

The Tradition and Modernity in the Study of Japanese Narratives - Narratives and Historical Narration

*Fujii Sadakazu**

Introduction

The word monogatari narrative- meaning romance, novel, or tale- primarily meant in the Japanese language idle talk, conversation, or aimless talk. Talks in love and infant gibberish were also narratives. Old tales and fables are also narratives because these narratives are brought into the places of such tales. The reason why *Taketori Monogatari* (Tales of a Bamboo Gatherer, written possibly in the early 10th Century) and *Utsuho* (Tales of *Utsuho*, late 10th Century) are also called narratives is because these tales meet the rule to be told at such places. Poetic tales such as *Ise Monogatari* (Tales of Ise, completed in the 9th and 10th century) appear that the linguistic activities carried on at the places of talks over waka (31 syllable short Japanese poems) called poetic narratives settled on written narratives.

In the great long narrative literary work, *Genji Monogatari* (Tale of Genji written by lady Murasaki in the 11th Century), in a conversation with a princess (Princess Tamakazura) the hero, Prince Hikaru, states that *Nihon-gi* (Chronicles of Japan, a book of Japanese history) and the like are only tiny portions. (*Hotaru no Maki*, the Book of Fireflies).¹

* Professor of College of Arts and Science at the University of Tokyo.

Prince Hikaru continues to say with an embarrassing smile even that indeed in these (narrative literature and the like) one will find detailed descriptions that are reasonable.

In such utterances story is understood as the world of expression in books called historical narratives and what is written in them, and history is to have limits. While description called narratives make detailed descriptions by going into human morals and psychology, while history does not go into such depth. Such a comparison made above leads us to the thinking that if it is a true historical description, it may probe into human morals and psychology. Even though it is a fiction, it appears that one will find a depth aimed at history in the description of *Genji Monogatari*. This fact is never compatible with the interpretation that *Genji Monogatari* has the background of historical facts.

In the ancient period spanning the pre-6th Century to the post-7th Century², I judge that there were two forms of narration called narrative and ancient matters.³ Narrative which is description, based on narrative was evolved into *Genji Monogatari* and the like. In contrast to this historical description is a narration based on ancient matters, thus *Kojiki* (Chronicle of Ancient Matters) (the year of its Preface is dated 712) is

-
1. *Genji Monogatari* in New Series of Japanese Classical Literature, Iwanami Shoten, Book II, p.439.
 2. In the history of Japanese literature the Nara Period (the pre-8th Century) is designated as the early ancient period, and the 9th-12th Century period as the late ancient period. In that case, the 13th-16th Century is the medieval period, and the 17th-19th Century as the recent modern period, and some view the 18th Century as the beginning of the modern period.
 3. Furu Koto is written as koji (ancient matters), kogo (ancient tales), kuji (old words), and kuji (ancient matters). This, as kojoji (old epics) was formed permanently and authoritatively as narratives to orally handed down myths and histories. It is speculated that the rhetorical style of writing was left in the accounts of *Kojiki* and others, and a professional group called kataribe (clan of professional narrators) was charged with that technique. Narratives originally implied talks, aimless talks, conversations, talks between men and women, and child gibberishes. Into such sites of aimless talks were brought old tales and gossips, and these were called narratives. For details see, Fujii Sadakakzu, *A History of the Formation of Narrative Literature*, Tokyo University Press, 1987, p. 111 ff.

nothing but a book of ancient matters. Traditionally, if we assume that narrative literature grew from a common base, I would like to propose a perspective that there were plural numbers of bases called ancient matters and narratives.

It seems to me that the fact that *Kojiki* is a book on old matters is succinctly expressed in the fact that *koji* can be read as *furu koto* (old matters). However, the studies of *Kojiki* that began in the 18th Century hardly tolerates us to have such a view. It is probable that ancient texts assume reading methods convenient to the demands of the times, for instance the 18th Century and the 19th Century. *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki* (formed in 720),⁴ were the products of the ancient state in the late 7th Century to early 8th Century which urgently needed their myths, the stories of their origins, and history, with their imagination and their attempts at creation. These were the description they demanded. It must be sternly distinguished between that later generations made use of *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki* for their own intentions and that the pressing reason of the period concerned that *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki* themselves came into being.

I. What to Think of *Genji Monogatari*

1. *Written As Leaning On Both the Good and the Evil*

To repeat the hero of *Genji Monogatari*, Prince Hikaru develops an argument with Princess Tamakazura as follows:

Books such as Japanese history and the kind are only small portions. These (the kind of narrative literature) will indeed have detailed descriptions that are reasonable to the morals (The Book of Hotaru.).

This claims that historical description is one-sided and in narrative literature indeed can we find description that expands into the inside. To apply this to ancient matters and narratives these appear as a confrontation between historical description/narrative description,

4. This is from the account for May 21, 4th Year of Yoro (720, A.D.) in Shoku Nihongi Chronicles of Japan, This does not mention *Kojiki*.

orthodox narrative/narrative (of something, anything, and inferior), past writing style/non-past writing style. Thus it shows the dual dimensions of the existence of narrative literature since its birth. In modern times it may be advisable to juxtapose narrative to story in an easy to understand formula.

To inquire into it, *Kojiki*, a book of ancient matters, in reality it demonstrates the realistic feeling of Narrative, here and there, and the quality of narrative common with later narrative literature.

Narrative literature, in its fiction, told about the free tales of narrative literature, and pushed it to the extreme of possibility. *Genji Monogatari* itself unfolded such an argument in the conversation between Prince Hikaru Genji and Princess Tamagazura as quoted above, Prince Hikaru Genji says:

Because of his situation in life, he (the character in the tale) might not have started telling as it is. But he started telling about good things and bad things and the points he was not tired of seeing and those points he was tired of hearing, as he could not keep to himself. When he wanted to talk about good things he went to the rim to select good things, and when he wanted to obey the interest of others he collected all evil and rare matters, so that all these were based on both good and evil, and these were not out of the real world. There may be a distinction between the shallow thing and the deep things, it would be unrealistic to declare all them to be fictions. Buddhist teachings that Buddha preaches with the right mind contain some points of convenience. Those who have not attained enlightenment are sure to find wrong (contradictory) here and there. Although many such points are found in various Buddhist sutras, they are included as meaning, and the distance between enlightenment and agony showed that there was difference at about of the same level as human goodness and evil. To put it favorably, everything and all things disappear as no meaning, do they not just because it is a fiction. it needs not end in nonsense.

