

## 2. Myth, Memory, and the *Scrolls of the Mongol Invasions of Japan*

Thomas D. Conlan

A set of two illustrated handscrolls commissioned by the warrior Takezaki Suenaga 竹崎季長 (1246–ca. 1324), who fought in defense against the two attempted Mongol invasions of Japan in 1274 and 1281, provides insight into how picture scrolls were viewed and abused. Created sometime between the invasions and Suenaga's death in the 1320s, his scrolls, called as the *Scrolls of the Mongol Invasions of Japan* (*Mōko shūrai ekotoba* 蒙古襲来絵詞), were known to only a few warrior families from northern Kyushu for five centuries before they became widely disseminated and appreciated in Japan.<sup>1</sup> These scrolls were valued enough not to be discarded, but not thought precious enough to merit special care or conservation, and the images that survive have been badly damaged, with a number of pages and scenes missing.<sup>2</sup>

Some accidents contributed to alterations in the Mongol Scrolls—which changed hands several times and were copied repeatedly from the late eighteenth century—but others were intentional. Names of characters and images of figures and objects were added to scenes, as too were criticisms of artistic inaccuracies. The Ōyano 大矢野, who owned the scrolls late in the sixteenth century, even scratched out Takezaki Suenaga's name in one scene so as to emphasize the valor of their ancestors.<sup>3</sup> Other changes emphasize Suenaga's role in the narrative at the expense of his brother-in-law Mii Saburō Sukenaga 三井三郎資長.<sup>4</sup> Suenaga's face has been redrawn repeatedly, with his complexion whitened considerably, and his name was inserted next to some figures at a much later date.<sup>5</sup> Finally, what has been thought to be the oldest representation of an exploding shell (*teppō* 鉄砲) was in fact added to the scrolls during the mid-eighteenth century.

Early in the eighteenth century, the Mongol Scrolls began to be conceived of as a historical source that could supplement written texts. Arai Hakuseki 新井白石 (1657–1725), a scholar and advisor to shoguns of the Tokugawa warrior government or bakufu, described a scene of the Mongol Scrolls in his 1709 history of arms and armor, entitled *Honchō gunki kō* 本朝軍器考 (*Thoughts on Japanese Military Equipment*).<sup>6</sup> No visual traces of the scrolls survive from this time, but after Matsudaira Sadanobu 松平定信 (ca. 1759–1829), a later shogunal advisor, requested to see the scrolls in 1793, the scrolls were copied repeatedly, with the earliest surviving reproduction dating to 1795.

That viewers started copying scrolls instead of merely viewing them suggests a new appreciation for the format of picture scrolls. Initially, copyists carefully reproduced the Mongol Scrolls in their current guise, but some thoughtful artists tried to reconstruct how the scrolls must have originally appeared. Along with this increased reverence for the visual images, attitudes changed and visual images came to be perceived as unparalleled sources for understanding the past.

Prior to the eighteenth century, picture scrolls had relatively limited influence as historical sources because they were expensive to commission, difficult to copy, and vulnerable to destruction. The ability to easily copy words, rather than images, explains the paucity of early illustrated examples. For example, a fifteenth-century monk reproduced the complete text of the *Scrolls of the Suwa Deity* (*Suwa Daimyōjin ekotoba* 諏訪大明神繪詞), no longer extant, but omitted the images, noting merely where they had appeared in the narrative.<sup>7</sup> In many cases, the scrolls depicting historical events, such as the *Scrolls of the Hōgen Disturbance* (*Hōgen monogatari ekotoba* 保元物語繪詞), have not survived, even though written accounts of the campaign have.<sup>8</sup>

Members of the elite—be they courtiers, emperors, or from the fourteenth century onward, the Ashikaga shoguns—possessed enough wealth to commission scrolls and could borrow and view these images. At times, courtiers and emperors consulted handscroll illustrations of annual court rituals (*nenjū gyōji* 年中行事), for these proved far more detailed and informative than primitive sketches of rites in court diaries.<sup>9</sup> Nevertheless, even among those able to view picture scrolls, few considered their images an authentic trace of the past, which explains the ease with which images of historical events were altered or retouched.

That observers altered images as they saw fit reveals that they did not perceive the images as having intrinsic historical value per se. The twelfth-century illustrated scroll *Tale of the Counselor Ban* (*Ban Dainagon ekotoba* 伴大納言繪詞)—which depicts an earlier historical incident, the burning of the Ōten 応天 gate

of the Imperial Palace in Kyoto in 866—contains images of a courtier with redrawn robes, which represent an amalgamation of two unrelated scenes in an attempt to hide another significant scene that was otherwise missing.<sup>10</sup> Anonymous viewers of the scrolls altered the narrative as they saw fit, and felt no need to reconstruct the missing scenes; on the contrary, they attempted to obscure them. Likewise, eighteenth-century artists altered the *Kibi Grand Minister Visiting the Tang* (*Kibi Daijin nittō emaki* 吉備大臣入唐絵巻), which had originally belonged to the collection of Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa 後白河上皇 (1127–1192).<sup>11</sup> Takezaki Suenaga's *Scrolls of the Mongol Invasions of Japan* experienced a similar process of reordering and redrawing.

### The Creation and Transmission of the Mongol Scrolls

*The Scrolls of the Mongol Invasions of Japan* provides an invaluable eyewitness account of the two attempted Mongol invasions. Takezaki Suenaga, who commissioned the scrolls, was a *gokenin* 御家人 or “houseman” of the Kamakura bakufu, a judicial and policing entity located in eastern Japan. We know little about him save what can be gleaned from the narrative of the Mongol Scrolls, and a few precepts that he penned late in life. Suenaga first fought against the Mongol invaders when they landed off the coast of Hakata 博多, in northern Kyushu, in 1274. Ordered to wait for reinforcements, he decided instead to lead the charge against the enemy, and was wounded. Once his name was duly recorded on a list of the wounded, Suenaga traveled to Kamakura in search of rewards. For this, he received no support from his relatives, and had to sell his horse in order to pay for his travel.

The Kamakura bakufu had not perfected a means of recording battle service. While in Kamakura, Suenaga had claimed that he was first in battle, and therefore deserving of rewards, but Adachi Yasumori 安達泰盛 (1231–1285)—a ranking official, head of the board of appeals—rebutted him: because he had not killed any enemy, nor suffered any fatalities among his men, he did not merit any compensation. Suenaga thereupon threatened to kill himself, and Yasumori relented, giving him lands (*jitō shiki* 地頭職) in Higo 肥後 province and a horse, and then issued a law prohibiting others from directly appealing to Kamakura for rewards.

