Stylistyka
XXXII · 2023

ISSN 1230-2287 • e-ISSN 2545-1669
https://czasopisma.uni.opole.pl/index.php/s

ORIGINAL ARTICLE
Received 06.02.2023 • Accepted 28.05.2023

# *Dialogised heteroglossia and the Japanese-Chinese mixed style of "Kaidōki"*[*]

ADAM BEDNARCZYK[**]

CITATION: Bednarczyk A., 2023, Dialogised heteroglossia and the Japanese-Chinese mixed style of *Kaidōki*, *Stylistyka* XXXII: 59–81, https://doi.org/10.25167/Stylistyka32.2023.5

## 1. Introduction – sinocentric bilingualism in the Japanese communication environment

The idea of written literature, which was born in Japan in the middle of the first millennium CE following contacts with the Chinese civilisation of the time, opened up new possibilities for the culture of this island country. The Japanese, who hitherto had no writing system of their own, decided to implement written Chinese, mainly to serve the needs of the developing administration and to popularise various religious and philosophical concepts, including Buddhism, Taoism, and Confucianism. Intense sinicisation, also in the sphere of social

[*] The article was written as part of research in frame of the project *Performativity of the Medieval Japanese travel literature* funded by the National Science Center, grant number: 2021/41/B/HS2/02664.

[**] https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9634-7011, Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń, Poland, a_bed@umk.pl

communication, mainly in court and monastic elite circles, popularised Classical Chinese literature, or *kanbun* 漢文[1] (meaning: "texts written in Chinese/Chinese writing"), which, by analogy with other languages throughout the East Asian Sinographic culture sphere (Japanese: *kanji bunkaken* 漢字文化圏) (Huszcza 2011: 115 et seq.), led rather quickly to a pronounced bilingualism, with spoken Japanese functioning alongside written Chinese[2].

Due to the incompatibility between Chinese and Japanese, it was necessary to find a method of writing Japanese that matched the features of the native language. The breakthrough came with a novel way of reading sinograms, implemented as early as the 7th century, the so-called *man'yōgana* 万葉仮名 (named after the title of the oldest anthology of native Japanese poetry, *Man'yōshū* 万葉集 [Collection of ten thousand leaves, c. 780]), involving the use of previously desemanticised phonograms (i.e., notations *ongana* 音仮名 and *kungana* 訓仮名, and – less frequently – elaborate rebuses *gisho* [= *tawamuregaki*] 戯書, lit. 'playful writing', or *gikun* 戯訓) alongside semantograms (*mana* 真名 meaning: "real writing/names") (Majtczak 2009; Liu 2016). The initiated process of modification and simplification of sinogram notation resulted in the creation of the *kana* 仮名 system (meaning: "borrowed/adapted/temporary writing/names") – syllabary, two variants of which, formed in the 9th century, became the foundation of a coherent method of writing Japanese text called *wabun* 和文. The resulting digraphia based on

[1] This paper uses a modified version of the Hepburn transcription (the so-called *Hebon-shiki rōmaji* ヘボン式ローマ字) for Japanese and the *hànyǔ pīnyīn* 漢語拼音 transcription (a contemporary Chinese reading with marked tones) for Chinese. In both cases, the transcription is accompanied by the standardised original ideographic notation (*shinjitai* 新字体 for Japanese and a traditional unsimplified form of *jiùzìtǐ* 舊字體 for Chinese). In the case of Japanese names, the surname is placed before the first name, following the Japanese order. All translations of terms, titles, and quotations into English are made by the author unless otherwise indicated.

[2] This phenomenon was accurately described by Romuald Huszcza: "The ideographic writing system developed in the Chinese language environment and within the circle of Old Chinese material culture played a special role in the contacts of Chinese with its three other neighbours in the region, i.e., Vietnamese, Korean, and Japanese. These contacts began in each case with exoglossia, or rather exography, i.e., a situation whereby a language taken over from outside is dominant in terms of stylistic variety or a number of varieties in written function (official, court, literary, prose and poetic, liturgical and ritual, and others) in the local language environment and the consolidation of one's own (native) texts is preceded by accelerated perception of foreign texts and equally strenuous efforts to acquire writing competence. At the beginning, writing competence was limited and professional in nature; it was a kind of craftsmanship of writers who came from outside and were then trained locally. Only later did it acquire the status of a non-professional skill, although still socially limited, a component of courtly and artistic refinement, and a canon of knowledge" (Huszcza 2011: 116); cf. Sonoyama 2019: 51–52.

incorporated Sinoxenic lexis and native syllabic notation enabled the precise notation of content in Japanese but invariably affected not only the linguistic and literary situation but also the social situation as it did not, in practice, lead to the departure from the diglossia of Japanese. It should be emphasised, however, that with the beginning of the Heian period (794–1185), bilingual linguistic communication in Japan no longer meant only the separation of written language (Chinese) and spoken language (Japanese) but above all the distinction between official and unofficial (private) written language, *otokode* 男手 ("male writing") and *onnade* 女手 ("female writing")[3].

The reception of continental written culture and its assimilation into the Japanese-speaking environment were particularly reflected in the literary output practised in *kanbun*, *wabun*, or the mixed style. The earliest monuments of Japanese literature, such as the *Kojiki* 古事記 (Records of ancient matters, 712) are an example of a text written down in japanised Chinese (the so-called *waka kanbun* 和化漢文), into which selected content phonetically written in pure Japanese was embedded. This was the standard way of writing in the 8th century on the one hand and an expression of the authors' ambition to appeal to Chinese standards on the other as they wished to be part of the continental writing culture (Głuch 2015: 176). The love of writing and composing poetry taken over from Tang China became an essential component of court life, which was based on the concept of a state governed according to the proper code and etiquette (Głuch 2015: 177). This was particularly evident in the 9th century, which brought a radical and official curtailment of Sino-Japanese contacts but did not cool the reading fervour and did not affect the practice of writing in Chinese[4]. With the progressive japanisation of the reading of classical Chinese texts and its adoption from Buddhist circles into the milieu of the court aristocracy, bilingualism continued to be the

[3] The difference between *otokode* and *onnade* is based on the notation system. Men, who were subjected to an education in Chinese classics, used a formal, "true/real writing" (*mana*), and therefore sinograms (also in the form of *man'yōgana*), while women used a simplified, informal, "temporary script" (*kana*), based solely on syllabograms.