It is judged that such mode of thinking has served the author as a motive power to write this tale endlessly. Because of Prince Hikaru Genji statement above, since the medieval period *Genji Monogatari* was highly evaluated as was written from the idea of encouraging the good and chastising the evil or it superbly explained the tale with the

parables from the Buddhist teaching. Although I have no objection to such high evaluation, when I closely trace the description in the main text, it never does appear that the author preached the idea of encouraging the good and chastising the evil. Even if it is the obligation of the reader to obediently accept what is written, just because the parable called convenience is available, if the reader should interpret that the narrative is about the evil (for instance, the heroic eroticism), and that the purpose of the narrative is about the encouraging the good and punishing the evil, it would be rather a deviation than obedient reading.

As for Buddhism, the way of parable here called the distance between enlightenment and agony is unprecedented (generally it is referred as enlightenment equals agony)⁵, and one should not be negligent of the fact that this was a painstaking expression by the author.

2. Model Theory, pathos of Things and Pornographic Book

Generally there are a number of opinions as to what kind of a narrative *Genji Monogatari* is. A phenomenon is found that as the more the celebrated a theory is, the less its evidence is found in the text of the narrative. Such a phenomenon is found. If it is written clearly in the main text of the narrative, it hardly becomes a theory because it is already in the main text. As to matters that are never clearly written, even though they may be interpreted vaguely, if someone advocates an opinion, supporters rally to evolve this into a big theory. Among such I will extract (a). (b). and (c) below.

(a) An interpretation that the reign of Emperor Kiritsubo .which forms the stage for Kiritsubo, the Book One, is a reign of sage is advocated even in contemporary research articles. However, my account exists which says that it was a reign of a sage in the Book of Kiritsubo, nor we find any marked evidence in other books that Emperor

5. Generally, enlightenment equals agony is preached. However, in the Book of Hotaru (Fireflies), it is expressed as the gap between enlightenment and agony. Refer to Fuji Sadakazu, Commentaries on *Genji Monogatari*, Iwanami Shoten, 2000, p. 670. Also the article on *Genji Monogatari* by Fuji Sadakazu in *Philosophies and Ideas*, Iwanami Shoten, 1998.

Kiritsubo was a sage. This is related to one of the model theories that the reign of Emperor Kiritsubo was superimposed on that of Emperor Daigo (reigned 897-930) in the early 10th Century. This is one of the theories prevalent from the medieval period on and even now many believe it.

(b) The theory which finds the essence of *Genji Monogatari* was started by Motoori Norinaga (1730-1801), as is widely known.⁶ In the main text of *Genji Monogatari* the words, aware, mono no aware, and mono aware are found more than 1,000 times. The sharp-minded scholar of Japanese literature, Kazamaki Keijiro (1900-1962) pointed out that appreciating *Genji Monogatari* in terms of mono no aware was did not started with Motoori Norinaga but with contemporaries of *Shin Kokin - shu* (An Anthology of Old and New Waka Poems), *Genji Monogatari no Seishin* (The Spirit of *Genji Monogatari*), 1942.⁷ I also agree. More than 1,000 instances of the words, aware, mono no aware, and mono aware in *Genji Monogatari* itself never connote special significance. Perhaps such an aesthetic significance was discovered by later generations.

(c) The image of the people in the Heian Period (9th Century-12th Century) entertained by the people of the late early modern and contemporary periods is only that they had loose moral and both men and women were absorbed in love affairs. In that respect people have argued about *Genji Monogatari* that it is an amorous book or contrarily a book to warn about amorousness. According to the scholar of Japanese literature, Yoshizawa Yoshinori (1876-1954), *Genji Monogatari* was reviled even as a book of pornography because at the time of the importation of Western literary theories, aided by the degradation in the capacity for interpretation the way to view narratives turned erroneous. (The Construction of the Great East Asia and the Ideal Way of the Japanese Language and Japanese Literature, 1943⁸) That Yoshizawa maintained that annotators since *Kakai-sho* (The Book of Rivers and Seas), 20 volumes, 1367 all theorized that *Genji Monogatari* was a book of encour-

6. Refer to *ono no aware* (Pathos of Things) in *Iwanami Dictionary of Philosophies and Ideas* written by Fujii Sadakazu.

7. Akiyama Ken edited, *Collections of Commentaries on Genji Monogatari*, Vol. 5. Yumani Shobo, p. 462.

8. *Collections of Commentaries on Genji Monogatari*, Vol. 5, p. 152.

aging the good and punishing the evil and said that he himself viewed *Genji Monogatari* as a book of expedience.

Of above (a) it cannot be denied that the reign of the emperor was written as a generation of a sage to some extent. It is a doubt about the argument that the era was described as though it was an era of a sage, based on the model theory,

Of above (b) it is well that one pays attention to the word aware (originally meaning a sigh, ah! ah! ,and it amounts to superimpose the aesthetics since the medieval period on *Genji Monogatari*. This is seriously questionable.

Of above (c), in the image of the people in the Heian Period there was loose moral, to which the folklorist Yanagida Kunio (1875-1962) proposed an opposing view. According to Yanagida *Mukoiri-ko* (A Study of Adopted Sons-in-Law, in *Konin no Hanashi* (The Story of Marriages, 1929), even though It appeared loose they had strict rules about customs and marriage systems. Thus he clarified that only these rules have been changed in the modern period. Also as a kind of a counterview earlier Motoori Norinaga treasured the emotion of love among the people of the Heian Period and expressed it with waka poems.

