

## The Politics of Poetics: Socioeconomic Tensions in Kyoto Waka Salons and Matsunaga Teitoku's Critique of Kinoshita Chōshōshi

©Scott Alexander Lineberger, Beloit College

The poetic salons in Kyoto during the early Tokugawa period were vivified by the simmering tension between the factions of Matsunaga Teitoku 松永貞徳 (1571-1654) and Kinoshita Chōshōshi 木下長嘯子 (1569-1649). These two poets hailed from fundamentally different socio-economic backgrounds, displayed contrasting personalities, developed diametrically opposed views on the proper decorum for composing waka, and competed against each other at poetry contests. They were also surprisingly fast friends.

Chōshōshi, the nephew of Toyotomi Hideyoshi 豊臣秀吉 (1536-1598), held various distinguished military positions until his faction's resounding defeat at the Battle of Sekigahara, after which he retired to luxurious seclusion just outside Kyoto. Teitoku, on the other hand, was born as the second son of a minor renga poet in the commoner district of Kyoto and through diligent effort overcame his relatively modest social standing to create vast intellectual and artistic networks. Although both men studied the art of poetic composition under the prominent daimyo-poet Hosokawa Yūsai 細川幽齋 (1534-1610), they responded to his version of the Nijō-lineage orthodoxy in fundamentally contrasting ways. Teitoku revered Yūsai with nearly religious devotion, zealously preserving and transmitting his teachings. Chōshōshi, on the other hand, adopted highly iconoclastic approaches to scholarship and composition, brusquely flouting literary precedents and social conventions as he saw fit.

Despite these fundamental differences, Teitoku and Chōshōshi remained on friendly terms for over five decades until Chōshōshi's death in 1649. Abundant personal records detail intense but affable disagreements at poetry gatherings as well as frequent poetic exchanges between the two poets throughout their long acquaintance. They also were active in the same social circles which included such luminaries as Neo-Confucian scholars Fujiwara Seika 藤原惺窩 (1561-1619) and Ha-

yashi Razan 林羅山 (1583-1657); courtier-poet Nakanoin Michikatsu 中院通勝 (1556-1610); Shinto scholar Yoshida Bonshun 吉田梵舜 (1553-1632); comic writer Anrakuan Sakuden 安楽庵策伝 (1554-1642); *chanoyu* practitioner and garden designer Kobori Enshū 小堀遠州 (1579-1647); raconteur Ōmura Yūko 大村由己 (1536-1596); Tokugawa governmental officials Itakura Katsushige 板倉勝重 (1545-1624) and his son Shigemune 重宗 (1586-1657); and affluent merchants such as Suminokura Soan 角倉素庵 (1571-1631).<sup>1</sup>

Immediately after Chōshōshi's death, however, a quarrel erupted in the normally placid world of Kyoto's waka salons that suggested profound resentment and discontent was festering between the poetic factions headed by Teitoku and Chōshōshi. The incident was sparked by the publication of Chōshōshi's personal poetry and prose collection, *Kyohakushū* 挙白集 (Collection of Offered Cups of Sake, 1649), which was compiled by Uda Kin'nori 打它公軌 (?-1647) and his son Kagenori 景軌 (dates uncertain) along with Yamamoto Shunshō 山本春正 (1610-1682).<sup>2</sup> Within months of the publication of the anthology, a scathing critique of its content and the compilers, titled *Nan-kyohakushū* 難挙白集 (Critique of *Kyohakushū*), was published under the pseudonym Jinkyūbō 尋旧坊. Many scholars assume that *Critique of Kyohakushū* actually was composed by either Teitoku or a close disciple in part because Kin'nori, Kagenori, and Shunshō had all defected from Teitoku's school to study under Chōshōshi. Viewed from Teitoku's point of view, Chōshōshi's experimental poetic style was problematical, but because Chōshōshi operated on the fringes of the Kyoto poetic circles he did not pose a major treat until Kin'nori, Kagenori, and Shunshō published his collected works. Thus, it is the text of *Kyohakushū* and the three disciples who compiled it, not Chōshōshi himself, who received

<sup>1</sup> For information about the intellectual and artistic groups in Kyoto during this period see Odaka Toshio, *Kinsei shoki bundan no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Meiji Shoin, 1964) and Kamakura Isao, *Kan'ei bunka no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1988).

<sup>2</sup> The collection's title references Kyo-hakudō 挙白堂, the name of Chōshōshi's residence.

the brunt of the attack in *Critique of Kyohakushū*. This confrontation left an indelible mark on how the relationship between Teitoku and Chōshōshi has been interpreted, highlighting the latent socioeconomic tensions between them.

Through a close reading of *Critique of Kyohakushū* and *Taionki* 戴恩記 (Records of Favors Received), a memoir and poetic treatise that Teitoku completed in 1644, this article will examine Teitoku's complicated relationship with Chōshōshi, focusing on the two poets' contrasting approaches to interpreting the classical canon, their distinct poetic styles, and the complex changes in literary practice that transpired in the first few decades of the Tokugawa period. Although based on starkly different methodologies, Teitoku and Chōshōshi both played vital roles in the shift from the medieval tradition of oral transmissions (*kokin denju* 古今伝授) of the canon to the kind of positivistic philological scholarship based on objective evidence developed by early Kokugakusha 国学者 such as Keichū 契沖 (1640-1701).<sup>3</sup> Likewise, their innovations in poetics and poetic practice provided the underpinnings for the startling literary revolution of the Genroku period (1688-1704). Particular attention will be given to the shifting social dynamics in Kyoto's poetic salons engendered by the gradual infiltration of the merchant and artisan classes into these previously exclusively aristocratic circles and the resultant transformation of poetic taste that paved the way for the rise of the popular genres of haikai 俳諧 and *kyōka* 狂歌.

### Biographies

Chōshōshi took a rather circuitous route to becoming one of the most acclaimed and infamous poets of the early Tokugawa period. He was born in Owari province (Aichi Prefecture) as the first son of Kinoshita Iesada 木下家定 (1543-1608), a power-

ful warlord of the Azuchi-Momoyama period. About the time of Chōshōshi's birth, Iesada's sister, O-Nene, became the principal wife of Toyotomi Hideyoshi.<sup>4</sup> This marriage later provided critical opportunities for Chōshōshi because he served Hideyoshi from an early age and quickly rose through the ranks of the hegemon's army. In 1587, at the age of nineteen, Chōshōshi was given charge of Tatsuno castle in Harima (Hyōgo Prefecture) and the next year he converted to Christianity, taking the name Pierre. Then, in 1590 he participated in Hideyoshi's massive siege of the Hōjō clan at Odawara, which he documented in the journal *Azuma no michi no ki* あづまのみちの記 (Record of a Journey to Azuma).<sup>5</sup> In 1592 he led a force of 1500 men in Hideyoshi's invasions of Korea, an experience that he detailed in the poetic dairy *Kyūshū no michi no ki* 九州の道の記 (Record of a Journey to Kyūshū). In this text Chōshōshi records episodes such as a day in Kashima when he entertained the locals with a display of his *kemari* skills—this relaxed, almost flippant, attitude both mirrors Hideyoshi's casual bearing on campaigns and presages Chōshōshi's later approach to poetry. As a reward for his faithful military service, in 1594 Hideyoshi put Chōshōshi in charge of Obama castle in Wakasa province (Fukui Prefecture), which entailed a 80,000 *koku* income. During these years Chōshōshi began to seriously study poetry composition. For example, in 1587 he participated with Hideyoshi in a poetic gathering in honor of the memory of Emperor Antoku 安徳天皇 (1178-1185) at Amida Temple in Shimonoseki, so it is clear that he had begun his poetic career by this time.<sup>6</sup> Records also indicate that during the Korean campaign Chōshōshi began to study *waka* with

<sup>4</sup> She is often referred to as Kita no mandokoro 北政所 (the title she was given when Hideyoshi was appointed to the post of Kampaku) or Kōdai-in 高台院, the Buddhist name she took after Hideyoshi's death.

<sup>5</sup> Shimanaka Michinori, "Kinoshita Chōshōshi hito to sakuhiin," in *Kinsei no waka Waka bungaku kōza* volume 8, edited by Shimazu Tadao and Ariyoshi Tamotsu. (Tokyo: Benseisha, 1994), 69.

<sup>6</sup> Tsuda Shūzō, "Kinoshita Chōshōshi-den zakkō," *Kyūshū Daigaku gobun kenkyū* 48 (1979): 19.

<sup>3</sup> In this article I intentionally eschew translating the term *kokin denju* 古今伝授 as "secret transmission" because doing so misleadingly connotes that the emphasis of this practice was on secrecy. As will be made clear in the following sections, the actual hallmark of this practice was the oral transmission of knowledge from master to disciple.

Yūsai.

As was the case for so many men of his generation, Chōshōshi's fortunes took a sudden turn in 1600 at the Battle of Sekigahara. In the days leading up to the battle, Chōshōshi was placed in a difficult position as he had familial ties to both the Toyotomi and the Tokugawa, the two principal combatants. At the time, Chōshōshi was serving under Torii Mototada 鳥居元忠 (1539-1600) in defense of Fushima Castle. When Ishida Mitsunari's 石田三成 (1560-1600) forces approached, however, Chōshōshi abandoned his post and fled to Kyoto, forsaking his duty. In the aftermath of the war the Tokugawa stripped him of his domain, but spared his life and allowed him to retain much of his fortune. Still only thirty-two years old, Chōshōshi divorced his wife and retired to a villa at Higashiyama Ryōzan 東山靈山, which with the support of aunt Kita no mandokoro, he was able to expand and remodel.

