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From the Editor
編纂者のメッセージ

EMJNet AT THE AAS: As we have for the past several years, members of EMJ met on the Thursday afternoon of the start of the AAS Annual Meeting. This time we departed from past practice and had two formal presentations by Marcia Yonemoto and Peter Shapinsky on the subject of maps and mapping in Early Modern Japan. Although smaller than our last gathering, an enthusiastic audience spent three hours in discussion. We hope to be publishing these two presentations in a future issue of EMJ.

Solicitation of Proposals: Early August marks the deadline for submission of panel proposals for next year’s AAS. As in the past, EMJNet will is willing to support and endorse panel proposals that deal substantially with the history, culture and society of Early Modern Japan. Proposals should be sent to Philip Brown at brown.113@osu.edu. As a condition of support, if proposals are accepted with EMJNet endorsement, Early Modern Japan: An Interdisciplinary Journal should be given first opportunity to publish papers based on the presentations.

If your proposal is not accepted by the AAS Program Committee, please consider offering it as the core of next year’s EMJNet meeting, which we will once again schedule for the Thursday afternoon before the evening program that opens the formal AAS meeting. Proposals for EMJ activities should be submitted to Philip Brown by September 30 (brown.113@osu.edu). Note that we have in the past entertained a variety of formats, from very informal discussions with authors of recent books, to formal presentations of a more traditional nature.

A NOTE ON THIS ISSUE OF EMJ: This issue marks a considerable departure for EMJ from past practice. While we have always sought to present materials that go well beyond the purview of the standard professional journals in the field, publishing essays on pedagogy, state of the field articles on Early Modern Japanese studies in France and the USSR, with this issue we publish articles entirely in Japanese for the first time. If our readers feel this venture to be worthwhile, the opportunity to publish in Japanese can expand the range of materials and authors who we can publish: Japanese scholars with very limited confidence in their own English-language ability would be able to share their contributions with their non-Japanese colleagues more directly in this format. Please do convey your feelings about this approach to the editors.


Lawrence E. Marceau, University of Delaware

The three essays found in this issue were first presented in an unusual panel at the AAS Annual Meeting on March 30, 2003. The panel was distinctive in two respects. First of all, the lingua franca of the panel was Japanese (supplemented by occasional interpretation into English). Secondly, the panel topic dealt with books and publishing in Japan (as well as Japanese book collection and library development in the U.S.), topics which heretofore rarely, if ever, had appeared on the AAS panel roster. The panel was well attended, and resulted in an active exchange of knowledge and information on the topic. Most noteworthy were the extended comments by Ms. Miwa Kai, retired curator of the Japanese collection at Columbia University. Ms. Kai shared her background into the circumstances behind the diffusion of materials from Japan to the Library of Congress, and several East Asian collections at U. S. universities after WWII.

The three essays below are by Kigoshi Osamu, Kanazawa University, Komine Kazuaki, Rikkyō University, and Watanabe Kenji, Rikkyō University. These three eminent scholars of medieval and early modern Japanese literature took part in a series of surveys (Watanabe actually served as team leader) sponsored by the National Institute of Japanese Literature, Tokyo, that catalogued most of the collection of premodern Japanese books in

Kigoshi's study, 「米国議会図書館所蔵『梅若一代記図絵』をめぐって」("On the Ume-waka ichidai-ki zue in the Library of Congress Collection"), traces the publishing history of the novel, *Umewaka ichidai-ki zue* (pub., c. 1856) from its first appearance as an ukiyo-zōshi in 1734, through its transformations with a new title and new illustrations in 1778, and as a third publication again with a new title in 1842. Since the c. 1856 edition has heretofore been unknown, its "discovery" in the LC collection sheds light on publishing trends throughout the early modern period, and attests to the unusual popularity of this particular narrative. Kigoshi's article here provides a good example of the LC collection serving as a source of new scholarship in the field of Japanese literary studies.

Komine's article, 「議会図書館及びイェール大学所蔵朝川収集本をめぐって」("On the Asakawa Acquisition Books in the Library of Congress and the Yale University Library"), focuses on the major contributions to collection development made by Yale University professor of Japanese history and East Asian librarian Asakawa Kan'ichi nearly a century ago. Two characteristics of the books acquired by Asakawa stand out: first, they were rebound in a Western library binding, which divorced them from their original physical context on the one hand, but served to protect them on the other. The second characteristic is that many of the manuscripts found in these collections are actually Meiji-era copies of earlier texts, for which the originals are no longer extant in some cases. These two characteristics make the Asakawa books at the LC and at Yale especially important for scholars worldwide.

Watanabe's paper, 「米国議会図書館日本古典籍目録刊行までの状況と集書傾向の大略」("The Circumstances Leading up to the Publication of the Catalog of Japanese Rare Books in the Library of Congress, and an Outline of the Collection's Parameters"), provides a valuable background into the conditions by which the LC Japanese books had been kept, a brief history of attempts at cataloguing, and a brief statistical analysis of the breadth and depth of the collection. One result of the survey demonstrates that the largest number of titles is in literature, followed by the military arts, and the sciences, including wasan or Japanese mathematics. Furthermore, 204 titles do not appear in the Japanese union catalogue Kokusho sōmokuroku, and another 72 titles are found in four archives or fewer in Japan. The fact that many of these titles originated from collections in Japan's former Imperial Naval Academy and Imperial Military Academy reveals something of the spread of Japanese materials after WWII.

**米国議会図書館所蔵『梅若一代記図絵』をめぐって**

○木越治、金沢大学

本年（2003年）2月、日本の八木書店より刊行した『米国議会図書館蔵古典籍目録』の113頁、通し番号0886番に掲載されている『梅若一代記図絵』という書物がここで私が問題にしたい書物である。

まず、そこに記載されているままを引用してみる。

0886 梅若一代記図絵 UMEWAKAICHIDAIKI ZUE IN:85/LCCN:98847081

（江島其磧）刊 4冊 揚絵有 袋

20.5cm×18.8cm

序文: 文亭主人誌

巻5欠 『都鳥妻恋笛』の改題本 異称:【松若全伝】梅花柳水

WEBで公開されているLibrary of Congress（以下LCと略する）のオンライン目録では、これよりやや詳しい情報が記されている。こちらも、念のために引用してみよう。

LC Call No.: PL793.6.U64 1842

Notes: Caption title (v. 2).

巻2にある鉛筆での書き込み"Exchange Drevel Institute Technology 11-15-44"により、LCに入ったのは、1944年11月のことであったことがわかる。LCが所蔵する古典籍は、第二次大戦以前に朝河貫一・坂西志保らによって収集されたもので、大戦後に占領軍によって取組まれた旧日本陸軍関係諸組織に所蔵されていたものに大別されるが（この間の事情については本目録解題を参照のこと）、本書はそのどちらにも属さない時期にDrevel Institute Technologyよりもたらされたものである。

『米国議会図書館蔵古典籍目録』では、国文／小説／近世小説／読本に分類している。備考欄にも記されているように、この書物は江島其磧作の浮世草子『都鳥妻恋笛（みやこどりつまこいのふえ）』（享保19年（1734）刊）の読本仕立て改題改裝本であるが、しかし、『八文字屋本全集・第12巻』（1996年、汲古書院刊）の書誌解題にも出ておらず、その意味では、新出資料とみなすことができる。ただし、残念なことに、刊記を有しているはずの第5巻を欠いているため刊行年を特定することができない。その手がかりを求め、国文学研究資料館（国書総目録）オンラインデータで「一代記図絵」という書名を持つ作品を探したところ、以下のような例が見つかった。

WORK[95874]
【書名】一休禅師一代記図絵（いっきゅうぜんじいちだいきずえ）K1
【巻冊】五編二〇巻
【別書名】
[1]一休一代記図絵（いっきゅういちだいきずえ）
【分類】合巻
【著者】
[1]楼花亭/江島（うたがわ/えじま）作者
[2]吉重（よししげ）[歌川/芳重（うたがわ/よしげ）]作者
【成立】嘉永六-安政三刊
【著作注記】（般）一休諸国物語図絵の模刻再版。
【著作種別】J

