Keikō 25 and 27, which record official activities of Takeuchi no Sukune, although, according to other information in the Shoki (concerning both his parentage, Keikō 3, and his being born on the same day as Seimu, Seimu 3) he would still have been an infant at this time. In the Kuji Hongi we find a more natural account. In that work the first mention of Takeuchi is his appointment as 棟梁之臣 in Keikō 51, to which the note is appended that he was born on the same day as the

Emperor and therefore especially favoured. The Shoki's application of this remark to Seimu looks like an attempt at consistency with the information on the parentage of Takeuchi, in spite of its inconsistency with the entries mentioned above. It might be argued that the Kuji Hongi's account represents an attempt to clear up the Shoki's inconsistencies; but there is absolutely no trace of such attempts in the Kuji Hongi, which, like the Shoki, preserves numerous inconsistencies.

VI. Comments

When we examine the way in which the so called "original commentary" of the Shoki is treated in the Kuji Hongi, we find the following five categories:

- (i) The comment appears in the Kuji Hongi, as a comment, in the same, or almost the same, words.
- (ii) as (i), but a part of the comment is absent from the Kuji Hongi.
- (iii) The comment appears in the Kuji Hongi as part of the main text.
- (iv) Where the comment is of the 一云 type, the Kuji Hongi sometimes, but by no means always, incorporates the 一云 version in its text, without saying '一云' etc.
- (v) The comment is altogether absent. (This includes all those comments which give the pronunciation of proper names etc. in kana, and most other explanatory comments.)

Whatever view may be taken of the date of the original compilation of the Kuji Hongi, all these cases deserve study, since they may help to throw light on what is or is not truly 'original commentary' in the Shoki. But in the present context, the most interesting category is (iv) above, of which the following examples may be cited:

- (a.) The offspring of Keikō.

When enumerating the offspring of the Empress 播磨稻日大郎姫, the Shoki

(I 198-3) says: 后生二男一曰大碓皇子第二曰小碓尊 一書云皇后生三男其第三曰稚倭根子皇子

In the same context, the Kuji Hongi (105-3) says: ...誕生三男第一大碓命次小碓命次稚園根子命矣

That this is not merely a copy of the Shoki's comment is suggested by the title (命 for 皇子尊), to which attention has already been drawn ('formulae' b.). Nor does it appear to be based on the Kojiki, which attributes 5 offspring to this Empress. It is true that the Kuji Hongi later attributes 稚倭根子 to 八坂入姫 (as does the Shoki), but this is precisely the kind of inconsistency which is more abundant in the Kuji Hongi than in the Shoki. It seems possible that it is to the Kuji Hongi that this comment in the Shoki refers.

(b.) The assassination of Sushun.

The accounts of the two works are the same except that the Shoki's comment, 或本云 about the part played by the jealousy of 大伴嬪小手子, is included by the Kuji Hongi as part of its main text at the end of the entry common to both works for 五年十月丙子. In the same passage, the earlier 或本云 of the Shoki, concerning the parentage of the assassin, is entirely absent from the Kuji Hongi, which again suggests that the compiler was not simply copying the Shoki's comments.

(c.) The death of Chūai.

The Shoki concludes its account of Chūai 8 (I 237-2): 天皇猶不信以強擊熊襲不得勝而還之

The Kuji Hongi's briefer account of the same year (109-6) ends: ...不信神教誨猶親擊熊襲中賊矢也

Then, after recording the death of Chūai in the following year, the Shoki says: 即知不用神言而早崩 一云天皇親伐熊襲中賊矢而崩也 while the Kuji Hongi says 即知不信神教而中賊矢早崩之矣

While there is little here to indicate which of the two versions is the earlier, the analogy of the other examples may be invoked, and it should be remembered at the same time that not all the alternative versions given in

the Shoki are treated in this way in the Kuji Hongi.

(Compare also 'contents', penultimate paragraph.)

