

# Hitomaro's Poems on the Decayed Capital

A narratological approach to *Man'yōshū* poems 1: 29 to 31

ローベルト F. ヴィットカンフ

Robert F. Wittkamp

Hitomaro's poems 1: 29 to 31 depict the ideas, memories, and feelings of the narrator at the sight of the overgrown ruins of Ōmi no Ōtsu no Miyako, the decayed capital at Lake Biwa. The sequence comprises one long poem (*chōka*) and two short poems (*tanka*). These compositions are followed by two more short poems by another poet. These poems are assigned by the author of this paper to the preceding sequence in a narratological reading. A narratological reading must also importantly consider peritexts such as the title, preface, postscript, and annotations. There exists a long history of research on Hitomaro's three poems, which have also been analyzed from the narratological perspective (Misaki Hisashi 2005). However, the extant article dealt only with the aspects of time and space, and the narrator was not examined.

The present study attempts a new approach based on the elaborate analysis of narratological poetry, probing whether a narratological lyric analysis of Hitomaro's poems can offer new insights.

キーワード：『萬葉集』第一卷 (*Man'yōshū* Book 1)、柿本人麻呂 (Kakinomoto no Hitomaro)、ナラトロジー・物語論 (narratology)、近江荒都歌 (poems on the decayed Ōmi capital)

The *Man'yōshū* 萬葉集 is the oldest collection of poems in the Japanese style. It contains over 4,500 poems in 20 volumes, and the last poem dates from 759. This paper focuses on poems 1: 29 to 31 from the first volume, which contains a total of 84 poems. A special feature of the first two volumes is the division into historical sections or spaces, respectively, which are preceded by a so-called *hyōmoku* 標目 (“historical section heading;” cf. Duthie 2014, p.181). According to Torquil Duthie, 1: 29 (book 1: poem 29) by Kakinomoto no Hitomaro 柿本人麻呂 is “one of the most famous poems in the anthology *Man'yōshū*, but there is little scholarly consensus on how to interpret it” (2014, p.337). After a brief discussion of some theories, he locates the reason for “such conflicting interpretation” in the “ambiguous nature of the first-person voice” (ibid., p.339). That the voice is indeed a problem in this poem is also evidenced by Misaki Hisashi, whom Duthie considers “the pioneer of narratological approaches of the poetry of the *Man'yōshū*” (ibid., p.219). In Misaki’s analyses, the narrator (*katarite* 語 手) is the most important element along with time and space, yet his examination of poem 1: 29 avoids addressing the problematic nature of the narrator, instead focusing on the factors of space and time (cf. Misaki 2005, pp.185-196). In principle, Duthie’s observations are similarly guided by narratology, but in this poem he too excludes the narrator from the outset. The present study offers another narratological approach, but one in which the question of the narrator will be addressed. However, the guiding question is whether narratological tools are at all necessary for deepening our understanding of the poems.<sup>1)</sup>

Since the first volume as a whole displays narrative features, it is useful to take a look at its structure first, as Hitomaro’s poems 1: 29 to 31, known as the “poems on the decayed Ōmi capital” (Ōmi *kōto-ka* 近江荒都歌),<sup>2)</sup> can only be understood within this framework. Furthermore, these three poems are followed by two short *tanka* 短歌 poems composed by another author that must not be excluded from the investigation. I understand a coherent group of poems with shared narrative features as a sequence, as opposed to groups without such connections.<sup>3)</sup> Although the two *tanka* following Hitomaro’s poems on the decayed capital are usually not considered in this context, they share similarities in content,

---

1) For another narratological approach to *Man'yōshū* poems, see Wittkamp 2021.

2) Cf. Itō 1, p.124, Maruyama 1999, or Misaki 2005, p.185.

3) Cf. Wittkamp 2021, pp.74-75. The term ‘sequence’ here is not to be confused with the term *rensaku* 連作 in Japanese descriptions.

expression, and formal aspects, so that they are understood in the present study as belonging to the sequence. The position of these two poems poses a puzzle in the first place, as the third book contains another poem on the old capital by the same author that for some reason was not included in the first book.

The poems in the *Man'yōshū* are presumed to have been composed on various occasions and were then incorporated in the anthology later on. However, a narratological study can discount this context and be limited to the texts alone. This is also done by Misaki, for example, who even detaches individual poems from a coherent sequence, an approach which is not the exception but rather the norm in current research. Be that as it may, within the framework of the collection, the poems furthermore have peritexts, such as titles, prefaces, or notes that were added later. These peritexts can guide the reading of a poem or sequence and should necessarily be included in the examination as well (cf. Klimek 2018).

Long *chōka* 長歌 poems in particular can unfold complex narrative structures, and the poem 1: 29 is an impressive example of this. As mentioned, Misaki analyzes the *Man'yōshū* poems in terms of the three basic factors of narrator, space, and time, but in recent Western narratology the narratological approaches to poems have been refined further (cf. Schönert, Hühn, and Stein 2007). This makes it necessary to examine the extent to which these new analytical tools can be fruitful for *Man'yōshū* research. The following observations focus on text description and analysis, which solidify the basis for interpretation. The interpretation itself, however, like the long-discussed question of the main theme (*shudai* 主題, cf. Misaki *ibid.*, p.189), a reading as addressing “spiritual pacification (*tamasidume* 鎮魂;” Duthie 2014, p.338, cf. Itō 1, p.127), or having political undertones, cannot be pursued in this essay, as it would take us too far away from the present topic.

## 1 The Position of the Poems within Book 1

Like the collection as a whole, the first book has come under scrutiny particularly from two directions. On the one hand, the focus has been on the matter of the “structural treatises” (*kōzō-ron* 構造論) dealing with the compilation history of the single books (*maki* 卷) and, on the other hand, on the *Man'yōshū* as a closed and coherent work as we have it before us today. The latter approach, which goes back to the so-called *sakuhin-ron* 作品論, “textimmanence-based analysis,” is a fairly recent concept known as “conception theory (*kōsō-*

ron 構想論).”<sup>4)</sup> In the structural theories, there is unanimity regarding the so-called “Jitō Man’yō” 持統万葉 or the “*ur*-selection” (*gensenbu* 原撰部, Ogawa 2010, p.14) respectively, i.e., the first fifty-three poems of the first book, which were then supplemented in several stages.<sup>5)</sup> However, if there was such an *ur*-selection, it can be further subdivided for hermeneutical reasons into two groups, namely poems 1: 1 to 27 and poems 1: 28 to 53. The first group consists of old poems, that is, poems prior to the move to the Court Fujiwara no Miya, and the second group represents poems of the Fujiwara period.

Before I turn to the order of the poems as it relates to their compilation history, it is worth taking a look at conceptual theories. The first book consists of the *ur*-selection (poems 1: 1 to 53) and one or two supplements, respectively. Within the framework of the first book as a closed and coherent whole, Ichinose Masayuki, Shirotsuki Yōko, and Murase Norio locate its standpoint and perspective in “the present of the Fujiwara Court” (cf. Ichinose 2014, p.37). In other words, the first book was completed during the Fujiwara period, which lasted from 694 to 710. Even poem 1: 84, the last poem belonging to the historical section heading (*hyōmoku*) “Nara no Miya,” does not yet represent the Nara period, but rather “the desire [or hope] for this next period” (Ichinose *ibid.*) that was just beginning to unfold. Thus, from the perspective of conceptual theories, there are also old poems from before Fujiwara contained in this volume, but since advocates of conceptual approaches are not interested in text genesis, they assume a “continuum” (Ichinose *ibid.*). Hitomaro’s poems on the decayed capital can thus be viewed from two angles—conception and compilation—both of which, however, lead to the same results. What is important in any case is their position within the framework of the second subgroup of the *ur*-selection, which must be briefly considered.

4) For *Man’yōshū* and *kōsō-ron*, cf. Ichinose, Shirotsuki, and Murase 2014. The *kōzō-ron* is probably better known as *hensan-kenkyū-shi* 編纂研究, research on compilation history, and the description as *kōsō* versus *kōzō* is a play on words by the authors; cf. *kenshō to kenshō* 顕彰と検証 from the title of the first chapter (Murase 2014). Duthie’s study *Man’yōshū and the Imperial Imagination in Early Japan* (2014) also ultimately belongs to conceptual theories, since he reads the anthology more or less indiscriminately as “imperial imagination” (title) and “imperial history;” cf. Duthie 2014, p.5 and chapter 5, “Poetry Anthology as Imperial History,” *ibid.*, pp.161-200. Such an understanding of the collection as a closed whole with a specific common goal is a core concern of conceptual approaches; for *kōsō-ron* in *Kojiki* research, cf. Wittkamp 2018, pp.49-52.

5) Ogawa (2010) shows that these were not merely additions but that they placed the old parts in new contexts. He describes this process as the “*Man’yōshū* as a rebirth in a transformed form as document (*shomotsu* 書物);” cf. Ogawa 2010, pp.99-101.