Suenaga gained wealth and influence with the receipt of his *jitō shiki*. During the second invasion of 1281, Higo warriors who lived near Suenaga's new lands, such as the Yaigome 焼米, accompanied him in battle. Pretending to be a commander, he boarded a boat and used a shin guard as an ersatz helmet; Suenaga man-

aged to take some enemy heads shortly before a typhoon obliterated the ill-fated Mongol expedition.

Suenaga proved to be skilled at lending money and using his new Kaitō Shrine 海戸神社 to solidify his control over these lands. Through this financial acumen, Suenaga remarkably managed to commission a group of artists to create two copies of his scrolls, which he stored in his Kaitō Shrine.<sup>12</sup> This shrine was important to him, and his final scroll ends with his praise for the deities of the Kaitō Shrine for their inspiration in convincing him to travel eastward to Kamakura.

Suenaga's scrolls represent an amalgamation of courtly and provincial painting styles. The identity of the artists who created the Mongol Scrolls continues to generate debate.<sup>13</sup> Some sections of this work, such as the initial scenes, are of the highest quality, while others were drawn with a weaker line.<sup>14</sup> In contrast to works commissioned by capital nobility, which frequently emphasized portraiture, the artists who created Suenaga's scrolls possessed varied perspectives: some attempted to recreate the appearance of warriors—such as Shōni Kagesuke 少貳景資 (d. 1285), a commander of Japanese forces in 1274—as had been typical for many courtly inspired works, while others lavished more attention on horses and their gear.

### The Transmission of the Mongol Scrolls

Takezaki Suenaga's scrolls did not survive unscathed. The descendants of Suenaga suffered political eclipse and near destruction in the civil wars of the fourteenth century (lasting from 1333 to 1392), and the scrolls were confiscated from the Kaitō Shrine by the Nawa 名和 family, who kept them until late in the sixteenth century, when Nawa Akinori 名和顕孝 married his daughter to Amakusa no Ōyano Tanemoto 天草の大矢野種基.<sup>15</sup> Tanemoto belonged to a longstanding Higo family whose ancestors are mentioned in the scrolls. Accordingly, Akinori gave the scrolls to Tanemoto as part of his daughter's dowry. Nevertheless, Tanemoto and his son died during the 1592 invasion of Korea, and thereupon the Ōyano fell onto hard times. Suenaga's scrolls appear to have deteriorated under the Ōyano's stewardship. According to lore, they were once dropped into the ocean and suffered extensive water damage—even the glue that held the pages together dissolved.

The oldest copies of Suenaga's scrolls, created late in the eighteenth century, reveal how the images and passages were preserved loosely and in no clear order.<sup>16</sup> Late eighteenth-century inventories also explain how the "sixteen records" that constitute the passages of this work were stored separately from the painted scenes.<sup>17</sup> To confuse matters further, the Ōyano possessed two copies of

the scrolls.<sup>18</sup> Ōyano house precepts prohibited anyone from looking at these images, or reading the passages, which hindered their dissemination. Although one copy of the scrolls was loaned to ranking officials of the Tokugawa bakufu twice during the eighteenth century, fragments of the other copy remained stored in secret until 1823.<sup>19</sup>

Fearing that they might lose their scrolls or cause them to suffer further damage, the impoverished Ōyano entrusted them to Hosokawa Tadatoshi 細川忠利, the lord of Kumamoto 熊本 domain (*han* 藩) and Higo province, in 1825. They remained in the Hosokawa archive until 1869, when the government of the Meiji 明治 era (1868–1912) abolished all domains. The Hosokawa returned the scrolls to Ōyano Jurō 大矢野十郎, who presented them to the Meiji emperor in 1890. In 1989 the scrolls were bestowed upon the nation, and now they are housed in the Museum of the Imperial Collections.<sup>20</sup>

### Retouching the Scrolls: Barbaric Figures and Exploding Projectiles

Takezaki Suenaga's scrolls have achieved great fame because they represent an eyewitness account, and are thus an unsurpassed record of the invasions. In addition, they have been thought to provide the oldest visual representation of a *teppō* 鉄砲, or exploding projectile. The veracity of the scrolls was further enhanced in 2001, when underwater archeologists discovered the hollow metal projectiles alluded to in the scrolls. Recent scholarship has shown, however, that some scenes of the scrolls have been significantly altered, with images of Mongol warriors and exploding *teppō* drawn in the scrolls. These changes reveal that when confronted with a disjunction between written records of the past and the images in the Mongol Scrolls, early viewers altered the scrolls so as to better reflect textual sources.

### Toward an Ethnic Imagination of What Constituted “the Mongols”

The Mongol Scrolls carefully depict the tactics, uniforms, and facial features of the Mongol invaders. The first scroll, which recounts the invasion of 1274, reveals how the Mongol troops were forced to retreat and mass in an encampment behind shields, using gongs to coordinate their troops. The Mongols—wearing similarly patterned dull brown armor—are primarily on foot. A variety of skin colors and facial types suggest that their force was drawn from a diverse population.<sup>21</sup> The contrast, too, between these troops and some of the men with elaborate coiffure, seen on the Mongol ships in the second scroll, is indicative of an attempt to convey



Fig. 1. Anonymous, detail of Takezaki Suenaga being thrown from his wounded horse from the *Scrolls of the Mongol Invasions of Japan*, handscroll, ink and colors on paper, Imperial Household Collection.

appearances as accurately as possible, for exaggerated features and distortions are strikingly absent from this work.

The best known scene in the Mongol Scrolls depicts Takezaki Suenaga being thrown from his wounded horse. A projectile explodes above him and three large Mongol soldiers stand firmly in front of their already fleeing compatriots (fig. 1). The art historian Matsumoto Aya has explained how these three warriors were in fact later painted into the scrolls, for they were drawn over the fleeing warriors and onto a seam where two disparate scenes had been pasted together.<sup>22</sup> The scene thus represents an amalgamation of what should be considered two scenes.<sup>23</sup> As a result of this change, Suenaga appears before his brother-in-law Mii Saburō Sukenaga, who in fact should most logically be leading the charge (compare figs. 2 and 3).

The three Mongol warriors located near the exploding projectile differ from the other Mongol warriors in that they have leering grimaces, unkempt beards, strange winged helmets, short robes, and prominent black boots. Seemingly epitomizing the “barbaric” invader, these larger-than-life figures draw attention away from their bland and fleeing compatriots. Close inspection of these warriors reveals that the brush strokes used to depict them are rough, and the ink of low quality, for in contrast to the black ink used to depict Suenaga and his mount, the ink around these Mongols is smudged, blackening the surrounding paper.<sup>24</sup> Other similarly clad Mongols appear in the second scroll as well, with one implausibly standing on the rail of a ship in his black boots, and another commander drawn in red robes and black boots and twice the size of nearby adjuncts.