VII. Contents

Comparison of the contents of the Chronicle of the Emperors in the Kuji Hongi with those of the corresponding volumes of the Shoki discloses absence from the Kuji Hongi of certain distinct categories of information. Now, at least some of this information has been shown by Tokugawa or subsequent scholars to have been drawn by the compilers of the Shoki from distinct sources. I suggest, therefore, that these sources were not available to, or not used by, the compiler of the Chronicle of the Emperors. Those who hold that this chronicle was written after the Shoki and copied from it, would have to resort to one of three arguments, none of which seems convincing, namely (i) that the compiler (forger) of the Kuji Hongi in the 9th or 10th century had some knowledge of the sources of the Shoki, or (ii) that the compiler anticipated the results of later criticism, or (iii) that the general plan of the Kuji Hongi required (for some reason yet to be explained) the omission of this information, and the fact that some of it can now be shown to have derived from distinct sources is no more than a coincidence.

The omissions referred to are as follows:

- (a.) Korea. Korea (including Mimana) and Koreans are not mentioned in any way after the expedition of Jingō, with the following trivial exceptions:
- (i) Ōjin pre-accession. Ōjin is stated to have been born “皇后討新羅之年”
 - (ii) Nintoku pre-accession. 吾子籠 was summoned from 韓國.
 - (iii) Kimmei 32. The Emperor's dying injunction to his heir 汝須打新羅國封建任那更遺夫婦惟如舊日死無恨之
 - (iv) and (v) 高麗僧慧慈 the teacher of Prince Shōtoku (Suiko 1.), who lamented on the death of Prince Shōtoku (Suiko. 29).

We may note that, in dealing with the expedition of Jingō, the Kuji Hongi merely says 幸新羅國狀具在征服三韓記. The Kuji Hongi's account of the reign of Jingō contains no further reference to Korea, although the Shoki contains a large amount of material in its account of this and the following reign, which as has been pointed out by Professor Tsuda Sōkichi 津田左右吉, appears to have been taken from Korean (百濟) sources. Professor Tsuda also shows that where the 百濟記, 百濟新撰 and 百濟本紀 appear in the 'original commentary' in the Shoki, the text, upon which they are offered as comment, itself seems to have been drawn from the work cited, and that, in general, much of the material relating to Kudara was drawn by the compilers of the Shoki from Kudaran sources. Professor Tsuda further suggests reasons for supposing that, apart from the entries apparently based on Kudaran material, most of the Shoki's entries relating to Kudara, Shiragi, Mimana or Koma, up to about the reign of Kimmei, were fabricated at some later time for various reasons and in various circumstances. This may be an extreme view, but, if Professor Tsuda's analysis is generally correct, the omission of material relating to Korea by the Kuji Hongi would seem to be significant.⁽¹⁾

(b.) Progresses.

Accounts of progresses, e.g. in the reign of Keikō, which are closely related to passages in the Fudoki, are omitted by the Kuji Hongi. The question of the precise nature of the relationship between the Shoki and the Fudoki is a controversial one, but, unless one adopts the extreme view, that these passages in the Fudoki were actually based on the Shoki, their absence from the Kuji Hongi may be significant.

(c.) Extended citations from Chinese works.

Until the Tokugawa period, there seems to have been no consciousness of the presence in the Shoki of whole passages consisting largely of a series of quotations from Chinese works. It can hardly, therefore, have been such a

(1) Nihon Koten no Kenkyū 日本古典の研究 (Tokyo, 1950) vol. 2 pp. 193-262.

consciousness, which accounts for the absence of all such passages from the Kuji Hongi. This is not to say that the Kuji Hongi is entirely devoid of Chinese ornament. The descriptions of the character and appearance of many of the Emperors are identical with those of the Shoki and contain purely Chinese phrases. But, apart from these, Chinese quotations in the Kuji Hongi are largely confined to the narratives leading up to the accession of some of the Emperors (especially Nintoku, Ingyō, Yūryakū and Kenzō) and consist of only a few characters at a time. Thus none of the numerous Chinese style edicts of the Shoki appear in the Kuji Hongi, the only examples of such edicts being those of Suiko 27 and 28, which do not appear in the Shoki.⁽¹⁾ This involves the absence from the Kuji Hongi of such important items as, for example, the edict under Seimu 4, appointing local officials, or that under Ingyō 4, concerning the falsification of lineages, or that under Sujin 10, commissioning the 四道將軍. (Perhaps it is begging a question to say, at the present day, what is or is not 'important'. There exists the view that the Chronicle of the Emperors in the Kuji Hongi is an abridgement of the Shoki, something like the corresponding portion of the 日本紀略. If we refer to the 紀略 under the above dates, we find the Sujin 10 edict in full, the chinoiserie of the Seimu 4 edict reduced to “云云” but the specific measures transcribed in full, and the Ingyō 4 edict omitted)

