

 PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

東亞圖書館
East Asian Library
and the *Gest Collection*

This title is provided ONLY for personal scholarly use. Any publication, reprint, or reproduction of this material is strictly forbidden, and the researcher assumes all responsibility for conforming with the laws of libel and copyright. Titles should be referred to with the following credit line:

© The East Asian Library and the Gest Collection, Princeton University

To request permission to use some material for scholarly publication, and to apply for higher-quality images, please contact gestcirc@princeton.edu, or

**The East Asian Library and the Gest Collection
33 Frist Campus Center, Room 317
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08544
United States**

A fee may be involved (usually according to the general rules listed on <http://www.princeton.edu/~rbcs/research/rights.html>).

Zhenping Wang, "The Use of Japanese Records in Sung Official Histories: A Textual Study", The East Asian Library Journal 7, no. 1 (1994): 43-71, accessed January 14, 2017, https://library.princeton.edu/eastasian/EALJ/wang_zhenping.EALJ.v07.n01.p043.pdf

The Use of Japanese Records in Sung Official Histories

A Textual Study

ZHENPING WANG

The tenth century saw private Chinese merchants actively trading in Japan, facilitating more frequent and extended contacts between the two countries. This represents a major advance in Sino-Japanese relations and a sharp contrast with the situation during the T'ang dynasty (618–907), when travel abroad required government permission in China, and efforts to reach the Middle Kingdom had to be sponsored by the court in Japan. Over a period of more than 250 years from the seventh to the ninth century, the Japanese court organized only eighteen ambassadorial missions to China, fifteen of which actually reached their destination.

The increased bilateral contacts greatly advanced the understanding of Japan among tenth-century Chinese court officials as well as commoners, especially those in the coastal cities of southeast China. In Northern Sung (960–1127) works, contemporary writers express their appreciation and admiration of the fine quality and design of Japanese handicraft products: Japanese swords;¹ folding fans made with carved frames; and Japanese paper on which landscape, flowers, and occasionally pornography, were painted.² In the Southern Sung (1127–1279), the Chinese

preferred to use expensive Japanese pine, which is said to have been close-grained,³ in building palaces, temples, and coffins.⁴ They also favored Japanese bronze ware,⁵ and the five-colored paper decorated with golden flowers. Sulphur in lumps, screens decorated with Japanese painting, flower-shaped flat boxes inlaid with shell and metal, and cypress-wood fans had become the best-selling Japanese products in Sung China. Some Chinese authors demonstrate in their works an astounding knowledge of the Japanese language,⁶ social customs, and even the intimate details of Japanese private habits: the public bath where Japanese men and women bathed together; the malodorous body of the Japanese female, who tried desperately to deodorize it by fragrant cream; and the outlandish sexual behavior Japanese sailors displayed when calling on Chinese prostitutes in port cities in Fukien.⁷

The enriched knowledge of Japan is equally noticeable in Chinese official historiography if one examines in quantitative and qualitative terms the "Account of the Japanese" (Wo-jen chuan) in three Chinese dynastic histories: the *Old Dynastic History of the T'ang* (*Chiu T'ang shu*), the *New Dynastic History of the T'ang* (*Hsin T'ang shu*), and the *Dynastic History of the Sung* (*Sung shih*).

The "Account of the Japanese" in the *Old Dynastic History of the T'ang* amounts to only 450 Chinese characters. It contains no detailed information on Japanese history, geography, social customs, or relations with China. That this dynastic history of Japan is brief comes as no surprise since it was compiled during the Five Dynasties (907–960), after numerous T'ang archives and imperial collections, indispensable to the compilation of any dynastic history, had been reduced to ashes by warfare in the early tenth century.⁸ The loss was particularly devastating for historians wishing to write about foreign peoples since they themselves usually had no direct contact with foreigners and relied primarily on government records for their information. Such records were gathered through a well-established governmental practice that required local and court officials to interview visiting foreign envoys and visitors, and forward reports to the court.⁹ When the compilation of a dynastic history was officially commissioned, those reports, together with the *Veritable Records* (*shih-lu*) of Chinese emperors in which foreign envoys' visits to

the court were also briefly mentioned, would be made available to the compilers. Unfortunately for the compilers of the *Old Dynastic History of the T'ang*, only a tiny portion of these materials had survived destruction, forcing them to produce a brief and shallow account of Japan and its people.

In contrast, the contents of the "Account of the Japanese" in both the *New Dynastic History of the T'ang* and the *Sung shih* have been substantially expanded, the former amounting to 994 Chinese characters, the latter to 3,098. The expansion allows much more detailed coverage of Japan and its history. The account in the *Sung shih* in particular includes a lengthy and quite accurate genealogy of the Japanese imperial family, indicating that the compilers must have consulted some sort of written Japanese records to improve the accuracy of their descriptions of Japan. Among these written Japanese records, the *Imperial Genealogy* (*Ō nendai ki*), the *Statute on Government Officials* (*Shikiin ryō*),¹⁰ and *Chōnen's Memorial (to the Sung Court)* (*Chōnen hyōkei*) were personally presented to the Sung court by Chōnen (938–1016), a Japanese monk who was on a pilgrimage in China between 983 and 986.

Modern scholars have praised the *Ō nendai ki* as a valuable primary source and meticulously used it to advance our understanding of Japanese imperial genealogy, Japanese society, and Sino-Japanese Buddhist contacts.¹¹ Unfortunately, the *Ō nendai ki* no longer exists as a complete work, but appears only in the form of an excerpt in the *Sung shih*.¹² This immediately raises questions about the authenticity and reliability of the excerpt. Did the compilers of the *Sung shih* avail themselves of the original *Ō nendai ki*? Did they faithfully transcribe it? Where exactly does the excerpt start and end in the *Sung shih*? And who was its author? It is necessary to look into these questions before we accept the excerpt as authentic, reliable source material. And since it appears in the *Sung shih*, it is necessary to scrutinize the compilation process of this dynastic history, and the source materials for its "Account of the Japanese."

The *Sung shih* was completed during the reign of Emperor Shunti (Toghon Temür, r. 1333–1368) of the Yüan dynasty (1271–1368). An edict promulgated in 1343 had officially started the project, and T'o-t'o (1314–1355) had been appointed its supervisor.¹³ Within three years, in

the tenth month of 1345, a vast work of 496 *chüan*, at that point the most voluminous dynastic history, was presented to the throne.¹⁴ The speedy completion of the work does not, however, imply that its quality was compromised, for the *Sung shih* was not the first history of the Sung to be compiled. Well before the Mongols conquered the Sung, Sung historians had already produced “national histories” (*kuo-shih*) that covered the reigns of thirteen emperors.¹⁵ Amounting to some one thousand *chüan*, these national histories were based on such minute and generally accurate court documents as the *Records of Current Government* (*shih-cheng chi*), the *Court Diaries* (*ch’i-chü chu*), the *Calendar* (*jih-li*), and the *Veritable Records of Successive Reigns*.¹⁶

It is fortunate that during the chaotic Sung-Yüan transition these valuable historical works were spared the destruction that often accompanied dynastic change in China. In the spring of 1276, after Lin-an (modern Hangchow), the capital of the Southern Sung dynasty, fell into Mongol hands, Tung Wen-ping (1217–1278), a high-ranking Chinese official of the Mongol court, arrived to supervise the sealing up of the Sung imperial storage houses and the expropriation of Sung sacrificial vessels, musical instruments, and books. A man of political vision with a strong sense of history, Tung regarded the Sung cultural objects as political assets for the Mongols, useful to the Mongol court’s efforts to establish Chinese-style institutions to govern its Chinese subjects. He is reported to have said:

A nation can be eliminated, but its history should not be obliterated. The Sung dynasty had sixteen emperors and had ruled China for more than 300 years. It is therefore appropriate to preserve all the records written by Sung historians which are now housed in the Institute of Historiography (shih-kuan), and to collect ritual vessels and musical instruments to be used in ceremonies [at the Mongol court].

Thanks to Tung’s farsightedness, more than five thousand *chüan* of Sung historical works were preserved intact and later transported to the Yüan capital.¹⁷

These Sung works provided a solid basis for the Yüan historians’ compilation of a Sung dynastic history. The project was first commis-

sioned by Emperor Shih-tsu (r. 1271-1294). Imperial edicts appointed officials to preside over the project, and instructed provincial officials to encourage commoners to present Liao (916-1125), Chin (1115-1234), and Sung books in their possession to local governments, to reward them with cash, and to transport the collected books to the capital for use by official compilers.¹⁸ Although the compilation proceeded smoothly, the final completion and presentation of the work to the throne were delayed by disputes among high-ranking Yüan officials, who disagreed with each other over the appropriate contents and style for a Sung dynastic history.¹⁹ The preservation of Sung historical works, the preparation by earlier Yüan historians, and the draft of a Sung dynastic history compiled in the early years of the Yüan made it possible for T'o-t'o and his subordinates to produce a quality work in less than three years. In most cases, they simply reclassified or rearranged accounts in the Sung national histories, and copied them into their own work. In only a few cases, as when the fast crumbling Southern Sung empire had left no official history for its last three rulers, the Emperors Kung-tsung (r. 1275-1276), Tuan-tsung (r. 1276-1278), and Ti Ping (r. 1278-1279), did the Yüan compilers exert themselves to produce completely new accounts.²⁰ The *Sung shih* is a high-quality work of scholarship based on solid and reliable Sung national histories and other Sung official documents.

