

A NOTE ON THE SURNAMES OF IMMIGRANT OFFICIALS IN NARA JAPAN

CORNELIUS J. KILEY

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

DURING the seventh and early eighth centuries, the Japanese imperial court employed numerous officials of Korean origin, usually technical experts whose skills were rare or non-existent among native Japanese. Such specialties often continued for generations in the same lineage of immigrants and included such areas as engineering, architecture, astrology, and even professional scholarship.¹ However indispensable these services may have been, non-Japanese officials very rarely attained high court rank. The highest ranks were generally reserved for native aristocrats who exercised generalized civil and military authority.²

On all levels the recruitment of officials and their subsequent promotions were largely determined by an individual's social status, as evidenced by his surname. This was equally true of native and non-native members of officialdom.³ In the year 670 a nation-wide census was taken, and thereafter all surnames were regarded as fixed.⁴ Although no change of surname was permitted without official sanction, surname changes were in fact often permitted by imperial decree, frequently as a means of rewarding meritorious service. In 684, by imperial proclamation, a definite prestige order was imposed on the surnames of officials. This was done by regulating the final element present in most surnames, called *kabane* 姓. Eight *kabane* were established, of which the three highest, *mabito* 真人, *ason* 朝臣, and *sukune* 宿禰 were not available to the immigrants. The fourth, *imiki* 忌寸, was the highest to which they might aspire. This alone sufficed to bar them from the inner circle of the elite.⁵

Some immigrant officials lacked *kabane* completely; others possessed them. In either case, however, the foreign origin of a person could be determined on the basis of surname alone. By the end of the eighth century, however, this distinctiveness had been almost totally lost. As

a result, it became possible for persons of foreign origin to claim kinship with native aristocrats and thereby improve their prestige position. The following discussion is a consideration of one feature of this naturalization process, which will, it is hoped, clarify one respect in which many of the older immigrant names were distinctive.

Among the many ambiguities to be resolved in a consideration of this problem is the meaning of the character *sei* 姓 as used during the eighth century. The character was at times used to designate the *habane*, that is, prestige-titles such as *ason*, *imiki*, and the like. More often, however, it referred to the entire surname.⁶ In the passage translated below, it has been assumed that *sei* was used in its more common meaning, "surname." The passage itself is the most famous reference made in historical texts to the problem under consideration here. Written in 814,⁷ it occurs in the introduction to the *Shinsen shōji roku* 新撰姓氏錄 (A record of the clans, newly compiled). The process of naturalization is set forth, somewhat vituperatively, as follows:⁸

During the Shōhō era [749–757] there were from time to time edicts permitting the several immigrants to be granted [surnames] in accordance with their wishes. And so it came about that the characters for the older [Japanese?] surnames and the newer surnames [granted to the immigrants] became thus alike; whether a family was immigrant or Japanese became doubtful; lowly families everywhere numbered themselves among the offshoots of the nobles; and foreign residents from Korea claimed descent from the gods of Japan. . . .

The passage, when interpreted in this way, clearly implies that there was something distinct about the orthography of the names of the immigrants, which was lost in the middle of the eighth century. There remains a further problem, however, that of explaining the nature of the orthographic distinction mentioned in the text. It is intended here to present a partial solution to this problem, which will require some examination of the comments of an early Nara period legal glossator.

The Taihō Code, in effect from 702 to 757,⁹ contained the following rule dealing with funeral privileges:¹⁰ "Those of third rank and above, as well as separate ancestors and *uji no kami*, may all have tumuli. Others may not. . . ." The accompanying commentary makes it quite clear that the term "separate ancestor," (*besso* 別祖) means a person

who, by virtue of an officially sanctioned change of surname, has been separated from his kindred so as to be the first ancestor of a new surname group.¹¹ The comment most relevant to our interest here, however, deals with the effects of a change of surname that is merely partial. According to this comment, in which the character *sei* 姓 is clearly used to mean the entire surname and not merely the *kabane*, any change of surname, however partial it may be, suffices to make a person a *besso*. The comment reads:¹²

Even though a separate surname is not made, changing or adding to the characters of the surname will have the same effect. Examples of this are Takaoka no Muraji 高岡連, Shiino no Muraji 椎野連, Fujii no Muraji 葛井連, Ōagata no Fuhito 大縣史, Yosami no Ason 依羅朝臣, Yamato no Sukune 大養德宿禰, and the like.

