

Hyōgo Kenritsu Rekishi Hakubutsukan Hyōgo Rekishi Kenkyūshitsu (ed.) *Harima no Kuni Fudoki no Kodai Shi*. Kobe: Kōbe Shimbun Sōgō Shuppan Centre, 2021, pp. 245–249.

The dawn of research into *Harima no Kuni Fudoki*: Oka Hirayasu, priest of Kamo Shrine

Akira KAKIUCHI (trans. Edwina Palmer)

The groundswell of research into *Harima no Kuni Fudoki*

Research into *Harima no Kuni Fudoki* commenced with TANIMORI Yoshiomi's (1852) copy of the Sanjō Nishi manuscript scroll (ur-text), and progressed based on Yoshiomi's *rinmōbon* (exact facsimile, including even worm holes) and his *kyōgōbon* (edited copy based on comparing and contrasting other texts) as sources.

INOUE Michiyasu's¹ (1931) publication of *Harima no Kuni Fudoki Shinkō* (*New Thoughts on Harima no Kuni Fudoki*) (hereafter *Shinkō*) was a groundbreaking work of research into *Harima Fudoki*. We can now safely say that this became a classic of *Harima Fudoki* research, along with SHIKIDA Toshiharu's (1887) publication of *Hyōchū Harima Fudoki* (*Harima Fudoki with commentary and notes*) (completed in 1871; hereafter *Shikichū*), and KURITA Hiroshi's (1899) *Hyōchū Ko Fudoki* (*Harima*) (*Ancient Fudoki with commentary and notes [Harima]*) (completed 1863; hereafter *Kurichū*).

In the interim, in 1921 FUJIMOTO Masaharu published *Harima Fudoki*; in 1926 Inoue published *Harima Fudoki* in *Ko Fudoki Shū* (*Ge*) (*The Collected Ancient Fudoki, Volume 2*); in 1927 MATSUOKA Shizuo² published *Harima Fudoki Monogatari* (*The Harima Fudoki Story*); and in 1933 Fujimoto published *Harima Fudoki Shikō* (*Personal Thoughts on Harima Fudoki*). Inoue and Matsuoka were brothers of YANAGITA Kunio³ and both came from Tsujikawa in Fukusaki-chō, while Fujimoto became mayor of former Awaga *Mura*, Kanzaki-gun (present-day Kamikawa-chō) after the Second World War, so it goes without saying that men of Harima were greatly involved in research into *Harima Fudoki*.

However, there was one in Harima who published a forerunner to *Shikichū* and *Kurichū*. That was OKA Hirayasu, priest of Kamo Shrine in Murotsu, Mitsu-chō, Tatsuno-shi, who published *Fudoki Kō*.

Fudoki Kō and *Harima Fudoki Kō*

Hirayasu copied KŌZUKI Tamehiko's text of *Harima Fudoki* in the tenth month of 1857, and once he had finished writing *Fudoki Kō* (*Thoughts on Fudoki*) in the third month of 1859, he added a supplement later, but this ended up in manuscript draft form only, without being published.

As a result, only two entries for ***Fudoki Kō*** are included in *Kokusho Sō Mokuroku* (*Comprehensive Catalogue of Japanese Literature*):⁴ one is a text in the Historical Sources Editorial Unit, Tōkyo University (hereafter Tōkyo University) and the other is the Mukyūkai Kan Narai Bunkobon text (current whereabouts unknown). But more recently the existence of a copy of *Harima Fudoki Kō* has been verified (deposited in Tatsuno Museum of History and Culture), which was copied from the the Oka family text **and/or?** the Izuta family text that faithfully replicated the Oka family text. Judging by the fact that the Oka family text and the Tokyo

¹ Translator's note: 1867–1941. Ophthalmologist and literary scholar. An elder brother of folklorist YANAGITA Kunio.

² Translator's note: 1878–1936. Naval officer, philologist and ethnologist. A younger brother of folklorist YANAGITA Kunio.

³ Translator's note: Folklorist, 1875–1962. He is credited with founding Folklore Studies in Japan.

⁴ Translator's note: an index of works published in Japan or written in Japanese (excluding Chinese classics, Buddhist scriptures and works from non-Japanese sources) prior to 1867. First published in 1963 by Iwanami Shoten.

University text are both woodblock print versions, it became clear that there are two *stemmata*: the draft manuscript (*sōkō*) *stemma* (i.e., the Oka family text and the the Izuta family text), and the ‘clean copy’ (*seisho*) text (Tokyo University text)—despite the fact that their content is the same. Apart from the Oka family text, these bore the title *Harima Fudoki Kō*.

