

## Rhetoric of TANKA

Akira AMAGASAKI

### 1. Two wordings: ordinary and rhetorical

Before the Meiji period, literary theories in Japan were mainly concerned with poetry: *tanka*, *haiku*, *renga* and Chinese verse. Especially, rhetoric was considered as a characteristic of poetry, not of prose. For instance, Motoori Norinaga (1730–1801) said that “ordinary wording” (*tada-no-kotoba*) can describe the state of things and argue with logic on it through *kotowari* (logical meaning or signification), but cannot communicate *aware* (feeling or emotive quality) of things. It is poetry, he said, that expresses *aware* through rhetorical wording. This is, in a sense, a summing up of Japanese traditional thoughts on rhetoric. The points are as follows.

- 1) There are two kinds of wording. One is ordinary and the other is rhetorical.
- 2) There are two contents of verbal statement. One is *kotowari* for ordinary wording and the other is *aware* for rhetorical.
- 3) Therefore, rhetorical sentence is not a transform of ordinary sentence. In other words, the function of rhetoric is not to express the same content better than ordinary wording, but to express what cannot be mentioned by ordinary wording.
- 4) Poetry, especially *tanka*, is the literary form to express *aware* through rhetoric.

According to this view, rhetoric is not a technique of good description or good argument, which is a problem within ordinary wording. But rhetoric has its own field to work. We may call it the poetic world. It would be distinguished from the ordinary world which can be described and argued with ordinary wording. If there are two worlds, there will be two ways of cognition and two systems of communication. Thus, Japanese poetics has become a science of another world as mentioned below.

### 2. Two meanings: sense and signification

In traditional Japanese poetics poetry has been treated in three aspects: *kokoro* (心), *kotoba* (詞) and *sugata* (姿). *Kotoba* means “word”, and *sugata* is the “figure” or “appearance” of a thing. *Kokoro* originally means “heart”, then the “essential” of a thing, and when used as “the *kokoro* of a poem”, it means “what is expressed” by that work. Therefore, *kokoro* is often translated as “meaning”. This is not a mistake, but might be misleading.

In Japanese poetics, there are two words that can be the counterpart of English word “meaning”. One is *kokoro* and the other is *kotowari* (理), which originally means “logic”, “reasoning” or “judgement”, and when used as “the *kotowari* of a poem”, it means “what is stated” by that text. When we say “the meaning of a text,”

in most cases, we mean rather *kotowari* than *kokoro*. We will adopt “sense” for the translation of *kokoro*, and “signification” for *kotowari*.

The function and limitation of this *signification* was a main issue of Buddhistic linguistics, which has influenced Japanese poetics. The most influential sect until 13th century was Tendai. Tendai gave two courses of learning: theoretical philosophy and practice of contemplation, namely, Zen. Fujiwara Shunzei (1114–1201), one of the greatest poets and theorists of *tanka*, studied Tendai philosophy and cited *Mo-ho Chi-kuan*, a bible of Tendai, in his work of poetics. Shinkei (1406–1475), a great poet and theorist of *renga* (chained *tanka*), held a good position as a priest in Tendai sect. We may suppose that their poetics were based on Tendai linguistics.

Tendai philosophy has three essential theses: *Śūnyatā* (空) or non-being of substance, *Prajñapti* (仮) or fictionality of name, and *Madhyamā pratipad* (中) or freedom from obsession. The second can be put as “conventional word” or “illusional concept”. We can say that “name”, “word” and “concept” are the same thing from the Buddhistic point of view. Then, what is the “fictionality of name”?

Helen A. Keller was not able to see, to hear nor to speak. There seemed to be no way to be intellectual. Indeed she remained brute for some years. But oneday she suddenly broke through the darkness when she felt falling water. At this moment, she grasped that, which she was feeling, with a concept “water”, and came to know that this concept can be signified by a certain symbol, namely, “W-A-T-E-R”. As soon as she realized this naming system, chaos transformed into cosmos. The world became the equivalent of an organization of names. She had only to learn the symbols of them.

She noticed that what she was feeling and what she had felt have, even if they were different in their temperature or their pressure, the same “form” in common. And she became aware that this form has its own “name”. In this way, she could get the concept of “water”. She could not understand the world until she interrupted her immediate contact with what she was feeling, and bring the abstract “form”, that is, the concept of “water”, to her consciousness as the object.

This episode shows a nature of language. Man articulates chaotic world into a group of “forms”, and gives a “name” to each one, then settles them as “concepts”. Name, word and concept are in this sense one. The system of word is the system of concept. The world is recognized with this “name=concept=word” system, namely, language. In other words, the world which we think existent is, as Buddhists say, the world which we have constructed with “fictionality of name” (system of concept=word).

