Introduction: Russian and Japanese Interpretations of Japanese Culture

James C. BAXTER
International Research Center for Japanese Studies

The Moscow symposium on interpretations of Japanese culture. This book offers a sampling of the current research of a number of leading Russian researchers on Japan, plus several essays by members of the faculty of the International Research Center for Japanese Studies, originally presented at a symposium in Moscow in 2007. The theme of the event was broad, "Interpretations of Japanese Culture: Views from Russia and Japan," and the twenty-nine essays in the following pages reflect the authors' diverse disciplinary orientations. The contributions by Russian researchers cannot comprehend the whole of the field of Japanese studies in their country—it was impossible for the organizers of the conference to invite all of Russia's Japan specialists—but it is our hope that these essays come close to being representative. We have arranged the contents of this volume under the headings Terms of Discourse and Genres of Comparative Research, Literary Studies, Historical Studies, Social Thought, International Relations, Art History and Cultural Property Preservation, and Games in Cultural Studies. In this introductory chapter, I will say a few words about each of the essays. Before I turn to do that, however, I briefly survey the three-century history of Russian studies of Japan, to provide a sense of the impressive background against which our 2007 event took place.

Early Russian studies of Japan.[1] Russian studies of Japan and Japanese language go back a long way. Shortly after Peter the Great built the new city of St. Petersburg in 1703, teaching of Japanese was begun there. The instructors were accidental immigrants, Japanese fishermen who had lost their way, ended up on Russian shores, and eventually been escorted to the capital. A quarter-century after the first Japanese arrived, in 1729, another Japanese mariner was shipwrecked on Russian soil, in Kamchatka. That was Gonza, who later converted to Christianity and took the name Demyan Pomortsev. Conveyed to St. Petersburg in 1733 and presented at court, he continued his work there with support from the government. A gifted linguist, Gonza compiled a Russian-Japanese dictionary, a Japanese grammar, and a Japanese-Russian phrase book. From the time of Peter the Great, Russian officials collected information about Japan with the aim of opening trade relations, and studies of language went on under state sponsorship. In 1754, Irkutsk became the center of studies of Japanese in Russia, and it would hold that distinction until 1816. The early efforts to promote Japanese language acquisition and gathering of information about Japan cannot be described as academic, but they were the precursors of systematic study of Japan, and they took place earlier than state-supported Japanese studies in any other Western nation. They also set the basic pattern for Russian *Japanologie*,

scholarship grounded on painstaking philological research. The pattern remains powerfully influential today.

Academic study of Japan in Russia can be dated to 1870, when Japanese language instruction was introduced at St. Petersburg University. The first chair in Japanese philology was established at the same university in 1898, and a year later, the Oriental Institute (forerunner of the Far Eastern University) was opened in Vladivostok to offer practical training in oriental languages and studies.

It was only at the beginning of the twentieth century that a Russian studied in Japan for an extended period, obtained a thorough training in language and literature, and then returned to teach in his native land. Serge Elisséeff (1889–1975), scion of a wealthy St. Petersburg merchant family, has aptly been called (by Edwin O. Reischauer) "the first fully trained Occidental scholar in the field of Japanese studies—in other words, the first professional 'Japanologist' in the West." After a little more than a year at Berlin University, where he made contact with several famous Japanese scholars, he was admitted as a regular student at Tokyo Imperial University in 1908. Applying himself with great industry to master the language, he concentrated in Japanese literature and graduated in 1912 with an outstanding record. He remained in Japan two years longer, doing graduate study, before returning home to become a doctoral candidate at St. Petersburg University. By 1916 he had passed his doctoral examinations and been appointed as an instructor (*Privat-Dozent*) at the university and begun teaching, using materials and passing along knowledge he had acquired in Japan. After the Revolution of 1917, his family fortune was lost, and with the change of government, he was dismissed from a part-time post as official interpreter for the Foreign Ministry. Although he was promoted to assistant professor in 1920, Elisséeff had begun to suffer much difficulty under the new Soviet regime, and at the end of that year he and his family went into exile. He was to continue his productive career and make great contributions to the field of Japanese studies for another half century, but in France and the United States, not his native Russia.

Soviet studies of Japan.[2] With Elisséeff no longer on the scene, three other brilliant scholars of Japanese came to prominence, men who would exercise leadership as teachers and researchers until their deaths. There were other outstanding Russian scholars working on Japan during their time, of course, but Nikolai I. Konrad (1891–1970), Nikolai A. Nevsky (1892–1937), and Yevgeny D. Polivanov (1891–1938) merit special mention. The lives of the latter two were cut short by the secret police, who arrested and executed them during one of Stalin's repressions. Konrad survived to become the most important Japanologist in the Soviet Union, although he, too, was arrested in 1938 and spent three years in prison before being released. He has been credited with devising the classic Russian approach to Japanese studies, described as "a science of texts" by Elena Diakonova, Irina Lebebeva, and Alexander Mesheryakov, and he was the editor of the standard Japanese-Russian dictionary, published after World War II. The Japan-Korea Office of the Institute of Oriental

Studies in Leningrad, headed by Konrad, became the center of Japanese studies in the U.S.S.R. in the 1930s. Research on language and literature, particularly premodern literature, kept the momentum that had been achieved before the Revolution, and many basic works of literature were translated by that institute's Japanologists, among them *Ise monogatari*, *Hōjōki*, *Kojiki*, *Makura no sōshi*, and *Heike monogatari*. In addition, work on ethnography and religion was undertaken by some staff members, and Konrad himself wrote about Japanese history. The Soviet state also required Institute scholars to produce studies of contemporary history, politics, and ideology.

Nevsky, a friend of Konrad's since their student days at St. Petersburg University, had gone to Japan to study before the Revolution, in 1915. He stayed for a decade and a half. Early on he was introduced to Yanagita Kunio, Origuchi Shinobu, and Kindaichi Kyōsuke and their circle and became close to them. Thereafter much of his research concentrated on folklore and linguistics. In 1925 he began his pathbreaking study of the Tangut language, working on the manuscripts that were (and still are) in the collection of the Institute of Oriental Studies in Leningrad. In 1929, Nevsky returned to Russia, and for the rest of his life taught at Leningrad University and worked also at the Institute of Oriental Studies. He collaborated closely with Konrad on the great Japanese-Russian dictionary.

Polivanov won a reputation as a genius linguist while still a student at St. Petersburg University. He studied not only Japanese, but also Chinese, Korean, Tibetan, Uzbek, and Dungan, and made highly regarded contributions to the field of theoretical linguistics. Acquaintances said he knew some forty languages or dialects. Among his accomplishments was fabrication of the system for transliterating Japanese into Cyrillic that was officially adopted in the U.S.S.R. and is even today considered by linguists (such as Alexander Vovin) to be the best cyrillicization system.

Another group of Soviet Japan specialists was formed in Moscow. By the 1930s, most of them worked at the Institute of the World Economy and World Politics, where their research focused primarily—indeed, after 1956, exclusively—on current economic, political, and social issues.

World War II broke out soon after the political repressions had swept up many Russian scholars of Japanese studies, and caused even greater disruption. Those who were young and fit enough to serve were mobilized into the army, and some of them did not return from the war. Others evacuated Leningrad and Moscow.

After the war, organizations for Japanese studies were restructured. The Institute of Oriental Studies was divided into Moscow and Leningrad units, and most of its staff, including Konrad, transferred to Moscow. Many social scientists who specialized on Japan managed to produce impressive studies of subjects such as state finance, *zaibatsu*, and small and medium enterprise, but they were under considerable ideological pressure, and this very well may have limited their analysis. For example, Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy "made it difficult to evaluate objectively the Meiji government's role in the industrial and constitutional development of Japan," as Yulia Mikhailova has noted in a deliberate understatement. Similarly, given that

Marxism-Leninism held fast to its prediction of the inevitable collapse of capitalism, it was practically impossible for Soviet Japan scholars to evaluate the dynamics of the modern Japanese economy and the interaction between market forces and the government. Instead they were constrained to focus only on negative features, or dysfunctional aspects, of modern Japan.

