



## SINO-JAPANESE STUDIES

Volume 19 (2012), Article 2

<http://chinajapan.org/articles/19/2>

Fogel, Joshua A. “On Saeki Arikiyo’s Monumental Study of the ‘Treatise on the People of Wa’” *Sino-Japanese Studies* 19 (2012), article 2.

**Abstract:** Saeki Ariyiko was one of the world’s premier historians of ancient Japanese and East Asian history. His knowledge of texts and his ability to use them in creative ways and thus bring antiquity to life were virtually unmatched. One of his last works was a reading of the single most commented upon text in Sino-Japanese historical and cultural relations, the Treatise on the People of Wa in the Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei (known in Japan as *Gishi Wajinden*). Saeki’s book, entitled *Gishi Wajingden o yomu* 魏志倭人伝を読む (Reading the Treatise on the People of Wa in the Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei), appeared in two volumes (over 450 pages in total) and was published by Yoshikawa kōbunkan in 2000. To give a flavor of the work, I offer a translation of the introductions to each of the volumes.

## On Saeki Arikiyo's Monumental Study of the "Treatise on the People of Wa"

Joshua A. Fogel

Saeki Ariyiko 佐伯有清 (1925-2005) was one of the world's premier historians of ancient Japanese and East Asian history. His knowledge of texts and his ability to use them in creative ways and thus bring antiquity to life were virtually unmatched. Although I never had the honor to study with or even meet him, I have long been an admirer of his scholarship both for his approach and product. One of his last works was a detailed, explanatory reading of the single most commented upon text in Sino-Japanese historical and cultural relations, the Treatise on the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei* (known in Japan as *Gishi Wajinden* 魏志倭人伝, although this is slightly different from its original Chinese title).

Saeki's book, entitled *Gishi Wajinden o yomu* 魏志倭人伝を読む (Reading the Treatise on the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei*), appeared in two volumes (over 450 pages in total) and was published by Yoshikawa kōbunkan in 2000. Translating it in full would take an enormous amount of time and research, based as the work is in so many ancient Chinese and Japanese texts and with references as well to Korea, Viêt Nam, and numerous other ethnic groups in early East Asian history. To give a flavor of the work, though, I offer a translation below of the introductions to each of the volumes. Each is preceded by the subtitle of that individual volume.

Readers will note Saeki's palpable anger at an unnamed "scholar" (the use of scare quotes throughout clearly meant to cast doubt on using that term for this person) with whom he strongly (to say the least) disagrees on the historical value of the standard Chinese histories. If anyone happens to know who this person is, please let me know. Many thanks in advance.

\* \* \*

"The Road to the State of Yamatai" 邪馬台国への道  
Introduction (vol. 1)

Recently, a "scholar" loudly announced that the "Treatise on the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei* is of no value as a historical document." The assumption behind such a remark is to emphasize that the "level of the standard Chinese histories is low." As proof for this assertion that the "level of the standard Chinese histories is low," a certain "scholar of East Asian history" offered a passage in the Treatise on Japan in the *Ming shi* 明史 (Ming history), and he then claimed that the standard Chinese histories were lacking in reliability.

The passage in question described the career of Toyotomi Hideyoshi 豊臣秀吉 as background for recording Hideyoshi's moving an army of invasion into Korea and his two wars of invasion of the Bunroku 文禄 and the Keichō 慶長 eras (in Korean: Imjin Waeran 壬辰倭亂 and Chōng'yu Waeran 丁酉倭亂). This passage in the text reads as follows: "In antiquity Japan had a king. Beneath him the one who is more honored is called a *kanpaku* 關白. At this time the one who held this [position] was Nobunaga 信長 who was chief of Yamashiro 山城 Province. On one occasion he went hunting and

happened upon a man sleeping beneath a tree. Startled, the man rose to his feet and ran at him. He was seized, rebuked, and then said that he was Taira Hideyoshi 平秀吉, the servant of a man from Satsuma 薩摩 Province. He was courageous, strong, fleet of foot, and nimble, and he was also well spoken. Nobunaga liked him and made him responsible for his horse, dubbing him Kinoshita 木下 [man beneath the tree].” Nobunaga was subsequently murdered by Akechi Mitsuhide 明智光秀, and Hideyoshi conquered sixty-six provinces, seized control of the regime, and he “invaded China and sought to destroy Korea.”