Of the thirteen Sung so-called national histories of separate reigns, the one compiled for Emperor T'ai-tsung's reign deserves special attention. When compiling this particular national history, Sung historians were granted access to the three Japanese works that Chōnen had presented to the court. They consulted and incorporated accounts from these works in the *National History of Emperor T'ai-tsung's Reign*, which was to become one of the major source materials for the *Sung shih* in whose "Account of the Japanese" the excerpt from the *Ō nendai ki* appears. An examination of the compilation process of this national history therefore provides further information useful in evaluating the authenticity and reliability of the excerpt from the *Ō nendai ki*.

In a preparatory step, Ch'ien Jo-shui (960-1003) and Yang I (974-1020) were commissioned by Emperor Chen-tsung in 998 to produce a *Veritable Record* for Emperor T'ai-tsung's reign. They took only nine months to

complete this work, which amounted to eighty *chüan*, fifty of which were single-handedly written by Yang I himself.²¹ Systematic compilation of the *National History of Emperor T'ai-tsung's Reign* did not start until the second month of 1006, when Chu I and Chang Fu were instructed to arrange in chronological order events recorded in the *Court Calendar*, the *Records of Current Government*, the *Court Diaries*, and the *Veritable Records* for Emperors T'ai-tsu and T'ai-tsung. Wang Ch'in-jo (962-1025) was appointed editor-in-chief.²² An imperial edict also ordered the Bureau of Military Affairs (*shu-mi yüan*) and the Finance Commission (San-ssu) to select and transfer their documents to the court for use by the compilers.²³ Compilation officially started in the eighth month of 1007 under the supervision of Wang Tan (957-1017), with Wang Ch'in-jo, Ch'en Yao-sou (961-1017), Chao An-jen (958-1018), Ch'ao Chiung (951-1034), and Yang I being the major participants. Emperor Chen-tsung displayed great interest in the project. When the draft of the first *chüan* of the *Annals for Emperors* (*pen-chi*) was completed, he carefully reviewed it and pointed out errors to be corrected and places where revisions were needed. It soon became routine for the compilers to present the draft for each *chüan* to the throne for final approval. Almost nine years had passed when the work was completed in the second month of 1016. It consisted of 120 *chüan*, 9 of which were devoted to the "barbarian" peoples, including the Japanese.²⁴

Yang I is a noteworthy person among the major compilers of the *National History of Emperor T'ai-tsung's Reign*. A "presented scholar" (*chin-shih*), Yang I is said to have composed his first piece of prose when he was only seven years old. At eleven, his unbelievable literary talent caught the attention of Emperor T'ai-tsung, who instructed Chang Ch'ü-hua, fiscal commissioner in Chiang-nan, to hold an examination specifically for Yang I. Soon after the examination, Yang I was on his way to the capital for service at court. He was only twenty-five years old when he finished his own fifty-six *chüan* of the eighty-*chüan* *Veritable Records of Emperor T'ai-tsung*.²⁵ It was "when serving in the Institute of Historiography that I [Yang I] read the books from the imperial collection. Among them there are the *Jih-pen nien-dai chi* (Japanese: *Nihon nendai ki*) and the *Tiao-*

jan piao-ch'i (Japanese: *Chōnen hyōkei*), each in one volume. [These works] enabled me to write the history of Japan in considerable detail."²⁶

Yang I's account confirms that the *Imperial Genealogy* and *Chōnen's Memorial (to the Sung Court)* formed the documentary basis for his account of Japan in the *National History of Emperor T'ai-tsung's Reign*. To gather information about Japan, in 1006 Yang I also interviewed a Japanese monk Jakushō (?-1034) when he was working at the Memorial-Forwarding Office (Yin-t'ai t'ung-chin ssu), a government branch under the Chancellery. The two, neither able to speak the other's language, communicated in written Chinese.²⁷ This was perhaps the first time that any Chinese historian had used written Japanese records when compiling a national history. And this was indeed a milestone in Chinese official historiography. It symbolized a stride toward greater accuracy in the descriptions of Japan and its people in Chinese official history.²⁸ There should be little doubt about the credibility of the excerpt from the *Imperial Genealogy* in the *Sung shih* since this is essentially a transcription from the *National History of Emperor T'ai-tsung's Reign*, whose reliability has survived the thorough scrutiny of modern scholars.

This argument, however, should not obscure the textual problems present in the excerpt, problems of the sort that usually arise when accounts in one work have been selected, edited, and incorporated in another work. Even a careful transcription is sometimes not totally free from unintended miscopying, not to mention the fact that the original text is often subjected to deliberate omissions and abridgments. All of these tend to distort accounts in the original work when they appear in the form of quotations in another work.

The first of such textual problems concerns the original Japanese title for the *Imperial Genealogy*, which differs in Chinese and Japanese primary sources. In both the *Huang-ch'ao lei-yüan* and the *San tendai godaisan ki* the work in question is referred to as *Nendai ki* and *Nihon nendai ki* (in one *chüan*),²⁹ but in the *Sung shih* it is referred to as *Nendai ki* and *Ō nendai ki*.³⁰ These different titles suggest that the *Nendai ki* is an abbreviated title for either *Nihon nendai ki* or *Ō nendai ki*.³¹ But the full title for this work might have been *Nihon ō nendai ki*. One need only

examine the titles for the “six Japanese national histories” (*Rikkoku shi*)³² to realize that using the term “Nihon” (Japan), or “Dai Nihon” (Great Japan) as part of a book title was a common practice for Japanese writers if their work concerned the Japanese monarchy.³³

The second question concerns the scope of the *Nihon ō nendai ki*'s coverage. The term *ki* seems to suggest that this work is a simple chronicle, similar to the Chinese “basic annals” (*pen-chi*), a genre employed in Chinese dynastic history to document the important activities of Chinese emperors. In Japan, this genre was adopted as early as Emperor Temmu's reign (673–686).³⁴ One example is the compilation of the *Chronicle of the Emperors* (*teiki*). The *teiki*, together with the *Ancient Words* (*kyūji*), laid the documentary foundation for the first comprehensive Japanese history, the *Records of Ancient Matters* (*Kojiki*). A well-received modern interpretation suggests that the Japanese *ki* in general, and the *Chronicle of Emperors* in particular, contain information on the names of successive Japanese rulers; the imperial genealogy; the names of the rulers' spouses, consorts, and children; the locations of the imperial palaces; important domestic events that occurred during a ruler's reign; their ages, number of years on the throne, and the locations of their tombs.³⁵

It is perhaps because they endorse this interpretation that some modern scholars have suggested that the excerpt from the *Nihon ō nendai ki* in the *Sung shih* begins at “Accounts in his *Nendai ki* say (*ch'i Nien-tai chi so-chi yün*)” and ends with “All the preceding is said to have been taken from the written account of Chōnen (*chieh Tiao-jan so-chi yün*),”³⁶ a passage that contains 1,205 Chinese characters (see appendix one below). This excerpt describes the succession to the throne, the imperial genealogy, Buddhist contacts with China, the administrative establishment, and the jurisdiction of the court. Reading carefully the excerpt from the *Nihon ō nendai ki*, however, one can't help but notice that accounts of Sino-Japanese relations, indexed by Arabic numerals [2] to [12] in appendix one, from time to time interrupt the otherwise smooth flow of the description of Japanese imperial genealogy. These peculiar components do not fit well with the style of the traditional Japanese chronicle, which usually focuses on the Japanese throne. It is well known that authors of those chronicles are arbitrary in handling Chinese records concerning

ancient Japan. They either turn a blind eye to events relating to bilateral relations or accord them only brief treatment.³⁷ It is therefore highly unlikely that in the original *Nihon ō nendai ki* accounts of Sino-Japanese relations and Buddhist contacts would appear eleven times. The frequent appearance of these accounts casts serious doubt on the assertion that all the 1,205 characters are directly and integrally quoted from the original *Nihon ō nendai ki*. Internal evidence suggests that the “excerpt” is probably a conflation of passages transcribed from the *Nihon ō nendai ki* and *Chōnen’s Memorial (to the Sung Court)*. It is the final product of an editorial procedure during which compilers of the *Sung shih* edited and rearranged some of the accounts in the two works, and then incorporated them into their own work to create a comprehensive history of Japan.

Indicative of such a possibility is the appearance of thirteen sentences, indexed by upper-case letters [A] to [M], which contain the name of a Chinese dynasty, the title of a Chinese reign, or an exact year in a Chinese reign period. The sentences were used to relate a specific year during a Japanese reign period to a corresponding year in Chinese history, thus further defining the time an event happened. In the excerpt from the *Nihon ō nendai ki*, an account of an event in Sino-Japanese relations usually follows the title of a Japanese emperor, serving as an indication of when the event occurred. Occasionally, this time indicator includes such specific elements as a Japanese reign title or an exact year of a reign period, or both. But this Japanese-style time indicator is sometimes supplemented by one of the thirteen sentences in question, which either immediately follows the title of a Japanese emperor or appears after the account of an event. One example reads: “This year corresponds to the first year of the Ch’eng-sheng era (552) in the Liang dynasty of this land.” The use of the phrase “this land” (*tz’u-t’u*) is particularly worth noting. The phrase undoubtedly refers to China, because the Liang (502–557) was a Chinese dynasty. The phrase, indexed by lower-case letters [a] to [e], appears five times in the excerpt from the *Nihon ō nendai ki*, and should have put modern scholars on guard. The use of “this land” and of the explanatory sentences in question implies that the author was writing from a Chinese point of view, trying to explain in Chinese terms a period in Japanese history. This immediately suggests

that the thirteen sentences are unlikely to have been part of the original *Nihon ō nendai ki*. Not only are they discordant with the style of Japanese chronicles, they are unnecessary, and indeed it would have been odd for a Japanese author to explain Japanese reign periods in Chinese terms if his work was intended for his own people. Since anybody, Chinese or Japanese, could have used the phrase "this land" to refer to China as long as he was in China at the time, it is either Chōnen who coined and used the phrase in his memorial to the Sung court, or the compilers of the *Sung shih* who employed the phrase and the explanatory sentences to make their account of Japan more comprehensible to Chinese readers. In either case, it seems likely that the eleven specific accounts of Sino-Japanese contacts are also not from the original *Nihon ō nendai ki*, but were derived from *Chōnen's Memorial (to the Sung Court)*.

