

The *Kanshi* of Mori Ōgai: Allusion and Diction

John Timothy Wixted, Harbert, Michigan

There are 232 *kanshi* 漢詩, or Sino-Japanese poems, by Mori Ōgai in the two-volume edition annotated and translated by Kotajima Yōsuke 古田島洋介;¹ they vary in length from 2 to 124 lines. Most also appear, with annotation and modern-Japanese translation, in the two-volume study by Chén Shēngbǎo (Chin Seiho) 陳生保.² Additionally, 6 of the pieces identified as being by Ōgai in the 1889 work of poem-translation, *Omokage* 於母影, are rendered wholly in *kanji* 漢字. This makes for a total of 238 poems.

There are different ways to approach Mori Ōgai's *kanshi*: the biographical, to understand Ōgai better (the person, the author, the public figure); the historical, to better understand the era in which he wrote, as well as the poet's perceptions of his own age and earlier periods; and the literary, to better appreciate Ōgai's achievement as a writer by looking at features of his use of language, especially the ways he used the writings of others, to construct his poems in Sino-Japanese. Each approach implicates the others, for all of Ōgai's *kanshi* are mediated through language; none is without a context with at least one historical dimension; and each is in some way a reflection of its author.

Ōgai's *kanshi* shed light on various topics for which the author's Sino-Japanese poetry has seldom been cited, at least in Western-language studies: Ōgai's attitude toward women, his role as physician and military figure, his translation activity, his stay in Germany, his interaction with Yamagata Aritomo 山縣有朋, his stance as counselor to friends (especially to figures to whom he dedi-

-
- 1 Kotajima Yōsuke 古田島洋介, *Kanshi* 漢詩, vols. 12 and 13 in *Ōgai rekishi bungaku shū* 鷗外歴史文學集 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店, 2000–2001). Poem and line numbers are keyed to this edition (e.g., “#209.9–10”); other references to the Kotajima work are to volume and page number (e.g., “2:209”), treating it as if the volumes were numbered 1 and 2. A good bibliography of the secondary literature on Ōgai's *kanshi* is included: 2:345–348.
 - 2 Chén Shēngbǎo [Chin Seiho] 陳生保, *Mori Ōgai no kanshi* 森鷗外の漢詩 (Tokyo: Meiji Shoin 明治書院, 1993), 2 vols.

cated series of poems: Ozaki Yukio 尾崎行雄, Ishiguro Tadanori 石黒忠憲, and Araki Torasaburō 荒木寅三郎), his attitude toward contemporary events (such as the opening of the Suez Canal, the occupation of Taiwan, the Sino-Japanese War, etc.), his views on various painters and paintings, and his attitude toward China and the Chinese.

It is possible to view Ōgai's *kanshi* in other terms, as well: as part of his apprenticeship and maturation as a writer, as a vehicle for social intercourse with the cultured elite, and as masks for personae he adopted – brilliant and inquisitive young man, impatient innovator and careerist, wise counselor, stern guardian of tradition, and reflective sage.

A central problem in understanding Ōgai's *kanshi* lies in interpreting his use of allusion.³ Like any literature, that of *kanshi* is built out of a common *langue*, in this case, *kanji*. It is just that in the construction of poetic lines out of Chinese characters, the building blocks are more obvious. These include not only individual *kanji*, but also two-character compounds, three-character phrases, and stories and incidents from earlier writing utilizing Chinese characters.

What functions does allusion serve? The conscious use of allusion can second earlier statements or find support in them; it can echo, put a new twist on, and/or stand in contrast with them. The use of allusion highlights the learning of the user, tests the knowledge of the reader/listener, and by celebrating class identity, reflects the background, proclivities, and character of the parties involved, especially the one producing the lines. The use of earlier phrasings can also be unconscious or purely fortuitous. The problem is not the “burden of the past” and the need to be original – which in any case is a secondary and late development in the *kanji* world of China, Japan, Korea, and Vietnam.⁴ It is rather that it is virtually impossible to use many *kanji* in combinations that have *not* been employed earlier.⁵

3 According to one typology, there are two kinds of allusion: topical and textual. *Topical allusions* refer to contemporary events, so are synchronic or horizontal. *Textual allusions* refer to prior sources, so are diachronic or vertical; see David Lattimore, “Allusion and T'ang Poetry,” in *Perspectives on the T'ang*, ed. Arthur F. Wright and Denis Twitchett, (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1973), pp. 405–438. Although references to contemporary affairs in Ōgai's *kanshi* are outlined above (in the third paragraph of this article), in what immediately follows the focus is on textual allusion.

4 Cf. W. Jackson Bate, *The Burden of the Past and the English Poet* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 1970).

5 It can serve as a warning to all that a locution identified as being “original” with a writer can turn out to have prior examples. As noted by Yasukawa Rikako 安川里香子 (p. 26) in her *Mori Ōgai 'Hokuyū nichijō' no ashiato to kanshi* 森鷗外「北游日乗」の足跡と漢詩

In a rare admission of the kind – to those accustomed to using annotated editions of *kanbun* 漢文 writings, whether Chinese or Sino-Japanese texts⁶ – Kotajima Yōsuke comments on the problem. When explicating the use of a line in Ōgai’s poetry (#34.4 [1882]) that contains the compound 深處 (*fukaki tokoro* [shēnchù]), he asks rhetorically whether he should point to an earlier example by Dù Mù 杜牧 (803–852), to one by Bó Jūyì 白居易 (772–846), or to still another by Fujii Kei (Chikugai) 藤井啓 (竹外) (1807–1866), adding that Ōgai could be alluding to more than one of them.⁷ One might qualify his statement to say that Ōgai may have had *any*, *all*, or *none* of the three sources in mind.

But Kotajima does not take the argument a step further and go to the heart of the matter. The real questions regarding allusion are these: Has the writer – in this case, Ōgai – read the work one finds cited in the commentaries to his writing? And even if he has read it, how can we be sure he is consciously alluding to it?⁸ Even more important, if the use of an allusion is intentional or at

(Tokyo: Shinpisha 審美社, 1999), Chén Shēngbǎo in his work (cited above in n. 2 [1:51]) is incorrect in saying that the phrase, 吟鞋 (*ginkei*, according to Yasukawa; *gin'ai*, according to both Chén and Kotajima [yínxié]) in #8.4 (1882), was “probably coined by Ōgai.” She points out that the *Pèiwén yùnfǔ* 佩文韻府 (1711, suppl. 1720) cites usage of the phrase by Yuán Hàowèn). The Yuán Hàowèn example, printed in standard editions of the poet’s *shī* 詩 corpus with the variant 鞵 for 鞋, appears in “Yóu Tàishān” 游泰山, Poem #262 of his corpus as numbered by John Timothy Wixted, “A Finding List for Chinese, Japanese, and Western-Language Annotation to and Translation of Poetry by Yüan Hao-wen,” *Bulletin of Sung-Yüan Studies* 17 (1981), pp. 140–185; the same compound (*sans* variant) also appears in Yuán Hàowèn’s corpus of *cí* 詞 song-poetry.