Since *Genji Monogatari* was narrated in accordance with their marriage customs as Yanagida maintains, should its writing ways be judged by posterity, its author and readers would be baffled. Much less, during the militaristic era in the early Showa period (1935-1945) *Genji Monogatari* was suppressed as a book of blasphemy⁹, and if the author who challenged to write the disorder of the imperial power out of his ambition as a literary person should be revived to learn about the suppression, he would be staggered. Because in *Genji Monogatari* the author described the matter concerning the disorder of the imperial power (such as the empress adultery, the birth of the prince and his accession), the confidential matter at the court, in the modern Japanese translation of *Genji Monogatari* by the novelist, Tanizaki Junichiro (1886-1965) Tanizaki was forced to delete and rewrite several parts.¹⁰

9. Refers to the refusal to pay respect to imperial family, shrines and temples. In concrete terms, it amounts to criticizing the imperial family.

10. Refer to *Collections of Commentaries on Genji Monogatari*, Vol. 5, p. 275 ff, and also to *Commentaries* by Kobayashi Masaaki in the same.

3. *He Becomes the Founder of a Dynasty*

In Book 1, Kiritsubo, after Prince Hikaru Genji was born and his mother (Lady Kiritsubo) died, worrying about her son future. Before her death she must have wished that Prince Hikaru Genji would access to the throne. However, would her hopes be realized. In the Book of Kiritsubo, there is a passage that a celebrated fortune-teller from Korai (Korea) arrived and told the Prince Hikaru Genji future. That Korean told as follows:

The gentleman who has the physiognomy to unfailingly ascend the supreme rank, the emperor, has his fortune told, his reign would be disturbed and worrisome incidents would occur. If his fortune is told from the angle that he might become a pillar at the court to assist politics, he has no physiognomy to become such a subject.¹¹

The original text of the passage that as he becomes the founder of a dynasty is written as he becomes the parent of the country, and parent seems to mean founder, and I would like to understand it to be the one who opens a dynasty. However, general annotators and researchers besides me take the parent of the country to mean the emperor or the emperor's parent. How should it be? Because students of Japanese society cannot believe that the country called Japan declines and perishes, and also they think the genealogy continues as far as the emperor is concerned, they naturally understand the parent of the country to be the emperor or the parent of the emperor. But this passage refers to the prophecy of the fortune teller purported to be a Korean. Would it not be the prophesy that a dynasty ends and a new one begins, that is he comes its founder?¹²

Prince Hikaru Genji committed adultery with the princess called Fujitsubo, and disturbed the royal tradition. He let the child born thereof ascent the throne. If we should take it as that Prince Hikaru Genji opened a dynasty and let his son ascend the throne, instead of simply becoming the parent of the emperor, it amounted to having the

11. *Genji Monogatari* in *New Great System of Japanese Classical Literature*, Vol. 1, p. 20.

12. Fujii Sadakazu, *Treatises on Genji Monogatari*, p. 88 ff.

prophecy precisely realized. It is needless to say it is creation in the narrative, whether it is the prophecy, or the super human child (Prince Hikaru Genji). In other words, *Genji Monogatari* is never a narrative based on some historical facts. It is acceptable that there be many readers who support with interest a narrative written in the style of history. However, if there should be some readers who may think that the narrative may be a tale to hide historical facts, I am afraid that the author would become dissatisfied. Not only during the medieval period but also in the modern period the readers who select the model theory (the way to read *Genji Monogatari* is a narrative to hide historical facts) are endless, it is nothing but a conjecture to misjudge the real status of the narrative.

It may be surmised that generally speaking the way of reading narrative description as practiced in Japanese society tends to superimpose history on narrative. It is an interesting point why Japanese society seems to fall into historicism in that sense. Such view about *Genji Monogatari* shows that readers do not fully understand it yet. Thus there are many points to be researched.

II. Problematic Points in *Kojiki*

1. *Teiki (Chronicles of Emperors) is not data material*

We will discuss the topic that it is never written in the Preface to *Kojiki* that *Teiki*¹³ is the material. If we seek documents that have become the basis of *Kojiki*, it says that ancient chronicles of the imperial receipts recited by Hieda no Are. And it was by the order of the Empress Gemmei (reigned 707-715) in the early Nara Period (8th Century) that this was selected, recorded and presented.

On September 18th in the fourth year of Wado (711 A.D.), an imperial command was given to me to record and present the Ancient Dicta learned by imperial command by Hieda no Are. Reverently, in accor-

13. Also known as *Teio Hitsugi* (Sun Succession of the Emperors) and *Senki* (Chronicles of the Preceding Period), and is considered as one of the source materials of *Kojiki*. This will be commented upon later.

dance with the imperial will, I chose and took them up in great detail

Since the 18th Century questions raised about this preface itself. Even though it was labeled Preface, it was probably meant to be a statement of dedication. At the end, it states that Your subject Yasumaro reverently present altogether three volumes, respectfully and sincerely, January 28, the fifth year of Wado, Ono Asomi Yasumaro

Thus the one who wrote this (in the 5th year of Wado, 712 A.D) was Ono Asomi Yasumaro. In the main text of *Kojiki* itself a phonetic writing system based on old pronunciation is maintained¹⁴, and it cannot be said to be a forged book. However, in certain quarters there is a strong opinion of viewing it as a forged statement of dedication, and this cannot be necessarily ignored. According to this alleged forged statement of dedication, Hieda no Are is a fictitious character¹⁵, and he made the Preface by using again the statement of dedication. That is to say, it was a fiction fabricated in the 9th Century. As far as I am concerned, I view that even if the allegation of forgery is valid, *Kojiki* is a book of ancient matters as claimed in the Preface, and that the pains taken in the expression therein is an important piece of information for explaining the character of the main body of *Kojiki* itself and it contains vital contents.

In the Preface or the statement of Dedication as said above he recorded and presented the Ancient Dicta learned by Hieda no Are as was by the imperial command. And it does not say that Teili (Imperial Chronicle) is the material. What Hieda no Are was ordered were Teio Hitsugi (Imperial Genealogy) and Sendai Kuji (Handed Down Myths and Legends) to begin with. That point is stated as Hieda no Are was commanded by an imperial edict to recite Teio Hitsugi and Teio Kuji. It was said to be during the era of Emperor Temmu (reigned 672-687). To verify this, what Hieda no Are recited under the imperial command

14. In *Kojiki* the sound system with eight vowels from old is left in the phonetic expressions. Furthermore, the different ways of writing in the phonetic expression older than that in *Manyoshu* can be detected in *Kojiki*. Incidentally, the modern Japanese language has five vowels, and the basic dialect of modern Okinawa (Ryukuan) has three vowels.

