

Elsewhere, to support his contention that the themes of modern erotic poetry are not new to Tibetan literature, the author supplies copious examples from pre-modern writings. These range from the cryptic sensuality of some *kāvya*-inspired lines, to the outright crudity and bawdiness of more popular literature. This is a revealing and entertaining journey through a regularly overlooked area of Tibetan writing. The relevance of some examples here, and even whether they all belong in a single category, seems more debatable. The universality of the themes of sex and bodily functions makes it difficult to depict their reappearance as a literary continuity. Correspondences and recurrences, especially spread over so many centuries, *do not necessarily represent continuation*. Doubts about categories and continuity might also be raised in relation to the author's discussion on "the Tibetan Tradition of Social Criticism" (Chapter 3).

I welcome the author's decision to place politics centre-stage. Rather than a mere backdrop, the political situation is the crucible in which modern Tibetan literature has been forged. The battle between censorship and creativity continues to shape this most vibrant and dynamic form of Tibetan literature. However, in emphasizing the continuity of indigenous writing, the book underplays debts to foreign literature. In the essay and short-story genres (also innovations by the modern movement) these are especially obvious, but this volume hardly mentions them. A majority of the influential first-generation writers attended the same educational institutions. Their compositions reflect their exposure to an array of traditions: Chinese, Western, and Communist, as well as Tibetan. The richness and brilliance of much modern writing derives in no small part from this concoction of influences.

This book presents modern literature within the framework of the bigger issues and causes. It does not address the authors' smaller-scale, personal conflicts: the battles between integrity and naked ambition, the authors' struggles with modernity, juvenility, public and self-image, machismo, and occasionally with each other. Most importantly, one has a sense that the attitudes of many individual authors to their literary and cultural heritage are extremely conflicted. My own contacts with writers and readings of the literature lead me to the belief that it is ambivalences and ambiguities (as much as certainties and convictions), and the authors' struggle to resolve the irreconcilable tensions between feelings of pride and despair in their cultural and historical inheritance that are essential to understanding the literature.

My reservations about this book are relatively minor: they relate only to certain aspects of the argumentation and the occasional limitations imposed by its framework. The journey that this work takes one on is extremely rewarding. This is an absorbing and illuminating read. It is composed in a style that should appeal both to the academic community and a wider audience. For anyone with a specific interest in modern Tibetan literature this is essential reading. Equally, it can be recommended to anyone wishing to learn about contemporary Tibetan culture, and even the traditional literary heritage of Tibet.

Kokuhō Jingoji Sanzō to wa Nani ka 国宝神護寺三像とは何か.

By Kuroda Hideo 黒田 日出男. Tokyo: Kadokawa sensho 角川選書, 2012. Pp. 360.

ISBN 10: 4047035092; ISBN 13: 978-4047035096.

Reviewed by Thomas D. Conlan, Princeton University

E-mail tconlan@princeton.edu

doi:10.1017/S1479591416000085

Imagine that a scholar discovered that the Gilbert Stuart portrait of George Washington, which graces the dollar bill, turned out to be actually Alexander Hamilton, or that the iconic image of William Shakespeare was in fact Charles I of England. Implausible as it may seem, this happened in Japan. Twenty years ago, Yonekura Michio discovered that the famous portrait of Minamoto no Yoritomo, the founder of Japan's first warrior government was in fact that of Ashikaga Tadayoshi, the brother of the first shogun of Japan's second warrior government.¹

The history of Yonekura's discovery, its reception, and indeed, how these portraits came to be misunderstood constitutes the core of Kuroda Hideo's monograph. Kuroda Hideo shows how this set of three impressive images does not depict Minamoto Yoritomo, and two lesser-known figures. Instead, they are of the first shogun of the Ashikaga regime, Ashikaga Takauji, his brother Tadayoshi, and the second shogun Ashikaga Yoshiakira. Kuroda also explains how these images, which were created in the fourteenth century, came to be misidentified in the seventeenth century, when they were used to curry support for the reconstruction of Jingoji.

Jingoji, located near Mt. Atago, in northwestern Kyoto, has frequently required repair. As this temple features prominently in the *Tale of the Heike*, its monks used these nearly three-hundred-year-old images to show patrons important figures of Jingoji's past who had appeared in this epic. Nineteenth-century scholars such as Okakura Teishin correctly revealed the mistaken attribution of two images, but continued to assume that the remaining one was that of Minamoto no Yoritomo, and relied on a temple chronicle, the *Jingoji ryakki*, to determine the provenance of all three portraits. This attribution remained unquestioned for decades. In 1942, Tani Shinichi discovered a prayer from Ashikaga Tadayoshi, which had been originally written in 1345, and later copied in 1571. This document reveals that Tadayoshi donated two portraits, of himself and of his brother, to Jingoji.² So strong was the notion that one of these images was Minamoto Yoritomo that Tani did not appreciate the significance of his discovery. Nevertheless, later scholarship by Miyajima Shinichi and Yonekura Michio effectively revealed that these portraits had no connection to Yoritomo or any of the figures described in the *Jingoji ryakki* (pp. 77–80). This allowed Yonekura to turn to the Tadayoshi prayer and link these images to the Ashikaga brothers.