This man offers this as proof that the standard Chinese histories were lacking in reliability; that is, from the Treatise on Japan in the *Ming shi* all the way back to the Treatise on the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei* compiled some 1,500 years earlier, he concludes that the latter has no value as a historical document.

Compilation of the *Ming shi* including the Treatise on Japan began in 1679 (the eighteenth year of the reign of Emperor Kangxi 康熙 of the Qing dynasty in China) and was completed in 1739 (the fourth year of the reign of Emperor Qianlong 乾隆). The Bunroku invasion (Imjin Waeran) took place in 1592 (the twentieth year of the Wanli 萬曆 Emperor’s reign in the Ming), while the Keichō invasion (Chōng’yu Waeran) began in 1597 (the twenty-fifth year of the Wanli reign). Calculating from the start of the compilation of the *Ming shi*, the two invasions took place over eighty years earlier. When it came to the work of compiling this standard history, all sorts of historical materials were used, and the depictions of Hideyoshi’s career under no circumstances indicate a low level of the standard Chinese histories. The *Ming shi* is of great value even among the standard histories as a whole.

We find a similar account in the section on Japan in the fourth fascicle of the *Liangchao pingrang lu* 兩朝平攘錄 (Record of pacifying the realm over two reigns): “When he was young, Hideyoshi was of humble station. He did not know the whereabouts of his own father. His mother was working as a servant when she became pregnant. She planned to abandon him after she gave birth. She had a change of heart and did not carry out the abandonment. When he grew up, he became brave and fleet of foot. Having no occupation, he initially dealt in fish. Once when drunk he fell asleep beneath a tree. Nobunaga had gone out hunting. [Hide]yoshi was startled, jumped to his feet, and ran at him. Although he [Nobunaga] was going to kill him, because [Hide]yoshi was well spoken, he [Nobunaga] did not. He had him care for his horse and named him Kinoshita.”

The story that the place where Toyotomi Hideyoshi first met Oda Nobunaga was beneath a tree, and that he thus took the surname Kinoshita, circulated in Japan as well. Probably the tales of Hideyoshi’s career as seen in the Treatise on Japan in the *Ming shi* and before that in the section on Japan in the *Liangchao pingrang lu* came from Japan, or perhaps they spread from Korea to China. In the Treatise on Korea in the *Ming shi*, we read: “In the eleventh [lunar] month of [Wanli] 19, a report to the throne stated that the Japanese chief [Woqiu 倭酋], the *kanpaku* Taira Hideyoshi announced that in the third month of the following year he would be coming to attack. An edict was sent to the Ministry of War ordering it to get to work on maritime defenses. Taira Hideyoshi was from Satsuma Province, and he initially was a follower of the Japanese *kanpaku* Nobunaga. It happened on one occasion that Nobunaga was murdered by one of his

subordinates. Hideyoshi came to take control over Nobunaga's troops, gave himself the title of *kanpaku*, and brought about the surrender of sixty-six provinces." This account of Hideyoshi's career, too, accords with that of the *Ming shi*.

As a work by Chinese, the *Liangchao pingrang lu* of Zhuge Yuansheng 諸葛元聲, written in Wanli 34 (1606), is a highly regarded work for its ability to grasp the gist of the situation at hand. Although it contains errors based on hearsay among the less important details, as concerns the two Japanese invasions, his descriptions capture the significance of these events quite accurately. Hideyoshi died in the eighth month of Wanli 26 (1598), and the *Liangchao pingrang lu* was completed a mere eight years after his death.

The tale about Hideyoshi that the "sun brought about his conception" was already circulating in Wenlu 2 (1593) while Hideyoshi was alive. This legend was Hideyoshi's own concoction to astonish foreign states. The legend of his "surname Kinoshita" was also perhaps a rumor that spread quickly while Hideyoshi was still alive. It clearly made its way to Korea and China.

Needless to say, such stories about Hideyoshi's career and especially his birth did not convey facts. Nonetheless, the accounts in the Treatise on Japan in the *Ming shi* explaining that Nobunaga was treacherously murdered by his subordinate Akechi Mitsuhide and that Hideyoshi destroyed Akechi and went on to seize the realm were by no means absurd; in their general outlines, they did convey the historical facts.