Poem 1: 28 is preceded by the historical section heading (*hyōmoku*) “Fujiwara no Miya 藤原宮,” and the poem thus introduces this time-space section. The poem’s title (*daishi* 題詞) indicates that it is by the ruler, and a note to the historical section heading reveals the Japanese posthumous name (*kokufū shigō* 国風諡号) of Jitō Tenno. Since the poem focuses on the direct sight of Mount Ame no Kaguyama 天之香來山, it is obvious that the *locus* of the depicted action is the Court Fujiwara no Miya. This is also made clear by the historical section heading that precedes it. The following poem 1: 29, Hitomaro’s long poem on the decayed capital, begins by naming the mountain Unebi no Yama 畝火之山, and this mountain and the Kaguyama, together with Mount Miminashiyama 耳梨山, are the landmarks of the Fujiwara Court built between these three mountains.<sup>6)</sup> They are also known as the “Three Yamato Mountains” (Yamato *sanzan*), and the mention of the names creates textual coherence and strengthens cultural identity. Regarding poem 1: 28, it should be added that, unlike the court’s move to Nara, there is no corresponding poem that thematizes the move to Fujiwara. Thus, the court in Fujiwara already seems to be a reality. This is also the understanding implied in Ichinose’s “Fujiwara as the present.”

The three poems 1: 50 to 53 are dedicated to the Fujiwara Court, and 1:50 gives a glimpse of the history of the city’s construction. Poems 1: 52 and 53, however, take just the court as their theme and, though not thematized, it is very likely that the construction of the city dragged on for a long time—probably even until shortly before the move to the Court Nara no Miya. While poems 1: 29 to 33 are about a journey of court officials, the following poems exclusively relate to journeys of members of the ruling family. Poems 1: 34 and 35 testify to a journey to Ki no Kuni, 1: 36 to 39 to a journey to Yoshino, 1: 40 to 44 to a journey to Ise,<sup>7)</sup> and finally poems 1: 45 to 49 to a hunting trip by Karu no Miko, the designated heir

---

6) The three mountains are already addressed in poems 1: 2 (Kaguyama) by Jomei Tenno and the sequence 1: 13 to 15 by Tenmu Tenno. Therefore, they are present in the reading memory and need not be mentioned again individually.

7) The five poems (1: 40 to 44) were probably written at a banquet on the occasion of a journey by Jitō Tenno to Ise. The first three of these are by Hitomaro, who describes the travelling women from the perspective of someone who stayed at home. The fourth poem (1: 43) is written by a woman who also stayed at home, and the fifth is by a man who was among the travelling group. There is a longer note after 1: 44 that puts Jitō in a different light. This note and the title before 1: 40 ensure that the five poems belong together, but Hitomaro’s three poems are usually discussed without the other two poems and without the note.

(Monmu Tenno) to the throne. The hunting ground is located between Fujiwara and Ise in the east, just as Yoshino is located between Fujiwara and Ki no Kuni in the south.

Poems 1: 22 to 27 fall under the historical section heading “Asuka no Kiyomihara no Miya,” which was the name of Tenmu’s and after him Jitō’s Court. While the first three poems of this group are dedicated to the Ise region, the last three bear witness to a journey to Yoshino. Thus, poems 1: 28 to 53, the poems of the second subgroup of the *ur*-selection, actualize and reaffirm the old core area around Asuka, that is, they confirm it as the original space of the Tenmu-Jitō dynasty. The framework for this update is provided by poems 1: 28 and the concluding poems 1: 50 to 53, which are all dedicated to the Fujiwara Court, but within this framework the poems of the journey to Lake Biwa—poems 1: 29 to 33—occupy a unique position.

This can also be observed on the social level because, as seen, all other poems of this group (1: 29 to 49) originate from members of the ruling family or bear witness to their travels. The poems on the overgrown capital, however, (1: 29 to 33) were not only written by non-members of the royal family, but in the order of the anthology they come *before* the poems of the journeys of the members of the ruling family. Of course, they follow the poem 1: 28 by the *new* ruler Jitō Tenno, her only poem in the *ur*-selection. Poem 1: 34 is composed by a son of Tenmu, 1: 35 by Princess Ahe, the later Genmei Tenno. If we now take a closer look at who is responsible for the other poems in this subgroup, we experience the next surprise. With the exception of the two poems 1: 43 and 44, which belong to the Ise-journey sequence explained above (cf. footnote 7), all the poems are by Hitomaro. However, the two exceptions, as well as 1: 32 and 33, have to be seen in connection with Hitomaro’s poems, that is, in the context of sequences of which his poems form the nucleus. In the—so to speak—new world of the *ur*-selection formed by poems 1: 28 to 53, Hitomaro is the voice of the realm. Strangely enough, his poems no longer appear in the poems of the later supplements 1: 54 to 83 and 1: 84, but the second book is again dominated by his poems.

## 2 The Peritexts

The title to Hitomaro’s poem 1: 29 is as follows: “At the time when we paid a visit to the ruined capital, Kakinomoto *no asomi* Hitomaro composed poems” (過近江荒都時柿本朝臣人麻呂作歌). Actually, “we” is not inscribed in the title, but details from the poems and the

presence of two named authors suggest a travel group. According to Itō Haku (1, pp.129-130), the title belongs to the so-called “A-form” with the structure “circumstances of composition + author’s name + [indication of] poem production” (作歌事情 *sakka jijō* + 作者名 *sakkamei* + 作歌 *sakka*). The “B-form,” on the other hand, follows the pattern “author’s name + circumstances of composition + poem production” (作者名 + 作歌事情 + 作歌), and the title of poems 1: 32 and 33 corresponds to this type. This combination of an officially titled sequence (A-form) introduced by Hitomaro’s poems and containing poems with B-form titles is also present in the aforementioned sequence 1: 40 to 44. In both sequences, the titles of the B-form are, so to speak, within the sphere of activity of the title of the A-form. If the information about the circumstances of the poem is not limited to “the author” and concerns a third party, the A-form comes into play, but private poems have B-form titles, which Itō considers applicable to the *Man’yōshū* in general. Thus, the official character of the poetry is already displayed in the title structure, and Itō (1, p.126) draws on this to strengthen his thesis that the poems are about a travel group that was on an official mission. Surprisingly, Duthie turns down the assumption that

[...] it is the poet, Hitomaro himself, who “visits” (過) the Ōmi capital. But in fact all that the heading says is that Hitomaro “composed” (作) the poem. The grammatical subject of “visiting” (過) is not clearly stated. (2014, p.339)

Presumably, Duthie has to take this standpoint to clarify the “first-person voice of the poem,” but he is to be challenged for two reasons. The first one concerns the use of 過 in classical Chinese *shi* 詩 poetry, the second the contemporaneous reception, regarding which there is an important hint. The character 過 means “to pay a visit during a journey” or “to make a detour to visit something.” It appears in various titles of *shi* poetry, which was known in Japan, with another example in old Japanese poetry being poem no. 95 from the Japanese *shi* anthology *Kaifūsō* 懷風藻 (cf. Tatsumi 2012, pp.420-423). No one would doubt in classical Chinese poetry that it was the person specified in the title who paid the visit. Otherwise, even as fictional literature, the situation would be far too complicated: The poet sits at home while someone else pays the visit. In fact, this is the case in the sequence 1: 40 to 44, but there it is also explicitly stated that this someone else (Jitō Tenno) is on a journey

while the poet (Hitomaro) has to watch over the capital. In addition, there is also the question of the two poems 1: 32 and 33 that are identified by name. Why should this person be on site but not “Hitomaro”? Furthermore, Duthie does not pay attention to ... 時, “At the time when ...” The two characters, 過 indicating space and 時 indicating time, together create a typical chronotopos<sup>8)</sup> expressing reflexivity. This conventionally preset situation evokes a speaker instance—be it a poet or narrator—that is on location as indicated.

The second objection is that, that unlike many other poems, the sequence 1: 29 to 31 is not annotated. The importance of correctly understanding the names given in the title is shown by the note on the title to poems 1: 32 and 33, which corrects the given name “Furuhito” to “Kurohito.” These notes, which are inscribed to the left of the poem (*sachū* 左注), presumably were added about one generation later and mostly involve explanations of the author’s name or the biographical (historical) circumstances of the composition. If the reason for the omission of a note was the lack of material, the simple mention “unknown” etc. could have been made, as occurs in other notes. In other words, the names and the circumstances explained in the title to 1: 29 were not at all in doubt, nor was the given information unclear in any respect.<sup>9)</sup> I will come back to this, but first the poems themselves must be introduced and narratologically analyzed.<sup>10)</sup>

### 3 The Narrative Structure of the Sequence

Although the following analyses focus on poem 1: 29, to understand the overall narrative framework it is necessary to translate the entire sequence. The text contains so-called *ibun*

---

8) Toya Takaaki (2000, pp.18-20) sees in 1: 29 to 31 an example of his thesis that landscape (*kei* 景) is structured by concrete things (*butsu/mono* 物) existing at the points of contact of space and time; for “chronotopos” (Mikhail Bakhtin), cf. Wittkamp 2014 a, pp.134-135.

9) Hitomaro’s Yoshino poems 1: 36 to 39 and the sequence 1: 45 to 49 also have no annotations, but the aforementioned sequence 1: 40 to 44 does.