These five figures of Mongols were added to the Mongol Scrolls because the images otherwise did not correspond with how the Mongols had come to be re-

Fig. 2. Anonymous, details from the *Scrolls of the Mongol Invasions of Japan*, handscroll, ink and colors on paper, Imperial Household Collection.



Fig. 3. Anonymous, Digitally altered version of the *Scrolls of the Mongol Invasions of Japan*, handscroll, ink and colors on paper, Imperial Household Collection.





membered. Takezaki Suenaga, for example, does not refer to Mongol barbarity in his comments; instead he laconically refers to the Mongols as rebels, or foreign pirates. Mongol actions do not seem to have been perceived as being beyond the pale of acceptable behavior. After the Yuan 元 dynasty (1279–1368) collapsed, a perception of Mongol ruthlessness and barbarity became prominent. The *Yuanshi* 元史 (*History of the Yuan Dynasty*), compiled by officials of the succeeding Ming 明 dynasty (1368–1644), provides a vivid account of Mongol cruelty. The Ming, insecure in their hold over northern China, emphasized the brutality of the Mongol invaders. The *Yuanshi* account contains a harrowing narrative, with Mongols “ruthlessly murdering and slaughtering” captured women and stringing them with wire to the sides of their ships.<sup>25</sup>

“Official” histories served as the primary source for reconstructing the Mongol invasions, and so their biases profoundly influenced later historical accounts. Early histories of the invasions rely almost exclusively upon the *Yuanshi*. The *Ishō Nihon den* 異稱日本伝 (*Treatises on Japan under Different Titles*), written in 1537 and published in fifteen volumes in 1693,<sup>26</sup> contains references to the dynastic histories written in China and Korea: the *Yuanshi* and the *Goryeosa* 高麗史 (*History of the Goryeo Period*), both of which were compiled approximately a century after the invasions. The *Gyojū gaigen* 馭戍概言 (*General Remarks on Mounted Defenses*)—written in 1778 by the Kokugaku 国学 scholar Motoori Norinaga 本居宣長 (1730–1801)—likewise refers almost exclusively to the *Yuanshi* in reconstructing the Mongol invasions of Japan.<sup>27</sup>

This *Yuanshi* account describes how the Mongols used exploding projectiles or *teppō* and catapults to attack the Japanese.<sup>28</sup> The *Hachiman gudōkun* 八幡愚童訓, a fourteenth-century Japanese source dedicated to the miraculous activities of the Hachiman deity, corroborated the use of *teppō*, and appears to have been the most widely used Japanese source on the invasions.<sup>29</sup> Mention of these objects piqued the imaginations of those who attempted to reconstruct the invasions in later centuries, when *teppō* had become relatively commonplace. Later erudite readers altered the paintings in the scrolls based upon their understanding of the past.

### How Teppō Came to Be Added to the Scrolls

Varied sources confirm that Arai Hakuseki borrowed the scrolls early in the eighteenth century. He referred to them in a treatise he wrote in 1709, and annotations on the 1795 copy of the Mongol Scrolls state that Hakuseki viewed the scrolls while writing his manuscript.<sup>30</sup> Even though his history of weaponry—the

aforementioned *Honchō gunki kō*—contains the oldest surviving description of the scrolls, it has not been analyzed in depth.

In his history of weapons, Hakuseki confined his description of the Mongol Scrolls to an early scene, where Suenaga is about to attack the Mongols in 1274, in order to describe a fish-shaped ornament located at the end of a scabbard.<sup>31</sup> Significantly, he does not mention viewing an image of a *teppō* in the Mongol Scrolls, even though he provided detailed analysis of projectiles elsewhere in his text. He writes of objects “which are called *teppō*, which [first appear] during the reign of [Emperor] Kameyama 龜山天皇, during the Bun’ei era (1264–1274), when the Mongols attacked. That is the time when this word first appeared.”<sup>32</sup> Hakuseki otherwise relied upon the *Hachiman gudōkun* to recount the history of *teppō*, adding that no such objects survive.<sup>33</sup>

This lacuna proves surprising, for Hakuseki relied upon visual sources to supplement written accounts,<sup>34</sup> and the scene of a shell exploding above a charging Takezaki Suenaga would be germane to his work. Thus, it seems most likely that no image of an exploding shell existed when Hakuseki perused the scrolls. Inspection of the Mongol Scrolls also supports the notion that the *teppō* did not exist in the original, but was added later, for it was drawn with rough brushstrokes, in contrast to the skill of the original artwork. Furthermore, the ink used to draw the *teppō* has smudged just as it has around the added Mongol figures.<sup>35</sup> Circumstantial and physical evidence corroborates that the *teppō* image was added to the scrolls after 1709.<sup>36</sup>

## The Scrolls in the Eighteenth Century

Whoever added images of *teppō* had to have been well versed in the *Yuanshi* and the *Hachiman gudōkun*, so as to know about their existence, and have had the chance to alter the Mongol Scrolls after Hakuseki had viewed them. One cannot easily know what happened to the Mongol Scrolls from 1709 until 1795, when the oldest surviving copy was created. Kawazoe Shōji has shown how a 1728 Higo Province Gazetteer records the narrative of Suenaga, describing how he was wounded and later mounted enemy ships and “this shows how Suenaga’s brother-in-law Mii Saburō Sukenaga also received a great name” from Narase Hisataka 成瀬久敬 of Higo.<sup>37</sup> This account refers to the *Mōko shūraiiki*, a chronicle of the Mongol invasions that was probably written by Kiyama Shōtaku 木山紹宅, who can be verified as copying works dating between 1578 and 1579.<sup>38</sup> That Takezaki Suenaga and his brother-in-law, Mii Saburō Sukenaga, receive equal billing suggests that the scrolls remained in their original order, whereby Sukenaga, and not Suenaga,

led the initial 1274 charge. Leering Mongols and exploding shells could only have been added after the scene was rearranged with Suenaga leading the charge, for they were drawn over two disparate pages.

Member(s) of the Tsuda 津田 family of northern Kyushu most likely added images of exploding *teppō* and fearsome Mongols while they were compiling their *Sankō Mōko nyūkōki* 参考蒙古入寇記 (*A Mongol Invasions Chronicles Reference*), a five-volume compendia of sources pertaining to the invasions published in 1758.<sup>39</sup> The Tsuda were familiar with textual sources that described *teppō* and barbaric Mongols, for one can reconstruct how their work relied upon the *Ishō Nihon den* and the *Hachiman gudōkun*. Kawazoe Shōji has also shown that the Tsuda had access to the Mongol Scrolls in the mid-eighteenth century.<sup>40</sup> With their knowledge of the sources, they would have had the confidence to alter the scrolls, and at the same time, the ink that they had access to was of inferior quality. The added images, although drawn in a bold and evocative manner, do not compare in technical skill to those of the thirteenth-century artists who originally painted the scrolls. Such a fate befell the *Kibi Daijin Nitō emaki* in the mid-eighteenth century as well, as Nagasawa Rosetsu 長沢蘆雪 (1755–1799) added scenes, replete with clumsily drawn donkeys with long ears, and reordered the scrolls, thereby confusing the narrative considerably.<sup>41</sup> Rosetsu's work caused the reputation of the *Kibi Daijin Nitō emaki* to suffer. By contrast, it is a measure of the Tsuda's skill that when the scrolls were viewed approximately a generation later, none realized that the *teppō* scene represented a later accretion.

