

The Poet and the Politician

Teika and the Compilation of the *Shinchokusenshū*

IVO SMITS

A NUMBER of scholars cherish the belief that the medieval Japanese poet Fujiwara no Teika 藤原定家 (1162–1241) sought to keep art and politics separated. This notion has its source in what is probably the best known statement in Chinese written by Teika, a passage in his diary that reads, “The crimson banners raised for subjugation of the rebels are none of my concern.”¹ The undated passage is attached to an entry for the 9th month of the 4th year of Jishō 治承 (1180), at the outset of the Genpei War, which was to change forever the political landscape of Japan. The red banners refer to the Taira troops ready to fight the Minamoto.

This well-known line is not, however, what it seems. First of all, it is not by Teika, but the famous Chinese poet Bo Juyi 白居易 (772–846).² Secondly,

THE AUTHOR is a research fellow with the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) at the Center for Japanese and Korean Studies of Leiden University. He wishes to thank Associate Professor Kanechiku Nobuyuki 兼築信行 of Waseda University, Dr. Peter Kornicki of the University of Cambridge, Professor H. Mack Horton of the University of California, Berkeley, and Professor W. J. Boot of Leiden University, as well as the two anonymous readers for this journal, for their incisive comments. Research for this paper was supported by a Nissan Fellowship from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO).

¹ *Kōki seijū wagakoto ni arazu* 紅旗征戎非吾事. *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 1, p. 6. In the following, when no source is mentioned, the details are taken from *Meigetsu ki* 明月記 (Record of a Clear Moon), the diary Teika kept throughout most of his life. The first to select relevant passages from Teika’s diary pertaining to the compilation process of the *Shinchokusenshū* seems to have been Asukai Masayasu 飛鳥井雅康 (Buddhist name Sōsei 宋世, 1436–1509) in the second half of the fifteenth century. At the end of his personal copy of the *Shinchokusenshū* Masayasu arranged a selection of Teika’s notes. Teika had often added these later to earlier passages in his diary; they were also taken from the colophon to Teika’s own copy of the *Shinchokusenshū* and his bibliographical notes (*shikigo* 識語). The existence of Masayasu’s copy of the anthology was not generally known until the early 1970s, when Higuchi Yoshimaro 樋口芳麻呂 brought it to light. It is in the collection of the Imperial Household Agency and is referred to as the “Kunaichō Shoryōbu-zō Sōsei okugaki-bon *Shinchokusenshū*.” Transcriptions are given in Higuchi 1975, pp. 40–41; Higuchi 1980; and Satō 1991. In a few instances passages cannot be traced to the *Meigetsu ki* itself; these I indicate as coming from “Sōsei okugaki-bon *Shinchokusenshū*.”

² 紅旗破賊非吾事. *Bo Juyi ji*, vol. 2, p. 359. Teika changed one word, but did not alter the meaning of the opening line of Bo’s *jueju* 絕句 (a regulated poem in four lines).

graphological research by Tsuji Hikosaburō 辻彦三郎 indicates that in reality Teika probably did not add these words to the 1180 entry until 1230, half a century later, when he began to revise his diary. He had previously used this line on a different occasion, the 15th day of the 5th month of the 3rd year of Jōkyū 承久 (1221), the very day that Retired Emperor Go-Toba 後鳥羽 (1180–1239) started his ill-fated coup d'état against the Kamakura shogunate.³ If Tsuji is right, the traditional image of Teika as a *l'art pour l'art* poet turns out to be somewhat misleading. Not only is Teika's diary entry a case of rewriting personal history, but, as we shall see, his words were wishful thinking rather than an implemented aesthetic program.

Teika's last large-scale poetic project, the compilation of the ninth imperial anthology, the *Shinchokusenshū* 新勅撰集 (New Imperial Collection, preface dated 1232), shows that no matter how often he might vow that "crimson banners" had nothing to do with his art, the political situations in which he found himself dictated otherwise. The project turned out to have nearly everything to do with crimson banners and subjugating rebels. Teika was to learn that he could not bypass the legacy of Go-Toba's war against Kamakura.

Traditional and Recent Views of the Shinchokusenshū

The *Shinchokusenshū* is a somewhat neglected chapter in Japanese literary history. Whereas one could easily fill a modest library with studies of the previous imperial anthology, the *Shinkokinshū* 新古今集 (New Collection of Ancient and Modern Poems, submitted 1205), works on this particular anthology would take up barely half a shelf. The general trend has been to regard the *Shinchokusenshū* as a text that illustrates the poetic tastes of its compiler at the end of his life. The anthology, in other words, is at best seen as a mildly interesting but perhaps slightly disappointing literary project by a famous poet.⁴ With this judgment comes the somewhat unsettling notion that there may have been an unsavory side to Teika's character. Since Teika switched sides after the defeat of his old patron Go-Toba, and afterwards seems to have ignored the disgraced emperor, the conspicuous absence of Go-Toba and his sons from the imperial anthology edited

³ *Reizei Tamesuke-bon Gosen wakashū okugaki*, original quoted in Kubota 1994a, p. 252; and in Hosono 1956, p. 29. For a facsimile, see Matsumura 1995, p. 59. For a complete translation, see Brower 1972, p. 21. For a discussion of the dating of the *Meigetsu ki* entry, see Tsuji 1977, pp. 76–99. On the implications of the phrase "crimson banners," see also Kubota 1994b, p. 15; Kubota 1994a, pp. 251–57; Hirota 1989, p. 41, note 1; Keene 1989, pp. 95–96; Yasuda 1975, pp. 41–49; Ishida 1972a, vol. 1, pp. 71–91; and Hosono 1956.

⁴ E.g., Keene 1993, p. 673; Watanabe 1996, p. 235. Yasuda Ayao 安田章生 hardly mentions the *Shinchokusenshū* in his monumental Teika study (Yasuda 1975). The Sengoku warrior and Nijō 二条 poet Hosokawa Yūsai 細川幽齋 (1534–1610), on the other hand, declared in his lecture notes that it was Teika's finest work as a compiler: "Even though, to be sure, Lord Teika was one of the compilers of the *Shinkokinshū*, there were five compilers and all had different ideas, which is why Lord Teika's true intentions (*hon'i* 本意) never became visible. Then he received an imperial commission and compiled the *Shinchokusenshū*. In the *Shinkokinshū* his flower faded, but in the *Shinchokusenshū* it bore fruit, and I regard this work as his essence (*konpon* 根本)." *Hosokawa Yūsai kikigaki*, p. 107. See also the remarks of Teika's son Tameie 為家 about the "unadorned style" (*sugata sunao ni* すがたすなをに) of the *Shinchokusenshū*, quoted in Higuchi 1959, p. 41.

by Teika has been difficult to explain away. This elicited from Robert Brower the remark that Teika's "dereliction has been contrasted unfavorably with the unflagging devotion of [the former minister of the imperial household Fujiwara no] Ietaka . . . Teika had evidently included some [of Go-Toba's poems] in his manuscript, but deleted them because his nervous patrons feared to offend the Kamakura government. Yet it cannot be denied that his silence and tame obedience are uncomfortably suggestive of time-serving."⁵

In the case of imperial anthologies, however, art was never totally free from politics. Such collections were government projects, not private expressions of idiosyncratic literary taste. Seen from that perspective, literary alliances often turn out to be political alliances. The history of the *Shinchokusenshū*, infamous for being the first imperial anthology to suffer outright political censorship by high-ranking bureaucrats, offers a particularly clear example of such a pattern. While scholars have only recently begun to pay attention to this aspect of the *Shinchokusenshū*,⁶ its history throws light on the process of compilation and specifically on the ways in which social and political as well as artistic considerations figured in it.

The compilation committee of Japan's first imperial anthology, the *Kokinshū* 古今集 (Collection of Ancient and Modern Poetry, 905), had agreed that the anthology's structure should reflect social codes in addition to poetic principles.⁷ The imperial anthologies, therefore, should not be regarded as collections simply of superior poems, nor were they necessarily seen as such by contemporaneous poets. When, in the course of the late eleventh century, poets began to formulate the notion of poetry as a "way" (*michi* 道) that should be assessed on its own terms, this notion did not affect official attitudes concerning the imperial anthologies. Compilers were never entirely free to select or ignore poets to their own liking. In his *Fukuro zōshi* 袋草紙 (The Bag Book), Fujiwara no Kiyosuke 清輔 (1104–1177) explicitly declared that social status was a compelling principle in the compilation of an imperial anthology. "It is absolutely necessary to include poems by the highest-ranking nobles of one's time, even if their poems are not good," he wrote on the topic of the compilation process, whereas "poets of the lowest class must not be included unless they are really famous."⁸ Censorship also was not completely unknown to earlier compilers. Retired Emperor Shirakawa 白河 (1053–1129), for instance, twice called upon the compiler of the fifth imperial anthology, the *Kin'yōshū* 金葉集 (Collection of Golden Leaves, 1127), to revise his selections of poems. Teika's father, Fujiwara no Shunzei 俊成 (1114–1204) applied, or was forced to apply, self-censorship and suppressed the names of several Taira poets included in the seventh imper-

⁵ Brower 1972, p. 21.

⁶ E.g., Satō 1991; Huey 1997, pp. 172–75; Huey 1990, p. 655. Robert Huey devotes considerable attention to the *Shinchokusenshū* as the starting point of warrior control over imperial anthologies. See p. 439 below.

⁷ For concise information about the compilation of different anthologies, see Kubota 1983. See also Huey 1990, pp. 652–60.

⁸ *Fukuro zōshi*, p. 34.

ial collection, the *Senzaishū* 千載集 (Collection for a Thousand Years, 1188), compiled after the Minamoto had defeated the Taira in the Genpei War.⁹

In these two instances, the compilation was assigned to one man, who worked on the project alone and submitted his draft to the emperor or retired emperor commissioning the anthology. The role of the commissioning sovereign varied, but from the mid-Heian period onwards there was a tendency to favor certain poetic schools through the choice of a specific compiler who was given increased editorial control. In the case of the *Shinkokinshū*, a committee was appointed instead of an individual compiler, and the commissioning monarch, Go-Toba, actively involved himself in the compilation process. No emperor had ever supervised the editing of an imperial anthology in so imperious and direct a way as did Go-Toba with the *Shinkokinshū*. In fact, for years after the authoritative version was completed late in 1210, Go-Toba continued working on *his* version of the anthology. His involvement in the compilation was, nevertheless, largely motivated by artistic considerations, even if he did intend the anthology to exemplify his rule.

The history of the *Shinchokusenshū* differs from that of its predecessors in the greater degree of open interference for political reasons by the project's actual sponsor, Kujō Michiie 九条道家 (1193–1252). This article will make clear that the shape of the resulting anthology owed as much to Michiie's scheming as to Teika's views on compilation. While Teika may have hoped to bring in certain poets even if their political position made their inclusion problematic, he could not ignore the concerns of his patrons. Within the political context of the medieval court, the growing notion of poetry as a "way" practiced by experts devoted to their art was frequently at odds with the realities of poetry as a profession.

The history of the compilation of the *Shinchokusenshū* had a direct impact as well on Japan's most famous poetry anthology, the *Hyakunin issu* 百人一首, or *One Hundred Poets, One Poem Each*, also the work of Teika. Standing in a number of ways as a commentary to the *Shinchokusenshū*, the *Hyakunin issu* may be read as a correction of regretted choices Teika had been forced to make some months earlier as the compiler of that imperial anthology.

The Jōkyū War

The final version of the *Shinchokusenshū* took form against the backdrop of Go-Toba's 1221 war against the bakufu, the military regime in Kamakura. Known as the Jōkyū War, this clash is well documented in Western languages, and we need only to touch briefly upon it here.¹⁰

⁹ Shunzei listed as anonymous certain poems by poets of the Kanmu Taira 桓武平, e.g., Tadanori 忠度 (1144–1184), Tsunemasa 経正 (?–1184), Tsunemori 経盛 (1124–1185), and Yukimori 行盛 (?–1185). *Senzaishū* 66, 199, 246, 668, and 520.

¹⁰ In Western languages, see Mass 1990, pp. 66–73; Hirota 1989, pp. 174–215; Hurst 1982, pp. 15–19; Mass 1979, pp. 3–35; Brownlee 1975; W. McCullough 1968; W. McCullough 1964; Sansom 1958, pp. 379–82; Siegmund 1978, pp. 54–105.

From the start of his reign Go-Toba was obsessed with the idea of restoring imperial political power. In his eyes, this power had been wrested from the imperial house by the Seiwa Genji 清和源氏 under Minamoto no Yoritomo 源頼朝 (1147–1199), the founder of the Kamakura regime. From 1200 the tension between Go-Toba's ambitions and Kamakura's efforts to consolidate and expand the bakufu's control of the country had built up. When the last Minamoto shogun died in 1219 without an heir, the Hōjō 北条 family, who effectively controlled the military regime, had hoped to secure Go-Toba's infant son as his successor, but Go-Toba had refused. After the aristocratic Kujō family had supplied Kamakura with an infant candidate of their own, Go-Toba had not granted formal recognition of the appointment. All this did the relations between the two capitals little good.

Finally, in the 5th month of 1221, Go-Toba decided to take military action against Kamakura. Having raised an army, he had his Retired Emperor's Bureau (*in no chō* 院庁) issue a proclamation that condemned the military regent (*shikken* 執権) Hōjō Yoshitoki 義時 (1163–1224) for illegal usurpation of the shogun's power and called for his dismissal. After a brief debate over the propriety of fighting imperial troops, Kamakura readied an army of 190,000 men and marched against Go-Toba's ill-prepared forces. Go-Toba's defeat was swift. The actual fighting lasted only sixteen days, but the death toll was high; on the bakufu side alone the commanding general reported 13,620 casualties. Exactly one month after Go-Toba's proclamation, bakufu troops marched into Kyoto.

The bakufu's victory resulted in a definitive shift in the power balance between Kyoto and Kamakura in favor of the latter. The authority of the military regime was no longer challenged. Although the court retained formal authority and some legislative power, judicial prerogatives tended to be delegated to Kamakura, and the Hōjō and their Kyoto allies worked to increase the court's reliance on Kamakura. Go-Toba's camp was in disarray. He himself was exiled to the Oki islands. His son Juntoku 順徳 (1197–1242), who had assisted him in the war, was banished to Sado. Go-Toba's eldest son, Tsuchimikado 土御門 (1195–1231), had not taken an active part in the struggle with Kamakura, but chose to go into voluntary exile, first in Tosa and later in Awa. None of these three retired emperors would ever return to the capital and all died in exile. The warriors and courtiers implicated in the war who were not beheaded kept a low profile around the capital.

Glory for the Kujō House

The project of compiling the *Shinchokusenshū* was inaugurated by a politician: the chancellor (kanpaku) Kujō Michiie, who in the 2nd year of Kangi 寛喜 (1230) began to gather support for a new imperial anthology. The previous one, the *Shinkokinshū*, was by then twenty-five years old and had been the pet project of Go-Toba, the retired emperor now banished because of his involvement in the Jōkyū War. Some five months earlier, Michiie had become father-in-law to Emperor Go-Horikawa 後堀河 (1212–1234), a circumstance that strengthened his

position at the imperial court. His ties with the military regime in Kamakura were also good. After the murder of Shogun Minamoto no Sanetomo 実朝 (1192–1219) in the 1st month of the 1st year of Jōkyū (1219), Michiie had sent his infant son Yoritsune 頼経 (1218–1256) to Kamakura to become the fourth shogun. As Go-Toba had thwarted the military authorities' desire to have an imperial prince succeed the murdered Sanetomo, this demonstration of good will toward the bakufu enabled the Kujō family to contrast itself favorably with the imperial house and ingratiate itself further with Kamakura.¹¹

In 1230 Michiie was therefore well situated to undertake a project such as an imperial anthology. He evidently was thinking out loud about his plans, since Teika's son Tameie 為家 (1198–1275) told Teika that the palace complex was rife with rumors about a new imperial anthology.¹² Michiie had clear ideas as to what kind of product the collection should be. He wanted not so much an anthology glorifying the reign of Emperor Go-Horikawa as one that would once again establish the Kujō house as an important patron of the literary arts.¹³

With such hopes in mind, Michiie propelled his salon into action and began organizing poetic meetings at frequent intervals. From the beginning he was attentive to the political sensitivities of the relationship between the bakufu in Kamakura and the imperial court in Kyoto. In the 6th month of 1230, for instance, he excluded Fujiwara no Ietaka 家隆 (1158–1237) from a planned hundred-poem sequence, presumably so as to avoid possible problems with the bakufu. Ietaka, a talented and highly regarded poet who had been one of the *Shinkokinshū* compilers, was, after all, known to be still loyal to Go-Toba. To make the omission of Ietaka look non-political, Michiie also excluded Teika, on the grounds that preference should be given to younger poets.¹⁴ The following month, Michiie went to great lengths to organize a *shodo wakakai* 初度和歌会 (first poetry meeting) for his daughter Sonshi 鱒子 (sometimes read Shunshi; 1209–1233) to commemorate her elevation to the status of Go-Horikawa's official consort. No sooner had the poetry meeting been scheduled, however, than Michiie considered postponing it out of consideration for the bakufu, which was in mourning for the death of Hōjō Tokiuji 時氏 (1203–1230), the eldest son of the military regent Yasutoki 泰時 (1183–1242).¹⁵

Michiie's son Norizane 教実 (1210–1235) and son-in-law Go-Horikawa also were mobilized to organize poetic meetings. The idea was to include the results in the new anthology, and several of the poems produced in these meetings actually were selected. In the end, the *Shinchokusenshū* indeed became an anthology that emphasized the talents of those poets who had allied themselves with the Kujō family, be it before or after the Jōkyū War. The fact that, as we shall see,

¹¹ See Gomi 1992, pp. 239–40, 255–56; Hurst 1982, p. 15; Varley 1982, pp. 158–59; Ishii 1974, pp. 362–63.

