

THE TWO PREFACES OF THE KOKINSHŪ¹

by E. B. CEADEL

The Japanese poetic anthology the *Kokin wakashū*, from which Dr. Waley translated thirty-five poems in his book *Japanese Poetry, the "Uta"* (Oxford, 1919), was compiled as a result of an Imperial order of 905 A.D. by Ki no Tomonori, Ki no Tsurayuki, Ōshikōchi no Mitsune, and Mibu no Tadamine. Of these four poets, Ki no Tsurayuki undoubtedly took the largest part in the compilation, as may be judged from the fact that out of the 1,111 poems in the collection as many as 102 are his own poems, compared with 60 by Mitsune, 45 by Tomonori and 38 by Tadamine.

Ki no Tsurayuki holds a significant place in early Japanese literature as an advocate of the claims of the native Japanese language to be treated as a literary language in its own right, and his prose writings² did much to advance those claims: as a poet he was an eager protagonist of the revival then taking place in the prestige and popularity of Japanese *tanka* poetry, which had rapidly declined from its fine achievements of the seventh and eighth centuries in the *Manyōshū* and had been in the ninth century almost entirely eclipsed by Chinese poetry written in imitation of Six Dynasties and T'ang models.

The *Kokinshū* has two prefaces. One, in Japanese, was composed by Ki no Tsurayuki³ himself; the other, in Chinese, was composed by Ki no Yoshimochi⁴ 紀淑望, a scholar well versed in the Chinese classics. The Japanese preface is famous and has been highly praised by both Japanese and Western writers.⁵ The Chinese preface, however, has received little notice:⁶ some modern Japanese editions of the *Kokinshū* do not even include it,⁷ and only the most recent commentaries annotate it.⁸

The two prefaces may be said to be two different versions of the same material: in spite of divergences between them, their subject-matter is basically the same. The problem therefore arises of the relationship between them. Since it is hard to believe that at the time of the presentation of the anthology to the Emperor the preface was simultaneously submitted in two forms, one Japanese and the other Chinese, it can only be concluded that one of the two was the original and that the other was for some reason derived from it or substituted for it later.

The problem of the relationship thus divides into two. Firstly, which of the two was the original, the Japanese or the Chinese? and secondly, why, and in what circumstances, was the second preface derived from or substituted for the original one?

For almost a thousand years Japanese scholars have debated these two linked questions. Controversy has been extensive, all kinds of theories have been evolved, and a whole mass has been written on the subject. A volume could be filled just with a historical account of the controversy.

The view that the Japanese preface was the original is the traditional one and has been widely held by scholars up to the end of the nineteenth century and by several modern scholars.⁹ Many reasons have been offered to support this view, among which the following are perhaps the most pertinent:

(1) A number of early works, such as the *Eiga monogatari* (which was written not long after 1092), quote from the Japanese preface as if it were the one and only preface.¹⁰

(2) Several early manuscripts contain the Japanese preface at the beginning and either omit the Chinese preface or place it at the end of the text.¹¹

(3) Since the *Kokinshū* was commissioned by the Emperor as a token of the revival of Japanese *waka* poetry after the "dark age" in which it had been overwhelmed during the ninth century by Chinese poetry, it is claimed that a Chinese preface would have been highly inappropriate and that therefore the Japanese preface was the true and original preface. This view was expressed as early as the beginning of the thirteenth century by the emperor Juntoku in his treatise *Yakumo mishō*,¹² and again about a hundred years later by Kitabatake Chikafusa in his *Kokinshūjo chū*.¹³

(4) Such of the subsequent imperial anthologies compiled in the next three centuries as have a preface have a Japanese, not a Chinese, one.¹⁴ This, it is argued, shows that the first of the series, the *Kokinshū* itself, must have possessed a Japanese preface to set the precedent of Japanese prefaces for the later imperial anthologies.

