

Prefaces as Sino-Japanese Interfaces:

The Past, Present, and Future of the *Mana* Preface to the *Kokin wakashū*

Wiebke Denecke

I. Heian Poetic Prefaces

This study pivots around the Sino-Japanese preface to the *Kokin wakashū* (hereafter called “*Mana* Preface”), the neglected double of the most influential statement of Japanese poetics, the *Kana* Preface. However, the pivot will not be the main focus; rather, the prehistory and aftermath of this text will be under examination. I argue that the *Mana* Preface appropriated the authority held by the prefaces to previous imperial *kanshi* anthologies and created a genre of *waka* prefaces [*wakajo* 和歌序]¹ which not only carried on the legacy of the *Mana* Preface, but succeeded in creating a hybrid space, in which poets would write about *waka* poetics in *kanbun* style.

Prefaces can be anything from a hasty note on the date, place, and authorship of a poem or poetic collections all the way to weighty statements about the function of poetry in the cosmos, as we see in the *Kokinshū* Prefaces. To use Gérard Genette’s term, prefaces are “paratexts” or “peritexts”, part of a textual apparatus that surrounds the main text and can only exist in symbiosis with it.² Since they accompany a main text grammarians would call them “enclitic.” This fact has certainly not inhibited compilers from collecting prefaces in their own right.³ Yet, the tension between the literal “marginality” of prefaces and

I would like to thank Mioko Uchida, Stephen Owen, Ed Cranston and the audience at the 2003 Annual Meeting of the “Association for Japanese Literary Studies” at UCLA for discussions about this paper.

¹ There are two major types of “poetic prefaces”. “*Shijo*” [詩序] are poetic prefaces to *kanshi* poems or poetry collections, “*wakajo*” preface *waka* poems, but are written in *kanbun* style. “*Wakajo*” are also called “*jodai*” [序題] or “*shōjo*” [小序]. The latter appellation is based on the fact that *wakajo* are generally shorter than *shijo*; since *wakajo* are believed to derive from *shijo* they are considered the “small” sibling of *shijo*. In the following I will use “*kanshi* preface” and “*waka* preface” for “*shijo*” and “*wakajo*” respectively.

² Gérard Genette. *Palimpsestes. La littérature au second degré* (Paris: Seuil, 1982)

³ It was common practice in traditional China and Japan to preserve prefaces independent from the works they prefaced. Pleasant modern collections that assemble prefaces in their own right are *A Book of Prefaces*, edited and glossed by Alasdair

their occasional rise to extraordinary prominence belongs to the fascinating characteristics of the genre. We will see how Heian *waka* prefaces grapple with their role as “small” prefaces of marginal function, while carrying on the legacy of the great *Mana* Preface that along with the *Kokinshū* had advanced to a central statement of *waka* poetics.

The earliest prefaces in Japan introduce the first historical and literary compilations of the eighth century, such as the *Kojiki* 古事記 (712) and the *Kaifūsō* 懷風藻 (751). Yet, starting in the ninth century, prefaces make their appearance as a genre collected in their own right. We know that the *Keikokushū* 經国集 (827), the third imperial *kanshi* anthology, contained a whole volume of *kanshi* prefaces, but unfortunately only the volumes with poetic expositions [賦 *fū*], poetry [詩 *shi*], music bureau poetry [樂府詩 *gafushi*], and examination essays [対策 *taisaku*] survive. *Kanshi* prefaces became an increasingly popular prose genre towards the mid-Heian period and are preserved in Fujiwara no Akihira’s (989-1066) *Honchō monzui* 本朝文粹, its mid-12th century successor *Honchō zoku monzui* 本朝続文粹 and in the Late Heian preface collection entitled *Shijoshū* 詩序集.⁴ *Waka* prefaces were preserved in similar venues like *kanshi* prefaces. They appear in the *Honchō monzui* and *Honchō zoku monzui* after the *kanshi* prefaces. There are also two independent preface collections, the *Fusō kobunshū* 扶桑古文集⁵ and the *Honchō shōjoshū* 本朝小序集⁶

II. The Pivot: the *Mana* Preface

Gray (London, New York: Bloomsbury, 2000), and Jorge Luis Borges’s *Prólogos. Con un prólogo de prólogos* (Buenos Aires: Torres Agüero, 1975).

⁴ The *Shijoshū* contains 46 prefaces. Satō Michio attributes it to Fujiwara no Atsumitsu (1063-1144), a son of the above-mentioned Akihira, and dates it to around 1132. For his assessment see the article “*Shijoshū* seiritsu kō,” in: Satō Michio. *Heian kōki Nihon kanbungaku no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Kasama shoin, 2003): 149-172.

⁵ The collection is also known as *Waka manaji joshū* and was assembled by an unknown compiler between 1144 and 1162. It contains 33 prefaces by 27 authors. A third of the pieces are not preserved in other collections. A photoreprint and a typescript version of the only surviving manuscript is published in *Tōkyō daigaku shiryō hensanjo hō no 2* (1968.3)

⁶ The collection is alternatively known as *Waka manaji jo*, and comprises 53, which mostly overlaps with pieces preserved elsewhere. That it also features seven prefaces from the *Man’yōshū* is probably due to the generous hand of the compiler, who may simply have looked for any type of *kanbun* text introducing a *waka*

Two types of approaches have dominated the voluminous scholarship on the *Kokinshū* Prefaces. First, the *Kana* Preface has been extensively researched as the single most important statement of *waka* poetics. This approach has largely disregarded the *Mana* Preface. We could call such studies of the history of *waka* poetics in the aftermath of the *Kokinshū* Prefaces “vertical”. In contrast, a “horizontal” approach that compares both prefaces has been the second focus of study. Ki no Yoshimochi (-919), son of the famous *kanbun* writer Ki no Haseo (845-912), has traditionally been regarded as the author of the *Mana* Preface. Although this attribution has been questioned, the major bone of contention regarding the prefaces is still the question of relative chronology. Since Late Heian times theories that gave precedence to the *Kana* Preface as a model for the *Mana* Preface competed with claims that credited the *Mana* Preface with an earlier date. Another scholarly focus has been the identification of “Chinese influences” on both prefaces. The list of identified sources ranges from the obvious, such as the “Great Preface” to the *Classic of Poetry* for the opening or also the *Categories of Poetry* [*Shipin* 詩品] by Zhong Rong (465-518) for the appraisal of the Six Poetry Immortals. But it also extends to more risky claims, such as Takeoka Masao’s conviction that the entire *Mana* Preface vaguely mimics the structure of Liu Xie’s (ca. 465-522) *A Literary Mind and the Carving of Dragons* [*Wenxin diaolong* 文心雕龍]⁷

The arguably most interesting question in the comparison of the two prefaces is to determine what exactly is the difference between them and how to properly assess that difference. In other words, the question is how to straddle the hermeneutic gap between the host of minute or less minute variations and an overarching pattern of difference. Take for example the formulation “That all things have their song is a natural principle” in the *Mana* Preface, which reads “among all creatures, what would not make songs?” in the *Kana* Preface. Does this difference illustrate a radical difference between a Sino-Japanese focus on pattern in a Confucian cosmos versus a Japanese emphasis on the personal joy of creaturely expressivity?

⁷ Takeoka Masao. *Kokin wakashū zenhyōshaku Kochū shichishū shūsei* (Tokyo: Yūbun shoin, 1976): 30-1. For a thoughtful analysis of Chinese influences on the *Kokinshū* Prefaces see John Timothy Wixted’s article “The *Kokinshū* Prefaces: Another Perspective,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 43.1 (1983): 215–38.

Or is it merely a matter of stylistic caprice? The linguistic difference between the prefaces invites projection onto ethnic categories and unfortunately encourages explaining difference in diction as cultural difference.

To avoid explanatory paralysis that comes with the impossible assessment of countless differences, some scholars have proposed suggestive master tropes to describe the difference between the prefaces, keeping the hermeneutical gap in check from a bird's-eye view. Thomas LaMarre has projected onto the prefaces the complementary modes of *hare* 晴礼 [in its most basic sense “bright”, “shining towards the outside”, thus official, solemn] and *ke* 藪 [“intimate”, “hidden”, thus private and sentimental]. To introduce Heian terms to describe Heian literature is an important step forward⁸ and the couple of *hare* and *ke* allows LaMarre to translate his perception of difference between the prefaces into various spheres of Heian reality: it functions as a bipolar model in “formal” and “informal” writing style, in fashion and clothing, for the type of occasion of composition and even as to mark the diurnal cycle of “day” versus “night”. However, this master trope bears a striking resemblance to the cliché that equates *kanbun* literature with the official, male, and Chinese, and *wabun* literature with the private, female, and Japanese, although LaMarre constantly emphasizes that he argues on aesthetic, not social or ethnolinguistic, grounds. Moreover, the master trope does little to explain concrete differences. Why does the *Mana* Preface not quote poems as the illustration of the “Six Principles” [*rikugi* 六義] as the *Kana* Preface does? Or why does only the *Mana* Preface mention that the first commission for what later became the *Kokinshū* was called *Shoku Man'yōshū*? These are surely questions quite beyond the explanatory power of master tropes.