It would be unreasonable to look solely at just one report in Hideyoshi's life beginning with his birth and then boast about the low level of China's standard histories. To go from there and claim this about the Treatise on the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei*, no one would consent.

This "scholar" argued that, compared to the Treatise on the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei*, the *Kojiki* 古事記 (Record of ancient matters) and the *Nihon shoki* 日本書紀 (Chronicles of Japan) are full to the brim with content that richly stirs up human relations.

Although this all strikes me at a glance as a sound statement, in fact to compare the three fascicles of the *Kojiki* and the thirty fascicles that comprise the *Nihon shoki* with the mere total of 2,008 characters of the Treatise on the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei*, itself within the massive sixty-five fascicles of the *Sanguo zhi* 三國志 (Chronicle of the Three Kingdoms), and to argue that the two Japanese texts describe "human activities and thoughts" but the Chinese text says nothing of the sort is an utterly irrational argument. To claim that, in comparison with the *Kojiki* and *Nihon shoki*, the Treatise on the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei* is "of no value as a historical document" is downright absurd.

To show his contempt for the Treatise on the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei*, he offers the phrase *jingmian wenshen* 黥面文身 (tattoo their faces and bodies) from it as one piece of evidence and claims casually that this derives from accounts of south China. However, we can point to many such references to facial and body tattooing in the *Kojiki* and *Nihon shoki* which this "scholar" so reveres: "Kume no mikoto's tattooed eye" (*Kume no mikoto no sakeru tome* 久米命の黥ける利目) and the story of the "old man with the tattooed face" (*omo sakeru rōjin* 面黥ける老人) (both in the *Kojiki*), and "have the keepers of the birds tattoo their faces" (*omote o kizamite*

*torikaibe* 面を黥みて鳥養部としたまう) and “tattoos of the keepers of horses” (*imakaibe no mesakinokizu* 飼部の黥) (both in the *Nihon shoki*). Despite this sort of corroborating evidence in the *Kojiki* and *Nihon shoki*, he ignores it and heaps scorn on the Treatise on the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei*, a statement which has to have been done purposefully.

The point this “scholar” stresses that “a critical approach to historical documents is imperative” is a basic attitude which all scholars of history should follow. It goes without saying that scholars before us and our contemporaries have approached the Treatise on the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei* with this very attitude, because “text criticism” is simply to be taken for granted in historical research. Far from the “Treatise on the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei* being of no value as a historical document,” in exploring the history of ancient Japan of the second and third centuries, the Treatise on the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei* constitutes historical materials of the first order.

Mr. Ōiwa Yoshiaki 大岩由明 of the editorial staff of Yoshikawa kōbunkan Publishers issued a written appeal to me: “Transcribe into Japanese the original sections of the Chinese classics—*Han shu* 漢書 (Former Han history), *Hou Han shu* 後漢書 (Later Han history), *Jiu Tang shu* 舊唐書 (Old Tang history), *Liang shu* 梁書 (History of the Liang), *Han yuan* 翰苑 (Garden of writing), and the like—concerning Wa, adding explanations.... Please describe the historical background from a historiographical perspective based in documents, and use the basic documents for the state of Wa. My entire book was written in accordance with this request.