Scholars of literature and others in the humanities were also restricted by Soviet ideology, but the pressure on them was not as great as that on researchers treating contemporary problems. Konrad's contributions were recognized by his appointment to full membership in the Academy of Sciences in 1958. Nevsky was rehabilitated, in large measure through the efforts of Konrad, who saw that his work on Tangut was collected and published. In 1962, Nevsky received the posthumous honor of the Lenin Prize, the highest Soviet award for scholarly achievement. Polivanov, too, had his reputation restored in the post-Stalin era, and was officially rehabilitated in 1963.

Evgenia M. Pinous (1914–84), a student of Konrad and Nevsky who later became a professor at Leningrad State University, won recognition for her translations of Ihara Saikaku and Tokutomi Roka and her partial translation of *Kojiki*. Vera N. Markova (1907–95), another Japanologist trained by Konrad and Nevsky, spent most of her career in Moscow, and in the 1950s published translations of Chikamatsu Monzaemon, Saigyō, Bashō, Ishikawa Takuboku, and various popular old tales; in 1975, her rendering of Sei Shōnagon's *Makura no sōshi* appeared. Vladislav N. Goregliad (1931–2002) established himself as a scholar of distinction with an annotated translation of Yoshida Kenkō's *Tsurezuregusa* in 1970. He later published studies of medieval diaries and *zuihitsu*, a biography of Ki no Tsurayuki, and translations of *Kagerō nikki* and *Hōgen monogatari*, among other works. Chair of the department of Japanese language at Leningrad State University and also head of the Department of Far Eastern Studies at the Institute of Oriental Studies in Leningrad, Goregliad received the Yamagata Bantō Prize in 1986 and the Order of the Rising Sun, fourth class, in 1997. Anna E. Gluskina (1904–94) published a translation of the *Man'yōshū*, with commentaries, in 1971–72, a monumental work. (Gluskina's renderings of the poems have not been universally well received, but then critics have questioned translations, especially translations of poetry, from time immemorial. Her work was highly evaluated by the Japanese government, which honored her with the Order of the Blessed Treasure, fourth class, in 1990.)

In terms of the output of books and articles, numbers of students completing graduate programs, and numbers of employed specialists, the 1970s and 1980s were the high-water mark for Japanese studies in Russia. General interest in Japan was high, stimulated by news of the success of the Japanese economy, but in the purely intellectual sphere, there was strong demand by the Russian reading public for translations of Japanese poetry, novels, and plays.

Recent Russian studies of Japan.[3] Changes in Russian society and the Russian economy since the dissolution of the U.S.S.R. have had great impact on Japanese

studies. Alexei Zagorsky of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations in Moscow described those changes in starkly negative terms in 1998:

> Like any other social or humanistic field, Japanese studies in Russia is currently experiencing heavy financial problems due to the general economic situation, the changing patterns of resource allocation and the fiscal problems in the government. The Moscow research institutes remain highly dependent on the unstable and scarce financial allocations from the federal budget to the Russian Academy of Sciences. The absence of foundations providing grants for research . . . and the lack of incentives for the business community to support such activities confines the possible sources of extra income to foreign grants and projects initiated from abroad. . . . The constrained financial situation produces several destructive trends. First, the average official salaries in academic institutes are close to the lowest levels nationally. . . . In the 1990s all academic institutes have experienced a severe personnel drain. . . . Second, the financial constraints have radically reduced the number of Japanese books and periodicals available at libraries as well as the chances to arrange research in Japan.

Over a decade has passed since Zagorsky wrote those words. The leadership of the Russian government has changed, the Russian economy has gone through an energy-based expansion and then contracted again, and the Russian state, like other nations around the globe, has had to face the threat of terrorism and actual terrorist activity. Today, after all this, things are still tough for educational and research institutions and individual scholars. Possibly in all fields of the humanities, certainly in the field of Japanese studies, researchers have continued to suffer from inadequate funding. Despite severe adverse conditions, however, many Russian specialists on Japan have gone on with their work, in many instances with extraordinary dedication.

One area of great productivity in post-Soviet Japanese studies is translations of premodern literature. In 1991–93 T. L. Sokolova-Delyusina's four-volume translation of *Genji monogatari* was published, with a supplement and an introductory article in a fifth volume. Liudmila Ermakova and Alexander Mesheryakov collaborated to complete, with two additional volumes that came out in 1994, E. Pinous' translation of *Kojiki*. Ermakova and Mesheryakov also worked together to translate and annotate *Nihon shoki* (1997). On his own, Mesheryakov produced translations of *Murasaki Shikibu nikki* (1995) and the *setsuwa* collection *Nihon ryōiki* (1996). Alexander Kabanov's translations of and commentaries on Gozan *bungaku* appeared in 1998. Elena Diakonova's translation of *Ōkagami*, with commentaries, was published in 2000. A two-volume study of Shinto (2002) contains a full translation of *Kogo shūi* by Ekaterina Simonova-Gudzenko and partial translations from *Sendai kuji hongi* (or *Kujiki*, also by Simonova-Gudzenko), *Shinsen shōjiroku* (by M. V. Grachev), *Shozan engi* (by A. Gorbylev), and *Yamatohime no mikoto seiki* (by Liudmila Ermakova). Maria Toropygina's translation and study of *Torikaebaya monogatari* was published

in 2003. In the field of modern literature, a Library of Twentieth-Century Japanese Literature (*Biblioteka klassicheskoy Yaponskoy literatury XX veka*), edited by Elena Diakonova, is in progress; the first two of the planned twenty volumes present works of Mori Ōgai (2002) and Kawabata Yasunari (2002). Alexander Dolin's four-volume study of modern Japanese poetry was published just before our Moscow symposium.

A very positive development just before the turn of the century was the formation of the Russian Association of Japanologists, which held its first conference in 1999. That organization has held an annual meeting every year since then, giving Japan scholars in all specializations (not only literature and premodern history, which I reported briefly on in the preceding paragraph) an opportunity to present their latest work and to strengthen their connections with each other. We were fortunate to have the cooperation of this association in organizing our Moscow event.

Terms of discourse and genres of comparative research. With this brief overview of the history of Japanese language study and Japanology in Russia, let us turn to the task of introducing the contents of this volume. The first two essays in this collection, by Alexander Mesheryakov and Suzuki Sadami, invite us to rethink some terms of discourse and genres of comparative research that had widespread currency in the twentieth century, particularly the latter half of that century.

Professor Mesheryakov offers a critique of the view of history propounded by twentieth-century leaders in the field of folklore studies. In their 1954 book *Nihonjin*, Yanagita Kunio and several of his followers disparaged the methodology of academic historians of Japan. Historical scholarship based on written records was biased toward the ruling class and not representative of the values of the "common people," they argued, and such work could not be used for construction of Japanese self-identity. By maintaining that only folklore studies has the potential to reveal the "true Japanese" and to foster "true patriotism," Yanagita and his collaborators in effect were attempting the "destruction of history" (*rekishi hakai*), Mesheryakov says—that is, the folklorists rejected history as it was practiced by professional historians. In the immediate postwar period, Mesheryakov observes, folklore studies did not enjoy great popularity, but later, especially after the appearance of *Nihonjin*, the approach and methods of the Yanagita school gained broad support. One genre of writing that reflected the strong influence of the folklorists was Nihonjinron, which found an increasingly receptive audience from the 1970s. In the wake of the collapse of "utopian" or "totalitarian" regimes (and associated modes of thinking) in Japan, Germany, and the Soviet Union, the Yanagita school's proposed solution to the problem of identity appealed to many Japanese. The implication of Mesheryakov's analysis is that the folklorists and Nihonjinron theorists have gone too far in rejecting the results of historical studies based primarily on written records, and notions of Japanese identity that ignore solid historical evidence cannot be regarded as well founded.