6 For discussion of preference for the term “Sino-Japanese,” rather than “Chinese,” to refer to *kanbun* written by Japanese, see John Timothy Wixted, “*Kanbun*, Histories of Japanese Literature, and Japanologists,” *Sino-Japanese Studies* 10.2 (April 1998), pp. 23–31. For bibliographical information about the article’s reprint and Spanish-language translation, as well as online access to it, see n. 11 in John Timothy Wixted, “Mori Ōgai: Translation Transforming the Word / World,” *JH* 13 (2009–2010), pp. 61–109.

7 Kotajima, 2:344.

8 Indeed, one might ask, is conscious use of, or acquaintance with, a prior source even necessary for there to be an allusion? (Cf. discussion below in reference to the *Hōjōki*.) Note the distinction made by Earl Miner between “allusion” and “intertextuality.” Whereas allusion consists of “[a] poet’s *deliberate* incorporation of identifiable elements from other sources, preceding or contemporary, textual or extratextual,” “[i]ntertextuality is *involuntary*: in some sense, by using any given real language, one draws on the intertexts from which one has learned the words, and neither the poet nor the reader is aware of the connections”; “Allusion,” in *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, ed. Alex Preminger and T.V.F. Brogan (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), pp. 38–39 (italics added). The distinction, while useful, shifts reader focus too much on an author’s biography, in the

least likely, what role is the allusion fulfilling in the instance under question? Is it used to confirm someone else's formulation, to find support (and prestige) for a current stance, to display one's learning, to test the knowledge of the reader/listener, to ratify class membership, to add a new twist to a familiar turn of phrase, to be ironic, to be a clever way of expressing oneself or making a point – or for what combination of these? The problem is central to virtually all writing in China (but especially poetry) from the end of the Tang dynasty onward. It is perforce central to understanding the use of virtually any locution in *kanji* by Japanese well into the twentieth century (to say nothing of allusion to earlier writings in Sino-Japanese). Yet this central interpretive task is almost always completely shirked, or at best treated perfunctorily, by the vast majority of Chinese and Japanese commentators.

In a famous formulation, Huáng Tíngjiān 黃庭堅 (1045–1105) said of the poetry of Dù Fǔ 杜甫 (712–770) that “No word is without its source”: 無一字無來處. The later critic Yuán Hào wèn 元好問 (1190–1257) modified the statement by saying, “While one can say of Dù's poetry that ‘No word is without its source,’ one can also say [that like minerals transformed into a chemical compound], ‘His verse does not issue from that of the ancients’”: 故謂杜詩爲無一

attempt to determine whether a reference is “deliberate” or not.

The problem of trying to decide between conscious allusion and fortuitous intertextuality is present when dealing with virtually any expression (especially any striking, or rich, or suggestive one). For example, when reading *Shayō* 斜陽 (*The Setting Sun*) by Dazai Osamu (1909–1948), one might ask if the author was aware of the use of the work's title, *xiéyáng* 斜陽 in Chinese, in poem lines by Dù Mù, Hán Wò 韓偓 (844–923), and Bó Jūyì; *Dai Kan-Wa jiten* 大漢和辭典, comp. Morohashi Tetsuji 諸橋轍次 (Tokyo: Taishūkan 大修館, 1955–60), 13 vols., 5:615 (entry #13509.80).

For a combination of reasons – Dazai's comparative “youth” as a child of the twentieth century (in terms of *kanbun*), and his education and life circumstances, including his early death – it is quite unlikely he was acquainted with two of the three poets noted. But since Bó Jūyì had been the most popular Tang poet in Japan for centuries, Dazai, via one avenue or another, may have at least read the poet and this phrase.

The question (and apparent conundrum it presents) might be resolved as follows. Whereas an author “brings” allusion “to the table” simply by writing a text (made up of words that necessarily echo earlier words, even if just by contrast as “new” expressions), it is the reader who makes inferences about likely or possible earlier or contemporary references (i.e., allusions), and who may venture to point out intertextual associations (i.e., intertextual parallels). Yet the construing of an allusion should not be too forced or unduly complicating (cf. pp. 95–96 and n. 16 below); at the same time, intertextual association should be at least minimally relevant (cf. n. 21 below).

As the Dazai example illustrates, where conscious allusion to an earlier text is highly improbable but possible, reference to parallel usage (notwithstanding the warnings cited at the end of n. 21) can enrich understanding of a locution, and even foster fuller appreciation of a text.

字無來處亦可也。謂不從古人中來亦可也。⁹ Similar statements have been made about Shakespeare and his use of sources.¹⁰ Yet, with authors whose transformation of earlier language is less seamless than that of Dù Fǔ or Shakespeare, questions of allusion go to the heart, first, of understanding what the writer is saying, multilayered as it may be, and second, to appreciating more fully how it is being expressed – as if the two could be separated.

The problem can be illustrated in Ōgai's case by examples. In one poem, written three months after his retirement, he quotes from a line by Huáng Tíngjiān:¹¹

Ōgai #201.3-4 (1916):

替我豫章留好句 *Ware ni kawatte Yoshō kōku o todomu*

Tì wǒ Yùzhāng liú hǎojù

自知力小畏滄波 *'Mizukara chikara no shō naru o shiri sōha o osoru' to*

Zì zhī lì xiǎo wèi cāngbō

On my behalf, Yùzhāng [= Huáng Tíngjiān 黃庭堅] left behind a fine poetic line:

'Knowing full well my strength is modest, I fear the ocean waves.'

Echoing Huáng Tíngjiān, Ōgai appears to be saying that powerful forces – those in government and the military – can inflict great damage on him: a reason for his retiring. It is a view confirmed by a line written a few months later, that the world of those in power, with its ups and downs, can drown a person:

9 “Wú yízì wú láichù”; and “Gù wèi Dù-shī wéi ‘Wú yízì wú láichù’ yì kě yě. Wèi ‘Bù cóng gǔrén zhōng lái’ yì kě yě.” For sources (with fuller context) and further discussion, see John Timothy Wixted, *Poems on Poetry: Literary Criticism by Yuan Hao-wen (1190–1257)*, Calligraphy by Eugenia Y. Tu (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1982; rpt. Taipei: Southern Materials Center, 1985) (Münchener Ostasiatische Studien, Band 33), pp. 91–92, 282 n 16, and 394.

