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Abstract

This thesis explores the political messages contained in the seventeenth imperial anthology of Japanese poetry (waka), the Fūgawakashū (1346). Through reaffirmation of values presented in previous anthologies, imperial waka anthologies served as a source of mutual legitimization for the commissioning regime and the compiling poets. I examine how Retired Emperor Hanazono (1297-1348, r. 1308-1318), as the head of the Jimyōin faction and the guardian of the Kyōgoku school of poetry, establishes ties between the Fūgawakashū and canonical texts of Japan and China to legitimize his Kyōgoku-Jimyōin faction against the rival Nijō-Daikakuji faction.

I argue that Hanazono uses the Confucian concept of feng (風, J. fū) as the organizing principle for his claims in the Fūgawakashū. I discuss the origin of the title “fūga,” which pays homage to the Chinese anthology, the Shijing 詩經 (c. 600 BCE). In the two prefaces composed in kana and mana in the fashion of Kokinwakashū (c. 905) and ShinKokinwakashū (1205), Hanazono identifies governance through the virtue of great men, or feng, as the true function of poetry. By reiterating some arguments from the Kokinwakashū and ShinKokinwakashū prefaces and omitting some aspects to which the Nijō school adheres, Hanazono weaves a poetic lineage that connects the Shijing, Kokinwakashū tradition, and the Fūgawakashū. He proclaims his Kyōgoku school to be the legitimate heir to the spirit of feng represented in the canonized Chinese and Japanese anthologies; the commissioning Jimyōin line is the virtuous rulers abiding by the feng.
This thesis also offers some explanation as to the strong legitimacy claim and the explicit critique of the rival faction toward the end of the anthology. I follow evidence for Hanazono’s favourable assessment of Emperor GoDaigo in the early years, consider the turn of events from the perspective of the Jimyōin faction, and conclude that Hanazono’s disappointment in GoDaigo’s revolutionary manoeuvres result in the critical tone in the prefaces. By the assessment of Hanazono’s strategies this study offers to depart from the accepted interpretation of the Fūgawakashū as the Kyōgoku school’s innovative compilation and reconfigures the anthology within a longer tradition of Chinese and Japanese canons.
Lay Summary

Reference to already-established literary works is a strategy often used to enhance the authority of one’s own work. In the history of imperial Japanese poetry anthologies, compilers frequently choose a title and a structure that refer to a previous anthology, and draw authority for their own anthology.

This study examines methods of legitimization used by Retired Emperor Hanazono in the *Fūgawakashū*, a fourteenth-century imperial anthology from the period of divided courts. Hanazono gives the anthology a title that refers to ancient China’s *Shijing*. He writes two prefaces where he develops a poetic lineage between the *Shijing*, Japanese anthologies, and the *Fūgawakashū*. By asserting that the *Fūgawakashū* succeeds values embodied in the established Chinese and Japanese traditions, Hanazono strengthens his legitimacy claims against the political and cultural rivals. The study departs from the accepted model of *Fūgawakashū* as an innovative attempt and places the anthology in a much longer tradition.
Preface

This thesis is the original, independent, and unpublished work of the author, Yoon-Kyung Kim.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

This thesis explores the political messages contained in a fourteenth-century imperial anthology of Japanese poetry (waka, 和歌) by examining components other than the poems in the compilation and the strategies employed to represent political ideas found in the extra-poetic text. The work I analyze is the Fūgawakashū 風雅和歌集, commonly abbreviated as the Fūgashū 風雅集, commissioned by Retired Emperor Kōgon 光厳 (1313-1364, r. 1332-1333) in the volatile years shortly after the fall of the Kamakura shogunate 鎌倉幕府 (1185-1333). In the history of waka scholarship, the Fūgashū has never enjoyed the kind of attention given to the first major anthology of Japanese poetry, the Man'yōshū 万葉集 (Collection of a Myriad Leaves, c. 8th century CE), or the first imperial waka anthology, the Kokinwakashū 古今和歌集 (Collection of Japanese Poetry Old and New, c. 905, hereafter the Kokinshū 古今集). The Fūgashū is already the seventeenth of twenty-one waka anthologies ordered by emperors and retired emperors spanning over five centuries, and as such held little promise of presenting novel literary characteristics. Nonetheless, the sociopolitical backdrop in which the anthology was compiled makes it an illustrative example of literature becoming a ground from which to fight for legitimacy against formidable political and literary rivals.

Even without accounting for the complex political situation of the last few decades of the Kamakura period, the fact that the Fūgashū is an imperial anthology renders it political in nature. That is, imperial favour and intentions are reflected in an imperial anthology through the compilers and editors that the emperor entrusts with the task, the poets who are considered, the number of poems by particular poets or schools of poetry included, and the kind of poems represented in the anthology. An imperial anthology therefore is not merely a collection of
“good” poems, but a collection of poems that the emperor deems good. It is a space representative of the power and intent of the commissioner, achieved through the hands of the selected compilers.

Scholars of *waka* and imperial *waka* anthologies have long understood the role of imperial anthologies as a public sphere. For instance, the political usage of imperial anthologies or their “political appropriation” is the premise for Marra’s study of medieval imperial anthologies. Placing thirteenth and fourteenth century imperial anthologies within the context of political events of the time, Marra demonstrates that double legitimation occurs through the medium of imperial anthologies, between the producer (artists) and the patron (the emperor).¹ A poet or school of poetry gains honour from being included in the anthology project, with the greatest honour being nomination as a compiler or a member of the compiling committee. At the same time, the imperial favour is reciprocated through the anthology project. The artistic beneficiaries confirm and adhere to the imperial authority whence they derive their cultural capital using techniques to reaffirm the values expressed in previous imperial anthologies. Imperial anthologies thus function as a medium for “double legitimation.”²

The five imperial anthologies compiled during the late Kamakura period (1185-1333) performed the additional function of delegitimizing rivals when an irreversible split occurred to both the patrons and anthologizers. At the court, the brother emperors GoFukakusa (1243-1304, r. 1246-1259) and Kameyama (1249-1305, r. 1259-1274) each insisted that his progeny had rights to the throne, with their dispute resulting in the split of the court into

² Ibid.
the Jimyōin line 持明院統 (descendants of GoFukakusa) and the Daikakuji line 大覚寺統 (descendants of Kameyama). The heir to the throne was decided by the Kamakura shogunate from either line. By the beginning of the fourteenth-century, the shogunate began to consider a system that was later referred to as the system of alternate succession. As for the artists, the Mikohidari house 御子左家 of the Fujiwara 藤原 clan had been recognized as the most respectable house of poets after the poetic giants Shunzei 俊成 (1114-1204) and Teika 定家 (1162-1241), and to a lesser degree, Tame’ie 為家 (1198-1275). The Mikohidari poets were considered the hereditary compilers for imperial anthologies, either as sole compilers or members of the compiling committee. At around the time of the succession dispute at court, sons of Tame’ie were also disputing financial and cultural inheritance. The brothers would not reconcile, resulting in three schools of poetry, Nijō 二条, Kyōgoku 京極 and Reizei 冷泉. Each school claimed legitimacy to the legacies of Shunzei and Teika. The older sons secured sponsorships of the rival imperial houses, forming Kyōgoku-Jimyōin and Nijō-Daikakuji bonds. With emperors at this time placed on the throne from either house, anthologies from this time were also factionalized productions. The Kyōgoku-compiled anthology favoured the Jimyōin line and the Nijō-compiled anthologies favoured the Daikakuji line. Anthologies produced in the

---

3 Appendix C charts the division of the imperial house and the alternate succession order, as decided by the Kamakura shogunate, up until when the Fūgashū was completed.

4 Shunzei compiled the seventh anthology, the Senzaishu 千載集 (1188); Teika, the ShinKokinshū 新古今集 (1205) as part of a committee and the ShinChokusenshū 新勅撰集 (1234) as a sole compiler; Tame’ie, the ShokuGosenshū 続後撰集 (1252) as a sole compiler and the ShokuKokinshū 続古今集 (1266) as part of a committee; Tame’ie’s son Tameuji 為氏 (1222-1286) compiled the ShokuShūishū 続拾遺集 (1278) before the succession disputes.

5 The Reizei school, founded by Tamesuke 為相 (1263-1328), did not enter the competition for many years, Tamesuke being forty years junior to (Nijō) Tameuji (1222-1286). The Reizei school is outside the scope of this study.
late Kamakura period functioned to legitimize the compiling patron-artist alliance on one hand, and to negate the rival patron-artist alliance on the other.

The Kyōgoku-Jimyōin versus Nijō-Daikakuji rivalry coincides with the accelerated pace at which imperial anthologies were commissioned. The first three anthologies, or the sandaishū 三代集 were completed at fifty-year intervals. The intervals are shorter thereafter, roughly a couple of decades apart, with the exception of the ShinKokinshū, the presentation banquet for which delivered only seventeen years after the completion of the anthology before it, possibly to commemorate three hundredth anniversary of the Kokinshū. The five anthologies from the late Kamakura period are produced at a noticeably faster pace, in some cases less than ten years apart. As the rivalry at court intensified, the Daikakuji faction in particular attempted anthologization every time a new emperor ascended to the throne.

The Fūgashū was completed in 1346, twenty years after the completion date of the third Nijō anthology, ShokuGoShūishū, and some ten years after the fall of the Kamakura shogunate. Although the Fūgashū appears after the fall of the Kamakura shogunate—after the establishment of the Muromachi shogunate 室町幕府 (1336-1573), in fact—I find it logically convincing to see it together with the five late Kamakura anthologies, as a Kyōgoku-Jimyōin counter to the

---

6 Retired Emperor GoToba 後鳥羽 (1180-1239, r. 1183-1198) urged the committee many times in 1205 to quicken the pace and produce visible results. He insisted on a presentation ceremony in that year regardless of objections from the committee. The official reason for GoToba’s insistence on the presentation date is unknown; some scholars claim that GoToba wanted the 1205 presentation because it was the three hundredth year from the Kokinshū—more exactly, because it was the same sign on the sixty-year cycle of the Chinese calendar. Hirota Akiko, “Ex-Emperor Go-Toba: A Study in Personality, Politics and Poetry” (PhD Diss., University of California Los Angeles, 1989), 166.

7 There was a nine years’ interval between ShinGosenshū 新後撰集 (1303) and Gyokuyōshū 玉葉集 (1312), eight years between Gyokuyōshū and ShokuSenzaishū 続千載集 (1320), six years between ShokuSenzaishū and ShokuGoShūishū 続後拾遺集 (1326). See Appendix E for the list of late Kamakura anthologies with their compilation intervals. The commissioning years for the Nijō-Daikakuji anthologies coincide with the accession year of a Daikakuji emperor, with the exception of ShokuGoShūishū. See Robert Huey, “Warrior Control over the Imperial Anthology,” in The Origins of Japan’s Medieval World: Courtiers, Clerics, Warriors, and Peasants in the Fourteenth Century, ed. by Jeffrey P. Mass (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997), 179.
Nijō-Daikakuji claim for legitimacy. Its commissioner and compiler Kōgon was a representative poet of the Kyōgoku school; Retired Emperor Hanazono 花園 (1297-1348, r. 1308-1318), arguably the greatest contributor to the Fūgashū, was a renowned scholar of Confucianism and Buddhism, a respected Kyōgoku poet, and the de facto head of the Kyōgoku school. Hanazono titled the anthology “Fūgawakashū” and propped it up with two prefaces. Before his death, Hanazono was responsible for the overall direction of the project and Kōgon frequently consulted his opinion on the selection of poems.\(^8\) The imperial status of the two main anthologizers is unique in the history of imperial anthologization. Commissioning imperial figures in the past may have been deeply involved in the anthology projects—GoToba, for example, deeply engaged himself at every step of making the ShinKokinshū—but none were listed as the compiler; Kōgon is the only imperial figure to be recorded as the compiler in the history of the twenty-one imperial waka anthologies. Such a high degree of involvement by senior imperial members testifies to the weight put on this anthology project.

Paradoxically, the level of imperial involvement also reveals the urgency and, possibly, the shortage of seasoned poets the Jimyōin-Kyōgoku faction found themselves confronted with. Despite the fact that Hanazono and Kōgon were serving as retired emperors and poets, the involvement of the highest members of the court in what was ordinarily the job of lesser officials can be interpreted as, on one hand, the elevation of the anthology’s status, and on the other hand, a decline of imperial authority. Indeed, Hanazono and Kōgon had many a reason to elevate the status of their authority in both the political and literary dimensions. On the literary side, they had to compete against the Nijō school who had an advantage in public recognition. The Nijō

\(^8\) Tsugita Kasumi 次田香澄 and Iwasa Miyoko 岩佐美代子, eds., Fūgawakashū 風雅和歌集 (Miyai shoten, 1974), 22.
school was founded by Tame’ie’s first son Tameuji. As direct descendants of Tame’ie’s, Nijō school leaders were considered mainstream and earned wider acclaim. The Nijō leaders had already produced three imperial anthologies during the reign of the two Daikakuji rulers, whereas the Kyōgoku had produced only Gyokuyōshū at that time. The Kyōgoku-Jimyōin effort to produce another anthology began in 1293 but ended without fruition when the head of the Kyōgoku school, Tamekane 為兼 (1254-1332), was exiled in 1298; Tamekane was exiled again in 1316 and died without an heir in 1332, and continuing the Kyōgoku school was left to the two retired emperors. Another long-awaited chance to prove Kyōgoku superiority over Nijō this time was not to be missed. Politically, the Jimyōin line had just experienced a greater threat to its survival than ever with the Kenmu Restoration of GoDaigo 後醍醐 (1288-1339, r. 1318-1332, 1333-1339). Successor of Hanazono to the throne, GoDaigo was the first emperor in a long time who was mature and enthusiastic enough to bring a long-dismissed concept back to realization: the emperor’s direct rule. Although his anti-shogunate plots leaked prematurely, resulting in his exile, GoDaigo’s later escape and military confrontations with the Kamakura shogunate cornered the Jimyōin line. What was a triumphant restoration from the Daikakuji line’s perspective was usurpation from the Jimyōin line’s perspective, since GoDaigo did not recognize Kōgon as a legitimate successor but as a pretender when GoDaigo had never officially abdicated. For the senior Jimyōin members, after GoDaigo’s fleeing to Yoshino and the opening of the Southern

---

9 Retired Emperor Fushimi 伏見 (1265-1317, r. 1287-1298), then head of the Jimyōin line, originally ordered four poets to form a committee, including Kyōgoku leader Tamekane and also Nijō leader Tameyo 為世 (1250-1338). Of the four poets, Tamekane was exiled in 1298, Kujō Takahiro died the same year, Asukai Masaari died in 1301, and Tameyo “allegedly declined the commission.” Tamekane’s exile was not the sole reason for the project’s failure, but was a crucial loss for Fushimi, who would have liked to order Tamekane as the sole compiler were he not a relatively new poet from a non-direct line (that is, not the first born) of the Mikohidari house. Stefania Burk, “Reading Between the Lines: Poetry and Politics in the Imperial Anthologies of the Late Kamakura Period (1185-1333)” (PhD Diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2001), 128.
Court there, it must have been a matter of imperial dignity to prove that the Mandate of Heaven (天命, tenmei) was truly with the Jimyōin line, not the Daikakuji line.

In this thesis, I examine how Hanazono as the head of the Jimyōin faction and the guardian of the Kyōgoku salon used the genre of the imperial waka anthology as a space of legitimization. Politics and poetics merge in Hanazono’s defence of his line, as he and Kōgon serve the unique role of imperial compilers who hand down a collection of “good” poetry to their subjects. Hanazono’s weapon of choice is to closely follow tradition and appeal to the authority of precedents. The tendency of anthologies for more than a century (or from the ShinKokinshū on, with few exceptions) has been to bear a title that points to an earlier anthology and expresses ties to the namesake, as listed in Appendix E. Hanazono’s title “fūga” does not make a direct reference to any of the sixteen previous imperial waka anthologies. Although it might not be conspicuous to modern readers, the title references the Shijing 詩經 (Book of Poetry, or Book of Odes, c. 600 BCE) instead, since “fūga,” or “fengya” in Chinese pronunciation, is another way to call this oldest poetry anthology from China. By naming his anthology after the Shijing, Hanazono demonstrates that he seeks linkage to the oldest established poetic authority and inherits its cultural and political implications. He then structures the Fūgashū after the format of the Kokinshū, dividing the anthology into twenty volumes and writing two prefaces, a manajo (a preface in mana, or Literary Sinitic) and a kanajo (a preface in kana, or Japanese syllabary). Through this format Hanazono aligns the Fūgashū with the Kokinshū, ShinKokinshū, and ShokuKokinshū, or anthologies in the “kokin” tradition that share the same format, and draws on the spirit of the oldest imperial waka anthology. By establishing ties to Japanese and Chinese canons, the Fūgashū appeals to the established authorities more strongly than any other imperial waka anthologies. I examine the Fūgashū’s structural similarities and allusions to previous
works in the Japanese and Chinese canons made in the *kanajo* and *manajo* to answer how and why the *Fūgashū* functions as a Jimyōin-Kyōgoku space of legitimization.

The next section of Chapter 1: Introduction is a brief look at the sociopolitical backdrop against which the intense political statements of the *Fūgashū* Prefaces were born, from the split of the imperial house until GoDaigo’s Kenmu Restoration, and the division of the Mikohidari house after Tame’ie’s death. Much ink has been spilt over these two factionalizing events of the late Kamakura period. My purpose is not to merely repeat previous work but to highlight specific accounts of the two events and reconstruct the context in which Hanazono wrote the Prefaces as per his own political agenda. I review two legitimacy disputes over a few generations up to the compilation of the *Fūgashū*, one concerning the regalia and the other concerning the brush. I examine how the imperial succession dispute began, intensified through conflicts within the divided imperial houses and against the Kamakura shogunate, and culminated in GoDaigo’s clash with the shogunate. Since GoDaigo was the emperor between Hanazono’s and Kōgon’s reigns, GoDaigo’s manoeuvres directly affected the political career of the commissioner and the compiler of the *Fūgashū*. On the literary plane, I consider how the two older sons of Fujiwara no Tame’ie turned against each other until the hostility bore antagonistic schools of poetry. When the Kyōgoku school gained an opportunity to produce an imperial anthology under a Jimyōin emperor, the founder Kyōgoku Tamekane died without leaving an heir. His tutor Hanazono instead of a Fujiwara (Kyōgoku) became the head of the Kyōgoku school. By his time, Hanazono fulfilled the dual position of heading the imperial house and the poetic school. By tracing these historical events I demonstrate the urgency Hanazono faced in his position.

The historical overview is followed by a review of the treatment of the *Fūgashū* in English-language scholarship. There are few studies on or relating to the *Fūgashū*; when
analyzed, the Fūgashū is most often mentioned in the context of the two Kyōgoku school anthologies against the three anthologies compiled by the more prominent Nijō school. Moreover, as a poetry anthology, poems and the contributing poets are the focus of scholarly attention. I pose a challenge to the accepted translation of the title and find my evidence in the Prefaces to the anthology.

Chapter 2 discusses the Fūgashū Prefaces in the context of the Kokinshū and the ShinKokinshū. As one of the few imperial anthologies that has both a kana and a mana preface, I argue that the Fūgashū should be placed within the small group of dual-prefaced anthologies and that the significance of the prefaces themselves should be given more attention. In writing the two prefaces, Hanazono alludes to arguments in the Kokinshū and the ShinKokinshū prefaces. The conspicuous textual references solidify the idea that the Fūgashū succeeds the standards set by the two authoritative anthologies, and henceforth is the true heir to the spirit of waka demonstrated by the respective chief compilers Tsurayuki and Teika. Also noted is how Hanazono came to write the Prefaces; whether due to a shortage of staff or to establish a strong commanding voice, having the name of a retired emperor at the full front as the chief anthologizer was unprecedented. Hanazono’s literary prowess and imperial status give the Prefaces a uniquely authoritative voice that attempts to dwarf the literary rivals of the Nijō school and political opponents from the Daikakuji line.

The focus of Chapter 2 is to demonstrate the ties Hanazono establishes between canonical Japanese anthologies and the Fūgashū through the Prefaces, with reference to the kanajo for comparisons. Chapter 3 looks at how Hanazono establishes ties to Chinese texts, with reference to the manajo for reference comparisons. Using the terms that appear in the Great Preface (Daxu) to the Shijing, Hanazono aligns his manajo with the canonical Chinese text while reiterating the
ancient and function of poetry. Applying the parallel structure characteristic of Chinese prose, he juxtaposes and criticizes poetic errors of the two rival schools of poetry. The intertextual association with the Chinese canon that Hanazono develops reaffirms the Confucian orientation of his composition, and he claims that poems included in the *Fūgashū* will be models of the ancient Way of poetry, the keyword of which is *feng* (風). Guidance through the Way of poetry appeals to the virtue of the sovereign who rules according to the Way. I demonstrate how, in the later part of the *manajo*, Hanazono’s allusions to Chinese histories uniformly criticize GoDaigo through allegories to tyrannical rulers in ancient China who were defeated by sage kings.