In his essay "Kokusai kyōdō kenkyū, mittsu no teian: Gainen oyobi gainen henseishi kenkyū o chūshin ni" 国際共同研究、三つの提案―概念および概念編成史研究を中心に― (Three High-Priority Tasks for International Joint Research: Concepts and the History of Their Formulation), Professor Suzuki advances a vigorous argument for the urgency of revising received notions in three areas. One is scholarship on the history of the formulation of concepts of learning and the arts in East Asian modernity. Here he calls for genuine interdisciplinary research that reexamines the creation of academic institutions and disciplines in East Asia, breaks free of the Eurocentrism that dominated discourse about learning through the twentieth century, and clears a path for understanding of a conceptual system distinctive to East Asia. To achieve this, he remarks, will require scholars in different East Asian nations to work together, cooperating across fields of specialization and correlating results from their separate research endeavors. Another area that calls out for rethinking is cultural history in the region that was once encompassed within the Japanese empire. For a long time, there were hardly any studies of cultural life in Manchuria, the region of Northeast China that was under Japanese military, political, and cultural influence for several decades in the early twentieth century (the region that became, from 1932 to 1945, the client state of Manchukuo). Recently, however, scholarship has made significant progress, in part because of joint research projects Suzuki and his Nichibunken colleague Liu Jianhui have organized. Suzuki challenges us to consider this work as we reevaluate trends in Japanese thought and culture throughout the first half of the twentieth century, and the influence that thought and culture had on other East Asian nations in the post-World War II era. The third area that Suzuki is concerned with is the realm of our views of life itself (*seimeikan*). It should now be possible, he believes, through study that integrates recent findings in the natural sciences with insights from the humanities, to construct a new, twenty-first century standard (or understanding of the fundamental principle) of life (*seimei hon'i*).

Literary studies. Both Japan and Russia have grand literary traditions, and it is no surprise that Japanese literature has been of interest to Russians and Russian literature of interest to Japanese. The next six chapters of this book, all by Russian authors, give us an inkling of the kind of issues Japan scholars in Russia are currently working on. Three of these essays deal with premodern topics, and three with modern topics.

In "Nihon kodai bungaku to 'sakusha' no mondai" 日本古代文学と「作者」の問題, Liudmila Ermakova, trained in the philological tradition of Russian study of Japanese and also conversant with current Western and Japanese literary theory, considers the problem of authorship of *Kojiki* from the perspectives of narratology and recent thinking about the multivalence of texts and authorial diversity or pluralism. The content (the "facts") of *Kojiki*, like that of a tale or a narrative poem, has been refracted through the prism of the narrator's vision. If we think of *Kojiki* in terms of

its being a communicative act, there is always, in any act of communication, a sender and a receiver. Current narratological theory has proposed a number of methods by which to classify multiple authors' voices operating on different levels within a single text. Drawing on that theory, Ermakova suggests several concepts that can be productively applied to *Kojiki*, to reach a better understanding of the characteristics and the abilities of the creators of that text. She also comments on early poets—on "the 'first creators' of Japanese verse" (*waka no "saisho no sōsakusha"*) or "the 'progenitors of verse' in the Japanese myths" (*shinwa jō no "uta no sosen"*).

Through an analysis of different translations of Aesop's fables, Maria Toropygina casts new light on similarities and differences between Japan and Russia in the early modern period. Her innovative excursion into reception history shows how this classic of Western literature was disseminated in the two countries. Aesop's tales were translated in 1593 in Japan and in 1607 in Russia; they were the first literary texts to be introduced at almost the same time in the two countries. *ESOPONO FABVLAS*, based on a Latin translation published in Germany in 1477, was printed in a romaji edition by the Jesuit Mission Press in 1593 and contained seventy tales. Another Japanese translation based on the same Latin version, *Isopo monogatari*, appeared in a movable type edition in 1639, and an illustrated edition in 1659. These early Japanese translations were published, and never circulated in manuscript form. By contrast, until the beginning of the eighteenth century, Russian translations existed only as manuscripts. The first Russian translation, by Theodore Gozvinsky, was based on a Greek version that had been published in Milan just two years after the Latin edition used by the Jesuits in Japan. Gozvinsky's translation includes a biography of Aesop and 144 fables. Two more seventeenth-century Russian translations were done, one in 1674 from a German version, the other in 1675 from a Polish version. The latter included 260 of Aesop's fables. Toropygina observes that *ESOPONO FABVLAS* seems not to have been widely influential in Japan, and speculates that one reason may have been that the translation used colloquial language which was not yet accepted in Japanese literature. The same factor seems to have affected reception in Russia of the 1675 Aesop translated by Kashinsky. Comparing the three most widely read translations (*Isopo monogatari*, Gozvinsky [1607], and Vinius), Toropygina reveals that the translators had different attitudes toward the original—the Japanese translation is very selective, while the Russian versions have only short omissions.

Viktor Rybin entreats us to reevaluate *kyōka*, the comic verse or satiric poems that have often been characterized—as in *Kōjien*, for example—as vulgar or philistine (*hizoku*). Also concentrating on premodern literature, in his essay "Kyōka o bengo shite" 狂歌を弁護して (In Defense of Kyōka), Rybin emphasizes the parodic nature of *kyōka* and how many of these verses have used humor not only to delight but also to instruct. This kind of poetry was written in earlier eras of Japanese history, but they gained popularity with publication of such collections as *Ehon mushi no erami* 画本虫撰 (1788) and *Momo chidori kyōka awase* 百千鳥狂歌合はせ (1790), for which Kitagawa Utamaro provided illustrations. Rybin explicated several *kyōka* that

treat insects and birds, showing that these poems can be read as metaphors for human relationships, especially romantic love, and arguing that they are technically very accomplished and not as unrefined as the *gesaku* writing that was also popular at the same time as these *kyōka* were being written. What is important is to identify and appreciate the parodic elements in this genre. If we can appreciate those, we can grasp how early modern notions of what was good poetry shifted with passing time.

Elena Diakonova turns our attention from premodern to modern literature with her elucidation of the poetic theory of Masaoka Shiki (1867–1902). In "The 'Human' and the 'Celestial and Earthly' in Masaoka Shiki's Theory of Haiku," Diakonova shows how Shiki aimed to revive tanka and haiku, genres that he regarded as having become commonplace (*tsukinami*) and dull. The main theme of his poetics, articulated in some eighty treatises composed between 1893 and 1902, is elaboration of the category of *bi* (beauty) and of criteria to evaluate it. In his view, *bi* was relative, not absolute, and he discussed it in terms of several bipolar oppositions, for example, positive/negative, objective/subjective, ideal/empirical, simple/complex, and the opposition on which Diakonova places the greatest emphasis, natural/human, or "celestial and earthly" (*tenchiteki*, in Shiki's terminology) and human (*jinjiteki*). Theme (*dai* or *daimoku*) was another of Shiki's primary concerns, and Diakonova touches on his treatment of that, as well. Her essay guides us toward greater understanding of some of the versification techniques that Shiki advocated and the canonical themes that he identified, and consequently toward a richer comprehension of tanka and haiku.

