Re-Examining Japanese Mythologies:

Why the *Nihon Shoki* has two books of myths but the *Kojiki* only one[1]

ヴィットカンプ　ローベルト F.

WITTKAMP, Robert F.

Initially, the so-called "Japanese myths" were a textual product of the *Kojiki* (712) and the *Nihon shoki* (720). In the course of the centuries, these myths were altered, re-written, supplemented, and later eventually exploited to serve Japanese nationalism. As a result, even today in using the word "Japanese myths" many people think of the *Kojiki* as the official mythology and of Amaterasu Ōmikami as the genuine ancestor god of the imperial family. The creation of this image as a monotonously uniform mythology is the result of various developments and ideologies, but comparative mythology bears part of the responsibility as well.

However, since the late 1960s Japanese scholars have conducted a close reading of the mythical narratives contained in the first book of the *Kojiki* and in the two initial books of the *Nihon shoki*, respectively. This has revealed distinct differences between the two corpora, dispelling the image of a homogeneous mythology. These text-oriented approaches can offer a viable answer to the thorny question of why there are two books of myths in the *Nihon shoki* whereas the *Kojiki* has only one. This paper will elucidate some of the reasons for the plurality and variability of Japanese myths as well as why it took so long to give a convincing answer to that question.

キーワード：古事記・日本書紀神話（myths in *Kojiki* and *Nihon shoki*）、比較神話論（comparative mythology）、古事記神話の研究史（history of research on *Kojiki* myths）、構想（conceptualization）、上代史（pre-Heian history）

---

[1] This article is based on a presentation given at École Française d'Extrême-Orient/Italian School of East Asian Studies（EFEO/ISEAS, Kyōto, May 27, 2019）, which in turn was based on the book *Arbeit am Text –Zur postmodernen Erforschung der Kojiki-Mythen* （Wittkamp 2018）. Please note that the present paper provides only the most relevant sources.

In his influential book *Imperial Politics and Symbolics in Ancient Japan – The Tenmu Dynasty* (2009), Herman Ooms writes about Kōnoshi Takamitsu that his "interpretation constitutes a radical break with a centuries-old hermeneutics guided by the unquestioned aim to clarify 'the' Japanese mythology, thought to be retrievable as a single-strand ideology from a number of versions, some contradictory, others almost repetitious" (2009: 29). Torquil Duthie, the author of *Man'yōshū and the Imperial Imagination in Early Japan*, confirms this assessment:

> Most recent scholarship both in Japanese and in English reflects the post-Kōnoshi understanding that there was never a single mythohistory of the imperial lineage. (2014: 275)

The central objective of these books is not an examination of Japanese myths per se. Moreover, Kōnoshi's theories did not meet with universal approval.[2] Although his name usually appears in connection with Japanese myths and mythology, an inspection of the bibliographies in his later works concerning Japanese comparative mythology shows that representative names such as Oka Masao 岡 正雄 (1898–1982), Ōbayashi Taryō 大林太良 (1929–2001), Matsumae Takeshi 松前 健 (1922–2002), or Matsumura Takeo 松村武雄 (1883–1969) are missing. Seen from this perspective, Ooms' assessment of Kōnoshi as marking a "radical break with a centuries-old hermeneutics" might lack persuasiveness, and today, even Duthie's term "post-Kōnoshi" requires a closer look. This situation necessitates an overview of the history of research on Japanese myths,[3] with the aim of understanding why the answer to the question posed in the title is found in recent research after Kōnoshi.

Research on Japanese myths

Motoori Norinaga 本居宣長 (1730–1801) established the foundation of philological *Kojiki* research by providing the text written exclusively in Chinese characters with transliterations,

---

2) Ooms writes that Kōnoshi's "rigorous hermeneutics, however, keeps him from venturing beyond the texts, out of what he calls a refusal 'to read what one wants to read in them'" (2009: 32–33).

3) The overview follows Wittkamp 2018: 29–36. The three-volume *Kojiki no kenkyūshi* ('History of *Kojiki* research') published in 1999 by the Kojiki Gakkai is more detailed but does not take into account developments from after around 1995, which are of particular relevance to the present paper.

explanations, and commentaries. Although his quest for the *furukoto* 古言, the ancient words which he thought to be the true Japanese language representing the pristine Japanese identity, was ultimately not successful, his research perfectly fitted the demands of Japanese ideologies. The myths were utilized, exploited, and altered in the service of Japanese nationalism. Today, the 44 books of Motoori's *Kojiki-den* 古事記傳 （1798） form the basis for contemporary *Kojiki* research.

    While Japanese scholars at the end of the 19th century based their *Kojiki* research on Motoori's works, modern *Kojiki* research is primarily inspired by Basil Hall Chamberlain's （1850‒1935）*Kojiki* translation from 1883. In a detailed introduction, he claims that some of the historical facts in the *Kojiki* and *Nihon shoki* are questionable while certain elements of Japanese myths, even whole narratives, independently exist in other parts of the world as well. Six years later, Iida Nagao 飯田永夫 （1854‒1918） translated the introduction into Japanese and provided it with headnotes in which he and six other Japanese scholars discuss Chamberlain's claims.[4] Of course, Chamberlain's theories did not meet with general approval, and some were rejected.

    The Japanese discussion of Chamberlain's work, which Michael Wachutka described as "reziproke Interpretationskritik"（2018: 295, 302）, was an important step, and other developments followed. In 1904, Takagi Toshio 高木敏雄(1876‒1922) introduced the methodology of comparative mythology into Japanese research with his book *Hikaku shinwa-gaku* 比較神話学. Takagi graduated from Tōkyō Teikoku University, where he had studied German language and literature with his teacher Karl Florenz （1865‒1939）. Florenz himself was a scholar of Japanese literature and myths, who not only published a substantial history of Japanese literature but translated and annotated the Japanese myths of the *Kojiki*, *Nihon shoki*, *Sendai kuji hongi* 先代旧事本紀, and *Kogo shūi* 古語拾遺 as well.[5]

    4） Iida's translation and the discussion were published as *Nihon jōkoshi hyōron: genmei eiyaku Kojiki* 日本上古史評論：言名英訳古事記; cf. Saigō 1984: 299‒300. Iida had already published an article to introduce Chamberlain's translation in September of the same year （1883）; cf. Wachutka 2018: 294. Wachutka discusses Iida's translation and introduces the six scholars （pp. 297‒299）, on whom see Wachutka 2012, passim （in English）.

    5） His two books on Japanese myths are *Japanische Mythologie* （1901） and *Die historischen Quellen der Shinto-Religion*（1919）, both republished in 2014. His *Geschichte der japanischen Litteratur* was published in 1906; for Florenz' life and work, see Satō 1995.

The works of Chamberlain, Florenz, and others on comparative mythology, such as *Das Zeitalter des Sonnengottes* (1904) by Leo Frobenius (1873-1938), prove that modern research on Japanese myths began as a fruitful international project, which nevertheless lacked sustainability. Although scholars such as Oka Masao and Ōbayashi Taryō spent many years in Europe and were closely involved in international research, the mainstream of Japanese research on the *Kojiki* myths developed not as an international but rather as an interdisciplinary program comprising comparative mythology, folklore studies, ethnology, historiography, and, of course, literary studies.[6] The labelling of this stage of research as "modern," which distinctly differs from *pre*-Chamberlain *Kojiki* research, inevitably means re-labelling previous research as "pre-modern."

According to Terakawa Machio, in the early 1960s, Ōta Yoshimaro 太田善麿 (1918-1997) claimed that the *Kojiki* and *Nihon shoki* are different works with different contents and should therefore be examined separately.[7] As seen above, interdisciplinarity was the main characteristic of "modern" research on Japanese myths. Furthermore, these modern approaches had in common that they treated the two chronicles as a source of materials to explore the realities outside of or underlying the texts.[8] This resulted in the idea that Japanese myths conveyed a "single mythohistory" or a "single-strand ideology," even though it has now been established that they had international origins. Differences between several texts or within one text were either ignored or explained away as being due to different lines or phases of transmission.

In the later 1960s, Saigō Nobutsuna 西郷信綱 (1916-2008) turned decidedly away from the

---

6) The remarks on comparative research on Japanese myths in Wittkamp (2018) are based mostly on the works by Oka and Ōbayashi; see Ōbayashi 1990 and 1994 (12 papers by Oka edited by Ōbayashi).

7) Cf. Terakawa 2006: 157, 2009: 171. Terakawa refers to Ōta Yoshimaro's four-volume contribution *Kodai Nihon bungei shichō-ron* 古代日本文芸思潮論 published in 1961-1966, specifically vol. 2 (1962) and 3 (1964).