10 See entries under “allusion” in the indexes to John Lewis Walker, ed., *Shakespeare and the Classical Tradition: An Annotated Bibliography, 1961–1991* (New York: Routledge, 2002), and John W. Velz, *Shakespeare and the Classical Tradition: A Critical Guide to Commentary, 1660–1960* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, [1968]), as well as Stuart Gillespie, *Shakespeare's Books: A Dictionary of Shakespeare Sources* (London: Athlone, 2001).

11 *Kundoku* parsings of poem lines, given here in romanization, include an extra blank-space between certain phrases to indicate caesura (usually after the 2nd character in 5-character poem lines, and after the 4th [as well as sometimes 2nd] character in 7-character poem lines). Modern Chinese readings have also been added for the reasons noted at the end of n. 70 in Wixted, “Mori Ōgai: Translation Transforming the Word / World.”

Ōgai #212.3 (1917):

官海浮沈吾遯跡 *Kankai fuchin shite ware wa ato o nogare*
Guānhǎi fúchén wú dùnjī

The sea of officialdom: floating up, sinking down – I have escaped.

To appreciate the Huáng Tíngjiān line, however, one has to confirm its usage in the context of that work.¹² And in the process of doing that it becomes clear that the expression is, in fact, drawn from Dù Fǔ: 力小困滄波 (Lì xiǎo kùn cāngbō): “Their strength being modest, they are thwarted by the mighty waves.”¹³

Ōgai, by using an expression that points to the similarity between the condition he finds himself in and that outlined by Huáng Tíngjiān centuries earlier, is not just communicating his own feelings of vulnerability and of being ominously threatened by unseen forces. He is also putting the situation in perspective, finding solace and affirmation in the fact that Dù Fǔ as well as Huáng Tíngjiān had written with empathy of those similarly vulnerable. Doubtless Ōgai takes pride and pleasure in being able to express the whole of this – echoing the one writer while leaving the resonance with the other only implied, to be appreciated by the cognoscenti – all in the compass of only seven characters.

The problem of allusion is further illustrated by these lines by Ōgai, ones clearly reminiscent of the opening to the *Hōjōki* 方丈記:¹⁴

12 The passage is Line 3 of “Xiǎoyā” 小鴨, a *juéjù* 絕句 that speaks of a duckling that is ‘marvelous’ (Line 2: 妙 miào), but aware of its vulnerability as it pauses in the twilight: “Knowing full well its strength is modest, it fears the mighty waves”; for the poem, see *juàn* 卷 7 of *Huáng Shāngǔ shījī* 黄山谷詩集, as reproduced in Saku Misao (Setsu) 佐久節, ed., *Kanshi taikan* 漢詩大觀 (Tokyo: Seki Shoin 關書院, 1936-39), 5 vols., *gekan* 下卷, p. 3169.

13 Line 6 of “Zhōuqián xiǎo é-ér” 舟前小鵝兒, found in 杜詩引得 [*Dùshī yǐndé*], *A Concordance to the Poems of Tu Fu* (1940; rpt. Taipei: Chinese Materials and Research Aids Service Center, Inc., 1966), 3 vols., vol. 2, *juàn* 23, #36.

In the poem, Dù Fǔ says he loves the newly born goslings (Line 2: 愛新鵝 ài xīn-é) that are in front of his boat. But (per Line 6), “Their strength being modest, they are thwarted by the mighty waves.” Lines 7–8 end the poem by asking, “When the guests disperse and night falls on city walls, / What will you do about the foxes [i.e., clearly threatening forces]?” (客散層城暮 / 狐狸奈若何, Kè sàn céngchéng mù / Húlí nài ruò hé).

Translations of the Dù Fǔ poem include the version by Rewi Alley, *Tu Fu: Selected Poems*, comp. Feng Chih [馮至, Fēng Zhì] (Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1962), p. 122; and the more reliable rendering by Erwin von Zach, *Tu Fu's Gedichte*, ed. James Robert Hightower (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952), 2 vols., 1:286 (VIII.60). For Japanese-language annotation and translation of the poem, see Mekada Makoto 目加田誠, *To Ho* 杜甫 (Tokyo: Shueisha 集英社, 1965) (*Kanshi taikai* #9), pp. 271–272.

Ōgai #211.1–4 (1917):

| | |
|-------|--|
| 重渡非故水 | <i>Kasanete watareba moto no mizu ni arazu</i> |
| | Chóng dù fēi gùshuǐ |
| 湯湯無少閑 | <i>Shōshō to shite shōkan nashi</i> |
| | Shāngshāng wú shǎoxián ¹⁵ |
| 世事亦如此 | <i>Seji mo mata kaku no gotoku</i> |
| | Shìshì yì rú cǐ |
| 逝者不復還 | <i>Yuku mono wa mata kaerazu</i> |
| | Shìzhě bú fù huán |

Ever passing by, water is never the same –
 Turbulent its flow, without the least break.
 Worldly matters too are like this:
 What has departed does not again return.

But the source is supposedly not the *Hōjōki*. Ōgai himself, in a note to the poem, says the phrasing comes from that of “a Greek,” presumably Heraclitus: 希臘人言 (*Girishia-jin no kotoba* [Xīlìè-rén yán]). Furthermore, if we take into account that the passage opens a poem eulogizing Ueda Bin 上田敏 (1878–1916), and know that Ueda had as a motto in his study the Greek phrase by Heraclitus, *panta rhei*, meaning “all is in flux” or “all is in a fluid state” – or per its translation into Japanese, 物總て流る (*mono subete nagaru*) or 萬物流轉 (*banbutsu ruten*) – the allusion in the opening lines of the Ōgai poem takes on added depth of implication and increased intimacy in reference to Ueda Bin. This is not to say one should ignore the seeming restatement here of the *Hōjōki*. Authors’ stated sources and intentions are always to be questioned. Here the added dimension, being reasonable, relevant, and not forced (i.e., not complicating matters unnecessarily) – applying Ockham’s razor, as it were, to

14 *Hōjōki* 方丈記 1: ゆく河の流れは絶えずして、しかももとの水にあらず。 *Yuku kawa no nagare wa taezu shite, shikamo moto no mizu ni arazu*. “Ceaselessly the river flows, and yet the water is never the same”; A.D. Sadler, tr., *The Ten Foot Square Hut and Tales of the Heike: Being Two Thirteenth-Century Japanese Classics, the ‘Hōjōki’ and Selections from the ‘Heike Monogatari’* (1928; rpt.; Rutland, Vermont & Tokyo, Japan: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1972), p. 1. For full reference to eighteen other complete Western-language translations of the text (nine into English [one of which is in fact comprised of three different renderings], four into French, four into German, and one into Spanish), see John Timothy Wixted, *A Handbook to Classical Japanese / 文語ハンドブック* [Bungo handobukku] (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell East Asia Series, 2006), pp. 294–296.