15. Uji (clan) as in Hieda Uni cannot be confirmed. Neither can the person called Hiedano Are be confirmed in other places than this Preface.

were Teiki and Kuji. Then about 30 years later what was elected and recorded was *Kojiki* with the raw material from Kuji.

2. *Kuji and Koji Are Ancient Matters*

Nevertheless, the view prevalent since the 19th Century as witnessed in many commentaries on *Kojiki*, textbooks, histories of literature, and dictionaries maintain that the raw materials of *Kojiki* are Teiki and Kuji of the ancient period as recited by Hieda no Are. In the modern period, the *Comprehensive Dictionary of Classical Japanese Literature* (Iwanami Shoten, 1984) summarizes that way. So does the *Comprehensive Japanese Language Dictionary* (the fourth edition, 1991). You may guess what others do, and the national understanding is exhausted here.

Why has the interpretation that Ono Asomi Yasumaro commanded by Empress Gemmei selected and recorded what Hieda no Are recited from Teiki and Kuji of preceding generations as was ordered by Emperor Temmu prevailed to the present? The reason why is nothing but that the idea of thinking that way was preceded. There were some who felt that such an interpretation of the Preface was strange. Moreover, many scholars of *Kojiki* in the modern period led by Motoori Norinaga who authored *Kojiki-den* (Exposition of the Chronicle of Ancient Matters, completed in 1798) were aware of.¹⁶

The historian, Tsuda Sokichi (1873-1961) asserted that *Kojiki* selected and recorded Teiki and Kuji as facts. and stated that the imperial edict was an error of Teiki.

To summarize all these, while the scholars of *Kojiki* were aware of, Norinaga said that sentences were omitted after compressing them in Kuji (Yamada Yoshio). Kuraano Kenji said that it was a customary way with Chinese sentences, thus seeking the raw materials of *Kojiki* not only in Kuji but also extending to Teiki as well. How can we say that the imperial edict to Are to recite Teio Hitsugi and Kuji of the preceding generations is same as Kuji Hieda no Are recited by the imperial order

16. Refer to Saigo Nobutsuna, *Commentaries on Kojiki*, Heibonsha, 1975, p. 59. Incidentally, refer to Fujii Sadakazu, *A History of Formation of Narrative Literature*, pp. 189 ff.

is the same. Since it is the utterances of great scholars of *Kojiki*, in this manner a nation-wide explanation of the completion of *Kojiki* is formed.

According to Kobayashi Hideo (1902-1983), the expression, Teiki and Honji (The Primary Chronicle) was transformed into Teio Hisugi and Senki (The Preceding Chronicle) and then finally into Kuji and Senki learned by imperial command by Are and thus Motoori Norinaga viewed that the context of sentences and emphasis placed on words in *Kojiki* determined the meaning of the word, ji (dicta)¹⁷ Kobayashi sees through that in contrast to this Tsuda does not change his thinking that ji (dicta) cannot be equated to ji (matter), he does not tolerate such way of saying as ancient dicta learned by imperial command. It is possible that Kobayashi was aware of the gravity of the matter.

The fact is extremely simple. It is imperative that the fact that *Kojiki* is formed on the basis of Kuji (that is, Teiki is excluded from the material) be discerned in the statement that Kuji learned by imperial command by Hieda. This may be said to be expressed itself in the names.

In other words, this was clearly pointed out in my *History of the Formation of the Narrative Literature*¹⁸, and Kuji (Ancient Dicta) may be read as furu koto (ancient matters). On the other hand, Koji in the title of *Kojiki* was ancient matters in the same manner. This matter must be considered in an opposite way. First, there were ancient legends and ancient stories called furu koto, and were transcribed by using Chinese characters as kuji, and also as furu koto.¹⁹ We must admit that as a principle *Kojiki* is a book of ancient matters. The title of *Kogo Shui* (Collection of Remnant Ancient Words) by Imbe Hironari (formed in 807), a book similar to *Kojiki*, the transcription of furu koto with the Chinese characters, kuji as in *Sendai Kuji Hongi* (Principal Chronicle of Ancient Dicta of the Preceding Generations) of the 9th Century, or *Kujiki* with a forged preface to pretend it to be a formation in the early Heian Period) was nothing other than furu koto. As a principle both *Kogo Shui* and *Sendai Kuji Hongi* were books of ancient matters.

17. Tsuda Sokichi, *A Study of Japanese Classical Literature*, Vol. 1, Iwanami Shoten, 1948, pp. 39 and 64.

18. Kobayashi, *Motoori Norinaga*, Shincho Sha, 1977, p. 324.

19. See Note 3 above.

3. *Painstaking With Expression*

That pains were taken in the expression of *Kojiki* were obvious in its Preface(or may a statement of dedication). With regard to this, is there a tendency in the contemporary study of Japanese literature to evaluate Ono Asomi Yasumaro who selected and recorded *Kojiki* as though he were an original inventor, thus excessively making a hero out of him The pains in the expression in *Kojiki* were as below.

In ancient time both words and meanings were simple and laying sentences and forming phrases by using letters was difficult. To state everything by the phonetic use of Chinese characters was not completely fitting to the essential spirit.(B) To express all sounds by the ideographic use of the Chinese characters would render long-winded in expressing the gist of the matter. In one place both phonetic and ideographic were interchangeably used, or a matter was recorded by using all Chinese characters ideographically.²⁰

How creative is it to discard what are called (A) and (B) above and adopt (C) as above, that is, to use in one phrase both phonetically and ideographically in an interchangeable manner , or record one matter all with phonetics I cannot help but doubt as we may be reading to much into his achievements in an overpraising of Ono Yasumaro. This may be rephrased : what did Ono Asomi Yasumaro do

As far as we obediently read the Preface, Ono Yasumaro becomes the editor of *Kojiki* who took pains in choosing characters to be used. But we should have doubts, shouldn't we? In the study of narratives we must remain faithful all the way to the description of classic literature. At the same time, we should not swallow it whole (that is, uncritically accept it). But we need to boldly attempt at unavoidable criticism.