The contrary view, that the Chinese preface was the original, has been held from early times by various writers and has been supported by a number of modern scholars.¹⁵ The following are some of the reasons adduced in favour of this view:

(1) The poet and scholar Fujiwara no Kintō (966-1041) in his collection *Wakan rōeishū*, compiled just after 1000 A.D., quoted¹⁶ the Chinese preface as if it were the one and only preface. In addition, a few parts of a commentary by Kintō are preserved embedded in a later

commentary by Kenshō. Those parts of Kintō's commentary quote 18 passages¹⁷ from the preface, of which number 13 are quotations from the Chinese preface while the other 5 are quotations of single words or names which occur in both prefaces. Since Kintō wrote only about a century later than the *Kokinshū*, this is important evidence.

(2) Another poet and scholar, Fujiwara no Akihiro, a slightly younger contemporary of Kintō, included the Chinese preface in his collection of Chinese writings composed in Japan, the *Honchō monzui*.¹⁸

(3) Up to the time of the compilation of the *Kokinshū*, a Chinese preface for a Japanese work had been the rule. From the *Kojiki* onwards, where a work had been provided with a preface, that preface had been in Chinese;¹⁹ this was because the preface had been recognized in T'ang China as a separate and important genre of literature, and had been adopted as such in Japanese literature also, still in its Chinese form.

With such conflicting arguments available to support the claims of both the prefaces to be the original, impartial critics have found it difficult to choose between them, and the regular judgment of almost all Japanese works of reference has been that it is impossible to establish for certain which of the two prefaces was written first.

Now it will be observed that all the evidence outlined above is external evidence, and it must be admitted that on the basis of external evidence no definite solution of this problem is possible. But there is plentiful internal evidence in the two prefaces themselves, which is sufficient to prove (incontestably, I believe) which of the prefaces was written first.

For the internal evidence to be displayed at length would require a much more detailed treatment of the material than is possible in this article,²⁰ but an outline of the method used may be given here, with some examples. The key to the internal evidence lies in the fact that both the prefaces contain numerous passages which, in vocabulary and ideas, are identical or almost identical with passages in the prefaces of certain Chinese poetic anthologies and works of literary criticism. This crucial point was not fully noticed by Japanese scholars until recently:²¹ the failure to notice it is not entirely surprising because, as already mentioned, Yoshimochi's preface (in which the parallels with the Chinese prefaces are naturally much more easily recognizable) has received little attention from scholars and because the specialists in Japanese literature who studied Tsurayuki's preface were unlikely to be familiar with these Chinese prefaces.

It is chiefly due to two scholars, Ōta Hyōzaburō²² and Ozawa Masao²³, that most of the parallels between the *Kokinshū* prefaces and the prefaces of the Chinese texts have now been published in Japan. The main²⁴ Chinese texts which contain these passages which are identical or almost identical with those in the *Kokinshū* prefaces are:

(1) the "Great preface"²⁵ 大序 of the *Shih-ching*: this preface, ascribed to Wei Hung 衛宏 of the first century A.D., was perhaps the beginning of literary theory in China and greatly influenced later literary criticism.

(2) Hsiao T'ung's preface²⁶ to his *Wên-hsüan*, a classified anthology of Chinese literature, compiled at the beginning of the sixth century; the preface contains an account of his literary principles and is a valuable document.

(3) Chung Hung's preface to his *Shih-p'in*, a work of about the same date as the *Wên-hsüan*; the *Shih-p'in* is the earliest methodical attempt in China at the critical assessment of poetry.

The parallels between passages in these important Chinese works of literary criticism and passages in the *Kokinshū* prefaces are so extensive that coincidence can be immediately ruled out. Since the Chinese works are all earlier in date, it must be recognized that the *Kokinshū* prefaces have a large proportion (probably not less than half) of their material, both in vocabulary and ideas, deliberately borrowed from these Chinese sources. This fact has to be taken as the starting point in considering the relationship between the two prefaces of the *Kokinshū*; it is necessary to realize that the author of the preface which was written first must have been the person who was responsible for this extensive borrowing from Chinese sources. Which of the two authors concerned would have been the one more likely to borrow thus? Ki no Tsurayuki, the opponent of Chinese influence and the exponent of the independent use of the Japanese language for literary purposes, or Ki no Yoshimochi, a well-known scholar of Chinese literature, writing a preface in Chinese? Undoubtedly it would seem in these circumstances to be probable that Ki no Yoshimochi would be the one to base his preface on Chinese sources, and accordingly that the Chinese preface came first.

