

**Twilight Reflections of Kyokutei Bakin (1767-1848): An Annotated Translation of  
“Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō”**

by

Kevin P. Mulholland

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment  
Of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
(Asian Languages and Cultures)  
in The University of Michigan  
2016

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor Jonathan E. Zwicker, Chair  
Associate Professor Kevin G. Carr  
Associate Professor Christopher L. Hill  
Associate Professor David Rolston

© Kevin P. Mulholland

## **Dedication**

This dissertation is dedicated to my father Michael W. Mulholland, who has taught me to love reading, and to my mother Patricia Mulholland, whose never-ending love made this project possible.

## Acknowledgements

I find myself at the end of my graduate career looking back on the path that led me to this point. I am humbled and indebted to many people whose support and encouragement have helped me along the way.

I wish to thank my adviser, Jonathan Zwicker, for his support and guidance at the University of Michigan. Over the years he has introduced me to a world of academic wonders and sparked my curiosity about intellectual topics outside of Japanese literature. When I struggled, he asked the tough questions that I did not have the courage to pose myself, and these questions gave me the direction I needed. I am profoundly grateful for his support.

I also wish to thank the other members of my dissertation committee. Christopher Hill has kept his office door open when I needed support and his friendship continues to invigorated my drive for research. David Rolston, though a scholar of Chinese literature, has given me tremendous insight into how to approach the study of literary criticism in Japan. Kevin Carr has kindly joined my committee towards the end of my project and I look forward to building on our scholarly relationship into the future.

There are several other faculty members at the University of Michigan to whom I am deeply grateful: Miranda Brown, Benjamin Brose, Mayumi Oka, Masae Yasuda, Yoshihiro Mochizuki, Yuta Mori, Micah Auerbach, Donald Lopez, Reginald Jackson, Allison Alexy,

Hitomi Tonomura, Par Cassel, and Sean Silver. I am also thankful for the guidance of Michael Bourdaghs at the University of Chicago for his guidance when I studied there. Strangely, he is the first person to have recommended studying Kyokutei Bakin to me. I also wish to thank the staff of the Inter-University Center for Japanese Language Studies, in Yokohama, Japan.

This dissertation would not be complete without the support of my colleagues and friends. In no particular order, I wish to thank Brian Dowdle, Molly Des Jardin, Joseph Leach, Martino Dibeltulo, Anna-Alexandra Fodde-Reguer, Ignacio Villagran, Aaron Proffitt, Harjeet Grewal, Anna Johnson, Ha Nul Jun, Eric Haynie, Rebecca Bloom, Melissa Van Wyk, Angeline Baecker, Irhe Sohn, and Susan Hwang. The maintenance of my sanity fell to my best friends Jeff Honeyman and Casey Bodley, and I owe more than I can say for providing an outlet that is outside of the academic world.

Finally, and most importantly, my most profound debt is to my family. My siblings Erin, Katie, and Brenna gave me courage when I felt most vulnerable. I thank their husbands Andy Zimmer, Casey Bates, and Charles Kalil for keeping straight faces when I explained my project to them. My nieces and nephews Mia, Ben, Lucie, and Quinn cheered me up with their beautiful faces. This project would not have been possible without the love of my father Michael Mulholland and my mother Patricia Mulholland, and to whom I dedicate my dissertation.

## Preface

### A New Discovery

The Sekisui Art Museum 石水博物館, in the city of Tsu, Mie Prefecture 津市三重県, is nestled within shady grounds adjacent to the Iwataike Pond 岩田池 that has given Iwataike Park its name 岩田池公園. The museum has a history dating back to its foundation in 1930 by the banker and potter Kawakita Handeishi 川喜田半泥子 (1878-1963) as the Sekisui Kaikan 石水会館, a facility devoted to the cultural enrichment of the citizens of Tsu.<sup>1</sup> In 2010 a manuscript called “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō” 著作堂旧作略自評適要 was discovered among the Sekisui Art Museum’s collection of popular theater prints.

The manuscript was uncovered during preparations for an exhibition on the culture of Kabuki theater aimed at commemorating the dedication of the Museum’s new facility in 2010.<sup>2</sup> The exhibition was centered on the history of the theatrical world of Ise province and scholars like Kamiya Katsuhiko, Tomita Yasuyuki, Okamoto Hiroshi, and Ishikawa Kayo gathered to look at the *yakusha banzuke* 役者番付 and the *ezukushi* 絵尽し in the Museum’s holdings. It was during these preparations that Kamiya discovered and catalogued a previously unknown

---

<sup>1</sup> Several small biographies of Kawakita Handeishi can be found online, including a website devoted to the museum and historical park created from his kiln Hironaga-kama, located in the city of Tsū. Handeishi was his literary name; his real name was Kawakita Kyūdayu Masanori. He was born into a wealthy merchant family at the end of the first decade of the Meiji era. Soon after his birth, both his grandfather and his father died, leaving him to be raised by his aunt. His primary livelihood came from financial institutions that he ran in Mie prefecture. Handeishi he participated in pottery (with a particular focus on tea implements), poetry, photography, and painting. (August 28, 11:29 am. <http://www.chitose.co.jp/artist/handeishi.html>)

<sup>2</sup> BJH, p. 2.

manuscript with “Chosakudō kyūsakuryaku jihyō tekiyō” (hereafter abbreviated as CKJT) written on its cover in the hand of Ozu Keisō 小津桂窓, who is a well-known member of Kyokutei Bakin’s 曲亭馬琴 literary circle. Furthermore, “Chosakudō” is one of Bakin’s well-known pseudonyms.

