

Medicine and New Knowledge in Medieval Japan: Kajiwara Shōzen (1266–1337) and the “Man’anpō” (1)

Andrew Edmund GOBLE

*Associate Professor, Department of History and Department of
Religious Studies, University of Oregon*

*Research Associate, Department of the History of Medicine, Oriental
Medicine Research Center of the Kitasato Research Institute*

Introductory

Between 1315 and 1327 the Buddhist priest and physician Kajiwara Shōzen 梶原性全 (1266–1337),¹⁾ assisted in the transcription of the final version by his son Fuyukage 冬景 and an *emigré* Chinese by the name of Daoguang 道広, compiled a fifty-volume work on medicine, the *Man’anpō* 万安方 (other contemporary treatises of Shōzen were added after his death, to give us an extant *Man’anpō* of 62 volumes, plus a detailed table of contents).²⁾ It was Shōzen’s *magnum opus*. At close to 6800 leaves of Chinese script in length, it is far longer than the near-3000 leaves of the far more prolix Japanese script (*kana majiri*) that we find in his earlier work (completed c.1304), the *Ton’ishō* 頓医抄.³⁾ In conception it clearly surpasses his earlier works, such as the no-longer extant three-volume *Hokiron* 保气論 (dealing with throat ailments and referencing 300 wonder drugs, that he wrote in order to treat Fuyukage’s chronic illness,) or the individual works (now included as volumes 50–62) that he wrote between 1313 and 1331 concerning such things as pharmaceutical nomenclature, qualities of *materia medica*, moxibustion, matters calendrical, or on the (for Japan) unprecedented topic of anatomy and viscera. And it represents the culmination of a lifetime of clinical practice and of wide reading in Chinese and (a very few) Japanese medical works. We might also note that the *Man’anpō* testifies to an unflagging

pursuit of knowledge, the very human side (and sense of posterity) of which effort is revealed in Shōzen's postscript to volume 41 (volume three of the pediatrics section), written when he finished the clean copy on the night of 1326/11/1:

“with these old eyes and being unable to sleep, by torchlight I took up my brush and copied it out; my descendants are to be diligent in this spirit and be not flagging; I wrote this out once again for Fuyukage; Shōzen, sixty-one; it took four nights.”⁴⁾

The *Man'anpō* is also worthy of note for other reasons. It is the most extensive medical compilation to have been produced in Japan prior to the 1600s (at the earliest), and only the second attempt (after the perhaps better known *Ishinpō* 医心方 of Tanba Yasuyori 丹波康頼, completed 984)⁵⁾ to comprehensively engage Chinese medical writings. It reflects the influence of new medical knowledge that was part of the new wave of Chinese cultural influence in medieval Japan, associated particularly with the activities of Buddhist priests. It represents a qualitative advance in the knowledge of illness, pharmaceuticals, and *materia medica* at a time when, it seems, some physicians had recognised significant failings in Japanese medicine. That is, the *Man'anpō* represents the onset of a new period in Japanese medical history.

The *Man'anpō* is a lengthy work, and one cannot do full justice to its contents and its contributions to Japanese medicine in one article. Accordingly, the present essay will, in hoping to introduce this major work, look at: the personal and intellectual background of Shōzen, and the material to which he had access; some of the technical challenges he faced in compiling the work; some of his observations on contemporary Japanese medicine; and conclude with a brief summary.

Section One: Shōzen's Horizons

We have only fragmentary direct evidence regarding Shōzen's personal life—a letter by him, a few mentioning him, his own

comments in the *Ton'ishō* and the *Man'anpō*—even though by the time he died in 1337 (a period of wrenching national turmoil)⁶ he was regarded sufficiently highly on a national level to have his death recorded in the “obituary chronicle,” the *Jōrakuki* 常樂記.⁷ And, while we have his own statements on the value of being a physician, we have no information on why he decided to become one (nor, for that matter, on why he became a Buddhist monk). It is nonetheless possible to reconstruct some elements of the context, or contexts, in which he was active.

The two most salient factors to appreciate about Shōzen's overall context are that he was a Buddhist monk and physician, and that he lived in the eastern warrior city of Kamakura in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. These two factors, while not separately or even together unique to Shōzen, were shared by few people, and they provided him with three particular opportunities. First, in an intellectual world often noted for restricted private knowledge rather than widely shared public knowledge, and in a medical world that was comprised of (loosely) three different systems or traditions (unwritten folk medicine; the Court tradition dominated by the hereditary physician families of Tanba and Wake 和氣; and the medical traditions of Buddhist clergy), he had the opportunity to form links with, and to have access to sources of information in, all three. Second, it gave him access to the Song Chinese bibliographical riches arriving in Japan as part of a broader trade and cultural boom in which Buddhist monks (Chinese and Japanese, and notably monks of the Zen sect) were key figures, for which the city of Kamakura was a key site, and whose warrior leaders were noted patrons. Finally, and while I will only be touching on this briefly towards the end of the paper, Shōzen, whose home temple was Gokurakuji 極楽寺, was directly involved in the activities of a Buddhist hospice lineage whose leading figures, the monks Eison 叡尊 and Ninshō 忍性, well known for their activities on behalf of lepers, were also connected with Gokurakuji.

Some Routes of Knowledge

Shōzen's most illuminating statement regarding his involvement in the world of Buddhist priest physicians, and a good starting point for us, comes from a comment in volume fifty-two (on purgative medicines) of the *Man'anpō*:⁸⁾

"I state that as to this medicine [*Yūke gūsen-tan*] ⁹⁾ 兪家遇仙丹 *Dōshō biku* 導正比丘 of the Mikawa *Jisshō-in* 実相院 resided in China for nine years in order to learn and have transmitted to him the medical arts. He received transmission of prescriptions for *Kokuyō-tan* 黒錫丹, *Yōsei-tan* 養正丹, *Reisha-tan* 靈砂丹 etc; the oral transmissions for pulse analysis, acupuncture and moxibustion; and this *Gūsen-tan* 遇仙丹. [Mujū] Ichien *zenji* (無住) 一円禪師 (Owari 長母寺 Chōboji's elder) because of his fondness for learning received this from *Dōshō biku*; then Ichien *zenji* transmitted this to his brother Jisshō 実照, and Jisshō further transmitted this to Shōzen. In China [*Sōchō* 宋朝, the Song court] this prescription has been a secret of Mr. Yū's lineage and is not transmitted to any other families; it is strictly guarded and did not [previously] come to Japan [*Honchō* 本朝, Our court]. Consequently the lineage of *Dōshō zenshi* has transmitted it and it has come into my hands. Our descendants must maintain this as secret."

This is a rare, and rich, piece of evidence that addresses succinctly the cultural capital of patent medicines, the types of medical training that Japanese priests might receive in China, medical lineages, and the type of network (or networks) that developed among priest physicians. And it lets us flesh out Shōzen.

It appears that *Dōshō* returned from China to the Zen temple of *Tōfukuji* 東福寺 (located in the Imperial capital of Kyoto), which at the time was one of the centers (along with the Nara temple *Saidaiji* 西大寺) of the cult of the Healing Monjusri Buddha (*jibyō monjū*, 文殊).¹⁰⁾ Resident at the temple, with apparently a greater responsibility for medical matters, and thus ultimately given greater credit for the development of the "Tōfukuji stream" of medicine, was the

priest Mujû Ichien, who, as noted, received the secret transmission from Dôshô.¹¹ Mujû (who was born into the Kajiwara clan) later moved to Chôbôji, and there became more generally known for his didactic writings, such as the *Shasekishû* 沙石集 (*Tale of Sand and Pebbles*),¹² but his ongoing interest in medical matters is attested to by, indirectly, the notable number of illness and medicine-related stories in that work, and directly by his transmission of the prescription to his brother and fellow priest Jisshô. We do not know if Jisshô was a priest physician or, like many priests, simply interested in knowing more about good medicines—as the painful example of the priest *Ingô* 院豪 suggests, having medicines readily to hand was highly advisable.¹³ In any event he passed on the recipe to Shôzen, another priest and likewise born into the Kajiwara clan (we do not know any further details on the relationship between them).

This type of circulation of prescriptions or sources of information through personal channels seems not to have been uncommon, although just how extensive it was we do not know. Shôzen provides us with some examples of his own access to some type of information network. From Chinese-origin sources he notes the most secret oral tradition for *Reihô-kô* 靈宝膏, a medicine composed of over 100 ingredients, so secret that it is written out on a separate scroll and not included in the *Man'anpô* itself¹⁴; the most secret and marvellous *Hihô seii-tô* 秘方生胃湯 transmitted from China (*Sôchô*)¹⁵; the newly-arrived (*shinto* 新渡) secret medicine *Daikô shien-gan* 大効紫菀丸, a purgative for which there is an oral transmission, to be used for many illnesses, with applications adjusted according to the illness;¹⁶ and, another of the secret transmissions from Dôshô to Shôzen noted elsewhere in the *Man'anpô*, *Chôsei yaku* 長生薬, whose description resembles an advertisement for a patent drug (which, of course, it was): “it treats all types of swellings and cuts from the very first through to relief, just put it on the swollen spot and it brings down the swelling, it gets rid of toxicity and adjusts cold and heat, it is of miraculous efficacy without parallel.”¹⁷