8) The term 'chronicles' is used here for the sake of convenience to refer to both works. The *Nihon shoki* books Nos. 3 to 30 are written in the style of Chinese annals (*biannian ti* 編年体, Japanese: *hennentai*), on which see Wilkinson 2015: 612-620. The *Kojiki*, on the other hand, does not follow a chronological order but rather a spatial one, naming the Courts where the rulers lived. Of course, the order of the rulers is genealogical, but the three books of the *Kojiki* make no distinction between 'myth' and 'history.' The first two books of the *Nihon shoki*, however, which have the original title 'Shindai' 神代 ("Age of the Gods", usually called: 'Kamiyo'), while showing the same pattern, shift to the Chinese annalistic style from the time of Jinmu Tennō onwards.

methods of comparative mythology, historiography, and folklore studies, which he compared to dissecting a corpse or peeling away the layers of an onion.[9] He further used the metaphor of *zōsui* 雑炊, literally "rice gruel",[10] to characterize the single-strand mythology. In an attempt to read the *Kojiki* myths as mythical language once again,[11] he established the foundation for the approach later termed *sakuhin-ron* 作品論. This method understands a literary work such as the *Kojiki* as a single coherent and self-contained unit to be differentiated from other works. *Sakuhin-ron*, which is similar to New Criticism in its close reading of the text, can be translated as text-immanence-based analysis. Its best-known proponent is Kōnoshi Takamitsu.

Since Saigō and other scholars tried to refute "modern" approaches, their works may be collectively described as postmodern *Kojiki* research.[12] However, it should be noted that the sakuhin-ron approach seems to have exhausted its possibilities, since recent scholars are no longer willing to comply with Kōnoshi's rigid demands to focus exclusively on the text and to refrain from including any extra-textual evidence in their analyses.[13] As a result, more recent research adopts a wider perspective, for example, incorporating approaches such as theories of gradual textual genesis and development once more.[14] It is crucial to appreciate that post-Kōnoshi scholarship attempts to rebut *sakuhin-ron* without falling back on conventional "modern" approaches. Many concepts established by *sakuhin-ron*, such as textual differences, plurality, and self-containment, were adopted. These considerations and the focus on the text explain why both *sakuhin-ron* and the approaches to abolishing *sakuhin-ron* may be described as text-oriented or postmodern research.

Kōnoshi labelled the idea of a single unique mythology as '*hitotsu no shinwa*' *to iu paradaimu*

---

9) Cf. Saigō 1984: 300–301.

10) Cf. Saigō 1984: 230 and Kōnoshi 1983: 260.

11) Cf. Saigō 1967 (latest edition 2015).

12) For a self-description as 'postmodern'(*posutomodan*) see Saijō 2005: 4–5.

13) Cf. Terakawa 2009: 14–17; for a summary of critical remarks on Kōnoshi's works, see Wittkamp 2018: 64–70, who also shows that even critical works such as Saijō 2005 nevertheless rely on *sakuhinron*.

14) In Kōnoshi's view, these methods, which he summarizes as *ikkei-teki hatten-dankairon-teki* 一系的発展段階論的 (gradual development on a simple trajectory), are responsible for the "rice gruel (*zōsui*)" called *Kiki shinwa*, cf. Kōnoshi 2013: 73 and 2008: 17 ("rice gruel"). Kōnoshi locates the beginnings of these methods in Tsuda Sōkichi's work, *Shindaishi no atarashii kenkū* 神代史の新しい研究 from 1931; cf. Wittkamp 2018: 19. A new approach to text genesis is Saijō 2005. Mizoguchi (2016: 103–104) presents a model in four steps to show the developing textual history of the *Kojiki*.

（〈一つの神話〉というパラダイム）or "the paradigm of a single Japanese mythology" (2013: 138, 208), and by so doing automatically implied a paradigm shift. However, the development of text-immanence-based *Kojiki* research was not a paradigm shift because the old paradigm, the independent existence of the so-called Japanese myths elsewhere, was neither rejected nor replaced.

According to Saigō, the new development represented a turn (*tenkan*). In the understanding of cultural studies, 'turn' signifies a new approach added to existing methods. Furthermore, it is not at all unusual for turns—such as *sakuhin-ron*—to have a tendency to ignore existing approaches, such as comparative mythology.[15] In contrast to this postmodern turn, "modern" research on the *Kojiki* caused a genuine paradigm shift because it ended the old world view of a pristine and unique Japanese mythology, which, as already mentioned, was nothing but a construct of Japanese ideology. Consequently, Ooms' assessment of Kōnoshi's works as "a radical break with a centuries-old hermeneutics" must be relativized. Duthie's "post-Kōnoshi", on the other hand, seems a preferable term for critical developments *after* Kōnoshi and is more suitable as a characterization of the new approaches after the 2ⁿᵈ millennium, which attempt to abolish Kōnoshi's *sakuhin-ron*. The following model summarizes the history of research on the *Kojiki* myths:

> **Premodern**: Motoori Norinaga and the *Kojiki-den*, providing the philological foundation
> **Modern**: Basil Hall Chamberlain's *Kojiki* translation from 1882: an international approach combined with interdisciplinarity (e.g. comparative mythology: Takagi Toshio; historiography: Tsuda Sōkichi 津田左右吉, 1873–1961, ethnology: Oka Masao)
> **Postmodern**: Saigō Nobutsuna's 'turn' and Kōnoshi Takamitsu's text-immanence-based analysis *and* text-oriented research, which endeavour to overcome the restrictions of Kōnoshi's *sakuhin-ron*

Premodern and postmodern approaches have close reading of the text in common, while modern approaches look for what is outside the text or underlies it.[16] The following model is

---

15) Saigō speaks of *hōhō no tenkan* 方法の転換 ("turn of methods") or *hōhōteki tenkan* 方法的転換 ("methodical turn"); cf. Saigō 1984: 302–302, and on turn in cultural studies, Bachmann-Medick 2006.

16) Postmodern *Kojiki* research usually starts with Motoori Norinaga's *Kojiki-den*, and premodern and

designed to schematize the complexity of the separate realms of *Kojiki* research. It shows the fields or 'layers,' on which the different approaches and disciplines tend to focus.[17] One has to keep in mind that every model is an extreme simplification of a complex reality and can thus function only as a heuristic tool. Furthermore, the following model contains keywords which, although not a focus of the present paper, are important for the understanding of the *Kojiki* and *Nihon shoki* chronicles:

1st layer（global, transregional）

◉old myths, elements of myths, mythical building blocks（Antoni 2012, "Bausteine"）originating outside of the Japanese archipelago

◉material mainly transmitted orally（including archaeological artefacts, linguistic and genetic data）

2nd layer（'Old Japanese,' transition from orality to literacy）

◉myths stemming from different parts of the outside world that continued（altered, enriched, abbreviated）to be told on the Japanese islands

◉new myths from the Korean Peninsula（most of them orally transmitted but, from the 7th century onward, also in written form）

◉Yamato's separation from the Chinese realm called 'Under Heaven'（*tianxia* 天下）and the building of a Japanese 'Under Heaven'（*ame no shita* 天下）

◉first written constitutions and narratives（*teiki, kyūji*）, which provided material for the composition of the chronicles *Kojiki* and *Nihon shoki*

3rd layer（written texts from the end of the 7th century onward）

◉rearranging and rewriting that led to the final versions of the two chronicles（political-ideological myths）

◉constructing of a polity based on a *ritsuryō* constitution（to address the underlying problem of creating a system of succession to the throne based on heredity within the imperial family）

---

postmodern are tightly connected. However, Motoori also looked for something（a language）underlying the text, which connects his work with modern research.

17）The model is based on suggestions by Matsumoto 2003: 73, 78–79 and Antoni 2012: 333. Both scholars provide a model consisting of two layers; cf. Wittkamp 2018: 36–49.

Historiography is interested in all three layers; comparative mythology was concerned with the first layer; while Kōnoshi's *sakuhin-ron*, particularly his later work, focused exclusively on the third layer. The second layer was more or less neglected in both comparative mythological and text-immanence-based analysis. This layer, particularly its historical and textual transition to the third layer, is the field that most recent works are concerned with.[18]

The two lines (or systems) of myth transmission

The question posed in the title of the present article has to be seen in the context of post-Kōnoshi research, which, as mentioned above, seeks to incorporate "modern" approaches to myth. To better understand the issue a summary of the present state of knowledge concerning the origins of Japanese myths is desirable. Of course, this knowledge has—in great part—already been uncovered by comparative mythology and ethnology. However, in the context of "modern" research, it was not deployed in the analysis of the texts in order to identify differences, but rather to show extratextual similarities.[19] As argued above, the first scholar explicitly suspicious of the uniqueness of Japanese myths was Chamberlain. Although his assumptions were rather vague and although scholars such as Florenz and Oka jumped to conclusions in several instances, research on the origins of Japanese myths became increasingly thorough and comprehensive in the 20th century. Today, it is common knowledge that there were two lines or systems of myth transmission, usually labelled as southern and northern.[20]

This knowledge is not restricted to specialists. For example, Miura Sukeyuki, who is one of the most radical critics of the concept of *Kiki shinwa* 記紀神話 (the myths of the *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki* understood as 'the' Japanese myths),[21] gave a four-part lecture on the *Kojiki* on

---

18) Aspects belonging to this liminal space between the second and the third layer have already been scrutinized in modern approaches. An example is *seiritsuron* 成立論, i.e. the question of how the texts gradually achieved their present form. Kōnoshi attributes *seiritsuron* to the historian Tsuda Sōkichi and uncompromisingly rejects this methodology; see Yamaguchi / Kōnoshi 2007: 434, Wittkamp 2018: 19–28.