## Who is Bakin?

Kyokutei Bakin 曲亭馬琴 (1767-1848) is among Japan’s most celebrated 19<sup>th</sup> century literary figures. He is known mostly for his work in the *yomihon* 読本 genre, but he participated in a number of other different genres as well, including, short-length illustrated fiction *kibyōshi* 黄表紙, long-length illustrated fiction *gōkan* 合巻, miscellaneous essays or journals *zuihitsu* 隨筆, and poetry *kyōka* 狂歌. Bakin’s *Nansō Satomi Hakkenden* 南総里見八犬伝 (serialized from 1814-1842) is considered both his magnum opus and a representative work of early modern Japanese literature. Other works by Bakin that have been received with acclaim are *Chinzetsu yumiharizuki* 椿説弓張月 (serialized 1807-1811), *Shinpen Kinpeibai* 新編金瓶梅 (serialized 1831-1847), and *Kinse setsu Bishōnenroku* 近世説美少年録 (serialized 1829-1845).

Bakin’s father Takizawa 滝沢興義 (1725-1775) was a member of the samurai class and a low-ranking retainer of the Matsudaira family, who were *hatamoto* 旗本 to the Tokugawa bakufu government 徳川幕府. Despite being members of the samurai class, the Takizawa household lived in poverty as a result of the low-stipend of his father and the father’s illnesses from excessive drinking. Bakin’s father died in 1775, leaving Bakin, his mother, and Bakin’s two brothers, Rabun and Keichū, and three sisters with their living stipend reduced by half.

After the death of his father, Bakin's two brothers found temporary positions that allowed Bakin to pursue some of the childhood education that is expected of a member of the samurai class, including the study of classical texts. Though Bakin was a devoted son and also participated in acquiring money for his family, his relationship with his mother was strained until her death in 1785. After her death, Bakin continued to try and find positions in accordance with his class, but he also dabbled in cultural pursuits like poetry and medicine.

Bakin began producing works of popular literature from 1790 as a member of Santō Kyōden's 山東京伝 (1761-1816) literary coterie. His first works were *kibyōshi* 黄表紙, a type of illustrated chapbook that resembles the modern-day comic book in many ways. Bakin used *Tsukai hatatshite nibu kyōgen* as a means to become acquainted with Kyōden—attested to by the inclusion of the words “pupil of Kyōden” in the preface. While that relationship of master-pupil was never fully formalized, Bakin's friendship with Kyōden brought him into contact with many of the popular writers of Edo. These included, Jippensha Ikku 十返舎一九 (1765-1831), Shikitei Samba 式亭三馬 (1776-1822), Shinrotei 振鷺亭 (dates unknown), and Utei Enba 烏亭焉馬 (1743-1822).

## **What is the CKJT?**

The CKJT contains no proper preface and opens with the following in lieu of any formal preface or foreword.

I have grown old and lost my memory, and now know only the titles of my old works from 30 or 40 years ago. There is little else that I remember. It is for this reason that when I had my daughter-in-law read them to me on a full spring



day this year, these works struck my ears with a new feeling—like they are the works of a writer departed from this world.<sup>3</sup>

All of the eighteen works evaluated within the CKJT are attributed to Bakin, who also used the pseudonym of Chosakudō that forms part of the title. Bakin’s daughter-in-law Omichi served as his amanuensis from 1834, when he effectively lost his eyesight.<sup>4</sup>

The manuscript has two different volumes, each with their own name. The first volume is titled “Kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō” 旧作略自評摘要. The books covered within the first volume in the order they appear are as follows: *Raigō Ajari kaisoden* 頼豪阿闍梨怪鼠伝 (1808), *Kumo no taema amayo no tsuki* 雲妙間雨夜月 (1807), *Itozakura shunchō kien* 糸桜春蝶奇縁 (1812), *Shunden jitsujitsuki* 旬殿実々記 (1808), *Sumidagawa bairyū shinsho* 墨田川梅柳新書 (1806), *Beibei kyōdan* 皿皿郷談 (1813), *Shin Kasane gedatsu monogatari* 新累解脱物語 (1807), *Mino furuginu Hachijō kidan* 美濃旧衣八丈綺談 (1813), *Shunkan sōzu shima monogatari* 俊寛僧都鳴物語 (1804), *Shitennō shōtō iroku* 四天王剿盜異録 (1807), *Aoto Fujitsuna moryōan* 青砥藤綱摸稜案 (1811), *Kataki kidan wake no hato* 敵討綺談推枝鳩 (1803), and *Sangoku ichiya monogatari* 三国一夜物語 (1806). The first volume ends with a small paragraph:

Well, the self-evaluations of this volume are collections of details and abbreviations from those of my own works for which I am satisfied. Like *The Strange Fate of a Spring Butterfly Amongst Cherry Blossoms*, the woodblocks were lost to fire. While there is nothing in terms of the writer’s satisfaction that equals *The Tale of One Night in the Three Kingdoms*, I have abbreviated the good points and can only speak of the Koishikawa volumes. The aforementioned

---

<sup>3</sup> All translations are my own, unless otherwise noted. (BJH, p. 135).

