On the Inscription of the Hitomaro Poetry Collection: Between Literary History and the History of Writing

by

David B. Lurie

This article is intended to provide an overview of the place of the Hitomaro Poetry Collection in the history of early Japanese writing, to indicate some trends in recent research on the topic, and to explain some of my thoughts about the state of this sub-field. In addition to being one of the most studied and debated areas of *Man'yōshū* studies—and especially of the portion of that immense field that concerns itself with the manner in which the poems of the anthology are written—the inscription of the Collection is a central problem in the history of writing in general. The received text of the *Man'yōshū* is thought to reflect with tolerable accuracy the original late 7th-century inscription of the Collection; if so, these texts provide an invaluable window onto the most important moment in the history of writing in Japan. The mysterious manner in which they are inscribed has far-reaching implications, not just for literary history or the history of writing, but more broadly for the study of early culture, language, and society.

The Hitomaro Poetry Collection (*Kakinomoto no ason Hitomaro [no] kashū* 柿本朝臣人麻呂 [之] 歌集; commonly abbreviated as *Hitomaro kashū* 人麻呂歌集) is one of several early, now lost poetry anthologies that are preserved solely by virtue of having been incorporated, piecemeal (and, perhaps, incomplete), into the *Man'yōshū*. In addition to its association with the 7th century poet Kakinomoto no Hitomaro, one of the most venerated and frequently studied figures in the Japanese literary tradition, this collection is notable for several reasons: a large number of its poems

are included in the *Man'yōshū* (364 according to the most influential count); these poems are prominently placed in the books in which they appear (mainly VII, IX, X, XI, and XII); and they include apparent stylistic and structural innovations in the *tanka* and *sedōka* forms. These factors alone would suffice to make the surviving poems of this lost collection the subject of much study, but these texts are also noteworthy for the unusual manner in which they are inscribed. Their distinctive written style has been the object of commentarial speculation for centuries, but in the last decades of the 20th century, the emergence of new archaeological sources led scholars to a fundamental—and ongoing—re-evaluation of its meaning. At present, the study of the inscription of the Hitomaro Collection is a fertile area of overlap between historical, literary, archaeological, and linguistic approaches. Further progress in understanding the nature and development of this form of inscription has the potential to transform the ways in which the history of writing in early Japan is understood.

In the following article, I attempt to introduce the Collection's unusual modes of inscription, to locate them within the overall history of writing in early Japan, and to survey some of the major debates about their nature and significance. Following an initial overview of the Collection's inscription and the transformation of writing in the late 7th century, I turn to the Old Form/New Form theory of Inaoka Kōji 稲岡耕二, which represents the most influential postwar attempt to make sense out of the relationship between the Collection and the history of writing. After introducing some recent archaeological discoveries that have deprived this theory of much of its former authority and opened up research on this topic to a variety of new lines of inquiry, I conclude by outlining some of those new approaches and tentatively formulating some of my own views about them, about the inscription of the Collection itself, and about the relationship between literary history and the history of writing.

I. The Hitomaro Collection and Late 7th Century Inscription

The significance of the inscription of the Hitomaro Collection is partly a matter of its own distinctive characteristics, and partly a matter of the crucial moment at which it is thought to have been written down. Although they do have fundamental continuities with the mode of inscription that dominates the majority of Books of the *Man'yōshū*, the poems of the Collection are strikingly different in the enigmatic brevity with which they are written; they also involve expressive uses of writing itself that are unlike those displayed elsewhere in the anthology. These characteristics—particularly the brevity of the Collection's inscription—are tantalizingly similar to those seen in archaeological and epigraphic texts dated to the latter half of the 7th century, which has contributed to the privileged and disputed place that the Collection has in literary history and the history of writing.

Before outlining the distinctive elements of the inscription of the Hitomaro Collection, it is necessary to briefly review the basic ways in which writing is employed in the twenty books of the *Man'yōshū*. Broadly speaking, there are two modes in which its poems are inscribed: the primarily or entirely phonographic method that predominates in Books V, XIV, XV, XVII, XVIII, and XX, and the primarily logographic method found mainly in Books I through IV, VI through XIII, and XVI (Book XIX is an atypical mixture of both primarily phonographic and primarily logographic modes). A typical example of the former is the following, in which each syllable is indicated with a character employed simply for its sound—that is, as a phonograph.

余能奈可波/牟奈之伎母乃等/志流等伎子/伊与余麻須万須/悲之可利家理

世間は/空しきものと/知る時し/いよよますます/悲しかりけり

When I realize/this world is an empty thing/then all the more I feel/

a deeper and deeper sorrow (V : 793)[1]

This method of inscription is not as simple as it may seem: there are multiple character options for each syllable (and corresponding problems in the historical phonology of both Chinese and Japanese), poems written in this mode sometimes make limited use of logographs (often to write proper names), and there are cases in which the logographic traces of meaning attached to these graphs seem to be manipulated for expressive purposes. However, in principle this mode involves a basic surface rejection of *kundoku* 訓読 (the reading/writing process by which logographic inscriptions are associated with Japanese-language texts) and a more direct indication of the phonic shape of the utterance being inscribed. (I specify *surface* rejection of *kundoku* because it has been convincingly argued that all vernacular Japanese texts, no matter how phonographic their inscription may be, rely on circumlocutions and calques created by and for *kundoku*-based reading and writing).[2]

The following poem is well suited to stand as an example of the second, primarily logographic method of inscription, in part because it demonstrates the variety of phonographic adjuncts commonly employed in that mode :

相見而者/幾日毛不経乎/幾許久毛/久流比尓久流比/所念鴨

相見ては/幾日も経ぬを/ここだくも/狂ひに狂ひ/思ほゆるかも

Since last we met/Not so many days have passed./Must I long for you/In such helplessness as this—/In madness piled on madness?
(IV : 751)[3]

With the exception of the fourth line, the major units of meaning in this poem are denoted logographically—that is, characters are employed to write words (or in some cases, parts of words), as in, for example, 相見而

者, in which both the verb and the particles te and Fa are written logographically, or in 幾日毛不経乎, in which the noun ikuFi and verb/auxiliary verb combination Fenu are as well.[4] It is important to note, however, that this mode is *primarily* rather than *entirely* logographic : in the second and third lines, the particles are indicated with the sinitic phonographs (*ongana* 音仮名) 毛 and 乎 ; the entire fourth line is also inscribed with sinitic phonographs ; and the final particle of line five is written with a common vernacular phonograph (*kungana* 訓仮名), 鴨. Depending on the nature of the poem and the predilections of the authors or scribes involved, different portions of the anthology display different approaches to this combination of logographs, sinitic phonographs, and vernacular phonographs, but in general this poem serves as an exemplar of the primarily logographic register of the *Man'yōshū*.

What is most striking about the inscription of the Hitomaro Collection is the way that it departs from this basic approach to writing poetry. It has long been noted that, among the texts of the Collection, many display a strikingly truncated form of inscription, as in the following example.

何為/命継/吾妹/不戀前/死物
なにせむに/命継ぎけむ/我妹子に/恋せぬ先に/死なましものを

Why did I do it—/Go on clinging to my life?/I wish I had died/Before I started this longing/For the love of a young girl (XI : 2377)[5]

The striking brevity of this mode of inscription is immediately apparent, as is its cause : almost all notation of particles and auxiliary verbs has been omitted, leaving a simple string of logographs (the sole exception is the partial inscription of the final particle in line five). A tremendous amount of information about how to recover a poem from these characters is missing ; indeed, it is only by virtue of the thousands of other, more capaciously inscribed poems in the *Man'yōshū* itself—not to mention the

centuries of philological inquiry represented by phonographically annotated manuscripts, commentaries, treatises, and other scholarly works dating back to the Heian period—that poems like this are currently associated with relatively stable readings. (And even in the context of that relative stability, certain elements of the readings remain open to dispute : for example, the most recent major edition of the *Man'yōshū* reads the third line of the preceding poem as *koFizaru saki ni*.[6])

This use of a string of logographs that rely on a robust process of *kundoku* for the reconstitution (or, perhaps, simply the constitution) of a Japanese-language utterance, is not unusual in the broader context of the history of writing in Japan. Indeed, it is quite typical of the primarily—and often solely—logographic *prose* texts, of varying degrees of consistency with literary Chinese character usage and word order, that are usually subsumed under the broad concept of *kanbun* 漢文. The striking anomaly in the case of the preceding type of inscription, as found in the Collection, is not simply how abbreviated it is, but more specifically the fact that such a truncated form of inscription is employed to write *poems*

—that is, texts that, first and foremost, have a definite phonic form. Of course, it is true that the regular prosodic structure of poetry, as well as the formulaic nature of its imagery and language and the determining role of certain sound-based devices (such as pillow words and prefaces linked by virtue of aural repetition), serve to some extent to enable reconstructions of these entirely logographic texts. Even so, the basic, puzzling paradox of this form of inscription remains : it seems a singularly inappropriate method of writing poems, inasmuch as, on the surface at least, it dispenses with precisely the fidelity to phonic shape that one would expect to be the *sine qua non* of any attempt to inscribe them.

The question of how to explain this mode of writing is complicated by the fact that the poems of the Collection are not all written this way. Since the Edo period, it has been noted that there are actually two modes

of inscription employed in the Collection: the truncated one, exemplified above, and another that does make more generous use of phonographic adjuncts, as can be seen in the following poem.

巨椋乃/入江響奈理/射目人乃/伏見何田井尓/鴈渡良之

巨椋の/入江とよむなり/射目人の/伏見が田居に/雁渡るらし

Thunder in the air/Over the inlets of Ōkura:/It must be the wild geese/Crossing to Fushimi's paddy fields,/Where in blinds the hunters lie in wait (IX : 1699)[7]

Of the 364 poems labelled as having been taken from the Hitomaro Collection, 210 of them employ the extremely logographic mode seen in XI : 2377 above, while 150 of them use the less truncated mode exemplified in the immediately preceding poem.[8] It is important to stress that the texts of the former group are not completely devoid of phonography; as seen in XI : 2377, they do make use of some vernacular phonographs, and even, in rare and limited cases, of sinitic phonographs. Further, as will be mentioned below, it is not the case that the texts of the latter group exemplified here by IX : 1699 employ only sinitic phonographs, or never omit phonographic adjuncts. The distinction between these two modes of inscription is based on clear tendencies rather than on absolutes : both of them employ primarily logographs, with phonographic adjuncts, but the former mode is far more likely to rely solely on logography, and to omit explicit indication of grammatical elements (whether logographic or phonographic).

A variety of terms have been used for these two modes, but the dominant pair are those first proposed in 1956 by Aso Mizue 阿蘇瑞枝: Abbreviated Form (ryakutai 略体) and Unabbreviated Form (hiryakutai 非略体).[9] As Inaoka Kōji points out, these terms risk giving the impression that the Abbreviated Form inscription is a truncation of an existing,

dominant mode, while the Unabbreviated Form is simply an untruncated version of the same.[10] However, despite such potentially problematic implications, *ryakutai* and *hiryakutai* are currently the most popular terms, and I prefer them to the alternatives, so I will continue to use their English versions for the remainder of this article. (The third important group of Hitomaro-related poems, the 84 *chōka* and *tanka* that are directly attributed to him, is the *sakka* 作歌, or Works.)