Yang I is perhaps the person who created this conflation in the first place. To prepare an account of Japan for the *National History of Emperor T'ai-tsung's Reign*, he seems to have attached events in Japan reported in Chōnen's memorial to the corresponding Japanese reign periods in the *Nihon ō nendai ki*. An assortment of information about Japan was thus created, which is similar in style to the Chinese "basic annals." This preliminary account of Japan was further edited when it was incorporated into the *National History of Emperor T'ai-tsung's Reign* and when the history itself underwent revision and recompilation throughout the Sung.³⁸ It assumed its present form as an excerpt from the *Nihon ō nendai ki* when the *Sung shih* was completed in early Yüan times.

Yang I is not the only Northern Sung historian to have employed this method when assembling an account of ancient Japan. Some fifty years after the compilation of the *National History of Emperor T'ai-tsung's Reign*, Ou-yang Hsiu (1007-1072) and Sung Ch'i (998-1061), two of Yang's younger contemporaries, used the same method to prepare the "Account of the Japanese" in the *New History of the T'ang*, which was completed in 1060. In this substantial 994-character coverage of Japan, the Japanese imperial lineage down to the fifty-eighth Tennō, Emperor Kōkō (r. 884-887), also appears. Moreover, individual events in Sino-Japanese relations are attached, in the same manner as they are in the *Sung shih*, to the Japanese reign period during which they occurred. This could

hardly be a coincidence. Ou-yang Hsiu and Sung Ch'i must also have had access to Japanese materials in the government archives. And the striking similarities between these two works further suggest that they were probably based on the same sources: the *Nihon ō nendai ki* and *Chōnen's Memorial (to the Sung Court)*. There are, however, two major discrepancies between them. Whereas records of Japanese monks' visits to China appear eleven times in the "Account of the Japanese" in the *Sung shih*, its counterpart in the *New History of the T'ang* contains only one brief statement about these events.³⁹ More important, a different phrase "*chih . . . nien*" (this corresponds to the year of) has replaced "*tz'u-t'u*" (this land) as the time indicator.⁴⁰ The absence of the eleven records concerning Sino-Japanese Buddhist contacts,⁴¹ and the use of a different phrase as the time indicator in the "Account of the Japanese" of the *New History of the T'ang* provide additional evidence for the argument that the records in question and the phrase "this land" may have been quotations from the *Chōnen hyōkei*.

The *Chōnen hyōkei* is a collection of Chōnen's written answers to questions posed him by the Sung court during his audiences with Emperor T'ai-tsung. In the Chinese sources it is referred to as his "memorial."⁴² The sentence "When asked about his country, he [Chōnen] would only reply in writing" introduces this memorial to readers. The excerpt starts at "In my country there are five canons and Buddhist sutras" (*kuo-chung yu wu-ching chi fo-ching*) and ends with "Officials and officers, both civil and military, all hold hereditary positions" (*wen-wu liao-li chieh shih-kuan*), a passage totaling 128 characters (see appendix one below).⁴³ The first impression one gets from reading the excerpt is that the questions asked of Chōnen had nothing to do with Sino-Japanese Buddhist contacts, and that they are narrowly focused on Japanese "social customs" (*feng-t'u*). But the *Honchō kōsō den*, an eighteenth-century Japanese work, suggests that Emperor T'ai-tsung did ask Chōnen about the Japanese imperial genealogy as well as the spread of Buddhism from China to Japan.⁴⁴ Furthermore, the *San tendai godaisan ki*, the diary of Jōjin (1011-1081),⁴⁵ a Japanese monk who traveled to China in 1072 and was received by Emperor Shen-tsung (r. 1068-1085), shows that the Sung emperor raised as many as seventeen questions with his Japanese visitor, which touch on

a wide range of social, economic, and political issues in Japan. The questions dealt with:

1. social customs in Japan (*Jih-pen feng-su*);
2. the scale of the metropolitan areas (*ching-nei li-shu to-shao*);
3. the number of residential buildings in the metropolitan areas (*ching-nei jen-wu shu to-shao*);
4. the population of the country (*jen-hu to-shao*);
5. the territorial boundaries of the country (*pen-kuo ssu-chih pei-chieh*);
6. the number of prefectures and counties (*kuo tu-i to-shao*);
7. the rulers' titles (*pen-kuo wang shen-hu*);
8. the family names of subjects and commoners (*yu pai-hsing hao*);
9. the reasons Japan, which was adjacent to Ming-chou, had not initiated any official contact with China (*pen-kuo hsiang-ch'ü Ming-chou chih-chin yin-ho pu-t'ung Chung-kuo*);
10. the titles for high-ranking officials (*pen-kuo kuei-kuan yu shih-ho ming-mu*);
11. the imperial genealogy (*pen-kuo shih-hsi*);
12. whether the weather in Japan was similar to that in China (*pen-kuo ssu-shih han-shu yü Chung-kuo t'ung pu t'ung*);
13. which Japanese prefecture one would arrive in first if one traveled from Ming-chou to Japan, and how far this prefecture was from the capital (*tzu Ming-chou chih Jih-pen-kuo hsien-tao ho chou-chün? Ch'ü kuo-wang so-tu chin-yüan*);
14. the kinds of Chinese goods needed in Japan (*pen-kuo yao-yung Han-ti shih-ho wu-huo*);
15. the kinds of animals found in Japan (*pen-kuo yu shih-ho ch'in-shou*);
16. the family name of the Japanese ruler (*pen-kuo wang hsing-shih*);
17. the distance between Japan and the country of hairy men (the Ainu) (*pen-kuo ch'ü Mao-kuo chin-yüan*).⁴⁶

Similar questions might have also been asked of Chōnen since it was routine for the court to collect as much information as possible through interviews with foreign envoys and guests. And the questions might have been customary ones. With the help of those seventeen questions, plus

the two recorded in the *Honchō kōsō den*, we can determine more precisely which account in the alleged excerpt from the *Nihon ō nendai ki* is in fact Chōnen's written answer to a question asked him by the Sung court.⁴⁷ Circumstantial evidence in support of the argument that some passages in the *Nihon ō nendai ki* are probably in Chōnen's own words is also found in the *General History of Buddha and His Patriarchs (Fo-tsu t'ung-chi)*, a work compiled in 1269 by Chih-p'an (1220-1275). He attributed twenty-seven sentences to Chōnen, all of which follow the phrase "Chōnen said" (*Jan yen*), and these sentences are almost word for word the same as some of the sentences in the alleged excerpt from the *Nihon ō nendai ki*.⁴⁸ Another piece of circumstantial evidence is the last sentence in the quotation "All the preceding is said to have been taken from the written account of Chōnen." This sentence seems to have escaped the attention of modern scholars who take it for granted that "the written account of Chōnen" refers to the *Nihon ō nendai ki* and that Chōnen is the author. What they have failed to notice is that the paragraph that immediately precedes the sentence in question describes the administrative scope of the Japanese court and the number of taxable inhabitants in Japan. These are not the essential elements of a traditional Japanese genealogy. The "written account of Chōnen" therefore may not refer to the *Nihon ō nendai ki*, and the information in this last paragraph may have been taken from Chōnen's memorial.

The reason modern scholars have so far made no attempt to differentiate the *Nihon ō nendai ki* from *Chōnen's Memorial (to the Sung Court)* is because they assume that Chōnen is the author of both works.⁴⁹ This is an unwarranted assumption, which has hindered further textual study of these two important Japanese works. Except for the diary that he kept while in China and a few poems,⁵⁰ Chōnen did not bring out any major works during his lifetime. No primary Japanese sources have ever hinted that he was involved, or even interested, in compiling a genealogy of the Japanese imperial house. The lack of documentary evidence makes it impossible to determine the authorship of the *Nihon ō nendai ki*. But it seems safe to suggest that the *Nihon ō nendai ki*, just like the *Statute on Government Officials*, was an official work by Japanese court historians. The Japanese court probably granted these two works to Chōnen at his

request, so that Chōnen could use them to explain to Emperor T'ai-tsung the Japanese imperial lineage and the administrative system in Japan.