The precise context in which these omissions occur is sometimes interesting. For example, the accounts of Nintoku 1 are identical in the two works, except for some trivial verbal discrepancies and excepting the account of the rough finish of the palace and the reason for it, which is absent from the Kuji Hongi. (The 紀略 includes the account of the rough finish but omits

(1) Sakamoto, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*, remarks that these two edicts are almost impossible to reconcile with the corresponding context in the Shoki, but that they do not seem to be the figments of the writer of the Kuji Hongi. Thus the presence of these two edicts presents a small but awkward problem to holders of the conventional view of the Kuji Hongi, whereas, if the Kuji Hongi is viewed as a draft, the omission of such discordant material from the Shoki need cause no surprise.

the reason for it.) It should be noted that this item is not at either the beginning or the end of the account of the year, but in the middle.

Again, in the account of Seinei 3, the Kuji Hongi shares with the Shoki the ornamental phrase 主青蓋車 (under the 5th month) but it lacks the three items, all based on 隋書高祖紀 of the 9th, 10th and 11th months of this year. (The 紀略 includes the last of these three items only.)

In this context we should also consider two points already mentioned above, the 赦天下 of Kenzō 1, and the phrase 畏敬兼抱 of Seinei 3. (See 'expansion in the Shoki', examples a. and c.)

I believe that the absence from the Kuji Hongi of all the longer Chinese passages of the Shoki is more plausibly explained by the supposition that the Kuji Hongi is the earlier work, than by the supposition that its compilers had the perspicacity to see that all such passages were 'unimportant or untrue.' (A detailed comparison of the sources of Chinese phrases common to the two works with those peculiar to the Shoki might reveal interesting results, though, in view of the interesting suggestion of Mr. Kojima Noriyuki 小島憲之⁽¹⁾ concerning the use of Chinese 類書 by the Japanese historiographers and in view of the probable closeness in time of the compilation of the two works, such an investigation might prove fruitless.)

In contrast to the above categories of material absent from the Kuji Hongi, the following omissions involve material, which so far as I am aware, has not hitherto been regarded as derived from specific sources.

(d.) Buddhism.

The Kuji Hongi's allusions to Buddhism are extremely sparse and consist only of the following (which are common to the Shoki):

- (i) Bidatsu pre-accession: 天皇不信佛法
- (ii) Yōmei " 天皇信佛法

(1) Shoki no Jussaku—sono sozai ni tsuite 書紀の述作—その素材について—(in Jimbun Kenkyū 人文研究, vol. 2, no. 1, 1951)

- (iii) Yōmei 2. The Emperor's desire to revere the Three Precious Things (三寶), and the ensuing argument about it between the ministers.
- (iv) Suiko 1. The studies of Prince Shōtoku under 慧慈.
- (v) Suiko 2. Promotion of the prosperity of the Three Precious Things, and the rivalry between the noble families in building temples.
- (vi) Suiko 29. Lament of 慧慈 on the death of Prince Shōtoku.

It would be hard to conjecture any 'policy', which would lead to the inclusion of precisely these allusions to Buddhism and no others. Certainly there is no attempt here at consistency with the notion that Prince Shōtoku and Soga no Umako were the compilers of the work. It may then be plausibly conjectured that the numerous further references to Buddhism in the Shoki were derived from some source or sources not used by the compiler of the Kuji Hongi.

(e.) None of the Shoki's items concerning the construction of ponds, canals etc. appear in the Kuji Hongi.

(f.) “Be” 部

Only one of the numerous items in the Shoki, which purport to account for the origin of the various “be”, appears in the Kuji Hongi. This is the account of the origin of the 鳥取部, 鳥養部 and 譽津部 under Suinin 23, 11th month.

The absence of this last category of information is to be attributed, I am told, to deliberate consistency with the Preface, where it is alleged that the early death of prince Shōtoku prevented the completion of the work, including the account of the 百八十部. But inconsistency with its preface is one of the characteristics of the Kuji Hongi, which first led to its rejection by scholars. In particular, if consistency in respect of contents is held to have been a conscious aim of the writer, we may justifiably ask what has become of the accounts of the *omi*, *muraji* and *tomo no miyatsuko*, promised

by the Preface.

