SINO-JAPANESE STUDIES

Volume 23 (2016), Article 2

http://chinajapan.org/articles/23/2

Persiani, Gian-Piero "China as Self, China as Other: On Ki no Tsurayuki's Use of the *wa-kan* Dichotomy" *Sino-Japanese Studies* 23 (2016), article 2.

Abstract: The article discusses Ki no Tsurayuki's strategic othering of "China" (*Kara*, *Morokoshi*) in order to theorize an independent "Yamato" cultural identity. It opens with an overview of the debate on the *wa-kan* issue in Japanese and Anglo-American scholarship and then moves on to explore Tsurayuki's use of the *wa-kan* dychotomy in such texts as the *Kokinshū* prefaces (905) and the *Tosa nikki* (935). Although Tsurayuki often appears to adopt a regionalist stance in his writings, I stress the strategic nature of these claims (his priority was to exalt his genre of choice, not to lambast Chinese forms), and argue against seeing the making of the *Kokinshū* as the beginning of a cultural move away from China. Rather, cases like Tsurayuki's point to the multiplicity of functions that *Kara* played within Heian culture. With remarkable pliability, Heian Japan's "China" was both unquestionably part of the Heian self and a convenient inner Other in opposition to which new personal, political, ethnic, and cultural identities could be fashioned.

Keywords: *wakan*, Sino-Japanese interaction, East Asia, Heian period, ethnicity, self-fashioning, Ki no Tsurayuki, *Kokinshū*

China as Self, China as Other: On Ki no Tsurayuki's Use of the *wa-kan* Dichotomy

Gian-Piero Persiani

For Japan, the pre-Nara, Nara, and Heian periods were times of frantic, large-scale cultural import from the continent. "Chinese" culture did not just completely revolutionize "native" culture, it became an integral part of it to the point that boundaries between "native" and "foreign" became all but impossible to draw. Yet, as is often the case, the encounter with the Other also ignited a process of self-reflection and self-definition whose effects on the culture of the archipelago were no less profound and far-reaching than the influx of Chinese culture itself. One can take the heated disputes between the Soga, Mononobe, and Nakatomi clans over the adoption of Buddhism as state creed in the sixth century as an early recorded manifestation of this process of self-building triggered by the influx of new, imported ideas.[1] Such debates mirror similar disputes in China (Abramson 2008: 52ff.; Zürcher 2007: 288ff.; Kohn 2000: 387-388), and are neither particularly rare nor unique to Japan. Chinese culture, in other words, once fully incorporated into the local milieu, served the twofold function of authoritative domain of culture and convenient inner Other in opposition to which new local identities (personal, ethnic, cultural, and political) could be negatively constructed. That is to say, transnational cross-fertilization and local self-building went hand in hand, and both must be recognized as essential aspects of the culture of early Japan.

Of the many intellectuals who, over the centuries, dealt with the "China"-"Japan" question, Ki no Tsurayuki 紀貫之 (d. 945?) is perhaps the one who has cast the longest shadow on Japanese cultural history. His contributions to the development of the "Japanese style" of writing (*wabun*), the diffusion of the phonetic script (*hiragana*) and the overall development of what came to be known as "*wa*" 和 culture are well known and need not be repeated. Yet his role as an intellectual grappling with China's twofold role as cultivated Self and inner Other has yet to be fully understood. Tsurayuki was a learned man and was

[1] *Nihon Shoki*, KT 1: 174; Aston 1896, 2: 66-67.

fully conscious of China's cultural magnitude. He also lived in a world where foreign and native, *kara* and *wa*, home grown and foreign-born were inextricably intermingled, and nothing in his writings suggests that he ever wished it to be otherwise. Yet, time and again in his writings, Tsurayuki employed the tropes of cultural difference and cultural incommensurability, which suggests that they had a place in his intellectual outlook and activity as a writer. The word employed is used advisedly here; Tsurayuki's pronouncements on these matters were not ideologically driven; he was a practical man and in his work ideas and concepts always served an agenda. Far from making them any less deserving of attention, however, the strategic nature of these remarks is what makes them uniquely significant both as a record of the cultural moment in which they were made and as a key to understanding it. While too openly Sinocentric to tolerate overt challenges to Sinitic cultural dominance, tenth-century Japanese culture was sufficiently capacious and heterogeneous to accommodate more circuitous ones, especially if paired to other, patently non-controversial claims. Examining Tsurayuki's strategic use of the *wa-kan* dichotomy (*wa* 和 = Yamato, Japan; *kan* 漢 = Han, China) may bring us closer to understanding how it was possible for "China" to be so unquestionably part of the Heian self while at the same time serving as external term of comparison to theorize an independent Yamato identity.

Approaches to the *wa-kan* question

In order to provide some context for the foregoing discussion of Tsurayuki's use of the *wa-kan* dichotomy, I will first offer a brief overview of the debate in Japanese and Anglo-American scholarship. The issue is currently one of the most hotly debated and it has been for some time. On the Anglo-American front alone, there have been full studies (Pollack 1986; LaMarre 2000; Sakaki 2006), more pointed interventions (Kamens 2007; Smits 2007; Denecke 2007), and comments within broader discussions (Lurie 2011; Denecke 2014; Duthie 2014; Clements 2015). Wixted (1998), Denecke (2007), and Kornicki (2010) have addressed important terminological issues. In Japan, the issue has been addressed by Kawaguchi (1981), Chino (1993; 1996), Nakajima (1999), Watanabe (2008), Kawazoe (2007, 2014), to name but a few notable examples. Historians have also made important

contributions, among them Nishimura (2002), Obara (2007), and, most recently, Nishimoto (2015).[2]

In Japan as elsewhere, the debate has developed in reaction to the account of Sino-Japanese cultural interaction popularized by Meiji-period and early to mid-twentieth century Japanese cultural historians. According to this account, the early focus on and admiration for Chinese forms (approximately 600-900 CE, with a peak in the early ninth century) gradually gave way to interest in Japan-centered forms, which eventually supplanted Chinese forms at/as the center of culture. This account configured Chinese culture as irreducibly foreign and never truly integrated in the native cultural milieu, and its alleged displacement from the tenth century onwards as a predictable and inevitable return to a condition of cultural and linguistic normality.[3] In recent years, this understanding has been universally rejected, although it retains some currency in school textbooks and other books for the non-specialist. The first step has been to state as plainly and unequivocally as possible that, in fact, *wa* never replaced *kara* and that *kara*, far from slowly fading from view, continued to thrive as a fundamental, if not the fundamental, element of Heian culture (Smits 2007). Another important move has been to acknowledge the huge debt that the so-called *kokufū* 国風 (native ways, native culture) owes to continental models, thus questioning its inherent "Japaneseness" (Watanabe 1991, 2008, 2014; Kawazoe 2007, 2014).