[4] The highly educated Saga Emperor (reigning between 809 and 823), like many poets of his time, embodied, "the Chinese ideal of ruling scholar statesmen who worked for the state and at the same time practiced poetry and writing" (Głuch 2015: 183). The motto of his reign was the words of the Chinese emperor Cao Pi 曹丕 (187–226), who wrote in his work *Dian lun* 典論 (Treatises) that, "literary works are great undertakings that decide the fate of the state and magnificent achievements that are eternally lasting" (Cao 2007: 96), pointing to the utilitarian function of literature and, emphasising its cultural and state-forming value worthy of support (Olszewski 2003: 30–31).

communicative norm. Sinocentrism only began to decline somewhat from the 11th century onwards, which was primarily due to the steadily increasing position of Japanese as the language of literature and popular writing. However, this did not mean that reading in Chinese was abandoned. Many prominent experts in ancient Chinese who were fluent in interpreting Chinese classics were still active (Głuch 2015: 188). Nevertheless, the changes that took place in this respect with the end of the Heian period, including the demise of the court academy, i.e., Daigakuryō, showed that the stature of the Chinese language also declined and, "successive generations of lecturers deprived of competition and direct contact with the written culture of China showed less and less knowledge in this field" (Głuch 2015: 191). It is also worth noting that, while there was a potential risk of foreign linguistic traditions dominating the native one, it became clear, from the perspective of several centuries, that this kind of, "attempt to sinicise the system of government and introduce Chinese as the language of the elite failed", and in the following period, i.e., Kamakura (1192–1333), "the perception of Chinese writing fundamentally changes its mode and scope" (Głuch 2015: 191–192). The aim of this paper is to discuss this perception and to analyse the technique of assimilation of Chinese writing used in texts written in a mixed Japanese-Chinese style (the so-called *wakan konkō buntai* 和漢混淆文体)[5]. Referring to the text of *Kaidōki* 海道記 (Records of [a journey along] the seacoast road, 1223), a medieval[6] Japanese travel diary, the attempt will be made to demonstrate

[5] This refers to a style containing both Japanese elements (native vocabulary written in *wabun* and read in Japanese) and Chinese elements, that is, characterised by a sinicised reading of characters, terms, and phrases. cf. Ōsone 1998: 1355.

[6] According to the generally accepted universalist periodisation, Japanese court literature (Japanese: *ōchō bungaku*), is classified as part of antiquity (*kodai* or *jōdai*), which lasted until the end of the Heian period and was followed by the Middle Ages (Japanese: *chūsei*), lasting from the late 12th to the 16th century (cf. Kotański 1961: 11; Melanowicz 1994: 20). It should be noted, however, that literary works of late antiquity (Japanese: *kodai kōki*) developing during the Heian period are alternatively called early medieval literature (*chūko*). Some literary scholars tend to believe that medieval Japanese literature falls into a period much earlier than the late 12th century. For example, Robert N. Huey (1990) believes that the Middle Ages within Japanese literature began around 1080. The research of historians is also helpful as they are able to perceive social, economic, and political processes and phenomena typical of the feudal period (which, according to popular opinion, were initiated with the first military rule) in a period well before the end of the Heian period; cf. Hall, Mass 1988: xiii. This paper assumes that the phrase "medieval Japanese literature" means both the works of the Heian (early medieval) period and the later works of the Kamakura and Muromachi periods (1336–1573).

on selected passages how, in the spirit of Bakhtin's heteroglossia, a dialogue on the level of Chinese and Japanese writing occurs[7].

## 2. Bilingual dialogism as a source of *poeisis*

The new genres of courtly prose that emerged and were popularised in the middle Heian period, represented, among others, by tales (*monogatari* 物語) or diaries/memoirs (*nikki* 日記), contain much testimony demonstrating the actual competence of the Japanese of the time to read, understand, and interpret content written in Chinese. Głuch explains as follows:

> [...] although numerous Sinoxenic borrowings were present in the Japanese of the Heian period and the writing culture developed intensively, the ability to read classical Chinese texts freely was not common even at the imperial court. Despite the competence in writing according to the established pattern of official letters, there was no ability to read and interpret well texts that were unfamiliar and therefore uncommented on or not subjected to any "processing transposing" them into the Japanese-speaking environment (Głuch 2015: 189).

This would imply that the courtiers' competence in terms of knowledge of Chinese writing was much more limited than it might initially appear[8]. There are many arguments that Chinese literary culture was then gradually "domesticated", as Brian Steininger (2017: 7) suggests. This took place through (1) the "appropriation" of imported literary texts on the basis of metaphrases, recognisable allusions, and paraphrases, which, not necessarily explicitly referring to the context of Heian period works, enhanced their aesthetic value, and (2) the "local production" of literary forms ascribed to the Chinese literary tradition (mainly poems in literary Chinese – *shi* 詩).

---

[7] It should be noted at the beginning that the dialogue in question between Chinese and Japanese writing has almost always meant a one-way oriented relationship. It was Classical Chinese texts, as products of mainland culture, that provided a point of reference for texts produced within Japanese (peripheral) culture.

[8] According to Ivan Morris (1964: 173), this state of affairs was probably influenced, among others, by the lack of stimuli coming from the continent, but the underlying cause was "the almost exclusive concentration on a foreign language and on foreign patterns of experience, which were static and, for many a young Heian student, dead. Like the pupil of *grammaticus* and the *rhetor* in ancient Rome, the aristocratic Japanese youth, who struggled to memorize passages about the ancient history of a foreign country written in a language he had never heard (and never would hear) spoken, and who received virtually no other form of instruction, was, 'the slave of an artificial literature and the prisoner of a narrow classicism'".

Before the native *waka* poetry entered the court salons for good in the 9th century, Chinese poetry was the main genre practised by aspiring and educated poets (Sonoyama 2019: 53–54). However, they gradually moved away from imitating compositions based on Tang patterns to studying the works of native masters (their essays, treatises, and collections of poems). All these works, headed by anthologies as well as dictionaries and manuals explaining the principles of poetry composition, formed the local (Japanese) canon of literature in classical Chinese (ibid). However, the basic didactic canon making it possible to acquire the rudiments of knowledge about works in the language and about the language itself, consisted principally of various primers (the so-called *yōgakusho* 幼学書) and "four books to read" (*shibu no dokusho* 四部ノ読書), i.e., *Qiānzìwén* 千字文 (Japanese: *Senjimon*, Text of one thousand characters)[9], *Lǐ Jiào záyǒng* 李嶠雜詠 (Japanese: *Ri Kyō zatsuei*, Various compositions of Li Jiao)[10], *Méngqiú* 蒙求 (Japanese: *Mōgyū*, Exploration of the ignorant)[11], and *Wakan rōeishū* 和漢朗詠集 (Collection of Japanese and Chinese poems for recitation)[12] (Głuch 2015: 192). All these texts provided the Japanese elite of the time with what can be described as the essence of Chinese literature, which allowed them to acquire the scholarship that was highly valued at the time.

---

[9] *Qiānzìwén* was written with children in mind as it had served since the 6th century CE as a primer for learning the characters of the Chinese script. This text contains equally a thousand non-repeating sinograms, arranged 4 in 250 lines forming four-line rhyming stanzas. This primer is even referred to in *Kojiki*, which confirms that it was already widespread in the first decades of the Nara period (Steininger 2017: 138–139).

[10] *Lǐ Jiào záyǒng*, also called *Lǐ Jiào bǎi[èrshí] yǒng* 李嶠百〔二十〕詠 (Japanese: *Ri Kyō hyaku[nijū] ei*, One hundred [twenty] compositions by Lǐ Jiào), is a collection of poems by Lǐ Jiào (645–714), a courtier and poet writing in the early Tang period. His 120 most famous works were known and read in Japan from at least the beginning of the Heian period. For a more extensive discussion, vide: Brian R. Steininger, 2016, Li Jiao's Songs: Commentary-Based Reading and the Reception of Tang Poetry in Heian Japan, *East Asian Publishing and Society*, vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 103–129.