Further, whether or not we believe the statement of the Shoki that, in Suiko 28, Prince Shōtoku and Soga no Umako undertook an historical compilation, which included 百八十部并公民等本記, we may be reasonably certain that, at the time of the compilation of the Shoki, the idea that the "be" could be treated separately in a historical work was an acceptable one, and there may well have been made a separate compilation concerning the "be", the contents of which were incorporated in the Shoki.

In isolation, therefore, the explanation which connects the absence of "be" with the Preface is an ingenious one, but it is not, on a wider view, the only possible one.

Anyone who holds the view that the Chronicle of the Emperors consists mainly of a series of extracts from the Shoki, would presumably admit, in view of the above omissions, that the extracts were not taken at random. But the holder of such a view should be prepared to go further and to explain, at least conjecturally, how this part of the Kuji Hongi came to consist of precisely its present contents. In fact, no such explanation has been offered, nor does it seem possible to conjecture one. The view that the extracts consist of a series of pegs on which to hang items concerning the Mononobe is indefensible (as will be shown briefly below; see 'Mononobe'). The contents of the Chronicle of the Emperors have, indeed, a certain homogeneity, in that they are almost wholly concerned with strictly dynastic matters and court affairs, that is to say, the births, marriages, progeny and deaths of Emperors and members of the Imperial clan, the location of palaces and tombs, the circumstances leading up to the accession of the Emperors, the appointment of ministers, etc. But there are, nevertheless, so many items of this kind included in the Shoki but not in the Kuji Hongi, that it is difficult to regard the Chronicle of the Emperors, homogeneous though it is, as extracted from the Shoki. It would be tedious to list all the examples here, but a selection may

be mentioned: the title of Sujin, 御肇國天皇 (Sujin 10); death and burial of 倭彥命 (Suinin 28); progress to Ise (Keikō 53); appointment and death of 彥狹嶋 (Keikō 55); the story of 髮長媛 (Ōjin 13); progress to 河內 to choose site for "misasagi" (Nintoku 67); bestialities (Buretsu); death of 箭田珠勝大兄皇子 (Kimmei 13); etc., etc. In addition, we may mention here again the absence from the Chronicle of the Emperors of the accounts of the institution of "be", so many of which were allegedly founded to perpetuate the names of Emperors or other members of the Imperial clan. The above items and many more are precisely such as a perusal of the Chronicle of the Emperors suggests would have been included in it, had it really been extracted from the Shoki. (It may be remarked that the majority of the above items are found in the 紀略.)

Finally in this connection, we may perhaps consider the fairly frequent references in the Kuji Hongi to 別記, (具在別記, 語在...記 etc. etc.). Unless these are to be regarded as the contributions of an ingenious forger, they at least suggest that the compiler of this section of the Kuji Hongi did not omit without mention any material, of the existence of which he was aware. Assuming, provisionally, that the parts of the Kuji Hongi concerning the Divine Age are indeed parts of the same work, such a tendency, apparently to use or to mention all available material, so conspicuous in the Divine Age, would be expected also in the Chronicle of the Emperors.

It may be worth adding a speculative explanation for the form and contents of the Chronicle of the Emperors. The Shoki is commonly regarded as the splendid fruit of the attempt to emulate the official histories of China. In particular, it is clear that the compilers of the Shoki were familiar with the Han Shu 漢書. It is not a little surprising, then, that the Shoki does not follow the form of the Han Shu and the other Chinese official histories; it has none of the biographies (列傳) or special treatises (志) of those works; it follows, in fact, the form of the Han Chi 漢紀 rather than the Han Shu

漢書. Whatever the reason for this, it is possible that the first essay at a history of Japan was more closely modelled on the Han Shu 漢書. This is suggested by the statement of the Shoki under Suiko 28, alluded to above, in which the history compiled by Prince Shōtoku and Soga no Umako is alleged to have consisted of "a history of the Emperors, a history of the country, and the original record of the omi, the Muraji, the Tomo no Miyakko, the Kuni no Miyakko, the 180 Be, and the free subjects." (Tr. Aston.) But even if the above statement is a fabrication, it shows that such a history was a possibility in the minds of the Shoki compilers. It seems possible that the Chronicle of the Emperors in the Kuji Hongi represents the pên-chi (本紀), only, of a history conceived in the form of the Han Shu 漢書, and that it was later decided, perhaps owing to poverty of material, to change the plan and incorporate all available material in one narrative. Were it not for the other evidence brought forward in this article, there would be little ground for claiming that a history on the lines of the Han Shu preceded, rather than followed, one on the lines of the Han Chi 漢紀, though it could be claimed that such is both the natural order and the order followed by the Chinese historiographers in practice.