Having demonstrated the ties to Japanese and Chinese canons, in Chapter 4, I consider circumstantial reasons that generated Hanazono’s emphasis on the *feng*. The tone of the *Fūgashū* Prefaces is political and critical, conscious of a rival both poetically and politically. Since I argue that the title of the anthology and the political arguments of the *Fūgashū* Prefaces is a product of the pressure Hanazono felt as the leader of the Kyōgoku-Jimyōin line faction, I relate the factors that might have convinced Hanazono for the significance of prefaces. I find evidence from Hanazono’s diary and suggest that Hanazono was once favourable to GoDaigo’s political decisions but was disappointed over time, and that this change of mind resulted in his sharp critique of GoDaigo in the Prefaces.

Finally, in the Appendices I offer my translations of the Prefaces. The base text I use is the versions in *Fūga wakashū zenchūshaku*, edited and annotated by Iwasa Miyoko. Unlike poems included in the anthology, different versions of which can be cross-examined and compared in *Fūga wakashū kōhon to kenkyū*, there are few discrepancies in the prose of the Prefaces. I also rely on Iwasa’s *kakikudashi* for the translation of the *manajo* and sometimes depart from her
rendering to follow Itō Masafumi’s *kakikudashi*. Although my translations are raw and do not fully capture the elegance of the original text, the main objective of offering my translations is to convey the dignified tone and the deeply Confucian orientation of the prose.

1.1 **Historical Background**

1.1.1 **The Court divided: Jimyōin and Daikakuji**

The emperor in the late Kamakura period in reality was far from being “the ruler.” The sovereign’s power curbed by the practice of cloistered rule (*insei*) continuing from the late Heian period, and control of the realm had long been shared with the Kamakura shogunate. The shogunate held military control and the right to appoint and reward military governors (*shugo*) and stewards (*jitō*), which in the medieval period functioned as its grounds for power. The shogunate also developed jurisdictions based on warrior law. However, the Kamakura shogunate also shared power with another head. From as early as the second shogun’s rule, the power in the shogunate was transferred to the Hojō family who acted as the regent, or *shikken*: the status of shogun in the later Kamakura period was but nominal.

The late Kamakura power map became further convoluted when Emperor GoSaga 後嵯峨 (1220-1272, r. 1242-1246) went against conventional succession order and desired his favoured second son Kameyama (1249-1305, r. 1259-1274) as emperor after his first-born GoFukakusa (1243-1304, r. 1246-1260) retired. The succession dispute arose because GoFukakusa and

\[\text{\textsuperscript{10}}\]

\[\text{In the Kamakura period the emperors tended to be enthroned at a very young age, typically before their late teens, and abdicated when they were still young. Emperors naturally lacked the education, connections, experience, and other qualities the retired emperors had, which resulted in power imbalances. Since the emperors usually abdicated when they were still young, there were always “surplus” retired emperors. The retired emperors and the emperor would form a power hierarchy, with the oldest retired emperor at the top (That is, until the court was divided and subdivided within each faction and the succession order became complicated).}\]
Kameyama each believed his descendants should rise to the throne. Appendix C traces the succession right moving between the two factions. The court was thus split into GoFukakusa’s Jimyōin line (later Northern court in the Northern and Southern courts period, 1334-1392) and Kameyama’s Daikakuji line (later Southern court). The culprit of this conflict, GoSaga, named Kameyama’s son the crown prince after the brothers, but left no instructions regarding what would happen afterwards. Instead, GoSaga left that question to the Kamakura shogunate, which at the time was nominally headed by his other son, Prince Munetaka (1242-1274). Through this lineage, the shogunate was on good terms with the court at this time, but being a puppet shogun controlled by the Hojō, Shogun Munetaka lacked real power. The shogunate moved between the two imperial camps, unable to grasp GoSaga’s true intention. Naturally, the most logical solution for Kamakura was to crown someone who was best for the interests of the shogunate (and the shikken). The decision to name the candidate for the crown prince therefore was influenced by the aims of pacifying an unhappy retired emperor (GoFukakusa), fending off an ambitious retired emperor rumoured to be plotting against the shogunate (Kameyama), and satisfying factions within Kamakura bearing new political enemies. Upon learning that Retired Emperor Kameyama was secretly plotting against the shogunate, the Kamakura shogunate appointed Fushimi from the Jimyōin line as the next crown prince (1265-1317, r. 1287-1298). Unfortunately for Kamakura, Fushimi was a young man of twenty-two when he became Emperor and was an “energetic reformer,” unlike his father GoFukakusa. The final compromise the shogunate offered was a system of alternate succession between the Jimyōin line and the
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12 Ibid.
Daikakuji line. The best candidates among the princes of each imperial line were to be nominated as the next emperor upon notice from the shogunate.

1.1.2 GoDaigo Seizes the Throne

A dramatic change occurred in this precarious arrangement when GoDaigo from the Daikakuji line (1288-1339, r. 1318-1332, 1334-1339) came to power after Hanazono (1297-1348, r. 1308-1318). By this time the succession dispute had evolved and competition became fierce even within the familial lines. GoDaigo was next in line within the Daikakuji line after his elder brother’s untimely death, but Kameyama’s support for him changed in favour of a new son, Prince Tsuneakira, born just two years before the Retired Emperor’s death. Due to pressure from Kamakura and also within the Daikakuji line, GoDaigo had to pledge before he was enthroned that he would relinquish succession rights for his descendants. Perhaps the humiliating pledge brought the opposite result of what the shogunate and the rest of the Daikakuji line had hoped. When enthroned at the age of twenty-nine, GoDaigo was ambitious and mature, and possessed knowledge far exceeding that of previous child emperors. He had no intention of stepping down from the throne after spending some years as a puppet of the Kamakura shogunate. Instead, he upheld the Confucian ideology and believed that for the realization of an ideal Confucian state, radical sociopolitical changes were necessary under the leadership of a powerful ruler, namely, himself. GoDaigo’s model court was the imagined golden age represented by Daigo’s court in the early Heian period. Goble elaborates on a series of measures GoDaigo took immediately following his accession in an effort to strengthen imperial power in all directions, starting with

13 Ibid.
14 Ibid. Incidentally, the Kokinshū, the first Imperial waka anthology, was commissioned by Daigo.
the reform of the court rank and rewards system and securing the tax base.\textsuperscript{15} Whether his projects turned out to be a success or a failure, short-term or long-term, his goal was clear: the restoration of imperial authority as the only sovereign under Heaven.

In the meantime, the Kamakura shogunate was eroding after two Mongol invasions in 1274 and 1281, and due to the rewards and appointments process following the invasions. Several retired emperors were suspected of plotting against the shogunate, but they did not take decisive action. GoDaigo, on the other hand, carried out reforms. He remained steadfast even after two failed attempts at overthrowing the Kamakura shogunate and subsequent punitive measures, including exile and abdication in favour of Kōgon.\textsuperscript{16} The Kamakura shogunate eventually fell; GoDaigo returned from exile with a strong army and claimed resumption of his rule. These years are known as the Kenmu Restoration. Yet there were problems still unresolved, and troubles newly created. Most importantly for the purpose of this paper, when he returned from exile and proclaimed himself the emperor once again, GoDaigo refused to recognize Kōgon (Jimyōin line) as the legitimate emperor succeeding him. To GoDaigo, the throne was still his as his exile did not come from his willful resignation, and Kōgon was a mere pretender while he was away. The latter was “ordered” to vacate the throne unceremoniously.\textsuperscript{17} Moreover, there was the problem of the birth of another shogunate. The Ashikaga, a powerful family from the north, at first lent military force to GoDaigo against the Kamakura shogunate, but amidst conflicts of interest with GoDaigo after the fall of the Kamakura shogunate, the leader Takauji settled in the Muromachi

\textsuperscript{16} In his second conspiracy attempt in 1331, GoDaigo collected his sympathizers, both warriors and courtiers and held out against the shogunate’s military forces in Mount Kasagi, only to be captured two days later. The shogunate had already seated Kōgon on the throne despite the fact that not all of the regalia were available on Kōgon’s ascent. G. Cameron Hurst III, “The Kōbu Polity: Court-Bakufu Relations in Kamakura Japan,” in \textit{Court and Bakufu in Japan: Essays in Kamakura History}, ed. by Jeffrey P. Mass (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), 27.
\textsuperscript{17} Goble, \textit{Kenmu}, 138.
district near the capital and adopted the title of shogun for himself, opening an era of a second shogunate (the Muromachi shogunate, sometimes referred to as the Ashikaga shogunate). The aspirations and interests of GoDaigo and the Ashikaga shogun clashed so violently that the former established his own court in Yoshino, denouncing the court in the capital (then with a Jimyōin figurehead Kōmyō) supported by Takauji: the Northern and Southern Dynasties (Nanbokuchō) era had formally begun.

1.1.3 Nijō and Kyōgoku

The bifurcation of the imperial line roughly coincided with another important division in the cultural field, amongst the sons of Fujiwara no Tame’ie (1198-1275), heir to the great Teika. After the literary accomplishments of Shunzei and Teika, Tame’ie was given the honour of compiling two imperial anthologies. Although politics and rivalry were involved, and although Tame’ie never achieved the level of renown and later evaluation as his grandfather or father enjoyed, Tame’ie and his Mikohidari house were the favoured poets of the day and as such enjoyed great political influence.

Tame’ie planted seeds of conflict toward the end of his life when he revised his will to accommodate his young son. Appendix D charts Tame’ie’s offspring and how they branched out to form different schools of poetry. Originally, he left most of his property in his first will to

18 For details on the establishment of the Muromachi shogunate and its confrontations with GoDaigo, see John Whitney Hall, “The Muromachi Bakufu,” in The Cambridge History of Japan Volume 3: Medieval Japan, ed. Yamamura Kozo (Cambridge University Press, 1990), doi:10.1017/CHOL9780521223546.006. Ashikaga Takauji had wanted the authority to establish a shogunate but GoDaigo did not grant him the authority during his lifetime. Quelling the remaining Kamakura supporters gave Takauji an excuse to keep his own army, and Takauji began to exercise shogunal rights of giving out land patents and confirmations without the emperor (GoDaigo)’s approval. Soon GoDaigo declared Takauji an “enemy of the throne” (chōteki), and the two became full-fledged enemies. The Jimyōin court supported Ashikaga military power and the cause to confront GoDaigo, through a commission of chastisement of Nitta Yoshisada, a military rival to Ashikaga Takauji and supporter of GoDaigo.

19 Tame’ie alone was commissioned for the ShokuGosenshū, but for the ShokuKokinshū, four poets aside from him were appointed. The move was to keep the Mikohidari house in check (the line to which Tame’ie belonged).
Tameuji, his first son by his principal wife. After Tameuji and his full brother Tamenori had grown up, Tame’ie’s other wife, popularly known as Nun Abutsu, bore him more children. Tame’ie altered his will to accommodate Tamesuke, his son with Abutsu—among other things, he arranged that Tamesuke, instead of Tameuji, would inherit the propriety and \textit{jitō} rights to the Hosokawa estate. Tameuji and Tamenori were left with residences on Nijō and Kyōgoku in the capital, respectively, from where the names of their respective schools of poetry derive.\footnote{Robert Huey, \textit{Kyōgoku Tamekane: Poetry and Politics in Late Kamakura Japan} (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989), 25.} Along with the Hosokawa estate, Tame’ie also bequeathed invaluable cultural capital—numerous manuscripts, rare transcriptions by Shunzei and Teika, Tame’ie’s critical writings and such—that could give the inheritor the name of true successor of Teika’s (and Tame’ie’s) legacies. The dispute following Tame’ie’s death in 1275 was between Tameuji and Abutsu. Tameuji aggrieved his disinherirtance from the estate and the manuscripts had it not been for his forty-years-younger half-brother. Abutsu in turn was determined to guard what Tamesuke had inherited. The income from the estate would also give immediate support for her, while she reared and educated her young children into well-versed adults, who can then be recognized as literary authorities and legitimate branch of the Mikohidari house.\footnote{For a detailed recount of the origin of the dispute and its complex dimensions, see Paul Atkins, “Nijō v. Reizei: Land Rights, Litigation, and Literary Authority in Medieval Japan,” Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies 66, No. 2 (Dec. 2006). According to Atkins, Tame’ie “bequeathed to Tamesuke all the documents he owned pertaining to classical literature and \textit{waka}” three years before his death, fully aware that his decisions would initiate litigation. Atkins quotes Fujimoto Kōichi on the symbolic implications of the bequest, i.e. that he wished Tamesuke to be selected as an imperial compiler some day. Ibid., 504. Scholars highly evaluate Abutsu’s intelligence and literary talent; some even remark that had it not been for Abutsu, the bitter dispute would never have happened. The legal validity of the new will was not recognized by the courtier jurisdictional system of Rokuhara, and Abutsu took the case to Kamakura, where she sought an alternate tribunal based on warrior law to redress the Rokuhara ruling. For a more detailed account of the dispute and Abutsu’s strategic use of her literary skills and status as having access to Tame’ie’s teachings, see Christina Laffin, \textit{Rewriting Medieval Japanese Women: Politics, Personality, and Literary Production in the Life of Nun Abutsu} (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2013). See especially Chapter 5.}
Tameuji’s full younger brother, Tamenori, was outside the focal point of this inheritance dispute, but from around 1276 he had developed fierce disagreements over poetry with (Nijō) Tameuji, and by 1279 they were irreconcilable. So hostile were they that “they excluded each other from poetry contest at their homes, and just months before he died, Tamenori wrote an angry letter to the Bureau of Poetry, protesting that his children, Tamekane and Tameko, had been slighted by Tameuji in the ShokuShūishū.” The brothers’ relationship was irreconcilable and the poetic styles they pursued went different ways even before the Nijō and Kyōgoku schools formally bore their names. By the time the Fūgashū was being compiled in the 1340s, the feud between the two schools, highlighted by criticisms and counter-criticisms of each other, had been ongoing for three generations.

1.2 Reception of the Fūgashū

The prime reason that the Fūgashū Prefaces have been understudied may be in the fact that the Fūgashū was not a novel project but the seventeenth of twenty-one imperial waka anthologies compiled. The first anthology, the Kokinshū, and its manifesto on the nature and function of waka, has stirred much attention and scholarly interest since it was presented in Engi 2 (905 CE). Various records evince that people diligently memorized the poems contained in the anthology, and poetry masters gave lectures on the preface(s) to members of the imperial house. In modern days also, a simple search of “Kanajo” and “Manajo” using Japanese
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22 Inoue Muneo 井上宗雄, Kyōgoku Tamekane 京極為兼 (Tokyo, Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 2006), 13.
23 Huey, Tamekane, 26.
24 I am aware that the evaluation of the kana and mana prefaces changed over time and the lectures may have concerned only one, instead of both. In The Pursuit of Harmony: Poetry and Power in Early Heian Japan, Gustav Heldt explains that contrary to its status today, the Kokin kanajo was likely a personal note by Tsurayuki and was often missing in manuscripts as opposed to the manajo, which, composed in the formal Literary Sinitic, was the official manifesto prepared for the palace archives. The kanajo was largely ignored until the twelfth century. See Gustav Heldt, The Pursuit of Harmony: Poetry and Power in Early Heian Japan (Ithaca, New York: East Asia Program, Cornell University, 2008), 192-196.
academic search engines shows that the focus of waka study is heavily skewed in favour of the 
Kokinshū prefaces (followed by the ShinKokinshū). The Fūgashū was never in a position to enjoy the same kind of spotlight, despite the fact that it was one of the handful anthologies prefaced in both mana and kana.25

This is not to say that it has been completely neglected by modern Japanese researchers. Scholars such as Iwasa Miyoko, Inoue Muneo, and Tsugita Kasumi have conducted extensive studies on Kamakura-Muromachi waka poets and waka anthologies, including the Fūgashū. Their works commonly note the peculiar sociopolitical background of this second and last imperial anthology by the Kyōgoku poets after the Gyokuyōshū compiled by Kyōgoku Tamekane. The overall attention they give to the Fūgashū is ample, one may say, when one compares it to the treatment of the ShokuKokinshū, or other anthologies compiled by Nijō school poets.

Still, I cannot help but think that such treatment of the Fūgashū is a double-edged sword. The stigma of being “the second Kyōgoku effort” frames the readers’ perspective, and once framed, the readers are prone to overlook features that differentiate the Fūgashū from its “elder sibling,” the Gyokuyōshū. While some scholars such as Tsugita Kasumi and Nakamura Takeshi attempt to illuminate the significance of the manajo to recast the Fūgashū as a freestanding project, the number of such studies is too few to alter the common understanding.26 The same tendency is mirrored in English scholarship. The first substantial discussion of the Fūgashū was

25 Imperial waka anthologies with two prefaces are: the Kokinshū (c. 905), the ShinKokinshū (1205), the ShokuKokinshū (1265), the Fūgashū (1346), and the ShinShokuKokinshū (1439).
26 One piece of evidence is the very fact that even the recent articles in Japanese are still dedicated to the topic of the title of the Fūgashū. For example, Nakamura’s 2009 article opens with the briefing and additional approval of Tsugita’s argument that fūga comes from the Shijing, published in 1963. Nakamura Takeshi, "Fūga wakashū no daigō ni kansuru ichi kōsatsu: wakan ryōjo to tame ‘ie kokinjo shō no kakawari kara" 風雅和歌集の題号に関する一考察:和漢両序と『為家古今序抄』のかかわりから, in Kokugo kokubun 国語国文 77:10 (Jan. 2009), 1.
in Robert Brower and Earl Miner’s extensive 1961 study, *Japanese Court Poetry*. Brower and Miner follow the common Japanese notion and introduce the anthology as “the last of the great collections of Court poetry,” adding that it marks the end of “a time of steady decline from the accomplishments represented by the *ShinKokinshū*.” Brower and Miner’s description creates and perpetuates the impression that poems selected for anthologies of this period are qualitatively inferior to those up to the *ShinKokinshū*. They open the chapter “The Late Classical Period: 1241-1350” with a brief layout of the division of the imperial line into the Daikakuji (later the Southern line) and Jimyōin (later the Northern) houses, and the division of Fujiwara Tame’ie’s household into three rival schools of poetry—the Nijō, Kyōgoku and Reizei—and their entangled political effect, to explain the dynamics involved in the compilation of the eight imperial anthologies produced during the period covered in the chapter. The authors rightfully call readers’ attention to the political conflicts deeply affecting the literary scene, since the split was complete as the Daikakuji line sponsored the Nijō school and the Jimyōin line the Kyōgoku school (the Reizei name enters competition after the *Fūgashū* was completed). But their portrayal enhances the binary image of the Nijō-Daikakuji line for safe conventionalism versus Kyōgoku-Jimyōin line’s originality. So lucid is this portrayal that it frames the period in a static dichotomy, unaffected by changes of time and entrances and exits of key players.

An added misrepresentation of the *Fūgashū* is that Brower and Miner translated the title as “The Collection of Elegance.” To modern readers this translation appears natural and appropriate; however, the authors have overlooked the fact that in the fourteenth century, when
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28 Ibid., 338.  
29 Ibid., 355.
the anthology was entitled *fūga* (風雅), the term did not have the same connotations as it does six or seven centuries later. It specifically referred to the first two sections of the *Shijing*, and by derivation, the Way of Poetry. Japanese dictionaries and Japanese *kanji* dictionaries alike list the term to mean “of the *Shijing*.” It was not until the eighteenth century that the compound word “fūga” came to mean “elegance,” according to the *Nihon kokugo daijiten*. “The Collection of Elegance,” then, is an anachronistic rendition that requires reconsideration.

This interpretation is, though, far from hasty and ill-considered. Readers learn that the authors have a convincing explanation for this title. Indeed, their theory perfectly fits the conservative Nijō-Daikakuji camp versus the innovative Kyōgoku-Jimyōin camp schema introduced in the earlier part of the chapter. The authors find their evidence in the titles of preceding anthologies:

The very titles of the anthologies are revealing.... The Nijō compilers chose titles that reflected their conservative thought and even their pessimism, for the names are usually versions of earlier titles, and significantly of the most conventional, least distinguished collections. About a decade before the first Kyōgoku-Reizei collection was completed, the Nijō poets had compiled the *Shingosenshū* or “New Gosenshū”; and about two decades before the second Kyōgoku-Reizei collection, they completed the *Shokugoshūishū*, “The Goshūishū Continued,” or, in full translation, “The Later Collection of Gleanings Continued.” The Kyōgoku-Reizei poets appropriately chose more original titles, and titles moreover whose
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associations were radical. The Gyokuyōshū, compiled by Tamekane, is not a “continuation” of some earlier collection. Insofar as its name, “Collection of Jeweled Leaves,” carries any associations, it recalls Shunrai’s Kin’yōshū or “Collection of Golden Leaves.” The echo served Tamekane well, since Shunrai was known as an innovating poet; “Gyokuyōshū” was therefore a manifest declaration of radical intentions. Tamekane must have expected that he would be criticized as Shunrai had been for such a pretentious title, and he was, but his point was clear.

