

An Investigation of the Relationship between Prince Shōtoku's *Shōmangyō-gisho* and Two Dunhuang Buddhist Manuscripts: A Debate over Originality and Canonical Value*

MARK DENNIS

Texas Christian University

m.dennis@tcu.edu

Abstract: This article examines the relationship between *Nai 93* and *Tama 24*—two manuscript fragments discovered at Dunhuang—and the *Shōmangyō-gisho*, a Buddhist text written in classical Chinese that scholars traditionally attributed to Japan's Prince Shōtoku (574–622). This discussion focuses on Fujieda Akira's discovery that these Dunhuang manuscripts predate and closely resemble the text attributed to Shōtoku.

Fujieda's research caused heated scholarly debate by questioning the *Shōmangyō-gisho*'s authorship and value, leading to the production of a substantial body of research in the late 1960s and 1970s seeking to clarify the relationship between the *Shōmangyō-gisho* and the Dunhuang manuscripts. Specialists in Shōtoku Studies saw these efforts as crucial because assertions of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*'s origi-

* The first part of this article appeared in the Fall 2017 issue of *Manuscript Studies*. I thank the journal's editors for their gracious permission to use and revise this previously published material. I have made several minor revisions to that article.

nality are central to its perceived value. One can view this research as part of the broader search for the ‘true record’, a goal that informed much of the scholarship on the *Shōmangyō-gisho* and two other Buddhist commentaries attributed to the prince. After discussing Fujieda’s work, the article examines how those who accept Shōtoku’s authorship of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* tried to respond to Fujieda’s key findings, focusing on how they address the Dunhuang discoveries in modern translations and critical editions of the text attributed to the prince. It concludes by offering an alternative angle of critical vision on the relationship between these texts that differs in key ways from this received body of scholarship.

Keywords: Dunhuang manuscripts, false-composition-hypothesis, Fujieda Akira, Prince Shōtoku, *Sangyō-gisho*, *Shōmangyō-gisho*, true-composition-hypothesis

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.15239/hijbs.03.01.01>

Introduction

This article investigates the relationship between two manuscript fragments discovered at Dunhuang,¹ referred to as *Nai 93* 奈九三 and *Tama 24* 玉二四, and the *Shōmangyō-gisho* 勝鬘經義疏, a Buddhist text written in classical Chinese traditionally attributed to Japan’s Prince Shōtoku 聖德太子 (574–622). The determination of Fujieda Akira 藤枝晃 and Koizumi Enjun 古泉円順 that the Dun-

¹ Dunhuang is located in northwest China’s Gansu province. In 1900, the Daoist monk Wang Yuanlu 王圓籙 (c. 1849–1931) discovered a large cache of manuscripts in the Mogao Caves 莫高窟. Those manuscripts included a large number of Buddhist texts, many composed in classical Chinese, but also manuscripts written in other languages representing Buddhism and other religious traditions. See <http://idp.bl.uk> for a link to the International Dunhuang Project (IDP).

huang manuscripts predated and bore a striking resemblance to the text attributed to Shōtoku caused a heated scholarly debate. Indeed, scholars spent much intellectual effort in the late 1960s and 1970s seeking to clarify the texts' relationship because the *Shōmangyō-gisho*'s originality is central to its perceived value and canonical status. We can view this scholarship, which continues in the present, as part of the broader search for 'the true record' (Japanese, *jitsuroku* 実録) of Shōtoku studies, which informs much, but not all, scholarship on the *Shōmangyō-gisho* and two other Buddhist commentaries attributed to the prince.

A little background information may help readers understand Prince Shōtoku's place in history. He appears in the *Nihon shoki* 日本書紀 (compiled in 720) and other early texts as an accomplished politician and key patron of the nascent Buddhist community in Japan, which was beginning to develop with the support of continental immigrants. These texts credit him with composing a seven-point constitution and promoting diplomatic contacts with the Chinese dynasties and Korean kingdoms from which Buddhist teachers brought their texts and traditions. To promote the local assimilation of Buddhism, the texts say Shōtoku donated land to the community, built temples, and collected texts written in classical Chinese. The texts also describe him as a brilliant and devout practitioner of the new faith who quickly mastered its teachings under the tutelage of Hyeja 慧慈, a Buddhist monk from Goguryeo (one of the Three Kingdoms of Korea). Although differing in details, these texts mostly agree that Shōtoku's tutelage under Hyeja led to lectures by the prince on key Buddhist texts at court; those lectures served, in turn, as the basis for his composition of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* and two other Buddhist texts known collectively as the *Sangyō-gisho* 三經義疏 (Commentaries on the Three Sūtras).

In this earliest period of Japanese Buddhism, adherents recognized the *Sangyō-gisho* as valuable religious texts; for instance, Chikō 智光 (708?–780?), Saichō 最澄 (767–822), and other figures from this period used the *Sangyō-gisho* texts to understand and illuminate other Buddhist texts. But it seems that for many adherents it was the very act of their composition by a local Japanese author that was crucial to their perceived value. Some five hundred years after

Shōtoku's death, Gyōnen 凝然 (1240–1321), a Kamakura-era Buddhist monk of the Kegon school, wrote the first detailed treatises on each of the *Sangyō-gisho* texts, thereby inaugurating an exegetical tradition that survives into the present day as one key element of Shōtoku studies.

The Search for the 'True Record'

A key point in the modern period of Shōtoku studies is marked by the 1905 publication of Kume Kunitake's 久米邦武 *Jōgū Taishi Jitsuroku* 上宮太子実録 (The True Record of Prince Jōgū).² Since its publication, scholars, artists, novelists, and others have produced a massive body of Shōtoku-related materials, including highly technical scholarly studies, *manga*, television dramas, and online blogs that depict, discuss, and debate key events from Shōtoku's life, such as his patronage of Buddhism and study of Buddhist teachings with Hyeja.³

Many of these studies sought to recover the 'true record' of Shōtoku by sifting historical fact from rhetorical embellishment. This goal also sharply defined *Sangyō-gisho* scholarship, a subdiscipline within Shōtoku studies, wherein most scholars fall into one of two main camps known as the true-composition hypothesis and the false-composition hypothesis.⁴ Proponents of the former posi-

² Jōgū Taishi is one of Shōtoku's names. After publishing *Jōgū Taishi Jitsuroku* 上宮太子実録 [The True Record of Prince Jōgū] in 1905, Kume published *Shōtoku Taishi Jitsuroku* 聖徳太子実録 [The True Record of Prince Shōtoku] in 1919; it was reprinted in 1942.

³ Examples include a three-hour NHK drama titled *Shōtoku Taishi* that was broadcast in 2001 and a large number of *manga* either dedicated to the prince or discussing his contribution to, for example, the history of Japanese Buddhism. There are also Shōtoku Taishi T-shirts, figurines, and jigsaw puzzles, among other such items of popular culture.

⁴ There is a third position that posits joint authorship in which Shōtoku played some sort of meaningful role in their composition.

tion expended great intellectual effort trying to prove not only that Shōtoku authored the three *Sangyō-gisho* texts, but that they are also original works of a brilliant Japanese mind, certainly deserving of their valued canonical status. Hanayama Shinshō 花山信勝, Kanaji Isamu 金治勇, and other scholars from this camp tried to defend the texts' canonical status by revealing their uniqueness, lucidity, and profundity, which requires, in part, detailing their distinctiveness from intellectual models and predecessors. In the case of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*, for instance, these scholars scrutinized the relationship between Shōtoku's *Shōmangyō-gisho* and a text it refers to regularly as the *hongī* 本義, or 'model text', as well as its relationship to a group of texts it refers to as 'other commentaries'.

Many true-composition hypothesis scholars devoted their energies to responding to the assertions of Tsuda Sōkichi 津田左右吉 (1873–1961) and his false-composition hypothesis successors who reject Shōtoku's authorship of the three *Sangyō-gisho* commentaries. Their scholarship represents one part of a broader attack on the received narrative of Shōtoku as a pivotal figure of early Japanese history. Tsuda and other proponents of this position offer evidence they claim proves Shōtoku could not possibly have written the *Sangyō-gisho* texts, arguing instead that they were likely written by a continental author (or authors) and brought to Japan, or were composed solely or jointly by an immigrant monk (or monks) from the Korean peninsula residing in Japan, after which they were falsely attributed to Shōtoku. Since the publication of Tsuda's scholarship in the 1930s and 1940s, Fujieda Akira, Koizumi Enjun, and other false-composition hypothesis scholars have elaborated upon and refined his assertions.

The Discovery of the Dunhuang Manuscripts

While rejecting Shōtoku's authorship of the *Sangyō-gisho* texts, Fujieda and Koizumi also challenged the *Shōmangyō-gisho*'s originality by revealing its high degree of correspondence with *Nai 93* and *Tama 24*—the two Dunhuang manuscripts mentioned above, which, scholars agree, pre-date Shōtoku's text.⁵ Yang Yufei 楊玉飛 notes that

Nai 93 is thirty-six pages in length but is missing material that would have appeared at the beginning of the manuscript, while *Tama 24* is thirteen pages and corresponds to material from the last section of *Nai 93*. He describes both manuscripts as being skillfully brushed in *gyōsho* 行書, a semi-cursive script.⁶

Scholars consider the revelation of this high degree of correspondence between the *Shōmangyō-gisho* and these Dunhuang manuscripts to be one of the most important modern discoveries in *Sangyō-gisho* studies.⁷ Its significance is attested to by the flurry of subsequent scholarly activity seeking to determine the precise relationship between these manuscripts and the *Shōmangyō-gisho*.

In their initial findings, Fujieda and Koizumi identified the Dunhuang manuscripts as the *hongī* of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*, and thus referred to them as the ‘*Shōmangyō-gisho hongī*’ 勝鬘經義疏本義 (the model text of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*).⁸ But further study revealed

⁵ For a discussion of these findings, see Fujieda, ‘Hokuchō ni okeru’, 325–49; Fujieda, ‘*Shōmangyō-gisho*’, 484–544; Fujieda and Koizumi, ‘Sankō E hon’, 429–62; and Koizumi, ‘Tonkōhon’, 59–141. For a discussion of the relationship between the *Shōmangyō-gisho*, the Dunhuang manuscripts, and the *hongī* from the perspective of the true-composition hypothesis, see Kanaji, ‘Tonkō hakken no *Shōmangyōsho*’, 835–41; Kanaji, ‘*Shōmangyō-gisho* to *Shōmangyōsho*’, 270–73; Kanaji, ‘*Shōmangyō-gisho* no “*hongī*”’, 25–38; Hirakawa, ‘*Shōmangyō-gisho* to *Nai 93*’, 207–30; and Fujii, ‘*Shōmangyō-gisho hongī*’, 142–43.

⁶ See Yang, ‘Chūgoku Nanbokuchō Jidai’, 153–54.