The names listed are all recorded in the official chronicle as having been granted by edict during the early eighth century. The following table, based on those reports, lists the surname changes to which the commentator was evidently referring:¹³

Surname Changes in *Shoku Nihongi*

Original Surname (with Traditional Reading)	Changed Surname	Year of Change
1. Sasanami 樂浪	Takaoka no Muraji 高丘連	724
2. Shii 四比	Shiino no Muraji 椎野連	724
3. Shirai no Fuhito 白猪史	Fujii no Muraji 葛井連	720
4. Watoku no Fuhito 和德史	Ōagata no Fuhito 大縣史	725
5. Mononobe no Yosami no Muraji 物部依羅連	Yosami no Ason 依羅朝臣	732
6. Yamato no Imiki 大倭忌寸	Yamato no Sukune 大倭宿禰	737

In considering this list of examples, it must be remembered that, by the terms of the comment they are intended to illustrate, the newly granted names must have something in common with the older ones. This is so because the comment specifies that a "separate surname" not be created, but that the characters be changed or added to. It is therefore appropriate to consider in what way these examples conform to the criteria given.

The most obvious sort of change involved here concerns the *kabane*. The *kabane* appearing here are, in order of increasing prestige, *fuhito*, *muraji*, *imiki*, *sukune*, and *ason*. Examples 3, 5, and 6 therefore illus-

trate change of *kabane* in an upward direction, and examples 1 and 2, addition of *kabane* to names originally lacking that element. Example 4 illustrates retention of *kabane*, while in example 6, the *kabane* was the only element changed. These facts should suffice to demonstrate that, in the original comment, the character *sei* was used to indicate the entire surname and not merely the *kabane*.

The most abrupt advancement in *kabane* occurs in example 5, in which the surname "Mononobe no Yosame no Muraji" was changed to "Yosami no Ason." This case also involves a change in the surname proper, called the *uji* 氏 name. "Mononobe no Yosami" is a compound *uji* name; since the *uji* name "Mononobe" was already quite old, the name "Mononobe no Yosami" must certainly have implied some sort of affiliation to these original "Mononobe." One may suspect that "Mononobe no Yosami" was regarded as designating an inferior subspecies of "Mononobe."¹⁴ The simple *uji* name "Yosami" would not have had such an invidious implication. We may, therefore, presume that the two changes made in the original name, the dropping of the "mononobe" element and the changing of *muraji* to *ason*, are aimed at the same goal, and that this goal is the status enhancement of the person undergoing the change. We may further suspect that the granting of the *kabane* "ason" required that the *uji* name itself be altered so as to reflect greater dignity. That is, it may well have been that the name "Mononobe no Yosami no Ason" would have sounded incongruous, so that the granting of "ason" required, in this case, the dropping of the element "Mononobe" from the compound name.

It is one thesis of this writer that certain sorts of *uji* names could not be followed by certain sorts of *kabane*. The "Mononobe no Yosami" example given above is one illustration of this thesis. With this in mind, we may now turn to examples 1 through 4, all of which involve persons of continental origin. The only *kabane* involved there are *fuhito* and *muraji*. These cases seem to indicate that *muraji* could be appended only to *uji* names of a generally "Japanese" type. We may assume here that such a name typically consists of two characters read in the Japanese fashion and contains some sort of geographical referent. The new names granted in cases 1 through 3, in which *muraji* was also awarded, satisfy this criterion. *Fuhito*, however, was typical of immigrant families, and the mere possession of this *kabane* was undoubtedly regarded as a sure indication of foreign origin, what-

ever the *uji* name may have been. In case 4, where "Watoku no Fuhito" became "Ōagata (or Ōgata) no Fuhito" the naturalization was incomplete. However, even in this case, as will appear presently, an element indicating status enhancement was added to the *uji* name.

