

APPENDIX B

Notes on the So-Called ‘Remnant Texts of the Suiko Court’

As explained in Chapter Four, the “Asuka Enlightenment” narrative of late 6th and early 7th century cultural development has long been supported by a group of texts that were thought to have been composed during that period: the so-called ‘remnant texts of the Suiko court’ (*Suikochô ibun* 推古朝遺文). However, review of 20th century scholarship on these texts reveals that most of them are of doubtful authenticity (this is not to say that they are forgeries, but rather simply to argue that they are not actually as old as they have often been thought to be). In the second section of Chapter Four, I explained the implications of approaching these texts skeptically; here I will simply list them and summarize how they have been criticized.¹ However, before beginning the list, I would like to examine one of the most famous of these texts in a bit more detail. Doing so will clarify the nature of the critical approaches that I summarize in the rest of this appendix, but it will also suggest why misleading dates—and misconceived dating attempts—are so common in early epigraphs and textual fragments.

The sample ‘remnant text of the Suiko court’ that I will consider here is an inscription on the reverse of the mandorla, or halo, of a 63.8 centimeter tall gilt cast bronze statue of Bhaisajyaguru (Yakushi 薬師), the healing Buddha, that currently sits in the eastern bay of the Golden Hall (*kondô* 金堂) of Hôryûji, the famous temple in the Ikaruga district of Nara prefecture. The mandorla itself is 79.7 centimeters tall; in a

¹ These texts have been individually analyzed and interpreted by historians, scholars of literature, architectural historians, epigraphers, Buddhologists, art historians, and linguists, to name most of the disciplines that have been involved. However, attempts to compile the various criticisms of all of them as a group have been less common. The high proportion of these texts that are questionable is discussed in detail in classic discussions of the origins of the term “Tennô” (Watanabe Shigeru 1967 and Tôno 1977a) and in a recent revisionist account of the origins of written Japanese (Kônoshi 1997). This latter work in particular presents an excellent starting point for

rectangular (29 by 13.5 centimeter) space in the center of its flat back, the following 90-character text is inscribed.²

When the Tennô who ruled all under heaven from the Great Palace of Ikenobe was in poor health, in the senior fire/horse year [586], he summoned the Great King Tennô and the Prince and made a vow, proclaiming: “Because We hope to ameliorate Our great illness, We intend to construct a temple and make an image of Bhaisajyaguru.” However, because around that time he passed away and was unable to complete the construction, the Great King Tennô who ruled all under heaven from the Great Palace of Owarida and the Saintly Prince of the Eastern Palace accepted the great command and carried it out in the junior fire/rabbit year [607].

池邊大宮治天下天皇、大御身勞賜時歲
次丙午年、召於大王天皇与太子而、誓願賜、我大
御病大平欲坐故將造寺藥師像作仕奉詔。然、
當時崩賜造不堪者、小治田大宮治天下大王天
皇及東宮聖王、大命受賜而、歲次丁卯年仕奉。(KKI 2)

The style of this text is striking: there are many passages in object-verb order, honorifics are indicated in ways foreign to literary Chinese style, and particles are employed to clarify the relationships between sentence elements. All of these features are consistent with the logographic *mokkan* style that I discuss in Chapters Four and Five; in fact, because of its brevity and clarity, this inscription is often used as a sample of the so-called ‘non-standard Chinese’ (*hentai kanbun*) style.³

However, my concern here is not with the way this text is written but rather the question of *when* it was written. It is often dated to 607, but a glance at the inscription reveals that this practice is based on a misreading: nowhere does it claim that that is the

reconsidering the “*Suikochô ibun*” as a group.

² Because the size of the characters and the space between them varies, the number of graphs per line is unequal (16/19/18/19/18) even though the lines themselves are of the same length. I have maintained the original line breaks in the following transcription of the inscription, but I ignore them in my translation.

³ For a succinct discussion of the stylistic features of the text, see Seeley 1991, 27-28. A recent and very interesting analysis that criticizes the approach many scholars have taken to the honorific elements, and provides a systematic reading of the structure of the text, can be found in Komatsu Hideo 1998, 211-72.

year in which it was made. In fact, this inscription is not dated at all, which is very unusual for a dedicatory text inscribed on a Buddhist image; the absence of a date in itself suggests that it is likely to have been written long after the events that it describes. Such a suspicion can be supported by other aspects of the text itself: the term “Great Palace” is more suited to an earlier reign than an ongoing one, and it would be more natural for Shôtoku to be referred to as “Saintly Prince of the Eastern Palace” after his death than during his lifetime. Furthermore, examination of the *Nihon shoki* and consideration of other sculptures make it clear that the cult of Bhaisajyaguru (Yakushi) did not arrive in Japan until late in the 7th century, so it is unlikely that this inscription was written before that point.⁴ If one looks beyond the content of the text itself to the object on which it is inscribed, one finds that art historians agree that typological comparison of this sculpture and mandorla with the Sakyamuni image that sits next to them in the Golden Hall reveals that this image is newer; if the 623 date of the inscription on the Sakyamuni image is taken seriously (see #11 below), this is further reason to believe that the above inscription was produced no earlier than the mid-7th century.⁵

⁴ These points were made by the architectural historian Fukuyama Toshio in a classic article on the dating of several Hôryûji inscriptions, which will be cited repeatedly in this appendix (Fukuyama 1935).

⁵ For excellent large photographs of these images and their inscriptions accompanied by art historical essays and bibliographies, see Nara rokudaiji taikan kankôkai 1999; for a detailed comparison of the two images that focuses on the dating problem, see Ishida Hisatoyo 1993. As it is possible that the text was inscribed some time after the image itself was made (*tsuikoku* 追刻), the dating of the sculpture itself would only establish an upper limit, or *terminus post quem*. A final point about the dating of this inscription is its use of the term “Tennô.” The majority of historians of early Japan now agree that this title was not employed until the reign of Tenmu (r. 672-686), and that it did not come into general use until the following reign of Jitô (r. 687-697). (On this issue, see Watanabe Shigeru 1967, Tôno 1977a, and Mori Kimiyuki 1998a; English-language discussion can be found in Piggott 1997, 91-92 and 144.) In the case of this inscription, and those of the several of the other so-called “remnant texts of the Suiko court” that also include this title (#3, #8, #9, and #10), the use of “Tennô” is yet another reason to doubt the early dating of the text. However, one reason that so many

If the traditional date of 607 is incorrect, then when was this text written? A lower limit, or *terminus ante quem*, is provided by the *Hôryûji garan engi narabi ni ruki shizaichô* 法隆寺伽藍縁起并流記資材帳, a 747 report on the history and holdings of Hôryûji. This text includes the Bhaiṣajyaguru (Yakushi) image at the head of its list of the temple's treasures, noting that it was created by Yômei, Suiko, and Shôtoku in 607 (HE 345); as that information is clearly derived from the inscription, we can assume that it existed by the mid-8th century. However, the *Hôryûji engi* also provides an important hint about the purpose of the above inscription: the very beginning of the *engi* is a brief history of Hôryûji, the first entry of which explains that the temple was founded on behalf of Yômei and the generations of previous Tennô by Suiko and Shôtoku in 607. This entry, which is almost certainly based on the content of the inscription, suggests that the purpose of the inscription itself is to testify to this story of temple origins.