Among the extraordinary writings that have preceded me in explication of the Treatise of the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei*, I should name the following: Kan Masatomo 菅政友, “Kanseki Wajin kō” 漢籍倭人考 (On the people of Wa in Chinese sources), *Shigakkai zasshi* 史學會雜誌 3.27 (February 1892), 3.28 (March 1892), 3.29 (April 1892), 3.33 (August 1892), 3.34 (September 1892), 3.36 (November 1892), later including with portions not published in this journal in his *Kan Masatomo zenshū* 菅政友全集 (Complete writings of Kan Masatomo) (Tokyo: Kokusho kankōkai, 1907); Naka Michiyo 那珂通世, “Gishi Wajinden” 魏志倭人傳 (The Treatise of the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei*) (the precise time that Naka penned this annotation of the text is unclear, but I surmise that it was after 1894 and before 1897; it first appeared in Naka Michiyo hakase kōseki kinenkai 那珂通世遺書功績紀念會 [Commemorative committee for the accomplishments of Dr. Naka Michiyo], *Naka Michiyo isho* 那珂通世遺書 [The posthumous writings of Naka Michiyo] [Tokyo: Dai Nihon tosho, 1915]), later one part of *Naka Michiyo isho* was published as *Gaikō ekishi* 外交繹史 (Explanatory history of foreign contacts) (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1958); Ise Sentarō 伊瀬仙太郎 and Higashi Ichio 東一夫, “Gishi Wajinden seisetsu” 魏志倭人傳精說 (A refined thesis on the Treatise of the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei*), in Yamazaki Hiroshi 山崎宏, ed., *Tōyō shijō no kodai Nihon: Gishi Wajinden seisetsu* 東洋史上の古代日本: 魏志倭人傳精說 (Ancient Japan in East Asian history: A refined thesis on the Treatise of the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei*) (Tokyo: Shimizu shoten, 1948); Kasai Wajin 笠井倭人, “Chukai” 注解 (Explication), in Mishina Shōei 三品彰英, ed., *Yamataikoku kenkyū sōran* 邪馬台国研

究総覧 (Survey of studies on the state of Yamatai) (Osaka: Sōgensha, 1970); Sugimoto Kenji 杉本憲司 and Mori Hiromichi 森博道, “*Gishi Wajinden o tsūdoku suru*” 「魏志」倭人伝を通読する (Reading through the Treatise of the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei*), in Mori Kōichi 森浩一, ed., *Wajin no tōjō* 倭人の登場 (The emergence of the people of Wa), vol. 1 of series *Nihon no kodai* 日本の古代 (Japanese antiquity) (Tokyo: Chūō kōronsha, 1985); Mizuno Yū 水野祐, *Hyōshaku Gishi Wajinden* 評釈魏志倭人伝 (Commentary on the Treatise on the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei*) (Tokyo: Yūzankaku shuppan, 1987); and Miki Tarō 三木太郎, “*Gishi Wajinden*” 「魏志」倭人伝 (Treatise of the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei*), in *Yamataikoku kenkyū jiten I: bunken shiryō* 邪馬台国研究事典、I : 文献資料 (Reference work of studies of the Yamatai state, vol. 1: documents and historical materials) (Tokyo: Shin jinbutsu ōraisha, 1988), among others.

In addition to all these annotations and commentaries on the Treatise of the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei* of earlier scholars, I would like to refer readers to the second volume of this work in which I have an appendix (pp. 207-20), “List of Works for Reference,” listing many studies. Given the nature of this work, I have not given each and every name of the authors of these works in the main body, but let me thank them all profoundly here.

My book is in two volumes. I take examples of words taken from the Chinese classics and histories and used in the Treatise of the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei*, and I then offer a new explanation to terms such as *shiyi* 使譯. I also look, for example, at the nature of *xi* 檄 and several examples of *gaoyu* 告諭 that accompanied them, in an effort to explain what these *xi* that the Wei dynasty presented to the state of Wa were. The work can also serve as a dictionary to read about the state of Yamatai and the state of Wa in the second and third centuries. Thus, for specific issues in which readers are particularly interested or items deemed necessary, they can easily be looked up by means of the sub-headings given in the table of contents. If this work is useful even a small amount to people concerned with issues of Yamatai and Wa, then as the author I will be more than overjoyed.

February 2000

\* \* \*

“Himiko and Civil Disturbance in Wa” 卑弥呼と倭国内乱  
Introduction (vol. 2)

In the introduction to volume 1 of this work, I mentioned that recently a “scholar” had appeared who loudly claimed that the “Treatise on the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei* was of no value as a historical document.”