Ex-Emperor Hanazono, in compiling the Fūgashū, also chose a fresh name, “The Collection of Elegance.” The title represented a partial compromise, an effort to pick up some of the poetic pieces scattered by Tameyo and Tamekane. It recalled no earlier anthology, but it suggested what was one of the persistent stylistic ideals of Court poetry of all schools from the Man’yōshū on.32

For Brower and Miner, Hanazono’s title fūga echoed no earlier anthology but suggested radicalism and innovation, and also represented the stylistic ideals of waka, which was elegance.

In the following sections, I show how the title “fūga” was, rather than being an innovative name, a choice implying a culmination of a long-standing tradition of poetry as a means of political communications that started with the canonical Shijing. Moreover, it is difficult to agree that the Nijō poets’ titles reflect their pessimism by addressing the least distinguished anthologies, since with the exception of the ShokuSenzaishū their choices allude to the earliest anthologies in one way or another, which were already canonized at the time and together called

32 Brower and Miner, Japanese Court Poetry, 355.
with respect the *sandaishū*, or “the first three imperial *waka* anthologies.” If the Nijō poets sought legitimacy from the earliest anthologies, Hanazono went a step further and found legitimacy in the source of inspiration for the *Kokinshū*: the *Shijing*. His choice was also in keeping with the continental trends of his time, where over a dozen poetry collections bearing the title *fengya* (the Chinese pronunciation of 風雅, or *fūga* in Japanese) appeared, each with its claim for connections to the oldest poetry anthology spelled out in the preface. This fact is the key factor distinguishing the *Fūgashū* from the *Gyokuyōshū*.

Brower and Miner’s analysis is, to the best of my knowledge, the first in which an English rendition was applied to the titles; other anthologies of Japanese literature and studies of Japanese literature in English translation either skipped introducing imperial *waka* anthologies from the late Kamakura period on or mentioned them in passing only. Brower and Miner’s work was the first attempt to familiarize English audiences with the specifics of the *waka* tradition and imperial anthologies, and it is more than understandable that the authors employed a schematic historical guide, even if it was an oversimplification. Their legacy was so consequential that the dichotomous schema they offered has held up for decades, and their interpretation of the title *fūga* has not been directly challenged.
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33 三代集. The term appears in the *kanajo* and *manajo* of the *Fūgashū*. This should not be mistaken for 三代集, also pronounced “sandaishū,” a term coined in a later period referring to the *Man’yōshū*, the *Kokinshū* and the *ShinKokinshū*.

Brower and Miner’s unfavourable evaluation of the later anthologies likewise held up for a long time. Michele Marra’s 1993 publication *Representations of Power* is one of the few monographs concerned with medieval imperial anthologies. Marra examines the political implications of the series of medieval anthologies in relation to the disputes of the two imperial lines. He also demonstrates deeper complications than suggested in *Japanese Court Poetry*: how the style of later generation poets evolved from that of their predecessors even within the same tradition, sometimes attacking the predecessor, and how, by including poems composed by followers of the rival tradition, the anthologies themselves do not necessarily present the stylistic contrast one may expect.\(^3^5\) Still, Marra’s project is concerned with the big picture between Nijō-Daikakuji line and Kyōgoku-Jimyōin line factions and accepts Brower and Miner’s schema, the English translation of the titles, and hence their implications.

Steven D. Carter also adheres to the existing representation of the poetry scene of this period. Although it is not specifically concerned with the *Fūgashū*, or more broadly, the Nijō-Kyōgoku rivalry, his study *Householders: The Reizei Family in Japanese History* includes a discussion of the two houses before he demonstrates how the third, the Reizei household, emerged as an independent school and rightful successor of the literary legacies of Shunzei and Teika.\(^3^6\) Carter weaves together historical incidents and poems composed by the key players, and demonstrates stylistic characteristics of rival traditions, and from where each tradition’s claim as the true heir of Shunzei and Teika comes, through his poetry analysis. Nonetheless, Carter’s is an emphatic study separating the Reizei tradition from the “Kyōgoku-Reizei” conception, and he
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focuses his study on cross-analyses of the rival schools rather than on a specific poetry anthology. Carter follows the earlier translation, “Collection of Elegance,” and the tendency to make little distinction between the Fūgashū and the previous Kyōgoku anthology in his assertion that distinguishes the Reizei style from the Kyōgoku style. When describing the inclusion of the Reizei school poems in the Fūgashū, Carter emphasizes that the Reizei poets valued versatility of style, and sometimes chose to write in the favoured style of the Kyōgoku school. While warning against the notion that Kyōgoku and Reizei schools are stylistically identical, Carter implicitly accepts that the two Kyōgoku anthologies are similar: “[J]ust as surely as Fūgashū was a Kyōgoku project, a sort of Gyokuyōshū II, it was therefore not a Reizei project in any meaningful sense of the word….“37

In this way, it was not until the studies of later-generation waka scholars that the Fūgashū was considered for its own characteristics. Michael S. Kleinkopf’s dissertation introduces the anthology and details the politico-historical backdrop against which it was born.38 However, his research also focuses on the political peculiarities of the epoch, the poets’ (largely the Kyōgoku school’s) orientations and poems selected for the first volume. He does justice to Hanazono’s choice of title by identifying it with two of the rikugi, or the Six Principles laid out in Daxu; however, his discussion does not mark a significant departure from the received wisdom that Kyōgoku titles promote innovation.39

Stefania Burk’s 2001 dissertation, “Reading Between the Lines: Poetry and Politics in the Imperial Anthologies of the Late Kamakura Period (1185-1333),” concerns the five imperial

37 Ibid., 119: 121.
39 Ibid., 55-56.
waka anthologies produced from the division of the imperial house to one anthology prior to the *Fūgashū*; ironically, though, her study appeals for scrutiny of the *Fūgashū* on its own merits, in isolation from the *Gyokuyōshū*.⁴⁰ Her basic research question derives from a challenge to Brower and Miner’s diagnosis of the anthologies of this period—to put it crudely, that only the two Kyōgoku anthologies and not the more numerous Nijō anthologies have qualitative worth for study.⁴¹ Burk urges that the existence of two prefaces for the *Fūgashū* in itself is an important deviation from the *Gyokuyōshū*, since “prefaces [are] special spaces where commissioners and compilers [can] address the tradition, their intentions, and the relationship between the two.”⁴² On the matter of the title also, she acknowledges that the *Fūgashū* is an “unconventional title” that resonates with Tamekane’s choice, *Gyokuyōshū*, but carefully avoids repeating the accepted wisdom by demonstrating that Tamekane, “like his Nijō rivals, looked to earlier imperial anthologies for authority and precedent.”⁴³ The scope of her research stops at the fall of the Kamakura shogunate, however, and the *Fūgashū* comes ten years too late to receive the analysis she argues it deserves.

A survey of past studies shows that the *Fūgashū* was largely studied in the context of political and literary factions, and its extra-poetic components were understudied, shrouded by the discussion on poetic styles. Granted, the most noticeable portion of a waka anthology is arguably the waka itself—as the most substantial entrée, or the flesh of a fruit. Often it is well appreciated enough as is, as evidenced by the majority of the imperial anthologies accompanied by no preface and the poems speaking for themselves. Nevertheless, the complex dimensions of
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⁴⁰ Burk, “Reading Between the Lines,” 91.
⁴¹ Ibid., 2-3.
⁴² Ibid., 91, footnote 34. Besides recognizing the significance of the inclusion of prefaces, I am indebted to Professor Burk for kindling an interest in me for the meaning of the title *fūga*, especially for the first character *fū*.
⁴³ Ibid., 191-192.
an anthology would be better understood by considering its other components together, in this case the title and the preface(s)—the fruit’s skin and the core—especially when they stand out. I believe this is particularly true in the case of the Fūgashū since its Prefaces mark a sudden decision to break with the long absence of prefaces in the five previous anthologies, or to append a rationale for the first time since the succession disputes started. This decision, as Burk argues, denotes a departure even from its “Kyōgoku elder sibling.” Scrutiny of the Fūgashū Prefaces reveals from whence the title derives, and that the title is not so much original to the spirit of the Kyōgoku school than an invocation of an older tradition and authority than to which the Nijō school resorted. Hanazono’s credit for innovation may be found less in the originality of the title he gives the anthology than from the majesty his Prefaces bear by employing the voice of the sovereign, and the imagined fraternity with numerous Chinese poetry anthologies that share the origin of the title. In the following sections, I explore the contents of the Prefaces and reconsider the implications of the title fūga, and thereby recontextualize the Fūgashū as a project that communicates with traditions far and wide, both temporally and spatially.
Chapter 2: Contextualizing the Fūgashū as part of the Kokin tradition

Looking through the list of twenty-one anthologies, one notices a pattern wherein anthologies bearing the phrase *kokin* (“ancient and modern”) are given a dual preface: one in *mana* and one in *kana*. The Fūgashū is the only exception to this pattern by not claiming affiliation with the original imperial *waka* anthology in its title. Conventionally, prefaces open with a definitive statement of what *waka* is, which, when traced back, derives from the Chinese-Confucian theorization of *shi*. The argument is more or less the same every time with a Chinese flavour more apparent in Literary Sinitic texts, as Confucian concepts can be referenced conveniently by using the same characters as those in the Confucian classics without requiring translation. Despite the ennui from the redundancy, the prefaces are not devoid of innovation. Comparing and studying these prefaces for their use of language, argument, and tone allows us analyze what is repeated and what is changed from one anthology to the next, which can yield insight into the time and society in which each anthology was compiled. Close resemblance to or repetition of old arguments signifies that later commissioners identified with those values; they needed reiteration and reinforcement. Similarly, departure from established ideas and a move toward a new attitude does not stop at reflecting “spontaneous” societal change over time; it also suggests an occurrence grave enough that the author decided to treat the occasion with a public articulation of his stance. To that end, in this section I review the main arguments and characteristics propounded in the *Kokinshū* and *ShinKokinshū* prefaces that I deem particularly
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44 See, for example, Burk, “Reading Between the Lines,” Appendix Three: Survey of Imperial Anthologies of Japanese Poetry.
45 For side-by-side comparison and analysis of the historical prefaces, see Fukatsu Mutsuo 深津睦夫, “Hanazono in no wakakan saikō” 花園院の和歌観再考—宋学の影響の可能性をめぐって in Kōgakkan ronsō 皇学館論叢 22, no. 4 (1989: 08), 17. In addition to the double-prefaced anthologies, Fukatsu also includes excerpts from the Senzaishū and ShinGoShūishū’s *kana* prefaces to demonstrate the conventionalized reiteration.
relevant to the composition of the Fūgashū Prefaces, and contextualize the Fūgashū Prefaces, in particular the kanajo, as the successor of that tradition rather than as part of a novel poetic move within the Kyōgoku school.

2.1 Keeping with the Convention

The tradition of imperial waka anthologies starts with the Kokinshū, commissioned by Emperor Daigo (885-930, r. 897-930) in the beginning of the tenth century (905 CE is the traditionally attributed year). Approximately 1,111 poems were compiled into twenty volumes of poetry under various themes, by officials Ki no Tsurayuki, Ki no Tomonori, Ōshikōchi no Mitsune, and Mibu no Tadamine. Since the legitimacy and authority of a work came from aligning it with precedents, the general framework of the Kokin prefaces does not make original claims pertaining to the nature of poetry itself, but follows established arguments. It is the minute change in tone or words within that framework that differentiate the anthologies and reflect the social and literary tastes of the time. In the case of the Kokinshū, the main concern was to demonstrate that waka was a respectable genre deserving imperial attention. The authors of the prefaces strove to establish a Japanese tradition using Chinese models. The principal author, Tsurayuki, closely follows the arguments, flow, and some passages of the Chinese classics, notably the Great Preface (Daxu; 大序) of the Shijing (詩經) and the treatises Shipin (詩品), Lunwen (論文), and Wenfu (文賦). It is to be anticipated, therefore, that the Kokinshū prefaces express criticism of contemporary waka using the vocabulary developed long ago to discuss shi

46 The number of poems included in the Kokinshū vary depending on the manuscripts.
47 I say “authors” here because the kanajo (kana preface) and manajo (mana preface) are attributed to two different names, although circumstances suggest that both prefaces came out of Tsurayuki’s hand. In the following section I use the singular form “author” and mean Tsurayuki, treating him as the figure who orchestrated both compositions.
in ancient China; it can also be anticipated that Tsurayuki’s words, in turn, would be echoed in later prefaces to imperial anthologies.

The famous opening of the *Kokinshū kanajo* largely replicates that of the *Daxu* (with minor changes that sound un-Chinese), claiming that *waka* is a spontaneous expression of one’s feelings caused by external stimuli. Tsurayuki builds on the scaffolding of the Confucian ideal, adding Yamato pride by tracing the origin of *waka* to Shintō deities as accounted in the earliest histories, before moving on to the first *waka* in the age of humans. Then he moves on to name two specific poems as the first *waka* in the age of humans. The Naniwazu poem celebrates Emperor Nintoku’s reign, and a waiting woman from the countryside sings the verse of the Asaka Mountain in simple words. These poems become the “parents” of *waka* (*waka no oya*).

Brower and Miner observe that the next section dedicated to the discussion of the *rikugi*, the six poetic principles or the six forms of verse, is probably an unnecessary byproduct of copying the Chinese format, in this case specifically that of the *Shijing*. In the *Daxu* it says:

“Thus there are six principles in the poems: 1) Airs (*fēng*); 2) exposition (*fù*); 3) comparison (*bǐ*); 4) affective image (*xīng*); 5) Odes (*yă*); 6) Hymns (*sòng*).”

The meaning and order of *rikugi* as

---

49 Brower and Miner comment that Tsurayuki’s six categories “were an obvious attempt to produce equivalents for the six genres distinguished in China” and “were not only meaningless in terms of Japanese poetic practice but also... conveniently ignored by the poets.” For a follow-up, they add: “On the other hand, practice often follows ideals, if not theory, and the refinement of the Japanese poetic vocabulary stemmed from a deep impulse to produce a native tradition that could stand on a level of equality with that of China.” Brower and Miner, *Japanese Court Poetry*, 178-179. Tanaka Kazuo suggests that Tsurayuki had merely borrowed the concept of six forms and tried to establish an independent categorization for *waka*. Tanaka argues that while it is certain that Tsurayuki followed the *Shijing* method of categorization based on style, he referred to more general and wider Chinese sources to create a Japanese-style *rikugi* categorization. Tanaka Kazuo 田中和夫, “Kokinshū rikugi no genkyo ni tsuite: chūgoku shiron no rikugisetsu wo tsūjite”『古今集』六義の原拠について: 中国詩論の六義説を通じて, in *Bunge ronsō* 文藝論叢, 12 (2012), 41.

50 故詩有六義焉。一日風。二日賦。三日比。四日興。五日雅。六日頌。Stephen Owen, *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought* (Cambridge, MA: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1992) 45. Note that the “types of poetry” or the three main divisions of the *Shijing* are capitalized in the English rendering, and “the three modes of presentation under which any poem in the collection might be classified” are not capitalized.
they appear in the Daxu has been a much debated topic, since “two essentially distinct orders have been mixed together.” With a detailed comparison of the passages, Wixted demonstrates that “variously interpreted and inconsistently applied by Chinese commentators to the [Shijing], the terms had become in China a sacrosanct formula invoked for the purposes of legitimizing one’s critical stand. Yoshimochi and Tsurayuki employed them in much the same way.” Indeed the rikugi categorization is not always clear-cut in the case of waka, let alone in the Chinese genre, and it is a difficult task to apply it to the concise thirty-one syllable form. One of Wixted’s conclusions is that, compared to the Chinese poetry oriented toward pragmatism and didactics, the emphasis in Japanese poetry is oriented toward expression. The discussion of rikugi comes to an abrupt stop, with the subject moving to Tsurayuki’s lament on the degradation of poetry.

Tsurayuki complains that present-day society has given way to ostentation and poetry has become a go-between among amorous people, instead of retaining its ancient political function. In ancient days, according to the prefaces, sovereigns used poetry to distinguish talented officials from those who were not skilled. The emphasis on the political use of poetry is short and the placement of the comment rather modest, considering how the ShinKokinshū prefaces state that waka is a governing device at the beginning section. Tsurayuki then moves on to the evaluation of poetry by six poets of distinctive poetic styles (who are later referred to as the Six Immortals, or rokkasen). Although the harsh words about the former generation of poets may have been unnecessary, the criticism is an addition on the author’s part that matches similar judgments in the Shijing. Another effect I think it achieves is that it warns readers against various traps in waka-composition practices in general, without putting contemporaneous poets on the spot—an

51 Ibid.
act unadvisable for relatively low-ranking courtiers such as Tsurayuki and Yoshimochi, as if to say: if even the best of the poets possess these fallacies, then what about the rest of us, the ordinary people?

Tsurayuki then makes an oblique criticism about people who are only concerned with “alluring beauty as their standard and [who] remain ignorant of poetry’s fundamental principles.”53 This criticism provides the rationale for launching the imperial anthology project: the poems included in the imperial waka anthology are the court-approved examples of good poetry that will guide people to poetry’s fundamental principles. Later prefaces reuse the same rationale with subtle variations.

Retired Emperor GoToba (1180-1239, r. 1183-1198) ordered a large-scale anthology that emulated the Kokinshū in many ways. Various records testify that because GoToba was keen on holding a presentation banquet in Genkyū 2 (1205 CE), and on making the project historically significant, constant and countless changes had to be made even after the official presentation, to the great dismay of the compilers. GoToba’s radical changes of mind gave birth to multiple versions of the ShinKokinshū. Nevertheless, these versions consistently contain poems collected in twenty volumes and two prefaces.

The assertion in the prefaces to the ShinKokinshū regarding the function of poetry is first and foremost political, in contrast to the Kokinshū, which affirms the soothing and harmonizing effect of poetry first, and allotts a significant portion of the prefaces to presenting waka as a genre worthy of imperial attention. Fujiwara no Chikatsune, the foremost Confucian scholar of the day composed the ShinKokinshū manajo and Fujiwara no Yoshitsune, Regent and Chancellor,

penned the kanajo; both prefaces assume the voice of the young Retired Emperor GoToba, who also influenced the content. The tone is more elevated than that of the Kokinshū prefaces, and the speaker is more unrestrained in incorporating the Confucian idea of relationships between ruler and subjects: that poetry serves “to govern the world and pacify the populace” is stated in the opening lines. The use of poetry for governance is affirmed in the Kokinshū prefaces on several occasions, with the clearest mention appearing before the criticism of the Six Poetic Immortals. However, the mention of governance is shrouded in lyricism and soon gives way to exemplary compositions about various natural phenomena. In contrast, the marked straightforwardness of the statement and its placement at the very beginning of the prefaces in the ShinKokinshū attest that the need to articulate the Confucian ideal through poetry had become greater than in the Kokinshū. In relation to this attitude Rodd writes of the title: “A title was selected that both evoked the connection to the Kokinshū and at the same time emphasized the innovation of the collection…. At a time when the court was in eclipse with the rise of power of the Shogunate, the title evoked the glories of the early tenth-century reign of Emperor Daigo.” We may then interpret the composition of an anthology that reminisces about the glories of the past as a projection of GoToba’s desire to revive the imagined strong court of the

54 Meigetsuki, Teika’s diary, indicates that a draft of the manajo was prepared on Genkyū 2 (1205), second month, twentieth to twenty-first day and reviewed by GoToba, who ordered him to show it to Chikatsune. Chikatsune in turn suggested a few additions to the manajo. Robert Huey, The Making of Shinkokinshū (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), 300. Although the prefaces come from two courtiers, this entry and many other accounts of GoToba’s high degree of involvement in every stage of preparation imply that the contents reflect GoToba’s intentions.


mid-Heian era. The speaker of the prefaces elaborates his statement saying that it is for this function of governance that “generations of rulers” of all the people who appreciate the genre, “have not abandoned Japanese poetry.”