To return to the text itself, when it is viewed in this light some telling differences from normal dedicatory inscriptions become apparent. I have already mentioned that the lack of a date for the inscription itself is unusual; even more so is the

scholars subscribe to the Tenmu-Jitô theory is that the authenticity of these early inscriptions has been called into question, so relying in turn on that theory in discussing the dating of the texts clearly runs the risk of falling into circularity. It is for that reason that I have not stressed the presence of the title in this or the other inscriptions, but I would like to point out here that when one is dealing with early texts, circularity is not the anathema that it is often thought to be, as long as it is openly acknowledged. As with the identification of Wakatakiru and Yûryaku that I discussed in Chapter Three, when one collates a variety of approaches to a problem, their mutual interaction makes certain interpretations seem increasingly likely, and that increased likelihood itself then becomes a factor in evaluating those interpretations. In this case, there are other reasons to doubt the authenticity of all of the inscriptions that contain the term "Tennô"; given that there are also other reasons to place the origin of the term "Tennô" in the late 7th century besides the doubt that has been cast upon these inscriptions, when one becomes increasingly sure of the late appearance of this term, that in turn will tend to strengthen one's suspicion of the dating of these inscriptions. This kind of feedback is certainly circular, but when one is dealing with a complex assortment of rare and difficult texts from a poorly known period, a certain degree of common-sense inflected circularity is often necessary if one is to formulate any theories about the material with which one is working.

absence of a dedicatory vow for the image itself. Indeed, the text seems less concerned with the provenance of the image on which it is inscribed than it is with the origins of the temple within which it is housed: it asserts dual origins for Hôryûji in the founding will of Yômei, and the virtuous acceptance of that will by the saintly Shôtoku and the great Suiko. In short, the inscription can be seen as an attempt to firmly tie the history of the temple to the institution of the Tennô. The centrality of this project is nicely symbolized by the placement of the phrase “construct a temple” 造寺 at the exact center of the inscription.

This interpretation does not bring us any closer to an exact date for the text, but it goes a long way towards clarifying the circumstances under which it must have been produced. As I discuss in Chapter Four, in the latter half of the 6th and former half of the 7th centuries, Buddhism was established in the form of clan-sponsored *ujidera* 氏寺 institutions, but the late 7th century saw a dramatic increase in Tennô-centered state sponsorship and control. Under these circumstances it was necessary for both apologists and historians of the Tennô (e.g., the *Nihon shoki* compilers) and for priests looking to preserve and support their temples to create narratives that linked Buddhist institutions with the royal family. These circumstances formed the matrix within which the cult of Shôtoku first developed, but they also clearly underly this inscription on Hôryûji’s Bhaiṣajyaguru (Yakushi) image, which almost certainly represents a late-7th or early 8th century attempt to establish an official, royal origin for a temple that actually began as a private *ujidera* for Shôtoku or members of his family.⁶

This inscription has much in common with the other texts discussed below. Many of them concern the origins of temples or of objects associated with temples;

⁶ This interpretation was first proposed in Fukuyama 1935; for some subsequent attempts to develop and extend it, see Yabuta 1950 and especially Ônishi 1990, which also contains an extensive bibliography.

several others are famous texts attributed to the legendary Shôtoku. In quite a few cases, they are works that were produced for much the same reasons as the Bhaijaguru (Yakushi) image inscription: in order to provide crucial credentials for an institution in need of the support and legitimization that would be forthcoming if an early, royal founding were established. In other cases, they have been affected by the same kind of wishful reception that leads some scholars to date this inscription to 607, even though the text itself does not support that interpretation. All of the texts discussed below have long and complex histories of often contentious attempts to interpret and re-interpret them. In the brief discussions that follow, it is of course impossible to do justice to those histories, or to the many fascinating problems presented by the texts themselves; I have limited myself to explaining the more important ways in which the traditional dating of so many of them has been called into question.⁷ In the following list, the so-called “remnant texts of the Suiko court” are arranged by their putative dates. Because many of these texts are no longer extant, or exist only in fragments or transmitted quotations, I have **bolded** the titles of those that actually remain as intact artifacts (#1, #5 [*Hokekyô gisho*], #6, #7, #10 [very few fragments], #11, and #12).⁸

⁷ One issue I have not gone into is the question of the written style of these texts, which is a primary concern of Kônoshi 1997, a study on which I have relied extensively in preparing this appendix. One of the dominant approaches to the so-called remnant texts of the Suiko court has been an emphasis on their stylistic variety, which has been conceived of as ranging from ‘legitimate’ literary Chinese to nonstandard literary Chinese (*hentai kanbun*) to full-blown Japanese (for a useful statement of this approach, see Nishimiya 1970, 21-38). As I argue in Chapter Four, I do not see signs of the emergence of ‘written Japanese’ until the middle of the 7th century, but there is no need to take up this problem here, because the dating of all the relevant texts is so doubtful. If they are not early examples of important writing practices, but rather later texts that have been mistakenly back-dated, then there is no need to deal with them when discussing the origins of the writing practices in question.

⁸ The repeated emphasis of the transmitted nature of many of these ‘inscriptions’ is not meant to imply that that alone casts doubt on their authenticity: it is certainly true, for example, that the *Kojiki*, *Nihon shoki*, or *Man’yôshû* all exist only as transmitted texts, and yet I take them seriously (for the most part) as sources for 8th century writing. However, when discussing those texts, everyone is aware that they are transmitted, and

1) **Hôryûji (now Tokyo National Museum) Sakyamuni Mandorla Inscription**
 旧法隆寺釈迦光背銘 ('594' [Suiko 2]) (ZKKI 3).