But this is only a subjective argument, and objective proof is available. This is provided by undertaking a series of comparisons between, on the one hand, passages in the Chinese sources, and, on the other hand, the corresponding passages, in Chinese and Japanese, in the two versions of the *Kokinshū* preface. The following table takes the beginning of the preface as an illustration. Successive sections of the Chinese preface are here numbered C. 1-8 for reference, and similar reference numbers have been given to successive sections in the Japanese preface to indicate variations in the order of sections between the two prefaces. (The Japanese preface is transliterated in accordance with the original *kana*.)

Chinese source

Chinese preface

Japanese preface

Shih-ching "Great preface"

- S.1 詩者志之所之也，在心爲志，發言爲詩。 C.1 夫和歌者，託其根於心地，發其花於詞林者也。 J.1 *yamato uta ha hito no kokoro wo tane to site yorodu no koto no ha to zo narerikeru*
- S.2 情動於中而形於言.... C.2 人之在世，不能無爲，思慮易遷，哀樂相變，感生於志，詠形於言。 J.2 *yo no naka ni aru hito kotowaza sigeki mono nareba kokoro ni omohu koto wo miru mono kiku mono ni tukete ihiidaseru nari*
- S.3 情發於聲....治世之音，安以樂....亂世之音，怨以怒.... C.3 是以逸者其聲樂，怨者其吟悲，可以述懷，可以發憤。 J.4 *tikara wo mo irezu site ametuti wo ugokasi me ni mienu onigami wo mo ahare to omohase otoko onna no naka wo mo yaharage takeki mononohu no kokoro wo mo nagusamuru ha uta nari*
- S.4 動天地，感鬼神，莫近於詩.... C.4 動天地，感鬼神，化人倫，和夫婦，莫宜於和歌。 J.12 *somosomo uta no sama mutsu nari kara no uta ni mo kaku zo arubeki*
- S.5 故詩有六義焉。 C.5 和歌有六義。

- S.6 一曰風，二曰賦，三曰比，四曰興，五曰雅，六曰頌。 C.6 一曰風，二曰賦，三曰比，四曰興，五曰雅，六曰頌。 J.13 *sono mukusa no hitotu ni ha soheuta hutatu ni ha kazoheuta mitu ni ha nazuraheuta yotu ni ha tatoheuta itutu ni ha tadagotouta mutu ni ha ihahiuta nari*

Shih-p'in preface

- 若乃春風春鳥，秋月秋蟬....四候之感諸詩者也。 C.7 若夫春鶯之囀花中，秋蟬之吟樹上，雖無曲折，各發歌謠物皆有之，自然之理也。 J.3 *hana ni naku uguhisu midu ni sumu kahadu no kowe wo kikeba iki to si ikeru mono idure ka uta wo yomazarikeru*

Wên-hsüan preface

- 世質民淳，斯文未作。 C.8 然而神世七代，時質人淳，情欲無分，和歌未作。 J.7 *tihayaburu kamiyo ni ha uta no moji mo sadamarazu sunaho ni site koto no kokoro wakigatakarikerasi*

A careful study even of the limited material in the above table provides indisputable proof of the priority of the Chinese preface, since that is *always* nearer to the original Chinese sources than is the Japanese preface. This is what would be expected on the assumption that the Chinese preface was based on the Chinese sources and then the Japanese preface was based on that, but would not happen on the assumption that the Japanese preface was based directly on the Chinese sources and the Chinese preface was then based on the Japanese one.