VIII. The threefold division of the Chronicle of the Emperors.

The division of the Emperors into 天皇 (Jimmu to Jingō, vol. 7), 神皇 (Ōjin to Buretsu, vol. 8) and 帝皇 (Keitai to Suiko, vol. 9) has received little attention from commentators and critics. I have been able to find only three references to it. The only constructive suggestion appears in the 舊事本紀抄, an anonymous, undated MS in two volumes, preserved in the Mukyūkai Jinshū Bunko. The writer, who believes in the authenticity of the Kuji Hongi but sees that it must contain later interpolations, suggests, when commenting on the contents of the Kuji Hongi, that the 天皇本紀 was so named because

it dealt with the Emperors from Jimmu to Jingō, and that perhaps the next volume was named as it was because of the 神明 of the Emperors concerned. These are not, indeed, very helpful ideas but nothing else has been offered. The author of the 先代舊事本紀間疑⁽¹⁾, who is suspicious of the Kuji Hongi, simply wonders why the Emperors were so named and divided, implying that he finds the fact suspicious. This notion is carried further by Ise Sadatake, who, with questionable logic, says that the division is one proof of spuriousness, since it is inexplicable and not found in other works.⁽²⁾

Thus the question seems to remain open to conjecture. First, it might be held that the Chronicle of the Emperors, being too long for accommodation in one or even two 卷, was divided in this way simply for convenience, and that the explanation for the actual titles chosen for the three parts, as opposed to the division itself, is now inaccessible to conjecture. Perhaps this is the case, but, as for the division itself, it is worth noting that the lengths of the three parts are very far from equal, being, in the Ise Jingū Bunko MS, 93, 68 and 48 pages respectively, while the number of reigns comprised is 15, 11 and 8. Further, the dubiousness of the succession of both Ōjin and Keitai (the first Emperors of vols. 8 and 9 respectively) has been remarked more than once in the past. Recent works by Professor Maruyama Jirō 丸山二郎⁽³⁾ and Mr. Mizuno Yū 水野祐 allude to it, and one of the main conclusions of Mr. Mizuno's work is that new dynasties started with these two Emperors.⁽⁴⁾ It would probably be generally agreed that obliteration

(1) An undated MS, in one volume, signed 田旁軒 (whom I have not yet been able to identify), preserved in Tokyo University Library. As the title implies, the author is suspicious of the authenticity of the Kuji Hongi, and he seems to be under the impression that he is the first to entertain such suspicions.

(2) Kuji Hongi Hakugi 舊事本紀剝偽 (1778).

(3) Nihon Shoki no Kenkyū 日本書紀の研究 (Tokyo, 1955) Section III, Chapter 1. Kōi Keitō no Mondai 皇位繼承の問題

(4) Nihon Kodai Ōchō Shiron Josetsu 日本古代王朝史論序説 (revised, supplemented edition, Tokyo, 1954)

of traces of rifts in the Imperial line would have been felt as one of their main duties by the compilers of the Shoki. But it is not inconceivable that, in a draft version of the Shoki, a purely formal trace of such rifts should survive, whereas its survival in a subsequent work would be less likely. The change in the nature of the Kojiki with the reign of Keitai may be just such a formal trace, while possible parallels are also afforded by the threefold chronological divisions of the Korean works, 三國史記 and 三國遺事, for which Professor Suematsu Yasukazu 末松保和 has recently offered new and somewhat analogous explanations.⁽¹⁾

Naturally, scholars who draw attention to the possibility of breaks in the Imperial line, do not seem hitherto to have taken this division of the Kuji Hongi into consideration. It is indeed generally held that the division of the Kuji Hongi into ten 本紀 is a late feature. This may be the case, but it may also be important to distinguish between the titles of the ten parts and the physical division itself. Even if the former are late, it would be hard to show positively that the latter is also late.