¹² *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 3, p. 225, Kangi 2 (1230).7.8.

¹³ Satō 1991, pp. 294–99.

¹⁴ *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 3, p. 217, Kangi 2 (1230).6.9. See also Satō 1991, pp. 296–97.

¹⁵ *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 3, p. 228, Kangi 2 (1230).7.23. Sonshi became *chūgū* 中宮 on 1230.2.6.

Michiie pressed on with the project at its darkest moment, when even Teika had abandoned hope of finishing the anthology, testifies to his eagerness to ensure the completion of an anthology that the Kujō family might call its own.

Michiie's eagerness is largely attributable to the eclipse his family had suffered in the last years of the twelfth century and first decades of the thirteenth. Around 1194, shortly before that eclipse, Michiie's father, Yoshitsune 良経 (1169–1206), had successfully organized a poetry contest in six hundred rounds (the *Ropyakuban utaawase* 六百番歌合) judged by Teika's father, Shunzei. The sheer scale of this poetic event attested to Yoshitsune's stature as a literary patron, which in turn reflected the political power he and his family wielded. A little later the tables had been turned.

In the early Kamakura period, the power balance between the bakufu and the imperial court, the so-called *kōbu* 公武 polity, was precarious. Thanks to the scheming of monarchs such as Go-Shirakawa 後白河 (1127–1192) and to Kamakura's somewhat hesitant attitude towards the court, the latter retained considerable political power. *Kōbu* policies affected relations within the imperial court as well. Michiie's grandfather, the chancellor Kanezane 兼実 (1149–1207), had worked closely with Yoritomo, which led to an enlargement of Minamoto influence over politics in Kyoto. Kanezane had been instrumental, for instance, in securing the title shogun for Yoritomo in 1192, four months after Go-Shirakawa's death. A few years later, however, Yoritomo betrayed Kanezane by trying to have his own daughter Ōhime 大姫 installed as imperial consort. He sided with Kanezane's adversaries at court, notably Minamoto no Michichika 通親 (1149–1202) and Go-Shirakawa's favorite concubine, Tango no Tsubone 丹後局, and supported their machinations against the Kujō.

The Kujō were hit hard by what is now known as "the Kenkyū purge" (*Kenkyū no seihen* 建久の政変). On three consecutive days in the 11th month of the 7th year of Kenkyū (1196), Kanezane's daughter Taeko 任子 (or Gishūmon-in 宜秋門院) was dismissed as Go-Toba's consort, and both Kanezane and his brother Jien 慈円 (1155–1225) had to step down from their respective posts as chancellor and Tendai abbot primate (*zasu* 座主). Jien went into voluntary seclusion, and Konoe Motomichi 近衛基通 (1160–1233) was reinstated as head of the regent house and chancellor. In 1198 Yoshitsune gave up his post as major captain (*taishō* 大将) and also went into voluntary seclusion. Ironically, all this scheming came to naught for Yoritomo as his daughter died the following year, and for the time being bakufu representatives kept quiet around the imperial capital.¹⁶

After Michichika's death, Yoshitsune reappeared in court. He became regent at the end of the 2nd year of Kennin 建仁 (1202), and worked closely with Go-Toba's Retired Emperor's Bureau. Within less than three and a half years, however, he suddenly died. Jien had been reinstated as Tendai *zasu* in 1201 and got along reasonably well with Go-Toba. But, on the whole, the decision to tie their fortunes to those of the bakufu had caused the Kujō a severe setback in the polit-

¹⁶ See Gomi 1992, pp. 161–64, 216–20; Mass 1990, pp. 65–66; Hurst 1982, pp. 9–12; Mass 1979, pp. 7–9; Brower 1976, p. 233; and Ishii 1974, pp. 233–34.

ical arena. Kanezane never returned to a court position and received the tonsure in 1202. He died in 1207, less than a year after Yoshitsune's premature death. This left the fifteen-year-old Michiie in charge of the family's affairs. Michiie strengthened his ties with the bakufu and the Saionji 西園寺 family, and although he was initially favored by Go-Toba, he had to wait until the Jōkyū War of 1221 to be installed as regent. In 1230 Michiie must have thought that the time was right to create a monument to the glory of his family that would reaffirm its power and its position in the field of the arts.

Teika: From Kujō to Go-Toba

On the 5th day of the 7th month of 1230 Michiie sent a letter to Teika inquiring after his views on a new imperial anthology. Did Teika think precedent allowed for a new anthology at this point in time? Was such a project feasible? Such were the questions Michiie asked. He was sounding out the situation; nothing was fixed yet. We need not be surprised that he should knock on Teika's door with these queries. Michiie's Kujō lineage and the Mikohidari 御子左 house to which Teika belonged shared longstanding ties. This is not to say that the relationship between the two houses had never been strained. An alliance with the Kujō had not always been fruitful for Teika, and he had once switched camps accordingly.

After the Kenkyū purge, Go-Toba became the center of political and cultural activities in Kyoto. Especially after his abdication in 1198, the young sovereign acted as an enthusiastic patron of virtually all the arts. The Mikohidari house, and Teika in particular, tried to develop links to the literary salon of the new retired emperor. This was not an easy task, since the Mikohidari had been patronized by the Kujō, now in disgrace, and Go-Toba's salon was dominated by poets from the competing Rokujō 六条 house. Thanks, however, to the help of political allies who had survived the Kenkyū purge, such as Teika's brother-in-law Saionji Kintsune 公経 (1171–1244), to the stature of the Mikohidari as poets, to an eloquent letter from Shunzei to the new abdicated monarch, and, last but not least, to Teika's own undeniably formidable poetic talents, Teika succeeded in becoming a trusted and valued member of Go-Toba's literary circle. He was invited to participate in hundred-poem sequences (*hyakushu* 百首) and was appointed fellow (*yoriodo* 寄人) of Go-Toba's new Poetry Bureau (*wakadokoro* 和歌所). The main task of this office was to compile and edit the eighth imperial anthology, the *Shinkokinshū*.¹⁷

The ties between the Kujō and Mikohidari were not completely severed, and, indeed, Kujō poets such as Jien also frequented Go-Toba's salon, but Teika and his father saw quite clearly that for the moment the Kujō had little to offer in terms of secure patronage. Go-Toba's salon was the main stage for poets to secure an audience and recognition of their cultural value. By the outbreak of the Jōkyū War, however, relations between Teika and Go-Toba had cooled.

¹⁷ See Kubota 1994b, pp. 118–45; Gomi 1991, pp. 183–86; Hirota 1989, pp. 79–87; Brower 1976, pp. 233–36; and Brower 1972, pp. 12–16.

Falling Out with Go-Toba

Teika's involvement in Go-Toba's artistic salon was a mixed blessing to the ambitious poet. The monarch was always on the move. He ran around the capital and the countryside, made countless trips to his country residences, especially those at Toba 鳥羽 on the north bank of the Yodo 淀 river and at Minase 水無瀬 near Naniwa, and went on numerous pilgrimages to shrines and temples. The poetry parties Go-Toba organized at his residences were far enough from the capital to seriously inconvenience Teika, who had to attend and often stay overnight without being sure where he would find a place to sleep. To make matters worse, Go-Toba tended to make increasingly longer stays at his residences, which forced Teika to be away from home for equally long periods, but without equal resources. The expenses of such trips were worrisome enough, but Teika also had to cope with chronic bronchitis and rheumatism. In short, he was paying for his attendance with both his health and meager income. Go-Toba seldom recompensed his courtiers in material terms, and Teika regularly vented his frustration in his diary.¹⁸ But that was not all.

In the 12th month of the 1st year of Kenpō 建保 (1213), Go-Toba made a present of the Minoura 箕浦 estate on the east coast of Lake Biwa to a boy with a hazy background, who may well have been Go-Toba's lover of the moment. It is not clear whether this adolescent was actually given ownership (*ryōke shiki* 領家職) of the estate or merely the rights accruing to the position of manager (*azukaridokoro shiki* 預所職). Either way, Teika was outraged: the Minoura estate formed part of the Yoshitomi 吉富 estate over which the Mikohidari family held managerial rights. "Teika's bad-mouthing is one of the attractions of the *Meigetsu ki* 明月記," Gomi Fumihiko 五味文彦 writes,¹⁹ but here Teika had good reason to be upset. The monarch had given away part of an estate that Teika felt belonged to his own house. He could prove that he had inherited rights to the estate from his mother's family. Teika's maternal grandfather, Fujiwara no Chikatada 親忠, had been married to the wet nurse of Bifukumon-in 美福門院, Emperor Toba's 鳥羽 principal consort. Bifukumon-in had given the estate to her daughter Princess Akiko 暲子 (1137–1211), also known as Hachijō-in 八条院, but she had named both Chikatada and Teika's mother, an attendant to Akiko, as managers of the estate.²⁰

¹⁸ Brower 1972, pp. 17–18; Ogawa 1994.

¹⁹ Gomi 1991, p. 13.

²⁰ *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 2, p. 342, Kenpō 1 (1213).12.6; Murayama 1962, pp. 201–205. The happy new owner or manager of the Minoura estate was one of "two boys, Iō and Saburō" 医王三郎兩童, who accompanied the retired emperor on an outing to his Nachi 那智 villa. The exact role of the two boys in Go-Toba's entourage is unclear, but *warawa* 童, or *chigo* 稚兒, referred to boys who had not yet undergone their capping ceremony (*genpuku* 元服) and thereby attained manhood. Usually not much older than fifteen, they often were involved in homosexual relationships with older men. See Childs 1980. Today, scholarly willingness to accept the existence of homosexual and bisexual relationships in early medieval Japan is growing, both within and outside Japan. See Gomi 1998. Murayama 1962 suggests that the two boys accompanying Go-Toba were *dōfu* 童巫, by which he seems to mean male *miko* 巫女-like sorcerers of a very young age. There are indications that children were used as mediums, for instance in healing sessions, which may

At one point legal ownership of the Yoshitomi estate seems to have passed into the hands of the Mikohidari family. Since a list of holdings owned by members of the imperial family, dated the 4th year of Kagen 嘉元 (1306), no longer lists the Yoshitomi estate as Akiko's property, Murayama Shūichi 村山修一 suggests that in the aftermath of the Jōkyū War Teika had managed to secure the property rights to the estate.²¹ The *Minkei ki* 民經記, on the other hand, mentions that by 1231 the Yoshitomi estate belonged to Go-Horikawa's elder sister Kuniko 邦子 (Ankamon-in 安嘉門院, 1209–1283).²² Murayama believes this was an estate of the same name in Tanba province, but the *Minkei ki* makes it clear that the property lies in Ōmi and is in fact the holding managed by the Mikohidari family. In addition, Reizei 冷泉 family documents claim that at one point Teika had been given the ownership of “Ankamon-in's Yoshitomi estate.”²³ Apparently, in the end, Teika did get the ownership deeds of the Yoshitomi estate, but only after 1231.

While in 1213 Teika was not legal owner of the Yoshitomi estate, he did hold the deed of estate manager, which entitled him to managerial rights over the Minoura estate as well, or so he felt. If he were to lose the Minoura estate to these unknown types suddenly favored by Go-Toba, Teika would suffer a cut in income. As it turned out, the Minoura estate was forever lost to the Mikohidari family. Not only had Go-Toba proved annoyingly careless about material recompensation for his courtiers, he now showed himself to be careless with their property as well. Go-Toba seems, in fact, to have been in the habit of giving away land holdings he did not own to people of obscure background. The *Jōkyū ki* 承久記 (Record of the Jōkyū War) mentions that “the ex-emperor consolidated ten holdings [owned by temples] . . . and gave them to *shirabyōshi* 白拍子 dancers. The aged monks whose fields were taken from them must have lamented sorely indeed.”²⁴ Teika must have bemoaned the financial consequences of his artistic ties with the youthful and impulsive retired emperor.

Gradually, the monarch and the poet drifted apart. They were dissimilar in character, and both were stubborn. Teika was irritated by Go-Toba's habit of distracting Tameie, Teika's son and heir, from poetry by summoning him at night to play kickball (*kemari* 蹴鞠) with the retired emperor and his cronies. He may

help explain Iō's name, a reference to Yakushi nyorai 藥師如来, the Medicine Master Buddha. Medical care often consisted as much of religious ritual as administering medicine.

²¹ *Shōkeimon-in goryō mokuroku*, p. 364. See Murayama 1962, p. 204, who relies for this theory on Ishida 1957, pp. 104–105. While irregular things did happen to many ownership records in the aftermath of the Jōkyū War (see Mass 1979, p. 36), this theory has some flaws. *Shōkeimon-in goryō mokuroku* (also known as *Go-Uda no in goryō mokuroku* 後宇多院御領目録) lists the Minoura estate as originally belonging to a temple dedicated to Go-Toba (*mieidō* 御影堂), and as having been passed on to Go-Uda 後宇多在 the 9th month of the 1st year of Kengen 乾元 (1302). Perhaps, then, the estate once was owned by Go-Toba himself, and he was fully entitled to make his gift.

²² *Minkei ki*, vol. 4, pp. 155, 157, Kangi 3 (1231).10.9.

²³ As referred to in *Kokushi daijiten*, vol. 11, p. 596, with a date of the 7th month of the 2nd year of Shōwa 正和 (1313).

²⁴ *Jōkyū ki*, p. 305; trans. W. McCullough 1964, p. 181.

well have been frightened, too, by Go-Toba's continuous scheming against the Kamakura bakufu. Eventually, Teika himself caused the final falling-out. In the 2nd month of the 2nd year of Jōkyū (1220), Go-Toba summoned Teika to attend a poetry gathering at the palace on the 13th. Claiming that it was the anniversary of his mother's death and that he must be excused because of ritual defilement, Teika planned to stay away. He was pressed to participate, however, and finally sent in a poem that severely annoyed Go-Toba. We do not know whether Teika had foreseen Go-Toba's reaction, but the result was that Teika was forbidden entrance to the palace and excluded from all poetry gatherings held by the court until further notice. There is no evidence that the two men had any contact or tried to mend the rift before the 5th month of the following year, when Go-Toba plunged into war with the shogunate.²⁵

Teika's Initial Reaction to Michiie's Plan

When in 1230 Michiie broached the subject of a new anthology, Teika's reaction was mixed. With his old patrons Go-Toba and Juntoku far away in exile for the past nine years, Teika must have regarded the headstrong senior retired emperor with greater sympathy. At the very least he felt that a new imperial anthology should include Go-Toba's poems, for he answered Michiie's queries as follows:

昨日事申入殿下、可有勅撰集歌之仰、其年限先例無定、事遲速可依時儀哉、仰撰者尤被撰其器量、定家於道者無其機緣、不能繼家跡、況棄置謫居之後、悲淚掩眼、優火焦肝、和歌之氣味隔境忘却之由也、仰云、去比聊伺天氣、頗以快然、東方之悲嘆暫過其程、重可申出歎、於今度者撰者在誰乎、專一勿論者於道雖可謂本意、心中之望更無他、又近日若有其事者、事体頗不似前々例、進退可谷事歎、聖代之勅撰、前代御製尤以殊勝、撰之者可充滿集之面、事体機間可然哉、前代之御製員數多者、當時所見有忌諱之疑、略其數者、定又有世間之誘歎、前宮內秀入道弥可讒言彈指、彼是極測、窃以可過此程哉

I replied to His Excellency about yesterday's matter (his remark whether there could be a new imperial anthology) as follows: there is no fixed precedent concerning the years between anthologies; whether a new one follows soon after the previous one or after some interval depends on the circumstances of the time. The compiler should be chosen for his talents. I, Teika, have no special bond with this Way of Poetry that would qualify me, nor have I been able to maintain my family's fame. Still more, after I was forgotten and left in isolation by the world, sad tears blurred my eyes and flames of sorrow scorched my soul. I have become far removed from the subtleties of Japanese poetry and have totally forgotten them.

Michiie said: "The other day I inquired after His Majesty's feelings, and he was extremely pleased with the idea. After the bakufu's grief [over Tokiuji's death] has

²⁵ See Brower 1976, pp. 19–21. For Teika's worries about Tameie's infatuation with *kemari* and Go-Toba's "bad influence," see *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 2, pp. 274–75, 319, Kenpō 1 (1213).5.16 and i9.4. The poem that caused Go-Toba's anger is *Shūi gusō* 拾遺愚草 2603. For a translation and commentary, see Brower 1972, p. 20.

subsided somewhat, I shall bring the matter up again. Who should be the compiler this time?"

Well, of course, first of all, I sincerely hope that it will be someone who understands the essence (*hon'i*) of the Way of Poetry. But should this project be undertaken in the near future, how could one be sure how to proceed? After all, the situation bears no resemblance to previous cases.

The former emperors [Go-Toba, Tsuchimikado, and Juntoku] composed many admirable poems; one could fill a collection with their poems alone. But is now the right moment? If there are many poems by the former emperors in an imperial anthology of the present court, it may arouse the suspicion that one is aiming to offend [the shogunate]. But if their number is reduced, people are sure to be critical. The former minister of the imperial household [Ietaka] and the lay priest Hideyoshi are bound to make even more false allegations. All these things are difficult to assess, and it may be better to quietly put the matter off for a while.²⁶

Teika's report of his conversation with Michiie is revealing of the various factors involved in the compilation of an imperial anthology. The first question raised was the proper interval between anthologies. The compilers of the *Shinkokinshū* had already posed themselves this question and had come up with the same answer as Teika: namely, there was no absolute stipulation regarding the number of years between anthologies. In the future, in fact, imperial anthologies would follow one upon the other with increasing speed; at times there was as little as three years between one and the next.

