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Abstract

Öe no Masafusa and the Convergence of the “Ways”:
The Twilight of Early Chinese Literary Studies and the Rise of Waka Studies in the Long Twelfth Century in Japan

Saeko Shibayama

This dissertation examines two major parallel but intersecting trajectories: that of kangaku (Chinese studies), specifically the Kidendō (history and literature) curriculum that flourished at the State Academy in the Heian period (794-1185), and kagaku (waka studies), which emerged in the twelfth century. I trace the concept of “way” (michi) as it evolved from the Chinese studies curriculum to an aesthetic “way of life,” characterized by a spontaneous and rigorous pursuit of literature and art. The emergence of the study of waka was significant not only because it functioned as a catalyst for the preservation and renewal of the ancient practice of waka, but also because numerous commentaries on the subject formed a canon that defined Japanese cultural identity in subsequent centuries.

As in the European Middle Ages, the long twelfth century (1086-1221) in Japan saw the revival of ancient customs and texts. In the West, the Greco-Roman Classics, particularly Aristotelian philosophy, were rediscovered, partly through Arabic translations. In Japan’s case, the “twelfth century renaissance” of court culture was not ushered in through contact with new intellectual trends from overseas. Rather, after a century of regency rule by the non-imperial Fujiwara clan, the imperial rulers of the twelfth century were eager to legitimatize their regimes by applying the standards of newly reinterpreted precedents from the past. Called the “era of retired emperors” (insei-ki), Japanese society in the twelfth century was retrospective in character, and witnessed an effusion of cultural production, including the compilation of numerous literary anthologies, sequels to existing religious and historical texts, and treatises and commentaries on poems from the past. For courtiers, participation in imperial cultural enterprises was their sole means of assuring their families’ survival, as warriors established their own government by the early 1190s.
Part One examines kanshi and waka traditions before the twelfth century through textual analyses of “prefaces” (jo), the majority of which appear in the literary anthology, Honchō monzui (Literary Masterpieces of Japan, ca. 1058-65). This is followed by an examination of the role of the composition of Sino-Japanese poems in the lives of scholar-officials. I show how scholar-officials professionalized this practice as part of their household studies in the ninth through eleventh centuries. As part of my investigation of the literary genre of poetry prefaces, I also analyze the Chinese and Japanese prefaces to the Kokin wakashū (Collection of Japanese Poems from Ancient Times to the Present, 905), and the poet Nōin’s preface to his private collection of waka.

Part Two turns to the life and works of Ōe no Masafusa (1041-1111), the foremost scholar of his time. I show how Masafusa responded to the changing realities of Kidendō scholars, while idealizing his learned ancestors, their fellow academicians, and their imperial patrons’ “passions” (suki) for the composition of Chinese poems. By closely reading some of the writings attributed to Masafusa, such as the Zoku honchō ōjōden (Biographies of Those Reborn in Paradise in Japan II, ca, 1099-1104) and the Gōdanshō (Notes on Dialogues with Ōe Masafusa, ca, 1107-11), I argue that Masafusa’s nostalgic recollections of literati culture from the tenth and eleventh centuries ushered in the setsuwa (anecdotal tales) mode of narrative that epitomizes literary production in the twelfth century.

Part Three investigates the evolution of waka studies in the twelfth century. I first turn to Minamoto no Toshiyori’s (1055?-1129?) waka treatise, Toshiyori zuinō (Toshiyori’s Principles of Waka, ca. 1111-15) and discuss the peculiarly anecdotal ways in which Toshiyori glosses ancient poetic diction for a female reader. I then examine how the Rokujō school of waka incorporated some of the formal trappings of kangaku scholarship in its revival of waka, while the Mikohidari school of waka further consolidated hereditary studies of poetry by emphasizing the difficulty of mastering waka composition. In sum, by analyzing Chinese and Japanese writings from Japan’s long twelfth century, I propose a new intellectual history of Japan in a crucial period of transition from the ancient to the medieval age.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GR</th>
<th>Gunsho ruijū</th>
<th>群書類従</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IBR</td>
<td>Inseiki bunka ronshū</td>
<td>院政期文化論集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KKS</td>
<td>Karon kagaku shūsei</td>
<td>歌論歌学集成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGB</td>
<td>Kōdansha gakujutsu bunko</td>
<td>講談社學術文庫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM</td>
<td>Kōhon manyōshū</td>
<td>校本萬葉集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSS</td>
<td>Kōzanji shiryō sōsho</td>
<td>高山寺資料叢書</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NKT</td>
<td>Nihon kagaku taikei</td>
<td>日本歌学大系</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NKBT</td>
<td>Nihon koten bungaku teikai</td>
<td>日本古典文學大系</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NKBZ</td>
<td>Nihon koten bungaku zenshū</td>
<td>日本古典文學全集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NKZ</td>
<td>Nihon koten zenshū</td>
<td>日本古典全集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NST</td>
<td>Nihon shisō taikei</td>
<td>日本思想大系</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSS</td>
<td>Reizeike shiguretei sōsho</td>
<td>冷泉家時雨亭叢書</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNKBT</td>
<td>Shin nihon koten bungaku taikei</td>
<td>新日本古典文学大系</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNKBZ</td>
<td>Shinpen nihon koten bungaku zenshū</td>
<td>新編日本古典文学全集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNKS</td>
<td>Shichō nihon koten shūsei</td>
<td>新潮日本古典集成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKT</td>
<td>Shinpen kokka taikan</td>
<td>新編国歌大観</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Shikashū taisei</td>
<td>私家集大成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SZKT</td>
<td>Shintei zōho kokushi taikei</td>
<td>新訂增補国史大系</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UUD</td>
<td>Utakotoba utamakura daijiten</td>
<td>歌ことば歌枕大辞典</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBJ</td>
<td>Waka bungaku jiten</td>
<td>和歌文學辞典</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBT</td>
<td>Waka bungaku taikei</td>
<td>和歌文学大系</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZGR</td>
<td>Zoku gunsho ruijū</td>
<td>続群書類従</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acknowledgment

I have been extremely fortunate in receiving the generous support of various individuals and institutions, without which I would never have begun or completed the doctoral program at Columbia University.

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to three teachers, to whom I will forever be indebted. In the words of Ōe no Masafusa, I can only “humbly aspire to walk in their dust.”

Professor Haruo Shirane, my dissertation adviser at Columbia University, planted the seeds of the current study when I first arrived at Columbia in the fall of 2004, and joined his graduate seminar, “Poetry and Poetics in Japanese pre-modern literature.” Ever since, he has patiently guided me through every step of the doctoral odyssey. He read my dissertation at least three times, offering challenging but encouraging feedback each time.

Professor Isao Okuda, who was a visiting professor at Columbia over the years, has always shown me the ideal “Way” of bibliographical research, whether we met in New York, Tokyo or in monasteries in the mountains of Kyoto and Shiga.

Professor Yasuaki Watanabe of the University of Tokyo kindly accepted me as an auditor in his graduate seminar from November 2007 through July 2009. His seminar on Kamo no Chōmei’s waka treatise Mumyōshō taught me the art of making commentaries and gave me confidence in my own reading of primary texts.

At my dissertation defense in February 2012, I learned much from the members of my dissertation committee, Professors David Lurie and Michael Como of Columbia University and Professor Wiebke Denecke of Boston University, as well as Professors Shirane and Okuda. In particular, Professor Denecke, whose comparative studies of Japanese and European classical literature have long inspired me, filled the margins of an early version of my dissertation, which I gratefully incorporated in the present version.

Professor Tomi Suzuki of Columbia University most kindly supported me in scholastic and personal ways throughout my years as a Ph.D student.

The department of East Asian Languages and Literatures at Columbia University, in particular Tamara Kachanov and Tracy Howard, as well as Noguchi Sachiyo of the Starr East Asian Library were always there to help.

The Shinchō Foundation generously supported my research years in Tokyo in 2007-09. In January 2010, The Sonkei-Kaku Library allowed me to view a copy of Maeda Tsunanori’s bibliographical note, Sōka shoshi, containing the intriguing waka catalogue, “Koseki kasho mokuroku.” Professor Tōru Asada of Ochanomizu University and Professor Aya Nakamura of
Saitama Gakuen University kindly shared their opinions about the “Koseki kasho mokuroku” with me prior to my visit to the Sonkei-Kaku Library. Professor Nobuyuki Kanechiku of Waseda University sponsored the second year of my stay in Tokyo, and introduced me to Professors Asada and Nakamura.

Professor Arthur Thornhill of the University of Hawaii at Manoa graciously offered invaluable comments that markedly improved my dissertation.

My colleagues, friends and family members made my years as a doctoral student not only memorable but enjoyable: Satoko Naito, Anri Yasuda, Hitomi Yoshio, Nate Shockey, Shiho Takai, Daniel Poch, Charles Woolley, Robert Tuck, Nan Hartmann, Tom Gaubatz, Tae Hirano, Rumi Nomoto, Takashi Kimura, Umeda Kei, Alice and Ted Cohn, Libbie Cohn, Karen and Woody Applebome, Hiroko Hatanaka and Alan Sukojen, Kazunori and Tomoyoshi Shibayama.

Last but not least, I’d like to express my special thanks to my partner Don J. Cohn, who not only lived through the ups and downs of my life as a graduate student with our five Pekingese dogs, and read all the drafts and fragments that eventually culminated in this dissertation, but who also taught me the joy of writing.

I dedicate this dissertation to my parents, Tetsurō and Fumiko Shibayama.
Preface

Setsuwa (Anecdotes): A Cognitive Mode of Insei Japan

“Histories of peoples are no impediment to those who wish to read useful works, for many wise people have imparted the past deeds of humankind in histories for the instruction of the living. Through history they handle a final reckoning back through seasons and years, and they investigate many indispensable matters through the succession of consuls and kings.”

Isidore of Seville (ca. 560-636), *Etymologies*, Book 1:31:3.¹

The present study originates in my early fascination with Fujiwara no Teika’s (藤原定家, 1162-1241) poetics, especially his concept of ushin-tei (有心体, mindfulness). As Teika warns in his treatise, *Maigetsushō* (毎月抄, *Monthly Notes*, 1219), this poetic style was extremely difficult to master. I now propose that ushin-tei is not only a style of waka (和歌, Japanese poems in thirty-one syllables) composition, something a poet can decide to use or not, but also a way of life, a commitment to confront and interact with history. By emphasizing ushin-tei in poetry, Teika stressed the importance of historical verisimilitude. But what history was he talking about?

To answer this question, I first turned to the eighth imperial anthology of waka, *Shinkokin wakashū* (新古今和歌集, *A New Collection of Japanese Poems from Ancient Times to the Present*, 1205). By reading through the two thousand waka in its twenty volumes, I became convinced that the *Shinkokinshū* demonstrated its redactors’ deep understanding of the literary history of waka, with its beginnings in the first anthology, the *Man’yōshū* (萬葉集, *Collection of

Just as I was about to write about how the *Shinkokinshū* constructs a particular literary history of waka, I realized that not only the *Shinkokinshū*, but the majority of waka treatises from the late twelfth century also provided their own historical views of the literary genre. Why were those poet-scholars, including the five compilers of the *Shinkokinshū*, so concerned with writing literary histories of waka? What is *kagaku* (歌学, waka studies) and when did the tradition begin? Why was waka considered relevant to people’s lives at the beginning of the thirteenth century?

As I began my preliminary research on poetic treatises from the twelfth century, I noticed that nearly all the bibliographical sections of the books’ modern editions referred to a catalogue of books on waka, entitled “Koseki kasho mokuroku” (古蹟歌書目録, “An Old Manuscript Catalogue of Books on Waka”). The idea of obtaining material evidence about the proliferation of waka studies in the late twelfth century was very appealing. At the same time, I was intrigued when Japanese scholars in Tokyo told me that while they knew about the catalogue, only the historian Ōta Shōjirō (太田晶二郎, 1913-87), who discovered the book in 1954, had written about it. My visit to the Sonkei-kaku Library (尊経閣文庫) in Tokyo in January 2010 was one of the high points of my seven years of research on waka. However, when I was shown a Meiji copy of Maeda Tsunanori’s (前田綱紀, 1643-1724) bibliographical memoranda, *Sōkashoshi* (桑華書志), vol. 72, I recognized the futility and risks of basing my work solely on bibliographical evidence. Since the original twelfth-century manuscript of the “Kasho mokuroku” does not survive, little can be said about the original catalogue. However, the present study has been made possible through the efforts of generations of textual scholars, who in their tireless search
for urtexts, rescued and reconstructed numerous works for the benefit of those of us–students of Japanese literature. In any case, my optimism about gaining critical insight into the twelfth-century revival of waka through material artifacts was premature.

To solve the question of why courtiers in twelfth-century Japan wrote so many commentaries and treatises on waka, I finally turned to the existing scholarship on *insei* (院政, administration by retired emperors) and the *insei* period (院政期). By acquainting myself with recent historical scholarship on the subject, I realized that the revival of waka was not merely a matter of literary history, aesthetics, nor of taste. I became convinced that the cultural phenomenon of the emergence of numerous scholarly texts on waka needed to be contextualized historically within a particular socio-political environment. But how to proceed?

My solution was to link the otherwise autonomous individual literary texts of the *insei* period to the larger narrative of the social history of Japan at the time, through the insight I gained from my reading of the kanbun texts written by the scholar-official, Ōe no Masafusa (大江匡房, 1041-1111). Masafusa’s works provided me with a theoretical framework that proved useful in understanding waka studies in the late twelfth century. The first hint I gained from his *Zoku honchō öjōden* (続本朝往生伝, *Biographies of Those Reborn in Paradise in Japan II*, ca. 1099-1104) was that at least in Masafusa’s mind, the Kidendō (紀伝道, history and literature, lit. “Way of annals and biographies”) curriculum in the State Academy was in decline by the end of the eleventh century. The second clue I discovered in my close reading of his *Gōdanshō* (江談抄, *Notes on Dialogues with Masafusa*, ca. 1107-11) was that Masafusa was the proliferator of the glorification of Emperor Daigo (醍醐天皇, r. 897-930) and his son Emperor Murakami (村上
天皇, r. 946-67), due to his respect for the “passions” (好き, suki) these rulers exhibited in the composition of Sino-Japanese verse (漢詩, kanshi).

Based on these two ideas, the present study proposes the following hypothesis: in the absence of rigorous philological research on the part of kangaku academicians after Masafusa and Fujiwara no Atsumitsu (藤原敦光, 1062-1144), waka studies evolved in the second half of the twelfth century and soon attained the social recognition only accorded to Chinese literary studies in the past, while the ancient practice of waka composition was rediscovered as something authentically “poetic” and “Japanese.” In fact, Fujiwara Teika attained the Senior Second Rank (正二位) as well as the post of Acting Counselor (権中納言), mainly due to his being a prominent waka poet in the 1230s; such a scenario would have been impossible a century earlier. As to why the late-twelfth-century waka commentators and the compilers of the Shinkokinshū were obsessed with writing literary histories of waka in Japanese, when no major official chronicles were written in Chinese at the time, it is even possible to speculate that literary histories of waka functioned as social histories of early Japan in the twelfth century.

The present study does not return to the specific discussions of the Shinkokinshū and Teika’s theory of waka (歌論, karon). However, with the broad perspective on “literature” and “poetry” I gained through Masafusa’s writings, I am now ready to propose that the literary history of waka embodied in the Shinkokinshū resonates with the last insei ruler, Retired Emperor GoToba’s (後鳥羽院, r. 1183-98, 1180-1239) desire to revive the Confucian political ideology of state building (経国治世, keikoku chisei) through the promotion of ancient literary
practices. Incidentally, the turn of the thirteenth century also witnessed the restoration of the Myōgyōdō (明經道, the study of Confucian Classics) curriculum at the Academy, under the leadership of the Kiyohara (清原) family. From the viewpoint of Chinese literary studies (漢学, kangaku) in Japan, the gradual transition that took place throughout the twelfth century at the Academy, from the belletristic Kidendō to the more politically oriented Myōgyōdō, set off a brief “dark age” in Japan’s long tradition of Chinese studies.

Because kangaku itself thrived in Japan in various hereditary and institutional contexts until the late-nineteenth century, it is erroneous to assume that the discipline as a whole declined in the twelfth century. Rather I argue that it was during this temporary hiatus in Chinese studies that waka took on the formal trappings of early Kidendō scholarship and itself became a “Way” (道, michi). Theoretically, the transformation of waka from a Japanese native custom (風俗, ōzoku) to the embodiment of poetic refinement (風流, fūryū) on a par with the composition of Chinese verse was not surprising, because by the early tenth century, the prefaces to the first imperial anthology of waka, Kokin wakashū (古今和歌集, Collection of Japanese Poems from Ancient Times to the Present, 905), had already defined the indigenous practice of waka composition in terms similar to those applied to the kanshi composition. In other words, the decline of the Kidendō provided the external impetus for Japanese poets to rediscover the origins of waka as described in the Kokinshū.

2. The convention of a retired emperor being in charge of the imperial family continued through the end of the Edo period, but after GoToba’s Jōkyū Disturbance, the authority of bakufu was established, and the subsequent retired emperors no longer claimed political sovereignty. For this reason, the historical epoch of insei-ki is normally considered to have ended with GoToba.
To understand the significance of the revival of waka in its historical context, the characteristics of the *insei* period and its impact on Japanese society in the subsequent centuries need to be discussed. Indeed, no individuals better epitomize the ethos of the *insei* period, or Japan’s “long twelfth century” (1086-1221), than Ōe no Masafusa. Born into a Confucian family in charge of the Kidendō at the Academy, his life as a scholar-official appears quite uneventful, compared to that of his distant relative Ōe no Sadamoto (大江定基, ?-1034), who, after serving as a provincial governor for many years, took the tonsure, made a pilgrimage to China and died in Hangzhou (杭州) as a Buddhist monk. On the other hand, Masafusa’s rapid admittance to the highest echelon of senior nobles (公卿, *kugyō*), and his eventual promotion to the post of Acting Counselor and later to the Senior Second Rank, were career advances that no academicians of the preceding centuries, including his great-grandfather Ōe no Masahira (大江匡衡, 952-1012), could even dream about.

One reason why Masafusa’s talent as a scholar-official came to be valued so highly was that his first imperial patron, Emperor GoSanjō (後三条天皇, 1034-73, r. 1068-72), after having spent many years as crown prince during the Fujiwara regency, launched various political reforms, including the revival of the system of appointment of officers based on merit rather than family connections. Because GoSanjō attempted to restore imperial sovereignty to its “original” state before the heyday of Fujiwara no Michinaga (藤原道長, 966-1027) and his son Yorimichi (藤原頼道, 992-1074), he was willing to give opportunities to Masafusa, who was fully aware of his immediate ancestors’ unsatisfactory lives as middle-ranking officials, and eager to assist the sovereign’s “state building” project, thus manifesting his renewed sense of responsibility as a
Confucian scholar.

GoSanjō’s son, Emperor Shirakawa (白河天皇, 1053-1129, r. 1072-86), officially inaugurated the institution of *insei* by disobeying his father’s wishes regarding imperial succession, and abdicated in favor of his own son in 1086. Ruling for an unprecedentedly long period of fifty-six years, first as emperor, then as the father and the grandfather of succeeding emperors, Shirakawa further pursued the revival of imperial authority, mainly through symbolic acts such as offering Buddhist prayers for the benefit of the state, and by sponsoring such literary activities as commissioning waka anthologies. Despite making ostentatious gestures in this regard, Shirakawa’s pursuit of his own private interests, epitomized by his forceful implementation of the primogenitary succession of the throne, ironically reduced the authority of the imperial household to the level of other institutions, such as the regents’ line of the Fujiwara family, Buddhist establishments, and even the emerging warrior-houses of the Minamoto (源) and the Taira (平) clans. By the time of the death of Shirakawa’s grandson, Emperor Toba (鳥羽天皇, 1103-56, r. 1107-23), the imperial household was no longer able to manage its own succession politics without the assistance of the Minamoto and Taira warriors, culminating in the Högen and Heiji Disturbances (保元平治の乱, 1156, 1159). The civil strife was followed by the brief anachronistically “noble” regime of the military leader Taira no Kiyomori (平清盛, 1118-81). In 1185, Minamoto no Yoritomo (源頼朝, 1147-99) inaugurated the country’s first military government (幕府, *bakufu*) in Kamakura. The political institution of *insei* continued to function until the defeat of Retired Emperor GoToba, following his attempt to overthrow the *bakufu* in 1221 (承久の乱, the Jōkyū Disturbance).
A crude chronological outline, like that presented above, only portrays the *insei* period in terms of the rise and the fall of retired emperors’ administrations. Paradoxically, however, while the actual power of retired emperors as the rehabilitated executives of the imperial state dwindled by the end of the twelfth century, the notion that the imperial family was the longstanding guardian of Japanese culture emerged on a hitherto unknown scale in the minds of the imperial sovereigns and their subjects. Indeed, it is remarkable that military figures like Taira no Kiyomori and Minamoto no Yoritomo preferred to coexist peacefully with the imperial family, and even partially adopt their legacy through marriage and the appropriation of key elements of imperial culture, such as waka and court music. For these reasons, despite the actual weakening of the imperial state, the *insei* period witnessed a great increase in literary production, with many of the resulting works attempting to encompass the long literary and cultural histories of the country. Fundamentally neoclassical, this period witnessed the compilation of numerous literary anthologies, sequences to the existing religious and historical texts, and treatises and commentaries on poetry from the past and the present. For courtiers, participation in imperial cultural enterprises became the only way to secure their families’ survival, as warriors had established the *bakufu* by the early 1190s.

Interestingly, Japan was not the only geopolitical entity which underwent “the renaissance of the twelfth century.” As Charles Haskins (1870-1937) discussed in his influential book *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (1927), twelfth-century Europe also witnessed the revival of the Greco-Roman Classics, particularly, Aristotelian philosophy, partly through Arabic translations.3 In Japan’s case, however, the cultural revival was not directly ushered in through

3. For interdisciplinary studies of the influence of Haskins’ book in the fields of religion, education, law, politics, history, philosophy, science, literature and the arts, see Benson and Constable, eds. *Renaissance*
contact with new intellectual trends from overseas. Rather, as briefly discussed above, it was a byproduct of retired emperors’ attempts to legitimatize their regimes by applying the standards of newly reinterpreted precedents from the past.

Regarding the fundamentally retrospective nature of cultural production in twelfth-century Japan, it is not merely coincidental that as a form of intellectual activity in early Japan, *michi* (Way) is analogous to the Latin word *via* (“path”), and what the literary historian of the European Middle Ages, Mary Carruthers, calls a “cognitive” mode, equivalent to the concept of “imagination” in the modern sense:

> But if we can get away for a moment from [the mental] “faculties” analysis [based on modern literary scholars assumption that “our understanding of the process of composition is the natural one”], and think instead of human cognition in terms of paths or “ways” (like the *via* of the ancient liberal arts), and then focus on the cognitive way called “composition,” we can see that this process can be presented and analyzed as “recollective,” because it was assumed to involve acts of remembering, mnemonic activities which pull in or “draw” (*tractare*, a medieval Latin word for composing) other memories. The result was what we now call “using our imagination,” even to the point of visionary experience. But medieval people called it “recollection,” and they were neither wrong nor foolish nor naive to do so.⁴

> Although Carruthers supports this statement with a textual analysis of John Cassian’s (360-435) writings, her model of “human cognition in terms of paths or ‘ways’” as something inseparable from “acts of remembering, mnemonic activities” provides invaluable insight into understanding the peculiar ways in which poets in the *insei* period embraced historical precedents even in their own compositions. Unlike the earlier institutional Way or a specific

---

④ Carruthers, p 70.
curriculum at the State Academy, the emerging Way in medieval Japan was spontaneous and highly emotive, epitomized by its dissemination through *setsuwa* (説話, anecdotal tales).

Loosely defined as “tales,” or anecdotal prose writings, *setsuwa* were not merely a reconstructed literary genre, but rather a mode of cognition and self-expression. In fact, one of the most peculiar phenomena in the cultural production of twelfth-century Japan was the retrospective nature of almost everything written in that society. Be they courtiers’ kanbun diaries, biographies, waka treatises and anthologies, or historical narratives, the present was always viewed through the lens of the past. By the time of the *Shinkokinshū*, through the production of numerous poetic treatises that discuss specific expressions found in the existing waka discourses, certain fixed notions regarding these expressions came to be shared by poets. Called “poetic essence” (*本意, *hon’i*), the ability to recall specific narrative situations associated with words and phrases became an important aspect of waka composition during the *insei* period.

When Fujiwara no Teika elaborated the compositional technique of “allusive variation” (*本歌取, *honkadori*) in his waka treatises, he was not merely advising waka novices, including the third *shōgun* Minamoto Sanetomo (源実朝, 1192-1219), how to use old diction in their compositions. Rather, Teika emphasized that the composition of waka was primarily a spontaneous act of integrating oneself with the collective memory of early Japan through one’s imagination. The primary purpose of the present study, then, is to explore how seemingly heterogeneous writings from twelfth-century Japan all share the characteristics of *setsuwa*: retrospective, illustrative, and thus memorable.
The Master said, ‘I set my heart on the Way, base myself on virtue, lean upon benevolence for support and take my recreation in the arts.’

(Confucius, The Analects, 7:6.)

Introduction

1. An Overview

This dissertation proposes a new intellectual history of Japan from the late eighth through the early thirteenth centuries by tracing the trajectories of two of the country’s oldest poetic traditions—waka and kanshi. Waka are poems composed in vernacular Japanese, normally in the fixed format of thirty-one syllables, whereas kanshi, more varied in form and length, are poems composed in Chinese style by Japanese poets. The exact origins of waka and kanshi practices are unknown, but the earliest extant anthologies of the respective genres in Japan, the Man'yōshū and the Kaifūsō, both date from the mid-to-late eighth century.

I will argue that the twelfth century was a pivotal period in the history of Japan because the institution of the State Academy (大学寮), especially its most prestigious literary and history curriculum, Kidendō (紀伝道, “the Way of annals and biographies”) entered a period of decline, leaving the legacy of academy-trained literati as purveyors of poetry and cultural refinement in the hands of emerging waka scholars. But while the more pragmatic and politically attuned curriculum, Myōgyōdō (明経道, the study of Confucian Classics) was revived at the end of the

twelfth century, the demise of Kidendō did not put an end to *kangaku* (漢学, Chinese studies) in Japan. The present study will attempt to demonstrate that while new intellectual trends, such as Myōgyōdō, had not yet taken hold in the Academy, the practice of waka composition incorporated the style of early Chinese literary studies in a short period of time, while commentaries on waka formed a canon that eventually came to define Japanese cultural identity in the subsequent centuries. These evolutionary changes in the nature of academic studies can be understood in part by examining the word *michi*.

Literally meaning “road” or “path,” the word *michi* (道, Ch. dao) has long been used figuratively in China and Japan, and is most often translated as “Way.” Historically, perhaps the best known instance is the ancient Daoist philosopher Laozi’s (traditionally dated to 6th century BCE) book *Dao de jing* (道徳経), which provides multifaceted, often ambiguous expositions of the term. In Japan, by the early eighth century, the Academy was established as an organ of the centralized state, with a hierarchical system of professors (博士, hakase) and students (学生, gakushō). Education was provided for the sons of middle-ranking bureaucrats, who aspired to succeed in officialdom by mastering the specialized knowledge found in the Confucian Classics and other Chinese literary and philosophical texts. In this institutional climate, the term *michi* came to represent individual “curriculums” taught in the Academy. By the end of the ninth century, the Academy offered students four clearly defined “paths”: Myōgyō, Kidendō, Myōbōdō (明法道, studies of legal codes), and Sandō (算道, astrology). In this regard, the term *michi* is analogous to the Latin terms, *via* (“path”) and *artus* (“strait”), which were applied to the ancient
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2. For more details, see Ishimura, vol. 1, pp. 69-73; Momo, pp. 62-132.
and medieval practices of the liberal arts in Europe.3

Based on the evolution of these academic studies (michi) in Japanese society during the eighth through twelfth centuries, the present study proposes to use the term as a paradigm for the sociological and psychological characteristics of intellectual activity in Japan during the period. It will focus on three aspects of the term michi. Firstly, as professions that are maintained through the hereditary transmission of knowledge within clans (氏 uji) and families (家 ie). For instance, the Monjōin (文章院, “Literature Hall”), a residential facility for students specializing in the Kidendō track, was established during the Jōwa era (834-48) under the auspices of the Ōe and Sugawara clans, who held the majority of key posts in the Academy during the heyday of the Kidendō.4

Secondly, michi lies at the heart of the Confucian-influenced master-disciple relationship, admission to which was open to highly qualified students from other family backgrounds. This appears to contradict my supposition that michi referred primarily to occupations practiced by particular families. However, we need to understand that a genuine sense of devotion to certain professions is often observed among individuals who chose to follow the paths of those whom they considered worthy and inspiring. For example, Sugawara and Ōe scholars were, formally speaking, rivals, but their actual literary compositions reveal a great deal of literary borrowing and exchange. Furthermore, there were a number of highly talented academicians who did not belong to either of the clans, but who nonetheless studied under leading Sugawara or Ōe scholars.

3. For discussion of the Trivium (Lat. three paths)–grammar, rhetoric, and dialectics, and the Quadrivium (Lat. four paths)–arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy, the seven subjects comprising the liberal arts in the European Middle Ages, see Curtius, pp. 37-38. Unlike Seven Liberal Arts in Europe, curriculum of which was comprehensive and sequential, students in Heian Japan chose one of the four tracks of Myōgyō, Kidendō, Myōbōdō and Sandō.

4. For a detailed study of the consolidation of the Kidendō track and Monjōin, see Momo, pp. 132-243.
academicians, and produced some of the most innovative literary anthologies of their time. Prime examples are Yoshishige no Yasutane’s (滋治保胤, ?-1002) *Nihon ōjō gokuraku ki* (日本往生極楽記, *Record of Rebirths in Paradise in Japan*, 983-85) and Fujiwara no Akihira’s (藤原明衡, 989-1066) *Honchō monzui* (本朝文粹, *Literary Masterpieces of Japan*, ca. 1058-65). The master-disciple relationship in which students primarily had the freedom to choose their teachers, either in person or imaginatively through the textual appropriation of their teachers’ works in their own compositions, gave them a sense of identity and pride. By espousing the ideal of *suki* (数寄, “poetic passion”), waka poets of the twelfth century embraced the master-disciple relationship as a social and psychological basis for their own innovative waka practice.

Thirdly, *michi* also refers to the transmission of knowledge mediated through the interpretation of classical texts. For example, the Sugawara and Ōe scholars passed down their own understanding of the canonical works in the Kidendō curriculum, including the *Shiji* (史記, *Records of the Grand Historian*, ca. 91 BCE), the *Hanshu* (漢書, *History of the Former Han Dynasty*, ca. 82 AD), the *Hou Hanshu* (後漢書, *History of the Later Han Dynasty*, ca. 432), and the *Wenxuan* (文選, *Literary Anthology*, 6th century). Due to the paucity of surviving source material from the pre-twelfth century period, the exegetical techniques developed by the Sugawara and Ōe academicians cannot be reconstructed systematically.\(^5\) However, judging from fragmentary references made by Ōe no Masafusa (大江匡房, 1041-1111) in his *Gōdanshō* (江談抄, *Notes on Dialogues with Masafusa*, ca. 1107-11), their main concern was how to “read” (*yomu* 読む, more precisely, to “apply Japanese reading to” *kundoku* 訓読) the Chinese

\(^5\) For discussion of the exegetic practice of the *Wenxuan* in early Japan, see Chapter 1 of Brian Steininger’s dissertation.
texts in stylistically refined, yet aurally pleasing Japanese. We also know from a variety of sources that the Sugawaras and Ōes had their own family libraries, that consisted of manuscripts, the interlinear markings in which presumably preserved each school’s methods of reading.

One objective of this dissertation is to show how the particular trend of kangaku studies that thrived during the eighth through eleventh centuries served as a model for twelfth-century waka poets in the latter’s revival of the ancient practice of waka as a medium for cultivating cultural refinement and Japanese identity. However, the present study will not simply promote an evolutionist narrative, i.e., that when Kidendō declined, the study of waka emerged as an alternative “Way.” Rather, by pointing out parallel structures in pre-twelfth century kangaku on the one hand and twelfth-century kagaku (歌学, waka studies) on the other, I examine the particular roles that poetry played in the formation and the sustenance of these two intellectual movements in the ensuing centuries.

Considering the long history of waka, it is indeed curious that while it evolved as a literary practice as early as the eighth century, it only became an object of scholarly pursuit in the twelfth century. Waka were composed by both male and female members of the aristocracy, and actively exchanged among themselves in the form of personal correspondence during those early centuries. According to the waka poet Fujiwara no Kiyosuke (藤原清輔, 1104-77), there were no formal master-disciple relationships among waka poets until Priest Nōin (能因, 988-active 1051) became a student of Fujiwara no Nagatō (藤原長能, 949?-active 1005). Kiyosuke also recounts how waka poets in the late eleventh century, mostly male, middle-ranking officers whose main duties were to serve in the provinces as governors or their assistants, came to revere

---

Nōin for his “passion” (suki) for poetry, and emulated him as a model. Without institutional affiliation, these self-styled poets’ spontaneous efforts to differentiate themselves from the rest of the aristocracy as “aficionados” (好き者) of waka set the stage for the revival of waka in the twelfth century.

After Nōin and his male followers, Minamoto no Toshiyori’s (源俊頼, 1055?-1129?) waka treatise, the Toshiyori zuinō (俊頼髄脑, Toshiyori’s Principles of Waka, ca. 1111-15), marked another turning point in the literary history of waka. Originally commissioned by Regent Fujiwara no Tadazane (藤原忠実, 1078-1162) for his daughter’s education as a future empress, the somewhat eccentric and digressive Toshiyori zuinō provides anecdotal rather than philological commentaries on ancient expressions. The contents of the Toshiyori zuinō may not be what a modern reader expects in a poetic treatise, but the fact that such a book was widely circulated suggests that by this time, many of the expressions from the Man'yōshū and the Kokin wakashū (古今和歌集, Collection of Japanese Poems from Ancient Times to the Present, 905) were no longer readily understood by readers without the aid of commentaries. Although Toshiyori zuinō itself is not a scholarly book, the many etymological conundrums it presents soon became the object of avid scrutiny by waka poets in the mid-twelfth century.

After Toshiyori, more rigorous study of waka was taken up by the two branches of the Fujiwara clan—the Rokujō (六条) and the Mikohidari (御子左). It should be noted that while the earlier Chinese studies were represented by larger family units, or uji (氏 clans), twelfth-century waka studies developed along with the smaller units, or ie (家 houses), within the existing clans.7

7. In his book Nikki no ie, the social historian Matsuzono Hitoshi (松岡斎) examines the role of kanbun
Aside from the Rokujō and Mikohidari, Fujiwara no Akihira’s line of the Fujiwara family, Fujiwara Shiki-ke (藤原式家) is an example of a new scholarly household. The reorganization of the existing aristocratic clans into smaller units with their own household specialties in the arts and court service in the mid-to-late twelfth century suggests that this was the only way the majority of aristocrats could survive in the increasingly volatile society. Historically speaking, uji and ie are not synonymous. Nevertheless, on a superficial level, the rivalry between the leading “waka houses” (和歌の家), the Rokujō and the Mikohidari, is analogous to the relation between the Sugawara and Ōe clans in the previous centuries.

The Rokujō school of waka, founded by Fujiwara no Akisue (藤原顯季, 1055-1123), incorporated various formalities of kanshi practice in their waka-centered activities. For instance, like the kanshi poets who deified the scholar-official Sugawara no Michizane (菅原道真, 845-903) as Tenjin (天神, Heavenly God), Akisue established the rite known as Hitomaro eigu (人麻呂影供, Offering to Hitomaro’s Portrait), in which the Man’yōshū poet Kakinomoto no Hitomaro (栞本人麻呂, active late seventh century) was revered as the God of Waka. The setsuwa collection, Kokon chomonjū (古今著聞集, Collections of Old and New Famous Tales, 1254) recounts how the portrait of Hitomaro used by Akisue for liturgical purposes was passed diaries (日記, nikki) in the transformation of the concept of household (ie) from that of ancient “courtly noblemen” (王朝貴族) to “medieval houses” (中世的な「家」). (Matsuzono, p. 204.) Throughout the book, he argues that the late twelfth century was a turning point in Japanese history, because the decline of the state as the official “record-keeping organization” (記録組織) during this period inevitably prompted individual aristocratic families to hold onto their own “stock” of information regarding court service, preserved in the form of kanbun diaries. (Ibid, pp. 334-5.)

8. However, unlike the Rokujō and Mikohidari houses of waka, the Fujiwara Shiki house ran the State Academy as the last guardians of the Kidendō tradition, after the death of Ōe no Masafusa.
on to his third son Akisuke (顕輔), because Akisue insisted that “no biological son of [his was] permitted to inherit [the portrait] unless he excelled in this Way [the art of waka].”

Akisuke’s waka studies were taken over by his son Kiyosuke. According to the modern literary scholar Asada Tōru (浅田徹), Kiyosuke finally consolidated the authority of the Rokujō family as a purveyor of specialized knowledge of waka, by collating his own in-house editions of the canonical texts of waka, such as the Man’yōshū and the Kokinshū, and by transmitting them to a small number of his relatives. In this regard, Asada’s conclusion that only after Kiyosuke “waka houses” became further professionalized as “waka specialists” (歌道家) is reasonable.

Kiyosuke’s awareness of being a legitimate heir to the Kidendō legacy is evinced by his humorous signature as “Kiyosuke, a scholarship student of waka” (和歌得業生清輔, waka tokugōshō kiyosuke) in the colophon of his own manuscript of the Kokinshū. At the State Academy, two “scholarship students in Literature” (文章得業生, monjō tokugōshō) were selected from some four hundred students by examination, which included the composition of kanshi, but a “scholarship student of waka” is an entirely imaginary post. Likewise, some recensions of Kiyosuke’s waka treatise, Fukurozōshi (袋草子, The Pocket Book, 1157) contain

9. 実子なりともこの道にたへざらん者には、伝ふべからず。SNK 59, p. 263.
11. Pointed out in Note 18 in the Fukurozōshi (SNKBT 29, p. 51.) In the marginalia of the Fukurozōshi, Kiyosuke also referred to himself as “a former scholarship student of waka Yamabe no Sukune” (前和歌得業生山辺宿補), a parody on the name of the Man’yōshū poet, Yamabe no Akahito (山辺赤人). Similarly, Kiyosuke signed his waka treatise Ōgishō (奧義抄, Secret Notes, ca. 1124-44) as “edited by the former scholarship student of waka Kakinoshita no Mitsura” (前和歌得業生柿下躬撰), also a parody on the names of the Kokinshū redactors, Ōshikōchi no Mitsune (凡河内躬恒, active early tenth century) and Ki no Tsurayuki (紀貫之, ca. 868- ca.945).
Kiyosuke’s self-description as “Fujiwara, an old Confucian scholar of waka” (和歌旧儒藤原).\footnote{12}{This name does not appear in the SNKBT edition of the Fukurozōshi, but is discussed in the “kaidai,” pp. 489-491. For more detailed analyses of this and other names used by Kiyosuke, see Nishimura, pp. 190-194.}

Even Fujiwara no Teika (藤原定家, 1162-1241), a scion of the Mikohidari school, praised Kiyosuke’s encyclopedic knowledge of waka lore by calling him a “Confucian master of Waka.”\footnote{13}{清輔朝臣は和歌の儒士也。This comment appears in Teika’s waka treatise, Kenchū mikkan (顕注密勘). Quoted in Nishimura, p. 175.}

However, Teika’s father, Fujiwara no Shunzei (藤原俊成, 1114-1204) was an outspoken critic of the Rokujō poet-scholars’ ostentatious imitation of literati culture. It cannot be denied that Shunzei’s own theory of waka initially grew out of his distaste for Kiyosuke’s informative yet somewhat uncritical approach to waka as poetry. Nevertheless, Shunzei launched the Mikohidari school as an alternative to the Rokujō school, by emphasizing the difference between the Chinese literary tradition and the composition of waka. For example, in his waka treatise, Korai fūteishō (古来風跡抄, Commentary on Ancient and New Styles of Waka, 1197, revised 1201), Shunzei condescendingly calls kanshi “that which kangaku scholars regard as poetry,”\footnote{14}{漢家の詩など申もの. KKS7, p. 46.} and criticizes many rules about the format and rhyme schemes of kanshi composition, while praising waka for its relative simplicity and spontaneity. Shunzei goes so far as to claim that waka is so profound that perfection in the composition of waka is unattainable, whereas kanshi composition can be mastered through practice. Compared to Kiyosuke’s lighthearted imitation of scholarly mannerisms, it is easy to discern cultural chauvinism in Shunzei’s defense of waka.
However, it is erroneous to conclude that Shunzei completely dismissed the Chinese-style literary tradition. On the contrary, unlike Kiyosuke, Shunzei was aware that kanshi and waka were both respectable forms of “poetry,” that made imaginative use of language, although he does not state this explicitly in the *Korai futeisho*. For that matter, Kiyosuke’s waka treatises, such as the Ōgishō (*Secret Notes*, ca. 1124-44) and the *Fukurozōshi*, do not rule out the superiority of kanshi over waka, either. Read uncritically, the waka treatises from the mid-to-late twelfth century are no more than anthologies of ancient lore and exemplary poems. In other words, while providing source material indispensable for the understanding of the historical development of waka, neither Kiyosuke or Shunzei expounds on individual topics or poems in a way modern readers would expect to find in poetry treatises.\(^{15}\)

The fundamentally open-ended nature of twelfth-century waka treatises suggests that either the authors assumed that their readers were capable of relating their own life situations to the body of knowledge presented in the written texts, or that the authors further circulated comments on their treatises orally or privately to qualified and interested individuals. In either case, unlike waka treatises attributed to Fujiwara no Teika during the first few decades of the thirteenth century, which are replete with more explicit and practical advice on how to compose waka, Kiyosuke and Shunzei’s texts need to be approached obliquely. The critical study of waka, Kiyosuke and Shunzei’s texts need to be approached obliquely. The critical study of

\(^{15}\) Unlike Kiyosuke and Shunzei’s treatises, texts written by Kenshō (顕昭), Kiyosuke’s half-brother and an active member of the Rokujō School, tend to provide more focused, in-depth analyses of individual topics. For example, his *Kakinomoto no hitomaro ason kannon* (柿本人麻呂朝臣人麻呂勘文, 1184) discusses various mysteries concerning the biography of Kakinomoto no Hitomaro, whereas his philological magnum opus *Shūchūshō* (袖中抄, *Sleeve Notes*, 20 vols., 1185-90) expounds on over one-hundred poetic locutions, by meticulously citing both Chinese and Japanese sources. For a discussion of the important sub-genre in twelfth-century waka studies, *kannon* (勘文, lit. “research reports”, monographs, originally a genre in Sino-Japanese composition), including one written by Kiyosuke on Hitomaro, see Nishimura, pp. 47-69.
twelfth-century *kagaku* texts begins by questioning what the authors left unspoken.

In fact, looking back on the historical development of kanshi and waka, the paths of the two poetic traditions crossed during the reign of Emperor Daigo (r. 897-930, 885-930). Popularly called the Engi era (延喜, 901-23), this period witnessed two of the most important events in the cultural history of early Japan: the death of the scholar-official Sugawara no Michizane (菅原道真, 845-903) in exile in Kyūshū, and the compilation of the first imperial anthology of waka, *Kokinshū* in 905. On the one hand, the banishment of Michizane led to the disgracing of Kidendō officialdom by the emerging Fujiwara regents and their political acolytes. Concurrently, shortly after his death, Michizane came to be venerated as Japan’s first genuine kanshi poet, who was able to internalize the techniques of poetry composition as a means of expressing his own thoughts and feelings. Disillusioned with the lack of meritocracy, academicians after Michizane turned to expressing themselves through poetry, rather than by using their literary skills in pursuing the Confucian ideal of “state building” (経国, *keikoku*). On the other hand, two prefaces to the *Kokinshū*, one written in vernacular Japanese by a waka poet, and the other in Chinese by a kangaku scholar, define waka as a creative product of the human mind, as opposed to more objective knowledge and scholarship.

The acknowledgement of waka as a form of poetry, based on human psychology and the imagination responding to external sensory stimuli, must have challenged Kidendō academicians, because that was precisely how they themselves perceived kanshi, especially after Michizane. In order to protect the scholarly image of the Sugawara and Ōe families as Confucian households (儒家, *juka*), during the tenth and eleventh centuries, top academicians
from these clans camouflaged their increasingly private and apolitical literary activities under the rubric of “Confucian refinement” (儒雅, juga). They also began, euphemistically, to refer to the composition of kanshi as fūgetsu (風月, the wind and the moon) and claimed that their ability to engage in the practice of fūgetsu was a gift inherited from their ancestors. In the meantime, after the Kokinshū, scholar-officials established the norm of referring to waka as one form of the fūzoku (風俗, native customs) of Japan, while reserving the epithet fūgetsu–also a synonym of “poetic refinement” (風流, fūryū)–for their own practice of the composition of kanshi poems.

Considering the fundamental similarities between kanshi and waka as manifestations of poetic language, as envisioned by practitioners of both genres at the beginning of the tenth century, in retrospect, neither the decline of the Kidendō in the twelfth century nor waka poets’ appropriation of the literati’s nurturing of “poetic refinement” is surprising. Nevertheless, the transformation of waka from fūzoku to fūgetsu took about one century, beginning shortly after the compilation of the Honchō monzui (ca. 1058-65?), wherein the dichotomy of waka-fūzoku and kanshi-fūgetsu is set out succinctly.

Beyond its original role as a sample book of Sino-Japanese compositions in various literary genres (文体, buntai) that were in vogue in Japan during the tenth and eleventh centuries, as a literary anthology, the Honchō monzui provides vivid portraits of Kidendō-trained scholar-officials at the time. In this regard, Ōe no Masafusa’s prolific output at the turn of the twelfth century enriched the literati’s universe first documented through the Honchō monzui, and made it accessible to the wider aristocratic audience of new imperial Japan administered by retired emperors, by adding his own commentaries on the lives of historical scholar-officials and their
imperial patrons, in the form of anecdotal tales.

2. Primary Sources

One of the most curious characteristics of the *insei* period as a cultural paradigm is the sheer amount of biographical and commentarial literature produced, many of the texts remarkable for their length. *Insei* texts capture and preserve the historical realities of the diminishing imperial state in the form of fragmentary tales, called *setsuwa* (說話, anecdotal tales) by modern literary historians. In this regard, Ōe Masafusa was one of the innovators of *setsuwa*, which can be regarded not merely as a literary genre, but also as a mode of cognition, a body of recollective narrative, and even a way of life that enabled individuals to reconnect with the past. To cite one example, the *Gōdanshō* is a collection of spoken discourse attributed to Masafusa. One of its most widely disseminated editions, the Ruijūbon (類聚本, Topically Categorized Recension), consists of six books and contains some 445 anecdotes, many of which feature Kidendō scholars and their imperial patrons from earlier centuries. The *Zoku honchō ōjōden* (續本朝往生伝, *Biographies of Those Reborn in Paradise in Japan II*, ca. 1099-1104) is a collection of forty-two biographies by Masafusa of individuals from the tenth and the eleventh centuries, who are believed at the time to have achieved rebirth in the Buddhist Pure Land. As its title suggests, Masafusa intended it to be a sequel to Yoshishige no Yasutane’s Buddhist hagiography, *Nihon ōjō gokuraku ki* (985-87).

In this way, twelfth-century authors’ and anthology compilers’ treatment of the history of imperial Japan as an entirety is exemplified by their tendency to produce literary compendiums meant to be read as sequels to their predecessors. For instance, the historical narrative *Ōkagami*
(大鏡, *The Great Mirror*, early 12th century), written in vernacular Japanese, covers fourteen imperial reigns between 850 and 1036, and is thus a sequel to the early official chronologies of Japan (六国史, “Six Chronicles of Japan”), compiled sporadically between 720 and 901, which record the history of the country from its mythological origins through 887. Moreover, the Ōkagami itself was followed by another vernacular historical narrative, the *Imakagami* (今鏡, *The Mirror of the Present*, ca. 1170), which covers the years 1016 to 1181. Written in Chinese, Fujiwara no Akihira’s *Honchō monzui* was followed by the *Honchō zoku monzui* (本朝続文経, *Literary Masterpieces of Japan II*, ca. 1155-63). Toward the end of the *insei* period, this trend culminated in the compilation of the *Shinkokin wakashū* (新古今和歌集, *A New Collection of Japanese Poems from Ancient Times to the Present*, 1205), a *New Kokinshū*.

The sheer volume of these vernacular histories and literary anthologies certainly poses a challenge for modern readers. While relying heavily on *insei* texts as historical sources, in particular the *Imakagami* and the *Konjaku monogatarishū* (今昔物語集, *Collection of Tales of from Times Now Past*, ca. 1120), a *setsuwa* collection by an anonymous editor, the present study attempts to listen to the critical voices of anthology compilers as expressed in their lacunae, rather than taking what they describe at face value.

In this regard, I consider the *Honchō monzui* to be the most important forerunner of the numerous anthologies produced during the *insei* period. By selecting Chinese writings, both prose and verse, composed by Japanese literati from the ninth through the mid-eleventh centuries, Akihira not only preserved the voices of Kidendō scholars in public and private settings, but also canonized them as the finest authors in pre-*insei* Japan. But it was Masafusa,
Akihira’s student and a product of the culture that created the *Honchō monzui*, who opened the insular world of the literati to the wider aristocratic (and later, non-aristocratic) audience of medieval Japan.

3. Existing Scholarship

Because the present study proposes a new intellectual history of eighth to early-thirteenth century Japan through textual analyses of *kangaku* and *kagaku* discourse from these centuries, it necessarily relies on an enormous body of scholarship dealing with both poetic traditions. Firstly, among studies on kangaku in early Japan, the first volume of Ōsone Shōsuke’s (1929-93) posthumously published collected works, *Nihon kangungaku ronshū* (1998) and Satō Michio’s *Heian kōki Nihon kanbungaku no kenkyū* (2003) proved instrumental in formulating my thinking. In particular, Ōsone’s essay, “Fūgetsu kō–Sugawara no Michizane wo chūshin to shite” (「風月」執—菅原道真を中心にして, “On ‘the Wind and the Moon’—Before and After Sugawara no Michizane”) opened my eyes to a reconsideration of kanshi as “psychological poetry,” on a par with waka, as discussed in the *Kokinshū* prefaces. Satō’s book provides important insights for understanding Ōe Masafusa’s difficult kanbun composition. His chapter on Masafusa’s reception of the *Wenxuan* offers an excellent literary criticism of Masafusa’s long poems composed during his years as Acting Governor General of Dazaifu.

Brian Steininger’s unpublished dissertation, *Poetic Ministers: Literacy and Bureaucracy in the Tenth-Century State Academy* (2010) is an important study of the lives and works of tenth-century Kidendō academicians, and provides socio-historical and linguistic material.

16. For the Japanese rendition of the names of the scholars and books mentioned here, see bibliography.
indispensable to an understanding of the culture of Japan’s “Sinitic” literary tradition. Steininger’s dissertation also contains a chapter on the scholar-official, Minamoto no Shitagō (源順, 911-83), one Kidendō giant from the tenth century, whose compositions the present study does not examine in detail. In discussing the early convergence of kangaku and waka cultures, Shitagō is important because he is considered one of the first “poets versed in both Chinese and Japanese literature.”

For studies on Ōe no Masafusa, Kawaguchi Hisao’s biography, Ōe no Masafusa (1968) is a classic, but the author’s tendency not to cite historical sources properly inevitably frustrates contemporary readers accustomed to a more precise approach to historical texts. A series of essays by Komine Kazuaki on Masafusa’s various “records” (記, ki) and Buddhist prayers (願文, ganmon, “vows”), all included in his Inseiki bungakuron (2006), provides valuable introductions to Masafusa’s prose writings. Yamazaki Makoto’s Gō totoku nagon ganmon shū chūkai (2010) is a much awaited, completely annotated version of Masafusa’s 120 vows. Although presented in the form of commentaries, Yamazaki’s in-depth analyses of Masafusa’s vows demonstrate the peculiar ways in which “Royal Laws” (王法, ōhō) and “Buddhist Laws” (仏法, buppō) overlapped during the insei period. The publication of Iso Mizue’s new biography of Masafusa, Ōe no Masafusa–sekigaku no bunjin kanryō (2010) is noteworthy.

In English, there is no book-length study of Masafusa, but Chapter 3 of Fredric Kotas’ unpublished dissertation, Ōjōden: Accounts of Rebirth in the Pure Land (1987), provides a concise, well-documented biography. Marian Ury’s article, “The Oe Conversations” (1993) contains a short biography of Masafusa, based on Kawaguchi’s book, along with annotated


For studies on the insei period, the five-volume multi-author collection of essays, Inseiki buka ronshū (2001-5) provides a gateway to insei culture as a whole, from the point of view not only of literary historians, but also of experts in political theory, legal studies, social history, sociology, linguistics, urban studies, Buddhist studies, and the performing arts. Komine’s opening essay visualizes the insei period as a cultural paradigm, and the present study is inspired by this approach. Social historian Cameron Hurst’s Insei: Abdicated Sovereigns in the Politics of Late Heian Japan 1086-1185 (1976) provides useful historical background for understanding the evolution of the institution of insei. However, in light of recent revisionist histories by Motoki Yasuo and Mikawa Kei, whose works attempt to provide new “holistic narratives of political history,” rather than structural analyses of particular institutions, such as in no chō (院庁, retired emperors’ office), which is the focus of Hurst’s book, a new social historiography of insei Japan in English is needed.

For scholarship on the formation of waka studies in the long twelfth century, due to the inestimable number of secondary sources in Japanese on the subject, covering virtually every aspect of literary texts (and even every edition of particular texts), poetry events, and their

authors and participants, a comprehensive summary cannot be provided here. However, regarding certain texts and authors’ names mentioned in the bibliographical catalogue, “Koseki kasho mokuroku” (古蹟歌書目録, “An Old Manuscript Catalogue of Books on Waka”), the complete annotated translation of which I provide in Appendix I, I refer to noteworthy scholarship in my annotations to the catalogue. Also in the bibliography, I provide a complete list of primary sources of kagaku texts, such as waka anthologies and treatises from the twelfth century, with multiple editions by different modern commentators.

In sum, few modern Japanese scholars have attempted to construct an intellectual history of insei Japan by means of close textual analyses of both kangaku and kagaku discourses. The work that comes closest to the scope of the present study is Konishi Jin’ichi’s (1915-2007) three-volume study of Kūkai’s kanshi treatise, Bunkyō hifuron (Discussion of the Treasury of Literary Models, 6 vols., ca. 809-20). In the second volume of this study, Konishi gives comparative analyses of the historical developments of “kanshi maladies” (詩病, shibyō) and “waka maladies” (歌病, kabyō) in Japan, even including the latter’s far-reaching influence on medieval renga (連歌, linked-verse).

Even more pertinent to the present study is Konishi’s book, Michi–chūsei no ninen (1975), wherein he calls michi a “central principle that forms the core of a particular epoch.” This book offers a somewhat dry narrative history of the literary arts (文芸史, bungei-shi) in Japan’s Middle Ages (中世, chūsei)—the period between the late twelfth through the mid-

---

20. Konishi (1951), pp. 22-123.
sixteenth centuries, as he defines it. Still, his understanding of the twelfth century as “a period during which criticism flourished, something quite unusual for Japan”\(^\text{22}\) and “a time which witnessed the early stages of the formation of the concept of *michi*”\(^\text{23}\) is incisive. Because I consider *michi* to be a historical construct of the Kidendō academicians of the ninth through eleventh centuries, I disagree with Konishi’s view that it was formulated as late as the twelfth century. However, his theory of *michi* as “something materialized through specialization, heredity, standardization, universality and authority”\(^\text{24}\) proves highly insightful, even in examining the nature of kangaku scholarship in pre-twelfth-century Japan.

The literary scholar Kawahira Hitoshi (1947-2006) further developed Konishi’s theory of *michi* in his article, “Kagaku to kadō” (歌学と歌道, 1989), in which he examines interacting tendencies in the history of *kagaku* and *kadō* (歌道, the Way of Waka).\(^\text{25}\) Narrowly defining *kagaku* as “analytical or comprehensive academic studies on waka,”\(^\text{26}\) or more broadly as “all theories of waka, including so called *karon*–compositional principles of waka,”\(^\text{27}\) Kawahira points out that unlike Western poetics, which in his mind is epitomized by Aristotle but not by other important literary figures such as Horace, *kagaku* is always presented through the

\(^{22}\) Ibid., p. 25.

\(^{23}\) Ibid., p. 18.

\(^{24}\) Ibid., p. 15.

\(^{25}\) Originally published in the journal *Kokubungaku kaishaku to kyōzai no kenkyū*, vol. 34-12 (1989): 66-73. This article is included in his collection of articles, *Chūsei waka ron* (中世和歌論, 2003).

\(^{26}\) Kawahira, p. 814.

\(^{27}\) Ibid.
perspective of waka poets. In Kawahira’s view, Aristotle’s poetics, for instance, is characterized by the “tendency to objectify and academically scrutinize ‘every detail’ regarding poetry.”

Noting that such approach was rare among waka poets, he acknowledges that certain objectification of waka composition took place in the mid- to the late twelfth century, thus echoing Konishi’s assessment of the insei period as an age during which “criticism flourished.”

In contrast to his detailed exposition of kagaku, Kawahira somewhat hastily ascribes his own analytical thinking to Shunzei’s understanding of the term michi. By pointing out how Shunzei repeatedly refers to the term in his preface to the seventh imperial anthology of waka, Senzai wakashū (千載和歌集, Collection of Japanese Poems for Thousands Years, 1183), Kawahira argues that although he primarily conceived of michi “in association with Japanese and Chinese poetry and prose writings, Shunzei also envisioned it from the viewpoint of ‘literature’ (文),” which transcends the individual frameworks of Japanese and Chinese literature. Kawahira also presumes that although Shunzei was a waka poet, he was cognizant of the “more universal [role of] linguistic representation or poésie.” Whether Shunzei himself conceived of poetry in such metaphysical terms, which lie beyond the comfort zone of kagaku, is highly questionable. Nevertheless, Kawahira’s notion that the term michi embodies “certain frameworks of intellectual history” (思想史的背景) is important, and the present study also aspires to use the term in this manner.

28. 詩についての「あらゆる事柄」を対象化して学的吟味を施そうとする観点. Ibid.

29. 和漢の詩文と共に、しかもそれらを超えた一層広い「文」の次元を見据える眼で見られてい る。Ibid., p. 815.

30. より高次の言語表現あるいは詩（ポエジー）を見つめる視点。Ibid.
Despite the importance of the *insei* period in both the social and literary histories of Japan, surprisingly few studies have been published in English. Although some studies of individual texts, poets, poetry events, and compositional techniques of waka from Japan’s long twelfth century exist, there are no book-length studies on the literary production of this period with the exception of Robert Huey’s *The Making of Shinkokinshū* (2002). Likewise, except for Helen McCullough’s translation of the Ōkagami, and annotated translations of relatively short waka treatises written at the turn of the thirteenth century by Shinkokinshū poets, such as Fujiwara no Teika and Retired Emperor GoToba, complete translations of key literary works from the *insei* period are still unavailable in English. (The eleventh century literary anthology *Honchō monzui* also remains untranslated.) Because of these lacunae, I try to provide translations of compositions and passages from these texts, whenever they relate to my arguments.

Finally, Robert Brower and Earl Miner’s venerable *Japanese Court Poetry* (1961) deserves mention here. This book, dedicated to Konishi Jin’ichi, contains an extensive chapter

31. For example, Katō (1968) introduces Kamo no Chōmei’s (鴨長明, 1155?-1216) waka treatise, *Mumyōshō* (無名抄, Nameless Notes, ca. 1211-16). Shirane (1990) examines Shunzei’s poetics from the viewpoint of intertextuality. Bialock (1994) expounds on the compositional technique of *honka dori* (本歌取, allusive variations), through close textual analyses of many poems from the *Shinkokinshū*. Edward Kamens discusses quite a few poems composed by pivotal twelfth-century figures, including Ōe no Masafusa’s waka composed at the *Horikawa hyakushu* (堀河百首, ca. 1105) and Fujiwara Shunzei’s poem from his personal collection, *Chōshū eisō* (長秋詠藻). (Kamens, pp. 79-82.)

32. See for example, Brower (1972, 1985), Brower and Miner (1967), and Bundy (1994).
on the long twelfth century (in their definition, 1100-1241), which the authors call “the mid-classical period.” This periodization is problematic, because in most Japanese scholarship on both social and literary historiography, “Middle Classical” (中古, chūko) refers to the pre-insei segment of the Heian period (794-1185), namely, the ninth through eleventh centuries. Therefore, calling the twelfth century—the dawn of the “medieval” (chūsei) period, according to Konishi Jin’ichi and others—“Mid-classical” is not only misleading, but erroneous.

Moreover, Brower and Miner’s inclusion of the twelfth century in Japan’s “classical” period reflects the idiosyncratic view that after all, waka is Japanese “court poetry,” as opposed to “traditional” or “classical” poetry. In other words, Brower and Miner view the “medieval” period as contiguous with the age of warriors (according to them, after 1350) which, in the aftermath of the division of the imperial house into the Northern and Southern courts in 1336, witnessed “[t]he final breakdown of the Court government” and consequently “the final decline of the Court tradition,” including that of waka. However, this view is hardly acceptable today because neither the history of waka nor the institution of the imperial household suffered its “final breakdown” in the mid-fourteenth century. One may argue that Brower and Miner’s chronology only concerns the stylistic evolution (and devolution) of waka, thus enabling it to be examined apart from social history. This raises the question of whether a literary history of waka


35. For a recent study of waka from the mid-fourteenth through the mid-nineteenth century, including the discussion of waka’s evolution into modern “tanka” (短歌, “short poems”), see Suzuki and Suzuki (2011), pp. 143-234.
can exist in a vacuum, solely comprised of assessments of “the esthetic of the age” and “poetic techniques and meanings.” Furthermore, the epithet “Japanese court poetry” is problematic because essentially, kanshi was also a mode of court poetry in Japan. Like waka, kanshi continued to be composed by educated members of both aristocratic and non-aristocratic circles even after the decline of Kidendō (e.g. after a brief revival among Zen monks at the Five Mountain monasteries in Kyoto in the fourteenth century, kanshi composition thrived throughout the Edo period [1603-1867] and even into the modern period).

Nevertheless, Brower and Miner’s chapter on the long twelfth century remains the most detailed and comprehensive study of the subject in English today. In particular, their reference to “an idea of poetry as a ‘way of life’ (michi)” has a critical vigor that is rare in recent scholarship:

Theoretically at least, a farmer who pursued his way of life wholeheartedly, a shopkeeper who sold honest goods, and a poet who gave himself up to his art were all faithful adherents to their separate “ways.” But poetry had a longer tradition, was more articulate, and was felt to be inherently superior to many other vocations.

The present study does not support Brower and Miner’s judgment that the Way of poetry was “superior to many other vocations.” However, their intuitive observation that ultimately, michi (in their translation, “ways of life”) refers to an individual’s “wholehearted” and selfless pursuit of the arts and the professions coincides with my understanding of michi as a highly idealized “way of life” guided by the principle of suki (poetic passion), itself a byproduct of the

36. Ibid, p. 231.
37. Ibid., p. 234.
38. Ibid.
transformation of Kidendō-centered Chinese studies to that of waka studies, and the psychological link between the two poetic traditions.

4. Outline

This dissertation consists of three parts. Part One examines the Chinese and Japanese poetic traditions before the twelfth century. Chapter One examines some of the most memorable anecdotes about the academician Ōe no Masahira (952-1012) and his wife, the waka poet Akazome Emon (赤染衛門, active 1041) in the Konjaku monogatari shū (ca. 1120), and affirm that in the early twelfth century, waka (as opposed to other literary and artistic activities, such as the composition of kanshi and musical performance) was not yet considered a Way, something to be studied and pursued rigorously.

Chapter Two analyzes the Honchō monzui and various kanbun compositions featured therein. Prose writings by literati are pertinent to the present study because they provide first-hand insight into the socio-political realities of the pre-twelfth century Kidendō scholar-officials, some of whom, like their Chinese predecessors, rejected the State Academy and officialdom and became recluses or Buddhist monks. Particular attention will be paid to the literary genre (文体) of “kanshi prefices” (詩序, shijo), including the Chinese preface to the Kokinshū.

Chapter Three examines the poetic tradition of Japanese vernacular literature before the twelfth century. I will reintroduce the Chinese preface to the Kokinshū from the viewpoint of a literary history of waka, by comparing it to both its predecessor, the preface to the waka treatise in Chinese, Kakyō hyōshiki (歌経標式, Basic Rules of Waka, 772?), as well as its counterpart,
the Japanese preface to the *Kokinshū*. Moreover, I argue that Nōin, formerly a student in the Kidendō curriculum, was a pivotal figure who bridged the kangaku and waka traditions. I demonstrate this by analyzing Nōin’s preface to his private collection of waka, in which he expresses his desire for public acknowledgment of his skill and passion in the composition of waka.

Part Two examines the life and works of Ōe no Masafusa. Chapter Four provides a biographical study of Masafusa, a pivotal figure in the consolidation of administrations by retired emperors. Drawing largely on his autobiographical essay, “Bonen no ki” (暮年記, “A Record of My Twilight Years,” ca. 1099), originally a kanshi preface attached to the no-longer extant collection of his Chinese poems, I compare his successful official career with the political misfortunes of his ancestors, whose compositions are featured in the *Honchō monzui*. By analyzing Masafusa’s statement that “the moon and the wind” (composition in Chinese) was his “slave” (奴隷), with which he served his patrons as their spokesperson, I argue that Masafusa was acutely aware that academicians no longer made use of their specialized knowledge of the Chinese Classics and skill in Chinese composition for the realization of the Confucian ideal of “building state through literary enterprise” (文章経国, *bunshō keikoku*).

Chapter Five focuses on Masafusa’s Buddhist hagiography, *Zoku honchō ōjōden*, and analyzes the ways in which he recorded the decline of Kidendō and the historical role his family played in pre-twelfth century Chinese studies, through the glorification of some of his ancestors. I also discuss the unique reception of Masafusa’s kanbun diary, *Gōki* (江記, Ōe’s Diary), the wide circulation of which among courtiers before and after Masafusa’s death indicates the
dissolution of the Ōe clan as one of the leading kangaku households in the early twelfth century. Beginning in the twelfth century, courtiers’ kanbun diaries were normally transmitted from one generation to the next within aristocratic families, but the reception of Masafusa’s diary does not follow this pattern. I also analyze Masafusa’s encomium to his first imperial patron, Emperor GoSanjō, and discuss how Masafusa set a precedent by regarding GoSanjō as a sagacious ruler because of his mastery of the Chinese Classics.

In Chapter Six, I analyze Masafusa’s central role in the dissemination of *setsuwa* in medieval Japan. As best exemplified in the *Honchō monzui*, before the twelfth century, Kidendō academicians expressed themselves through Sino-Japanese compositions in various literary genres (*buntai*). Often pragmatic, these scholars nevertheless aspired to compose musically and visually exquisite prose and verse. However, beginning in the twelfth century, another mode of expression, or “literary genre,” in the modern sense, became prevalent in literary texts produced by the Japanese aristocracy: anecdotal narratives (*setsuwa*). Containing biographical details about poets and scholars from the past, the majority of *setsuwa* narratives were written during the *insei* period. Although Masafusa’s *Gōdanshō* (Notes on Dialogues with Ōe Masafusa, ca. 1107-1111) is a collection of his spoken discourse, recorded by an interlocutor, and thus technically speaking not Masafusa’s own writing, it contains numerous tales, slightly modified versions of which were included in other *setsuwa* collections, such as the *Konjaku monogatari shū*. Relying upon the oldest extant manuscript of the *Gōdanshō*, the Kanda Recension (神田本, 1111-15), I examine how Masafusa’s colorful anecdotes about Emperor Daigo and his son Emperor Murakami, and their personal interaction with Kidendō scholars such as Sugawara Fumitoki, became a prototype for subsequent medieval *setsuwa* discourse, with their nostalgic
portrayals of individuals who demonstrate a “passion” (suki) for literary and other aesthetic activities.

Part Three examines how the study of waka became a new scholarly pursuit in the twelfth century. Chapter Seven introduces Minamoto no Toshiyori’s (1055?-1129?) poetry treatise, *Toshiyori zuinō* (*Toshiyori’s Principles of Waka*, ca. 1111-15), which contains his commentary on ancient poetic diction from the *Man’yōshū*, the *Kokinshū* and other waka anthologies, as well as a number of orally transmitted teachings of historical poets and their lives and works. By focusing on one of the most eccentric passages in the book, concerning the ancient expression, “a man who picked bitter herbs” (*seri tsumishi hito*), I discuss how Toshiyori enlivened the otherwise obsolete phrase in the memory of his contemporary readers, while entertaining them with this bizarre anecdotal narrative.

Chapter Eight examines the formation of waka studies (*歌学, kagaku*) as household studies (*家学, kagaku*). I will first examine how Fujiwara no Akisue invented the rite of *Hitomaro eigu* (人磨影供, “An Offering to Hitomaro’s Portrait”), inspired by the biannual ceremony at the State Academy, the *sekiten* (秋饌, “Offering to Confucius”). By consigning the portrait of Hitomaro used in the ceremony, and the privilege of conducting the *Hitomaro eigu* exclusively to his son, Akisue established the tradition of waka studies as a family profession for the first time in Japanese history. I also examine the kangaku scholar Fujiwara no Atsumitsu’ (藤原敦光, 1063-1144, Akihira’s son) personal involvement in Akisue’s waka rite, as well as the fundamentally different attitudes toward the composition of waka demonstrated by Akisue and Minamoto Toshiyori on the
occasion. The second half of this chapter examines the ways in which both Akisue’s and Toshiyori’s approaches to waka were further developed in the philological activities of Fujiwara no Kiyosuke of the Rokujō school and Fujiwara no Shunzei of the Mikohidari school.

In Chapter Nine, I attempt to substantiate my view that by the 1170s, the practice of waka had become a scholarly activity among Japanese courtiers; I seek material evidence for this in the “Koseki kasho mokuroku” (“An Old Manuscript Catalogue of Books on Waka”). Bibliographically speaking, the “Kasho mokuroku” is a highly unstable text, because neither an urtext nor copies made before the Edo period exist. I rely mainly on the modern historian Ōta Shōjirō’s print edition provided in his influential article “Sōkashoshi shosai ‘Koseki kasho mokuroku’” (“『桑華書志』所載「古蹟歌書目録」, “An Old Manuscript Catalogue of Books on Waka” in Maeda Tsunanori’s Japanese and Chinese Bibliography,” 1954). I discuss the significance of this catalogue, assuming that it was compiled under the auspices of Shukaku Hosshinnō (守覚法親王, 1150-1202), the son of Retired Emperor GoShirakawa (後白河天皇, 1127-92, r. 1155-58) and the chief priest at Ninnaji (仁和寺) in Kyoto. In particular, I draw attention to the fact that major exegetical works of the Rokujō and Mikohidari schools are equally represented in the catalogue. I argue that the comprehensiveness of the “Kasho mokuroku” not only attests to the fruition of kagaku with its own literary history in the late twelfth century, but also epitomizes the seemingly obsessive practice of gathering historical information and writing commentaries on historical matter, among scholar-poets during the insei period, or Japan’s long twelfth century. Appendix I contains a translation of the catalogue in its entirety with annotations. Appendix II lists modern Japanese bibliographical studies of insei
texts, based on Ōta’s attribution of the *Kasho mokuroku* to Shukaku.

In sum, the present study proposes a new intellectual history of Japan in the Heian period by tracing the concept of Way as it evolved from the Chinese studies curriculum at the State Academy to an aesthetic “way of life,” characterized by the rigorous, yet spontaneous pursuit of literature and art. The Kidendō curriculum first served to train candidates for the examinations that would qualify them for a career in the imperial bureaucracy. However, as the administrative function of the centralized state weakened during the *insei* period, the Academy’s prestige as a center for literary activity gradually diminished. As if to fill this intellectual vacuum, the study of waka emerged in the second half of the twelfth century and shifted the focus of study from the Chinese Classics to Japan’s own ancient customs, thus forming a foundation for the cultural identity of medieval Japan.

On the one hand, the demise of Kidendō was inevitable because the Sugawara and Ōe academicians’ professionalization of kanshi composition as their exclusive “family treasure” (*kashi*) was antithetical to the fundamentally individualistic and psychological nature of poetry. On the other hand, after the twelfth century, medieval waka studies grew in importance through the hereditary transmission of esoteric interpretations of the waka canon, symbolized by the splitting of the Mikohidari school into three individual traditions, each initiated by a grandson of Fujiwara no Teika. In the twelfth century, poet-scholars attempted to overcome the contradiction between their hereditary claim to the legacy of waka, and their rediscovery of waka as a form of “poetry” and a means of self-expression, by developing the quasi-romantic notion of *suki*, and by valorizing those individuals who devoted their lives to the cultivation of poetic
refinement. The literary genre of setsuwa served as a medium for disseminating historical knowledge about such exemplary individuals.

By introducing literary texts hitherto unexplored in English, the present study attempts to provide a foundation for the interdisciplinary study of insei Japan. In particular, by analyzing texts in seemingly heterogeneous literary (and non-literary) genres—Sino-Japanese verse and prose writings, kanbun diaries, Buddhist hagiographies, vernacular history, waka poems, treatises and commentaries—I will illustrate the wide range of philological activities and their meaning in twelfth century Japan.
Chapter One

Searching for the Way of Waka in the *Imakagami* and the *Konjaku monogatarishū*

**Introduction**

One of the common features of *insei* studies, both in social and literary history, is the use of primary texts from the *insei* period as the main source of information. While such texts can be regarded as authentic witnesses of the age, we tend to forget that they also construct the period they describe in an arbitrary manner. The historical narrative *Ima kagami* (今鏡, *Mirror of the Present*, ca. 1174-75) is one of the most accessible *insei* texts, often cited uncritically or taken at face value by modern scholars. In this chapter, I first examine how the *Imakagami*, written in vernacular Japanese by the waka poet Jakuchō (寂超, ?- 1187?), nostalgically reconstructs the reigns of Emperors GoSanjō (後三条天皇, r. 1068-72, 1034-73) and Shirakawa (白河天皇, r. 1072-86, 1053-1129) as periods that saw the revival of kangaku studies. I then turn to the *setsuwa* collection, *Konjaku monogatarishū* (今昔物語集, *Collection of Tales of Times Past*, author unknown, ca. 1120) and discuss how it differentiates the composition of waka from *michi* (道, “ways”), which refer to literary and scholarly pursuits. Questioning the significance of the *Konjaku’s* avoidance of calling waka a “Way,” I examine how the text conceives of waka primarily as a Japanese “custom” (風俗, *fūzoku*), something to be practiced by all members of society as a means of harmonizing interpersonal relationships. In so doing, I confirm that in the 1120s, waka was not yet considered a “Way.” Only by observing how male intellectuals in the early twelfth century, represented by the *Konjaku* editor, differentiated waka from kanshi, can we
understand why, half-a-century later, the author of the *Imakagami* portrayed GoSanjō and Shirakawa’s reigns as an age when the composition of kanshi was considered a key in attaining promotions in the state bureaucracy.

1. *Michi* and the Literary Arts in the *Imakagami*

Regarding the medieval notion of art, the definition proposed by the German literary scholar, Ernst Robert Curtius (1886-1956), in his survey of the liberal arts and education in the European Middle Ages, proves insightful:

The concept of *art* must be rigorously distinguished from “art” in the modern sense. It means “branch of learning”—that is, “–logy,” as that suffix is used in such words as “theology.” Antique etymology connected the word with *artus* “strait”; the *artes* enclose all things in “strait” rules.¹

Although in medieval Japan there was no ready equivalent to the seven European liberal arts—grammar, rhetoric, dialectic, arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy, or to the concepts of *trivium*² and *quadruvium,*³ Curtius’ definition of art as a “narrowed down” discipline or specialized field of study, appears strikingly similar to the Japanese notion of *michi* (道, “way”). The *Imagakami*, for instance, recounts the emergence of a scholastic approach to Buddhism during the reign of Emperor GoSanjō:

---

2. *Trivium* (Lat. “three paths”): grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic
3. *Quadruvium* (Lat. “four paths”): arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy.
Dispatching the governors, consultants and deputies of the Six Watches to the Ceremony of Releasing Animals (hōjōe 放生会) at Iwashimizu Temple was also initiated during [GoSanjō’s] reign. Regarding the Way of Buddhism (hotoke no michi, lit. “the Way of Buddha”), henceforth a number of scholastic approaches (makotoshiki michi) came into being. GoSanjō also initiated a lectureship for the Dual Ceremonies [of the Lotus Sutra and of the Golden Light Sutra] at Enshū Temple. Priests known for their excellence in Chinese scholarship (zae 藩) attained high positions in Mount Hiei and at Mii Temple, and profound teachings (fukaki michi) [of Buddhism] were spread far and wide.

In this passage, michi denotes multiple aspects of Buddhist practice during GoSanjō’s reign at the end of the eleventh century. First, it is used as a general reference to the “field” of Buddhism (hotoke no michi), namely Buddhist practices. Secondly, it designates “various scholastic approaches” (makotoshiki michi) to Buddhism. Thirdly, and most figuratively, it indicates “a profound way of life” (fukaki michi), translated above as “profound teachings [of Buddhism].” Especially in its primary and secondary sense, michi is analogous to Curtius’ definition of “art” (“strait, discipline”) in the European Middle Ages. However, in its third meaning, the pattern of thinking in which a “way of living” is implicitly identified with a particular body of knowledge (in this case Buddhist teachings), michi is fundamentally different from the Western notion of “art.” Most importantly, in this passage from the Imakagami, the

The emergence of new critical studies of Buddhism under GoSanjō’s reign is closely associated with Buddhist practitioners’ learning in Chinese studies (才, zae).

The following anecdote, also from the Imakagami section on GoSanjō, attests to the point that familiarity with the Chinese Classics was considered a prerequisite, even for Buddhist monks, for gaining the personal trust of Emperor GoSanjō:

Emperor GoSanjō had accumulated profound knowledge of Buddhism (“Way of Dharma”) since the time he was crown prince many years ago. The following conversation took place when one Abbot Shōhan made a visit to the sovereign:

[GoSanjō]: “Please bring me a Buddhist monk, who is knowledgeable about the teachings of both esoteric Shingon (lit. “mantras”) and exoteric Tendai (lit. “contemplative”) Buddhism, and also well versed in secular literature. I don’t know anyone of this kind, whom I can personally trust.”

[Priest Shōhan]: “Because it is normal [for a monk] to study both exoteric and esoteric teachings, there are many [who can be relied upon for their expert knowledge of these subjects]. However, those who are well versed in the Chinese Classics are rare. This being said, I will search for someone.”

Thus saying, Shōhan returned home; and [in the mean time] a monk called Yakuchi was sent […]

昔、御子の宮におはしまし時より、法の道をも深く知ろしめせりけり。勝範座主といふ人参り給へりけるに、「真言止観兼ね学びたらむ僧の、俗の書も心得たらむ一人たてまつれ。さるべき僧の、おのづから頼みたるがなきに」と仰せられれば、「顕密兼ねたるは、常の事にて、あまた侍り。唐の書の心知りたる者こそありがたく侍つれ。さらにても、尋ねて申侍らむ」とて、帰りて、薬智といふ僧をぞたてまつられけるに…⁵

From this passage we learn that the promotion of Buddhist “priests known for their excellence in Chinese scholarship” during GoSanjō’s reign was not a matter of coincidence but rather was due to a policy promoted by the ruler himself. The author of the Ima kagami does not explain why, but consistently depicts GoSanjō as a learned sovereign, who cared about “Chinese literature” (kara no fumi) to the extent that he expected certain familiarity with it from Buddhist priests, who were usually not associated with “secular” (俗, zoku) literature.

Such an unorthodox religious view could have also existed in medieval Europe, where the literary arts were founded upon the two pillars of the patristic and the secular traditions, with the school curriculum consisting of both “Christian” and “pagan” works. Similar to the way in which students at cathedral schools and universities in the European Middle Ages studied classical Latin authors (despite their paganism) in order to enhance their proficiency in the Latin language, the Chinese Classics, including Confucian and Daoist literature, were referred to as “Non-Buddhistic Scriptures” (外典, geten), but were still an integral part of Buddhist pedagogy in pre-modern Japan, because most of the “Buddhist scriptures” (内典, naiten or 聖典, seitên) were written in classical Chinese and training in that language was considered indispensable.

2. The Glorification of Excellence in Chinese Studies (zae) in the Ima kagami

6. For details, see Curtius, pp. 39-42, 49-54.

7. For instance, Peter Kornicki mentions that as early as the eighth century, a bibliographical catalogue from the Shōsōin treasure repository (正倉院目録, 748) contained 128 Buddhist texts and 42 secular Chinese texts, that could be classified into the four categories: literature, politics, military affairs, and medicine. (Kornicki, pp. 416-7.)
Regarding the two passages from the *Ima kagami* quoted above, however, it is important to note that the image of Emperor GoSanjō as a learned scholar who demanded high literary standards even from Buddhist priests, was retrospectively constructed by the book’s author Jakuchō (寂超, ?- 1187?), also known as Fujiwara no Tametsune (藤原為經) before taking the tonsure in 1143. Jakuchō spent most of his life as a middle-ranking court official and was a devoted waka poet. After he took the Buddhist vows, his wife remarried Fujiwara no Shunzei, and the couple gave birth to Teika and other children. However, Jakuchō was not a member of an elite Buddhist establishment such as Mount Hiei or Mii Temple, nor was he an accomplished scholar of Chinese literature. In fact, he may have depicted GoSanjō’s enthusiasm for classical literature in a favorable light because in the 1170s, neither he nor his patron were competent in that subject. Jakuchō’s praise for Chinese learning vis-à-vis other skills, such as waka composition, is most dramatically depicted in the following anecdote from the chapter “Bays and Shores Without Fishing Activity” (釣りせぬ浦々) of the *Imakagami*:

During the emperor’s [Shirakawa] reign, there were many instances in which various customs of the past were revived. With regard to the appointment of officials, the emperor adhered to his own principles, and conducted it in a highly disciplined manner. At the time, there was a man called Akisue, the Director of Upkeep of the Rokujō, who enjoyed a fine reputation. A doctor of letters, whose name was Atsumitsu, said to him:

“Why haven’t you become a Consultant? There are seven ways to obtain the post. Most importantly, you already hold the third rank. Also, according to some sources, those who have governed five provinces [in the course of their carer] are entitled [to become a Consultant].”

---

Akisue replied: “I also thought that was so, and asked for Retired Emperor Shirakawa’s opinion, but he said: ‘That [standard] only applies to those who have skill in Chinese composition.’ I was not able to comment upon this and did not pursue the issue any further.”

Also, regarding the Counselor named Akitaka, who was known as “Chancellor of the Night,” [when he still held an undistinguished post], Shirakawa made the following comment: “I would like to promote him to Controller, but how can I appoint someone who does not compose Chinese poems [to this post]? Only those who compose regulated verse [lüshi] can become a Controller.”

Akitaka was greatly inspired by this and became an enthusiastic practitioner [of Chinese literature].

この御時ぞ、昔の跡を興させ給ふことは多く侍りし。人の官（つかき）などなさせ給ふ事も、よしありて、たはやすもなさせ給はぞりけり。六条の理修大夫顕季といひし人、世におぼえにておはせしに、敦光といひし博士の、「など殿は宰相にはならせ給はぬぞ。宰相になる道は七つ待るなり。中に、三位におはすめり。また、五国治めたる人もなるところは見え侍れ」とひければ、「顕季も、さ思ひて、御気色とりたりしかば、『それも物書くうへのことなり』と仰せられしかば、申すにも及ばで止みにき」とぞ言はれ侍りけり。また、顕隆の中納言といひし人、世には夜の関白など聞こえしも、「『弁になさむ』と思ふに、詩つくらではいかがならむ。四韻詩つくる者こそ、弁にはなれ」と仰させられれば、驚きて好みなどせられけり。10

The above-mentioned Fujiwara no Akisue (藤原顕季, 1055-1123), whom Emperor Shirakawa considered unqualified to become a Consultant (sangi 参議), despite his prominent status (Third Rank) and abundant experience as a provincial governor, was a renowned waka

9. Fujiwara no Akitaka (藤原顕隆, 1070-1129) was nicknamed the “Chancellor of the Night,” because even though he was not formally a Chancellor (kanpaku), he visited Shirakawa “every night” as the master of the retired emperor’s household (in-no-tsukasa) and exerted immense power as Shirakawa’s personal aide.

poet, who founded the Rokujō school of waka. Thus it is hard to imagine that this passage was written by Tametsune—a waka poet—without an element of self-deprecation (as a waka poet vis-à-vis kanshi poet) on his part. In the second half of the twelfth century, there was a fierce rivalry between the Mikohidari (御子左) school of waka, represented by Fujiwara no Shunzei (藤原俊成, 1114-1204), the person to whom Jakuchō entrusted his wife after taking the tonsure, and the Rokujō school of waka. Jakuchō’s animosity toward Fujiwara no Akisuke (藤原顕輔, 1090-1155, Akisue’s son), was so strong that he compiled a waka anthology provocatively titled Goyōshū (後葉集, After the Florilegium, ca. 1155-56), shortly after Akisue had compiled the sixth imperial anthology of waka, Shika wakashū (詞花和歌集, The Florilegium, 1151-54). Therefore, one may argue that in the passage above from the Imakagami, Jakuchō was simply attempting to demean his rival’s father, rather than denouncing waka composition in general as an unworthy pursuit vis-à-vis Chinese literature.

However, it is unquestionable that the Imakagami depicts Emperor Shirakawa as believing that public servants unskilled in Chinese composition were not entitled to key positions at the imperial court, such as Consultant, of which there were normally eight, ranked immediately below Junior Counselors (少納言, shōnagon), and Junior Controllers (小弁, shōben), who handled official documents. Shirakawa’s strictness in this matter is significant considering his close relationship with Akisue, who as the son of Shirakawa’s wet nurse,

---

11. For my discussion of Akisue and his founding of Rokujō school of waka, see Chapter 8.
Fujiwara no Chikako (藤原親子, 1021-93), became one of Shirakawa’s personal confidants (近臣, kinshin). Historians, both medieval and contemporary, under the influence of the Imakagami passage cited above, often contrast Akisue the “upstart” with more “talented” scholar-officials who attained social prominence through meritocracy, such as Ōe no Masafusa. However, few have analyzed the passage critically in light of the rivalry between the author of the Imakagami and Akisuke’s offspring. In either case, the issue here is why GoSanjō and Shirakawa’s reigns are retrospectively associated with the explicit respect for the study of classical Chinese literature.

3. Michi in the Konjaku monogatarishū


13. Chikako eventually received the prestigious Second Rank, although she was the daughter of a “plebeian” (地下, jige) courtier, as opposed to that of a “privy gentleman” (殿上人, tenjōbito).

14. After serving as Chamberlain (蔵人, krōdo) and Master of the Retired Emperor’s Household (院別当, in bettō), Akisue was appointed to Commissioner of Upkeep (修理大夫, suri taifu) in 1094. Akisuke also served as Governor in Sanuki, Tanba, Owari, Iyo, Harima and Mimasaka provinces. He received the Third Rank (lower grade) in 1104, the Third Rank (upper grade) in 1108. For a biography of Akisue, see Kawakami, pp. 974-992.

15. 仏ノ道 (SNKBT 36, pp. 94, 149); 法ノ道 (p. 66); 文ノ道 (p. 273); 顕密ノ道 (p.360); 真言ノ道
Anecdotes about individuals who excelled in these disciplines are collected in Book 24 of the Konjaku monogatari shū (below, Konjaku), titled “Secular Tales from Japan” (本朝世俗).

Twenty-seven tales pertaining to waka also appear in this section, but oddly, the phrase, waka no michi (和歌ノ道) never appears. Why is waka differentiated from the other artistic pursuits? Was waka considered unremarkable, or not respectable enough to be called a “Way?” Judging from the number of tales about waka poets (twenty-seven out of a total of fifty-seven in this section of the Konjaku), it is evident that the anonymous compiler of the Konjaku regards waka as a major part of Japanese “secular” culture. Book 24 also includes tales on other activities such as “craft making” (細工, saiku), “pounding textiles” (打物, uchimono) and “the game of go” (碁, go), and practitioners such as “painters” (絵師, eshi), “medical doctors” (医師, ishi) and “fortune tellers” (相人, sōnin), whose specialties are not necessarily called the “Ways.” However, because these miscellaneous activities are represented only by a handful of examples, their importance as attributes of Japanese secular culture is much less significant.

One might also argue that waka was not as “serious” a practice as other activities, because the Konjaku editor emphasizes the fundamentally performative, rather than scholarly aspect of waka—poems to be composed, recited, exchanged and appreciated spontaneously, rather than texts to be studied. However, because the Konjaku applies the term “Ways” (michi) to even more strictly performative activities, such as playing musical instruments, martial arts and archery, the exclusion of waka from the category of “Way” on account of its seemingly less academic style of practice is not convincing.

(p. 363); 陰陽ノ道 (pp. 112, 179); 算の道 (pp. 424, 427); 文章ノ道 (pp. 472, 475); 管弦ノ道 (pp. 384, 427, 428, 430); 兵ノ道 (pp. 117, 121, 495, 516, 517); 武芸ノ道 (p. 43); 弓箭ノ道 (pp. 131, 490).
Rather, I believe that the Konjaku editor differentiated the composition of waka from other culturally and intellectually notable activities because of its egalitarianism. In short, waka was distinguished from the other artistic and scholarly pursuits, because mediated through the vernacular Japanese language, as opposed to classical Chinese, it was accessible to both men and women of all social strata in Japan, namely from high-ranking courtiers to lowly provincial people. One may even discern a mild condescension toward waka on the part of the Konjaku editor for adamantly not honoring it as a “Way,” despite its popularity. However, regardless of the personal tastes of the Konjaku compiler, most likely a highly educated male aristocrat with extensive bibliographic resources and an encyclopedic knowledge of the Buddhist and secular histories of Japan (本朝, Honchō, lit. “This Court”), China (震旦, Shintan) and India (天竺, Tenjiku), importantly, he acknowledged that Book 24 on “Secular Tales from Japan” would have been incomplete without tales about waka poets.

16 In this regard, Komine Kazuaki, the editor of the SNKBT edition of the Konjaku monogatarishū Book 24, points out that the sequence of tales on waka is one of the “weakest” areas in the entire collection (本集の苦手とする話群であったことをうかがわせる). According to Komine, the Konjaku anecdotes on waka are written so simply that their descriptions are not much different from “headnotes” to waka poems (kotobagaki 詞書), and from the viewpoint of storytelling, they are “insufficiently expanded” (物語としてのふくらみに欠ける). (SNKBT 36, p. 382.) It is true that the many of the Konjaku tales on waka are rather terse and even read as summaries of other popular setsuwa discourse at the time. As I discuss in Chapter 6, for example, an almost verbatim but slightly less conversational version of Tale 23 (on Minamoto Hiromasa and a blind man) appears in the Gōdanshō. Similarly, an expanded version of Tale 57 on Fujiwara Nobunori’s waka on “Ki no marodono” (“log shrine” 木の丸殿) appears in the Toshiyori zuinō. In other words, it cannot be denied that the Gōdanshō and the Toshiyori zuinō versions of the respective vignettes are more detailed in some ways. However, as I will demonstrate below, the seemingly detached narrative style of the Konjaku often succeeds in conveying the Konjaku redactor’s more didactic approach to waka, even with irony and humor.
In the *Konjaku* anecdotes, individuals skilled in the composition of waka are referred to variously as “excellent poets” ( Guerr￥歌読), “masters of waka” ( 和歌ニ極メタル人),

“exceptional masters of waka” ( 極タル和歌ノ上手) and “skilled poets” ( 和歌ノ上手). They are also collectively called “waka composers” ( 和歌読ム人・歌読ム者・歌読ドモ). The majority of waka poets mentioned by name in the *Konjaku* lived in the late-ninth through mid-eleventh centuries; they include Ariwara no Narihira ( 在原業平, 825-80), Ise ( 伊勢, active late 9th century, Emperor Uda’s consort), Ki no Tsurayuki ( 紀貫之, ca. 868-ca.945), Fujiwara no Kintō ( 藤原公任, 966-1041), Fujiwara no Michinobu ( 藤原道信, 972-94), Fujiwara no Sanekata ( 藤原実方, ?-998), and Akazome Emon ( 赤染衙門, active in 1041 at the age of 85). However, poems composed by prominent historical figures, who were not usually remembered for their poetic skills, such as Jōtōmon’in ( 上東門院, 988-1074, the mother of Emperors Goichijō and GoSuzaku), as well as by anonymous rural people, such as “an extremely impoverished woman” ( 極ク貧カリケル女) and “an indescribably lowly country person” ( イフカヒナキ下臓ノ田舎人), are also included.

By meticulously gathering tales on waka composed by an imperial consort, an empress, a prince, Counselor, Grand Counselor, a female court attendant, governors in various provinces

17. SNKBT 36, p, 444.
19. Ibid., p. 449.
20. Ibid., pp. 455, 483.
21. Ibid., pp. 446, 461, 479.
and their wives, local magistrates, a student who traveled to China on a state-sponsored mission who never returned to Japan, an exiled official, a scholar of Chinese literature, a chief priest, and even a “dead” person (a son of a former Regent, who was a passionate waka poet during his lifetime) and many other social types, the Konjaku editor seems to emphasize the grass-roots appeal of waka, and its ubiquity in Japanese society, be it the imperial court or the provinces. Moreover, by admitting that virtually everyone in society had the potential to become an “excellent waka poet,” the Konjaku compiler reveals his own notion of waka as primarily an amateur activity. As such, he could not call waka a specialized “Way.”

Indeed, the Konjaku editor’s association of waka with amateurism should be compared to his assuming a certain degree of professionalism on the part of practitioners of other forms of cultural activity. For instance, in the Konjaku, even Ki no Tsurayuki, one of the compilers of the Kokin wakashū (905) and among the most famous waka poets of all times, is introduced in the subtitle as a “governor of Tosa” (土佐守, Tosa no kami) and then as a “waka poet” (歌読, uta yomi). Likewise, the female poet Ise, renowned for the fact that twenty-two poems of hers appeared in the Kokinshū under that name, is referred to as “Ise Haven” (伊勢御息所, Ise no miyasu dokoro)–Retired Emperor Uda’s consort–in the Konjaku. Here the Konjaku editor wished to reintroduce Ise, whose reputation as a waka poet needed no explanation (see, for example, how she is referred to with no biographical information in the Toshiyori zuinō), as an important figure in the secular history of Japan, namely Retired Emperor Uda’s consort. In other

22. Ibid., p. 464.

23. See for example, pp. 23, 236-7 of the SNKBZ edition of the Toshiyori zuinō (SNKBZ 87). For my analysis of Toshiyori’s reference to Nōin’s reverence toward Ise (pp. 236-7), see Chapter 7.
words, like Tsurayuki, according to the *Konjaku* editor, Ise’s role as an imperial consort took precedence over her being a waka poet. This attests to his view that composing waka was not a profession by itself.

By comparison, the *Konjaku* compiler refers to yin-yang masters and scholars of Chinese literature as “Doctors of Astronomy” (天文博士, *tenmon hakase*) and “Doctors of Literature” (文章博士, *monjō hakase*), respectively. For instance, the *Konjaku* depicts how the “master of yin-yang lore” (陰陽師, *onyōji*), Kamo no Tadayuki (賀茂忠行, dates unknown) taught “everything he had known about [his] profession (lit. “Way”)” (我ガ道ニ知ト知タリケル事ノ限り24) to his son Yasunori, and also imparted various teachings about the “art of yin-yang practice” to a disciple called Abe no Seimei (阿部晴明, 921-1005) “as if pouring all the water from one a jar into another container” (此道ヲ教フル事瓶ノ水ヲ写スガ如シ25).

Although Book 24 of the *Konjaku* contains only eight tales pertaining to yin-yang lore, we observe in these examples that the *Konjaku* editor regarded yin-yang studies as a “profession” (我ガ道・此道), entry to which was strictly limited to the male offspring of the masters, and to some exceptional students like Abe no Seimei.26

As for the “Way” of Chinese literature, the *Konjaku* contains even fewer (only six) anecdotes on the subject, and does not elaborate on the issue of the transmission of knowledge in this field.27 Instead, the compiler highlights a few historical groups of “people who are

---

24. SNKBT 36, p. 411.
25. Ibid., p. 412.
26. For other “legendary” anecdotes on Seimei, see for example, *Kojidan*, vol. 6, tales 62 and 64.
27. Five tales out of the six on the “Way of Chinese Compositions” (文章ノ道, *monjō no michi*) in the
passionate about composition in Chinese” (文章ヲ好ム輩), in one of which Emperor Murakami is a protagonist, and expresses his approval of these enthusiasts’ active discussions of their peers’ “subtle mastery of the composition of Chinese prose and verse“ (文花ノ微妙ナル事共28). In other words, the Konjaku editor reveals little about the public personas of the Kidendō (紀伝道, “history and literature curriculum,” lit. “the Way of annals and biography”) scholars at the State Academy (or even that of Emperor Murakami), but rather introduces them as literati, who in their elite yet semi-private coteries cultivated the life of the mind.

We tend to assume that in the ritsuryō state of the ninth through eleventh centuries, skill in the composition of waka and Chinese verse was regarded in the similar way, especially in comparison to practical skills such as administration, medicine, martial arts and Yin-Yang lore, because after all, both waka and kanshi were poetry. However, modern scholars tend to obscure the subtle differences in the socially constructed images of Japan’s dual poetic traditions of waka and kanshi, when they indiscriminately apply the ambiguous terms, such as “poetic” (詩的) and “belletristic” (文學的). As far as the Konjaku monogatarishū is concerned, the editor introduces the “Way of Literature” (文章ノ道, monjō no michi), namely, the art of literary composition in Chinese, as one belletristic trend in Japan’s secular culture. Thus, the Konjaku editor only

---

28. Ibid., p. 435. Tale 27 discusses how admirers of the scholar-official Ōe no Asatsuna’s (大江朝織, 886-957) compositions gathered a few years after Asatsuna’s death in 957, and reminisced about his poem on the moon, on the night of the Fifteenth Day of the Eighth Month.
discusses how posterity came to admire the “exquisiteness” of the Chinese couplets composed by the “Doctor [of Literature]” Ōe no Asatsuna (大江朝綱, 886-957), an “exceptional scholar” (止事無カリケル学生) who “for many years publicly served in the field [of Chinese studies]” (年来道ニ付テ公ニ仕ケル). In other words, the Konjaku editor does not explain how Asatsuna’s career success was facilitated by his specialized skill in the composition of Chinese.

Turning back to the Konjaku tales on waka, on the other hand, it is apparent that the editor collected so many examples on the subject, not for the purpose of claiming that waka was the paramount aesthetic activity in Japan. Rather, he emphasizes the more utilitarian benefits of waka culture, praising it as a grass-roots phenomenon and a form of vernacular communication that directly affected human thinking and promoted harmony in human relationships. Accordingly, regardless of the social diversity of those who composed waka, many of the Konjaku anecdotes end with the formulaic conclusion that waka “moved people” (皆哀レガリケリ 29), often to the point of making them “shed tears” (コレヲ聞クヒト、皆泣ケリ 30). In other words, without making stylistic judgments about individual poems, the Konjaku editor strategically constructs a long sequence of somewhat terse and impersonal vignettes about waka poets with the semi-didactic narrative theme of “poetic virtues” (歌徳, katoku). 31

29 Ibid., p. 469.

30 Ibid., p. 462.

31 My understanding of the term katoku is broader than that of other scholars. For example, in his article entitled “Ideologies in Waka” (「和歌の思想」), Nishiki Hitoshi (錦仁) somewhat narrowly defines katoku setsuwa (歌徳説話) as “anecdotal narratives which contain the formulaic motif of gods reacting to waka composed by humans, and reciprocally giving happiness to them” (人間の歌に神が感応して幸福を与える). (Nishiki, in IBR 1, p. 250.)
poems were considered meritorious not necessarily because of the beauty of the language, but because of the positive outcomes they brought about in human relationships.

4. Ōe no Masahira and Akazome Emon’s Waka Poems in the *Konjaku monogatarishū*

Tale 51, for example, describes how Akazome Emon used her poetic skills to bring happiness to her family life. The following poem, which Akazome sent to her patron Fujiwara no Rinshi (藤原倫子, Michinaga’s daughter), for instance, was forwarded to Michinaga, to enlist his sympathy in assisting Akazome’s son Ōe no Takachika (大江挙周, ?-1046, Masafusa’s grandfather) to obtain a long coveted position as governor in the province of Izumi:

His Excellency, please
Understand that as I shake off
The snow covering my head,
I am terribly anxious
That at least before I die...

オモヘキミ
カシラノ雪ヲ
ウチハラヒ
キエヌサキニト
イソグ心ヲ

Akazome also sent the following poem to the house of a woman—the daughter of the chief priest at the Inari Shrine, with whom her husband Ōe no Masahira (大江匡衡, 952-1012) was having a secret affair, and succeeded in making Masahira feel “embarrassed” (恥カシ), and end the affair:

The pine tree in my residence
Does not even bear a sign anymore,
Just waiting for you.
Were it among the luxuriant cedar trees,

ワガヤドノ
松ハシルシモ
ナカリケリ
スギムラナラバ

32. SNKBT 36, p. 473.
You would happily come and visit. タズネキナマシ

Like the previous example, this poem is not particularly refined or elaborate. Neither is the *Konjaku* author’s prose narrative, and he does not explain how the poem in question actually caused Masahira’s “embarrassment” (unless he was ashamed of his behavior from the beginning); or why such a reproachful poem did not further estrange him from her. In other words, Masahira’s moral compliance, as assumed in the *Konjaku*, appears somewhat simplistic. Nevertheless, the *Konjaku* editor seems to suggest that Akazome’s poem was effective and thus historically meaningful, precisely because of its indirectness.

The first three measures of the poem capture the forlornness at Akazome’s residence, which does not even have a visible signpost for a visitor, with the conventional use of the “pivot word” (掛詞, *kakekotoba*) “matsu,” which means both “pine tree” and “to wait.” Likewise, the second half of the poem implicitly yet ironically refers to the Inari Shrine, sanctified and separated from the mundaneness of everyday life by its thick growth of cedar trees. Incidentally, the fourth imperial waka anthology, *GoShū wakashū* (後拾遺和歌集, *Later Collection of Gleanings*, 1086) includes a reproachful poem Masahira sent to Akazome when “a rumor of her affair with Fujiwara no Michitsune was spread” (赤染、右大将道綱の名立ち侍りける頃つかはしげる), but the *Konjaku* does not mention this. It is apparent that the editor is more keen on depicting Akazome as a wise mother and wife.

33. Ibid.

34. Poem #883. SNKBT 8, p. 282.
Still it cannot be denied that Akazome’s poems appear to be tongue-in-cheek and even vulgar, displaying much lower “aesthetic” standards than seasonal poems in the *Kokinshū*, for example. In other words, these are typical examples of those thousands of minor poems that survived in individual poets’ poetry collections but did not make it to imperial waka anthologies. Nevertheless, the *Konjaku* editor considered these casual poems notable examples of Japanese secular culture, not so much for the elegance of their subject matter or compositional styles, but because of the emotive effects they could generate in the minds of the reader. In other words, the *Konjaku* compiler’s emphasis on the affective potential of Akazome’s poems reveals his positive appraisal of waka as a historically viable practice useful in the maintenance of social order in Japan.

Tale 52 reintroduces Masahira as a waka poet. For instance, when he was a student at the State Academy (*大学寮, daigaku ryō*), he was “talented in Chinese literature, but was too tall, had square shoulders and was quite ugly” (才ハ有レドモ、長ケ高クテ、指肩ニテ、見苦カリケル). Female court attendants made fun of his appearance: “If you are so erudite, you should be able to play this [a Japanese zither 和琴]! You play, and we’ll listen to you.” (万ノ事知リ給ヘルナレバ、此レヲ弾キ給ラム。此弾給ヘ。聞カラム。) Masahira immediately composed the following poem:

Since I have never seen
What lies beyond the barrier
Of Osaka,
I know nothing about the East,
Nor do I know how to play the zither.

35. SNKBT 36, p. 474.
The *Konjaku* anecdote states that upon hearing this, the awestruck female attendants stopped laughing and “ran away” (皆立て去ニケリ). In this poem, also included in the *GoShūishū*, Masahira skillfully expressed his own thoughts without emotional involvement, through the ingenious use of a pun in the fourth measure, “azuma no koto,” which means both “things from the eastern provinces” and “eastern zither” (azumagoto)–the Japanese zither. The tale also comments on poems Masahira composed at courtiers’ excursion to the Ōi River (大井河) in 1009, and upon the occasion of a fellow courtier’s departure to a northeastern province. Judging from the ways Masahira’s poems profoundly “moved people” (人々此レヲ讃メ感ジケル), the *Konjaku* concludes that “from what is known by hearsay, Masahira had mastered the Way of Chinese Literature, but also composed waka exquisitely just like this.” (コノ匡衡は文章ノ道極タリケルニ、亦和歌ヲナム此ク微妙ク読ケルトナム語リ伝へタルトハ。) This statement confirms that while the *Konjaku* editor regards the “Way of Chinese Literature” as Masahira’s profession, his skill in the composition of waka was admirable, yet ancillary to his role as a scholar.

36. In Book “Miscellaneous 2,” poem 937. (SNKBT 8, p. 301.) Although not explicitly a love poem (partly because it is not included in a section of love poems), the headnote to the *GoShūishū* version of the poem indicates that Masafusa composed it “when he was visiting a woman in her residence, she brought a Japanese zither” (女のもとにまかりつけるに、あづまをさし出して待けば). In light of the *Konjaku* editor’s discussion of Masahira’s affair with the daughter of a priest, and his immediate change of behavior after he received his wife’s reproachful poem (Tale 51), the *Konjaku* reworking of this “Japanese zither” (あづまこと) poem in the less romantic setting of the protagonist’s encounter with a group of mocking female court attendants “when he was still a student” (学生ニ有ケル時) is interesting. The *Konjaku* editor’s reference to Masahira’s success as a scholar, along with some of the negative details of his physical features suggest his interest in Masahira’s biography.

37. Ibid.
Indeed, the *Konjaku* editor’s tendency to comment more on individual waka poets’ social roles and less about their poetry itself, is highly idiosyncratic. In the case of Ōe no Masahira and Akazome Emon, in particular, it is apparent that the editor attempts to underplay the fact that in a standard history of waka written in the early twelfth century, Akazome was more highly regarded as a poet than her husband. (Twenty-two poems by Akazome appear in the *GoShūishū*, whereas only seven by Masahira are included in the same collection.) In other words, like the *Kokinshū* poet Ise, the name Akazome Emon required no further commentary, but the *Konjaku* persistently calls her “Mother Akazome” (母ノ赤染) and “Ōe no Masahira’s wife Akazome” (大江匡衡妻赤染). These seemingly minor details attest to the *Konjaku* editors’ reluctance to accept waka as a fully-fledged activity, and to grant waka the respect due a specialized profession (“Way”). Rather, he valorized waka as a generator of harmony in human relationships.

The following exchange of poems between Ōe no Masahira and Akazome Emon at the very end of the *GoShūishū* in the subcategory “Comic Poems” (*haikaika* 謹話歌), in the last book of “Miscellaneous 6” (雑六), demonstrate one reason why the *Konjaku* editor was enticed to regard Akazome and Masahira as couple poets:

Composed upon discovering that the recently hired wet-nurse was flat-breasted
Lord Ōe no Masahira

How absurd
Her intentions were!
In this Professor’s house,
A wet-nurse
Without even a drop of milk/intelligence?
The reply

Akazome Emon

Let it be!
So long as she is competent in
Practical matters,
Despite her meager supply of knowledge/milk
Let her stay here.

乳母せんとてまうできたりける女の乳の細う待りければよみ待ける
大江匡衡朝臣

はかなくも
思ひけるかな。
ちもなくて
博士の家の
乳母せんとは

返し

赤染衡門

さもあらばあれ
山と心し
かしこくは
ほとちにつけて
あらす許ぞ38

Although included in the imperial anthology, *GoShūshū*, because of the explicit references to mundane topics such as the “wet-nurse” and her “breast milk” (*chi* 乳), these poems appear even more vulgar than the couple’s poems that appear in the *Konjaku monogatari*. Certainly these poems are less conventional than Akazome’s poem on her “solitary residence” or Masahira’s on “the Japanese Zither,” and for that reason, they are categorized as “comic” (*haikai*) poems. However, having humorous traits does not make them inferior to other

38. SNKBt 8, pp. 395-6.
more aesthetically refined poems, and they are officially recognized as the last and penultimate poems of an imperial anthology. Certainly, not all the connoisseurs of waka at the time approved of the GoShūishū and its compiler Fujiwara no Michitoshi’s (藤原通俊, 1047-99) selection. Most famously, Minamoto no Tsunenobu (源経信, 1016-97), an influential courtier who was also a renowned waka and kanshi poet, criticized the GoShūishū in his poetry treatise, Nan goshūi (難後拾遺, Anti-GoShūishū, ca. 1086-97),39 supposedly the first polemical work to critically examine individual poems in an imperial waka anthology.40

In any case, these exchange poems are unique not only because of the references to the “wet-nurse.” Masahira’s use of a colloquial phrase, “Professor’s house” (博士の家), is also unusual in waka composition. The ingenuity of his poem lies in his proud self-reference as a professor (hakase), the words’ association with “intellect” (chi 智), and punning on “intellect” and “breast milk” (chi 乳). Akazome, however, is no less dignified in her reply, and reciprocates with the equally unusual non-poetic word, “practical matters” (yamato gogoro 山と心, euphemistically glossed as “mountains and hearts” but literally means “Japanese minds”).41

So long as the couple simply debate on the literal level whether or not to dismiss the “flats-breasted” wet-nurse, their poems are trivial. But because they both allude to the fundamental ways in which particular bodies of knowledge determined Masahira and Akazome’s


40. WBJ, p. 504, under “Nan goshūi.”

41. For my discussion of Ōe no Masafusa’s (Masahira and Akazome’s great-grandson) reference to yamato damashii (やまとだましい, “practical skills” lit. “Japanese spirits”) as recollected by the Regent Fujiwara no Tadazane in his diary, Chūgaishō, see Chapter 4.
social roles as an academician and a waka poet, the hidden meaning of these poems are profound enough to be included in the imperial anthology. Moreover, in light of the previously discussed retrospective view in the *Imakagami* that Emperor Shirakawa’s reign, during which the *GoShūishū* was compiled, was marked by the revival of *kangaku* scholarship, Masahira and Akazome’s poems appear to have an even bolder symbolic significance.