19) Recent approaches consider genetic and linguistic aspects as well.

20) Besides Oka and Ōbayashi, some other names deserve to be mentioned here, such as Torii Ryūzō 鳥居龍蔵 (1870–1953), Matsumura Takeo, Matsumoto Nobuhiro 松本信廣 (1897–1981), and Mishina Shō'ei 三品彰英 (1902–1971); cf. Wittkamp 2018: 183. For Torii and Matsumura, see Saijō 2005: 71; and for Matsumoto (myths from the south) and Mishina (myths from Korea), see Hirafuji 2015.

21) See the section 'The spell named Kiki' (「記紀」という呪縛 '*Kiki' to iu jubaku*) in Miura 2013: 8–9 and p. 11, where he even speaks of "mind control" (*maindo konturōru*).

NHK education television （E-*tere*）. In the course of the program （broadcasted in September 2013）, he presented a chart of the so-called *Kojiki* worldview（*Kojiki no sekaikan* 古事記の世界観）. It consisted of a vertical worldview （*suichokuteki sekaikan* 垂直的世界観）and a horizontal worldview （*suiheiteki sekaikan* 水平的世界観）, representing the northern line and the southern line, respectively. Besides these two basic orientations, other characteristics listed by Miura were "patriarchal, *tennō*, and Yayoi" for the northern line versus "matriarchal, deities of the land （*kuni tsu kami* 国 つ 神), and Jōmon" for the southern system.[22] The vertical worldview presented in Miura's chart puts Takaama no Hara （"the high plains of heaven"）at the top, Ashihara no Naka tsu Kuni （"the central realm of reed plains"）in the middle, and Yomi no Kuni （"Land of Yellow Springs"）at the bottom.[23] Realms belonging to the horizontal world view are Tokoyo no Kuni, a mysterious world beyond the sea; Wata tsu Mi no Miya, the palace of the sea deity; and Ne no Katasu Kuni, the world to which Susa no Wo eventually retired and where Ohoanamuji was promoted to Ohokuninushi, Great Master of the Land.[24]

A map in Miura's book based on the NHK program depicts an area from East Asia to Australia and the Pacific Islands. Miura locates in this extended region the origins of some famous narratives belonging to the southern system, such as the accounts of Konohana Sakuyabime and Susa no Wo, the lost fishing hook （i.e. the famous story of the brothers Umisachi and Yamasachi), and the so-called "island pulling （fishing)"（*kuni-hiki* 國引）from the myths of the *Izumo Fudoki* 出雲風土記.[25] Miura estimates the arrival of these narratives within

---

22） The words 'line' and 'system' both refer to Japanese *kei* 系 as in *nanpōkei* 南方系 and *hoppōkei* 北方系, southern and northern line; for the chart see Miura 2016: 95.

23） The first two names follow the *Kojiki* translation by Heldt 2014: 7, 16, but his rendering of Yomo tsu Kuni with "the land of the Underworld" is not tenable, because the *Kojiki* does not present Yomo （Yomi）tsu Kuni as a subterranean world. Since Satō Masahide's 佐藤正英 influential article, 'Yomo tsu Kuni no arika' 黄泉国の在りか, published in *Gendai shisō* 現代思想 （September 1982), the question has been the subject of discussion. It is as if the *Kojiki* deliberately avoids revealing any exact information on its location; see Wittkamp 2018: 190–196.

24） Held translates Tokoyo no Kuni with "Everworld"（cf. Heldt 2014: 246）and Ne no Katasu Kuni with "the land that lies beneath the hard earth's roots"（p. 30). Here again, the suggestion of a subterranean world is questionable. Yamaguchi/Kōnoshi （2007: 54–55）explain *ne* 根, literary 'root,' as an expression for "far away;" cf. Wittkamp 2018: 201–204, with other sources.

25） Cf. Miura 2016: 107. Miura's localization of the origin of these myths, e.g. the island fishing on the Niue Island, seem to be too precise. Presumably, their origin is to be sought in a much larger area, since the path of their transmission to the Japanese islands is not yet clear.

the Jōmon period. Exact dates are unknown; nevertheless, these myths are probably old enough to be labelled as autochthonous or indigenous. In contrast, the history of the myths from the northern system on the Japanese islands is much more recent. Miura dates their origin to the Yayoi era, which lasted from about 500 BCE (or earlier) to about 300 CE, but evidence indicates that they were still being transmitted into the 5th century, a date which might be more relevant for the present paper.

The main items of the myths from the northern line in Old Japanese narratives are the existence of the heavenly realm Takaama no Hara (*Kojiki*), the descent of Ho no Ninigi[26] from Takaama no Hara related in the *tenson kōrin* myths (*tenson kōrin shinwa* 天孫降臨神話), and a military expedition by the descended ruler to the east (*tōsei* 東征). According to Mizoguchi Mutsuko, these narratives originally belonged together and formed one continuous story, which she calls *kenkoku densetsu* 建国伝説 or *kenkoku shinwa* 建国神話, the national foundation myth.[27] The *musuhi* gods mentioned in the two chronicles, particularly Takami Musuhi and Kamu Musuhi, are also typical of the northern line and were worshipped at the Yamato Court.[28]

Another significant aspect of these myths that needs to be addressed is the identity of those who transmitted them. The myths of the southern line presumably were told all over the Japanese archipelago for many centuries, but historical, political, and religious circumstances led to changes in the narrative told by the powerful groups within Yamato, the later political center of the Japanese Islands. According to Ōbayashi Taryō and other scholars, the transmitters of the

---

26) The abbreviation of the name Ame-nikishi Kuni-nikishi Ama tsu Hi-taka Hiko Ho no Ninigi no Mikoto 天邇岐志 國邇岐志 天津日高 日子 番 能 邇邇藝 命 is usually 'Ninigi.' However, it is important to include the element "Ho" 番 because it appears likely that this phonogram for *ho* was used deliberately to bring together *ho* 穂 ("rice ear"), as in Oshihomimi (Amaterasu's son), and *ho* 火 ("fire"), as well as in the names of the three generations after Ho no Ninigi, to blur differences between the narratives preferred by different groups; cf. Wittkamp 2018: 142, 171, 442.

27) See Mizoguchi 2016: 21. However, "for reasons of space" (ibid.) she deals exclusively with *tenson kōrin shinwa*; see also pp. 103–104, 130, etc. The concept of *kenkoku shinwa* can be traced back to Takagi Toshio's book, *Nihon kenkoku shinwa* 日本建国神話 from 1912.

28) The rituals at Court to worship the *musuhi* deities were called *tsukinami no matsuri* 月次祭 (literally 'monthly rituals'). They were among the most important rituals at Court and were conducted in the 6th and 12th month by the *tennō* personally (*tennō shinsai* 天皇親祭), presumably from the late 7th or early 8th century onwards; cf. Dettmer 2010: 5, 7, Ooms 2009: 106–108 (see also index p. 352), Mizoguchi 2016: 72–74, or Maruyama 2001: 187.

myths from the northern system were the imperial family, the priests at the Court, the "allochthons" from China and the Korean peninsula,[29] and the so-called *uji* 氏 groups ("clans") of the *muraji* 連 and *banzō* 伴造 (*tomo no miyatsuko*), i.e. groups that were bound directly to the imperial family in Yamato.[30]

The question of why it was so important for the imperial family to possess unique myths distinct from the ones of other *uji* groups, especially from those which circulated among the powerful families in the regions further away from Yamato, is a central theme of text-oriented *Kojiki* research. While different attempts were made to answer the question, all point to political circumstances during the transition from the era of kingdoms to a *ritsuryō* state based on a constitution. Several entries in the two chronicles and other sources confirm that at the end of the 7th century the Tenmu-Jitō dynasty was still dependent on the goodwill and approval of the *chihō gōzoku* 地方豪族. These powerful families, spread all over the country, were the main carriers of the myths belonging to the southern line.[31]

A new wave from the north ?

In 1948, the historian Egami Namio 江上波夫 (1906–2002) proposed his famous theory that a horse-riding nation or tribes from the Korean Peninsula conquered the Japanese Islands and built a kingdom (*kiba minzoku seifuku ōchō-setsu* 騎馬民族征服王朝説). Although the 'Horserider Theory' as a whole was rejected by many scholars, archeological findings in Japan

---

29) "Allochthons" comes from Ooms 2009: xviii, 43, 51, etc. (*shoban* 諸蕃). There was a lively discussion on the PMJS list in Summer 2019 concerning the translation of *ban*, but it seems that Ooms' proposal was passed over in silence. However, his translation appears to be appropriate, because the expression is strange enough to render the original concept, which must have had a similar effect of strangeness, without being disparaging. However, taking it as an antonym to autochthon would be misleading, and the risk of obscuring the hybrid character of the society remains, too.