In the Anglo-American world, the critique of the earlier paradigm has taken bold, in some ways extreme, forms. In his pioneering 2000 study, Thomas LaMarre launched an all-out attack on the idea of a Sino-Japanese dichotomy in early culture. Moving from the assumption that categories like "Chinese" and "Japanese," "native" and "foreign," "us" and "them" did not emerge until the modern period, he proposed a view of the Heian period as a time of synthesis, rather than collision and conflict, of native and continental forms. In his view, texts like the *Man'yōshū* 万葉集 (Collection of Ten Thousand Leaves, ca. 759) and

[2] The list is partial and limited to items that either mention the term *wakan* explicitly or are particularly relevant to this discussion. The number of works that touch on the relationship between (originally) imported and native culture in some way or other is virtually infinite.
[3] See LaMarre (2000: 30-38) and Kawazoe (2007: 273-278) for references to specific works and authors.

the *Kokinshū* 古今集 (Collection of *Waka* Old and New, 905) are marked by an irreducible hybridity which makes it all but impossible to assign them to one or the other cultural sphere. To the narrative of negation and exclusion of what he calls the "national imagination," he opposed one of "confusion and conflation" (45) epitomized in the image of the rebus, a puzzle-like figure interpretable in many different but equally acceptable ways. LaMarre's iconoclastic views have found strong support, not least because they provide a refreshing alternative to the stifling essentialism of nineteenth and twentieth century accounts. Among the scholars who, more or less enthusiastically, have endorsed his views are Yoda (2004), Sakaki (2006), Kamens (2007), and Denecke (2007; 2014). In a review of Sakaki's book *Obsessions with the Sino-Japanese Polarity* (2006), Denecke faults Sakaki for not going far enough in the direction shown by LaMarre: "she creates an artificial divide between *kanbun* literature, which she claims was closely bound to direct and realistic experience of China, and *wabun* literature" (2007: 366).

On the whole, Japanese scholars have been less eager to do away with the idea of a *wa-kan* polarity altogether and more interested in exploring its multiple configurations. In a useful overview of the field written in 2008, the prominent comparatist Watanabe Hideo identified four areas of inquiry within *wa-kan* scholarship, which roughly correspond to the main areas in which research is being conducted in Japan today:

- *Kara* as model and inspiration for *Yamato* [influence]

- *Kara*-*Yamato* as distinct but complementary and often overlapping codes [juxtaposition, comparison, tension]

- The role of *Kara* music theory within *Yamato* poetics [synthesis]

- The Nipponization of *Kara* [domestication]

Watanabe himself has done significant work in at least several of these areas (2004, 2000, 1991), and although a detailed discussion of his work is beyond the scope of this brief overview, he can serve as an example of the variety of issues currently being dealt with in Japanese-language scholarship.

An influential voice in the debate on both sides of the Pacific has been that of art historian Chino Kaori (1993; 2003). Acknowledging the rise of a new (China-influenced)

Yamato culture in the tenth and eleventh centuries, Chino set out to explain not its displacement of *kara* but its coexistence with it. She proposed a view of the two as distinct but complementary codes with separate domains of efficacy, *kara* being the preferred code in official, formal contexts, and *wa* being the code of choice in the private sphere (1993: 5). An important concept in Chino's work is the idea of China-Within-Japan (*Wa ni okeru kan*), that is, China as it functioned culturally within the culture of the archipelago rather than Sinitic culture as such (2003). The idea has been developed by Kawazoe Fusae (2014), who distinguishes not one but several types of China-Within-Japan, including Japan-made "Chinese" culture (*wasei karamono*) and "Nipponized Chinese-culture" (*wayōka shita Kara*).

To sum up, Japanese scholars have not attempted to replace a totalizing paradigm (*wa* replaced and all but obliterated *kan*) with another (*wa* as coexisting and seamlessly interacting with *kan*). In her most recent book, Kawazoe denies that hybridity alone can account for all the different and contrasting configurations that Sino-Japanese interaction took through history:

> I used to be one of those who subscribed to this view [of *wa* and *kan* as an indivisible continuum]. But as I explored in more depth the reception of things Chinese in Japan, I grew increasingly dubious that we can encompass [the whole of] cultural history under this one overarching idea. Granted that in the Muromachi period the distance between "*Kara*-within-Japan" and "*Wa*-within-Japan" seems to have shrunk, one cannot just reduce the whole of cultural history to this single idea. (2014: 224)

The differences between English-language and Japanese-language scholarship stem in part from the different vantage points from which the two schools approach the issue. The Anglo-American debate has been spearheaded by modernists (LaMarre, Yoda, Sakaki) whose primary concern was to deconstruct what LaMarre dubs "the modern 'ethnolinguistic regime' of reading Heian texts" (2000: 7).[4] The theoretical foundation of their critique is the work of anthropologists and historians like Benedict Anderson and Eric

[4] I use the term "modernist" (and its correlate, "pre-modernist") as a convenient and necessarily approximate description of these scholars' main research interests, not to erect or uphold unhelpful boundaries between areas of specialization.

Hobsbawn, who view the nation, the national language, and ethnic purity as modern inventions, and because of their acceptance of this paradigm, they cannot but conclude that binarisms such as "Japanese" vs. "Chinese," native vs. foreign, and us vs. them can have no place in the study of antiquity.[5] By contrast, most scholars working on the *wa-kan* issue in Japan today are pre-modernists seeking a better understanding of their period of focus. Their point of departure is not a preconceived view of the past (that proposed by late twentieth-century Western historians and political scientists), but the sources themselves and what they say about early culture. While agreeing with the general thrust of LaMarre's argument, Atsuko Sakaki acknowledges that the dichotomy she is in principle opposed to is, in fact, in the sources:[6]

> Attempts to define given attributes as typically Japanese predate the Japanese search for cultural identity in the age of nationalism […]. Characters in fiction and theater frequently made statements such as, "This is how Japanese do this, unlike the Chinese," prior to the advent of nationalism. Whereas national territories were not delineated as they are in modern geography, the boundaries between the two "countries" were clearly drawn. I am not suggesting that there were essential entities that were distinct from each other as "Japan" and "China" (in fact I am opposed to that understanding), but I will reveal that, inconsistencies and inaccuracies notwithstanding, there was an obsession with contrasting what was Japanese from what was Chinese. (2006: 21-22)

Far from signifying adherence to an outdated, openly nationalistic understanding of the past, the reluctance among Japanese scholars to do away with the idea of a *wa-kan* dichotomy altogether is quite simply a matter of adherence to the sources. To give only one example, the historian Nishimura Satomi (2002: 299) quotes the preface of the *Nihon ryōiki* 日本霊異記 (Record of Miraculous Events in Japan, 822), in which the author Keikai 景戒 (no dates) comments on the geographical provenance of his source material, in order to

[5] The Heian world as imagined by LaMarre is very much the reverse image of the modern Japanese nation; whereas the modern Japanese nation imagines itself to be territorially stable, ethnically and culturally homogeneous, and linguistically monolingual, LaMarre's Heian Japan is territorially vague, ethnically and culturally heterogeneous, and linguistically diverse.

[6] LaMarre also concedes that "the binary schema was fundamental to the Heian imagination of order" (2000: 31), but for most of his book he seems to treat it as a modern fantasy.

show that the relation between local and imported knowledge was a concern for Japanese intellectuals as early as the early Heian period:

> Long ago in the land of the Han, the *Mingbaoji* [J. *Myōbōki*, Record of Invisible Karmic Retribution] was compiled and, during the great Tang, the *Bore yanji* (J. *Hannyagenki*, A Collection of Stories on the Diamond Sutra) was written. But why should we respect only these transmitted records of other countries and not believe the miraculous events that occur in our own land? Having seen them happen with my own eyes, I cannot hesitate; having pondered long and hard, I cannot remain silent. Thus in order to pass them on to future generations, I have collected them into three volumes, and entitled them *Record of Miraculous Events of Karmic Retribution of Japan.* (SNKBT 30: 201-202)
>
> 昔漢地造冥報記、大唐国作般若験記、 何唯慎乎他国伝録、弗信恐乎自土奇事。粤起目矚之、不得忍寝、 居心思之、不能黙然、故聊注側聞、号曰日本国現報善悪 霊異記、作上中下参巻 、以流季葉

As early as the early ninth century, therefore, the relationship between foreign and local, native and continental, here and there was an item on the agenda of Japanese intellectuals, and it is fair to say that it remained such for the next one thousand years of Japanese cultural history (Pollack 1986; Sakaki 2006). Indeed, it is likely that as more work on early sources gets done, it will be our view that intercultural tensions based on ethnic and cultural differences are an exclusively modern phenomenon that will need to be modified, not vice versa.[7]