⁷ Its importance is evident in other ways: for example, Kanaji Isamu notes that these findings were reported in the August 28, 1968 edition of the *Yomiuri Shimbun*, one of the main Japanese daily newspapers. And the preface to one of the critical editions of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* notes that its production was motivated, in part, because none of the previous editions had been produced after the publication of Fujieda’s and Koizumi’s research. See Kanaji, *Shōmangyō-gisho no shisōteki kenkyū*, 23.

⁸ Koizumi’s reconstruction of *Nai 93* can be found in ‘Tonkōhon *Shōmangyōsho hongī*’, 59–141. Fujieda notes that although *Shōman-gisho* 勝鬘義疏 would have been a more appropriate title, since other commentaries were already known by that name, the former was selected (Fujieda, ‘*Shōmangyō-gisho*’,

the existence of material in the *Shōmangyō-gisho* that differed from *Nai 93–Tama 24*, and thus seemed to point to a different *hongī* pre-dating the Dunhuang manuscripts. These differences led them to conclude that *Nai 93–Tama 24* and the *Shōmangyō-gisho* were composed based on the same *hongī*, which Koizumi labels the ‘hongī genpon’ 本義原本 (source text of the model text).⁹

Based on his reconstruction of *Nai 93*, the more complete of the two manuscripts, Koizumi estimates that of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*’s roughly 1,400 lines, only about three hundred differ from these manuscripts, and thus over three-quarters of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* came directly from the *hongī*.¹⁰ He and Fujieda thus argue that because the *Shōmangyō-gisho* relies so heavily on this earlier text, it exhibits very little originality regardless of the latter’s identity and their precise relationship. This high degree of correspondence between the Dunhuang manuscripts and the *Shōmangyō-gisho* leads Fujieda to conclude that scholars should understand the latter as no more than a ‘revised text’.¹¹ These sorts of texts, he notes, are not uncommon in

487). Based on the brush work, Koizumi concludes that both manuscripts are sixth-century texts from the Northern Dynasties period, but concedes that while it is possible they were transmitted from the south, they were, at a minimum, copied and read in the north. Although there are differences between *Nai 93* and *Tama 24*, Koizumi notes that the meaning of the text is not significantly altered by them and that they are clearly copies of the same text. Most of these differences are related to specific characters: variants that have the same sound or the omission of characters in one or the other manuscript. Koizumi, ‘Tonkōhon’, 69.

⁹ Koizumi, ‘Tonkōhon’, 69.

¹⁰ Koizumi, ‘Tonkōhon’, 67.

¹¹ Fujieda, ‘*Shōmangyō-gisho*’, 504. In a similar way, Watanabe Shōkō describes the three commentaries as ‘notebooks’, which could have been written by a student studying with a Chinese master. See Watanabe, ‘*Sangyō-gisho* no sakusha mondai’, 154. In assessing the originality of the *Sangyō-gisho*, Hirai Shun’ei writes: ‘Because the *Sangyō-gisho* relies on the *hongī* for over two-thirds of its interpretations, and also draws on the [thought of scholars cited in the] work of Jizang, [these commentaries] should be considered patchworks. And because there are so few quotations of the *sūtras* and other commentaries, they

the East Asian commentarial tradition and function mainly ‘to supplement, correct, and abbreviate their root texts’.¹² Fujieda further questions the originality of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* by noting that over half its differences with *Nai 93–Tama 24* occur in short summaries of the succeeding section that appear at the beginning of section breaks in the *Shōmangyō-gisho*, but which do not appear in the Dunhuang manuscripts.¹³

The True-Composition Hypothesis Response to the Dunhuang Manuscripts

While Hanayama, Kanaji, and other true-composition hypothesis scholars acknowledge these relationships and the *Shōmangyō-gisho*’s reliance on its intellectual predecessors, they sought with great effort to prove that it is not, as Fujieda and Koizumi argue, simply a rehashing of the Dunhuang manuscripts and the *hongji*, but rather a valuable religious work in its own right. These scholars see the *Shōmangyō-gisho*’s reclassification as an unoriginal copy as a crucial blow to the large corpus of scholarship extolling Shōtoku’s great intellect and position as first patriarch of the nascent Japanese Buddhist tradition. Moreover, this proof is, naturally, crucial to maintaining the text’s value because even if scholars proved Shōtoku

are basic texts that are rather unsophisticated. In this way, as is pointed out by Ōno [Tatsunosuke], it would not be unusual if they were produced in the Asuka period. But in that case, just as is asserted by the false-composition-hypothesis, it is with the assumption that they were not the work of *Shōtoku Taishi* alone’. Hirai, ‘*Sangyō-gisho* no seiritsu’, 533.

¹² Fujieda, ‘*Shōmangyō-gisho*’, 504.

¹³ Fujieda, ‘*Shōmangyō-gisho*’, 501–4. For example, the text uses the combination *rui* 來意 six times to summarize a chapter or a longer passage. For instance, *T* no. 2185, 56: 0016b08–9 reads: ‘The central subject of this chapter is that sentient beings, having heard [the teachings] on the tathāgatarbha described in Chapter 2, are encouraged to have faith in the Eight Noble Truths’ 此章來意者。物聞上第二如來藏章勸信八聖諦。

composed it, if it is little more than a restatement of the *hongji* and other commentaries, its value would diminish significantly. To this end, they stress that although the *Shōmangyō-gisho* is similar in some ways to *Nai 93–Tama 24*, and possibly to an even earlier *hongji*, a number of its passages do not agree with these manuscripts. Indeed, some appear to address the work of Chinese Buddhist exegetes whose work is lacking in the Dunhuang manuscripts, while still others are unique to the *Shōmangyō-gisho*.

Hanayama argues that while Shōtoku relies on the *hongji*, he does not ‘follow it blindly’,¹⁴ and that although the prince accepts some of the interpretations of his Chinese predecessors, he criticizes them at other times, and thus exhibits a ‘critical attitude’ toward the work of these exegetes. He writes: ‘Based on my research into the thought, sentences, language, and so forth of the entire *Shōmangyō-gisho*, and on comparisons to other extant commentaries [on the *Srīmālā-sūtra* 勝鬘經], I estimate there to be approximately one hundred eighty passages that reveal the author’s own interpretations’.¹⁵ Thus, for Hanayama, although the text attributed to Shōtoku participates in and transmits the Chinese exegetical tradition, it represents a crucial, locally produced interpretive development. Accordingly, Hanayama justifies it as an object of value and reverence that is worthy of detailed exegesis in the model established in the Kamakura era by Gyōnen.

While Kanaji also acknowledges that the *Shōmangyō-gisho* relies on this body of previous scholarship, he too argues that it exhibits unique interpretations,¹⁶ writing:

¹⁴ Hanayama, *Jōgūōsen*, 405. In this regard, he cites Shōtoku’s use of phrases such as, ‘I believe that these views are insufficient’, among others, as proof of Shōtoku’s ‘critical attitude’. Hanayama, *Jōgūōsen*, 313.

¹⁵ Hanayama, *Jōgūōsen*, 408.

¹⁶ Kanaji discusses what he describes as the *Sangyō-gisho*’s ‘special characteristics’ in a number of articles and books, including *Shōtoku Taishi kyōgaku no kenkyū*, 27–52, 194–217. See also Kanaji, *Sangyō-gisho no Shomondai*, 75–94. See also Watanabe, ‘*Shōmangyō-gisho no tokuchō*’, 126–32.

When we think in these terms, it is not then so important [to determine] to what extent the interpretations of the *hongī* [appear] in the *Shōmangyō-gisho* and to what degree they are the individual [ideas] of [Shōtoku] Taishi. Since there is no meaning to the *gisho* 義疏 apart from the *hongī*, a more important concern is how the *gisho* was composed based on [Shōtoku's] interpretation of the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*. If we search too deeply in this way, we will not only lose the vitality of the *gisho*, it is also possible that our understanding of the *sūtra* itself will become muddled. We must seek, therefore, to understand how, based on the *hongī*, Shōtoku read and interpreted the *sūtra*, and then to make his way of reading and accepting it our own as we too taste again the *sūtra* itself. If we do not, we have not truly read the *gisho*. And in this way, there are no obstacles to taking the *gisho* as a whole as the work of [Shōtoku] Taishi. That is, [while it is true] he used the *hongī* to understand the *sūtra*, it is still his own work because it is not simply [the repetition of the *hongī*'s ideas]; rather, [Shōtoku's commentary] surpasses the *hongī* by putting forth such new interpretations.¹⁷

In this way, the *Shōmangyō-gisho* participates in the East Asian commentarial tradition but exhibits a 'progressive, interpretive step forward'.¹⁸ Even though Kanaji argues it is not so important to separate the interpretations of the *hongī* from those of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*, the great intellectual effort that he, Hanayama, and others made to prove the latter's uniqueness seems to belie this claim. Kanaji also observes that determining the text's authorship is a complex project, and he writes: 'Even if we knew that a single individual wrote the *Sangyō-gisho*, proving conclusively that it was Shōtoku Taishi is difficult. Thus, even Hanayama's work must be understood as a hypothesis'.¹⁹

These comments raise the following questions that I plan to pursue as part of a broader project on the intellectual history and

¹⁷ Kanaji, *Shōmangyō-gisho no shisōteki kenkyū*, 24.

¹⁸ Kanaji, *Shōmangyō-gisho no shisōteki kenkyū*, 23.

¹⁹ Kanaji, *Sangyō-gisho no Shomondai*, 64.

exegetical tradition of *Sangyō-gisho* studies. Given this complexity and these seemingly inconclusive results, why have these and other scholars persisted in searching for the true record? What are the key assumptions regarding textuality, authorship, and canon formation that undergird that search? Furthermore, in focusing so intently on proving or disproving Shōtoku's authorship of the text and its inherent originality in pursuit of the 'true record', what intellectual roads have they foreclosed?

The rest of this article sketches out some preliminary answers to the second and third questions by first taking up the text's authorship through a broad lens. Having done so, we will then examine how this issue was addressed in six modern editions of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* in light of Fujieda's discovery. Here, we will consider these editions' responses to the Dunhuang evidence by focusing on how each one presents and interprets the text's initial declaration of authorship, which Fujieda and other scholars agree is an interpolation. Our investigation of these passages in the six editions will provide the material for the article's final section outlining an alternative way to understand the *Shōmangyō-gisho* that is unbound by the binaries—true-false, Japanese-Chinese, and so on—that undergird received scholarship. The term *unbound* gestures toward an 'unbinding' of the text from its 'original' form that is narrowly tied to a particular time, place, and person; this process will, in turn, 'unbind', or open up, other angles of critical vision on the *Shōmangyō-gisho* that will be articulated in the final section.

