When Chikuma Shobō, a medium-sized publisher in Tokyo, decided to publish the complete works of Motoori Norinaga (1730–1801) in twenty plus volumes in the late 1960s, Volume 1, the inaugural volume, included two important works—*Uiya-mabumi*,1 *Tamakatsuma*—and a record of questions and answers to Norinaga’s students (unpublished manuscript). When Iwanami Shoten, one of Japan’s largest publishers, put together the iconic *Nihon shisō taikei* (*Canon of Japanese Thought*), the only two Norinaga titles they published were *Uiya-mabumi* and *Tamakatsuma*. It is significant that *Tamakatsuma* is the work that two separate publishing houses decided to put forth as representative of his “thinking,” in spite of its being one of the last major works he published. Regardless of when it came out, *Tamakatsuma* is perhaps the single most important work of Motoori Norinaga for scholars and students alike who wish to have a fuller picture of this multifaceted man in one volume.

Motoori Norinaga was born in Matsuzaka in Ise Province on the seventh day of the fifth month of the fifteenth year of Kyōhō (1730; all dates given are lunar calendar dates). He was born into the Ozu family, believed by his parents to be a blessing child of the Shintō deity Mikumari no kami.2 As a child, Norinaga was known

1. *Uiya-mabumi*: Translated by Sey Nishimura (1987). Usually translated as “first steps into the mountains,” this small work is an essay for students interested in pursuing scholarship. While admonishing students to avoid Chinese learning, Norinaga notes that the ancient lexicon should be the primary foundation of a student’s learning.

2. Mikumari no kami is a Shintō deity originally believed to be connected with running water, and thus worshipped as a deity that enhanced the growing of rice. As Iwai notes, “Due to its domain over the allocation of water, the *kami* was also the object of worship in rites invoking rain (*amagoi*). The gradual change over time in the pronunciation of the
as Tomi no Suke. In his eleventh year, his father, Sadatoshi, passed away, and the family business, cotton wholesale, was taken over by his brother-in-law, Sadaharu. In this same year, he received the name of Yashirō; he was an avid reader and loved literature and poetry; at the age of sixteen, he was sent as an adopted son to the Imaida family in Yamada, a town roughly twelve miles southeast of Matsuzaka. The Imaida family business dealt with papermaking, but Norinaga’s talents were not suited for business, and three years later he returned home.

In the first year of Hōreki (1751)—Norinaga’s twenty-second year—Sadaharu passed away, and the ownership of the family business passed to Norinaga. As Matsumoto Shigeru explains, Sadaharu had previously liquidated much of the family business in Edo and deposited the sum of four hundred ryō so Norinaga, his mother, and siblings could live off the interest: “Although this man (Sadaharu) has so far attracted little attention from Norinaga’s biographers, his existence seems to have had a significant effect on Norinaga’s life and personality” (1970:12).

Roughly a year after Saraharu’s death, Norinaga’s mother, Okatsu, sent her son to Kyōto to study. Not long after arriving in Kyōto, he changed his surname back to Motoori, which was the name of his grandfather eight generations removed. We learn that in the third month of the third year of Hōreki (1753) he changed his given name to Norinaga.

In Kyōto Norinaga studied medicine under the tutelage of Hori Genkō (1686–1754) and then later Takekawa Kōjun (1725–1780). He also quickly became a student of Hori Keizan (1689–1757). It was through Keizan that Norinaga became aware of the work of Ogyū Sorai (1666–1728), one of the most influential Con-
fucian philosophers of the Edo period. He also encountered the works of Keichū (1640–1701), a monk who had written a number of books on earlier Japanese texts, the most prominent being Man'yō daishōki, an important work on Japan’s oldest extant poetic anthology, Man'yōshū.