It may be a cliché to say so, but there is some truth in all the different positions outlined above. It is certainly true that what Japanese scholars sometimes refer to as *Kara-fū* 唐風 (Chinese-style culture) did not simply give way to *kokufū* 国風 (native culture), not in the tenth century, not ever. But it is just as undisputable that a *wa* formally, conceptually, and functionally distinct from *kara* (although clearly greatly influenced by it) became an increasingly powerful cultural force from the tenth century onwards. The

[7] The view that nationalism is a purely modern phenomenon has recently begun to be challenged from multiple fronts. For a thorough critique in the context of European history, see Hirschi 2011. Bruce Batten's brilliant work on early ethnicity (2003: 90ff.) shows that modern Japanese nationalism did not emerge *ex nihilo* in the modern period but developed from forms of ethnic community and ethnocentric thinking dating from as far back as 700 C.E. See also Yoshida 1997: 192-197.

availability of two languages, multiple scripts and writing styles certainly allowed for areas of synthesis and cross-fertilization, but there was also friction, and boundaries were not always (if ever) as porous and volatile as they are sometimes said to have been. The way out of this morass may be to adopt a capacious view of the *wa-kan* issue that allow for multiple different attitudes at the same time. Rather than replacing the earlier narrative of displacement (from *kara* to *wa*) with an equally totalizing one of radical hybridity (*kara* and *wa* as an indivisible continuum), it may be more fruitful to acknowledge that different configurations of the two emerged at different times for different reasons. Exclusion, hybridization, hierarchization, and functional division all had a place in the complex, dynamic world of Heian culture, and if we are to do justice to all of these cultural processes, we need to give up the idea of a single, valid-for-all theory. The remainder of this paper will explore one of these processes (Tsurayuki's strategic othering of *kara* to define and exalt *wa*) without implying that it was the only one.

Tsurayuki's life and works

Far more is known about Tsurayuki's literary achievements than about his life. He was born around 872, the son of Ki no Mochiyuki 紀茂行 (no dates), a mid-ranking bureaucrat. His clan, the Ki, had once been powerful, but by this time it had become one of the many once illustrious aristocratic clans to have lost the battle for political supremacy to the Fujiwara. Although his writings reveal an intimate knowledge of Chinese sources and during his life he held several positions that required advanced knowledge of literary Chinese, nothing is known about his studies of Chinese. If he did attend the imperial university, as it is likely, he almost certainly majored in the literary *kidendō* (history and literature) rather than in any of the other disciplines on offer at the time (Mezaki 1961: 51). He no doubt could compose Chinese poems (*shi* 詩 or *kanshi* 漢詩), but none of his Chinese compositions survives. It is from *waka* that Tsurayuki derived his successes, and it is as a *waka* poet that he was and still is primarily known. In the 890s, he participated in a number of high-profile poetry contests such as the "Koresada no miko no ie no uta-awase" 是貞親王家歌合 (Poetry Contest at the Residence of Prince Koresada, 892) and the

"Kampyō no ontoki kisai no miya no uta-awase" 寛平御時后宮歌合 (Poetry Contest at the residence of the Kampyō-era Empress, 893), and, together with fellow poets Fujiwara no Toshiyuki 藤原敏行 (?-907?), Fujiwara no Okikaze 藤原興風 (no dates), Ōshikōchi no Mitsune 凡河内 躬恒 (859-925), and Ise 伊勢 (c. 875-c.938), he defined the canons of what is now known as the *Kokinshū* style.[8] In the early years of the tenth century he was one of the four compilers of the *Kokinshū*, the first imperially-commissioned *waka* anthology. The *Kokinshū* turned him into a veritable literary star; he was a regular guest at all major court poetry events and was by far the most highly sought-after purveyor to the elite of screen poems (*byōbu-uta* 屏風歌), a popular subgenre at the time (Mezaki 1961: 110). He was also frequently asked to compose poems on behalf of elite figures (a practice known as *daisaku* 代作), an honor that suggests his standing in the literary world (Fujioka 1966). Around 930, emperor Daigo (r. 897-930) ordered him to compile an abridged version of the *Kokinshū*—the *Shinsen waka* 新選和歌 (Newly-edited *waka*)—which he only completed after Daigo's death in 930. Despite these remarkable literary achievements, his career in the government did not take off the way he may have wished. After serving for some years as Junior Secretary (*shōnaiki* 小内記) and then as Senior Secretary (*dainaiki* 大内記) at court, he held various provincial posts, notably that of governor of Tosa (present-day Kōchi prefecture) between 930 and 934. His account of his return journey from Tosa to the capital, the *Tosa Diary* (*Tosa nikki* 土佐日記, 935), is famous as the earliest prose work to be written entirely in *kana*. He died rather inaudibly around 945, not as famous and celebrated as he no doubt would have wished.

Theorizing native culture in the *Kokinshū* prefaces

The most thorough and articulate formulation of Tsurayuki's views on the *wa-kan* question can be found in the two prefaces (one in Japanese and one in Chinese) to the *Kokinshū*. Although the Japanese preface (*kana-jo*) does not bear the author's name, it is traditionally

[8] On the *Kokinshū* style, see Konishi 1978.

attributed to Tsurayuki and there are no sound reasons to doubt the attribution. The Chinese-language preface (*mana-jo*) was authored by Tsurayuki's adopted son, Ki no Yoshimochi 紀淑望 (d. ca. 917), and save for some relatively minor discrepancies, it covers much the same ground as the Japanese preface.[9] Opinions vary as to which of the two texts was written first and served as a model for the other (Wixted 1983: 225-228; Kudō 2004: 146-148), but given Tsurayuki's leading role in the *Kokinshū* project and his close relationship to Yoshimochi, the likelihood of him having been involved in the writing of both texts—indeed, of him having been the only real driving force behind them—is very high indeed.

As duly noted by scholars like Wixted (1983) and Watanabe (2000), the Prefaces make abundant use of Chinese sources and ideas to mount a forceful defence of Japanese poetry. Notable influences include the "Great Preface" to the *Shijing* 詩経 (J. *Shikyō*, Classic of Poetry, also known in Japan as *Mōshi*), the preface to the *Wenxuan* 文選 (J. *Monzen*, Literary Selections, ca. 520), the "Yueji" (Music) section of the *Liji* 禮記(J. *Reiki*, Book of Rites), the "Lun wen" 論文 (Essay on Literature) by Cao Pi 曹丕 (187-226) and the *Shipin* 詩品 (Poetry Gradings) by Zhong Rong 鍾嶸 (468-518), among others (Wixted 1983: 217-221). While drawing on Chinese ideas and models for precedents, however, Tsurayuki also introduced what can only be described as elements of ambivalence toward or resistance to Sinitic culture and *shi* in particular. The most unequivocal of these appears in the portion of the *mana* preface that deals with the early history of *waka*:

> Since Prince Ōtsu [late 7th c.] first composed *shi* poems and rhyme-prose, poets and men of talent have admired these practices and followed in his wake. The introduction of the Chinese writing system modified the customs of our land. The ways of the people were changed and *waka* gradually declined.[10] (NKBZ 7: 416)

[9] Interestingly, the differences happen to concern primarily the way Chinese sources and references to China and Chinese culture are dealt with. With its reliance on local imagery and phrases from ancient poems, the *kana* preface seems to have been designed to flaunt its "Japaneseness" and to deliberately avoid explicit mentions of and comparisons with China, which abound instead in the *mana* preface. See also footnote no. 8.

[10] All translations are mine unless otherwise noted.