A pine tree, drawn by the legs of Suenaga's bucking horse, provides further evidence that this scene was altered in the mid-eighteenth century, rather than in 1793, when Tokugawa officials once again viewed the scrolls. Matsumoto Aya has shown that this tree represents another addition to the scene where Suenaga confronts three Mongols and their *teppō*.<sup>42</sup> Whoever altered the Mongol Scrolls did not understand the unfolding of the visual narrative, for pine trees only appear in what are now known to be the first scenes of the scroll, where Japanese forces mass in a woods. Once they launch an attack against the Mongols, however, no trees are evident. Thus, the artist who added this tree near Suenaga's horse assumed that he was wounded in a pine forest. The oldest copy of the scroll, dating from 1795, contains many errors in reconstructing how the scenes of the scrolls were linked, but even at this time, the lone pine tree by Suenaga's mount appears out of place in the battle scene, thereby revealing that a more sophisticated grasp of the narrative existed by 1795.

Matsudaira Sadanobu viewed the Mongol Scrolls in 1793, and although

no record survives of this event, two years later, the first copies appeared, and in them—and all subsequent versions—images of fearsome bearded Mongols, a pine tree by Suenaga's wounded horse, and an exploding projectile appear, and have been thought to constitute part of the original scrolls. In 1797, Takamoto Shi'un 高本紫溟 and Nagase Saneyuki 長瀬真幸 had two specialists named Miyazaki and Kami'e restore the images as part of two scrolls, and it is in this format that they survive today.<sup>43</sup> Since then, the "original" has changed little, except that one scene and one textual passage were added upon their discovery some twenty-six years later.<sup>44</sup>

Even though the scrolls were being copied in the nineteenth century, the textual passages of the scrolls received wider dissemination when the scholar Hanawa Hokinoichi 塙保己一 compiled sources pertaining to the Mongol invasions and included the text of the *Handscrolls of Takezaki Gorō* (*Takezaki Gorō ekotoba* 竹崎五郎絵詞) in 1811.<sup>45</sup> Hanawa's version does not mention the word *teppō* even though he does note the nearby captions describing Takezaki Suenaga,<sup>46</sup> suggesting that the textual passages reflected the state of the scrolls before the *teppō* images had been added. Later in the nineteenth century, however, Hanawa's compilation would descend into relative obscurity, for woodblock prints of the Mongol Scrolls would become widely disseminated due largely to the efforts of Fukuda Taka, a noted Higo artist who strove to restore the scrolls.

### The Movement to Restore the Scrolls

Over the course of the nineteenth century visual images gained an authority as both sources of the past and important artifacts in their own right. Matsudaira Sadanobu, the Tokugawa bakufu official who viewed the Mongol Scrolls in 1793, wrote that he attempted to view as many scrolls as possible after retiring from office.<sup>47</sup> An antiquarian impulse underpinned his work, for he used these sources in 1800 to publish *Shūko jishshu* 集古十種 (*Ten Types of Collected Antiquities*), an encyclopedic compilation of images including about two thousand treasures from the past.<sup>48</sup> Sadanobu also strove to complete fragmentary scrolls and had artists reconstruct the final two volumes (*maki* 卷) of the *Illustrated Handscrolls of the Origins of the Ishiyamadera* (*Ishiyamadera engi* 石山寺縁起) in 1805, with the images based upon scenes found in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century *emaki*, such as *The Miracles of the Kasuga Deity* (*Kasuga gongen kenki-e* 春日権現験記絵), or *The Tales of Heiji* (*Heiji monogatari ekotoba* 平治物語絵詞).<sup>49</sup> Sadanobu made his restoration manifest in the case of the *Ishiyamadera engi*, for he added a colophon to the text. Lacking a coherent understanding of the Mongol Scrolls, Sadanobu did not attempt

to reconstruct them, for copies of the Mongol Scrolls reproduced in 1795 reveal several clearly fragmentary and yet unaltered scenes.

Although the Mongol Scrolls were altered over the course of the eighteenth century, once they were carefully copied in 1795 viewers felt less free to add to the images as they saw fit. Indeed, with increased interest in the images of the Mongol Scrolls came a sense that the scrolls themselves should be restored. Some copyists, aware of certain of the more egregious alterations, omitted them in their own copies.

Fukuda Taka 福田太華—a painter and disciple of Nagase Saneyuki, one of the men who fitted the loose images of Suenaga’s account into two scrolls in 1797—first attempted to reconstruct rather than merely copy the Mongol Scrolls. It has long been believed that Fukuda pasted Suenaga’s original images and texts into two scrolls, for an 1832 memorial incorrectly describes how Taka, lamenting the poor state of the “original version,” collected the scattered images and pasted them together as two scrolls.<sup>50</sup> Fukuda instead made copies of how he perceived the scrolls to have originally appeared. His restoration reveals a new sense of respect for the images, and a corresponding desire to publicize the Mongol scenes. Fukuda created six copies of the scrolls. One of these reproductions, copied in turn by Takashima Chiharu 高島千春 (1777–1859), became widely disseminated, for the daimyo of Kii 紀伊 province, Mizuno Tadanaka 水野忠央 (1814–1865), included it in his compilation, the *Tankaku sōsho* 丹鶴叢書 (*Tankaku Series*).<sup>51</sup>

The *Tankaku* version of the scrolls uniquely contains two scenes that do not appear in the “original” or any other copies of the scrolls. One depicts two warriors carrying the heads of Mongol captives, while the other shows a group of warriors. Takashima Chiharu claimed that Fukuda Taka created these scenes, otherwise described only in Suenaga’s written narrative, so as to most accurately reconstruct the Mongol Scrolls in their original state.<sup>52</sup>

The textual and visual progression of the *Tankaku sōsho* narrative unfolds more logically and corresponds more closely to the written narrative than does the current reconstruction of the original. In the *Tankaku* version Takezaki Suenaga’s brother-in-law, Mii Saburō, is depicted as attacking retreating Mongols after Suenaga’s horse had been shot, unlike in the original, which juxtaposes events by showing Mii Saburō chasing Mongols, in full flight, before Suenaga was unhorsed. Nevertheless, the Mongols did not begin to flee from the battlefield until after Suenaga’s horse had been shot.