This paper takes a step away from either “vertical” inquiries into the reception history of the *Kana* Preface or “horizontal” analyses of the differences between the two prefaces. Instead, it attempts to put the *Mana* preface in historical perspective. After all, unlike the *Kana* Preface, the *Mana* Preface had a

⁸ For the wide range of meanings of this conceptual couple see *Ōchōgo jiten*, ed. by Akiyama Ken (Tokyo: Tōkyō daigaku shuppankai, 2000): 355. In the realm of poetry, it appears that the terms were used in judgements of *utaawase* since the Late Heian period.

precedent in the prefaces to the earlier *kanshi* anthologies. Also, the *Mana* Preface lived on in the genre of *waka* prefaces, whose popularity seems to have peaked in the Late Heian period.

Several goals can be achieved by retracing the prehistory of the *Mana* Preface and then tracing its afterlife in the genre of *waka* prefaces. This inquiry will contribute to the scholarship on the *Mana* Preface, which has been deplorably rare compared to scholarship on the *Kana* Preface. Second, it will allow us to shift the insolvable question of differences from the prefaces themselves to their history of reception. This may be an ignominious escape from a major challenge, but it will be an instructive one. Third, it will reflect on the linguistic disjunction between a *kanbun* preface and its accompanying *waka* poem that places the genre of *waka* prefaces among a number of hybrid genres that mix Sino-Japanese and vernacular Japanese units in intriguing ways.

III. The Past of the *Mana* Preface: the *Kaifūsō* and the Three Imperial *Kanshi* Anthologies

Since the compilers of the *Kokinshū* intended to produce a collection that could put public composition of *waka* on a par with the flourishing tradition of *kanshi* composition at court, it is a disarmingly simple conclusion that the *Mana* Preface should be seen not just in relation to the *Kana* Preface, but also as a successor and rival to the prefaces of the *kanshi* anthologies. Surprisingly, this line of thought is rarely pursued. What does the *Mana* Preface respond to? How does it follow and outdo the prefaces of the preceding *kanshi* anthologies?

III a. Preserving Past Writing: The Preface to the *Kaifūsō*

The *Kaifūsō*, compiled in 751 by an unknown compiler, contains the earliest extant preface to a Japanese literary anthology. It is the first compilation that faces the crucial question of how to invest the young tradition of *kanshi* composition with historical depth, and it therefore uses the venerable preface to

the *Wenxuan* 文選 [J. *Monzen*] as a blueprint.⁹ In other words, in writing a history of writing and literature since the beginning of the world, it had to delicately handle the “historical flatness” of Japanese tradition compared to Chinese precedent. The author of the preface solves this problem ingeniously with a suggestive double-voiced narrative that couples Japanese history with highlights of Chinese history. The advent of writing through tribute documents presented by the Korea envoys Wani and Shinmi is implicitly compared to the invention of writing by the mythical hero Fu Xi, who is said to have invented the hexagrams of the *Book of Changes* [*Yijing* 易經] by looking at bird tracks. The age of Emperor Tenji (626-671), who is presented as an illuminated sovereign and patron of learning and the arts, parallels the splendid court of Xiao Tong, Crown Prince Zhaoming of the Liang Dynasty (501-31), the compiler of the *Wenxuan*. It is intriguing that the preface is always moving within a world of literacy, even when talking about pre-literate times. It is therefore hardly surprising that it begins with the compiler’s reading about the time before the advent of writing:

逖聽前修
遐觀載籍
襲山降蹕之世

橿原建邦之時
天造草創
人文未作

I have heard of sages from the remote past
and surveyed the written records of yore.
In the age when the Heavenly Grandchild’s chariot descended on
Peak Takachiho
and when [Emperor Jimmu] founded our state at Kashihara,
the workings of Heaven had barely begun
and human pattern¹⁰ was not yet created.¹¹

In the same way as the preface is narrated through the eyes of an archival bookworm, the main motivation for compiling the collection is the reverence for the writings of “past sages” [*sentetsu* 先哲] and the anxiety of their loss. The destruction of written documents during the Jinshin war is described as another “burning of books” that the First Emperor of the Qin ordered in 213 B. C. The compiler-archivist

⁹ I undertake a more detailed discussion of the *kanshi* anthology prefaces and their concept of literary history in “Chinese Antiquity and Court Spectacle in Early *Kanshi*,” in: *Journal of Japanese Studies* 30.1 (Winter 2004). For a French translation of the entire preface and the prefaces to the first two imperial *kanshi* collections see Maria Chiara Migliore. “L’antologie entre tradition et transformation: les recueils de poèmes en chinois au Japon (VIIIe-IXe siècle),” in: *Extrême-Orient, Extrême-Occident* 25 (2003): 39-53.

¹⁰ “Jinbun” covers a broad semantic spectrum ranging from everything considered human as in “human pattern” (as opposed to the patterns of Heaven and Earth) and “civilization” to the more specific connotations of “writing” and “literature”.

¹¹ Kojima Noriyuki (ed.) *Kaifūsō, Bunka shūreishū, Honchō monzui* NKBT, vol. 69 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1969): 58-9

has two things in abundance: Leisure, which he spends in the archives perusing books, and the reverence for a lost past, from which he feels painfully separated. He confesses: “Since I am a humble official with time at my hands, I have been roaming at heart in the Garden of Letters.”¹² [余以薄官餘閒 遊心文囿] With this statement of devotion to Letters he directly echoes Xiao Tong’s remark in the *Wenxuan* Preface: “During spare moments from my duties supervising the state and tending the army, I have spent much leisure time reading through the Garden of Letters, extensively perusing the Forest of Literature”¹³ [余監撫餘閒 居多假日 歷觀文囿 泛覽辭林]

The pleasure of reading is in uneasy tension with the past and present threats of textual destruction. The preface is a requiem for the Jinshin war; while providing a suggestive timeline for a history of *kanshi* composition in Japan, it is a praise of reading and preserving rather than of writing and composition.

III b. Celebrating Present Production: The Three Imperial *Kanshi* Anthologies of the 9th Century

The first imperially commissioned anthology was the *Ryōunshū* 凌雲集 compiled in 814 under the auspices of Emperor Saga (786-842). As an imperial anthology, it served as a model for the two *kanshi* anthologies to come. Unlike the *Kaifūsō*, it does not take the sketch of literary history in the *Wenxuan* Preface as its model, but opens with the famous statement of Cao Pi (187-226), Emperor Wen of the Wei dynasty, from his “Discourse on Literature” [*Lunwen* 論文]:

“Your subject Minemori states: ‘King Wen of the Wei dynasty (i. e. Cao Pi) once remarked: ‘I would say that literary works are the supreme achievement in the business of state, a splendor that does not decay. A time will come when a person’s life ends; glory and pleasure go no further than this body.’”¹⁴ [臣岑守言 魏文帝有曰 文章者經國之大業 不朽之盛事 年壽有時而盡 榮樂止乎其身]

¹² Kojima. *Kaifūsō, Bunka shūreishū, Honchō monzui*: 61

¹³ *Xinyi Zhaoming Wenxuan* (Taipei: Sanmin shuju, 1996), vol. 1: 7 The translation is from David Knechtges *Wenxuan or Selections of Refined Literature*, vol. 1 (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1982): 87.