According to *Sanka no ki* 山家の記 (Record of My Mountain Hut), Chōshōshi's account of his eremitic life that is included in *Kyohakushū*, he lived at this villa for the next four decades in seeming peace and tranquility. Chōshōshi refused to accept payment for correcting students' verses (a key source of income for most poetry teachers of the time); this act attests to his material comfort during these years. In 1641, however, Chōshōshi moved from Higashiyama to Oshioyama 小塩山 in western Kyoto. At the time, Teitoku and Chōshōshi exchanged the following verses:

たかき名を世にのこしつゝほとゝぎすふ  
かき山路にいりにけるかな

takaki na wo  
yo ni nokoshi tsutsu  
hototogisu  
fukaki yamaji ni  
irinikeru kana

Cuckoo,  
leaving behind a grand reputation  
in this world,  
you have ascended  
deep along the mountain path. Teitoku

Chōshōshi responded:

み山いでゝ里なれぬれど時鳥きかぬは人の  
またぬなるべし

miyama idete  
sato narenuredo  
hototogisu  
kikanu wa hito no  
matanu narubeshi

The cuckoo  
departs from the deep mountains  
and frequents the village.  
People do not hear its song  
only because they do not wait. Chōshōshi<sup>7</sup>

Texts such as *Kinsei kijinden* 近世畸人伝 (Biographies of Eccentric People of Recent Times, 1790) speculate that Chōshōshi had to move because he could no longer afford to maintain the residence at Higashiyama. Considering his wealth at the time of his retirement and close connections to key military and political leaders, this interpretation might appear somewhat implausible. As Odaka Toshio points out, however, in the decades after his retirement the Toyotomi family had been destroyed and he had lost family support, so it is entirely possible that he had fallen on hard economic times.<sup>8</sup> This view is supported by the following poem by Chōshōshi:

Upon leaving Higashiyama with no place to go.

いける日の宿のけふりそ先たゆるつひのた  
きぎの身はのこれども

ikeru hi no  
yado no keburu zo  
mazu tayuru  
tsuhi no takigi no  
mi ha nokoredomo

As the day passes  
the smoke rising from the lodging  
tapers off first  
though the last log

<sup>7</sup> Odaka Toshio, *Matsunaga Teitoku no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Shibundō, 1956), 272.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 274.

of firewood remains.<sup>9</sup>

The poem creates a general sense of wistful nostalgia, whereas the foretext generates the specific impression that Chōshōshi left his Higashiyama hermitage in dire straits. *Critique of Kyohakushū* picks up on the apparent contradiction between the foretext and the poem:

This is a very moving poem but, the manner in which it is presented here is dubious. In a letter addressed to Anrakuan that included this poem, Chōshōshi wrote “Please lend me money.” I saw the poem written in his own hand. Based on that letter, the sense of the poem is very clear and becomes all the more moving. The phrase “with no place to go” in the foretext are the words of the compilers. They changed the foretext when they put this poem in the anthology. There is no sense that he is leaving without a place to go in the poem. Why would they change it? If they did so because they thought it sounded improper that he was borrowing money, then that conversely would be rather unsympathetic on their part. (*Nan-kyohakushū*, 77-78)

The author of *Critique of Kyohakushū* clearly takes great pleasure in exposing Chōshōshi’s embarrassing situation. Although *Critique of Kyohakushū* endeavors to portray Chōshōshi and his disciples in as unflattering a light as possible, it is difficult to believe that its author would fabricate this story. The claims presented in *Critique of Kyohakushū* cannot be corroborated by other sources, but Chōshōshi’s last years apparently were not particularly happy. He was separated from his family and his once powerful political connections had been totally eradicated in the new era. In his last years Chōshōshi must have looked back longingly on the sanguine days of his youth.

Teitoku was born in 1571, just two years after Chōshōshi. He was the second son of Matsunaga Eishu 松永永種 (1538-1598), a man of samurai heritage, who due to the chaos of the times was reduced to working as a professional renga poet.

<sup>9</sup> Yoshida Kōichi, ed., *Chōshōshi zenshū*, volume 4 (Tokyo: Koten Bunko, 1973), 77. Hereafter cited in text as “*Nan-kyohakushū*.”

After Teitoku’s older brother Otokuma took the tonsure and became a Nichiren monk, Eishu selected Teitoku to follow in his professional footsteps and become a poet. Thus, from a young age Teitoku studied all of the fields requisite for a professional renga teacher, often from the leading practitioners in their respective fields. Teitoku’s career later evolved along an unexpected vector, so his education continued far beyond that necessary for a renga poet as he developed into one of the foremost literary scholars of his time. He began studying classical literature at age ten and received a proprietary oral transmission of the *Tale of Genji* from Kujō Tanemichi 九条植通 (1506-1594), heir to the scholarly traditions of Sanjonishi Sanetaka 三条西実隆 (1455-1537). By the age of fifteen he was practicing linked verse intently with Satomura Jōha 里村紹巴 (1527-1602), a friend of his father and the foremost renga poet of the day. Later Teitoku studied a variety of arts, particularly waka composition, from Yūsai. Teitoku also studied *kyōka*, *kanshi* 漢詩, and *wakan renga* 和漢連句 (linked verse combining Japanese and Chinese verses) from Eiho Eiyū 英甫永雄 (1547-1602, also commonly known as Yūchōrō 雄長老), a Renzai Zen priest affiliated with Ken’nenji Temple. In fact, Teitoku’s cultural and literary education was so extensive that *Taionki* 戴恩記 (Records of Favors Received, 1644) lists more than fifty prominent scholars, poets, aristocrats, and intellectuals who mentored him.

Throughout his childhood and most of his adult life Teitoku lived at the intersection of Sanjō Avenue and Koromonotana Street 三条衣棚 in Shimogyō 下京区 (Lower Capital), the so-called commoner section of Kyoto.<sup>10</sup> His affection for this area of the city often appears in his haikai verses.

春たつは衣の棚のかすみかな

haru tatsu wa  
koromo no tana no

<sup>10</sup> Koromonotana Street did not exist in the original layout of the city during the Heian period. It was created during Hideyoshi’s reforms of the city during the Tenshō period (1573-93). In the Edo period there were many haberdashers located on this street and the adjacent Muromachi-dori.

kasumi kana

spring begins  
in the Robe Bureau district  
with bolts cut from mist<sup>11</sup>

Although Teitoku is remembered today mainly for his haikai poetry, most of his scholarly, pedagogical, and creative energy was focused on preserving the traditions of waka. *Shōyūshū* 逍遊集 (Shōyū's Collected Poems), a collection of Teitoku's waka published in 1677 by his disciple Wada Ietsu 和田以悦 (1596-1679) to mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of Teitoku's death, contains over 2750 poems, demonstrating the extent of Teitoku's devotion to the art. Teitoku taught about waka and the poetic canon in an array of contexts, both public and private. He wrote numerous commentaries on classical texts, some of which were transmitted exclusively to select disciples via autograph manuscripts while others were published and widely disseminated. Teitoku was also a pioneer in publicly teaching the classics. In 1603, at the request of the Confucian scholar Hayashi Razan, he famously gave lectures on *Tsurezuregusa* 徒然草 (*Essays in Idleness*) and *Hyakunin isshu* 百人一首 (A Hundred Poets, One Poem Each). Based on these efforts and the transmission of oral teachings from Yūsai, Teitoku came to lead the so-called *jige* 地下 (commoner) lineage of literary scholarship in the Edo period, which included his disciples such as Wada Ietsu, Kitamura Kigin 北村季吟 (1625-1705), Katō Bansai 加藤盤斎 (1621-1674), and Mochizuki Chōkō 望月長孝 (1619-1681). Late in life his philological inclination took the form of a scholarly project aimed at systematically classifying poetic words in lexicons including: *Waka hōju* 和歌寶樹 (The Jeweled Trees of Waka, date uncertain), *Karin bokusoku* 歌林樸櫛 (Scrubby Tree in the

<sup>11</sup> Abe Kimio and Asō Isoji, eds., *Kinsei haiku haibunshū* NKBT 92 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1964), 36. This poem is constructed around two complex puns. The term “tatsu” can mean: 1. for spring to begin, 2. cutting fabric, and 3. for mist to rise. “Tana” means: 1. a type of furnishing, 2. a description of trailing mist (kasumi no tana), and 3. a place name.

Poetic Forest, date uncertain), and *Wakuge* 和句解 (Explanations of Japanese Terms, early 1620?).<sup>12</sup> Teitoku also ran a private academy for the children of townsmen that educated many of the next generation of cultural luminaries in diverse fields such as Confucian studies, poetry, and medicine, including Itō Jinsai 伊藤仁齋 (1627-1705) and Kinoshita Jun'an 木下順庵 (1621-1699). Teitoku even composed a textbook for primary-school students titled *Teitoku bunshū* 貞徳文集 (Teitoku's Collection of Letters, 1650), which provides a treasure-trove of information about the daily lives of Kyoto townsmen during the early Edo period.<sup>13</sup>

When Teitoku turned sixty-four, his life went through a radical transformation. As a devout Buddhist, Teitoku made a practice of purchasing fish and birds at the markets and releasing them. One night after having freed some loach into a river he dreamt about the fish speaking to him.<sup>14</sup> He interpreted this dream to mean that he had exhausted his allotted lifespan and continued to live on thanks only to these good deeds. He thereafter claimed to be reborn, took the childlike name Chōzumaro 長頭丸, began wearing young boy's clothing, and counting his age from one. He turned over his school to his son, Matsuei Sekigo 松永尺五 (1592-1657), and retired to a hermitage on the grounds of the Hanasaku Inari Shrine 花咲稻荷社 at Gojō Avenue. Around this time Teitoku began to more actively compose haikai poetry. In particular, Teitoku came to the forefront of the world of haikai in 1633 with the publication of the *Enokoshū* 犬子集 (Puppy Collection), an anthology of the haikai poetry of his school. In his later years, despite intermittent eye ailments, Teitoku oversaw the compilation of several major haikai anthologies

<sup>12</sup> For more information about these texts see Nishida Masahiro, *Matsunaga Teitoku to monryūno gakugei no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 2006), 30-80 and Shimamoto Shōichi, *Matsunaga Teitoku: Haikaishi e no michi* (Tokyo: Hōsei Daigaku Shuppankyoku, 1989), 150-157.

<sup>13</sup> This text is an example of an *ōraimono* 往来物, a common form of premodern textbook consisting of a group of letters listed chronologically.

<sup>14</sup> Shimamoto, *Matsunaga Teitoku*, iv.

with his disciples: *Takatsukubashū* 鷹筑波集 (Hawk of Tsukuba Collection, 1638), *Konzanshū* 崑山集 (Kunlun Mountain Collection, 1651), and *Gyokkaishū* 玉海集 (Jeweled Sea Collection, 1656). Additionally, Teitoku composed several handbooks and manuals for haikai composition including *Shinzōku inutsukuba-shū* 新增犬筑波集 (New Supplemented Doggerel Tsukuba Collection, 1643), *Tensuishō* 天水抄 (Notes of Collected Rain, 1644), and *Haikai gosan* 俳諧御傘 (Haikai Umbrella, 1651).