30) Ōbayashi subdivides the myths into three groups: the Ame no Minakanushi group, the Kuni no Tokotachi group, and the Umashi Ashikabi Hikoji group, named after three deities. While the carriers of the latter two groups were the rice farmers and fishermen all over the country, the carriers of the Ame no Minakanushi group, which believed in a god in heaven (*ame*), were the predecessors of the imperial family and the priests around them; cf. Ōbayashi 1990: 18–41 (groups) and pp. 41–47 (carriers). See also Mizoguchi 2000: 82–84, 2016: 103–104.

31) See Kōnoshi 2013: 167 and the chapter 'Legitimierung und Ernennung'('legitimization and appointment') in Wittkamp 2018: 111–121.

indicate profound cultural changes occurring during the late 4th and 5th century.[32] Most evident are the "5 th-century keyhole tombs built on the Ōsaka plains" about which Gina L. Barnes writes that "starting in the mid- 5 th century, the tombs begin to yield horse-trappings; and in the 6 th century they become the main grave goods."[33] She explains that "horse gear is only one of the types of artifacts adopted from the Korean Peninsula in the 5 th century, which witnessed the migration of skilled craftspeople, scholars, and elites from the Peninsula" (ibid.). In addition, we can assume that these people brought not only artifacts and technical know-how with them but also stories and myths. The riddle of the sudden appearance of a horse culture now seems to have been solved. Historical evidence indicates that the Korean kingdom Baekje (Paekche; Japanese *Kudara*) asked Yamato for support against Goguryeo (Japanese *Kōkuri*) and sent horses together with trainers to the Japanese Islands to teach them horse keeping.[34]

Another scholar who pushed the theory of Japanese predecessors further is Mizoguchi Mutsuko.[35] Her research is of particular relevance for the present paper because she connects the evidence of archaeology and history with mythology. She begins the first chapter of her book *Amaterasu no tanjō—kodai ōken no genryū o saguru* ('The Birth of Amaterasu—In Search of the Origins of the Ancient Kingdom') by confirming the "striking similarities" between the *tenson kōrin* myths, which she, too, regards as the "kernel of the *Kiki* myths (the myths contained in *Kojiki* and *Nihon shoki*)," and the myths about the founders or ancestors (*shiso shinwa* 始祖神話) of the ancient state(s) of the Korean Peninsula. Referring to previous research, she points out that these latter myths were connected to those of the old horse-riding

32) According to Gina L. Barnes, it was W. Edwards who, in 1983, rejected Egami's "fanciful theory once and for all in English" (2007: 9). However, the conference talks collected by the editorial committee of the Kodaishi shinpojiumu "*hakken, kenshō: Nihon no kodai*" (2016 II) show that Egami's ideas are not entirely off the table as Japanese and Korean scholars continue to debate the issue of 'Horse Rider Culture and the Innovations in Ancient Times' (*Kiba bunka to kodai no inobēshon* 騎馬文化と古代のイノベーション). Egami's intriguing paper is included in the second volume (cf. pp. 10–60).

33) Cf. Barnes 2007: 9, 18.

34) Cf. Shiraishi 2016: 100. He gives an overview of the "horse culture" (*uma no bunka* 馬の文化) of the late 4th and early 5th centuries (pp. 88–101). According to him, horses did not exist on the Japanese islands before that time (p. 92).

35) Mizoguchi discusses her observations in Mizoguchi 1982, 2000, and other works. For the sake of convenience, in the present paper I refer mainly to Mizoguchi 2016 (2009, 1st ed.), whose introduction is based on previous works; see also Wittkamp 2018: 45, pp. 47–49, and pp. 451–468.

nomads from the "far grasslands of northern Eurasia." While there is much archaeological and historical evidence to support these similarities, Mizoguchi opines that the questions of the when and the why of the reception of Korean influences are rarely discussed adequately.[36]

Mizoguchi quotes the archaeologist Sawara Makoto 佐原真 (1932-2002), who also rejects Egami's 'Horserider Theory' but nevertheless confirms that "during this time, many people came from the outside (*toraijin* 渡来人)," and that "it is certain that the culture of horse riding tribes had arrived."[37] For these reasons, Mizoguchi widened the scope of her investigation of the Japanese myths and examined developments in northern China during the 4th and 5th centuries. This era, usually labelled as Wuhu Shiliuguo 五胡十六國, literally "Five Barbarians Sixteen Kingdoms" (Japanese *goko jūrokkoku*),[38] was identified by Mizoguchi (2016: 21-23) as having witnessed violent upheavals and migrations in Northeast Asia, which affected the Korean Peninsula and thus the Japanese Islands as well.[39] In this context, she attempts to explain the arrival of nomad myths from northeast Asia, particularly the narratives summarized under *kenkoku shinwa*.

The *tenson kōrin* myths

The *tenson kōrin* myths, the accounts of Ho no Ninigi's descent from heaven, are considered to be the central narratives of the Japanese myths of the two chronicles because they attempt

---

36) Cf. Mizoguchi 2016: 20. The deliberate use of the term *Kiki shinwa* in *post*-Kōnoshi *Kojiki* research has to be seen as disapproval of Kōnoshi's persistent objections to it. This is very evident in the title of Mizubayashi Takeshi's book, *Kiki shinwa to ōken no matsuri* ('*Kiki* myths and the kingdom rituals'). His introduction offers a criticism of Kōnoshi's theories; see Mizubayashi 2001: 3-37 (newly revised ed., original 1991) and Wittkamp 2018: 18-20. Kōnoshi's criticism of the term *Kiki shinwa* is a central part of almost all of his works since 1983; cf. Kōnoshi 1983: 259-279.

37) Sawara 1987, quoted after Mizoguchi 2016: 21.

38) Endymion Wilkinson explains "Sixteen Kingdoms" as "the conventional term for more than 23 mainly short-lived dynasties (and one long-lived one) established in different parts of North China, Sichuan, and Gansu between 304 and 439 (none of which was counted in the legitimate succession). [...] Collectively the non-Chinese peoples who founded states in the North at this time were known as the *wuhu* 五胡 (five barbarians)" (2015: 728). He lists 23 dynasties in a table (p. 729); "long-lived one" refers to the Bei-Wei 北魏 dynasty, which lasted from 386 to 534 (ibid.).

39) According to Shiraishi, Gogryeo was under great pressure from the Qianyuan 前燕 (Japanese *Sen'en*) dynasty, which was established by the Xianbei 鮮卑 (Japanese *Senpi*) nomads, one of the "Five Barbarians" and the founders of the Xianbei Empire; cf. Shiraishi 2016: 97.

to establish a legitimate hereditary line from the highest god at the top of the heavenly hierarchy to the imperial family on earth. The narrative with which we are familiar today is that contained in the *Kojiki*, which presents Amaterasu as the ancestor deity of the imperial family. But to this must be added the account of *Nihon shoki* which offers five different narratives: the main version of the ninth block and the alternative versions Nos. 1, 2, 4, and 6.[40] In this section, I will isolate and compare some core elements of the six accounts. In reading what follows, three facts have to be kept in mind. First, that the eleven blocks of the *Nihon shoki* myths are contained in two separate books, the primary topic of the present paper. Second, that its ninth block, containing the narratives of Ho no Ninigi's descent, is the opening chapter to the second book. And finally, that it is this ninth block in which Takami Musuhi appears for the first time in the main narrative.

But first a résumé of the storyline, including the developments leading to the descent. The following overview summarizes the *Kojiki* text, which differs from the *Nihon shoki* versions. As already mentioned, it is very likely that the account of the descent from heaven was originally part of a longer narrative, which Mizoguchi describes as nation foundation myths（*kenkoku shinwa*）. Some of the *Nihon shoki* versions contain fragments of accounts of a military expedition into the east, which can be summarized under the original term *kuni-magi* 覓國, the quest for the good land,[41] directly following Ho no Ninigi's arrival at Mount Takachiho. These fragments are absent in the *Kojiki* narrative. However, the actual narrative of this expedition in both chronicles is the tale of Jinmu's journey to the east, which marks the beginning of the second *Kojiki* book and of the third *Nihon shoki* book. The relevant episodes in the *Kojiki* text of Ho no Ninigi's descent from heaven are:

1. After the creation of the world Ashihara no Naka tsu Kuni（"earth"）is completed by Ohokuninushi, Amaterasu gives an order to her son Oshihomimi to descend and reign

---

40）The *Nihon shoki* myths consist of eleven blocks that together form the main version. Alternative versions, varying in number and length, intersperse them, but the blocks must be read as one coherent narrative. The alternative versions are written in conspicuously smaller characters inserted in two lines into the text. Eight alternative versions accompany the ninth block, containing the *tenson kōrin* myth, but only four of them tell of Ho no Ninigi's descent. In using the term "blocks" I follow Metevelis 1993: 386–387, who describes them as "main variants" and "variants."