> 自大津皇子之初作詩賦。詞人才子。慕風継塵。移彼漢家之字。化我日域之俗。民業一改。和歌漸衰。

That the understanding of literary history presented here is less than accurate is beside the point; the indictment of the fad for composing *shi* as the main cause of the decline of *waka* is as unequivocal as it is complete. It is the introduction of the Chinese script and the popularity of poetry in Chinese, we are told, that caused a change in the native ways and the decline of *waka*.

Another, more subtle attempt to present *shi* and *waka* in oppositional terms is made in the following passage of the *mana* preface:[11]

> After this point, the only people to acquire fame at all have been *waka* poets. That is because the diction is familiar to the ear and the meaning reaches up to the Gods. (NKBZ 7: 418)
>
> 適為後世被知者、唯和歌之人而已。何者。語近人耳。義慣神明也。

Two distinct claims are made here. The first is that *waka* can be easily understood when recited or read aloud. The phrase *jin ren er* (J. *hito no mimi ni chikashi*) means "familiar to the ear," that is, comprehensible without the mediation of a written text or the aid of dictionaries and glosses. Although *shi* poetry is not mentioned explicitly, there is an implicit comparison between *waka* and genres that were accessed primarily through texts and required advanced literacy to be understood and appreciated. The second claim is that *waka* possesses some sort of special connection with the divine realm. This is an idea which can be found, for instance, in the eighth-century *Kakyō hyōshiki* 歌経標式 (The Code of Poetry, 772) by Fujiwara no Hamanari 藤原浜成 (724-790).[12]

[11] It is a problem worth exploring that the most direct "*pro*" *waka* and "*anti*" *shi* arguments are made in the *mana* preface rather than the *kana* preface. A possible explanation may be that Tsurayuki viewed the Japanese-language preface as a purely Japanese space, and thus deliberately avoided mentions of and comparisons with Chinese culture and *shi* in particular.

[12] The idea is also of Chinese origin and it originally applied to music; see Watanabe (2004: 16).

The most direct precedent for both claims is the often-cited *chōka* (long poem) that the monks of the Kōfukuji temple in Nara presented to emperor Ninmyō 仁明 (r. 833-850) in 849 on the occasion of the celebrations for his fortieth birthday. Here the authors flaunt the native origins of the language of the poem and its connections to the indigenous *kami*:

> [...]
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | *Ōmiyo o* | We pray that your august reign |
> | *Yorozuyo inori* | may continue for ages innumerable, |
> | *Hotoke ni mo* | to the Buddhas |
> | *Kami ni mo* | and the Gods |
> | *mōshiageru* | humbly we direct our prayer; |
> | *Koto no kotoba wa* | the words of our poem |
> | *Kono kuni no* | are but from one source, |
> | *Moto tsu kotoba ni* | the native words |
> | *Oiyorite* | of this country; |
> | *Morokoshi no* | we have not borrowed |
> | *Kotoba o karazu* | words from Cathay; |
> | *Fumi shirusu* | we have not sought the help |
> | *Hakase yatowazu* | of professors of belles lettres. |
> | *Kono kuni no* | As it has long been told |
> | *Iitsutauraku* | in these lands, |
> | *Hi no moto no* | the country of Yamato, |
> | *Yamato no kuni wa* | land of the rising sun, |
> | *Kotodama no* | is the country where words are filled |
> | *Sakiwau kuni to zo* | with wondrous powers; |
> | *Furugoto ni* | they have flowed down to us |
> | *Nagarekitareru* | in the legends of old, |
> | *Kamugoto ni* | they have been passed down to us |
> | *Tsutaekitareru* | in the words of the Gods." |
>
> [...]
> (KT 3: 224-225)
>
> 大御世乎。 萬代祈利。 佛尓毛。 神尓毛。 申上流。 事之詞波。 此國乃。 本詞尓。 逐倚天。 唐之詞乎不レ借良須。 書記須。 博士不レ雇須。 此國乃。 云傳布良久。 日本乃。 倭之國波。 言玉乃。 幸國度曾。 古語尓。 流來礼留。 神語尓。 傳来礼留。

By emphasizing that the poem was written entirely in "the native words of this country" (*ko no kuni moto tsu kotoba*) without resorting to Chinese words (*Kara no kotoba o karazu*) or

the help of professional scholars of Chinese, the authors load with polemical vitriol their choice to craft the poem in Japanese. In the closing lines, the belief that the native words have the power to bring about a desired effect (a belief known as *kotodama*) is expounded, presumably as the rationale for choosing to craft the poem in Japanese in the first place.[13] In a comment appearing immediately after the poem in the *Shoku Nihon kōki* 続日本後紀 (Later Chronicle of Japan, Continued, 869), the compiler (probably Fujiwara no Yoshifusa 藤原良房, 804-872) makes the assertion that nothing can move people's hearts quite as *waka* can:

> As to the form of Japanese poetry, metaphor comes before all else. And in terms of moving people's hearts, nothing surpasses it. As the world falls into decline, this noble tradition has declined, to the point that only some among the clergy now know the old words (*furukoto*). When an epoch loses sight of ritual, one must seek it in the meadows of the country. For this reason, the poem has been included here. (KT 3: 224-5)
>
> 夫倭歌之體。比興爲先。感動人情。最在茲矣。季世陵遲。斯道已墜。今至僧中。頗存古語。可謂禮失則求之於野。故採而載之。

Again, Chinese poetry is not mentioned explicitly, but by stressing what is unique to *waka* and what *waka* can do best, the author clearly means to imply that other forms do not possess such qualities. When the poem and the ensuing comment are read together, the impression that native poetry and Sinitic culture are being pitted against one another is very strong indeed.

Tsurayuki takes one final lunge at *shi* poetry in his discussion of the "Six styles" (*rikugi* or *mutsu no sama*) of Japanese poetry. He is fully aware that the six styles he enumerates are nothing but a Japanese adaptation of the "Six Principles" (*liuyi* 六義, J. *rikugi*) of Chinese poetics, but, feigning ignorance, he notes: "There are six styles in the *uta* and so there are, apparently, in the *shi* of China" (NKBZ 7: 51). As Gerlini aptly notes (2014: 108-9), Tsurayuki first appropriates Chinese poetic theory for his own purposes, and

[13] The poem and the role of *kotodama* in early poetry are discussed in Pekarik 1983: 108ff.

then discounts its importance by assuming an air of ignorance or, at best, haughty indifference.

So while co-opting China and its hallowed literary tradition as an authoritative precedent and model for his defense of *waka*, Tsurayuki does not refrain from lamenting the negative effects that the adoption of Chinese models had on the culture of "our country," nor from enumerating the respects in which *waka* was, in his opinion, superior to Chinese poetry. One must be careful, however, not to misinterpret these statements as an attempt to set up a genuine binarism between the two traditions. Tsurayuki here acts in the manner of the intellectual omnivore who utilizes whatever one can find to bolster one's cause without much regard for coherence. The very nature of the *Kokinshū* as an imperially-sponsored anthology of the (up to that point) non-canonical *waka* required such intellectual flexibility. The *Kokinshū* brought together the worlds of authoritative state literature and what was still then perceived as popular (in the sense of informal and unofficial) verse; the well-established and the emerging; given the circumstances, it is not surprising that two different logics and two distinct sets of values (China's glorious literary tradition and "regionalist" claims about *waka*'s uniqueness and greater cultural intimacy) were called upon simultaneously in articulating a defence of such a project. It is also worth stressing that Tsurayuki's primary aim here is not to wage a war against Chinese culture but to affirm the value of *waka*; his use of the native-continental dichotomy, in other words, is first and foremost a means to an end and it is as such that it should be read.