With respect to Japanese sources, Shōzen provides us with differing degrees of information. Some are “anonymous:” for example, 13 of the 112 listed prescriptions noted in chapter 20 (dealing with oral cavity ailments) of the *Ton'ishō* derive from oral tradition, or are of secret transmission in use in his own clinical practice;¹⁸⁾ he notes a prescription for *Rokumotsu jakō-gan* 六物麝香丸 which Japanese physicians keep secret,¹⁹⁾ the Japanese oral tradition for preparing beans,²⁰⁾ and a secret Japanese amulet and moxibustion point for treating infant *ranula glottis* (*jūzetsu* 重舌).²¹⁾ The source of other prescriptions is specific: the secret oral transmission for the use of the juice from the fruit of a certain tree in order to enhance sexual congress, not to be transmitted to anyone for any amount of money, and which is not known apart from six students of one Kawatsū *nyūdō* 川津入道 (i.e. the warrior Itō Sukechika 伊東祐親);²²⁾ some useful information on treatments for *cholera morbus* (*kakuran* 霍乱) that he received from one *Bakka kusuri hangan* 幕下薬判官;²³⁾ a recipe for *Kuko-san* 枸杞散 noted in the *Ton'ishō* is from the oral tradition of Wake Moronari 師成;²⁴⁾ in both the *Ton'ishō* and the *Man'anpō* he refers to a secret remedy for the treatment of *ranula glottis*, in the former noting it is an oral tradition transmitted in the main line (*chakuryū* 嫡流) of the Tan [ba] family,²⁵⁾ in the latter noting it as a secret remedy handed down in the main line [*ichiryū* 一流] of the Wa [ke] family, which, since from the beginning has not been a technique of medical families (*ika* 医家), has been transmitted secretly.²⁶⁾

These last references are significant, since they indicate some connection with those hereditary families, the Tanba and the Wake,²⁷⁾ that represented the learned lineages of Chinese medicine that had been transmitted to Japan through the mid-Heian period, and which had heretofore been at the pinnacle of medical prestige. Even if higher-placed aristocrats might on occasion make sarcastic comments,²⁸⁾ a claimed association with them was sufficient to lend credibility to claims of effective treatment,²⁹⁾ their status engendered

respect for their own various secret prescriptions for many centuries,³⁰⁾ and they felt entitled to criticise the treatments being recommended by other physicians in other parts of the country.³¹⁾ It was thus natural, when the newly-founded Kamakura warrior government (*bakufu*) sought to staff its bureaucracy with hereditary specialists from the Imperial capital of Kyoto from the 1180s, that members of the Tanba and Wake families were recruited as official physicians.³²⁾

Accordingly, Shōzen's access to the knowledge of these families was of some distinction. And, there are hints that the contact may have been more than casual. There is a reference in the *Man'anpō* to Shōzen being in the lineage tradition of the Wake family,³³⁾ on other occasions he refers to Wake terminology and knowledge, such as wondering whether what is termed "palpitation due to frightening" is what the Wake refer to as "kidney energy," and elsewhere noting that Wake Tanenari 種成 (1221-1288) first referred to this as "kidney energy" and that now that is the popular term for it,³⁴⁾ and in the *Man'anpō* he has a lengthy discussion of 13-ingredient *Kariroku-gan* 訶梨勒丸 and how it is to be found in volume 30 of Tanba Yasuyori's *Ishinpō*, though he mentions his puzzlement at not finding the prescription in the original source listed by Yasuyori.³⁵⁾

This reference to the *Ishinpō*, the crown jewel of Tanba medical writing, is of some interest. The Tanba and Wake families, as specialists in lore, kept careful note of who read, borrowed, or copied a text (such as the Wake family's copy of the classic *Qianjinfang/Senkinhō* 千金方;³⁶⁾ the Tanba family's copying of the *Huangdi neijing mingtang/Kōtei daikei meidō* 黄帝内经明堂 through four generations, 1213, 1244, 1270, 1296;³⁷⁾ or Wake Tanenari copying out the *Qimin yaoshu/Seimin yōjutsu* 齐民要術 in 1248, the *Huangdi neijing mingtang/Kōtei daikei meidō* in 1264, which he reads again in 1282).³⁸⁾ And, while these families seem not to have been substantial beneficiaries of newer medical information that may have found its way to Kyoto,³⁹⁾ they were sometimes reluctant to share either

the existence or the title of a newly-arrived work that came into their possession with even the most highly-placed aristocrats.⁴⁰⁾ However, while it was not, it seems, widely circulated,⁴¹⁾ the *Ishinpô* was highly regarded, and (naturally) Tanba physicians might draw extensively from it in commissioned works (such as Tanba Yukinaga's 行長 *Eisei Hiyôshô* 衛生秘要抄 of 1288),⁴²⁾ or allow perusal of one section if specifically requested.⁴³⁾

Although the sense one gets is that contact with the traditionally prestigious physician families and their medical texts would provide very little useful or up-to-date information, it is of note that two medical works compiled in Kamakura should both make reference to information in the *Ishinpô*. The first of these is the *Sanshô ruijushô* 産生類聚抄, a work on matters related to birth and based primarily upon efficacious prayers and mantras drawn from Buddhist texts, compiled in the late 1200s by a priest associated with Shômyôji 称名寺 near Kamakura.⁴⁴⁾ The second is the *Man'anpô*. We do not know how these two authors came by the *Ishinpô*, but it seems possible that both obtained access primarily because of their contacts in Kamakura.

Kamakura and New Knowledge

While full exploration of the bibliographic and cultural riches of the city of Kamakura is outside the scope of this paper, we may usefully note that during the thirteenth century the city became a major intellectual center. Its leading bureaucrat families (Nagai 長井, Ôe 大江, Nikaidô 二階堂)⁴⁵⁾ all seem to have maintained large libraries and to have been regularly engaged in training their progeny, and some scions of the leading Hôjô 北条 family, in the Chinese classics; and it was they who were responsible for the compilation of the Bakufu's official history, the *Azuma Kagami* 吾妻鏡.⁴⁶⁾ Additionally, the Nikaidô were involved in trade with China, both in Kamakura and in Kyûshû, for most of the Kamakura era,⁴⁷⁾ and it is not difficult to imagine that they acquired Chinese works for

their collection. In another area, the various Zen and other Buddhist temples, that flourished under Hōjō patronage from the 1250s,⁴⁸⁾ built their collections from scratch; in so doing, they drew extensively on editions of imported Chinese books that were readily available in Chinese book-stores, or from Chinese temple presses, and which represented the cutting edge of Chinese written culture.⁴⁹⁾ Thirdly, encouraged by Kanesawa 金沢 (Hōjō) Sanetoki 実時 (1224-1276, who may have been moved to do so following the loss of some of his own library in a fire in 1270),⁵⁰⁾ the family temple Shōmyōji conducted a bibliographic acquisition program that, over time, made it the most extensive library in eastern Japan. Finally, all these elements could on occasion be tied together, as with the combination of patronage from the Bakufu, the Kanesawa family, and the Nagai family that, for the purposes of temple reconstruction, enabled Shōzen's home temple of Gokurakuji to dispatch a trade and acquisition mission by ship to China.⁵¹⁾

However, it is difficult to know what factors governed either the original acquisition of individual titles or their dissemination once they arrived in Kamakura, and we have no comprehensive catalog of all the items, so it could not be claimed that Shōzen or anyone else had a choice of reading matter that would have been comparable to that available in a major Chinese city of the time. But we would not be too far off the mark in stating that Kajiwara Shōzen lived in one of the richest knowledge environments in Japan during his day, and it appears to have been, in marked contrast to Kyoto, one in which circulation of ideas, and exchange of information about texts, was highly prized.

From what we can gather, Shōzen was well-connected in that milieu. References to he and his writings provide one part of the picture. In volume 16 of the *Man'anpō* Shōzen notes that his own hand-written copy of his *Hokiron* is in the possession of Nagai Munehide 宗秀 (fl. 1284-1326), and that there was another copy in the library of Nikaidō Yukifuji 行藤 (1246-1302),⁵²⁾ both individuals

were highly influential bureaucrats in Kamakura.⁵³⁾ From letters written by Munehide's son Sadahide 貞秀 to Myōnin 明忍, the head of Shōmyōji, it is clear that at least one copy of the *Ton'ishō* held by the Nagai was in active circulation: on one occasion Sadahide asks him to return the copy of the *Ton'ishō* that he had borrowed since someone has expressed a wish to look at it;⁵⁴⁾ and in another letter he writes that he is forwarding the *Ton'ishō* in fifteen sheafs to be borrowed, and that the work is a genuine treasure.⁵⁵⁾ It also appears that Shōzen was clinically active at high levels, as suggested by one letter in which it is noted that the sore ointment that Shōzen had brought to and applied to one Lord Tanaka had worked marvellously.⁵⁶⁾

Another part of the picture comes from Shōzen's side. As far as we know, he never travelled to China. Yet in Kamakura it was not uncommon for Chinese (and Japanese who had been to China) to be in residence. Apart from Zen masters and prelates who have traditionally drawn most attention from scholars, we have reference to Chinese physicians such as Liangyuanfang/Rōgetsubō 朗月房 and Hanzhang/Kanshō 漢章 who were in attendance on the Bakufu leader Hōjō Tokimune (1251–1284),⁵⁷⁾ and Zhiguang/Chikō 智光 who Musō *kokushi* 夢窓国師 (1275–1351, author of the *Byōgiron* 病儀論) notes as being resident in Kamakura.⁵⁸⁾ Some of these monks may have been the source of information on new medicines and oral traditions that we noted earlier; for example, the noted Minji Chujun/Minki Soshun 明極楚俊 (1262–1336), who when he came to Japan and to Kamakura in 1330, brought with him eleven medicines (one, Tsūritsu san 通栗散, later became a "secret tradition").⁵⁹⁾ And there were others, such as Daoguang/Dōkō, and at least one other unnamed Chinese (*Sōjin*), who wrote out clean copies of some of the *Man'anpō* chapters,⁶⁰⁾ a task for which, given the need for accuracy, we might imagine they were selected because of their knowledge of the subject matter. Indeed, such people may have provided Shōzen with some first-hand information on terminology and identification

of Chinese and Japanese *materia medica*.