In short, if we accept the *Imakagami* author’s assessment that talent in the study of Chinese literature was more respectable than skill in the composition of waka at the turn of the twelfth century, we can hardly resist an allegorical interpretation of the strange fact that the *GoShūishū*, commissioned by Shirakawa, ends with Akazome’s poem with its defense of “Japanese minds.” In other words, the “wet-nurse,” after all, may allude to fundamentally practical, Japan-centered traditional skills and “knowledge,” that are not necessarily obtained through studying books, such as the Chinese Classics. If that is the case, the hidden message in Akazome’s poem is that the age of waka—“Japanese minds” *par excellence*—is just around the corner.
Chapter Two

Reconstructing Scholar-Officials’ Lives in the Honchō monzui

Introduction

The idea sustained throughout the Konjaku monogatarishū (ca. 1120)—that waka during the ninth through the eleventh centuries was primarily an amateur activity widely practiced by men and women in society—is worth pursuing, because it was not a one-time casual remark expressed by the anonymous editor of the setsuwa collection. Rather, the understanding of waka as a social “custom” (風俗, ōzoku) in Japan, as opposed to a specialized profession (michi) or the outward manifestation of certain “poetic elegance” (風流, ōryū), was a traditional view, deeply rooted in some of the canonical works of kanshi and waka poetics from earlier centuries.

In this chapter, I focus on the literary anthology Honchō monzui (本朝文粹, Literary Masterpieces of Japan, 14 vols., ca. 1058-65) and examine how definitions of waka and kanshi can be drawn from the Chinese compositions in this anthology. Special attention will be paid to the “literary genre” (文体, buntai) of “prefaces” (序, jo), which before the twelfth century often served as a medium for literary discussions. I examine how the anthologist, the academician Fujiwara no Akihira (藤原明衡, 989?-1066), expresses his views of the way Kidendō scholars evolved from purveyors cum executors of the Confucian political ideal of “state building through literary activities” (文章経国, bunshō keikoku) to introspective poet-literati.

I investigate the ways in which middle-ranking scholar-officials of the Sugawara and Ōe clans, who were increasingly frustrated by the narrowing of their career opportunities under the
Fujiwara regency in the late-tenth through the mid-eleventh century, came to assert through their writing their hereditary inheritance of “the wind and the moon” (風月, fūgetsu), and transformed the composition of kanshi into their family prerogative. I argue that while professionalizing kanshi composition, and thus securing the elitist image of kanshi composition vis-à-vis vernacular waka, these poet-scholars paradoxically embraced the “psychological” definition of poetry, originally introduced in Japan by the scholar-official Sugawara no Michizane (菅原道真, 845-903) and most extensively elaborated upon in early waka discourse, such as the prefaces to the Kokinshū (905).

1. Ramifications of the Literary Genre of the Kanshi Preface in the Honchō monzui

In pre-twelfth century Japan, unlike in other fields such as Buddhist studies and Chinese literature, extensive theoretical or exegetic writings on waka were rare, and criticism of waka often took the form of “waka prefaces” (wakajo 和歌序). Written exclusively in Sino-Japanese by renowned academicians, these short essays commemorated the compilation of waka anthologies and other notable literary events at which waka were composed. The modern scholar Ōsone Shōsuke (大曾根章介, 1929-93) points out that due to their relative brevity, wakajo were often referred to as jodai (序題・序代, “introductory notes”) or shojo (小序, “brief prefaces”) in courtiers’ diaries and other prose writings in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.¹

¹ Ōsone, vol. 1., p. 588. Ōsone’s essay, “Wakajo shōkō” (和歌序小考, “Preliminary Research on Waka Prefaces”), originally published in Koten waka ronsō (古典和歌論叢, Meiji Shoin, 1988), is an excellent study on the subject. In particular, his comparison of wakajo to shijo (詩序, “kanshi prefaces”), and his dynamic argument for the existence of standardized formats for wakajo, based on his extensive knowledge of shijo and other literary genres (buntai 文体) of Chinese literature, (all of which were normally classified in accordance with certain fixed formats and styles), is extremely insightful. Although
Even more numerous were “kanshi prefaces” (詩序, shijo) that, also written in Sino-Japanese, commemorated various public and private gatherings during which kanshi were composed. In contrast to shijo and wakajo, prefaces written in Japanese were called “Japanese prefaces” (kanajo 仮名序), and their subject matter was limited to waka. In other words, there are no kanajo, introducing a kanshi anthology, or commemorating a literary event at which kanshi were composed. By the early tenth century, therefore, a subtle hierarchy existed within the originally Chinese “literary genre” (文体, buntai) of the “preface” (序, jo) and their indigenous offshoots in Japan: kanshi prefaces, waka prefaces (fewer in number and shorter in length), and the Japanese prefaces (Japanese-language versions of the waka preface.)

As the gene of “preface” has its origin in China, most famously represented by the “Great Preface” (大序, before 1st century CE) of the Book of Songs (Shijing 詩經, attributed to Confucius, normally called the Mōshi 毛詩, The Mao Recension in early Japan), and Wang his careful analyses of exemplary wakajo from the Honchō monzui, and of influential twelfth century literary texts, such as Ōe no Masafusa’s Gōdanshō and Fujiwara no Kiyosuke’s Fukurozōshi, actually “disprove” his hypothesis that wakajo had its own generic formats, the combination of the lucidity of his arguments and the detail-oriented nature of his textual analyses makes this essay stand out in his posthumous, three-volume collected works, thus making it one of the most critical studies exploring the nexus between the Sino-Japanese and Japanese poetic traditions in early Japan. (Ōsone, vol. 1, pp. 588-605) The same volume of his book also contains an earlier, shorter version of his essay on wakajo, entitled “Wakajo ni tsuite–honchō shojoshō to gyokutaku fuketsu shō” (和歌序について 『本朝小序集』と『玉沢不竭抄』), originally published in Shintei zōho kokushi taikei, vol. 30, geppō 46, Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1966.) (Ibid, 606-611.) Satō Michio also discusses wakajo briefly from the viewpoint of the historical development of the practice of kudai (句題, “topic composition”) in the late eleventh through mid-twelfth centuries. Satō (2003), pp. 199-203.

2. See Owen, pp. 37-49. His observation that in the Chinese literary tradition, unlike in the Western literary tradition epitomized by Aristotle’s Poetics, discussions of the nature of poetry are “presented in the form of exegesis of a particular text,” and thus “the model of authority in the Chinese tradition is inductive, going from specific poems to larger question that follow from reading those poems” is highly insightful. (Owen, p. 38.) This theory holds true to the ways in which the Kokinshū prefaces attempt to define waka through the discussions of the Six Principles (六義, rikugi) and poetic styles of the six model poets; and also the exegetic methods explored by late twelfth-century waka poet-scholars (eg. Shomyō 勝
Xizhi’s (王義之 307?-65?) “Preface to a Banquet at the Orchid Pavilion” (蘭亭序, 353), even kanshi prefaces in Japan were initially written under the heavy influence of their Chinese precedents. For instance, the prefaces to Japan’s three imperially redacted kanshi anthologies (chokusen kanshi shū 勅撰漢詩集)–the Ryōunshū (凌雲集, Collection Beyond the Clouds, 814?), the Bunka shūreishū (文華秀麗集, Collection of Beautiful and Excellent Literature, 818?) and the Keikokushū (経国集, Collection of National Building Discourse, 827) allude to the preface to the Chinese Classics, Wenxuan (文隨, Literary Anthology, 30 vols., compiled by Prince Shaoming 昭明 of the Liang Dynasty 梁 [502-57]). Also, in the Chinese tradition, prefaces to anthologies are sometimes further classified as shojo (書序, “book prefaces”), and

命, Fujiwara no Norinaga 藤原教長 and Kenshō 順昭) to elucidate various aspects of “Japaneseness” in the history of waka, though their vigorous adherence to textual authorities of existing bibliographical sources. As Asada Tōru points out, Norinaga’s commentary on the Kokinshū, for instance, occasionally digresses excessively into the auxiliary subject of “aristocratic lore” (有職, yūsoku), and fails to provide any specific comments about Kokinshū poems or even about poetry in general. (Asada, 1998, pp. 38-41.) In this case, we need to acknowledge that the twelfth-century exegetist’s approach was not only “inductive,” but he had his own purpose in annotating the Kokinshū. Furthermore, Norinaga was not necessarily appropriating the text as a great classic of Japanese “literature,” or as the source of Japanese “aesthetics,” as the modern reader tends to regard the anthology.

3. Before the Ryōunshū, the kanshi anthology Kaifūsō (懷風藻, In Memory of the Beauty of Ancient Literature, 1 volume, 120 poems, 751) was compiled, albeit not as the result of an imperial edict. See Kojima Noriyuki’s “kaisetsu” for the Kaifūsō in NKBT 69, pp. 6-19. For a discussion of the indebtedness of the preface to the Kaifūso to that of the Wenxuan, see Denecke (2004), pp. 102-105. Denecke also discusses literary borrowings in the Ryōunshū preface from Cao Pi’s (曹丕, 187-226) “Lunwen” (論文) in his Dianlun (典論, Authoritative Discourses). Ibid., pp. 106-107.


5. Texts of the three anthologies, including their prefaces, are in GR 8, no. 123, pp. 449-554. The Bunka shūreishū is also in NKBT 69, pp. 185-317. Also see Denecke, pp. 109-110.

are distinguished from (shijo 詩序, “poetry prefaces”). Thus, technically speaking, the “Great Preface” is a shojo, while the “Preface to a Banquet at the Orchid Pavillon” is a shijo.

Soon after, with the compilation of the Kokin wakashū (古今和歌集, Collection of Japanese Poems from Ancient Times to the Present, 905)–Japan’s first imperially commissioned waka anthology (chokusen wakashū 勅撰和歌集), the auxiliary genre of the “waka preface” (wakajo) was established, along with its Japanese version (kanajo). In fact, Ōsone Shōsuke points out that the first anthology of waka, Man’yōshū (萬葉集, Collection of Myriad Leaves, 20 vols., ca. 785) contains a handful of wakajo, composed by scholar-poets such as Ōtomo no Tabito (大伴旅人, 665-731), Yamanoue no Okura (山上憶良, 660-733?) and Ōtomo no Yakamochi (大伴家持, 717?-85, Tabito’s son) in Books Five, Seventeen, and Eighteen. However, he doubts that these Chinese compositions had a specific purpose to serve as kanajo, because of their highly inconsistent formats, some of which are epistolary. The Many’ōshū kanbun “prefaces,” some of which no doubt are too elaborate to be called kanbun “headnotes” (箋書 kotobagaki), certainly deserve further investigation.

7. The last and the twenty-first chokusen wakashū, Shin shoku kokin wakashū (新続古今和歌集, New Sequel to the Kokinshū, 20 vols.) was compiled by the poet Asukai Masayo 飛鳥井雅世 at the command of Emperor GoHanazono (後花園天皇, 1419-70, r. 1428-64) in 1439. The twenty-one imperial waka anthologies are collectively called, the Nijū-ichi-dai shū (二十一代集, the Collection of the Twenty-One Reigns).

8. Ōsone, vol. 1, pp. 591-2. According to Ōsone, Tabito’s “Preface to Poems on Plum Blossoms” (梅花歌序, in Vol. 5), which is influenced by Wang Xizhi’s (王羲之) “Preface to a Banquet at the Orchid Pavilion” (c.f. SNKS 21, Manyōshū, vol. 2, p. 61), “may be the only [kanbun prefaces in the Man’yōshū] with the proper format of a wakajo.”
However, I consider the Chinese preface to the *Kokinshū* (真名序, *manajo*, lit. “Chinese Preface”) as the first notable example of *wakajo*, for the simple reason that that is how the composition is introduced in the *Honchō monzui*, the literary anthology compiled by the academician Fujiwara no Akihira (藤原明衡, 989?-1066). Following the structure of its model *Wenxuan*, which contains some eight hundred compositions in prose and verse classified into thirty-seven literary genres, the *Honchō monzui* categorizes Sino-Japanese compositions by Japanese authors into thirty-nine genres, of which only twelve appear in the *Wenxuan*. In the words of Satō Michio (佐藤道生), although inspired by the *Wenxuan*, the *Honchō monzui* is “a florilegium based on the practical needs, appropriate for particular situations and circumstances in Japan.”

Akihira’s exclusion of some of the oldest examples of *shijo* (or more precisely *shojo*) in Japan, such as the prefaces to the aforementioned three imperial anthologies of kanshi, as well as his deliberate designation of the *Kokinshū* preface (“Manajo”) as the first *wakajo*, indicate that the *Honchō monzui* was not only an anthology that records particular trends in the production of kanbun discourse in Japan in the mid-ninth through mid-eleventh centuries, but also an

---

9. SNKBT 27, pp. 310, 320-1.


imaginary textual universe, wherein the compiler, himself a product of the Kidendō (紀伝道, “history and literature”) curriculum in the State Academy, demonstrate his own understanding of literary history of Japan during these centuries.

Since the compilation of the Kokinshū, the quintessentially Japanese genre of the waka preface was added to Kangaku academicians’ “service list”–the composition of prefaces and other kinds of writings, both public and private in nature, such as shō (詔, imperial edicts), hyō (表, reports/addresses to the sovereign), shojō (書状, private correspondence), san (讃, letters of praise), and ron (論, treatises), to name a few, at the request of their imperial and non-imperial patrons. As in the case of shojo and shijo, wakajo were normally composed for high-ranking courtiers who either compiled waka anthologies (such as the Kokinshū), or organized waka banquets wherein they themselves composed poems, or had other members of the aristocratic society do so to entertain the hosts and their guests.

Of particular interest are those instances in which wakajo served as the Japanese equivalent of shojo for books on waka anthologies or treatises. Here they provided an opportunity for Kangaku scholars to apply their knowledge of Chinese literature, acquired through the studying of prefaces and other Chinese literary discourse, to their own understanding of waka. However, this type of wakajo are few in number, and only two examples are included in Book Eight of the Honchō monzui, which contains a total of eleven wakajo; they are the Chinese Preface to the Kokinshū and Ki no Tsurayuki’s preface to the privately compiled waka anthology (shisenshū, 私撰集), Shinsen waka (新撰和歌, New Anthology of Waka, 4 vols., 360 poems, ca. 943s). The other wakajo, except for one composed in “praise of the twenty-eight

12. An annotated yomikudashi (Japanese reading) rendition of Tsurayuki’s kambun preface appears in
books of the *Lotus Sutra* (法華経廿八品), are remarkably short (comprising of no more than ten lines), and were written to celebrate poetry banquets and other ceremonial events, such as the “Fortieth Birthday of Emperor Murakami” (村上天皇四十御算), “One Hundredth Day Anniversary of the Empress’ Giving Birth” (中宮御産百日) and “The First Princess’s Donning of the Trousers” (女一宮御着袴). It needs to be noted that in these wakajo, waka is repeatedly referred to as *fūzoku*, or even as “custom of our country” (吾朝之風俗).

Concurrently, it was also around the time of the compilation of the *Kokinshū*, during and after the Emperor Daigo’s (醍醐天皇, 885-930, r. 897-930) reign, that the significance of composing kanshi prefaces began to change for kangaku scholars. The act of writing, or scholars’ highly self-conscious act of production of “literature” (文, *bun*) or “verse and prose” (文筆 *bunpitsu*), evolved from a means of contributing to “state building” (経国, *keikoku*) to the private pursuit of “poetic elegance” (風月, *fūgetsu*, lit. “the wind and the moon”). As mentioned above, in comparison to Akihira’s inclusion of the Chinese preface to the *Kokinshū* as the first wakajo, his exclusion of the preface to the first kanshi anthology, *Ryōunshū*, in the “book prefaces” section of the *Honchō monzui* is highly idiosyncratic. Since in eleventh and twelfth

---

NKBT 69, pp. 399-400. According to Tsurayuki, the *Shinsen waka* was originally conceived under an imperial order after the compilation of the *Kokinshū*, but because of the death of the emperor and another patron who supported the project, it remained in a draft format for a long time, until Tsurayuki completed it privately with the preface in question.

13. *Hakama gi*: “A rite of passage during which a little boy or girl, typically three or five years old, was first dressed in trousers.” (Tyler, p. 1138, “General Glossary.”) For a more detailed explanation of the rite, see Yamanaka and Suzuki, eds., pp. 106-8.

14. SZK 29-ge, pp. 278 (Gidō sanshi’s preface), 279 (Ki no Haseo’s preface), 280 (Tachibana no Aritsura’s preface), and 282 (Minamoto no Michinari’s preface).
century Japan, the Many’ōshū was considered to have been imperially redacted, it is likely that
Akihira did not conceive the Kokinshū as the first imperial anthology of waka.

Nevertheless, not only was the Ryūunshū the first imperial anthology of kanshi, it was
also the textual source of the concept that developed hand-in-hand with the centralized state and
the institution of the State Academy: that literature plays a key role in the establishment of a
state. In fact, in their discussion of the prominence of political elements in early kanbun
literature, modern scholars have often quoted the following statement from the beginning of the
Ryūunshū preface: “According to Emperor Wen of the Kingdom of Wei [220-65, China],
‘Literature is a vital work in state building and a great enterprise that never declines.’” (魏文帝
有曰。文章者經國之大業。不朽之盛事。15) Akihira’s deliberate exclusion of the Ryūunshū
preface in the Honchō monzui gives the cynical impression that he himself no longer advocated
this idea.

As in other literary anthologies, the compiler’s opinions are most succinctly expressed
though his selection and classification of source material. In this regard, the fact that nearly one
third of the Honchō monzui consists of jo (prefaces) and its sub-genres (6 shojo, 139 shijo and 11
wakajo–a total of 156 jo) is remarkable. Because the Wenxuan contains only nine prefaces (3
shijo, 2 fujo 賦序, 1 shojo and 3 other prefaces), the disproportional emphasis placed on
prefaces, in particular, shijo, in the Honchō monzui is apparent. Furthermore, the following two
literary genres that do not exist in the Wenxuan, make up the three most numerous categories in

15. GR 8, no. 123, pp. 449.
the Honchō monzui along with shijo: sōjō (奏状, “letters of supplication,” 37 examples) and
ganmon (頌文, “Buddhist vows,” 27 examples).16

Because of the peculiar ways in which the number of shijo outweighs that of other genres, we cannot simply assume that the composition of shijo was proportionally more popular, or in greater demand than that of other genres. For this, we have to presume that the compiler of the Honchō monzui, Fujiwara no Akihira’s view on what he considers as the “essence of literature” (monzui) is reflected. However, the two lesser constituents of the top three genres in the Honchō monzui (sōjō and ganmon) seem to simply reflect their ubiquity in Japanese society in the eleventh century, as Sei Shōnagon nonchalantly listed them in her Makura no sōshi (枕草子, The Pillow Book, after 1000?):

Chinese Literature:

The Collected Works of Bo Juyi.
The Wenxuan, [in particular,]
The volumes of new rhymed prose.
The Book of History, [in particular,]
The biographies of the Five Emperors.
Buddhist vows.
Reports to the Sovereigns.
Professors’ letters of application.

ふみは もんじふ。もんぜん、しんぶ。史記、五帝本紀。ぐわんも
ん。表。はかせのまうしぶみ。
(197 dan, emphasis added.)17

---

16. In the Honchō monzui, a total of thirty-nine literary genres (buntai) are included. See the table of contents of the Honchō monzui, for example, in SNKBT 27, pp. 5-16. Ōsone shōsuke briefly discusses the structure of the anthology in his “kaidai” in the same book, pp. 441-444. For a convenient list, see Satō (2003), pp. 36-7.

17. SNKBT 25, p. 245.
2. Letters of Proposals in the *Honchō monzui*

The majority (twenty-one out of thirty-seven) of the “letters of proposal” (奏状) in the *Honchō monzui* were written for the specific purpose of “applying for official posts and ranks” (申官爵). Sei Shōnagon calls them “letters of application“ (申文, *mōshibumi*). For instance, Book Six of the *Honchō monzui* includes four letters of application written by Ōe no Masahira (大江匡衡, 952-1012) whose waka poems were discussed in the previous chapter. Incidentally, Masahira is the best-represented author in the *Honchō monzui*, with 47 compositions of his included in the anthology, followed by Ōe no Asatsuna and Sugawara no Fumitoki, with 44 and 39 compositions, respectively. According to Gotō Akio (後藤昭雄), all the letters of application were written in a standardized format, containing an indented headline that reads like a modern cover letter. The first of Masahira’s four letters of application begins as follows:

Junior Fifth Rank Upper and still a Professor of Literature cum Acting Governor of Owari Ōe no Masahira hereby submits his humble proposal with his deepest respects

This letter contains my request for the attainment of an additional post by the grace of [his Majesty’s] magnanimity, and in accordance with precedents, as a replacement for [the current] Controller, Acting Deputy of Left or Right Gate Watch, or Head of the Academy when they apply for another post.

従五位上行文章博士兼尾張権守大江朝
臣匡衡誠惶誠恐謹言

---


In this letter, dated the eleventh day of the First Month of 993, Masahira demonstrates his qualifications for the aforementioned posts by describing his former service to the state, and “precedents” (先例, senrei) in which “Professors of Chinese Literature” (文章博士, monjō hakase) like himself held these positions in the past. This letter reveals that although Masahira had been a professor (as he proudly called himself in the GoShūshū poem on the “wet-nurse”) since 989, and had held a dual-appointment as an absentee acting governor of Owari (present-day Aichi prefecture) since 992, he was discontented with this situation. In the letter, he further attempts to solicit the sovereign’s (Emperor Ichijō 一条天皇, 980-1011, r. 986-1011, although at the time of the letter’s composition, he was a child of thirteen) sympathy by describing what he calls his “chilling misery” (寒苦, kanku) due to the slowness of his promotion to more “rewarding posts” (温官, onkan):

Confucian study has been my profession, and the composition of Chinese verse is my [personal] asset.

In poverty, I have relished the Way [of literature], but received no cross-appointments to rewarding posts.

Lowly in rank, I have found pleasure in literature, but can no longer bear this chilling misery.

My residence is all but four walls, and I am ashamed about the gradual dispersal of [my family’s] books.

20. Ibid., p. 127.


My mother, an octogenarian, is saddened by the delay in my receiving sufficient means to care for her.

Observing how Masahira assumed none of the posts he had requested in this letter, and also how he filed similar letters of application twice in 996 (this time, for the governorship of either Echizen or Owari, and Bitchū), we can conclude that his first letter was dismissed. Moreover, in 1009, only three years before his death, he submitted a similar application for the governorship of Mino (美濃, in present-day Gifu prefecture) and in the same year, finally became the “Governor” (守, kami) of Owari, after having served as “acting governor” (権守, gon no kami) in the same province twice during the years 992-96 and 1001-05. From these biographical details, we can draw a picture of the difficult (and highly worldly) life of a middle-ranking scholar-official in the beginning of the eleventh century, whose life revolved around the quest for higher posts, rather than remaining content with a secured academic position. In fact, even though he served as “imperial tutor” (侍読, jidoku) to Emperor Ichijō, at the time of his death, Masahira’s rank was only Senior Fourth Lower (正四位下). For Masahira, the rank and status attained by his great-grandson Masafusa, whom he did not live long enough

to meet–Senior Second Rank (正二位) and Acting Counselor (権中納言), which placed him among the kugyō (公卿, “senior nobles”)–was beyond what he could dream about.

Regarding Masahira’s first letter of application, therefore, his appeal for promotion on account of his “meager social status” (賤) that was the cause of his and his family’s “poverty” (貧) is understandable. His reference to his elderly mother distressed with her son’s slow promotion even reminds us of Akazome’s poem in the Konjaku monogatarishū, which impressed Michinaga (Emperor Ichijō’s grandfather), and brought about his decision regarding her son’s promotion. It is remarkable that the Konjaku visualized that the power of Akazome’s waka to influence her son’s promotion was greater than Takachika’s own letters of application, which he must have written in the manner of his father, Masahira.

In fact, there is nothing more ironical for the “Confucianist” (儒者) Masahira, as he calls himself in another supplication letter, than to accept the reality that being a professor of “Confucian study” (儒学) has not provided him with sufficient means to support his mother, implying his inability to fulfill his role as a Confucian filial son, or even to maintain their family “library” (文籍). One may argue that such emphasis on poverty is nothing but a popular trope in literati writing, or that such hyperbole only gives the impression that his request was not urgent or sincere. However, one thing very peculiar in his logic is his acknowledgment that although Confucian study left him and his family poor, he himself actually “enjoyed” (楽) the “Way” [of Chinese literature] and “found pleasure” (嗜) in it. In other words, the “profession” (業) of Confucian studies failed to bring happiness and comfort to his family, and that is why he wrote this letter; nevertheless, Masahira is confident that “the composition of Chinese verse” (唐月,
fūgetsu, lit. “the wind and the moon”) has personally “benefitted” (資) him, and for that reason alone, he can maintain his self-respect as a Confucianist.

I will further examine the notion of “the wind and the moon” in conjunction with some of the kanshi prefaces from the Honchō monzui below. Regarding the genre of sōjō, we can conclude that although no example of it appears in the Wenxuan, in eleventh century Japan, it was an important means of communication, through which scholar-officials expressed their personal views, many of them unapologetically self-serving, rather than expounding on the dryer topic of nation-building. Masahira’s rhetoric of self-preservation becomes even more aggressive in another sōjō, in particular, his “application for tuition” (申学問料), which he wrote on behalf of his son Yoshitomo (能公). In this letter, also included in Book Six of the Honchō monzui, Masahira requests a stipend for Yoshitomo to enable him to take over his father’s “business” (令継箕裘之業, lit. “the art of making birch baskets and fur coats, [alluding to a famous passage from the Confucian Classics, The Book of Rites 礼記].” In the same letter, he repeatedly refers to his “family occupation” (門業) and “the occupation of six consecutive generations” (六代業). The second expression, in particular, reflects his elitist view of the Ōe clan and their rival, Sugawara scholars as “those with great lineages” (累代者, ruidai sha), in contrast to “upstarts” (起家者, kike sha) from other clans.

Masahira’s condescending reference to the kika scholars, and its inclusion in the Honchō monzui may surprise conscientious readers, because Fujiwara no Akihira—the compiler of the

---

24. SNKBT 27, pp. 229-230; Japanese reading (yomikudashi) in pp. 41-42.
literary anthology—was himself a self-made *kika* scholar, although he is known to have studied under Masahira in his formative years. The composer and the filer of the other two tuition requests, dated 956 and 965, is Sugawara no Fumitoki (菅原文時, 899-981). From these records we can draw the following conclusions regarding the *sojō* in the *Honchō monzui*: 1) shortly after Emperor Murakami’s era (村上天皇, 926-67, r. 946-67), during which Fumitoki was active, scholar-officials became increasingly more disgruntled about their ranks and posts, and thus wrote and submitted a greater number of letters of application; 2) by including Sugawara no Fumitoki and Ōe no Masahira’s letters, in which they both sought financial support for the sustenance of their “family occupation” of Confucian studies, Akihira may have conceived the eleventh century, especially after Masahira’s death in 1012, as a turning point in the history of *kangaku* studies in Japan, which saw a gradual decline of the hegemony of the Sugawara and Ōe scholars in the State Academy.

3. Buddhist Supplications in the *Honchō monzui*

The literary genre of “vows” (願文, *ganmon*), like *sōjō*, does not appear in the *Wenxuan*, but Books 13 and 14 of the *Honchō monzui* contain twenty-seven examples, classified into the following four types of Buddhist rites, during which they were recited: “ceremonies [lit. “good deeds”] for shrines” (神祠修善 *shinshi shūzen*, two examples); “[ceremonies for] towers and temples erected in memory of the deceased” (供養塔寺 *kuyō tōji*, four examples);

“miscellaneous ceremonies” (維修善 zōshūzen, six examples); and “ceremonies for the deceased” (追修 tsuishū, fifteen examples). Literally meaning “supplicatory compositions,” ganmon were written from the viewpoint of the hosts of these “good deed” events (e.g. in case of funeral rites, usually the immediate relatives of the deceased), and expressed their personal motives for organizing them.27

Alternatively, ganmon can be figuratively rendered as “supplicants’ brocade,” because in order to solicit sympathy, feelings of awe and respect from the other participants at the ritual for the hosts (and in case of funerary rites, for the deceased), the prayers had to sound impressively lofty when recited. Accordingly, both male and female members of the imperial family, and other senior nobles and their families in early Japan entrusted some of the top academicians in society with the task of composing ganmon, wherein the scholars could demonstrate their knowledge of elegant phrases in Sino-Japanese, which were not only appropriate for each occasion, but were a means of immortalizing the deceased. In the words of the modern scholar

---

27. The actual procedures of Buddhist rites from the tenth and eleventh centuries are not clear, but judging from late twelfth-century “manuals” (次第 shidai) for various Buddhist ceremonies, the recitation of ganmon often took place in the middle of the events, following the recitation of hyōbyaku (表白, “adorations”). (See for example, Ninnaji konbyōshi shōsōshi kenkyūkai, ed., pp. 913-1272.) An abbreviation of the term, hyōkei kokuhaku (表敬告白, “announcements in honor of [the faithful acts of the hosts, their love for the deceased, etc.]”), hyōbyaku was written to be addressed by the officiating priests, and often contained various sermons and lessons with an ecclesiastical viewpoint. (For more details, see Komine (2009), pp. 45-46, 281-310.) However, as Komine Kazuaki discusses, hyōbyaku were normally written by Buddhist priests, and very few kangaku scholars were involved in their composition. (Komine 2009, pp. 289-91.) For example, Kūkai wrote some hyōbyaku, but Sugawara no Michizane did not write any. Therefore, only one example of hyōbyaku appears in the Honchō monzu. It needs to be noted that Sei Shōnagon mentions ganmon as one of the familiar genres of Chinese composition, but not hyōbyaku, indicating that the latter was elevated to the status of “public literary discourse” (ハレの文芸) on a par with ganmon, mostly during the inset period. (Komine 2009, p. 46.)
Watanabe Hideo (渡辺秀夫), *ganmon* were “highly stylized, lavishly embroidered, patterned language.”

The composition of *ganmon* dates back to the Nara period (710-84), and in some of the earliest extant texts, the prayers appear in the blank space at the beginning and the end of scrolls of handwritten Buddhist sutras. As a considerable number of *ganmon* are also included in Kūkai’s (空海, 774-835) posthumously edited personal collection of Chinese texts, *Shōryōshū* (性霊集, edited by Shinsei 眞渉, 10 vols.) and Sugawara no Michizane’s (845-903) *Kanke bunsō* (菅家文章, *Collected Works of Sugawara Michizan*, 12 vols., 900), it was a well-established genre by the time of the *Honchō monzui*. Moreover, Watanabe, who defines *ganmon*, in particular those written for the deceased, as a kind of “elegiac literature” (哀傷様式の文学), makes the important observation that although not included in the *Wenxuan* as an independent genre, many of the *ganmon* in the *Honchō monzui* take expressions from funeral poems and rhymed verse (詩賦) in the *Wenxuan*.

In the same way he neglected prefaces to the three imperial anthologies of kanshi, Akihira eliminated Kūkai’s *ganmon* and any others that represented the era of the three official anthologies; instead, Akihira selected the scholar-official Yoshishige no Yasutane’s (菅千代田, ?-1002) *ganmon* written “in appreciation of Minister Sugawara [no Michizane’s] Mausoleum” (菅菅丞相廟) as the first specimen of this hybrid genre that draws on the

---

28. 様式化された表現類型の織物である. Watanabe Hideo, p. 53.
29. SNKBT 27, p. 417.
30. Watanabe Hideo, p. 53.
Buddhistic and secular literary traditions. I argue that Akihira symbolically selected Yasutane’s ganmon as a talisman for his fellow Kidendō-trained “literati” (文士, bunshi) of the past, present (and possibly future), assuring them that Michizane would always protect them from the sense of guilt that may arise from pursuing “the wind and the moon” (風月, fūgetsu), namely, the act of composing kanshi, instead of actively taking part in state building, or leading a more meaningful life as a Buddhist practitioner.

In fact, shortly after his exile to Dazaifu in 901, and death in 903, during Emperor Murakami’s Tenryaku era (天暦, 947-57), Michizane’s reputation as an academician was rapidly restored through his deification as Tenjin (天神, lit. “Heavenly God”), and dual-enshrinement at Kitano Shrine (北野天満宮) in Kyoto and at Anrakuji Temple (安楽寺) in Kyūshū.31 The historical narrative Ōkagami (大鏡, The Great Mirror, early 12th century) recounts various personal misfortunes that befell Fujiwara no Tokihira (藤原時平, 871-909) and his family as results of “Michizane’s grief” (北野の御嘆き). Calling Tokihira’s plot against his political rival Michinaga “an unconceivably evil deed” (あさましき恥事), the Ōkagami implies that the pacification of Michizane’s soul could not have been done in any ordinary manner.32 It is also known from the historical record Nihon kiryaku (日本記略, Abridged Chronicle of Japan, 34 vols. late 11th century?) that Michizane had already become a legendary figure, when the rank of

31. For a discussion of Michinaga’s deification process from the viewpoint of the “Shinto-Buddhist syncretism,” see the final chapter of Borgen (1986), pp. 307-36.

32. SNKS 82, p. 76. It is remarkable that the anonymous author of the Ōkagami deploys a mini-chapter in his chronicle, preassigned for the biography of Minister of the Left Tokihira, as a textual space wherein he outrightly demonizes and ridicules Tokihira, while showing his sympathy to Michizane and his offsprings by adding appreciative comments on Michizane’s waka and kanshi poems composed in exile.
Senior First (正一位) was posthumously conferred on him in 993, along with the titular post of Chancellor (太政大臣 daijō daijin). Written in 986, Yasutane’s ganmon for Michizane is an early testament to the emergence of the Tenjin cult, in which Michizane was worshipped as a god of learning, a practice still popular among students and their parents in Japan today.

The dramatic life (and afterlife) of Michizane with his banishment and resurrection as Tenjin was something that Kidendō scholar-officials of later generations (perhaps with the exception of Ōe no Masafusa) could not experience even in their imagination. For example, Ōe no Masafusa’s rank was merely Senior Fourth Lower at the time of his death. Even Sugawara no Fumitoki, the grandson of Michizane, is known to have twice submitted two separate letters of application for the rank of Junior Third (徒三位) in 974 and 980, respectively. After the second attempt, his request was finally granted, but only eight months before his death at the age of eighty three. These biographical details suggest that the lives of Kidendō-trained scholars, even that of top academicians like Fumitoki and Masafusa, who as Professors of Literature, Head of the Academy, and Acting Commissioner of Ceremonial (式部様大輔), held the highest posts in the State Academy, were not all rewarding. Under such circumstances, not all of the students who followed in their footsteps and passed the civil examinations (対策, taisaku) were able to complete their careers as scholar-officials, or as Confucians (儒者, jusha). Yoshishige no Yasutane, for one, studied under Fumitoki, passed the exams, served several minor posts in the provinces and the capital, but eventually left officialdom and took the tonsure in 986. His ganmon in question was written shortly after this.

33. SNKBT 27, pp. 213-4.
For these reasons, Akihira’s selection of Yasutane’s *ganmon* as the first of the genre in the *Honchō monzui* might be regarded as his homage to Yasutane, one of the earliest *kike* (non-Sugawara or Ōe, lit. “upstart”) scholars, who in the words of Ōe no Masahira, were all “doomed to be belittled” (起家者見軽). In other words, because Yoshishige was a *kika* scholar (he hailed from a family specializing in yin-yang lore), not only was he free from the sectarian professionalism which restricted Masahira and Fumitoki (e.g. their insistence on inheriting their “family occupation,” as they expressed in appeals to secure tuition for their sons), he had the liberty to explore different paths as a Buddhist monk. Therefore, special attention needs to be paid to what Yasutane says about his former and current “selves,” when we read his *ganmon* for Michizane:

A novice (that is myself) stepped forward and made the following statement before the Buddha:

“In the years past, in the hope of obtaining prosperity and fame, I went to [Michizane’s] shrine and prayed day after day; I prayed [also in the name of] Buddha’s teachings. Thereby, I was able to pass the civil examination, and was assigned to some minor posts. That was [Michizane’s] heavenly deed, [his] divine provision. In one of the supplications [I presented to him in the past], I made a request to visit Tenjin’s [lit. “Heavenly God,” deified Michizane] shrine, congregate with my fellow literati, and [collectively] offer our poetic compositions. This was because Tenjin is the father of the Way of Literature, the master of the poetic realm.

In my twilight years, [recently] I took the tonsure. [Since then], now and forever, I am in search of the Buddhist Way.

---

34. Masahira made this comment in his application letter for tuition for his son Yoshitomo (竜公), which I briefly mentioned in my discussion of *sōjō*. (SNKBT 27, p. 230.) However, his great-grandson Masafusa seemed to have had sincere respect for Yasutane, because his *Honchō zoku ōjōden* was inspired by Yasutane’s *Nihon ōjō gokurakuki*, and meant to be read as its sequel. Also, although admitting that Yasutane hailed from a family that specializes in yin-yang lore, Masafusa praises him for his literary talent, and writes about his rebirth in heaven. For a discussion of Masafusa’s *Ōjōden*, see Chapter 5.
Now I, the novice, am old; I have no means with which to express my gratitude for [Tenjin's yearlong guidance in my pursuit of] “the wind and the moon.”

[At the same time,] the teachings of the *Lotus Sutra* [have given me] a solid understanding of how to organize a congregation of “incense and flowers” [those who provide offerings to the Buddha.]

Alas! Amusements of flowery language and embellished words, how can they be beneficial for the Way of Gods?

[Only by studying] the obscure and difficult teachings [of the *Lotus Sutra*], one can expect to attain the Buddha Body.

Now at this time of our age, if Tenjin is pleased, all the sentient beings will depend on him. The magnanimity [of the *Lotus Sutra*] has no limits; therefore, it will take care of all the matters in this [and the other] worlds.”

With reverence, I make the above statement.

Twentieth day of the Seventh Month in the year 986 (Kanna 2).

沙弥は前白し仏言。

往年 為二栄分、
為二声名、
為二廟社、
為二仏法、有二日矣。
遂二其大成、
徙二干微官。
是天之工也、
是神之福也。
其二願曰、
就二天満天神廟、
会二文士、献二詩篇。
以二其天神為二文道之祖、詩境之主也。
暮年出家、一旦求二道。
今老沙弥、無二便、
營二風月之賽、
此二乘教、有二心、展二香花之筵。
嗟乎、花言綺語之遊、何益二於神道。
The exact circumstance in which this Buddhist prayer was offered is unclear, but from its title, “Supplication [written for the purpose of] Showing Gratitude at Minister Sugawara’s Mausoleum” (赛菅丞相廟・願文), it can be presumed that Yasutane composed it to be recited at Kitano Shrine. However, whether the shrine compound included an adjacent Buddhist temple, where such a Buddhist prayer could be recited, or Yasutane brought this composition to Michizane’s “mausoleum” (廟, byō) is uncertain. In either case, the prayer is unique because Yasutane implores Buddha to assure “Michizane’s happiness” (一神有慶). Due to Michizane’s status as a “god” (一神), we tend to assume that he is the main provider of the individual supplicant’s personal felicity. But Yasutane confesses that now that he is a devout Buddhist, he can no longer approach Michizane in that manner. Having described him as “the father of the Way of Literature, and the master of the poetic realm” (文道之祖、詩境之主), Yasutane used to regard Michizane as the guardian god of learning (Tenjin), and visited Tenjin’s shrine regularly, where he prayed for his own “prosperity” (栄分) and “fame” (声名) as a scholar-official.

Calling such one-way (Yasutane always asking Tenjin a favor) relationship between himself and the deity “the wind and the moon,” or more precisely, Tenjin’s support in Yasutane’s pursuance of “the wind and the moon,” now Yasutane is eager to return the favor to Tenjin.

35. SNKBT 27, p. 351. To emphasize the parallel structure of Yasutane’s composition, I modified the format of the text.
Because one of his earlier supplications (願, gan) to Tenjin was about “congregating with his fellow literati and offering their poetic compositions [to Tenjin]” (会文士献詩篇), we know that “the wind and the moon” also refers to the act of composing kanshi in this context. Furthermore, contrasting the expression with “incense and flowers” (香花), Yasutane emphasizes that all that he can offer to Tenjin are the teachings of the Lotus Sutra. Denouncing kanshi composition as an “amusement of flowery language and embellished words” (花言綺語之遊), he declares that in his Buddhist practice, Chinese poetry, no matter how pleasurable and elegant, can no longer be his preoccupation.

In the words of Ōsone Shōsuke, Yasutane’s ganmon is “the earliest example of that which shows the notion of ‘wild phrases and embellished words.’” Originally appearing in the Chinese poet Bo Juyi’s (白居易, 772-846) postscript to his poetry collection, the Luohang Anthology, dedicated to Xiang shan Temple (香山寺) in 840, the phrase kyōgen kigo (狂言綺語, “wild words and embellished phrases”) became widely known in Japan through its inclusion under Bo Juyi’s name in the Wakan rōeishū (和漢朗誦集, Japanese and Chinese Poems to Sing, ca. 1017-21), a collection of Chinese, kanshi and waka poems, edited by the courtier Fujiwara Kintō (藤原公任, 955-1041). Throughout the mid-eleventh and twelfth centuries (and even in subsequent centuries), the concept of kyōgen kigo was important in explaining the relationship between Buddhist doctrine and secular literary productions that included not only kanshi but also waka and vernacular prose literature such as The Tale of Genji, because the term was interpreted variously by both critics and defenders of so-called bellettristic literature.

Whether Yasutane himself coined the expression, *kagen kigo* (花言綺語, “flowery language and embellished words”) under the direct influence of Bo Juyi’s prose is unknown, although Bo Juyi’s works are known to have been first imported to Japan during the Jōwa (承和, 834-48) era. 

Yasutane’s renunciation of poetry on account of his Buddhist faith needs to be discussed in conjunction with Pure Land (浄土, *jōdo*) Buddhism, in which the *Lotus Sutra* was canonical. Furthermore, Yasutane’s *ōjōden* (往生伝, “biographies of those reborn in heaven”), *Nihon ōjō gokuraku ki* (日本往生極楽記, *Record of Rebirths in Paradise in Japan*, ca. 985-87) is an indispensable source of his Buddhist beliefs. However, because these topics are not directly pertinent to the subject of the present study, I will instead focus on elucidating the notion of “the wind and the moon,” and attempt to clarify some of its connotations that are often nebulously associated with “poetry” (詩), as opposed to more ideological “Ways” of Buddhism and Confucian socio-political thought.

4. The Wind and the Moon Before and After Sugawara Michizane

The ubiquity of the phrase, “the wind and the moon” is evident from a casual browsing of the *Honchō monzui*. Aside from Yasutane’s *ganmon*, I have already shown that Masahira

---

37. According to Ōsone, the *Montoku jitsuroku* (文徳実録, *Record of Emperor Montoku’s Reign: 850-58*) in its entry of the Ninth Month of Ninju 1 (851) recounts that in Jōwa 5 (838), Fujiwara no Takemori (藤原岳守) obtained the *Hakushi monjū* (白氏文集, *Collected Works of Bo Juyi*), of all, the manuscript copy of the author’s friend, Yian Bai (元白), in a Chinese merchants’ cargo ship, and submitted it to Emperor Ninmyō (仁明天皇, 810-50, r. 833-50). (Ibid., p. 66.)

mentions it in his *sōjō*. In the long selection of “kanshi prefaces” in the *Honchō monzui*, the pervasive references to “the wind and the moon” appear to be balanced by equally frequent appearances of various “Ways” (*道, michi*). I will later discuss the structure of the *shijo* volumes in detail, but at least seven usages of the phrase are found. This is remarkable because while references to “Ways” also abound, such as “the Way of public servant” (*臣子之道*), “the Way of the gentlemen” (*夫子之道*), “the Way of education” (*教學之道*), “the Way of Letters” (*書契之道*), and “the Way of the Buddha” (*仏道*), there are no reference to “the Way of poetry” (*詩之道*) or any of its equivalents, such as “the Way of kanshi.” These seemingly incidental details suggest that in the *Honchō monzui*, the word “Way” was commonly used to designate various aspects of Confucian (and rarely Buddhist) practices, considered fundamental in the realization of the ideal of state building (*經國, keikoku*). However, elegantly labeled as “the wind and the moon,” the composition of poetry seems to be ruled by a completely different set of standards, that could not be considered “Ways.”

39. Brian Steininger’s dissertation introduces three very important references to *fūgetsu*, made by the academician Minamoto no Shitagau (*源順, 911-83*), all included in the *Honchō monzui*. He also provides a translation of Shitagau’s preface to the *Wamyō ruiju shō* (*倭名類聚抄, Collected Encyclopedia of Japanese Names*, ca. 931-38), in which he quotes the commissioner of the encyclopedia, Princess Kinshi’s somewhat negative reference to *fūgetsu*. (Steininger, pp. 88, 98-99.)

40. SZK29-ge, p. 215. In the preface by Sugawara Michizane.

41. Ibid. In the preface by Ōe Sumiakira (*大江澄明*).

42. Ibid., p. 222. In the preface by Sugawara Fumitoki.

43. Ibid., p. 224. In the preface by Ki Arimasa.

44. Ibid., p. 239. In the preface by Yoshishige Yasutane.
As Brian Steininger points out in his dissertation, “[t]he term fūgetsu, like its cousin furyū, has a complicated history in Japan,”[^45] because what it designates beyond the familiar natural images is ultimately a matter of interpretation. For instance, the modern literary scholar Ikeda Genta’s (池田源太) book chapter entitled, “Fūgetsu and Furyū as a Way of Living in the Heian Period” (平安時代に於ける生活理念としての「風月」と「風流」),[^46] proposes furyū as “one of historical life principals.”[^47] Alternately calling fūgetsu “a pattern of life,”[^48] with its own “aesthetics of life,”[^49] Ikeda argues that fūgetsu cannot be separated from the “thought pattern of ‘building nation through literature,’”[^50] because only through developing their own version of thought-patterns called fūgetsu, people in Japan were not only able to appropriate but to internalize the Chinese culture (most notably the composition of kanshi), which had initially been merely “something borrowed from foreign countries.”[^51]

[^45]: Steininger, p. 98.


[^47]: 一つの時代的な生活理念. Ikeda, p. 278.

[^48]: 一つの生活の型. Ibid., 288.

[^49]: 生活の美学. Ibid.

[^50]: 「文章経国」の思想形態. Ibid.

[^51]: 外国からの借物. Ibid.
Defining \textit{fūgetsu} as “natural imagery that invokes poetry in the manner of a motif,”\textsuperscript{52} as opposed to “actual natural phenomena and imagery,”\textsuperscript{53} Ikeda argues that there are many instances in which \textit{fūgetsu} functions as the embodiment of “the poetics of state building”\textsuperscript{54} in the early imperial anthologies of kanshi. As an example of this, Ikeda discusses the following kanshi composed by Emperor Saga (嵯峨天皇, 786-842, r. 809-23), from the \textit{Keikokushū}:

A rhapsody on “Autumn Sadness” [composed] on the ninth day of the Ninth Month, at Shinsen Garden (lit. Garden of the Divine Fountain) [in the palace]

Retired Emperor Saga (when he was on the throne)
[...]
Autumn is sorrowful.
The extremely long night in autumn is sorrowful.
The wind is chilling and the moon is beaming bright.

Lying down, I watch the wind and the moon;
Indeed, it feels profoundly desolate.
Through the window, how can I bear listening to the falling leaves?

[My head] on the pillow, I cannot fall asleep;
Wishing the night would soon be over.
When dawn comes, in the vicinity of my palace, who might be pounding robes?

Chillingly, [various] sounds of night come and go;
A forlorn person am I, I can take no more sorrow.

Deep in bedroom, how can I regret the separation?
Alas, the four seasons change as they come and go.

\textsuperscript{52} 詩趣を誘発するモチーフとしての自然形象. Ibid., p. 291.

\textsuperscript{53} 具体的な自然現象や自然形象. Ibid., 289.

\textsuperscript{54} 経国の詩趣. Ibid., pp. 239-91.
Despondent indeed, the three months of autumn are forever sorrowful.

Noting that “the wind and the moon” in this poem are concrete natural images that function as “poetic motifs” (詩材), Ikeda argues that the fourth line quoted above, “[My head] on the pillow, I cannot fall asleep […] who might be pounding robes?” signifies Saga’s “concern about the welfare of his people as head of the state,” and thus fūgetsu here expresses his feelings as a responsible sovereign. As Ōsone Shōsuke points out, Ikeda’s reading of the passage appears to be misconstrued, because the reason the poetic protagonist is unable to sleep is the “come and go” of various phantasmagoric “sounds of [autumn] night.” In other words, the sound of “pounding robes” cannot be interpreted as noise rising from humble folks’ manual labor, as Ikeda seems to infer. Despite the dubiousness of his textual interpretation of Saga’s poem, Ikeda concludes insightfully that during the “period when ‘literature’ had the function of

55. GR 125, P. 497, (in Book 8).
56. 一国の元首として生民の、安危を憂うる心情. Ikeda, p. 289.
57. Ōsone, vol. 1, p. 329.
state building,”

fügetsu embodied “eternal nature,” “a realm that lies beyond human affairs and the vulgarity of everyday life,” and that which enticed individuals to “contemplate the vastness and eternity of Nature.”

Actually, what he means by “eternal nature,” or a “grandiose view of nature” is vague, but he seems to suggest that whether natural images actually exist in the eye of the poeticizing subject (in this case, Emperor Saga) or not, so long as they invoke feelings (“autumn is sorrowful”) and other associated images (the sound of falling leaves, pounding of robes, etc.) as poetic motifs, they are certainly “eternal” and thus “beyond the vulgarity of everyday life.”

Despite its intuitive manner, Ikeda’s study provides important insights into the historical development of the notion of fügetsu around the time of Sugawara no Fumitoki (899-981).

Regarding Fumitoki’s wakajo, entitled “Waka Preface for the Banquet Held at Minister of the Left’s Flower Pavilion” (左丞相花亭遊宴和歌序), which appears in Book 11 of the Honchō monzui, Ikeda argues that the once “vaguely grandiose nature” was reduced to “a miniature world right before one’s eyes.”

Fumiroki’s wakajo in question begins with the following lines:

It is autumn.

As intense darkness falls on this breezy evening,
We are glancing over the wind and streams in the front garden.

As the moon floats on the water,

58. 「文章」の経国的時代に於いては… Ikeda, p. 291.

59. 永遠なる自然, 人事や俗塵を超えた境地, 大自然の荒漠さとか, 永遠性とかいうものを観想… Ibid.

60. 自然の大景観. Ibid., p. 292.

61. 漠然とした自然, 目前の小世界. Ibid.
In this *wakajo*, the concept “the wind and moon” (*fūgetsu*) is replaced by “the wind and streams” (*fūryū*). We have no way of knowing whether Fumitoki intentionally avoided using the term *fūgetsu* because this is a waka preface. In contrast to “the wind and the moon” in Emperor Saga’s poem discussed above, however, the term *fūryū* in Fumitoki’s waka preface seems to infer “nature” (in the abstract sense) in the constructed garden, which is exemplified by the particular images of “the moon on the water” and “crickets chirp amidst blossoms.” (The invoked images here are similar to those in the *Kokinshū* prefaces, as I will discuss in Chapter 3.)

As another example of “*fūryū* as seasonal objects (自然景物としての風流), Ikeda discusses Ōe no Masahira’s kanshi preface, entitled “Attending [with fellow literati] a Winding Stream Banquet at the Minister of the Left’s [residence], on the third day of the Third Month, and with [the same colleagues] improvising poems as wine cups float along the streaming water” (三月三日陪左相府曲水宴。同賦。因風流泛。酒), that appears in Book 8 of the *Honchō monzui*:

> […] Now, [we are here] playing the game;

> Where would we not enjoy today’s radiant water? But those who [have the privilege of] lingering in a senior noble’s garden and entertaining themselves in the poet’s utopia [lit. place where “peaches blossom”] are still few.

---

62. SNKBT 27, p. 322.

63. However, Ikeda cites only the first three lines of the quoted passage below.
Likewise, who would not appreciate the wind and streams of this place? But those who are entitled to queue with this group of grand literati, and show off their poetic virtuosity are limited.

Today’s festivities are indeed exuberant, indeed exquisite.

By drawing to Masahira’s reference to “today’s radiant water” (今日之華水), Ikeda argues that the objectification of nature had further accelerated by Masahira’s time, to the point that nature became merely “temporary” (暫時的). Because Masahira’s kanshi preface was written to commemorate the Winding Stream Banquet (曲水宴, kyokusuien) in 1007, which originated in China as a purification rite, his comment on the water specifically refers to the winding stream that was “temporarily” created in his host’s residential garden, allowing cups of sake to be floated upon it. According to the rules of the game, each of the invited “Daoists and Confucian officials” (仙郎儒吏) was supposed to compose an entire kanshi before his cup flowed past the place he was standing. In this regard, Ikeda’s argument that Masahira’s reference to fūryū has more to do with “personal and temporary interests” (個人的・暫時的興味) rather than “state building characters” (經國的性格) is reasonable. Moreover, his

64. SNKBT 27, p. 262.

65. Ibid. For more information of the Winding Stream Banquet, see Yamanaka and Suzuki, pp. 192-3.
conclusion that when ōgetsu ceased to embody “major natural phenomena,” it became “a day’s entertainment” explains how mediated through banquets that accompanied the composition of kanshi, the term ōgetsu eventually came to denote the composition of kanshi itself.

Critically reviewing Ikeda’s study, in his 1990 article titled, “On ōgetsu–Before and After Sugawara Michizane” (「風月」放—菅原道真を中心にして), Ōsone Shōsuke offered a new historical perspective on the subject. Like Ikeda, Ōsone analyzes examples from the early kanshi anthologies (even the Kaifūso), and concludes that around the time of Sugawara no Fumitoki (899-981), “the term ōgetsu came to denote Sino-Japanese verse and prose.”

However, Ōsone pays special attention to the ways in which Sugawara no Michizane (845-903) diversified the application of the term ōgetsu in his oeuvre. Ōsone presumes that Michizane played a pivotal role in the transformation of the meaning of the term because like Yoshishige no Yasutane (?-1002), who exalted Michizane as “the father of the Way of Literature, and the master of the poetic realm,” Ōe no Masahira (952-1012) calls him “the great father of the Way of Literature, and the genuine master of ōgetsu” (文道之大祖、風月之本主). In other words, by Yasutane and Masahira’s time at the beginning of the eleventh century, ōgetsu was synonymous with what Yasutane calls “the poetic realm,” namely the composition of kanshi.

67. Ibid., pp. 293-4.
69. 文時によって「風月」の語が詩文の意に定着した. Ōsone, vol.1, p. 333.
70. SNKBT 27., p. 347. However, this “composition” (文 bun) offered to the Kitano Shrine under Masahira’s name, but was composed by his disciple, Nakahara no Nagakuni (中原長国, ?-1054).
To ascertain these literati’s claims that Michizane ultimately altered the Way of “Literature” (文, bun), which could also mean “verse,” as opposed to “prose” (筆, hitsu), Ōsone briefly discusses the famous passage from the “Great Preface” to the Shijing (詩经, Book of Songs), which profoundly influenced Michizane’s poetics:

The poem is that to which what is intently on the mind goes. In the mind it is “being intent”; coming out in language, it is a poem.  

詩者志之所之也。在心為志、發言為詩。  

Ōsone draws attention to the following two statements made by Michizane:

Rhapsody is one strand of ancient poetry;
The poem is that to which what is intently on the mind goes.  

賦者古詩之流、詩蓋志所之  

[Addressed to his friend Ki Haseo: Nowadays], I am becoming increasingly oblivious to that feeling of being moved by things. You guess [what I mean] and you will understand what inspires a poet.  

触物之感、不覺滋多。詩人之興、推而可知  

It is obvious that directly alluding to the “Great Preface,” Michizane’s first statement contrasts “rhapsody” (賦, fu), a kind of rhymed prose, to “poems” (詩, shi). He suggests that in the composition of rhymed prose, conforming with the existing style of “ancient poems,” or

71. Translated by Stephen Owen. (Owen, p. 40.)
73. Kanke bunsō (菅家文草, 12 vols., 900), vol. 7, also in Honchō monzū, vol. 1:11. Quoted from ibid, p. 331.
74. Kanke kōshū (菅家後集, 1 vol., 903). Quoted from ibid.
poems from the *Shijing*, is required; but in the composition of poems, being true to the “intentions” (志, *shi/kokorozashi*) of one’s own feelings and thoughts is essential. Ōsone argues that Michizane’s predilection for the “Great Preface” attests to his “awareness that poems were to be composed when the mind is inspired by some [external] events or objects.”75 Regarding the “Great Preface” passage in question, in his commentary to the text, Stephan Owen similarly discusses the dynamics between the “inner” and “outer” faculties of the poeticizing subject: “The spatialization of poetic production in a ‘going’ [之] creates a model of movement across the boundaries between inner and outer.”76 Thus, rendering the key term *zhi* (志) as “what is intently on the mind,” Owen calls the “Great Preface” passage a “psychological definition” of poetry, which became “the canonical definition for all subsequent poetry.”77

In appropriating this influential theory of poetry from China, Michizane not only introduced the foreign concept in his numerous poetry compositions, he also internalized the poetic ideal by living up to the “intentions” (志) of his own “heart” (心). Thus in the second statement quoted by Ōsone, which originally appeared in a letter (状, *jō*) entitled “A Letter Concerning the Disposition of the Collection of My Works” (献家集状), that Michizane wrote in exile to his disciple Ki no Haseo (紀長谷雄, 845-912), Michizane claims that due to the despondency in his life, external things no longer inspire his poetic imagination.78 Shortly before

75. 詩は物に触れて感興が心に生ずる時に詠むものであることを自覚. Ibid., p. 330.

76. Owen, p. 40. According to Owen, the “paradigm of ‘inner’ and ‘outer’” was not a new concept in Chinese poetics.

77. Ibid., pp. 40-41.

78. For a detailed account of Michizane’s life in exile, see Borgen, pp. 289-304.
his death, Michizane entrusted to Haseo a collection of forty-six verse and prose compositions from his years in exile, which would become Kanke Kōshū (菅家後集, Posthumous Collection of Michizane’s Writings, 903). Even a short description like this suggests we can presume that poet-scholars after Michizane soon began to deify him as the “the genuine master of poetry [fūgetsu],” because they considered Michizane as the first poet in Japan to succeed in accommodating the theory of Chinese literature to his personal taste and circumstances without pedantry.

As for the term fūgetsu in general, Ōsone points out that in his prose and poetry collection, Kanke bunsō, Michizane refers to fūgetsu in various nuanced ways: as actual images of the wind and the moon, as natural imagery that invokes poetic feelings (not limited to the wind and the moon), as elegant entertainment that stimulated the appreciation of nature, and even rather specifically as talent in the composition of poems. Nevertheless, he stresses that Michizane himself never used the term as an epithet for Sino-Japanese verse. Guided by the historical perspective presented in Ōsone’s study, we can make the assumption that the emergence of the understanding of fūgetsu as the composition of kanshi was a reflection of how poet-scholars of the later generations, such as Michizane’s desciple Ki no Haseo and his grandson Sugawara Fumitoki, dealt with his extraordinary legacy.

In order to ascertain this view, Ōsone analyzes four compositions by Fumitoki included in the Honchô monzui, all of which refer to fūgetsu. Among them, the most important is

79. Michizane’s letter to Haseo is included in the collection.
80. 風流な遊び, 詩文の才能. Ōsone, Vol. 1, p. 325.
Fumitoki’s “ballad” (行, kō, a type of free-style verse) entitled “Rōkankō” (老閒行, “The Ballad of an Idle Old Man”), that appears in Book 12 of the anthology as the single representative of the genre. Because it is a remarkable composition in multiple respects, I will quote it in its entirety:

Daytime and evening

Come and go, alternating.

Spring steals away; summer furtively turns dim.

Autumn grow will not stay; the daylight descends quickly.

Hours pass and [at night,] the dew in my garden grows cool; At daybreak, fog on the window is still dark.

The students are all gone, and no longer visit my abode; Old friends are too weary to stop by my gate.

On the floor, books are scattered, so inattentively, I look at them; In the barrel, no wine is left, so naturally, I am awake.

Despite my advanced age, I have not yet forgotten our family treasure— The composition of poems (fūgetsu); Despite my [emotional] distance, I can still hear the clamor in worldly paths of life.

Nevertheless, I am incapable of making a living by watering fields [and raising crops] Or fencing a backwater [and catching fish]; Nor can I practice musical instruments Or learn composing songs, as a way of releasing my agony.

Then, what about retiring from my posts, Wandering about and resting my tired body in a cave [like a Daoist immortal]; Or changing into a pitch-black robe, diligently fulfilling [the duties of a Buddhist monk], And searching for dharma in a mountain grove?

I know [from the Shiji] that Sima Xiangru had a reputable talent in literature, But his house had only four standing walls; I also know [from the Shiji] that Sun Hong scored the highest and passed an exam, But he was nearly an octogenarian then.
Don’t you see the sight of piles of dark tomb mounds at Beimang Hill
In the evening rain?
Or don’t you see the sound in the rows of white poplars under the autumn wind
In the eastern capital suburb?

Don’t you see the sight of piles of dark tomb mounds at Beimang Hill
In the evening rain?
Or don’t you see the sound in the rows of white poplars under the autumn wind
In the eastern capital suburb?

Fumitoki composed this poem in 977 when he was eighty years old. It is extraordinary
first because of its format, which consists of gradually lengthening lines. Gotô Akio remarks that
“character-accumulating poems” (加字詩, kajishi) or “pagoda-shaped poems” (宝塔詩, hōtōshi)
were occasionally composed by Tang poets, including Bo Juyi, but that most modern scholars
have overlooked the fact that Fumitoki’s ballad was composed in this format. 83 According to


83. For instance, a modern print edition of Fumitoki’s ballad in NKBT 69, pp. 405-407 is not rendered in
this format. Furthermore, Gotô points out that Fumitoki’s ballad, the longest line of which contains
twelve characters, as opposed to more common seven or nine characters, shows an astonishing similarity
to the Tang poet, Zhang’s (張謂, 721-780?) composition, including its rhyming scheme and the subject
matter, suggesting that the style and format of Fumitoki’s ballad was not his invention. See Gotô, pp.
115-124.
Gotô, the first critic who drew attention to the “fan-shaped” format of this poem was Ōe no Masafusa in his Gōdanshō.\(^{84}\)

Secondly, Fumitoki’s ballad succinctly shows how he conceived of fūgetsu. In his mind, fūgetsu has become a “family treasure” (家資, kashi) of the Sugawara clan. In contrast to Michizane, who regarded the composition of poems as primarily an individual matter, under the direct influence of the “psychological definition” of poetry in the “Great Preface” to the Book of Songs, Fumitoki claims that his skill in the composition of kanshi, which he amply displays in this composition, is hereditary. Nevertheless, Fumitoki does not directly mention Michizane or his poetic charisma as we saw in Yoshishige no Yasutane’s ganmon. By euphemistically relying on his ancestors’ (no doubt including his grandfather Michizane’s) Academy-trained skill in the composition of kanshi as fūgetsu, Fumitoki was expressing the wish that his family’s reputation would recover after the fall of Michizane. If the ganmon composed in 986 by Fumitoki’s student Yasutane was the first homage to Michizane as as Tenjin,\(^ {85}\) then it is possible that Michizane’s public image was not fully restored at the time of Fumitoki’s composition of this poem in 977.

Furthermore, Fumitoki’s reference to fūgetsu as a “family treasure” can be viewed alongside Ōe no Masahira’s understanding of it as his “personal asset” (風月為資), as we saw it in his application letter (sōjō) for higher posts (Honchô monzui, Book. 6:160). Perhaps because Masahira is a member of the Sugawara’s rival, Ōe clan, he is too modest to call fūgetsu their “family treasure.” However, if we compare Masahira’s letter to Fumitoki’s ballad, it is

---

\(^{84}\) See Ruijûbon 5:73 or 5:74, or Kandabon recensions of the Gōdanshō. For my discussion of the Gōdanshō passage on this poem, see Chapter 6.

\(^{85}\) Ōsone, vol. 1, p. 321.
obvious that the former alludes to the latter in multiple ways. (e.g. Masahira’s rhetorical reference to “the house had only four standing walls” as a metaphor of extreme poverty, and also his mentioning of his octogenarian mother and books.) From closely reading seemingly unrelated texts that are loosely connected through the understanding of fūgetsu as a family or personal treasure, we can envisage a master-disciple relationship between Fumitoki and Masahira, that transcended their family schism, and manifested itself through their mutual commitment to a poetic way of life (fūgetsu), despite their shared persistent discontent as scholar-officials. In the words of Ōsone, “It was natural that now that [these academicians’] roles in society were significantly reduced [after the Engi and Tenryaku eras], they were more inclined to pursue poetry rather than the Confucian Classics,” and their assertions that the composition of kanshi and their talent therein are a hereditary privilege only accentuate the “pathetic situation of the scholars who were trapped [in their own imaginary worlds].”

Lastly, compared to Yasutane’s ganmon, Fumitoki’s ballad indeed brings to the fore the torment inflicted upon him due to his family’s traditional identity as a Confucian household. While it may appear contradictory to his claim about fūgetsu being a Sugawara privilege, Fumitoki’s ballad most powerfully depicts his sense of resignation in old age. He confesses that what makes his life so hard is his position as a middle-ranking official, which estranges him from both the humble producers of crops and other foodstuffs, whom people of his social status normally governed in the provinces on the one hand, and the music-playing, leisured senior

86. 活躍の場を狭められた彼等が勢い経学よりも詩賦に傾斜するのは自然の勢勢である。Ibid, p. 333.

87. 追詫められて行った学者の悲しい姿. Ibid.
nobles, whom he served with his compositional skills, on the other. Through rhetorical questions, Fumitoki further denies the possibilities of his becoming a recluse like a Daoist, or taking the tonsure.

In sum, Fumitoki’s ballad reveals the harsh realities behind the gradual processes in which fūgetsu became synonymous with the composition of kanshi, and the hereditary profession of Sugawaras and the Ōes. Ironically, as Sino-Japanese anthologies like the Wakan rōeishū and the Honchō monzui, in which these tenth and eleventh century academicians’ verse and prose feature amply, took on a canonical role in the education of the aristocracy during the insei period, various worldly outcries, expressed by those scholar-officials turned literati, like Fumitoki and Masahira, were gradually forgotten. Instead, these scholars would become the protagonists of various personalized setsuwa, in which they curiously reappear as men of “poetic elegance” (fūryū); and as these anecdotes became part of the collective memory, these kanshi poets’ ability to interweave personal feelings (no matter how dejected they were) into fine tapestries of “flowery language and embellished words” became a model for waka poets. Before concluding this chapter, we must briefly examine how the poetic ideal of fūgetsu, already glimpsed through ancillary genres of sōjō and ganmon, actually manifests itself in the Honchō monzui section on kanshi prefaces.

5. Kanshi Prefaces in the Honchō monzui

Earlier, I mentioned that nearly one-third of the Honchō monzui is devoted to a single literary genre of “kanshi prefaces” (詩序, shijo), of which there are 139, in stark contrast to a mere three examples in its Chinese model, the Wenxuan. In short, in the Honchō monzui, the
genre of shijo presents itself as a microcosm that consists of the following eighteen categories:


Hierarchically organized by subjects that concern celestial, natural and calendric matters, interpersonal relationships, Buddhism and other miscellaneous issues, and ending with flora and fauna, the range of subjects suggests the prevalence of kanshi in Japanese society by the time of the anthology’s compilation in the mid-eleventh century. (Kanshi prefaces would not have been written in a place where kanshi were not composed.) However, it is not difficult to imagine that Akihira emphasized the ubiquity of kanshi composition with ambivalence. On the one hand, as Sugawara no Fumitoki and Ōe no Masahira considered fūgetsu as their family and personal “assets,” Kidendō scholars after Michizane regarded their skills in the composition of kanshi as a privilege of their institutional education. On the other hand, the proliferation of the practice of kanshi composition in every sphere of society meant that kanshi had become a Japanese “custom” (風俗, fūzoku) as waka had long been. In other words, the Kidendō-trained literati’s tendency to regard the kanshi composition as their own or their families’ prerogative ironically ushered in the transformation of kanshi from a state building discourse to a means of self-
exploration. Were the scholar-official in the eleventh century aware that their kanshi poems were becoming ever more similar to waka? How, then, did they maintain their social status and identities as trained Confucian scholars (儒家, juka), once they had become lyric poets who mainly poeticize for themselves? I argue that the Kidendō-academics’ way of dealing with this reality was to draw a line between kanshi (ふげつ) and waka (ふぞく) by simply referring to them as such.

In fact, the topical classification of poetry anthologies was first experimented with waka with the compilation of the Kokin waka rokujō (古今和歌六帖, Ancient and New Waka in Six Books, ca. 976-82), which divided some 4500 waka poems from the Man’yōshū, the Kokinshū and the Gosenshū, and classifies them into 516 topics. Considered the earliest example of the genre of “topically classified waka anthologies” (類題和歌集, ruidai wakashū), the Kokin waka rokujō (hereafter Kokin rokujō) consists of six books, each containing the following subject matter: Book One–the Calendar and Four Seasons (歳時); Book Two–Mountains (山), Rice Paddies (田), Fields (野), Capital (都), Countryside (田舎), Dwellings (家), Humans (人) and Buddhist Matters (仏事); Book Three–Bodies of Water (水); Book Four–Love (恋), Celebrations (祝) and Departures (別); Book Five–Miscellaneous Thoughts and Feelings (雑思), Clothing and Accessories (服飾), Colors (色) and Textiles (錦綾); Book Six–Plants (草), Insects (虫), Trees (木) and Birds (鳥). Although the redactor of the Kokin rokujō is unknown, some scholars attribute the work to the academician, Minamoto no Shitagō (源順, 911-83),\(^8\) the author of the

\(^8\) See for instance, WBJ pp. 212-3, under “Kokin waka rokujō.”

On the surface, the scheme of classification in the kanshi preface sections of the Honchō monzui and the Kokin rokujō appear almost identical except for “The Way of Emperors” and “Scholarly Discussions” in the former, and “Love” in the latter. What is even more remarkable is that the Honchō monzui features many kanshi prefaces on flora and fauna, in particular on “trees” with numerous prose compositions on cherry blossoms and fallen leaves—the best represented seasonal topics in waka anthologies. The incorporation of perspectives associated with waka in the Honchō monzui was most likely mediated through the Wakan rōeishū, an anthology of Chinese, kanshi and waka poems, which is also divided into similarly encyclopedic topics, each of which includes examples of the three major types.

These topically categorized anthologies often served as “primers” (啓蒙書, lit. “books of enlightenment”), and were intended to be used as reference material for youth learners or non-scholars. Because of their fundamentally non-scholarly nature, the compilation of primers were usually not carried out by the Kidendō-trained Sugawara and Ōe “Confucian” scholars. Modern scholars have argued that because Akihira was a self-made (kika) scholar, although he shared the similar academic background as the Sugawara and Ōe academicians, he was less restricted by family traditions, and therefore was able to compile an innovative book like the Honchō monzui, which not only served as a practical book for general audiences, but also well reflected the

89. For the biography of Shitagō and discussion of the Wamyō ruiju shō, including Shitagō’s preface to the dictionary, see Chapter 5 of Brian Steininger’s dissertation. (Steininger, pp. 181-216.)

compiler’s thoughts on literature. In other words, the Honchō monzui is a collection of Akihira’s literary and social criticism, through which he attempted to solve the issue of what academicians could do once their Confucian upbringings were no longer valued in society.

In structural terms, the expansion of kanshi prefaces in the Honchō monzui is actually foreshadowed by Akihira’s idiosyncratic selection in the preceding section on “book prefaces” (shojo) in Book 8. As mentioned earlier, his omission of the prefaces to the three imperial Kanshi anthologies of the Ryōunshū, Bunka shūreishū and Keikokushū was highly questionable, considering the symbolic roles they served in the formation of the Confucian political ideal of “state building through literary enterprises” (文章経国, bunshō keikoku) in mid-ninth century Japan. Of the six “book prefaces” Akihira selects, four are introductions to legal codes such as the Ryō no gi ge (令義解, Commentary to the Yōrō Code, 10 vols., 834), Kōnin kyaku (弘仁格, Collections of Edicts and Legal Amendments from 701 Through 819, 40 vols., partially extant), Jōkan kyaku (貞観格, Collection of Edicts and Legal Amendments from 820 Through 868, 12 vols., lost), and Engi kaku (延喜格, Collection of Edicts and Legal Amendments from 869 Through 907, 12 vols., lost). What are selected together with these as book prefaces are two highly personal essays entitled, “Preface to My Kanshi Poems Composed After the Engi Era,”(延喜以後詩序) and “Preface to the Collected Works of Priest Kyōkō” (沙門敬公集序). The former was written by Ki no Haseo, and the latter by Minamoto no Shitagō. I believe that Akihira selected Haseo and Shitagō’s essays; both can be read in the light of “defense of kanshi

91. See for example, Satō (2003), pp. 5-10.
92. Annotated in SNKBT 27, pp, 50-54.
poetry,” together with some of the most formal writings in the history of the ritsuryō state, in order to endow the numerous kanshi prefaces that follow them with symbolic significance. In other words, these essays, written (in Shitagō’s words) in honor of “those who have profound knowledge of literature, and are skilled at composing poems” (深於文巧詩之徒),93 figuratively serve as “prefaces” to the colossal section on kanshi prefaces in the Honchō monzui.

In particular, Haseo’s essay, written after Emperor Daigo’s Engi era (901-23), features his personal recollections of Michizane. Considering the later academicians’ glorification of Michizane as the master of fūgetsu, I cannot help but see Akihira reading special meaning into Haseo’s essay, which consists of the following four topics: 1) Haseo’s brief autobiographical reference to the time before he met Michizane; 2) his memories of how he became Michizane’s disciple, how they interacted with each other at various “literary gatherings” (文会), and how his skill in the composition of kanshi improved during those years; 3) and his report on Michizane’s being “charged with a crime and being demoted at the end of the Shōtai era [898-901]” (至昌泰末、或丞相得、罪左遷。) and “death [in exile] in 902” (延喜二年、忽化異物。), accompanied by a quotation from the farewell message sent by Michizane to Haseo: “Consultant Haseo must be overwhelmed by hard work [as an official] all alone [in the capital], while all my other contemporaries are great scholars [and not poets]” (紀相公独煩劇務、自余字輩盡鴻儒。); and 4) Haseo’s criticism of his fellow academicians on account of their “unpoetic” life as “Confucian scholars”:

Because Confucians serving at the imperial court are numerous, I have many colleagues. They are all the followers of Wang Bi and He Yan

93. Ibid., p. 256.
In this essay, Haseo criticizes his fellow scholar-officials for their utilitarian approach to Chinese history and literature, which demonstrates their superficial understanding of the foreign culture. By accusing these scholars of not appreciating the “varied richness” (趣, “essence, flavor”) of “literary compositions” (文体), Haseo reiterates the point made by Michizane that
they were serious scholars of the Confucian classics but not necessarily poets. Furthermore, alluding to Michizane’s own adaptation of the psychological definition of poetry in the “Great Preface,” Haseo argues that after Michizane’s death, he is distancing himself from his fellow literati by faithfully living up to the poetic ideal prescribed by Michizane.95

One may argue that Hasao’s “rejection” of fūgetsu contradicts my argument that it became the modus operandi of the poetic universe wherein kanshi was composed at every social occasion. But we should interpret Hasao’s reference to fūgetsu as rhetorical, because his comment about his openness to “whatever comes into his view,” and attentiveness to his own thoughts only attest to his acceptance of fūgetsu, namely, that which invokes “poetic feelings” in the mind. For these reasons, Akihira’s inclusion of Haseo’s essay as one of the exemplary “prefaces” to the subsequent sections on kanshi prefaces can be interpreted as his symbolic testimonial that even after the Engi era, Kidendō-trained scholar-officials actually heeded Haseo’s criticism, and were willing to shift the focus of their career pursuits from pedantic scholarship to the composition of more personalized prose and verse. In retrospect, Michizane and Haseo’s espousal of a more spontaneous approach to the composition of kanshi shows striking similarity to the theory of waka promulgated in the Kokinshū prefaces, also products of the Engi era.

95. “I simply allow ‘what comes to mind’ [志] to guide me…”
Chapter 3

Constructing A Literary History of Waka Before the Twelfth Century Through Waka Prefaces

Introduction

The previous chapter examined how kanshi prefaces (shijo) and Chinese compositions in other literary genres (buntai) such as application letters (sōjō) and supplicatory Buddhist prayers (ganmon) in the literary anthology Honchō monzui (ca. 1058-65) provided vivid portraits of Kidendō academicians in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Those writings demonstrated that the Sugawara and Ōe scholars differentiated the composition of kanshi from other professions, and appropriated the former as their family prerogative because of the reduced status of their role as “Confucian scholars” (juka), originally trained to assist learned imperial rulers’ “building of the state” (keikoku) through their literary skills, in particular, the composition of verse and prose in highly stylized Chinese.

In this chapter, I focus on waka prefaces (wakajo) and through them attempt to construct a literary history of waka between the mid-eighth through the late eleventh century. In the Honchō monzui, waka prefaces, including the Chinese preface to the waka anthology, Kokinshū (905), are regarded as ancillary, a sub-genre of kanshi prefaces. However, before the twelfth century, there was no systematic approach to waka or a tradition of writing lengthy commentaries on waka, and poets’ self-reflective discussion on the genre often took the form of prefaces to individual poetry collections. A few individual short waka treatises written in Japanese by the courtier Fujiwara no Kintō (966-1041) are exceptions, but even after Kintō, wakajo continued to be written by both waka and kanshi poets.
I first examine the Japanese preface ("Kanajo") to the *Kokinshū*. (Because “Kanajo” is written in Japanese, technically speaking it is not a wakajo.) I discuss how it defines waka as manifestation of universal poetic language, through which human beings spontaneously express emotions. I then turn to the presumably oldest extant waka treatise, *Kakyō hyōshiki* (*Basic Rules of Waka*, 722?), written in Chinese by the academician Fujiwara no Hamanari (724-90). In analyzing Hamanari’s preface to this treatise, I discuss how he defines waka using rhyme schemes and other formalistic elements of kanshi composition. I compare Hamanari’s treatise to the Chinese preface to the *Kokinshū* (“Manajo”), and speculate why the compiler of the *Honchō monzui*, Fujiwara Akihira, dismissed the former and selected the latter as the chronologically first example of wakajo. Finally, I examine the waka poet Nōin’s (988-active 1051) waka preface to his own poetry collection, *Nōin shū* (*The Works of Nōin*, after 1045). Nōin was trained in the Kidendō curriculum at the State Academy before taking the tonsure. I discuss the significance of his writing about waka in the manner of a kangaku academician, while harshly criticizing society’s disregard for waka.

Each of my textual analyses of these waka prefaces will be followed by a brief discussion of their reception by twelfth-century waka scholars. Regarding the Japanese preface to the *Kokinshū*, I examine how the later poet-scholars embraced a certain recension of the text that contained a set of pre-twelfth century interlinear comments called *sachū* (“comments in the left margin”) or *kochū* (“old commentaries”). As for the *Kakyō hyōshiki*, I examine how twelfth-century poet-scholars regarded it as a prototype for a series of waka handbooks called *kashiki* (rule books of waka). I also discuss how Fujiwara no Kiyosuke (1104-77) constructed the biographical image of Nōin as the object of worshipping among middle-ranking male officials
who often served in the provinces, for his “passion” (suki) for the composition of waka.

1. Universalist Definition of Waka in the Japanese Preface to the *Kokinshū*

In the literary history of waka, the most influential are the two prefaces to the *Kokinshū*. The “Kanajo” (仮名序) in Japanese is attributed to the waka poet Ki no Tsurayuki, and the “Manajo” (真名序) in Sino-Japanese to the scholar-official Ki no Yoshimochi (紀淑望, ?-919, Haseo’s son). Although discussions in the two prefaces only concern waka, in the early tenth century, formal discussions of poetry, in particular in the vernacular Japanese, were rare. In fact, both pre-modern and modern scholars have speculated on the relationship between the two prefaces, (e.g. the compositional order), but there is no scholarly consensus. In order to shed light on some of the innovative ideas in the two prefaces, as well as to illustrate how a proper understanding of these issues became an “internal” stimulus for the consolidation of “waka studies” (歌学 kagaku) by poet-scholars in the late twelfth century, I will discuss some of the representative twelfth-century commentaries to the *Kokinshū* prefaces. An attempt to analyze the *Kokinshū* prefaces in conjunction with their historical receptions may lead to confusion.

However, because the texts we read today (even in modern print editions) are without exception

---

1. For instance, Ozawa Masao hypothesizes that the “Kanajo” was written by Ki no Tsurayuki, whereas the “Manajo” was likely to have been written by Ki no Yoshimochi. He also argues that the “Manajo” was written before the “Kanajo.” For details, see Ozawa (1963), pp. 131-55. In contrast, Sasaki Nobutsuna maintains that the “Kanajo” precedes to the “Manajo.” NKT 1, “kaidai,” pp. 20-23. For the most comprehensive summary of the scholarly debate over the issue, see Konishi (1951, vol. 2), pp. 336-46. (Konishi Jin’ichi also supports the view that the “Manajo” precedes the “Kanajo.” However, he, like other scholars, stresses Tsurayuki’s involvement in the composition of the “Manajo.”) In fact, the authorship of the two *Kokinshū* prefaces was a curious issue for poet-scholars in the twelfth century. For instance, in the concluding section of his *Kokinshū jo chū*, Kenshō (顕昭, ca. 1130-ca. 1210) introduces the kagaku scholar Fujiwara Atsumitsu’s (藤原敦光, 1063-1144) opinion that the Manajo was most likely to have been written by Yoshimochi’s father, Ki no Haseo. (NKT bekkkan 4, p. 164.)
based on some of the most valorized medieval or early-modern Kokinshū manuscripts, all of which are derived from a handful of carefully collated (and thus “authenticated”) manuscripts of the Kokinshū from the insei period, any discussion of the Kokinshū prefaces requires an understanding of some of the major “events” that took place in the long history of their textual reproduction and transmission. For this reason, I will discuss some of the fundamental issues of the “Kanajo” as an embryonic, pre-twelth century criticism of waka, with special attention to the interlinear commentary known as sachū (左注) or kochū (古注), which is often integrated into the main text of the “Kanajo.” The “Kanajo” begins with the following paragraph:

2. For example, the SNKBT edition of the Kokinshū is based on a mid-seventeenth century copy of a 1318 manuscript that was transcribed by Fujiwara no Tamesada (藤原為定, 1293-1360), the great-grandson of Teika’s grandson, Fujiwara no (Nijō 二条) Tameuji (藤原為氏, 1222-1286, Tamei’s son), based on Teika’s own 1223 (Jōō 貞応 2) manuscript of the Kokinshū. Teika’s own 1223 manuscript does not survive. However, RSS 2 contains a facsimile of a much earlier copy of Teika’s 1223 manuscript, which was transcribed by Teika’s grandson, Priest Kakuson (覚尊法印, Tamaie’s son) under the supervision of Fujiwara no Tameie (藤原為家, 1198-1275, Teika’s son). In his “kaidai” to RSS2, Katagiri Yōichi points out that because Teika’s 1223 manuscript of the Kokinshū was used as the “authorized text” (訳本) for the “Kokin denju” (古今伝授, “transmission of secret teachings regarding the Kokinshū”), the master-disciple relationship among waka poets, semi-institutionalized by the Nijō family throughout the medieval and early-modern period, Kokinshū manuscripts that derived from Teika’s 1223 manuscript “outnumber” any other recensions. (RSS 2, “Kaidai,” pp. 24-5.) Teika is known to have made at least seventeen copies of the Kokinshū throughout his life. For detailed information of each one of these textual (re)production, see Katagiri’s “Kaidai” in RSS 2, pp. 3-14. Akase Tomoko (赤瀨知子) also briefly discusses Teika’s involvement in the production of the Kokinshū manuscripts. (However, she counts the total number of his Kokinshū manuscripts as sixteen, not seventeen.) Akase, p. 83. Originally published as “Shoki no kokinshū chūshaku to waka no ie no tenkai–insei ki kara kamakura ki” (初期の古今集注釈和歌の家の展開—院政期から鎌倉期) in Yokoi Kaneo and Arai Eizō eds., Kokinshū no sekai–denju to kyōju (古今集の世界—伝授と享受, Tokyo: Sekai shisōsha, 1986), Akase’s book chapter (pp. 75-93) provides a useful overview of the history of the Kokinshū scholarship in the eleventh through the early fourteenth centuries, especially focusing on the late twelfth century, which saw the emergence of poet-scholars such as Shōmyō and Fujiwara no Norinaga, and the family-based Rokujō and Mikohidari schools of waka. Each of these topics are further developed by Akase herself (pp. 94-113 on Shōmyō) and a series of articles by Asada Tōru and Kami Hiroyuki.

3. The term sachū is generic, and commentaries in the sachū format are found in manuscripts of other texts, such as the Man’yōshū.
Japanese songs, with the human mind as their seeds, have grown into a myriad of leaves of words. By the time human affairs and actions had become complex, people in society began to express their feelings in association with what they saw and what they heard—that was the beginning [of Japanese songs].

When one hears the warbler’s chirping among the blossoms, or the croaking of a frog in the water, among all sentient beings in the world, who can resist singing a song?

It is songs that gently stir heaven and earth, affect the minds of invisible gods and demons, harmonize the relations between men and women, and comfort the souls of fierce warriors.

やまとうたは、ひとのこゝろをたねとして、よろづのことのはとぞなれりける。世中にある人、ことわざしげきものなれば、心におもふことを見るものきくものにつけていひだせるなり。花になくうぐひす、水にすむかはづのこゑをきけば、いきとしいけるものいづれかうたをよまざりける。ちからをもいれすしてあめつちをうごかし、めに見えぬ日に神をもあはれとおもはせ、をとをむなのなかをもやはらげ、たけきものゝふの心をもなぐさむるは、うたなり。(From Teika’s 1226 manuscript of the Kokinshū)

Visually rendered in Teika’s characteristically exuberant kana syllabary with a minimum use of Chinese characters, with numerous references to nature images and fairly-tale like depictions of “earth and heaven,” “gods and demons,” “men and women,” and “fierce warriors,” a quick reading of the “Kanajo” may give the impression that waka is all about the beauty of flora and fauna, and the splendor of creationist mythology in ancient Japan. However,

---

4. RSS 2, p. 14. My translation is based on the Karoku 2 (1226) manuscript of the Kokinshū, transcribed by Teika himself. To facilitate the reading, however, I added the punctuation and “dakuten” (voicing marks) in the Japanese text. Also, in order to emphasize the dynamics of the arguments in the otherwise run-on passages, in the translation, I divided the paragraph into three sections.
underneath the bucolic tapestry surprisingly logical arguments about the nature of poetry unfold.

First, through the metaphoric use of “seeds” (たね), “minds/hearts” (こころ) and “language” (lit. “leaves of words,” ことのは), the “Kanajo” declares that waka—introduced here as “Japanese songs” (yamato uta)—derives from the human mind. Carrying over the botanic motif of the opening line by the word “complex” (shigeki, lit. “luxuriant”), in the second sentence, the preface makes a bold statement that waka is the representation of human emotions that emerge in various circumstances, expressed through visual and auditory images. The somewhat ambiguous verb tsukeru (つける) suggests that everything that comes to one’s mind (心におもふこと) was primarily expressed figuratively through the descriptions of what one saw and heard.

The “Kanajo” further expounds on the organic relation between human cognition and external sensory stimuli by giving examples of “the warbler’s chirping among the blossoms,” and “the croaking of the frog in the water.” These examples suggest that the visual sensation of these particular scenes must be pleasant enough (e.g., the presence of blossoms and quietly streaming water is assumed in the background), but it is mainly the “sounds” made by the warbler and the frog that make the viewer sing. (Nature as envisioned in these examples can

---

5. According to Kojima Noriyuki and Arai Eizō, the modern commentators of the SNKBT edition of the Kokinshū, this botanical metaphor has its origin in the following passage from the Collected Works of Bo Juyi (白氏文集·予元九書): “感人心者。莫先乎情… 詩者根情苗言。華声実義。” (那波本巻二十八, quoted in SNKBT 5, p. 338.)

6. This schema best describes kibutsu ei (寄物詠, “object poems”), that collectively appear with attributions to anonymous poets in Books 7 and 10 of the Man’yōshū. For a discussion of some of the kibutsu poems from Book 10, from the viewpoints of “imagination” and “nature,” see my article in Japanese, “Manyōshū maki jū no kibutsuei ni okeru shizen to sózōryoku no mondai ni tsuite” (万葉集卷十の寄物詠における自然と想像力の問題について) in Ajia yūgaku 143, pp. 88-94.
exist either in the wilderness or in artificially crafted gardens.) Moreover, by raising a rhetorical question, “among all the sentient beings in the world, who can resist singing songs,” the “Kanajo” implies that humming or the act of enunciating sounds with some variations in pitch and rhythm is so fundamental to human behavior that even other living creatures will act in a similar way. In other words, people may be drawn to the bird and frog’s “voices” (こゑ), more than their appearance, because they hear in them something akin to their own vocalizing or singing.7 Earlier, I mentioned that in pre-twelfth century waka prefaces, waka was often considered a “custom” of Japan. However, the argument presented in the “Kanajo” is that of a universalist, concerned with elucidating the human act of sound making through utterance—speaking, singing, rhyming and the recitation of poems—in the broad category of which waka (lit. “Japanese songs”) is included.

In the third part of the passage quoted above, the “Kanajo” concludes its definition of waka by proposing its practical functions and benefits. Although the effect of the argument is slightly obscured by the use of plain verbs, such as “to stir” (うごかす), “to make one feel” (おもはす), “to harmonize” (はらく) and “to comfort” (なぐさむ), the “Kanajo” makes the point that because waka is a type of “song”—the universal language though which humans express emotions—poetry acts upon the human mind, and facilitates inter-personal communication. Thus, in human relationships, the power of waka manifests itself “gentl[y]” (ち

7. The Kokinshū preface author’s analogy of human speaking voice to that of “all the sentient beings in the world” appears strikingly similar to what the modern linguist Roman Jakobson (1896-1982) calls the phatic function of language, which is characterized by a “profuse exchange of ritualized formulas” for the purpose of prolonging communication. Jakobson says that “the endeavor to start and sustain communication is typical of talking birds; thus the phatic function of language is the only one they share with human beings.” (From “Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbances, 1956, in Jakobson, p. 69.)
からをもいれず，lit. “even without adding much force”), because based on the universal
cognitive model discussed above, all sentient beings (here paraphrased as “heaven and earth,”
“invisible gods and demons,” “men and women” and “fierce warriors”) are born with the ability
to appreciate “songs.”

This view is the origin of the idea of “moral power of waka” (katoku 歌德), the belief
that the composition of a “meritorious” waka could bring about the fulfillment of personal
wishes, as in the case of Akazome Emon’s poems in the Konjaku monogatarishū discussed in
Chapter 1. However, in contrast to the Konjaku editor, who as discussed earlier, judged waka
mainly by their cleverness and wit, the author of the “Kanajo” does not rule out the importance
of certain aesthetic virtues in his discussion, such as the pleasantness of the sound. For example,
“the warbler’s chirping” and “the croaking of the frog” stimulate people’s poetic imagination,
whether for the inexplicable serenity or the strangeness of the sound, the “Kanajo” suggests that
certain elements in the musicality of waka (presumably when recited) create a sense of unity and
harmony among people.

In a sense, what the “Kanajo” attempts to expound on waka is not only logical but
profoundly linguistic and philosophical. By making the theme of the first paragraph “songs” and
other aural phenomenon, the preface not only defines waka from a musical point of view, but
also touches upon the mystery of language in general, raising questions of phonology, and why
certain words in certain languages consist of certain phonetic values, and why certain words in
certain language sound more pleasant than others. Recognized as such, throughout the “Kanajo,”
waka (after its first introduction as “Japanese songs”) is referred to as “songs” (uta 歌). In
other words, there is no “waka” but only songs in the “Kanajo.”
Because the “Kanajo” was written as an introduction to the subsequent twenty books of the *Kokinshū*, it contains basic information about the anthology, such as the names and titles of the four compilers, editorial guidelines, and a praise for Emperor Daigo (醍醐天皇, 885-930, r. 897-930)–the imperial commissioner of the anthology. However, supplementing the universalist definition of waka with a discussion of more localized topics, the “Kanajo” also contains literary and social histories of waka, ascribing its origin to the primordial age of mythological gods and goddesses; discussions of the “six styles of songs” in the manner of the Six Principles (六義 rikugi) of poetry, which originated in the “Great Preface” to the *Shijing* (詩經, *Book of Songs*) and flourished during the Six Dynasty period (212-606) in China; and appraisals of the poems composed by the six model poets of Priest Henjō, Ariwara no Narihira,

---

8. They are “Grand Secretary Ki no Tomonori (大内記紀友則), Imperial Librarian Ki no Tsurayuki (御書所筆記貫之), Former Officer in the Province of Kai Ōshikō no Mitsune (前甲斐小目官凡河内躬恒), Member of the Ministry of the Right Palace Guard Mibu no Tadamine (右衛門府生千生忠岑).” SNKBT 5, p. 16.

9. For instance, the “Kanajo” mentions that Emperor Daigo ordered that the four compilers to “select old poems that are not included in the *Man’yōshū*, as well as the redactors’ own compositions” (万葉集に入らぬ古き歌、自らのをも奉らしめ給ひてならむ.) SNKBT 5, p. 16.

10. Tsurayuki, one of the editors and the author of the Japanese preface to the *Kokinshū*, for instance, expresses his “joy in being a contemporary of [the commissioner of the *Kokinshū*, Emperor Daigo] and becoming a participant in this imperial project [lit. “that which takes place during this emperor’s reign]” (この世に同じく生まれて、この事の時に会へるをなむ、喜びぬる). Ibid., p. 17.


12. “To begin with, there are six styles of songs” (そもそも、歌の様、六つなり). Somewhat reluctantly admitting the continental origin of this classification of poems, (“This must also be the case in Chinese poetry” 唐の詩 [うた] にも、かくぞ有るべき), the “Kanajo” introduces the six styles of waka–そへ歌, かぞへ歌, なずらへ歌, たとへ歌, たぐごと歌, and いはひ歌–with examples. Ibid, pp. 6-9.
Funya no Yasuhide, Priest Kisen, Ono no Komachi, and Ōtomo no Kuronushi.¹³

2. The Mysteries of Old Commentary in the Japanese Preface to the *Kokinshū* and Twelfth-Century Waka Exegetists

Because of the cursory manner in which “Kanajo” discusses these topics regarding the origin and the historical development of waka, it has long been an object of scholastic scrutiny. A set of interlinear notes called *sachū* (左注, lit. “note in the left-side margins”) by modern scholars, were added to the Japanese preface to the *Kokinshū* before the early twelfth century.¹⁴ For example, the “Kanajo” mentions some of the legendary characters from the Japan’s earliest historical chronicles—the *Kojiki* (古事記, Record of Ancient Matters, 712) and the *Nihon shoki* (日本書記, Chronicles of Japan, 720)—as the pioneers of waka composition. However, the author of the preface simply assumes the reader’s familiarity with these names, and provides few explanation of the narrative contexts in which their poems appear. Likewise, each of the “six styles of songs” is represented by a single example, but no explanation is provided, while the compositional style of the “six model poets” are critiqued with terse comments but no examples.

¹³. Priest Henjō (遍昭, 816-90), Ariwara no Narihira (在原業平, 825-80), Funya no Yasuhide (文屋康秀, active during the reigns of Seiwa and Yozei emperors in the late ninth century), Priest Kisen (喜撰, active in 810-24), Ono no Komachi (小野小町, early to mid ninth century), and Ōtomo no Kuronushi (大友黒主, date unknown) For a detailed discussion of each of the Six Immortals of Waka (*rokkasen* 六歌仙), see, for example, Ozawa (1976), pp. 159-96. However, the term *rokkasen* does not appear in the *Kokinshū* prefaces. According to the *Waka bungaku jiten*, the term itself was devised around the time of the second imperial anthology of waka, *Gosen wakashū* (後撰和歌集, Subsequent Anthology of Waka, 951). WBJ, p. 706, under “Rokkasen.”

¹⁴. Nishimura Kayoko points out that the earliest extant manuscript of the *Kokinshū*, the Gen’ei Recension (元永本, 1120) already contains the *sachū*, which she calls *kochū* (古注). Nishimura, p. 10.
In short, these are the passages in the main text of the “Kanajo,” where the anonymous commentator of sachū inserted his interlinear glosses. In contrast, the absence of the sachū comments in the opening paragraph of the “Kanajo” suggests that the commentator did not think the issues discussed there were contestable.

Regarding the sachū comments, the literary historian Nishimura Kayoko (西村加代子, 1946-96) proposed the highly compelling argument in a 1995 essay that they were written by the courtier Fujiwara no Kintō (藤原公任, 966-1041, the compiler of the Wakan rōeishū) after he had written comments on the “Manajo,” in order to demonstrate his own understanding of the relationship between the Chinese theory of Six Principles and the “six styles of songs,” and also to aid female readers of the “Kanajo,” who were not necessarily familiar with myth-histories.15 Equally significant is the fact that by the time the earliest extant commentary to the “Kanajo” was written in the late 1160s, a tradition of copying the sachū comments into manuscript versions of the “Kanajo” had been established. Therefore, the interlinear glosses, now attributed to Kintō, appear in the majority of medieval manuscripts of the “Kanajo,” sometimes with indentations or other discourse markers, sometimes completely integrated into the body of the main text.

For instance, in the Kokinjo chū (古今序訳, Commentary to the Preface to the Kokinshū, before 1168), the earliest extant commentary to “Kanajo,” transcribed by Priest Shōmyō (勝命, 15. Nishimura’s article, “Kokinshû kanajo ‘kochû’ no seiritsu” (古今集仮名序「古注」の成立), originally appeared in Chûko bungaku (中古文学), vol. 56 (1995). It is included in her book, Heian kôki kagaku no kenkyû (平安後期歌学の研究, 1997), pp. 18-31. Kintō’s comments to the “Manajo” does not survive independently, but Nishimura reconstructs the text through its citations (逸文) in Kenshô’s Kokinshû jo chû. (Nishimura, pp. 21-26.)
also known as Fujiwara no Chikashige 藤原親重, 1112-87?), the sachū are indented from the main text, and the anonymous exegetist’s own comments (mainly on sachū) are further indented, resulting in a three-tiered structure.\(^{16}\) Similarly, Priest Kenshō’s (顕昭, 1130?-1209?) Kokinshū jo chū (古今集序注, Commentary to the Kokinshū Prefaces, 1183), in which corresponding passages from the Japanese and Chinese prefaces to the Kokinshū are paired, sachū (which appear only in the “Kanajo”) are called kochū (古注, “ancient commentaries”), clearly distinguished from Kenshō’s own comments, “present-day commentaries” (今注, konchū).\(^{17}\)

\(^{16}\) According to the colophon of the Kokinjo chū, Shōmyō made the manuscript based on the “Ôe Family’s Recension” (江家本), which does not survive. (The inscription is of interest because it suggests that kangaku scholars of the Ôe family were involved in annotating the Japanese preface to the Kokinshū, at some time.) The text of the Kokinjo chū is available in SNKBT 5 (Appendices), pp. 416-21. For a facsimile reproduction, see 論集古今和歌集 (笠間書院). The earliest extant commentary to the “Manajo” is also known as the Kokinjo chū (古今序註, Commentary to the Preface to the Kokinshū, before 1167), and it is known to have been written by Shōmyō. Text is available in SNKBT 5, pp. 374-415. For a study of Shōmyō’s commentary to the “Manajo,” and its similarities to various medieval commentaries to the Nihon shoki, see Akase Tomoko, pp. 94-113 and Nishizawa’s summary, pp. 122-26.

Shōmyō is known as the author of the Nan senzai (難千載, Anti-senzaishū), a polemical text critical of the seventh anthology of waka, Senzai wakashū (千載和歌集, Collection of Japanese Poetry for Millennia, 1188), that does not survive today. The setsuwa collection Kokon chomonjū (古今著聞集, Collection of Famous Tales from Ancient Times to the Present, 20 vols., ed., Tachibana Narisue 橘成季, 1254) includes a tale which records the shōshikai (尚齒会, lit. “venerating the elderly poetry gathering”) in the spring of 1182, which Shōmyō (at the age of seventy-one) attended along with other “elderly” waka poets, such as Hōribe no Narinaka (祝部成仲, eighty-four years old) and Shunē (俊恵, seventy years old). According to this anecdote, Shōmyō wrote a “Japanese preface” (仮名の序) to commemorate the event. (SNKS 59, p. 264.) In his waka treatise, Mumyōshō (無名抄, Nameless Book, after 1211), Kamo no Chōmei (賀茂長明, 1155-1216, Shunē’s disciple) makes occasional references to Shōmei as a highly opinionated and knowledgeable person about waka. (See, for example, NKBT 65, pp. 40, 59.) For more detailed textual study of Shōmyō’s exegetical works, see Asada (1990) and Nishizawa (1996), pp. 118-122.

\(^{17}\) From the inscription in the colophon (奥書) of the Naikaku Bunko Recension of the Kokinshū jo chū, “Thereby, I sparsely recorded what my narrow mind investigated, and unwarrantedly prepare for His Highness’s perusal” (繁載管見之所勘、整備竹園之高覧。), it can be surmised that Kenshō submitted the Kokinshū jo chū to Shukaku Hosshinnō (守覚法親王, 1150-1202) in 1183. (NKT bekkkan 4, p. 164.)
Although meticulously marked by the formulaic phrase “According to the Ancient Commentary” (古注云), and thus identifiable, kochū are not indented from the main text of the prefaces, whereas Keshō’s comments, following the phrase, “According to the present-day commentaries” (今注云), are always indented. This formatting style suggests that Keshō regarded the kochū as essentially part of the main text of the Kokinshū prefaces.

In Fujiwara no Teika’s own manuscript of the “Kanajo” in the Karoku 2 (1226) recension of the Kokin wakashū, which is designated as a National Treasure (国宝), the sachū comments are also integrated into the text of the “Kanajo.” However, Teika distinguishes them from the main text of the preface by rendering them in characters one half the size of the main text.18 Because Teika’s recension became the basis of the majority of modern printed editions of the Kokinshū, this method of transcription (also adopted in Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei edition of the Kokinshū) is most familiar to the modern reader. In contrast, in his Kokin wakashū chū (古今和歌集註, Commentary to the Kokin Wakashū, 1177), Fujiwara no Norinaga (藤原教長, 1109-?) indents his own detailed, line-by-line comments to the “Kanajo” passages, but he does not mark the sachū as other commentators did. In other words, in Norinaga’s commentary, sachū is completely amalgamated into the main text of the “Kanajo,” and no longer retains its format as interlinear commentary.19

---


19. Norinaga’s Kokin wakashū chū is believed to be the lecture notes (kikigaki 聞書) of his lecture to Shukaku Hosshinnō during the twelfth through twenty-third day of the Ninth Month of 1177. The modern print version of Norinaga’s Kokin wakashū chū is available in Kokin wakashū (Nihon Koten
These subtle yet carefully made textual markers left by the late-twelfth century “Kanajo” exegetists to separate the sachū from their own commentaries indicate that they had a preconceived notion that the former were an inseparable part of the text of the “Kanajo,” that needed to be transmitted verbatim to posterity, along with the main text of the preface. For example, according to Fujiwara no Kiyosuke’s waka treatise Fukurozōshi (Pocket Book, 1157), three “authorized texts” (証本, shōhon) of the Kokinshū were known during his lifetime.²⁰ Kiyosuke confirms that the first two manuscripts, both transcribed by Ki no Tsurayuki (貫之自筆) and respectively known as Her Cloister Yōmeimon’s Recension (陽明門院御本) and Empress GoReizei’s Recension (小野皇太后宮御本) were lost in fires. (The indication that in the late eleventh century, these precious Kokinshū manuscripts were in the hands of women is noteworthy.) Kiyosuke also records the fact that the former, known to have once belonged to Emperor Daigo, “did not have prefaces” (この本序なし), but the latter “contained the Japanese preface” (仮名序ありと云々).²¹

Because these two manuscripts were lost by Kiyosuke’s time, the manuscript he himself used as a master text is the third one, transcribed by Tsurayuki’s sister (貫之妹自筆), which had been given to Retired Emperor Sutoku (崇德天皇, 1119-64, r. 1123-41). This manuscript, known as Emperor Sutoku’s Recension (崇徳院御本), also included the “Kanajo” (仮名序ありと云々)...

---

²¹ SNKBT 29, p. 56.
In his study of the Sutoku Recension of the *Kokinshū*, Kami Hiroyuki (紙宏行) discusses how both Kiyosuke and Fujiwara Shunzei used the Sutoku Recension as either a master copy (底本, *teihon*) or a text for collation (対校本, *taikōbon*), when they made their own house copies of the *Kokinshū*. Significantly, as Kami notes, both Kiyosuke and Shunzei expressed their doubts (不審, *fushin*) about the authenticity of the Sutoku Recension because of its inclusion of old commentary in the Kanajo. For instance, in the colophon of his Hōgen 2 (1157) manuscript of the *Kokinshū* (清輔本保元二年奥書), Kiyosuke noted that he collated his own manuscript with the Sutoku Recension, but “because the preface contained commentary, the text appeared somewhat questionable.” (但有序注。少以有疑殆。)²³ Nishimura further points out that in a “little note” (勘物, *kanmotsu*) inserted in the same text (the 1157 manuscript of the *Kokinshū*), Kiyosuke mentions that Fujiwara no Michitoshi (藤原通俊, 1047-99) believed that the old commentary in the “Kanajo” was written by Fujiwara no Kintō, but he himself does not accept the view (信受けせられず).²⁴

These bibliographical details reveal that by the late twelfth century, the “Kanajo,” along with the main text of the *Kokinshū*, had been so fervently valorized that the Sutoku Recension—the most authentic extant copy of the anthology at the time—unanimously became the new standard of the text, together with its mysterious old commentaries. This suggests that as far as the “Kanajo” is concerned, it first became an object of exegetical scrutiny in the early eleventh century.

²² Ibid.


²⁴ Quoted in Nishimura, p. 9. According to Nishimura, Kiyosuke’s step-brother Kenshō supported the view that the old commentary in the “Kanajo” was written by Kintō. (Ibid.)
century (based on the assumption that the *kochū/sachū* were added by Kintō). Then in the mid-twelfth century, a handful of waka exegetists (Shōmyō, Norinaga and Kenshō) critically examined and challenged the views presented through the old commentary, while accepting it to be an integral part of the *Kokinshū* manuscripts. In the late-twelfth century, Kiyosuke and Shunzei embraced the Sutoku recension of the *Kokinshū* that contained *sachū* comments to prove the authenticity of their own house copies of the *Kokinshū*, regardless of their doubts about the origin of the old commentaries.

These demonstrate that in the long history of waka practice, waka itself had its own “in-house” material that was critical and contentious enough to result in the consolidation of the systematic study of waka in the mid-to late twelfth century. In other words, these textual details concerning the reception of the “Kanajo” show that the formation of waka studies in the twelfth century had its own solid material basis, and was not merely a result of waka poet-scholars’ ostentatious act of imitating the customs and mannerisms of kangaku academicians. In the words of Kenshō, “[i]n general, the *Kokinshū* prefaces lie at the heart of waka” (抑古今序者、和歌之肝心也。), and “[a]mong waka prefaces, the Japanese preface [to the *Kokinshū*] is the most refined” (是和歌序之秀逸也).25 Likewise, in his waka treatise *Yakumo mishō* (八雲御抄, *Commentary of the Eight-fold Clouds*, early 13th century), Emperor Juntoku 順徳天皇 (1197-1242, r. 1210-21) calls the *Kokinshū* prefaces “the essence of waka” (歌の眼, *uta no kaname*).26

3. The *Kakyō hyōshiki* and the Theory of Sounds and Rhymes in Waka

Technically speaking, however, the “Kanajo” was not the first waka treatise in Japan, because although written in Chinese, the oldest extant book on waka is the *Kakyō hyōshiki* (歌経標式, *Basic Rules of Waka*, 772?), also known as the *Hamanari shiki* (浜成式, *Hamanari’s Rules of Waka*), due to its attribution to Fujiwara no Hamanari (藤原浜成, 724-90). There are two variants of the *Kakyō hyōshiki*—the so called “Genuine Recension” (真本, *Shinpon*) and the “Abridged Recension” (抄本, *Shōhon*); the former is believed to have been authored by Hamanari himself. According to this view, the *Kakyō hyōshiki* even predates the *Man’yōshū*, the compilation of which was completed around 785.

Originally known as the *Kashiki* (歌式, *Rule Book of Waka*), the *Kakyō hyōshiki* consists of a short preface and discussions of seven “poetic maladies” (歌病, *kabyō, uta no yamai*) and three “poetic formats” (歌体, *katai*). Because the notion of “waka maladies” was evidently modeled after the “poetic maladies” (詩病, *shibyō*) described in Chinese poetics, discussions of

---

27. For a detailed discussion of the debates among modern Japanese scholars over the “authenticity” (真偽説) of this attribution, see Ozawa (1963), pp. 293-95, 299-304. Also in Ozawa (1979), pp. 201-4, 237. For a brief biography of Hamanari, see Satō Makoto’s (佐藤信) essay, “Fujiwara hamanari to sono jidai” in Okimori, et. al., eds., pp. 308-21.

28. The Abridged Recension, on the other hand, was completed sometime during the Heian period, before Fujiwara no Kiyosuke’s *Fukurozōshi* (ca. 1157). Both versions of the *Kakyō hyōshiki* are included in NKT 1. See Sasaki Nobutsuna’s “kaidai” for further bibliographical information about the two recensions. Ozawa Masao concludes that the “Abridged Recension” was compiled no later than the eleventh century, judging from the language used in the manuscript. For more details, see Ozawa (1963), pp, 300-304.

which are best preserved in Kūkai’s (空海, 774-835) literary treatise, *Bunkyō hifuron* (文鏡秘府論, *Discussion on the Treasury of Literary Models*, 6 vols., ca. 809-20), modern scholars have often dismissed the *Kakyō hyōshiki* as a “mere imitation” of Chinese poetics. In fact, the *Kakyō hyōshiki* proposes a very odd theory of waka, mainly concerned with the phonological and syllabic components of poems, and even goes so far as to delineate rules about the proper use of “sound” (音・声), “homophones” (同音・同声), “identical characters” (同字) and “rhyme” (韻) in the composition of waka. Calling such rules “new standards” (新例), the preface to the *Kakyō hyōshiki* explains why they had to be established:

Your subject Hamanari’s proposal:

In principle, song had its origin in affecting gods and ghosts’ profound emotions, and consoling heavenly beings’ romantic feelings.