The divergences of the Chinese preface from the original Chinese sources are not extensive, and in most cases both the vocabulary and ideas are little altered beyond what is necessary to change the subject-matter from Chinese to Japanese poetry: the faithfulness, for example, with which almost the whole of the "Great preface" of the *Shih-ching* is copied in the Chinese preface is noteworthy. On the other hand the Japanese preface makes freer changes in its handling both of vocabulary and of the relative

order of sections. Thus of the six sections in the quotation from the "Great preface", the Japanese preface omits one and transfers two others to a much later position, while it also places in the middle of the quotation a quite separate passage which the Chinese preface took from the *Wên-hsüan* preface. Such changes can only be explained if it is realized that Tsurayuki was basing himself on Yoshimochi's text without realizing that it had been so carefully constructed from quotations from Chinese sources. A good example is the section in the above passage derived from the *Shih-p'in* preface, which the Chinese preface follows fairly closely. Tsurayuki's version accepts "the nightingales singing among the blossoms" but replaces "the cicadas chirruping in the trees" by "the frogs living in the water". It is easy to follow the transition from the Chinese source to the Chinese preface and then to the Japanese preface: but if it is thought that Tsurayuki's preface came first, that he took this section direct from the *Shih-p'in* preface, and that the Chinese preface was copied from the Japanese preface (and not from the Chinese source), why did Yoshimochi alter "the frogs living in the water" back into "the cicadas chirruping in the trees"—since the Japanese version is so different from the *Shih-p'in* original that that source is unrecognizable from the Japanese text itself.

The conclusion is therefore inescapable that Ki no Yoshimochi's Chinese preface was the first to be written and that it was very carefully modelled on a number of Chinese sources. Yoshimochi had methodically studied these prefaces of Chinese poetic anthologies and other works of Chinese literary criticism and had constructed his preface to the *Kokinshū* by an amalgamation of numerous quotations from these sources, skilfully interwoven. Such patchwork construction might be expected to give a motley and inferior result, but this is not so. The adaptation of earlier material was a normal practice in much of Chinese literature,²⁷ and Yoshimochi had the additional justification that most of the vocabulary and ideas of poetic criticism had to be taken in any case from Chinese, since very little had been written on this subject before in Japan, and the little that had been written in Japan had concerned Chinese, rather than Japanese, poetry.

The Chinese preface is in fact a work of importance, deserving fuller recognition than it has yet received. Its layout and sequence of thought are logical and complete; as mentioned below, it gives more details about the early history of *waka* poetry than does the Japanese preface; and it is perhaps the first extant attempt to apply the Chinese techniques of literary criticism to a specific work of Japanese literature. (The Japanese work *Bunkyo hifuron* 文鏡秘府論, written about 820 by Kōbō Daishi, was indeed an earlier treatise on literary criticism, but was of a more general nature.²⁸) Georges Bonneau, who in 1935 published the only edition of the Chinese preface to have appeared in the West, committed a serious error of judgment in writing²⁹ concerning it, "Rien de plus terne, rien de moins

digne du *Kokinshū* que cette prose maladroite, mal composée et mal écrite . . . Sensibilité nulle, transitions chaotiques, images inharmoniques . . ."

Attention may now be turned to the second problem of the relationship of the two prefaces—why, and in what circumstances, was the Japanese preface derived from the Chinese preface? Although several theories have been proposed by Japanese scholars to explain why a Chinese preface should have been derived from a Japanese preface assumed as the original, I know of only two theories to explain why the Japanese preface should be derived from the original Chinese preface.

The first theory, mentioned by Fujiwara no Kiyosuke in his *Fukuro sōshi*³⁰ 袋草紙 written about 1160, was that Tsurayuki asked Yoshimochi to write a rough draft of a preface in Chinese so that he, Tsurayuki, could base his own, official, Japanese preface upon it. On this theory the Chinese preface, although anterior, is merely an unimportant outline draft which has only happened to survive by accident.

The second theory, first advanced,³¹ as far as I can trace, by the Tokugawa period scholar Ōkuni Takamasa (1792–1871), also known as Nonoguchi Takamasa, was that the Emperor permitted, or even ordered, Tsurayuki to make a Japanese translation of the Chinese preface, as a result of suggestions made to him after the Chinese preface had been submitted, that it would be appropriate to have a Japanese version also of a preface of an anthology celebrating the revival of Japanese *waka* poetry.