Norinaga’s love of poetry seemed to dovetail well with scholars and students who had a love for the ancient learning of Japan. He purchased a large number of works in Kyōto and read what he could about classical Japanese literature and poetry. It is fair to say that at this point in Norinaga’s life he was more interested in poetry and literature than in anything more multifaceted. He would later write about how reading Keichū’s work opened his eyes, “It is Keichū who discovered the true significance of the way of waka poetry” (Matsumoto 1970:32).

After roughly five years in Kyōto, Norinaga returned to Matsu-zaka where he opened a humble pediatric clinic. In his spare time, he participated in poetic circles, and in the summer of the eighth year of Hōreki (1758), he began lectures on Genji monogatari. He later included lectures on Ise monogatari, Tosa nikki, and Makura no sōshi (Matsumoto 1970:33). Several years later, he penned Shibun yōryō [The essence of Murasaki’s text (Genji monogatari)] and Isonokami sasamegoto (Personal Views on Poetry).

Having said that, it is clear that from a rather young age Norinaga possessed a philological knack that would serve him greatly later in his career. At the age of nineteen there is evidence that Norinaga was already reading Man’yōshū through the lens of Kitamura Kigin’s Man’yō shūsuishō (1686), a collection of various commentaries on the poems in Man’yōshū. In one of his earliest manuscripts, Waka no ura, there is a page titled “Kanatukafi”

---

4. Norinaga completed Shibun yōryō on the seventh day, sixth month, of 1763. It is a loose record based on the extensive lectures Norinaga gave on Genji monogatari, outlining details about the author, the origin of the work, and a variety of issues surrounding the tale. The majority of the work deals with the meaning and intent of the work. Later in that same year Norinaga completed another manuscript, Isonokami sasamegoto, which outlines the basics of good poetic composition, arranged in a question and answer format. He also quotes songs from Kojiki and Nihon shoki and stitches traditional poetry into a Shintō ideology.

5. Waka no ura: Begun around 1747 when Norinaga was eighteen years of age; he completed the fifth volume in 1761.
(character usage). As Ōno notes, this is copied from Fujiwara no Teika’s work on proper character usage. During this time when Norinaga appears to have been aware of Teika’s attempt to regulate aberrant character usage, he made a list of 246 man’yōgana (both phonograms and rebus characters). In a section titled “Differences in man’yōgana,” Norinaga lists sixty-six words where confusion in the kana spelling has occurred. Here he has noticed confusion with o / wo, e / we, e / fe, i / fi, fa / wa, and o / fo. Ōno concludes, “This matter [regarding this phonological distinction] cannot be recognized without a fair amount of scholarship conducted into the classical language … . It is apparent that while Norinaga was still young, he was not reading Man’yōshū simply as a hobby. He was plunging into the study of ancient Japanese literature with a thorough mind of research” (Ōno 1976.5:17–18).

The definitive point in Norinaga’s intellectual journey appears to have occurred in the summer of 1763. According to Norinaga’s own account, not long after he had returned to Matsuzaka, he obtained a copy of Kanjikō, a study on poetic epithets in Man’yōshū, written by Kamo no Mabuchi (1697–1769). Norinaga relates,

> Now, after this time, I returned to my hometown [of Matsuzaka], and a person visiting from Edo let me see a recently published book called Kanjikō. And this is how I came to know the name of Great Master Agatai [Kamo no Mabuchi]. When I first read Kanjikō, it was full of ideas I could not comprehend; it was so different from the other theories that I had read that I felt they were too strange to believe. Nevertheless, because I felt there was some truth involved, I read the work one more time, and found places where I began to agree with the author. Therefore, I read Kanjikō a third time, finding many areas where I agreed wholeheartedly with the author. The more I read the work, the greater a strong conviction began to fill my breast, and in the end, I came to the realization that the ancient spirit

---

6. For this section I am greatly indebted to the work of Ōno Susumu (in Ōno and Ōkubo, 1976, vol. 5:16–18). Teika’s work on reforming character usage appears in Gekanshū (date unclear, though perhaps after 1210, according to Asada 2000).
of Japan and the ancient words were just as Master Agatai had stated.