15 Here and below, romanized Chinese syllables that are underlined in a poem selection indicate characters that rhyme.

literary exegesis¹⁶ – makes a good fit with available data and so has heuristic value.

Similarly, it is not too much of an interpretive leap to see kinship between the *Man'yōshū* tag, “To what might one compare this world?” and the poetic line by Ōgai, “What might human life be likened to?” To cite the two:

Man'yōshū 萬葉集, 3/351:

世間を何に譬へむ
朝びらき漕ぎ去にし船の跡なきごと[し]。

Yo no naka o nani ni tatoemu

Asabiraki kogi-inishi fune no ato naki-goto[shi].

To what might one compare this world?

It is like a boat that, rowed away at dawn, leaves no trace behind.¹⁷

Ōgai #215.17–18 (1917):

人生畢竟譬何物 *Jinsei hikkyō nanimono ni ka tatoen*

Rénshēng bìjìng pì hé wù

死囚待刑犧俟屠 *Shishū no kei o machi ikenie no hōraruru o matsu ga gotoshi*

Sǐqiú dài xíng xī sī tú

Human life, after all, can be likened to what?

A condemned criminal awaiting execution, a sacrificial animal anticipating slaughter.

But the interpretive value of an allusion’s “source” can be doubtful at best, especially if the resemblance between texts is fortuitous or forced. Among the more interesting locutions in Ōgai’s *kanshi* is:

Ōgai #209.9–10 (1917):

世上爭名利 *Sejō no myōri o arasou koto*

Shìshàng zhēng mínglì

16 The principle devised by William of Ockham (ca. 1285 – ca. 1349) variously as *Non sunt multiplicanda entia praeter necessitatem* (“Entities are not to be multiplied beyond necessity”) or *Numquam ponenda est pluralitas sine necessitate* (“Multiples should not be posited without necessity”). Known as the “law of economy,” it was employed by later scientists such as Galileo and Ernst Mach to mean that one should aim to explain the facts of nature in the simplest and most economical formulations. In other words, a simple explanation that accounts for available data is preferable to an unnecessarily complicated one, Ockham’s “razor” paring analysis of its inessentials.

17 Wixted, *A Handbook to Classical Japanese*, p. 225; for page references to sixteen other translations of the poem, see p. 282.

群蠅逐腥羶 *Gun'yō no seisen o ou ga gotoshi*
 Qúnyíng zhú xīngshān

The world strives for fame and profit,
 A swarm of flies going after putrid mutton.

The image of “going after putrid mutton” had been used in a poem entitled “Hating Flies” (憎蠅 “Zēng yíng”) by the Qing-dynasty author, Táng Sūnhuá 唐孫華 (1634–1723);¹⁸ but it is open to question whether Ōgai ever read it. On the one hand, the earlier citation is abstruse enough to question its being a source; on the other, the mutton and fly phrasing might be more than coincidental, and Ōgai did have catholic reading tastes.¹⁹ But the image and wording are very similar to what has become a set phrase in Chinese, “a swarm of ants in pursuit of mutton,” one that ultimately derives from a phrase in *Zhuāngzǐ* 莊子; for example, Liáng Qǐchāo 梁啟超 (1873–1929) wrote (in 說國風 “Shuō guófēng”), “Our people are drawn to the West, like a swarm of ants in pursuit of mutton” 國人之慕西方，若羣蟻趨羶 (Guórén zhī mù Xīfang, ruò qún yǐ qū shān).²⁰ In short, it is possible to overread literary origins and resonances into phrases that have become a more general part of the language.²¹

18 The line is quoted by Kotajima, 2:209.

19 A related problem is presented by the poem on moxibustion by Ōgai (#227), which, exceptionally among his *kanshi*, seems merely reworded from other verse: two obscure poems (reproduced in Kotajima, 2:301302) found in Ming-dynasty moxibustion manuals; 15 of the 20 characters in Ōgai’s poem overlap with the wording in one, and 17 of 20 in the other.

20 *Hànyǔ dàcídiǎn* 漢語大詞典, gen’l. ed. Luó Zhúfēng 羅竹風 (13 vols., 1987–95; 3-vol. reduced-print ed. [suōyìnběn 縮印本], Shanghai: Hànyǔ Dàcídiǎn Chūbǎnshè 漢語大詞典出版社, 1997), 3:5383a. (To convert citations to the 13-volume edition, use Victor H. Mair, *Conversion Tables for the Three-Volume Edition of the ‘Hanyu Da Cidian’, Sino-Platonic Papers #169* [Jan. 2006].) The phrase – in the form “rú yǐ fù shān” 如蟻附羶, “like ants glumpfing onto mutton” – is also found in numerous dictionaries of set expressions (*chéngyǔ* 成語).

21 They illustrate “the wholly fortuitous resemblance [between texts]” that James R. Hightower (p. 109) speaks of as being “only a trap for the too conscientious exegete or the too learned reader”; “Allusion in the Poetry of T’ao Chien [陶潛, Táo Qián],” in *Studies in Chinese Literary Genres*, ed. Cyril Birch (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), pp. 108–132. Note the seven types of allusion and intertextual similarity that Hightower illustrates, outlined as follows (pp. 109–110, verbatim):

- (1) The allusion is the subject of the poem. Unless it is identified you do not know what the poem is about.
- (2) The allusion is the key to a line; you cannot understand the line without knowing the allusion.

In terms of earlier Sino-Japanese writing, it is hard to specify which Japanese *kanshi* authors Ōgai in fact read. The locution in one poem, however, is striking enough to see it as being inspired by Rai San'yō:

Ōgai #112:12 (1886):

文耶武耶法耶醫 *Bun ka bu ka hō ka i*
Wén yé wǔ yé fǎ yé yī

[As for your boy, who just turned two, will he become–]
Civil or military official, lawyer or doctor?