Apart from these two theories no other reasonable suggestions have been put forward, and none other in fact seems possible. In support of each of these two theories various arguments have been adduced by Japanese scholars on the basis of external evidence, but as in the question of the relative order of the prefaces, external evidence is insufficient to settle the matter. Internal evidence, however, may again be produced with decisive effect:³² this evidence is extremely interesting, and its implications do not appear to have been previously noticed. The whole argument cannot be unfolded in a small space, but the key to it is contained in the fact that there are upwards of a score of small but nevertheless significant places where there is a definite difference of opinion between the two prefaces. One of these may be quoted as an example: it is the passage assessing the qualities of the Rokkasen 六歌仙, the "Six Great Poets". Yoshimochi's Chinese preface speaks with uniform praise of all six, and possibly the name "Rokkasen" originates from his preface. But it may be deduced that Tsurayuki approved wholeheartedly of only three of them, Henjō, Ariwara no Narihira, and Ono no Komachi, since he included as many as 17, 30 and 18 respectively of their poems in the *Kokinshū*: in the case of the other three, Bunya no Yasuhide, Kisen and Ōtomo no Kuronushi, only 4, 1 and 2 respectively of their poems were selected by him in the *Kokinshū*.³³

In case it is objected that it is unsafe to postulate Tsurayuki's opinions

of poets by the number of their poems he chose, confirmation is available from Tsurayuki's treatment of the comments in the Chinese preface. In the case of Henjō, Ariwara no Narihira and Ono no Komachi, Yoshimochi's favourable assessments are faithfully rendered: but his assessments of the other three are toned down or omitted by Tsurayuki in his Japanese version. Thus Yoshimochi's comment on Kisen, 其詞華麗, "his words are beautiful" is altered by Tsurayuki to *kotoba kasuka ni shite*, "his words are vague" and Yoshimochi's praise of Ōtomo no Kuronushi, 頗有逸興, "he had a great deal of remarkable inspiration" is cut out entirely in Tsurayuki's preface.

The existence of cleavages of opinion such as this completely disposes of the theory that the Chinese preface was a rough draft on which Tsurayuki based his own preface. If this had been the case, and the Chinese preface had been a private draft, Tsurayuki would have been able to depart from it freely whenever he wished, especially when he disagreed with it. For instance, in the example just quoted, he could have entirely disregarded Yoshimochi's selection of six poets and the title of "Rokkasen" which he had used, and he could have made his own selection and given them his own title. It may well be conjectured that had Tsurayuki been free to construct his preface as he wished, it would have been absolutely different. The fact that Tsurayuki followed the Chinese preface so closely, only daring for the most part to make slight and inconspicuous changes, can only be explained on the assumption that the Chinese preface had already been imperially commissioned and officially recognized, and that Tsurayuki had been allowed, or ordered, by the Emperor to prepare a Japanese version. In such circumstances it would have been impossible for Tsurayuki to have departed to any noticeable degree from the framework of the Chinese preface: to have done so would have been an affront to the Emperor (as well as a public slight to Yoshimochi).

The only major divergence³⁴ Tsurayuki permitted himself was to add some fairly long sentences in semi-poetic vein illustrating the themes and diction of Japanese poetry: this addition he probably felt defensible on the ground that it would have been impossible for Yoshimochi to have handled this in Chinese. Apart from allowing himself this one piece of licence, Tsurayuki must have felt highly constricted by the limitation imposed on him, and many of the faults³⁵ that can be seen in his Japanese preface are the direct result of this limitation. In the first place, as he was not a scholar of Chinese literature himself and was an opponent of the influence that this literature had in Japan, he must have had difficulty in understanding Yoshimochi's Chinese and the allusions involved. It is hard to escape the conclusion that in some passages he actually misunderstood and mistranslated Yoshimochi's preface.³⁶

Another problem for Tsurayuki was the Chinese way of thought visible in much of the expression (which was of course appropriate enough

in the Chinese preface); some of these Chinese ideas and attitudes were quietly omitted or altered by him, but he dared not go too far in so doing, and there are several passages in the Japanese preface where Chinese ideas still remain, even though in Japanese garb.