WORK[221578]
【書名】釈迦御一代記図会（しゃかごいちだいきずえ）K1
【巻冊】六巻六冊
【別書名】
[1]釈迦御一代記図会（しゃかいちだいきずえ）
[2]釈迦御一代図会（しゃかごいちでうえ）
[3]釈迦如来御一代図会（しゃかにょらいごいちでうえ）
[4]釈尊御一代記図会（しゃくそんごいちだいきずえ）
世尊一代図会（せそんいちだいずえ）
【分類】読本
【著者】
[1] 山田／意斎叟（やまだ／いさいろう）[山田案山子（やまだのかかし）] 作者→編
【成立】天保一十二刊
【著作注記】（般）明治一七版あり。
【著作種別】J

ワーク[247541]
【書名】親鸞聖人御一代記絵（しんらんしょうにんごいちだいきずえ）K 1
【巻冊】五巻五冊
【分類】伝記
【著者】
[1] 一禅（いちぜん）作者
【著作注記】（般）明治一九版あり。
【著作種別】J

ワーク[461632]
【書名】天満宮御一代記（てんまんぐうごいちだいき）N 0
【別書名】天神一代記図會（てんじんいちだいきずえ）
【著者】
[1] 岡野／是重（おかの／これしげ） 作者→編
【著作種別】J

ワーク[523488]
【書名】祐天上人御一代記図会（ゆうてんじょううにんごいちだいきずえ）K 1
【巻冊】六巻六冊
【別書名】
【著者】
[1] 祐天上人一代記（ゆうてんじょううにんいちだいき）
【分類】絵本
【著作種別】J

ワーク[526874]
【書名】義経一代記図会（よしつねいちだいきずえ）K 1
【分類】絵本

【著者】
[1] 鈍亭／魯文（どんてい／ろぶん）[仮名垣／仮名垣（かながき／ろぶん）] 作者
[2] 歌川／広重（うたがわ／ひろしげ）[歌川／広重／一世（うたがわ／ひろしげ／1せい）] 作者→画
【成立】安政三刊
【著作種別】J

ワーク[1796458]
【書名】義経一代記図抄（よしつねいちだいきずしょう）K 1
【巻冊】一冊
【分類】絵画
【著作種別】J

年代的には『仏迦御一代記図会』の天保12年（1841）がもっとも早く、他には嘉永5年（1852）・安政3年（1856）などの年号が見える。後述するごとく、『都鳥妻恋笛』が読本仕立てで刊行されたのははじめは天保13年（1842）であり、安政3年の再版本も存在することからすれば、LC本は安政期以降の刊行と考えるべきであろう。

そもそも時代物浮世草子として出版されたこの『都鳥妻恋笛』という作品は、以後何度も体裁を変えて刊行されており、今回出現したLC本は、その最下限の時期に刊行された版とみなされる。

以下において、私はその間の事情を整理しながら、この作品がこれほど長い生命を持った理由を考えてみたいと思う。

オリジナルの『都鳥妻恋笛』は5巻5冊で、享保19年（1734）に八文字屋自笑・江島其磧連名の序文を付して刊行されているが、実質的な執筆者が江島其磧であったろうことは長谷川強氏はじめ諸家の指摘するとおりである。

そして、初版刊行から54年後の天明5年（1788）には折柄流行していた鶴化物（かんげもの）ふうの体裁に改められて『梅若丸一代記（うめわかもまるいちだいき）』という題
名で再刊される。そして、それからさらに50年以上経過した天保13年（1842年）に於いて、今度は読本に至り、題名も『梅花柳水（ばいかりゅうしんしょ）』として、三度の勤めを果たすことになったのである。この間の事情については、横山邦治氏の『都鳥妻恋笛』から『隅田川梅柳新書（すみだがわばいりゅうしんしょ）』へ（『読本の研究』1974年）にくわしに論じられており、前記『八文字屋本全集・第12巻』解題や石川俊一郎氏「近世梅若物の一考察—『都鳥妻恋笛』他二篇の書誌」（『梅若縁起の研究と資料』昭和63年1月）等にくわしい書誌的な記述がある。

今回出現したLC本は、それから更に10年以上経過したあたりにおいてもなお—初版刊行時からすれば120年以上あるともな—この作品が現役の小説として読み継がれていたことを物語るもので、この浮世草子作品の驚嘆すべき長さを端的に示す資料といえる。しかも、注目すべきは、この間、本文にほとんど変更が加えられていないことである。版面のいたみや刊記を新しくする等の関係で一部彫り直しがなされ、それにとまってごくわずかな変更がみられるが、いずれも本文に書かれていた要素なので、挿絵としては本文にきわめて忠実であるといえるが、絵としての美しさは全く感じられないといってよい。

これが、『梅若丸一代記』になると、さらわれていく松若と天狗がくっきりと描かれ、呆然と見送る班女の姿も印象的である。さらには、『梅花柳水』（『梅若一代記図絵』も同じ）になると、天狗は化鳥のような姿の非常によく様の図柄になり、班女や家老の山田三郎の着物の柄も手の込んだものになっている。

まず最初の例（挿絵A1・A2・A3, p.68）は、天狗になった松若丸の伯父夫婦大輔員貫（かずさのたゆうかずつら）＝吹笛上人（すいてきしょにん）が、松若丸をさらっていく場面で、本文では巻1の3にあたる。

初版の『都鳥妻恋笛』では、吹笛上人が吉田少将の妻になった班女（はんじょ）に横恋慕してくどくどシーンが右半分にあり、左側に出る天狗の顔つきもやや鼻が高い程度にすぎない。その下に立ち騒ぐ家来たちの姿も描かれているため、全体としてはかなりごたごたした感じを受ける。いずれも本文に書かれていて要素なので、挿絵としては本文にきわめて忠実であるといえるが、絵としての美しさは全く感じられないといってよい。

これが、『梅若丸一代記』になると、さらわれていく松若と天狗がくっきりと描かれ、呆然と見送る班女の姿も印象的である。さらに、『梅花柳水』（『梅若一代記図絵』も同じ）になると、天狗は化鳥のような姿の非常によく様の図柄になり、班女や家老の山田三郎の着物の柄も手の込んだものになっている。
A-1 『都鳥妻恋笛』 (1734 年刊) (The left and right panels are displayed here in reverse order)
A-2: 『梅若丸一代記』（1788年刊）
A-3: 『梅花流水』（1842年刊）（『梅若一代記図絵』、c.1856年刊も同じ）
もうひとつの例（挿絵B1・B2・B3，p.11-13）は、松若を救うため班女が遊女になって吹笛上人をおびきよせるところ（本文巻5の1）である。『都鳥妻恋笛』では挿絵の下半分に班女が遊女になったことを示す図柄があり、上半分は山伏姿になって班女に会いに来た吹笛上人を尼になった班女が迎える図である。『梅若丸一代記』では、班女に言いくさりはっきりしており、絵としても洗練されたものになっている。これに対し、『梅若丸一代記』になると、内容的に興味深い部分や視覚的にも不思議な要素だけが選び出され、他は捨てられ、絵としての独立性も高くなる。その傾向は『梅花柳水』になるといっそうはっきりしており、絵としても洗練されたものになっているので、これだけでも十分に鑑賞に値するものになっている。こうした視覚面での変化が、この作の長い寿命の大きな要因であったろうとはまず疑いないところである。

ただ、そうはいっても、この長い作品のなかには、挿絵として全く取り上げられない要素もある。たとえば、不揃いの男らしき人物が、班女の布衣を脱ぎ去られるシーン（本文巻1の2）や、尼になった班女を前にして班女の肉体が消え去るシーン（本文巻5の1）である。かつて考証したように、これらのシーンは初版以来絵にされるほどの要素であり、おそらく、こういった伝奇的な趣向は、目で楽しむよりも文章を通して楽しむべきであるという共通理解が生じていたのであろう。