This inscription can be found on the back of a small (31.0 by 17.8 centimeter) gilt-bronze mandorla (unattached to any image) now held by the Tokyo National Museum as one of the "Hôryûji Treasures."⁹ The short, 59-character text is a typical dedicatory inscription: it records the date and the name of the sponsor of the image, explains that it is a sculpture of Sakyamuni made on behalf of his parents, and then concludes with a vow detailing the spiritual benefits it is hoped will accrue to them through the merit gained by making the image itself. The cyclical date at the head of this inscription is senior wood/tiger, which could correspond to 594 or 654; the former possibility is the reason that this text is sometimes included in the '*Suikochô ibun.*' This date is not completely solid, however: there is an influential, early line of thought on this object that dates it to 654 (Miyake Yonekichi 1929, 236-83). The currently dominant opinion is that 594 is more appropriate (see Nara kokuritsu bunkazai kenkyûjo Asuka shiryôkan 1979, 148-49), but the art historian who made the most

thus need to be used with care and considered in light of other, artifactual evidence. In the case of the texts discussed here, even though few of them remain as inscriptions on extant objects, there has been a marked tendency to treat them as if they all did.

⁹ More precisely, the "Treasures Donated by Hôryûji [to the Imperial Household]" (*Hôryûji kennô hômotsu* 法隆寺献納宝物), often referred to as the Former Imperial Treasures from Hôryûji. This is the collective designation of a large group of sculptures, paintings, textiles, ritual objects, documents, and so on that date from the 6th through the 18th centuries and are currently owned by the Japanese government and exhibited in a special hall at the Tokyo National Museum in Ueno, Tokyo. All of these items were once held by Hôryûji, but in an ultimately successful bid to gain sponsorship that would save the temple from bankruptcy, they were donated to the imperial household in 1876. After the Fifteen Years War (1931-45), the vast majority of these objects became government property (these are the "former" treasures), but a few were returned to Hôryûji and about ten (including some of the choicest items) were kept under the control of the Imperial Household Agency. There are several excellent National Museum publications about these objects, but the best starting place is provided by the large catalogue to a recent exhibition that assembled all of the objects from the original donation (Tôkyô kokuritsu hakubutsukan 1996). The mandorla in question is object number N196; unfortunately, it is exhibited inscription-side down.

influential argument for that date did so on the grounds that the inscription resembles those found on similar mandorla from late 6th century Koguryo and Paekche. As he himself pointed out, this certainly is reason to prefer 594 to 654, but it is also reason to suspect that the mandorla and the inscription it bears were both made, not in the Japanese archipelago, but in one of the Three Kingdoms of the Korean peninsula (Kumagai 1960).

2) Dôgo Hot Springs Stele Inscription 道後湯岡碑文 ('596' [Suiko 4]).

The stele which is said to have borne this text no longer exists, if it ever did, and the 'inscription' itself is only known through a twice-removed later source; it is important to stress this point, as there is a tendency to view this work as something that remains on an actual 6th century artifact rather than as a quotation of a quotation found in a Kamakura period text. According to a passage from the no-longer extant *Iyo no kuni fudoki* 伊予国風土記 that is quoted in two 13th century commentaries, when Shôtoku visited the Dôgo Hot Springs (in modern Matsuyama city, Ehime prefecture [Shikoku]) a stele was erected to commemorate the occasion.¹⁰ The inscription, which is an exceedingly ornate piece of Six Dynasties-style parallel prose, states that the royal progression to the hot springs occurred in 596; it does not explicitly claim that the text itself was composed at that time, but it can certainly be read that way.¹¹ However, given

¹⁰ The relevant quotations from the *Iyo no kuni fudoki* are found in the 14th volume of the *Shaku Nihongi* 釈日本紀, a late 13th century *Nihon shoki* commentary by Urabe no Kanekata 卜部兼方 (fl. c. 1278-c. 1306) (ShaN 188) and the 3rd volume of the *Man'yôshû chûshaku* 万葉集註釈, a 1269 commentary on the *Man'yôshû* by Sengaku 仙覚 (1203-after 1272) (MYSC 111). However, the portion of the *fudoki* text that includes the stele inscription is omitted in the latter, so the *Shaku nihongi* quotation is the only source for it.

¹¹ Because modern editions of the *Fudoki* include not just the five relatively intact "old *Fudoki*" (*kofudoki* 古風土記), but also collections of quoted fragments of no-longer

the ornateness of the inscription and the strength of the cult of Shôtoku from the 8th century onward, it is very likely that this text was composed long after Suiko's reign. The timing with which other stelae appear in the Japanese archipelago lends added support to this supposition: references to them in the *Nihon shoki* do not emerge until the mid-7th century, while the earliest extant stelae date to the late 7th century (see Appendix A #69, #81 and #119). Furthermore, several scholars have argued that aspects of the wording of this 'inscription' rule out the possibility that it was composed in 596.¹²

3) Gangôji Pagoda Steeple-Base Inscription 元興寺露盤銘 ('596' [Suiko 4]).¹³

This text is often treated as if it had the authority of an inscription on an actual artifact remaining from the 6th century, but actually it exists only as a quotation in the *Gangôji engi*, or rather the section of a 12th century collection of temple histories (the *Shoji engishû* 諸寺縁起集) that is entitled *Gangôji garan engi narabi ni ruki shizaichô* 元興寺伽藍縁起并流記資財帳 ('Temple history of Gangôji's facilities

extant Fudoki, both the *Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshû* edition (FDK 505-510) and the *Nihon koten bungaku taikai* edition (Akimoto 1958, 493-96) incorporate annotated versions of the relevant portion of the *Iyo no kuni fudoki*. A detailed discussion of the rhetorical structure and numerous classical allusions of the stele 'inscription' can be found in Kojima 1968, 71-108.

¹² For example, Yabuta Kaichirô saw the format of the initial date, which uses an unusual era name also found on the Hôryûji Golden Hall Sakyamuni Mandorla Inscription (#11 below), as inconsistent with that employed in other early epigraphs, and suspected that the Hot Springs Text was a medieval forgery (Yabuta 1950, 81), while Miyake Yonekichi argued that because of its hagiographic treatment of Shôtoku, who is referred to as "Great King Dharma King" 法王大王 even though he would have been only 23 years old in 596, the text must have been written some time after that date (Miyake Yonekichi 1929, 236-83).