The *Kokinshū* as the Beginning of a Native Canon?

Though the pronouncements discussed so far are rather self-explanatory, it is important to consider the context in which they were made and avoid equating them with the *Kokinshū* as a whole, or, worse, with the directions of culture in general. Older accounts of the Heian period in textbooks and literary histories tend to present the making of the *Kokinshū* as the beginning of a new age of focus on "native culture" (*kokufū bunka*) after centuries of dependence on Chinese models. As noted earlier, this account has been universally refuted, and can be readily dismissed as flawed. The *Kokinshū* was not in any way, nor should it be

read as, a manifesto *pro* vernacular literature and *against* literature in Chinese. Anti-*shi* arguments are made in the Prefaces, as we have seen, but primarily as rhetorical expedients to affirm the value of *waka*. In order to correctly position the *Kokinshū* within the cultural milieu of the time, it is necessary to consider not only the views of Tsurayuki and the rest of the compilers but those of emperor Daigo, who first commissioned the anthology and later affixed the imperial seal to it. What was Daigo's attitude toward vernacular poetry?

The *Kokinshū* prefaces go to great lengths to emphasize Daigo's role as both the original architect and the final recipient of the work. The Confucian idea that the sage king cherishes old customs and revives extinct practices is presented as Daigo's primary motivation for commissioning the compilation of the anthology:[14]

> In the rare moments of respite from official duty, ever desirous to lend his support to all endeavors bar none, eager not to forget the old customs, to see the old ways thrive today under his protection, and in order to transmit them to posterity, [Our Sovereign] ordered the Senior Secretary Ki no Tomonori, the Clerk of the Imperial Library Ki no Tsurayuki, the former Vice Clerk of Kai Ōshikōchi no Mitsune, and the Junior Captain of the Palace Guards of the Right Mibu no Tadamine to present to him [a collection of] old poems not included in the *Man'yōshū* and some of their own poems. (NKBZ 7: 60).
>
> 万の政をきこしめす暇、もろもろのことを捨て給はぬあまりに、古のことをも忘れじ、古りにしことをも興し給ふとて、今も見そなはし、後の世にも伝はれとて、延喜五年四月十八日に大内記紀友則、御書所預紀貫之、前甲斐少目官凡河内躬恒、右衛門府生壬生忠岑らに仰せられて、『万葉集』に入らぬ古き歌、みづからのをも奉らしめ給ひてなむ。

In other sections of the Prefaces, the idea that literature benefits government (known as *monjō keikoku shisō* 文章経国思想 in Japanese) is put forth, and the imperial support of *waka* is presented as an emanation and symbol of Daigo's wisdom and magnificence as a ruler.[15]

---

[14] The idea appears in various sources including the *Analects* and the *Book of Rites*. See, Watanabe 2000: 5-6.

[15] On *monjō keikoku shisō*, see Fujiwara 1980. Tsurayuki consistently presented this orthodox view of imperial patronage in different works throughout his life. It is expressed in the "Preface to Poems at Ōi River Imperial Progress" (*Ōikawa gyōkō waka-jo* 大井川行幸和歌序, 907) and, later, in the Preface to

Commentators of these passages tend to assume one of two stances. Some regard them as a reliable indicator of Daigo's attitude toward *waka* and thus view the making of the *Kokinshū* as evidence of *waka*'s acceptance into the ranks of state literature (Watanabe 2000; Heldt 2008). On the other side are the "skeptics" (Kudō 1993, 2004; Takikawa 2004), who view these statements as mere rhetorical expedients to assert the importance of *waka* and do not consider them a reliable record of contemporary attitudes toward *waka* among the elite. Kudō Shigenori (2004: 167) calls the prefaces "strategic texts" (*senryakuteki bunshō*) and argues that, despite claims to the contrary in the Prefaces, "from a Confucian standpoint, *waka* was devoid of value" (1993: 118). Takikawa compares Daigo's on the whole rather timid patronage of *waka* with the much more vigorous and enthusiastic one of his father Uda (r. 887-897), and concludes that "Daigo was probably apathetic to the idea of elevating *waka* to the public sphere" (2004: 161).

There could be no clearer indicator of Daigo's still ambivalent attitude toward *waka* than the lack of poems by him in the anthology. Indeed, one of the most striking differences between the *Kokinshū* and the three imperial collections of *kanshi* compiled in the early ninth century is that whereas the former contain a substantial number of poems by emperors,[16] starting with Saga 嵯峨 (r. 809-823), the *Kokinshū* contains only two.[17] The *Gosenshū* 後撰集 (Later Collection of Waka, 951), the second of the imperial *waka* anthologies, also contains very few poems by emperors. The first *waka chokusenshū* to feature poems by emperors in any significant numbers is the *Shūiwakashū* 拾遺和歌集 (Collection of Gleanings of *waka* Poems, c. 1005), the third of the official *waka* anthologies, which was compiled a full one hundred years after the *Kokinshū*. In discussing the most representative poets of the past in the Preface, the compilers state that poets of high rank were not mentioned out of deference for their station and it is conceivable that the

---

the *Shinsen waka* 新選和歌 (Newly Selected *waka*, 930).

[16] The three *kanshi* anthologies are the *Ryōunshū* 凌雲集 (Collection of Wandering Clouds, 814), the *Bunka shūreishū* 文華秀麗集 (Collection of Masterpieces of Literary Flowers, 818), and the *Keikokushū* 経国集 (Collection for Governing the Realm, 827). For details on the authorship of the poems, see McCullough 1985: 160.

[17] Both (nos. 21 and 347) are by Daigo's grandfather, Kōkō 光孝 (r. 884-887).

same policy was followed in selecting the poems to include.[18] However, this explanation raises more questions than it answers: why was it acceptable or desirable to feature poems by emperors and other senior figures in an anthology of *shi* and not so in a *waka* anthology? It is hard to think of better evidence of the still ambivalent attitude toward *waka* among the elite than this reluctance to be too directly associated with it.[19] So even if Daigo was generally sympathetic to the idea of producing an imperial anthology of *waka*, it would be an exaggeration to assert that his role in the project was more than that of passive, at best tepidly supportive, bystander. The reasons were cultural rather than personal; despite significant steps forward in terms of both prestige and popularity between the mid-ninth and early-tenth centuries, the cultural milieu simply had not changed to the point that a sovereign could openly embrace *waka*—a genre up to this point considered minor, if not plainly disreputable—as a form of state art on a par with *shi*.

Sixty years after the compilation of the *Kokinshū*, emperor Murakami 村上 (r. 946-967) found himself in a similar predicament when he hosted the famous "Tentoku yo'nen dairi utaawase" 天徳四年内裏歌合 (Poetry Contest at the Palace of the Fourth Year of Tentoku, 960), the most lavish and historically most influential of all tenth-century poetry contests. Although he formally hosted the event in his private quarters, the Seiryōden hall of the palace, in his diary he felt it necessary to justify his conduct as follows:

> 3.30.Tentoku 4. Yin Earth Snake. The women's poetry contest was held on this day. In the autumn of last year, in the Eighth Month, the courtiers with access to imperial presence battled in a competition of Chinese poetry. At that time, the Assistant Handmaid, the Palace Lady and other members of staff said: "Men have had their competition of literary Chinese; women must have their own match of *waka* […] (NKBT 74: 88)
>
> 天徳四年三月卅日己巳、此日有二女房歌合事一。去年秋八月、殿上侍臣闘レ詩。爾時、典侍命婦等相語曰「男己闘二文章一。女宜レ合二和歌一。

[18] NKBZ 7: 57.

[19] Had elite figures wanted a more prominent role in the anthology, it would have been easily within their powers to obtain it.