As the unrehearsed and straightforward answers to questions posed to him by Sung officials during solemn court audiences, Chōnen's memorial has preserved some interesting and valuable details about Sino-Japanese relations that do not appear in any other Japanese or Chinese primary sources. These details enable us to evaluate the credibility of certain related Chinese records and to depict more vividly particular events. Here are three examples:

It is well known that Prince Shōtoku (574–622) dispatched Ono no Imoko to Sui China in 607.⁵¹ The aim of Imoko's mission, however, is not specified in the *Nihon shoki*. Modern scholars have argued that the revitalization of Buddhism in China was the major impetus for the Yamato rulers to send this mission: they hoped that Buddhism would help bolster their political status and strengthen their control in Japan. Quite convincing when examined in the general historical context, this argument is nevertheless based on a single record in the *Dynastic History of the Sui* (*Sui shu*).⁵² Chōnen's memorial offers supporting Japanese evidence. It clearly spells out that Imoko was sent to obtain, among other things, the *Lotus Sutra* (*Hokke kyō*) from Sui China.⁵³

Another example is the dispatch of Awada no Mahito (?–719), the seventh Japanese envoy to China, in 702.⁵⁴ In the *Chronicle of Japan Continued* (*Shoku Nihongi*), there is again no further explanation of the task assigned to Mahito, except for a brief mention of his departure to the Middle Kingdom. Thanks to Chōnen's memorial, it is now clear that Mahito was sent on a "shopping spree" to obtain books in China (*ju-T'ang ch'iu shu-chi*).⁵⁵ This Japanese account also independently confirms the credibility of two relevant T'ang records that Mahito "used all the rewards granted to him [by the Chinese court] to purchase books" (*so-te tz'u-lai, chin-shih wen-chi, fan-hai erh-kuei. Hsi shang-wu mao-shu i-kuei*).⁵⁶

Chōnen's memorial also sheds light on the introduction into Japan of the *Golden Light Sutra of the Most Victorious Kings* (*Konkōmyō saishō kyō*), which the eighth-century Japanese emperors enthusiastically promoted for its magic power of protecting the state and the people. In 741 when Emperor Shōmu ordered the establishment of provincial monaster-

ies and nunneries all over Japan, many of them were named the "Temple of Golden Light Four Deva Kings" (Konkōmyō Shitennō no ji).⁵⁷ No doubt an important event in Japanese political and religious history, the introduction of this Buddhist sutra to Japan is mentioned only in Chōnen's memorial, which points out that the sutra was brought back to Japan by Dōji (?-744), a Japanese monk who accompanied Mahito to China.⁵⁸

Valuable as they are, accounts in Chōnen's memorial should nevertheless be treated with caution. These accounts are based primarily on Chōnen's memory, and not all of them are accurate. Chih-p'an was the first to detect such inaccuracies. In an annotation to the *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi*, he pointed to a mistaken statement that Kūkai (774-835), the famed Japanese Buddhist master, came to China during the Yüan-ho period (806-820) and studied the T'ien-t'ai (Japanese: Tendai) Buddhist teachings, and that Kūkai and Saichō "took back to Japan the *Chih-kuan i* of Chih Che [i.e., Chih I]."⁵⁹ It is common knowledge that Kūkai studied the esoteric teachings while in China and later became the founder of the "True Word" Buddhist school (Shingon shū) in Japan. And he played no part in introducing the *Chih-kuan i*, a major work of T'ien-t'ai teachings, to Japan.

Traditional Japanese scholars were also aware of the inaccuracies in Chōnen's memorial. In his remark on Chōnen's pilgrimage to China, Sesson Yūbai (1290-1346) implied that Chōnen had exaggerated: "In ancient times when Chōnen visited China, he bragged about the history of Japan to Emperor T'ai-tsung" (*tsai-hsi Tiao-jan ju-Hua hsi tui T'ai-tsung k'ua-ku hsi*).⁶⁰ Modern scholars have singled out one such exaggeration: "In Japan domestic animals are buffalo, mules, and sheep. Rhinoceroses and elephants are numerous."⁶¹ Chōnen's statement is in fact based on Indian folktales, which were introduced to Japan along with Buddhism. Strange animals, such as rhinoceroses and Indian birds, are important subjects in this folklore, which was widely circulated among the Japanese during the late Heian period.⁶² Meticulous modern Japanese scholarship has also demonstrated that a discrepancy exists between the number of provinces in the Tosandō and Saikaidō prefectures recorded in Chōnen's memorial and in the *Ordinances of the Engi Period* (*Engi shiki*), the former work listing over twenty provinces more than the latter.⁶³ Moreover,

Chōnen's memorial totally ignores the Southern Islands in modern Okinawa: Tanejima, Yakushima, Amami, Tokushima,⁶⁴ Shiga, and Kumi,⁶⁵ whose rulers had pledged their loyalty to the Japanese court during the late seventh and early eighth centuries, and which the Japanese court had since then considered territories under Japanese jurisdiction.⁶⁶

Although the original, unabridged *Nihon ō nendai ki* has long been lost, it is possible to reconstruct part of this important Japanese work after elements from Chōnen's memorial have been removed from the 1,205-character excerpt from the *Nihon ō nendai ki* preserved in the *Sung shih*. The *Nihon ō nendai ki* should start at "The first ruler was called Amenominakanushi" and end with "and then Morihira Tennō, who is the present sovereign, now reigning as the sixty-fourth in line." A reconstructed text is shown in appendix two below.

The reconstructed text reveals some major characteristics of the *Nihon ō nendai ki* as a genre of historical writing. It deals almost exclusively with Japanese imperial genealogy: the successive emperors and empresses, their titles, their children who succeeded to the throne, the year of their enthronement, and the location of the palace. Its contents suggest that the *Nihon ō nendai ki* is analogous to a Japanese imperial genealogy, and therefore an appropriate English title for this work would be *The Japanese Imperial Genealogy*, not *The Japanese Imperial Chronology*. On the other hand, ancient Japanese historians also saw such "genealogy" as a historical expression in its own right. They believed that the source and the legitimacy of the power held by any reigning Tennō ultimately came from being a member of the imperial house,⁶⁷ and therefore had always been preoccupied with the imperial lineage, making the affirmation of the uniqueness of Japan's line of priestly rulers the primary purpose of their writings. Historical writings in this particular genre are commonly referred to as the *kōdai ki*. They must have existed long before Chōnen presented the *Nihon ō nendai ki* to the Sung court. But the primitive form and the brief contents of the *kōdai ki* writings as revealed in the reconstructed text did not remain unchanged. Over time the coverage of these writings seems to have been gradually broadened. The thirteenth-century *kōdai ki* writings give more detail on the imperial house, listing not only

the names of a Tennō's parents, the number of years of his or her reign, and the location of the tomb where a deceased Tennō was buried, but also the names of the regents.⁶⁸ Important political events have been incorporated in these works as well, indicating that the *kōdai ki* genre had evolved from being primarily an imperial genealogical record to a chronicle that focused on the Tennō, the central court, and events that happened in the capital.⁶⁹ In particular, the thirteenth-century Japanese monks made major contributions to enriching the contents of the *kōdai ki* writings. They "arranged the imperial chronicles of successive emperors in order, and attached to them the old records of [Japanese] Buddhism [in the past] one thousand years."⁷⁰ Some of the imperial genealogical records were still available to contemporary historians. When Kitabatake Chikafusa (1293–1354) was writing his *A Chronicle of Gods and Sovereigns* (*Jinnō shōtōki*), he "looked for a most concise *kōdai ki*" and used it as the framework for his own book.⁷¹ This "most concise *kōdai ki*" must refer to an early form of Japanese imperial genealogy, and the *Nihon ō nendai ki* Chōnen brought to China is similar to such a work.

The *kōdai ki* genre probably experienced a three-stage evolution: in its formative stage, the *kōdai ki* writings (i.e., the "most concise" ones) were basically imperial genealogical records; they then evolved into the more elaborate imperial chronologies; in the fourteenth century they developed into "full-fledged" chronicles, which contain not only detailed information on the imperial genealogy and important political events in the capital, but also accounts of Sino-Japanese Buddhist contacts. Modern scholars who suggest that the accounts of Sino-Japanese Buddhist contacts are part of the original *Nihon ō nendai ki* have apparently read back the features of the more sophisticated thirteenth-century *kōdai ki* writings into the primitive tenth-century *Nihon ō nendai ki*. This is not only premature, but, indeed, groundless.⁷²

NOTES

The author wants to express his gratitude to Professors Denis C. Twitchett and Martin Collcutt of Princeton University for their unfailing guidance and assistance.