¹⁴ Kojima Noriyuki *Kokufū ankoku jidai no bungaku* (Tokyo: Hanawa shobō, 1968-98), Vol. II.2: 1326. The translation of the Cao Pi quote is from Stephen Owen. *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1992): 68

The compiler-subject, in this case Ono no Minemori, is no longer an archivist of a lost past but the subject of the glorious present of ruling Emperor Saga. He is part of the imperial coterie with Saga at its center. Kojima Noriyuki has pointed out close parallels between the preface and the language of court petitions [*hyō* 表] that shows the close connection between the imperial court and literary composition characteristic of Saga's age.¹⁵ Not the leisure and eccentric passion of the archivist drives the compilers, but their participation in the “supreme achievement in the business of the state”—the term “*ye* 業” [J. *waza*] signifies “achievement” as well as actual employment in that “enterprise”—that is not completely of either Saga's or Cao Pi's invention, but ultimately goes back to the civilizing enterprise of King Wen of the Zhou dynasty (ca. 11th century BC). The preface explains: “[Emperor Saga] lamented how easily times would turn and he regretted that our cultural heritage [*shibun* 斯文] might decline. Thus he summoned his subjects and [ordered them] to assemble recent compositions.”¹⁶ [歎光陰之易暮 惜斯文之將墜 爰詔臣等 選集近代以來篇什]

Emperor Saga commissions an anthology because he is afraid that King Wen's “cultural heritage” might decline. His worry matches Confucius's prophetic confidence that the civilization created by the early kings of Zhou is protected by Heaven:

“When surrounded in Kuang, the Master said, ‘With King Wen long dead, is not this culture/*wen*¹⁷ residing here in me? If Heaven intends to destroy this culture of ours, those who come after me will not have any part of it. If Heaven does not want to destroy it, then what can the people of Kuang do to me!’”¹⁸ [子畏於匡 曰 文王既沒 文不在茲乎 天之將喪斯文也 後死者不得與於斯文也 天之不喪斯文也 匡人其如予何]

King Wen, Confucius, Emperor Saga—they all symbolize the care for “this culture of ours” [斯文]. The *Wenxuan*, and with it the *Kaifūsō* Preface, had sketched the history of “*wen*” [pattern, culture, writing, literature], and although the *Ryōunshū* Preface chooses Cao Pi's “Discourse on Literature” and not the

¹⁵ Kojima Noriyuki *Kokufū ankoku jidai no bungaku*: 1324 and 1328.

¹⁶ Kojima, *Kokufū ankoku jidai no bungaku*: 1328, 1332-33

¹⁷ “*Si wen*” is a pun on the name of King Wen, the embodiment of the virtuous rule of the Zhou dynasty mentioned later in the passage.

¹⁸ *Analects* 9.5 My translation benefited from D. C. Lau (trans.). *Confucius. The Analects* (London: Penguin, 1979): 96

Wenxuan Preface as a guiding motto, it reconfirms King Wen’s enterprise and the political function of literature in Japan.

The preface to the second imperial *kanshi* anthology, the *Bunka shûreishû* 文華秀麗集 (818), picks up what the *Ryôunshû* had left out and celebrates the literary fecundity of its age. The compiler of the preface highlights the superior power of the emperor. In response to the increase in literary production, selection becomes necessary and is based on the ultimate authority of the emperor, who decides, when compilers are undecided, and takes the lead.

The last imperial *kanshi* anthology, the *Keikokushû* 經国集 (827) constitutes a great leap in scale and ambition; it consists of 20 books—14 of them unfortunately lost—and introduces for the first time major prose genres, such as “poetic expositions” [*fu*], the royal genre of the *Wenxuan*. It combines Cao Pi’s vision of literature as of greatest importance to governance from the first two anthologies imperial anthologies with the *Kaifûsô*’s efforts to give a grand narrative of the history of civilization and literature. Unlike the *Kaifûsô*, the *Keikokushû* preface does not give a double-lined historical narrative, where Japanese developments and Chinese corresponding events appear in conjunction, but provides a story of *kanbun* composition entirely populated with Chinese characters. At the same time, however, the preface provides early evidence of a particular competitiveness towards things Chinese that became a standard theme throughout the Heian period. Typically, Chinese personages, place-names or events would be matched implicitly or explicitly with Japanese realities, just to claim superiority or at least delight in a position of stalemate.

寶跗染筆
無勝負於八體
翡翠開匣
不優劣於六書

When [Emperor Junna] wets his preciously inlaid brush
he is not outdone by the “Eight Calligraphic Styles”¹⁹,
and when he opens his kingfish feather writing case
he measures up to the “Six Character Types”²⁰

¹⁹ From the preface to the 1st century dictionary *Shuowen jiezi* 說文解字 by Xu Shen 許慎. The eight calligraphic styles include the well-known “great seal script”, “small seal script”, and “clerical script” See Kojima. *Kokufû ankoku jidai no bungaku*: 2168. For the Chinese background of calligraphic styles see the chapter “The Evolution of the Shapes and Styles of Chinese Characters (Part II)” in Qiu Xigui. *Chinese Writing*. Trans. By Gilbert L. Mattos and Jerry Norman. (Berkeley: The Society for the Study of Early China and the Institute of East Asian Studies, 2000): 113-49

²⁰ The six types of characters are also from the preface to the *Shuowen jiezi*. Since Xu Shen argued for the correspondence between writing and cosmological patterns that is claimed in the *Xicizhuan* 繫辭傳, one of the commentaries to the *Book of*

堯之克讓文思	Yao's modesty and cultivated thoughtfulness
舜之濬哲好問	Shun's profound sageliness and passionate curiosity
先聖後聖	[show that] the former and the later sages
其揆一焉	are of the same caliber ²¹

Although the only explicitly Japanese subject in the passage is Emperor Junna (786-840), the claim that the former and later sages are of the same caliber compares the sages of high antiquity, Yao and Shun, to Retired Emperor Saga and Emperor Junna, to whom Saga had abdicated in 823. By implication the two sets of Chinese and Japanese emperors are not just matching up to each other—with the younger Shun equal to Yao and Emperor Junna equal to Retired Emperor Saga—but the Japanese emperors are also measuring up to their older Chinese models and are “of the same caliber.” They are also up to the Chinese standards of calligraphy, the “Eight Styles,” and philological expertise, the “Six Character Types.” In Heian Japan, the agonistic comparison between things Japanese and Chinese often provided a wonderful occasion to show off expertise in Chinese culture, because, as in this case, the message was stated in purely Chinese terms and the reader had to know how to match the Chinese examples with the parallel Japanese phenomena.²²

The “Six Character Types” [*rikusho*] is also an alternative name for the “Six Principles of Poetry” [*rikugi*], but it is evident that in this passage they refer to calligraphic expertise, not to poetic tropes, because the Emperor is pictured in the moment of dashing off a literary piece. It may seem a random coincidence that the *Keikokushū* preface uses the “Six Character Types” to show its high regard for technical and philological mastery while the *Mana* Preface mentions the “Six Principles” as rhetorical devices and styles of poetry. However, the move from a history of writing and literature as a civilizing

Changes, he arranged the six character types in descending order of the prominence of the pictographic element. They start with the most “graphic” characters, namely “pictograms” [*xiangxing* 象形], continue with “simple ideograms” [*zhishi* 指事], “compound ideograms” [*huiyi* 會意], “phono-semantic compounds” [*xingsheng* 形聲], “derived graphs” [*zhuanzhu* 轉注], and conclude with “loan graphs” [*jiajie* 假借], which show no relation whatsoever between graphic form and semantic content. For more information see the chapter “The Six-Principles Theory of Chinese Script” in Qiu Xigui *Op. cit.*, 151-63.

²¹ Kojima. *Kokufū ankoku jidai no bungaku*: 2162-70. The last phrase echoes Mencius 4B 1. However, in Mencius Shun and King Wen are compared as representatives of the “former” and “later” sages respectively.

²² The rhetorical pattern of parallelism in *kanbun* styles was quite conducive to explicit agonistic comparison between China and Japan, but the omission of the Japanese side was much more elegant, flattering both author and audience with their command of *kanbun* education and the mastery of a system of cultural correspondences that did not call for explanation, but was part of an erudite game.

craft to a psychology of actual poetic composition is precisely characteristic of the shift in poetics that occurs between the prefaces of the *kanshi* anthologies and the *Kokinshū* Prefaces.

IV. The Present of the *Mana* Preface: Introducing a Psychology of Composition

The *Mana* Preface, composed some eight decades after the completion of the *Keikokushū*, succeeded the *kanshi* anthologies as a *kanbun* preface to an imperial anthology. The preface can roughly be divided into four parts, which respectively discuss the psychological root of poetry, its historical origin and development, the state of the art in the recent past and present, and previous compilation enterprises. It closes with an auspicious invocation of a bright future for *waka* poetry.

The *Kokinshū* Prefaces open on a powerful plant metaphor to retrace the psychological origin of poetry: “*Waka* takes root in the soil of one’s heart and spreads its flowers into a forest of words”²³ [夫和歌者 託其根於心地 發其華於詞林者也] The *Kana* Preface reads: “The Songs of Yamato, settling as seeds in the heart of the people, become leaves of ten thousand words”²⁴ [倭歌は人の心を種としてよろづの言の葉とぞなれりける]

Both prefaces rely on the unfolding from latency to manifestation described in the “Great Preface” to the *Classic of Poetry*, which states: “Poetry is the endpoint of one’s intention. In the heart it is (mere) intention, when put into words, it becomes poetry.” 詩者 志之所之也 在心爲志 發言爲詩。

The choice of the image of organic growth to convey the process of how a poem becomes manifest, grows from a seed into flowers, leaves, and forests, is crucial because it facilitates a convenient figural flow between nature and the mind, and enables the “interiorization” of nature into psychological processes, but also the “exteriorization” of thoughts and emotions into natural landscapes.