Cf. the Rai San'yō 賴山陽 (1780–1832) line: “Clouds or mountains, Wú or Yuè?” 雲耶山耶吳耶越.²²

One way to approach Ōgai's knowledge of and use of earlier writers' texts is to make the following elementary distinctions. First, there are writers he names in his *kanshi* (often by pen-name or other sobriquet). These include the following Chinese authors:²³

| | | | |
|---------|----|--------------|---------|
| Dù Mù | 杜牧 | (803–852) | #184.3 |
| Gāo Qǐ | 高啟 | (1336–1374) | #131.3 |
| Hán Yù | 韓愈 | (768–824) | #3.60 |
| Lǐ Bì | 李泌 | (722–789) | #209.19 |
| Lù Jī | 陸機 | (261–303) | #211.7 |
| Lú Tóng | 盧仝 | (d. 835) | #209.18 |
| Lù Yóu | 陸游 | (1125–1209) | #41.10 |
| Mèngzǐ | 孟子 | (372–289 BC) | #3.60 |

-
- (3) The line makes sense, but not in context; the allusion provides another reading which makes the line meaningful as a part of the poem.
 - (4) The line makes perfect sense; the allusion, when identified, adds overtones that reinforce the literal meaning.
 - (5) An expression or phrase in the line also occurs in a text undoubtedly familiar to the poet, but it makes no contribution to the reader's appreciation of the line, and it is impossible to say whether the poet's adaptation of it was conscious or not.
 - (6) A word is used in a sense familiar from a classical text. It makes no difference whether you (or the poet) learned the meaning of the word from a dictionary or other source.
 - (7) The resemblance is fortuitous, and misleading if pressed.

22 *Un ka san ka Go ka Etsu* (Yún yé shān yé Wú yé Yuè); cited by Kotajima, 1:253.

23 In this and the following lists, only one reference (of sometimes several possible ones) is given for each entry; some are made explicit by Ōgai's interpolated notes. Names (and book titles) are not repeated in later lists.

| | | | |
|--------------|------|---------------|---------|
| Ōuyáng Xiū | 歐陽修 | (1007–1072) | #3.59 |
| Sīmǎ Qiān | 司馬遷 | (135?–93? BC) | #138.13 |
| Sīmǎ Xiāngrú | 司馬相如 | (179–117 BC) | #123.1 |
| Sū Shì | 蘇軾 | (1036–1101) | #131.3 |
| Wú Wěiyè | 吳偉業 | (1609–1671) | #156.4 |
| Zuǒ Sī | 左思 | (253?–307?) | #211.8 |

Furthermore, the Japanese authors, Ishikawa Jōzan (Shisendō) 石川丈山 (詩仙堂) (1583–1672) and Matsuo Bashō 松尾芭蕉 (1644–1694), are specifically referred to in Ōgai's *kanshi* (#183.1 and #138.16, respectively), as is the *Genji monogatari* 源氏物語 (#35 and #138.20).

Second, there are locutions in Ōgai's *kanshi* that are incomprehensible without reference to an earlier source; in other words, they have to be allusions. Among the earlier texts or authors referred to in this way are the following:

| | | | |
|-----------------------|------|-------------------|----------------------|
| <i>Chūnqiū</i> | 春秋 | | #166.1 |
| Dù Fǔ | 杜甫 | (712–770) | #192.3–4 |
| <i>Hànshū</i> | 漢書 | | #182.2 |
| <i>Hòu Hànshū</i> | 後漢書 | | #181.4 |
| Jiǎ Dǎo | 賈島 | (779–843) | #109.4 |
| Lǐ Pānlóng | 李攀龍 | (1514–1570) | #101.4 |
| <i>Lǐjì</i> | 禮記 | | #220.4 |
| <i>Sānguózhì</i> | 三國志 | | #182.3–4 |
| <i>Shǐjì</i> | 史記 | | #153.8 |
| <i>Shìshuō xīnyǔ</i> | 世說新語 | | #162.4 |
| <i>Shūjīng</i> | 書經 | | #165.9–10 |
| <i>Sōushénjì</i> | 搜神記 | | #223.1 |
| <i>Tàipíng yùlǎn</i> | 太平御覽 | | #177.4 |
| Wáng Wéi | 王維 | (699–759) | #72.2 |
| <i>Wénxuǎn</i> | 文選 | | #161.1 |
| Xúnzǐ | 荀子 | (298?–ca. 235 BC) | #162.24 |
| <i>Yìyuàn</i> | 異苑 | | #151.18 |
| <i>Zhànguó cè</i> | 戰國策 | | #71.5 |
| <i>Zhuāngzǐ</i> | 莊子 | | #176.3 |
| <i>Zīzhì tōngjiàn</i> | 資治通鑑 | | #214.24 |
| <i>Zuǒzhuàn</i> | 左傳 | | #173.1 ²⁴ |

24 Some items in the *Hànshū* 漢書 or *Hòu Hànshū* 後漢書 that are alluded to by Ōgai may be familiar through later retelling (e.g., in the *Shìshuō xīnyǔ* 世說新語 or *Méngqiú* 蒙求).

Third, there are passages that *in all likelihood* draw on the following classical works or writers:

| | | | |
|--------------|------|-----------|--------|
| Bó Jūyì | 白居易 | (772–846) | #182.3 |
| Kǒngzǐ jiāyǔ | 孔子家語 | | #180.2 |
| Méngqiú | 蒙求 | | #186.8 |
| Shījīng | 詩經 | | #180.1 |
| Táo Qián | 陶潛 | (365–427) | #182.1 |
| Wéi Zhuāng | 韋莊 | (836–910) | #183.4 |

In other words, Ōgai had at least passing acquaintance with the above authors and texts, and in the majority of cases much more.

Stated in overall terms, many of the above authors and texts Ōgai read and in many cases alluded to – specifically, those on history and certain belles-lettres – reflect the conventional yet far-from-narrow training of a well-educated Chinese or Japanese of the time. But three additional points are worth noting. For one, Ōgai’s reading goes beyond that of major anthologies or abridgements of Chinese sources: namely, the *Wénxuǎn* (*Monzen*) 文選 for early authors, the *Táng Sòng bā dàjiā* (*Tō-Sō hachi taika*) 唐宋八大家 for prose masters of the Tang and Song dynasties, and the *Shíbā shǐlùe* (*Jūhasshiryaku*) 十八史略 for eighteen of the traditional Chinese dynastic histories (a work especially popular in Japan) or the *Zīzhì tōngjiàn* (*Shiji tsugan*) 資治通鑑, which covers most of the same material. Second, some of the authors or works that figure as sources for, or influences on, Ōgai reflect especially catholic tastes on his part (e.g., Wéi Zhuāng, Gāo Qǐ, and Lǐ Pānlóng), if not *recherché* ones (per n. 19 above). And third, not surprisingly, except for the *Sōushénjì*, none of the Chinese vernacular-fiction works that figure so prominently in Ōgai’s *fiction* as sources or references (most famously at the beginning of *Gan* 雁) are cited in his *kanshi*. They form another subset.