30. According to Ozawa Masao, the trend of discussing various “maladies” (yamai 病) in the composition of poems first took place as early as the late Six Dynasty period (212-606). However, most of the early Chinese poetic discourse on the maladies, under whose influence Hamanari’s *Kakyō hyōshiki* must have been written, does not survive. Thus, Kūkai’s *Bunkyō hifuron* is the earliest extant text that contains citations from the pre-Tang Chinese poetry treatises that are known for their references to poetic maladies, such as Shen Yue’s (沈約, active during the Qi and Liang dynasties) theory of Eight Poetic Maladies (八病説). Ozawa (1963), pp. 347-99. For detailed analyses of Kūkai’s commentary to each of the twenty-eight poetic maladies he introduces in the *Bunkyō hifuron*, including Shen Yue’s Eight Maladies, see Konishi (1951), pp., 22-79.

31. For instance, Hirasawa Ryūsuke argues that “despite [Hamanari’s] occasional references to the judging criteria that appear appropriate to the specific issues of waka, the *Kakyō hyōshiki* as a whole appears to be a mere imitation of Chinese poetics, and fails to provides critical standards that are relevant to the reality of the waka composition” (... このように部分的には穏当な批評基準が示されているにもかかわらず、全体としてみるならばやはり本書は中国詩論をほとんどそのまま和歌にあってはめた感が強く、和歌の実態に即した批評基準を提示していないように思われる。) Okimori et al., p. 294.

32. For discussions of “poetic maladies” (kabyō), see Ozawa (1963), pp. 401-404; Ozawa (1979), pp. 208-210, 237-8; Okimori, et. al. eds., pp. 121-151 (annotation to the “Genuine Recension” of the *Kakyō hyōshiki*). For discussions of “poetic styles” (katai), see Ozawa (1963), pp. 416-422; Ozawa (1979), pp. 238-240; Okimori, et al., pp. 152-220 (annotated text).
Historically, verse has been differentiated from the language of [everyday] manners and customs, and enhances the spirit of joy and happiness.

Therefore, [legend] has it that when the Dragon Maiden [Princess Toyotama] returned to the sea, the Heavenly Grandson [Prince Ninigi] sent the maiden a love song; when [Prince] Ajisuki ascended to Heaven, those who congregated there composed songs in honor of his majesty.

These two events mark the beginning of the utilization of exquisite and elegant *phonema* and *rhuthmos* [GK “sound” and “rhythm”) [in the Japanese language].

Poets of recent times have indeed mastered poetic diction, but know very little about [how] sounds and rhymes [function].

They can make others joyful and delighted [with their compositions], and yet know nothing about “maladies” [errors to be avoided in poetry].

Compared to antiquity, it [the extent to which contemporary poets’ ignorance of rhyme schemes and “poetic maladies” disappoints me] is like the fragrance of spring blossoms vanishing completely;

Compared to the transmission of knowledge to posterity, it is like someone who does not appreciate the flavor of autumn fruits.

Without [knowing] the Six Styles [of poetry, in every one of which sound and rhyme play a vital role], how well can one “influence and pacify” the realms between heavenly beings and humans?

Therefore, I have established new standards, and have excerpted some rhymed compositions in order to provide examples. Combining these in one volume, I call the book “The Rules of Songs.”

Hopefully, [this set of rules] will prove useful for poets [in learning how to compose poems] to be free of errors, and for those who listen to [others’ compositions to learn how] to criticize [the errors in them].

臣湊成言。原夫歌者、
所以 感鬼神之幽情、
慰天人之恋心者也。
韻者所以 異於風俗之言語、
Because of the multiple correspondences between the preface to the *Kakyō hyōshiki* (Genuine Recension) and the Japanese preface to the *Kokinshū*, such as the persistent reference to waka as “songs” (*uta*), the discussion of the origin of waka based on myth-histories, the idea that waka “affects gods and ghosts’ emotions” and “pacifies the realms between heavenly beings and humans,” it is somewhat difficult to believe that the preface to the *Kakyō hyōshiki*...
was written completely independently from the *Kokinshū* prefaces, unless we assume the latter heavily alluded to the former.\(^{35}\) However, it is not my objective to argue against the scholarly consensus that the Genuine Recension was written by Hamanari in the late eighth century. Rather, I want to draw attention to the claim made in the preface that poetic language (韻, verse) “is different from the language of everyday manners and customs” (韻者所以異於風俗之言語).

This view appears strikingly modern and sophisticated, regardless of modern scholars’ oft-repeated negative appraisals of the *Kakyō hyōshiki*,\(^{36}\) because it is based on the non-essentialist view that even in the vernacular Japanese language, the distinction between poetic and everyday language existed, and it was the task of the poet to make use of “exquisite and elegant sounds and rhythms” (雅妙之音韻) in the language of his/her choice. According to the modern scholar Yajima Izumi (矢嶋泉), in the main text of the *Kakyō hyōshiki*, Hamanari selected samples of “rhymed compositions” (韻曲) from the *Kojiki*, the *Nihon shoki* and an earlier draft version of the *Many’ōshū*, called the Fifteen-Volume Man’yōshū (十五巻本万葉),\(^{37}\) and often modified them into particular formats he needed as examples. Thus, the phrase “poets of recent times” (近代歌人) mainly refers to poets whose works are featured in the *Manyōshū*.\(^{38}\)

---

\(^{35}\) In contrast, the Abridged Recension occasionally alternately refers to *uta as waka* (和歌), the term first appears in the Chinese preface to the *Kokinshū*. NKT 1, pp. 1-17.

\(^{36}\) In Kyūsojin Hitaku’s words, the *Kakyō hyōshiki* “has little value from the viewpoint of waka studies, […] because] it is an unreasonable and unnatural adaptation of Chinese poetics […] and] extremely childish.” (歌学上よりは大した価値は認められない[…] 詩学そのままを当嵌めた不合理不自然なもの […] 極めて幼稚なもの […] ) NKT1, p. 2.

\(^{37}\) The “Fifteen-volume Man’yōshū” did not contain volumes 5, 6, 9, 12, 14, 15, 26 of the current *Many’ōshū*. (Okimori et al, pp. 342-47.)

\(^{38}\) According to Yajima, of some 4500 poems in the current *Many’ōshū*, merely 740 fulfill the demand of what Hamanari calls “rhymed compositions.” (Okimori et al, p. 331.)
The individual issues Hamanari raises in his treatise are complex, and cannot be easily summarized or shown here in their entirety. I will briefly discuss his comment on one of the seven “waka maladies”:

The third [malady] is called The Bottom of the Waist. Final syllables of the other measures cannot have the same sound as those in the main rhyming measures. “Other measures” refer to the three measures [of the first, second and forth], that are distinguished from the main rhyming measures [of the third and fifth].

For example, Princess Kagami’s poem on the passing of spring makes this particular error:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wagayanagi} & \quad \text{my willows} \\
\text{midori no ito ni} & \quad \text{green threads} \\
\text{narumade ni} & \quad \text{before turns into} \\
\text{minaku uretami} & \quad \text{not seeing is upsetting} \\
\text{kakete kumitari} & \quad \text{place [over my head] and braid}
\end{align*}
\]

For example, Princess Kagami’s poem on the passing of spring makes this particular error:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wagayanagi} & \quad \text{my willows} \\
\text{midori no ito ni} & \quad \text{green threads} \\
\text{narumade ni} & \quad \text{before turns into} \\
\text{minaku uretami} & \quad \text{not seeing is upsetting} \\
\text{kakete kumitari} & \quad \text{place [over my head] and braid}
\end{align*}
\]

三は腰尾。他の句の尾字は本韻と同声なることを得ず。他の句とは、本韻を除き余れる三の句を言ふ。
失てるは、鏡女王、去く春を讃む歌に日へるが如し。

わがやなぎ 一句 みどりのいとに 二句 なるまでに 三句
みなくうれたみ 四句 かけてくみたり 五句 (Emphasis added)\(^9\)

The third measure of a tanka (短歌, “short poem” in thirty-one syllables) is sometimes figuratively called the “waist measure” (腰句), as it connects the upper and lower halves of the poem. The passage quoted above concerns the last syllable of that measure, which Hamanari alternately calls one of the “main rhyming measures” (本韻, hon’in). In another section of the

treatise, he designates the last syllables of the third and fifth measures of *tanka* as *hon’in*, and also classifies “rhyme” (韻, but here means “vowels”) into two types of “a” and “o, i, u, and others.” According to this rule, Princess Kagami’s poem is flawed because the final syllables of the second and the third measures have the same sound, “ni.” In other words, the closest Japanese equivalent of the Chinese rhyming schemes, as interpreted by Hamanari, was the modulation of vowels. Because in a properly “rhymed composition,” the last syllables of the third and fifth measures had to have the identical vowels, we can assume that having the same vowel at the end of another measure was considered redundant. In comparison to Kagami’s poem, Hamanari shows that the following poem composed by Fujiwara no Kamatari (藤原鎌足, 614-69) is free of this error:

> imogahimo    my wife’s belt  
> tokuto musubite    untied and then tied  
> tatutayama    I left home; now in Mount Tatsuta  
> miwatasu nobe no    as I glance over the field  
> momiji keraku wa    [covered with] red maples

いもがひも とくとむすびて  たつたやま みわたすのへの もみ
ちけらくは (emphasis added)\(^{41}\)

According to Hamanari, this is proper “verse” (韻) because the last syllables in the third

---

40. 短歌は第三句の尾字を以て初韻とし、第五句の尾字を以て終韻とす。[… 韻には二種あり。一つは亀韻（そん）二つは細韻（さいむん）。亀は山（やま）・玉（たま）・島（しま）・浜（はま）等の類、細韻は言（こと）・時（とき）・離（かる）・吟（うたふ）・知（しる）等の如きの類なり。Ibid., 153.

41. Ibid., p. 153.
and the fifth measures “rhyme.” However, these examples show that no matter how progressive Hamanari’s approach to poetic language appears in the preface, in reality, his poetics is unconvincing because of his ultimate insensitivity to what these “elegant” (or non-elegant) sounds signify. Hamanari certainly attempted to reform the vernacular custom of the composition of waka by applying the parameters of Chinese literary criticism as early as the late eighth century, and that itself was remarkable in the long history of kanshi and waka in Japan. However, because he was overtly a formalist, unlike Sugawara no Michizane and the authors of the Kokinshū prefices, who held the unwavering belief that poems (both kanshi and waka) were products of the human mind as opposed to mere correct rhyming schemes, Hamanari’s theory soon became obsolete. Perhaps that was why Fujiwara no Ahikira did not select Hamanari’s preface to the Kakyō hyōshiki as the first example of waka prefaces (wakajo) in the Honchō monzui.

4. The Reception of the Kakyō hyōshiki in Twelfth Century Waka Treatises

During the insei period, nevertheless, because waka-scholars were keen on gathering all historical references available about waka practices at the time, the Kakyō hyōshiki is often cited in waka treatises as a reference. For instance, Fujiwara no Kiyosuke copies Hamanari’s explanations and examples from the so called Abridged Recension of the Kakyō hyōshiki in his Ōgishō (密義抄, Secret Notes, 1124-44?), under the subjects of “Three Styles of Waka” (和歌三

42. For instance, in the “Jeweled Chaplet” (玉鬘, Tamakazura) chapter of the Genji monogatari, the protagonist Genji states that he found those books generically known as “principles of waka” (鰲脰, zuinō) extremely “restricting” in learning how to compose waka, because they contained many rules about “maladies and errors one was supposed to avoid” (病ざるべき所). (SNKBT 20, pp. 370-1.)
The first “rules of waka” were established by Consultant Fujiwara no Hamanari during the reign of Emperor Kōkō [r.770-81]. Since then, various rule [books of waka], such as the Hikohime shiki (Princess Hiko’s Rule Book of Waka), the Kisen shiki (Priest Kisen’s Rule Book of Waka) have described their own “maladies.” Among them, repeating the same words [in a poem, which is ruled out in the Hikohime shiki], and also the tautological use of words [lit. “referring to the same meanings in two places”] are mainly considered unacceptable today. Other maladies do not even appear to be something one should carefully avoid. Nevertheless, since their names appear in these rules, probably one should at least know about them. So, I will write them down here.

٨٣٧٦٩٥١٧٦٩٤٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٤٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٤٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٤٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٤٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٤٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٢٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩١٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٠٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٩٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٨٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٧٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٦٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٥٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٤٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٢٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩١٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٠٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٩٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٨٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٧٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٦٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٥٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٤٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٢٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩١٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٠٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٩٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٨٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٧٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٦٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٥٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٤٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٢٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٢٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩١٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٠٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٩٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٨٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٧٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٦٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٥٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٤٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٢٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩١٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٠٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٩٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٨٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٧٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٦٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٥٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٤٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٢٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩١٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٠٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٩٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٨٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٧٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٦٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٥٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٤٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٢٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩١٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٠٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٩٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٨٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٧٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٦٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٥٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٤٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٢٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩١٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٠٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٩٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٨٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٧٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٦٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٥٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٤٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٣٧٧٥١٧٦٩٢

43. NKT 1, pp. 229-234, 237-8. During the insei period, Kenshō and Fujiwara no Teika used the Genuine Recension, whereas Kiyosuke and Shunzei cited from the Abridged Recension of the Kakyō hyōshiki.

44. Ibid., pp. 377-379.

45. KKS 7, pp. 91-2.
Unlike Kiyosuke and Norikane, Shunzei does not cite Hamanari’s examples from the *Kakyō hyōshiki*, because he thinks that they are no longer relevant to his own standards of waka composition. Viewed from the broader perspective of Sino-Japanese and Japanese cultures before the twelfth century, Hamanari’s waka treatise presents itself as an anomaly, because of the unusually “hands-on” ways in which Hamanari—the academician—discussed waka. In his biography of Hamanari, Satō Makoto (佐藤信) quotes from the *Shoku nihongi* (続日本紀, *Chronicle of Japan II*, 40 vols., 797), which describes him as a scholar-official who was “extensively well read” (略渉群書). In short, Hamanari was the first and yet the last kangaku scholar, who attempted to redefine waka with a set of foreign parameters of “sound and rhymes” (音韻). As Shunzei mentions, in the literary history of waka, the *Kakyō hyōshiki* became a model and set a precedent for the production of other waka treatises called “rule books” (*kashiki*).

In other words, after the consolidation of the Kidendō (history and literature) curriculum in the State Academy during the Jōwa era (承和, 834-48), academicians’ approach to kanshi composition itself became less formalistic and more lyrical, especially after Sugawara no Michizane (845-903), as discussed in the previous chapter. This means that by the time of Michizane, even kanshi poets were unlikely to have accepted Hamanari’s unapologetically formalistic approach to poetry, no matter how important rhyme schemes were in the composition of Chinese verse. After the compilation of the *Kokinshū* (905), although prominent kangaku scholars continued to compose even greater number of Chinese prefaces for waka banquets

46. Okimori et al., pp. 314-5.
(wakajo), they no longer attempted to challenge the definition of waka established in the
Kokinshū prefaces. In other words, after the Kokinshū prefaces, waka no longer needed a
kangaku scholar to expound on it, with standards borrowed from Chinese poetics. This coincides
with the trend that the waka poet Fujiwara no Kintō (966-1041) wrote some of the early waka
treatises in Japanese in the early eleventh century, such as the Shinsen zuinō (新撰簡囊, Newly
Selected Principles of Waka, date unknown) and the Waka kuhon (和歌九品, Nine Levels of
Waka Poems, after 1009). And perhaps it was in this climate that Kintō added interlinear
commentary to the Japanese preface of the Kokinshū, most likely for his female audience, as
hypothesized by Nishimura Kayoko and other modern scholars.

5. The Chinese Preface to the Kokinshū

In the Chinese preface to the Kokinshū, also called “Manajo” (真名序, “Chinese
Preface”), we first encounter the familiar term, waka (和歌, lit. “Japanese songs”) in the
following statement: “Japanese songs have their roots in the realm of the heart, and their flowers
bloom in the grove of words.” (夫和歌者。託其根於心地。發其華於詞林者也。) As this
opening statement parallels the one in the Japanese preface, it can be easily surmised that the
term “waka” is a Chinese rendition of “Japanese songs” (yamato uta). The fact that throughout
the “Manajo,” waka is referred to in this way, unlike in the “Kanajo” and the Kakyō hyōshiki,
wherein the term uta persists, suggests that the kangaku scholar Ki no Yoshimochi, to whom the
“Kanajo” is attributed, primarily viewed waka vis-à-vis other “non-Japanese” songs, that is
Chinese and Sino-Japanese poems.
If the *Kakyō hyōshiki* was the first attempt to define waka through the parameters of Chinese poetics, the “Manajo” was the first attempt to write about waka in highly stylized kanbun. In short, while featuring the localized subject of Japanese poetry and its historical development, the writing style of “Manajo” has its own aesthetic quality, and even as a prose composition, it embodies certain elements of *fūgetsu*, such as the metaphorical references to “roots,” “flowers,” and the “grove” of words. In other words, the “Manajo” was written by a scholar with a *fūgetsu*; and that is why the compiler of the *Honchō monzui*, Fujiwara no Akihira, designated it as the first example of the literary genre of *wakajo* in Book Eleven of the anthology.\(^\text{47}\)

The topics discussed in the Japanese and Chinese prefaces to the *Kokinshū* are mostly analogous, but the following passage about the general circumstances surrounding waka poets after the compilation of the *Man'yōshū* is unique to the “Manajo”:

In the past, Emperor Heizei (774-824, r. 806-9) issued an imperial edict and ordered his subjects to compile the *Man'yōshū*. Since then, there have been ten imperial reigns, and over one hundred years have passed. After the *Man'yōshū*, waka was neglected, and no further anthologies were compiled. Consultant Ono no Takamura (小野篁, 802-52) was renowned for his poetic refinement, and Middle Counselor Ariwara no Yukihiro (在原行平, 818-93) for his lighthearted wit; but this only refers to their talent (*zae* 才) in other fields [such as the composition of kanshi], not in the Way of waka [lit. “this Way”].

昔平城天子、侍臣に詔して、万葉集を撰ばしめたまふ。爾れより以来、時は十代を歴、数は百年を過ぐ。其の後和歌は棄てて採られず。風流は野宰相の如く、輕情は在納言の如しと雖も、皆他の才を

\(^\text{47}\) Later in the mid twelfth century, in the *Fukurozōshi*, Fujiwara no Kiyosuke discusses various theories about the author of the “Manajo.” He personally advocates the idea that it was written by Ki no Haseo. (SNKBT 29, pp. 53-4.)
For the present study, this passage is of interest because of the expression, "this Way" (斯の道), which apparently refers to the "Way of waka." Although this is one of the few instances in which waka is specifically referred to as a "Way" before the 1170s, the term as it is used here does not designate a particularly respectable activity. Rather, this passage explicitly states that after the Man'yōshū, waka was "neglected" (棄てて採られず) at a time when kanshi was enjoying much popularity among scholar-officials and the emperors who sponsored the compilation of three imperial anthologies of the Ryōunshū (814?), the Bunka shūreishū (818?) and the Keikokushū (827). The author of the "Manajo" goes so far as to say that during this period, admirable gentlemanly traits, such as "poetic refinement" (風流, fūryū) and "lighthearted wit" (軽情, keijō) are discernible only in "other fields" (他の才, lit. "other talents"), not in the composition of waka.

The Kokinshū prefaces state that the compilation of the anthology signaled the end of the state of dishonor into which the art of waka had fallen, and thus in the larger context of the "Manajo," the passage in question does not harm the image of waka. (In other words, the statement needs to be understood rhetorically.) Curiously, however, the Japanese preface does not include a comment specifically corresponding to this passage in Sino-Chinese. Moreover, no matter how highly kanshi had been regarded as a means of state building in the early ninth century, Sino-Japanese compositions from this period, including those in the imperial kanshi anthologies, were to be "neglected" in later collections, such as the Honchō monzui.

48. Ibid., p. 347.
In the mid-eleventh century, Fujiwara no Akihira disregarded the early heyday of kanshi during the 810s and 820s probably because they predated the consolidation of the Kidendō curriculum in the State Academy, and the importation of the *Collected Works of Bo Juyi* (白氏文集, *Hakushi monjū*), which took place during Emperor Ninmyō’s (仁明天皇, 810-50, r. 833-50, also known as Emperor Fukakusa 深草帝) Jōwa era (承和, 834-48). In this regard, it was no coincidence that the opening passage of the Chinese preface to the *Kokinshū* alludes to the following statement made by Bo Juyi:

> Emotions are what moves the heart most powerfully. When poetry is rooted in an emotion, words become its seedlings; Sounds become its blossoms, and ideas become its fruits.

Most likely due to the influence of Bo Juyi, waka and kanshi are both regarded as “poetry” (詩) in the *Kokinshū* prefaces. Although they shared common “roots” as early as at the beginning of the tenth century, however, the trajectories of waka and kanshi would not cross until the mid-to late twelfth century. While male and female members of the aristocracy composed waka on a casual basis, drawing on the *Kokinshū* as a model, Kidendō scholars professionalized the composition of kanshi. In other words, it was only after the *Kokinshū* that the composition of waka became synonymous with a “custom” (ふぞく) of Japan, while that of kanshi became “the wind and the moon” (ふうげつ), the embodiment of literati’s poetic refinement and sensitivity.

49. Quoted in SNKBT 5, p. 338.
6. Nōin’s Waka Preface and the Way of Waka

Another rare reference to waka as a “Way” before the 1170s appears in the poet Nōin’s (能因, 988-active 1051) preface to his own collection, *Nōin shū* (能因集, *The Works of Nōin*, 3 vols., after 1045). Born Tachibana no Nagayasu (橘永恵), before he took the tonsure around 1013 in his mid twenties, Nōin studied at the Academy as a “Scholar of Literature” (文章生, *monjōshō*). According to Kawamura Teruo’s (川村晃男) biography, after taking the priesthood, Nōin lived reclusively in Settsu (摺津, present-day Ōsaka prefecture), raising horses to support himself.\(^\text{50}\) Throughout his life, Nōin exchanged waka with his former colleagues at the State Academy, including some members of the Ōe family.\(^\text{51}\)

Why Nōin gave up his career in the Kidendō even before joining the officialdom is unknown, but he was a pivotal figure in a literary history of waka, who bridged the two worlds of the kangaku scholarship and waka poetics. His participation at a waka contest held at Minister of the Left Fujiwara no Yorimichi’s (藤原頼通, 992-1074) residence in 1035 suggests that despite his unconventional lifestyle, by this time, he had been recognized for his skill as a waka poet. The fourth imperial anthology of waka, *GoShūi wakashū* (後拾遺和歌集, *Later Collection of Gleanings*, 1086) contains thirty-one poems by Nōin. Nōin’s preface to his waka collection, quoted below in its entirety, is written in stylized Sino-Japanese:

---


51. Kawamura discusses Nōin’s friendship with Ōe no Masatoki (大江正言), Ōe no Yoshitoki (大江嘉言) and Ōe no Kinzane (大江公資). Ibid., pp. 105-28.
Reflecting upon human affairs, inevitably, it appears that those who are talented are considered useful, and those who are skilled are judged beneficial. Even Zhao, the butcher of dried meat, Zhi the sword polisher, and Zhang Li the equestrian doctor in the Han dynasty were able to profit from their particular skills. It goes without saying that thoroughly talented scholars have been rewarded because of their learning.

However, only those who [pursue] the Way of Waka—a native custom—have gained no benefits, even if they have studied hard. Even if [waka scholars] pass on [various teachings about] waka [lit. “this Way”], they normally venerate what is ancient and condescend to anything new, making such an attitude the norm. Even when certain people compose waka, while being oblivious to [proper] styles of composition, depending on the occasion and who they are, society overlooks them. In general, the public disdains those who are passionate about waka, and pays no attention to those who are knowledgeable about it.

In the years before and after the Tenryaku era, the three emperors [Daigo, Murakami and Kazan] issued imperial edicts which promoted the Way [of waka]. Four “poetic sages” [i.e. the compilers of the Kokinshū: Ki no Tsurayuki, Ki no Tomonori, Ōshikōshi no Mitsune and Mibu no Tadamine] received the edicts and subsequently submitted their own poetry collections [to the emperors]. In this way, the sagacious emperors’ trusted servants [lit. “arms and elbows”] came into contact with the multitude, and gathered [approved] poems, while Confucian scholars with boundless knowledge drafted [Chinese] prefaces, and placed them at the beginning of the anthologies. The redactors [did not mind] selecting unscrupulous people’s ditties and recording them in anthologies, so long as they contained interesting phrases. At the same time, they [did not hesitate to] eliminate and discard rulers’ compositions, if they were lacking in stylistic elegance or profound ideas. In this manner, some poets’ names and compositions became renown only after their death. Indeed, a poet’s social status does not determine the superiority or inferiority of his poems.

Now that I have organized my own clumsy compositions [lit. “cacophonous tunes”], how will I ever encounter someone who can appreciate them [lit. “someone who appreciates the sound of a zither made of paulownia wood from Mount Yiyang”? In fact, [waka] as a Way is in decline, but I cannot readily abandon my old habits. This is why I have compiled my random jottings into an essay, and have placed it here at the beginning of this [poetry] collection.

予天下の人事を歴覧に、才ある者は必ず其の用有り、芸ある者は必
Nōin’s early training in the Academy certainly enabled him to compose an elaborate
wakajo (waka preface), and there is obvious irony when he says that “Confucian scholars with
boundless knowledge drafted prefaces” (儒林河漢之才，冠卷首而顕序). In a sense, this is a
parody of the literary genre of prefaces, which includes the most exalted and numerous of the
type in Japan—kanji prefaces (shijo).\(^{53}\) However, for Nōin, a waka preface is a means of
expressing his criticism of the present social image ascribed to waka composition vis-à-vis that
of kanji composition, and by no means a panegyric on waka nor his own achievement as a
waka poet. Nōin demonstrates his knowledge of the Chinese Classics, attested by rhetorical
expressions extracted from such canonical texts as the Han shu (漢書), the Collected
Works of Bo Juyi (聞耳賤目), the Wen xuan (竹紹之概吹) and the Meng qiu (知音), only to

53. For my discussion of shijo in the Sino-Japanese literary anthology, Honchō monzui, see Chapter 2.
bitterly criticizes the public “disdain” (嘲) and “indifference” (無[…]興) shown towards those who are “passionate about waka” (嗜之者). Furthermore, echoing the Chinese preface to the Kokinshū (“Manajo”), Nōin calls the composition of waka a “way,” albeit in a negative context, when he concludes that although waka is “a native custom of Japan” (本朝之俗), the general conservatism among leading waka poets and their low standards reduced it into a “declining Way” (消没之道).

However, even more powerful than Nōin’s criticism is his confession: knowing that the composition of waka would bring him no “practical benefits” (無益), he cannot “abandon [his] old habits” (宿弊尚未能弃). Although he left the State Academy before assuming an official post, Nōin’s career appears similar to that of Yoshishige no Yasutane (?-1002), who a few decades before Nōin, took the tonsure and denounced the composition of kanshi as “flowery language and embellished words.” But unlike Yasutane, Nōin did not subscribe to the Buddhist precept that the composition of poems was a sinful act. Rather, like the author of the Chinese preface to the Kokinshū, Nōin, in his own waka composition, upheld Bo Juyi’s definition of poetry as a product of the heart (心, kokoro), and applied it to waka, as in the following poem:

In the First Month, while staying in the province of Tsu, Priest Nōin

I wish to show this こころあらむ

54. For my discussion of this, see Chapter 2.
To the person who has the “heart” to appreciate: 人にみせばや
The landscape of early spring つのくのにの
In the district of Naniwa なにはわたりの
In the land of Tsu. はるのけしきを

(GoShūishū, Spring I: 43)\(^{55}\)

7. The Group of Six Waka Poets

In the literary history of waka, as Nōin pointed out, indeed there was a vacuum in the eleventh century, during the years between the compilation of the third imperial waka anthology, \(Shūi\) wakashū (拾遺歌集, Collection of Gleanings, ca. 1005-7), and the fourth, GoShūi wakashū (1086). It needs to be noted that the anthology of Chinese compositions by Japanese scholar-officials, the \(Honchō\) monzui (ca. 1058-65) was compiled during these decades. Of some twenty waka poets featured in the \(Konjaku\) monogatarishū (ca. 1120), with the exception of early \(Kokinshū\) poets such as Ise, Narihira and Tsurayuki, and Takashina no Tameie, who died in 1106, the majority of poets—such as Fujiwara no Kintō, Ōe no Sadamoto, Ōe no Masahira and Akazome Emon—died in the mid-eleventh century. The mother of Emperors GoIchijō (後一条天皇, 1008-36, r. 1016-36) and GoSuzaku (後朱雀天皇, 1009-45, r. 1036-45)—Jōtōmon’in (988-1074, retrospectively lauded as “National Mother” 国母 in the \(Imakagami\))—for example, lived for exceptionally long eighty-six years, but died without seeing a new imperial anthology of waka. In other words, the \(Konjaku\) editor did not cover waka poets after the reign of Emperor Ichijō (一条天皇, 980-1011, r. 986-1011, Jōtōmon’in was Ichijō’s empress).

A likely cause of the \(Konjaku\) editor’s disregarding waka poets active in the mid-eleventh

\(^{55}\) SNKBT 8, p. 24.
century onward is not because Japanese courtiers stopped composing waka after the Ichijō’s reign (i.e., Emperor GoReizei hosted a waka contest at Imperial Palace in 1049, to which Nōin participated); but because the demography of waka practitioners, and their attitude toward waka suddenly changed in the second half of the eleventh century. In short, waka as a quotidian literary activity casually practiced among aristocratic men and women in an urban space rapidly became a fashionable pursuit among predominantly male, middle-ranking officials, who often served in the provinces.

The earliest written record of the new generation of waka poets in the late eleventh century appears in Fujiwara no Kiyosuke’s waka treatise, *Fukurozōshi* (袋草紙, *The Pocket Book*, 2 vols, ca. 1157). In a section entitled “Miscellaneous Conversations” (雑談) in Book One, Kiyosuke cites Ōe no Masafusa’s diary *Gōki* (江記, *The Ōe Diary*), and introduces a waka coterie, already known at Masafusa’s time as “The Group of Six” (六人党), which consisted of six male, middle-ranking court officials, who served as provincial governors or assistants at some point in their careers. Being members of the “provincial governor” (受領, zuryō) class, their embracing of waka as a means of cultivating their personal identities, and their way of cultivating social relations through poetry, was inherently different from their predecessors from the early eleventh century:

The *Diary of Ōe [no Masafusa]* says: “In the past, there was the Group of Six. They were Fujiwara no Norinaga, Taira no Munenaka, Fujiwara no Yorizane, Minamoto no Kanenaga, Fujiwara no Tsunehira and Minamoto no Yoriie. As for Yoriie, the other members were quite unsure [why he was

---

56 In modern scholarship, usually called “The Group of Six of Waka Poets” (和歌六人党, *waka rokunin-tō*).
considered part of the circle]. Norinaga also said, ‘Whether Kanenaga’s [poems] always reached a visionary realm was questionable.’ [Obviously, Tsunehira was incensed at such a remark.]

[The Diary of Ōe Masafusa] also says: “According to Toshikane [Kanenaga’s grandson], Yorie circulated the following gossip: In his late years, Tachibana no Tamenaka had sent Yorie a waka from the Province of Mutsu [in present-day Tōhoku area], which read: ‘You and I are the [sole] guardians of the essence of waka.’ This apparently enraged Yorie, who replied bitterly: ‘Tamenaka was originally not one of the six. His assumption that we are the sole survivors [of the guardians of waka] is absurd.”

江記に云はく、「往年六人党有り。範永・棟仲・頼実・兼長・経衡・頼家等なり。頼家に至りては、かの党頼るこれを思ひ低（かたぶ）く。範永日はく、「兼長は常に佳境に到るの疑ひ有り。」これ経衡
の怒る所なり。また云はく、「仏兼の日はく、「頼家またこの由を称す。為仲、後年奥州より歌を頼家の許に送る。歌の心を遣す所の人は君と我となり」と云々。頼家怒りて日はく、「為仲は当初この六人に入らず。君と我と生き遺るの由を称せしむるは、安からざる事なり」と云々。57

These two passages from the Gōki cited in the Fukurozōshi do not appear in the present-day, reconstructed version of the Gōki,58 suggesting that these excerpts were available as a general reference to Kiyosuke in the mid-twelfth century, but did not survive long afterwards. According to the citations, the “Group of Six” consisted of the following six individuals:

Fujiwara no Norinaga (藤原範永), Taira no Munenaka (平棟仲, ?-1059?), Fujiwara no Yorizane (藤原頼実, 1015-44), Minamoto no Kanenaga (源兼長, date unknown), Fujiwara no Tsunehira (藤原経衡, 1005-72) and Minamoto no Yorie (源頼家, 1007?-?). Not much is known about

57. SNKBT 29, pp. 90-91.

their lives, except that most of them (with the exception of Munenaka and Yorizane) served as provincial governors and that their official rank stopped at either Fourth or Fifth.\textsuperscript{59}

The \textit{Goki} passages are terse and cryptic, but reveal very peculiar ways in which the six middle-ranking court officials interacted with one another, mainly through slandering each other, and by bickering over who was the better waka poet. For example, the first citation of the \textit{Goki} shows that Minamoto no Yoriie, unknown to himself, was ostracized by the other members of Group of the Six, because they were “unsure” why he was considered as a member of the group. Fujiwara no Norinaga, perhaps the most recognized as a poet among the six, had doubts about Minamoto no Kanenega’s poetic creativity, as he mentioned: “Whether Kanenaga’s [poems] always reached a visionary realm (佳境, \textit{kakyô}) was questionable.” Referring to this comment, Masafusa (according to Kiyosuke) notes that Tsunehira was “incensed,” probably because Tsunehira had a closer personal affinity with Kanenaga and interpreted Norinaga’s criticism as a personal attack on his credentials as a poet.

The second citation from the \textit{Goki}, on the other hand, shows that even Yoriie, the seemingly the lesser important member of the Group of Six, had such an exalted opinion of himself as a member of the coterie that he was offended when an unaffiliated poet, Tachibana no Tamenaka (橘為仲, 1001?-85), claimed that he and Yoriie were the sole “guardians” of waka. This description also suggests that Tamenaka later joined the Group of Six (“Tamenaka was originally not a part of the six”), but was considered inferior to the original members of the

\textsuperscript{59} For example, it is known that Fujiwara no Norinaga became Governor of Settsu (摂津) Province in 1065; Minamoto no Kanenaga served as provincial officer (地方官, perhaps not governor) in Bizen (備前) and Sanuki (讃岐); Fujiwara no Tsunehira was governor in Yamato (大和) and Chikuzen (筑前); and Minamoto no Yoriie was the governor of Bicchû (備中) and Ecchû (越中). (From \textit{Waka bungaku jiten}.)
group. Masafusa claims that he heard this story directly from Minamoto no Toshikane, the grandson of Minamoto no Kanenaga, one of the six member poets. Kanenaga might have attempted to besmirch Yoriie’s reputation even further by telling his grandson how he had acted in a condescending manner to Tamenaka, a new comer to the group. In either case, what we can glean from Masafusa’s accounts is the small-mindedness of the members the Group of Six, rather than their poetical skills.

These individuals might have been somewhat flawed as human beings, but as poets, their reputation was not all negative. The imperial anthology, GoShūishū, for instance, contains 14 poems by Norinaga, eight by Tsunehira, six by Yoriie, five by Yorizane and Kanenaga, and two by Munenaka and Tamenaka, respectively. In contrast, only two poems composed by Ōe no Masafusa appear in the same collection. Probably under the influence of Masafusa, Emperor Juntoku (順徳天皇, 1197-1242, r. 1210-21) made the following comment about Norinaga and his fellow poets in his waka treatise, Yakumo mishō (八雲御抄, Commentary of the Eight-fold Clouds, early 13th century):

[After the demise of Fujiwara no Kintō in 1041], the poets who threw their weight around by calling themselves the Group of Six are Norinaga, Munetō, Kanenaga, Tsunehira, Yoriie and Yorizane. With the exception of Norinaga, none appear to be waka poets.

The aforementioned description of the six middle-ranking waka poets in Kiyosuke’s *Fukurozōshi* is supplemented by a following anecdote:

60 KT bekkan 3, p. 443.
Minamoto no Yoritsuna [Yoriie’s younger brother] had visited Priest Nōin and recalled their meeting: “At the time, when Nōin lived in Higashiyama, people used to visit him in groups. Nōin sat with them and [was happy to] converse with them. Nōin told Yoritsuna: ‘I excel at waka, because fortunately, I love it so much.’ He also told Yoritsuna: ‘There are five excellent poems on the cuckoo. If you include mine, there are six altogether.’ Nōin’s particular poem is:

If I can tell
On which evening a cuckoo
Does not appear and sing,
At least one night
Won’t be a sleepless night.

I [Fujiwara no Kiyosuke] thought about this. What, then, are the other five cuckoo poems? Are they Tsurayuki’s “A single song [of a cuckoo]/The eastern sky is dawning,”61 Kimitada’s “I spent a night on a mountain road,”62 Kanemori’s “Until the dawn, I can enjoy its singing,”63 Sanekata’s

[Transcription]

61
On a summer night,
I was about to lie down;
Just then, the single cry of
A cuckoo,
As dawn breaks in the East.
(Kokinshū 156, Summer, Ki no Tsurayuki)

62
Not going any further,
I spent a night on a mountain road;
Just one more
Cuckoo’s song,
So badly, I wanted to hear.
(Shūshū 106, Summer, Minamoto no Kimitada)

63
Leaving a mountainous area,
By midnight
A cuckoo arrives [at our abode];
And then, until dawn,
I can enjoy its singing.

“A cuckoo/In Mount Kurahashi that is so dark,”⁶⁴ or Michitsuna’s mother’s “Folks in the capital/ May still be sleepless, waiting for/ A cuckoo.”⁶⁵ This is indeed a conundrum.

頼綱朝臣は能因に遇ひて云はく、「当初能因東山に住むの比、人々相ひ伴ひて行き向かひて精しく談ず。能因云はく、「我れ歌に達するは、好き給ふる所なり」と云々。また云はく、「郭公の秀歌は五首なり。而して能因が歌を相ひ加ふれば六首なり」と云々。伴の歌は、

郭公
き鳴かぬよびの
しるからば
ぬるもよ、よ
あらましものを

予これを案ずるに、かの五首の歌何れぞや。もし貫之が「なくひとこゑにあくるしののめ」、公忠が「山路らくしづ」、兼盛が「暁かけて今ぞなくなる」、実方が「くらずはやまの郭公」道綱母の「み

---

(Shūishū 101, Summer, Taira no Kenemori)

---

(Shūishū 124, Summer, Fujiwara no Sanekata)

---

(Shūishū 102, Summer, Michitsuna no haha)
Kiyosuke does not specify a source of this anecdote, but it is loosely related to the previous two passages from the Gōki, as Kiyosuke claims that it is a story told by Minamoto no Yoritsuna (ca. 1024-97)—Yoriie’s younger brother. Here, the previously discussed Yoriie’s marginal position in the poetic coterie seems to be irrelevant, or at least, Kiyosuke does not continue his discussion in that light. More importantly, the third section, which describes Yoritsuna’s visit to Nōin, reveals the peculiar way in which male poets in the mid-eleventh century idolized Nōin as a sage, and flocked to his residence in a mountainous area in the outskirts of Kyoto, in the hope of listening to him retell waka lore. In other words, Yoritsuna’s account of his visit to Nōin shows that in the mid-eleventh century, waka went through a transformation from a means of spontaneous personal communication in everyday human relationships (i.e. friends, husband-and-wife) to an obsessive “pursuit/hobby” of predominantly male, middle-ranking officials. These male poets, like Yoritsuna, were mainly interested in learning about waka, rather than demonstrating their own poetic sensibilities in daily life.

This view represents nothing but Kiyosuke’s own ideas about the history of waka and the particular role that a pivotal figure like Nōin played in changing the course of its trajectory. In this regard, Kiyosuke’s association of Nōin with the concept of “poetic passion” (好き・数奇・数寄, suki) is important, because it was this kind of nonchalant yet highly romantic attitude toward waka, epitomized in Nōin’s statement “I excel at waka, because, fortunately, I love it so much” (物を歌に達するは、好き給ふる所なり), that attracted a new generation of waka.

66 SNKBT 29, p. 91.

67 Ibid., p. 88.
poets in the mid-eleventh century. In another passage in the *Fukurozōshi*, Kiyosuke cites Nōin’s admonition to a young poet, “You have to love it! Only because you love it, you compose waka! (数奇給へ、すきぬれば歌をよむ).”

It is possible that many of the middle-ranking officials, like the members of the Group of Six, who often lived far away from Kyoto during their tenures as provincial governor or filling other less prominent posts away from the capital, wished to “carry” waka with them, as an emblem of courtly refinement. However, not everyone had the talent or perseverance to master the composition of waka. In other words, not all waka poets in the mid-eleventh century, referred to somewhat pejoratively as “song composers” (歌読み, *uta-yomi*) in the *Konjaku monogorari shū*, understood “poetry” in the way Bo Juyi and the authors of the *Kokinshū* prefaces defined it. Accordingly, those male poets who worshipped Nōin and uncritically embraced his aphorisms must have assumed that the possession of such knowledge would somehow endow them with their attainment of courtly refinement, which they needed to display in the provinces as a means of legitimatizing their authority as representatives of the central state.

Therefore, the way in which the Group of Six promoted waka was, ironically, antithetical to Nōin’s approach to waka. Kiyosuke does not mention this, but when Masafusa wrote about the Group of Six in his diary *Gōki*, he was probably sarcastic about the snobbishness of these emerging poets, who judged others based on their secondhand knowledge of waka lore. Emperor Juntoku’s comment also suggests that the success of the Group of Six poets in the *GoShūishū* only reflects that they “were throwing their weight around” (のりける) at the time.

---

68 Ibid.
Chapter Four

Ōe no Masafusa: The Life and Legacy of the First Critic of Insei Japan

Introduction

The previous chapters in Part One examined kanshi and waka practices between the eighth and the eleventh centuries, mainly through textual analyses of “prefaces” (jo) in the literary anthology Honchō monzui (ca. 1058-65). In Part Two, I examine how Ōe no Masafusa (大江匡房, 1041-1111) altered the Kidendō tradition at the dawn of the insei period, or Japan’s long twelfth century (1086-1221). There is no better place to launch an inquiry into the general aristocratic ethos as well as the particular intellectual and cultural trends of the twelfth century than by examining the life and works of Masafusa, whose writings range in the following nine categories:

1) Diaries: Gōki (江記)
2) Ceremonial proceedings and manuals: Gōke shidai (江家次第), Gōke nenjū gyōji (江家年中行事), Masafusa shō (匡房抄), and Naiben saiki (内弁細記)
3) Buddhist prayers (願文, ganmon): Gō totoku nagon gamonshū (江都督納言願文集)
4) Biographies (伝, den): Zoku honchō ōjōden (続本朝往生伝), Honchō shinsen den (本朝神仙伝);
5) Records (記, ki): “Tsushima kōginki” (対馬貞銀記), “Kobi no ki” (孤狐

3. A reconstructed annotated text of Masafusa’s Buddhist vows is available in Yamazaki Makoto’s Gō totoku nagon gamonshū chūkai, (2010).
After passing the civil-service examination at the unusually early age of eighteen, which tested the examinee’s skill in composition in Sino-Japanese, Masafusa was appointed tutor to the crown prince (東宮学士, tōgū gakushi) in 1067, and held that position until 1085. As such, he served as the private tutor (侍読, jidoku) for three consecutive sovereigns, Emperor GoSanjō, his son Emperor Shirakawa, and Shirakawa’s son, Emperor Horikawa. In short, Masafusa was not only a key player in the insei administration in its earliest decades but also one of the innovators


5. For a textual analysis of the “Tsushima kōginki,” “Kobi no ki,” “Kuiraiishi no ki” and “Yūjo no ki,” see Komine, pp. 76-152, and also Fukazawa, pp. 104-62. For a study of the “Rakuyō denrakuki,” see Fukazawa, pp. 63-103.

6. For the Rōei gōchū, see Kuroda Akira, pp. 1-27.

7. Komine Kazuaki mentions that Masafusa once write commentary on the Genji monogatari. ([…] 匝房自身、『源氏物語』の注釈をつけていた節がある。Komine, p. 223.) For the partially surviving text of the Setsugetsushō (雪月抄) and its bibliographical analysis, see Horibe Shōji, pp. 116-137 (In a book chapter entitled, “源氏物語雑々私記,” “3. 鑑倉末期の古注「雪月抄」逸文について.”)

8. Fujiwara no Akihira, for instance, was in his forties when he passed the exam. Sugawara no Michizane was twenty-nine years old when he passed the taisaku (対策次第) examination in 874. (Kugyō bunin, p. 151.)

9. The Sonpi bunmyaku (尊卑分脈, Branches of Clans of All Classes), for instance, notes that Masafusa was an “imperial tutor for the three generations of [emperors] GoSanjō, Shirakawa and Horikawa.” (三代侍読後三条白河堰川) (Kuroita, vol. 4, p 96.)
of the new political system and culture of emerging “medieval” Japan.

Modern biographical studies of Masafusa have reconstructed his legacy as an influential scholar-official by mainly focusing on his “self” and complex “personality.” Approaching historical figures by making analogies to “ourselves” is unavoidable, and is a basic method used in modern historiography. However, a historical individual’s “personality” cannot be reconstructed without examining the significance of his life and works in their own historical contexts. For these reasons, in this chapter, I reintroduce Masafusa as the first critic of insei Japan, whose prolific writings accentuate the evolving nature of Kidendō scholarship, namely, the studies of the Chinese Classics and the cultivation of elegant Sino-Japanese prose and verse style, and the meaning of the composition of bellettristic discourse in aristocratic society. I argue that a unique combination of Masafusa’s family background, his talent in both academic and administrative matters, and his patrons’ enthusiasm in reviving ancient customs provided him career opportunities only enjoyed by Sugawara no Michizane (845-903) before his exile in 901.

In fact, it was Masafusa’s high status as a senior noble (kugyō) that enabled him to express his somewhat cynical appraisals of the society that he lived in with relative freedom, by commenting on the gradual devolution of the role of Kidendō scholars from trusted personal counselors of learned emperors to somewhat reclusive literati with high literary achievements, and then finally to mere spokesmen for their increasingly self-serving imperial patrons. By closely analyzing Masafusa’s biographical essay “Bonen no ki,” a youthful Chinese composition, and a Buddhist vow (ganmon) written in memory of a fellow academician, I show how the opinions Masafusa expressed in a highly cryptic manner eventually became the basis for the insei mentality.
I also examine the ways in which anecdotal writings about Masafusa became a popular trope in various prose narratives from the insei period, such as courtiers’ kanbun diaries, books on yūsoku kojitsu (courtly customs and their precedents), vernacular tales and historical narratives. Considering Masafusa’s own versatility as a writer, such widespread reception of his written and spoken words is no surprise. By closely reading some of the representative anecdotal narratives about Masafusa, I explore what their aristocratic authors wished to draw from Masafusa’s legacy as a scholar-official.

1. “Bonen no ki” and the Legend of Student Ōe no Masafusa

Masafusa—a scion of the Ōe clan, which produced generations of Confucian scholars who served in the State Academy (大学寮, Daigakuryō, also called funya no tsukasa) beginning in the mid-ninth century—was an extremely talented student of the Chinese Classics. In his autobiographical essay, “Bonen no ki” (暮年記, “A Record of My Twilight Years,” ca. 1099), originally written as a preface to a now lost collection of his Sino-Japanese poems (漢詩, kanshi), he reminisces about some of his earliest academic achievements. Alluding to the famous passage from the Confucian Analects, “At fifteen I set my heart on learning; at thirty I took my stand; at forty I came to be free from doubts […],” “Bonen no ki” begins:

10. The “Bonen no ki” survived because shortly after Masafusa’s death, it was included the popular anthologies of kanbun compositions, such as the Chōya gunsai (朝野群載, 1116, ed. Miyoshi no Tameyasu 三善為康, 30 vols., of which nine are missing) and the Honchō zoku monzui (本朝続文粹, 13 vols., after 1140). The modern annotated edition by Osone Shōsuke is available in Yamagishi et. al. eds., NST 8, pp. 161-64. Marian Ury’s English translation is based on this modern edition. “Bonen no ki” is also called “Bonen shiki” (暮年詩記). (See Iso Mizue’s biography of Masafusa.)

I learned to read in my fourth year; was well acquainted with Shih chi [史记, The Records of the Historian] and Han shu [漢書, The History of the Former Han Dynasty] in my eighth year; and composed Chinese poems in my eleventh year. All the world called me a child prodigy [神童]. [...]

When I was in my sixteenth year, I wrote my Rhyme-Prose on “Autumn Day’s Idleness” [秋日閑居の賦]. The late head of the Academy, his lordship Fujiwara no Akihira [藤原明衡, 989?-1066], gave it warm approbation.”

Masafusa’s recollection of his formative years reveals that in mid-eleventh century Japan, education for a young student in the Kidendō (紀伝道, lit. “Way of annals and biographies,” history and literature curriculum) at the State Academy consisted of three stages of training in Chinese literature: 1) learning the basic vocabulary, grammar and syntax of classical Chinese, presumably through “primers” (幼学書, yōgakusho) such as the Qian zi wen (千字文, Thousand Character Classic) and the Meng qiu (蒙求, Search for Enlightenment)13; 2) gaining familiarity with Chinese history and a corpus of biographical anecdotes of famous individuals (i.e. emperors, ministers and generals) through chronicles such as the Shijing and the Han shu; and 3) cultivating skill in the composition of prose and verse in Chinese, based on knowledge of the classical texts. Masafusa was considered a “child prodigy” not only because of his literary “creativity.” Rather, he was considered extraordinary for the speed and precision with which he mastered Chinese literary studies, the tradition of which in part had been devised and

12. Translated by Marian Úry. Úry and Borgen, pp. 148-149.

safeguarded by his ancestors.

For instance, in Masafusa’s “rhyme prose” on the topic “Autumn Day’s Idleness,” he combines his literary imagination with his knowledge of the Chinese Classics. Masafusa also proudly refers to this composition and Akihira’s positive response to it as one of the most memorable events in his life in the “Governor General’s Self-Praise” (都督自讚の事) section of the Godanshō. A quick review provides a key to understanding Masafusa’s own self-appraisal as a Confucian scholar. This composition survives today, because within a few decades after Masafusa’s death, it was included in the mid-twelfth century anthology of Sino-Japanese verse, Honchō zoku-monzui (本朝続文粹, Later Literary Essence of Our Country, editor unknown, ca. 1155-63).

First, Masafusa associates the given topic (“Autumn Day’s Idleness” 秋日閑居) with a “recluse,” who “lives frugally” because of his proclivity for a “dark and quiet place” and a “mind absorbed in books.” (夫逸士之貧居也。地尋幽閑。心耽文籍。) He then expands upon the topic by describing the bookish man’s reverie-like visions of the deepening autumn, with an unfolding tapestry of nature images: dew, rain, an interlude of zither music, wine, a moonlit lake, a cricket’s cry, the sound of the wind, geese and cranes in the sky, storm, withering grass, pale mists, colorful foliage, crying pheasants, withering willow, and wild beasts trampling on

15. SZKT 29-2, Honchō zoku-monzui, p.3. Kawaguchi Hisao briefly discusses the first few lines of this poem in his biography. (Kawaguchi, pp. 27-29.) Satō Michio discusses that the Honchō zoku-monzui was compiled by an academician among Akihira’s descendants in his Fujiwara Shiki House (藤原式家), sometime between the Kyūju 2 (久寿, 1155) and Ōhō (応保, 1161-1163) era. Satō (2003), pp. 35-65.
16. SZKT 29-2, Honchō zoku-monzui, p.3.
mugwort.

The reader soon realizes that this almost too extravagant phantasmagoria of an autumn
day is actually taking place in the recluse’s imagination, not in the vicinity of his humble abode.

In the introduction to the poem, Masafusa describes his poetic protagonist’s life as follows:

My garden is barely open to three narrow paths;  
In the house, all I stare at are the four walls.

Behind a closed door, I have long stopped thinking about paddies and fields;  
Behind a draped curtain, despite the remoteness, I have acquainted myself with [scenes from] the past.

Fragrant boughs hang from the tree;  
All alone, I familiarize myself with Pan Anren’s works.

A sagging willow stands besides the gate;  
Despite the distance, I aspire to follow Tao Yuanming’s path.

庭纔開三徑。家唯對四壁。  
閑戶以久忘田園。下帷以遙知疇昔。  
芳枴樹架。獨慣於潘岳之詞。  
長楊在門。遠繫於陶淵之跡。17

It needs to be noted that the phrase “All I stare at are the four walls” (家唯對四壁)  
alludes to an expression used by Masafusa’s great-grandfather Ōe no Masahira, (952-1012) in his  
letter of proposal (sōjō) to an emperor, in which he complained about his and his family’s  
poverty: “My residence is all but four walls” (家徒四壁).18 Unlike Masahira’s composition,  
Masafusa’s reference to the “four walls” appears fanciful. The final stanza confirms that the

17. Ibid.  
18. Gotô (2006b), p. 128. For my analysis of Masahira’s composition, included in the Honchō monzui,  
see Chapter 2.
series of autumnal visions discussed above were indeed hallucinatory, since they emerged while the recluse was attempting to concentrate on his studies:

Alas! Here am I perusing books of classical literature, and studying ancient philosophy and historical chronicles.

Even if the names of the old dynasties have become obscure, posterity still honors the beauty of the language [in texts].

Li Guang was a “flying general,” who served a Han emperor. For him living in Longshan was part of his destiny [before his government service].

Fan Li was a wise prime minister, who served in the state of Yue. Living by a lakeside, he avoided receiving rewards [after his retirement].

I humbly aspire to walk in the dust of these eminent gentlemen’s footsteps because I revere their lofty achievements!

The image of the ascetic scholar who denies the sensory pleasure of the deepening autumn for the sake of his bookish pursuit closely resembles that of the young Masafusa. For instance, Kawaguchi Hisao (川口久雄, 1910-93), the literary scholar and first modern biographer of Masafusa, once called this verse Masafusa’s “fine self-portrait, the ostensibly mature writing style of which vividly depicts the ways in which he devoted himself to [Chinese] studies, in order to take on the mantle of his family’s tradition.”

19. Ibid.

20. 一見老成した文章の背後に、かえって江家の学統を知るべき、学にうちこむ高たるを若々
juxtaposition of the season’s natural images, and the poetic protagonist’s forthright expression of his adoration for the morally upright politicians and dedicated scholar-poets from Chinese history reveal something youthful about this composition.

In “Bonen no ki,” Masafusa goes on to say that his mentor Fujiwara no Akihira (藤原明衡, 989-1066) was impressed by another poem he composed in his sixteenth year, on the topic “Falling Leaves Covering the Stream and the Rocks” (落葉泉石埋), and commented that Masafusa “had already reached his poetic zenith” (すでに佳境に到りたり). Although Masafusa may have exaggerated Akihira’s appraisal, the poem in question shows that Masafusa was capable of expressing his own thoughts and ideas in highly stylized classical Chinese when only in his mid-teens. Moreover, when this poem appeared posthumously as one of seven compositions by Masafusa in the opening section of the first volume of the anthology Honchō zoku-monzui, along with the inscription, “[Composed by] Student Ōe no Masafusa, in his Sixteenth Year” (学生江匡房年十六), the self-prescribed image of Masafusa as a “prodigy” became part of the Masafusa legend, numerous variants of which would appear in the vernacular anecdotal literature that flourished throughout the insei period.22

2. Modern Biographical Studies of Ōe no Masafusa

Kawaguchi, p.29.

21. Yamagishi, et. al., p. 162. “I had already become an outstanding poet.” (Ury and Borgen, p. 149.)

22. For a summary of biographical tales about Masafusa in setsuwa, historical narratives, and war chronicles (gunki) from the medieval period, such as the Kojidan, Zoku kojidans, Kokon chomonjū, Jikkinshō, Gukanshō, Imakagami, Heike monogatari and Taiheiki, see Yoshihara Hiroto’s (吉原浩人) “Ōe no Masafusa no chuseizō” (“Ōe no Masafusa Seen Through Medieval Narratives”s). (Kobayashi et. al., eds., pp. 146-56.)
Among modern scholars, Kawaguchi Hisao first introduced Masafusa as “an intellectually and politically complicated human being”23 in his 1968 biography, Ōe no Masafusa, the first book-length study of the scholar-official. In this book, Kawaguchi attempts to reconstruct Masafusa the man by incorporating various historical sources into his narrative, based on his belief that what appears extraordinary about Masafusa to the modern reader is largely due to his complex personality rather than to the particular socio-political conditions that surrounded him and his courtiers.

To this day, the most comprehensive biography of Masafusa in English remains Chapter Three of Fredric J. Kotas’ unpublished dissertation, Ōjōden: Accounts of Rebirth in the Pure Land (1987).24 Kotas’ main subject is the Zoku honchō ōjōden (続本朝往生伝, Later Biographies of Those Reborn in Paradise in Japan, ca. 1099-1104), the second of the Heian ōjōden–biographies of people believed to have achieved rebirth (往生, ōjō) in the Pure Land–written by Masafusa. Kotas provides a succinct, well documented overview of Masafusa’s life and works, while carefully examining his family background and career as well as such issues as the religiosity of the aristocratic laity in Heian Japan and Pure Land Buddhism, which was particularly popular among them. Furthermore, citing Fujiwara no Munetada’s condemnation of


24. Among a handful of published works on Masafusa in English, two articles written by Marian Ury (1933-95), the first introducing the Gōdanshō (江談抄, Notes on Dialogues with Ōe no Masafusa, translated by Ury as Oe Conversations, ca. 1107-11) and second, a translation of the “Bonen no ki,” exemplify the biographical approach pioneered by Kawaguchi. Ury claims that “in old age [Masafusa] appeared at least to some of his contemporaries as eccentric, childish and self-indulgent.” Citing an individual most likely to have held such an opinion, she turns to Fujiwara no Munetada (藤原宗忠, 1062-1141), whose diary Chūyūki (中右記, 1087-1138) has long been valued as a comprehensive source of first-hand accounts of everyday political and cultural activities in the Japanese imperial court in the early twelfth-century.
Masafusa as “one crazed about writing” (文狂, fumi gurui), Kotas introduces an array of Masafusa’s writings in “a tremendous variety of formats and styles,” including the ostensibly religious Zoku honchō ōjōden. Kotas’ primarily textual approach to Masafusa foreshadows a series of “non-biographic” studies of Masafusa undertaken by numerous scholars in Japan since the early 1990s, as part of the new discipline of insei studies, which was an outgrowth of interdisciplinary scholarship on twelfth-century Japanese culture.

It is certainly tempting to confer such epithets as “eccentric, childish and self-indulgent” on someone who does not hesitate to call himself a “child prodigy.” In fact, the narrative tone of many of Masafusa’s writings is highly judgmental, hyperbolic and yet at the same time, enigmatic. Thus, any desire on the modern reader’s part to analyze the “inner-self” of such an

25. Also in Kawaguchi, p. 137. Kotas refers to the page 292 of Kawaguchi’s biography, but the key word fumi gurui does not appear there.


27. One indispensable guide to this non-biographical approach is the October 1995 issue of the journal, Kokubungaku kaishaku to kanshō (国文学 解釈と鑑賞, National Literature: Interpretation and Appreciation), entitled “Special Issue on Ōe no Masafusa: The Philological Universe of the Insei Period” (特集 大江匡房: 院政期の言語宇宙). Comprising twenty-one short articles by nineteen contributors, this pathbreaking publication attempts to reconstruct the “universe” embodied in Masafusa’s writings by deconstructing Masafusa the author into the following six elements: 1) the zeitgeist of the time he lived in (大江匡房の時代); 2) diaries, aristocratic lore, and biographies (日記・有職・伝記); 3) the reception of Chinese studies (漢学の受容); 4) waka and Sino-Japanese compositions (和歌・漢詩文); 5) anecdotal narratives and language (説話・言語); and 6) religion and the performing arts (宗教・芸能). This multi-author issue provides a kaleidoscope of views of Masafusa’s “philological universe,” but what the reader will make out of such fragments of diversely textured pieces is another matter. Even today, while close textual analyses of Masafusa’s individual writings abound in Japanese (see for example, Komine, pp. 45-400; Fukazawa, pp. 63-164), holistic studies of Masafusa’s “philological universe” are surprisingly rare. As his derogatory nickname, fumi gurui, suggests, part of the difficulty of attaining a macroscopic view of Masafusa’s philological activities is the sheer number and the variety of texts attributed to him.

“anxious individual” through writings attributed to him are understandable. This modern belief in individual psychology provided the impetus for the biographical approach, epitomized in the following statement by Ury: “[t]he stars that beckons one to study these two works [the “Bonen no ki” and the Gōdanshō] is the reconstruction of a human being, or at least a portion of one.”

But the assumption that these texts are autobiographical in the modern sense needs to be reconsidered, because the extent to which Masafusa glorifies his own literary achievements is rather unusual.

The Gōdanshō, for instance, consists of Masafusa’s private conversations with his disciple Fujiwara no Sanekane (藤原実兼, 1085-1112), but the text was not written by Masafusa himself. As such, it is a valuable source of Masafusa’s “off-the-record” comments on various literary and interpersonal matters. However, as I will discuss in Chapter Six, a literary historian cannot rely on the Gōdanshō alone because as a composite text of various discourses associated with Masafusa, the information it contains was reconstructed not only by Masafusa and Sanekane, but also by its readers in subsequent centuries. In contrast to the lengthy Gōdanshō (at least in its most widely circulated edition, the Ruijūbon 類従本), “Bonen no ki” fills only three pages, and Masafusa’s self-referential remarks in this brief text are actually less prominent than his comments about other people. In short, as far as the Gōdanshō and the “Bonen no ki” are concerned, Masafusa reveals more of himself as a critic than an autobiographer. And the

29. Ury and Borgen., 145.
30. Ibid, p. 147.
31. In this regard, Ury’s observation that no matter how “truly autobiographical” Masafusa’s “Bonen no ki” appears to be, it is fundamentally different from a Western autobiography, the common elements of which are “the author’s awareness of his being ‘singular’—his (or in one and half cases, her) difference from his fellows” is important. Risking an ostensible contradiction with her initial recognition of Masafusa’s individuality, Ury concludes that in “Bonen no ki,” Masafusa “testif[ies] to being part of a
only way to overcome the overemphasis placed on Masafusa’s personality or his “self” in modern biographical studies of Masafusa is to broadly contextualize his writings diachronically and synchronically, both with other Kidendō scholars’ writings in Sino-Japanese (i.e. compositions in the Honchō monzui) and other insei texts (i.e. courtiers’ kanbun diaries and setsuwa collections). Only by doing so, can we understand why Masafusa expressed his opinions in certain idiosyncratic manners and why his opinions matter to our understanding of Japanese literary history and insei culture in general.

3. Ritsuryō State and the Fujiwara Regency

Why did Masafusa’s skill in Chinese composition matter so much in the society that he lived in, and why did Masafusa regard his achievements in this area as notable? In the ritsuryō (律令, “penal and administrative laws”) state, the structure of which was modeled after Tang China in the early eighth century, all official documents were drafted in Chinese, and written fluency in that language was considered a prerequisite for entering public service. By the mid-eleventh century, political power was seized by Fujiwara no Michinaga (藤原道長, 966-1027) and his son Fujiwara no Yorimichi (藤原頼通, 992-1074), who as the maternal grandfather and uncle of young emperors, became regents. Nevertheless, as the historian Cameron Hurst discusses, “[d]espite the growth of extensive private interests and the increasing ‘familiarization’ of authority during the Fujiwara regency, the Chinese-style state structure did not wither away

community, whose members accept him and applaud him for conforming to their ideals.” This not only suggests the paradoxical nature of modern biographical studies in general, but also reaffirms the notion that pre-modern Japanese cultural phenomena cannot be simply explained by literary models and theories, based on Western or/and modern paradigms, such as concepts of the self and autobiography.
and die but continued to function as the source of ultimate legitimacy.”

Previously, historians assumed that during the heyday of the Fujiwara regency, the imperial state system declined because important political decisions were made privately in the regent’s “household administrative office” (政所, mandokoro). However, recent scholarship has rejected this view, because it oversimplifies the complex relation between the traditional state apparatus (particularly its decision-making body) and the regents’ offices. For instance, the Japanese historian Mikawa Kei (美川圭) emphasizes the continuation of the ritsuryō system during the Fujiwara regency, and provides a structural analysis of the regental politics and the locus of its power through an examination of the “Senior Nobles’ Assembly” (陣定, jin no sadame), an ad hoc organization consisting of senior nobles (公卿, kugyō), similar to today’s national parliament, which was part of the Council of State (太政官, Daijōkan). In this revisionist history, Fujiwara regency politics is no longer considered an alternative to the ritsuryō system; rather, by outnumbering the assembly with their own “family members” (ミウチ), the Fujiwaras exploited the existing political institution to serve their own interests. It was during the final decades of the Fujiwara regency that Masafusa spent his formative years at the State Academy under the tutelage of the Fujiwara scholar, Akihira. For the same reason that the

32. Hurst, p. 28.

33. This view is represented by the following statement by Hurst: “At the height of their power, from the mid-tenth to mid-eleventh centuries, Fujiwara regents made most of the important political decisions within their own household administrative office (mandokoro). Documents issued by this office, called kudashibumi, bore more weight than imperial edicts.” (Ibid., pp. 4-5.)

34. Mikawa (2006), pp. 48-51. “Council of State stood above the eight major bureaus as the highest organ of government. Its members were the three Ministers (大臣, Left, Right and Palace); the Counselors (納言, Counselor, Grand Counselor); and the Consultants (参議).” (Tyler, p. 1162.)
emperor (regardless of his age or ability to rule the country) continued to function as “the symbol of public authority” even during the Fujiwara regency, the formal structure of the *ritsuryō* state and the role of classical Chinese as the official language of civil service did not diminish in the mid-eleventh century.

4. Kidendō and the Ōe Clan

Judged by contemporary standards, the society Masafusa lived in was too non-egalitarian to grant him career opportunities were it not for the long history and high reputation of his clan. Considered one of the most prominent scholarly households on a par with the Sugawara since the Jōwa era (承和, 834-48), the Ōe family produced generations of “scholars” (*monjōshō*), “scholarship students” (*monjō tokugyōshō*) and “Doctors of Letters” (*monjō hakakase*) in the Kidendō track. At the State Academy, which was part of the Bureau of Ceremonial (式部省) and staffed by a ranked hierarchy of teachers and students, aside from the Kidendō, courses were offered in the following three fields: “Confucian Classics” (*myōgyō*), “Legal Studies” (*myōbō*) and “Astronomy” (*sandō*). Since it was customary for sons of the Ōe clan to specialize in the Kidendō, it is not surprising

35. Hurst, p. 31.

36. Yamanaka, p. 229. In his *Heian jinbutu-shi* (平安人物志, Biographies of Heian Personages), the historian Yamanaka Yutaka (山中裕) provides concise yet well-documented biography of Masafusa and his family. (Yamanaka, pp. 229-45). For a complete genealogy of the Ōe clan, see the *Sonpi bunmyaku*, vol. 4, pp. 89-107. For an abridged version, see Kawaguchi (1968), pp. 346-48 or Kawaguchi and Nara (1984), p. 1579. An index of people’s names in the appendices to the *Gōdanshō* (SNKBT 32, pp. 1-22) provides useful references to the majority of the Ōe scholars, whom Masafusa discusses in the *Gōdanshō*.

37. For a summary of the history of Academy, see Ishimura, pp. 69-73.
that Masafusa began his studies with the two canonical texts of Chinese history, *Shiji* and the *Han shu* after mastering elementary Chinese.

According to the modern Japanese historian Ishimura Teikichi (石村貞吉, 1876-1973), who wrote extensively on “knowledge of ancient matters and customs” (有職故実, *yūsoku kojitsu*)--a body of precedents from the ancient imperial state regarding court service, and retrospective study of them in the subsequent centuries--the State Academy became obsolete around the Hōen era (保延, 1135-40). Nevertheless, in a society wherein ancient customs were valued, the Chinese classics and the language they were written in never lost their prestige or practical values. In the same way that ancient imperial rulers cultivated themselves by studying the Confucian canon and Chinese historical chronicles, both aristocratic and military leaders continued to study them rigorously in the medieval and early modern period.

For these reasons, scholars of the Chinese Classics, especially those who served as private tutors for the rulers were greatly valued in premodern Japanese society. One of the *yūsoku kojitsu* compendiums from the *insei* period, *Kinpishō* (禁秘抄, *Commentary on Secret Matters in the Imperial Court*, ca. 1219-22) contains miscellaneous notes written by Emperor Juntoku (順徳天皇, r.1210-21, 1197-1242) on some ninety-one topics related to court culture, ranging from various details of the imperial palace complex, calendrical events, Buddhist ceremonies, officials and attendants and their particular duties. The following passage on the

---

38. The *Shiji* is “the official history of China from the beginning up to the reign of Emperor Wu of the Early Han dynasty, completed by Sima Qian (司馬遷, Jp. Shiba Sen) in 91 B.C. It covers up to the Early Han dynasty and is the model for all later dynastic histories. A basic text at the Academy (together with the *Han-shu*), and essential reading for Heian officials, it left traces in the *Tale of Genji*.” (Tyler, p. 1148.)

39. Ishimura, p. 73.
“Matter of A Private Tutor.” (御侍読事) summarizes the role of a private tutor:

A [crown prince’s] private tutor for “annals and biographies” (kiden) has to be selected very carefully. [The fact that he has to be] recognized in society is evident. Before the prince’s accession to Heir Apparent and his First Reading, the tutor is supposed to draft imperial edicts on behalf of senior nobles and emperor’s messengers as well as ceremonial compositions for various Buddhist rites.

The tradition of the Ōe as the house of academicians began with Ōe no Otando (大江音人, 811-77), the grandson of Prince Abo (阿保親王, 792-842), who requested that his clan name Ōe (大枝, “great branches”) be changed to the more auspicious Ōe (大江, “great rivers”) in 866. Otando was an accomplished student of the Chinese Classics, and tutored Emperor Seiwa (清和天皇, r. 858-76, 850-80) in the Shijing. It was during Otando’s time that the Ōe became the unofficial caretaker of Kidendō scholarship together with the Sugawara. Otando’s grandson

40. On-fumi hajime (御書始) is “a ceremony in which a Prince, Heir Apparent, or young Emperor gave a first, formal reading from the Chinese classics.” (Tyler, p. 1139.) Usually, it took place when the prince was seven years old, as in the case of the male protagonist of the Genji monogatari: “Now the boy [Genji] was permanently in attendance at the palace. When he reached his seventh year, His Majesty had him perform his first reading, which he carried off with such unheard-of brilliance that his father was frankly alarmed.” (Ibid., p. 12.)

41. Kinpishō kōchū, shūkaishō, p. 117.

42. Otando was the son of of Ōe no Motonushi (大枝本主), the son of Prince Abo. Prince Abo’s father is Emperor Heizei (平城天皇, r. 806-809, 774-824). Celebrated poet-brothers Ariwara no Yukihiro (在原行平, 818-93) and Ariwara no Narihiro (在原業平, 825-80) are also the sons of Prince Abo.

Öe no Koretoki (大江維時, 888-963) served as private tutor for three consecutive sovereigns (三代侍読, sandai jidoku)–Emperor Daigo (醍醐天皇, r. 897-930, 885-930), Emperor Suzaku (朱雀天皇, r.930-46, 923-52) and Emperor Murakami (村上天皇, r.946-67, 926-67). Öe no Masahira (大江匡衡, 952-1012), Masafusa’s great-grandfather, taught Emperor Ichijō (一条天皇, r.896-1011, 980-1011) and Emperor Sanjō (三条天皇, r.1011-16, 976-1017), while Öe no Takachika (大江挙周), Masafusa’s grandfather, taught Emperor GoIchijō (後一条天皇, r.1016-36, 1008-36). Normally two scholars are selected for the office of the Tutor of Crown Prince (東宮学士), and Masafusa’s immediate predecessor was Fujiwara no Akihira. Imperial tutorship was generally passed on among the Sugawara and Öe scions.

Therefore, Masafusa was not the first in his clan to act as tutor for three emperors. What differentiates Masafusa from his ancestors, is the speed at which he advanced in the court bureaucracy. Since the time of Otondo, who served as the provincial governor (守, kami) of Mino (美濃, present-day Gifu prefecture), Tanba (丹波, part of present-day Kyoto and Hyōgo), Harima (播磨, part of present-day Hyōgo) and Ōmi (近江, present-day Shiga), it was customary for the sons of the Öe to start their official careers with a governorship after passing the civil service examination. Called zuryō (受領, lit. “the receiver of business from the predecessor”), governors in the period administered the quotidian affairs of sixty-seven provinces, and thus were an integral part of the centralized state, but their ranks were middle-ranking.

During his lifetime, Otondo attained Junior Third Rank (從三位), becoming the first Öe to join the “senior nobles” (kugyō, also called 上達部 kandachime)–the highest echelon of the imperial bureaucracy made up of people with the Third Rank and above. Distinguished from the
other two lesser classes of “privy gentlemen” (殿上人, *tenjōbito*)—a group of officials of the Forth and Fifth Ranks\(^{44}\) and “common courtiers” (地下人, *jigenin*), senior nobles were the equivalent of today’s cabinet members. Prior to receiving the Junior Third Rank in 875, Otondo became one of the eight Consultants (参議, *sangi*) in 864, and together with Ministers (大臣, *daijin*) and Counselors (納言, *nagon*), actively participated in decision-making in the Council of State. Since it was customary for former princes and sons of Fujiwara ministers to assume the position of senior nobles, Otondo’s promotion was rather unusual, and it was his rare combination of academic and administrative abilities, and Emperor Seiwa’s willingness to promote men of talent, that paved the way for the promotion of Otondo. Accordingly, his reputation as an excellent scholar and his many years of public service as governor eventually enabled him to take up a series of respectable posts in the central government such as Right Grand Controller (右大弁), Left Grand Controller (左大弁), Intendant of the Left Gate Watch (左衛門監), and Master of Police (検非違使別当),\(^{45}\) culminating in his obtaining the status of Senior Noble.

Following a similar career trajectory, Otondo’s grandson Koretoki became Consultant in 949. Although his rank at the time was Senior Fourth Lower Grade, in 955 he was promoted to Junior Third Rank. Like Otondo, Koretoki first served as the governor of Mino, Bizen (備前, part of present-day Okayama prefecture) and Ōmi provinces, while maintaining the position of

\(^{44}\) Or Sixth Rank in case of Chamberlains (蔵人, *kurōdo*), “individually authorized by the Emperor to enter the privy chamber (殿上の問).” Tyler, p. 1160.

\(^{45}\) Ishimura, p. 97.
Commissioner of Ceremonial (式部大輔) in the central government. In 960, he assumed Middle Counselor (中納言)—the highest office given to a member of the Ōe clan at the time. Shortly after his death in 963, Koretoki even received the titular status of Junior Second Rank directly from the emperor, “for having been a private tutor for the three consecutive emperors.” (有勲贈従二位。依三代侍読也。) However, most of Masafusa’s immediate ancestors, including his father Narihira (成衡), grandfather Takachika and great-grandfather Masahira, served as provincial governors, and received the Fourth Rank (四位) for their lifetime service in the court, but never became Senior Nobles. As discussed in Chapter Two, a series of Masahira’s formal letters of the application for promotion, included in the Honchō monzui, succinctly reveal his disappointment as a scholar-official.

5. Masafusa and Sugawara Michizane

Because of the similarities in their family backgrounds, their skill as scholar-poets, and their successful career trajectories in the bureaucracy, Sugawara no Michizane (菅原道真, 845-903) and Masafusa are often compared to each other as examples of Heian literati par excellence. On the one hand, their fame as top academicians illuminates the fundamentally unchanged role of kangaku scholarship in society, as something nurtured and thriving within the political framework of the ritsuryō state in ninth-to-twelfth-century Japan. On the other hand, their contrasting political fate brings to fore the dynamic changes in the modus operandi of the seemingly unchanging political institution.

The political heyday of Michizane declined suddenly in 901, when conservative Fujiwara and Minamoto politicians became wary of his promotion to Minister of the Right, and he was subsequently demoted to Supernumerary Acting Governor General of Dazaifu (太宰員外権帥).\(^{47}\) By contrast, Masafusa, who also assumed the post of Acting Governor General of Dazaifu in 1097 (in his case, the appointment was not a form of demotion), did not attain an administrative post as high as Michizane’s, but his longstanding position at court as one of the most influential scholar-officials remained unchallenged until his death in 1111.

As discussed in Chapter Two, the tarnished public image of Michizane was soon restored after his tragic death in exile. Robert Borgen writes that in his later years as Governor General of Dazaifu, Masafusa became “an enthusiastic exponent of the Tenji cult” and played a pivotal role in the further consolidation of the divine image of Michizane as Tenjin or an “epitome of learning.”\(^{48}\) In fact, the Gōdanshō contains numerous examples of Masafusa’s glorification of Michizane. For instance, Book Four of the Ruijubon recension of the Gōdanshō contains the following statement (託宣, “oracle”), believed to have been uttered by the then deified Michizane on the occasion of his conferment of the titular post of Prime Minister in 993:

In days of yore, I was a man of suddenly befallen sorrows on the northern side of the imperial palace;

---

47. The Japanese historical narrative Ōkagami (大鏡, Great Mirror, author unknown, the late 11th or the early 12th century) recounts that the plot against Michizane grew out of Minister of the Left Fujiwara no Tokihiira’s jealousy. Compared to Michizane, Tokihiira was “much younger in age, considerably inferior in terms of his knowledge of the Chinese Classics” (御としもかくく、才もことのほかにおとり給へる), and thus less favored by the young sovereign Daigo. (Matsumura, p. 71.)

48. According to Borgen, as Acting Governor General of Dazaifu, Masafusa “regarded Tenjin’s protection as an vital element in maintaining order in Kyushu.” (Borgen, pp. 357-58 and 368.)
Today, I am a corpse whose humiliation has been alleviated in the Western Capital.

Regretting those days when I was alive and rejoicing in death, how can I be of use [to you]?

Now, all that I had wished for has come true; I shall protect the foundation of our imperial enterprise!

昨は北服に悲しみを蒙る土と為り
今は西都に恥じを雪く尸を作る
生を恨み死を飲ぶ我をいかんせん
今すべからく望み足りて皇基を護るべき。

The majority of Masafusa’s references to Michizane in the Gōdanshō, however, focus more on the human characteristics of his “divine predecessor”\textsuperscript{50}—namely Michizane’s ability as a scholar of the Chinese Classics. For instance, in Book Five of the Ruijūbon recension of the Gōdanshō, Masafusa is quoted as saying, “[t]hereby, Michinaga’s academic achievements, and the verse and prose he trained himself to compose were a gift of genius [lit. “heavenly given”]. One should refrain from criticizing them. (しかれば御所学の才智、習はしめ給ふ文章は、天に受けしめ給ふなり。左右を申すべからず。)\textsuperscript{51} In the same volume of the Gōdanshō, Masafusa goes so far as to say that Michinaga’s compositions in Chinese “stretch the limits of the human mind” (心の及ぶところにあらず), and thus are unfathomable and cannot be readily understood; and unlike those written by Michizane’s disciple, Ki no Haseo (紀長谷雄, 845-912),

\begin{itemize}
\item[49.\hspace{1em}]SNKBT 32, p. 136.
\item[50.\hspace{1em}]Borgen, p. 381.
\item[51.\hspace{1em}]SNKBT 32, p. 177.
\end{itemize}
they “appear to embody the Way of Dark Mystery” (幽玄の道有るか). 52

Unlike Michizane, Masafusa’s reputation as a scholar-official was unchallenged from the beginning. Fujiwara no Munetada (藤原宗忠, 1062-1141), Masafusa’s contemporary and the author of the diary Chūyūki (中右記), is known to have denounced Masafusa by calling him fumiguru (文狂, “one crazed about writing”) and criticized Masafusa for his negligence of official duties during the last few years of his life. However, in his obituary, Munetada actually

52. Ibid., pp. 179 and 180. In light of Haseo’s kanshi preface, “Preface to My Kanshi Poems Composed After the Engi Era” (延喜以後詩序) in the Honchō monzui, in which Haseo emulates Michizane as his teacher of kanshi composition, and from which Masafusa borrows the expression “… only do my best to avoid grammatical and metrical errors” (只避格律) in his “Bonen no ki,” originally written as a kanshi preface, it is remarkable that the Gōdanshō records Masafusa’s casual remark that Hasao’s compositions were only secondary to Michizane’s poems. For my discussion of Haseo’s kanshi preface, see Chapter 2. No doubt an editorial choice by the anonymous editor of the Ruijōbon recension of the Gōdanshō, is responsible for arranging these separate anecdotes in a single sequence, loosely tied together under the theme of “Michizane’s compositions” (菅家の御文章・御作・御草). In the older Gōdanshō recensions which partially survive today, these passages are either excluded or appear in other sections. For example, Masafusa’s comment that “Michizane’s academic aptitude, and the verse and prose he trained himself to compose were heavenly given. […]” appears in the Kanda recension (神田本), the extant manuscript of which contains only 50 anecdotes but can be dated to as early as 1114 or 1115. Masafusa’s remarks that Michizane’s compositions are “unfathomable” and seem to embody “the Way of Dark Mystery” both appear in a version of the Gōdanshō called Suigenshō (水言抄, written with the radicals of the Chinese characters 江 and 談 of the Gōdanshō 江談抄), which dates from 1198 and consists of 256 anecdotes. Neither Kandabon or Suigenshō contains the previously discussed “oracle” attributed to Michizane the Tenjin. The Ruijōbon recension, which contains the oracle, consists of some 445 anecdotes, a handful of which indicate that additions were made after Masafusa and Sanekane’s death. (See for example the poet Abe no Namamaro’s episode in Volume 3, SNKBT 32, p. 71.) The SNKBT edition of the Gōdanshō is based on a Ruijōbon manuscript dated in 1735, which was presumably copied from the medieval courtier Sanjōnishi Kineda’s (三条西公枝, 1487-1563) manuscript. Kawaguchi Hisao and Nara Shōichi’s commentary, Gōdan shōchū is based on an Edo-period woodblock print version of the Ruijōbon Gōdanshō, which is also available in print in the Gunshō ruijū 486, 3 vols. In his introduction to the SNKBT edition of the Gōdanshō, Gōtō Akio states that the older recensions (especially the Kandabon), which primarily consist of Masafusa and Sanekane’s dialogues, are often dissolved, expanded and reorganized into a topically categorized six-volume compendium in the Ruijōbon. Gōtō refers to Kuroda Akira’s (黒田彰) theory that the bulk of new content in the Ruijōbon is concentrated in Books Four and Six, and was likely to have been adopted from Masafusa’s commentary to the eleventh-century bilingual poetry anthology, Wakan rōeishū. Masafusa’s commentary to the Rōeishū, generally called Rōeishū chū (朗詠集注), survives in the form of interlinear notes and comments in the marginalia of some old manuscripts of the Wakan rōeishū. For a detailed discussion of different Gōdanshō recensions, see Chapter 6.
praised Masafusa, referring to him a “brightest mirror in the world” (天下明鏡), a “key figure in our imperial court” (朝之簡要), and a “fine public servant” (良臣).

Although never deified like Michizane, by the late twelfth century, Masafusa was revered as an exceptionally talented scholar-official. For instance, in Taikai hishō (大塊秘抄, Secret Commentaries of the Earth)–a treatise on kingship that Fujiwara no Koremichi (藤原伊通) wrote for Emperor Nijō (二条天皇, 1143-65, r. 1158-65), Masafusa is referred to as a model example of an individual who “studied the Chinese Classics in order to better serve his sovereign” (君につかうまつらんと学問をしてこそなれ). In fact, the following passage in the Taikai hishō suggests that as early as in the 1160s, it was considered imperative for an imperial ruler to know of Masafusa’s legacy as a scholar official:

Masafusa was the son of a Commissioner of Civil Affairs [of the Junior Fifth grade]. He also served in three other posts and ascended to the rank of Senior Second as a Middle Counselor. Since he climbed [the career ladder] by means of his own [academic and administrative] authority, in my humble opinion, no one was able to criticize him.

臣房、民部大輔が子にて、三事をかねて正二位中納言までなりのぼり候も、みな身をもてのぼり候へば、人もえもいはぬ事にこそ申思みて候へ。54

In the late eleventh century, the regent Fujiwara no Yorimichi’s daughters failed to produce imperial sons, and the Fujiwara regency suddenly came to end. Accordingly,
sovereignty was swiftly transferred to Emperor GoSajō. As exemplified by the earlier success of Michizane under the auspices of the Retired Emperor Uda (宇多上皇, r. 887-97, 867-931), the Confucian political ideal of a top academician assisting a ruler in “building and ruling the state” (經国治世) itself was not new. However, the sudden decline of Fujiwara family politics provided a new pretext for reviving the Confucian ideal, both on the part of the mature imperial sovereign (GoSanjō), who as Crown Prince had waited for such an opportunity for twenty-two years, and the exceptionally talented Confucian scholar (Masafusa), whose family background gave him the privilege of assisting the ambitious emperor.

However, the imperial administration under the auspice of GoSanjō lasted for only four years. In 1072, GoSanjō abdicated in favor of Shirakawa, and died at the age of forty the following year. Even after GoSanjō’s death, however, Masafusa continued to work hand-in-hand with new rulers, benefiting from their promotions as well as influencing them and their contemporary courtiers.

6. Masafusa, Fujiwara no Akihira and Changing Roles of Kidendō Scholars

In the introduction to Heian kōki Nihon kanbungaku no kenkyū (平安後期日本漢文学の研究, Studies of Sinological Studies in Late-Heian Japan, 2003), the scholar of Sino-Japanese literature Satō Michio (佐藤道生) provides a useful intellectual framework for understanding the role Ōe no Masafusa played as a Confucian scholar and a statesman at the turn of the twelfth century. According to Satō, Chinese studies at the State Academy had been monopolized by members of the Sugawara and the Ōe clans since the institution’s inception in the early eighth
century, in particular after the establishment of the Kidendō curriculum in the early ninth century. However, in the eleventh century, this tradition in the Academy was challenged as a new generation of Fujiwara scholars emerged, supported financially and politically by the Fujiwara regents, whose wealth enabled them to acquire recently published classical texts from Song-dynasty China.\(^5^5\) As the center of learning gradually shifted from the traditional Sugawara and Ōe “Confucians” (儒家, juka) to Fujiwara “self-made scholars” (起家, kika), the role of the scholars in the imperial academy also changed. Satō describes the state of kangaku scholarship at the time of Fujiwara no Akihira (藤原明衡, 989?-1066), the first Fujiwara academician to hold various influential posts in the Academy,\(^5^6\) who is best known for his compilation of the Honchō monzui, as follows:

One of the reasons [why Akihira, who held important posts in the Academy, wherein studies were focused exclusively on enhancing public service to the state, compiled a text like the Honchō monzui, which was essentially practical and introductory—in other words, for the personal edification of individual readers,] is that Akihira—the “upstart” (kika) scholar—had a defiant attitude towards traditional “Confucian” (juka) scholars. However, the more plausible explanation is that by Akihira’s time, the official duties of juka scholars were reduced, and the actual contents of a scholar’s everyday service were evolving into the mere act of drafting lavish compositions that had nothing to do with the ideal of “building the state and ruling the society.” In other words, Confucian academicians [in the mid-eleventh century] were relinquishing their fundamental role as legislators of the imperial state while becoming

---

55. Satō points out that the regent Fujiwara no Michinaga’s diary, Midō kanpakuki (御堂関白記) contains records of monks and merchants from Song China offering several Chinese classical texts to Michinaga. (Satō, pp. 6 and 12.)

56. In his later years, Akihira held posts traditionally filled by the Ōe and Sugawara scholars, such as Deputy Commissioner of Ceremonial, Doctor of Letters, Imperial Tutor and Chief of Academy, and received the Junior Fourth Rank Lower. (Satō, p. 7.)
increasingly subordinate to [the private needs of] the higher echelons of the aristocracy.  

If this was the actual situation in the Academy in the second half of the eleventh century, Masafusa, a generation or two younger than Akihira, was a completely different type of Confucian, embodying the spirit of a new age at the turn of the twelfth century. On the one hand, as the nexus of politics shifted from the Fujiwara regents to Emperor GoSanjō upon his accession to the throne in 1068, Masafusa became a paragon of Confucian tradition. As an active supporter of the revival of imperial authority, he attempted to restore the lofty ideals of his ancestors who as public servants in the classical imperial state studied and taught Chinese Classics, tutored wise sovereigns and their sons, and established the “household status” (家格) of the Ōe family as one of Confucian scholars. In other words, Masafusa served Emperor GoSanjō as a public servant for the realization of the Confucian ideal of “building the state and ruling the society” during his patron’s reign.

On the other hand, Masafusa was an eclectic and progressive scholar, who was willing to embrace new trends in kangaku studies, rather than simply adhere to the orthodox scholarship espoused by his ancestors. For instance, Satō points out that as a genuinely dedicated intellectual, Masafusa was inevitably drawn to the comparatively new Song (960-1279) edition (宋刊本) of the Collected Works of Bo Juyi (白氏文集), which had presumably been brought to

---

57. [公的職務に於する研究を主とする江林の要職にある明衡が『本朝文粹』のような実用的・啓蒙的、つまり読者一般を私的に益するような書物を編纂したことは] 一つには明衡の中に儒家に反発する家教的な反骨精神があったことによるのであろうが、それよりも寧ろ当時すでに儒家の職務が矮小化され、その内実が經国治世としては無縁な文章雕琢の作業へと漸次移行してゆく過程にあった（換言すれば、儒家が議政官としての役割を失い、上流階級に従属する関係を深めつつあった）ことによるものと考えられる。Ibid., p. 9.
Japan during the heyday of the Fujiwara regents, and even acknowledged its superiority to the traditional Tang (618-907) edition (唐錦本), upon which his ancestors based their in-house interpretations.58 The first appearance of the Collected Works of Bo Juyi in Japan is considered to have taken place around 838 (承和5), around the same time that Kidendō track was being consolidated by the Sugawara and Ōe clans.59 Trivial as it may seem, Masafusa’s choice of texts is remarkable because it suggests that he was not afraid of challenging the authority of his own family tradition for the sake of more advanced scholarship.

On a slightly different note, Masafusa wrote a series of “records” (記, ki) featuring “obscene and vulgar” (卑猥・卑俗な) subjects such as prostitutes, performing artists, foxes’ mysterious deeds, and carnivals (田楽, dengaku) that actually took place in the capital.60 His interest in these subjects also indicates his departure from his family’s orthodox scholarship. As Satō notes, these writings are influenced by Akihira’s compositions on similar topics in the Honchō monzui, as well as his essay on performing artists and craftsmen, Shin sarugaku ki (新猿楽記, An Acount of the New Monkey Music, ca. 1050).61 In short, Masafusa emulated his innovative teacher as much as his own ancestors, and that was probably why Akihira’s praise for

58. This episode appears in the Gōdanshō (6:49), regarding Masafusa’s interpretation of a line in Bo-Juyi’s ballad, “Chōgonka” (長恨歌). (SNKBT 32, p. 238, Satō, pp. 12-13.)


60. See, for example, Masafusa’s “Yūjo no ki” (遊女記), “Kuiraiishi no ki” (傀儡記), “Kobi no ki” (孤狐記) and “Rakuyō dengakuki” (洛陽田楽記), discussed in Komine (2006), pp. 97-154.

young Masafusa’s composition remained memorable to Masafusa throughout his life.

In contrast to Akihira, whose compilation of the Honchō monzui is considered to have represented the pragmatism of “self-made scholars” vis-à-vis the more politically charged idealism of traditional “Confucians,” in Masafusa, the dichotomous view of the role of the Confucian scholar was sublimated into the completely novel idea of the poeticization of politics. For example, especially in his later years, Masafusa composed numerous “Buddhist vows” (願文, ganmon) in highly stylized Chinese on behalf of his imperial and non-imperial patrons. The extant ganmon prayers only demonstrate that Masafusa, the Confucian public servant, was neither so dogmatic nor ill at ease with the idea of securing his own political footing by privately serving influential people, if not subordinating himself to them. As discussed in Chapter Two, the composition of ganmon among Kidendō-trained scholars was common in the eleventh centuries, and twenty-seven examples of this literary genre are included in the Honchō monzui. What was extraordinary about Masafusa’s involvement with ganmon is the sheer number of ganmon he composed.

In fact, his commitment to the practice of composing ganmon, which only increased in his later years, suggests Masafusa’s eclectic and pragmatic attitude toward life and personal success in general as a Confucian scholar, because these prayers are exclusively Buddhistic. A handful of them were written for Masafusa’s deceased relatives, such as his wife, mother and son, and for major Buddhist rituals, such as the Forty-Ninth Day [after a person’s death] (七七日供養) and memorial services (周忌供養) conducted for the pacification of their souls.62

---

Similarly, Masafusa occasionally composed prayers to encourage his own recovery from illness. Anticipating his demise, he even composed a highly panegyric and retrospective supplication to be recited on his behalf at the Buddhist rite of his own Forty-Ninth Day.\(^{63}\)

However, the majority of the 120 extant vows included in the *Gō totoku nagon ganmonshū* (江都督納言願文集, The Collected Prayers of Ōe, Acting Governor General and Counselor, 6 vols., presumably edited by Masafusa’s son Koreyori 維順 in the mid-twelfth century)\(^{64}\) were written for the welfare and salvation of Masafusa’s patrons and their families. Indeed, the list of people on whose behalf Masafusa composed Buddhist prayers, either during their lifetime or posthumously, contains the names of the most politically influential individuals at the dawn of the *insei* period: three generations of Retired Emperors: Gosanjō, Shirakawa and Horikawa; Regent Fujiwara no Morozane and his son Moromichi; Minister of the Left Minamoto no Toshifusa (源俊房, 1035-1121) and his son Grand Counselor Minamoto no Toshiaki (源俊明, 1044-1114); and Fujiwara no Akisue (藤原顯季, 1055-1123), who was the son of Emperor Shirakawa’s wet-nurse, Shirakawa’s confidant (近臣, *kinshin*), and also the founder of the Rokujō (六條) school of waka. Masafusa also composed prayers for the wives and daughters of the elite, including Shirakawa’s favorite, Empress Kenshi (賢子, 1056-84),\(^{65}\) and their daughter Teishi (媞子, 1076-96, also known as Ikuhō mon’in 郁芳門院), whom Shirakawa adored so

---

63. See ibid., pp. 392-397.

64. According to Yamazaki Makoto, Masafusa had four sons, the most famous of which was Takakane (隆兼) who died in Dazaifu in 1102, and one daughter. Yamazaki (2010), pp. 11-12. See also a family tree in Kawaguchi (1968), p. 347.

65. Komine, p. 301.
much that he installed her as the wife of her own brother, Emperor Horikawa; Morozane’s wife and Moromichi’s mother Reishi (麗子); and finally, Akisue and some other middle-to-high-ranking courtiers’ wives. In sum, at the beginning of his career, Masafusa was a promising Confucian scholar; by the end, his responsibility as a top academician revolved around making use of his erudition to compose supplicatory prayers on behalf of his patrons.

In the Buddhist vows he composed in honor of the academician Fujiwara no Atsumoto (藤原敦基, 1046-1106, Akihira’s son), Masafusa refers to the life of his fellow Kidendō scholar as follows:

[...]  
The style of his household treasure is to respect  
Cloth-covered books [that would fill] thirty carriages.

The legacy of his household occupation is deep like accumulated dust, and  
The camphor trees have [slowly but steadily grew] for three generations.

The Confucian academy is now deserted, and people are scarce;  
He thus made “the wind and the moon” his slave.

The literati’s gardens are desolate, and gatherings there are seldom;  
He thus made grammar and rhyme schemes his industry.

Although his talent and fame cannot match his father’s,  
His compositions are yet much superior to others’.

[...]  
家資風扇、繰繚三十乘、  
門業塵深、檐樟両三代。  
蟠林擁而稀人、以風月為奴隸。  
詩苑闊而少事、以格律為產業。  
才名雖無及於父、
Although this passage specifically concerns the life of Atsumoto, it is curious that Masafusa thought that by 1106, “the [Confucian] academy was deserted” (儒林孤) and “the literati’s gardens were desolate” (詩苑閟). Furthermore, Atsumoto, the son of Fujiwara no Akihira, was a kika (起家, “self-made”) scholar. In this regard, it is remarkable that Masafusa acknowledges that Akihira’s line of the Fujiwara Shiki family (藤原式家) already thrived for “three-generations” (三代) with their own “household occupation” (門業) and “household treasure” (家資). In contrast to his great-grandfather Ōe no Masahira, who “belittled” kike scholars (see Chapter Two) to assert the prominence of the Ōe as a traditional Confucian household, Masafusa praises his teacher, Akihira’s “talent and fame,” as well as Akihira’s son’s skill in the “composition in Chinese” (文章). In other words, in this vow, Masafusa makes almost no distinction between his own family and Akihira and Atsumoto’s branch of the Fujiwara family as an established scholarly household. Furthermore, Masafusa regards Atsumoto as one of his important colleagues at the dwindling State Academy. Such a collegial attitude toward a kike scholar would not have been shown by the Ōe scholars among Masahira’s generation.

For these reasons, Masafusa’s comment that Atsumoto “thus made ‘the wind and the moon’ his slave” could also apply to Masafusa’s own situation as a scholar-official at the dawn of the insei period, wherein he had to employ his skill in “the composition of Chinese poems” (ふうにげつ) regardless of his own feelings in order to serve his patrons. The word “slave” (奴隷) suggests that Masafusa and Atsumoto no longer considered composing Chinese

verse as a personal asset. Instead of enjoying “poetic elegance” (fūgetsu) with their fellow literati at poetry gatherings, they “enslaved” their own poetic talent in order to serve their patrons. In other words, Masafusa’s highly self-conscious reference to fūgetsu in his ganmon reveals his view that by the beginning of the twelfth century, the composition of Chinese verse and prose had become a mere means of survival for him and his fellow academicians.

Masafusa’s reference to Chinese “grammar and rhyme schemes” (格律) as “an industry” (産業) further attests to his self-deprecating view that the hereditary trade of Kidendō academicians was reduced to a mere means of profiting their imperial and non-imperial patrons.

7. Masafusa in Dazaifu

After having served as Deputy Governor (介, suke) and Governor (守, kami) of various provinces, including Tanba (丹波), Bitchū (備中, western Okayama prefecture), Mimasaka (美作, northern Okayama), Bizen (備前, south-eastern Okayama), Suō (周防, northern Yamaguchi prefecture) and Echizen (越前, eastern Fukui prefecture), Masafusa was appointed Acting Governor General of Dazaifu (太宰權師, in present-day Fukuoka prefecture) in 1097 and again in 1106. Since Masafusa held numerous administrative posts concurrently in the capital while being in charge of governorship in these provinces, it is assumed that he was an absentee governor most of the time.

According to Kawaguchi Hisao’s biography, Masafusa actually stayed in Mimasaka and Dazaifu for periods of six months and four years, respectively. While in Mimasaka, Masafusa’s
wife died in childbirth;\(^{67}\) on his return trip from Dazaifu to the capital, upon the completion of his first term there in 1102, he learned of the death of his favorite son Takakane (隆兼), who had been visiting Dazaifu for medical treatment.\(^{68}\) Perhaps because Masafusa associated these personal tragedies with his time away from the capital, when Masafusa was reappointed Acting Governor General of Dazaifu at the age of sixty-six, he kept the post for five years, until one year before his death, but never again traveled to the fateful place. As Fredric Kotas notes, for this, Masafusa was “severely rebuked by some of his contemporaries, in particular Munetada.”\(^{69}\)

Kawaguchi acknowledges that “by and large, Masafusa was a historically important person, but [his life] as a Confucian academician was rather uneventful.”\(^{70}\) Indeed, a glance at several chronological tables of Masafusa’s life, the most comprehensive version of which appears as an appendix to Kimoto Yoshinobu’s (木本好信) important study of the Gōki (江記, ᴇₒ ᴡ🍕Masafusa’s Diary),\(^{71}\) reveals that the main events in Masafusa’s life were his near annual promotions and appointments to new posts in the imperial bureaucracy. For instance, beginning with his official debut as Junior Aide of Management (治部少丞)\(^{72}\) at the age of twenty in 1060 and his subsequent conferment of Junior Fifth Rank Lower (従五位下) in the same year,

\(^{67}\) Kawaguchi, p. 99.

\(^{68}\) Ibid., pp. 248-50.

\(^{69}\) Kotas, pp. 110-11. Also in Fukazawa, pp. 165-72.

\(^{70}\) Kawaguchi, p. 2.

\(^{71}\) Kimoto, pp. 763-88.

\(^{72}\) Bureau of Management (治部省) was one of the eight bureaus (省) in the ritsuryō system, handling the household registry, music performances at the imperial court, religious personnels, imperial mausoleums, and diplomacy.
Masafusa assumed fourteen different posts in the central government, culminating in the prominent posts of Acting Counselor (権中納言) in 1094 and Lord of the Treasury (大蔵卿) in 1111.

Upon the completion of his first tenure as Acting Governor General of Dazaifu in 1102, he attained the remarkably high Senior Second Rank (正二位). According to the Kugyō bunin (公卿補任, Appointments of Courtiers), a record of “senior nobles” (kugyō), before Masafusa, the highest rank given to a member of the Ōe clan was Junior Second Rank (従二位). Since it was conferred posthumously to Ōe no Koretoki for having served as private tutor for three generations of emperors, technically speaking, the highest rank previously attained during the lifetime of an Ōe scion was Junior Third Rank (従三位). Thus, as insignificant as it may seem, the bestowing of such a high rank on Masafusa was a phenomenal event not only in his personal life but also in the long history of the Ōe family.

While Kimoto’s chronology, primarily based on fragments of Masafusa’s diary and other sources, provides almost no information about Masafusa’s personal life, except the date of his wife’s death, it provides much information about various services Masafusa performed for the imperial state and his patrons throughout his academic and administrative careers. In this regard, it is remarkable that in recent Japanese scholarship, particular attention has been paid to the years Masafusa spent in Kyushu as Acting Governor General of Dazaifu, and that scholars have examined the impact of his years away from the capital on Masafusa’s development as a prolific writer as well as a shrewd politician. For instance, Fukazawa Tōru (深沢徹), the author of

Chûsei shinwa no rentan-jutsu–Ôe Masafusa to sono jidai (中世神話の鍊丹術—大江匡房とその時代, The Search for the Elixir of Immortality in Medieval Myth: Ôe Masafusa and His Era, 1994), the first non-biographic, book-length study of Masafusa, dedicates a chapter to Masafusa’s term as Acting Governor General of Dazaifu. Strategically located at the southern end of the Japanese archipelago and long functioning as Japan’s gateway to its East Asian neighbors since the late seventh century, Dazaifu—also called “the Remote Imperial Court” (遠の朝廷) or Western Capital (西都)—continued to have both international and domestic significance. Like other provincial capitals, Dazaifu administered various local affairs such as public and private lands, and tax collection. But because of its location, Dazaifu also administrated diplomacy and commerce with China, Korea and other countries in the region.

As Fukazawa reviews, the governorship of Dazaifu was a sinecure customarily assigned to princes. Thus, the Acting Governor was practically the highest individual in charge of this place so important in both foreign and domestic affairs.

Fukazawa’s study focuses on the ostensibly insignificant historical fact that Masafusa was the only Acting Governor of Dazaifu in the turn of the twelfth century (1097-1102, 1106-11) who was able to complete the formal five-year tenure of the post without becoming involved in political turmoil with local religious establishments, which jeopardized many of Masafusa’s

74. It was also referred to as “the Western Capital” (西府), as it appears in Masafusa’s Chinese poems.

75. For a detailed historical and archeological study of Dazaifu in early Japan, see Bruce Batten, Gateway to Japan: Hakata in war and peace, 500-1300. University of Hawai’i Press, 2006. Calling Dazaifu “the imperial headquarters for western Japan” and “home to several thousand bureaucrats, soldiers and their families” already during the Nara period, Batten examines the role it played in the formation and maintenance of the Japanese centralized state in the seventh century onward. (Batten, p. 5.)
predecessors and successors’ tenures, or before dying in office.\textsuperscript{76} Also, he stresses that Masafusa was unique in Japanese history for having been assigned to such a highly “challenging post” twice in his lifetime, despite his illness in old age.\textsuperscript{77} Accordingly, questioning what particular abilities enabled Masafusa to govern riot-smitten and even occasionally “anarchical” Dazaifu successfully,\textsuperscript{78} Fukazawa attempts to shed light on the dark side of Masafusa as an unscrupulous politician, who was in fact, “able to fictitiously mimic the kingly mannerisms that often deviated from normative rules.”\textsuperscript{79}

In his biography of Masafusa, Kawaguchi Hisao also touches upon “a kind of disagreeable quality in Masafusa,” specifically the way Masafusa, as Governor of Mimasaka, slandered a superior who had admonished him for not having included certain tax documents in an official report.\textsuperscript{80} Similarly, assuming that Masafusa “must have been” familiar with the Confucian notion of “law-abiding officers” (循吏, \textit{junri}) and “ruthless officers” (酷吏, \textit{kokuri}), both commonly appear in the Chinese chronicle \textit{Shijing}, Fukazawa discusses “certain

\textsuperscript{76} For an overview of the fate of generations’ of Acting Governors of Dazaifu, see the chart in Fukazawa, pp. 168-170.

\textsuperscript{77} Borgen, p. 380.

\textsuperscript{78} According to Fukazawa, Munetada condemned Masafusa for not taking any action as absentee governor during his second term as Acting Governor of Dazaifu, because at the time, the region was plagued by violent revolts by supporters of the local shrine Usa Hachiman; the situation was almost “anarchical.” (Fukazawa, pp. 169-70.) Kotas also mentions that such criticism by Munetada “raises questions at to why [Masafusa] was reappointed to the position at all, especially considering the chronic nature of his illness.” (Kotas, p. 110.)

\textsuperscript{79} 規範逸脱的な王者のしぐさを擬制的に体現することの出来た匡房. Ibid., p. 184.

\textsuperscript{80} 匡房にある、一種のいやらしさ. Kawaguchi, pp. 126-7.
dubiousness and shadiness”\(^{81}\) on the part of Masafusa as a politician.

In Fukazawa’s view, these particular qualities enabled Masafusa to complete the five-year tenure at a dangerous post, twice in his lifetime. For example, he points out that Masafusa curried favor with administrators and followers at the Usa Hachiman Shrine (宇佐八幡宮), whose expansion as private landholders in the region had long threatened the public interest of the Dazaifu government, by making lavish donations to the shrine.\(^{82}\) However, the way in which Masafusa lured the local authorities like the associates of the Usa Hachiman was very unique. In addition to money, land and other material goods, Masafusa frequently composed elaborate Chinese prose, verse and ganmon, glorifying the shrine. Fukazawa argues that by doing so, Masafusa not only sanctified the religious institution and its history, but also elevated himself as the generous provider of “verbal potlatches.”\(^{83}\)

Fukazawa argues that these writings came to embody special value not because they were written by one of the top academicians in Japan at the time, but because they were authored by one of the highest officials in the central government, who also happened to be the Acting Governor of Dazaifu at the time. Furthermore, Fukazawa points out that Masafusa’s alliance with the local religious establishment was not limited to the Usa Hachiman Shrine. While

---

81. ある種のいかがわしさやうさん臭さ. Fukazawa, p. 182.

82. Fukazawa, pp. 182-189. As one of the reasons why Masafusa was considered appropriate for undertaking this task as Acting Governor of Dazaifu, Fukazawa mentions Masafusa’s involvement in GoSanjô Emperor’s regulation of private estates (荘園) during the Enkyû era (延久, 1069-74), which included the case against the Usa Hachiman. For a detailed study of this in English, including the role of the Office for the Investigation of Estate Documents (記録荘園労務所, or simply the Records Office 記録所), see Hurst, pp. 110-18.

83. 言葉の贈与という意味でのポトラッチ行為の成文化. Fukazawa, p. 188.
improving the Dazaifu government’s relationship with the Usa Hachiman, Masafusa also became deeply involved in the administration of Anrakuji (安楽寺, present-day Dazaifu Tenmangū 太宰府天満宮), where Sugawara no Michizane was enshrined. For instance, in 1100, Masafusa dedicated a long panegyric poem entitled “A Poem Composed upon My Visit to the Anrakuji” (参安楽詩, in the Honchō zoku monzui, Book 1:6) to the temple, followed by material offerings such as the building of a prayer hall, and making sifts of land and hiring trained monks for the temple. According to Satō Michio, Masafusa’s Anrakuji poem is an appropriation of Bo Juyi’s “Poem Composed When I Traveled to Wu Zhen Temple” (遊悟真寺詩, in Hakushi monjū, 6:264), in terms of its length and format.

Regarding Masafusa’s relationship to Anrakuji, Fukazawa offers an even more extensive interpretation. He points out that Masafusa attempted to augment his public authority as an embodiment of the centralized imperial state by reviving various court annual events (年中行事) in the provincial temple compound such as “palace banquets” (内宴, naien) and “winding stream banquets” (曲水宴, kyokusui en) which had long been obsolete even in the capital. In Fukazawa’s words:

> By mimicking [these] courtly events and relying upon the [divine] authority of Michizane, who was supposed to have been associated with all “wickedness” and was banished for being a rebel against the state, Masafusa attempted to reestablish Dazaifu as a miniature version of the “royal palace”; furthermore, by adopting imperial mannerisms, he

---

84. Borgen, pp. 363 and 366.
86. For my discussion of a kanshi preface Masafusa’s great-grandfather Masahira composed at a Winding Stream Banquet (曲水宴) in 1007, see Chapter 2.
attempted to sanctify himself and to guarantee certain charisma in his own literary compositions.87

In Chapter Two, in conjunction with the term fūgetsu, I briefly discussed Ōe no Masahira’s (952-1012) kanshi preface, composed in 1007 to commemorate one “winding stream banquet” to which Masahira was invited with his fellow literati. Regarding Fukazawa’s comment quoted above, whether Masafusa “attempted to reestablish Dazaifu as a miniature version of the ‘royal palace’” is uncertain. However, in comparison to Masahira, who in his characteristically pompous yet obsequious manner expressed joy in having been invited to the annual event at a nobleman’s home because he was one of the renowned poet-scholars at the time, Fukazawa’s study suggests that in Masafusa’s case, he was the senior noble, who hosted an event like “winding stream banquet” in the remote “Western Capital,” Dazaifu. With regard to Masafusa’s “kingly manners” (王者としてのふるまい) Fukazawa goes so far as to make the following conclusion:

87. そもそも国家の反逆者としてすべての＜悪＞を担わされ追放された菅の道真をかづぎ出し、宮中のまね事をやってみせた匡房の意図は、この太宰府の地を＜王城＞のミニアチュールとし、そこから王者のしくざをくみ取ることで自らを聖別して、己の起草する文章のカリスマ性を末長く保障して行こうとすることにあった。Fukazawa, p. 192.