By referring to the event as the "women's poetry contest" (*nyōbō uta-awase*) and by specifying that it was hosted to comply with a request from female members of his staff, Murakami minimizes his own role in the staging of the event. As some critics have noted, this may have been simply a stratagem to forestall possible future criticism for having indulged in idle pastimes (Bundy 2007: 36-37), but the fact that Murakami deemed such a proviso necessary is significant; if still in 960 an emperor had to be cautious in openly presenting himself as a patron of *waka*, it is difficult to imagine that one could have done so in 905.

It is because of the ultimate lack of evidence of Daigo's personal commitment to the making of an imperial anthology of *waka* that scholars have looked at other figures as possible primary sponsors of the anthology. The name cited most frequently is that of Fujiwara no Tokihira (871-909), the leader of the powerful Northern branch of the Fujiwara family and Minister of the Left under Daigo (McCullough1985: 294-295; Murase, 1981: 138). That Tokihira was committed to promoting *waka* as a form of court poetry can be seen from his role in such events as the "Wisteria-hall banquet" (*Fujitsubo no en*) of 902, which he hosted in the living quarters of his daughter Yasuko (Heldt 2008: 136-138). As Gustav Heldt notes, the Fujiwara had much to gain from *waka*'s return to court circles. Since at least the times of Yoshifusa (mid-9th century), they had worked tirelessly to "establish a distinctly Yamato mode of state literature" as a means to "legitimize the Fujiwara household as an alternate center of ritual authority" (Heldt, 2008: 63-64). *Waka* lent itself well to such use because, unlike *kanbun*, it traditionally lied outside the domain of state-sponsored literature and had less obvious ties with both the *ritsuryō* concept of state and imperial power.

Overall, the claim that the compilation of the *Kokinshū* marks the beginning of a new "native" canon is problematic on several levels. Firstly, the emperor's commitment to such a program is far from easy to demonstrate. Secondly, the compilers' self-interest as *waka* poets engaged in the struggle for recognition needs to be taken into account. Tsurayuki and the rest of the compilers were certainly committed to the advancement of *waka*, but whether this reflects a commitment to a regionalist agenda or rather their personal stakes as ambitious *waka* poets remains to be determined.

After the Kokinshū

Tsurayuki returned to the question of linguistic difference and cultural incommensurability in the *Tosa nikki*, his account of his journey back to the capital at the end of his mandate as governor of Tosa. In recollecting about Abe no Nakamaro 阿部仲麻呂 (c. 698-c. 770), a Japanese functionary who had travelled to China in the early eighth century and had spent the rest of his life there despite several attempts to return home, the narrator describes Nakamaro's last moments on Tang soil on the eve of his departure for home as follows:

> On the night of the twentieth, the moon was shining. There being no mountains nearby the moon rose from the sea. Was that what Abe no Nakamaro saw, when having travelled to China, he was about to head back? As he prepared to board the ship, the people of that country held a farewell party, and lamenting their imminent separation, they composed their local Chinese-style poems. Saying goodbye must have been too much to bear, so he stayed until moonrise on the night of the twentieth. The moon rose from the sea and, upon seeing it, Lord Nakamaro composed a poem, which he presented saying: "In my country, this kind of poems have been composed since the age of the Gods. Nowadays people of all social ranks compose them when lamenting someone's departure, or to express joy or sadness."
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | *Aounabara* | When I cast my gaze |
> | *furisakemireba* | upon the wide blue ocean, |
> | *Kasuga naru* | the moon is the very one |
> | *Mikasa no yama ni* | that rose from Mount Mikasa |
> | *ideshi tsuki kamo* | in Kasuga, so long ago. |
>
> Although he knew that the people of that country would not understand it, he wrote down the essence of the poem in the masculine script and explained the meaning to someone who knew our language, and they must have understood it because, rather surprisingly, they praised it most highly. The languages of China and of our country are different, but maybe because the moon looks the same in both places, the way people feel on looking at it is also the same. (NKBZ 9: 17-18)

> 廿日の夜の月出でにけり。山の端もなくて、海の中よりぞ出で来る。かうやうなるを見てや、昔、阿部の仲麻呂といひける人は、唐土に渡りて、帰り来ける時に、船に乗るべき所にて、かの国人、馬のはなむけし、別れ惜しみて、かしこの唐歌作りなどしける。飽かずやありけむ、廿日の夜の月出づるまでぞありける。その月は海よりぞ出でける。これを見てぞ、仲麻呂の主、「我が国にかゝる歌をなむ、神代より神も詠ん給び、今は上中下の人も、かうやうに別れ惜しみ、喜びもあり、悲しびもある時には詠む」とて、詠めりける歌、
> 青海原振り放け見れば春日なる三笠の山に出でし月かも
> とぞ詠めりける。かの国人、聞き知るまじく思ほへたれども、言の心を、男文字に様を書き出だして、こゝの言葉伝へたる人に言ひ知らせければ、心をや聞き得たりけむ、いと思ひの外になむ賞でける。唐土とこの国とは、言異なるものなれど、月の影は同じことなるべければ、人の心も同じことにやあらむ。

Though unlikely to be anything more than a fictional re-imagining of Nakamaro's experience, the account shows that Tsurayuki continued to utilize the *topoi* of linguistic difference and cultural incommensurability late in his writings. In order to make his poem comprehensible to the local audience, Nakamaro is said to have rendered the "essence of the poem" (*koto no kokoro*) in some form of written Chinese, but something is inevitably lost. Although the scene ends reassuringly with the assertion that the heart of people is one and the same despite geographic and language barriers, one comes away from it with the distinct impression that language can indeed be a formidable barrier and that intercultural communication is difficult and often only partially successful.[20]

Though Tsurayuki's opinions on the matter seem to have remained constant throughout his life, the world had changed much in the thirty years or so between the compilation of the *Kokinshū* and the writing of the *Tosa nikki*, and the whole cultural milieu now seemed to be moving toward greater attention to local problems and locally-produced answers. A glance at the titles of works written or compiled during the first half of the tenth century, for instance, reveals that a surprisingly high number of them feature

[20] For two very different treatments of the same passage, see Lurie (2011: 327-328) and Sakaki (2006: 23-26).

the word "Japan" (in its various forms). The list includes the *Honsō wamyō* 本草和名 (Japanese Names of Medicinal Plants, ca. 923) by Fukane Sukehito 深根輔仁 (898-922), the *Wamyō ruijūshō* 和名類聚抄 (Japanese Words by Category, ca. 931-938) by Minamoto no Shitagō 源順 (911-983), the *Nikkanshū* 日観集 (Japan's Literary Florilegium, ca. 945) by Ōe no Koretoki 大江維時 (888-963), the *Wachū setsuin* 倭注切韻 (*Qieyun* with Japanese Annotations, preface dated 939) by Ōe no Asatsuna 大江朝綱 (886-957), the *Yamato monogatari* 大和物語 (Tales of Yamato, ca. 951), and the now lost *Shinkokushi* 新国史 (A New History of the Realm, mid-10th c.)[21] Slightly earlier, we have the *Nihonkoku genzaisho mokuroku* 日本国見在書目録 (Index of Books Currently in Japan, 891) by Fujiwara no Sukeyo 藤原佐世 (847-897), the *Nihon sandai jitsuroku* 日本三代実録 (True Record of Three Japanese Reigns, 901), and, slightly later, Yoshishige no Yasutane 慶滋保胤's *Nihon ōjōgokuraku-ki* 日本往生極楽記 (Biographies of People who Attained Rebirth in the Pure Land, 985). Commenting on the surge of works focusing on Japan in the tenth and eleventh centuries, the prominent Sinologist Kawaguchi Hisao 河口久雄 (1981: 202) called this period a time of increased "Japanese self-consciousness" (*honchō ishiki* 本朝意識), for want of a better translation. The idea has since been explored by Obara (2007), Enomoto (2008), and, most recently, Nishimoto (2015).[22]

[21] *Nikkan* (literally, "Sun-view") is the Japanese reading of Riguan, the name of the southeastern peak of Mount Tai which was known for its associations with sunrise and sun worship. Koretoki uses it here as an appellation for Japan. See Kawaguchi (1981: 202) and Kitayama (2003: 25).