This system of “concept=word” is shared by people in the same language area. When we want to communicate something we have only to make it into a set of concepts and put them into symbols. If an addresser presents a set of symbols (a sentence) according to the convention (grammar), the addressee will decode them and organize a set of concepts in his mind. This set of concepts is what we call *signification* (*kotowari*) of a text.

Everytime we discuss or communicate something, we always grasp it as *significa-*

tion. Here, Buddhists think, is the merit and limit of language. Concepts can be manipulated in mind. The more strictly we manipulate them, the more exactly we understand the world. We discuss about the world in precise and rigid way, and we call those propositions "truth". But if all the "words=concepts" are artificial, the truth stated by words is just a fiction.

Thus, from the Buddhistic point of view, the mundane truth which can be stated by words must be different from Truth which cannot be stated by words. The mundane truth is useful for our daily life. But the world as it is cannot be known by naming "forms". Therefore, Zen Buddhists say that Reality cannot be taught by language, and that, for the true realization of the world, there is no way but to share the guru's "heart" itself through personal contact.

But the *Mo-ho Chi-kuan* (Great meditation), a bible of Tendai sect, takes up this issue in the first chapter and says that we must speak of this unspeakable Truth for the salvation of people, and that in fact we can do it. How?

"If the moon has sunk behind mountains," *Mo-ho Chi-kuan* says, "we can take up a fan as the represent of it." This means that, if Truth cannot be stated with *signification*, we can speak of it with metaphor. Here is another function of language. And here is the ground that *tanka* is not simply the "false words, illusional phrase" as some Buddhists says, but that poetry shares the same way with Buddhism.

Of course *tanka* does not always speak the Truth of Buddhism. But it expresses man's heart and mind which cannot be represented through *signification*. And what a *tanka* means to express is called *sense* (*kokoro*) in Japanese poetics. *Sense* and *signification* are two phases of meaning. But the way of *sense* communication will be different from that of *signification*.

*Kokin-waka-shu* (The Anthology of Japanese Poems Ancient and Modern) is the first *tanka* anthology that was edited under the imperial comand in 905. In that preface the editor, Ki-no Tsurayuki, says, "man in the world, facing many affairs, expresses what he holds in mind referring to what he sees and hears." According to Tsurayuki, *tanka* is the expression of "what man holds in mind" at an affair. But there will be two sorts of "what man holds in mind".

One is what he thinks about the affair, that is, the object of that experience. He will recognize the visible situation, infer the invisible factors, recall the related things and judge the value of it. He does it by manipulation of concept and others will easily be able to share its *signification* through linguistic symbols.

But at the same time he experiences the effect that the affair has left on his mind. It can be an astonishment, uneasy or an ecstasy. Anyway, he perceives it immediately as "his own state", and need not the mediation of concepts.

Thus, the experience of an affair has two phases. One is the affair as the object of conceptual cognition. The other is his state of mind effected by the affair. The former can be reconstructed by others with *signification*, but the latter is a private feeling or sense which is held in mind without concept=word.

Therefore, when one wants to communicate this *sense*, in most cases, it is no use to objectify it and put it into some concept. For instance, when a man sees cherry

blossoms scattering in the sun light, he may describe the state and situation of it with *signification*. But he cannot settle the *sense* as a concept, for it is an amorphous feeling that might be predicated either "happy" or "sad". In most cases, we have no *signification* to represent this *sense* correctly, and if ever we do, communication of *signification* does not mean communication of *sense*. By the word 'anxiety', we can share the concept of anxiety, but not the feeling of anxiety itself. In short, *sense* is, as Norinaga said, "unspeakable".

To communicate this "unspeakable" *sense*, man makes poems with rhetoric. No man makes a poem to communicate the shape or state of cherry blossom. A moving emotion, intended to express with the media of *tanka*, is the *sense* of *tanka*. For example, Ki-no Tomonori made a *tanka* as follows.

Sun light of eternity makes a spring day peaceful,  
Cherry blossoms seem restless to leave trees and fall.

At this *tanka*, a reader will understand a certain *sense* as the meaning of this poem, which might be predicated either "happy" or "sad".

When a *tanka* is made, a private and unique *sense* becomes a type of *sense*, and shared publicly by readers. In other words, the *sense* of a *tanka* is the particular one which is cristalized into a *form* so that others can share and re-experience. Emotion is usually transient and amorphous. But as concept is the *form* to articulate phenomenon, so *sense* of a *tanka* is the *form* to recognize an emotion.