Robert Borgen, whose study of Masafusa’s embracement of Tenjin (Michizane) worship seems to have been greatly influenced by Fukazawa’s work, tones down the thrust of Fukazawa’s argument and concludes that “Masafusa regarded Tenjin’s protection as an vital element in maintaining order in Kyushu.” (Borgen, p. 368.) Borgen’s view of Masafusa’s revival of Palace Banquets and Winding Stream Banquets at Anrakuji, quoted below, for instance, is very similar to Fukazawa’s: “Masafusa’s local palace banquet was one component in a broader strategy of attempting to transplant elements of imperial charisma in Kyushu with Tenjin as their agent.” (Borgen, 366.) Unlike Fukazawa, however, Borgen offers psychological reasons why Masafusa—the poet-scholar just like Michizane—was drawn to the now deified Tenjin (天神, lit. “Heavenly God”) or Michizane in Dazaifu, based on his interpretation of Masafusa’s Gōdanshō. (Borgen, pp. 379-83.)
Masafusa—with his experience of having served as a “Crown Prince’s Private Tutor” for three generations—Gosanjō, Shirakawa and Horikawa—was a teacher of the art of kingship for Shirakawa, who was twelve years younger than him. Therefore, perhaps we should regard the Retired Emperor Shirakawa’s kingly manners, which especially became prominent after Masafusa’s death [in 1111] as something Shirakawa himself learned by imitating and practicing Masafusa’s behavior in Dazaifu. In other words, the Retired Emperor Shirakawa himself was Masafusa’s “miniature.”

Because Masafusa regarded himself as an “enslaved” academician, serving the private needs of his imperial and non-imperial patrons, Fukazawa’s conclusion that “Shirakawa himself was Masafusa’s ‘miniature’” is hard to accept. However, especially after he was promoted to Senior Third Rank and Chamberlain (sangi) in 1088 (Kanji 寛治 2), Masafusa became a senior noble (kugyō), for whom academicians of his family background, like his great-grandfather Masahira, had normally served. For these reasons, it is important to discuss how Masafusa dealt with his unusual dual identity as a Kidendō scholar and senior noble after the Kanji era.

Fukazawa’s method of proposing a revisionist history through a scrupulous examination of seemingly minor historical details (the fact that Masafusa was the only person at the turn of the twelfth century who successfully completed a four-year term as Governor General of Dazaifu, and was also appointed to the post twice in his lifetime) appears similar to that of the New Historians. However, despite his astonishing conclusion that “Shirakawa himself was Masafusa’s miniature,” Fukazawa’s argument lacks the critical insight of New Historicism at its best. According to the theory propounded by Catherine Gallagher and Stephen Greenblatt, a “counterhistory opposes itself not only to dominant narratives, but also to prevailing modes of historical thought and methods of research; hence, when successful, it ceases to be ‘counter.’” (Gallagher and Greenblatt, p. 52.) Contrary to this model, the alternative historical view Fukazawa proposes is too facilely based on the “dominant narrative” that Masafusa was an exceptional academician because he tutored three emperors, and that Retired Shirakawa was a despot. It is not easy to devise a revisionist history, the tenets of which contradict mainstream ways of thinking. However, at least we have to question why and how these ideas became “dominant narrative.”
8. Masafusa During and After the Kanji Era (1087-94)

In “Bonen no ki,” for instance, the opening passage quoted at the beginning of the present chapter, is followed by a series of encomia for Masafusa by eleven historical figures who were deeply impressed by his Sino-Japanese compositions. Aside from the head of the State Academy, Fujiwara no Akihira, Masafusa recalls how prominent politicians such as the regent Fujiwara no Yorimichi, Minister of the Right Minamoto no Morofusa, and Acting Governor General of Dazaifu Minamoto no Tsunenobu (源信, 1016-97), as well as a handful of provincial governors and middle-ranking officials all praised his writings, which included not only the rhyme-prose he composed as a student but also a range of public documents he drafted as an official, such as a regent’s letter of resignation, a diplomatic letter to the kingdom of Goryeo (present-day Korea), as well as Buddhist vows.

Masafusa concludes “Bonen no ki” by reminiscing about these eleven individuals, all deceased by the time of the composition of the essay, who gave him moral support at various critical moments in his academic and administrative careers. He makes the point that their own interest in Chinese literature enabled them to recognize Masafusa. Or in the case of Commissioner of Ceremonial Fujiwara no Sanetsuna (藤原実綱, 1012-82), Masafusa describes him as being “lacking profound knowledge of Chinese literature” (文章に深からずといへど)

89 Satō Michio argues that “these self-praise in ‘Bonen no ki’ are not listed randomly.” He states that descriptions in the opening passage, for instance, indicate such events as Masafusa’s admission to the State Academy at the age of four, and passing examinations in “the Three Historical Books” (三史) at the age of eight. (Satō, pp. 136-7, note 3.)
but was nonetheless deeply touched by Masafusa’s writings. In other words, Masafusa’s somewhat exaggerated presentation of his achievements was only a means of expressing his disappointment with the society in which he lived:

But that was years ago, and since then all such men have passed away. Of the men who knew how to judge literature, not one now remains. In the words of Ssu-ma Ch’ien: ‘For whom do you do it?’ Whom are you going to get to listen to you?’ I have heard that Carpenter Shih ceased whirling his hatchet with the plasterer’s death, and that Po-ya broke his lute strings because Chung Tzu-ch’i was gone. Those who understand the true Way of poetry are few. A man of old grieved that the products of refined minds should be viewed by untrained eyes. Since the Kanji era [1087-94], I have not thought deeply about literary composition; I have only tried to avoid censure for errors in my verse. When something does move me inwardly, I give it outward form in words. From time to time, I chant poems to myself, and I have made them into a mere trifle of a book. And because of that, in turn, I have recorded the story of my life for posterity.

According to Satō Michio, Masafusa wrote “Bonen no ki” at the beginning of the Kōwa era (康和, 1099-1104) in Kyūshū, about one year after he moved there to assume the position of Acting Governor General of Dazaifu in 1098. In the passage quoted above in Ury’s translation,

---

90. Yamagishi, et. al., p. 163.

91. Translated by Marian Ury. Ury and Borgen, pp. 150-51.

92. Satō, pp. 131-36.
what is most remarkable is that Masafusa himself viewed the Kanji era (1087-94) as a turning point in his intellectual and political life. Moreover, for anyone familiar with the Honchō monzui, it is apparent that Masafusa’s “Bonen no ki,” in particular the paragraph quoted above, alludes to Ki no Haseo’s book preface (shijo), entitled “Preface to My Kanshi Poems Composed After the Engi Era” (延喜以後詩序). As discussed in Chapter Two, Haseo wrote this essay shortly after Sugawara no Michizane’s death. Highly critical of his “non-poetic” colleagues in the State Academy, who were merely busying themselves as “great scholars” (鴻儒, kōju) and officials, Haseo expressed his indignation in the following manner:

[...] [A]fter the Engi era, I have been unwilling to compose poems. [...]  
Even when invited to public banquets, I no longer think deeply about poetry composition, and only do my best to avoid grammatical and metrical errors.  

故予延喜以後、不欲好言詩、[...]
雖不閑公宴、不欲深思、只避格律之責而已。93

Imitating Haseo’s expression almost word for word, Masafusa wrote in “Bonen no ki” that “Since the Kanji era, [he had] not thought deeply about literary composition; [he had] only tried to avoid censure for errors in [his] verse” (寬治以後、文章不敢深思、唯避翰墨之責而已). The loss of his mentor Michizane made Haseo realize that the composition of Chinese poems (詩) was no longer the same. Then, what made Masafusa think in a highly analogous manner that the “true Way of poetry” (風騷之道) no longer existed after the Kanji era? Reasons

93. SNKBT 27, p. 255.
for this can be surmised by critically analyzing chronologies of Masafusa’s life, particularly the one compiled by Kimoto Yoshinobu.94

The Kanji era had special significance for Masafusa because the era name “Kanji” (寛治, lit. “magnanimous rule”) itself was devised by Masafusa, citing the Chinese Classics, Liji (礼记, Book of Rites).95 According to Kimoto, for a Confucian scholar in the imperial state, no other task was as honorable as devising a new reign title (元号勘申, gengō kanshin), a privilege normally reserved exclusively for “renowned Confucian scholars” (学儒), such as Doctors of Literature, Commissioners of Ceremonial (the Bureau of Ceremonial that supervised the State Academy) and Directors of the Academy.96 Masafusa was appointed Commissioner of Ceremonial in the First Month of 1087, and the Kanji era began in the Fourth Month of the same year. This followed Emperor Shirakawa’s abdication and the accession of his son Taruhito (善人), who was eight years old at the time, to the throne as Emperor Horikawa (1079-1107, r. 1086-1107), in the Eleventh Month of 1086. Subsequently, Masafusa devised four subsequent reign titles, including Ten’ei (天永, 1110-13), which ended two years after his death.97

94. Kawaguchi Hisao’s biography, Ōe masafusa, for instance, contains an abridged chronology of his life, along with a list of other noteworthy events at the imperial court. (Kawaguchi, pp. 350-69.) On the other hand, Kimoto’s chronology is a detailed documentation of Masafusa’s personal and private life, reconstructed through relevant descriptions in numerous primary sources (i.e. courtiers’ diaries, poetic treatises, and manuals for imperial ceremonies) from the twelfth century. (Kimoto, pp. 763-88.)

95. Kimoto, pp. 767 and 808.

96. Ibid., p. 810.

97. Other era names devised by Masafusa are Kahō (嘉保, 1094-96, the name was originally conceived by Ōe no Koretoki), Eichō (永長, 1096-97), Tennin (天仁, 1108-10) and Tenei (天永, 1110-13). Kimoto points out that except for Kanji, which was chosen over Fujiwara no Atsumune’s (藤原敦宗) “Jiwa” (治和) with the approvals of Grand Controller of the Right (右大弁) Fujiwara no Michitoshi (藤原通俊, 1047-99, the compiler of the forth imperial anthology of waka, GoShūi wakashū) and Minamoto no
Traditionally, a new era name was announced upon the enthronement of a new emperor (代始, *dai hajime*) or in the aftermath of inauspicious events such as natural disasters. However, in 1087, power remained in the hands of Shirakawa (1053-1129, r. 1072-86) even after Horikawa’s enthronement. While it can be considered a milestone in the restoration of imperial sovereignty, Retired Emperor Shirakawa’s administration, characterized by the installation of his young son as emperor, was closer in type to that of the Fujiwara regencies of the eleventh century, as opposed to emperors’ direct imperial administration (*shinsei*) as practiced in earlier centuries. For instance, Shirakawa’s insistence on primogeniture succession appears to be a continuation of the privatization of politics favored by the Fujiwaras, rather than a reversion to the traditional *ritsuryō* state wherein public interests outweighed the individual emperor’s wish to stay in power.

These facts lead to two conclusions. Firstly, Masafusa must have felt honored when he received an imperial order to devise a new era name as a top academician, because such a request was a public acknowledgment of his erudition. Secondly, however, he must have felt somewhat disconcerted because the new emperor for whose sake he was doing this was an eight-year-old boy. This must have made him aware of the discrepancy between the Confucian ideal of a talented scholar assisting a wise and mature emperor, which he experienced to some extent under Emperor GoSanjō. Even if Shirakawa may not have been a despot during the Kanji era, the observance of courtly customs and rituals, such as the creation of a new era name, became a mere formality.

Tsunenobu, all the four names were accepted with the strong support of Minister of the Left Minamoto no Toshifusa (源俊房, 1035-1121). (Kimoto, pp. 808-11.)
In the aforementioned passage from “Bonen no ki,” Masafusa acknowledges that since the beginning of the Kanji era, his passion for composition in Chinese waned. Once he had scaled the heights as an academician, Masafusa’s promotion in the state bureaucracy shifted to attaining high administrative posts, hitherto considered beyond the reach of a person in that profession. As mentioned before, in 1088, Masafusa attained the Senior Third Rank, and became one of the eight Consultants, who worked directly below Counselors and Ministers. In 1094, he was appointed Acting Counselor and attained the Junior Second Rank. Why wasn’t Masafusa satisfied with his growing success as a public servant during and after the Kanji era? How does his promotion at the imperial court correlate with his waning passion for composition in Chinese? What does it really mean that his passion for literary composition waned? The key to answering these questions is Masafusa’s relationship with the Regent Fujiwara no Moromichi and his sudden death in 1099.

9. Masafusa and Fujiwara no Moromichi

Masafusa’s deep involvement with Regent Fujiwara no Moromichi (藤原師通, 1062-99, regent: 1096-99) is of particular interest in understanding the political structure of the Japanese imperial court at the turn of the twelfth century because it sheds light on Masafusa’s role as an independent scholar-critic, who served both imperial and non-imperial patrons, such as the regent-household, but who was not under pressure to express loyalty to either one of the two establishments. In English-language studies of the social history of the inset period, Masafusa’s political independence has been understated. For instance, Cameron Hurst examines the structure of in no chō (院庁, Retired Emperor’s private office), which Shirakawa established
upon his abdication following the precedent set by his father GoSanjō, and describes how Masafusa was appointed as one of the five bettō (別当, directors) in Shirakawa’s office, along with Fujiwara no Sanesue (藤原実季, 1035-91, the brother of Moshi 茂子–GoSanjō’s empress and the mother of Shirakawa), Fujiwara no Akisue (藤原頼季, 1055-1123, the son of Shirakawa’s wet-nurse Chikako 親子), Fujiwara no Nakazane (藤原通実, 1055-1121, Sanesue’s third son) and Minamoto no Masazane (源雅実, 1058-1127, descendant of Emperor Murakami and the son of Minister of the Right Minamoto no Akifusa). Calling them “the nucleus of the group of close associates or confidants (近臣, kinshin)” of Shirakawa at the outset of his tenure as retired emperor, Hurst notes that “[a]ll five were longtime confidants of Shirakawa and had close connections with the imperial house, by association or marriage [and…] were all courtiers of middle rank, and none had close connections with the sekkanke.”

This statement is misconstrued, firstly because Sanesue, Masazane and Masadusa were not courtiers of “middle rank,” each holding the post (and rank) of Grand Counselor (Senior Second Rank), Acting Grand Counselor (Senior Second Rank), and Grand Controller of the Left (Junior Third Rank) respectively at the time of Shirakawa’s abdication in 1086. Indeed, Hurst’s

98. For the discussion of GoSanjō’s establishment of his private office, see Hurst, p. 122.
99. For a brief biography of Sanesue, see Hurst, p. 304.
100. Ibid., p. 295.
101. Ibid., p. 305.
102. Hurst lists Minamoto no Morotada (藤原師忠, died 1114, the son of Minamoto no Morofusa) instead of Masazane. Ibid., 142.
103. Ibid., p. 142.
blurring of the functional difference between these “Senior Noble Directors” (公卿別当) and Akisue and Nakazane—the “Forth Ranked Directors” (四位別当) is problematic because as members of the highest echelon of the imperial court, the former—including Masafusa—were relatively unconstrained in terms of power and influence, and were not dependent solely on Shirakawa.104

Secondly, Hurst’s assumption that Masafusa had little association with the regent’s household is misleading. The fact that Masafusa was in the personal service of both Retired Emperor Shirakawa and Regent Fujiwara no Moromichi is a key to understanding how, despite his middle-ranking origins, Masafusa came to influence his fellow courtiers as a critic and expert on old and new customs at the imperial court. In fact, Moromichi’s son Fujiwara no Tadazane (藤原忠実, 1078-1162), recollects in his diary Chūgaishō (中外抄) that his father Regent Moromichi formed a special friendship with Masafusa through their passion for Chinese literature, and that Masafusa frequently visited Moromichi105:

The Late Nijō Regent [Moromichi] considered [Masafusa] an extraordinary scholar. Masafusa used to live at the Second Avenue South and East Tōin West. The late [Regent] Nijō used to live at the Second Avenue South and East Tōin East. [Whenever he came to our house,] Masafusa looked grumpy, and his clothes were extremely shabby.

104. For example, see Motoki, p. 81.
105. Tadazane’s kanbun diary Chūgaishō is recorded by his interlocutor Nakahara no Moromoto (中原師元, 1109-1175).
The condescending tone in Tadazane’s description of Masafusa suggests that he did not cherish fond memories of the scholar when he visited his father, during the years before Moromichi’s sudden death at the age of thirty-seven in 1099. Another passage from the Chūgaishō reveals that Tadazane’s disdain can be traced back to his youth, from which time Masafusa did not take him seriously because of Tadazane’s lack of aptitude in Chinese learning:

When I was visiting my late father, he said to Masafusa, “It is regrettable that my son doesn’t study the Chinese Classics.” Hearing this, Masafusa made the following comment: “As for regents and chancellors, as long as they are versed in the practical details of Japanese tradition, even if they don’t have an understanding of Chinese literature, they’ll have no difficulty in administering the politics of the country. They should have someone write statements on their behalf, for example: ‘Please have somebody run an errand immediately,’ or ‘The weather is fine today,’ and fill four or five volumes [with these statements]. When ten or twenty volumes of this nature are completed, how can they not be considered scholars!”

我、参詣せし時に、故殿の仰せて云はく、「この男、学問をせぬこそ遺憾なり」と仰せられしかば、匡房卿の申して云はく、「摂政関白は、必ずも漢才候はねども、やまとだましひだにかしこくおはしまさば、天下はまつりごたせ給ひな。紙を四、五巻続けて、『只今駆せ参らしめ給ふべし』『今日、天晴る』など書かしめ給ふべし。十廿巻だに書かせて給ひなば、学生にはなぜ給ひなん」と申しき。107 (Emphasis added.)

106. Gotō, Ikegami and Yamane, p. 312.
107. Ibid., p. 338.
As evinced from these passages, Tadazane’s father Moromichi was a devoted student of Chinese literature. However, Masafusa’s advice to Morozane regarding his son as recollected by Tadazane is contradictory. On the one hand, Masafusa seems to have trusted the regent Mozomichi as a person with whom he could discuss Chinese literature. In other words, although a regent, Masafusa certainly appreciated Moromichi’s *karazae* (漢才, knowledge of Chinese literature and skill in the composition in Chinese). On the other hand, Masafusa is straightforward in saying that Tadazane does not need to study the Chinese classics, if he wishes, because he will be a regent someday, not an emperor.

Masafusa’s kanbun diary, *Gōki*, which only survives in fragments, also reveals that Masafusa privately tutored Moromichi on the two Chinese classics, *Han shu* (*History of the Han Dynasty*) and *Hou han shu* (*History of the Later Han Dynasty*) intermittently between 1090 and 1093.\(^{108}\) As further evidence of Moromichi’s passion for Chinese literature, most of the poetry contests in which Masafusa took part in the 1090s were sponsored by Moromichi. However, it is questionable whether Masafusa himself considered an aptitude for Chinese studies (*karazae*) and knowledge of what he called *yamato damashii* (やまとだましご, “practical matters particular to the Japanese imperial court”) to be mutually exclusive.\(^{109}\) It is more likely that in retrospect, Tadazane exaggerated what had appeared to him as Masafusa’s dismissal of his weakness in Chinese learning. For instance, Tadazane’s claim that Masafusa told his father that even he could

---


109. For my discussion of the usage of the word, *yamato damashii* in Akazome Emon’s waka poem, written as a reply to her husband Ōe no Masahira’s poem, see Chapter One.
become a “scholar [of Chinese literature]” (gakushō) by simply keeping records of his public duties and random impressions of daily events at court, sounds like nothing more than sarcasm.

Furthermore, in another diary of Morozane entitled Fukego (富家語), he is quoted as saying that “the Gō[ke] shidai was written by Lord Masafusa at the request of the Late Nijō Regent [Moromichi].” (江次第は、後二条殿の料に匡房卿の作てる所なり。) Because the Gōke shidai (江家次第, The Ōe Manuals) is Masafusa’s annotated manual of imperial court ceremonies, it is apparent that even Moromichi had a high regard for yamato damashii, suggesting that even for the regent, karazae and yamato damashii were never mutually exclusive. What can be gleaned from these diary entries by Morozane is how exceptional Moromichi was as a Fujiwara regent in his eagerness to study both Chinese literature and practical matters at the imperial court, and how intimately he trusted Masafusa as his adviser on these subjects. Thus, it is very likely that Masafusa’s critical assessment of contemporary literary taste in “Bonen no ki” was partly prompted by the death of Moromichi in the Sixth Month of 1099, which Masafusa learned about shortly after his arrival in Dazaifu. In remote Kyushū, the news of his young patron’s death must have caused him great distress, to the extent that he believed that engaging in serious scholarship on Chinese literature would no longer have the same meaning for him.

10. Masafusa and Emperor Shirakawa

Earlier, I discussed how the year 1087 (Kanji 1) was a turning point in Masafusa’s life as a scholar-official, and speculated that Emperor Shirakawa’s abdication in favor of his young son

110. Ibid., pp. 384-5.
the previous year had probably alarmed Masafusa and given him the impression that the
traditional customs of the country practiced for centuries were becoming increasingly
impractical. However, it is wrong to assume that Masafusa discontinued his service to
Shirakawa because of his personal feelings or opinions. In fact, even after the Kanji era,
Masafusa remained a faithful retainer of Retired Emperor Shirakawa.

For instance, the first two volumes of the *Gō totoku nagon ganmon shū* (*The Collected
Vows of Ōe, Acting Governor General and Counselor*) are dedicated to Buddhist prayers that
Masafusa composed for his imperial patrons over the course of four generations—GoSanjō,
Shirakawa, Horikawa and Toba. Among the thirty-four prayers, twenty-five have Retired
Emperor Shirakawa as the “petitioner” (*ganshu*) indicating that Masafusa composed these
prayers at his behest. As discussed above, *ganmon* are highly ornate and stylized compositions
recited at Buddhist ceremonies on such occasions as the dedication of new prayer-halls or stupas,
or special sutra readings. These rituals usually carried out on the anniversaries of the death of
members of the retired emperor’s family (father, wife, daughter), or took the form of appeals for
the welfare of Shirakawa himself, his family and the state, especially at a time of epidemics that
threatened the lives of people in the Kyoto area.

Because these prayers were written from the perspective of the Retired Emperor
Shirakawa, and also because Shirakawa outlived Masafusa by eighteen years (and thus Masafusa
did not write an obituary for Shirakawa), they do not contain encomia for Shirakawa himself.
The elaborate use of allusive language from the Chinese classics and Buddhist literature certainly
exalts in the most solemn and dramatic manner the deceased individuals, for whom Shirakawa
offered these prayers, but it does not necessarily commend Shirakawa—the purported speaker of
the supplications.

Moreover, except for a few prayers Masafusa composed for Shirakawa’s commemoration of GoSanjō and his late wife, Empress Kenshi (賢子, 1056-84, Horikawa’s mother) in 1076 and in the mid-1080s, respectively, most of Masafusa’s Buddhist prayers were written in the final years of his life. If we accept Satō Michio’s view that Masafusa wrote “Bonen no ki” (A Record of My Twilight Years) while he was in Kyūshū around 1099, his statement that since the Kanji era, he had lost interest in literary composition does not necessarily reflect the situation during the period between 1005 and 1111, when Masafusa so prolifically composed most of the Buddhist prayers on Shirakawa’s behalf.

For these reasons, it can be hypothesized that after the Kanji era (1087-94), especially after Masafusa received the Senior Second Rank upon the completion of his service in Dazaifu in 1102, he might have thought that rather than playing the role of a Confucian scholar in a wise ruler’s state-building project, he had become the mere spokesman for Retired Emperor Shirakawa, who favored his own private interests over those of the state, and who was becoming increasingly autocratic after the death of his son, Emperor Horikawa in 1107. And it was probably under these circumstances that the ability to compose Sino-Japanese prose and verse, formerly a family and personal “asset” (家資・資), became a “slave” (奴隸), or a mere means for Masafusa and other Kidendō scholars, to survive and serve their increasingly self-serving patrons.

As I will discuss in detail in the next chapter, GoSanjō was Masafusa’s first imperial patron, and Masafusa’s respect for this learned and mature sovereign, who spent twenty-two years as Crown Prince during the last stage of the Fujiwara regency, was profound. By contrast,
Masafusa appears to have been ambivalent about Shirakawa. Komine Kazuaki admits that “Masafusa’s opinion of Retired Emperor Shirakawa is not clear.” Shirakawa’s abdication in favor of his son took place about one year after the death of Shirakawa’s half-brother, Crown Prince Sanehito (実仁, 1071-85). When GoSanjō abdicated in 1072 in favor of Shirakawa, he installed the then two year-old Sanehito as Crown Prince, anticipating that the throne would be quickly passed on to Sanehito after Shirakawa.

In fact, GoSanjō preferred Sanehito to Shirakawa as his heir, because Shirakawa’s mother, Fujiwara no Moshi (藤原茂子), was an adopted daughter of Fujiwara no Yoshinobu (藤原能信, 995-1065), Fujiwara no Michinaga’s son. Moreover, Shirakawa’s wife, Kenshi, was an adopted daughter of Fujiwara no Morozane (藤原師実), Michinaga’s grandson. In contrast, Sanehito’s maternal relatives were not Fujiwara clan members, since his mother, Minamoto no Kishi (源基子), was the granddaughter of Prince Atsuakira (敦明親王, 994-1051), the son of Emperor Sanjō (三条天皇, 976-1017, r. 1011-16), the ill-fated sovereign who was forced by Michinaga to abdicate on account of his poor eyesight. In short, historians have argued that GoSanjō’s abdication, which some considered to be the origin of the institution of insei, was only a means of ensuring that the sovereignty would never be compromised by the Fujiwara.

Thus, it is not hard to imagine that for Masafusa, whose talents were first recognized by GoSanjō, and who consequently became a strong advocate of GoSanjō’s post-Fujiwara political reforms, Shirakawa’s abdication in favor of his son in 1086 was offensive because the act was a violation of his former master’s will. However, because Masafusa did not leave his own account

of this matter, further speculation is futile. We do know that some of the *setsuwa* written between the late-twelfth and fifteenth centuries discuss the issue in detail, apparently subscribing to the view I hypothesized above as Masafusa’s, and thus portraying Prince Sukehito in an extremely favorable light, while remaining taciturn about Shirakawa.

For example, the war chronicle *Genpei jōsuiki* (源平盛衰記, 48 vols., ca. 13th-15th century) recounts the circumstances of imperial succession in Book Six, entitled “Imperial Succession is Sometimes Beyond Human Control” (帝位非人力事). This anecdote suggests that GoSanjō had an elaborate plan regarding imperial succession after his death. According to the tale, GoSanjō told Shirakawa that after Sanehito’s enthronement, Sanehito’s full-brother Prince Sukehito (輔仁親王, 1073-1119) should be appointed Crown Prince, and Shirakawa agreed. The reference to Shirakawa’s accession to his father’s will accentuates and further dramatizes Shirakawa’s future transgression, as it is reconstructed in the mind of the medieval chronicler.

Likewise, the historical narrative *Ima kagami* (今鏡, *The Mirror of the Present*, ca. 1174-75) depicts Sukehito in an exceedingly positive manner:

This prince had a special talent in learning the Chinese Classics, and his great skill in the composition of Chinese verses is reminiscent of Prince Nakatsukasa in the past. Also, he was a very refined waka poet.

Prince Sukehito was a renowned poet of Japanese and Sino-Japanese poems, and nine poems composed by him appear in the fifth imperial anthology of waka, *Kinyōshū* (金葉集,
Collection of Golden Leaves, 1124-25, 1127). (Only five poems by Emperor Shirakawa appear in the same collection.) Another anecdote from the Imakagami recounts that Shirakawa was disconcerted when he first saw the draft version of the Kinyōshū, submitted by the compiler Minamito no Toshiyori (源俊頼, 1055?-1129?). Shirakawa did not take offense because Toshiyori held Sukehito’s poems in high regard, or because Sukehito’s poems in the anthology outnumbered his own. Rather, Shirakawa could not tolerate the fact that Toshiyori had referred to Sukehito as “Prince Sukehito” (すけひとのみこ), and not as the more impersonal “Third Prince” (三の宮).112

The “Royal Hunt in Red Foliage” (紅葉の御狩) section of the Imakagami discusses Emperor Shirakawa’s “talent in Chinese and Japanese poetry” (和漢の才). The narrator mentions that both the GoShūishū (1086) and the Kinyōshū (1127), the two waka anthologies commissioned by Shirakawa, include a number of poems composed by Shirakawa himself, but offers neither positive nor negative judgment of them. In other words, in the Imakagami, Shirakawa’s “talent” for Japanese poetry is mostly attributed to his patronage of waka; he sponsored not only the two imperial anthologies, but also numerous poetry excursions and poetry contests, all in emulation of the “sagacious” emperors of the past. However, the narrator notes that the following waka, which Shirakawa composed about his excursion to the Ōi River “reminds one of the good old days” (昔の心地して), and is “extremely elegant” (いとやさしく

112. For more accounts of the animosity between Shirakawa and Sukehito, see “The Genji Haven” (じのにやすどころ) section of the Chapter Eight “Imperial Children” (御子たち) in the Imakagami. (Takehana, vol. 3, pp. 234-39.)
Here we are at the Ōi River, revisiting a stream of ancient customs; in our view is red foliage in this stormy mountain called Arashiyama.

The second and third verses, “revisiting” “a stream of ancient customs,” specifically refers to Emperor Uda’s trip to the same place in 907. This poem and the *Imakagami* narrator’s comment on it both suggest that by the late twelfth century, in the collective memory of Japanese courtiers, Shirakawa was a great patron of traditional Japanese poetry, but not necessarily a great poet. As seen in the passage on Prince Sukehito cited above, the *Imakagami* narrator normally depicts those who excel in poetry composition, either in Chinese or Japanese, in a highly favorable manner. Of course, this may have something to do with the fact that the *Imakagami* was written by the waka poet Jakuchō (寂超).

As for Shirakawa’s “talent” in Chinese poetry, although the *Imakagami* mentions that Shirakawa “cared very much for Chinese poetry” (唐国の歌をもてあそばせ給へり), it gives no example of his own compositions in Chinese. Similar to the way he promoted waka by sponsoring various poetry gatherings and anthologies, Shirakawa commissioned an anthology of Chinese verse composed by Japanese poets, *Zoku honchō shūku* (続本朝秀句, *Later Excellent Taka*).


114. Ibid.
Verse of Japan), which does not survive.\textsuperscript{115} The following passage from the Imakagami portrays Shirakawa as a sovereign who may not have been an accomplished scholar himself, but was at least keen on promoting the Chinese Classics, and knew which scholastic authorities to rely on:

One day, Retired Emperor Shirakawa came up with the idea of matching the Chinese couplets in the Wakkan rōeishū with the verses omitted from the original poems, and presenting them in the proper format of four rhymed verses [making a total of eight verses]. It was Counselor Masafusa who put these verses together. One of the Rōeishū couplets was “Cicada’s cry in the Fifth Month, bidding a farewell to so and so ‘autumn’”; but no one was able to supply the missing lines. Then, someone presented [a set of verses], saying, “This might be it!” Governor General Masafusa took note and said to Shirakawa, “I don’t think these are the missing lines of this couplet.” I heard that they discovered the original of this poem [in its complete form] at a later time among the calligraphy textbooks preserved at Ninnaji Temple.

This passage is of particular interest from the viewpoint of the reception of the Wakkan...
roeishū (和漢朗詠集, *Chinese and Japanese Poems to Sing*, ed. Fujiwara no Kintō, ca. 1017-21). It suggests that by the end of the twelfth century, the *Roeishū* had become a standard textbook for Japanese aristocrats, especially for students of calligraphy. (The anthology contained short excerpts and poems written in both Chinese characters and Japanese *kana*.)

Moreover, the passage suggests that some 230 Chinese couplets and 350 *kanshi* (Chinese verse composed by Japanese poets) couplets, drawn from longer poems from elsewhere, along with 215 waka, had become so familiar to ordinary readers that those who studied the book naturally became curious about the lines omitted in the anthology. Interestingly, it was the Retired Emperor Shirakawa who came up with the idea of finding original contexts for the familiar couplets from the anthology. However, the *Imakagami* narrator seems to place less emphasis on Shirakawa’s innovative concept itself, stressing the fact that he was fortunate to have someone like Masafusa to guide him through this project. The narrator even compares Masafusa to an anonymous retainer with lesser knowledge of Chinese literature, as if to make a point how learned and reliable Masafusa was.

Although Masafusa himself wrote very little about Retired Emperor Shirakawa, as evinced from this passage from the *Imakagami*, the personal relationship between the two “giants” from the turn of the twelfth century never ceased to capture the imagination of Japanese courtiers in the late-twelfth and subsequent centuries, and the same fascination continues to this day, as modern scholars reconstruct the life and works of Masafusa as a key figure of the early *insei* period. The following passage from the *setsuwa* collection, *Kojidan* (古事談, *Conversations on Ancient Matters*, 6 vols., ed. Minamito Akikane, 1212-15), beautifully sums up the way in which the Masafusa-Shirakawa relationship, on which we have almost no firsthand
information, had already become an integral part of the collective cultural memory of imperial Japan by the early thirteenth century:

Retired Emperor Shirakawa said: “I am a ‘cultured ruler.’ I am not saying that I am cultured because of my own erudition. I discovered and encouraged Masafusa. Doesn’t this show that I value the Way of Literature? Because I respect the Way of Literature, I can thus claim that I am a cultured ruler.”

白河院仰せられて云はく、「吾れは是れ文王なり。必ずしも稽古の大才を以て、文王とは謂はず。吾れ匡房を抽賞す。文道を尊ぶに非ざるや。文道を尊ぶを以て則ち文王と謂ふなり」と云々。117

Conclusion

In this chapter, I examine the life of the scholar-official, Ōe no Masafusa, a pivotal figure at the dawn of insei Japan. The existing modern biographies of Masafusa have variously portrayed him as a “complicated human being” (Kawaguchi, 1968), a shrewd politician with “certain dubiousness and shadiness” (Fukazawa, 1994), “a somewhat anxious individual” (Ury and Borgen, 1996), a Confucian scholar with “a flexible mind” (Satō, 2003) and a “multi-talented” man (Iso, 2010). The present study attempted to elucidate the meaning of Masafusa’s professional career as a scholar-official mainly through a reexamination of his biographical essay, “Bonen no ki” (ca. 1099), translated and introduced to English speaking readers by Ury and Borgen in 1996.

By showing that “Bonen no ki” is an appropriation of Ki no Haseo’s essay, “Preface to My Kanshi Poems Composed After the Engi Era,” in which Haseo harshly criticizes the prosaic

lives of Kødendō scholars in the early tenth century, following the death of Sugawara no Michizane, I question why Masafusa came to disparage the composition of Sino-Japanese verse after the Kanji era (1087-94). I argue that superficially, the untimely death of the regent Fujiwara Moromichi in 1099 at the age of thirty-seven, and Masafusa’s learning of the tragic news in Kyūshū, where he was Acting Governor General of Dazaifu since 1097, caused him to make the dejected statement.

However, more deeply, in light of the fact that the Kanji era was precisely when Masafusa experienced a dramatic promotion to a high position in the state bureaucracy which made him a senior noble (kugyō), I argue that Masafusa’s former identity as a Kødendō academician was seriously challenged during this period. One key to understanding the subtle differences in Masafusa’s attitude toward literary activities is to examine why he composed a massive amount of ganmon (Buddhist vows) for his imperial and non-imperial patrons in his later years. In other words, after the Kanji era, Masafusa was aware that although a senior noble, he had become a mere spokesman for his increasingly self-serving patrons, in particular Retired Emperor Shirakawa.

As shown by Masafusa’s vow in honor of his fellow academician, Fujiwara no Atsumoto, in which he self-deprecatingly refers to the way Kødendō academicians served their patrons by making “the wind and the moon” their “slaves,” by the early twelfth century, kangaku scholarship had declined to the extent that scholars—even Masafusa, out of the most prominent scholarly household of all time—thought that they had sold out their writerly skills for their and their families’ survival.
Chapter Five

Oe’s Diary, Household Studies and

Ōe no Masafusa’s Glorification of His Ancestors in the Zoku honchō ājōden

Introduction

The previous chapter examined the life and works of Ōe no Masafusa. Particular attention was paid to his personal relationships with his imperial and non-imperial patrons, namely retired emperors and Fujiwara regents, and Masafusa’s dual roles as an academician and a senior noble (kugyō) who attained his position through the meritocracy, thus enabling him to express his critical opinions about the changing roles of Kidendō scholars and the meaning of literary activities at the beginning of the twelfth century.

This chapter continues to explore Masafusa’s legacy as the first and most influential critic of insei Japan, by focusing on his understanding of the notion of “household studies” (家学, kagaku). I first examine the widespread circulation of Masafusa’s diary, Gōki, to be used as a reference book of matters related to the court, among his fellow courtiers at the beginning of the twelfth century. During the insei period, the circulation of kanbun diaries was customarily restricted to individual aristocratic households, whose members used them as instruction manuals concerning the details of court service. As the importance of the state bureaucracy diminished by the mid-twelfth century, individual aristocratic households became increasingly keen to secure their own positions and raisons d’être in the rapidly changing sociopolitical environments by relying on the special knowledge contained in their own “household diaries.”
The fact that Masafusa’s diary was widely circulated outside of his family during his lifetime suggests the following two possibilities: 1) Masafusa’s opinions were so respected that people sought them in order to establish and improve their own family diaries; 2) the tradition of the Ōe family as the purveyor of kangaku studies was discontinued after Masafusa, thus enabling otherwise confidential household material to circulate in the public domain.

Since the first point is difficult to prove without extensive bibliographical research in kanbun diaries, I will cite Masafusa’s references to the dwindling role of the Ōe’s “family occupation” (祖業) of Confucian studies in his Zoku honchō ōjōden (続本朝往生伝, Biographies of Those Who Were Reborn in Paradise in Japan II, ca. 1099-1104). In the Ōjōden, Masafusa provides biographies of forty-two individuals, only four of whom are members of his own clan. I examine the way Masafusa praises his ancestors not so much for their Buddhist faith but for their commitment to Kidendō scholarship and for their skill in refined Chinese composition. I also investigate Masafusa’s somewhat enigmatic notion of his ancestors’ “meritorious deeds” (宿善), to which he attributes his personal success as a scholar-official. I then examine Masafusa’s biographies of two emperors, Ichijō (一条天皇, 980-1011, r. 986-1011) and GoSanjō (後三条天皇, 1034-73, r. 1068-72) and compare his ambivalence about the former and wholehearted approval of the latter as a wise sovereign. Analyzing the panegyrics in the Ōjōden, I identify what is probably one of Masafusa’s finest works as the source for Ōe no Masafusa legend in later setsuwa narratives.

The chapter concludes with analyses of a few passages from the historical narrative Imakagami (ca. 1174-5) that feature vignettes of Masafusa’s personal relationship with Emperor
GoSanjō. Through reading the *Imakagami* anecdotes, I demonstrate how posterity embraced Masafusa’s glorification of Emperor GoSanjō, while at the same time elevating Masafusa as a model scholar-official for future generations.

1. Household Studies and Ōe no Masafusa’s Diary

On the occasion of the first anniversary of Masafusa’s death, Fujiwara no Munetada wrote in his diary *Chūyūki* that Masafusa had “burned all his diaries from his later years; on the evening of the same day, he passed away.” (焼老後間日記了。入夜薨云々。)¹ Masafusa’s presumed attempt to destroy “all his diaries from his later years” suggests that like diaries today, the diary in twelfth-century Japan was a private document, which might contain information inappropriate for public distribution. The fact that no fragments written after 1108 (Tennin 天仁 1) appear in Kimoto Yoshinobu’s *Gōki itsubun shūsei* (記逸文集成, *A Collection of Fragments of the Gōki*, 1985) suggests the accuracy of Munetada’s testimony.

Diaries—particularly those written in terse *kanbun* by male Heian courtiers like Masafusa—functioned quite differently from the body of texts we normally associate with the genre, and also from their counterparts written in *kana*, often by female hands, such as the *Sanuki no suke niki* (讃岐典侍日記, *Lady Sanuki’s Diary*, 2 vols., ca. 1107). Throughout the Heian period, the *kanbun* diary, including Fujiwara no Munetada’s (藤原宗忠, 1062-1141) *Chūyūki* (中右記) and Masafusa’s *Gōki*, functioned officially as a reference and a record, providing detailed accounts of everyday administrative, ceremonial and inter-personal matters that took place at court. As such,

¹ The fifth day of the Eleventh Month of 1112 (天永 2).
they were transmitted and perused by the male diarists’ descendants, who were expected to study the customs of the recent and distant past through precedents established by their forebears. In the words of Komine Kazuaki, *kanbun* “diaries were originally written in order to transmit a broad range of knowledge of ancient practices, etiquette and esoteric teachings regarding various ceremonies [in the imperial court] to descendants.” In short, insomuch as the *kanbun* diary served a semi-public function as a reference for posterity, familiarity with the contents could be as respectable and worthwhile as *karazae* (唐才)–knowledge of the Chinese classics, and of various historical precedents from China.

The Japanese literary scholar Ogawa Takeo (小川剛生) calls these collections of material related to courtly matters (公事, *kuji*), designed to be passed down from one generation to the next in aristocratic households (家, *ie*) as “household studies” (家学, *kagaku*). The emergence of numerous individual households within the pre-existing clans (氏, *ujii*), such as the Fujiwara and the Minamoto, with their own household specialties in the arts and other areas of “the system of knowledge” (知の体系) as Ogawa puts it, was one characteristic phenomena of the *insei* period. Examples of these particular pursuits include the waka poetry of the Rokujō (六条) and Mikohidari (御子左) branches of the Fujiwara, calligraphy of the Sesonji (世尊寺) family, and kickball (蹴鞠, *kemari*) of the Asukai (飛鳥井) family. According to Ogawa, “the primary purpose of *kagaku* [家学, “household studies”] was to assist [members of the household] in

---


carrying out their official duties as courtiers,” and “since they are officials serving at the imperial court, whatever they regarded as kagaku [家学] had something to do with courtly matters.”

Moreover, according to the historian Matsuzono Hitoshi (松脇斎), the custom of keeping kanbun diaries containing details of courtly service had long been established since the tenth century, but it was at the very end of the eleventh century when the “concept of ‘households with diaries’” (「日記の家」という概念) emerged.4

In this regard, Masafusa’s Gōki is unique: while being an exemplary kanbun diary in terms of its subject matter, it was from the beginning widely circulated, with a readership not limited to the members of the Ōe family.6 The following references to Masafusa’s “record” (記) and “diary” (日記) in the GoNijō Moromichiki (後二条師通記, Diary of Fujiwara no Moromichi), a diary of the regent Fujiwara Morimichi (藤原師通, 1062-99),7 suggests that “journal” would be a more apt designation for kanbun nikki than “diary,” because of their fundamentally “journalistic” function:

4 自らの先途に至るまでの官職（官途）を勤め上げることに資するのをその第一の目的とする/廷臣である以上、「家学」と呼び得る内容は公事に関する事柄のみであろう。Ogawa Takeo, “Chi to chi: sekkanke no kuji no setsu wo megutte” (知と血：摂関家の公事の説をめぐって) in IBR 1, pp. 152-73.

5 Matsuzono Hitoshi, Nikki no ie--chūsei kokka no kiroku soshiki (日記の家＝中世国家の記録組織, Households with Diaries: Record-Keeping Organs of Medieval State, 1997), p. 12.

6 Regarding the Kidendō academician Fujiwara no Atsumitsu (藤原敦光, 1062-1144, Akihira’s son), Matsuzono Hitoshi makes an important observation that Atsumitsu initiated the custom of keeping a household diary and transmitting it to his offspring in his Fujiwara-shiki family (藤原式家). Ibid, p. 21.

7 For my analysis of the personal relationship between Masafusa and Moromichi, recalled in Moromichi’s son Tadazane’s diary, see Chapter Two.
[Some of the details regarding the Retired Emperor Shirakawa’s Sightseeing] needs to be consulted along with the record of the Grand Controller of the Left [Ōe no Masafusa].

左弁記 可被相尋 云：[Kanji 寬治 4 (1090), 4.10]

Regarding today’s affair [–sending an envoy to the Ise Shrine], [the opinions of] Grand Controller of the Left are to be consulted; [his] diary has been delivered for consultation.

今日事相尋左大弁處、日記被示送也、[Kanji 6 (1092), 8.21]

Indeed, Moromichi was not the only non-Ōe-family courtier who had access to Masafusa’s journal, because the text was also mentioned in other courtiers’ kanbun nikki during Masafusa’s lifetime, where it was referred to variously as Gō chūnagonki (江中納言記, Counselor Ōe’s Record), Masafusa nikki (匡房日記, Diary of Masafusa), and Ōkurakyō masafusa nikki (大蔵卿匡房日記, Diary of the Minister of Treasury, Lord Masafusa). Whether we consider Masafusa’s nikki a typical kanbun diary–a basis for household studies, or a kanbun journal–an early milestone in the history of Japanese reporting, if we accept Fujiwara no Munetada’s account that Masafusa destroyed most of his recent journal entries before his death, we can understand why his action appeared so scandalous in the eyes of his contemporaries. Disposing of even a portion of a kanbun nikki was an unthinkable act because it meant Masafusa was blatantly denying access to others. The issue here is why wasn’t the Gōki treated as the

8 The Tamefusakyō ki (為房卿記), Kōwa 5 (1103). 8.27. (Kimoto, p. 802.)

9 The Denryaku (殿暦), Chōji 1 (1104), 12.18. (Ibid.)

10 The Eishōki (永昌記, Diary of Fujiwara no Tametaka, 1105-29), Ten’ei 2 (1111), 10.10. (Ibid.)
private property of the Ōe family? Was the concept of “household studies” not fully established in the 1100s? Or did the Ōe clan, as custodians of Confucian studies, somehow discontinue after Masafusa’s generation?

The posthumous popularity of Masafusa’s diary as a source of information on courtly matters among aristocrats is even more remarkable. According to Kimoto Yoshinobu, the earliest reference to the title Gōki (Records of the Ōe) appears in Nakayama no Tadachika’s (中山忠親, 1132-95) diary, Sankaiki (山桜記, Record of Minister Nakayama, 1151-94). In fact, a large number of the texts from the twelfth to fifteenth centuries contain references to the Gōki. The variety of the texts in terms of genre and date that cite passages from the Gōki indicates its widespread and sustained influence throughout the medieval period. The circumstances surrounding Masafusa’s diary attest to the peculiar fervor with which his opinions were sought after by members of the aristocratic society. In other words, regardless of the ostensible lack of desire on the part of Masafusa to be remembered as an influential diarist (as far as judging from his act of diary burning), posterity did not allow his writings to fade into oblivion.

2. Masafusa’s Hagiographies of his Ancestors in the Zoku honchō ōjōden

\[\text{References to the Gōki appear in the following: the Honchō seiki (本朝世紀, Chronicle of Japan from 935 to 1153, ed. Fujiwara no Michinori); the Heihanki (兵範記, Diary of Taira no Nobunori, 1132-71); the Taiki (台記, Diary of Fujiwara no Yorinaga, 1136-55); the Gyokuyō (玉葉, Diary of Fujiwara no Kanezane, 1164-1200); Fujiwara no Kiyosuke’s waka treatise, Fukurozōshi (袋草子, Pocket Book, ca. 1157) [For an analysis of a Gōki passage in Kiyosuke’s Fukurozōshi, see Chapter One]; music treatises Kyōkunshō (教訓抄, 1233) and Gyorogushō (魚魯愚鈔, ca. 1347-60); and Ichijō Kanera’s (一条兼良, 1402-81) handbook on courtly customs, Tōka zuiyō (桃華藥葉, 1480). For a complete list of texts that contain partial excerpts of Masafusa’s diary, see Kimoto, pp. 551-54.}\]
Among the many literary texts from the Heian period, a genre called **ōjōden (往生伝, “biographies of those reborn in paradise”)** exemplifies how prose narratives functioned as a synthesizer of religious, historiographical and belletristic ideas in pre-modern Japan. Originally inspired by biographies of Buddhist monks and nuns written during the Tang (唐, 618-907) and the Five Dynasties (五代, 907-60) periods in China, seven different **ōjōden**, all composed in Chinese during the tenth through the twelfth centuries, survive today. The earliest of the genre, Yoshishige no Yasutane’s (慶滋保胤, ?-1002) *Nihon ōjō gokuraku ki* (日本往生極楽記, *Record of Rebirths in Paradise in Japan*, 983-85), for example, contains forty-two biographies of Japanese Buddhist priests, monks, nuns and laypeople.\(^{12}\) One of its variants—the so-called “complete edition” (完成本, as opposed to the “first draft” 初稿本)—starts out with hagiographies of Prince Shōtoku (聖徳太子, 574-622) and Priest Gyōki (行基, 668-749).

Despite the fact that they were long revered as the pioneers of Buddhism in Japan, Shōtoku and Gyōki’s teachings made no specific reference to the idea of rebirth in the Pure Land (浄土, **jōdo**) by chanting the Buddha’s name (念仏, *nenbutsu*). In the words of the Japanese scholar Inoue Mitsusada (井上光貞, 1917-83), “The *Ōjō gokuraku ki* is filled with biographies of meek and naive adepts of Buddhism, and the pure fragrance of religiosity permeates its volumes.”\(^{13}\)

---

\(^{12}\) Yasutane, a student of Sugawara no Fumitoki (菅原文時, 899-981), is knows as the author of the kanbun essay *Chiteiki* (池町記, 982). Yasutane took the Buddhist vows in 986, a few months before Emperor Kazan’s abdication of the throne following Fujiwara no Kaneie’s (藤原兼家, 929-90) pressure. Shortly after his retirement, Kazan took the tonsure in the same year. Inoue and Ōsone, p. 713-4. For my analysis of Yasutane’s *ganmon* in the *Honchō monzui*, see Chapter Two.

\(^{13}\) 往生極楽記の諸伝が柔和で純真な願生者で満たされ、宗教的な香気が全巻にただよっている。Ibid., 732.
Óe no Masafusa’s *Zoku honchō ōjōden* (続本朝往生伝, *Biographies of Those Reborn in Paradise in Japan II*, ca. 1099-1104), the second example of the genre, is modeled after Yasutane’s *Nihon ōjō gokuraku ki*.14 A collection of biographies of forty-two individuals, including Yasutane himself, the *Zoku honchō ōjōden* (below, *Ōjōden*) appears more secular in nature than its predecessor. Instead of setting a religious tone by beginning with biographies of “Bodhisattva-like” figures, such as Shōtoku and Gyōki,15 the *Ōjōden* opens with the biographies of two emperors: Ichijō (一条天皇, r. 986-1011, 980-1011) and GoSanjō (後三条天皇, r. 1068-72, 1034-73). Today, however, neither of these emperors is associated specifically with Buddhism. According to Inoue, “the primary reason why [Masafusa] placed these two individuals in the beginning of his book is that they were enlightened rulers.”16

It is not only its contents that attests to the fundamentally secular ambience of Masafusa’s *Ōjōden*. His biography of Yasutane reveals that Masafusa probably wrote a sequel to Yasutane’s *Ōjō gokurakuki*, not so much out of devotion to a particular teaching or school of Buddhism, but rather out of respect for Yasutane as a like-minded literatus and a Kidendō academician. Noting that Yasutane descended from “many generations of a family steeped in Yin-Yang” (業業陰陽の家), as opposed to a scholarly family, Masafusa writes that “he had great talent in learning the

14 Masafusa directly refers to Yasutane’s “record of rebirths” (往生の記) in the preface to his *Zoku honchō ōjōden*. Ibid., p. 223.

15 Priest Gyōki, for example, is called Bodhisattva Gyōki (行基菩薩) in the *Nihon ōjō gokurakuki*. Shōtoku is not referred to in the same manner, but Inoue calls these two figures as “two Bodhisattvas” (二菩薩) in his analysis. Ibid., p. 731.

16 著者がこの二人を巻初において第一の理由は、二人が国王として英明であったからである。Ibid., p.732.
Chinese classics, and was skilled in composition in Chinese; as such, he was far superior to his contemporaries.” Moreover, recalling that Yasutane “studied with Sugawara no Fumitoki [菅原文時, 899-981]” during the reign of Emperor Murakami (村上天皇, 926-67, r. 946-67), Masafusa concludes that “fine phrases from Yoshitane’s verse and prose are still recited by people today.” Although Masafusa also touches on Yasutane’s religiosity, (“since his boyhood, he had yearned for [rebirth in] paradise”) and Yasutane’s taking the tonsure in 986, it is apparent that Masafusa identifies himself as the legitimate successor to Yoshitane, as a biographer whose ojōden immortalizes the lives of worthy individuals in highly stylized Chinese prose.

While containing biographies of some twenty-five monks and a handful of nuns, both famous and unknown, Masafusa’s ojōden also includes descriptions of four members of the Ōe clan: Otondo (音人, 811-77), the founder of the clan; Tamemoto (為基) and Sadamoto (定基, 957-1034), both Masafusa’s great uncles; and Takachika 拳周 (?-1046), Masafusa’s grandfather. Otondo, who “quickly mastered Confucian studies, and proudly ascended to the position of

17 Ibid., p. 246.

18 For my analysis of a Gōdanshō anecdote which features Murakami and Fumitoki’s “debate” over poems, see Chapter Four.

19 Ibid., pp. 246-7.

20 Ibid., p. 247.

21 Ibid., 228.
Senior Noble” (早く儒業を遂げて、高く公卿に昇り)\(^2\) and is referred to as Consultant and Intendant of the Left Gate Watch, Lord Ōe no Otondo (参議左衛門督大江音人卿), appears in the opening section of the book, directly following entries on the two emperors and Minister of the Right Fujiwara no Muneyori (藤原頼宗, 993-1065) and Counselor Minamito no Akimoto (源顕基, 1000-47).

In contrast to Otondo, who received the high rank of Senior Third Grade, biographies of Tamemoto, Sadamoto and Takachika appear toward the end of the book. Takachika, whose rank was Senior Forth Lower Grade (正四位下), was a relatively well known scholar of the Chinese Classics, and a private tutor (侍読) of Emperor GoIchijō (後一条天皇, r. 1016-36, 1008-36). However, judging from their even lower ranks (Senior Fifth Lower Grade and Junior Fifth Lower Grade, respectively), Tamemoto and Sadamoto were undistinguished as scholar-officials. In standard historical reference, such as the Sonpi bunmyaku (尊卑分脈, Family Trees of Clans of All Classes), wherein genealogies of the major and minor branches of aristocratic families such as the Fujiwara, Minamoto, Taira, Nakatomi, Tachibana are provided along with the rank and office of all the individuals members of the families, Tamemoto and Sadamoto’s sections appear conspicuously empty, suggesting that their careers were unremarkable.\(^3\) In sum, Masafusa’s inclusion of not only the two emperors, but also his own relatives in the Ōjōden, and moreover, the way in which he makes distinctions among his ancestors based on their achievements and official ranks (e.g. prioritizing the more prominent Otondo over the other members of the Ōe

\(^2\)Inoue and Ōsone, p. 228.

\(^3\)Kuroita, vol. 4, p. 95.
family) attests to what Inoue calls Masafusa’s “fundamentally secular, bureaucratic class
consciousness.”

However, Masafusa’s inclusion of his relatives in the Ōjōden was not only for the sake of
glorifying his ancestors or authenticating their long-standing aristocratic lineage. Further
examining Masafusa’s treatment of the three ordinary academicians (at least from the viewpoint
of ranks), Tamemoto, Sadamoto and Takachika, reveals the characteristics of the “secular”
standard Masafusa employed to differentiate the lives of the three. To some extent, the genuine
motive behind Masafusa’s inclusion of his relatives in the Ōjōden was to provide true-to-life
portraits, and even to suggest that fate is so unpredictable that even Buddhist belief can have
little effect on the future trajectory of the “meritorious deeds” (宿善) of one’s ancestors or former
life.

For example, Masafusa recounts that Sadamoto was “only interested in hunting before his
religious awakening” (いまた発心せざるの前は、ただ狩猟を事とせり); but after taking the
tonsure, he became extremely devout, obtained permission to travel to China and made a
pilgrimage to Qingliangshan (清涼山 also known as 五台山) and died in Hangzhou (杭州) in
1034. Sadamoto’s brother, Tamemoto, on the other hand, is one of the few individuals in the

24 もっぱら世俗的な、いわば官僚的な身分意識. Ibid., 728. Senior noble refers to “[a] noble of at
least the third rank and holding a post at least at the level of Consultant (Sangi).” Tyler, p. 1167.

25 Masafusa uses the term “meritorious deeds” (宿善) in his biography of Minamoto no Noritō (源章任).
(Inoue and Ōsone, p. 250.)

26 The Konjaku monogatarishū also contains several anecdotes about Sadamoto, both before and after he
came to be known as Priest Jakushō (寂照). (SNKBT 36, pp. 72-73, 106-110.) Book 24 entitled “Secular
Tales of Japan,” for instance, features Sadamoto as a governor of the Mikawa (參河) province. (Ibid., p.
468.)
book whose rebirth in paradise is explicitly classified as “Lower Inferior” (下品下生), the lowest of the nine grades in the Pure Land, based on a person’s karma. This certainly appears incongruous with Masafusa’s statement that Tamemoto “deeply longed for paradise since his youth” (幼少の日より深く極楽を慕へり), eventually took the tonsure and “prayed to the Buddha for many years” (多年念仏して). However, Masafusa does not explain what Tamemoto did during his career as Professor of Literature and Governor of Settsu province (in present-day Osaka and Hyōgo prefectures) to deserve such a “regrettable” (遺恨なり) reputation.

Indeed, Masafusa’s description of Tamemoto’s final moment is surprisingly terse. Acknowledging that “he was revived temporarily and his family was overjoyed” (俄にして蘇生せり。家人喜悦す), Masafusa continues that “he had nothing else to say, […] he died and everything was over.” (他言なくしてただ曰く・… 事絶えて終りぬ。)27 In contrast, Masafusa elaborately describes the final moments in the life of Sadamoto, who by the time of his death was revered as Priest Jakushō (寂照) in China:

At the final moment of Sadamoto’s life, auspicious signs appeared.
He composed a couplet in Chinese:

I hear the sound of a shō in a distance,
From the top of a solitary cloud;

To escort me, the consecrated delegation is approaching near,
Before the setting sun.

Sadamoto also composed a waka poem:

Above the clouds,

---

27 Inoue and Ōsone, 247.
the faintly trailing sound
of music.
I wonder if others can hear it too.
Or perhaps my ears are deceiving me.

臨終の剋、瑞祥掲焉なり。また一絶の詩を作れり。その一句に曰く、
笙歌遙聴 伺雲上。
聖衆来迎 落日前。

といふ。また和歌を詠みて曰く、
雲の上に 遙かに楽の 音すなり。
人や聴くらむ 虚耳かもし28

といへり。29

It can be assumed that Masafusa describes Sadamoto’s final moment in such poetic detail because in contrast to Tamemoto, who did nothing but recite Buddha’s names, Sadamoto traveled all the way to the “Great Kingdom of Song” (大宋国) to “master the teachings of the prominent priest Feibo of that country” (かの朝の高僧、飛鉢の法を修して).30 However, it is too hasty to conclude that Sadamoto’s devotion to Buddhism was what made him superior to Tamemoto, because Masafusa depicts the death of his own grandfather, Ōe no Takachika, in a fashion similar to that of Sadamoto, even though Takachika’s level of commitment to the Buddhist faith was not so different from Tamemoto’s:

28 This waka also appears in Fujiwara Kiyosuke’s Fukurozōshi, but the forth measure is changed to 人にとはばや. (SNKBT 29, p. 164.)

29 Ibid., pp. 248-9, and 578.

30 Ibid., p. 248.
Afterwards, he took the tonsure and finally, he peacefully closed his eyes. On that day, exotic scent filled his residence, a brocade of clouds appeared above the rooftop, and the sound of the shō floated delicately in the air. After his final moment, the clouds returned to the west. Because it was so brilliantly sunny [in the western sky], the clouds were visible to everyone. Between the moment he closed his eyes to the time of funeral ceremony, twenty days passed. Although it was a humid summer, [his body] did not decay. At the time of cremation, an exotic scent filled the burial chamber.

その後出家して遂にもて瞑目しぬ。この日異香室に満ち、綵雲箒に生りて、笙歌の声、空中に縹渺たり、気絶えたる後、雲気西に還りぬ。白日たるに依って、人皆見たり。瞑目してより葬斎に及ぶまで廿余日、蒸暑のときに当るといへども、遂に爛れ壊れず。茶毘の時、異香猶し墳墓に満てり。31

Both in Masafusa’s vignettes of Sadamoto and Takachika, the “sound of the shō” is referred to as a symbol, or “auspicious sign” (瑞祥, zuishō), of their rebirth into paradise. Why did these two individuals deserve these highly poeticized encomia, and what did they have in common during their lifetimes aside from being members of the Ōe clan? According to Masafusa, both Sadamoto and Takachika died with their personal integrity intact, the first as an academician-turned-Buddhist monk, and the latter as a scholar. On their deathbeds, they also recalled their deeds as literati, Sadamoto in his kanshi and waka poems quoted above, and Takachika by proudly declaring that “I have no regrets for having served as Acting Commissioner of the Bureau of Ceremonial, Head of the State Academy, [the holder of the] Senior Forth Rank Lower, and an imperial tutor for two generations,” (式部権大輔・大学頭・

31 Ibid., p. 249.
Masafusa’s respect for Sadamoto’s literary talent seems to outweigh his regard for Sadamoto’s religious passion. Acknowledging that Sadamoto was not a devout Buddhist until the death of his wife, Masafusa introduces him as a talented academician: “he quickly accomplished his household studies, and accordingly became a Chamberlain. […] He was well versed in Chinese literature, and his fine phrases are still recited by people today.” (早く祖業を遂げて、続いて夕郎となる。… 文章に長じ、佳句は人の口にあり。33) As discussed earlier, Masafusa’s praise for Yoshishige no Yasutane, whose “fine phrases are still recited by people today” was Masafusa’s rhetorical way of referring to a person’s talent in poetry. Similarly, Takachika was a “brilliant jewel in the Way of Literature” (文道炳然の光花なり。34) Ironically, Masafusa mentions Tamemoto’s long-coveted wish for rebirth in heaven, but praises him for his literary accomplishments.

From these examples, we can surmise that the “secular” standard Masafusa employed in his Ōjōden referred to achievements in Confucian studies (“household studies” 祖業) and the Chinese Classics (“the Way of Literature”). In other words, if Masafusa praised his ancestors in the Ōjōden, it was because of their literary merits as the Kidendō-trained academicians and poets. In this regard, the Ōjōden can be described as Masafusa’s homage to the “household studies” of the Ōes, which he was safeguarding singlehandedly at the turn of the twelfth century.

32 Ibid., p. 249.
33 Ibid., p. 247.
34 Ibid., p. 249.
So long as Masafusa used the public medium (or an established literary format) of Ōjōden to exalt the lives of the hitherto unrecognized literary merit of his kinsmen Sadamoto and Takachika, who died with unremarkable official ranks, we know that Masafusa’s primary purpose in writing his Ōjōden was not only the secular but highly private.

However, this does not mean that the Ōjōden is completely devoid of religious content. Rather, as mentioned above, the Ōjōden is not only secular; it occasionally appears even heretical from the Buddhist point of view. Masafusa’s Ōjōden includes villains such as Minamoto no Noritō (源章任), a “stingy and greedy” governor of Tajima (present-day northern part Hyōgo prefecture) whose “personal greed was his priority in life” (性太吝惜にして、刺史たる時は、貪をもて先となせり),35 and Minamoto no Yoriyoshi (源頼義), a former governor of Iyo (present-day Ehime prefecture) who “hailed from a family of many generations of warriors” (累葉武勇の家に出でて), and “made his living by killing people during his entire lifetime” (一生殺生をもて業となせり)36; and their eventual attainment of normal (or, at least not specified as Lower or Inferior) rebirths in paradise. Indeed, it is puzzling why seemingly devotional Ōe no Tamemoto, the former Professor of Literature, is considered inferior to Noritō and Yoriyoshi, in terms of the rebirth they sought. On what account does Masafusa justify the rebirth of “villains in paradise” (悪人往生, akunin Ōjō), a controversial concept in Buddhism? How does Masafusa justify a better afterlife for one man who exploited innocent people as a governor, and for another who “beheaded and massacred innumerable people” (人の首を梟し物

---

36 Ibid.
According to Masafusa, Yoriyoshi the assassin was reborn in paradise because he “deeply regretted his crimes and sins, recited the Buddha’s name for many years, and finally took the tonsure.” (深く罪障を悔いて、多年念仏し、遂にもて出家せり。) However, Noritō the merciless governor, “read the forty-nine volumes of the Sukhavati Sutra every day” (日々に阿弥陀経四十九巻を読み), but did not repent as dramatically as Yoriyoshi. According to Masafusa, Noritō “importuned [rebirth in paradise by reciting the name of Buddha] only on his death bed, yet he was welcomed into paradise.” (臨終正念にして、極楽の迎を得たり。) Masafusa’s comment is highly equivocal: “Rebirth in paradise does not necessarily depend on one’s deeds during one’s lifetime; I must say that it depends more on meritorious deeds in one’s previous lives.” (往生は必ずしも今生の業のみに依らざることを。宿善なりと謂ひつべし。)

3. Masafusa’s Ancestors’ “Meritorious Deeds”

Masafusa seems to be emphasizing the “meritorious deeds” performed by his Ōe ancestors, for having established and passed down the great family tradition of Confucian studies, and his own indebtedness to them. In this regard, Masafusa’s condescension toward his great-uncle Tamemoto probably reflects his personal view that for a son of the Ōe clan to yearn

---

37 Ibid.
38 Ibid.
39 Ibid.
40 Ibid.
rebirth in Buddhist paradise but to show little pride in his scholarship was, morally speaking, as
great a transgression as a provincial governor’s exploitation of his people and a warrior’s
massacring of innocents.

Furthermore, in contrast to the concept of “household studies” (家学), such as waka and
yūsoku kōjitsu (“encyclopedic knowledge of ancient matters”), which emerged during the insei
period, the “household studies” (祖業, sogyō) of the Ōe is depicted as a declining tradition. In
this regard, it is curious that Masafusa thought Ōe no Otondo’s “meritorious deeds” (shukuzen)
as not only the basis for the clan’s prosperity as a scholarly household, but also the ultimate
source of his success as a scholar-official. In the second volume of the Ruijūbon Recension of
the Gōdanshō, Masafusa makes the following comment about Otondo:

I, Masafusa, was able to serve the sovereign and assume the post of
Counselor, because the founder of our family, Lord Otondo devoted
himself to serving the state, when he was still a Superintendent of Police.
For this reason, I was destined to serve the sovereign.

Beginning with Otondo, who Masafusa calls “a son of Prince Abo [792-842]” (阿保親王
の子なり), the Ōe produced generations of fine Confucian scholars, such as Asatsuna
(886-957), Koretoki (888-963) and Masahira (952-1012). Yet we can only speculate why

41 SNKBT 32, p. 43.
42 Inoue and Ōsone, p. 228.
43 For my discussion of their brief biographies, see Chapter Two. For my analysis of some of the waka
poems composed by Masahira, see Chapter One.
Masafusa did not include the biographies of these individuals in his Ōjōden. It is possible that by comparing Otondo, who appears at the beginning of the book, with the three relatively recently deceased members of the Ōe family, Tamemoto, Sadamoto and Takachika, at the end of the book, Masafusa may have been alluding to the change and the possible dissolution of the family occupation of the Ōe, that had been inaugurated by Otondo.

Even excluding Tamemoto, whose potential “transgression” is discussed above, Sadamoto’s personal attainment of rebirth in paradise as the venerated Buddhist monk Jakushō does not add much to the Ōe’s prestige as a house of Confucian scholars. In fact, in Chapter Two, I argued that Yoshishige no Yasutane was able to take the tonsure and abandon his career as a scholar-official, mainly because he was a kike (self-made) scholar, and therefore, unburdened with a family tradition. On the other hand, we saw that in his pyramid-shaped ballad, “Rōkankō” (老闆行, “The Ballad of an Idle Old Man”) in the Honchō monzui, Sugawara Fumitoki (899-981) expressed the pride and agony in taking over the Sugawara family’s occupation. Therefore, although Sadamoto is a contemporary of Masafusa’s great-grandfather Masahira, we can surmise how eccentric it was for a scion of the Ōe clan to become a Buddhist monk and pursue his faith to the extent of traveling to China in the early eleventh century. (Of course, one can also say that because Sadamato had studied the Chinese classics as a Japanese Confucian, he would have had little difficulty conducting exegetical studies on Buddhist scriptures, even in China.)

It is equally important to inquire why Masafusa praises his grandfather Takachika, but does not even mention his father Narihira. Regarding Ōe no Narihira (大江成衡), the following
anecdote in the Kandabon Recension of the Gōdanshō (and also divided into two parts in Books 1 and 2 of the Ruijūbon) is well known:

Masafusa said: “My father was a devout Buddhist. He recited prayers and sutras everyday and never lapsed in his religious duties. But because my father was like this doesn’t mean that I am also like him. My father’s devotion and steadfast belief in Buddhism could not be compared to that of other men. After all, I wonder if he was fortunate enough to have had [sufficient] leisure time to act in that manner. Or perhaps he was simply a staunch believer in the faith. He was always wearing a collarless monk’s robe which resembled a suikan [a type of a robe], and carried in his hand a rosary made of fifty beads joined together with a knotted string. Whether it was a Day of Abstinence or not, he did not mind eating leeks, meat and raw seafood. On such occasions, I remember him always saying, ‘May our great sages and great teachers save us!’ Also, he was always spreading out the books [transmitted in our family] for generations, repairing the deteriorating and damaged parts, and affixing a seal to every one of them; the way he treasured books was remarkable. Someone asked my father, ‘Why do you do this?’ Apparently he answered, ”I am the Ōe family librarian.”

又被命云、亡考者道心者也。毎日念誦読経、敬以不懈。雖然自ハ不然。彼ハ道心之堅固事非他事。吉々有其假歎。又者頗可謂信者。常頃紙不差ヌ、水千ノ如法師衣ナル二、結綴ニテ五十許ツラヌキタル数珠ヲ持テ、不論精進不精進。雖食荤腥、以先聖先師助給ヘト云。為其口実、或又常披畑代之文書、修理其朽損、皆悉捺印重之無極。或人問云、何故如此ナルト問ケレバ、弊身ハ江家ノ文頼也トソ被命ケル云々。45

---

44 cf. Komine, p. 375. Similar passage appears in the Gōdanshō, Ruijūbon Recension, vol. 2:17. Kawaguchi Hisao’s biography of Masafusa calls Narihira a “great librarian” (すくれたライブラリアン), and refers to this Gōdanshō passage (Ruijūbon 2:17), but does not provide a proper citation. (Kawaguchi, pp. 6-7.)

45 Kotenhozonkai, pp. 9-10.
Assuming the authenticity of the Kanda Recension of the Gōdanshō (for the discussion of this, see Chapter 6), this passage is replete with Masafusa’s ambivalent feelings about his father Narihira and Buddhism vis-à-vis the Ōe’s household studies. Calling his father a “staunchn believer” in Buddhism, Masafusa implies that Narihira dedicated himself to “reciting prayers and sutras everyday” in lieu of practicing the Way of Literature such as tutoring the Chinese Classics and drafting documents (“I wonder if he was fortunate enough to have had [sufficient] leisure time to act like that.”) According to the Sonpi bunmyaku, Narihira served as the Head of the Academy, and Governor of Shinano (信濃, present-day Nagano prefecture). Nevertheless, without paying attention to his father’s public roles, Masafusa, then discusses Narihira’s somewhat nonchalant attitude towards Buddhist dietary restrictions, and his emotional dependency on the “great sages” (先聖) and “great teachers” (先師) of the Ōe clan. However, instead of censuring Narihira for not living up to the academic standards set by his ancestors, Masafusa reiterates that Narihira was “the Ōe family librarian” (江家ノ文預), and taciturnly (and somewhat poignantly) expresses his indebtedness to his father. With such mixed feelings about his father, Masafusa probably thought that the Ōjōden was not a place where he belonged. Despite his devotion to Buddhism, it is likely that Narihira did not attain rebirth in paradise at all; or, even if he had attained an inferior kind of rebirth, like Tamemoto, it is not hard to imagine that Masafusa was unwilling to present his father in a negative light.

In either case, these details reveal that Masafusa’s inclusion of the four members of the Ōe family in the Ōjōden does not simply mean that Masafusa glorified them or their family tradition by recording their lives in a quasi-religious book. Rather, through recounting the lives of some of his most influential (Otonto), eccentric (Sadamoto), hypocritical (Tadamoto) and
exemplary (Takachika) ancestors, Masafusa expressed his doubts about the future of the family occupation. In this regard, it is interesting that Inoue Mitsusada discuses that the Ōjōden was written during the Kōwa era (康和, 1099-1104), probably while Masafusa was in Dazaifu, or shortly after his return to Kyoto from there. Moreover, because Masafusa’s favorite son Takakane (隆兼), a promising scholar-official, had died of illness in 1102 (Kōwa 4), Inoue argues that it is probable that Masafusa’s statement, “Recently, I am haunted by a thought” (近感じするところあり) in the preface to the Ōjōden, refers to Takakane’s death. If we accept this view, while purporting to be a sequel to Yasutane’s Nihon ōjō gokurakuki both in terms of form and content, Masafusa’s Ōjōden served as a vehicle for him to not only record but express his preoccupation with the fate of his clan’s survival as a scholarly house.

4. Masafusa’s Glorification of Emperor GoSanjō in his Zoku honchō ōjōden

How does Masafusa’s trepidation about the future of the Ōe family’s household studies relate to his encomia for the two emperors, Ichijō and GoSanjō? The Ōjōden opens with the following passage about Ichijō:

46 Inoue and Ōsone, p. 728.
47 Ibid., p. 223.
48 Masafusa writes in the preface to the Ōjōden:

Therefore, I made inquiries with various grass cutters and woodcutters, and visited both the interior and exterior of the imperial court. Also, I tried to select [individuals] who were omitted from the previous record, and I added things that took place subsequently. In so doing, I finished [the book] during the Kōwa era.

故に葛薫に詣び朝野を訪ねて、在る或は前の記の遺漏するところを採り、或はその後の事を接ぎて、康和に竟へぬ。(Ibid.)
Emperor Ichijō is the son of Retired Emperor Enyū. His mother is Higashi-sanjōin. He ascended to the throne at the age of seven, and throughout his twenty-five-year reign, his wisdom was remarkable, and he excelled in the execution of a myriad of tasks. His talent for learning the Chinese Classics and the beauty of his composition were superior. And he was outstanding in the field of music, both instrumental and vocal. He composed many fine phrases, and they are still recited by people today.

一条天皇は円融院の子なり。母は東三条院、七歳にして位に即きたまひ、字を御めたまふこと廿五年的間、叡哲欽明にして、広く万事に長れたまへり。才学文章の、詞花人に過ぎ、糸竹絃歌の、音曲倫に絶れたり。佳句既に多く、悉くに人口にあり。49

It is interesting to note that while Masafusa mentions that Ichijō “excelled in the execution of a myriad of tasks,” his reference to Ichijō’s “wisdom” is limited to the cultural sphere, such as Chinese literature, poetry and music, as opposed to his political skills.


49 Ibid., 224.
world” (皆これ天下の一物なり), Masafusa praises Ichijō for having “acquired [the assistance of] his contemporaries” (時の人を得たること). Admitting that the insertion of such a lengthy list of people at the beginning of the Ōjōden is “somewhat eccentric,” Komine Kazuaki describes the list as a “group profile of those who supported the cultural [programs] of the imperial state,” and an example of Masafusa’s “ambitious attempt to capture Ichijō’s reign as a whole.”

Accordingly, Komine concludes that Masafusa’s glorification of Ichijō’s era is fundamentally cultural, and not political.

For the purpose of the present study, it should be noted that under the category of “Scholars and Literati,” Masafusa first lists his great-grandfather Ōe no Masahira (952-1012) and another family member, Mochitoki (以言, 955-1010), followed by eight other academicians from the Sugawara, Ki, Takashina, Minamoto, Fujiwara and Takaoka clans. If Ichijō’s reign was “sagacious” (聖代) for Masafusa, it was because members of the Ōe clan were still recognized as leading figures in the perpetuation of the Kidendō curriculum at the Academy, (as opposed to other fields such as Buddhism), and competed with their rivals from other clans. In this regard, Komine makes the reasonable claim that Masafusa “attempted to depict the rebirth in paradise of the Ichijō’s entire reign.”

In short, even in the encomium for Emperor Ichijō, Masafusa implicitly expresses his personal view that Ichijō’s reign was the heyday of the Ōe clan as a house of Confucian scholars.

Finally, we will examine Masafusa’s account of Emperor GoSanjō, which follows.

50 王朝国家の文化を担った群像/一条院の往生伝に託して、一条朝全体を掌握しようとする積極的な姿勢. Komine, pp. 219-221.

51 一条朝そのものの往生をもくろんだ. Ibid., p. 220.
immediately after a detailed description of Ichijō’s dying moments, narrated in a way that emphasizes various ostentatious services conducted on behalf of Ichijō by prominent monks, as opposed to the emperor preparing for his death by himself. In Masafusa’s biography of GoSanjō, quoted in its entirety below, Masafusa’s references to GoSanjō’s political acumen, and his ability to take full control of his own death at his last minutes is remarkable:

Emperor GoSanjō is the second son of Emperor GoSuzaku. His mother is Her Cloistered Yōmeimon. His accession to the throne took place at a moment of thousand-fold felicities. The influence of his virtuous learning over the country nearly rivaled the situation in the Jōwa [834-48] and Engi [901-923] eras. According to what I have learned from others, after the reign of Emperor Reizei [r. 967-69, 950-1011], political matters were overseen by chancellors and regents; during the two-year tenure of Emperor Kazan, the country was for the most part peaceful; thereafter, sovereignty again returned to the hands of the chancellor’s kin; and as a result, imperial authority declined.

At the time, Emperor [GoSanjō] managed all the important affairs of state [with his own initiative] for five years. Society rediscovered plain living and simplicity; people practiced decorum and righteousness; and the nation was saved from the pain of “falling into mud and burning charcoal”; now, the populace benefits greatly from his gifts. The emperor’s talent in learning and his knowledge of the Japanese and Chinese Classics are indeed superior to [the standards set during] all ages past. Thus neither elderly Confucian scholars nor veteran statesmen dared to contradict him; his occasional demonstration of menacing authority, as bold as rumbling thunder, never failed to be followed by blissful rain and dews. He administered both civil and military affairs, and balanced a broadminded approach with a more severe one. And thus the recent past was an era of peace.

Emperor GoSanjō established the Enshū Temple, and inaugurated “Two Rituals” [based on his lectures on the Lotus Sutra and the Sutra of Golden Light, respectively] therein. He also paid a visit to the Hie Shrine, and demonstrated his devotion in One Vehicle. After his abdication, he took the tonsure. <Buddhist Name> In his final days, he concentrated his mind and did not suffer; with little ceremony, he chanted the Buddha’s name, and then passed away.
The wife of the late governor of Bingo province\textsuperscript{52} Fujiwara no Yasuie, lived in Seika Temple.\textsuperscript{53} At the dawn of the Seventh Day of the Fifth Month in 1073, she had the following dream: In the Western sky, brocade-like clouds were trailing in a westward direction, and voices accompanied by the \textit{shō} were chanting continuously. In her dream, she asked about the significance of this; people told her that this was the sign of the retired emperor’s rebirth in paradise. She awoke to discover that on that very morning, Emperor GoSanjō had actually passed away.

In general, when people move on to the other world, regardless of their high or low social standing, they often leave behind [in this world] their own [rancorous] ghosts. In the case of Emperor GoSanjō, no such evil omen has yet appeared. As one person envisioned in a dream, GoSanjō’s untimely departure took place so that he could serve as a ruler for other degenerate nations. However, this theory is mistaken. In fact, he has assumed a new position as sovereign in paradise—that is all. Upon learning of the demise of Emperor GoSanjō, the former chancellor of Uji [Fujiwara no Yorimichi] bemoaned the loss saying, “Woe to our country!”

後三条天皇は後朱雀院の第二の子なり。母は陽明門院なり。九五の位を履みて、一千の運に鐘り、聖化の、世に被ること、殆に承和・延喜の朝に同じ。相伝えて曰く、冷泉院の後、政執柄にあり。花山天皇の二ヶ年の間、天下大に治まれりといへり。その後、権また相門に帰りて、皇威廃れたるがごとし。ここに、天皇五ヶ年の間、初めて万機を視たまへり。俗は淳素に反りて、人は礼義を知り、日域塗炭に及ばず。民今にその賜を受けくるの故ならくのみ。和漢の才智は、誠に古今に絶れたまひ、著儒元老といへども、敢えて抗論せず。雷霆の威を発したまふといへども、必ず雨露の沢あり。文武共に行ばれて、寛猛相済へり。太平の世、近くここに見られたり。円宗寺を作れて、始めて二会を置き、日吉の社に幸して、深く一乗に帰したまへり。禅隷の後、遂に世を廃れたたまへり。＜法名＞御大漸の剋、心を専にして乱れず、先づ念仏を修して、一旦に崩御したまへり。

\textsuperscript{52} In present-day Hiroshima prefecture.

\textsuperscript{53} According to the chronicle \textit{Sandai jitsuroku} (三代実録, 901), Seika Temple (lit. “Haze Nestling Temple”) was build in the cite of the former Minister of the Left Minamoto no Tōru’s (源融, 822-95) residence.
While the biography of Emperor Ichijō was merely a list of his servants, this passage on GoSanjō consists of Masafusa’s recollection of the emperor’s actions. And while Masafusa praises Emperor Ichijō for his cultural superiority, in the beginning of the passage above, Masafusa explicitly criticizes the quality of leadership in the period of the Fujiwara regency, which extended from the reign of Emperor Enyū (円融天皇, 959-91, r. 969-84) through that of Emperor GoReizei (後冷泉天皇, 1025-68, r. 1045-68), except for the “two-year tenure of Emperor Kazan” (花山天皇, 968-1008, r. 984-986). Not only does Ichijō’s era fall within this epoch, during when “political matters were overseen by chancellors and regents,” it was a pivotal moment in the history of the Fujiwara regency; by marrying Michinaga’s daughter Shōshi (彰子, 988-1074) who bore two future emperors, Ichijō paved the way for the three subsequent imperial reigns in the eleventh century (GoIchijō, GoSuzaku and GoReizei), administered by regents Michinaga and his son Yorimichi. In Masafusa’s laconic phrase, this was a period when “imperial authority declined” (皇威廃れたるがごとし).

Masafusa then describes the emergence of Emperor GoSanjō, whose accession to the

54 Inoue and Ōsone, pp. 226-7.
throne took place at “a moment of thousand-fold felicities.” Comparing “the influence of his virtuous learning over the country” to that of Emperors Ninmyō (仁明天皇, 810-850, r. 833-850) and Emperor Daigo (醍醐天皇, 885-930, r. 897-930), Masafusa emphasizes the ways in which GoSanjō himself “managed all the important affairs of state for five years” unlike Ichijō, who was on the throne for twenty-five years under the auspice of his grandfather, Regent Michinaga. Regarding his deep understanding of the Japanese and Chinese classics, Masafusa extols GoSanjō in a highly original and confessional manner (“neither elderly Confucian scholars nor veteran statesmen dared to contradict him”), instead of resorting to the cliched expression, “many fine phrases composed by him are still fondly recited by people today,” which he uses in the biographies of Ichijō and several other individuals in the book. These details show that Masafusa examined GoSanjō’s reign, “an era of peace” (太平の世), through a political and analytical lens.

As to GoSanjō’s death, Masafusa reports that it was not as prolonged as Ichijō’s, because GoSanjō remained in control of himself (“he concentrated his mind and did not suffer”), and thus he did not have to depend on ostentatious rites and ceremonies. Finally, the description of GoSanjō’s rebirth deserves some analysis because the language used in the description is strikingly similar to Masafusa’s characterization of his grandfather’s rebirth.

In Takachika’s case, for example, Masafusa refers to the two “signs”: “brocade-like clouds trailing in the Western sky” (綾雲西に聳き) and “endless voices accompanied by the shō” (笙歌絶えず). Although here the narrator is a random witness, the wife of a provincial governor, the combined images of “brocade-like clouds” and “the sound of the shō” appear only
in the biographies of Ōe no Sadamoto, Takachika and Emperor GoSanjō. This may suggest either Masafusa’s acknowledgment of GoSanjō as one of his fellow (or even superior) literati, or his expression of intimacy with GoSanjō.

In the end, Masafusa introduces “one person’s dream” and presents his new interpretation of it. Refuting the anonymous person’s idea that GoSanjō departed with lettle fanfare “so that he could serve as a ruler for other degenerate nations” (which once again emphasizes the notion that Japan before GoSanjō was degenerate), Masafusa claims that “GoSanjō’s departure means that he has become a new ruler in paradise” (偏に極楽の新しき主なり). In short, unlike his biography of Ichijō, there is no ambiguity in Masafusa’s appraisal of GoSanjō. GoSanjō’s biography includes no references to his dependency on his retainers, both during his tenure as emperor and on his deathbed, or any other details that could potentially be interpreted negatively.

Certainly, Masafusa does not criticize or belittle Emperor Ichijō explicitly in the Ōjōden. However, as discussed above, Masafusa’s writings are often ambivalent and equivocal. As seen in the biographies of his kinsmen Ōe no Tamemoto and Sadamoto in the Ōjōden, as well as in his vignette of his father in the Gōdanshō, Masafusa has a tendency to censure people by leaving the essence of his criticism unspoken. The modern reader may find much of Masafusa’s writing somewhat enigmatic, leaving the interpretation of a subject unresolved. Thus one reason why the majority of Masafusa’s writings were soon sought after by posterity is that while they often sound authoritative due to the terse and highly stylized Sino-Japanese language in which they are written, they are always open to new interpretations. However, one remarkable aspect of Masafusa’s biography of Emperor GoSanjō is that the clarity of Masafusa’s message does not permit alternative interpretations, and Masafusa’s claims about the greatness and learnedness of
GoSanjō were readily accepted by other *insei* texts, such as the *Imakagami*.

6. Masafusa and GoSanjō in the *Imakagami*

The chapter entitled “Appointments” (司召し, *Tsukasa meshi*) in the *Imakagami* contains numerous detailed accounts of Emperor GoSanjō’s personality and effective political stewardship, epitomized by his introduction of a meritocracy similar to the Chinese examination system, as the chapter title suggests. The following anecdote recounts how Masafusa began his service at GoSanjō’s palace in 1067, setting out on a career that eventually culminated in his appointment as Acting Counselor in 1094, and in his receiving Senior Second Rank in 1102, an unusually high honor for a scholar-official:

The Emperor’s [GoSanjō] ability to master the Chinese Classics was even superior to that of many celebrated scholars. When the emperor was still crown prince, Counselor Masafusa held only an insignificant position [at the court]. He was discontented with such treatment and said things like “I am going to retire in the mountains and sever all my connections with society.”

Having heard this, one Counselor [Fujiwara no] Tsunetō admonished Masafusa, saying, “You are considered a man of rare qualities. Therefore, [if you become a recluse,] it will be regrettable for society as well as for yourself.” Thanks to [the counselor’s intervention], although Uji Chancellor [Fujiwara no Yorimichi] did not understand [why such special treatment for a minor officer was necessary], Masafusa [was permitted to] make a visit to the crown prince’s palace.

The prince was overjoyed [to meet Masafusa], and immediately invited him to serve him in his residence. While [Masafusa was preparing himself by] borrowing appropriate attire from other people, a wooden identification tag [with his name inscribed on it] appeared [among those of other attendants]. Before long, Masafusa became the prince’s companion in the study of the Chinese classics.

When the prince ascended to the throne as emperor, Masafusa was awarded the title of Chamberlain of the Fifth Rank, although he held no specific post, and was thus called “Commissioner of Ceremonial cum
Chamberlain.”  Subsequently, when the post of Junior Deputy Officer [at the Bureau of] Central Affairs became available, he assumed that position.

Some of the details in the passage above appear to have been refashioned by the author of the Imakagami.  For example, since no other historical source mentions that Masafusa was ever “discontented with” the trajectory of his career, the veracity of this particular turn of events cannot be ascertained.  Likewise, although Fujiwara no Tsunetō (藤原経任, 1000-66) actually held the position of Acting Counselor from 1048 to 1065, his influence over Masafusa’s career is unknown.  If Tsunetō’s advice was so crucial to Masafusa, he would certainly have included Tsunetō among the eleven individuals whose moral support Masafusa himself acknowledged in “Bonen no ki” (暮年記, “A Record of My Twilight Years,” ca. 1099). 56

Moreover, in the “Bonen no ki,” Masafusa proudly states that the Chancellor Fujiwara no

55 Ibid., p., 191.  I consulted Royall Tyler’s appendix (“Offices and Titles”) in his The Tale of Genji (pp. 1159-1168) for translations of of official titles.

56 For a detailed analysis of the “Bonen no ki,” see Chapter Four.  For Masafusa, these people were remarkable because either as patron, mentor or colleague, their belief in Masafusa’s talent helped to promote him throughout his career.  Eulogizing them retrospectively, Masafusa called them “the men who knew how to judge literature,” and “those who understand the true Way of poetry.” (Ury and Borgen, p. 150.)
Yorimichi “examined [Masafusa’s] face for portents and said [that he would] outpace the other men of the nation [and was] certain to rise to high rank.” In the *Imakagami*, however, the nuanced narrative gives the impression that the author lightly censured Yorimichi for not being discerning enough to “appreciate” why Masafusa–the holder of an “insignificant” post–should enjoy the privilege of an audience with the crown prince. Perhaps, in light of Masafusa’s own testimony that Yorimichi was impressed by his thoughtfulness, this comment can be interpreted by considering the possibility that Yorimichi himself became jealous of the crown prince, and thus disapproved altogether of the idea of Masafusa assisting him. Indeed, the incongruity in the treatment of Yorimichi as described in the *Imakagami*, on the one hand, and in the supposedly less fictitious “Bonen no ki,” on the other, highlights some of the underlying narrative tendencies in the *Imakagami*, which may appear highly subjective to the modern reader, accustomed to finding greater objectivity in history books.

What is remarkable in the *Imakagami* passage quoted above is that in the similar way Masafusa wrote about his ancestors and Emperor GoSanjō, Masafusa himself is being talked about in a highly positive manner as an exceptionally talented individual whose academic

57 Ibid., p. 148.

58 The chapter “Teacher of Buddhist Lore” (*Minori noshi*) of the *Imakagami* also includes a statement that implies Yorhimichi’s irrational disapproval of GoSanjō as the future emperor: “When GoSanjō was crown prince, he felt that his life was constantly threatened because there were many obstacles to [his acceding to the throne].” (春宮におはしましける時、世のへだて多くおはしましければ、危く思いける。Takehana, vol. 1, 236.) Without actually referring to Yorimichi, the *Imakagami* narrator repeatedly depicts Emperor GoSanjō as having been unfairly taunted by his “enemies” during his unprecedentedly long (twenty-four-year) period as crown prince, because neither his maternal grandfather nor his uncles (外戚, *gaiseki*) were Fujiwara regents. (For example, see ibid., 236-40.) For Fujiwara patriarchs like Yorimichi, the enthronement of a prince whose mother was not a Fujiwara daughter meant the end of their influence in regency politics. In other words, the subtle condemnation of the regent Yorimichi in the *Imakagami* to some extent serves as a narrative device to exalt Emperor GoSanjō.
acumen was recognized by the emperor himself. However, one difference between the treatment of the narrative subjects in Masafusa’s Ōjōden and the Imakagami is that while Masafusa left considerable ambiguities in his narrative, especially regarding his ancestors and Emperor Ichijō, the author of the Imakagami presents both Masafusa and GoSanjō’s excellence in Chinese studies as self-evident matter. As I discussed earlier, in the Ōjōden, one exception to Masafusa’s equivocal narrative was his exaltation of Emperor GoSanjō. For these examples, we can draw the following two points: 1) the so called setsuwa (“anecdotal tales”) narratives are often based on pre-established ideas and thoughts; 2) in the Ōjōden, Masafusa’s panegyric for Emperor GoSanjō is based on his conviction that GoSanjō was a great ruler and individual, but his anecdotes about his ancestors and the two individuals who were reborn in paradise despite their villainous acts in their previous lives retain the traces of Masafusa’s thought-processes that cannot be presented in a clear-cut manner. As far as his family is concerned, Masafusa was inevitably ambiguous because he wrote the Ōjōden when the declining fate of his family was just becoming evident to him, especially because of his son’s death.

To further examine the setsuwa discourse’s characteristics as narratives based on pre-established thoughts and views, the Imakagami narrator’s preliminary assumption that GoSanjō was a naturally learned and respectable man (“[GoSanjō’s] ability to master the Chinese Classics was superior to that of many celebrated scholars”) needs to be examined. In the Imakagami, which covers the reigns of thirteen emperors, from Golchijō through Emperor Takakura (高倉天皇, 1161-81, r. 1168-80), stories are told by a fictive female raconteur—a centenarian with a walking stick, who identifies herself as the granddaughter of the narrator of the book’s predecessor Ōkagami (大鏡, The Great Mirror, author unknown, early twelfth century). This
female narrator, herself a lowly member of the aristocracy and a purported former attendant of
Murasaki Shikibu, the author of the Tale of Genji, is aware that the society she lives in, which
witnessed numerous “shocking disturbances” (あざましき乱れ) such as the exile of Emperor
Sutoku (崇徳天皇, 1119-64, r. 1123-41) and the Hōgen and Heiji Wars (1156, 1159), is clearly
showing all the signs of a “degenerate age” (末の世). Despite such overwhelmingly
pessimistic undertones, the narrative of the Imakagami is often serene and ebullient, limiting the
topics to the aristocratic author’s praise for particular emperors’ religious practices, poetic skills
and refined taste in the arts, while saying little about social issues such as political reforms.

One exception, however, is Emperor GoSanjō, whose reign is repeatedly glorified with
panegyric statements such as “the emperor’s reign was not inferior to the sagacious eras of the past” (世を治めさせ給ふ事、昔かしこき御世にも恥らずおはしまし), and “the manner in which the emperor administered the numerous affairs of state was not inferior to [the emperors of] the past, and his reign was as undisturbed as a unwavering single tree branch on a mountain in a storm.” (よろづの事、昔にも恥らず行はせ給ひて、山の嵐枝もならさぬ御代ならば). The following description in the chapter “A New Imperial Palace” (大内わたし, Dairi watari) of the Imakagami shows that by the time of Emperor GoShirakawa (後白河天皇, 1127-92, r. 1155-58), GoSanjō’s reign was already considered an exemplary model (例, tameshi):

59 Ibid., p. 31.
60 Ibid., pp. 471, 494 and 514.
61 Ibid., p. 188.
62 Ibid., p. 220.
Emperor [GoShirakawa’s] reign was in no way inferior to [those of the emperors of] the past. Emulating the Emperor GoSanjō, he managed worldly matters by making numerous wise appointments in the Bureau of Records, such as Commander of the Left Fujiwara no Kinnori, who administers the office; three Controllers; and numerous other staff.

The narrator of the Imakagami does not mention that GoShirakawa was initially regarded as a temporary successor to the autocratic Retired Emperor Toba (鳥羽天皇, 1103-56, r. 1107-23), because his mother was not Toba’s favorite wife, the Cloistered Bifukumon (美福門院, 1117-60); nor the fact that during GoShirakawa’s initial tenure as an emperor, during which time the Bureau of Records was established (1157), the court was in the hands of the scholar-official, Shinzei (信西, formerly Fujiwara no Michinori 藤原道憲, ?-1159)–GoShirakawa’s confidant (近臣), who like Masafusa hailed from an academic family.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I first briefly introduced Masafusa’s diaries and their reception throughout the insei period. By raising the question of how the Ōe family’s “clan occupation” (祖業) differed from the newly emerging “household studies” (家学), which were normally limited to Japanese topics such as waka and yūsoku kojitsu, I hypothesized that Masafusa’s diaries were widely disseminated among courtiers in twelfth-century Japan because the household studies in the second sense had yet to become materialized, while the Confucian learning practiced by the

63 Ibid., p. 467.
The Ōe clan was no longer sustainable after Masafusa.

In the second half of this chapter, I sought Masafusa’s own references to his family’s declining status as a purveyor of the Kidendō tradition in his Zoku honchō ōjōden. I first analyzed the biographies of four members of the Ōe clan–Otondo, Tamemoto, Sadamoto and Tamechika, and discuss the “secular” standards Masafusa adopted in recounting the lives of the forty-two individuals who purported to have achieved rebirth in Pure Land. Ultimately describing the Ōjōden as Masafusa’s homage to the dying tradition of the household studies of the Ōe clan, I examined some of the seemingly contradicting comments about his ancestors and lacunae in the narrative, such as his non-mentioning of his father Narihira in the Ōjōden. I also compared Masafusa’s Ōjōden biographies of emperors Ichijō and GoSanjō, and further explored the characteristics of Masafusa’s writings–his often ambiguous and ironical treatment of subject matter. By pointing out the absence of Masafusa’s characteristic sarcasm in his biography of GoSanjō, I discern a rare instance wherein Masafusa’s “true voice” is heard.

Finally, by comparing Masafusa’s biography of Emperor GoSanjō to the reception of the Masafusa-GoSanjō legacy in the Imakagami (ca. 1170), I documented how the once “true opinion” of Masafusa became a pre-established notion that inspired and sustained the setsuwa mode of narrative in the Imakagami, whose author prefers not to discuss increasingly distressing sociopolitical realities of his time.
Chapter Six

Ōe no Masafusa’s Espousal of the Way of the Arts in the Gōdanshō

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I examined Masafusa’s canonization of his ancestors and his imperial patron, Emperor GoSanjō, in his Buddhist biography, Zoku honchō ōjōden (ca. 1099-1104). Through a close reading of some of the biographies, I concluded that Masafusa wrote about his ancestors in a manner slightly different from the way he depicted Emperor GoSanjō. In other words, I argued that while Masafusa was rather equivocal about his ancestors, expressing his judgment about how some of his family members, including his father, ceased to practice the ideal of the Kidendō scholarship, he was indisputably clear about Emperor GoSanjō’s uniqueness as a ruler because of his scholarship and political acumen. I concluded the chapter by examining how Masafusa’s appraisal of Emperor GoSanjō was incorporated into setsuwa narratives of the insei period, such as the Imakagami (ca. 1174-75), while Masafusa’s personal evaluation of GoSanjō became part of the shared knowledge of the past.

This chapter further explores the way in which texts attributed to Masafusa influenced the evolution and dissemination of the setsuwa mode of narrative, characterized by a relatively straightforward depiction of the subject matter. For Masafusa’s own setsuwa tales, I turn to the collection of his spoken discourse, Gōdanshō (江談抄, Notes on Dialogues with Ōe no Masafusa, ca. 1107-11), presumably the most famous and best studied text among Masafusa’s oeuvre. Probably due to its popularity ever since its creation in the early twelfth century, the Gōdanshō has been disseminated in many variants and recensions. The first half of this chapter
will focus on the textual production and reception of the *Gōdanshō* variants. In a sense, this is my attempt to bridge the gap between bibliographical and interpretative studies of one of the most influential *insei* texts.

The second half of the chapter will discuss Masafusa’s appraisal of Emperors Daigo and Murakami in the *Gōdanshō*, based on my reading of the Kanda Recension (1114-15), presumably the oldest extant copy of the book identified as a collection of Masafusa’s spoken discourse. I examine how Masafusa developed a theory of the Way of Arts (*suki no michi*) by means of a series of vivid depictions of passions of the emperors for the composition of Chinese poetry. I also examine the longest and most intriguing anecdote in the Kanda Recension, the tale of Emperor Daigo’s grandson Hiromasa’s passion for the music of the *biwa*, and his quasi-romantic quest to become a disciple of a reclusive *biwa* master.

1. Textual Studies of the *Gōdanshō*

Among the many writings attributed to Ōe no Masafusa, the most widely read today is the *Gōdanshō* (*Notes on Dialogues with Ōe no Masafusa*, ca. 1107-11). Compared to Masafusa’s other major works such as his collection of Buddhist vows, *Gō totoku nagon gammon shū*, the *Gōdanshō* is a relatively “stable” text, with several medieval and early-modern manuscripts surviving in relatively good condition. These manuscripts are all unique; produced over the course of four centuries, they differ significantly in terms of content and format, clearly demonstrating the ways in which the *Godanshō* was received and transmitted by posterity.

† 江談筆録の上限は1107年、下限は1111年、前後5年間にわたるとみることができる。（Kawaguchi and Nara, p. 1530.）
The most commonly disseminated text is the Ruijûbon (類聚本, “Topically Categorized Type”) recension, which consists of a total of 445 anecdotes. While Kawaguchi Hisao and Nara Shôichi’s 1984 annotated edition of the Gôdanshô, Gôdan shôchû is based on a late-Edo, three-volume woodblock print version of the text, Gôto Akio’s 1997 annotation of the Gôdanshô in the Shin nihon koten bungaku taikei series is based on a Ruijûbon manuscript, copied in 1735 directly from Sanjônishi Kineda’s (三条西公条, 1487-1563) hand-copy, which has not survived. Several other modern editions of the Ruijûbon are available in print today. The relative importance of the Ruijûbon, despite the lack of a reliable early manuscript, is due to its broad coverage of topics. In fact, some 170 anecdotes in the Ruijûbon do not appear in other recensions.

As its name suggests, the Ruijûbon classifies anecdotes into the following six categories: 1) Courtly Matters (公事), The Regent’s Household Matters (摂関家事) and Buddhist and Divine Matters (仏神事), 2) Miscellaneous Matters (雑事), 3) Miscellaneous Matters II (雑事), 4) [information is missing in the manuscript but the title is likely “Poetic Matters” 詩事], 5) Poetic Matters (詩事), and 6) Long Verses (長句事). Kuroda Akira (黒田彰) argues that the majority of the addendum in the Ruijûbon appear in Books 4 and 6, and that they most likely were drawn from the Rôei gôchû (朗詠江注, Masafusa’s Commentary to the Wakan roeishû), a

2 This edition contains 444 anecdotes. (Ibid., p. 1508.)

3 This Edo-period manuscript is now in the collection of National Institute of Japanese Literature (国文学研究所資料館) in Tokyo.

4 For example, Gôganshô kenkyûkai, ed. Ruijûbonkei gôdanshô chûkai.

5 Kawaguchi and Nara, p. 1495.
set of interlinear notes in old manuscripts of the *Wakan roeishū*, attributed to Masafusa.\(^6\)

The Ruijūbon also contains several spoken remarks not attributed to Masafusa,\(^7\) as well as a comment which postdates Masafusa’s death in 1111.\(^8\) These minor textual discrepancies suggest that from its inception, the Ruijūbon recension had a life of its own apart from Masafusa or even Sanekane, Masafusa’s interlocutor and the purported original redactor of his speeches.

In other words, the actual process of the formation of the Ruijūbon remains shrouded in mystery, but its comprehensiveness and organized structure attest to late-medieval and early-modern readers’ continual appropriation of the *Gōdanshō* as a source book of imperial lore, or as a resource tool for “encyclopedic knowledge of ancient matters” (有職故実, *yūsoku kojitsu*).

In fact, the oldest extant catalog of Japanese books in Japan, the *Honchō shojaku mokuroku* (本朝書籍目録, *Catalog of Japanese Books*, editor unknown, late 13th or mid 15th century?)\(^9\) includes two variants of the *Gōdanshō* in the section entitled “Miscellaneous Commentaries” (雑抄). Both are entitled *Gōdan* (江談, *The Ōe Conversations*), and the catalog

---

6 However, Gotō Akio points out in his “kaidai” of the SNKBT edition of the *Gōdanshō* that about half of the contents in Books 4 and 6 originate in the *Rōei gōchū*, indicating that the *Rōei gōchū* was merely “one of the many sources” used by the anonymous compiler of the Ruijūbon. (SNKBT 32, p. 598.) See Kuroda, Akira, pp. 1-27. For studies of *Rōei gōchū*, see also Satō (2005a).

7 For example, see 4-125, 5-23, 6-42, 6-69 in SNKBT 32.

8 See 3-3 “Abe no Nakamaro Composes a Waka Poem” (安部仲麿歌を詠む事), which includes a passage ending with the line, “In the Third Month of Eikyū 4 (1116), someone asked Morotō these questions.” (永久四年三月、ある人師遠に問へり。) (Ibid., p. 71.)

9 According to the *Gunsho kaidai*, the *Honchō shojaku mokuroku* has been attributed to the following three individuals: Shigenoi Sanefuyu (滋野井実冬, 1242-1303), Kiyohara Naritada (清原業忠, 1409-1467) and Reizei Tamefuji (冷泉為富, 1425-97). As no consensus has been reached among scholars, neither the editor nor the compilation date of the catalog is established. (*Gunsho kaidai*, vol. 19, pp. 130-31.) In a recent study on bibliographical culture in Medieval Japan, Ogawa Takeo writes that “it is not clear who compiled this catalog and when,” but “it is said to have been compiled by the late Kamakura period [the late 12th through the early 13th centuries].” (Ogawa, p. 56.)
indicates that one consisted of “six volumes” (六巻), and the other of “three volumes” (三巻). Uncertainties surrounding the production of this catalog advise against any hasty conclusions, but if we regard the aforementioned six-volume version of the Gōdan as a prototype for the six-volume Ruijūbon, it can be surmised that the Ruijūbon (or a version of the Gōdanshō equivalent to its length and contents) existed as early as the late-thirteenth or as late as the mid-fifteenth century. In either case, these dates do not contradict the fact that by the time of the Muromachi aristocratic scholar-poet Sanjōnishi Kineda, the Ruijūbon was circulating among the cultural elite.

In the overall structure of the Honchō shojaku mokuroku, which consists of a total of twenty categories beginning with “Divine Matters” (神事), “Imperial Chronicles” (帝紀) and “Courtly Matters” (公事), both copies of the Gōdan appear in the penultimate section entitled “Miscellaneous Commentaries” (雑抄). However, as discussed above, the Ruijūbon itself contains both identical and similar categories (i.e. “Courtly Matters,” “Buddhist and Divine Matters”) in its opening volume. This indicates that the reorganization of Masafusa’s spoken discourse was carried out by an individual or a group of people heavily influenced by imperial and aristocratic traditions from the past centuries.

Other pre-Edo manuscripts of the Gōdanshō are called by modern scholars the Kohonkei (古本系, “Old Manuscript Type”). The following three kohon manuscripts survive in part today: the Kanda Recension (神田本, 1114-15, 50 anecdotes), the Suigenshō Recension (水言抄, 1198, 256 anecdotes), and the Maeda Recension (前田本, 1245, 87 anecdotes).10 The Kanda

---

10 For brief summaries of the bibliographical information of these manuscripts, see Kawaguchi and Nara, pp. 1503-8, and Gotō, p. 597. Kawaguchi counts 258 episodes in the Suigenshō.
Recension is named after the Japanese philologist Kanda Kiichirō (神田喜一郎, 1897-1984), whose grandfather acquired the manuscript. Hashimoto Shinkichi (橋本進吉, 1882-1945), the editor of the 1930 facsimile reproduction of the Kanda Recension, asserts that the provenance of this manuscript was the Kōzanji Temple (高山寺), because of the vermilion seal of the monastic library that appears on the first page. He also argues that the format of this manuscript more or less coincides with the description in the *Catalogue of Buddhist Books at Kōzanji* (高山寺聖教目録, 第九十八乙), which indicates that the monastic library at one point contained “Two books of the Gōdanshō” (江談抄二巻). Defining the evolution of this manuscript in the following manner, “someone acquired Sanekane’s unprocessed drafts, and copied them one by one as they came into his possession during the years 1114 and 1115,” Hashimoto concludes that unlike the “Popular Recension” (流布本, aka. Ruijūbon), which “no longer resembled the original” (原著の面目を失へるもの), the Kanda Recension is one manuscript which indeed “resembles the original” (原著に近きもの) of the Gōdanshō.

The Suigenshō (水言抄) Recension, rendered by the left-side radicals that make up the Chinese characters 江 (the “water” radical) and 談 (the “word” radical) of the Gōdanshō (江談抄), originated in the Daigo Temple (醍醐寺), and was designated as a Japanese National Treasure (国宝) in 1922. According to Kawaguchi Hisao, the colophon indicates that it was passed on to Priest Jōken (成賢) in 1198 from his uncle Priest Shōken (勝賢, 1138-96), the

---

11 Koten hozonkai, ed. p. 33.

12 或人の実兼が筆録せる未整理の草稿を、得るに随つて順次に永久二三年にあたりて書寫したるものと解すべきかと想はる. Ibid., pp. 33-34.
grandson of the purported original redactor Sanekane, and thus it has a “very proper provenance.” Marian Ury explains her preference for the Suigenshō over the longer Ruijūbon edition as follows:

In making the translation that follows, I have chosen the Suigenshō text […] not because the former is earlier—although there is some reason for suspecting that the first ten items [which Ury translated into English] follow the order of the lost original—or in some way more authentic, but because as it moves from topic to topic it gives the impression that there are real people speaking.  

Kawaguchi points out that while the Kanda Recension appears to preserve the natural flow of Masafusa and Sanekane’s dialogues, the Suigenshō already displays a tendency toward topical organization. Nevertheless, echoing Ury, Gōto Akio says that unlike the Kohon recensions in general, the Ruijūbon often obliterates “the locale of dialogues” and abruptly cuts “the links between conversations” in favor of topical associations. The other Kohon manuscript, the Maeda Recension, is similar to the Suigenshō, but it does not contain most of the passages pertaining to poetry, and consists mainly of aristocratic and courtly lore. We can thus

---


15 Kawaguchi and Nara, p. 1533.

16 Gotō, Ikegami and Yamane, p. 599. For instance, a Gōdanshō passage on Masafusa’s father, Narihira, which I discussed in Chapter Five, provides a good example. The Ruijūbon divides what appears in the Kandabon into two parts, placing them in Books 1 and 2, respectively; whereas the newly contextualized passage in Book 2 is supplemented with similar, yet different details that do not appear in the Kanda Recension.

17 Ibid., p. 596.
conclude that by the mid-thirteenth century, the book-title Gōdanshō or Gōdan was given to a body of texts that was loosely compiled from the existing primary source identified as Masafusa’s spoken discourse, in accordance with the particular interests and needs of the reader/copier. In other words, within a century and a few decades since its first appearance, the Gōdanshō or its earlier editions became so widely disseminated that people at the time were able to customize their own versions of it, depending on their personal interests and the needs of its redactors and their audience.

In the present study, most of the excerpts from the Gōdanshō are taken from the Kanda Recension. This is not to support Hashimoto Shinkichi’s claim that the relatively early dates on the manuscripts (1114-15) indicate that the Kanda Recension must resemble the urtext of the Gōdanshō (if ever it existed). But rather, it is intriguing that the Kanda Recension is the only extant copy of the Gōdanshō from the early twelfth century. Even the more valorized Suigenshō Recension (with the designation of National Treasure; see Ury’s comment quoted above) only dates from 1198. Although nothing can be ascertained about the production of the Kanda Recension, the fact that it is roughly contemporary with Minamoto no Toshiyori’s Toshiyori zuinō (Toshiyori’s Principles of Waka, ca. 1111-15)18 is also a point of consideration. By gathering some of the most memorable anecdotes from the Kanda Recension, I attempt to shed light on some of the oldest tales, those that have been identified and circulated as transcriptions of Masafusa’s conversations.