41）Cf. Wittkamp 2018: 170–171, 456, 460.

over the earth（first command）.

2. Since Oshihomimi realizes that the earth is still in chaos, Amaterasu and Takami Musuhi dispatch a deity to subjugate the gods of the land, but that mission and a subsequent one fail.

3. A third mission is successful, and Ohokuninushi hands over the land to Takaama no Hara（"heaven"）together with the right to rule it.

4. Amaterasu and Takagi（＝Takami Musuhi）give another order to Oshihomimi to descend（second command）.

5. During the three missions, Oshihomimi fathers a son, Ho no Ninigi, and proposes to send him to earth instead of himself the proposal is immediately and tacitly accepted. Takagi is not mentioned thereafter.

6. Ho no Ninigi receives the order to descend and reign over the earth.

7. Amaterasu provides him with attendant deities, a mirror, jewels, a sword, and gives him instructions on how to worship her（the mirror）and another deity in Ise.

8. Ho no Ninigi and the accompanying deities descend to Mount Takachiho, the starting-point of the narratives of the first three generations on the earth ― but without the *kunimagi*, the quest for the good land.

The most significant aspect of the six tales as political myths concerns the deity（*kami* 神）who gave the command to descend（*shireishin* 指令神・司令神）, because the commanding god is considered to be the ancestor deity of the imperial family. The following table shows the presence of the commanding deities Amaterasu（At）and Takami Musuhi, alias Takagi（TM）, within the six narratives:

Table 1 : The commanding gods.

Kojiki (integration)	No.1	No.2	No.4	No.6	*Nihon shoki* (main version)	Receiver of the command
At	At	At	---	---	---	Oshihomimi
At＋TM	---	---	---	---	---	Oshihomimi（2nd command）
（At＋TM）	At	At	TM	TM	Takami Musuhi	Ho no Ninigi
At	---	---	---	---	（Takami Musuhi）	Ho no Ninigi's descent

The brackets around names indicate that the text contains no explicit information on them, though the narrative and grammatical contexts hint at the given names; concerning Ho no Ninigi's descent in the *Kojiki*, Amaterasu is the only acting god mentioned. Also, the symbol "---" indicates that the command itself does not appear.[42] Table 1 shows that the *Nihon shoki* main version and the alternative versions 4 and 6 present Takami Musuhi alone as the commanding god. In contrast, the alternative versions 1 and 2 have Amaterasu as the sole commanding deity. In the *Kojiki*, however, Amaterasu and Takagi (Takami Musuhi) act together, but the narrative gives more weight to Amaterasu. In this sense, the *Kojiki* narrative is distinctly closer to the alternative versions Nos. 1 and 2. This is corroborated by another fact: while the *Nihon shoki* main version (NSK) and the alternative versions Nos. 4 and 6 do not contain the two commands to Oshihomimi, the *Kojiki* contains the first command derived from alternative version Nos. 1 and 2.

The fact that only the *Kojiki* narrative contains the second order to Oshihomimi suggests that it might be the most recent of all the versions.[43] This assumption becomes more plausible when we examine a different element of the narratives, the *zuihanshin* 随伴神, i.e. the accompanying deities. Saijō Tsutomu divides them into two groups (*kei*): a) the "military expedition to the east group" (東征系 *tōsei-kei*) and b) the "rock cave group" (石屋戸系 *iwayado-kei*) who figure in the account of Amaterasu's hiding in the rock cave. They are found in the various versions as follows:

---

42) At the beginning of the ninth myth block main version, Amaterasu is mentioned shortly as the Grandmother of Ho no Ninigi, but she plays no role in the actions that follow.

43) Several elements and passages support the assumption that the *Kojiki* presents the most recent version of the myth; cf. Wittkamp 2018: 545 (index entry: '*Kojiki*-Mythen als jüngste Mythenfassung'). The second command presumably has to do with narratological needs. However, even Takagi (Takami Musuhi) acknowledges this god and the myths he represents, but one must not forget that this concerns the second command, which is less important in any case.

Table 2: The accompanying deities (*zuihanshin*) in *tenson kōrin* myths.

Kojiki (integration)	No.1	No.2	No.4	No.6	*NSK*	Accompanying deities *zuihanshin*
Ame no Oshihi Ama tsu Kume	---	---	Ama no Oshihi Ame Kushitsu no Ohokume	---	---	a) expedition to the east group *tōsei-kei*
Ame no Koya Futotama Ame no Uzume Ishikoridome Tama no Oya Tokoyo no Omohikane Tajikara Wo Ame no Ihatowake	Ama no Ko-yane Futotama Ama no Uzume Ishikoridome Tamanoya	Ama no Koyane Futotama *morobe no kami* 諸部神	---	---	---	b) rock cave group *iwayado-kei*

For b), the episode of Amaterasu's hiding in the rock cave, *Nihon shoki* main version (NSK) and alternative versions Nos. 4 and 6 do not provide the names of the accompanying deities. Only alternative version No. 4 gives two names, which are from the "rock cave group," and both of which are not mentioned in the other *Nihon shoki* texts. The *Kojiki* brings all the names together, which corroborates the hypothesis that it is a more recent version. A similar conclusion can be drawn from the different arrangements of the commanding gods. While there are two groups of narratives presenting either Amaterasu or Takami Musuhi as commanding deities, only in the *Kojiki* do they act together, although there is a noticeable emphasis on Amaterasu.

For these (and other) reasons Saijō (2005: 159) subdivides the six versions into three groups: 1) the "Amaterasu line" with alternative versions Nos. 1 and 2; 2) the "Takami Musuhi line" with the *Nihon shoki* main version and alternative versions Nos. 4 and 6; and 3) the *Kojiki*

version which forms its own system, referred to as "integration" (*tōgō* 統合). Incidentally, the latter's underlying unitary concept might also explain why the *Kojiki* is the only version containing the second command, which was issued by the two deities together.

Further analysis of other "elements" could potentially reveal additional information. It would, for example, be interesting to look at the elements connected to the Ise Shrine, which are contained only in the *Kojiki* and alternative version No. 1.[44] Focusing on the guiding question of this paper, the elements shown in tables 1 and 2 allow us to entertain Saijō Tsutomu's and Mizoguchi Mutsuko's theories. While the *Kojiki* attempts to bring the different story-lines together ("integration"), a feature also described as "continuity" (*renzokusei* 連続性; see below), the *Nihon shoki* main version draws a distinct line of separation between the account of Ho no Ninigi's descent from heaven and elements connected to the Amaterasu line, such as the names mentioned in the rock cave episode and Oshihomimi, Amaterasu's son.[45] Since the episode of Amaterasu's hiding in the rock cave is also an essential part of the myth, it is not surprising that it is also contained in the *Nihon shoki* main version (seventh block with 3 alternative versions). However, the *Nihon shoki* main version and the alternative versions Nos. 4 and 6 contain no names that would connect the two accounts. It is noteworthy that the *Kojiki* not only brings all the names together but furthermore adds another one, Ame no Iwato-wake, unique to that text. Both Yamaguchi and Kōnoshi regard the mention of this deity's name as "quite surprising," and assume that its "appearance has to do with the episode of the rock cave" (2007: 115), presumably because *iwato* means "rock cave."

The Amaterasu line and Takami Musuhi line

"Modern" research provided several analyses of different episodes, attempting to isolate

---

44) While in the *Kojiki* the account of the origin of the Ise Shrine is found in book 1, which contains the narratives considered today to be myths, the *Nihon shoki* main version separates the account of the origin from the first two books of myths (*shindai*); it is part of the historiographical books, which are written in the style of Chinese annals (*biannian ti*).

