

## The network of manuscripts of *Harima no Kuni Fudoki* from the end of the Edo Period

Akira KAKIUCHI (trans. Edwina Palmer)

### A survey of manuscripts of *Harima no Kuni Fudoki*

For the past several years I have been conducting a comparative survey of copies of *Harima Fudoki*. This project was triggered by my realisation that the manuscript copies and printed books of *Harima no Kuni Fudoki* that OKA Hirayasu [1809–1882] used when he published *Fudoki Kō (Thoughts on Fudoki)* (1859, Oka family collection) do not all match. Hirayasu was the Shintō priest of Kamo Shrine in Murotsu, Mitsu-chō, Tatsuno-shi.

Of course, when I first commenced this project from mere curiosity, I did not think it would be of much consequence. However, the more I examined the manuscripts, the more I noticed that there were subtle discrepancies between such points as the graphs (i.e., Chinese characters) used and in the inserted textual notes (*kakiire*) and ‘post-it’ notes (*fusen*), and I was thereby able to gain an insight into such aspects as the route of textual transmission that had not been indicated in their colophons (*okugaki*), and also the reasons for the conclusions reached by the copyists. I realised that from the point of view of historical research into *Harima Fudoki*, these were extremely important sources. Clues from corrections to the source texts had been, so to speak, frozen in time.

### The discovery of the Sanjō Nishibon Text of *Harima no Kuni Fudoki* and its circulation

Of the five extant ‘ancient fudoki’, those for the four provinces other than that of Harima had been reproduced as woodblock print texts (*hanpon*) and research into them had already progressed by the end of the Edo period. The existence of the sole extant manuscript copy (the ur-text) of *Harima Fudoki*—the Sanjō Nishibon scroll (National Treasure; Tenri University Library collection)—first came to light in 1703. It seems that was copied, and one copy was definitely made in 1797—the Yanagihara text, but it was never made publicly available.

In the third month of 1852, TANIMORI Tanematsu (hereafter referred to by his later name, Yoshiomi), produced an exact facsimile copy (*rinmobon*) of it—a copy that precisely replicates the ur-text, down to the form of the graphs, worm holes, etc. Then in the ninth month of the same year, he produced the Yanagihara text: an edited version (*kyōgobon*), which compared the available sources and corrected points that differed. As a result, research into *Harima Fudoki* eventually got going.

The situation regarding the *Harima Fudoki* text, with only Yoshiomi’s copied facsimile version and the sole edited Yanagihara version, remained unchanged until 1926, when *Harima no Kuni Fudoki* was published by the *Koten Hozon Kai* (Classics Preservation Society) in the form of a photographic facsimile (*ei’inbon*) of the Sanjō Nishi manuscript. *Hyōchū Harima Fudoki (Harima Fudoki with commentary and notes)* was compiled by SHIKIDA Toshiharu<sup>1</sup> in 1871 and published in 1887. *Hyōchū Ko Fudoki (Harima) (Ancient Fudoki with commentary and notes [Harima])* by KURITA Hiroshi<sup>2</sup> (completed in the summer of 1864) appeared in published form in 1899. Both of these had been based on Yoshiomi’s texts.

So saying, in the early stages of *Harima Fudoki*’s circulation, Tanimori’s text was copied by a few people, such as Shintō priests and nativist (*kokugaku*) scholars who were friends of Tanimori (especially those associated with the nativist HIRATA<sup>3</sup> School whose ideology was the revival of

<sup>1</sup> Translator’s note: Nativist scholar. 1817–1902.

<sup>2</sup> Translator’s note: Nativist scholar and historian. 1835–1899.

<sup>3</sup> Translator’s note: HIRATA Atsutane, Shintō theologian, considered one of the four great scholars of Nativist Studies (*Kokugaku*). 1776–1843.

ancient Shintō, *fukko Shintō*), as is evidenced by one section appearing in SUZUKI Shigetani's *Nihon Shoki Den*.<sup>4</sup> But it cannot be denied that it was distributed within extremely limited circles.

### The network of text transmission

Although at first *Harima Fudoki*'s distribution was very restricted, it started to become more widely circulated from the early 1860s, through word-of-mouth personal connections among fellow students and 'old boys', like-minded people and family members. Information about its route of transmission was not necessarily all recorded in their colophons, but even so, the routes of transmission start to become just a little more clear.