2. Early Receptions of the Gōdanshō

18. See Chapter Seven for my discussion of the Toshiyori zuinō.
As in the case of Masafusa’s diary, Gōki, the popularity of the Gōdanshō among aristocratic literary scholars and critics in twelfth-through-fifteenth-century Japan is also attested by numerous references to it in various medieval commentaries and treatises. For example, the following books are known to contain quotations from the Gōdanshō, or Gōdan: Priest Kenshō’s (顕昭, ca. 1131-ca. 1209) commentary to the Kokinshū, Kokinshū chū (古今集詠, Commentary to the Kokinshū, 1185); biographies of Prince Shōtoku (聖徳太子, 574-622) such as Shōtoku taishiden konokokuroku shō (聖徳太子伝古今目録抄, Priest Kenshin 顕真 ed., mid-Kamakura), and Taishiden gyokurin shō (太子伝玉林抄; commentaries to the Genji monogatari (源氏物語, Tale of Genji, Murasaki Shikibu, early 11th century), such as the Kakaišō (河海抄, 20 vols., Yotsui Yoshinari 四辻善成, 1367), and Kachō yosei (花鳥余情, 30 vols., Ichijō Kanera 一条兼良, 1472). Varied in their subject matter, these commentaries similarly refer to the Gōdanshō as a general reference on courtly matter and anecdotal portraits of historical figures, such as the emperors and poets of the past.

One of the earliest and most important textual references to the Gōdanshō appears in the Imakagami 今鏡 (The Mirror of the Present, ca. 1174-75). This passage is worth analyzing in detail because in modern Japanese textual studies, it has long been considered the sole external evidence for Fujiwara Sanekane’s (藤原実兼, 1085-1112) involvement in the production of the Gōdanshō as its original redactor.21 Before analyzing the Imakagami passage, however, a

---

19 For a comprehensive list of these itsubun (逸文, “fragmentary passages”), see Kawaguchi and Nara, pp. 1399-1442.

20 Commissioned by Shukaku Hosshinnō. Text is available in KT bekkan 4.

21 Recently, Iso Mizue offered the alternative view that Fujiwara no Sanekane is not the single compiler
number of issues concerning the production of the Gōdanshō needs to be examined.

3. Circumstances Behind the Production of the Gōdanshō

In fact, some of the most revealing details about the making of the Gōdanshō appear in the text itself. In the Kanda Recension, for example, the following passage appears after the inscription, “This [was transcribed] in the Forth Month of Eikyū 3 (1115)” (永久三年四月夜半之). This memorandum indicates that the anonymous scribe of the Kanda Recension took a few months break after having finished transcribing the previous section and resumed another round of transcription with this passage:

Masafusa said to me: “After all, thinking about the nature of things, be it ranks and posts, or happiness and [high] salaries, I have achieved all of these things through [my] virtue in the Way of Literature. Furthermore, I believe that [my] reputation for the study of Chinese literature and skill [in composition] is superior to that of most of people from the recent past. I acknowledge that this may sound like self-adulation, but what I say is not groundless. As for my life-span, attaining the age of seventy years is quite rare nowadays. I am not one of those short-lived types. Yan Hui was a great sage, but he only lived to thirty. Therefore, in terms of worldly achievements, I have nothing to complain about. My only regrets are that I never attained the post of the Chief of Chamberlains, and also that my children are mediocre and lacking in prospects. If only I had a son like

of the body of the texts known as the Gōdanshō, nor the sole conversation partner of Masafusa. She acknowledges, however, that the currently available manuscripts of the Gōdanshō do not allow her to identify other figures, who might have taken part in the production of the Gōdanshō. (Iso, pp. 219-36.)

22 In the Kanda Recension, this conversation and two others, directly following this conversation, are flanked by this inscription and another which indicates that “Thirteenth of the Eighth Month of Eikyū 3 (1115); Upon obtaining the text, this was transcribed.” (永久三年八月十三日隨書得寫之。) The interlinear notes suggest that the Kanda Recension was made up from fragments of an earlier version of the Gōdanshō or what would eventually become the Gōdanshō, which “came into the hand [of its anonymous scribe/compiler] during the years 1114 and 1115” as the modern textual scholar Hashimoto Shinkichi argues. (Koten hozonkai, ed., pp. 33-34.)
you, I would have had nothing to worry about. Various documents belonging to our family, secret teachings in the art [of Literature, lit. “Way”]—all of these things are about to vanish [lit. “be destroyed by fire”]. In particular, secret teachings about the Book of History and the Confucian classics are about to disappear forever. There is no one to whom I can entrust and transmit this wisdom. For this reason, I would most willingly share some of these things with you. How would you like that?”

I replied: “This would give me more joy than I have experienced in my entire lifetime!”

Masafusa said to me: “In the Shiji, only three volumes contain corrupt texts. (The biographies in Volumes One, Four and Five of the Main Biographies section.) In the Hou Han shu, corrupt texts appear in the Discussion of Twenty-Eight Generals. (For both books, I have written more details on a separate sheet of paper.)

Masafusa said to me: “Do you well understand Fumitoki’s ‘The Ballad of an Idle Old Man?’”

I replied: “I do not understand it very well yet. But, according to what my late father told me, I know something about the way Chinese characters are allocated [in the poem]. Starting from the single characters of ‘Daytime’ and ‘Evening,’ the number of characters eventually adds up to twelve [per line], or something like that.”

Masafusa said: “That is correct. [The poem] spreads like an unfolding fan. [In fact,] Fumitoki completed this ballad, after having worked on it carefully without a moment’s rest for three years. When the draft was complete, Fumitoki first sent it to Minamoto Shitagō and showed it to him. Shitagō perused it and composed a reciprocal [poem in a similar format] overnight, and had it delivered to Fumitoki. Fumitoki grieved intensely, and said that Shitagō was a thoughtless person. People at the time also criticized Shitagō and sympathized with Fumitoki’s point of view. It was not because Shitagō’s composition was ordinary; it was because he had shown no consideration for others. They both found this incident regrettable.

被談云。「倩案物情、云官爵云福禄、皆以文道之德所曆経也。何況才藝名誉、殆過於中古之人所思給也。雖似自讚、又非無謂。於壽命者、及七十事近代之難
This conversation between Masafusa and an anonymous first-person narrator also appears in Book 5 of the Ruijūbon Recension of the Gōdanshō, with a new subtitle “Governor-General’s Self-Praise” (都督自讃の事). The Ruijūbon, however, makes a few minor modifications in the text, improving what appear to be scriptural errors in the Kanda Recension, but the overall conversation remains identical. This anecdote is not included in either the Suigenshō or the Koten hozonkai, pp. 19-21.

23 Koten hozonkai, pp. 19-21.

24 For example, the Ruijūbon gives 家々文章 into 家之文章, as well as 乱達 into 異脱. In both cases, the characters used in the Kanda Recension make little sense.
Maeda Recension. While reminiscing on his earlier self-glorification in the “Bonen no ki,” this passage also depicts Masafusa as a verbose and somewhat arrogant person. While he acknowledges that his “self-adulation” may be offensive to the listener, he is unabashed in claiming that his personal attainments were not “groundless,” because they were the result of his own “virtue in the Way of Literature” (文道之徳).

However, as the conversation unfolds, it becomes evident that the focus of the discussion is not Masafusa or his exceptional academic talent, but rather what he calls the “Way of Literature,” and how it should be preserved and transmitted. Specifically, this conversation makes it clear that Masafusa actually believed that such a body of knowledge should be passed down from one generation to the next. Moreover, because of the untimely death of his favorite son Takakane (隆兼) in 1102, and the “mediocrity” of his other offspring, Masafusa was willing to impart a portion of his family’s most vital tradition to an anonymous individual who was apparently not a member of the Ōe clan.

This type of master-disciple relationship, usually nourished by the confluence of two individuals’ curiosity, passion and commitment to a particular activity, instead of a blood relationship, would become a model for elite education throughout medieval Japan, particularly in the field of artistic pursuits (often called michi or the “Way”) such as poetry and music. As Masafusa suggests by expressing his greatest concern about the future of “[v]arious documents belonging to [his] family” (家々文章), this kind of master-disciple relationship was often founded upon the transmission of highly valued texts, access to which was limited to those who

qualified by undergoing rigorous training and study.\textsuperscript{26} In other words, the \textit{Gōdanshō} passage in question documents the dissolution of the Ōe clan as the scholarly household on the one hand, and the transformation of Masafusa’s oral teaching of “secret matter” (道之秘事) into a written text, on the other hand.

It is also curious how Masafusa’s conversation with his anonymous interlocutor digresses into a discussion of Sugawara no Fumitoki’s (菅原文時, 899-981) poem called “The Ballad of an Idle Old Man” (老閑行). As discussed in Chapter Two, Fumitoki composed the poem in 977, at the age of seventy-eight. At the time, Fumitoki’s fellow academician, Minamoto no Shitagō (源順, 911-83) was sixty-six. Because the anonymous individual already knew about the peculiar format of Fumitoki’s poem, the only “secret teachings” that Masafusa was willing to impart to him were some trivial personal anecdotes. However, this is an example of how sharing seemingly unimportant details was one way for Masafusa to engage in the master-disciple relationship. Who, then, is the fortunate individual who was permitted to study with Masafusa and access the private teachings of the Ōe family? As the \textit{Gōdanshō} itself provides no textual clues, we have to turn to external evidence.\textsuperscript{27}

4. Textual Confirmation of the Authorship of the \textit{Godanshō} in the \textit{Imakagami}

The following passage from the \textit{Imakagami} is the earliest extant proof of the theory that

\begin{itemize}
  \item As for my discussion of Masafusa’s acknowledgment of his father as the “librarian” (文頴, fumi azukari) of the Ōe family, see Chapter Five.
  \item Considering the singularity of this anonymous young individual, who recorded the oral exchange between him and Masafusa, as far as the Kanda Recension is concerned, Iso Mizue’s hypothesis about the multiple dialogue partners and redactors, who were involved in the production of the proto-\textit{Gōdanshō}, does not appear sound.
\end{itemize}
[One day], I picked up a bird’s egg that was lying on a lotus leaf on [the surface of] a pond by a monk’s chamber in the temple compound called Bodhi Tree Residence, and placed it in a basket. A warbler then flew into the basket and began to feed the fledgling. So, I assumed the young bird was a warbler. Yet I found it odd that as the fledgling grew up, it did not quite resemble its parent. As it slowly matured, it began to cry, “ho to to gi su” (lit. “cuckoo”). Realizing that “indeed, there is truth in some of the old sayings transmitted from ancient times,” someone composed the following poem:

Now, I’m curious about
The parent of this parent-bird.
A cuckoo,
I see that you are a warbler’s
Formidable child.

Among the long poems in the Man’yōshū, one [goes like this]: “Among warblers’ eggs, a cuckoo….” 28 This is exactly what happened. It is highly

28 From the Man’yōshū, Book. 9, 1755, 1756.

Among warblers’ eggs, a cuckoo hatched out all by itself.
You don’t twitter like your father.
You don’t twitter like your mother.

From the field covered with deutzia blossoms,
You soar straight up, and
To this direction you fly, singing and echoing;

Disturbing the orange blossoms,
Wherein you like to hide away,
All day long, you chirp.
It’s so pleasant to listen to you!

I’ll be happy to reward you.
So, don’t fly away.
Stay forever
Among these orange blossoms
In my garden.

ENVOY
intriguing, isn’t it? I also heard that in the book [that contains] Masafusa the Counselor’s stories recorded by one Sanekane the Chamberlain, people witnessed and wrote about the same phenomenon in the recent past. The fact that a story that was passed down to me in this way actually took place in real life is extremely delightful! A person holding the title of Acting Commissioner of the Left City Yorimasa, who was also a renowned poet, heard that such a thing had taken place, troubled himself to visit us from a great distance, composed a poem, and attached a copy of it to the bird’s basket:

A cuckoo
In a basket has turned into the son
Of a warbler;
Which [family’s] song
Are you going to twitter?

The Manyōshū poem in question says: “You don’t tweet like your father. You don’t tweet like your mother.” Therefore, it was very unlikely that the bird chirped like a warbler. That was [Yorimasa’s] highly refined opinion.

On this rainy night
Of thickening fog,
A cuckoo
Chirping, flies away.
How poignant is that bird...

反歌
かき霧らし雨の降る夜を、ほととぎす鳴きて行ばり。あはれその鳥。
The intertextual relationship between the two twelfth-century texts—a passage from the Kanda Recension of the Gōdanshō on the one hand, and a random passage from the Imakagami on the other—reveals the somewhat insular and coincidental nature of modern bibliography. In her recently published biography of Ōe no Masafusa, Iso Mizue (磯水絵) argues that Masafusa’s reference to his having “attained the age of seventy years” (及七十事) indicates that this remark was made in the year of his death (1111), or a year before that, and the inclusion of the comments suggests that the Kanda Recension is “newer” than the other two Kohon recensions—Suigenshō and Maedabon. She also speculates that the interlocutor in the Kanda Recension was not Fujiwara no Sanekane, who died at the age of twenty-seven, shortly after Masafusa’s death in

30 Iso, p. 229.
However, Iso’s argument is not convincing and there is not enough contrary evidence to dismiss the conclusion that Masafusa’s conversation partner was Sanekane.

Even more remarkable is the fact that due to the untimely death of Sanekane, the body of his written records of Masafusa’s speeches became available as a *setsuwa* text for a third party, as the Kanda Recension was apparently copied out of another text as early as in 1114 and 1115. In other words, we cannot identify the person who made the present-day Kanda Recension, but some minor scriptural errors such as using the character 何 instead of 行 in the titled of Fumitoki’s poem, “Rōkankō” (老閑行) suggests that the Kanda scribe was unfamiliar with the Fumitoki’s famous poem from the literary anthology, *Honchō monzui*.

5. Emperor Daigo in the *Gōdanshō*

In the previous chapter, I discussed how Masafusa compared Emperor GoSanjō (後三条天皇, r. 1034-73, r. 1068-72) to Emperor Daigo (醍醐天皇, 885-930, r. 897-930) as a sagacious ruler in the *Zoku honchō ōjōden*. In fact, throughout the *insei* period, Daigo and his son Emperor Murakami’s (村上天皇, 926-67, r. 946-67) eras were known as the golden age of Japanese culture. Although the precise origins of popular discourse about Emperors Daigo and Murakami are unknown, Masafusa’s *Gōdanshō* contains various references to these two sovereigns, many of which are highly animated and detailed. In the *Gōdanshō*, for example, Masafusa repeatedly refers to Emperor Daigo as “the sagacious sovereign of Engi” (延喜の聖

---

31 For instance, Fujiwara no Shunzei calls Emperor Daigo “the sagacious ruler of the Engi” (延喜の聖の帝) in his *Korai füteishō*. (KKS7, p. 40.)
and Emperor Murakami as “Tenryaku Great Emperor” (天暦皇帝). Considering that the other emperors from the fifth through the early-twelfth centuries discussed in this text are simply called “emperors” (天皇) or “retired emperors” (院), it is obvious that Masafusa intentionally differentiated Daigo and Murakami from their predecessors and followers. A similar honor is also paid to Emperor Uda (宇多天皇, 867-931, r. 887-97), for whom the superlative epithet, “His Cloistered Eminence” (太上法皇) is used.

Indeed, Masafusa seems to have had a keen interest in Daigo and Murakami’s personal qualities; whenever he mentions them, he cites specific, often memorable incidents in their lives. In other words, Masafusa did not praise them inordinately merely out of convention or formality. The following anecdote from the Gōdanshō exemplifies the detailed manner in which Masafusa discusses Emperor Daigo:

I [Fujiwara no Sanekane] asked Masafusa again: “Should I avoid composing a poem of level tone using a Chinese character, which can be pronounced in either the level tone or non-level tone?”

References to Daigo appear on pp. 7, 11, 13, 85, 94, 112, and 188 of SNKBT 32. On page 41, the epithet “sagacious sovereign” (聖主) is also used for Murakami. Similarly, on page 219, Murakami is referred to as “the Tenryaku Emperor” (天暦帝) (tenryaku no mikado), but the title mikado is not applied to other emperors, except on page 246, where in a different rendition, mikado (軍門) is used for Emperor Yūryaku.

For a detailed study of the glorification of the Engi and Tenryaku eras before Masafusa, see Hayashi Rokurō’s book chapter, “Iwayuru ‘engi tenryaku seidai’ setsu no seiritsu” (所謂「延喜天曆聖代」説の成立) in his Jōdai seiji shakai no kenkyū (上代政治社会の研究), pp. 510-534. In this article, Hayashi attributes the notion to Ōe Masahira.

Uda, also called “Cloistered Eminence of Kampyō” (寛平法皇, pp. 83, 238) and “Teishi Cloister” (亭子院, p. 10.), is the only emperor referred to, as “Cloistered Eminence” (上皇, jōkō, Ibid., P. 123), as well.
Masafusa said: “No, you have no need to avoid it. [Look at] Michizane’s stanzas: ‘Cranes are flying over one thousand li; but, they have not yet departed from the land,’ and ‘I am here, sitting besides a brazier; but my hands are not cracked like a tortoise [shell].’ [Look at the ways in which he uses] the Chinese characters “to depart” and “tortoise.” In the Book of Songs and the Zhuangzi, they are read in non-level tones. Nevertheless, [in Michizame’s stanzas,] they are used as level tones. Also, when [Ôe no] Asatsuna used these two characters in their level tones in his composition at the civil service examination, various Confucian scholars on the evaluation [committee] in the ceremonial hall nearly gave him a failing grade. Then, Asatsuna stood up by their side and proudly recited: ‘kakuhi-senri, bi-ri-chi,’ which is the [entire] stanza in [its Sino-Japanese] reading. The Confucian scholars still did not accept [Asatsuna’s interpretation]. And then, Asatsuna said, ‘I’ve heard that the Deputy Minister Sugawara also spoke of this.’ The sagacious ruler of Engi heard this, and said: ‘There must be some reason for what he [Asatsuna] is saying. Let him pass the examination.’ Therefore, you have no need for concern [about what you said].”

This passage reveals some fascinating details about the civil service examinations—the imagined space wherein scholarship and public service converged in Japanese court life in the early tenth century. First, we learn that Masafusa considered Michizane an exceptionally innovative poet, who was not satisfied with mechanically studying and copying the Chinese classics, such as the Book of Songs and the Zhuangzi. Second, Masafusa scrupulously studied

35 Koten hozonkai, pp. 7-8. I transcribed the passage in kanbun and added punctuations to facilitate comprehension. I also consulted Gōdanshō kenkyūkai, ed. Kohonkei gōdanshō chūkai, pp. 294-5.
Michizane’s (here referred to as a Heavenly God” 天神) poems, to the extent that he was able to recite some of the stanzas on the spot, and explain what was so special about them. Third, Masafusa was not alone in studying Michizane’s compositions. One of his kinsmen, Ōe no Asatsuna (大江朝綱, 886-957), was fifteen years old when Michizane was exiled in 901. Nevertheless, at his civil service examination, presumed to have taken place within a decade or so after Michizane’s banishment, Asatsuna looked up to Michizane as a great model and source of poetic inspiration. In other words, in the world of kangaku scholarship, Michizane’s poetry had become a new model and a trend, despite his having suffered political disgrace.

Finally, and most importantly, this anecdote gives interesting details about Emperor Daigo’s direct involvement in the selection of state officials. Not only was Daigo present at the final stage of the examination, but he appeared to have the authority to intervene in the decisions of the committee, which consisted exclusively of conservative Confucians, and to make the final judgment about each candidate. Moreover, in this particular incident, Masafusa implies that Daigo paid close attention to Asatsuna’s final, desperate remark, when Asatsuna mentioned the “the Deputy Minister Sugawara.” This indicates that even Daigo recognized Michizane’s extraordinary achievement as a poet. From this passage alone, it is not clear whether Daigo had a firm understanding of Asatsuna’s theory about Michizane’s unconventional use of the “even tones.” However, because other Gōdanshō anecdotes portray him as an accomplished poet, it is likely that Daigo had actually been aware of the “poetic truth” (謂, iware, lit. “reason”), that Asatsuna was trying to express, while using Michizane as an authority.

Furthermore, the terse, enigmatic way Masafusa narrates this story (i.e., he might have explained why the committee did not like Asatsuna’s answer in the first place; or what Asatsuna
and Daigo actually meant to say in their respective speeches), invites further interpretations on the part of the modern reader. Considering the fact that Daigo was only one year older than Asatsuna, this anecdote may even illustrate the emergence of a generational gap in the literati culture of the early tenth century—the conservative academicians who tested Asatsuna on the one hand, and Asatsuna and Emperor Daigo, on the other. The following two short comments about Emperor Daigo, which appear only in Book 4 of the Ruijûbon Recension of the Gödanshô, provide perfectly matching images of the young sovereign as an enthusiast of Chinese poetry, with an innovative style:

Glacial winds aimlessly caress [the pine tree];
the [white] flock grows even thicker.
The ever-whitening moon rises gently;
while its brilliance is not obscured.

This topic was devised by his Majesty for the civil service examination: “In a bright mountain, looking over the snow on a pine tree.” [Composed by] Sugawara no Ariakira

According to the ancients, even before the evaluation, the sagacious sovereign of Engi had already recited this couplet, while playing upon his zither. Confucian scholars [on the committee] received this news and let [the candidate] pass the examination.

Despite his clan name, nothing is known about the poet Sugawara no Ariakira (probably an erroneous reading of Naakira). In this event, which is considered to have taken place

36 Göganshô kenkyûkai, ed. Ruijûbonkei gödanshô chûkai, p. 131.
in 924, Emperor Daigo and the committee members do not meet face-to-face in the ceremonial hall; nor does the emperor make the final decision about the candidate. The terse narrative, which does not have the conversational format of the longer passage discussed above, somehow makes the absent emperor appear even more animated and human. The following anecdote, also from Book 4 of the 《貞觀政要》, even offers a comment to a Chinese couplet composed by Daigo himself:

Being intoxicated, I would appreciate and dally with [half-blossoming flowers]; though I yearn to do so, may I actually realize my wishes?

Being the master of my mind, I have not been able to be half-heartedly intrigued by them.


According to the ancient sages, as for the seven characters in the second half of these concluding stanzas [in an eight-line verse], various Confucian scholars, such as reciters and their assistants, have pondered them, but [their comprehension] were in disagreement with His Majesty’s thoughts. When he provided his own explanation, the Confucians were in awe.

醉中賞賜欲其奈 未得将心地忍之
古老云，此落句下七字，講師諸儒、味不諧於叔情、被仰由儒者恐。  

37 Ibid. Also in SNKBT 32, p. 113.

38 《貞觀政要》. Ruijūbonkei gōdanshō chūkai, ed. Ruijūbonkei gōdanshō chūkai, pp. 116-7. I modified the second stanza of this couplet by consulting with the yomikudashi (Japanese reading) and the original text in SNKBT 32, pp. 106 and 508. Specifically, following the new interpretation in SNKBT, I replaced the word “Confucian poets” (諸儒) in the prose text with “various Confucians” (諸儒).
Perhaps from the orthodox Confucian viewpoint, Daigo’s use of the unusual diction, “half-heartedly intrigued by them” (地忍之, one Japanese reading is ただにしのぶこと[^39]), appeared puzzling. However, according to modern commentators, the Chinese classic *Han shu* includes one example of this expression. Therefore, it is possible that Daigo’s seemingly novel phraseology was actually based on his through acquaintance with the *Han shu*. In either case, this episode succinctly illustrates Daigo’s profound “poetic mind” (心), wherein a sensory stimulus (such as the poignant image of half-blossoming flowers) and his knowledge of literary precedents coalesce in a poem. This is exactly what Daigo means in this couplet; the way in which a poet “adores” beautiful things in his imagination is not the same as ”involuntarily” (or “half-heartedly”) doing so in a state of intoxication. In short, Daigo’s own kanshi compositions reveal him as a refined poet, whose theory on poetry was no doubt influenced by Sugawara no Michizane’s psychological definition of poetry:

> The poem is that to which what is intently on the mind goes.  
> In the mind it is “being intent”; coming out in language, it is a poem[^40].

[^39]: SNKBT 32, p. 106.
[^40]: Translated by Stephen Owen. (Owen, p. 40.)

6. Emperor Murakami in the *Gōdanshō*

As for Daigo’s son Murakami (村上天皇, 926-67, r. 946-67), the *Gōdanshō* is also replete with anecdotes that feature his passion for Chinese poetry, and the fundamentally

[^41]: Quoted from Ōsone, vol. 1, p. 330.
“human” relationship between the sovereign and his like-minded scholar-officials, who constituted a poetry coterie with the emperor himself taking part. Murakami even held a “debate” (相論, sōron) with Sugawara no Fumitoki, the grandson of Michizane, over the merits of their poetry compositions:

Masafusa said to me: “During Emperor Murakami’s reign, the emperor summoned Fumitoki, of the Third Rank, to give a lecture on the poetic topic, ‘A Palace Warbler Chirping, in the Early Morning Light.’ Do you know this story?”

I said, “I do not know it.”

Masafusa said to me: “This is most interesting. That was the day on which Murakami and Fumitoki ended up debating about each other’s poem. [On that topic,] the emperor composed the following couplet:

When dew is thick, [I hear] aimless chatting, at the bosom of flowers in the garden.

When the moon recedes, [I hear] lofty chirping, in the shadows of the imperial willows.

Fumitoki composed the following couplet:

At the Western Tower, when the moon has receded, [there is pleasant] music between flower and flower.

At the Middle Hall, where candles lingers, [there is a rustling] sound behind the bamboo leaves.

After the emperor heard Fumotoki’s verse recited, he said: ‘I thought I did an excellent job in composing on this topic, but Fumitoki’s poem is also exquisite.’ Calling Fumitoki to move closer to himself, the emperor said: ‘Without any prejudice or bias, and with no inhibitions, tell me whether or not there are faults [in my poem].’

Fumitoki replied: ‘Your Majesty’s poem is exquisite. Especially, the seven characters in the second half are superior to [my own verse in] my poem. I
suppose you have hinted the [word] ‘palace’ [in the topic] by saying ‘in the shadows of the imperial willows.’ Then, in the first half of the couplet, where did you indicate the poetic essence of the word ‘palace?’ I imagine that your ‘garden’ must exist in your imperial palace.’

Emperor Murakami said: ‘You don’t know that? [Of course,] that garden is my garden.’

Fumitoki replied: ‘I understand. You meant something like the Shanglinyuan [an historical Chinese emperors’ garden]. But still, I don’t quite get this.’

The emperor said: ‘Of course, I have sufficient reason [to support my argument].

Fumitoki said to himself, ‘Again, he’s going to tell me an ‘interesting’ story,’ then turned to the emperor and said, ‘I’m sure this is true...’ and then tried to withdraw from the sovereign’s room.

The emperor told him: ‘Then what about the overall merits of our respective poems? Who do you consider the winner and who do you consider the loser? Just relax and tell me.’

Fumitoki said, ‘Your Majesty’ poem is superior. Exquisite, indeed...’

The emperor replied, ‘In fact, I have my doubts. Please relax, and then you must tell me [the truth].’ Summoning the head of Chamberlains, the emperor said: ‘If Funiroki does not announce the winner and loser between our poems, and if he does not tell me the truth, from now on, whatever he says will never reach my ears.’

Overhearing this, Fumiroki said to the emperor: ‘Actually, Your Majesty’s poem and mine are equal [in quality].’ ‘Then swear to me that you will tell me the truth,’ the emperor said.

Fumitoki replied: ‘Actually, my poem is infinitesimally superior to yours.’ Having said this, Fumiroki fled from the emperor. But the emperor was greatly moved, wept and shed tears.”

又被談云。『村上御時、「宮鷲曄曉光」題詩二、召文時三位被講二、其間物語被知乎如何。』
答云、『不知。』
Comparing the two poets’ couplets on the topic “A Palace Warbler Chirping, in the Early Morning Light,” it is obvious that Fumiroki’s is superior, because on the one hand, he skillfully paraphrases the poetic essence of one of the keywords in the topic, “palace” (宮), by mentioning two buildings on the palace grounds, “Western Tower” (an eponym for 露景楼) and “Middle Hall” (an eponym for 清涼殿). On the other hand, as Fumitoki points out, it is not clear where Murakami “indicate[d] the poetic essence of this word, ‘palace.’” Murakami only says “in the shadow of the imperial willows,” but takes for granted that what he means by the “garden” is his “imperial garden.”

42 Koten hozonkai, pp. 26-29.
What is remarkable in this anecdote, a more concise version of which appears in Book 24 of the *Konjaku monogatarishū* (*Collection of Tales of Times Now Past*, ca. 1120), is the straightforward manner in which the two literati discuss the “truth.” Fumitoki becomes increasingly roundabout as Murakami becomes more persistent in attempting to draw a definite answer from his competitor, but Fumitoki was candid at first, expressing his initial reservation about Murakami’s treatment of the word “palace.” Compared to the previously discussed couplet composed by Emperor Daigo, Murakami’s “warbler” couplet is less imaginative. He simply may not have been as great a philosopher-poet as his father. Nevertheless, Masafusa considers this anecdote a “most interesting matter” (尤有興事也), and recollects what he must have learned from his own teachers with precision and enthusiasm. In other words, by telling this story, Masafusa exonerates Murakami not because of his superiority as a poet or a sovereign, but because of his weakness, humility and openness to criticism, all for the sake of poetic truth. For Masafusa, Murakami’s greatness lies in his ready acceptance of his subject’s criticism, to the point of tears.

The shorter version of the tale in the *Konjaku monogatarishū* does not mention that Murakami “wept and shed tears” in the end. However, the anonymous compiler of the tale concludes his narrative with a comment, “According to what I learned from hearsay, emperors in the past loved Chinese literature to the extent of acting like this.” (古ノ天皇ハ文章ヲ好テ此ナム御ケルトナム語リ伝ヘタルトヤ。44) In short, by recalling these highly personalized stories, Masafusa constructed the image that Daigo and Murakami were learned rulers *par* 43 SNKBT 36, pp. 433-434.

44 Ibid., p. 434. Emphasis added.
excellence, who cared about poetry out of passion, rather than conventional kingly mannerism as patrons of literary activities. Like the Konjaku editor, in the Kanda recension of the Gōdanshō, Masafusa also directly discusses the notion of suki (好も, “to like”), or “passion” for literary activities, this time in the context of waka and music, instead of that of Chinese literature.

7. The Way of Arts (suki no michi) in the Gōdanshō

Among some fifty dialogues in the Kanda Recension of the Gōdanshō, the following anecdote, entitled “Hiromasa of the Third Rank’s Transmission of the Musical Compositions, Streaming [Fountains] and Woodpeckers by the Blind Man in Ōsaka” (博雅三位流啄木曲傳會坂目暗事) is of particular interest. Minamoto no Hiromasa (源博雅, 918-80), a grandson of Emperor Daigo, is featured in this tale. Masafusa exquisitely captures the nobleman’s obsession with the performance of the string instrument, biwa:

Masafusa said to me: “When Hiromasa of the Third Rank played the flute, a demon was blown away and fell down. Have you heard of this incident?”

I answered: “That’s an unexpected question; but yes, I have heard of it.”

“Then, have you heard of his having learned how to play the biwa from a blind man in Ōsaka [Mountain]?”

I said: “No, I haven’t.”

Masafusa said to me: “This is most interesting. Hiromasa of the Third Rank was a renowned musician, and he pursued the study of music extremely seriously. At the time, there was a rumor that a blind man in Ōsaka was the best player of the biwa. People constantly sought him out to study the instrument, but he never imparted [his teaching.] Also, his dwelling was very small, and so very few people visited him. Hiromasa
first sent his servant to [the blind man] and told him to ask him confidentially: ‘Why do you live in such an unusual place? Why don’t you move to Kyoto and spend your time there?’ he solicited. Thereupon, the blind man recited a waka:

In either way,  
I’ll be happy to live  
In this world.  
A palace or a grave-keeper’s house—  
No home is ever permanent.

The blind man recited this poem but did not reply to the question. When the servant reported this, the following thoughts occurred to Hiromasa: ‘This blind man’s remaining days are few. There’s no guarantee that I will live long either. But I have learned that the musical compositions called “The Streaming Fountains” and “Woodpeckers” were transmitted solely to this blind man. If only I could somehow make arrangements to listen to his performance [of these pieces] and to transmit them [to posterity].”

For three years, Hiromasa visited the blind man’s residence in Ōsaka [Mountain] every night. Stealthily he stood by the entrance of the man’s house and listened carefully, but the man never played either of the pieces. In the third year, on the night of the fifteenth day of the Eighth Month, when the mountain peaks appeared in a haze and a breeze was blowing, Hiromasa thought: ‘Ah, such a beautiful evening. The blind man in Ōsaka must be playing “The Streaming Fountains” and “Woodpeckers” tonight.’ Hiromasa left for Ōsaka taking musical scores with him. As he expected, the blind man was making random sounds on his biwa while tuning the strings [on the instrument]. The resulting melody sounded like the banjiki mode. Hiromasa found that extremely interesting, because “Woodpeckers” was written in that particular mode. ‘Perhaps, the man is going to tune the strings in this mode, and then play the piece tonight.’ While Hiromasa’s heart was filled with excitement, the blind man sought solace for his loneliness by reciting a poem, even though there was no listener present:

The storm  
Is severe at the Barrier  
Of Ōsaka;  
Blind am I, I chose to remain here,  
Spending a sleepless night (–and thus ending my life!)

In this manner, the blind man recited the poem as he tuned the strings. Hiromasa shed tears and sobbed. As he marveled at the ways in which the
blind man committed himself to the Way of the Arts (suki no michi), the man spoke to himself again: ‘What a beautiful night it is tonight! I wish someone—not just me—a person of true understanding (sukimono), were here. If only someone who understands the finer things (kokoro etaramu hito) would pay me a leisurely visit this evening! I would surely tell him the story!’ Upon hearing the man’s monologue, Hiromasa broke his silence and said: ‘It is I, Hiromasa!’ The blind man asked: “Who are you, Sir?” Hiromasa mumbled. Since the blind man knew [about Hiromasa,] he was moved, found solace in telling his stories, and transmitted the repertoire in question [to Hiromasa,] and so on. Since Hiromasa did not bring his biwa with him, he received the transmission only in the form of [written] notation. Those who truly understand the finer things in any discipline of art should be like this. In recent times, manners have become truly despicable. No wonder there are so few true adepts (jōzu) in any of the disciplines. It is indeed extraordinary, is it not?”

This was how Masafusa told me the story.

Then, I asked again: “Is the repertoire in question still in current use?”

He answered: “No, it is not.”

I asked again: “What’s the name of the blind man?”

He answered: “I don’t remember exactly. But, his name was said to have been Chitose (Lit. "a millennium"), perhaps.”

I asked again: “As for the flute, it is true that Hiromasa mastered it?”

He answered: “Yes, he was the finest player. No one could compete with him. His primary repertoire consisted of “The Imperial Reign” and “Growth of Group Turmoil.” Those who learned these pieces were few in number, and the person in question was the one who transmitted them.”

Thirteenth Day of the Eighth Month of Eikyū 3 (1115)
Upon obtaining the text, this was transcribed.
被談云、「尤有興事也。博雅三位高名管弦ノ人ニテイミジク道ヲ重
ク求ニ、會坂目暗琵琶坂上之由、風聞世上ニ。人々難之請習、更ハ
不傳。又住所極以トコロセクテ、行向人少ニ、博雅先以下人内々ニ
イハスルヤウ、『ナノクテ不思懸所ニハ住スルゾ。京都ニ居テ過
セカシト』スカスニ、目暗詠歌云。

ヨノナカハトテモカテモスグシテシ。ミヤモッカヤモ、ハ
テシナケレバ

ト詠ジテ不答。使者以此由云ニ、博雅思様、『此目暗命有旦暮、我
モ寿ハ不知ネヲモ、尚流 процедур木ト云曲ハ此目暗ノミコソ傳ナレ。相
構テ聞弾テ欲傳之處。』三箇年間、夜々向會坂目暗許、竄立聞宅頭
ニ、更以不弾。三年ト云八月十五夜オロウハクモリタルニ風少シ吹
ニ、博雅思様、『アハレ今夜ハ有興夜カナ』。會坂目暗、流 процедур
ナハ今夜や弾ラムト思テ、琵琶譜ヲグシテ向會坂ニ、如案琵琶ヲ
鳴テシムル程ニ、盤涉調ニ鳴ニ、博雅聞テ尤有興。啄木ハ盤涉調
也。『今夜此弦鳴定ヲ欲弾カ』ト思テウレシ克思間、目暗獨遣心
て、人モノキニ、詠歌云。

アフサカノセキノアラシノケハシキニ、シキテゾキタルヨヲ
スグストテ

ト詠テ、鳴絃ニ、博雅流涙テ啼泣ス。『好道アハレナリ』ト思ニ、
目暗獨又云、『アハレ有興夜カナ。若我ナラヌスキモノヤ、今夜世
間ニアラムナ。今夜心得クラム人ノ来遊セヨカシ。物語セム』ト獨
云ヲ聞テ、博雅出音云、『博雅コソ参タレ』ト云ケレバ、目暗云、
『タレニカオハスル』ト問ニ。然也答、目暗ヲトニ聞ケレバ感ジテ
物談シテ、遺心。令傳件曲云々。博雅依不隨身琵琶、只以譜書請帰
云々。諸道之好者可如此也。近代作法誠以不可有。サレバコソ上手
ハ諸道ニ無事也。誠以アハレナリ』ト被談ニ、

又問云、「件曲近代アリヤ。」
被答云、「不然。」
又問云、「件目暗名如何。」
被答云「惛不覚。但千歳ト云カヤト」云々。
又問云、「横笛ハ博雅極テ候モノカ。」
被答云、「第一也。無競者。皇代国飛施を第一ノ曲ニ用也。伝者
少。件人所傳也云々。
永久三年八月十三日隨書得書之。
This long anecdote also appears almost verbatim in Book 3 of the Ruijūbon Recension of the Gōdanshō, wherein various fragmentary descriptions of legendary musical instruments are gathered. Also, a slightly modified version of the same story, with additional commentary, is included in Book 24 of the Konjaku monogatarishū. This is a particularly unique anecdote in the Kanda Recension, because although written in katakana, it is the only conversation that contains waka poems. In the Ruijūbon, for example, a total of eleven waka appear in the Gōdanshō, but considering the size of the compilation (a total of 445 tales), the rarity of Masafusa’s reference to waka should be acknowledged. Because the first poem composed by the blind man, “The storm/is severe at the Barrier/of Ōsaka,” appears at the very end of Book 18 (Miscellaneous Poems III) in the Shinkokin wakashū (1205), along with the poet’s name Semimaru (鰐丸), the impact of this anecdote on the collective mind of Japanese courtiers at the turn of the thirteenth century is palpable, even in terms of the reception of this waka alone.

This vignette is crucial to the present study not only because of its inclusion of two waka,

45 SNKBT 32, pp. 97-100.

46 For example, in the Konjaku monogatarishū, Hiromasa is introduced as “the son of the person called His Highness of War, who was the son of [Emperor] Daigo [lit. “Engi”] (延喜ノ御子ノ兵部卿ノ親王卜申人ノ子). (SNKBT36, p. 427.) Likewise the blind man in the Konjaku is called by the name, Semimaro (鰐丸). It even provides a background story that Semimaro served as a “page” (雑色, zōshiki) to one of the sons of Retired Emperor Uda. For an English translation of the Konjaku tale, see Ury, trans. Tales of Times Now Past, pp. 143-46.


48 The modern commentators in the SNKBT edition of the Shinkokinshū, Tanaka Yutaka and Akase Shingo mention in their interlinear note that the placement of this poem at the end of Book 18 corresponds to that at the opening of the volume, of a series of twelve poems composed by Sugawara no Michizane, here respectfully called “Sugawara Chancellor” (菅贈太政大臣). (SNKBT 11, p. 539.) It may be possible to attribute to Masafusa the popularization of the Semimaru poem in question (although Masafusa does not identify it as such) and the deification of Michizane in the Shinkokinshū.
but because of its similarity to the other Gōdanshō anecdotes examined above, regarding Emperors Daigo and Murakami’s passion for Chinese literature. Just as Masafusa introduced the vignette of Emperor Murakami’s “debate” with Sugawara no Fumitoki by saying, “This is most interesting,” and piqued the curiosity of the listener, Masafusa begins his storytelling with the phrase, “This is most interesting” (尤有興事也). His description of Hiromasa and his abnormal passion for music (“Stealthily he stood by the entrance of the man’s house and listened carefully... [for three years]”) resonates with Murakami’s persistence in knowing the winner of the poetry match. Also the portrayal of Hiromasa “shed[ding] tears and sobb[ing],” when he heard the blind man reciting his second waka while tuning the biwa on that fated evening, reminds us of how Murakami was also moved to tears when Fumitoki told him the “poetic” truth.

What is so significant about this vignette is that Masafusa succeeds in explaining the psychological origins of a passion for the arts, that can cause grown-up men, even emperors, to express strong emotions (“weeping, sobbing, shedding tears”). Instead of censuring such displays, Masafusa (through the voice of Hiromasa) marvels at (アハレナリ) the old man’s commitment to the “Way of Arts” (好道, suki no michi, lit. “the Way of passion”) and “those who understand [such a way of] things in various fields” (心得サラム人).

The notion of suki (数寄・好き, “passion”) is a key to understanding insei culture, because references to historical figures, mostly waka poets and musicians from the tenth and eleventh centuries, who lived up to this highly poetic ideal abound in setsuwa narratives from the
insei period. In the words of Kinoshita Hanako (木下華子), “[i]n a broader sense, suki is the spirit of passion, such as a single-minded enthusiasm for certain things,” or, “[i]n the narrow sense, suki refers to the spirit of passion which entails a certain aspect of surprise (‘ah!’) manifested through abnormal behavior that transcends conventional values.”

Although Kinoshita’s study mainly focuses on the waka poet Kamo no Chômei’s (鴨長明, 1155?-1216) discussion of eccentric waka poets in his waka treatise, Mumyōshō (無名抄, Nameless Book, ca. 1211-16) such as Minamoto no Yorizane (源頼実, 1015-44), who prayed for one “superb waka” (秀歌) in exchange for his own life, and actually died young; and the monk Tören (登蓮, ?-1182), who despite heavy rain, attempted to visit a man who supposedly knew the secret of the poetic term (歌語) masuho no susuki (ますほの薄, “pampas grass of Masuho”), her general understanding of “suki as an assessment made by others, and therefore a constructed concept” is highly insightful. In other words, in general, suki is applied retrospectively to certain biographical details of historical figures. Kinoshita points out that there is a hiatus of about one century between the action taken by those who embodied suki (such as Yorizane and

---

49 For a list of exemplary sukimonono (すきもの, those who live up to the ideal of suki), see a list provided in Kimura Ken’s article. (Kimura, pp. 26-7.)


51 狭義には、そのような愛好精神が世俗的価値を超えるような、平たく言えば常軌を逸した行為となって現れ出た「鳴呼」とも称すべき側面を持つもの. Ibid.

52 「数寄」とは、他者による判断、作られた概念なのである. Ibid.
Tōren) and Chōmei’s appraisal of them. Calling the individuals associated with the spirit of *suki sukimono* (すきもの), the literary scholar Kimura Ken makes the following comment:

The fact that various *setsuwa* concerning *sukimono*, hidden in people’s lives before the medieval period came to be rediscovered and recorded in texts from the early medieval period [the *insei* period] suggests the emergence of the tendency to understand and evaluate the meaning of *suki*, embodied by those *sukimono* figures, rather than simply indicating that they thrived in the earlier centuries.

Masafusa’s anecdote about Hitomasa and the blind musician also falls into the pattern of *insei* literature in which historical figures’ extraordinary passion for artistic activities is recollected retrospectively. Why did the *insei* period witness the rise of *setsuwa* narrative that “rediscovered” *sukimono* from previous centuries? In other words, by romantically reconstructing the lives of *sukimono* figures from the past centuries, what were authors in the *insei* period attempting to convey to their contemporaries? To answer this question, we need to examine once again what we mean by an “abnormal” passion for arts, or “abnormal” behavior. In this regard, the following comment by Kimura helps contextualize “abnormality” in the particular historical situation of tenth-through-twelfth-century Japan:

---

53 一世紀のタイムラグ. Ibid.

54 中世以前の生活の裏面に隠されていた「すきもの」の話が、中世初頭の文献において、あらためて発掘され、記されていることは、換言すれば、前代において「すきもの」たちが横行した、というよりも、「すきもの」たちが具現した「すき」の意味を把握し、意義づけるといった傾向が、この時代になってあらわれてきたことを示すものであろう。Kimura, p. 28.
Sukimono are those individuals who strived for the world in which they themselves believed in, discovered new ways of living and became highly self-conscious about it. They did not concern themselves with existing values and the social order, nor were they disturbed by their relatively low status in society, during the mid-Heian period, when the imperial state gradually began to disintegrate.55

Because Hiromasa was the grandson of Emperor Daigo, he was not a sukimono in the formal sense as Kimura defines. Kimura’s reference to “their relatively low status in society” is more appropriate for middle-ranking, male officials of the zuryō class, such as the Group of Six Waka Poets (see Chapter Three). Instead, the abnormality in Hiromasa’s behavior was his insistence on seeking the companionship of a lowly blind man in a deserted mountain. Unlike the late twelfth century setsuwa narratives, such as Chômei’s Mumyōshō, Masafusa’s anecdotes in the Kanda Recension of the Gōdanshō features emperors and their offspring discovering new ways of appreciating literature and art. For these people, “the existing values” were the Confucian ideal of state building through literary activity.

We tend to associate Emperor Daigo and Murakami with the first two imperially commissioned waka anthologies, Kokinshū and Gosenshū, compiled under the auspices of these respective emperors. But at the dawn of the insei period, Masafusa did not extol them for their prowess as rulers. Instead, Masafusa crafted new images of these two emperors as literati who “loved Chinese literature”s (文章ヲ好[ヲ者]), in the words of the editor of the Konjaku monogatarishū. For that matter, Masafusa’s “secret teachings” about Sugawara no Fumitoki’s

55しかし実はその「すきもの」こそ、平安中期、王権も次第に崩れをみせはじめ、逼塞した状況の中で、従来の価値観や秩序にこだわることなく、それ故、身分の低さなどはぼかることなく己が信ずる世界に向いてつき進む、新しい生き方を見出し、自覚し始めた連中に他ならなかった。Ibid., p. 26.
fan-shaped ballad was not so much about the interpretation of the poem per se, but about Fumitoki’s extraordinary perseverance in perfecting the poem (“[Fumitoki] worked on it carefully without a moment’s rest for three years”), and Minamoto no Shitagō’s insensitivity to Fumitoki’s devotion to the art of kanshi composition.

While Masafusa refers to the master-disciple relationship between Hitomasa and the blind man as the Way of the Arts (好道, suki no michi), it should be noted that this relationship is based solely on a mutual acknowledgment of a commitment to the arts, in this case musical performance, and that their mutual respect and trust is based on it. Because of Hiromasa’s conviction about the blind man’s talent in playing the biwa, he begins his quest for the man by dispatching his servant. The blind man, on the other hand, “already knew about Hiromasa,” when he decided to share the secret teaching with him. The tale implies that as long as the two parties involved are genuine seekers of the Way of Music, their differences in social standing and the fact that they are not related by blood do not matter. This also alludes to Masafusa’s relation to Fujiwara no Sanekane, who was supposed to have recorded Masafusa’s speeches. In other words, the Way of the Arts, unlike the old kangaku scholarship of the Kidendō in the State Academy, was fundamentally open to everyone committed to or passionate about the arts.

Finally, the Way of the Arts was mediated through written texts. What makes Hiromasa’s anecdote so characteristic of the twelfth century is its reference to the textual transmission of knowledge as an ideal method of teaching. Masafusa’s detailing the fact that “Hiromasa did not bring his biwa with him, [and thus] he received the transmission [of the secret of how to play The Streaming Fountains and Woodpeckers] only through notation” (只以譜傳請帰), and the statement, “all disciples of the arts should be like this” (諸道之好者可如此也) characterize the
Way of Arts as a new mode of intellectual activity, beyond the limitations of lineage and social status. In this regard, the fact that Masafusa considered this anecdote “most interesting” indicates that although he was the scion of a prestigious Confucian scholars’ family, he was also an avid enthusiast of a new style of intellectual exchange—the one based on the transmission of written texts rather than oral teachings, which was to flourish in medieval Japan.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I first attempt to clarify the characteristics of some of the major extant copies of Masafusa’s Gōdanshō. I argue that while the most widely used Ruǐjūbon Recension is more preferable than its earlier counterparts in terms of the large number of selected tales (a total of 445), it should to be regarded as a byproduct of the century-long reception of the body of texts loosely identified as Masafusa’s Gōdanshō, and thus be used with discretion. In the present study, I rely on the earlier Kanda Recension (ca. 1111-15, 50 tales) as much as possible, not because its relatively early date proves its resemblance to the urtext of the Gōdanshō (if such a text ever existed), but because as an artifact from the early twelfth century, I wish to present and analyze it as it is.

In the second part of this paper, I examine anecdotes pertaining to Emperors Daigo and Murakami in the Gōdanshō. In conjunction with my analysis of a lengthy Gōdanshō anecdote that features Daigo’s grandson Hiromasa, I argue that Masafusa’s glorification of these rulers was based on his belief in the Way of the Arts (suki no michi), by which Masafusa positively appraised these emperors’ passion for, if not obsession with artistic activities, in particular the composition of Sino-Japanese poems. The notion of suki frequently appears in waka treatises
from the *insei* period, such as the *Tōshiyori zuinō*, the *Fukurozōshi*, and the *Mumyōshō*, in
association with the waka poet Nōin and his followers. Masafusa’s positive assessment of
literary-minded emperors from the early tenth century enables us to attribute the popularization
of *suki*, a concept that brilliantly characterizes *setsuwa* narratives from the *insei* period, to him,
and also to discern its
early association with literati culture, epitomized by the act of the composition of Sino-Japanese
poems.
Chapter Seven

Minamoto no Toshiyori’s Eccentric Theories of Waka in the *Toshiyori zuinō*

Introduction

The previous chapter examined the pivotal role the scholar-official Ōe no Masafusa played in the formation of the new literary genre of *setsuwa* at the beginning of the twelfth century. Through my analyses of the Kanda Recension (1114-15) of the *Godanshō*, I documented the peculiar way in which Masafusa decided to impart the secret teaching of the Kidendō canons, hitherto transmitted only within his family, to Fujiwara no Sanekane (1085-1112), a young Confucian scholar, rather than to his “mediocre” offspring. Masafusa’s decision was essentially guided by his pragmatic view that no household documents would survive forever, and thus his family’s legacy as the purveyor of Kidendō scholarship would outlive him only when recorded in writing by a qualified individual like Sanekane.

However, some of the most memorable anecdotes in the Kanda Recension reveal that Masafusa was concerned with the abnormal “passion” (*suki*) that some of the historical emperors, their offspring, and their retainers displayed in the composition of Chinese and other literary activities, rather than commenting on specific interpretations of canonical texts. Therefore, by discussing how the collection of Masafusa’s spoken discourse, *Gōdanshō*, offers a prototype of the so-called *setsuwa* (anecdotal tales) narrative in the early twelfth century, I investigated another aspect of Ōe no Masafusa’s legacy as the first critic of *insei* Japan.

This chapter turns to the *Toshiyori zuinō* (俊頼雑識,*Toshiyori’s Principles of Waka*, ca. 1111-15), written by Masafusa’s contemporary, the courtier Minamoto no Toshiyori (源俊頼,
1055-1129), and further explore the relation between *setsuwa* and the poetic ideal of *suki*. I first provide a brief biography of Toshiyori and explain that the *Toshiyori zuinō* was originally conceived as a handbook on the composition of waka for a future empress. By focusing on Toshiyori’s commentary to a poem which contains the phrase, “the man who used to pick bitter herbs” (*seri tsumishi hito*), I discuss how Toshiyori attracted his female audience through mildly didactic but entertaining anecdotes about the history of the expression.

I then propose a new interpretation of Toshiyori’s commentary on “the man who used to pick better herbs,” in which he introduces the bizarre tale of a male janitor working in the imperial palace, who falls in love with an empress after having improperly watched her eating bitter herbs while she was behind a screen. The motif of love that transcended social status was a common topic in prose literature from earlier centuries, such as the *Ise monogatai* (*Tales of Ise*, ca. 947) and the *Genji monogatari* (*Tale of Genji*, early 11th century). Often referring to noble or middle-ranking gentlemen who became infatuated with women from the lower classes, these *suki mono* (“men of *suki*”) figures represented one aspect of the private lives of Japanese aristocrats during the tenth and eleventh centuries, whose affairs were often mediated through the exchange of waka poems. ¹ The ingenuity of Masafusa’s *Gōdanshō* was that it transformed the somewhat pejorative image of *suki* into a more positive, aesthetic, and laudable way of living, exemplified by Emperors Daigo and Murakami’s pursuit of “poetic truths” (*iware*) in their composition of Chinese poems. I argue that by means of his animated discussion of the humble palace cleaner

¹ See for example, section 40 of the *Ise monogatai*; and also the so called “Discussion on a Rainy Evening” (雨夜の品定) passage in the “Bloom Tree” (庭木) chapter of the *Genji monogatari*, wherein male fictive characters, including Genji, exchange opinions about various “issues related to *suki*” (すきごとども) and examples of “those who embody the spirit of *suki*” (世のすきもの) who exhibit a tendency to pursue romantic affairs with women belonging to lower classes. SNKBT 19, pp. 32-59.
who fell in love with an empress, Toshiyori also illuminates the familiar trope of suki mono, adding an even more poignant note by describing the lowly man’s unrequited love.

I further discuss how waka poets in the mid-twelfth century began to compose poems on such topics as “Poor Folk’s Love” (貧恋) and “Overreaching Love” (不知身程恋). These topics (題, dai) suggest that by this time, the composition of waka was not merely a means for individual poets to express their thoughts and feelings, but also a testing ground for their knowledge of narrative situations based on existing literature, that demonstrated the essence of the given topics. Called “poetic essence” (本意, hon’i), this form of literary knowledge epitomizes the ethos of the insei period, along with setsuwa narratives.

Finally, I examine Toshiyori’s own espousal of the poetic notion of suki in his “abnormally” passionate act of writing the Toshiyori zuinō. Indeed, exceeding over two hundred pages in modern editions, the Toshiyori zuinō is not merely a commissioned textbook on waka written for a Fujiwara regent’s daughter. As Toshiyori himself acknowledges in the opening section, it is one-man curatorial collection of material from the written and spoken traditions dealing with ancient poetic lore, sustained through his “passion” (suki) for the language and his commitment to preserve it. If Ōe Masafusa improved upon the notion of suki by implicitly associating it with learned emperors who cared about literature to the point of humbling themselves for the sake of the attainment of poetic truth, Toshiyori redefined it as a spiritual principle, the wholehearted acceptance of which was a prerequisite for waka poets of the mid-twelfth century, whose rigorous philological labors eventually formed the Way of waka. In other words, by demonstrating a spiritual foundation for future waka poet-scholars through his act of
writing the *Toshiyori zuin*, Toshiyori made possible the evolution of waka from a casually practiced local custom to a profession, a respectable “Way.”

1. Short Biography of Minamoto no Toshiyori

Toshiyori’s father, Minamoto no Tsunenobu (源経信, 1016-97), was a gifted courtier, whose talents in the “Three Vessels” (三船の才)—Chinese literature, waka and music—rivalled those of the eleventh-century courtier, Fujiwara no Kintō. Accordingly, Tsunenobu received the Senior Second Rank (正二位), was appointed Grand Counselor (大納言) in 1091, and became Acting Governor of Dazaifu (太宰權帥) in 1094. Upon his death in Dazaifu, the governorship was taken over by Masafusa.

The highest rank Toshiyori achieved was a modest Junior Fourth (從四位), and thus, he never became a Senior Noble; his highest post was Acting Director of Carpentry (木工權頭). Although his father provided strong support for his promotion, Toshiyori was never appointed to serve as a provincial governor. Before taking part in waka contests at court, Toshiyori served as a court musician performing on the *hichiriki* (篳篥), a double-reed wind instrument. In the words of the modern literary historian Hashimoto Fumio (橋本不美男, 1922-91), Toshiyori had “little talent in the composition of kanshi,” and was “an artistic type of person, shy, and with little practical skill or scholarly aptitude.”

2. 詩之道には暗かった。/性格的にも内気で、事務能力も、学才もない、芸術家肌の人であつたらしい。Hashimoto, p. 140. Alternately, Hashimoto mentions that “Toshiyori [the third son of Tsunenobu] inherited most of his father’s talent in waka and music, but was not blessed with his other skills.” (俊頼は、父の和歌・音楽の才能をもつとも強くうけたか否りに、他のすべての才能にはめぐまれなかった人であったと推定しても誤りなからう。) Ibid.
However, according to Hashimoto’s biographical study of Toshiyori,\(^3\) he became an active member of Emperor Horikawa’s (堀河天皇, 1079-1107, r. 1086-1107) literary salon, in part because Horikawa, himself a virtuoso bamboo flute player, appreciated Toshiyori’s talent in music and waka.\(^4\) Toshiyori is perhaps best known to posterity as one of the sixteen waka poets in the *Horikawain hyakushu waka* (堀河院百首和歌, *One Hundred Poem Sequence of Emperor Horikawa’s Era*, ca. 1105-06, also called *Horikawa hyakushu*), which included Ōe no Masafusa. Masafusa is thought to have devised one-hundred topics (題, dai) for this event.\(^5\)

In 1124, Retired Emperor Shirakawa (1053-1129, r. 1072-86, Horikawa’s father) honored Toshiyori by asking him to single-handedly compile the fifth imperial anthology of waka, *Kinyōwakashū* (金葉和歌集, *Collection of Golden Leaves*). As briefly discussed in Chapter Four, due to Toshiyori’s handling of poems composed by Shirakawa’s half-brother, Prince Sukehito (輔仁親王, 1073-1119), early drafts of the *Kinyōshū* were returned twice by Shirakawa and revised in 1125 and 1126, respectively. Toshiyori’s father, Tsunenobu, was disgruntled by the fact that a junior court official and Shirakawa’s “confidant” (kinshin) Fujiwara no Michitoshi (藤原通俊, 1047-99) was appointed to compile the fourth imperial waka anthology, *GoShūi wakashū* (後拾遺和歌集, *Collection of Gleanings of Japanese Poems II*, 1086), and wrote a polemical treatise entitled *Nan goshūi* (難後拾遺, *Anti-GoShūishū*, 1086). In this regard, at least as a compiler of an imperial waka anthology, Toshiyori surpassed the legacy of his father.

---

3. Hashimoto, pp. 135-45.
4. Accordingly, Hashimoto calls Horikawa an “Emperor of suki” (数寄の帝王). Ibid.m p. 143.
5. For a detailed study, see “kaidai” in WBT 15, pp. 310-18.
Toshiyori’s own anthology of waka, *Sanboku kikashū* (散木奇歌集, *Collection of Eccentric Poems by Toshiyori Without Rank*, ca. 1128) is a massive book containing some 1620 poems. The fact that Shukaku Hosshinnō (守覚法親王, 1150-1202) commissioned the waka poet-scholar Kenshō (顕昭, ca. 1130-ca. 1209) to write a commentary to the *Sanboku kikashū* in 1183 suggests the extent of influence Toshiyori enjoyed as a waka poet throughout the *insei* period.  

2. *Toshiyori Zuinō* as a Textbook for a Future Empress

From a description in the chapter, “The Emperor’s Personal Correspondence” (玉章, *tamazusa*) in the *Imakagami*, which mentions “an instruction book on the composition of waka, presumably written by the Director of Carpentry [Toshiyori] for Her Cloistered Kōyō, when she was still known as the daughter of His Excellency [Fujiwara Tadazane]” (木工頭も高陽院の大殿の姫君と聞え給ひ時、作りてたてまつり給へりとか聞ゆる、和歌の詠むべきやうなど待る書), and another similar description in the colophon of Kenshō’s Recension (顕昭本), a version of the *Toshiyori zuinō*, the *Toshiyori zuinō* was written for Fujiwara no Isako (藤原勲子, 1094-1155), the daughter of Regent Fujiwara no Tadazane (藤原忠実, 1078-1162). Isako, also known as Taishi (泰子), married Retired Emperor Toba (鳥羽天皇, 1103-56, r. 1107-23, Horikawa’s son) in 1133. In other words, Toshiyori originally wrote the *Toshiyori zuinō*–one of

---

6. Kenshō’s commentary, entitled *Sanbokushū chū* (散木集注) addresses ninety-nine poems from Toshiyori’s collection.


8. For a detailed study of various recensions of the *Toshiyori zuinō*, including the Kenshō Recension and the most popular, Teika Recension, see Akase Tomoko, pp. 33-74.
the most widely disseminated waka treatises in the twelfth-century, for the general education of a future empress.

The *Toshiyori zuinō* is a voluminous text. For instance, the oldest manuscript version, the Teika Recension (定家本, transcribed under the auspices of the poet Fujiwara no Teika in 1237, complete facsimile in RSS 79) is made up of 244 pages (122 leaves), bound into fourteen fascicules. Hashimoto Fumio’s modern edition, based on the National Diet Library Recension (国会本)—a mid-Edo copy of the Teika Recension, is also over 200 pages in length. Whether Toshiyori wrote this extensive text exclusively for Isako is somewhat questionable. More likely, he hoped that the book would circulate widely among waka poets. However, Toshiyori’s intended readers were, unmistakably, young women; the text is replete with anecdotes that feature women, both historical and fictional, ancient and contemporary, and Japanese and Chinese. Some of Toshiyori’s comments are overtly didactic. Also, the fact that the earliest surviving text, the Teika Recension, is written predominantly in *kana* (Japanese syllabary) with a minimal use of Chinese characters attests to a female readership in the early reception of the *Toshiyori zuinō*.

Some of the memorable (and often puzzling) references to women in the *Toshiyori zuinō* include: Emperor Shōmu (聖武天皇, 701-56, r. 724-49), whom Toshiyori misidentifies as a woman9; Toshiyori’s own grandmother, the Nun Takakura10; “a woman [who] pursues an

---


10. たかくらのあまうへ. Ibid., p. 40ウ.
extramarital affair”\textsuperscript{11}; “when the emperor had many consorts, he announced that the consort who could succeed in making a bird sing would become an empress […]”\textsuperscript{12}; the Chinese Emperor Wu (武帝) “especially favored a female attendant”\textsuperscript{13}; “In the past, the lady called Kyōgoku Haven was Minister Tokihira’s daughter”\textsuperscript{14}; “Women in the past had a very different way of thinking compared to women today”\textsuperscript{15}; “Prince Shitateru is the wife of Prince Amewaka.”\textsuperscript{16}; “This [poem] was composed by a person called Ise Priestess the Consort during Emperor Murakami’s reign, when she lived in a place called Nagaoka […]”\textsuperscript{17}; “This [poem is associated with this anecdote, regarding] a daughter of an officer in Ōmi province, who was exceptionally comely, […]”\textsuperscript{18}; “This [poem] is composed about a mediocre woman who desperately wanted to have a child […]”\textsuperscript{19}; \textit{renga} (linked verse) exchanged between Ōe no Masahira and his wife Akazome Emon\textsuperscript{20};

\textsuperscript{11} 女の、みそかごとする折りに. SNKBZ 87, p. 120.

\textsuperscript{12} 女御の、あまたおはしけるに、この鳥鳴かせたらむ女御を、後にはたてむと[…] Ibid., p. 124.

\textsuperscript{13} 采女なりける人を、たぐひなくおぼしけり. Ibid., p. 133.

\textsuperscript{14} 昔、京極の御息所と申しける人は、時平の大臣の御むすめなり. Ibid., p. 137.

\textsuperscript{15} むかしの、女の心は、今様の、女の心には、似ざるけるにや. Ibid., p. 143.

\textsuperscript{16} 下照姫は、天栄みこの妻なり. Ibid., p. 163.

\textsuperscript{17} これは、村上の御時に、斎宮の女御と申しける人の、長岡といへる所に、住み給ひける時 […] Ibid., p. 181.

\textsuperscript{18} これは、近江の国にありける郡司のむすめ、ことのほかに、容姿のよくて […] Ibid., p. 185.

\textsuperscript{19} これは、いとしもなき女の、子ほしげなるをみて、かやうに申し. Ibid., p. 187.

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., p. 191. For my discussion of Masahira and Akazome Emon’s exchange waka poems featured in the \textit{Konjaku monogatarishū} and the \textit{GoShūishū}, see Chapter One.
poems that Akazome and another poet composed on the topic of Wang Shaojun (王昭君, active BC 33\(^2\)); a poem on Yang Guifei (楊貴妃, 719-56\(^2\)); ”To make a distinction between a good and a bad poem is an extremely difficult task. Incidentally, Fujiwara no Kintō asked his son, “Which is superior, Izumi Shikibu (active early eleventh century) or Akazome Emon (active 1041)? [...]”\(^2\).

The list reveals that Toshiyori widely featured both familiar topics, such as his own grandmother and then canonical female poets in Japan such as Akazome Emon and Izumi Shiibu,\(^2\) and women legendarily known through the Chinese Classics such as Wang Zhaojun and Yang Guifei. Particular attention is also paid to anecdotes that accentuate both morally laudable and controversial behaviors demonstrated by famous and anonymous women, suggesting that the Toshiyori zuinō could simply be enjoyed as a primer for young readers, rather than a waka treatise that contains certain authoritarian and practical teaching of waka composition.

3. Toshiyori zuinō as a Collection of Setsuwa

The Toshiyori zuinō is not an ordinary poetry treatise. It is neither a set of “principles of waka” (縦計, zuinō) as its later-added title suggests, nor an “instruction book about how to compose waka,” as it is referred to in the Imakagami. It is true that the book begins with

\(^{21}\) Ibid.; pp. 211-14.

\(^{22}\) Ibid., pp. 214-19.

\(^{23}\) さまざまなことを知らぬ事は、ことのほかのためしなめり。四条大納言、子の申納言の、「式部と赤染と、いづれかまされるぞ」と、尋ね申されければ [...] Ibid., p. 238.

\(^{24}\) Numerous poems composed by Izumi Shikibu and Akazome Emon are included in the GoShūishū (1086).
Toshiyori’s comments on the rudiments of waka, such as the variety of poetic forms, not limited to the thirty-one-syllable format; it continues with mistakes to be avoided in composition, euphemistically called “maladies” (病, yamai); the composition of poems on pre-assigned topics (題, dai); different poetic styles and examples thereof; the use and variety of utamakura (歌枕, “poetic places”); and a list of useful poetic vocabulary, starting with such common nouns as “heaven” and “earth.”

However, as Toshiyori moves on to provide commentary on individual poems, his narrative becomes freer and more digressive. As gleaned from some of the female-centered listed above, despite his attempts to provide conventional commentary, such as “This poem was composed by…,” the author seems unable to resist giving a detailed account of the poet, the poetic subject, or the particular circumstances in which a poem was composed, rather than simply analyzing the language of the poem. In this regard, like other literary texts form the insei period, such as Ōe no Masafusa’s Gōdanshō and the Konjaku monogatarishū, the Toshiyori zuinō is closer to a “collection of anecdotes” (説話集, setsuwashū), as conventionally called in modern scholarship, than a poetry treatise or poetic commentary per se. In the words of Komine Kazuaki, the Toshiyori zuinō is an embodiment of textual “kinetics, through which waka and setsuwa compete with one another and yet amalgamate.”

Moreover, evinced from Toshiyori’s references to the noted Chinese women Wang Zhaojun and Yang Guifei, the Toshiyori zuinō contains commentaries on some fifteen waka.

25. For my discussion of “waka maladies” (病, kabyō) in an eighth-century waka treatise, Kakyō hyōshiki, see Chapter Three.

poems, which require a knowledge of the Chinese Classics to be understood. Referring to China as Morokoshi (もろこし, 唐土), Toshiyori details the various “sources” (本文, honmon) on which these poems are based. For instance, the following poem composed by a Kokinshū poet, Ki no Tomonori (紀友則, ?-905?) alludes to Chinese history:

In the autumn wind, I head the cry of The season’s first goose. I wonder whose letter It is carrying.

秋風に はつかりがねぞ きこゆなる。 たが玉づさを かけてきつらむ

Toshiyori recounts the honmon of this poem as follows: During “reign of a ruler called Emperor Wu of Han” (漢ぶてい[武帝]と申しけるみかどの御時に), “a person called Su Wu” (蘇武といへる人) was sent to “a place called Hu Sai [lit. “barbarian pass”]” (こそい[胡塞]といへる所); however, because he did not return to Wudi’s court within a few years, “a person called Wei Lü” (ゑいりつ [衛律]といへける人) was sent to look for Su Wu; Su Wu had been captured by Xiongnu (匈奴) in Hu Sai, and the local representative of the enemy lied to Wei Lü and said that Su Wu had died; Wei Lü replied, saying “Su Wu is not dead. This autumn, he wrote a letter attached to the foot of a goose and sent it to the emperor. The letter informed the emperor that Su Wu was still alive.” (蘇武は死なざるなり。この秋、雁のあしに、ふみを書いて、たてまつれり。その文を御覧じて、蘇武いまにあり、とはしろしめした

27. For a detailed discussion of Toshiyori’s commentary on Wang Zhaojun, see Chapter 3 of Okazaki Makiko’s book. (Okazaki, pp. 99-137). Komine also discusses a variety of “Chinese sources” (中国故事, chūgoku kojī) in the Toshiyori zuinō. (Komine, 2006, pp. 418-41.)

28. This poem also appears in the Kokinshū (Autumn I, 207).
The enemies realized that it was useless to conceal Su Wu, and brought him in the presence of his countryman.

Toshiyori presents this story, the details of which appear in the Chinese history *Han shu* (漢書, *The History of Han Dynasty*, ca. AD 82), without mentioning the name of that source. Except for the roundabout references to proper nouns (“a person called…”), the plot-oriented narration is consistent with the way he writes about Japanese topics. From the viewpoint of a female readership, on the linguistic level, Toshiyori’s method of introducing Chinese proper nouns is very similar to how names from the mythological histories are introduced in the interlinear *kochū* (古註, “old commentaries”) in the Japanese preface to the *Kokinshū*, which have been attributed to Fujiwara no Kintō.30 In association with this particular method of commentary, the literary scholar Nishimura Kayoko hypothesizes that Kintō wrote the *kochū* for female readers of the *Kokinshū*.31 Similarly, the circuitous way Toshiyori refers to Emperor Wu, Su Wu, Hu Sai, and Wei Lü suggests that he was not expecting his female reader(s) to be familiar with these names.

As Hashimoto Fumio has suggested, Toshiyori was “in a sense, uneducated.”32 Indeed, his aptitude for Chinese literary studies, in particular his skill in written Chinese, was probably inferior to that of his father and Ōe no Masafusa. However, Toshiyori’s explanation of Chinese

---

29. SNKBZ 87, pp. 132-3.

30. For discussion of the intertextuality between the Japanese preface to the *Kokinshū* (Kanajo) and the opening passage of the *Toshiyori zuinō*, as well as Kintō’s commentary to the Chinese preface to the *Kokinshū*, see Chapter 2 of Suzuki Norio, pp. 27-50.

31. Nishimura, pp. 18-31. See Chapter Three for my discussion of mid-to-late twelfth-century poet-scholar’s reception of the *kochū* in the Japanese preface to the *Kokinshū*.

32. いはゆる無学でもあった. Hashimoto, p. 143.
setsuwa suggest that not only did he have a basic knowledge of the Chinese Classics, he also had storyteller’s ability to make even ancient tales from China relevant to the lives of his readers.

4. The Man Who Used to Pick Bitter Herbs

One of the most curious anecdotes in the Toshiyori zuinō portrays Empress Saga (786-850, neé Tachibana no Kachiko 橘嘉智子) as a mischievous (if not explicitly “adulterous”) woman who “preferred sneaky affairs” (みそか事). Toshiyori reveals Kachiko’s habit of “sneaking out” (いで給ひける) of her imperial residence, and relates one particularly bizarre incident in which she “disguised herself as a fruit (or some type of snack food), concealed herself in a rectangular gift box, and was thus successfully carried away.” (いちどは、くだ物とおぼしきく、長欄にいてぞ、いで給ひける。33) Empress Saga is very unlikely to be caricatured in this matter because she was a devout Buddhist, and the founder of the Danrin Temple (檀林寺), the first Zen temple in Japan. Accordingly, Kachiko is also reverentially called Empress Danrin (檀林皇后).34 Toshiyori concludes the anecdote with even stranger details:

Perhaps, those lowly folks who were carrying her up knew [the purpose of her escapade]. So, in collaboration, they held her upside down, whereupon blood congealed in her face, which she found unbearable. This taught her a lesson, and after that she stopped making such excursions. Someone told this story–I only learned about it through hearsay.

33. SNKBZ 87., p. 149.

34. For more detailed study of Empress Saga, see for instance, Okazaki, pp. 381-86.
While demonstrating that the empress’ inappropriate behavior caused unpleasant consequences, Toshiyori does not appear to be concerned about either the source of this anecdote or its historical verisimilitude. More important, however, is the fact that the story has very little to do with the poem in question:

The man in the old legend  
Who used to pick bitter herbs everyday  
Is just like me;  
Perhaps his secret wishes  
Never came true.

Neither the author nor the source of this poem is known, but by the early twelfth century, the phrase “picking bitter herbs” (芹詰し) was commonly used as a metaphor for a situation in which a person’s desire was not fulfilled. For instance, Sanuki no Suke (讃岐典侍, ca.1079-?), a female attendant of Emperor Horikawa and the author of the diary, Sanuki no suke niki (讃岐典侍日記, Lady Sanuki’s Diary, ca.1107), refers to this phrase, when she was obliged to abruptly

---

35. Ibid.

36. In Chapter 12 of her book, Yamato kotoba hyōgenron: Minamoto no Toshiyori e (Theories on Literary Expressions in Classical Japanese: [My Response?] to Minamoto Toshiyori, 2008), Okazaki Makiko provides a detailed analysis of various anecdotes regarding the phrase “picking bitter herbs” (芹詰し). She points out that this expression first appears in the Makura no sōshi (枕草子, Pillow Book, ca. 1000?), in Section 245. In her commentary to Toshiyori’s poems (Sanbokukikashū #74), Sekine Yoshiko also points out that similar expressions are found in the Sarashina niki (更級日記, Sarashina Diary, ca. 1058), and the Sagoromo monogatari (狭衣物語, The Tale of Sagoromo, late eleventh century) in Book 3.
cease mourning her beloved master, Horikawa, and to take part in the inauguration ceremony of
the new emperor:

Even matters like this could not be carried out according to my wishes; instead of waiting for the
proper moment to change out of my mourning dress [which I donned upon the death of Retired
Emperor Horikawa], being forced to remove the [mourning robe] is upsetting. It indeed reminds
me of the old saying, “picking bitter herbs.”

Considering the widespread familiarity with the phrase at the time, especially among
female writers like Sanuki no Suke, it was considerate of Toshiyori to provide commentary for
the poem, from which the expression is taken. However, Toshiyori immediately confesses that
he does not know much about the poem: “I suspect that this has something to do with the notion
of “Offering Herbs” in the Chinese Classics, but I am not certain.” (これは、文書に、献芹と
申す本文なりとぞ、うたがへども、おぼつかなし。38) Instead of explaining what he means
by the Chinese concept of “Offering Herbs” (献芹, kenkin) Toshiyori introduces an anonymous
incident, which he heard in a “casual talk” (ただ物がたりに、人の申すは) […]: One day, “a
cleaner who was working the morning shift in the imperial palace” (九重のうちに、朝ぎよめ
する者) accidentally glanced at an empress eating bitter herbs behind a screen. The wind blew
the screen away just as he happened to be sweeping in the area. He instantly fell in love with

38. SNKBZ 87, pp. 147-8.
her, and as a way of attracting her attention, he “picked bitter herbs” (芹を摘みて) everyday and placed them beside her screen for years to come. Many years passed, and the man grew old and eventually died, although his desire to see the empress remained unrequited. The man’s daughter happened to be serving the empress, and one day she told the empress the story of her father, to which the empress replied: “Actually, I remember having been seen by someone like that, when I was eating bitter herbs one day.” (我こそ、芚をばくひて、さる者には見えたりしやうにはおぼゆれ。) Toshiyori continues the narrative: “This empress was called Empress Saga.” (その後、嵯峨の后をぞ申しける) And at this point, he digresses into the strange story about Tachibana no Kachiko.

Overall, Toshiyori’s exegesis is neither scholastic nor philological, but it is pedagogic; by associating the expression “picking bitter herbs” with the story of the unrequited cleaning man, and even with Tachibana no Kachiko, he made the otherwise obscure ancient poem accessible, and even enjoyable to his readers in the twelfth century. In other words, without Toshiyori, it is likely that an odd expression like “picking bitter herbs” would have become obsolete. And thus the Toshiyori zuin served its original purpose well: to educate an empress-to-be. Moreover, simply because of the comprehensiveness of topics covered (Toshiyori annotates over 200 waka in a manner similar to that cited above, although not all the poems receive the same lengthy

39. Citing Itō Hiroshi’s (伊藤博) article entitled “Seritsumi setsuwa wo megutte” (On the Anecdote ”Picking Bitter Herbs”), Okazaki discusses the similarity between this passage and the one in the “New Herbs–Part One” (若菜上) chapter of the Genji monogatari, wherein the male character, Kashiwagi, while playing kickball in a courtyard, peeps at Third Princess when a screen in her residence was accidentally rolled up by a cat, and falls in love with her.

40. Ibid., p. 149.

41. Ibid.
narrative explanations), the *Toshiyori zuinō* soon became a new standard, the first poetic *vade mecum* of the twelfth century.

5. The Reception of the *Toshiyori zuinō* during the *Insei* Period

In fact, references to the *Toshiyori zuinō* abound in poetry treatises from the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. However, they call the text variously, suggesting that Toshiyori himself did not designate a specific title for his work. For instance, Fujiwara no Norikane’s (藤原範兼, 1107-65) *Waka dōmōshō* (和歌童蒙抄, *Waka Commentary for Beginners*, 10 vols., ca. 1145-53) refers to the *Toshiyori zuinō* as *Toshiyori’s Treatise Without a Title* (俊頼無名抄);\(^{42}\) Fujiwara no Kiyosuke’s *Fukurozōshi* calls it the *Lord Toshiyori’s Commentary* (俊頼朝臣抄物); Fujiwara no Shunzei’s *Korai fūteishō* has *Lord Toshiyori’s Oral Teachings* (俊頼朝臣の口伝);\(^{43}\) Kenshō’s *Shūchūshō* (袖中抄, *Sleeve Book*, ca. 1186) as *Treatise Without a Title* (無名抄); Kiyosuke, Kenshō and Fujiwara no Tsunehira’s (藤原経平) catalog of books on waka, *Waka genzaishō mokuroku* (和歌現在書目録, *The Catalog of Extant Books on Waka*, ca. 1166-68) as *Collection of Toshiyori’s Oral Teachings* (俊頼口伝集); and Emperor Juntoku’s *Yakumo mishō* as *Toshiyori’s Oral Teachings* (俊頼口伝). In his polemic against Shunzei’s judgement of his poems at the *Roppyakuban utaawase* (六百番歌合, *Poetry Match in Six Hundred Rounds*, 1194) entitled *Roppyakuban chinjō* (六百番陳情, *Appeal Against Shunzei’s Judgement at the

\(^{42}\) NKT vol. 10, pp. 372, 374

\(^{43}\) KKS vol. 7, pp. 47, 91, 93, and also as *Toshiyori ason no kuden* (俊頼朝臣の歌の口伝) p. 68.
Roppyakuban utaawase), Kenshō calls the Toshiyori zuinō “a book called ‘Principles of Waka,’” which many people in society own (世人に人のあまた持て待る和歌雑紀に申す草子).”

Particularly, the identification of the Toshiyori zuinō as a collection of “oral teachings” (口伝, kuden) is important because it implies that in some cases, the text was simply read aloud and transmitted mainly from person to person; Toshiyori himself admits that he also gathered many of the anecdotes in informal contexts. In other words, challenging my assumption that the Toshiyori zuinō was a pivotal text in the transformation of waka from a mere custom to a fully-fledged academic activity, it is highly plausible that the Toshiyori zuinō was first received and disseminated orally. (It is also evident that in the case of Norikane and Kenshō, who call the Toshiyori zuinō a “treatise,” the text was from the beginning used as a written reference.) The following inscription in the colophon of the Teika Recension of the Toshiyori zuinō, the first three pages of which were copied by the waka poet Fujiwara no Teika (藤原定家, 1162-1241) himself, reveals how Teika first encountered the text:

As for this book [Toshiyori zuinō], I [first] heard it recited by someone during the Angen era (1175-77). Later, the manuscript was lost in a fire, and for over sixty years, I forgot about it, and could recall none of its contents. However, as recently as 1237, I unexpectedly encountered this book again, and [immediately] had it copied.

According to my late father [Shunzei], [his teacher] Fujiwara no Mototoshi thought that [this book] was extremely unreliable because Lord [Toshiyori] was a believer in naive opinions, and a collector of many fanciful thoughts.

此草子安元之比聞人讀
其本焼失六十余年忘
却不覺悟□□年嘉禎三

44. SNKBT 38, p. 477.
Interestingly, just as Toshiyori wrote the *Toshiyori zuinō* for Fujiwara no Isako, who was approximately twenty years old at the time of the book’s composition, Teika was in his mid-teens when he first heard the book. While some of the trivial incidents in the book, such as the story about Tachibana no Kachiko, might have been particularly enjoyable to the young listeners, Toshiyori’s contemporary and poetic rival, Fujiwara no Mototoshi (藤原基俊, 1060-1142), denounced Toshiyori for spreading “naive opinions” and “fanciful thoughts.” Furthermore, in the *Roppyakuban chinjō*, Kenshō wrote that he was “aware that the book [*Toshiyori zuinō*] contained many questionable ideas.”

In Mototoshi and Kenshō’s comments, we discern certain ambivalence toward *Toshiyori zuinō*. On the one hand, these poets acknowledge that the *Toshiyori zuinō* is an innovative text of importance, and thus deserves to be read by all waka poets, at the very least to familiarize themselves with what Toshiyori has to say about poetic lore. On the other hand, they are condescending toward Toshiyori, criticizing him for not being a rigorous philologist. In

---

45. RSS 79, pp. 488-9. I was unable to decipher some characters, here indicated by □.

46. For a detailed study of Fujiwara no Mototoshi, see Hashimoto, pp.87-135.

47. SNKBT 38, p. 477. Kenshō’s polemic, however, was directed at Fujiwara no Shunzei, who criticized Kenshō’s poem on the topic “Love in association with a robe” (*寄衣恋*), on account of the “text written by Lord Toshiyori” (*俊頼朝臣の書きたる物*). In other words, Kenshō expressed his reservation about the *Toshiyori zuinō* in order to question Shunzei’s opinion that was based on the text. Shunzei also recalls his debate with Kenshō over the interpretation of the word “kawayashiro” (*河社*) in his *Korai futeishō.* (KKS vol. 7, pp. 68-70.)
retrospect, it seems unfair to criticize Toshiyori for his lack of authenticity as a teacher, because by compiling such a wide range of existing discourses on waka, transmitted both orally and in writing, he paved the way for the revival of waka in the mid-twelfth century. In other words, because of its incompleteness, the Toshiyori zuinō set off a flood of scholarship about every aspect of waka—its origin, history, poets, major and minor works, diction, literary styles, manuscripts, and the relevance of waka for the aristocratic poet-scholars who carried out such investigations.

Toshiyori opened a pandora’s box, and his successors—such as Kiyosuke, Kenshō, and Shunzei—followed in his path and eventually elevated waka to a respectable scholastic discipline by recasting the corpus of poetic lore into a system of “ancient customs” (故実, kōjitsu), as in Kiyosuke’s Fukurozōshi; by rigorously supplementing many of Toshiyori’s incomplete discussions on poetic diction by researching their textual sources, as in Kenshō’s Shūchūshō; and by attempting to define poetic taste, while acknowledging the impossibility of such an endeavor, as in Shunzei’s Korai futeishō. In fact, Kiyosuke, in his waka treatise Ōgishō (奥義抄, Secret Commentaries, ca. 1124-44), refutes Toshiyori’s interpretation of the poem, “The man in the old legend/Who used to pick bitter herbs every day,” by proposing an alternative version of the tale in which the lowly cleaner is replaced by a young country boy called Mabukutamaru (まぶくた丸), and the empress by the daughter of a provincial lord. Likewise, in his Shūchūshō, Kenshō

48. NKT vol. 1, pp. 357-59. The basic plot of the anecdote (a young, lowly male protagonist strives to become a poet, scholar and eventually a Buddhist sage under the patronage of his female beloved, who is of much higher social status) appears strikingly similar to that of Monogusa tarō, an otogizōshi tale from the Muromachi period. However, in Kiyosuke’s treatment of the protagonist Mabukutamaru’s transformation from an uneducated young man to a Buddhist sage, I discern a departure from the standard trope of suki, often characterized by a lowly man’s unrequited love for a noble woman. Okazaki discusses this Ōgishō variant from the viewpoint of the further incorporation of Buddhist thought in medieval setsuwa, that eventually culminated in the late medieval discourse on Prince Shōtoku (聖德太
elaborates on “offering herbs” by citing a long passage from the Chinese literary anthology, *Wenxuan* (文選, sixth century AD). Neither of them mentions Tachibana no Kachiko, suggesting that they completely disregarded Toshiyori’s opinion on this matter.

6. The Influence of the *Toshiyori zuinō* on Waka Poems from the Twelfth Century

The influence of the *Toshiyori zuinō* on twelfth-century poets can also be measured by the ways in which particular details from Toshiyori’s teachings directly inspired poems and even poetic topics. For instance, Isako’s brother, Fujiwara no Tadamichi (藤原忠通, 1097-1164, Regent: 1121-58), an accomplished waka and *kanshi* poet, composed the following, demonstrating his familiarity with the phrase, “picking bitter herbs”:

“Poor Folks’ Love”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Poor Folks’ Love”</th>
<th>貪恋</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With the end in sight,</td>
<td>せりをだに</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I cannot even pick</td>
<td>つむべき末も</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitter herbs;</td>
<td>なき身哉</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How, then, can I show my feelings</td>
<td>いかでか心を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To my beloved?</td>
<td>人にみせまし</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

子, 574-622), generally called “Prince Shōtoku legends” (太子伝). (Okazaki, pp. 375-89.)

49. KKS 4, pp. 155-6.

Likewise, Toshiyori’s son Priest Shun’e (俊恵, 1113- active 1179), who hosted numerous poetry events at his monastic residence Karin’en (歌林苑, “Poets’ Garden”), composed the following two poems:

“Overreaching Love”

Why should you despair so much? Isn’t it true that in this world, there once was a man who used to pick bitter herbs?

Five poems composed on “Enduring the Pain of Love” at a Poetry Contest of One Hundred Sequences at the home of the Minister of the Right 右大臣家百首 忍恋五首

Perhaps she will know that my sleeves are wet from the dewdrops. From the bitter herbs I picked in the fields of Mikaki, no longer able to endure the pain of my love.

---


52. From the Rinyō wakashū (林葉和歌集, Collection of Grove and Foliage, collection of Shune’s poems, 6 vols, 1008 poems). (ST 2, p. 647, also cited in Okazaki, p. 394.)

Tadamichi’s poem and Shun’e’s first poem demonstrate how the pre-assigned topics, “Poor Folks’ Love” and “Overreaching Love,” evoked Toshiyori’s anecdote about the man who picked bitter herbs. Because the phrase “picking bitter herbs” was already widely known as an idiom by end of the eleventh century, these poems may be simply referring to a then-common expression. However, judging from the specificity of the ideas of “poverty” (貧) and “disregard for one’s own social status” (不知身程), it is highly plausible that not only Tadamichi and Shun’e, but also the anonymous innovators of these poetic opics had Toshiyori’s anecdote about the lowly janitor’s love for the empress in mind and expected the poets to allude to the story.

The topic of Shun’e’s second poem, composed at a Hundred-Sequence contest (百首歌) sponsored by Fujiwara no Kanezane (藤原兼実, 1149-1207, Tadamichi’s son, regent: 1186-96) in 1179 is more abstract, and its theme of “enduring pain” (忍) in pursuit of love can be associated with any individuals regardless of gender or social status. Despite the lack of specificity in the topic, this poem, composed not long before Shun’e’s death, succeeds in portraying the interiority of the herb-picker as something universal. Once detached from the quotidian work environment of the imperial palace, the custodian, no longer labeled as such, finds himself in the imaginative space called the field of Mikaki (御垣の原, lit. “fields of the Imperial Barrier”), an utamakura located in Nara.\textsuperscript{54} Often associated with the annal event of picking “young herbs” (若菜, wakana) in the First Month, the connotation of the place-name is

\textsuperscript{54} The combination of the phrase “picking bitter herbs” (芹摘みし) and the fields of Mikaki (御垣が原) appears in Toshiyori’s “long poem” (長歌, the format of which is not confined to 31 syllables) in the \textit{Horikawa hyakushu} on the topic, “Personal Reflections” (述懐). (The poem is partially cited in Okazaki, p. 394.) Okazaki points out that one of the poems in the “New Herbs–Part One” chapter of the \textit{Genji monogatari} also refers to Mikakigahara. (Ibid., p. 397.)
auspicious (e.g. “new year”), serene, and bucolic (e.g. it is usually noble young girls who pick the young herbs). Shun’e seems to suggest that in the fields of Mikaki, the poetic protagonist can no longer hide his love because his sleeves are soaked in tears, although indistinguishable from “dewdrops from the bitter herbs.”

Although this poem was not included in any imperial anthologies, the following poem composed by Taira no Tsunemori (平經盛, 1124-85) around the same time (ca. 1177-79) appears in the seventh imperial anthology, Senzai wakashū (千載和歌集, Collection of Japanese Poetry for Thousand Years, 1187):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Unknown</th>
<th>だいしらず</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What else can I do?</td>
<td>いかにせむ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The roots of the bitter herbs</td>
<td>みかきが原に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That I pick in the fields of Mikaki;</td>
<td>つむせりの</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audibly, I cry,</td>
<td>ねにのみなけど</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But no one will hear me.</td>
<td>しる人もなさき</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We cannot ascertain if Tsunemori (poignantly referred to in the collection as “anonymous” because of his clan’s dramatic downfall in 1185) composed this poem under the

---

55. For instance, Fujiwara no Shunzei composed the following poem:

霞たち
雪もきえぬや
み吉野の
みかきが原に
若菜摘みてむ
(Kyōan hyakushū: 803, ShokuGosenshū: 31, citer in UUD, p. 819.)

56. SNKBT 10, poem #668, p. 205.
influence of Shun’e or vice versa. However, it is easy to speculate why Fujiwara no Shunzei—the compiler of the Senzaishū—preferred Tsunemori’s poem to Shun’e’s. While the subject matter (unrequited love) and the imagery (picking bitter herbs in the fields of Mikaki) in the two poems are identical, Tsunemori’s use of the “pivot word” (kakekotoba, pun), ne, which means both the “roots” (根) of the herbs and the “sound” (音) of the man’s sobbing, is more creative than Shuné’s rather typical association of “sleeves” with “dewdrops.” In other words, Tsunemori’s poem is rhetorically more elaborate; the homonym ne turns the first three measures into a “preface phrase” (序, jo) that introduces the keyword, “sound,” at the beginning of the forth measure. The use of a preface phrase is archaic and novel at the same time, due to its association with the many “object poems” (寄物歌, kibutsuka) in the Man’yōshū. Tsunemori’s new appropriation of the phrase “picking bitter herbs” as a preface phrase suggests that the imagery associated with the expression itself had become so commonplace that it had to be rearranged differently, in the style of the Manyōshū poems.

Compared to Tadamichi, Shun’e and Tsunemori, Toshiyori’s own waka containing the phrase “picking bitter herbs” is surprisingly unimaginative:

At Director of Upkeep Akisue’s Rokujō residence, when people composed on ten poems on cherry blossoms

修理大夫顕季卿六条家にて、桜歌十首人々によませ待りけるに

57. Detailed analyses of some of the exemplary object poems from the Man’yōshū, see my article in Japanese, “Manyōshū maki jū no kibutsu ei ni okeru shizen to sōzōryoku no mondai ni tsuite” (『萬葉集』巻十の寄物詠における自然と想像力の問題について, On Nature and Imagination in Object Poems in Book Ten of the Manyōshū), in Ajia yūgaku 143, pp. 88-94.
I will not confess
That I had to pick bitter herbs.
Great is my fortune that now
I enjoy the view of cherry blossoms in full bloom,
In the light of the setting sun.

Toshiyori uses “picking bitter herbs” as a metaphor for some unrecognized efforts on his part, which cannot be identified from the information given in either the headnote (詞書, kotobagaki) or the poem itself. We can only surmise that Toshiyori is expressing his joy at viewing the cherry blossoms (or euphemistically at having been invited to the poetry gathering at Akisue’s residence), by implying that otherwise, he would have had to put up with some kind of hardship, the details of which he “will not confess.” The five poems discussed above suggest that while the poets of Toshiyori’s son’s generation placed the expression “picking bitter herbs” in the specific narrative context of the lowly cleaning man and the empress (even transcending the narrative framework with their own poetic imagination), Toshiyori himself simply chose to use the phrase as an idiom, and did not, overtly, draw poetic inspiration from any particular images evoked by the phrase. In other words, the fundamentally different treatment of the phrase “picking bitter herbs” by Toshiyori and a later generation of poets indicates that the “poetic essence” (本意, hon’i) associated with the phrase was established only after the dissemination of the Toshiyori zuinō.

7. Toshiyori’s Espousal of the Poetic Ideal of Suki in the Toshiyori zuinō

58. From Toshiyori’s poetry collection, Sanbokukikashū. (SKT, also in Sekine, vol. 1, p. 68, poem #74, also cited in Okazaki, p. 394.)
Indeed, it is easy to take issue with Toshiyori for not being critical enough with the poetic lore he introduces in the *Toshiyori zuinō*, or for not being imaginative enough in his handling of the poetic idiom. However, Toshiyori’s fundamentally non-judgmental approach to his poetic subjects also testifies his open-mindedness, his non-utilitarian, near-romantic yearning to be part of the poetic world. In this regard, Toshiyori’s life and work perfectly embodies the ideal of “poetic passion” (すき・数寄, suki), discussed earlier in conjunction with Nōin (Chapter 3), as well as Ōe no Masafusa’s *Gōdanshō* (Chapter 6). Like the Group of Six Waka Poets who idolized Nōin for his pursuit of the dictum, “Only because you love it, you compose waka!,” Toshiyori also revered Nōin. Toward the end of the *Toshiyori zuinō*, Toshiyori offers a vignette about him:

When Priest Nōin recited a poem, he always rinsed his mouth first; when he handled a book, he always washed his hands first. [Do not assume that] he acted like this casually. When a former governor of Sanuki, Fujiwara no Kenbō, (?-1069) went out riding with Nōin, the priest took the seat at the back of his ox-drawn carriage. [Just then, they approached] Second Avenue at East Tōin, the former residence of [the famous female poet from the early-tenth century] Ise. [In the residence there was] an extremely tall pine tree, which [once must have been] a small seedling from the Day of the Rat, planted with the tips of its branches knotted together. When the treetop came into view [of the two travelers,] Nōin [suddenly] stepped down from the back [seat] of the carriage in a somewhat agitated manner. Kanefusa did not understand Nōin’s actions, and asked, “What is the matter?” Nōin replied, “Wasn’t this pine tree knotted by the famous Ise? How can I pass such a [monumental] pine tree while seated in a carriage?” Thus saying, Nōin walked along for some distance and only took his seat in the carriage once the treetop had disappeared from his sight.

のういんほうしは、哥をもうがひして申し、さしょうををも、てあらひてとりもひろげる。たうちするかと思けれど、さぬきのぜむじけんぼうと申し・人の、のういんをくるまのしりにのせて、物
By portraying Nōin, the sage-like male poet, as deferential to Ise the poetess, Toshiyori seems to be emphasizing the important role women poets played in the history of waka for his female audience. More importantly, however, like many other anecdotes in the Toshiyori zuinō, this passage is linked to another loosely related story, in this case one which features Fujiwara no Kuniyuki (藤原国行), a waka poet (哥よみ), who traveled to northern Michinoku province in the mid-eleventh century. Toshiyori relates how Kuniyuki instructed his fellow poets, with whom he was having a banquet, “to tidy up their hair and put on fine clothing when they arrive at the Barrier at Shirakawa” (しらかはのせきすぎむひは、水びんかき、うちぎぬなどきてすぎよ), where Nōin composed the following famous poem:

I left
The capital
Together with the lingering haze,
But here at the Barrier of Shirakawa,
An autumn wind is blowing.

みやこをば
かすみとゝもに
たちしかど
秋風ぞふく
しらかはのせき

60. Goshūshū 518, Travel. (SNKBT 8, p. 169.)
According to Toshiyori, people laughed at Kuniyuki for having made such a strange request regarding their appearance, but Kuniyuki solemnly admonished his confreres: “If you wish to love (konomu) waka [lit. “this Way”], only by doing [what I told you to do], will you be able to compose [good] poems. (さりとも、「この道をこのまむとおばさむは、さやうにしてぞ、哥はよまれ絵はん」とぞ申ける。) Toshiyori wholeheartedly supports Kuniyuki’s idea and concludes the anecdote with the following statement: “Therefore, those who wish to love waka [lit. “this Way”] have to respect [these examples], even though we live in a degenerate age.” (それはこの道をこのまん物は、世のすふなりとも、かしこまるべきなぬり。)

This statement contains a key to understanding why poets in the mid-to late twelfth century considered the Toshiyori zuinō as a new standard for the emerging “Way of waka” (waka no michi). By associating the essence of the Way of Waka with spontaneous devotion (suki/konomu) to waka, Toshiyori seems to be proposing a new “Way” (michi) that is fundamentally different from the career-oriented and professionalized commitment to studies of Chinese classics (kangaku). Toshiyori’s method of retrospectively highlighting Nōin and Kuniyuki’s devotion to waka strikingly resembles the way Ōe no Masafusa portrayed Emperors Daigo and Murakami and their enthusiasm for the composition of kanshi, and Minamoto no Hiromasa with his passion for the biwa.

Nevertheless, it is wrong to assume that Toshiyori had such a firm belief in the Way of waka that he championed it as an alternative that would subvert the preexisting authorities of

61. RSS 79, p. 467.

62. Ibid.
kangaku studies. Had Toshiyori been more gifted in the composition of Chinese, and if he held a more prominent post in the imperial bureaucracy, like that of his father or of Masafusa, it might have been unnecessary for him to advocate the Way of Waka. Earlier, I mentioned that Toshiyori had been given the honor of compiling the Kinyōshū toward the end of his life. However, even an imperial commission gained him no promotion, and he took the tonsure shortly before his death.

It is thus not hard to imagine that midway through his career, Toshiyori experienced a personal crisis, around the time (ca. 1111-15) the regent Fujiwara no Tadazane commissioned him to write a textbook for his daughter. In the opening of the Toshiyori zuinō, he expresses his despair at being unrecognized and unappreciated by his imperial patron and by aristocratic society at large, while imploring Tadazane and his family to become the first patrons to restore dignity and honor to those who have single-mindedly dedicated their lives to the Way of waka:

Songs written in Japanese are a playful form of entertainment in Japan. They evolved in the age of gods and goddesses, but they are still composed today. In general, everyone born in this country is supposed to be pleased to learn them, be they male or female, lofty or lowly. However, those who have a passion for such things tend to make more progress, while those lacking in passion seem to have difficulty making any progress at all. [For Japanese people, not having Japanese songs] is for instance, analogous to a fish living in water without fins, or a bird flying in the sky without wings.

In general terms, the origins of waka have already been discussed in the Prefaces to the Kokinshū and in various waka instruction books. As time passed and the human mind grew more subtle, out of respect for the order of the seasons, people began to cherish flowers and plants; to anticipate the arrival of the cuckoo; to adore the colored foliage; to appreciate the whiteness of snow; to celebrate their sovereigns; to lament their misfortunes; to regret being separated from their loved ones; to recall past journeys; to yearn for romantic relationships; and to express their private wishes. As a result, in poetry, all available phrases have been exhausted,
and all possible words have been put to use. Thus, how can we, in this
degenerate age, compose new waka? Nobody truly understands waka, but
everyone knows at least something about it. Likewise, no one can
compose a truly excellent waka, but everyone can at least produce
mediocre verse. Those who cannot compose waka pretend to be able to do
so, and those who have only scanty knowledge of waka pretend to be
authorities on the subject.

Customarily, people attempted to teach waka to children, and to instruct
inexperienced poets by explaining the various styles of waka, by pointing
out the eight “maladies,” and by establishing nine criteria [for poetic
excellence]. Nevertheless, if one does not study [waka properly with a
teacher] and receive [correct instruction], it is hard to understand the
essence of waka. Likewise, if one does not memorize [poems by rote] and
study them with care, one can learn very little about waka. [Thereupon,] I
visited numerous unexplored caverns, now covered by bogwood, and also
attempted to collect old leaves of words, now washed away by the torrents
of a waterfall. Only then did I realize that [such words] are more numerous
than grains of sand on the shore; more infinite than the drops in a rain
shower. [Composing waka without a knowledge of ancient phrases] is like
trying to climb a mountain in a dense haze; or like hoping to enjoy the
countryside in autumn on a misty, overcast day. Even the vulgar language
of hunters and woodcutters in the mountains will disappear like the
morning dew, if no one carries out an investigation. Even the brilliant lines
composed by people living in bejeweled towers will be as dust blowing in
the wind, if no one pays attention to them.

How sad it is that the Way [of waka, kono michi] is perishing before my
very eyes! I have devoted myself to waka, spending long years in vain, but
not even the sovereign cares much about [waka]. People in society also
lack an understanding of it. From morning to night, I lament over my
personal misfortunes; every day and night, I regret people’s indifference.
Privately, I yearn for the great compassion of the Iwashimizu Hachiman
presiding in Otoko Mountain; publicly, I inscribe my wishes on the backs
of wisteria leaves blossoming at the Kasuga Shrine in Mikasa Forest. Help
me! Pity me! If only my private beliefs [in the Way of waka] could
actively move [the gods and goddesses]!

やまとみことの哥は、わが秋つしまのくにのたはぶれあそびなれ
ば、神よよよりはじまりて、けふ今にたゆる事なし。おほやまとの
くに、生まれなむ人は、男にても女にても、たかきもいやしきも、
このみならふべけれども、なさけある人はすゝみ、なさけなき物は
すゝまざる事か。たとへば、水にすむ魚のひれをうしなひ、空をかける鳥のつばさのおひざらむがごとし。

おぼよそ哥のをこり、古今の序、和哥の式にみえたり。世もあがり、人の心もたくみなりし時、春夏秋冬につけて、花をもてあそび、郭公をまち、紅葉をゝしみ、雪をおもしろしと思ひ、君をいはひ、わが身をうれへ、別れをゝしみ、旅をあはれび、いもせのなかをこひ、事にのぞみて思ひをのぶるにつけても、よみのごしたるふしみなく、つゝけもらせる詞もみえず。いかにしてかは、すゑの世の人、めづらしきさまにてもとりなすべき。よくしれるともなく、よくしらざるものし。よくよめるもなく、よくよまざるものし。ようれぬをもよみがほにおもひ、しこらざるをもしりがほにいふなるべし。

そもそもうたに、あまたのすがたをおから、やつの病をしるし、九のしなをあらはして、いときなき物をゝしへ、をろかなる心をさとらしむる物あり。しかはあれど、ならひつへざられ、さとる事かたく、うかべてまばばざれば、おぼゆることすくなし。むもれ木のむもれて、人にしられざるふしみをたづね、たきのながれにながれて、すぎぬることばのはをあつめてみれば、はまのまさごよりもおほく、雨のあしみよりもしげし。かすみをへだてゝ春の山にむかひ、ぎりむせびて秋のゝべにのぞめるかごときも。山がつのいやしきことばならど、たづねざれば、朝のつゆときえうせぬ。玉のうてなのがへなるみことならど、きゝしぜざれば、風のまへのちりとなりぬるにや。

あはれなる哉や。このみちのめのまへにうせぬる事を。とよりものみ一人、このことをいとなみて、いたづらにしつきをゝくれども、わがきみもさぎめてまはず。よの人もまた、あはれぶともなし。あけくれば身のうれへをなげき、おきふしはひとのつらざをうらむ。かくれてはおとくやまにましませるやつのはたのおほむうつくしみをまち、あらはれてはみかさのもりにさかえ給へるふぢのうらばにたのみをかく。めぐみ給へ。あはれ給へ。かくれたるしんあれば、あらはれたるかむある物をや。63 (Emphasis added.)

63. Transcribed from Reizeike Shiguretei Sōsho 79, pp. 1-3. To facilitate reading, I have added punctuation and voicing marks (潤点). I also consulted Hashimoto Fumio’s transcription. (Hashimoto,
This introductory section consists of four parts. First, Toshiyori discusses the origins of waka, or “songs in the Japanese language” (やまとみことの哥). His emphasis on the Japanese language suggests that Toshiyori is making a clear distinction between waka and kanshi. His assumption that “in general, everyone born in this country is supposed to be pleased [lit. “like it” このむ] to learn waka” also brings to fore the characteristic of waka as a native custom (ふうぞく), practiced by both men and women of all social status. Although Toshiyori does not state explicitly, formal training in kanshi composition was exclusive to male members of the aristocratic society. (However, instead of simply reiterating the commonsense notion that waka is a Japanese custom, Toshiyori emphasizes people’s spontaneous “liking” for waka.)

Secondly, Toshiyori explains the present status of waka. Acknowledging its long history, he points out that in poetry, “all available phrases are exhausted, and all possible words have been put to use.” This refers to the state of waka at the turn of the twelfth century, when as a result of the canonization of the “Three Imperial Anthologies” (三代集, Sandaishū), the Kokinshū, the Gosenshū and the Shūishū, all expressions that did not appear in these collections were considered inappropriate, thus greatly restricting the scope of poetic imagination. In fact, as discussed in Chapter 3, similar criticism against conservative taste in waka had already been made by Nōin in his preface to his own waka collection in the mid-eleventh century.

In the same passage, Toshiyori also points out that “Nobody truly understands waka, but everyone knows at least something about it. Likewise, no one can compose a truly excellent waka, but everyone can at least produce mediocre verse.” Here again he seems to be contrasting

---

Ariyoshi and Fujihira, eds. Karonshū, SNKBZ 87, pp. 15-17.) Hashimoto’s translation into colloquial Japanese tends to be too interpretive and somewhat misleading.
waka with kanshi; for a Japanese person, even to compose a mediocre verse or two in Chinese was difficult without learning the rudiments of the classical Chinese language. Toshiyori seems to suggest that unlike kanshi, waka is simple enough to be practiced as a custom, but probably because of its presumed simplicity, the essence of waka cannot be mastered, nor can one learn how to “compose a truly excellent waka.”

Thirdly, Toshiyori emphasizes the importance of “studying waka with a proper teacher,” and “memorizing poems.” This was probably his practical advice for Fujiwara no Isako, for whom the book was written, or for anyone who read the Toshiyori zuin in the hope of learning waka, conveying the message that waka cannot be learned from a textbook. (This is analogous to Ōe no Masafusa’s teachings about master-disciple discipline in the Kanda Recension of the Genji monogatari presents the author’s view on the subject, spoken by her fictive protagonist Genji in his conversation with Tamakazura:

[Prince Suetsumu] is knowledgeable about poetry collections and handbooks, and has perused them all. Obviously, she borrowed phrases from these books. But once-established expressions cannot be changed much. In the past, she sent me a book made of workshop-paper, which [her late father] Prince Hitachi had written, saying that I should read it. The principles of waka were indeed restricting, and there were many “maladies” which one was supposed to avoid. Because I never considered myself a good poet, [having so many rules on composition] really made it difficult for me to express myself freely, so I returned the book. [As for Prince Suetsumu’s poem,] considering her knowledge of waka lore, it was rather unoriginal.

よろづの草子、歌枕、よくあなひ知り、見尽くして、その中の言葉を取り出づるに、よみつきたる筋こそ強は変はらざるべけ。常陸の親王の書きをき給へりける、紙屋紙の草子をこそ見よ、とておこせたりしか。和歌の髄脳いところせう、病さるべき所多くりしかば、もとよりをくれたる方の、いとえなかも動きすべくも見えざりしかば、むつかしくて返してき。よくあなひ知り給へる人の口つきにては、目駄れてこそあれ。

(SNKBT 20, pp. 370-1.)
Toshiyori then explains how his love for waka enabled him to compile “old leaves of words, now washed away by the torrents of a waterfall,” the sources of which extended well beyond the familiar terrain of the “Three Imperial Anthologies,” and included the Manyōshū and oral teachings. Toshiyori even seems to suggest that whether it would benefit Isako’s education or not, he was already committed to accumulating material about ancient poetic diction, as a way of conserving the linguistic legacy of Japan and invigorating otherwise outmoded poetic language and style. In other words, Toshiyori admits that the Toshiyori zuinō is a product of his passion for waka.

Finally, Toshiyori states “not even the sovereign cares much about waka,” and thus he directly beseeches the Fujiwara regent’s family—“I inscribe my wishes on the backs of wisteria (“Fuji” 藤) leaves blossoming at the Kasuga Shrine (the patron deity of the Fujiwara)”—to serve as the guardian of waka. After the death of Emperor Horikawa, an enthusiastic patron of waka, in 1107, Toshiyori may have felt that neither Retired Emperor Shirakawa nor the young sovereign (Emperor Toba) who was still a boy of ten around the year of the composition of the Toshiyori zuinō, would appreciate his devotion to waka.

Toshiyori’s statement provides an answer to the question of the dissociation of waka from other artistic and literary pursuits called “Ways” in the Konjaku monogatari shū (ca. 1120), as discussed in Chapter One. As Toshiyori testifies (although calling waka a Way), the ancient practice of waka, which in the scholastic mind of the Konjaku editor failed to meet the criteria of a “Way,” was in decline in the first few decades of the twelfth century. In the next chapter, I discuss how Toshiyori’s contemporary Fujiwara no Akisue (藤原頼輔, 1090-55) established Rokujō School of waka, incorporated some of the salient formalities of Kidendō scholarship, and
transformed waka practices from a native custom to his family’s prerogative. Especially under the leadership of Akisue’s grandson Kiyosuke (藤原清輔, 1104-77), poet-scholars of the Rokujō family such as Priest Kenshō engaged themselves in rigorous philological investigations, often so as to further explore the issues unresolved in the Toshiyori zuinō. Nevertheless, like the lowly cleaner who died with unrequited love for the empress, Toshiyori died without witnessing the revival of waka that began in the 1150s. In the following late poem, Toshiyori reveals that it was his own idea to compare his life to that of the herb-picker:

Since my wishes are always incongruous with reality, I composed this poem, wondering how things would be in the afterlife:

思ふことのみたがふ身なければ、のちの世もいかがと思ふにやす

Even Amitabha’s blessing
Can do nothing for
My sadness
Due to the habits of my heart–
Picking bitter herbs.