The suggestion made here is still only vague conjecture and admittedly cannot be held to prove the antiquity of the Kuji Hongi. But it seems possible that the work has here preserved for us formal traces of important facts deliberately obliterated by the Shoki.

IX. Mononobe

As has already been briefly suggested, there seems to be no ground for the view that the Kuji Hongi as a whole, and the Chronicle of the Emperors in particular, were compiled for the purpose of glorifying the Mononobe. Analysis of the information about the Mononobe contained in (a.) the Tenson

(1) Shiragi Shi no Sho Mondai 新羅史の諸問題 (Tokyo, 1954) Part 1, Shiragi Sandai Kō 新羅三代考

Hongi (b.) the Chronicle of the Emperors, and (c.) the Shoki, discloses the following facts:

(i) Of the items in the Tenson Hongi about two thirds appear also in the Chronicle of the Emperors (about 35 items).

(ii) Of the above items, only 4 appear also in the Shoki.

(iii) 7 of the entries in the Tenson Hongi appear in the Shoki but not in the Chronicle of the Emperors. (These include 'important' items, e.g. concerning the 神寶, of which a part, only, appears in the Chronicle of the Emperors, and also items concerning the reign of Temmu.)

(iv) The Shoki contains a large amount of information concerning Mononobe scions (including, e.g. the quarrel between the Mononobe and the Soga concerning Buddhism, in Kimmei 13 and Bidatsu 14), which appears nowhere in the Kuji Hongi, but in nearly every case the Mononobe persons concerned are mentioned in the Tenson Hongi (and sometimes in the Chronicle of the Emperors as well.)

(v) There is one item of information shared between the Shoki and the Chronicle of the Emperors, which does not appear in the Tenson Hongi (Ankō pre-accession. But the man concerned, 大前宿禰連, is mentioned in the Tenson Hongi.)

(vi) There is not one item concerning the Mononobe, which is wholly peculiar to the Chronicle of the Emperors.

(vii) In only two instances is a year assigned by the Tenson Hongi to the events which it records; in both these cases, the event is found also in the Shoki.

(viii) One of the above two events (Sujin 60) is also found in the Chronicle of the Emperors, phrased identically the same as the account in the Tenson Hongi, which differs slightly from the Shoki.

These facts are doubtless susceptible of various explanations, but the most plausible would seem to be:—

(a.) That the Tenson Hongi and Chronicle of the Emperors were originally separate compilations, of different authorship.

(b.) That the majority of the Mononobe items in the Chronicle of the Emperors were inserted, often carelessly, when it and the Tenson Hongi had been brought together, from the Tenson Hongi.

(c.) That the Tenson Hongi was originally no more than a bare genealogy and record of the titles obtained by the Mononobe, and that one or two stories, taken from the Shoki, were later interpolated.

It remains possible that the Tenson Hongi was not compiled at all until after the Shoki, but it would still have to be regarded as basically an independent work, subjected to interpolations from the Shoki. In any case, the Tenson Hongi appears to be a composite work in view of the contradictions it contains, the use of 足尼 as well as 宿禰, and the occurrence in the same paragraph of different spellings of Ōjin's name, 譽田 and 品太. (This latter spelling is used throughout the Harima Fudoki.) But these questions do not affect that of the original date of compilation of the Chronicle of the Emperors, if the relationship between these two portions of the Kuji Hongi is as above conjectured.

X. Kojiki

The only items for which the Chronicle of the Emperors appears to be directly indebted to the Kojiki concern the ages, dates of death and places of burial of six successive Emperors, as follows (some of these particulars have already been mentioned above, under 'dating.'):—

Nintoku —date of death, apparently based on the 'original commentary' of the Kojiki. ('dating', l.)

Richū —alternative date of death, basis as above. ('dating', n.)

Hanzei —age and place of burial. (Information on these points is lacking

in the Shoki. Note that the place of burial—毛須—is spelt as in the Kojiki, while for Richū the same place is spelt as in the Shoki 百舌鳥.)

Ing'yō —age (78) (Various MSS of the Shoki give various ages, but not this one.)

Ankō —age of the Emperor and of 眉輪王 at the time. (This information is lacking in the Shoki.)