[11] *Méngqiú*, a children's textbook written down in 746 by Lǐ Hàn 李翰 (Japanese: Ri Kan, 7th/8th century), was constructed from pairs of four-character sequences that were a collection of sentences and phrases referring to well-known stories and tales from the Chinese literary tradition. It was also extremely popular in Japan, becoming the inspiration for numerous adaptations, including *Mōgyū waka* 蒙求和歌, a collection with a partial translation and included *waka* poems compiled in 1204 by Minamoto no Mitsuyuki (cf. Głuch 2015: 192–194; Steininger 2017: 138–139).

[12] *Wakan rōeishū* is considered the most significant and widely circulated anthology of Chinese poetry in the Heian period (Steininger 2017: 96). It was compiled around 1013 by Fujiwara no Kintō 藤原公任 (966–1041). It contains three types of poetry in each chapter: (1) poems in Chinese by Chinese authors, (2) poems in Chinese by Japanese courtiers, and (3) native *waka* poems (Rimer, Chaves 1997: 15).

It was customary for sinological competence to be required only of men. Nevertheless, during the court period, there were women authors who, like Murasaki Shikibu 紫式部 (between 973? and after 1019) or Sei Shōnagon 清少納言 (between 966? and 1025?), could read *kanbun* and were familiar with Chinese literary works (Steininger 2017: 126–128). The authorship of works that were written in Chinese or in the Japanese-Chinese style was an exclusively male domain. The degree of "Chineseness" of a given text varied depending on the genre and its purpose. However, almost all texts exhibited features of digraphia, at least to an elementary degree (except *kanbun*, which, as a rule, contained only writing in Chinese characters). Due to the genological heterogeneity resulting from the bilingualism of Japanese writing, i.e., written language (imported = Chinese) vs. spoken language (vernacular = Japanese) and the original sinograms (Chinese script characters *hànzì*, Japanese: *kanji* 漢字) vs. reduced sinograms (Japanese *kana* syllabograms), it is necessary to look not only at the problem of the literary work itself but also at the creative process (*poiesis*)[13], whose final result (*ergon*)[14] is a specific work.

In explaining the principles on which the "domestication" of ideological, historical, and literary knowledge borrowed from China took place, Steininger refers to the deliberate transplantation of phrases that were direct references to Chinese sources into Japanese literature (Steininger 2017: 7). This was undoubtedly the most effective method of constructing a literary work whose composition resulted directly from the linguistic usage of the time. Firstly, from the middle Heian period onwards, as a result of increasing

---

[13] *Poiesis* derives from the Old Greek verb ποιεῖν (*poieín*) meaning, "to do; to create". As a noun ποίησις (*poíēsis*), it indicates a creative act, a performance, or an action by which something that did not exist before is brought into being.

This paper refers to the meaning of *poiesis* embedded in the concept of geopoetics developed by Elżbieta Rybicka (2014: 82–85). There are three reasons for this. Firstly, it is possible to capture the chiasmatic interaction occurring between literary works (and the cultural practices associated with it) (= *poiesis*) and geographical space (= *geo*). In the case of the study of travel diaries, the possibility of describing the experience of places and their poietic creation and at the same time the active role of places in this experience, constitutes an important tool for understanding the entire creative process. Secondly, to explain the heteroglossic nature of the literary work, it is necessary, according to the author, to shift the focus from literary creation, as its final product, to the creative process understood as an act, an action, or a creation. Analysing a particular work from such a perspective, it is possible not only to describe its textual layer but also to visualise its poietic dimension, also indirectly relating to the creation of its style. Thirdly, the poietic and performative aspect shifts considerations towards literature that creates places, changes reality, and actively influences geographical space (Rybicka 2014: 92–111).

[14] Old Greek: ἔργον (*érgon*) – "creation, work."

linguistic hybridisation and the emergence of new literary genres, a variety of adaptations of elements of foreign literary culture became widespread in Japanese texts and they were increasingly less often merely quotations from the original. Secondly, the "domestication" implied a constant maintenance of the dynamism between the represented worlds of Chinese and Japanese. By referring to Chinese classics, the author of the text incorporated it into a literary standard that was widely recognised (and accepted) in Japan, thus also integrating it into a wider intercultural circulation of themes and motifs. Thirdly, the domestication enabled the author to assert his erudition, which stemmed from, among others, his personal ambitions, the expectations of the environment, and the mere affirmation of continental culture. The last reason, in particular, played an important role, since, as Oyler (2015: 141–142) aptly points out, "China is a model, an older civilization, for which the Japanese felt an affinity and beside which they placed their culture as an offshoot: geographically and culturally, Japan was smaller and less ancient, peripheral to both China and India, the latter being the ultimate cultural referent where Buddhism was concerned". Looking at the issue of literary creation (understood as *poiesis*) and therefore the process of producing a work in a somewhat broader perspective, it is impossible to ignore the phenomenon of dialogism that occurred in ancient Japanese literature both in the linguistic (spoken and written) and ideological/cultural spheres. This phenomenon was particularly reflected in the above-mentioned process of hybridisation of Japanese, modified over the centuries, as Japanese written language relied on the sinographic system.

It is hard to resist the impression that the bilingualism formed on this foundation, which became the norm for writing in the court period and beyond, fits into the concept of heteroglossia (Russian: *разноречие*) formulated by Mikhail Bakhtin. According to this Russian literary theorist, "the real environment in which an utterance lives and is shaped is the dialogised heteroglossia, anonymous and social in terms of language but concrete and saturated with content and accents in terms of individual utterance" (Bachtin 1982: 98). For Bakhtin, this language is like a Tower of Babel – a melting pot of different languages which, as an amalgam of, "socio-ideological contradictions between the present and the past", orientations, schools, etc., allows them to cross and generates their new social varieties. They are all methodologically different, e.g., in terms of functionality or content and theme.

Although it may seem difficult to define a unified comparative plane, "they can relate to one another dialogically", and this kind of interlingual penetration creates a particular view of the world, makes it possible to understand it through the word, and opens up, "horizons of subjects and meanings as well as values" (Bachtin 1982: 120–121).

In Bakhtin's view, varied-speechedness (= heteroglossia[15]) is dialogic, as any rational utterance formulated at a particular time and place, "must inculcate the thousands of living dialogic threads that social and ideological consciousness wrapped around the given object of utterance" (Bachtin 1982: 103), and even agonistic[16] since, "in the arena of almost every utterance, there is an intense interaction and struggle between one's own and others' words" (Bakhtin, Emerson, Holquist 1986: 354). The result of this dialogicality and agonisticness is the work, which is a "replica"[17] of the social dialogue and its continuation. This point of view explains the phenomenon of literary *poiesis* in the literary tradition in Japan from the 10th century onwards and provides an answer to the question of why the effect of this kind of work is characterised by a dialogised heteroglossia. Bakhtin believes that dialogue is analysed:

> [...] exclusively as a compositional form of constructing utterances, while the internal dialogism of the word [...] permeating the whole structure and all layers of meaning and expression is completely overlooked. By contrast, it is precisely the internal dialogism of the word, not assuming the external compositional forms of dialogue and not separating itself into an autonomous act independent of the word's grasp of the subject, that is characterised by enormous style-forming energy (Bachtin 1982: 106).