The great man of *fudoki* research AKIMOTO Kichirō [1910–1960] assessed the ‘clean copy’ *stemma* of *Harima Fudoki Kō* as follows:

It includes theories about the evaluation of the main text, and attempts to explain why no entries were included for Akaho *Kōri*, so it is noteworthy as an early work of research, but while it has detailed accounts of the four coastal *kōri* of Kako, Inami, Shikama and Ihibo (especially the latter two), regrettably there are considerable deficiencies regarding the six inland *kōri*.

It must be said that Akimoto’s observations went no further than evaluating just one aspect of Hirayasu’s work.

Along with Hirayasu copying the Oka family text of *Harima Fudoki* and his production of *Fudoki Kō*, he inserted into *Harima Fudoki Kō* other notes of his that do not appear in *Fudoki Kō*. The Oka family text of *Harima Fudoki* influenced most of the later versions, especially Yoshiomi’s, about whom I shall elaborate later. It is only when we consider both texts (*Fudoki Kō* and *Harima Fudoki Kō*) side by side (see illustration above) that we can appreciate his work a whole.

The works of Oka Hirayasu

While Hirayasu was writing *Fudoki Kō*, he visited the places mentioned in the text, and when that was not possible, he asked local people or asked those who were knowledgeable. For researchers, going out into the field is fundamental, and it was a good research environment for the men of Harima.

As Akimoto points out, *Fudoki Kō* mentions textual differences in the sources, but essentially Oka followed the main existing views about the locations of *sato* and place names. Especially as regards the four coastal *kōri*, he tended to list the villages belonging to the *gō* (townships) and *shō* (manors) of the Edo Period that corresponded with *sato* names in *Harima Fudoki*.

He paid attention to the readings of place names, too. For example, for the reading of Magari *Sato*, Kako *Kōri*, he referred to the example of Ōtomo no Muraji Maguta in the entry for the sixth month of the twelfth year of Emperor Tenmu in *Nihon Shoki*. With regard to the graph 原 in the entry for Murofu, Urakami *Sato*, Ihibo *Kōri*, which Yoshiomi’s *kyōgōbon* text surmised was an *enji* (a superfluous graph inserted by mistake), he drew upon examples such as the *Murofu no Tomari* in MIYOSHI Kiyotsura’s⁵ *Iken Fūji* and *Honchō Goen*; Murofu Ryūketsu Shrine in Yamato Province listed in *Engishiki*;⁶ and examples of this 原 graph being glossed *fu* in some poems of the *Man’yōshū*. He deduced from these that this was not actually a superfluous character inserted by mistake but that it was correct and that the place name should be glossed as Murofu. Likewise, he corrected the *kyōgōbon* text’s *ishi no umi* to *inami* as shown in *Wamyō Ruijushō* (hereafter *Wamyōshō*),⁷ and Koibe as in *Wamyōshō* to Woyake.

Most of Hirayasu’s revisions are still to this day adopted in edited versions.

The significance of Oka Hirayasu’s annotations

As noted above, not being published, *Fudoki Kō* remained in manuscript form from which few copies were made, and we might have expected that it would have escaped the notice of researchers; but such was not the case.

According to the *shikigo* (explanation of the provenance) of *Shikichū*, in 1871 its author Shikida Toshiharu inquired of both Kōzuki Tamehiko, who was the priest at Harima no Kuni Sōja (Itate Hyōzu Shrine in Himeji), and Hirayasu about the locations of place names mentioned in the text, through NISHIMATSU Shigehiko, a samurai of Himeji *han*, who was a student (*monjin*) of his. In

⁵ Translator’s note: Confucian scholar, 847–918 CE.

⁶ Translator’s note:

⁷ Translator’s note: a Japanese dictionary of Chinese characters, dating from 938 CE, compiled by Minamoto no Shigatō (911–983).

the headnotes to *Shikichū*, there are indeed twenty-three places where he attributed information to Hirayasu.

IZUTA Tomimasa was the priest of Yahira Shrine (Tatsuno-shi). He copied *Harima Fudoki Kō*, in which in his entry for Iwa Sato, Shikama Kōri, there is a *fusen* (traditional ‘post-it note’) that says ‘According to Yoshiomi ...’, which is the same as a post-it note insertion and headnote to the same passage in the Tanimori (215) text of *Harima Fudoki*. And in the headnotes and insertions to each of the entries for Magari Sato, Kako Kōri, and Woyake Sato, Ihibo Kōri and Tada Sato, Kamusaki Kōri, in the Tanimori (215) text of *Harima Fudoki*, there is a sentence that is thought to have been misread based on the Oka family text of *Harima Fudoki* (which Izuta copied in 1871). These pointers make it certain that Yoshiomi and Izuta were exchanging views about the Oka family text of *Harima Fudoki*, so Yoshiomi must also have been acquainted with the work of Hirayasu.

Thus, although *Fudoki Kō* ended up not being published, its content and influence were passed on without interruption, and have been incorporated into *fudoki* research right down to the present.