As one piece of evidence, he based this argument of an article by a certain “scholar of East Asian history” who had noted that the accounts concerning Japan in the standard Chinese histories were “all but useless for us Japanese” and gave “as an example of such” the Treatise on Japan in the *Ming shi*. Namely, this “scholar of East Asian history” translated the original text of the Treatise on Japan in the *Ming shi* as follows:

Originally, Japan had a king, and the most important person below him was a man called the *kanpaku*. At this time, the *kanpaku* was Nobunaga of Yamashiro Province. One day while he was out hunting, there was a guy sleeping beneath a tree. [The man] was surprised and jumped to his feet; he was caught and questioned. He said he was Taira Hideyoshi and that he was the servant of a man from Satsuma Province. As he was nimble and spoken well, Nobunaga was pleased by him and had him take care of his horse. He had him named Kinoshita.... Nobunaga had a staff officer named Akechi (阿奇支 [C. Aqizhi]) who had committed an infraction, and Nobunaga ordered Hideyoshi to lead an army and attack him. However, suddenly Nobunaga was murdered by his subordinate Akechi (明智). Hideyoshi had just then attacked and destroyed Akechi. When he heard of the calamity, he [Hideyoshi] together with Commander Yukinaga 行長 returned with their troops, building on the momentum from their victory, and annihilated Akechi.

He then comments: “Such a bizarre history is unimaginable.” And, on this basis, he extends his criticism from this entry in the Treatise on Japan in the standard Chinese history, the *Ming shi*, all the way back to the Treatise of the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei*, concluding:

The *Ming shi* was completed in 1735, and the *Sanguo zhi* in 285. Given the level of errors in the political information on Japan conveyed in the Treatise on Japan of the *Ming shi*, as for the Treatise of the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei*, compiled nearly 1,500 years earlier at a time when Japan’s great influence on Chinese history was not at all as strong, there was no one with a rational spirit who could faithfully convey the internal conditions of Japan in the third century. Thus, I would like to warn anyone who would trust the Treatise of the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei* and on its basis attempt an analysis of the state of Yamatai that such would be extremely dangerous.

The “scholar” who emphasized on the basis of the foregoing that the “Treatise on the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei* was of no value as a historical document” went on to state:

This is the state of knowledge of Japanese history as concerns Nobunaga and Hideyoshi in the ‘standard histories’ which was written down in China some 150 years afterward.... The sensibility of the Chinese who think of themselves as the center of everything and relegate their neighbors to the east, west, south, and north as eastern barbarians (*dongyi* 東夷), western barbarians (*xirong* 西戎), southern barbarians (*nanman* 南蠻), and northern barbarians (*beidi* 北狄) is such that in every instance it considers those accounts of their neighbors to be inaccurate. In addition, the Treatise on the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei* was written some 1,500 years before the aforementioned Treatise on Japan in the *Ming shi*.

He even went so far as to state that the “Treatise on the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei* is the ruins of history” and thus criticizes it as being of no value.

By claiming that, because the Treatise on Japan in the *Ming shi* has misinformation concerning Nobunaga and Hideyoshi, and that this is an indication that the *Ming shi* is “utter nonsense,” you can’t then go all the way back and state that the Treatise on the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei* is an unreliable work.

In fact, the *Ming shi* enjoys the following sort of reputation everywhere: “in an excellent class within the standard histories,” “a superb compilation within the standard histories,” and “an outstanding standard history.” Focusing solely on the misinformation concerning Nobunaga and Hideyoshi in the Treatise on Japan and then making the exaggerated claim that “Chinese historical works are utter nonsense” is simply not acceptable in the world of scholarship.

I have already addressed in the introduction to the first volume what is actually written in the entry concerning Nobunaga and Hideyoshi in the Treatise on Japan in the *Ming shi* and won’t repeat that here. That entry, though, does not appear for the first time in the *Ming shi*. In the fourth fascicle of the *Liangchao pingrang lu* by Zhuge Yuansheng, we find:

