Oral Tradition, 24/1 (2009): 249-268

Performative Loci of the Imperial Edicts in Nara Japan, 749-70

Ross Bender

> The *naiki* presented the text to the Minister, the Minister submitted it to the Emperor. This being over, the Minister selected a capable man to read it, who received it and went back to his proper place. The Prince Imperial rose in the Eastern side of his seat and faced the West. Then everybody present from the princes downward rose and did likewise. The *senmyō no taifu* (herald) went to his appointed place and read the *senmyō*. Its contents were…. Then he said: Everybody obey this. The Prince Imperial first of all said "Aye." Then everybody from the princes downward said likewise "Aye." The Prince Imperial made obeisance. Then everybody present from the princes downward did the same. This was repeated as many times as *senmyō* were read. The ceremonial was always the same (*Jōganshiki*, c. 871; trans. Snellen 1934:166).

This description of the reading of an Imperial edict (*senmyō*) from the *Jōganshiki*, a late ninth-century compendium of court procedures, provides an image of the formal declamation of the Emperor's words in an orderly, routinized setting. The nobility are seated in their appointed places, the ritual is predetermined, and indeed, as the text notes: "The ceremonial was always the same."

But this illustration is deceptively static and misleading. The contemporary performative context of imperial edicts may in fact be accurately reflected in this late ninth-century handbook of court ritual, but the *senmyō* texts that we know from the official court histories, the *Rikkokushi* (*Six National Histories*, Sakamoto 1991) date back to the end of the seventh century. The official history *Shoku Nihongi* (*Chronicles of Japan, Continued*, Aoki et al. 1989-98) is the *locus classicus* for these texts and covers the years 697-791. The actual historical circumstances of these 62 *senmyō*, written in a peculiar form of Old Japanese, and some 900 other royal decrees inscribed in the Chinese of the chronicle, illuminate far more vivid and dynamic settings for imperial proclamations than is suggested by later sources such as the *Jōganshiki*.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the performative *loci* of the imperial edicts during the reign of the "Last Empress," Kōken-Shōtoku (r. 749-70)—their historical setting, geographical locale, and sometimes even the audiences for these royal pronouncements. This is the era in which fully half of the *senmyō* were recorded in *Shoku Nihongi*, and during which the production of the edicts inscribed in Chinese were also at their peak. The court annals of this period depict the reign of a powerful woman in a tumultuous epoch, as the Last Empress staved off challenges to her power from her royal cousins, and, in the famous dénouement of her reign,

attempted to hand the throne to a Buddhist priest, not of imperial lineage, who may or may not have been her lover.

Imperial Edicts—*Senmyō*, *Choku*, and *Shō*

The *senmyō* were introduced to the world of Western scholarship in Sir George Sansom's pioneering but unfinished translation, "The Imperial Edicts in the *Shoku Nihongi*" (1924). Since that time what little attention has been paid to them in the West has often taken the terms "*senmyō*" and "imperial edicts" as synonymous.[1] This ignores the fact that *Shoku Nihongi* also contains a much larger number of imperial edicts called "*choku*" and "*shō*." These latter are inscribed in the Chinese of the body of the chronicle. The *senmyō*, however, are written in a unique form of "Old Japanese" or "Western Old Japanese" (Miller 1967:34; Vovin 2005:15) that was famously deciphered in a lengthy commentary by the eminent eighteenth-century philologist Motoori Norinaga (Ōno S. 1971:185-482).

It was the linguistic peculiarity of the *senmyō*, akin to that of the *Kojiki* (*Records of Ancient Matters,* 712) and *Man'yōshū* (*Ten Thousand Leaves Collection,* c. 757), which accounted for Norinaga's special interest. As a Japanese nationalist, he had very little concern for the Chinese text itself. Norinaga's interpretations of the Old Japanese *senmyō* have been so influential as to form the foundation for the study of these texts to the present day. His disdain for the Chinese was also responsible for the relative neglect of *Shoku Nihongi*. A complete five-volume collated and annotated version was not completed in Japan until the turn of the century.[2] With the project has come a great new interest in the text, with at least three translations into modern Japanese having been completed in the last two decades of the twentieth century.

The Chinese of the chronicle is that of the Sui and early Tang dynasties. This was famously identified by Bernhard Karlgren (1940:3) as the language spoken in Changan, the capital, in the sixth and early seventh centuries CE, which he termed "Ancient Chinese." More recent Sinologists have spoken of it as "Middle Chinese" (Pulleyblank 1984; Baxter 1992). *Shoku Nihongi* was the second in a series of the Chinese-style *Six National Histories* (*Rikkokushi*) that purported to record Japanese history from the Age of the Gods until 887 AD. It was compiled in two recensions and presented to Emperor Kammu in 794 and 797 by a committee of court nobles and historians. *Shoku Nihongi* does not contain the mythological accounts of its predecessor, *Nihongi* (or *Nihon Shoki*), and has been judged by Japanese and Western historians to be in large part a factual chronicle (Sakamoto 1991:20-21; Snellen 1937:158-64). However, textual and form criticism is proceeding apace, and there are numerous

[1] There is a complete German translation by Herbert Zachert (1950), and a partial English translation in a dissertation by John Kenneth Linn (1950). There are English translations of individual *senmyō* to illustrate a Buddhist or Confucian emphasis (e.g. de Bary et al. 2001:114-15; Piggott 2003:56). See Bender 1979:149-51 for a survey of the *senmyō* prefaces.

[2] References in this paper to *Shoku Nihongi* [*SN*] refer to volumes 1-5 of the Shin Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei edition, vols. 12-16, edited by Aoki Kazuo et al. (1989-98). Snellen (1937) translated the annals for the years 697-715 into English.

questions about Emperor Kanmu's influence on the received version of the text, particularly for the reign of Kōken/Shōtoku (Nakanishi 2002:206-07).

The peculiarity of Old Japanese (*jōko nihongo*) is its orthography. Simply put, the *senmyō* are written in a combination of Chinese characters used semantically and phonetically, where the phonetic graphs are written in a smaller script and used primarily to denote verb endings and particles. (This style is sometimes referred to as "*Man'yogana*," or the graphic style of the *Man'yōshū*, the eighth-century poetry anthology.) Some of the *senmyō* are prefaced in a grand archaic style, as evidenced in this translation by Sansom (1924:10): "Hearken all ye assembled August Children, Princes, Nobles, Officials and People of the Realm-under-Heaven to the Word which he speaks even as the Word of the Sovereign that is a manifest God ruling over the Great Land of Many Islands."