When a *tanka* is published, a *sense* is shared by the public in that cultural area. A man may recall this *sense* at a similar phenomenon, and may feel it according to this *form* of *sense*. For instance, we may feel nothing at the sight of a boat on a lake, but a man who remembers Manzei's old *tanka*, would see it as a symbol of the Buddhist theme of eternal transition. The *tanka* is like this.

What could be the metaphor of this world?

White wave behind a boat rowing in the dawn.

As Helen Keller, learning the name of things, became to articulate the world into *forms* of concept, so we, learning the *sense* of *tanka*, will become to re-experience the *form* of *sense* at phenomena.

When a man recalls the *sense* of an old poem, he not only re-experiences the *form*, but also grasps it as an object. He experiences the *sense*, being conscious of its particular *form* different from other *senses*. A poet carves an emotion, which is amorphous even to himself, into a *form* with clear contour, and recognize it as an object for himself. A reader learning these *forms*, becomes able to discriminate vague *senses*. A painter may discriminate hundreds of colors. He articulates the color into hundreds of *forms*, while we discern a score or two in daily life. We may suppose that the painter is much more sensitive to color than us. Likewise, a man who knows more *forms* of *sense* will be more sensitive to emotive phenomena.

Publication of *Kokin-waka-shu* including one thousand *tankas* means public sharing of one thousand *senses*, and means that people become aware of one thousand ways to feel nature and human affairs, especially the seasonal beauty and the love affair. As people in the same linguistic area grasp the world in the same way, so people in

the same culture area will feel phenomena in same way. People cultured a by *tanka* tradition would feel more delicately than people who do not know *forms* of *sense* enough.

In Japan, a man with poor ability to evoke this *sense* has been called "insensitive to *aware* (emotive quality)" or "heartless". It has been supposed that a man could be sensitive to *mono-no-aware* (emotive quality of a thing) through learning *tanka* which teaches him how to feel phenomena.

*Sense* has two aspects. One is the *sense* which is felt as an air or an impression of object. The other is the *sense* which is felt as a feeling of himself. We may call them briefly "*air*" and "*feeling*". In Japanese, "*mono-sabishi*" (deserted) is an adjective for an *air*, and "*sabishi*" (lonely) is for a *feeling*. Therefore, an evening of autumn is predicated with "*mono-sabishi*", and a single life is predicated with "*sabishi*". *Air* is the way of presentation of things to me (or taste of phenomenon), while *feeling* is the posture of my heart to the object (or attitude of heart). Generally, *tankas* on seasonal nature convey *air* as their *sense*, and *tankas* on love or misfortune convey *feeling* as their *sense*.

But "*mono-sabishi*" is just a compound word which consists of "*mono*" (thing) and "*sabishi*". This suggests that there must be a some relation between "*mono-sabishi*" and "*sabishi*". 'Deserted' autumn evening will evoke us a *feeling* like "lonely", and our "lonely" *feeling* will tint all things with an *air* of "deserted". Thus an *air* of object evokes in us a *feeling* corresponding to it, and our *feeling* gives objects an *air* corresponding to it. This is the relation between "*sabishi*" and "*mono-sabishi*", or "*kanashi*" (feeling sad) and "*mono-ganashi*" (appearing sad).

Therefore, a *sense* of *feeling*, in many case, involves *air*, and vice versa. So, a *tanka*, conveying both *feeling* and *air*, can unify them inseparable and make only one *form* of *sense*. In this case, we cannot discriminate the *air* of object and *feeling* of ourself. Because, as Tamekane said, "we find the *sense* at the point of contact between the thing and our heart that are corresponding each other."

### 3. Two way of referring: *comparison* and *evocation*

Ordinary wording works well enough to convey *signification*, but is unreliable for *sense*. Therefore, *tanka* needs rhetoric. To see the function of rhetoric, we must think about the scope of *sense* conveyed by ordinary wording.

Among our vocabulary, there are words invented to express *sense*: "sad", "lonely", "beautiful" etc. But these words do not evoke immediately the *sense* denoted by them. For instance, a sentence "there was a beautiful river" can make us know the *affair* "there was a river" through its *signification* (concepts organization), but cannot make us share the *sense* which might have been aroused in the writer. The adjective "beautiful" is, of course, not *nonsense*. The reader knows well in what case this word is used. So, he understands that this river is not ordinary one, but it gives man an impression of a certain sort. Thus, a word "beautiful" does not add a positive information concerning the *affair* of the river, but limits the scope of denotation in some degree. However, it has little power to evoke in the reader's

mind the same *sense* which was once experienced by the writer.