The arguably most crucial part of the picture, and the most obvious, comes from the commentary and prescriptions that we find in the *Ton'ishō* and the *Man'anpō*. We have noted earlier that Shōzen had access to oral traditions in Japan, to indirectly imparted knowledge, to the *Ishinpō* that had been compiled in 984. That information is not unimportant. Yet those elements pale into relative insignificance—or, perhaps, reveal the limited basis of knowledge upon which the practice of Japanese medicine had come to be built—when we consider the following.

By any measure Shōzen simply had access to an astonishing amount of information provided in Chinese medical works printed during the Song and Yuan dynasties, from books that he consulted in Kamakura. The *Man'anpō* lists by name some 273 different Chinese medical works (plus 3 Japanese, and 55 non-medical works, and 279 individuals) and cites them on at least 1861 occasions (latter cited 1912 times).⁶¹⁾ As was common in Chinese medical writing, later works often cited earlier works, and so a not minimal number of Shōzen's citations seem to be indirect rather than direct ones (tabulation of this has yet to be attempted), and so it is evident that Shōzen did not have direct access to all the works that are cited (though as one case study, on the influence of the classic *Shanghan-lun/Shōkanron* 傷寒論 on the pediatrics section of the *Man'anpō* has argued, those indirect citations tell us much of the ongoing winnowing process in Chinese medical writing of which Shōzen was a beneficiary).⁶²⁾ But closer, if not exhaustive, analysis of the *Ton'ishō* and the *Man'anpō*, indicates at the very least the works upon which Shōzen placed greatest weight. Going by the number of prescriptions cited (the *Ton'ishō* contains around 1416, the *Man'anpō* somewhere around 3103 prescriptions)⁶³⁾ the *Ton'ishō* was most influenced by the *Shenghuifang/Seikeihō* 聖惠方 (published 992, 258 prescriptions cited), the *Hejijufang/Wazai kyokuhō* 和劑局方 (published 1107-1110, and includes illustrated sections on qualities of *materia medica*; 220

prescriptions cited),⁶⁴ the *Qianjinfang/Senkinhō* 千金方 (published c.652; 196 prescriptions cited), the *Sanyinfang/San'inhō* 三因方 (published 1174; 191 prescriptions cited), and in descending order of numbers of prescriptions cited, by about another 6 works (total 334 prescriptions). The *Man'anpō* by contrast was most influenced by the *Shengjizonglu/Seizai sōroku* 聖濟總錄 (published 1111-1117; 1797 prescriptions, virtually all in volumes 1-38), which accounts for about 58% of the total number of prescriptions cited, and then, with fewer total prescriptions (480), by the four main works used in the *Ton'ishō* (respectively, 217, 156, 84, 23 prescriptions cited).

The prescriptions don't tell the whole story. It is evident that Shōzen spent time comparing works, selecting what he thought was useful, and adjusting and revising accordingly. Headnotes throughout the text informing the reader that more information on the topic can be found in another work than that cited in the body of the section, or the passages that quote separate works by name, leave no doubt of Shōzen's active engagement with texts.⁶⁵ In a different vein, the main influence on the pediatrics section (volumes 39-49) of the *Man'anpō* was the *Youyouxinshu/Yōyō shinsho* 幼幼新書 (originally published in 1132), and the information and organisation in that work is closely followed in the *Man'anpō*. Yet the *Youyouxinshu/Yōyō Shinsho* has very few of its "own" prescriptions, instead drawing them from works that its author consulted in the compilation,⁶⁶ and thus while it is cited at least 143 times,⁶⁷ few if any prescriptions are attributed to it.⁶⁸ But, it is from the works cited in the *Youyouxinshu/Yōyō shinsho* that Shōzen provides a list of earlier medical texts (*zendai hōsho*) 前代方書, at the minimum giving a sense of what works had been influential in the study of pediatrics.⁶⁹ As another example, the *Shenghuifang/Seikeihō* used in the *Ton'ishō* was a printed edition from the year 1147, the edition of the *Shengjizonglu/Seizai sōroku* used in the *Man'anpō* was a printing of the year 1300.⁷⁰ While neither text was by any means new, the more recent publication date of the *Shengjizonglu/Seizai sōroku*

undoubtedly suggested a more current work, quite apart from whatever professional judgement Shōzen was making about the two texts. Lastly, while the *Shengjizonglu/Seizai sōroku* and the *Youyouxinshu/Yōyō shinsho* dominate the *Man'anpō*, to buttress our sense that newer works were read and incorporated, if cited less often, we can point to the use in the *Man'anpō* of medical writing from the late Southern Song such as Chen Ziming's 陳自明 *Furen daquan liangfang/Fujin taizen ryōhō* 婦人大全良方 (a work on obstetrics, completed 1237) and his *Waike jingyao/Geka seiyō* 外科精要 (on external medicine, first published 1263),⁷¹⁾ and the Yuan (Mongol) dynasty compilations of the *Yuyaoyuanfang/Gyoyakuinhō* 御藥院方 (c.1242), or the *Fengke jiyān mingfang/Fāka shūken meihō* 風科集驗名方 (first published in 1306).⁷²⁾

In short, only access to Chinese printed works on medicine, an access that seems to have been most possible in Kamakura, enabled Shōzen to write his magnum opus. The point is not new, and may seem obvious, but we should perhaps bear in mind that the entire enterprise was dependant on a number of contingent and fortuitous elements that were not, as far as we can tell, replicated easily. And, as far as we can tell, the qualitative gap between Shōzen's access to knowledge and that of virtually all others in Japan's medical systems of the time was stunning.

Shōzen's Technical Challenges

A detailed perusal of the pediatrics section of the *Mananpō* (chapters 39 through 49, comprising a little over one fifth of the "main body") reveals that Shōzen was introducing, and spreading new knowledge of the medicines produced by, a substantially more complex pharmaceutical regime than had until then existed in Japan.⁷³⁾ The medicines noted for the pediatrics section, which draws heavily on the *Youyou shinshu/Yōyō shinsho*, reveal to us, by comparison with the older knowledge and prescriptions recorded in the *Ishinpō*, a dramatic increase in the percentage of multiple-

ingredient medicines employed; an increase in the percentage of internal versus external treatments (which were far more likely to be single ingredient); and a greater use of pills (certainly more readily portable by either physician or patient) rather than decoctions. And in this section Shōzen *inter alia* notes what Japanese substitutes could be employed for Chinese ingredients, what ingredients should not be employed, what changes in ingredients can produce a different medicine, and, on occasion, what plants are best grown in one's own garden.

Yet for Shōzen to be successful in introducing, in essence, the new medical and pharmaceutical knowledge of the Song, he had to deal with a set of issues that ensured that he would be involved in the process of technical translation as much as that of technical transmission—and this quite apart from incorporating his own clinical experience into his evaluations and observations.

Shōzen faced three main technical issues. First, the issue of rationalising, or at least understanding, variant standards of measurement that had accumulated over the centuries. The problem was not a new one in Shōzen's time (and indeed it is still sometimes a problem for modern scholars),⁷⁴⁾ and would remain so even after Shōzen, as is shown by *Yūrin's Fukudenpō* 有林福田方 (better known to modern scholars in this regard) which devotes an entire chapter to the problem of understanding the variant Tang and Song measuring standards.⁷⁵⁾

The second issue involved terminology for *materia medica*. There was no agreed standard of scientific nomenclature for *materia medica*, either in China or Japan, and *materia medica* might be referred to in different sources by a “generally common” Chinese name, or by a variant term; sometimes the same Chinese term may have been used to indicate in Japan a different item of *materia medica*; as was true of China, indigenous names reflected regional variations; and finally, as was the case with the “new” item of sugar in the fifteenth century,⁷⁶⁾ sometimes information was simply incor-

rect. Here too the problem was not new. A contemporary of Shōzen (though they apparently had no contact), Koremune Tomotoshi 惟宗具俊 decries in his *Idanshō* 医談抄 of 1284 such things as failing to recognise specialised usages of Chinese characters (the character for *ayu* 鮎 or sweet-water trout in fact refers to *namazu* ナマズ or catfish, and thus people don't realise that the "trout" referred to in lists of permitted and contra-indicated foods for sick people is "catfish), or in his own case not knowing that an item of *materia medica* he listed in a prescription (*Zhangliugen/Shōryūkon* 樟柳根) was a variant name for Pokeberry root (*Shanglu/Shōriku*, 商陸 *Radix phytolaccae*).⁷⁷⁾ Tomotoshi was sufficiently concerned by these issues that he compiled his *Honzō iroha shō* 本草色葉抄, that cross-referenced variant vocabulary and terminology to that appearing in the highly regarded Chinese work of 1108, the *Daguan bencao/Taikan honzō* 大觀本草.⁷⁸⁾ But, perhaps not surprisingly, Shōzen seems not to have had access to this work.