At that time, the ruler of the land was named Hata 秦 and he made Taira Nobunaga the *kanpaku*. Nobunaga magisterially managed his subordinates. He made Hideyoshi an adopted son. At birth, Hideyoshi was of humble station. He did not know the whereabouts of his own father. His mother was working as a servant when she became pregnant. She planned to abandon him after she gave birth. She had a change of heart and did not carry out the abandonment. When he grew up, he became brave and fleet of foot. Having no occupation, he initially dealt in fish. Once when drunk he fell asleep beneath a tree. Nobunaga had gone out hunting. [Hide]yoshi was startled, jumped to his feet, and ran at him. Although he [Nobunaga] was going to kill him, because [Hide]yoshi was well spoken, he [Nobunaga] did not. He had him care for his horse and named him Kinoshita. Hideyoshi enjoyed climbing up tall trees; people called him *jiyajing* 猻精 [see below].... He was made commander of Settsu 摂津. Now, there was a man on the staff named Akechi who had committed an infraction toward Nobunaga. [Hide]yoshi was ordered to bring troops under his command, [attack him suddenly], and kill him. When it was already too late, Nobunaga was murdered by his lieutenant. Hideyoshi then attacked Akechi. Hearing this news, then, Lieutenant Yukinaga and others took advantage of their victories, raised troops, and killed Akechi. This all took place in Wanli 14 [1586].

This story of the lineage concerning Hideyoshi is effectively the same at that of the Treatise on Japan in the *Ming shi*.

The spots at which the Treatise on Japan in the *Ming shi* mention “sleeping beneath a tree,” being “startled, the man rose to his feet and ran at him,” and Nobunaga “had a staff officer named Akechi (阿奇支) who had committed an infraction” are the same as in the *Liangchao pingrang lu*. Similarly, where the Treatise on Japan in the *Ming shi* is extremely similar to the *Liangchao pingrang lu* where the former mentions:

Nobunaga “had him care for his horse and named him Kinoshita”; “made commander of Settsu”; “[Hide]yoshi was ordered to bring troops under his command, and kill” Akechi; “Hideyoshi set to attack and destroy Akechi”; and “hearing the news, Lieutenant Yukinaga and others seized the momentum from their victories, returned with his troops, and destroyed” Akechi.

Zhuge Yuansheng was from Kuaiji 會稽, Zhejiang Province, and in the woodblock edition of his *Liangchao pingrang lu* there is a preface dated Wanli 34 (1606, corresponding to Keichō 11). That year was only eight years after the death of Hideyoshi in 1598 (Keichō 3, Wanli 26). Another work, entitled *Wubei zhi* 武備志 (Treatise on military preparedness) by Mao Yuanyi 茅元儀 (1590-1640?) of the Ming era, contains an “investigation of Japan” (日本考) in fascicle 230, the eighth fascicle under a section entitled “four barbarians.” It reads in part:

The man called king in Japan passed from one named Minamoto 源 to Tachibana 橘 to Taira 平 and on to Hata. Thereupon, the Fuji[wara] 藤氏 dubbed the man who took control of government *kanpaku*, and for the first time the court named Nobunaga *kanpaku*. He magisterially managed his subordinates. There was one named Hideyoshi. He was of humble station at birth, brave, fleet of foot, and well spoken. He dealt in fish. Once when drunk he fell asleep beneath a tree. Nobunaga had gone out hunting. His horse was startled, and he tried to kill him. He talked his way out of trouble. [Nobunaga] supported and adopted him [Hideyoshi].

Where this text refers to “magisterially manag[ing] his subordinates,” “[o]nce when drunk he fell asleep beneath a tree,” and “Nobunaga had gone out hunting,” the *Wubei zhi* uses exactly the same language as the *Liangchao pingrang lu*, and similar materials on the careers of Nobunaga and Hideyoshi would indicate that these were on hand for historiographical officials in the late Ming. The Treatise on Japan in the *Ming shi* or the Treatise on Japan in the *Ming shi gao* 明史稿 (Draft history of the Ming), compiled by Wang Hongxu 王鴻緒 (1645-1723) of the Qing, which was completed before the official standard history and served as a reference work for the *Ming shi*, adopted one of the extant sources conveying the careers of Nobunaga and Hideyoshi. To rebuke the compiler of the *Ming shi* for incompetence, sneer at the “utter nonsense of Chinese historical writings,” and then go all the way back and show contempt for the value of the Treatise on the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei* has to be deemed erroneous.