There can be two ways to help to communicate the *sense* with ordinary wording. One is to add the word of *sense*, and the other is to add the description of the affair. But does the sentence below become more evocative than above one?

“There was a lovely, graceful, fascinating, . . . and beautiful river.”

Indeed the scope of rivers which this sentence can be applied will become more limited. In this sense, these adjectives are not meaningless. But the addition of the *sense* words is hardly effective to evoke the *sense* itself. In fact, the general way is to add the information concerning the affair, that is to say, to give a cotext of *signification* to the word “beautiful”. For instance,

“There was a beautiful river which changed its color with red leaves fallen on the surface of it.”

At this sentence we may form some image by its *signification* and might understand the *sense* which the word “beautiful” is to express, if it is not same as the writer experienced.

But this will mean that if a text can convey an enough image with a *signification* to evoke *sense*, the word for *sense* itself is needless. Therefore the sentence above can be put as follows keeping almost same effect.

“There was a river which changed its color with red leaves fallen on the surface of it.”

Do readers really feel beauty at such ordinary wording? If we ignore the clumsiness of the example above, it will be possible in three cases as follows.

- 1) The case that the reader remembers the aesthetic experience of his own at a sight of the same kind. The text will remind him the past experience, and he will hold its *sense* as the meaning of the text.
- 2) The case that the text has enough description for the reader to imagine the *affair* with its impressive quality, and the reader is *ready* to find “beauty” at that image.
- 3) The case that the reader remembers the aesthetic experience at a similar text. He will recall it and applies its *sense* as the meaning of the text concerned. (This is the base of the method *honka-dori*, which means, literally, original-poem-citation.)

In the case 1) and 3), a *form* of *sense* is already prepared in reader’s mind as available. In the case 2), the verbal representation of the *affair* brings the reader a quasi-experience through the image of the *affair*. But this is powerless for a man who has no ability to feel some *sense* at that image. For instance, a detailed explanation of colors and states of red leaves fallen on a river will be ineffectual for a man who considers dead leaves dirty. Thus, when a poet discovers a new type of beauty, he can represent the scene by *signification*, but he can hardly communicate his private experience of the *sense* by it, for readers are not ready for that type.

In this case, the poet can make use of a similar type of *sense* which readers already have. This is the rhetoric to refer to other things, namely, trope. An old *tanka* says as follows.

Even in the mysterious age of gods  
 We never heard like this, the river of Tatsuta,  
 Waters are patterned by spot-dyeing with Korean scarlet.

At this *tanka*, a man who knows the patterned cloth spot-dyed with Korean scarlet will, as he imagine red leaves on the river, feel the *sense* of a “beauty” from the image. Thus the rhetorical text teaches a man, who had never seen dead leaves beautiful, “a way of appearing” of the phenomenon that the red leaves appears as the spot-dyeing of Korean scarlet, and “a way of seeing” that he can see the red leaves on rivers beautiful. After this, the reader will feel “beauty” at the real red leaves by recalling the *sense* of the *tanka*. And he will also recall and apply this *sense* to other texts which include the phrase “red leaves fallen on a river . . .” or like that.

When a new kind of beauty is expressed as the *sense* of *tanka*, we may say, a new beauty is born for the reader and for the society. Then Shunzei said, “if there were no poetry, no one would know the beauty of flowers and red leaves.” Thus *tanka* verbalizes the *form* of a private *sense* through rhetorical wording, and establishes it as an item of the culture shared in that linguistic area. The most basic (at least the earliest known) rhetoric is to refer to things already known. In *Manyo-shu* (literally, Anthology of Ten-thousand-leaves; Japanese word “*kotoba*”, for “language” or “word” in English, originally means “leaf of thing”), the oldest *tanka* selection, there are titles of sections such as “straight expression of heart”, “expression of mind referring to things” and “metaphor”. But this is firstly stated as an essential of *tanka* in the preface of *Kokin-waka-shu*. This preface is considered the first poetics in Japan. We will cite the beginning of it again.

“*Tanka* grows from a seed of human heart into ten thousand leaves of word.  
 Man in the world, facing many affairs, expresses what he holds in mind referring  
 to what he sees and hears.”