<sup>4</sup> Zolbrod, p. 128.

self-evaluations of 13 or 14 volumes will be bound up. For the others, I should have them read to me over time when my proxy reader and copyist has the free time, and with the additional self-evaluations, compile a second half for this book.<sup>5</sup>

The first volume was indeed followed by a second, which is titled “Sessaku kyūkoku no mono no hon ryaku jihyō kan no ge” 拙作旧刻の物の本略自評卷の下. The books contained within the second volume, in the order of appearance, are: *Geppyō kien* 月表奇縁 (1803), *Sekigen ikyō* 石言遺響 (1803), *Kanzen Tsuneyo monogatari* 勸善常世物語 (1804), *Tōchū sono no yuki* 標註園の雪 (1805), and *Kukuri zuki chirimen kamiko* 括頭巾縮緬紙衣 (1807). It is worth noting that the first volume is written out on a type of lined manuscript paper (*genkō yōshi*) that bears within its gutter the name “Keisō” 桂窓. The second volume of the manuscript is written out on blank sheets of *mino* 美濃 paper. The manuscript appears to be a copy of an original written in Omichi’s hand to Bakin’s dictation which is now lost.<sup>6</sup>

The greatest difference between the evaluations of the first volume and those found in the second volume is length: despite the first volume covering thirteen works and the second only five, the text of the second volume is twice as long as that of the first. This longer length of evaluation does not correspond to longer lengths of the works; four of the five works evaluated in the second volume are among Bakin’s shortest *hanshi-bon yomihon*. Also, the final three evaluations contained in the first volume are considerably longer than those of the preceding ten evaluations. It seems plausible to assume that these evaluations are ordered according to when Bakin composed them, suggesting that Bakin took greater care or interest in the project of self-evaluation over time.

---

<sup>5</sup> BJH, p. 164.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid, p. 12.

One possible explanation for the difference in length between the first and second volumes is that those works found in the second volume are all problematic in some way. Bakin writes in his letters that some of these works, like *Geppyō kien*, *Sangoku ichiya monogatari*, and *Tsuneyo monogatari*, were difficult to acquire full, undamaged copies. He discusses how he compared several different copies to find the right edition for his library, and in doing so probably spent a great amount of time reviewing those works. Other works, like *Kukuri zokin chirimen kamiko* and *Sono no yuki*, were poignant because of how publishers and other literary figures interfered with their publication. The greater length of an entry, therefore, can be seen as a marker of Bakin’s own attempts to grapple with the problematic nature of these works.

## The 2013 Transliteration

The manuscript of CKJT has been transliterated to modern typeface by the editors Kamiya Katsuhiko and Hayakawa Yumi, and published Kyōko Shoin in March of 2013. The title of the transliteration is *Bakin no jisaku hihyō—Sekisui kabutsukanzō “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryakujihyō tekiyō”*. This book includes a preface; a table of contents; introductory essays (*gesetsu* 解説) set of introductory essays; high quality photographs of the manuscript (*eiin* 影印); a transliteration of the manuscript to modern text, with some annotations (*honkoku* 翻刻・*chū* 注); and, an index of people names and book titles. *Bakin no jisaku hihyō—Sekisui kabutsukanzō “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryakujihyō tekiyō”*— has been an invaluable tool for my dissertation project, and I am indebted to the work of Kamiya and Hayakawa.

Kamiya offers informative and concise introductory essays to help guide the reader in understanding CKJT. The first essay explores what the Sekisui Art Museum is and how it is

likely the CKJT manuscript came to be in its collections. Kamiya only briefly probes the question of the moon-shaped symbols that are at the head of each entry. Kamiya's introductory essays also provide two lists explaining the use of this manuscript for understanding how Bakin evaluated *Geppyō kien* and *Raigō Ajari kaisoden*. In the case of the list for *Geppyō kien*, he says the entry is useful for understanding how publishers and artisans interacted with Bakin for making books; Bakin's methodology for writing stories; and, information on the sources of those stories. In the case of the list for *Raigō Ajari kaisoden*, Kamiya states that the entry helps us understand how Bakin saw changes in popular trends over time; his attitude towards working with specific historical sources; and, the complexities of his attitude towards the financial success of a work and its literary merit. The final introductory essay provided by Kamiya is also another list that provides passages from different entries that touch upon the points above.

## **General Literature Review**

An appropriate literature review for this dissertation will touch upon four points. Firstly, there is scholarly literature relating to Kyokutei Bakin, his life, and his works. Secondly, there is scholarly literature relating to the eighteen works covered by Bakin in the CKJT. Thirdly, there is scholarly literature relating to the genre of *yomihon*. Finally, there is the scholarly literature written in English on the subject of Bakin, his works, and his life.

There is a considerable amount of scholarship on Bakin, his life, and his works in the Japanese language. Mizuno Minoru's has written on Bakin's life and activities and Hamada Keisuke has a smaller essay on Bakin's life at the end of the second volume of his edited modern edition of *Nansō Satomi Hakkenden*. Hayashi Yoshikazu also has a multi-part essay published in the journal *Edo Shunshū* that talks about the hardships of Bakin's early life, with particular

focus on his relationship with his parents and education.<sup>7</sup> Perhaps the most substantive bound volume focused on Bakin's works is Itasaka Noriko's *Kyokutei Bakin no sekai: gesaku to sono shūen* 曲亭馬琴の世界：戯作とその周縁 (Itasaka, 2010).<sup>8</sup> This book collects her previously published articles into four themed chapters: one focused on Bakin's illustrated fiction (*gōkan*), another focused on Bakin's medium length *yomihon* *Yume awase nanka kōki* and the serialized *Nansō Satomi hakkenden*, another focused on the relationship of Bakin's imagination to the structure of his household, and a final chapter examining the readerships of his works.