Since dialogicality is reflected in the style of the work and not in the composition, it can be argued that it is also an essential element of *poiesis*. How, then, did this feature interact with medieval Japanese literary works?

In a little more general terms, the heteroglossia of medieval Japanese prose, resulting from the bilingualism of Japanese that had taken shape over several centuries, initiated a dialogue not only at the level of the word but

---

[15] Old Greek: ἕτερο- [*hétero-* "different"] + γλῶσσα [*glṓssa* "language, speech"].

[16] i.e., competitive, Old Greek: ἀγών (*agṓn*) – "competition, contest."

[17] In Bakhtin's terms, the replica is based on a dialogue between one's own and other's utterances (the speaker and the partner) and is reminiscent of the dichotomous nature of the word, which, "lives, as it were, on the border between its own and another's context" (Bachtin 1982: 111).

also within the process of creating "replicas". From the perspective of the word, the intermingling of native and borrowed vocabulary (through digraphia based on *kanji* and *kana* characters) played a significant role in the first place. From the perspective of the creation of the content and style of a literary work, the ever-present interaction between the author's subjective utterance and foreign content (native and/or borrowed from the continent) was essential. It is an interaction between the author's language (a centripetal force) and the mosaic of social and historical heteroglossia (a centrifugal force stratifying the language) that emerged from the juxtaposition of various literary conventions, stylisations, idiolects, "implicit speaking", and apparently independent speech (Bakhtin 1982: 96–101). To understand how all these interrelationships influenced ancient Japanese *poiesis* (the act of literary creation), *creatio* (literary creation/creativity, including the creative qualities of the imagination), and *praxis* (practice oriented towards creative production, reinterpretation, re-writing, etc.), it is worth looking at *Kaidōki*, which provides a good exemplification of both dialogism at the level of the word and the literary work as a whole.

## 3. Dialogised heteroglossia in practice

*Kaidōki* is characterised by a mixed Japanese-Chinese style, although, as is well known, Japanese travel diaries/memoirs could be written in three language styles: (1) *kanbun* (Chinese), (2) *wabun* (Japanese), and 3) *wakan konkōbun* (mixed Japanese-Chinese). Depending on whether the writer intended to document events, write down facts, or focus on the artistic dimension of their notes, they chose the appropriate style or combination of styles. This choice of language/style largely determined the content itself (Plutschow 1982: 11), although there were no norms that would require a particular way of writing. This was particularly true of the mixed style and may have been due to the following reason:

> The *wakan konkō* style appears to varying degrees in travel diary literature, with some works leaning more towards *kambun*, and others towards *wabun*. The first type of work resembles a direct translation of *kambun* into *wabun*, and the style is often called the *kambun chokuyaku-tai* (translated *kambun*). The *Kaidō Ki* (1233) is an important example of this style, which may be considered an attempt to adapt the Japanese language to Chinese stylistic devices (Plutschow 1982: 14).

A similar view is taken by Donald Keene (1999: 117) who states that the somewhat "crabbed" language of the diary suggests that, "the author was trying to create a new kind of Japanese, one more effective in conveying his emotions than the more mellifluous Heian Japanese". However, this attempt was unsuccessful as *Kaidōki* language, "was not imitated by later writers, but his attempt compels admiration" (Keene 1999: 117). Furthermore, "the ornate writing, full of allegorical and metaphorical language, makes *Kaidō Ki* one of the most difficult works in Japanese literature to translate" (Plutschow 1982: 14). To understand this "crabbedness" of the *kikō* style, as proposed by Keene, it is worth examining one its passage, which demonstrates the multifaceted nature of heteroglossia and its influence on the creative production of a literary work.

On the fifth day in the month of the flowering of the deutzia (i.e., in the fourth month according to the lunar calendar) in the second year of Jōō (1223 CE), the author of *Kaidōki* wandered through the Suzuka mountains. Having reached one of the resting places, he depicted it in his notes as follows:

> At dusk, I stopped for a rest at the barrier-keepers lodge in Suzuka. The sickle of the moon hung over the peaks – an illusory bow that someone had left in vain in the path of returning wild geese. The water flowing downwards fell into the valley, hitting a tiger-like boulder with the speed of a flying arrow. I eventually spent another night at the travellers' station. Bound by karma, I made a bedhead of grass for myself. In the morning, my clothes as a wandering monk were cool, even though I spread my [sleeping] mat on the moss at the foot of the rocks. The pines showed their virtue of a noble man and sheltered me like the sky, but I rested and spent the night in the shade of a bamboo, which I called my friend.

薄暮(はくぼ)ニ鈴鹿(すずか)ノ関屋ニトマル。上弦(しやうくゑん)ノ月峯(みね)ニカヽリ、虚弓徒(きよきういたづら)ニ帰雁ノ路ニ残ル、下流ノ水谷(たに)ニオツ、奔箭速(ほんせんすみやか)ニシテ虎ニ似タル石ニ中(あた)ル。爰(ここ)ニ旅駅漸(やうやく)ニ夜ヲカサネテ、枕ヲ宿縁(しゆくえん)ノ草ニ結ビ、雲衣暁サムシ、席ヲ岩根ノ苔(こけ)ニシク。松ハ君子ノ徳ヲタレテ天ノ如ク覆ヘドモ、竹ハ吾友ノ号(な)アレバ陰ニ臥(ふし)テ夜ヲ明(あか)ス。(Kubota, Ōsone 1990: 78–79)

The above passus can be divided into two parts. One (on a macro scale) describes the evening landscape of the mountainous Suzuka area and the other one (on a micro scale) depicts the morning scenery – the author's nightly resting place. From the point of view of language, both parts are characterised by the same style of expression, filled with metaphorical, symbolic, and parallel phrases. For the average reader, this kind of linguistically creative

"crabbedness" of style may be a direct result of the idiolect used by the author of the travel diary on his journey to Kamakura. An expert in Chinese classics and native Japanese works, on the other hand, would rather point to an intentional poetisation of language. In a sense, both theses are correct, as *Kaidōki*'s individualised (somewhat experimental) language, as already shown, has been recognised by scholars. However, from the analytical point of view, it is also not difficult to document its intertextuality (imitation of another's language expressed through the means of one's own language)[18], which affects not only the content but, above all, the style of the work.