Judging from the fact that he was a high-ranking court official and a senior of the distinguished clan with military achievements, we may guess that he was a recorder in name only without involving himself in actual editing, while he received outwardly the imperial command to

20. Since in the ancient period the expression of sounds was difficult , sometimes Chinese characters were used phonetically, sometime ideographically, and at other times both were mixedly used.

Kojiki. we should consider that the references to pains taken in the selection of words to be used were made by those scholars who took pains or those who were engaged in editing. This amounts to that we should treat Ono Asomi Yasumaro as a symbol, and it is uncalled for to treat him as if he were the actual writer of *Kojiki*.

Although the following is a part of my free and unfettered assessment, but at the moment I start saying at this juncture that this should be the basic interpretation when we come across the sentences that a politician, a top administrator, or a clan were entrusted to write, it would become an opinion that cannot be ignored. Isn't it true that Ono Yasumaro was merely set up as an anchor for completion The one who had pains in expressing the main text was Ono Asomi Yasumaro as a sign. And it is uncalled for to treat Ono Asomi Yasumaro as if he were the actual writer of *Kojiki*. That task was painful, to be sure. But it is asserted that it could not be that he had pains in making an original invention.

4. Expressions in *Kojiki* and *Manyoshu* (Songs of Myriad Leaves)

When we write (A), (B), and (C) in a row, it may be summarized that:

In (A) if the entire sentence is written using the Chinese characters ideographically, the words do not completely match the essence of the words.

In (B) If words are all connected by using Chinese characters for phonetics, the account will be much long-winded.

For this reason in (C) the phonetical use and the ideographic use of the Chinese characters are interchangeably adopted in a phrase, or the ideographic use is adopted in recording an entire sentence.

All (A), (B), and (C) can be discerned as the means of expressing words and marks in *Manyoshu*, collections of poems of the 7th-8th Century in 20 volumes completed in the 9th Century). It is said that in its Preface that of the three (C) was selected, sometimes with (A) to write *Kojiki* (Underlined are Chinese characters used ideographically, and include post-positional particles.).

(A)

Tama hoko no michi yukazushite aramaseba nemokoro kakaru koi ni awazaramu. (if I had not ventured to travel this path, I may not have encountered that girl and may not have been tormented by longing for her.) (Song Number 2393 in Volume II in Manyoshu)

Asakage ni wagami wa narinu tamakakiru honokani miete inishi ko yuenit. (I have become thin as the gem with delicate rays after that girl with a faint figure had departed.)

(B)

Natusobiku unakamigata no okitsusu nifune wa todomemu sayo fukenikeri (Let us moor our boat near the sandbar far off along the far-reaching beach; the night wears on.) (Song Number 3348 in Volume 14)

(C)

Komoyo miko mochi fukushimo yo mibukushi mochi kono oka ni na tsumasu ko The lass, with a basket and a wooden knife, who plucks young grass shoots on this hill) (Song Number 1, in Volume 1)

Yamato niwa murayama aredo toriyorohu ameno kaguyama noboritaschi kunimi o sureba kunihara wakemuri tachi tatsu In this Yamato region there are the mountain ranges one after another. However, on this beautiful Ameno Kaguyama I climb up to look out over the country? (Song Number 2 in Volume 1)

(A) is the expression of the Chinese character poem style. (B) is the one sound for one letter expression. And as to (C), I have once said it is the Silla Hyangga style expression in my *History of the Formation of Narrative Literature*²¹. The (A) style is the expression in the Collected Poems of Kakinomoto Hitomaro (one of the original materials in *Manyoshu*). The (B) type is frequently found in Volumes 5, 14, and 17 and following. The type (C) is found in other volumes and expressions in other than Kakinomoto Hitomaro poems and this is most frequently

21. Indigenous languages (the ancient Japanese language and the ancient Korean language) are expressed by combining the ideographic and phonetic expressions. See Fujii, *A History of the formation of Narrative Literature*, pp. 209 and 726. Also see, by the same author, *The Birth of Japanese Literature*, Sangensha, p. 32.

found in *Manyoshu*.

The expression in *Manyoshu* is the same as the style of expression in the songs of the Korean Peninsula and with same principle applied and these two probably had influence on each other. Such basic element almost has no supporters frontally among today scholars of *Manyoshu*. But is it not the situation that there is the similar style of expression of poems in ancient Korea (Silla) cannot be ignored? However, in Japan the Silla *hyangga* is completely ignored or the scholars easily exclude it on the ground that *Samguk Yusa* (Heritages of the Three Kingdoms²²) were compiled later than *Manyoshu*. It may be surmised that the self-righteousness of Japanese literature bent on proving Japan, we distinguished from others survives like snow drifts in the today studies of *Manyoshu*.

5. From *Furu Koto* (Ancient Matters) to Narratives

If we peruse *Taketori Monogatari* (A Tale of a Bamboo Gatherer), *Utsuho* (A Tale of *Utsuho*), and *Ise Monogatari* (A Tale of Ise). the way of narration is mainly in the non-past tense²³. and they are free narratives. the feature of narratives is an unfettered free-style apropos talks. Even though narratives loom large in the Heian Period, they had existed from olden times, and they had been latent linguistic activities.

In contrast to this, since *furu koto* (ancient matters) are historical descriptions, the past tense is the keynote as seen in the writing style of *Kojiki*. In a typical case the narratives of myths are reminiscent of the activities of old narrators who belonged to occupational guilds and families in charge of historical legends and myths, and who demonstrated a heavy-toned lyrical and heavily rhetorical style of narration. It may well be imagined that politicians supported it in order to place history on a solid, orthodox, and prestigious ground.

However, we should note that if we review *Kojiki*, not all demonstrated such a rigid style of narration. That is to say, it is one side. The

22. In five volumes, edited by Ichinen (1208-1289).

23. Although narrative literature set s its main stream in the past incidents, the tense is narrated basically in the non-past(that is, the present) events. In contrast to this, historical description is basically set in the past .But when *Genji Monogatari* and others are translated into European languages, English for instance, the past tense is adopted.

other side consists of free and cheerful narratives that can be said to belong to truly the world of narratives.

