

# **FUSŌ GOBUSSHIN RON**

- HONKOKU -

## **PREFATORY REMARKS:**

⟨...⟩ marks interlinear characters.

⟨⟨...⟩⟩ marks headnotes.

The *kaeriten* and *okurigana* that are inserted in black in the original text are reproduced as subscript and superscript respectively.

The punctuation, which has been added by a later hand in red, is reproduced as 「、」 and 「。 」, as the context indicates.

## **ABBREVIATIONS:**

Mor. = Morohashi Tetsuji, *Dai Kan-Wa jiten*.

NSTS = *Nihon Shisō Tōsō Shiryō*.

T2115 = *Taishō zōkyō*, text (number).

TZ vol. = *Taishō zōkyō*, vol. (number).

ZST = *Zoku Shintō Taikei*.

『扶桑護佛神論』 本刻

0 : 1 才

扶桑護佛神論序」

昔嵩明教大師隱西湖」

三十載廣索魯誥普探」

竺典着述于輔教徧及」

排韓<sup>1</sup>三十篇扶翼欲釋」

教之已顛墜矣令余遁』

0 : 1 ウ

南牧閱林氏陽揚神道」

陰抑神法顯關佛道為」

邪說而不忍默為此論」

冀有意神佛之人者讀」

之誦之何是何非為當」

臺明鏡易辨胡漢而已』

0 : 2 才

也然則於此二教豈其」

無小補<sup>2</sup>哉」

維峇<sup>3</sup>貞享四丁卯年<至<sub>二</sub>安永四年<sub>一</sub>—經<sub>二</sub>八十九年<sub>4</sub>>」

<sup>1</sup> Chōon makes mistakes in both titles. In *Fujiaobian*, the character 徧 is a mistake for 編, and in *Fei Han*, 排 is a mistake for 非. The title *Fei Han* 非韓 is attested, the title *Pai Han* 排韓 is not; see *Tanjin wenji* 鐔津文集 ("Collected works of Qisong"), T2115; TZ vol. 52, p. 722a17. We will emend accordingly

<sup>2</sup> The character is unclearly written. The left half is radical 113 示, and the right half just might be 申, but 神 makes no sense. The right half might also be 甫. As this makes more sense, we have decided to adopt the present interpretation. It is a reference to *Mengzi* 7A13, where we find: 「豈曰小補之哉」. Legge translates this as: "How can it be said that he mends society but in a small way!"

<sup>3</sup> This character is the old form of 時.

<sup>4</sup> These last ten characters are written in red ink, on the left side of the four characters 四丁卯年. A stroke

□□黒瀧湖山僧自題』

0 : 2 ウ

1 : 1 才

扶桑護佛神論卷之上』

□□□□□上州黒瀧嗣祖沙門湖音撰』

林氏神社考<五之三右<sup>5</sup>>厩戸皇子傳曰、余考ニルニ聖徳太子』

事ヲ、標ニ出日本紀所レ載既已如レ右。或問テ曰傳燈』

録ニ雲居ノ道膺ノ傳ニ曰<sup>6</sup>南岳思大和尚生ニシテ倭国ニ作レ』

王。鑑真又曰、我聞ク南岳思公生ニシテ和国ニ弘ニムト佛法ヲ』

聖徳太子ノ事我知レレリ之。且又曰、所レノ行ニ于世ニ之太』

子傳具載ニス此事ヲ。未レ知果シテ然リヤ否ヤ。余答曰、再生之』

1 : 1 ウ

説浮屠氏之所レ言也非吾儒ノ之所ニ專言ニ也雖』

レ然羊祐<sup>8</sup>圓澤カ之叟、是史傳之所レ稱スル、亦不レ可レ誣』

乎。有レ説ニ于此ニ。人物之生スルヤ也、皆天地陰陽之所レ』

感、生者ハ自ラ息ヒ、死者ハ自ラ消ス。譬ハ如ク逝川之不レ舍ニ晝』

夜ヲ更無ニ一息ノ之間斷ニ也。今年之春非ニ去年之』

春ニ。樹頭ノ之花非ニ復根ノ之花ニ。易ニ曰ク原レ子始反レル終ニ故ニ』

知ニ死生之説ヲ。由レ是觀レレハ之無ニシ人死シテ再ヒ生スルノ義ニ。雖レ』

resembling a bracket connects 四 and 至.

<sup>5</sup> These four characters are written in red ink next to 考厩. They are connected to 考 by a kind of bracket. It will be a reference to where the quoted passage is to be found in the edition of *Jinja-kō* the author used. The passage is in the fifth fascicle, but "third (page?), right" is somewhat strange.

<sup>6</sup> The edition in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* (NSTS) vol. 1, p. 521, has 謂 instead of 曰.

<sup>7</sup> The intended character must be 果 (*hatashite*), which also fits the *okurigana*.

<sup>8</sup> The correct character is 祐; cf. Mor. IX: 28425-59/60. We have substituted this character in the *yomikudashi*.

然聚散遲速、如二火ノ之初テ滅ヘテ而烟氣猶鬱一セルカ乎。故ニ』

1 : 2 才

有ニ鬼神之感格一、有ニ厲灵之来出一、有ニ精爽之依」

託一、有ニ魂魄之流行一、而其終ニ由ニル太虚一ニ無レ所レ不レト云之ユカ。」

何ノ蹤跡ノ之遺カ有ンヤ哉。況ンヤ其レ人死シテ又託胎センヤ乎。佛氏」

三世ノ之説、今ノ果ハ夙ノ之因也、今ノ之因ハ後ノ之果」

也。其ノ要ニスル<sup>9</sup>至レル令ニルニ人人ヲシテ修レシ善止一レメ惡而ノミ已。下愚庸昧」

不レ悟ニ此ノ意一ヲ。恐懼疑惑シテ遂ニ以為ニ實ニ有ニ三世一。是必」

野狐耳ノミ。若ニキンハ夫レ祭ニ祀スルカ祖考一ヲ存ニス其ノ至誠一ヲ、則洋洋トシテ乎」

如レ見ルカ如レ在カ。譬ヘハ如下植ニ梅子一ヲ得ニ梅樹一、種ニヘテ杏仁ヲ得中杏』

1 : 2 ウ

樹上ヲ。於レ物已ニ然リ、人モ亦如レ此。是レ蓋シ一氣之條理也。」

故曰非ニシテ其ノ鬼一ニ而祭レルハ之謠ル<sup>10</sup>也ト<已上林氏全文<sup>11</sup>>○林氏<已下

六之七以下取要<sup>12</sup>>於ニテハ厩戸傳一ニ」

者、説レ無ニ再生因果之事一。又至ニ僧正カ谷ノ傳一ニ者、即」

説ニク人ノ之死灵為ニルト天狗一ト。其人者歴代ノ天子ノ之中ニハ、」

讚岐院、後鳥羽院、後醍醐院。又沙門之中ニハ、傳」

教、弘法、自覺、知證、柿本僧正、尊意、慈惠、覺鑿、」

法然、日蓮、栄西、普門、十野、文觀、踈石、妙吉。一」

卷ノ書ノ中ニシテ、前ニハ謂レヒ無ニト再生因果一、後ニハ又説レ有ニ再生因』

1 : 3 才

<sup>9</sup> Both the *kaeriten* and the *okurigana* of this character are crossed out in red ink. This agrees with the punctuation in the edition in NSTS vol. 1

<sup>10</sup> The character 謠 is read *utagau* or *tagau* (Mor. X: 35831), which makes no sense in the present context. The intended character will have been 諂, which is glossed as *hetsurau* or *kobiru* (+/2); see Mor. X: 35616. In the *Yomikudashi*, we will, therefore, emend the character to 諂 and we will read *koburu*.

<sup>11</sup> Written in red, to the left of the line, and linked to the character 也 by a kind of bracket. The foregoing is a complete and correct quotation of Razan's first comment on the biography of Shōtoku-taishi; see *Honchō jinja kō* 5 (NSTS vol. 1, p. 521).

<sup>12</sup> Written in red, to the right side of the line, and linked to the character 林 with a kind of bracket.

果一。嗚呼汝聰明ニシテ無ニトハ智慧一以レノ是故也也。不レ憚ニ吾朝」  
之天子一ヲ、而謂レ墮ニト魔道一ニ。此邦ノ謂ニテ有徳高僧一ヲ悉墮ニトス」  
魔道ニ。大逆無道ノ人也也。林氏前ニハ謂ニヒ羊祐圓澤等」  
事、史傳所レ称スル、亦不レト可レ証乎、後ニハ謂ニフ人死無ニ再生ノ」  
之義一。又是前後不レ同之論也也。汝為ニタリ博識之人一。」  
然出レスコト辞ヲ前後相違如ニナルコト醉狂ノ人ノ何ソヤ也。林氏又曰、「  
佛氏所レ説三世因果雖ニ曾無一レ之、要ニスル使レ人修レ善」  
止一レント惡而耳ノミト。夫レ非ニ釋氏ノミ立ニ三世因果一ヲ。吾國於ニ神」

1 : 3 ウ

道一ニ詳ニ有ニリ此ノ説一。佛ニハ謂ニヒ地獄一ト神ニハ謂ニ根ノ國一ト謂ニフ底ノ國一ト。  
佛ニハ」

《神道説ニ三世》

謂ニヒ天道一ト神ニハ謂ニ天原一ト。佛ニ謂ニヒ極樂一神ニハ謂ニフ常世一ト。佛家ニ閻」  
魔大王者ト云フハ神道服狹ノ雄ノ尊<sup>ソ</sup>来<sup>サ</sup>冉<sup>ヲ</sup>ノ尊也。佛家ニハ」  
説レク植ニト八識田ニ於善惡ノ種子一ヲ<sup>13</sup>。 神道ニ八識田ハ者人」  
之五臟ノ中ニハ指ニシテ脾ノ臟一ヲ為ニル八識田一ト者也也。所謂ル脾ハ者」  
土也也。植ニカ善惡種子ヲ於脾臟一ニ故、生前死後所ノ植ル」  
種子、善惡相現<sup>ムクフ</sup>シテ、而相報酬ル者也也。然則日本神」

道ニハ者、機<sup>14</sup>先ニシテ而説ニキ三世因果一ヲ天竺ノ佛法ニハ者遙カ後也」

1 : 4 才

也、又<sup>15</sup>為ニ此説一矣。神道佛道、説ニコト三世ノ因果一ヲ一般也」

<sup>13</sup> The sentence would make more sense in the reversed order: 植善惡ノ種子於八識田. We will emend and translate accordingly.

<sup>14</sup> This character is an *itaiji*, and difficult to identify. In form it is closest to 杭, but that character would not make any sense. One of the many *itaiji* of 機 resembles this character; the combination 機先 is attested (see Mor. VI: 15561-105) and *does* make sense. However, the same *itaiji* appears again in our manuscript (1:12b, line 1), in a passage quoted from *Taisei-kyō*. Both printed editions of that text have the character 祝 in the second instance. Unfortunately, neither in this, nor in the other context does 祝 make any sense. We have, therefore, decided to retain 機 at this point.

也。於<sub>レ</sub>テハ儒ニ上古ハ悉ク知<sub>ル</sub>ニル三世ノ因果一ヲ。中古以往ノ儒士ハ」  
不<sub>レ</sub>シテ知<sub>レ</sub>之説ニク妄説一者也。吾カ邦ノ起請文用<sub>ル</sub>コトハ熊野ノ牛」  
《熊野牛王起請文》

王一ヲ者、蓋シ<sub>シ</sub>公來冉尊從ニ底根國一、來ニテ那智ノ瀧一、<sup>ミソギ</sup>灌頂シ」  
除<sub>レ</sub>穢鎮ニ坐<sub>ス</sub>此地一ニ。故ニ公來冉尊能ク知<sub>ル</sub>ニル根ノ國之事一ヲ。」  
故ニ以<sub>ニ</sub>テ熊野ノ牛王一ヲ為<sub>ニ</sub>スル起請紙一ト者也也。徒ニ非<sub>レ</sub>用<sub>レ</sub>之。又』  
熊野ノ比丘尼、説<sub>ニ</sub>コト地獄ノ繪圖一ヲ者、去來冊尊ハ者女」  
體ニシテ而已ニ入<sub>ニ</sub>根ノ國一知<sub>ル</sub>ニル其極苦一ヲ。故ニ比丘尼圖<sub>レ</sub>シ之説<sub>レ</sub>』

1 : 4 ウ

之實ニ不<sub>レ</sub>誣矣。汝カ輩使<sub>ニ</sub>ムレハ因果撥無ノ之人一ヲシテ親ニ近セ君」  
父一ニ則思<sub>レ</sub>フ無<sub>ニ</sub>ト因果<sup>16</sup>。故ニ陽ニハ忠ニ孝シ君父一ニ、陰ニハ為<sub>ニ</sub>スコト弑逆一ヲ  
必セリ」  
矣。未濁邪見ノ之世ハ者、只以<sub>レ</sub>テ恐<sub>ニ</sub>ヲ因果一修<sub>レ</sub>メ身齊<sub>レ</sub>ヘ家」  
治<sub>ニ</sub>天下一ヲ。若シ蔑<sub>レ</sub>トハ之則為<sub>ニ</sub>ル斷無ノ外道一ト者也。故佛ノ曰」  
寧<sub>ロ</sub>起<sub>ニ</sub>スコト有<sub>ノ</sub>見一ヲ如<sub>ニ</sub>ナルトモ須弥山一。莫<sub>下</sub>レ起<sub>ニ</sub>コト無<sub>ノ</sub>見一如<sub>中</sub>スルノ芥子上  
也。戒<sub>レ</sub>メ」  
之慎<sub>レ</sub>メ之ヲ」

林氏編ニ神社考一其ノ序ニ先引<sub>ニ</sub>延喜式神名帳一曰、」  
日本國中大小神社三千一百三十二座<sup>17</sup>。林』

1 : 5 才

氏已ニ知<sub>ニ</sub>テ入<sub>ニ</sub>麻燼<sub>ニ</sub>コトヲ國記一ヲ而言<sub>レ</sub>之<sup>18</sup>。然<sub>ル</sub>トハ則秦火ノ之後」  
奚<sub>ソ</sub>不<sub>レ</sub>疑<sub>下</sub>孔壁ノ之中ニ有<sub>レ</sub>ノ藏<sub>ニ</sub>コト論語一ヲ之事<sub>上</sub>ヲ、而還<sub>テ</sub>根<sub>ニ</sub>本<sub>ト</sub>シテ」

15 It is a strange construction with 也又 ... 矣, but in view of the meaning of the sentence, the character 也 should not be regarded as a sentence-final particle (*nari*), but as pause marker (*ya*).

16 The character used here for the first time to render *in*, is not in the font, and not listed in Morohashi. The same character is also used in the next line.

17 A correct quotation from the Preface of *Honchō jinja kō*; see NSTS vol. 1, p. 365, line 1.

18 This is stated in the Preface of *jinja-kō*; see NSTS vol. 1, p. 366, line 3.

于<sup>19</sup>馬子ノ舊事紀安丸<sup>20</sup>ノ古事紀<sup>21</sup>舍人日本紀延」  
喜神名帳一ヲ編ニシテ神社考一鑿レ板傳レ世。大ニ生ニスルヲ天下古」  
今學者ノ迷乱一是何ソヤ也。實ニ尺モ有レ所レ短<sup>22</sup>トスル也者ノカ乎。幸」  
汝カ所レノ覽太子先代舊事紀ノ中有ニ神社本紀<sup>23</sup>一不シテ」  
用ニ此ノ先書一ヲ、用ニテ彼ノ後書一ヲ、爲ニス左道ノ之說一ヲ。又伊勢太」  
《大神宮ハ生身而謂ニ宗廟一誤》

神宮謂ニフ之ヲ宗廟一ト<sup>24</sup>。其レ謂ニフハ之廟一ト不當之說也。伊勢』

1 : 5 ウ

太神宮者ハ生身ノ神ナルカ故ニ太子舊事紀ニ称ニスル也宗宮一ト也。」

〈五之五葉全文<sup>25</sup>〉

林氏又曰或又問<sup>26</sup>太子ノ未来紀<sup>27</sup>在ニト天王寺一ニ如」

《太子未来記》

何。余答曰、世俗ノ所レ称スル有下可レ信者上、有ニ可レ疑者一、有ニ」

可レ排ス者一。太子未来紀吾レ初メ疑レ之。世未下曾テ有中見レ」

之者上。是レ亦浮屠誇說之事<sup>ノミ</sup>耳。夫レ識緯術数ハ聖」

人所レ排也。雖ニ太子作一レト之ヲ不レ可レ信ス也。況ヤ無レヲヤ之乎。」

設使有レトモ之復後世託ニスル也言于太子一ニ也。傳教嘗テ作ニル」

19 The intended character is 于. First, the character 牙 was written, but this was a mistake, as is indicated by the the *katakana* ヒ (= 非: "not correct") written to the left of that character. Next to it, 于 was written.

20 Intended is Ō no Yasumaro 太安万侶, the writer of the *Kojiki*.

21 Here and in many other instances Chōon uses the character 紀 instead of 記.

22 This is the first half of an old Chinese saying, quoted from the poem *Bu Ju* 卜居 ("Divining a place to stay") in *Chu Ci* 楚辭 ("Poems of Chu"). The complete saying runs as follows: 「尺有所短寸有所長」 - "For some things a foot is too short, and for some things an inch is too long." See see Mor. IV: 7632-100, and *Soji* (Hoshikawa Kiyotaka 星川清孝, ed., *Shin'yaku Kanbun taikei*, Tokyo: Meiji Shoin, 1970), p. 276.

23 The ten volume *Sendai kuji hongei* (*Kujiki*) does not contain a chapter that bears the title *Jinja hongei*. Hence, Chōon must be referring to 71 of *Sendai kuji hongei Taisei-kyō*. In other works as well, such as *Shigatsu yawa* 指月夜話, Chōon time and again refers to or quotes from *Sendai kuji hongei*, but in almost all cases, he actually means *Taisei-kyō* in seventy-two fascicles.

24 Razan says so in the preface of *Jinja-kō*; see NSTS vol. 1, p. 365, line 4.

25 These six characters are written in red ink on the right side of the four characters 林氏又曰, to which they are connected by a kind of bracket. The reference is to *Jinja-kō* 5, p. 5.

26 *Jinja-kō* inserts the character 曰 at this point; see NSTS vol. 1, p. 522, line 12.

27 Again, Chōon uses the character 紀 instead of 記, though the latter is correct, and used in *Jinja-kō*.

天台座主ノ記一ヲ。〈後28〉至<sup>レ</sup>位<sup>ニ</sup>者ハ開テ而見ルニ、我姓名前定シテ而』

1 : 6 才

在リト云29。是與ニ太子ノ未来紀一同日之談也也。余豈ニ信<sup>シ</sup>ヤ」

焉哉。曰元弘ノ中楠正成請ニシテ天王寺ノ僧一ヲ、開ニテ秘府ヲ」

見ニル未来紀一。其中ニ云ク、東魚食ニフ西鳥一ヲ。西鳥飛來テ而」

食ニムト東魚一ヲ30。今何ソ謂<sup>レ</sup>無<sup>レ</sup>之乎。曰ク夫<sup>レ</sup>正成者ハ謀畧之」

士也也。時ニ<sup>チン</sup>軍ニテ31於寺ノ側一ニ、掠ニメテ和泉河内一ヲ、將<sup>レ</sup>襲ニハント六波羅一  
ヲ。」

於<sup>レ</sup>是以ニ東魚西鳥一ヲ、爲ニ當時之<sup>シルシ</sup>一32 識一ト、令ニ人人ヲシテ信シテ而」

不<sup>レ</sup>疑。是勸33<sup>レ</sup>士勵<sup>レ</sup>勇之術。蓋シ楠氏之所<sup>レ</sup>カ爲乎。34 〈以上林氏35

林」

氏此ノ説爲ニ楠氏勸<sup>レ</sup>士勵<sup>レ</sup>勇之術一。有<sup>レ</sup>云<sup>レ</sup>見ニル<sup>レ</sup>未来紀一ヲ、』

1 : 6 ウ

近世ノ武人以テ爲ニ<sup>下上</sup>信然36一ト。汝カ此ノ邪説罪不<sup>レ</sup>許<sup>レ</sup>誅者也」

也。爲<sup>レ</sup>破ニ汝邪解一ヲ、今茲ニ記ニ未然本紀序37一ヲ。天皇三」

28 The character is written at the left side of the line; a dot indicates that it is to be inserted at this point.

29 *Jinkja-kō* inserts the character 爾 at this point; see NSTS vol. 1, p. 523, line 1. 云爾 at the end of a sentence indicates a fictitious quotation.

30 Chōon correctly quotes *Jinja-kō*, but Razan had not correctly quoted *Taihei-ki* 太平記. For details, see Translation, note 60.

31 The *furigana chin* does not fit the character 軍; for the reading *chin / jin*, one needs the character 陣. Furthermore, the *okurigana te* must be a mistake for *shite*. *Gun-suru* can have the meaning "to strike camp," while *jin-suru* rather means "to array the army for battle." The Jingū Bunko *bon* of *Gobusshin-ron* gives the *furigana ikusa-dachi*, and a *yomikudashi* of *Honchō jinja kō* gives *ikusa* ("war, battle") as the reading for the character 軍, which is possible, but not very likely in the present case. If he had been fighting, Masashige would not have been able to visit the temple.

32 The *kaeriten* '一' next to 之 must be a mistake. The object of 為 is 識, and 之 just serves to subordinate 當時 to 識.

33 *Jinkja-kō* has the character 勤 instead of 勸; see NSTS vol. 1, p. 523, line 4. 勸, however, seems superior.

34 But for the differences mentioned in the preceding notes, this is a complete and correct quotation of *Jinja-kō* 5; see NSTS vol. 1 from p. 522, line 12 to p. 523, line 5.

35 These four characters are written in red ink on the right side of the characters 乎林. They are connected to 乎 by a kind of bracket.

36 The meaning or function of the characters 下 and 上 to the right of 信 and 然 is unclear.

37 See *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 69: frame 2-4; ZST vol. 4, pp. 279-280.



十三年ノ春正月、山背<sup>ヤマシロ</sup>ノ大兄ノ王自持<sup>スハ</sup>ニシテ一卷<sup>スハ</sup>前<sup>スハ</sup>テ以テ」

直<sup>ニ</sup>38獻上ス。天皇悦ヒ觀<sup>テ</sup>察<sup>レフ</sup>39之、文章頗<sup>ク</sup>ル幽冥<sup>シ</sup>シ。尋<sup>テ</sup>以テ給<sup>ニフ</sup>」

之ヲ於才郷<sup>40</sup>ニ。又旨<sup>ハ</sup>舛<sup>ミ</sup>迷吟ス。獨<sup>リ</sup>中臣鎌子考<sup>ヘテ</sup>白<sup>サク</sup>。聖」

皇時<sup>ニ</sup>入<sup>ニフ</sup>夢殿<sup>一</sup>。臣<sup>タヒタヒ</sup>度<sup>見</sup>レ<sup>レ</sup>微<sup>得</sup>レ<sup>レ</sup>入。神女從<sup>レ</sup>東來、聖」

童自<sup>レ</sup>西至<sup>ル</sup>。答<sup>ニ</sup>ヘテ於問<sup>一</sup>相語。今此章句多<sup>ニシ</sup>所<sup>レ</sup>聞<sup>更</sup>」

也。干支筭<sup>レ</sup>之其数<sup>一</sup>千。維<sup>コレ</sup>是<sup>カ</sup>ノ國事未然<sup>ノ</sup>文<sup>歟</sup>41。』

1 : 7 才

知<sup>ニル</sup>未然<sup>一</sup>神人ノ業也。言不<sup>レ</sup>レ<sup>ハ</sup>明<sup>アラフ</sup>ナラ<sup>ハ</sup>聖賢慮<sup>也也</sup>也。神人ノ業ハ在<sup>ニリ</sup>」

灵怪ノ不<sup>レ</sup>レ<sup>ル</sup>ニ測。聖賢ノ慮在<sup>ニ</sup>天運無<sup>レ</sup>レ<sup>ニ</sup>辞。未<sup>レ</sup>レ<sup>ハ</sup>知<sup>ニ</sup>灵怪<sup>一</sup>ヲ鬼」

神之愚<sup>ナル</sup>人。不<sup>レ</sup>明<sup>ニ</sup>天運<sup>一</sup>ヲ、君子之迷者<sup>也</sup>也。鬼神ハ是<sup>レ</sup>天」

中ノ尊者。君子ハ又人間ノ上輩<sup>也</sup>也。取<sup>レ</sup>レ<sup>レ</sup>譬<sup>ヲ</sup>曳<sup>レ</sup>車<sup>拳</sup>レ<sup>レ</sup>例<sup>ヲ</sup>指<sup>レ</sup>」

鳥。這ノ文思<sup>レフ</sup>ニ之<sup>ノ</sup>擊<sup>ニ</sup>中<sup>42</sup>學徒ノ慢<sup>一</sup>ヲ、解<sup>ニ</sup>キ道客ノ惑<sup>一</sup>ヲ、助<sup>ニ</sup>テ鬼神ノ用<sup>一</sup>ヲ、」

清<sup>ニム</sup>人倫ノ常<sup>一</sup>ヲ。近<sup>ク</sup>ハ立<sup>ニ</sup>ヲ<sup>43</sup>齋元<sup>一</sup>ヲ無<sup>レ</sup>ク究、遠<sup>ク</sup>ハ示<sup>ニ</sup>ス道學<sup>一</sup>ヲ不<sup>レ</sup>偏。

文」

面ハ似<sup>レ</sup>無<sup>ニ</sup>近依怙<sup>一</sup>、句情ハ孔<sup>タ</sup>有<sup>ニ</sup>遠示<sup>一</sup>〈德〉<sup>44</sup>功<sup>一</sup>、不<sup>レ</sup>可<sup>レ</sup>不<sup>レ</sup>ハアル崇」

38 Henmui 偏無為 (*gō* of Yoda Sadashizu 依田貞鎮, 1681-1764) leaves out this character; see *Henmui sōsho* 16: *Mizen hongī chū*, p. 4a (N.B. *Henmui sōsho* is a manuscript; the page numbering is our own).

39 As the Ise Bunko *bon* indicates, the *okurigana fu* is short for (*shi*)*tamau*. We have, therefore, decided to follow to reading marks of our manuscript. The alternative would be *tennō yorokobite kore wo kansatsu-shitamau*.

40 As is confirmed by ZST vol. 4, p. 279, and by *Mizen hongī chū*, p. 5a, 郷 is a mistake for 卿.

41 ZST vol. 4, p. 279, and *Mizen hongī chū*, p. 6a, have the character 與 instead of 歟. Furthermore, *Mizen hongī chū* inserts the words 「(維ハ是レ國事)豫メ記<sup>レ</sup>スルノ當<sup>レ</sup>ヲ有(未然ノ文ナランカ與)」 into the sentence.

42 *Mizen hongī chū*, p. 7b, inserts the phrase 其ノ意幽玄ナリ at this point. The purpose of the character 中 next to the *itaiji* which in *Mizen hongī chū* and ZST vol. 4, p. 279, is given as 擊, is unclear. It has no counterpart in the other versions of the text.

43 The *okurigana wo* is strange; it would seem better to see it as a mistake for *te*. Cf. *Yomikudashi*, note 27.

44 The character 德 is written between the lines, and connected to the character 示 by a kind of bracket. The idea seems to be that 示 is to be replaced by 德. This is confirmed by ZST vol. 4, p. 279, and *Mizen hongī chū*, p. 8a, which both omit 示, and write 句情孔有遠德功.

之。君子ノ常理ハ在ニル<sup>7</sup>45世世一有レル<sup>7</sup>之多<sup>46</sup>。神人ノ奇怪ハ經ニ代<sup>7</sup>』

1 : 7 ウ

代一無<sup>ク</sup>シテ而少<sup>シ</sup>弃ニ奇怪一。宇<sup>47</sup>ニハ希<sup>48</sup>レニ信<sup>レ</sup>鬼怖<sup>レ</sup>神行一。執ニ常理一<sup>カト</sup>

家ニハ逮ニ偏<sup>レ</sup>人ヲ<sup>タカフ</sup>充<sup>レ</sup>ル己思一。故ニ聖皇恒行ニニシテ百年<sup>49</sup>ノ常理一ヲ、時<sup>7</sup>』

具ニフ一事ノ奇怪一ヲ。譬ヘハ如<sup>下</sup>韓國<sup>カラクニ</sup>ニ有ニテ百丈堀一守ニ千里畿一ヲ、<sup>7</sup>』

愚王忘<sup>レ</sup>武佞臣含<sup>レ</sup>逆ヲ、以ニ美石一相埋<sup>テ</sup>失ニ防<sup>レ</sup>ノ敵之<sup>7</sup>』

堅一ヲ。非ニ美石不<sup>レ</sup>好、斷ニ防<sup>レ</sup>敵堀一是不上<sup>レ</sup>カ好也。唯<sup>50</sup>取ニ常<sup>7</sup>』

理ヲ而捨ニルモ<sup>51</sup>奇怪一亦復如<sup>レ</sup>是。夫<sup>レ</sup>異國ハ人域ニシテ純<sup>ラ</sup>以ニル<sup>7</sup>常<sup>7</sup>』

理一ヲ、尚<sup>7</sup>聖人認ニ奇怪跡一ヲ。況<sup>ン</sup>ヤ吾朝<sup>52</sup>神國ニシテ最<sup>モ</sup>持ニツ靈<sup>53</sup>妙<sup>54</sup>一ヲ。』

豈ニ生民疎ニ<sup>ン</sup>ヤ奇怪ノ業一ヲ。帝誤<sup>テ</sup>偏ニテ於人倫ノ常理一ヲ<sup>55</sup>、忽<sup>ニ</sup>ニス<sup>56</sup>乎<sup>7</sup>』<sup>ユルカセ</sup>

1 : 8 オ

鬼神奇怪一ヲ、俗習<sup>テ</sup>蔑<sup>57</sup>ニ乎神祇ノ灵妙<sup>58</sup>一ヲ、輕ニス乎天孫寶<sup>7</sup>』

祚一ヲ。此時君王如<sup>レ</sup>無ニ社稷一、其世ノ臣民互ニ亡<sup>59</sup>ス家運一ヲ。』

聖皇以ニ真人聖智一ヲ豫<sup>メ</sup>照ニシ其ノ理一ヲ、兼<sup>テ</sup>設ニク是ノ文一ヲ。乃<sup>チ</sup>發ニ<sup>7</sup>』

45 *Mizen hongi chū* p. 8b and *Ise Bunko bon* both write *ari-te* instead of *aru koto*.

46 *Mizen hongi chū* p. 8b has the *okurigana* -ku instead of -n, thus reading *ōku* instead of *ōkaran*.

47 The character 宇 is a mistake. Both ZST vol. 4, p. 279, and *Mizen hongi chū*, p. 8b-9a, have 宇. *Mizen hongi chū* adds the following note to the character: 「展呂切、音柱、門屏之間」, which matches both the *fanjie* and the explanation of the character as given in Mor. III: 7055 s.v.. For obscure reasons, the *furigana* & *okurigana* カトニハ are placed on the left side of the character.

48 Both ZST vol. 4, p. 279, and *Mizen hongi chū*, p. 8b, insert the *kaeriten* 'ニ' at this point; it is *not* written in our manuscript, but it is needed in order to account for the *kaeriten* '一' after 行. Furthermore, in *Mizen hongi chū* the following note is appended to the character 希: 「虚宜切、音熙、散也、施也、奇也、又少也」.

49 ZST vol. 4, p. 279, and *Mizen hongi chū*, p. 9a, have 百事 instead of *hyakunen*, which makes more sense.

50 ZST vol. 4, p. 279, uses the character 維, but *Mizen hongi chū*, p. 9b, also has 唯.

51 Underneath the *okurigana* ル the character 寸 (*toki*) was written, but it has been crossed out, and been replaced by the *okurigana* mo.

52 *Mizen hongi chū*, p. 10a, has the character 國 instead of 朝, but ZST vol. 4, p. 279, also has 朝.

53 The *itaji* {日+大} used in our manuscript is not in the font.

54 The *edn* ZST, p. 279, has the character 妙 instead of 妙, but *Mizen hongi chū*, p. 10a, has 妙.

55 *Mizen hongi chū*, p. 10b, has the *okurigana* ni instead of wo; ni is preferable.

56 *Mizen hongi chū*, p. 1b, has *yurugase ni seba*; *seba* is preferable.

57 *Mizen hongi chū* adds the *okurigana* ro ni shi, indicating the reading *naigashiro ni shi*.

58 See *supra*, note 54.

59 A *kaeriten* 'ニ' is lacking at this place, but it is used in ZST vol. 4, p. 279, and *Mizen hongi chū*, p. 10b.

先神ノ術道一ヲ、以テ置ニ後皇慮界一ニ。不レ可レ不ニシハアル信崇一。天皇」  
問曰、朕熟と60思ニ物ノ上一ヲ、真人説ニフ未然事一ヲ、非レスヤ所ニ以欲下」  
令レ民豫知ニ其事一ヲ使中レ人ヲ、兼テ慮ニ其憂一以テ無ニ其ノ惡ト一、」  
而除中其災禍上乎。而今見ニルニ此ノ文一ヲ雖ニ一事一無レ知ニ其」  
象一ヲ、然モ即チ此ノ文置レテ之何ノ益ソ。鎌子慎テ答言ク、或聖人』

1 : 8 ウ

現テ兮知ニラハ能ク可一レヲ解、當ニ能ク解ニ憂ノ因61一ヲ。又賢人出テ、兮知レ」  
不レ可レ解、宜レ不レ悔ニ憂果一ヲ。其得レ解者ハ是レ安ニ萬姓一ヲ、其ノ」  
不レ悔者ハ62安ニ一心一ヲ。若シ然ハ非レ無ニ其益一矣。由63夫レ爲レヨシイタルモ64無」  
レ益、猶ニ日月ノ蝕見アラハニスカ天歴ノ實一ヲ。以下テ真65人記ニ後年一ヲ非中虚」  
妄上、見下ス聖人ノ教ニル今日一ヲ弗中ルフヲ空言上。或ハ才人ノ言語有ニ理ノ」  
以可レシテ然不レ得ニ其跡一ヲ。又真人ノ記句有ニ理ハ是レ難レシテ信」  
皆能得其跡一。其ノ可レシテ然而無レハ跡、是美言ノ之空言也。」  
此難レシテ信而有レ跡、是空言之誠言也也。真智ノ之人ハ』

1 : 9 オ

不レ惡レ難レキヲ信、專ラ取ニル誠言一ヲ。虚智ノ之人ハ唯樂レンテ可レ然徒ニ」  
取ニル空言一ヲ。嗟世人頗迷ニテ此ノ二間一ニ、爲ニシテ風俗一而空ニス其」  
百學一ヲ。夫レ只勞テ以テ而無レ功矣。神記非レ無レ益。聖言」  
不レ可レ疑。必有ニ當事一。應下ニ速ニ奉66行上ス。于時天皇讚シテ曰、」

60 The repeat sign is not given in ZST vol. 4, p. 279, but it is given in *Mizen hongi chū*, p. 11a.

61 ZST vol. 4, p. 280, has the character 困, but *Mizen hongi chū*, p. 11b, has 因. In view of the character 果 in following sentence, 因 must be correct.

62 *Mizen hongi chū*, p. 11b, inserts the character 乃 at this point, reads *sunawachi*.

63 *Mizen hongi chū*, p. 12b, gives the *okurigana na-wo* for 因, instead of *yoshi*; *nao* would be preferable.

64 *Mizen hongi chū*, p. 12b, gives no *okurigana* at this point; *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679 (69, frame 4 right), gives the *okurigana -mo*. The *okurigana itaru mo* in our manuscript and in Ise Bunko *bon* do not make sense.

65 Our manuscript has the character 直. This is obviously a mistake for 真, as is shown by the parallel passages in ZST vol. 4, p. 280, and *Mizen hongi chū*, p. 12b. We have emended accordingly.

66 ZST vol. 4, p. 280, gives the character 舉 instead of 奉, but *Mizen hongi chū*, pp. 13b-14a, has 奉, just like our manuscript. The latter seems more plausible, although the compound 舉行 is attested (Mor. V: 12863-

汝ハ少年ノ才長ニ百歳ノ智一ニ。汝ハ是レ聖カ焉。尋テ伏ニス鎌子言一ニ」

信受奉崇フ。春ル二月天皇勅シテ曰、於<sup>ア、</sup>鎌子ノ君雖ニ少」

年ニシテ不レ任レ役ニ、循ニ武内ノ臣カ稚歳ニシテ爲一レ任レル力、閣<sup>サシヲ</sup>ニイテ大人ノ  
凡67一ヲ」

用ニ小兒ノ聖一タルヲ。即<sup>タマハ</sup>下ニッテ未然記一ヲ命シテ會レセシム之ヲ。鎌子給ニテ聖  
経一ヲ68』

1 : 9 ウ

頼ニ神助一ヲ、入ニ潔齋一ニ、籠ニル浄室一ニ。有ニ一ノ老人一69来テ告テ曰ク、我」

是レ金粟如来、汝ハ又無垢菩薩<sup>タフ</sup>シ70。我昔シ来テ住ニム田生ノ」

峯一ニ。汝チ後チ降来ニ福田山一ニ。此ノ時鎌子乍ニ開ニ心眼一ヲ。記」

中ノ百年貫ニ達ス千夏<sup>ノミ</sup>71ニ已而。唯密聞ニ天皇ニ佗カ72不レ語ニ」

旁客一ニ天皇聴レ之、喜嘆交<sup>ヒ</sup>73發テ黙止シテ不レ宣。盖シ此ノ未」

然本紀、吾カ國萬世ノ重寶、誰人不レ寶ニ重之一乎。見ニルニハ」

此ノ未然本紀一ヲ、則能ク辨ニ知スルニ古今之事一ヲ、毫髮不レ違」

者也也。余讀ニテ太平記一ヲ楠氏以レテ有レヲ見ニト云フ未来紀一ヲ、先代』

1 : 1 0 オ

11).

67 Both Ise Bunko *bon* and *Taisei-kyō* (edn 1679, 69, frame 4, left) insert the copulum *-taru* at this point.

68 *Mizen hongī chū*, p. 15a, inserts the two characters 甚々敬<sup>ヒ</sup> at this point. The same two characters also occur in other versions of *Mizen hongī chū*, e.g. Kokubunken *ya2-82-9/10*, frame 17 left.

69 *Mizen hongī chū*, p. 15a, inserts the character 直 at this point. The same character also occurs in other versions of *Mizen hongī chū*, e.g. Kokubunken *ya2-82-9/10*, frame 17 left.

70 The *okurigana* in our manuscript definitely looks like シ, but in the present context *shi* does not make sense. The Ise Bunko *bon* and the text in *Taisei-kyō* 69 (edn 1679, 69, frame 4, left) clearly read *nari*, which seems correct.

71 *Taisei-kyō* 69 (edn 1679, 69, frame 4, left) has the character 年 instead of 夏; cf. Translation, note 121. If the characters 已而 are to be read *nomi*, as is indicated by the *furigana*, the *okurigana* (*kantatsu*)-*su* is strange; we need the *rentaiki* -*suru*. The *okurigana* ニして, given in *Taisei-kyō* 69 (edn 1679, 69, frame 4, left), does not help, either.

72 *Mizen hongī chū*, pp. 16a-b, has the *okurigana* *wa* instead of *ka*. It also inserts *sara ni* 更ニ at this point. The same character also occurs in other versions of *Mizen hongī chū*, e.g. Kokubunken *ya2-82-9/10*, frame 18 left.

73 For the use of this repeat sign, cf. p.1:8a, line 5: 朕熟<sup>ヒ</sup>思物上.

《大成經在二磯宮三輪天王寺一》

舊事本紀、詳ニ知ル秘ニ在スルヲ磯宮三輪天王寺ノ三處一ニ」

不レ疑レ之也。」

林氏又曰或問曰、太子乘ニ甲斐<sup>クロコマ</sup>ノ驪駒一ニ上富士ノ」

《太子乘ニ驪駒一上ニ富士ニ》

嶽一。舍人調使麻呂隨レ之奈何シ。余答曰、都氏富」

士山記ニ、不レ云ニ太子登陟之事一ヲ。俗間所レ傳レル之縁」

起ニモ、亦不レ載ニ此事一ヲ。是レ余之所レ訝也。世之褒ニ美スル太」

子ヲ者、每每過誇シテ而鑠<sup>ケ</sup>ニスヲ其ノ實ヲ惟不レ少カラ矣。今云レ昇ニト」

富士岩一ニ、猶且ツ疑レ之。而ヲ云下ヤ太子駕ニシ青龍車一ニ入ニテ隋』

1 : 1 0 ウ

國一ニ、取ニテ南岳舊房ノ法華經一ヲ、凌ニテ<sup>74</sup>虚空ヲ而皈<sup>中</sup>ルト日本上ニ、則」

愈々疑フ愈々訝ル。余豈ニ信ヤ哉。案ニニ釋迦譜一ヲ、其ノ託ニ誕シテ于淨」

飯王宮一ニ、而為ニ悉陀太子一ト。十九年中種種祥瑞」

神變不レ可ニ勝テ数一フ也。彼ノ撰ニフ聖徳太子傳一ヲ者、亦蓋シ」

見ニテ悉陀大<sup>75</sup>子之譜一ヲ、而羨慕シテ相似<sup>ノミ</sup>セタル耳ノミト<已上林氏<sup>76</sup>>聖皇本  
紀」

亦有下甲斐ノ驪駒上ニルヲ富士ノ嶽一ニ、入ニテ隋國一取ニ法花一ヲ來ル」

之事上。然ルニ林氏謂ク訝レ之。而過誇<sup>ケ</sup>スレケスヲ實ヲ。林氏漸讀ニテ」

聖賢ノ書一ヲ知ニリ常道治倫一ヲ、讀ニテ神至ノ書一ヲ不知ニ通怪神』

1 : 1 1 才

變一テ。故ニ有ニ此ノ疑。即是レ異國本朝古今ノ儒士ノ通病也」

74 Sic! No doubt, the *okurigana te* was intended.

75 Sic! The character 太 must have been intended.

76 It is a complete and correct quotation from *Jinja-kō* 5; see NSTS vol. 1, p. 524, lines 5-10.

也。實<sup>ツルヘナハ</sup>是綆索短シテ、而不<sub>レ</sub>可<sub>レ</sub>汲<sub>レ</sub>深<sub>ヲ</sub>之謂カ乎。若シ欲<sub>レ</sub>知<sub>ニ</sub>」  
太子ノ始末<sub>一</sub>ヲ、須<sub>レ</sub>ク讀<sub>ニ</sub>聖皇本紀<sub>一</sub>ヲ也。太子ハ者諡シテ曰<sub>ニ</sub>オハ真<sub>」</sub>  
至太聖皇太子<sub>一</sub>、則於<sub>ニ</sub>漢土聖賢之中<sub>一</sub>ニ、無<sub>下</sub>比<sub>ニ</sub>並<sub>」</sub>  
之<sub>一</sub>ニ人上。有<sub>ニ</sub>天竺悉陀太子ノ出生<sub>一</sub>。蓋シ其同類ニシテ而モ於<sub>ニ</sub>ヲ<sub>」</sub>  
世間ノ政道<sub>一</sub>ニ有<sub>レ</sub>出<sub>ニ</sub>一頭地<sub>一</sub>ヲ者カ乎。」

林氏<五之四葉>又曰、或又問曰、平氏所<sub>レ</sub>撰太子傳曆ニ載ス、  
太子嘗<sub>テ</sub>令<sub>ニ</sub>人造<sub>ニ</sub>陵墓<sub>ヲ</sub>、而告曰ク、斷<sub>ニ</sub>此処<sub>一</sub>ヲ截<sub>ニ</sub>彼処<sub>一</sub>ヲ<sub>」</sub>

1 : 1 1 ウ

不<sub>レ</sub>欲<sub>レ</sub>有<sub>ニ</sub>繼嗣<sub>一</sub>也。夫<sub>レ</sub>子孫不<sub>レ</sub>ルハ續豈ニ云<sub>ニ</sub>大咎<sub>一</sub>ト。孔子<sub>」</sub>  
遺教ニ無<sub>ニ</sub>後嗣<sub>一</sub>者ハ為<sub>ニ</sub>不孝<sub>一</sub>。吾為<sub>ニ</sub>釈迦ノ弟子<sub>一</sub>、不<sub>レ</sub>為<sub>ニ</sub>

孔子ノ弟子<sub>一</sub>ニ77。是ノ言如何。余答曰、頃年見<sub>ニ</sub>邯<sup>カンソ</sup>穌<sub>78</sub>者ノ<sub>」</sub>

之書<sub>一</sub>ヲ。論シテ而及<sub>レ</sub>此無後為<sub>ニ</sub>ハ不孝<sub>一</sub>ト、則伯夷叔齊不<sub>レ</sub>

聞<sub>レ</sub>有<sub>レ</sub>ルヲ子。夷齊ハ其<sub>レ</sub>為<sub>ニ</sub>ニヤ不孝<sub>一</sub>乎。有<sub>レ</sub>後為<sub>レ</sub>孝則多ク買<sub>ニ</sub>テ<sub>」</sub>

妾婦<sub>一</sub>ヲ、而姿<sub>79</sub>ニ色欲<sub>一</sub>者其<sub>レ</sub>為<sub>レ</sub>孝カ乎。余惟ニ夫<sub>レ</sub>太子之<sub>」</sub>

言與<sub>ニ</sub>邯<sup>カンソ</sup>穌<sub>カ</sub>之論<sub>一</sub>、共ニ拘<sub>ニ</sub>テ于一偏<sub>一</sub>ニ、失<sub>ニ</sub>其中正<sub>一</sub>者也ト也<已上林  
氏<sub>80</sub>>」

聖皇本紀ニ曰ク、冬十二月太子命<sub>レ</sub>駕届<sub>ニ</sub>ル科長陵<sub>」</sub>

1 : 1 2 オ

77 Razan is quoting here, though rather freely, from *Denryaku*; see *Shusho Taishi den* 4:30a-31a, where it says: 「冬十二月、太子命駕科長墓處、覽見 墓者、直入墓内、四望謂左右曰、此處必断、彼處必切、欲令 應絶子孫之後。墓工隨命、可絶者絶、可切者切。太子大悦。即夕旋駕、歎謂妃曰、遥憶過去、因果相授、吾 未賽了、禍及子孫、子孫不續、豈云大咎、孔子遺教、无後嗣者為不孝矣、吾為釋迦大聖弟子、豈為孔子小 賢弟子乎。妃答啓曰、左之右之、依殿下命耳、三從之妾、更何異望。太子喜之。」。(See also our transliteration of *Honchō jinja kō bengi*, *Honkoku*, note 163.)