Fukuda correctly restored other scenes as they had originally appeared. For example, in the second scroll, two soldiers are depicted as sprinting before a stone wall. One of these warriors was transformed in the original into a man standing

awkwardly behind his nimble compatriot, but Fukuda portrays both as running. Another variation is that a passage of text that is duplicated in the scrolls is absent from the *Tankaku* version.<sup>53</sup> In some of his reproductions, Fukuda also omitted a large Mongol general drawn out of proportion in the penultimate scene of the scrolls, for he perceived this figure to constitute a later addition.<sup>54</sup>

Fukuda's reconstructions suggest that he held *emaki* in reverence. Whereas eighteenth-century viewers had no qualms about skillfully inserting images of projectiles and bearded black-booted barbarians, the nineteenth century witnessed a different movement, as copyists attempted to reconstruct how the original scrolls had been created, even at times adding scenes and erasing figures believed to have been added later. Fukuda Taka did not, however, realize that the projectile and some Mongol warriors had been added later, which is why they appear in his copies.

### Picture Scrolls as the Basis for Imaging the Past

With Fukuda Taka's restorations—and the advent of more sophisticated means of transmitting images by woodblock print and, eventually, photography—*emaki* became enshrined as unchanging objects that allowed for a “visualization” of the past in popular imagination. The Mongol Scrolls and Takezaki Suenaga achieved great fame as the nineteenth century progressed.<sup>55</sup> Even in the aftermath of the Second World War, the scrolls would remain influential because they contained the oldest representation of a *teppō*. The scene of *teppō* exploding over the heads of three fierce Mongols has been reproduced in textbooks, and on the rare occasions when the Mongol Scrolls are displayed on exhibit, this scene is invariably shown, for it has become the iconic image of the invasions.

In recent years, archeological discoveries have revealed that the Mongols used projectiles. Some, discovered in the early 1990s, were of rounded stone, and others, of hollow metal cast, were unearthed in 2001.<sup>56</sup> The latter discovery made headlines in the major Japanese newspapers, which described how hollow “exploding projectiles” (*kayaku buki* 火薬武器) or “exploding shells” (*kayaku dan* 火薬弾) had been discovered.<sup>57</sup> Claims that they were “filled . . . with gunpowder” have yet to be confirmed.<sup>58</sup> Nevertheless, assumptions regarding these objects are based upon their images in the Mongol Scrolls. This becomes explicit in the writings of archaeologists Hisa Yōichirō and Katada Masaki, who analyzed the *teppō* in scholarly reports, and frankly explained that they expected these objects “would have

gunpowder in them, and were capable of exploding in fragments . . . as was depicted in the Mongol Scrolls.”<sup>59</sup>

This image has become an authoritative source for reconstructing the Mongol Invasions. Some archaeologists, confusing archaeological and artistic evidence, even used the existence of hollow *teppō* to prove that they must have existed in the scrolls.<sup>60</sup> The idea that images allow for one to “visualize” the past has led to increased interest in these sources, and their subsequent reproduction in textbooks, television, and the Internet.

Perhaps unsurprising, it is the images and scenes added to the Mongol Scrolls that resonate with contemporary imaginations of the invasions. Hirsute barbaric Mongols in black boots better correspond to contemporary understandings of their empire than do images that suggest a polyglot and multi-ethnic force. Picture scrolls became valued as historical sources over the course of the eighteenth century as viewers gained distance from past sources and no longer felt comfortable about editing or shifting them; instead they chose to preserve and reconstruct copies of the scrolls. In doing so, they revealed a greater respect for the past and, at the same time, increased distance from it as well.

#### Endnotes

1. Suenaga wrote his last testament in 1324 and died presumably shortly thereafter. Sometime during these fifty years, these scrolls were created. Slight differences suggest that the commissioning of the scrolls represents a longer process.
2. Satō Tetsutarō 佐藤鉄太郎, *Mōko shūrai ekotoba to Takezaki Suenaga no kenkyū* 蒙古襲来絵詞と竹崎季長の研究 [Research on Takezaki Suenaga and the Mongol Scrolls] (Tokyo: Kinseisha, 2005), pp. 221–40. According to Satō, thirteen out of fifteen written passages survive almost in their entirety.
3. Close observation of Scene 16 in the original reveals that Suenaga’s name has been scraped from the page. Suenaga’s identity can be ascertained from Passage 11, because his helmet made from shin guards is shown falling off his head. By contrast, the Ōyano names remain legible in this scene. For how this scene has been redrawn see Satō, *Mōko shūrai ekotoba to Takezaki Suenaga no kenkyū*, pp. 451–52.
4. Matsumoto Aya reveals how the later scrolls emphasize Suenaga’s role, but the earlier passages do not, and instead treat him as one of several important characters. See Matsumoto Aya 松本彩, “*Mōko shūrai ekotoba no seiritsu to denrai ni tsuite—sono saikō*” 蒙古襲来絵詞の成立と伝来について—その再考 [Further Thoughts on the Creation and Transmission of the Mongol Scrolls], *Sannomaru Shōzōkan nenpō kiyō* (1996): 68.
5. A perusal of the copies of the scrolls located at Kyushu and Kumamoto Universities reveals that a later viewer added Suenaga’s name at places in the scrolls. For example, the name “Suenaga” that appears in Scene 12 of the second scroll is missing from the Kyushu copy, and was accordingly added at a later time. The best recent analysis of writing styles in the scrolls appears in Matsumoto,

“*Mōko shūrai ekotoba* no seiritsu to denrai ni tsuite—sono saikō,” particularly pp. 68–70.

6. Hakuseki’s *Honchō gunki kō* is located most conveniently in Ichishima Kenkichi 市島謙吉, ed., *Arai Hakuseki zenshū* 新井白石全集 [The Complete Works of Arai Hakuseki] 6 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Hanshichi, 1907), p. 281.

7. For the textual passages of this scroll see the *Suwa Daimyōjin ekotoba*, in *Zoku gunsho ruijū jingi bu* 3.2. 1925. (Reprint ed., Tokyo: Gunsho ruijū kanseikai, 1975: 494–539). Kosaka Enchū, a trusted administrator of the Ashikaga regime, showed this scroll to Ashikaga Takauji on 11.28.1356 (p. 538). The text and images survived through 1442. See Nakahara Yasutomi, *Yasutomiki* 康富記 (Kyoto: Rinsen shoten, 1965), 11.26.1442 and 12.1.1442, and Arakawa Hidetoshi 荒川秀俊, “*Suwa daimyōjin ekotoba*” 諏訪大明神絵詞, *Gunsho* ぐんしょ 2, no. 1 (1.1963): 3–5. The text alone was copied at Mt. Kōya in 1472. See “*Suwa Daimyōjin ekotoba*,” in *Zoku gunsho ruijū jingi bu*, pp. 514 and 538.