In cases 1 through 3, all evidence of foreign origin was obliterated from the names themselves. If such changes were to be permitted on a really large scale, as they were in the middle of the eighth century, it would become rather easy for an immigrant family to falsify its genealogy so as to complete the naturalization process. These considerations throw some light on the statement made by the authors of the *Shinsen shōji roku* that "the characters for the older surnames and the newer surnames became like one another; whether a family was immigrant or Japanese became doubtful . . . and foreign residents from Korea claimed descent from the gods of Japan."¹⁵ In the absence of a clearly documented genealogy, the sort of name a person had was important in the determination of his origin. We are informed by both the *Shinsen shōji roku* and the legal comment quoted above that the orthography of surnames was somehow important. A closer examination of the six examples tabulated above may give some indication of why the "characters" making up a name could be of crucial importance.

In considering examples 1 through 4, we must first concentrate on the manner in which the characters of the original names were intended to read. The pronunciations given are the traditional readings.¹⁶ These readings, however, are not entirely consistent with the text of the comment itself. The most vulnerable of them is probably the original name in case 1, "Sasanami." The text of the comment giving these examples clearly indicates that they are meant to illustrate incomplete changes of name. It seems questionable that a change from Sasanami to Takaoka no Muraji could have been regarded as anything but complete.

Example 2 is quite unambiguous in this regard. The change from Shii to Shiina no Muraji clearly illustrates "changing and adding to" the characters, as set forth in the text of the comment. The original name Shii was phonetically preserved, although it underwent a change of orthography so as to permit its incorporation into a typically Japanese name. This change of orthography, moreover, involved the substitution of a character in its Japanese reading for a meaningless

rebus, read in Sino-Japanese style. It would appear that the "changing" of the characters referred to in the text implies retention of the original phonetic value of the name or an approximation thereof. When example 1 is considered in this light, it would appear that the original characters 樂浪 sounded something like "Takaoka." Indeed, the modern Korean pronunciation "Nangnang (nak + nang)" certainly has more in common with "Takaoka" than does "Sasanami." Probably, however, no effort to reconstruct the eighth-century readings of characters in either their Chinese, Japanese, or Sino-Korean readings can be entirely satisfactory. It would seem, however, that this text demands the conclusion that the original name 樂浪 was pronounced in some way, either Sino-Japanese, Sino-Korean, or pure Korean, which approximated the sound of the Japanese name "Takao-ka," as it was pronounced in the eighth century.

The same considerations apply to examples 3 and 4. If this interpretation is for the moment accepted, it may be seen that all six examples illustrate different sorts of change. Example 1 shows "change of characters" in the *uji* name plus the addition of *kabane*; example 2, both "changing" and "adding to" the characters of the name, plus addition of *kabane*. Example 3 most probably shows "change" of characters in the *uji* name plus promotion in *kabane*. In example 4, there was retention of the original *kabane*, but, as will be explained below, both a "change" and an "addition" in the *uji* name. Example 5, already discussed, shows dropping of one element from a compound *uji* name plus promotion in *kabane*, while example 6 shows mere promotion in *kabane*. It is noteworthy that in examples 5 and 6, involving "Japanese" names, there were no "changes" in characters, while in examples 1 through 4, there were such changes. Also, in all four of those cases, "change" was accompanied by further alterations.

Examples 3 and 4 remain in need of some explanation. In case 4, where Watoku no Fuhito became Ōagata no Fuhito, the element 縣 *agata* was probably intended to reproduce or approximate the sound of the entire original *uji* name 和德. The initial element of the new name, 大 (great), was therefore an "addition." The pronunciation of the character 和 is given in Karlgren as *g'wā*.¹⁷ If the final "k" sound of the character 德 were absent or unstressed, *gata* or *agata* could approximate the original pronunciation of this name. The addition of the element "great" to the beginning of the new name would

then indicate that, although no *kabane* promotion was permitted, the status of the donee was deliberately enhanced. The element *ō*, furthermore, is like the *kabane muraji* in another respect. Since it is a Japanese word, it is unlikely that it could be prefixed to the purely foreign name Watoku.