²³ Katagiri Yōichi. *Kokinwakashū zenhyōshaku* (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1998): 279. For a complete English translation of the *Mana* Preface see Leonard Grzanka’s in Laurel Rasplica Rodd. *Kokinshū A Collection of Poems Ancient and Modern* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1984): 379-85. Unless otherwise noted the translations from the *Mana* Preface are mine.

²⁴ Katagiri Yōichi. *Kokinwakashū zenhyōshaku*: 95

The opening of the *Kokinshū* Prefaces constitutes a radical reformulation of the Chinese “Great Preface,” which introduced a new potential for poetological imagery. True, it merely takes the “Forest of Words” from the *Wenxuan* preface back to its organic “roots,” but it does so in a radically new and successful way, by placing these roots into the “soil of the heart.” This move psychologized the plant imagery for a powerful definition of the *nature* of poetry—stated in what we may call an eternal “poetic present.” The *Mana* Preface introduces one more step of organic growth, namely the “flowers,” whereas the *Kana* Preface moves more promptly from seed to leaves and evokes with the “ten thousand leaves of words” an image of textual production of the *waka* world—not the least insinuating its first instantiation, the “ten thousand leaves” of the *Man’yōshū*.

As a transition from the “poetic present” to the history of poetry, the second part of the *Mana* Preface expands on the natural impulse of poetry composition. Not only are humans inspired by songs of the spring warbler, but they are only a special case of the general natural principle that living creatures bring forth song [*kayō* 歌謡]. As the first instance of this impulse, already in astonishing formal perfection, Susanō’s divine 31-syllable verse is evoked, as the “Ur-*Waka*.” As with poetic composition the history of poetry develops from a single root into a forest of forms such as *chōka*, *tanka*, or *sedōka*. The poems presented to Emperor Nintoku at Naniwa Ford and to Prince Shōtoku at Tomi-no-o River illustrate this second stage of development, the diversification of form of the *waka* tradition, which is here called “local custom or local airs” [*fū* 風]. The increasing diversification of *waka* is blocked and forced to retreat by the advent of Chinese characters and the beginning of *kanshibun* composition [*shifu* 詩賦] around the time of Prince Ōtsu, a son of Emperor Temmu who was later executed by Temmu’s wife, Empress Jitō. The prince, whose famous deathbed poem is preserved in the *Kaifūsō*, is accused of ushering in the decline of *waka*, of Japanese customs in general, and this reproachful connection between the introduction of Chinese writing and literature and the decline of *waka* poetry is only mentioned in the *Mana* Preface. The *Kana* Preface, not by coincidence, does not refer to the introduction of the technology of writing at all. The author of the preface is painfully aware that the greatest *Man’yō* poets such as Kakinomoto no

Hitomaro were approximate contemporaries of Prince Ôtsu and therefore—if we are to believe the proposed narrative—witnesses of the decline of *waka* rather than proponents of its Golden Age. Perhaps to avoid the collision between chronology and evaluation, Hitomaro is withheld from historical time altogether and described as “unparalleled in past and present”²⁵ [獨步古今之間] within an unbroken lineage of *waka* “officials.” And yet, so continues the preface, the decline into the trivial, described as a lapse from substance to superficiality, from fruit to flower, ensued quickly. The preface laments that poetry came to be abused as a messenger between lovers, for trite subjects such as flowers and birds, and poems were thus only presentable to women, no longer in male aristocratic circles.

The *Mana* preface states that in the recent past and immediate present only a few poets are left who compose in the good old style [*kofû* 古風] of the period preceding the advent of Chinese writing. The tradition of *waka* is again described as a local style of composition, but already alienated from its “old” practice that did not know the use of Chinese graphs. To illustrate the present state of the art, the “Six Poetry Immortals” are praised and criticized in the fashion of the Chinese poetic handbook *Categories of Poetry* [*Shipin* 詩品], which orders poets by artistic rank and lineage and judges them based on mood and technical skill. To conclude the historical survey of *waka* poetry on a note that immunizes it against time, *waka* is contrasted with mundane occupations such as official civil or military appointments and it is singled out as the only profession that guarantees immortality. Cao Pi’s praise of poetry’s immortalizing power in his “Discourse of Literature”, which was so crucial for the three imperial *kanshi* anthologies, is here untied from the business of the state, from its ministers and generals, and instead grafted onto the mystique of the art itself.

Part four of the *Mana* Preface, however, brings *waka* composition back to the courtly arena. It relates previous compilation projects, such as the “Heizei Emperor’s” alleged compilation of the *Man’yôshû*, an otherwise unconfirmed assumption that may only derive from the author’s desire to name a precedent for the present imperial commission. The last section of the preface is significant, because it

²⁵ Katagiri Op. cit., 292.

introduces another expression for the enterprise of *waka*, which has hitherto been described as a “local custom” [*fū* 風] of Japan. The newly introduced term is “our way” [*waga michi* 吾道] and has fascinating implications. The preface ends on a reformulation of *Analects* 9.5, in which Confucius confirmed the immortality of “this our cultural heritage.” The preface to the *Ryōunshū* had alluded to this passage and stated Emperor Saga’s commitment to the preservation of “this our heritage” on the model of Confucius’s preservation of the heritage of King Wen of Zhou with the help of Heaven. When the *Mana* Preface closes on the formula “Alas, with Hitomaro long dead, is not [the art of] *waka* here in this/here with us!” [嗚呼 人丸既沒 和歌不在斯哉]²⁶, the “Way” and its most noteworthy practitioner Hitomaro has replaced both the “cultural heritage” that Confucius attributed to King Wen of Zhou and the “cultural heritage” that Emperor Saga committed himself to in ordering the compilation of imperial *kanshi* anthologies. In the light of the unmistakable allusion to *Analects* 9.5, “our Way” [吾道 *waga michi*] of *waka* in the preface to the first imperial *waka* anthology becomes an indirect challenge against the “culture heritage” of *kanshi* composition in the prefaces to previous imperial *kanshi* anthologies.

In conclusion, the *Mana* Preface constituted a radical step away from the prefaces to the *kanshi* anthologies in three areas

First, the different emphasis on reading versus writing of poetry is revealing. Most notably, the *Kaifūsō* preface begins with the act of reading. The *Mana* Preface, in contrast, opens on a vision of the psychology of writing. Only after sketching the timeless nature of poetry does it proceed to give a history of *waka*. There are certainly great masters, like Hitomaro, who are known because their works were transmitted in writing, but the *Kokinshū* Prefaces reflect in no way the desire to preserve or the anxiety of loss of the textual record that inspired the “archivist-compiler” of the *Kaifūsō*. Quite to the contrary, in the midst of its lamentations about the decline of the way of *waka*, the *Mana* preface not only expresses the hope for revival, but declares that the cause of poetry is quite beyond the mortality of any of its practitioners, even the great Hitomaro. With the gesture of “the king is dead, long live the king!” poetry

²⁶ Katagiri. Op. cit., 313

has become an institution independent of the fate of the state, unlike in the preface to the *Ryōunshū*, for which poetry is bound up with the court and its authority to preserve King Wen's cultural heritage. True, this declaration of independence is ironic, if we consider that the *Kokinshū* was the first imperially commissioned *waka* collection. But we may therefore call it an all the bolder gesture of the preface's author, who apparently didn't want to content himself with a reduction of the Way of *waka* to a recognized state enterprise.

This leads us to the second fundamental difference between the *Mana* Preface and the prefaces to the *kanshi* anthologies: They inhabit different temporal spaces, *chronotopes* in Mikhail Bakhtin's words. While the prefaces to the *kanshi* anthologies hover between a lost past and a glorious present, the *Mana* preface does indeed bemoan a lost past, but it also decidedly laments the decadent present, and ultimately directs its attention towards the hope for a glorious future. And besides the introduction of the chronotope of future—not in the guise of Cao Pi's immortality, but as a wish for further generations of practitioners of the “Way of *waka*”—the *Mana* Preface introduces another dimension of time. The eternal “poetic present” constitutes a universal psychology of the creaturely drive to expression through song; and it is this chronotope that allowed the author to place Hitomaro beyond time and put the longevity of poetic practice out of the reach of historical coincidence. Although the *Kokinshū* marks the moment when *waka* enters the imperial stage, its proponents lodge its power and future life into something that is less susceptible to the vicissitudes of the imperial enterprise. *Kanshi* composition needed the spiritual tutelage of an exemplary Confucian monarch who continues King Wen's enterprise. In contrast, Emperor Daigo (885-930) is virtually left out of the picture in the *Mana* Preface and King Wen is replaced with the emblematic embodiment of the poetic present, the great Hitomaro, who exists beyond time and moves freely between past and present.