[22] This heightened sense of self-worth (often incorrectly described as a cultural "inward turn") was largely an effect of developments outside Japan (Nishijima 2000, Enomoto 2008). The fall of Tang in 907 led not only to the dissolution of many of the old polities (Silla and Balhae in 926) but to the emergence of new ones with much clearer ethnic identities (the Khitan empire in the north, Vietnamese independence in the south, Kŏryo's unification of Korea). At the international level, there was a complete reorganization of diplomatic and tributary relations between states, as the old, roughly centralized system of Tang times was supplanted by what Yuan-kang Wang (2013: 207) describes as "a multistate system without a regional hegemon;" see also Hirose (2011). The simultaneous emergence in various parts of East Asia of a number of new, sinographically-inspired scripts (Tangut, Khitan, Western Xia, and the *kana*) is often cited as a symptom of this process (Nishijima 2000: 169-170; Yoshida 1997: 192-193).

The *Nikkanshū* is a now lost anthology of poems in Chinese by Japanese poets. In the preface, the compiler Koretoki describes the predicament faced by tenth-century Japanese poets of *shi*:

> It is the custom of the ordinary person to value what comes from afar and pay no attention to what is close at hand, but to cover one's ears and ignore the obvious is not the proper demeanor of the wise person. To gaze at green mountains or to look at the waves: are not these actions both equally elegant? To listen to the sounds of music and to admire smoke and mist on a painting are one and the same thing. In this country, we go to great lengths to recite the work of Chinese poets, but we do not have the slightest consideration for the fine writing that we produce. Although the leaves of words grow thickly, they just lie there gathering dust—what a truly lamentable state of affairs! (KT 29: 7)
>
> 夫貴遠賤近、是俗人之常情、閉聰掩明、非賢哲之雅操、望青山而對白浪、何異風流、聞絲竹以賞煙霞、既同聲色、我朝遙尋漢家之謠詠、不事日域之文章、草稾滋生、塵埃空積、寔可重心咨歎者也、

Even the most acclaimed of the Chinese-style literati, therefore, seem to have been growing increasingly conscious that their stage as writers was primarily a local one.[23] East Asia may have been a transnational community united by a shared idiom and common beliefs and institutions, but in practice local contexts retained their strong grip on their members, in Japan as in the other peripheries of the East Asian world.

One event that captures especially well the shift in the cultural landscape is the journey to China of priest Kanken 寛建 (no dates). In 926 (Enchō 4), Kanken of the Kōfukuji temple in Nara petitioned the throne to obtain permission to travel to China to visit the monasteries of Mount Wutai. He asked to be given copies of works by various prominent Japanese literati including Sugawara no Michizane 菅原道真 (845-903), Ki no Haseo 紀長谷雄 (845-912), Tachibana no Hiromi 橘広相 (837-890) and Miyako no Yoshika 都良香 (834-879). Daigo granted his request, and added to the list the works of

[23] Koretoki came from a prominent family of Confucian literati. After receiving his Literature doctorate in 929, he held many of the court's most prestigious offices for a professional *bunjin*, including those of Head of the Imperial University and Tutor to the Crown Prince.

the eminent calligrapher Ono no Michikaze 小野道風 (or Tōfū, 894-966) with the order to circulate them in China.[24] As Wang Yong 王勇 (Wang and Kuboki 2001: 245) has noted, Kanken's journey represents the first attempt in history to export Japan-made cultural artefacts to the Asian mainland, thus reversing the traditional flow of information between China and Japan.[25] It may well be, as is often suggested, that the demise of Tang in 907 encouraged Japanese leaders and intellectuals to take a more assertive role in their cultural dealings with the continent. However, it is important not to see this surge of interest in Japan and Japan-made culture simply and simplistically as a move away from Sinitic culture. Originally "Chinese" culture was now fully and unquestionably part of "Japanese" culture, and it remained so for the rest of the Heian period and beyond. What these developments point to is rather the plurality of functions that "China" played within early Japanese culture. To reiterate: while continuing to thrive as the most prestigious and authoritative domain of Heian culture, *Kara* also served as a convenient, inner Other in opposition to which new personal, cultural, and political identities could be fashioned. With remarkable pliability, Heian Japan's "China" was both inside and outside Heian culture, both essential part of the cultural fabric and outside of it.

[24] *Fusō ryakki* 扶桑略記, 5.21.Enchō 4; KS 12: 197.

[25] Texts produced in Japan had been circulated in China before, but only in the context of Buddhist learning and independently from the state. See, Kornicki (2010: 34-35); Kornicki (1998: 306-308).

Works cited

(The following abbreviations have been used for primary sources:)

KT *(Shintei zōhō) Kokushi Taikei* 新訂増補国史大系, 66 vols. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1929-1964.

NKBT *Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei* 日本古典文学大系, 102 vols. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1958-1978.

NKBZ *Nihon koten bungaku zenshū* 日本古典文学全集, 51 vols. Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1970-76.

SNKBT *Shin Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei* 新日本古典文学大系, 100 vols. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1989-2005.

Adolphson, Mikael S. Edward Kamens and Stacie Matsumoto, eds. 2007. *Heian Japan: Centers and Peripheries*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Abramson, Marc S. 2008. *Ethnic Identity in Tang China*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Aston, William George. 1896. *Nihongi, Chronicles of Japan from the Earliest Times to A.D. 697*. 2 vols. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner.

Batten, Bruce Loyd. 2003. *To the Ends of Japan: Premodern Frontiers, Boundaries, and Interactions*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Bundy, Rose. 2007. "Court Women in Poetry Contests: The *Tentoku Yonen Dairi Utaawase* (Poetry Contest Held at Court in 960)," *U.S.-Japan Women's Journal*, no. 33: 33-57.

Chino Kaori. 2003. "Gender in Japanese Art." In *Gender and Power in the Japanese Visual Field*, edited by Joshua S. Mostow, Norman Bryson, and Maribeth Graybill, 17-34. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press. [Originally published 1996].

Chino Kaori 千野香織. 1993. *Jū-jūsanseiki no bijutsu: ōchō bijutsu no sekai* 10-13世紀の美術―王朝美術の世界. Vol. 3 of *Iwanami Nihon Bijutsu no Nagare* 岩波日本美術の流れ. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Clements, Rebekah. 2015. *A Cultural History of Translation in Early Modern Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Denecke, Wiebke. 2014. *Classical World Literatures*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

——— . 2007. "[Review of] Obsessions with the Sino-Japanese Polarity in Japanese Literature," *China Review International* 14, no. 2: 360-368.

Duthie, Torquil. 2014. *Man'yōshū and the Imperial Imagination in Early Japan*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Ebersole, Gary L. "The Religio-Aesthetic Complex in *Man'yōshū* Poetry with Special Reference to Hitomaro's 'Aki no no' Sequence." *History of Religions*, Vol. 23, No. 1 (Aug. 1983): 18-36.

Enomoto, Jun'ichi 榎本淳一. 2008. *Tō-ōchō to kodai Nihon* 唐王朝と古代日本. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Fujioka Tadaharu 藤岡忠見. 1966. *Heian wakashi-ron: Sandaishū jidai no kichō* 平安和歌史論―三大集時代の基調. Tokyo: Ōfūsha.