そして、（わずらわしいのでもはやいちいち例証はしないが）、挿絵の構図として一貫して変わっていない最大の例が、隅田川土手の柳の木の下に笛を吹きつつ姿をあらわした梅若丸と班女の姿（本文巻4の3）である。中世の謡曲『隅田川』以来受け継がれてきた隅田川物には欠くことのできない場面であるわけだが、すでに死んでいる梅若丸をどう扱うかがそれぞれ作者の腕を見せたところであろう。

謡曲では、行方不明の子供を追ってきた母親が隅田川のほとりの塚の中から聞こえる我が子梅若の声にさそわれて一瞬の幻影を見る、という詞章になっているが、実際の上演においてはいろいろの違いがある。また、近松の『双生隅田川』（享保5年初演）では、救い出された松若丸を梅若丸の身代わりのようにして登場させという趣向を流している。が、本作においては、梅若丸の亡霊を登場させ班女に即して天狗とそのすぐに逃げ出す松若丸の姿が対照的に描かれており、《梅花柳水》では、松若丸の姿も消えて、班女と天狗二人の図になる。こちらでは、天狗のいやらしい目つきが特に印象的である。

これらの挿絵は、いまでもなく本文に対する手引きであるわけだが、初版のものは、1話の内容を表すのに不充分に盛り込む誠に一念五百生懸念無量劫、恐るべき慎むべきは愛着の道と、そのをのぞこしけり。とある。1『雨月物語』（安永5年刊）『青頭巾』にも利用されていて、その意味では有名な部分であるが、しかし、これらのシーンは初版以来絵にされるほどの要素は顧わかないのである。おそらく、こういった伝奇的な趣向は、目で楽しむよりも文章を通して楽しむべきであるという共通理解が生じていたのであろう。

挿絵では、行方不明の子供を追ってきた母親が隅田川のほとりの塚の中から聞こえる我が子梅若の声にさそわれて一瞬の幻影を見る、という詞章になっているが、実際の上演においてはいろいろの違いがある。また、近松の『双生隅田川』（享保5年初演）では、救い出された松若丸を梅若丸の身代わりのようにして登場させるという趣向を流している。が、本作においては、梅若丸の亡霊を登場させ班女に即して天狗とそのすぐに逃げ出す松若丸の姿が対照的に描かれており、《梅花柳水》では、松若丸の姿も消えて、班女と天狗二人の図になる。こちらでは、天狗のいやらしい目つきが特に印象的である。

挿絵では、行方不明の子供を追ってきた母親が隅田川のほとりの塚の中から聞こえる我が子梅若の声にさそわれて一瞬の幻影を見る、という詞章になっているが、実際の上演においては、梅若丸の亡霊を登場させ班女に即して天狗とそのすぐに逃げ出す松若丸の姿が対照的に描かれており、《梅花柳水》では、松若丸の姿も消えて、班女と天狗二人の図になる。こちらでは、天狗のいやらしい目つきが特に印象的である。
との対面の場面を設けたうえに（このシーンの下敷になったのが浅井了意の『伽婢子』巻八の巻八「幽霊に無気まみゆ」であったことも（注3）拙稿で指摘した）、夢の中ではあるが梅若の亡霊に長々と前生を語らせているのである。そのようにして、作者は、子を失った母親の悲しみに同化し、それを共有、なぐさめようとしているのである。

本作の最大の魅力がここに存することを、私はここで何度も強調しておきたいと思う。そして、それゆえにこそ、巻5において松若を奪い返すための計略に班女が加担していくという展開が自然なものになっているのである。

その意味では、子を失った母親の悲しみという、隅田川ものが本来有しているテーマを、本作品は非常にくっきりしたかたちで描き出しているといえる。それを中心に置きつつ、お家騒動という近世長編小説に通有の骨格をからませ入定僧の破戒と天狗への変貌という伝奇的趣向とそれにからんだ色模様等等が非常にうまく融合してできあがっている世界なのである。その意味で、本作は、近世長編小説の基本的な要素を過不足なく備えた作品と評してよいと思われ、おそらく、そうした点が、江戸の後半期、120年以上にもわたって本作が読み継がれた最大の要因であると考えられるのである。
B-1: 『都鳥妻恋笛』（1734年刊） (Note: Image displayed is of the right panel only)
B-2: 『梅若丸一代記』（1788年刊）
B-3: 『梅花流水』（1842年刊）
朝河収集本の全容解明

戦前の日本法制史学者でイエール大学教授だった朝河貫一がイエール大学とワシントン議会図書館両方からの要請を受けて日本に一時帰国し、積極的に資料を収集、その大半を日本で洋装本に仕立て直し、アメリカに送った。その数はイエール大学・議会図書館両方を合わせると、1万点、6万冊を越える膨大なものであった。1906年7月、明治39年4月のことである。これを朝河収集本もしくは収集資料と呼ぶ。二十世紀初頭、アメリカにおけるごく早い時期での本格的な日本語資料のコレクションとして特筆される。朝河は図書館の初代東アジア部長にも就任、日本の帝国主義化や日米開戦にも異を唱えたことで知られる。朝河が日本に帰国する前年、日露戦争で日本が勝利し、アメリカのポツマスで講和条約が締結されていた。アメリカと日本との交流が必要に迫る情勢が背景にあったと思われる。朝河はこの要請によく応え、質量ともに優れた資料を収集した。またこの頃、朝河は日本の外交政策に強い危機感を表明し、1909年、「日本の過機」を出版する。

朝河の収集した典籍の領域は多岐にわたり、基礎研究に必要なあらゆる領域をほぼ網羅していると認められる。その全貌は容易に知られなかったが、1987年から89年の3年間に及ぶ国文学研究資料館の海外調査にもとづく「イエール大学蔵・日本文書コレクション目録」（「調査研究報告」11号、1990年3月）によって、まずイエール大学における蔵書資料の様相が明らかになり、ついでこの度のプロジェクトによって議会図書館目録が完成を見、ようやく朝河収集本の全貌が理解されるに至った。今後の研究のおおきな足がかりを得ることができるといえる。

イエール大学では、朝河収集本の大半は貴重書収蔵の専門図書館バイネキ・ライブラリに収蔵されているが、スタートリング記念図書館の東アジア部にも146点が未整理のまま置かれていた。国文学研究資料館調査の折り、これを整理し目録にはSMLの記号で架蔵番号をつけたが、2001年に再訪した折りもそのままの状態であった。いずれもバイネキに合わせて所蔵されるべきものであろう。

ところで、朝河収集資料には、もうひとつイエール大学のバイネキ・ライブラリに所蔵される日本イエール協会出資コレクションがある。これはイエール大学の日本人の卒業生を中心に組織されたもので、横浜に本部があったそうだが、現在は存在しないようだ。1934年にこの出資を受け、朝河は別コレクションを形成していたのである。しかもこのコレクションについては、朝河自身それ以後の収集本も含めて、1945年に『GIFTS OF THE YALE ASSOCIATION OF JAPAN』という英文の目録（略称・YAJ目録）を公刊している。国文学研究資料館の調査の折り、この英文目録をもとに、全点を山室規子氏が調査していた書誌カードを合わせて、和文目録として報告書に同時に掲載した。

このYAJ目録本には、洋装仕立ての装幀はほとんどなく、ほぼ原装のままである。古写本をはじめ貴重な資料がすくない。人麿図や天神影など掛幅の図絵や複製本など、写本から版本に至るまで内容・形態ともに多様であり、みるべきもののが少なくない。1945年という太平洋戦争終結の時点での目録刊行には、日米開戦に異を唱えていた朝河の今後の日米交流へのそれなりの思いを感じられてならない。
Ⅱ 朝河収集本の特徴

1906年、7年の朝河収集本のほとんどは洋装仕立てになっているが、しかも日本でそのような装幀が認められていたことが何より注目される。おそらく洋装でなければ書物として認知されないことが意識されていたためではないかと思われる。たとえば、東京大学図書館にもこの種の和装本を洋装仕立てにしており、西洋文化にともなう書物の一種の文化衝撃を示す例で、書物の歴史からみてきわめて興味深いものである。

そのうち、和装の原装表紙が残されてい る場合と処分されてはぎ取られている場合 があり、その差異に何か意味があるかどうかは判断できない。表紙がない場合、書誌学上貴重な資料が失われてしまっていることになる。