45) There are several attempts to answer the question of the need to present Ho no Ninigi as Takami Musuhi's grandson. According to Saijō (2005: 164), Tsukushi Nobuzane (1962, 'The birth of Amaterasu') connected the mythical account to the historical fact that Jitō put her grandson Obito (Monmu) on the throne. One could say that the myths are a kind of test case to legitimize Jitō's act. However, this idea was criticized by Saijō Tsutomu (ibid.) as a reflection of historical reality and opportunism; cf. Wittkamp 2018: 444–445.

their constituent elements. The ultimate aim was to reveal different lines of transmission, different steps（*dankai* 段階）of text genesis, or different "forms"（*kata*）that gradually led to their final shape in the two chronicles.[46] Tables 1 and 2 above are based on the analyses by Saijō Tsutomu and Mizoguchi Mutsuko.[47] Saijō's contribution was originally published in 1994, and although Mizoguchi（2000: 66-93）replied to him directly in his book of 2005, which includes the paper as Chapter 5, Saijō did not respond.[48]

Both scholars describe the two lines or systems as the Amaterasu line and Takami Musuhi line. Mizoguchi's substantial book, 'The Dual Structure of the Kingship Myths: Takami Musuhi and Amaterasu'（*Ōken shinwa no nigen kōzō—Takami Musuhi to Amaterasu*）, reveals in its subtitle that the "dual structure" refers to Takami Musuhi and Amaterasu.[49] The topics of the

---

46) A model that was extremely influential was introduced by Mishina Shōei. It distinguishes three "forms" （*kata* 型）: 1. only Takami Musuhi is the commanding deity, 2. Amaterasu and Takami Musuhi are the commanding deities, and 3. only Amaterasu is the commanding deity （Mishina 1943, quoted after Terakawa 2009: 22）. While these three forms correspond with the analysis conducted above, the problem is that Mishina assumed their gradual development in the order listed. Hence, alternative versions Nos. 1 and 2 would be the most recent versions. Terakawa, Saijō, and Mizoguchi reject this order. For them, Mishina's second form—the *Kojiki* narrative, not the text—is the most recent form; cf. Wittkamp 2018: 449-450.

47) Cf. Saijō 2005: 161 （original 1994）and Mizoguchi 2000: 68 （presenting Saijō's table）, pp. 72-73, or p. 76. For a detailed discussion, see Chapter 3.7 （'Die *tenson kōrin*-Mythen'）in Wittkamp 2018: 441-485.

48) This failure to respond to Mizoguchi is probably connected to the general problem that Japanese works in book form are usually not monographs but collections of published articles. They can bear witness to many years of commitment to a certain theme, and if published in a journal with a good academic reputation, the previous publication might to some extent guarantee the quality of the content. Of course, there are many exceptions, but it seems to be common practice to put the papers together without including new research or editing them in a way that avoids redundancy. As far as I can see, the exceptions to this academic practice are the *shinsho* format, i.e. books intended for a general audience that are usually based on long research and, in most cases, provide introductions （e.g. Mizoguchi 2016 and Miura 2013）; and introductory monographs （*kaki-oroshi* 書下ろし）, such as those provided by the "Shibundō kokubungaku kakioroshi shirīzu."

49) In her book, which only partially consists of previously published articles, Mizoguchi describes the period between the 5th and 7th century as "Yamato *ōken jidai* ヤマト王権時代"（2000: 1）. Her aim is to reveal the "thinking and culture"（ibid.）of that time, and in her later book（originally 2009）she describes Yamato *ōken jidai* as a time when "society without writing changed into a society with writings"（2016: 220）. The term *ōken*, to be distinguished from *chōtei* 朝廷, the Imperial Court （2000: 10）, is traced back by Saijō （2005: 4-5）to the 1960s, i.e. to works from Saigō Nobutsuna and other scholars who were influenced by works such as James G. Frazer's *The Magic Art and the Evolution of Kings*（*Ōken no jujutsuteki kigen* 王権の呪術 的起源）, Arthur Maurice Hocart's *Kingship*（*Ōken* 王権）and other works by cultural anthropologists.

sections of the first two chapters show that Mizoguchi follows this dual structure through the "creation myths"（創成神話 *sōsei shinwa*), the *tenson kōrin* myths, and the "myths of the two chronicles," to the question of the "highest gods"（*saikōshin* 最高神), who are the "ancestor deities of the imperial family"（*kōsoshin* 皇祖神). Concerning the northern line of the Japanese myths, she refers to previous scholars such as Egami Namio and Oka Masao but only to assert that her research is closer to the work of Ōbayashi Taryō.[50] The term "northern"（*hoppō* 北方) appears repeatedly in the introductory chapter, for example, in "starting from the Hun, the cultural and civilization area of the northern horse riding nomad people," and she mentions the "southern" line, too.[51] In a nutshell, it is very likely that her understanding of "Amaterasu line" and "Takami Musuhi line" corresponds to the theory of the myths of the southern and northern line.

Saijō Tsutomu's collection of papers（2005) is an attempt to establish a new field of research called *seisei-ron* 生成論 （"text genesis") intended to dissociate himself from Kōnoshi's *sakuhin-ron* （2005: 10). It is a good example of new research by a scholar trying to shed light on the transition from the second to the third layer and at the same time seeking to distance himself from Kōnoshi's *sakuhin-ron* while using methods typical of that approach.

In one footnote（and only there), he refers to Oka Masao, Mishina Shōei, and Ōbayashi Taryō to mention their theory that the *tenson kōrin* myths might be connected to narratives from the Korean Peninsula, but immediately casts doubt on this hypothesis.[52] He also briefly mentions the "myths of the northern line,"[53] but in chapter five, which was originally published in 1994 and which analyzes the elements of the *tenson kōrin* myths, the possibility of influence of myths from the northern line is completely excluded from his examination. The exclusion has to be seen as deliberate. In his original article, this issue was of minor importance because he was bent on proposing a different theory. He saw connections to Chinese thinking, particularly to *tenmei shisō* 天命思想, the idea of a mandate from heaven given to a person of virtue （*yūtokusha* 有徳者), which can be taken away （*yixing geming* 易姓革命, Japanese: *ekisei*

50）Cf. Mizoguchi 2000: 10 and concerning Ōbayashi 2000: 188 and p. 199.

51）Cf. Mizoguchi 2000: 3, 185, 269, 294 etc.

52）Cf. Saijō 2005: 190, footnote 2.

53）Cf. Saijō 2005: 72 with reference to the papers by Torii Ryūzō （1925) and Matsumura Takeo already mentioned. Chapter 3 was originally published in 1995.

kakumin）if the rulership fails.[54] Saijō regards the *tenson kōrin* myths as an attempt to synchronize Chinese thinking with the actual needs of the imperial family to legitimize a line of rulership based on heredity. The rulership of the family, particularly as it is related in the *Kojiki*, could thus be justified as an eternal mandate from heaven, which could not be taken away because it had been granted by the highest gods in heaven to the imperial family and was meant to be passed on by succession.[55] This is an intriguing idea warranting further inquiry.[56] However, it is disappointing that Saijō did not consider Mizoguchi's model of the dual structure mentioned above.

Final remarks and observations on the *Kojiki* text

The reasons why the compilers of the two chronicles rearranged the myths in different forms need to be examined further. However, there is no doubt that the account of Amaterasu's hiding in the rock cave and the *tenson kōrin* myth are either deliberately connected（*Kojiki*）or deliberately kept apart （*Nihon shoki* main version）. Concerning this fact, Saijō and Mizoguchi agree,[57] even if their interpretations of it are totally different.

The present paper has offered observations on the different texts themselves as well as the scholarly research on them （observation of the second order）. One consideration which both Saijō and Mizoguchi have overlooked calls for a final comment. Admittedly, it is rather inconspicuous, yet it facilitates an understanding of the text's structure, which is why it should be addressed. It is found only in the *Kojiki* and probably serves the function of enhancing narrative coherence and of establishing another connection between the rock cave episode and

---

54）The Tenmu-Jitō dynasty ended with the enthronement of Kōnin Tennō in 770, when the Tenchi line was restored. Before moving the new capital Heiankyō, Kanmu Tennō worshipped his father Kōnin with Chinese rituals, probably to legitimize the new line via *ekisei kakumin*; see Higashi 1999: 140–141.

55）See Chapter 6 'From Command to the Son of Heaven to Descent of Heaven's Grandson'（天子受命から皇孫降臨へ *tenshi jumei kara kōson kōrin e*）in Saijō 2005: 175–194.

56）Mizoguchi attempted to show that the influence of Chinese thinking must be relativized. One of her aims is to show that many such foreign ideas, motifs, elements, and views are more likely connected to the nomads of northeast Asia; cf. Mizoguchi 2000: 188–198 and 2016: 51–59.

57）Saijō 2005: 157–164 on the "continuity of the rock cave episode and the *kōrin* episode"（*iwayado-korinjō no renzokusei* 石屋戸・降臨条の連続性）and Mizoguchi 2000: 82–91 on the "non-continuity"（*fu-renzokusei* 不連続性）of the episodes.

34

the account of Ho no Ninigi's descent:[58]

爾［…］幷五伴緒矣支加而天降也。於是副賜其遠岐斯 ｜此三字以音｜ 八尺勾璁、鏡、及草
那藝劒

And so they assigned their roles to the leaders of the five sacred professions ［…］ and sent
them down from heaven.