78 Cf. *Jinja-kō bengi* 2:6b-7a, and notes 163-165 to the *Honkoku*. We stated there that the character 邯 should be 耶, but in *Gobusshin-ron* twice the reading *kan* is specified. Nevertheless, there is little doubt that the Christians are meant.

79 This character makes no sense in the present context. It is no doubt a mistake for 恣, which is also used in Razan's original text.

80 Apart from the discrepancies mentioned in the preceding notes, this is a complete and correct quotation from *Jinja-kō* 5; see NSTS vol. 1, p. 522, lines 1-5.

処一ニ。而覽ニフ造レ墓状一ヲ、直ニ入ニ墓ノ内一ニ望レ四命シテ曰ク、此ノ処必」  
断チ、彼ノ処必切レ。所ニ以不ニレ嗣子孫ノ後一ヲ也。墓ノ工隨レ命」  
可レ絶者ハ絶、可レ切者切ル。太子大ニ悦テ即夕ニ旋レ駕ヲ。群」  
卿啓シテ曰ク、先皇ノ之道ハ以ニス後嗣ノ永一。無レオハ嗣則非也。那為ナンスレソ」  
吾カ大王断レ陵欲レスルヤ絶一ヲ哉。太子答曰ク、寡人數<sup>シハトオモンミル</sup>以ニ人」  
生得レ命、御レ氣託レ數。氣ト數ト依レ宿。吾宿世ノ身數ト修ニ」  
真諦一ヲ、不レ逗ニ天地一ニ。雖レ在ニ天地一假借スル而已ノミ。故ニ今生」  
身其ノ數其ノ氣託ニシテ絶法一ニ生ス。天命無レ私、已ニ知ニ子嗣ノ』

### 1 : 1 2 ウ

絶一ヲ知レ之、入ニ祝<sup>81</sup>墳一恐クハ亡ニシ<sup>82</sup>陵師ノ法一ヲ、又惡ソ恐レテ非ヲ而謾レンヤ」  
己ヲ乎。先皇ノ遣<sup>83</sup>法在ニ大方ノ事一ニ、必蒙ニ一切一ニ、天法又」  
虚カラシ。群臣聞レ之悲惜歎伏。蓋シ平氏ノ所編太子傳ハ」  
入鹿焚ニ國記一ヲ之後、平氏編レ之ヲ故多シ謬錯一矣<sup>84</sup>。聖」  
《太子傳多レ誤聖皇本紀ハ正之義》

皇本紀者ハ、聖徳太子崩御之後、秦ノ河勝學賀」  
所レ編書ニシテ而推古天皇任ニテ天孫太神ノ託一ニ収ニ蔵於スルノ」  
磯宮三輪天王寺之三處一書也也。故ニ聖皇本紀ト」  
與ニ平氏ノ所説一悉ク以テ相違スル者也也。平氏太子傳ノ之』

### 1 : 1 3 オ

語者ハ、後人之説ニシテ而非ニ太子ノ自説一ニ。然林氏太子ト」  
與ニ耶<sup>85</sup>穌一一般ニ論之。林氏廣長舌乎。兼好徒然」

<sup>81</sup> This is the second time the *itaiji* resembling 杭 occurs; cf. 1:3b, line 8. Ise Bunko *bon* has this character in the earlier passage, but in this second instance, it writes 祝, which corresponds with the quoted passage of *Taisei-kyō*, which also has 祝. It does not make great sense, but we will maintain it for the time being. Interpreting it as 機, as we did earlier, does not make sense, either.

<sup>82</sup> The *okurigana* in our manuscript clearly is *-shi*, while the Ise Bunko *bon* and *Taisei-kyō* (edn 1679, 38:52b) have *-san*. We have decided to follow the latter, and will emend accordingly in the *Yomikudashi*.

<sup>83</sup> In view of the context, this character must be a mistake for 遣.

<sup>84</sup> Here ends the quotation from *Taisei-kyō* book 38 (ZST vol. 2, p. 394; edn 1679, 38:52a-b).

草ニ、太子者論下以レ無ニ子孫一為上レ好。故古今雷同シテ以ニテ」

太子一ヲ称ニ不孝第一一ト。此説非也。太子追ニ思スルニ過去」

因果一ヲ、子孫不ニ相續一故ニ、<sup>ノタマ</sup>謂ニフ造レ墓ヲ截レ此截一レ彼者也也。」

以ニ子ノ嗣絶一ヲ非ニス之為レルノ好ト謂一ニ也」

林氏〈五之九右〉又曰或又問曰、太子<sup>86</sup>神道者根本也也。儒」

道者枝葉也。佛道者花實也也。此ノ言如何。余答』

1 : 1 3 ウ

曰此非ニ太子之言一也。後來ト部中臣之所レ托」

也。太子無ニ獻王好古之心一、而有ニ蕭衍<sup>87</sup>講經之」

質。若シ令ニ太子ヲシテ好レフ神ヲ如一レナア好レカ佛ヲ、則豈ニ費ニシメ多<sup>88</sup>財一ヲ立ニ  
ンヤ若」

干寺一ヲ哉。奉レスルフ儒ニ如レセハ奉レスルカ釋ニ則何ソ謂ニンヤ篤ク信ニスト三寶一ヲ哉  
只」

佛ヲ為根本一、神儒為ニ枝花一。蓋シ太子之意ナラン也<sup>アハ</sup>吁。一<sup>89</sup>」

以<sup>90</sup>ニ寺院一ヲ為ニシ學校一ト、而佛事ヲ為ニシテ祭祀一ト、教レルニ之ニ以ニシ孝弟<sup>91</sup>  
一ヲ」

勸レルニ之以ニル寸忠誠一ヲ則神道人道豈ニ其レニアランヤ哉乎。惜カナ乎」

太子之不レルフヲ如レトナラ<sup>92</sup>此也〈已上林氏〉<sup>93</sup>。『聖皇本紀』曰敏達七年<sup>94</sup>』

1 : 1 4 才

<sup>85</sup> This time the character with the ear radical is used, without any *furigana*.

<sup>86</sup> *Honchō jinja kō* inserts the character 曰 at this point.

<sup>87</sup> The text uses an *itaiji* that is not in the font.

<sup>88</sup> *Honchō jinja kō* inserts the characters 少之 at this point.

<sup>89</sup> The function of this stroke is unclear. Repetition of the foregoing character? Filling out the line?

<sup>90</sup> *Honchō jinja kō* inserts the character 之 at this point.

<sup>91</sup> In view of the context, this will be a mistake for 悌.

<sup>92</sup> The *okurigana to* can best be interpreted as a partial rendering of *go-to-ku*, for that is the form we need.

<sup>93</sup> But for the discrepancies noted above, this is a complete and correct quotation from *Jinja-kō* 5; see NSTS vol. 1, pp pp. 525 line 12 -526 line 2.

<sup>94</sup> *Taisei-kyō* here adds the character 春.



三月十九日天皇感ニシ太子ノ生才勅シテ徵ニシテ太子ヲ大」  
殿ニ問ニフ儒釋教ノ之意一ヲ。太子奏シテ曰ク、儒ハ人倫道也同ニシ先」  
皇ノ道一ニ是レ道ノ枝葉也。佛ハ大覺ノ道ノ天祖ノ師也焉。是道ノ花」  
實也。二法自立テ合ニフ吾神道一ニ成レ三ヲ大ニ95成ス。吾道ハ道ノ根」  
本也。有レ本而有レ枝、有枝レ而有レ菓、有レ菓而生レ本。自」  
有ニ三法ノ經一。世尊レ之習レ之ヲ。天皇聞レ之不レ得ニ押廢一スルヲ。 96」  
若シ因ニ聖皇本紀一、則非ニ中臣之所一レ托、而實是レ太」  
子之說也也。然林氏為レ非ニ太子之言一。邪解之人』

1 : 1 4 ウ

開レ口說レ邪。吾道ハ道ノ根本、有レ本而有レ枝、有レ枝而」  
有レ菓、有レ菓而生レ本。蓋シ菓ハ者佛道也也。枝ハ者儒也也。」  
根者神道也也。然則一ノ根枝菓相ニ為ス始終一ヲ者也。」  
特吾國ハ者日也也。震旦ハ者星也也。天竺ハ者月ニ也也。星」  
月者以レ日増レ光者也。豈ニ不ニヤ其為一レ根哉。故從ニ神」  
道、儒佛二道出生スル者也也。此理ハ者非ニ灌傳之人一ニ。」  
輒不レ能レ知レ之者ノカ乎。」

林氏火雷神辯ニ曰、昌泰四年因ニ左僕射ノ藤時』

1 : 1 5 才

《菅丞相》

平之讒一ニ、左ニ遷ラレテ太宰府都督一ニ而薨ス。其灵爲ニ天神一ト。」  
其眷屬使者、別ニ有ニ火雷神一、震ニ死藤清貫平ノ希レ」  
世等一ヲ。火ニ焼ス大内及諸寺等一ヲ。即是レ俗說也也。不レト足レ」  
取ニ也。引ニテ程子胡氏雷神ハ無レ形以レテ理ヲ推一レヲ之、誹ニル異」

<sup>95</sup> Ise Bunko *bon* and *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 35:9a, do not have the *okurigana ni* and read *taisei-su* 大成ス. We will follow this reading and emend accordingly.

<sup>96</sup> But for the discrepancy noted above, this is a complete and correct quotation from *Taisei-kyō* 35:9a; ZST vol. 2, p. 340. The same passage is also quoted by Chōon in his essay *Ichiju gusan* 一樹具三 (*Shigetsu yawa* 3, no. 77), though provided with a slightly different commentary.

端ノ龍車石斧鬼鼓火鞭怪誕之難<sup>レ</sup>ト信也<sup>97</sup>。林氏」

<sup>アマ</sup>甘<sup>ニ</sup>ジテ宋儒程子胡氏妄説<sup>一</sup>ヲ不<sup>レ</sup>信<sup>ニ</sup>天竺ノ佛説吾朝ノ」

神談<sup>一</sup>ヲ。輕<sup>ニ</sup>シ佛神<sup>一</sup>ヲ重<sup>ニ</sup>ス程胡<sup>一</sup>ヲ、實<sup>ニ</sup>可<sup>レ</sup>笑也。茲<sup>ニ</sup>出<sup>ニ</sup>ン雷神有<sup>レ</sup>ノ」  
形之證<sup>一</sup>ヲ。大成經雄略天皇ノ傳<sup>98</sup>ニ曰壬寅<sup>99</sup>大霹靂、』

1 : 15ウ

諸妃及采女悉恐怖無<sup>レ</sup>色。時神捉ノ連陪<sup>ニ</sup>ル於禁」

堂<sup>一</sup>ニ。爰<sup>ニ</sup>天皇勅<sup>シテ</sup>曰、雖<sup>ニ</sup>天雷<sup>100</sup>ト豈不<sup>レ</sup>ヤ制セ。又尋<sup>テ</sup>敕曰、汝<sup>シ</sup>」  
氣至<sup>テ</sup>勇<sup>シ</sup>。試<sup>ニ</sup>往<sup>テ</sup>得<sup>レ</sup>ヨ之。時<sup>ニ</sup>神捉連乘<sup>レ</sup>駕<sup>ニ</sup>拳<sup>レ</sup>鞭ヲ、追<sup>ニ</sup>テ雷」  
声<sup>一</sup>ヲ發<sup>レ</sup>言曰、人ノ氣實<sup>ニ</sup>存、鬼ノ氣虛<sup>ニ</sup>現ス。吾<sup>レ</sup>何不<sup>レ</sup>ン得<sup>レ</sup>汝ヲ。」

鬼若有<sup>ニ</sup>ラハ勇力<sup>一</sup>來<sup>テ</sup>競<sup>レ</sup>ヘト與<sup>ニ</sup>吾カカト。追<sup>テ</sup>到<sup>ニ</sup>雷岳<sup>一</sup>ニ。雷神不<sup>レ</sup>」

降。<sup>イカ</sup>威<sup>ツテ</sup>以<sup>ケ</sup>踏<sup>レ</sup>ル馬ヲ。乃<sup>101</sup>驚飛<sup>テ</sup>兮昇<sup>レ</sup>ル虛<sup>ニ</sup>量<sup>ニ</sup>十丈<sup>一</sup>。雷<sup>102</sup>神恐<sup>テ</sup>」

墮<sup>103</sup>レ地形相可<sup>レ</sup>怖。率至<sup>ニ</sup>大殿<sup>一</sup>。天皇一目見<sup>テ</sup>懼不<sup>レ</sup>」

能<sup>ニ</sup>再覽<sup>一</sup>ヲ。諸殿雷鳴、諸舍<sup>イナヒカリ</sup>雷光<sup>104</sup>ス。敕<sup>シテ</sup>求<sup>ニ</sup>玉フ放遣<sup>一</sup>ンヲ。雷神』

1 : 16オ

不<sup>レ</sup>退。奏<sup>ニ</sup>神樂<sup>一</sup>ヲ和<sup>レ</sup>之。修<sup>ニ</sup>祭供<sup>一</sup> <sup>アカシム</sup>饜<sup>105</sup>レ之。遂<sup>ニ</sup>招<sup>レ</sup>テ雲ヲ御<sup>レ</sup>シテ之」

發<sup>ニ</sup>霹靂<sup>一</sup>飛去ル。天皇自<sup>レ</sup>是不<sup>レ</sup>輕<sup>ニ</sup>神德<sup>一</sup>ヲ。神捉連名」

加<sup>ル</sup>ニ以<sup>ニ</sup>テス雷言<sup>一</sup>ヲ。云<sup>ニ</sup>神雷捉<sup>一</sup>ト。號<sup>ニ</sup>テ雷墮<sup>106</sup>地<sup>一</sup>ニ曰<sup>ニ</sup>雷岳<sup>一</sup>ト矣。又」

97 The above is a partial quotation, partial paraphrase of Razan's disquisition; see *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 26 (*Bunshū* [Kyoto: Heian Kōko Gakkai, 1921] vol. 1, p. 296b-297a).

98 See *Taisei-kyō* 26:14b-15a; ZST vol. 2, p. 154.

99 *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, inserts the characters 廿七 at this point.

100 Both editions of *Taisei-kyō* and the Ise Bunko *bon* insert the characters 恣也、汝獲霹靂邪。神捉連應奏曰、雖天雷 at this point.

101 *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, inserts the character 馬 at this point.

102 This character is omitted in *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST.

103 *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, has the character 墮 instead of 墮; this must be a mistake. *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, has 墮, as has our manuscript.

104 Both editions of *Taisei-kyō* have the compound 電光 instead of 雷光.

105 The reading of the character is *aku*; see Mor. XII: 44453.

106 *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, again writes 墮 instead of 墮; cf. *supra*, note 103.

称ニ鬼捉連一依ニヲ107形赤鬼一108。又非ニ雷神ノ有レ形、吾國ノ神ハ」

《吾國ハ多生神」異國ハ死魂爲神》

者多是レ生神ナルカ故ニ有レ形。異國ハ祠ニ人死鬼一ヲ爲レ神ト。故ニ」

儒者思レ無レト形。吾朝異國ノ神莫ニ取テ爲ニ一ト一體一ト。縦ヒ是レ」

吾國ハ雖ニ人ノ死魂一ト、大ニ有ニ神變奇怪一。遠ハ宇佐吉野、」

近クハ北野天神是レ其證也也。大成經109曰ク于時去来」

1 : 1 6 ウ

諾尊已ニ別ニシテ去来冉尊一深ク歎<sup>イフカシミヲホシメス</sup>テ不審慮焉。110有ニ三ノ躬一」

理ノ躬、氣ノ躬、精ノ躬。其レ謂ニフ理ノ躬一ト者ハ久方ノ元有之縁」

生極易定。是レ111神ハ於レ理總灵也。心ハ此ノ理之性也。」

氣ハ為ニ此理一身也。境ハ為ニ此理一ヲ處也。心ハ不レ言レ五者」

未ニ分現施一也。氣ハ攝シテ納亦然リ。神ハ居レ元不レ別。境ハ入ニ」

乎虛密112一。唯理即113レ法ニ現ル故ニ押レテ之取レル状ヲ。其レ未ニ天ノ興一」

先ニ有114ニ常世國一神皆是レ理ノ躬也也。故無<sup>ホシ</sup>レ欲無レ迷故ニ」

無ニ等115終期一。始メ天祖ノ躬是也。自不レ欲レ見神モ不レ能レ見。』

1 : 1 7 オ

天生而后又生<sup>ナリテ</sup>リマス神ハ者以ニテ此理躬一ヲ來ニ於天中一ニ以ニテ」

107 Both editions of *Taisei-kyō* insert the character 雷 at this point. N.B. The particle *wo* makes no sense. *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 26:15a, has the *okurigana te shi*, which suggests the reading *yorite shi*. It is possible, but at the end of a pericope, a *shūshikei* would have been more appropriate.

108 Here ends the quotation from *Taisei-kyō*; it is complete and correct, apart from the discrepancies noted above. N.B. *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 26:15a, inserts the *okurigana naru ni* at this point.

109 See *Taisei-kyō (Kōsen hongī)* 4 (ZST vol. 1, p. 96-97; edn 1679, 3:1b-2b).

110 Both editions of *Taisei-kyō* insert the characters 於神身 at this point.

111 Both editions of *Taisei-kyō* end the sentence *after* 是, which is preferable. We will emend accordingly.

112 *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, has the character 蜜 instead of 密, no doubt by mistake. The edn 1679, 4:2a, has 密.

113 *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, has the character 印 instead of 即, no doubt by mistake. The edn 1679, 4:2a, has 即.

114 Both editions of *Taisei-kyō* have the character 在 instead of 有.

115 Both editions of *Taisei-kyō* have the character 壽 instead of 等. 壽 is preferable; we will emend accordingly.

天精氣<sup>一</sup>為<sup>二</sup>神躬<sup>一</sup>生其以<sup>二</sup>理躬<sup>一</sup>為<sup>二</sup>厥神魂<sup>一</sup>。其以<sup>二</sup>  
氣境<sup>一</sup>ヲ為<sup>二</sup>厥神身<sup>一</sup>ト116、是<sup>レ</sup>道ニフ氣躬<sup>一</sup>。七代天祖是也。天終ル<sup>ハ</sup>」  
則117終ル以<sup>二</sup>其理躬<sup>一</sup>ヲ、又以<sup>二</sup>氣躬<sup>一</sup>118入<sup>二</sup>父母氣<sup>一</sup>。以<sup>二</sup>119其氣<sup>一</sup>ヲ」  
為<sup>レ</sup>身依<sup>レ</sup>精<sup>アレマ</sup>生産<sup>カミ</sup>ス神謂<sup>二</sup>諸<sup>レ</sup>精躬<sup>一</sup>ト。故<sup>二</sup>先<sup>レ</sup>テ天<sup>ニ</sup>終ル。吾生<sup>ウ</sup>メル」  
神等是也也120。氣ノ躬、精ノ躬者、身終<sup>ハ</sup>則成<sup>二</sup>理躬<sup>一</sup>。有<sup>レ</sup>咎」  
不<sup>レ</sup>シテ成<sup>121</sup>皈<sup>二</sup>黃泉國<sup>一</sup>、無<sup>レ</sup>ンハ咎成<sup>テ</sup>以<sup>122</sup>還<sup>二</sup>常世ノ國<sup>一</sup>ニ123。又曰、大」  
成經十卷卅四葉ノ裏124曰、宗源道者、無<sup>レ</sup>盡<sup>アヤシモノ</sup>靈物、』

1 : 17ウ

無<sup>レ</sup>ノ窮識物ノ、法極斷物ノ、滿動元物ノ、是<sup>レ</sup>皆内物一ツ」  
物而已。然<sup>二</sup>成<sup>二</sup>外物<sup>一</sup>ヲ生<sup>ニ</sup>ス世ノ物<sup>一</sup>ヲ也。於<sup>レ</sup>中<sup>ニ</sup>有<sup>レ</sup>一物<sup>一</sup>無<sup>レ</sup>」  
靈而虛物絶<sup>レ</sup>色絶<sup>レ</sup>音絶<sup>レ</sup>絶有<sup>レ</sup>似、還<sup>テ</sup>領<sup>ニ</sup>シテ衆靈<sup>一</sup>ヲ建<sup>二</sup>  
立一切<sup>一</sup>ヲ。其一物ノ名ハ理<sup>125</sup>真緣冥生玄極幽易妙」  
定<sup>シナミ</sup>品分<sup>リ</sup>五<sup>ニ</sup>シテ只一也。是<sup>レ</sup>外<sup>ノ</sup>物幾物<sup>ニ</sup>シテ而更<sup>ニ</sup>爲<sup>二</sup>萬物<sup>一</sup>ト126。』  
神形不<sup>レ</sup>定或ル時ハ壯年、或時ハ老年童形女像唯」  
依<sup>レ</sup>時<sup>ノミ</sup>耳127。荒魂和魂<sup>128</sup>術魂之品各形質異也。雄神トモ」  
和魂ハ女像多シ矣。女神モ荒魂ハ男体多シ矣。幸魂ハ大』

116 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 4:2b, has the particle *wo* instead of *to*.

117 Both editions of *Taisei-kyō* insert the character 身 at this point.

118 Both editions of *Taisei-kyō* omit the four characters 又以氣躬.

119 Following *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 4:2b, we have inserted the *kaeriten* 'ニ' at this point.

120 Both editions of *Taisei-kyō* omit the character 也, but the edn 1679 gives the *okurigana* *nari*.

121 Ise Bunko *bon* and both editions of *Taisei-kyō* omit the two characters 不成.

122 Both editions of *Taisei-kyō* omit the two characters 成以.

123 Here ends the quotation from *Taisei-kyō*. Apart from discrepancies mentioned in the preceding notes, it is a complete and correct quotation.

124 *Taisei-kyō* 10 (*Tenjin hongī*); see ZST vol. 1, p. 203, edn 1679, 10:24b.

125 Both editions of *Taisei-kyō* omit the character 理.

126 Here ends the second quotation from *Taisei-kyō* 10. Apart from the discrepancy mentioned in the preceding note, it is a complete and correct quotation.

127 With this phrase a new quotation begins, this time from *Taisei-kyō* 12 (*Chigi hongī*); see ZST vol. 1, p. 240, and edn 1679, 12:11a.

128 Both editions of *Taisei-kyō* insert the four characters 幸魂奇魂 at this point.

1 : 18才

底人形、竒魂ハ多分ハ物ノ姿チ。吾カ太神<sup>129</sup>ノ状ハ就レ中尊長」  
多面多手、依ニ魂ノ異状一ニ<sup>130</sup>。汝カ輩貴ニ吾邦ノ神明一ヲ、莫レレ貴ニ」  
異國近代邪儒之説一ヲ也。」

林氏隨筆ニ曰<sup>131</sup>、或問神道ト與ニ儒道一如何別レ之。曰」

自レ我觀レ之理一<sup>ノミ</sup>而已矣。其<sup>ハサ</sup>ノ爲<sup>ノミ</sup>132異ナル耳。夫レ守屋大」

《守屋没シテ神道不レ」行空海出神法」亡》

連没シテ而神道不レ行。空海法師出テ而神法忽ニ亡。」

異端之爲レ害也大ナリ矣。曰ク日本紀神代書ト、與ニ周」

子太極圖説一相表裏スルヤ否ヤ。曰ク我未レ知嗚呼王道』

1 : 18ウ

一ヒ變シテ至ニル於神道一ニ。神道一ヒ變シテ<sup>133</sup>至ニル於道一ニ。道ハ吾所謂ル」

儒道也ナリ。非ニ所謂ル也<sup>134</sup>外道一ニハ也。外道ハ<sup>135</sup>者佛道也也。佛ハ」

者充ニ塞ク乎仁義ノ之路一ヲ。悲哉天下之久ク無ニ」ヲト夫道一」

也<sup>136</sup>。林氏謂ニ神儒一理ニシテ而佛道外道一也ト。余料ニリ想フニ其ノ」

意一ヲ、釈氏不レルカ對ニ妻女一ヲ故ニ五倫ノ之外也。神儒ハ對ニスルカ妻」

子一ニ故一同也也。苟モ然ハ問レン汝ニ儒ニ爲レ甚有ニ太伯伯夷一」

不レルヤ對ニ妻子一乎。神ニ爲レ甚有ニ高貴皇尊月夜誦尊一」

<sup>129</sup> Both editions of *Taisei-kyō* write 大神, not 太神.

<sup>130</sup> Here ends the quotation from *Taisei-kyō* 12. It is a complete and correct quotation.

<sup>131</sup> What follows is a quotation from *Zuihitsu 2 (Razan Rin-sensei bunshū 66)*; see *Bunshū* vol. 2, pp. 360b-361a.

<sup>132</sup> The *furigana ha-sa* in our manuscript will be a mistake for *wa-sa (waza)*, which is the reading given in *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 360b.

<sup>133</sup> The *okurigana* are *shi-ni-ha*, but these make no sense. After the first appearance of 一變, higher in the same line, the identical *okurigana shi-ni-ha* seem to have been written, but there, they have been deleted, and replaced by *shi-te*. Therefore, we do the same, here. *Shite* is also the reading given in *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 360b.

<sup>134</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 360b, does not have this character 也. It cannot be explained grammatically, and is probably a mistake. Cf. the next note.

<sup>135</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 360b, inserts the character 也 at this point.

<sup>136</sup> The quotation ends here. Apart from the two discrepancies mentioned in the preceding notes, it is a complete and correct quotation.

不<sub>レ</sub>レ<sub>レ</sub>ヤ對<sub>二</sub>妻子<sub>一</sub>乎。特<sub>二</sub>釈氏分<sub>二</sub>四部<sub>一</sub>教<sub>二</sub>弟子<sub>一</sub>曰比丘、』

1 : 19 才

曰比丘尼、曰優婆塞、曰優婆夷。比丘比丘尼ハ」

出世ノ法、而受<sub>二</sub>持二百五十戒五百戒<sub>一</sub>ヲ。教<sub>二</sub>化スルカ在」

家<sub>一</sub>ヲ故<sub>二</sub>不<sub>レ</sub>對<sub>二</sub>妻子<sub>一</sub>ヲ。優婆塞優婆夷受持<sub>シテ</sub>三皈戒<sub>一</sub>ヲ、」

治<sub>レ</sub>國齊<sub>レ</sub>家、故<sub>二</sub>無<sub>レ</sub>不<sub>レ</sub>對<sub>二</sub>妻子<sub>一</sub>ヲ。蓋<sub>シ</sub>五戒ハ者與<sub>二</sub>五常<sub>一</sub>」

<sup>ヒトシ</sup>等。汝思<sub>下</sub>釋氏在出<sub>一</sub>同<sub>二</sub>不<sub>レ</sub>シテ對<sub>二</sub>妻子<sub>一</sub>、而無<sub>中</sub>五倫」

之道<sub>上</sub>故<sub>二</sub>云<sub>レ</sub>尔。神ノ之明神、儒ノ之明德、釋ノ之妙心、」

即是<sub>レ</sub>一般。汝獨神儒一理<sub>ニ</sub>シテ釋爲<sub>レ</sub>別。釋ノ妙心與<sub>二</sub>」

神儒之明神明徳<sub>一</sub>、何処<sub>カ</sub>是<sub>レ</sub>別ナル。汝不<sub>レ</sub>明<sub>二</sub>儒ノ明德<sub>一</sub>ヲ。』

1 : 19 ウ

故爲<sub>レ</sub>別而言<sub>レ</sub>之。雖<sub>二</sub>神道灌傳ノ灵宗ハ秘秘中ノ秘<sub>一</sub>ト、」

如<sub>レ</sub>汝心盲者ノタメ<sub>ニ</sub>記<sub>レ</sub>之ヲ。初<sub>メ</sub>晦日ノ月ハ凡夫之心、朔日ノ」

月ハ學者之心、二日ノ月ハ理者之心、三日ノ月ハ善人」

之心、四日ノ月ハ美人之心、五日ノ月ハ大人之心、六」

日ノ月ハ聖人之心、七日ノ月ハ至人之心、八日ノ月ハ真」

人之心、九日ノ月ハ仙人之心、十日ノ月ハ后神之心、」

十一日ノ月ハ帝神之心、十二日ノ月ハ祖〈皇敷〉神之心、十」

三日ノ月ハ尊神之心、十四日ノ月ハ祖神之心、十五』

1 : 20 才

日ノ月ハ過神之心<sup>137</sup>。蓋<sub>シ</sub>過神ハ者妙覺果<sup>138</sup>滿佛位ナリ也。」

以<sub>ニ</sub>テ此次第<sub>一</sub>ヲ見<sub>レ</sub>寸ハ之、則聖人之位ハ當<sub>二</sub>六夜ノ月<sub>ニ</sub>。神明ノ」

<sup>137</sup> The preceding part, starting from 1:19b, line 2, could be a quotation from one of the initiation texts related to *Taisei-kyō*, in particular *Hyōshin sōden* 表心總伝. This text is included in Henmui's *Henmui shinpi shoden* 偏無為神秘書伝 and can be accessed through the database of the National Institute of Japanese Literature.

<sup>138</sup> The character used in the text is 杲, but that will be a mistake for 果.

位當二十四夜ノ月一ニ。佛果<sup>139</sup>當ニル十五夜月一ニ。此ハ是レ以ニ神」  
儒佛ノ用功一ヲ、論スル者也。以ニ其體徳一ヲ論ル寸ハ、則神儒佛一」  
理也。夫レ守屋ハ者外ニハ雖レ似レ崇ニ神道一ヲ、内ニハ蔑ニシ神道一ヲ、移ニ」  
帝位一ヲ、弑ニ太子一ヲ。嫌ニ儒道一、呵ニ學弣一。然ルヲ汝謂ニ守屋没シテ」  
而神道不レト行。實ニ可レ笑可レ笑。以ニテ神敵皇敵一ヲ、爲レ善、」  
興ニ神道一護ニ皇道一爲レ惡、不レ分ニ黑白一。今問レ汝世間』

1 : 20ウ

雷同シテ以ニ守屋一爲レルヤ善人ト乎。以ニ弘法一爲ニスルヤ惡人一乎。汝チ」  
獨横説シテ爲ニ善人一ト<sup>ノミ</sup>耳。又曰王道一ヒ變至ニ於神道一、」  
神道一ヒ變至ニ於道一。道ハ吾所謂儒道也ト也。因ニテハ汝所」  
説一ニ儒道從ニ神道高ク、從ニ神道一王道高ク、若論ニセハ如レ此」

三道高低一、愚蒙ノ邪見也。汝豈不<sup>ヤ</sup>レ見邪。儒之河」

圖洛書者、天地開闢相生相尅之圖ニシテ、而吾國」

神道ハ者從ニ河圖洛書最初ノ一數一出生、而天神」

七代地祇五代有レ之者也。蓋シ河圖洛書圖ハ者、』

1 : 21オ

當ニ地神五代之初日神ノ出生一者也也。然ルヲ如此妄リニ」

爲ニ次第ノ論判一ヲ、於ニ吾國一者、神敵也。王敵也也。」

林氏放生ノ辨<sup>140</sup>ニ曰、儒者有ニ兩説一。一説ハ天生ニ禽獸一ヲ。」

本ト為ニ人食一。此ノ説不レ是。豈ニ有<sup>下</sup>ニヤ人為ニニ蟻虱一而生<sup>上</sup>ニヤ邪」

一説ハ禽獸ハ待レ人而生ス。殺レ寸ハ之則不仁也。此説亦不レ」

《力勝可レ食》

然。大抵力能勝<sup>レ</sup>ツ之ニ者皆可<sup>レ</sup>シト食<sup>ツ</sup>141 <已上林氏> <下彈><sup>142</sup>若シ如ニ

<sup>139</sup> Again, the character used in the text is 杲, but that will be a mistake for 果.

<sup>140</sup> Text in *Razan Rin-sensei Bunshū* 26 (*Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 302b-303b); the quoted part in *Bunshū* 1, pp. 302-303. The quotation is accurate, but for some of the *okurigana*.

汝カ所説一ノ力」

能勝レ之者皆可ニ以テ食一ツ<sup>143</sup>。今有ニテ大鬼一食レハ、人、如何為レヤ」

可ト乎、為ニヤ不可一乎。佛世鬼子母神食レ兒、吾邦ノ酒』

1 : 2 1 ウ

天童子食レ人は是也也」

林氏引易傳<sup>144</sup>曰、庖犧氏之王ニ天下一ニ也、作ニメ結繩一

而為ニ網罟一、以佃シ以テ漁。故ニ歐陽子曰、庖犧氏其」

始ヲ<sup>145</sup>教レルニ民取レテ物資レク生ヲ以テ為ニ萬世之利一ト。此所ニ以也ト為ニ」

聖人也<sup>146</sup>。＜已上林氏＞＜下彈＞蓋庖犧氏者、漢土ノ人間、最初以レ無ニ衣」

裳一綴ニ柴葉一被レ之。以レ無ニ五穀一取ニテ禽獸一食レ之。乏ニ其」

衣食一不レ忍レ死故ニ為レ此佃漁ス。然ルニ歐陽子教レ民取レ」

物資レ生、以為ニ萬世之利一、為ニハ聖人則湯王開ニキ三』

1 : 2 2 オ

面羅<sup>147</sup>一ヲ。孔子以ニテ釣戈一不ニ網射<sup>148</sup>一。孟子遠ニ于庖廚一不レ」

食ニ其食一。蓋シ此三人ハ者皆是レ聖賢也。汝謂ニル如何一トカ。」

<sup>141</sup> As Razan made clear immediately in front of the quotation, the whole is quoted from *Chengzi waishu* 程子外書 8:3a, where it is part of an answer given by Cheng Yichuan to a question about the Buddhist prohibition of killing. It ends with two lines from a poem by his elder brother Cheng Mingdao, written when he set free a scorpion: 「殺之則傷仁、放之則害義」 - "If you kill it, you wound Benevolence; if you let it go, you harm Duty." The part Razan quotes he has quoted completely and correctly.

<sup>142</sup> The first phrase stands to the left of the line, and begins slightly higher than the second phrase, which stands on the right side of the line.

<sup>143</sup> Again, the *okurigana tsu*. As it makes no sense, we have interpreted as a mistake for *fu*. This emendation is also supported by the *okurigana* added in Razan's *Bunshū*.

<sup>144</sup> Reference to *Yijing: Xici, xia 2*; see Harvard-Yenching Index p. 45a. For a full quotation and translation, see the Translation, note 227.

<sup>145</sup> The *okurigana wo* is strange. Being placed in front of the verb, the characters 其始 cannot be the object of 教. They should rather be interpreted as an adverbial clause. We will emend accordingly in the *Yomikudashi*.

<sup>146</sup> Complete and correct quotation from the same "Disquisition" as in the preceding section; see *Razan Rin-sensei Bunshū* 26 (*Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 303a-b).

<sup>147</sup> This character might be a mistake for 網; cf. Mor. I: 12-1690.

<sup>148</sup> A botched quotation from *Lunyu* 7.13: 「子釣而不網、弋不射宿。」 The character 戈 is a mistake for 弋; cf. Mor. XI: 40172-59.



《禽獸當ニツ人食一ニ》

未濁ノ俗儒不レ知聖賢之意一ヲ、而妄ニ想ニフ禽獸ハ自レ天」

當ニツト人食一。以レ借<sup>ナダ</sup>149ニ己カ命一ヲ可レ恕ニム佗命一。」

林氏又曰、浮屠氏<sup>150</sup>禁殺スル者仁也也。<sup>151</sup>非レ不レニ善也。而モ」

顛倒錯乱而用レ之為レスル仁者ノハ自ニ孝弟一始ル。浮屠不レル寸ハ」

知五教一則孝弟何カ在ル。浮屠仁ニシテ于物一ニ、不仁ニ于人一」

者也也乎。〈已上林氏<sup>152</sup>〉汝豈不レ見邪。千佛所説ノ梵網經ニ曰、其ノ』

1 : 2 2 ウ

初孝ト云ハ者百戒之根也也。須レク孝ニ順父母師長一ニ、其後」

説ニ寸ハ十重四十八輕戒一ヲ、則先仁ニニシテ于人一ニ、後ニ仁ニルヲ于物一」

必セリ矣。儒者井中ノ蛙、不レ知ニ釋天ノ東海一ヲ自謂ニテ儒者ノミ」

有レト孝、不レ知積門孝ヲ。儒有ニ二十四孝一、釋ニ亦有ニ二」

十四孝。神亦有ニ五孝一。神儒佛ノ三道孝為レルヲ本是レ」

同シ矣」

林氏菅諫議圓爾問答ノ辨<sup>153</sup>曰<sup>154</sup>、圓爾自説ニテ世系一ヲ<sup>155</sup>」

問ニフ儒ノ系受ヲ於菅公一ニ<sup>156</sup>。公不レ答筭<sup>157</sup>口<sup>158</sup>。何為ニカ管公不レルヤ』

149 The parallel text of Ise Bunko *bon* has the character 惜 with the *okurigana* -mu, reading *oshimu*. In the context, it makes better sense than *kasu*. We will emend accordingly.

150 *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 303a, has 夫 instead of 浮屠氏.

151 Razan inserts the three characters 浮屠氏 at this point.

152 With the differences mentioned in the preceding notes, this is a quotation from the same Disquisition as quoted in the two preceding sections; see see *Razan Rin-sensei Bunshū* 26 (*Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 303a).

153 For *Kan kangi Enni mondō no ben*, see *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 26 (*Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 299-300). As Razan indicates himself (p. 299b, line 15-p. 300, line 1), the discussion between *Kan kangi* (Sugawara no Tamenaga) and Enni [Ben'en] in this *ben* is partly based on the description of the same discussion that Kokan Shiren 虎関師鍊 (1278-1346) gives in his biography of Enni in *Genkō shakusho* 7: *Shiden-bu* 1 (ed. *Kokushi taikei* vol. 14, Tokyo: Keizai Zasshisha, 1901, p. 746 lines 2-10).

154 The text hereafter, until the sentence that starts with '古徳曰', consists of a mixture of more or less accurate quotations from Razan's *Kan kangi Enni mondō no ben* (I.), of paraphrases or summaries of parts of the same text (II.), and of a phrase that seems to be a mixture of a phrase in Razan's *ben* and a phrase in Kokan Shiren's *Genkō shakusho* (III.). Below, we will indicate for each phrase to which category it belongs.

155 The character in our text clearly is 糸, but the intended character will be 系, which is used in Razan's disquisition and also in the next line in our text. We have emended the character accordingly.

156 II. a very short summary of Razan's *ben* (*Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 299b, l. 9-14), which in itself is a quotation from *Genkō shakusho*.

1 : 2 3 才

言哉。我請述<sub>レ</sub>之<sup>159</sup>。真言天台華嚴法相三論律」  
宗成實俱舍八宗者<sub>ハ</sub><sup>160</sup>、不<sub>レ</sub>因<sub>二</sub>師授<sub>一</sub>為<sub>二</sub>虛<sup>161</sup>說<sub>一</sub>ト。八宗」  
皆虛<sub>ニ</sub>シテ而禪宗獨<sub>リ</sub>為<sub>レ</sub>ンヤ實乎<sup>162</sup>。若自<sub>ニ</sub>シテ八宗<sub>一</sub>而言<sub>レ</sub>寸ハ之、則」  
禪ノ所謂迦葉密附者<sub>ハ</sub>不<sub>レ</sub>知出<sub>ニ</sub>ルヤ于何經<sub>一</sub>乎。大梵」  
王問佛決疑經亦疑<sub>シ</sub>矣。又曰禪<sub>ハ</sub>至<sub>二</sub>師子尊者<sub>一</sub>」  
而絶<sub>ヌ</sub><sup>163</sup>矣。 <sup>164</sup> 嗚乎大ナルカナ矣哉。我道統之傳也、堯以<sub>レ</sub>是ヲ」  
傳<sub>ニ</sub>之舜<sup>165</sup>、乃至至<sub>二</sub>朱子<sub>一</sub>。其道者大學之道也<sup>166</sup>。其」  
書<sup>167</sup>ハ四書五經、其位<sup>168</sup>ハ君臣父子夫婦兄弟朋友」

1 : 2 3 ウ

其事<sup>169</sup>トハ格物致知誠意正心修身齊家治國平」  
天下<sup>170</sup>。特<sub>ニ</sub>此心之體隱<sub>ニ</sub>ル乎人君ノ躬<sub>一</sub>行之中、百姓」

157 The character used in our text (bamboo head - hand radical - ear) is not listed in the dictionaries, nor available in the fonts. No doubt, the intended character was 箝, as used in Razan's disquisition. We have emended the character accordingly.

158 III. a mixture of a paraphrase of *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 299b, l. 14-15, and of Kokan Shiren's 「諫議箝口」. See Translation, note 250.

159 I. an accurate quotation from Razan's *ben* (*Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 300a, line 2). N.B. Razan has 諫議之 instead of Kan-kō.

160 II. a paraphrase of Razan's *ben* (*Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 300a, l. 2-5): 「八宗者密者猛法相者彌勒天台者於支那章安華嚴者龍樹三論者文殊律者優婆離成實者迦梨俱舍者天親皆是佛滅已後或數百年或一千年之間出來者也」. Between this paraphrase and the next quotation, Chōon leaves out the phrase 「今附爾之言不因師授為虛設則夫八宗之為設也皆虛而禪者之為設也」. Cf. Translation, note 252.

161 I. an accurate quotation of Razan's *ben* (*Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 300a, l. 6), and of Kokan Shiren's *Genkō shakusho*.

162 II. a paraphrase of Razan's *ben* (*Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 300a, l. 6-7): 「夫八宗之為設也皆虛、而禪者之為設也獨實乎、是大不然也」.

163 From its shape, the *okurigana* could just as well be read *su*, but in view of the context, the reading *nu* should be preferred. The original text in *Razan bunshū* has the *okurigana* *yu* (< *tayu*).

164 I. an accurate quotation from Razan's *ben* (*Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 300a, l. 8-10). Chōon leaves out the next phrase: 「然則於其異端之中已互有駁難、何至于言我道之事乎」 (*Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 300a, l. 10-11).

165 I. an accurate quotation from Razan's *ben* (*Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 300a<sup>165</sup>, l. 11-12).

166 Chōon leaves out all details about the transmission from Shun to Zhu Xi, which are given by Razan: 「舜以是傳之禹以是傳之湯湯以是傳之文武周公文武周公傳之孔子孔子傳之 孟軻軻之死不得其傳焉得其傳乎百世之下者濂溪周先生也濂溪傳之河南程 子兩夫子程子傳之新安朱夫子朱夫子之後不可勝計也其所者何也道也所謂 大學之道也非向所謂異端之道也。」 (*Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 300a, l. 12-15-300b, l. 1-3).

167 *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 300b, inserts the character 則 at this point.

168 *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 300b, inserts the character 則 at this point.

169 *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 300b, inserts the character 則 at this point.