A second issue concerned who would sponsor the anthology. An imperial anthology naturally needed an imperial commissioner. Michiie mentioned that he had sounded out his son-in-law, Go-Horikawa, and that the emperor seemed to like the idea of a new anthology. In itself this is somewhat odd, because Go-Horikawa never indicated any interest in poetry and hardly seems to have composed a single poem in his life. But then Go-Shirakawa had commissioned the *Senzaiishū* even though his interest in waka was slight; he preferred *imayō* 今様 song. The point was that the commissioning monarch should be committed to the importance of an anthology as a state project. In the case of the *Shinchokusenshū*, however, it was not sufficient simply to secure an imperial sponsor. The views of Kamakura also had to be taken into account. At the moment, Michiie recognized, bakufu leaders would be preoccupied with mourning for Hōjō Tokiujī, who had died on the 18th day of the previous month.²⁷ He thus planned to wait for a more opportune moment to seek their support.

Michiie clearly considered it impossible for a new imperial anthology to succeed without endorsement from the military regime in the east. The effects of

²⁶ *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 3, p. 224, Kangi 2 (1230).7.6. The former minister of the imperial household (*saki no kunai*[*kyō*]) is Fujiwara no Ietaka, who was *kunaikyō* 宮内卿 in the period Genkyū 3 (1206).1 to Jōkyū 2 (1220).3. He was one of Go-Toba's ardent supporters. Fujiwara no Hideyoshi, too, was one of Go-Toba's loyal retainers.

²⁷ *Azuma kagami*, vol. 2, p. 268, Kangi 2 (1230).6.18. I follow Ishida Yoshisada's explanation of the phrase *tōhō no hitan* 東方之悲嘆 ("the grief of the east"). Ishida 1931, p. 15.

the Jōkyū War extended to cultural projects as well as political affairs. The process of compilation of the *Shinchokusenshū* would, in fact, show the bakufu to be increasingly keen to appropriate the cultural and political value of the imperial anthologies. Robert Huey quite justly believes that the *Shinchokusenshū* is where “the Bakufu first begins to tamper with the *chokusenshū* process,” and he shows that by the early fourteenth century the bakufu had become an important formal party with an institutionalized role in the compilation process.²⁸

The biggest problem, as Teika explained, was what to do with the exiled ex-emperors. An imperial anthology needed a certain number of imperial poems (*gyosei* 御製 or *on’uta* 御歌). Such “august compositions” provided an official sanction to the poetic enterprise and made it a truly imperial collection. Not all *gyosei* were necessarily composed by the commissioning ruler,²⁹ and apparently there was no clear definition in classical and medieval Japan as to how many poems by the formal instigator of the project should be included, but it was vital to incorporate at least a few. In the case of Go-Horikawa, few suitable poems were at hand. Teika was to have a hard time getting as many as five poems from this emperor and was to lament that this was two less than there should be.

Inclusion of the compositions of Go-Toba, Tsuchimikado, and Juntoku thus could not be avoided. Teika’s immediate concern was the political implications of doing so, an indication that he was well aware that poetic suitability was not the sole issue at stake in the project. Too many poems by the three disgraced sovereigns might anger the bakufu. But if the compiler failed to include any poems at all by these three ex-emperors, there was bound to be criticism from certain quarters. Teika mentioned by name two poets who had remained loyal to Go-Toba, Ietaka and Hideyoshi 秀能 (1184–1240), both of the northern house of the Fujiwara.

Although seventy-three years old in 1230, Ietaka was still a formidable personality and was a staunch supporter of his old patron, Go-Toba. Teika recognized and admired his poetic genius, and Ietaka ended up with forty-three poems in the *Shinchokusenshū*, by far the largest number for an individual poet in that collection. Hideyoshi, Teika’s junior by twenty-two years, was a warrior who had first served Michichika. It is unclear under whose tutelage he studied poetry, but he was soon noted as a talented poet by Go-Toba, and he joined the retired emperor’s staff in the 1st year of Shōji 正治 (1199) at the age of sixteen. He served Go-Toba both in a military capacity and as fellow of the poetry bureau; in the 2nd year of Kenryaku 建暦 (1212), Go-Toba charged him with looking for the sacred sword, the one symbol of imperial authority irretrievably lost in the sea at the battle of Dannoura 壇の浦 seventeen years earlier.³⁰ He and members of his family fought actively in the Jōkyū War. His younger brother and son died in battle, and his elder brother committed suicide after the defeat. Having suf-

²⁸ Huey 1997, especially pp. 172, 183.

²⁹ See Inoue 1968, p. 79, for a concise overview of the ways in which the authors of imperial poems were categorized.

³⁰ Headnote to *Nyogan hōshi shū* 如願法師集 815.

ferred such losses, Hideyoshi was forgiven for his part in the war and spared beheading, the punishment meted out to many others. He received the tonsure and entered the monastery at Mount Kōya under the name Nyogan 如願, but in the 1st year of Karoku 嘉祿 (1225), returned to Kyoto, where he associated with Tameie. He remained loyal to Go-Toba; for instance, he sent in poems for the *Entō utaawase* 遠鳥歌合 (Poetry Contest from the Distant Isles, 1236) that Ietaka had helped Go-Toba organize.

In suggesting that Ietaka and Hideyoshi would criticize the anthology if it failed to incorporate poems by the exiled emperors, Teika sidestepped the question of his own ultimate views of this issue. It was clear from the outset that the new anthology would have to juggle immediate political considerations against those of literary taste and decorum. Perhaps Teika was not just being modest when he claimed to be unfit for the compiler's job. There may well be a hint of honesty here, a veiled prayer that this particular can of worms might be opened by someone else.

The project had hardly begun when it practically ground to a halt. Whether Teika's advice was partially responsible is unclear. Not until two years after Michiie first broached the idea did his son-in-law accept the anthology as a state project. It has been suggested, and quite rightly, that the court was occupied with other matters, notably coping with the effects of a terrible famine between the autumn of 1230 and the spring of 1231. According to an anonymous contemporaneous historian as well as Teika himself, corpses filled the streets of the capital. As the major statesman in Kyoto, Michiie had his hands full in dealing with the resulting chaos. Not only was the Kyoto population decimated, but estates were losing their farmers, and decisions had to be made as to how to handle legal suits over losses.³¹

Teika's Commission and His Preface

This situation was not to last for long. Whatever the reason for the delay, on the 13th day of the 6th month of the 1st year of Jōei 貞永 (1232), Teika finally received the official order to compile an imperial anthology. The official commissioner was Emperor Go-Horikawa. With his courtier's wand (*shaku* 笏) held high at the proper angle, Teika accepted the commission to put together a collection totaling twenty volumes. He evidently had already assumed that the commission would be his and had been working on the anthology for the past two years, because within three and a half months of receiving Go-Horikawa's order, he already had something to show. On the 2nd day of the 10th month, he submitted the preface of the anthology together with a *mokuroku* 目録, or "list of contents." Generally the composition of a *mokuroku* was one of the last stages in compiling an anthology. A *mokuroku* was a rough outline listing the number

³¹ *Hyakurenshō*, p. 222. See also *Hyakurenshō*, p. 220, Kangi 2 (1230).10.4; *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 3, p. 238, 1230.9.3; p. 239, 1230.9.8; p. 247, 1230.10.13; p. 239, 1230.9.8; p. 300, Kangi 3 (1231).7.2; p. 301, 1231.7.3; *Minkei ki*, vol. 3, p. 37, 1231.4.6; *Azuma kagami*, vol. 2, p. 278, 1231.7.16. See also Ishida 1931, p. 17; Kyūsojin and Higuchi 1961, p. 205; Gomi 1992, pp. 263-64.

of books in the anthology and the distribution of categories, e.g., the four seasons, love, etc., among them. It often also listed the poets who figured in the anthology and the poems anthologized, and was used to check possible overlaps and to adjust the number of poems included. So if Teika had finished his *mokuroku*, he must have already done a substantial amount of work on the anthology.³²

Both title and preface of the *Shinchokusenshū* had strong political overtones. The very name of this anthology was a political statement on behalf of Go-Horikawa and the Kujō family. It brought to memory and simultaneously refuted the claims laid by the previous anthology, the *Shinkokinshū*, or *New Collection of Ancient and Modern Poems*. Not Go-Toba's collection, but the *New Imperial Collection* was to be the pattern of a new type of imperial anthology. Whereas the *Shinkokinshū*, an anthology commissioned by a retired emperor, was associated with the turmoil of war, the new collection, commissioned by an emperor still on the throne, was to signal a new reign of peace and order, in the political as well as the literary field.³³ More than a century later, a historian commented that Teika had been rather reckless in claiming the epithet "new" for the imperial anthology he had compiled.

This year, too, came fleetingly to an end and was followed by the first year of Jōei [1232]. Having received the imperial order for an anthology, Teika, the middle counselor, set about compiling it. Around this time, rumor had it that the emperor was about to abdicate, and Teika hastily submitted the anthology on the second day of the tenth month. That he was able to submit it within the same year was truly

³² *Hyakurenshō* 百鍊抄, the unofficial record of the late Heian and early Kamakura periods, omits the time of Teika's submission of the preface. It does the same, however, with the other imperial anthologies. According to the draft preface (*mokuroku no jo* 目錄序) to the *Shokugosenshū* 続後撰集 (Later Collection, Continued), the imperial anthology compiled by Teika's son Tameie, the latter apparently saw this as the moment of official submission of the entire anthology. Tameie seems not to have produced a finished version of this preface; the *Shokugosenshū* as we have it today contains no preface whatsoever. He is quoted in *Daishū* 代集 (comp. ca. 1279–1302) as having written, "In the winter of the third year of Kenchō 建長 [1251] I respectfully submitted [the *Shokugosenshū*], etc. This was nineteen years after the *Shinchokusenshū*." *Daishū*, p. 3. Since Tameie himself was closely following the progress on the *Shinchokusenshū*, he may simply have meant that Teika submitted the preface and the rough outline at this point. He must have known, as we do today, that the project was far from finished at this stage. In fact, the most dramatic developments were yet to come. The anonymous compiler of the *Daishū* nevertheless thought that this was the moment of completion, for he gives the following data: "*Shinchokusenshū* (under the reign of Go-Horikawa): one part, twenty books, one thousand poems. Compiler: the former middle counselor Lord Teika. Submitted on the second day of the tenth month of the first year of Jōei [1232], that is, twenty-six years after the *Shinkokinshū*." *Daishū*, p. 3. The number of one thousand poems, incidentally, is strange. The *Shinchokusenshū* as it exists today contains 1,374 poems. There was, then, some confusion as to when the *Shinchokusenshū* was officially submitted. This is probably due to the fact that the final version of the *Shinchokusenshū* was never officially presented to the throne. Even so, no one seems to have regarded the collection as anything other than an officially approved imperial anthology. Similar uncertainty, of course, exists over the *Shinkokinshū*, which at Go-Toba's insistence was "presented" at a banquet before it was actually finished and which Go-Toba himself kept revising long after most people had agreed on its definitive version.

³³ See also Tanaka 1969, pp. 153–56; Kyūsojin and Higuchi 1961, p. 222; and Kanechiku 1981, pp. 48, 50.

wonderful. He called it the *New Imperial Collection*. “In the Genkyū 元久 era [1204–1205],” some whispered, “the *New Collection of Ancient and Modern Poems* came out. The world has indeed changed greatly since then; nevertheless, it is not good to have the character ‘new’ (*shin* 新) in this anthology as well.”³⁴

The preface was equally political. Teika submitted it on the same day that Michiie announced the abdication of Go-Horikawa, which was to take place barely two days later.³⁵ One can only speculate how eager Michiie must have been to complete this formal part of the compilation process while Go-Horikawa was still on the throne. Reading Teika’s preface to the *Shinchokusenshū*, one cannot help wondering whether Michiie had a hand in its tone and message.

Teika’s preface reads as follows:

To receive an imperial command to make a selection of poems native to our country is a custom that started long ago and has come down to us through the generations. Apart from the two collections *Kokinshū* and *Gosenshū* 後撰集 (Later Collection), there are many other collections, both past and recent, that have been compiled as an affair of state. And yet, to be summoned to the palace above the nine-fold clouds and allowed to mingle with the lofty constellations of ministers, and to be given the honor of carrying out this task, is a rare privilege indeed.

In the glorious reign of Shirakawa [r. 1072–1085], the emperor, while engaged in the myriad matters of governance, had the *Goshūishū* 後拾遺集 (Later Collection of Gleanings) compiled early in his life that was to last for more than seventy years. This was the only time that [a ruling emperor] did so.

Since Our Lord began his reign over the world more than ten springs and autumns have passed; ever since that moment the incessant waves of the four seas have silenced their murmur and the people plentiful as the grasses along the seven circuits have bowed with joy. He has restored order where there was disorder like that of fresh-cut reeds and has restored life to decay like that of the withered grasses of autumn. He has revived the prosperity of our Autumn Islands and has once more brought glory to the Sun Throne of Heaven.

We do not simply look back fondly to the Engi 延喜 [901–923] and Tenryaku 天曆 [947–957] eras, when under the ruler’s governance the times were unadorned³⁶

³⁴ *Masukagami*, p. 286. As in most other sources, the submission refers to the preface, not to the actual anthology. *Masukagami* 増鏡 (Clear Mirror) was compiled sometime between 1338 and 1376, perhaps by the chancellor and renga poet Nijō Yoshimoto 二条良基 (1320–1388), although other authors have been named as well.

³⁵ Go-Horikawa abdicated on Jōei 1 (1232).10.4. The abdication was announced by Michiie on the 2nd day of that month. *Hyakurenshō*, pp. 223–24. See also *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 3, p. 322, 1232.10.2. The new emperor was the two-year-old Shijō 四条. His mother was Sonshi, his maternal grandfather was Michiie.

³⁶ Compare the Chinese preface to the *Kokinshū* (p. 335): “But during the seven generations of the era of the gods, the times were unadorned and the people simple” 然而神世七代、時質人淳。The reference in this context was to a time before the poetic format of waka had been established, and the author of the preface, Ki no Yoshimochi 紀淑望, did not necessarily mean the phrase to be flattering. He borrowed the phrase from the *Wenxuan* 文選 preface by Xiao Tong 蕭統 (501–531): “It was a pristine age of simple people./ And writing had not yet been invented” 世質民淳、斯文未作。 *Wenxuan*, vol. 1, p. 1; trans. Knechtges 1982, p. 73. Teika, on the other hand, uses *sunao* 質, 素直 as a positive attribute.

and the people prosperous and happy; now, too, in our own Kangi [1229–1232] and Jōei [1232–1233] eras, the world is well-governed and men are at peace. Thus it is that words of joy³⁷ are to be made known by collecting them.

I, Teika, have piled up the years like the pine tree on the beach; I have served as faithfully as the bamboo at the palace. I have passed the age of seventy and attained the second court rank. I have held the position of one charged with listening to the words of those below and submitting them to those on high, and receiving the words of those above and transmitting them to those below.³⁸

Following in the footsteps of my father, I have received an imperial command to choose from what remains of old poems. Thus, beginning with the poems of the seasons, spring, summer, autumn, and winter, and continuing with those concerning the celebration of the reign of Our Lord, the governing of our provinces, veneration of the deities, prayers to the Buddhas, love for one's wife, and expressions of personal grievances, I have divided them into categories and organized them into books. The poems I have collected, numerous as grains of sand on the beach, luxuriant as seaweed in the bay, I submit now on the second day of the tenth month of the second year of Jōei [1232]. I have given this anthology the name "New Imperial Collection."³⁹

Simply put, the preface heralds the reign of Go-Horikawa as a new age of prosperity for the nation. Chaos has made way for order and decay for a new bloom. Although never mentioned in so many words, the Jōkyū War is clearly intended to stand as the negative antithesis of present order. After all, Go-Horikawa had been appointed to replace Juntoku immediately after Go-Toba's revolt against the bakufu. To underline the importance of the new reign, Teika took the unprecedented step of beginning the *Shinchokusenshū* with a poem by the monarch who had commissioned it. All previous imperial anthologies, and even those immediately following this one, began with poems by poets chosen for their literary achievements rather than political position.

Go-Horikawa's reign is paired with those of Emperors Daigo 醍醐 (r. 897–930) and Murakami 村上 (r. 946–967), eras that by Teika's time had acquired the status of an almost mythical golden age. In developing this conceit, Teika reverts to a typically Chinese notion: literature mirrors the state, and political and social order are reflected in poetry. To underline this point Teika echoes classic phrases from the *Wenxuan* 文選 (Selections of Literature), the classic sixth-century Chinese

³⁷ Compare the Great or Mao Preface to the *Shijing* 詩經: "The tones of a well-governed world are peaceful and lead to joy, its government harmonious" 治世之音、安以樂、其政和. *Wenxuan*, vol. 5, p. 2029; trans. Yu 1987, p. 32. An earlier *locus* for this notion is found in the *Shujing* 書經 (*Yi Ze* 益稷), in a passage where Emperor Shun 舜 instructs his servants to listen carefully to the songs of the people as they can inform him about the defects and virtues of his government. *Shujing*, p. 81.

³⁸ A reference to Teika's office as middle counselor (*chūnagon* 中納言). Teika is stressing that he now belongs to the select *kugyō* 公卿 class of courtiers and therefore is a fit and proper person to act as compiler.