これら洋装表紙の扉に年次を示したゴム 印が押されていて、それによって登録年代が 確定できるのである。これはイエールもワシントンも同様である。

また同時にこれらの書物の多くは、当時 の写生生といわれる人たちによって写されたもののが大半を占める。もちろん原本のものもあるが、貴重な写本はあえて日本に残し、それを転写して、アメリカに伝えたのである。これは朝河の一貫した方針で、まさに卓見であった。今後、研究が進展すれば、具体的にどの本をどのように写したかが解明できるであろう。明治期における書物の書写史の面からも貴重な例となるに相違ない。

それにしても書写に費やした労力は大変なものであったろう。コピー機もないし、写真機もそれほど普及していない時代であっても、古書を写すことはいわば当たり前の選択であり、戦前ではこれが普通であった。戦前の研究者 はみずから写本を写すことすくなかった。東京大学史料編纂所など各地の史料を 腕写して収集すること自体が重要な業務であった。また各地の文庫などでも、学者の依頼に応じて書写するサービスもあったよう で、それが一般的であったようだ。

この書写作業の担い手の多くは写生生といわれる若者であり、一種の学生アルバイトのようであったろう。ほとんど無名の写生生たちはたったの役割は無視できない意義があり、活字文化からは見えなくなった、隠された学的界の基盤形成から見直されるべきことであろう。これを「写生生の文化」と名付けてみてもよいと思う。

たとえば、議会図書館の朝河収集本の中 に、明治36年、本願寺留学生中野慧遠が「覚禅抄」を書写し、その苦労が序文に秘に と紹告される例は少ないので、これはきわめて貴重な例ではないかと思われる。

「写生生の文化」はたとえば南方熊楠のような存在にもかかわって来る。熊楠はロンドン時代、大英図書館で膨大な書物を次から次へ写し、『ロンドン抜書』にまとめた。また、田辺に落ち着いてから、神社の研究問題の渦中に、これも万巻の書籍を深更に及んで写続いている。これが『田辺抜書』である。今では忘れ去られつつある、写すという身体行為のもたらす意味を見直す必要がある。

朝河収集本からは南方熊楠などにも共通する、「写生生の文化」が見い出される。今後の研究の進展を見守りたいと思う。

さて、朝河収集本はイエール大学と議会図書館とに分けられたが、その差異はどこにあるのか、従来はまったくわからなかった。イエール大学調査の折り、仏書関係が少ないことを感じていたのだが、はたして議会図書館からは大量に仏書が出きた。長年上の疑問が氷解した思いだった。今回の目録によって全容が姿をあらわし、解明におむずかしくなることになった。ある程度双方のコレクションの色分けをしていたことがこれではっきりした。今回の目録によって全容をあらわし、研究はむしろ近くに近づくことになった。ある程度両方のコレクションの色分けをしていったことがこれではっきりしきたが、その区分の契機が何かもの、まだ明らかではない。これも今後の展開が期待されるところである。

仏書では、天台宗系の資料が比較的多く、特定寺院の聖教をそっくり寄贈された可能性がある。一例をあげれば、「花山元慶寺」の印記の写本が多く、まとまったコレクションの可能性が高い。名高い僧僧正遍照ゆか
りの古刹であり、細かくみたいば、この種
の例はほかにも出てくるであろう。

Ⅲ 貴重本をめぐる

以上のごとき朝河収集本の中で、とりわけ
貴重なテキストについて最後にふれておき
たい。

議会図書館所蔵分では、いわゆる古写本
はほとんどないようだ。これに対してイエー
ル大学所蔵分には、古写本がみられる。
すでに紹介したが（『平家物語の転生と
再生』笠間書院, 2003 年）、『元徳二年
後宇多院聖忌曼荼羅供』がある。巻子1軸。
元徳二年（1330）六月に行われた後宇多
院の七回忌における曼陀羅供の法会儀礼の準
備と当日の次第を記録した転写本である。応
永32年（1425）の具注暦の紙背文書に
相当する。この年をさほど下らない頃の書写
と思われる。後宇多院は有名な後醍醐天皇の
父、鎌倉最末期、南北朝の動乱にいたる時代
の仏事法要記録として貴重である。

貼付された書き付けのメモによれば、本書
は西洞院家旧蔵本で、明治37年（190
4）に春和堂が入手、軸装を施し、滋野井家
からすき返しの表紙を譲り受けたという。イ
エール大学の書票は、1907年であり、朝
河教授が春和堂から直接入手したのであろう。

朝河収集本で最も編年時の古いのは、
Y A J 目録分になるが、建長五年（125
3）の『伝法許可作法次第』であり、他に
元亀二年（1571）、尊円法親王筆の『雲
州消息』がある。

また、国文学研究資料館の調査目録作成
の折り、スターリング記念図書館分（S M
L）にありながら目録に漏れたものが2点あ
ったので、追記しておきたい。神明訪話の
『日吉山王利生記』、お伽草子の『はまぐ
り』である。後者は和表紙の絵入り横本で、
本文は渋川版とおおきく変わらない。前者は
絵入り3冊本である。

さらにイエール大学には、二曲一双の古
文書張り交ぜ屏風があり、建久三年（119
2）から延享四年（1747）にいたる興福
寺を中心とする南都の論義などの古文書が貼
付されていて貴重である。

今後は議会図書館とイエール大学の双方
に目配りした総合的な朝河収集本の研究の積
み重ねが必要であろう。また、朝河収集本以
外の議会図書館資料としては、旧陸軍参議本
部所蔵の兵法書コレクションが注目される。
とりわけ『調閏集』が大量に出てきたので、
これも今後の課題としたい。
私が、本蔵書の存在を具体的に知りえたのは、1996年、インディアナ大学客員研究員として滞在中、同大学スミエ・ジョーンズ教授の御教示によるものである。その存在を確認すべく、私は同年の秋、これまで、日本国内における未公開文庫・図書館の蔵書調査と目録作成のためのプロジェクトを組んで共同作業を行ってきた市古夏生(お茶の水女子大学)・揖斐高(成蹊大学)・木越治(金沢大学)等に、来米を依頼した。これに、当時揖斐のもとで日本近世文学の研究を行なっていたマーク・ボーラー(イェール大学院生、当時)を加えた5名で、L.Cに直接おもむき交渉を重ねた。その結果、東洋部部長ヘレーン・ポー氏を始めL.C側から、所蔵日本古典籍の公開にむけ全面的な協力が得られるという確約を取り付けることができた。このあと、同館所蔵の未公開日本古典籍の状況について立ち入り調査を行なった。その結果、東洋部部長ヘレン・ポー氏を始めL.C側から、所蔵日本古典籍の公開にむけ全面的な協力が得られるという確約を取り付けることができた。このあと、同館所蔵の未公開日本古典籍の状況について立ち入り調査を行なった。その結果、明治以前の日本古典籍(いわゆる和装版本・写本)が、4800点余り、冊数にして15,000冊有余存することが確認された。1980年代の終わり頃から本蔵書公開促進のための努力が重ねられてきた。その第一の功労者は、元L.C職員本田正静氏である。氏によって、1990年代初頭から、日本文学・演劇関係の書目計627点及び和算関係書目計403点の合計1,030点の書名についてすでに整理が行なわれ、それぞれ『Japanese Literature, Performing Arts, and Reference Books/ A Bibliography』(小西甚一監修1996年)及び『Japanese Mathematics』として議会図書館より目録が刊行されていた。これらは、先駆的かつ貴重な仕事と評すべきものである。前記の日本文学の書目には、本田氏の御好意により、これら二種の目録に記載された全ての書目のデータを掲載することができた。しかし、全貌が公開されなかったのは、L.C側が、この間、これらの古典籍を一貫して第二次大戦後の没収資料の一部とみなし、秘密書類に指定して一括管理していたため、その努力はなかなか実を結ばなかったためである。先に述べた如く、L.Cの前向きな姿勢を受けて、われわれは、プロジェクトを組織し、文部省より、1998年度から3年間にわたり科学研究費助成金の交付、さらに又、東芝国際財団の援助を受け、この調査を開始し、又調査を終えることが出来たのである。我々がここに目録化したのは、米国議会図書館アジア課（Asian Division）のJapanese Sectionが管理する書庫に保管されている書名のうち、明治以前として記録されている区画の書籍すべてである。一般に、Japanese Rare Booksと称されている書物群で、現在（2002年12月現在）のところ、Jefferson館とAdams館の書庫に分けて保管されている。ただし、仔細に見れば、明治期刊行の書籍も少なくなくあり、ごくわずかではあるが近代活字本や洋書も含まれている。なお、現在、保存課（conservation）の管理に帰している百万塔陀羅尼や幕末・明治期の銅板画及びペリー来航関係絵巻なども、もとはこのJapanese Sectionの書庫に保管されていたとのことであり、この他にも、地図や絵本などが他のSectionに移管されたとのことである。詳細については不明なままである。本目録では、保存課により提供されたごく一部の資料を採録することにとどめざるをえなかった。本格的に日本関係の書籍が収集されたのは、イェール大学の朝河貫一教授が、議会図書館の要請をうけて直接日本に赴き、書目を選定し購入して以後のことである。朝河氏に関しては、小峯氏の発表があるのでこれに譲ることにする。
料の一部である。そしてこのとき、議会図書館の日本古典籍は飛躍的に増大したのである。本目録に収載した書目の7〜8割がここに属すると考えられる。