Fujiwara Katsumi 藤原克己. 1980. "Monjō keikoku shisō kara shigonshi e: chokusen sanshū to Sugawara Michizane 文章経国思想から詩言志へ―勅撰三集と菅原道真." *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 国語と国文学 57, no. 11: 12-23.

Gerlini, Edoardo. 2014. *Heian Court Poetry as World Literature: From the Point of View of Italian Poetry*. Florence: Firenze University Press.

Heldt, Gustav. 2008. *The Pursuit of Harmony: Poetry and Power in Early Heian Japan*. Ithaca, NY: East Asia Program, Cornell University.

Hirose Norio 廣瀬憲雄. 2011. *Higashi Ajia kokusai chitsujo to kodai Nihon* 東アジアの国際秩序と古代日本. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Hirschi, Caspar. 2011. *The Origins of Nationalism*: *An Alternative History from Ancient Rome to Early Modern Germany*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kamens, Edward. 2007. "Terrains of Text in Mid-Heian Court Culture." In *Heian Japan: Centers and Peripheries*, edited by Michael Adolphson, Edward Kamens and Stacie Matsumoto, 129-152. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Kawaguchi Hisao 川口久雄. 1981. *Heianchō no kanbungaku* 平安朝の漢文学. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Kawazoe Fusae 河添房江. 2014. *Karamono no bunkashi* 唐物の文化史. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

——— . 2007. *Genji monogatari to higashi Ajia sekai* 源氏物語と東アジア世界. Tokyo: Nihon Hōsō Shuppan Kyōkai.

Kitayama Mitsumasa 北山円正. 2003. "Ōe no Koretoki 'Nikkanshū-jo' chūshaku" 大江維時「日観集序」注釈. *Kōbe Joshi Daigaku Bungakubu Kiyō* 神戸女子大学文学部紀要 36: 15-33.

Kohn, Livia. 2000. "The Northern Celestial Masters." In *Daoism Handbook*, edited by Livia Kohn, 283-308. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Konishi Jin'ichi. 1978. "The Genesis of the *Kokinshū* Style," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 38, no. 1: 61-170.

Kornicki, Peter. 2010. "A note on Sino-Japanese: a Question of Terminology." *Sino-Japanese Studies* 17: 29-44.

——— . 1998. *The Book in Japan: A Cultural History from the Beginnings to the Nineteenth Century*. Leiden: Brill.

Kudō Shigenori 工藤重矩. 2004. "*Kokinshū* no seiritsu: waka chokusen e no michi" 古今集の成立―和歌勅撰への道. In *Kokinwakashū kenkyū shūsei* 古今和歌集研究集成 1, edited by Masuda Shigeo 増田繁夫 et al., 143-172. Tokyo: Kazama Shobō.

——— . 1993. *Heianchō ritsuryō shakai no bungaku* 平安朝律令社会の文学. Tokyo: Perikansha.

LaMarre, Thomas. 2000. *Uncovering Heian Japan: An Archaeology of Sensation and Inscription*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Lurie, David. 2011. *Realms of Literacy: Early Japan and the History of Writing*. Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Asia Center.

McCullough, Helen C. 1985. *Brocade by Night: Kokinwakashū and the Court Style in Japanese Classical Poetry*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Mezaki Tokue 目崎徳衛. 1961. *Ki no Tsurayuki* 紀貫之. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Murase Toshio 村瀬敏夫. 1981. *Ki no Tsurayuki-den no kenkyū* 紀貫之伝の研究. Tokyo: Ōfūsha.

Nakajima Wakako 中島和歌子. 1999. "'Karafū ankoku jidai' no naka de" 「唐風暗黒時代」の中で. In *'Heian bungaku' to iu ideorogī* 「平安文学」というイデオロギー. Vol. 1 of *(Sōsho) Sōzō suru Heian bungaku* 叢書想像する平安文学, edited by

Kawazoe Fusae 河添房江 et al., 58-85. Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan.

Nishimoto Masahiro 西本昌弘. 2015. "'Tōfū bunka' kara 'kokufū bunka' e「唐風文化」から「国風文化へ」" In *Iwanami Kōza Nihon Rekishi* 岩波講座日本歴史, vol. 5, edited by Ōtsu Tōru 大津透 et al., 139-180. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Nishimura Satomi 西村さとみ. 2002. "Tōfū bunka to kokufū bunka 唐風文化と国風文化." In *Heiankyō* 平安京. Vol. 5 of *Nihon no jidai-shi* 日本の時代史, edited by Yoshikawa Shinji 吉川真司 , 270-309. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Obara Hitoshi 小原仁. 2007. "Sekkan/insei-ki ni okeru honchō ishiki no kōzō 摂関・院政期における本朝意識の構造." In *Chūsei kizoku shakai to bukkyō* 中世貴族社会と仏教, 206-236. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Pekarik, Andrew J. 1983. "Poetics and the Place of Japanese Poetry in Court Society Through the Early Heian Period." PhD diss., Columbia University.

Pollack, David. 1986. *The Fracture of Meaning: Japan's Synthesis of China from the Eighth Through the Eighteenth Centuries*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Sakaki, Atsuko. 2006. *Obsessions with the Sino-Japanese Polarity in Japanese Literature.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Smits, Ivo. 2007. "The Way of the Literati: Chinese Learning and Literary Practice in Mid-Heian Japan." In *Heian Japan: Centers and Peripheries*, edited by Mikael S. Adolphson, Edward Kamens and Stacie Matsumoto, 105-128. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Takikawa Kōji 滝川幸司. 2004. "Uda/Daigo-chō no kadan to waka no dōkō 宇多・醍醐朝の歌壇の和歌の動向." In *Kokinwakashū kenkyū shūsei* 古今和歌集研究集成, vol. 1, edited by Masuda Shigeo 増田繁夫 et al. Tokyo: Kazama Shobō.

WangYong 王勇 and Kuboki Hideo 久保木秀夫. 2001. *Nara-Heianki no nicchū bunka kōryū: Bukkurōdo no shiten kara* 奈良・平安期の日中文化交流. Tokyo: Nōsan Gyoson Bunka Kyōkai.

Wang, Yuan-kang. 2013. "Explaining the Tribute System: Power, Confucianism, and War in Medieval East Asia." *Journal of East Asian Studies* 13, 207–232.

Watanabe Hideo 渡辺秀夫. 2008. "Heianki no kokubungaku to kanbungaku: Wakan hikaku no naka no 'kokufū' 平安期の国文学と漢文学ー和漢比較のなかの「国風」." *Rekishi hyōron* 歴史評論, no. 702: 20-33.

——— . 2004.“*Kokinshū*-jo no bungakushi: Waka chokusen to reigaku” 古今集序の文学史：和歌勅撰と「礼学」. In *Kokinwakashū kenkyū shūsei* 古今和歌集研究集成, vol. 1, edited by Masuda Shigeo 増田繁夫 et al. Tokyo: Kazama Shobō.

——— . 2000. “Wakan hikaku no naka no *Kokinshū* ryōjo: waka chokusen no shisō,” *Kokugo kokubun* 69, no. 11: 1-27.

Wixted, John Timothy. 1998. “Kanbun, Histories of Japanese Literature, and Japanologists.” *Sino-Japanese Studies* 10, no. 2: 23-31.

——— . 1983. “The *Kokinshū* Prefaces: Another Perspective.” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 43, no. 1: 215-238.

Yoda, Tomiko. 2004. *Gender and National Literature*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Yoshida Takashi 吉田孝. 1997. *Nihon no tanjō* 日本の誕生. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Zürcher, Erik. 2007. *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China*. 3rd ed. Leiden and Boston: Brill.