Third, the prefaces differ in their manipulation of powerfully ambivalent key terms. Much more than the prefaces to the *kanshi* anthologies, the *Mana* Preface plays with semantic puns to make its case. First, there are examples, which play only a limited role in the *Mana* Preface, but became influential later

on Such an example is the pivoting meaning of “wa 和” The preface reads, “To move heaven and earth, to affect the gods and demons, to transform human relations, or to **harmonize** husband and wife, there is nothing more suitable than **Japanese** poetry.”²⁷ [動天地 感鬼神 化人倫 和夫婦 莫宜於和歌]. Since the passage is an almost literal rendering of the “Great Preface”, the exchange of the expression “to regulate [經] the relation of husband and wife” in the Chinese text with “harmonizing” [和] in the *Mana* Preface must be purposeful, especially because the same character reappears in the immediately adjacent phrase as “Japanese” [和] poetry. That the term “wa 和” pivoted between signifying the “Japanese,” but also the act of “responding” to each other in poetry, to “harmonize” relationships or even point to a “gentle” breeze²⁸, enabled a convenient metaphorical distillation of what was deemed most characteristic of *waka* poetry. The fact that name, response in song, auspicious effect and even meteorological manifestations could be accommodated within one word constituted a potential of desired ambivalence, which, as we shall see shortly, was successfully exploited in the genre of *waka* prefaces

The most attractive ambivalence was contained in the expression 風 “kaze”/ “fū” [C. *feng*]. Also one of the “Six Principles of Poetry” [*rikugi*], it conveyed a host of meanings, ranging from its most physical connotation, namely wind—also by extension “influence”, “transformation”, or “local customs”— to musical “airs” to “remonstration” against rulers. This last meaning dropped out in the *Mana* preface and later *waka* prefaces. In its more specific meaning as “airs” and “poetry,” the term “fū” appears in the *Mana* preface most notably as an overarching term for *waka* poetry in its various verse forms. Also, as “old airs” [*kofū* 古風], it points to *Man'yō* poetry from the perspective of the *Kokinshū* age. In its more comprehensive meaning of “local customs” it proves particularly applicable to the Japanese tradition, because as a part of the *Classic of Poetry*, the “feng” or “Airs” were considered folk songs from the various regions of the Zhou Kingdom, transmitting “local customs” and the lore of local histories and festivals. We may indeed say that—from the perspective of “feng” and the *Classic of Poetry*, whose

²⁷ Katagiri. *Op. cit.*, 279. Translation from Leonard Grzanka in Rodd, *op. cit.*, 379. Emphasis is mine

²⁸ For an exploitation of this meaning see Fujiwara no Arisuna's *waka* preface below.

poetics constituted the backbone of the *Kokinshū* Prefaces— Japanese *waka* represented metaphorically the particular local customs and poetic tradition of one of the locales of the Kingdom of Zhou. Although this was certainly historically and politically wrong, there is some cultural and poetic truth to it.

To these three differences between the prefaces to the *kanshi* anthologies and the *Mana* preface we could add as a fourth the different choice of Chinese master narratives about the nature and history of literature. As already emphasized, the *kanshi* prefaces had preferred a history of “*wen*”: of writing, literature and also King Wen of Zhou’s cultural heritage. They had also adopted Cao Pi’s view of literature as crucial to the enterprise of the state and cherished the “Discourse on Literature” as a veritable model for the Saga court. One may argue that the decision of the *Mana* Preface’s author to evoke the “Great Preface” was nothing too unexpected,²⁹ because the text had probably been available in Japan from early on since it was part of the “Five Confucian Classics.” Yet, it was not the quoting of the “Great Preface” in and of itself that was the radical innovation, but the specific way its textual potential was mobilized for the cause of Japanese poetry. More than the *Wenxuan* and the “Discourse on Literature,” the “Great Preface” relied, as Stephen Owen has put it, on a “theory of manifestation and perfect correspondence between inner and outer.”³⁰ This theory allowed for a psychologization of the writing process, accounting for the stimulus to write poetry, not its historical instantiations, that had been at the heart of the history of “*wen*” in the *Wenxuan* and *Kaifūsō* Preface. I argue that the further fate of fundamental differences between *waka* and *kanshi* poetics was vastly influenced by the way in which the *Mana* Preface mobilized the “Great Preface” for its purpose and filled a spot that had—curiously enough—not yet been claimed by its *kanshi* anthology predecessors.

V. The Future of the *Mana* Preface: Heian *Waka* Prefaces [*wakajo* 和歌序]

V a. *Waka* Prefaces in the *Fukurozōshi* 袋草子

²⁹ Timothy Wixted has made this argument for the *Kokinshū* Prefaces in general. “In sum, one can say there is no new critical theory in the *Kokinshū* prefaces; it is all based on Chinese models, but with an emphasis that highlights the expressive function of literature.” See Wixted, “The *Kokinshū* Prefaces: Another Perspective,” 238.

³⁰ Owen. Op cit, 39.

Claims of the *Mana* Preface had a vivid afterlife in the genre of *waka* prefaces -- prefaces written in *kanbun* to either *waka* anthologies or *waka* composed at seasonal banquets or ritual occasions.³¹ The genre became important enough for the Late Heian poet Fujiwara no Kiyosuke 藤原清輔 (1104-1177) to devote two subchapters to it in his poetic manual *Fukurozōshi*. Kiyosuke relates the words of Ōe no Masafusa's son about the challenges of and suggestions for writing *waka* prefaces:

“Ōe no Koreyori³² [once] remarked, ‘My late father Masafusa said that there was a certain way of writing *waka* prefaces and that one has to learn how to write them. Yet, the theory is that there are no prescriptive rules or patterns, but that one just has to write them based on memorization [of precedents] Learning [how to write *waka* prefaces] consists precisely of understanding this method.’ How much more does this apply to [the writing of] *Kana* prefaces!³³ One should just jot them down following one’s whim and tongue. (...) Taira no Kanemori’s (-990)³⁴ preface composed at Murasakino on the day of the Rat is written too stiffly. The genre of diary records [of poetry gatherings] is different in that its phrases concretely recall events at hand. Thus, one has to read through a lot of old prefaces, but nothing more specific can be stated [about the writing of prefaces]. In writing prefaces one has to be particularly familiar with the Japanese readings of official titles.”³⁵

「維順朝臣語りて曰はく、「故帥^{そち}匡房曰はく、「和歌序は書様^{かきやう}有り。学びて書くべき事なり。その説と云ふは、式法なく様もなく、ただ記せる所をもつてこれを書け。かくの如く知るを学ぶとなすなり。」と云々。況や仮名序においてをや。ただ意に任せて述ぶべき事なり。[...] 兼盛の紫野子の日の序は、慎みて書く所なり。また日記はその躰^{てい}これに異なり、その句具さにして、寄り来る所を諷すべき事なり。且つは故き序等を多くこれを見るべし。委^{くは}しきこと能はず。序を書くには諸官のやまとよみ尤もこれを知るべし。」

Kiyosuke emphasizes that one can only become accomplished in the composition of *waka* prefaces by internalizing skillful samples of the genre. His pronounced reluctance to spell out explicit rules is striking, especially considering that *kanshi* poetical manuals such as the Late Heian *Ōtaku fuketsushō* 王沢不渴抄 prescribe the structure and rhetoric of *kanshi* prefaces meticulously.³⁶ The internalization of models that warrant a “secondary” spontaneity of composition in the case of *waka* prefaces stands in sharp

³¹ For an appraisal of the genre see Ōsone Shōsuke. “Wakajo shōkō,” in: Ōsone Shōsuke *Nihon kanbungaku ronshū*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 1998).

³² Ōe no Masafusa's (1041-1111) son. He served as governor of Higo and also headed the State Academy for some time.

³³ Kiyosuke discusses here the difference between prefaces to *waka* poems written in *kana* and prefaces to *waka* poems written in *kanbun*, the “*waka* prefaces” we are concerned with in this paper.

³⁴ Mid-Heian *waka* poet and one of the thirty-six poetry immortals. He has a personal collection entitled *Kenjōshū*.

³⁵ Fujioka Tadaharu et al. (ed.) *Fukurozōshi* SNKBI vol. 29 (Iwanami shoten, 1995): 31-32.

³⁶ Ōsone Shōsuke. “Wakajo shōkō,” 595-96

contrast to the prescriptive poetics of the twin genre of *kanshi* prefaces. In addition, the genre of *waka* prefaces is suspended in the hybrid space between Masafusa's "ways of composition" [*kakiyō* 書様]—a trace of the prescriptive—and outbursts of emotions—the allegedly spontaneous that still has to be cultivated and acquired through the internalization of precedents. It is a genre that is less definable than genres such as the "ritual diary," but Kiyosuke does not discuss the precise nuance of difference other than just emphasizing it.