In this regard, the sharp-minded critic of civilization, Saigo Nobutsuna (1916—) commented:

Comical and humorous were spun into at many places into *Kojiki*. and this played the role of rendering narratives unauthoritative. This was the result of that the spoken language was alive in it..Perhaps he considered what formed the foundation of the direct ground of *Kojiki* may be the spoken language (*Commentaries on Kojiki*, 1989).²⁴

Accepting this, a researcher in the middle standing of *Kojiki*, Saijo Tsutomu (1950—) declares that in essence *Kojiki* is a piece of literature in the spoken language (*The Method of Letters in Kojiki*, Kazama Shoin).²⁵ We may summarize Saijo's views that it is written down with live sounds by effectively mixing with adverbs that express various nuances, personal pronouns with connoting affectionate feeling and slang words. In that sense it may be said that Saijo hit the mark at the narratives at the other side of *Kojiki*.

To reiterate, although the contents of *Kojiki* are the raw materials, myths and history. But in actuality in the sketches of emerging personalities and their tense give-and-take are interwoven with slangs, mimetic words, exclamations, auxiliary verbs, and postpositional particles. That description truly precedes the way of works written in kana (the phonetic Japanese alphabet) called narratives later in the Heian Period. The development of the confrontation between ancient matters and narrative and by extension the dramatic development of description from ancient matters to narratives are given glimpses well in *Kojiki*.

24. Saigo, *Commentaries on Kojiki*, Vol. 4, 1989, p. 473

25. Saijo, *The Laws of Writing in Kojiki*, 1998, p. 326

III. The Fantasy in *Nihon Shoki*

1. *Doubts About the Accounts in the 7th Century*

We have this difficult to understand word, value as historical material. It probably refers to its worth in elucidating historical material. If we suppose that *Nihon Shoki* should turn out to be a book with various hidden tricks to cover up historical facts, then it has no value as historical material. On the contrary, if we should have other documents and artifacts that expose the tricks to cover up, the latter has a value as historical material.

On writings in the 7th Century, the following six questions among others may be extracted.

First, according to *Nihon Shoki* Empress Saimei ascended the throne again after she quit the position of empress, Empress Kogyoku. It is unthinkable that the sovereign who was once a sovereign again ascended the throne. It is not that we doubt the facts. But *Nihon Shoki* showed the dual sovereignty as a fantasy so to speak, (if that can be called fantasy.) Then, what is the essence of the fantasy.

Second, related but the intricate fantasy of the scheme that the same person, Empress Kogyoku and Empress Saimei, was separated into two, and in between the male Emperor Kotoku who was in Naniwa (present day Osaka) away from Nara ascended the throne. What did the account intend for.

Third, it is said that the two, Kogyoku (Saimei), and Kotoku, ascended the throne in spite of the fact that both had fathers, mothers, grandfathers, and grandmothers, never ascending the throne. How was this possible that the person without being the descendants of the sovereign became sovereign. Incidentally, Kogyoku (Saimei) and Kotoku had the same mother

Fourth, Nakano Oe (Emperor Tenchi) remained as the crown prince for too long a time? There is an article at the end of the Chronicle of Jomei (in *Nihon Shoki* that crown prince Kaibetsu was assassinated Also, at the end of the Chronicle of Kogyoku an article says that akano Oe was appointed crown prince. That person, Nakano Oe kept remaining as the crown prince during reign of Kotoku following Kogyoku and the reign of Kotoku after the next.

Fifth, even when the time arrived for him to ascend the throne, Nakano Oe left the throne unoccupied for six or seven years. Then, finally he was able to ascend the throne not in Yamato but in the vicinity of Lake Biwa (Shiga Prefecture). Is it that the historical facts were fantasized and finally he ascended the throne. What kind of fantasy is that we see in the vacancy of emperor equals the sovereign by proxy system.

Sixth, when did he come to the capital from Kyushu in that the sovereign by proxy system. Where was the capital? These were obscured but resultantly the Chronicle of Tench (in *Nihon Shoki*, Book 27), a part of the historical book was fully formed. This is indeed an astonishing fantasy.

We cannot help but saying that Emperor Tenchi is suspicious, but we sense, no matter how, that more suspicious is none other than Emperor Temmu. To say it succinctly, can we trust that Tenchi and Temmu were brothers who had the same mother? Everything is suspicious but the historical book in the 7th Century was only *Nihon Shoki*. Since such was the situation within Japan that is no other alternative but exposing the fiction of *Nihon Shoki*, whether one was a historian or a non-historian. Many have argued that for the time being we would depend on *Nihon Shoki*.

2. Double Ascension, Emperors, Same Mother, and the Unbroken Lineage for Generations

Of the first item above, the double ascension by Empresses Kogyoku and Saiamei, we feel that it is not possible for an emperor or an empress to become sovereign again. According to the description all emperors and empresses were lifetime sovereigns. There were many historians even in the modern period who thought about it, and they seemed to have reached the conclusion that in view of the principle that the sovereign was lifetime the empress ascended the throne again in order to cancel the unnaturalness that she resigned before the end of her life. However, with such reasoning, they could not explain why she quit once unnaturally.

In the modern period some scholars argued for the particular nature of an empress. This is related to the argument whether or not

Princess Iitoyo no Himehiko and Princess Hashihito no Himemiko ascended the throne. However, such an argument leads to conclusion that *Nihon Shoki* included arbitrary accounts that a certain female ascended the throne while another did not.

In order to rationalize and straighten out some hidden historical facts, someone came up with a bright idea to describe *Nihon Shoki* so as to let the empress resign once and then let her ascend the throne again. Are we to involve ourselves in such endless arguments.

Of the second fantasy above which referred to the contention with the power in Naniwa and the dual imperial power, if we assume that both Empress Kogyoku and the emperor Kotoku in Naniwa were full-fledged sovereigns with the imperials spirit it was a case of a plural number of sovereign on the throne. It is probably not problematic to surmise that the description to set up both sovereigns as brother and sister was a fiction. If we assume that the chronicler hated and avoided the dual sovereignty, then it was following the historic idea of an endless continuation from emperor to emperor. Such an idea was indeed what *Nihon Shoki* and *Kojiki* were designed to advocate. In accordance with the idea of an endless genealogy of emperors for generations, beginning with Emperor Jimmu to Emperors Suisei, Annei, Itoku, Muretsu, Keitai, Ankan, Senka, etc., the dual sovereignty would have been the fabrication of the profound thought of the historical describers during the era of Emperor Temmu so as to adjust the historical facts in the first half of the 7th Century called the dual sovereignty.