Sino-Japanese sources for locutions and references in Mori Ōgai’s *kanshi* are more difficult to determine than Chinese ones, given the comparative paucity of annotated commentaries, concordances, and other reference works. Nevertheless, there are references to Sino-Japanese writers by Ōgai; and the author’s commentators have pointed to similarities between specific phrases in his *kanshi* and the *kanbun* writings of the following Japanese authors:

Items cited here as deriving from the *Zhuāngzǐ* 莊子 and *Zuǒzhuàn* 左傳 could be known through any number of later texts.

| | | | |
|---------------------------|------------|-------------|----------|
| Ema Tenkō | 江馬天江 | (1825–1901) | #34.4 |
| Fujii Kei (Chikugai) | 藤井啓 (竹外) | (1807–1866) | #34.4 |
| Hirose Kyokusō | 廣瀬旭莊 | (1807–1863) | #146.4 |
| Hōjō Chikutan | 北條竹潭 | (Edo-Meiji) | #90.3 |
| Ishikawa Jōzan (Shisendō) | 石川丈山 (詩仙堂) | (1583–1672) | #183.1 |
| Kan Sazan | 菅茶山 | (1748–1827) | #14.3 |
| Kashiwagi Jotei | 柏木如亭 | (1763–1819) | #30.9-10 |
| Kikuchi Sankei | 菊池三溪 | (1819–1891) | #67.1 |
| Miura Moriharu | 三浦守治 | (1857–1919) | #19.2 |
| Nakajima Sōin | 中島棕隱 | (1779–1855) | #205.1 |
| Rai San'yō | 賴山陽 | (1780–1832) | #76.1-3 |
| Yanagawa Seigan | 梁川星巖 | (1789–1858) | #34.4 |

This combination of Chinese and Sino-Japanese source material presents a vast range of material to consider. But at least the problem is being approached inductively and not deductively; for some would address the issue of allusion by first checking to see what works were in the library of the writer involved (something one is able to do in the case of Ōgai).²⁵ But useful as this can be (especially when there are annotations in a work in the author-owner's hand), the problems involved should be obvious. Who has read all of the books in his/her library, let alone absorbed them enough to cite from memory? What writer has not borrowed books that would not appear in such a register? Who has not learned from texts presented orally, or at an age young enough for them not to be represented in a listing of one's personal copies?

The problem of allusion is not just one of trying to understand a text better. Allusion presents special difficulties when referring to a passage, or when translating or explicating it. This can be illustrated by the following. In 1916, the anthology of Ōgai writings, *Minawashū* 水沫集, was republished (earlier titled *Minawashū* 美奈和集). First printed in 1892, it had included not only the author's famous "original" works – the three short stories that take place in Germany: *Maihime* 舞姫, *Utakata no ki* うたかたの記, and *Fumizukai* 文づ

25 A handwritten list (i,158,8 pp., dated May 1927) of Ōgai's East Asian-language books is available at the University of Tokyo Library: "Ōgai bunko mokuroku: Wa-Kan sho no bu" 鷗外文庫目録: 和漢書之部. Also available is a typescript (i,ii,iii,148,18 pp., undated) listing his Western-language holdings: "Der Author Katalog von ausländischen [sic] Bücher [sic] in der Bibliothek des Drs. Rintaro Mori." Individual titles can be checked online at the library's website, where items that were owned by Ōgai have call numbers beginning with 鷗 and are housed separately.

かひ – but also his translations of prose pieces by Alphonse Daudet, Heinrich von Kleist, and Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, as well as his *Omokage* 於母影 poem-translations – material which Ōgai considered ground-breaking. On the occasion of the reprinting of the anthology, Ōgai wrote two poems, one of which reads as follows:

Ōgai #199, Entire poem (1916), No. 1 of 2:

丙辰夏日校水沫集感觸有作

Hinoetatsu kajitsu, 'Minawashū' o kōsu, kanshoku shite saku ari

Bǐngchén xiàrì, xiào 'Shuǐmòjí,' gǎnchù yǒu zuò

“*Hinoetatsu* Year [1916], Spring Day: Editing *Minawashū*, I Feel Moved and Write”

空拳尚擬拓新阡

Kūken nao shinsen o hirakan to gisuru mo

Kōngquán shàng nǐ tuò xīnqiān

2 意氣當年却可憐

Iki tōnen kaette awaremu beshi

Yìqì dāngnián què kělián

將此天潢露涸沫

Kono tenkō o motte komatsu o uruosan to shi

Jiāng cǐ tiānhuáng zhān hé mò

4 無端灑向不毛田

Hashi naku mo fumō no den ni mukatte sosogu

Wúduān sǎ xiàng bù máo tián

The first two lines are straightforward enough:

With but bare fists, intent on opening new fields;
My determination then – how pathetic it seems now.

But the next two lines present a problem. Rendered in more “literal” fashion, they become something like:

With this Heavenly Pond, moistening dessicated foam;
Useless, to sprinkle water on non-arable fields.

But the lines are so pared down as to be gnomic; so the problem remains, what does the couplet mean? Filling in the translation to communicate more of its sense, one might offer the following “expanded” version:

With [splashes of] Heavenly River water [from the Milky Way], I wanted to
moisten [fish] bubbling [at the mouth, on the point of death] from being
dried out;

But it is of no use to sprinkle water on barren land.

In the second version, the allusion in Line 3 has been paraphrased but not identified. If one wanted to make the source clearer,²⁶ and to fill in what the couplet is “really saying” on the author’s personal level, something like the following “paraphrased” version emerges:

With freshets of water as from the Milky Way’s stream (namely, with my new and experimental writings of twenty-five years ago that are being reprinted here – both original works and translations), I wanted to resuscitate a literature that was gasping for life, like the frothing fish in *Zhuāngzǐ* 莊子;

But it is pointless to try to water totally barren land – a public and literary world (*bundan* 文壇) both unreceptive.

Although each of these renderings has its validity, the first and third seem to complement each other.

Often, with lines like 1–2 above, a single rendering of a passage is sufficient. But as Lines 3–4 illustrate, a “literal” version, standing alone, can be enigmatic, especially if an allusion is involved; and a translation can lose its “concreteness,” and most of its poeticity, if “paraphrased.” In such instances, “literal” and “paraphrased” versions are best *both* supplied. Either can be the main text, as long as it is accompanied by the other interlinearly, in a footnote, or on a facing page.