³⁹ *Shinchokusenshū*, pp. 11–12. References in this article are to the Iwanami bunko edition. Work is under way on an annotated edition, *Shinchokusen wakashū zenshaku*. Two facsimile editions are *Shinchokusen wakashū* (Nihon Koten Bungakukai) and *Shinchokusen wakashū* (Eisai Bunko). The latter reproduces a version allegedly in Teika's own hand.

anthology. To be sure, the sentiment that the ruling monarch ensured a prolonged period of peace for the country and that this is reflected in poetry was not alien to previous Japanese imperial anthologies. The *Kokinshū* was presented as a national symbol of peace, and the *Shinkokinshū* preface refers to the power of poetry to induce order.⁴⁰ None of the earlier prefaces, however, matches the explicitly political tone of Teika's introduction to the *Shinchokusenshū* with its adamant assurance that the poems in the collection illustrate the righteousness of the reign of the ruler who commissioned it.

Teika tries to justify his presentation of the *Shinchokusenshū* in such terms by suggesting that earlier imperial anthologies had also testified to the peace and glory of the imperial administration (*matsurigoto* 政) of the time. In particular he draws parallels between the *Shinchokusenshū* and the *Goshūishū*. The fourth imperial anthology, the *Goshūishū* was ordered by Shirakawa in 1075 and completed eleven years later.⁴¹ The last poetry collection Teika mentions in the preface is this fourth imperial anthology; after that the literary landscape is bleak until the reign of the next emperor who is as wise and benevolent as Shirakawa: Go-Horikawa. As another point in common, Teika emphasizes that these were the only anthologies to be commissioned by a ruling rather than retired emperor. To further strengthen the analogy, Teika tried to wrest from Go-Horikawa as many poems as Shirakawa had contributed to the *Goshūishū*. The more parallels Teika could evoke, the more firmly could he assure that his *Shinchokusenshū* would be given its rightful place in literary history.⁴²

Contributions: Warriors

Although Teika submitted his preface within a few months of receiving the commission, work thereafter did not progress so smoothly. Halfway through 1233

⁴⁰ The Japanese preface to the *Shinkokinshū* (p. 33) states: "This way of poetry came to prosper . . . and became a way that rules the world and calms the people" その道さかりにおこり . . . よををさめ、民をやはらぐるみちとせり。See also Hirota 1989, pp. 133–35.

⁴¹ The preface to the *Goshūishū* also provides an explicit laudation of a reigning emperor: "Ever since Our Lord has ruled the world, the waves of the four seas have silenced their murmur, and tributes from the nine provinces have not ceased to be paid" 我が君天下のしろしめしてよりこのかた、四の海波の声聞こえず、九の国貢き物絶ゆることなし。 *Goshūishū*, p. 4.

The Japanese preface to the *Shinkokinshū*, too, contains a similar passage in praise of Go-Toba, from which Teika took his cue. There Yoshitsune writes, speaking for Go-Toba: "I have chosen to live on Mount Hakoya [‘faraway Gushe Mountain’ 藐姑射之山, in the first section of the *Zhuangzi*, where the Daoist immortals live; here the reference means that Go-Toba lives in the Sentō 仙洞 Palace], but as the emperor [Tsuchimikado] adheres to the way of non-action [i.e., the appropriate attitude for a ruler] and as the star-ranked ministers do not forget their old promise to help with the administration, the numerous affairs of this world are no different from the past when I was still on the throne. Therefore the ten thousand people, like the grasses on Kasuga's plain, bow in obedience, and the four seas and the moon above our Autumn Islands shine with peace . . ." はこやの山にすみかをしめたりといへども、すべらぎはおこたる道をまぼり、ほしのくらゐはまつりごとをたすけしちぎりをわすれずして、あめのしたしげきことわざ、くものうへのいにしへにもかはらざりければ、よろづの民、かすがの草のなびかぬかたなく、よものうみ、秋つしまの月しづかにすみて。 *Shinkokinshū*, p. 36.

⁴² For a more detailed analysis of how Teika pairs the two anthologies in his preface to the *Shinchokusenshū*, see Tanaka 1969, pp. 146–56.

Teika deleted more than thirty poems from the anthology, “because the total number is growing too large.”⁴³ Unfortunately, he does not tell us which poems he deleted nor how he chose them.

Compilers of imperial anthologies took their material from private anthologies and personal poetry collections, occasionally from tales (*monogatari*) and memoir literature (*nikki*), and, increasingly, from poetry contests and long poem sequences, several of which were composed with precisely such imperial anthologies in mind. Teika was no exception. For the fourteen poems by Izumi Shikibu 和泉式部 (ca. 970–ca. 1030), for instance, he drew from both her poetry collection and *Izumi Shikibu nikki* 和泉式部日記 (*Izumi Shikibu Memoirs*), the fictionalized account of her affair with Prince Atsumichi 敦道 that may or may not have been written by Izumi herself.⁴⁴

What was new about the *Shinchokusenshū*, however, was that it contained an unusually high number of poems by warriors. As Ton’a 頓阿 (1289–1372) tells us, this resulted in the anthology being nicknamed *Ujigawa shū* 宇治川集 (*Uji River Collection*).⁴⁵ Fourteen warriors are represented in the collection. A few of these, long dead by the time Teika included their poems, belonged to the Taira lineage, but most were members of the Hōjō lineage or other bakufu vassal families. Robert Huey raises the question what actually constituted a “warrior” at the time. Most warrior poets were aristocrats living in Kamakura rather than sword-brandishing fighting men with a literary inclination. Nevertheless, it is also true that most of the warriors included in the *Shinchokusenshū* were not known for their poetic talents. Tameie’s collections also featured unusual numbers of warrior poets. Whether such choices reflected Teika’s or Tameie’s liter-

⁴³ 此撰歌其数自然多、今日切棄卅餘首。 *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 3, p. 364, Tenpuku 1 (1233).6.7.

⁴⁴ For an attempt at analyzing Teika’s use of personal poetry collections, see Ikuzawa 1986.

⁴⁵ The source for this information is *Seiashō* 井蛙抄 (*Frog in the Well Notes*, ca. 1360), whose author, Ton’a, writes, “The *Shinchokusenshū* was called the *Uji River Collection*. This is because it includes so many warriors (*bushi*).” *Seiashō*, p. 108. See also Ishida 1939, p. 15; Huey 1997, pp. 174–75. Warriors were associated with Uji river because of the expression *mononofu no yasoujigawa* found in one of Hitomaro’s poems:

A poem composed by Kakinomoto no Hitomaro on reaching Uji River, coming up from the province of Ōmi.

物乃部能 八十氏河乃 阿白木爾 不知代經浪 去辺白不母

<i>mononofu no</i>	In Uji River
<i>yasoujigawa no</i>	(Uji of the eighty warrior clans)
<i>ajiroki ni</i>	Along the weir-stakes
<i>isayou nami no</i>	Pile the hesitating waves,
<i>yukue shirazu mo</i>	Not knowing where they go.

Man’yōshū 3.266; trans. Cranston 1993, pp. 192–93. The poem was anthologized in the *Shinkokinshū* (17 [Misc. 2].1650; compare *Shinkokinshū* 3 [Summer].251). This literary association was possibly enhanced by the fierce battles that raged at Uji bridge near the Byōdōin 平等院. Battles, so eloquently described by *biwa hōshi* 琵琶法師 in Teika’s days, were fought there in the Genpei War on Jishō 4 (1180).5.23 and in Genryaku 1 (1184). Then again, the last battle of the Jōkyū War was also fought at Uji bridge, on Jōkyū 3 (1221).6.14. See *Heike monogatari*, vol. 1, pp. 308–18; trans. H. C. McCullough 1988, pp. 152–58.

ary idiosyncrasies or were otherwise motivated, is hard to determine, but one may agree with Huey that they indicate that “the Mikohidari house was beginning to broaden its patron base.”⁴⁶ Certainly, Teika was indebted to Shogun Sanetomo, thanks to whom he had gotten the full proprietary rights to the Hosokawa 細川 estate, in present-day Hyōgo prefecture. After the Jōkyū War this was Teika’s economic mainstay, and it would later prove to be one of the Mikohidari’s most valued resources.⁴⁷

Contributions: Imperial Compositions

Meanwhile Teika was reminded of the existence of the two retired emperors in exile. Their associates wished to be involved in the new anthology, and one of the exiles explicitly requested to be included. On the 12th day of the 8th month of the 1st year of Tenpuku 天福 (1233), he heard from Minamoto no Ienaga 家長 (?1173–1234) that retainers loyal to Go-Toba had undertaken a poetic project on behalf of the exiled monarch. Ienaga had served Go-Toba since 1196, but had not joined him in exile in 1221. Having been appointed editorial secretary of Go-Toba’s newly established Poetry Bureau in the 7th month of the 1st year of Kennin (1201), he had worked with Teika on the compilation of the *Shinkokin-shū*, and the two knew each other well.

Ienaga told Teika that Michiie’s younger brother Kujō Motoie 基家 (1203–1280) and Fujiwara no Ietaka had put together a *sanjūrokunin kasen* 三十六人歌仙 (thirty-six immortal poets) especially for Go-Toba. Ever since Fujiwara no Kintō 公任 (966–1041) had compiled his *Sanjūrokunin sen* 三十六人撰 (Selected Thirty-six [Immortal] Poets), it had become a popular custom to make collections of thirty-six outstanding poems by different poets throughout waka history. More than a pastime, such compilations expressed the medieval belief that poetry was a “way,” the practice of which demanded both a thorough knowledge of the history of the art and dedication to literary notions inherent in the work of its founders. Similarly, beginning in 1118, the custom developed of venerating an early poet such as Kakinomoto no Hitomaro 柿本人麿 (?–?710) by conducting ceremonious and almost religious poetry meetings in front of his portrait (*eigu* 影供). The next step, the integration of portraits and poems in selections of “immortal poets” (*kasen* 歌仙), soon followed.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ Huey 1997, pp. 179–80, 423, note 25.

⁴⁷ Teika had been given the *ryōke shiki* of the Hosokawa estate from his elder sister Hachijō-in no Chūnagon 八条院中納言, also known as the “Kujō nun,” in 1212. From Sanetomo he received the *jiū shiki* 地頭職 (rights as bakufu estate manager) to the same estate as a reward for teaching the shogun poetry, so after the Jōkyū War he could claim that the estate was completely his. Murayama 1962, pp. 216–17, 219–20; Ishii 1974, pp. 330–31.

⁴⁸ The first *Hitomaro eigu* 人麿影供 was organized by Fujiwara no Akisue 顯季 (1055–1123), the founder of the Rokujō house, on Gen’ei 元永 1 (1118).6.16. After a ceremony in front of a portrait of Hitomaro, waka were composed. Afterwards the Chinese scholar and *kanshi* 漢詩 poet Fujiwara no Atsumitsu 敦光 (1063–1144) wrote an account of the ceremony, the *Kakinomoto eigu ki* 柿本影供記. See Yamada 1966. For a concise introduction to *kasen-e*, see Mostow 1996, pp. 87–88.

Motoie and Ietaka had asked the painter and poet Fujiwara no Nobuzane 信実 (?1177–?1265) to paint the portraits of the poets included in their *sanjūrokunin kasen*, and had sent the illustrated sequence to Go-Toba on Oki. Nobuzane's father, Takanobu 隆信 (1142–1205), a stepbrother of Teika, was the first to paint lifelike portraits, the so-called *nise-e* 似絵. Realism not being highly regarded in the late Heian period, at first this genre met with some disdain, but by the early thirteenth century it had become much in vogue.⁴⁹ Nobuzane continued in this new style, and drawing the portraits for a “Thirty-six Immortal Poets” became something of a specialty with him. One of his most famous is the *Agedatami-bon sanjūrokkasen-e* 上臬本三十六歌仙絵, so called because the poets are depicted sitting on individual tatami mats, with calligraphy by Teika's son Tameie, but there are several more. The version commissioned by Motoie and Ietaka is probably lost. Nobuzane knew the exiled monarch fairly well. Indeed, in a dramatic moment after Go-Toba's defeat and just before his exile, Nobuzane had painted the portrait that was destined to become the last memento of Go-Toba's tumultuous presence at the center of Japan's cultural and political life.⁵⁰ The result of the artistic collaboration between Motoie, Ietaka, and Nobuzane must have been a beautiful gift from loyal servants to the poet-monarch in exile, a symbol of the relationship that Teika had foregone.

Three days later, on the 15th of the 8th month, Teika heard from the other banished retired emperor. From his place of exile on Sado Juntoku sent word by the court lady Toku Tenji 督典侍 that he would like to have some of his poems included in the new imperial anthology. One of the court ladies who accompanied Juntoku into exile, Toku Tenji had returned to the capital in 1229, pleading ill-health. There is no indication that Teika hesitated to comply with Juntoku's wishes.⁵¹ After all, he had known the exiled emperor well. Even as his relations with Go-Toba deteriorated, his ties with Juntoku had remained friendly. Juntoku had perhaps been even more shocked by Teika's 1220 banishment from the court's literary life than had been Teika himself.⁵² Juntoku also had always regarded Tameie as an especially favorite retainer. On the other hand, Teika, counting his losses, had forbidden his son to accompany Juntoku into exile when the retired emperor had requested this gesture of Tameie in 1221.⁵³

Sometime between the 10th month of 1233 and the end of the 5th month of the following year, the 1st year of Bunryaku 文暦 (1234), Juntoku seems to have sent Teika a hundred-poem sequence to be read and commented upon. This sequence, *Juntoku no in onhyakushu* 順徳院御百首 (Retired Emperor Juntoku's

⁴⁹ For a brief and entertaining introduction to *nise-e*, see Stanley-Baker 1984, pp. 114–15. After the death of her first husband, Takanobu's mother remarried Shunzei.

⁵⁰ *Jōkyū ki*, p. 354; trans. W. McCullough 1964, p. 442. This was not the first time Nobuzane had painted Go-Toba's portrait. See *Kokon chomonjū* (11.401), p. 319.

⁵¹ *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 3, p. 381, Tenpuku 1 (1233).8.15; p. 105, Kangi 1 (1229).6.17.

⁵² See, for instance, *Juntoku no in gyōki*, p. 259, Jōkyū 3 (1221).2.22; trans. Brower 1972, p. 46, note 53.

⁵³ *Jōkyū ki*, p. 402 (*Kokatsujibon* variant). See also Hirota 1989, p. 218.

Hundred-Poem Sequence), is also known as the *Jinshin hyakushu* 壬辰百首, and thus is believed to have been composed in 1232, since the zodiacal count for that year was *mizunoe-tatsu* (or *jinshin*) 壬辰. We know that Teika added reading marks and comments to this particular series and sent it back to Sado by the 3rd year of Katei 嘉禎 (1237), but it is probable that Juntoku in fact conceived of this poem sequence as material for the new imperial anthology. This hypothesis, first propounded by Fujita Yuriko 藤田百合子 entails the following assumptions.⁵⁴

First, Juntoku must have begun his hundred-poem sequence almost immediately after learning in 1232 that Teika had received the order to compile a new anthology. By this time such series were an accepted method of offering poems for selection. Second, Juntoku must have sent Teika his *hyakushu* before the 6th month of 1234, when Teika submitted his draft to Go-Horikawa. Teika must have written his comments after the 10th month of the 1st year of Tenpuku (1233), because he signed his commentary as Myōjō 明靜, the Buddhist name (*hōmyō* 法名) he assumed when he received the tonsure on the 11th day of that month. And, as it appears that Ietaka was still alive when Teika wrote his remarks, he must have completed them at the latest before Ietaka's death on the 9th day of the 4th month of 1237. It is thus possible that Juntoku sent his series to Teika in time for the latter to read and comment on it and choose poems from it for the *Shinchokusenshū*. Whether Toku Tenji was actually carrying the poem sequence with her on the day she called on Teika to tell him of Juntoku's request cannot be known.⁵⁵

Juntoku was not the only one to ask that his poems be included. Teika's diary for this year is full of reports of poets visiting him to request the same favor. Meanwhile Teika had been copying the *Senzaishū*, the imperial anthology his father, Shunzei, had compiled as a one-man project in the years 1183–1188. It gave him the opportunity to ponder his father's techniques of arranging poets and alternating older with newer poems; he remarked darkly that the format of this collection left him with "many regrets."⁵⁶

While the exiled ex-emperors seemed only too eager to contribute, nothing was forthcoming from the retired emperor who had commissioned the anthology. For the previous three years Teika had been unsuccessfully requesting Go-Horikawa for poems. As noted above, Retired Emperor Go-Horikawa was not a prolific poet, to say the least. In fact, all that is left of his poetic efforts is a meager total output of seven poems. Compared to Go-Toba (2,364 poems), Tsuchimikado (459 poems), or Juntoku (1,366 poems), this is a remarkably small number, even if we allow for Go-Horikawa's short life span. It also raises the

⁵⁴ Fujita 1991. See also Karasawa Masami's expansion of this hypothesis, Karasawa 1994; and Kamijō 1993, p. 159. The text edition of the *Juntoku no in onhyakushu* includes both Teika's and Go-Toba's comments. The *Juntoku no in onhyakushu* is also given as an appendix to Juntoku's personal poetry collection in *Zoku gunsho ruijū*, vol. 15, pp. 681–88.

⁵⁵ Another assumption is that Toku Tenji acted as a messenger on more than one occasion. Teika's diary makes several mentions of her, but there is no evidence that she actually ever went back to Sado herself to pick up messages from Juntoku.