Buddhist Scriptural Self-sufficiency

To better understand the significance of the Dunhuang discovery, we can place that declaration of Shōtoku's authorship in the context of efforts to create an authoritative local Buddhist tradition based on models brought to the archipelago in the prince's era by immigrant groups from the Chinese dynasties and the Korean kingdoms. Through a broad lens, we can identify helpful similarities among these attempts to assimilate Buddhism on the archipelago and attempts to do so in China, Korea, Tibet, and elsewhere, wherein local pro-

ponents of Buddhism sought to create, using diverse means, what Robert Buswell describes as scriptural and ‘cultural self-sufficiency’.²⁰ For instance, he and other scholars have shown how the composition of falsely attributed Buddhist texts in China fit this pattern. Buswell argues in this regard that ‘the composition of Chinese Buddhist apocrypha is but one example of a complex process of cultural hermeneutics whereby foreign Indian concepts were transformed into familiar Chinese ideas’.²¹

In the case of Silla, one of the Korean kingdoms, he argues that the ‘discovery’ of the *Vajrasamādhi-sūtra* 金剛三昧經 beneath the sea off the Korean peninsula by a kingdom envoy was meant to prove Silla Buddhism’s cultural and scriptural self-sufficiency relative to Chinese Buddhist models, as part of efforts to create legitimate local Korean Buddhist traditions.²² That is, since the text was of local provenance, these indigenous Buddhist traditions no longer needed a constant influx of texts and interpreters from China. The process Buswell describes includes a complex negotiation between the legitimacy that Buddhists have sought in earlier or, preferably, the earliest forms of Buddhism, that often came from the west and across the sea or mountains, and what Charles Hallisey describes as the production of meaning in ‘local circumstances rather than in the origins of the tradition’.²³

In the case of Japan, Buddhists in Shōtoku’s era and beyond often understood the legitimacy of Buddhist texts, teachings, and schools in relation to traditions that lay across the sea to the west. For instance, in the Kamakura era (1185–1333), a period of heightened interest in Shōtoku, major Buddhist thinkers like Gyōnen understood this relationship through the lens of the *sangoku* 三国, or ‘three lands’, paradigm, through which they saw Chinese Bud-

²⁰ Buswell, *The Formation of Ch’an Ideology*, 58. Buswell identifies ‘cultural self-sufficiency’ as the phrase of Michael Rogers. He also uses this phrase in Buswell, *Cultivating Original Enlightenment*, 39.

²¹ Buswell, ed. *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, 13.

²² Buswell, ‘Imagining “Korean Buddhism”’, 73–107.

²³ Hallisey, ‘Roads Taken’, 50.

dhist traditions as the proximate source of authoritative Buddhism, while Indian models provided legitimacy at further remove. Indeed, we can detect the earliest stage of this process of negotiation on the archipelago in the declaration itself, which asserts the prince's local authorship of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* but does so in what David Lurie describes as the 'transregional' Chinese language—we revisit Lurie's ideas on the development of writing and reading practices on the Japanese archipelago in the conclusion. Its ongoing negotiation plays out in relation to the text in several fascinating ways, including the production of a large body of scholarship written in Japan, but also through the transmission of Shōtoku's texts back across the sea as proof of Shōtoku's erudition and the assertion of Japanese Buddhism's cultural and scriptural self-sufficiency. As this process played out over the centuries, the *Shōmangyō-gisho* naturally diverged further from the Dunhuang manuscripts.

Modern *Shōmangyō-gisho* Scholarship

Since the *Shōmangyō-gisho* served as just such a symbol of cultural and scriptural self-sufficiency, Fujieda and Koizumi's Dunhuang evidence struck at the very heart of the text's perceived value, which has, as noted above, depended not only on the veracity of the declaration of authorship itself but also on scholarly appraisals of its originality, its profundity, and even its inherent 'Japaneseness'. For instance, Nakamura Hajime 中村元 describes Shōtoku as 'one of the best and most benevolent of all the rulers of Japan and the real founder of Buddhism in Japan', claiming Shōtoku's spirit served as the foundation for the later development of 'Japanese thought'.²⁴ He contends, moreover, that the composition of the *Sangyō-gisho* was crucial to establishing Japanese Buddhism and that the prince's choice of the three texts was 'entirely based on the Japanese way of thinking'.²⁵ He argues that Shōtoku's text compares favorably to Jizang's 吉藏 (549–623)

²⁴ Nakamura, *Japanese Thought*, 3.

²⁵ Nakamura, *Japanese Thought*, 17.

commentary on the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*, asserting that while the work of the Chinese exegete is exhaustive, it represents a lifeless formalism and scholasticism, concurring with the assessment of the Japanese Buddhist monk Fujaku 普寂 (1707–1781). On the other hand, Shōtoku's text is concise and reveals the root *sūtra*'s central meaning.

In a particularly vitriolic defense of the *Sangyō-gisho* from Tsuda's scholarship of the 1930s and 1940s, Umehara Takeshi 梅原猛, a well-known proponent of *Nihonjin ron* 日本人論 (the theory of Japaneseness), attacked Tsuda for not reading the commentaries in any depth and relying mainly on 'external' evidence. Tsuda, writes Umehara, consequently 'brings Shōtoku down to his own level as he rejects the achievements of the prince because he cannot comprehend them based on his own limited capacity'.²⁶ Umehara inveighs against Tsuda's methods, writing:

Having barely even read someone's work, to then reject that person's authorship of it is extremely rude. This is the very height of rudeness toward an author. But Tsuda lacks any sense of this. That is, having read very little of the *Sangyō-gisho*, he inverts the very tradition that has respected them as the work of [Shōtoku] Taishi. But tradition is correct. Rather than rejecting Shōtoku's authorship of the text without reading it thoroughly, would it not be more scientific and ethical to admit that even though one had not read it, one does not believe [these accounts]. Lacking any understanding of this, Tsuda has done something that is very unethical and very unscientific.²⁷

Although these statements of Umehara represent the more vitriolic end of the scholarly spectrum, the debates over Shōtoku's authorship of the *Sangyō-gisho* and their place in the canon have been atypically emotional in the generally staid world of Japanese Buddhist Studies. Indeed, similar, but more muted, sentiments about the important role Shōtoku played in establishing Buddhism on the archipelago inform much, but not all, of post-war *Shōmangyō-gisho*

²⁶ Umehara, *Shōtoku Taishi*, 389.

²⁷ Umehara, *Shōtoku Taishi*, 393.

scholarship, including the post-Dunhuang versions of the text examined below, produced by scholars, temples, and Shōtoku-related associations who affirmed the declaration of authorship. Before doing so, however, we look briefly at key early editions of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* and at the interpolated declaration of authorship to provide helpful context to those modern *Shōmangyō-gisho* editions.

Premodern *Shōmangyō-gisho* Editions

Hōryūji 法隆寺, one of the temples closely associated with Prince Shōtoku, is the site of the first printing of the *Sangyō-gisho*. This printing, executed in 1247, served as the model for all future prints, and is, in the case of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* printing, the oldest extant version of the commentary. The colophon of the *Hokke-gisho* notes that the printing was produced in the first year of the Hōji era 宝治 (1247), and is thus referred to as the ‘Hōji printing’, and that ‘the original text of Prince Jōgū, which is extant in Hōryūji, was used as the model for this engraving’.²⁸ Since the prints of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* and the *Yuimagyō-gisho* 維摩經義疏 lack colophons, however, their dates are uncertain. Some scholars believe that because the commentaries were printed as a set, a postscript was added only to the *Hokke-gisho*, which they believe, following the traditional ordering of Shōtoku’s composition of the commentaries, was the last of the three printed. Hanayama Shinshō thus concludes that the *Shōmangyō-gisho* and the *Yuimagyō-gisho* were likely printed before this date.²⁹ He also notes that the wood blocks used in the Hōji printing added markings to the text to aid in reading. Hanayama observes that this

²⁸ Quoted in Hanayama, *Jōgūōsen*, 35.

²⁹ Since the Hōji print of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* lacks a colophon, however, it is unclear what manuscript was used as a model. Based on a comparison of the style of the characters found in the Kamakura prints of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* and the *Hokke-gisho*, Hanayama concludes that even if the Kamakura print of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* was not based on the original, it was, at a minimum, based on a very early manuscript. See Hanayama, *Jōgūōsen*, 127.

first printing did not, however, interpolate passages from other texts, such as the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* or Mingkong's 明空 (dates unknown) *Shengmanjing shuyi sichao* 勝鬘經疏義私鈔, as was done in later printed *ehon* editions.

Just as significant in this regard, Fujieda Akira points out that marginalia from the extant manuscript of the *Hokke-gisho*, claimed to be in Shōtoku's hand, were omitted when the wood blocks for the Hōji printing were engraved, and that the 'original text' was thereby altered in this and other significant ways.³⁰ He observes that although this manuscript exhibits two distinct styles of writing separated by over one-hundred years, this distinction was lost once the text was cut onto woodblocks. He also points out that these marginalia—which include red markings as well as paper pasted onto the text—were also lost in this printing.

Based on this high degree of fidelity between the extant original of the *Hokke-gisho* and the Kamakura print, Kanaji Isamu, Hanayama, and Fujieda believe the Kamakura prints of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* and the *Yuimagyō-gisho* likely exhibit a similar degree of fidelity to the manuscripts that were available at the time.³¹ Since the original manuscripts of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* and the *Yuimagyō-gisho* are no longer extant, however, no one can confirm this point.³²

³⁰ Fujieda, 'Shōmangyō-gisho', 491.

³¹ Hanayama discusses other similarities between the Kamakura prints of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* and *Hokke-gisho*, noting, for example, that their characters are the same style, they have nineteen characters per line and seven lines per page, and both lack *kaeriten*, *okurigana*, or other types of markings that were added to later prints. He believes, moreover, that the high degree of fidelity between the Kamakura print of the *Hokke-gisho* and the extant 'original' suggests that it was engraved by a skilled artist who was knowledgeable about the text and was possibly a follower of Shōtoku. He adds that although there is no conclusive proof that the same individual engraved the blocks for the *Shōmangyō-gisho* print, the style of the characters suggests this to be a reasonable assumption. See Hanayama, *Jōgūōsen*, 97 and 128.

³² Kanaji was able, however, to offer a degree of support to this hypothesis by comparing the *Yuimagyō-gisho* print with two extant, but incomplete, man-

Although it is unclear how many printings and copies were made, Hanayama notes that extant copies of the Kamakura printing of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* prove that the blocks were corrected and reprinted at least once.³³

Fujieda also argues that a series of such alterations in the presentation of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* on the printed page transformed the reader's contact with the text. He cites, among other examples, the Kan'ei 寛永 edition of 1637, which added *kaeriten* 返り点 and *furigana* 振り仮名. Although meant to make the text more accessible to the reader, these and other changes, he argues, actually took it further from its original form.³⁴ Fujieda reminds us that although the Kan'ei print added *kaeriten* and *furigana*, 'In the time of Shōtoku

uscripts: one housed in the collection of Hōryūji, dating to the Eiman era 永万 (1165–1166), and another at Ōtani University, dating to the Kangen era 寛元 (1243–1247). Based on these comparisons, Kanaji discovered that the Kamakura print of the *Yuimagyō-gisho*—just as was evident in a comparison of the *Hokke-gisho* original manuscript and Kamakura print—mixes the characters 身子 (forty-one times) and 真子 (seventeen times) to translate the name Śariputra. Since the appearance of these character combinations in the printed edition of the *Yuimagyō-gisho* matches their locations in the two manuscripts, Kanaji is able to offer limited proof for the claim that the three prints were all faithful to their models. See Kanaji, *Sangyō-gisho no Shomondai*, 59.