¹³ The *roban* 露盤 (literally, 'dew-board') is the square base of the *sôrin* 相輪, the antenna-like metal structure atop the roof of a pagoda that I have taken the liberty of translating as 'steeple.'

with a catalogue of its holdings”).¹⁴ The ‘inscription’ is a long text appended to the conclusion of the narrative portion of the *engi*, preceded by the simple notation that it was “presented” (授) in 651 (GE 332).¹⁵ It describes the arrival of Buddhism (in a passage translated in Chapter Four, section 1) and its sponsorship by Suiko, Shôtoku, and Soga no Umako, and then narrates the construction of the monastery Kentsûji 建通寺, starting in 588 (senior earth/monkey 戊申) and ending in 596 (senior fire/dragon 丙辰). It is this latter date that has traditionally been taken as that of the text itself, but nowhere is there a reference to when this ‘inscription’ was written; if one were to insist on finding a date for it, the year 651, when it is said to have been “presented,” would seem to be a more natural choice.¹⁶ It has been argued that the entire inscription (Kita 1980) or at least its first half (Fukuyama 1968b) was written long after the supposed founding of the temple, but on the other hand, it has also long been known that the phonographs it employs are older than those used in 8th century texts.¹⁷ However,

¹⁴ On the *Gangôji engi*, see the discussion in section 1 of Chapter Four.

¹⁵ For a translation, see Stevenson 1999, 314–15. It is unclear to or by whom, or for what reason, the inscription would have been ‘presented,’ although the character employed (授) suggests that it is the ‘Tennô’ (Kôtoku) who did so, as elsewhere in the text items or actions performed by subjects are usually marked with verbs indicating ‘offering up’ (上, 奉) (the editors of the *Shisô taikai* edition would seem to endorse that position through their addition of the honorific ‘*tamafu*’ in the *yomikudashi* transcription of the text’s kundoku [GE 19]). It is possible that this notation has some connection with several entries in the *Nihon shoki* for the same year, which record a great deal of Buddhist sponsorship by Kôtoku: production of embroidered and carved images and convocation of a Buddhist feast (NS II:317/Aston II:240), and large-scale sutra readings (Appendix A #73).

¹⁶ The reason for the traditional ascription to 596, of course, is that scholars have assumed that the inscription would have been written at the time it states the temple was completed.

¹⁷ In a pioneering work of scholarship that inaugurated the modern study of early Japanese writing—and also firmly established the notion of the ‘*Suikochô ibun*’—the linguist Ôya Tôru (1850–1928) and other members of the government-sponsored

even if parts of this quoted text do ultimately derive from early—that is, 7th century—materials, there is little reason to assume that they date as far back as 596.

4) ‘Seventeen Article Constitution’ 十七条憲法 (‘604’ [Suiko 12]).

This long text is perhaps the best known of all the ‘*Suikochô ibun*.’ Indeed, if taken at face value, it alone is sufficient to create an impression of sophisticated, advanced textuality at the very beginning of the 7th century. These seventeen articles (‘code of conduct’ is a far better translation than the traditional ‘constitution’) are quoted in their entirety in the *Nihon shoki* (NS II:181-87/Aston II:128-33; an alternate translation can be found in Deal 1999, 324-27); although there are independent texts consisting of just the Articles, it is clear that they are all later extracts derived from this quoted text. The *Nihon shoki* does incorporate quotations from other works, including the *Sanguozhi* (see Appendix A #4), several histories of Paekche-Wa relations (see Chapter Three, Section 1), the *Nihon seiki* (see Appendix A #81), and reports written by emissaries to the Tang court.¹⁸ However, the Seventeen Articles are far longer than any of those other quotations, they are included in the main text rather than as interlinear

“National Language Investigative Committee” (*kokugo chōsa iinkai* 国語調査委員会) investigated the phonological origins of the phonographs used in many of these texts, arguing that they were based on older stages of Chinese than the phonographs used in Nara period texts like the *Man’yōshū* or *Nihon shoki* (Kokugo chōsa iinkai 1911). On linguistic aspects of these phonographs, see Case 2000, 205-245; on the history of the *Kokugo chōsa iinkai*, see Gottlieb 1995.

¹⁸ The *Iki no muraji Hakatoko no sho* 伊吉連博徳書 is quoted at length three times in the *Nihon shoki* Saimei annal (NS II:339-41/Aston II:260-63; NS II:345/Aston II:266-67; NS II:349-51/Aston II:271-72). It describes in detail the experiences of Wa ambassadors to the Tang court, who left in 559 and returned in 661. (A possible fourth quotation in the Kōtoku annal [NS II:323/Aston II:246] is the subject of a great deal of debate; see NS II:575 suppl. n. 33.) The *Naniwa no kishi Ohito no sho* 難波吉士男人書, which appears to have been similar to Hakatoko’s text, is quoted once, briefly, in the Saimei annal (NS II:341/Aston II:263). In addition to these named texts, there are numerous vaguely attributed quotations from “a certain text” (一, 一書, 或本); on the works quoted in the *Nihon shoki*, see Yamada Hideo 1979, 43-44 and 55-58.

notes, and they are not introduced by a general citation of the work's title (as, for example, "The *Nihon seiki* says" 日本世記曰)—rather, each article is preceded by "the first says" 一曰, "the second says" 二曰, and so on. This special treatment suggests that they differ in quality from pre-existing works referred to by the *Nihon shoki* compilers. It is largely for this reason that the great Edo period scholar Kariya Ekisai 狩谷棭齋 (1775-1835) argued that the Articles were "embellishment added by the *Nihon shoki* compilers" 日本紀作者の潤色 (KEZ VIII:124).

Of course, these features are not the only reason that several prominent twentieth century historians, including Tsuda Sôkichi and Naoki Kôjirô, also doubted the authenticity of this text.¹⁹ As Tsuda pointed out, the Articles themselves contain anachronistic references to provincial governors, appointed bureaucrats, centralized taxation, and other institutions that the *Nihon shoki* itself places after the 'Taika reform' of 645 and 646 (Tsuda 1950, II:121-24).²⁰ Moreover, the general tenor of the Articles is quite inconsistent with what is known of the political structure of the Suiko court, but it makes perfect sense if they are viewed as latter-day admonitions for bureaucrats and

¹⁹ Naoki discusses his support for Tsuda, and considers the surprising laxness with which Tsuda's criticism of the Articles has been received, in Naoki 1996. He concludes by speculating that there may have been an original set of articles that lay behind the *Nihon shoki* version, comparing this possibility to the frequently advanced argument that actual Taika proclamations underlie the elaborate ones found in the *Nihon shoki*, but as there is no corroborative evidence whatsoever for Shôtoku's having composed any Articles, I see no reason to make such an assumption.