Of the third item above, it is understood that the fact that both sovereigns had none of their fathers, mothers, grandfathers, and grandmothers had ever ascended the throne was intended to be seen through some kinds of historical facts. There is no reason why the fathers, mothers, grandfathers, and grandmothers of sovereigns should have been sovereigns. It probably suggests that the 7th Century, preceded by the 5th Century and the 6th Century, was a part of the ancient period and the struggle for the imperial tradition continued. Indeed toward the end of this era the Reform of Taika (645, A.D.) and the last strife, the Jinshin Rebellion (672, A.D.) took place. And an era designed to be an attempt for an institutional accomplishment, various reforms were implemented by Emperor Temmu and his bureaucrats. This would be an overview of this period.

3. Are Crimes in History Written?

Who was Nakano Oe It is nothing but a riddle. Empress Saimei passed away in July, the autumn of the seventh year (661, A. D.) at the Asakura Palace in Kyushu. Then, Nakano Oe reached the Iwase Palace (the Nagase Palace near Hakata, Kyushu). He stayed overnight at a certain place and composed a poem to longingly mourn her. The funeral procession of the deceased empress stopped overnight in Naniwa, and in November that year she was laid in state at the field along River Asuka. (from the Chronicle of Saimei).

In the Chronicle of Tenchi references were made to the Battle of River Hakuson (Kum River in Korea) and the fall of Kudara (Baekje in Korea). Where was Nakano Oe (later Emperor Tenchi) in the meanwhile Did he remain at the Nagatsu Palace or did he come with his mother Empress Saimei's casket to Yamato Since nothing was recorded about this, we are not knowledgeable about his whereabouts.

In February in the spring in the third year (664, A.D.) the emperor commanded his elder Brother to promulgate the 26h Crown Ranks, the ancestral gods, the people guild and the family guild. Theses were common with the reforms during the era of Emperor Temmu. Therefore, the elder Brother was probably the Emperor Temmu later. Who was the person who was referred to as the elder Brother. He (Nakano Oe) was not on the throne yet. We cannot ascertain where he returned to, even if he returned from Kyushu, and where the place referred to as the capital was. (March of the same year). It was probably in Yamato that the crown prince Nakano Oe personally visited the house of Saeki no Komaro no Muraji . His mother Empress Saimei and Dowager Hashihito who passed away the year before last were buried together at the mausoleum of Koichioka. And it was recorded that he thus moved to Omi and finally ascended the throne in January of the seventh year (668, A.D.). In regard to the prolonged interregnum for six year the historians,, in an attempt to fill the vacant years, imagined that during this period Dowager Hasahito had ascended the throne. The vacancy was a puzzle to the historians. Their thinking was at the same level of the historical scribes of the Temmu, including Jito, period who filled the vacancy with the rule by proxy.

We should say that it was known where the real power, Tenchi,

came from. Similarly, where the next generation? Temmu who won the imperial power after going through the Jinshin Rebellion came from was not known. It is easy to reason that the real culprits who made Tenchi completely obscure were none other than Temmu himself and his historical scribes. I would believe that historical facts were covered up to the level of a perfect crime. I would like to say that the book that fantasized he crimes of history to the level of a perfect crime was *Nihon Shoki*.

If we assume that it was that man, Temmu, who by the free exercise of fantasy made the sovereign right continue unbroken for generations forever, and made that to be supported by the bureaucratic system, and institutionalized the emperor itself so as to prevent another Jinshin Rebellion from breaking out, we may say that the era of Temmu was not only the time when the system of criminal laws and civil laws was really initiated, but also is was time when the imperial system of the ancient period began?

Historians have calculated the year of Emperor Temmu's birth. We cannot determine the age of Emperor Temmu because nowhere in *Nihon Shoki* can we find the year of his birth. Even that is the case, modern commentators of *Nihon Shoki* attempt at annotation. According to the annotations to *Nihon Shoki* as in the Outline of Japanese Literature²⁶, the age of Emperor Temmu's death was recorded as 65 years old in *Ichidai Yoki* (The Summary of the Generation) and *Shoun Roku* (The Records of Shoun), and as 63 years old in *Jinno Shotoki* (A History of the True Succession of the Divine Emperors). However, these accounts make Emperor Temmu older than his elder brother Emperor Tenchi. Today, is reported to be a potent theory to view the age 65 as the perversion of 56.

That emperor Temmu becomes older than his elder brother Emperor Tenchi is accredited to various books in the Kamakura Period (13th Century) and the North-South Imperial Families Period (141th Century) including *Ichidai Yoki* (A Summary of the One Generation), *Koin Shoun-roku* (Records of the Succession of the Imperial Descendants), and *Jinno Shotoki*. This does not make it embarrassing in narration. However,

26. *Nihon Shoki* in A Great System of Japanese Classical Literature, Vol. 2, 481. Also see, Fuji Sadakazu, *The Beginning of Japanese Novels*, Taishukan Shoten, 1995, p. 63.

historians overturn it probably because as they want to reject it as illogical that 65 years old is the perversion of 56 years old. It is needless to say that the ages written in *Ichidai Yoki*, *Koin Shounroku*, and *Jinno Shotoki* should not be blamed at all. When we come to the reversing of 65 years old to 56 years old, it is pitiful. For, it happened more than one 1.000 years ago which is beyond comprehension in the modern period. Nevertheless, the way of historical studies in the modern and recent modern periods which claims to clarify the truth by hanging on to *Nihon Shoki*. blocks our view like walls.

It is important, I am afraid, that we cannot determine the years of birth or ages from *Nihon Shoki*. Therefore, we cannot tell whether Temmu was older than his elder brother Emperor Tenchi. From today's perspective, we can determine neither way. What is to be blamed is the attitude that since it cannot be determined, the level of the accounts as in *Nihon Shoki* is temporarily assumed to be a premise. This constitutes a beginning of moral decay. Indeed such a method of preserving *Nihon Shoki* renders fantasies unquestionable. It is a way to deceive the lost history with a fake redemption.