*Tanka* was supposed to express what he holds in mind not through *signification* but through referring to things. And this poetic method had been discussed, before Tsurayuki, in Chinese poetics. In the preface of the *Book of Poetry* (詩經), the oldest anthology of Chinese poems edited in 5th century B.C., six styles are classified. Three of which are styles of expression. “Fu” (賦) is to describe affairs straightly, and is equivalent to “ordinary wording” in Japanese poetics. “Pi” (比) or “*comparison*” and “hsing” (興) or “*evocation*” are expressions referring to something. Tsurayuki, coping with these six styles of Chinese poetry, also classified six styles of *tanka*. The *Old Annotation* of Tsurayuki’s poetics, the author of which is ascribed to Kinto who was the greatest poet and scholar in 11th century, interprets the six styles of *tanka*, being based on the six style theory of Chinese poetics. The annotation explains *comparison* as “referring to a thing and saying ‘like that’”, then cites a love poem as an example.

A silkworm raised by parents,  
 Who is confined in his cocoon,  
 It is depressing,  
 For I do not meet you.

*Comparison* is the rhetoric to refer to a thing and to appeal 'like that'. This example, intending to express a depressive *sense* of not seeing the lover, explains how that depression is in the former half, because the simple description "it is depressive" is not enough to communicate the feeling itself. If he explains the situation of himself, it will be a "ordinary wording". But when he cited "a silkworm in the cocoon", the text became rhetorical. The reader will imagine what it is to be confined in a cocoon, and will realize how the "depression" is. Then, according to the implicit instruction that the silkworm is the poet himself, he will sympathize with the poet sharing the *sense* "depression" which is firstly understood as of the silkworm.

In short, *comparison* is the technique to appeal the *sense* of A by stating the *sense* of B saying, explicitly or implicitly, that "A is like B". In this case, A and B are both things (including person). Therefore, the method of *comparison* is, basically, substitution of words "A" and "B" (including its modifier).

"*Evocation* is," the *Old Annotation* says, "to express one's heart by referring to various weeds, trees, birds and animals." This assertion is apparently based on the Chinese poetics. The *Authentic Interpretation of "the Book of Poetry"* (詩經正義) says, "*evocation* is rousing. The adoption of metaphor or citation of similars, arouses our own emotion. Poems or proses which express one's heart by referring to weeds, trees, birds, and animals are all evocational words."

This annotation explains the meaning of *evocation* in the former half, and the method in the latter half. The concerning sentence of the *Old Annotation* can be said thorough translation of the latter part. But the former part seems to be based on the most well known book of Chinese poetics, the *Wêh-hsin tiau-lung* (文心雕龍) written by Liu Hsieh around 500 A.D.. "*Evocation* is rousing," Liu Hsieh says, "in order to arouse emotion, the reader needs to guess the implication for himself from the vague suggestion. Because of arousing emotion, it is called the style of *evocation*."

In *comparison*, the intended *sense* of A is explicitly mentioned as the *sense* of B, so that the reader have only to understand it and apply it to A. But in *evocation*, he is requested to rouse the *sense* by himself. *Comparison* and *evocation* are discriminated whether the reader rouse the emotion by himself or not. In other words, *comparison* and *evocation* are same in referring to other things, but the *sense* is explicit in *comparison* and implicit in *evocation*.

Thus, in *evocation*, as Chung Jung says in the *Poetic Grade* (詩品), the *sense* must be grasped beyond the *signification* of the text. And the method of this *evocation* is to express one's heart "by referring to weeds, trees, birds and animals", that is, to mention pairing human affair and natural matter. For instance, Tsurayuki made a poem as below.

Being unable to repress the passion,  
I was on the way to your home,  
In the night of winter,  
River's wind chilled a plover to cry.

Of course this *tanka* is a love poem. But the *sense* is not explicitly mentioned.

Only he mentions the human affair that "I", being unable to repress the passion, was going to the lovers place in a winter's night, and the natural phenomenon that a plover was crying chilled by the wind on river in that night of winter. If he said that "I" am like the plover, it would be the *comparison*. He did not so.

But the image of a man, who cannot control himself and goes out in a winter's night wishing to see his lover, will suggest us, even if vague, a certain sort of *feeling*. Also the image of a plover that is screaming above a river in the wind of frosty winter's night will make us feel a certain sort of *air*. And, as mentioned before, *feeling* and *air* reflects each other. Especially if they are paired in one *tanka*, the mutual influence becomes stronger. Human *feeling* and natural *air*, by reflecting each other, carve the opposit clearer which seemed vague at first. However, they do not become two different *senses*, but one *sense* in the end. With this *tanka*, the *air* of the plover (or the scene including the plover), reflecting the desperate and passionate *feeling* of love, will become a some pathetic *sense*, and the *feeling* of love reflecting the lonely and chilling *air* of the scene, will become a *sense* tinged with some poignant tone. Then these two *senses* will be unified and get one form of *sense*. This *sense* found "at the point of contact between things and our heart which are corresponding each other" is the real meaning of this *tanka*. This *sense* is not mentioned as the narrater's nor as the plover's, but aroused by the reader for himself.