A third issue was the extent to which there might be indigenous substitutes for *materia medica* noted in Chinese texts. Sometimes, of course, there might not be good substitutes, or (a slightly different point) the Chinese *materia medica* might be preferable. To cite Tomotoshi again, he was unsure to what the Japanese Mandarin peel (*Kippi* 橘皮) corresponded, but where Tangerine peel (*Chenpi/Chinpi* 陳皮 *Pericarpium Citri Reticulatae*) or Mandarin peel (*Jupi/Kippi*, 橘皮 also *Citri chachensis exocarpium*) are indicated in Chinese prescriptions it ought not be used; instead one should use the Tangerine peel brought into Japan by the Chinese (*Sōjin*, Song people).⁷⁹⁾ Still, even allowing that by the early fourteenth century both a greater quantity and wider variety of *materia medica* were being commercially circulated in East Asia, and that the Japanese pharmaceutical regime had been enhanced accordingly,⁸⁰⁾ questions of the availability and cost of imported items were no doubt real ones.

Let us look at these issues.

Doseage and Measurements

The unwanted consequences of administering incorrect doseages of medicines—lack of effect for a weak dose, the excessive delivery of an ingredient efficacious in small doses but perhaps toxic in larger ones—hardly needs extended comment. We may also assume that as a general rule physicians would wish to be accurate when measuring their ingredients. The concern itself was hardly new in the 1300s. For example, the *Chōsei ryōyōhō* 長生療養方⁸¹⁾ of the priest Renki 蓮基 written in the 1180s has a section dealing with various measurement standards and equivalences, noting such things as: the fact that, quoting the (classical) *Bencaojing/Honzōkyō* 本草經, whereas there used to be only [for weight] *shu* 銖 and *ryō* 兩, now there was 10 *sho* 黍 for one *shu*, 6 *shu* to one *bu* 分, four *bu* to a *ryō*, and 16 *ryō* to a *kin* 斤; or the volume of a *shō* 升, the difference between small and large medicinal *shō*, what constitutes a *shō* for infusion (*tō* 湯) and powder (*san* 散) medicines, and what systems are in use in the *Yakuden* 藥殿 and the *Ten'yakuryō* 典藥寮 respectively; and making his own observations on the dimensions of a *shaku* 尺 of *katsura* 桂 (*Cinnamomum cassia*). Renki was accurate in his understanding of the changes under the Tang, and is intriguing in his suggestion that there may not have been a standardised system of weights and measures in Japan. But he was apparently ignorant of the changes during the Song that had been taking place for well over a century before his time.

These restandardisations of units of measurement no doubt reflected the political authority of the respective dynasties, but they did present physicians and pharmacists with the exciting challenge of having to work with multiple systems—a prescription by itself would not tell you which standard was relevant in the prescription (unless perhaps a notation on the textual origin of the prescription would provide the necessary guide if one knew the text). Possibly many physicians continued to compound “in the old way,” but this was of little help when confronted, as was Shōzen, with the immense

corpus of printed medical works produced under the Song and the pharmaceutical and medical advances they represented.

On occasion we find Shōzen puzzling over apparent discrepancies in measurement for an individual prescription:

In the old prescriptions [for *Sogokō-gan* 蘇合香丸] one prescribes one *gan*, but in the newly arrived [*Furen*] *Daquan Liangfang*/ [*Fujin*] *Taizen ryōhō* it prescribes four *gan* 丸, [then, commenting upon another part of the original text] now eight, nine *ryō* are four *sen* 錢, one *ryō* is eighty *gan*, so is it that nine *ryō* is thus eight nines seventy-two seven hundred and twenty *gan*?;⁸²⁾ I say that with this medicine, apart from the jujube (*zao/natsume* 棗, *Zizyphus jujuba*), it should be 22 *ryō*. The reason for this is that in the Tang Zhengyao era the Tang court made four *sen* [*jian*] equivalent to one *ryō* [*liang*];⁸³⁾ I Shōzen say that there are 4 *ryō* of fresh ginger (*Sheng-jiang/shōkyō* 生薑, *Zingiber officinale*). Ten *sen* make one *ryō*, thus forty *sen* weighs at four *ryō*; and with the jujubes at forty-nine kin, since Japanese jujubes are smaller it will be 100–200 *kin*;⁸⁴⁾ I say that in all these ten *sen* constitute one *ryō*.⁸⁵⁾

In another instance (following along from a section dealing with types of female stranguria and a recipe using *Achyranthes*) Shōzen addresses equivalences more generally, providing along the way a sense of both the precision required and frustration engendered in dealing with the matter—as well as indicating that he had to hand (it is not clear from the phrasing whether he was the author) a one-volume work on measurements.⁸⁶⁾

“I say as to a little amount of musk (*Shexiang/jakō* 麝香, *Moschus moschiferus*), frankincense (*Ruxiang/nyūkō* 乳香, *Boswellia carterii*), the *Youyou Xinshu*/*Yōyō shinsho* states that “one *bu* is insufficient, and I call this a small amount.” This is within one to two *sen* or three to four *sen*. Root of native *Achyranthes* (*Du Niuxi*/*To Gōshitsu* 杜牛膝, *Achyranthis Aspera*) is local *Achyranthes* grown in the wild. Fruit of Puncture-vine (*Du Jili*/*To Shitsuri* 杜蒺藜, [*hamabishi*], *Tribulus terrestris* L.), Spicebush] (*Du Wuyao*/*To Uyaku* 杜烏藥,

Strychifolia), and Fennel (*Du Huixiang/To Uikyô* 杜茴香, *Foeniculum vulgare* Miller) are all like this. For one *gô* the *Bencao/Honzô* gauging for *shô* and *gô* notes that “for *shô* the rule is that the top diameter is one *sun*, the bottom diameter six *bu*, and the depth is eight *bu*.” This is a *gô*. With this *gô* ten *gô* constitute one *shô*. However, this is the Tang court’s *shô*. The Song court’s *shô* takes three of the old *gô* and makes it now one *gô*, and takes three of the old *shô* and makes it now one *shô*. (These are the explanations from the *Sanyinfang/San’inhô* and the *Youyou xinshu/Yôyô shinsho*). Consequently now as to one *gô* of *Achyranthes* (*Niuxi/Gôshitsu* 牛膝, *Achyranthes bidentata*) this *Bencao*’s three *gô* constitute one *gô*. Further the *Sanyin [fang]/San’in [hô]* says that “one large *sakazuki* 盞 patterns on one *shô*, and one medium *sakazuki* patterns on five *gô*, one small *sakazuki* patterns on three *gô*.” As to this, further the *Bencao*’s three *gô* constitutes one *gô*, ten *gô* constitute one large *sakazuki*, etc. Shôzen has a one-volume work, *Discourse on Shô and Gô* 升合論, and one should look at that. One cannot memorise all this.”

One finds it difficult to disagree with this final assessment.

But even when measurements were correct, Shôzen was still confronted with the issue of whether doseages would be given as noted in the formula, or whether there may be some need to adjust them in light of his own clinical experiences. It is evident that Shôzen was aware of and sensitive to the matters of doseage and prescription, and made adjustments as necessary. Thus we find information such as the following: Instead of ten pills per dose, “I say” that one dose should be 30–50 pills;⁸⁷⁾ in a recipe that calls for 40 granules, “I say” that it ought to be 100 granules;⁸⁸⁾ with respect to the recipe for *Tôki-san* 当帰散 (used as a purgative for treating intestinal worms) “I add” 2–3 ryô of new shoots of morning glory (*Qianniuzi/Kengoshi [Asagao]* 牽牛子 [朝顔], *Pharbitis nil* Choisy), which is very good;⁸⁹⁾ with respect to *Yuô-gan* 雄黄丸 (used for treating chronic indigestion and dyspepsia [?]), “I say” that the

amount in this dosage is too small and does not have efficacy, one must give double the amount, and it must normally must be used at the rate of one dose every two or three days;⁹⁰⁾ with respect to the dosage of five cones for moxa treatment, “I say” that depending upon the size and age of the infant or child then one applies five to ten or twenty to thirty cones;⁹¹⁾ and in a final example Shōzen suggests augmenting a prescription with another ingredient, but since he doesn’t see this theory at all in any Tang or Song prescriptions, he wonders whether Japanese physicians should take the import of his suggestion.⁹²⁾

Nonetheless, Shōzen is confident in his general judgement on clinical matters. For example: when discussing *Goshaku-san* 五積散, he notes that in Japan (*honchō*) not everyone responds to it, and that *Shōki-san* 正氣散 is more efficacious in producing sweat and dispelling heat, so since *Goshaku-san* is inferior to *Shōki-san* it goes without saying that one uses *Shōki-san*.⁹³⁾ Or, when dealing with a prescription for treating pelvic pain caused by movement of the fetus between the second and third to eighth and ninth months, “I say” that one dose of the old prescription (*kohō* 古方) is strong, so patterning on the new prescription (*shinpō* 新方), masticate the [named ingredients] for each dose of four *seni*, and boil it with one *seni* and a half of water; when it is boiled down to one *seni*, then remove the dregs and administer it warm.⁹⁴⁾

Identification and Recognition of Materia Medica

Challenges may have been posed by memorisation and the need for precision in dosage, but other challenges were posed by a different form of lack of knowledge, the misidentification of ingredients. It is clear that Shōzen found the issue of correct identification to be one that demanded considerable attention. Indeed, while we cannot know how much actual time Shōzen devoted to the matter in his lifetime or during the twelve year period in which the *Man’ampō* was compiled, it is worthy of note that, quite apart from comments

that appear *inter alia* throughout the *Man'anpô*, at least two chapters of the current work—chapters 59 and 60—appear to have originally been a separate and slightly later (1331) compilation on classifications and terminology of *materia medica*, under the self-explanatory title of *Collation of Materia Medica Terminology* (*Yakumei ruijû* 薬名類聚).⁹⁵ And as will be apparent, Shôzen's skepticism regarding accepted identifications led him to a fairly wide-ranging interrogation of, or at least comparison of his knowledge with, the classic Japanese work on *materia medica* terminology, the *Wamyô honzô*.