One day in the fifth month of the thirteenth year of Hōreki (1763), Norinaga got word that Mabuchi would be lodging for the night in Matsuzaka on his journey home from the Shogun’s capital. We have nothing but Norinaga’s account of the visit, as Mabuchi apparently treated it as a simple visit from another admirer, so caution needs to be exercised when reading this one-sided account. According to Norinaga’s account, Mabuchi advised the younger student,

It appears that you wish to make a commentary upon the ancient record of the deities (Kojiki), but first you must rid yourself of the Chinese Heart before you try to study about the true spirit of the ancients. In order to study about the ancient spirit, however, you must have the ability to understand the ancient lexicon. Being able to understand the ancient lexicon means that you must thoroughly study the Man’yōshū text. Therefore, I have first tried to elucidate Man’yōshū, but in the process have grown old, and my remaining years are few, so I could not attempt to put together a commentary on Kojiki. You, however, are in the prime of life, and have a long future ahead of you. If you study without indolence, you will be able to reach your goal of producing a commentary upon the Kojiki text.

Nevertheless, I see some scholars in the present who do not engage in basic research, but immediately strive to do highly specialized work, notwithstanding they do not even comprehend the basics. These scholars can in no way do highly specialized research because they have no foundational knowledge. It seems to me that they are wasting their time producing incorrect works. So you must not forget what I have said, and keep these words alive in your memory. First, get the basics down pat, and then you must strive to do higher, more specialized research. That is why I have not been able to produce a commentary on Kojiki.
yet. You must not try to do highly specialized research while you are still young and immature in your studies.

This single visit apparently left such a deep impression on the young student that in the twelfth month of that year Norinaga became a student of Mabuchi’s, and the two began a lively correspondence, where Norinaga mined the genius of his master regarding *Man’yōshū* and other topics. In spite of Mabuchi’s counsel to be patient and master the basics of *Man’yōshū* before attempting to elucidate *Kojiki*, Norinaga began his *magnum opus*, *Kojiki-den*, the very next year. His exegetical work on *Kojiki* would become a thirty-five-year journey that would ultimately make the work accessible to a variety of people, from the common folk to the samurai to the nobility. On the thirteenth day of the ninth month of the tenth year of Kansei (1798), a congratulatory banquet was held, where Norinaga and his students celebrated the conclusion of *Kojiki-den*.

During the many years of work on *Kojiki-den*, it appears that Norinaga felt he should jot down answers to questions that his students might ask in the future, or should have asked in the past. He also kept a record of actual “Question and Answer” sessions he held with his students. Sometimes he felt that a particular problem needed to be addressed with an essay. There were also times that he desired to go back and emend or correct something that he had written earlier. This slowly growing collection of information needed a place to be tethered.

Ōno Susumu imagines that after a quarter of a century of going line by line through *Kojiki*’s text, a text created from a classical Chinese matrix with an inverted order to reflect Japanese syntax, and punctuated with phonograms to help the reader of ancient Japanese process the meaning—the mechanism for deciphering the matrix lost to most in society then—Norinaga would have become weary with his time-consuming annotational work. While that work would have been tedious, it also produced nearly countless opportunities to answer a variety of questions. Norinaga also entertained questions from his students who came from far and near. No doubt, he gained insight into the dialects of Japan that still preserved a number of archaic forms that he found
in Kojiki. With this large amount of information as a by-product of his work on Kojiki, he may have envisioned himself throwing these tidbits into a bamboo basket for later when he could write these thoughts down in Japanese, graceful Japanese sentences created by imitating the elegant language of classical Japanese: “Having assembled (this knowledge), let us try making one bamboo basket for letters. We can imagine that Norinaga’s heart moved in that direction. The katsuma of Tamakatsuma is known in the ancient language as katama. It is a basket woven of bamboo one throws in miscellaneous stuff” (Ōno-Ōkubo 1976, vol. 1:18).