One of the main features of the mixed Japanese-Chinese style is the high degree of sinicisation of the literary work, which abounds in vocabulary borrowed from the continent, such as *kyokyū* 虚弓 (mock/false/illusory bow), *kigan* 帰雁 (returning wild geese), and *honsen* 奔箭 (flying arrow), as in the passage analysed above. The incorporation of similar phrases, typical of classical Chinese and written in *kanji,* into text notated in syllabograms is an excellent example of the bilingualism of Japanese writing, which enables dialogue at the level of the word. The seemingly ordinary, albeit foreign, expressions listed here constitute an interlingual space of penetration between the past and the present as perceived by the author of *Kaidōki*. They were "appropriated" and became a constituent part of a new literary reality. All these attributive-nominal phrases are so "semantically activated" (Ben-Porat 1988, as cited in Głowiński 2000: 13–14) that they can constitute a style-forming force on their own. The author of the notes, however, went a step further, quite often prosaising the whole or fragments of the poems in place of single-word allusions. In this way, by abandoning the metre of the poem and transforming it into a narrative fragment, the author inventively created an image of reality that was

[18] In some cases, intertextuality may be synonymous with dialogism (in Bakhtin's terms), although, on the other hand, intertextuality is a narrower concept than dialogism and cannot be used to make the Bakhtin's concept more detailed. This is because Bakhtin did not make, "a distinction between the internal dialogism inherent in a given utterance, resulting from its structure, and dialogism which connected this utterance with the utterances of others, so he did not distinguish between the different levels of the text structure on which the principle of dialogism is based" (Głowiński 2000: 8–10). This is important insofar as intertextuality occurs when, "reference to an earlier text is an element of the semantic construction of the text affected" (Głowiński 2000: 13), or, as Ziva Ben-Porat put it, when, "a semantic activation of two texts takes place, with the referring text acting as the leading factor and the activation of the text that is the object of reference being a secondary phenomenon" (cf. Z. Ben-Porat, 1988, Poetyka aluzji literackiej, translated by M. Adamczyk-Garbowska, *Pamiętnik Literacki*, vol. 79, No. 1, pp. 315–337, as cited in Głowiński 2000: 13–14).

simultaneously Chinese and Japanese. Bringing the originally prosaised Chinese, but also Japanese poems into dialogue at the level of language was intended to, "evoke a rich and novel pattern of ideas about a specific topic", and presumably served as, "one important way of structuring narrative" (Oyler 2015: 139). This process can be reconstructed by verifying the hypotexts (earlier, primary texts) which, through transformation, became in *Kaidōki* the basis for the language and meaning of the hypertexts (later, secondary texts, created on the basis of the hypotext(s)), ultimately modelling the style of the entire work (the terminology drawn from Gérard Genette (1992: 322–323)[19]).

One of the most important sources of Chinese poetry created also by Japanese authors, which, as many researchers have shown[20], the author of *Kaidōki* undoubtedly reached for, was *Wakan rōeishū*, the above-mentioned anthology belonging to the didactic canon. The following sentence from the quote cited above (bold added):

> [translation:]
>
> The **sickle of the moon** hung over the peaks – a **mock bow** that someone had left in vain in the path of returning wild geese. The **water flowing downwards** fell into the valley, hitting a tiger-like boulder with the **speed of a flying arrow**.
>
> [original notation:]
>
> **上弦ノ月**峯ニ**カヽリ**、**虚弓**徒ニ帰雁ノ路ニ残ル、**下流ノ水**谷ニオツ、**奔箭速ニシテ**虎ニ似タル石ニ中ル。(Kubota, Ōsone 1990: 78)
>
> [transcription:]
>
> ***Jōgen no tsuki*** *mine ni* ***kakari***, ***kyokyū*** *itazura ni kigan no michi ni nokoru,* ***karyū no mizu*** *tani ni otsu,* ***honsen sumiyaka ni shite*** *tora ni nitaru ishi ni ataru.*

is an example of the prosaisation of one of the poems in this collection – a piece from the chapter *Gan* 雁 (*Wild Geese*) by Gōshōkō 江相公, or Ōe no Asatsuna 大江朝綱 (886–957). It reads as follows:

> It will be difficult to avoid the **false bow** –
> the **hanging crescent** still does not allow them to give up their doubts.

---

[19] The terms "hypotext" and "hypertext" were introduced by Genette in his book *Palimpsestes – La littérature au second degré* (1982) as complementary elements of one of the five types of transtextuality (*transtextualité*), namely hypertextuality (*hypertextualité*).

[20] Including, among others, Plutschow 1982: 14; Nagasaki 1994: 12; Nagasaki 2000: 181; and Oyler 2015: 129.

A **streaking arrow** can easily go astray –
however, they confuse it **with the rapid stream flowing below**.

**虚弓**難避　　未抛疑於**上弦之月懸**
**奔箭**易迷　　猶成誤於**下流之水急**
(Fujiwara 1980: 128–129)[21]

While it is possible in the above poem, solely by its title *Hin gan shiki shū ten*[22] 賓雁識秋天 (Knowing the autumn sky by the wild geese that fly by), to recognise who is afraid of the false bow hung in the evening sky, its secondary form from *Kaidōki* informs *expressis verbis* that it is about, "returning wild geese". An analogical situation occurs in the second part of the sentence, where reference is made to the water in a mountain stream, which, flowing rapidly like a flying arrow, "hit a tiger-like boulder". Asatsuna's poem only evokes this scene by highlighting the illusory image of the "streaking arrow" and juxtaposing it with the rushing water. Thus, one could say that the hypertext is semantically more elaborate than the hypotext, which is a differentiating element. Since a certain relationship is established between them, which Bakhtin describes as, "a play of distances – overlapping and diverging, approaching and distancing", the, "creative freedom in stylistic variations" (Bachtin 1982: 184), i.e., the element of dialogicity (Głowiński 2000: 22), will always be present in it. The analysed passage is a perfect illustration of the intertextual relation as it makes it possible to recognise, "what has been already said", as an element of something new ("what is being said"). This is not an authoritative reference, in which the hypertext is subordinated to the hypotext. In *Kaidōki*, the text taken over from *Wakan rōeishū*, referred to as intertext[23] in the terminology of, among others, Michael Riffaterre, has taken on a new linguistic and stylistic form and, as a result of recontextualisation, has become an element of the narrative documenting

[21] cf. Rimer, Chaves 1997: 102–103.

[22] As this poem was written by a Japanese poet, the transcription of the title is given in the Sino-Japanese reading. This is the basic form of decoding a classical Chinese text called *ondoku* 音読 (sound/vowel reading). The use of this reading in place of its recoded version (transposition), i.e., *kundoku* 訓読, which follows the grammar of the Japanese language, corresponds to the practice of reading such texts in the Middle Ages (Głuch 2015: 193). In the decoded version, as a so-called "read text" (*yomikudashibun* 読み下し文), the title would read as follows: *Hingan shūten o shiru* 賓雁秋天を識る. For more on strategies for decoding classical Chinese in the Japanese language environment, vide: Głuch 2015: 50–77.

[23] cf. M. Riffaterre, 1988, Semiotyka intertekstualna: interpretant, translated by K. Falicki and J. Falicki, *Pamiętnik Literacki*, vol. 79, No. 1, pp. 297–314.

reality as seen through the eye of the traveller. This is the specified function that a borrowed element performs in a new textual environment without losing its "certificate of origin"[24].