In example 3, where a name written as 白猪史 became Fuji(w)i no Muraji 葛井連, we may again question the traditional reading of the original name, Shira(w)i no Fuhito. Probably the characters 白猪 were meant to be read in some Sino-Korean fashion. For these characters, Karlgren gives the pronunciation *b'ektiwo*.¹⁸ If the final "k" of the first character were to be dropped in a manner analogous to that suggested for the Watoku case, we would arrive at something suspiciously like Fuji(w)i, since the initial "f" of that name may well have had a "p" sound. It may be argued, of course, that the element "wi" is common to Shirawi and Fujiwi, and that this alone may have sufficed to persuade the commentator that the change of name was somehow incomplete. That argument, however, seems rather unsatisfying. It is rather difficult to imagine how such a common element could have indicated clan affiliation, which is, after all, the commentator's main concern in discussing *besso*.

A reexamination of the hundreds of name changes recorded in the Nara period would doubtless yield more examples of the phenomenon described here. For example, the change of the Korean name Kim 金 to Kunimi no Muraji 國看連, made in 724, is most probably another such case.¹⁹ If the "i" vowel in the second syllable of *kuni* were de-emphasized, the result would be "Kummi," which is rather like the modern Korean reading *kūm*, given to this character when not a surname. For this character, Karlgren gives *kjəm*.²⁰ It is now possible to consider that all "ku" sounds in Nara Japanese were perhaps pronounced as "kyu"; that, however, is beyond the scope of this discussion. The important feature of this change for our purposes is that it provides further evidence that *muraji* was considered inappropriate for the name Kim, whereas it would have not been so considered had the original name been Yamato or the like.

Although the evidence presented above is drawn from a rather small and admittedly specialized sample, it points to a crucial distinction made between two sorts of *uji* names, the one "foreign," and the other "Japanese." In the former case *fuhito* was considered appropri-

ate, whereas *muraji* was not. The distinction itself had nothing to do with the actual ancestry of a person, but simply with the meaning of his name as expressed orthographically. If the name was composed of characters read in the Japanese fashion, it could have a Japanese meaning. The *kabane muraji* would then be appropriate. *Fuhito*, on the other hand, would be appropriate to either sort of name, but it would be an unmistakable indication of foreign origin.

Most of the name-changes obtained by officials of Korean origin were probably not of the type discussed in the legal comment given above. Many of them appear to have been complete changes, mere substitutions of the name of the place of residence for the original foreign name. This too, however, involved the same sort of naturalization discussed above, except that it was most probably even more complete. In most such cases, the new name was "orthographically" different from the old, in that it was of the "Japanese" type as defined above. It would seem, in fact, that any Japanese place name could serve as an *uji* name of the Japanese type. Perhaps the orthography itself was not the crucial factor, but rather the meaningfulness of the name itself in Japanese terms. People of the early Nara period, it should be noted, were often far from meticulous in the ascription of characters to names.²¹

Most probably, at the time the early legal commentaries were written, the officialdom was well aware of the provenance of every *uji* name of importance, however written. The clan system was fairly well under control, and the authorities were not faced with the confusion deplored by the authors of the *Shinsen shōji roku*. As noted there, however, this control was somewhat loosened in the mid-eighth century when naturalization by name-changing came to be permitted on a truly wholesale basis. Mere application to have one's *uji* name changed was sufficient cause for the granting of the change. That, at least, is the implication of the edict of 757, which declared:²² "Whereas there are people from Koguryō, Paekche and Silla who have long yearned after assimilation to the sacred [i.e., naturalization], have adopted our ways and earnestly pray to be granted surnames, and it is to be permitted in every case, . . ." The name changes contemplated here are not, most probably, those of the *besso* type described above. Whole groups appear to have been involved.