Yonekura's provocative theory generated a boisterous argument – Kuroda himself recounts five historians and art historians writing nine articles attacking the Yonekura argument, and likewise nine articles by six scholars (pp. 86–88) supporting the thesis. Aware that academic debates in small fields can devolve into overly impassioned arguments (p. 56), Kuroda eagerly, and unfortunately, relies on overly emotional arguments or criticisms (p. 91), and unfairly insinuates that a rival scholar used his position to advance a counter argument (p. 81). This is unnecessary, as dispassionate analysis of the evidence reveals that, even after two decades of debate, Yonekura's thesis still stands.

The adage "less is more" should apply to this book, as it is bloated and unwieldy, replete with overly long biographies of individuals, long-winded overviews of institutions, and extended quotations from scholars. Kuroda's book is a testament to the utility of footnotes by omission. Furthermore, of its ten chapters, the prologue and the first two chapters could be condensed and Chapter 8, "Ashikaga Tadayoshi to Musō Soseki — Muchū *mondo shū*," which merely summarizes one text at great length, could be profitably distilled to a few pages.

Kuroda's work is more than merely an attempt to bludgeon countervailing arguments, although he does that; instead he provides important insights into the images themselves. Chapter 3 effectively shows how Jingoji monks relied on these three images to finance a seventeenth-century reconstruction of their temple. Chapters 4 and 5 analyze the materials and size of the images, and show that the silk used and the size of the portraits reveals that they date from the fourteenth century. In Chapter 6, Kuroda confirms that the portraits of Ashikaga Takauji and Tadayoshi were drawn by the same artist, while the third image of Ashikaga Yoshiakira was crafted sometime – years, or perhaps decades – later than the first two. Kuroda's careful analysis of the 1345 prayer by Tadayoshi constitutes the seventh chapter. Here Kuroda reveals that the portraits of Takauji and Tadayoshi were created and displayed during the lifetime of these two brothers, which was unusual, as most portraits tended to be posthumous.

1 Yonekura Michio, *Minamoto Yoritomo zō: Chinmoku no shōzōga* (Heibonsha, 1995).

2 See Kuroda, pp. 11, 47–48 for Tani's discovery and pp. 210–37 for analysis of the document itself.

In Chapter 9, Kuroda suggests that the portraits were not merely images of the two brothers, but concurrently asserted that Tadayoshi was an incarnation of Prince Shōtoku and Takauji was a manifestation of the Hachiman avatar. Kuroda also shows how the creation of these portraits was linked to Uesugi Kiyoko, the mother of both brothers. One missed opportunity is that Jingoji, on the border with the province of Tanba, was not that far from a place called Uesugi, where Uesugi Kiyoko lived, and where, according to lore, Takauji was born. This region was important to the Ashikaga brothers, as it was where Takauji raised the flag of rebellion against Kamakura, and retreated at moments of great need.

Finally, Chapter 10 takes up the question of the third portrait, that of the second shogun Yoshiakira, which has, in comparison to the others, attracted relatively little attention. In what is groundbreaking scholarship, Kuroda presciently reveals that the Yoshiakira portrait was meant to replace the image of Takauji, and would have been displayed in tandem with Tadayoshi's image. This is surprising, because Yoshiakira was known to be an enemy of Tadayoshi, and their period of shared authority proved brief and fleeting, as the outbreak of the Kannō Anomaly (*Kannō no jōran*). Kuroda's assertion that these portraits were meant to be viewed as a pair of images is convincing, but his chronology is slightly off.

According to Kuroda, the image of Yoshiakira was created during a three-month span between the third and seventh months of 1351 (p. 307), but this is implausible for several reasons. Already by that time, Takauji and Tadayoshi had come to blows, and Tadayoshi's supporters had killed Takauji's chief of staff. Likewise, Tadayoshi had already renounced the world, and a portrait of him in court robes would not resonate after he had become a monk. Finally, the third through seventh months of 1351 represent a temporary rapprochement between the Ashikaga, but at this time Takauji and Yoshiakira were actively plotting Tadayoshi's ouster and destruction, and so such visual symbols of unity would not have been favored at that time.