Yūryaku—干支 of the year of death ('dating', o.), age and place of burial. (Shoki lacks the age but gives the place of burial under Seinei 1. The Kuji Hongi also gives the place of burial under Seinei 1 and follows the spelling of the Shoki, having previously followed that of the Kojiki. In this case only, the Kojiki's formula, 御陵在... is used in the Kuji Hongi instead of the usual 葬(于)...))

It seems that most, if not all, of the above items should be regarded as later interpolations. In any case they seem to throw no light on the question of the relative antiquity of the Chronicle of the Emperors and the corresponding portion of the Kojiki. It is difficult to know what significance, if any, attaches to the fact that successive Emperors are involved; these are not the only Emperors for whom the Shoki and Kuji Hongi lack such information. (It is, doubtless, no more than a curious coincidence that, among these six Emperors, five are probably to be identified with the five kings of 倭 mentioned in the 宋書倭國傳.)

It is true that in its account of the death of Chūai, the Kuji Hongi (109-7 & 8) has a passage of some 70 characters, which is not found either in the Shoki or in the Kojiki, but which contains one phrase from the parallel passage of the Kojiki—乃舉火見之 (Kojiki, 卽舉火見者. Shintei Zōho Kokushi Taikei vol. 7 p. 95-2), and one which might be an elegant translation of the Kojiki, and some phrasing reminiscent of, but not the same as, the Shoki. But it cannot be said that this passage is truly either a tran-

script or a summary of either work.

As has already been suggested, this paucity of direct borrowing from the Kojiki renders it implausible to account for slight deviations from the Shoki by invoking the "influence" of the Kojiki.

XI. Objections

Some specific objections to the arguments here brought forward have been mentioned and, it is hoped, answered in the preceding pages. However, the assertion, mentioned in formulae (b.) above, that the Chinese posthumous names were in the original version of the Chronicle of the Emperors has not yet been answered. I have also searched for objections and found two, which, though serious, can hardly be said to outweigh the accumulated evidence already offered; these two points are specified below.

(a.) The Chinese posthumous names. The use of these names constitutes the only feature of the Chronicle of the Emperors (apart from item c., below), which is demonstrably later than the date of the compilation of the Shoki. These names appear in three ways:

- (i) As the heading of each reign.
- (ii) 6 times in the text, in comments, or brief passages resembling comments, which do not appear in the Shoki.
- (iii) Twice in the text in place of the Japanese 'okurina', which appear in the corresponding passages of the Shoki.

The assertion that the account of each reign was originally preceded by the name of the Emperor seems reasonable. Not only does this occur throughout the Shoki, but the syntax of the first sentence of the accounts of at least two reigns in the Kuji Hongi is such that the heading must be read as part of the sentence. The two reigns concerned are those of Jimmu and Chūai; those of Suizei, Annei and Itoku may be included, depending on the

way in which the opening words are read. But the further contention that the heading must from the first have consisted of the Chinese posthumous name and not the Japanese, though strongly based, cannot be proved. The argument would seem to be that, in the case of Jimmu and Chūai, the Japanese posthumous name, which appears in the second and first sentences respectively (for texts, see 'formulae' a., above.), would be redundant if it had already appeared in the heading; therefore, it could not have appeared in the heading. This is a strong argument but, it involves the following serious contradiction. At the beginning of the reign of Suizei we find: 綏靖天皇 (heading) 神日本磐余彥天皇第三子諱神渟名川耳天皇諡曰綏靖天皇. Here is an example of precisely such redundancy as that to which objection is raised. It cannot be argued by those who hold that 綏靖天皇 was the original heading, that the 諡曰 etc. in the text was an interpolation; while redundancy in the original composition (such as seems to have occurred in the cases of Jimmu and Chūai) is conceivable, so unnecessary an interpolation is surely not. On the other hand, from the standpoint that the original heading consisted of the Japanese posthumous name, such an interpolation is readily conceivable. Thus the only way out of this position open to the objector is to maintain, at least in the case of Suizei, that the original heading was indeed the Japanese posthumous name and that the 諡曰 etc. found in the text (together, perhaps, with the other textual Chinese posthumous names) was in the original text. This seriously reduces the strength of the objection.

As for (ii) and (iii) above, there is little difficulty in regarding these as interpolations or glosses, which supplanted the original text.