The term *senmyō* itself is a two-character compound meaning "to proclaim the command"—hence "imperial edict." The Chinese characters "*choku*" and "*shō*" are each single graphs with the same meaning. In his study, Norinaga glossed all three of these terms as "*mikotonori*"—roughly, the "proclamation of the Emperor's word." The term "*mikotonori*" may be analyzed as the honorific particle "*mi*" ("exalted"), the noun "*koto*" ("word"), and the verb stem of "*noru*" (to declare") (Martin 1987:478, 737).

While the distinction in content among the three forms remains unclear and insufficiently studied, both the *choku* and the *shō* during the years 749-70 dealt with a broad array of administrative matters. The *senmyō* are viewed by Japanese historians as a subset of the *shō*. Although it is tempting to believe that the *senmyō* were oral proclamations due to their peculiar Old Japanese language, while the Chinese forms were simply inscribed in the chronicle, we shall see that this distinction is not at all unambiguous. In fact, much of the difficulty in working with texts as formal as the court chronicle is to try to discern what was oral and what was written from the content and the contexts. The *senmyō* certainly sometimes read as marvelous ancient oratory, whereas the other edicts strike us as bland bureaucratic prose. But in their context of performance the distinction becomes more blurred.

Orality, Literacy, Text, Ritual, and Performance

In her 1992 overview of the orality/literacy discussion to date, Rosalind Thomas very usefully distinguishes between theories of the general or "autonomous" effects of literacy, and those that attempt to study its actual historical path (15-28). To summarize very crudely, the former are theories that account for the effects of the introduction of writing as a mechanistic change in mentality—for example, the idea that the Greek adoption and adaptation of the alphabet was responsible for the development of rationality, philosophy, and ultimately science. Included in this stream of interpretation are anthropological studies of modern societies and psychological studies of the function of memory in the human brain. Historical studies on the other hand, she argues, have the potential to be more nuanced and to describe a whole range of oralities and literacies as a society changes.

One lacuna immediately noticeable in the orality/literacy discourse of the last century is the striking absence of historical studies of the development of East Asian scripts and, more to

the point here, of the Japanese transition from an oral to a literate culture in its adoption of Chinese writing. This situation is partly due to the fact that Western knowledge of Asian script and history is still so relatively recent, and that the "Oriental" is still so exotic. A great deal of Western ink has been spilled in the discussion over whether the graphs historically employed in writing Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Vietnamese were in some sense pictographs that conveyed meaning directly in a way impossible with alphabetic systems. This debate has aptly been summarized and critiqued by David B. Lurie in his recent article on the "Ideographic Myth" (2006).

While later oral and performative traditions in East Asia have been widely explored in the pages of this journal and elsewhere, the formation of Chinese script and its adoption by Japan has not. In recent studies of writing in early China, this issue has begun to appear under the rubric of "text and ritual." Thus Martin Kern, in his collection of essays titled *Text and Ritual in Early China* (2005), explicitly asks "What are the specific functions of the written text? How should we imagine the relation between oral and written textual practices? What are the social contexts of texts?" (ix). Michael Nylan, in the lead essay of the same volume, uses the concept of "text, ritual and the culture of public display" (2005:3-49). These and other chapters concern themselves with the performative contexts of ancient texts, the ritual matrix in which texts were composed and displayed. Kern's earlier monograph, *The Stele Inscriptions of Ch'in Shih Huang: Text and Ritual in Early Chinese Imperial Representation* (2000), described the great imperial progresses of the "First Emperor," the extraordinarily grand and conspicuous processions to the frontiers of the new empire, and the texts that were inscribed on stone monuments to proclaim the authority of the new monarch. It is significant that Mark Edward Lewis, in his monumental study *Writing and Authority in Early China,* unequivocally excuses himself from the debate at the outset (1999:1): "This book is about the uses of writing to command assent and obedience in early China. It does not deal explicitly with the opposition between the written and the oral, nor does it attempt to assess the changing forms or degree of literacy. Instead it examines the types of writing employed in state and society to generate and exercise power." Thus the orality/literacy meme is foregrounded even in Lewis' emphatic rejection of its hermeneutical application.

Turning to ancient Japan, we find an explosion of new interest in the origins of the Japanese writing system and in the linguistic analysis of Old Japanese. These studies in English include histories of the Japanese writing system and the Japanese book (Habein 1984; Seeley 1991; Kornicki 1998) as well as two dissertations on the origin of the *kana* system and Japanese writing as a whole (Case 2000; Lurie 2001). In a 1994 article Victor Mair made the provocative suggestion that Buddhism and the translation of Buddhist texts into Chinese was directly responsible for the making of the national vernacular in Japan as well as the rest of East Asia. Recent linguistic investigations of the grammar and phonetics of Old Japanese have been undertaken by John R. Bentley (2001), Marc Miyake (2003), and Alexander Vovin (2005), and an attempt has been made at the reconstruction of Proto-Japanese (Frellesvig and Whitman 2008).[3]

[3] The *senmyō* are utilized as source material for Old Japanese by Vovin (2005:1, 15) and Frellesvig and Whitman (2008:197).

It was in the late seventh and early eighth centuries that, in Havelock's phrase (1986), the muse of Japan was beginning to write. The Nara period saw the production of the mythohistories *Kojiki* and *Nihonshoki* (712 and 720, respectively), the poetry collections *Kaifusō* and *Man'yōshū* (c. 751 and 757), as well as the local gazetteers, the *Fudoki*. The official eighth-century history *Shoku Nihongi*, as we have seen, was compiled at the very end of the 700s. Unfortunately, due to the trajectory of Western historiography, the eighth century is in the West the least well-known of Japanese historical epochs. While ongoing archaeological research has illuminated a great deal of early Japanese history and to some extent the Nara period itself, serious historical investigation of the eighth century has not been undertaken: until very recently there was not a single monograph-length treatment of Nara history in English (Ooms 2008).[4]