A more compelling chronology for the Yoshiakira portrait would be that it was drawn sometime between the eighth month of 1349 (Jōwa 5), when Yoshiakira was selected to serve as Takauji's heir, and the final rupture in the tenth month of 1350. Although Tadayoshi had initially been removed from governance, by 8.21.1349, he was able to once again exercise authority "as before."³ Symbolizing this cooperation between Tadayoshi and the new Ashikaga heir, Yoshiakira moved into Tadayoshi's old mansion on 10.22.1349.⁴ Politically, then, the idea that Yoshiakira and Tadayoshi would rule together was conceivable from late in the eighth month of 1349 through at least 12.8.1349, when Tadayoshi renounced the world,⁵ although the last possible moment for this cooperation would extend through 10.27.1350 (Kannō 1) when Tadayoshi fled the capital, and took up arms against Yoshiakira and Takauji.⁶

To conclude, Kuroda's book represents both an end and a beginning. The debate about the identity the images depict should be over; the image thought to represent Yoritomo in fact is that of Ashikaga Tadayoshi, a figure worthy of being remembered in his own right, but further research is required regarding these portraits. Equally importantly, the Yonekura findings need to be disseminated more widely. In the English-speaking world, Jeffrey Mass used an accepted image of Yoritomo in his *Yoritomo and the Founding of the First Bakufu* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), and I have long too used the portraits to describe the Ashikaga in my work, but common encyclopedias, popular histories, and of course Wikipedia still identify the image as being that of Yoritomo. In

3 Tōin Kinkata, *Entairyaku*, vol. 3 (Taiyōsha, 1937) 8.14.1349 (Jōwa 5), p. 101, and 8.21.1349 (Jōwa 5), p. 104.

4 *Dainihon shiryō* series 6, vol. 12, 10.2.1349 (Jōwa 5), p. 993, and 10.22.1349 (Jōwa 5), p. 1009.

5 *Entairyaku*, vol. 3, 12.11.1349 (Jōwa 5), p. 123.

6 *Entairyaku*, vol. 3, 10.27.1350 (Kannō 1), p. 360.

order to understand the debates regarding these images, Kuroda's work is invaluable. But if one were to read only a single book on this topic, then select Yonekura Michio's masterful *Minamoto Yoritomo zō: Chinmoku no shōzōga*, republished by Heibonsha in 2006, instead.

The Undiscovered Country: Text, Translation, and Modernity in the Work of Yanagita Kunio.

By Melek Ortabasi. Harvard University Asia Center, 2014. Pp. xiii + 329. ISBN 10: 0674492005; ISBN 13: 978-0674492004.

Reviewed by Kenji Sato, The University of Tokyo

E-mail satoken@l.u-tokyo.ac.jp

doi:10.1017/S1479591416000140

This work, based on many years' research, is a very exciting introduction to the new interpretations of Yanagita Kunio that have emerged on the basis of the new *Yanagita Kunio Zenshū* 柳田国男全集, an expanded collection of Yanagita's work organized chronologically. The three words in the subtitle of the book, "text," "translation" and "modernity," skillfully represent the points crystallized in Yanagita's own methods of investigation. As a specialist in the work of this great scholar myself, I feel that the main title is difficult to translate into appropriate Japanese, especially since the interpretation of the word "country" is debatable. "Sokoku 祖国," meaning motherland, is obviously inadequate, whereas "Kokudo 国土," concerning a nation state and "Kyōdo 郷土," connoting the region of a person's birth, would both present a difficult choice to the translator. For the present, "Kuni 国" is perhaps acceptable, even though this term still sounds like a national organization in modernizing Japan rather than indigenous living space in a broader sense.

Why did Ortabasi highlight the texts rather than the author? For the reason that within the sphere of human communication, the movement or the force mediated by words is more significant than the static position of ideas or the contents of thought in one's mind. She writes, "I argue that the continuing fascination surrounding Yanagita's work is rooted precisely in the individual texts: in other words, in the way they express their ideas, rather than in the ideas themselves" (p. 2). Hence, she claims that "a rigorous focus on the materiality of his texts" is required. Yanagita's fertile and multiphasic texts themselves yield insightful perspectives. They are relevant to a wider range of disciplinary and methodological issues than has previously been acknowledged. In other words, Yanagita's heterogeneous texts "highlight the radical potential of translation as a method of resistance to the homogenizing national narrative of Japan's early and mid-twentieth century" (*ibid.*).

The core of the originality of this book is that Ortabasi comprehends Yanagita Kunio as a brilliant "translator," rather than following previous appraisals of him as a cultural nationalist or a political modernist, a conspiring colonialist, or a converted poet.

Chapter 1 discusses the possibilities of modern literature by focusing on the famous work *Tōno Monogatari* 遠野物語 (Tales of Tōno). Ortabasi examines Yanagita's theoretical idea of "truth" (*jijitsu* 事実) in the texts of small magazines of this period, and discusses the critical difference between Yanagita's text and the "naturalism (*shizenshugi* 自然主義)" that was dominant in the contemporary "I novel (*shishōsetsu* 私小説)." The Tales of Tōno is rediscovered as an original creation of revised modern narratives. Her discussion of the phrase "*Hito no na wa wasuretaedo* 人の名は忘れたれど ([I] have forgotten the person's name)" involves the insightful suggestion of "the idea of shared selfhood" in the texts of Yanagita's narration, which is clearly "an alternative" modernity against the individual private self being produced by the dominant literary stream in those days.

Chapter 2 examines concepts of travel and landscape in modern Japan. Travelling is recognized as reading local scenery as texts, making it possible for us to consider the travelogue to be popular literature. While modern travellers graduated from the conventional formula of "*bibun* 美文" and began