These changes took place during the ascendancy of Fujiwara no

Nakamaro (706–764), whose general policy involved attacks on clan privilege and emphasis on merit alone in the recruitment of officials. These efforts seem to have been associated with Nakamaro's attempts to acquire a loyal constituency of his own.²³ In any case, the period of his dominance was characterized by a serious crisis in which aristocratic privilege and bureaucratic meritocracy were sharply contrasted, and the sudden willingness to naturalize all immigrants may probably best be considered in the light of this development. On the other hand, immigration had fallen off considerably in the preceding decades, and most immigrants were undoubtedly naturalized in fact. The specialties they monopolized, moreover, had been fairly well diffused among the native Japanese.²⁴ The result was the assimilation of the immigrants, their adoption of Japanese names, and, at the same time, the commencement of efforts to indelibly record their origin. In 761 the editing of a clan register similar to the *Shinsen shōji roku* began.²⁵

On the basis of the data presented above, we may draw two tentative conclusions concerning surnames borne by immigrants in the early eighth century. The first is that if the surname lacked meaning in terms of the Japanese language, the name would be considered as alien. Secondly, lack of meaning had certain consequences, among them the unavailability of the *kabane muraji*. It must be emphasized here that the significant thing in such cases was not the actual lineage of a person, but the quality of his name. Some immigrant families were alien in a sense in which others were not. In contrast to this, the *Shinsen shōji roku* reflects an attitude whereby all persons of acknowledged foreign origin, however thoroughly naturalized in the cultural sense, are equally alien.

NOTES

¹ A general treatment of immigrants and their role in the early Japanese state may be found in Seki Akira 關晃, *Kihajin 歸化人* (Immigrants) (Tokyo, 1956). In preparing this paper, I have relied heavily on this work.

² One notable exception to this rule was the family known as Kudara no Konikishi 百濟王. Descended from the royal house of Paekche, which had fallen in 660, they were admitted into the top stratum of Japanese aristocracy. Kudara no Konikishi Keifuku 敬福 (698–766) was, at the time of his death, Chief of the Board of Punishments and held Junior Third Rank. For his biography and lineage, see *Shoku Nihongi 續日本紀* 27 (Tempyō Jingo 2:6:28), *Kokushi taikei* Ser. 1.4 (Tokyo, 1961), 333–334.

³ A good account of the manner in which family status and official privilege were integrated under the law codes may be found in Nomura Tadao 野村忠夫, "Ritsuryō kanjin no kōsei to shutsuji" 律令官人の構成と出自 (The origin and background of the code system officials), Osaka rekishi gakkai ed., *Ritsuryō kokka no kiso kōzō* 律令國家の基礎構造 (The basic structure of the code state) (Tokyo, 1960), 235–292.

⁴ See Inoue Mitsusada 井上光貞 *Nihon kodaishi no shomondai* 日本古代史の諸問題 (Various problems of Japanese ancient history) (Tokyo, 1949), 259–320.

⁵ See Takeuchi Rizō 竹内理三, *Ritsuryōsei to kizoku seiken* 律令制と貴族政權 (The code system and the regime of the aristocracy), Vol. 1 (Tokyo, 1957), 85–104 for a good account of Emperor Temmu's *kabane* system. *Imiki* was quite frequently given to immigrants.

⁶ I have here adopted the view expressed and amply demonstrated in Hirano Kunio 平野邦雄, "Kodai shisei, jimmei ni arawareta kaikyū kankei" 古代氏姓. 人名に現われた階級關係 (Class relationships shown by name and clan-title in ancient Japan), Sakamoto Tarō Hakushi Kanreki Kinenkai ed., *Nihon kodaishi ronshū* 日本古代史論集 (Collected papers on Japanese ancient history), Vol. 1 (Tokyo, 1962), 3–46.