There are a number of individual scholarly articles that examine the eighteen works that are covered in CKJT. It should be noted here that all of the works covered in CKJT, with the exception of *Itozakura shunchō kien* and *Kukuri zuki chirimen kamiko*, have been photographed and collected into a series called *Bakin chūhen yomihon shūsei*. At the end of each volume of *Bakin chūhen yomihon shūsei*, there is a "Gedai" essay written by Tokuda Takeshi that gives an outline of the bibliographic information, the story, and the sources for the work. Perhaps the most frequently addressed book is *Geppyō kien*, probably for its virtue as being recognized as Bakin's first *hanshi-bon yomihon* and the connections of this work to vernacular Chinese fiction. Ōtaka Yōji has explored *Geppyō kien* from these angles in multiple articles, though Tokuda Takeshi's "Geppyō kien' no inbi" has substantive analysis on the influence of Chinese fiction on the composition of *Geppyō kien*. Ishikawa Hidemi has written extensively on both *Raigō Ajari kaisoden* and *Shunkan sōzu shima monogatari*, with each of his essays exploring Bakin's efforts with historical biographies called *shiden mono* 史伝もの. Suzuki Toshiya's

---

<sup>7</sup> Mizuno Minoru's collection of essays entitled *Bakin* has an entire selection devoted to Bakin's life and activities (Mizuno, 1974).

<sup>8</sup> Itasaka Noriko's *Kyokutei Bakin no sekai: gesaku to sono shūen* 曲亭馬琴の世界：戯作とその周縁 collects her previously published articles into four themed chapters: one focused on Bakin's *gōkan* illustrated fiction; another focused on Bakin's medium length *yomihon* *Yume awase nanka kōki* and the serialized *Nansō Satomi hakkenden*; another focused on the relationship of Bakin's imagination to the structure of his household; and, a final chapter examining the readerships of his works (Itasaka, 2010).

“Sayonakayama katakiuchi’ kara ‘Sekigen ikyō’e” is an excellent study of how Bakin draws on Buddhist prose narratives for composing his own works. Liu Ying has several articles devoted to how Bakin adapted Chinese *gong’an* 公安 for composing *Aoto Fujitsuna moryōan*. Hong Soo Joon is a scholar studying at the University of Tokyō who is both engaged with the CKJT and several of Bakin’s earliest *yomihon*.

The genre of the *yomihon* has also been well studied by scholars. The seminal study is Yokoyama Kuniharu’s *Yomihon no kenkyū: Edo to Kamigata to*.<sup>9</sup> This study breaks down *yomihon* into a variety of categories, including, time period, geography of the writer, and subgenres. Yamamoto Takashi and Kigoshi Shunsuke have contributed some of the most important studies of *yomihon* associated with the *Kamigata* region. Ōtaka Yōji and Hamada Keisuke have contributed excellent studies on the relationship of *yomihon* to the sources from which they draw their influence. They have also probed the different forms of plot or story structure found in *yomihon*. Satō Satoru and Takigi Gen have contributed some of the most important studies of the nature of materiality for considering the *yomihon* of Edo.

English-language scholarship on *yomihon* as a genre or Kyokutei Bakin exists, though the amount is considerably smaller than Japanese-language scholarship. The most detailed study of Kyokutei Bakin’s life and works is Leon Zolbrod’s *Takizawa Bakin*, which attempts to narrate Bakin’s writing career and motifs through a frame of his wanting to return to the samurai class. Though not specifically focused on Bakin himself, Robert Leutner’s *Shikitei Sanba and the Comic Tradition in Edo Fiction*, Adam Kern’s *Manga from the Floating World*, Jonathan Zwicker’s *Practices of the Sentimental Imagination*, and Andrew Lawrence Markus’s *The*

---

<sup>9</sup> This work categorizes *yomihon* in a variety of ways. From a periodization perspective, Yokoyama splits the *yomihon* into three groups: emergence (1789-1803), flourishing (1803-1830), and final years (1830-1860s). Within these periods, Yokoyama generally breaks *yomihon* into subgenres: *haishi mono*, *chūbon mono*, and *zue mono*, *adauchi mono*, *oie sōdō mono*, *kōdan mono*, *densetsu mono*, and *shiden mono*. Finally, he is clear to categorize *yomihon* geographically, by placing them in the category of Edo or Kamigata (Yokoyama, 1973).

*Willow in Autumn* each touch upon Bakin and the social and literary world in which he wrote. *Yomihon* as a genre is discussed in anthologies of Japanese literature, including Donald Keene's *World Within Walls* and Haruo Shirane's *Early modern Japanese Literature: an anthology, 1600-1900*. Recently, there have been several dissertations that feature Bakin or *yomihon* in some way. Glynne Walley's "'I would rather be a faithful dog than an unrighteous man': Virtue and vice in Kyokutei Bakin's 'Nansō Satomi hakkenden'" examines the different figurations of virtue in Bakin's *Nansō Satomi hakkenden* and provides translations of the opening chapters of that work. Brian Dowdle's dissertation "Transformations in Print: The Re-creation, Reception, and Representation of Edo-period Fiction in Turn-of-the-Century Japan" examines the reception of Bakin's works as Japan's book market shifted from being based on woodblocks towards western-style books. William Evan Young's "Family Matters: Managing Illness in Late Tokugawa Japan, 1750-1868" talks about Bakin in the broader context of vision loss and Tokugawa society.<sup>10</sup> William Fleming's "The World Beyond the Walls: Morishima Chūryō (1756-1810) and the Development of Late Edo Fiction" discusses the *yomihon* of Morishima Chūryō, focusing on how Chūryō's own intellectual curiosity and humor gave his *yomihon* a distinct style.