The Chinese preface provides a short but nevertheless full and systematic account of the earlier history of Japanese poetry, including three references to the decline of *waka* after the *Manyōshū*. Tsurayuki was such an eager exponent of the revival of *waka* which the *Kokinshū* heralded that he could not bring himself even to mention its earlier decline, and he omitted these three passages. In addition, he was such an advocate of *tanka* poetry that he failed to mention in his preface the other types, *sedōka*, *kompon*, and *nagauta* (with accompanying *kaeshiuta*) to which Yoshimochi had referred. The result of these and other minor changes made by Tsurayuki in the passages dealing with the early history of Japanese poetry is that the well-ordered account of the Chinese preface is badly distorted and confused in the Japanese preface.

The same thing is true in reference to the make-up of the whole preface. Whereas the Chinese preface is clear, complete, logical and well-arranged, the Japanese preface, in consequence of the cumulative effect of the changes (small in themselves) which Tsurayuki made, appears in some places muddled and difficult to follow. This defect was partly Tsurayuki's fault, partly the inevitable consequence of the limitations within which he had to work.

The Japanese preface, therefore, stands revealed as possessing little real originality in its subject-matter and as having a number of defects in its structure. It may be asked whether the high opinions which have been held of it are still tenable. The answer would appear to be that without question it may still be regarded as an outstanding landmark in Japanese literary history and an achievement of Tsurayuki's skill as a writer. Not only is it probably the earliest extant example of a long passage of polished, fluent prose in the Japanese language: it is also the first known attempt to introduce literary criticism into Japanese instead of leaving it in Chinese.

NOTES

¹ The substance of this article was communicated as a paper to the XXIIIrd International Congress of Orientalists at Cambridge on 24th August 1954. Some of the arguments used by me have since been independently put forward by Ozawa Masao, "Kokinshū ryōjo sengo oyobi kana jo sakusha kō", *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 392 (1956) 10-22.

² The prose writings of Tsurayuki (?868-946) include the Japanese preface of the *Kokinshū* (as the *Kokin wakashū* is by abbreviation commonly known), the *Tosa nikki* and the *Ōigawa gyōkō waka no jo*: for the last-mentioned, see "The Ōi River Poems and Preface", *A.M. (N.S.)*, iii, 1 (1952), 65-106. Tsurayuki's prose was much superior to Tadamine's, see "Tadamine's Preface to the Ōi River Poems", *BSOAS*, xviii, 2 (1956), 342.

³ Tsurayuki's authorship of the Japanese preface, although not indicated in the MSS., may be regarded as certain, and has scarcely been challenged except by Yamada Yoshio, who in "*Kokin wakashū* no kana no jo no ron", *Bungaku*, iv, 1 (1936), 1-23, pointed out certain defects in the Japanese preface. He suggested that these were so serious as to be unworthy of Tsurayuki and considered that it must be the work of a later writer. These defects, however, have a different explanation, see below. The genuineness of the Japanese preface is vouched for by the similarity of its style to Tsurayuki's preface to the Ōi River poems in 907, and to his *Tosa nikki*.

⁴ Yoshimochi (866-919), son of Ki no Haseo, was a scholar of Chinese literature as well as a Japanese *tanka* poet (one poem of his, 251, was included in the *Kokinshū*). He had by 905 reached a high rank at court, and his qualifications made him a suitable person to be chosen to write the Chinese preface. Yoshimochi's authorship of the Chinese preface is given in some MSS. of the *Kokinshū* and in *Honchō monzui*, compiled by Fujiwara no Akihiro in the middle of the eleventh century, and there is no reason to question it. (The last words of the Chinese preface, 臣紀貫之等謹序, cannot be taken to disprove Yoshimochi's authorship: Tsurayuki's name was formally used as that of the main compiler of the anthology, and Yoshimochi included himself in the 等.) The theory of Ueda Akinari (1734-1809), to be found in Fujii Otoo (ed.) *Akinari ibun* (1919), 529-30, restated by Yoshida Kōichi, *Kokugo to Kokubungaku* 217 (1942), 60-81, that Tsurayuki was the author of both prefaces is disproved by the comparatively small but nevertheless highly significant differences between the two versions.

⁵ Thus W. G. Aston, *A History of Japanese Literature*, London (1898), 63, wrote "it has to this day a reputation in Japan as the *ne plus ultra* of elegance in style".