At this time the great and mighty spirit Heaven Shining ［Amaterasu］ gave her grandson
her long strands of many curved pendants, the mirror used to lure her out of Heaven's
Boulder Cavern, and the sword Grass Scyther.（Omissions, additions, and underlining by the
author of the present paper）

The element of interest here is the underlined verb form *wokishi* 遠岐斯（*woku*, 'to lure out,'
with-*ki* indicating past tense, here in attributive form-*shi*）because it is written phonographically.
The gloss immediately after the word makes clear that the characters are phonograms. Why
use phonograms, which are obviously only comprehensible with the help of a gloss, particularly
if there are simple alternatives？ For example, the character 招 could have been used.
Furthermore, the question arises of why the word is used in the first place. It is absent from the
Nihon shoki main version after all. Evidently, there must be an explanation that has nothing to
do with the semantics of the word. Probably, the aim was to make the written expression
sufficiently prominent so as to guide the reader's memory back to the first appearance of
wokishi in the account of Amaterasu's hiding in the rock cave. In that episode, the mirror was
used to lure her out of the cave, and there the expression *wokishi* is written with the same
phonograms, followed by a gloss confirming the desired reading. Consequently, both episodes
are connected not only by elements of content （i.e. the names of the deities and the items that
Amaterasu gave to the group）but also by the phonographically written verb *wokishi* and its
gloss, which is supplied in both instances, even though a gloss in the first occurrence would
certainly have sufficed.[59]

58）Japanese text after Kurano 1971: 126, 128, English translation by Heldt 2014: 49.

59）The use of phonograms poses a special problem for translation. However, this example alone shows that
the script must of necessity be taken into account in the translation. My proposal for a German translation
is "Darauf geruhte ［sie ihm］ jene *yasaka*-Krummjuwelen und ［jenen］ Spiegel, die ［sie aus der Höhle］ *raus-*

This kind of textual connection is particularly interesting because it is detectable exclusively on the level of the textual surface.[60] The appeal to the reading eye not only strengthens the coherence of the text, it also corroborates the assumption that the texts are more than mythical matter transmitted via oral narratives. The *Kojiki* and *Nihon shoki* are political documents in nature. They are examples of textual 'conceptualization'(*kōsō* 構想),[61] and of the phenomenon that has been termed political myth-making. In the case of Japanese myths, written texts and political myths are different aspects of the same phenomenon.

Because of this it is essential to rethink the structure of the *Nihon shoki*, particularly the chronological order of the Chinese annals. According to Ogawa Yasuhiko, East Asian manuscripts in *maki* form (*juan* 巻, Japanese *kan/maki*) present self-contained entities.[62] These two aspects—Chinese annals and coherent *maki*— would suggest that a new book (*maki*) of the *Nihon shoki* means a new chapter of history.[63] The principle also applies to the first two books

---

ge-lockt ⌊diese drei Zeichen dem Laut nach⌋ hatten, und weiterhin das Kusanagi-Schwert, und weiterhin […]" (2018: 452). The phonograms are rendered in italics and subdivided into three syllables (accordingly *wo-ki-shi*). The gloss appears where it is supposed to — immediately after the word — and is represented by a smaller font.

60) Detailed analyses like this one are typical of the text-immanence-based methodology, which compares the occurrence of words or characters within the text itself.

61) Scholars such as Yoshii Iwao 吉井巌 (1922-1995), Nishimiya Kazutami 西宮一民 (1924-2007), and Sugano Masao 菅野正雄 (born 1932) show how much emphasis the *Kojiki* puts on conceptualization; see Wittkamp 2018: 44-45, 49-52 and for an analysis of 'The Body as a Mode of Conceptualization in the *Kojiki* Cosmogony' see Wittkamp 2018a (a PDF file is available at the journal's homepage and my profiles at academia.edu and researchgate.net).

62) Cf. Ogawa 2010: 88-98; manuscripts in rolls are called *kansubon* 巻子本.

63) The possibility remains that the reason for the division into two books is merely a question of text length. In the Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū edition, book 1 covers about 90 pages (vol. 1, pp. 18-107) and book 2 about 80 pages (vol. 1, pp. 110-185); the amount of text is roughly equal. On the other hand, the two books dedicated to Tenmu Tennō (books 28 and 29) have about 40 pages in book 28 (vol. 3, pp. 301-345) and about 120 pages in book 29 (vol. 3, pp. 348-469). Presumably, the reason for this imbalance is connected to the contents. Book 28 describes the circumstances legitimizing Ohoama's (Tenmu's) coup d'état and book 29 the new era under Tenmu Tennō. The imbalance suggests that the reason for the different lengths of the books (*maki*) lies in their content. Concerning the first two books, one has to ask why the second book with 3 blocks has almost the same amount of pages as the first book with 8 blocks, which present the accounts of the long process — in mythical terms — from the beginning of the cosmos to the creation of the world, and the complicated developments leading to the gift of the earth to heaven. Compared to this, the contents of book 2 appear much simpler. However, when counting the lines of the original texts (presented on the right-hand side), one can see that the number is the same: 135 lines in book

with the common title 'Shindai'('Kamiyo'). While Saijō also scrutinized differences in the textual versions as part of a study of continuity and discontinuity, it was Mizoguchi who solved the riddle of the conceptual problem of the two *Shindai* books:

[...] The contents of 'shindai, Book I' present a mythical system which collects and structures the autochthonous Japanese myths and stories that were transmitted since ancient times. The structure of the contents of 'shindai, Book II' is that of *kenkoku shinwa* [...]. It was modeled after the origin myths of the rulers of the northern line, which were imported during the fifth century. (2016: 103)

The myths of the first book present the ancient narratives, while the second book marks the beginning of a new era, the age of Takami Musuhi, the ancestor god of the imperial family and probably the most important god of the *banzō* and *muraji* groups at the Fujiwara and Nara Courts.

As has been noted above, the Tenmu-Jitō dynasty in the late 7th century was still dependent on the approval of the powerful local families (*chihō gōzoku*). Other aspects of the *Kojiki* text indicate that the compilers' strategy was to emphasize the role of the *chihō gōzoku*, presumably to gain their goodwill. The so-called Izumo myths present in *Kojiki* have to be considered here because they occupy just a tiny part of the *Nihon shoki* narratives. Another example of conceptualization is the text's treatment of the ancestor gods of the *uji* groups. For Tenmu, this was a delicate task of particular significance. However, at the beginning of the 8th century, the historical circumstances were changing. The *Kojiki*'s sweet talk aimed at the local *uji*-families (*chihō gōzoku*) and its preferential treatment of their myths and deities was an attempt to guarantee their support for the sovereign administration of the ruler (*tennō shinsei* 天皇親政), which was claimed to be hereditary. This attempt might in fact have overshot the mark.[64] Eventually, Tenmu's measures were overruled because the idea of a *tennō shinsei* system was not generally accepted and the bureaucrats under the leadership of the Fujiwara family, who

---

1 and 130 lines in book 2, though it should be noted that the eleventh block consists of only 4 lines. It seems the compilers of the *Nihon shoki* went to great lengths to embellish the main narratives of block 9 and 10 in book 2.

64) See chapter 5, 'Conceptualization and ideological preferences,' in Wittkamp 2018a: 58–62.

had successfully strengthened their power by marrying their daughters into the imperial family, were gaining more power and self-confidence.[65] A new official ideology was required,[66] and as attested observance of the important *tsukinami* ritual proves, the worship of the *musuhi* gods was the reality at the Yamato Court. Why should this reality be hidden in the background ?

Bibliography:

Antoni, Klaus: *Kojiki - Aufzeichnungen alter Begebenheiten*. Berlin: Verlag der Weltreligionen im Insel Verlag, 2012.

Bachmann-Medick, Doris: *Cultural Turns. Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften*. Reinbek: Rowohlt, 2006.

Barnes, Gina L.: *State Formation in Japan. Emergence of a 4 th-century ruling elite*. London and New York: Routledge, 2007.

Dettmer, Hans A.: *Der Yōrō-Kodex*, vol. 1-4. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 2009-2015 (vol. 1: 2009 [Die Gebote, Buch 1], vol. 2: 2010 [Die Gebote, Buch 2-10], vol. 3: 2012 [Die Verbote], Bd. 4: 2015 [general index]).

Duthie, Torquil: *Man'yōshū and the Imperial Imagination in Early Japan*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2014 (Brill's Japanese Studies Library, vol. 45).

Heldt, Gustav: *The Kojiki - An Account of Ancient Matters*. New York: Columbia University, 2014.

Higashi Shigemi 東茂美: *Man'yōshū to chugoku bungaku*『万葉集』と中国文学. In: Tada Kazuomi 多田一臣 (ed.): *Man'yōshū handobukku* 万葉集ハンドブック. Tōkyō: Sanseidō, 1999, pp. 140-147.

Hirafuji Kikuko 平藤喜久子: Kindai shokuminchi shugi to Kojiki kenkyū no yami 近代植民地主義と『古事記』研究の闇. In: Yōsensha Henshūbu 洋泉社編集部 (ed.): *Kojiki - kodaishi kenkyū no saizensen* 古事記──古代史研究の最前線. Tōkyō: Yōsensha, 2015, S. 220-235.

Kodaishi Shinpojiumu 'hakken, kenshō - Nihon no kodai' Henshū Iinkai 古代史シンポジウム「発見・検証日本の古代」編集委員会 (eds.): *Kiba bunka to kodai noinbēshon* 騎馬文化と古代のインベーション. Tōkyō: Kadokawa, 2016 (Hakken, kenshō - Nihon no bunka, vol. I -Ⅲ).