The extent of Shôzen's concerns are not always immediately apparent, even when he is unmistakably clarifying some information, providing us with what we might call a "positive identification," or noting some differences between Chinese and Japanese common terminology. For example: noting that when using Gromwell root (*Zicao/Shisou* 紫草, *Radix Arnebiae seu Lithospermii*)⁹⁶ it is possible to use both the root and the seedling (*nae*); placing Japanese readings besides the Chinese characters on lists of permitted and prohibited foods;⁹⁷ remarking that the term *Fûnetsu* 風熱 denotes what is now called *Kigyakujiô* 氣逆上, and that it very prevalent;⁹⁸ noting that for *Tandoku* 丹毒 (a type of transmittable ailment that arises from bacterial infection from a cut, tumor, or swelling) "the Japanese word is *hi* 火, also referred to as *moekusa* 燃草,"⁹⁹ or that for this the *Wamyô* is *chirike* 散氣, or *moegusa*, or *hi*;¹⁰⁰ in Japan an item is called yellow lotus flower and is used by paper-makers;¹⁰¹ *Gastrodia* (*Tianma/Tenma* 天麻, *Gastrodia tuber*) exists in Japan, and as in the *Wamyô* is *notochi* 乃土知, or alternately *nusubito no ashi* 賊足 (thief's foot);¹⁰² in the case of *Carpesium* (*Tianmingjing/Tenmeisei* 天名精, *Carpesium abrotanoides*), Shôzen notes that what the Chinese refer to as Crane Lice (*Kakushitsu* 鶴蝨) is what Japanese call the fruit of Dog's Bum (*inu no shiri* 犬の尻, later more commonly referred to as *yabu tabako*);¹⁰³ whereas a Chinese text will refer to tortoise chest (*Kiku* 龜胸), the *Wamyô*

notes that the Japanese equivalent reference is to pigeon chest (*Hatomune* 鳩胸).¹⁰⁴⁾ And, bearing in mind some of the later terminology for syphilis (*Ryûkyû kasa* 琉球瘡 or Ryûkyû sores, *Tôkasa* 唐瘡 or Chinese sores), it is of interest to learn that in Shôzen's time one form of genital sores, termed *Tsukushi byô* 筑紫病, or the Kyûshû illness, seems to have been directly associated with overseas contact.¹⁰⁵⁾

In a different vein, in a section dealing with the treatment of stranguria—which Shôzen in at least two places notes is a condition that Japanese physicians have not sufficiently understood nor distinguished properly from diabetes (*shôkachi* 消渴)¹⁰⁶⁾ i.e. they have been misled by some shared symptoms—Shôzen is highly critical of Japanese physicians for their uninformed assumptions about material equivalences:¹⁰⁷⁾

[Following a section on treatment for female stranguria with “young staff root” 若杖根 [*Jyakujôkon*]; I Shôzen say that this *To* names “trees and plants” 杜苑. *To-en shitsuri* [*hamabishi*] “Trees and plants” *hamabishi*, and likewise *To shitsuri* [*hamabishi*], *To uyaku* (*Wuyao*) [Spice-bush], *To Uikyô* (*Huixiang*) [Fennel], *To Gôshitsu* (*Niuxi*) [Achyranthes]. Further the *Bencao* lists *To Gôshitsu* [Achyranthes] (omitting the tree radical). The *Daquan liangfang/Taizen ryôhō* 大全良方 volume eight notes that the *Bencao* says that Achyranthes treats pain in the stem [penis] (*keichâtsû* 茎中痛).¹⁰⁸⁾ Thusly Japanese medical people take the name “young staff” and mistakenly apply it to Giant knotweed *itadori* (*Huzhang/kojô* イタドリ, *Polygonatum cuspidatum*) [also *kojôkon*] 虎杖根. Most exceedingly, should one laugh at this or should one be saddened?”¹⁰⁹⁾

And in another example of earlier failure to identify something correctly, he goes into considerable detail about the origins of the name and type of rice known as Jinrin. While in another section of the *Man'anpô* his comments are terse—*furuki kome* 古き米, do not use it after three to four years have elapsed¹¹⁰⁾—in this portion he has an extensive, and learned, commentary that seeks to rectify a

mistaken interpretation (that can be traced back to the earliest reference texts, the *Honzô wamyô* 本草和名 and the *Sukehito honzô* 輔仁本草)¹¹¹⁾ that it is old, stored rice rather than recently harvested rice, a mistake that could have been rectified if people had bothered to read the [Tang] *Annotated Bencao*. In addition, he notes that the type of rice referred to is akin to that available in the Japanese provinces of Shinano and Kai, with the implication that for all medical purposes these are the ones to be used in any medication prescribing it.¹¹²⁾

These kind of extensive comments give us a clear sense of Shôzen's frustrations, but more often the observation or clarification is brief and to the point. For 菊花 *Kiku no hana*, the *Wamyô* has *kawara yomogi* カワラヨモギ 河原艾;¹¹³⁾ For 鱗, the *Honzô wamyô* has *ayu* アユ 鮎, but is this a major mistake? The Japanese and the Chinese are at odds;¹¹⁴⁾ For 青魚 the [*Honzô*] *wamyô* has *saba* サバ 鯖, which doesn't suit, as in the *Bencao* this is a big fish;¹¹⁵⁾ For 蚌蛤 *hamaguri*, a big *hamaguri*, this is a different type, and the *Wamyô honzô* has *tagai* タガイ 田貝;¹¹⁶⁾ For 橙 *Tô*, コウジ 柑子 *kouji*, the *Honzô wamyô* has *aetachihana* アエタチハナ, which doesn't suit;¹¹⁷⁾ For 秦子 [read as] *Hashibami* ハシバミ, I say that this is *shibaguri* 柴栗 (small chestnut), and the Japanese *hashibami* does not correspond to this;¹¹⁸⁾ Regarding 芥子 *karashi*, I say that in Japan currently 瞿栗子 *kuzokushi* is called 白芥子 *shirokarashi*, and it is not this.¹¹⁹⁾

In another case we find that one Japanese term, *awabi kasa* アサビカサ (abalone sores), had been applied to a number of Chinese terms: 瘡癬 read as *awabi kasa*;¹²⁰⁾ 癬瘡 *Sensô* (ringworm) - *awabi kasa*;¹²¹⁾ 癩瘡 *Kusô* - *mushikasa* 虫カサ, *awabikasa* アワビカサ, *mushi no aru kasa* 虫ノアル瘡.¹²²⁾

Sometimes we are led around a little, as perhaps was Shôzen himself, as between *fugu* and *sake*: Regarding two fish characters, is this 鰻 the Japanese *sake* 鮭?, and in Japan this 鱻 is the *fuku* (fugu) フク [フグ];¹²³⁾ For 鰻鱺魚, the *Honzô wamyô* has *fuku*, one theory

has 鮭魚 = *fuku*, (for which) *Honzô wa* [*myô*] has *sake* サケ;¹²⁴⁾ I say that this 河豚 is probably *fuku*; one name for this is 吹肚魚 *suitouo*, the character 吹 corresponds to *fuku*;¹²⁵⁾ I think this 鰻 is probably *sake*.¹²⁶⁾

In another case the correct identification of a fish, as eel or moray eel, would seem to be very helpful, since the medicine involved was thought to be effective in treating one of the truly feared pre-modern afflictions, communicable pulmonary ailments (*denshibyô* 伝屍病):¹²⁷⁾ For the 鰻鱺, a large version of the *tsuchikujiri* ツチクジリ 土抉, a proven medicine for debilitation associated with *denshi*;¹²⁸⁾ For 鰻魚, this is *unagi* ウナギ;¹²⁹⁾ For 鰻魚, the *Honzô wamyô* has *kome* コメ 古女, or *ebi* エビ, which doesn't suit;¹³⁰⁾ For 鰻鱺 the *Honzô wamyô* has *hajikamiuo* ハジカミウオ, another theory has *unagi*, but I say that it is *tsuchikujiri* ツチクジリ.¹³¹⁾

Another example suggests even more obvious need for caution and precision: Shôzen notes that with respect to *Shiô* 雌黄, or yellow ochre, a *karamono* 唐物, in Japan people consider mercury 水銀 to be yellow ochre, which is a mistake, for it is extremely poisonous.¹³²⁾

Parenthetically, this reference to toxicity and death enables us to note Shôzen's concern that names for medicines not be infelicitous. After a long entry on the drug *Shien* 柴円, used for treating infant febrile ailments, Shôzen, concerned that the original name sounds like "death pill," announces that he has renamed it:

"I name this and call it *Tangenshi* 丹元子 (the reason for this is that the violet 紫 (*shi*) and death 死 (*shi*) character are homophones and in the world are avoided). As to croton (*hazu* 巴豆, *Croton tiglium* L.) and apricot (*kyônin* 杏仁, *Prunus armeniaca* L.) granules, there are both large and small, and further the Chinese and Japanese ones are not the same. It says in the *Bencao* that you strip off the husk, the heart and the membrane, and make one *fun* equivalent to sixteen granules. Thus Shôzen states that Hematite (*Daizheshi*/*Taisha* [*seki*] 代赭石) and Halloysite (*Chishizhi*/*Syakuseki* [*shi*] 赤石脂) (each one *ryô*), powdered cotton seed [巴豆霜, *semen crotonis*

pulveratum] (two *fun*), apricot seed [*Armeniacaese semen*] (three *fun*), taking a honey ball and making them like hemp-seeds and give one pill to infants who are more than thirty-days old, for [infants] from one year and up to two or three years you must give [respectively?] 2-3 pills and 6-7 pills.”¹³³⁾