Thus, Tamakatsuma appears to have been compiled for a variety of needs. As Ōno has hinted at, there was the need to write in free-flowing, elegant Japanese to express his ideas, a natural outcome, as he believed that anyone who had rid themselves of kara-gokoro (the Chinese Heart) and understood mono no aware (the profundity of things) would realize. Writing in classical Japanese—as opposed to the learned medium of classical Chinese—may have been something he learned from his master, Mabuchi, who also wrote in classical Japanese, but in a more stilted and artificial fashion, using enigmatic epithets as some use salt and pepper. On the other hand, perhaps using classical Japanese reflects the literary and poetic side of Norinaga, imitating the world he loved in Genji monogatari.

The other need was to record the information that he had gleaned from years of work on Kojiki and other projects. The reason that Kojiki-den comprises four volumes of Motoori Norinaga zenshū, even though the actual text of Kojiki totals only about 155 leaves, is because Norinaga comments on almost every word or particle in the work. Such painstaking analytical and philological work clearly generated extra material.

As Norinaga’s own introduction to Tamakatsuma records, he began the compilation of ideas and short essays on the eighteenth day of the first month of the fifth year of Kansei (1793), when he was sixty-three years of age. However, because several handwritten fragments of earlier drafts survive, scholars know that the foundation for this work actually was laid five years earlier, in the first year of Kansei (1789).

These fragments also make it clear that some editing was done,
perhaps for pragmatic reasons. This may demonstrate, in a minor way at least, that Norinaga was cognizant that what he advocated would be taken seriously. What is interesting is that if we accept the fact that the subject matter of entry 125 was changed from “An argument about excessive veneration for Confucius by Confucian scholars and their lack of veneration for Shūkō (Zhou Gong)” to “The burial tumulus of Emperor Jinmu,” because of a fear of how the authorities, trained on Confucian models, would react, how do we then explain that Tamakatsuma includes four other entries that deal rather harshly with Confucian scholars or Confucianism? Could we not also conclude that perhaps Norinaga swapped the former for the latter because he felt it was underdeveloped? On the other hand, perhaps it was too harsh, not politically, but morally. We may never know, but what we do know is that these early fragments illustrate that Norinaga began this new project with the intention of illustrating to his current and prospective students what his thoughts were on kogaku (the study of the ancient things,) what later scholars interpret to mean kokugaku (national studies). As time went on, this project grew and spread to encompass his thinking on a wide variety of subjects.

The majority of topics covered in Tamakatsuma can be placed under one of the following five categorical headings: (i) advice to students, (ii) Japanese history, (iii) linguistics, (iv) native versus foreign ideas (including Shintō and Japanese customs), and (v) philology (including literature and poetry). The following chart illustrates the distribution of these five categories among the entries translated in this work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Advice</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Linguistics</th>
<th>Native/Foreign</th>
<th>Philology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Sugito (1984:477) wonders if the reason one quite caustic entry about Confucianism (originally entry 125) was later deleted was due to the fear of offending the authorities, who were often Confucianists.

8. Tahara (1973:56) writes, “Kogaku 古學 = kokugaku.” I have translated kogaku as “the study of ancient things.”

9. It needs to be noted that a fair number of entries are a mixture of philology, linguistics, and nationalistic work. This makes it somewhat difficult to categorize some of the entries in Tamakatsuma.
It is quite interesting that the distribution is roughly equal between the five categories, though almost a third falls under Norinaga’s passion of trying to separate Japanese culture/religion from Chinese influence. What this distribution likely demonstrates is that Norinaga was conscious of these several topics throughout the decade that he compiled, added, and edited the manuscript. One could also claim that he had nearly equal interest in history, linguistics, philology, and eradicating foreign ideas, as well as imparting wisdom to his students. Whatever the conclusion, it seems quite apparent that Norinaga’s research was broad and balanced. This helps explain why Tamakatsuma is such an important work: it provides a fairly comprehensive overview of Norinaga’s thought and scholarship.