A great deal of scholarship has been devoted to the content of the Abbreviated and Unabbreviated Form poems, to their arrangement in the *Man'yōshū* in its received form, and to their likely relationship in the now-lost original version of the Hitomaro Collection.[11] My primary concern here, however, is with the attention paid to the specific problem of how they are inscribed and what that method of inscription means. Perhaps the first person to mention the distinctive nature of the Abbreviated Form poems was Keichū 契沖 (1640-1701), who noted that dozens of Hitomaro Collection poems in Book XI "were written with classical simplicity" 簡古ニカヽレタリ) and surmised that they reflected the original style of writing of the Collection.[12] Kamo no Mabuchi 賀茂真淵 (1697-1769) disagreed, seeing a baleful post-Hitomaro influence at work :

The [original] text of this Hitomaro Collection could not have been written in this form, based on Chinese poetry [*shi* 詩] and omitting grammatical elements [*joji* 助辞] thusly. As Hitomaro seems to have been a very powerful individual, in his poems he did not use any Sinified language at all. With such a soul [*kokoro* 心], it could not have been that his poems would imitate the Chinese style. This appears to be just the doing of some person of the Nara period with a singleminded enthusiasm for such things.[13]

Mabuchi's argument that the distinctive nature of the collection's poetry

was the result of later rewriting was once very influential, but the current consensus is rather that this style of inscription is original, and is an integral part of the poetic enterprise of these works (which, for that matter, is utterly dependent on a deep grounding in a wide range of Chinese literary texts).

For the most part, contemporary research on the inscription of the Collection also insists that Hitomaro *himself* is responsible for its unusual characteristics. Given the parallels between the peculiarities of both of the Collection's written styles and of that employed in the Works, as well as the differences between these three styles and the other logographic registers of the *Man'yōshū* (about which more below), it is reasonable to associate them with Hitomaro himself, but beyond those similarities and the fact that his name was linked to all of these texts by the compilers of the *Man'yōshū* itself, there is little other evidence to bring to bear on the question. Another issue that has been subject to much debate is whether Hitomaro *composed* the poems of the Collection: some have argued that the Collection poems, or at least the Abbreviated Form texts, are anonymous folksongs (Hashimoto Tatsuo 橋本達雄, for example), while others, like Umehara Takeshi 梅原猛, go so far as to argue vehemently that Hitomaro should be viewed as the full-fledged author of all of the Collection poems.[14] This problem, which is deeply connected to the equally well-trodden issue of the stylistic similarities and differences between the poems of the Collection and the Works, is also not susceptible to easy solution, given the paucity of applicable evidence. In the end, however—and this is a point to which I will return—the most interesting aspects of the Collection's inscription have little to do with the problem of whether Hitomaro can or should be treated as their scribe or their author.

At any rate, Mabuchi's claim that the Abbreviated Form poems were an 8th century Sinophilic rewrite of an earlier original text inaugurated a long tradition of explaining this puzzling form of inscription by postulat-

ing that it is a kind of secondary manifestation of the poems it purports to record. For Mabuchi, this truncated mode of inscription was explicable because it came after and replaced a presumably fuller original version; later scholars have also supposed that the Abbreviated Form Poems are as they are because they are rough memoranda, jotted down by Hitomaro to remind himself of poems that were already lodged in his memory (Saitō Mokichi 斎藤茂吉 and others), or because they record songs that were already circulating at court and thus widely known (Hashimoto Tatsuo, among others).[15]

Given the paradoxical lack of phonic information carried by the Abbreviated Form poems, some argument along these lines seems necessary to explain how they can function. That is, whether one focuses on the role of stereotyped poetic form and diction, or assumes outright that these poems must have been already 'known' in some form by the intended reader(s) of these texts, some source of information external to the text seems to be a necessary component for the (re)construction of the phonic shape of the poems themselves. However, this does not mean that one must inevitably postulate the Abbreviated Form inscription itself as a secondary product, dependent for its existence on a more fully articulated mixture of logography and phonography. Indeed, the most influential explanation of the inscription of the Collection in the postwar period, the Old Form/New Form theory of Inaoka Kōji, is based on a fundamental denial of the existence of such a mixture prior to the Unabbreviated Poems—a denial that stems from a turn to the history of writing in general. However, before examining that theory it is necessary to consider how the Collection can be situated in the late 7th century, and, even more importantly, what that period means in terms of the overall history of writing in Early Japan.

Although some supporting speculation has been based on headnotes that remain attached to the Unabbreviated Form poems in Book IX, the

dating of the Collection depends largely on a single note appended to an Unabbreviated Form poem in Book X (2033): "this single poem was composed in the Senior Metal-Dragon year" 此歌一首庚辰年作之. The cyclical date here could correspond to 680 or 740, but based on the cyclical format itself and other considerations, it is generally taken to denote the former, which is the ninth year of the reign of Tenmu 天武 (r. 672–686) as calculated by the *Nihon shoki*.[16] The other key date is the starting point of the Works, which begin in the early years of the Jitō court (r. 687–697); the earliest firmly datable texts clearly attributed to Hitomaro are the set of poems on the temporary enshrinement of Prince Kusakabe 草壁皇子, who died in 689 (II: 167–169).

As will be further discussed below, these two dates, 680 and 689, have been treated as turning points in Hitomaro's own methods of inscription, and furthermore as grounding for bold claims about the place of those methods in the overall history of writing. Although these dates do not seem equal to the interpretive load that they have been made to carry by many scholars, in tandem with the stylistic and inscriptive similarities between texts in the Collection and the Works—and taken in light of what seems to have been a policy of maintaining the original modes of inscription of materials incorporated into the *Man'yōshū*—they do provide support for a tentative view of the Collection's inscription as datable to the late 7th century, and perhaps more specifically to the reigns of Tenmu and/or Jitō. In the final section of this article, I will return to the question of whether or not the Collection's inscription can be so precisely dated, but in this introductory section I would like to turn now to the consequences of tentatively locating it in the late 7th century, especially as viewed from the perspective of the history of writing.

It is increasingly apparent that the most crucial transition in the history of Japanese writing occurred during the latter half of the 7th century. From the early appearances of artifacts with characters on them in the

middle of the Yayoi period (around the first century C.E.) through to the early 7th century, the technology of writing was employed in the Japanese archipelago only in highly limited circumstances, and served as a quasi-magical means for the display of political power rather than a method of communication and information storage. There were important developments in the first six hundred years of the common era—most notably, the appearance in the 5th century of sword inscriptions bearing Japanese proper names and associated with Great Kings (大王) of the Yamato region—but such changes were incremental increases in the employment of scribes by the ruling elite, and involved the production of small numbers of texts to display political power domestically and, possibly, for diplomatic purposes.

Contrastingly, the 8th century is clearly a period of full-blown literacy, at least in limited but important contexts in the capitals and other centers in the provinces. The hundred-odd years from the age of the Fujiwara capital 藤原京 (694–710) through the Nara period saw the production of legal codes and their commentaries, historical works like the *Kojiki* (at 712 the earliest extant intact literary work) and the *Nihon shoki* (720), belletristic collections like the *Kaifūsō* (751) and the *Man'yōshū* itself (compiled in several stages over this entire period, and reaching its final form in the late 8th century)—to list simply the most prominent and better know examples. To these texts must be added the copying of truly massive numbers of sutras and other religious texts, the circulation of Chinese secular works from the Analects 論語 and the *Wenxuan* 文選 to encyclopedias and other reference works, and the production of vast numbers of bureaucratic documents like those preserved in the Shōsōin 正倉院 repository. The great and abiding question of the history of writing in Japan is how the transition to this thriving textual world occurred, and the answer—or at least the beginnings of an answer—to this question are clearer now than ever, thanks in large part to a cascade of discoveries that

has remade the study of early inscription, and brought into much clearer focus the importance of the 7th century as *the* transition into a robust literacy with transformative consequences for almost every aspect of society and culture.[17]

From the mid-6th century onward, there is some limited evidence of slight increases in the use of writing and of the emergence of new methods of inscribing texts in Japanese, but the writing's overall place in society seems to have remained continuous with the preceding century or so. Narratives of the development of literacy used to place a great deal of importance on the aftermath of the mid-6th century 'transmission' of Buddhism, and especially on the court of Suiko 推古 (r. 592-628) as a key turning point in terms of both an increase in the quantity of writing and the development of methods of inscribing vernacular texts.[18] In recent years, however, the authority of many of the materials that grounded this view has been called into question, and archaeologists have discovered large amounts of written material from the late 7th and 8th centuries ; the result has been increased attention to the importance of the latter half of the 7th century, and in particular to its last quarter : the reigns of Tenmu and Jitō.[19]

As tens of thousands of *mokkan* 木簡 have been unearthed over the past four decades, a picture of writing as it functioned in everyday contexts has emerged that is unprecedented in its detail. In addition to rich lodes of information about institutional history, social structures, foodways, other aspects of everyday life, and so on, these sources provide a window into an impressive variety of techniques for written communication, thereby complementing the transmitted and preserved 8th century materials mentioned above, such as the *Kojiki* and the *Man'yōshū* itself.[20] It is apparent that vernacular texts were inscribed with a wide variety of techniques, including an entirely phonographic mode like that seen in certain books of the *Man'yōshū* and in the 'songs' of the *Kojiki* and *Nihon*

shoki, but also a range of principally logographic registers, with and without phonographic complements.

A central problem in considering the transformation of writing leading up to the 8th century has been : at what point in the 7th century did this variety emerge? When did it become possible to record vernacular texts in such a range of methods of inscription? Some of the earliest *mokkan* to be discovered at the Fujiwara capital included texts like the following, which is the upper portion of a wooden strip that was unearthed from a ditch on the northern perimeter of the palace site (the fragment is just over 20 cm long and a bit more than 2 cm wide).

郷等前恐々謹解□□...
郷尓受給請欲止申

Most respectfully submitted before your lordships [...]/Stating that
[I] would like to humbly receive from your lordship [...]21

This fragment of a formal communication between a low-ranking official and his superiors shows striking evidence of everyday logographic vernacular communication ; crucially, the inscription on the reverse side of the strip employs sinitic phonographs (不 and 止) as adjuncts to the logography it uses throughout. This mixture involves clear parallels with the dominant primarily logographic mode in the *Man'yōshū*, and is also very similar to the mixture of large logographs and small phonographs employed in the *senmyō* 宣命 proclamations of the Fujiwara and Nara courts that are incorporated into the *Shoku Nihongi* 続日本紀 (797).[22] Along with other Fujiwara palace *mokkan*, some of which seem to represent portions of actual *senmyō* texts, this text provides evidence of the emergence of mixed logograph/phonograph vernacular style by the very end of the 7th century.