The weightier argument on poetics appears later, when the speaker states that the feelings aroused by external stimuli form words, which then become poetry (kokoro uchi ni ugoki, kotoba soto ni arawarezu to iu koto nashi). It is a reiteration of the idea introduced in the Kokinshū prefaces and, although the statement proposes that feelings (kokoro) are aroused before words (kotoba) form, the statement emphasizes the importance of balance between the two with innumerable good examples found in well-known waka.

Kokoro and kotoba are juxtaposed concepts used in the discussion of poetry, as feelings and words, content and form, the intangible and the tangible. Based on what is stated in the ShinKokinshū, good poetry should express an appropriate amount of feelings through expressive yet controlled words. It is not good poetry if the balance of kokoro and kotoba is lost. The speaker in the Fūgashū Prefaces elaborates upon this idea by denouncing countless bad practices in (recent) composition instead of praising good examples.

The latter part of the ShinKokinshū prefaces unfold accounts of the selection of poems and compilation of the anthology from GoToba’s perspective, who was deeply involved in the compilation process and also provided an unusually large number of poems. The voice is

57 I should be careful to qualify that this observation, however, may be no more than a literally imagined strong court from posterity’s point of view. Although there was no shogunate to compete for power in ninth- and tenth-century Japan, the Fujiwara regents dominated the court most of the time. During Daigo’s reign Tokihara was in control, and the previous Emperor Uda’s clash with the Fujiwara did not help Daigo’s position vis-à-vis the Fujiwara. See William H. McCullough, “The Heian Court, 794-1070” in The Cambridge History of Japan, Volume 2: Heian Japan, eds. Donald H. Shively and William H. McCullough (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), doi:10.1017/CHOL9780521223539.003.
58 Rodd, Shin Kokinshū, xlvi.
59 Shin kokinwakashū, 19.
concurrently imperial and personal. In the kanajo, he speaks down from his heavenly dwelling on Mt. Hakoya to his subjects whom he strives to educate by proper influence: “The multitudes of the populace sway like the grass of Kasuga meadows and the seas of the four directions peacefully reflect the moon over the Dragonfly Isles.” 60 This is perhaps why he is not apologetic when confessing he has included an unusually large number of waka by himself, though the words feign modesty. The passage is also personal, in that it repeatedly brings the audience’s attention to his person, his decisions, and his works.

The dignified tone and GoToba’s agency shown here in the ShinKokinshū prefaces likely left a deep impression on Hanazono and illuminated the path when it was time to produce “his” anthology, the Fūgashū. In his correspondence with Regent Ichijō Tsunemichi, he writes that of all the poetry anthology prefaces, he finds the ShinKokinshū kanajo most dear to his heart. 61 He does not elaborate on the reason, but we know his opinion was formed after a careful study of many anthologies.

Readers can glean from his diary, Hanazono tennō shinki 花園天皇宸記 (hereafter the Shinki), what his poetic education would have been like, and what he envisioned to achieve through the two prefaces that he penned for the Fūgashū. The Shinki covers events at the court around Hanazono or his courtiers, both public and private, for twenty-three years from 1310 to 1332. The Shinki was originally bound in 47 volumes but was reorganized into 35 volumes in 1950, when the manuscript was moved to the Library of the Imperial Household Agency. I use

60 Ibid., 20. Although the imagery is very Japanese with references to popular legendary place names, the primary allusion is to the Confucian metaphor of top-down influence from the virtuous man. The rhetoric in manajo does not use the characteristically Japanese metaphors but emphasizes GoToba’s imperial status by alluding to Emperor Wen of Han, and reminding readers that he is the father of the present emperor. Ibid., 576.


In his younger years, Hanazono was educated in the classics such as the Kokinshū and the ShinKokinshū under the tutelage of Kyōgoku Tamekane, Teika’s great-grandson and Retired Emperor Fushimi’s poetry teacher and confidant. Tamekane was also the head of the Kyōgoku school of poetry. When his teacher was sent into exile, Hanazono had just started receiving lectures on the Man’yōshū. But even without Tamekane’s lectures, he had developed a strong philosophy regarding the Way of Poetry. After Fushimi and his consort Eifukumon-in (1271-1342), he became the leading poet and guardian of the Kyōgoku salon. Hanazono did not spare even Eifukumon-in’s poems his criticism when he saw them departing from Tamekane’s teachings.

Concerned as he was with preserving the standards of the Kyōgoku school, Hanazono in his Prefaces to the Fūgashū makes it clear that the scheme for the anthology was conceived according to tradition. Although not considered in this paper, the eleventh imperial anthology, the ShokuKokinshū, compiled around 1259-1266 by a committee of five poets (including Teika’s son Tame’ie), follows the same format as the Kokinshū and the ShinKokinshū. Such structural decisions made twenty-volume anthologies with kanajo and manajo for all “kokin” anthologies a convention, or a tradition within a tradition.62 Hanazono was aware of this fact and makes it evident that the Fūgashū follows that same tradition; in the Prefaces, Hanazono writes that he presents the twenty-volume anthology after the example of the Genkyū era, that is, the

62 The structural similarity is indeed the reason Tsugita Kasumi and Iwasa Miyoko argue that Fūgashū prefaces should be examined in context with the Kokin, ShinKokin, and ShokuKokinshū. Tsugita and Iwasa, Fūgawakashū, 26.
ShinKokinshū, which draws from the example of the Kokinshū.footnote[63]

The resemblance does not stop at the structural features of the anthology. Hanazono follows the ShinKokinshū example of writing in the voice of a sovereign—Kōgon, the commissioner of the Fūgashū.footnote[64] Following precedence, the tone is dignified throughout. The subject matter has become visibly political, establishing a strong bond between governance and poetry. The sovereign of the Fūgashū is deeply concerned with the well-being of the state, which indicates two things: a) he is a truly benevolent ruler, or at least he successfully presents himself as one; and b) the political atmosphere of the time was such that it called for the ruler to advocate for himself. Skillfully linking poetry and governance, the speaker criticizes the collapse of the Way of poetry, and extends this criticism to the ruler who allowed the Way to collapse, whether by ill governance or incompetence. It is critical therefore to note that the Prefaces are not only written in the voice of a sovereign but that the author himself is one; only the “highest under heaven” can publicly reproach the foibles of other emperors, if the occasion calls. Recall that the speaker of the Kokinshū prefaces maintained a humble attitude in offering up the anthology. In the ShinKokinshū prefaces, the tone is more elevated and the speaker speaks down to the subjects who will no doubt be swayed by the positive influence of the poems he has selected, but condescending though he may be, he is not condemning. The speaker of the Fūgashū is likewise a sovereign, and this time, the hand (Hanazono) behind the persona (Kōgon) is also a sovereign, and as such, there is really no need to be apologetic. In this way, the double “imperiality” of the Fūgashū Prefaces adapts precedence and turns it into an effective tool to discuss and criticize the quality of the opposite imperial court (the Southern Court) and the poetry it sponsors. As will be

footnote[63]{Incidentally, Hanazono makes no reference to the ShokuKokinshū.}

footnote[64]{Kōgon retired in 1333 when GoDaigo returned from exile.}
demonstrated in the translation I provide in the Appendices, a substantial portion of the *Fūgashū* Prefaces is dedicated to criticism of poetics and a discussion of contemporary trends in *waka* composition—a discussion that derives from disapproval of the imbalance between *kokoro* and *kotoba*.

Although he does not name individuals, Hanazono’s attack is primarily directed at the Nijō school, rival to the Kyōgoku poets and sponsored by the Daikakuji line. Hanazono was likely to have felt pressed to hold the Nijō school in check, since the Nijō poets had already compiled three imperial anthologies compared to Kyōgoku’s one, and since the survival of the Kyōgoku school was already a matter of concern after only two generations. Recall my earlier assertion that one effect achieved by the discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the Six Poetic Immortals in the *Kokinshū* prefaces was to warn against common poetic errors. The majestic speaker of the *Fūgashū* explicitly condemns people who are oblivious to the true function of poetry: subjects admonishing the ruler and the ruler educating the ruled. This statement appears to be a further development of the *ShinKokinshū* statement introduced earlier, but in reality, it is a reference to the source of all Japanese imperial *waka* anthology prefaces: the *Shijing Great Preface*. Compare: “By feng those above transform those below; also by feng those below criticize those above” in the *Shijing* and “[waka] teaches those below and remonstrates the one above; that is, it becomes the foundation of governance” in the *Fūgashū kanajo*. By this time the lyricism exemplified in Tsurayuki’s *Kokin* prefaces had made way for Hanazono’s didactic

66 Owen, Readings 46.  
approach. Following Wixted’s earlier mentioned argument, if Tsurayuki’s proclamation preferred expression over pragmatism and didactics in Japanese poetry, and set standards for generations to come, Hanazono appealed to Chinese sources and authority once more to emphasize pragmatism and didacticism to attack his rivals and legitimize himself as the guardian of the Way of poetry.

In addition to the structural link to the “kokin” convention, Hanazono inserts another link in terms of content—he establishes a triangular bond between the Fūgashū, the Kokinshū and the Shijing by developing Tsurayuki’s argument for his own ends, using the Shijing principles. In the first part of the Prefaces, immediately after the customary statement that poetry is a spontaneous expression manifest since the time of chaos, Hanazono returns to the Naniwazu poem and the Asaka Mountain poem that Tsurayuki called “the parents of waka” (waka no oya). To these he applies a new interpretation that places the parents of waka on par with the poems selected in the Shijing. Hanazono writes that the virtue of sages had reached Japan through the Naniwazu poem (the father of waka), and is thus comparable to the Airs (fēng) from Southern Zhou. The Asaka Mountain poem (the mother of waka) likewise signifies that the edification of the wise had spread to the four corners of the realm, also comparable to the Airs (fēng) from Southern Zhao. The Airs from the two Southern States, Zhou and Zhao, make up the first part of the Shijing, the “proper fēng” (zhēng fēng), which teaches proper principles. Hanazono concludes the opening section with a syllogism that because of these symbolic ties, Japanese poetry (waka, or yamato uta) is equal to the profound ways of the lessons transmitted through the poems (shi) in

the *Shijing* despite the fact that it is in the crude Japanese language.\(^6^9\) Demonstrating that the *Fūgashū* succeeds the values and the true function of poetry captured in the *Kokinshū* would mean that the *Fūgashū* succeeds the values of the *Shijing*.

There are two main points that the *Fūgashū* Prefaces take from the *Kokinshū* and *ShinKokinshū* prefaces: poetry is primarily composed to express *kokoro* through *kotoba*, and despite the fact that rulers of old used poetry as a means of governance, it has degenerated in modern days and now only serves the petty purpose of amorous people. Hanazono details all sorts of bad habits perpetuated by people who do not understand the true Way of poetry. Some are interested in *kotoba* only, and their poems are superficial and hollow. They “steal” expressions and diction from good examples without capturing the deep meanings behind them. Some overexpress *kokoro* to such an extent that their resultant *kotoba* is disastrous. Similarly, the attempt at stylistic boldness yields curt, aggressive lines; a verse that is meant to be sensitive and profound ends up weak or excessive instead. All of these poetic mistakes happen because the writer has not striven hard enough to attain the true Way of Poetry. What, then, is this Way of poetry of which Hanazono speaks?

In the opening of the *kanajo*, Hanazono writes: “Its words few and its meaning profound, [Japanese poetry] may truly rectify human feelings/minds” (*kotoba kasuka ni shite mune fukashi, makoto ni hito no kokoro wo tadasu fukashi*).\(^7^0\) Two things above all are apparent in this statement: one is that Hanazono emphasizes the transformative function of poetry, and the other is that he advocates a technique whereby the depth of meaning is conveyed in few words, or by subtle diction (J. *kotoba kasuka*; lit. “faint words”). Hanazono means to establish that simple but

---

\(^6^9\) This link, according to Nakamura, appears in Tame’ie’s treatise, *Tame’ie kokinjo sho*, which he surmises Tamekane had access to through his father Tamesuke’s notes.

\(^7^0\) *Fūgashū kanajo* in Iwasa, *Fūga wakashū zenchūshaku*, 12.
deep words are weighty enough to sway people’s hearts to the correct way.

This statement occurs in the midst of rhetoric and diction strongly reminiscent of the Great Preface to the Shijing, and is made more explicit through the reference to transformative influence (tadashimu). Establishing the waka/shi analogy through the “parents of waka,” the model poetry Hanazono has in mind can be found in the Shijing, and in particular the feng poems, the simple but sincere words of which have been believed to have profound meanings in terms of politics and governance.71 Added to this reference is the choice of the title fūga (Ch. fengya) which are the titles of the two of the three main divisions of the Shijing, and also a common way to refer to this canonical text (I discuss the choice of the title and the meaning of the terms in the next chapter). At first glance, it seems ironic that the second-generation head of the innovative Kyōgoku school so strongly advocates a return to the ancient principles of the Shijing. The awkwardness of the irony could have been what led Brower and Miner to overlook the repeatedly conspicuous references to the Chinese classic and opt for the conservatism-innovation dichotomy. Yet, a comprehensive look at the era offers a convincing explanation for the phenomenon: the school labeled as innovative was paradoxically able to make legitimacy claims by invoking the authority of the oldest text because it never attempted to depart from the tradition in the first place.

Tracking the political complications in the court during the late Kamakura period, Burk demonstrates that political factions and poetic confrontations mutually intensified each other, and Hanazono’s arguments in the Prefaces are no exception. Burk observes that both the Nijō and

71 See, for example, Steven Van Zoeren, Poetry and Personality: Readings, Exegesis, and Hermeneutics in Traditional China (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991). See especially Chapter 4 for how the canonical texts were regarded to have transformative power for individuals and society as a whole in the Han Dynasty, and the Great Preface propagates that idea.
Kyōgoku schools base their stylistic orientation in the same tradition as Shunzei and Teika, summarized in the dictum “kotoba furuku, kokoro atarashi” (old diction, new treatment), but they arrive at different interpretations. Since the rivalries were fueled by the bitter discord between the brothers Tameuji and Tamenori, further amplified by the fact that each school was sponsored by rival imperial lines, she concludes: “political rivalries engendered accentuated stylistic differences.” After a comparative analysis of poems by Nijō and particularly Kyōgoku poets, she admits that generally speaking, the Kyōgoku approach is more innovative than that of the Nijō, but qualifies this conclusion with the assertion that this innovative tendency still occurred “within the bounds of tradition.” For both Kyōgoku and Nijō poets, the question was where in Teika’s dictum they should place emphasis—on kokoro or kotoba—and not whether to accept his dictum. Their choice of “which had to be preserved was the pursuit of new and meaningful treatment, not the conservation of conventions of diction or technique.” Hanazono’s stance agrees with this conclusion. The diction may be simple, or “faint,” but the pursuit of new and meaningful treatment will make the poem resonate in readers’ hearts.

In the next part of the kanajo, Hanazono stresses the exquisite balance between kokoro and kotoba, criticizes a series of bad habits and approaches, and reaches back for the poetry-composing attitudes of antiquity. It is precisely because Hanazono situated himself and the school he headed within the tradition that he was able to draw authority from the oldest Japanese canon, which is faithful to the Shijing’s spirit of poetry. By extension, the Kyōgoku school he champions (by allowing most representation in the anthology) is the exemplary poetic style that

---

72 Burk, “Reading Between the Lines,” 134.
73 Ibid., 116. Burk also reminds readers that although the discord stemmed from Tameuji and Tamenori, the latter is not considered the founder of the Kyōgoku school; see Ibid., 70, footnote 5 and 125, footnote 21.
74 Ibid., 133-134, emphasis mine.
75 Ibid., 134.
stands closest to the Way of poetry.

2.2 The Logistics of Hanazono’s Composition

Whereas it had been customary for the composition of prefaces to be divided between two courtiers, the manajo by a distinguished Confucian scholar and the kanajo by a leading poet, Retired Emperor Hanazono composed both prefaces for the Fūgashū. Although the ShinKokinshū prefaces are also written in the voice of the emperor, the Fūgashū was the first and the only case in which a (retired) emperor wrote the prefaces for an imperial waka anthology himself. Similarly, whereas a distinguished poet or poets among the courtiers were entrusted with the task of editing and compiling poems, Hanazono’s relatively inexperienced nephew, Retired Emperor Kōgon—a highly esteemed poet himself, although overshadowed by Hanazono—was named the compiler. 76

In the case of the Kokinshū, the name attributed to the preface in each script does not necessarily mean original authorship. Heldt underscores the fact that both the kanajo and the manajo conclude with Tsurayuki’s name, although the Confucian scholar Ki no Yoshimochi is the credited author of the manajo. He indicates the possibility that the preface was drafted in kana by Tsurayuki, and later polished in Literary Sinitic—the official script—for court archives. 77 If this were the case, the role of Yoshimochi is more auxiliary than authorial in

76 This situation compares with GoToba’s at the time of making the ShinKokinshū. Although GoToba was constantly and deeply involved in the compilation process of the ShinKokinshū, he is not considered as the compiler. Questions have been raised regarding the division of tasks between the two retired emperors in the past, but since Tsugita and Iwasa provide solid evidence from court records and Hanazono’s diary in their book it has been accepted that Hanazono penned the two prefaces and gave the title, and Kōgon did most of the editing and compiling, with the assistance of a few other poets and through occasional consultation with Hanazono. Tsugita and Iwasa point out that because Hanazono guided Kōgon’s education, his philosophy and poetic style resembled those of Hanazono. Tsugita and Iwasa, Fūgawakashū, 20-22.

77 Heldt, Pursuit of Power, 195-196. Heldt forewarns readers, however, of layers of mysteries concerning the Kokinshū prefaces, and notes another perspective on which preface was written first. Following previous studies,
creating the manifesto for the first Imperial waka anthology. In the case of the Fūgashū, in contrast, Hanazono contained his views in the voice of Kōgon. In Hanazono’s single authorship evinces the retired emperor’s prowess at both kana and mana composition as well as the centrality of his knowledge and experience in compiling the Fūgashū.

Hanazono was the best candidate to write the Prefaces both for his literary abilities and for political reasons, and evidence shows that he felt very strongly about prefaces. The previous Gyokuyōshū lacked prefaces in either mana or kana, to the regret of later Kyōgoku poets. Then-head of the Kyōgoku school Tamekane had been exiled twice, and although the exact reasons for the punishment were unclear even at the time, the consensus was that it was inappropriate to appoint a (former) criminal to compile an imperial anthology; further, it was out of question to have Tamekane compose the prefaces because he was “illiterate” (monmō). Fushimi, who led the Kyōgoku school after Tamekane’s exile, was ill. Thus it was decided upon the strong recommendation of Tōin Kinkata, an advisor of Hanazono and Kōgon, that for the new anthology Hanazono should include prefaces. Tsugita Kasumi observes that considering Hanazono’s character, it is plausible that Hanazono had set upon writing the prefaces himself first but waited for Kinkata to actually speak the words. Be it for decorum or out of calculated manipulation, Hanazono maintained a reserved appearance regarding this decision: even the voice of the sovereign heard in the Prefaces is not his, but his nephew Kōgon’s. Yet evidence points to his long-term design to leave a timeless Kyōgoku-Jimyōin line anthology.

Wixted also discusses the possibility of the manajo being written first and serving as the basis for the kanajo. See Wixted, “The Kokinshū Prefaces,” 225.
78 Tsugita and Iwasa, Fūgawakashū, 31.
79 Hanazono tennō shinki, article Jōwa 2/11/9, quoted in Tsugita Kasumi, “Fūga wakashū jo no kōsatsu,” 52. Since Tamekane was not only the founder of the Kyōgoku school of poetry but also a formidable political figure, “illiterate” probably means his skills at composing in Literary Sinitic did not come close to his reading skills.
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suggests that Hanazono might have been preparing the outline for prefaces and criteria for selection of poems for Kōgon from as early as Ryakuō 3 (1340 CE).  

Moreover, as early as Shōchū 2 (1326 CE), he criticized the sixteenth anthology, *ShokuGoshūishū*, for having no prefaces, even though it bore a title claiming heritage with the *sandaishū*, or the first three anthologies. The circumstances are well recorded in the *Shinki*.

While waiting for the appropriate timing to execute Fushimi’s wish to compile another anthology by a Kyōgoku hand, Hanazono learned that the Nijō poets had entitled their new anthology, commissioned by GoDaigo, *ShokuGoshūishū*. To this Hanazono expressed displeasure, remarking that earlier in the year he had been told that the new anthology would inherit the well-formed examples of the *sandaishū*, and yet for an anthology that pays homage to the *GoShūishū*, how could there be no preface? He did not understand. Kinkata also recalled that his father had always regretted that the *Gyokuyōshū* had no prefaces. Although more imperial anthologies are without preface than with one (and even less with two prefaces), and five consecutive anthologies before the *Fūgashū* were without a preface, the decision-makers of the *Fūgashū* project were keenly aware of a preface’s role in illuminating the intention of the compilers and became zealous advocates of prefaces. From the earliest conception stage of the second Kyōgoku anthology, Hanazono advocated for endowing it with double prefaces.