²⁰ A common retort to this argument has been that these terms are being advanced as ideals, or are used as equivalents for pre-Taika institutions, but Tsuda anticipates this by pointing out that there are internal contradictions in the Articles themselves that make sense only if they are seen as having been written after Taika (Tsuda 1950, II:123-24). The widespread skepticism about the historicity of the 'Taika Reform'—and more particularly of the detailed edicts associated with it by the *Nihon shoki*—has little impact on Tsuda's critique of the Seventeen Articles. Actually, if one accepts that the 'reforms' located by the *Nihon shoki* in 645 and 646 are actually an idealized depiction of state-building activities that lasted throughout the latter half of the 7th century and culminated in the Taihō code of 701, that is even more reason to doubt the authenticity of the Articles, which are suspiciously consistent with that idealized depiction.

provincial administrators (*ibid.*, II:124-29). However, the most telling argument against the authenticity of the Articles is a more recent one based on aspects of their style—in particular, on the ways in which their character usage and word order depart from strictly correct literary Chinese norms. Such patterns closely parallel those seen in the rest of the Suiko annal and other annals that are thought to have been compiled by the same group of editors (the so-called ‘beta group’), strongly suggesting that the Articles were composed along with that portion of the *Nihon shoki*, or at the very least around the same time that it was composed (Mori Hiromichi 1999b, 185-96).

5) ‘*Sankyô gisho*’ 三經義疏 (‘606-622’ [Suiko 14-30]).²¹

“*Sankyô gisho*” is the collective title of three sutra commentaries that have traditionally been attributed to Shôtoku: the *Shômangyô gisho* 勝鬘經義疏 (Commentary on the Lion’s Roar Sutra), the *Yuimagyô gisho* 維摩經義疏 (Commentary on the Vimalakirti-nirdesa Sutra), and the *Hokekyô gisho* 法華經義疏 (Commentary on the Lotus Sutra).²² The first two of these three texts exist only in transmitted versions, but the ‘original’ of the latter is famously extant, and in very good

²¹ None of these texts is dated; the period 606-622 is bounded by *Nihon shoki* references to Shôtoku sutra lectures in 606 (Appendix A #42) and the year of his death according to the *Jôgû shôtoku hôô teisetsu* and other Hôryûji sources (the *Nihon shoki* records his death a year earlier, in 621 [Suiko 29]). According to the 9th century *Jôgû shôtoku taishiden hoketsuki* 上宮聖徳太子伝補闕記, he composed them in the order given here between 609 and 615 (JSTDH 341), but there is no reason to take seriously the late appearance of such specific dates.

²² All three can be found in the Taishô Tripitika and the *DaiNihon bukkyô zenshō* (*Shômangyô gisho*: T 56:1-19 [no. 2185]/DNBZ 4:1-42; *Yuimagyô gisho*: T 56:20-64 [no. 2186]/DNBZ 5:1-92; *Hokekyô gisho*: T 56:64-127 [no. 2817]/DNBZ 14:1-30), but separate editions including *yomikudashi* transcriptions, modern Japanese translations, or commentaries are also available: for the *Shômangyô gisho* see Ienaga et al. 1975; for the *Yuimagyô gisho* see Hanayama 1980; and for the *Hokekyô gisho* see Hanayama 1975. Owing to the importance of the latter for the history of calligraphy, portions of it are reproduced in most surveys of the same (see SZ 4-6), and facsimile editions are also available (Shôtoku taishi hōsankai 1971).

condition (it is currently held by the Imperial Household, having been donated to it by Hôryûji at the same time as #1 above). None of them are dated or signed, but the *Hokekyô gisho* has the following written (in a different hand than the text itself) under the title on a piece of paper affixed at the beginning of its first scroll: “This here is a private compilation by the Prince of the Upper Palace of the country of Yamato. It is not a book from overseas” 此は大委国上宮王私集非海彼本 (SZ 4).²³ This somewhat strident note would appear to be a late addition by someone who wanted to emphasize the domestic provenance and Shôtoku connection of the text, and thus does not provide reliable evidence of authorship.²⁴ Moreover, the *Nihon shoki*, which devotes a great deal of space to hagiographic catalogues of Shôtoku’s achievements, makes no reference whatsoever to his having composed such sutra commentaries; this in itself should encourage skepticism about their attribution to Shôtoku (Tsuda 1950, II:134-36). Further, more positive reasons for doubting them have been provided by the great Dunhuang scholar Fujieda Akira, who discovered close parallels between the *Shômangyô gisho* and a Dunhuang commentary on the same sutra, and also concluded that the format and style of the *Hokke gisho* manuscript was consistent with the work of continental professional copyists; both points lead to the conclusion that these texts were imported from the continent rather than composed in the archipelago (Fujieda 1975).

The first appearance of these commentaries is in the 747 *Hôryûji garan engi narabi ni ruki shizaichô*, which records all three of them in its list of the temple’s

²³ The first two characters are written slightly larger than the rest; after them the text is split into two parallel lines. The character for country (國) has been inserted to the right of the two characters that precede and follow it, as if the person writing this note glanced over it and was moved to emphasize the ‘national’ character of “Yamato.” This same note is appended to the beginning of the *Shômangyô gisho*, the earliest extant version of which is a Kamakura period printed edition (see Ienaga et al. 1975, 26 and 386 suppl. n. 1).

²⁴ The note is often seen as having been written at some point in the mid-8th century, but Tôno Haruyuki has recently argued that it dates back to the very beginning of the 8th century, and possibly even earlier (Tôno 2000a, 46-50).

holdings, adding this note: “The above are the work of His Majesty Dharma King ‘Sainly Virtue’ [*Shôtoku*] of the Upper Palace” 右上宮聖徳法王御製者 (HE 346).