That the *waka* preface seems to be a generic and stylistic hybrid is certainly also due to its bivalent diction, as Kiyosuke explains:

Already the ancient worthies thought that prefaces are a difficult matter. Why are they so difficult? When leaning towards vernacular custom by using many Japanese terms [倭語 *wago*], the style will be too weak, but when [preferring] *kanbun* flavored style it will be overly strong. Not too weak, nor too strong, neither too little nor too much, with beginning and end in agreement, and rhetorical flourish and substantial content in equal measure, these are the issues why the ancients deemed [prefaces] difficult. Moreover, although the preface might be appropriate, it is utterly regrettable if the poem itself turns out amateurishly. How should it then be composed? [I say] it calls for rare beauty. Also, it is not customary that the one who has been selected [to write the preface] refuses the task. Even if one cannot win golden fame [with one's preface], it is still better to avoid the shame of leaving one's sheet blank.³⁷

序代は古賢なほもつてこれを難となす。難の故は、何となれば、^{ひとへ}偏に風俗によりて和語を用うればその躰弱く、また風情の漢事^{からこと}なるはその躰強し。弱からず強からず、少なからず多からず、首尾相ひ兼ね、花実共に備ふ。故にもつて難となすのみ。また序題宜しといへども和歌拙きに至りては、遺恨第一なり。詠吟如何となれば、いはゆる珍美なり。また序題はその撰に当りては、辞退は習ひなきの事なり。たとひ黄絹の誉れに非ずとも、宜しく白紙の恥を免るべきのみ。

As with their suspension between prescribed and spontaneous composition, *waka* prefaces have to navigate between many other poles, such as the use of *kanbun*-flavored versus vernacular expressions, between weak and strong diction, "substantial" and "ornamental" expression, which means content and rhetorical flourish. The genre was challenging in practical terms: It demanded an adroit preface written in *kanbun* for equally adroitly written *waka* poems. This disjunction apparently caused distress to those poets who were not equally good at both *waka* and *kanshibun* composition. Kiyosuke laments the cases where an elegant preface is followed by a botched poem, and in turn encourages those who are good at *waka*, but

³⁷ Fujioka Tadaharu Op cit., 32

dread the *kanbun* preface, to nevertheless write spiritedly in order to tackle the *horror vacui* of the empty page. Apparently a good number of people desired to get around the preface, since otherwise Kiyosuke would not have urged poets to face the task once chosen. That the poets writing the prefaces at public occasions were often outstanding academicians with a facility in *kanbun* composition, as Ôsone Shôsuke points out,³⁸ was probably an attempt to avoid failures that must have been humiliating for both author and audience.

As Kiyosuke's remarks indicate, the genre of *waka* prefaces was seen as challenging due to its hybrid linguistic form. The *Fukurozôshi* contrasts the internalization of precedents with written rules of technical poetics, and I will show below how such a poetics is reflected in the peculiar relationship between the *Mana* Preface and the genre of *waka* prefaces: many *waka* prefaces are creative elaborations on particular claims from the *Mana* Preface. I argue that *waka* prefaces recreated parts of the *Mana* Preface using two main strategies: First, intertextually, by further elaborating on passages or expressions from the *Mana* preface, and second, pragmatically, by punning on poetologically pregnant expressions—such as “wind” or “flowers”—that helped conflate the nature of poetic composition with the natural scene of composition. This clever move, which reinstated the essence of poetry in every single one of its compositions, also made the working of poetic craft disappear into the self-evident workings of nature

V b. The *Mana* Preface as Precedent for *Waka* Prefaces: Recreation and Elaboration

An interesting example of how an element from the *Mana* Preface could be elaborated or adapted is the following piece that Fujiwara no Nochiô 藤原後生(909-70)³⁹ wrote during celebrations for Emperor Murakami's fortieth birthday:

夫和歌之興
來尙矣
自神代至聖朝

The rise/stimulus of *waka*
Goes far back.
From the age of the Gods until our sagely court

³⁸ Ôsone Shôsuke. “Wakajo shôkô,” 592

³⁹ He was a son of Fujiwara no Fumisada. In addition to a *waka* in the *Shûishû* some *kanshi* as well as two *waka* prefaces and two votive prayers [願文 *gammon*] are attributed to him. Emperor Murakami's birthday celebration took place in 965.

春花開時	at the time when the spring flowers are blooming,
詠歌之思不絕	longings for composing poetry never cease
秋月朗夜	during nights when the autumn moon is bright
謳吟之聲猶忙	voices of poetry recitation are ever busy.
行基菩薩	The monk Gyōki ⁴⁰
臨難波津	when approaching Naniwa Ford
贈於婆羅門僧正	dedicated a poem to Bodaisenna;
達磨和尚	And Bodhidharma
至富緒河	upon reaching the Tomi-no-o River
寄於斑鳩宮太子	gave a poem to Prince Shōtoku ⁴¹
況上古既有奉賀帝王之嘉什	Since in high antiquity there were already beautiful stanzas celebrating emperors and rulers,
當今何無奉祈寶算之誦音哉	how could there not be songs recited today to pray for His Majesty's precious old age?
敢獻四首其辭云	I dare to present four poems, which go as follows . . . ⁴²

The preface sketches a vast historical timeline of poetry from the Age of Gods to the human present. The multiple meaning of “*okori/kyō* 興” as “rise”, but also as “stimulus” to poetic composition—and in its most technical meaning the rhetorical figure of “evocative image” from the “Six principles” [*rikugi*]⁴³—suggests a historical, but also psychological, timeline. Thanks to the multiple meanings of a single word, poetry is summarized as a practice with historical pedigree, as a timeless human instinct, and as its concrete manifestation in the particular rhetorical trope that is part of the “Six Principles.”

As in the *Mana* Preface, Naniwa Ford and Tomi-no-o River are evoked simultaneously as seminal locations for early poetic exchanges. However, this *waka* preface exchanges some of the actors and gives the practice of poetry a more Buddhist, possibly particularly auspicious, slant for an imperial birthday celebration. In the *Mana* Preface, the scenes at Naniwa Ford and Tomi-no-o River had embodied the

⁴⁰ The itinerant monk Gyōki (668-749), popularly considered a reincarnation of Mañjuśrī, is particularly known for his charitable care for the common people. After refusing the honor to perform the eye-opening ceremony for the Great Buddha at the Tōdaiji, he set out for the seashore to welcome Bodaisenna (704-60), an Indian monk who reached Japan via China in 736 and to whom he entrusted the ceremony. Upon their first encounter at Naniwa Ford they exchanged *waka*, confirming that their meeting had been determined by fate. Gyōki is considered a descendant of the Korean envoy Wani mentioned in the *Kaifūsō* Preface. He is a popular figure in *setsuwa* stories. *Waka* attributed to Gyōki appear in the *Shūishū*, in the *ShinKokinshū*, and in the *ShinChokusenshū*.

⁴¹ Prince Shōtoku (574-622) allegedly covered a man who was suffering from hunger and cold with his fine robe. This man turned out to be an incarnation of Daruma (Bodhidharma), the founding figure of Chan Buddhism. They addressed and thanked each other in *waka*. The story of Gyōki and Bodaisenna, and of Prince Shōtoku and Bodhidharma appear together, like in this poem, in the 13th century *setsuwa* collection *Shasekishū* 沙石集. See NBT 85, ed. by Watanabe Tsunaya (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1966): 252-56.

⁴² Kakimura Shigematsu (ed.) *Honchō monzui chūshaku* (Tokyo: Naigai Shuppan Kabushiki Kaisha, 1922): 596-98.

exchange of poetry between a ruler and his subject, namely between Emperor Nintoku and the Korean envoy Wani and Prince Shôtoku and the monk Daruma respectively. Nochiô replaces Emperor Nintoku and Wani with Gyôki and Bodaisenna. The substitution is especially apt, since Gyôki was considered a descendant of Wani. The disposal of the Confucian subject-ruler dynamics from the *Mana* Preface in favor of a Buddhist rhetoric of expedient conversation between foreigners in the universal tongue of *waka* may appear minor, but it imposes a significant change on the enterprise of *waka* as a whole, and in particular on the *waka* composed for Emperor Murakami on his birthday.