葉つみし
心ならひの
かなしきは
みだのちかひも
たのまれぬかな65

Conclusion

In this chapter, I examined how Minamoto no Toshiyori laid the groundwork for the consolidation of waka studies by providing highly animated anecdotal explanations on some two hundred old poems containing language unfamiliar to the average reader of the early twelfth century. By analyzing Toshiyori’s commentary on an ancient poem that contains the expression,

“the man [in the old legend] who used to pick bitter herbs” (*seri tumishi hito*), I discussed how Toshiyori captivated the mostly female readers of the *Toshiyori zuinō* by providing entertaining yet at the same time didactic *setsuwa* narratives, while making the future waka scholars and philologists curious about the history of the poetic diction but frustrated by not providing satisfactory answers. Inspired by Toshiyori, poets in later generations, including his son Shun’e, intentionally alluded to the phrases discussed in the *Toshiyori zuinō*, including the “the man who used to pick bitter herbs,” while establishing the concept of *hon’i* (poetic essence) concerning the phrase. Poet-scholars, such as Fujiwara no Kiyosuke, Kenshō, and Fujiwara no Shunzei, also followed Toshiyori by critically scrutinizing the many philological issues that Toshiyori had overlooked.

The *Toshiyori zuinō* is probably one of the most influential literary works of *insei* Japan along with Ōe no Masafusa’s *Gōdanshō*. However, like Nōin in the late eleventh century, Toshiyori himself essentially viewed waka as a declining “Way” at the dawn of the *insei* period. Toshiyori also provided memorable biographical details about Nōin and his followers, and made their abnormal devotion to waka a new standard of waka poets in the twelfth century. In his understanding of *suki* (poetic passion) and the new Way of the Arts (*suki no michi*) Toshiyori’s position is thus analogous to his contemporary, Masafusa.
Introduction: Three Stages in the Consolidation of Waka Studies in the Twelfth Century

After Minamoto no Toshiyori (源俊頼, 1055?-1129?), the composition and study of waka thrived under the leadership of the poet-scholars of the Rokujō (六条) and Mikohidari (御子左) branches of the Fujiwara clan. The fact that after Toshiyori’s Kinyō wakashū (金葉和歌集, Collection of Golden Leaves, 1127), Fujiwara no Akisuke (藤原顕輔, 1090-1155) of the Rokujō family compiled the sixth imperial anthology of waka, Shika wakashū (詞花和歌集, Florilegium of Japanese Poems, 1151), and that Fujiwara no Shunzei (藤原俊成, 1114-1204) of the Mikohidari family followed with the Senzai wakashū (千載和歌集, Collection of Japanese Poems for Millennia, 1187), succinctly demonstrates the influence of these individuals as teachers of waka and as the leaders of the poetry schools they represented.

The Rokujō school of waka was founded by Akisuke’s father, Fujiwara no Akisue (藤原顕季, 1055-1123), the son of Emperor Shirakawa’s (白河天皇, 1053-1129, r. 1072-86) wet-nurse.1 The name “Rokujō” derives from Akisue’s residence at the intersection of Rokujō (Sixth Avenue) and Karasumaru in Kyoto. Through his personal connection to Shirakawa, Akisue became the emperor’s confidant (kinshin 近臣), and served in various prosperous provinces as governor, despite his lack of a solid background in Chinese literary studies.2 Before the twelfth

---
1. For Akisue’s biographies, see Inoue, pp. 85-95; Kawakami, pp. 974-92.
2. In Chapter One, I discussed how the Ikamakami sheds lights on Akisue’s weakness in Chinese
century, provincial governorships were customarily filled by the most academically gifted scholar-officials, trained at the State Academy (大学寮, Daigakuryō) and well versed in Chinese. As I discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, skill in Chinese composition was indispensable for officials in the ritsuryō state; like Latin in the European Middle Ages, classical Chinese was the lingua franca of officialdom. Akisue’s socio-economical ascendancy epitomizes the final breakdown of meritocracy in the imperial state, which in a sense had already begun during the Fujiwara regency in the eleventh century.³

Social historians have argued that the privatization of various public resources (both human and material) was accelerated by Retired Emperor Shirakawa’s increasingly despotic behavior following his abdication in favor of his young grandson in 1107, upon the death of his son Emperor Horikawa (堀河天皇, 1079-1107, r. 1086-1107).⁴ In short, Akisue was a social “upstart,”⁵ whose political ascendancy was one of the many outcomes of the consolidation of Shirakawa’s insei administration. As Retired Emperor Shirakawa was keen on reviving composition, and how the author presented it as a reason for his failure to obtain a post he had long coveted.

³ The anthology of Sino-Japanese compositions by scholar-officials, Honchō monzui, for instance, collects numerous letters of application (sōjō 梵状) written by disgruntled Academy-trained bureaucrats, requesting various posts including governorships, at the beginning of the eleventh century. For my discussion of one example of the genre, composed and submitted by Ōe no Masahira, see Chapter Two.

⁴ Shirakawa was not necessarily “despotic” in the late 1080s through the late 1090s, after his abdication in favor of his son Emperor Horimawa in 1086, the year often considered as the beginning of the insei period. Even after his seemingly authoritarian act of abdication, Shirakawa still respected the practices of the ritsuryō state during the early phase of his rule as a retired emperor. According to the social historian Motoki Yasuo, the social climate changed only after the death of the regent Fujiwara no Moromichi (1062-99), whose son and successor Tadazane (忠実, 1078-1162) became a subordinate to Shirakawa. Motoki (1996).

⁵ In his chapter on Hitomaro eigu, Watanabe Yasuaki calls Akisue an “upstart” (成り上がった人物). Watanabe 2009, p. 193.
ostentatiously various customs and rituals of the *ritsuryō* state so as to camouflage the fundamentally unlawful practices of his administration,⁶ his protégé, Akisue also needed to find his own way of establishing himself as a “cultured” man of power. Instead of expending the effort necessary to attain the literary standards set by earlier scholar-officials in the study of Chinese literature, Akisue merely imitated the Kidendō scholars’ manners in his waka-related activities, while promoting his branch of the Fujiwara family as a house of waka specialists.

In the words of the literary historian Inoue Muneo (井上宗雄, 1926-2011), “[w]hen an individual with political power and financial success possessed average or above-average talent in waka composition, cared about [lit. “liked”] it, and became passionate about it, it was natural for him to become a leader in the field, or to be promoted to such leadership.”⁷ This statement does not adequately explain why Akisuke preferred waka to kanshi (nor why he made no efforts to improve his Chinese), and instead suggests that he simply had a particular “fondness” (*suki*) for the composition of waka. As a poet, whether Akisue personally represented the poetic ideal of *suki* as his contemporary Minamoto no Toshiyori is,⁸ is open to question, and the issue needs to be examined carefully. In any case, the novelty and significance of Akisue’s literary activities lay not so much in what he did as a poet; but rather in how he made the act of conducting waka-related activities his own family’s prerogative, by transmitting his own teaching of waka to his

---

⁶. Shiwakawa was the first emperor in Japanese history to commission more than one imperial anthology of waka (*GoShūshū* in 1086 and *Kinyōshū* in 1127) during his lifetime.

⁷. 政治的權勢・経済的富裕さを持つ人物が水準かそれを上まわる歌人的力量を持ち、和歌を好み、熱心になれば、グループのリーダーに推され、或はその地位に昇るのは自然である。
*(Inoue, p. 94.)*

⁸. For my discussion of *suki* and Minamoto no Toshiyori, see Chapter 7.
son Akisuke.\footnote{For biographies of Fujiwara no Akisuke, see Inoue, pp. 96-118. For those of Kiyosuke, see Inoue, pp. 119-149; Ozawa (1979), pp. 135-63.}

The second waka school that emerged in the twelfth century, the Mikohidari school was founded by Fujiwara no Shunzei, who studied waka with Fujiwara no Mototoshi (藤原基俊, 1060-1142), a conservative poet who was critical of Minamoto no Toshiyori’s innovative approach to waka.\footnote{For my discussion of Mototoshi’s criticism of Toshiyori zuinô, recalled by Shunzei in the words of Shunzei’s son Teika, see Chapter 7. For a biography of Fujiwara no Mototoshi, see Inoue, pp. 177-91.} The name Mikohidari originates in the name of the residence, Mikosatei (御子左第, “Mikohidari Residence”), which Fujiwara no Nagaie (藤原長家, 1005-64), the sixth son of Fujiwara no Michinaga (藤原道長, 966-1027) and Shunzei’s grandfather, inherited from a son of Emperor Daigo. Shunzei transmitted his teaching of waka to his son Teika (藤原定家, 1162-1241), who after having participated in the compilation of the eighth imperial anthology of waka, Shinkokin wakashû, with five other poets,\footnote{See Huey (2002) for a detailed study of the compilation process of the Shinkokinshû. Also Watanabe Yumiko’s book chapter in Suzuki and Suzuki eds. (2011), pp.103-14.} singlehandedly edited the subsequent Shin chokusenshû (新勅撰集, New Imperial Anthology of Waka, 1235). Teika counseled his son Tameie (為家, 1198-1275) in the art of compiling imperial anthologies by recording various details of his court service as a teacher of waka in his kanbun diary, Meigetsuki (明月記, Records of the Clear Moon).\footnote{For a discussion of Teika’s meticulous recording of matters regarding the compilation of an imperial anthology of waka, in conjunction with his ambivalent attitude toward those who he called, somewhat pejoratively, kôshi (好士, waka fans, lit. “folks who like waka”), see Tabuchi, pp. 221-46. According to Tabuchi, kôshi were relatively inexperienced waka poets who pleaded with Teika to select their poems for inclusion in Teika’s Shin chokusenshû. Tabuchi argues that despite his personal indifference to these individuals, Teika nevertheless recorded his quotidian interaction with them in the Meigetsuki, because of his “awareness [as the head of] a household [of waka]” (家の意識) and his wish to preserve the}
Nijō (二条), Kyōgoku (京極) and Reizei (冷泉), represented by Tameie’s three sons, Tameuji (為伊, 1222-86), Tamenori (為教, 1227-1279) and Tamesuke (為相, 1263-1328) respectively.13

This chapter examines the significance of the emergence of these two aristocratic families that made the study of waka their household prerogative, while exploring a new meaning in court service during the socio-politically volatile twelfth century in Japan. As discussed in Part One and Part Two, members of the Sugawara and Ōe clans were in charge of Chinese literary studies at the State Academy during the mid-eighth through the mid-eleventh centuries, and thus the monopolization of certain academic professions by particular aristocratic families was not a new phenomenon. How then, did “waka studies” (歌学, kagaku) become “household studies” (家学, kagaku) of in aristocratic families as late as the twelfth century?

In light of the fact that by the beginning of the twelfth century, Ōe no Masafusa (大江匡房, 1041-1111), the scion of the Confucian Ōe clan, was aware of the decline of his family’s dynastic leadership in Kidendō scholarship at the Academy,14 the idea of the consolidation of household studies appears remarkably anachronistic. In fact, waka-scholars’ method of establishing their household studies of waka was hardly innovative during its nascent period in the early twelfth century, because they were mostly keen on imitating various formal and ritualistic elements of the earlier Kidendō literati’s activities into their waka activities. As to why

---


14. See Chapter 5 for my discussion of Masafusa’s religious text, *Zoku honchō ōjōden*, in which he nostalgically recollects his scholarly ancestors’ achievements. See Chapter 6 for my discussion of how in his *Gōdanshō*, Masafusa explains his decision to impart some of his family’s secret teachings of the Chinese classics to an enthusiastic young scholar from outside of his clan.
the early-twelfth century pioneers of waka studies, such as Fujiwara no Akisue, drew inspiration from the earlier kangaku scholars’ activities, we can only speculate.

Waka-composing courtiers in the twelfth century were attracted to the ways in which middle-ranking Kidendō scholars of the preceding centuries partook in the formation and the maintenance of the imperial state through fulfilling their highly specialized academic and administrative roles, probably because they were living in a society which witnessed the very dissolution of the ritsuryō state, including the institution of the Academy. As I discussed in Chapter 2 in conjunction with my analyses of Kidendō scholars’ compositions in the literary anthology Honchō monzui (本朝文粹, Literary Masterpieces of Japan, 14 vols., ca. 1058-65), at the beginning of the eleventh century, academicians were already frustrated because the Confucian ideal of scholars’ corroboration with wise imperial rulers to “build the state and govern society” (経国治世) had been compromised by the Fujiwara regency. That can explain why the Sugawara and Ōe academicians “escaped” from officialdom to poetry composition and claimed that fūgetsu (風月), the act of poeticizing nature and expressing feelings associated with it, was their family prerogative.

In retrospect, those twelfth century waka poets who embraced Kidendō scholars’ ways appear somewhat limited in their insight, or in their academic acumen, because they appear to have been overwhelmed by a sense of inferiority vis-à-vis those scholar-officials versed in Chinese literature, like Masafusa, whose knowledge of the subject and ability to compose highly sophisticated prose and verse in Sino-Japanese justified his ascending to one of the most influential posts in the imperial bureaucracy despite his middle-rank background. Or, alternatively, early twelfth-century waka scholars were aware that Kidendō and its bastion, the
State Academy, were actually losing their significance, especially after Masafusa’s death in 1111; and thereby became determined to take over the Kidendō academicians’ role as the producers cum guardians of bellettristic discourse in Japan.

In this chapter, I will examine how members of the Rokujō and Mikohidari schools altered the hitherto widespread predominantly vernacular and quotidian image of the waka composition as Japan’s “custom” (fūzoku) into a more literary and academic pursuit, and then redefined waka as a manifestation of an individual’s poetic sensitivity (風流, fūryū) or poetic elegance (風雅, fūga), on a par with kanshi. However, like Chinese studies (kangaku) in the preceding centuries, waka studies (kagaku) in the twelfth century was a literary movement founded upon somewhat contradictory ideas about poetry composition.

On the one hand, like literati in the past, waka poet-scholars of the twelfth century knew that waka was a linguistic art form, a means of demonstrating innate ability to recognize and react to internal and external phenomena, and express the particular feelings, emotions or ideas associated with the stimuli by way of an effective use of language. Because this universalist theory of waka had long been proclaimed in the prefaces to the Kokinshū (905),¹⁵ and no poet-scholars of waka in the twelfth century attempted to establish their own theories of waka without acknowledging the Kokinshū prefaces,¹⁶ there must have been a shared awareness that the composition of waka was ultimately a solitary act, based on the individual poet’s psychology.

¹⁵. For my analyses of the Japanese and Chinese prefaces to the Kokinshū, see Chapter 3.

¹⁶. For example, the openings passages of Minamoto no Toshiyori’s Toshiyori zuinō (see Chapter 7) and Fujiwara no Šunzei’s Korai fūteishō, which I examine in the final section of the present chapter, alludes to the famous opening statement of the Japanese preface to the Kokinshū. Fujiwara no Kiyosuke’s Fukurozōshi is also replete with references to the Kokinshū prefaces. (SNKBT 29, pp. 35-38, 52-53, 58.) For more detailed discussion of twelfth-century commentaries to the Kokinshū, including the Chinese and Japanese prefaces, see Chapter 3.
On the other hand, waka scholars in the mid-to-late twelfth century were eager to establish themselves as masters of waka, by promoting their own interpretations of the existing waka discourse. This was followed by their withholding of their teaching and waka documents, such as commentaries, manuscripts and carefully collated texts of the canonical texts of waka, to their own family members. In other words, they showed little concern about “privatizing” the fundamentally individual literary art form for the sake of securing their own and their descendants’ social status as experts of waka.

Significantly, the different ways in which Kidendō scholars from the earlier centuries and twelfth-century waka poet-scholars of the Rokujō and Mikohidari houses responded to these antithetical elements at the core of their literary activities determined the level of their influence as models for literary production in subsequent centuries. Kidendō academicians were unable to problematize the contradictory issue in their highly specialized literary practices. As I discussed in my comparison between the lives of Fujiwara no Akihira and Ōe no Masafusa’s (Chapter 4), the production of primers (幼学書, yōgakusho) or any introductory books of Chinese literature had normally been considered the task of lesser professionalized academicians, such as Minamoto no Shitagō, who compiled the first Chinese-Japanese dictionary, Wamyō ruijū shō (倭名類聚抄, Collected Encyclopedia of Japanese Nouns, ca. 931-38). In other words, the

17. See Chapter 5 of Brian Steininger’s dissertation for a biography of Shitagō and an analysis of the Wamyō ruijū shō. Note that the Wakan rōeishū (和漢詠詠集, early 11th century), the innovative, topically organized literary anthology for an ordinary readership, juxtaposes Chinese compositions by Chinese authors, Sino-Japanese compositions by Japanese authors (kanshi, kanbun) as well as Japanese poems composed by Japanese poets (waka), was compiled by the courtier Fujiwara no Kintō (藤原公任, 966-1041), who was not trained at the State Academy. Also, as discussed in Chapter 4, Fujiwara no Akihira’s compilation of the Honchō monzui was a rare (perhaps the first) example of a Kidendō scholar producing a literary anthology for the aristocracy.
leading Sugawara and Ōe scholars never wrote kanshi treatises for a general audience, while transmitting highly specialized interpretations of Chinese Classics to their sons and a handful of qualified students from other families, presumably verbally. Due to the high insularity of their academic activities, as they gradually lost career opportunities during the Fujiwara regency, they came to compose kanshi even more privately among themselves, and eventually ceased to function as state Confucians (儒家, juka) by the mid-twelfth century.

In contrast, Rokujō and Mikohidari poet-scholars were not limited by the old academicians’ elitist attitude, and embraced the act of writing waka treatises for a general aristocratic audience as an integral part of their professional activities. More specifically, neither Fujiwara no Akišue nor his son Akišuke of the Rokujō school of waka appear to have been much involved in writing waka treatises. In this regard, the founding fathers of the Rokujō school were more similar to the traditional Kidendō academicians, in that they did not write poetry treatises. (In fact, it is known that Akišue transmitted his teaching of the Man’yōshū to his son Akišuke orally, not in writing.) It was only the third-generational leader of the Rokujō school, Kiyosuke (1104-77), who broke with this custom by writing thirteen waka commentaries and treatises. Kiyosuke’s philological activities were followed by his half-brother Kenshō, as well as Shunzei of the Mikohidari in the 1180s. In the words of the literary historian Nishimura Kayoko (西村加代子, 1946-96), by turning to writing about waka, Kiyosuke “consciously explored and

18. Nishimura Kayoko also makes this observation: それまで [until Kiyosuke] 六条家系の人々は歌学書を殆ど著さなかったのに対し、清輔は精力的にこれを行った。（Nishimura, p. 192.）

19. 清輔は、父から万葉集の講釈を受けるなどの一方で、自身は伊勢物語の注釈にも意を用いたと見られ、六条家で伊勢物語に関心を持ち始めたのは、顕輔であるらしい。（Ibid., pp. 182-3.）
eventually found his own identity as a specialist in the Way of waka.\textsuperscript{20}

Particularly in the mid-to late twelfth century, by writing waka treatises, the leaders of the Rokujō and Mikohodari schools seem to have accepted the aforementioned paradox in their own literary practice by emphasizing the difficulty of teaching the composition of waka, and consequently succeeded in augmenting their authority as teachers of waka because of the purported unattainability of the “truth” concerning the art of waka. Although their writings on waka were hardly “theoretical” in the modern sense, as we will see in this chapter, unlike the earlier Kidendō literati, the majority of whom left no teachings in writing and are remembered mainly as poets, the poet-scholars of the Rokujō and Mikohidari schools remained influential throughout pre-modern Japan, as pioneers of studies of the Japanese Classics, such as the \textit{Man'yōshū} and the \textit{Kokinshū}.

Existing scholarship on the Rokujō and Mikohidari schools has placed too much emphasis on the styles of poems composed by poets representing them, and undermined the significance of their common undertaking as leading “waka households” (\textit{waka no ie}). Japanese literary scholars have meticulously examined the particular roles these rivaling schools of waka played in literary histories of waka, but did not much discuss the schools’ significance in the larger context of cultural and intellectual histories of early Japan.\textsuperscript{21}

In this chapter, I propose to view the Rokujō and Mikohidari schools not so much as rivals but as representatives of different stages in the consolidation of \textit{kagaku} (歌学, waka studies) or the Way of waka (歌道, \textit{kadō}), which took place throughout the twelfth century. The

\textsuperscript{20} 和歌の道の研究家としての自分を、しまいに自覚的に探り取っていった […] (Ibid., p. 192.)

\textsuperscript{21} For an overview of the subject, see for instance, Yoshino Tomomi’s book chapter in Suzuki and Suzuki eds., pp. 88-98.
formation of *kagaku* can be divided into three phases: 1) 1110 through 1120s; 2) 1130-1170s; 3) 1180-1204.

During the first few decades of the twelfth century, as I discussed in Chapter 1 in conjunction with my reading of the *setsuwa* collection, *Konjaku monogarishū* (ca. 1120), waka was not considered an object of academic pursuit on a par with Chinese poetry and Buddhism. Minamoto no Toshiyori also lamented the “decline of the Way of [waka]” in the introductory passage in his waka treatise, *Toshiyori zuinō* (ca. 1111-15). This is when Fujiwara no Akisue founded the Rokujō school of waka, mainly by imitating kangaku scholars’ literary activities, such as conducting certain literary-themed rituals formerly held at the State Academy. During this period, Akisue consolidated the foundation of household studies of waka, specifically by initiating the *Hitomaro eigu* (人影供, An Offering to Hitomaro’s Portrait) ritual in 1118, and exclusively passing on the right to conduct this ritual to his son Akisuke.22

While closely working with Akisue even as one of the guest poets at his *Hitomaro eigu*, Minamoto no Toshiyori made another significant contribution to the revival of waka, by demonstrating the spirit of *suki* (poetic passion) in his anecdotal explanation of numerous ancient words and phrases in the *Toshiyori zuinō*, as well as in his experimental use of them in actual waka composition. In short, during the first three decades of the twelfth century, Toshiyori and

---

22. Nishimura introduces the opinion held by Yamada Shōzen (山田昭全) in his 1966 study that Akisue’s performance of the *Hitomaro eigu* ritual symbolized the “establishment of an [aristocratic] household specializing in the Way of waka” (歌道家の成立). However, in pointing out that this view was amended in a 1984 study by Inoue Muneo, who wrote that this phenomenon only took place when “Akisue handed down the portrait of Hitomaro [used in his 1118 ritual] to [his son] Akisuke” (顕季が顕輔に人丸影をゆずった時点), Nishimura also supports the latter’s view. She calls such transmission a sign of Akisue’s “bequeathing his own lasting influence as a poet to his own son” (歌人としての永続性を子に託したもの […]) (Ibid., p. 180.)
Akisue explored and represented universalist and utilitarian approaches to waka, in writing and hosting a new type of poetry gatherings, respectively.

The first section of this chapter examines Akisue’s Hitomaro eigu ceremony. Particular attention will be paid to Akisue’s collaboration with the Kidendō scholar Fujiwara no Atsumitsu (藤原敦光, 1063-1144) on this occasion. I argue that Atsumitsu’s unprecedented personal involvement as a kangaku scholar in this waka-centered event marks the changing realities not only of the lives of waka poets, but for Kidendō scholars in the late 1110s. By analyzing Atsumitsu’s waka preface (wakajo) written to commemorate this new ritual, I examine how Atsumitsu redefines waka from an ambiguously designated native custom to the very “source” (本, moto) of all local customs in Japan, presumably including the composition of kanshi. I also compare the poems composed at the Hiromaro eigu ritual by Akisue and Minamoto no Toshiyori. By contrasting Akisue’s conventional compositional technique with Toshiyori’s, which embodies his commitment to actualize the poetic lives of model poets from antiquity through his suki (poetic passions) and imaginative use of ancient diction, I reveal two contrasting foundations, one formal and the other imaginative, of the consolidation of waka studies in the mid-twelfth century.

The second phase of the formation of waka studies revolved around the further consolidation of the Rokujū school by Akisue’s son and grandson Akisuke (1090-1155) and Kiyosuke (1104-77), through the former’s compilation of the imperial anthology Shikashū (1151) and the latter’s numerous waka treatises and his collation of “in-house” editions of various
canonical texts of waka such as the *Kokinshū*. According to Nishimura Kayoko, the Rokujō school of waka “gradually clarified” the workings of their waka studies by adding “one newly designated item” every time a patriarch transmitted his teaching to the next generation: “Akisue passed on the portrait of Hitomaro to Akisuke, Akisuke added to it an ink-grinding stone with a cover and a partition, […] and eventually Kiyosuke added waka documents when he passed on his teaching to [his younger brother] Suetsune (季経).” It is highly plausible that Akisuke treasured the ink stone with which he drafted the first imperial anthology of waka compiled by a member of the Rokujō household, the *Shikashū*. Likewise, Kiyosuke’s designation of his own “waka documents” suggests that by the end of his life, the waka production of the Rokujō school shifted from a ritualistic space to a textual one, while making the act of waka composition ever more intertextual, rather than simply interpersonal.

Like his grandfather, Kiyosuke was eager to incorporate various trappings of Kidendō academicians’ literary activities in his waka practices. For instance, he wrote the majority of his waka commentaries, essays and treatises in kanbun, which was unusual for waka poets at the time, and also hosted a waka version of yet another Kidendō scholars’ traditional literary event

---

23. For a complete list of Kiyosuke’s waka commentaries and treatises, see Nishimura, pp. 186-88.

24. 後藤者が代を移る度に、顕季は人丸影を、顕輔はそれに加えて破子硯をと、それぞれの意思を託して次第に伝授した。歌の家と言いうる初期のもの—当時の六条家においては、このようにしてそのあり方が漸々に明確化されていったのであろうと思われる。やがて清輔から季経に伝頼される折には、新たに和歌文書が相続品目として取り沙汰されることになる。（Ibid., pp. 180-81.) Nishimura’s description is based on Sasaki Takahiro’s (佐々木考浩) 1990 study on the *Hitomaro eigu*. The earliest reference to the three symbolic objects of the “Hitomaro portraits, ink grinding stone with a cover and a partition, and waka documents” is found in an anecdote about Kiyosuke in the *setsuwa* collection *Kokon chomonjū* (1254). (SNKS 59, p. 258.)
called *Shōshikai* (尚ië会, Poetry Gathering for Elderly Men) in 1172. In short, before his death in 1177, Kiyosuke succeeded in transforming his family’s Rokujō residence into a new “Academy” (*daigaku*) of waka, hence his humorous yet highly self-conscious signature as “The Former Scholarship Scholar of Waka Kaki no shita Mitsura” (前和歌得業生柿下躬貫) or “An Aged Confucian of Waka, Fujiwara” (和歌旧儒藤原) in various texts.

By calling himself a “Waka Scholar” and “Aged Confucian,” Kiyosuke displayed pride in his encyclopedic knowledge of waka lore. For instance, his masterpiece *Fukurozōshi* (袋草紙,

25. The *Kokon chomonjū* recounts the details of Kiyosuke’s *Shōshikai* gathering held on the nineteenth day in the Second Month of 1172. (SNKS 59, pp. 257-62. The *Shōshikai* gathering originated in China, and was first conducted in 845 by the Tang poet, Bo Juyi (白居易, 772-846). In Japan, the earliest such gathering on record took place at the residence of Grand Counselor Minabuchi no Toshina (南淵年名) in 877.

26. The name “Kaki no shita Mitsura” is a hybrid of three ancient poets: Kakinomoto no Hitomaro (歌本人 смысл) of the *Man’yōshū*, and Ōshikōshi no Mitsune (凡河内躬恒) and Ki no Tsurayuki (紀貫之) from the *Kokinshū*. (Emphasis added for the syllables Kiyosuke appropriated.) According to Nishimura Kayoko, Kiyosuke referred to himself in this playful manner throughout his lifetime; four variants are found in different waka documents he wrote and edited. First, the aforementioned “Former Scholarship Scholar of Waka Kaki no shita Mitsura” (前和歌得業生柿下躬貫) is the earliest example used in his waka treatise, *Gishi* (袋文, 1135-41). Second, Kiyosuke employed a similar signature, “Former Scholarship Scholar of Waka Yamabe no Sukune” (前和歌得業生山辺宿祢) in his “report” (勘文, *kanmon*) on the biography of Hitomaro, entitled “Hitomaro kanmon” (人丸勘文, 1153), which survives only as a citation in Kiyosuke’s own waka treatise, *Fukurozōshi*. The name “Yamabe no Sukune” evokes the *Man’yōshū* poet Yamabe no Akahito (山辺赤人). Third, in the manuscript of the *Kokinshū* collated and transcribed in his own hand from Emperor Sutoku’s manuscript in 1160, Kiyosuke calls himself “Scholarship Scholar of Waka Kiyosuke” (和歌得業清輔). Finally, in the opening of Book 2 of the *Fukurozōshi* (ca. 1157-58), Kiyosuke refers to himself as “An Old Confucian of Waka Fujiwara” (和歌旧儒藤原). Nishimura points out that “the degree of humor and humility” in Kiyosuke’s signatures gradually decreased as time passed to the point where he eventually integrated the “scholarly” and “Confucian” elements of his titles with his own names (Kiyosuke, Fujiwara) in the final two examples, suggesting that Kiyosuke became more “confident” with his own role in society as “a scholar of waka.” ([…] 射書・名前ともに，謙謙性や篤晦の色合いが薄れてゆくのがわかる。それは年功を積むにつれて清輔の余裕のようなものを感じさせ，「和歌の学者である自分」への自信の深まりを表わすように思える。Nishimura, p. 191.)
Pocket Books, ca. 1157-58, 2 vols), one modern annotated edition of which is over three-hundred pages long, gathers numerous “precedents” (故実, kojitsu) and his teachings on such topics the proceedings of waka parties (和歌会); rules and manners regarding the public recitation of waka; the Daijōe (大嘗会, an emperor’s inauguration) ceremony; formats of waka prefaces (和歌序); a list of Japanese readings for the official titles of state ministers and offices; rules for the compilation of imperial waka anthologies; details concerning the compilation of waka anthologies from the Man’yōshū through the Shikashū; the relationship between the two Kokinshu prefaces; notable manuscripts of imperial anthologies of waka; privately compiled anthologies (私家集); obscure names of poets in waka anthologies; “miscellaneous discussions” (雑談, zōdan) that contain various biographical details about historical poets in the manner of setsuwa; reflections on how waka composition changed people’s lives, including his own; a collection of rare poems (希代歌); [the following appear in Book 2 of the

27. SNKBT 29.
29. Ibid. pp. 31-32
30. Ibid., p. 34.
32. Ibid. p. 53.
33. Ibid. pp. 67-68.
34. Ibid., pp. 70-73.
35. Ibid., pp. 74-143.
36. Ibid., pp. 104-105. Kiyosuke recollects his promotion to the Fourth Rank due to his service as a “waka poet” (歌詠) during the reign of Retired Emperor Toba.
Fukurozōshi] poetry contests (和歌合) in history, beginning with the Teishiin Poetry Contest (亭子院歌合, 913) through the “Poetry Contest at a Certain Person’s Residence” (或所歌合, 1138), and all the relevant details about these events such as the dates, locations, settings, dress codes, preassigned topics, participating poets and judges, judges’ comments and results; “sample poems” (証歌) displaying various “maladies” (病, yamai), or compositional errors; and poems that contain unusual words and phases (詠異事歌).

In terms of the length and the comprehensiveness of the coverage of topics, Kiyosuke’s Fukurozōshi is analogous to Minamoto no Toshiyori’s Toshiyori zuinō. However, its pronounced emphasis on details about the production and reception of imperial anthologies, poetry contests and other ceremonies attests to Kiyosuke’s passion not only to record ancient poetic diction but all the formalities associated with the composition of waka in history. In this regard, it is not surprising that in the Fukurozōshi, Kiyosuke frequently cites factual information about literary events that took place at the imperial court from the Gōki (江記, Ōe’s Diary), while mentioning “Lord Toshiyori’s commentary” (俊証朝臣の抄物, Toshiyori zuinō) only twice. In other words, Kiyosuke limits his references to court service only to those directly relevant to waka, but the

37. Ibid., pp. 143-171.
38. Ibid., p. 216.
39. Ibid., p. 280.
40. Ibid., pp. 295-323.
41. Ibid., pp. 313-37.
42. For an example of Kiyosuke’s reference to the Gōki, see the Fukurozōshi passage which introduces the “Group of Six Waka Poets” (和歌六人党). For my discussion of this anecdote from the “Miscellaneous Discussions” (zōdan) section of the Fukurozōshi, see Chapter 3.
ways in which he juxtaposes and records them in his terse kanbun appear to have been inspired more by the Gōki and other reference books by Ōe no Masafusa, such as the Gōke shidai (江家次第, The Ōe Family’s Records of Court Ceremonies), rather than the waka treatise Toshiyori zuinō. 43

In a literary history of waka, it was for his “eruditeness” that Kiyosuke was remembered and praised. In his waka treatise-cum-collection of setsuwa narratives about waka poets from the twelfth century, Mumyōshō (無名抄, Nameless Commentary, after 1211), the waka poet Kamo no Chōmei (鴨長明, 1155–1216) introduces an anecdote in which his teacher Shōmyō (勝命, 1111–active 1188) stated that “Kiyosuke’s erudition in the field of waka was unmatched.” (清輔朝臣、歌の方の弘才は肩並ぶ人なし。) 44 Likewise, in the Kenchū mikkan (顕注密勘, Secret Studies on Kenshō’s Commentary to the Kokinshū, 1221), Fujiwara no Teika calls Kiyosuke a “Confucian scholar of waka, who mastered the subject in a highly reasoned manner.” (和歌の儒士なり。たどりしらぬ事ならりける人にこそ侍れ。) 45 Why did Chōmei and Teika place so much focus on Kiyosuke’s “erudition”? What is the significance of the appearance of such an “erudite” scholar of waka in both literary and intellectual histories of early Japan?

In fact, too much emphasis on Kiyosuke’s “scholarliness” obscures two equally remarkable aspects of his philological activities as the third-generation patriarch of the Rokujo school of waka. Firstly, the enthusiasm for waka lore Kiyosuke demonstrated in his writings is

43. It goes without saying, however, that Kiyosuke most frequently cites the Man’yōshū and Kokinshū.

44. KKS 7, p. 224. For my brief discussion of Shōmyō’s waka activities, including his commentaries on the Chinese and Japanese prefaces to the Kokinshū, see Chapter 3.

45. Quoted in Nishimura, pp. 175 and 192. The text of the Kenchū mikkan is available in NKT bekkan 5.
yet another manifestation of suki (poetic passion), or the love for waka and its poetic language, which essentially motivated Minamoto no Toshiyori to write his Toshiyori zuinō. Neither Kiyosuke’s father nor grandfather exhibited this fundamentally selfless attitude in their waka-promoting activities. Certainly it cannot be denied that Akisue conducted the Hitomaro eigu, and Akisuke compiled the Shikashū out of their “love” for waka. However, as I will discuss in the first section of this chapter, in Akisue’s case, his desire to attain self-respect by making the hitherto casually practiced waka composition an austere ritual seems to have outweighed his “poetic passion” per se.

Kiyosuke followed his grandfather’s path by writing waka treatises in kanbun, and making the history of waka appear as formal and official as that of any other court rituals. Nevertheless, his method of doing so is remarkably similar to Toshiyori’s anecdotal way of commenting on ancient poetic expressions. For these reasons, in order to understand the significance of Kiyosuke’s philological activities, it is not enough to uncritically repeat the view constructed in the the medieval setsuwa collection Kokon chomonjū, that the Rokujō family’s teachings are characterized by their linearity, symbolized by the transmission of particular objects such as the portrait of Hitomaro and the ink grinding stone. I argue that it is more important to investigate why Kiyosuke so soon had to change the course of his family’s waka studies by turning to text-oriented activities such as collating canons of waka and writing commentaries. To do so, we have to trace the influence of Toshiyori’s non-utilitarian approach to waka in Kiyosuke’s own writings.

Secondly, no matter how “encyclopedic” Kiyosuke’s writings are, the extent to which he remains non-judgmental about many of the issues he introduces in his writing is puzzling to the
modern reader. For instance, as discussed above, the *Fukurozōshi* contains information about almost every aspect of the practice of waka composition from ancient times through the mid-twelfth century, including such details as how to write down poems, topics, poets’ names and their titles and offices on paper.⁴⁶ However, in the same book, Kiyosuke does not even once express his own understanding of how he composes a waka poem, or how his student should aspire to do so. It is possible that observing the precedent set by his grandfather and father, Kiyosuke reserved the most important element of his teachings for verbal transmission. Or simply, as Minamoto no Toshiyori had discussed in the introduction to the *Toshiyori zuinō*,⁴⁷ Kiyosuke also acknowledged that teaching the compose of waka was nearly impossible.

This issue of impossibility of teaching waka was to be more directly addressed, if not entirely solved, by poet-scholars of the Mikohidari school. Nevertheless, without becoming self-reflective about the subject-matter, Kiyosuke also touched on the difficulty of teaching waka, by including anecdotes about Nōin and his teacher of waka, Fujiwara no Nagatō (藤原長能, 949-?) in the *Fukurozōshi*. The second part of this chapter will explore Kiyosuke’s teaching of waka mainly by analyzing the meaning of what he does not explain in his “encyclopedic” book.

The third phase of the consolidation of waka studies in the twelfth century is

---

⁴⁶. SNKBZ 29, pp. 8-11.

⁴⁷. “Customarily, people attempted to teach waka to children, and to instruct inexperienced poets by explaining the various styles of waka, by pointing out the eight ‘maladies,’ and by establishing nine criteria [for poetic excellence.] Nevertheless, if one does not study [waka properly with a teacher] and receive [correct instruction], it is hard to understand the essence of waka. Likewise, if one does not memorize [poem by rote] and study them with care, one can learn very little about waka.”

(Transcribed from Reizeike Shiguretei Sōsho 79. Also in SNKBZ 87, p. 16. Translation is mine.)
characterized by the leadership of Fujiwara no Shunzei (藤原俊成, 1114-1204), the founder of the Mikohidari school of waka, who became influential after Kiyosuke’s death in 1177. Shunzei was already actively composing poems in the mid twelfth century, during the lifetime of Emperor Sutoku (崇徳天皇, 1119-64, r. 1123-41). For instance, as early as 1140, Shunzei composed a series of one-hundred poems entitled, *Shukkai hyakushu* (述懐百首, *One Hundred Poetry Sequence on Personal Grievances*), on the theme of “personal grievances” (述懐, *shukkai* or *jukkai*). Emperor Sutoku, who was forced to abdicate young, politically ostracized by his father Retired Emperor Toba, and himself an avid waka poet, took a great interest in Shunzei’s ability to express variations and ramifications of the personal feeling of “disgruntlement” through the sophisticated waka composition. As soon as recognizing Shunzei’s talent in composing highly evocative waka with emotional appeals, Retired Emperor Sutoku included him as one of the fourteen poets for his *Kyūan hyakushu* (久安百首, *One Hundred Poetry Sequence of the Kyūan Era*, 1145-51). In 1150, Sutoku further ordered Shunzei to topically categorize the completed versions of the *Kyūan hyakushu* poems.

Because this period of Shunzei’s early activity as a prolific waka poet coincides with the

---

48. According to Yoshino Tomomi, in his *Shukkai hyakushu*, Shunzei added the theme of “personal grievances” (*jikkai*) to each one of the one-hundred compositional topics (*題, dai*) from the *Horikawa hakushu* (堀河百首, *One Hundred Sequence Poems Composed for Emperor Horikawa*, ca. 1105). (Suzuki and Suzuki, eds., pp. 93.) Because the literary anthologies of Sino-Japanese writings, *Honchō monzui* (ca. 1058-65) and its sequence, *Honchō zoku monzui* (ca. 1155-63) are replete with compositions through which Kidendo scholars expressed their “personal grievances” such as dissatisfaction with the slowness of their promotion in imperial bureaucracy, or inevitability of aging and death, it is plausible that Shunzei’s introducing the subject of “personal grievances” as poetic trope is yet another example of twelfth-century waka poets’ incorporation of Kidendo academicians’ literary traditions. For my discussion of one of such example from the *Honchō monzui*, a letter of application (*sōjō*) written by Ōe no Masahira, see Chapter 2.

49. Ibid.
time when Kiyosuke was producing his commentaries and treatises by calling himself a “scholar of waka.” Shunze and Kiyosuke are often regarded not only as contemporaries but also as rivals.

One of the early textual sources of such constructed images of the two poet-scholars is the following passage from Kamo no Chōmei’s Mumyōshō (after 1211):

Kenshō made the following comment: “Regarding the judgment of waka [at poetry contests] in recent times, Lord Shunzei and Lord Kiyosuke are equally prominent. Nevertheless, they are both biased judges, but of different kinds. [When pointing out compositional mistakes], Shunzei seems to acknowledge that he himself also makes [similar] errors, and without much criticizing, says things like ‘because it is just the way things have been, how can it be not like this?’

In contrast, Kiyosuke appears immaculately fair-minded, and shows no signs of being biased. When someone raises questions [about Kiyosuke’s comments], however, he changes his facial expression, harshly criticizes [that person’s opinion] and argues back. When this happens, Kiyosuke’s message is clear, and no one dares to make further comments.

According to Chōmei, the source of these biographical sketches of Shunzei and Kiyosuke is Kenshō (顕昭, ca. 1130-ca.1210), Kiyosuke’s half brother. As is usually the case with setsuwa

50. KKS 7, p. 226.
discourse, presumed to have been transmitted orally, the verisimilitude of the narrative cannot be ascertained. In this anecdote, remarkably, Kenshō of the Rokujō family does not necessarily provide a favorable portrait of Kiyosuke.\textsuperscript{51}

Recently, the Japanese literary historian Nakamura Aya (中村文) criticized the traditionally held view that the mid-to the late-twelfth century \textit{kagaku} (歌学, waka studies) revolved around the rivalry between Rokujō and Mikohidari schools of waka.\textsuperscript{52} Calling attention to the fact that both Rokujō and Mikohidari poets, as well as those individuals not usually associated with either one of these “waka circles” (歌壇, \textit{kadan}) participated in waka events held at Shun’e’s (俊恵, 1113-active 1179, Minamoto no Toshiyori’s son) residence in the Shirakawa (白川) district in Kyoto, called Karin’en (歌林苑, “Poets’ Garden”), Nakamura proposed a new literary history of waka, which questions the preconceived notions about different “waka circles.” Accordingly, Nakamura redefined Shun’e’s Karin’en, long considered a third waka circle where poets who did not belong to either Rokujō or Mikohidari schools congregated, as a shared space of poetry composition, spontaneously formed by “those poets, prompted by poetic

\textsuperscript{51} For an important study of Kiyosuke and Kenshō, in particular the differences in their interpretations of some of the most fervently discussed ancient poetic diction such as “もち鳥,” “よしゑやし・はしどやし” and “賜の草ぐき,” see Nishimura, pp. 229-248. Nishiura’s view on the two key poet-scholars of the Rokujō school is summarized in the following statement: “[…] 六条・御子左の別なく歌人たちを捲きこんだ、万葉集成立時代の論争において、清輔の説とももっと鋭く対立したのが顕昭であるなど、その歌学上の立場や清輔との関係は、必ずしも単純とはいえないと。” (Nishimura, p. 230.)

\textsuperscript{52} See Nakamura Aya’s book chapter, “Uta ga yomidasareru basho--karin’en josetsu” (歌が詠み出される場所－歌林苑序説), originally published in Waka bungaku ronshū henshū iinkai, ed., \textit{Heian kōki no waka}, 1994. (Nakamura, pp. 370-400.) For an earlier scholarship of Rokujō and Mikohidari schools, see for example, Ozawa (1979), pp. 77-96.
feelings (風雅心, fūgashin).”

Nakamura’s attempt to construct a revisionist literary history of waka by paying a closer attention to individual poets’ psychological propensities such as their “poetic feelings,” is highly insightful. However, because her study focuses on Shun’e’s Karin’en, it does not address particular issues regarding the Rokujō and Mikohidari schools of waka, nor discuss what the key concept “poetic feelings” meant for Rokujō and Mikohidari poets, and how it affected their participation in Karin’en. In fact, the existing scholarship on twelfth-century waka studies seems to focus too much on the differences between Rokujō and Mikohidari schools, while eclipsing the more fundamental impact they left as an aristocratic family unit on cultural and intellectual histories of Japan.

Viewed in retrospect, the differences between the two schools became pronounced mostly at the very end of the twelfth century, through their respective polemical texts on waka. For instance, on the one hand, in his Roppyakuban chinjō (六百番陳情, Appeal Against Shunzei’s Judgement at the Roppyakuban utaawase), Kenshō (顕昭, ca. 1130-ca.1210) of the Rokujō school refuted Fujiwara no Shunzei’s comments on a series of poems he composed at the Roppyakuban utaawase (六百番歌合, Poetry Match in Six Hundred Rounds, 1193). On the other hand, in the Korai fūteishō (古来風略抄, Commentary on Old and New Poetic Styles, 1st edition 1197, second edition 1201), Shunzei criticized Rokujō scholars’ theories on issues such

53. 風雅心にうながされた歌人たちが俊徳の家に参入し、「歌よみ所」即ち「詠歌の場」をその折りその折りに成り立たせていた。Ibid., p. 385.

54. The Roppyakuban utaawase was sponsored by the regent Fujiwara no Yoshitsune (藤原良経, 1169-1206).
as the proper reading of the basic terms, *chōka* (長歌, “long poems”) and *tanka* (短歌, “short poems”), and their uncritical appropriation of the standards set by kanshi poets such as rhyming schemes into waka composition. Probably before seeing Kenshō’s rebuttal in the *Roppyakuban chinjō*, Shunzei reiterated his disagreement with the scholar-poet over the interpretation of the poetic word, “Kawayashiro” (河社, water shrine) in the *Korai fūteishō*.

These textual debates certainly attest that by the end of the twelfth century, both Rokujō and Mikohidari schools of waka had grown into major forces with their own sets of values and ideas regarding the history of waka. However, shedding light only microscopically on their different positions in individual issues such as an interpretation of a poetic word, obscures their shared efforts to make the composition and study of waka their own family professions. In fact, it is obvious that Kenshō and Shunzei polemicized in the aforementioned texts so as to distinguish their own teachings from others, and promote themselves as more authentic guardians of waka tradition. The third section of this chapter will examine Shunzei’s waka treatise, *Korai fūteishō*, and how he presents and promotes himself as a teacher of waka, by comparing the difficulty of waka composition to that of attaining the Buddhist “truth.” By critically examining literary texts written by influential teachers of the Rokujō and Mikohidari schools of waka, I will uncover hidden links between the two schools; and by doing so,

55. しかるを、まず長歌短歌といふこと、もとより争ひある事なり。[...] それを、清輔朝臣と申し者の、奥義とかいかひて懸想と書いて待なるものには、ひとへに長きを「短歌」と定めて書いて待とかや。[...] しかれども万葉集の事を言ひながら、ひとへに卅一字の反歌・短歌を「長歌」と言ふらん懸想は、万葉集を詳しく見ざるに似たり。（*Korai fūteishō*, KKS 7, pp. 47-49.)

56. Ibid., pp. 92-93.

57. Ibid., pp. 69-70.
investigate why the cultivation of the individual person’s “poetic mind” or that which has been variously called ふるゆ (風流) and ふうがしん (風雅心), was promoted through these hereditary units in twelfth century Japan.

2-1. Fujiwara Akisue and the Hitomaro eigu Ritual

In 1118, Akisue invited Minamoto no Toshiyori to perform the role of “master of waka” (和歌の宗匠) at a ceremonial event called “An Offering to Hitomaro’s Portrait” (人影供, Hitomaro eigu).\(^{58}\) Kakinomoto no Hitomaro (fl. ca. 690) is a prolific poet whose works are featured in the Man’yōshū (ca. 785). Hitomaro had long been recognized as a “patron saint of poets” (歌のひじり・和歌仙)\(^{59}\); the Japanese and Chinese prefaces to the Kokinshū (905) referred to him as such, along with another Man’yōshū poet, Yamabe no Akahito (山辺赤人, active in the early 8th century).\(^{60}\) However, during the tenth and eleventh centuries, the canonical status of Hitomaro among waka poets did not result in his becoming the object of cult worship.

The modern literary scholar Sasaki Takahiro (佐々木孝浩) suggests that the idea of the

---

\(^{58}\) SNKS 59, p. 233.

\(^{59}\) This translation appears in Shirane (2007), p. 68.

\(^{60}\) SNKBT 5, p. 11. Interestingly, there is a subtle difference in the treatment of Hitomaro and Akahito in the Japanese and Chinese prefaces to the Kokinshū. On the one hand, the Japanese preface singles out Hitomaro as a “poet sage” (歌のひじり). (Ibid., pp. 11-12.) Highly positive comments on Akahito follow the designation of Hitomaro as a poet sage, but it is clear that this epithet is only meant for Hitomaro. On the other hand, the Chinese preface states that Hitomaro and Akahito “are equally immortals/sages of waka” (並和歌仙也). (Ibid., pp. 342-43.) In formulating the ritual worshipping of Hitomaro, it is highly plausible that Akisue was under the influence of the Japanese preface to the Kokinshū preface, or intentionally preferred to accept its theory on the “sages of waka.” For a general discussion of the influence of the Japanese preface to the Kokinshū on twelfth-century scholar-poets, see Commons, p. 117.
Hitomaro *eigu* was likely to have been inspired by the “Confucian Rites” (植煥, *sekiten* or *shakuten*, Ch: *Shidian*), traditionally held biannually at the State Academy. Originally transmitted from China, the first *sekiten* was conducted as early as 701 in Japan. During this rite, portraits of Confucius and his ten principal disciples were honored by participants’ offering foodstuffs (mainly meat), reading and discussing the Confucian classics, and composing Chinese verses. By the early twelfth century, the ritual had expanded into a full-fledged state-sponsored event with over one hundred participants, mainly professors and students in the Academy. In her book on the reception history of Kakinomoto no Hitomaro, Anne Commons points out that “a likely immediate model for Akisue’s Hitomaro *eigu* in terms of size and setting, was private *sekiten* held at the residence of a member of the Ōe clan (a scholarly family) in the Twelfth Month of 1114 […]” Commons also discusses the influence of particular rituals of esoteric Shingon Buddhism, *mieku* (御影供, also mioku, offerings to portraits) and *daishikō* (大師講, offerings to [Kūkai] the Great Teacher), on the Hitomaro *eigu* ritual.

---

61. According to Commons, the rite of *shidian* was “recorded in China at least as far back as the third century C.E.” (Commons, pp. 98-99.)


63. For detailed study of the *sekiten*, see Ishimura Teikichi, vol. 1, pp. 285-89. According to Ishimura, after the building of the State Academy had been burned down, sometime before 1180, the rite was conducted at some other state bureaus’ buildings. At court, the tradition was discontinued by the time of the Muromachi period, but at the Kanazawa Bunko (金沢文庫) in Kamakura, it endured longer. During the Edo period, the rite was revived and conducted at 昌平坂堂 in Edo and other provincial schools such as 足利学校. (Ishimura, pp. 288-9.)

64. Commons, pp. 99-100.

65. Ibid., p. 100. Pointing out that “the Sekiten account in the [Chinese] *Da tang kaiyuan li* [Rituals of the Kaiyuan era, 732] does not mention images of Confucius and his disciples as the object of worship,” Commons argues that the use of a portrait was mainly a Buddhist tradition: “The implicit parallel between Hitomaro and the sect founders ties the development of Hitomaro portraiture to that of esoteric Buddhist sect ancestors, whose portraits were transmitted from master to disciple as proof of transmission of the
Unlike the original sekiten, Akisue’s Hitomaro eigu was conducted privately at his residence on the Sixth Avenue (rokujo 六条) in Kyoto, in the presence of twelve waka poets. However, Hitomaro eigu retained some of the most salient formal features of the Confucian sekiten, including the use of a portrait of the object of worship, an offering of food, and the recitation of poetry, in this case, waka. Why did Akisue, who was not born into a scholarly family like Ōe no Masafusa, nor a dedicated student of Chinese studies, so ostentatiously imitate a quintessentially “academic” ritual at his home, with an ancient waka poet as the object of worshipping?

2-2. The Kidendō Scholar Fujiwara no Atsumitsu’s Participation in Hitomaro eigu

The setsuwa collection Kokon chomonjū (古今著聞集, Collection of Old and New Renowned Tales, 20 vols., ed., Tachibana no Narisue, 1254) includes a detailed account of Akisue’s Hitomaro eigu, supposedly the first of its kind, that took place in the Sixth Month of 1118. The most curious aspect of the Kokon chomonjū account of the event is its reference to Akisue’s collaboration with the leading Kidendō scholar at the time, Fujiwara no Atsumitsu (藤原敦光, 1063-1144), the son of Fujiwara no Akihira—the compiler of the literary anthology Honchō monzui (本朝文粹, Literary Essence of Our Country, ca. 1058-65). In fact, the description in the Kokon chomonjū relied heavily upon Atsumitsu’s own kanbun documentation teachings.” (Ibid., p. 101.)


67. For my discussion of Fujiwara no Akihira (藤原明衡, 999-1066) and his anthology of Chinese writings by Japanese authors, Honchō monzui, see Chapter 2.
of the event, “Kakinomoto eigu ki” (栞本影供記, “A Record of the Offering to the Portrait of Kakinomoto”).

According to these sources, as part of the preparation for the event, Atsumitsu had composed a “panegyric” (san 賛) for Hitomaro, and the verse was inscribed in a panel of the scroll above Hitomaro’s portrait by a renowned calligrapher. (Thus, san is often called gasan 画賛, “panegyric inscription.”) The literary genre of san (Ch: zan) originates in China, and the Chinese scholar Liu Xie’s (劉勰, ca. 465-520) literary treatise, Wenxin diaolong (文心雕龍, The Literary Mind and the Carving of Dragons) states that a panegyric verse consists of lines made up with “four characters” with a “simple rhyming scheme” that “plainly captivates the emotions.” Following the example of the Chinese anthology Wenxuan, which contains two

68. The text of Atsumitsu’s Kakinimoto eigu ki is available in GR 16 Waka-bu, pp. 58-60. For a brief discussion of variants of the text, see Commons, p. 97, note 22. For an English translation of the first “diary-like” part of the Eigu ki, see Commons, pp. 97-8.

69. The “praise inscription” in Commons’ translation. (Commons, p. 96.)

70. The Kokon chomonjū (1254) contains another setsuwa, that briefly recounts how Akisue came to obtain a new portrait of Hitomaro, copied from the one in possession of the Retired Emperor Shirakawa. (SNKS 59, pp. 262-3. Translated in Commons, pp. 104-5.) The setsuwa collection Jikkinshō (十訓抄, Collection of Ten Lessons, 3 vols., 1252) also includes a similar tale on Akisue’s acquisition of the Hitomaro portrait, from a slightly different perspective. (Translated in Commons, pp. 102-3). For a detailed study of the iconography of Hitomaro portrait, see Commons, pp. 108-110. For sample images of Hitomaro portrait from the medieval period, crowned with Atsumitsu’s praise inscription, see the front cover of Commons’ book, and Shirane (2007), p. 68. Incidentally, the front cover of Robert Brower and Earl Miner’s Japanese Court Poetry (1961) features the painter Teizei Takechika’s (冷泉為恭, 1823-1864) portrait of Hitomaro. As Atsumitsu describes in his “Kakinomoto eigu ki,” even in this the mid-nineteenth century portrait, Hitomaro, “whose age is around sixty” (年齢六旬余人) is depicted “holding paper on his left hand, gripping a brush on his right hand” (左手操紙。右手握筆). (GR 16, p. 58.)

71. According to Atsumitsu, it was Fujiwara no Akinaka (藤原顕仲, 1059-1129).

72. A “praise inscription” in Commons’ translation.

73. In the Japanese literary scholar Gōtō Akio’s (後藤昭雄) words, “讃の本来の意義は称賛すること
examples of san, the Honchō monzui includes five examples.\textsuperscript{75} Atsumitsu’s panegyric on Hitomaro is included in the Honchō zoku monzui (本朝続文粹, Literary Essence of Our Country II, 1155-63), which contains eleven examples of the genre.\textsuperscript{76} Atsumitsu’s own “Kakinomoto eiguki” does not quote his san, but the Kokon chomonjū cites it in its entirety, suggesting that the mid-thirteenth compiler of the setsuwa collection combined the two kanbun sources for the convenience of his readers. The following translation of Atsumitsu’s san along with its preface is based on the text in the Honchō zoku monzui:

A Panegyric Inscription on the Portrait of Lord Kakinomoto no Hitomaro, with a Preface

The official’s clan name was Kakinomoto, and his given name was Hitomaro. He was a waka poet in ancient times. He served during the sagacious reigns of [Emperors] Jitō [r. 690-97] and Monmu [r. 697-707], and associated himself with Princes Niita[be] and Takechi. He dedicated felicitating poems on the spring breeze at Mount Yoshino, while accompanying Emperor [Jitō’s] excursion [to that place]; on the autumnal fog at the Bay of Akashi, he conjured up the finest words, imagining a small boat. These were indeed excellent examples of the Six Principles [of poetry], and laudable deeds [that will endure] for millennia. Nowadays, a profound and mysterious [yūgen], antiquated style is valued [in painting]. Incidentally, I [learned that] a portrait [of Hitomaro] in an innovative style

にあり、ことばは四字句にまとめ、脚頃も数字を踏む程度で、簡潔なことばで感情を尽くし、きれいな文を締っていくものと述べる。” (SNKBT 27, p. 419.)

74. For an analysis of one of these, see Commons, p. 108.

75. See SNKBT 27, pp. 328-30. They are all relatively short verse, but not necessarily written in the format of four-characters per line, except for Miyako no Yoshika’s (都良香, 834-79) verse on “a good horse” (良馬讃).

76. For a foundational study of the Honchō zoku monzui, including its presumed date of compilation and editor(s), see Satō (2003), pp, 35-65. Curiously, Akimitsu’s san for Hitomaro is preceded by other literati’s verse written in honor of various Buddhist monks, scholars, and even “wine” (酒) and “tea” (茶), suggesting a marginal position the waka-related topic held in the minds of the Kidendō-trained scholars.
is being transmitted. I was greatly inspired and [decided to] compose the following panegyric:

Being a patron saint of poets,
Your nature is heavenly given.

Your talent is exceptional,
Whatever emerges from your brush is majestic.

[Though limited to] thirty-one syllables,
Your florid language is vivid and colorful.

For over four centuries,
Subsequent generations have inherited your legacy.

Being a first teacher in the Way of Waka,
You are a wise pioneer in Japan.

Tarnishing [your reputation] would do no good.
Damaging [your image] would only result in its further consolidation.

[The splendor of] a peacock’s feather is rare.
The uniqueness of a kylin’s horn is matchless.

You have long been outstanding,
No one shall stand equal to you.

柿下朝臣人麿畫讚

大夫姓柿下。名人麿。蓋上世之調人也。仕持統文武之聖朝。遇新田高市皇子。吉野山之春風。從仙駕而獻壽。明石浦之秋霧。思扁舟而瀉詞。誠是六義之秀逸。万代之美談者歟。方今為重幽玄之古篇、聊傳後素之新樣。因有所感、乃作讚焉。其辞曰。

和調之仙 稚性于天
其才卓絶 其鋭森然
三十一字 詞華露鮮
四百餘歳 來葉風傳
斯道宗匠 我朝先賢
涅而無縫 鑽之弥堅
Alluding to the *Kokinshū* prefaces, Atsumitsu opens his panegyric on Hitomaro with the epithet, “a patron saint of poets.” In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, Kidendō-trained literati customarily expressed their penchant for Daoist motifs in “kanshi prefaces” (*shijo* 詩序), in particular those collected in the *Honchō zoku monzui.*

Thus, *waka no hijiri* (和歌之仙) in this context could also mean “an immortal of waka,” in a more explicitly Daoistic sense. The second half of Akimitsu’s verse similarly begins with his reference to Hitomaro as “a first teacher in this Way” (道道宗匠).*

Considering the fact that the designation of waka as a “Way” appears to be conspicuously avoided in the eleven “waka prefaces” in the *Honchō monzui,* except for the Chinese Preface to the *Kokinshū,* which calls it “this Way” (道) in an unquestionably negative context,* Atsumitsu’s recognition of waka as such is probably what Akisue needed the most to legitimize his own version of cult worship. On the significance of the correlation between the emergence of waka as a Way and the canonization of Hitomaro, Sasaki Takahiro provides the following analysis:

> [O]nce waka was acknowledged as a Way, sooner or later what became indispensable was [the notion], that would guarantee the tradition and

---

77. *SZKT* 29-ge, p. 179. Commons also provides a translation of this verse. Commons, pp. 106-7.

78. See for instance Öe no Masahira’s *shijo* in the *Honchō zoku monzui,* in which he refers to “old sayings of Laozi and Zhuangzi” (老莊之遺言). (*SZKT* 29-ge, p. 131.)


80. For my discussion of this passage, see Chapter 2.
authority of the Way—namely the founder or the [guardian] God of the Way. In Confucianism, Confucius had enjoyed such a status, whereas in the Way of Kanshi, Bo Juyi and Sugawara no Michizane had been revered as such. [The notion of] Hitomaro as a poetic sage [perfectly] fulfilled the requirements for a God of Waka, shared subliminally among those who were highly conscious of the [emerging] Way of Waka, men like Akisue and his contemporaries, as well as by waka poets of subsequent generations. 81

Sasaki’s argument that the newly emerging Way of Waka required its own centripetal force, or an object of worship, that strengthened the spirit of camaraderie among those individuals dedicated to the composition of waka, is convincing. However, as Commons argues, in Akimitsu’s panegyric, Hitomaro is “still termed as uta no hijiri, ‘sage of Japanese poetry,’ rather than a deity of Japanese poetry (waka no kami).”82 The Japanese literary scholar Watanabe Yasuaki (渡部泰明) further expounds on the not fully deified status of Hitomaro in Akisue’s first Hitomaro eigu, and calls it “a ritual that encouraged one to perform and act like Hitomaro.”83 Watanabe argues that when the object of worship is a “genuine god or buddha,” the identification of oneself with such an ineffable being is nearly impossible.84 According to Watanabe, this worldly image of Hitomaro as the “first teacher” and “wise leader of Japan” guided the participants of the Hitomaro eigu to take him as a model, and to aspire to become fine teachers of

81. 81. また、和歌が道として意識された時、遅かれ早かれ必要となるのは、その道の伝統と権威を保証する精神的な支柱となる存在、即ち道の祖・道の神です。儒学では孔子、詩の道では白楽天や菅原道真がそのような存在です。顕季やその同時代の人々、そしてそれに続く時代の歌人達で、和歌の道を意識するもの達が潜在的に持っていた、歌の神を求める要求に応え得る存在が、歌仙人騏であったのです。(Sasaki, p.144.)

82. Commons, p. 107.

83. 人麻呂影供は、人麻呂になる演技を促す儀式である。Watanabe (2009), p. 200.

84. Ibid.
Why, then was waka considered so important for the participants of the Hitomaro eigu?  

2-3. Fujiwara no Atsumitu’s Waka Preface to the Hitomaro eigu

Descriptions in Atsumitsu’s “Kakinomoto eigu ki” reveal that the active way in which he participated in Akisue’s Hitomaro eigu was fundamentally different from how his predecessors interacted with waka poets of the day. For instance, during the eleventh century, it was customary for academicians to write kanbun prefaces upon the request of waka poets, the majority of whom were high-ranking courtiers who had the means to host semi-public waka parties and other formal events at their residences. However, at Akisue’s Hitomaro eigu ceremony, Atsumitsu not only prepared the panegyric inscription (gasan), the poetic topic (dai 题), and the “preface” (jo 序) that introduced the twelve waka poems composed by Akisue and his guests, but also composed a waka and recited the poem along with the waka poets. The following is Atsumitsu’s waka preface (wakajo) for the Hitomaro eigu, accompanied by his own

85. 賛仰する対象になろうとする気持ちをかきたてる儀式、それが人麻呂影供である。相手が本物の神・仏であったら、そのものになろうとするには特別な修行が必要になろうが、人麻呂だったら不可能ではないかもしれない、という気にもなるだろう。 (Ibid. Emphasis added.)

86. See, for example, all the “waka prefaces” (和歌序) in the Honchō monzui.

87. They were Fujiwara no Saneyuki (藤原実行, 1080-1162, Akisue’s son-in-law), Fujiwara no Nagazane (藤原長実, 1075-1133, Akisue’s first son), Fujiwara no Tsunetada (藤原経忠, 1075-1138, his wife was Emperor Toba’s wet nurse), Minamoto no Masasada (源雅定, 1094-1162, Akisue’s son-in-law), Minamoto no Toshiyori, Fujiwara no Akisuke (藤原顯輔, 1090-1155, Akisue’s third son), Fujiwara no Michitsune (藤原道経, active during the insei period), Minamoto no Yukimune (源行宗, 1064-1143), Fujiwara no Akinama (藤原顕仲, 1059-1129), a Junior Counselor Munekane (少納言宗兼) and Fujiwara no Tametada (藤原為忠, ?-1136).
A Waka Poem on “Water and the Arrival of the Wind in the Evening” and a Preface

By Atsumitsu, Director of the Academy

The customs of Japan have their origins in Waka. A Waka poem is generated by [human] intentions, and takes form in language. It describes every event, and features every object. As such, waka has served as a means of edification, expressing the beauty of [the relationships] between ruler and subject.

Thus, whenever he has spare time while serving the sovereign, Director of Palace Maintenance [Akisue] has contemplated the condensation of language in accordance with the Six Principles [of poetry].

What satisfies his sensitive mind are the refined pleasures of flora and fauna. Those who responded to his invitation are men of brilliant minds with fragrant robes and fine horses.

Today’s gathering is simply the result of our like-mindedness. Now, streaming water, exposed to the summer, brings freshness. Cool breezes greet the evening and arrive [in this residence].

Leaves of the reeds tremble in the wind, rustling forlornly. Hazy shorelines finally darken, while the tops of cedar trees shake vigorously.

The fresh moonlight on the sand brightens, and [my] stirring emotions are endless. Provisionally, I recite the following [poem]:

When the wind blows
[In the sea,] waves rise
Signaling the arrival of autumn.
[But today,] it is still a summery evening,
With the edge of the stream so cool and [breezy].

水風晚來和歌一首井序 大学頭敦光

我朝風俗和歌為本。生於志 形於言。記一事 詠一物。誠為 風論之端。
From the viewpoint of the long history of waka, and its parallel development with kanshi before and after the compilation of the *Man'yōshū*, it is remarkable that the composition of waka thrived without having a single model figure, or an organized structure akin to Confucian studies and the composition of kanshi, until Akisue invented the practice of revering the image of Hitomaro as the patron saint of waka poets. In other words, before Akisue, the composition of waka was a widely practiced custom among male and female courtiers, but not necessarily a discipline, a field of study, or a cult actively pursued by a relatively small number of “likeminded” (一揆) people.

Atsumitsu’s *wakajo* is remarkable for three reasons. Firstly, instead of simply repeating the typical view that waka is a Japanese custom, Atsumitsu astonishingly turns logic on its head.
and declares that “the customs of Japan have their origins in waka” (我朝風俗和歌為本).

Waka had hitherto never been so positively appraised by kangaku scholars. This statement even suggests that so long as the composition of kanshi takes place in Japan, and is thus a sanctioned Japanese custom, it may have derived in part from the composition of waka. Although Atsumitsu does not go so far as to articulate that the compositional skill of waka is prerequisite or simply assumed for kanshi poets, the logic of his statement certainly facilitates such an interpretation.

Secondly, Atsumitsu praises Akisue’s “mind that appreciates [nature]” (賞心), as if admitting that waka poets can also possess fūgetsu (風月). The association of “flora and fauna” (花鳥) with the composition of waka was already commonplace among waka prefaces in the Honchō monzui. On the one hand, because waka had been formulaically called “custom of Japan” (風俗，吾朝之風俗，習俗), the inner mechanism of waka poets, namely how they related their linguistic act to nature, or how nature affected their perception when conjuring up a poem (although such a theory had long been presented in the Kokinshū prefaces), was normally left unexplained in waka prefaces. On the other hand, in their kanshi prefaces (shijo 詩序), academicians customarily referred to their own kanshi compositions as fūgetsu, assuming that

---

90. For example, see Ōe no Masahira’s wakajo upon the occasion of Emperor Ichijō’s excursion to the Ōi River (Honchō monzui, vol. 11:351, SNKB T 27, p. 324) and a provincial governor Minamoto no Michinari’s (源道済, 1019) wakajo, also in the Honchō monzui. (SNKB T 27, p. 324.) These waka prefaces contain specific reference to “flora and fauna” (花鳥).

91. See Honchō monzui, vol, 11: 345, 348, 350, 351. (SNKB T 27, pp. 322-24.) In the Honchō zoku monzui, in his wakajo, Ōe no Masafusa refers to waka as shūzoku (習俗). (SZKT 19-ge, p. 167.)
the term literally meant the poet’s appreciation of nature, such as “the wind and the moon.”

The use of the expression “appreciative mind” appears rarely in kanshi and waka prefaces in both the *Honchō monzui* and the *Honchō zoku monzui*. One example appears in Atsumitsu’s father Akihira’s kanshi preface, in the *Honchō zoku monzui*: “ Truly, Minister Minamoto [no Tsunenobu] appreciates the wind and the moon, enjoys flora and fauna in this place.” In this passage, Akihira uses the nebulous term *fūgetsu* in its most literal sense as a metaphor for nature. While still avoiding to apply the term *fūgetsu* to waka, by commending Akisue’s “appreciative mind” of nature, Atsumitsu acknowledges that waka can also become a means to express one’s *fūgetsu*, the poetic mind.

Thirdly, Atsumitsu’s statement, “Today’s gathering is simply the result of our like-mindedness” literally places the kangaku academician Atsumitsu, his host Akisue, and his eleven guest poets, on the same level as those who appreciate nature and poetry, under the semi-divine auspices of Hitomaro. In fact, among eleven wakajo in the *Honchō monzui* and eighteen in the *Honchō zoku monzui*, none contains a waka poem composed by the authors of the kanbun prefaces. Typically ending with the expression, “Following are [the poems composed on this occasion]” (其詞曰), wakajo introduce poems composed by waka poets at particular gatherings. Thus it is remarkable that at Akisue’s *Hitomaro eigu*, Atsumitsu initiated

---

92. For my discussion of *shijo* and *fūgetsu*, see Chapter 2.

93. Minamoto no Tsunenobu (源経信, 1016-97), Toshiyori’s father.


95. In contrast, Ōe no Masafusa refers to *fūgetsu*, in conjunction with the term “slave” (奴隷), somewhat ironically as Kidendō-trained scholars’ “service” to their patrons, namely composing Chinese prose and verse. For my discussion of this, see Chapter 3.
the recitation of poems with the work of his own. Perhaps because of such an unconventionally participatory attitude on the part of the Kidendō academician, while Atsumitsu’s panegyric inscription (gasan) on Hitomaro was selected in the “panegyric” (san) section of volume eleven of the Honchō zoku monzui, his wakajo in question did not merit a place in the same collection. What, then, is the significance of Atsumitsu’s direct participation in Hitomaro eigu as a waka poet? What he means by “likemindedness” needs to be discussed in conjunction with the poems composed for the event.

2-4. Fujiwara no Akisue and Minamoto no Toshiyori’s Poems Composed at the Hitomaro eigu

As discussed in the previous chapter, Akisue’s contemporary, Minamoto no Toshiyori, was acutely aware of the declining state of waka in the 1110s. While remaining politically marginal, Toshiyori responded to the unpromising reality, i.e. his patrons’ indifference to the composition of waka, and his fellow poets’ conservative taste, by studying ancient poetic diction and meticulously preserving and integrating them in his waka treatise, Toshiyori zuinō. As I discussed in Chapter 7, Toshiyori’s involvement in the revival of waka appears to have been fundamentally driven by his personal “passion” (数寄, suki) for ancient poetic language, and his commitment to live up to the standard set by his predecessors such as Nōin.

Unlike Toshiyori, the historically reconstructed image of Akisue as the innovator of the Hitomaro eigu ritual, reveals more about his ambition to establish his branch of the Fujiwara clan as a “house of waka studies” (歌の家) and much less about his personal enthusiasm for waka.

96. For analyses of Toshiyori’s “unconventional ideals and [poetic] practice,” see Brower and Miner, pp. 242-44.

97. Commons also discuss the fundamentally retrospective nature of Akisue’s reputation as the founder of
Another anecdote from the *Kokon chomonjū* recounts how Akisue transmitted the valuable portrait of Hitomaro he used for his 1118 ceremony to his third son Akisuke (顕輔), instead of bequeathing it upon his eldest son Nagazane (長実) or his second son Ieyasu (家保), because of his conviction: “So long as they do not excel in this Way [of Waka], not even my own children shall inherit or receive my permission to copy the portrait.” (実子なりともこの道にたへざらん者には、伝ふべからず、写しもすべからず。) By ruling out the possibility of unconditional primogenitary transmission of his self-claimed status as the head of the Rokujō school of waka, symbolized by the possession of Hitomaro’s portrait in question, it seems that Akisue attempted to maintain a balance between the two antithetical forces that enabled the consolidation of the Way of Waka in the twelfth century: individual, mainly amateur poets’ passion (suki) for waka, and the professionalization of waka-related activities by members of a small number of aristocratic families. Most tellingly, Akisue’s poem composed at the Hitomaro *eigu* ceremony suggests that his outward gesture to facilitate the event as a host and the head of the Rokujō school of waka outweighs his commitment to live the lives of ancient poets:

Poems composed on [the topic of] “Water and the Arrival of the Wind in the Evening,” presented before the portrait of Officer Kinomoto

We don’t have a spring  
[On the surface of which] you can scoop up  
This evening moon;  
Yet the rippling waves on the shore of Shiga

*Hitomaro eigu* and the Rokujō school of waka. In particular, her argument that “there is no record that Akisue ever held Hitomaro eigu again” is crucial in examining the meaning and the influence of Akisue’s Hitomaro *eigu* in 1118. (Commons, pp. 115-6.)

98. SNKS 59, p. 263. For the translation of the entire anecdote #204 of the *Kokon chomonjū*, see Commons, pp. 104-5.
Appear refreshing.

柿下大夫の前に於いて、水風晩来といふことを詠ずる和歌

夕づく夜
むすぶ泉も
なけれども、
志賀の浦波
ずずしかしけり

The first half of the poem appears to be Akisue’s humble remark to show his gratitude to his guests, one third of whom were his relatives, including his sons. The expression “the waves on the shore of Shiga” alludes to following famous Man’yōshū poem composed by Hitomaro:

Cape Kara of Shiga
In the wave-ripping region of Sasanami,
Still looks promising;
Yet, I cannot bring myself to await [the arrival of] the boats
Of those courtiers.

ささなみの
しかのからさき
さきくあれど
おほみやびとの
舟待ちかねつ

(Man’yōshū, Vol. 1:30100)

Hitomaro composed this poem when he visited the former site of Emperor Tenji’s (天智天皇, 626-71, r. 668-71) capital in Ōtsu (大津, the present-day capital of Shiga prefecture)


100. SNKS 6, pp. 61-2.
O Kara Cape of Shiga in Sasanami,/though you are unchanged,/in vain we wait for the courtiers’ boats. (Edward Cranston’s translation in Shirane 2007, p. 80.)
beside Lake Biwa. In this poem, Hitomaro uses the place-name “Sasanami” (楽浪) as a pillow-word (makura kotoba 枕詞), a nominal modifier, for the region name, Shiga. The ways in which Akisue’s poem alludes to the place-name Shiga are too incidental, and the poem does not invoke profound nostalgia for the ruined capital as it does in Hitomaro’s poem. The superficialness of Akisue’s poem is attested by the fact that there is no logical or emotive linkage between “Shiga” and its state of being “refreshing/cool” (すずしかりけり). Watanabe Yasuaki interprets Akisue’s reference to the coolness as part of his formal gratitude towards his guests.¹⁰¹ In either case, by referring to “Shiga no uranami,” Akisue entices his guests to relocate themselves with their imagination from his “humble” abode to the lakeside where Hitomaro once daydreamed about courtiers commuting to the old capital. Yet, Akisue himself does not imagine or “perform” the role of Hitomaro by composing a poem with similarly deep emotive effects. In the words of Watanabe, Akisue’s poem reveals his “efforts to make up for his disadvantages as an upstart, born without a prestigious [family] history and status.”¹⁰²

On the same occasion, Toshiyori composed a more emotionally profound and touching poem which skillfully alludes to Hitomaro’s “Cape Kara of Shiga”:

```
The field watchman’s mirror  ゆふ日さす
on which the setting sun shines  野守のかがみ
```

¹⁰¹. また、「涼しかりけり」というのは、涼感だけではなく、心が晴れ晴れとした状態をも表すので、この場に集ってきた人々への感謝の意を表することにもなる。はっきりいえば、歌として何の深みがあるわけではない。この催しを記念するだけの歌である。(Watanabe 2009, p. 195.)

¹⁰². 成上がり者ゆえに由緒と格式を持たず、どうにかその負い目を回復しようとする頼季の努力. Ibid.
This poem probably sounds like a riddle to those who are not familiar with the expression, “the field watchman’s mirror” (野守の鏡, nomori no kagami). In the Toshiyori zuīnō, Toshiyori provides an anecdotal commentary to an ancient poem which includes the phrase in question:

“I wish I could get
the field watchman’s mirror,
[with which he found] the sparrow hawk.
I want to know whether that person is thinking of me or not, without my leaving home.”

In the past, when an emperor called Tenji went out in the field and engaged himself in falconry, his falcon was blown away by the wind and disappeared. At the time, they had a guard in the field. The emperor called upon him and said to him: "My falcon is lost. Make sure you will find it."

In awe, the guard replied: "Your falcon is [resting] on the upper branch of a pine tree in that hill, facing south."

The emperor was surprised by this and said: "After all, you are looking down, with your head touching the ground; you have no view of the outside. How can you tell the exact location of the falcon on the treetop?"

The elderly guard replied: "[It is true that we] humble folk are not supposed to mingle our faces [with those of] the emperor's daughters. We see the whiteness of our hair and count the wrinkles on our faces by using the water that collects on the shrubs as a mirror. By looking in [one of these] mirrors, I learned that the falcon is in the woods."

After this, water that collects in the middle of a field is called "the field watchman’s mirror."
watchman’s mirror." That is how the story goes.

[Also,] "the field watchman’s mirror" [can be interpreted as] Xu Jun's mirror. His mirror had a special power to reveal the contents of the human mind. Because it was such an extraordinary mirror, everyone in society wished to possess it. Xu Jun thought that there was no way he could keep the mirror safely, so he hid it underneath a burial mound. I learned this by hearsay.

I wonder which is more truthful.

Toshiyori comments on the poem “I wish I could get” (hashitaka no) in his typically digressive manner, while focusing on the history of the poetic diction, “the field watchman’s
mirror,” and leaving the actual interpretation of the poem to his readers. It almost gives the impression that Toshiyori mentioned the poem for the sake of introducing the two anecdotes about the “field watchman” and the “mirror,” one from Japan and the other from China. While the first anecdote is associated with Emperor Tenji, whose temporally relocated capital of Shiga Hiromato reminisces about in his “Cape Kara of Shiga” (sasanamino) poem, the second tale introduces the phrase’s Chinese origin as well as the trope of the mirror’s extraordinary mind-reading power. The first half of the poem Toshiyori introduces alludes directly to the anecdote about the humble field watcher and his “mirror” in the open space, while the the second half is incomprehensible without knowledge of the Chinese anecdote.

Neither can the poem Toshiyori himself composed at Fujiwara no Akisue’s first Hitomaro eigu be properly understood without the familiarity with the expression “the field watchman’s mirror.” By referring to the expression, which according to the setsuwa is a pool of water on the shrubby surface, and the absence of “human figures” (specifically, courtiers attending in Tenji’s Ōmi capital) who dared to look in the mirror in the hope of reading people’s minds, Toshiyori evokes the same kind of nostalgia and poignancy, alluding to the historical realities that emperor Tenji’s capital once stood in Ōmi, and that soon after the capital was moved back to Kyōto in 672, Hitomaro eulogized the splendor of the emperor’s reign during his time in Ōmi by expressing that he could not “bring himself to await the arrival of the courtiers’ boats” (ōmiya bito no fune machikanetsu) at the now deserted Cape Kara in Shiga.

Certainly not all of Akisue’s poems are superficial, nor are Toshiyori’s emotionally powerful and profound like this one. However, as far as the poems they composed at the first Hiromaro eigu ceremony in 1118 are concerned, we can make the following conclusion: the
attitudes shown by Akisue and Toshiyori epitomize two conflicting but hard-to-separate aspects of waka practices in the mid-through the late twelfth century. On the one hand, Akisue’s act of hosting Hitomaro eigu and incorporating the formalities of kangaku scholarship, and transforming waka practices from a local custom to his family prerogative was an essential step toward the consolidation of kagaku (waka studies) as something respectable as kangaku. On the other hand, Toshiyori’s way of living the lives of ancient poets through his imagination and philological attentiveness continued to inspire waka poets in subsequent generations, regardless of their family background or affiliation. (Toshiyori’s son, Shun’e 俊恵, was also a renowned waka poet, but unlike Akisue, Toshiyori did not form a hereditary school of waka.) In other words, Akisue and Toshiyori set the foundation for the future development of waka studies in the mid-to-late twelfth century by demonstrating waka’s new potentiality as a recourse to self-preservation, and a means to enrich one’s life through poetic imagination.

3. Fujiwara Kiyosuke on Nōin and Fujiwara Nagatō’s Master-Disciple Relationship

Akisue’s Hitomaro eigu ritual established the idea that the Man’yōshū poet Kakinomoto no Hitomaro was the “first teacher of the Way [of waka]” (斯道宗匠). As mentioned earlier, Hitomaro was described as “the patron saint of waka” (uta no hijiri) as early as in the Kokinshū prefaces (905), but little is known about his actual teaching of waka. In fact, in his waka treatise Fukurozōshi (袋草紙, The Pocket Book, 1157), Fujiwara no Kiyosuke states that the concept of “a master-disciple relationship” was foreign to the culture of waka (和歌“昔ヨリ無師”105) until

105. SNKBT 29, p. 380.
the early eleventh century. According to Kiyosuke, Nōin (能因, 988-active 1051) was the first student of Fujiwara no Nagatō (藤原長能, 949-?) and “both signed a contract” (相互契約) to form a master-disciple relationship in the study of the art of waka. However, Kiyosuke’s rendition of the story is equivocal about how Nōin actually acquired skill in the composition of waka from Nagatō:

Once, when Nōin was still a Higo Scholar, he was on his way to carry out an errand, and one of the wheels of his carriage broke in front of Nagatō’s house. While Nōin was having someone fetch a new wheel, he went into Nagatō’s house and met with him for the first time. The meeting was indeed serendipitous, because Nōin had long wanted to visit Nagatō, but had never done so. Nōin mentioned [his earlier intention to meet with Nagatō], and they signed a contract [confirming their master-disciple relationship].

Nōin asked: “How should I compose a waka poem?”

Nagatō replied:

“A sudden rainstorm is striking the dry colorful leaves which fall and form piles, because it is deep in the mountain.”

You should simply compose a poem like this.”

Thereafter, Nōin formally regarded Nagatō as his teacher.

106. Ibid.
108. Present day Kumakoto prefecture. Nōin’s father was a governor there. (SNKBT 29, p. 117.)
Kiyosuke may have included this anecdote to make the point that although Nōin and Nagatō had established a formal master-disciple relationship, according to custom, teachers of waka usually remained silent, thus encouraging students to explore “poetic truth” spontaneously. In other words, the essence of Nōin and Nagatō’s relationship as it appears in this anecdote was formed through the confluence of their taste, epitomized by their mutual appreciation of the poem quoted by Nagatō. As Kiyosuke points out, the poem in question was not even written by Nagatō; it was composed by the academician Ōe no Yoshitoki (大江嘉言, ?- 1009?), and was included in both the Kinyōshū (Collection of Golden Leaves, 3rd edition, 1128) and Shikashū (Florilegium of Japanese Poems, 1151). Kiyosuke shows his “scholarly” side by correctly identifying the author of the poem, but does not explain why the poem was so remarkable for Nagatō and Nōin. Reading Kiyosuke’s Fukurozōshi is challenging because despite its comprehensive coverage of topics, the author’s treatment of individual issues is often cursory, leaving the interpretation of unique material, much of which seems to have been derived orally, up to the reader.


110. 予これを案ずに、件の歌は嘉言の歌なり。何ぞ高進の歌をもって証となせるや。もし口伝の醜事か。(SNKBT 29, p. 118.)

111. For Nōin’s friendship with the Ōe academicians, such as Yoshitoki and Masatoki (正言), see Kawamura (1991), pp. 105-28.

112. Kiyosuke questions if Yoshitoki’s poem was “erroneously quoted in oral teaching” (もし口伝の醜事か).
The poem quoted above reads effortlessly, with an unusually smooth, top-down syntax, and with no *kugire* (句切れ), “measure breaks.” In it, Yoshitoki captures the sound of the rain falling on the dry leaves on a mountain path on a late autumn or early winter day. We can only speculate why Nagatō and Nōin “signed a contract” based on their mutual appreciation of this particular poem. In my interpretation, Yoshitoki’s depiction of an ordinary scene in nature embodies exactly what Kidendō literati used to called *fūgetsu* (風月), the poetic ability to capture the essence of nature (images, sounds and the particular feelings they evoke) in language. In other words, Yoshitoki’s waka is composed in the manner of a kanshi; and that Nagatō and Nōin’s newly formed alliance symbolizes their mutual determination and commitment to introduce innovations in waka in accordance with the aesthetic standards set by the Kidendō literati. This instance of waka poets’ incorporating Kidendō scholar-poets’ manners into their waka practices not only preceded Akisue’s Hitomaro *eigu* ceremony by a century, but was more substantially and directly influenced by the aesthetics explored by the Kidendō literati. Judging from his own comment following the quotation, however, Kiyosuke was probably unaware of the historical significance of this incident.

Immediately after his discussion of Nōin and Nagatō, Kiyosuke cites the following exchange between the Kidendō academicians Sugawara no Fumitoki (菅原文時, 899-981) and Minamoto no Shitagō (源順, 911-83) concerning the interpretation of a waka poem:

Lord Fumitoki recited:

The divine seat [that we had prepared] ひもろぎの

---

*事か), because Yoshitoki was “junior” (後進) to Nōin. (SNKBT 29, p. 118.)*
must have pleased the god’s heart.
On the peak of Mount Hira, he has placed a white hair decoration.

Shitagō inquired about the meaning of the poem. Fumitoki replied, “Shitagō, you don’t know about anything,” and provided no further explanation.

As in the previous example about Nōin and Nagatō, Kiyosuke does not explain what the reader of the *Fukurozōshi*, including the Emperor Nijō (二条天皇, 1143-65, r. 1158-65), to whom Kiyosuke dedicated a copy of the book, should learn from this anecdote. Interestingly, the narrative depiction of Fumitoki’s condemnation of Shitagō resembles the passage in Ōe no Masausa’s *Gōdanshō*, wherein Fumitoki laments Shitagō’s lack of respect for his year-long commitment to compose a fine poem. In any case, by juxtaposing these anecdotes, Kiyosuke compared Shitagō’s inability to understand the poem Fumitoki cited, to Nōin and Nagatō’s confluence of taste through the appreciation of a poem. Although Kiyosuke does not present Fumitoki and Shitagō as participating in a teacher-disciple relationship, Kiyosuke’s recounting of the tale depicts Fumitoki as an individual who is dismissive of a person who lacks the proper disposition to enter into a personal relationship in pursuit of “poetic truth.”

113. Ibid., pp. 380-1.
114. See Chapter 6 for my discussion of Masafusa comments on Fumitoki’s famous poem, “Rōkankō” (老隠行, “An Old Man’s Ballad”).
115. This is not to claim that Fumitoki was Shitagō’s teacher, but the latter was twelve years younger than the former.
about Emperors Daigo and Murakami and Daigo’s grandson in the *Gōdanshō*, as well as

Toshiyori’s depiction of Nōin in his *Toshiyori zuinō*, these *Fukurozōshi* anecdotes suggest that

Kiyosuke also tacitly acknowledged the principle of *suki* as an integral element in the study of waka.

4. Fujiwara Shunzei on the Composition of Waka

It is of particular interest that Fujiwara no Shunzei, Kiyosuke’s rival and the founder of

the Mikohidari school of waka, also quotes Ōe no Yoshitoki’s poem, “A sudden rainstorm is striking…” (*Yama fukami…*), in his waka treatise, *Korai fūteishō* (*古来風聆抄, Commentary on Old and New Poetic Styles*, first edition 1197, second edition 1201)*116*. Unlike Kiyosuke, Shunzei does not provide anecdotal details about Nōin and Nagatō for this poem. If Kiyosuke’s

*Fukurozōshi* is a collection of waka lore and anecdotal tales about waka poets, Shunzei’s *Korai fūteishō* is a mere anthology that consists of selections of waka poems from the *Man’yōshū* and seven historical imperial anthologies of waka from the *Kokinshū* (905) through Shunzei’s own

*Senzaishū* (1187).*117* In other words, at first glance, there are so few critical components in the *Korai fūteishō*, that the work cannot be considered a waka treatise.

In the *Korai fūteishō*, Yoshitoki’s poem appears along with other thirty-five poems from

---

*116*. KKS7, p. 163.

*117*. In modern scholarship, the *Man’yōshū* is usually not considered to have been imperially commissioned. However, it is obvious that Shunzei thought it was compiled under an imperial auspices, “during the reign of Emperor Shōmu [701-756, r. 724-749]” (この集をは聖武天皇の御時撰せらる、事は、疑ひなく侍うべに、まことにさざありけんと見えて待なるなり。) KKS 7, p. 99. Shunzei seems to have held the view that the *Man’yōshū* was compiled during Emperor Shōmyō’s reign by Tachibana no Moroe (橘諸兄, 684-757). Ibid., pp. 99-100.
the sixth imperial collection, *Shikashū* (1151-54), in the sub-section devoted to winter poems. For those readers familiar with Kiyosuke’s account of Nagatō and Nōin’s forming a master-disciple relationship, Shunzei’s *Fūteishō* must have seemed dull, because the book lacks anecdotal tales. Although Shunzei provides lengthy explanations for some of the contested poetic diction, such as *kawayashiro* (河社, “water shrine”),118 *kabiya* (鹿火屋, hut for a smudge fire), and *tamabahaki* (玉鬘, “bejeweled bloom”),119 often citing anecdotal accounts from the *Toshiyori zuinō*, he does not apply the same method of interpretation to the majority of the poems he quotes from pre-existing waka anthologies. In a sense, the *Korai fūteishō* is as elusive as Kiyosuke’s *Fukurozōshi* and many other literary anthologies produced during the *insei* period, which require the modern reader to read between the lines or what the author/editor does not say in their seemingly obsessive act of compiling ancient lore.

However, I will demonstrate below that Shunzei’s *Korai fūteishō*, written as late as 1197, differs fundamentally from Kiyosuke’s *Fukurozōshi* and other quintessential *insei* texts, such as Ōe no Masafusa’s *Gōdanshō* and Minamoto no Toshiyori’s *Toshiyori zuinō*, because in the very beginning of the book, translated below, Shunzei demonstrates his understanding of the essence of waka composition in a lucid and logical manner quite unusual for the waka poets who came before him:

> The origin of waka (lit. “the song of Yamato”) lies in the distant past. The practice of composing waka started in the age of the gods and goddesses. Since then, it has become a literary art form (*kotowaza*) in Japan, and its subject-matter (*kokoro*) has broadly incorporated the Six Principles of

---

118. KKS7, pp. 68-70.

119. Ibid., pp. 93-99.
poetry,\(^{120}\) and its language has never lost its splendor. As stated in the prefaces to the *Kokinshū*, [waka] plants its seed in the human mind (*kokoro*) and develops into a myriad leaves of language. Accordingly, when seeking blossoms in spring, or viewing colored leaves in autumn, without waka (lit. songs), no one can [truly] recognize the colors or fragrances; or generate a conceptual framework (*moto no kokoro*) as a means of expressing [such touching scenes in nature]. Therefore, throughout the generations, no emperors have abandoned the practice of waka, and members of different clans never stopped competing and enjoying [poeticizing] in waka composition.

For these reasons, both in the past and today, texts known as rules of waka (*shiki*), waka principles (*zuinō*) and handbooks on poetic names (*utamakura*), which variously gather together place names or clarify numerous uncertain points [in interpretation], abound in our society, no matter how similar they appear to be. It is due to individual [aristocratic] families having been eager to produce such texts and put them aside [for their offspring]. However, regarding the style (*sugata*) and language (*kotoba*) of waka (lit. songs), it is extremely difficult to explain why a particular usage of the Yoshino River is superior (*yoshi*) to another, or why some references to the reeds (*ashi*) at the Bay of Naniwa are inferior (*ashi*) to others.

At the beginning of the [Buddhist scripture] *Mohe zhiguan* (*Great Cessation and Observation*, 594), a man called Master Zhang’an\(^{121}\) made the following statement: “I have never heard a clear explanation of [the key concept of Tendai Buddhism,] Cessation and Observation.” When I heard this, somehow the topics appeared extremely profound and precious, so much so that they enable me to grasp the allegorical meaning of [Zhang’an’s] statement. Indeed, it is difficult to articulate how I distinguish superior waka poems from inferior ones, or how I understand the profound ideas and feelings (*fukaki kokoro*) [expressed through waka]. That is why I say that [waka] is similar [to the teaching of Tendai

---

\(^{120}\) According to the Chinese preface to the *Kokinshū*, they are the Suasive (*fēng*), Description (*fù*), Comparison (*pì*), Evocative Image (*hsīng*), the Elegantia (*gāi*) and Eulogia (*sūng*). Translations are Tim Wixted’s. (Wixted, pp. 228-229.) The theory of Six Principles originates in the “Major Preface” (大序) to the Chinese literary anthology, *Shih jing* (詩經). In Wixted’s words, “Chinese critical discourse [including the theory of the Six Principles] is used in the prefaces [to the *Kokinshū*] to legitimize the compilation of the anthology in intellectual terms.” (Ibid., p. 238.)

\(^{121}\) Zhang’an (章安 561-632, aka. Guanding 灌頂) was a principal disciple of Zhiyi (智顗, 538-597), the *de facto* founder of Tiantai (天台, J. *Tendai*) Buddhism in China.
Now, the [Mohe] zhiguan first explains how Buddha imparted his teachings, and then clarifies how the Way of his teachings has been transmitted to others. The Greatly Enlightened World-honored One [Śākyamuni] passed his teachings to Great Kāśyapa; and Kāśyapa passed them to to Ānanda. In this way, from one person to another, [Buddha’s teachings] were transmitted to twenty-three individuals, until the time of Zhiyi [538-97, the founder of Tiantai Buddhism in China]. It is very inspiring to know the way in which Buddha’s teachings have survived. Similarly, waka (lit. “songs”) has a long tradition. At one point, [the custom of] compiling literary anthologies was established. And [thanks to this] we can now learn a great deal about waka and the [different] ways in which poems were composed [in particular waka anthologies], starting from the Man’yōshū and including the Kokinshū, Gosenshū and Shūishū. On the one hand, however, Buddha’s teaching and speeches contain profound theories. On the other, waka is a form of frivolous entertainment made up of “floating words and embellished phrases” (fugen kigo).

Nonetheless, waka poems can convey [various] profound ideas [related to the human experience]. Because we all wish to make use of this [in our pursuance of] the Way of Buddha, or because mental afflictions [which can be expressed through waka] are [an unavoidable precondition to the attainment of] enlightenment, [Buddhist scriptures have raised the issues of the meaningful use of secular literature, as well as the fundamentally transient nature of the workings of the human mind]. Thus, according to the Lotus Sutra, “if one promotes the texts that are canonical in secular society [e.g. the Confucian Classics], or [various] professions indispensable for one’s survival, all of these will harmonize well with the proper teachings of the Buddha.” According to the Sutra of Meditating on Samantabhadra Bodhisattva, “Who possesses evil? Who possesses happiness? Neither evil nor happiness have owners. My mind is by default, empty.” Because the profound Way of waka resembles [this teaching of] the Threefold Truths of Emptiness, Provisional Existence, and the Mean, I made this association [between Buddhism and waka].

The Grand Counselor of the Fourth Avenue, Fujiwara no Kintō, named [his anthology of waka] A Collection of Golden Jewels (Kingyokushū), and Lord Michitoshi claimed in his preface to the GoShū wakashū (Gleanings of Japanese Poems II, 1086) that “the language (kotoba) [of waka] is as beautiful as embroidery, its meanings (kokoro) deeper than the sea.” Waka poems (lit. “songs”) do not need to be as fine as brocade [all the time]; but they should sound somehow elegant (en) and moving (aware), when they
are vocalized and recited. In any case, we call [the composition of waka] “the recitation of songs” (eika); therefore, the overall quality of a poem is determined by how it sounds when it is read out loud.

For many years, I was wondering how to explain the essence (kokoro) of waka composition. I could feel it in my heart (kokoro), but it was difficult to put it into words; I had an internal conviction, but it was hard to describe it verbally.

Recently, a certain prince (lit. “High Mountain”) reached a through understanding of the Way of the Japanese language (yamato kotonoha no michi122), and made the following inquiry and request:

“What does it mean when one claims that a waka poem has a fine style (sugata)? Or that its language (kotoba) is touching (okashi)? No matter how long your explanation might be–like an angler’s white fishing line [lit. “fiber rope”], just write everything down (kaku), as if you were harvesting (kaku 揺く) seaweed [for salt production]. His Highness’s wish only reflects her profound understanding of the Way of Waka [lit. “this Way”] [that would enable her to see through] the dense forests of Mount Tsukuba, or from the bottom of the sea. […]

大和歌の起こり、その来ること遠いかな。ちはやぶる神代より始まりて、敷島の国のことわざとなりにけるよりこのかた、その心おのづから六義にわたり、その詞万代に朽ちず。かの古今集の序にいへるがごとく、人の心を種として、よろづの言の葉となりけれど、春の花をたづね、秋の紅葉を見ても、歌といふものならからましかば、色も香をも知る人もなく、何をかばもとの心ともすべき。このゆへに世々の帝もこれを捨て給はず、氏々のもろ人も争ひもてあそばずといふことなし。

よりて、昔も今も、歌のしきといひ、髥髪・歌枕などといひて、あるいは所の名を記し、あるいは疑はしきことを明かしなどしたるものは、家々、われもノと書き置きたれば、おなじことのやうながら、あまた世に見ゆるものあり。たぐこの歌の姿詞におきて、吉野

122. In the first edition (1197) of the Korai füeishū, it is yamato kotono michi (大和言の道). In the revised edition (1201), it is changed to yamato kotonoha no michi, which I adopted in my translation. KKS 7, p. 29.
川良しとはいかなるをいひ、難波江の芦の悪しとはいづれを分くべきぞといふことの、なかノいみじく説き述べがたく、知れる人も少なかるべきなり。

しかるに、かの天台止観と申す文のはじめの言葉に、「止観の明静なること、前代もいまだ聞かず」と章安大師と申人の書き給へるが、まづうち聞くより、事の深さも、限りなく奥の義を推し量られて、尊くいみじく聞こえるように、この歌の良し悪しき、深き心を知らんことも、言葉をもて述べがたきを、これによそへてぞ同じく思ひやるべき事なりける。

さて、かの止観にも、まづ仏の法を伝へ給へる次第を明かして、法の道の伝われることを人に知らしめ給へるものなり。大覚世尊、法を大迦葉に付け給へり、迦葉、阿難に付く。かくのごとく次第に伝へて、師子にいたるまで廿三人なり。この法を付くる次第を聞くに尊さも起こるやうに、歌も昔より伝はりて、撰集といふものも出で来て、万葉集より始まりて、古今、後撰、拾遺などの歌のありさまでて、深く心を得べきなり。ただし、かれは法文金口の深い義なり。これは浮言経語の戯れには似たりとも、事の深き旨も現れ、これを縁として仏の道にも通はさむため、かつは煩悩すなはち菩提なるがゆへに、法華経には「若説俗間経略之資生業等順正法」という、普賢観には、「何者かは罪、何者か是福、罪福無主、我心自空なり」と説き給へり。よりいま、歌の深き道も空仮中の三昧に似たるによりて、通はして記し申なり。

歌の良きことを言はんとては、四条大納言公任の卿は金玉の集と名づけ、通仏教を研究の序には「詞縁物のごとくに、心海よりも深し」など申されど、かならずしも縁縁物のごとくならなけれども、歌はたどよみあげもし、詠みたしたるに、何とかく艶にもあればることも聞こゆる事のあるなるべし。もとより詠歌といひて、声につきて良くも悪しくも聞こゆるものなり。

この心は、年ごろもいかで申述べんとは思ふ給ふるを、心には動き

123. (法華経ヲ持受・読誦・書写スレバ) もし俗世間で聖典とされている書や、生活のための仕事などを説いても。みな正しい仏法の教えに調和するだろう。Interpretation by Watanabe Yasuaki, KKS 7, p. 292, note 8.
In this opening passage of the Korai fūteishō, unlike Kiyosuke, Shunzei is concerned with the issue of what makes one waka poem superior to another. He claims that he knows the answer, but admits that he cannot articulate it in words. On account of the difficulty of elucidating the truth about waka composition, he compares his own teaching of waka to that of the Threefold Truths of Tendai Buddhism.

Unlike Minamoto no Toshiyori, who also described the difficulty of teaching waka composition, Shunzei attempts to conceptualize the issue at stake by employing the ambiguous term, sugata (姿), which I translated as the “style” of a poem. Although Shunzei admits that he cannot explain the essence of waka, he says that “waka should sound somehow elegant (en) and moving (aware), when they are vocalized and recited.” He calls that “the overall quality of a

poem,” or sugata, which is essentially determined by “how it sounds when it is read out loud.”

For the purpose of the present study, Shunzei’s emphasis on the oral/musical aspects of waka is important because it reflects his view that waka–composed in the vernacular Japanese language–is fundamentally different from kanshi, which is based on the literary language of ancient China. Shunzei’s rediscovery of the phonetic qualities of vernacular Japanese appears strikingly similar to what Dante Alighieri (1265-1321) wrote in his poetry treatise, De Vulgari Eloquentia (1303-5) about his native Florentine Italian, and its use in poetry composition, as opposed to gramatica–the Latin language–and other less “illustrious” Italian vernaculars. This kind of comparative approach, which pursues the meaning of “vernacular” languages in different cultural contexts, may be useful in further investigating Shunzei’s poetics.125

It needs to be noted, however, that the language of waka was certainly becoming less “vernacular” and increasingly more archaic in Japan by the end of the twelfth century, and the term “vernacular” needs to be applied carefully. The effusion of waka commentaries in the twelfth century simply attests to the fact that the language of ancient waka had already become obsolete or difficult to understand for the majority of Japanese aristocrats by the mid-twelfth century. In other words, Shunzei’s assumption that mastering his own selection of exemplary poems from the past is the best and only way to cultivate one’s one poetic “style” (sugata) ironically narrows the scope of the Japanese vernacular language at the time.

In other passages of the Korai fûteishô, Shunzei compares the waka and kanshi composition, and claims that the former is more difficult and profound because it is less

restricted by rules and other considerations. In any case, in Shunzei’s Korai fūteishō, or at least in its preface, we have the first example in Japanese literary history (perhaps after the Kokinshū prefaces) of analytical kagaku (歌学) discourse, a discussion that is not characterized by uncritical, appreciation of those eccentric figures who personified the ideal of suki or poetic passion, and their way of life.

Conclusion

In the first part of this chapter, I outlined the formation of waka studies (kagaku) in the twelfth century by dividing it into the three phases: 1) 1110-1130 under the leadership of Fujiwara no Akisuke (1055-1123) and Minamoto no Toshiyori (1055?-1129?); 2) 1130-1180 under Fujiwara no Kiyosuke (1104-77); and 3) 1180-1204 under Fujiwara no Shunzei (1114-1204). By situating Kiyosuke of the Rokujō school and Shunzei of the Mikohidari in this chronology, rather than treating them as rivals, I emphasized the similarities between the two schools of waka as hereditary aristocratic units that made the study of waka their family prerogative.

The pivotal change in the nature of waka studies in the 1150s through the 1170s was engineered by Kiyosuke, the third-generation teacher of the Rokujō school of waka, who codified the hitherto orally-transmitted teachings of waka in his family by composing a series of waka commentaries and treatises, often in the style of setsuwa narratives. I argued that after Kiyosuke, Rokujō and Mikohidari poets’ active production of waka handbooks for an ordinary aristocratic audience enabled them to distinguish themselves from traditional Kidendō scholars,

126. KKS7, pp. 46, 92-93.
who rather than committing their secret interpretations of the Chinese Classics to writing, transmitted them orally to their descendants and to a handful of other qualified individuals. Except for Masafusa, as a result, the influence of the Kidendō scholars faded by the beginning of the twelfth century.

The second part of this chapter examined the founder of the Rokujō school of waka, Fujiwara no Akisue, and his innovation of the Hitomaro eigu ritual in 1118. By analyzing the record of the event preserved in the setsuwa collection, Kokon chomonjū (1254), I discussed how Akisue drew inspiration for designating the Man’yōshū poet Kakinomoto no Hitomaro as the “first teacher of waka” from the Kidendō scholars’ semi-annual ceremony at the State Academy, which featured the worship of Confucius and the composition of kanshi poems. I also examined Akisue’s collaboration with the Kidendō scholar, Fujiwara no Atsumitsu at this event, and with the waka poet Minamoto no Toshiyori. By comparing the waka Akisue and Toshiyori composed at the Hitomaro eigu ceremony, I concluded that unlike Toshiyori, who showed his respect for Hitomaro by composing an imaginative poem incorporating the ancient locution “the field watchman’s mirror” (nomori no kagami), Akisue only presented himself as an obsequious host.

The third section of this chapter examined Fujiwara no Kiyosuke’s waka treatise Fukurozōshi (ca. 1157-58). Rejecting the image of Kiyosuke as a scholar of waka with an “encyclopedic” knowledge of waka lore, I interpreted the meaning behind the cursory manner in which he juxtaposed anecdotes and other information about the history of waka composition in this book. Special attention was paid to Kiyosuke’s discussion of Nōin and his waka teacher, Fujiwara no Nagatō. By including a number of anecdotes that demonstrate Nōin’s adherence to the spirit of suki (poetic passion), while providing few comments on them, Kiyosuke seems to
have acknowledged the importance of the non-utilitarian, highly idealistic approach to waka composition, that was explored by Nōin and Toshiyori as a means of cultivating the “poetic mind” (fūryū), rather than simply pursuing waka lore as an academic subject.

Finally, I examined Fujiwara no Shunzei’s Korai fūteishō (1197, revised in 1201), wherein he not only incorporated the logic of the Kidendō academicians (unlike Kiyosuke who did not problematize various issues at stake), but also made a radical departure from their model by drawing a close analogy between the “profundity” of the composition of waka and the search for Buddhist truth. The novelty of Shunzei’s teaching is also attested by his departure from the pattern of thoughts governed by the nebulous concept, suki.

I argued that partly because of the efforts on the part of the Rokujō scholar-poets to incorporate Kidendō academician’s manners in their waka practices, Shunzei was able to write the Korai fūteishō, in particular its opening paragraphs, which can be read as a preface to the entire book, even though he made no reference to the fact that he was inspired by earlier waka prefaces (wakajo) and other compositions in kanbun.127 In a sense, Shunzei’s lack of interest in suki128 suggests that by end of the twelfth century, the idea that waka could express poetic

127. I owe this insight to Watanabe Yasuaki, who examines the influences of some of the kanbun compositions from the anthology, Honchō shōjo shū (本朝小序集, Collection of Short Prefaces in Japan) and the Honchō mudaishi (本朝無題詩, Kanshi Poems Composed Without Topics in Japan), on how Shunzei came to incorporate such ideas as kyōgen kigo and the “profound disposition of the mind” (kokoro no fukasa) in his preface to the Korai fūteishō. (Watanabe 1999, pp. 290-312.)

128. In the words of Tabuchi Kumiko, しかしこの時代 [ca. Kamo no Chōmei’s Mumyōshō, after 1211]、もはや「数寄」は色あせ、新鮮さを失っていた。(Tabuchi, pp. 222-23.)
refinement (ふるよ), just as kanshi embodies ふげつ, was well established. Thus it was no longer necessary for Shunzei to emphasize the shared authority of waka and kanshi as the earliest verbal art forms in Japan, to reiterate the importance of すき, nor to discuss how waka poets like Nōin and Toshiyori promoted, in their characteristically eccentric manner, the respectability of waka as the embodiment of ふるよ.

In Shunzei’s こらいふてしょ, ultimately, I discern the demise of the anecdotal discourse that was first explored by Ōe no Masafusa and Minamoto no Toshiyori, and which, throughout the twelfth century, supplied the images of particular individuals who believed in すき, and in kanshi and waka composition as enlightening, life-altering pursuits. Shunzei no longer needed to depend on すき because his own teaching of the “profundity” of the waka composition more logically addressed such potential value of waka composition to an even wider audience that included Buddhist practitioners and warrior elites at the turn of the thirteenth century.
Chapter Nine

“Koseki kasho mokuroku” and Shukaku Hosshinnō’s Poetic Quest for Imperial Identity

Introduction

The previous chapter examined Fujiwara no Akisue’s incorporation of kangaku scholars’ manners and formalities into his waka activities as the founder of the Rokujō school of waka. By focusing on his innovation of the Hitomaro eigu (An Offering to Hitomaro’s Portrait) ceremony in 1118, I discussed how Akisue collaborated with the Kidentō scholar, Fujiwara no Atsumitsu to elevate the social image of waka composition, and made the ceremony his own family’s prerogative.

In this chapter, I will examine the life and works of Shukaku Hosshinnō (守覚法親王, 1150-1202), a princely monk who resided at the Ninnaji temple (仁和寺) in Kyoto, and whose contribution towards the conservation of both religious and secular customs of the ritsuryō state was one of the hallmarks of the cultural production of the insei period. Although still part of Japan’s long twelfth century, the socio-political environments that surrounded the prince monk differed greatly from those at the beginning of the century. After the death of Retired Emperor Toba (鳥羽天皇, 1103-56, r. 1107-23), in the absence of a strong ruler, the imperial family were no longer capable of settling the matter of succession without the military support of the Minamoto and Taira clans. (Hōgen and Heiji Disturbances, 1156-59). This led to the regency of Taira no Kiyomori (平清盛, 1118-81), whose daughter married Emperor Takakura (高倉天皇, r. 1168-80, 1161-81), Shukaku’s younger brother. As the maternal grandfather of Emperor Antoku
Kiyomori became the most powerful figure at the court during the late 1160s through the mid-1180s.