(The *Jôgû shôtoku hôô teisetsu* also states that Shôtoku wrote commentaries on the Lotus and other sutras [JSHT 360], but the section of the work in which this reference is found is thought to date from the mid-8th century, and very likely draws on the text of the *engi*, or at least on the Hôryûji beliefs that are reflected there.) Given the strength of the cult of Shôtoku and its importance for the institution of Hôryûji, it is likely that this mid-8th century notation reflects not the actual provenance of these works, but a more recent development: the discovery of some old commentary manuscripts among the texts held by the temple, and their subsequent attribution to the legendary founder of the institution (Ogura 1953).²⁵ As noted in the discussion of the Hôryûji Golden Hall Bhaiṣajyaguru (Yakushi) inscription which began this appendix, this explanation is entirely consistent with the nature of the *engi* text itself, and with what is known of other 8th century attempts to legitimize Hôryûji.

6) Hôryûji (now Tokyo National Museum) Bodhisattva Image Base Inscription
 旧法隆寺弥勒菩薩造像銘 (‘606’ [Suiko 14]) (KKI 1).

This is a short (34 character) dedicatory text inscribed on the circumference of the irregular rectangular base of a small (41.7 centimeters tall) gilt bronze seated bodhisattva image that is one of the “Hôryûji treasures” (like #1 above).²⁶ The

²⁵ For a very useful overview of the religious significance of the *Sankyô gisho* from the Nara period through the Kamakura period, see Abe Yasurô 1996. Although the skeptical approach championed by Tsuda and Ogura has been influential, many scholars still insist on the authenticity of the *Sankyô gisho*, especially of the *Hokekyô gisho*, which is thought to be a precious relic of Shôtoku himself. For a recent statement of this ‘conservative’ position that questions the reasons for skepticism and adds important original observations to the discussion, see Tôno 2000a, 37-52. However, Tôno’s arguments in this typically edifying essay can be taken as establishing the early emergence of the Shôtoku cult rather than the authenticity of the *Hokekyô gisho*.

²⁶ In referring to this statue simply as an image of a ‘bodhisattva,’ I follow Tôkyô kokuritsu hakubutsukan 1996 and Nara kokuritsu bunkazai kenkyûjo Asuka shiryôkan

precise readings of several parts of the inscription are debated, but it is clear that it states the identity of the sponsor of the image (one Takaya daifu 高屋大夫) and explains that it is being made for the benefit of his wife. The cyclical date is senior fire/tiger 丙寅, which could correspond to 606 or to 666; attempts to decide between the two involve art historical analysis of the sculpture itself, and they are complicated by apparent contradictions in its style. On the one hand, the figure has decorative armbands, which are not found on other Asuka period sculptures, and the superior quality of its workmanship would suggest that the date corresponds to 666. On the other other hand, it is stylistically very different from the Yachûji Maitreya image, another sculpture of a seated Bodhisattva image that had once thought to date to 666, so there was a tendency to date it to 606 (Nara kokuritsu bunkazai kenkyûjo Asuka shiryôkan 1979, 150-51). However, the date of the Yachûji image's inscription has been solidly refuted, which makes it much easier to interpret the date on this inscription as 666.²⁷

**7) Hôryûji Golden Hall Bhaisajyaguru [Yakushi] Image Mandorla Inscription
法隆寺金堂薬師仏光背銘 ('607' [Suiko 15]) (KKI 2).**

As I explained at the outset of this appendix, there are a host of reasons not to accept this text as a product of the Suiko court. Although there is little chance that it predates the reign of Jitô (r. 687-697), the only solid point for its dating is 747, the

1979. There seem to be competing theories as to the identity of the bodhisattva in question. The figure is seated with one leg pendent, in a position much like many well-known images of Maitreya in meditation, and thus it is frequently identified as an image of Maitreya (see, for example, Tôkyô kokuritsu hakubutsukan 1990), but one also sees references to it as an image of Cintamani-cakra (Nyoirin kannon 如意輪観音), one of the six manifestations of Avalokitesvara (Kanzeon/Kannon) (see, for example, KKI 1). (It is also possible that this is a representation of Prince Siddhartha [Nara kokuritsu bunkazai kenkyûjo Asuka shiryôkan 1979, 149-50].) Because differences of this sort can be very confusing, I have been careful to link early epigraphs to their *Kokyô ibun* and *Zoku kokyô ibun* numbers, which provide a consistent way of referring to them.

²⁷ On the dating of the Yachûji image inscription, see Tôno 1977a, 412-15 and Tôno 2000b.

terminus ante quem provided by the *Hôryûji engi*, which clearly relies on the text of this inscription. Given its stylistic similarities to the *Kojiki* and the *senmyô* proclamations of the *Shoku Nihongi*, I suspect that it is an 8th century work.

8) Gangôji Sixteen-foot-tall Sakyamuni Mandorla Inscription 元興寺丈六釈迦仏光背銘 ('609' [Suiko 17]).

Like the Gangôji Pagoda Base Inscription (#3 above), this text exists only as a quotation in the *Gangôji engi*, and does not contain any reference to when it was written. Introduced as the "sixteen-foot [image] halo inscription" 丈六光銘 (GE 332), it recounts the narrative of early Buddhism (see Chapter Four, section 1) and its sponsorship, but it also includes a dedicatory vow, or *ganmon* 願文 (into which a description of the King of Koguryo donating gold has been interpolated), a reference to the Sui embassy of 608, and a note that the statue was completed in 609. This latter date has been taken to be the date of the 'inscription' itself, but as with the Gangôji text, there is little reason to believe that to be the case. Fukuyama Toshio argued that this 'inscription' was not composed until the reign of Monmu (r. 697-707), nearly a century after its received date (Fukuyama 1968b).

9) Shôtoku and Soga no Umako's Histories (the "Tennô Record," the "Country Record" and the "Basic Records" of the *omi*, the *muraji*, the *tomo no miyatsuko*, the *kuni no miyatsuko*, the one hundred and eighty occupational groups, and the common people 天皇記及國記、臣連伴造國造百八十部并公民等本記) ('620' [Suiko 28]).

According to the *Nihon shoki*, Shôtoku and Soga no Umako recorded these histories, but other than the titles listed in that entry (Appendix A #46) and what may be a reference to some of them later on in the *Nihon shoki* (Appendix A #55) there are no

signs that they ever existed.²⁸ As Tsuda Sôkichi argued, even if there were some sort of written records in the early 7th century (and as I state in Chapter Four, I believe that such things did exist in certain limited contexts), it is unlikely that these ‘Histories’ are authentic (Tsuda 1950, II:118-21). The more important question is the purpose served by this entry in the *Nihon shoki*’s overall narrative of Shôtoku’s life and achievements (Appendix A #46).

10) Hôryûji (now Chûgûji) Tenjukoku Mandala Embroidered Arras Inscription 法隆寺
天寿国曼陀羅繡帳銘 (‘622’ [Suiko 30]).