⁵⁶ 此集之躰猶以遺恨多. See *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 3, p. 377, 378, Tenpuku 1 (1233).7.30 and 8.5.

question whether Go-Horikawa was really interested in the anthology himself, or simply wanted to please Michiie. In the 5th month of 1234, however, Teika at last received what he had been seeking.

密々下給御製五首、付内外懇望三ケ年、欣感之間、廿卷草案片時可進入、御一見之後即可被返下之由被仰之、雖未定狼藉、倉卒注出之

Privately I was given five imperial poems (the ones I have entreated him for through various contacts over the past three years). I am delighted. I am to submit the draft of twenty books right away; His Majesty said he wishes to have a look at the anthology and that he will then give it back to me. Although the draft is still in rather chaotic shape, I will copy it out as quickly as possible.⁵⁷

All the five poems Go-Horikawa sent Teika were produced on social occasions with high-ranking court nobles (*ue no onokodomo* うえのおのこども), and they have the air of dutiful compositions rather than irrepressible expressions of poetic inspiration.⁵⁸ Nevertheless, with them came the retired emperor's demand that he be shown the final product. It would seem that even if he was not quick in supplying his own contributions, Go-Horikawa's interest in the project was at last aroused.

Teika included all five poems by Go-Horikawa. With the compulsory poems by the retired emperor finally in place, he now could say that the draft of the *Shinchokusenshū* was finished. The following month he submitted it to its commissioner, Go-Horikawa.

進入之料紙、色紙、自筆鳥跡表紙、青薄物、裏唐綾、紐、組、軸、摺杏葉丸、当時所載歌一千四百九十八首、後拾遺佳例加給御製今二首、可滿五百首之由令奏之

Paper for presentation of the anthology (colored paper); the cover sheets scrawled in my own poor hand (blue thin silk, with a Chinese pattern on the back); the string (braided); the scroll rods (rolled up with a round design of apricot leaves). I submitted the draft, noting that the number of poems now included amounts to 1,498 and that, with the *Goshūishū* as a model, I would have liked to add two more imperial poems, to make it a round [one thousand] five hundred.⁵⁹

Teika's allusion to the *Goshūishū* has much to do with precedent. As noted

⁵⁷ *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 3, p. 414, Bunryaku 1 (1234).5.

⁵⁸ *Shinchokusenshū* 1 (Spring 1).1; 4 (Autumn 1).271; 11 (Love 1).684; 12 (Love 2).743; and 17 (Misc. 2).1157. Apart from these five poems, Go-Horikawa has two waka and one couplet of Chinese verse in the *Wakan kensakushū* 和漢兼作集 (Collection of Poetry in Both Japanese and Chinese). *Wakan kensakushū*, pp. 118, 157–58, 174. One of these waka is also anthologized in the *Fubokushō* 夫木抄 (ca. 1310; 14 [Autumn 5].5930). Seven extant waka by an emperor certainly do not point to serious poetry composition. If we are to believe the *Fubokushō* compiler, Fujiwara no Nagakiyo 長清, however, Go-Horikawa did have a personal poetry collection, which is now lost.

⁵⁹ *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 3, p. 415, Bunryaku 1 (1234).6.3. The “scroll rods” (*jiku* 軸, or *kanjiku* 卷軸) indicate a *kansubon* 卷子本 or scroll format. The outer sheet of the scroll, in this case made of silk, was usually thicker, and functioned as a cover (*hyōshi* 表紙).

above, the *Goshūishū* with its 1,218 poems was the only previous example of an imperial anthology ordered by a monarch still on the throne. Since it contained seven poems by its commissioner, Shirakawa, Teika had hoped to include the same. His preference for a neat figure of fifteen hundred poems accords with the taste of his times, which favored large, round numbers. The late Heian and early Kamakura periods were, after all, the age of poetry contests in six hundred or fifteen hundred rounds and hundred-poem sequences.

Contributions: Rehabilitation

While Teika was ultimately to give in to pressure and eliminate poems by Go-Toba and his sons that he had initially included, he did take steps to provide some politically problematic poets with a sanctioned forum for their work. This was especially true when the poets happened to be close friends of his. One example is poem 1194 (book 17, Miscellaneous 2), by Taira no Yukimori 平行盛 (?–1185), who had been dead for nearly half a century when the *Shinchokusenshū* came out. Yukimori had been a close friend and pupil of the youthful Teika, but in 1183 had been forced to flee the capital together with other members of the Taira lineage when the Minamoto forces approached Kyoto. The headnote and poem are as follows.

In the second year of Juei 寿永 [1183], when the world was not at peace, he sent the poem that he had composed as his farewell to Teika; on the wrapping paper he wrote,

Taira no Yukimori

ながれての名だにもとまれゆくみづのあはれはかなき身はきえぬとも

<i>nagarete no</i>	Handed down
<i>na da ni mo tomare</i>	my name at least must stay!
<i>yuku mizu no</i>	Even if, all too fleeting
<i>aware hakanaki</i>	like the flowing waters,
<i>mi wa kienu tomo</i>	my body will have vanished.

Although Yukimori had been branded an enemy of the court some fifty years before, doubtless few readers of the time would have been shocked to see his name in an imperial anthology. For Teika, however, revealing the name of this poet was an act not only of friendship but also defiance. He did not want to include a friend's good poem as "anonymous," as his father, Shunzei, once had done.

The story is famous, but is always worth retelling. When Shunzei was compiling the *Senzaishū*, ordered by Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa in 1183, one of his former students, Taira no Tadanori 忠度 (1144–1184), risked his life, so eager was he to have his poems included in the anthology. At the time the capital was full of Minamoto warriors, but Tadanori secretly visited Shunzei and asked him to look over some hundred poems of his. Shunzei agreed, and shortly thereafter Tadanori was killed in battle at Ichinotani 一谷. After the final defeat of the Taira, when all had been branded enemies of the court by the victorious Minamoto,

Shunzei did include one of Tadanori's poems, but to avoid problems with the new regime, he labeled it "anonymous."⁶⁰ As one historian writes in the early-fourteenth-century *Genpei jōsui ki* 源平盛衰記 (Rise and Fall of the Minamoto and Taira Clans), Teika felt that such behavior did not accord with his father's true intention.

The director of the imperial stables of the left Yukimori was the son of Motomori, the assistant commander of the guards of the left and Aki police constable, who in turn was the second son of the lay-priest prime minister [Kiyomori]. After the Hōgen Insurrection, his father had been seized by the water deity in the Uji river and had died. He now was an orphan, but he became close to the Kyōgoku middle counselor, Lord Teika, and studied the way of poetry with him. When he had to flee the capital, he loathed to part from Teika and sent him a scroll together with a letter. This scroll contained the poems that he had recently composed. When Teika opened it and read them, he found that Yukimori had written sensitively about the past and future, and to the side he had added,

流れなば名をのみ残せ行く水のあはれはかなき身は消ゆるとも

<i>nagarenaba</i>	If it is handed down,
<i>na o nomi nokose</i>	so let my name at least remain!
<i>yuku mizu no</i>	Even if, all too fleeting
<i>aware hakanaki</i>	like the flowing waters,
<i>mi wa kiyuru tomo</i>	my body will vanish.

When Teika read this, he was moved to tears and decided that if ever he was to compile an imperial anthology, he would include this poem. He believed that when his father, Shunzei, had included the governor of Satsuma Tadanori's poem as an anonymous poem, that act did not accord with his original intention (*hon'i*). As an important vassal of the imperial court, Tadanori had ranked with the highest courtiers. To have his name concealed was a shame, Teika thought, so if only he could somehow reveal Yukimori's name! Because he was regarded as an enemy of the court, Yukimori was forgotten for three generations. But following the reigns of Go-Toba, Tsuchimikado, and the retired emperor at Sado [Juntoku], in the reign of Go-Horikawa, the *Shinchokusenshū* was commissioned, and Teika could reveal the name of Yukimori, director of the imperial stables of the left; it would not hurt anyone now. So he included this poem. It is moving indeed to imagine how pleased Yukimori's spirit must have felt.⁶¹

The parallel with Go-Toba's and Juntoku's poems presents itself. One should not force it too far, for Yukimori was no longer a political threat to anyone, whereas the two retired emperors were still in exile. Similarly, after the death in exile of Go-Toba and his sons, Tameie was free to include their poetry in the next imperial anthology, the *Shokugosenshū* 続後撰集 (The Later Collection, Continued). By then they were harmless enough. Perhaps the conclusion must

⁶⁰ *Heike monogatari* (7.15), vol. 2, pp. 102–104; trans. H. C. McCullough 1988, pp. 246–47. See also Brower and Miner 1961, p. 234.

⁶¹ *Genpei jōsui ki*, vol. 2, pp. 256–57.

be that Teika, as well as other compilers, could only afford to be magnanimous when the political implications of his gestures were no longer of immediate significance.

Setback

Then disaster struck. On the 6th day of the 8th month of 1234, Go-Horikawa died at the age of twenty-three. The next morning Teika went into his garden and burned the manuscript of the *Shinchokusenshū*.⁶² This drastic act was prompted by the knowledge that when the commissioner of an imperial anthology died before its official completion, the project was terminated.

The example that Teika must have had in mind as he saw the smoke from his burning poetry collection rise into the cloudless sky, was the *Shokushikashū* 続詞花集 (Collection of Word Flowers, Continued). This anthology was put together by the Rokujō poet Fujiwara no Kiyosuke and took its name from the sixth imperial anthology compiled by Kiyosuke's father Akisuke 顯輔 (1090–1155), the *Shikashū*. Although it essentially had been finished, Emperor Nijō 二条 (1143–1165), who had commissioned it, died suddenly in 1165 before its official submission. As a result, the completed anthology was never accepted as an imperial collection, much to the chagrin of the Rokujō house. The fact that the next imperial anthology was compiled by Shunzei, from the competing Mikohidari house, hardly softened the blow.⁶³

This, then, was the end of the *Shinchokusenshū* and of Teika's last chance to certify his position as the grand old man of poetry. Or so it seemed. Two months later Michiie took a completely unprecedented step. He went to Go-Horikawa's villa and picked up the copy of the *Shinchokusenshū* that Teika had submitted to the retired emperor four months earlier.⁶⁴ Here was someone who had no intention of giving up.

Michiie's Censorship

Michiie and his son Norizane, who had now been named regent, sat down with Go-Horikawa's copy of the *Shinchokusenshū* and read it through. The result was that within a month they had deleted more than a hundred poems and added a few others.⁶⁵ Their aim seems to have been twofold: to ease out the problematic emperors and some of their associates, and to ensure a strong Kujō presence. Teika was summoned by Michiie and Norizane for an interview; they told him that they were quite enthusiastic about the poems by older poets, but had misgivings about those by certain contemporaneous figures. Teika notes,

⁶² *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 3, p. 424, Bunryaku 1 (1234).8.7. See also *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 3, p. 415, addition to the entry for 1234.6.3.

⁶³ *Waka genzaisho mokuroku* (1166), p. 235. See also Shunzei's *Shōji sōjō* 正治奏状 (The Letter of the Shōji Era, also known as *Waji sōjō* 和字奏状, Letter in Japanese Script, 1200). *Shōji sōjō*, pp. 740–41.

⁶⁴ *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 3, p. 415, addition to the entry for Bunryaku 1 (1234).6.3.

⁶⁵ *Hyakurensō*, p. 233, Bunryaku 1 (1234).11.9.

十一月上旬頗有召、九日參上、撰進古歌等、殊預御感言、猶時輩歌有承旨等

At the beginning of the eleventh month I was repeatedly summoned [by Michiie and Norizane]. On the ninth day I went to see them. For the old poems I had submitted, they had especially warm words. As for the poems by contemporary poets, however, they had instructions for me, etc.⁶⁶

The “instructions” (*shōshi* 承旨) Teika received bespoke the Kujō family’s anxiety to maintain good relations with the military regime in Kamakura. We can safely guess whose poems were excised. The compositions eliminated must have been by Go-Toba, Juntoku, and others involved in the Jōkyū War. The *Shinchokusenshū* as we have it today contains not a single poem by the emperors banished for their part in the war against the shogunate.

There is no evidence that Teika objected. In fact, he responded quickly to Michiie’s wishes and had a new version ready by the 2nd month of the following year, 1235. Then, on the 5th day of that month, Michiie inquired whether Teika would care to make yet another change in the anthology. He wanted to have a poem included by Lady Reishi 麗子. Reishi (dates unknown, active second half of the eleventh century) was the daughter of Minamoto no Morofusa 師房 (1008–1077); around 1069 she had married the chancellor and regent Fujiwara no Morozane 師実 (1042–1101). As he was known as “the Kyōgoku lord,” she became known as “the Kyōgoku chancellor’s wife” (*Kyōgoku kita no mandokoro* 京極北政所). As such she was one of Michiie’s ancestors.⁶⁷

⁶⁶ “Sōsei okugaki-bon *Shinchokusenshū*,” quoted in Higuchi 1980, p. 696; and Satō 1991, p. 310.

⁶⁷ *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 3, p. 445, Katei 1 (1235).2.5. Reishi’s poem is *Shinchokusenshū* 17 (Misc. 2).1199.

Having copied the *Tale of Genji*, I added at the end,

はかもなきとりのあとゝはおもふともわがすゑずゑはあはれとを見よ

<i>haka mo naki</i>	Incoherent
<i>tori no ato to wa</i>	this scribbling of mine,
<i>omou to mo</i>	I think, but please
<i>waga suezue wa</i>	do look upon my fate
<i>aware to o miyo</i>	with some compassion!

For Reishi, see also *Sonpi bunmyaku*, vol. 3, p. 496. Another last minute inclusion was a poem by the *gon daisōzu* 権大僧都 (vice-abbot) Kyōen 経円 (*Shinchokusenshū* 17 [Misc. 2]. 1191). Kyōen, a high-ranking Fujiwara priest, came to see Teika and persuaded him to accept one of his poems.

Composed when the primate (*sōjō* 僧正) Engen had been ill for quite some time,
Vice-Abbot Kyōen

のりのみちをしへしやまは霧こめてふみゝしあとに猶やまどはん

<i>nori no michi</i>	The mountains
<i>oshieshi yama wa</i>	of which you taught me the dharma road
<i>kiri komete</i>	are hidden in the mist;
<i>fumi mishi ato ni</i>	but now that I saw the prints you left
<i>nao ya madowan</i>	I will not stray.

Meigetsu ki, vol. 3, p. 438, Katei 1 (1235).1.7. For Kyōen, see *Sonpi bunmyaku*, vol. 2, p. 77; and Ishida 1939, pp. 17–18.

This was the last change made to the *Shinchokusenshū*. During the following month Fujiwara no Yukiyoishi 行能 (dates unknown) worked on the final clean copy of the anthology, finishing it on the 12th day of the 3rd month of 1235. Yukiyoishi was probably the most famous calligrapher of his day. He belonged to the Sesonji school 世尊寺流 of calligraphy, founded by his forefather Yukinari 行成 (972–1027).⁶⁸ At several stages of the compilation process Yukiyoishi had already been asked by Teika and Michiie to provide the clean copies of the *Shinchokusenshū* that were to be submitted for inspection. When Michiie summoned Teika to carry out his revisions, for instance, he also sent a copy of the censored work to Yukiyoishi so that he might make a new clean copy. Teika notes,

同十日更給之除棄百余首、進上之所儲置之清書料紙、用千載集之時、入筥、蒔絵、副進之、同十五日被下清書之人訖云々

On the tenth day of the same [eleventh] month, I was again given the anthology, from which I excised some hundred or so poems. The paper for the clean copy, which I had put aside for the final submission (the same as was used at the time of the *Senzaishū*), I put in a box (with lacquer decorations) and submitted together with the new draft. On the fifteenth day of the same month, the revised anthology was handed over to the man who makes the clean copy [Yukiyoishi] (etc.).⁶⁹

At last, the *Shinchokusenshū* was finished. Tameie, who for the past years had functioned as the aged Teika's errand boy and kept him informed of what went on in the city, reported to him the safe delivery of the completed anthology.

申時許又歸來云、行能朝臣終勅撰清書送遣之、仍清書廿卷、入冠絵筥、副進之、草廿卷持參、大殿進入之、此事已果遂、悦思食由被仰者、聞此事心中殊感悦即歸

At the hour of the monkey [ca. 4 p.m.], [Tameie] came back again and said: "Yukiyoishi has finished his clean copy of the imperial anthology and sent it to me. So I took the twenty books of the clean copy (which had been put in a decorated box) and submitted it together with the twenty books of the draft to His Excellency [Michiie]. Now that this business is finally completed, he is pleased indeed, he said. When I heard this, my heart filled with joy. Then I returned here."⁷⁰

Since the anthology was never officially resubmitted to an emperor, this

⁶⁸ See DeCoker and Kerr 1994, pp. 315–29, for an introduction to the Sesonji school.

⁶⁹ Bunryaku 1 (1234).11.10. "Sōsei okugaki-bon Shinchokusenshū," quoted in Higuchi 1980, p. 696; and Satō 1991, pp. 310–11. It appears that Teika prepared yet another final draft, which Tameie delivered to Yukiyoishi together with a letter early the next year. *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 3, p. 445, Katei 1 (1235).2.4.

⁷⁰ *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 3, p. 452, Katei 1 (1235).3.12. See also Higuchi 1980, pp. 697–98, whose punctuation of this passage I follow. Another of Teika's notes corroborates that he heard from Tameie that Michiie had accepted the final version of the anthology, "Twelfth day of the third month of the second year of Bunryaku [1235]: I heard that the clean copy [of the *Shinchokusenshū*] was submitted for inspection" 文曆二年三月十二日清書進覽之由伝聞之. "Sōsei okugaki-bon Shinchokusenshū," quoted in Higuchi 1975, p. 41. Note that Teika uses the term *shinran* 進覽, a common way to refer to the official submission of an imperial anthology, which suggests that he, too, saw this moment as marking the completion of the *Shinchokusenshū*.

moment is regarded by most scholars as the date of completion of the *Shinchokusenshū*.⁷¹ How did Teika feel, more than four years and eight months after Michiie had first approached him with plans for a new imperial anthology? Judging from his notes about the compilation process, he was far from jubilant.