This adaptation of elements from the *Mana* Preface to a Buddhist cause could go much further. The *Honchô monzui* contains a preface that Fujiwara no Arikuni 藤原有国 (943-1011) wrote for a set of poems on the *Lotus Sutra*. For a *waka* preface it is a remarkably long piece. Followed by a second part that gives examples of compositions on Buddhist themes, the first part is—quite surprisingly—a partial rearrangement of the Chinese “Great Preface” with some variations:

讚法華經廿八品和歌序

“On praising the 28 chapters of the Lotus Sutra”

和歌者志之所之也
 用之鄉人焉
 用之邦國矣
 情動於中
 言形於外
 遊讌歡娛之辭
 樂且康
 哀傷貶謫之詠
 愁且悲
 行旅餞別之句
 惜而怨
 鶯花鳧藻之思
 态⁴⁴以僞

A *waka* poem is that to which what is intently on the mind goes.
 It is used in smaller communities
 as well as larger states.
 When emotions are stirred inside,
 words take form on the outside.⁴³
 Phrases of happy roaming and banqueting
 are joyful and serene,
 while chants of mourning and exile
 are sorrowful and sad.
 Expressions for travels and parting banquets
 are pitiful, even resentful,
 While longing for warblers, blossoms, happy ducks and water cress
 is arrogant and full of conceit.

上自神代下訖人俗
 國風之始也
 故以和爲首

From the age of the Gods to human usages,
 [*waka*] are the beginning of our local customs.
 Because we use “responses” as stanzas,

⁴³ This is the first part that paraphrases ideas from the “Great Preface” to the *Classic of Poetry* such as the “intention” in the mind that comes out as a poem, the use of poetry on various levels of society, the possibility to understand the life reality of the poet from the tones of the poetry.

⁴⁴ The text has Morohashi. *Dai Kan-Wa jiten* no. 10385 (†+大).

吟詠之至也	they are the ultimate in the recitation of poetry;
故以歌爲名	and since they are called “songs,”
和歌之美也	they have the beauty of “songs responding to each other.”
其來遠矣	Their origin goes far back.
自爾以降或應詔以選錄古今	Some time later somebody responded to the imperial order to collect [poems] old and new
或起意以編次新舊	and at some point the idea arose to compile poetry of present and past,
興自萬葉集至於諸家集	starting from the <i>Man'yōshū</i> to the various House collections,
卷軸已多	a good number of scrolls.
源流寔繁	Ever since its beginnings [poetry] thrived:
行基菩薩婆羅門僧正者當朝之化人	The monks Gyōki and Baramon, both reincarnations at [Emperor Shōmu's] court,
異俗之權者也	were authoritative exemplars of foreign [Buddhist] customs.
思靈山而成詠	Their longings for Spirit Mountain ⁴⁵ turned into poems
契真如而遺詞	and they thus left behind their promises to stay truthful.
花山僧正元慶之人師也	Monk Kazan was a teacher of the people in the <i>Gangyō</i> era [877-885],
素性法師延喜之遊徒也	priest Sosei an itinerant scholar of the <i>Engi</i> era [901-923].
所詠詞什多存人口	Many of the poems they composed still survive in people's oral memory.
雖有風雲之興	Yet, although they were stirred [to write] on [natural scenes] of wind and clouds,
未以法花爲題	They never chose the “Flower of the Law” as a poetic topic (...)” ⁴⁶

The preface unfolds in three stages. First, it offers a medley of almost literal quotations from the Chinese “Great Preface”. The plant metaphor from the opening of the *Kokinshū* Prefaces is replaced with the “Great Preface’s” famed statement “[*Waka*] poetry is that to which what is intently on the mind goes.” This crucial dictum of Chinese poetics had not been included in the *Mana* Preface, but Arikuni nevertheless pounds on this weighty formula in his opening line. Also, Arikuni’s piece puts a greater emphasis on poetry as a “local” Japanese custom [*kokufū*] “used in smaller communities and larger states,” and the *Mana* Prefaces’s explanation of the relation between poetry and the psychological state of its author at the moment of composition is further developed. The “Great Preface” had claimed that—based on this relation—poetry could serve as a diagnostic tool of the government under which the poet

⁴⁵ This refers to the Indian mountain where the Buddha preached the Lotus Sutra. “Ryōzen” is an abbreviation for “Ryōjuzen” [靈鷲山], an appellation that evoked the eagle-head shape of the mountain.

⁴⁶ Kakimura Op. cit., 606-8.

lives and composes. But the *Mana* Preface had eliminated the diagnostic and critical potential ascribed to poetry in the “Great Preface” and had instead toned it down to a general interdependence between stimulus and response, between circumstances of composition and corresponding poem. Arikuni’s emphatic description of poetic moods that go with particular circumstances such as mourning or exile, travel and parting or seasonal stimuli such as warblers or blossoms is an expansion on the *Mana* Preface’s simplified stimulus-response theory. Thus, the first part of Arikuni’s preface harks back to claims of the Chinese “Great Preface” that had been left out in the *Mana* Preface; it also consolidates some of the alterations the *Mana* Preface had boldly imposed onto the “Great Preface.”

The second section of the preface evokes the historical origin of poetry in the Age of the Gods and adds interesting twists to the account of the *Mana* Preface; however, the text returns immediately to the timeless psychology of composition by offering an analytic etymology of the term “*waka*” that the *Mana* Preface had not capitalized on: “songs” [*utalka*] sung “in response” [*kotau/wa*] is a welcome shorthand for the art of *waka* as a vocal outpouring of emotion as well as communal enterprise. Then, in an interesting return to the discussion of the origins of poetry, the preface silently skips over the *Mana* Preface’s claim that Susanô ought to be credited with the first poem in Japanese history and jumps instead to Gyôki and Bodaisenna, who had replaced Emperor Nintoku and the Korean envoy Wani in Fujiwara no Nochiô’s preface discussed above. Again, the *waka* tradition is connected to Buddhist progenitors. Unlike their secular poetry colleagues who would have been moved to write poetry by flowers and birds, they find inspiration in their longings for “Spirit Mountain,” in remembrance of the Buddha’s teaching. Accordingly Arikuni’s preface calls for a new era in poetry which should emanate from allegorical “flowers,” such as the “Flower of the Law,” the Lotus Sutra. Arikuni suggests replacing the nature enjoyed at excursions and banquets with a poetic search for the “nature” of Buddhist truth.

The preface is a *tour de force*. It starts with a weighty and vague gesture from the “Great Preface,” worshipping a literalness that almost reprimands the *Mana* Preface for its omissions. It then continues to declare *waka* the discharge of religious yearning and finally proposes to literally “transplant” the practice

of writing *waka* into the Buddhist landscape of the *Lotus Sutra*. Arikuni's preface beautifully illustrates that the genre of Heian *waka* prefaces not just regurgitated stock phrases from the *Mana Preface*, but put its rhetoric to astonishing new uses. Arikuni's piece speaks vividly to the *Mana Preface*'s potential for translation into radically different contexts; though still basing himself on the rhetoric of the *Mana Preface* Arikuni abducts poetry into Buddhist realms by allegorizing its textual surface. His remark that nobody has so far chosen the "Flower of the Law" as a poetic topic shows his awareness of the novelty of his preface and the accompanying poems.

In the Late Heian period, the rhetoric of the *Mana Preface* was also twisted into amusingly secular directions. A preface by the Late Heian poet Fujiwara no Munemitsu 藤原宗光, composed in the fourth month of 1104, is an entertaining illustration of this tendency

早夏於鳥羽院同詠郭公聲稀和歌一首并序

Composing together on "Voices of cuckoos are few" at the Toba Palace⁴⁷ in early summer. A *waka* with preface

夫郭公者自古以來好事之輩

以之爲翰墨之謀
以之抽雅頌之義
爰一聲纔聞
望雲端兮馳思
餘情未飽
倚林間兮傾耳
于時侍射山者
十有餘輩
屬九牧之無事
展五華而考槃
初命燕飲
唇染荆南之露

後詠倭語

The cuckoo has since ancient times been the companion of "great things,"
whether you take him as go-between with brush and ink
or in order to instantiate the principles of the "Odes" and "Hymns"⁴⁸.
Thus, when finally hearing its voice,
one gazes to the end of the clouds with galloping longings,
and if the lingering desires are not yet satiated,
one turns to the woods and pricks up one's ears.
At such a time we, a dozen fellows
in the service of Retired Emperor [Shirakawa],
belonging to those Kyūshū officials with time on our hands,
deployed the "five blossoms" [mats] and set up a hermit residence⁴⁹.
First a drinking banquet was ordered,
during which lips were moistened with wine-dew from Southern
Regions,
then we chanted poems of Yamato;

⁴⁷ This probably refers to the 鳥羽殿, the Toba Palace that Emperor Shirakawa built in the Fushimi area South of Kyoto after becoming Retired Emperor in 1086.