This text is a fascinating composite of transmitted quotation, fragmentary early artifact, and fragmentary copy of early artifact. The Tenjukoku Mandala Arras was a large square piece of silk cloth, several meters on each side, embroidered with colorful depictions of paradise; only fragments remain, but they attest to the ornate beauty of what must have been an awe-inspiring object. Among the figures were embroidered turtles, each of which bore four characters on its shell: all together, these characters form a four-hundred character inscription explaining the creation of the arras. It begins with a genealogy that traces the descent of Shôtoku and one of his consorts, Tachibana no iratsume, from Kinmei and two daughters of Soga no Iname, and then records the death of Shôtoku’s mother (Queen Consort Hashihito) in 621 (junior metal/snake 辛巳) and Shôtoku’s death in the following year. Tachibana no iratsume mourned her husband, and asked the Tennô (Suiko) for permission to make an arras depicting the Buddhist paradise in which she believed he had been reborn; Suiko approved this project, and a group of artisans undertook it.

²⁸ The preface to the early Heian period *Sendai kuji hongî* 先代旧事本紀 states that it corresponds to these histories, but this has long been recognized as a fiction; although does seem to have drawn on some earlier materials, that text itself was actually composed in the 9th century. (The standard study of the *Sendai kuji hongî* is Kamada 1960-62.)

The earliest attestation to this inscription is provided by a quotation of the entire text in the *Jôgû shôtoku hôô teisetsu*'s third section, which is thought to date from the 10th or early 11th century (JSHT 368-70). The whereabouts of the arras itself were unknown for a long time, but in 1274 it was rediscovered in a storehouse at Hôryûji; it had already deteriorated a great deal, but it was repaired and a copy was made; both the original and the copy were stored in Chûgûji, a nunnery associated with Hôryûji, but by the Edo period they had already been reduced to something like their current fragmentary state. Out of the original four hundred characters of the inscription, only twenty-four remain, but the entire text can be reconstructed from the quotation in the *Teisetsu* and from reports on the condition of the arras that were written at the time of its rediscovery.²⁹

This inscription is often treated as if it were written in 622, but the text itself simply states that Shôtoku died in that year; unlike almost all dedicatory inscriptions on Buddhist images, it does not contain any notation of the date of its own production. This in itself is reason to suspect that this text was actually written long after 622; moreover, the date given for the death of Shôtoku's mother is inconsistent with the Yuanjia 元嘉 calendar that would have been employed were it written in the early 7th century. Given that the 747 *Hôryûji engi narabi ni ruki shizaichô* lists an embroidered arras as having been donated by Jitô (r. 687-697) (HE 352), it is likely that the Tenjukoku arras was made in the late 7th century, or, at least, that the inscription was added to it on that occasion (Tôno 1977a, 410-12). There is no question that both the format of the genealogies and the phonographs used to write proper names are older than those found in 8th century sources, but that does not mean that this text dates all the way back to the Suiko court.

²⁹ On the arras and its complicated history, see Ôhashi 1995 and Iida 2000, 404-477.

**11) Hôryûji Golden Hall Sakyamuni Image Mandorla Inscription 法隆寺金堂
釈迦仏光背銘 ('623' [Suiko 31]) (KKI 3).**

This text is inscribed on the reverse of the mandorla of a gilt cast bronze statue of Sakyamuni that currently sits in the center of Hôryûji's Golden Hall. The inscription, which is in 14 lines of 14 characters (a total of 196) at the center of the reverse side of the mandorla, describes the circumstances of the statue's creation in the following terms. In 621 (junior metal/snake 辛巳) Shôtoku's mother (Queen Consort Hashihito) died, and in the following year both Shôtoku (referred to as "Law Sovereign of the Upper Palace" 上宮法皇) and his consort (Kashiwade no omi Hokikimi no iratsume) became ill. A statue of Sakyamuni of the same height as the prince was commissioned by the consort, princes, and various nobles, with the intention that the merit gained thereby end the illness and prolong Shôtoku's life, or at the very least, ensure his rebirth in the Pure Land and speedy enlightenment. However, before the statue could be completed both Shôtoku and his consort died, so it was dedicated to the enlightenment of those who commissioned it, and more generally to the release from suffering and future Buddhahood of all sentient beings. Completed in 623 (junior water/sheep 癸未), it was made by Shiba Kuratsukuri no obito Tori.

In contrast to the inscription on the Bhaisajyaguru (Yakushi) image that sits next to this image of Sakyamuni (#7 above), many scholars believe that this text actually was written in 623. However, there are influential dissenters who argue based on aspects of the inscription that it could not have been composed during Suiko's reign. The two primary sources of doubt are the format of the text's initial date and certain distinctive terms that it employs. The date notation begins with what seems to be a combination of an era name and a cyclical date: "Hôkô 31, a junior metal/snake year

[623] 法興卅一年歲次辛巳.³⁰ The *Nihon shoki*'s first reference to the use of era names in the archipelago does not come until "Taika" in 645 (Appendix A #59), and so it has been argued that this apparent era name is anachronistic, and therefore a sign that the inscription dates from some time after 623 (Fukuyama 1935, 58-59; Yabuta 1950, 80-81).³¹ Moreover, the inscription uses the words "Law Sovereign" 法皇 and "Buddha [Image] Master" 仏師 to describe Shôtoku and the sculptor Tori, respectively, but it has been argued that because both of these terms do not appear in other sources until much later than the Suiko court, their use here is further evidence of the later production of the inscription (Fukuyama 1935, 58; Yabuta 1950, 84-85).

On the other hand, none of these criticisms is decisive, and a recent re-examination of the mandorla itself suggested that the inscription was cast rather than incised: given the near-consensus among art historians that the Sakyamuni image and its mandorla were made in the Asuka period, this proposal provides strong support for those who would see the text as having been written in 623 (Tôno 2000a, 32-37).³² Along with that discussed in the following section (#12), this inscription is thus a rare example of a potentially authentic early 7th century text.

³⁰ Some interpret the graph 卅 not as 'thirty' (卅) but as 'reign' (世), leading to the interpretation "The first year [a year?] of the first reign in which the law arose." Whether or not it is read as an era name, the word "hōkō" is clearly related to one of the alternate names for Gangōji/Asukadera: Hōkōji 法興寺, literally "temple of the arising of the law." As the *Nihon shoki* dates the creation of such temple names to 676 (NS II:435/Aston II:341), this in itself is reason to doubt that this inscription was produced in 623 (Yabuta 1950, 81).