8. For the references to the *Hōgen monogatari ekotoba* see *Kanmon gyoki* 2, in Ota Toshirō, ed. (Tokyo: Zoku gunsho ruijū kanseikai, 1958–59), urū 5.4.1436, pp. 388–39. For reference to the *Taiheiki* 太平記 see 5.12.1436, p. 382; for the *Heike monogatari* 平家物語 see urū 5.1.1436, p. 437. For his copying of the *Taiheiki* see 9.10.1436, p. 416 and 9.26.1436, p. 417; for copying the Ukifune chapters of *Genji monogatari* see vol. 1, 6.24.1418, p. 144. See also 8.9.1418, p. 162 and 10.21.1418, pp. 187–88.

9. This is amply illustrated in Chapter 5 in this volume. A manuscript copy of Tōin Kinkata’s diary *Entairyaku* dating from the first month of 1314 (Shōwa 3) reveals Kinkata’s stick-figure like sketches of nobles engaged at ritual activities. Conlan viewed this copy at Kyoto University in April, 2002.

10. Kuroda Taizō 黒田泰三, *Shōgakkan Gallery shinpen meihō Nihon no bijutsu* 小学館ギャラリー—新編名宝日本の美術, vol. 12, *Ban daïnagon emaki* 伴大納言絵巻 (Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1991), pp. 72–73. For Kuroda’s reproduction of how the scene should be restored see pp. 74–75.

11. For an informative study of how images in this scroll have been reordered see Kuroda Hideo, *Kibi Daijin nitō emaki no mayoi* [Mysteries Regarding the Scrolls of the Kibi Grand Minister Visiting the Tang] (Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 2005).

12. This is evident because two copies of the same passage appear in the current reconstruction of the original scrolls. For an overview see Satō, *Mōko shūrai ekotoba to Takezaki Suenaga no kenkyū*, pp. 221–40. One copy of the Mongol Scrolls, held by the Saitama Prefecture Museum, also contains another distinct textual fragment of the original interspersed with what otherwise constitutes a copy. See Moriuchi Yūko 森内優子, “Tōkanzō *Mōko shūrai ekotoba* ni tsuite” 当館蔵「蒙古襲来絵詞」について [Concerning the Tōkanzō Copy of the Mongol Scrolls], *Saitama Kenritsu Hakubutsukan kiyō* no. 21 (1996): 9–34 (for the analysis and the photos on pp. 16–17 see p. 12, and for a transcription of this passage see p. 34).

13. Matsumoto Aya argued that court artists composed the scrolls in her “*Mōko shūrai ekotoba* no seiritsu to denrai ni tsuite—sono saikō.” According to Ōyano Jurō’s history of the scrolls, Tosa Nagataka and his son Nagaaki created them. See Matsumoto, “*Mōko shūrai ekotoba* no seiritsu to denrai ni tsuite—sono saikō,” pp. 67–69. Fujimoto Masayuki has advanced the possibility that Scene 2 of the scrolls was painted by an artist from the Dazaifu, familiar with the styles of the capital and yet immersed in the mentalities of the provinces. See Fujimoto Masayuki 藤本正行, *Yoroi o matō hitobito* 鎧をまとう人びと [People Who Wear Armor] (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 2000), pp. 35–36.

14. For stylistic distinctions among the artists who drew Suenaga’s scrolls and their styles of painting see Miya Tsugio 宮次男, *Kassen no emaki* 合戦絵巻 [Battle Scrolls] (Tokyo: Kadokawa



shoten, 1977), pp. 122–27. For a differing interpretation of the scenes and the quality of their drawing see Satō, *Mōko shūrai ekotoba to Takezaki Suenaga no kenkyū*, pp. 451–52 (for how one of the “poorly drawn” scenes was in fact retouched later).

15. This narrative comes from Ōyano Jurō’s explanation of how the scrolls were transmitted. See Matsumoto, “*Mōko shūrai ekotoba no seiritsu to denrai ni tsuite—sono saikō*,” p. 67.

16. These earliest copies vary greatly in the ordering of the images and the placement of textual passages. For more on the scrolls’ scattered state of preservation see Sujaku Shinjō 朱雀信城, “*Mōko shūrai ekotoba denzon katei no fukugen ni tsuite*” 「蒙古襲来絵詞」伝存過程の復原について [A Reconstruction of the Transmission of the Mongol Scrolls], *Hakata kenkyū kaishi* 博多研究会誌 7 (1999): 105.

17. *Ibid.*, pp. 100–5. This reference to sixteen passages is inaccurate, for only fifteen passages survive, while one is duplicated, appearing twice in the current version of the original scrolls. See Satō, *Mōko shūrai ekotoba to Takezaki Suenaga no kenkyū*, pp. 221–40. According to Horimoto Kazushige, as late as 1709, all the visual images were preserved in one scroll, but without any written narrative. Horimoto Kazushige 堀本一繁, “*Mōko shūrai ekotoba no genjō seiritsu katei ni tsuite—Aoyanagi Tanenobu hon no kentō to shōkai*” 「蒙古襲来絵詞」の現状成立過程について—青柳種信本の検討と紹介 [How The Mongol Scrolls Came to Be: An Introduction and Analysis of the Aoyanagi Tanenobu Copy], *Fukuokashi hakubutsukan kenkyū kiyō* 8 (1998): 15.

18. For this path-breaking research see Horimoto, “*Mōko shūrai ekotoba no genjō seiritsu katei ni tsuite—Aoyanagi Tanenobu hon no kentō to shōkai*,” particularly p. 39, which reproduces an account explaining that one scene and passage of text were discovered in 1832.

19. Horimoto, *loc. cit.*

20. Matsumoto Aya, “*Mōko shūrai ekotoba*” 蒙古襲来絵詞 [The Mongol Invasion Scrolls] in *Emaki—Mōko shūrai ekotoba, Eshi no sōshi, Kitano Tenji engi* 絵巻—蒙古襲来絵詞、絵師草紙、北野天神縁起 (Tokyo: Sannomaru Shōzōkan, 1994), p. 9.

21. The informative account by William of Rubruk, for example, reveals how an impressive variety of individuals served with the Mongols, with a Parisian silversmith making their throne and Hungarian and Germans serving in the Mongol forces. See Christopher Dawson, *Mission to Asia* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980).

22. Matsumoto Aya, “*Mōko shūrai ekotoba ni tsuite no ichikōsatsu—arata na mondaiten o kuwaete*” 「蒙古襲来絵詞」についての一考察—新たな問題点を加えて [Analysis of the Mongol Invasion Scrolls—Considering a New Problem] in *Emaki—Mōko shūrai ekotoba, Eshi no sōshi, Kitano Tenji engi*, pp. 62–67.