References

- 1) The main studies of Shōzen's life and work are: the explanatory essay by Ishihara Akira 石原明 in the Kagaku shoin edition of the *Man'anpō* (see next note), “Kajiwara Shōzen no shōgai to sono chosho,” 梶原性全の生涯とその著書 1731-1752 (this is a revised version of his article of the same title that appeared in *Nihon ishigaku zasshi*, 6.2 (1956), 9-20, and 6.4 (1956), 7-28); Hattori Toshirō 服部敏良, *Kamakura jidai igakushi no kenkyū* 鎌倉時代医学史の研究 (Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1964), 93-158; Yamada Shigemasa 山田重正, “Kajiwara Shōzen to sono shūi,” 梶原性全とその周囲 *Hanazono daigaku kenkyū kiyō*, 1 (*sōsetsu gō*, 1970), 309-341; Adachihara Hanako 安達原瞳子, “*Man'anpō* shōnimon ni mirareru Shōkanron no eikyō,” 万安方小児門にみられる傷寒論の影響 in Onchi kai 温知会 ed., *Yakazu Dōmei sensei kiju kinen bunshū* 矢数道明先生喜寿記念文集 (Onchi kai, 1981), 280-292; Adachihara Hanako, “*Man'anpō* no shōnimon ni tsuite,” 万安方の小児門について in *Nihon ishigaku zasshi*, 29.4 (1983), 353-367.
- 2) *Man'anpō*. Kagaku shoin edition, 1986. This is a reproduction of the edition held in the *Naikaku bunko* (Cabinet Library).
- 3) *Ton'ishō*. Kagaku shoin edition, 1986. This is a reproduction of the edition held in the *Naikaku bunko* (Cabinet Library).
- 4) *Man'anpō* (Kagaku shoin edition, p. 1066), volume XLI, leaf 104. Hereafter, cited as: *Man'anpō* (KS, p. 1066), XLI-104.
- 5) *Ishinpō*, compiled in 984 by Tanba Yasuyori. For an introduction to the text and its transmission see Sugitatsu Yoshikazu 杉立義一, *Ishinpō no denrai* 医心方の伝来 (Kyoto, Shibunkaku, 1991). For a partial translation see Emil Hsia, Ilza Veith, Robert Geertsma trans., *The Essentials of Medicine in Ancient China and Japan: Yasuyori Tanba's Ishinpō* (Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1986; 2 vols.).
- 6) See Andrew Edmund Goble, *Kenmu: Go-Daigo's Revolution* (Cambridge, Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University Press, 1996).
- 7) *Jōrakuki* 常楽記, entry on 1337/1/22, in Honiwa Hokiichi ed., *Gunsho ruijū*

群書類従 (Tokyo, 1932), vol. 29, kan 513, 209-242.

- 8) *Man'anpô* (KS p. 1398), LII-134, 135.
- 9) *Man'anpô* (KS p. 1397-1398), LII-130-135.
- 10) Ueda Jun'ichi 上田純一, "Tôfukuji to Saidaiji - jibyô monjû shinkô wo megutte," 東福寺と西大寺 *Nihon rekishi*, 537 (1993), 18-34.
- 11) Oshima Takayuki 小島孝之, "Mujû denki shokô - ijutsu to shisô wo megutte," 無住伝記小考医術と思想をめぐって *Kokugo to kokubungaku*, 1975.12 (52.12), 41-54.
- 12) See Oshima, pp. 44-45. For a partial English translation see Robert E. Morrell, *Sand and Pebbles* (State University of New York Press, 1985).
- 13) See 1280/4/16 Ingô shojô, in Takeuchi Rizô 竹内理三 ed., *Kamakura ibun* 鎌倉遺文 (Tôkyôdô shuppan, 1971-1996), volume 18, document 13926. Hereafter, cited as *KI*, 18:13926. The document notes that during the night of 3/29 Ingô suddenly developed an illness of the genitals (*inshitsu*), the pain being unbearable, and after daybreak he could take no food or drink for a day; there were no doctors in the area and also no medicine (*yakuji*) available; through the present he had been unable to treat it.
- 14) *Man'anpô* (KS p. 622), XXII-81: While it is not stated in the passage whether this is a Chinese or a Japanese secret tradition, my sense is that it is a Chinese one.
- 15) *Man'anpô* (KS p. 317), XIII-79, 80.
- 16) *Man'anpô* (KS p. 1424), LII-240.
- 17) *Man'anpô* (KS p. 621), XXII-79, 80.
- 18) Tode Ichirô 戸出一郎, "Ton'isho kandai nijû, kôkû shikkan ni kansuru kôtsatsu," 頓医抄卷第二十・口腔疾患に関する考察 *Nihon ishigaku zasshi*, 38. 2 (1992), 288-289.
- 19) Shôzen refers to this prescription for treating stomach ailments of adults and infants at least twice. First in *Man'anpô* (KS p. 576), XXI-39, where he notes that it is a secret prescription, that he has not seen the original text, but it appears in the Japanese work *Chôsei ryôyô hô* 長生療養方 (unfortunately the extant version of Renki's 蓮基 *Chôsei ryôyô hô* (*Zoku gunsho ruijû*, 31.1, 143-173) is apparently not as complete as the original work, and so the prescription to which Shôzen alludes is not included). Second, in *Man'anpô* (KS p. 1382), LII-71, noting it as secret.
- 20) *Man'anpô* (KS p. 1708), LXII-43.
- 21) *Man'anpô* (KS p. 1027), XL-51.

- 22) *Ton'ishō* vol. 45 (KS, p. 678), XXII-41, 42. My initial reference, and identification of Kawatsu *nyūdō* as Itō Sukechika, from Ishihara Akira, "Kajiwara Shōzen no shōgai to sono choshō," 1742.
- 23) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 274), XI-19. The *Bakka kusuri hangan* could be a reference to a physician in the service of the shogun. However, the term *bakka* did not exclusively denote the Kamakura shoguns, but could apply to Kyoto aristocrats also (see J. Mass, "What Can We Not Know About the Kamakura Bakufu," in Jeffrey Mass and William Hauser, *The Bakufu in Japanese History* [Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1985], 15), so any identification would be tentative.
- 24) *Ton'ishō* (KS p. 384), XI-46, original reference from Hattori Toshirō, *Kamakura jidai igakushi no kenkyū*, 108. Moronari I identify as a Kamakura period figure: see Shinmura Taku 新村拓, *Kodai iryō kanjinsei no kenkyū* 古代医療官人制の研究 (Hōsei daigaku shuppan kyoku, 1983), 378, note 7.
- 25) *Ton'ishō* (KS, p. 357, 358), X-108, 109 (noted also in Hattori Toshirō, *Kamakura jidai igakushi no kenkyū*, 94).
- 26) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 822), XXX-21, 22.
- 27) See Shinmura Taku, *Kodai iryō kanjin sei no kenkyū*; Yamada Shigemasa, *Ten'i no rekishi* 典医の歴史 (Shibunkaku shuppan, 1980).
- 28) See *Gyokuyō* 玉葉 (Kokusho kankōkai edition), entry for Angen 2=1176/10/11. Kujō Kanezane 九条兼実 (1149-1207) notes, after Tanba Norimoto had been accused (apparently wrongly) of participating in a murder prompted by a dispute over tax payments, that Norimoto was not the most talented of physicians, but he had not heard that the techniques for averting illness and promoting long life included the "way of wounding and murdering."
- 29) *Kokon chōmonjū* 古今著聞集, 7.298 (*Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei* edition, 240-241; in the *Kokushi taikei* edition, see 164-165).
- 30) *Reiranshū* 靈蘭集, of Hosokawa Katsumoto 細川勝元 (1430-1473). Katsumoto notes at least five examples of an oral tradition (*kuden*) for medicines coming from members of the Wake and Tanba families: Wake Sadashige 定成 (fl. late 1100s), Tanba Tokinaga 時長 (fl. c. 1200), Tanba Naganobu 長宣 (fl. c. 1300), Wake Tsugunari 嗣成 (d. 1355), and Tanba Mitsuyoshi 光吉 (fl. c. 1350). For some information on these people, the reader is directed to Shinmura Taku, *Kodai iryō kanjin sei no kenkyū*.
- 31) See Koremune Tomotoshi's 惟宗具俊 *Idanshō* 医談抄 (Fujikawa Yū *et al*

富士川游 eds., *Kyôrin sôsho* 杏林叢書, vol. 1, 201-239), in the section on “treating chills and fevers,” 211, noting an apparently well-remembered instance from the 1240s when [Tanba] Nagatada 長忠, [Wake Tomonari 知成, and [Wake] Arinari 有成 wrote an opinion criticising the treatment practices of a person in the Kantô who had styled himself a “water physician” and gone around recommending that to “various people.” For the family identifications of the three I am following the genealogies in Yamada Shigemasa, *Ten'i no rekishi*, 104-108, 114. Nagatada's son Tada-shige 忠成 appears several times in the bakufu's history, the *Azuma kagami*.