今回の調査によって、はじめて、これらの書目の全貌が明らかになったのであるが、これらの書目の由来やワシントン・ドキュメントセンターに収まるまでの経緯等については、すべてこれから調査・研究によって明らかにされなければならない。その意味で、すべてこれからであるといっても過言ではない。本目録によってその蔵書印だけをみてても、陸軍参謀本部はじめとして、陸軍予科士官学校、陸軍士官学校文庫、大阪陸軍地方幼年学校、熊本陸軍幼年学校所蔵、仙台陸軍地方幼年学校等々があり、一例に旧陸軍の蔵書といえどもその内容・出自は多岐にわたりる。

議会図書館における戦前からの集書は、日本の全体像を知る上での基礎資料たることを念頭においたものであるので、かなりバランスの取れた蔵書傾向を示しているが、1600年以前のいわゆる貴重書の類はほとんど見出ることができないし、1700年以前の文学書・歴史書の類も豊富であるとは言いがたい。これらの中でワシントン・ドキュメントセンターからの譲渡された旧陸軍・海軍本の中には、兵法関係の稀覧本が含まれている。この点について若干述べておく。

既に述べたように、米国議会図書館の収蔵典籍は、広くまんべんなく、集められているのが特徴であるが、この中でももっとも書籍点数の多いのは文学関係の761点である。これに次ぐのは、武学・武術の555点、和算を含む理学の505点である。文学関係は、日本にあるものが多く、ここにだけ所在が確認されているが、小西甚一氏が紹介された中村仲蔵関係の日記等がその例となれるであろう。

これに対して、武学・武術関係の書物は、内容の重複したものが多いから、これをもってして、貴重本の存在の多さを過大評価するのはいかがなものかとは思うけれども、今後の武道・武術の研究にとって、米国議会図書館がもっと重要な図書館となることは間違いない。

又、一例をあげれば、江島為信の『新篇』も存在する。江島為信は、「身の鏡」・「理非鏡」等の作品で知られる仮名草子作者である。彼が兵法に手を染めていたことが、これで初めてはっきりする資料である。又、江島為信の兵法関係の書物は、内容のかなり重複したものが多いから、これをもってして、貴重本の存在の多さを過大評価するのはいかがなものかとは思うけれども、今後の武道・武術の研究にとって、米国議会図書館がもっと重要な図書館となることは間違いない。

読者各位が、この論文を読むと、日本文化の本質を知る上で、大きな助かることになることを願う。
なるパートナーシップ形成にいささかでも寄与できればと心より願う次第である。

追記 本目録の刊行に際しては、L.C職員始め多くの方のご支援があった。殊に、スミエ・ジョーンズ教授・ヘレン・ポー氏・本田正静氏・日本国文部科学省・東芝国際財団に深く感謝申しあげる。

BOOK REVIEWS
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Professor Emeritus Marius Jansen passed away on December 10, 2000, but to crown a lifetime of distinguished publications, he left the world this book as his parting gift. It is indeed fortunate that in spite of failing eyesight, he was able to complete it—and to see it published one week before his death. In spite of the very reasonable price of both the paperback and hardcover versions, its size will likely discourage its use as a textbook in all but the most ambitious courses on early modern and modern Japanese history. But for the very same reason, it is sure to be used for many years as a reference and resource tool by both students and scholars interested in various topics in Japanese and East Asian history. Each of the twenty chapters can serve in its own right as a manageable reading assignment on a particular aspect of early modern or modern Japanese history, and there is no lack of fresh perspectives based on recent scholarship as well as Jansen’s distinctive Sino-Japanese research background. In 871 pages, needless to say, Jansen is able to give a much fuller treatment of the rise of modern Japan than any book of standard textbook size.

Jansen is a past master at writing narrative history, and his account frequently has the power to grip the reader and make history come alive through the people who actually lived it, at times with the aid of their own words. The first two paragraphs present a highly vivid, yet concise, description of the battle in 1600 that ended Japan’s medieval age and laid the foundation for four centuries of great cultural creativity. A major reason for the particular vividness of the description here is that Jansen is describing a pair of Tosa-school screens depicting the battle, screens that Ieyasu presented to his adopted daughter as part of her dowry. The story of a momentous historical event that took many thousands of lives is encapsulated by a Tosa-school master painter on sixteen panels, and then encapsulated again by a Princeton-school master wordsmith in about 500 words.

The narrative progress here from representation to historical event to interpretation, and then back to historical event and representation, is a good symbol for the task that Jansen has set himself in this book—to cover the rise of modern Japan comprehensively by alternating between descriptions of events and socio-political structures, descriptions of cultural and artistic movements, quotations of written representations of these events and cultural phenomena by both European and Japanese contemporaries, and summaries of some recent interpretive perspectives. While the book, though gigantic, remains highly readable to the general reader and the university student, most scholars of Japan—unless they are extremely widely read—are also likely to find facts and perspectives that they were previously unaware of among its pages.

In the preface Professor Jansen gives an interesting intellectual autobiography in which he explains the reasons why his generation had to pursue breadth in their scholarship and teaching and take up all kinds of different topics of inquiry. As an attempt to synthesize and summarize the results of half a century of his own research and that of his students and successors in the field, the present work follows in this same tradition. Inevitably, due to the very comprehensiveness of the book and its concern for narrative readability, specialists in particular areas of early modern or modern Japanese history are likely to find certain
lacunae or defects in the treatment of their own area of research, as well as an insufficient representation of the scholarly controversies that have animated recent scholarship in that particular area. In my own area of research, for example, a few long-lived historical “myths” or oversimplifications created by interschool polemic rivalry in the Edo period but exposed by recent scholarship are reproduced uncritically. In the chapter “Education, Thought, and Religion,” for instance, we are told that Yamaga Sokō (1622–1685) was “an immensely influential teacher; the forty-seven rōnin considered themselves followers of his strategy,” and that Sokō was the chief originator of the concept and ideology of bushidō. However, the scholarship of Hori Isao (Yamaga Sokō, 1959) and John A. Tucker has long since demonstrated that (1) the form of gentlemanly Confucian shidō 士道 that Sokō taught was diametrically opposed to the violent revenge ideology expressed in the vendetta of the Akō rōnin, whose leader Ōishi Kuranosuke (1659–1703) was an adolescent when Sokō was living in Akō under indefinite bakufu-imposed exile (not as a teacher) for publication of the Seikyō yōrou 聖教要録; (2) the only evidence for the old story that Ōishi’s and his band’s beliefs that culminated in the vendetta were inspired by Sokō’s strategic teachings are polemic statements to that effect by Satō Nakokata and Dazai Shundai in their essays condemning the rōnin’s vendetta (written ca. 1705 and 1731–33 respectively), and Shundai’s attribution of the same view to his teacher, Sorai; (3) although Sokō had a considerable following in Edo for about a decade before his banishment, during and after his almost ten years of banishment in Akō domain (arranged by Hoshina Masayuki, the patron of Yamazaki Ansai in Edo and a devout follower of Ansai’s understanding of Zhu Xi Neo-Confucianism), his influence greatly diminished. According to Tucker, after the rōnin debate, there are few references to him or his writings—apart from the teachings of the hereditary Yamaga school itself, which disappeared from Edo in the mid-eighteenth century—until Yoshida Shōin began to extol his ideas in the 1840s; (4) Sokō’s image as the systematizer and propagator of the concept and ideology of bushidō, while not without some foundation in Sokō’s writings, is largely a creation of Inoue Tetsujirō’s book Nihon kogakuha no tetsugaku (1902) and his subsequent writings on kokumin dōtoku.