Another indication of the weight placed upon the *Fūgashū* Prefaces is the completion date

---

81 Ibid., 53.
83 Kleinkopf, “Introduction to the *Fūgawakashū*,” 56.
and the public presentation at a banquet, particularly when compared to precedents. Heldt suggests that for the *Kokinshū*, the *manajo* was likely composed for court archives and not intended for distribution among members of the court.\(^8^4\) For the *kanajo* he suggests that following the norms of the time, it was written for copies that Tsurayuki had personally compiled and distributed to a wider readership, but was not intended for official presentation.\(^8^5\) The *ShinKokinshū* follows the example from the golden days of Heian court culture and has two prefaces, but neither was ready at the time of the presentation banquet. The *kanajo* was completed first, within a month of the anthology’s presentation banquet in the second year of Genkyū (1205 CE), third month, fifth day. The *manajo* came considerably later, possibly not until the eleventh month, twenty-first day of the same year.\(^8^6\)

In keeping with the precedent set by the *ShinKokinshū*, a presentation banquet was held for the *Fūgashū* on Jōwa 2 (1346 CE), eleventh month, ninth day. Whereas both prefaces were appended to the *ShinKokinshū* after the presentation banquet, both Prefaces for the *Fūgashū* were completed *before* the banquet, on the tenth month, eleventh day of the same year.\(^8^7\) Only the two Prefaces and the first book of Spring were completed at the time of the banquet, where both Prefaces and the first seven poems were read, followed by a lecture on *waka*, then entertainment.\(^8^8\) The *Fūgashū* Prefaces are the first prefaces to be vocalized and intended for all members of the court participating at the presentation banquet. The content and procedure of the presentation banquet affirm that Hanazono was making his intentions known, seeking attention more actively than his predecessors who had recorded their intentions only on paper for future

\(^{8^5}\) Ibid., 192-193.
\(^{8^6}\) Rodd, *ShinKokinshū*, XLV.
\(^{8^7}\) Tsugita and Iwasa, *Fūgawakashū*, 18. The prefaces are dated Jōwa 2/11/9, the day of the banquet.
\(^{8^8}\) Tsugita, “*Fūga wakashū* jo no kōsatsu,” 55.
appreciation. Concurrently, the Prefaces would have served as guidelines for the selection process, rather than a summation of the project in hindsight.

The exact reason for holding an official presentation when only a fraction of the anthology was completed is unclear. One possibility could be Hanazono’s ill health. In 1346 he was already quite ill, perhaps to the extent that he was unable to attend the banquet but only to listen behind a screen. Moreover, although the capital was relatively peaceful, the ceasefire between the Muromachi shogunate and GoDaiho’s sons outside the capital could have reverted to civil war any time. It is likely that the Jimyōin line reflected on the time of Fushimi and Tamekane’s efforts for an anthology and decided to promulgate the “completion” of a new anthology before political circumstances interrupted them once again, and while a senior member taught by Tamekane was leading the faction.

On the morning following the banquet, both Hanazono and Kōgon expressed utmost satisfaction and congratulated the reciter, Kinkata, on his successful presentation in separate messages, using nearly identical words. This episode reaffirms that the two retired emperors, the brains behind the Fūgashū project, shared the similar views and ideals on poetry and found the presentation delivered their intentions well. I discuss their intentions in terms of poetics and politics in the next two chapters.

89 Tsugita and Iwasa, Fūgawakashū, 32.
91 Tsugita and Iwasa, Fūgawakashū, 32.
Chapter 3: The Chinese Influence on the Fūgashū Prefaces

In the previous chapter, I demonstrate that previously written prefaces to imperial waka anthologies influenced the author of the Fūgashū Prefaces. By making explicit allusions to the Kokinshū and ShinKokinshū prefaces and following a similar line of argument, Hanazono presents the Fūgashū as the legitimate successor of the literary legacies of Tsurayuki and Teika. At the same time, by choosing a title that does not contain the phrase kokin, Hanazono draws his audience’s attention to the differences of his anthology compared to the respected precedents rather than to the ways it conforms to tradition. The title fūga, as I pointed out in the Introduction, is a reference to the Shijing, the oldest Chinese poetry anthology (ca. 600 BCE). In the manajo to the Fūgashū, Hanazono closely follows the diction (the same Chinese characters) and logic of the Daxu, reaffirming that his anthology pays homage to the spirit of the oldest Chinese poetry anthology. He then alludes to other Chinese sources—mainly histories; a strategy to assert authority from an older and well-respected tradition. In this chapter, I scrutinize the terms, structure and arguments of the Fūgashū manajo and trace its references to canonical Chinese works. I argue that Hanazono demonstrates the affiliation of his Kyōgoku literary salon to the Chinese literary tradition in an attempt to legitimize his faction against his Nijō rivals, and that he wields the same literary weapon to claim his Jimyōin line as the one legitimate ruler over the Daikakuji line.

3.1 Chinese Terms in the Manajo

The language of the mana Preface to the Fūgashū is reminiscent of Chinese classics, namely the Daxu to the Shijing and the Preface to the Wen xuan (文選; En. Selections of Refined Literature; J. Monzen), in key terms, parallel structure and arguments. The key term in the
Fūgashū Prefaces is *feng* (風; J. *fū*), whose multiple layers of meaning are difficult to render into English. The generic meaning of the word is “wind,” or “air,” the movement of the atmosphere as a natural phenomenon. It is also “change.” The metaphorical “wind” is the air or mood a person or a work carries, and has the power to move people’s hearts: hence the meaning “influence.” Of the many kinds of influences, *feng* specifically refers to the virtue and benevolence of the wise man (君子; Ch. *junzi*, J. *kunshi*) which sways the hearts of the “small people” (小人; Ch. *xiaoren*, J. *shōnin*), bringing about social change. This analogy is famously preached by Confucius: “The nature of the noble man is like the wind, the nature of the inferior man is like the grass. When the wind blows over the grass, it always bends.”

Generations of poets picked up the analogy of wind blowing over grass, including the author of the *Fūgashū manajo* himself. One of Hanazono’s poems reads:

あし原や みだれし国の風をかへて民の草葉もいまなびくなり

*ashi-hara ya*  O Japan!

*midareshi kuni no* changing the air

*kaze wo kahete* of the disturbed realm,

*tami no kusa-ba mo* the blades of grass, the people,

*ima nabiku nari* now sway under that wind.  

---


93 *Fūgashū* 2198 (Vol. 20 Gaka, or Congratulations). Iwasa Miyoko, *Fūgawakashū zenchūshaku ge* 風雅和歌集全注釈，下 (Tokyo: Kasama shoin, 2003), 393. Translation mine. From the fact that the wind is analogous to virtue and benevolent rule, and that Hanazono uses the term *feng* repeatedly in the *Fūgashū* Prefaces, Nakamura suggests that the wind (*kaze*) in this poem refers to the Jimyōin rule that blows over the realm disturbed (*midareshi kuni*) by GoDaigo’s rebellions. Nakamura Takeshi, "Hanazono-in no waka ishiki: 'fū' wo megutte" 花園院の和歌意識—「風」をめぐって—, in *Kokugo kokubun* 国語国文, 78:4 (June 2009), 12.
The poem is largely an extended metaphor of the imagery from \textit{Analects}, and sings of the virtue of a wise man, the ruler, likened to the wind gently sweeping over the people and making them sway. This meaning of influence is at the base of the first part of the \textit{Shijing}, the \textit{Feng}, translated into English as “Airs.” It is both the short form of \textit{Guofeng}, or the “Airs of the States” section, and the category of poems that comprise the \textit{Feng} genre. In the \textit{Daxu} it states:

上以風化下，下以風剌上，主文而諷諫，言之者無罪，聞之者足以戒，故曰風.

By \textit{feng} those above transform those below; also by \textit{feng} those below criticize those above. When an admonition is given that is governed by patterning (\textit{wen}), the one who speaks it has no culpability, yet it remains adequate to warn those who hear it. In this we have \textit{feng}.\textsuperscript{94}

The \textit{Guofeng} section is further divided into the “proper \textit{feng}” (正風; Ch. \textit{zheng feng}, J. \textit{shōfū}) and “mutated \textit{feng}” (變風; Ch. \textit{bian feng}, J. \textit{henpū}).\textsuperscript{95} Additionally, \textit{feng} is sometimes used interchangeably with the homonymous “\textit{feng}” (諷), which means “to criticize.” Since \textit{zheng} means “proper,” “correct,” when Hanazono writes “正風” in the \textit{manajo}, he is simultaneously alluding to the \textit{Guofeng} and invoking the transformative influence that the poems in the \textit{Fūgashū} will have on those who take them to heart.

\textsuperscript{94} The Great Preface (\textit{Daxu}) to the \textit{Shijing} and Owen’s translation in Owen, \textit{Readings}, 46.
\textsuperscript{95} For discussion on the relationship between the proper and mutated \textit{feng}, see Owen, \textit{Readings}, 47-48. Despite the connotation, the mutated \textit{feng} does not “simply manifest moral decline” of the period they come from; rather, Owen suggests, they should be taken as “responses by virtuous men to the problem of moral decline.” The term \textit{bian} also has the meaning “change” but differs from \textit{feng} in that it connotes departure from the norm. For fuller explanations on the concepts of \textit{zheng} and \textit{bian}, see ibid., “Glossary of Basic Terms,” pp. 584 and 590.
Ya (雅; J. ga), the second character forming the anthology’s title, has the meanings of “dignity,” “elegant,” “gracious” and so on. It is also the second section of the *Shijing*, known in English as “Odes.” Put together with Feng, Feng-Ya, “Airs and Odes,” has become one way of referring to the old tradition of poetry in general. In later generations in China, it became a fashion to use the term in poetry anthologies. Bruce Rusk charts how commonly fengya was used in the titles of Yuan and Ming anthologies in *Critics and Commentators: The Book of Poems as Classic and Literature*. Rusk counts at least twenty-four such anthologies from the Yuan and Ming dynasties, around the time when the *Fūgashū* was compiled in Japan. Some anthologies reference the *Shijing* by using an alternative term, but either feng or ya remain in those cases. Rusk also notes that the authors and/or compilers typically explained in the prefaces that the works included in their volumes served the same function as that of the *Shijing*, “as a political barometer and source of moral suasion.” In other words, they borrowed the authority of the canon as a way to legitimize their works, and the preface was the space to bridge the new and the classic. The extent to which Hanazono was aware of this growing trend in China is difficult to know, but considering his keen interest in Chinese studies, it is plausible that he was following the continental examples and sought to legitimize his anthology by establishing similar ties to the Chinese classic.

---

96 Ibid., 594.
97 Ibid., 586. Nakamura Takeshi argues the same for the origin of the title “fūga” in “Fūga wakashū no daigō ni kansuru ichi kōsatsu.” He further explains that although the synecdoche could have been any combination of Feng, Ya and Song (頌), the sound fengya was most agreeable to the ears.
98 Bruce Rusk, *Critics and Commentators: The Book of Poems as Classic and Literature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2012), 88-94. For a comprehensive list of Chinese anthologies from early seventh to mid seventeenth century referencing the *Shijing*, see Ibid., Appendix IV.
99 Ibid., 89.
100 While he was on the throne, Hanazono was given lessons in Chinese studies under Sugawara no Arikane (1248-1321); in 1313, tenth month, Hanazono resolved to read one volume (kan) of Chinese text or a Japanese book (shō), and in a few years increased the volume of his daily reading. For specific titles of Hanazono’s study, see Andrew
Although one of the primary meanings of ya is “elegance,” it does not seem that the “elegant beauty” of the poems was Hanazono’s principal criterion for inclusion in the anthology. Hanazono does not use the term "miyabi," the Japanese equivalent of “elegance” or refined style in poetry tradition, in the kanajo. In fact, he warns against overstressing style and compromising content. Ga in the manajo therefore may be better interpreted as “proper” and “correct,” as defined in the Daxu: “Ya means ‘proper’” (雅者正也, Ch. ya zhe zheng ye).¹⁰¹ This interpretation agrees with Inoue Muneo’s introductory notes to the Fūgashū which state that upon deciding on the title, Hanazono first opted for “shōfū” (正風, “proper feng”). Shōfū means “correct influence” of the virtuous man over the lesser people with which he educates and changes, and simultaneously refers to “the Airs in their primordial form” or “the Airs of a moral society,” the opening division of the Shijing.¹⁰² However, one Japanese pronunciation of these Chinese characters was inauspicious, hence he revised the title to fūga (風雅, fengya), after two of the three main divisions of poetry in the Shijing or as a synecdoche for the Shijing itself.¹⁰³ Arguments for correct influence remain in the Prefaces, and the present title allowed Hanazono to maintain his intention and adorn it with a strong literary tie to the revered classic.

Goble, “Social Change, Knowledge, and History: Hanazono’s Admonitions to The Crown Prince” (Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies 55, No. 1 (June 1995), pp. 61-128), 79-80. For some years, Hanazono created a list of what he had studied in a given year at the end of the year. For example, the entire entry of the last day of Shōchū 1 (1325/1/15) is a list of Chinese texts he studied, followed by Japanese texts; the list is much shorter in Shōchū 2 (1326/3/2) and Hanazono laments the small number of titles. Hanazono tenno shinki, Shōchū 1/12/30 and Shōchū 2/12/30. Neither year-end list contains titles of poetry anthologies other than the Shijing, but we cannot completely rule out the possibility of Hanazono’s acquisition of Chinese poetry anthologies with fūga in the title outside his curriculum, or in the years in which he did not create a list.

¹⁰¹ Owen, Readings, 48-49.
¹⁰² Ibid., 38-39, and 584.
¹⁰³ Chūsei wakashū 中世和歌集, introductory notes, in Shinpen nihon koten bungaku zenshū 新編日本古典文学全集, Vol. 49, edited and introduced by Inoue Muneo (Tokyo: Shūgakukan, 2000), 264. In one Japanese reading of the Chinese characters, the title is homonymous to “傷風,” an umbrella term for all kinds of illness related to too much exposure to cold wind.
3.2 Structure and Arguments in the Manajo

The Fūgashū manajo can be roughly divided into four sections, although one may argue for a more meticulous division. The arguments of the manajo and kanajo are nearly identical and need not be repeated verbatim; here I highlight only the parts that demonstrate strong ties to Chinese literature. Based on the argument of each section, the four sections are as follows:

Section 1: Declaration of the origin and the nature of waka

Section 2: Criticism of degenerate composition habits rampant in the author’s time, and argument for the balance of meaning and style, equivalent to kokoro and kotoba

Section 3: Promulgation of a new anthology, entitled Fūga waka shū, to serve as a correct model

Section 4: Further rationale for compiling this anthology, alluding to historical episodes of China

Section 1 accords with the customary opening words for an anthology, but the words of Hanazono’s opening are particularly reminiscent of the Daxu of the Shijing. Hanazono not only unfolds his argument in a similar fashion, but also uses the terms—kanji—of the Shijing. The frequent appearance of the character 風 (J. fū, Ch. feng) is the most conspicuous example, followed by the appearances of 雅 (J. ga, Ch. ya), and 興 (J. kyō, Ch. xing), which all refer to principles of poetry included in the Shijing.104

104 The character 風 is also very conspicuous in the kanajo as an occasional kanji in the stream of kana. It is not strange to see a kana-kanji interchange at places in different texts, for example 心 instead of こころ; but in all versions of the Fūgashū texts 風 is never written out in kana. Ishizawa Kazushi 石澤一志, Fūgawakashū: kōhon to kenkyū 風雅和歌集 校本と研究 (Tokyo: Bensei shuppan, 2015), 7-10.
Hanazono closes Section 1 stating that the origin of Japanese poetry corresponds to the fulfillment of the Airs (feng) of the two Southern States, that is, Southern Zhou (周南) and Southern Shao (召南). In the Shijing, Airs of the two Southern States open the Guofeng section, collectively referred to as the zheng feng, or proper feng. In the previous chapter I argue that Hanazono’s opening section elevates the status of waka to that of the oldest canonized Chinese poetic tradition by creating a syllogistic bond based on the expression, “waka no oya.” Concurrently, his logic solidifies the Shijing as the reference point for all that is to be argued in the Fūgashū Prefaces, and all that is embodied by the zheng feng section has become the orientation of waka.

In Section 2, Hanazono sharply criticizes what he considers ill habits in poetry composition, fully using the parallel structure commonly found in Sinitic essays. This parallel structure is particularly effective at criticizing two contrasting stylistic vices while demonstrating the fairness of the author’s judgment. Specifically, Hanazono criticizes the practice of “stealing old words and delving into decorative presentation,” or copying a recognized diction and style without grasping the fundamentals the words imply. This criticism corresponds to the overemphasis on kotoba (words) and relative disregard for kokoro (spirit) discussed in the kanajo, the main criterion of the Kyōgoku attack on the Nijō school. Hanazono balances this attack with a parallel statement that some people believe in feeling before anything else and miss fine style/form (風體, fūtei). The remark is a warning to fellow Kyōgoku poets who were at the stylistic opposite of the Nijō poets. This being a mana composition, Hanazono does not use the

---

105 竊古語假艶詞，修飾而成之 (kogo wo nusumi enshi wo kari, shūshoku shite sore wo nasu). Fugashū manajo, in Iwasa, Fūgawakashū zenchūshaku, 5.
terms “kotoba” and “kokoro,” but characters that correspond to each, such as 語 (go; words), 辭 (ji; phrase, poetic style), 形 (tai, style, form) for kotoba, and 情 (jō; feeling) and 意 (i; intention) for kokoro. The ideal style, Hanazono writes, is simple practice and plain sentiment (淳風質朴情理之本, junpū shitsuboku jōri no moto), or the intention of the ancient feng (古風, kofū).

Although the Preface begins by closely following the Daxu, and makes frequent references to the words in it, there is no mention of the six types of verse, or what is called rikugi in Japan. It is worth noting that earlier in the Kokinshū prefaces, Tsurayuki follows the Chinese model of Six Dynasties poems (liu yi) and discusses the concept in the case of waka. The kanajo even provides example poems for each category. The omission of similar discussion on rikugi in the Fūgashū Prefaces, then, is an assertion of Hanazono’s literary opinion as well as his political stance not unrelated to the rivalry between the poetry schools of this day. According to Helen McCullough, Tsurayuki seems to have wanted a section to correspond to the Daxu’s discussion of liu yi to ordain an authoritative voice in Japan’s first imperial waka anthology; nevertheless, in discussing concepts obscure even to the Chinese, Tsurayuki sometimes translated them a bit too freely, possibly to appropriate them for the Japanese taste.

Tsurayuki’s translations, or interpretations, of the rikugi and selections of example poems,
aroused disagreement amongst scholars and commentators, including the *kochū* (“Old commentary”) author.\(^{108}\) Hanazono’s silence on the subject may be a tactful disagreement with Tsurayuki’s treatment of the *rikugi* as adapted to Japanese poetry, from the position of a well-versed Sinologist who is making legitimacy claims based on the original Chinese source.

Another important role his silence serves is a political statement of disapproval of the Nijō style, the school that compiled the *ShokuSenzaishū* (c.1318-1320) under the lead of Tameyo (1250-1338), then the *ShokuGoShūishū* (c. 1323-1326) under Tamefuji (1275-1324) and after Tamefuji’s death, Tamesada (1293-1360). According to Hanazono’s record, Tameyo seems to have been preoccupied with holding fast to the *rikugi* forms. In one entry of the *Shinki* dated Genkō 4 (1334 CE), seventh month, twenty-sixth day, writing on the topic of Tamefuji’s untimely death and the relevant topic of compiling imperial anthologies, Hanazono reveals unconcealed distaste for Tameyo and his poems:

> Tameyo’s poetry does not show even the slightest understanding of the old style. He is completely in the dark about the essence [*hon-i*] of it. At least Tamefuji made some effort to find out about the essential nature [*hon-i*] of poetry, and in this he was different from his father. How sad! Tamefuji had little talent, while his father Tameyo has no understanding of poetry’s essential nature. …Some foolish people say that Tameyo follows his own path of poetry. But one’s beliefs toward poetry are an indication of whether one is in accord with the will of Heaven. One should fear this will, for in the next life judgment will surely be made on one. The Emperor Go-
Daigo came to understand the true essence of poetry through Confucianism. Since Tameyo’s attitudes toward poetry are shallow, however, they are not of much use.\textsuperscript{109} Hanazono’s low opinion of Tameyo’s poems traces back at least a couple of years. In another entry dated Genkō 2 (1332 CE), third month, twenty-fourth day, Hanazono attacks Tameyo for his ignorance of the true Way of poetry, which is attained by profound understanding of Confucianism and Buddhism. He writes with disdain: “Tameyo, who claims the main descent form Shunzei and Teika, has no idea of [religious truths]. He jealously holds to the Six Genres of poetry [\textit{rikugi}] and cannot see the true meaning of the art.”\textsuperscript{110} He continues to lament that people of the world follow Tameyo’s way of poetry since it is the mainstream, and cannot distinguish good poetry from bad. In the same entry he writes that Kyōgoku Tamekane and Retired Emperor Fushimi are true masters of poetry who came to write in accordance with the Way through profound understanding of religious truths. Because by this time the Nijō and Kyōgoku salons shared mutual hatred, Hanazono had no reason to empower the Nijō by reiterating Tameyo’s emphasis on \textit{rikugi}, even if it meant disagreeing with the first imperial \textsuperscript{7}waka\textsuperscript{7} anthology. Rather, he would have surmised it much more beneficial for the Kyōgoku salon to acknowledge that Tsurayuki’s translation of the \textit{rikugi} and application of the concept to the \textit{waka} field was quite a departure from the \textit{liu yi}. Since Hanazono demonstrates his familiarity with the \textit{Daxu} in the rest of the \textit{manajo}, he indirectly argues that he, unlike the head of the Nijō school, chooses not to blindly follow Tsurayuki’s interpretation.