At this time, Fujiwara no Akisue’s son and grandson, Fujiwara no Akisuke (藤原顕季, 1090-1155) and Fujiwara no Kiyosuke (藤原清輔, 1104-77), took over Akisue’s mantle as the head of the Rokujō school of waka. While Akisuke compiled the sixth imperial anthology of waka, *Shika waka shū* (*詞花和歌集, Florilegium of Japanese Poems*, ca. 1151-54), after having been asked to do so by Emperor Sutoku (崇徳天皇, 1119-64, r. 1123-41), Kiyosuke further solidified the foundation of his branch of the Fujiwara family’s household study of waka by collating authentic editions of canonical texts of waka, such as the *Kokinshū*, and circulating them among his family members.

Thanks to these efforts on the part of the Rokujō scholar-poets and Emperor Sutoku, himself an accomplished poet, who until his exile in Sanuki (讃岐, present-day Kagawa prefecture) in the aftermath of the Hōgen Disturbance, promoted waka vigorously, by the time Taira no Kiyomori and his kinsmen came into power, waka was not only revived but highly revered as an embodiment of courtly splendor. As such, even some of the top Taira warriors became eager to compose waka poems to demonstrate their cultural refinement. By the early 1170s, around the time the historical narrative *Imakagami* was written by the poet

---

1. For biographies of Fujiwara no Akisuke, see Inoue, pp. 96-118. For biographies of Fujiwara no Kiyosuke, see Inoue, pp. 119-149; Ozawa (1979), pp. 135-163.


Jakuchō (和歌, waka spheres” (和歌, wakaken), both within and outside of the capital Kyōto.⁴

The continuous and widespread warfare, the decline of retired emperors’ political authority and the rise of the Taira and Minamoto warrior-elites reduced the functions and even the formality of the ritsuryō state to mere residual levels in the second half of the twelfth century. These social changes strengthened the desire on the part of both “declining” nobility and “emerging” warriors, as a means of survival and self-authentication, to connect themselves with the vanishing imperial past through the composition of waka. In other words, in the rapidly changing society, people sought the reaffirmation of their own “Japanese” identities by embracing and appropriating the culture that had flourished in the preceding centuries.

Minamoto no Toshiyori (源俊頼, 1055?-1129?), who lamented the decline of the Way of Waka in his treatise Toshiyori zuinō (ca. 1111-15), would not have foreseen the extent of the revival of waka, nor the fact that his own poetry collection would become the object of scholarly attention by late twelfth-century waka scholars. Unlike Nōin, Toshiyori and Fujiwara no Akisue, poet-scholars of the late twelfth century rarely expressed their anxieties about kanshi composition, nor made self-depreciative and vindictive comparison of waka to kanshi.

At such socially tumultuous time, Shukaku Hosshinnō, the second son of Emperor GoShirakawa (後白河天皇, 1127-92, r. 1155-58)⁵ emerged as a new patron of waka, partly

---

⁴ See for instance Nakamura Aya’s book chapter on the “waka circles” (歌壇, kadan) centered around the Kōfukuji (興福寺) and Tōdaiji (東大寺) temples in Nara in the late twelfth century. Nakamura, pp. 308-69. For the use of the phrase, wakaken, see Hirano, p. 41.

⁵ GoShirakawa’s first son is Emperor Nijō (二条天皇, 1143-65, r. 1158-65); his third son is Prince Mochihito (以仁王, 1151-80), who in 1180 attempted a coup against the Taira together with Minamoto no
because GoShirakawa himself was keen on promoting *imayō* (今様, popular songs) and neglected waka and kanshi. This chapter will examine Shukaku’s role as a patron, poet and a pedagogue of waka. Like Ōe no Masafusa, Shukaku was well versed in the Chinese Classics, an expert in both Chinese and Japanese poetry composition, and a prolific writer, whose prose works include diaries, didactic essays, liturgical manuals, and commentaries on Buddhist scriptures and music. According to the modern literary historian Wada Hidematsu’s (和田英松, 1865-1937) 1933 study, *Kōshitsu gyosen no kenkyū* (皇室御撰之研究, *Study of Books Written and Compiled by Members of the Imperial Household*), Shukaku Hosshinnō authored some ninety-five works. Not all of these survive, but the majority of religious texts are conserved in the Ninnaji repository. Recent studies by Abé Yasurō (阿部泰郎) and others show that the Kanazawa Bunko (金沢文庫) in Kamakura also holds a significant collection of Shukaku’s writings, some of which are not in the Ninnaji collection.⁶

I will examine an inventory of books on waka, attributed to Shukaku, known today as “Koseki kasho mokuroku” (古跡歌書目録, “An Old Manuscript Catalogue of Books on Waka”).

Yorimasa, and was killed in a battle; his sixth son became Emperor Takakura; whereas Princess Shokushi (式子内親王, ?-1201), a major poet in the *Shinkokinshū*, is GoShirakawa’s third daughter. Fujiwara no Kiyosuke wrote his waka treatise, *Fukurozōshi* (袋草紙, *The Pocket Book*), at the request of Emperor Nijō. He also compiled the waka anthology, *Shoku shikashū* (続詞花集, *Florilegium II*), but because Emperor Nijō died in 1165, the anthology did not become a *chokusenshū* (imperial anthology). Ozawa (1979), pp. 139-144; Suzuki and Suzuki, pp. 92-93.

6. The texts attributed to Shukaku can be classified into the following ten categories: 1) proceedings of rituals of esoteric Buddhism (次第, shidai); 2) Buddhist pronouncements (表白, hyōbyaku); 3) records of important rituals; 4) records of the transmission of secret teachings of esoteric Buddhism (灌頂記, kanjōki); 5) records of orally transmitted teachings (口决, kuketsu) and lecture notes for oral transmission; 6) commentaries on various rituals (抄); 7) decrees (遺誥, ikai) and general instructions for Shukaku’s monastic disciples (記, ki); 8) diaries (日記, nikki); 9) a treatise on music; 10) and waka poetry.
If we accept this catalogue as a product of Shukaku’s hand, it then provides very strong material evidence to support my argument that by the late twelfth century, Way of Waka (waka no michi, or kadō 歌道) had become a fully fledged, independent field of study, based on the fact that a total of some 170 titles on waka, including both numerous poetry collections and fifteen books concerning “Poetic Principles” (懸髪, zuinō), existed in a single library. Why did Shukaku, the head priest of Shingon (真言) Buddhism at Ninnaji, collect such a wide array of books on waka? Did Shukaku and his fellow monks study and compose waka simply for recreation, or were their poems “expedient means” (方便, hōben, SK: upaya), written as a way of teaching and spreading Buddhist doctrines?

I first examine the institution of hosshinnō (princely priest), and how it evolved in the particular social environment of retired emperors’ administrations. I then turn to the “Koseki kasho mokuroku.” Although it was first identified as Shukaku’s book catalogue by the historian Ōta Shōjirō (太田晶二郎, 1913-87) in 1954 article, “‘Sōkashoshi’ shosai ‘koseki kasho mokuroku’: Imakagami chosha mondai no ichi chōshō nado,” neither the original nor complete manuscript of the catalogue exists today. Therefore, the first half of the present chapter discusses the peculiar ways in which the “Kasho mokuroku” survives in the form of a bibliographic notebook of Maeda Tsunanori (前田綱紀, 1643-1724), a daimyō of the prosperous Kaga (加賀) province (present-day Ishikawa prefecture) and a bibliophile.

In the second half of the chapter, I investigate what the “Kasho mokuroku” reveals about Shukaku Hosshinnō as a poet and a patron of waka, and as a pedagogical monk at Ninnaji. In fact, on the surface, the promotion of waka composition at a Buddhist temple appears at odds with the orthodox teaching of Buddhism, which traditionally disparaged poetry as “fabricated words” (綺語, kigo), the very antithesis of the “truthful words” (真言, shingon) of Buddhism. Surviving manuscripts at Buddhist temples show that by the early thirteenth century, the reverse sides of pages (紙背, shihai) of poetry collections were customarily “recycled” by hand into Buddhist sutras, suggesting the increasing marginality of belletristic literature in monasteries at the dawn of Japan’s medieval period.

Then, why was Shukaku so deeply involved with waka, to the point of building a library of books on the subject at his monastic residence? If we assume that Shukaku promoted waka because he was the scion of the imperial family, rather than because he was a Buddhist priest, how do we explain his association of imperial identity with waka? Furthermore, how did he “justify” his engagement in poetry composition to his monastic disciples? I will explore these questions by analyzing Shukaku’s Uki (右記, Records of the Right, 1186), which he wrote for his young disciples at Ninnaji regarding various secular matters, including the composition of poetry. By doing so, I will demonstrate how Shukaku came to view waka as a form of poetry, on a par with kanshi, an essential component in the cultivation of cultural refinement (ふるゆ) and historical sensibility through the contemplative and imaginative use of language.

8. It is not clear why Shukaku’s written instructions on miscellaneous secular matters are collectively called Uki. However, it is obvious that they were meant to be read together with sets of rules on mostly religious matters in the similarly titled Saki (左記, Records of the Left, ca.1186) and Onki (御記, Prince Monk Shukaku’s Records, 1180). These three texts are available in the The Taishō Shinshō Daizōkyō, vol. 78 zoku shoshū bu 9, pp. 601-19.
1. *Insei* and the Institution of *Hosshinnō*

The institution of *hosshinnō* (lit. “Dharma-prince,” princely monk) developed hand-in-hand with that of *insei*. Traditionally, once imperial sons took the tonsure, they left the court, moved into monasteries and became auxiliary members of the imperial family. Just as those imperial sons who became commoners were no longer eligible for succession to the throne, these “Buddhist princes” (*nyūdō shinnō*) also renounced their imperial privilege and devoted the rest of their lives to offering prayers and rituals for the welfare of the imperial family and the state. Since its establishment by Emperor Uda (宇多天皇, 867-931, r. 887-97) in 888, Ninnaji had been administrated by generations of such princes, who passed down the teachings of esoteric Shingon Buddhism. For Shukaku, the legacy of Uda was more important than that of other past imperial sovereigns because Ninnaji, named after Uda’s reign period (Ninna: 885-89) literally meant Emperor Uda’s Temple.

In 1099, Retired Emperor Shirakawa conferred the title of prince (*shinnō*) on his son Kakugyō (覚行, 1075-1105), who had taken Buddhist vows at Ninnaji at the age of eleven. Kakugyō was twenty-five years old at the time. The *Imakagami* (今鏡, *The Mirror of the Present*, ca. 1174-75) recounts that Shirakawa favored Kakugyō because he “turned out to be

---

9. For a brief summary of the history of Ninnaji and imperial sons during the end of the ninth through mid-twelfth century, see Abé Yasurō, pp. 434-5.

10. However, the first two years of the Ninna era (885-6) were the reign of Uda’s father, Emperor Kōkō (光孝天皇, 830-87, r. 884-7, also nicknamed as Emperor Komatsu 小松帝.)
very competent and trustworthy as he matured.” The narrator mentions that the regent Fujiwara no Moromichi (藤原師通, 1062-99) remonstrated with Shirakawa, claiming that such a procedure was unprecedented.

Shirakawa’s policy toward Buddhism, driven by his desire to control Buddhist establishments, as well as by his personal devotion to the religion, was especially radical. Most symbolically, Shirakawa himself took the tonsure and became a “Dharma-king” (法王, hōō, or Cloistered Emperor) in 1096. To rule the country as a de facto sovereign not only after abdicating but also after taking Buddhist vows was unprecedented in Japanese history. Certainly, he was not the first retired emperor to be called a Dharma-king. And in order to avoid unnecessary reproaches by his rivals, such as the regent Moromichi and his younger brother Prince Sukehito (輔仁親王, 1073-1119), Shirakawa compromised by not taking a Buddhist name (hōmyō 法名) so he could reclaim the throne (重祚, chōso) in case his sickly son Horikawa died. These details suggest that the institution of hosshinnō was nothing more than a byproduct.

12. Ibid.
13. In the Kokinshū, the Retired Emperor Uda is referred to as hōō in the footnotes to the poems 919, 920, and 1067. In the same anthology, he is also known as Emperor Kanpyō (寛平) because he ruled the country during the Kanpyō era (889-98); also as Emperor Suzaku Palace (朱雀院帝) because he had a villa by that name in Kyoto), and also as Retired Emperor Teishi (亭子院), named after another villa of his.
14. The “Bays without Fishing” (釣りせぬ浦々) chapter of the Imakagami details this episode along with other idiosyncratic acts and rules Shirakawa imposed to demonstrate his devotion in Buddhism, such as visiting an exiled high priest of Tendai Buddhism to learn the Lotus Sutra and its commentaries in sixty volumes with him, despite the monk’s modest initial refusal; and also banning the killing of “the lives of all the living creatures in this world” (生きとし生けるものの命), including fish, and the subsequent prosecution of fishermen who happened to possess fishing nets. (Takehana, vol. 1, pp. 278-86.)
of the newly consolidated administration of the Retired Emperor Shirakawa at the turn of the
twelfth century. Abé Yasurō (阿部泰郎), the pioneer of seminal research on Shukaku Hosshinnō
and his philological enterprise of esoteric Buddhism, argues that the integration of the Buddhist
and political spheres, furthered by the Retired Emperor GoShiarakawa and his son Shukaku,
symbolizes the intrinsically hybrid nature of Buddhism and imperial identity during medieval
Japan:

[If we consider] the “Dharma-king” (hōō) as the [quintessential] medieval
king, an ideal image might have been ascribed to him as a transcendent
ruler, who integrates and sublates the dualistic world view of the
religious and the secular, namely the kingly law and the Buddhist law. […]
And the [king’s] son became the princely monk (hosshinnō), who as a
religious acolyte of the retired emperor, [also known as] the Dharma-king,
was entrusted with the task of preserving Ninnaji, or Emperor Uda’s
“Royal Chamber” (omuro) and of transmitting his teaching of esoteric
Buddhism, alternatively known as “The Retired Emperor’s School.”

If a prince-monk (hosshinnō) played such a pivotal role as a retired emperor’s “acolyte”
in the formation of religious identity of Japanese imperial household during the medieval period,
it will become equally important to elucidate the specific role that an exemplary prince monk
such as Shukaku played in the cultivation of the imperial family’s secular identity.

2. The Modern Discovery of “Koseki kasho mokuroku”

15. 中世の王としての「法皇」とは、王法と仏法という、真俗の二元的な世界観を統一止揚す
る、超越的な支配者という理想像が託されていたのかもしれない。… 宇多天皇の「御室」仁和
寺を預かり、その「御流」法流を相承する、院または法皇の宗教的分身として、その皇子が法
In bibliographical terms, “Koseki kasho mokuroku” is far from stable. Its discovery and appraisal was essentially based on one scholar’s journal article, describing his perusal of an early Meiji copy of an Edo transcription of the catalogue in question. The text was first introduced by the historian Ōta Shōjirō (太田晶二郎, 1913-87) in his 1954 article, “Sōkashoshi’ shosai ‘koseki kasho mokuroku’–‘imakagami’ chosha mondai no ichi chōshō nado” (「桑華書志」所載「古蹟歌書目録」—「今鏡」著者問題の一徵証など, “An Old Manuscript Catalogue of Books on Waka” in Maeda Tsunanori’s Japanese and Chinese Bibliography: One Source for Determining the Authorship of the Imakagami, and so on). As the title of the article suggests, the catalogue was presented as bibliographical “evidence” (徵証), in an effort to resolve centuries of debate over the authorship of the Imakagami.

In the modern scholarship of Japanese classical literature, dominated by two seemingly contrasting approaches—positivistic textual studies and appreciative aestheticism, this discovery by an outsider to the field—the historian Ōta, was considered a sensation, when it was reported in an article in the Chūbu nihon shimbun (中部日本新聞) on July 3, 1954 with the headline: “Jakuchō is the Author of the Imakagami—Solving a 700-Year Long Puzzle of National Literature” (国文学・七百年のナゾ解く『今鏡』の作者は寂超). Ōta humbly commented in an interview that he could not say much except that he had discovered the author of the Imakagami. However, in a longer article published later the same year, he described his discovery in his characteristically pompous manner:


The Jakuchō-authorship theory has finally produced a further revelation. [The formerly known inscription in] the *Nihongi shishō* (*Private Commentary to the Nihongi*) [which indicated the Jakuchō-authorship] was handwritten by Ken’ a of Shōmyōji no earlier than the late Kamakura period; it was, after all, quite suspicious, because it belonged to the genre of texts known as “miscellaneous records.” Compared to that manuscript, not only is [the present document] older, but it [dates] from a time not so long after the completion of the *Imakagami*. Moreover, it is a bibliographical catalogue with an unmistakably proper [provenance]. Therefore, it has much greater reliability.18 (Emphasis added.)

Due to its extensive coverage of literary texts from the mid-eighth through the early thirteenth centuries, in the post-war scholarship of Japanese classical literature, the “Kasho mokuroku” is often referred to as the sole or one of the earliest bibliographical records to provide detailed information about the production, reception of early texts, and recording of the author, format, the number of volumes, copies and variants. (For a list of references to the “Kasho mokuroku” in Japanese literary scholarship, see Appendix 2.) However, except for Nishimura Kayoko’s 1997 study on Fujiwara no Kiyosuke’s waka treatises, the titles of which are given in the “Kasho mokuroku,” no scholars have attempted to examine Ōta’s study directly, although many have claimed that their philological studies rely heavily on the textual authority of the “Kasho mokuroku.”

Ōta’s discovery undoubtedly remains a cornerstone of Japanese modern philology. Not only did it stimulate the development of new philological approaches in the study of Japanese classical literature, it also inspired generations of Japanese scholars by demonstrating the power

---

of a single bibliographical discovery, in this case, Shukaku Hosshinnō’s philological activity and
his enthusiasm for waka, as an accomplished poet, and the main protagonist in the revival of
waka in the twelfth century. The purpose of the present study it not to question Ōta’s theory per
se. Rather, instead of making use of the catalogue as a source of information about particular
books on waka, I attempt to discuss the catalogue as a whole as evidence for the consolidation of
the Way of Waka by the end of the twelfth century.

3. Maeda Tsunanori (1643-1724) and his Sōka shoshi

It should be noted that no document entitled “Koseki kasho mokuroku” exists today. The
title was created by Ōta in his 1954 article. The “Koseki kasho mokuroku” we know today is in
fact an untitled ten-page transcription of a manuscript, purchased and studied by Maeda
Tsunanori (前田綱紀, 1643-1724, also known as Shōunkō 松雲公), the fifth lord of the Kaga
Domain (加賀藩, present-day Kanazawa prefecture) in the early eighteenth century.

The serendipitous survival of the catalogue is due in large measure to the studious and
scholarly nature of the samurai lord, as well as to the immense financial resources of his
province, known as Kaga hyakuman goku (加賀百万石, Kaga’s one-million rice fief).

Tsunanori, himself a devoted scholar of the Chinese classics, widely promoted learning by


20. For a summary of Tsunanori’s biography and cultural enterprises, as well as photographs of many of
the Maeda family’s in-house treasure, see the exhibition catalogue, Exhibition on Maeda Tsunanori–The
Flower of Culture in Kaga (加賀文化の華—前田綱紀展, 石川県立美術館), 1988.

21. *Koku* is a measurement for rice. One *koku* is approximately 180 litters. *Kokudaka* (石高) is the
production yield of rice, used to measure the size of a single municipal unite, such as a village or a
province. (*Maeda Tsunanori ten*, p. 8.)
inviting prominent scholars to his domain. He was also an enthusiastic collector of books, and a student of both the Chinese and Japanese Classics. He began collecting books at the age of seventeen. In Ōta’s words, he was a “bibliophile who deserves to be revered as a pioneer of Japanese bibliography.”

The so-called “Kasho mokuroku” exists in the Sōka shoshi (桑華書志, Japanese and Chinese Bibliography)–a collection of Tsunori’s bibliographic notes, housed today in the

---

22. For instance, Tsunori lectured on passages from the Confucian Classics such as the Zhong yong (中庸), Da xue (大学), and Lun yu (論語) to the fifth shōgun Tsunayoshi (徳川綱吉, 1646-1709). (Ibid., p. 5.) Regarding Confucianism, he summoned members of the notable Hayashi family, such as Hayashi Razan (林羅山, 1583-1657), his son and grandson Hayashi Gaoh (林鶴峯, 1618-80), and Hayashi Kohō (林鳯岡, 1645-1732); Confucian scholars sponsored by the Bakufū such as Kinoshita Jun’an (木下順庵, 1621-98) and Muro Kyūsō (室鳩巢, 1658-1734); Isogawa Gōhaku 五十川剛伯 (1649-99) who studied neo-Confucianism (朱子学) under the exiled scholar from Ming China, Zhu Shun Shui (朱舜水, Jp: Shu Shunsui, 1600-82). For national studies and shinto, he invited Tanaka Ikkan (田中一関, 1625-1701), and for botanical studies (本草学), he hired Inō Jakusui (稲生若水, 1655-1715) as well as Buddhist monks from 黄檗, 高泉 and 悅山. (Ibid., p.5.) Tsunori also studied neo-Confucianism with Tokugawa Mitsukuni (徳川光圀, 1628-1700) of the Mito Province, the compiler of the compendium of historical sources, Dai nihonshi (大日本史). Although Tsunori and Mitsukuni represented domains from different parts of Japan, their temporary residences in Tokyo were located in close proximity to each other. Unlike Mitsukuni who gathered historical documents for the compilation of his historical magnum opus Dai nihonshi, Tsunori was “primarily a bibliophile and a book connoisseur.”

23. The method of his book search was highly systematic. He appointed a few “book commissioners” (書物奉行), and also dispatched “research commissioners of the book” (書物調奉行) to various imperial, shōgunal, aristocratic, monastic and private archives and libraries all over Japan. He was interested not only in the Japanese and Chinese Classics, and purchased new books from China and Korea, and even some medical and botanical books written in Dutch. (Ibid., p. 5 ) Furthermore, when he did not succeed in obtaining the original of certain books, Tsunobu often had them transcribed and made them available for scholars. Likewise, after purchasing a book, he actually studied the text. Therefore, when the Kasho mokuroku–an “exceptionally rare document”–came into his possession in 1708, he soon transcribed it (but with some arbitrary abbreviations) in his bibliographical notebook, Sōka shoshi. The original manuscript which Tsunori purchased and from which he made his notes in the Sōka shoshi does not survive in the Sonkei-Kaku Library. Cf. Ōta (1991), p. 86, note 10.

Sonkei-Kaku Library (尊経閣文庫) in Tokyo. The Sōka shoshi consists of thirty-one booklets (冊), and contains various records and memoranda on books, mostly written by Tsunanori himself, under the following three categories: “Books sought and given to others” (求遺書, kyūisho), “Books in my personal collection” (家蔵書, kazōsho) and “Books seen and heard of” (見聞書, Kenbunsho). The “Kasho mokuroku” is included in Book 72, under the third category.

Since the Sōka shoshi is considered part of the Maeda family’s private archive, it remains “sealed” (御直封) still today, and thus Tsunanori’s original is not available for viewing by the public. Ōta acknowledges that his print edition of the catalogue, published in his 1954 article, is based on the duplicate copy (副本, fukuhon) of the Sōka shoshi. I had an opportunity to examine the same duplicate copy of Book 72 of the Sōka shoshi, in January 2010 at the Sonkei-Kaku Library. The book (21cm wide and 15.5 cm tall) consists of front and back covers made of thick, cardboard-like beige paper, and fifty-four folded sheet of thin paper (so called “calligraphy paper” 半紙), bound with string. As each sheet of paper is folded, the total number of pages in

25. According to their own in-house gazette, the Sonkei-Kaku Library now houses some 35,100 books (Japanese: 17,600 titles, Chinese: 11,900 titles, and materials on the Kaga domain: 5600 titles) 前田育德會 尊經閣文庫 小刊 十, 「尊經閣文庫 閷答」 (1980.10), p. 4.

26. Maeda tsunanori ten, p. 230. In the Sonkei-Kaku Library, the Sōka shoshi is kept together with the Sōka jien (桑華字苑, Japanese and Chinese Dictionary)–Tsunanori’s miscellaneous notes on words and literary topics in forty-four booklets. While the Sōka jien takes up the “first” (ken 乾) box, the Sōka shoshi is contained in the “second” (kon 坤) box. For the photographs of the wooden boxes and a few random pages from the Sōka jien and Sōka shoshi, see Maeda tsunanori ten, p. 25.

27. The photograph of the inside cover of the box, which contains the forty-three books (冊) of the Sōka jien, in which the Sōka shoshi is included, has an inscription in red ink, “Sealed by the Lord in person” (御直封). Maeda tsunanori ten, p. 25.

the booklet is 108. On the front cover, the title Sōka shoshi is inscribed on the left side. Beneath the title, the category “Kenbunsho” (Books seen and heard of) appears, and to the right of the title, a subject heading “Including ōjōden” (往生傳在此內) is inscribed. The book number, seventy-two (七十二), appears at the bottom right corner of the booklet.

The first fifteen pages contain random notes on miscellaneous classical texts, mostly historical records: Rikkokushi (六国史, Six Chronicles of Japan, 720-901), Kojiki (古事記, Record of Ancient Matters, 712), Kogo shūi (古語拾遺, Gleanings of Ancient Lore, 807) and Inabadō engi (因幡堂縞起, A Pictorial History of the Inaba Prayer Hall) – a picture scroll from the early fourteenth century. The “Kasho mokuroku” begins abruptly without a title (although the previous page is blank) on page 16 (front), and continues through page 20 (back), making a total of ten pages. The transcription of the catalogue ends with Tsunanori’s signature, “Transcription completed on the eighteenth night of the Ninth Month of 1714” (甲午菊月十八夜写了), “Junior Third Rank Minister Captain Sugawara no Tsunayoshi’s Writing” (從三位宰相中将菅原綱紀書). This signature suggests that the daimyō Maeda Tsunanori considered himself as a scion of the Sugawara family. Ōta speculates that Tsunanori purchased the “Kasho mokuroku” from a dealer in 1708.29 We can thus surmise that Tsunanori was not only a book collector, but that he was eager to “study” the manuscript by copying it, even though six years passed since he acquired the item. Interestingly, he does not hesitate to abbreviate and omit undecipherable or corrupt lines in the text.

Bibliographical notes on various ōjōden (biographies of people reborn in Buddhist paradise, see Chapter 5), which appear in the middle of the book, occupy eight-pages, and the names Yasutane (慶滋保胤, ?-1002) and Masafusa (大江匡房, 1041-1111) are mentioned on page 28 (front). The rest of Book 72 of the Sōka shoshi also contains several booklists of music treatises, and references to the waka treatise, Maigetsu shō (毎月抄, Monthly Notes, 1219) attributed to Fujiwara no Teika, and some medieval commentaries on the Man’yōshū.

Tsunanori’s bibliographical notes give the impression of being random and incidental, but the “Kasho mokuroku” is best examined in its peculiar context, constructed through the literary taste and curiosity of an early-eighteenth-century daimyō. In other words, we can surmise that Maeda (cum Sugawara) Tsunanori approached the “Kasho mokuroku” in the same way he did other historical and literary texts from ancient and medieval Japan, presumably in search for his own “aristocratic” and Japanese roots.

4. A Literary History of Waka in the “Kasho Mokuroku”

The “Kasho mokuroku” is a concise catalogue of some 170 books on the subject of waka, from the Man’yōshū (萬葉集, Collection of Myriad Leaves, ca. 785) through the Shinkokin wakashū (新古今和歌集, A New Collection of Japanese Poems from Ancient Times to the Present, also New Kokinshū, 1205). It classifies books into the following seventeen sub-categories: 1) the Man’yōshū (万葉集); 2) topically categorized and abridged versions of the Man’yōshū (部類万葉集, 同抄); 3 and 4) the Six Imperial Anthologies of Waka (六代集); 5) privately commissioned waka anthologies (私修集); 6) privately compiled waka anthologies (私
撰集); 7) individual poets’ collections: the Thirty-Six Poets (諸家集 卅六人); 8) individual poets’ collections from Middle Antiquity (諸家集 中古); 9 and 10) individual poets’ collections from the Recent Period (諸家集 近代); 11 through 14) Dairin (題林); 15) Principles of waka (題腦, zuinō); 16) miscellanea (雑); and 17) catalogues of waka anthologies (和歌目録).

As an inventory of property, the “Kasho mokuroku” reveals certain forms and conditions that books as material objects existed in a historical time. For example, in Section One it states that this collection includes “one copy” (一部) of the Man’yōshū, in the format of “twenty scrolls” (廿巻). It also indicates that this copy of the Man’yōshū has a “Japanese preface” (假名序), consisting of “one volume” (一巻). Currently extant copies of the Man’yōshū do not contain a preface, but it can be surmised that at the time of the inventory’s compilation such a preface existed.

The arrangement of Section Two suggests that the Man’yōshū was so important that it not only appears as the first item in the list, but also that it was circulated in multiple formats. One example is a “topically classified Man’yōshū” (部類万葉集) in “twenty volumes” (廿巻), of which “the second volume is missing” (第二欠). The library also owned “another set” (又一部) of the Burui man’yōshū. Judging from the title, these may have been copies of Fujiwara no Atsutaka’s (藤原敦隆, d. 1120?) Ruiju koshū (類聚古集, Categorized Ancient Collection),30 the

30. Fujiwara no Teika (藤原定家, 1162-1241), for example, refers to the Burui man’yōshū on the Fourteenth Day of the Seventh Month of Kangi (寛喜, 1230) in his diary, Meigetsuki (明月記, The Record of the Clear Moon, 1180-1235):

Fourteenth Day. The rain has stopped. Clouds scattered in the morning, and after the Hour of the Snake (between 9 and 11 am), the sky cleared. In the early morning, I poured warm chrysanthemum [tea?] over my head. His Highness [Fujiwara no Michiie (藤原道家, 1193-1252), regent and the son of Fujiwara no
only extant copy of which is now in the Library of Ryūkoku University (龍谷大学) in Kyoto.31

Yoshitsune藤原良経, 1169-1206], gave me the Burui man’yōshū in two codices. <They say this is a property of the Renge’ō’ in [Temple]. Book I, Book II—these were handwritten by Suetoki (Minamito Suetoki (源季時), a close aid of Emperor GoShirakawa) the Novice.> “Transcribe [from these] and submit [the copies],” I was told. Since my hand began to swell in the spring, I am now certainly incapable of writing. Nevertheless, I told [His Majesty] that I would keep [them for a while], and do my best to [complete the] transcription. To strengthen [my] poor ability, I chant incessantly. (Those in triangle brackets are Teika’s own interlinear notes.)

十四日＜癸卯＞、雨止、朝雲分、巳後天晴、
早旦頭沃菊湯、
自殿下給部類万葉集二帖＜蓮華王院御物云々、第一、第二、季時入道書之＞、可書写進者、
自春手腫之後、彌不能執筆、但給置可書試之申申之、抝微力念誦頻…
(Meigetsuki kenkyu 明月記研究, vol.6, 2001.11, p. 20.)

In his commentary to this passage, Sōtome Tadashi (五月女肇志) mentions that the Burui man’yōshū “can be considered as the Ruiju koshū, which classified poems from the Man’yōshū, according to their formats (歌体) and topics (歌材).” (Ibid.)

31. The Ruiju koshū, originally consisting of twenty books, encyclopedically reorganizes a total of some four thousand poems from the Man’yōshū into the following categories: “spring,” “summer,” “autumn,” “winter,” “heaven and earth”; “mountains and waters”; “plants, trees, bamboos, vines, birds, animals, fish and insects”; “properties (財貨), clothes, objects, zithers, wine, housing, boats and horses”; “gods, immortals, and humans”; “celebrations, lamentations, departures, object poems (物語陳思)”; “travels”; “death poems (挽歌), object poems (物語陳悲緒)”; “episodic poems (有由縁歌), burlesque poems (戯咄歌部)”; “poems from the Eastern Provinces (東歌)”; “long poems (長歌).” The sole extant copy (孤本, kohon) of the Ruiju koshū is considered to be written in the hand of four scribes from the late Heian period. Regrettably, out of the twenty books of the Ruiju Koshū, Books 9, 10, 18, 20 are missing. They probably contained the topics “love” (9,10), “long poems (18—the topic also appears in volumes 17 and 19), ”sedōka, or head-turning poems” (旋頭歌) (20). (“Kaisetsu” by Nobutsuna Sasaki, in Ruiju koshū (類聚古集), 4 vols. Edited by Kazutoshi Ueda (上田萬年), 2nd revised ed., originally published by Kanbundō (換文堂) in 1913). Kyoto: Rinsen shoten, 1992.) In the Kasha mokuroku, however, he twenty-volume Ruijū koshū, also appears in the last section on poetic commentaries, with its commentaries in “five volumes.” (類聚古集廿巻 同注五巻). It cannot be determined, however, 1) whether this was identical to the Burui Manyōshū, which is included in Section Two; 2) whether the separate inclusion of the Ruiju koshū at the end of the catalogue suggests if this was added later, or this part of the catalogue was supplemented later. In any case, the appearance of the “commentaries” on the Ruiju koshū suggests that the Man’yōshū was such an essential text that even its reorganized version became the subject of a commentary.
The *Man'yōshū* also existed in codex formats. The inventory lists a “twenty-volume version” (廿巻本) of the *Man'yōshū* in “three codices” (三帖). Moreover, it had “another codex” (又一帖) that was a “five-volume version” (五巻本) of the *Man'yōshū*. This abridged version also existed in “one volume” (又一卷同).

The *Kasho mokuroku* also includes other classical texts in multiple copies and in different formats. For example, Section Three contains two sets of *Kokin* (古今), the *Kokin wakashū* (古今和歌集, *Collection of Japanese Poems from Ancient Times to the Present*, 905). One copy, introduced as (古今一部教長入道筆), was a manuscript in the hand of Fujiwara no Norinaga (藤原教長, 1109-?), the author of the *Kokinshū chū* (古今集註, *Commentary to the Kokinshū*, 1177), one of the earliest extant commentaries of the *Kokinshū*.32 The other, described as “another copy by the same hand” (又一部/同筆/山 德院本云),33 was based on the recension of the Retired Emperor Sutoku (崇德院, 1199-64, r. 1123-41), an accomplished poet and a patron of waka.34 Considering the pioneering roles both Norinaga and Sutoku played in the history of

---

32. Norinaga’s *Kokinshū chū* is based on notes (聞書, *kikigaki*) of Norinaga’s lecture to Shukaku Hosshinnō from the twelfth to the twenty-third of the Ninth Month in 1177. The only extant copy of this text is housed in the library of Kyoto University, and its photostatic version was published as part of *Kichō tosho eihon kankōkai* (貴重図書影本刊行会) in 1931. A modern print edition is available in *Nihon koten zenshū* (日本古典全集) edition of the *Kokin wakashū* (1927).

33. The interlinear note reads 山 德院本, but as Ōta Shōjirō speculates, the first character and the following space are probably a result of a transcription error of 崇, the first character of Emperor Sutoku (崇德院). Ōta (1991). p. 92, note 52.

34. Emperor Sutoku is the first son of Emperor Toba (1103-56, r. 1107-23) and Taiken’mon’in Shōshi (待賢門院璋子, 1101-45). He is usually remembered as the retired emperor, whose political influence was completely eclipsed by that of his father and grandfather Emperor Shirakawa, (白河天皇, 1053-1129, r. 1072-86). The medieval *setsuwa* collection *Kojidan* (古事談, *Talks on Ancient Matters*, 1212-15, ed.)
waka, in particular in *Kokinshū* scholarship, it can be assumed that these copies of the *Kokinshū* were the best and most authentic of their kind in the late twelfth century.  

Minamoto Akikane 源顕兼 even comments that Sutoku was probably Shirakawa’s son. Since the Retired Emperor Toba was still at the height of his power when Sutoku abdicated (and himself became a retired emperor), Sutoku was called the “newly retired emperor” (新院). After Toba’s death in Hōgen (保元1, 1156), Sutoku and his brother (Toba’s fourth son) GoShirakawa fought over sovereignty (Hōgen Disturbance 保元の乱). Sutoku, aided by Fujiwara no Yorinaga (藤原頼長, 1120-56) and his father Regent Fujiwara no Tadazane (藤原忠実, 1078-1162) lost the battle against GoShirakawa, who was backed by Fujiwara no Tadamichi (藤原忠通, 1097-1164), the first son of Tadazane. Consequently, Sutoku was exiled to Sanuki Province, present-day Kagawa prefecture, and died there in 1164. As far as Sutoku’s reputation among his contemporaries is concerned, however, he was remembered as a waka poet and a connoisseur of music. As a sovereign, he was determined to “take over what had been discontinued, and revive ancient precedents” (絶えたる事をつぎ、古きあとを興さん). (Takehana, ed. *Imakagami*, vol.1, p. 377.) In the “Sound of Spring” (*haru no shirabe* 春の調) chapter of the *Imakagami*, Sutoku is depicted as a young emperor who frequently hosted private poetry parties, and often challenged his retainers by making them compose difficult poems. As a fervent patron of waka, Sutoku requested the leading poets of his time to submit their own poems in one-hundred-poem sequences (百首歌). Part of this is now known as *Kyūan hyakushū* (久安百首, before 1150). He also commissioned the compilation of the sixth imperial anthology of waka, *Shika wakashū* (詞花和歌集, A *Waka Florilegium*, 1151, ed. Fujiwara no Akisuke 藤原顕輔). While five of Sutoku’s poems were included in the *Shikashū*, 23 poems and 7 poems were posthumously selected in the *Senzaishū* and the *Shinkokinshū*, respectively. The narrator of the *Imakagami*, however, suggests that Sutoku’s poetic career could have been even more glorious in his life time; that it was indeed “regrettable” (口惜し) that Sutoku did not host poetry contests (*uta-awase*), which were considered more formal occasions than poetry parties:

> Although Sutoku was determined to revive ancient precedents, since he was not able to conduct politics freely, and was completely manipulated by Retired Emperor Toba, he could not fulfill ordinary duties [of an emperor such as hosting poetry contests and promoting his own retainers.]

古き事ども興さむの御心ざしはおはしましながら、世を心にもえまかせさせ給はで、院の御ままならば、やすく事もかなはせ給はずなむおはしましける。 (Ibid., p. 390.)

35. Other texts in multiple copies include the *Shūi wakashū* (拾遺和歌集, Collection of Gleanings, ca. 1006); Collected Poems of Ki no Tsurayuki (貫之集, ca. 868- ca.945), Izumi Shikibu (和泉式部, active early eleventh century) and Minamoto no Toshiyori; the *Toshirori zuinō*; the *Ise monogatari*; and the *Ōkagami*. 


The Kasho mokuroku also records a series of lost texts (散佚書, sanitsu sho) such as the Jugeshū (樹下集, Collection Under the Tree), Shazanshū (射山集, Retired Emperors’ Collection), Waka zuinō (倭歌雑略, Principles of Waka), Inaka zuinō (田舎雑略, Principles of Waka in Countryside), Kawayashiro kanmon (河社勘文, Monograph on “Kawayashiro”) and Chū kokin (注古今, Commentary to the Kokinshū).\(^{36}\)

Concerning medieval European library catalogues, Mary and Richard Rouse write:

“Naturally, [library catalogs and inventories] offer a wealth of evidence for the history of medieval archive and library organization; perhaps unexpectedly, they also reveal the schemes of classifying knowledge that were accepted in a given intellectual context.”\(^{37}\) The Kasho mokuroku is also a product of such “schemes of classifying knowledge.” It is a list of canonical works of waka, compiled under the influence of a hierarchic view of the genre, both chronological and ideological. On the one hand, historically it prioritizes the Man’yōshū as the “origin” of the genre,\(^{38}\) and values imperial anthologies over privately compiled anthologies or individual poets’ collections. (It also suggests that at the time, the Man’yōshū was considered to have been imperially commissioned.) On the other, it does not limit its scope to primary works of waka, as it includes some twenty secondary works, poetic handbooks, treatises and commentaries, the majority from the twelfth century: the Nōin utamakura (能因歌枕, Nōin’s Poetry Catalogue, date unknown, Nōin: 988-?); Minamoto no Toshiyori’s Toshiyori zuinō (俊頼

---

36. According to the present catalogue, the author of the Chū kokin is Fujiwara no Kiyosuke.


38. See for instance, Japanese preface to the Shinkokin wakahō, which calls the Man’yōshū as the “origin of uta/waka” (かの万葉集はうたののみなもとなり). (SNKBT 11, p. 18.)
Toshiyori’s Principles of Waka, ca. 1111-15; Fujiwara no Norikane’s Dōmōshō (童蒙抄, Waka Commentary for Beginners, ca. 1145-53?); Fujiwara no Kiyosuke’s Commentary to the Kinoshū (注古今, now lost), Ogishō (奧義抄, Commentary on Secret Teachings, ca. 1124-44?); Wakayō no tei (和哥様之俳, Styles of Waka), and Fukurozōshi 覆草子 (Pocket Book, before 1159); Keshō’s Man’yōshū jidai kanmon (萬葉集時代勘文, Monograph on the Periodization of the Man’yōshū); and Kawayashito kanmon; and Fujiwara no Shunzei’s Korai fūteishō (古来風転抄, Commentary on Old and New Poetic Styles, 1st edition 1197, second edition 1201).

Considering the rivalry between Kiyosuke’s and Keshō’s Rokujō school on the one hand, and Shunzei’s Mikohidari school on the other in the mid-twelfth century, the inventory’s inclusion of polemical works written by representatives of both camps is especially remarkable. For instance, Shunzei’s Korai fūteishō, of which the library possesses two copies, both in two codices (古來風転抄二帖俊成入道撰 又二帖), contains his polemical attack on Kiyosuke for his attempt to explain waka through the application of rules appropriate to kanshi composition, based on Chinese rhyme schemes; and against Keshō for his complaints about the Roppakuban utaawase, particularly over the interpretation of the poetic word kawayashiro (河社, lit. “river shrine”). The title of one of Keshō’s monographs, Kawayashiro kanmon, which

40. Keshō authored a similarly titled, Manyōshū jidai nanji (万葉集時代難事, ZGR 451, KT bekkkan 4), but a text under the title Manyōshū jidai kanmon does not survive today.
41. KKS 7, p. 92.
42. Ibid., pp. 68-70.
does not survive today, even suggests that the debate between the two poet-scholars escalated to the point where Kenshō wrote an entire “report” (kanmon 勘文) on the subject. This suggest that Shukaku valued the opinions of both the Rokujō and Mikohidari schools of waka and attempted to synthesize their different approaches to waka studies.

As for the Toshiyori zuinō, discussed in detail in Chapter 7, the “Kasho mokuroku” includes Toshiyori’s own manuscript version in one codex (一帖自箋), as well as another copy in three volumes (又一本三卷). Details regarding the acquisition process of these items are lost, but the latter was probably added because the former, albeit in the author’s own hand, was a partial transcription of the Toshiyori zuinō. Another possibility is that the owner of the collection first obtained the three-volume edition of the Toshiyori zuinō, and then fortuitously acquired Toshiyori’s own manuscript afterwards. However, we have no way of knowing how many copies of the Toshiyori zuinō the author himself made.

The inventory also contains three copies of the collected poems of Toshiyori, usually known as Sanboku kikashū (散木奇歌集, Collection of Eccentric Poems by Toshiyori the Useless). The first is a single codex with “the title Sanbokushū inscribed in Toshiyori’s own hand” (一帖 外題二散木集 俊願筆). The second copy consists of ten codices (又一本十帖), and the third five codices (又一本五帖). The prioritized appearances of Toshiyori’s own manuscript versions of the Toshiyori zuinō and the Sanbokushū indicate that these copies were considered more precious than the non-autographed versions. The existence of multiple copies

---

43. For an important study of the sub-genre of kanmon in twelfth-century waka studies, including the first of the kind, Kiyosuke’s Hitomaro kanmon (人丸勘文, A Report on Hitomaro, 1153), see Nishimura, pp. 47-69.
of these books also suggests that along with the other titles that exist in more than one format (the Man’yōshū, the Kokinshū, the Shūishū, Collected Poems of Tsurayuki 貫之集, Collected Poems of Izumi Shikibu 和泉式部集, and the Korai fûteishô), both Toshiyori zuinô and Toshiyori’s poetry collection were highly valued texts by the end of the twelfth century.

In the “miscellanea” section, the “Kasho mokuroku” includes various prose works that can be classified into vernacular historical narratives, poetry-tales, diaries, and setsuwa: Ōkagami (大鏡, The Great Mirror, late eleventh century) and Imakagami (新鏡, The Mirror of the Present, ca. 1174-5)44; Uji dainagon monogatari (宇治大納言物語, Tales of Grand Counselor Uji) and Kara monogatari (漢物語, Tales from China); the Ise monogatari (伊勢物語, Tales of Ise, ca. 947) and Yamato monogatari (大和物語, Tales of Yamato, ca. 951); Miyaki no ki (宮築記, Record of Emperor Uda’s Royal Hunt in the Miyataki Waterfall, ca. 898, by Sugawara no Michizane 菅原道真),45 Takamitsu shōshō nikki (高光少将日記, Diary of Lieutenant Fujiwara no Takamitsu [ca. 940-94]), Makura no sōshi (枕草子, Pillow Book, after 1000?, by Sei Shōnagon 清少納言),46 as well as the Genji shū (源氏集, Collection from the Tale of Genji), a collection of poems from the Genji monogatari (源氏物語, The Tale of Genji). The fact that

44. The first character of the Imakagami is usually 今. According to Ōta Shōjirō, “it goes without saying that 新 can be pronounced as 今 (ima)” (「新」が「今」と訓まることはことごとしくいうまでもない […] ) (Ōta, p. 89, note 30.) To elaborate on this, he gives an example from Book Five of the Taigenshō (體源抄, 13 vols. 1512, Toyohara no Muneaki 豊原統秋), a treatise on courtly music (gagaku), wherein the Imakagami is referred to as 新鏡. (Ibid., p. 94, supplementary note 1.)


46. Makura no sōshi is usually written as 枕草子, but in the present catalogue, it appears as 枕造子. For more details on this, see Appendix, note 52.
these prose texts were part of the canon of waka studies in the “Kasho mokuroku” suggests that familiarity with court culture from the preceding centuries, in which waka played a pivotal role in everyday life as well as in the literary imagination, was considered as important as acquiring specialized knowledge of poetic diction.

5. Shukaku Hosshinnō and the “Kasho mokuoku”

Then, how and why did Ōta come to attribute the “Kasho mokuroku” to Shukaku Hosshinnō? In his 1954 article, he gave five reasons. Firstly, he points out that toward the end of the catalogue, there is a reference to “The Southern Imperial Residence [Accompanied with?] the Repository of Sutras” (南御経蔵御所). The combination of the words “imperial residence” (御所, gosho) and “repository of sutras” (経蔵, kyōzō) certainly implies a monzeki (門跡), a Buddhist temple inhabited by princes, such as Ninnaji.

Secondly, he says that in Section Ten, the catalogue contains an “autograph” (自筆) of Shunzei’s poetry collection, [Collected Poems of] Lord Shunzei (俊成卿集). Extant copies of Shunzei’s collection, Chōshū eisō (長秋詠藻, Collected Poems of Lasting Autumn) contain a colophon, actually written by his son Teika, which indicate that the Chōshū eisō was originally commissioned by Shukaku and submitted to him upon completion:

These three volumes were written and submitted in the summer of Jishō 2 (1178), in response to a request of His Highness, [residing at] the Ninnaji. In recent years, the draft version [the autograph] was loaned out due to the request of a dignitary. Because the borrower did not return it, to make a provision in case of [my] sudden memory lapses, additionally I asked
permission to borrow the valuable manuscript from the Ninnaji, and had it
transcribed. Using this copy, I have thus completed this edition.

Twenty-second day of the Fourth Month, 1229. Senior Second Rank
[Fujiwara no Teika]

三巻、治承二年夏、依仁和寺宮所、被書進也。
件草近年依貴所召進覧、未返給之間、為備忘忘、更申請竹園御本
令書留之。以件本又書之。

寛喜元年四月廿二日 正二位 （花押）

Thirdly, Section Three of the “Kasho mokuroku” indicates that this inventory included
the Retired Emperor Sutoku’s recension of the Kokinshū, which was transcribed in the hand of
Fujiwara no Norinaga. Ōta points out that according to one source, Shukaku received one of the
several copies of the Kokinshū Norinaga produced by copying Tsurayuki’s own Kokinshū
manuscript, which Minamito no Arihito (源有仁, 1103-47, Prince Sukehito’s 輔仁 son, aka 花園
左大臣) had earlier offered to the Retired Emperor Sutoku as a gift.

Fourthly, Priest Kenshō’s (顕昭, ca. 1130-ca.1210) relationship with Shukaku is widely
known.48 According to Nishimura Kayoko, Kenshō moved from a monastery in Mount Hiei (比
叡山) to Ninnaji around 1182-84.49 Shukaku was in charge of Ninnaji after the death of his
predecessor Kakushō Hosshinnō (覚性法親王, 1129-69, Emperor Toba’s son), who used to

47. Ōta, p. 86, note 16.

48. See for example, Hashimoto (1920); Kyūsojin (1942), pp. 17-23, Nishimura (1997), pp. 270-89. For
chronology (nenpū 年譜) of Kenshō’s life, see Kawakami, pp. 1024-34.

49. Nishimura, p. 270.
compose waka with Kenshō’s half-brother Fujiwara no Kiyosuke.50 Although Kenshō occasionally joined in Kakushō and Kiyosuke’s waka events, he had not yet become a prolific exegete of waka literature during the lifetime of his influential brother, Kiyosuke. Between the years 1183 and 1185, Shukaku commissioned Kenshō to write commentaries on imperial anthologies of waka, *Kokinshū* (905), *Gosenshū* (951), *Shūishū* (ca. 1005-7), *GoShūishū* (1086), *Kinyōshū* (1127), and *Shikashū* (1151-54), as well as on other miscellaneous collections from the relatively recent period such as the *Horikawa hyakushu* (ca. 1105-7) and Minamoto Toshiyori’s *Sanbokushū*.51 The fact that Section Ten of the “Kasho mokuroku” includes Kenshō’s poetry collection, which does not survive today, with its reference to the “imperial residence” (御所), attests to the intimacy between Shukaku and Kenshō.

Fifthly, Ōta points out that although the *Shinkokinshū* (1205) was completed three years after Shukaku’s death, the so-called Ajari Recension (阿闍梨本) of the *Shinkokinshū* contains a colophon, which indicates that Teika submitted his own manuscript version of the *Shinkokinshū* to Ninnaji. At the end of Section Sixteen, the “Kasho mokuroku” includes a copy of the *Shinkokinshū* in twenty books, written by Teika. This may not directly support Shukaku’s involvement, but Ōta argues that in any case, it was common for book catalogues to be emended by those who inherit library collections.

From the Buddhist point of view, the existence of such an elaborate collection of books on waka in a monastic compound is unusual, if not scandalous, because in Buddhism in early Japan, poetry was generally denounced as “wild words and decorative phrases” (狂言綺語,

50. Ibid.

51. Nishimura, pp. 272 and 277.
kyōgen kigo), and the composition of waka could not have been promoted officially. According to Hirano Tae (平野多恵), the enunciation of “fabricated words” (kigo), as opposed to truthful words of Buddha, was traditionally regarded as one of the “Ten Evil Actions” (十悪) in Buddhism.52 Although monks continued to compose waka partly because it was Japanese “custom” (fūzoku, 風俗), it was equally common to reuse the verso pages (紙背, shihai) of former books on waka, such as poetry anthologies, to copy Buddhist sutras and prayers, suggesting the priority of Buddhist texts over literary ones in monastic surroundings.54

Moreover, while Chinese classical texts were traditionally an integral part of monastic libraries, literary texts in Japanese were usually excluded from Buddhist repositories. As I discussed in Chapter One, Chinese literature was considered useful for monastic students because the majority of Buddhist scriptures were written in Chinese, and training in that

52. Hirano, p. 5.

53. For instance, Priest Jien (慈円, 1155-1225), the son of regent Fujiwara no Tadamichi, who while being a prolific waka poet, became chief abbot of Tendai Buddhism, made the following comment in his poetry collection, Shūgyokushū (拾玉集, Collection of Gleaned Jewels, posthumously edited in 1328-46):

“Indeed, waka softens [that which expressed in] Chinese letters. As such, it is a custom of Japan [lit. “Land of Gods”]. (当に彼の漢字を和らくべき和歌は神国の風俗なり。) Quoted in Hirano, p. 8. For discussions of waka-related activities at monasteries at Kōfukuji (興福寺) and Tōdaiji (東大寺) in Nara in the late twelfth century, see Nakamura, pp. 308-68. For a book-length study of the Buddhist priest Myōe (明恵, 1173-1232) and his lifetime commitment to waka composition, see Hirano (2011). According to Hirano, Myōe studied waka with his uncle Priest Jōkaku (上覚, 1147-1226), who was involved in Kenshō and Shukaku’s waka coterie (和歌圏, wakaken) at Ninnaji. Hirano, pp. 37-42.

54. For one instance, see Okuda Isao’s (奧田勲) bibliographical report on Fujiwara no Kintō’s (藤原公任, 966-1041) poetry collection Kingyokushū (金玉集), discovered on the verso pages of a Buddhist text, Shaku maka enron (釈摩詞衍論) at Kōzanji (高山寺). Okuda (1978), pp. 239-48. Kobayashi (1980) also points out that miscellaneous jottings in Japanese, such as poems, occasionally appear on the verso pages of scriptural writings from the Kamakura period, suggesting that former manuscripts of Japanese literature were commonly recycled into Buddhist manuscripts. (Kobayashi, p. 487.)
language through non-Buddhist texts was essential. However, that was usually not the case for vernacular literature. According to the modern Japanese linguist Kobayashi Yoshinori’s (小林芳規) study on the library at Kōzanji Temple (高山寺) in Kyoto, during the Kamakura period (1185-1333), Japanese literature, including waka, was not actively pursued by the monastic library. Because Kobayashi’s study is mainly based on thirteenth-and fourteenth-century bibliographical inventories at Kōzanji, his conclusion cannot be uncritically applied to the situation at Ninnaji a century earlier. However, as a rare example of a catalogue of waka books, with a plausible monastic provenance, the “Kasho mokuroku” is unquestionably an unique text.

Indeed, the peculiar status and function of Ninnaji in turn-of-the-thirteenth-century Japan is a key to understanding the uniqueness of the “Kasho mokuroku.” I will argue that Shukaku collected, or more precisely, was able to collect these manuscripts simply because he was a prince. The second son of Emperor GoShirakawa (後白河院, 1127-92, r. 1155-58), he retained his connection to the imperial household throughout his lifetime. In fact, as hosshinnō and the chief abbot of the Ninnaji, his principal role was to conduct Buddhist ceremonies for the welfare and prosperity of the imperial family. If Ōe no Masafusa (1041-1111), the prolific writer of ganmon (Buddhist vows) had earlier represented the individual voices of his imperial patrons by weaving them into the highly ornate Sino-Japanese compositions, Shukaku sublimated them into incorporeal incantations in the liturgical space of esoteric Buddhism.

56. For instance, another twelfth-century catalogue of waka books, Waka genzaisho mokuroku (和歌現在書目録), Catalogue of Extant Books on Waka, 1166-68), the reference to which actually appears in the “Kasho mokuroku,” and which partially survives in Zoku gunsho ruijū 470, does not show any direct links to a monastic library.
However, despite Shukaku’s efforts to protect the imperial family and the state with rituals, the “fate of the imperial family” (皇運) became increasingly uncertain by the end of the twelfth century. As Shukaku confessed in his diary, *Saki* (左記, *Records of the Left*, ca.1186), the drowning suicide of Emperor Antoku (安德天皇, 1178-85, r. 1180-85) at the age of eight along with the members of his maternal Taira (平) clan in 1185 was not only an appalling but “indescribable” (絶筆) event for him, especially because Shukaku had conducted a series of special Buddhist ceremony called “The Rite of *The Peacock Sutra*” (孔雀経法, *kujakukyō hō*) for the safe birth of the young emperor. As an official religious protector of the imperial family, Shukaku must have become aware of the futility of fulfilling monastic duties, especially after the rise of Minamoto no Yoritomo (源頼朝, 1147-99) and his establishment of the first military government in Kamakura in 1192.

At a time of social disorder, it is not hard to imagine that Shukaku approached waka, along with court music, as a means of recalling the past splendor of imperial Japan. Certainly, his collection of books on waka was a way of protecting them from physical damage and loss at a time of intensifying nationwide warfare, often accompanied by arson. Moreover, by studying waka and incorporating some of the most memorable lines by ancient masters into his own poems, Shukaku, whose public persona remained that of an austere Buddhist priest, continued, at

57. The *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*, vol. 78, p. 2492 (607).

58. The *Peacock Sutra* (SK: Mahāmāyūrī-vidyārājñī) is “an early work of Buddhist magic, derived from the peacock-protecting devotion (mora-paritta) found in the Theravādin ātānātiya-suttanta.” (*Digital Dictionary of Buddhism* on 孔雀明王経.) Accessed on April 25, 2011.

59. For the detail of this event, also recounted in the *Tale of Heike*, see Abé Yasurō, “Shukaku hosshinnō to ‘mitsuyōshō,’” pp. 35-46.
least in his imagination, to live the life of a learned ruler of the past, and express this side of his identity in poetry. In other words, like Emperors Daigo and Murakami as portrayed in Ōe no Masafusa’s *Gōdanshō*, Shukaku possessed “poetic passion” (*suki*) and actively pursued the Way of the Arts (*suki no michi*) by collecting books on waka. Shukaku’s intense collaboration with the poet-scholar Kenshō during the 1180s, and his commissioning of commentaries on the major canon of waka, epitomizes his sense of mission not only to preserve the ancient practice of waka but to revive it as a source of his own imperial identity.

6. Shukaku Hosshinnō and the Realization of *Fūgetsu* Through Waka

Shukaku’s safeguarding of the traditional art of waka may have been inspired by the unconventional taste of his father, Retired Emperor GoShirakawa, who preferred *imayō* (今様, “popular songs”) to waka or kanshi. Although GoShirakawa commissioned the seventh imperial anthology of waka *Senzai wakashū* (千載和歌集, 1187, ed. Fujiwara no Shunzei), he did not take part in waka-related activities. Shukaku, however, organized monthly waka gatherings at Ninnaji beginning from the Jishō era (治承, 1177-81), mainly inviting high-profile Taira poets, such as Taira no Tsunemori (平経盛, 1124-85) and his brother Taira no Tadanori (平忠度, 1144-84). In the introduction to his diary, *Saki* ([左記, The Record of the Left, ca. 1186], Shukaku fondly calls Tsunemori and Tadanori *kōshi* (好士, lit. “those who liked [waka]”).

60. For biographies of Taira no Tsunemori, Tadanori and other prominent Taira poets, see Inoue, pp. 371-418.

61. The *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*, vol. 78 zoku shōshū bu 9, p. 607. For a discussion of Fujiwara no Teika’s somewhat pejorative references to *kōshi* in his diary *Meigetsuki* (明月記, *The Record of the Clear Moon*), see Tabuchi, pp. 221-46. See Nishimura, pp. 274-75 for Shukaku’s collaboration with the Heike poets. For my analysis of one of Tsunemori’s poems, included in the *Senzaisū* with an attribution to an
1198, Shukaku commissioned fifty-poem sequences from seventeen leading waka poets at the time, paying no regard to their factional differences; these included Kenshō, Fujiwara no Suetsune (藤原季経, 1131-1221, Kiyosuke’s half brother), Fujiwara no Ariie (藤原有家, 1155-1216) from the Rokujō school, and Shunzei, Teika, Jakuren and Fujiwara no Ietaka (藤原家隆, 1158-1237) from the Mikohidari school. Known as *Shukaku hosshinno ke gojisshu* (守覚法親王家五十首) or *Omuro gojisshu* (御室五十首), a total of twenty-five poems from this collection were later selected in the *Shinkokin wakashū*, including the following poem, “one of Teika’s best known”\(^62\):

```
On a spring night
Floating bridge of dreams
Comes to an end;
The sky with trailing clouds
Separating at a mountain peak.
```

(Shinkokinshū, Spring 1: 38)\(^63\)

The phrase, “floating bridge of dreams” (*yume no ukihashi*) refers to the final chapter of the *Tale of the Genji*, but in this context, it probably alludes to a succession of intermittent dreams. The word *todae shite* in the third measure indicates that the protagonist’s dreaming stopped abruptly, replaced by an image of “trailing clouds separating at a mountain peak.” As it appears in the “Spring” section of the *Shinkokinshū*, in the poetic sequence of “spring dawn” (*春朝*), on the surface this poem can be appreciated for its atmospheric depiction of the end of a

---

\(^62\) Shirane (2007), p. 614. (Comment made by Lewis Cook in his commentary to this poem.)

\(^63\) SNKBT 11, p. 30.
“spring night.” However, read in conjunction with its *honka* (本歌, a base poem), from which Teika borrows the expression in the fourth measure, *mine ni wakaru* (‘separating at a mountain peak’), a whole new world of interpretation, which cannot be otherwise discovered by perusing Teika’s thirty-one syllables or reciting them like a mantra, unfolds:

```
White clouds  風ふけば
Separate at a mountain peak  峰にわかるゝ
When the wind blows;  白雲の
Completely indifferent are  たえてつれなき
Your feelings for me.  君が心か
```

(Mibu no Tadamine, *Kokinshū*, Love 2: 601)

Knowing Tadamine’s poem from the *Kokinshū*, the reader of Teika’s poem realizes that the image of the trailing clouds “separating at a mountain peak” symbolizes a separation from a loved one, and the lover’s “complete indifference.” In this regard, the fact that Teika’s poetic subject continued to see this image after waking up poignantly suggests that s/he was still caught between dream and reality, and that the dream in question was perhaps not a happy one.

I discuss Teika’s poem and its modus operandi as a way of questioning what it meant for the prince-monk Shukaku to encourage his contemporary poets to compose waka, within the pre-assigned framework of the fifty-poem sequence; twelve poems on spring, seven on summer, twelve on autumn, seven on winter and twelve on miscellaneous themes. In short, the compositional technique of “allusive variation” (*本歌取, honkadori*), often associated with the

---

64. Of the twelve “miscellaneous” poems, two are preassigned as “celebrations” (祝), three as “personal misery” (述懐), two as “reclusive life” (閑居) and three as “travels” (旅) SKT vol. 4, p. 615.
poetic style (歌風, kafū) of Shinkokin shū poets circa 1200, was not simply a matter of aesthetics, but rather a way of life, requiring not only knowledge of classical waka, but a commitment to immerse oneself in the world of poetic language from the past, if only for the brevity of thirty-one syllables.

Shukaku was not an ordinary patron who sponsored literary activities as a bystander. He also contributed his own fifty-poem sequence to the Omuro gojisshu event he organized. His poetry collections, Hokuin omuro gyōshū (北院御室御集, Collection of The Northern Cloister the Royal Chamber) and Shukaku hosshinō shū (守覚法親王集, Collection of Shukaku Hosshinnō) contain some three hundred of his waka. Six Seven of his poems appear in the Senzaishū, and five poem in the Shinkokinshū (two of them were composed at the Omuro gojisshu). The following poem appears in the Winter section of the Senzaishū:

At Henjōji Temple, a poem composed on the topic, “Snow Beside a Pond”
Dharma-Prince Shukaku of Ninaji

遍照寺にて、池辺雪といへる心をよみ侍ける 仁和寺法親王守覚

If waves rise なみかけば
Snow on the waterside みぎはのゆきも
Would completely melt away. きえなまし
With such a sensitive mind, 心ありても
The surface of the pond remains frozen. こほるいけかな

(Senzaishū, Winter: 456)

65. For commentaries to all the poems composed by Shukaku, see Oda (2001).

66. SNKBT 10, p. 137.
Compared to Teika’s poem on the “floating bridge of dreams,” this poem is less ornate and allusive, but no less imaginative. Its uniqueness lies in Shukaku’s application of the anthropomorphic phrase, *kokoro ari* (“having a sensitive mind”), to the pond, which remains still so as not to disturb the snow covered landscape. This poem does not have a base poem (*honka*) from which it borrows an entire measure verbatim, like Teika’s. Nevertheless, Shukaku possibly composed this poem under the influence of a Sino-Japanese couplet composed by Sugawara no Fumitoki (899-981), which appears in the *Wakan rōeishū*:

Who said that water has no heart?
When confronted with concentrated beauty,
waves [in the pond] change their hues.

Who said that blossoms have nothing to say?
When light movement on the water surface intensifies,
shadows [of blossoms] move their lips.

“the Light of Blossoms Floating on the Surface of Water”
Sugawara no Fumitoki

誰謂水無心 濃艶臨兮波変色
誰謂花不語 軽漾激兮影動脣

花光浮水上 管三品
*(Wakan rōeishū, Spring “Blossoms” 花: 117)* 67

---

67. SNKS 61, pp. 51-2. In Japanese, the couplet can be recited in the following manner:

たれかいつし 水こころなしと どうえん臨んで 波いろへんず
たれかいつし 花ものいはずと けいやう激して 影くちびるを動かす
花の光すいじょうに浮かふ 管三品
Fumitoki’s kanshi poems, even a short couplet like this one, epitomize the Kidendō scholar’s ability to capture in words a brief encounter with nature (even if it is in an artificially crafted environment like a garden, or utterly in his imagination). In this couplet, Fumitoki focuses on the topic “the Light of Blossoms Floating on the Surface of Water” (花光浮水上), and depicts the parallel images of the flowers and the water through somewhat humorous personification. As I discussed in Chapter 2, because this approach to kanshi composition was most rigorously practiced by literati in the tenth and eleventh century at the heyday of the Kidendō curriculum in the State Academy, the nebulous term fūgetsu (風月, “the wind and the moon”) itself came to symbolize the compositional skill in kanshi, and even more figuratively, “poetic elegance.” Although there is no linguistic correlation between Shukaku and Fumitoki’s poems, their poetic subjects, personified “ponds” in winter and spring, are surprisingly similar. Certainly, a conclusion regarding Shukaku’s poetic skill cannot be drawn from analyzing only one example. However, as far as the Senzaishū poem in question is concerned, we can say that Shukaku himself was a poet “with a sensitive mind,” who was able to compose a waka as an embodiment of his true understanding of fūgetsu.

7. Shukaku Hosshinō’s View on Waka and Kanshi in his Records of the Right (1186)

So far, I have argued that Shukaku Hosshinnō collected a large body of waka-related material in his library at Ninnaji for the following two reasons: 1) his “poetic passion” (suki) inspired him not only to collect old manuscripts and to commission commentaries to the existing canon of waka, but also to sponsor and participate in numerous waka events, while encouraging contemporary waka poets, like Fujiwara no Teika, to explore new realms of waka composition
through their use of the compositional technique of allusive variations (*honka dori*); 2) Shukaku considered the composition of waka a superior means of reconnecting himself with the imperial past (vis-à-vis *imayō*, popular songs, which his father Emperor GoShirakawa promoted), because waka was the embodiment of personal “poetic refinement” (*fūgetsu*) on a par with kanshi.

To ascertain these hypotheses, Shukaku’s own thoughts on waka need to be examined. In this regard, we are fortunate because along with many liturgical records and manuals of esoteric Buddhism, the *Uki* (*Records of the Right*, ca. 1186), a collection of Shukaku’s disciplinary guidelines for his monastic disciples, survives.68 The topics covered in the *Uki* are mostly secular matters, and range from music performance, dietary restrictions, instructions on how to clean the temple compound, the proper use of lanterns at night, and the prohibition of playing board games such as *go* (碁) and *sugoroku* (双六) as well as of keeping pets (禽畜類飼之事) with the exception of roosters and dogs. The following passage gives Shukaku’s views on “banquets and parties” (酒宴), during which waka was often composed:

Arriving at banquets and other meetings too early is unthinkable. You shall not show [excessive] enthusiasm (*suki*). [However,] if you arrive late, that will cause trouble for other participants. You should know what is appropriate. Arriving at kanshi and waka parties too early is like [those who have] passion (*suki*). Moreover, if you are a novice, [that is where] you will be meeting with [respected] kanshi and waka masters. It is important that you carefully check your “pocket paper” [*kaishi*, on which poems to be recited at the event are written] before presenting them in public; [do this] before anyone has shown up, while finding your seat at the end of a row. [Those poetry masters naturally] will give you advice. Showing excessive enthusiasm [lit. “inclination”] is a problem of immaturity. At a banquet, ordering attendants to pour many cups of wine for yourself is problematic. This invites drunkenness and may result in

your lying on your back. Is it permissible to leave before the banquet is over, in the middle of the event? I am very reluctant to advise [you] to leave [a poetry event] early. Because you must prepare in advance for kanshi and waka gatherings, you should not leave them early.

一。酒宴席並一切会合余早参慮外之体也。不可好也。遲参又及一会之違乱。可計宜程云云。詩歌等会早參又似数奇之至。其上初心輩過詩伯歌仙。座席未無人之時指講以前見合懷紙事大切也。且有仰提撕之旨。且似傾未練之憚。酒座之時余為隨人命傾数盃之事不便云云。酩酊之基平臥之始也。然不終宴席中間可罷立敷。痛令早出之段又返返無念次第也。作文詠歌等会相構不可有早出。[...Emphasis added.]

Earlier, I mentioned that in the introduction to his *Saki* (*The Record of the Left*), which as a companion to the *Uki*, supplies Shukaku’s instructions for various religious matter for his monastic disciples, Shukaku reminisces and fondly calls Taira no Tsunemori and his brother Taira no Tadanori *kōshi* (好士, lit. “those who like [waka]”). This and my discussion that Shukaku himself was an enthusiastic poet and patron of waka may give the impression that he wholeheartedly embraced the ideal of “poetic passion” (*suki*), as it was described in Ōe no Masafusa’s *Gōdanshō*, Minamoto no Toshiyori’s *Toshiyori zuinō*, and Fujiwara no Kiyosuke’s *Fukurozōshi*. In fact, judging from the “Koseki kasho mokuroku,” the somewhat obsessive manner in which Shukaku collected manuscripts of waka anthologies and treatises, and even some loosely related prose literature from the preceding centuries, is analogous to Emperors Daigo (r. 897-930) and Murakami (r. 946-67), who in the words of Masafusa did not mind humbling themselves for the sake of the attainment of poetic truth through the composition of kanshi; or to Toshiyori, who as an enthusiast of ancient poetic language, singlehandedly

excavated and commented on otherwise obsolete expressions in his *magnum opus Toshiyori zuinō*.

For these reasons, retrospectively, the idea of *suki* can be interpreted as the driving force behind literary production throughout the *insei* period, as attested by the extraordinarily large number of compilations. As for Masafusa himself, the derogatory epithet given to him by his contemporary Fujiwara no Munetada, *fumigurui* (文狂, “the man crazed about writing”), succinctly shows that Masafusa shared an inclination towards excessive writing (and in the words of Munetada, “gossiping,” which culminated in the *Gōdanshō*.)

In this regard, literary anthologies of the twelfth century, such as the collection of *setsuwa, Konjaku monogatarishū* and the collection of Sino-Japanese compositions, *Honchō zoku monzui*, are also the manifestation of the individual compilers’ “passion” (*suki*) for literature, as Emperor GoShirakawa’s anthology of popular songs (*imayō*), *Ryōjin hishō* (梁塵秘抄, *Dance of the Dust on the Rafters*, late 12th century). As in the case of the Fujiwara Shiki family (藤原式家), established by the Kidendō scholar Fujiwara no Akihira (藤原明衡, 989-1066), a member of whom was considered to have compiled the *Honchō zoku monzui*, and Fujiwara no Akisue’s Rokujō family, in the mid-twelfth century, individual poet-scholars’ *suki* was often augmented by their renewed sense of belonging to their households with their own specializations in the arts.

In light of this general trajectory of *suki* in the twelfth century, Shukaku’s own reference to it in the passage quoted above is remarkable because he denounces it outright. While encouraging his disciples to attend poetry gatherings, he admonishes them “not to show [their]

---

enthusiasm” (*suki*, 不可好也) for waka by arriving too early at such events. More specifically, Shukaku calls the individuals who out of excessive enthusiasm cannot help but arrive early at poetry gatherings, “men of *suki*” (數奇). Shukaku must have thought that displaying excessive enthusiasm for waka was distasteful because it implied that the poet considered waka as a means to an end and hence a source of pleasure and this worldly profit (such as fame and money), like gambling and other entertaining activities (in his opinion) such as *go* and *sugoroku* games. In other words, although a Buddhist, Shukaku attributes positive values to the act of composing waka itself. He even suggests that because attending a waka party requires that the poet arrive with his/her compositions carefully thought out, even when there is a danger that the party may dissolve into a drinking spree, it is still worthwhile for young poets to remain seated because they can learn so much from “kanshi and waka masters” on such occasions. Then where does Shukaku’s belief in the composition of waka come from? On what basis does he encourage his monastic disciples to spend their time carefully preparing for waka gatherings? (As in the *Omuro gojisshu*, preparing in advance for poetry parties meant composing waka on pre-assigned topics.) The following passage, also from the *Uki*, more explicitly shows Shukaku’s ideas on the subject:

>When participating in kanshi and waka gatherings, [it is important] to pay attention to the [kind of] “pocket paper” [*kaishi*, on which poets are written]. Even in warriors’ households, it is [now respected as] a standard rule [practiced by the] Confucian sages [of the past]. Therefore, the novices among you should stick to using beautiful and exquisite paper for the rest of your lives. [Showing] no refinement (ふるゆ) by simply using [thick] paper is utterly loathsome. In selecting paper, be it thick paper [used for] drafts, thin paper, or colored paper, there shall be no limit in pursuing the finest beauty.
Moreover, concerning dress, when you attend Japanese and Chinese literary events, [you should wear] especially bright and colorful garments. In the era of Emperor Daigo (r. 897-930), the Way of Poetry [lit. “this Way”] enjoyed a revival. In addition to the four Japanese masters [the compilers of the Kokinshū] and seven masters of Chinese literature, the [state’s political] leaders were always composing poems. Japanese and Chinese [literary] masters worked together.

During his reign, Emperor Murakami (r. 946-67) inherited the authentic practices of [his father] Emperor Daigo. At the time, the five masters of the Pear Pavilion [compiled the second imperial waka anthology Gosenshū in 951], whereas in the emperor’s garden two types of guests [for waka and kanshi composition] were invited. Furthermore, monks and laypeople [attached their poems on] plucked boughs and sought jewels [in their compositions]. Quite frequently, they entered poetic realms. In public and private, [the emperor] held refine literary gatherings. The participants arrived in the morning; at dusk [contentedly] they glanced towards [the emperor’s residence as they departed]. Likewise, brocaded carriages came and went, making bejeweled hats stand in a line.

On the surface of sonorous white paper there lives a poet whose calligraphy is like the patterns of a phoenix’s [wings]. Over the right and left arms stands a man whose sleeves have the pattern of embroidered cranes. As I peruse ancient people’s old documents, my eyes [widen] with astonishment.

At the present time, Shakua the novice [Fujiwara no Shunzei] keeps saying that not once, from youth to old age, has he discarded his passion (shūshin) for [the composition of waka] [lit. “this”]. Carefully arranging and keeping provisions for [poetry] gatherings such as the appropriate clothing, and attending such events out of excessive [excitement] is useless. Why should you indulge yourself in this manner? Furthermore, [nowadays] many poems are composed impromptu [at poetry gatherings], endlessly [without formal structures], or in the style of “selective topics” (saguri dai) [in which participating poets are assigned topics by lottery]. Do not engage yourselves in this kind of [waka] composition. It is the same with kanshi composition. Even when an adept [of waka composition] is a young boy,

71. Shukaku does not mention who these “seven masters” of Chinese literature were. Kidendō scholars active during emperor Daigo’s reign include Ōe no Asatsuna (大江朝綱, 886-957) and Ōe no Koretoki (大江維時, 888-963).

72. See Fujiwara no Kiyosuke’s Fukurozōshi for a definition of saguri dai (探題). SNKBT 29, pp. 11-12.
he should [possess] mindfulness (ushin, lit. “with heart”). You should only strive for exquisiteness in poetic feeling (fuzei), and contemplate the profound mystery (yūgen) found in the dewdrops of words.

This passage is remarkable for three reasons; 1) although he is a Buddhist priest, Shukaku advocates sensual beauty by his choice of “pocket paper,” on which he writes poems; 2) Shukaku regards Emperor Daigo and Murakami’s eras as the golden age of Japanese imperial culture, wherein both waka and kanshi were equally valued and promoted; 3) he reiterates that his monastic disciples should not practice certain types of poetry composition that are spontaneous and entertaining in nature (thus possibly involving gambling, as it was later the case with renga, linked verse), and instead, focus on the attainment of “poetic feeling” (fuzei) and

73. In The Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō text of Shukaku’s Uki (Records of the Right), technically speaking, the word yūgen does not appear. The first character of the word is 齒 (“teeth”), not 幽 (“dim, faint, profound, dark”). However, because the phrase shigen 齒玄 (“teeth darkness”) does not make sense in this context, I interpreted it as 幽玄 (“profound mystery”).

74. The Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō, vol. 78 zoku shōshō bu 9, p. 604.
“profound mystery” (yūgen) through the careful and imaginative use of language prior to attending events.

Regarding the first point, it is curious that no matter how superficial it seems, Shukaku believes that “beautiful and exquisite” (美麗) paper notes can aid in the poet’s attainment of cultural “refinement” (風流, fūryū). His unapologetic adherence to objects of beauty is further exemplified by his recommendation to wear “colorful garments” (殊可鮮) when attending poetry gatherings. As it was customary for those who took the tonsure to wear black robes, as in the phrase “monks and laypeople” (編素, shiso, lit. “black and white robes”) that Shukaku himself uses in the passage quoted above, it can be surmised that Shukaku regarded poetry gatherings as semi-public events, participation in which was not only a matter of individual poets’ personal “liking” (suki) or interests.

Shukaku confesses that his belief in formalities, such as wearing choice garments and using fine paper notes at poetry gatherings, is largely inspired by what he learns from “perusing ancient people’s old documents” (古人旧記従閲之所). It is not hard to imagine that those “old documents” included some examples of the canon of waka literature, such as the Kokinshū; or the Engi onshū (延喜御集, Collected Poems of Emperor Daigo) and Tenryaku onshū (天暦御集, Collected Poems of Emperor Murakami), as they appear in the “Kasho mokuroku.” Concerning Shukaku’s glorification of Emperors Daigo and Murakami, it is remarkable that he emphasizes the fact that these two emperors promoted both Japanese and Chinese poetry, through their collaboration with “Japanese and Chinese masters” (和四人漢七人, 両客). In fact, in all the literary texts the present study has examined (kanshi and waka prefaces in the Honchō monzui,
Nōin’s waka preface, *Gōdanshō, Toshiyori zuinō, Konjakumonogatarishū* and Fujiwara no Atsumitsu’s “Kakinomoto eigu ki”), waka and kanshi were never so explicitly discussed together, nor considered fundamentally equal in terms of respectability. In other words, in Shukaku’s view, the dichotomy between waka as a native Japanese custom (fūzoku) and kanshi as the embodiment of the scholar-poet’s ability to appreciate nature (fūgetsu) is sublimated into his new idea of poetry.

On the one hand, his insistence on the use of beautiful paper and costume at poetry parties shows that he considered both waka and kanshi composition as customs belonging to imperial Japan, with their own aesthetic formalities and conventions. Again, for Shukaku, poetry composition was not a matter of his personal “liking” (suki) or obsession. On the other hand, without mentioning the term fūgetsu, he was one of the first in the literary history of waka to state that waka (like kanshi) could capture and express “poetic feeling” (fuzei) and touch on the “profound mystery” (yūgen) of nature and human existence through the imaginative use of language. Shukaku is advocating what is essentially a solitary act, wherein the poet confronts unfolding psychological landscape of his predecessors through reading their works, experiencing their feelings and points of view, and then appropriating whatever language was required to express themselves.

In this method of poetry composition, *honkadori* (allusive variation) was not merely a new compositional technique, but a way of life, the natural outcome of a poet’s philological approach to the past and the present. Shukaku calls the poet who wisely takes part in this

---

75. For my analysis of Ōe no Masafusa’s reference to the word yūgen regarding Sugawara no Michizane’s poems, see Chapter 4.
fundamentally selfless exploration of the self through texts and language “one who possesses the heart” (有心者, ushin sha), or mindfulness.76 The poet who embodies ushin is here contrasted to one who is driven by suki (liking, passion, enthusiasm), which in Shukaku’s narrow definition refers to the self-centered attachment to the composition of waka. In other words, Shukaku emphasized the importance of waka composition for his monastic disciples not only because of his own imperial connection to the past embodied in the genre. Rather he promoted the composition of waka both within and beyond the monastic surrounding (i.e. writing instructions on how to approach waka to his young disciples at Ninnaji on the one hand, and collaborating with lay poets such as Fujiwara no Teika on the other hand), because he had the conviction that so long as human beings are sentient (kokoro aru, “with heart”), true religiosity cannot be attained without becoming self-reflective about this filter, or the cognitive agent called the

---

76. Earlier, in my analysis of Shukaku’s own waka which contains the similar expression, kokoro ari (心あり, “with the heart”), I translated the psychological state (in the poem question, of a personified “pond”) as “having a sensitive mind.”
human mind; and that we can contemplate upon and refine the filter only through our imagination and scrupulous studying of the existing literature, including the canon of waka.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I examined “Koseki kasho mokuroku,” a catalogue of books on waka attributed to Shukaku Hosshinnō. The “Kasho mokuroku” is well known in post-war Japanese textual scholarship of early literature. In the many references to the catalogue, I found few critical studies of Ōta Shōjirō’s 1954 article, which introduced the material to the academic world. Over the past half century, the majority of Japanese textual scholars have relied upon the catalogue as a source of “authentic” textual evidence for otherwise hard to obtain information about bibliography and the early material forms of the 170 listed books, which include a number of insei literary texts such as the Toshiyori zuinō, Imakagami and Korai fūteishō. (Appendix 2.)

Although my purpose is not to challenge Ōta’s hypothesis that the “Kasho mokuroku” represents Shukaku’s monastic library at Ninnaji, in order to draw attention to the extremely

---

77. A similar view was already expressed in Fujiwara no Kiyosuke’s waka treatise Fukurozōshi (袋草紙, The Pocket Book, 1157), which is included in Shukaku’s “Kasho mokuroku.” According to Kiyosuke, Priest Eshin (恵心, aka Genshin 源信, 942-1017), the author of the anthology, Ōjō yōshū (往生要集, Handbook on the Rebirth in Paradise, 985) was dismissive of waka on account of kyōgen kigo until he heard a well-known Man’yōshū poem on impermanence (無常, mujō) recited, and was greatly moved because the poem perfectly captured his own feelings and thoughts as he was witnessing a similar panoramic view that the poem describes: 世の中を何にたとへむあさぼけ。こぎゆく舟のあとのしら浪。 (This poem, attributed to Shami Manzei, first appeared in the Shūishū, and then was included in the Wakan rōeishū, under the subject of “impermanence.”) Kiyosuke quotes Genshin as saying that “waka can possibly become an aid to meditate upon Buddha and Buddhist paradise.” (和歌は観念の助縁と成りぬべかりけり) SNKBT 29, p. 111.
serendipitous way in which the “Kasho mokuroku” survived as a cultural artifact, I provided additional bibliographical information about the catalogue based on my research at the Sonkei-Kaku Library in Tokyo, where a Meiji-period replica of the handwritten copy of the catalogue, made by the early eighteenth-century daimyō Maeda Tsunanori is accessible to the public.

The main focus of this chapter was to examine the achievements of Shukaku Hosshinnō as a literary patron, poet and pedagogue. By conserving canonical works of waka, commissioning a series of new commentaries and treatises on them, and by composing highly imaginative waka, Shukaku not only acted as a guardian of the poetic tradition, but also ushered in a new age in the literary history of waka by collaborating with poets from both the Rokujō and Mikohidari schools. For example, Shukaku commissioned Keshō, a leading Rokujō scholar-poet, to write commentaries for a series of imperial anthologies, while encouraging the Mikohidari poet Fujiwara no Teika to experiment with the compositional technique of honkadori (allusive variation). I argued that such an accumulation of books on waka would have been impossible without Shukaku’s somewhat “obsessive” passion for waka. In other words, while serving the state as the chief abbot of Ninnaji, Shukaku was also a prince who maintained the waning tradition of imperial rulers who passionately promoted literary activities, in particular, the composition of Japanese and Sino-Japanese poems.

Through my close reading of Shukaku’s Uki (Records of the Right), I examined the ways in which he promoted waka composition among his young disciples at Ninnaji. I discussed the peculiar ways in which Shukaku synthesized the traditional view that waka is a Japanese custom (fūzoku) with the hitherto understated claim that it is also an embodiment of poetic refinement
(ふるゆ) on a par with kanshi. Shukaku expressed his new understanding of waka through his glorification of Emperors Daigo and Murakami, who promoted both waka and kanshi.

Shukaku’s insistence that poetry has to be composed “with mindfulness” (ushin), and his view that it is a solitary act which is as important as any public recitation of poems, distinguished him from the poets who became obsessed with attending waka parties because of their personal “passion” (suki) for waka. Retrospectively, we can argue that Shukaku’s involvement in waka activities was yet another example of literary passion (suki) that made possible the production of many literary compendiums in the insei period. However, Shukaku disassociated his noble mission of reviving waka from the poet’s personal propensity for suki. In this way, he elevated waka from a local custom (which people practiced without being overly concerned about the manners and language that were an integral part of poetic production) or an object of an individual “aficionado’s” (sukimono) obsession to that which materialized a poet’s sincere determination to take part in history and live up to the model set by predecessors.

In so doing, Shukaku considered poetry composition, be it of waka or kanshi, as an universal testing ground of human cognition, and as such, in his understanding, it was no longer contradictory with Buddhism, whose orthodox teaching condemned poetry as the act of writing “fabricated words” (kigo), and included it as one of the Ten Evil Actions of human beings. For these reasons, through his collection of books on waka, Shukaku transformed his monastic library into a unique space, where he and others could engage with the world of the past through poetry composition.
“One must resist the temptation, to which too many historians of science succumb, to make the often obscure, clumsy, and even confused ideas of the ancients more accessible by translating them into a modern language that makes them clearer at the cost of distortion.” (Alexandre Koyré1)

“To take an author seriously, to view his work in the context of its times, to attempt to describe the twists and turns of his thinking does not, however, mean that one agrees with his conclusions or subscribes to his views.” (Maurice Olender2)

Conclusion

Toward New Philological Studies of Literary Texts from Twelfth Century Japan

This dissertation examined an array of texts from the long twelfth century (1086-1221), also known as the insei period, in Japan. Instead of viewing them merely as sources of information for pre-established narratives about Japan during this sociopolitically volatile period, or manifestations of aesthetic awareness on the part of individual aristocratic authors, I attempted to discover historical understandings produced through these texts. In this sense, I full-heartedly embrace the concept of “critical philology,” which the literary critic and Sanskrit scholar Sheldon Pollock proposes in his thought-provoking essay, “Future Philology? The Fate of a Soft Science in a Hard World” (2009);3 the present work is my attempt to demonstrate yet another “global” or universal aspect of philology as a discipline and “core knowledge forms” of humanity.

1. Translated from French and quoted in Olender, p. 17.
2. Olender, p. 18.
Literally deriving from the Greek word *philologia* (“love of learning,” c.f. in Martianus Capeella’s treatise *The Marriage of Mercury and Philology*, 5th CE), in the words of the Italian philosopher Giambattista Vico (1688-1744), philology at the dawn of European modernity meant an “awareness of people’s languages and deeds” and even “the science of everything that depends on human volition: for example, all histories of the languages, customs and deeds or various peoples in both war and peace.” However, as Pollock writes, today philology as an academic discipline has lost its historical brilliance and relevance, and it is at best vaguely remembered as the art of close reading. According to Pollock, the discipline of philology at universities eventually “collapsed,” firstly because it was “confined to the classics”; secondly, in North America in the second half of the last century when it was “dispersed across the separate

---

4. Quoted in ibid, p. 933. In the nineteenth century, the German philologist August Boeckh went so far as to define philology as “the knowledge of what is known.” (Ibid.)

5. For instance, Pollock quoted Roman Jakobson, who once called philology “the art of reading slowly.” (Ibid., p. 933.)

6. Ibid., 946. Not only classical languages in European civilization, i.e. Greek, Latin and Hebrew, Pollock no doubt had Sanskrit, Arabic, Persian in mind, because linguistically attuned systematic studies of these languages by European philologist, i.e. the linguistic kinship theory between Sanskrit and other Indo-European languages, were the hallmark of European modern literary “sciences” until the mid-twentieth century. Citing examples of Persian philology developed in exile in Hindustan during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, classical Hindi collage flourished in Gujarat in Northern India in the mid-eighteenth through mid-twentieth centuries, and studies of classical Kannada in the south, Pollock claims that “the great achievements of Indian philologists” in the late premodern or early modern period have been neglected by scholars in the field both in and outside of India. (Ibid., pp. 936-44.) Heavily drawing on the scholarship of Benjamin Elman, the historian of early-modern China, Pollock briefly discusses that the situation is quite contrary in today’s China, where “philology and historical studies generally, perhaps shaped by [the] early modern truth [of “the extraordinary renewal of philology” or “evidential research studies” 考證学, kaozheng xue], have survived both Western nationalist-communist modernization and indeed have flourished.” (Ibid., p. 944.) Obviously, because both in Japan and overseas, almost every aspect of literary production during the Edo period has been studied, Pollock’s model of the “collapse of philology” based on Indologists’ general indifference to vernacular literary movements of the early-modern period appears weak. However, it it true that some of the earliest achievements in Japanese studies in the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were translations of classical literary canons, such as the *Kojiki*, the *Genji monogatari*, the *Man’yōshū*, and the *Kokinshū*; and also that even today, studies of medieval Japan, or the period between 1200 and 1600, are relatively less popular compared to classical or early-modern studies, especially outside of Japan.
domains of Oriental studies […] and the newly established European national literature departments,”7 and finally, when “the demolition of Oriental philology” began in the 1950s, transforming “non-Western philologies from forms of knowledge with major theoretical claims about the human sciences into a mere content provider for the applied sciences that went under the name of area studies.”8 In addition to these factors, Pollock also attributes the demise of philology to its practitioners’ lack of interest in establishing a general theory on what the “occluded and productively disruptive otherness of the noncapitalist non-West” could teach us today.9

By defining philology as “the discipline of making sense of texts,” the theory of “the history of textualized meaning,” and a “global knowledge practice,”10 Pollock argues that its revival is crucial today as a means of “discover[ing] one important way out of the dead-end area studies model of language labor as merely producing the raw data for the Lancashire mills of self-universalizing Western theory.”11 I do not agree with Pollock’s assessment of the state of the field as far as studies of twelfth-century Japan are concerned. The vast majority of insei studies are still published in Japanese, with few translations of primary texts available in English, and

7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid., p. 955.
10. Ibid., p. 934.
11. Ibid., p. 956. Alternately, Pollock makes the following statement: “If we are ever to make an argument for philology’s disciplinary identity, coherence, and necessity, it must be now, when both national and areal underpinnings of the foreign literature departments seem increasingly anachronistic, when comparative literature has been crushed under the weight of its own self-critique and rendered increasingly irrelevant for a post-Western world by the stubborn European bias that marked it at its birth and still does in most universities, and when philology itself is on the endangered species list in large parts of the world.” (Ibid., pp. 947-8.)
literary scholars in Japan, whose meticulous textual and bibliographical research the present study is indebted to, seldom refer to Western (or for that matter, non-Western) theory, or even attempt to draw generalizations from their discoveries.

Nevertheless, as I summarize below, the issues entailed in the variety of insei texts appeared surprisingly universal, when read in their entirety in light of their own sociopolitical and textual contexts. The intentions of the authors or editors of the texts, or what we consider as such, often disappear when particular passages are extracted out of context and approached as sources of information. Certainly, I am not free from this tendency to appropriate texts in this manner, especially the vernacular historical narratives of insei Japan, the Imakagami (The Mirror of the Present, ca. 1170), which I constantly referred to in the present study. Nevertheless, whenever possible, I tried to locate the problems that are unique to each text and yet concurrently indispensable to an understanding of other texts, through my own preliminary reading of primary texts in their purported entirety, rather than simply relying on resources such as indexes. (In Japanese this method of reading is called tsūdoku 全読, or cover-to-cover reading.)

While pertaining solely to the production of literary discourse in the Japanese language, whether written in Sino-Japanese (kanbun) or Japanese (kana), the texts I analyzed addressed general issues such as conceptions of particular literary genres (e.g., waka, kanshi, and setsuwa); the relationship between vernacular and foreign forms of self-expression in writing; the nature and function of commentaries; the mechanism behind textual transmission; and the history of manuscript culture. To my surprise, these topics are not only analogous but identical to the very elements that Pollock considers the embodiments of textuality in the “disciplinary theory of
philology” or “a global theory of the text.”

In short, by clarifying how individual texts from early Japan attest to these issues, we can understand “the very capacity of human beings to read their pasts and indeed, their presents and thus to preserve a measure of their humanity.”

How did I gain insight into the topics listed above from the Insei texts? What is the benefit of knowing how people in twelfth-century Japan attempted to “preserve a measure of their humanity?”

Part One provided socio-intellectual and textual background to my main argument that the Kidendō (history and literature) curriculum in Chinese studies at the State Academy declined by the early twelfth century, while the study of waka (kagaku) evolved and eventually attained the prestige of Kidendō-centered Chinese literary studies (kangaku) by the end of the century. I did so by examining the ways in which both kangaku and waka discourses were defined in pre-twelfth century literary texts.

Chapter One analyzed a sequence of anecdotes about waka poets in the Konjaku monogatarishū (Collection of Tales from Times Now Past, ca. 1120), and confirmed that in the early twelfth century, waka was not yet recognized as a scholarly pursuit or a “Way” (michi), in the manner of kangaku or Buddhism. Anecdotes about the Kidendō academician Ōe no Masahira (952-1012) and his wife Akazome Emon (956-active in 1041), which feature their exchange of humorous waka poems, showed not only the quotidian image ascribed to waka as Japan’s local custom (fūzoku), but also curiosity about the private life of the renowned scholar and his family on the part of the anonymous editor of the Konjaku monogatarishū.

12. Ibid., pp. 948-9.

13. Ibid., p. 934.
Chapter Two examined the anthology of Chinese compositions by Japanese scholar-officials, the *Honchō monzui* (*Literary Masterpieces of Japan*, ca. 1058-65). Literati writings in various “literary genres” (*buntai*) such as application letters (*sōjō*), Buddhist prayers (*ganmon*), kanshi prefaces (*shijo*) and ballads (*kō*), revealed that the actual lives of Kidendō scholar-officials were not as promising as the twelfth-century biographers such as the author of the *Konjaku monogatarishū* assumed. The *Honchō monzui* demonstrated that the late-tenth through early-eleventh centuries were hardly a heyday of the Kidendō scholarship. At least, that was not the way academicians at the time viewed the time they lived in. After the exile of the scholar-official Sugawara no Michizane (845-903), as a result of a political conspiracy plotted against him by Fujiwara politicians, and the reigns of relatively powerful Emperors Daigo (r. 897-930) and Murakami (r. 946-967), the old Confucian ideal of scholars’ assisting wise imperial sovereigns in their “building the state and ruling the society” (*keikoku chisei*), as well as the principle of meritocracy in the administration lost their significance during the period of the Fujiwara regency.

Under such circumstances, Kidendō scholars were driven to secure their own and their offspring’s academic posts (Ōe no Masahira); to give up both scholarship and officialdom, and take Buddhist vows (Yoshishige no Yasugane); to poeticize and take pride in their *fūgetsu* or the mastery of the composition of Chinese verse (Sugawara no Fumitoki); or to criticize the “prosaic lives” of scholar-officials who were oblivious to the fact that their utilitarian approach to Chinese literature did nothing to enrich their lives (Ki no Haseo). I did not elaborate on this, but such displays of “culture of discontent” as it appear in literati writings in the *Honchō monzui* indeed seems to have influenced the formation of the literary trope or the compositional mode of
“personal grievances” (jikkai or shikkai) in twelfth-century waka. Equally significant is a series of the actual kanshi poems composed by Kïndõ academicians on particular preassigned topics (kudaishi) or without such topics (mudaishi), and the literary anthologies that collect these poems, such as the Wakan rïeishû (Japanese and Chinese Songs to Sing, ca. 1017-21) and the Honchô mudaishi (Collection of Poems Composed Without Topics, mid-twelfth century). Because I focused on the Honchô monzui, which features prose writings, with a few exceptions like Sugawara no Fumitoki’s ballad (kô), the rich body of kanshi compositions remained out of the scope of the present study.

Chapter Three turned to the literary genre of waka prefaces (wakajo). Written in Chinese, wakajo first appeared as a sub-genre of shijo (kanshi prefaces), but at a time when critical and self-reflective writings about waka were still rare before the twelfth century, waka prefaces provided insight into how the literary genre of waka was conceived by both kangaku academicians and waka poets. The Chinese and Japanese prefaces to the Kokin wakashû (Collection of Japanese Poems from Ancient Times to the Present, 905) defined waka as a linguistic art form on a par with kanshi. The Kakyô hyôshiki (Basic Rules of Waka, 772?), attributed to the scholar Fujiwara no Hamanari (724-90), was the earliest known example of a kangaku scholar’s attempt to define and reform waka within the parameters set for the composition of Chinese poems.

14. For an excellent overview of the practices of kudaishi and mudaishi, and their relationship to waka composition from the time of the Man’yôshû through the end of the Edo period, see Horikawa Takashi’s (堀川貴司) essay in Suzuki and Suzuki, eds., pp. 272-89. For a study of the development of kudaishi in Japan, see Denecke (2007).
Although the *Kokinshū* prefices tacitly affirmed the common origins of waka and kanshi as the verbal art form based on the human mind/heart (*kokoro*), in the subsequent centuries until the twelfth century, the trajectories of the two genres hardly crossed again. Defined as *fūzoku* (local customs) and *fūgetsu* (poetic refinement), respectively, at least in the critical writings, such as in waka and kanshi prefices, the two poetic genres of waka and kanshi were seldom discussed together. In this regard, the innovativeness of the *Wakan rōeishū*, which juxtaposes poems in the two genres, as well as Chinese couplets composed by Chinese poets, cannot be overemphasized.

Although casually composed by both male and female members of the aristocracy on all levels, and exchanged as personal correspondence, waka poems in the tenth and eleventh centuries were never lacking in thoughtfulness, wit, or deep and sincere appreciation of nature, which could be called *fūgetsu*. The artificial distinction between waka and kanshi was probably imposed by Kidendō academicians, who were eager to “consecrate” and professionalize the act of composing elaborate prose and verse in Chinese, as their official roles as “Confucian scholars” (*jusha*) were reduced to the level of merely sustaining the formal features of the ancient imperial state during the period of the Fujiwara regency. The waka poet Nōin (988-active 1051), himself a product of the Kidendō curriculum, wrote in his waka preface that people generally respected studies of Chinese literature, but disdained those who showed similarly passionate interest in the composition or study of waka.

What we see in these entangled trajectories of waka and kanshi discourse in the tenth and eleventh centuries is what Pollock calls “the contest between local and superlocal forms of textuality,”¹⁵ and how a subtle classification of existing literary genres emerged as a byproduct of

---

such a contest. The subjects taught in the Kidendō curriculum, such as the Chinese chronicle
Shiji and the literary anthology Wenxuan, were unquestionably “superlocal,” both linguistically
and content-wise, for Japanese scholars at the Academy. However, as the scholars rigorously
studied these texts and their knowledge of the foreign subject-matter were tested (most
dramatically in the civil-service examinations), and demonstrated through their compositions in
Chinese, not only that the Chinese discourse became “localized” in accordance with the
particular taste and needs of the Japanese scholars, but became part of their lives.

In other words, Kidendō scholars’ mastery of the Chinese Classics and the widening of
their worldview through the lenses of the foreign language and topics gave them an opportunity
to enrich, if not compensate for their increasingly weakened roles as scholar-officials.
Consequently, Kidendō scholars disguised such inevitably “localized” aspects of their literary
practices by distinguishing the composition of kanshi, the epitome of the studies of Chinese
literature (but in reality, the most localized part of their literary practices), from that of waka, the
irrefutably vernacular form of verbal art. Despite the artificial ways in which waka and kanshi
were disassociated by Kidendō academicians in the eleventh century, the prestige of kanshi as a
more sophisticated poetic genre vis-à-vis waka did not last that long, because of the discoveries
by waka poets of the two genre’s common origin, as well as the unexpectedly early demise of the
model of Kidendō in the twelfth century.

Part Two examined the life and works of the scholar-official, Ōe no asafusa (1041-1111). Masafusa is a popular subject in insei studies, with two modern book-length biographies written
about him in Japanese.16 Nevertheless, his literary and political achievements, in particular his

influence on the formation and development of the insei culture, or what would become a blueprint for the collective cultural consciousness of medieval Japan, have not been discussed sufficiently, probably due to Masafusa’s astonishing versatility and prolificacy as an author of records of court rituals, various records and essays, Buddhist prayers, biographies and literary commentaries, as well as a diarist and kanshi and waka poet.

The present study demonstrated that Masafusa’s writings contained some of the key elements that made the convergence of the early Way of Chinese literature (monjōdō, another name for the Kidendō curriculum) and the emerging Way of Waka (kadō) possible in the mid-to-late twelfth century. Most importantly, Masafusa bridged the two worlds of pre-twelfth century Kidendō scholars and twelfth-century waka scholars by preserving the deeds of the literati in anecdotal writings (setsuwa), which could be easily shared, enjoyed and modeled by anyone who read the texts. In short, Masafusa vernacularized the richly textualized voices of Kidendō scholars in their Sino-Japanese compositions in varied “literary genres” (buntai) or situational modes of self-expression (as catalogued in the Honchō monzui), by reducing them into accessible and memorable anecdotal narratives.

Chapter Four attempted to make sense of the detailed but fragmentary scholarship on Masafusa both in English and Japanese by proposing to view him as the first critic of insei Japan. Scholars have discussed Masafusa’s success as a politician, epitomized by his promotion to the posts of Acting Counselor (gon-chūnagon) and Acting Governor General of Dazaifu (Dazai gon no sochi); or demonstrated close reading of some of his writings. I argued that especially after

the Kanji era (1087-94), when Masafusa became Commissioner of Ceremonial and carried out such exalted duties as devising an era-name, the tone of his writing became increasingly cryptic and ironical.

Contrary to his ancestors who expressed their feelings of discontent through literary compositions, Masafusa’s position in society was secured in the newly consolidated political institution of retired emperors’ administrations (insei), in part because of the confluence of his and his imperial patrons’ desire to revive the Confucian political ideal of “building the state through literary projects” (bunshō keikoku), or at least to revert the imperial state where it was before the Fujiwara regency. This gave Masafusa the freedom to express his social criticism (albeit implicitly) in various literary forms hitherto considered inappropriate for a Kidendō scholar, such as records on highly vernacular topics including street musicians, prostitutes and fox witchery. By closely analyzing his essay, “Bonen no ki” (A Record of My Twilight Years, ca. 1099), originally conceived as a preface to his own kanshi collection and as a parody of Ki no Haseo’s kanshi preface, and his Buddhist vow (ganmon) written to pacify the deceased soul of Fujiwara no Atsumoto, his fellow Kidendō scholar and the son of Akihira, I examined Masafusa’s reflections on the degenerate state of literary production both on the part of aristocratic rulers and Kidendō scholars.

19. In other words, although a scion of an established Confucian household (juka), Masafusa took his inspirations from the unconventional literary activities of his teacher, Fujiwara no Akihira (989-1066). Masafusa’s great-grandfather, Masahira, for instance, looked down on non-Ōe or Sugawara academicians, calling them “upstarts” (kika). As a kika scholar, after having assumed leading posts at the State Academy at his relatively advanced age, Akihira invigorated the stagnant Kidendō scholarship in the mid-eleventh century by compiling the Honchō monzui, and also by writing unusual essays, such as Shin sarugaku ki (A New Record of Monkey Music). I owe Satō (2003) for the distinction between juka and kika scholars within the Kidendō tradition, as well as his comparative analysis of Akihira and Masafusa’s careers.
Chapter Five turned to Masafusa’s Buddhist writing, *Zoku honchō ōjōden* (*Biographies of Those Reborn in Paradise in Japan II*, ca. 1099-1104). Belying its title and subject matter, as well as its literary predecessor, the academician Yoshishige Yasutane’s *Nihon ōjō gokuraku ki* (*Record of Rebirth in Paradise in Japan*, 983-85), the orientation of Masafusa’s ōjōden is unapologetically secular. For Masafusa, paying homage to his patron Emperor GoSanjō (r. 1066-72) and some of his ancestors by composing panegyric vignettes and praising their literary achievements, appeared more important than affirming his Buddhist faith. His characteristically enigmatic and cryptic manner of writing through which he portrayed his ancestors revealed how Masafusa viewed the inevitable changes in, if not the demise of, his family’s commitment to Chinese literary studies.

Chapter Six analyzed Masafusa’s *Gōdanshō* (*Notes on Dialogues with Ōe no Masafusa*, ca. 1107-11). The most famous and widely studied among the texts attributed to Masafusa, the *Gōdanshō* was actually not written by him. It is a record of Masafusa’s conversation with Fujiwara no Sanekane (1085-1112), the young Kidendō scholar. Apparently a popular text throughout the medieval and early-modern periods, today the *Gōdanshō* survives in various manuscript and print editions, in addition to modern annotated versions and a partial translation in English.²⁰ Firstly, I examined the peculiar ways in which some of the earliest instances of the reception of the *Gōdanshō* shed light on the production of the text, in the absence of an urtext.

---

²⁰ Ury (1993). For a complete list of modern annotated editions of the *Gōdanshō*, see Bibliography under “Ōe no Masafusa” in “Primary Works.”
By analyzing the Kanda Recension (1114-15), which contains only fifty anecdotes but is by far the oldest among the existing manuscripts of the Gōdanshō, I speculated about the existence of a proto-Gōdanshō or a collection of Masafusa’s spoken discourse that could be identified as such. As it appears in its early twentieth-century photostatic edition, the Kanda Recension is divided into a few sections with different dates of transcription. This gradual textual formation suggests that individual readers who borrowed and had the proto-Gōdanshō copied by scribes (or copied by themselves) rather freely customized it and made their own editions of the text in accordance with their own interests and the availability of source material. Most importantly, this pattern of the early dissemination of the Gōdanshō suggests the ways in which Masafusa’s spoken discourse was treated as a reference, presumably on the matter of court service and history, shortly after his death in 1111. As I briefly discussed in Chapter 5, Masafusa’s kanbun diary, Gōki (Oe’s Diary) was similarly consulted with frequency by courtiers even during his lifetime.

In the same chapter, also attempted to reconstruct the textual meaning embedded in the Kanda Recension. I was drawn to this particular version of the Gōdanshō after my preliminary reading of the much longer Ruijūbon Recension in a modern print edition. I came to realize that the majority of the anecdotes I found particularly “interesting” (as Masafusa is always quoted as

21. The widely read “Popular” (Rufuhon) or “Topically Organized” (Ruijūbon) Recension contains 445 anecdotes. The format of the Popular/Topically Organized Recension was well established by the time of the courtier Sanjōnishishi Kineda (1487-1563). However, the earliest surviving text, a copy of Sanjōnishishi Kineda’s manuscript, dates only in 1735. This text is used as a “base text” (teihon 底本) of the Iwanami’s Shin nihon koten bungaku taikei edition (1997) of the Gōdanshō.

22. The somewhat puzzlingly heterogeneous selections of Masafusa’s dialogues in the other pre-Edo manuscripts of the Gōdanshō, Suigenshō Recension (1198, 256 anecdotes) and Maeda Recension (1245, 87 anecdotes), also suggest the existence of now lost source, as well as the selective ways in which subject-matter was copied out in each recension.
saying about the lives of Kidendō scholars and their lively interactions with their imperial patrons, were almost all included in the Kanda Recension as well. Whoever compiled the Kanda Recension was interested in Masafusa’s glorification of Emperors Daigo (r. 897-930) and Murakami (r. 946-67), because of their passion for the composition of Chinese poetry. Together with a long anecdote about Daigo’s grandson, an enthusiastic biwa player, the theme of “poetic passion” (suki) runs throughout this edition of the Gođanshō. Considering that suki would become one of the driving forces for the revival of waka in the twelfth century (as various anecdotes were written about waka poets who demonstrated the spirit), and also that the passage about Daigo’s grandson contains a few waka poems, which is rare even in the voluminous Ruijūbon edition, I cannot help but imagine that the Kanda Recension was produced by a waka poet, who was eager to learn about the role suki played in the lives of past sovereigns.

The relatively wide circulation of Masafusa’s spoken and written discourse as reference material shortly after his death seems to affirm my hypothesis that the preeminence of the Ōe family as the guardian of Kidendō scholarship was over by the early twelfth century. Had the tradition of the family been strictly maintained, a particular body of knowledge, like the Gođanshō, would not have become available to outsiders, including Masafusa’s interlocutor Fujiwara no Sanekane. Here I discern not only the demise of the Ōe family as a scholarly unit and that of the Kidendō curriculum, but also a shift in academic learning from a tradition based on the oral transmission of knowledge to one dependent on texts; or from an aristocratic family prerogative to a system that was open, in theory, to whoever had access to the texts. The genre of setsuwa (anecdotes), of which the Gođanshō is one of the earliest and most prototypical

23. 尤有興事也.
examples, seems to have been a nexus between the oral and textual formation of knowledge, by preserving numerous biographical details about historical subjects, and by making it possible for readers to imagine the particular orality associated with the subjects.

In sum, my endeavor to grapple with Masafusa’s writings in their entirety has just begun, and my provisional conclusions need to be amplified by an examination of the many other works attributed to him, which the present study could barely mention. In particular, scholars have viewed the Gōchū (Ōe’s Commentary), Masafusa’s commentary to the Wakan rōeishū as one of the main sources of the Ruijūbon edition of the Gōdanshō. However, without examining what Masafusa actually says about poems in this multi-lingual anthology, as well as the text’s relationship to other medieval commentaries to the Wakan rōeishū and other literary texts such as the Genji monogatari, Masafusa’s influence as the first critic of insei Japan, or his contribution to the development of commentary culture in medieval Japan, cannot be elucidated.