⁴⁸ Together with the "Airs" [風], the "Odes" [雅], and "Hymns" [頌] are the three parts of the *Classic of Poetry* and belong to the "Six Principles" of poetry [*rikugi*]

⁴⁹ [Ch. *kaopan*, J. *kōhan*]. The meaning goes back to a poem in the "Airs of Wei" 衛風 of the *Classic of Poetry*. The poem relates a hermit's happy life in reclusion. According to the authoritative Mao interpretation, it was intended as critique of Duke Zhuang of Wei, who ruled less wisely than his father and caused many a worthy official to retire into reclusion.

詞慣柿下之風
便以郭公聲稀
爲其題目而已
於戲
不獨記仙洞鵝群之遊

有歌酒兩般之興矣
亦欲知雍州鳥羽之地
有山水仁智之樂焉

其詞曰

and our diction followed the “airs” of Hitomaro.
Since voices of cuckoos were few,
We ended up taking that as our topic.
To entertain ourselves
we did not just record the excursion of our bunch of “phoenixes of
the Immortals’ Cave”
but also had two types of “stimuli”⁵⁰: poems and wine.
Also we wanted to get to know the Toba Palace in Yamashiro
and had indeed a merry time among benevolent mountains and wise
waters.⁵¹
The lyrics say:”⁵²

Munemitsu joyfully contradicts the *Mana* Preface’s lament that *waka* poetry is abused as a facilitator of “good affairs” and amorous exchanges.⁵³ Here the cuckoo, known for its voice that calls forth inescapable yearning, is the incentive to composition. In the same situation the “stimulus” of the “Six Principles” is watered down to wine—though not women—and song. Also, as tongue-in-cheek name-dropping, three other of the “Six Principles” are mentioned—“odes”, “hymns” and “airs”—whose high-minded pretenses stand in comic contrast to the consciously casual scene. The party is pleasurable and spontaneous; the partygoers, posing under the comical pseudonym of “phoenixes of the Immortals’ Cave,” have a good time writing *waka* and decide to write a preface only on the spur of the moment. Not only is the topic somewhat randomly chosen—they take what is at hand; but the scarcity of the voice of cuckoos is in itself an undeniably anticlimactic topic. Longing to write poetry comes from the call of the cuckoo, not from the perception of its absence. In line with the comical tone that enjoys blending the cultured with the vulgar, the preface closes on a slapstick move. The moral geography of the wise who enjoy streams and the righteous who rejoice in mountains is a *kanbun* cliché from the *Analects*, which already in the *Kaifūsō* had become an idiomatic expression for an ideal landscape contemplated by refined Confucian gentlemen, most often the participants of the very imperial outings eulogized in the *Kaifūsō* poems.

⁵⁰ Also one of the “Six Principles” [*rikugi*] of poetry.

⁵¹ See *Analects* 6.23.

⁵² *Fusō kobunshū*: 6.

⁵³ See the *Mana* Preface: “Those infatuated with love affairs, used [*waka* poems] as ‘messengers of flowers and birds’ [to their beloved] and those begging for food used them as a go-between for their daily subsistence” 有好色之家 以此爲花鳥之使 乞食之客 以此爲活計之媒謀. Katagiri Op. cit., 292-3

Munemitsu, however, adopts a less solemn tone so that, for once, Confucius is pleasantly abused for having a truly good and merry time.

Again, echoes from the *Mana* preface—such as “love birds,” the joking evocation of the “Six Principles,” Hitomaro as the guiding spirit of *waka* poetry—populate a narrative of merry intoxication and adjust aptly to the venue. In Arikuni’s and Munemitsu’s prefaces, pieces from the *Mana* Preface are fitted into new semantic environments. Arikuni twists them to make *waka* into the mouthpiece of Buddhist devotion, while Munemitsu styles them into the unbridled side-effects of a drinking party of idle officials.

V c. The *Mana* Preface as Precedent for *Waka* Prefaces: Puns and Poetics

Apart from the creative adjustment of passages from the *Mana* Preface, some claims of the *Mana* Preface lived on in the genre of *waka* prefaces as metaphors and puns. Metaphors such as the plant metaphor in the beginning of the preface provided a tempting opportunity to conflate landscape and season with poetics and composition. An example by Fujiwara no Arisuna (-1082)⁵⁴ can illustrate this gesture:

暮春詠落華埋路和歌

治曆之年
陽春之侯
蓬壺侍臣二十許輩
忽乘禁掖之休假
遙指郊外而歷覽
蓋屬諸憂之無爲
賞三春之可樂也
于時
和風動枝落花埋路

宿雪封而難過
訪去跡於歌鶯之聲

濃霞鎖以易迷
任前程於管馬之智者也

“Composing on ‘Fallen blossoms cover the path’ in late spring”

During the Jiryaku era (1065-69),
at the time when spring was at its brightest,
some twenty Palace attendants
spontaneously took advantage of a day off from the Palace
and headed for the far outskirts of the city for an excursion.
They refrained from giving themselves to all kind of sorrows
and could rejoice in the joys of the three months of springtide.
At that time
the gentle breeze [or: our Japanese custom of writing *waka*] moved
the branches, and fallen blossoms [or: poems] covered the path.
When remaining snow blocked the way and it was difficult to pass,
we inquired about the traces we had left behind with the voice of the
song-singing warbler;
and when dense fog closed in on us and it was easy to get lost,
we entrusted the road ahead to the instinct of our harnessed horses.

⁵⁴ Arisuna came from a family of Confucian officials. He reached the position of Head of the State Academy. The preface is preserved in the mid-12th century *Honchō zoku monzui*.

請課柿本之秘事
將記花樹之勝概
其詞曰

Inspired by the precedent of Hitomaro's secret matters,
we wanted to record the overwhelming vista of the blossoming trees
The lyrics read."⁵⁵

On one level, the preface talks about the charms of spring and about natural instincts: Spring is at its best, a bunch of palace officials take off on an improvised excursion and end up writing poetry about the marvelous scene. They are led on by the superior instincts of other living creatures that are more receptive to the vernal landscape: The singing warblers and the horses make sure that the party does not get lost on its way. However, at second sight, the preface superposes a poetological landscape on its natural counterpart. The “gentle wind” can also be read as the “custom of Japanese poetry”, which moves the branches, so that “blossoms”—which according to the plant metaphor of the *Mana* preface are manifested poems—fall on the path. Although the horses have truly no place in the superimposed poetic landscape, the song-singing warbler is both the creature sharing the same landscape with Arisuna's company, but it is also the bird from the *Mana* Preface⁵⁶, which both sings its own “poetry” and inspires humans to do the same. When the party records the “overwhelming vista of the blossoming trees,” the blossoms on the trees are, again, both the flowers in immediate sight and also the recorded poems themselves, as they sprout from the “soil of the heart”—in the words of the *Mana* Preface. To continue the double architecture of the scene, the natural warblers and horses help out the humans' lack of instinct to move through the natural landscape, but the poets are also guided by one particular human instinct through the poetic landscape, namely the teachings of Hitomaro. Horses and warblers guide by natural instinct, whereas Hitomaro guides by precedent and inspiration, producing the summation of a cultivated, educated instinct of poetic creativity moving through its own subject matter—landscape.

VI. Conclusion and Outlook

⁵⁵ Kuroita Katsumi (ed.). *Honchō monzui. Honcho zoku monzui* Shintei zōho Kokushi Taikai 29 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1966): 167.

We have used what we might call the “back door” to the *Kokinshū* prefaces to get insight into a very particular part of the reception history of *Kokinshū* poetics by focusing on the *Mana* Preface and the Heian genre of *waka* prefaces it engendered. As I have argued, *waka* prefaces did not just repeat expressions from the *Mana* Preface, but constantly mobilized their original significance to claim *waka* variously as embodiment of sacred speech, as revered Japanese custom in proud awareness of its Chinese counterpart, or just in order to have a good time in a landscape that houses a double architecture of nature and *waka* poetics.

The early Japanese textual record is replete with interfaces between Chinese, Japanese and Sino-Japanese phrases and concepts, but the genre of *waka* prefaces occupies a very peculiar spot. As a genre cast in *kanbun* diction prefacing a *waka* poem that required the adaptation of its diction and poetics to both the *waka* poetic world and *kanbun* diction, it constitutes a hybrid niche among the various literary idioms of Heian Japan. Put differently, the genre was nothing more than an artificially created interface that reflected on *waka* from its linguistic outside and was always caught, as Fujiwara no Kiyosuke emphasized, in the tension between the flavor of *wabun* content and the façade of *kanbun* diction. Tracing the *Mana* Preface’s afterlife in Heian *waka* prefaces has provided a rare opportunity to reflect on a thought-provoking genre, which by its linguistic constellation was forced to be much more hybrid than other Heian genres, in which the *wabun* and *kanbun* decorum were kept more strictly apart.