1. Ou-yang Hsiu, *Ou-yang wen-chung kung chi* (SPTK edn.), 54, pp. 7a-b; Su Ch'e, *Luan-ch'eng chi* (Shanghai: Ku-chi ch'u-pan-she, 1987), 13, p. 321; Mei Yao-ch'en, *Wan-ling chi* (SPTK edn.), 55, pp. 11b-12a; Ssu-ma Kuang, *Wen-kuo wen-cheng Ssu-ma kung wen-chi* (SPTK edn.), 3, p. 16a.
2. Chiang Shao-yü, *Huang-ch'ao [shih-shih] lei-yüan* (Sung-fen-shih ts'ung-k'an edn. of twelfth-century work; rpt. Kyoto: Chübun shuppansha, 1981), 60, pp. 11a-b; Chou Mi, *Kuei-hsin tsa-chih (hsü-chi)* (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1988), b, pp. 176-177; Teng Ch'un, *Hua-chi* (preface dated 1176; Shanghai: Po-ku chai, 1922), 10, pp. 5b-6a.
3. Lo Chün, "Pao-ch'ing Ssu-ming chih," in *Sung-Yüan ti-fang-chih ts'ung-shu* (Taipei: Chung-kuo ti-chih yen-chiu-hui, 1978), 6, p. 8.
4. One of the palaces, the Ts'ui-han Hall, in the Southern Sung capital was built of Japanese pine. See Chou Mi, *Wu-lin chiu-shih (Chih-pu-tsu chai ts'ung-shu edn., 1793)*, 4, p. 2; *Kuei-hsin tsa-chih (hsü-chi)*, b, p. 176; Li Hsin-ch'uan, *Chien-yen i-lai ch'ao-yeh tsa-chi* (Shih-yüan ts'ung-shu edn., 1913), 1, p. 5a; T'ao Tsung-i, *Nan-ts'un ch'o-keng lu* (SPTK edn.), 18, p. 13b. For information on temples, see Lou Yüeh, "Ch'ien-fo ko chi," in *T'ien-t'ung ssu chih* (Pi-chi wu-pien edn. Taipei: Kuang-wen shu-chü, 1976), 2, pp. 6b-8b; 3, p. 22a. Also found in Lou's *Kung-k'uei chi* (SPTK edn.), 57, pp. 51 ff. For coffins, see Lu Yu, *Fang-weng chia-hsün (Chih-pu-tsu chai ts'ung-shu edn.)*, p. 5.
5. Lo Chün, *Pao-ch'ing Ssu-ming chih* (ca. 1227), 6, p. 7.
6. Lo Ta-ching, *Ho-lin yü-lu (ping-pien)* (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1983), 4, pp. 304-305. The author carefully recorded the pronunciations and meanings of certain Japanese words.
7. Chou Mi, *Kuei-hsin tsa-chih (hsü-chi)*, b, p. 176. For an interesting discussion, see Mori Katsumi, "Nissō kōshō to sōnin no Nihon fūsō e no kanshin," in his *Nissō bunka kōryū no shomondai* (Tokyo: Kokusho kankō kai, 1975), pp. 149-158. For a general discussion of the advancement in mutual understanding between China and Japan during the Sung, see Mori Katsumi, "Nissō kōtsū to Nissō sōgō ninshiki no hadden," in his *Nissō bunka kōryū no shomondai*, pp. 27-74. See also Miura Keiichi, "Nissō kōshō no rekishiteki igi," in Kobata Atsushi kyōjū taikan kinen gigyōkai, eds., *Kobata Atsushi kyōjū taikan kinen kokushi ronshū* (Kyoto: Naigai insatsu kabushiki kaisha, 1970), p. 327.
8. Liu Hsü, *Chiu T'ang-shu* (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1975; hereafter referred to as *CTS*) 46, p. 1962; 149, p. 4008; Wang P'u, *Wu-tai hui-yao* (Kuo-hsüeh chi-pen ts'ung-shu edn. Shanghai: Shang-wu yin-shu-kuan, 1937), 18, p. 228. For a detailed discussion of the compilation of the *Old Dynastic History of the T'ang*, see D. C. Twitchett, "The *Chiu T'ang shu*," in his *The Writing of Official History under the T'ang* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 191-236. See also Ch'en Kao-hua, *Chung-kuo ku-tai-shih shih-liao hsüeh* (Peking: Pei-ching ch'u-pan-she, 1983), pp. 187-192.
9. For example, when Ennin, a Japanese monk, was visiting T'ang China, he recorded in his diary that the magistrate and an administrative officer asked him and his party

- about customs in Japan. See his *Nittō guhō junrei kōki* (Taipei: Wen-hai ch'u-pan-she, 1971), 2, p. 48. A detailed description of this information-gathering procedure can be found in my "Sino-Japanese Relations before the Eleventh Century" (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1989), pp. 48-88. These reports might have formed the documentary basis for three lost T'ang works, Kao Shao-i, *Ssu-i ch'ao-kung lu*, in ten *chüan*; Lü Shu, *T'ang Hsia-chia-ssu ch'ao-kung t'u-chuan*; and Li Te-yü, *T'ang i-yü kuei-chung chuan*, in two *chüan*. A work compiled during the Hui-ch'ang period (841-886), the *Ssu-i ch'ao-kung lu* contained information on more than two hundred countries. It was originally in twenty *chüan* and was later reduced to ten. See Ma Tuan-lin, *Wen-hsien t'ung-k'ao* (Shih-t'ung edn. rpt. Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1986), 196, p. 1653; Ch'en Chen-sun, *Chih-chai shu-lu chieh-t'i* (Shanghai: Shang-hai ku-chi ch'u-pan-she, 1987), 5, p. 147; Wang Ying-lin, *Yü-hai* (Taipei: Hua-wen shu-chü, 1967), 58, p. 26b. The *T'ang Hsia-chia-ssu ch'ao-kung t'u-chuan* seems also to have been completed during the Hui-ch'ang period. It is said that Lü Shu, the author, personally brought the draft of the work to the foreign guesthouse where the Kirghiz envoy stayed. The two reviewed the draft together to make sure that transliterations for Kirghiz words were correct and the descriptions of mountains and rivers in the country were accurate. See Li Te-yü, *Li Wei-kung wen-chi* (SPTK edn.), 2, pp. 9a-b; Wang Ying-lin, *Yü-hai*, 58, p. 15a. The third work, *T'ang i-yü kuei-chung chuan*, contains biographies of thirty foreigners, ranging from those in the Ch'in down to the T'ang, who had pledged allegiance to the Chinese court, remained loyal to Chinese emperors, and personally contributed to the Chinese cause. See Wang Ying-lin, *Yü-hai*, 58, p. 15b; Ch'en Chen-sun, *Chih-chai shu-lu chieh-t'i*, 7, p. 198. Information about foreign peoples was collected by Chinese envoys sent abroad and military commanders on expeditions. Their reports provided materials for such works as P'ei Su, *T'ang p'ing-jung chi* in five *chüan* and Lu Chih, *T'ang ch'ien-shih lu* in one *chüan*. For bibliographical information about these two works, see Wang Ying-lin, *Yü-hai*, 57, p. 39b and 58, p. 25a, respectively. Wei Hung-chi, a T'ang envoy to the Western Turks, was determined to bring information on the host country back to the T'ang court. When his return to China was postponed for three years because of a rebellion in the Western Region that made the journey back to Ch'ang-an unsafe, he is said to have torn apart his own clothes and used them as paper to draft a book entitled *Hsi-cheng chi*, in which he described the customs and products of the Western Turks. When he eventually came back to Ch'ang-an, Wei Hung-chi presented this work to Emperor T'ai-tsung. See Wang Ying-lin, *Yü-hai*, 57, p. 36a; CTS, 185a, p. 4795; Ou-yang Hsiu, *Hsin T'ang-shu* (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1975; hereafter referred to as HTS), 100, p. 3944.
10. Kimiya Yukihiko suggests that *Shikiin ryō* is one of the statutes in the *Taiho ryō*. See his "Nyūsō sō Chōnen no jiseki (jō)," *Nihon rekishi* 133 (1959), p. 94.
 11. Kimiya Yasuhiko, *Nikka bunka kōryū shi* (Tokyo: Fūsanbo, 1955), pp. 272-277; Kimiya Yukihiko, "Nyūsō sō (ge)," pp. 84-90.
 12. To-t'ō, *Sung-shih* (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1977; hereafter referred to as SS) 491, pp. 14131-14134. An English translation can be found in L. C. Goodrich and

- R. Tsunoda, *Japan in the Chinese Dynastic Histories* (South Pasadena: P.D. and Ione Perkins, 1951), pp. 56–61. A quotation from this genealogy also appears in a Yüan-dynasty work, the *Wen-hsien t'ung-k'ao* 324, pp. 2552–2553, and has been translated by E. H. Parker in his “Ma Tuan-lin’s Account of Japan up to A.D. 1200,” *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan* 22.1 (1894), pp. 54–64. There is, however, a considerable discrepancy between these two quotations, which awaits further study.
13. T’o-t’o, *Yüan shih* (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1976), 41, p. 868; 138, p. 3344.
 14. T’ao Tsung-i, *Nan-ts’un ch’o-keng lu*, 3, p. 1a; T’o-t’o, *Yüan shih*, appendix, p. 14253; Chao I, *Nien-erh-shih cha-chi* (Shanghai: Shih-chieh shu-chü, 1939; rpt. Peking: Chung-kuo shu-tien, 1987), 23, p. 304.
 15. These thirteen national histories cover the reigns of Emperors T’ai-tsu, T’ai-tsung, Chen-tsung, Jen-tsung, Ying-tsung, Shen-tsung, Che-tsung, Hui-tsung, and Ch’in-tsung of the Northern Sung, and Kao-tsung, Hsiao-tsung, Kuang-tsung, and Ning-tsung of the Southern Sung. For accounts concerning the compilation of these national histories, see Li T’ao, *Hsü Tzu-chih t’ung-chien ch’ang-pien* (Taipei: Shih-chieh shu-chü, 1983), 62, p. 4a; 66, p. 15a; 86, p. 7b; 314, pp. 9b–10a; 318, p. 14b; 325, p. 14b; Wang Ying-lin, *Yü hai*, 46, pp. 46a–b, pp. 47a, 49a; Ma Tuan-lin, *Wen-hsien t’ung-k’ao*, 192, p. 1628; Ch’ao Kung-wu, *Chün-chai tu-shu chih* (SPTK edn.), 2a, pp. 8b–9a; Li Hsin-ch’uan, *Chien-yen i-lai hsi-nien yao-lu* (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1956), 125, p. 2041. See also a discussion by Ko Chao-kuang, “Sung kuan-hsiu kuo-shih k’ao,” *Shih-hsüeh shih yen-chiu* 1 (1982), pp. 47–54.
 16. SS, 445, p. 13131; Chao I, *Nien-erh-shih cha-chi* 23, p. 306; Chin Yü-fu, *Chung-kuo shih-hsüeh shih* (Hong Kong: Shang-wu yin-shu-kuan, 1964), pp. 106–107.
 17. T’o-t’o, *Yüan shih*, 156, p. 3672; Chao I, *Nien-erh-shih cha-chi*, 23, p. 304. See also Su T’ien-chüeh (a Yüan-dynasty scholar), *Tz’u-hsi wen-kao* (Yüan-tai chen-pen wen-chi hui-k’an edn. Taipei: Kuo-li chung-yang t’u-shu-kuan, 1970), 25, p. 982.
 18. T’o-t’o, *Liao shih* (Peking: Chung-hua, 1974), appendix, p. 1554; Wei Su, *Kuei-chai chi* (Taipei: Kuang-wen shu-chü, 1957), 16, p. 11a. See also a discussion by Ch’en Fang-ming, “Sung Liao Chin shih te tsuan-hsiu yü cheng-t’ung chih cheng,” first published in *Shih-huo yüeh-k’an* 2.8 (1972), reprinted in Sung-shih tso-t’an-hui, ed., *Sung-shih yen-chiu chi* (Taipei: T’ai-wan shu-chü, 1974), vol. 7, pp. 205–232.
 19. Chao I, *Nien-erh-shih cha-chi*, 23, p. 305. For a detailed and accessible account of the compilation of the Sung official history, see Hok-lam Chan, “Chinese Official Historiography at the Yüan Court,” in *China under Mongol Rule*, ed. John D. Langlois, Jr. (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1981), pp. 55–106.
 20. *Nien-erh-shih cha-chi*, 23, pp. 304, 305, and 308.
 21. Ch’en Chen-sun, *Chih-chai shu-lu chieh-t’i*, 4, p. 123; SS, 305, p. 10079; Chao I, *Nien-erh-shih cha-chi*, 23, p. 306. For the *Veritable Record of T’ai-tsung’s reign*, see also Yu Mao, *Sui-ch’u t’ang shu-mu* (Shuo-fu edn. Shanghai: Shang-hai ku-chi ch’u-pan-she, 1988), p. 28; SS, 203, p. 5090.
 22. Li T’ao, *Hsü tzu-chih t’ung-chien ch’ang-pien*, 62, p. 4a.
 23. *Ibid.*
 24. Wang Ying-lin, *Yü hai* 46, pp. 46a–b.