In contrast to the decidedly bleak ending to Chōshōshi's life, Teitoku's last years were filled with joy and satisfaction. He lived in material comfort as he had done quite well for himself financially and his family-life appears to have been quite content. Teitoku must have been particularly proud of his son Sekigo, who had constructed a prominent Confucian academy named *Kōshūdō* 講習堂 on Horikawa Street across from Nijō Castle with patronage of the Kyoto *shoshidai*.<sup>15</sup> Also, in his last years Teitoku was able to build a remarkable residence called *Kakisono* 柿園 (Permission Curtilage) just to the southwest of the Great Buddha Hall at Hōkōji 方広寺 on land granted to him by Cloistered Prince Gyōnen 堯然法親王 (1602-1661). He originally hoped to construct an elaborate compound including a ward for sick and orphaned children, but due to funding issues had to settle for a slightly more modest design centered on a hall for poetry called *Ashi-no-Maruya*, which became an important center of poetic activity in the city. Ever the fervent Nichiren Buddhist, Teitoku continued to carry out the practice of releasing sparrows and swallows so often that the site came to be nicknamed *Hōjōen* 放生園 (Garden of Emancipation).

By all accounts, Teitoku contentedly passed his last years in this urban sanctuary surrounded and supported by his family as well as numerous students and disciples. The jovial tone of this period in Teitoku's life is aptly captured in a verse from a linked poem included in the Bashō school collection *Fuyu no hi* 冬の日 (Winter Sun, 1684).

桃花をたをる貞徳の富  
正平

tōka wo taoru  
Teitoku no tomi

taking a peach blossom in his hand  
the wealth of Teitoku  
Shōhei<sup>16</sup>

Teitoku died in 1653 at the age of eighty-three and was laid to rest at Jisōji 実相寺 in southern Kyoto.

### The Controversy Surrounding *Kyohakushū*

Throughout most of their lives Teitoku and Chōshōshi were close associates and friendly rivals, participating together in poetry gatherings and exchanging verses on various ceremonial occasions. As both men studied waka under Yūsai, their poetics were ostensibly built upon the same foundation of the traditional Nijō style. Moreover, both men were keenly aware that they lived in an age of radical social change and this understanding is clearly reflected in their poetic practice. Teitoku resolved to embrace the conservative and orthodox aspects of Nijō waka, choosing to use the genres of *kyōka* and haikai to explore new avenues of expression. On the other hand, after Chōshōshi became an eremite in Higashiyama he decided to break from the Nijō tradition and develop an unconventional style of waka. Despite these differences Teitoku and Chōshōshi attended poetry meetings together until their later years with no signs of discord and Teitoku even composed a eulogistic poem after Chōshōshi's death in 1649, so on the surface at least Teitoku and Chōshōshi appear to have remained on friendly terms.

Within months of Chōshōshi's death, his personal poetry and prose collection, *Kyohakushū* 挙白集 was compiled by his disciples Kin'nori, Kagenori, and Shunshō. In the second month of the next year a text titled *Nan-Kyohakushū* 難挙白集 (*Critique of Kyohakushū*) was published under the fictional name Jinkyūbō 尋旧坊. Jinkyūbō was keenly aware and quite piqued by the popularity of

<sup>15</sup> John Allen Tucker, *Itō Jinsai's Gomō Jigi and the Philosophical Definition of Early Modern Japan* (Boston: Brill, 1998), 40.

<sup>16</sup> Shiraishi Teizō and Ueno Yōzō, eds., *Bashō shichibushū* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1990), 8.

Chōshōshi's style among all classes of people, stating: "Chōshōshi was a renowned poet, so poems he composed one day could be heard recited on street corners in the merchant's market the very next day and the words he composed in the morning would be sung in the fields by peasant women in the evening. His poetry was even more popular among the discerning nobility" (*Nan-kyohakushū*, 4). The contemptuous tone of *Critique of Kyohakushū* is summed up elegantly and callously in the following statement from the afterword: "This collection breaks the rules of our ancestors, pilfers both old and new phrases already established by previous masters and contains poems of heretical form and vulgar diction, so it should be called the *Collection of Broken Laws and Stolen Words* or the *Demon's Profane Style Collection*" (*Nan-kyohakushū*, 100).

The dispute continued to fester with the publication of *Kyohaku shinhyō* 拳白心評 (*A Considered Evaluation of Kyohakushū*, 1650), in which another anonymous author evaluates both factions from a more objective point-of-view, concluding that both sides are "biased."<sup>17</sup> This dispute caused such a stir in the capital that it is jokingly referenced in the introduction of *Tōgenshū* 桃源集 (*A Guide to Peaches*), a 1655 guidebook to the Shimabara pleasure quarter:

In our country Tsunenobu wrote *Criticism of the Goshūishū* to critique the *Goshūishū*. *Tale of Gion* was composed as a response to *Tale of Kiyomizu*. *Crushing Evil and Reveling Virtue* was mocked in *Remonstrance of Superstitions*. *Blown Fur Grass* is ridiculed in *Icehouse Guard*. After *Critique of Kyohakushū* was composed to criticize *Kyohakushū*, *A Considered Evaluation of Kyohakushū* appeared. Based on these precedents it is only a matter of time until *Criticism of a Guide to Peaches* appears. My defense will be withering.<sup>18</sup>

Considerable scholarship has been conducted in an attempt to ascertain the identity of the author of

<sup>17</sup> Yoshida Kōichi, ed., *Chōshōshi zenshū*, volume 4 (Tokyo: Koten Bunko, 1973), 111. Hereafter cited in text as "Kyohaku."

<sup>18</sup> Odaka Toshio, *Matsunaga Teitoku no kenkyū zokuhen* (Tokyo: Shibundō, 1956), 101.

*Critique of Kyohakushū* because solving that mystery would provide valuable insight into the relationship between Teitoku and Chōshōshi as well as the workings of the contemporary poetic society. This scholarship has resulted in four main theories concerning the identity of the author.<sup>19</sup> The oldest theory holds that the text was written by a member of the aristocracy who opposed Chōshōshi's radical innovations on the grounds that they were an affront to traditional decorum. In contrast, Yamamoto Kashō and Tsuda Shūzō have posited that the text represents a factional struggle among non-aristocratic groups, arguing that Teitoku composed the text himself out of his long-standing resentment toward the traditions of the art of waka. Odaka Toshio and Yoshida Kōichi have speculated that while Teitoku was not directly involved, someone from Teitoku's group composed the text in order to give voice to feelings of umbrage their temperate master was reticent to express. The final theory, forwarded in recent years by Okamoto Satoshi, presents a radical new interpretation by proposing that the text was composed by a poet from Chōshōshi's own group, probably a long-standing disciple who resented being overlooked for the duty of compiling the master's anthology.

The only solid information about the identity of the author is provided in the preface of *Critique of Kyohakushū*, where the author states that he came to the capital about twenty years earlier (around 1630), but was not involved in poetry circles (*Nan-kyohakushū*, 4). The statement about when the author arrived in the capital is corroborated by internal textual evidence, particularly references to various poetic ceremonies in Kyoto from 1633 to 1649. The claim about the author not being involved in poetic circles, however, is highly dubious. The evaluations of Chōshōshi's poetry in the text are clearly based on Nijō poetics and in the commentary on the very first poem in the collection the author uses the phrase "honored theory of our lineage" 当流の御説 (*Nan-kyohakushū*, 7). This term is closely associated with the Nijō lineage and the fact that it is used in a discussion concerning the proper pronunciation of a poem from *A Hundred Poets, One Poem Each*, a favorite text in the Nijō

<sup>19</sup> Okamoto Satoshi, *Kinoshita Chōshōshi kenkyū* (Tokyo: Ōfū, 2003), 56-57.

lineage, only adds to the impression that this text was composed by someone with close ties to the Nijō faction. All of this evidence also points to the possibility that Teitoku, a devoted adherent of the Nijō school, was either directly or indirectly involved in the creation of the text.

There are other compelling reasons to believe that Teitoku could have been involved in the creation of *Critique of Kyohakushū*. Chōshōshi's privileged upbringing, advantageous social connections, and impertinent attitude toward the Nijō traditions certainly could have provided Teitoku ample motive for such an attack. Moreover, Kin'nori, Kagenori, and Shunshō—the three men who compiled and published *Kyohakushū*—are all said to have defected from Teitoku's school to study under Chōshōshi in the late 1630's or early 1640's. These kinds of defections would be painful in any case, but Kin'nori and Kagenori were prosperous merchants and Shunshō was a renowned lacquer artist, so their defections could have had a serious economic impact on Teitoku's group. Another factor that points to Teitoku possibly being involved is the numerous references in the text to the kind of inside information that only someone in Teitoku's position could have known, such as the dates certain private poetry meetings were held, the poets who attended, and even the weather on those days.

There are, however, equally compelling reasons to believe that Teitoku was not involved in composing *Critique of Kyohakushū*. As mentioned previously, the dateable entries in *Critique of Kyohakushū* range from 1633 to Chōshōshi's death in 1649. Teitoku knew Chōshōshi for some sixty years, so it would be rather odd for him to limit himself to discussing only this limited period. Also, while the author clearly has some inside information about the goings-on of various poetic gatherings, he seems unaware of other key facts Teitoku clearly would have known. Moreover, key passages in *Critique of Kyohakushū* explicitly praise Teitoku and his poetry. As Odaka points out, the intended audience of the text was the members of the tightly-knit world of the Kyoto poetic salons, many of whom may very well have known the real identity of the author, so it is all but impossible to believe that Teitoku would do something as tactless as praise his own poems.<sup>20</sup> Also, Okamoto argues that although

the students of Teitoku and Chōshōshi are often depicted as being at odds, there was actually considerable collaboration between the two groups even after the publication of *Critique of Kyohakushū*.<sup>21</sup> They included each other's poems in collections and participated together in poetry meetings. Finally, Teitoku specifically mentions the attacks on *Goshūiwakashū* 後拾遺和歌集 (Collection of Later Gleanings 1086), which are often cited as a precedent for *Critique of Kyohakushū*, as an example of unseemly behavior that should never be emulated. Thus, based on Teitoku's restrained personality and the impassioned statements he made about the importance of maintaining harmonious personal relations, it is very difficult to believe that he could have been responsible for a text like *Critique of Kyohakushū*.