Alexander Dolin's chapter in this volume is also about Japanese poetry, in his case, tanka in the twentieth century. After the Meiji Restoration, in a search for creative national identity, pioneers of new tanka schools such as Yosano Tekkan, Masaoka Shiki, and Itō Sachio opposed the overwhelming flow of Western culture and devoted themselves to revitalizing traditional poetics. They were working against the severe criticism of *shintaishi* and *kindaishi* poets, who charged that traditional tanka and haiku, bound by rigid conservatism, no longer could offer anything fresh and interesting. Tekkan sought to make tanka relevant to his own day, infusing his verse with civil feelings, military vigor, and masculine passion. Shiki, in Dolin's judgment, placed himself mostly within the mainstream of tradition; for Shiki, renovation and reformation of classic genres was possible only on a conventional basis. His concept of *shasei* ("copying life") had a dramatic impact on both tanka and haiku in the twentieth century. Followers of Shiki who published in the journal *Araragi* eventually gained the dominant position in the world of tanka and followed this *shasei* trend for several decades more. Not everyone trod in Shiki's footsteps, however. Yoshii Isamu and others developed a refined trend of romantic and "naturalist" poetry focused on human sentiment. Symbolists such as Kitahara Hakushu incorporated an eloquent exoticism into their tanka. Sasaki Nobutsuna and others fused a realistic worldview with expressionist techniques. Ishikawa Takuboku put forward what he called "the Poetry of Life," and he had the talent to elevate the most prosaic topics to the level of lyrical revelation. A postwar tanka revival contributed to the formation of

a new Japanese national identity, Dolin says. He concludes by observing that Tawara Machi's recent collection became the biggest poetic bestseller of the twentieth century, but it evidences the decline of classic tanka and the rise of popular mass tanka.

Kim Reho introduces a fascinating episode in the history of Russo-Japanese literary exchange in his essay "Futabatei Shimei saigo no intabyū (1909-nen): Peteruburugu Roshia chishikijin ga mita Futabatei Shimei no hito to bungaku" 二葉亭四迷　最後のインタビュー　（1909年）：ペテルブルグ　ロシア知識人が見た二葉亭四迷の人と文学 (Futabatei Shimei's Last Interview [1909]: Futabatei Shimei and His Works in the Eyes of the St. Petersburg Intelligentsia). Professor Kim discovered a newspaper report on this interview in the Tolstoy museum in Moscow, in one of the scrapbooks in which Sophia Andreevna Tolstoy kept clippings of articles about her novelist husband Lev. Interviewed in the Russian capital city, to which he had been dispatched by the *Asahi shinbun* as a special correspondent, the Japanese scholar and translator of Russian literature commented on Tolstoy's novella *Kreutzer Sonata*. Futabatei expressed a critical opinion of the view of marriage propounded in the novella (Tolstoy advocated abstinence except for the purpose of procreation, and condemned any idealizing of romantic love, a view that had sparked widespread controversy from the time of publication in 1889). Published in the 1 January 1909 edition of the St. Petersburg newspaper *Slovo* (Слово), the article containing the interview described Futabatei admiringly, commenting on his scholarly demeanor, his refined Russian language, and his deep familiarity with Russian literature. Plainly Futabatei's personal style was one that Russians could relate to. The *Slovo* piece by A. Tyrkova (А.Тыркова) is significant precisely because it is Futabatei's last interview; four months later, he died.

Historical studies. The next thirteen essays in these pages treat historical matters. Four deal with ancient Japan. Actually, the first of these, by Inoue Shōichi, asks provocatively whether there really was such a thing as an "ancient age" (*kodai*) in Japan, and the next three take up topics that their Russian authors—Vladimir Kozhevnikov, Evgeniya Saharova, and Alexey Bachurin—confidently situate in ancient times. Following those chapters is one on a medieval and early modern theme (by Markus Rüttermann) and three on early modern history (by Karine Marandjian, Vadim Klimov, and Svetlana Korneeva). My own essay and that by Hosokawa Shūhei are on the Meiji period, and Yuri Pestushko, Nikolay Ovsyannikov, and Matsuda Toshihiko explore twentieth-century subject matter.

Professor Inoue's presentation in Moscow, "Nihon ni kodai wa atta no ka" 日本に古代はあったのか (Was there an Era of Antiquity in Japan?), later became the basis for a book with the same title (Tokyo: Kadokawa Gakugei Shuppan, 2008). In the version in this volume, he begins with an anecdote, recalling that some years ago he introduced his book about Hōryūji (*Hōryūji e no seishinshi* 法隆寺への精神史, Tokyo: Kōbundō, 1994) to an English architect, explaining that it was about Japanese architecture of the late seventh and early eighth centuries—that is, about ancient Japan.

To his surprise, the Englishman responded by questioning the characterization of the seventh and eighth centuries as antiquity, arguing that instead those centuries should be regarded as medieval times. In the West, Inoue realized, this rings true; antiquity is typically taken as ending and medieval times as beginning in the fifth century. Inoue does not remark on it, but it was standard in Russian accounts of Japanese history in the Soviet era to treat the historical process as a succession of primitive, feudal, and capitalist ways of production. As Karine Marandjian has observed, this periodization scheme was exemplified as recently as 1988, in a textbook entitled *History of Japan* by Yu. D. Kuznetsov, who labeled the seventh century through the mid-nineteenth century as feudal. Yet it has been conventional in Japan to regard the ancient period as lasting through the late twelfth century, that is, until the beginning of the Kamakura era. The rest of Inoue's chapter is a broad-ranging rumination on how we periodize phases in the development of human society, comparing several societies at various times over a very long span of years. With a characteristically light touch, he calls into question the criteria by which historians have made distinctions between the ancient and the medieval, criteria that on second thought may not be appropriate for comparing one society to another.

Vladimir Kozhevnikov ponders several questions about Shōtoku Taishi, who, he points out, has hardly been studied by Russian Japan specialists. In "Shōtoku Taishi no nazo" 聖徳太子の謎 (The Enigma of Shōtoku Taishi), Kozhevnikov—who, by the way, does not doubt that the time his subject lived should be labeled antiquity, *kodai*—remarks that although Shōtoku Taishi is universally recognized as one of the great heroes of state-formation in Japan, most people have only a hazy image of him. Few can do more than list a couple of the things credited to him by school textbooks, such as the Seventeen-Article Constitution (604), the adoption of the system of court ranks (603), and the dispatch of missions to Sui China (600). Referring to scholarship by Nakanishi Susumu, Tsuda Sōkichi, and others, but mostly relying on a rereading of *Nihon shoki*, Kozhevnikov reconsiders the prince's historical significance by considering theories about six "enigmas": (1) his birthplace and the name (Umayado no ōji) by which he was known in his lifetime, (2) actual authorship of the so-called Seventeen-Article Constitution and the system of court ranks, (3) the role Shōtoku Taishi played in sending emissaries to Sui, and when exactly they were sent (*Nihon shoki* says 607, Chinese sources say 600), (4) actual authorship of three important commentaries on Buddhist sutras that have traditionally been attributed to Shōtoku Taishi, and the role the prince played in construction of Hōryūji, (5) exactly when Shōtoku Taishi died, and why *Nihon shoki* says nothing about the cause of his death, and (6) how Shōtoku Taishi came to be regarded as a saint (*seija*) or sanctified person (*seikasha*).

Antiquity as it is represented in recorded histories, in this case *Kojiki* and *Nihon shoki*, is the focus of Evgeniya Saharova's research. In her essay here, she presents an analysis of state formation and Japanese elite society outside the capital region in the late seventh and early eighth centuries. She notes that until the seventeenth century,

Kojiki was unused and almost unknown by literate Japanese, while *Nihon shoki* was often cited. Possibly the reason for this is that *Kojiki* and *Nihon shoki* are based on different conceptions of what politics should be. Inspired in part by and drawing on the work of the historian Mizoguchi Mutsuko, Saharova looks at genealogies mentioned in *Kojiki* and *Nihon shoki*, paying particular attention to relations between the center and the periphery (i.e., lineages resident in the capital and lineages resident in other regions of Japan). Using the terminology of classification found in *Shinsen shōjiroku* (compiled in 815), Saharova remarks on a significant difference between the two early histories: more than eighty percent of the 201 lineages mentioned in *Kojiki* are offshoots of the imperial family (*kōbetsu*), as compared with slightly over half of the 93 lineages mentioned in *Nihon shoki*, in which forty-seven percent of the mentioned lineages are putatively descended from deities other than Amaterasu Ōmikami (they are *shinbetsu*). Saharova hopes in future work to be able to account for the difference, while continuing to focus on the position and role of elite lineages in the society outside the capital.