\textsuperscript{109} \textit{Hanazono tennō shinki} 1334/7/26, translated by Huey in Huey, \textit{Tamekane}, Appendix B, 156-157.
\textsuperscript{110} \textit{Hanazono tennō shinki} 1332/3/24, in ibid., 158.
Section 3 is a short but assertive promulgation of a new anthology and the rationale for compiling it. In this section Hanazono clarifies the Fūgashū’s pedigree: the new anthology follows the example of the Genkyū years, that is, the anthologizing of the ShinKokinshū.

What further strengthens Hanazono’s position as a literary authority is his allusion to a number of other venerable Chinese texts toward the close of the manajo in Section 4, showing his familiarity with other literary and historical documents and solidifying links to other dimensions of Chinese civilization. The customary reasoning for a compilation was that the imperial commissioner wished to collect and introduce exemplary waka in addition to what had been collected in existing anthologies. Hanazono’s manifesto is particularly notable, however, for his references to historical episodes of China and the parallels he draws to contemporary Japan’s political state. The corresponding section in the kanajo also directs readers’ attention to the tense political conditions in which the anthology was compiled: “Recently the dust of conflict in our land has settled, the horses on the battlefields are reined in, and the rough waves on the four seas have calmed.”111 The words are descriptive and implicitly eulogize the recent change of regime that settled the conflict in the realm, but are apparently without allusions to historical events. The manajo passage draws on the images of a sage ruler defeating a tyrant, making the tone more critical of the previous ruler and the declaration of peace more dramatic.

Tsugita and Iwasa identified the historical allusions in the Fūgashū manajo many decades ago; more recently, Nakamura re-illuminated the significance of Hanazono’s choice of historical

Following Nakamura’s analysis, I argue that in the *Fūgashū manajo* Hanazono carefully chooses his references in ways that demonstrate his familiarity with continental history and literature. Hanazono uses his cultural capital to promote his Jimyōin line and demote the Daikakuji line by finding allegories in the revered histories of China. Through the allegories, Hanazono reminds his audiences of the precedents from which the terms originate, and proclaims that he will likewise succeed the great values and intentions of the sage kings of the alluded episodes.

As for the reason for compiling the *Fūgashū*, Hanazono writes:

Once again the smoke is quickly calmed down and spring horses run around freely in the *feng* (winds, also the airs) of Mount Hua. Unforgiving laws and strict punishments are no longer in use and autumn’s bitter weeds decay in vain as though dewdrops in the meadow. The works by the public already flourish, and accomplishments of the officials verily shine. Be it the smallest piece of good, we have uncovered it, and found it painful to miss even one. Therefore, alas! We lament that this Way has been long abandoned, and no distinction between vulgar and graceful made, like the waters of the Jinghe and the Weihe. Such is the reason for compiling this anthology. We did not preponderantly select in favour of splendid expressions and beautiful words that offer momentary pleasure to look at. We solely desired to raise correct *feng* and rightful *ya*, and thus leave a beautiful legacy for a thousand ages.113

112 Nakamura Takeshi, “Waka to seidō.”
To fully illuminate Hanazono’s intentions, Nakamura takes a philological approach, digging for the circumstances in which the alluded historical episodes were born and verifies that fourteenth-century Japanese intellectuals were familiar with the references through primers, didactic materials and poems by well-known figures. He identifies three references in particular from the above excerpt that contain politically significant messages about the power struggle between the Jimyōin and Daikakuji lines. Here I introduce the historical episodes or rulers to which those allusions refer, and explain how they clarify Hanazono’s political stance, largely basing my argument on Nakamura’s analysis.

In Fūga wakashū zenchūshaku, Iwasa Miyoko stops at merely identifying the geographical location of Mount Hua, and proposes that the mountain was mentioned simply to mean a beautiful mountain. In fact Mount Hua is one of the Five Sacred Mountains of China and its location coincides with the centre of the old Zhou state. The cultural significance of Mount Hua alone suggests that the horses run freely in the breeze (fēng) of the home of the Shijing. But why spring horses? Nakamura finds that the imagery of spring horses below Mount Hua is

---

114 The acquisition, memorization, and transmission of knowledge on historical personages and episodes of ancient China was possible through primers and commentaries on those primers. For example, the first allusion of horses below Mount Hua, discussed below, appears in Wakan rōeishū (Collection of Japanese and Chinese Verses for Chanting), 439:

華山有馬蹄猶露     保胤
傳野無人路漸滋


Compiled in the eleventh century, the Wakan rōeishū was a popular meant to be chanted, as the title indicates, and copied for calligraphy practice. Students of the primers such as the Wakan rōeishū were familiarized to the personal and geographical names as well as episodes related to the names through repeated chanting and copying. For various levels of literacy and the use of primers, and the role of knowledge in Chinese writings, see Jennifer Guest, “Primers, Commentaries, and Kanbun Literacy in Japanese Literary Culture, 950-1250CE” (PhD diss., Columbia University, 2013).

115 The fourth reference Nakamura identifies is of the Jinghe and Weihe, but this is a well-known metaphorical device rather than having to do with a sage king’s accomplishments.

116 Ibid., 10.
specifically of warhorses, the reference going back to the Shujing (Book of Documents). The phrase first appears in the episode of Emperor Wu of Zhou (r. 1046-1043 BCE), defeating the tyrannical ruler of the Shang dynasty (c.1600 BCE-c. 1046 BCE) in lunar second month. Once the smokes from the battlefield had been cleared, warhorses returned from the battle and ran freely in the spring breeze beneath Mount Hua. In earlier scholarship, the imagery was taken as an allegorical reference to the pacified realm from the general context of the Prefaces. But taking into account the multilayered meanings of “wind/breezes” (feng) and the symbolic meaning of Mount Hua, it is evident that Hanazono carefully chose his allusion to refer to the oldest of the Feng poems in the Shijing. Hanazono implicitly critiques GoDaigo’s greed for power, which led to military confrontations that threw the realm into chaos and grieved the people. The uproar was pacified when GoDaigo was dethroned and a Jimyōin sovereign once again ascended to the throne. The comparison of the Jimyōin succession to the throne is glorified through the analogy of King Wu’s legendary seizure of power.

The next phrase, “Unforgiving laws and strict punishments,” similarly criticizes the oppressive rule of the previous regime and praises the virtue of the ruler who put an end to the tyranny. The idiomatic expressions for severe punishments derive from a late Han legal discussion, Yan Tie Lun (鹽鐵論, Discourses on Salt and Iron, 81 BCE), which introduces the episode of three treaty laws in the Annals of Gaozu, in Records of the Grand Historian (c. 94 BCE). As for the significance of the revised legal codes, Nakamura adds that under the Confucian doctrine of governance, a shift from (oppression by) law to virtue, and from

118 Ibid., 8.
punishment to rites was considered the most ideal state of guidance. Once more, Hanazono is aligning the recent Jimyōin ruler Kōgon with the virtuous ruler of ancient China and proclaims his line to have ended GoDaigo’s outrageous rule by law.

Now that the tools of torture and punishments are put down and are rotted away by morning dew, officials’ works thrive and the people’s businesses flourish. This third reference owes to Shujing, Yao dian (Canon of Yao). According to Nakamura, this passage not only promulgates the advent of a peaceful era, but more importantly promotes a ruler who has pacified the realm and stabilized people’s lives, just like the mythical sage emperor Yao. Hanazono’s message thus reads that the Jimyōin sovereign’s ascent to the throne and virtuous guidance of the people are comparable to Emperor Yao’s replacement of the bad rules of Emperor Zhi, and it is thanks to his virtuous accomplishments that people of all rungs on the social ladder are now able to concentrate on hard work and reap its fruits. The passage is a multilayered propaganda for Jimyōin rule embedding an attack against the rivaling Daikakuji line, GoDaigo in particular.

After praising the pacified state, the speaker of the Preface laments that the correct Way had long been abandoned until he came to oversee the realm and that there is no distinction between vulgar and graceful customs which are as contrasting as the waters of the Jinghe and Weihe. This popular river metaphor is drawn from the fact that the former river is extremely muddy and yellow-coloured, whereas the latter is clear blue. The imperial speaker declares that the very reason for compiling the Fūgashū is this lamentable state: the abandonment of the Way and the deplorable confusion of the vulgar and the graceful. In other words, the speaker declares

119 Ibid., 9.
120 Ibid., 11.
that this anthology is to be more didactic than ever, that he knows what poems conform to the
Way and, in the capacity of the rightful imperial authority, will personally select them to educate
his people. This attitude, as discussed in the previous chapter, clearly differs from the tones of
previous prefaces where the speakers either offered up poems that well-represented the era in
their humble opinion or that complemented existing compilations in similar aesthetic criteria.
Even the speaker of the ShinKokinshū preface refrained from making as decisive top-down
remarks as those found in the Fūgashū Prefaces. The proud statement in the current Preface
declares that only he, the Jimyōin sovereign, is the rightful, virtuous ruler who has brought peace
to the land after wiping out all vices and follies of the opposing ruler, and that his qualifications
are demonstrated in the poems he uses to educates his people, which accord with the Way.
I insist once more that, when a strong political statement such as that found in the Fūgashū
Prefaces appears, it belies the occasion that calls for it—in other words, behind the authority
being proclaimed, the author (or the authoring party) is feeling threats or challenges from outside.
In the case of the Jimyōin line in the early-mid fourteenth century, the challenges came from
multiple directions. For the last few generations the throne had been shared between the Jimyōin
and Daikakuji lines, with the right to name the crown prince belonging to the shogunate.
Emperor GoDaigo, the Daikakuji line successor of Hanazono, revolted against the shogunate and
saw the fall of the Kamakura shogunate during his reign, but in the long course of power struggle
between GoDaigo and the Kamakura shogunate, a second shogunate by the Ashikaga clan was
established, and the divided imperial lines were completely split into two courts—factors
weakening the position of the Jimyōin line all the more. In the poetry realm, the Nijō school had
been considered the mainstream, and Kyōgoku poets were conscious of that perception, as
witnessed in Hanazono’s diary entry quoted earlier.\textsuperscript{121} The following chapter delves into circumstances that may have necessitated Hanazono’s writing of the Prefaces in the style he chose, highly political and authoritative but reliant on the halo of canonical works.

\textsuperscript{121} Hanazono tennō shinki, 1332/3/24, translated in Huey, Tamekane, Appendix B, 156-157.
Chapter 4: Politics and Poetics

The previous chapters discuss how Hanazono’s choice of the title *fūga* for the anthology reflects the values and implications of *feng* and *ya* as represented in the *Shijing*. An innovative choice he did make; but it did not mark a stepping away from the tradition; rather, he traced back to the origins of poetry as a tool of governance to solidify the status of the *Fūgashū* as the rightful heir to that tradition. I suggest that when a legitimacy claim is made, it is because the party concerned feels pressure to make that claim, as an act that seeks external affirmation usually occurs when one’s position is insecure. In the case of the *Fūgashū*, I argue that the title is Hanazono’s deeply calculated answer to the troubles of his time, and the role of the ruler, in the context of a convoluted succession dispute in the imperial lineage entangled with another succession dispute among the descendants of Teika.

Brower and Miner do not fully reject the Japanese mainstream view that *waka* after the *ShinKokinshū* was continually worsening, and that it was living on its past glory. Although they note the tumultuous social and political changes, they are not eager to demonstrate the mutual relationship between the political field and the cultural field. But when circumstances change, behaviour that appears unchanged may take up new meanings. The hurried pace of compilation means a greater number of poems harvested over a shorter span of time, from which one may deduce that the quality would have dropped. However, there may be other variables that will lead to a different conclusion. For instance, the harvest of a greater number of poems may have been furnished by a greater pool of poets, or a more active composition environment with larger-scale and/or more frequent poetry contests (*utaawase*), which was indeed a great source of
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poems to be considered for anthologies.\footnote{For example, Kōgon held a small \textit{utaawase} on Kōei 1 (1342), eleventh month, fourth day, and another on twelfth month, first day, and in the following year hosted bigger \textit{utaawase} on fifty-four and ninety-six topics each. In Jōwa 2 (1346), the year the shogunate officially approved the \textit{Fūgashū} anthologization, a \textit{Jōwa hyakushu (utaawase)} was held to collect materials for compilation. The practice of having one hundred topics \textit{utaawase} for the anthologization purpose was a custom in the Nijō salon, save at the turn for \textit{ShokuGoShūishū}. Tsugita Kasumi, “Fūgashū no keisei (ge)” 風雅集の形成（下），in \textit{Kokugo to kokubungaku 国語と国文学} 40:6 (June 1963), 35 and 37.} For such reasons, rather than attempting a qualitative poetry evaluation, I now turn to circumstantial reasons responsible for the extra-poetic components of the \textit{Fūgashū} that reminisce on the \textit{Shijing}. I introduce a few excerpts from the \textit{Shinki} that allow us garner Hanazono’s opinions on GoDaigo and his policies. Though I admit an insufficiency of evidence, I suggest that Hanazono’s political opinion on GoDaigo went through a critical change after the Kenmu Restoration, which may be a reason for the politically charged tone and the choice of the speaker of the \textit{Fūgashū} Prefaces.

\subsection{The Merger: Patron’s Head, Artist’s Hand}

The two legitimacy disputes became intertwined as the rival imperial lines sponsored the Nijō and Kyōgoku schools. This sponsorship was closely related to marriage and political alliances. For instance, Kyōgoku Tamekane, Tamenori’s son, secured the Jimyōin line’s sponsorship through connection with the powerful Saionji family, which had produced generations of prime ministers. Tamekane’s family had served the Saionji as retainers, and his mother came from the Miyoshi family, who were also close retainers of the Saionji.\footnote{Inoue, \textit{Tamekane}, 14-16.} Prime Minister Saionji Sanekane’s daughter Eifukumon-in (1271-1342) was the favourite consort of Fushimi and a talented poet, and Tamekane became one of the poetry teachers of then-Crown Prince Fushimi in 1280.\footnote{Huey, \textit{Tamekane}, 26. The family ties did not always mean political alliance, however. Sanekane did not fully commit himself to one faction; and although he was the link to the Jimyōin line, in later days Sanekane became Tamekane’s formidable political enemy (Ibid., 149 and 6).} According to Huey, it was from this point that Tamekane’s political
Records have it that Fushimi’s affection and respect for Tamekane grew deeper over time. Eventually, members of Fushimi’s salon wholeheartedly championed the Kyōgoku style. With Tamekane twice sent into exile, and with his leaving no children to succeed his family vocation, the imperial members of the Jimyōin line became Tamekane’s poetic heirs—Fushimi, Eifukumon-in, then Hanazono, then Kōgon.

As the two schools consolidated their union with the feuding imperial houses, their antagonism was projected in the compilation of the imperial anthologies and the criticisms thereof. Political factionalism was at play. Tamekane enjoyed rapid promotion when Fushimi took office. Nijō Tameyo, older cousin of Tamekane, had a head start but was not promoted during the same period. Indeed, Fushimi demonstrated his utmost trust and affection for the head of the Kyōgoku school on a number of occasions, which culminated in his appointment as the guarantor (jōju) at then-Emperor Hanazono’s coming-of-age ceremonies and supporting him to be appointed as the sole compiler of the anthology Fushimi commissioned, despite a five-year exile that gave Tamekane a bad name. Compiling an imperial waka anthology was one way to assert the ruler’s authority and cultural capital, and the primary compiler, being the mouthpiece of the sponsoring ruler’s intentions, was granted the honour and power to select poems and poets best representing the glories of the sovereign. The resulting anthology Gyokuyōshū was harshly criticized by the Nijō school on every point imaginable, including an attack on the unconventional title. In an essay titled Kaen Rensho no Kotogaki (歌苑連署事書, “Poetic
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126 Ibid.
127 Ibid., 27.
128 Ibid., 30.
129 Ibid., 56. Tamekane was a member of the committee when the plan was first discussed, but the project was deferred due to two older compilers’ deaths and Tamekane’s exile. See Ibid., 35-40 and Burk, “Reading Between the Lines,” chapter 3.
Garden Particulars Jointly Signed,” 1315), the author finds Tamekane’s title *Gyokuyō* (“jeweled leaves”) resonating the fifth imperial anthology *Kinyōshū* (collection of golden leaves, 1127), just as unacceptable and unconventional.\(^\text{131}\)

Perhaps it is due to the Nijō criticism of the *Gyokuyōshū* for its unprecedented title that modern scholars such as Brower and Miner also focus on the title of the *Fūgashū*, and less on its other features such as the presence of the prefaces. Yet this view overlooks that Hanazono, one generation after Tamekane and Fushimi, has had a different political agenda and perspective. He holds a firm belief in the function of prefaces, as gleaned from the episode concerning the *ShokuGoshūishū* having no preface as discussed in Chapter 2. For Hanazono, poems in the anthology do not necessarily speak for themselves; the purpose of the anthology has to be more clearly articulated and available for perusal in the form of a preface.

The question of necessity arises. If people find the anthologies to be no more than a collection of exemplary poems, after sixteen such anthologies the next one would not require a preface explicating its raison d’être. In fact, *ShokuGoshūishū* is the tenth anthology with no preface, and its namesake *Shūishū* does not have a preface either. Conversely, if after a series of anthologies a preface is desired, it suggests that there is something different about this anthology, or at least that it is trying to be different, from the pre-existing ones. What is the message that Hanazono wants to communicate through the *Fūgashū*, but feels that poems alone would not sufficiently convey? What prompted him to write prefaces for the *Fūgashū*? Scrutiny of the two Prefaces and the *Shinki* entries concerning poetry and the *Fūgashū* project suggest that he is reacting to the insecure status of both the Kyōgoku school and the Jimyōin line in the chaotic

milieu. Specifically, his beloved nephew Kōgon had been forced to vacate the throne by GoDaigo’s Kenmu Restoration, and the establishment of the Southern Court and the presence of another shogunate at the doorstep weakened the imperial power even more than before GoDaigo’s regime. I maintain that in the face of the deep politics-poetics entanglement, Hanazono thought his status and calibre to contribute to a waka anthology the most effective means to claim legitimacy of the Kyōgoku-Jimyōin existence. That is, through the Fūgashū he sought to prove it was they who were following the correct Way as laid out in the revered Chinese classic (the Shijing) and echoed in the Japanese classic (the Kokinshū). Hanazono had an unchanging belief that the Kyōgoku style truly reflected the correct Way. The balance of simple, sincere kotoba and deep kokoro is the essence of poetry that the ancient people of Zhou pursued. What can be more important to a righteous ruler than educating and influencing people by means of poems that embody the Way? This is the everlasting correct feng. Success of the project would be a proclamation that the Jimyōin line was conducting its duty as the ruler. On the other hand, GoDaigo has caused years of disturbances and grief in the country; GoDaigo, and by extension the Daikakuji line, was not in accordance with the Way.