Barring the discovery of new evidence, determining with any certainty whether or not Teitoku was involved in composing *Critique of Kyohakushū* does not appear to be possible. All that we know for certain is that *Critique of Kyohakushū* was composed by an author, or perhaps a group of authors, in order to attack the work of Kin'nori, Kagenori, and Shunshō in compiling *Kyohakushū*. In other words, there is little textual evidence to support the traditional perception that Teitoku and Chōshōshi were personally involved in a fierce rivalry. This incident, however, generates intriguing interpretive possibilities for Teitoku's memoirs and poetic treatises. When read in a contextual vacuum Teitoku's writings on poetics, particularly the last section of *Record of Favors Received*, can appear like an inventory of trivial personal anecdotes and a hackneyed rehashing of issues already thoroughly debated in medieval texts. When read in the cross-lighting of the latent conflict with Chōshōshi, however, these passages suddenly come to life with complex personal dynamics that resonate with the socioeconomic issues rife in the poetic salons of Kyoto during this period of dramatic political transformation. The second half of this paper will explore such a reading.

### Opposed Poetics

Dairies and records of poetic contests indicate that Teitoku and Chōshōshi often disagreed about

<sup>20</sup> Odaka, *Matsunaga Teitoku*, 314-319.

<sup>21</sup> Okamoto, *Kinoshita Chōshōshi*, 64-65.



fundamental poetic issues. While their debates normally were carried out in a civil manner befitting the high tradition of waka and never stooped to the kind of derisive taunts witnessed in the debates inspired by *Kyohakushū*, there were clearly major disagreements. The source of these disagreements about poetic style between Teitoku and Chōshōshi can be traced back to the two men's early years of training. Teitoku and Chōshōshi both studied waka from Yūsai and they could not have hoped for a better teacher. Using his connections in both military and aristocratic circles, Yūsai had been amassing and collating many of the lineages of private transmissions. This process had reached the point that when he was besieged in Tanabe Castle in Tango during the fighting leading up to the Battle of Sekigahara, Emperor Goyozei 後陽成天皇 (1571-1617), fearing that priceless teachings would be lost if Yūsai were killed, interceded to have the siege lifted long enough that Yūsai could at least pass his documents to the court. Teitoku and Chōshōshi's reactions to his training, however, were radically different.

In *Record of Favours Received* Teitoku admirably details numerous stories of Yūsai's exploits in fields beyond poetry, such as martial arts, equestrian arts, *kemari*, and Noh drumming. Most importantly for Teitoku, Yūsai was the guardian of the oral transmissions on the classics. Teitoku states that "the secret teachings have been orally conveyed from Teika to Yūsai like water poured from vessel to vessel."<sup>22</sup> Teitoku was honored to be taught by a man he considered "the reincarnation of Teika" (*Taionki*, 57) and accordingly closely followed his teachings. Chōshōshi on the other hand was more independent. *A Considered Evaluation of Kyohakushū* quotes Chōshōshi as describing his approach to waka in the following terms: "I compose without regard to form and without regard to classical precedent" (*Kyohaku*, 109). Again, "I do not understand the Way of Poetry, so I just say what is in my own heart for my own amusement. I do not bother to record my poems and I do not try to determine which are good and which are poor compositions" (*Kyohaku*, 107-8). Unsurprisingly, these

two attitudes led to numerous disputes.

There are several passages in *Record of Favours Received* in which Teitoku openly criticizes Chōshōshi. In the following episode, for example, Teitoku disparages Chōshōshi's decorum based on the manner in which he and his guests behaved at a poetry meeting at Higashiyama.

One time, upon reception of an invitation from Chōshōshi to a waka contest at Ryōzan, in which the participants would also act as the judges, Michikatsu accepted saying that it was a unique idea. It was the thirteenth day of the Ninth Month of 1601. The topics, which had been given in advance, were: chrysanthemums illuminated by the moon, famous sites in moonlight, and love under the moon. I record below Michikatsu's poems, except his first which has slipped from my memory.

名にしあふ秋の二よののちせやまのちせ  
かはらず月もすまなむ

na ni shi au  
aki no futayo no  
nochise yama  
nochise kawarazu  
tsuki mo suma namu

Befitting their names  
these two autumn nights:  
Mt. Latter Rapids  
even on the night of the Latter Moon  
the moon will be clear.

くもらん月さへうとくなりにはけりこぬ  
人つき袖のなみだに

kumoru ran  
tsuki sae utoku  
nari ni keru  
konu hito tsuraki  
sode no namida ni

Has even the moon  
clouded over?  
It has grown distant.  
Bitterly I wait for he who comes not

<sup>22</sup> Odaka Toshirō and Matsumura Akira eds., *Taionki, oritaku shiba no ki, rantō kotohajime* NKBT 95 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1964), 32. Hereafter cited in text as "*Taionki*."

with sleeves wet with tears.

Michikatsu secretly sent these waka to be recopied by a calligrapher. He took his seat at the gathering populated by attendants. Expecting to find nobles, he found the other participants ill-mannered with graceless speech and rough voices. These people slandered his waka imprudently. They did not understand the ancient Way of Poetry, so did not realize that his poems were based on expressions with precedent in classical poems. Since they did not even know the basic proscriptions of poetry, such as the rule that two words with the same meaning should not be used in a poem, the same word should not be repeated, the fourth line of the poem should not start with the same syllable as the first line nor should the last line end with the same syllable as the second line. Therefore, they could not identify such faults. They believed that they should critique all of the waka not composed by Chōshōshi. They did not realize that by mentioning Mt. Nochise Michikatsu was praising the host. One guest said that the author of this waka must be a neophyte because this mountain has become so clichéd. Another guest speculated that it was not the poem of a beginner but rather the work of a well-studied but unskillful poet. I usually do not hastily give my views at these meetings and I wish to avoid repeating the opinions of others, so I pretend to not even listen to the poems and follow the opinions of others. In this case, however, I was so taken aback that I suggested that the other guests consider the poems more deeply and realize that waka should not be judged so rashly. Nobody paid me any heed over the merchant-like din of the crowd. All three of Michikatsu's waka ended up being slandered.

Generally, at all waka competitions members of each team criticize the other side's poems and praise their team's poems. At these kinds of events each waka should be seriously analyzed to note such faults as outdated diction. In this way, participants will learn from both praise and criticism. The guests at Chōshōshi's gathering, however, were vulgar men who did not even understand the rules of

renga, much less waka. They secretly contacted the scribes and found out which poems were composed by Chōshōshi and praised only these poems regardless of quality (Taionki, 37-9).<sup>23</sup>

Passages such as this from *Record of Favors Received* are extremely valuable for understanding the dynamics of the rivalry between Teitoku and Chōshōshi. Sadly, because Chōshōshi never commented on these issues, we can only analyze the situation from Teitoku's viewpoint. Based on Teitoku's accounts of this and other poetry meetings, however, a picture of Chōshōshi's role in the two men's rivalry does emerge. Chōshōshi's samurai background and family connections that guaranteed material security allowed him a degree of freedom from the norms and conventions of the world of the Kyoto waka salons that would have been unimaginable to Teitoku. For the most part Chōshōshi appears to have wielded the freedom this marginal position allowed him simply to explore his own unique poetic vision. However, it appears that occasionally he was not above using his social standing to create situations that a more traditional poet like Teitoku would find humiliating.

While these passages are interesting in their own right and it is telling that Chōshōshi is the only person mentioned in *Record of Favors Received* about whom Teitoku made exclusively negative comments, the more fascinating possibilities lay in the sections where Chōshōshi is not mentioned by name. Considering the latent tension between the two men and the striking similarities between key passages from *Record of Favors Received* and *Critique of Kyōhokushū*, one of Teitoku's main goals in writing *Record of Favors Received* appears to have been to discredit Chōshōshi and his poetics. In order to discredit Chōshōshi, Teitoku formulates an unusual history of waka and creates a bold new understanding of waka's place in society, which in turn reveals his own insecurities and anxieties.

First, let us examine a few representative passages from *Critique of Kyōhokushū* in order to gain a sense of the interpretive stance of this text. The

<sup>23</sup> This passage is typical of Teitoku's attention to the social, rather than the artistic, aspects of poetry. Time and again Teitoku emphasizes that "poets must have excellent manners at waka gatherings" (*Taionki*, 32).

criticisms of Chōshōshi's poetry in *Critique of Kyohakushū* focus predominantly on questions of diction, particularly use of words and phrases unprecedented in classical waka. This objection appears to have been quite prevalent at the time as Takuan Sōhō 沢庵宗彭 (1573-1645) among others also criticizes Chōshōshi's use of eccentric vocabulary.<sup>24</sup> A number of passages in *Critique of Kyohakushū* focus on a single word or phrase in one of Chōshōshi's poems and point out that there is no precedent for it. Take for example the following poem from the spring section:

さほ姫のかたなもふれすかさは先かすみの  
衣いかて立らん

saohime no  
katana mo furezu  
kasa wa mazu  
kasumi no koromo  
ikade tataran

Untouched by  
the sword of Princess Sao  
first the sedge hat  
then the robe of mist  
how will they rise?

The author of *Critique of Kyohakushū* complains, "is there some explanation for the phrase 'sword of Princess Sao'? This is doubtful." He then cites *Shūiwakashū* 拾遺和歌集 (Collection of Gleanings, 1007) poem 708 as a possible source poem.

から衣われはかたなのふれなくに先たつ物  
はなき名なりけり

Karakoromo  
ware wa katana no  
furenaku ni  
mazu tatsu mono wa  
naki na narikeri

Although I  
haven't touched the knife  
to cut the Chinese robe  
already what has begun

are unfounded rumors

The author then states, "one normally should not use the phrase 'Princess Sao's sword'. Also, the poem's form is not elegant" (*Nan-kyohakushū*, 9). This passage is emblematic of the critical stance taken throughout *Critique of Kyohakushū* as primary attention is focused on Chōshōshi's use of unconventional diction. This poem is compared with the classical canon, and as no satisfactory precedent can be found, readers are warned not to copy his example. Then, attention is turned to the overall quality of the poem and it is found to be inelegant. These factors are characteristic of the Nijō lineage's approach to appraising poetry that Teitoku learned from Yūsai.

In another case the author of *Critique of Kyohakushū* attacks a poem for sounding too much like a narrative.

けさよりは物あちきなく心ほそし人わひさ  
する秋やきぬらん

kesa yori wa  
mono achikinaku  
kokorobososhi  
hito wabi sasuru  
aki ya kinuran

From this morning  
things have been out of sorts  
and I am forlorn.  
Has it arrived? The autumnal season  
which saddens the hearts of men.