³¹ As I mentioned in the preceding note, Yabuta ultimately rejects the 'era name' interpretation and argues for an alternate reading of this initial clause.

³² For a survey of art-historical approaches to this sculpture, as well as spectacular photographs of the object and its inscription, see Nara rokudaiji taikan kankōkai 1999.

12) **Hôryûji Sakyamuni Triad Mandorla Inscription 法隆寺釈迦三尊仏光背銘**
 ('628' [Suiko 36]) (ZKKI 1).

This text is inscribed on the back of the 38.4 by 27 centimeter mandorla of a small gilt bronze seated image of Sakyamuni that was originally flanked by two attendants, although one of them is missing.³³ A typical dedicatory inscription, it records the date, the names of those who commissioned the statue (the readings of which are unfortunately undecipherable), the person on behalf of whom they had it made, the nature of the image, and the spiritual benefits expected to accrue from its production. The name of the dedicatee is very clearly "Soga Great Minister" 嗽加大臣, and as the cyclical date (senior earth/rat 戊子) is usually taken to refer to 628, that dedicatee is often identified as Soga no Umako, who died in 626, although there are those who propose instead his son Emishi (d. 645) or more broadly 'the generations of Soga Great Ministers.'³⁴ There is an alternate theory that proposes moving the date down one cycle to 688 (Fukuyama 1935, 62-64), in which case there are several more Soga candidates for dedicatee, but given the stylistic similarities between this sculpture and the Sakyamuni image that sits in Hôryûji's main hall (see #11, immediately above), it is likely that this text actually was composed in 628. Of course, if one questions the dating of that Sakyamuni image inscription, then it becomes easier to accept the 688 theory for this one, but as it stands this text is a rarity among the "*Suikochô ibun*" in that it may actually date back to the reign of Suiko.³⁵

³³ Unlike the small bronze mandorla (#1) and image (#6) discussed above, this sculpture is still held by Hôryûji.

³⁴ In general, when particular dedicatees are specified by such inscriptions, they tend to be deceased, but there is nothing specific in the wording of this text to rule out the possibility that this "Soga Great Minister" might still be alive.

³⁵ The commentary on this inscription in the *Kokyô ibun chûshaku* is unusually comprehensive, and provides an excellent starting point for any further consideration of the many problems involved in interpreting it (Jôdai bunken o yomu kai 1989).

13) Quoted fragments from the *Jôgûki* 上宮記逸文

This no-longer extant text exists only in the form of a few quoted fragments found in later works. It is cited as the source of two long quotations: one, contained in the 13th century *Shaku Nihongi*, is a famous genealogy of the 6th century ruler later known as Keitai (ShaN 172); the other, included in the 1314 *Shôtoku taishi heijiden zakkanmon* 聖徳太子平氏伝雜勘文, is a series of genealogical fragments listing the children of Shôtoku, three of his sons, and two of his brothers (STHZ 103-104).³⁶ Another reference in this latter source reveals that by the 14th century the *Jôgûki* was thought to have been composed by Shôtoku himself (STHZ 105), but given the long history of texts attributed to or written in the name of that legendary figure, this traditional assignation of authorship cannot be taken seriously. The reason that the *Jôgûki* is often included in lists of the “*Suikochô ibun*” is that it employs old phonograph characters and an archaic format for stating genealogical relationships. However, although these elements suggest that it dates from the 7th century, and thus provides precious evidence of historical writing predating the *Kojiki* and *Nihon shoki*, there is little reason to believe that it was compiled as far back as the beginning of 7th century.

³⁶ The *Shôtoku taishi heijiden zakkanmon* is a commentary on the *Shôtoku taishi denryaku* 聖徳太子伝曆 (a mid-Heian work that is the most influential of the early Shôtoku biographies) by Hôkû 法空, a priest of the Tachibanadera about whom little more is known than what can be surmised from his writings. In addition to these two quoted passages, the *Shaku Nihongi* cites the *Jôgûki* as a source for a kun reading of part of the opening passage of the *Nihon shoki* (ShaN 221), which suggests that it included material about the “Age of the Gods.” Furthermore, a late Kamakura treatise on the Tenjukoku Mandala Arras, the *Tenjukoku mandara shûchô engi kantenmon* 天寿国曼陀羅續帳縁起勘点文, quotes portions of genealogies for Kinmei, Bidatsu, Yômei, and Shôtoku from “a certain book” 或書 which is thought to be the *Jôgûki* (Iida 2000, 365-403). For a collection of all of these quotations and a very useful bibliography of studies concerning this famous lost text, see Wada 1995, 250-54 and 770-72.

14) Portions of the *Jôgû shôtoku hô teisetsu* 上宮聖徳法王帝説

This heterogenous text is not thought to have reached its current form until the mid-11th century, but it clearly contains sections derived from much earlier material. In particular, based on the type of phonograph characters they employ, other usage patterns, and a lack of legendary material, the first and last sections (I and V) are thought to date from the 7th century (see the discussion in Chapter Four, section 1). However, despite the temptation to see these sections as having been produced during Shôtoku's lifetime or shortly thereafter, there is no way of supporting such a supposition; they certainly seem to be older than 8th century sources like the *Kojiki* or *Nihon shoki*, but there is no reason not to locate them in the latter half of the 7th century, rather than as far back as the reign of Suiko.

As emphasized in several of the preceding discussions, it is clear from their archaic formats and phonographs that several of these texts are quite old. A few of them may even date back to the reign of Suiko, but I am inclined to see this as a real possibility only for #11 and #12; of the remaining items, those that are actually early were probably composed in the mid- to late-7th century, like the mokkan texts discussed in Chapter Four. After surveying the many ways in which the authenticity of so many of these texts has been questioned, it is hard to avoid the following conclusion: the late 6th and early 7th century golden age of written culture described in the *Nihon shoki*'s Suiko annal and other Shôtoku-centered hagiographies is a fiction. At this point it is difficult to take seriously the idea of a large group of 'remnant texts of the Suiko court'; as I argue in Chapter Four, such a body of domestically produced textual material did not begin to appear for at least another half-century.

**The Origins of Writing in Early Japan:
From the 1st to the 8th Century C.E.**

David Barnett Lurie

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
Requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences**

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

2001

© 2001

David Barnett Lurie
All Rights Reserved