However, studies of ancient Japan by literature specialists have begun to probe the meaning of the ritual and performance contexts of early Japanese documents. Gary L. Ebersole, in his 1989 study *Ritual Poetry and the Politics of Death in Early Japan*, attempted to locate poetry from the *Man'yōshū* in its performative setting, particularly in the ritual of temporary enshrinement before final burial of emperors and high officials, known as *mogari no miya*. He drew explicitly on the orality/literacy debate for his methodology of "imaginative re-creation" of the ritual background of oral poetry (18):

> Paradoxically, perhaps, the only access to the oral stage of early Japan is through written texts that have survived. These texts, however, were not intended to serve as ethnographic monographs, and the oral poems incorporated within them are frequently preserved out of their generative and performative loci and, moreover, sometimes in altered form. Nevertheless, because the earliest texts, including the *Kojiki*, the *Nihonshoki*, and the M*an'yōshū*, come out of Japan's transition from a primarily oral culture to a literate one, at least among the intelligentsia and in the court, they preserve enough evidence of the oral aspects of the culture to permit certain generalizations. The textual evidence, however, must be supplemented and interpreted in light of what scholars have learned about orality since the pioneering work of Milman Parry in the 1920's.

Two of Ebersole's points deserve special emphasis here. First, the eighth-century texts (*Kojiki*, *Nihonshoki*, and *Man'yōshū*) are rightly identified as embodying the start of the transition from a primarily oral culture to a literate one. Second, the generative and performative loci are not self-evident from the texts themselves; the textual evidence must be supplemented by theories of orality. It seems to me noteworthy that Ebersole is here stating that the texts do not speak for themselves. While they preserve extremely important data concerning the transition from an oral to a literate culture, the texts require significant hermeneutical work to recover them as "performative" texts. This recovery is for Ebersole a literary project. My criticism concerns the possibility of recovering the "performative loci" of ancient texts without "reimagining" them. I would argue for this possibility.

---

[4] The Nara period is defined as the years 710-84, when the primary capital was at Nara, or *Heijō-kyō*.

In a more recent study, David Bialock (2007) has undertaken to retrieve the meaning of ancient Japanese texts as a prologue to his investigation of the performative aspects of the medieval epic *Heike Monogatari*. His study of "Eccentric Spaces" and "Hidden Histories" constitutes a very far-reaching and sophisticated preamble to his interpretation of the *Heike* itself. However, his attempts in early chapters to "recover the Daoist text" of royal authority seem to me to suffer from much the same hermeneutical constraints as those affecting Ebersole's study. Bialock's methodological presuppositions are key to his entire study, and deserve quotation here at length (9):

> In focusing on *representation* and *performance* rather than a narrative of "fact" and "events," I am interested in the ways power and authority are mediated through a variety of symbolic practices that cut across the false barrier that has been erected between "documents," which are held to transmit "facts" and reliable "evidence," and "literature," which is treated as an epiphenomenon. This latter practice has tended to enforce a sharp separation between literature (*bungaku*) on the one hand and history (*rekishi*) on the other, which has removed texts from their embeddedness in an ensemble of cultural practices, including ritual and ceremonial, and transformed them into abstractions in a discourse *about* rather than *of* the periods in question. By returning texts like *Nihon Shoki* and *Man'yōshū* to their performative function (i.e., their embeddedness in an ensemble of cultural practices), we can better grasp their role in either enforcing or contesting specific ideologies of royal authority, irrespective of their historicity and factual accuracy.

Bialock seems to me rather premature in wishing to blur the distinction between literature and history. I contend that the imperial edicts of *Shoku Nihongi* are precisely performative texts embedded in a historical chronicle, and that these re-scripts must be investigated at least initially as historical rather than literary documents. Here I would assert that literature is indeed an "epiphenomenon"—the exhumation of the edicts from the historical chronicles is the primary task—one that has not yet been performed by Western scholars for the Nara period—and the interpretation of texts as literature is secondary. Although Bialock presents a great deal of fascinating evidence from *Nihon Shoki* for his project of recovery of the Daoist text, my point is that he almost completely neglects *Shoku Nihongi*. As a result, his evidence for the Nara period comprises primarily quotations from the *Kaifusō*, an eighth-century collection of Chinese poetry, and the *Man'yōshū*.

A telling illustration of his methodology is his use of what he terms a "Daoist" text from the *Engi Shiki*, a tenth-century compendium of court procedures like that of the *Jōganshiki*.[5] Bialock observes that "the *Shoku-nihongi* account does not record the magical formula chanted by the Fubito-be, but the text as well as details regarding its ritual performance have been preserved in the *Engi-shiki*" (95-96). In other words, he is using as his evidence an early tenth-century text, while he admits that the contemporaneous chronicle is silent.

Finally, the significance of performance in traditional Japanese poetry was discussed recently in the pages of this journal by Haruo Shirane (2005), who views performance as the "direct interaction between the performer and audience," emphasizing the critical aesthetic

[5] See the quotation that prefaces this article.

response by the audience (217). Fundamentally, of course, the performance of an imperial edict is a command, the only appropriate, or even possible, response to which is unquestioning obedience. Nevertheless, even in this lack of formal dialogic structure there is sometimes implicit a type of reciprocity, especially in the case of imperial bestowal of gifts. Certainly the locus and often even the specific audience for imperial re-scripts can be identified. Thus I identify the genre of imperial edict as a performative genre, to be classified along with other such utterances in ancient Japan.

To summarize, the discourse concerning the transition from oral cultures to literate cultures has begun to surface in discussions of early China and ancient Japan. The question of the performative spaces created by ancient utterances, whether royal ritual, poetry, prayer, or imperial pronouncements, must certainly be viewed as a central concern in the analysis of archaic documents. However, I would argue that disciplinary boundaries, however outmoded they may seem, are still of cardinal significance in this emerging debate. Furthermore, the classification of ancient genres has yet to be sufficiently articulated. As Gertrude Stein famously asked, "What is poetry and if you know what poetry is what is prose?" (1935:209). Her question is as relevant to the eighth century as it was to the twentieth.[6]

This study of the imperial edicts of a twenty-year period in eighth-century Japan focuses on this genre as it is embedded in an official historical chronicle, the *Shoku Nihongi*. The decrees are examined in their mundane contexts—they are not poetry, although some of the *senmyō* are inscribed in high-flown rhetorical language. The mostly rather prosaic edicts are exhibited in their performative context, which is the everyday functioning of the royal court—in the palace, in mansions of the high nobility, in temples favored by the emperors, in royal progresses through hastily erected temporary palaces. Only after a great deal of similar and perhaps somewhat tedious excavations by historians working in parallel to the literature specialists will the groundwork be adequately laid for theoretical overviews of the reimagined and hidden spaces that are so significant to scholars such as Ebersole and Bialock.