此草子、去年内々進入之時、所書留也、切弃歌等摺除訖、其闕文之跡甚見苦、永不可他見

This draft is what I wrote when I informally submitted it last year [in the eleventh month of 1234]. The poems finally having been excised, it is extremely painful to see the place where they had been. For a long time to come I will be unable to show it to anyone else.⁷²

Looking back at the original draft of the anthology, Teika, now seventy-four years old, found that what should have been the grand finale of his poetic career had somehow gone sour. It was his son who was the happy one, glad that the business was over and that their Kujō patrons were satisfied.

Naturally, Michiie's outright interference with the *Shinchokusenshū* gave some people pause. Judging from his reaction, Tameie may not have cared much, so long as the project was brought to completion. Other members of the Mikohidari family, however, were unnerved. Teika's niece, the woman we know as "Lord Shunzei's daughter" (*Shunzei kyō no musume* 俊成卿女; ca. 1170–?after 1252) since Shunzei adopted her, wrote about the affair in a letter to Tameie, her *Koshibe zenni shōsoku* 越部禪尼消息 (Letter from the Koshibe Nun, after 1251). According to her, Michiie had marked the offensive poems with "nail marks" (*ontsumaten* 御つま点) and forced Teika to delete these from the anthology.

Not one of the sovereigns (*goshō* 御所, i.e., Go-Toba, Tsuchimikado, and Juntoku), who were wonderful poets, was included; only poems by the retired emperor [Go-Horikawa], who is not particularly worth mentioning as a poet, were incorporated as "imperial compositions." I felt as though the world had turned dark before my eyes. I heard that [Michiie] indicated with nail marks those [poems] he wanted deleted, even though the poems were good, and that the number of poems he selected amounted to seventy or so.⁷³

The question is why Michiie acted at this point. During the preceding four and a half years he seems to have given Teika no hint that he or the bakufu would not allow poems by the exiled ex-emperors, even though Teika had made it plain that he believed the new anthology should include such poems. Unfortunately, there is a four-year gap in Michiie's diary for exactly the period during which

⁷¹ E.g., Watanabe 1996, p. 235; Tanaka Yutaka 田中裕 in *Nihon koten bungaku daijiten*, vol. 3, p. 494; Araki 1983, p. 555; Higuchi 1980, p. 693.

⁷² "Sōsei okugaki-bon Shinchokusenshū," quoted in Higuchi 1975, pp. 41, 44. Higuchi notes that the term *shōjo* 摺除, "to rub out," gives an interesting glimpse of the physical process of excising poems from an anthology.

⁷³ *Koshibe zenni shōsoku*, p. 385.

Teika was working on the *Shinchokusenshū*; one therefore has to piece together a possible answer to this question from other sources.⁷⁴

Recently an intriguing theory has been put forward.⁷⁵ At this time forces aimed against the growing power of the military regent Hōjō Yasutoki were gathering around Shogun Yoritsune. Eventually Yoritsune would prove to be no match for the Hōjō, and in 1244 he was released from his post; two years later he was banished to Kyoto. In the mid-1230s, however, plans were evidently afoot in Kamakura and Kyoto to secure the return of Go-Toba and Juntoku from exile as a step towards restoring old power balances within the bakufu camp and in its relationship with the court. Eventually, sometime during the winter of 1234 or spring of 1235 such a request was put forward. The Hōjō took their time with their answer, but in the 5th month of 1235 resolutely turned down the request.⁷⁶

It has been proposed that, confronting this turn of events, Michiie, even though Yoritsune was his own son, thought it prudent not to upset the Hōjō and aggravate relations between court and bakufu.⁷⁷ He therefore decided to excise the exiled monarchs' poems from the *Shinchokusenshū*. This would explain why he did not feel it necessary to give "instructions" to Teika until the two exiled emperors suddenly became an issue again in Kamakura. The removal of the hundred or so poems from the new imperial anthology was indeed an act of appeasement towards the Hōjō, but was prompted by recent political developments rather than by long-term Kujō policies. This theory assumes that plans for Go-Toba's return were in the air within the shogun's camp well before the formal request was made.⁷⁸ If not, it is highly unlikely that Michiie could have used the existence of such a plot in the shogunal camp as an excuse for his editorial work.

Unfortunately for this attractive theory, Michiie himself seems to have backed the request for Go-Toba's return from exile.⁷⁹ His apparent support for the request may have had to do with a belief that Go-Toba's angry spirit was wreaking havoc on the Kujō. During the years 1233 and 1234 important young members of Michiie's family died one after the other. First his pride and joy, his

⁷⁴ Michiie's diary, *Gyokuzui* 玉蘂, contains no record for the period between Kangi 1 (1230).10 and Katei 1 (1235).1. Neither does *Gyokuzui bekki*.

⁷⁵ The theory originates, it seems, with Kamijō Shōji 上條彰次. Kamijō 1993, pp. 155–60. See also Karasawa 1994, pp. 34–35. Higuchi Yoshimaro has proposed a similar scenario. Higuchi 1975, p. 706.

⁷⁶ *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 3, pp. 462, 464, Katei 1 (1235).5.3 and 5.14. I can find no reference to this request in the *Azuma kagami* or *Gyokuzui*. It is unclear when exactly the formal request for the retired emperors' return from exile was put forward to the bakufu. See also Matsumura 1995, p. 79; Kamijō 1993, pp. 155–56; Higuchi 1980, p. 701; Higuchi 1975, p. 710; and Ishida 1972b, p. 6. In his biography of Go-Toba, however, Higuchi makes no reference to this request. Higuchi 1985.

⁷⁷ Kamijō Shōji suggests that Michiie may have been unaware of his son's scheming against the Hōjō. Kamijō 1993, p. 156. I find this difficult to believe; Michiie was, after all, an experienced politician who kept a watchful eye on the bakufu.

⁷⁸ This is Kamijō Shōji's argument. He believes that the request was put forward around Bunryaku 1 (1234).11. Kamijō 1993, p. 155. He gives no sources, however; as mentioned above (note 76), it is unclear when exactly the formal request was made.

⁷⁹ Kamijō 1993, p. 155; Hirota 1989, p. 226; Higuchi 1980, p. 701; and Ishida 1972b, p. 6.

daughter Sonshi (Sōhekimon-in 藻壁門院), whom he had married to Go-Horikawa and who had furnished him with the new emperor, Shijō 四條, died unexpectedly. Next, Emperor Chūkyō 仲恭 (1218–1234), who as an infant briefly had occupied the throne in 1221, also died. Although Chūkyō was a son of Juntoku, he was also Michiie's nephew, as his mother was Michiie's sister Tatsuko 立子.⁸⁰ Finally, Sonshi's husband and Michiie's son-in-law, Retired Emperor Go-Horikawa, passed away equally suddenly.

Rumor quickly spread that this sequence of personal disasters was Go-Toba's doing. As the anonymous historian of the *Godai teiō monogatari* 五代帝王物語 (Tales of Five Generations of Emperors, early fourteenth century) wrote less than a century later, the deaths were seen as the result of Go-Toba's "grudge" (*go'onnen* 御怨念).⁸¹ The belief that a living person's spirit (*ikiryō* or *ikisudama* 生靈) could kill other people was one element in the complicated fabric of beliefs that made up the reality of medieval Japanese religious life. The person in question might not be consciously aware of his or her spirit's vengeful actions, but unless the spirit was somehow placated it would continue to be a serious menace.⁸² While it is quite plausible that a fear of Go-Toba's spirit prompted Michiie to endorse the request for the emperors' return to Kyoto, the question remains why he would have thought that Go-Toba's spirit would be less angered by the removal of his poems from the *Shinchokusenshū*. One is almost tempted to believe that Michiie made a miscalculation, because his personal losses did not end here. In the 3rd month of 1235, his son Norizane died at the age of twenty-six.

In the final analysis, there is no ready explanation why Michiie should have wanted to remove Go-Toba's poems from the *Shinchokusenshū* as a token of his Hōjō alliances, only to ask the Hōjō at almost the same moment to lift the ban on the return of the exiled emperor. In the end his policy was perhaps one of bal-

⁸⁰ Chūkyō had been placed on the throne at the outbreak of the Jōkyū War, but was quickly removed by the bakufu after some seventy days and replaced by the less stigmatized Go-Horikawa. Not having had a proper enthronement ceremony, he came to be known as "the Kujō dethroned emperor" (*Kujō haitei* 九条廢帝). Chūkyō had to wait until 1870 before he was officially given a place in the imperial lineage as the eighty-fifth emperor of Japan.

⁸¹ *Godai teiō monogatari*, pp. 420–21. Many courtiers in Kyoto seem to have believed the story about Go-Toba's angry spirit. The prevalent notion was that Go-Toba was taking revenge on everyone connected to the Hōjō family and that his spirit was to be blamed for the death of several Hōjō family members as well, including Tokiuji's. Uwayokote Masataka suggests that it was Go-Toba's malicious grudge that prompted the Kujō to ask for the return of the exiled emperors to the capital in the spring of 1235. Uwayokote 1994, pp. 218–22, and in *Kokushi daijiten*, vol. 4, p. 771.

⁸² In literature, the most famous example is undoubtedly the hapless Lady Rokujō in the *Tale of Genji*, whose spirit was thought to have killed her rivals Yūgao and Aoi. Initially, Rokujō is unaware of her spirit's actions, and when she realizes the extent of her jealousy, she is genuinely distressed. See Tubielewicz 1980, pp. 36–46, for a short and conventional introduction in English to Heian vengeful spirits. Doris Bergen, on the other hand, argues for more attention to the possessed rather than the possessor. In her view, which is interesting but not entirely without problems, Yūgao's and Aoi's spirit possession and even their subsequent deaths are a way of coping with oppressive social constraints. They actively invite Rokujō's spirit and use it for their own ends. Bergen 1997.

Table 1. Prominent poets in the *Shinchokusenshū*

This list obviously does not include all *Shinchokusenshū* poets. Nor is the division between pro- and anti-Go-Toba so black and white as this table suggests.

Kujō camp <i>(Includes poets who severed ties with Go-Toba and/or Juntoku only after their exile as well as dead poets with ties to the Kujō or bakufu)</i>		Go-Toba's loyal retainers <i>(These poets kept in contact with Go-Toba after his exile.)</i>	
Yoshitsune (Kujō)	36 poems	Ietaka (Fujiwara)	43 poems
Shunzei (Mikohidari)	35	Nobuzane (Fujiwara)	10
Kintsune (Saionji)	30	Ienaga (Minamoto)	9
Jien (Kujō)	27	Hideyoshi (Fujiwara)	9
Michiie (Kujō)	25		
Sanetomo (Minamoto)	25	Poets who were not included in the <i>Shinchokusenshū</i>	
Saneuji (Saionji)	15		
Teika (Mikohidari)	15		
Norizane (Kujō)	10	Go-Toba	
Yukiyoshi (Fujiwara)	8	Juntoku	
Shunzei kyō no musume (Mikohidari)	8	Tsuchimikado	
Kanezane (Kujō)	7	Motoie (Kujō)	
Tameie (Mikohidari)	6		
Go-Horikawa	5		
Yoritsuna (Utsunomiya)	3		

ancing the risks: ask for the return of the emperors, but at the same time omit their poems so as not to irritate the Hōjō unduly. The key object remained the successful completion of the *Shinchokusenshū* as a tribute to the cultural accomplishments of Michiie's own lineage and its allies. If the presence of Go-Toba's and Juntoku's poems would jeopardize the completion of the anthology, he presumably was prepared to suppress qualms about sacrificing them.

Finale: The Hyakunin isshu

Teika's best-known compilation is without doubt the *Hyakunin isshu*, or *One Hundred Poets, One Poem Each*. Nowadays played as a card game, akin to Memory or Concentration, the hundred-poem sequence offers Teika's condensed course in poetic history from the archaic age up to his own time. Teika's poetic testament, if one may call it that, is firmly linked to his experiences as the compiler of the *Shinchokusenshū*.

A month or so after finishing the last copy of the *Shinchokusenshū*, Teika was asked by Utsunomiya Yoritsuna 宇都宮頼綱 (1172–1259) to compile a selection of poems. Yoritsuna, who by this time went by his Buddhist name, Renshō 蓮生,

was descended from a warrior family with ties to the Hōjō, but as his daughter had married Tameie, he had close relations with Teika. He wished to use cartouches (*shikishi* 色紙) with the poems written on them as decoration for the sliding doors (*shōji* 障子) at his mountain villa at the Chūin 中院 in Saga, just west of the capital. Teika chose to make a selection of “one poem each by poets from the past until now, starting with Emperor Tenji 天智 up to Ietaka and [Asukai] Masatsune [飛鳥井] 雅經.”⁸³ This passage in Teika’s diary has led to much speculation regarding its relationship to the *Hyakunin isschu* and to Teika’s other hundred poem selection, the *Hyakunin shūka* 百人秀歌 (Exemplary Poems by One Hundred Poets).

The two selections are almost identical; ninety-eight poets and ninety-seven poems are the same in both anthologies. The major difference is that the *Hyakunin shūka* contains no poems by Go-Toba and Juntoku, whereas the *Hyakunin isschu* does. As pointed out most recently by Joshua Mostow, the hypothesis that this passage in the *Meigetsu ki* refers to the *Hyakunin shūka* is likely correct. The selection for Yoritsuna then served as the basis for the *Hyakunin isschu*, cartouches from which were used to decorate Teika’s own mountain villa at Ogura. The oldest name for the *Hyakunin isschu* is, after all, *Ogura sansō shikishi waka* 小倉山莊色紙和歌 (Poems from the Cartouches of the Ogura Mountain Villa). The issue is when exactly Teika added the two poems by Go-Toba and Juntoku. Some hold that at the earliest it was following Go-Toba’s death in 1239; there is even a hypothesis that the person who added the poems was not Teika but his son Tameie, after Teika’s death. Since, however, a cartouche with Go-Toba’s poem in Teika’s own hand has been discovered, one can safely assume that Teika did in fact include the emperors’ poems himself.⁸⁴

⁸³ *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 3, p. 465, Katei 1 (1235).5.27. Quite likely Teika was first asked by Yoritsuna for the poems on the 1st day of the 5th month. *Meigetsu ki*, vol. 3, p. 461, 1235.5.1. For more details about this entry in Teika’s diary, see Matsumura 1995, pp. 24–30, and Mostow 1996, p. 25. The latter also provides an English translation of this passage. Teika’s own mountain villa was close to Yoritsuna’s, and Teika himself usually referred to his own villa as the “Saga grass hut” or “Chūin grass hut.” The name “Ogura mountain villa” came into being to distinguish it from Yoritsuna’s villa. Tsunoda 1983, p. 318.

⁸⁴ Matsumura 1995, pp. 71–80; Mostow 1996, pp. 25, 434. Tokuhara 1994 offers a useful overview of the debate regarding which of the two sequences preceded the other. Virtually all scholars agree that the *Hyakunin shūka* preceded the *Hyakunin isschu*. An exception is Ii Haruki 伊井春樹, who believes that Teika had made a selection of hundred poems from a draft version of the *Shinchokusenshū*, that this selection is what we now know as the *Hyakunin isschu*, and that Yoritsuna knew of it and asked for a similar one for his new Saga villa. For political reasons, Go-Toba’s and Juntoku’s poems were omitted from the second selection, which became the *Hyakunin shūka* and which is the poem sequence referred to in Teika’s diary of Katei 1 (1235).5.27. It is, after all, says Ii, the latter anthology that has “Poems from the Cartouches of the Saga Mountain Villa” (*Saga sansō shikishi waka* 嵯峨山莊色紙和歌) for a subtitle (*naidai* 内題). Ii 1990, pp. 52–53. The *Hyakunin shūka*, incidentally, contains poems by 101 poets. For my argument, the order of compilation is academic, because all that matters is that Teika himself included Go-Toba’s and Juntoku’s poems in the *Hyakunin isschu*, and that certainly appears to be the case. The Ogura *shikishi* of Go-Toba’s poem was first made public in 1963. See Haruna 1963, pp. 36, 48–50. Although most scholars believe this cartouche to be in Teika’s hand, not everyone is convinced that this is actually so. See, for instance, Ishida 1972b, pp. 16–20.

The *Hyakunin isshu* concludes with poems by the two exiled retired emperors Go-Toba and Juntoku. Poem 99 is by Go-Toba:

人もをし人も恨めし味気なく世を思ふゆゑに物思ふ身は

<i>hito mo oshi</i>	Some people I hold dear
<i>hito mo urameshi</i>	and some people I hate
<i>ajikinaku</i>	when vainly
<i>yo o omou yue ni</i>	I brood about this world,
<i>mono omou mi wa</i>	this brooding self that is me. ⁸⁵

This poem is part of a hundred-poem sequence composed in the 12th month of the 2nd year of Kenryaku (1212) with four other poets, including Teika and Ietaka. Go-Toba contributed five poems on the topic of *jukkai* 述懐, or “personal grievance,” of which this is one. In retrospect, the temptation to interpret the poem as political is great, and scholars have often read a dissatisfaction with the Kamakura bakufu into these lines.