The topic of this poem is "A poem in autumn." The phrase "saddens the hearts of men" does not sound elegant. From the beginning to the fourth line sounds like a narrative. Although poems similar to this one appear in Teika's *Shūigūō* that is a special form (*Nan-kyohakushū*, 34).

Here the syntax rather than the diction is singled out for censure. Although a possible model for this style can be found in Teika's poetry, the author explains that this style is a special case which again should not be emulated. This position also appears in the evaluation of a poem that is compared to Shō-

<sup>24</sup> Tsuda, "Kinoshita Chōshōshi-den," 22.

tetsu's 正徹 (1381-1459) famously eccentric style.

すきとをる 野原の雪の下みとりこゝにあり  
とや若なつむらん

Sukitōru  
nohara no yuki no  
shita midori  
koko ni ari toya  
wakana tsumu ran

Under the translucent  
snow covering the moor  
glimmers an emerald hue.  
Might that be where they  
harvest young herbs?

The first line seems as though it would be used in poems and it sounds poetic. There are elegant words with the same meaning. This line, however, does not appear in classical poems. If this phrase has ever been used it would have been in the poems of Shōtetsu (*Nan-kyohakushū*, 11).

Although esteemed for his poetic innovations, Shōtetsu was a member of the Reizei lineage and so his style was considered heterodox by Nijō poets and thus an unfit model for poets to imitate. Numerous other examples could be listed. *Critique of Kyohakushū* mentions one poem's use of the phrase "warbler's nest in the plums" (鶯のぬくらの梅), stating, "warblers should not be described as sleeping among the blossoms. Even if there happened to be a poetic precedent this should not be used" (*Nan-kyohakushū*, 13).<sup>25</sup> Another poem is cited for referring to the Weaver Maiden in a Tanabata poem as "younger sister" (*Nan-kyohakushū*, 36). In all of these critiques the first question is always whether or not a particular word or phrase has a precedent in classical waka. Then attention turns to evaluating the elegance and decorum of the poem.

The kinds of criticisms seen in *Critique of Kyohakushū* resonate with both Teitoku's poetics and

his poetic practice. For example, he repeatedly points out that "for waka practitioners selecting poetic diction is of greatest importance" 歌よみは詞の吟味肝要なり (*Taionki*, 45). He also argues for maintaining strict limits on acceptable diction in waka.

In *Eiga taigai* Teika wrote, "your style should be modeled on the poetry before the Kanpyō era." By that statement he is referring to the time around the *Man'yōshū*. There are secret teachings to this effect. When Teika taught that poets should imitate the *Man'yōshū*, he did not mean that one should compose without considering words as was the case in the *Man'yōshū*. He had already established that "diction should not extend beyond the *Sandaishū*." By stating that poetic style should be based on the Kanpyō era he was emphasizing the need to avoid weakness in the poetic form (*Taionki*, 87).

By arguing that poets should compose using only diction found in the *Sandaishū* (三代集), the first three imperially commissioned anthologies, but with the emotional purity of the *Man'yōshū*, Teitoku is aligning himself squarely with the Nijō tradition. For centuries Nijō poets had quarreled with the Rokujō 六条 and Reizei 冷泉 lineages about the proper method for carving out "a margin of originality within the strictures of a closely bordered and strongly prescriptive tradition."<sup>26</sup> Following the example of Minamoto no Toshiyori 源俊頼 (1055-1129), the Rokujō and Reizei lineages stretched the bounds of poetic decorum and even transgressed them "by using words without clear precedent and conceits which impinged upon the borders of *haikai*."<sup>27</sup> Nijō poets conversely, following the examples of Fujiwara no Shunzei 藤原俊成 (1114-1204) and his son Teika, argued for maintaining strict adherence to the diction and decorum of classical verse and advocated for creating innovative verses

<sup>25</sup> The point here is that poets should not follow obscure poetic precedents, but rather compose based on the established and mainstream poetic ideals.

<sup>26</sup> Lewis Cook, "The Discipline of Poetry: Authority and Invention in the *Kokindenju*" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 2000), 68.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 72.

by means of “poetic variation,” or *honka-dori* (本歌取, sometimes translated as “allusive variation”). To put the matter simply, Nijō poets advocated using only the diction and syntax of previous *chokusenshū*, particularly the *Kokinshū*, while urging poets to find fresh combinations of images by means of allusive variations of poems from canonical texts like the *Tale of Genji*. Thus, the confrontation between Teitoku and Chōshōshi was, at least in Teitoku’s eyes, the continuation of a struggle that had simmered for most of the history of waka. For Teitoku this was not a personal disagreement, but rather a matter of defending what he believed was the true Way of Poetry.

The similarities between the critical stance of *Critique of Kyohakushū* and Teitoku’s comments about Chōshōshi in *Record of Favors Received* are most striking in connection with the following poem.

雨になくさのゝ渡りのほとゝぎすなれもやど  
れるかげやなからん

ame ni naku  
sano no watari no  
hototogisu  
nare mo yadoreru  
kage ya nakaran

Crying in the rain  
at Sano Ford  
the cuckoo.  
For you, my friend, there is  
no shelter from the storm.

In *Critique of Kyohakushū* this poem is followed by the following comment.

“The topic of this poem is “cuckoo in the rain.” This is a moving poem, but the conception of hototogisu at Sano Ford does not appear in classical waka. I heard that from the time this poem was composed Chōshōshi was not on good terms with Yūsai” (*Nankyohakushū*, 31-2).

The critique concerning the unprecedented combination of cuckoo and Sano Ford is in keeping with the general tone of the text, but the comment about a falling out between Chōshōshi and Yūsai is rather

vague. This story is fleshed out in *Records of Favors Received*. Teitoku explains that this poem was presented at a waka gathering held by Yūsai at his residence at Jurakudai. Then he elaborates:

Yūsai said, “I wonder why Chōshōshi did not submit the poem he had already shown to me?” I replied, “Perhaps he mistakenly brought the wrong paper or he may have forgotten it.” Yūsai said, “No, that is not the case. I think that this poem is more interesting than the one that I judged for him, so he intentionally brought it. Although I see the superiority of this poem, one should not compose waka about famous places in other provinces for a gathering in the Capital. Also, there is no precedent for composing about a cuckoo at Sano Ford, so I did not give this poem a high mark.” These kinds of ancient practices are the treasure of poets. Their meaning cannot be known without a teacher (*Taionki*, 55-6).

The fact that such similar passages appear in both texts is strong evidence that Teitoku, or someone in his immediate circle, was the author of *Critique of Kyohakushū*. Also, the attention to whether or not a particular phrase has a poetic precedent is the key focus that links *Critique of Kyohakushū* with Teitoku’s writings. It is also revealing that both texts use this as an opportunity to drive a wedge between Chōshōshi and Yūsai. Teitoku’s reputation as a poetry teacher rested largely on his having received a direct oral transmission from Yūsai, thus it would be extremely advantageous for him to create the impression that his chief rival was not well liked by their shared master.

In his own waka Teitoku fastidiously abides by the rules of poetic diction that he learned from Yūsai.

雪と見えはこよひの月にうからましよしや  
吉のゝ櫻なりとも

yuki to mieba  
koyoi no tsuki ni  
ukara mashi  
yoshi ya yoshino no  
sakura nari tomo

If they were confused with snow  
bathed tonight in moonlight  
they would not be so poignant,  
even though they are the cherry blossoms  
of beautiful Mt. Yoshino.<sup>28</sup>

としをへて山路の菊をてらせばやおもがは  
りせぬ秋のよの月

toshi wo hete  
yamaji no kiku wo  
teraseba ya  
omogawari senu  
aki no yo no tsuki

As the years pass  
may it shine down on  
the chrysanthemum on the mountain path.  
The unchanging  
moon of autumn nights. (*Taionki*, 62)

Poems such as the two quoted above reveal Teitoku's deft and adept manipulation of the traditional approaches to composition. There is nothing about the diction, syntax, or imagery of these poems that would be out of place in the *Kokinshū*. Teitoku's determined and deliberate effort to compose waka entirely within the limits of established precedent has been seen as a lack of originality by some modern scholars; however, his aim in composing waka was to participate in and maintain what he believed was a socially, politically, and even spiritually significant tradition. He did not aim to frivolously display his individuality or originality. Teitoku even goes so far as to relay the following words of praise he received from Yūsai.

Yūsai, impressed by my love of poetry, said to me, "If waka were better respected in Japan you would be famous." I replied, "I am glad that waka is not popular. If it were popular then many daimyō and court nobles would rush to study with you. In that case, how could a man like me hope to know you?" (*Taionki*, 46).

The foregoing comparison of Teitoku and Chōshōshi's waka should not be taken to mean that

Chōshōshi is an innovative poet while Teitoku was conservative. While Teitoku advocated for a conservative style of waka, he is of course legendary for his use of haikai as an outlet of his radical poetical innovations. Both men were innovators: Teitoku's issue with Chōshōshi's poetry was the way in which it deviated from what he saw as the vitally important decorum of waka. In this connection, it is significant that in *Critique of Kyohakushū* a poem is attacked for sounding like a *haikaika* 誹諧歌, or haikai-style waka.

我そうきつまとふねこもしはしふす目もい  
とすちをわたる日影に

waga zo uki  
tsuma tou neko mo  
shibashi fusu  
me mo ito suchi wo  
wataru hikage ni

I am forlorn  
and the cat prowling for a mate  
repeatedly lies down  
with its eyes hair thin  
in the crossing sunlight.

The slit of the cat's eyes becomes thin. Even in the glare of daylight it probably would not be "hair thin." Also, the poem is vulgar. Why was it not placed in the haikai section? Even if he was joking with his students this kind of poem should not be recorded for posterity (*Nan-kyohakushū*, 66).

Teitoku understood better than most poets that *haikaika* had a place within the orthodox waka repertoire since the time that this form was included in the *Kokinshū*. Like other Nijō poets, however, he was deeply committed to confining the unconventional topics and idiosyncratic tropes that typified *haikaika* only to poems clearly designated as such. Teitoku was not opposed to composing eccentric poems. He composed hundreds of bizarre poems himself, but he always clearly labeled them as *kyōka* or *haikaika*.