Thus the rhetoric of referring is divided into two types. One is *comparison* which is to refer to a something and compare it to the subjective matter (generally "I"). The other is *evocation* which is to make two things reflect each other and arouse a *sense*. Anyway, both are the communicational way of *sense* which is difficult to convey by ordinary wording, taking advantage of word's connotation already shared by people.

#### 4. Three obscultation

*Sense* and *signification* are both meaning of a text, but do not stand in same level. When a man wants to communicate a state of an affair, he will at first put it into *signification*. It is an organization of "concept=word", so its status can be said as the translation to the original affair itself. But without this translation we cannot organize symbols to communicate something with others. On the other hand, *sense* is, if not the original affair itself, a part of the experience of the affair. Therefore, if we want to communicate the *sense*, we must take an indirect way to translate the concerning affair (or another affair as the referred) into a *signification*. In short, while *signification* can be put directly into sentence, *sense* needs the mediation of *signification*, namely, concept-organization.

Conversely speaking, a text necessarily has a *signification*, but not necessarily a *sense*. Therefore, in a text we always try to understand its *signification*, but not always its *sense*. When we read a text, we usually give attention to the *signification* and try to know what the writer intended to say, through the right interpretation of *signification*. In this case, the problem of right or wrong of the interpretation has no concern with presence or absence of *sense*. And if we do not succeed in the inter-

pretation of *signification*, we generally feel it “meaningless” so that we become aware of insufficiency of our interpretation and will make another attempt. But man hardly become conscious that the *sense* is not sufficiently realized. Moreover, if a text does not communicate any *sense* readers usually will not think it inconvenient. Therefore, when a reader feels that he completely understands the *signification* of the text, he is apt to be content with its state and not reach the depth of the *sense*, for we have an inclination to stop the operation of interpretation when a text seems understood completely. In this sense, the completion of *signification* can be an obstacle for arousing *sense*.

This is the reason why there arose a trend in middle age with which some poets made light of such poems that convey clear *signification*. Poets of new trend adopted such a queer usage of words that the *signification* was too vague, while the rhetoric worked fully. Conservative poets criticized the new style as meaningless and called it “Dharma poem” for its absurd usage of words similar to Zen discussion. Adversely, reformist condemned the old plain style as “vulgar”. It was the reformist who finally won. Their poems were called “*yugen* (幽玄) style”. Today, some critics point out its similarity to symbolism in 19th century France.

In this new style poems, there were three main rhetorical methods to make *signification* vague: ① to transgress the rule of language and break the unity of *signification*, ② to make *signification* multiple with multivocal words, ③ to remind a meaning by citation and make it intrude into the literal *signification* of the poem.

#### ① Transgression of syntax

##### a) Discordance among words

“Words combination” has been considered vital for *tanka*. The rule of “words combination” (grammatical and semantic demand to convey meaning) is more strict for ordinary text than *tanka*. However, we cannot say there is no rule for *tanka*. Indeed, in *Manyo-shu* we can find “nonsense poem”, but these poems were made only for fun not by serious motive. But the “Dharma poem” broke up the syntactical combination close to “nonsense poem”. For instance, Fujiwara Teika (1162–1241), the son of Shunzei and the greatest poet in *tanka* tradition, made a poem as below. (For multivocal phrase, two meanings are shown with /)

*Samushiro-ya* (a small carpet/it is cold)

*Matsu yo no aki no* (in autumn of waiting night)

*Kaze fukete* (wind is blowing/night grows late)

*Tsuki wo katashiku* (lies on the moon)

*Uji no Hashi-hime* (a girl on bridge of Uji/princess Hashi in Uji)

We have no space to examine Japanese grammar and how the above instance transgresses it. Anyway, from a grammatical point of view, this *tanka* is just nonsense. But, with this transgression each word is released from the context of *signification* and floats in ambiguity suggesting images as much as possible. We cannot decide grammatically which is the right meaning “a small carpet” or “it is cold”, “wind is blowing” or “night grows late”, so that we have to keep two images in

mind at one phrase.

Teika's transgression brings the reader a image complex. A reader hardly can integrate this image complex depending on the *signification*, but will be able to easily integrate it if he grasp the *sense*. Thus, to interpret a *tanka*, the reader is requested to orient his mind to *sense* rather than to *signification*.