⁷ The *Shinsen shōji roku* was the culmination of various efforts to stabilize the prestige order within the capital officialdom by certifying the ancestry of the various clans making it up. Those efforts were, in part, inspired by similar compilations made during the early T'ang period in China. At least fourteen persons contributed to the compilation of the work, but the directors of the project appear to have been Imperial Prince Manda 萬多 (788–830), Fujiwara no Sonondo 園人 (756–818), and Fujiwara no Morotsugu 諸嗣 (774–843). The work, in thirty *kan*, was completed and presented to the throne in 814. In the following year, however, it was slightly expanded so as to make up thirty-one *kan*; there was at this time a preface placed before the original introduction. It is the latter which is cited here. The present version of this work is an abridgment of the original in thirteen *kan*. See Sacki Arikiyo 佐伯有清, *Shinsen shōji roku no kenkyū* (*kenkyū hen*) ||||| の研究 (研究篇) (A study of the *Shinsen shōji roku* [interpretation]), (Tokyo, 1965), 3–72. The *Shinsen shōji roku* occupies *kan* 448 of the *Gunsho ruijū* 群書類從. The version of the introduction used here appears in Ueda Mannen 上田萬年 *et al.* ed., *Shinkō* 新校 *Gunsho ruijū*, Vol. 19 (Tokyo, 1932), 435–437.

⁸ *Shinkō Gunsho ruijū*, Vol. 19, 436.

⁹ The Taihō Code (*Taihō ritsuryō* 大寶律令) is no longer extant, although the greater part of it may be reconstructed with a fair degree of certainty. The *Yōrō ritsuryō* 養老 ||, often mistakenly confused with the *Taihō ritsuryō*, has been better preserved. The Taihō Code was in effect from 702 to 757, when it was supplanted by the Yōrō Code. The latter, however, had been completed and presented to the throne in 718. The provisions of the *Yōrō ryō*, the administrative portion of the *Yōrō ritsuryō*, have been preserved nearly intact in the form of quotations contained in two Heian period works of legal commentary, the *Ryō no gige* 令義解 (The meaning of the *ryō* explained) and the *Ryō no shūge* 令集解 (Collected interpretations of the *ryō*). The first of these works was a compilation supervised by the Minister of the Right Kiyowara Natsuno 清原夏野 (782–837); after its composition it was regarded as the official interpretation of the *ryō*. The original version contained the entire text of the *ryō*, after each phrase of which interpretative glosses were written in. The *Taihō ryō* was, at the time of this

writing, a dead letter and consequently ignored. The *Ryō no shūge* was compiled by a professional legal scholar, Koremune Nakamoto 惟宗直本, who was active during the late ninth and early tenth centuries. Its format is similar to that of the *Ryō no gige*, except that following each quoted phrase of the *Yōrō ryō*, Koremune gathered every preexisting comment that he considered relevant. Among the sources quoted by Koremune was a body of commentary on the *Taihō ryō* referred to as *koki* 古記. The *koki* comments are a major source of information on the *Taihō* Code and on early Nara administrative practice in general. In some cases, *koki* comments make contrasts between the *Taihō* Code then in force and the completed, but not yet enacted, *Yōrō* Code. *Koki* comments were, according to Nakada, written at some time between 737 and 740; see Nakada Kaoru 中田薫, "Yōrō ryō no shikōki ni tsuite" 養老令の施行期に就て (On the time of promulgation of the *Yōrō ryō*) in *Hōseishi ronshū* 法制史論集 (Collected papers on legal history), 1 (Tokyo, 1921), 627–639. There is, however, reason to suspect that at the time of their writing *koki* comments did not constitute a single work. It is quite possible that, after the actual promulgation of the *Yōrō ryō*, a number of older works on the *Taihō* Code had come to be so designated. It may be regarded as established, however, that *koki* materials contain nothing written after 740.