³³ By comparing the copies held in the collections of Ishii Kōyū and Hōryūji, Hanayama produces evidence for multiple printings by noting examples of these corrections that appear in one but not both prints; these corrections include the interpolation or elimination of characters that do not appear in Guṇabhadra's 求那跋陀羅 Chinese translation of the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*. The Ishii print, for example, includes a passage reading 無異所攝受正法者 ('is not different from the acceptance of the True Dharma') for which the corresponding passage in the Hōryūji print omits the character 所, and thus reads 無異「」攝受正法者. By creating a space between the characters 異 and 攝, and by deleting the character 所, the passage is altered so that it agrees with Guṇabhadra's translation. The passage, appearing at *T* no. 353, 12: 218b28, reads: 無異正法. 無異攝受正法. 正法即是攝受正法. See Hanayama, *Jōgūōsen*, 128.

³⁴ Fujieda, '*Shōmangyō-gisho*', 493.

and Empress Suiko, such markings were unavailable’, and ‘although the early reader would have memorized the *sūtra* and its reproduction was thus unnecessary, this is not the case with the modern reader’.³⁵ Fujieda cites, for example, the interpolation of a text map in the Meiji period’s 明治時代 *Shimada Bankon* 島田蕃根 printed edition (1895) of the text. He adds that in some cases these changes inadvertently shifted the reader’s focus back to the root text because the Chinese translation of the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*, divided to match the corresponding sections of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*, appear in the *ehon* as bold characters.

One of the key changes in the modern era that Fujieda highlights is the declaration of authorship, which in some editions became indistinguishable as an interpolation. That declaration, which also appears in the *Hokke-gisho* 法華義疏 (one of the two other *Sangyō-gisho* commentaries), reads: ‘This is from the private collection of King Jōgū of the Land of Yamato, it is not a text from across the sea’ 此是大倭國上宮王私集非海彼本.³⁶ As Fujieda observes, the interpolated declaration represents one of many important additions to the *Shōmangyō-gisho*, which has been altered in the modern era as it was reproduced in printed editions at temples associated with Shōtoku, as *ehon* 絵本 (also written as 會本) that combine the *Shōmangyō-gisho* with the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* and other related texts, and, finally, as modern translations, appearing in both print and digital formats. These additions, which Gérard Genette calls ‘paratexts’, include title pages and introductions, footnotes and endnotes, tables of contents and indexes, diacritic markings and text maps, and many other sorts of materials. In his description of the paratext, Genette observes that a text is rarely presented to the world in a ‘raw’ or ‘unadorned’ state since these and other sorts of ‘verbal productions’ generally accompany it.³⁷


³⁵ Fujieda, ‘*Shōmangyō-gisho*’, 493.


³⁶ Hanayama Shinshō notes that the interpolations into the two texts differ slightly: while the *Shōmangyō-gisho* uses 委 and 国 for ‘Yamato’ and ‘country’, the *Hokke-gisho* uses 倭 and 國. See Hanayama, ‘Gyobutsu *Hokkeso*’, 397–422.

³⁷ Genette, *Paratexts*, 1.

Modern Versions of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*

The modern editions of the text produced before the discovery of the Dunhuang manuscripts include the *Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本佛教全書 (1912) and the *Nihon Daizōkyō* 日本大藏經 (1917), which combines the *Shōmangyō-gisho* with Fujaku's *Shōman shishikukyō shūshō* 勝鬘獅子吼經宗鈔 in the form of an *ehon*. In 1929, the three *Sangyō-gisho* commentaries were included in Volume 56 of the *Taishō Shinsbū Daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經, the most recent printing of the Chinese Buddhist canon and Japanese commentaries, digitized in 2005 as part of the SAT Daizōkyō Database project (SAT 大正新脩大藏經テキストデータベース), making the *Shōmangyō-gisho* freely available online.³⁸

As reference for the following section and the conclusion, I reproduce below the first few lines of the Taishō edition of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* with my own translation.³⁹ The  icon serves as a hyperlink that brings up a copy of the printed text in the left-hand column of the screen, while ① and ② are footnotes: the first lists the Hōji and other earlier printed editions of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* and the second indicates the different ways that those versions present the declaration of authorship.

T no. 2185, 56: 0001a01: 

T no. 2185, 56: 0001a02: no. 2185 [cf. no. 353]

T no. 2185, 56: 0001a03: ①勝鬘經義疏

T no. 2185, 56: 0001a04:

T no. 2185, 56: 0001a05: ②此是 大倭國上宮王
私集非海彼本

T no. 2185, 56: 0001a06: 夫勝鬘者。本是不可思議。

Translation:

T no. 2185, 56: 0001a03: *Shōmangyō-gisho*

T no. 2185, 56: 0001a05: This is from the private collection of King Jōgū of the Great Land of Yamato. It is not a text from across the sea.

³⁸ The database is available at: http://21dzk.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp/SAT/index_en.html. See also, Takakusu and Watanabe, eds., *Taishō shinsbū Daizōkyō*.

³⁹ Dennis, *Shōmangyō-gisho*, 2011.

T no. 2185, 56: 0001a06: As for [Queen] Śrīmālā, she was originally inconceivable.

Six Post-Dunhuang Editions of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*

In this section, we examine the presentation and interpretation of the declaration of authorship in six modern editions of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* presented in chronological order. We will compare those editions, each produced after the discovery of the Dunhuang manuscripts, to the Taishō edition's presentation of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* and consider how each deals with the Dunhuang evidence. For each edition, I list the information appearing on the title page and the presentation of both the declaration of authorship and the first sentence of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* (*T* no. 2185, 56: 0001a06). I also offer a one-paragraph summary of the edition, focusing on its treatment of the Dunhuang evidence.⁴⁰ Although those summaries offer just a cursory treatment of this crucial issue, they provide useful material for constructing an alternative understanding in the conclusion of the fascinating process by which the Dunhuang manuscripts and the *Shōmangyō-gisho* diverged.

Example I. Shitennōji *ehon* 四天王寺會本 (1971)⁴¹

i. Title page:

聖德太子御撰 – [honorific] Composed by Prince Shōtoku
 四天王寺 – Shitennōji
 會本 – *ehon*
 勝鬘經義疏 – *Shōmangyō-gisho*

⁴⁰ I made several minor modifications to how this material is presented. For instance, I changed all vertical text to horizontal text to conserve space and modified some of the markings. I also added '[honorific]' to indicate the use of the character 御.

⁴¹ *Shitennōji ehon*, 1971.

四天王寺蔵版 – Shitennōji printing

ii. Declaration of authorship:

此²レハ是^レ大倭國上宮王ノ私集^ニシテ非^ス海彼本

‘This is from the private collection of King Jōgū of the Great Land of Yamato. It is not a text from across the sea’. The declaration matches the Taishō text although the editors inserted *katakana* to indicate Japanese syntax.

iii. Footnote from Declaration of authorship:

㊦ナシ㊦㊦大倭國上宮奉詔撰㊦上宮皇太子御製㊦

This footnote offers the same information as the Taishō edition about how the declaration of authorship appears in different printed editions. ㊦ refers to the An’ei 安永 printed edition executed in 1779, which renders the declaration as: ‘Written upon imperial decree by [King] Jōgū of the Land of Yamato’ 大倭國上宮奉詔撰.⁴² ㊦ points to the 1895 Meiji edition, referred to above as the *Shimada Bankon* edition, and renders the declaration: ‘[honorific] Written by Prince Jōgū’ 上宮皇太子御製.⁴³

iv. First sentence:

夫^レ勝鬘^ハ者[、]本^ハ是^レ不可思議。

‘As for [Queen] Śrīmālā, she was originally inconceivable’. The first sentence matches the Taishō text although the editors inserted *katakana* to indicate Japanese readings.

⁴² *Shitennōji ehon*, 1.

⁴³ *Shitennōji ehon*, 1.

v. Summary:

The editors state that they published the *Shitennōji ehon* to commemorate the 1,350-year anniversary of Prince Shōtoku's death, for which the temple had planned several activities. This edition includes a table of contents, introductory material, an afterword, index, and a text map divided into three fold-out sections. The afterword describes Shōtoku as the 'Preceptor of Yamato' 和国の教主,⁴⁴ an epithet found in the hymns of Shinran 親鸞 (1173–1263), the founder of Jōdo Shinshū 浄土真宗. In explaining their decision to produce the *ehon*, the editors mention the value of Shōtoku's teaching of 'harmony' in the turbulence of the present age that threatens humanity itself. Their decision was also due, in part, to *Shōmangyō-gisho* research entering a new phase because of the discovery of the Dunhuang manuscripts, although they do not examine the significance of the discovery. They do offer thanks to Fujieda Akira for his assistance with the Dunhuang texts, which they consulted in preparing their edition.

Example II. *Nihon Shisō Taikai* 日本思想大系 (1975)⁴⁵

i. Title page:

勝鬘經義疏 – *Shōmangyō-gisho*
 早島鏡正 – Hayashima Kyōshō
 築島裕 – Tsukishima Hiroshi
 校注 – editors

ii. Declaration of authorship-right hand page:

此は大倭国上宮王私集非海彼本

⁴⁴ *Shitennōji ehon*, 172.

⁴⁵ Hayashima and Tsukishima, *Shōmangyō-gisho*.

‘This is from the private collection of King Jōgū of the Great Land of Yamato. It is not a text from across the sea’. This matches the *kanbun* of the Taishō text.

iii. Declaration of authorship-left hand page:

^{*}此(は)是(れ)大倭国上宮王ノ私ノ集(にして)海彼の本(に)非(ず)

‘This is from the private collection of King Jōgū of the Great Land of Yamato. It is not a text from across the sea’. This rendering offers an interesting combination of *hiragana* inside parentheses to indicate Japanese readings but also *katakana* to indicate the possessive.

iv. First sentence-right hand page:

夫勝鬘者本是不可思議。

‘As for [Queen] Śrīmālā, she was originally inconceivable’. This version matches the Taishō text.

v. First sentence-left hand page:

^{*ソ]} 夫レ勝鬘(は)[者]本^{*もと}は是れ不可思議なり。

‘As for [Queen] Śrīmālā, she was originally inconceivable’. *Kundoku* 訓読 version.

vi. Summary:

This edition reproduces the classical Chinese on the right-hand page and the corresponding *kundoku* version on the left-hand page. The asterisk appearing above the character 此 in the declaration of authorship in the *kundoku* version points to a note in the upper column of the page that reads: ‘It is believed that these two lines of the declaration were added by someone else. See the endnotes’.⁴⁶ That endnote states the

declaration of authorship was added to both the *Shōmangyō-gisho* and the *Hokke-gisho* some time after 753, possibly to assert the legitimacy of the Japanese Buddhist tradition and mentions the arrival of the Chinese Buddhist monk Jianzhen 鑑真 (688–763) on the archipelago in 754. The translators then refer readers to the work of Fujieda Akira and Hanayama Shinshō that I described above. Additional endnotes take up the Dunhuang manuscripts, noting how, for instance, the *Shōmangyō-gisho* differs from those manuscripts in its division of the *sūtra*, and offers an extensive comparison of the differences found among the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*, the *Shōmangyō-gisho*, the Dunhuang manuscripts, and other commentaries addressing the root text.