23. Matsumoto, “*Mōko shūrai ekotoba ni tsuite no ichikōsatsu—arata na mondaiten o kuwaete*,” pp. 66–67. Likewise, the pine tree appearing behind Suenaga’s bucking horse represents a later addition, as does the copious blood flowing from his wounded mount. See Matsumoto, *loc. cit.* and Satō, *Mōko shūrai ekotoba to Takezaki Suenaga no kenkyū*.

24. Conlan viewed the scrolls in the exhibit *Toki to koete kataru mono: Shiryō to bijutsu no meihō* 時を超えて語るもの史料と美術の名宝 [Voices from the Past: Historical Sources and Art Treasures] (Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, January 2002). This smudging is not readily discernible in photographs of the scrolls.

25. For the most convenient translation of the *Yuanshi* see Ryusaku Tsunoda, *Japan in the Chinese Dynastic Histories* (Pasadena: P.D. and Ione Perkins, 1951), p. 81. For an excellent edition see Nihon Shiryō Shūsei Hensankai, comp., *Chūgoku Chōsen no shiseki ni okeru Nihon shiryō shūsei shōshi no bu* 中国朝鮮の史籍における日本史料集成正史之部1 [Sources Pertaining to Japan in Chinese and Korean Records: Official Histories, Section 1] (Tokyo: Kokusho kankōkai, 1975),

pp. 55–144 (for all references to Japan in the *Yuan shi*). For Korean (Kōrai/Goryeo) accounts of the invasions see Nihon shiryō shūsei hensankai, comp., *Chūgoku Chōsen no shiseki ni okeru Nihon shiryō shūsei sankoku Kōrai no bu* 中国朝鮮の史籍における日本史料集成三國高麗之部 [Sources Pertaining to Japan in Chinese and Korean Records: Three Kingdoms and Kōrai/Goguryeo] (Tokyo: Kokusho kankōkai, 1978).

26. For a printed version see Kondō Heijō 近藤瓶城, comp., *Shiseki shūran* 史籍集覽 [A Compilation of Written Sources] 20 (Kyoto: Rinsen shoten: 1902) (for the original date of publication see p. 741).

27. The *Ishō Nihon den* refers to the *Yuanshi* on pp. 3, and 117ff, and relies on Korean accounts on pp. 550ff. Much of this analysis is based on the unsurpassed research of Kawazoe Shōji 川添昭二, who explores historical views of the Mongol invasions in his invaluable *Mōko shūrai kenkyū shiron* 蒙古襲来研究史論 [Analysis of Research Concerning the Mongol Invasions] (Tokyo: Yūzankaku, 1977). Motoori Norinaga’s work also has the gloss *Kara osame no uretamigoto* 馭戍概言, and was probably written in 1777–78. See Ōkubo Shō 大久保正, ed., *Motoori Norinaga zenshū* 本居宣長全集 [The Complete Works of Motoori Norinaga] (Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1972), pp. 12–13 (for the origins of the text), and pp. 24–118 (for the account itself). The colophon states that this text was written on 2.1778 (p. 118). For the significance of the *Yuanshi* as a source see pp. 71–75.

28. Tsunoda recounts the “decisive” use of firearms in 1274 (p. 82), and their use in the second invasion (p. 86). He also tells of the use of catapults in the second invasion (p. 87), and “moveable artillery that had been newly manufactured” (p. 91). Some catapults were also discovered that contain writing indicating that they had once belonged to the Sung navy. See Nagasaki Ken Takashima Chō Kyōiku Iinkai, comp., *Takashima kaitei iseki* 鷹島海底遺跡 [Artifacts from the Takashima Seabed] 8 (Takashima: Takashima chō bunkazai chōsa hōkokusho, 1992–2004), pp. 60–68. Rounded stone projectiles suitable for use by catapults were discovered, as too were earthen balls (*Ibid.*, vol. 1, pp. 75–79, 88, 93 and vol. 8 [2003] pp. 12–13). I am grateful to Yamashita Junko for her help in providing copies of the Takashima reports.

29. The *Hachiman gudōkun* states that “when [the Japanese fled] *teppō* were fired, making [the sky dark] and a loud roaring sound.” The best transcription of two variant texts of the *Hachiman gudōkun* appears in Sakurai Tokutarō 桜井徳太郎, et al., eds., *Jisha engi* 寺社縁起 [Legends of Temples and Shrines] (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1975), pp. 169–274 (for the quote, see p. 184). This passage has been translated by Farris in his *Heavenly Warriors: The Evolution of Japan’s Military, 500–1300* (Cambridge: Harvard Council on East Asian Studies, 1992). However, he elides the specific reference to these projectiles. The narrative of the *Ishō Nihon den* closely resembles that of the *Hachiman gudōkun*, for it recounts how the Shōni were defeated and how the Mongols attacked Iki Island, which represents a vivid episode from the *Hachiman gudōkun* (see the *Ishō Nihon den*, pp. 121–22 ff).

30. For a transcription of this passage of the Kenchūji copy of the scrolls see Horimoto, “*Mōko shūrai ekotoba no genjō* seiritsu katei ni tsuite—Aoyanagi Tanenobu hon no kentō to shōkai,” p. 15.

31. Hakuseki, *Honchō gunki kō*, p. 352.

32. *Ibid.*, p. 336.

33. *Loc. cit.*

34. In addition to the Mongol Scrolls, Hakuseki refers to the *Go-sannen emakimono*, the *Hōgen Heiji monogatari emakimono*, the *Heiji monogatari emakimono*, and the now lost *Ichi no tani tatakai emakimono* in his work. For Hakuseki’s list of visual sources see p. 281. For a sample

of such visual references in his work see pp. 324, 345, 350, 366, 377, 387, 390–91 (*Go-sannen kassen-e*); pp. 328, 388, 390 (*Heiji monogatari e*); and p. 387 (*Hōgen Heiji monogatari no e*).

35. This holds true for the ink used for the added three Mongol soldiers, but not the ink used to draw Suenaga's horse (based on this author's observation of the Mongol Scrolls, Tokyo, January 2002.)

36. Matsumoto argues, to the contrary, that the projectile is probably an original part of the scrolls, but she admits that the phrase *teppō* probably represents a later addition; "*Mōko shūrai ekotoba ni tsuite no ichikōsatsu—arata na mondaiten o kuwaete*," pp. 65–66. Conlan claims that this image is suspicious in his *In Little Need of Divine Intervention* (Ithaca: Cornell East Asia Series, 2001), pp. 12, 73. Satō also claims that the *teppō* image represents a later accretion; *Mōko shūrai ekotoba to Takezaki Suenaga no kenkyū*, pp. 22–24, 31–34, 449.

37. *Higo no kuni shigusa kō* 肥後国志草稿 [Higo Province Gazetteer], in Kawazoe, *Mōko shūrai kenkyū shiron*, p. 67.