On page 198, we are told that Sorai “was one of those consulted in the case of the forty-seven rōnin, and it was his proposal for the middle path of seppuku for the rōnin that eventually carried the day.” However, the most thorough study of the controversies surrounding the Akō rōnin, Tahara Tugu’s Akō shijūrokushirōn (1978), on pp. 65–69, has examined this tradition and found it unreliable. It is true, he notes, that Sorai was respected by Tsunayoshi, and was a retainer of a person whom Tsunayoshi had promoted to karō rank, so that his opinion could have been conveyed to the highest authorities. However, Tahara shows that the documents that claim that Sorai’s opinion in effect decided the case, including the Giritussho (擬律書) supposedly written by Sorai, are unreliable and conflict with other historical records. Yoshikawa Kōjirō also finds no evidence that the Giritussho was written by Sorai. That the idea that Sorai’s opinion was accepted and followed by the bakufu should have gained acceptance, however, demonstrates that Sorai’s philosophy came later to be identified with the legalistic position of the bakufu regarding the judgment of the rōnin case. Large portions of the primary documents relating to the debate over the Akō rōnin are included in volume two of the new revised and much expanded Sources of Japanese Tradition, and their impending publication will do much to clear up these questions. Ironically, Professor Jansen was originally slated to serve as co-editor of this source book with Professor de Bary, but the deterioration of his health made that task impossible to fulfill.

The Akō rōnin vendetta was not, of course, the first rōnin plot in the Edo period. On page 118, Jansen discusses the anti-bakufu rōnin plot led by Yui Shōsetsu uncovered in 1651 and then mentions the raﬀish kabukimono of early Edo times. He then states that “In later years some of the most popular theatrical pieces served to commemorate this spirit of resistance and gave thescenariogoes the vicarious thrill of watching daring supermen who supposedly stood for justice and challenged authorities. This was also true of the rōnin plot, which was immortalized in seventeenth- and eighteenth century plays.” I am not a
specialist in Edo-period drama, so it may be my knowledge that is insufficient here, but I have never heard of Yui Shōsetsu’s plot being celebrated in plays, and no matter how much it might have been disguised by being set in another time period, I cannot imagine that such a celebration would have been tolerated by the bakufu.

There are a few other minor errors and one not-so-minor omission in the area of intellectual history. On page 90, for instance, we read about the colloquial Chinese commentary on the Six Maxims, Rikuyu engi 六諭衍義, which, through the translation and explication work of Sorai and Muro Kyūsō, became a textbook of popular ethical education in Japanese schools. But here the origin of the Six Maxims is attributed to the first emperor of the Qing. It was, of course, the first emperor of the Ming who first promulgated the maxims, although the Rikuyu engi itself was written in the early Qing. Again, on page 207, we read that Motoori Norinaga taught that, “To succumb to innovations that had been introduced into the Japanese language together with Chinese characters was to lose the ‘pure Japanese heart’ (yamatogokoro) in favor of an ‘errant’ magokoro…” Can the magokoro, by definition, ever be “errant”? Is the word Jansen is thinking of here not, perhaps, karagokoro? As for omissions, a great historian, kanbun writer, and calligrapher whose history, Nihon gaishi (An Unofficial History of Japan), was instrumental in forging the national consciousness and imperial loyalty that led to the Meiji Restoration and the rise of modern Japanese nationalism in the Meiji period, Rai San’yō (1780–1832), has inexplicably been left entirely out of Jansen’s account of “the making of modern Japan,” at least to judge from his absence in the index. To fill this lacuna, the reader may wish to consult this reviewer’s recent study of San’yō’s philosophy of history and its impact in bakumatsu and Meiji Japan in *East Asian History*, No. 24, December 2002, pp. 117–170.

Such occasional omissions, inherited inaccuracies, or slips, however, detract little from the descriptive richness of the book as a whole, which abounds with fascinating and eye-opening accounts of various aspects of early modern and modern Japanese society, politics, economy, and culture. The third chapter, “Foreign Relations,” which places early modern Japan in its international context in relation to Europe, Southeast Asia, and East Asia, is particularly rich in factual and documentary detail that is missing from most standard textbooks and reference books on early modern Japan. Some of the details and nuances found in the analyses of the Tokugawa state, society, status system, economy, communication system, and popular culture may compel us to revise certain established conceptions or oversimplifications about Tokugawa Japan that we have been taking for granted for years. Due to space limitations and the focus of this journal, I will defer comment on the second two-thirds of the book that deals with modern, as opposed to early-modern, Japan, except to say that the accounts of the “Meiji Revolution” and the building of the Meiji state are written with great vigor and confidence, making them very much worth reading not only by students, but also by those of us who are already very familiar with this period.

In conclusion, this book is an excellent summation of a lifetime of path-breaking historical scholarship that itself continues to push forward the frontiers of our understanding of early modern and modern Japan. It falls into a humanistic tradition of history defended eloquently by writers such as Jacques Barzun and Keith Windschuttle, who deplore the intrusion of social science theory, literary criticism, or an obsession with quantification into the historian’s craft. Accordingly, readers may sometimes feel swamped by an endless stream of historical details with insufficient theoretical anchors to help them make sense of the whole story. Thus readers who can draw some theoretical perspectives from their own or other disciplines may find this book even more useful as a resource book than those who cannot. I will not attempt to answer the question of whether this is the best comprehensive one-volume history of early modern and modern Japan now in print, but it is certainly a major candidate for that distinction.

© Brett L. Walker, Montana State University, Bozeman

In Japan's early modern period, literate people, for the first time, could conjure and confront spatial representations of their country, whether they called it "our realm" (honchō), Greater Japan (dai-Nihon), or just Japan (Nihon) proper. Insofar as the roots of modern Japanese nationhood can be traced to the early modern period, the ability to conjure a spatial image of Japan—and, in what amounts to a "spatial inflection," those countries that were not Japan—became an important part of a burgeoning realmwide consciousness. In many ways, people conjured and confronted these images of their country because of a "spatial turn" that occurred in the early modern period, one which, in Japan's case, took place not just in the arena of late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century cartographic sciences, but in an earlier explosion of published travels accounts, encyclopedias, and satirical writings. Literally, early modern Japanese, whether shogunal officials or religious pilgrims, were hungry for spatial information regarding their country and, by extension, the largely unexplored world outside it. In Mapping Early Modern Japan, Marcia Yonemoto investigates this early modern hunger and the incredibly diverse "maps" of Japan that fed it, working under the assumption that "mapping is as much about the processes of perception and representation as it is about the material products of those acts" (p. 2).

Mapping and crafting other spatial representations are productive processes. That is to say, as geographer David Harvey argues in other contexts, social and cultural practices do not just happen within the natural context of a space such as the Japanese archipelago; rather those practices create such spaces (David Harvey, Justice, Nature & the Geography of Difference [Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 1996], 210-11). Ultimately, Yonemoto is concerned with diverse aspects of this creative process. What she reveals in her five chapters is that "mapping allowed for and even encouraged the endless arrangement and rearrangement of multiple spatial, cultural, and political identities whose protean nature reflected the possibilities as well as the limitations of being Japanese in the early modern period" (p. 7). To do so, as is convention for many "new cultural" histories, Yonemoto does not trace personal genealogies or historical teleologies regarding the development of maps and political power, geographies and descriptions of local customs, satirical maps and forms of disorder, and the "antipolitics of pleasure," rather she slowly "unpacks" these topics over the course of her narrative. Like unpacking any carefully chosen gift, Yonemoto offers the reader many pleasant surprises, not the least of which is an extremely thoughtful presentation of the ways that Japanese, through the birth of a broader spatial imagination, "produced" Japan.