Example III. Hanayama Shinshō 花山信勝 (1977)⁴⁷

i. Title page:

花山信勝校訳 – Hanayama Shinshō revised translation
 勝鬘經義疏 – *Shōmangyō-gisho*
 付解説宝治板勝鬘經義疏 (影印) – includes commentary and
 a facsimile of the Hōji edition of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*
 吉川弘文館刊行 – Publication of Yoshikawa Kōbunkan

ii. Declaration of authorship:

これ こ やまとのくに かむつみやのみこ わたくしにあつむるところ
 此は是れ、大倭国上 宮王の 私 集、

わたのあなた ほん あら
 海 彼 の本には非ず (撰号は後人加筆)

‘This is from the private collection of King Jōgū of the Great Land of Yamato. It is not a text from across the sea’. *Kundoku* version.

⁴⁶ Hayashima and Tsukishima, *Shōmangyō-gisho*, 26.

⁴⁷ Hanayama, *Shōmangyō-gisho kōyaku*.

iii. First sentence:

[総序] 夫れしょうまん勝鬘もと(夫人)は、本ふ(本体)は不可思議かしぎなり。

‘As for [Queen] Śrīmālā, she was originally inconceivable’.
Kundoku version.

iv. Summary:

This edition includes a table of contents, the text rendered in *kundoku*, commentary, a complete copy of the Hōji print, and an index. Among the nine notes Hanayama includes in the introduction, the last reads: ‘For the purpose of having as many people as possible read [this revised translation], I have attached many *rubi* ルビ markings, which do not necessarily represent the readings from ancient times’.⁴⁸ Hanayama mentions that he had started working on his earlier translation of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*, which he describes as ‘our country’s first literary work’,⁴⁹ the day after World War II ended as the country turned from military might to humanistic endeavors. He produced this revised edition some thirty years later because of important changes in the modern Japanese language but also because of the discovery of the Dunhuang manuscripts, which he describes as quite valuable. In the commentary, while Hanayama admits the close connection between the *Shōmangyō-gisho* and the Dunhuang texts, he argues that Shōtoku’s text differs in key ways, offering important critiques and unique interpretations of the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*.⁵⁰

⁴⁸ Hanayama, *Shōmangyō-gisho kōyaku*, 7.

⁴⁹ Hanayama, *Shōmangyō-gisho kōyaku*, 1.

⁵⁰ Hanayama, *Shōmangyō-gisho kōyaku*, 273.

Example IV. Inazu Kizō 稲津紀三 (1983)⁵¹

i. Title page:

上宮・聖徳太子撰 – Composed by Jōgū-Prince Shōtoku
 改訂新版:勝鬘經義疏 (漢訳文 勝鬘經対照) – Newly revised
 edition-*Shōmangyō-gisho* (Translation of Chinese text with
 comparison to *Śrīmālā-sūtra*)
 稲津紀三 釈注 – Translator Inazu Kizō

ii. Declaration of authorship:

これ こ やまとのくにに じょうぐうおう ししゅう うみ あなた ほん あら
 此は是れ、大倭国上宮王の私集にして、海の彼の本に非ず

‘This is from the private collection of King Jōgū of the Great Land of Yamato. It is not a text from across the sea’. *Kundoku* version. This edition offers no notes explaining the declaration.

iii. First sentence:

そうじょ
 総序

そ しょうまん いもと ふ か し ぎ
 夫れ勝鬘は、本はこれ不可思議なり。

‘As for [Queen] Śrīmālā, she was originally inconceivable’. *Kundoku* version.

iv. Summary:

In his introduction, Inazu invokes Shinran’s description of Shōtoku as the ‘Preceptor of Yamato’ and includes copies of Shinran’s hymns to Shōtoku as an appendix. He writes: ‘The most important goal of this publication is to enable people to

⁵¹ Inazu Kizō, *Shōmangyō-gisho kaitei shinpan*.

become directly familiar with Shōtoku Taishi's *Shōmangyō-gisho*'.⁵² He also describes the discovery of the two Dunhuang manuscripts by Fujieda Akira as a valuable contribution to Shōtoku studies. Although he acknowledges that a comparison of Shōtoku's *Shōmangyō-gisho* to these manuscripts reveals many similarities, he, like Hanayama, highlights the differences, including Shōtoku's reinterpretation of the ten stages of the bodhisattva. He concludes that the discovery of the Dunhuang manuscripts 'does not diminish the original value of the prince's text since it was given expression through the remarkable individuality of Prince Shōtoku himself. Therefore, regardless of whatever other materials may be discovered, my interpretation of the [*Shōmangyō-gisho*] will not change'.⁵³

Example V. Shōtoku Taishi Research Association 聖徳太子研究会 (1988)⁵⁴

i. Title page:

国民文化研究会聖徳太子研究会著 – Produced by the National Culture Research Association-Prince Shōtoku Research Association

聖徳太子佛典講説 – Explication of Prince Shōtoku's Buddhist Texts

勝鬘經義疏の現代語訳と研究 (上巻) – Modern Translation and Research of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* (first volume)

大明堂發行 – Publication of Taimeidō

ii. Declaration of authorship:

'This is from the private collection of King Jōgū of the Great

⁵² Inazu, *Shōmangyō-gisho kaitei shinpan*, 8.

⁵³ Inazu, *Shōmangyō-gisho kaitei shinpan*, 24.

⁵⁴ Shōtoku Taishi Kenkyūkai, *Shōmangyō-gisho no gendaigoyaku*.

Land of Yamato. It is not a text from across the sea'. This translation omits the declaration of authorship.

iii. First sentence:

[総序 その一『勝鬘経』の大意とその題名の御解釋](現代語譯)
 [Preface-Number 1-The central meaning of the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*
 and the (honorific) interpretation of its title] (modern translation)

そもそも、この^{きょうてん}經典の主役として登場する^{しょうまん}勝鬘^{かた}という方は、その

^{もと(1)}本^{れいみょう}は靈妙不可思議であって、

‘Originally, the person known as [Queen] Śrīmālā, who appears as the *sūtra*’s protagonist, is miraculously inconceivable...’

iv. Summary:

The Shōtoku Taishi Research Association comprised a group of nine men (two were deceased by the time the association published its translation) in their 60s and 70s who met regularly for some twenty years to study Shōtoku’s texts. After performing an exhaustive study of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* in which they read the text together multiple times, they produced a modern Japanese translation that is the most accessible of all these editions. Its ease of use is evident in the translation of the first sentence above, which presents Shōtoku’s text in modern Japanese and inserts helpful terms, adding ‘*sūtra*’, ‘protagonist’, ‘appears’ and ‘miraculously’. This two-volume edition, which includes a lengthy introduction, divides the *Shōmangyō-gisho* into short sections, with each section having three parts: a modern Japanese translation accompanied by endnotes; a *kundoku* version of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* with *furigana* and additional endnotes; and a research section that includes short explanations of key points not covered in the

notes. Unlike all the other editions, this translation omits the declaration of authorship but acknowledges the controversy over the text's authorship. Even so, the translators assert: "The more we have studied [the *Shōmangyō-gisho*], the more we have developed faith that Shōtoku authored it. While it may cause discomfort for those holding the contrary position, we ask that they kindly substitute "the author of the *Sangyō-gisho*" in the spots in our research where it says "Prince Shōtoku".⁵⁵ They also acknowledge the claim made by such contrarians that the Dunhuang manuscripts were the source of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*. In response, they assert that those texts offer a 'superficial' reading of the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*, while Shōtoku's text penetrates to its very essence.⁵⁶

Example VI. Hayashima Kyōshō 早島鏡正 (1999)⁵⁷

i. Title page:

早島鏡正 – Hayashima Kyōshō
 勝鬘經-勝鬘經義疏 – *Śrīmālā-sūtra-Shōmangyō-gisho*
 世界聖典刊行協会 – Association for the Publication of the
 World's Scriptures

ii. Declaration of authorship:

この注釈書は大和国の上宮王聖徳太子がみずから撰述
 したもので、海のかなたの書物ではない¹。

'This commentary was written by King Jōgū-Prince Shōtoku of the Land of Yamato himself; it is not a book from across the sea'.

⁵⁵ Shōtoku Taishi Kenkyūkai, *Shōmangyō-gisho no gendaigoyaku*, 19.

⁵⁶ Shōtoku Taishi Kenkyūkai, *Shōmangyō-gisho no gendaigoyaku*, 21.

⁵⁷ Hayashima Kyōshō, *Shōmangyō: Shōmangyō-gisho*.

iii. First sentence:

総序 – Preface

釈尊と勝鬘夫人 – Śākyamuni and Queen Śrīmālā

そもそも勝鬘夫人(『勝鬘経』の主人公)の、本来の姿は、われわれの想像を超えた存在者である。

‘From the start, Queen Śrīmālā (the protagonist of the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*) was one whose original form surpasses our imagination’.

iv. Summary:

Describing his work as a modern translation, Hayashima offers a lengthy introduction to the text that includes an examination of the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* in the history of Mahāyāna Buddhist texts, chapter-by-chapter summaries, and Shōtoku’s method of dividing the *sūtra*. Hayashima’s edition offers a translation of a small section of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* with *furigana*, footnotes, and explanatory notes inserted into his translation, as seen above, with the following interpolation: ‘(the protagonist of the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*)’. At the end of each section of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*, he inserts a separate section surrounded by a border that contains the relevant passage from the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*. In footnote one at the end of the declaration of authorship, he repeats the information that appears in his joint translation with Hiroshi Tsukishima in the *Nihon Shisō Taikēi* edition described above. In the afterword, Hayashima mentions being introduced to Shōtoku’s teachings in 1942 in a seminar at Tokyo University with Hanayama Shinshō, and describes the significant changes that occurred in Shōtoku Studies since the end of World War II, mentioning that although some questioned Shōtoku’s authorship of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*, there was, at the time, no consensus.

Reflections on the Scholarly Field

Although the *Shōmangyō-gisho* and the Dunhuang manuscripts have come down to us in the present day, their histories of preservation and reception are distinct, thereby offering us a fascinating case study of authorship, textuality, and canon formation. That is, someone in China clearly valued those manuscripts since they attempted to preserve them for posterity. Even so, Japanese *Shōmangyō-gisho* scholarship offers no evidence that they became foundational to the development of Chinese Buddhist traditions more broadly, unlike the *Shōmangyō-gisho*, which played just such a role in the development of Japanese Buddhism. Its valued status is evident in, for example, the effort scholars made to study, translate, and preserve it and the two other *Sangyō-gisho* texts, beginning with the treatises of Chikō, Saichō, and others. That value is also evident in the modern scholarship examined above, which has, in pursuing the ‘true record’, been forced to respond to Fujieda’s Dunhuang evidence.