Even then, during the period of the Fujiwara capital, and during the

subsequent Nara period, the predominant means of everyday communication was an entirely logographic vernacular mode; interestingly, *mokkan* and other sources have long provided evidence for the use of that style significantly earlier, at least as far back as the courts of Tenmu and Jitō. The following two inscriptions exemplify this early, all-logograph mode of vernacular inscription: one is a stele inscription that has drawn extensive scholarly attention since the Edo period, and the other is a much-studied *mokkan* that was discovered in the 1980s. The first, the Yamanoue stele 山上碑, is a grave marker that still stands in Takasaki city 高崎市 in Gunma prefecture.

辛巳歳焦月三日記

佐野三家定賜健守命孫黒売刀自此

新川臣児斯多々弥足尼孫大児臣娶生児

長利僧母為記定文也　放光寺僧

Written on the third day of the 6th month of a Junior Metal-Snake year. / The granddaughter of Lord Takemori who established the Sano *miyake*, Kurone no Toji, / The child she bore after marrying Ōko no omi, the grandson of Shitatami no sukune, son of Niikawa no omi: / The priest Chōri; this is a text he wrote for his mother.　He is a priest of Hōkōji. [23]

For much the same reasons as was the case with the note following poem X: 2033, the cyclical date on this inscription is thought to correspond to 681. [24]　The ordering of the logographs here makes clear that this is a vernacular inscription of a Japanese text, but there are no phonographic supplements employed. This same is true for the second example, a famous *mokkan* with a relatively intact inscription that attests to the typical mode of everyday communication in the last quarter of the 7th century.　It is a strip of wood, 41 cm long and 3.5 cm wide, that was

unearthed in Shiga Prefecture in 1985, at Nishigawara Morinouchi 西河原／森ノ内, a site somewhat inland from the southeast coast of Lake Biwa.

椋 [直] [伝] 之我 [利] [住] 稲者 [馬] [不] 得故我者反来之故

是汝ト〜

自舟人率而可行也　其稲在処者衣知評平留五十戸旦波博士家

[Kura no Atai says,] as for the rice sheaves that I brought, I was unable to obtain horses, so I came back.　Therefore you, Urabe, / should yourself bring boatmen and go [to retrieve them].　The location of the sheaves is Echi district, Heru village, in the house of Tanba no Fubito. [25]

Here as well, an entirely logographic mode of inscription is used to record a vernacular message.　As will be discussed at the end of the following section, a cluster of discoveries in the late 1990s led to a new understanding of 7th century inscription, but until then it appeared that the written style of the Yamanoue stele and the Morinouchi *mokkan*, and other texts like them, was the only method of vernacular inscription evident in archaeological sources up until the Fujiwara palace *mokkan* of the very end of the 7th century.　This played a formative role in the development of the most influential postwar approach to the inscription of the Hitomaro Collection, which in turn transformed how the history of writing in general was conceptualized.

Even if it had not appeared that there was no evidence of mixed phonograph-logograph inscription until the very end of the 7th century, the Hitomaro Collection would still have been prominent in the history of writing.　If the date of the note following X: 2033 is assumed to be a rough benchmark for the date of the entire Collection (and, as I have already suggested, that is a highly arguable assumption), then the 364 poems of the Collection would predate the *Kojiki*, the earliest extant

complete literary text, by some three decades. Even if one is less sanguine about the viability of dating the entire Collection by means of that one note, or in relation to the comparatively solid date of 689 for the start of the Works, as long as the Collection is taken seriously as a body of material from the late 7th century it is of crucial importance for the history of writing simply by virtue of its quantity and its nature as a collection of poetic texts rather than epigraphs or practical everyday communications.

However, as it turned out, the prevailing (until recently) sense that late 7th century epigraphic and archaeological texts showed no use of phonographic supplements proved to be a crucial component in an approach to the Collection that was even more ambitious in evaluating its importance for the history of writing. From the 1960s onward, the emergence of *mokkan* as a resource for historians and other researchers examining all aspects of early Japan, along with other dramatic discoveries (especially the Inariyama kofun 稲荷山古墳 inscription in 1979) spurred a re-evaluation of the history of writing itself, and of the wider causes and consequences of the introduction and subsequent development of this crucial technology—a re-evaluation that continues to this day. It is in this context that the literary scholar Inaoka Kōji pioneered a theory of the inscription of the Hitomaro Collection that would prove to have far-reaching influence not only on literary scholarship, but also on the history of writing in general.

II. The Intersection of Literary History and the History of Writing

There are three reasons for focusing so extensively on Inaoka's Old Form/New Form theory here. As already mentioned, it is the most complete and most influential of various postwar interpretations of the Collection's inscription; it articulates explicitly, and very clearly, what is at stake in approaching these texts in terms of both literary history and the history of writing; and finally, although at present the continued viability

of the theory per se is highly questionable, both its hegemony and its recent loss of authority have provided contexts for innovative and thought-provoking investigations of the Collection, by Inaoka himself, by his colleagues, and by a succeeding generation of scholars. I have attempted here to review the basic outlines of the Old Form/New Form theory, paying particular attention to the way in which it incorporated an approach to the history of writing in general; in the latter half of this section, I turn to a series of recent discoveries that have called into question some of the founding assumptions of Inaoka's theory, and thereby, perhaps paradoxically, clarified further the reasons for its great appeal and apparent explanatory power. In reviewing the Old Form/New Form theory, I have presented it a coherent complex of ideas, without attempting to strictly follow the specific order in which its components were initially presented. It began with a group of articles published by Inaoka in the late 1960s and early 1970s and then collected and revised in his 1976 classic, *Man'yō hyōkiron* 万葉表記論. Although that remains the fundamental statement of the core of the theory, it was considerably expanded and augmented in the ensuing decades, resulting in books published in 1985 and 1991, and in a continuing series of articles.[26]

The theory takes off from the work of Aso Mizue, which drew a statistical distinction between Abbreviated and Unabbreviated Form poems on the basis of the number of graphs per *tanka* and examined clear differences in their content and style. Inaoka revisited the issue of statistical differentiation, basing the distinction between the two groups on the rate at which grammatical elements such as particles and auxiliary verbs were omitted from the inscription of the poems. This enabled him to extend the distinction to the *sedōka* and *chōka* that were labelled as part of the collection, but also to consider the omission rates of the Works and of primarily logographic inscription in non-Hitomaro poems from the *Man'yōshū*. Dividing the *sedōka* of the Collection into two groups

showing more and less truncated inscription resulted in five sets of poems: 1) the Abbreviated Form *tanka*, 2) the newly designated Abbreviated Form *sedōka*, 3) the Unabbreviated Form *tanka*, 4) the Unabbreviated Form *sedōka*, 5) the Works. (Importantly, all of the five groups omitted more grammatical elements than non-Hitomaro logographic poems.) Inaoka saw these five groups as chronologically ordered: that is, the texts in 1) were inscribed earlier than those in 2), and so on. This meant that there was a movement in time from the Abbreviated Form *tanka* through to the Works that was accompanied by a corresponding increase in the frequency with which grammatical elements were indicated.

Even having gone only this far, it is apparent why Inaoka felt compelled to propose an alternative nomenclature for the two broad types of inscription found in the Collection: the terms 'Abbreviated' and 'Unabbreviated' did not communicate any sense of developmental connection between the forms, and more importantly they risked giving the impression that the latter were distinguished simply by not being abbreviated. Contrastingly, he wanted to emphasize that, while that latter group was 'Unabbreviated' relative to the 'Abbreviated' poems, it was still more abbreviated than the Works or extra-Hitomaro logographic poems. This would have been enough to justify Inaoka's proposal of *kotai* 古体, 'Old Form' and *shintai* 新体, 'New Form,' as replacements for 'Abbreviated' and 'Unabbreviated,' respectively, but the most important reason for doing so was the real core of his theory, which was his turn to the history of writing in general to explain the progressive development of inscription that he had located in this arrangement of 'Old Form,' 'New Form,' and 'Works.'

These groups could be further fixed in time, he argued, by virtue of the two dates that were discussed in the previous section: since the X: 2033 is classifiable as a 'New Form' (Unabbreviated) poem, the date in the note attached to it, 680, could be taken as a rough benchmark for the divide

between 'Old' and 'New' Forms, the assumption being that the 'Old Form' poems were inscribed before that date, while the 'New Form' poems were written down between then and the beginning of the Works around 689. The key step came next: Inaoka turned from this argument about dating the progressive development of inscription in the context of Hitomaro-related texts to the overall state of late-7th century inscription (as it was conceptualized before the late 1990s). It was clear that phonograph-supplemented logographic inscription emerged by the very end of the century (the period of the Fujiwara capital), but early than that, it appeared, the only means of inscribing vernacular texts had been the all-logographic method employed in exemplars like the Yamanoue stele and the Morinouchi *mokkan*. If that was what the archaeological and epigraphic record had to say about the state of vernacular inscription during the courts of Tenmu and Jitō, then the dating of the 'Old Form' (Abbreviated) and 'New Form' (Unabbreviated) groups of the Collection took on tremendous significance. In the differences between these two groups of texts, Inaoka argued, we were witnessing more than the development of Hitomaro's own technique for inscribing poems: this was, in fact, nothing less than the epoch-making development of a new method for more accurately inscribing the Japanese language. In addition to providing a clear and compelling explanation for the different modes of inscription seen in Hitomaro-connected texts, this argument provided very convincing support to Inaoka's vision of the temporal progression of those modes.

The powerful idea of the development of a new technique of inscription also served in turn to link this progression from 'Old Form' to 'New Form' (with the *sedōka* as a transitional group) and then to the Works to changes in the content and style of the poems themselves, with a particular focus on the emergence of the individual lyric voice and the development or transformation of certain technical poetic devices such as prefaces (*joshi* 序詞), pillow words (*makurakotoba* 枕詞), and parallelism (*tsuiku* 対句).

In part as an extension of that avenue of inquiry, the Old Form/New Form theory also came to involve a set of arguments about orality and literacy (or, more precisely, about primary orality, literacy, and secondary orality), in which the 'Old Form' poems were seen as an initial stage in the transition between oral song and written poem. (A transition that, admirably, Inaoka refused to conceptualize as anything like the simple transcription of the songs.) These concerns ultimately lead to a comprehensive picture of the early development of Japanese poetry, incorporating the 'songs' of the *Kojiki* and *Nihon shoki* as well as *Man'yōshū* poetry in general.