Kojiki Gakkai 古事記学会 (ed.): *Kojiki no kenkyūshi* 古事記の研究史. Tōkyō: Takashina Shoten, 1999, pp. 287-308 (Kojiki kenkyū taikei, 3 vol.).

Kojima Noriyuki 小島憲之 / Naoki Kōjirō 直木孝次郎 / Mōri Masamori 毛利正守: *Nihon shoki* 日本書紀,

---

[65] These developments might be the beginning of the differentiation between *kenryoku* 権力 (power) and *ken'i* 権威 (authority), which presumably led eventually to the differentiation between the authority center in Heiankyō and the political center in Kamakura; cf. Wittkamp 2018: 28, p. 46.

[66] There were other reasons involved as well, primarily, the issue of heredity. According to the *Kojiki*, it would have been impossible for Obito to become the new *tennō* because his mother was a Fujiwara. In *Kojiki* ideology, the mother of the new *tennō* had to be a daughter of the former *tennō*; cf. Wittkamp 2018: 11, 92, 96, 130-131. According to Yajima Izumi, the presentation of the *Kojiki* was something like a stopgap solution for legitimizing Obito (Shōmu) as the Crown prince; cf. Yajima 2008: 232-234. Significantly, Shōmu was enthroned in 724, four years after the submission of the *Nihon shoki*, which does not reflect the strict hereditary rules of the *Kojiki*.

vol. 1-3. Tōkyō: Shōgakukan, 2012（1st ed. 1994; Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū, vol. 2-4）.

Kōnoshi Takamitsu 神野志隆光 : *Kojiki no tassei - sono ronri to hōhō* 古事記の達成 —— その論理と方法. Tōkyō: Tōkyo Daigaku, 1985.

—— : *Kojiki no sekaikan* 古事記の世界観 . Tōkyō: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2008（2nd ed., 1st ed. 1986）.

—— : *Kojiki to Nihon shoki - 'tennō shinwa' no rekishi* 古事記と日本書紀 ——「天皇神話」の歴史. Tōkyō: Kōdansha, 2013（21st print ed., 1st ed. 1999）.

Kurano Kenji 倉野憲司 : Kojiki 古事記 . In: Kurano K. / Takeda Yūkichi 武田祐吉 : *Kojiki - Norito* 古事記・祝詞. Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten, 1971, pp 3-361（1st ed. 1958; Nihon koten bungaku taikei, vol. 1）.

Maruyama Yumiko 丸山裕美子: Tennō saishi no hen'yō 天皇祭祀の変容. In: Ōtsu Tōru 大津透 et al.（eds.）: *Kodai tennōsei o kangaeru* 古代天皇制を考える. Tōkyō: Kōdansha, 2001, pp. 179-229（Nihon no rekishi, vol. 8 ）.

Matsumoto Naoki 松本直樹 : *Kojiki shinwaron* 古事記神話論. Tōkyō: Shintensha, 2003.

Metevelis, Peter: A Reference Guide to the Nihonshoki Myths. In: *Asian Folk Studies* 52, 1993, pp. 383-388.

Miura Sukeyuki 三浦佑之: *Kojiki o yominaosu* 古事記を読みなおす. Tōkyō: Chikuma, 2013（2nd ed., 1st ed. 2010）.

—— : *Hyakufun de meicho bukkusu: Kojiki - rekishi wa hitotsu de wa nai* 100 分 de 名著ブックス：古事記 —— 歴史はひとつではない. Tōkyō: NHK, 2016（2nd ed., 1st ed. 2014）.

Mizubayashi Takeshi 水林彪: *Kiki shinwa to ōken no matsuri - shinteihan* 記紀神話と王権の祭り —— 新訂版. Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten, 2001（newly revised ed., 1 st ed. 1991）.

Mizoguchi Mutsuko 溝口睦子: *Nihon kodai shizoku keifu no seiritsu* 日本古代氏族系譜の成立. Tōkyō: Gakushūin, 1982.

—— : *Ōken shinwa no nigen kōzō: Takami Musuhi to Amaterasu* 王権神話の二元構造：タカミムスヒとアマテラス . Tōkyō: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2000.

—— : *Amaterasu no Tanjō - kodai ōken no genryū o saguru* アマテラスの誕生 —— 古代王権の源流を探る. Tōkyō: Iwanami, 2016（*shinsho*, 2nd ed., 1st ed. 2009）.

Ōbayashi Taryō 大林太良: *Nihon shinwa no kigen* 日本神話の起源. Tōkyō: Tokuma Shoten, 1990（original 1961）.

—— （ed.）: *Oka Masao ronshū: Ijin sono ta - hoka jūni-hen* 岡正雄論集 —— 異人その他十二編. Tōkyō: Iwanami, 1994（collection of 12 papers by Oka Masao; original: *Ijin sono ta - Nihon minzoku/bunka no genryū to nihon kokka no keisei*, 1979）.

Ogawa Yasuhiko 小川靖彦: *Man'yōshū - kakusareta rekishi no messēji* 万葉集 —— 隠された歴史のメッセージ. Tōkyō: Kadokawa, 2010.

Oka Masao see Ōbayashi 1994.

Ooms, Herman: *Imperial Politics and Symbolics in Ancient Japan. The Tenmu Dynasty,* 650-800. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, 2009.

Saijō Tsutomu 西條勉: *Kojiki to ōke no keifugaku* 古事記と王家の系譜学. Tōkyō: Kasama Shoin, 2005.

Saigō Nobutsuna 西郷信綱: *Kojiki no sekai* 古事記の世界. Tōkyō: Iwanami, 1967（37th printing）.

—— : *Kojiki kenkyū* 古事記研究. Tōkyō: Miraisha, 1984（8th ed., 1st ed. 1973）.

Satō Masako: *Karl Florenz in Japan*: *Auf den Spuren einer vergessenen Quelle der modernen japanischen Geistesgeschichte und Poetik*. Hamburg: OAG, 1995（MOAG 124）.

Shiraishi Taichirō 白石太一郎: Nihon rettō no kiba bunka wa dono yō ni shite hajimatta no ka 日本列島

の騎馬文化はどのようにして始まったのか. In: Kodaishi shinpojiumu "hakken, kenshō - Nihon no kodai" Henshū Iinkai 古代史シンポジウム「発見・検証 日本の古代」編集委員会（eds.）: *Kiba bunka to kodai no inbēshon* 騎馬文化と古代のインベーション. Tōkyō: Kadokawa, 2016，pp. 88‒103（Hakken, kenshō - Nihon no bunka, vol. 2）.

Terakawa Machio 寺川眞知夫: *Susa no Wo no seikaku to seiyaku* スサノヲの性格と誓約. In: Ueda Masaaki 上田正昭（ed.）: *Kojiki no shinkenkyū* 古事記の新研究. Tōkyō: Gakuseisha, 2006，pp. 156‒171.

—— : *Kojiki shinwa no kenkyū* 古事記神話の研究. Tōkyō: Hanawa Shobō, 2009.

Wachutka, Michael: *Kokugaku in Meiji-Period Japan: The Modern Transformation of 'National Learning' and the Formation of Scholarly Societies*. Leiden: Global Oriental, 2012.

—— : Reziproke Interpretationskritik als Impetus kritischer Noesis: Basil Hall Chamberlains Einleitung seiner Übersetzung des *Kojiki* im Spiegel von Iida Nagaos *Nihon jōkoshi hyōron*. In: Wachutka, M. / Monika Schrimpf / Birgit Staemmler（eds.）: *Religion, Politik und Ideologie: Beiträge zu einer kritischen Kulturwissenschaft*（Festschrift für Klaus Antoni zum 65. Geburtstag）. München: iudicium, 2018，pp. 289‒305.

Wilkinson, Endymion: *Chinese History. A New Manual*. Cambridge（Massachusetts）/ London: Harvard University, 2015（Harvard-Yenching Institute Monograph Series, vol. 100; 1st ed. 1998）.

Wittkamp, Robert F.: *Arbeit am Text - Zur postmodernen Erforschung der Kojiki-Mythen*. Gossenberg: Ostasienverlag, 2018（Deutsche Ostasienstudien, vol. 34）.

—— : The Body as a Mode of Conceptualization in the *Kojiki* Cosmogony. In:「東西学術研究所紀要」第51輯、2018a 年（*Tōzai gakujutsu kenkyūsho kiyō*, vol. 51，2018a, pp. 47‒64）.

Yajima Izumi 矢嶋泉: *Kojiki no rekishi ishiki* 古事記の歴史意識. Tōkyō: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2008.

Yamaguchi Yoshinori 山口佳紀 / Kōnoshi Takamitsu 神野志隆光: *Kojiki* 古事記. Tōkyō: Shōgakukan, 2007（1st ed. 1997; Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū, vol. 1）.