Alexey Bachurin's title, "Unusual Phenomena, Divination, and *Monoimi* in the Heian Period," announces directly what he is concerned with. As he explains, *monoimi* was an avoidance taboo that prescribed against leaving one's house or inviting guests to the house; it was proclaimed by an official diviner (*on'yōji* or *onmyōji*) following a divination conducted after an unusual phenomenon or "strange happening" (*ayashiki koto*) occurred. What Bachurin wishes to do is to contextualize *monoimi*, to analyze it as a part of a wider complex that included registration of "strange happenings" and divination, and to trace the links among components of the complex. In the early eighth century, unfavorable "strange happenings" were often interpreted as results of a kami's anger (*tatari*). Divination was seen as the means to identify which kami was responsible for that *tatari*, which kami should be propitiated with offerings, and where pacification and purification rites should be performed. In the late eighth century, strange happenings were understood to be signs of future disasters; later even neutral but unusual events came to be interpreted as the first signs of *tatari*. From the ninth century *onryō* and other spirits were included among the supernatural beings that could cause strange happenings, and in the early tenth century, *monoimi* was taken into the complex. The reason for *monoimi* was fear of *tatari*, which was understood as capable of entering a house and causing diseases and disasters. *On'yōji* were credited with ability to determine the days when a *tatari* was most dangerous for members of a family or officials working in the governmental office where the strange occurrence took place.

Markus Rüttermann delves into the exquisitely complicated world of etiquette in premodern Japan. He introduces several texts that were compiled as guides to the writing of letters to be exchanged with correspondents of the opposite sex. The oldest of those, *Ensho bunrei* 艶書文例 (Sample Phrases for Charming Letters), dates from the early twelfth century, when it appeared as the appendix to a collection of verses composed for a poetry competition hosted by the retired emperor Horikawa-in. The

"Sample Phrases" comprise both rules for letter writing and a number of model letters. Handwritten manuscripts containing the same examples or variants of those appeared in subsequent centuries, some of them also titled "Samples," and between 1651 and 1698, a printed version called *Shikakenroshū* 詞花懸露集 (Compilation of Words, Blossoms, and Dew [Drops]) was published in several editions. Rüttermann cites the recent work of Ogawa Takeo in pointing out that writings called "Samples" (together with the rules) after the late fourteenth century are thought to be edited or abridged versions of Nijō Yoshimoto's 二条良基 (1320–1388) *Omoi no tsuyu* 思露 (Dew [Drops] of [Sentimental] Thoughts [= Love]), written in 1385. In the Edo period the edition of love letter collections such as these was regarded as belonging to the "literary tradition," incorporating, as they did, verses from *utaawase* (poetry competitions) as well as prose texts inspired by the poems. It is likely, Rüttermann believes, that right from the beginning prose texts were produced for common use, with the intention that they be taken as models for real letters. He illustrates the verbal techniques taught by these "Samples" and explains the customs of courting for which they were designed, showing how men and women in medieval and early modern Japan were trained to appeal to one another, to string another person along, to express or hide their moods and decisions, and to make declarations.

Focusing on the intellectual history of early modern Japan, Karine Marandjian discusses Itō Jinsai's (1627–1705) concept of learning. One of the leading exponents of Confucian thought and a founder, along with Ogyū Sorai, of the "Ancient Learning" school, Jinsai elaborated, in his treatise *Dōjimon* (Boy's Questions), a view of education that had much in common with the view of Zhu Xi (whose Neo-Confucianism Jinsai generally opposed). *Dōjimon* is presented in the form of a dialogue between master and students, and one of its basic themes is that individual self-perfection is attainable by means of learning. Several terms are employed to render the idea of learning—*gakumon*, *oshie*, and *gaku* among them. All these terms can be applied to both individual knowledge and the totality of Confucian teaching. For individuals, learning produces education or erudition, and in the totality of Confucian teaching, learning yields a Confucian worldview. Depending on context, Marandjian tells us, the same term can be used in either sense, even within the same paragraph. Her chapter here helps us to disentangle some of the semantic ambiguities of Jinsai's treatment, with reference to the familiar notion of an inner-outer (*uchi-soto*) dichotomy. In her conclusion she reminds us that in an era when opportunity in the political sphere was restricted, "there was only one realm of application where 'self-realization' could be attained—and that was the educational sphere."

American and Western European students of modern Japanese history are generally aware that the bakufu sent missions to the U.S.A. in 1860 and Europe in 1862. Few, however, have looked closely at the membership or the specific itineraries of those missions. Vadim Klimov's essay here makes up for that omission in the case of the visit of the 1862 envoys to St. Petersburg. The thirty-six-man bakufu group was headed by Takeuchi Yasunori, who held the two important posts of finance

commissioner (*kanjō bugyō*) and foreign affairs commissioner (*gaikoku bugyō*) at the time, and included Fukuzawa Yukichi in the role of interpreter. Before reaching the Russian capital, they had visited Paris, London, Rotterdam, the Hague, and Berlin, and after departing St. Petersburg they would go to Berlin and Paris again before calling at Lisbon. Their primary objective was to appeal for postponement of the opening of the ports of Kanagawa, Nagasaki, Niigata, and Hyōgo and the cities of Edo and Osaka, which had been provided for in a clause of the treaties signed by the bakufu in 1858. Takeuchi's party arrived in St. Petersburg on 8 August, and were received in audience by Tsar Alexander II on 14 August. The Japanese guests were housed in what Klimov describes as a "reserve palace" (*yobi kyūtei*), rather than a hotel, although official visitors from other nations including England routinely were put up in hotels. The Russians followed the diplomatic protocol that had been established for the visit of the ambassador plenipotentiary of Persia in 1855. Takeuchi conducted his negotiations in six sessions between 21 August and 15 September, with the chief of the Asia Bureau of the Foreign Ministry representing the Russian side; in addition Takeuchi called on Foreign Minister Gorchakov on 12 September. The Russians accepted Japan's request to delay opening the cities in question and expressed sympathy for the currency crisis and other economic difficulties that had resulted from a sudden influx of imports into Japan, and the two nations signed a memorandum. They failed to agree on how to resolve their conflicting claims over Sakhalin, but they did agree to send representatives to that island to determine boundaries on the scene.

Svetlana Korneeva's research promises to correct many misconceptions—not only outside Japan, but in Japan as well—about *seppuku*, which has often been exoticized or depicted as bizarre. In her essay here, "Seppuku o meguru ichi kōsatsu: Seppukukei to zanshukei to no hikaku o tōshite" 切腹をめぐる一考察：切腹刑と斬首刑との比較を通して (Some Considerations Regarding Obligatory *Seppuku*, Approached through a Comparison of *Seppuku* and *Zanshu*), she begins by distinguishing between two kinds of *seppuku*, one voluntary, a method of suicide, the other obligatory, a form of capital punishment. It is the latter that concerns her. Obligatory *seppuku* was a punishment for disgraced samurai, and it always concluded with decapitation by a *kaishaku*, or assisting swordsman. Contrary to common belief, she points out, in most cases disembowelment was only partial or did not take place at all. Yet obligatory *seppuku* was not identical to decapitation, or *zanshu*; execution by beheading was another type of capital punishment that was reserved for samurai. Korneeva compares these two kinds of death sentences, established in the penal code of the Tokugawa period and continuing in force through the early Meiji period, by examining several instances. She finds clear differences in the way the two types of punishments were implemented.