When looking at Mori Ōgai’s use of language, one feature stands out in his early *kanshi*: repeated reference to fog, mist, vapor, haze, smoke, overcast, and murkiness. The following examples are only from *Kōsei nikki* 航西日記 (Diary of a Voyage Westward), his 1884 travel diary written on the way to Germany (there are other examples that predate it):

烟霧起 (#84.2), 烟雲 (#85.4), 輕烟 (#86.2), 蠻烟 (#89.1), 縹烟氛 (#91.2), 水烟茫々 (#91.18), 十里青烟 (#92.4), 紫嵐 (#99.2), and 暮烟 (#99.4).

What is interesting in this regard is that once Ōgai gets off the ship in Marseilles, he is drawn to images of light (not daylight, but light nevertheless): the

26 *Zhuāngzǐ*, Dà Zōngshī 莊子、大宗師: 泉涸、魚相與處於陸、相响以濕、相濡以沫、不如相忘於江湖。(Quán gù, yú xiāng yǔ chǔ yú lù, xiāng xǔ yǐ shī, xiāng rú yǐ mò, bù rú xiāng wàng yú jiānghú.) From the chapter “The Great and Venerable Teacher”: “When the springs dry up and the fish are left stranded on the ground, they spew each other with moisture and wet each other down with spit – but it would be much better if they could forget each other in the rivers and lakes”; Burton Watson, tr., *The Complete Works of Chuang Tzu* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1968), p. 80. Hence also the title, *Minawashū* 水沫集.

sheer number of gas-lamps in Marseilles (#108), cool moonlight seen from the train near Lyon (#109), and the unexpectedness of meeting a friend from Japan after three years under a foreign moon in Paris (#110). During his stay in Germany, the foggy mist that had been so frequent a feature of his earlier verse largely evaporates.²⁷

A feature that stands out even more in Ōgai's early *kanshi* is the sheer range of his *kanji* usage: not just the number of *kanji* employed, but also the frequent use of unusual *kanji*. The characteristic is so pronounced that Ōgai might even be called the “*Kanji* King.”²⁸ But he is a “king” whose reign extends over three periods. First, there is young Ōgai, the “*Kanji* Show-off.” By middle age, he becomes the “*Kanji* Grand Master.” And in his final years, he is a retired “*Kanji* Emperor.” The stages are reflected in Ōgai's Sino-Japanese verse, and frequently in his other writing as well.

There is abundant evidence for young Ōgai, the “*Kanji* Show-off.” As a young man he was much given to using unusual individual *kanji*,²⁹ unusual

27 Mist even appears in a positive context in an idyllic description of Starnberger See by Leoni near Munich (渺茫烟水) (#116.1 [1886]). The only exception appears to be the “cloudy vapors dank” (雲氣暗) used in reference to Leipzig's smokestacks “belching black soot” (吐青煤) (#120.3-4).

It is worth further noting that in Ōgai's *kanshi* about history, most of which were written when he was young (for example, #78, #85, and #100), a historical site is often described as being just out of sight: “It must be off there somewhere *in the mist*,” he says. This is partly owing to their shipboard composition in some cases, and there may even have been mist on the occasions in question. But they likely also reflect a state of mind. This is of particular interest when one considers that Ōgai was to become a master of the *shiden* 史傳, or historical biography genre. In the latter he piles up ever more positivistic historical detail about figures of the past in the vain attempt to sweep away more and more of the wisps of fog that enshroud them; cf. Marvin Marcus, *Paragons of the Ordinary: The Biographical Literature of Mori Ōgai* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1993), *passim*.

Ōgai does employ phrases that are hackneyed, through overuse either by earlier poets or by himself. Two examples are: 丹青 (*tansei* [dānqīng]) to refer to painting (#155.2 [1894], #226.6 [1918]); and 傾蓋 (or 傾蓋) (*keigai* [qīnggài]) to describe a first meeting where two people “hit it off” (#138.3 [1888], #212.2 [1917]). Ōgai was also enamored of the locutions 帷幄 (*i-aku* [wéiwò]) or its inversion (幄帷) to describe army tents in the field (#169.3 [1905], #171.5 [1905]), and 平生 (*heizei* [píngshēng]; #77.7 [1884], #101.2 [1884], #115.3 [1886], #122.4 [1887], #138.19 [1888], #144.2 [1890], #162.7 [1899]) to refer to a person's customary way of doing things.

28 Ōgai's is a *kanji*-centric world. See Wixted, “Mori Ōgai: Translation Transforming the Word / World,” *passim*, esp. pp. 68–72 (including citation in n. 16 of relevant terminology by the critic Karatani Kōjin 柄谷行人).

29 Note the four examples cited in *ibid.*, entry #3.

kanji-compounds,³⁰ unusual *kanji*-variants,³¹ and ordinary *kanji* in unusual senses.³² This is to say nothing of the many *kanji* compounds he devised to create in Japanese the scientific, medical, and material worlds of the West.³³ In a word, Ōgai's predilection in his early years was for more recondite, *recherché* expression. But a majority of his "show-off" locutions date from before 1889, when Ōgai was twenty-seven years old.³⁴ The need for such personal display on his part seems to attenuate with time.

By middle age, Ōgai broadened his *kanji* usage, employing a particularly full, sometimes lush vocabulary that merits his being called the "*Kanji* Grand Master." This is most in evidence in his translation – or rather, in terms of language, his immensely creative adaptation – of the Hans Christian Andersen work, *Improvisatoren* (The Impromptu Poet), titled *Sokkyō shijin* 即興詩人, into *gabun* 雅文-style Japanese. Ōgai's earlier training in *kanbun* made pos-

30 Note the six examples cited in *ibid.*, entry #6.

31 See n. 34 below.

32 For example, 殷 to mean 'dark red' (#18.2 [1882]); 軒 to mean 'tall' (#21.3 [1882]); and 遲 to mean 'to wait for something' (#177.3 [1915]).

33 Six examples of scientific terms are cited in *ibid.*, entry #13; and several examples from the material world are cited in *ibid.*, entries #11 and #12. Note the lists of Western scientific terms (rendered by Ōgai in *kanji* compounds) found in *Ōgai zenshū* 鷗外全集 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店, 1971–75), 38 vols.: there is an important list in 37:3–23 (from which the six examples just noted are drawn) and a less important one that follows in 37:24–30, as well as the makings of a list in 32:402–453.