## **The Structure of this Dissertation**

This dissertation is at its core an annotated translation accompanied by several introductory chapters that are designed to locate CKJT in its historical context. All of these chapters are designed with one central question in mind: How can we better understand this text by looking at Bakin's other writings and activities? As such, these chapters draw from a variety

---

<sup>10</sup> I have not yet read William Evan Young's work, but I am aware of it from discussions with his colleagues at Princeton.

of sources and use various approaches. I have chosen to arrange them in a way that best moves my reader forward through Bakin's literary life, starting with the earliest sources and ending with those sources produced alongside the composition of CKJT.

The second chapter, "How was the Chosakudō kyūsakuryaku jihyō tekiyō Created?", asks how the *text* as a whole came into being. Because of the sporadic nature of Bakin's diaries and letters towards the end of his life, it is difficult to retrace the process by which the manuscript was composed but something of its composition can be grasped through an examination of how his "Kinsei mono no hon Edo sakusha burui" came into being.

"Edo sakusha burui" and CKJT share several aspects that make "Edo sakusha burui" a useful model for understanding how CKJT was created. Both projects are forms of literary history that attempt to define, in some way, the nature of the Edo *yomihon*. Many of the people involved in the creation of CKJT—like Ozu Keisō, Tonomura Jōsai, and Kimura Mokurō—are also involved in the "Edo sakusha burui." Furthermore, the nature of their participation in both projects is similar. There are some differences, however, between the contexts under which "Edo sakusha burui" and CKJT were written that necessitate caution about drawing inferences about the latter from the former.

This chapter also discusses how "Edo sakusha burui" plays another important role in the history of the CKJT. Although Bakin does not cite the "Edo sakusha burui" as the inspiration for revisiting his earliest works, it is clear from his correspondence that he immediately set about collecting all of those works at the end of the period when he worked on the "Edo sakusha burui" manuscript. The process of collecting these works is anything but smooth, since Bakin prioritizes first editions and many of the titles he is seeking are difficult to find. Also, the



establishment of a personal collection of his works leads to a lasting legacy that is akin to the CKJT: a place where Bakin's close associates can access his earliest work even after the death.

The third chapter asks where we can look to understand the content and shape of the entries found in the CKJT. I seek to explain the shape and substance of the entries by comparing them to another manuscript written by Bakin, *Ken'i hyōbanki*. A comparison between these two works shows that CKJT shares many of the same analytical focuses and methods found in *Ken'i hyōbanki*, including, the use of special symbols for evaluation, dissatisfaction with the relationship of the writing to theater, and the use of concepts now termed as the “Seven Rule of the Historical Novel” (*haishi shichi hōsoku* 稗史七法則). Yet, a deeper look at the comparison also shows that CKJT is not entirely stylistically consistent with the earlier *Ken'i hyōbanki*.

In the third chapter, I examine the question of why Tamenaga Shunsui is the only other contemporary writer mentioned in the CKJT. CKJT needs to be thought of, at least partially, as a response by Bakin to Shunsui's own position of authority and popularity in Edo's marketplace of popular literature. Only years after Bakin finished privately defining the field and history of popular literature in Edo, Shunsui and the publisher Chōjiya Heibei publically release their own catalog of Edo's *yomihon*. Bakin's frustration with the organization of this catalog and the attention it draws to Shunsui as an authority can be seen in how much energy he expends in refuting Shunsui and his work.

Bakin is also acutely aware of the power publishers and other popular writers, like Shunsui, who are acting as editorial assistants have for altering the shape and content of Bakin's earliest works. Bakin sees these alterations in reprints of works like *Geppyō kien* and *Kukuri zokin chirimen kamiko*, where different titles and different kanji characters are used from the

newly recarved woodblocks. The case of *Kukuri zuki chirimen kamiko* truly infuriates him because in his comments on the book Shunsui has altered the title, the illustrations, and even the number of volumes. Bakin views this as a violation of his reputation and of that of his work.

The actions of Shunsui and publishers, therefore, may be part of the reason for the shape and look of the CKJT. First, Bakin's need to set the record straight in regards to *Kukuri zuki chirimen kamiko* may have led to that work having the longest and most detailed entry of all the eighteen works. More importantly, however, Bakin's dismal evaluations of *Raigō ajari kaisoden* and *Shunkan sōzu shima monogatari* seem like a rebuke to Shunsui's evaluation of the latter as Bakin's "single greatest work" outside of the *Nansō Satomi hakkenden*.

The fourth chapter asks where we can look to understand the content and shape of the entries found in the CKJT. I seek to explain the shape and substance of the entries by comparing them to another manuscript written by Bakin, *Ken'i hyōbanki*. A comparison between these two works shows that CKJT shares many of the same analytical focuses and methods found in *Ken'i hyōbanki*, including, the use of special symbols for evaluation, dissatisfaction with the relationship of the writing to theater, and the use of concepts now termed as the "Seven Rule of the Historical Novel" (*haishi shichi hōsoku* 稗史七法則). Yet, a deeper look at the comparison also shows that CKJT is not entirely stylistically consistent with the earlier *Ken'i hyōbanki*.