棹姫の裳吹返しやはらかけしきをそそとみ  
する春風

<sup>28</sup> Odaka, *Matsunaga Teitoku zokuhen*, 82.

saohime no  
mosuso fukikaeshi  
yawarakana  
keshiki wo sosoto  
misuru harukaze

Princess Sao  
her skirt billowing up:  
a tranquil  
vista for a moment  
revealed by the vernal breeze<sup>29</sup>

On the surface and in the translation this *kyōka* by Teitoku appears to describe a pleasant view of a spring breeze wafting through the foothills via the metaphor of the vernal goddess Sao. The term ‘sosoto’ (suddenly or momentarily), however, is a pun with ‘soso’ a vulgar term for the female genitalia, leading to a lewd depiction of the goddess Sao being exposed when her skirt is lifted by the wind. This conceit is of course far more radical and unprecedented than anything to be found in Chōshōshi’s waka, but Teitoku found it acceptable because it was clearly labeled as a *kyōka*. Teitoku criticizes Chōshōshi and his editors because they misrepresent Chōshōshi’s more radical experiments as standard waka.

The difference in Teitoku and Chōshōshi’s approaches to poetry is perhaps most apparent in the following poem, which is disapproved of in *Critical of Kyōhakushū* for sounding like a Chinese poem:

雨にあらひ風にけつりて青柳の手ふれぬか  
みもまかふ筋なし

ame ni arai  
kaze ni ketsurite  
aoyagi no te  
furenu kami mo  
makau fushinashi]

Rain washed  
and combed by the wind  
even the green willow’s  
unkempt hair

<sup>29</sup> Yoshida Kōichi ed., *Teitoku kashū* volume 2 (Tokyo: Koten Bunko, 1975), 9.

has not a tangle.

It is unacceptable that the first and second line sound like a Chinese poem (*Nan-kyōhakushū*, 14).

While allusion to Chinese texts was of course widespread in waka, Teitoku would never accept the use of language that actually mimicked Chinese syntax in waka, but he positively encouraged it in his students’ haikai. Take for example the following anonymous hokku that Teitoku included in *Puppy Collection*:

春雨にあらいてけづれ柳がみ

harusame ni  
araitte kezure  
yanagi kana

in the spring rain  
washing and combing  
her hair—the willow.<sup>30</sup>

This poem draws on the same conceit and nearly the exact same syntax that is condemned in Chōshōshi’s waka. This should not be at all surprising because Teitoku defined haikai as poetry that includes *haigon* 俳言, unprecedented diction that was banned from waka and renga.

The disagreement between Teitoku and Chōshōshi was not a matter of one poet experimenting with change and innovation while the other defended tradition and convention. Rather both men believed in poetic innovation, but disagreed about the proper venue for change. Chōshōshi supported change within waka and composed waka that clearly departed from established norms. Teitoku, on the other hand, believed that poets should continue to compose waka in the traditional manner with established diction and helped develop the genres of haikai and *kyōka* as outlets for his originality. Teitoku believed that each of the poetic forms had its own unique decorum.

#### Relationship between Scholarship and Poetry

<sup>30</sup> Morikawa Akira, Katō Sadahiko, and Inui Hiroyuki eds., *Shoki haikaishū* SNKBT 69 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1991), 23.

In the closing section of *Record of Favours Received* Teitoku explains the foundations of his poetics in detail via the traditional extended flora metaphor for the process of poetic composition (seed 種=heart, leaves 葉=words, blossoms 花=expression, and fruit 実=essence) and a discussion of the meaning of the character *wa* 和 in the term *yamato-uta* 大和歌. While Chōshōshi is never mentioned by name, when this section is read in the context of Teitoku's criticism of his poetic style Chōshōshi's presence hangs over every word.

In this section of *Record of Favours Received* Teitoku discusses the various classification schemes for the styles of waka. He then summarizes:

Teika describes two styles: blossom and fruit. This is the teaching of 'florid style and form of fruition'. The florid style gives bloom to both good and bad poems, but there is only one kind of form of fruition (*Taionki*, 80).

The blossom-fruit dichotomy is famously articulated in a passage from the Mana preface to the *Kokinshū* that provided the conceptual framework and much of the language for Teitoku's poetics.

Then when the times shifted into decline and men revered the lustful, frivolous words arose like clouds, and a current of ostentatiousness bubbled up like a spring. The fruit had all fallen and only the flower bloomed. Later the licentious used poetry as the messenger of flowers and birds, beggarly guests used it as a means of existence. Because of this, it became half the handmaid of woman and was embarrassing to present before gentlemen.<sup>31</sup>

Fujiwara no Teika clarifies this metaphor in his poetic treatise *Maigetsushō* 毎月抄 (Monthly Notes, 1219): "the fruit is the spirit [kokoro], and the blossom is the language [kotoba] (いはゆる実と申すは心、花と申すは詞なり).<sup>32</sup>

<sup>31</sup> Grzanka, Leonard, trans. "Manajo: The Chinese Preface," in *Kokinshū: A Collection of Poems Ancient and Modern* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1984) 382.

<sup>32</sup> Hashimoto Fumio, Ariyoshi Tamotsu, and

Teika argues that a good poem must have a balance between "kokoro" and "kotoba," but also points out that "inferior diction is preferable to a deficiency of feeling."<sup>33</sup> Teitoku, of course, claims that he composes in the form of fruition and he makes clear that he believes that Chōshōshi is a representative of the florid style. While repeatedly claiming that he is capable of composing both styles, Teitoku goes on to explain his reasons for preferring the form of fruition. Teitoku was well aware that this approach would not garner much popularity in contemporary poetic circles.

Someone said, "Teitoku, your poems are well constructed and reveal your training and contain nothing outdated. However, as they do not contain beautiful or tender words, people do not clamor to praise you. Trends change with the times, so you should adjust your thinking to elicit praise." I replied, "You are a true friend for telling me what other people whisper in the shadows. Please tell me more about what people say about me." After this conversation, I was thankful for the benevolence of my teachers. Had I not received their teachings these evil winds may have blown me down a false path. Therefore, it pleases me to think that by trying to write down the thoughts and words of my honored teachers, later generations will not fall into wicked ways and return to the true way of waka (*Taionki*, 77-8).

This description of a misguided poet matches perfectly with the depiction of Chōshōshi in *Critical of Kyohakushū*, so it is not difficult to guess who Teitoku thought was the poet who people "clamored to praise" for his "beautiful words." Teitoku repeatedly states that his lack of popularity was of no concern to him. "The poems that people in the world like, I do not care for. The poems I like are disdained by the public" (*Taionki*, 88). He also warns his students:

Pay no mind to the opinions of people of the world concerning who is a skillful poet and

Fujihira Haruo, eds. *Karonshū* NKBZ 50 (Tokyo: Shogakukan, 1975), 518-519.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 519.



who is inept. These opinions are arbitrary and impetuous. What they say is not indicative of the actual value of poems. This type of person, even if they have been instructed in detail by a teacher, can only discern the very best poems and the very worst, but cannot distinguish between poems of middling skill. Those without a teacher cannot make any judgments, so they base their opinions on the name of the poet. If my name was affixed to a poem by Teika, the poem would be disparaged. If, conversely, one of my poems was presented as having been written by Teika, then people would regard it with esteem. This situation is similar to determining pitch. Everyone can distinguish the highest tone from the lowest, but few people can perceive halftones (*Taionki*, 75-6).

Again, Chōshōshi lurks in the background as Teitoku's account of judging poems based purely on the name of the author resonates with his description of how people behaved at Chōshōshi's poetry gathering. Also, note that the comment about uninformed poets who "have been instructed in detail by a teacher" is rather confusing if this text is not read in the context of the dispute between Teitoku and Chōshōshi. Teitoku goes on to explain the misguided attitudes of his contemporaries:

Poets without teachers who have practiced for many years and developed skills settle upon this conclusion: "the ideographs 大和歌 mean 'to make very gentle' and are read *yamato-uta*. These people also say that the qualities of sincerity すなを and vigor つよき are not admired, so poems with these qualities are not enjoyed and do not receive praise. Poets who compose in this style do not garner a high reputation. Rather than laboring on a path without reward, it is better to aim to be praised by the public. . . . No matter how things were in the past, nowadays our chief aim should be to write beautiful, ornate poems that people will praise." This concept is worlds away from the correct path. How disgusting! (*Taionki*, 78).

In this passage Teitoku fleshes out the dichotomy of the florid style and the form of fruition. The florid style is characterized by ornate language which led to its popularity. Based on the earlier analysis of Chōshōshi's waka, it is hard not to conclude that this passage is referring, at least in part, to Chōshōshi. In contrast to this "weak" style, the less popular form of fruition springs from sincere feelings and is expressed in powerful diction. Teitoku then explains the correct interpretation of the character *wa*.

The *wa* 和 of the word waka is the same *wa* as the term *chūwa* 中和. This character does not arbitrarily mean "tenderness." The concept of *chūwa* is explained by Zisi, Confucius' grandson, in *The Doctrine of the Mean*: "Equilibrium (*chū*) is the fundamental principle of the world. Harmony (*wa*) is the universal path. When equilibrium and harmony exist in perfection, heaven and earth are ordered and all things will be nourished and flourish." Only this meaning of *wa* can sate divine spirits and human hearts. How could poems that entertain the public with ingenuity and tenderness "affect the gods and demons?" (*Taionki*, 78).

This kind of belief in the combination of Confucian ethics and magical efficacy of waka is typical of the Nijō school. This passage reveals that Teitoku's distaste for Chōshōshi's style was not simply a matter of literary taste, but rather he felt that his rival's clever compositions were at odds with the vital political and spiritual functions of waka. Subsequent passages make clear that in Teitoku's view waka is not a weak, effeminate art.

The Way of Poetry would be incomplete without the florid style, however, the form of fruition should be the foundation and florid style should be used later. The indispensable florid style becomes harmful if it exceeds the 'form of fruition'. After the *Man'yōshū*, people's hearts soon lost their simple purity. Tsurayuki lamented the loss of the form of fruition by stating, "all of the fruit has fallen and only the blossoms remain." While the florid style is valuable, it is conventionally feminine and thus tends to exhibit weakness.

Those who would make beauty the true essence of waka, even if it is weak, would have to replace Hitomoro with Komachi as the chief master. The preface to the *Kokinshū* states, “Ono no Komachi’s poems are moving but weak” and “they are weak because they are feminine poems.” Therefore, weakness should be fastidiously avoided in the poems composed by men. In general, no matter what topic you compose on if you string together thirty-one syllables and avoid vulgar terms it will naturally have the tenderness befitting the name Yamato-uta. If, however, you contrive to compose beautifully then you become disingenuous. Therefore, this approach is detested like a fox in the evening transforming itself into a beauty to trick people (*Taionki*, 80).