For example, the text produced by Yoshiomi was the main one, and that branched off into several *stemmata*:<sup>5</sup> the ŌHASHI Nagaoki *stemma*, the MUTOBE Yoshika<sup>6</sup> *stemma*, the SUZUKA (NAKATOMI) Tsuratane<sup>7</sup> *stemma*, and the TOYODA Yasushi *stemma*. The SUZUKA Tsuratane *stemma* further branches into the KUROKAWA Harumura<sup>8</sup> *stemma* and the KŌZUKI Tamehiko *stemma*. The most notable copyists were, as may be expected, those belonging to the Hirata School. Most of them were appointed as priests to influential Shintō shrines after the Meiji Restoration, and that network of priests must have been active in some way in distributing copies of *Harima Fudoki*. The KŌZUKI Tamehiko *stemma* was a group that developed within Harima, and will be elaborated later.

Even within the same *stemma* of copies, discrepancies appeared among them (especially in the number of *kakiire* and *fusen* annotations), and there were those that contained notes that were distinctive of other *stemmata*. These very much depended on the particular interests of the copyist in question, and were the result of information collected and passed on among acquaintances.

### The network of transmission within Harima

Now, let us focus on Harima. In the tenth month of 1856, Kōzuki Tamehiko, who was the priest at Harima no Kuni Sōja (i.e., Itate Hyōzu Shrine, Himeji-shi), made a copy of Yoshiomi's *kyōgobon* text that was in the possession of Suzuka Tsuratane, who was the priest of Yoshida Shrine in Kyōto. This was the advent of copying *Harima Fudoki* within Harima Province itself. This is a relatively early example of a copy, but both men were Shintō priests, so they would no doubt have been in the habit of frequently lending each other works of the classics.

In the tenth month of the following year (1857), Oka Hirayasu transcribed the Tamehiko text in his possession (the Oka manuscript), and in 1859 he wrote *Fudoki Kō* (*Thoughts on Fudoki*), which heralded the beginnings of annotated commentaries (*chūshakusho*) on *Harima Fudoki*. However, Hirayasu took a whole year to copy the Tamehiko text, from which we can see that even though he was living on the spot in Harima, its reproduction was no easy task.

Thereafter, the copies of *Harima Fudoki* fell into two main *stemmata*: the Tamehiko *stemma* and the Oka *stemma*. In essence, the volume of notes and insertions in the Oka *stemma* was greater.

Now, within Harima Tanimori's edited version (*kyōgōbon*) was mostly used, but his facsimile copy (*rinmobon*) did not become available until as late as 1902. However, I have found no trace of its being used for further research purposes.

### Why would *Harima no Kuni Fudoki* be copied?

---

<sup>4</sup> Translator's note: An annotated version of *Nihon Shoki*, produced in 1853 as the life's work of nativist scholar SUZUKI Shigetani [1812–1863].

<sup>5</sup> Translator's note: The original manuscript, in this case the Sanjō Nishibon scroll, is called the ur-text. A branch of a 'family tree' of manuscripts is referred to by the Latin *stemma* (pl. *stemmata*). The first text of any given *stemma* is its own ur-text.

<sup>6</sup> Translator's note: Nativist scholar. Son of a Shintō priest in Yamashiro Province. 1798–1864.

<sup>7</sup> Translator's note: Nativist scholar and hereditary priest of Yoshida Shrine, Kyōto. 1795–1871.

<sup>8</sup> Translation's note: Nativist scholar. 1799–1867.

There is a version, the Kandai text (Kansai University Library collection), that touches on this question. TARUI Moriki, a samurai in the Yamasaki fiefdom (*han*) of Harima Province was put in charge of making the copy, and in his afterword (*batsubun*) he says that ŌSUMI Masatsuna, an attendant at Yamasaki Hachiman Shrine, was shown *Harima Fudoki* in the summer of 1863 by his old friend Kōzuki Tamehiko. This information was passed on through the samurai HORIUCHI Hisatomo and reported up to the commissioner (*bugyō*) BUMA Yoshinori. The afterword says that Yoshinori had Masatsuna write a letter via Hisatomo in order to receive permission to borrow *Harima Fudoki* from Tamehiko, and that Moriki finished copying it at the beginning of the eighth month. It was quite unusual for the manager of a *han*—albeit a small one of only ten thousand *koku* in income—to undertake something like the copying of *Harima Fudoki*; but Yoshinori's motivation was highly political: so that he could learn the origins of place names within his jurisdiction.

Moriki, well versed as he was in the Chinese classics and himself a poet, publicly disclosed an important document that recorded in detail ancient matters relating to his beloved Harima that did not appear in *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki*. It goes without saying that the many other people involved in the copying would have felt similarly to Moriki.

[Captions to diagrams:]

Stemma of copies of *Harima no Kuni Fudoki* within Harima

Stemma of copies of *Harima no Kuni Fudoki* (excluding Harima)