The Court of the "Last Empress"

The Nara period was an era of remarkable cultural growth as Japan adopted the Chinese writing system and Chinese forms of government and religion, but it was also politically a very turbulent time. The eighth century was bracketed by a shift of the capital to Nara at the beginning (710) and to Nagaoka (784) and then Kyoto (794) at the end. The century began with the subjugation of indigenous peoples, the Hayato, in Kyushu and closed amid a decades-long series of wars against the Emishi, another group of "barbarians" in the northeast. Nara Japan was subjected to a lethal epidemic starting in 735 that apparently wiped out a third of the populace and, according to William Wayne Farris (1985:64-69; 2006:264), depressed the level of population for the rest of the century and well into early medieval times.

---

[6] In *Man'yōshū to Kodaishi,* Naoki Kōjirō (2000) suggests ways to employ the poetry collection as a historical document. As a historian, he privileges *Shoku Nihongi* as the basic source for Nara history. However, in one example he traces the poet Ōtomo Yakamochi's attendance at banquets as a way of evaluating Yakamochi's degree of collusion in Naramaro's conspiracy (167-75).

Nara's court experienced almost continuous intense challenges to the newly formed state, including the events leading to the suicide of Prince Nagaya in 729 and the revolt of Hirotsugu in 740. A major succession dispute followed the Emperor Shōmu's death in 756, ensuing in the suppression of Tachibana Naramaro's conspiracy in 757. The enthronement, dethronement, exile, and assassination of the "Deposed Emperor" Junnin were closely linked to the major rebellion of Fujiwara Nakamaro in 764. With the affair of the Buddhist priest Dōkyō and the death of his supposed paramour, the Empress Shōtoku, in 770, an archaic pattern of female rulership came to an end (Bender 1979). For the years from 592 to 770 women were the paramount rulers more than half the time—six females beginning with Suiko are named as *Tennō* in the official chronicles. (*Tennō* is usually and anachronistically translated as "Emperor" or "Empress," signifying the paramount ruler, whether male or female.)

The "Last Empress,"[7] styled Kōken during the first part of her reign and Shōtoku during the latter, was in fact not the very last Empress, as two women sat on the Chrysanthemum Throne during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when actual power had passed to the military ruler, the Shogun. But the six ancient Empresses, or *Tennō*, were arguably rulers quite as powerful as the males. This was a pattern of rulership different from that in China, where despite the presence of many powerful women at court over the centuries there was only ever one titular Empress, the Empress Wu Ze Dian (r. 690-705). The six Japanese female *Tennō* were rulers in their own right, not merely the wives of rulers.

Kōken/Shōtoku, the ruler whose edicts for the period 749-70 are the subject of this study, was in fact never married. She was appointed to the office of Crown Prince by her father Shōmu in 738 and formally acceded to the throne as Kōken Tennō in 749. Although her early years were spent in the shadow of her father, the Retired Emperor, and his queen, Kōmyō, the evidence is that she was very much in control of court politics, fighting off challenges from her royal cousins Tachibana Naramaro and Fujiwara Nakamaro. During the brief interregnum of the unfortunate Junnin, whom she set up and then deposed (and who was not formally added to the list of monarchs by court historians until the nineteenth century), she continued to issue occasional re-scripts and may be seen as the power behind his titular throne.

The production of edicts—*senmyō*, *choku*, and *shō*—reached a climax during the reign of Kōken/Shōtoku. Half the *senmyō* and about a third of the *choku* and *shō* recorded in the 95 years covered by *Shoku Nihongi* date to this roughly twenty-year period. As we will see, a good number of these imperial pronouncements were issued in response to the tumultuous events of the time. Many more, however, concern commonplace issues of governance.

Performative Loci

Hayakawa Shōhachi, in one of the essays in his collection entitled *Shoku Nihongi* (1993:9-18), underscores the importance of visualizing the ceremonial contexts of many entries

[7] *Saigo no Jotei* (Takinami 1998); Joan R. Piggott (2003) more precisely terms her "the last classical female sovereign."

in the chronicle, and of understanding that edicts were originally delivered orally by a herald speaking for the emperor. He discusses two edicts, from the years 698 and 702, the first of which bestows court titles upon provincial officials and the second on high Buddhist clergy. In each case he paints a picture of the various officials standing in ranks facing north toward the emperor, who faces south.

He notes that even in the case of edicts recorded in Chinese, it is not possible to judge whether in fact they were delivered orally, like the *senmyō* that he assumes to have been spoken. But in either case he stresses that it is necessary first to have some grasp of the ceremonial setting. In this essay, and also in much greater detail in his 1997 opus, Hayakawa discusses the process by which oral transmission (*kōtō dentatsu*) became "documentized" (*monjoka*). In the latter book (18-21) he parses the *senmyō* pronounced upon Emperor Shōmu's accession in 724. While the body of this magisterial work is devoted to a thoroughgoing study of the process by which oral documents were written down, beginning with an examination of the transmission of commands up and down through levels of the bureaucracy, I would here simply like to pursue in a preliminary way Hayakawa's insight that it was ceremony (*gishiki*) that comprised the fundamental context for the imperial re-scripts of the eighth century. It is this insight that suggests to me that the performative loci of all the edicts must be examined in detail, and that both the sites and the texts must eventually be understood in the overall process of movement from oral transmission to documentization.

The remainder of this essay will be devoted to four sites where edicts inscribed in *Shoku Nihongi* were delivered during the years 749-70: major royal palaces, Buddhist temples, mansions of the high nobility, and temporary palaces during a royal progress. While not all of the roughly 300 imperial pronouncements can be scrutinized here, these loci illuminate the scope of the command and control that the Last Empress exercised over her realm, and the types of governance issues she addressed in the course of her reign.