β) Discordance between phrases

If the former half phrases of a *tanka* and the latter half are combined closely in *signification*, it is called "*shin-ka*" or "related verse". If they have little relation, the *tanka* is called "*so-ku*" or "alienated verse". It is said that good works are found more in alienated verses than in related verses. For instance, Jien made a *tanka* as below.

Why does no one ask me what I am thinking,

I look up the sky and find the moon bright.

The image represented by former half seems apparently to have no relation to the latter. But, by the enforcement of integration that a *tanka* must express one meaning as a whole the reader takes each half for the context of the other, then arouse the third meaning integrating them, that is, the *sense* of *tanka*. This *sense* cannot be understood until he meditates so deep as to integrate the alienated phrases. At a related verse, which offers no resistance to interpretation, the reader need not to sink in meditation. But at an alienated verse, he cannot integrate phrases while he stays on the stage of *signification* and cannot grasp the work as a whole, so that he must go down to the stage of *sense*.

② Polysemy

α) Polysemy of word

A word of double meaning is called "*kake-kotoba*" or "*su-ku*". The explicit meaning was called "*the over*", and the implicit one "*the under*". *Etsumoku-sho*, a book of poetics in middle age, cites a phrase for an instance.

"*Azusa-yumi* (a bow of catalpa) *haru wa* (to draw/the spring) *sakura* (cherry blossom) *no . . . .*"

The word "*haru*" plays two roles, and the text can be read with two *significations*: to draw a bow of catalpa and cherry blossoms in the spring. Taking advantage of polysemy of "*haru*", the poet puts two syntaxes in one sentence. The reader, after he read "*azusa-yumi haru*", he is compelled not only to stop but to return and read "*haru wa sakura no . . .*" to proceed the reading. This method will bring not only the multiple *signification*, but a transgression of syntax (the same effect as ①α), and an enforced integration of alienated phrases (the same effect as ①β).

β) Polysemy of phrase

The polysemy of phrase was called "*kikishire*". This is a kind of trope, taking advantage of multivocation in a phrase, to show some other *signification* on the surface in order to refrain from the broad expression of one's feeling. *Etsmoku-sho* cites an instance as below.

"*Momiji-ba no* (red leaves are) *kogarete* (burning/yearning) *mono no kanashiki*

*wa* (I feel sad) . . .”

“The over” *signification* is that: dying leaves are burning red, this sight of autumn reminds me of the transiency of the world and makes me sad . . . . But if we take off the first word “*momiji-ba*”, “the under” meaning comes out: my heart is burning (or yearning) with the love of you, but this love also makes me sad . . . .

Thus, a *tanka* of *kikishire* has two *signification*. If the sense of “the over” corresponds with that of “the under”, it will have a great effect of *evocation*. For instance, we have a well known *tanka* of Ono-no Komachi.

*Hana no iro wa* (the color of flowers/the charm of a beauty)

*Utsurinikerina* (is gone away)

*Itazura ni* (uselessly or in vain)

*Wagami* (I) *yo ni* (in the world) *furu* (fall/become old)

*Nagame* (long rain/meditation) *seshi ma ni* (while)

In the former half, the state of losing color of flowers is the metaphor of losing the charm of a beauty. The latter phrase has two *signification*: “while it rains long in the world” and “while I meditate many things I become old for the world.” A miserable *air* of a flower losing its color during long rain and a repentant *feeling* of an old lady who lost her charm in useless reflection correspond each other and arouse a subtle *sense*.

### ③ Citation

① Transgression is the device for vague *signification* from the side of syntagm, and ② polysemy is from paradigm, but both are devices within the text. Citation is a device to stir the *signification* through the invasion of meaning from the outside.

#### α) Citation of a word

For *tanka*, there are words which have the effect of citation with a single word. *Makura-kotoba* (pillow word) which is the propositive epithet conventionally combined with a certain noun, and *uta-makura* (poetic pillow) which is the noted place through poetic tradition. If a word of this kind is used in a *tanka*, usually it plays little role in the *signification* of the text, but has the function to suggest something out of the text. But the citation of this kind has not only one original text. *Makura-kotoba* or *uta-makura* does not suggest a particular text of *tanka*, but the common tradition of “poetic world” to which they belong. As to use a word in fashion to express the participation of “today”, the use of these conventional words expresses that the text belongs to “poetic world”. Thus, it claims the reader not to interpret the text only by *signification*, but to do it with the same attitude as he had at classic *tankas*. In short, it provides the reader with a certain attitude of mind. Therefore, these words have no effect for people who have never read classics.