10) My translations are “working translations” that serve only to clarify the narrative aspects. An attempt was made to preserve the original line sequence as much as possible. For more sophisticated translations, see Duthie 2014, pp.334-336 and Cranston 1993, pp.190-192, and for the transliterations with emphasis on the Chinese characters cf. Wittkamp 2014 a, pp.25-28. A closer examination and exact translation of the grammar as well as the translation of the *makura-kotoba* 枕詞 (“pillow word”) have been omitted; for these aspects and linguistic problems, cf. Vovin 2017, pp.93-103.



異文, i.e., alternative verses and expressions inscribed using smaller characters.<sup>11)</sup> These phrases and lines, which belong to the peritext, are presumably preliminary versions that were altered and adapted during the compilation.<sup>12)</sup>

過近江荒都時柿本朝臣人麻呂作歌

玉手次 畝火之山乃 檀原乃 日知之御世從 或云  
 自宮 阿礼座師 神之盡 樛木乃 彌繼嗣爾 天下 所  
 知食之乎 或云 食来天爾滿 倭乎置而 青丹吉 平  
 山乎超 或云 虛見 倭乎置 青丹吉 平山越而 何方 御  
 念食可 或云 所念計米可 天離 夷者雖有 石走 淡  
 海國乃 樂浪乃 大津宮爾 天下 所知食兼 天皇之  
 神之御言能 大宮者 此間等雖聞 大殿者 此間等  
 雖云 春草之 茂生有 霞立 春日之霧流 或云 霞立  
 春日香霧流 夏草香 繁成奴留 百礪城之 大宮處 見  
 者悲毛 或云 見者左夫思毛

反歌

樂浪之 思賀乃 辛碕 雖幸有 大宮人之 船麻知兼  
 津  
 左散難彌乃 志我能 一云 比良乃 大和太 與杼六  
 友 昔人二 亦母相目八毛 一云 將會跡母戸八

高市 古人感傷近江舊堵作歌 或書云高市連黑人  
 古人爾和禮有哉 樂浪乃 故京乎 見者悲寸  
 樂浪乃 國都美神乃 浦佐備而 荒有京 見者悲毛

At the time when we paid a visit to the ruined capital, Hitomaro composed poems.

[*tama-da-suki*] / At Mount Unebi / Since the age of the sun-lord in Kashihara [also said  
 “since the palace”] / (5) Those who were born / Every single one of those gods / [like]  
 Evergreen *tsuga* trees / One after another / [the realm] Under Heaven / (10) [they]

11) The alternative versions, marked with different typography, are typical of Hitomaro's texts. Usually, improvements at the written level (*suikō*) are assumed, but Saijō (2009, pp.139-170) rejects this. Based on the two aspects of “style” (*buntai*) and “ideation, idea” (*hassō*), he concludes (ibid., 144) that the “foreign text system” (*ibun-kei*) was written in the style of recitation (reading out loud) and the authorized “main text system” (*honbun-kei*) in the style of writing (silent reading). Furthermore, he (ibid., 150) suspects that the changes were not made to each poem individually, but collectively.

12) Vovin (2017, pp.92-99) presents two different texts of the poem. However, by arranging them as “1.29 a” and “29 b,” the genesis is reversed, and the text from “29 b” containing the smaller characters should be first. Vovin is certainly right in writing that “the readings from a second version are multiple and sometimes very divergent” (ibid., p.93), but he does not reflect on the problem sufficiently. Why, for example, are the two poems 1: 25 and 26, which are very similar, written out as separate poems? There could be reasons for the difference in representation that are now completely lost.

Have reigned [also said: “ (as I see now, they have reigned<sup>13)</sup>”] / [sora ni mitsu] / [Tenji Tenno] Leaving Yamato / [awo-ni-yoshi] / And passed across Nara mountains [also said: “[he] left ... Yamato / crossing ... Nara mountains] / (15)—What did [he] / Deign to have thought? [also says: “could have been in his mind?”]<sup>14)</sup>—/ That far away from heaven / In the barbarous [land] / [iha-bashiru] / (20) In the land Ōmi / in Sasanami / In the Ōtsu Court / [From there he] (25) ruled [the realm] Under Heaven / The lord from heaven / The sovereign god [Tenji tenno] / “His Great Court / here it was,” we have heard / (30) “The Great Hall / Here it was,” they have said / [However,] spring grasses / Has overgrown [everything] / [covered in] The rising spring mist / (35) [Where the] Spring sun is shining [one says: “The rising spring mist / The sun? Is shining / The summer thicket / is growing so densely] / [...] / The place of the Great Court / Seeing it, makes [me/us] so sad [another says: “Seeing it, [I/we] feel grief”]

Envoy (*hanka*)

In Sasanami / Cape Kara / though [you are] not changing / For the boats of the people from the Great Court [You] wait in vain

In Sasanami / The wide shore of Shiga [one says: “of Hira”] / Though [your] waters are still / The people of old times / How could [you] meet them [you cannot]? [one says: “Do you think to meet them?”]

- 
- 13) I translate the presumably older version in the sense of representing sudden recognition (*kizuki no keru* 気づきのけり), and the improved version as presenting the historical events more as facts. Vovin translates lines 9 and 10 and their older versions indiscriminately by “(10) Although [Emperor Tenji] ruled (9) [the Land] under Heaven [...]” (2017, p.94) and “(10) [Emperor Tenji] ruled over (9) [the Land] under Heaven [...]” (ibid., p.98). The added subject “Emperor Tenji” is wrong. Saijō (2009, p.141) sees a “separating” (*kireru* 切れる) in the authorized *honbun* text versus “non-separating” (*kirenai* 切れない) in the *ibun* text; cf. Inaoka 1, p.28. In the *honbun* text, there is a concessive subordinate clause due to *wo*, but in the *ibun* version, the verses stand as attributive embellishments to Yamato.
- 14) While the *ibun* version emphasizes the presumption about the past (*shi-kemu*), the authorized version places more emphasis on honorific expression (*shi-mesu*) and “question conditions” (*gimon jōken* 疑問条件; Kojima et al. 1, p.43). Saijō (2009, p.141) summarizes the versions as “present tense” in the *honbun* text versus “past tense” in the *ibun* text; cf. also Duthie 2014, pp.345-346.

Takechi no Furuhiro felt sadness towards the old capital and composed poems.  
Another book says: „Takechi *no muraji* Kurohito.“

A man from the past / Is it me? / In Sasanami / The old capital / Seeing it makes me  
sad

In Sasanami / The Spirits of the Land / Their hearts darkened and / The old capital /  
Seeing it makes me so sad

The structure of poem 1: 29 consists of a long sentence leading to the “mediating agent”<sup>15)</sup> (or narrative medium, which is for the time being the narrator, speaker, poet, [implied/abstract] author, or narrated self), its perceptions, and expression of feelings. Within this structure, lines 15 and 16, *ikasama ni omohishimese ka*, “what did [Tenji Tenno] deign to have thought?”, seem heterogeneous. As an “argument” they belong to another “text-type”<sup>16)</sup> and are an expression of mourning poetry, occurring in the *banka* poems 2: 162, 2: 167, or slightly modified in 2: 217. They triggered the “mourning poetry discourse on the poems on the decayed capital Ōmi” (近江荒都歌挽歌論 Ōmi *kōto-ka banka-ron*), which, according to Misaki (2005, p.185), forms one of the main currents within the plentiful research on this poem (cf. Duthie 2014, p.338). As Misaki continues, recent scholarship understands the two lines as “interpolated lines” (*sōnyūku* 挿入句), and the entire poem sketches “one [single] sentence” (*ichibun* 一文).<sup>17)</sup> The question of the insertion of the verses remains open, but it is conceivable that the authorized lines occurred when the preliminary version was revised for presentation at court or for the *ur*-selection compiled in the late 690 s. For the narratological analysis, however, only the text at hand counts, and from this perspective the function and position of the lines must again be questioned.

15) Cf. Hühn and Sommer 2012 (“Narration in Poetry and Drama”, revised 2013).

16) Seymour Chatman distinguishes the three “text-types [...] Narrative, Description and Argument” (1990, p.7). While the text immediately before and after the two lines 15 and 16 belong to the “text-type” of “narrative,” the two lines present an “argument.” At the end of the poem 1: 29, the text type “description” also occurs.

17) Itō (1, p.126) calls this structure *zenbun ichibun* 全文一文, “the whole text in one sentence.” Vovin (2017, pp.94 and 98), who “translates” all the poems as syntactically and grammatically correct prose texts, divides the long poem into five sentences, which in oral recitation meant lowering the voice or pausing and breaking the tension of the voice.