For Ōgai's invention of the material and spiritual world of Italy in his *Sokkyō shijin* adaptation (referred to below), see Wixted, "Mori Ōgai: Translation Transforming the Word / World," *passim*.

34 This is best illustrated by his use of 'fancy substitution.' Two-thirds of the following examples date from 1889 or earlier.

Note that the duality operative with allusion (where "X" stands both for "X" and for some antecedent form of "X") can also be seen to operate in the use of unusual individual characters or compounds (where "Y" stands both for itself – a rare "Y" – and implicitly for an absent, 'plain-Jane' "Y" near-equivalent):

藁 for 稿 (#3 title), 焮 for 秋 (#3.53 [1880]), 翻 for 翻 (#3.106 [1880]), 埃 for 俟 (#3.117 [1880]), 互 for 宜 (#4.3 [1881]), 穉 for 稚 (#50.4 [1882]), 亾 for 亡 (#65.2 [1883]), 敵 for 敵 (#68.1 [1883]), 艸 for 草 (five times), 盪 for 蕩 (#85.1 [1884]), 眦 for 眦 (#91.17 [1884]), 媿 for 愧 (#112.17 [1886]), 炯 for 炯 (#115.2 [1886]), 蓋 for 蓋 (#138.3 [1888]), 劍 for 劍 (three times), 湏 for 須 (#141.21 [1889]), 醫 for 醫 (#146.3 [1891]), 窮 for 窮 (#151.15 [1891]), 濶 for 闊 (#152.2 [1991]), 鼓 for 鼓 (three times), 祇 for 祇 (#187.3 [1915]), 腸 for 腸 (#189.3 [1915]), 稊 for 粳 (#195.2 [1915]), 天潢 for 天河 (#199.3 [1916]), 繇來 for 由來 (#200.2 [1916]), 塵埃 for 塵埃 (#226.10 [1918]) 去 for 去 (#228.10 [1918]), 暫 for 暫 (#230.16 [1918]), and 蜚 for 飛 (#230.18 [1918]).

Five of the above are cited in *ibid.*, entry #1.

sible the luxuriating in language, much of it extraordinarily rich *kanji* usage, in this work, arguably Ōgai's greatest literary accomplishment.³⁵

In his later years Ōgai rose to the level of “*Kanji* Emperor” – for, like a retired but strong-minded emperor or pope, one preferring the shadows to the limelight, he did not need to make a display of his authority; it was simply there, and needed only be used sparingly. When displayed, it had even greater effect. Such is the case with Ōgai's *Faust* translation, where a fluid vernacular is only occasionally punctuated by more learned or arresting *kanji*.³⁶ In his late *kanshi* as well, only occasionally is an expression used that might otherwise seem unnecessarily “fancy”; in context it is an appropriate *bon mot*.

Ōgai's masterful use of *kanji*, learned but understated, in his later *kanshi* is illustrated by the following: his employ in a 1915 poem of the elegant variation 彫塼 (*chōso* [diāosù], #174.1), to complement the more common 彫塑 (*chōso* [diāosù]) in the poem's title, both meaning “sculpture, carving, etc.” The poem in which the phrasing appears was written as a dedicatory piece for the publication of the pioneering work on early Chinese art by Ōmura Seigai 大村西崖 (1868–1927).³⁷ By using the less common compound, Ōgai is both highlighting the subject of the book and, in effect, “blowing a kiss” to all involved, one that says: “You (Ōmura), I, and you readers of Ōmura's book and of this poem that heads it – we all share a love of art and rejoice in this groundbreaking work. I am taking part in the celebration by writing this poem that, with its difficult but intelligent expression, embodies our shared cultural world (a world that includes *kanbun*, which, like the allusions it incorporates, the educated can read and understand). Indeed, in concert we are ‘enacting’ civilization: Ōmura, by having written such a fine work; others of us, by reading it and gaining further appreciation of our East Asian cultural world; myself, by penning this dedicatory poem; and all of you, by reading these lines and delighting in being able to understand them and to appreciate a *bon mot*

35 See *ibid.*, *passim*.

36 For good examples, see *ibid.*, entry #33.

37 *Shina bijutsu shi: Chōso hen* 支那美術史: 彫塑篇 (Tokyo: Butsusho Kankōkai Zushōbu 佛書刊行會圖像部, 1915), 2 vols. Note Alexander Soper's ambiguous acknowledgment of indebtedness to the work for his *Literary Evidence for Early Buddhist Art in China* (Ascona, Switz.: Artibus Asiae, 1959): “I have begun in this volume with the earlier half of Ōmura's Buddhist history, the art of Han, Chin, and the Six Dynasties, ...” For fuller citation of both works, see John Timothy Wixted, *Japanese Scholars of China: A Bibliographical Handbook / 日本の中国学専門家ハンドブック* [Nihon Chūgokugaku senmonka handobukku] (Lewiston, N.Y.: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1992), p. 177.

such as the one included here. Ritually, we are participating in the cultural world of East Asia that these poetic lines developed from and form part of.³⁸ Like the Chinese art in the volume and the Buddhism that much of it portrays, our *kanji* world transcends mere borders; in effect, it comprises a greater East Asia shared cultural realm.”³⁹

Kanbun, including *kanshi*, made this transnational cultural world possible, where *kanji* diction and allusion meld.

38 As David Lattimore notes (“Allusion and T’ang Poetry,” pp. 410–411): “Any allusion gives a sort of conspiratorial pleasure by reinforcing the feeling that the speakers, or the author and reader, are in on the joke, hip, ‘in the know.’ In a learned group, legitimated by its ties to the past, the use of learned allusions will reinforce this feeling in the special form which it takes in such a group, a sense of corporate legitimacy based in great part on shared, exclusive knowledge of the past. In such a group, reading an allusive poem is something like taking part in a ritual.”

39 Cf. Saitō Mareshi 齋藤希史, *Kanbunmyaku no kindai: Shinmatsu-Meiji no bungakken* 漢文脈の近代: 清末=明治の文学圏 (Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppankai 名古屋大学出版会, 2005), and idem, *Kanbunmyaku to Kindai Nihon: Mō hitotsu no kotoba no sekai* 漢文脈と近代日本: もう一つのことばの世界 (Tokyo: Nihon Hōsō Shuppan Kyōkai 日本放送出版協会, 2007). Note also the “kanji sphere” discussed by Charles Holcome, *The Genesis of East Asia, 221 B.C.–A.D. 907* (Honolulu: Association for Asian Studies and University of Hawai‘i Press, 2001).