## Table of Contents

Dedication		ii
Acknowledgements		iii
Preface		iv
List of Appendices		xix
List of Abbreviations		xx
Chapter One	How was the “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jīhyō tekiyō” Created?	1
Chapter Two	Why is Shunsui the only other contemporary writer mentioned in “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jīhyō tekiyō”?	24
Chapter Three	Where does the style of the “Chosakudō kyūsakuryaku jīhyō tekiyō entries come from?”	45
Appendices		68
Bibliography		156

## List of Appendices

Appendix A “Kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō”	68
<i>Raigō Ajari kaisoden</i>	68
<i>Kumo no taema amayo no tsuki</i>	70
<i>Itozakura shunchō kien</i>	72
<i>Shunden jitsujitsu ki</i>	76
<i>Sumidagawa bairyū shinsho</i>	78
<i>Beibei kyōdan</i>	82
<i>Shin Kasane gedatsu monogatari</i>	82
<i>Hachijō kidan</i>	83
<i>Shunkan sōzu shima monogatari</i>	84
<i>Shitennō shōtō iroku</i>	86
<i>Aoto Fujitsuna moryōan</i>	88
<i>Katakiuchi kidan Wakae no hato</i>	90
<i>Sangoku ichiya monogatari</i>	95
Appendix B “Sessaku kyūkoku no mono no hon ryaku jihyō kan no ge”	101
<i>Geppyō kien</i>	101
<i>Sekigen ikyō</i>	118
<i>Kanzen Tsuneyo monogatari</i>	123
<i>Tōchū Sono no yuki</i>	128
<i>Kukuri zuki chirimen kamiko</i>	142

## List of Abbreviations

- BN *Bakin nikki* 馬琴日記, 4 vols. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1953.
- BJH *Bakin no jisaku hihyō—Sekisuikabutsukanzō “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryakujihyō tekiyō”*—. 馬琴の自作自評—石水博物館蔵 『著作堂旧作略自評摘要』—. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 2010.
- BSS *Bakin shokan shūsei* 馬琴書簡集成, 7 vols. Tokyo: Yagi Shoten, 2003.
- BKSS *Bakin kenkyū shiryō shūsei* 馬琴研究資料集成, 5 vols. Tokyo: Kuresu Shuppan, 2007.
- BCYS *Bakin chūhen yomihon shūsei* 馬琴中編讀本集成, 18 vols. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 1996.
- KH ”Ken’i hyōbanki” in *Tokugawa Bungei ruishū*, 徳川文芸類集 vol. 33 (Tokyo: Kokusho Kankō Kai, 1914).
- ESB *Kinsei mono no hon Edo sakusha burui*. 近世物之本江戸作者類, Tokyo: Yagi Shoten, 1988.
- NSH *Nansō Satomi Hakkenden*. 南総里見八犬伝, 12 vols. Edited by Hamada Keisuke. Tōkyō: Shinchōsha, 2003.
- ZGK *Tamenaga Shusnsui-hen Zōho Gedai kagami* 為永春水編増補外題鑑, Tokyo: Izumi Shoin, 1985.

## Chapter One

### How was the “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō” Created?

#### Introduction

The extant manuscript of the “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō” (hereafter abbreviated CKJT) has the distinctive handwriting associated with Ozu Keisō and is likely a copy of a manuscript written out by Bakin’s daughter-in-law Omichi. What might be the relationship of this copy to an original? We may never be able satisfactorily to answer this question: no original and no other copies of the manuscript survive and Bakin’s composition of the text took place over a period of time when his household diary is silent and his letters less frequent. These problems make contextualizing his work difficult, but not impossible. This chapter proposes that another significant project of literary evaluation undertaken by Bakin can serve as an imperfect parallel for understanding how the CKJT project was most likely undertaken. That earlier project is “Kinsei mono no hon Edo sakusha burui” 近世物之本江戸作者部類 (hereafter abbreviated as “Edo sakusha burui”)

There are several ways that an understanding of the textual history of “Edo sakusha burui” helps with our understanding of the creation of CKJT. First, “Edo sakusha burui” is itself a literary project that was preserved as several different manuscripts held by members of Bakin’s literary circle. By understanding why and how “Edo sakusha burui” came into the hands of Keisō in the seventh year of the Tenpō era (1836) we can imagine a similar process for CKJT. Second, the textual history of “Edo sakusha burui” shows us how money and materials, like books and paper, flowed between different members of these literary circles. Third, after selling off his personal library in the years immediately following the completion of “Edo sakusha

burui”, Bakin begins re-collecting copies of his earliest *yomihon* 読本. Several of the works that he is searching for, however, have become rare in the literary marketplace and others have been changed through the reprinting process. Bakin’s need to review the quality of the editions of his works that he wants to include in his personal library may be one of the impetuses for starting the CKJT.

### **A Multiplicity of Manuscripts**

A close analysis of the textual history of “Edo sakusha burui” teaches us that this literary project involved a number of people in different locations and created multiple circulating versions of the text. The people involved in this literary project include Bakin himself, Kimura Mokurō 木村黙老 (1774-1856), Ozu Keisō 小津桂窓 (1804-1858), Tonomura Jōsai 殿村篠齋 (1779-1847), Ishikawa Jōsui 石川 豊翠 (1807-1841), and the copyist Ōhashi Ugenji 大橋右源氏 (dates unknown). These members of the literary circle created between them a number of different manuscripts, each with their own unique qualities.<sup>1</sup>

Kimura Mokurō a samurai of the Takamatsu Domain in Sanuki Province who took residence in the domain’s mansion in Edo, was the member living closest to Bakin. Mokurō taught the classics and martial arts within the schools of the Takamatsu Domain before being sent to Edo to attend to the Domain’s residence there from 1815 to 1822 and again from 1827 to 1835. He excelled at literary arts, including *waka* 和歌 and *kyōka* 狂歌 poetry and literary commentary. His association with Bakin dates back to at least the end of the Bunsei period, when he is first mentioned by Bakin in a letter to Jōsai.