¹⁰ *Ryō no shūge* 40, *Sōsō ryō* 喪葬令, *Sammi ijō no jō* 三位以上條; *Kokushi taikei* Ser. 2.5 (Tokyo, 1961), 967–968. The *Taihō* provision given here has been reconstructed on the basis of the quoted *Yōrō* provision and its accompanying *koki* comments, which are, in this case, quite adequate for the purpose. The reconstructed statute may be found in Takikawa Masajirō 瀧川政次郎, *Ritsuryō no kenkyū* 律令之研究 (A study of the *ritsuryō*) (Tokyo, 1931), 544–545.

¹¹ *Ryō no shūge*, *Sōsō ryō*, *Sammi ijō no jō*; *Kokushi taikei*, Ser. 2.5 (Tokyo, 1961), 967–968. The most illuminating of the *koki* comments reads: "Besso means one who, originally the same as his kindred, presently receives a separate surname. For example, the Minister of the Right Tachibana [Tachibana no Moroe 橘諸兄, 684–757], the Inner Minister Fujiwara [Fujiwara no Kamatari 藤原鎌足, 614–669], and the like. It means the one man who first separates [from his kindred]; his descendants may not [have tumuli]." Tachibana no Moroe received the name Tachibana in 736; he held the position of Minister of the Right from 738 to 743, when he was appointed to the more prestigious office of Minister of the Left. The reference to him as Minister of the Right, if accurately transcribed, tends to verify Nakada's dating of the *koki* comments. In the comment following this, the name Yamato is written as 大養德, a usage prescribed by edict from 737 to 747. This tends to confirm further Nakada's dating.

¹² *Ryō no shūge*, *loc. cit.*

¹³ All changes recorded in the comment may be found in the *Shoku Nihongi*; *Kokushi taikei* Ser. 1.3 (Tokyo, 1959). The references are in order of listing:

1. *Kan* 9, *Jingi* 1:5:13; KT, p. 101
2. *Kan* 9, *Jingi* 1:5:13; KT, p. 101
3. *Kan* 8, *Yōrō* 4:5:10; KT, p. 80
4. *Kan* 9, *Jingi* 2:6:6; KT, p. 103
5. *Kan* 11, *Tempyō* 4:5:1; KT, p. 128
6. *Kan* 12, *Tempyō* 9:11:22; KT, p. 148

¹⁴ See Ōta Akira 太田亮, *Shizoku seido* 氏族制度 (The clan system) (Tokyo,

1920), 187–188. This case involves a serious textual difficulty. There is good reason to believe that, in fact, the element Mononobe was never dropped from the name. The *Shoku Nihongi* passage cited as (5) in note 13 above states merely that “Senior Sixth Rank Lower Grade Mononobe no Yosami no Muraji Hitoe 物部依羅連人會 was granted the *kabane ason*.” The chronicle contains no other instance of a grant of *ason* to a person whose name included the element Yosami. In this case, however, the element Mononobe appears not to have been dropped. In four subsequent references to this individual in the chronicle, his name invariably appears as Mononobe no Yosami no Ason Hitoe. These are: Kan 13, Tempyō 11:1:13; KT, p. 154; Kan 13, Tempyō 12:11; 21; KT, p. 161–162; Kan 16, Tempyō 18:5:7; KT, p. 187; Kan 16, Tempyō 18:6:21; KT, p. 188.

It is possible that the element Mononobe was deleted from the name given in the *Ryō no shūge* text because of a copyist’s error. This, however, seems unlikely. If example 5 were given as Monobe no Yosami no Ason and example 6 as Yamato no Sukune, both examples would reflect simple change of *kabane* with no other alterations of name. *Ryō no shūge* texts are usually extremely concise and avoid repetition of this sort. It may be noted, for example, that the cases of Fujiwara no Fuhito and Tachibana no Moroe, given as examples in the text cited in note 11, are actually qualitatively different. Fuhito was a subject noble who exchanged his preexisting surname for Fujiwara; Moroe was a prince at birth and as such lacked an officially cognizable surname. By assuming the surname Tachibana, he automatically became a subject. Most series of examples given by legal commentators are designed to illustrate diverse instances to which the same principle applies. It is therefore unlikely that the commentator in this case would have included *two* identical cases. It is not impossible that the *Shoku Nihongi* is incorrect here. It is an official history, compiled at a time when surnames and ancestry were very sensitive subjects. The legal commentaries, on the other hand, were not so directly concerned with the preservation of family histories as such.