Misaki (ibid., 187) divides the poem into two halves. He locates the “node” (*kessetsu-ten* 結節点) in lines 26 and 27 with the deifying description of the Tenno as *sumeroki no kami no mikoto no* and sees the first half as an “attributive embellishment” (*rentai shūshoku-ku* 連体修飾句) of the two lines. This corresponds to an attributive subordinate clause in the poem’s structure, but the two lines themselves are again an attributive embellishment of line 28 using *oho-miya* to address the Grand Palace (*oho-miya*). Thus, the Grand Palace mentioned twice is the actual node, resulting in the following model:

A: introduction (history) → (location of the) Grand Palace ← B: view (narrative present)

The description as a node concerns an important aspect, but should not distract from the fact that the entire structure boils down to the mediating agent, its perceptions presented as descriptions by a guide, and its expression of emotions. As Misaki (ibid.) shows, there is a tendency in research to understand part A as history and thus as a representation of time, whereas in part B, the emphasis is on space. These are differences which Chatman’s distinction of “text-types” help to clarify. Misaki, however, is concerned with proving that both factors (time and space) are involved in part A as well. In any case, it is crucial to note that the *location* of the Grand Palace (*ohomiya / ohomiya-dokoro*) is the node in spatial *and* temporal terms because this chronotopos par excellence is the scene (location) of the narration, that is, of thoughts about the past and perceptions in the narrative present.

The introductory part A can again be divided into two parts. The subpart A 1 is arranged as a concessive subordinate clause (“although”) and up to line 10 it describes in a “compressed narration” (Schmid 2010, p.202, also: “summary narration”) the unbroken line of rulers from Jinmu on, who—allegedly—always had their courts in Yamato.<sup>18)</sup> The subpart A 2 depicts in lines 11 to 24 Tenji’s departure from Yamato and the way over the hills of Nara towards the new capital. At the same time, at the discourse or presentation level, there is a noticeable “expansion,” a throttling of the “narrating time,” which is intensified by the

---

18) Part A 1 is thus a fine example of an invention of a tradition. Furthermore, it should be noted that such a compressed narration of history did not exist before in Japanese literature. It summarizes twenty-six volumes of *Nihon shoki* 日本書紀 (volume 3 from Jinmu to volume 27, the book “Tenji”).

epithets or “pillow words” added to the place names.<sup>19)</sup> The two subparts A 1 and A 2 can be read as a coherent embedded narrative in which Tenji's leaving is a “type II event.” In other words, the poem displays “eventfulness” (“Ereignishaftigkeit,” cf. Hühn and Schönert 2007), i.e., an event worthy of narration (tellability).<sup>20)</sup> These aspects will be returned to in the conclusion.

In this context, it is noticeable that the interpolated lines “what did he deign to have thought?” occur, in a sense, too late, between the Nara Hills and the arrival in the “distant barbarian province” (*hina*). Strictly speaking, the lines question not the leaving of Yamato, but the choice of destination. So they put more emphasis on the place where the mediating agent is at the moment. On the other hand, the interpolated lines conversely bind the two subparts A 1 and A 2 closer together, since they emphasize the eventfulness and the change of state, respectively.

From a narratological point of view, the whole of part A presenting an embedded narrative (a story within a story) can be read as an “aufbauende Analepse,” a formative or introductory analepsis.<sup>21)</sup> In literary construction, the effect consists in an emphasis on the fact that the mediating agent is actually at the site of the former capital during the narrative time of the analepsis. The inserted lines *ikasama omohoshimese ka*, “what did he deign to have thought?”, not only represent thought-speech but also emphasize the whole building analepsis by indicating that the thoughts are running through the mediating agent's mind in the here and now (*origo*) of the dilapidated and overgrown location of the Grand Palace (*oho-*

---

19) For “compression and expansion,” see Schmid 2010, pp.199-204. The distinction between “Erzählzeit” (narrating time) and “erzählte Zeit” (narrated time) was introduced by Günther Müller in 1947; cf. Müller 1968, pp.269-286 and Martínez and Scheffel 2016, pp.42-47.

20) As Peter Hühn explains the “term ‘event’ refers to a change of state as one of the constitutive features of narrativity [...]. We can distinguish between *event I*, a general type of event that has no special requirements, and *event II*, a type of event that satisfies certain additional conditions. A type I event is any change of state explicitly or implicitly represented in a text. A change of state qualifies as a type II event if it is accredited—in an interpretive, context-dependent decision—with certain features such as relevance, unexpectedness, and unusualness. The two types of event correspond to broad and narrow definitions of narrativity, respectively: narration as the relation of changes of any kind and narration as the representation of changes with certain qualities” (Hühn 2013, “Event and Eventfulness”). For eventfulness and tellability, cf. Schmid 2010, pp.1-21.

21) Cf. Martínez and Scheffel 2016, p.38. For a “building analepses” in the introduction to Bashō's *Oku no hosomichi*, see Wittkamp 2019, pp.53-57.

*miya-dokoro*). In other words, an important function of the two lines is to guarantee an understanding of the entire analepsis as thought-speech presenting a narrative. This could be the reason that the lines were not inserted directly after Yamato, but after the Nara hills and thus closer to the place of the narration. However, it thereby constitutes another argument against Duthie's idea that "Hitomaro" is not on site. Admittedly, it still has to be clarified what is to be understood by this name.

The accentuation of the spatial aspects in part B can be seen, on the one hand, in the slowed down, almost paused time during the description of the overgrown ruins—in contrast to the high narrative speed in part A. The repetition of the deictic references 此間 *koko*, "here," is striking. The deixis that Misaki (*ibid.*, p.188) describes as *genjō shiji* 現場指示, which means spatial references in the area of the visible environment, thus refer to the origo, that is the "reference point on which deictic relationships are based" ([en.wikipedia.org](http://en.wikipedia.org)), the deictic center in the here and now of the perceiving mediating agent or the narrated self, respectively (see below).<sup>22)</sup> According to Kojima et al. (6, p.43) the characters 此間 *cijian* from classical Chinese literature stand for "here" in colloquial language (*zokugoteki yōhō* 俗語の用法), and Inaoka (1, p.28) sees the repetition as a "parallel form close to oral song poetry." However, the poem may have strayed far from oral forms, and perhaps the Chinese characters stage a situation in which the mediating agent refers to a local guide or member of the group who speaks colloquial language. It would thus be a staged colloquialism, but it remains questionable, of course, whether the classical Chinese phrase was understood as colloquial in its ancient Japanese reception.<sup>23)</sup>

22) Kageyama (2011, p.23) claims that within *Man'yōshū* poems there is usually no "marker that determines the poem producer (*eisakusha* 詠作者)." All he seems to have in mind are the names woven in (as in 3: 337 or 16: 3826), not clues such as deixis or perspective. That the "author"—in the sense of implicit or abstract—"principally" exists outside the poem, that is, exclusively within the peritexts, is not comprehensible. There is a semantic relationship between the instance appearing in the title or the postscript and the poem text, which is consequently noticeable in the fact that the peritexts can considerably guide the interpretation of the poem texts.

23) In passing, one aspect should be pointed out at this point that speaks against Duthie's proposal that in "Hitomaro's poem, the Jitō court is 'pretending,' so to speak, to have no first-hand experience or living memory of the Ōmi capital" (2014, p.343). If Duthie were right about this, it would mean that Jitō herself also lacked knowledge of the ancient capital's past. This is difficult to imagine, especially since Hitomaro in the first book (in the Yoshino poems) elevates her to the level of a deity. If local leaders, who speak colloquial language, know the past, but not the ruler—what kind ↗

Misaki highlights the repetition of *koko*, but in doing so seems to overlook another spatial reference, 所 *tokoro* in *oho-miya-dokoro* in line 36, the “location” of the Grand Palace, which sight makes the mediating agent “sad.” According to Misaki, it is about “something that cannot be seen in reality, namely that which is presented on the other side of the real landscape, half as an illusion” (ibid., p.188). In some ways, however, this undermines his claim for the thematic primacy of time, for what is perceived by the mediating agent /narrated self is the location (*tokoro*) with rampant green plants, sultry air, and finally, in the two *hanka* poems 1: 30 and 31, the shore region of Lake Biwa.<sup>24)</sup> It is the—literarily staged—sight of a real world that triggers cognitive processes. Here, once again, the function of the analepsis in Part A must be considered, and the two *hanka* poems are doubly connected to part B in narrative terms, namely in terms of content via the ideas/memories and spatially as a *lieux de mémoires*, a site of memory.

Misaki (ibid.) suspects in the narrator's (*katarite*) change of view from the courtyard to the lakeshore a passage of time associated with a change of place, even if both are minimal. As in the long poem, the new setting of the lakeshore serves as a trigger (cue) for imaginations or memories of the past. For Misaki (ibid., p.188, p.190), “the boats of the people from the court” in poem 1: 30 and the “people from the past” in 1: 31 are a “non-existent landscape” (*hizai no kei* 非在の景), but since they are there nonetheless, it is an “illusionary landscape” (*genkei* 幻景). The juxtaposition of the real landscape and the illusionary landscape gives rise to the “moment in which the past is confronted (*taiji* 対峙) with the present.” However, there is an essential difference between the sight of the location of the Grand Palace and the lakeside: for how does the mediating agent /narrated self, to whom everything must be explained in the long poem, know about the former activities on the lakeside? Is this difference to be taken as a sign of an unreliable narrator, or is it the change from the diegetic narrator to a non-diegetic narrator<sup>25)</sup> with the competence to know the

---

↘ of ruler would that be?