In chapter 1, Yonemoto investigates the "controlled fiction" of the official kuniezu mapping projects of the Tokugawa shogunate. Most of these official mapping projects occurred in the seventeenth century, but a final one was conducted in 1835. Yonemoto covers these projects in some detail, concluding that, rather than view them as successfully standardizing and centralizing Tokugawa administrative mapmaking, "the continuous battles to define provincial boundaries and the persistence of local proprietary concerns revealed the shogunate's less-than-complete control over the spatial politics of the realm" (p. 12). What is most interesting about Tokugawa administrative maps is that the "sweeping visions of an integrated polity" distorted what was in fact a polity divided among localities, the status system, and even emerging class differences. But herein lies the brave new imagination that led to an early realm-wide consciousness among Japan's ruling elite and literate people. Along with Tokugawa administrative maps, Yonemoto also explores the "stable" and "conventionalized" Japan in both Ishikawa Ryūsen's Honchō zu kan kōmoku (Outline map of our empire; 1687) and Nagakubo Sekisui's Kaisei Nihon yochi rōtei zenzu (Revised complete roadmap of all Japan; 1774), elucidating the ways they did, and did not, conform to the official Tokugawa maps of their day. Mobility
was the assumption inherent in all these maps; but they nonetheless always presented Japan as an "orderly, legible space" (p. 34).

Yonemoto devotes chapter 2 to the annotated travel writings of Kaibara Ekiken. For Kaibara, the journey became ritual; meisho, "famous places," served as spatially and historically important locales for reflection on the meaning of travel. The meisho became part of the topography of Japan's "memoryscape," and the travel account, when painstakingly annotated, emerged as "a mosaic of space, time, and knowledge" (p. 60). Yonemoto insists that if Tokugawa administrative maps established a "spatio-symbolic language, travel accounts constructed a spatio-narrative language, the formal analysis of which is essential for analyzing a largely discursive process: the writing and graphing of space and place – mapping – in historical context" (p. 66).

Chapter 3 explores the travel narratives of Nagakubo Sekisu, Furukawa Koshōken, and Tachibana Nankei. To varying degrees, these three authors transformed places and people into "icons of historical and cultural significance," sometimes as "Others" according to the "logic of difference," whether Dutch and Chinese traders at Nagasaki, the Ainu of Ezo, or the countryfolk of Tsugaru. Difference became a measure of distance, as often the stranger the customs one encountered the further one had traveled from the metropole; even though certain distant meisho, rooted in "Japanese" historical significance, carried temporal meaning that could carry one back in time to the cultural center.

Yonemoto does not confine her analysis of travel writings to annotated or narrated nonfiction travel accounts, but rather extends her analysis to fiction as well. Chapter 4 features a careful reading of Hiraga Gennai's Fūryū Shidōken den (The tale of dashing Shidōken; 1763), an early example of fictional foreign travel. Such fictional travel accounts offered an opportunity to paint the familiar in strange new hues; but they also offered meetings with some of the bizarre peoples featured in encyclopedias such as the Wakan sansai zue (Illustrated Japanese-Chinese encyclopedia of the three elements; 1712). By contrast, chapter 5 investigates the geography of early modern pleasure through a mapping of Japan's "way of love" (shikidō). Yonemoto argues that both saiken, "detailed views," and sharebon, satirical "books of style," served as literal and figurative Yoshiwara maps; through the works of Hōsei-dō Kisanji, Shikitei Sanba, and Akatsuki Kanenari, the Yoshiwara evolved into a mappable world unto itself. Yonemoto remarks, "Whereas in its early phases geography and cartography were the vehicles for criticizing Japan by engaging in fantasy about the 'foreign', by the mid-nineteenth century they were much more about the immediate bodily and material realities readily available at home" (p. 169).

In 1800, explains Yonemoto, "the universalizing forces of modern geography and cartography" confronted earlier Tokugawa mapping practices, which led to "more accurate" surveys and maps of Japan's coastline. Basically, Yonemoto concludes her study by mentioning some of these post-1800 surveyors and mapmakers, figures such as Inō Tadataka, who turned the page to the next chapter in the history of spatial representations of Japan. But, in some respects, the emergence of "universalizing forces" (i.e., European forces) in the arena of cartography might have been worth Yonemoto's attention. When unpacking maps by earlier mapmakers such as Nagakubo Sekisui, for example, she argues that their maps "chronicled the particularity of place rather than the universalism of space" (p. 40).

Yonemoto insists that Tokugawa maps resist conforming to the map-as-science teleology of "progress," the notion that somehow maps always "improved" over time. Instead, she argues that these maps moved in a "horizontal" or even "circular fashion" in the period before 1800 (p. 43). But what strikes this reader about many post-1800 cartographers, some explorers of the North Pacific such as Mamiya Rinzō, is that, although they employed the conventions and technologies of scientific mapping, they too relied on the "annotating" and "narrating" conventions of Kaibara Ekiken, Furukawa Koshōken, and others, as well as ethnographic portrayals reminiscent of Nagakubo Sekisui. They never completely shed the "particularity of place." Exploring the practices and activities of post-1800 mapmakers, perhaps even in the form of a brief epilogue, might have exposed important continuity – something less than the genealogies and teleologies of progress; but even more historically salient for those inter-
ested in the looming changes of Japan's nineteenth century -- and, in the process, exposed the science of cartography as not exclusively a "universalizing force," but rather as the socially and culturally constructed arena of knowledge that it is, particularly when transported to such places as Japan.
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In Martha Chaiklin’s Cultural Commerce and Dutch Commercial Culture: The Influence of European Material Culture on Japan, 1700-1850, the author examines the influence of finished European manufactured objects on the cultural sphere of Japan during the last half of the Tokugawa period. Her work challenges the misconception that Dutch/European influence on Japan was negligible. According to Chaiklin, this misconception came about due to the fact that historians to this point have concentrated primarily on the economic and intellectual aspects of Dutch/European contributions, rather than on the influence of material culture – which she defines as “the objects generated by a society for use in daily life” (5).

In general, Chaiklin’s work succeeds admirably in depicting a greater European cultural impact on Tokugawa Japan than has previously been acknowledged. This has been achieved in spite of the admission by the author that her study had to cope with “the constraints of imprecise historical data” (173) and the fact that “Cultural influence may ultimately be unquantifiable….” (177). In an effort to address these challenges, Chaiklin attempts to treat material culture as a primary source; however, in practice, she ultimately ends up using predominantly Dutch-language trade records and printed Japanese-language sources for her study.

The book, which reads like a dissertation, and is referred to as such on more than one occasion by the author, is divided into two sections: the first (chapters two through five) examining the trading relationship between the Dutch and the Japanese, and the second (chapters six through eight) detailing three case studies (clocks, glass and firearms) in terms of their diffusion and acculturation in Japan.

Chaiklin begins her study with a discussion of the diffusion of imported manufactured goods in Tokugawa Japan through both legal and illegal means. These goods came into Japan via legal trade (both officially-sanctioned company trade and quasi-legal private trade), smuggling, and the theft of legal imports. Whereas bulk commodities were the main concern of the Dutch East India Company’s (VOC) official monopolistic trade policy with Japan, “European material culture in the form of finished manufactured goods…were brought as a speculative sideline, as gifts, in response to special requests, or even as ballast” (12). Private trade (goods trafficked by employees of the VOC) was originally prohibited by the Company but encouraged by local Nagasaki officials who profited handsomely from the transactions. By 1700, however, the VOC had grudgingly accepted the practice and limited the goods that could be sold by individual Dutch employees. Both the official and private trade continued side-by-side until the end of the Tokugawa period, fluctuating at times depending on the state of the Japanese economy.