170 Apart from the differences mentioned in the preceding notes, this is I. an accurate quotation (*Bunshū*

日ニ用ノ之間ニ、賢者識ニ其ノ大ヲ、不賢者識ニ其小ヲ<sup>171</sup>。而體ニスル寸ハ」  
其ノ全フシテ且盡ル者ヲ、則得ニル其傳一ヲ耳ノミ<sup>172</sup>。古徳曰外道聰明ニシテ」  
無ニシトハ智慧一、蓋シ謂下カ如ニ林氏一者上ヲ乎。林氏博識ニシテ而不レ辯ニ」  
黒白一ヲ不レ知ニ邪正ヲ。所以如何ナレハ、諸宗ノ傳法因ニ經論一ニ」  
遙ニ繼ク。密宗ハ感授如ニ吾禪宗一ノ的的相承シテ面受直ニ」  
傳。豈同レシテ日ヲ謂レヤ之乎。儒門ノ道統、與ニ諸宗ノ道統一以ニ』

1 : 2 4 才

其相似一ヲ、欲レ渾ニト禪門ノ面受直傳一ニ。實ニ可レ笑フ也。迦葉」  
獅子之論者ハ委正宗記ニ、如何不レルヤ見乎。若シ禪宗」  
斷絶セハ扶桑大唐不レ有ニ此宗一汝謂ニ如何一トカ。又汝儒」  
門道統之傳者、不レ知下堯舜執レ中之道理上、而妄ニ」  
引ニク大學之道八條目五倫及四書五經ヲ。若シ因ニラハ」  
所説一ニ、孔門十哲之中、不レ知大學之道八條目」  
五倫一ヲ乎。然孔子一貫之道傳レ之者、豈ニ不ニスヤ曾子」  
一人一哉。又從ニ周茂叔一及ニマテノ朱子一宋儒ノ之輩ニト與ニ孔』

1 : 2 4 ウ

孟一為ニセハ一般一ト、則恐ハ有ニ天壤ノ之隔一。宋儒ハ者對ニハ六朝」  
漢唐ノ儒者ニ、似レリ有レニ辨ニ明ニスルヲ儒ノ之道理一ヲ。雖レ然啜ニス、ツテ古人ノ」  
糟粕一ヲ<sup>173</sup>、無下一句モ從ニ自己ノ襟胸<sup>174</sup>一流出スル語上也。宋儒之」  
中何人カ有ニルヤ聖賢ノ氣象一乎。不レ知ニ佛法一ヲ無理ニ誹謗ス。」  
悉ク是レ聰明ニシテ無ニ智慧一類也也。

vol. 1, p. 300b, lines 5-7). The sentence that comes hereafter, i.e. 「此則非如口傳耳授密相附屬者」, has been left out by Chōon.

<sup>171</sup> These two clauses are quoted from *Lunyu* 19.22: 「文武之道、未墜於地、在人。賢者識其大者、不賢者識其小者、莫不有文武之道焉。」. See also Translation, note 258.

<sup>172</sup> I. an accurate quotation from Razan's *ben* (*Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 300b, l. 8-10).

<sup>173</sup> The characters in our text, with the wine radical instead of the rice radical, are *itaiji*; see Mor XI-40003 and XI-39837. They are not in the fonts.

<sup>174</sup> The character {月+匈} is not to be found in the dictionaries or in the fonts, but it must be an *itaiji* of 胸.

大猷院殿謁ニ日光之廟一。次テ而到ニル栗橋一ニ時有ニ忌」

部ノ丹齋<sup>175</sup>ト云者、携ニテ聖徳太子所レ選先代舊事本紀、」

因ニ阿部豊後守一ニ奉レ献ニ殿下。便命ニ丹齋一回ニシム江府一ニ』

1 : 2 5 才

殿下自ニ日光一還府之後、使ニ林氏ヲシテ覽ニ此書一ヲ。林カ曰ク」

一ニ覽スルニ此書一ヲ、以下太子ノ時有中<sup>レ</sup>所<sup>レ</sup>無<sup>レ</sup>字、及讀ニ大學之」

事上、為ニタリト偽書一奏之ヲ。以テ返ニシ此書ヲ於丹齋一ニ、丹齋大ニ發」

嗔<sup>176</sup>シテ即時焚レ書ヲ。余考下ルニ林氏謂ニ偽書一之意上、且ツ有ニ二」

義一。此書真至ノ所説、故ニ記人ノ見ルカヲ難レ及是レ一也也。」

此ノ書ト與ニ彼カ所レノ編神書詩文等一、有ニ大ニ相違一故ニ云レ」

尔是レ二也也。於ニ此二義ノ中一恐ハ不レ免ニ後説一者ノカ乎。夫レ」

吾カ國三部神書者ハ、舊事紀古事紀<sup>177</sup>日本紀也也。』

1 : 2 5 ウ

於ニ此ノ三書ノ中一ニ、天神七代神名悉ク以テ相違ス。然林」

氏博識ニシテ而不レ訂レ之。以下テ從ニリ舊事紀一五十年後所レノ」

編古事紀、又從ニリ舊事紀一百年後所レノ編日本紀上ヲ」

為ニシテ證據一ト、以テ神社考詩文等ニ書レス之ヲ。汝此ノ日本紀」

神代ノ二卷悉ク通解シテ無レキヤ疑否ヤ。古今儒釋神道ノ學」

者、此ノ書ノ之中或説多シテ難レシ為レシ解。然ルニ近代ノ唯一神」

道者ハ、設ニテ種種ノ邪解一ヲ為ニシ講説一ヲ誑ニス貴賤一ヲ。如ニシハ太子ノ此ノ」

書、則有ニ三部ノ神道。曰宗源、曰齊元、曰灵宗。此』

<sup>175</sup> In the first instance, the name is written with the character 齊, but this must be a mistake for 齋, which is also used in later instances to write the name.

<sup>176</sup> The character in our manuscript is {口+直}; it is not attested in the dictionaries. We have interpreted it as 嗔 (Mor. III: 4074), in the second meaning mentioned s.v.: *ikaru* (*on-yomi: shin*). Our emendation is based on Henmui's *Taisei-kyō raiyu* 大成経来由 as quoted in Kōno Seizō 河野省三, *Kuji Taisei-kyō ni kansuru kenkyū* (Tokyo, 1952), pp. 127-128.

<sup>177</sup> In the case of *Kojiki*, 紀 is wrong; the correct character is 記.

1 : 2 6 才

三部一部各有二十二傳、都テ是レ六十六傳也也。」

灌傳シテ而不レシテ受ニ六十六ノ秘傳一ヲ、而謂ニ偽作一ト、謂ニ妄説一ト、」

豈ニ夫レ可シヤ哉」

林氏隨筆ニ曰ク、我カ朝ハ神國也也。神道ハ及チ王道也也。一ヒ」

自ニリ佛法興行一シテ後、王道神道都テ擺却シ去ルト<sup>178</sup>。林氏雖下」

口ニハ説ニ神國一論中ト神道上ヲ、心ニハ有下輕ニシ<sup>179</sup>神國一蔑中スルヲ神道上<sup>180</sup>ヲ。

即出ニシ」

其ノ證一ヲ。汝見ニテ日本紀神代ノ書、太子ノ舊事紀一ヲ、不レ究ニ」

此ノ國ノ出生シテ詳畧一ヲ、而却テ委ク視ニ異國ハ史記一ヲ。只貴ニ彼ノ』

1 : 2 6 ウ

《理當神道》

國一ヲ豈ニ不ニヤ是レ輕ニ神國一邪。又汝自ラ造ニテ理當神道ノ書一ヲ、」

却テ不レ見ニ先代舊事紀一ヲ、不レ受ニ神代水灌ノ秘傳一ヲ。豈ニ」

不ニヤ是蔑ニ神道一ヲ邪。余見ニルニ汝カ所レノ編理當神道ノ書一、悉ク」

是レ應神天皇ノ時入朝セル儒者王仁カ解説ニシテ、而吾國ノ」

神道不ニ曾テ符合一セ者也。王仁吾邦ノ神道ヲ解説シ、宇」

治ノ太子委ク關ニ誹之一ヲ。謂ニ是ヲ宇治ノ訓解一ト也。豈ニ是レ擺ニ」

却センヤ王道神道一ヲ邪。又曰佛法興行ノ後王道神道」

擺却シ去ルト。吾爲レニ汝カ辯レン之。夫レ吾國開關以徃到ニ推』

1 : 2 7 才

古ノ朝一ニ始テ太子和ニ訓シ漢字一ヲ、吾國之人漸ク通ニ異國ノ」

儒釋ノ之書一ニ。異國之人恐レルカ不レ通ニ吾國ノ神道一ニ故、翻ニシテ」

<sup>178</sup> Razan Rin-sensei bunshū 66 (*Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 360b).

<sup>179</sup> We have inserted the *kaeriten* 'ニ' and the *okurigana* -shi on the basis of the Ise Bunko *bon*.

<sup>180</sup> Our manuscript has the *kaeriten* '一', which is incorrect. We have replaced it with the *kaeriten* 'ニ' and added the *okurigana* according to Ise Bunko *bon*.

神字一ヲ爲ニ<sup>181</sup>漢字一、作ニ先代舊事紀七十二卷一ヲ。不幸ニシテ」  
而入鹿焚ニク日本ノ國紀一ヲ之後チ、馬子舊事紀安丸」  
古事紀舎人日本紀漸漸造成ス。以ニ日本紀ノ神」  
道一ヲ傳ニト部ノ家一。弘法傳教受ニテ之ト部家一、兩大師」  
多ク造ニ神書解釋ノ書一ヲ。然ルヲ佛法興行之後、王道神」  
道擺却スト。不レ知何処カ是レ擺却ノ処。還テ以下テ扶ニ助スルヲ王道』

1 : 27ウ

神道一者上ヲ爲ニシ擺却一スト乎。余想擺ニ却王道神道一者ハ、不レ」  
可レ有ニ過レ汝者一也。」

林氏元亨釋書ノ辯ニ曰ク、本朝僧史之權輿カ乎。<sup>182</sup>我カ」

道何爲無レ人之如レ此ナルヤ哉。師鍊不レ足ニ庶幾一矣<sup>183</sup>。借ニテ」

儒者之言一ヲ、以テ文ニル佛氏之説一ヲ<sup>184</sup>。豈ニ惟リ虎関ノミナランヤ哉。大藏」

經五百餘函ノ文、皆是以ニテ我カ文字一ヲ借レ之而ノミ已<sup>185</sup>。猶ニシ」

盜ノ之於ニカ主人一ニ也。剽掠僭竊スルヲ爲レル工耳ノミ<sup>186</sup>。夫レ舊事紀」

古事紀日本紀延喜式者、雖ニ吾邦之史記一ト儒』

1 : 28オ

釋ノ學者見レ之者稀也也。於ニ吾釋書一者、儒釋共ニ嗜ム。」

學者無レ不レト云フ視レ之。林氏自謂ヘリ幼年閱レ之。其ノ時我」

道謂レ無レ人。今爲レルカ有レト人乎。如レ汝邪儒若シ爲レハ有レ人」

却テ不レ如レ無。又曰大藏經ノ文字、及虎関ノ釋書、皆」

是以ニ我文字一ヲ、借レ之。夫レ大藏經梵字ニシテ而渡ニル漢土一ニ。」

<sup>181</sup> We have inserted the *kaeriten* 'ニ' on the basis of the parallel passage in Razan's *Bunshū*.

<sup>182</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 302a, inserts the characters 「林子曰吁」 at this point.

<sup>183</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 302a, inserts the characters 「黃勉齋有云守虛靈之識而昧天理之眞」 at this point.

<sup>184</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 302a-b, inserts the characters 「者師鍊有焉使之如此何也以我道之無人故也若使虎関及門於孔氏則殆庶幾乎或曰」 at this point.

<sup>185</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 302b, inserts the characters 「矣豈惟虎関哉林子曰愈師鍊之於我書」 are inserted at this point.

<sup>186</sup> Apart from the discrepancies referred in the preceding notes, this is a correct quotation from *Razan Rin-sensei Bunshū* 26 (*Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 302).

漢土之人難レ通ニ梵語一。故ニ以ニ漢字一翻譯。爲レシ使<sub>下</sub>シカ漢」  
土之人ヲシテ易<sub>上</sub>レ通ニ梵書<sup>187</sup>ニ也。又吾邦雖レ有ニト神代ノ文字」  
四十八字一、聖徳太子翻ニ譯神字一ヲ爲ニ漢字一ト。編ニフハ先』

1 : 28ウ

代舊事紀一ヲ者、爲レ使ニシカ漢人ヲシテ易一レ通ニ吾道一ニ也。文字ハ者」  
器也也。若シ借レ器爲レ盜ト、今汝借ニル漢字一豈ニ非レ盜乎。虎」  
関爲ニ剽掠借<sup>188</sup>竊一ト。見ニルニ汝カ詩文一ヲ悉ク是レ剽掠僭竊ナリ。古」  
今造レ文ヲ者ノ、豈其レ不レシヤ然哉。」

<sup>コレタカ</sup>  
林氏惟喬辨ニ曰沙門師鍊ノ書ニ謂ク惟喬惟仁争レニ」

位、乃<sup>カケモノ</sup>賭<sub>一</sub>ニシテ競馬相撲ニヲ<sup>ヒト</sup>惟仁乞ニ僧ノ慧亮一ニ祈レ之。惟喬」  
亦タ請ニ僧ノ真濟一ニ祈レ之。各求ニ法力一。慧亮ノ持念有レテ驗」  
而惟仁登ニ帝位一<sup>189</sup>。然ルヲ林氏評シテ曰ク浮屠夸ニ説其ノ祈』

(1 : 29オ)

驗一ヲ、以テ吐ニ虚ヲ于民俗一ニ、傳ニ演于後人一<sup>190</sup>。林氏汝輩能」  
記<sub>下</sub>孔子丘之禱ルコト久シ矣。又獲ニトキハ罪ヲ於天一無レ所レ禱之」  
二事<sub>上</sub>ヲ<sup>191</sup>。不<sub>下</sub>曾テ知<sub>中</sub>周公ノ禱ニ武王ノ疾一ヲ之事<sub>上</sub>。若シ聖人不レ」  
禱周公何ヲ以テ禱。孔子丘之禱コト久シト矣。與<sub>下</sub>獲ニトキハ罪」  
於天一ニ無<sub>上</sub>レ所レ禱之説ハ者、對ニ門弟ノ輩一一時應レ病之」  
教ニシテ、而實不レ謂レニハアラ無レト禱ニ鬼神一ニ。不レシハ然奚ソ説<sub>下</sub>シヤ孔子禱ニ  
泰」  
山一ニ祭ニ社稷一。禹菲ニシテ飲食一而致ニノ孝乎鬼神<sup>192</sup>一之事<sub>上</sub>哉。」

187 Our manuscript here omits the *kaeriten* '一'.

188 This character will be a mistake for 僭, which is used above, and in Razan's *Bunshū*. We will emend accordingly in the *Yomikudashi*.

189 For "Koretaka no ben" see *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 26 (*Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 305-306). Chōon partially quotes, partially paraphrases p. 305a, lines 1-7.

190 Complete quotation of *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 305b, lines 7-8. The only difference is that the *Bunshū* has the character 吠 instead of 吐; Chōon's version seems preferable.

191 References to *Lunyu* 7.35 and 3.13. See Translation, note 300.

唐宋儒者不<sub>レ</sub>會<sub>二</sub>聖人之意<sub>一</sub>ヲ、而妄<sub>リ</sub>謂<sub>二</sub>淫祠詆<sub>ニ</sub>テ<sub>イ</sub>訾<sub>シ</sub>ズ』

(1 : 29ウ)

之<sub>一</sub>ヲ。何輩<sub>ニ</sub>効<sub>レ</sub>テ之<sub>レ</sub>云<sub>レ</sub>爾。豈<sub>ニ</sub>是<sub>レ</sub>上古聖人意哉<sub>ナラ</sub>ンヤ。先於<sub>ニ</sub>」  
吾邦<sub>一</sub>ニ聖徳太子命<sub>ニ</sub>シ玉フ釋氏<sub>ニ</sub>四役<sub>一</sub>ヲ。一曰ク祈禱、二ニ曰ク」  
教化、三曰ク葬禮、四ニ曰ク追善。汝以<sub>ニ</sub>所<sub>レ</sub>ノ役第一<sub>一</sub>ヲ為<sub>ニ</sub>」  
夸説<sub>一</sub>ト。嗚呼是<sub>レ</sub>何ノ意乎<sub>ソ</sub>ヤ。神道<sub>ニ</sub>立<sub>ニ</sub>九天<sub>一</sub>ヲ。第九ノ天之」  
説當<sub>ニ</sub>天竺佛説<sub>一</sub>ニ。第五ノ天之説當<sub>ニ</sub>日本神説<sub>一</sub>ニ。其ノ」  
之第一ノ天之説當<sub>ニ</sub>漢土儒説<sub>一</sub>ニ。故<sub>ニ</sub>佛ト神トハ者上天」  
之説<sub>ナル</sub>カ故<sub>ニ</sub>、誦祝<sup>193</sup>スル寸之<sub>一</sub>ヲ則有<sub>レ</sub>驗也。儒之説ハ者下天<sub>ナル</sub>カ故<sub>ニ</sub>雖<sub>レ</sub>」  
誦無<sub>レ</sub>驗也。宜<sub>カ</sub>ナ哉汝<sub>カ</sub>笑<sub>ニ</sub>呵<sub>一</sub>スル<sub>ト</sub>我<sub>一</sub>邪。林氏又タ曰ク我』

(1 : 30オ)

蒙<sub>ニ</sub>台命<sub>一</sub>ヲ修<sub>ニ</sub>本朝編年録<sub>一</sub>ヲ。至<sub>ニ</sub>淳和文徳之時<sub>一</sub>、考」  
舊記<sub>一</sub>ヲ作<sub>ニ</sub>浦嶋カ辨惟喬ノ辨<sub>一</sub>ヲ、以<sub>ニ</sub>關<sub>ニ</sub>キ古來之疑<sub>一</sub>ヲ、而解<sub>ニ</sub>ク」  
衆人ノ之惑<sub>一</sub>ヲ。此外編集之次多<sub>レ</sub>所<sub>ニ</sub>發明<sub>一</sub>者ハ、載<sub>テ</sub>在」  
其分註<sub>一</sub>ニ今不<sub>ニ</sub>悉<sub>ク</sub>挙<sub>一</sub><sup>194</sup>。余常常<sup>195</sup>痛嘆<sub>ス</sub><sup>196</sup>、効<sub>ニ</sub>テ宋朝以來」  
諸儒所<sub>レ</sub>編史筆<sub>一</sub>ニ、而悉<sub>ク</sub>刪<sub>ニ</sub>リ<sup>ケツ</sup>神佛<sub>一</sub>ヲ除<sub>ニ</sub>ク奇怪<sub>一</sub>ヲ。夫<sub>レ</sub>日本ハ」  
從<sub>ニ</sub>太子造<sub>ニ</sub>五憲法<sub>一</sub>ヲ、已往以<sub>ニ</sub>三道<sub>一</sub>治<sub>ニ</sub>天下國家<sub>一</sub>ヲ。」  
若<sub>シ</sub>欲<sub>レ</sub>修<sub>ニ</sub>吾邦ノ國史<sub>一</sub>ヲ者、釋氏神氏儒氏集<sub>ニ</sub>會<sub>三</sub>」  
家ノ博識之士<sub>一</sub>修<sub>ニ</sub>セハ國史<sub>一</sub>ヲ為<sub>ニ</sub>平衡<sup>197</sup><sub>一</sub>。不<sub>レ</sub>爾而使<sub>ニ</sub>一家<sub>一</sub>ヲシテ』

(1 : 30ウ)

192 Reference to *Lunyu* 8.21. See Translation, note 303.

193 This character is added among the *furigana*. A circle underneath 誦 indicates that it has to be inserted at this place.

194 But for the first word (我 should be 先生), this is a complete and correct quotation of the postscript the editors of Razan's Works added after these two *Ben*; see *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 306a.

195 *Sic!* The character is repeated in our manuscript.

196 The *okurigana* is placed next to 効, rather under 嘆, and it is rather sloppily written, but in view of the context this seems to be the best interpretation.

197 Both our manuscript and Ise Bunko *bon* have the character 衡, which in the present context makes no sense. No doubt, the intended compound will have been 平衡. We will emend and translate accordingly.



編レ之、隨レ所ニ己好ニ恣ニ以テ造ニ偏説ニ必セリ矣。余視ニルニ信長」  
大閤三河之三記一ヲ、儒士偏見之説ニシテ、而然モ不レ如レ」  
無レ造レ之矣。其ノ主君ノ所レノ敬佛神悉ク以テ删除ス。吾邦」  
之軍記、須レク因ニ上古平家物語太平記之筆法一ニ、」  
莫レ用ニ後世邪儒ノ毫規一ヲ。戒レ之慎レ之。汝多下シ所ニノ發明一スル」  
者上。悉ク以テ邪説ニシテ不ニ正説一ニ。視ニ此ノ二辨一餘以可レ知矣。」  
林氏浦嶋カ子ノ辨ニ曰、丹後風土記浦嶋カ子經ニテ三」  
百餘年一ヲ而帰ルト。本朝神仙傳唯云フ經ニテ百年一而帰ルト』

(1 : 3 1 才)

二説不レ同。神仙之説渺茫恍惚不レ可レ信也<sup>198</sup>。聖」  
徳太子ノ先代舊事本紀、雄略天皇二十二年」

秋七月谿羽ノ國夜更<sup>ヨナ</sup>ノ郡筒川ノ人水江浦嶋カ子」

乘レ舟釣ニス於海一ニ、而釣ニリ得タリ大龜一ヲ、便<sup>199</sup>チ化シテ為ニ美女一ト。時ニ浦」  
嶋カ子感メデ、以テ為レ妻レト。遂ニ入ニテ海中一通シテ到ニ蓬萊山一ニ、歴ニ觀」  
衆仙宮<sup>200</sup>一ヲ。即チ返ニ使童女一ヲ。浦嶋カ子留居テ遥ニシテ尚ヲ未ニ販」  
去<sup>201</sup>一。余考ニルニ風土記神仙傳舊事紀一ヲ、舊事紀者最」  
初也也。二書ハ者後説也也。故ニ舊事紀ニ謂ク浦嶋カ子未レタ』

(1 : 3 1 ウ)

販。二書ニ謂ク已ニ販ルト也。只三百餘ト與ニノ百年一有ニ異説一」  
耳ノミ。林氏謂ク神仙之説渺茫恍惚トシテ不レ可レ信也。汝ハ」  
以吾所レ見所レ知之外一ヲ、悉ク是為ニ妄説一ト、為ニ虚作ト。然ル寸ハ」

<sup>198</sup> Complete and correct quote from *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 304b, lines 4-6.

<sup>199</sup> Our manuscript has the character 使, which does not fit the *okurigana* -chi and makes no sense in the present context. No doubt, as in indicated in Ise Bunko *bon*, the character 便 was intended, which can be read (*sunawa*)chi, thus fitting both the *okurigana* and the context. We have emended accordingly.

<sup>200</sup> Razan, who quotes *Nihon shoki*, writes 「遊蓬萊歴觀仙衆」; see *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 304a, final line. Chōon's text, however, follows *Taisei-kyō*.

<sup>201</sup> Complete and correct quote from *Taisei-kyō* (*Tennō hongji*); see edn ZST vol. 2, p. 157, edn 1679, 26:21b.

則汝論下スル劉晨院肇李少柳毅琴高黃緒令威」

王質等之漢國列仙之事上何ソヤ乎。為レ有ト論ス[ル]カ乎。為」

無レ論スルカ乎。又林氏曰聖人記レシテ異而不レ語レ怪ヲ202。此ノ論」

藏ニテ其頭露ス其尾一ヲ也也。聖人ノ記レルハ異ヲ者、豈ニ不レ語レ怪」

而是レ何ソ乎。推古天皇先代舊事紀ノ序ニ曰ク不レ用ニ』

(1 : 3 2 オ)

奇怪一ヲ者、立ニル也君子之跡人倫之行一ヲ也。故ニ奇怪妙」

變棄ニテ其者203一ヲ漏ニス於史一ニ多シ。是西國ノ中古來コノカタノ史法也也。」

而差ニフ於真人至人204蹟一ニ又多シ也。於ニケル其國一ニ尚ヲ前後」

不レ同。效ニ於其後史一ニ者、疑ニテ上古ノ跡一ヲ而称ニ205シシ寓言一ト、謂」

虛誕一ト。又更ニ不レ知下真206勝ニ於至聖一ニ人207ノ不レ及ニ於至一ニ之」

玄微上208。況ヤ我カ神祇以ニ灵徳ヲ立、以ニ妙變一ヲ治ヲヤ矣。同ニ於ハ於」

彼一ニ則失レ此、而失レ於ハ此則入ニ於異俗一ニ。以失ニ齋元一ヲ、而」

失ニスル齋元一者ハ、是レ天臣＜神イ＞209之罪人、天皇之怨人也也210。汝』

(1 : 3 2 ウ)

於ニ吾國一ニ者ハ、為ニ神敵一為ニ皇敵一。若シ以ニ刑罰一ヲ不レ知五」

202 Also quoted by Razan near the end of his disquisition; see *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 304b, 2nd line from the back. 不語怪 comes from *Lunyu* 7.21: "The Master did not talk of extraordinary things, feats of strength, disorder, and spiritual beings." The origin of 記異 may be the *Gongyang* 公羊 Commentary on the *Chunqiu*, where any number of times we find the locution 何以書? 記異也 ("Why did he write this?" - "He recorded unusual events.").

203 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, Preface (*Jo*) 6b, has 有 instead of 者. We will emend accordingly.

204 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, Preface (*Jo*) 6b, inserts the character 之 at this point.

205 We have emended the *kaeriten* '一' to 'ニ', following *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, Preface (*Jo*) 6b.

206 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, Preface (*Jo*) 6b, inserts the character 之 at this point.

207 Both editions of *Taisei-kyō* character 之 instead of 人.

208 According to the *furigana* in *Taisei-kyō* edn 1679, Preface: 6b, this phrase should be read: *mata sara ni kan-tsu-hijiri 真 no naka-tsu-hijiri 至 ni masari, shin-no(?)-hijiri 聖 no naka-tsu-hijiri ni oyobazaru no fukaki kotowari wo shirazau*. We follow this in our translation.

209 In the interlinear commentary, the *katakana i* stands for 異, indicating that 臣 is wrong, and that it should be 神. On the other hand, Ise Bunko *bon* and both editions of *Taisei-kyō* have 臣, not 神. *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, Preface (*Jo*) 6b, even specifies the reading *ama no (w)on no* for 天臣. Hence, although the compound 天臣 is not otherwise attested, it can hardly be regarded as a mistake. The reasons for the emendation in our manuscript are unclear.

210 With the exception of the discrepancies mentioned in the preceding notes, this is a complete and correct quotation from the preface to *Taisei-kyō*, *Jo*, 6a-b.

刑之中以レ甚ヲ當レシヤ之耶

扶桑護佛神論卷上終」

(2 : 1 才)

扶桑護佛神論卷之中」

林氏神社考序曰、中世寢<sup>ク</sup>211微ニシテ佛氏乘レシテ隙ニ、移ニシテ彼ノ」  
西天ノ之法一ヲ、變ニス吾東域ノ之俗一ヲ。王道既ニ衰ヘ神道漸ク」  
廢ル。而以ニ其ノ異端離レ我ヲ而難一212レキヲ立、故設ニテ左道ノ之説一ヲ」  
曰、伊弉諾伊弉冉<sup>213</sup>ハ者梵語也也。日ノ神ハ者大日也也。」  
大日ノ本國ナル故ニ名テ曰ニ日本國一。或ハ其本地佛ニシテ而垂」  
跡ハ神ナリ也。大權同レ塵故ニ名テ曰ニ權現一ト。結レヒ縁ヲ利レス物ヲ故」  
曰ニ菩薩一。時ノ之王公大人、國ノ之侯伯刺史、信伏シテ』

(2 : 1 ウ)

不レ悟。遂ニ至レル令ニルニ神社佛寺ニシテ混雜シテ而不レ疑。巫祝沙」  
門同住シテ而共レ居。嗚呼神在而如レ亡。神如シ爲レラハ神」  
其奈何ソヤト哉<sup>214</sup>。林氏以爲ラク佛神本地垂跡ノ之説ハ者、」  
弘法傳教私ニ所ニト建立一。處處ニ謗レ之。夫レ此ノ本地垂」  
跡之義ハ者三輪明神ノ託言ニシテ而非ニ僧家ノ所説一。權」  
現ノ之始吉野ナリ也。此ノ權現有ニ本地垂跡。本地ハ佛、」  
垂跡ハ神、吉野ノ本地ハ者弥勒大士ナリ也。安閑天皇」  
崩御ノ之後、示ニ現王ヒ吉野一ニ、有ニテ種種ノ奇瑞一成ニフ此ノ山神一ト。』

(2 : 2 才)

211 The character 寢 means "to sleep" ; it cannot accommodate the *okurigana ku* that is supplied in the text, and would not make any sense in the context, anyhow. The intended character will be 寢, which can be read as *yōyaku*. We will emend accordingly.

212 We have inserted the *kaeriten* '一', following the Preface of *Honchō jinja kō* (NSTS vol. 1, p. 365, line 8).

213 The character used in our text, and also in the Preface of *Jinja-kō* is Mor. II: 1523; it is not in the font. It looks like 冊, with one extra horizontal stroke. We have decided to replace it with the character 冉, which is the usual character for writing the name Izanami.

214 This is a complete and correct quotation from the Preface of *Honchō jinja kō*; see NSTS vol 1, p. 365, lines 7-11. The same passage is quoted (and criticized) in an essay in *Shigetsu yawa 2* (no. 64), *Benpaku jasetsu* 辨白 (ママ) 邪説.

吾ハ是權現神<sup>カリアラカミ</sup>ナリ護ニリ寶祚一守ニ國家一。造レ像祭<sup>レレ</sup>之<sup>215</sup>。又有ニ<sup>ナハ</sup>」

此權現一、則奉仕ノ之有ニテヨリ役行者一ト云モノ以来、修驗道ノ之」

山伏有レ之。外學レ神内修レ佛。至レ今弥彌ニ滿シ一天一流ニ」

布四海一ニ、即是天道ノ自然ナリ也。苟モ無ニ灌傳一不レ可レ知」

也。此ノ義ハ神道極秘傳ノ者ナリ也。然ルニ林氏謂ク佛ハ者私」

造、而時ノ之王公大人、國ノ之侯伯刺史、信伏シテ不レ」

悟<sup>ラ</sup>216。因ニ<sup>ラ</sup>ハ汝所説一ニ、王公大人者、悉ク以テ無智ニシテ而相迷フ」

故ニ爾ルカ乎。衆人ハ皆醉、汝獨醒タルノカ乎者。又謂神社佛」

(2 : 2ウ)

寺巫祝沙門混雜同住ト。夫レ社寺ノ巫僧同住スル<sup>ト</sup>、巫」

僧ノ之私ニ好テ非ニス混雜同住一スルニ、即是吾神明ノ因ニテナリ詫言一ニ」

也。若シ不レ然豈ニ能ク得ニ同住一スル<sup>ト</sup>哉。佛法ハ吾邦ノ神明所レ」

好。故ニ國國懸懸村村家家有レ寺有レ僧。儒法ハ此」

邦ノ地神嫌レフ之。故ニ學校從レリ古処処ニ雖レ建、難ニ以テ繁」

《神嫌レ儒》

榮一シ。是即其證多ナリ也。我神嫌レ儒出ニ<sup>ン</sup>其證一。舊事紀」

雄略天皇傳曰<sup>217</sup>、日本媛<sup>ヤマトヒメ</sup>ノ命、集會<sup>ツトヘテ</sup>ニ諸神ノ司等一告レ」

215 Chōon here paraphrases *Taisei-kyō* 29 (edn 1679, 29:32a): 「三年，秋八月，勾大兄 (= 安閑天皇) 現魂於金峯、告吉野國縣主物部吹荒子曰：『我是勾大兄丸。元在戶科外天内津宮明津宮。昔成天皇、取國政焉。今成此山神。吾是權現神、護寶祚、守國、叶乎民之願。』權化神名，於此時始」。

216 The *okurigana* clearly is *wo*, but that must be a mistake for *ra*. We have emended accordingly.

217 Chōon quotes the introduction to, and the final words of a speech by Yamato-hime, reported in *Taisei-kyō* 26. The complete passage is as follows: 「日本媛命、集會諸神司等、告之而謂曰：『吾事皇太神四百七十年。今三光大神一處集鎮坐、天下位太平、亦無待之謂之、今當歸於神都。汝等能事大神、宜祈天下泰平、神魂無盡常坐。雖天地盡神魂不竭、吾恆見皇太神、日魂直降垂跡。天日在限、地大神在。天孫大神、曉星遺魂。豐食太神、月魂直降。見天宜知三神、吾有所不知者。皇太神最忝、又恐下問時、問五瀨 (= 伊勢) 太神、向後有異事、立神子奉問。代代天皇異事問定。寶祚威永、憑人情慮。輕虛神境不致神問、必至王威衰微。是以知神常坐、崇祭齋祇得利。吾今雖歸神城、非外往、在於茲。從武姬天皇時、異國人來。其人者中且有稱入魂竭、神魂既歸亡者。是吾國怨。無神威者、五瀨 (= 伊勢) 太神中坐大殿、是吾皇祖鼻磐余彥天皇也。吾奉見之、常恆鎮坐、守日祚永、護國民泰、衛吾國強、瞪佗國負。余雖婦人、守若四守。若有國急、予見婦形、見國人等。時諸神司知有國急、奏猿女君神樂、奉問五瀨 (= 伊勢) 大神。是以知人魂神魂共不盡。又田鹿宮祈神樂者、向二社三宮而祈奏祈調、祈

之而謂曰、乃神官等正ニ聽ニケ我言一ヲ避ニヨト異國一ヲ、異法ノ』

2 : 3 才

ミタマツクルノヲシヘノイキ  
魂竭教之氣ヲサヘニ。又聖皇本紀曰<sup>218</sup>、夕時旋<sup>カヘ</sup>ニリ玉フ班鳩宮<sup>イカルカノミヤ</sup>一ニ」

是ノ夜即入ニ玉フ夢殿一ニ。中臣鎌兄給侍ス。以レ幼ヲ得レ入ニ殿」

内一ニ。三更有ニ二客來一ル。一口駕ニ四龍車一、一口駕ニ青」

龍車一。容貞蕩蕩然タリ矣。下<sup>ノリモノ</sup>レテ乘<sup>ヨリ</sup>從容トシテ歩ミ到テ、而北面」

頓拜曰、天帝命レ臣稱ニ大王ノ寡一ニ使以來至。太子」

從容俱ニ禮受レ拜。客ハ<sup>ヒサマツ</sup>踞跪キ坐ズ。太子告テ曰、寡人於ニテ」

此ノ國一ニ欲レ弘ニ汝等ノ道一ヲ。吾國ノ神動スレハ<sup>コハ</sup>樞ムレ之。汝等鎮ニ坐シテ」

吾國一ニ、守ニ大道ノ之與<sup>219</sup>弘一ヲ。山代ノ國平野ノ地任ニスルノ其場一ニ」

(2 : 3 ウ)

佳地ナリ也。吾<sup>ナニハ</sup>カ浪花ノ<sup>ウチ</sup>220天皇及ヒ菟道ノ太子<sup>221</sup>與ニ汝兩公一」

同氣相催ス。四神相俱ニ鎮坐ニシテ平野一<sup>222</sup>宜レク護ニ寶祚及」

其大道一ヲ。二客肯レ命向レ北而去ル。鎌兄奉レ問客ハ是レ」

天下富，增神威妙。乃神官等，正聽我言，避異國異法魂竭教之氣。』。(Taisei-kyō, edn 1679, 26:15a-16b)

<sup>218</sup> Here begins another quotation, c.q. paraphrase, this time from *Taisei-kyō* 38, where, under Suiko 27, first month, we find the following: 「夕時、旋斑鳩宮。是夜、即入夢殿。中臣鎌兄給侍。以幼得入殿内。三更、有二客來。一口駕四龍車、一口駕青龍車、容貌蕩蕩然矣。下乘從容、步到而北面、頓拜曰：『天帝命臣、稱大王寡、使以來至』。太子從容、俱禮受拜。客踞跪坐。／太子告曰：『寡人於此國、欲弘汝等道。吾國神動樞之、汝等鎮坐吾國、守大道之興弘。山代國平野地、任其場佳地也。吾浪花仁德天皇及菟道太子、與汝兩公、同氣相催。四神相俱、鎮坐平野。宜護寶祚及其大道。』二客肯命、向北而去。鎌兄奉問、「客是誰人。」太子告曰：「一周公旦、一孔仲尼。寡人請於天帝、而勸請二大神。』須臾有神使、至自北啟曰：『大鴨大神、樞地不與。』／太子命曰：『大神勿慮。寡人即除之。宜暫託於虛。』既而太子、出自夢殿、召僧惠聰、而命之曰：『汝至山代平野、為地鎮、除神障。』並命御食子公、立麻結祠居神。」(Taisei-kyō, edn 1679, 38:54b-55b)

<sup>219</sup> The character in our manuscript indubitably is 興, but in view of the original text in *Taisei-kyō*, the character 興 will have been intended. We will emend accordingly.

<sup>220</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, here inserts the characters 仁德 (Nintoku).

<sup>221</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, too, has 少 instead of the flower head on top of the character. N.B. The character composed of 少 on top of 兔 exists (Mor. IV: 7511); it is an *itaiji* of Mor. XII: 42502. The meaning is "small rabbit" (*usagi no ko*). As neither character is in the font, we have decided to replace the character in our manuscript with the character 菟.

<sup>222</sup> We insert the *kaeriten* '一', which has been left out, no doubt by mistake.

誰人ソ。太子告曰、一ハ周公旦、一ハ孔仲尼。寡人請ニテ」  
於天帝一ニ而勸ニ請ニ太神一ニ。須更<sup>223</sup>ニシテ有ニ神使一。至レ自レ北」  
啓曰、大鴨ノ大神摺レ地不レ與。太子命シテ曰、太神勿レレ」  
慮ルヲ。寡人即除レ之。宜ク暫ク託ニス於虛一ニ。既ニシテ而太子出レ自ニ」  
夢殿一召ニ僧ノ惠聰一ヲ而<sup>224</sup>命レ之曰、汝至ニ山代平野一ニ爲ニ」

(2 : 4 オ)

地鎮一除ニ神障一ヲ。並命ニメ御食子<sup>ケ コ</sup>ノ公一ニ立レ麻結レ祠居レラシム神<sup>225</sup>。」

又未然本紀曰<sup>226</sup>、新儒至テ吾儒微ニ、牛鹿ノ祠リ數成テ」

忌齋<sup>227</sup>ノ祭リ且ツ減ル。其ノ徒賤ニテ吾國風一、彼ノ黨貴ニ異俗ノ品一ヲ。」

謗レルヲ佛爲レ宗、嘲レルヲ神爲レ事。崇ニメテ彼ノ少<sup>228</sup>徳ノ先王一ヲ如レ天、捨ニ  
テ、」

吾カ多徳ノ先皇一ヲ如レ土。<sup>229</sup>云先生余リ云先法<sup>ル</sup><sup>ク</sup>230這ノ流ヒ」

若シ盛ナラハ吾法當シレニ衰。此ノ徒或ハ大ナラハ吾國應レ伏。神防レ之」

故彼等多レ災。神嫌レ之故ニ其方難レ<sup>231</sup>立<sup>232</sup>。近代神職」

等悉ク云、日本媛ノ命ノ曰避ニヨト佛法ノ氣<sup>イキ</sup>一ヲ、以レ<sup>233</sup>之爲レ證。學ニ」

(2 : 4 ウ)

<sup>223</sup> Both printed editions of *Taisei-kyō* have 與 instead of 更, which is undoubtedly the correct character..

<sup>224</sup> Our manuscript inserts the *furigana* ミ at this point, but that does not make any sense. We have, therefore, decided to omit it.

<sup>225</sup> With the few differences mentioned in the preceding notes, this is a complete and correct quotation from *Taisei-kyō* 38.

<sup>226</sup> What follows is a quotation from the prediction for the final one-hundred-year period; see *Mizen hongī* (*Taisei-kyō* 69: edn ZST vol. 4, p. 287, and edn 1679, 69/70, frames 14-15).

<sup>227</sup> *Mizen hongī* has the ancient form 齋 (Mor. I: 273) of the character 齋. As usual, this character is used instead of 齋.

<sup>228</sup> *Mizen hongī* (edn ZST) has the character 小 instead of 少, but the edn 1679 has 少.

<sup>229</sup> Following the punctuation in *Mizen hongī*, and in view of the parallelism between the following two sentences, we have put the full stop before the character 云 instead of after it.

<sup>230</sup> The edn 1679 has the character 余 instead of 尔.

<sup>231</sup> Our manuscript adds the *kaeriten* 'レ' after the character 方. As this makes no sense, we follow the *Mizen hongī* and place the *kaeriten* behind the character 難.

<sup>232</sup> Here ends the quotation from *Mizen hongī*. But for the differences mentioned in the preceding notes, it is a complete and correct quotation.

<sup>233</sup> We insert here the *kaeriten* 'レ', which obviously has been omitted.

神儒一ヲ者ハ、佛法ハ謂ニ神ノ所一レ嫌也。雄略天皇之時佛」

《避ニ仏法ノ息一》

法未レ渡ニ此国一ニ。如何ソ有<sub>下</sub>ンヤ避<sub>ニ</sub>ノ仏法ノ氣<sup>イキ</sup>ヲ之辞<sub>上</sub>乎。神職ノ」

等<sup>234</sup>以ニ日本媛ノ世紀一為レ證言レ之。此ノ世紀ハ者伊勢」

五月<sup>235</sup>丸カ所<sub>レ</sub>ナリ造也。故ニ其ノ書雜乱是<sub>レ</sub>多。此所<sub>レ</sub>ハ言フ者」

避ニトハ異国異法ノ魂<sup>ミタマツクル</sup> 竭<sub>レ</sub>教ノ之氣一ヲ、所謂ル避<sub>ニ</sub>ルノ儒教一ヲ之義ナリ」

也。儒教ハ者應神天皇之朝来ニ此ノ土一ニ者ナリ也。此ヲ以テ」

可<sub>レ</sub>知吾神嫌ニ<sub>コ</sub>ヲ儒道一ヲ矣。又地祇拒<sub>ニ</sub>テ儒道一欲<sub>レ</sub>不<sub>レ</sub>安ニ<sub>ラ</sub>カ」

此ノ国一ニ。又天正年中朱子四書ノ集註及五經集」

(2: 5 才)

註等渡<sub>ニ</sub>ル此ノ土一ニ。惺窩カ輩読<sub>レ</sub>テ之弘<sub>レ</sub>メ之以来、儒道興」

隆<sub>シ</sub>テ以<sub>ニ</sub>シ儒葬禮一ヲ、以<sub>ニ</sub>ス儒ノ祭祠<sub>ニ</sub>ヲ。逢<sub>ニ</sub>フ災難一者多<sub>シ</sub>。不<sub>レ</sub>可<sub>ニ</sub>勝<sub>テ</sub>」

数一也。未然紀ノ之説實ニ不<sub>レ</sub>誣矣。又タ此ノ邦ノ神好<sub>レ</sub>ム仏ヲ」

即出<sub>ニ</sub>ン其證一。旧事紀宣化傳曰ク<sup>236</sup>、二年春二月<sup>237</sup>五」

瀬ノ国渡會ノ神乳山大耀光滿國中。神官行<sub>テ</sub>見<sub>ニ</sub>」

有<sub>ニ</sub>一人兒一、年度<sup>ヨハイツハアマリムツハカリ</sup> 十<sup>ア</sup> 六<sup>テ</sup>、端嚴<sup>ウルハシ</sup>ニ美麗、娟々<sup>ミメヨク</sup> 238 尊<sup>トフトキヲカキリ</sup> 極<sub>ナシ</sub>不<sub>レ</sub>」

234 This is an *itaiji* of 等.

235 The *furigana* looks like 寸, but *sa* must be the intended reading, as *satsuki* is the name fifth month.

236 The following is a quotation from *Taisei-kyō* 29, *Senka* 2/2/? : 「二年春正月、五瀬(=伊勢)國渡會神乳山、大耀光、滿國中。神官行見、有一人兒、年度十六、端嚴美麗、娟娟尊極、不可親倚。而乘大獸、長量一丈二三咫焉。毛色濃紫、極猛怖形。乃皇天大神託／巫、敕曰：『是客大神兒。尊大神在辰旦震旦國五峯山嶽。世智中智、世聖中聖、天地師也。今來至也、常崇祭之、以非犧供。彼辰旦國、八十萬歲先、此兒大神在。故文巧也。從是、這國當文巧也。這兒大神所乘、駕獸稜威神獸荒之。庶惡神見焉、甚怖之。正善眾明神、為惡神被襲。故造此獸形、置焉神前也。是兒尊來助吾。神威增、國德益。永久奉留祭之。』于時、兒大神乃分／神身也、譬如分燈火。一躬逗於茲、駕獸化磐、兒尊密形。一軀飛空、至於奧國、直如石成永居。故此地名永居。」 (*Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 29:31a-32a) Differences between the original text and the quotation will be noted as they occur.