As we have seen, the editors of the six editions mentioned different goals for producing them: for instance, Hanayama points to important changes in the Japanese language since he produced a translation immediately after the war. Publication of the *Shitennōji ebon* marked the 1,350th anniversary of Shōtoku’s death, while the Shōtoku Taishi Research Association intended its two-volume work to honor the memory of their teacher, Kurokami Masaichirō 黒上正一郎 (1900–1930). Despite these differences, each edition seeks to help readers recover and understand Shōtoku’s thought and, in so doing, show why the *Shōmangyō-gisho* has rightly been considered a classic, canonical text worthy of ongoing study and reflection.

The editors of these six editions also responded, in their own ways, to the uncomfortable questions about authorship and originality raised by Fujieda, Koizumi, and others because of the discovery of the Dunhuang manuscripts. Some scholars highlighted minor differences as the basis for maintaining the text’s valued, canonical status. As noted above, Hanayama Shinshō, for instance, identifies some one-hundred eighty distinct passages as evidence for the text’s distinctiveness and has, with other scholars, pointed to characteristically ‘Japanese’ word choice, suggesting the *Shōmangyō-gisho* could

not have been written, as Fujieda and other critics asserted, in China. The Prince Shōtoku Association acknowledges this evidence but maintains its belief that Shōtoku authored the text, inviting skeptical readers to simply substitute ‘author of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*’ for their references to Shōtoku as author when reading their two-volume translation. Others have obliquely acknowledged the Dunhuang evidence. For instance, the afterword to the Shitennojō *ehon* mentions the Dunhuang discoveries and notes that the editors consulted with Fujieda Akira in compiling the *ehon*, but it does not make any sort of statement about the significance of the Dunhuang evidence relative to the *Shōmangyō-gisho*.

These responses to Fujieda’s findings are instructive because they reveal contours of the scholarly field that has focused on recovering the ‘true record’ of Shōtoku as an author and the *Shōmangyō-gisho* as a text. In this approach, scholarship serves mainly an instrumental purpose for recovering facts about the past, whether those facts pertain to the question of authorship or to the qualities seen by many to abide in the text itself and to be the basis of its perceived value: originality, profundity, independent thought, Japaneseness, and so on. While the Dunhuang evidence put proponents of the true-composition hypothesis on the defensive, critics seem to have taken disproving Shōtoku’s authorship as the ultimate end of their scholarship.⁵⁸

⁵⁸ In Shōtoku studies more broadly, Ōyama Seiichi produced a number of provocative studies claiming that Prince Shōtoku was a fictitious figure created during the compilation of the *Nihon Shoki*, distinguishing Shōtoku Taishi from Umayato no miko (see, for example, *Shōtoku Taishi no shinjitsu*). Ōyama asserts that unlike the former, the latter is an actual historical figure about whom we can recover just a small number of details. In ‘The Thesis That Prince Shōtoku Did Not Exist’, Kazuhiko Yoshida, citing Ōyama’s work, writes about the early records like the *Nihon Shoki* that describe Shōtoku and asks: ‘What is one to make of these various episodes? Do they convey historical facts or are they mere fiction? More than one hundred years have elapsed since the birth of modern historiography in Japan, and during this time historians, basing themselves on the spirit of rationality and on positivism, have overturned past historical perceptions and rewritten history through the determination of facts. On the subject of Prince

Although this persistent focus on the question of authorship represents one form of valid historical inquiry, it seems to have foreclosed other productive and, for me, more interesting avenues, or ‘roads’, of scholarly study related to this long history of transmission and reception, whereby the text attributed to Prince Shōtoku has diverged from these manuscripts from ‘across the sea’. Indeed, if we view this question of authorship and the search for the ‘true record’ as simply one small part of *Shōmangyō-gisho* studies and adopt different assumptions about text and author, then other sorts of fascinating avenues of inquiry open up in relation to the Dunhuang discovery. By way of conclusion, I outline just a few of those avenues.

Conclusion

To separate this debate over authorship from the subsequent 1,500-year history of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*’s reception and use in Shōtoku’s name, we can draw on the scholarship of Alexander Nehamas who makes the useful distinction between the *writer/text* and the *author/work*. In the former pair, the *writer* represents a historical person who acts as the ‘efficient cause of the text’s production’, and exists outside the *text* which he or she precedes ‘in truth and appearance’.⁵⁹ A *writer* does not have ‘interpretive authority’ over a *text*, even if it is her legal property. If a *text* were taken from a *writer*, she would not change as an individual. Nehamas writes: ‘Precisely for this reason,

Shōtoku too historians have been unsparing in their evidential research and have been steadily clarifying the relevant facts’ (3). He also observes: ‘In school education too one finds, for instance, that in a history textbook used in many high schools, Prince Shōtoku has come to be referred to as “Prince Umayato (Prince Shōtoku)” and there is no longer any mention of his having been crown prince or regent, nor is there any reference to the commentaries on three Buddhist *sūtras* traditionally attributed to him. It would appear that the authors of this textbook have decided that these aspects of his career cannot be regarded as historical facts’ (1).

⁵⁹ Nehamas, ‘Writer, Text, Work, Author’, 272.

writers are not in a position of interpretive authority over their writings, even if these are, by law, their property. We must keep the legal version of ownership...clearly apart from what we might well call its “hermeneutical” aspect’.⁶⁰ The *text* is, then, the written material produced by a *writer* and put out into the world. In *Shōmangyō-gisho* studies, scholars concerned themselves almost exclusively with the *writer* and the *text*, framing their search for the ‘true record’ like lawyers presenting their arguments in a courtroom drama.

By contrast, Nehamas treats an *author* mainly as a product rather than a producer of a *text*—that is, a figure who evolves as a *text* like the *Shōmangyō-gisho* undergoes study, interpretation, and reproduction. The *author* then is a role or figure emerging with, not preceding, textual interpretation. In the case of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*, then, scholars and critics have continually remade Shōtoku the *author* as they transmitted and transformed the *text* over the centuries, regardless of whether a historical figure known as Prince Shōtoku actually sat and composed it. Therefore, the *work* would include the *Shōmangyō-gisho* as others have studied, edited, and copied it since its appearance under Shōtoku’s name, including its presentations in the editions examined above.

If we adopt this distinction, we are no longer beholden to the legalistic, true-false binary that defined the search for the ‘true record’, and have instead a workable set of concepts with which to investigate aspects of the distinct reception histories of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* and the Dunhuang manuscripts, which are, in Nehamas’s language, similar *texts* but quite different *works*.

The following observation of Charles Hallisey is also helpful:

If the survival of any particular text is not self-explanatory, but in fact it is normally the case that texts fade in their significance as social change occurs, then we need to discover how those texts which do endure are maintained. In part, this will require us to look at the manner in which texts were circulated—the technology, practices, and institutions which made their survival possible—but espe-

⁶⁰ Nehamas, ‘Writer, Text, Work, Author’, 272.

cially the processes by which certain texts were singled out as worth preserving. Discovering answers to such questions will require investigations about the extent to which the production and survival of a text is both dependent and independent of the audiences which receive it.⁶¹

By reversing our temporal perspective in this way, we can compare how different interpretive communities engaged and remade the *Shōmangyō-gisho* as a *work*. Brian Stock calls these sorts of groups who orient themselves around a particular text a ‘textual community’, which he defines as ‘a group that arises in the space between the written text and the formation of a particular form of social group: It is an interpretive community, but it is also a social entity’.⁶² For example, I have written elsewhere about the quite different sorts of textual communities that developed in the Kamakura period at Tōdaiji around the figure of the polymath Gyōnen and in the modern period around the Shōtoku Taishi Association who produced the modern Japanese, two-volume edition of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* examined above.⁶³ A representative of the powerful Kegon school in the Kamakura era, Gyōnen defined his monastic identity in relation to the ability to interpret the *Sangyō-gisho* commentaries. The textual community that developed around him, and which transmitted his exegetical works, is distinct from the association’s modern textual community that developed, notes Ishii Kōsei 石井公成, out of a modern nationalist organization whose extremist forebears had organized attacks on Tsuda Sōkichi during the war for his contrarian views.⁶⁴

⁶¹ Hallisey, ‘Roads Taken’, 51.

⁶² Stock, *Listening for the Text*, 150.

⁶³ See Dennis, ‘Serious Texts in Funny Places’, 2011.

⁶⁴ In ‘Why Do Debates About Shōtoku Taishi Get So Heated?’, Ishii Kōsei notes that students at ‘Tokyo University formed the Tōdai Seishin Kagaku Kenkyūkai 東大精神科学研究会 (Tokyo University Research Association for the Promotion of the Japanese Spirit) and they would call on various other universities and eventually formed the Nihon Gakusei Kyōkai 日本学生協会 (Japan

However, we can compare these two communities in other ways. For instance, Gyōnen's detailed *kanbun* subcommentaries on the *Sangyō-gisho* became foundational to the exegetical tradition of the three texts and students still study them today, notes Mark Blum, as primers at Japanese universities. From the perspective of the *work*, Gyōnen's commentary on the *Shōmangyō-gisho* is also relevant because he remarks that he added markings to Shōtoku's texts to help his disciples better understand their meaning.⁶⁵ Those markings added to the Chinese text represent the early stages of a process that developed over the centuries, culminating in the paratextual markings we examined above, including those appearing in the association's modern translation. In this way, we can see how a *text* written in the transregional Chinese language has become available as a *work*, through the association's two-volume translation, to the public in highly accessible modern Japanese with extensive *furigana*, notes, and other sorts of paratextual material that made it possible today for someone proficient in college-level Japanese to make sense of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* with no facility in its original language.

As Fujieda suggests, these sorts of changes to the presentation of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* can reorient the reader in important ways and are

National Students Association). When Tsuda Sōkichi lectured at Tokyo University and was grilled by a mob of students it was mostly students from this organization. After the war the Tōdai Seishin Kagaku Kenkyūkai became the Kokumin Bunka Kenkyūkai 国民文化研究会 (National Culture Research Association). This organization continues to this day, and although they have calmed down considerably since the wartime they still conduct conservative "enlightenment campaigns" directed at students, publish the works and poetry of Kurokami, and even put together a research group that published a commentary on the *Shōmangyō-gisho*. See Ishii, Public Lecture. The commentary referred to by Ishii is one of the six texts examined above.

⁶⁵ Gyōnen recorded this activity in the colophon of a copy of the Hōji print of the *Yūimagyō-gisho*, writing: 'I have added markings to the text and given it to [my disciple] Zenmyō. This [version] can be used to aid in the transmission of [Shōtoku] Taishi's three commentaries'. He signs it as 'Gyōnen, Scholar of the Three Commentaries of Shōtoku Taishi'. Quoted in Hanayama, *Jōgūōsen*, 102.

thus worthy of scholarly attention, especially as we try to understand how these varied ‘technolog[ies], practices, and institutions’ influenced the process of textual divergence. We can also view these changes to the *Shōmangyō-gisho* as a *work* in light of broader linguistic and cultural changes that have taken place over the centuries since Gyōnen inserted paratextual markings to aid his students—indeed, Hanayama states that the revised edition he produced in 1977 was occasioned by such changes in the relatively short span of just over thirty years.