In the case of the quoted passage from *Kaidōki*, there is yet another thing worth realising in connection with the content absent from Asatsuna's poem. Although this work is a source of reference for the author of the travel diary, it is a secondary composition to the earlier texts. The omitted theme of wild geese fearing a bow that is seemingly pointed towards them is present in *Jiǔ rì shì yàn lèyóuyuàn yīng lìng shī* 九日侍宴樂游苑應令詩 (Poem [composed] on the 9th day [the 9th month] at a banquet during the imperial visit to the Park of Joyful Walks) by Yǔ Jiānwú 庾肩吾 (Japanese: Yu Kengo, 487–551)[25]. An excerpt of it reads as follows: "[Tree] climbing monkeys doubt strong arrows and frightened wild geese avoid the illusory bow" 騰猿疑矯箭、驚雁避虛弓 (Li 1985). Similarly, the prototype of the thread about the streaking arrow is an episode related to Lǐ Guǎng 李廣 (Japanese: Ri Kō, c. 184–119 BCE), one of the most prominent Chinese commanders of the Western Han Dynasty. Sīmǎ Qiān, who in *Shǐjì* 史記 (Japanese: *Shiki*, Historical records, c. 90 BC) devotes the entire 109th chapter of the book, i.e., *Lǐ jiāngjūn lièzhuàn* 李將軍列傳, to Guǎng, describes him as a portly man, proficient in archery, who could drive an arrow into a boulder:

> Once upon a time [Lǐ] Guǎng went hunting and spotted a rock in the grass, which he considered to be a tiger. He shot an arrow at it and hit it with such a force that the arrowhead penetrated the rock. When he discovered that it was a stone, he tried to shoot at it again but failed to penetrate it a second time. As soon as Guǎng found out that there was a tiger living in the commandery in which he stayed, he decided to personally shoot it at all costs. He was about to take a shot at the tiger in the Yòuběipíng area, but the tiger jumped high and wounded him. Eventually, he managed to release the arrow and kill [the animal] with it.
>
> 廣出獵、見草中石、以為虎而射之、中石沒鏃、視之石也。因復更射之、終不能復入石矣。廣所居郡聞有虎、嘗自射之。及居右北平射虎、虎騰傷廣、廣亦竟射殺之。
>
> (Shiba 1927: 540–541).

[24] For more on this subject cf.: Głowiński 2000: 17–18.

[25] Chinese official and literary author of the Liáng 梁 dynasty (502–557) during the Southern and Northern dynasties (Six Dynasties).

The contents of the two sources discussed here, independent of each other, are juxtaposed in Asatsuna's poem, presumably as a result of the intention to build a poetic association linking the bow and arrow. The significant aspect is that the composition and content of this poem was borrowed by the author of *Kaidōki*, reconstructed as a different form of expression, and recontextualised for the purposes of the diaristic narrative.

A twin example of reference to *Wakan rōeishū* can be found in the last sentence of the quoted account of the author's stay in the Suzuka mountains. This time, the statement was built on the basis of two intertexts contextually fused into one whole. The underlined passages correspond to the discussed content:

[translation:]
**The pines showed their virtue of a noble man** and sheltered me like the sky, but I rested and spent the night in the shade of **a bamboo, which I called my friend**.

[original notation:]
**松ハ君子ノ徳ヲタレテ**天ノ如ク覆ヘドモ、**竹ハ吾友ノ号アレバ**陰ニ臥テ夜ヲ明ス。

[transcription:]
***Matsu wa kunshi no toku o tarete*** *ten no gotoku ōedomo,* ***take wa wagatomo no na areba*** *kage ni fushite yoru o akasu.*

(Kubota, Ōsone 1990: 79)

In the eyes of the author of *Kaidōki*, the evergreen pine trees embody people with a strong character who are guided in life by an unwavering code of ethics. This metaphor is also a direct evocation of the phrase, "pine trees express/embody/show the virtue of the noble", which is an excerpt from the descriptive poem by Minamoto no Shitagō 源順 (911–983) contained in the *Matsu* 松 (Pines) chapter of the anthology (Kubota, Ōsone 1990: 79; Nagasaki 1994: 23; Mittenzwei 1977: III,3):

During the peak summer heat months,
bamboo grove hides a breath of refreshment,
and on cold mornings during a snowy winter,
**the pines embody the virtue of the noble**.

九夏三伏之暑月　竹含錯午之風
玄冬素雪之寒朝　**松彰君子之徳**

(Fujiwara 1980: 157)[26]

[26] cf. Rimer, Chaves 1997: 130.

The second part of the sentence is an allusion to the poem by Fujiwara no Tokubo (= Atsushige) 藤原篤茂 (10th century), which is included in the chapter *Take* 竹 (Bamboo); it reads as follows:

> During [the] Jìn [dynasty], imperial guard commander Wáng Zǐyóu planted it and called it "This Gentleman."
> During [the] Táng [dynasty], adviser to the heir apparent Bái Lètiān **loved it as "my friend."**
>
> 晋騎兵参軍王子猷　栽称此君
> 唐太子賓客白楽天　**愛為吾友**

(Fujiwara 1980: 159)[27]

The work does not explicitly refer to bamboo. Instead, through the juxtaposition of the historical figures Wáng Zǐyóu and Bái Jūyì, the phrases *kono kimi*/*shikun* 此君 and *wagatomo* 吾友, which appear in the poem, became synonymous with it. However, the lack of direct naming of the poem's main "protagonist" did not render the poem unreadable, as Tokubo composed his poem based on earlier texts. The story of the calligrapher and scholar Wáng Zǐyóu, or rather Wáng Huīzhī 王徽之 (Japanese: Ō Gishi, 338–386), who fell in love with bamboo, is described in the 50th chapter of *Jìn shū* 晉書 (Japanese: *Shinjo*, Book of Jin, 648)[28]. Bái Jūyì [= Bó Jūyì, Japanese: Haku Kyoi] 白居易 (772–846) refers to the bamboo friend in a poem entitled *Chí*

---

[27] Rimer, Chaves 1997: 132.

[28] This story reads as follows:

> In the house of one of the mighty lords in [the country of] Wu, magnificent bamboos grew. [Wáng Huīzhī] desired to see them, so [he] went there in a litter. [The master of the house] was just sitting in the shade of the bamboos and was trying to remember a poem for a long time. Meanwhile, the host had cleaned up the farmyard and asked [Huīzhī] to come and sit [with his master]. However, [Huīzhī, absorbed in watching the bamboos,] paid no attention to him. Eventually, he went away and the host closed the gate behind him. Huīzhī raved about [the beauty of the garden] and left it with regret. Once [a colleague] came to [Wáng Huīzhī]. There was a bamboo planted around [his house], [so the visitor] asked [why nothing else was growing there]. However, pretending not to remember the poem, he pointed to the bamboo and said: "Oh, I could not live a day without This Gentleman!"
>
> 時吳中一士大夫家有好竹、欲觀之、便出坐輿造竹下、諷嘯良久。主人灑掃請坐、徽之不顧。將出、主人乃閉門、徽之便以此賞之、盡嘆而去。嘗寄居空宅中、便令種竹。或問其故、徽之但嘯詠、指竹曰：「何可一日無此君邪！」 (Fáng 1778).