Again it is tempting to imagine that this tricky fox is none other than Chōshōshi: he contrived to compose beautifully and his poetry certainly at times borders on being disingenuous. One aspect of this passage that is easily overlooked is that it limns a very curious historical narrative. Teitoku claims that waka poetry went into decline not during his lifetime, not with the rise of the samurai, but before the compilation of the *Kokinshū*.<sup>34</sup> This extraordinary claim makes one wonder how an art that has been in decline basically since its inception managed to not only survive but flourish century after century. Such intellectual contortions were necessary for Teitoku in order to explain the profound value of his unpopular style of waka.

While admitting that composing in the florid style will bring popularity, Teitoku claims that it is not the proper method.

True happiness is not to be found in taking the pleasure in composing beautiful poems to win people’s praise. The joy above all other joys is only found in savoring masterful poems of the form of fruition that naturally have also achieved the effect of the florid style (*Taionki*, 81).

Teitoku clearly makes the case that winning popularity is less important than following the true Way of Poetry. Always the teacher, Teitoku explains exactly how to go about composing the right kind of verse.

Beginners do not find the true path interesting. Even if it is not interesting, you should believe the teachings of your master, have tastefulness (*suki*) in your heart, and savor old poems day and night. Classical poems are devoid of any unusual contrivances and can appear like the words of children, but if you contemplate their spirit then the earnest simplicity of these poems will be revealed to you like the dawn of a day or like a drunk sobering and you will come to understand the sordidness of the florid style (*Taionki*, 81).

As we have already seen, Teitoku views the study of waka as a form of religious practice and in this passage he clearly spells out the steps in that practice. Students first must have faith in their teachers, then must cultivate the proper state of mind, and finally they must study classical poetic examples. According to Teitoku, Chōshōshi failed to master any of these steps.

Teitoku then elaborates on the importance of the concept of tastefulness (*suki*).

If you seek fame by composing contrived poems, you will be infamous. Pay no mind to people, put your heart into the straight path (*sugunaru michi*), constantly devote yourself to tastefulness and without fail you will have a dazzling legacy. In ancient times the word *suki* 数寄 (tastefulness) was always connected to the art of poetry. *The Tales of Heike* contains the phrase, “Since Tadamori was a man of *suki* and had refined taste in poetry...” The term ‘elegant man’ (好士) refers to a poet. The term *suki* now calls to mind *chanoyū* because the Way of Poetry is in decline in the world. Do not think that I dislike the florid style because I cannot compose tender poems. I have written this text even though these ideas are important secrets (*Taionki*, 82).

<sup>34</sup> This idea was, of course, first articulated in the prefaces to the *Kokinshū*.

In this passage, Teitoku imagines poetic and hermetic practice being controlled by an assemblage of

‘elegant men’ (好士) who would be selected by their skill and knowledge, not by their class. As we will see, this claim is central to Teitoku’s push to gain legitimacy in the Kyoto waka salons.

In his poetics, Teitoku describes the path of studying waka as a kind of religious practice with important political consequences. According to Teitoku, poets must first focus on proper diction, which can only be learned by scrutinizing classical poems. This study will lead to the proper state of mind (*suki*), which is learned from a teacher. A poet who has developed the proper mental and spiritual state will naturally exhibit proper behavior. When men’s hearts are true and their behavior is correct then there will be harmonious relations among people. Here we see the fundamental difference between Teitoku and Chōshōshi. Teitoku viewed waka as a kind of ritual practice while Chōshōshi saw it as just a literary form and as a means of personal expression.

#### Importance of Class in Poetic Circles

Considering the degree to which the relationship between Teitoku and Chōshōshi is inflected by the registers of class and socioeconomic status, studying these issues is crucial in order to understand the tension between the two poets. In the social circles and poetic salons of the early Edo period, status markers influenced every aspect of social discourse. Issues of class were particularly prevalent in Kyoto’s poetic salons during the late 1500’s and early 1600’s because the merchant and artisan classes, who had previously been entirely excluded from these groups, had begun to gain access. This dynamic is apparent throughout *Critique of Kyohakushū* and *Considered Evaluation of Kyohakushū* in derogatory remarks about poets’ class affiliations. For example, in the commentary about a poem included in the spring section of *Kyohakushū*, the author of *Critique of Kyohakushū* condemns Kin’nori for mentioning his own name in a foretext to the poem as his was the first name to appear in the text. This action is deemed disrespectful to the higher-ranking poets whose names appear later in the text, so the author derides Kin’nori as a “commoner” and “merchant” (*Nan-kyohakushū*, 9-10). Similarly, in *Considered Evaluation of Kyohakushū* Teitoku is described as “conducting himself in the manner of a vagrant” while Chōshōshi and Teitoku’s disciples

are all described as “merchants without ancestors” (*Kyohaku*, 112).<sup>35</sup>

Access and control of texts have been an important symbol for the disparity in social status between Teitoku and Chōshōshi. For example, Donald Keene describes the *kokin denju* as “almost stupefying inconsequential bits of lore,” but speculates that “Teitoku undoubtedly would have given anything to be inducted into these secret traditions.”<sup>36</sup> Keene then presents an incident Teitoku recorded in *Teitoku no ki* 貞徳翁の記 (Record of Master Teitoku, 1605?), stating that this is the closest Teitoku came to viewing the texts of this tradition.

On the twenty-fourth of November, 1593, I went with my father to call on Hosokawa Yūsai. He took us to the back room of his house where he opened a box and showed us the contents, saying, “These are all the secret books of the Tradition. Look at them!” There were four books of different sizes with the words ‘transmitted text’ on the covers.

Keene adds that “Teitoku felt especially chagrined because he knew that in an earlier day, before *kokin denju* became the exclusive privilege of the nobility, he might have received instruction.”<sup>37</sup> In a similar vein, Kendall H. Brown describes how a supposed inequality in financial resources influenced the access Teitoku and Chōshōshi had to texts.

Although he writes of genteel poverty in two four-and-one-half-mat rooms, Chōshōshi did not want for money. Much to the irritation of Matsunaga Teitoku, his rival in waka composition and teaching, Chōshōshi refused to accept money for his services and, even more to Teitoku’s chagrin, Chōshōshi assembled one

<sup>35</sup> While this kind of pejorative language had been used against poets who were perceived to be exploiting poetic knowledge for commercial gain dates back to at least the medieval period, the rhetoric heated up after the Ōnin War because ever more courtiers received payment for their literary services.

<sup>36</sup> Donald Keene, *Appreciations of Japanese Culture* (New York: Kodansha International, 1971), 76.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 76.

of the finest private libraries of the time— with more than 260 volumes in Japanese and fifteen hundred volumes in Chinese.<sup>38</sup>

While not strictly incorrect, by ignoring the prevailing culture of the Kyoto renaissance and selectively neglecting salient details these two accounts paint a rather skewed view of Teitoku and Chōshōshi's access to texts.

During Teitoku and Chōshōshi's lifetimes there was an extraordinary range of texts. Printed books were beginning to appear in large numbers, but hand-copied manuscripts still dominated the field. Even within the narrow scope of texts related to the private literary transmissions, there was a wide range of texts. Keene's interpretation imagines the *kokin denju* as a single unit, and thus envisions access to it as an all-or-nothing proposition. In reality, the received teachings on classical texts were constituted from numerous overlapping lineages each of which were divided and sub-divided into almost unimaginably byzantine gradations of confidentiality. The entire point of the enterprise was to restrict access to the uninitiated in order to maintain the value of the teachings. Far from living in an age when access was more restricted, due to his close ties to Yūsai who had worked to gather and collate the various lineages, Teitoku had a level of access to various texts that would have been unimaginable just a generation earlier. *Record of Master Teitoku* and *Records of Favors Received* are teeming with references to secret texts to which Teitoku had gained access.

As Keene and Brown point out, the ability to attain texts was closely tied to social status and economic wherewithal, but this situation was very complex because class and status were not fixed but rather changed over time. The shorthand terms of class designation can easily lead to misunderstandings and oversimplifications. This is certainly true of Teitoku as is apparent from a summary of his ancestry. Teitoku tends to be described as a commoner and Chōshōshi is thought of as a member of the upper echelon of the samurai class, but this situation is very relative. Teitoku's paternal grandfather, Irie Masashige 入江政重, was the master of

Takatsuki castle and his wife was from the lower Reizei family 下冷泉, an important poetic lineage. Teitoku's father, Eishu, was orphaned at age six after his mother died and Masashige was killed during the fighting in 1541 around the capital. Eishu was adopted by his maternal grandmother and took her name (Matsunaga). Eishu was then placed in the care of Tōfukuji, one of the Zen *gozan* temples, which dominated medieval religious culture. Later he left Tōfukuji to become a Nichiren monk before eventually returning to lay life. Thus, Teitoku was just barely separated from both the heights of samurai and court culture. Chōshōshi conversely renounced samurai culture, so he and Teitoku were not really all that different. Chōshōshi found himself in a position not dissimilar to Teitoku's father as a man born into the warrior class, but due to military defeat ended up taking the tonsure. Thus, the class difference between Teitoku and Chōshōshi was a matter of degrees and timing rather than a fixed absolute. The kinds of social connections the two men could call on illustrate this point. Teitoku's father maintained close ties to the elites of the samurai class in Kyoto such as Yūsai. These acquaintances were vital to Teitoku's education and his eventual ascent in the literary world. Chōshōshi, on the other hand, was able to use his connections to the Toyotomi to rise in the world, but with the decline of that clan he had ever fewer allies to rely on. Therefore, when general terms are used and Teitoku is described as a commoner and Chōshōshi a samurai, Chōshōshi would appear to have much greater access to texts, particularly those associated with secret poetic traditions. When their social standing is considered a bit more carefully, however, it becomes clear that since their status was not all that different they would have about the same opportunities to accrue texts.