- 32) For a brief look at physicians mentioned in the Kamakura bakufu's official history, the *Azuma kagami*, see Higuchi Seitarô 樋口誠太郎, “*Azuma kagami* wo chûshin toshite mita Kamakura no ishi,” 吾妻鏡を中心としてみた鎌倉の医師 *Nihon ishigaku zasshi*, 18 (1972), 246-257.
- 33) *Man'anpô* (KS p. 358), XIV-6. The phrase is “Wake *suemago* 末孫,” and may or may not have been written by Shôzen himself. I interpret this as a reference to Shôzen being in the lineage tradition of the Wake, but whether this indicates a formal association, or a general association by virtue of having in some measure been a beneficiary of medical knowledge transmitted by the Wake, is unclear.
- 34) For the first reference, see *Man'anpô* (KS p. 375), XIV-71. For the second, *Man'anpô* (KS p. 223), VIII-97. Note also *Man'anpô* (KS p. 16), M-63 (for chapter 25, section 7): “What is commonly called kidney energy is in this category.”
- 35) *Man'anpô* (KS pp. 706-707), XXV-68, 69, 70, 71 headnote. Intriguingly, the *Ton'ishô* also lists this 13-variety *Kariroku-gan*, but without any comment on provenance, raising the question of when Shôzen knew of the *Ishinpô* connection (after the *Ton'ishô* began to circulate?—see below), and if so whether he saw the whole text or just that related to this particular *Kariroku-gan* [*Ton'ishô* (KS p. 71), III-50, 51, 52]. The recipes for the two prescriptions are identical (allowing for conversion of different measuring units, *Ton'ishô* listing in *ryô* and *bu*, the *Man'anpô* listing in *bu*), except for *Kengoshi* (*asagao*), which could be a transcription error (thirteen *ryô* versus thirteen *bu*).
- 36) Kosoto Hiroshi 小曾戸洋, *Chûgoku igaku koten to Nihon* 中国医学古典と日本 (Hanawa shobô, 1996), 446-447: Tanenari's 種成 (1221-1288) son Naka-

- kage 仲景 (?-1319) copies the *Qianjinfang/Senkinhō* in 1277; in 1301 his son Hirokage 弘景 (?-1349) reads; another son, Hirokage's brother Otonari [?] 音成, reads it in 1309; and Nakakage's son Tsugunari (1275-1355) copies it in 1315, and in copying it checks it against the copy made in 1277 by Nakakage.
- 37) *ibid*, 164-165.
- 38) *ibid*, 167, 446.
- 39) See for example: *Kokon chōmonjū*, 4.124 (*NKBT*, 130-131), noting a Song merchant visiting the noted scholar Fujiwara Yorinaga 藤原頼長 in the early 1150's; or the *Myōkaiki* 妙槐記 (Shiryō taisei edition), entry for 1260/4/22, noting the visit of a Song bookseller to the mansion of the diary's author Kazan'in Morotsugu 花山院師繼.
- 40) See the example noted in the *Gyokuyō*, entry for Yōwa 2=1182/8/29 (2.572), and the telling entry for Shōan 3=1173/4/15 (1.294).
- 41) For a useful overview, see Shinmura Taku, *Nihon iryō shakaishi no kenkyū* 日本医療社会史の研究 (Hōsei daigaku shuppankyoku, 1985), 274-281. But the extent of knowledge of the work is uncertain. The collection of the great bibliophile Fujiwara Michinori 藤原通憲 (see *Tsūken nyūdō zōsho mokuroku* 通憲入道蔵書目録, in *Gunsho Ruijū*, *zatsu bu* 3, 545-554) lists *Honzō wamyō*, *Daguan bencao*, and some other works, but not the *Ishinpō*. It is listed in the 1293 *Honchō shōjaku mokuroku* 本朝書籍目録 (*Gunsho Ruijū*, *zatsu bu*, 166-181) along with such Japanese works as *Daidō ruijū hō* 大同類聚方, *Wamyō honzō* 和名本草, *Shōchū hō* 掌中方. But Emperor Hanazono 花園 (1297-1348), who had access to these two collections, read widely and extensively, and who was very aware of the medical afflictions of himself and those around him, reveals no knowledge of it in his diary (for Hanazono's lists of his reading, see *Hanazono tennō shinki* 花園天皇宸記 [Shiryō sanshū edition], 1324/12/last, 1325/12/last).
- 42) *Eisei hiyōshō* 衛生秘要抄 (*Zoku Gunsho Ruijū*, 31.1, 205-218), was compiled at the request of Saionji Kinpira 西園寺公衡 (1249-1322).
- 43) *Gyokuyō*, Kaō 2=1170/3/2, noting that Tanba Norimoto brings a copy of chapter 28 of the *Ishinpō* for Kujō Kanezane's perusal.
- 44) Ishihara, "Kajiwara Shōzen," KS 1743-1744. Shinmura Taku, *Shussan to seishokukan no rekishi* 出産と生殖観の歴史 (Hōsei daigaku shuppan kyoku, 1996), 144, suggests that the *Sanshō ruijūshō* 産生類聚抄 did not enjoy very wide circulation. Hattori Toshirō, *Kamakura jidai igakushi no kenkyū*, 158-

- 163 suggests that it was read by people (1318/1/9 Junnin seikyō shakujū, *KI*, 34:26515), but he feels that Shōzen's writings had no impact on the work. However, it is quite likely that it was written earlier than the *Ton'ishō*.
- 45) For some background on these families see Andrew Goble, "The Kamakura Bakufu and its Officials," in Jeffrey Mass and William Hauser, *The Bakufu in Japanese History* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1985), 31-48; Satō Shin'ichi 佐藤進一, "Kamakura bakufu shokuin hyō fukugen no kokoromi" 鎌倉幕府職員表復元の試み in *Kamakura bakufu soshō seido no kenkyū* 鎌倉幕府訴訟制度の研究 (Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1993), 225-323; Gotō Norihiko 後藤紀彦, "Sata mirensō no okugaki to sono denrai" 沙汰末練書の奥書きとその伝来 in *Nenpō chūseiishi kenkyū*, 2 (1977), 31-39; Koizumi Yoshiaki 小泉, "Gokenin Nagai shi ni tsuite" 御家人長井氏について in *Takahashi Ryūzō sensei kijū kinen ronshū Kokiroku no kenkyū* 高橋陸三先生喜寿記念論集古記録の研究 (Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1970) 707-765; Hosokawa Shigeo 細川重男, "Mandokoro shitsuji Nikaidō shi ni tsuite" 政所執事二階堂氏について in Kamakura ibun kenkyūkai ed., *Kamakura jidai no shakai to bunka* 鎌倉遺文研究会鎌倉時代の社会と文化 (Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1999), 215-251.
- 46) The standard text is the Kokushi taikai edition. For one of the few studies of the work, see Gomi Fumihiko 五味文彦, *Azuma kagami hōhō* 吾妻鏡方法 (Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1990). In the compilation of the work the editors seem to have had access to hard-to-come-by diaries and other records in the hands of Kyoto aristocrats.
- 47) For some discussion of the Nikaidō family's involvement in international trade activity, see Yanagihara Toshiaki 柳原俊昭, "Chūsei zenki minami Kyūshū no minato to Sōjin kyoryūchi ni kansuru ichi shikiron" 中世前期南九州の港と宋人居留地に関する一試論 *Nihonshi kenkyū*, 448 (1999), 102-134.
- 48) For an introduction to this vast subject, see Martin Collcutt, *Five Mountains: The Rinzaï Zen Monastic Institution in Medieval Japan* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1981).
- 49) See for example Murai Shōsuke 村井章介, "Torai sō no seiki" 渡来僧の世紀 in Ishii Susumu 石井進 ed., *Miyako to hina no chūsei shi* 都と鄙の中世史 (Tokyo, Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1992), 170-198; Nishio Kenryū 西尾賢隆, *Chūsei Nitchū kōryū to Zenshū* 中世日中交流と禅宗 (Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1999).

- 50) Seki Yasushi 関靖, *Kanazawa bunko kenkyū* 金沢文庫研究 (Geirinsha, 1951), 184.
- 51) Fukushima Kaneharu 福島金治, *Kanesawa Hōjōshi to Shōmyōji* 金沢北条氏と称名寺 (Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1997), 215-233.
- 52) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 471), XVI-6, (KS p. 488), XVI-72, 73.
- 53) The reference to Yukifuji (1246-1302) is of interest here, since he had died prior to the completion of the *Ton'ishō* in 1304. Accordingly, if the Hokiron went into Yukifuji's library while he was still alive, then it cannot have been written after 1302. Alternately, if the reference to the library was to the collection previously owned by Yukifuji, or to a library based upon Yukifuji's collection, then this would not hold. In either case, reference to the library's existence is an important piece of information regarding Kamakura bureaucrat families and their bibliographical activity. Sadahide died young, but apparently was a very well read individual.
- 54) Nagai Sadahide shōjō [1308?]/4/14 (*KI*, 31:23503).
- 55) Undated Nagai Sadahide shōjō (*KI*, 31:23528).
- 56) Cited by Hattori Toshirō, *Kamakura jidai igakushi no kenkyū*, 97.
- 57) Noted in Okanishi Tameto 岡西為人, *Honzō gaisetsu* 本草概説 (Ōsaka, Sōgensha, 1977), 358. I have followed Shinmura Taku, *Nihon iryō shakai shi no kenkyū*, 331, who reads the first name as Rōgetsubō, or Liangyuefang, in contrast to Okanishi's reading of Rōgenbō 朗元房 or Liangyuanfang.
- 58) Shinmura Taku, *Nihon iryō shakai shi no kenkyū*, 331.
- 59) See Kyoto fu ishikai 京都府医師会 ed., *Kyoto no igakushi* 京都の医学史 (Kyoto, Shibunkaku, 1975), 149.
- 60) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 52), 1-87: The *Sōjin* Dōkō (Daoguang) did the clean copy; *Man'anpō* (KS p. 91), III-74: The *Sōjin* Dōkō did the clean copy; *Man'anpō* (KS p. 166), VI-188: *Sōjin* Dōkō did the copying; *Man'anpō* (KS p. 268), X-129: Note that the clean copy was by a *Sōjin*.
- 61) Guo Xiu-mei 郭秀梅, Kosoto Hiroshi 小曾戸洋, Okada Kenkichi 岡田研吉, "[Wan'anfang] yin zhongguo yishu guankui" 万安方引中国医書管窺 *Journal of Chinese Medicine*, 9.3 (1998), 127-135, at 129.
- 62) Adachihara Akiko, "*Man'anpō* shōnimon ni mirareru *Shōkanron* no eikyō," 280-292.
- 63) For the former figure, see the chart inserted at p. 150 of Hattori's *Kamakura jidai igakushi no kenkyū*, for the latter 122-124.
- 64) I have referred to the *Zōkō Taihei keimin wazai kyoku hō*, in volume 4 in the

Wakoku Kanseki isho shūsei 和刻漢籍醫書集成 (Entapraizu, 1988) series.