Palaces

Outlines of the Heijō Palace in Nara have been established by postwar archaeological investigation, and the visitor today can stroll in the huge park-like site where the Last Empress dwelled and where the myriad high officials and the common people worked. In fact, portions of the palace, notably the *Suzakumon* (south gate), have been rebuilt, and in 2010, on the 1300th anniversary of the founding of Nara, a reconstruction of major palace buildings will be unveiled.

The largest of these structures was called the Daigokuden; it occupied the central site in the northern end of the palace enclosure, which in turn was sited at the northern end of the ancient city of Nara. From this throne room the emperor would face south toward the other palace buildings and the entire city. It was in the Daigokuden that the edict upon the abdication of Kōken's father Shōmu Tennō was proclaimed in 749, and where the one announcing her accession to her first reign was also read (*SN* 3:83). The Daigokuden was also the site for half of the fourteen New Year's Day celebrations recorded in the chronicle for the period 749-70.

The New Year festivities typically extended throughout the first month and during that time the Empress frequently invited the high-ranking officials to banquets in other, smaller

buildings within the palace enclosure. Those structures mentioned in the chronicle are the Dairi, Chōdō, Tōin, Daianden, and Kōmon. After the banquets, edicts were customarily proclaimed announcing the New Year's list of promotions and honors. A paraphrased summary of the calendar for the first month of the year 754 (*SN* 3:137) provides an idea of the New Year celebrations and the types of edicts read:

> **First day:** Banquet at the Dairi for officials fifth rank and higher.
> **Fifth day:** The emperor went to Tōdaiji (Great Eastern Temple) where 20,000 lanterns were lit. An edict was read announcing spring, the calendar, and a great amnesty.
> **Seventh day:** Banquet at the Tōin for officials fifth rank and higher. An edict was read announcing promotions.
> **Sixteenth day:** At the Daianden an edict was read announcing promotions.

It will be noted that the audience for the edicts in this case was the officials of fifth rank and higher. The precise number of these officials is difficult to estimate, although it may have been fewer than a hundred. There were eight ranks of bureaucratic office at the time and each was subdivided. The highest three grades included princes and princesses of the blood; these grades were each divided into a higher and lower level. From the fourth rank down, each rank was subdivided into four levels. The fifth rank and higher were the *crème de la crème*. But an entry from the first month of the year 769 (*SN* 4:227) shows that the lower echelons were also feted at the New Year:

> **Seventeenth day:** The emperor went to the Tōin and gave a banquet for mid-level officials. There was a banquet at the Chōdō for the heads of the various civil and military offices and for the *Emishi* from Michinoku. The *Emishi* were given gifts and awarded low rank.

Here the numbers of officials involved would be even more difficult to calculate. The *Emishi*, by the way, refers to representatives of the indigenous people from the north against whom there was intermittent warfare during the latter part of the century.

In 764, a dramatic edict was issued at the Heijō Palace on the occasion of Fujiwara Nakamaro's revolt (*SN* 4:43). This was a highly unusual circumstance; the titular Emperor Junnin was accused of complicity in the revolt and a messenger was sent from Retired Emperor Kōken to formally dethrone Junnin and announce that he was being exiled to the island of Awaji. At the time, Kōken was actually residing in the Hokkeji Temple east of the palace complex, a site that had been her grandfather Fujiwara Fuhito's mansion. In this extraordinary instance, soldiers were sent to roust Junnin from bed in the palace; an imperial prince read the decree of exile to him and his family, then immediately sent them on their way.

In addition to the main Heijō Palace, the Last Empress also spent significant amounts of time in the palaces of other, lesser capitals—Naniwa, Hora, and Yugi no Miya. Each of these palaces was the site for at least one edict. In addition to these more stable locales in the capitals, special temporary palaces were constructed especially for the frequent royal progresses, or *miyuki*, to neighboring provinces.

Temples

Since its construction and the completion of its enormous Buddha image (*Daibutsu*) in 752, the Tōdaiji (Great Eastern Temple) played an occasional role as an impressive setting for court ritual. Situated in the northeast corner of the city of Nara, this temple was the apex of a system of official temples located in every province. We have noted above that Tōdaiji was the site of an imperial visit on the fifth day of the first month of 754, among a series of festivities in the palace itself to mark the New Year. The temple was the setting for the famous *senmyō* of 749 (*SN* 3:97) in which Retired Emperor Shōmu addressed the god Hachiman. Note especially that although Kōken had already succeeded to the throne, the edict is recorded as the words of her father Shōmu read by the herald, the *Sadaijin* (Great Minister of the Left). This was a feature of the early years of Kōken's reign, when her mother, here described as the retired empress, also issued occasional edicts. Note also that both the high nobility and officialdom attended the ceremony, and that the specific number of 5,000 priests is recorded. While the accuracy of such numbers in *Shoku Nihongi* may be open to question, the spacious grounds of Tōdaiji as it exists today can easily accommodate such throngs (Bender 1979:135):

> The nun and priestess of the Great God Hachiman, Ason Ōmiwa Morime, worshipped at *Tōdaiji*. (Her palanquin was of a purple color, like that of the imperial palanquin.) Emperor Kōken and the retired emperor and empress also proceeded to the temple. On this day, great numbers of government officials and various members of the aristocracy all gathered at the temple. Five thousand priests prayed, performed ceremonies of veneration of the Buddha, and read sutras. The music of Great T'ang, Palhae and Wu, and the Gosechi and Kume dances were performed. The Great God Hachiman was awarded the first rank, and Himegami the second. Sadaijin Tachibana Moroe presented an edict and read it to the god.

Particularly during the latter part of Shōtoku Tennō's reign, the great temples of the capital were the destinations of imperial visits and the sites for a variety of court activities. Below is an extract from the calendar for the first three months of 769 (*SN* 4:149-57):

> **First month, eighteenth day:** The emperor went to Tōin (in the palace grounds); a shō was issued announcing promotions.
> **Second month, fourth day:** The emperor went to Tōdaiji and announced promotions.
> **Second month, eighth day:** The emperor went to Kōfukuji; there was a performance of music and conferral of court rank on temple personnel.
> **Second month, fourteenth day:** The emperor went to Tōin, and witnessed a sacred liturgy presented by the governor of Izumo Province.
> **Third month, second day:** The emperor went to Gangōji and presented gifts.
> **Third month, third day:** The emperor went to the Hōin of *Saidaiji*; literati were invited to a winding water banquet, and the emperor presented gifts.
> **Third month, ninth day:** The emperor went to Daianji and announced promotions.