Poem 100 is by Juntoku:

百敷や古き軒端の忍にもなほ余りある昔なりけり

<i>momoshiki ya</i>	Stone-built palace!
<i>furuki nokiba no</i>	On its old eaves grows
<i>shinobu ni mo</i>	memento grass—
<i>nao amari aru</i>	a past ever more fondly
<i>mukashi narikeri</i>	recalled lies here revealed. ⁸⁶

Composed in the 3rd month of the 4th year of Kenpō (1216), that is, five years before the outbreak of the Jōkyū War, this poem, too, is generally interpreted as political. Juntoku implicitly bemoans the loss of imperial authority to the bakufu.

Teika constructed the *Hyakunin isshu* in such a way that the beginning and end of the sequence make a parallel. The parallel consists of two father and child rulers paired with two loyal servants. For the archaic age there are Emperor Tenji (626–671) and his daughter Empress Jitō 持統 (?645–702), paired with Hitomaro and Yamabe no Akahito 山部赤人 (early eighth century). For Teika’s age there are Go-Toba and Juntoku, paired with Ietaka and Teika himself. Technically he had been regarded as equal to Hitomaro. The parallel goes even further, as Juntoku’s closing poem may be read as an echo of Tenji’s opening poem. Although Teika may have seen it as expressing the monarch’s concern for the hardships

⁸⁵ *Go-Toba no in gyoshū* 1472; *Shokugosenshū* 17 (Misc. 2).1202. Some scholars argue that this is one of Go-Toba’s lesser poems, certainly not representative of his poetic style. Teika’s choice for this particular poem may reflect a preference for representing what he perceived as Go-Toba’s personality in exile, or his preference later in life for the *ushin* 有心 style—implying a rejection of Go-Toba’s more gaudy literary preferences. See Andō 1976, p. 263; and Carter 1991, p. 205.

⁸⁶ *Shikinshū* 紫禁集 (= *Juntoku no in gyoshū*) 800; *Shokugosenshū* 18 (Misc. 3).1205.

of his farmers, Tenji's poem, too, is usually regarded as a lament over declining imperial authority, and thus as expressing "personal grievances."

秋の田の仮りほの廬の苫を荒みわが衣手は露にぬれつつ

<i>aki no ta no</i>	In autumn fields
<i>kariho no io no</i>	my rough-and-tumble hut,
<i>toma o arami</i>	its thatch so crude
<i>waga koromode wa</i>	that the long sleeves of my robe
<i>tsuyu ni nuretsutsu</i>	stay soaked with dew. ⁸⁷

The inclusion of Go-Toba's and Juntoku's poems seems a clear statement on Teika's part. At one level, the *Hyakunin isshu* was a postscript to the *Shinchokusenshū*, Teika's attempt to retroactively undo Michiie's censorship. Higuchi Yasumaro 樋口芳麻呂 put the case most comprehensively two decades ago, but scholars such as Yoshida Kōichi 吉田幸一, Ishida Yoshisada 石田吉貞, Katagiri Yōichi 片桐洋一, and Shimazu Tadao 島津忠夫 have also noted the connection with the *Shinchokusenshū*. What, then, about the absence of Go-Toba and Juntoku from the *Hyakunin shūka*? According to Higuchi, the original *Hyakunin shūka* also contained poems by the ex-emperors. Teika seized the opportunity presented by Yoritsuna's request to give Go-Toba and Juntoku the places in an anthology to which, in his view, they were entitled. But when on the 14th day of the 5th month of 1235 the bakufu decided against lifting the ban on the retired emperors' return, Teika took the precaution of excising the poems, only to reinsert them when he compiled his own *Hyakunin isshu*.⁸⁸

This theory is not so new. Already at the end of the seventeenth century, the scholar-monk Keichū 契沖 (1640–1701) suggested that poems by Go-Toba and Juntoku had been included in the *Hyakunin isshu* to redress their omission from the *Shinchokusenshū*. He also gave a political reading of their two poems. In the preface to his *Shinchokusenshū hyōchū* 新勅撰集評註 (Commentary on the *Shinchokusenshū*, 1699), he writes,

When it says "the sovereigns" in the letter of Lord Shunzei's daughter, she means that no poem by any of the three retired emperors Go-Toba, Tsuchimikado, or Juntoku was included. Perhaps, however, there was no imperial approval for this [omission] and it was a scheme by the Kanto [i.e. the bakufu]? Surely, Lord Teika can hardly have intended this himself? At the end of the *Hyakunin isshu*, he included special poems by Their Majesties Retired Emperors Go-Toba and Juntoku that express their feelings about their downfall. That Tameie included these two poems by the two monarchs in his *Shokugosenshū* must have been to implement at last his father's original preferences.⁸⁹

⁸⁷ *Gosenshū* 6 (Autumn 2).302. See Mostow 1996, p. 142.

⁸⁸ Higuchi 1980, pp. 700–704; Higuchi 1975; Katagiri 1975; Shimazu 1973, pp. 226, 236, 256–266; and Yoshida 1971, pp. 113–124. See also Mostow 1996, pp. 434–35, 437; Matsumura 1995, pp. 73–80; Tokuhara 1994; and Ishida 1975.

⁸⁹ *Shinchokusenshū hyōchū*, p. 569. *Hyakunin isshu* nos. 99 and 100 were anthologized by

Indeed, may that have been the case? Literary historians have a hard time quelling the demon of attempts at justification. Perhaps our wish to exonerate Teika from the charge of dereliction of his old patrons fathers ingenious interpretations. On the other hand, as Teika's last attempt at poetic history, the *Hyakunin isshu* surely deserves careful scrutiny. The inclusion of poets whom he had tried but failed to anthologize in the *Shinchokusenshū* to conclude this work is a reminder that the "crimson banners" were never far off.

Conclusion

Some may still regard the *Shinchokusenshū* as an anthology that has little to offer in literary qualities. Yet the story of its compilation offers a fascinating insight into the workings of literary enterprises in medieval Japan. The first anthology in which the political dimensions of the compilation process are clearly visible, the *Shinchokusenshū* was also the first occasion for the bakufu to exert its influence over imperial anthologies. It shows as well that a poet who wanted to give priority to the principles of his craft necessarily also had to heed extra-literary dynamics, such as economic dependence on patrons. Particularly in the case of an imperial anthology, poetic production was not only a matter of personal taste; it required responsiveness to the demands of one's audience and its political concerns.

Tameie in the *Shokugosenshū* as 17 (Misc. 2).1202 and 18 (Misc. 3).1205 respectively. Both have as headnote "Topic unknown." I take it that Keichū means the words *jukkai no gyosei* ("imperial compositions on personal grievances") to refer specifically to the Jōkyū War.

Table 2. Protagonists

- Go-Horikawa 後堀河. 1212–1234. Emperor 1221–1232. Took Michiie's daughter Sonshi as official consort in 1230. Five poems in the *Shinchokusenshū*.
- Go-Toba 後鳥羽. 1180–1239. Emperor 1183–1198. Instigator of the Jōkyū War. After his swift defeat by bakufu forces, exiled to the Oki islands. Died in exile. No poems in the *Shinchokusenshū*.
- Hideyoshi 秀能. 1184–1240. Fujiwara, Northern house. First served Michichika and then (1199) as a bushi under Go-Toba. Attached to Go-Toba's Poetry Bureau as fellow. After the defeat in the Jōkyū War, received the tonsure at Kumano and entered Kōya. In Karoku 1 (1225) returned to Kyoto. Associated with Tameie. Nine poems in the *Shinchokusenshū*.
- Ienaga 家長. ?1173–1234. Minamoto, Daigo. Entered Go-Toba's service in the winter of 1196. When Go-Toba established his Poetry Bureau, Ienaga became the editors' secretary. Nine poems in the *Shinchokusenshū*.
- Ietaka 家隆. 1158–1237. Fujiwara, Northern house. Waka poet, loyal to Go-Toba. One of the *Shinkokinshū* compilers. Forty-three poems in the *Shinchokusenshū*.
- Juntoku 順徳. 1197–1242. Emperor 1210–1221. Involved the Jōkyū War of 1221. After his defeat, exiled to Sado island. Died in exile. No poems in the *Shinchokusenshū*.
- Kintsune 公経. 1171–1244. Saionji. Younger brother of Teika's wife. Ties with the bakufu and Kujō family. Thirty poems in the *Shinchokusenshū*.
- Michiie 道家. 1193–1252. Kujō. Son of Yoshitsune. Regent and chancellor 1221, 1228–1231, 1235–1237. Twenty-five poems in the *Shinchokusenshū*.
- Motoie 基家. 1203–1280. Kujō. Younger brother of Michiie. Was in secret correspondence with Go-Toba during his exile on Oki, as one of his loyal retainers; perhaps for this reason did not get along well with Teika. No poems in the *Shinchokusenshū*.
- Nobuzane 信実. 1177–1265. Fujiwara. Famous painter of realistic portraits, the *nise-e* genre established by his father, Takanobu (1142–1205). Painted Go-Toba's portrait just after the Jōkyū War, shortly before Go-Toba's exile to Oki. Also well known as a poet. Ten poems in the *Shinchokusenshū*.
- Norizane 教実. 1210–1235. Kujō. Son of Michiie. Chancellor and regent, 1231–1235. Ten poems in the *Shinchokusenshū*.
- Sonshi (also read Shunshi) 罇子. 1209–1233. Kujō. Daughter of Michiie; mother of Emperor Shijō. Married (*nyōgo* 女御) Go-Horikawa on Kangi 1 (1229).11.23 and became his official consort (*chūgū* 中宮) on Kangi 2 (1230).2.16. Palace name (*ingō* 院号) Sōhekimon-in 藻壁門院.
- Tameie 為家. 1198–1275. Fujiwara, Mikohidari house. Son of Teika. Six poems in the *Shinchokusenshū*.
- Teika 定家. 1162–1141. Fujiwara, Mikohidari house. Son of Shunzei. Fellow of Go-Toba's Poetry Bureau; compiler of the *Shinchokusenshū*. Fifteen poems in the *Shinchokusenshū*.
- Tsuchimikado 土御門. 1195–1231. Emperor 1198–1210. Eldest son of Go-Toba. Did not want to participate in his father's actions against the bakufu, and was replaced by Juntoku at Go-Toba's instigation. After the Jōkyū War, went into voluntary exile, first to Tosa and later to Awa. Died in exile. No poems in the *Shinchokusenshū*.
- Yasutoki 泰時. 1183–1242. Hōjō. Military regent of the bakufu.

Yoritsune 頼経. 1218–1256. Kujō. Third son of Michiie. Became fourth Kamakura shogun (first Fujiwara [Kujō] shogun) following the murder of Minamoto no Sanetomo in 1219. No poems in the *Shinchokusenshū*.

Yukiyoshi 行能. Dates unknown. Fujiwara. Calligrapher belonging to the Sesonji school. Eight poems in the *Shinchokusenshū*.

REFERENCES

Waka collections not listed here follow KT numbering.

Andō 1976

Andō Tsuguo 安東次男. *Hyakunin issshu* 百人一首. Shinchōsha, 1976.

Araki 1983

Araki Hisashi 荒木尚. “Kaidai” 解題. In *Shinchokusen wakashū* 新勅撰和歌集, ed. [Hosokawa-ke] Eisei Bunko [細川家] 永青文庫. Kyūko Shoin, 1983.

Azuma kagami

Azuma kagami 吾妻鏡. Ed. Hayakawa Junzaburō 早川純三郎. 3 vols. Kokusho Kankō-kai, 1915.

Bargen 1997

Doris G. Bargen. *A Woman's Weapon: Spirit Possession in the Tale of Genji*. University of Hawai'i Press, 1997.

Bo Juyi ji

Bo Juyi ji 白居易集. 4 vols. Peking: Zhonghua Shuju, 1979.

Brower 1972

Robert H. Brower. “‘Ex-Emperor Go-Toba’s Secret Teachings’: *Go-Toba no In Gokuden*.” *HJAS* 32 (1972), pp. 5–70.

Brower 1976

Robert H. Brower. “Fujiwara Teika’s *Hundred-Poem Sequence of the Shōji Era*.” *MN* 31:4 (1976), pp. 333–91.

Brower and Miner 1961

Robert H. Brower and Earl Miner. *Japanese Court Poetry*. Stanford University Press, 1961.

Brownlee 1975

John Brownlee. “Crisis and Reinforcement of the Imperial Institution: The Case of the Jōkyū Incident, 1221.” *MN* 30:2 (1975), pp. 193–201.

Carter 1991

Steven D. Carter. *Traditional Japanese Poetry: An Anthology*. Stanford University Press, 1991.

Childs 1980

Margaret Childs. “*Chigo Monogatari*: Love Stories or Buddhist Sermons.” *MN* 35:2 (1980), pp. 127–51.

Cranston 1993

Edwin A. Cranston. *A Waka Anthology, Volume One: The Gem-Glistening Cup*. Stanford University Press, 1993.

Daishū

Daishū 代集. In vol. 5 of *Nihon kagaku taikei* 日本歌学大系, ed. Sasaki Nobutsuna 佐々木信綱 and Kyūsojin Hitaku 久曾神昇. Kazama Shobō, 1957.

DeCoker and Kerr 1994

Gary DeCoker and Alex Kerr. “*Yakaku Teikinshō*: Secret Teachings of the Sesonji School of Calligraphy.” *MN* 49:3 (1994), pp. 315–29.

Fujihira 1969

Fujihira Haruo 藤平春男. *Shinkokin kafū no keisei* 新古今歌風の形成. Meiji Shoin, 1969.

Fujita 1991

Fujita Yuriko 藤田百合子. “Juntoku no in onhyakushu no seikaku: Sono eisaku mokuteki to Teika hyōgo no seiritsu made” 『順徳院御百首』の性格: その詠作目的と

- 定家評語の成立まで. In *Nihon bungei shichōron* 日本文芸思潮論, ed. Katano Tatsurō 片野達郎. Ōfūsha, 1991.
- Fukuro zōshi*
Fukuro zōshi 袋草紙. SNKB 29, ed. Fujioka Tadaharu 藤岡忠美.
- Genpei jōsui ki*
Genpei jōsui ki 源平盛衰記. Vols. 15 and 16 of *Nihon bungaku taikai* 日本文学大系. Kokumin Toshosha, 1926.
- Godai teiō monogatari*
Godai teiō monogatari 五代帝王物語. In vol. 2 of *Gunsho ruijū* 群書類従. Keizai Zasshisha, 1893.
- Gomi 1991
 Gomi Fumihiko 五味文彦. *Fujiwara no Teika no jidai: Chūsei bunka no kūkan* 藤原定家の時代:中世文化の空間. Iwanami Shoten, 1991.
- Gomi 1992
 Gomi Fumihiko. *Kamakura to kyō* 鎌倉と京. Vol. 5 of *Taikai Nihon no rekishi* 大系日本の歴史. Shōgakukan, 1992.
- Gomi 1998
 Gomi Fumihiko. “Seiai ni miru chūsei” 性愛に見る中世. *Asahi Shinbun*, 14 June 1998.
- Goshūishū*
Goshūishū 後拾遺集. SNKB 8, ed. Kubota Jun 久保田淳 and Hirata Yoshinobu 平田喜信.
- Gyokuzui*
Gyokuzui 玉蘂. Ed. Imagawa Fumio 今川文雄. Shibunkaku Shuppan, 1984.
- Gyokuzui bekki*
Gyokuzui bekki 玉蘂別記. In vol. 1 of *Zushoryō sōkan: Kujō-ke rekisei kiroku* 図書寮叢刊:九条家歴史記録, ed. Kunaichō Shoryōbu 宮内庁書陵部. 3 vols. Kunaichō Shoryōbu, 1989.
- Haruna 1963
 Haruna Yoshishige 春名好重. “Teika no shoseki kaisetsu” 定家の書跡解説. *Bokubi* 墨美 129 (1963), pp. 30–56.
- Heike monogatari*
Heike monogatari 平家物語. NKBT 32–33, ed. Takagi Ichinosuke 高木市之助 et al.
- Higuchi 1959
 Higuchi Yoshimaro 樋口芳麻呂. “Shokugosen mokuroku no jo zanketsu to sono igi” 続後撰目録序残欠とその意義. *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 国語と国文学 36:9 (1959), pp. 39–50.
- Higuchi 1975
 Higuchi Yoshimaro, “Hyakunin isshu e no michi” 『百人一首』への道. *Bungaku* 文学 43:5 (1975), pp. 38–50; 43:6, pp. 78–91.
- Higuchi 1980
 Higuchi Yoshimaro. “Kaisetsu.” In *Shinchokusen wakashū*, ed. Nihon Koten Bungakukai. Kichōhon Kankōkai, 1980.
- Higuchi 1985
 Higuchi Yoshimaro. *Go-Toba-in: Ware koso wa Niishimamori yo* 後鳥羽院:我こそはにい鳥守よ. Shūeisha, 1985.
- Hirota 1989
 Akiko Hirota. “Ex-Emperor Go-Toba: A Study in Personality, Politics and Poetry.” Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1989.
- Hosokawa Yūsai kikigaki*
Hosokawa Yūsai kikigaki 細川幽齋聞書. In vol. 6 of *Nihon kagaku taikai*, ed. Sasaki Nobutsuna and Kyūsojin Hitaku. Kazama Shobō, 1956.

Hosono 1956

Hosono Tetsuo 細野哲雄. "Meigetsu ki 'sejō no rangyaku tsuitō mimi ni mitsu to iedomo kore o chūsezu, kōki seijū wagakoto ni arazu' no go meguru saikentō" 明月記「世上乱逆追討雖滿耳不注之、紅旗征戎非吾事」の語めぐる再検討. *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 国語と国文学 33:2 (1956), pp. 22-30.