24) According to the Kojima et al. (6, p.43), lines 31 to 34 as “parallel verses” precede “attributively and decoratively” the “location of the Grand Palace” in line 35. The spoken language actually shows a parallel arrangement of five and seven syllables, where the long verses correspond in content (but not the short verses). However, since the verses consist of three, three, two, and five characters, they do not form a parallelism for the reading eye, and there are doubts about their content as well.

25) The opposition of *diegetic* narrator versus *non-diegetic* narrator describes the “presence of the ↗

inner workings—so to speak—of the landscape?

#### 4 The *hanka* Poems 1: 30 and 31

Misaki (ibid., 189) sees the main theme of the two *hanka* poems not as landscape or space but time, while arguing that the poems are not mere appendages to the long poem either. According to him, they absorb the whole of the long poem, that is, its time and space. This reading deserves mentioning for two reasons. On the one hand, on the level of content, it confirms the structure of the long poem, which boils down to the origo, that is, to the perceptions of the mediating agent/narrated self in the here and now. The second reason is the formal level, on which the markings of the presumably older versions are not only done by smaller characters inscribed in two lines. For in the poem 1: 29, the alternative or older versions are introduced by 或云, “it also says,” but in the poem 1: 31 by 一云, “another says.”<sup>26)</sup> Kōnoshi Takamitsu (quoted from Inaoka 1, p.464) therefore assumes that poem 1: 31 initially existed independently—the first version—and was adapted as a *hanka* poem when it was added. The place name “Hira” occurring in the older version, which is already known from the note to 1: 7, is located about twenty kilometers further north from Cape Karasaki. According to Kōnoshi, as a *hanka* poem, this was too far away from the old capital (cf. Omodaka 1, p.267).

Whether Kōnoshi also explains the exchange of the last line of 1: 31 has not been checked, but *omofu*, “to think, to remember,” in *omohe ya* is a mnemo-noetic verb phrase that is typical of poetry of memory (“Erinnerungsdichtung”) in this position within the last two lines (cf. Wittkamp 2014 a/b). Kojima et al. (6, p.44) assume as the subject of *omofu* the “author” (*sakusha* 作者), and it is conceivable that the exchange of this phrase accordingly has the effect of emphasizing anthropomorphism or creating it in the first place.<sup>27)</sup> What

↘ narrator on both levels of the represented world, the level of the narrated world, or diegesis, and the level of narration, or exegesis” (Schmid 2010, p.68).

26) Itō (1, p.128) assumes that the inserted versions were the first versions that were created on site during the journey. These were then improved into the present main text for presentation at the court.

27) Misaki (2005, p.190) also understands both *hanka* poems 1: 30 and 31 as anthropomorphism (*gijinka* 擬人化) and asks about the triggering moment of this “idea formation.” As he further explains, the narrator’s method of not expressing his feelings himself nor transferring them to other people and instead transmitting them to an “insentient existence” (*hijō no sonzai* 非情の存在) ↗



these observations, as well as the older versions themselves, bring to mind once again is the literary staging as a whole, in which even the “real landscape” is ultimately a fictional, replaceable one.

In the *banka* poem 2: 152 mourning Tenji's death, the “longing” for a boat from Cape Karasaki also occurs.<sup>28)</sup> Gary L. Ebersole reads this as a variant of anthropomorphism, adding as subject “the *kami* or local divinity” from Cape Karasaki:

This is another rhetorical device used to emphasize the sovereignty of the deceased emperor as even the land (i.e. the local *kami*) feels a deep sense of loss whenever he is absent. It also functions in the ritual context to draw the spirit of the deceased back to this place so closely connected with his life. (1989, p.177)

The mourning poem is about the boat of the deceased ruler, which Nukata no Ōkimi 額田王 makes the subject of the preceding poem 2: 151. In the order of the collection, the two related *banka* poems are older than Hitomaro's *hanka* poems 1: 30 and 31, as they were reportedly written during the time of the “great temporary enshrinement” (*oho-araki* 大殯), shortly after Tenji's death 671, when the old capital still existed.<sup>29)</sup> Although Hitomaro's 1: 36

---

↘ tends to suppress subjective feelings. This expression was therefore essentially different from the expression of *banka* mourning poetry and indicated that it was not a consolatory (*ibu* 慰撫) or spiritual pacification (*tamashi-zume* 鎮魂). Omodaka (1, pp.268-269) also reads this passage as anthropomorphism but sees a difference: while in 1: 30 the grammar...*are do...kane-tsu* speaks for reality, in 1: 31 the grammar expresses with...*tomo...me ya* a hypothesis (*katei* 假定) in which a subjectivity is inscribed that deepens the memories of the past and the feelings of the author. Vovin presents the long poem in the two versions “1.29 a” and “1.29 b,” but leaves 1: 31 as just one version. The differences, he writes, are not great enough (2017, p.101). Furthermore, while he paraphrases 1: 30, where the translation of *sakiku* as “to be calm” is questionable, as an anthropomorphism, he adds the subject “I” in 1: 31 (ibid., pp.99-101). As with Omodaka, this draws into the two *hanka* poems a difference that makes no sense—the deletion of *omohe ya*, “should I think that? (hardly),” might just be aimed at avoiding an “I.” Vovin, however, does not address the different markings 或 云 in the long poem and in the 一 云 *hanka* poem. Omodaka (1, p.268) describes the corrected version as “appropriate,” but without giving reasons for this.

28) Shiga was the site of, among other things, the temple Yamadera 山寺, built in 668 on the orders of Tenji Tenno. Like Sūfukuji 崇福寺, it was one of the “ten great temples,” but it no longer exists. Poem 2: 115 was composed when a prince was sent to this temple.

29) Reading according to Kojima et al. (6, p.110); the character 殯 is also read *mogari*. Omodaka ↗

makes the pleasure of the “people of the Great Court” (*oho-miya-hito*) in boats a theme in one of Jitō’s journey to Yoshino, thereby hinting at some predilection, the symbolism of the boats of the court members in 1: 30 and 31 seems to go beyond that.

Misaki (*ibid.*, p.190) wonders why it is the “people of the Grand Palace” and the “people of old” who represent the “time gone by” (*ōji* 往時) in Hitomaro’s two *hanka* poems. Here he notes again that Tenji Tenno does not occur in the long poem in the syntactic “position as subject,” but precedes the Grand Palace (*oho-miya*) attributively in the deification as *sumeroki no kami no mikoto no* in lines 26 and 27. Misaki concludes that it is not Tenji but the decayed and overgrown palace area “in and of itself” that is thematized.<sup>30</sup> This is acceptable because, after all, the long poem does not say “when I think of it” etc., which would concern part A, but “when I see it” (見者 *mire ba*), which refers to actual viewing in the narrative present. However, this is done from the perspective of the mediating agent, so that ultimately the mediating agent makes itself the main theme as a narrated self.

Although the move of the capital to the location of the narrative present appears as a misstep of history by means of the interpolated lines “what did he deign to have thought?” as well as the geopolitically evaluative description “heavenly far away in barbarian province (*hina*),” the location itself, as well as the no-longer-existing facilities, suggest cultural sophistication. Not only was there a Grand Palace (*oho-miya*) and a Great Audience Hall (*oho-tono*),<sup>31</sup> but the capital allowed the “people of the Great Court” or the “people of old” time to enjoy boat rides, which in Hitomaro’s poems presumably means leisure and amusement at the highest level. This picture of high cultural achievements, especially with regard to

---

↘(1, pp.266-267) draws attention to an essential difference between 1: 30 and 2: 152. While 2: 152 expresses an assumption through the auxiliary verb *ramu* (“the Kara-Kap in Shiga is probably waiting eagerly”), in 1: 30 the auxiliary verb *tsu* (perfective aspect) proves the waiting to be in vain—the expected object no longer comes. This detail thus also shows the temporal difference between the two poems.

30) Cf. Misaki 2005, pp.190-191. He merely mentions that the ruler is “drawn into and integrated into the textual context,” but does not bring up the subject of the long sentence (*ichibun*), namely the mediating agent, at any point. Since, as seen, he excludes the narrator (*katarite*) in the study of 1: 29 to 31, it almost seems as if he recoils from the idea that the mediating agent ultimately thematizes itself.