*shàng zhú xià zuō* 池上竹下作 (Composing a poem by the pond under the bamboos)[29].

It is worth noting that the explicit references to Wáng Zǐyóu and Bái Jūyì in Tokubo's poem make these phrases revealed intertextual relations. By communicating explicitly who called the bamboo "This Gentleman" and who called it "my friend", Tokubo redirects the reader/viewer to the hypotexts that are the first to "say" on the subject. This is a typical example of metatextual signals that describe allusions or evocations with attribution added[30].

## 4. Summary – various aspects of dialogised heteroglossia

The multi-level complexity of intertextual relations, which reveals the deep rootedness of the ancient Japanese literary tradition in classical Chinese writing, provides a starting point for the discussion of more specific issues. One of the questions is how the bilingualism of Japanese and the dialogism at the level of Chinese (*kanbun*) and Japanese (*wabun*) writing affect the act of creating (*poiesis*) a literary work (*Kaidōki* in this case) and shaping its style.

---

[29] The translation and the original of the poem read as follows:

I push my way through the hedge that wraps around my homestead like a green ribbon.
Half the area of my farmyard of ten *mǔ* is taken up by a pond.
After the meal, when I take a nap by the window again,
With light feet, I go to walk alone through the grove.
And that is when water becomes my friend because it can show the tranquillity of nature,
and bamboo is my teacher as it is able to capture the emptiness of the mind.
Something is happening to peaceful people in this world
as they tire their minds, wear out their eyesight, and seek knowledge.

穿籬遶舍碧逶迤
十畝閑居半是池
食飽窻閒新睡後
脚輕林下獨行時
水能性淡爲我友
竹解心虛即我師
何必悠悠人世上
勞心費目覓親知
(Bái 1705)

Although the above work implies that water is the poet's friend and bamboo is the teacher, scholars of Bái Jūyì's poetry consider this to be an obvious mistake of the author and believe that it should be the other way around (cf. Fujiwara 1980: 159; Rimer, Chaves 1997: 132).

[30] For more on this phenomenon, vide: Głowiński 2000: 19–20.

Authors of travel diaries/memoirs/accounts inherently focus on the importance of place/space (*geo*) in the process of creating the work. This is because places are subject to perception by the authors themselves, who experience them personally, with their own senses, which is reflected in specific descriptions of places and affects the text as a whole (in other words, *poiesis* is characterised by its geographicalness), and because such places, fixed in literature also become a forum for intertextual dialogue as well as for actions and practices stemming from the performative side of geopoetics[31]. The interaction of *geo-poiesis*, which in this particular case (i.e., the travel account) closely relates to the categories of place and space as seen "along the route", prompts reflection not only on how literature represents places and what literary works do with them but also on how the works themselves function and circulate within literary works and the cultural sphere in general. Geopoetic performativity, which makes use of various tools of representing the geographical space (mapping, naming, describing, etc.), including the symbolic space, suggests that, "any artistic or literary topography is a form of geocultural constructions that reconfigure and produce cultural dependencies and communities" (Marszałek 2011: 101; Rybicka 2014: 109). It can be assumed that these (inter)cultural dependencies and communities can be reconfigured much more expressively, externally (linguistically) and internally (intertextually), by a dialogised literary topography, given, for example, literary works based on a mixed Japanese-Chinese style.

While this is true with many other *kikō*, the analysis of *Kaidōki* makes it possible to see this dialogicality primarily in the language of the text. The bilingualism that functioned in Japanese writing at the time (and earlier) when the author of *Kaidōki* lived and wrote required an inevitable and at the same time expected, as was often the case, dialogisation with the space of classical Chinese and the literary tradition fixed in that language. The degree of sinicisation of individual texts varied depending, among others, on the percentage of Sino-Japanese sublexicon and elements of classical Chinese stylistics. As a result, the Japanese text actually functioned as a creation with numerous foreign lexical and phraseological loanwords that were related to the Chinese historical and literary tradition. *Kaidōki*, as an exemplary work for the mixed Japanese-Chinese style, is filled with these types of borrowings and calques,

[31] This is discussed in detail by Rybicka (2014: 107–111).

which force the interaction between the author's statements and the heteroglossia in vocabulary, phrases, and borrowed expressions. In fact, this is the same mechanism that Steininger calls the "domestication" and "appropriation" of Chinese literary culture to develop native works on its foundations, thus acquiring a higher aesthetic and erudite value. The discussion and interpretation of the *Kaidōki* passage presented in this paper clearly demonstrate the significance of this kind of writing practice. Reaching for borrowed historical and literary templates from the Chinese tradition, the ordinary description of the surroundings of the barrier-keepers lodge in Suzuka has become more dynamic in semantic terms, has gained in expressiveness and plasticity of narration, which, through the Sinoxenic vocabulary, phrases, and sentences present in the original text of the diary, makes it definitely more attractive (and more difficult to read at the same time) for the reader on the one hand and turns it into a testimony to the author's scholarship and proficiency in the art of writing on the other.

This also translates into the style of *Kaidōki*, the narrative elements of which are eclectic in nature due to the significant Sino-Japanese component. By intentionally sinicising his account, the author of *Kaidōki*, has led to the juxtaposition and interaction of the experienced Japanese reality with the borrowed reality depicted in classical Chinese writing through mono- and polylexical allusions as well as the prosaisation of longer poetic phrases. In particular, the prosaisation and recontextualisation of the world portrayed in Chinese-language poetry in the local Japanese landscape, revealing the partly reconstructive and multi-layered nature of the narrator's perception, help to, "emphasise the value of maintaining multiplicity of vision and of voice, a voice predicated on an understanding that such mediated experience is the best and perhaps the only way to convey his meaning". Put differently, the fullness of the Japanese world depicted in *Kaidōki* can only be captured through the dialogised heteroglossia of its description (Oyler 2015: 142).

However, note that while *Kaidōki* suggests the dominant role of the Sino-Japanese layer of the text and its associated references to the classical Chinese historical and literary tradition, it is also in dialogue with the native literary tradition. As a work in the *kikō* genre, in which (usually) longer prose passages are interspersed with Japanese *waka* poetry, this travel diary also cultivates the heritage of recording, in the form of native poetry, the emotions and experiences of visits to well-known places (*meisho*) scattered

along the route of a journey along the coastal road. These places as a category of poetic words (called *utamakura*) that for centuries have strengthened allusiveness and intertextuality between *waka* compositions, testify not only to the epigonisation of poetic imagery and descriptions of places but also demonstrate the influence of geography on literary works as a method of building Japan's local and national literary geography. The places visited by the author of *Kaidōki* motivated him for specific descriptions and poetic compositions. On the other hand, these places gained another literary image embedded into the dialogue of, "what is being said", with, "what has been already said". However, a more detailed consideration of this subject requires discussion in a separate study.

## References

Bachtin M., 1982, *Problemy literatury i estetyki*, transl. W. Grajewski, Warszawa: Czytelnik.