However, my focus here is on the elements of the theory that are specifically devoted to the differences between the 'Old Form' (Abbreviated) and 'New Form' (Unabbreviated) poems, and in particular on how those difference were linked to the history of writing in general. It is here that the explanatory power of the theory is most apparent. Where earlier approaches had offered speculation about sinophilic rewriting or memoranda as reasons for the strange quality of the Abbreviated Form mode of inscription, the Old Form/New Form theory proposed that those poems were written that way because they had to have been : there simply was no other way to record Japanese texts at the time those poems were written down. In other words, this group of texts employed very little in the way of phonographic adjuncts because systematic use of such a technique was literally unimaginable at that stage in the development of Japanese writing. The basic historical argument was that texts like the Yamanoue stele and the Morinouchi *mokkan* were typical of vernacular inscription in the period of the Tenmu court, and that the Abbreviated Form was essentially an extension of that method of inscription. (As will be seen in the following section, some of the most striking other characteristics of the Abbreviated Form mode of inscription also seemed susceptible to the explanation that it was an early stage in the development of techniques for

24

On the Inscription of the Hitomaro Poetry Collection (Lurie)

writing vernacular texts.) Conversely, the explanation for the emergence of phonographic adjuncts in the Unabbreviated Form poems was that this technique had been newly invented, in the context of the development of both more refined methods of writing and more advanced forms of lyric poetry.

When viewed from the perspective of the history of writing, this theory meant that the Hitomaro Collection took on even more importance ; it was not just an important group of early literary texts, but a kind of frozen laboratory in which initial forays into fundamentally new techniques of inscription could be observed and analyzed in detail. Perhaps most importantly, in its thorough-going commitment to ideas of progressive development—of techniques for inscription, but also of literary style—the Old Form/New Form theory melded together two different kinds of the teleological focus on origins and development, or *seiritsuron* 成立論, that already dominated both of the areas of scholarly inquiry involved. The crucial transition between the two groups within the Collection was seen as the product of progress toward greater fidelity and accuracy in recording power, progress that was intimately related to progress towards more powerful and sophisticated forms of literary expression.

Both this tandem teleological vision, and the basic move of seeing the Abbreviated Form as an extension of everyday inscription, involve fundamental methodological assumptions that are addressed in the following section. Another weakness of the theory was a more contingent one : the familiar problem that any assertion about the state of the archaeological record is provisional, and liable to being qualified or disproved by new discoveries. The heyday of the Old Form/New Form theory was from the mid-1980s through the mid-1990s ; in these years, the discovery of texts like the Morinouchi *mokkan* seemed to confirm the nature of everyday inscription during the period of the Tenmu court, and the literary-historical aspects of the theory (the focus on the development of Hitomaro's lyric

25

voice and poetic technique, and more broadly on the shift from oral to literate forms of expression) had extensive influence on the development of the study of early Japanese literature. Even so, there were some who argued against the notion that exclusively logographic inscription was the only option before the development of the 'New Form' style, among them Tôno Haruyuki 東野治之 and Kudô Rikio 工藤力男, but in general the archaeological record seemed to support Inaoka's vision of the significance of the Collection's inscription.[27] However, a series of discoveries in the late 1990's would dramatically change this situation. Finds from two sites in particular—one in Shikoku and one in the old capital of Asuka—played a crucial role, contributing to the development of a new picture of late 7th century inscription.

The first of these discoveries was one of dozens of *mokkan* that were unearthed in 1998 from several layers in the bed of a natural watercourse at the Kannonji 観音寺 site in Tokushima. This site is near those of the Awa 阿波 provincial temple (*kokubunsôji* 国分僧寺) and nunnery (*kokubunniji* 国分尼寺), and is thought to have been the location of the provincial headquarters during the Nara period. The following string of characters is written on one side of a 16 by 4.3 cm rectangular plaque whose lower portion is missing.

奈尓波ツ尓作久矢已乃波奈

naniFadu ni saku ya könö Fana
They bloom in the port of Naniwa! These flowers ...[28]

These are the first two lines of a traditional *waka* poem, referred to in the early 10th century *Kokinshû* 古今集 preface and familiar from other early archaeological finds, including 8th century *mokkan* from the Heijô 平城 palace site in Nara.[29] Based on its position in the layers at the Kannonji site, it has been claimed that this *mokkan* dates to the period of the Tenmu

court or possibly earlier; this would make it one of the earliest known examples of all-phonograph inscription.

The other paradigm-shifting 1998 discoveries are two *mokkan* from the Asukaike 飛鳥池 site in Asuka Village, Nara Prefecture. This was the location of a state-run manufacturing complex from the mid-7th through the beginning of the 8th century; it was razed during the subsequent construction of a museum devoted to the *Man'yôshû*, which therefore has the dubious distinction of having destroyed precious and irreplaceable traces of the cultural efflorescence that it purports to commemorate. Among well over seven thousand *mokkan* found at Asukaike, there was a fragmentary 10.3 by 1.6 cm strip with two columns of writing on each side; only portions of one column on each side were legible, but they have been read as the following:

□止求止佐田目手□□
□久於母男皮

tôku tö sadamëte / ku omöFëba [30]
Deciding quickly ... / because ... think [continuative or nominalizing ending]

Although it is too fragmentary to be certain, it is quite likely that this was originally a poem; at any rate, like the Kannonji *mokkan*, it is written entirely with phonographs. Another *mokkan* that was also found at Asukaike is a 7.5 by 2.2 cm fragment with its bottom portion missing; although only one side has legible characters, they form the following inscription in two columns:

□止牟止言而□
□本止飛鳥寺

Saying that ... would do ... / as the basis ... Asukadera ...[31]

This text shows a striking mixture of logographs and phonographs : the combination of the verb "to do" and the auxiliary verb *mu* (世牟 *semu*) and the particle *tö* (止) are written with phonographs; but the verb "to say" (曰), its continuative particle *te* (而) and the nouns "basis" (本) and "Asukadera" (飛鳥寺) are written with logographs. This method of mixed phonograph-logograph inscription is very similar to that employed on the Fujiwara palace *mokkan* that was quoted in the preceding section. As far as the dating of these Asukaike *mokkan* are concerned, the all-phonograph text was found in a group of *mokkan* that included one with a cyclical date corresponding to 677, and the mixed text is from a group that has been dated to the end of the period of the Tenmu court or thereafter.

These recent finds, along with other early *mokkan*, have contributed to a vivid new picture of writing in the late 7th century.[32] Although the dominant style for everyday communication does seem to have been the all-logograph mode seen earlier in the Morinouchi *mokkan*, it is now clear that this method of writing was accompanied by other options, both a phonograph-supplemented logographic style and an all-phonograph style. This range of possible modes of inscription seems to have existed as early as the period of the Tenmu court, and its exemplars include texts found in sites outside of the cultural centers of the Kinai Home Provinces, and poems rather than isolated words or phrases. In light of this new situation, the Old Form/New Form theory has been weakened considerably. Certainly, Inaoka's exhaustive examination of the technical dimensions of inscription in important sections of the *Man'yōshū* remains indispensible, his arguments about the stylistic and technical differences between the Collection groups and the Works still merit careful consideration, and his overall conceptualization of poetry inscription in an age of early literacy has not lost its interest and ability to provoke thought. Furthermore, as will be seen in the following section, his work on the expressive dimensions

of writing, especially in the Abbreviated Form poems, involves pioneering new interpretations. However, the lynchpin of the Old Form/New Form theory was its basis in the general history of writing, and without that, much of the authority of the various components of the theory, including its vision of the progressive development of both inscription and literary style, has been lost. Even so, in some circles there has been an inertial tendency to continue postulating development in style and content from the Abbreviated to Unabbreviated Form poems, and thence to the Works, although that narrative has essentially come ungrounded. There have also been, however, some prominent attempts to leave the Old Form/New Form theory behind and reconsider the meaning of the Collection's inscription in this new context; among them are the work of Saijô Tsutomu 西條勉 and Inui Yoshihiko 乾善彦.[33]

In a series of articles on the Hitomaro Collection, Saijô responds to the new discoveries of 7th century *mokkan* by postulating that the Abbreviated Form poems were written *after* the Unabbreviated Poems, which he juxtaposes with *mokkan* and other inscriptions and sees as the result of Hitomaro's experimentation with different forms of logographic inscription with phonographic adjuncts from the period of the Tenmu court onward. He sees the inscription of the Abbreviated Form poems, in turn, as part of Hitomaro's late literary endeavors (but postulates that the poems themselves are 'hit songs' that would be readily familiar to readers despite their truncated inscription).[34] With the weakening of the grounding in the wider history of writing that the Old Form/New Form theory claimed, there is ample room to imagine different sequences of development linking the Abbreviated and Unabbreviated Form Poems and the Works. However, as I will argue below, the collapse of the Old Form/New Form theory is not simply an opportunity to replace it with another teleologically oriented narrative of development ; rather, it encourages a reconsideration of the entire enterprise of constructing such narratives in the first place,

whether in connection with changes in literary style or in technical methods of inscription.

In this connection, the response of Inui Yoshihiko to the recent transformation of the understanding of late 7th century writing is instructive. Approaching the Abbreviated Form inscription of the Collection from the perspective of the history of writing, he also starts from the implications of the Kannonji and Asukaike discoveries, but rather than simply adjust the temporal priority of narratives of development, he emphasizes the importance of the simultaneous existence of multiple possible modes of inscription. Although he leaves room for the possibility that the Abbreviated Form poems actually could have preceded the Unabbreviated Form poems, he emphasizes that both styles of writing must now be conceptualized as the product of a *choice* among other possibilities, including the all-phonograph style. This is part of an overall approach to the history of writing that downplays the traditional orientation towards teleological narratives and focuses rather on the implications of variation, of the contemporary juxtaposition of multiple modes of writing; it also represents a fundamental rejection of the core postulate of the Old Form/New Form theory, not in terms of temporal priority, but in terms of methodological orientation.35

In a sense, much of the remainder of this article will be devoted to reviewing some of the implications of Inui's point that the writing of the Collection—and particularly of the Abbreviated Form poems—should be seen as the product of a *choice* among several possible modes of inscription. However, as I will argue below, the role to be played by evidence from *mokkan* and other non-literary sources in that inquiry is limited to little more than establishing the possibility and basic technical parameters of such a choice. Beyond that, pursuit of the nature of the modes of inscription employed in the Collection necessitates a reconsideration of the linkage that was at the center of the Old Form/New Form theory: that

between the history of writing in general and the distinctness of the Hitomaro Collection's methods of writing.

III. Reconsidering the Inscription of the Abbreviated Form Poems

Up until now, this article has considered the distinction between the Abbreviated and Unabbreviated Form modes primarily in terms of the presence or absence of phonographic adjuncts to logographic inscription. There is, however, another distinctive element of the use of writing in the Abbreviated Form poems, one that has far-reaching implications not just for debates on the nature and meaning of the written style of the Collection, but more broadly for fundamental problems in the history of writing. This other distinctive element is the prevalence in the Abbreviated Form poems of unusual and expressive forms of character usage, all of them dependent on key aspects of the creation and functioning of logographs in the Japanese context. These unusual usages have received a great deal of scholarly attention, and been described by a variety of terms, including *gisho* 戯書 ('playful writings'), *gikun* 義訓 ('semantic logographs'), *hitaiō-kun* 非対応訓 ('non-equivalent logographs'), *kundoku kanji* 訓読漢字, and *koyū kunji* 固有訓字 ('distinctive logographic characters'). This section will survey some of these usages, and then consider their implications for considering the broader meaning of the inscription of the Abbreviated Form poems.