> **Third month, fourteenth day:** The emperor went to Yakushiji, presented gifts, and awarded court rank.

Although the presentation of gifts and the award of rank and promotion were not always couched in the format of an edict, the pattern of utilizing the grand temples for court ceremonial is clear. The emperor's visits were frequent and consistent enough to demonstrate that such activity was a fundamental imperial duty and ritual responsibility. The laconic chronicle does not always describe the proceedings in detail, but it is obvious from the above that these visits often included the performance of music and occasionally a banquet. The winding water banquet was a literary activity that involved the floating of wine cups down a stream and the composition of poems by the famous writers of the day. While the temples listed here were all within the confines of the imperial city, we will see below that the pattern was repeated in lesser provincial temples when the emperor journeyed on royal progresses around the countryside.

Mansions

Scattered through the record are notations of visits to mansions of high officials. Particularly notable are the *Tennō*'s visit to the mansion of the *Sadaijin* (Great Minister of the Left) Fujiwara Nagate in 769, upon which occasion he was promoted to the Junior First Rank (*SN* 4:229). Soon afterward, Shōtoku went to the mansion of the *Udaijin* (Great Minister of the Right) Kibi no Makibi and awarded him the Senior Second Rank. These two officials had been mainstays of her earlier administration and were to oversee the transition of power after her death. At this point Shōtoku was already ailing, and these appointments may be seen as attempts to ensure a smooth succession. But the most famous of these visits was earlier in her reign, when Kōken and the whole court was relocated to the Tamura Mansion of Fujiwara Nakamaro, her cousin, south of the palace in the eastern sector of Nara.

In 757 Kōken and her mother the Dowager Empress Kōmyō moved there with the rest of the court due to repairs at the Heijō Palace. Their two-month residence saw a peak in the production of edicts. In the fifth month Kōken appointed Nakamaro to an extracodal high office and also issued a *choku* ordering the promulgation of the Yōrō law code, which had been the handiwork of their mutual grandfather Fujiwara Fuhito and for unknown reasons had never been fully disseminated (*SN* 3:187). It was while the court was residing at the Tamura Mansion that the conspiracy of Tachibana Naramaro (another cousin of Kōken) was unmasked and ruthlessly suppressed. Alternating pronouncements from both *Tennō* and the Dowager Empress were handed down almost daily from the second to the ninth day of the seventh month (*SN* 3:197-201). Finally, on the twelfth day Kōken returned to the Heijō Palace and from the Daigokuden issued a *senmyō* proclaiming the details of the curbing of Naramaro's plot and the exile of high officials (*SN* 3:203).

One *senmyō* from the Dowager Empress was read to the five main conspirators, royal princes and nobles who had been summoned to the Tamura Mansion (*SN* 3:201). The edict was quite personal: she refers to the conspirators as her close relatives, wonders how they could have had it in their hearts to rebel, and, as a compassionate Buddhist monarch, forgives them. The

chronicle records that the five backed out of her presence via the south gate, kowtowing and making profound apologies. It also records their deaths or sentences of exile the following day.

Royal Progresses (*Miyuki*)

Fujiwara Nakamaro, whose mansion had served as the temporary home of the court in 757, raised a rebellion in 764. After his resounding defeat, Kōken, who had abdicated and put the puppet Junnin on the throne, ascended the throne again with the name Shōtoku. In the following year she and members of her court embarked on a royal progress through the adjacent provinces of Kawachi and Izumi to the province of Kii (*SN* 4:91-101). It is tempting to view this as a triumphal procession. *Shoku Nihongi* does not designate it explicitly as such, although it was during this *miyuki* that the news of the exiled Junnin's death was formally reported to the court. Junnin had been a party to the revolt of Fujiwara Nakamaro. It was ordered that temporary palaces (*karimiya*) be erected along the route of the procession. *Shoku Nihongi* notes that the highest officials were appointed to oversee the royal progress, and narrates the procession in detail. It lasted about a month, and the court visited the sites of ancient palaces and an imperial tomb, where the Empress read an edict honoring her ancestor Prince Kusakabe. At the island of Tamatsushima in Kii province, which Shōtoku's father Shōmu had visited in 724 to worship the local divinity,[8] a special camp was established facing the sea and music and dance were performed.

Along the route the court inhabited several temporary palaces, and at one such location a special market was opened for the local merchants. The commerce included the sale of relatively low court ranks to the regional potentates. The provinces along the way were expected to furnish provisions for the royal retinue, and imperial edicts announced amnesties and the remission of local taxes in recompense. As the procession moved from one province to the next, Shōtoku issued re-scripts thanking and rewarding the provincial governors with gifts.

The route of the *miyuki* led to the home province, Kawachi, of the Buddhist priest Dōkyō, now a close advisor to the sovereign, who visited several temples in the vicinity. The climax of the royal progress was a ceremony at Dōkyō's clan temple, where music and dance of China and Korea were performed and the Empress proclaimed a decree appointing the priest to the highest office in the civil bureaucracy. As the *miyuki* left Kawachi and wended its way home, edicts

[8] A poem in the *Man'yōshū* commemorates Shōmu's visit (Sasaki et al. 1969:191):

From Saiga's plain, where we serve
At the palace everlasting
Of our august Sovereign reigning in peace,
The island lies athwart in the sea.
White waves gambol along its clean shore
When the wind arises.
Men gather the dainty seaweed
When the tide is low –
So precious since the age of the gods,
This Tamatsu-shima, Island of Jewels!

granted tax relief, gifts to the elderly and local officials, promotions to the latter, and a general amnesty. When the court returned to the Heijō Palace in Nara, further re-scripts awarded gifts and promotions to the military officials who had accompanied it.

Conclusion

The imperial edicts in *Shoku Nihongi* in fact constitute the backbone of the chronicle, and their contents comprise a narration of the major political events at court during the eighth century. As we follow the Last Empress peregrinating around the core of her realm, we witness a powerful woman in the tradition of the female sovereigns before her, dealing with a fractious body of officialdom that was almost never free of succession disputes, conspiracies, and rebellions. The edicts conjure visions of the grand New Year ceremonies in the Heijō Palace, the magnificent Buddhist temples and noble mansions that served as backdrops for court ritual and entertainment, and the spectacle of grand processions in which the empress and officials moved across the landscape and camped in temporary palaces. Although the language of the chronicle is spare and does not offer us all the detail we would wish, the performative loci are sketched sufficiently to provide a picture of the active production of royal re-scripts in a dynamic variety of settings.