In this connection, let us take a look at the character *jia* 猯 which appears in the aforementioned citation from the *Liangchao pingrang lu*: “Hideyoshi enjoyed climbing up tall trees; people called him *jiating*.” The *Liangchao pingrang lu* which is excerpted in Matsushita Kenrin’s 松下見林 (1637-1703) *Ishō Nihonden* 異稱日本傳 (Treatises on Japan under foreign titles) cites this term and adds a *katakana* reading of *inoko* (wild boar). Of course, *inoko* is written with the graph 猪 (猪). However, if we explain *jia* as a wild boar in the phrase “Hideyoshi enjoyed climbing up tall trees; people called him *jiating*,” then it completely contradicts the common sense of liking to “climb trees” [that is, boars do not commonly climb trees, let alone enjoy such a behavior]. In the twelfth

fascicle of Gan Bao's 干寶 [d. 336] *Sou shen ji* 搜神記 (Records of searching for the supernatural), we find a tale about an animal called a *jiaguo* 狻國 which is similar to a *hou* 猴 (*yuan* 猿) or a *juehou* 獼猴 that inhabits the high mountains in the southwestern part of Shu 蜀 (Sichuan Province)—[all meaning monkey or ape]. It thus becomes clear from this story that *jia* is meant to convey the idea of a “monkey.” If indeed *jia* bears such a meaning, then the line of the text, “Hideyoshi enjoyed climbing up tall trees,” would make sense. Hideyoshi's *yixing* 異形 (fantastic qualities) and *shicao* 仕草 (his behavior) might be found expressed here: “if he looks like a monkey, he's a person, and if he looks like a person, he's a monkey.... He would fetch a chestnut with the skin on it and give it to you. He would peel off the skin with his mouth and eat it. His mouth was just like that of a monkey” (Tsuchiya Tomosada 土屋知貞 [late sixteenth, early seventeenth century], *Taikō sujō ki* 太閤素生記 [Record of Hideyoshi's lineage]). And, imitating his facial expression, “his features resembled those of a monkey” (Oze Hoan 小瀬甫庵 [1564-1640], *Taikō ki* 太閤記 [Records of Hideyoshi]). In one of the satirical poems critical of Hideyoshi which were posted in the capital [Kyoto] in the second lunar month of Tenshō 19 (1591), while Hideyoshi was still alive, we find him referred to as: “the monkey *kanpaku* under the tree.” Thus, even in his lifetime, Hideyoshi was sarcastically called “the monkey *kanpaku*,” and his regime accordingly criticized.

As for Hideyoshi's lineage and origins, an assortment of stories was transmitted to Korea and China from early on. Some of them even made their way into the standard history, the Treatise on Japan of the *Ming shi*.

The “scholar of East Asian history” in question who considered “the great Yamatai state and its mysterious female sovereign Himiko” “phantoms concocted by Chinese household circumstances of the third century” describes Himiko in the following manner:

Somewhere on the Japanese archipelago there was an old sorceress whom the Chinese called Himiko. She lived in a place called Yamatai. These are undoubtedly facts. Using the religious authority of Himiko, the Chinese selected her as representative of the people of Wa, and without a doubt they had her play the role of China's honorary consul-general. However, from the perspective of her contemporaries in Wa, what level of royal authority did female sovereign Himiko truly have? This is incomprehensible from a reading of the Treatise on the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei*.

Such an image of Himiko is only natural given the perspective of this advocate of the view of “those history books written by sly Chinese.”

Was Himiko actually a name that the Chinese gave her? Was Himiko really an “old sorceress” at first who became a female sovereign? Is it indeed true that the Chinese selected Himiko to serve as representative of the people of Wa? Is it completely impossible to determine “what level of royal authority female sovereign Himiko truly had?” Are not those who think about “the great Yamatai state” among scholars? The image of Himiko and the perspective on the state of Yamatai of this “scholar of East Asian history” outlined here seem utterly warped.

This volume continues the previous one, going from the “birth of Himiko, female sovereign of Wa” to “from female sovereign Himiko to Iyo.” As we read the latter part of the Treatise on the People of Wa in the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Wei*, I hope to bring to the fore just what sort of female sovereign Himiko by means of commentary on segments of the text. We start with a prologue entitled “Changing Images of Himiko,” and then commence the text proper.

As with the previous volume, this one makes considerable reference use of previous studies. I have chosen, by the nature of this work, not to name each and every author, but I refer interested readers to the bibliography at the end of this volume. Let me then express my gratitude here to earlier and contemporary scholars alike.

February 2000