Regardless of what they are called, such expressive usages can be termed a disruption of the fundamental principle of equivalence—that is, of translation—that governs the formation of Japanese-language logographs from Chinese ones. The typical logograph is a character employed to write a Japanese word that has roughly the same meaning as the Chinese word(s) originally associated with that character; such graphs are often termed *seikun* 正訓 or *kunji* 訓字. However, there are cases in the *Man'-yōshū* of logographs wherein the relationship between character and word

is more complex, and these are particularly common in the Abbreviated Form Poems. For example, some combinations of characters have a descriptive, circumlocutionary relationship to the words that they inscribe, as in 丸雪 for *arare*, 'hail' (VII : 1293), 小端 for *FatuFatu*, 'barely' (VII : 1306 ; XI : 2411), or 未通女 for *wôtôme*, 'maiden' (XI : 2360). Although this kind of usage, usually referred to as *gikun* 義訓, or 'semantic logography,' can be found elsewhere in the logographic registers of the *Man'yôshû*, it is particularly striking in the collection, where it has sometimes been shown to play an expressive role in the context of the poem as a whole, as in the following Abbreviated Form *sedôka* :

人祖/未通女兒居/守山邊柄/朝々/通公/不来哀

人の親の/娘子居ゑて/守山辺から/朝な朝な/通ひし君が/来ねば悲しも

Through the Guard Mountain area, where parents cloister young maidens, he who visited daily does not come, alas! (XI : 2360)

In this context, it has been argued, the inscription of 'maiden' as 未通女 (literally, 'woman to whom [a man] is not yet making conjugal visits') resonates with the poem itself, which can be read as lamenting an aborted courtship.[36]

This sort of resonance is one of the striking characteristics of the mode of inscription employed in the Abbreviated Form Poems, and it is not just a matter of this kind of use of 'semantic logographs' (*gikun*) with meanings that emphasize elements of the entire poem in which they appear. There are also cases in which characters or groups of characters carry additional meanings, unrelated (or only indirectly related) to the phonic surface of the poem transcribed by those graphs. Such cases have been pointed out in usage of vernacular phonographs (*kungana* 訓仮名 ; also *shakukun[ji]* 借訓 [守]), as in the graph employed to write *ikari*, 'anchor,' in the

following poem :

大船/香取海/慍下/何有人/物不念有

大舟の/香取の海に/いかり下ろし/いかなる人か/物思はざらむ

A great ship, dropping anchor in the Katori Sea ; what kind of person wouldn't be weighed down by thoughts of love? (XI : 2436)

In the original poem, the first three lines are a preface (*joshi* 序詞), linked to the last two by the repetition of the initial syllables of *ikari* and *ikanaru*, 'what kind of.' However, although the graph 慍 is here used phonographically for the *sound* of the word with which it is associated ('fury' [*ikari*], a homonym of 'anchor'), the sense of that word adds another layer of meaning to the poem as a whole (and another kind of connection between the preface and the final lines), suggesting something of the nature of the submerged thoughts with which the speaker is preoccupied.[37]

This kind of literary amplification of meaning can also be seen in more straightforwardly logographic usages, as in the following off-discussed poem.

里遠/香浦経/真鏡/床重不去/夢所見与

里遠み/恋ひうらぶれぬ/まそ鏡/床の辺去らず/夢に見えこそ

With your village distant, I have worn myself out in yearning. As a clear mirror, always beside the bed, please appear in my dreams! (XI : 2501)

In this case, the expressive use of writing turns on alternate meanings of a particular character. In Chinese contexts, the graph 香 is sometimes associated with words meaning 'long for' or 'yearn,' hence its function in the second line as a logograph for *koFu*. However, this same graph is also

linked with words having the sense of 'look over one's shoulder' or 'look back' and in the context of the first two lines of the poem, this alternate reading resonates with the distant village upon which the yearning speaker 'looks back.' Here, the graph 奮 does function as a logograph, inscribing the word koFu, but its alternate meaning creates overtones that echo one of the themes of the poem as a whole.[38]

In all of the preceding types of logographic resonance, the conduits of meaning remain consistent with the intellectual foundation of literary character usage : the network of kunko 訓詁, or 'exegetical philology,' composed of classical Chinese loci, commentaries on them, and reference works collecting and distilling quotes from those commentaries. Indeed, it is only by virtue of careful work with the texts that make up that network —and, importantly, the early Japanese dictionaries and other references that provide hints of the concrete forms that network assumed in the late 7th century archipelago—that the kinds of connections exemplified above can be proposed and substantiated.[39] That is to say, the 'meanings' referred to herein do not exist in some abstract sense, but only as they are embodied in a complex environment of interlocking literary and scholarly sources ; those meanings are, moreover, accessible in the context of this article by virtue of the pioneering and deeply erudite labor of the researchers and commentators I have cited, and of their predecessors. (It is worth emphasizing that this is not only true of information about the overtones of particular usages, but also of the basic matter of how these strings of graphs are to be read as poems in Japanese, which is also governed by the kunko network and its extensions into Japanese-language texts.)

Although the resonant usages of logographs and vernacular phono-graphs cited thus far are consistent with the meanings of those graphs as established by the kunko network, there are other examples of character usage in the Abbreviated Form poems that depart from such meanings in

striking and important ways. Perhaps the most famous of these is the one in the second line of the following poem.

菅根/側隠者/結為/我紐緒/解人不有
菅の根の/ねもころ君が/結びてし/我が紐の緒を/解く人はあらじ

Like sedge-grass roots, tied with care by my lord : no one else shall undo my sash-cords (XI : 2473)

This expressive use of kundoku—based logography involves the inscription of the word nemökörö, an adverb with a range of meaning including 'deeply,' 'carefully,' 'thoroughly,' and 'kindly.' What is notable about the graphs employed to write this word, here and in four other Abbreviated Form poems—but nowhere else—is that they are a compound with a very different meaning.[40] As reflected in the aforementioned kunko network, in literary Chinese contexts the compound 側隠 means 'pity' or 'grieve'; this, and several other similar usages in the Abbreviated Form poems, shows a striking lack of association between the original sense of characters and the kundoku readings that they are given in the context of poem inscriptions. These usages are not incidental ; as was the case with the logographic overtones surveyed above, the 'original' meanings of the characters involved resonate with the overall sense of the poems in which they are found. In the preceding poem, it has been argued, the charged scene of leave-taking is deepened by the sense of emotional suffering inherent in the graphs that have been forcibly linked with the word nemökörö, despite the lack of a pre-existing semantic connection between the two.[41]

Abbreviated Form usages like 側隠/nemökörö, which could be seen as cases of 'logographic dissonance,' are unusual due to the lack of such a direct connection, but otherwise they have much in common with the other kinds of expressive uses of logographic overtones that were introduced

above. In all of these cases, meanings that inhere in individual characters or character compounds due to their embeddedness in the *kunko* network seem to have been manipulated in order to echo or emphasize thematic elements of the poem as a whole. In other words, in the Abbreviated Form poems, the ambiguity and multiplicity inherent in the process of *kundoku* seems to have been systematically appropriated as a means of literary expression.[42] Similar examples of play between particular words, the graphs used to write them, and the overall themes of the poem(s) in question have also been indicated in Hitomaro's Works, and it is also the case that instances of 'playful writing' and 'semantic logography' can be found in non-Hitomaro logographic registers of the *Man'yōshū*.[43] However, such usages are particularly common in the Abbreviated Form poems, and furthermore it seems highly likely that their ubiquity there is not unrelated to the truncated, almost entirely logographic mode of inscription with which those poems are written. Indeed, as the dimensions and *kunko* network-based functioning of the expressive use of writing in the Abbreviated Form poems has been increasingly clarified in recent years, the relationship between 'abbreviation' and expression has re-emerged as a central problem of the inscription of the Collection.

For the Old Form/New Form theory, these expressive uses of writing, and in particular extreme cases of logographic dissonance like that seen in the 側隠/*nemōkörö* usages, are intimately related to the truncated nature of the 'Old' (Abbreviated) Form poems. As, the argument went, these poems were an extension of the everyday vernacular register of the period in which they were written, it was not yet possible for them to employ extensive phonographic notation of particles and auxiliary verbs, and therefore it was necessary for Hitomaro to devise methods of communicating fine nuances in his poems, methods that included the various expressive uses of writing that are found in the 'Old' (Abbreviated) Form poems. In this context, examples of logographic dissonance, which Inaoka referred to

as 'non-equivalent logographs' (*hitaiōkun* 非対応訓)) had a double significance as characteristic aspects of what he held to be the earliest attempt to inscribe Japanese poems: they were part of an effort to engineer forms of expression that would give written poetry an appeal and power that could rival oral song, and they were also indicative of the lack of firm connections and articulations linking the Japanese language with logographs at an early stage in the development of vernacular inscription.[44]

In the aftermath of the recent transformation of how late 7th century inscription is understood, it is necessary to re-examine the issue of what connection there might be between the truncated nature of the Abbreviated Form poems and their expressive use of writing. That is, as it now appears highly likely that these qualities were not necessary, but rather were produced by active choice on the part of the author/scribe, it is worth considering the potential motivations for such a choice. It makes sense to see the expressive functions of logography that are mobilized in the Abbreviated Form texts as reason enough in themselves for selection as inscriptive strategies in literary texts, but it is also necessary to entertain the same idea with respect to the truncated written style of the same poems, with its lack of phonographic adjuncts and frequent omission of information about grammatical elements. It might well be rewarding to set aside temporarily the striking manipulations of logography and logographic overtones discussed above, and speculate about the possibility that purely (or almost purely) logographic brevity in and of itself may have had expressive potential.[45]

However, I have little to say about that possibility here. Instead, rather than setting aside the expressive uses of logography in the Abbreviated Form poems, I would like to examine them from another perspective, one that involves a re-evaluation of the connections between literary history and the history of writing made—implicitly and explicitly—by the Old Form/New Form theory. Even cursory examination of the Ab-

breviated Form poems reveals that not all of their character usage is as charged with significance as the examples discussed above. There are also numerous instances of logographs operating in a comparatively straightforward manner, with general agreement between the *kunko* network meaning of the graph and the Japanese word associated with it, and with few signs of the kind of resonance seen above. For example, the word *koFu* is generally written with the character 相, and the word *ömöFu* with the character 戀, the word *aFu* with the character 会. It is in this context of a standard logographic baseline (without which these texts would be even closer to incomprehensibility than they already are) that the expressive use of characters (as in the inscription of *koFu* with 香 in XI: 2501) has its effect : as a departure from the norm.