237 *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, has "first month" of spring, but the edn 1679 has "second month," as does our manuscript.

238 Morohashi lists over one hundred characters with the reading *mimeyoi*. The *itaiji* used here is closest



可ニ親キ倚ール。而モ乗<sup>ホフケモノ</sup>ニ<sup>ツヘ</sup>大獸ニ長ケ<sup>239</sup>一丈二三咫焉。毛ノ色濃ニシテ」

紫ニ極テ猛怖キ形ナリ。乃皇太神託<sup>マロウト</sup>レリ巫ニ勅曰、是客ノ大<sup>マ</sup>神ハ」

(2 : 5 ウ)

兒尊大神在辰旦国五峯ノ山嶽<sup>イツ子 ヤマタケ ヨノサトシ サトシ</sup>240ニ世智中ノ智、世ノ」

聖中ノ聖、天地ノ師<sup>ヒトシ アメツチ モノヲシ</sup>ヘナリ也。今来至也<sup>マフキ下フ</sup>241、當ニ<sup>アカ</sup>242崇メ祭レ<sup>マ</sup>レル之ヲ。以ニ

テセヨ<sup>キ</sup>非」

儀供<sup>ヨキソナヘ</sup>一ヲ。彼ノ辰旦国ニハ<sup>カラクニ ヤソヨロツ トシ サキ</sup>八十<sup>マスコロ</sup>万ノ歳ノ先ヨリ此ノ兒ノ太神在故」

文巧也ナリ。從<sup>アヤタクミ</sup>レ是這ノ国ニモ當ニ<sup>ノリマ</sup>文巧一也。這ノ兒ノ太神ノ所<sup>ノリマ</sup>レ乘

ス」

駕<sup>ユマ</sup>243獸ハ稜威<sup>イヌ イツ</sup>244ノ神<sup>モロワロ</sup>ノ獸ナリ。荒<sup>イトラン</sup>ル之<sup>イサキ</sup>245庶惡神見<sup>レテ</sup>テ焉ヲ甚怖<sup>レ</sup>ル之。正」

善<sup>ヨキ</sup>衆明神<sup>モロヲ、ン</sup>為<sup>ニ</sup>ニメ惡神<sup>ニ</sup>246被<sup>レ</sup>襲<sup>ハ</sup>故ハ、造<sup>リ</sup>テ此ノ獸ノ形<sup>ヲ</sup>一ヲ置<sup>ケ</sup>テ焉神ノ」

前<sup>ニ</sup>一也。是ノ兒ノ尊ノ来<sup>テ</sup>助<sup>レ</sup>ケマス吾<sup>ヲ</sup>神<sup>ノ</sup>威ヒ増シ、国ノ德<sup>シ</sup>247益<sup>ス</sup>。永久<sup>ヒタフル</sup>ニ奉

to Mor. III: 6213, which is the popular variant of Mor. III: 6321 娟 and can also be used in a reduplicated form. We have transcribed the character accordingly, also following *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST.

239 The printed editions of *Taisei-kyō* insert the character 量 at this point.

240 The edition of *Taisei-kyō* of 1679 reads 五峯 as Itsune. We have emended accordingly.

241 The *furigana* indicate the reading *mafuki-tamau*; the intended verb is *ma-u-ku* (4), which is a variant of *ma-wi-ku* and means "to arrive" (参来). The verb reappears in *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 30:14a (quoted *infra*, p. 2:8b), where the sentence 可來時至彼詞今來 is glossed as *mafuku-beki toki itarite kano koto ima mafukeri*. In *Gobusshin-ron* 2:8b, this phrase is glossed as *kitaru-beki toki itarite kare no koto ima kitareri*.

242 *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, has the character 常 instead of 當, but the edn of 1679 has 當.

243 On the following page (2:6a, line 4) the combination 駕獸 appears again, this time with *furigana* *ma-ko-i-nu*. No such word as *mako* exists, but *koma-inu* would make eminent sense. Moreover, *Taisei-kyō*, edition of 1679, 29:31b, reads 所乘駕獸 as *norimasu (tokoro no) koma-inu wa*. Although, in the first line of 2:6a of our manuscript, the *okurigana* indicates the reading *noRU inu*, we have decided to follow the reading given in *Taisei-kyō* and emended accordingly.

244 The character in the text ({{禾+土+父}}) is an unattested *itaiji*. The present character (Mor. VIII: 25069) is closest in form. The reading / meaning of the character will be discussed in the *Yomikudashi*.

245 *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, puts a full stop after 之, but that does not fit the grammar of both sentences. The function of 之, also indicated by the punctuation of our manuscript, is to make 荒 attributive to 庶惡. We have emended accordingly.

246 We insert the *kaeriten* 'ー' following *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 29:31b.

247 The only possible interpretation of *shi* is, that it is a particle and lays stress. However, in *Taisei-kyō*,

ニレ」

留テ祭レリ之ヲ。于時兒ノ大神乃分ニケ玉フ神ン身一ヲ也。譬ヘハ如レ分ニルカ灯ノ』

(2: 6 オ)

火一ヲ一ノ躬ハ逗ニリ於茲一ニ、駕ル獸ハ化<sup>ナ</sup>レル磐ト、兒ノ尊密<sup>カクシ</sup>レテ形<sup>ミカタチ</sup>ヲ、一ノ躬ハ飛<sup>レテ</sup>」

空至ニ於奧國一ニ、直ニ如<sup>タ</sup>レ石成<sup>ナカイマ</sup>テ永居ス。故ニ此ノ地ヲ名ニ永居一ト。」

又欽明天皇傳ニ曰<sup>248</sup>、丁酉天皇詔テ令レ祭ニ神乳山ノ」

駕獸<sup>マコイヌ</sup>249ヲ之岩<sup>イワ</sup>及兒ノ太神一非<sup>ニヘモノ</sup>シテ犧供祭レ之。先レ是兒大」

神託ニテ於巫一ニ教曰、吾ハ慈ミ悲ム<sup>シ</sup>至テ深シ故不<sup>ケ</sup>レ樂ニマ肉ノ食ヲ。吾レハ」

富無<sup>トミ</sup>ニ度量一<sup>コト</sup>不<sup>コト</sup>ニ依レ祭養<sup>コト</sup>250一レ身。唯受ニテ人ノ志ノ信一ヲ應ニフ於其ノ」

所一レニ願フ。仍テ以<sup>ニヘモノ</sup>テセヨ非<sup>カサネ</sup>ニ犧供一ニ。天皇重<sup>カサネ</sup>テ詔シテ曰、此ノ神ン大ニ有ニマス

イキ  
威」

ヲイ  
驗一。皇太神スラ尚ヲ崇<sup>イキ</sup>レメ玉フ之。祭礼宜ニク篤ク重一カル。依レ是重ク祭レ之。』

(2: 6 ウ)

齋食<sup>イミケ</sup>ノ祭ノ始ナリ也。是ノ日並ニ詔シテ便<sup>カリアラヒトカミ</sup>251祭ニル金峰ノ權現魂神ヲ」。

是又以<sup>イ</sup>ニ齋食ノ祭一。這ノ神甚忌<sup>シハケ</sup>ニミ玉フ肉食<sup>イミモノマツリ</sup>252一ヲ。自レ是齋供祭礼」

edn 1679, 29:31b, it is omitted, which seems preferable. We will emend accordingly.

<sup>248</sup> The following is a quotation from *Taisei-kyō* 30 (*Teikō Hongi*); the date corresponds to Kinmei 1/9/23): 「丁酉、天皇詔、「令祭神乳山駕獸之岩及兒大ノ神。非犧供祭之。」先是、兒大神託於巫、教曰：『吾慈悲至深、故不樂肉食。吾富無度量、不依祭養身。唯受人志信。應於其所願、仍以非犧供。』天皇重詔曰：『此神大有威驗、皇大神尚崇之。祭禮宜篤重。』依是、重祭之。齋食祭始也。是日、並詔使祭金峯權現魂神。是又以齋食祭。這神甚忌肉食。自是、齋供祭禮、且發於國國社。」. (*Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 30:4b-5a) Needless to say, there is no parallel entry in *Nihon shoki*.

<sup>249</sup> As we argued *supra*, note 243, the intended reading will be *koma*, not *mako*. We will emend and translate accordingly.

<sup>250</sup> The character in our text, written as {羊+良}, is an *itaiji* of 養, which character is also used in both printed editions of *Taisei-kyō*. As the *itaiji* is not in the font, we have emended it to 養.

<sup>251</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, has the character 使 instead of 便, but the edn 1679 has 便, with the *furigana* *su*, indicating the reading *sunawachi*.

且ツ發ニル於国々ノ社一。又壬午<sup>253</sup>天皇幸ニシ玉フ吉野ノ縣ニ<sup>マルヲフ</sup>勾大」

兄<sup>イロヘ</sup> 254ノ天皇故<sup>モトノミスカタ</sup>容<sup>ヤストモノカミ</sup>シテ<sup>アヨ</sup>駕ニ赤ノ馬一、將<sup>ソラ</sup>ニテ八十部神一誘<sup>ニマセ</sup>ニマセ半虚一ニ来テ」

告ニテ天皇一曰、汝ノ尊ノ天皇久遠<sup>ハルカ</sup>ニ不レ謁哉。快ク治ニメ玉フ天下ヲ」

哉。天皇慶<sup>イロエ</sup>玉フ作レ禮白ニ兄<sup>255</sup>ノ天皇ニ曰、<sup>ヲモハサリキ</sup>不慮見ニ玉ラント天皇ニ。<sup>ヨロ</sup>歡」

喜言語断ヘヌ崩<sup>カンサリマ</sup>御<sup>ヨリコノカタ</sup>シテ<sup>マ</sup>已<sup>ス</sup>來坐御ニヤ何ノ処一ニ。<sup>ヲンミヤスラカ</sup>聖體安穩ナル歟カ。」

宝世怡般<sup>ミヨタノシ</sup>キ歟カ。故ノ天皇告曰、吾ハ從<sup>モト</sup>ニ高天一<sup>アレ</sup>来テ助<sup>カソ</sup>ニケ玉フ考ノ』

(2 : 7 才)

天皇ノ政一ヲ。亦我レ<sup>シロシメ</sup>踐<sup>ソラ</sup>ニシキ帝政一ヲ今尚不レ歸<sup>ヲホ</sup>レ天ニ、欲<sup>ヒタフル</sup>ニス永尔ニ在<sup>イマ</sup>レシテ」

此衛<sup>マモ</sup>ニラント後<sup>ヨ</sup>ノ葉ノ王政一ヲ蒙<sup>メクミ</sup>ニル恩澤一ヲ、諸臣等咸来テ成<sup>モロランラミナ</sup>レテ神ト事レフ」

吾ニ。其ノ存生<sup>イケリ</sup>シ日、與<sup>ヒ</sup>ニ死没<sup>マカ</sup>ル今一ト<sup>モロコト</sup>諸物無<sup>カク</sup>レ所<sup>カク</sup>レ異<sup>ル</sup>ル<sup>256</sup>。唯昔日ハ」

不<sup>モノヲモヒ</sup>仕<sup>257</sup>ノミ將<sup>イマ</sup>タ<sup>コ</sup>如今ハ自<sup>コトナ</sup>在<sup>トコロ</sup>ナリ。是<sup>コトナ</sup>レ生<sup>トコロ</sup>ルト死<sup>コトナ</sup>ルノ異<sup>トコロ</sup>ル<sup>コトナ</sup>処<sup>トコロ</sup>ナリ。我好ムハ以<sup>ニ</sup>ニノ  
法一ヲ、」

252 On p. 2:6a, line 5, these same characters were read *shinoke*. *Shishi* is an ancient Japanese word for "meat," but neither of the compound *shinoke* nor the compound *shishike* is attested in the dictionaries. *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 30:5a, gives the reading *shishi-no-ke*, which probably is correct. We will emend accordingly in the *Yomikudashi*.

253 The following is a quotation from *Taisei-kyō* 30, dated Kinmei 13/5/15: 「壬午、天皇幸吉野縣。勾大兄 (=安閑) 天皇故容、駕赤馬、將八十部神、誘半虚來、告天皇曰：『汝尊天皇久遠、不謁哉。快治天下哉。』天皇慶作禮、白ノ兄天皇曰：『不慮見天皇、歡喜言語斷。崩御已來、坐御何處。聖體安隱歟。寶世怡般歟。』做天皇告曰：『吾從高天來、助考天皇政。亦我踐帝政、今尚不歸天。欲永爾在此、衛後葉王政。蒙恩澤、諸臣等咸來、成神事吾。其存生日、與死没今、諸物無所異。唯昔日、不任將。如今自在、是生死異處。我好以二法、又嫌以二法。其所好二法者、齋戒與無為也。所嫌非佗、我恣改造。齋戒神法、無為神意、勿致我為。豈唯我濁好之嫌之、天地群神、皆悉同之。又見齋戒、有恆齋戒、有別齋戒。隨故為善、今造為惡。一切大神、同好嫌也。齋戒元在天、至地數別科。諸依神意、皆古天道、非人新造。天皇常謹、宜依神法、依神心也。』既而大神迴鑣還幸」。 (*Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 30:8b-9b) Differences between the two texts will be referred in the following notes.

254 *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, here inserts the characters 安閑, which is the name of the twenty-seventh emperor; his traditional dates are 466-531-536.

255 This time the *furigana* reads *i-ro-we*, while just now (line 4) it was *i-ro-he*.

256 As the reading *kakuru* is not attested for this character, in the *Yomikudashi* we will follow the reading *kotonaru*, which is given in *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 30:9a.

257 Both printed editions of *Taisei-kyō* have 任 instead of 仕. The *furigana* in the edn 1679, 30:9b, also specify the reading *mono-omoi nomi*.

又嫌フニ以ニス二ノ法一ヲ。其所レ好二法ハ者、齋戒ト與ニ無為一也。」

所レ嫌非レ他ニ我盜ニシテ 政 造ルト也<sup>258</sup>齋戒ハ神シ<sup>259</sup>法ナリ、無為ハ神意ナリ。

勿ナ」

致セノ我レ為。豈ニ唯我レ独リ好レ之嫌レ之。天地ノ群神皆悉ク」

同レ之。又見ニルニ齋戒一ヲ有ニ恒ノ齋戒一ニ有ニリ別ノ齋戒一ニ<sup>260</sup>。隨レ故ノ為レス」

(2:7ウ)

善ト今造ル為レ惡一切大神同ニス好嫌一フヲ也。齋戒ハ元在レ」

天ニ至レ地 數 別レツ科諸依ニ神意一ニ。皆 古 天ノ道非ニ人ノ新ニ」

造一ルニ。天皇常ニ謹テ宜下ク依ニサシ神ノ法一ニ依中下フ神ノ心上。既ニシテ而大神」

廻レメ 鑣<sup>261</sup> 還 幸 シ玉フ。又五月戊辰ノ朔<sup>262</sup>凡河内國言於ニ和」

258 In both editions of *Taisei-kyō* this sentence is 「所嫌非佗，我恣、改造」。 In our manuscript, 盜 is an obvious mistake for 恣. In view of the *furigana*, 政造 must be read *matsurigoto wo (tsuku)ru*, which is all right from the point of view of Japanese grammar, but hardly correct Chinese. For that reason, it might be preferable to read 改造, as both printed editions of *Taisei-kyō* do, instead of 政造. N.B. *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 30:9a-b, reads the characters 改造 as *ara-goto*.

259 The *okurigana* after the character 神 is unclear; it could be *shi*, *n*, or *mi*. *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 30:9b, gives *kan-minori* as the reading of these two characters. We have decided to follow this reading, hence, have opted for the reading *n*.

260 The particle *ni* after 齋戒 is wrong; we do not need the copulum here, but the full verb "to be." We will emend accordingly.

261 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 30:9b, reads this character (Mor. XI: 41022) as *kutsubami*.

262 The following is a quotation from *Taisei-kyō* 30, dated Kinmei 14/5/1. The edn ZST is as follows: 「五月戊辰朔一、凡河内國言：『於和泉國茅渟海中、有妙梵音。震響若雷聲、見奇光彩晃、曜如日色。』天皇異之、遣溝邊直、入海見訪。果如言狀。是時、溝邊直入海、求其素、果見樟木浮海玲瓏。遂取而獻。天皇得之、深慮詔曰：『是木太異、為非人業、即天所作。當作何物。』問於群臣。群臣不辨。即亦詔曰：『是奇異物。妄作非物、即／招天責。』乃敕卜問於五十大神及三輪大神。三輪大神託小童曰：『浮木天木、不中異物。當作佛像。國中疫氣、中年速止。』五十大神託磐隈姬命皇女曰：『其光樟木、是吾意也。慎聞、勿懈。神代眾心皆淨白也。最正直聖亨、故無罪咎也。然自地神百萬歲後、漸漸其心生黑作黑。異國如是。故日庶增人等、吟于底國根國。依之西極近於天、國有神中神真人、而生能／代皇天、隨機訓教。可來時至、彼詞今來。自今已後、吾停託宣、隨其真聖大道妙詞、變惡成善、守護國邦。靈樟神木、與汝天皇、造彼聖真神中神像、當拂國中巨多災害。異國寶法、悉集吾國、能介吾祚。加於吾法、為三而佳。今立三印石、當至見之爾』。諸巫不知處。即見紫光立、猶虹立光。有神乳山、至以見之。三石立於岩上、光出自茲而已。天皇審聞之、知除國多／災、甚悅、即命造工、令作佛像二軀。今在吉野寺、放光樟像是也。未成已佛像、國疫皆止也。時人皆謂：『天為自然。』」。 (*Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 30:13a-14b) Differences with our manuscript will be noted underneath. N.B. The same story, with far less detail, is told in *Nihon shoki* 19 (vol. 2, pp. 78-79), under the same date: 「夏五月戊辰朔。河内国言。泉郡茅渟海中、有梵音。震響若雷聲。光彩晃曜如日色。天皇心異之。遣溝邊直、

泉國茅渟海中一有<sup>ニ</sup>妙梵音<sup>一</sup>。震<sup>フル</sup>響<sup>ヒ</sup>キテ若<sup>ニ</sup>雷ノ声<sup>一</sup>見ル奇<sup>」</sup>

光彩晃<sup>カハヤ</sup>曜<sup>イテ</sup>如<sup>ニ</sup>日ノ色<sup>一</sup>ノ。天皇異<sup>レトシテ</sup>之ヲ遣<sup>ニシ</sup>溝邊直<sup>ミソベノナツハ</sup>アタヒ263一入<sup>レ</sup>海<sup>ニ</sup>」

見訪<sup>ミ</sup>セシム。果<sup>シテ</sup>如<sup>ニ</sup>言<sup>トコロ</sup>ノ状<sup>一</sup>ノ。是時溝邊直入<sup>レニ</sup>海<sup>ニ</sup>求<sup>ニ</sup>其ノ素<sup>一</sup>。果<sup>」</sup>

見<sup>クスノキ</sup>樟木浮<sup>タ、ヨ</sup>レ海<sup>ニ</sup>冷瓏<sup>264</sup>一フヲ。遂<sup>ニ</sup>取<sup>テ</sup>而献<sup>玉ル</sup>。天皇得<sup>レ</sup>之深<sup>ク</sup>慮<sup>テ</sup>』

(2 : 8 オ)

詔曰ク、是ノ木大<sup>コレ</sup>タ異<sup>シ</sup>為<sup>シ</sup>非<sup>ニ</sup>265人業<sup>一</sup>ニ、即天ノ所作<sup>シワサ</sup>ナリ。當<sup>レニ</sup>作<sup>ニ</sup>何<sup>ノ</sup>」

物<sup>一</sup>ニカ。問<sup>ニ</sup>フ於群臣<sup>一</sup>ニ、群臣不<sup>レ</sup>辨。即亦詔<sup>シテ</sup>曰、是<sup>レ</sup>奇異物<sup>ナリ</sup>。』

妄<sup>ニ</sup>作<sup>ニテ</sup>ハ非<sup>アタシモノ</sup>物<sup>一</sup>ニ即招<sup>ニ</sup>天ノ責<sup>一</sup>ヲ。乃勅<sup>ウラト</sup>テト問<sup>ニ</sup>フ於五十大神<sup>」</sup>

及<sup>ヒ</sup>三輪大神<sup>一</sup>。三輪大神託<sup>ニ</sup>小童<sup>一</sup>曰、浮木ハ天ノ木<sup>ナリ</sup>。』

不<sup>レ</sup>中<sup>アタシモノ</sup>ニ異<sup>モノ</sup>物<sup>ニ</sup>。當<sup>レニ</sup>作<sup>ニ</sup>佛ノ像<sup>一</sup>ヲ。國中疫氣中<sup>レ</sup>年速<sup>ニ</sup>止<sup>ル</sup>。五<sup>」</sup>

十大神託<sup>ヨリ</sup>ニテ岩隈姫メ命皇女<sup>一</sup>曰、其ノ光<sup>イワフ</sup>リ樟木是吾<sup>カ</sup>』

意<sup>ナリ</sup>也。慎<sup>テ</sup>聞<sup>ケ</sup>勿<sup>ナラコタ</sup>懈<sup>リ</sup>。神代ハ衆ノ心<sup>キオカリ</sup>口皆淨白<sup>キ</sup>也。最<sup>モ</sup>正<sup>ク</sup>直<sup>シテ</sup>』

聖<sup>トヲ</sup>亨<sup>ル</sup>、故<sup>ニ</sup>無<sup>ニ</sup>罪咎<sup>一</sup>也。然<sup>ルニ</sup>自<sup>ニ</sup>地ノ神ノ百萬<sup>ニ</sup>アタル<sup>266</sup>歳<sup>一</sup>後、漸々<sup>」</sup>

(2 : 8 ウ)

(此但曰直、不書名字。蓋是伝写誤失矣。) 入海求訪。是月。溝邊直入海、果見樟木浮海玲瓏。遂取而献。天皇命画工、造仏像二軀。今吉野寺放光樟像也。」 Cf. W.G. Aston, *Nihongi* vol. 2, p. 68.

263 The *furigana* reading "Natsutsu" are to the right of the character; *a-ta-hi* is written to the left. In fact, our manuscript reads the character 直 two times, first as *atai* (a title), and next as "Natsutsu," which, by the way, is a very strange reading of the character. Ise Bunko *bon* reads the name as "Na(w)o," and does not mention the title *atai*. *Taisei-kyō*, edn of 1679, 30:13a, has no relevant *furigana*. For the time being, we will follow our manuscript.

264 Both the edn ZST of *Taisei-kyō* and *Nihon shoki* have 玲 instead of 冷. The compound 玲瓏 exists (Mor. VII:20888-4), but the glosses do not fit the context, and the reading given in our manuscript, *tadayou*, is not attested. The character 冷 exists (Mor. VI: 117306), but a compound 冷瓏 is not attested, and the glosses do not fit the present context. *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 30:13a, uses the character compound 玲瓏, which it glosses as *タユタフ*, which is more or less synonymous with *tadayou*.

265 Our manuscript here has the *kaeriten* '一', which undoubtedly is a mistake for 'ニ'. We have emended accordingly.

266 The *okurigana ni ataru* is written next to the character 歳, but that must be a mistake. *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 30:13b, writes (*hyakuman*) *ni ataru toshi*, which is no doubt correct.

其<sup>キタナクナ</sup>ノ心<sup>ワロキコトナ</sup>生<sup>アタシ</sup>黒<sup>モロマス</sup>リテ作<sup>サマヨ</sup>黒<sup>モロマス</sup>ス異<sup>サマヨ</sup>国<sup>モロマス</sup>如<sup>サマヨ</sup>是<sup>モロマス</sup>。故<sup>モロマス</sup>ニ<sup>サマヨ</sup>267庶<sup>モロマス</sup>增<sup>サマヨ</sup>人<sup>モロマス</sup>ト等<sup>サマヨ</sup>吟<sup>モロマス</sup>ニ<sup>サマヨ</sup>フ<sup>モロマス</sup>268<sup>モロマス</sup>于<sup>モロマス</sup>269<sup>モロマス</sup>」

底<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>ノ國<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>根<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>ノ國<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>一<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>ニ。依<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>レ<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>之<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>西<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>極<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>ノ近<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>ニ<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>キ<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>於<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>天<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>國<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>270<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>一<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>有<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>271<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>マ<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>ス<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>神<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>中<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>神<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>真<sup>ニシカラクニ</sup>」

人<sup>マス</sup>一<sup>マス</sup>而<sup>マス</sup>生<sup>マス</sup>ヨリ、能<sup>マス</sup>ク<sup>マス</sup>代<sup>マス</sup>ニ<sup>マス</sup>テ<sup>マス</sup>皇<sup>マス</sup>天<sup>マス</sup>一<sup>マス</sup>随<sup>マス</sup>272<sup>マス</sup>テ<sup>マス</sup>機<sup>ヒトノ心</sup>ニ<sup>ヒトノ心</sup>訓<sup>ヒトノ心</sup>教<sup>ヒトノ心</sup>玉<sup>ヒトノ心</sup>フ。可<sup>ヒトノ心</sup>レ<sup>ヒトノ心</sup>キ<sup>ヒトノ心</sup>来<sup>ヒトノ心</sup>ル<sup>ヒトノ心</sup>時<sup>ヒトノ心</sup>至<sup>ヒトノ心</sup>リ<sup>ヒトノ心</sup>テ<sup>ヒトノ心</sup>彼<sup>ヒトノ心</sup>ノ<sup>ヒトノ心</sup>詞<sup>ヒトノ心</sup>」

今<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>来<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>レ<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>リ。自<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>レ<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>今<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>已<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>後<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>吾<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>停<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>ニ<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>ム<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>託<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>宣<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>273<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>。随<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>ニ<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>テ<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>其<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>真<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>聖<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>ノ<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>大<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>ナル<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>道<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>妙<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>ナル<sup>カンヒシリ</sup>」

詞<sup>カ</sup>一<sup>カ</sup>ニ、變<sup>カ</sup>レ<sup>カ</sup>ヘ<sup>カ</sup>テ<sup>カ</sup>悪<sup>カ</sup>ヲ<sup>カ</sup>成<sup>カ</sup>レ<sup>カ</sup>善<sup>カ</sup>ヲ<sup>カ</sup>守<sup>カ</sup>護<sup>カ</sup>274<sup>カ</sup>セ<sup>カ</sup>ヨ<sup>カ</sup>國<sup>アヤシ</sup>邦<sup>アヤシキ</sup>一<sup>アヤシ</sup>ヲ。灵<sup>アヤシ</sup>樟<sup>アヤシキ</sup>ノ<sup>アヤシ</sup>神<sup>アヤシキ</sup>木<sup>アヤシキ</sup>ハ<sup>アヤシキ</sup>275<sup>アヤシキ</sup>與<sup>アヤシキ</sup>ニ<sup>アヤシキ</sup>汝<sup>アヤシキ</sup>ノ<sup>アヤシキ</sup>天<sup>アヤシキ</sup>皇<sup>アヤシキ</sup>

一<sup>ニ</sup>ニ、造<sup>ニ</sup>ニ<sup>テ</sup>」

彼<sup>カン</sup>ノ<sup>カン</sup>聖<sup>カン</sup>ノ<sup>カン</sup>真<sup>カン</sup>神<sup>カン</sup>ノ<sup>カン</sup>中<sup>カン</sup>神<sup>カン</sup>ナル<sup>カン</sup>像<sup>カン</sup>一<sup>カン</sup>ヲ。當<sup>コハタク</sup>レ<sup>コハタク</sup>ニ<sup>コハタク</sup>拂<sup>コハタク</sup>ニ<sup>コハタク</sup>国<sup>コハタク</sup>ノ<sup>コハタク</sup>中<sup>コハタク</sup>ノ<sup>コハタク</sup>巨<sup>コハタク</sup>多<sup>コハタク</sup>ノ<sup>コハタク</sup>災<sup>コハタク</sup>害<sup>コハタク</sup>一<sup>コハタク</sup>ヲ。異<sup>コハタク</sup>」

国<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>ノ<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>宝<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>ノ<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>恣<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>悉<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>ク<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>ニ<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>集<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>276<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>テ<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>吾<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>カ<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>國<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>一<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>ニ、能<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>ク<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>介<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>ニ<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>ク<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>吾<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup> 祚<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup> 一<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>ヲ、加<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>ニ<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>テ<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>於<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>吾<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>恣<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>一<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>ニ<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>為<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>レ<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>三<sup>アマツヒツキ</sup>」

而<sup>ヨシ</sup>佳<sup>ヨシ</sup>。今<sup>ヨシ</sup>立<sup>ヨシ</sup>ニ<sup>ヨシ</sup>ツ<sup>ヨシ</sup>三<sup>ヨシ</sup>ノ<sup>ヨシ</sup>印<sup>ヨシ</sup>石<sup>ヨシ</sup>一<sup>ヨシ</sup>ヲ<sup>ヨシ</sup>當<sup>ヨシ</sup>ニ<sup>ヨシ</sup>至<sup>ヨシ</sup>テ<sup>ヨシ</sup>見<sup>ヨシ</sup>ル<sup>ヨシ</sup>ル<sup>ヨシ</sup>。諸<sup>ノミ</sup>巫<sup>ノミ</sup>不<sup>モロカンナキ</sup>レ<sup>モロカンナキ</sup>知<sup>モロカンナキ</sup>レ<sup>モロカンナキ</sup>処<sup>モロカンナキ</sup>。即<sup>モロカンナキ</sup>」

(2 : 9オ)

見<sup>ニル</sup>ニ<sup>ニル</sup>ル<sup>ニル</sup>紫<sup>ニル</sup>光<sup>ニル</sup>ノ<sup>ニル</sup>立<sup>ニル</sup>一<sup>ニル</sup>ヲ、猶<sup>ニル</sup>ニ<sup>ニル</sup>ヨ<sup>ニル</sup>虹<sup>ニル</sup>ノ<sup>ニル</sup>立<sup>ニル</sup>光<sup>ニル</sup>一<sup>ニル</sup>。有<sup>ニル</sup>ニ<sup>ニル</sup>神<sup>ニル</sup>乳<sup>ニル</sup>山<sup>ニル</sup>一<sup>ニル</sup>ニ<sup>ニル</sup>至<sup>ニル</sup>テ<sup>ニル</sup>以<sup>ニル</sup>見<sup>ニル</sup>レ<sup>ニル</sup>之<sup>ニル</sup>、三<sup>ニル</sup>ツ」

石<sup>ノ</sup>立<sup>ノ</sup>於<sup>ノ</sup>岩<sup>ノ</sup>ノ<sup>ノ</sup>上<sup>ノ</sup>一<sup>ノ</sup>ニ、光<sup>ノ</sup>出<sup>ノ</sup>一<sup>ノ</sup>タル<sup>ノ</sup>自<sup>ノ</sup>レ<sup>ノ</sup>茲<sup>ノ</sup>而<sup>ノ</sup>已<sup>ノ</sup>。天<sup>ノ</sup>皇<sup>ノ</sup>審<sup>ノ</sup>ニ<sup>ノ</sup>聞<sup>ノ</sup>レ<sup>ノ</sup>フ<sup>ノ</sup>之<sup>ノ</sup>、知<sup>ノ</sup>レ<sup>ノ</sup>テ<sup>ノ</sup>」

除<sup>サハ</sup>ニ<sup>サハ</sup>ン<sup>サハ</sup>ヲ<sup>サハ</sup>国<sup>サハ</sup>ノ<sup>サハ</sup>多<sup>サハ</sup>ノ<sup>サハ</sup>災<sup>サハ</sup>一<sup>サハ</sup>ヲ<sup>サハ</sup>甚<sup>サハ</sup>タ<sup>サハ</sup>悦<sup>サハ</sup>ヒ、即<sup>タクミ</sup>命<sup>タクミ</sup>ニ<sup>タクミ</sup>シ<sup>タクミ</sup>テ<sup>タクミ</sup>造<sup>タクミ</sup>工<sup>タクミ</sup>一<sup>タクミ</sup>ニ<sup>タクミ</sup>令<sup>タクミ</sup>レ<sup>タクミ</sup>作<sup>タクミ</sup>ニ<sup>タクミ</sup>佛<sup>タクミ</sup>ノ<sup>タクミ</sup>像<sup>タクミ</sup>ニ<sup>タクミ</sup>軀<sup>タクミ</sup>一<sup>タクミ</sup>ヲ。今<sup>タクミ</sup>」

267 Both printed editions of *Taisei-kyō* insert the character 日 at this point. The edn 1679 makes clear that it is to be read *hibi ni* ("daily, from day to day").

268 *Samayou* is not an attested reading of this character. The same reading, however, is also given in *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 30:13b, so we will accept it.

269 Both printed editions of *Taisei-kyō* write 于 instead of 于, no doubt correctly. Cf. Mor. I: 251.

270 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, reads *seikyoku no ten ni chikaki kuni ni*. The *furigana nishi-karakuni* in our manuscript, and also in Ise Bunkko *bon*, must be interpreted as an explanation of *seikyoku*: "the western Chinese country."

271 Obviously, the *kaeriten* 'ニ' has been left out at this point.

272 Obviously, the *kaeriten* 'レ' has been left out at this point.

273 Obviously, the *kaeriten* 'ニ' has been left out at this point.

274 Again, a *kaeriten* has been left out. The *kaeriten* 'ニ' should have been inserted at this place.

275 The character 神 had originally been forgotten and was added later. It is written between the lines; a dot indicates where it should be fitted into the sentence.

276 Obviously, the *kaeriten* 'ニ' has been left out at this point.

在ニ於<sup>277</sup>吉野寺<sup>ヒカリ</sup>ニ放光樟<sup>278</sup>ノ像是<sup>279</sup>也。未<sup>レ</sup>成<sup>ニ</sup>己<sup>280</sup>佛ノ像<sup>一</sup>國」

疫皆止<sup>ヌ</sup>也。時<sup>ニ</sup>人皆謂天<sup>ノ</sup>為<sup>ヲ</sup>自然<sup>リ</sup>ト。推古天皇<sup>壬</sup>」

辰<sup>281</sup>三輪大神託<sup>ニ</sup>リテ采女<sup>一</sup>太踊躍。大殿甚<sup>タ</sup>震<sup>フ</sup>。大地」

巨<sup>ニ</sup>動<sup>ク</sup>。直<sup>ニ</sup>告<sup>テ</sup>奏<sup>ニ</sup>シテ天皇<sup>一</sup>ニ曰、來年春天下暗<sup>ナ</sup>ラン。日月<sup>モ</sup>失<sup>レ</sup>」

光、可<sup>ニ</sup>有<sup>テ</sup>モ如<sup>一</sup>レクナル無。天憂<sup>ヘ</sup>神恐<sup>ル</sup>。累年示<sup>レ</sup>怪、天皇不<sup>レ</sup>怖。』

(2 : 9ウ)

嗟吹悲<sup>キ</sup>哉為<sup>ニ</sup>如<sup>レ</sup>之<sup>ヲ</sup>何<sup>一</sup>。庶幾<sup>ハ</sup>天皇恐<sup>レ</sup>之、於<sup>ニ</sup>神風」

五十宮、及吾三輪大社<sup>一</sup>、急<sup>ニ</sup>造<sup>ニ</sup>リ廻廊<sup>一</sup>ヲ、置<sup>282</sup>ニキ百十僧」

像<sup>283</sup>一ヲ、讀<sup>ニ</sup>ム<sup>ヲ</sup>孔雀經<sup>一</sup>ヲ各一萬部<sup>シ</sup>テ、普向<sup>ニ</sup>ム<sup>テ</sup>天衆地類<sup>一</sup>ニ、祭<sup>ニ</sup>リ玉<sup>ハ</sup>國」

社縣社ノ神<sup>一</sup>、當<sup>下</sup>ニ轉<sup>ニ</sup>シテ其凶<sup>一</sup>ヲ天神地祇再<sup>ヒ</sup>復<sup>中</sup>喜樂<sup>上</sup>ヲ。天」

皇大<sup>ニ</sup>驚<sup>テ</sup>以<sup>ニ</sup>神教ノ旨<sup>一</sup>ヲ、而動<sup>ニ</sup>テ宸筆<sup>一</sup>ヲ告<sup>ニ</sup>玉<sup>フ</sup>皇太子<sup>一</sup>ニ。皇太」

子上<sup>レ</sup>表奏以停<sup>レ</sup>メテ祈<sup>ヲ</sup>曰、天示<sup>レ</sup>怪誠<sup>ニ</sup>有<sup>ニ</sup>故由<sup>一</sup>。臣雖<sup>ニ</sup>」

不敏<sup>ニ</sup>シテ而不肖<sup>一</sup>ナリト有<sup>レ</sup>所<sup>レ</sup>知不<sup>レ</sup>驚。非<sup>レ</sup>奉<sup>ニ</sup>為<sup>ニ</sup>天皇<sup>一</sup>ノ、亦非<sup>レ</sup>」

277 Both printed editions of *Taisei-kyō* omit the character 於.

278 The character is written in an idiosyncratic manner, which is not represented in the font, but in view of the context, this should be the intended character.

279 *Nihon shoki* 19 (vol. 2, p. 79), writes 「今吉野寺放光樟像也」.

280 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, reads the two characters 成己 together as *nari-owara(zu)*, which seems more sensible. We will emend accordingly.

281 The following is a quotation from *Taisei-kyō* 33; it is dated Suiko 28/12/3: 「壬辰、三輪大神託采女、太踊躍。大殿甚震、大地巨動。直告奏天皇曰：『來年春、天下暗、日月失光、可有如無。天憂神恐。累年示怪、天皇不怖。嗟吹悲哉、為如之何。庶幾、天皇恐之、於神風五十宮及吾三輪大社、急造迴廊、置百十僧、讀孔雀經、各一萬部。普向天眾地類、祭國社、縣社神、當轉其凶。天神地祇再復喜樂。』天ノ皇大驚、以神教旨、而動宸筆、告皇太子。皇太子上表、奏以停祈曰：『天示怪、誠有故由。臣雖不敏而不肖、有所知不驚。非奉為天皇、又非為臣民。可奏由而難言。神指來年春也。至時、見非社稷。夫君子道者、恐不脩人倫、而遇禍夭恥。不恐脩己住道、命來時至自天。臣聞、人壽長、則見辱又多。又聞、功成身退天道。怪又有禱可遯、有不禱不可遯。今思之、當不禱三ノ輪迴廊、任於神意。於可造理至、後日可所造。五十宮不可。此宮齋元本、不可改神代狀、不可增、不可減、不可用儒釋祭。若後有神所望、立別處、可修之。何為遯私災、改根神祠狀。天皇願守義理、勿驚非義妖怪。』」 (*Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 33:58b-59b) Differences with our manuscript will be noted as they occur. There is no parallel passage in *Nihon shoki*.

282 Our manuscript has a character that is attested nowhere: 𠄎+置. In view of the *okurigana ki*, and the character used in the edn ZST of *Taisei-kyō*, the character 置 must be intended.

283 The character 像 is lacking in both printed editions of *Taisei-kyō*.

為ニ臣民一ノ。可レ奏レ由而難レ言。神指<sup>サシ</sup>ニ玉フ來年春一ヲ也。至<sup>レ</sup>テ時ニ』

(2 : 10オ)

見レ非ニ社稷一ニ。夫レ君子ノ道者、恐<sup>下</sup>レテ不レ脩ニ人倫一ヲ而遇<sup>中</sup>284ヲ禍」

大<sup>ヲ</sup>285耻<sup>上</sup>ニ。不レ恐ニ脩<sup>レ</sup>メ己住<sup>レ</sup>シテ道ニ命來<sup>リ</sup>時至<sup>テ</sup>自<sup>ミ</sup>286天<sup>ノ</sup>287ヲ。臣聞人」

壽長<sup>ケル</sup>ハ則見<sup>レ</sup>辱、又多シ。又聞ク功成<sup>テ</sup>身退<sup>ク</sup>ハ天ノ道ナリト288。怪又」

有ニ禱<sup>テ</sup>可<sup>レ</sup>遯、有ニ不<sup>レ</sup>禱ナラ不<sup>レ</sup>可<sup>レ</sup>遯。今思<sup>レ</sup>之當<sup>レ</sup>不<sup>レ</sup>禱。三」

輪ノ廻廊ハ、任ニ於神ノ意一ニ於<sup>ニ</sup>テ可<sup>レ</sup>造理至<sup>一</sup>ニ後ノ日可<sup>レ</sup>所<sup>レ</sup>造。」

五十宮<sup>ヨカラス</sup>ニハ不可。此ノ宮ハ齋元ノ本ナリ。不<sup>レ</sup>可<sup>レ</sup>改ニ神代ノ狀一ヲ、不<sup>レ</sup>

可<sup>レ</sup>増不<sup>レ</sup>可<sup>レ</sup>減、不<sup>レ</sup>可<sup>レ</sup>用ニ儒釋ノ祭一ヲ。若後有ニハ神ノ代<sup>289</sup>一レ望」

立<sup>ニ</sup>テ別処一ヲ可<sup>レ</sup>修<sup>レ</sup>之。何ソ為<sup>ニ</sup>遯ニ<sup>カ</sup>私ノ災一ヲ改<sup>ニ</sup>ン根<sup>ツ</sup>神ノ祠ノ狀一ヲ。天』

(2 : 10ウ)

皇願<sup>ク</sup>ハ守<sup>ニ</sup>テ義理一ヲ勿<sup>レ</sup>驚<sup>ニ</sup>玉ヒソ非義妖怪一<sup>290</sup>。如<sup>レ</sup>此證拠分明」

辨白。然<sup>ル</sup>ニ汝思<sup>ニ</sup>ヒ<sup>ニ</sup>稷氏私為<sup>一</sup>レ之、儒<sup>291</sup>ニ<sup>ニ</sup>謗<sup>レ</sup>之<sup>ニ</sup>誹<sup>レ</sup>之。近世」

儒士神職ノ輩、謂<sup>下</sup>フ神儒一致ナリ、仏法ハ神明嫌<sup>レ</sup>292フト之。可<sup>レ</sup>

284 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 33:59a inserts the *okurigana fu* at this point.

285 Both printed editions of *Taisei-kyō* have 天 instead of 大. The edition of *Taisei-kyō* of 1679 has the *okurigana suru no* instead of *wo*.

286 The character 自 is lacking in the edn ZST of *Taisei-kyō*, but we find it in the edn 1679, 33:59a. Interestingly, in the edn 1679, the *furigana wo* is added to the character, suggesting the reading *onozukara* instead of *mizukara*.

287 The meaning of function of the *furigana ノ*, which our manuscript adds to the character 天, is unclear. We will ignore it.

288 The first quotation is a paraphrase of *Zhuangzi: Tiandi* 6: 「多男子則多懼，富則多事，壽則多辱。是三者，非所以養德也」 - "Many sons bring many fears; riches bring many troubles; and *long life gives rise to many obloquies*. These three things do not help to nourish virtue." (Legge's translation) The second quotation is from *Daodejing* 9: 「持而盈之、不如其已。揣而銳之、不可長保。金玉滿堂、莫之能守。富貴而驕、自遺其咎。功成身退、天之道也。」 - "It is better to leave a vessel unfilled, than to attempt to carry it when it is full. If you keep feeling a point that has been sharpened, the point cannot for long preserve its sharpness. When gold and jade fill the hall, their possessor cannot keep them safe. When wealth and honours lead to arrogance, this brings its evil on itself. *When the work is done, and one's name is becoming distinguished, to withdraw into obscurity is the way of Heaven.*" (Legge's translation)

289 Both printed editions of *Taisei-kyō* and Ise Bunko *bon* have 所 instead of 代; see edn 1679, 33:59b. We will emend accordingly

290 Here ends the quotation from *Taisei-kyō* 33. Apart from the discrepancies mentioned in the preceding notes, it is a complete and correct quotation.

291 Ise Bunko *bon* has the character 偏 (*hitoe ni*) instead of 儒. As this makes much better sense, we will emend accordingly.