Future research that will build upon this material will consider these changes in light of the scholarship of David Lurie and others on the development of writing and reading practices on the archipelago. Lurie argues that reliance on the Chinese-Japanese binary discussed above is often misleading because it masks multiple, often complex, reading and writing practices and registers. In describing the development and uses of *kundoku*, which are crucial to understanding the broader Japanese Buddhist textual traditions of which the *Sangyō-gisho* are a part, he states that rather ‘than phonographic transcription, it was this method of reading/writing that dominated all modes of literacy in early Japan, from at least the mid-seventh century on. This means that we cannot describe texts arranged in accordance with Chinese vocabulary and syntax as being written “in Chinese” (no matter what their origins), a conclusion that has profound implications for Japanese cultural history, which has been framed by a linguistic opposition between Chinese and Japanese’.⁶⁶ So too, naturally, for the study of Buddhist texts like the *Shōmangyō-gisho* and the two other *Sangyō-gisho* commentaries.

Lurie argues, moreover, that scribes from the Korean peninsula likely brought the *kundoku* practices to the archipelago and that because they were so widespread, it is impossible to distinguish between Chinese and Japanese writing in early Japan because regardless ‘of how thoroughly a text might conform to literary Chinese style and usage, it could potentially be read in Japanese (or Korean) rather than Chinese’.⁶⁷ Lurie also mentions errors committed by Japanese

⁶⁶ Lurie, *Realms of Literacy*, 5.

⁶⁷ Lurie, *Realms of Literacy*, 11.

authors when writing in a Chinese style that were ‘traditionally stigmatized as *washū*, “Japanese practice” 和(倭)習, sometimes more pejoratively written as the “reek of Japanese” 和臭’.⁶⁸ Hanayama Shinshō, Kanaji Isamu, and others identified these sorts of errors in the *Sangyō-gisho* as proof of Japanese authorship and they have been studied extensively by Ishii Kōsei in more recent scholarship.⁶⁹

⁶⁸ Lurie, *Realms of Literacy*, 181.

⁶⁹ The debate generated by the Dunhuang evidence has spurred on additional inquiries into the language of the text itself. In his exhaustive studies of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* and *Hokke-gisho*, produced before Fujieda’s discovery, Hanayama Shinshō identified passages in the two texts he describes as being clearly influenced by the Japanese language, suggesting that a native speaker of Chinese could not have written them. This assertion, repeated by others, was used to argue against the claim that the *Shōmangyō-gisho* was written in China, brought to Japan, and falsely attributed to Shōtoku, as Fujieda and others claimed. Although Ishii Kōsei 石井公成 recognizes Fujieda’s research as ‘epoch-making’, he too argues against Fujieda’s conclusion about the text’s provenance. Ishii used N-gram searches of the SAT, CBETA, EBTC, and other textual databases to show clear commonalities in word choice across the three *Sangyō-gisho* texts, suggesting that the same author or group composed them. For instance, after listing the first several lines of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*, Ishii writes the following about one of the passages examined above: ‘among these [passages], “[As for Queen Śrīmālā,] she was originally inconceivable”, appears in the *Shōmangyō-gisho* twice, the *Hokke-gisho* once, and the *Yuimagyō-gisho* twice; it does not appear in any other literature. The following [passage], “[No one knows] whether she is a transformation body of the Tathāgata, or [the Great Dharma Cloud]”, appears only in the [*Shōmangyō-gisho* and] once in the *Hokke-gisho*. If we consider just this [information], it becomes clear that the *Sangyō-gisho* was written by the same author or by those from the same academic lineage’. See Ishii, ‘*Sangyō-gisho* no kyōtsū hyōgen’, 390. Ishii also identifies a significant number of phrases found only in the *Sangyō-gisho*, or in the *Sangyō-gisho* and a small number of others texts. In support of Hanayama’s assertion about Japanese-inspired turns of phrase, Ishii identifies a number of passages that seem to be influenced by the Japanese language, and criticizes Fujieda, writing: ‘The research of Fujieda and the other members of the Dunhuang Research Group was groundbreaking for

Lurie describes the role ascribed by historians to Shōtoku as providing a native origin to the imported Buddhist religion and that ‘Shōtoku guaranteed the domestication and naturalization of imported ideas and practices, among them various sacred (and secular) uses of writing’.⁷⁰ The attribution of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* to Shōtoku that we examined in the declaration of authorship and the *work*’s subsequent divergence from the Dunhuang manuscripts can be viewed in this light. As I suggested above, the *Shōmangyō-gisho* played a key role in the early process of assimilating the translocal Buddhist traditions in the local conditions of the archipelago, offering interesting points of comparison and divergence from that process in other parts of East Asia. That process on the archipelago includes, as Michael Como’s scholarship reveals,⁷¹ the often underappreciated, and even elided, roles played in this process by immigrants from the Korean kingdoms and Chinese dynasties. From this perspective, we can consider how the translations and critical editions noted above, as well as the many other sorts of textual engagements and transformations have, over many centuries, transmitted and embedded the *Shōmangyō-gisho* in a particularly local context distinct from that of the Dunhuang manuscripts, while working through a shifting sense of the debt owed to the cultures and Buddhist traditions from across the sea and to the west.

both research on the history of commentaries of Chinese translations of the *sūtras* and on the *Sangyō-gisho*; even so, possibly because the discovery of the Dunhuang manuscripts was so shocking, we maybe can surmise that they did not pay attention whatsoever to the Japanese-influenced language and special characteristics found in the *Sangyō-gisho*, beginning with the [work here in this article on] the *Shōmangyō-gisho*. See Ishii, ‘*Sangyō-gisho* no gohō’, 524. Jamie Hubbard translated into English some of Ishii Kōsei’s scholarship that can be found at: <https://komazawa-u.academia.edu/ISHIIKosei>. Ishii also maintains an online blog, titled, ‘*Shōtoku Taishi Kenkyū no Saizensen*’ 聖徳太子研究の最前線 at: <https://blog.goo.ne.jp/kosei-gooblog>.

⁷⁰ Lurie, *Realms of Literacy*, 141.

⁷¹ See Como, *Shōtoku*.

Bibliography

Abbreviations

T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經. See Bibliography, Secondary Sources, Takakusu and Watanabe, eds.

Primary Sources

- Hokke-gisho* 法華義疏 [Commentary on the *Lotus Sūtra*]. 4 *kan*.
Attributed to Shōtoku Taishi 聖德太子 (574–622). *T* no. 2187,
vol. 56.
- Shōmangyō-gisho* 勝鬘經義疏 [Commentary on the
Śrīmālādevīsīṃhanāda-sūtra]. 1 *kan*. Attributed to Shōtoku
Taishi 聖德太子 (574–622). *T* no. 2185, vol. 56.
- Yuimagyō-gisho* 維摩經義疏 [Commentary on the
Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra]. 5 *kan*. Attributed to Shōtoku
Taishi 聖德太子 (574–622). *T* no. 2186, vol. 56.

Secondary Sources

- Blum, Mark L. *The Origins and Development of Pure Land Buddhism: A Study and Translation of Gyōnen's 'Jōdo Hōmon Genrushō'*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Buswell, Robert E. Jr., ed. *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1990.
- . *Cultivating Original Enlightenment: Wŏnhyo's Exposition of the Vajrasamādhi-sūtra (Kūmgang Sammaegyōng Non)*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2007.
- . *The Formation of Ch'an Ideology in China and Korea: The Vajrasamādhi-sūtra, A Buddhist Apocryphon*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- . 'Imagining "Korean Buddhism": The Invention of a National Religious Tradition'. In *Nationalism and the Construction of Korean Identity*, edited by Hyung Il Pai and Timothy R. Tangherlini, 73–107. Korea Research Monograph 26. Berkeley: University of California, Institute of East Asian

- Studies, 1998.
- Como, Michael. *Shōtoku: Ethnicity, Ritual, and Violence in the Japanese Buddhist Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Dennis, Mark. 'An Investigation of the Relationship between Prince Shōtoku's *Shōmangyō-gisho* and Two Dunhuang Buddhist Manuscripts: A Debate over Originality and Canonical Value'. *Manuscript Studies* 2, no. 2 (Fall 2017): 499–507.
- . 'Serious Texts in Funny Places: Comic Representations and the Search for the "True Record" of Prince Shōtoku's Buddhist Commentaries'. *Postscripts: The Journal of Sacred & Contemporary Worlds* 7, no. 1 (2011): 61–87.
- Fujieda Akira 藤枝晃. 'Hokuchō ni okeru Shōmangyō no denshō' 北朝における『勝鬘經義疏』の傳承 [Transmission of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* in the Northern Dynasties]. *Tōhō Gakkai* 東方學報 [Journal of Oriental Studies] 40 (March 1969): 325–49.
- . '*Shōmangyō-gisho*' 勝鬘經義疏. In *Shōtoku Taishi shū* 聖德太子集 [Shōtoku Prince Collection]. Vol. 2 of *Nihon shisō taikai* 日本思想大系 [Compendium of Japanese Thought], edited by Ienaga Saburō 家永三郎 et al., 484–544. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店, 1975.
- Fujieda Akira 藤枝晃, and Koizumi Enjun 古泉圓順. 'Sankō E hon *Shōman-gisho hongī* Tonkō hon' [参考] E 本 (「勝鬘義疏本義」敦煌本) [Dunhuang Manuscript E (Reference) The *Shōman-gisho Hongī*]. In *Shōtoku Taishi shū* 聖德太子集 [Shōtoku Prince Collection]. Vol. 2 of *Nihon shisō taikai* 日本思想大系 [Compendium of Japanese Thought], edited by Ienaga Saburō 家永三郎 et al., 429–62. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店, 1975.
- Fujii Kyōkō 藤井教公. '*Shōmangyō-gisho hongī*' 勝鬘經義疏本義 [The *Hongi* of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*]. In *Shōtoku Taishi jiten* 聖德太子事典 [Prince Shōtoku Encyclopedia], edited by Ishida Hisatoyo 石田尚豊, 142–43. Tokyo: Kashiwa Shobō 柏書房の古文書, 1997.
- Genette, Gérard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin with a foreword by Richard Macksey. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Hallisey, Charles. 'Roads Taken and not Taken in the Study of