In connection with this situation, two important aspects of the Abbreviated Form style should be recognized. First, this relationship between these two types of character usage is symbiotic : the expressive usages of characters, which gain a great deal of their impact by being unusual, exist only as a departure from the more standard usages. This connection, which is akin to that between figure and ground in a drawing or painting, means that *both* types of usage are charged with new significance in the context of the Abbreviated Form texts. Of course, the standard usages, by virtue of being standard, do not automatically become more expressive ; it is still necessary to acknowledge a difference between writing *Fitö* as 人 and *nemökörö* as 懃. But the presence of the latter 'figure'-like usages cannot help but impart new significance to the former ones, as the 'ground' against which they stand out. The 'specialness' of the connection between graphs and words in the Abbreviated Form poems is not limited to the unusual expressive uses, introduced above, that have been the object of so much scholarly investigation and speculation. It extends throughout the entirety of these texts, engulfing all of the graphs employed therein.

The second important aspect of this 'figure'-'ground' relationship is that it is part of an overall approach to inscription that exists in the Abbreviated Form Poems *as a collection*—that is, as a set of texts that exist cohesively, that depend on mutual inter-relations for at least some of their significance. The 'figure'-'ground' relationship that underlies the expressive uses of writing is possible only in a context of multiple poem-texts, so one can say that the full functioning of the inscription of the Collection depends on it being the inscription of a collection. Particular usages of writing resonate within the mini-context of a given poem-text, and are dependent on larger linguistic and literary contexts, including vernacular poetic rhetoric and the *kunko* network, but they take on their meanings and implications—whether as 'figure' or 'ground'—in an implicit local context of other poem-texts.

These points mean that the function of writing in these texts is fundamentally, essentially different from its functions in everyday texts like those seen in *mokkan* and other sources, where logographs serve simply as straightforward signs of particular words.46 It is difficult to imagine a set of *mokkan* in which unusual usages resonate with expressive effects within and between individual texts, against a background of more straightforward graphs. The reason for this difficulty is that the function of writing in such everyday contexts is communicating or storing information, so that play with inscription would be a distraction and an active diminishment of the usefulness of the texts themselves. This difference in the essential nature of writing in these two contexts renders problematic the entire enterprise of making sense out of the Collection's inscription simply by locating it within a broad history of writing.

It is important that new discoveries have produced a picture of varied possible forms of inscription in the late 7th century, and thus drastically reduced the viability of the clean narrative of progressive development that was the Old Form/New Form paradigm, but my point here is a more

fundamental one : ultimately, the history of writing in general can serve only as a means of establishing a kind of technological baseline, an overall context of possibility for the inscription of the Collection. It cannot be used to determine the essential nature of that inscription, because in the Collection—and, especially, in the Abbreviated Form Poems—the relationship between writing and language is fundamentally different than in the everyday texts that are the primary materials for the history of writing. Due to the nature of the Abbreviated Form poems it is impossible to make sense of their inscription by treating it simply as an extension of everyday methods of writing. The reservations about the Old Form/NewForm theory outlined at the conclusion of the previous section were historical, in the sense that they are based on arguments about what developments occured at what points in time ; the reservations under discussion here are more basic, and are not governed by the logic of origin and development of inscriptive techniques—or of literary genres—that has dominated scholarship on the Collection to date.

Even before the recent *mokkan* discoveries, it was of limited value to juxtapose such everyday uses of writing with those found in the Collection, but now that the picture of what was possible, in terms of phonographic and mixed phono-logographic inscription, has been radically expanded, there is even less point in arguing about the precise temporal location of the Collection in the broader history of writing. The interesting problem is the exploitation of the *kandoku* process and the *kunko* network for particular sorts of literary effects, in the context of an overall approach to inscription that avoids indicating phonic articulation and maximizes logography. The existence of such a phenomenon is deeply meaningful in the context of the overall history of writing, but the meaningfulness of the Collection's inscription, and its relation to other modes to writing, cannot be fixed by resolving narrow questions of temporal priority. The nature of the *Man'yōshū* as a source, and the absence of external evidence that

could be brought to bear in determinative ways, severely limit any such approach—and, more broadly, any sustained attempt to reconstruct pre-*Man'yōshū* texts or collections.

In a sense, the discovery that late-7th century everyday inscription included a wide range of vernacular registers has the potential to free the study of the Hitomaro Collection from the demands of narratives of progressive development (*seiritsuron*). It is certainly true that the Abbreviated Form poems could have been composed—or at least, written down—after the Unabbreviated Form poems (or before them, or at the same time...) ; one can also entertain varying ideas about the extent of Hitomaro's own involvement in those acts of composition and/or writing, or even argue that the entire collection is actually a product of the mid-8th rather than the late 7th century. However, these sorts of approaches to the Collection remain locked within the notion that the way to assign meaning to literary or linguistic characteristics is by explaining how and when they developed ; they also doom scholars to a perpetual recyling of the same fragments of information (e.g., the cryptic note after X : 2033). This is not to deny the possibility of literary history, but rather to argue for a more chastened approach to those aspects of it that are ultimately unknowable.

In terms of the history of writing in general, the very separateness of the inscription of the Abbreviated Form poems and of everyday uses of writing is an important point, in part because this field has also been governed by an obsession with development from earlier to later stages. Of course, as long as it is a historical enterprise, some consideration along such lines is necessary, but the range of basic inscriptive techniques available during this period, and the striking contrast in the essential nature of the modes of writing exemplified in the Collection and in everyday writing, serve to direct attention away from narratives of development and towards the complex issue of simultaneous variation, of the juxtaposition of differing written registers having different purposes and

belonging to different contexts.[47]

In pursuing the functions of the inscription of the Collection, and in considering what purposes and contexts could have governed its selection, there is much that should be retained from the work of Inaoka Kōji. Leaving behind the developmental framework of the Old Form/New Form theory does not mean jettisoning the many detailed and illuminating investigations of inscription that took place under its auspices. Particularly important is the stress that the theory placed on the conscious indication of linguistic elements, in addition to the expressive effects discussed above: among the most impressive aspects of the inscription of the Collection is the amount of sophisticated self-awareness and deep learning that it implies on the part of the scribe (whether or not the scribe or scribes were also the poet or poets). In a sense the new vision of these styles as existing simultaneously and available to be *chosen* among only serves to accentuate that striking impression of linguistic and technical self-consciousness.

The key to the development thus far of insight into the inscription of the Abbreviated Form poems has been the discovery and explication of specific instances of the expressive use of writing; and therein lies the way to further understanding of these texts as well. In this connection, Inaoka's commentary on Book XI remains the most sustained and comprehensive work to date; it is filled with insightful and thought-provoking suggestions about particular usages and the roles they play in the context of particular poems.[48] A series of influential essays by Uchida Masanori 内田賢徳 covers less territory, but sets high standards for the pursuit of potential cases of expressive inscription through the *kunko* network.[49] As Uchida points out, however, it can be difficult to distinguish between apparently expressive aspects of writing that are coincidental, or are made meaningful by an overeager interpreter, and those that can be more thoroughly supported.[50] In pointing out concrete instances of the expressive use of writing, or making arguments about the implications of the truncated nature of the

Abbreviated Form mode of inscription, one always risks lapsing into arbitrariness or games of free-association; this is a core methodological difficulty of working with the Hitomaro Collection, and yet the only way forward is to take this risk, albeit with as much rigor as possible.[51]

In this article, I have not attempted to pursue aspects of the function-ing of writing in concrete contexts (though, as I have just stressed, doing so is ultimately the only means of moving toward solving the riddles of these modes of inscription). For that matter, I have refrained from presenting many details of the examples and interpretations discussed here —at times, I fear, at the risk of over-simplifying or mis-representing complex aspects of the problems involved or the existing scholarship on them. Throughout, my aim has been to provide a general survey of some pioneering research on the difficult and important topic of the inscription of the Hitomaro Poetry Collection and its place in the history of writing. It is my desire that these comments will serve as a tribute to those who, through their dedicated and erudite involvement with the work of reading the Collection, have already done so much to further understanding of this fascinating and enigmatic body of texts.

NOTES

1. All *Man'yōshū* quotations—both the texts themselves and the transcriptions of their readings in modern orthography—are from Kinoshita Masatoshi 木下正俊, ed., *Man'yōshū CD-ROM-ban* 万葉集 CD-ROM 版 (Hanawa shobō, 2001). This translation is from Ian Hideo Levy, *The Ten Thousand Leaves* Volume One (Princeton University Press, 1981), p. 343.

2. See Okumura Etsuzō 奥村悦三, "Moji kara, kotoba e" 文字から、ことばへ, *Kokubungaku: Kaishaku to kyōzai no kenkyū* 44：11 (1999/9); and "Kotoba ga erabu mono, kotoba o erabu mono" ことばが選ぶもの、ことばを選ぶもの, *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 76：5 (1999/5).

3. Translation from Edwin Cranston, *A Waka Anthology Volume One: The Gem-Glistening Cup* (Stanford University Press, 1993), poem number 790, p. 443.

4. There has been a great deal of debate about how appropriate it is to use the term 'logograph' (*hyōgo moji* 表語文字) for characters as they function in Chinese contexts; while acknowledging the limitations of the term, especially in modern Chinese orthography, I insist that it is generally appropriate for the types of texts under discussion herein. Also, in the context of this article, I have not distinguished between logographic representation of nouns, verbs, and so on (e.g. 相見 or 幾日) and of bound parts of speech like particles and auxiliary verbs (e.g., 而 or 不).

5. Translation from Cranston, *Gem-Glistening Cup*, poem number 417, p. 251.

6. Satake Akihiro 佐竹昭広 et al., eds. *Man'yōshū 3, Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei* 新日本古典文学大系 3 (Iwanami shoten, 2002), p. 13.

7. Translation from Cranston, *Gem-Glistening Cup*, poem number 380, p. 241.

8. Primarily because of ambiguities in the way sets of Collection poems are delimited, there is some argument about the number of poems the *Man'yōshū* attributes to it; moreover, scholars disagree in some cases about which of these two groups given poems belong to. In this article, I have followed the dominant perspective on these issues, which remains that of Inaoka Kōji. The 210 poems of the former, more fully logographic group comprise 196 *tanka* and 14 *sedōka*, while the 150 poems of the latter, more mixed group comprise 127 *tanka*, 21 *sedōka*, and 2 *chōka*. The total figure of 364 *Man'yōshū* poems belonging to the Collection includes four from Book XIV (3417, 3470, 3481, 3490) that have been rewritten in an all-phonograph mode, consistent with the other poems included there.

9. Aso Mizue 阿蘇瑞枝, "Hitomaroshū no shoshiki o megutte" 人麻呂集の書式をめぐって, *Man'yō* 万葉 20 (1956). Reprinted in *Kakinomoto no Hitomaro ronkō* 柿本人麻呂論考, expanded and revised edition (Ōfū, 1998).

10. Inaoka Kōji 稲岡耕二, *Man'yō hyōkiron* 万葉表記論 (Hanawa shobō, 1976), p. 149. Both of these implications are problematic, although not equally so. As discussed below, the notion that the Abbreviated Form poems were inscribed in a context where other, less abbreviated methods of writing were available is increasingly accepted, despite the fact that the purported absence of such methods was a critical component of Inaoka's own Old Form/New Form theory. However, as Inaoka himself determined, despite the implication of their label, the "Unabbreviated" Form poems are actually more abbreviated than those directly attributed to Hitomaro, and are even more so compared to the primarily logographic poems elsewhere in the *Man'yōshū*.