31) The word *oho-tono* occurs repeatedly in the *Nihon shoki*, but *oho-miya* only at the end of the book “Jomei.” The first time both buildings are mentioned together is in the second book “Tenmu,” who was Tenji’s successor.

writing and poetry, is also represented by the preface to the *Kaifūsō*, which, with its regrets about the destruction of the capital, introduces a topic that seems almost taboo in the sequence 1: 29 to 31.<sup>32)</sup>

## 5 The *tanka* Poems 1: 32 and 33

1: 29 to 31 are followed by two more short poems on the “old capital” (舊堵)<sup>33)</sup> which also express “sad feelings” (感傷). Its title structure indicates a private poem, in which the author’s name is followed by the circumstances of the poem and poem production. In the *ur*-selection, the two poems are the first and perhaps only evidence of private poetry composed by a person who neither belonged to the ruling family nor was commissioned by it.<sup>34)</sup> Furthermore, with 和禮 *ware*, poem 1: 32 presents for the first time a mediating agent of non-aristocratic origin revealing itself in the text as “I.” In the history of storytelling, the poem is memorable for that alone.<sup>35)</sup> The contrast to Hitomaro’s A-form title argues at first glance for separation from his poems, but a narrative reading nonetheless brings the poems together as

---

32) Cf. the translation of the *Kaifūsō* passage in Duthie 2014, pp.148-149. As he (*ibid.*, p.154) shows, the *Nihon shoki* may also contain such praise. There it is said that “the [classical Chinese] *shi* and *fu* poetry began with/at Ōtsu” (詩賦興自大津始也). As the son of Tenmu Tenno, Ōtsu 大津 was a potential successor to the throne and was probably eliminated for that reason, having been accused of attempted rebellion in 686. The *Nihon shoki* entry portrays the prince as a sympathetic and highly educated person. The end of the entry presents the name without a designation such as “Prince,” so it can also be read as the place name “Ōtsu,” where Tenji’s Ōmi court was located. This would be in line with the statement in the *Kaifūsō* preface.

33) Kojima et al. (6, p.44) read the character 堵, which appears once again in the title to poem 3: 312, as *miyako* and explain it as a synonym to 都 *miyako* (cf. the title to 1: 29). The character with the Middle Chinese reading tuX means: “1 unit measure of earthen wall, usu. understood as 5 版 bǎn (equiv. 40 尺 feet) long and 1 丈 zhàng (equiv. 10 feet) tall; some sources say 10 feet long and 10 feet tall. a) gen. term for earthen wall. [...]” (Kroll 2015, digital). Satake et al. (1, p.36) read 舊堵 as *kyūto* and transliterate them as 旧都. They suspect that the characters refer to the dilapidated walls of the courtyard. Neither of the two characters can be assumed to be a “city” as we understand it today.

34) Poem 1: 43 from the sequence 1: 40 to 44 possibly also represents—as a literary production—another exception but should be understood as an official banquet poem under the influence of the title to 1: 40.

35) The personal pronoun *ware* (*are*) already occurs in poem 1: 1, where it stands for Yūryaku, as well as in 1: 16, a poem by Nukata no Ōkimi commissioned by the highest authority, and further in 1: 21, a poem by the “crown prince,” presumably Tenmu.

they continue the theme, contribute another voice and perspective, and share other points of reference. Itō Haku assumes in the composition of 1: 29 to 31 that an official travel group was on a journey to northern lands (cf. Itō 1, p.383), but he writes nothing about possible connections. However, the two poems support the impression of the existence of a group, to which the author of poems 1: 32 and 33 also belonged. The journeys occurring in the first two *Man'yōshū* volumes were in principle not undertaken for pleasure (cf. Duthie 2014: 184).

Nothing is known about the name “Takechi no Furuhiro” 高市古人 given in the title, and according to the note, the name “elsewhere is Takechi *no muraji* Kurohito” 高市連黒人. The latter, in turn, is a well-known poet, and commentaries see an error in the transcription or a confusion with 古人 *inishihe no hito* in the first line of 1: 32. Since the title to poem 1: 34 again is couched in the official A-form and indicates a Tenno journey, poems 1: 32 and 33 seem to be interpolated. However, they also create a sense of belonging with the preceding poems in that they answer some questions that may have been raised. Since the constellation of official poetry and appended private poetry occurs again in poems 1: 40 to 44, there is nothing to prevent connecting 1: 32 and 33 to the preceding sequence.

Poem 1: 32, despite Hitomaro’s poems, gives the impression that there is more to see from the old capital. With poem 3: 305, there is another one that Kurohito may have written on “the old capital at Ōmi” (近江 舊都) at the same time. Aso Mizue (1, p.133) suspects that the sympathy it expresses for the people of the old capital is too direct and that the poem was therefore not included in the first volume. The question of why 1: 32 and 33 were included does not arise in the commentaries consulted here. Be it as it may, Itō (1, pp.131-132) sees Kurohito as the younger poet oriented toward Hitomaro. Whereas in 1: 32 Kurohito sought direct connection to Hitomaro’s poems, Itō continues, in 1: 33 he expresses his own “true interests.” Among other things, Itō sees *kuni tsu mi-kami*, the “illustrious earth deities” (= 地 祇 *kuni tsu kami*, the “chthonic deities”) in 1: 33, as being in direct contrast to the 天神 *ama tsu kami*, the “heaven deities” in 1: 29.<sup>36)</sup>

1: 32 and 33 offer so many points of reference to Hitomaro’s poems that it would be difficult not to connect them—otherwise no reason could be found for their placement in

---

36) These heaven deities are not directly expressed, but a reference is given via 天下 *Ame no Shita*, “Under Heaven,” and other phrases with 天, “Heaven.” The deceased Tenno probably belong to the *ama tsu kami*, “heaven deities,” since the ancestors are descended from heaven.

their present position. They offer a different perspective and help to forestall possible ambiguities emerging from the preceding poems. Furthermore, they relativize a possible suggestion of criticism in that the second poem attributes the reason for the decayed and overgrown capital to the condition of the “illustrious earth deities” (*kuni no mi-kami*).<sup>37)</sup> From today's point of view, it seems that one reason for adding the two poems is to clarify some issues raised by Hitomaro's poems.

## 6 Transgeneric Narratology

In the introduction to “Narration in Poetry and Drama”, an article from the *Living Handbook of Narratology* (LHN, University of Hamburg, internet), Peter Hühn and Roy Sommer explain as follows:

[...] a communicative act in which a chain of happenings is meaningfully structured and transmitted in a particular medium and from a particular point of view underlies not only narrative fiction proper but also poems and plays in that they, too, represent temporally organized sequences and thus relate “stories,” albeit with certain genre-specific differences, necessarily mediating them in the manner of presentation. Lyric poetry in the strict sense (and not only obviously narrative poetry like ballads or verse romances) typically features strings of primarily mental or psychological happenings perceived through the consciousness of single speakers and articulated from their position. Drama enacts strings of happenings with actors in live performance, the presentation of which, though typically devoid of any overt presenting agency, is mediated e.g. through selection, segmentation and arrangement. Thanks to these features characteristic of narrative, lyric poems as well as plays performed on the stage can be profitably analyzed with the transgeneric application of narratological categories, though with poetry the applicability of the notion of story and with drama that of mediation seems to be in question. (2012 [revised 2013]; view date: 12 Nov 2021)

---

37) It should be noted that Kōnoshi Takamitsu and with him Misaki (2005, p.186, there also on Kōnoshi) identify a “main theme” of 1: 29 as “time,” specifically in the “time that allowed the Ōmi capital to decay” (ibid.). There is no mention of arson (671) or dismantling (672).

The basis of transgeneric narratology consists therefore of two “fundamental constituents” or “dimensions.” Narrativity is primarily constituted by “sequentiality [‘Sequentialität’] (that is, by the temporal organization and concatenation of individual elements of events and changes of state into a coherent sequence) and secondarily by mediality [‘Medialität’] (that is, by the mediation in construction, presentation, and interpretation of this sequence from a particular perspective).”<sup>38)</sup> While sequentiality basically means the linking of events and happenings that take place in the flow of time, the so-called tellability is based on the assumption that an event—understood as a deviation from an expected course (Schönert 2007, p.35)—occurs which leads to a change of state. This is especially difficult with the short *tanka* poem, since this change of state often is not detectable. However, one can understand the poem itself as a pregnant moment, that is, as an event that establishes the time before and after in a cognitive process.<sup>39)</sup> The long *chōka* poem, on the other hand, usually displays sequentiality,<sup>40)</sup> although the question of eventfulness certainly depends on what is perceived as an event in different cultures and times.<sup>41)</sup>

The analysis of poem 1: 29 has shown that it begins with an embedded narrative presented in thought-speech. This narrative changes at the site of the Grand Palace (*ohomiya*) into the representation of the mediating agent’s perceptions of what it hears and sees, which in turn cause a change of emotional state. As seen earlier, Misaki understands the two

38) On the two “dimensions,” see, Hühn and Schönert 2007, pp.6-12, quote p.2.

39) Cf. Wolf 2002, p.70.

40) Stein (2007, pp.63-68) shows that “sequences” do not refer only to changes in time and space. These links of the elements of events according to their chronological order mean only the first level of coherence (“Kohärenzstufe”). The second level of coherence Stein calls “correlative,” i.e., “if x, then also y,” which he associates with the analysis of events, i.e. the detection of breaks with or deviations from a schema. This, in turn, corresponds to eventfulness. The third level of coherence concerns motivational analysis, i.e., “grasping the presented event (especially the elements deviating from the schema) in terms of causes [causal], motivations [final], and consequences [consecutive],” (ibid., p.64).