What Hanazono argues about guidance by correct feng in the Prefaces, he shows through the ample representation of Kyōgoku poets in the anthology. In the Fūgashū, Hanazono and Kōgon prioritize the Kyōgoku poets even more than previously championed poets. Of the 2,111 poems by 561 poets, twelve poets make up nearly one quarter of the anthology, with Fushimi at the top with 55 poems. The majority of these twelve poets are Kyōgoku affiliates, counting nine out of twelve. Appendix F enumerates the most represented poets in the Fūgashū. The non-

132 Tsugita, “Hanazono jōkō no shisō to bungaku,” 230-231.
Kyōgoku figures listed in the table are poets from past eras admired by Kyōgoku and non-Kyōgoku poets alike. To be sure, the skewed proportional representation of their own poets had been a popular practice with the Nijō poets as well, and with the Gyokuyōshū compiler Tamekane, as their mutual hostility accelerated. Nevertheless, what distinguishes the Fūgashū from the previous anthologies is the justification for this bias given in its Prefaces. While other Nijō and Kyōgoku anthologies kept silent on their selection criteria, in the Prefaces Hanazono claims to have “collected and edited the poems appropriate for feng and ya” which embody the ancient Way. The reason for the skewed representation is not bias, argues Hanazono through the Prefaces, but simply because Kyōgoku poets best accord with the Way, some of them even better than Tsurayuki, Shunzei or Teika. Through the prose articulation of what constitutes the correct Way of Poetry, he attempts to create solid links between the Kyōgoku style and the revered canon in both the Japanese and Chinese traditions.

From the above perspective, the choice of fūga as the title was an apposite choice. The most authoritative Japanese title kokin had been claimed many times already and was no longer novel. In addition, appropriating another name for the Shijing makes for a clearer basis for Hanazono’s largely Chinese-Confucian arguments. Since concepts and arguments in the Confucian didactics are best delivered in the Confucian language, a mana preface, or a preface written in Literary Sinitic, is not only decorous but also necessary in the case of the Fūgashū.

4.2 Hanazono’s Confucian Lens: The Shinki and Hanazono’s Worldview

As much as Hanazono can be harsh in judging even the people in his own camp, he justly recognizes deeds of his opponents that he deems correct or appropriate. Hanazono’s foremost and gravest criterion is whether the deed accords with the Way. Several entries in the Shinki convey a pattern in evaluating a person—Hanazono seems to have been rather judgmental, but
acting according to principle. This principle, as I demonstrate below, aligns with the Confucian-Principle (C. li, J. kotowari). Through his education in Chinese thought and history Hanazono developed a lens strongly Confucian in nature. He contemplated upon the life and accomplishments of historical figures of Japan and China and discussed whether they understood the Mandate of Heaven put their knowledge of the Confucian Way into practice. He also applied the Confucian lens to his understanding of the epoch. In this section I examine the formation of this Confucian lens and how it might have shaped the closing passages of the Fūgashū Prefaces.

Records indicate that Hanazono was an avid reader and an industrious student of Chinese. Aside from his curriculum of Chinese and Japanese studies comprising what an emperor should know, Hanazono continued self-directed reading in Chinese texts throughout his life and kept records of his progress. He was interested in Chinese histories in particular, which, according to Goble, shaped his world-view differently from the notion of mappō (degenerate world) widespread in Japan that time. The turbulent state of things inside and outside the court was not because the world was coming to an end; it was but another vicious struggle for power, just like what had been repeated time and again in the course of thousands of years of continental history.

Such a Confucian-oriented understanding was shaped by Hanazono’s reading, and as an adult it was refined by his socializing with leading Confucian scholars such as Hino Suketomo 日野資朝 (1290-1332), with whom he was acquainted in 1319, a year after he stepped down from the throne in favour of GoDaigo. Incidentally, Suketomo was a pivotal figure in bridging the two emperors’ thoughts. As briefly mentioned earlier, GoDaigo upheld Confucian ideology and believed that radical sociopolitical changes were due under the sole leadership of a powerful

133 See note 100.
monarch. GoDaigo’s inclination to Confucianism may not have been for the realization of an ideal Confucian state with a benevolent ruler; considering the succession dispute that had become increasingly messy, a more likely interpretation would be that GoDaigo had been acting to retain power for himself and his issue rather than for the imperial house as a whole. In any case, Confucianism was a great banner under which GoDaigo could muster anti-shogunate momentum and not yield the throne to another puppet emperor.

A year after he became emperor, in 1319 (the same year Hanazono became acquainted with Suketomo), GoDaigo formed a discussion group “for the purpose of studying ‘Confucian morality and teaching.’” In addition to the essential Five Classics and Three Histories, he included a wide range of books from the Song dynasty that likely educated him in neo-Confucian ideology. Little is known in regards to which books GoDaigo read in his discussion group, but we know that members of his group were inclined to Song learning. Several people who had been members of GoDaigo’s discussion group, including Suketomo, were members of Hanazono’s study group. The same people they associated with for years had likely taught them the same books, and channeled GoDaigo and Hanazono’s views in parallel ways on the problems of the weak sovereignty and the direction they needed to move toward. The difference between them was that by the time Hanazono had absorbed these thoughts from such books he was already retired, strongly wishing to retreat from the mundane world (the Jimyōin line’s fast
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waning authority under GoDaigo’s rule being a monumental factor), and his older cousin was presently the Emperor, full of zeal despite the shogunate’s endless moves to curb his ambition.

Hanazono’s *Shinki* entries from the years soon after his abdication show that his ideological lens was firmly in place. From time to time after reading, he made an evaluation of historical figures using a Confucian criterion. For example, in one entry in 1324, Hanazono sternly evaluates Liu Zhiji 劉知幾 (661-721), the author *Shitong* 史通 (*“Generality of Historiography,”* 718-710), that despite being well-versed in Confucian doctrines Liu was insufficient in “comprehending the sages and plumbing the Way.”138 Apparently the author’s conduct falls short of the knowledge he demonstrates in his book, and Hanazono criticizes the disharmony between them. Only two months earlier in the same year, the target of criticism is Fujiwara no Yorinaga 藤原頼長 (1120-1156), whose downfall from the position of the Minister of the Right was contemplated upon vis-à-vis his reputation as an erudite Confucian scholar:

> This person [Yorinaga] was the most outstandingly talented student of Chinese learning of the recent past (*kinko*). And he considered the study of righteousness central. But the legacy of his life is not worth contemplating.
> …On every matter the correct principles were mangled. Or, even though laws were transcended, in many instances this was [simply] following old practices [and not the result of superior discernment of principles that inform laws]. Knowing the principles [of things] one necessarily is successful. For this person, even though wise and sagely, how could it have come to this pass? Because he did not know the great body of the Way, and even though in his heart there was no personal malice,

in all things he went contrary to the Way; it was for this reason he met with calamity. People of later ages should ponder this well.139

Here again, the retired emperor is firm that a truly wise man (kunshi, also means a virtuous ruler) must demonstrate the unity of knowledge and conduct. Knowing is doing. Knowing the principles correctly, one is naturally following the Way without error and thus has to be successful. Yorinaga’s decline, Hanazono interprets, is due to his failure to understand the “great body of the Way,” despite his reputation for Chinese learning. Hanazono criticizes that Yorinaga did not understand the Mandate of Heaven (tenmei), thus was not a kunshi. This entry on Yorinaga is one example in which Hanazono discusses a high official’s downfall in terms of the Mandate of Heaven.140 The instance hints at his Confucian standards with which he would have interpreted GoDaigo’s actions in later years.

Although the two imperial lines were antagonistic, when Hanazono learned of GoDaigo’s reformist policies he was empathetic toward the new Emperor’s decisions. In 1322, the first year of GoDaigo’s direct rule, upon hearing about the new emperor’s decision to be more actively involved in court appointments and the allocation of rewards and such, he writes:

It was reported to me [Hanazono] that “court appointments other than on two occasions in spring and autumn shall be discontinued,” and that “promotions likewise shall not be made subsequent to appointments. This is a matter to be addressed [by the sovereign] in the first month.” Is the reason for this that the old regulations are being restored? [I was told,] “The sovereign is in particular studying the Way of the Mean. This is most appropriate. The Way of Government shall be

139 Hanazono tennō shinki, 1324/2/13, quoted and translated in Ibid., 113-115.
140 Another instance of general discussion on governance and the Mandate of Heaven can be found in Hanazono tennō shinki, 1319/10/26.
based upon purity and simplicity.” This is most appropriate. In recent times the Confucian Way has for some time been abandoned. At this time, shall there be a restoration [of that Way]?\footnote{Hanazono tennō shinki, 1322/2/12, quoted and translated in Goble, Kenmu, 29.}

Not only does he agree that GoDaigo’s move is “most appropriate,” but he also seems hopeful that this decision will be the cornerstone for the restoration of the old customs abiding by the Confucian Way—namely, the sovereign exercising the greatest decision-making power over his supportive subjects.

A year and a half later when other members of the Jimyōin line accuse GoDaigo’s administration of inconsistency or going against the Way, Hanazono still maintains an objective, or patient, perspective. To a complaint over GoDaigo leaving a matter for over three years without issuing any orders, he admits that GoDaigo certainly should be more attentive; but he immediately advocates for him, explaining that it is not because knowing the Way is difficult, but because accepting and putting it into practice is.\footnote{Hanazono tennō shinki 1323/7/19. Lord Sadasuke visited Hanazono and complains on matters regarding a General Kobayashi that has been hanging on since the time of the Retired Emperor (GoUda).} He goes as far as saying that even during the golden age of Emperors Yao and Shun there were disturbances and confusion, and that one may call the current administration good management (decent government) more or less, as both the emperor and his officials are working hard toward reviving the Way of politics (good management) based on Confucianism.\footnote{Ibid.} An opinion like the above is surprisingly favourable, not only for a member of the Jimyōin line but also for Hanazono himself, considering how he does not spare even his closest mentors at times. He finds reasons for misrule in the Daikakuji line’s long severance from the experience of upper and lower orders cooperating for good
administration—the same can be said of the Jimyōin line and by extension it is a criticism of the Kamakura shogunate (Hojō shikken) which held the power to name the crown prince. Had the transition of power been smoother instead of going between two imperial houses, a newly enthroned emperor would be better supported by officials seasoned in the post from the previous emperor’s reign. Contradictions to the Way arises, Hanazono observes, because the new Emperor and newly appointed officials are engrossed with learning and mastering Confucian theories without any actual experience of carrying them out, and confusion is bound to happen when everybody insists on his opinion on matters. 144 All in all, Hanazono seems to have a firm  belief in GoDaigo’s Confucian learning and his character, and continues to assert that with enough time he will prove himself a just and benevolent ruler.

Hanazono’s position as GoDaigo’s predecessor in the “post” of the emperor and his deeply Confucian orientation allowed him to watch over GoDaigo with a humanitarian, congenial attitude in the first years of his rule, regardless of faction. Having experienced the limitations of a nominal emperor, he perhaps felt that returning power to the hands of emperors was a more urgent issue than the question of which line of emperors should have power. Could it be that, since the ultimate aspiration was the “reunification of the imperial family in a single line that would stop internal disputes as well as external conflicts with military leaders,” Hanazono saw that he and GoDaigo shared one vision and privately supported him? 145 After all, the common members in their study groups may have acted as agents of goodwill and seeds of harmony.

While I admit that the above conjecture requires documented evidence, I acknowledge that political orientation or allegiance involve far more factors and complexities than straightforward

144 Tsugita, “Hanazono jōkō no shisō to bungaku,” 228.
145 Marra, Representations, 38.
loyalty or affiliation to one’s faction. GoDaigo’s relationships with other members of the imperial house was complex, and different sources provide different impressions. At least one source observes that GoDaigo might have had shown gestures of reconciliation or attempts to bridge the gap between the two factions when one of his daughters was married to Jimyōin Crown Prince Kazuhito (later Kōgon), and once more when the eldest daughter of GoFushimi was received into his palace. Ponsonby-Fane suggests that these bonds could have helped the alternate succession problem, but in neither case were there children forthcoming. His suggestion is certainly attractive in that the rival lines might actually have been putting mutual effort into creating an amiable atmosphere. Nevertheless, once GoDaigo started direct rule and asserted his authority as the highest above all other imperial members, he did not have any reason to be concerned with bringing together the two lines: being the sole powerful monarch of his vision meant that the throne was never again to be shared among multiple candidates but succeeded by his direct descendants.

I suggest that Hanazono’s more or less optimistic opinion of the new emperor turned cold over the next two decades as he witnessed the series of events GoDaigo’s ambition brought—the reformist measures and anti-shogunate plots; military revolt and his exile; his return and the Kenmu Restoration, by which Kōgon was not recognized as a legitimate emperor; the establishment of the second shogunate almost immediately after the fall of the Kamakura shogunate; GoDaigo’s escape to Yoshino, and the establishment of the Southern Court; the continued tension between the Muromachi shogunate and sons of GoDaigo. The vision of returning power to one powerful sovereign was thus lost, leaving behind nation-scale military

confrontations and even worse political turmoil than before the fall of the Kamakura shogunate. In Hanazono’s Confucian logic this would have meant one thing: although GoDaigo’s motives and inspirations at first seemed well intended, something was contrary to the Way. Perhaps by this time Hanazono decided that ambitious and capable as he might be, GoDaigo misused his determination and tenacity to feed his personal lust for power, not unlike the conclusions he drew of Liu Zhiji or Fujiwara no Yorinaga. GoDaigo went against the Way and thus the Mandate of Heaven left him; the Mandate of Heaven was then upon the other line, that is, the Jimyōin line. This renewed opinion replaced his earlier patience and was reflected in the next imperial anthology, which became a space of justification for each faction.

I further suggest that, if Hanazono’s opinion of GoDaigo had thus changed over some twenty-five years’ lapse between the latter’s rule (1321) and the completion of the Fūgashū Prefaces (1346), his argument for the Jimyōin line’s legitimacy was further driven by Kōgon’s unfortunate political career. Kōgon’s political ideology and view of poetry paralleled those of Hanazono, but he also believed that current political circumstances deterred him from embodying Confucian ideals.147 Besides, his reign was terminated in less than two years in 1333, when GoDaigo returned from exile and “ordered” him to step down and restored the era name and court appointments as they were before his exile.148 GoDaigo made it clear that he did not consider Kōgon a legitimate emperor but a usurper while he was on a rather long sojourn, and seeing his beloved nephew regarded as a usurper must have been unacceptable to Hanazono, who also believed that his was the legitimate imperial line. To top it off, due to the continued

---

147 Marra, Representations, 37-38. Marra echoes Tsugita and Iwasa’s consistent argument on similarities between Hanazono’s and Kōgon’s views, and quotes Kōgon’s poems which reveal his feelings as an insufficient sovereign. Fūgawakashū 8: 870, in Tsugita and Iwasa, Fūgawakashū, 189 and ShinGoShūishū 1419, in Shinpen Kokka Taikan 1, 718.
148 Goble, Kenmu, 138.
pressure from Ashikaga Takauji—who defeated GoDaigo in the political battle and stood as the *de facto* ruler of the realm as the first Ashikaga shogun—Kōgon retired from the political scene completely and took the tonsure in a manner which Marra describes a “a political funeral.”¹⁴⁹

One poignant if sentimental hypothesis for Hanazono’s criticism of GoDaigo’s regime in the Prefaces would be that Hanazono wielded his best weapon—his brush—in defense of his nephew’s legitimacy.

Kōgon’s renouncement of the world in 1342 was the byproduct of the power struggle between GoDaigo and Ashikaga Takauji. In 1340, Ashikaga Takauji demanded Kōgon offer part of his estate to pay off the shogunate’s construction of a temple that was intended to pacify the spirit of GoDaigo, who died in 1339.¹⁵⁰ The estate in question was handed down in the Jimyōin line emperors from before the succession dispute arose, thus “becoming the symbol of Kōgon’s economic legitimation.”¹⁵¹ The Ashikaga shogun was bold enough to compensate the shogunate’s expenses from the Jimyōin line’s capital, and dressed up his manipulation of Kōgon’s economic capital and his thrusting of the ex-Emperor into the Buddhist order as an act of benevolence and felicitation on Kōgon’s side. I suggest that Hanazono then used this hurriedly fabricated image of Kōgon the benevolent ruler and presented the *Fūgashū* as a product of his concern for his subjects even in retirement and seclusion. Reciting the Prefaces along with the first volume of Spring at the 1346 banquet is then a meaningful occasion for an outspoken political statement in these circumstances. It is a criticism of the Nijō-Daikakuji line (now Southern Court) and Ashikaga Takauji simultaneously, for worsening the confusion and causing grief in the state, for not guiding people with correct governance, and for not showing

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 40.
¹⁵¹ Ibid.
appropriate deference to the sovereign but usurping the opportunity to seize power instead—all of which are indications that their rules shall not be recognized by Heaven.

The presentation of Kōgon as the benevolent ruler continues when the Retired Emperor is remembered as the sole compiler of the *Fūgashū*. For centuries, compiling an imperial anthology had been a job entrusted to courtiers, and an imperial commissioner would retreat one step from the surface of the project. However, in the *Fūgashū*, an imperial figure is voicing his deep concern for the people by his visible and leading involvement in the project as spelled out in the Prefaces. Leaving only Kōgon’s name can be interpreted as a careful strategy to maximize the political effect, propagating the most recent Jimyōin line emperor, unfortunate as he may be, as the only one worthy of the Mandate of Heaven.

---

152 The *ShinKokinshū* is an exceptional case to my generalization. GoToba zealously participated in the compilation and edition processes, even after the official presentation.
Chapter 5: Conclusion

This study began with a query on the received wisdom that the Fūgashū, the seventeenth imperial waka anthology, was a sister anthology to the Gyōkuyōshū compiled by Kyōgoku Tamekane. As a second Kyōgoku imperial anthology, Fūgashū was regarded to stylistically juxtapose the three imperial anthologies compiled by the Nijō poets. This view was popularly accepted from the time the Fūgashū was being conceived, and perpetuated by the antagonism between the rival schools’ efforts to present themselves as dissimilar from each other. At the base of this antagonism was a claim for legitimacy, that either school was the true heir to the principles of waka contained in the first imperial waka anthology by Tsurayuki, succeeded by poetic giants Shunzei and Teika.

A poetry anthology compiled by imperial command connected the patron and artists in a bond of mutual legitimation. The patron recognized the artist’s mastery of poetry by naming him the compiler; the artist in turn selected and organized poems in ways which demonstrated that values advocated in previous reigns were succeeded in the current regime. Imperial waka anthologies were thus more than a repository of exemplary poems: they were a legitimizing medium. When the imperial house split into the Jimyōin and the Daikakuji lines, each faction formed a liaison with rival poetic schools, and anthologization became a competitive enterprise to legitimize their faction and delegitimize their rivals.

By the time the Fūgashū project was launched, the Kyōgoku-Jimyōin faction was facing a pressing situation. The Daikakuji line had established the Southern Court in Yoshino a few years prior so there were two emperors in one realm. Although the capital and the vicinities were relatively quiet, the ceasefire between the forces of GoDaigo’s sons and the new Muromachi shogunate was vulnerable to developing into a civil war any time. Moreover, since the Kyōgoku
school founder Tamekane had died without a direct heir, his former student and now the head of
the Jimyōin line became the leader of the Kyōgoku school. The Jimyōin line faced an
unprecedented situation of being a patron-cum-artist, and the imperial house itself undertook the
Fūgashū anthologization project. Anthologizers of the Fūgashū were acutely aware of the
function of imperial anthologies as a source and tool of legitimacy and made every effort to
make their legitimacy claim as strong and long-lasting as possible. In the face of Nijō
anthologies already numbering at three to Kyōgoku’s one, the Kyōgoku anthologizers had to
devise a bold strategy while distinguishing their work from the Nijō works.

This thesis analyzes the Fūgashū’s title and its kana and mana Prefaces as selected
legitimizing devices and as distinguishing elements from the previous late-Kamakura anthologies.
Hanazono’s title "fūga" did not harken back to any of the previous Japanese imperial anthologies
but had its origin in the Shijing, the oldest poetry anthology of China from ca. 600 BCE. Since
Brower and Miner translated the title as “Collection of Elegance” in their extensive study,
Japanese Court Poetry (1961), their framework of Kyōgoku as heralds of innovation has been
largely accepted in English language scholarship. According to Brower and Miner, “fūga” was a
sign of innovation, to be distinguished from the Nijō convention of recycling existing titles. It
paralleled Gyokuyōshū, a choice of innovative title despite the opponents’ harsh criticism, which
represented the overall attitude of the Kyōgoku poets.

Brower and Miner’s argument created a convincing picture of Nijō-Kyōgoku competition,
but the framework was built upon an anachronistic conception that overlooked what “fūga”
entailed at that time. At the time when the Fūgashū was compiled, it did not have the meaning of
“elegance” but “of the Shijing.” Feng and ya being the two out of three poetic forms contained in
the Shijing, fengya (J. fūga) was a synecdoche that frequently referred to the ancient anthology.
In selecting the title for the second and likely the last Kyōgoku-Jimyōin anthology, Hanazono valued innovation less and tradition more, so that the anthology could surpass the bounds of Japanese imperial *waka* anthologies.