笑之甚ナリ也。若儒道吾神好<sup>レ</sup>玉ハ之、於<sup>ニテ</sup>神社<sup>一</sup>儒士奚ソ」  
不<sup>レ</sup>シテ勒<sup>ニ</sup>神職<sup>一</sup>、而只有<sup>ニ</sup>ルヤ<sup>一</sup>积氏領<sup>ニ</sup>スル<sup>一</sup>神職<sup>一</sup>乎。即吾神ノ不<sup>レ</sup>」  
好<sup>レ</sup>儒之證ナリ也」

林氏神社考引<sup>ニテ</sup>日本紀<sup>一</sup>垂仁天皇二十五年」

三月<sup>293</sup>離<sup>ハナ</sup>ニ<sup>チ</sup>マツリ<sup>リ</sup>天照大神ヲ於豊稻姫命<sup>ツ</sup>ニ<sup>ケ</sup>玉フ<sup>フ</sup>于倭姫命<sup>ニ</sup>」

(2 : 1 1 才)

爰<sup>ニ</sup>倭姫命求<sup>下</sup>テ<sup>シ</sup>鎮坐<sup>ニ</sup>メマサシム<sup>ツ</sup>太神<sup>一</sup>之処<sup>上</sup>ヲ而詣<sup>ル</sup>菟田<sup>タ</sup>笈<sup>ウ</sup>幡<sup>ノ</sup>」

笈此云〈佐佐〉<sup>294</sup>更還<sup>テ</sup>之入<sup>ニテ</sup>近江國<sup>ニ</sup>東<sup>一</sup>〈方〉<sup>295</sup>廻<sup>ニテ</sup>美濃<sup>一</sup>ヲ到<sup>ル</sup>伊勢國<sup>ニ</sup>」

時<sup>マ</sup>テ天照<sup>ス</sup>大神誨<sup>ニテ</sup>倭姫ノ命<sup>ニ</sup>曰是神風伊勢国ハ則」

常世ノ之浪<sup>シキナミヨ</sup>ノ重浪<sup>カ</sup>舩<sup>ウマシ</sup>スル國也。傍國ノ可<sup>レ</sup>怜國ナリ也。欲<sup>レ</sup>居<sup>ニ</sup>ト」

是ノ國<sup>ニ</sup>。故<sup>ニ</sup>随<sup>ニ</sup>太神教<sup>一</sup>ヘノ、其ノ祠ヲ立<sup>ニツ</sup>於伊勢ノ國<sup>ニ</sup>。因<sup>296</sup>ニ齋<sup>イハイ</sup>ノ宮」

于五十鈴ノ川上<sup>ニ</sup>。是謂<sup>ニ</sup>磯<sup>イソ</sup>ノ宮<sup>一</sup>ト。則天照大神始<sup>テ</sup>自<sup>レ</sup>」

天降<sup>ク</sup>リ玉フ<sup>297</sup>之處<sup>ナリ</sup>也。一云天皇以<sup>ニ</sup>倭姫ノ命<sup>一</sup>ヲ為<sup>ニテ</sup>御杖<sup>ト</sup>、貢<sup>タ</sup>ニテ」

292 The *kaeriten* '上' should have been inserted at this point. It seems to have been forgotten.

293 See *Nihon shoki* 6 (vol. 1, pp. 184-185); cf. Aston, *Nihongi* vol. 1, pp. 176-177. The text in *Nihon Shoki* is as follows: 「三月丁亥朔丙申。離天照大神於豊稻入姫命。託于倭姫命。爰倭姫命求鎮坐大神之処。而詣菟田笈幡。〈笈、此云佐佐。〉更還之入近江国。東方廻美濃、到伊勢国。時天照大神誨倭姫命曰。是神風伊勢国。則常世之浪重浪舩国也。傍国可<sup>レ</sup>怜国也。欲居是国。故随大神教。其祠立於伊勢国。因興齋宮于五十鈴川上。是謂磯宮。則天照大神始自天降之処也。〈一云。天皇以倭姫命為御杖。貢奉於天照大神。是以倭姫命以天照大神。鎮坐於磯城巖櫃之本而祠之。然後随神誨。取丁巳年（垂仁二六年丁巳前四）冬十月甲子。遷于伊勢国渡遇宮。」

294 These five characters are part of the text of *Nihon shoki*. For some reason, however, the copyist of our manuscript botched the passage: 此云 are written as if they formed one character, and the characters 佐々 are written to the left side of the character *sasa*.

295 The quotation in *Honchō jinja kō* does not have this character 方; see NSTS vol. 1, p. 371, line 2.

296 At this point, our manuscript omits the character 興, no doubt by mistake. Following to the text of the *Nihon shoki*, *Jinja-kō*, and *Ise Bunko bon*, we will insert it in our *yomikudashi*. All three texts agree that this character is to be read *tatsu*.

297 The *furigana* in *Nihon shoki* and *Honchō jinja kō* give the reading *kudari-masu*.

マツ  
奉<sup>リ</sup>玉<sup>フ</sup>於天照大神<sup>一</sup>ニ。是ヲ以テ倭姫ノ命以ニ天照大神<sup>一</sup>ヲ鎮<sup>シツ</sup>ニメ』

(2 : 1 1 ウ)

坐<sup>シテ</sup>298於礊ノ城山<sup>299</sup>ノ<sup>イツカシ</sup>巖櫃之本<sup>一</sup>ニ而祠<sup>レ</sup>之。然<sup>シテ</sup>後<sup>ニ</sup>隨<sup>ニ</sup>神<sup>ノ</sup>誨<sup>300</sup>ノ取<sup>ニ</sup>  
テ』

丁巳ノ年ノ冬十月甲子<sup>一</sup>ヲ<sup>ニ</sup>遷<sup>ニ</sup>玉<sup>フ</sup>于伊勢国<sup>ニ</sup>渡<sup>ヲ</sup>遇<sup>301</sup>ノ宮<sup>302</sup>一日』

本紀ノ本文ニ有<sup>ニ</sup>リ日神<sup>一</sup>鎮<sup>ニ</sup>坐<sup>玉</sup>礊宮<sup>一</sup>。以<sup>ニ</sup>ス其ノ或說ノ日ノ神』

有<sup>303</sup>ト云フヲ渡<sup>ニ</sup>遇<sup>宮</sup>一ニ、此渡<sup>ニ</sup>遇<sup>宮</sup>一者ハ内宮也。又神社考ニ一日』

トヨウケノミヤ  
豊受<sup>宮</sup>305ハ國常立尊也。左者瓊々杵尊、右者』

天兒屋根命。雄略帝ノ時建<sup>レ</sup>之<sup>306</sup>。一說ニ曰外宮者』

傳言天祖天御中主神也。皇太神託宣ニ、先祭<sup>ニ</sup>リ』

此ノ神<sup>一</sup>ヲ、先拜<sup>ニ</sup>セヨト此神<sup>一</sup>ヲ。且皇孫瓊々杵尊在<sup>ニ</sup>ス此ノ宮ノ相』

(2 : 1 2 オ)

殿<sup>一</sup>ニ。故天兒屋根命天太玉<sup>307</sup>命亦同在焉。因号<sup>シテ</sup>』

曰<sup>ニ</sup>二所太<sup>308</sup>神宮<sup>一</sup>ト<sup>309</sup>。旧事紀ニハ天御中主<sup>310</sup>者國常立ノ』

298 In the first line of p. 2:11a, the characters 鎮座 were read together as *shizume*. Here, however, the reading *shizume-mashite* seems to be intended. N.B. The *furigana* in *Nihon shoki* read *shizume-mase*, which in Ise Bunko *bon* and *Jinja-kō* is expanded to *shizume-masasete* - an honorific causative.

299 The character 山 is not in the text of *Nihon shoki*, which has 礊城. Note, also, that our manuscript has the character 礊 (Mor. VIII: 24527), which shares the Japanese reading *iso* with 礊 and is an *itaiji* of this character. We think, therefore, that the character 山 should be deleted.

300 The *kaeriten* '一' seems to have been left out at this point.

301 The *furigana* in *Honchō jinja kō* read *Wa-ta-ra-we no miya*; see NSTS vol. 1, p. 371, line 6.

302 Apart from the discrepancies mentioned in the precedings, the above is a complete and correct quotation from *Honchō jinja kō* 1; see NSTS vol. 1, p. 371, line 1-6.

303 The *kaeriten* 'ニ' seems to have been left out at this point.

304 The character 宮 is added in the margin; a small circle indicates that it should be inserted at this place.

305 The *furigana* in *Jinja kō* read "Toyoke," leaving out the syllable 'u'.

306 The above is a complete and correct quotation from *Honchō jinja kō* 1; see NSTS vol. 1, p. 373, line 1. It is the first line of Razan's description of the Outer Shrine in Ise. Razan does not indicate his source.

307 Our manuscript writes 王 instead of 玉, no doubt by mistake. We have restored the originally intended character.

308 *Honchō jinja kō* has the character 大 instead of 太.

309 Apart from the discrepancies mentioned in the preceding notes, this is a correct and complete quotation from *Honchō jinja kō* 1; see NSTS vol. 1 p. 373, line 7-8.

之弟也。如レ此日本伊勢宗宮ノ之神體有ニテ異説一」  
 不ニ分明一。因ニテ旧事紀一ニ略シテ出ニス三宮神體一ヲ。雄畧天皇」  
 傳曰、豊食宮、初ノ正殿豊月誦太神、左相殿ハ天」  
 八意命、右ノ相殿ハ天手力雄命。菟道宮正殿星<sup>ホシ</sup>」  
 天孫太神左ノ相殿天太玉命、右ノ相殿ハ天<sup>コヤ子</sup>ノ特棟」  
 命。五十宮中ノ正殿天照太神左御殿去來諾』  
 (2 : 1 2 ウ)  
 尊、右御殿、去來冊尊<sup>311</sup>。如レ此三宮神體分明ニ記レ」  
 之。神儒ノ學者不レ用レ之意、嗚呼何ノ之意ソヤ乎。」  
 林氏神社考愛當<sup>312</sup>ハ者謂ニフ日羅ノ之靈一ト<sup>313</sup>。稻荷ハ者謂ニフ」  
 負レフ稻ヲ老人一ト<sup>314</sup>。盖此ノ二神々體錯乱不レ少カラ。愛岩ノ神ハ」  
 者謂ニフ天ノ人熊ノ命一ト。稻荷ノ神ハ者云ニ地食保<sup>クニミケモチ</sup>ノ神一ト。詳ニハ出ニツ」  
 于旧事紀神祇本紀<sup>315</sup>一ニ。今茲ニ略レ之」  
 林氏永嘉碑ノ銘ニ曰今茲ニ仲秋十九日吾カ同胞」  
 永嘉<sup>316</sup>没ニス於東武一ニ年五十四於乎哀哉畚<sup>317</sup>ニ{木+里}<sup>318</sup>リス于』

310 Our manuscript writes 王 instead of 主, but that must be a mistake. We have restored the originally intended character.

311 This account is based on *Taisei-kyō* 26:30b-36a, where we find an exhaustive list of all deities worshipped in Ise. N.B. The list is preceded by a similar list of Miwa Jinja, and followed by similar lists of six other important shrines. The list is dated to Yūryaku 23, and preceded by the words 「庚申廿八、天皇與群臣、論定九社祭」 - "On the 28th day ... , the emperor, in discussion with his assembled ministers, determined (*agetsuraite sadame-tamau*) the sacrifices of the nine shrines."

312 *Honchō jinja kō* inserts the characters 山神 at this point.

313 Quoted from Razan's description of the Aitōsan 愛當山 (= Atago-san); see NSTS vol. 1, p. 491, line 11.

314 Reference to an anecdote about Kūkai, who met an old man carrying rice in front of the gate of the Tōji. Kūkai identified him as the protecting deity 鎮守 of the temple. Razan quotes it in his description of Inari in *Honchō jinja kō*; see NSTS vol. 1 p. 407, line 2.

315 Chōon here refers to a passage in *Taisei-kyō* 5: 「天照太神詔曰：『吾聞：「葦原中國、有地食保姬神。」宜爾天人熊命就。』天人熊命奉敕、降到地食保姬神許。地食保姬神迴頭、國嚮自口出飯。復海嚮嚮、鱈廣鱈狹、亦自口出。復山嚮肉、毛麤毛柔、亦自口出。夫品物也、貯之百机而以饗矣。天人熊命甚發忿、愠然作色曰：『穢哉！鄙哉！寧可以口而吐之物、敢養我乎！』是以觸於口物為穢、不向於人吐食、吐唾不禮、不為斯於人前、其厥法之元也。」. (*Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 5:8b-9a)

316 Razan uses the character 喜, which is correct.

317 The actual character used in *Razan Rin-sensei Bunshū* 43 (*Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 72a) and, in an abbreviated

(2 : 1 3 才)

先聖殿之北隅<sup>一</sup>ニ不用<sup>二</sup>異教<sup>一</sup>ノ也初<sup>ノ</sup>諱<sup>ハ</sup>信澄<sup>後</sup>チ改<sup>ニ</sup>メ」

永嘉<sup>319</sup>一ト、自号<sup>ニ</sup>シ東舟<sup>一</sup>ト晚<sup>ニ</sup>稱<sup>ニ</sup>ス樗墩<sup>一</sup>ト<sup>320</sup>。夫此ノ国ノ葬禮ハ、推古」

天皇之朝因<sup>ニ</sup>三輪明神ノ託語<sup>一</sup>、以<sup>ニ</sup>稻氏ノ祭禮<sup>一</sup>ヲ貴」

賤葬<sup>レ</sup>之。即出<sup>ニ</sup>ン其證<sup>一</sup>ヲ。先代旧事紀推古天皇ノ本」

紀<sup>ニ</sup>曰<sup>321</sup>、癸未<sup>322</sup>大伴連廉城奏聞<sup>シテ</sup>曰、請<sup>下</sup>フ改<sup>ニ</sup>テ父<sup>カ</sup>塚<sup>一</sup>ヲ為<sup>レ</sup>シ」

form, in our manuscript is Mor. IX: 32630 ( ++ + three times 田 + 糸). This character is not in the font. The relevant readings are *fugo* and *mokko*.

<sup>318</sup> This character, with the tree radical (Mor. VI: 14874), is used in *Razan Rin-sensei Bunshū* 43 (*Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 72a). The character is not in the font. The relevant glosses are *suki*, *fugo*, and *mokko*.

<sup>319</sup> Razan uses the character 喜, which is correct.

<sup>320</sup> The quotation from Razan's grave inscription ends here.

<sup>321</sup> Everything from the *eto* up till p. 2:17a, first line, is one long, continuous quotation from *Taisei-kyō* 34 (*Teikō hongī*): 「癸未、大伴連廉城奏聞曰：『請改父塚為祠、改亡奠為神祭』。天皇出入大殿、直敕廉

城曰：『汝何不知禮。皇祖天皇石間現形、譽田應神天皇<sup>カトキ</sup>狹現形、非依如斯靈驗、雖天子、無神祭、唯有陵、無社也。汝何謂也、汝何故也？夫非靈現、造祠為祭、遠齋元禁、近憲法制、汝是何人乎、汝父也何人乎？背吾神禮、背吾聖禮、以何國法、用孰人禮？汝若任大臣、持大臣田者、必危社稷焉。』廉城懼震退。即日、天皇詔大臣曰：『人以死為極、以葬為宗矣、以奠為大也。為人慎身、唯非生道、欲不辱死。恠其位祿、唯非生威、欲貴其葬。思其子孫、唯非生養、全其奠也。死葬奠有法、任古行之耳。雖然如是、譽田應神天皇御宇時、儒宗來且知之、傍有雜其式者。又父欽明天皇御宇時也、釋宗來至、又有依其法。以混交不純、從此混雜中、發私以猥禮。今朕是非之、更不知其是、宜問神格之。』大臣將群臣、至三輪廣前、設大祭之祠、奉請降大神。時大神託巫告曰：『葬禮亡奠、諸神所忌。神巫觸之、則下三年神不向其巫。上古無其人之行。則神訣、神不悅殘穢。今有僧者、神慶宛之。儒宗之禮太背齋元。其業非吾、若任之始行者、至後、必用牛鹿。當廢神威。今也、天皇欲定其法、尊卑之式。如聖皇禮、其他所行葬法、奠法、宜任僧尼。僧尼無為客、更不著污穢、任應執行。自今已後、不可改行。唯非吾國歸於此法、天覆悉然。所以者何？夫法有天外之理、來至成天極之理、降流成人倫之理。海內、海外有云聖賢、是知人倫理。好人倫依之、凡才雖敏、不能悉知。於天極理、余大神等由靈得知、好天地立。庶小神等、不能審知。於天外理、大神未知好法界立。法界立天地立、天地立人倫立。今僧尼法、從天外出、故不拘污穢。此理之為理、窮格以窮矣。故吾國、異國、廢先法移焉、欲恨而無由。悟人知之不恨、迷者不知為恨。以其今不立法、道右有、將立之。汲枯井求水、舉死灰燒木、悟者所不為也。其知故水故火、而不知今不得、謂之為迷而已。吾這語有無端理、似言今、又言後。似言先、有言今。雖逆耳、以正念、無不至諸理矣。』天皇憑託宣、乃下令定法。夫人存道、有宗源理、有齋元範、有先皇跡與聖皇教。兼習周孔、至死及亡。神忌死穢、周孔非吾。仍任僧尼、葬儀奠法依他不可。導人之道者、改惡行善、爾宗齊者、真周孔者理然。智者應依之、愚者不如何。故纔入尚少、釋之戒律精者格玄。粗者推淺、能智任愚。是以、僧尼自行、教他宜為先戒。僧、尼、寺、堂、多則信輕失、多得少。無則失信無據、無發。大國三寺、中國二寺、小國一寺、令僧住持、郡縣安庵、令尼居之。大家依僧。小屋依尼。僧尼別居別學不會、衣食以不美、司祈、教、葬、奠。令僧化男、令尼化女、是當古佛度僧尼理、為祭祀、為詣崇者。於大社、國社、縣社、是古來法也。輒請已崇碑、妄新場建社、私祭之請之、即輕神德與王法也。襄古在新成、廢本在末多。崇亡親、以神社、奠供之、以神祭、是背齋元道。有故靈驗者、宜依朝廷議、常生為歸佛、修生淨土供。諸孝道至實、今後無費也。儒學、人倫常、安學于群卿。長者、為師。短者、為弟。若別立家、恐遂為徒。荷異指吾、有齋元害。番發則同。故吾上宮、不立偏儒。」 (*Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 34:7a-11a) The differences with the printed text of *Taisei-kyō* will be pointed out in the following notes.

<sup>322</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, adds *sic* to the *eto*. Rightly so, for they cannot be correct. The preceding date

祠、改ニテ亡奠一ヲ為レシ神ト祭上ランヲ。天皇出ニテ、323大殿一ニ、直ニ勅ニシテ

<sup>カトキ</sup>  
廉城一ニ曰、」

<sup>イマシ</sup>  
汝何ッ不レ知レ禮。皇祖天皇石間<sup>シマ</sup>324現形シ、菅田ノ325天皇」

菟狹現レ形マス。非レンハ依ニ如レス灵験一ニ、雖ニ天子一無ニ神祭一。唯』

(2 : 1 3ウ)

有レ陵無レ社也。汝シ何ッ謂哉326、汝何ノ故也。夫ノ非ニシテ灵現一」

造レ祠<sup>ス</sup>為レルハ祭ヲ遠クハ齋327元ノ禁ニシテ近クハ憲法ノ制ナリ。汝ハ是何人乎ソヤ。」

汝父<sup>マタ</sup>ハ也何人乎ソヤ。背ニキ吾カ神礼、背ニテ吾聖禮一、以ニシ何ノ國ノ」

法一ヲ用ニルヤ孰ノ人ノ禮一ヲ。汝若シ任ニ大臣一ニ特328ニハ大臣田一ヲ者、必危ニメン  
カ」

社稷329ヲ焉。廉城<sup>ヲノ、フル</sup>懼<sup>キ</sup>震ヒ退リ。即日天皇詔ニシテ大臣一ニ曰、人ハ」

以レ死ヲ為レシ極ト、以レ葬為レシ宗矣、以レ奠為レ大也。為レシテ人慎レムハ」

身唯非ニ生ノ道一ノミニ、欲レス不レ辱レサラ死。怖ニモ其位禄一ヲ、唯非ニ生」

<sup>イ</sup>威一ノミニ、欲レ貴ニシテ其葬一ヲ。思ニフモ其子孫一、唯非ニ生ル330養一ノミニ全ニシ

ト其奠<sup>ナリ</sup>一ヲ也。』

(2 : 1 4オ)

mentioned in the text is 壬戌, i.e. Suiko 32/4/17. The date 癸未, twenty-two positions down in the cycle, cannot fall within the same month.

323 *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, inserts the character 入 at this point; the edn 1679 does not.

324 The *furigana* are unclear. The character 石 has シ; the character 間 has マシ, but that might also be interpreted as マニ and a flourish of the brush. *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 34:7a, gives the reading *shima ni*.

325 *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, glosses Homuda as 應神 (i.e. Homuda's posthumous name Ōjin).

326 Both printed editions of *Taisei-kyō* have 也 instead of 哉.

327 Our manuscript writes 齋, but the intended character will be 齋. We have emended accordingly, and will do so underneath.

328 Ise Bunko *bon* and both printed editions of *Taisei-kyō* have the character 持 instead of 特. In the context, 持 makes better sense; it is no doubt the intended character. We will emend accordingly.

329 The *kaeriten* "-" has been left out at this point.

330 Both Ise Bunko *bon* and *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 34:7b, have the *okurigana* -ru between the characters 生 and 養. It is not clear to us how this should be read. As the compound *seiyō* exists (Mor. VII: 21670-384), we have decided to ignore -ru and read *seiyō-suru*.

死葬奠<sup>ニ</sup>有<sup>レ</sup>法任<sup>レ</sup>古行<sup>レ</sup>ノ<sup>ミ</sup>之耳。雖<sup>ニ</sup>然<sup>モ</sup>如<sup>レ</sup>是譽田<sup>331</sup>ノ天<sup>」</sup>  
 皇ノ御宇ノ時也<sup>332</sup>、儒宗来<sup>テ</sup>且<sup>ツ</sup>知<sup>レ</sup>之。傍<sup>ニ</sup>有<sup>下</sup>雜<sup>ニ</sup>其ノ式<sup>一</sup>者上<sup>。」</sup>  
 又父<sup>333</sup>ノ天皇ノ御宇時也、<sup>ク</sup>積宗来<sup>至</sup>ル又有<sup>レ</sup>依<sup>ニ</sup>其法<sup>一</sup>ニ<sup>」</sup>  
 以<sup>テ</sup>混交<sup>テ</sup>不<sup>レ</sup>純。從<sup>ニ</sup>此混雜ノ中<sup>一</sup>發<sup>レ</sup>シテ私ヲ以<sup>レ</sup>猥<sup>レ</sup>礼。今朕<sup>」</sup>  
 是非<sup>334</sup>スニ之<sup>一</sup>、更<sup>ニ</sup>不<sup>レ</sup>知<sup>ニ</sup>其是<sup>一</sup>ナルヲ。宜<sup>ニ</sup>問<sup>レ</sup>テ神格<sup>一</sup>レ之。大臣將<sup>テ</sup>群<sup>」</sup>  
 臣<sup>一</sup>ニ至<sup>ニ</sup>三輪ノ廣前<sup>一</sup>ニ、設<sup>ニ</sup>大祭之祠<sup>一</sup>、奉<sup>レ</sup>ル<sup>ヲ</sup>請降<sup>ニ</sup>335シ大神<sup>一</sup>ヲ。于<sup>336</sup>レ<sup>」</sup>  
 時大神託<sup>レ</sup>巫告<sup>テ</sup>曰、葬礼亡奠ハ諸神所<sup>レ</sup>忌<sup>玉</sup>フ。神巫<sup>」</sup>  
 觸<sup>レ</sup>ル<sup>ヲ</sup>ハ之<sup>シ</sup>則<sup>下</sup>三年神不<sup>レ</sup>向<sup>ニ</sup>其巫<sup>一</sup>ニ。上古<sup>ニ</sup>ハ無<sup>ニ</sup>其ノ人<sup>一</sup>。行<sup>レ</sup>ハ<sup>」</sup>  
 (2 : 1 4 ウ)  
 之則神訣<sup>ル</sup>337神ハ不<sup>レ</sup>悦<sup>ニ</sup>殘ノ穢<sup>一</sup>ノ338。今有<sup>ニ</sup>僧者<sup>一</sup>神慶<sup>テ</sup>宛<sup>レ</sup>ツ之。<sup>」</sup>  
 儒宗ノ之礼大<sup>339</sup>背<sup>ニ</sup>ク齋元。其業非<sup>レ</sup>吾。若任<sup>レ</sup>ハ之使<sup>340</sup>ニレシメン行<sup>ク</sup><sup>」</sup>  
 者ヲ至<sup>レ</sup>後必用<sup>ニ</sup>牛鹿<sup>一</sup>。當<sup>ニ</sup>廢<sup>ニ</sup>ラス神威<sup>一</sup>。今也天皇欲<sup>レ</sup>定<sup>ニ</sup><sup>」</sup>  
 其ノ法尊卑<sup>341</sup>之式如聖皇禮<sup>一</sup>342。其他所<sup>レ</sup>行葬ノ法奠<sup>」</sup>  
 法ハ宜<sup>ク</sup>任<sup>ニ</sup>僧尼<sup>一</sup>。々々ハ無<sup>タ</sup>為<sup>アリ</sup>ノ客、更<sup>ニ</sup>不<sup>レ</sup>着<sup>ニ</sup>汚穢<sup>一</sup>。任<sup>レ</sup>應<sup>レ</sup><sup>」</sup>  
 執行、自<sup>レ</sup>今已後不<sup>レ</sup>可<sup>343</sup>改<sup>レ</sup>行<sup>一</sup>。唯非<sup>下</sup>吾國ノ<sup>ミ</sup>販<sup>中</sup>於此法上<sup>、</sup><sup>」</sup>

331 *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, again glosses Homuda with the characters 應神.

332 *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, omits the character 也.

333 *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, inserts the characters 欽明 (i.e. the name of Emperor Kinmei) at this point.

334 In our manuscript, the *kaeriten* 'ニ' is placed *between* the two characters 是 and 非.

335 In our manuscript, the *kaeriten* 'ニ' is placed *between* the two characters 請 and 降.

336 *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, omits the character 于, but it is present in the edn 1679, and also in Ise Bunko *bon*.

337 Ise Bunko *bon*, too, as reads the character as *hakaru*, but *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 34:8a, *hanaru*.

338 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 34:8a, has *wo* as *okurigana*, which in the present context is preferable to the particle *no*, suggested by our manuscript. We will emend accordingly.

339 Both printed editions of *Taisei-kyō* have the character 太 instead of 大.

340 *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, has the character 始 instead of 使, but the edn 1679, 34:8a, has 使.

341 Our manuscript has the character 早, but both printed editions of *Taisei-kyō* have the character 卑, which must be the intended character. We have emended accordingly.

342 Ise Bunko *bon* and *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 34:8b, insert the *kaeriten* '一' not at this point, but behind 其ノ法. They also insert the particle *wa* after 式, and add the *furigana nori* to this character. *Taisei-kyō*, loc. cit., also adds the *okurigana -shi* after 如. We will emend accordingly.

アマネ アマツクニ  
天覆<sup>344</sup>ク 悉 然。所以者何ナレハ、夫レ法ニ有ニ天外ノ之理一、来リ至テ」  
成ニシ天極ノ之理一、降リ流テ成ニ人倫ノ之理一。海ノ内海ノ外有レ』

(2 : 15オ)

《推倒明就座明亦作虎声一本此十字ナシ》<sup>345</sup>

云ニ聖賢一。是知ニ人倫ノ理一、好ニシ人倫依一レルニ之。凡才雖レ敏」  
不レ能ニ悉クニ知一ルヲ於ニ天極ノ理一。余大神等由レ灵得レ知、好ニシ」  
天地ノ立一ニ。庶<sup>サハヘ</sup> ナス小神ヲハ等<sup>346</sup>不レ能ニ審ニ知一。於ニ天外ノ理一大神」  
未レ知好ニシ法界ノ立一ニ。々々々テ天地立チ、々々々テ人倫」  
立ツ。今僧尼ノ法ハ從ニ天外一出ツ。故レ不レ<sup>カハハ</sup>抱ニテ汚穢一ニ。此ノ理之」  
為レ理窮格以窮ム矣。故ニ吾國異國廢ニテ先ノ法一移レル焉。」  
欲レ恨而無レ由。悟ル人ハ知レテ之ヲ不レ恨、迷フ者ハ不レシテ知為レ恨。」  
以ニ其ノ今不ルノ立法一ヲ道<sup>イ</sup>ニヒテ古<sup>347</sup>有一ト将レ立レ之。汲ニテ枯井一ヲ求レ水、』

(2 : 15ウ)

拳ニテ死灰一ヲ焼レク木ヲ。悟者所レ不レ為也。其知ニ故水故火一ヲ、」  
而不レ知ニ今不レ得一。謂レテ之ヲ為<sup>ス</sup>レル迷トノミ而已。吾レ這ノ語有ニ無レ」  
端理似レ言レ今。又有<sup>348</sup>言レ後似レ言レ先有レ言レ今雖レ逆レ」  
耳以ニセハ正念一ヲ無レ不レ至ニ諸理一ニ矣。天皇憑ニテ託宣一ニ乃下レ」  
令定レ法ヲ。夫レ人存<sup>ヨミアルミチ</sup>道ハ有ニ宗源ノ理一、有ニ齋元範一、有ニ<sup>349</sup>先」

<sup>343</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 34:8b, inserts the *kaeriten* 'ニ' at this point.

<sup>344</sup> The character used in our manuscript is {雨+復} (Mor. XII: 42467). It is a rare character, and its reading (*mizu wo kutsugaesu*) is hardly appropriate. The intended character will be 覆, which is also used in both printed editions of *Taisei-kyō*. We have emended accordingly. N.B. *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 34:8b, reads the two characters 天覆 as *amaneki kuni*.

<sup>345</sup> The characters between brackets are written in red ink, on a separate strip of paper that has been pasted into the manuscript. For an attempted explanation, see the *Yomikudashi*, note 245, and Translation, note 436.

<sup>346</sup> The reading *sawae nasu kami-ra wa* agrees with *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 34:9a.

<sup>347</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, has the character 右 instead of 古, but the edn 1679 has 古.

<sup>348</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, omits the character 有, but it is present in the edn 1679.

皇跡一、与ニ聖皇ノ教一兼<sup>ナラ</sup>テ習ニヘ周孔一ニ至レ死及レテハ亡、神ハ忌ニ死」  
穢一。周孔ハ非レ吾。仍任ニセハ僧尼一、葬ノ儀奠ノ法依レテハ他不レ可レ」  
導レ人<sup>350</sup>之道<sup>351</sup>者、改レ悪行レ善。余宗ト齋トハ者真正<sup>352</sup>周ト孔トハ者』  
(2 : 16才)

理然ナリ智者應レ依レ之。愚者不ニ如何一故纔<sup>353</sup>入レ<sup>354</sup>尚少シ積」

之戒律精者格レ玄粗者推レ<sup>タヘ</sup>淺能<sup>タフ</sup>レ智ニ任レ愚ニ。是以テ」

僧尼<sup>ヲノレ</sup>自行教レ他宜レ為レ先レ戒。僧ト尼ト寺ト堂ト多<sup>ナ</sup>ハ則信」

輕ク失ハ多得<sup>ナ</sup>ハ少シ。無<sup>ナ</sup>ハ則失レ信無レ拋無レ發。大國ニハ三寺、」

中國ニハ二寺、小國ニハ一寺、令ニ僧ヲ住持一。郡縣ニハ安レキ庵令レ」

尼居レ之。大家ハ依レ僧、小屋ハ依レ尼。僧尼ハ別居シ別ニ学ヲ」

不レ會。衣ト食トハ以レ不レルヲ美<sup>ヲ</sup>司ニ<sup>355</sup>祈ト教ト葬ト奠トヲ令ニ僧化一レ男、  
令ニレ」

尼化一レ女。是レ當<sup>ナ</sup>ル古ノ佛ノ度ニ僧ト尼トヲ理上。為ニシ祭祀一ヲ為ニ詣崇一ヲ」

(2 : 16ウ)

者ノハ於ニテセヨ大社國社縣社一ニ。是古來ノ法也。輒ク請ニヒ己レ崇ル」

神一ヲ、妄新場ニ建レ社私祭レ之詣<sup>356</sup>レフ之、即輕<sup>357</sup>シテ神德與ニト王」

法一也。襄<sup>358</sup>レ古在ニリ新ノ成一廢レシテ本ヲ在末ノ多ニ崇ニルニ亡親一ヲ以ニシ神」

<sup>349</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679 (34:9b) has the *kaeriten* '≡' instead of 'ニ'; hence, the character 有 also has 教 as its object. This punctuation seems preferable. We will emend accordingly.

<sup>350</sup> The *kaeriten* in 不レ可レ導レ人 must be mistaken. They make no sense in the context. Following Ise Bunko *bon* and *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, a full stop must be inserted after *fu-ka*. We have emended accordingly.

<sup>351</sup> Both printed editions of *Taisei-kyō* insert the character 道 at this point. We have emended accordingly.

<sup>352</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, omits the character 正, but it is present in the edn 1679.

<sup>353</sup> Both printed editions of *Taisei-kyō* insert the character 纔 at this point. We have emended accordingly.

<sup>354</sup> The *kaeriten re* is not present in Ise Bunko *bon* and *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 34:9b. This seems to be correct. It is difficult to imagine what the phrase 尚ニ入ル should mean. We will emend accordingly.

<sup>355</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 34:10a, has the *okurigana* -ru instead of -ri, but Ise Bunko *bon* has -ri.

<sup>356</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, has the character 請 instead of 詣, but the edn 1679 (34:10b) and Ise Bunko *bon* have 詣, with the *okurigana* *tsu*, evidently implying the reading *mōzu(ru)*.

<sup>357</sup> The *kaeriten* '≡' should be inserted at this point, as it is in Ise Bunko *bon*.

<sup>358</sup> Our manuscript, Ise Bunko *bon*, and also *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 34:10b, write the character without the



社一ヲ奠ニ供ルニ之ー以ニス神祭一ヲ。是背ニク齋元ノ道一ニ。有ニル故<sup>コレレイゲン</sup>灵驗一者」

宜レク依朝廷ノ議一。<sup>ツネナル</sup>常生ハ為<sup>コレ</sup>販レシテ<sup>下ヨ359</sup>仏修生ニ浄土一ニ供上ヲ。諸<sup>コレ</sup>360孝」

道ノ至レル實ナリ。今モ後モ無レ費也。儒學ハ人倫ノ常ナリ。安ニク學于郡」

郷一ニ。長者為レ師、短者為レ弟。若シ別ニ立レルオハ家恐クハ遂ニ為レ徒。」

荷<sup>アタシクニ</sup>ヒ361 異 ヲ指レシ<sup>アカクニ</sup> 吾 ヲ有ニ齋元ニ害一。<sup>トナリノクニヲコ</sup> 番 発<sup>クミ</sup>ラハ則同セン故ニ吾上宮不レ』

(2 : 17才)

立ニ偏儒一ヲ362。又禮綱死葬篇ニ曰363、生来ハ人倫ノ之<sup>イテ</sup>莫大ナリ。」

死去ハ生来<sup>イテ</sup>364極大ナリ也。故<sup>イテ</sup>365生涯ノ貴賤禍福格<sup>イテ</sup>366レ之ヲ367在ニ」

死時一ニ為レ人、不レルオハ得ニ其ノ美一ヲ則為レ得レ辱。故<sup>イテ</sup>368君子<sup>イテ</sup>369辱ニシ<sup>イテ</sup>370其」

賤一ニ371而持ニ<sup>イテ</sup>372其貴一ヲ、辱ニテ其猥一リヲ而持ニ<sup>イテ</sup>373其正一ヲ、為レ人其ノ死ノ

不レルヲハ」

野云<sup>イテ</sup>三何<sup>イテ</sup>374不<sup>イテ</sup>375在ニ生涯ノ行ト慮一ト376。是<sup>イテ</sup>377以テ天<sup>イテ</sup>378者命<sup>イテ</sup>下死礼<sup>イテ</sup>379在中」

two mouth radicals (not attested), but this character will be the one intended.

359 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 34:10b, also has the *okurigana yo*, indicating an imperative.

360 The *furigana kore* is added, following Ise Bunko and in *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 34:10b.

361 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 34:10b, inserts the *kaeriten 'レ'* at this point, no doubt correctly.

362 Here ends the quotation from *Taisei-kyō* 34.

363 Underneath, Chōon quotes the complete seventeenth section of *Taisei-kyō* 60 (*Reikō Hongi* 3); cf. edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63-66. The quotation is largely correct. Discrepancies will be referred in the notes below. In *Kyōhō* 17 (1732), the Shinto scholar Henmui (1681-1764) composed *Sōgi ryakurei* 葬儀略礼, a line by line commentary of this seventeenth section of *Reikō Hongi*. In our translation of this section of *Taisei-kyō*, we will also refer to Henmui's commentary.

364 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, inserts the particle *no* at this point.

365 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, inserts the particle *ni* at this point.

366 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, inserts the *okurigana -ru + koto* at this point.

367 The reading *ite*, specified in our manuscript, is incomprehensible. *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, gives no *okurigana*, which allows the reading *ari*. We will emend accordingly.

368 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, inserts the particle *ni* at this point.

369 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, inserts the particle *wa* at this point.

370 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, has the auxiliary *-te* instead of *-shi*. We will emend accordingly.

371 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, has the particle *wo* instead of *ni*.

372 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, inserts the *okurigana -chi* at this point.

373 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, omits the *okurigana -chi*, which allows the reading (*ta*)*motsu*. As it would be preferable to end the sentence at this point, we will follow this reading.

374 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, inserts the *okurigana -n so* at this point, and omits the *kaeriten '三'*.

375 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, inserts the *kaeriten 'レ'* and the *okurigana -re* at this point.

376 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, adds the particle *ni* at this point.

生位<sup>上</sup>380。聖人製<sup>レ</sup>スル礼ヲ、令<sup>三</sup>生德<sup>ヲ</sup>シテ見<sup>サ</sup>ニ死位<sup>381</sup>一。初死ノ之儀人」

脈絶<sup>382</sup>息絶<sup>383</sup>是<sup>レ</sup>ヲ云<sup>ニ</sup>死體礼<sup>384</sup>ト。不<sup>レ</sup>動<sup>レ</sup>席不<sup>レ</sup>動<sup>レ</sup>褥。依<sup>ニ</sup>」

春秋<sup>385</sup>ニ或<sup>386</sup>三日或七日、其間或穌<sup>387</sup>或息<sup>388</sup>、以<sup>ニ</sup>臭氣<sup>389</sup>』

(2 : 17ウ)

成<sup>ル</sup>ヲ是<sup>390</sup>云<sup>ニ</sup>死尸<sup>ト</sup>。々々之儀ハ沐<sup>ニ</sup>浴<sup>シ</sup>於<sup>ニ</sup>淨湯<sup>一</sup>ニ、以<sup>ニ</sup>時服」

及<sup>ヒ</sup>時裝<sup>一</sup>ヲ、皆白色。布<sup>ニ</sup>乎被<sup>一</sup>覆<sup>ニ</sup>乎被<sup>一</sup>ヲ。夏ハ以<sup>ニ</sup>391冬服<sup>一</sup>ヲ、冬ハ」

以<sup>ニ</sup>392夏服<sup>一</sup>ヲ、置<sup>ニ</sup>393是<sup>ヲ</sup>於<sup>上</sup>一ニ而納<sup>レ</sup>於<sup>レ</sup>棺結<sup>レ</sup>394之<sup>395</sup>、古<sup>396</sup>以<sup>レ</sup>397朱、  
今」

以<sup>レ</sup>綿。造棺ノ之儀ハ、天子ハ古ハ石棺長九尺幅六尺」

深<sup>サ</sup>五<sup>398</sup>尺皆短尺<sup>399</sup>也。是正棺御體九尺、餘ハ者長」

尺ナリ也。上<sup>ニ</sup>有<sup>ニ</sup>補棺同右<sup>400</sup>同尺甲冑弓矢劔刀珍」

377 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, inserts the particle *wo* at this point.

378 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, inserts the particle *wa* at this point.

379 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, inserts the particle *no* at this point.

380 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, inserts the particle *ni* at this point.

381 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, inserts the particle *ni* at this point.

382 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, inserts the *ren'yōkei -shi* at this point.

383 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, inserts the *rentaikei -ru* and particle *wa* at this point.

384 Both *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, and *Taisei-kyō*, edition ZST, omit the character 礼.

385 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, inserts the *kaeriten* '一' at this point.

386 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, inserts the particle *wa* at this point, and also behind the following three characters 或.

387 This character (Mor. VIII: 25263) is also written as 蘇 (Mor. IX: 32427).

388 Both *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, and edn ZST have the character 臭 instead of 息, but this seems to be a mistake, possibly inspired by the next character but one.

389 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, inserts the particle *no* at this point.

390 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, inserts the particle *wo* at this point.

391 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 63 left, inserts the *ren'yōkei -shi* at this point.

392 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 right, omits the *ren'yōkei -shi*.

393 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 right, inserts the auxiliary *-te* at this point.

394 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 right, adds the *furigana / okurigana tsu-yu-ru-ni* to the character 結. Neither this reading, nor the verb itself are attested in the dictionaries.

395 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 right, inserts the particle *wo* at this point.

396 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 right, inserts the particle *wa* at this point.

397 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 right, inserts the *shūshikei -su* at this point, and also after the next character 以.

398 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 right, omits the seventeen characters from 造棺 till here.

399 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 right, inserts the copulum *nari* at this point.

400 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 right, has the character 石 instead of 右. We will emend accordingly.

賤<sup>401</sup>納レ之。今ハ木棺法式同<sup>402</sup>右<sup>403</sup>。殯宮之儀<sup>404</sup>天井ノ下」

九尺地敷<sup>405</sup>、上六尺方ノ間十二尺、縁ノ間五尺方<sup>406</sup>』

(2 : 18 才)

有ニ迴廊一、右<sup>406</sup>有ニ番堂一左有ニ供院一。四面有レ堡<sup>407</sup>、四方ニ」

有レ門。楹至<sup>408</sup>ノ之儀ハ高十尺、上六尺、下四尺、無ニ天」

井一。廣十尺無レ縁。檻ノ方ニ有レ植。南<sup>409</sup>有レ門。四方迴リ堀」

三十六間。堀ノ外有ニ供殿一。陵廟之儀<sup>410</sup>正峰<sup>411</sup>ノ高サ六」

十肘ニ徒<sup>411</sup>峰ノ高<sup>412</sup>五<sup>413</sup>五肘中山ノ高サ四十八肘、陵根ノ」

長二百五十肘ノ陵<sup>414</sup>、根ノ幅<sup>415</sup>一百十五肘。正數ノ六ハ」

是レ表レ地<sup>415</sup>也。徒<sup>416</sup>レ數ノ五<sup>417</sup>是五行也。中數ハ重年ナリ。長幅ハ」

天數ナリ。一肘是レ二尺ナル而已。廟墓之儀ハ諸王ハ有ニ正』

401 Both *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 right, and *Taisei-kyō*, edition ZST, have the character 財 instead of 賤. As 財 makes better sense, we will follow this variant in the *Yomikudashi* and Translation.

402 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 right, inserts the *kaeriten* 'レ' at this point.

403 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 right, inserts the particle *ni* at this point.

404 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 right, inserts the particle *wa* at this point.

405 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 right, does not have the *furigana furi*, but it has the particle *no*.

406 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 right, inserts the particle *ni* at this point, as it does after the following character 左.

407 The characters used in our manuscript and in *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 right, have the earth radical to the left (Mor. III: 5255) instead of underneath (Mor. III: 5254). The latter is the regular form of this character. We have used it here, because the other character is not in the font. Both texts specify the reading *tsuiji*, which is *not* one of the standard readings of this character; these are *oka*, *tsutsumi*, *toride*.

408 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 right, has the character 屋 instead of 至, no doubt correctly. We will emend accordingly.

409 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 left, inserts the particle *ni* at this point.

410 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 left, inserts the particle *wa* at this point.

411 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 left, and edition ZST have the character 從 instead of 徒. No doubt, the first is the intended character. We will emend accordingly.

412 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 left, inserts the *okurigana sa* at this point.

413 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 left, inserts the character 十 at this point.

414 Both *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 left, and edition ZST read 「二百五十肘、陵根ノ幅」. This reading seems superior; we will follow it in our *yomikudashi*.

415 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 left, inserts the particle *wo* at this point.

416 Both *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 left, and edition ZST have the character 從 instead of 徒. *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, also omits the *kaeriten* 'レ'. - no doubt, correctly. We will emend accordingly.

417 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 left, inserts the particle *wa* at this point.

(2 : 18ウ)

從一有ニ長幅<sup>418</sup>三公<sup>419</sup>有ニ長幅一無ニ正從一三<sup>420</sup>公九卿ハ、有レ」  
角有レ段<sup>421</sup>。諸士ハ有レ角無レ段庶人ハ無レ角無レ段太子ノ」  
陵ハ天子ノ三二ナリ諸王ノ陵ハ天子三一ナリ三公ハ諸王ノ三」  
二ナリ九卿ハ又レ<sup>422</sup>減一<sup>423</sup>已下モ又亦減ニ一々一ヲ葬送之儀<sup>424</sup>」  
天子ハ鳳輦諸王ハ大輦三公ハ嚴輿九卿ハ大輿諸」  
士ハ美覆庶人ハ疎覆<sup>カク</sup>奏樂之儀ハ呂調ニシテ而終レ<sup>425</sup>於レ律<sup>426</sup>」  
天子ハ正峰ノ下中山ノ上<sup>427</sup>諸王ハ從峯<sup>428</sup>下中山ノ上<sup>429</sup>三」  
公ハ上半<sup>430</sup>限上ナリ九卿ハ下半ハ<sup>431</sup>限下諸士<sup>432</sup>墓下ノ地上」

(2 : 19オ)

庶人<sup>433</sup>塚下<sup>434</sup>地中ナリ古ハ供奉ノ人呂<sup>435</sup>乍レ生理<sup>436</sup>之土師ノ」  
才以ニ土人一<sup>レ</sup>代<sup>レ</sup>之<sup>437</sup>是今ノ禮也奠供ハ古ハ牲膳今<sup>438</sup>齋」

<sup>418</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 left, inserts the *kaeriten* '一' at this point.