41) Schönert, Hühn, and Stein (2007) draw on insights from cognitive narratology and refine their analyses with the two cognitive schemata of “frames” (“stereotypical knowledge about settings, situations and themes”) and “scripts” (“knowledge about stereotyped series of actions and processes;” definitions by Hühn and Sommer ibid., cf. Hühn and Schönert 2007, p.8). Of course, these analyses cannot be carried out here, since the frames and scripts first have to be worked out and identified. Nevertheless, a promising field of research is emerging here.

poems 1: 30 and 31 as a subtle transition of space and time. The stage of the action changes from the site of the palace to the nearby lakeside, where a second speaker appears in the two poems 1: 32 and 33. Four poems are devoted to the lakeshore, which is yet another noticeable expansion or throttling of the narrating time, respectively. On the level of content, events and eventfulness can thus be demonstrated, and this is even more true for the embedded narrative of poem 1: 29, in which the leaving of the traditional homeland is expressed as an incomprehensible event. It should be kept in mind above all that poem 1: 29 begins with a clear narrative. In the reception process, it would be almost impossible to keep the following short poems out of this narrative. From this perspective alone, a stringent narrative is formed that encompasses the five poems as a whole.

As Hühn and Sommer (ibid.) explain, eventfulness does not only concern the “‘events in the happenings,’ ascribed to storyworld incidents with the protagonist or persona as agent.” They distinguish between three “event types or planes of eventfulness,” but of particular interest for an analysis of Hitomaro’s poems is the second type, described as “presentation events,” which are “located at the discourse level with the speaker/narrator as agent enacting a ‘story of narration’” (ibid.). For example, there is an “old form of expression” that Ueno Satoshi (1981, p.36) describes as *rusu-ka* 留守歌, that is, poems by women who have stayed at home and whose husbands are on a journey. Ueno scrutinizes Hitomaro’s poems 1: 40 to 43 and questions the established opinion on the first two poems, which is limited to the leisure time of the court ladies on the coast. This image is no longer conveyed in the third poem presenting a violent, wave-raising sea current and rough cliffs typical of *rusu-ka* poems. Ueno then draws attention to the “reversal” (*tōsaku* 倒錯) in which Hitomaro, as a man who stayed behind in the capital, adopted the tradition of *rusu-ka* poetry by women who stayed at home. This “reversal,” in turn, can be understood as an impressive example of eventfulness on the level of expression. In Hitomaro’s poem 1: 29, this kind of presentation eventfulness might be less impressive but occurs repeatedly, firstly in the interpolated lines 15 and 16, which are an expression of lament poetry and another “text-type” (Chatman), secondly in the change from the embedded narrative presented in thought-speech to the descriptions and expressions of feeling at the site of the Grand Palace, and thirdly in the successive expansion of narrating time. The following *tanka* poems 1: 30 to 33 could possibly be understood as a further presentation eventfulness, but what is important for the

embedded narrative in the long poem 1: 29 is that the crucial event on the level of content (the traditional homeland → Tenji's departure) corresponds to the eventfulness on the level of expression (compressed narration → expansion or reduction of narrative speed).

In terms of sequentiality, Hitomaro's poems can thus be said to display a high level of narrative technique. This leads to the question of the second dimension, mediality. Hühn and Sommer (ibid.) distinguish two basic "aspects of mediation, agents or instances and levels of mediation and types of perspective." First, there are four agents, which they arrange on four different hierarchical levels. These are the biographical author, the abstract or implied author, the speaker/narrator, and finally the protagonist or character in the happenings. The two "types or modes of perspective" in turn are voice, i.e., "a narrator's or a character's verbal utterance, their language," and focalization, understood as "the position that determines perception and cognition, the deictic center of the perceptual, cognitive, psychological and ideological focus on the happenings." As Hühn and Sommer admit, the "problem of distinguishing speaker and abstract author and of relating focalization to agent (e.g. whether to speaker or character)," is "notoriously tricky."

While the implied or abstract author is receiving increasing attention in *Man'yōshū* research,<sup>42)</sup> the application of the four instances to Hitomaro's poetry is indeed a major challenge. However, there is a distance between these poems and their reception today that is sufficiently large to point to another problem, namely that of the contemporary reception at the time of their production. At the end of the present study, therefore, I do not want to attempt a determination of the four instances, but rather to direct our gaze back to the peritexts once again.

According to Kageyama Hisayuki, "the *waka* [*tanka* poem] is in principle a literary form that requires an 'author' (*sakusha* [作者])." This is an insight he prefaces to the examination

---

42) For Kōnoshi, Hitomaro is not the empirical author, but the author whom only the text "brings into being" (*arashimeru* あらしめる; 2013: II-IV). Ichinose (2014, p.42) describes Yakamochi's occurring in the *Man'yōshū* as "the thematized or rather the work that has become 'Yakamochi,'" and Kageyama (2011, p.23, p.30) marks *sakusha* as the "subject of poetry emerging in the text" with square brackets to distinguish it from the historical/real author. While the concept of abstract or implicit author is gaining popularity in recent Japanese literary studies, Western narratology is showing tendencies to distance itself from it again; cf. Pieper 2014, p.177, who refers to the "implicit author" as a "substitute author" ("Ersatz-Autor") in rejection.



of the conception (*kōsō*) of the *somon* section in the second volume. He quotes Itoi Michihiro 糸井通浩 claiming that “the reason why information about the poet is essential for the enjoyment of *waka* is that who composed the poem, when, where and under what circumstances, is deeply related to the understanding of the *waka* expression. The title/preface (*kotobagaki* 詞書) was also a supplement to such information” (2011, p.23).

It has already been mentioned that Hitomaro's poems did not require an annotation (*sachū*) and that therefore the information given in the title was not in doubt or unclear in any way. In general, annotations attempt to clarify the information from the peritexts, and some present alternative poet's names. In the annotations to the poems 1: 5 to 6 (亦軍王未詳也 *mata Ikusa no Ohokimi mo mishō nari*) or to 2: 143 to 144 (未詳 *mishō*), for example, it is stated that the name given is unclear (未詳). The annotation to 1: 52 from “a daughter of Suminoe” or that to the title to 2: 150 from a woman of presumably lower rank (婦人 *wominame*) state that the *kabane* and *uji* names are unknown (姓氏未詳). However, of particular interest are the annotations that provide a term for the mediating agent. Thus the notes to 1: 52 to 53, 1: 80, and 2: 227 say “author unknown” (作者未詳, 作主未詳), and in the note to 2: 90, the speaker is called 歌主 *uta-nushi* (reading according to Kojima et al. 6, p.81), literally “the master of the poem.” Thus there are different terms for the mediating instance, which testifies to a high level of reflexivity. However, it cannot be assumed that different agents and levels of mediation are meant or that a distinction has been made between author and implied author—let alone the narrator. The terms are likely to refer to the historical poet without exception.

In this context, the inserted lines containing presumably previous versions must also be taken into account, for it is to be asked what effect these have on the (contemporaneous) reader. Breaking down the grammatical differences in detail is a difficult task, but the previous versions trigger or strengthen a rather fundamental effect. They bring to mind that there is a temporal distance between the narrated world of the poem and the time of writing of the poem itself. This effect, that written characters in principle depict the past, is already typical of classical Chinese texts, which have no grammatical past tense,<sup>43)</sup> and the inserted older versions reinforce this effect. Through this temporal difference, however, something

43) This is called *rekishiteki genzai* 歴史的現在. However, it does not mean that the text is written in the present tense, but rather that it has no marked tense forms.

else happens because at the same time a difference arises between the speaker/poet and the experiencing instance portrayed in the poem: the narrating self becomes a narrated self.<sup>44)</sup>

This difference is not unusual, as poem 1: 7 by Nukata no Ōkimi also proves. In this short *tanka* poem, however, both instances are represented together. The *narrating self*, looking at a landscape, remembers (*omohoyu*) the time when the *narrated self* and the travel group cut grass (*mi-kusa kari*) during a journey, thatched a roof with it (*fuki*) and spent the night there (*yadorerishi*). It should be noted that these two lines *mi-kusa kari fuki / yadorerishi* probably present a narrative of the most basal form. The three verbs form a temporal sequence, and the last verb *yadoreri*, “we are spending the night” (*yadoru*), is in the past tense “we have been spending the night” (*ki* in attributive form *shi*). The poem is an impressive example of a *tanka* poem with complex narrative structures (sequentiality and mediality). It should also be noted that the note “unclear/unknown” on the title consisting of the poet’s name casts doubt on it. A longer note after the poem attempts a clarification, quoting among other things a narrative from the “Ki,” presumably the *Nihon shoki*.

The first *Man’yōshū* book, which can be read as a closed and coherent narrative, thus already presents complex narratives on different levels with a high degree of complexity, and narratological approaches help to make them visible.

#### **【Bibliography】**

- Aso Mizue 阿蘇瑞枝 (2006-2015): *Man’yōshū zenka kōgi* 萬葉集全歌講義, 10 vol., Tokyo: Kasama Shoin.
- Chatman, Seymour (1990): *Coming to Terms. The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Cranston, Edwin S. (1993): *A Waka Anthology. Vol.1: The Gem-Glistening Cup*. Stanford: Stanford University.
- Duthie, Torquil (2014): *Man’yōshū and the Imperial Imagination in Early Japan*. Leiden and Boston: Brill (Brill’s Japanese Studies Library 45).
- Ebersole, Gary L. (1992): *Ritual Poetry and the Politics of Death in Early Japan*. Princeton: Princeton University (first printing 1989).
- Hühn, Peter (2013): Event and Eventfulness. In: Hühn, Peter et al. (eds.): *the living handbook of narratology*. Hamburg: Hamburg University. URL = <http://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/article/event-and-eventfulness> [accessed on 3 Nov 2021].
- Hühn, Peter and Sommer, Roy (2021): Narration in Poetry and Drama. In: Hühn, Peter et al. (eds.): *The Living Handbook of Narratology*. Hamburg: Hamburg University. URL = <http://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/article/narration-in-poetry-and-drama>

---

44) For narrating self and narrated self, cf. Schmid 2010, p.69.