Huey 1990

Robert N. Huey. "The Medievalization of Poetic Practice." *HJAS* 50:2 (1990), pp. 651-68

Huey 1997

Robert N. 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. Jeffrey P. Mass. Stanford University Press, 1997.

Hurst 1982

G. Cameron Hurst III. "The Kōbu Polity: Court-Bakufu Relations in Kamakura Japan." In *Court and Bakufu in Japan: Essays in Kamakura History*, ed. Jeffrey P. Mass. Yale University Press, 1982.

Hyakurenshō

Hyakurenshō 百鍊抄. In vol. 14 of *Kokushi taikai* 国史大系. Keizai Zasshisha, 1906.

Ii 1990

Ii Haruki 伊井春樹. "Hyakunin isshu no seiritsu" 百人一首の成立. In *Sumi: Supesharu Hyakunin isshu* 墨:スペシャル『百人一首』(1990), pp. 49-54.

Ikuzawa 1986

Ikuzawa Kimie 生澤喜美恵. "Shinchokusenshū no senshū: Shikashū sonchō no shisei o megutte" 「新勅撰集」の撰集:私家集尊重の姿勢をめぐる. *Waka bungaku kenkyū* 和歌文学研究 53 (1986), pp. 46-55.

Imai 1991

Imai Akira 今井明. "Kenpōki no kadan" 建保期の歌壇. In *Shinkokinshū to sono jidai* 新古今集とその時代, vol. 8 of *Waka bungaku ronshū* 和歌文学論集, ed. Waka Bungaku Ronshū Henshū Iinkai. Kazama Shobō, 1991.

Inoue 1968

Inoue Muneo 井上宗雄. "Chokusenshū no sakusha hyōki" 勅撰集の作者表記. *Kokubungaku: Kaishaku to kanshō* 国文学:解釈と鑑賞 33:4 (1968), pp. 78-82.

Ishida 1931

Ishida Yoshisada 石田吉貞. "Shinchokusenshū no seiritsu ni tsuite" 新勅撰集の成立について. *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 8:7 (1931), pp. 14-30.

Ishida 1939

Ishida Yoshisada. "Shinchokusenshū no Teika-teki seikaku" 新勅撰集の定家的性格. *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 16:1 (1939), pp. 13-31.

Ishida 1957

Ishida Yoshisada. *Fujiwara no Teika no kenkyū* 藤原定家の研究. Bungadō, 1957.

Ishida 1972a

Ishida Yoshisada. *Shinkokin sekai to chūsei bungaku* 新古今世界と中世文学. 2 vols. Kitazawa Toshō Shuppan, 1972.

Ishida 1972b

Ishida Yoshisada. "Ogura Hyakunin isshu seiritsu no mondaiten: Go-Toba, Juntoku ryōin no uta o chūshin ni" 小倉百人一首成立の問題点: 後鳥羽・順徳両院の歌を中心に. *Gakuen* 学苑 385 (1972), pp. 2-20.

Ishida 1975

Ishida Yoshisada. "Hyakunin isshu sensha kō" 『百人一首』撰者考. *Bungaku* 文学 43:12 (1975), pp. 1-23.

Ishii 1974

Ishii Susumu 石井進. *Kamakura bakufu* 鎌倉幕府. Vol. 7 of *Nihon no rekishi* 日本の歴史. Chūō Kōron Sha, 1974.

Jōkyū ki

Jōkyū ki 承久記. In SNKB 43, ed. Masuda Takashi 益田宗 and Kubota Jun 久保田淳.

Juntoku no in gyoki

Juntoku no in gyoki 順徳院御記. In vol. 1 of *Ressei zenshū: Shinkishū* 列聖全集: 宸記集. Ressei Zenshū Hensankai, 1917.

Juntoku no in onhyakushu

Juntoku no in onhyakushu 順徳院御百首. In vol. 14 of *Zoku gunsho ruijū* 続群書類従. Keizai Zasshisha, 1910.

Kakinomoto eigu ki

Kakinomoto eigu ki 柿本影供記. In vol. 10 of *Gunsho ruijū*. Keizai Zasshisha, 1894.

Kamijō 1993

Kamijō Shōji 上條彰次. “Hyakunin issu tsuikō: Meigetsu ki kanren kiji no shūhen nado” 『百人一首』 追考: 『明月記』 関連記事の周辺など. *Bunrin* 文林 27 (1993), pp. 151-78.

Kanechiku 1981

Kanechiku Nobuyuki 兼築信行. “Shinchokusen wakashū zōka yon: Hairetsu genri no saiginmi” 『新勅撰和歌集』 雑歌四: 配列原理の再吟味. *Kenkyū to shiryō* 研究と資料 5 (1981), pp. 41-51.

Karasawa 1994

Karasawa Masami 唐沢正実. “Shinchokusen wakashū to Juntoku-in: Juntoku-in onhyakushu no seiritsu o megutte” 新勅撰和歌集と順徳院: 『順徳院御百首』 の成立をめぐって. *Waka bungaku kenkyū* 68 (1994), pp. 27-39.

Katagiri 1975

Katagiri Yōichi 片桐洋一. “Hyakunin issu zatsudan” 百人一首雑談. *Ripōto Kasama* リポート笠間 12 (1975), pp. 15-20.

Keene 1989

Donald Keene. *Travelers of a Hundred Ages: The Japanese as Revealed Through 1,000 Years of Diaries*. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1989.

Keene 1993

Donald Keene. *Seeds in the Heart: Japanese Literature from Earliest Times to the Late Sixteenth Century*. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1993.

Knechtges 1982

David R. Knechtges, trans. *Wenxuan or Selections of Refined Literature*. Vol. 1. Princeton University Press, 1982.

Kokinshū

Kokinshū 古今集. NKBT 8, ed. Saeki Umetomo 佐伯梅友.

Kokon chomonjū

Kokon chomonjū 古今著聞集. NKBT 84, ed. Nagazumi Yasuaki 永積安明 and Shimada Isao 島田勇雄.

Kokushi daijiten

Kokushi daijiten 国史大辞典. 15 vols. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1979-1996.

Koshibe zenni shōsoku

Koshibe zenni shōsoku 越部禪尼消息. In vol. 3 of *Nihon kagaku taikei*, ed. Sasaki Nobutsuna and Kyūsojin Hitaku. Kazama Shobō, 1956.

Kubota 1983

Kubota Jun 久保田淳 et al., ed. *Waka* 和歌. Vol. 6 of *Kenkyū shiryō Nihon koten bungaku* 研究資料日本古典文学. Meiji Shoin, 1983.

Kubota 1986

Kubota Jun. "Teika nenpu" 定家年譜. In vol. 2 of *Yakuchū Fujiwara no Teika zenkashū* 訳注藤原定家全歌集. Kawade Shobō Shinsha, 1986.

Kubota 1994a

Kubota Jun. *Fujiwara no Teika to sono jidai* 藤原定家とその時代. Iwanami Shoten, 1994.

Kubota 1994b

Kubota Jun. *Fujiwara no Teika* 藤原定家. Shūeisha, 1984; reprint Chikuma Shobō, 1994.

Kyūsojin and Higuchi 1961

Kyūsojin Hitaku 久曾神昇 and Higuchi Yoshimaro. "Kaidai." In *Shinchokusen wakashū* 新勅撰和歌集. Iwanami bunko 30-134-1. Iwanami Shoten, 1961.

Marra 1993

Michele Marra. *Representations of Power: The Literary Politics of Medieval Japan*. University of Hawaii Press, 1993.

Mass 1979

Jeffrey P. Mass. *The Development of Kamakura Rule, 1180–1250: A History with Documents*. Stanford University Press, 1979.

Mass 1990

Jeffrey P. Mass. "The Kamakura Bakufu." In *Medieval Japan*, vol. 3 of *The Cambridge History of Japan*. Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Masukagami

Masukagami 増鏡. In NKBT 87, ed. Tokieda Motoki 時枝誠記 and Kidō Saizō 木藤才藏.

Matsumura 1995

Matsumura Yūji 松村雄二. *Hyakunin isshu: Teika to karuta no bungakushi* 百人一首: 定家とカルタの文学史. Heibonsha, 1995.

W. McCullough 1964

William H. McCullough. "Shōkyūki: An Account of the Shōkyū War of 1221." MN 19:1/2 (1964), pp. 163–215; 19:3/4 (1964), pp. 420–55.

W. McCullough 1968

William H. McCullough. "The Azuma Kagami Account of the Shōkyū War of 1221." MN 23:1/2 (1968), pp. 102–55.

H. C. McCullough 1988

Helen Craig McCullough, trans. *The Tale of the Heike*. Stanford University Press, 1988.

Meigetsu ki

Meigetsu ki 明月記. Ed. Hayakawa Junzaburō 早川純三郎. 3 vols. Kokusho Kankōkai, 1912.

Minkei ki

Minkei ki 民経記. In *Dai Nihon kokiroku* 大日本古記録. 7 vols. Iwanami Shoten, 1975–1995.

Mostow 1996

Joshua S. Mostow. *Pictures of the Heart: The Hyakunin Isshu in Word and Image*. University of Hawai'i Press, 1996.

Murayama 1962

Murayama Shūichi 村山修一. *Fujiwara no Teika* 藤原定家. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1962.

Nihon koten bungaku daijiten

Nihon koten bungaku daijiten 日本古典文学大辞典. 6 vols. Iwanami Shoten, 1984–1985.

Ogawa 1994

Ogawa Hisako 小川寿子. "Meigetsu ki ni miru Teika to Go-Toba jōkō shikō: Kumano gokō to Kawakami gokō kara" 『明月記』にみる定家と後鳥羽上皇私考: 熊野御幸と川上御幸から. *Fuji ronsō* 富士論叢 39:2 (1994), pp. 292-310.

Ōtori 1988

Ōtori Kazuma 大取一馬. *Shinchokusen wakashū kochūshaku to sono kenkyū* 新勅撰和歌集古注釈とその研究. 2 vols. Shibunkaku Shuppan, 1988.

Ōtori 1994

Ōtori Kazuma. "Shinchokusen wakashū" 新勅撰和歌集. In *Chūsei no waka* 中世の和歌, vol. 7 of *Waka bungaku kōza* 和歌文学講座. Benseisha, 1994.

Reizei Tamesuke-bon Gosen wakashū okugaki

Reizei Tamesuke-bon Gosen wakashū okugaki 冷泉為相本後撰和歌集奥書. In Kubota 1994a and Hosono 1956.

Sansom 1958

George Sansom. *A History of Japan to 1334*. Stanford University Press, 1958.

Satō 1991

Satō Tsuneo 佐藤恒雄. "Shinchokusen wakashū seiritsu e no michi" 新勅撰和歌集成立への道. In *Shinkokinshū to sono jidai* 新古今集とその時代, vol. 8 of *Waka bungaku ronshū* 和歌文学論集. Kazama Shobō, 1991.

Seiashō

Seiashō 井蛙抄. In vol. 5 of *Nihon kagaku taikei*, ed. Sasaki Nobutsuna and Kyūsojin Hitaku. Kazama Shobō, 1957.

Senzaishū

Senzaishū 千載集. SNKB 10, ed. Katano Tatsurō 片野達郎 and Matsuno Yōichi 松野陽一.

Shimazu 1973

Shimazu Tadao 島津忠夫. *Hyakunin isshu* 百人一首. Rev. ed. Kadokawa Shoten, 1973.

Shinchokusenshū

Shinchokusen wakashū 新勅撰和歌集. Ed. Kyūsojin Hitaku and Higuchi Yoshimaro. Iwanami bunko 30-134-1. Iwanami Shoten, 1961.

Shinchokusenshū hyōchū

Shinchokusenshū hyōchū 新勅撰集評註. In vol. 9 of *Keichū zenshū* 契沖全集, ed. Hisamatsu Sen'ichi 久松潜一 et al. Iwanami Shoten, 1974.

Shinchokusen wakashū (Nihon Koten Bungakukai)

Shinchokusen wakashū. Ed. Nihon Koten Bungakukai 日本古典文学会. Kichōhon Kankōkai, 1980.

Shinchokusen wakashū (Eisei Bunko)

Shinchokusen wakashū. Ed. [Hosokawa-ke] Eisei Bunko [細川家] 永青文庫. Kyūko Shoin, 1983.

Shinchokusen wakashū zenshaku

Shinchokusen wakashū zenshaku 新勅撰和歌集全釈. Ed. Kansaku Kōichi 神作光一 and Hasegawa Tetsuo 長谷川哲夫. Kazama Shobō, 1994-.

Shinkokinshū

Shinkokinshū 新古今集. NKBT 28, ed. Hisamatsu Sen'ichi 久松潜一 et al., 1958.

Shōji sōjō

Shōji sōjō 正治奏状. In vol. 10 of *Gunsho ruijū*. Keizai Zasshisha, 1894.

Shōkeimon-in goryō mokuroku

Shōkeimon-in goryō mokuroku 昭慶門院御領目録. In vol. 29 of *Kamakura ibun* 鎌倉遺文, ed. Takeuchi Rizō 竹内理三. 42 vols. Tōkyōdō Shuppan, 1971-1995.

Shujing

Shujing 書經. Vol. 3, pt. 2 of *The Chinese Classics*, ed. and trans. James Legge. London: Henry Frowde; Chinese reprint, 1939; bilingual edition.

Siegmund 1978

Ingrid Siegmund. *Die Politik des Exkaisers Gotoba und die historischen Hintergründe des Shōkyū no ran unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Masukagami*. Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, 1978.

Sonpi bunmyaku

Sonpi bunmyaku 尊卑分脈. Ed. Kuroita Katsumi 黑板勝美. 5 vols. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1980.

“Sōsei okugaki-bon Shinchokusenshū”

“Kunaichō Shoryōbu-zō Sōsei okugaki-bon Shinchokusenshū” 宮内庁書陵部蔵宋世奥書本新勅撰集. 3 vols. Doc. no. 155:139. Kunaichō Shoryōbu, Tokyo.

Stanley-Baker 1984

Joan Stanley-Baker. *Japanese Art*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1984.

Tanaka 1969

Tanaka Yutaka 田中裕. *Chūsei bungakuron kenkyū* 中世文学論研究. Hanawa Shobō, 1969.

Tanaka 1995

Tanaka Yutaka. *Go-Toba to Teika kenkyū* 後鳥羽と定家研究. Osaka: Izumi Shobō, 1995.

Tokuhara 1994

Tokuhara Shigemi 徳原茂美. “Hyakunin isshu seiritsuron no henshen” 百人一首成立論の変遷. In *Hyakunin isshu to shūkasen* 百人一首と秀歌撰, vol. 9 of *Waka bungaku ronshū* 和歌文学論集. Kazama Shobō, 1994.

Tsuji 1977

Tsuji Hikosaburō 辻彦三郎. *Fujiwara no Teika Meigetsu ki no kenkyū* 藤原定家明月記の研究. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1977.

Tsunoda 1983

Tsunoda Bun'ei 角田文衛. *Ōchōshi no kiseki* 王朝史の軌跡. Gakutōsha, 1983.

Tubielewicz 1980

Jolanta Tubielewicz. *Superstitions, Magic and Mantic Practices in the Heian Period*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 1980.

Uwayokote 1994

Uwayokote Masataka 上横手雅敬. *Kamakura jidai: Sono hikari to kage* 鎌倉時代: その光と影. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1994.

Varley 1982

H. Paul Varley. “The Hōjō Family and Succession to Power.” In *Court and Bakufu in Japan: Essays in Kamakura History*, ed. Jeffrey P. Mass. Yale University Press, 1982.

Waka genzaisho mokuroku

Waka genzaisho mokuroku 和歌現在書目録. In vol. 17 of *Zoku gunsho ruijū*. Keizai Zasshisha, 1912.

Wakan kensakushū

Wakan kensakushū 和漢兼作集. In *Zushoryō sōkan: Heian Kamakura mikan shishū* 図書寮叢刊:平安鎌倉未刊詩集, ed. Kunaichō Shoryōbu. Kunaichō Shoryōbu, 1972.

Watanabe 1996

Watanabe Yasuaki 渡部泰明. “Waka no kakushin” 和歌の革新. In vol. 4 of *Iwanami kōza Nihon bungakushi* 岩波講座日本文学史, ed. Kubota Jun et al. Iwanami Shoten, 1996.

Wenxuan

Wenxuan 文選. 6 vols. Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Chubanshe, 1986.

Yamada 1966

Yamada Shōzen 山田昭全. “Kakinomoto no Hitomaro eigu no seiritsu to tenkai: Bukkyō to bungaku to no sesshoku ni shiten o oite” 柿本人麿影供の成立と展開:仏教

と文学との接触に視点を置いて. *Taishō Daigaku kenkyū kiyō* 大正大学研究紀要 51 (1966), pp. 44-124.

Yasuda 1975

Yasuda Ayao 安田章生. *Fujiwara no Teika kenkyū (zōhoban)* 藤原定家研究 (増補版). Shibundō, 1975.

Yoshida 1971

Yoshida Kōichi 吉田幸一. “Hyakunin isschu wa Fujiwara no Teika no sen ka: Ogura shikishi no senpitsu kara Hyakunin isschu seisho no seiritsu made” 「百人一首」は藤原定家の撰か: 「小倉色紙」の染筆から「百人一首」成書の成立まで. In *Hyakunin isschu kochū* 百人一首古註. Koten Bunko, 1971.

Yu 1987

Pauline Yu. *The Reading of Imagery in the Chinese Poetic Tradition*. Princeton University Press, 1987.