(b.) The burial of Ingyō. Instead of the usual 葬(于) . . . 陵, the Kuji Hongi says, 葬天皇於 . . . 陵. In the Shoki, where precisely the same wording appears, the abnormality of writing 天皇 is clearly due to the interposition, between the death and the burial, of an account of the grief of the king of

Shiragi. But this account, in common with nearly all other material concerning Korea, is absent from the Kuji Hongi (see 'contents', a.) and there is, consequently, no such explanation for this sole departure from the normal wording. However, it has already been remarked (see 'Kojiki' above) that in the accounts of six consecutive reigns, including that of Ingyō, information concerning date of death etc. appears to have been interpolated from the Kojiki. In two of these cases, the place of burial seemed to have come from the Kojiki, but it is perhaps just possible that for all these six reigns the Kuji Hongi originally lacked information on this point, and the information was supplied, where available, from the Shoki, and otherwise from the Kojiki. Thus this identity of wording would be explained as interpolation. But it must be admitted that the objection remains a strong one and the explanation weak.

(c.) The mention of 和歌 in the reign of Nintoku. Songs do not appear in the Chronicle of the Emperors, except in the account of Jimmu's pre-accession period, which appears in the Kōson Hongi (Vol. 6.). Elsewhere, either the whole context of the songs is omitted, or the omission of the songs themselves is admitted with the formula: 歌曰云云在別. But we find in Nintoku pre-accession (113-6): 謠曰云云別在和歌記. It seems, at the least, most unlikely that the term 和歌 was in use at the beginning of the Nara period. At the same time, it is difficult to regard this as an interpolation, since, in that case, we should expect "Nihon Shoki..." or words to that effect, instead of 和歌記. It might even be argued that this item throws suspicion on all the 別記 etc. mentioned elsewhere in the Chronicle of the Emperors, and that these references are all deliberate attempts to show that the Kuji Hongi owed nothing to the Shoki. This item is not easy to explain on any hypothesis about the compilation of the Kuji Hongi.

XII. Conclusion

For a summary of the foregoing evidence and arguments, the reader may be referred to the introduction, and a recapitulation will be dispensed with here. If there is any truth in the view advocated here, the Kuji Hongi once more becomes an indispensable document for the study of the Nihon Shoki and of ancient Japanese history in general. In this event, certain further problems urgently demand study. Such problems concern the purpose and date of the preface of the Kuji Hongi, the relative antiquity of the Kuji Hongi and the Kojiki, the source of the passages apparently derived from the Kogo Shūi, the relationship between the Chronicle of the Emperors and the account of the Divine Age in the Kuji Hongi, the true part played by the Mononobe in the production of the work, etc. etc. Whatever the outcome of these studies, comparison of the parallel passages of the Kuji Hongi and Kojiki should at any rate prove of considerable linguistic interest.

Finally, I wish to thank Professor Iwai Hirosato 岩井大慧, Director of the Library of the Toyo Bunko, Professor Wada Sei 和田清, Director of the Research Department, and Professor Enoki Kazuo 榎一雄, Deputy Director of the Research Department, not only for the privilege of publication in these Memoirs, but also for all the facilities and assistance extended to me by the Toyo Bunko. I am much indebted to Mr. Matsumura Jun 松村潤, Member of the Research Department, not only for proof-reading, but also for incessant practical assistance of all kinds throughout my stay in Japan.

Addendum to p. 82, note 1.

Since going to press, my attention has been drawn to the view of Mr. Saitō Shōji 齋藤昌二, the most vigorous champion the Kuji Hongi has ever had. In his *Nihon Kodai Shi Kō* 日本古代史攷, vol. 1 (Tokyo, 1952) pp. 102-108, Mr. Saitō roundly condemns the unproven assumption that the Kuji Hongi was copied from the Shoki etc., asserts that the style closely resembles that of documents of the Suiko period, and that it

was probably a Mononobe production of the reign of Bidatsu. It is unfortunate that Mr. Saitō ignores the impossibility of the Kuji Hongi having provided the source for the accounts of the Divine Age in the Shoki and Kojiki, and that he offers no proof of his assertions. Nevertheless, his interesting view does not deserve the severe treatment it receives at the hands of Professor Matsumura Takeo 松村武雄 in his *Nihon Shinwa no Kenkyū* 日本神話の研究 vol. 1. (Tokyo, 1954) pp. 341-2. Professor Matsumura takes the conventional view of the relationship between the texts of the Kuji Hongi and the Shoki etc.