- hamburg.de/article/narration-poetry-and-drama [accessed on 12 Nov 2021].
- Hühn, Peter and Jörg Schönert (2007): Einleitung: Theorie und Methodologie narratologischer Lyrik-Analyse. In: Schönert, J., Hühn, P. and Malte Stein: *Lyrik und Narratologie—Text-Analysen zu deutschsprachigen Gedichten vom 16. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter (Narratologia 11), pp.1-18.
- Ichinose Masayuki 市瀬雅之 (2014): Kōzō-ron kara kōsō-ron e 構造論から構想論へ. In: Ichinose Masayuki, Shirosaki Yōko 城崎陽子 and Murase Norio 村瀬憲夫: *Man'yōshū hensan kōsō-ron* 万葉集編纂構想論. Tōkyō: Kasama Shoin, pp.33-207.
- Ichinose Masayuki 市瀬雅之, Shirosaki Yōko 城崎陽子 and Murase Norio 村瀬憲夫 (2014): *Man'yōshū hensan kōsō-ron* 万葉集編纂構想論. Tōkyō: Kasama Shoin.
- Inaoka Kōji 稲岡耕二 (1994-2006 [vol.1-3], 2015): *Man'yōshū* 万葉集, 4 vol., Tōkyō: Meiji Shoin (Waka bungaku taikai vols. 1-4).
- Itō Haku 伊藤博 (2019): *Man'yōshū shakuchū* 万葉集釋注, 10 vols., Tōkyō: Shūeisha (first printing paperback 2005, original with original text: 1995-1998).
- Kageyama Hisayuki 影山尚之 (2011): *Man'yōshū* maki ni sōmon-bu no kōsō 万葉集卷二相聞部の構想. In: *Koku-go to koku-bungaku* 國語と國文学 88, 12, pp.16-30.
- Klimek, Sonja (2018): Lyrik und Autobiographik. Funktion von Orts- und Zeitangaben in den Peritexten von Gedichten im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert. In: Hillebrandt, Claudia et al. (ed.): *Lyrikologie*, vol.1: *Grundfragen der Lyrikologie*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, pp.177-206.
- Kojima Noriyuki 小島憲之, Kinoshita Masatoshi 木下正俊 and Tōno Haruyuki 東野治之 (1994): *Man'yōshū* 万葉集, 4 vols., Tōkyō: Shōgakukan (Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū vols. 6-9).
- Kōnoshi Takamitsu 神野志隆光 (2013): *Man'yōshū o dō yomu ka—uta no „hakken“ to kanji sekai*. 万葉集をどう読むか—歌の「発見」と漢字世界. Tōkyō: Tōkyō Daigaku.
- Kroll, Paul W. (2015): *A Student's Dictionary of Classical and Medieval Chinese*. Leiden: Brill (digital edition).
- Martínez, Matías and Michael Scheffel (2016 [first printing 1999]): *Einführung in die Erzähltheorie*. München: C. H. Beck.
- Maruyama Takashi 丸山隆詞 (1999): Ōmi kōto-ka 近江荒都歌. In: Kōnoshi Takamitsu 神野志隆光 and Sakamoto Nobuyuki 坂本信幸 (eds.): *Seminā: Man'yō no kajin to sakuhin* セミナー:万葉の歌人と作品. Vol.2: *Kakinomoto no Hitomaro* 1 柿本人麻呂 1. Ōsaka: Izumi Shoin, pp.152-164.
- Misaki Hisashi 身崎壽 (2005): *Hitomaro no hōhō—jikan, kūkan, „katarite“* 人麻呂の方法—時間空間「語り手」. Sapporo: Hokkaidō Daigaku Toshokan.
- Müller, Günther (1968): *Morphologische Poetik. Gesammelte Aufsätze*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Murase Norio 村瀬憲夫 (2014): Itō Haku cho *Man'yōshū no kōsei to seiritsu* no kenshō to kenshō 伊藤博著『万葉集の構造と成立』の顕彰と検証. In: Ichinose Masayuki 市瀬雅之, Shirosaki Yōko 城崎陽子 and Murase Norio: *Man'yōshū hensan kōsō-ron* 万葉集編纂構想論. Tōkyō: Kasama Shoin, pp.3-31.
- Ogawa Yasuhiko 小川靖彦 (2010): *Man'yōshū—kakusareta rekishi no messēji* 万葉集—隠された歴史のメッセージ. Tōkyō: Kadokawa.
- Omodaka Hisataka 澤瀉久孝 (1957-1977): *Man'yōshū chūshaku* 万葉集注釋, 20 vol., 2 supplements. Tōkyō: Chūō Kōronsha.
- Pieper, Vincenz (2014): Narratologie und Interpretation—Ein Beitrag zum besseren Verständnis von Kleists Erzählungen. In: Blumberger, Günter et al. (eds.): *Kleist-Jahrbuch 2014*, Stuttgart: J. B.

- Metzler, pp.172-187.
- Saijō Tsutomu 西條勉 (2009): *Kakinomoto no Hitomaro no shigaku* 柿本人麻呂の詩学. Tōkyō: Kanrin Shobō.
- Satake Akihiro 佐竹昭広 et al. (1999-2003): *Man'yōshū* 萬葉集, 4 vols., Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten (Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikai vols. 1-4).
- Schmid, Wolf (2010): *Narratology. An Introduction*. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter (translated by Alexander Starritt, original 2003).
- Schönert, Jörg, (2007): Adreas Gryphius: "An die Welt." In: Schönert, J., Hühn, Peter and Malte Stein (2007): *Lyrik und Narratologie—Text-Analysen zu deutschsprachigen Gedichten vom 16. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter (Narratologia 11), pp.33-43.
- Schönert, Jörg, Hühn, Peter and Malte Stein (2007): *Lyrik und Narratologie—Text-Analysen zu deutschsprachigen Gedichten vom 16. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter (Narratologia 11).
- Stein, Malte (2007): Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock: "Die Verwandlung." In: Schönert, Jörg, Hühn, Peter and M. Stein: *Lyrik und Narratologie—Text-Analysen zu deutschsprachigen Gedichten vom 16. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter (Narratologia 11), pp.59-73.
- Tasumi Masaaki 辰巳正明 (2012): *Kaifūsō zenchūshaku* 懐風藻全注釈. Tōkyō: Kasama Shoin.
- Toya Takaaki 戸谷高明 (2000): *Man'yō keibutsuron* 万葉景物論. Tōkyō: Shintensha.
- Ueno Satoshi 上野理 (1981): Ryūkyō sanshu ni okeru Hitomaro no hōhō 留京三首における人麻呂の方法. In: *Kokubungaku kenkyū* 国文学研究 (Waseda Daigaku) 75, 10, pp.32-40.
- Vovin, Alexander (2017): *Man'yōshū* Book 1. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Wittkamp, Robert F. (2014 a / b): *Altjapanische Erinnerungsdichtung—Landschaft, Schrift und kulturelles Gedächtnis im Man'yōshū*. Vol.1: *Prolegomenon: Landschaft im Werden der Waka-Dichtung*. Vol.2: *Schriftspiele und Erinnerungsdichtung*. Würzburg: Ergon. (Beiträge zur kulturwissenschaftlichen Süd- und Ostasienforschung 5 a/b).
- (2018): *Arbeit am Text—Zur postmodernen Erforschung der Kojiki-Mythen*. Gossenberg: Ostasienverlag (Deutsche Ostasienstudien 34).
- (2019): Zur Analepse in Bashō's *Oku no Hosomichi* mit vergleichendem Blick auf Heinrich von Kleists *Das Erbeben in Chili* und Thomas Manns *Der Tod in Venedig*. In: Klawitter, Arne (ed.): *Literaturtheorien in der Anwendung* (Studienreihe der JGG, internet publication), pp.51-63.
- (2021): A Narratological Look at a Correspondence between Yakamochi and Ikenushi: Reading *Man'yōshū* Poems 17: 3962 to 3982 as a Closed and Self-Contained Work. In: 『東西学術研究所紀要』第54輯 (Tōzai gakujuutsu kenkyūsho kiyō 54, pp.69-96).
- Wolf, Werner (2002): Das Problem der Narrativität in Literatur, Bildender Kunst und Musik: Ein Beitrag zu einer intermedialen Erzähltheorie. In: Nünning, Vera and Ansgar Nünning (eds.): *Erzähltheorie transgenerisch, intermedial, interdisziplinär*. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag (WVT Handbücher zum literaturwissenschaftlichen Studium 5), pp.23-104.