For men of Teitoku and Chōshōshi's social status there were a number of routes to acquire texts. First, financial resources were vital for amassing a personal library. As discussed previously Teitoku appears to have accrued considerable wealth during his lifetime while Chōshōshi's fortunes steadily declined. Thus, over the course of their lifetimes they probably had about equal recourses to procure texts. Furthermore, Teitoku's memoirs give numerous examples of the various other routes he was able to use to access texts. Teitoku was well-known for his calligraphic skill, so he was often called upon to

<sup>38</sup> Brown, Kendall H., *The Politics of Reclusion: Painting and Power in Momoyama* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1997), 164.

copy texts. For example, a letter from Seika to Razan states that Seika had requested that Teitoku copy some texts for him.<sup>39</sup> In *Records of Favors Received* Teitoku relates a story about being asked to deliver a copy of the Mana Preface to the *Kokinshū* owned by Tanemichi to Yūsai. Teitoku explains, “Taking advantage of the situation I transcribed it for my personal use as well” (*Taionki*, 45). Letters from Seika to Razan also indicate that Teitoku was a member of a group that included Seika, Razan, Chōshōshi, and Soan who all shared books. Furthermore, there is even a letter in which Teitoku requests that Chōshōshi return a copy of *Wakanrō-ishū* 和漢朗詠集 (*Collection of Japanese and Chinese Poems for Singing*, 1013) that he had borrowed.<sup>40</sup> Thus, Teitoku appears to have had ample access to texts.

In summary, the relative ability to acquire texts turns out to be a useful index for measuring Teitoku and Chōshōshi’s comparative social status and fiscal wellbeing. The situation, however, was quite complex and changed overtime. It was not simply a matter of Teitoku being of relatively lower rank and possessing fewer resources and connections than Chōshōshi. In fact, while Chōshōshi was born into better circumstances than Teitoku, the situation was inverted in later years.

Teitoku was certainly not immune to issues of class. In fact, his writings show a high degree of concern and even anxiety about the issue. Teitoku tries to detach waka from the context of class and social status, questioning the legitimacy of the proprietary claims of aristocrats and samurai. As we have seen, Teitoku was criticized because he used his poetic knowledge to make a living and thus he is accused of acting like a merchant. Taking this into consideration, two stories Teitoku conveys about famed courtier-poet Sanjōnishi Kin’eda 三条西公条(1487-1563) refusing to teach students are very interesting.

Lord Kin’eda once said that a man called Itō of Noto came to visit him when he had become so impoverished that he could not afford food and offered a hundred *kan* in exchange for the transmission of the *Kokin-shū*.

Kin’eda noticed that Itō was wearing a Zen stole which laymen are not supposed to wear. Kin’eda wondered what the man could be thinking doing such a thing and decided not to teach him.<sup>41</sup>

This passage shows the important relationship between oral transmissions and class. Even in Teitoku’s lifetime the trade secret of poetic lineages could not simply be bought with money. This dynamic is at play in even more interesting ways in the following story.

Jōha did not receive a transmission on the *Kokinshū* from Lord Kin’eda. The reason for this can be found in Tsurayuki’s words, “beggarly guests use poetry as a means of existence.” Kin’eda said that he felt that Jōha planned to use the transmission to make his way in the world.<sup>42</sup>

Here Teitoku tries to distance himself from the image of a professional poet by showing how he is different than Jōha, his own renga teacher. The message seems clear: Teitoku claims that he is different from a man like Jōha who made his living from teaching poetry. Teitoku wanted to be seen not as a merchant but rather as a ‘man of elegance,’ one of the guardians of the literary tradition who just happened to hail from the merchant class.

While Teitoku’s desire to distance himself from the merchant class is easily understandable, his comments regarding the relationship of waka to aristocrats and the samurai are more surprising.

There are those who despise waka as the tepid amusement of the nobility. This is not the case. People say this because the Way of Poetry has declined, there are no poems in the form of fruition, the florid style is enjoyed, and poetry is only seen as an intermediary in romantic affairs. Even before the reign of the samurai, as far back as just after the Engi era, poetry became florid and the Way of Poetry went into decline, so the Mana preface to the *Kokinshū* states, “it is difficult to present poetry in front of men” (*Taionki*, 83).

<sup>39</sup> Odaka, *Matsunaga Teitoku*, 144.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 144.

<sup>41</sup> Suzuki Jun and Odaka Michiko eds., *Kinsei zuisōshū* SNKBZ 82 (Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 2000) 17.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 17-8.

Teitoku once more is rehashing his strange history of waka in which the form was in decline since its very origin. Teitoku also takes the strange stance that waka is a vital art almost despite its deep connection to court culture. Furthermore, Teitoku clearly insinuates that “the reign of the samurai” has not been a positive change for waka practice. All of these concepts are built upon a foundation of Confucian ethics, both in the argument for position based on merit rather than birthright and its insistence that waka is not just a form of romance verse but that it has a vital political purpose. In other words, the court and the elite warrior class who are normally viewed as the custodians of classical culture are seen by Teitoku as a possible hindrance. Teitoku argues that waka is only tied to the court and samurai culture due to its long decline into the florid style when its only true practitioners are the “men of elegance” who can rise from any position in society. This argument nicely dovetails with Teitoku’s political philosophy, which he spells out even more clearly in *Endamaru otoshi-bumi* 延陀丸おとし文 (Endamaru’s Dropped Letter, 1635),<sup>43</sup> a socio-political treatise written at the bequest of his patron Shigemune. In this text Teitoku forcefully argues for the importance of maintaining foundations of feudal society particularly proper Confucian relations between ‘ruler and minister’ 君臣. While defending the existing class structure Teitoku argues that men of ability regardless of their class must be recognized for society to function. At this point we begin to see how Teitoku weaves together the various threads of his poetics to fashion a noose for Chōshōshi.

The form of fruition is fitting for men. If you are born as a man, even if you are not of the *bushi* class, then you must have a heart that upholds justice and understands respect, so even if it were to cost you your life you

<sup>43</sup> Endamaru is a pseudonym Teitoku used late in life. The term “otoshi-bumi” refers to a document recording ideas that cannot be expressed publicly so they are written in an anonymous document which is intentionally dropped in a public place.

<sup>44</sup> Kumakura, “Kan’ei bunka,” 279-282.

would not shame your ancestors. How then could a man enjoy composing poems that are intentionally weak? (*Taionki*, 81).

If we accept the assumption that when Teitoku speaks about the florid style he is referring to Chōshōshi, then this passage resonates with multiple levels of meaning. Teitoku again asserts the didactic and political value of waka as essential to maintaining peace and stability in the realm. Building upon the discussion of the two styles of waka, Teitoku once more associates the florid style with women and the form of fruition with men. The passage then takes a radical turn when Teitoku states that all men, even those not born into the warrior class, should be willing to sacrifice their lives in order to uphold the honor of their family based upon the values of justice and respect. In light of the tension between Teitoku and Chōshōshi and Chōshōshi’s ignominious desertion during the battle of Sekigahara it is difficult to not read this passage as a thinly veiled attack on him. Teitoku then equates composing weak poems with a dishonorable spirit.

As the preface to the *Kokinshū* states, “Japanese poetry takes its seed in the heart of men,” so you can see a man’s hearts in his poems. A man who composes weak, effeminate poems must be a coward (*Taionki*, 82).

This last passage hits like one final hammer blow to Chōshōshi. Through a kind of intellectual *jujitsu*, Teitoku has managed to take the moral high ground away from Chōshōshi, who as a member of the warrior class taught poetry composition without the expectation of payment and would be viewed as morally superior to Teitoku who had to use his knowledge to make a living. Teitoku makes the argument that by composing in the florid style Chōshōshi revealed his true craven nature. By the same logic, Teitoku, though not a member of the samurai class, is upholding the core values of the class by composing in the form of fruition.

## Conclusion

Scholars have had trouble explicating Teitoku’s literary oeuvre. The fundamental question that has perplexed them is: how could a poet so innovative and creative in his haikai and *kyōka* compose such

conventional waka and expose such conservative views in his poetic treatises? By examining Teitoku's critique of Chōshōshi, the answer to this conundrum has become quite clear. At the beginning of the Edo period poets were keenly aware that the radical social changes that were transpiring would have to be reflected in poetic practice in order for these arts to remain relevant. Poets such as Chōshōshi, consequently, attempted to transform waka by employing innovative diction and unprecedented tropes. A major source of Teitoku's prestige, however, was his access to and understanding of the traditional methods of waka composition. Therefore, any and all attempts to modify this genre would undercut his authority, so he steadfastly defended the traditional Nijō lineage's conception of correct poetic decorum. This literary foundation led directly to Teitoku's experimentations in *kyōka* and *haikai*, which were considered at the time to be lesser genres. In this way, Teitoku and Chōshōshi were continuing the age old debate about the place of *haikai* in poetic practice and the limits of acceptable decorum. Members of the Kyōgoku/Reizei factions typically did not include a *haikaika* section in the *chokusenshū* that they compiled, but included many *haikaika*-like poems in the standard sections of their anthologies. For example, the *Gyokuyōwakashū* 玉葉和歌集 (1312) compiled by Kyōgoku no Tamekane 京極為兼 (1254-1332) does not include a *haikaika* section, despite the fact that Tamekane was very interested in poetic experimentation and unorthodox styles like *haikaika*. This attitude is similar to Chōshōshi's approach which eschewed labeling his more experimental poems as *haikaika* or *kyōka*. Conversely, the *Shokuzenzaiwakashū* 続千載和歌集 (1320) compiled by Nijō Tameyo 二条為世 (1250-1338), the next *chokusenshū* after the *Gyokuyōshū*, includes a *haikaika* section, even though Tameyo was a very conservative poet. Thus, by promoting *haikai* Teitoku was actually following the traditional Nijō practice of using this genre to mark the limits of acceptable poetic composition and thus protect the propriety of waka.

Many elements of Teitoku's poetics have been explained here by examining how they related to the socioeconomic tensions in Kyoto poetic circles during his lifetime. Having been born as the second son of a minor *renga* poet, Teitoku faced nearly insurmountable obstacles to achieving his dream of mas-

tering the traditions of waka composition. Thus, it is natural that he would view with contempt a man of privileged status like Chōshōshi who flaunted tradition. By emphasizing the concept that "men of elegance" are the rightful and legitimate heirs to the tradition regardless of their class or background, Teitoku attempted to create an intellectual justification for his place in the exclusive waka salons of Kyoto. In this context, Chōshōshi's experimental waka style served as the perfect foil for Teitoku. Only by recognizing that Teitoku implicitly places Chōshōshi in the role of antagonist in *Records of Favours Received* can the internal coherence of the text's argument be understood.