Originally, each *makura-kotoba* had a meaning. But people came to forget and hardly remembered it when they read *tanka*. But the noun accompanied by *makura-kotoba* became impressive by the presence of it. This effect developed through the tremendous and complicated connotations which the long tradition of *tanka* brought up and charged the word. *Uta-makura* is the name of a place, so it is not a meaning-

less part for *signification* of the text. But most of the poets who use *uta-makura* have not really seen the place, moreover, sometimes do not know where it is. They use *uta-makura*, not for its physical condition, but for its historical position in the "poetic world". Kinto, a famous poet in 11th century, taught the beginner to put *uta-makura* in the former half and express "what you hold in mind" in the latter half. If a man intends to express his heart and mind by referring to something, it is the easiest way to cite a *uta-makura*. Kinto shows a *tanka* of Ise for instance.

Nagara bridge in Naniwa is already lost.

Now, what could I compare myself to?

The latter half of this *tanka* is a straight expression of thought, almost in ordinally wording. The success of this *tanka* is chiefly owed to the reference of the Nagara bridge for the reminder of the transiency of life. It does not matter what the Nagara bridge really was, which is said to be lost now. Important is the tradition that the Nagara bridge was used as a metaphor of the seemingly steady thing that is eventually lost. Then, while the former half has a rational *signification*, Nagara bridge has no relevancy to the meaning of the poem. The reader knows well that it suggests the going out of a seemingly long living thing, and has nothing to do with the real bridge. Thus *uta-makura* releases the reader's attention from the *signification* and leads it to the *sense* expressed in the latter half of the poem.

### β) Citation of phrase

Citation of phrase must be based on the well known classics. There are two ways of this citation. One is to cite a phrase of the original in its original form, and the other is to suggest the contents of the original with some suggestive words. The former is called "*honka-dori*" which is the citation of classical *tanka*, and the latter is called "*hon-zetsu*" which is based on a Chinese poem, a novel or a well known episode. While *hon-zetsu* was not welcomed in *tanka*, *honka-dori* was, at least in middle age, a representative method of *tanka*. For instance, Teika made a *tanka* below.

Autumn has gone, still I feel bitter against the dawn.

Cloud passing in the sky is also dropping rain.

This *tanka* has the original as follows.

I know well, if it comes the morning, then it will come the evening.

Still I feel bitter against the dawn.

The original is a love message which was sent to a mistress from a man who had just left her in the morning. They would meet in the evening and part in the morning. These two *tankas* overlap at the phrase "still I feel bitter against the dawn." Its effect is similar to that of *evocation*, *alienated phrase* and *kiki-shire*. The reader will need to arouse the third *sense* in mind to integrate these two texts.

The original plays another role. It can be a core to integrate images from a chaotic *tanka* with confused *signification*. The above mentioned Teika's *tanka* "*samushiroya* . . ." has the original in *Kokin-waka-shu* as follows.

On a small carpet, also tonight,

She may spread a robe to lie on, and may be waiting for me.

### The girl of Hashi in Uji.

When we imagine the scene of the original, the diffusing images of Teika's words becomes integrated and settle down in their own position. That is, Teika's poem does not expose its *sense* until the original is given as the precondition.

The original is the precondition to interpretation not only in the level of *signification*. Rather, the *sense* or image of the original determinate the meaning of new *tanka*'s words. The *form* of *sense* of the original is already shared by people in *tanka* circle, and anyone of them can recall it to hear a fragmental phrase of the text. Then, a citation of a part of the original will remind the reader the already known *sense* of it, and he will on this ground understand what the new poem's words means and form a new *sense* through the integration of the text.

The danger of this method is that the new poem may have the same *sense* as the original. Teika warned this and insisted that citation must be a method to create a new *sense*. "Concerning words, follow the old," he said, "but concerning *sense*, search for a new."

### Conclusion

A private form of *sense* becomes shared in common through the publication of *tanka*, and people in next generation, based on this common-*sense*, develop and diversify it into new forms of *sense*. Through this, flowers and red leaves manifest their various phases of beauty before people, and people learns how to feel *sense* at various affairs. This succession and expansive reproduction of the *forms* of *sense* through words was the Japanese traditional "Way of *tanka*" (歌道).

"Poetic world", which is different from daily rational world (the world considered with "fictionality of name") constructed as a system of *signification*, is another human world constructed as a system of *sense*.

People in the "Way of *tanka*", Teika, Norinaga, etc., tried to accept this *sense* world as much reliable as the *signification* world, and to live in there. They pose us a question, which is the more important world for human beings, and present us another way to face beings and their hearts. Rhetoric was a method to use words not by the logic of *signification*, but by that of *sense*. In other words, it was another grammar devised for the world of *sense*.

*University of Tokyo*