Bestowal of gifts, often in the form of appointment to court rank or office, is a major motif of the performative utterances of the sovereign in our twenty-year sample. Perhaps this is most obvious in the New Year's list of honors distributed in the round of banqueting at the Heijō Palace, but the Empress gives gifts wherever she goes, in her visits to mansions, temples, and especially on her royal progresses. Particularly during the latter, this largesse in the form of tax relief, amnesties, and award of official rank to local officials have the nature of reciprocity, as it is in fact given in exchange for the provisioning of the court on its travels. The function of the opening of local markets and the sale of titles should especially bear future scrutiny. The symbolic presence of the monarch is not sufficient—her "legislation" comprises a beneficence that functions as a sort of social leveling through the bestowal of favor.

Audiences for the proclamation of edicts may be as grand as the 5000 priests and hosts of officials at the Tōdaiji or as intimate as the five trembling conspirators in the Tamura Mansion. Musical offerings to the sovereign occur most often during imperial visits to Buddhist temples. In at least one case the literati are summoned to compose poetry for a state-sponsored banquet. The deposed Junnin and his family are dispatched into exile by a herald's reading of an imperial decree when the sovereign is not even present. Dōkyō's appointment to the highest civil office is announced to his extended family in the clan temple deep in his home turf to the accompaniment of continental music and dance. The role of the emperor in fixing the calendar is suggested not only by the importance of New Year's edicts, but in the single instance cited when Kōken goes to the Tōdaiji to announce the onset of spring.

Missing from the record is the humdrum routine of the scribes composing edicts, forwarding them up through the bureaucracy, the highest officials consulting with the monarch,

then presenting them to the herald to be voiced as the words of the emperor.[9] Among the many questions left unanswered by this study is that of these specific bureaucratic mechanisms. More fundamental and vexing is the question of precisely which of the *senmyō*, *choku*, and *shō* were actually presented orally. While the performative loci are amply documented, issues of performance are only hinted at by the occasional notice of the identity of the herald or the specifics of the audience. The entire body of some 900 edicts in *Shoku Nihongi* constitutes a crucial database for study of a document type that is only now beginning to be closely examined, particularly in the West.

Certainly the eighth century in Japan, when the adoption and transformation of the Chinese written language was in full bloom, should be ranked along with ancient Greece as a critical epoch in which an oral culture began to make its uncertain and wavering progress into literacy. The long history of Japan's development into a powerful and technologically advanced, twenty-first-century state still employing an orthography quite different from that of Western scripts would seem to give the lie to claims that the introduction of the alphabet in some mysterious way altered mind and society and inevitably led to the wonders of modern science and Western dominance. That Japan's transition from orality to literacy has been so long ignored is testimony to Occidental scholarship's wanton ignorance of the processes by which the Muse began to write in exotic cultures.[10]

Independent scholar, Philadelphia

References

Aoki 1973 — Aoki Kazuo. *Nara no Miyako*. Nihon no Rekishi, 3. Tokyo: Chuōkōron.

Aoki et al. 1989-98 — _____, Inaoka Kōji, et al., eds. *Shoku Nihongi*. 5 vols. Shin Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei, 12-16. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Baxter 1992 — William Hubbard Baxter, III. *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bender 1979 — Ross Bender. "The Hachiman Cult and the Dōkyō Incident." *Monumenta Nipponica*, 34:125-53.

[9] While this procedure is prescribed by law codes extant only in ninth-century compilations, the actual process is not documented in *Shoku Nihongi*.

[10] I wish to thank Wayne Farris, Cappy Hurst, Peter Nosco, Victor Mair, Futaba Terufumi, and Deborah Co for various forms of assistance.

Bender 2007 _____. "Performative Loci of *Shoku Nihongi* Edicts, 749-770." http://rossbender.org/perfloci.pdf.

Bentley 2001 John R. Bentley. *A Descriptive Grammar of Early Japanese Prose.* Leiden: Brill.

Bialock 2007 David T. Bialock. *Eccentric Spaces, Hidden Histories: Narrative, Ritual, and Royal Authority from* The Chronicles of Japan *to* The Tale of the Heike. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Case 2000 Theresa Leyden Case. "Kana in the Eighth Century: An Ancient Japanese Writing System." Unpubl. Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell University.

Coaldrake 1991 William H. Coaldrake. "City Planning and Palace Architecture in the Creation of the *Nara* Political Order: The Accommodation of Place and Purpose at *Heijōkyō*." *East Asian History,* 1:37-54.

de Bary et al. 2001 Wm. Theodore de Bary, Donald Keene, et al. *Sources of Japanese Tradition, Volume I: From Earliest Times to 1600*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Ebersole 1989 Gary L. Ebersole. *Ritual Poetry and the Politics of Death in Early Japan*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Farris 1985 William Wayne Farris. *Population, Disease, and Land in Early Japan, 645-900.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Farris 2006 _____. *Japan's Medieval Population: Famine, Fertility, and Warfare in a Transformative Age*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Frellesvig and Whitman 2008 Bjarke Frellesvig and John Whitman, eds. *Proto-Japanese: Issues and Prospects*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gerstle 2005 C. Andrew Gerstle. "The Culture of Play: Kabuki and the Production of Texts." *Oral Tradition,* 20:188-216. http://journal.oraltradition.org/files/articles/20ii/Gerstle.pdf

Goody 1968 Jack Goody, ed. *Literacy in Traditional Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Habein 1984 Yaeko Sato Habein. *The History of the Japanese Written Language*. Tokyo: Tokyo University Press.

Havelock 1986 Eric A. Havelock. *The Muse Learns to Write: Reflections on Orality and Literacy from Antiquity to the Present*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hayakawa 1993 — Hayakawa Shōhachi. *Shoku Nihongi*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Hayakawa 1997 — _____. *Nihon Kodai Monjo to Tenseki*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Kaneko 1989 — Kaneko Takeo. *Shoku Nihongi Senmyō*. Tokyo: Takashina Shoten. Orig. publ. Tokyo: Hakuteisha, 1941.