<sup>419</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 left, inserts the particle *wa* at this point.

<sup>420</sup> The established term is "Three Lords and Nine Ministers" 三公九卿. Yet, both *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 left, and edn ZST write "two Lords 二公 and Nine Ministers." Cf. Translation, notes 470 and 471.

<sup>421</sup> Both our manuscript and *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 left, use the character 段 (Mor. II: 3165), but as the context and the *edn ZST* (vol. 4, p. 79) indicate, it is a mistake for 段. We will emend accordingly.

<sup>422</sup> This *kaeriten* should be placed after the following character.

<sup>423</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 left, inserts the particle *wo* at this point.

<sup>424</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 64 left, inserts the particle *wa* at this point.

<sup>425</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 right, inserts the *okurigana* -ru at this point.

<sup>426</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 right, inserts the particle *ni* at this point.

<sup>427</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 right, inserts the particle *ni* at this point.

<sup>428</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 right, inserts the particle *no* at this point.

<sup>429</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 right, inserts the particle *ni* at this point.

<sup>430</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 right, inserts the particle *no* at this point.

<sup>431</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 right, has the particle *no* instead of *wa*, no doubt correctly. We will emend accordingly.

<sup>432</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 right, inserts the particle *wa* at this point.

<sup>433</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 right, inserts the particle *wa* at this point.

<sup>434</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 right, inserts the particle *no* at this point.

<sup>435</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 right, has the character 侶 instead of 呂. It connects this character with the preceding character 人 and omits the *kaeriten* 'レ'. We will emend accordingly in our *Yomikudashi*.

<sup>436</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 right, inserts the *okurigana* -mu at this point, reading *kore wo umu* 埋む. The character 理, which is used in edition ZST, must be a mistake.

<sup>437</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 right, inserts the particle *ni* at this point.

食依レ佛憑レ神<sup>439</sup>奠諷ハ古ハ鬼則今ハ佛經依レ理憑レ時<sup>440</sup>」  
 奠日ハ古ハ在レ年<sup>441</sup>今在レ月予<sup>442</sup>奠之儀ハ第七日ト第二」  
 七日<sup>443</sup>ト乃至<sup>444</sup>第七々ト<sup>445</sup>第百箇日ト第三年ト第七年ト」  
 第十三年ト第十七年ト第三十三年ト<sup>446</sup>從ニ天子一迄ニ」  
 庶人<sup>ヒトムキ</sup>一<sup>447</sup>同ニシテ而無レ所レ差矣第四十年ト第五十年ト」  
 第六十年ト<sup>448</sup>從ニ天子一迄ニ諸士一ニ一同<sup>449</sup>而子亡スル寸<sup>450</sup>則孫』  
 ( 2 : 1 9 ウ )  
 代ル第七十年ト第八十年ト第九十年ト<sup>451</sup>從ニ天子一迄ニテ」  
 九卿<sup>452</sup>一同ニシテ而及<sup>453</sup>子孫曾孫<sup>454</sup>第一百年ト第百十」  
 年ト第百二十年ト<sup>455</sup>從ニ天子一迄ニテ三公一ニ一同ニシテ而及ニ子ノ」  
 之曾孫<sup>456</sup>第百三十年ト第百四十年ト第百五十」  
 年ト<sup>457</sup>從ニ天子一迄ニ<sup>458</sup>諸王一ニ從ニ第百六十年一已下ハ唯天」  
 子修レ之<sup>459</sup>雖ニトモ天子一ト大會祖以上ハ以ニ大會祖ノ日一」

<sup>438</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 right, inserts the particle *wa* at this point.

<sup>439</sup> According to the particles and *okurigana* inserted in *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 right, these four characters should be read *hotoke ni yori kami ni yoru*.

<sup>440</sup> According to the particles and *okurigana* inserted in *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 right, these four characters should be read *ri ni yori toki ni yoru*.

<sup>441</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 right, inserts the particle *ni* at this point.

<sup>442</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 left, and edition ZST have the character 弔 instead of 予. This is no doubt correct. We will emend accordingly.

<sup>443</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 left, omits the character 日.

<sup>444</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 left, inserts the *kaeriten* 'ニ', the *okurigana* *-ru*, and the particle *to* at this point.

<sup>445</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 left, has the particle *ni* instead of *to*.

<sup>446</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 left, inserts the particle *wa* at this point.

<sup>447</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 left, inserts the particle *ni* at this point.

<sup>448</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 left, inserts the particle *wa* at this point.

<sup>449</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 left, inserts *ni shite* at this point.

<sup>450</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 left, inserts the particle *wa* at this point.

<sup>451</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 left, inserts the particle *wa* at this point.

<sup>452</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 left, inserts the particle *ni* at this point.

<sup>453</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 left, inserts the *kaeriten* 'ニ' at this point.

<sup>454</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 left, inserts the particle *ni* at this point.

<sup>455</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 left, inserts the particle *wa* at this point.

<sup>456</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 left, adds the *furigana* *hi-ma-ko* to 曾孫 and inserts the particle *ni* at this point.

<sup>457</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 left, inserts the particle *wa* at this point.

<sup>458</sup> *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 left, inserts the *okurigana* *-ru* at this point.

同修<sup>レ</sup>之<sup>460</sup>謂<sup>ニ</sup>フ<sup>之</sup>ヲ總奠<sup>ト</sup>人壽<sup>ハ</sup>有<sup>ニ</sup>長短<sup>一</sup>其<sup>ノ</sup>長<sup>ハ</sup>依<sup>レ</sup>代<sup>461</sup>予<sup>462</sup>」

奠<sup>ノ</sup>之<sup>儀</sup>ハ依<sup>レ</sup><sup>463</sup>孝憶<sup>ニ</sup>ヒ其冥路<sup>一</sup><sup>464</sup>依<sup>レ</sup>義要<sup>ニ</sup><sup>465</sup>其不<sup>レ</sup><sup>466</sup>忘奠位<sup>ノ</sup>』

(2 : 20オ)

之<sup>儀</sup>ハ天子<sup>ハ</sup>十<sup>也</sup>太子<sup>九</sup>也大王<sup>八</sup>也小王<sup>七</sup>也三公<sup>ハ</sup>六<sup>也</sup>」

二公<sup>ハ</sup>五<sup>ナリ</sup>九卿<sup>ハ</sup>四<sup>ナリ</sup>階官<sup>ハ</sup>三<sup>ナリ</sup>諸<sup>467</sup>二<sup>ナリ</sup>庶人<sup>ハ</sup>一<sup>ナリ</sup>善<sup>ハ</sup>以<sup>レ</sup>盡<sup>ス</sup>ヲ」

爲<sup>ニ</sup>之<sup>ヲ</sup>美<sup>ト</sup>禮<sup>ハ</sup>以<sup>レ</sup>節<sup>爲</sup>ニス<sup>之</sup>美<sup>ト</sup>共<sup>ニ</sup>無<sup>レ</sup><sup>468</sup>不<sup>レ</sup>ト云<sup>フ</sup>立<sup>レ</sup>之<sup>下</sup>位<sup>ニ</sup>シテ多<sup>」</sup>

祿<sup>ノ</sup>者<sup>ノ</sup><sup>469</sup>發<sup>ニ</sup>善<sup>以</sup>テ盡<sup>レ</sup>之<sup>自</sup>独<sup>リ</sup>ニシテ爲<sup>レ</sup><sup>470</sup>ハ之<sup>非</sup><sup>レ</sup><sup>471</sup>禮<sup>又</sup>不<sup>レ</sup>ル<sup>ハ</sup>爲<sup>レ</sup>之<sup>」</sup>

非<sup>レ</sup><sup>472</sup>善<sup>排</sup><sup>ニ</sup>ヘテ是<sup>ヲ</sup>於<sup>族</sup><sup>一</sup><sup>ニ</sup>而<sup>爲</sup>レ<sup>ヨ</sup>之<sup>473</sup>林氏<sup>自</sup>以下<sup>ノ</sup>嫌<sup>ニ</sup>ヒ<sup>積</sup>氏<sup>一</sup>ヲ<sup>愛</sup><sup>上</sup>スル<sup>」</sup>

儒家<sup>一</sup>ヲ故<sup>ニ</sup>不<sup>レ</sup>用<sup>三</sup>輪託語<sup>一</sup>ヲ。改<sup>ニ</sup>變<sup>推</sup>古法度<sup>一</sup>ヲ、改<sup>ニ</sup>國<sup>」</sup>

法<sup>一</sup>ヲ破<sup>ニ</sup>リ風俗<sup>一</sup>ヲ、蔑<sup>ニ</sup>シ天子<sup>一</sup>ヲ輕<sup>ニ</sup>スル<sup>フ</sup>執政<sup>一</sup>ヲ、詳<sup>ニ</sup>説<sup>ニ</sup>所爲<sup>一</sup>ヲ。推古<sup>以</sup>」

来代々天皇<sup>以</sup>ニテ<sup>積</sup>法<sup>一</sup>ヲ葬<sup>レ</sup>ル<sup>之</sup>ヲ。又武家<sup>ノ</sup>頼朝<sup>從</sup>レ<sup>柄</sup>ニ<sup>」</sup>

(2 : 20ウ)

兵馬<sup>ノ</sup>權<sup>一</sup>ヲ以<sup>来</sup>、世々<sup>ノ</sup>將軍<sup>以</sup>ニ<sup>仏</sup>家<sup>一</sup>ヲ葬<sup>レ</sup>ル<sup>之</sup>。然汝<sup>独</sup>」

以<sup>レ</sup>之<sup>爲</sup>レシテ非<sup>ト</sup>、以<sup>ニ</sup>儒法<sup>一</sup>葬<sup>レ</sup>フ<sup>之</sup>爲<sup>ニ</sup>其權輿<sup>一</sup>。故<sup>ニ</sup>国々<sup>慕</sup>フ<sup>」</sup>

儒家<sup>一</sup>者、棄<sup>ニ</sup>積氏法<sup>一</sup>ヲ以<sup>ニ</sup>テ儒家<sup>一</sup>ヲ葬<sup>レ</sup>。本朝慶長<sup>ノ</sup>之初<sup>、</sup>」

源大君<sup>ノ</sup>之<sup>治</sup>世、文<sup>474</sup>武兼備<sup>寛</sup>嚴相濟<sup>緊</sup>ク禁<sup>ニ</sup>ス<sup>耶</sup>」

459 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 left, inserts the particle *wo* at this point.

460 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 65 left, inserts the particle *wo* at this point.

461 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 66 right, inserts the particle *ni* at this point.

462 Both *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 66 right, and edition ZST have the character 甲 instead of 予. In addition, both editions insert the characters 其短依年 in front of 甲. All this is no doubt correct; we will emend accordingly it in our *Yomikudashi*.

463 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 66 right, inserts the *okurigana -te* at this point.

464 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 66 right, inserts the particle *wo* at this point.

465 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 66 right, adds the *furigana mo-to-mu* to the character 要.

466 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 66 right, inserts the *okurigana -ru* and the particle *wo* at this point.

467 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 66 right, edition ZST, and Ise Bunko *bon* insert the character 士 at this point.

468 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 66 right, inserts the *okurigana -shi* at this point.

469 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 66 right, reads the character 者 as *wa* instead of *no mono no*.

470 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 66 right, has the *okurigana -ru* instead of *-re*, but Ise Bunko *bon* also has *-reba*.

471 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 66 right, inserts the *okurigana -su (= zu)* at this point.

472 *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 59/60, frame 66 right, inserts the *okurigana -su (= zu)* at this point.

473 Here ends the quotation from *Taisei-kyō* 59/60.

穌ノ宗一ヲ。雖レ然此邪宗ノ殘黨蜂ニ起シテ有馬一ニ以徃弥以テ」  
禁レス之。日本國中之貴賤令レ取ニテ釈氏判印一ヲ、辨ニ白シテ」  
此ノ邪宗一ヲ禁レス之ヲ。然ルニ儒家之輩不レ用ニ釈氏判印一ヲ、不レシテ」  
因ニ葬法一ニ、以レ甚ヲ辨ニ此邪正一ヲ哉」

(2 : 2 1 才)

林氏隨筆曰<sup>475</sup>、我朝世俗鄙夫ノ之為ニス軍法一ヲ者、不レ」  
能レ説ニ其ノ要一ヲ。唯説ニキ天文星占望氣之遠渺一、以誣ニユ」  
少壯ノ之武人一ニ<sup>476</sup>。不<sup>タ</sup>ニ啻<sup>ノ</sup>此<sup>ノ</sup>レ而已一。依ニ托浮屠ノ呪咀禱」  
祀ノ之不<sup>レ</sup>ルニ根、以弘ニ己カ法一ヲ。世之白痴亦多哉。唐帝」  
逢ニテ西蕃<sup>アタ</sup>之寇一ニ、使<sup>マシナ</sup>下僧ノ不空ヲ厭<sup>上</sup>レハ之西蕃敗レ奔ル。時ニ奏」

《不空念ニ毘沙門一」神兵數千破ニ西」蕃一》

神兵數千自ニ空中一<sup>アタ</sup>来現ス甚タ可レ畏ル也。即寇平ク矣。」

不空念ニ毘舍門天王一ヲ、以ニテ神兵一破レルト之云レ尒。浮屠ノ」  
所説如レ是。爾後城樓立ニ毘舍門像一亦是ノ故也。』

(2 : 2 1 ウ)

不レ知ヲ果シテ神兵降り現ヤ否。彼レ以レテ之ヲ為ニス依托一ヲ。軍法ノ中ニ」  
祈ニ多聞天一ヲ、唱ニ陀羅尼一ヲ、誦ニシ般若心經一ヲ、称ニス大明呪」  
大神呪<sup>477</sup>一皆是ナルカト乎<sup>478</sup>。余覽ニテ林氏カ此説一ヲ且驚キ且嘆ス。若シ」  
使<sup>乙</sup>下シメハ汝輩<sup>479</sup>ノ惡儒ノ有ニ邪理邪智一者<sup>上</sup>、侍<sup>ニ</sup>甲仕大人君子」  
之傍一ニ、其邪理邪智、薰<sup>ニ</sup>習<sup>ヲ</sup>ハ乎大人君子眼耳一ニ、則」

<sup>474</sup> Our manuscript writes 又, but obviously the character 文 is intended. We have emended accordingly.

<sup>475</sup> Text in *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 70 (*Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 434).

<sup>476</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 434a, has the particle *wo* instead of *ni*. As *wo* is the usual particle in case of *shiiru*, we will follow this reading in our *Yomikudashi*.

<sup>477</sup> A quotation from the Heart Sutra (T253; *TZ* vol. 8, p. 849c): 「故知般若波羅蜜多、是大神呪、是大明呪、是無上呪、是無等等呪、能除一切苦、真實不虛。」

<sup>478</sup> Here ends the quotation from Razan's *zuihitsu*. It is a complete and correct quotation.

<sup>479</sup> The character used in our manuscript is an *itaiji* (Mor. X: 38250), which is not in the font. We have replaced it by the standard character; the same applies below.

非レ失ニ義國武國之家風一ヲ、而還テ心為ニラン異國異法」  
之奴婢一矣。夫吾國ハ者義國武國ナルカ故ニ、從ニ神代一以」  
往有レレトモ征ニ異國一、見レ征ニ異國一一度無レ之。即是所下以也』  
(2 : 2 2 オ)

吾國義國武國ニシテ、而吾神明ノ威徳、勝中彼ノ異邦ノ神」  
明灵威一ニ也。余見ニルニ林氏カ所レノ製スル軍書題説之十則一ヲ、」  
先ニシテ異國ノ軍法一ヲ、次ニス吾國ノ軍規一ヲ。聖武皇帝之朝、吉」  
備公傳ニヘテ軍法ヲ於中花一皈ル。從レ爾此ノ国軍法則レテ之」  
傳レフ之。若以レ之為レセハ證、吉備ハ近代、吾カ邦ノ神代有ニ軍」  
旅一、皇代有ニ軍旅一。特ニ推古ノ之世守屋因下テ自誇ニテ威」  
權一ニ蔑中スルニ天皇上ヲ故、推古天皇命ニ太子馬子一ニ征罰。此」  
時守屋之軍有ニ勢力一官軍悉ク負ルカ故ニ、太子為ニ馬』  
(2 : 2 2 ウ)

子一ノ一夜ニ造ニ軍旅本紀一ヲ賜レ之。以ニテ將軍木一ヲ彫ニ毘沙」  
門小像一ヲ、戴ニシム頭髮之上一。因レ之而大ニ勝ツ。即是吾カ朝」  
人王ノ之代定ニム軍法一ヲ。製ニ軍旅書一、即是權輿也也。如」  
何從480レ之、以後所レノ造ル吉備公軍書、及ヒ其ノ餘ノ軍書ヲヤ」  
乎。吉備公已往所レ造軍書ハ者、本ニク異國七書ノ之」  
説一ニ者也。若吾カ邦師ニトシテ七書一ヲ、而戰ニ異國一ト豈レニシヤ得レ勝レ之」  
哉。吾不レ用レ彼、々不レ用レ吾。此ノ國者因ニテ太子軍旅」  
本紀一ニ傳ニ受軍法一ヲ来ル。至レ今有ニ軍傳之人一、綿々不レ』  
(2 : 2 3 オ)

斷。生ニレ武門一柄ニ軍權一人ハ者、須レク傳ニ受之一ヲ、而莫レ用ニ異」  
國異法ノ之軍法一ヲ也。林氏以ニ文星ノ占一望氣ノ論ニ浮」

480 Our manuscript writes {彳+足}, but such a character is not attested in the dictionaries. The emendation to the character 從 follows the text of Ise Bunko *bon*.



屠ノ呪咀禱祀之亼ヲ為レ誣ニルト武人一、為ニス不根之説一ニ。然モ」  
汝カ所レ製軍書題説ニハ者説ニ軍ノ祭一、説ニ望氣一、説ニク符呪一。」  
前後之論不レシテ同、而只要下スルノミ呵ニ責シテ釈氏一ヲ莫中シメント  
流行上スルヲ耳。」

軍旅ノ事ハ者孔孟スラ尚ヲ謂レ不レ學レスト之。汝豈ニヤニ能識一レ之邪。」

孔孟ハ論ニシテ王霸勝劣一ヲ、以レ霸為レ賤、以レ王為レ貴。故異」

国儒士之輩ハ、兵者論ニス凶器也一也ト。於ニテ吾国一者王霸ノ」

(2 : 23ウ)

二ハ者如ニ両眼一、如両手一。為ニシ何ヲカ貴一ト、為ニシ何ヲカ賤一ト。天有ニ相」

生一有ニ相尅一。春夏ハ相生也也、秋冬ハ相尅也也。天地ハ以ニテ」

相生相尅一ヲ、運四時一ヲ、成ニス一歳一ヲ。人ハ者本レク天ニ者也。豈ヤニ」

敢テ違レ天ニ乎。故ニ吾レ謂フ莫下レト使ニ汝輩ノ惡儒一ヲ、近中侍スルヲ大人」

君子之傍一ニ矣。又軍旅本紀ニ有ニ五綱一。曰天、曰地、」

曰人、曰物、曰神也也。此五綱ハ者此邦ノ軍旅ノ大綱也」

也。異国ハ者漸説ニテ天ノ時地利人ノ和、而不レ説ニ物用」

神助一ヲ<sup>481</sup>。即是吾國ノ軍旅ノ所レ勝ニル異國一者也也。此ノ軍旅ハ」

(2 : 24オ)

者天ノ時不レ如ニ地ノ利一、々々ハ不レ如ニ人ノ和一ニ、人ノ和ハ不レ如ニ」

物用一、々々ハ不レ如ニ神助一ニ、々々ハ不レ如ニ物用一ニ、々々ハ不レ如ニ」

人和一ニ、々々ハ不レ如ニ地利一、々々ハ不レ如ニ天ノ時一ニ。如レ此逆」

順ニ論レ之。只以ニテ神助一ヲ為ニ眼目一ト、為ニス嚙喉一ト。儒士之輩」

不レシテ知レ之而論ニス吾國ノ軍法一。不レレノ當レ的ニ之論カ乎。汝輕ニ」

佛呪一ヲ似レレトモ重ニスルニ神祝一ヲ、此ノ仏呪ハ者神天重レ之。故ニ於ニ神」

<sup>481</sup> Originally, the manuscript had the character 明, but on the left side of the character there is the *katakana* sign ヒ, and on the right, the combination 助ヲ. Assuming that ヒ stands for 非, we conclude that the character 明 is a mistake, and is to be replaced by the character 助. We have emended accordingly.

前<sub>一</sub>法樂誦<sub>ニ</sub>ス經呪<sub>一</sub>ヲ。古今ノ傳記<sub>ニ</sub>載<sub>レ</sub>之。汝豈<sup>ア</sup>不<sub>レ</sub>見<sub>レ</sub>之<sub>」</sub>  
乎。嗚呼痛乎。』

(2 : 24ウ)

林氏隨筆<sub>ニ</sub>曰、花山院ハ者、十九出家、本朝為<sub>ニ</sub>梁<sub>」</sub>  
武<sub>一</sub>ト。何為<sub>ソ</sub>惑<sub>ニ</sub>ル<sub>一</sub>於浮屠<sub>一</sub>ニ如此甚<sub>ト</sub>哉<sup>482</sup>。余亦謂<sub>ン</sub>林氏如<sub>レ</sub>  
此其惑<sub>ニ</sub>ヘル<sub>一</sub>於儒<sub>一</sub>ニ甚哉。於<sub>ニ</sub>天竺<sup>483</sup>稊尊棄<sub>ニ</sub>王位<sub>一</sub>十九<sub>」</sub>  
出家。吾朝ハ者花山院慕<sub>ニ</sub>フ<sub>一</sub>其後蹤<sub>一</sub>ヲ者也。不<sub>レ</sub>加<sub>ニ</sub>讚<sub>」</sub>  
嘆<sub>一</sub>以為<sub>ニ</sub>ス<sub>一</sub>詆訾<sub>一</sub>ヲ何<sub>ソ</sub>ヤ哉。若以不<sub>レ</sub>繼<sub>ニ</sub>王位<sub>一</sub>ヲ謂<sub>レ</sub>ハ、爾、於<sub>ニ</sub>漢<sub>」</sub>  
土<sub>一</sub>許由<sup>484</sup>大伯讓<sub>ニ</sub>天下<sub>一</sub>不<sub>レ</sub>受<sub>ニ</sub>王位<sub>一</sub>。雖<sub>レ</sub>然孔孟不<sub>レ</sub>シテ<sub>」</sub>  
罪<sub>レ</sub>之、而為<sub>ニ</sub>之賢<sub>一</sub>為<sub>ニ</sub>之聖<sub>一</sub>矣。林氏又曰<sup>485</sup>願<sub>ハ</sub>拳<sub>ニ</sub>天<sub>」</sub>  
《焚<sub>ニ</sub>天下ノ佛書<sub>一</sub>》

下ノ之佛書<sub>一</sub>聚<sub>レ</sub>之焚<sub>テ</sub>而棄<sub>レ</sub>之。如<sub>レ</sub>此ノ之大害未<sub>ニ</sub>之<sub>」</sub>

(2 : 25オ)

有<sub>一</sub>也。嗚呼天子淫<sub>ニ</sub>ス<sub>一</sub>于佛<sub>一</sub>。悲<sup>486</sup>夫貽<sub>ニ</sub>スト<sub>一</sub>千歲之後<sub>一</sub>、<sup>487</sup>余カ<sub>」</sub>  
之一笑也<sup>488</sup>。林氏汝以<sub>ニ</sub>厩戸朕ノ一字<sub>一</sub>評之。若將<sub>ニ</sub>  
汝カ此惡言誹<sub>ニ</sub>謗<sub>一</sub>スルカ如<sub>ヲ</sub>天子<sub>一</sub>ヲ、以比<sub>ニ</sub>並<sub>セ</sub>ハ之<sub>一</sub>九牛一毛也也。<sub>」</sub>  
逆罪弥天無<sub>レ</sub>所<sub>レ</sub>誅<sub>レ</sub>スル<sub>ニ</sub>之<sub>一</sub>。夫於<sub>ニ</sub>此ノ國<sub>一</sub>皇子出家有<sub>レ</sub>  
利<sub>ニ</sub>天下<sub>一</sub>。然<sub>ル</sub>ヲ汝大<sub>ニ</sub>忌訾<sub>ス</sub>。余為<sub>レ</sub>汝論<sub>下</sub>有<sub>レ</sub>ノ利<sub>スル</sub>天下<sub>一</sub>之<sub>」</sub>  
事<sub>上</sub>ヲ。夫代々帝王ノ之皇子、若不<sub>ニ</sub>シテ出家<sub>一</sub>而一々賜<sub>ニ</sub>ハ<sub>」</sub>

<sup>482</sup> The entry quoted here corresponds to *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 66 (*Bunshū* vol. 2, pp. 361b-362a), but it is in no sense a complete or correct quotation.

<sup>483</sup> Evidently, the *kaeriten* ‘一’ should have been inserted at this point.

<sup>484</sup> The *itaiji* {言+ム+十} that is used in our manuscript is not in the font, but the intended character is clear. Xu Yu is attested; see Mor. X: 35298-5.

<sup>485</sup> Here begins the second quotation from the same entry in Razan's *Zuihitsu* 2 (*Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 666); see *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 362a.

<sup>486</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 362a, inserts the *okurigana kana* at this point.

<sup>487</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 362a inserts the character 之 at this point, thus making 一笑 the object of 貽, and adding *kaeriten* to support this. We have decided to follow this reading.

<sup>488</sup> Here ends the quotation from Razan's *Bunshū*. Apart from the discrepancies noted above, it is a complete and correct quotation.

領地一ヲ、則武家領地恐ハ無ニ寸土一乎。今百口不ニシテ出」  
家一、而對ニシ妻女一ヲ産ニセハ兒子、一人各ク産ニ三子一ヲ。一生増ニ』  
(2 : 25ウ)

三百口之人一ヲ、親子共是四百之人也。悉與ニ田」  
地一ヲ造ニラハ屋宅一ヲ、成ニ許多之<sup>ツイヘ</sup>費一ヲ。然ルニ出家者ハ無レ寸ハ子、則我」  
一個有ニシヤ何ノ大ナル費一乎。聚ニテ天下ノ佛書一ヲ焚而棄レト之、實ニ」  
是レ汝ハ秦世<sup>489</sup>ノ李斯、吾朝ノ守屋ト一般惡逆ノ之人也也。若」  
以レ汝使レ寸ハ治ニ國家一ヲ、則破ニ國制一ヲ乱ニリ國法一ヲ、而使ニレ人」  
逢ニ塗炭一ニ矣。故ニ近世以來國王大臣、聞ニテ汝カ<sup>490</sup>妄說」  
橫談一ヲ、破ニ却佛寺一ヲ者ノ是レ夥矣。偏ニ出ニツ于汝カ邪見一ヨリ。推」  
古天皇以來代々ノ天子崇ニ敬シ玉フ仏法一ヲ。悉弘ニ通ス天』  
(2 : 26オ)

下ニ。東照權現以ニ兩部一ヲ為レ神ト永ク守ニ兒孫一ヲ。將軍世」  
々皈ニ敬ス佛法一ヲ。然汝為ニ如レノ此惡口一ヲ者、欺ニ天子一ヲ、蔑ニ」  
將軍一ヲ、惑ニ國王一ヲ、亂ニリ臣民一ヲ、不レ可レ有ニ過レ汝者一ハ也。」

扶桑護佛神論卷之中終」

<sup>489</sup> This character 世 is written between the lines, but a dot on its left side indicates that it should be inserted into the main phrase at this point.

<sup>490</sup> In the clause 聞汝妄カ說 the particle *ga* is in the wrong place. It should be placed after 汝. We have transcribed accordingly.

## 扶桑護佛神論卷下

林氏山王ノ論ニ曰<sup>491</sup>、周ノ靈王ノ太子喬一旦仙シ去ル<sup>492</sup>入ニル」

天台山ニ。上帝入ニ<sup>493</sup>之ヲ上界官府ニ、命シテ為ニ桐柏ハ<sup>494</sup>真人」

右弼王ニ<sup>495</sup>。桐柏ハ天台ノ之別稱也也。建ニ<sup>496</sup>其ノ廟ヲ于山中ニ、」

號シテ爲ニ真君<sup>497</sup>、祭レルニ<sup>498</sup>之有レ效<sup>499</sup>、祈レルニ<sup>500</sup>之必<sup>501</sup>應<sup>502</sup>。俗呼テ為ニ山王<sup>503</sup>」

## 《白鬚ノ神》

土地ト<sup>504</sup>。又曰<sup>505</sup>白鬚ノ<sup>506</sup>神ハ者<sup>507</sup>杭州西湖ニ有レ靈、謂ニ<sup>508</sup>之ヲ湖」

光ト。鬼神ノ憑ニル山水ニ者宇宙ノ之間昭々タリ矣。其云フ<sup>509</sup>ハ」

見ニル<sup>510</sup>ト湖水七ヒ變シテ為ニナル芦原ト者、假<sup>511</sup>麻姑カ見ニル<sup>512</sup>東海三ヒ為ニル<sup>513</sup>」

491 For *Sannō ron*, see *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 25 (*Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 289a-291a). This first quotation is on p. 289a. Differences between our manuscript and the text in Razan's *Bunshū* will be referred in the succeeding notes.

492 Ise Bunko *bon* and *Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 289a, have the auxiliary *-te* instead of *-ru*.

493 *Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 289a, inserts the *okurigana -re* at this point.

494 The particle *wa* does not make any sense. *Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 289a, has no particle at this point.

495 *Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 289a, vol. 1, pp. 289a, has the particle *to* instead of *ni*.

496 *Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 289a, inserts the auxiliary *-te* at this point.

497 *Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 289a, inserts the particle *to* at this point.

498 *Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 289a, has the auxiliary *-te* instead of *-ru ni*.

499 *Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 289a, inserts the *okurigana -shi* at this point.

500 *Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 289a, has the auxiliary *-te* instead of *-ru ni*.

501 *Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 289a, inserts the *okurigana -su* at this point, reading *kanarazu*.

502 *Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 289a, inserts the *shūshikei su* at this point, reading *ō-zu*.

503 *Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 289a, inserts the particle *no* at this point.

504 Here ends the first quotation from *Sannō-ron*. Apart from the differences noted above, it is a complete and correct quotation.

505 This second quotation is from *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 290a. Differences between our manuscript and the text in Razan's *Bunshū* will be referred in the succeeding notes.

506 *Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 289a, omits the particle *no*.

507 At this point, our manuscript omits: 「湖水ノ之主カ乎其與レ佛晤語スル有レリヤ之乎。曰然リ。」

508 *Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 289a, inserts the *okurigana (f)u* at this point.

509 *Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 289a, inserts the *kaeriten 'レ'* at this point, and omits the *okurigana (f)u*.

510 *Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 289a, omits the *okurigana -ru*.

511 *Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 289a, inserts the *kaeriten '四'* at this point, and the auxiliary *-te*.

512 *Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 289a, has the *kaeriten '三'* instead of '二', and adds the particle *wo* after *-ru*.

513 *Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 289a, adds the particle *wo* after *-ru*.

3 : 1 ウ

桑田一設ニク此説一ヲ<sup>514</sup>。蓋シ山王日吉三輪ノ之三神ハ、各別ニシテ」

而體即是一也也。奈何三神ノ體ト者大己貴尊特ニ」

日吉神ハ者非ニ大山咋一クヒ也。白鬚ノ神者、太子ノ神社」

本紀謂ニオハ炬着塵ノ大神一、則非ニコ西湖ノ鬼神一ニ分明也也。」

東照權現傳ニ授シテ山王一實ノ神道ヲ於慈眼大師一ニ」

為ニテ權現一ト、守ニル兒孫一有ニ誓願一。本地ハ藥師、垂迹ハ權現也」

《山王一實神道》

也。夫山王<sup>ソレ</sup>一實ノ神道者ハ、吉田家ノ非ニ宗源一、非ニ習」

合一ニ、非ニ縁起一ニ、非ニス汝カ所レ建ル理當神道一ニ。昔日行圓直ニ』

3 : 2 オ

傳ニ兼スル山王一ニ之神道ニシテ、而即是非ニル也社家儒士ノ所レ識」

也。汝カ所レ奉レ仕東照權現ノ所ニノ尊敬<sup>515</sup>一玉フ、謗ニシテ神佛一謂ニ胡」

鬼一、為ニ異神ト一、大逆不忠ノ之人古今少<sup>レ</sup>也見ル<sup>コト</sup>也。」

林氏自謂<sup>ミ</sup>ク<sup>ミ</sup>積門ノ聖武帝源ノ頼朝豐臣父子造ニ」

大殿一鑄ニ大像一国家大費テ民生無<sup>レ</sup>ト益<sup>516</sup>。然<sup>オハ</sup>則儒家」

昔日於ニテ大唐一ニ、造ニ聖廟一鑄ニ聖像一、汝等近世於ニ扶」

桑一營ニ聖廟、彫ニス聖像一。国家ノ費ニシテ而民無<sup>レ</sup>カ益乎。謂ニ儒ハ」

無<sup>レ</sup>シテ費有<sup>レ</sup>益、佛ハ有<sup>レ</sup>費無<sup>レ</sup>シ益。不當ノ之論ニシテ、立<sup>レ</sup>我損<sup>レ</sup>スル他』

3 : 2 ウ

者也也。汝若シ謂<sup>下</sup>ハ造ニ鑄廟像一ヲ者、為<sup>中</sup>報<sup>レ</sup>功酬<sup>レ</sup>徳、以至」

<sup>514</sup> Here ends the second quotation from *Sannō-ron*. Apart from the differences mentioned in the preceding notes, it is a correct quotation.

<sup>515</sup> This character 敬 is written rather badly. Probably for that reason the copyist wrote it again to the right of the character, in the margin.

<sup>516</sup> These two sentences render the gist of the argument Razan makes in his *Daibutsu den* 大佛殿; see *Zassho* 雜書 ("Miscellaneous writings"), *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 56 (*Bunshū* vol. 2, pp. 218a-219a). It is a very loose paraphrase.

教中<sup>シ</sup>カ後世晩学<sup>上</sup>ヲ、敬<sup>ニ</sup>聖道<sup>一</sup>慕<sup>ニ</sup>儒風<sup>一</sup>。積門<sup>ニ</sup>モ亦爾<sup>也</sup>。豈<sup>ニ</sup>ニ其<sup>レ</sup>」  
有<sup>レ</sup>二哉。夫積門<sup>ニ</sup>造<sup>ニ</sup>鑄<sup>ハ</sup>殿像、非<sup>下</sup>但為<sup>517</sup>ノミニ報<sup>中</sup>酬<sup>シ</sup>功德」  
敬<sup>ニ</sup>佛<sup>518</sup>、道<sup>一</sup>慕<sup>中</sup>積風<sup>上</sup>、又為<sup>也</sup>勸<sup>ニ</sup>ヲ貴賤<sup>一</sup>ヲ發<sup>ニ</sup>善心<sup>一</sup>、施<sup>519</sup>ニ金穀<sup>一</sup>、」  
植<sup>ニ</sup>福德ノ種<sup>一</sup>、礼拝念經<sup>520</sup>シテ<sup>マカ</sup>時<sup>中</sup>シメンカ智壽ノ因<sup>上</sup>ヲ也。汝等論<sup>ニ</sup>シテ現<sup>」</sup>  
在一世<sup>一</sup>ヲ、不<sup>レ</sup>知<sup>ニ</sup>三世因果<sup>一</sup>ヲ。只想<sup>ニ</sup>ヲ費用<sup>一</sup>ト最<sup>モ</sup>理ノ之當<sup>」</sup>  
然<sup>也也</sup>。国王大臣有刀<sup>521</sup>ノ檀<sup>522</sup>護造<sup>ニ</sup>鑄<sup>ハ</sup>殿像<sup>一</sup>ヲ、則金穀<sup>」</sup>  
流<sup>レ</sup>下<sup>リ</sup>テ諸民自富ム。若<sup>シ</sup>無<sup>ニ</sup>ハ造鑄<sup>一</sup>則金穀積<sup>レ</sup>テ上<sup>ニ</sup>萬家<sup>」</sup>

3 : 3 才

貧窮ス。即是自然ノ理<sup>也也</sup>。若<sup>シ</sup>因<sup>ニ</sup>ラハ汝カ見処<sup>一</sup>ニ、天竺震<sup>」</sup>  
旦扶桑、其ノ餘諸國古今造<sup>ニ</sup>鑄<sup>スル</sup>殿像<sup>一</sup>ヲ之輩<sup>523</sup>ハ、悉く無<sup>」</sup>  
識ノ痴人<sup>ニ</sup>シテ、而汝獨思<sup>レ</sup>カ有<sup>レ</sup>智乎。偏見ノ邪儒省<sup>ニ</sup>ハ些ノ慙<sup>一</sup>ヲ<sup>」</sup>  
可<sup>也也</sup>。」

### 《片岡餓人》

林氏片岡ノ餓人<sup>524</sup>死<sup>シテ</sup>築<sup>レテ</sup>墓<sup>ヲ</sup>而葬<sup>レル</sup>焉ヲ。其ノ時曾<sup>テ</sup>無<sup>ニ</sup>シ以<sup>テ</sup>」  
為<sup>ニ</sup>スル<sup>ハ</sup>達磨<sup>一</sup>ト也。後人之衒<sup>ニ</sup>フ于禪<sup>一</sup>ニ者附<sup>會</sup>シテ以<sup>テ</sup>言<sup>レ</sup>之<sup>525</sup>。虎<sup>」</sup>  
関編<sup>ニ</sup>シテ<sup>526</sup>釈書<sup>一</sup>ヲ為<sup>527</sup>之<sup>カ</sup>傳<sup>一</sup>則愈乱<sup>レル</sup>真<sup>ヲ</sup>也。我<sup>レ</sup>想<sup>フ</sup><sup>528</sup>其餓芋<sup>ハ</sup><sup>529</sup>」

517 Here, and in the following, parallel sentence, the character 為 should be read *tame*.

518 Obviously, the comma should be put behind the next character, 道.

519 Our manuscript uses an *itaji* that is not in the font.

520 Our manuscript uses an *itaji* that is not in the font.

521 Our manuscript clearly writes 刀, but undoubtedly the intended character will be 力 (有力).

522 Our manuscript uses an *itaji* that is not in the font.

523 The *itaji* our manuscript uses looks like 車 with 此 on top, but this character is neither in the font nor in the dictionary.

524 Chōon here quotes from Razan's disquisition *Kataoka gajin ben* (*Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 26; *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 294).

525 *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 294b, inserts the following sentence at this point: 「至<sup>レ</sup>テハ如<sup>下</sup>キニ俗呼<sup>ニ</sup>テ其地<sup>一</sup>ヲ號<sup>ニ</sup>シ達磨墳<sup>ト</sup>又建<sup>中</sup>カ達磨寺<sup>上</sup>ヲ則益<sup>ク</sup>大ナリ及<sup>ニ</sup>テ」.

526 *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 294b, has the *okurigana mu* and the particle *ni* instead of *shite*, reading *amu ni*, and writes the characters 元亨 (Genkō) in front of 釈書, thus giving the complete title of the book.

527 *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 294b, inserts the *kaeriten* 'ニ' and the *okurigana -ru* at this point.

528 *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 294b, inserts the particle *ni* at this point.

529 *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 294b, omits the particle *wa*.

亦當時ノ之異人而巳<sup>ナラクミノ</sup> 530。何ソ以テ為<sup>マ</sup>レン531磨ト乎532。林氏ハ者惑レシ』

3 : 3 ウ

世誣レフ君ヲ狂妄ノ之士也也。自以レ不レ好之他ノ日本紀」  
大成經釈書及墓寺謂ニテ之ヲ附合虚説ト筆レテ書遺レス」  
世ニ。若有レ人以ニテ史記ノ孔子ノ世家及魯ノ城北ノ泗上ノ」  
墓處一ヲ為ニ之ヲ附合妄談一、汝豈ヤレニ容レ之乎。盖シ聖徳太」  
子真人至人也。故ニ具533神通力一ヲ。不レシテ知ニ彼ノ餓人為ニルヲ達」  
磨一、而贈ニシヤ之御衣一ヲ乎。昔年有ニ如レ汝邪疑人一。故ニ太」  
子差レシテ人使レ開レ之則全身脱去ス。只所レ賜御衣ノミ在。」  
使臣取ニ御衣一獻ニ太子一ニ。太子自服ニ其ノ御衣一。不レシテ有ニ』

3 : 4 才

達磨一ニ、而餓莩ノ異人豈ヤレ有ニ如レ此之神威一乎。汝知ニテ」  
聖賢常道ノ治論一ノミヲ、不レ知ニ真人至人ノ具ニ大神通一ヲ。實ニ對ニ」  
夏虫一ニ難レ語ニ冬雪一ヲ者ノカ乎。」  
聖徳太子分ニ九品一、上三品ハ曰真人、曰至人、曰」  
聖人、中三品ハ曰賢人、曰大人、曰善人、下三」  
品ハ曰記人、曰小人、曰惡人。余考ニ視スル林氏為一レリヲ人」  
記人<sup>ニシテ</sup>而為ニ小人一為ニ惡人一。所以者何ナレハ、林氏告ニ禪」  
徒一ニ文ニ曰534、大燈國師初為ニテ535乞人一536居ニ五條橋ノ下<sup>ニ</sup>537自538有ニ』

530 The intended reading here surely must be *naraku nomi* instead of *naraku mino*. *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 294b, glosses these two characters as *nomi*.

531 *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 294b, also supplies the *furigana tara-* and reads *taran ya*; it omits the particle *to*.

532 Here ends the quotation from *Kataoka gajin ben*. But for the omitted sentence, and the other differences mentioned in the preceding notes, it is a correct quotation.

533 In view of the subsequent '一', the *kaeriten* 'ニ' should be inserted here.

534 Here begin selective quotations from another of Razan's miscellaneous writings, entitled *Zento ni tsugu* ("Telling the Zen crowd"); see *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 56 (*Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227).

535 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227a, has the *furigana -taru* instead of *-te*.

536 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227a, inserts the character 時 at this point.

537 The first quotation from *Bunshū* ends here; Chōon resumes a few lines further on (*op. cit.*, p. 227a).

3 : 4ウ

妻子一。為<sup>レ</sup>539断ニシカ恩愛之欲一ヲ使ニレ妻買一<sup>レ</sup>540酒。因テ閉<sup>レ</sup>テ541戸ヲ殺ニシテ  
542其」

二歳ノ兒一串ニ<sup>ヤキ</sup>灸ス之<sup>一</sup>543。及ニテ妻還一ルニ見<sup>レ</sup>之恠<sup>レ</sup>焉544。及<sup>545</sup>噉ニ<sup>546</sup>灸<sup>547</sup>  
兒一ヲ」

《大灯國師噉ニ灸兒一》

以飲<sup>ス</sup>548。妻熟ト視<sup>テ</sup>549大<sup>550</sup>叫<sup>551</sup>喚<sup>シテ</sup>而〈出〉<sup>552</sup>灯<sup>553</sup>モ亦使<sup>554</sup>出<sup>555</sup>呼。佛  
氏ノ氏<sup>556</sup>」

蔽心至ニル於茲一ニ。酷<sup>カライカナ</sup>乎虎狼仁<sup>ヤ</sup>557也以<sup>レ</sup>558不<sup>レ</sup>559食ニ其ノ子一ヲ」

故也也。彼ノ滅ニシテ人倫一而絶ニ<sup>560</sup>義理一啜<sup>レ</sup>561羹ヲ、不<sup>レ</sup>及<sup>レ</sup>放ニ鹿兒一<sup>562</sup>。」

538 Instead of 自, *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227a, has the character 超, which is part of Daitō-kokushi's monk's name Shūhō Myōchō 宗峰妙超.

539 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227a, adds the *furigana* -(ta)me ni to the character 為.

540 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227a, inserts the *okurigana* ha at this point.

541 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227a, has the *okurigana* -chi instead of the auxiliary -te, reading *toji* instead of *tojite*.

542 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227a, omits the auxiliary -te.

543 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227a, inserts the reading marks *ni shi* behind the character 串, omits the *furigana* *yaki*, has the *okurigana* -ru instead of -su, and inserts the particle *wo* after the character 之.