25. SS, 305, p. 10079.
26. Yang I, "T'an-yüan," cited in Chiang Shao-yü and Tung K'ang, *Huang-ch'ao lei-yüan*, 78, p. 6a.
27. *Ibid.*, 43, pp. 9b-10a.
28. Wang Hsiang-jung, "Chung-kuo cheng-shih chung te Jih-pen chuan," in his *Chung-Jih kuan-hsi shih wen-hsien lun-k'ao* (Changsha: Yüeh-lu shu-she, 1985), pp. 42-48.
29. Chiang Shao-yü and Tung K'ang, *Huang-ch'ao lei-yüan*, 78, p. 6a; Jōjin, *San tendai godaisan ki* (Shiseiki shūran edn. Tokyo: Kondō shuppanbu, 1924-1938), 5, pp. 181-182.
30. SS, 491, p. 14131.
31. Kimiya Yasuhiko, *Nikka bunka kōryū shi*, p. 88, n. 3.
32. The *Nihon shoki* (compiled in 720), the *Shoku Nihongi* (797), the *Nihon kōki* (840), the *Shoku Nihon kōki* (869), the *Nihon Montoku tennō jitsuroku* (879), and the *Nihon sandai jitsuroku* (901). For a recent study of these works, see John S. Brownlee, *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1991).
33. For example, the *Kokusho sō mokuroku* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1963-1972), pp. 320, 379, 398, and 462, lists such works as the *Zoku Nihon ōdai ichiran*, the *Zoku Nihon ōdai ichiran kōki*, the *Nihon ōdai ichiran*, the *Nihon ōdai ichiran kō*, the *Nihon ōdai ki*, the *Nihon ōdai ki kakinuki*, the *Nihon ōdai kiryaku*, the *Nihon nendai ki*, the *Nihon nendai ki taisei*, the *Nihon nendai kiryaku*, and the *Dai Nihon ōdai ki*.
34. See, for example, Toneri Shinō, *Nihon shoki* (Kokushi taikai edn. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1974), 29, p. 357, the third month of 682: "The emperor . . . gave orders to the Imperial Princes Kahashima and Osakabe . . . to commit to writing a chronicle of the emperors, and also of matters of high antiquity." See also the *Nihon shoki*, 30, p. 398, the eleventh month of 688: "Chitoko, . . . in a eulogy recited the succession to the throne of the imperial ancestors." According to Sakamoto Tarō, these words about "the succession to the throne of the imperial ancestors" constitute a form of "chronicle of the emperors." See his *Rikkoku shi* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1970), p. 68. The English translations are from W. G. Aston, trans., *Nihongi* (rpt. Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1972), vol. 2, pp. 350, 389. After the compilation of the *Kojiki* in 720, Japanese historians continued to write along the lines of "chronicles." They completed the *Nippon teiki* in one volume and the *Teiki* in two volumes in 746 and 748 respectively. For further discussion, see Donald L. Philippi, *Kojiki* (Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1968), p. 10.
35. Tsuda Sōkichi, *Nihon koden no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1948), vol. 1, pp. 37-38; Sakamoto Tarō, *Rikkoku shi*, pp. 68-70.
36. Kimiya Yukihiko, "Nyūsō sō (jō)," p. 87; Kimiya Yasuhiko, *Nikka*, p. 273.
37. G. W. Robinson, "Early Japanese Chronicles: The Six National Histories," in *Historians of China and Japan*, ed. W. G. Beasley and E. G. Pulleyblank (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), pp. 224-225.
38. For the revision and recompilation of various Sung national histories, see Wang

- Ying-lin, *Yü hai*, 46, pp. 47a, 49a; Ma Tuan-lin, *Wen-hsien t'ung-k'ao*, 192, p. 1628; Li T'ao, *Hsü Tzu-chih t'ung-chien ch'ang-pien*, 86, p. 7b; 314, pp. 9b-10a; 318, p. 14b; 325, p. 14b; Li Hsin-ch'uan, *Chien-yen i-lai hsi-nien yao-lu*, 125, p. 2041; Tseng Kung, *Yüan-feng lei-kao* (Kuo-hsüeh chi-pen ts'ung-shu edn.), 31, pp. 216-217.
39. "With him [the Japanese envoy] went Tachibana Hayanari, a student, and Kūkai, a Buddhist monk. They asked permission to remain and pursue their studies." *HTS*, 220, p. 6209; Goodrich and Tsunoda, *Japan*, p. 47.
 40. In Ma Tuan-lin, *Wen-hsien t'ung-k'ao*, 324, p. 2553, where the *Nihon ō nendai ki* is also cited, the time indicator takes on yet two other forms: "tang . . . wang shih" and "tang-tz'u."
 41. In this conjunction, it is worth remembering that both Ou-yang Hsiu and Sung Ch'i are known for their hostility toward Buddhism. See Ch'en Kuang-ch'ung, "Ou Sung hsiu-shu i-t'ung lun," *Shih-hsüeh shih yen-chiu*, 4 (1982), pp. 5-8. This attitude must have affected the way they treated Buddhist monks and their activities in the *Hsin T'ang shu*.
 42. For a discussion of the Chinese literary genre "piao," see James R. Hightower, "The *Wen hsüan* and Genre Theory," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 20 (1957), pp. 524-528.
 43. *SS*, 491, p. 14131.
 44. Shibana, *Honchō kōsō den* (Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho edn.), 67, p. 373.
 45. For a brief study of this work, see Robert Borgen, "*San tendai godaisan ki* as a Source for the Study of Sung History," *Bulletin of Sung-Yuan Studies*, 19 (1987), pp. 1-6.
 46. *San tendai godaisan ki*, pp. 119-121. For a recent study of Jōjin, see Charlotte von Verschuer, "Le Voyage de Jōjin au Mont Tiantai," *T'oung Pao* 77.1-3 (1991), pp. 1-48.
 47. The preliminary result is shown in the following, where each Arabic numeral refers to one of the seventeen questions listed in the text that was presumably raised with Chōnen, and each Roman numeral represents an indexed passage in appendix one that is supposed to be Chōnen's answer: 1-i, 4-ix, 6-viii, 7-vi, 11-vi, 12-iii, 15-ii, 16-v. And the twelve accounts indexed by Arabic numerals [1] to [11] in appendix one were probably Chōnen's answer to the question concerning the spread of Buddhism from China to Japan.
 48. Chih-p'an, *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi* (*Taishō shinshu Daizōkyō* edn.), 43, p. 399b. Compare some of the sentences on this page with the following indexed passages in appendix one: [v], [vii], [1], [2], [3], [4], [6], [7], and [9].
 49. Kimiya Yasuhiko, *Nikka*, pp. 293-294. He suggested that the *Nihon ō nendai ki* was compiled by Chōnen after he had collected the available Japanese official historical works and consulted government officials. See also Kimiya Yukihiko, "Nyūsō sō (jō)," p. 94.
 50. The *San tendai godaisan ki*, 4, p. 117; 5, p. 181, reports that Chōnen's diary is in four *chüan*. In his *Jōjin shōki nyūsō shoshiden kō* (DNBZ edn.), p. 2, Takakusu Junjirō cites