Karlgren 1940 — Bernhard Karlgren. *Grammatica Serica: Script and Phonetics in Chinese and Sino-Japanese*. Stockholm: Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities.

Kern 2000 — Martin Kern. *The Stele Inscriptions of Ch'in Shih-Huang: Text and Ritual in Early Chinese Imperial Representation*. American Oriental Series, 85. New Haven: American Oriental Society.

Kern 2005 — Martin Kern, ed. *Text and Ritual in Early China*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Kishi 1969 — Kishi Toshio. *Fujiwara Nakamaro*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Kitagawa 1982 — Kitagawa Kazuhide. *Shoku Nihongi Senmyō*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Kornicki 1998 — Peter Kornicki. *The Book in Japan: A Cultural History from the Beginnings to the Nineteenth Century*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Kurano 1936 — Kurano Kenji. *Shoku Nihongi Senmyō*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Lewis 1999 — Mark Edward Lewis. *Writing and Authority in Early China*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Linn 1950 — John Kenneth Linn. "The Imperial Edicts of the Shoku-nihongi: An Annotated Translation of Edicts #30-62." Unpubl. Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University.

Lurie 2001 — David Barnett Lurie. "The Origins of Writing in Early Japan: From the 1st to the 8th Century C.E." Unpubl. Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University.

Lurie 2006 — _____. "Language, Writing, and Disciplinarity in the Critique of the 'Ideographic Myth': Some Proleptical Remarks." *Language and Communication,* 26:250-69.

Mair 1994 — Victor H. Mair. "Buddhism and the Rise of the Written Vernacular in East Asia: The Making of National Languages." *Journal of Asian Studies,* 53:707-51.

Martin 1987 — Samuel E. Martin. *The Japanese Language Through Time*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Miller 1967 — Roy Andrew Miller. *The Japanese Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Miyake 2003 — Marc Hideo Miyake. *Old Japanese: A Phonetic Reconstruction.* London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon.

Nakanishi 1993 — Nakanishi Yasuhiro. "'*Shoku Nihongi*' to Dōkyō Jiken." *Nihonshi Kenkyū,* 369:1-24.

Nakanishi 2000 — _____. "'*Shoku Nihongi*' to Jitsuroku." *Shoku Nihongi Kenkyū,* 328:1-12.

Nakanishi 2002 — _____. *Shoku Nihongi to Narachō no Seihen*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Naoki 1986-92 — Naoki Kōjirō, ed. *Shoku Nihongi*. 4 vols. Tokyo: Heibonsha.

Naoki 2000 — _____. *Man'yōshū to Kodaishi*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Nemoto 2003 — Nemoto Seiji. *Tempyōki no Sōryō to Tennō: Sō Dōkyō no Shiron*. Tokyo: Iwata Shoin.

Nylan 2005 — Michael Nylan. "Toward an Archaeology of Writing: Text, Ritual, and the Culture of Public Display in the Classical Period (475 B.C.E-220 C.E.)." In *Text and Ritual in Early China*. Ed by Martin Kern. Seattle: University of Washington Press. pp. 3-49.

Ong 1982 — Walter J. Ong. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. New Accents. New York and London: Routledge. Rpt. 2002.

Ōno S. 1971 — Ōno Susumu. *Motoori Norinaga Zenshū*, vol. 7. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō.

Ōno T. 1967 — Ōno Tatsunosuke, ed. *Shoku Nihongi Sakuin.* Rikkokushi Sakuin, 1. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Ooms 2008 — Herman Ooms. *Imperial Politics and Symbolics in Ancient Japan: The Tenmu Dynasty, 650-800.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Piggott 2003 — Joan R. Piggott. "The Last Classical Female Sovereign: Kōken-Shōtoku Tennō." In *Women and Confucian Cultures in Premodern China, Korea, and Japan*. Ed. by Dorothy Ko, JaHyun Kim Haboush, and Joan R. Piggott. Berkeley: University of California Press. pp. 47-74.

Pulleyblank 1984 — Edwin G. Pulleyblank. *Middle Chinese: A Study in Historical Phonology*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Sakamoto 1991 — Sakamoto Taro. *The Six National Histories of Japan*. Trans. by John S. Brownlee. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Sansom 1924 — George B. Sansom. "The Imperial Edicts in the *Shoku Nihongi*." *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan,* 2nd ser., 1:5-40.

Sasaki et al. 1969 — Sasaki Nobutsuna, Yoshizawa Yoshinori, et al., eds. *The Manyōshū.* New York: Columbia University Press. Orig. publ. 1940.

Sasayama 2000 — Sasayama Haruo. *Shoku Nihongi Sakuin Nenpyo*. Shin Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei [*bekkan*, "supplementary volume"]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Seeley 1991 — Christopher Seeley. *A History of Writing in Japan*. Leiden: Brill.

Shirane 2005 — Haruo Shirane. "Performance, Visuality, and Textuality: The Case of Japanese Poetry." *Oral Tradition,* 20:217-32. http://journal.oraltradition.org/files/articles/20ii/Shirane.pdf

Snellen 1934, 1937 — J. B. Snellen. "*Shoku Nihongi*: Chronicles of Japan, Continued, from 697-791 A.D.: Translated and Annotated by J.B. Snellen." *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan,* 2nd ser., 11:151-239; 14:151-278.

Stein 1935 — Gertrude Stein. *Lectures in America*. New York: Random House. Rpt. London: Virago Press, 1988.

Takinami 1998 — Takinami Sadako. *Saigo no Jotei: Kōken Tennō*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Thomas 1992 — Rosalind Thomas. *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ueda 2006 — Ueda Masaaki, ed. *Nihon Kodaishi Daijiten*. Tokyo: Daiwashobō.

Vovin 2005 — Alexander Vovin. *A Descriptive and Comparative Grammar of Western Old Japanese, Part I: Sources, Script and Phonology, Lexicon, Nominals.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Wrona 2008 — Janick Wrona. "The Nominal and Adnominal Forms in Old Japanese: Consequences for a Reconstruction of Pre-Old Japanese Syntax." In Frellesvig and Whitman 2008:199-221.

Yokota 1959 Yokota Ken'ichi. *Dōkyō*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Zachert 1950 Herbert Zachert. *Semmyō: Die kaiserlichen Erlasse des Shoku-Nihongi*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.