544 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227a, adds reading marks to these four characters as follows: 「見<sup>レ</sup>テ之ヲ恠<sup>ム</sup>焉」.

545 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227a, has the character 乃 instead of 及, which in view of the context will be correct.

546 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227a, inserts the auxiliary -te at this point.

547 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227a, inserts the *okurigana* -reru at this point.

548 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227a, has the *okurigana* -mu instead of -su.

549 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227a, omits the repeat sign after the character 熟, and has the *okurigana* -shi instead of -te, thus reading *jukushi-shi* instead of *jukujuku mite*.

550 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227a, inserts the particle *ni* at this point.

551 The standard form of the *itaiji* that is used here ({{口+斗}}) is 叫.

552 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227a, adds the *okurigana* -tsu after the character 出.

553 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227a, has the character 超 (of Myōchō) instead of 灯 (of Daitō).

554 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227a, has the character 便 instead of 使. 便 will be the intended character.

555 Here ends the second quotation from Razan's *Bunshū*. The third quotation begins with the character 呼 (N.B. *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227a, writes 吁) and covers the final four lines of *Zento ni tsugu*.

556 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227a, does not have the second character 氏. It will be a mistake. we will emend accordingly.

557 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227b, has the copulum *nari* instead of *ya*.

558 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227b, inserts the *okurigana* -te no at this point.

559 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227b, inserts the *okurigana* -ru wo at this point.

560 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227b, inserts the *okurigana* -tsu at this point, reading *tatsu* (*shūshikei*).

561 *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227b, inserts the reading marks -ru wa at this point.

562 This is a quotation from the poem 「有懷半山老人再次韻」 by Huang Tingjian 黃庭堅 (1045-1105); in the original, the line quoted here runs as follows: 「啜羹不如放鹿兒」. *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227b, has 及



況ンヤ於レヲヤ此哉。與下夫ノ大義渡ニ攔ニ殺其ノ所生ノ<sup>563</sup>之母一ヲ者上、」

同ニ大罪于天地ノ間一ニ。誠ニ可レ徵<sup>564</sup>焉<sup>565</sup>。林氏自稱ニ一代ノ」

儒宗一ト。不レ因ニ書傳一ニ、妄ニ用ニ世間妄浪之ノ説一、記レ之傳レ』

3 : 5 才

世、欲下排ニシテ<sup>566</sup> 積氏一興中隆儒家上。實ニ可ニ憐愍一矣。夫レ閱ニルニ天」

下古今ノ書一、不レ有下殺ニ其ノ子一ヲ食レ之者上。大燈為ニ積氏一」

作ニシヤ此惡業<sup>566</sup>一ヲ乎。林氏嫌ニ積氏一。偏小ノ見、大惡心於レ」

此可レ見。豈レ不<sup>567</sup> 所謂ル記人ニシテ而為ニ小人一為<sup>568</sup> 中ルニ惡人上乎。」

アア  
哂若シ微ニセハ斯人一誰レカ墮ニ<sup>569</sup> 拔舌獄一ニ。今為ニル其ノ兒孫一者為レ」

甚不<sup>570</sup> レルヤ關ニ此邪説一ヲ哉」

林氏曾テ嘗ニテ宋儒ノ之涎唾ノ<sup>571</sup> 謂ク<sup>572</sup> 浮屠ノ宗果<sup>573</sup> 一日謁ニ」

張南軒一ニ問ニ一以貫<sup>574</sup> レスルノ之之事一ヲ。南軒曰、一貫不易ニ」

(3 : 5 ウ)

與レ汝言一ヲ。且ク道ニ將忠恕奈何一ント来果<sup>575</sup> 不<sup>576</sup> レシテ能<sup>577</sup> レ言而去ル。」

渠ニ<sup>578</sup> 唆<sup>579</sup> シ<sup>580</sup> 子韶一了ル。忽遭ニ南軒一覷<sup>581</sup> 破シ了ラルト<sup>582</sup> 573。此ノ一絡索為ニシテ」

instead of 如 and writes the final two characters as one; it adds reading marks as follows: 「啜<sup>583</sup> レルハ羹ヲ不<sup>584</sup> レス及レハ放<sup>585</sup> レツ麩ヲ」 - "To sip the soup is not equal to letting the fawn go."

<sup>563</sup> *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227b, inserts the particle *no* and the *kaeriten* 'レ' behind the character 所, reading *umu tokoro*.

<sup>564</sup> Ise Bunko *bon* has the character 懲 instead of 徵, which is an improvement, but then it adds the *okurigana* -*tsu*, which makes no sense. In *Bunshū*, vol. 2, p. 227b, we also find the character 懲, but this time with *okurigana* -*rasu*, giving the reading *korasu*, which makes sense. We will emend accordingly.

<sup>565</sup> Here end the third separate quotation from *Zento ni tsugu*.

<sup>566</sup> The character in our manuscript looks like 葉, but surely the intended character will be 業. We will emend accordingly.

<sup>567</sup> The *okurigana* *no* will be a mistake for *wo*.

<sup>568</sup> What follows is a quotation from *Zuihitsu* 5 (*Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 69; *Bunshū* vol. 2, pp. 413-414). Very similar is the quotation in *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 403a; there, the text is as follows: 「僧宗杲謁張南軒、因問一貫之旨。南軒曰、一貫不向汝言之、汝試道忠恕來、吾將聞之。杲閉口而去。」 Cf. also *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 405a

<sup>569</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 413b, writes 杲 instead of 果. It inserts the following characters at this point, which are left out in our manuscript: 「以禪自負、罵風呵雨、超佛越祖」.

<sup>570</sup> As *supra*, note 569, *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 413b, writes 杲, which is correct.

<sup>571</sup> This character is usually read *sosonokasu*, but alternative readings *sosonakasu* and *sosonawakasu* also

儒家ノ面目ト、文集ノ之中ニ處々ニ論レ之。試ニ為レ汝辨レ之。」  
大慧禪師不レシテ知ニ忠恕一、而對ニシテ南軒一ニ不レカ言乎。知テ而」  
故ニ不レルカ言乎。忠恕之義ハ者雛僧知レ之、秀才辨レ之。」  
大慧豈不レシテ知而不レシヤ答乎。蓋シ為ニ南軒一カ無ニキハ一語一、痛」  
處ニ下ニ針錐一ヲ者也也。汝等自ニ負シテ聰明一ニ、柳ニ視ス不レレスト知ニ大」  
慧一貫忠恕一ヲ。自坐ニシテ井中一ニ見レ天想ニ別無レ天也。甚タ』

(3 : 6 オ)

可レ笑矣」

今茲ニ有レ人撮ニ大虚空一ヲ以テ為ニ兩片一。謂ニシテ一片貴一」  
片賤一ト其謂ニシテ之ヲ智一ト。又謂ニシテ不智一ト乎。林氏曰、翠竹真」  
如、黄花般若、見ハ則高キ也也。然トモ無ニ其ノ實一、鳶飛魚躍」  
道在ニ其ノ中一ニ、上下明察活{魚+發}<sup>574</sup>々地。萬物備ニル于我一」  
皆實理也也。<sup>ア、</sup>吁大哉若夫所謂翠竹黄花、則豈ニヤニ」

唯見解之虛遠本無工夫之實用。況世間常」

住滿月<sup>575</sup>青山乎カ。淫於異端者如レカト此歟<sup>576</sup>。余見ニルニ林』

(3 : 6 ウ)

氏カ此ノ説一撮ニ虚空一為ニ兩片一、諍ニフ貴賤一ニ心見聾盲ノ之」

人也也。奈何レハ翠竹真如、黄花般若ハ者境也也。鳶」

exits. Here we have a third variant: *sosonawasu*. *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 413b, reads *sosonokashi*.

<sup>572</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 414a, uses the character 觀.

<sup>573</sup> Here ends of the quotation.

<sup>574</sup> The intended character is Mor. XII: 46485 {魚+發}. It is not in the font.

<sup>575</sup> Our manuscript clearly and consistently writes 月, although Razan's *Bunshū* has the character 目 instead. The interesting thing is that the phrase 滿目青山 appears twenty-eight times in the index of *Taishō zōkyō* (the most common combination is 心外無法、滿目青山), while the phrase 滿月青山 is not attested anywhere. In a commentary of the Śūraṅgama Sūtra, i.e. 大佛頂萬行首楞嚴經會解 (Northern Yongle ed. of the Canon, vol. 185, no. 1618), however, we find the phrase: 「法華云是法住法位世間相當住韶國師云心外無法滿目青山」。Therefore, in view of the consistency of our manuscript, we have decided to maintain 月, rather than to emend it to 目.

<sup>576</sup> Here ends the quotation. It is a complete and correct quotation from *Zuihitsu* 4 (*Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 68; *Bunshū* vol. 2, pp. 401-402). The two following entries in the *Zuihitsu* embroider on the same theme. Further references to the same similes in *Zuihitsu* 3 (*Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 387a, with a quotation from Zhang Nanxuan!) and in *Zuihitsu* 4 (*ibid.*, p. 400b).

飛魚躍<sup>577</sup>ハ者人也也。會<sup>レ</sup>オハ人則會<sup>レ</sup>境、々<sup>レ</sup>オ々則會<sup>レ</sup>人。人」

境不二也。故曰色即是空、々即是色<sup>578</sup>。又曰諸」

法實相<sup>579</sup>。儒<sup>ニ</sup>曰一草一本天理悉<sup>ク</sup>備<sup>580</sup>ルト。又曰春風」

駘蕩家々到<sup>リ</sup>、天理流行日日新<sup>ナリト</sup><sup>581</sup>。然<sup>オ</sup>ハ則林氏非<sup>レ</sup>」

不<sup>ノ</sup>ミ<sup>ニ</sup>會<sup>ニ</sup>佛理<sup>一ヲ</sup>、儒理亦大<sup>ニ</sup>暗<sup>シ</sup>矣。又曰況<sup>ン</sup>ヤ世間相常」

住。滿月青山ヲヤト乎。夫此ノ二句一句ハ者佛說也也。一』

(3 : 7 オ)

句ハ者祖語也也。若<sup>シ</sup>因<sup>ニ</sup>ラハ汝カ見<sup>一ニ</sup>則翠竹真如黃花般」

若<sup>ヲ</sup>為<sup>レ</sup>高<sup>ト</sup>、世間常住滿月青山為<sup>レ</sup>スル低<sup>ト</sup>者也。於<sup>下</sup>テ又」

是<sup>レ</sup>撮<sup>ニ</sup>虚空<sup>一ヲ</sup>為<sup>ニ</sup>スル兩片<sup>一ト</sup>之上上<sup>ニ</sup>、生<sup>ニ</sup>スル眼花<sup>一ヲ</sup>者也也。汝若<sup>シ</sup>會<sup>レ</sup>オハ」

儒<sup>ヲ</sup>則會<sup>レ</sup>佛不<sup>レ</sup>會<sup>レ</sup>儒、故<sup>ニ</sup>特<sup>ニ</sup>生<sup>ニ</sup>ス異論<sup>一ヲ</sup>。儒佛入門雖<sup>レ</sup>トモ」

異<sup>ナリト</sup>、到<sup>ニ</sup>オハ奥室<sup>一ニ</sup>則是同。況<sup>ン</sup>ヤ儒門聖人、不<sup>レ</sup>レ<sup>レ</sup>及<sup>ニ</sup>果滿ノ如」

来<sup>一ニ</sup>天壤ノ隔也也。所<sup>レ</sup>ノ不<sup>レ</sup>及<sup>ニ</sup>汝等見處<sup>一ノ</sup>者ノカ乎。林氏」

八耳ノ太子ノ辨<sup>582</sup>ニ曰、因<sup>583</sup>ニル春秋法<sup>一</sup>鄭ノ公子歸生殺<sup>ニ</sup>シテ其」

君夷<sup>一</sup>、實ハ公子宋為<sup>レ</sup>セリ之ヲ。八耳ノ太子殺<sup>ニ</sup>天皇<sup>一</sup>、實<sup>アタ</sup>ハ直』

(3 : 7 ウ)

駒為<sup>レ</sup>セリト之。林氏以<sup>ニ</sup>テ直駒ニヲ殺<sup>ニ</sup>シ天皇<sup>一</sup>、或ハ謂<sup>ニ</sup>ヒ蘇馬子<sup>一ト</sup>、或ハ」

《八耳太子為<sup>ニ</sup>逆罪<sup>一</sup>》

<sup>577</sup> Reference to *Shijing* 239 (3): 「鳶飛戾天、魚躍于淵」. Karlgren translates: “The hawk flies and reaches heaven; the fish leaps in the deep.” The phrase illustrates the reassuring thought that “the myriad things all have their place.”

<sup>578</sup> These eight characters are a quotation for *Hannya shinkyō*.

<sup>579</sup> The preceding four characters are a hackneyed slogan of the Tendai Sect.

<sup>580</sup> Razan’s *Zuihitsu* contain an entry that commences: 「一草一本各具此理。格得窮得、了畢不外此心」 - “One blade, one twig all contain this principle. When you have exhaustively studied this, in the end it is identical to this heart. ...” (*Zuihitsu* 4; *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 402). In *Zhuzi yulei* 朱子語類 (“A Collection of Sayings of Master Zhu”) 15, it says: 「上而無極、太極，下而至於一草、一木、一昆蟲之微，亦各有理。」

<sup>581</sup> Quotation from *Zhuzi yulei* 朱子語類 (fasc. not specified), Zhu Xi quoting Zhang Jingfu 張敬夫. Only the last three characters are different: 事事清 instead of 日日新.

<sup>582</sup> The “disquisition” Chōon refers to is the second of the *So Bashi ga ben* 蘇馬子辯 (*Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 26; *Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 293-294).

<sup>583</sup> The following is not a quotation, but a paraphrase, loosely based on Razan’s text.

謂ニテ八耳ノ太子一ト、當ニ逆罪ノ之根本一ニ。余較ニルニ其ノ意一ヲ以レ興ニ」

隆スルヲ八耳太子馬子佛一ヲ法忌悪ニシテ而負ニス太逆ヲ於ニ」

公一ニ。崇峻天皇ノ悪逆還テ勝ニレリ紂桀一ニ。然ルヲ直駒殺レ之。若シ」

謂ニ是ヲ佛法ノ之罪一ト者、湯武殺ニス紂桀一ヲ、汝為ニン如何一トカ。曾」

子ノ曰好レトモ而知ニリ其悪一ヲヲ、悪レレトモ而知ニルト其美一ヲヲ<sup>584</sup>。然則奚ソ惡ト  
モ而」

不レ知ニ其ノ美一ヲヲ、好トモ而不レ知ニ其悪一ヲヲ乎。孔孟ハ者聖賢也也。」

太子ハ者真至也也。然ルニ以ニ聖賢一為レセハ劣ニセハト<sup>585</sup>真至一ヨリ者、譬ハ若下シ』

(3 : 8 オ)

以<sub>地</sub>テ銅鐵<sub>天</sub>ヲ劣<sub>中</sub>スルカ金銀<sub>上</sub>ヨリ、人誰カ信レン之乎。夫レ應神天皇ノ之」

朝、儒書始渡ニ本朝一。雖レ然吾朝ニ讀レ之者少シ。故ニ用ニル」

音語一ヲ<sup>ノミ</sup>耳。不レ辨ニ和訓一。到ニテ于推古之朝一ニ、八耳皇子」

始テ和ニ訓シテ漢字一万三千字一ニ、而以往吾朝ノ之人」

知ニ漢土ノ文字一ヲ、通ニ漢朝儒理一ニ。林氏汝等蒙ニテ八耳」

太子文字造化ノ餘澤一ヲ、而漸ク知ニリ文字一ヲ通ニシテ儒理一ニ、還テ」

貶ニ剝シテ太子一ヲ為ニ大逆ノ人一ト。逢蒙學ニテ射於羿一害ニス其ノ師一ヲ、」

一般之人也也』

(3 : 8 ウ)

林氏光明皇后ノ辨ニ<sup>586</sup>曰、林氏托ニ或説一ニ曰<sup>587</sup>、光明皇」

后設ニケ温室一ヲ取レテ浴ヲ去ニ千人ノ垢一ヲ<sup>588</sup>。好レ佛之罪也<sup>589</sup>。外カ在レ佛ニ」

<sup>584</sup> A partial quotation from *Daxue* 8.

<sup>585</sup> The *okurigana* are very unclear. On top, we have the *katakana* sign *se*, which has faded, as if an attempt has been made to erase it. Directly underneath we have the sign *ha*, the left dot of which is conflated with the dot of the *katakana* sign *to*. None of these signs is relevant to the reading of the character. Moreover, in Ise Bunko *bon* we find *twice* the character 勝 (*masaru*) instead of 劣, at the second occasion it is even 勝 substituted 劣. As 勝 makes better sense in the context, we have decided to emend accordingly.

<sup>586</sup> See *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 26 (*Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 294-295). The following is neither a complete, nor a correct quotation; compare the following notes.

<sup>587</sup> Apparently, Chōon does not know on which source Razan bases himself. Actually, the following is a quotation from the biography of Kōmyō *kōgō* in *Genkō shakusho* 18.

内在<sup>レ</sup>リ淫矣<sup>590</sup>。孔子ノ所謂君子ハ<sup>レ</sup>喻<sup>ニ</sup>リ於義<sup>一</sup>、小人<sup>ハ</sup>喻<sup>ニ</sup>於利<sup>一</sup>ニ<sup>591</sup>。豈<sup>ニ</sup>其<sup>レ</sup>不<sup>レ</sup>爾耶。林氏平生心在<sup>ニ</sup>好色<sup>一</sup>。故<sup>ニ</sup>見<sup>ニ</sup>他ノ善行<sup>一</sup>却<sup>テ</sup>為<sup>ニ</sup>淫乱<sup>一</sup>ト。夫<sup>レ</sup>衛ノ南子ハ者靈公之夫人<sup>ニ</sup>シテ而<sup>レ</sup>有<sup>ニ</sup>淫行<sup>一</sup>。孔子見<sup>レ</sup>之、子路不<sup>レ</sup>悦<sup>592</sup>。不審南子淫行者ハ、好<sup>レ</sup>見<sup>ニ</sup>孔子<sup>一</sup>之罪カ乎。吾カ光明皇后ハ、晩年<sup>ニ</sup>発<sup>ニ</sup>シテ大誓願<sup>一</sup>、建<sup>ニ</sup>立<sup>ヲ</sup>温<sup>593</sup>室<sup>一</sup>、為<sup>ニ</sup>貴賤<sup>一</sup>取<sup>レ</sup>垢。故<sup>ニ</sup>最後<sup>ニ</sup>感<sup>レ</sup>シ阿闍<sup>7</sup>』

(3 : 9 オ)

佛ノ来現、新<sup>ニ</sup>構<sup>594</sup>ニテ伽藍<sup>一</sup>號<sup>ニ</sup>ス阿闍寺<sup>一</sup>ト。聖武光明ノ之建<sup>ニ</sup>テ大伽藍<sup>一</sup>ヲ鑄<sup>ニ</sup>大佛像<sup>一</sup>ヲ、共受<sup>ニ</sup>ケ菩薩大戒<sup>一</sup>ヲ、始<sup>テ</sup>建<sup>ニ</sup>テ三戒壇<sup>一</sup>ヲ於<sup>ニ</sup>三國中<sup>一</sup>ニ、普ク創<sup>ニ</sup>ル<sup>ヲ</sup>ハ伽藍<sup>一</sup>ヲ於<sup>ニ</sup>六十六州<sup>一</sup>ニ者、昔日於<sup>ニ</sup>灵山會上<sup>一</sup>ニ、佛ノ非<sup>レ</sup>ンハ蒙<sup>ト</sup>ル<sup>ニ</sup>付<sup>ニ</sup>囑<sup>ス</sup>ルノ佛法國王大臣有<sup>レ</sup>力ノ檀那<sup>一</sup>ニ之受記<sup>上</sup>ヲ、奚<sup>ノ</sup>得<sup>テ</sup>作<sup>ニ</sup>ンヤ如<sup>レ</sup>此大勝事<sup>一</sup>ヲ乎。汝等カ非<sup>ニ</sup>得<sup>テ</sup>所識<sup>一</sup>レ也」

林氏十七憲法ノ辨<sup>595</sup>曰、其十六ハ可也。三宝其一不可也也。我捨<sup>ニ</sup>テ、佛老三宝之危<sup>一</sup>ヲ、取<sup>ニ</sup>ルト孟子土地人<sup>7</sup>』

(3 : 9 ウ)

民政事三宝之安<sup>一</sup>ヲ<sup>596</sup>。試<sup>ニ</sup>問<sup>ニ</sup>林氏何ノ處カ积老危<sup>キ</sup>処、」

588 *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 294b, has 「又建温室、令貴賤取浴。后誓曰、我親去千人垢」.

589 *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 295a, has 「是亦好佛之罪乎」.

590 *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 295a, has 「然則外在佛、内在淫乎」. These are the words of Razan's interlocutor; Razan neither agrees to disagree: 「云爾可也、不云爾可也。是則好佛之罪而已。」.

591 Quoted from *Lunyu* 4.16.

592 Reference to *Lunyu* 6.28. See also Mor. II: 2750-337

593 The copyist by mistake wrote 過, and then tried to rectify the character, adding the *furigana wo-n* for good measure.

594 The character in our manuscript is very sloppily executed, but it is within the confines of the *itaji* of *kamaeru*, and the reading fits.

595 See *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 26 (*Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 292-293). N.B. The title of the disquisition in Razan's *Bunshū* is 十七條憲法辯; it includes the character 條.

596 The quotation is by no means a complete or correct quotation. The original text in *Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 292-293, is: 「或問推古十二年夏四月聖德太子作憲令十七條、是否。曰、是也。曰、其第二章如何。曰、不知。曰、其詞曰篤信三寶。三寶者佛法僧也云々。曰、其十六可也。其此一不可也。老聃曰、我有三寶、持而保之。一曰慈、二曰儉、三曰不敢。為天下先。吁、入于佛乎。入于老乎。我則異於是。孟子曰、諸侯之寶三、土地人民政事。佛老之寶危、孟子之寶安。吁、太子之不知之、不幸乎。」

何ノ處カ、孟子安キ處。汝記人而小惡質ナルカ故レニ為ニ恁麼ノ」  
 説一。只讀ニ聖賢書一、曾テ不レ知ニ真至ノ書。自謂ヘリ孔孟政」  
 道ハ古今無雙ナリ。故ニ謗ニシテ太子憲法一ヲ為ニス不可也ト也。孔孟ハ」  
 者漸ク聖賢也也。汝所レ謗之太子ハ、諡ニス真至大聖皇」  
 太子一ト者也也。孔孟一代不レ治ニ一國一ヲ、況ヤ是天下乎。」  
 太子ハ吾朝摂政関白ノ之始ニシテ、而平ニ治天下ヲ之人也」  
 也。豈下ニ與ニ孔孟一同レシテ日ヲ而可上レ論哉。孔孟ノ政道ハ宜ニシテ彼ノ』  
 (3 : 10才)

國一ニ不レ宜ニ此ノ國一此ノ國ノ政道ハ不レシテ宜ニ彼國一、宜ニシ此ノ國一ニ。國」  
 々ノ政道自然ニ相變<sup>モノナリ</sup>スル者也。譬ハ如下キ醫ノ治ニスル陽國陰国」  
 人一ヲ藥方不上レ同ノ也者也。蓋シ汝カ此ノ辨者{春+鳥}{安+鳥}597ノ笑ニフ大鵬一  
 ヲ」  
 之謂歟<sup>カ</sup>矣」

林氏神武天皇ノ論ニ曰598、東山ノ599圓月600嘗テ修ニス日本紀一ヲ。」  
 朝儀601不レス協而不レシテ果遂ニ火ニク其書一ヲ。余竊ニ惟ニフニ円月ノ之」  
 意一ヲ按ニシテ諸書一ヲ以ニ日本一ヲ為ニス吳大602伯之後一ト603。或604以ニ三讓」  
 兩字一ヲ掲ニク于伊勢皇太神宮一ニ605。其牽合附會雖レ如レ」

3 : 10ウ

此而似レ有ニ其ノ理一606。又林氏引ニテ晋書一ヲ曰、日本ハ蓋シ夏」

597 The characters are respectively Mor XII: 47083 and Mor. XII: 46852. The first character (no Chinese reading given) is glossed as “name of a bird” and given the Japanese reading *shun*. The second character (C. *yan*) is glossed as *funashiuzura* and given the Japanese readings *an* and *en*. Neither character is in the font.

598 Quotation from *Jinmu-tennō ron*, in *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 25 (*Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 280a).

599 *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 280a, here inserts the character 僧.

600 *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 280a, here inserts the note 字中巖號ニ中正子一朔ニ建妙喜庵一.

601 *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 280a, uses the compound 朝議 instead of 朝儀, no doubt correctly.

602 *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 280a, writes 太 instead of 大.

603 Apart from the omissions mentioned in the previous footnotes, this is a complete quotation.

604 Here begins a second quotation from *Jinmu-tennō ron* (*Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 280b).

605 *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 280b, inserts the character 乎 at this point.

后<sup>607</sup>少康ノ之裔也也<sup>608</sup>。太<sup>609</sup>伯ノ之事乃古人多ク言レ之。余」  
不ニ始テ言レ之。少康ノ之事晋書ニ<sup>シハラク</sup>姑備ニ一説一。誠是上」  
世ノ之遠也也。不レ易ニ詳知一也<sup>610</sup>。又林氏引ニテ或説一曰<sup>611</sup>、吾」  
邦以ニ八咫ノ鏡草薙劔八坂瓊一、為ニ三種ノ神器一ト。自下」  
灵神繼レテ天ニ而劔<sup>612</sup>中宇内上ヲ、固ニ有ニ三器一。惟レ鏡惟レ劔惟レ」  
靈<sup>613</sup>、乃出ニテ于天成一ニ、歷代寶レ之。今若ニキンハ子カ之言一ノ、則是レ」  
亦異邦ノ之寶器ニシテ、而出ニ于人爲一ニ也奈何<sup>614</sup>。對曰ク太」

3 : 1 1 才

伯ノ之逃去時、豈ヤニレ不レ有ニ器物可ニ提携襲藏一乎。其ノ」  
祖公劉干戈戚揚マテニ有ニ以テ啓レク行。太伯何不レンヤ則ニ乃」  
祖ノ之法一ニ哉。只讓<sup>ノミ</sup>ニル天下而已。想フニ太伯不レンヤ爲ニ匹夫」  
之行一カ欵<sup>615</sup>。又引ニテ吳李札<sup>616</sup>カ劔、夫差カ屬鏤、周ノ赤刀大」  
訓弘璧琬琰五瑞ノ之類一<sup>617</sup>、以為ニ三種ノ神器一。嗚」  
呼林氏ハ者、神國ノ之人ニシテ而貴ニ異国ノ人皇一ヲ。鄙ニス吾カ邦ノ」  
神明一。大逆不道刑罰有レ餘。此ノ邦開闢以徃、未レ」  
見ニ如レ此大逆ノ人一ヲ也。特ニ托ニシテ僧ノ円月カ之意一ニ述ニテ自ノ臆」

<sup>606</sup> Here ends the second quotation from *Jinmu-tennō ron*.

<sup>607</sup> For the expression *xiahou*, see Mor. III: 5720-90-1.

<sup>608</sup> Chōon here correctly quotes a single sentence from the latter part of *Jinmu-tennō ron* (*Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 282a).

<sup>609</sup> Here begins the fourth quotation from *Jinmu-tennō ron*; see *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 282b.

<sup>610</sup> Here ends the fourth quotation from *Jinmu-tennō ron*.

<sup>611</sup> Here begins the fifth quotation from *Jinmu-tennō ron* (*Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 281a).

<sup>612</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 281a, and Ise Bunko *bon* have the character 馭 instead of 劔. This is no doubt correct; we will emend accordingly.

<sup>613</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 281a, and Ise Bunko *bon* have the character 璽 instead of 靈. This is no doubt correct; we will emend accordingly.

<sup>614</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 281a, has 也何 instead of 奈何, which will be a misprint.

<sup>615</sup> Here ends the fifth quotation from *Jinmu-tennō ron*. Apart from the differences noted above, it is a complete and correct quotation. N.B. The *okurigana ka* makes no sense. It might be intended as the reading of the character 欵 that follows behind, but that is already read as *ya*. The correct *okurigana* to be placed after 行 is *wo*, as is done in *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 281a.

<sup>616</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 281a, has the character 札 instead of 礼, which is undoubtedly correct. We will emend accordingly.

<sup>617</sup> The list is quoted from *Jinmu-tennō ron* (*Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 281a).

### 3 : 1 1 ウ

説一ヲ、為下以ニテ日本一ヲ吳ノ太伯ノ之後上ト。横説ノ罪人也也。汝博」  
識強記之人ニシテ、而不レ因ニ日本三部ノ神書一、引ニ他ノ邪」  
説一ヲ、而妄ニ為ニフハ如レ此邪説一ヲ、曩ニ負シテ儒宗一ヲ、蔑ニ視スルカ神道一ヲ故  
ナリ。汝」

謂下フハ太子ノ旧事本紀偽書上ト者、置テ不レ論重テ論レ之。旧」  
事紀古事記日本紀悉ク以為ニス日ノ神一ト。然ニ為ニスルフ太伯一ト」  
或説可レ知。因ニラハ汝カ所説一ニ吳ノ太伯ハ者、自ニ正保二年一」  
二千八百六十六年也也。吾カ国ノ開闢、豈ヤ下只二千」  
八百六十六年一ノミナランヤ哉。因ニ日本紀一ニ謂寸ハ則不レシテ論ニ天神』

### 3 : 1 2 オ

七代一ヲ、而地神五代ノ之年數、天照太神二十五」  
萬歳、忍穗耳尊三十万歳、瓊々杵尊三十一」  
万歳、彦火火出見尊六十三万七千八百九」  
十二歳、鷓鴣草葺不合尊八十三万六千」  
四十二歳也。如レ此年代深遠ニシテ而不レ及ニ筭數一ニ。然ルニ」  
為ニシテ吳太伯一ト漸ク謂下フ寸ハ二千八百六十六年上、則邪説妄」  
談分明也。又三種神器不レシテ為ニ神造一ト而謂ニ人造一ト。」  
又是林氏カ臆見也也。因ニ日本紀神代一謂寸ハ、則天照』

### 3 : 1 2 ウ

太神閉ニ磐戸一ヲ而幽居ス。六合常闇ニシテ、而不レ知ニ昼夜ノ」  
之相代一ルヲ。故ニ思兼神ノ命天兒屋ノ命天太玉ノ命上ツ枝タニ」  
懸ニ八坂瓊一ヲ、中ツ枝ニ懸ニ八咫鏡一、下ツ枝ニ懸ニ青和幣白」  
和幣一ヲ。不レ同ニ此ノ夏一ニ、而為レ甚為ニスル人造ノ宝器一トヤ乎。三種ノ」  
神器ノ之夏、委ク出ニタリ太子旧事本紀一ニ。茲ニ略レ之矣。林」



氏造ニテ許多邪説一、誑ニ惑ス天下古今ノ貴賤一。實ニ為ニ神」

《三敵》

敵一、為ニ佛敵一、為ニ皇敵一。汝兒孫以ニ三敵ノ之罪一ヲ恐ハ不ニ」

相續一。若シ汝兒孫相續セハ、吾邦ノ神明日神無ランカ之乎。』

3 : 1 3 才

可レ恐可レ戒」

大凡吾心ノ所レ好為レ是、所レ嫌為レ非。天下古今凡」

情之常也也。林氏欽明天皇ノ辨<sup>618</sup>ニ曰、欽明<sup>619</sup>ハ我カ朝之」

孝明カ乎。稻目<sup>620</sup>ハ我カ朝之楚英カ乎<sup>621</sup>。以ニテ吾カ朝ノ欽明異」

朝孝明初ニ渡ニスヲ佛法一ヲ故ニ為レ暗以ニテ吾カ朝ノ稻目異朝ノ」

楚英不ニレルヲ拜佛像一ヲ故ニ為レ明。然<sup>622</sup>ハ則漢土ノ孝明、吾邦ノ」

欽明以往信ニ敬スル佛法一ヲ者為レ暗乎。楚英稻目以」

後不レ尊ニ信佛法一ヲ者為レ明乎。夫レ後漢ノ孝明帝ノ之』

3 : 1 3 ウ

時佛像經卷初テ渡ニ漢土一ニ<sup>622</sup>。釈道比較ス焚レク經ヲ。諸子ノ」

<sup>618</sup> See *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 26 (*Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 292). N.B. Razan uses the character 辯, and instead of 天皇, he writes 天王.

<sup>619</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 292a, inserts the character 夫 before, and the character 者 after Kinmei.

<sup>620</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 292a, inserts the character 者 after Iname.

<sup>621</sup> End of quotation.

<sup>622</sup> Chōon's probable source is *Genkō shakusho wage* 元亨釈書和解, written by the priest Ekū 惠空 (pr. 1683; modern edn in *ZST: Ronsetsu-hen*, Tokyo: 2005). In the section 「度受志二」 (*Wage* 20), we find the following story is told in the commentary: 「是年、釈教ト道家ト比較ベテ、經ヲ焚クコトアリ、實ニ、永平十四年正月一日ノ事也、五嶽八山ノ道士一千三百一十人、表ニ上リ、今月十五日ヲ以テ、白馬寺ニ集テ、壇ヲ築テ、火驗スベキニ定ル、既ニシテ、道書七百四十八卷ヲ、旦ノ上ニ置キ、道士、香ヲ焚キ、咒シ已リテ、使火之、諸子ノ道書、皆ナ灰燼ト成ル、次ニ梵本ヲ驗ムルニ、火然赫奕トシテ、宛如トシテ、更ニ光潔ヲ増ス、(中略) 四嶽ノ道士六百二十八人、抽テ簪落髮ス、夫人、婕婦、宮中ノ美女二百三十餘人、厭俗歸眞、既ニシテ明帝、齋ヲ設ケ、親シク與ニ下髮、廣ク衣鉢ヲ」施シテ、大ニ玄宗ヲ啓ク、廣ク僧尼ヲ度シテ、高ク十寺ヲ崇ム、(中略) 寺ノ名ヲ得ル事、斯レヨリ始ル。」 (Here quoted from *ZST: Ronsetsu-hen* vol. 3, p. 223-224.) An earlier version of the story is found in *Fozu lidai tongzai* 佛祖歷代通載 ("Buddhas and Patriarchs in Successive Generations"; T2036; *TZ* vol. 49, p. 507b). It gives much more detail than either our manuscript of the version in the *Wage*. The relevant part runs as follows: 「(二十六 壬申) 釋道比較焚經。(中略) 諸子道書皆滅灰燼。褚費二人自感而死。次將梵本火然赫奕。宛如鼎新更增光潔。(中略) 既而明帝設齋。親與下髮廣施衣鉢。大啓玄宗廣度僧尼。高崇十寺。城外七寺安僧。城内三寺安尼。寺之得名自斯而始。備如佛道論。」 *On the whole*, as regards the use of characters etc., our manuscript is closer to the *Wage* than to *Fozu lidai tongzai*.

道書皆成<sup>623</sup>—ル灰燼—ト。次ニ將<sup>624</sup>ニテス梵本—ヲ。火然テ赫奕<sup>625</sup>トシテ宛妙<sup>626</sup>昇」  
新ニシテ更増ニ光潔—。於レ此道士六百二十八人抽レテ簪」

落髮ス。明帝大ニ啓ニテ玄宗—、廣ク度ニ僧尼—。高ク崇<sup>アカム</sup>ニ十寺—ヲ。寺ノ」

之得レテ名自レ斯而始ル<sup>627</sup>。本朝ノ欽明帝ノ之世<sup>628</sup>、百濟ノ聖」

明王獻ニス釈迦金像幡蓋經論—ヲ。蘇我ノ稻目奏シテ曰」

西蕃<sup>629</sup>ノ諸國一ヘニ皆礼レ之。豊秋<sup>アキツ</sup>日ノ本豈ヤニニ独リ背—ン哉。物」

部ノ大連ノ尾輿ト與ニ中臣連鎌真—一同奏シテ曰、我カ国』

3 : 14 才

元則<sup>モトツノリ</sup>ハ天ツ神地ツ祇春秋祭<sup>マツ ウヤマ</sup>リ拜<sup>イヤマ</sup>フ。方ニ今改レテ之拜<sup>ニフ</sup>ニフ<sup>630</sup>ハ蕃<sup>631</sup>神—ヲ」

者、恐必国神致<sup>フタリノコトハ</sup>レシ怒作<sup>レ</sup>災。天皇ノ曰、兩斷<sup>レ</sup>難<sup>レ</sup>決。宜<sup>レク</sup>」

付情<sup>ココロ</sup>ノ願<sup>ヒサマツ</sup>フ人—ニ。稻目宿禰<sup>ヲハリ</sup>跪<sup>キ</sup>受<sup>テ</sup>忻悅<sup>テ</sup>、安<sup>ニ</sup>置<sup>テ</sup>於<sup>テ</sup>小墾」

<sup>623</sup> *Fozu lidai tongzai* has the character 滅 instead of 成.

<sup>624</sup> *Fozu lidai tongzai* has the character 將, as does our manuscript; *Genkō shakusho wage* has the character 驗, which, as the *furigana* indicate, should be read *kokoromuru* (correct: *kokoromiru*, +/1).

<sup>625</sup> Both our manuscript and Ise Bunko *bon* have the characters 赫奕, while *Fozu lidai tongzai* (quoted *supra*, note 622) writes 赫奕. The compound 赫奕 is attested (see Mor. X: 37010-2); the compound 赫奕 is not. In view, moreover, of the glosses given to the characters 奕 and 奕, we have decided to emend 赫奕 to 赫奕.

<sup>626</sup> *Fozu lidai tongzai*, *Genkō shakusho wage*, and Ise bunko *bon* all have the character 如 instead of 妙. The character that follows in our manuscript is written like 昇; it is in the font, but the meaning is unclear. It is *not* listed in Morohashi, where we *do* find, however, the characters 暫 and 晰 (Mor. V: 13593 & 13594), which are composed of the same elements. Ise Bunko *bon* and *Fozu lidai tongzai* both have 鼎; we will follow this reading. N.B. *Genkō shakusho wage* has no characters corresponding to 鼎新.

<sup>627</sup> Here ends the partial quotation from *Fozu lidai tongzai* / *Genkō shakusho wage*.

<sup>628</sup> What follows is a paraphrase of, c.q. quotation from *Taisei-kyō* 30 (Kinmei 13): 「冬十月、百濟調貢。聖明王故感朝恩、而不厭忠事、遣西部姫氏達牟利斯致契等、獻釋迦佛金像一軀、幡蓋若干、經論若干。別上表曰：『由是百濟王臣明伏白。吾君天皇。為報天恩、雖國則盡、未盡其信。茲有無上真實大寶。(中略)蘇我大臣稻目宿禰即進奏曰：『西蕃諸國、一皆禮之。豊秋日本、豈獨背也?』物部大連尾輿、中臣連鎌真、一同奏曰：『我國元則王天下者、恆信敬祭之。以天神地祇八百萬神等、春秋祭拜、以之為事、已天下平。方今改之、拜蕃神者、恐必國神致怒作災。』天皇詔曰：『兩斷難決、宜付情願人。然稻目宿禰、試令禮拜。』大臣跪受而忻悅、安置於小墾田家、勸修淨業。捨向原家、為寺奉佛。」 More or less the same text can be found in *Nihon Shoki* 19 (vol. 2, pp. 76-77).

<sup>629</sup> The character 蕃 will be intended. We will emend accordingly.

<sup>630</sup> The *furigana* in our manuscript say *i-ya-ma-fu*, while just above it gives the correct reading *u-ya-ma-fu*. Ise Bunko *bon* has *i-ya-ma-fu* at both places.

<sup>631</sup> The character 蕃 will be intended. We will emend accordingly.

田ノ家<sup>タ</sup>一<sup>ニ</sup>632。國中甚行<sup>ハヤ</sup>ル<sup>ニ</sup>疫氣<sup>一</sup>。物部ノ尾興<sup>633</sup>中臣ノ鎌真奏<sup>シテ</sup>」

曰、奉<sup>レ</sup>詔將<sup>レテ</sup>衆向<sup>ニテ</sup>小墾田<sup>一</sup>ニ、取<sup>ニ</sup>釈迦ノ像<sup>一</sup>以<sup>レ</sup>鞞<sup>ヲ</sup>吹<sup>レ</sup>之<sup>」</sup>

終<sup>ニ</sup>不<sup>ニ</sup>融解<sup>一</sup>。火<sup>モ</sup>不<sup>ニ</sup>更<sup>ニ</sup>近<sup>一</sup>。以<sup>ニ</sup>鉄鎚<sup>一</sup>ヲ擊<sup>ツ</sup>ニ不<sup>レ</sup>附<sup>ニ</sup>小疵<sup>一</sup>ヲ。大<sup>」</sup>

臣稻目見<sup>ニ</sup>此<sup>アヤシ</sup>妙事<sup>一</sup>、舉<sup>レ</sup>声大<sup>ニ</sup>号<sup>マ</sup>ヒ顛身<sup>ヒテ</sup>大哭<sup>ナケ</sup>キ、以<sup>ニ</sup>大<sup>」</sup>

音<sup>一</sup>ヲ言<sup>ク</sup>災害不<sup>レ</sup>遠。於<sup>レ</sup>是<sup>ニ</sup>大連乃以<sup>ニ</sup>佛像<sup>一</sup>流<sup>ニシ</sup>弃浪<sup>ナミ</sup>634』

3 : 1 4 ウ

花<sup>ハ</sup>ノ堀江<sup>ソ</sup>ノ深底<sup>コ</sup>一<sup>ニ</sup>。後<sup>ハナツ</sup>縱<sup>ニテ</sup>火<sup>ヲ</sup>於<sup>テ</sup>伽藍<sup>一</sup>ニ燒<sup>キ</sup>燼<sup>ヌ</sup>以<sup>テ</sup>更無<sup>レ</sup>餘<sup>」</sup>。

於<sup>レ</sup>是<sup>ニ</sup>天無<sup>ニシテ</sup>風雲<sup>一</sup>忽<sup>ト</sup>動<sup>ニキ</sup>雷火<sup>一</sup>。即災<sup>635</sup>ケヌ大殿<sup>一</sup>。諸宮無<sup>レ</sup>」

殘疫氣彌<sup>ク</sup>盛<sup>也</sup>死<sup>スル</sup>者多<sup>シ</sup>也。漢國和朝有<sup>下</sup>如<sup>レ</sup>此大<sup>」</sup>

{戊+火}636驗<sup>上</sup>。故孝明欽明興<sup>ニ</sup>隆<sup>シ</sup>佛像殿堂<sup>一</sup>ヲ、弘<sup>ニ</sup>通<sup>ス</sup>正法<sup>一</sup>ヲ。」

然<sup>ル</sup>ニ林氏謂<sup>ク</sup>明欽ノ之為<sup>レル</sup>ハ暗<sup>也</sup>何<sup>ソヤ</sup>。吾又謂<sup>シ</sup>林氏カ為<sup>レ</sup>」

暗荷<sup>637</sup>ソ{口+酉}638」

632 Here ends the partial quotation from Kinmei 13 (552). Hereafter, our text continues with a partial quotation from Kinmei 14 (also in *Taisei-kyō* 30): 「國中甚行疫氣、民致夭殘、不能治療。物部大連尾興與中臣連鎌真、奏曰：（中略）奉詔將眾、向小墾田、取釋迦像、以鞞吹之、終不融解。火不更近。以鐵鎚擊、不附小疵。大臣稻目見此妙事、舉聲大號、顛身大哭、以大音言：『災害不遠！』於是、大連乃以佛像、流棄波花（難波）堀江深底、復縱火於伽藍、燒燼以更無餘。於是、天無風雲、忽動雷火、即災大殿、諸宮無殘。疫氣彌盛、死者多也。」 More or less the same text can be found in *Nihon Shoki* 19 [(vol. 2, p. 78), but under Kinmei 13, as an immediate sequel to the preceding quotation.

633 This character is wrong; it should be 興. We will emend accordingly.

634 The *furigana* given in our manuscript clearly is *na-mi*, which reading corresponds to the character. Ise Bunko *bon*, however, gives *na-ni*, which corresponds to the intended place name, Naniwa. We will emend accordingly in the *Yomikudashi* and the Translation.

635 The *kaeriten* 'ニ' should have been inserted at this place.

636 Our manuscript writes {戊+火}, which the *Itaiji jiten* identifies as a variant of Mor. V: 11556, which is not in the font. As readings of this character, Morohashi gives *tatsu* ("to cut off") and *sasu* ("to stab"), but these do not fit the context, nor the second character of the compound, 驗. A better case can be made for interpreting the character as 威, although the compound 威驗 is not attested, either. The way in which the character is written in Ise Bunko *bon* is unclear. Accordingly, we will emend to 威.

637 In view of the context and the *okurigana*, 荷 will be a mistake for 何, which is also the character used in Ise Bunko *bon*. We will emend accordingly.