4. Oral History and the Literature of the Minority or Conclusion

The folklorist Yanagida Kunio said:

The view that the cause that has made up not only our language but also the current conditions of our cultural life can be traced mainly to the recent past (*The Future of Our Language*, 1939).

Just because he preached that the cause and the cause of that cause can be found in the recent past, it is dangerous to find the cause and effect for today by leaping back in one motion to things of the olden times. Even though within the framework of the idea of the studies of national and state culture, Yanagida repeatedly criticized the traditional studies of the national language and the state.

Whether literature or accessories to literature, with the exception of Haiku which is supposed to be the poem of the moment, generally whether it is genre, work is formed over time. Also, even after it has been formed it continues metamorphosis and reappearance. However, written scripts allow us to view literature as visible. Thus, studies of

literature are predominantly positioned as the work to start with viewing literature as has been formed by avoiding to go into the process of its formation. Its heart I is in turning literature by written scripts into the objective. The world of oral literature termed as unwritten literature by the specialist in the study of the Ainu (aborigines of Japan) language, Kindaichi Kyosuke (1882-1971) is almost completely shut out by the main stream of the study of Japanese literature.²⁷

Needless to say, Yanagida initiated the study of folklores, Origuchi Shinobu (1887-1953) established the study of Japanese classical literature with the help of folklores, and Iha Fuyu (1876-1947) started the base for promising area studies of Okinawa. To Origuchi the discovery of Okinawa exists as the proof of the ancient period. That Okinawa area and the antiquated Shinto music and dance style (kagura) festivals became the popular targets of the students of literature even after Origuchi passing. It so happened that there the ancient was actually discovered one after another. Even if what was actually discovered was the medieval period, the fantasy of the ancient seen through it was difficult to be erased. The consciousness of crisis lurked in the self-examination that whether or not the flow of literature should end in a linear fashion from the ancient, to the new ancient (Heian), to Kamakura, to Muromachi, and so on. Consequently, the Ancient Life (Kodai Seikatsu, the first of draft *Emergence of the Japanese Classical Literature (Kokubungaku no Hasei)*, 1924) and others were discovered by the study of folklores. After criticizing the ideology-free Japanese classical literature, Origuchi, we should say Origuchi too, early declared for the study of Japanese classical literature from an extra literature sphere, called the study of folklores. To him too Japanese classical literature in the folklore fashion was the point of destination of the Japanese classical literature and not the starting point of criticism.

Kindaichi was closely questioned by his friend Ishikawa Takuboku (Japanese style poet, and poet, 1886-1912). that on earth are you going to do with the study of the Ainu (Japanese aborigines) This was a harsh questioning on his part. Entrusting Ishikawa Takuboku with the dream of literature Kindaichi aimed at linguistics. Kindaichi was questioned by

27. *The Study of the Yukara*, 1st Installment, An Outline of the Yukara, Toyo Bunko Foundation, 1931, p. 3 ff.

none other than Ishikawa Takuboku the poignant point that Kindaichi selected as the target the language of the Ainu among other languages. Kindaichi responded:

Even the investigation of that pathetic Ainu language is , to start with, for the study of the Japanese language. The study of the Japanese language is for the renewed recognition of Japanese culture. The renewed recognition of Japanese culture is for the deep and accurate interpretation of our real life. That is to say, it is the only way to think about our life tomorrow.²⁸

It is simple to rebuke the centralism on the Japanese language as expressed here. And it would be the perfunctory duty of the modern man to point out the Ideology of nation state. At the same time, Kindaichi's accomplishment in the *study of Yukara* (Yukar, the Ainu Saga) is a group of immortal studies, and it looms much larger than his early motive. The study of Japanese literature which pushes aside it as though it were a study of unknown literature, ignores it, and yet not ashamed of it should be truly rebuked.

28. Kindaichi, *Ishikawa Takuboku*, Bunkyo Kaku, 1934, p. 165.

Duara's study of the repressed history is undoubtedly one of the best in the field. He gives a detailed and illustrative account of the alternative historical view in modern China. A must-read for interested people. Read more. Prasenjit Duara weaves together theoretical and historical material on China and India in this insightful look at how history has become "nation-centric." Although historical writing has a long, diverse history beyond the nation-state, "modern history" in the Western sense began with the rise of the European nation-states in the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries. His essays on civil society and provincial narratives (Chapters 5 and 6) are especially interesting. My primary object is narrative form rather than the form of the surface of narratives – verbal nuance, graphic design, balletic movements. "Style" in this sense, the properties of the text. preface 11. There is a distinguished tradition of Anglo-American studies on narrative: Henry James, Percy Lubbock, Wayne Booth. Less known in this country but of great importance is a flood of recent work from Russia and France. On this view literary theory is the study of the nature of literature. It is not concerned with the evaluation or description of any particular literary work for its own sake. It is not literary criticism but the study of the givens of criticism, the nature of literary objects and their parts. It is, as Rene Wellek and Austin Warren point out, an "organon of methods." 4. And yet, just as early Japanese modernity often seemed haunted by remnants of the premodern past, the nation's newly heteronormative culture was unable and perhaps unwilling to expunge completely the recent memory of a male homosocial past now read as perverse. And I think you were in love with me as well. In the Japanese edition of Kawabata's collected works, the first sentence forms one vertical line in which each successive body part is represented by a single Chinese character, creating a plunging visual analogue for this long caress from fingers to eyelids Cite this Item. ONE Toward a Definition of Homosocial Narrative. ONE Toward a Definition of Homosocial Narrative. (pp. 24-42). DOI: 10.2307/j.ctt1x07z26.4. In contemporary historical theory the topic of narrative has been the subject of extraordinarily intense debate. Looked at from one perspective, this is surprising; for on the face of it there should be very little to debate about narrative. Narration is a manner of speaking as universal as language itself, and narrative is a mode of verbal representation so seemingly natural to human consciousness that to suggest it is a problem might well appear pedantic. See Art and Illusion: A Study in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation (New York, 1960), 116-146. 2. Thus, for example, M. Mandelbaum denies the propriety of calling the kind of accounts. 2 HAYDEN WHITE.