Hanazono buttressed his Kyōgoku-Jimyōin legitimacy claim with personally composed *kana* and *mana* Prefaces on top of creating a title that pays homage to the most revered canonical text. As the only lengthy prose section that speaks about the function of the anthology, a preface was a useful conduit to demonstrate a link to precedents and to appeal for the purpose of the present anthologization, which by this time had become an increasingly competitive enterprise between the two imperial houses. While the five late-Kamakura anthologies are devoid of prefaces, the *Fūgashū* utilizes the space prefaces afford to advocate the Kyōgoku school and the Jimyōin line. Having two prefaces is another explicit nod to the few previous like-featured anthologies: *Kokinshū*, *ShinKokinshū*, and *ShokuKokinshū* were the only ones among the sixteen anthologies prior to the *Fūgashū* that had two prefaces, and although the *Fūgashū* did not share the word “*kokin*” in its title, the gesture clearly bore the message that it belonged to the small group of anthologies that were affiliated with the very first Japanese imperial *waka* anthology. The author of the Prefaces follows the examples of the *Kokinshū*, the oldest imperial *waka* anthology, and the *ShinKokinshū*, and revives the practice of writing Prefaces in *kana* and *mana* to take full advantage of the imperial anthology as a space of legitimization.

Demonstrating the Kyōgoku-Jimyōin supremacy is Hanazono’s clear motive for writing the Prefaces, and in order to demonstrate it Hanazono weaves a syllogistic argument that reaches far back in both Japanese and Chinese canons. He first alludes to the poems that Tsurayuki called “the parents of *waka*” in the preface to the *Kokinshū* and equates the status of *waka* to the *Feng* poems in the *Shijing* which are regarded as vehicles of governance. After criticizing
various forms of contemporaneous poetic ills, he claims that the promulgation of a new anthology is to provide people with model poems that agree with the Way. Since the most represented poetic school in the anthology is Kyōgoku, Hanazono concludes that Kyōgoku style poetry is most concordant with the Way of poetry expressed in the authoritative texts of Japan and China. This way, Hanazono does not stop at continuing the poetic legacies of Kyōgoku founder Tamekane but proclaims the Fūgashū and the Kyōgoku school to be the true heir to the long tradition of Japanese and continental poetry cultures. Moreover, by selecting poems that accord with the Way and compiling them into an anthology, the sponsoring Jimyōin ruler proves to be the benevolent sovereign who governs by means of rites and transformative influence.

Despite the bold claims made in the Prefaces that the Fūgashū will prevail for a thousand ages to come, Hanazono’s efforts did not reach far in reality. The realm was already divided into Northern (Jimyōin) and Southern (Daikakuji) courts, and although a Jimyōin figurehead was seated on the throne, the Northern Court was under the control of the Muromachi shogunate. The authority of the presentation banquet where Hanazono’s Prefaces were recited would have been diminished by the fact that it was among the Kyōgoku-Jimyōin sympathizers. The Kyōgoku school of poetry waned about ten years after the compilation of the Fūgashū. Subsequent imperial waka anthologies were compiled by successors of the Nijō school.

While the Fūgashū is undeniably a Kyōgoku anthology with roughly one quarter of its poems by Kyōgoku poets, to call it merely “a second Kyōgoku (imperial) anthology” is limiting, framing it within the short span of the Jimyōin-Kyōgoku and Daikakuji-Nijō rivalry in the late Kamakura period. The present study demonstrates that the legitimization strategy used in the Fūgashū is indeed the same as that adopted by the Nijō compilers in that they both chose titles that look back on the established authority, made more assertive through its two Prefaces.
Scrubtny of Hanazono’s Prefaces tells readers that Hanazono has contextualized the *Fūgashū* in the tradition of *Kokinshū* and *ShinKokinshū*, and with the title has surpassed the boundaries of Japanese imperial anthologies, tracing back to the root of the *Kokinshū* tradition. Just as a *waka* is better appreciated when contextualized through its headnote and information on the poet, an imperial anthology is more fully appreciated when all of its components are considered, a point that I hope to have illustrated through a re-reading of the *Fūgashū* Prefaces and a reconfiguration of the *Fūgashū* within a longer tradition of *Kokinshū* and the *Shijing*. 
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Appendix A—Fūgashū Kana Preface—Translation

The principle of Japanese poetry (yamato uta) has spontaneously existed from the time Heaven and Earth were not yet divided. When human activities were settled, the Way of poetry finally emerged. It praises the world and criticizes the times; it is affixed to clouds and winds and gives expressions to people’s will; it holds joy and captures sorrow; it appreciates flowers and birds and moves feelings. Its words few and its meaning profound, Japanese poetry may truly rectify human minds (kokoro). It teaches those below and remonstrates the one above; that is, it becomes the foundation of governance. The poem on the Naniwazu lord stirs the wind (feng) beneath Heaven; the playfulness of the lady-in-waiting of Asaka Mountain soothes the hearts (kokoro) of people in four directions of the realm.153 Although it takes after the crudeness of the Japanese language, it is equal to the profound ways of shūga.154 Therefore, the sage emperors for generations did not neglect it: what traverses even to the hearts of the invisible spirits and gods is this poetry.

Still, since the world has declined and the Way has deteriorated, poetry has become an intermediary between those who vainly take pleasure in amorousness; they are ignorant of the art of governing the state by means of poetry.155 What is more, in recent generations various activities in every direction have become obsolete, wherewith sincerity has become scarce and falsity pervasive. Hence poetry also has become mainly about decorating appearances and being

153 In the kanajo to the Kokinshū, it says: “The Naniwazu poem inaugurates a sovereign’s reign at court. The words of the Asakayama song are by a waiting woman from the countryside. These two poems are as the father and mother of verse. In fact, they are the first ones done by people learning to write kana letters.” Translation by Gustav Heldt, in Heldt, The Pursuit of Harmony, 329-330.
154 周雅. Literally, the elegance of the Zhou dynasty. Ga (elegance) can also refer to poetry, or lessons, whereupon the term can be the Zhou poems and/or lessons from the Zhou dynasty.
155 A reiteration of the kanajo of the Kokinshū and ShinKokinshū.
clever, and the ancient feng nowhere remains. Some people steal the diction (kotoba) of old poetry to fix up their fabrications, digressing from the foundation of poetry all the more. Also, focusing only on putting content (kokoro) first, some people articulate nothing but the meaning (kokoro) that comes to mind, using rustic form and crude words. The righteous heart (kokoro) and simple words are the ancient Way; we should strive for these traits indeed. However, if people miss the principle and forcibly carry on with study anyway, they will then result in vulgar form. Eloquent style and clever content are not ungraceful; however, if people are oblivious to the essential character (hon 'i) but taken with vain finesse, this decorous method should be discarded entirely. Both practices miss the direction, so that neither agrees with the ancient Way.

In other cases, people focus on lofty style but the content does not measure up. When the content is thoughtful, its style is crude. What is meant for refined beauty is too playful, and what is meant to be strong style shows no intimacy. In discussing all of this, the Principle of poetry is so substantial that putting it thoroughly in words is difficult. One should find the intended meaning and discern the Way on one’s own.

To put it roughly, there is no end in the ages to come of people who dye their aspiration in the colors of the eight clouds of Izumo and hide their names in the waves of Waka Bay

---

156 Feng here refers to the style of poetry (airs) and the correct attitude it represents.
157 The Way of poetry, as suggested by the simple but sincere words of the earliest recorded waka, from the fact that the Kokinshū names the Yakumo tatsu poem to be the first thirty-one syllable waka, as recorded in the Kojiki:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Yakumo tatsu} & \quad \text{in Izumo eight} \\
\text{izumo yaegaki} & \quad \text{clouds rise} \quad \text{forming an eightfold} \\
\text{tsumagome ni} & \quad \text{fence that encloses} \\
\text{yaegaki tsukuru} & \quad \text{husband and wife} \quad \text{forming an} \\
\text{sono yaegaki wo} & \quad \text{eightfold fence} \quad \text{that eightfold fence}
\end{align*}
\]

(trans. By Laurel R. Rodd in Shin kokinshū, pp. 36)

Legend has it that the poem is by the deity Susano ō; In the Kokinshū prefaces, Tsurayuki refers to this poem as a reminder for the old history (together with the mythical origin) of the waka genre, but due to the political implications points to the Naniwazu poem and the Asaka Mountain poem as “the parents of waka.”
through ages as poets. They think only about polishing their individual thoughts like drops of light, threading them like beads, garnishing them with flowery scents of diction and weaving a brocade with them—among those people, the number of those who can acquire the true content (kokoro) and attain the Way of poetry is very few. It is difficult to discern the merits and demerits of the reeds of Naniwa, and people have fought over every single petty point and have become disorderly. Who would not mourn over this state? If only they follow the ancient style, and if only they learn the correct way, in due course they will certainly enter the boundaries of the Way of Poetry.

Originally, long ago we succeeded to the throne and in the palace spent our days buried under onerous duties; now we are away from the mundane world, but while occupying a quiet dwelling in Mountain Hakoya we still hear about the myriad matters of government under Heaven. We get up early in the morning and have no time to withdraw even late at night. Recently, the breakage of the eight embankments has calmed down, and people do not tie horses grazing on the pasture; the seas of the four directions have become undisturbed and the waves calm, and the boats carrying tax payment come and go ceaselessly: so now we lament the deterioration of the Way and the obsolescence of various activities in the four corners of the realm. Consequently, following the footsteps of the old event in the Genkyū era, we have selected among poems of old and new the ones that catch our eye and satisfy our heart, and have

---

158 Waka no uranami ni na wo kakuru hitobito. Waka no ura is the poem pillow (utamakura) for the Kii Province.
159 Naniwa no ashi. The phrase is a wordplay on reeds (ashi), a popular poetic motif, and “merits and demerits” (yoshiashi; here written in the switched order ashiyoshi, making the translation “demerits and merits,” presumably for the pun. Because reed was homonymous with “bad” or “evil” (ashi), it was sometimes called “yoshi” (good, pleasant) instead.
160 1331 C.E. is when the speaker of the prefaces Kōgon came to the throne; the actual writer Hanazono became the Emperor in 1308 C.E. Hakoya is an honorary name for the residence of a retired emperor. The term originally comes from the imaginary mountain of immortals in Zhuangzi.
collected them into twenty scrolls.\(^{161}\) We entitled it *Fūga waka shū*. This anthology is not about being stained by amorousness or drawn to affection so much so that it only focuses on immediate pleasure. It is for the purpose of passing down correct *feng* and the ancient Way till the last days, hence rescuing people from going astray.\(^{162}\) On the second year of Jōwa, eleventh month, ninth day, we have finished recording this. Since we have thus chosen poems on this occasion, we hope that the plover will leave long-lasting footsteps, and the seaweed from the bay will leave burnishing light, and the unyielding wind of Japan will blow from generation to generation, and become the undoubted guide to the people of later generations who would probe the correct Way of the poetry of Japan.\(^{163}\)

\(^{161}\) The *ShinKokinshū* was presented in the Genkyū era (1204-1206), emulating the *Kokinshū* in many ways. Both the *Kokinshū* and the *ShinKokinshū* are comprised of twenty scrolls (volumes).

\(^{162}\) Referring to the Zhengfeng (正風) section of the *Shijing*.

\(^{163}\) “Plover” is the preface to “leave/retain footsteps,” and “seaweed from the bay” to “burnishing light.” The later part of the sentence is an allusion to the poem by the Retired Emperor Hanazono, included in the *Fūgashū*, volume 20 *Gaka* (Congratulations), which makes reference to the allegory of wind in *Analect* (FGS 2198; see section 4.1).
Appendix B—Fūgashū Mana Preface—Translation

The spirit of *waka* fills between Heaven and Earth, and its boundary is the universe. From the time when the chaos was yet to be divided, its principle has spontaneously existed. When humans and things came into being, its form was finally manifest. As Nature—the winds, the clouds, the plants and trees—reach towards potentiality, all becomes the reason for the refined amusement of poetry; as human minds—thoughts, considerations, sadness and joy—are stimulated by scenery, wholeheartedness becomes the foundation of criticism and instruction. Through *waka* people sing and recite their temperament and sentiments, and praise or criticize governance and education. The Naniwazu verse sings of the virtue of the Emperor: through this poem the *feng* of sages at last reached our court. The verse of the Asaka Mountain is an amusement of a lady-in-waiting: through this poem the edification of the wise had by then spread to the four corners of the realm. Reflecting on the origin of the poetry of our court, it corresponds to the fulfilment of the Airs of the two Southern States.

However, the world has become frivolous and shallow, and people are inclined to superficiality and ostentation. Without knowing the true meaning of *waka* they regard it only

---

164 *Kikan* (機感). A Buddhist term used in the Kamakura period. *Ki* is the potentiality of all sentient beings to respond to Buddha, and *kan* refers to Buddha’s awareness of the needs of all beings in response. Here, rather than taking the Buddhist term at face value, it would be more appropriate to understand it in the broad sense that natural elements big and small have potentiality and can stir the viewer’s (human) feelings, which then will be projected as poetry.

165 *Fūyu* (諷諭). *Fū* means to satirize or criticize, and especially to admonish the ruler. A secondary meaning of this *fū* is to compose poetry. *Feng* (風) is sometimes used interchangeably. *Yu* means to instruct, educate, guide. Together, *fūyu* means to use an analogy or satire to make someone look back on his or her deeds.

166 Emperor Nintoku (仁徳天皇). According to *Nihon shoki*, he reigned from 313 to 399 C.E.

167 The influence of the virtuous man, i.e. the ruler.

168 The Southern Zhou (周南) and the Southern Shao (召南). The Airs of the two Southern States open the Guofeng (國風), and make up the “proper feng” (正風) part.

169 Allusion to the *Kokinshū manajo* “及彼時變澆漓，人貴奢淫” (*kano, toki gōri ni henji, hito shain wo tatsutobu ni oyobu*)
as a catalyst for amorousness. Obnoxious customs nowadays have become cleverer and more esoteric, and concentrate only on engraving beauty and charm; people steal old diction and appropriate charming expressions to decorate and embellish their poems, and instead become ill-informed about fundamentals. In other cases, people straightforwardly say their clumsy thoughts using crude, unskilled words, while tone (feng) and form are nowhere to be found. In both cases there is no composition worth savouring. Simple practice (feng) and plain sincerity are the basis of sense and reason; therefore, who shall not conform to these? However, people being blind to this attitude but utilizing it in a vulgar manner, their poems do not correspond to the true meaning of composition. Elegant sentiment and skilled words have resplendent beauty; there may seem nothing more to be wished. However, those who entertain elegant sentiment and words out of curiosity lose the style of the correct Way.

Moreover, an attempt at imitating graceful bearing for style makes it difficult to achieve the beauty of implied meaning. An attempt at succinct and delicate phrasing can easily fall into the error of pettiness and diminution. An upright style erroneously results in an angry tone; glamour also results in the vice of languid spirit. In discussing the modern day’s bad forms of writing, there is not enough time to list every little error. Whereupon, those who have attained both words and quality, and are accomplished at both meaning and phrasing, should rightfully earn the essence of poetry by departing from words—how can one possibly talk about it with brush or tongue?

To sum up, the majority of people do not achieve the essence of poetry but are mostly drowned in degeneration. They should soak themselves in the intentions of the ancient feng and should not tread into the trap of taking the wrong path or shortcut. Since the time of the first three anthologies (sandaishū), the people who attained the true meaning of poetry number only a
handful. Some of them made it to the entry way but were unable to enter the inner rooms; how much the more for people today? Alas, we sigh in lamentation!

In order to rescue this degenerate *feng* (custom), we have taken after the historical event of the Genkyū years and have collected and edited poems appropriate for *feng* and *ya*. As there are no words (*gen/kotoba*) under heaven that should be discarded, we have gathered from wide and visited far, from the days of antiquity to the contemporary era; we collected them and recorded them here and entitled it *Waka Collections of Feng and Ya* (*Fūga waka shū*).

Although we grab the divination chart and read our own fate, we know we are not destined to transcend our human state and become an immortal. Still, after we extend innumerable consultations in governance we subsequently have leisure hours in late nights. Now, once again the smoke is quickly calmed down and spring horses run around freely in the *feng* (winds, also the *airs*) of Mount Hua. Unforgiving laws and strict punishments are no longer in use and autumn’s bitter weeds decay in vain as though dewdrops in the meadow. The works by the public already flourish, and the accomplishments of the officials verily shine. Be it the smallest piece of good, we have uncovered it, and found it painful to miss even one. Therefore, alas! We lament that this Way has been long abandoned, and no distinction between vulgar and graceful

170 *Analect, Book IX Xianjin* 15.
171 The era of *ShinKokinshū* compilation, 1204-1206 C.E.
172 The original term is *shinsen*, which in its narrow sense means Daoist immortal. It is, however, widely used in the broad sense without much religious connotation meaning a superhuman being freed from secular concerns, a way to refer to retired emperors.
173 Huà Shān (華山), or the westernmost of the Five Sacred Mountains of China. It is located in the present Shaanxi province, in the core of the old Zhou region, from where the oldest of the Feng poems originate. The passage is the first of the three references to Chinese histories implying that the realm is finally pacified under the Jimyōin rule after GoDaigo’s revolution is put down.
174 Autumn’s bitter weeds (*qiú tu*), or the westernmost of the Five Sacred Mountains of China. It is located in the present Shaanxi province, in the core of the old Zhou region, from where the oldest of the Feng poems originate. The passage is the first of the three references to Chinese histories implying that the realm is finally pacified under the Jimyōin rule after GoDaigo’s revolution is put down.
made, like the waters of the Jinghe and the Weihe. Such is the reason for compiling this anthology. We did not preponderantly select in favour of splendid expression and beautiful words that offer momentary pleasure to look at. We solely desired to raise correct fēng and rightful yà, and thus leave a beautiful legacy for a thousand ages.

In the second year of Jōwa, eleventh month, ninth day, having roughly laid out the main ideas, we record the gist as above.

---

175 分涇渭 (kei wo wakarazu). The Jing River (Jinghe, 涇河) is a yellow, extremely muddy river whereas the Wei river (Weihe, 渭河) is clear, hence the two rivers are used as a metaphor for two contrasting characters.

176 正風雅訓 (J. shōfū gakun, Ch. zheng fēng yà xùn). 正風 is “correct governance,” as well as the first two airs (Airs of the two Southern States) sections of the Feng (airs) part in the Shijing. As for 雅訓, Iwasa refers to the phrase “雅者正也” (ya zhe zheng ye) in the Daxu, and sees it as “correct interpretation of phrases.” It may be interpreted as both legitimate interpretation and rightful lessons.
Appendix D—The Split of the Mikohidari House

Fujiwara no
Shunzei
1114-1204

Teika
1162-1241

Yoritsuna’s
Daughter
1200-1279

Tame’ie
1198-1275

Nun Abutsu
c. 1225-1283

[Nijō]
Tameuji
1222-1286

[Tameuji]
Tameyō
1250-1338

[Teika]
Tameko
1233?-1263?

[Reizei]
Tamesuke
1263-1328

[Reizei]
Tamemori
b. 1265

[Reizei]
Tamesuke
1263-1328

[Nijō]
Tameyō
1250-1338

[Kyōgoku]
Tamekane
1254-1332
Appendix E—Frequency of Imperial *Waka* Anthologies in the Kamakura Period, from *ShinKokinshū* to *Fūgashū*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Completion Year</th>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>Commissioning Imperial Line</th>
<th>Years from the Previous Anthology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ShinKokinshū</em></td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>GoToba</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ShinChokusenshū</em></td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>GoHorikawa</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ShokuGosenshū</em></td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>GoSaga</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ShokuKokinshū</em></td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>GoSaga</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ShokuShūishū</em></td>
<td>1278</td>
<td>Kameyama</td>
<td>Daikakuji</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ShinGosenshū</em></td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>GoUda</td>
<td>Daikakuji</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gyokuyōshū</em></td>
<td>1312</td>
<td>Fushimi</td>
<td>Jimyōin</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ShokuSenzaishū</em></td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>GoUda</td>
<td>Daikakuji</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ShokuGoShūishū</em></td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>GoDaigo</td>
<td>Daikakuji</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fūgashū</em></td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>Kōgon</td>
<td>Jimyōin</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix F—Table of Most-Represented Poets in the *Fūgashū*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>No. of poems included</th>
<th>Kyōgoku poet?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fushimi</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eifukumon-in</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hanazono</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tamekane</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tameko (Tamekane’s sister)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teika</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>GoFushimi</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kōgon</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kianmon-in (Hanazono’s daughter and Kōgon’s consort)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tsurayuki</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Shunzei</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Princess Shinshi (Hanazono’s daughter)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12 poets</td>
<td><strong>515/2,211 poems</strong></td>
<td>9/12 Kyōgoku poets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table is adapted from Tsugita Kasumi, “Fūgashū no keisei (ge),” 28.