- an old bibliography that specifies the diary as consisting of six *chūan*. The diary is also mentioned in his *Nyūtō shokkaden kō* (DNBZ edn.), 6, p. 178. For a study of Chōnen's diary, see Mori Katsumi, "Chōnen zaitōgi ni tsuite," *Shūkyō shakaishi kenkyū* 10 (1971), pp. 95-108. Three of Chōnen's poems have been preserved. Two of them can be found in "Chōnen Genkō showa shishū," collected in Takakusu Junjirō, *Nyūtō shokkaden kō* (DNBZ edn.), 6, p. 177; the other is in Fujiwara Sadaie, ed., *Shin kokin waka shū* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1966), 10, p. 204.
51. *Nihon Shoki*, 22, p. 148; Aston, *Nihongi*, p. 238.
 52. Wei Cheng, *Sui shu* (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chū, 1973), 81, p. 1827; Goodrich and Tsunoda, *Japan*, p. 32.
 53. SS, 1491, p. 14132.
 54. Sugano Mamichi, *Shoku Nihongi* (Kokushi taikai edn.), 2, p. 15, the twenty-ninth day of the sixth month, 702; the English translation is from J. B. Snellen, trans., "Shoku Nihongi: Chronicles of Japan, continued, 697-791 A.D.," *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan* (2d series) 11 (1934), p. 210.
 55. SS, 491, p. 14132.
 56. HTS, 220, p. 6209; CTS, 199, p. 5341.
 57. Kimiya Yasuhiko, *Nikka*, pp. 172-174.
 58. SS, 491, p. 14132.
 59. Chih-p'an, *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi*, 43, p. 399b; SS, 491, p. 14133; Goodrich and Tsunoda, *Japan*, pp. 52-53.
 60. *Mingaki shū*, cited by Nishioka Toranosuke in his "Chōnen no nyūsō ni tsuite (2)," *Rekishi Chiri* 45.3 (1925), p. 552.
 61. SS, 491, p. 14131; Goodrich and Tsunoda, *Japan*, p. 50.
 62. Nishioka Toranosuke, "Chōnen," p. 552; Goodrich and Tsunoda, *Japan*, p. 75, n. 7.
 63. Kimiya Yukihiro, "Nyūsō sō (ge)," pp. 89-91.
 64. As early as 689, the Japanese envoy Fumi no Imiki Hakase and seven others were dispatched to the Southern Islands to claim them. See *Shoku Nihongi*, 1, p. 5, the thirteen day of the fourth month of the second year of Mommu Tennō. See also Snellen, "Shoku Nihongi," pp. 174-175. In 699, envoys from Tanejima, Yakushima, Amami, and Tokushima went to the Japanese court accompanied by the Japanese envoy. They presented local products and were granted titles by the Japanese court. See *Shoku Nihongi*, 1, p. 8, the nineteen day of the seventh month of the third year of Mommu Tennō; Snellen, "Shoku Nihongi," p. 179.
 65. In 714, Futono Ason Enkenji and fifty-two other people from Amami, Shiga, and Kumi also paid tribute to the Japanese court. Kimiya Yasuhiko, *Nikka*, pp. 79-85.
 66. Kimiya Yasuhiko has offered an explanation for the discrepancy and omission. He suggests that the development of remote border areas in the Tōsandō and Saikaidō prefectures would have increased the number of provinces there. Also from the 770s onward, Japanese envoys stopped sailing to China by way of the Southern Islands, and began using a new sea route that started at Hakata in Kyūshū, stretched across

- the East China Sea, and stopped at the Chinese coast. The Southern Islands thus gradually faded from the minds of the Japanese. See Kimiya Yasuhiko, "Nyūsō sō (ge)," pp. 89-91.
67. Brownlee, *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing*, pp. 8-20; Delmer M. Brown, "Pre-Gukanshō Historical Writing," in Ishida Ichirō and Delmer Myers Brown, *The Future and the Past: A Translation and Study of the Gukanshō* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), pp. 353-401.
68. Kuroida Toshio, "Gukanshō to Jinnō shōtō ki," in *Nihon rekishi kōza*, ed. Rekishigaku kenkyūkai and Nihonshi kenkyūkai (Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku shuppankai, 1958), vol. 8, pp. 33-35. This work has been translated into English by John A. Harrison in his *New Light on Early and Medieval Japanese Historiography: Two Translations and an Introduction* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1960).
69. Hirata Toshiharu, *Yoshino jidai no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Yamachi shobō, 1943), pp. 603-610. He studied sixteen works in the *Ō nendai ki* genre which were compiled during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. These works bear such diverse titles as *Kōdai nendai ki*, *Kōdai ki*, *Rekidai kōki*, *Teiō hennen ki*, *Kō nendai ryakki*, *Kōdai ryakki*, and *Tōji ōdai ki*.
70. Eiyū, *Teiō hennen ki* (Kokushi taikei edn.), p. 1. Typical of such a work is the *Gukanshō* (Nihon koten bungaku taikei edn. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1967), which was compiled by the monk Jien during 1219-1220. This book consists of seven *chūan*. The first is devoted to a chronicle of the successive Chinese rulers, the second to the Japanese imperial house. The *Gukanshō* has been translated into English by Ishida Ichirō and Delmer Myers Brown, in *Future and the Past*.
71. *Jinnō shōtōki okugaki*, cited in Hirata Toshiharu, *Yoshino jidai no kenkyū*, p. 596. This passage has been translated into English by H. Paul Varley in his *A Chronicle of Gods and Sovereigns: Jinnō shōtōki of Kitabatake Chikafusa* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), p. 5, n. 9. It is worth noting that he also translates the term *Kōdai ki* as "imperial genealogy." But I disagree with him that the imperial genealogy used by Kitabatake Chikafusa is an "abridged" one. "A most concise imperial genealogy" may be a translation that better conveys the meaning of the original Japanese term.
72. In his study of *teiki*, a similar genre of Japanese historical writing, G. W. Robinson also touches on this issue. He asks: "Does *teiki* mean 'chronicles of the emperor,' as Chamberlain, following traditional opinion, translates? Or does it merely mean imperial genealogies? There are strong but inconclusive arguments for both views." See his "Early Japanese Chronicles," p. 217, n. 7. This preliminary study of the *Nihon ō nendai ki* has added one more piece of evidence in support of the latter view.

GLOSSARY

- Amami 奄美
 Awada no Mahito 粟田真人
 Chang Ch'ü-hua 張去華
 Chang Fu 張復
 Chao An-jen 趙安仁
 Ch'ao Chiung 晁迥
 Ch'en Yao-sou 陳堯叟
 Chen-tsung 眞宗
 ch'i Nien-tai chi so-chi yün
 其年代紀所記云
 Chiang-nan 江南
 ch'i-chü chu 起居注
 chieh Tiao-jan so-chi yün 皆奮然所記云
 Ch'ien Jo-shui 錢若水
 Chih Che (Chih I) 智者 (智顓)
 chih . . . nien 直 . . . 年
 Chih-kuan i 止觀義
 Chih-p'an 志磐
 ching-nei jen-wu shu to-shao
 京內人屋數多少
 ching-nei li-shu to-shao 京內里數多少
 chin-shih 進士
 Chiu T'ang shu 舊唐書
 Chōnen 奮然
 Chōnen hyōkei (Tiao-jan piao-ch'i)
 奮然表啓
 Chu I 朱巽
 Dai Nihon 大日本
 Dōji 道慈
 Engi shiki 延喜式
 feng-t'u 風土
 Fo-tsu t'ung-chi 佛祖統記
 Heian 平安
 Hokke kyō 法華經
 Honchō kōsō den 本朝高僧傳
 Hsi shang-wu mao-shu i-kuei
 悉賞物質書以歸
 Hsin T'ang shu 新唐書
 Jakushō 寂照
 Jan yen 然言
 jen-hu to-shao 人戶多少
 jih-li 日曆
 Jih-pen feng-su 日本風俗
 Jinnō shōtōki 神皇正統記
 Jōjin 成尋
 ju-T'ang ch'iu shu-chi 入唐求書籍
 ki 紀
 Kitabatake Chikafusa 北畠親房
 kōdai ki 皇代記
 Kojiki 古事記
 Kōkō 光孝
 Konkōmyō saishō kyō 金光明最勝王經
 Konkōmyō Shitennō no ji
 金光明四天王之寺
 Kūkai 空海
 Kumi 久美
 Kung-tsung 恭宗
 kuo tu-i to-shao 國都邑多少
 kuo-chung yu wu-ching chi fo-ching
 國中有五經及佛經

- kuo-shih 國史
 kyūji 舊辭
 Lin-an 臨安
 Nihon 日本
Nihon nendai ki (Jih-pen nientai chi)
 日本年代紀
Nihon ō nendai ki (Jih-pen wang nientai chi)
 日本王年代紀
Ō nendai ki (Wang nientai chi) 王年代紀
 Ono no Imoko 小野妹子
 Ou-yang Hsiu 歐陽修
 pen-chi 本紀
 pen-kuo ch'ü Mao-kuo chin-yüan
 本國去毛國近遠
 pen-kuo hsiang-ch'ü Ming-chou chih-chin
 yin-ho pu-t'ung Chung-kuo
 本國相去明州至近, 因何不通中國
 pen-kuo kuei-kuan yu shih-ho ming-mu
 本國貴官有是何名目
 pen-kuo shih-hsi 本國世系
 pen-kuo ssu-shih han-shu yü Chung-kuo
 t'ung pu t'ung
 本國四時寒暑與中國同不同
 pen-kuo ssu-chih pei-chieh
 本國四至北界
 pen-kuo wang hsing-shih 本國王姓氏
 pen-kuo wang shen-hu 本國王甚呼
 pen-kuo yao-yung Han-ti shih-ho wu-
 huo 本國要用漢地是何物貨
 pen-kuo yu shih-ho ch'in-shou
 本國有是何禽獸
Rikkoku shi 六國史
 Saichō 最澄
- Saikaidō 西海道
San tendai godaisan ki 參天臺五臺山記
 San-ssu 三司
 Sesson Yūbai 雪村友梅
 Shen-tsung 神宗
 Shiga 鹿島
 shih-cheng chi 時政記
 shih-kuan 史館
 shih-lu 實錄
 Shih-tsu 世祖
Shikiin ryō 職員令
 Shingon shū 真言宗
Shoku Nihongi 續日本紀
 Shōmu 聖武
 Shōtoku 聖德
 shu-mi yūan 樞密院
 Shun-ti 順帝
 so-te tz'u-lai chin-shih wen-chi fan-hai erh-
 kuei 所得賜賚盡市文籍泛海而歸
Sui shu 隋書
 Sung Ch'i 宋祁
Sung shih 宋史
 T'ai-tsu 太祖
 T'ai-tsung 太宗
 Tanejima 種子島
 teiki 帝紀
 Temmu 天武
 Tennō 天皇
 Ti Ping 帝昺
 T'ien-t'ai (Tendai) 天臺
 Tokushima 德島
 Tosandō 東山道
 T'o-t'o 脫脫