11. For pioneering treatments of these issues, see Aso, *Kakinomoto no Hitomaro ronkō*; Itō Haku 伊藤博, *Man'yōshū no kōzō to seiritsu, jō* 万葉集の構造と成立 上 (Hanawa shobō, 1974); and *Watase Masatada chosakushū* 渡瀬昌忠著作集 2 and 3 (Ōfū, 2002).

12. From the introduction to the revised version of *Man'yō daishōki* 万葉代匠記: Hisamatsu Sen'ichi 久松潜一, ed., *Keichū zenshū* 契沖全集 1 (Iwanami shoten, 1973), p. 177. All unattributed translations are my own.

13. (其人万呂集の本は、かくの如く助辞を略きて詩體に書くべきにあらず、人万呂は大きなる人と見ゆるに、其罪に一事もからさるまじと書べし也、かゝるんにて、哥は詩體をまねくべからず、たゞ奈良人の中にも、ひとくかゝる好みする人のわざにこそ見ゆれ) Inoue Yutaka 井上豊, ed., *Kamo no Mabuchi zenshū* 賀茂真淵全集 2 (Zoku gunshoruijū kanseikai, 1978), p. 327.

14. See Hashimoto Tatsuo 橋本達雄, *Man'yō kyūtei kajin no kenkyū* 万葉宮廷歌人の研究 (Kasama shoin, 1975) and Umehara Takeshi 梅原猛, *Uta no fukuseki* 歌の復籍, 2. vols (Shūeisha, 1979).

15. See Saitō Mokichi 斎藤茂吉, *Kakinomoto no Hitomaro: Hyōshaku-hen ge* 柿本人麻呂 評釈篇下 (Iwanami shoten, 1939), p. 31; and Hashimoto, *Kyūtei kajin no kenkyū*, pp. 267-271.

16. See Kumegawa Sadakazu 粂川定一, "Hitomaro kashū kōshin-nen kō" 人麻呂歌集庚辰年考, *Kokugo kokubun* 国語国文 (1966/10).

17. In recent decades, these dramatic increases in relevant archaeological discoveries have led to an rapid rise in the amount of research on early Japanese writing. For introductory accounts, see the dated but still very useful Kishi Toshio 岸俊男, ed., *Nihon no kodai 14: Kotoba to moji* 日本の古代14 ことばと文字 (Chūō kōronsha, 1988); Hirakawa Minami 平川南, ed., *Kodai Nihon no moji sekai* 古代日本の文字世界 (Taishūkan, 2000); and Okimori Takuya 沖森卓也, *Nihongo no tanjō: Kodai no moji to hyōki* 日本語の誕生 古代の文字と表記 (Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 2003). For an English-language survey of the entire history of Japanese inscription, see Christopher Seeley, *A History of Writing in Japan* (E.J. Brill, 1991; University of Hawaii paperback reprint, 2000). A preliminary attempt at a detailed English-language analysis of the development of early writing can be found in David Lurie, *The Origins of Writing in Early Japan: From the 1st to the 8th Century C.E.* (Columbia University Ph.D. Dissertation, 2001).

18. See, for example, Nishimiya Kazutami 西宮一民 *Nihon jōdai no bunshō to hyōki* 日本上代の文章と表記 (Kazama shobō, 1970).

19. See Kōnoshi Takamitsu 神野志隆光, "Moji to kotoba: 'Nihongo' to shite kaku koto" 文字とことば・「日本語」として書くこと, *Man'yōshū kenkyū* 万葉集研究 21 (1997).

20. To survey the variety of methods of inscription employed in *mokkan*, see Okimori Takuya 沖森卓也 and Satō Makoto 佐藤信, eds. *Jōdai mokkan shiryō shūsei* 上代木簡資料集成 (Ōfū, 1994).

21. Okimori and Satō, *Jōdai mokkan shiryōshū, mokkan* 46; see also Mokkan gakkai 木簡学会, eds., *Nihon kodai mokkan sen* 日本古代木簡選 (Iwanami shoten, 1990), *mokkan* 56.

22. On the emergence of this mixed system, and on its connections to the style in which *senmyō* proclamations are inscribed, see Kotani Hiroyasu 小谷博泰, *Mokkan to senmyō no kokugogakuteki kenkyū* 木簡と宣命の国語学的研究 (Izumi shoin, 1986) and Okimori Takuya 沖森卓也, *Nihon kodai no hyōki to buntai* 日本古代の表記と文体 (Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 2000).

23. *Shodō zenshū* 書道全集 9 (Heibonsha, 1954), pp. 13 and 146; see also Jōdai bunken o yomu kai 上代文献を読む会, eds., *Kokyō ibun chūshaku* 古京遺文注釈 (Ōfūsha, 1989), pp. 67-72.

24. Kumegawa, "Hitomaro kashū kōshin-nen kō."

25. Okimori and Satō, *Jōdai mokkan shiryōshū, mokkan* 9; see also Mokkan gakkai, *Nihon kodai mokkan sen, mokkan* 421, and Inaoka Kōji 稲岡耕二, "Kokugo no hyōkishi to Morinouchi iseki mokkan" 国語の表記史と森ノ内木簡, *Mokkan kenkyū* 木簡研究 9 (1987). On the final *kabane* title, see Tōno Haruyuki 東野治之, *Nagaya-ō ke mokkan no kenkyū* 長屋王家木簡の研究 (Hanawa shobō, 1996), pp. 287-295.

26. In addition to *Man'yō hyōkiron* (op. cit), see *Man'yōshū no sakuhin to hōhō* 万葉集の作品と方法 (Iwanami shoten, 1985) and *Hitomaro no hyōgen sekai: Kotaika kara shintaika e* 人麻呂の表現世界 古体歌から新体歌へ (Iwanami shoten, 1991). A recent restatement of the Old Form/New Form theory can be found in Inaoka's "Hitomaro kashū to Hitomaro" 人麻呂歌集と人麻呂, in Kōnoshi Takamitsu and Sakamoto Nobuyuki 坂本信幸 eds., *Seminā Man'yō no kajin to sakuhin* セミナー万葉の歌人と作品 2—Izumi shoin, 1999); in addition to being an excellent place to begin an enquiry into the Hitomaro Collection and its historiography, this article liberally cites work on the Collection published by Inaoka in the late 1990s.

27. Tōno Haruyuki 東野治之, *Sho no kodaishi* 書の古代史 (Iwanami shoten, 1994), pp. 69-73; Kudō Rikio 工藤力男, "Hitomaro no hyōki no' in to yō" 人麻呂の表記の陰と陽, *Man'yōshū kenkyū* 20 (1994). For a summary of Inaoka's counterarguments, with further references, see his "Hitomaro kashū to Hitomaro," pp. 21-23. Citing just the arguments of Tōno and Kudō here should not be taken as implying that Inaoka's theory went otherwise unchallenged; it has been tremendously influential, but that does not mean there were no other dissenters before the late 1990s. For an early challenge from a more thoroughly literary-historical perspective, see Misaki Hisashi 身﨑寿, "Hitomaro kashō no ichi: ryakutaika o chūshin ni" 人麻呂歌集の位置 略体歌を中心に, *Nihon bungaku* 日本文学 27: 6 (1978).

28. Mokkan gakkai 木簡学会, eds., *Nihon kodai mokkan shūsei* 日本古代木簡集成 (Tōkyō daigaku shuppankai, 2003), *mokkan* 434; see also Fujikawa Tomoyuki 藤川智之 and Wada Atsumu 和田萃, "Tokushima, Kannonji iseki" 徳島・観音寺遺跡, *Mokkan kenkyū* 21.

29. See Tōno Haruyuki 東野治之, *Nihon kodai mokkan no kenkyū* 日本古代木簡の研究 (Hanawa shobō, 1983), pp. 167-184.

48

30. Mokkan gakkai, *Nihon kodai mokkan shūsei, mokkan* 509; see also Terasaki Yasuhiro 寺嶋保広, "Nara, Asukaike iseki" 奈良・飛鳥池遺跡, *Mokkan kenkyū* 21 (1999).

31. Mokkan gakkai, *Nihon kodai mokkan shūsei, mokkan* 507; see also Terasaki, "Nara, Asukaike iseki."

32. For a survey of these and other ways in which *mokkan* have contributed to the ongoing re-evaluation of 7th century inscription, see Inukai Takashi 犬飼隆, "Nana-seiki mokkan no kokugoshiteki igi" 七世紀木簡の国語史的意義, *Mokkan kenkyū* 23, 2001.

33. For a sampling of articles by other scholars confronting this new situation, see the section devoted to the Hitomaro Collection in Saijō Tsutomu 西條勉, ed., *Kaku koto no bungaku* 書くことの文学 (Kasama shoin, 2001), which also contains a substantial bibliography of books and articles devoted to all aspects of the history of writing in early Japan.

34. See, for example, Saijō Tsutomu 西條勉, "Tenmu-chō no Hitomaro kashū: Ryakutai/hiryakutai no gainen o koete" 天武朝の人麻呂歌集歌 略体/非略体の概念を越えて, *Bungaku* 文学 10:4 (1999); "Hitomaro kashū ryakutaika no koyō kunji: kaku koto no shigaku" 人麻呂歌集略体歌の固有訓字 書くことの詩学, in Nishimiya Kazutami 西宮一民, ed., *Jōdaigo to hyōki* 上代語と表記 (Ōfū, 2000); and "Tekusuto to shite no 'shō': kaku uta no jiritsu ni tsuite" テクストとしての《集》書く《歌の目立について, *Kokubungaku: Kaishaku to kyōzai no kenkyū* 47:4 (2002/3).

35. Inui Yoshihiko 乾善彦, "Nihongo shokishi to Hitomaro kashū ryakutaika no 'kakizama'" 日本語書記史と人麻呂歌集略体歌の「書き様」*Man'yō* 175 (2000/11). For an examination by Inui of the broader issue of the development of phonograph adjuncts to logographic vernacular texts in which he similarly questions notions of development from one style to another, see "Senmyōgaki no seiritsu o megutte" 宣命書きの成立をめぐって, in *Ōsaka shiritsu daigaku bungakubu sōritsu gojisshūnen kinen kokugo kokubungaku ronshū* 大阪市立大学文学部創立五十周年記念国語国文学論集 (Izumi shoin, 1999). Both articles are incorporated, with revisions, in his *Kanji ni yoru Nihongo shoki no shiieki kenkyū* 漢字による日本語書記の史的研究 (Hanawa shobō, 2003).

36. Inaoka Kōji 稲岡耕二, *Man'yōshū zenchū* 万葉集全注 11 (Yuhikaku, 1998),

pp. 43–44.

37. Inaoka, *Man'yōshū zenchū*, p. 233–234.

38. Inaoka, *Man'yōshū zenchū*, p. 366, and, especially, Uchida Masanori 内田賢徳, "Uta no naka no kanji hyōgen: kunji to kana o megutte" 歌の中の漢字表現 訓字と仮名をめぐって *Man'yō* 161 (1997/5), pp. 18–19.