38. Kawazoe, *Mōko shūrai ekotoba kenkyū shiron*, pp. 67–68, and Morishita Kō 森下功, "Kinsei ikō no Takezaki jōseki to Takezaki Suenaga kenkyū" 近世以降の竹崎城跡と竹崎季長研究 [The Takezaki Castle Remains and Research Regarding Takezaki Suenaga in the Early Modern Period and Beyond] in *Takezakijō-Jōseki chosa to Takezaki Suenaga* 竹崎城—城跡調査と竹崎季長 [A Survey of the Takezaki Castle and Takezaki Suenaga] (Kumamoto: Kumamoto kyōiku iinkai, 1975), pp. 200–4.

39. Three copies of this work survive at Kyushu University, while another can be found at Tokyo University and a fifth at the Fukuoka Prefectural Museum. I am indebted to Judith Fröhlich for bringing this to my attention. See also Kawazoe, *Mōko shūrai kenkyū shiron*, pp. 68–71.

40. See Kawazoe, *Mōko shūrai kenkyū shiron*, pp. 67–71, 98.

41. Kuroda Hideo, *Kibi Daijin nitō emaki no mayoi*, pp. 132–38, 174–76 for analysis of how the scrolls were redrawn, with the rear of an ox and the body of a donkey clumsily added to a scene. Kuroda describes how the eyes of the poorly drawn donkeys resembled those of an elephant drawn by Nagasawa Rosetsu on p. 92. Likewise, pp. 86 ff recounts how these poorly drawn scenes caused the reputation of the scrolls to suffer.

42. Matsumoto, "*Mōko shūrai ekotoba ni tsuite no ichikōsatsu—arata na mondaiten o kuwaete*," pp. 62–67.

43. Examinations of the scrolls conducted during 1975–78 confirm Kawazoe's thesis that Nagase Saneyuki was primarily responsible for restoring the scrolls. See Matsumoto, "*Mōko shūrai ekotoba no seiritsu to denrai ni tsuite—sono saikō*," pp. 75–76.

44. Horimoto Kazushige, "*Mōko shūrai ekotoba no genjō seiritsu katei ni tsuite*," pp. 15–22, 39 (particularly pp. 21–22 and 39). For other informative explanations of the restoration of the scrolls see Sujaku, "*Mōko shūrai ekotoba denzon katei no fukugen ni tsuite*," pp. 102–5; Matsumoto, "*Mōko shūrai ekotoba no seiritsu to denrai ni tsuite—sono saikō*," pp. 75–76.

45. Kawazoe, *Mōko shūrai kenkyū shiron*, pp. 76–78.

46. *Shiseki shūran*, vol. 23 (1901), and Kawazoe, *Mōko shūrai kenkyū shiron*, pp. 76–78. This work also refers to the *Hachiman gudōkun*. For the textual passages of the Mongol Scrolls see pp. 58–60, 73–77.

47. Komatsu Shigemi 小松茂美, ed., *Ishiyamadera engi* 石山寺縁起 16 *Nihon no emaki* [Illustrated Handscroll of the Origins of Ishiyamadera, Vol. 16, Japanese Illustrated Handscrolls] (Tokyo: Chūō kōronsha, 1988), pp. 94–95, 108–9.

48. For more on the significance of this work see Chapter 8 in this volume.

49. Komatsu, ed., *Ishiyamadera engi*, pp. 94–95, 108–9. I am grateful to Hans Thomsen for

bringing Matsudaira Sadanobu's role in reconstructing the *Ishiyamadera engi* to my attention.

50. Matsumoto, "Mōko shūrai ekotoba no seiritsu to denrai ni tsuite—sono saikō," p. 75 (reproducing this passage of the *Takeda sōshi yūgaroku* 竹田莊師友画録).

51. The best summary of the transmission of these scrolls appears in Miya, *Kassen no emaki*, pp. 105–17 and Kumamoto Ken Kyōiku Iinkai Bunkakan, comp., *Takezakijō—Jōseki chosa to Takezaki Suenaga*, pp. 134–36. The *Tankaku* version is reproduced in Conlan, *In Little Need of Divine Intervention*.

52. *Takezakijō*, pp. 133–36. The most recent summary of differences between the text in *Tankaku sōsho* and other versions appears in Horimoto, "Mōko shūrai ekotoba no genjō seiritsu katei ni tsuite—Aoyanagi Tanenobu hon no kentō to shōkai," p. 21.

53. For an excellent study of the different textual variations see Miya, *Kassen no emaki*, pp. 124–31 (particularly the chart on pp. 124–25). Review of photographs of the original reveals that the "missing" passage constitutes a repetition of the first fourteen lines of Passage 7. See Komatsu Shigemi, *Mōko shūrai ekotoba* 蒙古襲来絵詞 13 *Nihon no emaki* [The Illustrated Handscrolls of the Mongol Invasion, Vol. 13, Japanese Illustrated Handscrolls] (Tokyo: Chūō kōronsha, 1988), pp. 64–65.

54. The image of the general is analyzed in *Takezakijō*, pp. 134–36.

55. Conlan, *In Little Need of Divine Intervention*, p. 11.

56. Numerous projectiles were discovered in the wreckage of the Mongol fleet, but most represent large rocks that had been rounded into balls, rather than explosive devices. See *Takashima kaitei iseki*, vol. 1, pp. 75–79, 88, 93; vol. 7 (2002) pp. 19–20, 42–55 (for the discovery of hollow projectiles); and vol. 8 (2003), pp. 12–13, plate 9.2, p. 34 and plate 28, p. 53.

57. See the *Asashi shinbun* 朝日新聞, 10.20.2001, evening edition.

58. James P. Delgado, "Relics of the Kamikaze: Excavations off Japan's coast are uncovering Kublai Khan's ill-fated invasion fleet," *Archaeology* 6, No. 1 (January/February 2003). <http://www.archaeology.org/0301/etc/kamikaze.html>. Actually, some metal fragments survive in the "unexploded" projectiles, but no clear traces of gunpowder are evident. Analysis of the powdery substance found in the projectiles reveals quartz and aragonite or calcium carbonate (CaCO<sub>3</sub>) but no samples of sulfur, which would be expected if they were filled with gunpowder. *Takashima kaitei iseki* 7 (2002): 44.

59. *Takashima kaitei iseki*, p. 42. For further claims of projectiles that resemble the *teppō* of the Mongol Scrolls see also *Takashima kaitei iseki* 8 (2003): 12–13.

60. Delgado, commenting on the discovery of a *teppō*, would confuse the difference between the veracity of the scroll's images and whether in fact such objects existed, stating "But [Conlan's] . . . suggestion that the exploding bomb is an anachronism has now been demolished by solid archaeological evidence." Delgado, "Relics of the Kamikaze."