This important work came out in installments. The first three books of Tamakatsuma were published in 1795. The next three were published at the end of 1797, then three more in 1799, and three more a year after his death. The final two volumes with a volume listing the contents came out in 1812.

One characteristic of Norinaga’s thinking that readers generally notice quickly is his almost fanatical loyalty to the ancient traditions of Japan. The Sun Goddess, Amaterasu Ōmikami, is the sun in the sky; China’s history is violent and chaotic precisely because China is not the divine land. Students and scholars could spend much time denigrating his “otherwise academically formidable study” (Nishimura 1991:21), but this scholar thinks we would be missing the more weighty matters.

There is much that is worthy and profound within Norinaga’s scholarship: his literary insights, his linguistic sensitivity, and his wisdom in relation to how students should pursue their studies. It is hoped that this translation will open a larger window into the diverse and complex scholarship of Motoori Norinaga.

NOTES ON THE TRANSLATION

Tamakatsuma consists of 1,005 entries, a fair portion of which are little more than quotes from (at the time) rare manuscripts that Norinaga wanted to make a note of and preserve. There are also
other entries where a substantial quote from some work is then given a brief evaluation by Norinaga. In the majority of cases, these are of little value for this translation. Overall, I have translated 504 entries (50 percent) from Tamakatsuma, and have tried to select entries from a broad range of topics reflecting the thinking and genius of Norinaga.

The text for my translation is Volume 1 of Chikuma Shobō’s Motoori Norinaga zenshū, which attaches a number to each entry, running consecutively throughout. Volume 40 of Nihon shisō taikei also attaches an entry number, but these only run consecutively through each maki, returning to “one” at the beginning of the next maki. My translation has kept the entry numbers from Chikuma Shobō’s text, as it better preserves the “encyclopedic” feeling of the original.

Norinaga was very sensitive to the proper “spelling” of ancient words, though he did not fully understand the underlying phonology of the earlier man'yōgana usages. As a matter of point, the minute details of that phonology are still debated in the present. With such a large amount of poetry or literature quoted from a variety of historical periods in Tamakatsuma, I have relied on a transparent transcription scheme so the reader can easily decipher it but also have an idea of the dating of the material. In all cases, aside from names of people, I have relied on the kunrei system for the spelling. My Romanization scheme is as follows: (i) when written in man'yōgana or kundoku from the Asuka or Nara eras I have used bold; (ii) when written in kana or kanji from the Heian era or later I have used italics. The following chart demonstrates this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Old Japanese</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Heian-era Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>阿米都知</td>
<td>ametuti</td>
<td>天地</td>
<td>ametuti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>國造</td>
<td>kuni no miyatuko</td>
<td>はじめ</td>
<td>fazime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. The only time I have bent this chronological rule is when Norinaga quotes from Shinsen jikyō (ca. 898) or Wamyōshō (ca. 935), both dictionaries from the early Heian era, because they continue to use the man’yōgana system.
Regarding the vowels of Old Japanese, I have ignored these differences, as Norinaga was not adequately aware of these vocalic values, and my representing these in a Roman transcription was thought to cause confusion. In the endnotes, there has been an occasion to refer to Old Japanese in a Romanization scheme that takes vowels also into account. In these instances, I have rendered keydown (or type A) with a subscript 1, and updown (or type B) with a subscript 2. When giving a reliable transcription in the notes, I leave the transcription of phonograms in lowercase, and rebus script (or logograms) in capitals. Thus 𒁒𒅕𒅄 faction TAMAgatuma. When transcribing Chinese words, I have relied on pinyin except in cases where the word is better known in its Wade-Giles transcription, such as Confucius.

ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KKS</td>
<td>Kokinshū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYS</td>
<td>Man’yōshū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NKBT</td>
<td>Nihon koten bungaku taikei (Iwanami Shoten)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKKS</td>
<td>Shin Kokinshū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNKBT</td>
<td>Shin Nihon Koten bungaku taikei (Iwanami Shoten)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Shūishū</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>