638 The character {口+酉} is not in the font. It is identical with Mor. II: 3726, but the meaning given there (part of the name of a robber of the late Han) is completely irrelevant. It might be a mistake for the

林氏蘇ノ馬子辨<sup>ニ</sup>639曰、嗚呼馬子之殺<sup>レ</sup>640君、誠<sup>ニ</sup>佛ノ之<sup>一</sup>」

罪也也。若使<sup>下ニ</sup>馬子<sup>一</sup>ヲ知<sup>中</sup>夫<sup>レ</sup>五典<sup>上</sup>ヲ則豈<sup>レ</sup>如<sup>レ</sup>此乎。為<sup>レ</sup>シテ人<sup>』</sup>

(3 : 15才)

而<sup>ル</sup>641不<sup>レ</sup>知<sup>ニ</sup>五典<sup>一</sup>ヲ非<sup>レ</sup>ルナリ人<sup>ニ</sup>也642。馬子直駒共是人面獸<sup>』</sup>

心<sup>ノ</sup>而已<sup>643</sup>。程子ノ曰、佛子<sup>644</sup>ノ之言比<sup>ニ</sup>之楊墨<sup>一</sup>ニ尤為<sup>レ</sup>近<sup>レ</sup>」

理。所以<sup>645</sup>其害尤為<sup>646</sup>甚。學者當<sup>下ニ</sup>必<sup>647</sup>ス如<sup>ニ</sup>淫声美色<sup>一</sup>ノ」

以遠<sup>上</sup>之。不<sup>レ</sup>ハ爾則駸々然<sup>トシテ</sup>入<sup>ニ</sup>ル於<sup>中</sup>其ノ中<sup>一</sup>矣。馬子非<sup>下</sup>」

啻<sup>タ、</sup>駸々<sup>トシテ</sup>入<sup>ニ</sup>於<sup>中</sup>其ノ中<sup>一</sup>而已<sup>上ニ</sup>、至<sup>下</sup>テハ其犯<sup>レ</sup>上好<sup>レ</sup>乱<sup>ヲ</sup>之事<sup>上ニ</sup>、」

則佛法ノ之為<sup>レ</sup>ル<sup>レ</sup>敝也大也矣。不<sup>レ</sup>ト可<sup>レ</sup>不<sup>レ</sup>ハアル戒<sup>レ</sup>之〈已上林氏<sup>648</sup>〉林氏馬<sup>』</sup>

子不<sup>レ</sup>知<sup>ニ</sup>五典<sup>一</sup>ヲ殺<sup>ニ</sup>ス天皇<sup>一</sup>ヲ。人面獸心、誠<sup>ニ</sup>論<sup>ニ</sup>佛ノ之罪<sup>一</sup>ナリト」

也。即是過當ノ之論也。畧為<sup>レ</sup>メ汝辨<sup>レ</sup>之ヲ。吾国ノ崇峻天<sup>』</sup>

(3 : 15ウ)

皇ノ惡逆無道ハ、還<sup>テ</sup>勝<sup>ニ</sup>殷ノ紂夏ノ桀<sup>一</sup>ニ。然<sup>ル</sup>ヲ直駒窺<sup>ニ</sup>テ馬子<sup>』</sup>

之意<sup>一</sup>ヲ即殺<sup>ニ</sup>ス天皇<sup>一</sup>。馬子直<sup>ニ</sup>命<sup>ニ</sup>シテ直駒<sup>一</sup>非<sup>レ</sup>殺<sup>ニ</sup>シムル<sup>ニ</sup>天皇<sup>一</sup>。其ノ」

後馬子數<sup>ニ</sup>ヘテ駒<sup>カ</sup>罪過<sup>一</sup>ヲ親<sup>ラ</sup>射<sup>ニ</sup>殺<sup>ス</sup>之<sup>一</sup>ヲ。殷ノ湯王周ノ武王<sup>』</sup>

能<sup>ク</sup>知<sup>ニ</sup>ル五典<sup>一</sup>聖人<sup>ニ</sup>シテ、而殺<sup>ニ</sup>君紂君桀<sup>一</sup>ヲ。謂<sup>ニ</sup>ンヤ之ヲ人面獸<sup>』</sup>

character 哂 (Mor. II: 3583), though, which is glossed *hohoemu* (to smile), *warau* (to laugh), *azawarau* (to laugh at)? The *furigana aa*, of course, more or less preclude this possibility. Ise Bunko *bon*, too, has the character 哂 with the *furigana a-a*.

<sup>639</sup> So *Bashi ga ben* is included in *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 26 (*Bunshū* vol 1, p. 293). The quotation begins on p. 293a, fourth line from the back.

<sup>640</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 293a, uses the character 弑 instead of 殺.

<sup>641</sup> The function of the *okurigana ru* is unclear, unless it is intended to specify the ending *-ru* of *shirazaru*.

<sup>642</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 293a, at this point inserts the phrase 「夫名者實之賓也」.

<sup>643</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 293a-b at this point inserts the phrase 「其名固當。昔者我孟軻氏關楊墨以其無君無父故也」.

<sup>644</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 293b, uses the character 氏 instead of 子.

<sup>645</sup> *Furigana* in *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 293b, indicate the reading *kono yue ni* for these two characters.

<sup>646</sup> In *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 293b, the order of the two characters 尤 and 為 is reversed.

<sup>647</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 293b, uses the character 當 instead of 必.

<sup>648</sup> This interlinear note is written in red ink. It marks the end of the quotation.

心一ト乎。忘ニレテ湯武不忠一ヲ、非ニ只責ニルノミニ馬子之罪一ヲ、罪却テ及レオハ」  
仏則湯武ノ之逆罪モ亦及ニシヤ伏羲一ニ乎。蓋シ從ニ神武一到ニ」  
推古一ニ、吾カ国ノ惡王ハ者武烈崇峻ニ也也。委ク出ニ大成」  
經一ニ。汝等須レク視レ之。又引下テ程子学者遠ニルヲ佛法當上レト云フヲ如ニクス』  
(3 : 16オ)

淫声美色一。吾又道シ遠ニルヲ邪儒一ヲ、學者須シトレク如ニクス淫声美」  
色一ノ。所以如何レハ不レシテ知ニ仏道一、而無理ニ排ニ謗仏法一ヲ。退ニ」  
轉シテ貴賤ノ之信心一、隨ニ在セシム因果撥無ノ見一。可レ謂大罪」  
也也。又謂ク仏法ハ者犯レ上好レ乱、仏法ノ之為レナリト敝也。吾」  
想フニ犯レ上好レ乱者ノ、不レ有レ過ニ汝輩ノ邪儒一ニ者ノ。縱ヒ君雖レ」  
尊ニ仏法一ヲ、己不レ好レ之ヲ。惡口横説シテ筆レシテ之ヲ遺レス世ニ。豈レ不ニ」  
是レ犯レシ上逆一レニ人ニ乎。又曰馬子不レ知ニ五典一ヲ也。林氏」  
自謂ヘリ五倫五常ハ者、独有ニ漢土ノ儒一ノミ餘国ハ無レト之。汝』  
(3 : 16ウ)

知ニルヤ異儒吾儒ノ二道一ヲ否ヤ。異儒ト云ハ者漢国ノ儒也也。吾儒ト云ハ者」  
此ノ國儒也也。異儒ハ者、王仁携ニヘテ儒書一ヲ應神天皇ノ之」  
世ニ始テ入朝ス。雖レ有ニ儒書一推古ノ朝太子始テ弘通スル者」  
也。吾カ國寄ニ應神天皇一已前ハ、豈レヤ無ニ倫法ノ五儒<sup>649</sup>五」  
《儒道ノミ耳有ニノ五輪五常一之彈斥》

常一乎。試ニ論レン有ニフヲ五倫五常一。五倫ハ者有ニオ夫婦一則有ニ」  
父子一、有ニ父子一則有ニ兄弟一、有ニ兄弟一則有ニ朋友一、有ニオ」  
ハ」  
朋友一則有ニ君臣一。有ニオハ此五倫、則一自然ニ夫婦有レ礼、」  
父子有レ仁、兄弟有レ知、朋友有レ信、君臣有レ義。鳥』

<sup>649</sup> The characters 儒 and 倫 have probably been swapped by the copyist, who wrote '倫法ノ五儒' instead of '儒法ノ五倫'. We will emend accordingly.

(3 : 17オ)

獸スヲ自有ニ五倫五常ノ之道一。<sup>イワンヤ</sup>況<sup>650</sup>是レ人間ヲヤ乎。五常當ニナハ」

五行一、則木ハ者仁也也、火ハ者智也也、土者信也也、金者」

義也也、水ハ者礼也。天地有ニナハ五行一、則人倫奚ソ無ニヤ五常一」

乎。汝謂漢國儒道ノミ有ニ五倫五常一者大ナル錯也也。」

林<sup>651</sup>氏玄昉辨<sup>652</sup>曰、藤ノ廣嗣妻美シ。玄昉通ニス花鳥使一ヲ。」

廣嗣嗟レテ之<sup>653</sup>。廣嗣死シテ後其ノ靈殺ニ玄昉一ヲ。又從レ此先」

玄昉通ニス光明皇后一ニ。「昉カ之淫乱ヤ也久シ矣。宜乎其ノ」

之遭レルヲ夭也。悉ク當ニツト佛法ノ之罪一ニ。林氏效テ唐ノ韓退之」

(3 : 17ウ)

宋ノ歐陽子程子朱子其餘小儒排ニスルニ釈氏一ヲ而汝」

亦欲レス排ニセント釈氏一ヲ。余モ亦鬻レン汝ニ。上古儒士ノ大犯惡罪ハ」

置テ而不レ論、且以ニ近世一ヲ挙ニシ其一ニ一ヲ。堀田氏奸{女+妄}<sup>654</sup>ニシテ」

而欲レ{丘+頁}<sup>655</sup>レ国ヲ。遭レ{又+木+或}<sup>656</sup>ニ某ノ人一。山本大順盜葉露顯ス見  
レ」

梟ニセ官家一ニ。洛陽ノ菅ノ得庵惡心僇行ニシテ被レ殺ニ門弟一ニ。尾」

陽ノ浦ノ新兵將レ脚踏ニテ僕子一被レ殺ニ僕子一ニ。此ノ四人ハ者」

<sup>650</sup> The character is unmistakably 况, but the *furigana* specifies the reading *iwan ya*, which requires the character 況. We have emended accordingly.

<sup>651</sup> In our manuscript, a red triangle is written at the top of the line, probably in order to indicate that a new section begins. In our manuscript, this is unclear, because the line before goes down all the way to the bottom of the page.

<sup>652</sup> There is no disquisition with this title in Razan's *Bunshū*. Chōon will be referring to 還亡辯 1 & 2; see *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 26 (*Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 295-296).

<sup>653</sup> The character is Mor. II: 4115. Its *on-yomi* is "i" ("exclamation of anger"). In the present context, however, it has an object and should be interpreted as a verb, with *ikaru* or *nikumu* as possible readings. The *okurigana te* suggests that the sentence goes on, but evidently, that is not the case. *Bunshū* vol. 1, p. 296a, has the *okurigana mu*, which suggests the reading *nikumu* (preferable to *ikara-mu*).

<sup>654</sup> Our manuscript writes {女+妄}, but no such character is attested in the dictionaries. The most likely emendation seems to be 佞, which we will adopt.

<sup>655</sup> Our manuscript writes {丘+頁}, but no such character is attested in the dictionaries. The most likely emendation seems to be 領, which we will adopt.

<sup>656</sup> Our manuscript writes {又+木+或}, but no such character is attested in the dictionaries. The most likely emendation seems to be 弑, which we will adopt.

近世學<sub>レ</sub>儒<sub>ヲ</sub>有<sub>レ</sub>聞<sub>ノ</sub>之<sub>士</sub>也也。然<sub>ハ</sub>則<sub>ハ</sub>釈<sub>氏</sub>ノ<sub>ミ</sub>非<sub>下</sub>有<sub>二</sub>惡<sub>罪</sub>一<sub>亡</sub>」

滅<sub>上</sub>スルニ、儒<sub>氏</sub>亦有<sub>レ</sub>之。古<sub>德</sub>ノ<sub>偈</sub>ニ<sub>曰</sub>、他<sub>ノ</sub>非<sub>不</sub>レ<sub>用</sub>ニ<sub>頻</sub>々』

(3 : 18才)

拳<sub>一</sub>スル<sub>ヲ</sub>己<sub>レ</sub>カ<sub>過</sub>方<sub>ニ</sub>須<sub>ニ</sub>トク<sub>旋</sub>々<sub>ニ</sub>除<sub>一</sub>ク<sub>657</sub>。豈<sub>ニ</sub>ヤ<sub>夫</sub>不<sub>レ</sub>然<sub>耶</sub>」

《此段<sub>ニ</sub>テ和<sub>ノ</sub>神<sub>異</sub>ノ<sub>神</sub>ノ<sub>立</sub>意<sub>ヲ</sub>知<sub>ル</sub>黒<sub>白</sub>ノ<sub>品</sub>有<sub>リ</sub>》

林<sub>氏</sub>隨<sub>筆</sub>ニ<sub>曰</sub><sub>658</sub>、三<sub>種</sub>ノ<sub>神</sub>器、璽<sub>ハ</sub>象<sub>レ</sub>仁<sub>也</sub>、劔<sub>ハ</sub>象<sub>レ</sub>勇<sub>也</sub>、

鏡<sub>ハ</sub>象<sub>レ</sub>智<sub>也</sub>。本<sub>具</sub>ニ<sub>スル</sub>此<sub>ノ</sub>三<sub>德</sub>一<sub>者</sub>ノ<sub>神</sub>明<sub>也</sub>也。夫<sub>レ</sub>心<sub>659</sub>ハ<sub>者</sub>神

明<sub>ノ</sub>之<sub>舍</sub>也也。既<sub>具</sub>ニ<sub>寸</sub>三<sub>德</sub>一<sub>則</sub><sub>660</sub>豈<sub>ヤ</sub>レ<sub>遠</sub>ラン<sub>矣</sub>哉。方<sub>寸</sub>ノ<sub>之</sub>」

間<sub>嚴</sub>然<sub>肅</sub>爾<sub>也</sub>ト<sub>661</sub>。林<sub>氏</sub>此<sub>ノ</sub>三<sub>種</sub>ノ<sub>神</sub>器ノ<sub>之</sub>説<sub>ハ</sub>者、漢<sub>土</sub>ノ

儒<sub>士</sub>王<sub>仁</sub>カ<sub>解</sub>ニ<sub>シテ</sub>而<sub>非</sub>ニ<sub>吾</sub>国<sub>神</sub>道<sub>ノ</sub>正<sub>説</sub>一。故<sub>ニ</sub>菟<sub>道</sub>太<sub>」</sub>

子<sub>造</sub>ニ<sub>テ</sub>訓<sub>解</sub>一<sub>ヲ</sub>教<sub>ニ</sub>王<sub>仁</sub>一。惜<sub>哉</sub>林<sub>氏</sub>生<sub>下</sub>レ<sub>テ</sub>于<sub>從</sub>ニ<sub>菟</sub>道<sub>太</sub>」

子<sub>一</sub>後、不<sub>レ</sub>シ<sub>テ</sub>聞<sub>ニ</sub>吾<sub>カ</sub>邦<sub>ノ</sub>神<sub>道</sub>一<sub>ヲ</sub>為<sub>ニ</sub>ル<sub>ヲ</sub>邪<sub>人</sub>一<sub>ト</sub>哉。林<sub>氏</sub>曰、心<sub>ハ</sub>者

(3 : 18ウ)

神明<sub>之</sub>舍<sub>也</sub>也。具<sub>ニ</sub>ス<sub>レ</sub>ハ<sub>三</sub>德<sub>一</sub>神<sub>不</sub>レ<sub>遠</sub>ラ。方<sub>寸</sub>ノ<sub>之</sub>間<sub>嚴</sub>然<sub>肅</sub>爾<sub>タリ</sub>ト。因<sub>ニ</sub>ラ<sub>ハ</sub>」

汝<sub>所</sub>解<sub>一</sub>ニ<sub>者</sub>、神<sub>明</sub>ハ<sub>只</sub>有<sub>ニ</sub>人<sub>々</sub>方<sub>寸</sub>ノ<sub>之</sub>間、嚴<sub>然</sub>肅<sub>爾</sub>タル<sub>ノ</sub>ミ。即<sub>是</sub>」

只<sub>認</sub>ニ<sub>得</sub>理<sub>一</sub>ヲ、不<sub>レ</sub>ル<sub>知</sub>レ<sub>事</sub>ヲ<sub>之</sub>論<sub>也</sub>。故<sub>ニ</sub>太<sub>子</sub>ノ<sub>曰</sub><sub>662</sub>、寡<sub>人</sub>聞<sub>ニ</sub>於<sub>古</sub>老<sub>一</sub>

<sup>657</sup> The same two lines also occur in *Dahui Pujue chanshi yulu* 大慧普覺禪師語錄 (T1998A, TZ vol. 47, p. 928c), in *Fouguo Yuanwu chanshi Biyanlu* 佛果圓悟禪師碧巖錄 (T2003, TZ vol. 48, p. 163a), and in *Beijian Jujian chanshi yulu* 北磻居簡禪師語錄 (1; No.1365, *Manji Shinpen Dai-Nihon zoku-zōkyō* vol. 69), and also in a calligraphy by Takujū Kosen 卓洲胡僊 (1760-1833), a Rinzai monk and abbot of the Sōkenji 総見寺 in Nagoya. The calligraphy is in the possession of the Historical Museum of Hanazono University (Kyoto), and was displayed at an exhibition in its Zen Bunka Kenkyūjo in the fall of 2011. The only difference is that the third character of the second line, 方, is 還 in the two *Yulu*, and 應 in the other two sources mentioned.

<sup>658</sup> Quotation from *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 69: *Zuihitsu* 5 (*Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 419a).

<sup>659</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 419a, has 必 instead of 心; that must be a misprint.

<sup>660</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 419a, correctly inserts the character 神 at this point. We will emend accordingly.

<sup>661</sup> Apart from the two discrepancies noted in the preceding notes, this is a complete and correct quotation.

<sup>662</sup> A quotation from *Taisei-kyō* 44: 「寡人偶依大神之命、以破王仁之異解。抑神代、正直而無令人思、無巧之業。史神為錄、純任有以記之、而不事文偽謀詐。惡不以正直之事為誠實之文、而以僻曲之權為虛誕之寓語。寡人聞於古老、『天地所有物者、事、理、相共具有、而雖微小、無缺之／為片矣。偏於理、名之邪。偏於事、名之愚。理事俱名之正』。又曰：『異人之思神也、唯在理氣無形之虛、未知奇怪生質之實。吾輩之知神也、見其以生質妙軀、在奇變怪用之實。』所以彼其住國人國、而非神國。吾

ニ、」

天地ノ所レ有物ハ者事ト理ト相共<sup>663</sup>具有シテ而雖ニ微小一也ト、無下欠レ此為上レ」

片矣。偏ニル於理一名ニ之邪一ト。偏ニル於事一名ニ之愚一。理事俱<sup>ソナハ</sup>ル名ニ之正一。」

又曰<sup>アタシ</sup>異人ノ之思<sup>ア</sup>レヤ神ヲ也、唯在ニ理氣無形之虚一。未レ知ニ奇」

怪生質之實一。吾輩ノ之知<sup>ア</sup>レルヤ神ヲ也、見下ル其以ニ生質妙軀一ヲ」

在ニル奇變怪用一之實上。所以下也彼ハ其ノ住ル國人ノ國ニシテ而非ニ神ノ」

(3 : 19才)

國一、吾カ其レ住ル國ハ神國ニシテ而非中人ノ國上ニ也。然モ即知ニルヤ其神一」

也、人ノ國之人ハ所レ見唯量<sup>ア</sup>リ看テ而虚ナリ焉。神國ノ之人ハ」

所レ見直視<sup>ア</sup>テ而實也也<sup>664</sup>。又菟道ノ太子訓ニヘテ王仁一曰<sup>665</sup>、汝」

見ニ吾指<sup>ア</sup>一唯ノ之ノ日尊<sup>コレ</sup>ハ維<sup>ア</sup>之天照太神也也。唯ノ之神」

尊ノ所ニ御命一シ玉フ性在レ爰ニ。汝得レ之而云ニ之明德一ト。汝明」

徳ハ雖ニ見在スルヲ希有一也ト、天ノ日ノ尊ハ日々ニ見在玉フ不<sup>ア</sup>レヤ見耶是」

《理事當然神道》

不<sup>ア</sup>レヤ見耶是汝何ノ之偏理ノ之推<sup>666</sup>語ソヤ也<sup>667</sup>。聖徳太子」

菟道ノ太子説ニテ理<sup>ア</sup>宜當然ノ神道一為レ正。汝等解ハ只」

其住國神國、而非人國也、然即知其神也。人國之人、所見唯量看而虚焉。神國之人、所見直視而實也。」 (*Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 44, frame 34, left - frame 35, right).

<sup>663</sup> The character rather looks like 昔, but instead of the character 日, it has 口 underneath. Such a character does not exist. Comparison with Ise Bunko *bon* and with the parallel passage in *Taisei-kyō*, shows that 共 is the intended character. We have emended accordingly.

<sup>664</sup> End of the quotation from *Taisei-kyō* 44.

<sup>665</sup> Beginning of a second Quotation from *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679 (44, frame 48, left). The relevant passage runs as follows: 「訓曰：『汝見吾指、唯之日尊維之天照太神也、唯之神尊所御命性在爰。汝得之而云之明德、汝明德、雖見在希有。天日尊、日日見在、不見耶。是不見耶、是汝何之偏理之推語也。』」。 An earlier, parallel passage (*Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 44, frame 32, right) says: 「神史曰：『天照太神、從天窟出時、高天原、葦原中國、及大地國、自得照明』。解曰：『天照太神者、人人命得之明德也。從天窟出者、明德出於意情之霧暗也。高天原者、天命之高性也。葦原中國者、中庸之極道也。大地國者、大過不及之屬道也。自得照明者、任宜理、明之道光也。』」。

<sup>666</sup> Our manuscript writes 樞, but both editions of *Taisei-kyō* have 推. As this makes better sense, we have emended accordingly.

<sup>667</sup> End of second quotation from *Taisei-kyō* 44.



(3 : 19ウ)

認レルノミ理耳故為レ邪。此ノ三種神器ハ者、不レン有下傳受<sup>668</sup>スル水」  
灌ノ秘傳一人上誰カ得知レ之。吾国三種ノ神器ハ秘々中ノ」  
之秘也也」

林氏隨筆<sup>669</sup>ニ曰、丁侯叛レ國<sup>670</sup>太公圖ニ其ノ像一屢射<sup>シハ</sup>レ之。」

丁侯疾病テ請レ降<sup>セント</sup>。太公以ニ十干<sup>671</sup>ノ日一拔ニ其矢一。矢皆」

拔畢テ丁侯病愈<sup>ユ</sup>。後世巫蠱咒詛ノ之術権ニ興<sup>スル</sup>カ於」

此一ニ乎。頗ル近ニ妖妄一ニ。豫讓斬ニテ趙ノ襄子ノ之衣一ヲ而襄子」

死。玄宗刎<sup>672</sup>ニテ閩州ノ太守ノ像ノ之頸一而閩守斃<sup>ル</sup>。其眞」

(3 : 20オ)

偽未レ可レ知。王莽射ニテ劉續カ像一ヲ而莽先ツ死ス。高駢信ニシ」

呂用カ之術一、使ニレ神兵ヲ拒<sup>コハム</sup> 673一レ敵。其祭未レ止敵襲ヒ來テ殺<sup>レ</sup>スト」

駢ヲ。嗚呼愚哉<sup>ア</sup> 674林氏謂ニ丁侯之事一為ニ妖妄一。或謂ニ」

豫讓閩守之事一為ニ真偽未レ可レ知。蓋シ丁侯豫讓」

閩守ハ儒書ニ記<sup>レ</sup>シテ之、古今為レ信。生ニテ千歳後一ニ、汝独不<sup>レ</sup>シテ」

信而謂ニ妖妄一ト、謂真偽未レ可レ知。若因ニラハ汝所見一、則」

儒ノ之有<sup>レ</sup>載ニ孝傳一ニ。孟宗生<sup>レ</sup>筍、王祥出<sup>レ</sup>鯉之類悉」

為ニラン妖妄一。然<sup>オ</sup>ハ則汝所<sup>レ</sup>貴儒典悉以為ニ妄說一矣。三」

<sup>668</sup> Evidently, the *kaeriten* 'ニ' should have been put after 伝受スル. We will emend accordingly.

<sup>669</sup> See *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 70 (*Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 427).

<sup>670</sup> This must be a mistake. *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 427a, writes 周. We will emend accordingly.

<sup>671</sup> Both our manuscript and *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 427a, write 于 instead of 干, which is a common mistake. We have therefore replaced 于 by 干. The same story is told, with more detail, in *Taigong jingui* 太公金匱 45.

<sup>672</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 427a, writes the character 剔 (*eguru*: to gouge, to scoop out).

<sup>673</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 427b, gives the *furigana fu-se-ga*, and Ise Bunko *bon* has *ko-ba-ma*. If one takes 使 as the auxiliary of the causative, the *mizenkei* is correct, and the readings would be, respectively, *fusega-shimu* and *kobama-shimu*. If we follow our manuscript, the reading would be (*shinpei wo*) *tsukawashite ... kobamu*. We will follow the reading of the *Bunshū*.

<sup>674</sup> Here ends the quotation from Razan's *Zuihitsu*. It is a complete and correct quotation, but for the discrepancies mentioned in the preceding notes.

3 : 20ウ

界惟<sup>675</sup>識ノ所変ナルカ故、以ニオハ一念至切一ナルヲ、則萬法悉ク是レ無レ」  
不下ト云フ感動上。以ニテ近キ譬一曉レ汝。螺贏<sup>676</sup>取ニ菜蟲一ヲ造レ巢安レ之。」  
朝暮祝<sup>677</sup>レ之曰似我々々、以ニ其尾劍一刺レオハ之、則時」  
至テ化シテ為ニ螺贏一。是レ以テ可レ知。小蟲スラ尚誦ニシ似我ノ明一、以ニ」  
尾劍ノ印一祝<sup>678</sup>ニオハ菜蟲一ヲ則為ニルヲ螺贏一、況ンヤ是人ハ者万物靈ナル」  
<sup>ヲヤ</sup>也。一念一心射レ之斬レ之、豈ヤ三其ノ無ニ其驗一也。又林」  
氏カ引ニ王莽高駢カ先ツ死来殺一スト云フヲ者、欲レテナリ謂レント妄ニ説也ト丁侯」  
襄子病愈己死一スト云フヲ也、吾又云ニ嗚呼愚哉』

3 : 21オ

林氏隨筆<sup>679</sup>ニ曰、國常立尊、一曰天御中主尊。古」  
人口訣ニ云、八百万神ハ即一神、一神ハ即八百万」  
神也。今按万物生レ自ニ五行一、五行即一陰陽也、陰」  
陽即太極也也、太極本は無極也也。於レ是此ノ尊之」  
奥義可ニシト以見一矣<sup>680</sup>。余見ニ林氏カ此ノ説一、本ニ日本紀一立ニ天」  
神七代一ヲ。汝為ニ博古〈智〉之人一、為レ甚不レ因ニ馬子ノ旧事」  
紀一。又不レ用ニ太子旧事紀ノ<sup>681</sup>、而因ニ日本紀一立レルヤ之乎。」  
余難レ之如ニキハ馬子太子旧事紀一ノ者、最モ始ニ立ニテ天帝〈常

<sup>675</sup> This is a writing error. It is reduplicated in Ise Bunko *bon*, but the compound 惟識 is not attested. The Buddhist term intended here must be 唯識.

<sup>676</sup> The character used in our manuscript is Mor. X: 33913, which is not in the font. As it is an *itaiji* of Mor. X: 33685, we have replaced it here and at the following occasions with this character.

<sup>677</sup> This character will be a mistake for 呪 / 咒. Cf. *infra*, note 678.

<sup>678</sup> Chōon's probable source for this story is the 17th-century collection of short, didactic stories and anecdotes, generally followed by a poem, entitled *Renshū ryōzai* 連集良材 (1 vol.; printed Kan'ei 8 [1631]; ID 8264). The story, with an appropriate Buddhist application, is told on pp. 20b-21a. Here the character 呪 (*norou*: "to cast a spell, to bewitch") is used, and not 祝 (*iwau*: "to celebrate"), which makes better sense. We will emend accordingly.

<sup>679</sup> The quotation is from *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 69: *Zuihitsu* 5; see *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 419a.

<sup>680</sup> End of quotation. It is a complete and correct quotation.

<sup>681</sup> The *okurigana* is unmistakably *no*, but *no* neither fits the context nor the grammar. We will emend it to *wo*. N.B. Ise Bunko *bon* does not have any *okurigana* at this point.

歟』 682』

3 : 2 1 ウ

立ノ尊一ヲ、次ニ安ニク<sup>クニ</sup>地<sup>683</sup>常立ノ尊一。即是天地相応之理也也。」

然ルニ置ニテ天常立ノ尊一ヲ、立ニルノ国常立ノ尊一ヲ之理、不相應ノ論也」

也。惣テ天神七代ノ神ノ各、日本紀ハ者悉ク以テ乱雜シテ而」

不ニ分明一。太子ノ旧事紀ハ者天神七代ノ之出生道」

《大成経ハ理明」日本紀ハ難レ證トシ》

理明白ニシテ悉ク以テ有レ傳。日本紀ハ者、只有ニ天神七代ノ」

名一ノミ無レ傳。不レル足レ證レトスルニ之ヲ書也也。太子ノ旧事紀秘ニ在ス神」

社一。故ニ至レテ今用ニ日本紀ノ説一ヲ也。幸ニ此ノ書出ニツ人間一。後」

學因レ之、須下ク究ニシテハ吾カ神道一ヲ可上ナル乎。又龍ノ尚舎謂ニテ国常』

3 : 2 2 オ

立ノ尊一ヲ為ニ自心一ト説ク。日本ノ神道混乱可レ見矣」

林氏隨筆<sup>684</sup>ニ曰、宗源ノ神道者、中臣卜部<sup>685</sup>習ニ傳之一。」

兩部習合ノ神道ハ者、最澄空海等ノ之沙門等ヲ、以ニ」

佛法一ヲ合ニセ神道一、以ニ胎藏金剛ノ兩界一、合ニテ於陰陽一ニ、遂」

以テ為ニ神佛本地一體一。吁々本迹縁起神道ハ者、」

某ノ社某ノ神古來傳來ノ之縁起有レ之。<sup>686</sup>謂ニ之ヲ三部」

神道一ヲ。此ノ上別ニ有ニル理當心地一者ナリ。人多不レスト能レ知之<sup>687</sup>。」

夫レ因ニ太子ノ旧事紀一論ヲハ、則三部ノ神道トハ者、一ニハ曰ク宗』

682 The two characters 常 and 歟 (abbreviated) are written in red to the left side of the character 帝. To the right of 帝 is a dot in red, to indicate that 帝 is a mistake. 歟 will indicate that the writer is not quite sure of his emendation. However, Ise Bunko *bon* also has 常. We will emend accordingly.

683 *Taisei-kyō* 1 is the only *locus* where the character 地 is used to refer to the second of the Heavenly Gods.

684 The quotation is from *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 69: *Zuihitsu* 5; see *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 419.

685 *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 419a, inserts the characters 忌部 (Inbe) at this point.

686 *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 419b, inserts the character 右 at this point.

687 Here ends the quotation. Apart from the two discrepancies mentioned in the preceding notes, it is a complete and correct quotation.

3 : 2 2 ウ

源、二ニハ曰齊元、三ニハ曰靈宗。此ノ宗源神道ト部家ノ  
所レ傳也。齊元神道ハ忌部家ノ所レ傳也。靈宗神道ハ  
吾道ノ家所レ傳也。雖レ然忌部吾道ノ二家今衰微シテ」  
不レ見。独有ニテト部一存ス。謂ニ之ヲ吉田一<sup>688</sup>ト者也。三部ノ祖神ハ」  
者天ノ物梁命在ニ河内ノ平岡ノ社一ニ。天ノ太玉ノ命在ニ畔」  
輪ノ々々社一ニ。天ノ恩<sup>689</sup>兼命在ル信濃ノ戸隱ノ社ノ傍一者也。」  
《説法明眼論朕字之評》

林氏隨筆曰、厩戸皇子<sup>690</sup>明眼論<sup>691</sup>、南天ノ祖師示レ」  
朕曰<sup>692</sup>。林氏皇子謗ニ朕一字一曰<sup>693</sup>秦ノ始皇帝制シテ曰天』  
(3 : 2 3 才)

子自稱シテ謂レ朕<sup>694</sup>。然<sup>695</sup>ハ則厩戸自レ謂朕、與ニ漢ノ王莽カ朕カ」  
弟少子封一ト一般ニシテ、而竟ニ致ニスト篡乱ノ事一<sup>696</sup>。余辨レン之。王莽ハ」  
者家臣也。厩戸ハ者太子也也。推古天皇再三讓ニレトモ」  
王位一而不レ受レ之。柄ニテ攝政權一ヲ平ニ治天下一。特ニ朕ノ字」  
上古ハ者上下貴賤共ニ稱レルヲヤ朕哉。林氏厩戸嫌ニ弘」  
樂佛法一ヲ。以ニ此一字一欲レ罪ニト厩戸一。々々皇子始和地」

<sup>688</sup> The *kaeriten* undoubtedly reads 'ニ', but that must be a mistake for '一'. We have emended accordingly.

<sup>689</sup> Although the character in our text is 恩, and in *Taisei-kyō*, edn ZST, fasc. 9, we find one instance of a god whose name is written with this character, the parallel passage in in *Taisei-kyō*, edn 1679, 9:9b, replaces it by 思. The god, thus, is Ama no Omoikane no Mikoto 天思兼命. We will emend accordingly.

<sup>690</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 361b, inserts the characters 説法 at this point.

<sup>691</sup> *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 361b, inserts the character 云 at this point.

<sup>692</sup> Here ends the first part of the quotation; see *Zuihitsu 2 (Razan Rin-sensei bunshū 66)*; *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 361b. Razan quoted *Seppō myōgen ron* correctly, but for the final character; here the printed texts of *Seppō myōgen ron* that we consulted, have 云, not 曰.

<sup>693</sup> The following is loosely based on the same entry in the *Zuihitsu* as the preceding quotation (*Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 361); it is not a direct quotation.

<sup>694</sup> The preceding renders the following text of Razan's *Bunshū* (*Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 361a): 「博士議曰天子自稱曰朕制曰可」。It is based on *Shiji 6: Qin Shihuang benji* (vol. 1, p.236).

<sup>695</sup> The *kaeriten* 一 should have been placed between 謂 and 朕, not after 自.

<sup>696</sup> Here ends the second part of the quotation / paraphrase. The preceding renders *Bunshū* vol. 2, p. 361b: 「漢王莽遂以為孟侯朕弟小子封及朕復子明辟之語、乃此周公居攝稱王之謂也。是以竟致篡亂之事」。See Translation, note 714, for a translation.

訓漢字天、為ニ文ノ字ノ造化一。至レ今汝等蒙ニ其恩疵一、漸」  
知ニテ儒道一、還テ句々言々為レ詆ニ訾之一。汝豈ヤレ不ニ逢蒙一ニ』

(3 : 2 3 ウ)

哉今有ニ儒士一以三伏犧蒼頡製ニスルヲ卦字一、後世儒士」  
蒙ニリ其ノ因<sup>697</sup>光一通ニ儒理一。誹ニ謗セハ之レ為レ可乎、為ニ不可一ト乎。」  
汝以恩報怨<sup>698</sup>者也」

林氏隨筆ニ曰、六韜者周ノ文武與ニ太公望一相問」

對シテ以論レ兵。其實ハ則偽作也也。但其内有下古語一」

兩句三四句<sup>マ、</sup>上。間在ニ其書一者是亦有レ所レ擇乎。若シクハ」

軍器ノ之屬有下所レ攻者所レ守者戰ニ于野一ニ者上、備ニ于」

風雨一ニ者具ニ于海陸川隍一者、言レフ之詳也矣。然トモ宜ニ於』

(3 : 2 4 オ)

昔一ニ、不レル宜ニ於今一者、有下用ニ於彼ノ地一、不可レ用ニ於此ノ地一」

者上。須シ下ク知ニリ其理一通中ス其變上ニ而可也也。不スト可ニ膠レ柱鼓レ瑟」

也<sup>699</sup>。嗚呼林氏ハ何人ソヤ哉。效ニテ宋儒ノ素問ヲ云ニニ偽作一ト、而」

謂ニ六韜偽作一ト、謂ニ先代旧事本紀偽作一ト。只其ノ書之」

中自不レシテ好マ、而有レ下レハ所レ悪ム者、不レ辨ニ邪正一ヲ、不レ分ニ是非一、」

恣ニ説テ為ニ偽作一為ニ妄説一。只非ニ之口ニ談一スルノミニシテ、筆ニ之ヲ書一以遺ニ

シテ」

于世、生ニス後學ノ疑惑一罪無レ大レ之矣。夫レ六韜者、太」

公望ノ實書也也。即出ニ其ノ證一ヲ。史記<sup>700</sup>ニ張良少シ時於ニ下』

<sup>697</sup> Ise Bunko *bon* has the character 恩 instead of 因. Evidently, 恩 is the correct character. We will emend accordingly.

<sup>698</sup> No doubt, the reverse will have been intended: 以怨報恩. We will emend and translate accordingly.

<sup>699</sup> The preceding is a complete and correct quotation of a complete entry in *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 70: *Zuihitsu* 6; see *Bunshū* vol. 2, pp. 433b-434a.

<sup>700</sup> For Zhang Liang's biography, see *Shiji* 55: *Shijia* 25 (vol. 6, pp. 2034-2035); cf. also *Jinja-kō bengi*, Translation, note 426. Chōon's rendering, however, is based on the version of *Shiji* as it appeared in *Shibashi lue* 十八史略 ("Eighteen Histories, abridged"), 2: 「良少時、於下邳圯上、遇老人、衣褐、墮履

(3 : 2 4 ウ)

邳<sup>ヒ</sup>圯<sup>イ</sup>上<sup>一</sup>ニ<sup>二</sup>遇<sup>三</sup>老人<sup>四</sup>墮<sup>ニ</sup>ス<sup>ニ</sup>履<sup>ヲ</sup>圯<sup>下</sup>ニ<sup>一</sup>謂<sup>良</sup>曰<sup>孫</sup>701子<sup>下</sup>テ<sup>取</sup>レ

履、良欲<sup>欲</sup>702<sup>レ</sup>毆<sup>タ</sup>ン703。後五日與<sup>レ</sup>我<sup>期</sup>ニ<sup>於</sup>此<sup>一</sup>、良如<sup>レ</sup>期<sup>往</sup>。」

老人已<sup>ニ</sup>先<sup>ニ</sup>在<sup>リ</sup>、怒曰與<sup>ニ</sup>長<sup>者</sup>一<sup>期</sup>後<sup>ノ</sup>何<sup>ソ</sup>ヤ也。後約<sup>ニ</sup>五<sup>日</sup>一<sup>ニ</sup>

及<sup>レ</sup>往<sup>ク</sup>ニ<sup>老</sup>人<sup>又</sup>先<sup>ニ</sup>在<sup>リ</sup>。怒<sup>テ</sup>復<sup>約</sup>ニ<sup>五</sup>日<sup>一</sup>ト。良半<sup>夜</sup>往<sup>ク</sup>。老

人<sup>至</sup>テ<sup>乃</sup>喜。授<sup>以</sup>ニ<sup>一</sup>編<sup>書</sup>一<sup>ヲ</sup>曰、讀<sup>レ</sup>此<sup>可</sup>レ<sup>為</sup>ニ<sup>帝</sup>者<sup>師</sup>一。」

異<sup>日</sup>見<sup>ニ</sup>濟<sup>北</sup>穀<sup>城</sup>山<sup>下</sup>一<sup>ニ</sup>、黃<sup>石</sup>ハ<sup>即</sup>我<sup>也</sup>。且<sup>704</sup>視<sup>レ</sup>ル<sup>ニ</sup>之<sup>」</sup>

乃<sup>太</sup>公<sup>望</sup>兵<sup>法</sup>也。良<sup>異</sup>レ<sup>ト</sup>ス<sup>之</sup>晝<sup>夜</sup>習<sup>讀</sup>シ<sup>テ</sup>既<sup>ニ</sup>佐<sup>705</sup>タ<sup>リ</sup>。以<sup>レ</sup>是<sup>」</sup>

見<sup>レ</sup>之<sup>、</sup>黃<sup>石</sup>公<sup>授</sup>ニ<sup>張</sup>良<sup>一</sup>書<sup>ハ</sup>者<sup>太</sup>公<sup>望</sup>ノ<sup>六</sup>韜<sup>也</sup>余<sup>』</sup>

(3 : 2 5 オ)

壯<sup>年</sup>之<sup>時</sup>讀<sup>ニ</sup>七<sup>書</sup>一<sup>。痛</sup>嘆<sup>不</sup>レ<sup>少</sup>。大<sup>唐</sup>七<sup>書</sup>ノ<sup>編</sup>者<sup>」</sup>

不<sup>レ</sup>具<sup>レ</sup>眼<sup>而</sup>編<sup>レ</sup>之<sup>次</sup>第<sup>雜</sup>乱<sup>ス</sup>。所<sup>以</sup>如<sup>何</sup>レ<sup>ハ</sup>、六<sup>韜</sup>ハ<sup>周</sup>

世<sup>ノ</sup>之<sup>書</sup>。太<sup>公</sup>望<sup>ハ</sup>者<sup>賢</sup>人<sup>也</sup>也。然<sup>ル</sup>ニ<sup>戰</sup>國<sup>ノ</sup>孫<sup>子</sup>吳<sup>子</sup>」

安<sup>706</sup>最<sup>初</sup>一<sup>、</sup>而<sup>置</sup>ニ<sup>六</sup>韜<sup>ヲ</sup>於<sup>後</sup>六<sup>一</sup>ニ<sup>義</sup>以<sup>レ</sup>似<sup>レ</sup>不<sup>レ</sup>安<sup>也</sup>。余<sup>」</sup>

圯下、謂良曰：『孺子、下取履！』良欲毆之。憫其老、乃下取履。老人以足受之曰：『孺子可教。後五日與我期於此。』良如期往。老人已先在、怒曰：『與長者期、後、何也？』復約五日、及往、老人又先在、怒復約五日、良半夜往。老人至乃喜授以一編書、曰：『讀此可爲帝者師。異日見濟北・穀城山下黃石、即我也。』且視之、乃太公兵法。良異之、晝夜習讀。既佐上定天下。」 . Cf. the translation in Sawyer, *The Seven Military Classics of Ancient China*, p. 282.

701 Our manuscript writes 孫 ("grandson"), but that will be a mistake for the character 孺 (C. *ru*; J. *ju*), used in both *Shiji* and *Shibashi lüe*, and in Ise Bunko *bon*. We will emend and translate accordingly.

702 The reduplication of the character 欲 evidently is a mistake of our manuscript. We will delete it in the *Yomikudashi*.

703 *Shiji* and *Shibashi lüe* have the character 毆, not 歐. The first is evidently correct, and also fits the *furigana utan*. We have emended accordingly.

704 *Shiji* and *Shibashi lüe* (but not Ise Bunko *bon*) have 且日 instead of 且. We will emend and translate accordingly.

705 The character in the text is a recognized *itaiji* of this character 佐; it is not in the font. In view of the *okurigana*, the intended reading will be *tasuketari*. It is unclear why the last four characters of the text in *Shibashi lüe* (cf. *supra*, note 700) have been left out. They explain to what purpose Zhang Liang put his studies.

706 The character 安 could be interpreted as a particle, in which case it should be read as *izukunzo*. In that case, however, it could not have *saisho* as its object, and the function of the *kaeriten* '一' would become obscure. The alternative would be to interpret 安 as a *oku* as we have done *supra*, 2:16a line 5, 2:16b, line 6, 3:14a, line 3 (安置), 3:20b, line 2, and 3:21b, line 1. In view of the character 置 used in parallel position in the next clause, we prefer this interpretation. The next character 安, however, must be interpreted

想ッ於ニ七書ノ之中一、説ニテ兵道一合ニハ聖道一ニ無レ為レ過ニ此書一。」  
為レ甚林氏言ニフヤ之偽作一ト哉。太公望者出ニ周世一教ニ」  
武王一誅ニシ桀王一ヲ、張良者讀ニ此ノ書一ヲ、出ニ漢世一訓ニ高祖一ヲ」  
滅ニ項羽一。太公張良為ニタリ帝者師一。孫子吳子輩出ニ』

(3 : 25ウ)

戰國一、漸為ニ一國師一。其徳功不レ可ニ同レ日論一也」

扶桑護佛神論卷之下終

正徳四星纏甲午秋八月上浣日