It has long been known that, in spite of the strict regulations of sakoku and the harsh penalties enforced by the Japanese government, smuggling was rampant in the Tokugawa period. Chaiklin rightly notes, however, that the smuggling of Dutch goods paled in comparison to the smuggling of Chinese goods, and that most of the smuggling involved Dutch commodities rather than manufactured objects. Theft of Dutch goods was also common, but this too usually consisted of small amounts of food items taken from the houses of VOC employees. Chaiklin con-
cludes that “Legal trade, both official and private, was the most significant route by which foreign objects entered Japan,” and that “Neither smuggling nor theft can be considered major routes for European goods to spread to the general populace of Japan” (31).

In Chapter Three, Chaiklin examines the role of gift-giving in the diffusion of Dutch/European commercial culture in Japan. On an official basis, the Dutch provided gifts to the Japanese twice annually: the first occurred on the court journey to pay respects to the shogun and included presents for the shogun and bakufu officials in Edo; and the second occurred at the beginning of the eighth month when hassaku gifts were provided for the local officials in Nagasaki. Chaiklin notes that these gift-giving occasions did little to spread European commercial culture, however, because “with the exception of a few wine bottles and a fixed number of wine glasses to a fixed number of officials, European-manufactured goods were not included in the preset official gift exchange mechanism after the seventeenth century” (42). Special gifts given by the Dutch to the shogun rarely left the palace grounds and thus had little influence on the ordinary people of Japan, but Chaiklin postulates that some of the smaller presents given to lesser officials in Nagasaki. Chaiklin argues that “The eisen goods came to form an essential part of the structure of exchange between Japan and the West” (69). She also concludes that the large number of these goods that came into Japan represented “the quest for knowledge in a restricted society” (69).

Chapter Five explores the distribution system that was developed by the Japanese to move imported European manufactured goods from the port of Nagasaki to various marketplaces across the country. By examining the accessibility of these goods to the Japanese consumer, Chaiklin attempts to determine the degree of European cultural influence in Japan. She concludes that a “complex but effective structure for purchasing imported goods was in place by the mid-seventeenth century” (71).

According to Chaiklin, two kinds of specialized wholesale and retail shops handled foreign goods at the consumer level: one dealt in a wide variety of imported items “from peacock feathers to glassware,” and the other “specialized in one kind of product but sold imported goods [often clocks and glassware] and produced the same sort of object on the premises” (80). While most of these shops were located in the major cities of Nagasaki, Osaka, Kyoto and Edo, “Itinerant merchants and gift purchases by visitors to [these cities] helped distribute products to more distant regions” (85).
Each of the final three chapters depicts an important aspect of technological diffusion and acculturation. Chapter Six examines clockwork, because, according to Chaiklin, “it is often seen as the primary technological advance that instigated and facilitated industrialization” (10). As she also notes, “clocks and watches were one of the non-monopoly products in highest demand throughout the Edo period” (86). It is evident that the Japanese were interested in clockwork from an early period. Clocks, which were first introduced into Japan by St. Francis Xavier in 1549, were being produced by the Japanese by the beginning of the eighteenth century. Pocket watches (introduced by the Dutch in 1645) were more difficult to manufacture, and their reproduction probably did not occur until the early nineteenth century. Other forms of clockwork, such as musical clocks, music boxes, astronomical instruments and automata, also became popular in the later Tokugawa period. Chaiklin argues that, unlike China, Japan absorbed and adopted European clockwork technology into its culture on many levels.

In Chapter Seven, Chaiklin examines glass production “because it illustrates a skill that cannot be copied but must be taught and thus provides a clear example of technological transfer” (10). Before the arrival of Europeans in Japan in the mid-sixteenth century, the Japanese could make glass metal but the technique of glass blowing was not yet known. While the Portuguese were the first to bring blown glass to Japan, it was the Dutch and English who actively imported it in the early seventeenth century and stimulated Japanese interest in the technique. By the 1670s, there were Japanese glassblowers in Nagasaki and soon thereafter, they could be found in the other large cities as well. The Dutch brought in all sorts of glassware, ranging from bottles to eyeglasses, and including items such as magnifying glasses, telescopes, magic lanterns and engraved wine glasses. The Japanese not only learned how to produce these objects, but they created their own inexpensive glass products, such as glass hair ornaments. According to Chaiklin, “By the last quarter of the eighteenth century, inexpensive glass objects by Japanese artisans were sold widely at temples, fairs and even small shops on back streets” (144-145).

Chaiklin concludes the body of her work with an examination of firearms and the role they played in Japan after the implementation of sakoku. She argues that Japan never rejected firearms in the Tokugawa period because even though firearms “were discouraged among the populace, they were maintained among the military” (151). In addition to their military uses, firearms were also utilized in ceremonies and for hunting. Hunting was both a leisure activity for the wealthy and a necessity employed by peasants in protecting their crops from animals.

During the first century-and-a-half of the Tokugawa period, Japan felt relatively safe from outside threats and because of this, the domestic production of firearms and the development of new weapons technology remained stagnant. However, both the importation of European weapons and Japanese interest in Western military technology increased dramatically in the early nineteenth century with the Russian threat from the north, the Phaeton Incident of 1808, the increased number of castaways from American whaling vessels, and, ultimately, the Opium War in China. As Chaiklin notes, “Each time gunfire was exchanged, the Japanese stepped up arms development. News of the Opium War and its outcome brought about the biggest change of all” (172).

In her brief concluding chapter, Chaiklin argues that even though European-manufactured objects did not comprise a major portion of the official VOC trade with Japan, “In the minds of the Japanese, pipes, clocks, watches, music boxes, spectacles, bottles, and pistols had a far greater impact than bulk commodities such as raw silk or tin” (173). She also asserts that “far greater numbers of distinctively European manufactured goods were imported into Tokugawa Japan than has ever been acknowledged” (172). This she attributes to poor or missing records concerning kambang trade, the failure to examine eisen documents, the underestimation by scholars of the importance of unofficial gift-giving practices, and ignorance of the vast trading networks that brought these goods to people across the country. On the other hand, Chaiklin believes that too much weight have been given to the roles of smuggling and theft in the Japanese acquisition of European material culture.
Chaiklin also claims that “The overall influence of imported European culture on Japanese society was not confined to the wealthy elite, but rather reached all social strata either through foreign objects or domestic interpretations of them” (176). And even though rangakusha and Japanese government officials were able to read about European developments through Western books and annual news reports (fusetsugaki) compiled by the Dutch, Chaiklin maintains that the material culture brought by Dutch ships was just as important in making the Japanese aware of European culture. In conclusion, she argues that “European manufactured goods played a vital role in awakening [the Japanese] to a different world of possibilities” (177).

Chaiklin has taken on the formidable task of trying to show the impact of European culture on Tokugawa society through an examination of European finished manufactured goods brought in by Dutch traders. Her claims of a European cultural influence that, in certain instances, reached all levels of Japanese society is best supported by her use of private trade and eisen records. Her argument is weakest when she relies on speculation and extrapolation from inconclusive trade records.

I would have also liked to see the author employ more local Japanese documents, especially from the Nagasaki area. By confining herself to printed Japanese collections (and sometimes even abbreviated forms of these), she has denied herself the fullest possible record of what is indeed a poorly documented field. In an attempt to strengthen her argument, she also, in my opinion, devalued the contributions of the Portuguese and, especially, the Chinese in introducing the Japanese to European material culture. Furthermore, I see very little use of archaeological data in her study. For example, I would imagine that the extensive work that has been done on Deshima would have provided valuable information on her topic.

Chaiklin’s study has certainly contributed to our increased understanding of the influence of European material culture on the Japanese during the latter half of the Tokugawa period. By confining herself to an examination of finished manufactured goods, she has omitted other important areas of Dutch/European influence, such as food, clothing, written materials and language – but this is another book. The book at hand is, in general, well-researched and well-written, and offers an entertaining and readable account of a valuable, yet neglected, aspect of Tokugawa history.
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