My chapter in this volume compares the visits to Japan of former U.S. President Ulysses S. Grant in 1879 and Russian Crown Prince Nicholas Alexandrovich in 1891. Neither man came as an official envoy of his nation, but their Japanese hosts

designated them as state guests and received them with the utmost courtesy. Grant, fifty-seven years old and a world-renowned war hero and ex-chief executive, stayed for two months and was quite impressed with the progress the Japanese were making in transforming their society. He engaged in informal diplomacy, attempting, at the request of the leaders of the Qing government in Beijing, to broker a settlement of a dispute between China and Japan. Nicholas, who turned twenty-three while in Japan, had been in the country for just two weeks when a Japanese policeman wounded him in a failed assassination attempt, and his father ordered him to terminate his stay and return to Russia. This disappointed the crown prince, who had been delighted by many aspects of Japanese culture that he encountered, especially the remnants of samurai values, the charm and elegance of geisha, and objects of art and craftsmanship, and wanted to continue his planned itinerary. In different ways, the visits of Grant and Nicholas ended up having the effect of strengthening relations between the nations involved, although in the Russian case the gain was short-lived, as regional rivalry soon intensified and led to the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–05. There is, however, no evidence in the contemporary primary sources (notably the tsarevich's diary and the highly detailed records kept by Japanese of meetings between the Russians and themselves) that the visit turned Nicholas into a hater of Japan. Nor do later sources substantiate any link between Nicholas' 1891 wounds and the war. The particulars of the itineraries of General Grant and Crown Prince Nicholas and their contacts in Japan are highly suggestive of the mentalities of Japanese, Americans, and Russians in the late nineteenth century.

Hosokawa Shūhei takes us into the realm of popular sentiment, to the degree it can be apprehended and interpreted from the music that was widely performed in a particular era. Here he resurrects some of the songs of the first decade of the twentieth century. We cannot reduce the causes of social and cultural change to war, he concedes, but we can get a sense of the emotions that swayed people at that time. A lot of war songs were produced during the Sino-Japanese War of 1894–95, putting lyrics about heroes and heroic deeds to melodies that owed much to the school songs composed in the early Meiji period, and the same phenomenon occurred during the Russo-Japanese War. With every major battle, new songs were written, fanning feelings of hostility toward the enemy. Musically there was not a great deal of difference between the songs of the war with China and those of the war with Russia, but one significant change allowed for depiction of images of hero and adversary that had previously not been possible; that was the use of minor keys, introduced in choral and wind ensemble music in the years between the two wars. Hosokawa illustrates this by analyzing the song *Sen'yū* (War Comrade). Not only hero worship of Japanese fighting men, but also scorn for the Russian foe was put to music. As had been the case a decade earlier, the enemy forces were characterized as weak and tricky. Audio recording was being developed just at this time—the first disks were recorded in 1903, and a studio recording of a piece titled *Ryojunkō no tatakai* (The Battle of Lüshun Harbor) was made in America—and thus we have not only visual images of

the Russo-Japanese War, but some evidence of its sounds. Perhaps the most striking thing about the Japanese songs written during this conflict, Hosokawa informs us, is that the music itself is Western, demonstrating the penetration of Western musical sensibility during the Meiji period.

Chronologically, Yuri Pestushko takes up the story of Russo-Japanese relations right where Hosokawa leaves off. Pestushko's chapter in this volume scrutinizes events, persons, and policies in the years from 1905 through the Revolution of 1917 up to the beginning the so-called Siberian Intervention (1918–22, in which Japanese soldiers joined troops from the British Empire, the U.S.A., and other nations to support White Russian forces fighting the Bolshevik Red Army in the Russian Far East). Immediately after the Russo-Japanese War, Japanese feelings of antagonism toward Russia remained fairly high, and there were many voices crying out for expansion of both the navy and the army. But another dynamic was at work, as well, one that encouraged the Japanese and the Russians to cooperate with each other. They shared an interest in the development of Manchuria, and they were both wary of the possibility of an expansion of American involvement in East Asia (where signs that U.S. interest was growing appeared just as American-Japanese relations were worsening). Japan and Russia agreed in 1910 to maintain the status quo in Manchuria, that is, to keep to their respective spheres of influence, and in 1912, they settled on a similar agreement applying to Inner Mongolia. After the beginning of World War I, the two nations continued their talks, with an intensive period of negotiation between February and July 1916. Differences over Japan's demands for railroad rights and insistence on new fishing rights prevented agreement on an alliance from being reached. But the two sides did sign a new treaty, secret provisions of which reaffirmed the existing common interests in East Asia and provided that the two nations would join forces to stop an invasion of Chinese territory by any power hostile to them. Less than a year later, after Revolutionary elements overthrew the tsar's government, the Japanese government was quick to recognize the new provisional government, doing so in March 1917. Relations between Japan and the new Russian authorities were cordial even after the Russians agreed with the German government to cease hostilities, ending Russian participation in the world war. However, Japanese military activity in Manchuria excited suspicion on the part of Russian officials and the Russian press. Anti-Japanese sentiment grew also. The Japanese consul in Vladivostok, worried about regional instability, appealed to the government in Tokyo in October 1917 for Japanese naval vessels to be sent to Vladivostok. After the Bolshevik Revolution of November, the Japanese adopted an openly adversarial stance toward Russia. When a multinational military force was assembled to implement the Siberian Intervention in 1918, Japan joined. Whatever possibility there had been for an alliance between Japan and Russia—and Pestushko's careful reconstruction of the period 1905–18 shows us that despite bad feeling left over from the war of 1904–05, there had in fact been some chance of an alliance, based on several common regional interests—was lost.

Nikolay Ovsyannikov believes that without appreciating the life and work of Saionji Kinmochi (1849–1940), we cannot really understand his times, and that previous studies have not given him his due. Certainly this is the case in Russia, where the political development of Japan from late Meiji to early Shōwa—not to mention specific personalities—has hardly ever been the focus of serious study, partly because of the influence of Soviet ideology on historiography, partly because primary Japanese-language sources on the period have not been in Russian hands. Born into the aristocracy, twice prime minister, and a close adviser to the Meiji, Taishō, and Shōwa emperors, Saionji should be recognized as one of the most prominent politicians and statesmen of modern Japan. Ovsyannikov regards Saionji's autobiography, first published in 1949, as a precious resource for modern history. The prince occupied a place near the center of Japanese politics for seventy-odd years. His intellect, broad interests, and progressive mindset made him one of the most vivid men of his age, and also one of the most controversial. He combined in himself incompatible features: a liberal and a monarchist, an oligarch and a party leader, an "elder statesmen" and a politically ambitionless aristocrat, an expert in Oriental arts and an admirer of the West. Saionji's individuality (Ovsyannikov labels it "unusualness") distinguished him from the many other talented statesmen of prewar Japan. His autobiography, written in an informal and lively manner, provides insight into the inner circle of Japanese power and politics and gives us a glimpse at the peculiarities of the political process and decision-making, as well as personal interrelationships within the Japanese establishment.

Matsuda Toshihiko's "Political Suffrage of Korean Residents in Japan before World War II" sheds new light on the history of the exercise of the rights to vote and to stand for election by Korean residents in the period before World War II. This has been a neglected area of historical scholarship. From the 1910 annexation of Korea, Matsuda notes, Koreans were officially considered to be "imperial subjects." If they visited the mainland, where the Election Law was in force, they theoretically had political suffrage, although it was not until 1920 that the Japanese government issued an interpretation of the elections law that clearly acknowledged Korean residents' right to vote. After universal suffrage was implemented in 1925, large numbers of Korean voters emerged, and most of their support went to the Farmer-Labor Party, at the time the party furthest to the left. This situation changed greatly in the 1930s. The Farmer-Labor Party was forced to disband, while changes advantageous to Korean residents such as the recognition of votes cast with *hangŭl* characters, took place. In the 1930s, Korean residents started to stand as candidates in elections at all levels. By 1943, a total of 386 Koreans had run for office, and ninety-six of them had been elected, mostly to positions in towns, villages, wards, and school districts. A relatively large number of the successful candidates belonged to *yūwa shinboku* 融和親睦 groups (groups in favor of conciliation between Japanese and Koreans). The political stances of prewar Korean candidates were rather vague, and cannot be characterized as either nationalist or pro-Japanese.