Equally important is to systematically study Masafusa’s some 120 Buddhist vows (ganmon), the reconstructed texts of which with full annotations are now available in a single volume. Because the majority of Masafusa’s ganmon were commissioned by his imperial and non-imperial patrons for their deceased relatives, and publicly recited at Buddhist ceremonies, functionally speaking, they are more conspicuously Buddhistic than Masafusa’s other writings, such as the Honchō zoku ōjōden. Attention should be paid to how Masafusa’s highly embellished compositions in literary Chinese, with ample borrowings from Chinese classical texts such as the


25. For an exemplary model of new textual and analytical scholarship on the Gōchū, see Satō (2005a, “Gōchū to shichū”).

Wenxuan, evoked particular religiosity and other feelings appropriate for each ceremonial situation.27

Because I often translated the kanbun texts directly from Sino-Japanese (or “visually” through the semantics of individual characters) into English, I feel that I was unable to capture most of the auditory elements of kanbun discourse, which distinguish it from vernacular Japanese and Chinese. Linguistically speaking, the convention of reading Chinese texts in the kanbun mode, either emphasizing the sound (ondoku) or the semantics (kundoku), is a form of translation, and kanbun is by default more “Japanese” than anything else. In this regard, the greatest achievement of Kidendō academicians from the mid-ninth through early eleventh centuries, in particular those belonging to the Ŭe and Sugawara clans, was that they established the very systems by which Chinese could be read in pleasing and fluent Japanese. Attesting to the centrality of the issue for Kidendō scholars in general, in the Gōdanshō, Masafusa refers to various secret teachings about “how to read” specific passages in Chinese.28 One reason for the decline of Kidendō scholarship may be related to the fact that the preliminary work in this area of Sino-Japanese philology was completed by the beginning of the twelfth century, leaving less quintessentially academic work for trained scholars in the Kidendō program.

27. For a systematic and bibliographical study of ganmon and its sister-genre, hyōbyaku, see Yamamoto (2006). For a more general study of Buddhist ceremonial literature, including ganmon, see Komine (2009).

28. そのよみ様はいかん (SNKBT 32, 5:14); […] この読み、秘事なり (Ibid. 6:51); […] 音に読むべしと云々 (Ibid., 6:57); […] 両字の訓読はいかん. (Ibid., 6:61.) For an important study of the characteristics of the Ŭe family’s reading (kundoku 訓読) of the Chinese texts, see Kobayashi (1967), pp. 1090-1155.
In relation to the auditory element of kanbun discourse, I again emphasize the importance of analytical studies of the *Wakan rōeishū* and its medieval commentaries. These texts demonstrate how the particular readings of Chinese and kanshi couplets with aesthetically distinctive and memorable sound qualities were first set forth by Kidendō academicians by the early eleventh century; and then rigorously studied, memorized, and spread to the point of influencing the language of other literary genres such as vernacular military chronicles (e.g. the *Tales of Heike*) in the subsequent centuries. Here the existing scholarship on Japanese historical languages (*kokugogaku*) can be instrumental in pursuing comparative studies of the “wa” (Japanese) and “kan” (Chinese) paradigms in medieval Japan.

Less intellectually invigorating but more directly pertinent to the present study is research on Masafusa’s waka poems, including the ones he composed at the event, *Horikawa hyakushu* (*One Hundred Sequence Poems Composed for Emperor Horikawa, ca. 1105*). Masafusa is considered to have provided the hundred topics used at this event. The composition of waka on a “set of topics” (*sodai* 組題), especially the hundred sequence from the *Horikawa hyakushu*, quickly became a new standard for waka poets in the mid-twelfth century onward.29

Last but not least, a series of Masafusa’s prose and verse compositions in Sino-Japanese selected posthumously in mid-twelfth century literary anthologies, such as the *Honchō zoku monzui*, the *Chōya gunsai* and the *Honchō mudaishi*, need to be studied carefully. In particular, a pair of short essays “On waka” (詳和歌) in the “Examination” (策) section of the *Honchō zoku monzui*...
monzui (Book 3) is worth mentioning. Also included in the Chōya gunsai and attributed to Masafusa, it is a parodical “question” (問) and “answer” (対) exchanged between an imaginary examiner, “Junior Forth Rank Professor of Waka Ki no Tsuranari” (従四位下行和歌博士紀朝臣貫成), and an examinee, “Waka Scholarship Student Junior Seventh Rank Hanazono no Akatsune” (和歌得業生従七位上行志摩目花園朝臣赤恒對).\(^{30}\) These strange hybrid names undoubtedly influenced the waka poet Fujiwara no Kiyosuke, who similarly called himself a “scholar of waka,” as I discussed in Chapter 8.\(^{31}\)

Part Three examined how the individual issues discussed above were further problematized by waka poets, while serving as catalysts for the formation of waka studies in the twelfth century. The most remarkable aspects of the revival of waka as a scholarly discipline on a par with Chinese literary studies are the waka poets’ willingness to transmit, through texts, knowledge regarding the history of court service, with waka lore as an integral element, and to adopt the anachronistic model of Kidendō scholars’ household studies. In order to clarify what twelfth-century waka poets’ philological activities actually entailed aside from composing waka poems, I examined the development of commentary culture from the perspectives of both authors and commissioners.

Special attention was paid to elucidating how commentarial discourse on waka evolved from unsystematic collections of anecdotes and other miscellaneous information (such as a list of utamakura or “poetic places,” and other tropes), to reflections about the history and

\(^{30}\) Shintei zoho kokushi taikei 29-ge, pp. 46-47.

\(^{31}\) The similarities between Masafusa and Kiyosuke’s parodical writings/self-identification are pointed out by Nishimura Kayoko, whose studies on Kiyosuke and the Rokujō School of waka was most instrumental in formulating my thoughts on the rise of waka studies. (Nishimura, p. 191.)
compositional styles of waka. I also analyzed how the Rokujo and Mikohidari branches of the Fujiwara family established studies of waka as their own prerogatives, and used the framework not only as a means for survival during the politically volatile period marked by the ascendancy of the warrior class, but also as a foundation of new medieval “Ways” (michi) in the arts, according to which their own and their descendants’ authority as teachers of waka was ensured in the subsequent centuries.

Chapter Seven examined Minamoto no Toshiyori’s waka treatise, Toshiyori zuinō (Toshiyori’s Principles of Waka, ca. 1111-15), composed at the same time as the Kanda Recension of the Gōdanshō as a textbook for a future empress. Unlike the Gōdanshō, however, it is not a transcription of dialogues, but is replete with eccentric teachings about waka poems and poets, the majority of which seem to have been derived orally. With its frequent narrative digressions and bizarre stories about particular poets and phrases, the Toshiyori zuinō is best described as a collage of setsuwa narratives, rather than a critical study of waka. Nevertheless, in terms of its value and influence as the first extensive study of the ancient diction of waka, the Toshiyori zuinō is unquestionably the most important text on the subject from the insei period.

Like the Kanda Recension of the Gōdanshō, the Toshiyori zuinō emphasizes the importance of the ideal of suki (poetic passion), and expands it into a “way of life” (michi), poignantly demonstrated in the words and deeds of the waka poet Nōin. Toshiyori deeply respected Nōin, and shared the latter’s opinion that waka, unlike kanshi, was neglected by both poets and patrons, and thus lapsed into decline. The enthusiastic but essentially unsystematic ways in which Toshiyori approached his subject matter soon became the object of criticism by waka poets in the mid-twelfth century. Yet, few of them surpassed Toshiyori in terms of their
creativity and commitment in preserving the particular (and often peculiar) anecdotal details associated with ancient language.

Chapter 8 examined the Rokujō and Mikohidari schools of waka. Modern scholars have considered these schools, or “waka coteries” (kadan), rivals, and have emphasized the stylistic differences of the schools. I criticized this tendency by arguing that in the larger framework of intellectual and cultural histories of early Japan, their commonalities as self-proclaimed hereditary units of waka specialists are far more significant, because this was not the first time that academic learning was promoted by certain aristocratic families. In fact, introducing a diachronic perspective of “household studies” was essential in finding a new direction in this rich field of twelfth-century waka in Japanese; whereas in English, because of the paucity of such scholarship, a generalization that would hopefully draw more attention to the field was equally necessary.

I first discussed the emergence of the Rokujō school by analyzing a passage from the setsuwa collection, Kokon chomonjū (Collection of Old and New Renowned Tales, 1254), which recounts Fujiwara no Akisue’s inauguration of the Hitomaro eigu ceremony (An Offering to Hitomaro’s Portrait) in 1118. I detailed how Akisue drew his inspiration from the Confucian rite of Sekiten (釈奠), a bi-annual festival for Kidendō scholars held at the State Academy; and his collaboration with the Kidendō scholar Fujiwara no Atsumitsu, the son of Akihira, the compiler of the Honchō monzui. Also by contrasting the waka poems composed for the ceremony by Akisue and Minamoto no Toshiyori, one of the guest participants, I tried to show the lack of poetic passion or suki, on the part of Akisue. In short, as far as the record of the Hitomaro eigu is
concerned, Akisue appears more anxious to prove that the composition of waka deserved the same respectability as kanshi composition, and was not merely a leisure pastime.

I then examined how Akisue’s grandson Kiyosuke took over and consolidated the Rokujō school of waka. I analyzed passages from his waka treatise *Fukurozōshi* (*Pocket Books*, 2 vols., ca. 1157-58), and concluded that Kiyosuke synthesized his grandfather’s formalistic approach to waka, characterized by the imitation of Kidendō academician’s literary practices, with Toshiyori’s unsystematic but passionate approach to waka, making both elements of scholarship and suki equally important for future waka poets.

On the one hand, writing a series of waka commentaries and treatises in terse kanbun, conducting another Kidendō literati’s event called *Shōshikai* (*Poetry Gathering for Elderly Men*) with waka poets in 1172, making an array of household editions of canons of waka such as the *Kokinshū*, and proudly calling himself “An Aged Waka Confucian Fujiwara,” no other waka poets seem to have embraced formal features of Kidendō scholarship as vigorously as Kiyosuke.

On the other hand, massive literary compilations, such as the *Fukurozōshi*, which were meant to be used as a reference by waka poets, appear as the product of Kiyosuke’s sincere “passion” (suki) for the subject. Roughly divided by themes, with a table of contents at the beginning of each volume, at first glance, the *Fukurozōshi* appears to be a systematic encyclopedia of waka. However, it is also rich in anecdotes, like the *Toshibori zuinō*, most prominently in a section entitled “Miscellaneous Discussions” (zōdan). Of the many anecdotes Kiyosuke gathers there, his depiction of Nōin as the first waka poet who was driven by suki
(“You have to love it! Only because you love it, you compose waka!”32) is of particular interest. Kiyosuke did not add much to Toshiyori’s discussion of Nōin in the Toshiyori zuinō.

Nevertheless, the inclusion of the anecdotes about Nōin and his followers, who even more radically adhered to suki by worshiping Nōin and his maxim, suggests that Kiyosuke, probably unconsciously, attempted to balance his scholarly approach to waka with a more poetic and artistic one, epitomized in the ideal of suki. In the future, the issue of Kiyosuke’s acceptance of suki needs to be explored through careful analyses of his actual waka compositions.

I then turned to the Mikohidari school of waka, and examined Fujiwara Shunzei’s waka treatise, Korai fūteishō (Commentary on Old and New Poetic Styles, first edition 1197, second edition 1201). Consisting mostly of Shunzei’s own selections of poems from the Manyōshū (ca. 785) through the Senzaishū (1187), the Korai fūteishō is hardly a “treatise.” However, the opening passage of the text, which serves as an introduction, concisely summarizes his purpose and his understanding of waka and its history. Although written in Japanese, the passage can still be considered an offshoot of waka prefaces (wakajo), which were traditionally written in Sino-Japanese for waka poets by Kidendō scholars. It is ironic that such a thought-provoking essay on the genre, consciously following the tradition of the Kokinshū prefaces, was written by Shunzei, who showed no interest in imitating kangaku scholars, and not by Kiyosuke.

The radicalism of Shunzei’s contention is attested by his comparison of the unfathomable profundity of waka composition on the one hand, and of the theory of the Threefold Truths (santei)—Emptiness, Provisional Existence, and the Mean—in Tendai Buddhism on the other; or between the impossibility of teaching the composition of waka, and that of elucidating the key

32. 数寄給へ、すきぬれば歌をよむ。 SNKBT 29, p. 88.
Tendai concepts of Cessation and Observation (shikan), cited by Shunzei from the preface to the Buddhist scripture, *Mohe zhiguan* (*Great Cessation and Observation*, 594).

Considering the fact that in the early 1120s, the composition of waka was not considered a proper “Way” on a par with Chinese literary studies or Buddhism (Chapter 1), no matter how rhetorical Shunzei’s intentions might have been, the extent to which Shunzei emphasized the difficulty of teaching waka composition through the analogy with Tendai Buddhism is surprising. On the one hand, without the Rokujō poet-scholars’ strenuous and ostentatious efforts to reform waka practices with the formalities set by the Kidendō scholars, the rehabilitation of the genre from the non-literary images ascribed to it would have been impossible. Had waka been still considered a “local custom” (*fūzoku*) or a declining “Way” (*Nōin, Toshiyori*), any claim as to equate it with conceptually even more “superlocal” and heterogeneous Buddhist discourse would appeared implausible.

On the other hand, by directly linking waka with Buddhism, and excluding kanshi from the analogy, Shunzei was also making a chauvinistic claim that both waka and Buddhist teaching are profound, whereas kanshi composition could be learned and even mastered merely by following rhyme schemes and other rules concerning style and format. The difficulty of teaching and learning waka had already been discussed by Toshiyori. However, in Shunzei’s critical writing, as in the opening passage of the *Korai fūteishō*, I discerned the seed of a more clearly articulated sense of Japanese proto-nationalism, for a proper understanding of which my typological comparisons of Kidendō and waka studies would prove inadequate.

To further investigate the emergence of proto-nationalistic discourse in medieval Japan, critical studies of the revival of the Myōgyōdō (*Confucian Political Texts*) curriculum at the State
Academy following the decline of the Kidendō, as well as Myōgyōdō’s influence on the literary activities sponsored by the Retired Emperor GoToba (1180-1239, r. 1183-98), in particular the compilation of the *Shin kokinwashū* (1205), are crucial. GoToba, the last ruler of *insei* Japan, vigorously pursued the “(re)building the state and ruling the society” (*keikoku chisei*) through literature, in particular, waka composition rather than through kanshi. Future research on the actual process of how the more politically attuned Myōgyōdō curriculum under the auspices of the Kiyohara family replaced Kidendō as the the dominant teaching at the Academy, as well as its influence on rulers, will be indispensable to understanding the meaning of the growing popularity of waka-related activities, centered around GoToba and the Fujiwara regents, after Minamoto no Yoritomo’s establishment of the *bakufu* in Kamakura in 1192.

Through his comparison of waka composition to the Buddhist search for “truth,” Shunzei imbued the Way of Waka with a mystic quality, making it even more serious than the scholarly Way of Waka envisioned by Kiyosuke. The Mikohidari school’s “profound” Way of Waka was further developed by Shunzei’s son Teika and by Teika’s descendants in the thirteenth century into a semi-religious set of teachings that focused on such issues as “mindfulness” (*ushin*) and “mysterious subtlety” (*yūgen*) in waka composition.

In so doing, on the one hand, the Mikohidari poets disassociated themselves from *suki*, by not discussing it enthusiastically, as if to make a point that such an “obsessive” attitude was too self-indulgent. On the other hand, *suki* or the once popular “poetic” way of living among waka poets in the early-to-the mid twelfth century, came to be associated with *renga* (linked-verse) poets in by the early thirteenth century. In the subsequent centuries, the notion of *suki* was

33. I gained insight into this aspect of *suki* from Tabuchi Kumiko’s book chapter, which discusses in
embraced by practitioners of the Way of Tea (cha no yu) and Way of Flower Arrangement (ikebana) as the core concept of poetic refinement in their undertakings. With its origins in vernacular literature such as the Ise monogatari and Genji monogatari, the evolution of suki as the fundamentally subversive force that linked highbrow and lowbrow art forms in premodern Japan is a worthwhile topic for future research.\(^\text{34}\)

Finally, Chapter 9 examined “Koseki kasho mokuroku” (“An Old Manuscript Catalogue of Books on Waka”), attributed to the prince monk Shukaku Hosshinnō (1150-1202). Although one of the most frequently cited sources in post-war Japanese scholarship on literary texts from the twelfth century, the catalogue survives in a highly “unstable” form as a material artifact. Based on my research at Sonkeikaku Library in Tokyo, I discussed the format in which the catalogue exists today as a full citation in a bibliographical notebook of the daimyō Maeda Tsunanori (1643-1724). Tsunanori was a bibliophile, and throughout his life time he passionately collected and studied Japanese and Chinese classical texts. The transmission and preservation of early manuscripts during the Edo period, as well as their relationship to print capitalism are important subjects, while the significance of Tsunanori’s philological activities need to be discussed in the sociopolitical and economic contexts of early-modern Japan.

More importantly, I examined what “Koseki kasho mokuroku” reveals about waka, and how it was practiced in the late twelfth century, assuming that it was an inventory of Shukaku’s private library at Ninnaji. I argued that the presence of such a list of over 170 titles, as well as great detail Teika’s references to the word kōshi (好士), a typical variant of “a person with suki” (すきもの) in a kanbun discourse, in his diary, Meigetsuki. Tabuchi (2001), pp. 221-46.

34. Hamanaka Osamu’s short essay in the chapter on “Suki” in Koten bungaku gairon is one attempt to analyze suki dischronically. Takeo Toshio, et. al., eds., pp. 96-97.
the systematization of sub-genres therein demonstrated the development of waka as a full-fledged scholarly discourse by the end of the twelfth century. I then discussed the particular roles Shukaku played as a waka patron, poet, and pedagogue for his monastic disciples. Particularly important was his collaboration with both Rokujō and Mikohidari poets, while commissioning new waka commentaries and gathering both old and new waka treatises, including the Toshiyori zuinō, the Fukurozōshi, and the Korai fūteishō. In a sense, the comprehensiveness of the “Koseki kasho mokuroku” embodies Shukaku’s near-obsessive commitment (suki) to waka, but in his instructions for his monastic disciples, Uki (Records of Right, 1186), Shukaku disavowed the composition of waka because of one’s passion.

One topic not covered in this chapter is the debate among Japanese scholars in the past fifty years over the commissioning of Shunzei’s Korai fūteishō. Watanabe Yasuaki describes the dispute as concerning, whether “a certain ‘High Mountain’ (takaki miyama),” which Shunzei identifies as the person who ordered him to write a waka treatise, refers to Shukaku Hosshinnō, or to his sister, the accomplished waka poet, Princess Shokushi (?-1201).35 Since the late 1960s, the Korai fūteishō was long considered to have been written for Shokushi.36 Recently, this view was questioned by the historian Gomi Fumihiko, who argued for Shukaku’s involvement in the production of the text, based on the “Koseki kasho mokuroku” and its reference to the Korai fūteishō.37 Like Tanaka Hiroki, who rejected Gomi’s argument, I also support the view that the Korai fūteishō was originally written for Princess Shokushi, due to its stylistic similarities to

35. KKS 7, pp. 1-3.


37. Gomi (2003). Quoted in Appendix 2. This view is approved by Watanabe in KKS 7, pp. 1-3.
Fujiwara no Kintō’s “old commentaries” (sachū) on the Japanese preface to the *Kokinshū*,\(^{38}\) and to the *Toshiyori zuinō*. However, unlike Tanaka, who argues that the revised edition (1201) of the *Korai fūteishō* was made at the request of Emperor GoToba’s brother, Prince Koreakira,\(^ {39}\) I raise the possibility that Shukaku could also have made such a request, in order to enrich his already impressive library of waka. In fact, judging from the logic behind Shunzei’s textual modifications, it is hard to believe that the revised edition of the *Korai fūteishō* was not presented to Shukaku.\(^ {40}\)

Finally, the cursory manner in which I discussed the concept of *kyōgen kigo* (“wild words and decorative phrases”) and the issue of why Buddhist practitioners, like Shuaku, embraced the composition of waka as a way of cultivating a meditative mind, needs to be expanded into a systematic study of the nexus between poetic and religious discourse in premodern Japan.

Originally derived from the Chinese poet Bo Juyi’s (772-846), the term *kyōgen kigo* (狂言綺語) appears as early as the Buddhist vow (*ganmon*) composed by the Kidendō scholar Yoshishige no

---

\(^{38}\) Nishimura (1997), pp. 18-31.


\(^{40}\) Tanaka also lists Shukaku as one of the potential nobles who could have requested a new copy/edition of Shunzei’s *Korai fūteishō* in 1201, along with Prince Koreakira, the Retired Emperor GoToba, the regents Fujiwara (Kujō) no Kanezane and Yoshitsune. (Ibid., p. 413.) However, while strongly arguing for Koreakira’s involvement, Tanaka does not explain why the second commissioner could not have been Shukaku (nor Kanezane or Yoshitsune). I examined some 360 major and minor changes (224 in Volume 1, 137 in Volume 2) in the two versions of the *Korai fūteishō*. (There is another version called “the middle edition” 中間本, aside from the first edition 初撰本 and the revised edition 再撰本, but I did not examine this. I based my study on Watanabe Yasuaki’s modern edition of the *Korai fūteishō* in KKS 7, the annotations to which indicate textual discrepancies between the three versions.) The majority of changes in Volume 1 dealt with revisions to the orthography of the quoted texts from the *Man’yōshū*, whereas in Volume 2, the most prominent textual discrepancies were found in Shunzei’s deletion of some of the love poems, including Izumi Shikibu’s famous poem in the *GoShūshū*, “あらざる人この世のほかの思い出に今一たびの逢ふこともがな。” These modifications demonstrates Shunzei’s respect for Shukaku, who was knowledgeable about the *Man’yōshū*, and whose own waka anthology does not contain love poems (apparently because he was a Buddhist priest.)
Yasutane in 986. Of particular interest is how the early association of *fügetsu* (the composition of kanshi) with Buddhist salvation (e.g. Yasutane’s *ganmon*) evolved into that of *fūryū* (poetic refinement), waka, and the realization of the Buddhist way of life, by the time of Shukaku. (It also needs to be noted that *fūryū*, like *suki*, is a useful concept, constantly renewed by new art forms throughout the premodern period.)

By filling the lacunae between the fields of kangaku, waka, and *insei* studies, the present dissertation proposes a new history of early Japan, actually a hybrid of literary and intellectual histories of Japan in the tenth through twelfth centuries. It suggests that when we revisit literary and scholarly activities as presented in texts produced in the place and the historical period in question, armed with preconceived notions of “literature” and “scholarship,” the essence of these activities become elusive. With this risk in mind, I let the texts speak for themselves and guide me towards the meaning of “literature” and “scholarship” in Japanese aristocratic society at the time. This seemingly paradoxical search for a universal understanding of the human capacity for creating literary texts through the act of reading them closely, only confirms that in twelfth-century Japan, both poetry composition and academic learning were essential to courtiers’ search for their aristocratic identity.

By pointing out the common ground between the earlier Kidendō and that of waka studies in the twelfth century, I view the two literary practices not so much as autonomous literary genres, but rather as two models of learning, wherein the seemingly conflicting values of

---

41. More precisely, Yoshishige uses the phrase, *kagen kigo* (花言綺語), not *kyōgen kigo*, in his *ganmon*, but the idea is the same. (See Chapter 2.)

42. Watanabe Yasuaki’s analysis of Shunzei’s reference to *kyōgen kigo* in the preface to the *Korai fūteishō* is an important study on the subject. (Watanabe, 1999, pp. 313-328.)
the individual cultivation of the poetic mind (fūgetsu, fūryū), on the one hand, and the sustenance of hereditary transmission of knowledge on the other, converged. In the pivotal twelfth century, Kidendō shed its historical relevance and was superseded by waka studies. This transition was mediated through the emerging setsuwa discourse that preserved the former’s transmission of oral knowledge in writing, and the ideal of suki, which brought to the fore the common origins of kanshi and waka as the earliest forms of poetry in Japan. In a sense, poetry-centered literary practices evolved at this time from “ancient” to “medieval.”

The future trajectories of these poetry-centered models of learning require further study. After the Way of Waka attained semi-religious status (unlike the earlier Kidendō) by the early thirteenth century, waka became most respected form of literary art in medieval Japan. How did it influence the more vernacular poetic discourses, such as renga, nō drama and even early-modern haiku? Did setsuwa and suki still prove effective as catalysts that bridged high and low art forms, when renga became popular among aristocratic and warrior elites, while modeling after waka by the late fourteenth century? Why did waka practitioners attempt to retain their authority vis-à-vis renga poets by establishing the custom of Kin Denju (The Transmission of the Secret Teachings of the Kokinshū), wherein the element of non-textual transmission of knowledge of the earlier Kidendō scholarship was restored in the form of kuden (oral teaching)? How did Buddhism, especially the esoteric teachings of Shingon, as well as more explicitly culturally chauvinistic “Shintō” discourse, relate to the Way of Waka in the thirteenth century and after? How did the emerging practice of kanshi composition among Buddhist monks at the Five Mountain (Gozan) monasteries in Kyoto in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries respond to
the earlier Kidendō model? The typological models established in the present study raise these and more questions for future research.

Ultimately, insofar as they “made sense of texts,” both Kidendō and waka studies could be considered “philological” studies in early Japan. Methodologically, however, whether such early practices reside in the realm of “critical philology” as proposed by Sheldon Pollock remains inconclusive. Building a historical connection between early models of philological studies of Chinese and Japanese literary texts, ushered in by a “love (suki) of learning” (philologia) and a sense of self-preservation, and our own philological endeavors, which are no less inspired by philologia but nevertheless aspire to create “core knowledge forms”43 in the humanities today, would require further investigation into how early philological traditions in Japan revived and flourished in the Edo period.

43. Pollock, p. 948.
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Appendix 1

An Old Manuscript Catalogue of Books on Waka in Maeda Tsunanori’s (1643-1724) Japanese and Chinese Bibliography

「桑華書志」所載「古蹟歌書目録」

[Japanese and Chinese Bibliography, Codex No.] 72, “Things Seen and Heard” [桑華書志] 七十二、見聞書

1. The Man’yōshū 第一 万葉集
   Man'yōshū (Collection of Myriad Leaves): 1 set 万葉集一部
   20 scrolls 十巻
   “Kanajo” (Preface in Japanese): 1 scroll 假名序一卷

2. Topically Organized Man’yōshū, and its Abridged Versions 第二 部類万葉集, 同抄
   Burui man’yōshū (Topically Arranged Man’yōshū): 1 set 部類万葉集一部
   20 codices 千帖, [Codex] 2 missing 第二欠
   Another set 又一部
   The same item, abridged 同抄: 3 codices 三帖
   20-volume recension 十巻本
   Another codex 又一帖: 5-volume recension 五巻本
   Another scroll 又一巻: the same as above 同

3. The Six Imperial Anthologies of Waka 第三 六代集
   Kokin (The Kokinshū): 1 set 古今一部
   Manuscript by Novice Norinaga 教長入道筆
   Another set 又一部
   In the same hand 同筆
   Recension attributed to the Retired Emperor Sutoku’s 山德院本云
   Gosan (The Gosenshū): 1 set 後撰一部
   私云此外俊経本|行宗筆|顔昭筆|又此外頭書無之本|四部|載之首書云|但人々手跡不知|依部数合記 又後撰ニモ二部頭書不注之

4. The Six Imperial Anthologies of Waka 第四 六代集
   Shūishū (The Shūishū): 1 set 拾遺集一部
   10 scrolls 十卷
   Another set 又一部
   4 codices 四帖
   Senzaishū (The Senzaishū): One set 千載集一
   6 codices 六帖
5. Privately Commissioned Anthologies 第五 私修集

   1 codex 一帖

Jugeshū (Collection Under the Tree): 1 set 樹下集一部
   7 codexes 七帖

Rokujō (The Kokin waka rokujō): 1 set 六帖一部
   6 codexes 六帖

Kingyokushū (Collection of Gold and Jade): 1 set 金玉集一部
   Included with the Sanjū-rokunin sen, the Sanjū-rokunin sen zoku, the Waka kuhon, the Jūgoban, the ShokuJūgoban, and the Gengenshū

Gengenshū (Collection of the Finest Poems): 1 set 玄々集一部
   1 codex 一帖

Shoku Shinsenshū: 1 set 続新撰抄一部
   1 codex 一帖

Horikawa hyakushū: 1 set 堀河百首一部
   1 codex 一帖

Goyōshū: 1 set 五葉集一部
   1 codex 一帖

Ryōgyokushū: 1 set 良玉集一部
   3 codices 三帖

Goyōshū: 1 set 後葉集一部
   3 codices 三帖

Shūi kokin: 1 set 拾遺古今一部
   6 scrolls 六卷
   With a catalogue in the last volume 奥有目録

Shoku shikashū: 1 set 続詞花集一部
   2 codices 二帖

Shin sanjūrokuin-sen 新卅人撰
   1 codex 一帖

Shoku sanjūrokuin-sen: 1 set 続卅人撰一部
   1 codex 一帖

Shūi jūgoban: 1 set 拾遺十五番一部
   1 codex 一帖

6. Privately Compiled Anthologies 第六 私撰集

Ichijiishō: 1 set 一字抄一部
   4 codices 四帖
7. Individual Poets' Collections: The Thirty-Six Poets

Hitomaro shū 人丸集 (Collected Poems of Hitomaro)
   1 scroll 一巻

Tsurayuki shū 貫之集 (Collected Poems of Tsurayuki)
   2 scrolls 二巻
   Another scroll 又一本: 2 codices 二帖

Mitsune shū 胴恒集 (Collected Poems of Mitsune)
   1 scroll 一巻

Ise shū 伊勢集 (Collected Poems of Ise)
   2 scrolls 二巻

Yakamochi shū 家持集 (Collected Poems of Yakamochi)
   1 scroll 一巻

Akahito shū 赤人集 (Collected Poems of Akahito)
   1 scroll 一巻

Narihira 業平 (Collected Poems of Narihira)
   2 scrolls 二巻
   The front cover of one scroll bears a title, “Collection of Captain Ariwara” 一本外題云中将集

Henjō 遍昭 (Collected Poems of the Priest Henjō)
   1 scroll 一巻

8. Individual Poets' Collections: Middle Antiquity

Engi onshū 延喜御集 (Collected Poems of the Emperor Daigo)
   1 scroll 一巻

Tenryaku onshū 天暦御集 (Collected Poems of the Emperor Murakami)
   1 scroll 一巻

Kazan-in onshū 花山院御集 (Collected Poems of the Retired Emperor Kazan)
   1 scroll 一巻
Nishi-no-miya shū 西宮集 (Collected Poems of Minamoto no Takaakira)18
  1 scroll 一巻
Horikawa-ufu shū 堀河右府集 (Collected Poems of Fujiwara no Mototsune)19
  1 scroll 一巻
Shijō-no-dainagon shū 四条大納言集 (Collected Poems of Fujiwara no Kintō)
  1 scroll 一巻
Sukechika shū 輔親集 (Collected Poems of Ōnakatomi no Sukechika)20
  1 scroll 一巻
Another copy 又一本: 1 scroll 一巻
Sanekata shū 實方集 (Collected Poems of Fujiwara no Sanekata)21
  1 scroll 一巻
Michinobu shū 道信集 (Collected Poems of Fujiwara no Michinobu)22
  1 scroll 一巻
Fukayabu shū 深養父集 (Collected Poems of Kiyohara no Fukayabu)23
  1 scroll 一巻
Nagatō 長能 ([Collected Poems of Fujiwara no] Nagatō)24
  1 scroll 一巻
Michinari 道濟 ([Collected Poems of Minamoto no] Michinari)25
  2 scrolls 二卷
Yoshitada 好忠 ([Collected Poems of Sone no] Yoshitada)
  1 scroll 一巻
Norinaga 範永 ([Collected Poems of Fujiwara no] Notinaga)
  1 scroll 一巻
Yoshitoki 嘉言 ([Collected Poems of Yuge no] Yoshitoki)26
  1 scroll 一巻
Egyō 恵慶 ([Collected Poems of the Priest] Egyō)27
  1 scroll 一巻
Dōmyō 道命 ([Collected Poems of the Priest] Domyō)28
  2 scrolls 二巻
Miare senji 御形宣旨 ([Collected Poems of] Miare Senji)29
  1 scroll 一巻
Izumi shikibu 和泉式部 ([Collected Poems of] Izumi Shikibu)
  1 scroll 一巻
Another copy 又一本
  2 scrolls 二巻
Another copy 又一本
  1 scroll 一巻
Akazome 赤染 ([Collected Poems of Akazome [Emon])
3 scrolls 三巻
*Uma Naishi* 馬内侍 ([Collected Poems of] Uma Naishi)
2 scrolls 二巻
*Sagami* 相模 ([Collected Poems of] Sagami)
1 scroll 一巻
*Ashita no shū* 朝集 (*Collection of Poems Exchanged After Dawn*)
1 scroll 一巻
非家集不可入□之□集諸朝者也

9. Individual Poets’ Collections: From the Recent Period 第九 諸家集 近代

*Iyama shū*: One set 射山集一部
8 scrolls 八巻
One scroll that contains Chinese verses may be lost 此内詩一巻欠歴
Another set in one codex 又一帖
*San-no-miya gyoshū* 三宮御集 (*Collected Poems of Prince Sukehito*)
1 codex 一帖
*Tsunenobu-kyō* 經信卿 ([Collected Poems of] Lord Tsunenobu)
1 codex 一帖
*Masafusa-kyō*: 1 set 匡房卿一部 ([Collected Poems of] Lord Masafusa)
2 codices 二帖
*Toshitada-kyō* 俊忠卿 ([Collected Poems of] Lord Toshitada)
1 codex 一帖
*Akisue-kyō* 顕季卿 ([Collected Poems of] Lord Akisue)
2 codices 二帖
*Akisuke-kyō* 顕輔卿 ([Collected Poems of] Lord Akisuke)
2 codices 二帖
*Yukimune-kyō* 行宗卿 ([Collected Poems of] Lord Yukimune)
1 codex 一帖
*Toshiyori* 俊頼 ([Collected Poems of Minamoto] Toshiyori)
1 codex 一帖
The front cover bears a title, “Sanbokushū” 外題二散本集
Manuscript by Toshiyori 俊頼筆
Another set 又一本
10 codices 十帖
Another set 又一本
5 codices 五帖
*Mototoshi* 基俊 ([Collected Poems of Fujiwara no] Mototoshi)
1 codex 一帖
Nakamasa shū 仲正集 (Collected Poems of [Minamoto no] Nakamasa) 33
1 codex 一帖
Entitled “A Collection of My Humble Mugwort House” 号藩屋集

10. Individual Poets’ Collections 諸家集: From the Recent Periods 近代
Norinaga-kyō 教長卿集 (Collected Poems of Lord Norinaga)
6 scrolls 六巻
Shunzei-kyō 俊成卿 ([Collected Poems of] Lord Shunzei)
3 scrolls 三巻, autograph 自筆
Shigeie-kyō 重家卿 ([Collected Poems of] Lord Shigeie)
1 codex 一帖
Yorimasa-kyō 頼政卿 ([Collected Poems of] Lord Yorimasa)
3 scrolls 三巻
Kiyosuke 清輔 ([Collected Poems of] Kiyosuke)
2 scrolls 二巻
Ise monogatari 伊勢物語下巻 (Tales of Ise: Part II) 34

Suketaka shū 資隆集 (Collected Poems of Suketaka) 35
2 scrolls 二巻, autograph 自筆
Jakuzen shū 寂然集 (Collected Poems of [Priest] Jakuzen)
1 codex 一帖
Shuné 俊恵 ([Collected Poems of] Shuné)
3 scrolls 三巻
Another scroll entitled “Rinyōshū” 号林薫集又一巻 36
Tōren 登蓮 ([Collected poems of the Priest] Tōren) 37
2 scrolls, entitled “Keisetsushū” 二巻号蠫雪集
Kenshō shū 頼昭集 (Collected poems of [the Priest] Kenshō)
2 scrolls 二巻 (in my opinion four 私云四) 38
Also two scrolls 又二巻: These were selected from the four-scroll [recension] at the Imperial Residence 於御所從四巻中被撰出之。
Horikawa shū (Collected Poems of Horikawa) 39
1 codex 一帖
Another copy in 2 scrolls 又二巻
Another copy in 1 scroll 又一巻
Hyōe shū 兵衛集 (Collected Poems of Hyōe) 40
1 codex 一帖

11. Collected Topics 第十一 諸林
Dairin (Collected Topics): 30 scrolls 題林三十巻
12. Collected Topics 第十二 題林
   *Dairin* (Collected Topics): 30 scrolls 題林卅卷
   One-Hundred-Poem Sequences 百首
   (o頭書) 「廿九卷一帖有之」

13. Collected Topics 第十三 題林
   *Dairin* (Collected Topics): 30 scrolls 題林卅卷
   Social Gatherings 會

14. Collected Topics 第十四 題林
   *Dairin* (Collected Topics): 30 scrolls 題林卅卷
   Miscellaneous 雜

15. The Principles of Waka 第十五 韵腦
   *Waka zuinō* 倭歌韻腦 (The Principles of Waka)
   1 scroll 一卷: Author Kisen, with colophon 喜撰作也奥有
   *Hikohime shiki* 孫姫式 (Princess Hiko’s Waka Rule book)
   *Nōin utamakura* 能因歌枕 (Nōin’s Poetry Catalogue)
   1 codex 一帖
   *Nan-GoShū* 難後拾遺 (Anti-GoShūshū)
   1 codex 一帖: Author Tsunenobu 経信作
   *Toshibyori zuinō* 俊顔韻腦 (Toshibyori’s Principles of Waka)
   1 codex 一帖: Autograph 自筆
   Another set 又一本
   3 scrolls 三卷
   *Shūi kokin mondō* 拾遺古今問答 (Polemics on the Shūi-kokinshū)
   1 scroll 一卷
   Retired Emperor Sutoku’s criticism 崇德院御難
   Lord Norinaga’s replies appended 教長卿答
   *Inaka zuinō* 田舍韻腦 (The Principles of Poetry Written in the Countryside)
   1 codex 一帖: Compiled by the Retired Emperor Sutoku 崇德院御撰
   *Dōmōshō*: 1 set 童蒙抄一部
   5 codices 五帖: Submitted to the Retired Emperor Nijō by Lord Norikane 範兼卿撰進二条院
   *Chū-kokin* (Commentary to the Kokinshū): 1 Set 注古今一部
   10 scrolls 十卷: Compiled by Kiyosuke 清輔撰
   *Waka □shō*: 1 scroll 倭歌□書一卷
   The same author 同作
"Ogishō" (Notes on the Poetic Lore): 1 set 奥義抄一部
2 codices 二帖: The same author 同作

Daimokushū-chū-shō (Commentary to the Collection of Book titles, Abridged): 1 set 題目集注抄一部
3 codices 三帖: The same author 同作

Manyōshū jidai kanbun (Monograph on the Era of the Manyshū): 2 scrolls 万葉集時代勘文二卷
Monograph and commentary by Kenshō 順昭勘注

Kawayashiro kanmon (Monograph on "Kawayashiro") 河社勘文
1 scroll 一卷: The same as above 同

Waka samazama no tei (Various Styles of Waka) 和歌様之軸
1 scroll 一卷: Compiled by Kiyosuke 清輔撰

Korai futeishō 古来風軸抄 (Notes on Old and New Poetic Styles)
2 codices 二帖: Compiled by the Novice Shunzei 俊成入道,
Also 2 codexes 又二帖

16. Miscellaneous 雜

Ise monogatari (Tales of Ise) 伊勢物語
1 codex 一帖
Also another scroll 又一本

Yamato monogatari (Tales of Yamato) 大和物語
1 codex 一帖

Miyataki no ki 宮瀧記 (Record of the Retired Emperor Uda's Journey to Miyataki Falls)
1 codex 一帖
端紀中納言 奥管丞相

Takamitsu shōshō nikki (Diary of Lieutenant Takamitsu) 高光少将日記
1 scroll 一卷

Ōkagami (The Great Mirror) 大鏡
5 scrolls 五卷
Also 2 codices 又二帖

Imakagami (The Mirror of the Present) 新鏡
2 codices 二帖, author Jakuchō 試超作

Makura zōshi (The Pillow Book) 枕造紙
2 codices 二帖, author Sei Shōnagon 清少納言作

Genjishū (Collected Poems from the Genji monogatari) 源氏集
1 codex 一帖

Shokoku utamakura (Poetic Place-Names from Various Provinces) 諸国歌枕
1 codex 一帖, author Nōin 能因作

Uji dainagon monogatari (Tales of Grand Counselor Uji) 宇治大納言物語
1 codex 一帖

*Kara monogatari (Tales from China)* 漢物語

1 codex 一帖, author Shigenori 成範

*Manyōshū mokuroku (The Manyōshū Catalogue)* 万葉集目録

4 codices 四帖

私云自是以下古今後撰拾遺後拾遺金葉詞花之目録在之略之

*Waka genzaisho mokuroku (A Catalogue of Extant Books on Waka)* 和哥現在書目録

4 codices 四帖

Compiled by Kiyosuke, Kenshō and Tsunehira 清輔顕昭等平朝臣撰之

Also 1 codex 又一帖: incomplete 未書終

*Yōsōkyō (Guide to the Physiognomy of the Falcon)* 鷹相経

1 scroll 一卷

以左近衛府生上道守恵口状注之

*Nihongi shiki (Private notes to the Chronicle of Japan)* 日本書紀: 2 scrolls 二巻

Vol. 1 and vol. 3 第一第三: author Taguchi Kimimochi 田口公望作

*Fukuro zōshi (The Bound-pocket Book)* 袋草子

1 codex 一帖

*Horikawain hyakushu chū (Commentary to the Horikawa-in hyakushu)* 堀河院百首注

3 scrolls 三巻

*Hyakushu waka chinjō (Counter-arguments to [the Judge's Comments from] the One-Hundred Poems)* 百首和歌陳狀

1 codex 一帖: Kenshō 顕昭

*Waka yamai shū (Collection of Stylistic Errors in Waka)* 和歌病集

*Shinkokin (the Shinkokinshū)*: 1 set 新古今一部

20 scrolls 十巻: handwritten by Lord Teika 定家朝臣筆

17. *Waka mokuroku (Catalogues of Waka)* 和歌目録

萬五 壹是甲乙 勺是甲乙

地儀居所抄 南御經藏御所

萬五

*Ruijū koshū (Topically Classified Ancient Collection)* 類聚古集

20 scrolls 十巻

Ditto, commentary 同注

5 scrolls 五巻

*Godaishū utamakura (Place Names Selected from the Five Imperial Anthologies)* 五代集歌枕

5 codexes 五帖

Ditto, catalogue 同目録

1 codex 一帖
Conventionally, the “Rokudaishū” or the Six Imperial Anthologies of Waka refers to the first six of the twenty-one “imperial anthologies of waka” (古今和歌集, Collection of Japanese Poems from Ancient Times to the Present, 905), the Gosen wakashū (後撰和歌集, Subsequently Selected Collection of Japanese Poems, 951), the Shūi wakashū (拾遺和歌集, Collection of Gleanings, ca. 1006), the GoShūi wakashū (後拾遺和歌集, Collection of Gleanings II, 1086), the Kinyō wakashū (金葉和歌集, Collection of Golden Leaves, 1124, revised and resubmitted in 1125 and 1126), and the Shika wakashū (祇花和歌集, Florilegium of Japanese Poems, 1151). It is not clear whether the omission of the GoShūi, the Kinyō and the Shikashū, and the inclusion of the seventh imperial anthology, the Senzaishū (千載和歌集, Collection of Japanese Poems for One Thousand Years, 1183) in the present catalogue was intentional or accidental. Considering that the Nan-GoShūi (難後拾遺, Anti-GoShūi)–Minamoto no Tsunenobu’s critique of poems from the GoShūshū, appears in section 15 (zuinō), the omission of the GoShūi is especially mystifying. Ōta speculates that the categorical heading of the “Rokudaishū” may have been the mistake of the “Sandaishū” (三代集), which only refers to the first three imperial collections of the Kokinshū, the Gosenshū and the Shūishū. However, this does not explain the question why the Senzaishū appears here. (Ōta, p. 88, note 25.)


纸宏行、「教長古今集註注釈の方法」在『文芸論叢（文教大学女子短期大学部）』（vol. 36, 2000.3）

-----. 『教長古今集註』の注釈史的分析在『文教女子短期大学部研究紀要』（vol. 43, 1999.12）。

3 As Ōta points out, it is likely that the first character 山 is a scribal error of the character 崇, with which the name of Emperor Sutoku 崇徳天皇 (r. 1123-41, 1119-64) is written. It is known that Minamoto no Arihito 源有仁 (1103-1147, Minister of the Left Hanazono 花園左大臣) submitted to Emperor Sutoku a copy of the Kokinshū handwritten by Ki no Tsurayuki 紀貫之 (ca. 868- ca. 945)–one of the four redactors of, and the sole author of the Japanese preface to the Kokinshū. This suggests that the “Retired Emperor Sutoku’s recension” was one of the most “authentic” editions of the Kokinshū, because it was collated by or under the auspices of Emperor Sutoku, who supposedly owned Tsurayuki’s own manuscript of the Kokinshū. (Ōta, p. 71, p. 87, note 17.)
4 Ōta attributes interlinear glosses starting with the first person pronoun 私云 ("in my opinion...") to Maeda Tsunanori. (Ōta, p. 92, note 55.)

5 The Shinsen waka (943) was initially compiled by Ki no Tsurayuki under the auspices of Fujiwara no Kanesuke 藤原兼輔 (877-933, Counselor Tsutsumi 堤中納言) and Emperor Daigo 頼朝天皇 (r. 897-930, 885-930) around 930-934. However, due to the death of the emperor and Kanesuke, the collection was not circulated until 943 or 944. It contains a preface and 360 poems, 278 of which also appear in the Kokinshū. The text is available in the GR 159. (Ariyoshi, p. 355.)

6 The Jugeshū does not survive today. Its existence is confirmed only through textual references in the Waka genzaishō mokuroku (see Section 16) and other poetic treatises from the twelfth and early-thirteenth centuries, such as the Ōgishō (see Section 16), the Waka iroha 和歌色葉 (Introduction to Waka), Priest Jōkaku 上覚, 1198) and the Yakumo mishō 八雲御抄 (Emperor’s Notes on Waka, Emperor Juntoku, ca, 1221). According to these sources, the Jugeshū was compiled by Priest Genken 源賢 (977-1020), and consisted of twenty volumes and a Japanese preface. (ZGR 17-1, p. 234; Ariyoshi, p. 439.)

7 The Kokin waka rokyōi 古今和歌六帖 (Old and New Japanese Poems in Six Books, ca. 976-82) is one of the earliest topically classified collections of waka (類題和歌集). It contains some 4500 poems from the eighth through the mid-tenth centuries, approximately a quarter of which were selected from the main'yōshū. Poems are classified into 516 topics, and further organized into six books 帖, each featuring the following themes of: Book One—the Calendar 歳時 (four seasons); Book Two—Mountains 山, Rice Paddies 田, Fields 野, Capital 都 Countryside 田舎, Dwellings 家, Humans 人 and Buddhist Affairs 仏事; Book Three—Water 水; Book Four—Love 恋, Celebrations 祝 and Departures 別; Book Five—Miscellaneous Feelings 雑思, Clothes and Accessories 服飾, Colors 色 and Textiles 錦織; Book Six—Plants 草, Insects 虫, Trees 木 and Birds 鳥. The compiler of the Kokin waka rokyōi remains unknown, but the involvement of Prince Kaneakira 兼明親王 (914-87, Minamoto no Kaneakira, Daigo’s son) and Minamoto no Shitagou 源順 (911-83, the compiler of the first Chinese Japanese dictionary, Wamyō ruiju shō 倭名類聚抄 [931-38]) has been considered plausible. (Ariyoshi, p.212.)

8 Compiled by Fujiwara no Kintō 藤原公任 (966-1041), the Kingyokushū (ca. 1007) is a fairly compact anthology of 78 poems by some 40 poets, whose poems mostly appeared in the Kokinshū and the Gosenshū. (Ariyoshi, pp. 154-5.)

9 Also compiled by Kintō, the Sanjūrokunen sen (Collection of the Thirty-Six Poets, ca. 1009) contains 150 poems composed by the following thirty-six “model poets” or kasen 歌仙 (poetic sages): Hitomaro 人屠, Tsurayuki 貫之, Mitsune 職恒, Ise 伊勢, Yamamoto 家持, Akahito 赤人, Narihira 業平, Priest Henjō 頼昭, Priest Sosei 素性, Tomonori 友則, Commissioner Sarumaru 猿丸大夫, Komachi 小町, Kanesuke 兼輔, Asatada 朝忠, Takamitsu 高光, Kintada 公忠, Tadamine 忠岑, Saigū Nyōgo 斎宮女御 (Ise Consort), Yorimoto 頼基, Toshiyuki 敏行, Shigeyuki 重之, Minamoto Muneyuki 宗元, Nobuakira 信明, Kiyomasa 清正, Shitagou 順, Okikaze 興風, Motosuke 元輔, Korenori 是則, Motozane 元真, Kodai
no Kimi 小大君, Nakafumi 仲文, Yoshinobu 能宣, Tamami 忠見, Kanemori 兼盛 and Nakatsukasa 中務. (Ariyoshi, p. 272)

10 Also compiled by Kintō, the Waka kuhon (also Kuhon waka, the Nine Ranks of waka, after 1009) selects eighteen sample poems, that are classified into the nine “grades” (shina 約) of “Superior: upper, middle, lower” 上（上中下）, “Modest: upper, middle, lower” 中（上中下）, and “Inferior: upper, middle, lower” 下（上中下）. (Ibid., 708.) The nine-tiered classification (kuhon 九品) has its origin in Buddhism, where the concept was commonly used to describe the different levels of “meritorious deeds” (kudoku 功德) achieved during one’s lifetime, the quality of which ostensibly determined the course of one’s rebirth in the Pure Land (jōdo 净土).

11 Compiled by Priest Nōin 能因 (988-?), the Gengenshū (ca. 1046) selects 166 poems composed by 92 poets, who were active during the reigns of Emperors Ichijō 一条天皇 (r. 986-1011), Sanjō 三条天皇 (r. 1011-16), Goichijō 後一条天皇 (r. 1016-36) and Gosuzaku 後朱雀天皇 (r. 1036-45). Its title alludes to the preface of Tsurayuki’s Shinshen waka (see Note 4), which states that Tsurayuki selected the “best of the best 360 poems” 玄之亦玄三百六十首 from the Kokinshū. The most prominent poet in the Gengenshū is Fujiwara no Nagato 藤原長能 (949-?), with ten poems selected in the collection. (See note 23.)

12 松野陽一, 『鳥帯－千載集時代和歌の研究』 (風間書房, 1995) 所収, 「後和歌集本文考」.

13 Compiled by Priest Kenshō 頤昭法師 (ca. 1130-ca. 1210), the Konsen wakashū (also Konsenshū, ca. 1165-66) contains a total of 216 poems composed by the compiler’s contemporaries, such as Fujiwara no Shunzei 藤原俊成, Sanuki 興岐, Kakushō Hoshinō 覚性法親王 (1129-69, fifth son of Emperor Toba 鳥羽天皇), Priest Tōen 登蓮 and Kiyosuke. The text is available in the GR 158. The Waka genzaisho mokuroku indicates that the Konsenshū existed in three volumes. In the Yakumo mishō, it is referred to as “Priest Kenshō’s Collection in Three Volumes” 頤昭法師三巻抄 (volume one, “Bibliography” 学書). (Sasaki, vol. 3, p. 40; Ariyoshi, p. 239.)

14 The Shūi genzonshū (ca. 1165-66) by Priest Kensei 憲盛 does not survive today. Its existence and the name of the compiler are confirmed through a reference in the Yakumo mishō (volume one, “Bibliography” 学書). (Sasaki, vol. 3, p. 42; Ariyoshi, p. 439.)
15 Although written as Kahanshō, Ōta points out that it is probably a scribal error of the Kaenshō. The Kaenshō does not survive today, but the title appears in the Yakumo mishō (volume 1, “Bibliography” 学書), and Waka iroha in the section “On Chronology of Anthologies and Collections, Supplemented with Oral History of Private Collections” 撰抄時代者 付私集伝物語 as “Shune’s Kaenshō 俊恵が歌宛抄.” Priest Shune’s 俊恵 (1113- ca. 1191, Minamoto Toshiyori’s son) cloister in Shirakawa 白川 in Kyoto was called “Karinén” 咲林苑 (Garden of Poetry Forests), and served as a salon (ba 場) for frequent poetry gatherings and contests during the Hōgen 保元 (1156-59) through Jishō 治承 (1177-81) eras. From the title, it is assumed that the Kaneshō was a collection of poems composed at the Kaeinén, or by poets associated with Shune’s group. (Ōta, p. 92, note 59; Sasaki, vol. 3, p. 42 and p. 115; Ariyoshi, pp. 312 and 438.)

松野陽一, 『鳥帯－千載集時代和歌の研究』 (風間書房, 1995) 所収「歌林苑とその周辺」. 中村文, 「歌が詠み出される場所－歌林苑序説」 in 『和歌文学論集』 (vol. 6, 1994.5).

16 The Sōmonshū (before 1166?) does not survive today. According to the Waka genzaishō mokuroku, it was compiled by Kanshō as a collection of “poems composed by monks from ancient times to the present” 古今僧侶歌, with a preface 有序. The title also appears in the Yakumo mishō (volume one, “Bibliography” 学書). (ZGR 17-1, p, 235; Sasaki, vol. 3, p. 41.; Ariyoshi, p. 439.)

17 SNKBT 28, pp. 3-92.

18 Minamoto no Takaakira 源高明 (914-82)–the tenth son of Emperor Daigo–became a commoner at the age of seven. He ascended to the highest non-imperial office of Minister of the Left 左大臣 in 967, but was demoted to Acting Viceroy of Dazai 大宰権帥 in 969 (Anna 安和 2). This incident, which is known as the Anna Disturbance 安和の変 was orchestrated by the Minister of the Right, Fujiwara no Morotada 藤原師尹 (908-60), who was desperate to prevent the ascension of Prince Tamehira 為平親王—the fourth son of Emperor Murakami, to the Heir Apparent 東宮, because Tamehira married Takaakira’s daughter. It is considered that the tragic life of Takaakira have in part inspired Murasaki Shikibu–the author of the Genji monogatari (Tales of Genji, early eleventh century)–to create the fictive protagonist Genji–an imperial son who became a commoner with the surname Minamoto. Takaakira is also known as the author of Saikyūki 西宮記 (Record of the Minister Nishi-no-mi, a book on the “encyclopedic knowledge” 有職 of “historical precedents” 故実, or the courtly rituals and customs from the past.

19 Fujiwara no Mototsune 藤原基経 (836-91) is posthumously known as Shōsenkō 昭宣公. As the father of Fujiwara no Onshi 藤原穂子 (889-954), who became a consort of Emperor Daigo and gave birth to the two emperors, Suzaku and Murakami, Mototsune built the foundation for the generations of Fujiwara regency politics that culminated in the splendor of Fujiwara no Michinaga 藤原道長 (966-1027) in the early eleventh century. Ufu is a Chinese variant of the official title of the udaijin 右大臣 (Minister of the Right). Mototsune became the Minister of the Right in 872, and the Regent (sesshō 拝政) in 876 upon the accession to the throne (senso 蹴祚) of the young Emperor Yōzei 陽成天皇 (r. 876-84, 868-84). In 880, he became the Chancellor (daiō daijin 太政大臣) and supported Yōzei. In 884, Mototsune dethroned 徹帝 Yōzei and requested (sōsei 奏請) the accession of Prince Tokiyasu 時康親王–Emperor
By doing this, Mototsune suppressed the influence of the Minister of the Left, Minamoto no Tōru 源融 (822-95, Minister of the Kawara Residence 河原院), the son of Emperor Saga, who expressed interest in the royal succession. The historical narrative Ōkagami recounts that Mototsune shunned Tōru’s appeal to succeed the throne on account of Tōru’s having once “descended” and became a commoner:

His Excellency Tōru—the Minister of the Left—was noble by birth. He had a serious intention of succeeding the throne, and announced: “Why is it necessary to discuss? If you [privy gentlemen] are in search of a person with close imperial lineage, I, Tōru, am surely here for you.” Upon hearing this, this Minister [Mototsune] replied to Tōru, saying: “Even if you insist that you have imperial lineage, have you ever heard of a precedent wherein a person who once received a surname and served [in the court] as a commoner ascended to the throne?” Tōru’s offer was quite reasonable after all, but because of Mototsune’s decision, Emperor Komatsu [Kōkō] acceded to the throne.

This episode also appears in the Kojidan 古事談 (Discussion on Ancient Matter, Minamoto no Akikane 源顕兼 ed., 1212-15). In the same year as Kōkō’s accession (884), Mototsune inaugurated the custom of kanpaku 関白 (lit. “interventional address”), mandating all the reports and requests addressed to the emperor to be consulted with him first. The kanpaku as a recognized office first appears in an imperial edict (mikotonori 詔) issued by Emperor Uda 宇多天皇 (r. 887-97, 867-931, Kōkō’s son) in 887.

20 Ōnakatomi no Sukechika 大中臣輔親 (954-1038) became the Student of Letters (monjō shō 文章生) in 986, Ise Priest (saishu 祭主) and Acting Deputy of the Counsel of Religion (kami zukasa gon おき普京 神祇権大副) in 1001, and Deputy of the Counsel of Religion 神祇大副 in 1008. Sukechika composed waka for the Great Food Offering Ritual (Ōnie no matsuri 大嘗会) upon the enthronement of the three emperors of Sanjō, GoIchijō 天智, and GoSuzaku. Sukechika’s daughter, Ise no Taifu 伊勢大輔 [Ise Deputy[‘s daughter]] is one of the most celebrated poets of the eleventh century, and twenty-six poems composed by her appear in the GoShūishū.

21 Fujiwara no Sanekata 藤原実方 (?-998) was active as a poet during the reigns of Emperor Enyū 円融天皇 (r. 969-984, 959-991) and Emperor Kazan 花山天皇 (r. 984-86, 968-1008). He was appointed as the Governor of Michinoku 陸奥 in 995, and died there in 999. A great number of his poems are included in the imperial collections: the Shūishū (7 poems), the GoShūishū (14), the Shikashū (3), the Senzaishū (4), and the Shinkokinshū (12). In many of these poems, Sanetaka appears as an exiled poet in the northern province of Michinoku. The real reason for his dispatch (not necessarily demotion or banishment) is unknown, but the Kojidan (see note 16) presents one legendary interpretation that during the reign of Emperor Ichijō 一条天皇 (r. 986-1011, 980-1011), Sanetaka had a quarrel with Fujiwara no
Yukinari 藤原行成 (972-1027, famous as a calligrapher) in the imperial court, violently grabbed Yukinari’s cap, threw it onto the ground and left; the emperor was overlooking this incident from the small screened window (kojitomi 小部), and immediately announced the promotion of Yukinari to the Secretary of the Chamberlain 蔵人頭, while appointing Sanekata to the Governor of Michinoku 陸奥守, saying “Go and visit those famous poetic places” 歌枕てまられ. (Kawabata and Araki, pp. 160 and 206.) For the Sanekata shū, see SNKBT 28, pp. 185-263.

22 Fujiwara no Michinobu 藤原道信 (972-994).

23 Kiyohara no Fukayabu 清原深清父 (date unknown) was active during the reigns of Emperors Uda and Daigo. He is the grandfather of Kiyohara no Motosuke 清原元輔 (908-90), Sei Shōnagon’s father. Fukayabu’s poems appear in the imperial collections: in the Kokinshū (17 poems), the Gosenshū (5), the Shūishū (1) and the Shinkokinshū (5).

24 Fujiwara no Nagatō 藤原長侍 (ca. 949-) was the younger brother of Michitsuna no haha 道綱母, the author of the Kagerō Nikki (Gossamer Diary). The Fukuro Zōshi (see section 16) introduces Nagatō as an eccentric poet, who was “abnormally passionate about the art of waka” 道を執る, and recounts an anecdote wherein Nagatō became “unable to eat” 不食に成り after one of his poems had been criticized by Kintō, and eventually died from it. As for Nagatō’s mentorship to Nōin, see note 10. (Fujioka, p. 81.)

25 Minamoto no Michinari 源道信 (?-1019) was appointed to the Governor of Chikuzen 筑前, and died there.

26 Yuge no Yoshitoki 弓削嘉言 (also Ōe no Yoshitoki 大江嘉言, date unknown) became an assistant Student of Letters 補文章生 in 992, and the Governor of Tsushima 対馬 in 1009. As a waka poet, he formed a coterie with Nōin and Michinari.

27 Priest Egyō 恵慶法師 (active late-tenth century) formed a literary coterie with Priest Anpō 安法法師, the great-grandson of Minamoto no Tōru (see note 16), who lived in the Kawara Residence (Kawara-no-in 河原院). The villa, famous for its garden decorated with an artificially crafted Bay of Shiogama 塩釜—a traditional utakamura (poetic allusion) and a scenic place in Michinoku (see note 18)—was once occupied by Tōru and served as the venue for numerous literary events under his auspices. After Tōru’s death, the residence was offered to the Retired Emperor Uda, and it was converted into a temple after Uda’s death. Ampō safeguarded the customary literary events at the temple. It is known that Egyō participated in a poetry contest at the Kawara Residence 河原院歌合 in 962. He also composed poems at Nishi-no-miya Residence 西宮 of Minamoto Takaakira (see note 15) shortly after Takaakira’s exile in Chikuzen in 962. Egyō also dedicated a poem to the retired Emperor Kazan, who took the tonsure in 986, on his trip to Kumano. (Ariyoshi, p. 64.) These fragmentary records of Egyō’s footsteps suggest that he was closely associated with individuals whose political careers were eclipsed by the Fujiwara regents. Eighteen poems composed by Egyō appear in the Shūishū, the most famous of which is the following poem selected in the Hyakunin Isshu 百人一首 (One Hundred Poets, One Poem Each):

At the Kawara Residence, when people composed poems on the subject, “the arrival of the autumn at a dilapidated residence”:

In this residence
desolate and
enshrouded with overgrown tangles,
not a single soul is observed,
but the autumn has come.

シェ～ず 140, アルト, ハマチヤ p. 42. 

28 Priest Dōmyō 道明 (974-1020)

29 Miare no Senji (“Kamo messenger,” date unknown) is the daughter of Minamoto no Sukemoto 源相職
(901-943), and believed to have served as a messenger for Emperor Kazan and Kamo Priestess during the
reigns of Emperors Murakami through Ichijō. Two poems composed by Miare appear in the
Shinkokinshū.

30 浅田徹 et al., 「あしたの集」略注稿－平安中期の後朝歌集, in 学習院大学国語国文学会誌,

31 Prince Sukehito 輔仁親王 (1073-1119) was the third son of Emperor GoSanjō 後三条天皇
(r.1068-72, 1034-73), thus called Third Prince (San-no-miya 三宮). Sukehito and his brother Prince
Sanēhito’s 実仁親王 (1070-1085) mother was Consort Kishi 女御基子, the grand-daughter of Kōchijō-in 小一条院 (994-1051), the son of Emperor Sanjō. Emperor Shirakawa 白河天皇 (r. 1072-86,
1053-1129) was Sukehito’s half-brother, and his mother was Fujiwara no Moshi 藤原茂子, the daughter
of Fujiwara no Kinnari 藤原公成, who was later adopted by Fujiwara no Yoshinobu 藤原能信
(995-1065, Michinaga’s third son). Sukehito and Shirakawa’s relationship was not amicable, especially
after Shirakawa appointed his son Prince Munehito (Emperor Toba, 1103-1156) as the Heir Apparent,
ignoring GoSanjō’s will that after Sanēhito, who became the Heir Apparent at the age of two in 1073 and
died in 1085, Sukehito would become second to the throne. The Imakagami vividly depicts the
discordant relationship between Sukehito and Shirakawha (“Genji Haven” 源氏のみやす所 section in
chapter “Princes” みこたち):

[Emperor GoSanjō] also had a third son, whose mother was the same as the Heir
Apparent [Sanēhito]. His was called Prince Sukehito, and born in the First Month
of 1069. In the Twelfth Month of 1075, he was appointed to the Prince. This
prince was learned in Chinese Classics, and the way he composed Chinese verses
was reminiscent of the His Highness of Central Affairs (either Prince Kaneakira
兼明親王—Emperor Murakami’s brother, or Prince Tomohira 具平親王—
Murakami’s son) in the past. Prince Sukehito was also excelled in the
composition of waka. It was very moving when he saw cherry blossoms at the
Enshū Temple [established by Emperor GoSanjō in 1070] and composed:

Cherry blossoms
that have spent many years
in this residence where my father no longer resides but
the trees he had planted remain,
may have the same feeling as me.
In the poetry collection that the Director of Carpentry [Minamoto no Toshiyori] compiled and submitted, poems like this appear under the name, Prince Sukehito. [Upon seeing a draft of the collection,] the Retired Emperor Shirakawa said: “Why did you write [Sukehito’s name] in this manner, knowing that I would see this?” Thereafter, Toshiyori changed [the poet’s name] to Third Prince. The relationship [between Shirakawa and Sukehito] was not amicable. Indeed it was because Sukehito was the younger brother of Shirakawa.

As for Chinese verses, Prince Sukehito left innumerable number of fine compositions. Among them, one verse went like this: “[Privately, entertain oneself with zither and wine;] Publicly, be benevolent to the people without joy or distress.” A dignitary who was called the Middle Chief Priest at the Ninna Temple [Kakugyō Hosshinnō 覚行法親王 (1075-1105, third son of Emperor Shirakawa)] commented, “[Prince Sukehito indeed spent his life] in distress!” However, since not all the emperor’s sons ascend to the throne, those who are discerning shall not necessarily consider [a situation like this] despairing. Indeed, this was the Prince of the Ninna Temple’s [Kakugyō’s] casual comment.

Certainly, Prince Sukehito would have desired nothing particular.

(Sakakibara et al., pp. 234-5.)

CF. 有琴有酒閑中樂  Privately, entertain oneself with zither and wine
無喜無憂世上情  Publicly, be benevolent to people without joy or sorrow
(新撰朗詠集下)

32 Minamoto no Yukimune 源行宗 (1064-1143) is the son of Minamoto no Motohira 源基平, the son of Kolchijō-in 小一条院. Yukimune is the brother of Priest Gyōson 行尊 (1055-1035), and Kishi 基子–Emperor GoSanjō’s consort and the mother of Prince Sukehito (see note 27).
33 Minamoto no Nakamasa (active late twelfth century). Nakamasa’s poetry collection under the title Hōoku shū does not exist today, but copies of the posthumously compiled Minamoyo no nakamasa shū (Collected Poems of Minamoto no Nakamasa) are owned by the National Diet Library and the Shōkōkan Library. (Ariyoshi, pp. 496-7.)

34 It is not clear why an incomplete set of the Tales of Ise, a mid-twentieth-century “poem-tale” (utagatari) is included here among collections of individual poets’ works from the twelfth century. Another copy of the Tales of Ise appears in the section 16, “Miscellaneous,” among other prose narratives.

35 Fujiwara no Suketaka (active late twelfth century), who was also versed in Chinese literature, participated in the following events: Upper officer of the Empress Mother’s Household Kiyošuke’s poetry contest 永暦元年太皇太后宮大進清輔歌合 (1160), poetry contest at Shuné’s Karinén 俊恵歌林苑歌合, Empress Mother’s Household Deputy Tsunemori’s poetry contest 太皇太后宮亮経盛歌合, Empress’s Household Deputy Shigeie’s poetry contest 中宮亮重家歌合, Master of the Imperial Police Yorisuke’s poetry contest 植非違使別当頼輔歌合, Intendant of the Left Gate Watch Sanekiuni’s poetry contest 左衛門督実国歌合, Poetry Contest at the Hirota Shrine 広田社歌合 (1172), Former Deputy of the Left Gate Watch Tsunemasa’s poetry contest 前左兵衛佐経正歌合, Poetry Contest at the Wakéikazuchi Shrine 別雷社歌合 (1178), and Minister of the Right Kanzane’s poetry contest 右大臣兼実歌合. Suketaka’s poetry collection that comprised of one-hundred poems (spring 20, summer 8, autumn 26, winter 6, love 20, miscellaneous 20) is called Zenrin oyōshū (Collection of a Buddhist Monk’s Congested Poems). Two poems by Suketaka appears in the Senzaishū. (Ariyoshi, p. 364.)

36 久保木秀夫, 『林葉和歌集－研究と校本』 (笠間書院, 2007).

37 The Priest Tōren (?-1182?), a member of Shune’s poetry coterie Karinén, participated poetry events such as Empress Mother’s Household Deputy Tsunemori’s poetry contest, Poetry Contest at the Hirota Shrine (1172) and Poetry Contest at the Wakéikazuchi Shrine (1178). The extant copies of Tōren’s poetry collection is simply known as Tōren hōshi shū 登進法師集. Referring to the present catalogue, Ariyoshi notes that Tōren’s poetry collection by the title Keisetsu shū 蜻雪集 does not survive today. Tōren’s poems appear in the Shikashū (1 poem) and the Senzaishū (4 poems). (Ibid., p. 479.)

38 According to Ōta, this note was added by Tsunanori. (Ōta, p. 92, note 55.)

西沢誠人, 「頑昭歴—仁和寺入寺をめぐって」 in 『和歌文学研究』 (vol. 28, 1972.6).

39 Horikawa, also known as Taiken-mon-in Horikawa 瑠薬門院堀河 is the daughter of Minamoto no Akinaka 源顯仲 (1064-1138), the Chief Officer of the Counsel of Religion 神祇伯. Horikawa first served Princess Reishi 令子内親王, the former Kamo Priestess 斎院, under the name Rokujō 六條. She then served Shōshi 璧子 (1101-45, Emperor Toba’s consort and the mother of Emperor Sutoku, also known as Her Cloistered Taiken-mon 待賢門院) under the name Horikawa. Horikawa gained her fame...
as a poet during her lifetime, and six poems by her were selected in the *Kinyōshū*. Her poems also appear in the *Shikashū* (2 poems), the *Senzaishū* (15 poems) and the *Shinkokinshū* (2 poems). Generous treatment of Horikawa’s poems in the *Senzaishū* is particularly of interest because it resonates with the highly positive assessment of her poetic skill in the *Imakagami*. In the “Plants of Musashi” むさしのくさ くさ section of the “Murakami Genji” 穂河名兼氏 穂河名兼氏 chapter, wherein the various achievements of the sons and daughters of Minamoto Akinaka—the descendant of Emperor Murakami (thus Murakami Genji) are described, the narrator refers to Horikawa’s poems that was selected in the *Kinyōshū*, and comments upon it:

As to [Akinaka’s] daughters, they were called Hotikawa the Intendant of the Right Gate Watch and the like, and from what I heard, they were all poets. The elder daughter had originally been called Rokujō of the former Kamo Priestess. In the *Kinyōshū*, she composed the following poem [under that name]:

Accustomed to the glassy surface
embedded with abundant dew,
a cricket
cries underneath
my arm that I use as a pillow.

The name Horikawa must have been given to her later. Indeed, it is quite unlikely that a female poet of this level would appear in the world again.

As to [Akinaka’s] daughters, they were called Hotikawa the Intendant of the Right Gate Watch and the like, and from what I heard, they were all poets. The elder daughter had originally been called Rokujō of the former Kamo Priestess. In the *Kinyōshū*, she composed the following poem [under that name]:

Accustomed to the glassy surface
embedded with abundant dew,
a cricket
cries underneath
my arm that I use as a pillow.

The name Horikawa must have been given to her later. Indeed, it is quite unlikely that a female poet of this level would appear in the world again.

おむなごは、ほりかはのは、右兵衛督などきこへ侍て、みなうたよみててお
はずときこへ給し。あねのきみは、もとは、さきのさいみむの六条と申け
るにや。きむようしゆに、

つゆしひきのべにならひてきりﾉ
すわがたまくらのしたになくなり

とよみたまへなるるべし。ほりかははほ、のちに申けるなるべし。かや
うなる女おたよみは、よにいき給はむ事かたく侍るべし。（Sakakibara et al., p. 225. ）

40 Hyŏe, also known as Taiken-mon-in Hyŏe 待賢門院兵衛, is the younger sister of Horikawa. (See note 34.) After the death of Taiken-mon-in in 1145, Hyŏe served Princess Toshi 続子内親王 (also known as Jōsai-mon-in 城西門院), the daughter of Taiken-mon-in. One poem by Hyŏe was selected in the *Kinyōshu*, while two appear in the *Shinkokinshū*. Along with Horikawa, Hyŏe is known as one of the fourteen poets (and one of the four women poets) of the *One Hundred Poetry Sequence of the Kyūan Era* 久安百首 (1150).


42 Literally meaning the 1) bone marrow 骨髓 and brain 脳, 2) myelencephalon 脳髓 and cerebrospinal fluid 脳漿, the generic term *zuinō* in the traditional waka discourse refers to poetic treatises 歌学書・歌論書 that provide the principles of composition. In the present catalogue, the category *zuinō*
encompasses a variety of essential texts for poets, such as “laws” 式, “catalogues of poetic diction” 歌枕, “critiques” 難, “polemics” 問答, “commentaries” 注・抄 and “monographs” 勅文 (kanmon).

43 It is highly probable that the Waka zuinō refers to the Shinsen waka zuinō 新撰和歌雑草 (Newly Selected Essence of Waka, Kagaku taikei 1), or a lost text that was structurally similar to it. The Kagaku taikei text of the Shinsen waka zuinō, based on two extant manuscripts under that title owned by the Imperial Library 宮内庁書陵部 contains the following colophon:

[The manuscript says that ] although the text gives an impression that it is disarrayed, in order to keep it as a record, I have transcribed it as it appears.

Commissioner of the Empress’s Household Toshi[yori]

I copied and transcribed this using the treasured text transmitted [in the family.] Finished the work in the early autumn of 1284.

Lord Fujiwara

*新撰和歌雑草為家七世春三之此終功* 藤原朝臣 （花押） (NKT, vol.1, p. 63.)

In his “Kaidai” (introduction) in the NKT 1, Kyūsojin Hitaku argues that this inscription indicates that Fujiwara no Tamei 為家 (1198-1275) transcribed a copy of the Shinsen waka zuinō, that had been scribed by his grandfather, Shunzei (also read as Toshinari). But this interpretation cannot stand judiciously because Tamei died in 1275. Thus, the second part of the inscription shall be attributed to Tamei’s son, Tameju 為氏 (1222-86). In either case, Kyūsojin’s paleographic examination reveals that the colophon, thus attributed to Shunzei and Tameiju, appears even today in both extant copies. In order to validate the authenticity of this inscription, Kyūsojin points out that although it only contains the first half of the colophon—the part attributed to Shunzei—one of the two extant copies is written in the calligraphic style of Shunzei. Kyūsojin does not discuss whether this calligraphic style applies to the colophon only or to the entire manuscript, but he argues that the fact that one of the two extant copies of the Shinsen waka zuinō has a colophon written in Shunzei’s calligraphic style is sufficient to confirm that there once existed Shunzei’s own manuscript of Shinsei zuinō. [...] 後者は俊成の筆跡まで忠實に模写して居り、それによって俊成本の存したことは明瞭である。 (NKT 1, p. 28.) Kyūsojin goes so far as to assume that “[i]f Shunzei himself made a copy of [the Shinsen waka zuinō], it is equally probable that it is a poetry treatise from the Heian period. 而して俊成『為備文書如形所書置也』と記してある以上、平安時代の歌學書であることも亦確実である。 (Ibid.) The Shinsen waka zuinō consists of five sections, each succinctly providing the following five rudiments of waka composition: 1) Six Principles 六義; 2) Four Transgressions 四病; 3) Eight Modes of Composition 八品; 4) Six Principal Forms 六義体; and Eight Transgressions 八病. The Six Principles, or the six “compositional styles” うたのさま of 風、賦、比、興、雅 and 頌 were well known among poets because they are discussed in the Japanese and Chinese prefaces to the Kokinshū. The Four Transgressions, each named euphemistically as kishi no ue ki 岸樹 (Tree on the Rock), kaze no tomoshibi 風煽 (Torch under the Wind), nami no fune 浪船 (Boat on the Wave) and chiru hana 落花 (Falling Blossoms) regulate erroneous application of homophones in different measures (ku 句) of a poem. For example, the “Tree on
the Rock” prohibits the appearance of homophones in the first syllable of the first and the second measures respectively, as in “teruhi sae/terasu tsuki sae てる日さ/てる月さへ. These are discussed more elaborately with examples in the Waka sakushiki 僕歌作式 (Compositional Laws for Waka, in NKT 1). The Waka sakushiki, written in Sino-Japanese, is attributed to Priest Kisen 喜撰 (active ca. 810-824) and customarily known as the Kisen shiki 喜撰式 (Kisen’s Laws). Kenshō mentions in his Kokinshū chū (Commentary to the Kokinshū) that the “Four Transgressions were expounded by Kisen during the time of Emperor Uda” 四病ハ仁和御代、喜撰注之. (NKT bekkann 4, p. 217.) The Eight Modes of Composition concern different functions of waka, classified into the following eight categories: “on objects” (in one theory, topic composition) 物ニ対スル或説題; “alluding to objects” (in one theory, sending gifts) 物ヲ寄ル(或物贈); “expressing feelings” 思ヲ述ル; “bearing a grudge against people” (in one theory, reproaching people) 人ヲ怨ル(或説恨); “loathing to depart” 別ヲ恋シム; “regretting faults” 昔ヲ悔シム, “extraordinary poems” (in one [theory], poems in which themes are prioritized [over rules]) 妙ノ歌(或歌ヲ為題); and “reply poems” 返の歌. Although the Waka zuinō only lists these epithetic titles of the eight compositional modes, as in the case of the Four Transgressions, the more detailed explanation with examples appears in the Kisen shiki. As to the note attached to four compositional modes in brackets, beginning with the phrase “[according to] another opinion” 或説, they seem to recapitulate the more literal reading of the description in the Kisen shiki, discussed in the section of “Eight Levels” 八階 of the composition. The Six Principal Forms include the following six forms of waka: 1) chōka 長歌 (long poem) consisting of the thirty-one syllable of 5/7/5/7; 2) tanka 短歌 (short poem), with the unrestricted alternation of the syllabic pattern of 5/7/5/7; 3) sedōka 旋頭歌 (head-turning poem) which “adds one more measure (in either five or seven syllables)” to the chōka; 4) konponka 混本歌 (irregular poems) which “subtracts one measure (in either five or seven syllables)” from the chōka; 5) oriku-uta 折句歌 (acronymic poems, lit. “poems with unfolding measures”), in which a word made of five syllables is parsed, and each of the five syllables are separately placed at the beginnings of each of the five measures; 6) kutsu-kabari 告冠 (Shoes and Crowns) in which a phrase or sentence of ten syllables is parsed, and each of the ten syllables are separately placed at the beginning and the end of each of the five measures. It should be noted that the Shinsen waka zuinō refers to the thirty-one syllable poem, normally called tanka for its relative shortness, as chōka; and much longer chōka as tanka. This reversal shall not be overlooked or simply dismissed as a scribal or typographical error, because the confusion over the presumably “correct” identification of these two major forms of Japanese poetry was actually one of the most memorable conundrums that affected all the leading poet-scholars of the twelfth century, while inciting a variety of highly original interpretations that crystalize differences in their understanding of waka. For example, in his Toshiyori zuinō, Minamoto Toshiyori refers to the thirty-one syllable poem as hanka 反歌 (envoy), whereas introducing the longer poem as tanka 短歌. (Hashimoto, pp., 17, 22).

Finally, the Shinsen waka zuinō discusses the Eight Transgressions, each of which is epideictically called the “Confluence of Ideas” 同心, “Dishevelled Thoughts” 乱思, “Butterflies on a Balustrade” 棚蝶, “Bean Goose on the Shore” 渚鴨, “Orange Blossom” 花橘, “Aged Maple” 老楓, “Unrestrained [Evil Thoughts] in Mind” 中飽 and “Remorse in Retrospect” 後悔. The set of these eight compositional taboos can also be found in the Waka shiki (Laws of Waka, in NKT, vol. 1), customarily known as the Hikohime shiki (Princess Hiko’s Laws). As in the case of the Four Transgressions and the Eight Modes, seemingly the more archaic (written in Sino-Japanese) and detailed accounts of which appeared in the Kisen shiki, the more specific yet somewhat enigmatic explanation of the Eight Transgressions can be found, also in Sino-Japanese, in the Hikohime shiki. What can be gleaned from these details is that the Shinzen waka zuinō is a “new” compendium that concisely extracts and summarizes some of the major issues discussed in the
older sources such as the prefaces to the *Kokinshū*, the *Kisen shiki* and the *Hikohime shiki*. Quoting a comment by Fujiwara no Norinaga 教長 on the importance of the Seven Transgressions 七病, that appear in the *Kakyō hyōshiki* 歌経標式 (Standarized Laws of the Letters of Waka, 772)—the oldest extant waka treatise by Fujiwara no Hamanari 藤原浜成 (724-90), Kenshō mentions in his *Kokinshū chū* (Commentary to the *Kokinshū*) that the Four Transgressions were expounded by Kisen during the period of Emperor Uda, whereas the Eight Transgressions (based on a woodblock print of 1676) are available in NKT (based on the manuscript owned by the Imperial Library 44 Kamakura or even in the Muromachi period. (The text of the *Kokinshū* serves as a quick reference for the poet who was most likely already familiar with the canonical “Four Major Laws” 四家式.)

As for the *Koiku joshiki* 語栄規式 (Commentary to the *Kokinshū*), both the *Iwami joshiki* 石見女式 (Iwami Lady’s Laws), as they appear in the *Yakumo mishō*. (Volume 1, in “Bibliography” 学書, NKT 3., p. 41.) As for the *Iwami joshiki*, extant manuscripts titled as such all contain overtly allegorical theories of waka, and they are considered to have been written in the late Kamakura or even in the Muromachi period. (The text of the *Iwami joshiki* is available in NKT 1.)

44 The *Nōin utamakura* is a list of poetic diction. Two variant versions of the “abridged edition” 略本 (based on the manuscript owned by the Imperial Library 宮内庁書陵部) and the “extended edition” 広本 (based on a woodblock print of 1676) are available in NKT 1. In the abridged edition, which is apparently older than the woodblock version, the *Nōin utamakura* consists of 91 word entries, each accompanied by a short gloss. The majority of the words (71 examples) are common nouns in the vernacular, followed by its rendition in poetic language. For example, “mountain” 山 is followed by an explanatory note, “use the phrase ‘ashibiki’ (leg-dragging) あしびきといふ, also use the phrase ‘shinateruya’ しなてるやともいふ; the expression originates in the Prince Susa-no-o’s saying that ‘ashihiki (a leg-dragger) will not enter into the mountain.’” そさのをのみことの、あしびきはやまへいらじといけるをはじめていひそむ。Although its actual date of the composition and original form are unknown, the *Nōin utamakura* was known as such at least in the late twelfth century. In the *Waka genzaiho mokuroku*, the *Nōin utamakura* is mentioned among other texts in the “Department of Poetry Treatises” 次部, in the *Yakumo mishō*, it appears as one of the “Major Five Poetry Treatises” 五家調
脳 along with Kintō’s 新撰韻稿 (Newly Revised Essence of Poetry), Toshiyori’s Mummyoshō 無名抄 (Commentary Without Name, ca. 1111-15, also known as Toshiyori zuinō, see Section 15), Fujiwara no Nakazane’s 藤原仲実 (1057-1118) Kigoshō 綺語抄 (Commentary on Embellished Words, ca. 1099-1118, in NKT bekkan 1), and Kiyosuke’s Ōgishō (see Section 15). Keshō also makes frequent references to the Nōin utamakura in his philological magnum opus, Shūchō shō 袖中抄 (Sleeve Commentary, ca. 1185-90). The biggest difference between the “abridged” and the “extended” editions of the Nōin utamakura is that the latter includes a comprehensive list of place names under the heading, “Names of Various Places in Various Provinces” 国々の所々の名. It features some 676 natural and manmade landmarks (such as mountains 山, peaks 嶺, valleys 谷, forests 森, fields 野, villages 里, rivers 川, waterfalls 瀧, lakes 池, bays 浦, harbors 津, capes 崖, islands 島, springs 井, bridges 橋, barriers 関, shrines 社 and the like) in sixty-one provinces, that are ubiquitous all over the Japanese archipelago from the southern Satsuma 薩摩 Province up the the northern Michinoku 陸奥. Regarding the treatment of place-names in the Nōin utamakura, Sasaki Nobutsuna makes an important observation in his “kaidai” to the NKT 1, that in his commentaries to the Kokinshū and the Shūishō, Keshō refers to a collection of place-names that is attributed to Nōin, under the title Shokoku utamakura 諸国歌枕 (Place Names in Various Provinces) or the Kongengi 坤元儀 (Manifestation of the Earthly Virtue):

スエノ松山ナミコスト云トトハ、奥義抄ヲ注。[…] 能因ガ坤元儀ニハ、モトノ松、中ノ松、末松トテ、三所アリト注セリ。（傍注）「能因ガ坤元儀ニハ、諸国ノ歌枕ヲ書スル物ナル。」

As to the expression “Sue no Matsuyama,” the Ōgishō has an explanation. […] According to Nōin’s Kongengi, the pine trees [in Matsuyama] are located in the following three areas of the mountain foot, the mid-slope of the mountain and the mountain top. Note: Nōin’s Kongengi is a book which records place-names in various provinces. (Keshō, “Kokinshū chū” in NKT bekkan 4, p, 215. References to the Kongengi also appear in ibid., pp. 217 and 349.)

イキノマツバラハ肥後国ニアリト被書テハベルニ、能因坤元儀ニハ筑後トイヘリ、如何。（頭注）「能因ガ諸国ノ歌枕三巻アリ。名坤元儀。」

It is written that “Iki no Matsubara” is located in the Higo Province. However, in Nōin’s Kongengi, it says it is in the Chikugo Province. How can I explain this? Note: Nōin compiled “Place-names in Various Provinces” in three volumes. The book is called the Kongenki. (Keshō, “Shūishō chū,” ibid., p. 394.)

If there existed a version of Nōin’s poetic catalogue which exclusively dealt with place-names during the lifetime of Keshō (ca. 1130-ca. 1209), as Sasaki argues, it is reasonable to speculate that the Nōin utamakura as circulated in the late-twelfth century did not include the extensive “Names of Various Places in Various Provinces” section. In either case, it is important to know that in the twelfth century, the word utamakura meant both 1) names of famous landmarks, and ethos that is associated with them through literary precedents; 2) poetic diction in general, the knowledge of which was indispensable for both reading and writing waka.

45 The Shūi-kokin 拾遺古今 (Gleanings of Poems from the Ancient Times to the Present, 20 volumes 二十巻) is a lost text. According to the Waka genzaisho mokuroku, it was compiled by the Right City Commissioner Fujiwara no Norinaga 右京大夫教長 (1109-?), in order to be contrasted with the Shikashū (1151) 詞花集撰之比撰之, that was compiled by Fujiwara no Akisuke (the Left City Commissioner) under the auspices of the Retired Emperor Sutoku. The Shūi-kokin had a preface written by Fujiwara no Naganori 藤原永範 (1102-1180), the Doctor of Letters 文章博士. (GR 17-1, p. 235.) Similar descriptions of the Shūi-kokinshū appear in the Fukuro zōshi (“After the Shikashū, the Shūi-kokin appeared. Novice Norinaga compiled this by way of excluding poems from the Shikashū.”, Fujioka, p. 67.), in the Waka iroha (“Consultant Norinaga’s Shūi-kokin wakashū 教長の宰相の拾遺古今和歌抄,” Sasaki, p. 115), and in the Yakumo mishū (volume 1, “Bibliography” 学書). According to Kiyosuke—the author of the Fukuro zōshi and the son of Akisuke, it was commonplace for privately commissioned poetry collections to appear shortly after the completion of imperial anthologies. 擬集の後、また集の出来する事、流例なり。 (Fujioka, p. 67.) It needs to be noted, however, that what the present catalogue contains is the “discussion” 問答 on the Shūi-kokin. From the interlinear gloss, it can surmised that the Retired Emperor Sutoku criticized Norinaga’s Shūi-kokin, that was originally written as an alternative to the Shikashū, the sixth imperial anthology commissioned by Sutoku. Norinaga was Sutoku’s close aide, and when the retired emperor was exiled to Sanuki in the aftermath of the Hōgen War 保元の乱 (1156), Norinaga supported Sutoku and was also exiled to Hitachi Province. Norinaga returned to the capital in 1162 and continued activity as a waka poet.


47 Kiyosuke’s commentary to the Kokinshū, Chū-kokin is a lost text. Ariyoshi refers to the present catalogue as the sole textual evidence that Kiyosuke–a famed transmitter of the Kokinshū manuscripts–wrote a commentary to the Kokinshū. (Ariyoshi, p. 150.)


48 西村加代子, 『平安後期歌学の研究』 (1997) 所収、「六条家歌学の形成と清輔」「清輔の和歌観」.

49 西村加代子, 『平安後期歌学の研究』 (1997) 所収、「和歌勘文考—藤原清輔『人丸勘文』を中心に」.

50 Noting that the first character appears as “三水偏 (讃)” plus “何” in the manuscript, Ōta amends it to “河” in his print transcription. (Ōta, p. 92, note 62.)

51 Ōta transcribes the fourth character of the title as “之,” while suggesting a possibility that it may be a scribal error of “々.” Since “之” in this context makes little sense, I follow Ōta’s suggestion and translate the title of the book as “various” 様々 styles of waka. (Ōta, p. 92, note 63.)
52 中村佳文、「宮詠御幸記の叙述と和歌表現」 in 『日記文学研究誌』 (vol.9, 2007.3).

53 In note 66, Ōta points out that in referring to Sei Shōnagon’s famous collection of essays, the unconventional use of the Chinese character 難 in lieu of the more standard 草 appears in Kenshō’s Kokinshū jo chū 古今集序注 (Commentary to the Kokinshū Prefaces, 1183). (Ōta, p. 94.) In his interpretation of the preface author’s (Ki Tsurayuki) panegyric concluding remark, which begins with the word “makura kotoba” ソレヲクラコトバ二春ノハニホヒスナクシテ、ムナシキナノミ秋ノヨノガキヲカコテレバ…, prior to his own discussion, Kenshō cites Fujiwara no Norinaga’s 藤原教長 (1109-?) commentary to the passage: “According to Lord Norinaga’s commentary, “makura kotoba” here means “conventional words.” [In order to familiarize oneself with such expressions,] one should familiarize oneself with such [reference] as the Pillow Book. 教長卿注云、夫マクラ詞トハ。常詞也、 枕造紙ナドハ。常二手ララス物也。 (NKT bekkan 4, p. 163. Also in GR 286.) The term “makura kotoba” in this context simply indicates Tsurayuki reference to his own “preface” in rhetorically self-deprecating manner. Kenshō’s own interpretation, on the other hand, is extremely “literal” and rather far-fetched. Closely comparing the Japanese passage to its Sino-Japanese version, he argues that “makura” is a form of humble first-person pronoun 九 [the equivalent of 麻呂・麴?], the equivalent of the Sino-Japanese 臣等. It is known that Norinaga’s commentary to the Kokinshū 古今集注 is a lecture note 講義 to His Highness of Dharma Shukaku, which took place from the 12th to the 23th day in the Ninth Month of 1177. It is considered to be the “oldest extant commentary to the Kokinshū,” and the text is available in print in Kokin wakashū (NKBZ 1927), and in photostatic reproduction by Kichitosho eiinbon kankai, 1931. (Ariyoshi, p. 207) Kenshō’s Kokinshū jo chū 古今集注 was originally part of his Kokinshū 古今集注 (Commentary to the Kokinshū, 1185), and also dedicated to His Highness of Dharma Shukaku. (ibid.)

54 The Uji dainagon monogatari does not survive today. Grand Counselor Uji is the nickname of Minamoto no Takakuni 源隆国 (1004-1077), whose poem appears in the GoShūshū (556).

世に、宇治大納言物語とふもとあり。此大納言は隆国といふ人なり、西宮殿従五位の孫、俊賢大納言の第二の男なり。年たかうしては、あつさをわびて、いとを申て、五月より八月までは、平等院一切経蔵の南の山ざはに、南奧庭と云に、こもりむられけり。さて、宇治大納言とはきこえけり。もっとりをゆひかけて、をかしげなる姿にて、むしろをいたにしきて、すまゐはべりて、大なる打輪をもて、あふがせなして、ゆききの者、上中下をはいはず、よびあつめ、昔物語をさせて、我は内にそひ臥して、かたるにしたがひて、おほきなる双紙にかかれけり。天竺の事もあり。大唐の事もあり。日本に事もあり。それかうに、たうとき事もあり。おかしき事もあり。おそろしき事もあり。あはれる事もあり。きたなき事もあり。少々はそら物語もあり。利口なる事もあり。さまへ様へなり。世の人、これをげうじむ。十四帖なり。その正本は、つてはて、侍従俊貞といひし人のもとにぞありけり。いかになりけりにか、後に、さかしき人々、かき入るあひだ、物語、おほくなれり。大納言より後の事、かき入る本もあるにこそ。… (Miki et al., pp. 5-6.)

小峰和明、『今昔物語集の形成と構造』 (笠間書院、1985).

56 The *Kara monogatari* (ca. 1165, ed. Fujiwara no Shigenori 藤原成範, 1135-88]). Shigenori’s poems appear in the *Senzaihū* (591, 761, 899).
Appendix 2

References to “Koseki kasho mokuroku 古蹟歌書目録”
(“An Old Manuscript Catalog of Books on Waka”) in Japanese Scholarship

1) Matsumura, Hiroji, ed.  Ōkagami 大鏡 (1960):

[On the title of the Imakagami]
鏡のことは大鏡の内容にも見ており、古いとぎました上等の鏡のように、古えを明らかに写し出すのだという意味で、作者も力を入れて述べているところであるから、愚管抄に「かぞみの巻」と呼んでいる理由も納得できるし、今鏡は、大鏡に云う古鏡に対して、新しい鏡という意味で命名されたのであろうが（尊経閣蔵桑華書志所引和寺御室蔵書目録には「新鏡」とある）、また「子鏡とやつけまし」とも云っているのは、すでに大鏡という名称があって、それに対する謙辞と見られる。（Kaisetsu, pp. 5-6.)


On 『注古今』 under “Kiyosuke,” p. 150.
On 『蓬莱集』 under “Nakama,” p. 496.

3) Takehana, Isao, ed. Imakagami 今鏡 (Kōdansha Gakujutsu Bunko, 1984):

[On the author of the Imakagami]
... 太田晶二郎氏によって『桑華書志』所載の「古蹟歌書目録」に、「新鏡 二帖 寂超作」とあることが紹介され、寂超説は強力な外部微証をえて、もっとも有力になった。
(Kaisetsu, p. 622.)


[Shukaku Hosshinno as the “unifier of various disciplines” 諸学の横断家]
「桑華書誌」[ママ] 所載「古蹟歌書目録」は、喜多院御室守覚法親王の御所「南御経蔵御所」の蔵録目録である。... 本目録は歌書目録であって、御室御所の経蔵の全貌を伝えるものではない。... 歌書以外の和書、仏典、漢籍等についても同じく目録のあったものであろうが、その伝承を聞かなかった。(p. 1.)

「古蹟歌書目録は」守覚法親王の南院御所経蔵の一週に、由緒正しい歌書が集積されていたことを証するものだが、そこには単に歌道に対する執心とばかりは言い尽くせない、情熱や積極的な意志のけはいが感じられてならぬのである。不幸にして守覚の集書の全容は測り難いが、諸学の横断家としての面貌はこの目録に明瞭に刻印されている。(p. 2)
5) Ishikawa, Tōru, ed. Ōkagami 大鏡 (Shinchō Koten Shusei, 1989):

[On early manuscripts of the Ōkagami]
尊経閣文庫蔵松雲公前田綱筆『桑華書志』に収められている「古蹟歌書目録」（守覚法
親王喜多院御室御所蔵目録）に「大鏡五巻 又二帖」とある由である。... これによる
と『大鏡』は、当初「五巻」の巻子本が作られたわけだが、その後、別に二帖の冊子本が
加わり、計七部の書物がひとまとめにされていたことがわかる。「七部」とは五巻の本と
二帖の本の意である。これが、四巻と二巻計六巻に整理され、一つに取り合せて、六巻本
ができた。そして、さらに、上・中・下三冊の書物に作り直されて三巻本『大鏡』ができた。
と、このような成長をしているようである。 (Kaisetsu, p. 362.)

6) Taniyama, Shigeru, intro. Korai fūteishō (Reike Shizuretei Shō 1, 1992):

[On the Korai fūteishō]
わたくしでは、平安時代後期から鎌倉時代初期の仁和寺の藏書目録、もしかしたら守覚法
親王の喜多院御室御所の蔵書目録であったかとされる『古蹟歌書目録』の「第十五髷脳」
の末尾に、「古来風体抄二帖 俊成入道撰」「又二帖」と、二部の『古来風体抄』の存在
が記載されているのが興味ふかい。 (Kaidai, pp. 10-11.)

7) Hibino, Hironobu. “Ōgishō jo to waka genzaisho mokuroku jo” 『奥義抄』序と『和歌現在書目

[On the Waka genzaisho mokuroku]
『和歌現在書目録』であるが、その資料的価値は絶大なものである。編者については長ら
く知られていなかったが、『古蹟歌書目録』に、
和歌現在書目録 （四帖 清輔顕昭経平朝臣撰之）
又一帖（未発終）
とあることによって、清輔、顕昭、経平の三人が関与していることが明かとなった。この
『古蹟歌書目録』は守覚法親王の蔵書目録であるらしく、とすれば、法親王と顕昭の関係
は従来述べられていたしており、この記述は信用することができるようである。清輔、顕
昭の二大歌学者が関与していたことを認めることができるわけである。 (p. 93.)


[On Fujiwara Kiyosuke’s waka treatises]
太田晶二郎氏によって調査された『桑華書志』所載の「古蹟歌書目録」（「髷脳」部）に、
他の資料には見えない清輔の著作三種が紹介される。 [...] (p印が当該の三書。)
注古今一部+清輔撰
○ 奥義抄一部同作
○ 風義抄一部同作
○ 頭目集抄一部同作
 [...]
○ 和歌様之術—清輔撰
件の三書は、清輔等編の『目録』[“Waka genzaisho mokuroku”]現在本にも見えないが、『目録』が作られた元永年間以後に著されたものであろうか。右のうち、『俊歌□書』の第三字について、太田氏は、「儒」に似た字が書いてある旨を注しつつ翻字をひかえておられる。これは、次項で考えるように『俊歌儒書』と読んでよいのではないかと思われる。和歌の学問の書物というほどの意味であろう。[[pp. 188-9.]]

[On Kenshō’s commentary on Toshiyori’s Sanbokushū]
頼昭が仁平四年書写本[の俊頼集]を用いずに、異本俊頼集を用いて『註』を著したのでは、そのがより適当と考えられる何らかの理由があったのであろうか。「桑華書志」所載「古蹟歌書目録」第九・諸歌集近代とある中、[[…]] にある。古蹟歌書目録は、太田晶二郎氏によって、守覚法親王の藤穂目録であることが考証されている。この目録によれば、守覚の許には俊頼の著した歌書の所蔵が充実しており、俊頼集が三本、俊頼顕髄が二本存した。その中に、俊頼自筆で外題に「散木集」とある一冊の本があった。[[…]] 頼昭が異本俊頼集を用いた理由を求めるとすれば、注釈の下命者である守覚法親王の所持していた俊頼自筆本が用いだれたのではなかったか。[[…]] pp. 331-2。


[On Shukaku’s philology]
おそらく、守覚自身が、その[“書物”の] 普遍性をすすれて体現していた筈である。その証の一端は、作成の主体が守覚であろうと推定されている『古蹟歌書目録』である。仁和寺南院御経蔵に集録された歴代の和歌集をはじめ、歌学書および歴史物語を含む“草子”類までが網羅されたこの目録は、守覚の<俗>の世界——文雅の領域の一側面をよく伝えるものであろう。自らの歌集中では、夭折した愛弟の兄への追悼に言寄せて、その遺物に含まれる和歌・音楽の書物に言及する。法親王の和歌への好尚は、前代の覚章（歌集『出観集』を遺す）より継承されたもので、守覚の許には“好士”達が集い、御室歌壇というべきサロンが存在していた。その晩年に定家を含めた『御室五十首』（建久十年）が編まれるなど、それは一貫して生涯にわたる数奇であった。そして彼の周辺には教長や顕昭があって、古今集・拾遺集等の注釈や歌辞を撰んで進献したものも知られている。俊成による『長秋詠藻』の撰進も守覚の求めるに応じてのものであった。顕昭による、六条藤家歌学の最高の成果として、本説本文の抄出と類聚によって成り立つ『袖中抄』も、守覚の“文化気”内で誕生したのではなかったか。 (pp. 140-141.)

10) Abé, Yasurō. “Shukaku hosshinnō ni okeru bunkengaku” 守覚法親王における文献学 in Yasurō Abé and Makoto Yamazaki, eds. Shukaku hosshinō to ninnaji onryō no bunkengakuteki kenkyū ronbun hen 守覚法親王と仁和寺御流の文献学的研究 論文篇, pp. 7-34. Tokyo: Benseisha, 1998:
[On Shukaku's philology and waka]

 [...] 何より、その求心力として守覚その人に文献にたいする強い好尚があった若である。『御記』に見られる、才学に劣ると「書籍書相承書」を尊重すべし、と言う守覚の認識はそのことをよく物語る。それは更に聖教・記録以外の分野の典籍に及ぶものであり、守覚による和歌関係の書籍蒐集の結果と推定される「和歌古蹟目録」(ママ)が著されている。また、守覚の許で顕昭をはじめとする歌人・歌学者の歌書の注釈進講と、その所産としての注釈書進献という事跡も、こうした守覚その人の積極的な“文献学”というべき志向と活動の一環として捉えられるであろう。（P.25）


[On the author of the *Kara monogatari*]

作者については、現時点では藤原成範が有力視されている。その根拠となるのは、大ママ田森二郎が紹介した『華漸ママ書志』所載の「古蹟歌書目録」の記載である。この中での要十六に『宇治大納言物語』などともに「漢物語 一帖 成範」という記述がある。この「漢物語」が『唐物語』に当てられれば、作者は成範と考えられるわけではない。 [...] 中国古典と和歌の融合という『唐物語』の性格を考えると、通憲の子であり、かつ和歌にも堪能な成範は、作者である必要条件を満たしていると云えるだろう。（Kaisetsu written by Matsumoto Shinsuke 松本真輔, p. 295.）


[The present catalogue is cited as one of the exemplary bibliographical sources wherein Kiyosuke and Kenshō’s works are listed.]

右の一覧の括弧内の略号は、それぞれを著録した書目を示したもので、以下の通りである。
現 『和歌現在書目録』（続群書類従巻第四百七十所収）
古 『古蹟歌書目録』（田田晶二郎氏「『桑華書志』所載「古蹟歌書目録」」（『日本学士院紀要』12 3, 昭和29・11、『田晶二郎著作集』第二冊, 平3刊所収）
色 『和歌色葉』（日本歌学大系本）
八 『八雲御抄』（同右[上]）
八私 『八雲御抄私記』（同右[上]）
代 『代集』（同右[上]）
冷 『私所持和歌草子目録』（冷泉家時雨亭叢書「中世歌学集・書目集」所収）（pp. 19-22.）

[On Kenshō’s *Manyshō jidai kanmon*]

ここに顕昭の独特の性格を感じるべきではないかろうか。その心は寛大で難いが、同じ主題の別々の著作を作成し、改稿を好まないという不思議な性格である。同様の例は事情を異にするが古今集の注釈以外にも認められる。顕昭には『万葉集難事』と『柿本朝臣人麻呂勘文』という性格の似た二著作が存在するが、その他に『古蹟歌書目録』に「万葉集時代
勘文二巻頼昭勘注」という名称の類似する散佚書を見える。一見前記二書の何れかの異名と思えるがそうではない。この点については早く『古蹟歌書目録』取引以前、橋本進吉氏に指摘があり、頼昭の『古今集序注』に「上件条々委裁万葉時代両度勘文。」（日本歌学大系本154頁）、同じく『後拾遺注』に「委旨載頼昭両度勘文了。」（日本歌学大系本415頁）と見えることを以て、「万葉集難事」に先立つ頼昭の勘文を想定され、『袖中抄』巻十七「たまはゝき」の項に見える『万葉時代之勘文』がそれであるとされた。

（Ibid., p. 42.）

[On Fujiwara Shigeie’s poetry collection Shigeie shū]

本集には尊経閣文庫と慶応義塾図書館に上下巻が分載されている著名な古写本があり、諸家の考案が加えられているので、多くは省略に従うが、既に指摘されているように、本集は治承二年（一一七八）七月三日に重家自撰本が守覚法親王に奉再、現在はその転写本であろうと考えられる。… 仁和寺宮守覚法親王の蔵書目録かとされる『古蹟歌書目録』に「重家卿一（集）一帖」と見えて以後、前述の足利義尚の和歌打聞撰集の際の「打聞記」文明十五年（一一八三）八月十四日条に「重家卿集上下」と見える以外存在が確認されず、『夫木和歌抄』等にも用いられていなかった。その後は国会図書館蔵本（小諸文庫、岡田希雄氏旧蔵）が江戸後期に書写されるまで全否不明である。（Ibid., pp. 940-941.）

[On the Waka genzaisho mokuroku]

本書は続群書類従巻四七〇に「和歌合略目録」と共に収められ、嘉永ころ見本刷として刊行されている。編者は不明であったが、「古蹟歌書目録」に「和歌現在書目録」「又一帖」「又一帖」をあることが指摘され、清輔、頼昭、経平（伝未詳）共編であることが明らかになった。 （Ibid., p. 945.）

12）Kawamura, Teruo, ed. Shichūshō 袖中抄 (Karon Kagaku Shūsei 4-5, 2001):

[On Kenshō’s interpretation of the word, “hashitaka” はし鷹 (a kind of a falcon)]:

校本注 [『袖中抄の校本と研究』橋本不美男・後藤祥子、1985] は『古蹟歌書目録』第十六集、「鷹相経一卷、以左近衛府生上道守恒口之注」（太田晶二郎『桑華書志』所載古蹟歌書目録日本学士院紀要十二三、昭29・11）を指摘、同目録は頼昭が親近した守覚法親王喜多院御室の蔵書目録でないかと推定されていると述べる。・・・ (Headnote 9, p. 234.)

14）Gomi, Fumihiko. Shomotsu no chūsei 番物の中世史 (2003):

[On the Waka dōmōshō]

… さらに藤原範兼の歌学書である『和歌童蒙抄』は、守覚法親王の『歌書目録』に「童蒙抄一部<五帖>範兼卿撰進二条院」とあって、これも二条天皇に撰進されている。（p.111.）

[On the Waka genzaisho mokuroku]
守覚の『歌書目録』は、本書[和歌現在書目録]の著者を藤原清輔・顕昭らとしている。その収録している歌書から見ても、彼が著したものと見てようと思う。...

[On the author of the Imakagami]
今鏡の著者が藤原為経（寂超）であることは、『本朝書籍目録』や守覚の『歌書目録』などにも見ており、それに誤らないと見られるが、それならば為経がどうしてこの歴史物語を著そうとしたのであろうか。このことを考えることに、本書の内部微証から著者の為経説を吟味しておく必要があります。（p.112.）

[On the Kara monogatari]
このように漢字で記されていたものを仮名で記している点が本書[水鏡]の特徴であるが、この時代には仮名で書物を著すことが広く試みられており、それには忠親のような貴族の関わりているものが多く見える。たとえば、中国的の話を仮名で記した『続群書類従』所収の『唐物語』は、『桑華書志』所収の『歌書目録』に『漢物語』として見え、作者を藤原成範とする。この『歌書目録』は守覚法親王の著作と見られ、成範と同世代の成立であれば成範が著者であったと見てよろう。（p.124.）

[On the Korai fūteishō and the person who commissioned it]
また注目されるのは、太田晶二郎氏が紹介した『桑華書誌』[ママ]所載の『古蹟歌書目録』である。これは二部から構成されていて、第一部は歌集・歌学書・物語などを十六編に分類して載せ、第二部は和歌目録を載せている。これについて太田氏は、この目録が仁和寺御室の目録であることを明らかにしているが、その根拠は守覚に献じられた自筆の『俊成卿』があり、同じく守覚に献じられたとされる『教長入道筆』の『古今』、「同筆 崇徳院本』の『古今集』があること、さらに『顕昭集四巻』に「又二巻、於御所従四巻中被撰出之」の注があって、顕昭と守覚の関係から、そこに見える『御所』とは御室御所であると見なすことなどによる。

そこからさらに全体も守覚の目録とされているが、第二部に見える『定家朝臣筆』の『新古今和歌集』は守覚の亡くなった後のことでであろうが、第二部は守覚の目録ではありえず、また『新古今和歌集』烏丸本の奥書には定家が御室に進呈した見えるので、守覚の跡を継いだ道法親王に関わるものであったろう。つまり第一部分は守覚の目録であり、第二部は同法がそれに追加した目録であったと考えられる。そこで守覚の蔵書目録である第一部を見ると、第十五編の『態學』の最後に次の記事が見える。

　古来風体抄　＜二冊＞　俊頼入道撰
　又二帖
　これによれば俊成が二度にわたって進めた『古来風体抄』が守覚の蔵書となっていることがわかる。この点からも『古来風体抄』が守覚に捧げられたであろうことはほぼ疑いない。（pp. 216-217.）

On "Certain Lofty and Noble Mountain" ある高きみ山 who commissioned the Korai jūteishō

ただしこ近年、五味文彦氏は、[古来風体抄の]宛先を守覚法親王とした（『書物の中世史』みすず書房、平15）。①「み山」は仏道者を指すのにふさわしい表現、②病床の式子内親王が再び提出を命じた、というのは無理がある、③「万葉集」に詳しいなど守覚法親王の好みにあう、④「仁和寺法親王抄」という「覚」の一字を懸り書かないと尊敬の表現は、守覚に献じたものとしてふさわしい、⑤守覚の蔵書目録とされる『古蹟歌書目録』第一部に、「古来風体抄 二部 俊成入道撰 又二帖」の記事がある、の諸点がその論拠である。有力な想定としてよいであろう。（P.2.）


[On manuscripts of the Toshiyori zuinō]

仁和寺には二本以上の『俊頼篹成』が残されていたらしい。守覚法親王の蔵書目録である「古蹟歌書目録」第二十蔵部に、「俊頼篹成 一部 自筆 又一本 三巻」とある。つまり、該本はいまだ俊頼自筆本の存在していた時代における写本であるといえるのである。（Kaidai, p.15.）


[On the Ashita no shū 朝集]

あるいは前述した近年新出の『あしたのしこ』に関しても、守覚法親王の蔵書目録に「古蹟歌書目録」に「朝集 一部 未定等不可 又一部 朝集朝著者抄」とあり、おそらく両者は同一作品だろうから、確実にその成立が平安時代末期以前だったと論証できるだろう。（P.15.）

[On the poetry collection of Minamoto no Nakamasa]

今日においては散佚してしまっているが、源頼政の父仲正に、かつて複数の和歌作品が存していたことが『夫木抄』の出典注記によって知られる。・・・うち一首目の「家集」について『漢書書志』所載「古蹟歌書目録」中の「仲正集 一部 朝著者抄」との関連が注目されよう。（P.98.）