¹⁵ See Note 8 above.

¹⁶ The pronunciations given here are taken from Ōta Akira, *Seishi hakei daijiten* 姓氏家系大辭典 (An unabridged dictionary of clans and lineages), 3 vols. (Tokyo, 1936). The pronunciations for the original names in the six cases given in the legal comment may be found as follows: Sasanami, II, 2592; Shi(h)i, II, 2808; Shira(w)i, II, 2961; Watoku, III, 6660; Yosami, III, 6466–6467; Yamato (or Ōyamato), III, 6324.

¹⁷ *Grammata Serica Recensa*, no. 8e.

¹⁸ The character 白 appears as Karlgren’s no. 782a. 猪 may be found, written as 猪, as no. 45h. The first appearance of the name 白猪 occurs in the *Nihon shoki* account of Emperor Kimmei (539–571) as the name of a group of colonies established in the Okayama area under direct imperial authority. Although no explicit reference to the national origins of these colonists appears, they were probably Koreans. At least, they were placed under the same supervisors as several other enclaves explicitly stated to be Korean colonies. The establishment of the “Shirai” no Miyake 白猪屯倉 appears in *Nihon shoki* 19: Kimmei 16:7:4; KT 88–89, where there is also a note to the effect that these settlements were called *miyake* 屯倉 because they were made up of Koreans. Sometime later the ancestor of the 白猪史 lineage was ordered to make a population register of the settlements and was given the name as a reward for successful completion

of the task. *Nihon shoki* 19: Kimmei 30; KT 96. The passage makes it clear that the award of the name symbolized his integration into the *miyake* administration of Emperor Kimmei.

It is conceivable that 白猪 is simply a variant phonetic representation of Paekche. It is undoubtedly true that the characters 百濟 were read Kudara by Japanese of the Nara period. By that time, however, the kingdom of Paekche was no longer in existence. It is possible that during the sixth and seventh centuries the country was called Paekche by the Japanese, and it is also of interest to note that in the province of Kawachi there was a district called Kudara 百濟, where Emperor Bidatsu (571–585) held court. It must be assumed that the Japanese aristocracy of this time were virtually illiterate and that they were therefore heavily dependent on the immigrants for all technical services. It is also clear that this area had a heavy Korean population. It is altogether possible that Kudara was originally the name of that particular area, to which the characters were later attributed. Similar cases may be cited. For instance, the surnames Hata 秦 and Aya 漢 are semantically Japanese, although the characters used are simply the names of Chinese dynasties representing the presumed ancestry of the families bearing the names. When these names were acquired, there was probably less concern with Chinese characters than appeared in the Nara period.

¹⁹ *Shoku Nihongi* 9: Jingi 1:5:13; KT 101.

²⁰ Karlgren no. 652a.

²¹ Takaoka, for example, could be written as either 高岡 or 高丘. The *Shoku Nihongi* report gives the former and the *koki* comment, the latter. Semantic value seems to have been more important than the characters themselves.

²² *Shoku Nihongi* 20: Tempyō Hōji 1:4:4; KT Ser. 1.3 (Toyko, 1961), p. 231.

²³ There are several studies of Nakamaro's career and its significance for Japanese institutional history. His policy toward hereditary privilege is discussed in Nomura Tadao 野村忠夫, "Ritsuryō kanjin no shakai kōsei to Nakamaro seiken no seiritsu" 律令官人の社會構成と仲麻呂政權の成立 (The social structure of *ritsuryō* officialdom and the establishment of Nakamaro's regime), *Kodaigaku 古代學 (Paleo-logia)* vi (April 1957).40–61.

²⁴ See Seki, *Kikajin*, 178 *et seq.*

²⁵ See Saeki, *Shinsen shōji roku no kenkyū*, 3–20.