Bái J., 1705, Chí shàng zhú xià zuò. – *Yùdìng quán Táng shī*, vol. 446, "Qīndìng sìkù quánshū", https://ctext.org/ (accessed on: 5 January 2023).

Bakhtin M., Emerson C., Holquist M., 1986, *The dialogic imagination: four essays by M. M. Bakhtin*, transl. C. Emerson and M. Holquist, Austin: University of Texas Press.

Cao P., 2007, Wzorcowe rozprawy. Rozprawa o literaturze ("Dian lun. Lun wen"), transl. A. Zemanek. – *Estetyka chińska. Antologia*, Ed. A. Zemanek, Kraków: Universitas.

Fáng X., 1778?, *Jìnshū*, "Qīndìng sìkù quánshū", Hángzhōu: Zhèjiāng Dàxué Túshūguǎn, https://ctext.org/ (accessed on: 5 January 2023).

Fujiwara K.,1980, Wakan rōeishū, *"Nihon koten bungaku taikei"*, vol. 73, Ed. H. Kawaguchi, Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten.

Genette G., 1992, Palimpsesty. Literatura drugiego stopnia, transl. A. Milecki. – *Współczesna teoria badań literackich za granicą. Antologia*, vol. IV, p. 2, Ed. H. Markiewicz, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.

Głowiński M., 2000, *Intertekstualność, groteska, parabola. Szkice ogólne i interpretacje*, "Klasycy współczesnej polskiej myśli humanistycznej", vol. 5, Kraków: Universitas.

Głuch D., 2015, *Kanbun – tekst klasycznochiński w środowisku językowym japońszczyzny*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Hall J. W., Mass J. P. (Ed.), 1998, *Medieval Japan. Essays in institutional history*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Huey R. N., 1990, The medievalization of poetic practice, *"Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies"*, vol. 50, No. 2, pp. 651–668, https://doi.org/10.2307/2719210 (accessed on: 11 December 2022).

Huszcza R., 2011, Wschodnioazjatycki krąg cywilizacji pisma: lingwistyczna analiza pojęcia. – *Orientalia Commemorativa*, Ed. L. Sudyka, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Keene D., 1999, *Travelers of a Hundred Ages: The as Revealed through 1000 Years of Diaries*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Kotański W., 1961, *Dziesięć tysięcy liści. Antologia literatury japońskiej*, Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Kubota J., Ōsone S. (Ed.), 1990, *Kaidōki*, "Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei", vol. 51 (Chūsei nikki kikō shū), Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten.

Lǐ F. (Ed.), 1985, *Tàipíng yùlǎn*, Shànghǎi: Shànghǎi Shūdiàn, https://ctext.org/ (accessed on: 5 January 2023).

Liu A., 2016, Sinographs in the "Man'yōshū": Nature, Function, and Double Meaning, *"Sino-Platonic Papers"*, No. 264 (Sinitic Language and Script in East Asia: Past and Present), Ed. V.H. Mairpp, pp. 157–173, https://sino-platonic.org/complete/spp264_sinitic_language_script.pdf (accessed on: 20.12.2022).

Majtczak T., 2009, How Are We Supposed to Write with Something like That? Early Employment of the Chinese Script to Write Japanese as Exemplified by the "Man'yōshū", *"Silva Iaponicarum"*, No. 29/30, pp. 53–63, http://silvajp.home.amu.edu.pl/Silva%202930.pdf#page=53 (accessed on: 11 December 2022).

Marszałek M., 2011, Rosyjska Północ jako punkt widzenia: Geopoetyczne strategie w prozie Mariusza Wilka, *"Rocznik Komparatystyczny"*, No. 2, pp. 97–110.

Melanowicz M., 1994, *Literatura japońska*, *vol. 1: Od VI do połowy XIX wieku*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Mittenzwei P., 1977, *Das Kaidōki: ein Reisetagebuch aus der Kamakura-Zeit,* Unpublished doctoral thesis, Frankfurt am Main: Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität.

Morris I., 1964,. *The World of Shining Prince. Court Life in Ancient Japan*, London: Oxford University Press.

Nagasaki K. (Ed.), 1994, *Kaidōki*, "Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū", vol. 48 (Chūsei nikki kikō shū), Tōkyō: Shōgakukan.

Nagasaki K., 2000, Kaidōki. – *Nikki bungaku jiten*, Ed. M. Iwasa, N. Tsumoto, S. Miyazaki, Tōkyō: Bensei Shuppan.

Olszewski K., 2003, *Ki no Tsurayuki a poszukiwanie tożsamości kulturowej w literaturze japońskiej X wieku*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Ōsone S., 1998, *Nihon koten bungaku daijiten*, Tōkyō: Meiji Shoin.

Oyler E., 2015, Japan on the Medieval Globe: The Wakan rōeishū and Imagined Landscapes in Early Medieval Texts, *"The Medieval Globe"*, vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 129–155, https://muse.jhu.edu/pub/306/article/758518/pdf (accessed on: 18.12.2022).

Plutschow H. E., 1982, Japanese Travel Diaries of the Middle Ages, *"Oriens Extremus"*, vol. 29, No. 1/2: pp. 1–136, https://www.jstor.org/stable/24047250 (accessed on: 15 December 2022).

Rimer J. Th., Chaves J., 1997, *Japanese and Chinese Poems to Sing: The "Wakan Rōei Shū"*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Rybicka E., 2014, *Geopoetyka. Przestrzeń i miejsce we współczesnych teoriach i praktykach literackich*, Kraków: Universitas.

Shiba S., 1927, *Shiki* (vol. 5), "Kanbun sōsho", vol. 12, Tōkyō: Yūhōdō Shoten.

Sonoyama S., 2019, *Poetyka i pragmatyka pieśni 'waka' w dworskiej komunikacji literackiej okresu Heian (794–1185)*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Steininger B., 2017, *Chinese Literary Forms in Heian Japan*, Cambridge (Massachusetts) – London: Harvard University Press.

## *Dialogised heteroglossia and the mixed Japanese-Chinese style of "Kaidōki"*

This paper attempts to analyse the technique of assimilation of classical Chinese writing into the Japanese literary tradition of the early medieval period. The author's main focus is one of the three styles used by Japanese authors of the time, namely the mixed Japanese-Chinese style (the so-called *wakan konkō buntai*). It was used in various prose genres, including travel diaries. Referring to the text of *Kaidōki* (Records of [a journey along] the seacoast road), a Japanese travel account from the early 13th century, the author shows on the selected source material how, in accordance with Bakhtin's understanding of heteroglossia, a dialogue occurs on the level of Chinese and Japanese writing and how intertextual relations can influence the formation of the style of a literary work. As can be noted, the historical and literary borrowings from the Chinese tradition (the rich Sino-Japanese vocabulary and the prosaised poems originally composed in classical Chinese) enriched the semantic layer of the Japanese text. This was also reflected in the style of the work, which, despite its "crabbedness" and the fact that it was shaped by the experience of borrowed but also native polyphony, seems to be the optimal way to express it.

Keywords: wakan konkōbun, *travel diary*, Kaidōki, *dialogised heteroglossia*, *Japanese literature*