- Theravāda Buddhism'. In *Curators of the Buddha: The Study of Buddhism under Colonialism*, edited by Donald S. Lopez, Jr., 31–62. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Hanayama Shinshō 花山信勝. 'Gyobutsu Hokkesho no sengō shize Yamato Jōgūō shishū hikai hihon ni tsuite' 御物法華疏の撰号「此は大倭国上宮王私集非海彼本」に就いて [Concerning the Statement—'This is from the private collection of King Jōgū of the Great Land of Yamato. It is not a text from across the sea'—Affixed to the *Hokke-gisho* Imperial Treasure]. In *Indo tetsugaku no shomondai* 印度哲学と仏教の諸問題: 宇井伯寿博士還暦記念論文集 [Several Problems Regarding Indian Philosophy and Buddhism: Collected Essays Commemorating Dr. Ui Hakuju's Sixtieth Birthday], edited by Ui Hakuju 宇井伯寿 et al., 397–422. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店, 1951.
- . *Shōmangyō-gisho kōyaku* 勝鬘經義疏校訳 [A Revised Translation of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*]. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 吉川弘文館, 1977.
- . *Shōmangyō-gisho no Jōgū ōsen ni kansuru kenkyū* 勝鬘經義疏の上宮王撰に関する研究 [Research on King Jōgū's Authorship of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店, 1944.
- Hayashima Kyōshō 早島鏡正. *Shōmangyō: Shōmangyō-gisho* 勝鬘經・勝鬘經義疏. Tokyo: Seikai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai 世界聖典刊行協会, 1999.
- Hayashima Kyōshō 早島鏡正, and Tsukishima Hiroshi 築島裕, eds. *Shōtoku Taishi shū* 聖徳太子集 [Shōtoku Prince Collection]. Vol. 2 of *Nihon shisō taikai* 日本思想大系 [Compendium of Japanese Thought]. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店, 1975.
- Hirai Shun'ei 平井俊榮. 'Sangyō-gisho no seiritsu to Kichizō so' 三經義疏の成立と吉蔵疏 [The Formation of the *Sangyō-gisho* and Jizang's Commentary]. In *Sanron kyōgaku no kenkyū* 三論教学の研究 [Research on Sanron Education], edited by Hirai Shun'ei 平井俊榮, 22–28. Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社, 1990.
- Hirakawa Akira 平川彰. 'Shōmangyō-gisho to Nai 93 to no kankei ni tsuite' 勝鬘經義疏と奈93との関係について [Concerning the Relationship between the *Shōmangyō-gisho* and *Nai 93*]. In *Shōtoku Taishi ronshū* 聖徳太子論集 [Collected Essays on Prince

- Shōtoku], edited by Kokumin Bunka Kenkyūkai Shōtoku Taishi Kenkyūkai 國民文化研究會, 207–30. Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平樂寺書店, 1971.
- Inazu Kizō 稲津紀三. *Jōgū-Shōtoku Taishisen Shōmangyō-gisho kaitei shinpan* 上宮聖德太子撰 勝鬘經義疏改訂新版 [A Revised Edition of the *Shōmangyō-gisho* Composed by Prince Jōgū Shōtoku]. Tokyo: Sanbō 三宝, 1974.
- Ishii Kōsei 石井公成, ‘*Sangyō-gisho no gohō*’ 三經義疏の語法 [Diction in the *Shōmangyō-gisho*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 57, no. 1 (2008): 530–524.
- . ‘*Sangyō-gisho no kyōtsū hyōgen to hensoku gohō* (Part 1)’ 三經義疏の共通表現と変則語法 (上) [Common Expressions and Irregular Diction in the *Sangyō-gisho* (Part 1)]. *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgakubu Ronshū* 駒澤大學佛教學部論集 [Journal of Buddhist Studies, Komazawa University] 41 (2010): 394–376.
- . ‘Why Do Debates About Shōtoku Taishi Get So Heated?’ Public Lecture given at Komazawa University Buddhist Studies Department, November 28, 2006. Translated by Jamie Hubbard, Smith College, July 2015. Subsequently published as Ishii Kōsei 石井公成, ‘Shōtoku Taishi ronsō wa naze atsukunaru no ka’ 聖德太子論争はなぜ熱くなるのか. *Komazawa Daigaku daigakuin bukkuyōgaku kenkyūkai nenpō* 駒澤大学大学院仏教學研究会年報 [Annual of studies of Buddhism. Graduate School of Komazawa University] 40 (2007): 1–29.
- Kanaji Isamu 金治勇. *Jōgūōsen Sangyō-gisho no shomondai* 上宮王撰 三經義疏の諸問題 [Various Problems Concerning King Jōgū’s Authorship of the *Sangyō-gisho*]. Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館, 1985.
- . ‘*Shōmangyō-gisho no “hongī” ni tsuite*’ 勝鬘經義疏の「本義」について [Concerning the Hongi of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*]. *Shōtoku Taishi Kenkyū* 聖德太子研究 [Prince Shōtoku Studies] 7 (1972): 25–38.
- . *Shōmangyō-gisho no shisōteki kenkyū* 勝鬘經義疏の思想的研究 [Research on the *Shōmangyō-gisho*’s Thought]. Tokyo: Sankibō busshorin 山喜房仏書林, 1971.
- . *Shōtoku Taishi kyōgaku no kenkyū: Sangyō-gisho ni tsuite* 聖

- 徳太子教学の研究—三経義疏について [Research on Prince Shōtoku Studies: Concerning the *Sangyō-gisho*]. Kyoto: Hyakkaen 百華苑, 1962.
- . ‘Tonkō hakken no *Shōmangyōsho* (*Nai 93*) to *Shōmangyō-gisho* to no hikaku: omo toshite bunshō kadan ni tsuite’ 敦煌発見の勝鬘経疏(奈93)と勝鬘経義疏との比較—主として分章科段について [Comparative Research on the (Relationship between) the *Shōmangyōsho* (*Nai 93*) Discovered at Dunhuang and the *Shōmangyō-gisho*: Mainly Concerning their Narrative Structure]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 18, no. 2 (1970): 835–41.
- . ‘Tonkō hakken no *Shōmangyōsho* (*Nai 93*) to *Shōmangyō-gisho* to no hikaku kenkyū-2: omo toshite sono gakkei ni tsuite’ 敦煌発見の勝鬘経疏(奈93)と勝鬘経義疏との比較(2)—主として学系について [Comparative Research (Part 2) on the (Relationship between) the *Shōmangyōsho* (*Nai 93*) Discovered at Dunhuang and the *Shōmangyō-gisho*: Mainly Concerning their Academic Lineage]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 19, no. 1 (1970): 270–73.
- Koizumi Enjun 古泉圓順. ‘Tonkōhon Shōmangisho *hongī*’ 敦煌本「勝鬘経疏本義」 [The Dunhuang Manuscript: The *Hongī* of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*]. *Shōtoku Taishi Kenkyū* 聖徳太子研究 [Prince Shōtoku Studies] 5 (1969): 59–141.
- Kume Kunitake 久米邦武. *Jōgū Taishi jitsuroku* 上宮太子実録 [The True Record of Prince Jōgū]. Osaka: Sekibunsha 積文社, 1905.
- . *Shōtoku Taishi jitsuroku* 聖徳太子実録 [The True Record of Prince Shōtoku]. Tokyo: Heigo Shuppansha 丙午出版社, 1919; reprinted Tokyo: Ryūginsha 龍吟社, 1942.
- Lurie, David B. *Realms of Literacy: Early Japan and the History of Writing*. Cambridge: Harvard East Asian Monographs, 2011.
- Nakamura, Hajime. *A History of the Development of Japanese Thought from A.D. 592 to 1868*. Tokyo: Kokusai Bunka Shinkōkai 国際文化振興会, 1969.
- Nehamas, Alexander. ‘Writer, Text, Work, Author’. In *Literature and the Question of Philosophy*, edited with introduction by Anthony J. Cascardi, 265–91. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins

- University Press, 1987.
- Ōyama Seiichi 大山誠一. *Shōtoku Taishi no shinjitsu* 聖徳太子の真実 [The Truth About Prince Shōtoku]. Tokyo: Heibonsha 平凡社, 2003.
- Shitennōji 四天王寺. *Shitennōji ebon: Shōmangyō-gisho* 四天王寺會本—勝鬘經義疏 [The *Shōmangyō-gisho ebon* of Shitennōji]. Edited by Shitennōji Kangakuin. Osaka: Shitennōji 四天王寺, 1971.
- Shōtoku, Taishi. *Shōmangyō-gisho* 勝鬘經義疏 [Prince Shōtoku's Commentary on the *Śrīmālā Sūtra*]. Translated with an introduction by Mark Dennis. Berkeley, Tokyo: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 2011.
- Shōtoku Taishi Kenkyūkai 聖徳太子研究會. *Shōtoku Taishi butten kōsetsu: Shōmangyō-gisho no gendaigoyaku to kenkyū* 聖徳太子仏典講説・勝鬘經義疏の現代訳と研究上下 [An Explanation of the Buddhist Scriptures of Prince Shōtoku: Research and a Modern Translation of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*—Two Volumes]. Tokyo: Taimeidō 大明堂, 1988.
- Stock, Brian. *Listening for the Text: On the Uses of the Past*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1990.
- Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭, eds. *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經 [Buddhist Canon compiled under the Taishō Era (1912–1926)]. 85 vols. Tokyo: Taishō issaikyō kankōkai 大正一切經刊刻會, 1924–1932.
- Umehara Takeshi 梅原猛. *Shōtoku Taishi* 聖徳太子 [Prince Shōtoku]. 2 vols. Tokyo: Shōgakkan 小学館, 2003.
- Watanabe Kōjun 渡部孝順. 'Shōmangyō-gisho no tokuchō ni tsuite' 勝鬘經義疏の特徴について [Concerning the Special Characteristics of the *Shōmangyō-gisho*]. In *Shōmangyō-gisho ronshū* 勝鬘經義疏論集 [Collected Essays on the *Shōmangyō-gisho*], edited by Nihon Bukkyo Genryu Kenkyūkai 日本仏教源流研究会 [Research Association on the Origins of Japanese Buddhism], 126–32. Kyoto: Nihon Bukkyō Genryū Kenkyūkai 日本仏教源流研究会, 1965.
- Watanabe Shōkō 渡邊照宏. 'Sangyō-gisho no sakusha mondai: nihon bukkyō no ayumi' (6): 三經義疏の作者問題: 日本仏教のあゆみ 6 [The Problem of the Authorship of the *Sangyō-gisho*: Advances

in Japanese Buddhism]. *Daibōrin* 大法輪 [Great Dharma Wheel] 24, no. 8 (1957): 148–55.

Yang Yufei 楊玉飛. ‘Chūgoku Nanbokuchō Jidai ni okeru Bonnōron: *Shōmangyō* no Shochūshakusho o Chūshin Toshite’ 中国南北朝時代における煩惱論—『勝鬘經』—の諸注釈書を中心として— [The Theory of Defilements in the Northern and Southern Dynasties Chinese Buddhism: Focusing on Several Commentaries on the *Śrīmālādevīsīmbanādasūtra*]. *Sengokuyama Journal of Buddhist Studies* 仙石山仏教学論集 8 (2016): 128–62.

Yoshida Kazuhiko 吉田一彦. ‘The Thesis That Prince Shōtoku Did Not Exist’. *Acta Asiatica: Bulletin of the Institute of Eastern Culture* 91 (2006): 1–20.