---

<sup>1</sup> ESB, p. 8.

Tonomura Jōsai and Ozu Keisō were both living in the Matsuzaka Domain in Ise Province. Jōsai, whose real name is Yasumori 安守, was a “national learning” (*kokugaku* 国学) scholar and a poet. He studied under the *kokugaku* scholar Motoori Norinaga 本居宣長 (1730-1801) until the latter’s death. Along with Keisō, Jōsai maintained a close correspondence with Bakin. Jōsai clearly valued that relationship and kept Bakin’s letters as a personal treasure—the majority of the extant letters attributed to Bakin come from Jōsai’s collection. Ozu Keisō was a member of wealthy merchant household that ran shops in Kyōto, Osaka, and Edo. Keisō was a literary name (he also used Hisatari) and his personal name was first Yasukichi 安吉 and then Shinzō 新藏. At the age of 14, Keisō studied under Motoori Haruniwa 本居春庭 (1763-1828), the oldest son of Motoori Norinaga. When Haruniwa died in 1828, Keisō took over some of his scholarly pursuits. His correspondence with Bakin dates from 1829, and like Jōsai, he became an important friend to Bakin.

Ishikawa Jōsui was the final of Bakin’s literary associates who played a significant role in the “Edo sakusha burui” project. He is first mentioned by Bakin in a letter to Jōsai in 1835, where Bakin notes that Jōsui “has no friends in Edo”. Bakin describes Jōsui as a man who loves books. Jōsui quickly became involved in the “Edo sakusha burui,” practically within a year of meeting Bakin, which suggests that their friendship quickened at a pace unusual for Bakin. Like Mokurō and Keisō, Jōsui also participated in the criticism of Bakin’s *Hakkenden*, but not to the extent of the members of Bakin’s other literary circle<sup>2</sup>

In his comprehensive look at the textual history of “Edo sakusha burui,” Kimura Miyogo 木村三四五 points to a series of textual exchanges between Kimura Mokurō and Bakin in the beginning of fourth year of the Tenpō era (1833) as one of the origins of the project. Among the

---

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, p. 150.



books which Bakin and Mokurō borrowed from each other's personal libraries were *Shiraichi sōsho* 白石草紙 and *Sozoro monogatari* そぞろ物語.<sup>3</sup> Their correspondence shows that they copied out passages from these works and consulted each other on the finer points of them. From this process of textual consultation, which included Bakin and Mokurō looking back on the notes of evidentiary scholarship found within Bakin's *zuihitsu* 随筆 *Chosakudō zakki* 著作堂雜記 and *Gendō hōgen* 玄同放言, they developed a list of Chinese and Japanese vernacular literature, called the "Kinrai gesakusha hentai enkaku" 近来戯作者変体沿革. This document was formed in conjunction with a second list kept by Mokurō called the "Wakan shōsetsu mokurō hoi" 和漢小説黙老補遺. Many of Bakin's letters and diary entries from December of the fourth year of the Tenpō era (1833) and into the following January and February show that Bakin worked closely with Mokurō on these lists, with Bakin responding to Mokurō's requests for additions or other amendments to the individual manuscripts.

The exact contents of "Kinrai gakusha hentai enkaku" are not now known, but a diary entry from December 2<sup>nd</sup> of the fourth year of the Tenpō era (1833) shows that Mokurō requested that Bakin write the manuscript for "the section on the writers of *akahon*". A strikingly similar section title can be found in "*Edo sakusha burui*." Shortly after, Bakin refers to a "Mono no hon sakusha burui" 物之本作者部類 in his diary entry from December 6th, which coupled with the similarity of "the section on the writers of *akahon*," suggests that "Kinrai gakusha hentai enkaku" is the earliest iteration of the "Edo sakusha burui" manuscript.<sup>4</sup>

The first mention of "Edo sakusha burui" in Bakin's correspondence appears in a letter addressed to both Tonomura Jōsai and Ozu Keisō dated December 12<sup>th</sup> of the fourth year of the

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid, p. 12-14.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, p. 12-14.

Tenpō era (1833). This letter is of considerable length and covers a variety of rumors and Bakin’s activities beyond his composition of a manuscript. It is only at the very end of this letter that Bakin discusses “Edo sakusha burui”: “I am writing something called ‘Kinsei mono no hon sakusha burui.’ I think I will soon finish the manuscript. I just started it four or five days earlier, my hand is tired from writing.”<sup>5</sup> Bakin further states that he wants to place the manuscript in his collection as a private document (*hisho* 秘書), but that he wants Jōsai, Keisō, and Mokurō to look at it first. He is explicit that the work is not intended for profit—it is simply something to do to pass the time in his final years—but that it also should become a work of great personal value in the future. This letter is likely the first introduction by Bakin of the “Edo sakusha burui” project to literary acquaintances living outside Edo. Even at this stage, Bakin is indicating that he wants the finished manuscript to circulate only within a select private audience. He is specific about that private circulation in a letter to Jōsai dated January 12<sup>th</sup> of the fifth year of the Tenpō era (1834), where he says: “this is a private document (*hisho* 秘書). It is difficult for me to give permission for others to see it aside from you and Keisō.”<sup>6</sup>

Bakin’s later letters show that he kept Jōsai and Keisō apprised of his progress and that he refused to send the manuscript until it was reasonably complete. Bakin seems to have had concerns regarding the state of the manuscript, and these concerns may have played a part in delaying his sending of the work for their comments. For example, in a letter dated January 6<sup>th</sup> of the fifth year of the Tenpō era (1834) and addressed to Keisō, Bakin writes: “I only completed the second volume yesterday. One volume has about 40 double-page spreads (*chō* 丁) and is written in a fine script (*komaji* 細字) of about 11 lines a page. It will be hard to make it all

---

<sup>5</sup> BBS 3: p. 143.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid, p. 156.

without fitting it into 4 volumes. It is roughly about the amount that I write for a *yomihon*.”<sup>7</sup>

There are a few things to note here. We see that by that date, Bakin had roughly finished a first draft of two of the volumes he intended to write. Even with his other writing obligations, he set a frenetic pace of writing, completing the equivalence of a four-volume *yomihon* in the space of a month.