tsai-hsi Tiao-jan ju-Hua hsi tui T'ai-tsung k'ua-ku hsi 在昔奮然入華兮, 對太宗誇古兮	Wang Tan 王旦 wen-wu liao-li chieh shih-kuan 文武僚吏皆世官
Tuan-tsung 端宗	Wo-jen chuan 倭人傳
Tung Wen-ping 董文炳	Yakushima 屋久島
tzu Ming-chou chih Jih-pen-kuo hsien-tao ho chou-chün? Ch'ü kuo-wang sso-tu chin-yüan? 自明州至日本國先到何州 郡? 去國王所都近遠?	Yamato 倭 Yang I 楊億
tz'u-t'u 此土	Yin-t'ai t'ung-chin ssu 銀臺通進司 yu pai-hsing hao 有百姓號
Wang Ch'in-jo 王欽若	Yüan-ho 元和

APPENDIX ONE

「【I】國中有《五經》書及佛經、《白居易集》七十卷，並得自中國。土宜五穀而少麥。交易用銅錢，文曰『乾文大寶』【II】畜有水牛、驢、羊，多犀、象。【I】產絲蠶，多織絹，薄緻可愛。樂有中國、高麗二部【III】。四時寒暑，大類中國。【IV】國之東境接海島，夷人所居，身面皆有毛。【I】東奧州產黃金，西別島出銀，以爲貢賦。【V】國王以王爲姓，傳襲至今王六十四世，文武僚吏皆世官。」

其《年代紀》所記云，初主號天御中主。次曰天村雲尊，其後【VI】皆以「尊」爲號。次天八重雲尊，次天彌聞尊，次天忍勝尊，次膽波尊，次萬魂尊，次利利魂尊，次國狹槌尊，次角龔魂尊，次汲津丹尊，次面垂見尊，次國常立尊，次天鑑尊，次天萬尊，次沫名杵尊，次伊奘諾尊，次素戔烏尊，次天照大神尊，次正哉吾勝速日天押穗耳尊，次天彥尊，次炎尊，次彥瀲尊，凡二十三世，並都於築紫日向宮。

彥瀲第四子號神武天皇，自築紫宮入居大和州橿原宮，即位元年甲寅，當周僖王時也。次綏靖天皇，次安寧天皇，次懿德天皇，次孝昭天皇，次孝天皇，次孝靈天皇，次孝元天皇，次開化天皇，次崇神天皇，次垂仁天皇，次景行天皇，次成務天皇。次仲哀天皇，國人言今爲鎮國香椎大神。次神功天皇，開化天皇之曾孫女，又謂之息長足姬天皇，國人言今爲太奈良姬大神。次應神天皇，【VII】甲辰歲，始於百濟得中國文字，今號八蕃菩薩，有大臣號紀武內，年三百七歲。次仁德天皇，次履中天皇，次反正天皇，次允恭天皇，次安康天皇，次雄略天皇，次清寧天皇，次顯宗天皇，次仁賢天皇，次武烈天皇，次繼體天皇，次安開天皇，次宣化天皇。

次天國排開廣庭天皇，亦名欽明天皇，即位十三年，【1】壬申歲始傳佛法於百濟國，當【a】此土【A】梁承聖元年。

次敏達天皇。次用明天皇，有子曰聖德太子，年三歲，聞十人語，同時解之，七歲悟佛法于菩提寺，講《聖鬘經》，天雨曼陀羅華。當【b】此土【B】隋開皇中，【2】遣使泛海至中國，求《法華經》。

次崇峻天皇。次推古天皇，欽明天皇之女也。次舒明天皇，次皇極天皇。次孝德天皇，白雉四年，【3】律師道照求法至中國，從三藏僧玄奘受經、律、論，當【c】此土【C】唐永徽四年也。次天豐財重日足姬天皇，【4】令僧智通等入唐求大乘法相教，【D】當顯慶三年。次天智天皇，次天武天皇，次持總天皇。次文武天皇，大寶三年，【E】當長安元年，【5】遣粟田真人入唐求書籍，律師道慈求經。次阿閉天皇，次皈依天皇。次聖武天皇，寶龜二年，【6】遣僧正玄昉入朝，【F】當開元四年。次孝明天皇，聖武天皇之女也，天平勝寶四年，【G】當天寶中，【7】遣使及僧入唐求內外經教及傳戒。次天炊天皇。次高野姬天皇，聖武天皇之女也。次白壁天皇，二十四年，【8】遣二僧靈仙、行賀入唐，禮五臺山學佛法。次桓武天皇，【9】遣騰元葛野與空海大師及延曆寺僧澄入唐，詣天台山傳智者止觀義，【H】當元和元年也。次諾樂天皇，次嵯峨天皇，次淳和天皇。次仁明天皇。【I】當開成、會昌中，【10】遣僧入唐，禮五臺。次文德天皇，【J】當大中年間。次清和天皇，次陽成天皇。次光孝天皇，【11】遣僧宗睿入唐傳教，【K】當光啓元年也。

次仁和天皇，當【d】此土【L】梁龍德中，遣僧寬建等入朝。次醍醐天皇，次天慶天皇。次封上天皇，當【e】此土【M】周廣順年也。次冷泉天皇，今爲太上天皇。次守天皇，即今王也。凡六十四世。

【VIII】畿內有山城、大和、河內、和泉、攝津凡五州，共統五十三郡。東海道有伊賀、伊勢、志摩、尾張、參河、遠江、駿河、伊豆、甲斐、相模、武藏、安房、上總、常陸凡十四州，共統一百一十六郡。東山道有通江、美濃、飛驒、信濃、上野、下野、陸奧、出羽凡八州，共統一百二十二郡。北陸道有若狹、越前、加賀、能登、越中、越後、佐渡凡七州，共統三十郡。山陰道有丹波、丹後、但馬、因幡、伯耆、出雲、石見、隱伎凡八州，共統五十二郡。小陽道有播磨、美作、備前、備中、備後、安藝、周防、長門凡八州，共統六十九郡。南海道有伊紀、淡路、河波、讚耆、伊豫、土佐凡六州，共統四十八郡。西海道有築前、築後、豐前、豐後、肥前、肥後、日向、大隅、薩摩凡九州，共統九十三郡。又有壹伎、對馬、多執凡三島，各統二郡。是謂五畿、七道、三島，凡三千七百七十二都，四百一十四驛，【IX】八十八萬三千三百二十九課丁。課丁之外，不可詳見。皆《奮然》所記云。

APPENDIX TWO

A Reconstructed Portion of the Nihon ō nendai ki

初主號天御中主。次曰天村雲尊。次天八重雲尊，次天彌聞尊，次天忍勝尊，次瞻波尊，次萬魂尊，次利利魂尊，次國狹槌尊，次角龔魂尊，次汲津丹尊，次面垂見尊，次國常立尊，次天鑑尊，次天萬尊，次沫名杵尊，次伊奘諾尊，次素戔烏尊，次天照大神尊，次正哉吾勝速日天押穗耳尊，次天彥尊，次炎尊，次彥瀲尊，凡二十三世，並都於築紫日向宮。彥瀲第四子號神武天皇，自築紫宮入居大和州橿原宮，即位元年甲寅，當周僖王時也。次綏靖天皇，次安寧天皇，次懿德天皇，次孝昭天皇，次孝天皇，次孝靈天皇，次孝元天皇，次開化天皇，次崇神天皇，次垂仁天皇，次景行天皇，次成務天皇。次仲哀天皇，國人言今爲鎮國香椎大神。次神功天皇，開化天皇之曾孫女，又謂之息長足姬天皇，國人言今爲太奈良姬神。次應神天皇，今號八蕃菩薩，有大臣號紀武內，年三百七歲。次仁德天皇，次履中天皇，次反正天皇，次允恭天皇，次安康天皇，次雄略天皇，次清寧天皇，次顯宗天皇，次仁賢天皇，次武烈天皇，次繼體天皇，次安開天皇，次宣化天皇，次天國排開廣庭天皇，亦名欽明天皇。次敏達天皇，次明用天皇，有子曰聖德太子，次崇峻天皇，次推古天皇，欽明天皇之女也。次舒明天皇，次皇極天皇，次孝德天皇，次天豐財重日足姬天皇，次天智天皇，次天武天皇，次持總天皇，次文武天皇，次阿閉天皇，次飯依天皇，次聖武天皇，次孝明天皇，聖武天皇之女也。次天炊天皇，次高野姬天皇，聖武天皇之女也。次白璧天皇，次桓武天皇，次諾樂天皇，次嵯峨天皇，次淳和天皇。次仁明天皇，次文德天皇。次清和天皇，次陽成天皇，次光孝天皇。次仁和天皇，次醍醐天皇，次天慶天皇。次封上天皇，次冷泉天皇，今爲太上天皇。次守平天皇，即今王也。凡六十四世。