39. For a series of articles exemplifying this kind of work brought to bear on questions of character usage in the *Man'yōshū*, including many from Hitomaro-related texts, see Kojima Noriyuki 小島憲之, "Man'yō yōji kōshō jitsurei" 万葉用字考証実例 1–4, *Man'yōshū kenkyū* 2–4 (1973–1975) and 7 (1978).

40. The other Abbreviated Form poems with this *nemōkōrō*/側隠 usage are XI: 2393, XI: 2472, XII: 2857, and XXII: 2863.

41. On the expressive dissonance between *nemōkōrō* and 側隠, see Kojima Noriyuki 小島憲之, *Jōdai Nihon bungaku to Chūgoku bungaku, chū* 上代日本文学と中国文学 中 (Hanawa shobō, 1964), p. 889; Watase Masatada 渡瀬昌忠, "Hitomaro kashū ryakutaika no wakun kango to wafū gikun jukuji: Sokuin, shin'ai, gyokukyō, saku to kon" 人麻呂歌集略体歌の和訓漢語と和風義訓熟字 側隠・心哀・玉響・昨と今, *Man'yōshū kenkyū* 16 (1988); and Inaoka Kōji 稲岡耕二, "Hitomaro kashū kotaika no 'hitaiōkun' ni tsuite: Sokuin, shin'ai, mubō nado" 人麻呂歌集古体歌の〈非対応訓〉について 側隠・心哀・無乏など, *Ronshū Jōdai bungaku* 論集上代文学 17 (1989).

42. For a catalog of these expressive uses of writing in the Abbreviated Form poems, see Saijō, "Hitomaro kashū ryakutaika no koyō kunji."

43. For discussions of expressive uses of writing in the Works that have profound implications for inquiry into the inscription of the Abbreviated Form poems, see Tetsuno Masahiro 鉄野昌弘, "Hitomaro ni okeru chōkaku to shikaku: 'Miyama mo saya ni' o megutte" 人麻呂における聴覚と視覚「み山もさやに」をめぐって, *Man'yōshū kenkyū* 17 (1989) and Itō Haku 伊藤博, "Sanshi: Kakinomoto no Hitomaro no shuhō" 三思 柿本人麻呂の手法 *Man'yōshū kenkyū* 18 (1991).

44. Inaoka, "Hitomaro kashū kotaika no 'hitaiōkun' ni tsuite." See also Inaoka, *Hitomaro no hyōgen sekai.*

45. Such a suggestion is made, though not fully explained, by Takagi Ichinosuke 高木市之助 in 1950: "Hitomaro kashū no yōjihō to Hitomaroteki na mono to no kanren ni tsuite" 人麻呂歌集の用字法と人麻呂的なものとの関連について, in *Takagi*

49

Ichinosuke zenshū 高木市之助全集 3 (Kōdansha, 1976), pp. 7-21.

46. See Kobayashi Yoshinori 小林芳規, "Hyōki no tenkai to buntai no sōzō" 表記の展開と文体の創造, in Kishi, *Nihon no kodai 14: Kotoba to moji*.

47. Inui Yoshihiko incorporates such considerations into his reconceptualization of the history of writing; see his *Kanji ni yoru Nihongo shoki no shieki kenkyū* and, for a recent discussion of the problem of choice and some of its implications for investigations of how differing modes of writing were conceived, "Kanji hyōgen no tajūsei to kanagaki uta no tei" 漢字表現の多重性と仮名書き歌の定位, in Kōnoshi Takamitsu 神野志隆光, ed., *Man'yōshū o yomu tame no kiso hyakka* 万葉集を読むための基礎百科 (Gakutōsha, 2003), pp. 193-195.

48. Inaoka, *Man'yōshū zenchū.*

49. In addition to Uchida, "Uta no naka no kanji hyōgen," see his "Kanji hyōgen no ōyō to naika" 漢字表現の応用と内化, *Man'yōshū kenkyū* 21 (1997); "Kojisho no kunko to Man'yōka" 古辞書の訓詁と万葉歌, *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 文学 75：5 (1998/5); and "Teikei to sono haikei: Tanka no reimeki" 定型とその背景 短歌の黎明期 *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 78：11 (2001).

50. Uchida, "Uta no naka no kanji hyōgen," p. 21.

51. Kōnoshi Takamitsu 神野志隆光, "Hitomaro kashū ryakutaika no moji hyōgen e no apurōchi, sono konnan" 人麻呂歌集略体歌の文字表現へのアプローチ、その困難, lecture delivered at Hokkaido University Symposium, "Kodai bungaku kenkyū no genjō to kadai" 古代文学研究の現状と課題 (22 March 2002).

（55）武朝成立をめぐっては、法隆寺の…

（56）福朝成立をめぐっては、…

（57）椎は福朝のもので、それらの時期を…椎立説を補強するものではないかと見られることから。

（58）そこでは『国風暗黒時代の文学』（補篇）【補巻三】において、「国風暗黒時代」という時代把握そのものが、決定的に考え直されてきた。これは一九九五年（平成七年）のことであるが、…仏像製作と法「作品」として、その年与から。小

編者／執筆者紹介

伊藤　博（いとう・はく）　平成15年10月6日逝去
筑波大学名誉教授
〒191-0042　東京都日野市程久保2-5-25　電話042 (594) 1121

稲岡　耕二（いなおか・こうじ）
東京大学名誉教授
〒180-0001　東京都武蔵野市吉祥寺北町3-1-17　電話0422 (53) 6046

伊藤　益（いとう・すすむ）
筑波大学哲学・思想学系教授
〒305-0045　茨城県つくば市梅園2-14-38　電話029 (851) 5004

大浦　誠士（おおうら・せいじ）
椙山女学園大学国際コミュニケーション学部　助教授
〒487-0017　愛知県春日井市高蔵台5丁目5-63　電話0568 (91) 9000

身﨑　壽（みさき・ひさし）
北海道大学大学院文学研究科教授
〒061-1142　北海道北広島市若葉町1-2-2　電話011 (373) 5316

平舘　英子（たいらだて・えいこ）
日本女子大学文学部教授
〒270-0035　千葉県松戸市新松戸南2-25、A-502 桑原方　電話047 (345) 6162

瀬間　正之（せま・まさゆき）
上智大学文学部教授
〒370-1206　群馬県高崎市台新田町42　電話027 (320) 2399

鉄野　昌弘（てつの・まさひろ）
東京女子大学文理学部教授
〒184-0012　東京都小金井市中町1-13-18-315　電話042 (386) 2467

神野　志隆光（こうの・し・たかつ）
東京大学大学院総合文化研究科教授
〒350-1103　埼玉県川越市霞ヶ関東5-9-27　電話0492 (33) 8873

David B. Lurie
Assistant Professor, Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures,
Columbia University
407 Kent Hall, Columbia University New York NY 10027 USA
TEL+1 (212) 854-5316

書記史と文学史の変遷
—— 人麻呂歌集の文字表現に関する研究の展望 ——

（要旨）

本稿は、人麻呂歌集歌の書記の問題——特に稲岡耕二氏の古体・新体説と最近のその再評価——をめぐって、歌集の文字表現の研究の現状と課題について展望するものである。

人麻呂歌集の文学史的かつ書記史的な重要性は、その特殊性と歴史的な位置による。つまり、その歌の形式・内容・現存する万葉集における配列などその書記的な技術は、万葉集の他の歌と比べて異質であるとともに、そのもとにあったはずのテキストの作成は日本文字史上もっとも大事な時期の一つとされている七世紀第四半期に位置付けられるものである。

近現代の主な人麻呂歌集研究は、同歌集の内容・形体の特質と作成年代の早さとの相互関係の追究に帰するものが多く、いわゆる「略体歌」のグループの書記の発明はこうした問題を解決するための鍵とされてきた。そのような研究で、もっとも影響力があったのはやはり一九七〇年代以降の稲岡耕二氏の古体・新体説であった。賀茂真淵以来、略体歌の書記は、後代の「詩体」の書き直し・「控え」または「馬上体」・流布されていた民謡の記録などのように、二次的な現象として説明付けられてきた。これに対して稲岡氏は書記史の視点から、略体歌こそが歌集の作成にあたって唯一のあり得た歌の書き方であり、さらにこれが「非略体歌」、そして人麻呂作歌の表記へ展開したことを論じた。古体・新体説は一九九〇年代末までに知られていた七世紀文字資料の

を含んでいる。

　人麻呂歌集の略体歌の文字表現の問題は、木簡などの日常的な文字資料との対比によって明らかにされるものではないかと思われる。技術のレベルでは、何が可能であったかどうかということは木簡などから分かるが、歌の〈集〉の書記としてである略体歌書記の本質は、そのテキストの中でしか把握できない。人麻呂歌集の書記は、特定のコンテクストの中の書記を問題とし、多様な可能性の中から選ばれた文字表現としてあるべきである。

David B. Lurie

状況に基づいていたが、その説に影響力を魅力をもたらした理由の一つは、二つの違った分野からの発展段階論が融合したことであった。つまり、一方で書記史の視点から、七世紀後半の日常的な和文表記（例えば、西河原森ノ内の文書木簡や山上碑の書記体）を出発点とした略体歌から非略体歌、そして人麻呂作歌への展開が想定されていた。また他方で、文学史の視点から、歌表現（短歌と旋頭歌の定型や序詞・枕詞・対句などの技法）の発展——特に、抒情詩的な表現の獲得という方向——も想定されていた。この二つの発展の相互関係を大きく促したことは言を俟たない。

古体・新体説は古代日本の和文表記の成立と飛鳥・奈良時代の和歌の成立を同時に論じる、いわば二面的な幅広い成立論となった。この枠組が提示されたことを契機に、人麻呂歌集の書記の特質や意義について多くが明らかにされたことを考えれば、古体・新体説が研究の進展を大きく促したことを考えたい。

しかし、一九九〇年代末に発掘された飛鳥池や観音寺の遺跡などから出土した文字資料によって、天武・持統朝時代の文字の使用は意外に多様をもち、表語文字専用・表音文字兼用・表音文字専用の幅があったことが明らかになった（もちろん、書記のバラエティーはテキストのジャンルや文脈と深い関係をもつので、そのスタイルは全く自由に選ばれたわけではない）。このため古体・新体説の根本であった七世紀後半の和文表記のありようの理解が大きく変わり、当然ながら現在では、前述の二面的な成立論にも疑義が呈されるようになった。しかし、これは単なる資料のグループの順番の入れ替え、つまり方向性の違う新しい成立論に変わることによって解決できる問題ではないように思われる。成立論が変わることによって、現象を発展や成立というような概念によって文学史でも、書記史でも、意味付ける立場そのものを考え直すべきである。ある意味では、現在明らかになりつつある七世紀後半の日本語書記に内在する多様性は、歌集に関する文学史的かつ書記史的な研究を成立論の枠から開放する可能性