⁶ Aston (*op. cit.*) and M. Revon, *Anthologie de la littérature japonaise*, Paris (1910), make no mention of the Chinese preface.

⁷ E.g., Nakamura Shūkō, *Kokinshū shōkai*, 1908. Several editions merely print it on the last page but do not otherwise refer to it.

⁸ Good notes are provided by Kubota Utsubo, *Kokin wakashū hyōshaku* (1937).

⁹ See Hisamatsu Senichi, *Nihon bungaku hyōronshū*, *Kodai chūsei hen* (1936), 159-164, Sasaki Nobutsuna, *Kaitei Nihon kagakushi* (1942), 10-11, and Kyūsojin Hitaku, "*Kokin wakashū ryōjo no ron*", *Kokugo kokubun*, viii, 8 (1938), 78-105, "*Kokin wakashū ryōjo seiritsu nendaikō*, *Teikoku gakushūin kiji*, ii, 1 (1943), 57-98.

¹⁰ There are two references in *Eiga monogatari*: *Kōchū Nihon bungaku taikai* (1927-8), xi, 13, line 4, *tadashi Kokin ni wa Tsurayuki jo ito okashū tsukurite*, and xi, 753, line 11, *suginishi koto wo ushinawaji ima yori no koto wo mo chirasaji to aru Kokin no jo*; the latter is not a word for word quotation, but a paraphrase of *inshie no koto wo mo wasureji* . . . *ima mo misonawashi nochi no yo ni mo tsutaware* in the Japanese preface.

¹¹ This is not a compelling argument since other early manuscripts have only the Chinese preface. In any case, in spite of the excellent work *Kokinshū no dempon no kenkyū* (1954), by Nishishita Kyōichi, the relative value of the manuscripts has not been finally determined.

¹² *Yakumo mishō* (originally called *Yakumoshō*), c. 1, in *Ressei zenshū* ii, (1915), 159.

¹³ *Zoku gunsho ruijū*, c. 452, vol. 16, ii, 539.

¹⁴ The prefaces of the fourth anthology, *Goshūishū*, and the seventh anthology, *Senzaiishū*, are in Japanese. For a convenient reference list of these anthologies, see E. O. Reischauer and J. K. Yamagiwa, *Translations from early Japanese literature*, Cambridge, Mass., 1951, 131-3.

¹⁵ See Yamada Yoshio, *op. cit.*, Nishishita Kyōichi, "Yamada hakushi no *Kokinshū* jo ni kansuru shinsetsu ni taishite hiken no nobu", *Kokugo to kokubungaku*, 145 (1936), 1-16, Kaneko Motoomi, *Kokin wakashū hyōshaku* (1927), 31-38, Igarashi Chikara, *Heianchō bungakushi*, i (Nihon bungaku zenshū, iii), 1937, 324-356, Yoshida Kōichi, "*Kokinshū ryōjo no sakusha seiritsu nendai ni tsuite no saigimmi*", *Kokugo to kokubungaku*, 245 (1944), 8-20, Konishi Jinichi, *Kokin wakashū (Shinchū kokubungaku sōsho)*, 1949, 47, Imai Takuji, "*Kokin wakashū ryōjo no kenkyū*", *Atomi gakuen kiyō*, 1 (1954), 11-70, Saeki Umetomo, *Kokin wakashū (Nihon koten bungaku taikai)*, 1958, 56-60. Even though the above writers agree on the priority of the Chinese preface,

they differ greatly in their interpretation of the second half of the problem—why and in what circumstances the Japanese preface was derived from it.

¹⁶ *Kodai kayōshū* (Yūhōdō bunko), 270.

¹⁷ See Yamada Yoshio, *op. cit.*, 5.

¹⁸ See Kakimura Shigematsu (editor), *Honchō monzui chūshaku*, Kyoto (1922), ii, 577-592.

¹⁹ For possible exceptions see Kyūsojin Hitaku, *Teikoku gakushūin kiji*, ii, 1 (1943), 68-73.

²⁰ I hope at a later time to publish an edition of the two prefaces, with a study of their relationship and literary significance.