Social thought. The next two essays, by Ushimura Kei and Gilles Campagnolo, also deal with subjects from modern Japanese history. Because their focus is social thought, however, I have put them together in a section under that heading, separate from the "Historical Studies" section.

Professor Ushimura reconsiders a controversial attempt by several leading intellectuals in the summer of 1942 to devise an appropriate description of the phase of history into which Japan had entered. Several months after the war had been expanded into the Pacific and Southeast Asia, the literary society Bungakkai invited a group of intellectuals, academics, and critics to a symposium on the theme *kindai no chōkoku*, "overcoming the modern." Participants were asked to submit papers on the issue and to read what other participants had written prior to the gathering. Despite the well-organized preparation, however, the discussion, which lasted for two days, did not develop as might have been expected. The participants never arrived at a common definition of *kindai no chōkoku*. Their debate about modernity and what follows it seemed superficial or emotional more often than scholarly. Probably due to such shortcomings and the seemingly unsatisfactory outcome of the symposium, Ushimura says, most postwar literature that discusses the theme of overcoming the modern has regarded the event as an aborted intellectual experiment and belittled its significance. He contends that this is an underestimation. Given the abundant discourse about civilization—primarily Western civilization, beginning with the *bunmei kaika* that was so influential in the Meiji era—in modern Japan, the symposium was indeed meaningful and deserves reevaluation. Taking the record of the symposium as his primary text, Ushimura presents an alternative view of this intellectual challenge to received notions of modernity and the phenomenon of modernity itself.

Dr. Campagnolo revisits the subject of modern economic development and "take-off" into sustained growth. He has been struck by the similarities between Japan and Russia as "follower" or late developing nations (late compared with the leader, eighteenth-century Great Britain, or the United States of America or France). Citing a book that can be called a classic of modernization theory, W. W. Rostow's 1960 treatise *Stages of Economic Growth*, Campagnolo reminds us of Rostow's typology of four developmental economic stages that nations pass through as they modernize and industrialize. Adapting Rostow's schema, Ozawa Terumoto described Japan and Russia as "classmates" in Class III, that is, state-controlled empires that achieved take-off in the late nineteenth century. Campagnolo incorporates the characterization of classmates into his essay here, and also the paradigm proposed by Kaname Akamatsu in the 1930s, the "flying-geese" paradigm of growth; this refers to the pattern of imitation of a hegemonic country (the "leading goose") and developmental "concatenation." Campagnolo suggests that besides industrial problems and political regimes, conditions of so-called "civil society" (inasmuch as it existed), as well as the degree of "awareness" in the conceptual representations of economics, played important roles in the growth of national "commonwealths" in both Japan and Russia.

International relations. Liana Areshidze was the lone specialist in contemporary political science at our 2007 Moscow symposium, but she is by no means alone in her field in Russia. Rather she is one of the heirs of the strong tradition of current affairs research on Japan that was created in the U.S.S.R. Her essay below attempts to interpret Japan's international relations posture in the post-Cold War era. For four decades after the end of World War II, Japanese foreign policy, in keeping with the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty, clearly followed the lead of the United States. More recently, in a number of instances, Japan has ventured to assert its own interests, distinct from those of the U.S., giving rise to the question in Areshidze's title "Nihon no gaikō jikuashi wa Beikoku ka Ajia ka" 日本の外交軸足は米国かアジアか (Is the Pivot of Japanese Diplomacy the U.S. or Asia?). Actually, as she points out, even in the 1960s Japan was already pursuing "quiet diplomacy" (*shizuka na gaikō*) in its relations with nearby nations in East and Southeast Asia and in the Pacific, proceeding with bilateral (i.e., not including the U.S.) talks with many of those nations. The Pacific Trade and Development framework, launched by Japan in 1968, set the pattern. With the end of the Cold War and the dissolution of the Soviet Union, and with U.S. withdrawal from its military bases in the Philippines in 1991 and 1992, the world was no longer bipolar, and new policies and new alignments among nations became possible. It became obvious to many that regional cooperation on security matters was advisable. A host of problems remained as a legacy of the Cold War, for example, tensions between North and South on the Korean peninsula; a dispute about the status of Taiwan; conflicting claims to the Senkaku Islands by China, Taiwan, and Japan; and Japanese-Russian disagreement over the issue of sovereignty in the Northern Islands. Also worrisome were the spread of weapons of mass destruction in the region, the rise of international terrorism, issues related to energy and fossil fuel prices, and a number of other territorial disputes. As Areshidze sees it, the nations of East Asia have come to realize that to avoid the risk of armed conflict in this unstable situation, collective cooperation is necessary. Japan has continued to conduct bilateral relations with other countries in the region, and has shown interest in broadening discussions on multinational security issues, but in Areshidze's view, Japan is still confined by the limitations of its security agreement with the U.S., and its foreign policy is still oriented toward the U.S.

Art history and cultural property conservation. Historian of art Elisabeth Malinina invites us to contemplate *zenkiga* 禅機画, didactic paintings that illustrate Zen parables. Commonly these depict the Buddha or one of the Zen patriarchs or some situation in which Enlightenment is expressed. Malinina sees the key feature of Zen philosophy as its tenet that Enlightment is not something that comes from outside, but rather it is a direct experience in the "here and now" brought about through concentration and the guidance of a master. If in Zen sudden spiritual transformation, the ability to see the world as it is, is not the result of intellectual work, and moreover is a wordless experience, then the language of symbols, gestures, and artistic representation can be taken as means of translation of spiritual experience. From Song dynasty

China, Japanese Zen inherited three types of Zen-influenced painting, namely monochrome landscape (*sansui*), portraiture (*chinzō*, solemn, reverential studies of well-known teachers), and *zenkiga*. Malinina's purpose in this chapter is to identify the main themes and motifs of Zen painting, to show its aesthetic features and principles, and to explain some of the symbolic and philosophic meanings. Among the things she brings to our attention are paradoxicality, acceptance and affirmation of everything (including contradictory principles such as life and death, growth and decay), and indifference to formal piety.

Ekaterina Simonova-Gudzenko is interested in space and the construction of buildings in Shinto shrines. We have no reliable information about ancient shrine architecture or what shrine territory looked like, she observes. Early written sources such as ritsuryō codes and *Ryō no gige* contain some information about the economic situation of shrines, but nothing about space or architecture. The first visual representations of shrine space surviving today are from the thirteenth through fifteenth centuries, the same period when the term Shinto appeared. Broadly speaking, those medieval representations of shrine space can be divided into two groups: Buddhist mandala-type drawings and schematic landscape paintings (*ezu*). The oldest mandala-type example is *Kasugamiya mandara* (Mandala of Kasuga Shrine), from 1320, while the oldest *ezu* example shows the Izumo shrine in 1234. Taking clues from the work of Jinnai Hidenobu, Naniwada Tōru, and Jilly Traganou, Simonova-Gudzenko reexamines some representations of both the mandala-type and *ezu*-type, noting the distribution of sacred space and non-sacred space. Both types are very close to actual topography, she observes, and both depict the nearby landscape along with the shrine territory, but the mandara-type drawings pay relatively more attention to man-made objects (especially shrine buildings), and the *ezu*-type to natural features. *Torii* appear in both types, of course, but their function can be said to differ. In mandara-type representations, the *torii* divide the territory of Buddhist and shrine precincts, and in *ezu*-type, *torii* separate the "microcosmic landscape" of sacred place and profane territory.

The Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography in St. Petersburg, known also from the time of its founding by Peter the Great as the Kunstkamera, possesses a sizable collection of Japanese objects, about 10,000 items. Alexander Sinitsyn currently has responsibility for preservation of these important cultural properties, and his essay introduces this collection. Peter the Great was the first Russian sovereign to order his government to seek new northern routes to Japanese ports, establish trade relations with Japan, and study the Japanese language and culture. He also ordered that all available things of Japanese origin be collected, Sinitsyn informs us, in order to understand the state of the Japanese crafts, arts, weapons, and goods that might be exchanged in trade. By the middle of the seventeenth century, the Japanese collection in the Kunstkamera had considerably increased. The first catalogue of the museum, *Musei Imperialis Petropolitani*, compiled in Latin in the 1740s, contained fourteen drawings of Japanese items. Those had been acquired in various ways—bought in

Holland, brought from Kamchatka or the Kurils (Aleutian islands) after shipwrecks of Japanese trade vessels, or bought from China. Some Japanese items were erroneously mixed with the Chinese collections. Sinitsyn acknowledges contributions to the early Japanese collections by Kazakh pioneers V. Atlasov and I. Kozyrevsky, by scholars including J. L. Blumentrost, and by the Japanese shipwreck survivors Denbei, Soza, and Gonza. Regrettably, many of the earliest items did not survive the great Kunstkamera fire of 1747. Today the earliest Japanese items in the Kunstkamera mostly date from the late eighteenth century. Especially important are the gifts to Catherine the Great by shipwrecked Japanese captain Daikokuya Kōdayū (1791), by the first official Russian envoy to Japan, A. Laxman (1792), and by Dr. A. I. Stutzer, a physician employed by the Dutch East India Company (1795). Sinitsyn makes clear that the Kunstkamera collections give us valuable insight into the early history of cultural exchange between Russia and Japan.

Andrey Sokolov describes the Ainu items in the Kunstkamera in his short paper here, which is the only one in this volume that was not originally presented at our Moscow symposium. Sokolov gave a talk on this subject in St. Petersburg several days after the Moscow meeting, and a few days before he successfully defended his doctoral dissertation. As he makes clear, Russians were interested in Ainu culture from at least the early nineteenth century. The collection of the Kunstkamera contains 1890 objects from the Kuril Islands, Sakhalin, and Hokkaidō that are valuable for ethnographic study.

Games in cultural studies. Games, other entertainments, and performative elements in leisure activities are the subject of Elena Voytishek's investigation. In her contribution to this volume, she introduces a number of pastimes that were inspired by *The Tale of Genji*. Originally, in the late Heian period, these pastimes were intellectual entertainments for the aristocracy. Later they were taken up by educated people in the Kamakura, Muromachi, and Edo periods. Voytishek describes several such entertainments and leisure activities and comments on them from both the viewpoint of the general theory of games and the viewpoint of cultural history. She is especially interested in the tea ceremony, *sadō* or *chadō*, and "the way of incense," *kōdō*, but she also looks at card games that are based on literature, in particular *Genji karuta*; board games (*sugoroku*) based on the novel; games such as *tōsenkyō* (literally, fan-throwing), in which the patterns produced by a fallen fan and a target butterfly are related to one of fifty-four chapters of *The Tale of Genji*. One tea ritual called *chakabuki* has theatrical performance elements, and incense rituals frequently refer to the novel, in which a number of descriptions of incense-making followed by contests are mentioned. In so-called tea duels (*tōcha*), the participants must guess one of fifty-four incense fragrances or tea brands, corresponding to the number of the chapters of the famous novel. An interesting feature of these games is an obligatory reference to the Genji fragrances table (*Genjikō no zu*), in which combinations of five vertical lines encode the names of fifty-two chapters of the novel (the first and last chapters are

omitted). Voytishek reminds us that these entertainments are a valuable resource for understanding Japanese elite culture in premodern times.

REFERENCES

Croskey 1991

Robert M. Croskey. "N. I. Konrad and the Soviet Study of Japan." *Acta Slavica Iaponica* 9 (1991), pp. 116–33.

Diakonova, Lebedeva, and Meshcheryakov 2002

E. Diakonova, I. Lebedeva, and A. Meshcheryakov [Mesheryakov]. "Japanese Studies in Russia: Brief History and Present State of the Art." *Bulletin of the European Association for Japanese Studies* 60 (2002), pp. 49–59.

Elisséeff 1917

Seruge Eriseēfu セルゲ・エリセエーフ [Serge Elisséeff]. "Rosia ni okeru Nihon kenkyū" 露西亜に於ける日本研究. *Teikoku bungaku* 帝國文學 23:10 (October 1917), pp. 82–91.

Konrad 1967

N. I. Konrad. *West-East, Inseparable Twain: Selected Articles*. Moscow: Central Department of Oriental Literature, 1967.

Marandjian 1993

Karine Marandjian. "Recent Early Modern Japanese Studies in Russia." *Oboegaki: The Newsletter of the Early Modern Japan Network* 3:1 (1993), pp. 1–3.

Mechtcheriakov 2001

Alexandre N. Mechtcheriakov [Mesheryakov]. "Japanese Studies in Current Russia: Inheritance and Inheritors." In *Japanese Studies around the World 2000* (Kyoto: International Research Center for Japanese Studies, 2001), pp. 27–35.

Mikhailova 1993

Yulia Mikhailova. "The Image of Japan in Russo-Soviet Japanese Studies." *Japanese Studies Bulletin* 13:2 (1993), pp. 59–74.

Pascha and Robashik 2003

Werner Pascha and Frank Robashik. "East Asian Studies in Russia." *Overview of East Asian Studies in Central and Eastern Europe* (Duisburger Arbeitspapiere Ostasianwissenschaften No. 48), 2003, pp. 27–41, published also in *Asien* 88 (July 2003), pp. 51–62.

Pinous 1977

E. Pinous. "Recent Soviet Translations and Studies of Pre-Modern Japanese Literature." *Monumenta Nipponica* 32:2 (1977), pp. 235–43.

Reischauer 1957

Edwin O. Reischauer. "Serge Elisséeff." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 20:1/2 (1957), pp. 1–35.

Rybin 2006

Viktor Rybin ヴィクター・ルィービン. "Sankuto Peteruburgu (Roshia) ni okeru Nihongo gakushū to Nihon kenkyū no 300-nen no ayumi" サンクト・ペテルブルグ（ロシア）における日本語学習と日本研究の三〇〇年のあゆみ. *Nihon kenkyū* 日本研究 32 (2006), pp. 261–84.

Zagorsky 1998

Alexei Zagorsky. "Japanese Studies in the West: Russia Today." *Tsūshin* 4:2 (1998), pp. 2–4.

NOTES

1 This very brief sketch of the history of studies of Japan and Japanese language in pre-revolutionary Russia draws on Elisséeff 1917; Reischauer 1957; Mikhailova 1993; Diakonova, Lebedeva, and Meshcheryakov 2002; Mechtcheriakov 2001; Pascha and Robashik 2003; and Rybin 2006.

2 On Russian studies of Japan in the Soviet period, see Reischauer 1957; Nishimura 1963; Pinous 1977; Croskey 1991; Mikhailova 1993; Marandjian 1993; Diakonova, Lebedeva, and Meshcheryakov 2002; Pascha and Robashik 2003; and Rybin 2006. On Nevsky, see "Na steklakh vechnosti . . . Nikolai Nevskii" На стеклах вечности . . . Николай Невский, *Peterburgskoe vostokovedenie* Петербургское востоковедение 8 [St. Petersburg Journal of Oriental Studies 8] (1996), pp. 241–560.

3 On Russian studies of Japan since 1991, see Marandjian 1993; Mikhailova 1993; Zagorsky 1998; Diakonova, Lebedeva, and Meshcheryakov 2002; Mechtcheriakov 2001; Pascha and Robashik 2003; and Rybin 2006.