- 65) As but one example, which illustrates both points, see the section on Yūhakuhi-san in *Man'anpō* (KS, p. 934), XXXVI-10, 11. Part of this is translated below.
- 66) For a study of the works cited in the *Youyouxinshu/Yōyō shinsho*, see Liu Shukui 劉書奎, 「*Youyouxinshu*」 yinyong yixue wenxian kao” 幼幼新書引用医学文献考 *Zhonghua Yishi Zazhi* 中華医史雜誌, 28.3 (1998), 177-180.
- 67) According to the count in Kosoto Hiroshi and Guo Xiu-mei's as yet unpublished *Man'anpō in'yō shomei sakuin* 万安方引用書名索引.
- 68) Adachihara Akiko, “*Man'anpō* no shōnimon ni tsuite,” 353-367.
- 69) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1295-1299), XLIX-101-118.
- 70) Kosoto Hiroshi, *Chūgoku igaku koten to Nihon*, 20. Hattori Toshirō, *Kamakura jidai igaku shi no kenkyū*, 132.
- 71) See the editions (with commentary by Kosoto Hiroshi) of the *Furen daquan liangfang/Fujin taizen ryōhō* and the *Waikē jingyao/Geka seiyō*, in Volume 3 of the *Wakoku Kanseki isho shūsei* (Entapraizu, 1989) series.
- 72) Kosoto Hiroshi, *Chūgoku igaku koten to Nihon*, 20.
- 73) For a very detailed and exhaustive commentary and tabulation of these points, see Adachihara Akiko, “*Man'anpō* no shōnimon ni tsuite,” and ” 「*Manan'pō*」 shōnimon ni mirareru 「Shōkanron」 no eikyō.”
- 74) See for example Watanabe Takeshi 渡辺武, Komai Hiroyuki 古米弘幸, and Nakajima Kōji 中島鉦二, “Ganjin Daiwajō no hihō Karirokugan no sagen to 「Ishinpō」 fūbyō hen, gendaiyaku no goyaku” 鑑真大和上の秘方訶梨勒丸の再現と医心方風病篇現代訳の誤訳 *Kanpō no rinshō*, 35.6 (1988), 45-58.
- 75) See *Fukudenpō*, volume 11 (KS, pp. 929-935), and comment in Takahashi Shintarō 高橋真太郎, “Chūgoku no yakubutsu ryōhō to sono eikyō” 中国の薬物療法とその影響 421-421, in *Nihon gakushiin Nihon kagakushi kankō-kai* ed. 日本学士院日本科学史刊行会, *Meijizen Nihon yakubutsugaku shi* 明治前日本薬物学史 (Nihon gakujutsu shinkōkai, 1958), vol. 2, 267-513.
- 76) See *Shaken nichiroku* 蔗軒日録 (*Dai Nihon Kokiroku* edition), entry for Bunmei 18=1486/3/14, where Shaken notes that the Ming Chinese (*Minjin*) Jin Zixi 金子西 brought to his attention the fact that Japanese mistakenly believed that *kansho* 甘蔗 or sugarcane is what is meant by *satō* 砂糖 or sugar, when in fact sugar is the liquid product from boiled sugarcane.
- 77) *Idanshō*, section on “*yakumei bunbetsu subeki koto*,” 215.

- 78) *Honzō iroha shō* (Naikaku bunko photo-reproduction, 1968).
- 79) See *Idanshō*, 215.
- 80) There is as yet no study that has determined fully which items mentioned in the *Man'anpō* are ones not previously found in the Japanese corpus. However, some guide to this is provided by study of Yūrin's *Fukudenpō* of c. 1362. Of the 114 *materia medica* listed, it has been suggested that 28 (or around 25%) are recent additions to the pharmacopeia, and that 41 of the 114 are items not listed in other near-contemporary works (Okanishi Tameto, "Chūgoku honzō no torai to sono eikyō" 中国本草の渡来とその影響, 150-153, in *Nihon gakushiin Nihon kagakushi kankōkai* ed., *Meiji zen Nihon yakubutsugaku shi*, vol. 2, 1-265).
- 81) *Chōsei ryōyōshō* 長生療養方, in *Zoku gunsho ruijū*, 31.1, 143-174, at chapter 15, "Yaku kin ryō shō gō hō," 藥斤兩升合法 173-174.
- 82) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 449), XV-134, 135.
- 83) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 329), XIII-127.
- 84) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 339), XIII-168 (Small characters). Shōzen elsewhere reminds the reader that Chinese and Japanese jujubes are of different sizes, to be taken into account when compounding: *Man'anpō* (KS p. 851), XXXI-62: Large jujube 12 granules, Japanese jujubes are small so use 34; *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1409), LII-179: I say that the Japanese jujube is smaller and one should use a *ryō* and powder of three granules; now [heat in?] white powder of mercury, of purgative medicines this is the most powerfully effective; *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1444), LIII-78: (Small characters) use 12 dried large jujubes, if Japanese jujubes does one use fifty?
- 85) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1341), LI-92.
- 86) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 865, XXXI-115, 116, 117). A similar elaboration is made on another occasion also. *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1081), XLII-56, 57, (respecting a prescription from the *Huorensu/Katsujinsho* 活人書 and its prescription amounts), I say that four *shō* are four large *sakazuki*, a half *shō* is half a *sakazuki*; the introduction to the *Bencao* states that "In sum one *shō* is patterned on one large *sakazuki*, five *gō* are patterned on a medium *sakazuki*, and three *gō* are patterned on one small *sakazuki*."
- 87) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 262), X-103.
- 88) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 278), XI-36.
- 89) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1424), LII-238.
- 90) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 444), XV-116.

- 91) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1063), XLI-89.
- 92) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 159), VI-129.
- 93) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 137), VI-74. For an extensive discussion of the drug see (KS pp. 136-137), VI-69-74.
- 94) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 933), XXXVI-7.
- 95) Ishihara Akira, "Kajiwara Shōzen no shōgai to sono chosho," 1737.
- 96) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 584), XXI-70.
- 97) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 511), XVII-91, 92.
- 98) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 82), III-38.
- 99) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 662), XXIII-53.
- 100) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1221), XLVII-6.
- 101) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 948), XXXVI-65.
- 102) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 93), IV-7. A later entry, however, gives no such information: *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1592), LIX-9.
- 103) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1183), XLV-125.
- 104) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1037), XL-92.
- 105) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 16), M-64.
- 106) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 586), XXI-78; *Man'anpō* (KS p. 864), XXXI-112.
- 107) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1457), LIII-127, 128.
- 108) I assume this meaning, even though the *Man'anpō* elsewhere provides two slightly different glosses on this: *Man'anpō* (KS, p. 420), XV-17 noting it as *inkeichū* 陰莖中 pain in the penis, and *Man'anpō* (KS, p. 865), XXXI-115 glossing as *suidō* 水道 or urinary tract pain.
- 109) A later entry for *To Gōshitsu* found in the originally-separate terminology section (*Man'anpō* (KS, p. 1599), LIX-38) is a fairly straight forward note that it is actually *Gōshitsu* with an extra part for the name, and in other texts is called *Jyakujō*.
- 110) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1663), LX-137.
- 111) The *Wamyō honzō* 和名本草 [*kōrai honzō* 康頼本草] (*Zoku gunsho ruijū*, 30.2, p. 453) reads this as *hisashiki yone*, while the *Sukebito honzō* (*Zoku gunsho ruijū*, 30.2, p. 428) reads it as *furuki yone*.
- 112) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1710), LXII-52, 53.
- 113) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1669), LXI-13.
- 114) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1689), LXI-94.
- 115) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1694), LXI-114.
- 116) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1695), LXI-119.

- 117) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1700), LXII-14.
 118) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1705), LXII-34.
 119) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1716), LXII-73.
 120) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 78), III-23.
 121) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1284), XLIX-60.
 122) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1285), XLIX-62.
 123) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1625), LIX-141.
 124) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1691), LXI-102.
 125) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1693), LXI-111.
 126) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1693), LXI-112.
 127) *Denshibyō* were the focus of considerable attention. They are addressed in volume nine of *Ton'ishō* (KS, 178-189); and were the focus of a work written in 1334 by the priest Gahō 我宝 in *Denshibyō nijūgohō* 伝屍病廿五方 (*Zoku gunsho ruijū*, 31.1, 264-275).
 128) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1625), LIX-139.
 129) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1624), LIX-136.
 130) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1689), LXI-95.
 131) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1693), LXI-109.
 132) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 90), III-69.
 133) *Man'anpō* (KS p. 1406), LII-168.