²¹ The debt of the *Kokinshū* prefaces to the preface of the *Shih-p'in* was pointed out as early as 1909 by Nonoguchi Seiichi, "*Kokin wakashū jo to Shihin*", *Kokugakuin zasshi*, xv, 579-586, and again in 1928 by Tsuchida Kyōson, *Bungaku no hassei*, 325-334, but the full significance of this fact was not then appreciated.

²² He gave a general survey of the influence of Chinese poetic theory on Japanese poetry including the *Kokinshū* preface in "Nihon kagaku ni okeru Shina shiron no eikyō", *Kokugo to kokubungaku*, 168 (1938), 121-142, and in "Rikuchō shiron to *Kokinshū jo*", *Nihon Chūgoku gakkai hō*, ii (1950) 118-128, he gave detailed parallels with the preface and other parts of the *Shih-p'in*.

²³ He outlined the general influence of Chinese poetic theory in "Heianchō waka wa rikuchō shi wo dō ukeireta ka", *Bungaku*, xxi, 9 (1953), 64-70, and gave parallels with the *Wên-hsüan* preface in "*Kokinshū no jo to Monzen no jo*", *Kokugo kokubungaku hō*, 5 (1955), 1-9, with the "Great preface" of the *Shi-ching* in "*Kokinshū no jo to Shi no daijō*", *Heian bungaku kenkyū*, 18 (1956), 8-17, and in "*Kokinshū jo no rikugi ni tsuite no kenkyū*", *Nihon gakushūin kiyō*, xiv, 1 (1956), 27-63, with the *Shih-p'in* in "*Kokinshū jo to Shihin*", *Heian bungaku kenkyū*, 19 (1956), 6-13, and with other sources in "*Kokinshū jo ni tsuite*", *Kokubungaku kaishaku to kyōzai no kenkyū*, ii, 7 (1957), 16-23.

²⁴ Apart from the sources pointed out by Ōta and Ozawa, parallels with passages in the writings of Po Chū-i have been given by Kaneko Hikojiro, *Heian jidai bungaku to Haku shi monjū* (1948), 180-209. Parallels with Liu Hsieh's *Wên-hsin tiao-lung* have been given by Ōta Hyōzaburō, *Kokugo to kokubungaku*, 168 (1938), 121-142.

²⁵ English version by J. Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, vol. iv, i (The She-King), London, 1871, Prolegomena 34-36.

²⁶ French version by G. Margouliès, *Le fou dans le Wen-süan, étude et textes*, Paris, 1925, 22-30 (supplement to *Le Kou-wen chinois*).

²⁷ This is well illustrated by the way in which phrases from the "Great preface" of the *Shih-ching* reappear in the prefaces of the *Wên-hsüan* and *Shih-p'in* themselves.

²⁸ See the excellent edition by Konishi Jinichi, *Bunkyo hifuron kō*, 3 vols., 1948-53.

²⁹ *Le Kokinshū, supplément au Volume Premier, Préface chinoise de Ki no Yoshimochi*, Paris, 1935, 12.

³⁰ This is the second of the views reported in *Fukuro sōshi*, c. 2, *Zoku gunsho ruijū*, c. 462, vol. 16, ii, 778, lower column line 3 (*aru setsu* . . . *umun*).

³¹ Quoted in Kaneko, *op. cit.*, 35.

³² It will be realized that all the internal evidence which shows how Tsurayuki based his preface on Yoshimochi's is also additional proof of the prior composition of the latter.

³³ The smallness of these figures can hardly be explained by a hypothesis that few or none other of their poems still survived, for Yoshimochi could not have based his critical assessments of the three poets on such exiguous material.

³⁴ Less important additions by Tsurayuki include a number of flattering references to the Emperor, presumably to indicate gratitude for his encouragement of the revival of Japanese poetry.

³⁵ These are the faults that made Yamada Yoshio doubt whether Tsurayuki could really be the author.

³⁶ It is true that Tsurayuki wrote the short Chinese preface to his *Shinsen wakashū* of 935, but its Chinese style is not impressive. As it is so much later in date, it cannot be used to prove that he had a good knowledge of Chinese when he wrote his preface to the *Kokinshū*.