Bakin informed Jōsai of a new plan he had for the “Edo sakusha burui” in a letter dated February 18<sup>th</sup> of the fifth year of the Tenpō era (1834):

As for the single booklet (*ichisatsu kōhon* 一冊) of the manuscript of “Edo sakusha burui,” while this is an extremely personal document, since friends are a special exception, in the beginning of spring I returned it to Mokurō. For the first draft of the manuscript (*yasei kōhon* 野生稿本), the writing is too fine (*amari komaji* あまり細字), with many deletions, and corrections to the writing. Since this is not something easily kept for a long time, now I am having it made with a larger characters. I have discussed with Mokurō about having him copy it out in his own hand, and that copy being taken to a copyist for binding into a book.<sup>8</sup>

Bakin says specifically that he thinks copying out such a dirty and messily written manuscript will be too difficult and time consuming for his friends. He wants to have it remade, with his preference being a professional copyist from Edo. Keisō and Jōsai should review that refined copy instead of the current draft. Still, he asked Jōsai his opinion regarding having the manuscript copied out in Matsuzaka and requests that Jōsai discuss the matter further with Keisō. Ultimately, Bakin decides to have the work copied out in Edo, using a copyist familiar to Mokurō by the name of Ōhashi Ugenji. Bakin’s diary mentions a visit by Ōhashi, who had come to Bakin to discuss a copying project involving a book called *Kaikodori* 飼籠鳥, for which he

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, p. 151.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, p. 177.

brought a bound volume and asked for 1 *kabu* 株 and 4 *mon* 文—a moderately large sum. Bakin complains that the copyist asked for money already paid. While negotiating the remainder of the *Kaikodori* project, Bakin discusses having the first volume of “Edo sakusha burui” copied out.<sup>9</sup>

A slew of letters sent by Bakin from May 2<sup>nd</sup> until June 1<sup>st</sup> of the fifth year of the Tenpō era (1834) shows how the manuscript copies of “Edo sakusha burui” multiplied. A very substantive discussion of that textual proliferation is given in a long letter to Jōsai.<sup>10</sup> In this letter, Bakin states that Mokurō’s large print version has largely been completed, and that version will be the master copy (*genpon* 原本).<sup>11</sup> He wants Jōsai and Keisō to both see and copy out this master copy. He follows with some interesting statements about the condition of the large character *genpon* version. “Since the first volume is in Mokurō’s hand it is fine, but the second volume is in someone else’s hand and there are quite a few mistakes and omissions.”<sup>12</sup> The state of the text is so bad that Bakin finds it difficult to use, which leads him to remark that this unnamed person has no respect for the art of transcribing. Bakin is left in despair and disbelief. He reiterates the need for secrecy by saying that Mokurō’s work with copying out the manuscript earlier was done secretly and that the poor quality of the versions means no outsider should see them.

The letter also raises points about the economics of copying out a manuscript. He lists the costs associated with the copyist: three *monme* for a bundle of *mino gami* 美濃紙 paper, 6 *mon* for other expenses, and 1 *mon* for copying out a single volume. Bakin’s dissatisfaction with the work done prompted him to negotiate for having the work redone, since he feels that “11 or 12 pages are useless, not a single page can be used. So, having to correctly rewrite from the

---

<sup>9</sup> BN 2: p. 67.

<sup>10</sup> It may be the case that this letter is written over a period of days.

<sup>11</sup> BSS 3: p. 192.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid, p. 192.

beginning is a waste of the money spent on the paper and the copying fee.”<sup>13</sup> The discussion of these financial considerations, alongside the repetitive mentions of the poor quality of the copies, makes Bakin’s letter to his friends in Matsuzaka seem like an apology that the copies of the manuscripts are not reaching them. Bakin is also emphasizing his need to invest additional money into the project—perhaps with the potential angle of trying to defray the costs onto them. In a letter sent to Keisō a few days later on May 11<sup>th</sup> of the fifth year of the Tenpō era (1834), Bakin more specifically describes the number of manuscripts now extant, writing that there are several fine-print versions, a good large-print, and a bad large-print version. He also makes the statement that the rates for “large-character” (*daiji* 大字) copying are cheaper than “fine-character” (*komaji* 細字).<sup>14</sup>

Eventually, worthwhile copies of the “Edo sakusha burui” made their ways into the hands of Mokurō, Keisō, and Jōsai, but the individual process of reading and amending the project by the participants meant that each manuscript took on a shape unique to itself. Bakin wrote in his letters some of those amendments and so coordinated with the others to track changes to each document. Bakin helped connect members of his literary group living in different areas, like Mokurō and Jōsai in Matsuzaka, Keisō in Sanuki and Jōsui in Edo.

Several of Bakin’s later letters show how he conveyed changes to the different manuscripts to different members. Suggested revisions can be seen in a letter sent in July, where Bakin admits there are problems with the entries for *Furu kuchiki* 古朽木, *Wakuraba monogatari* わくらはの物語 (which he calls “*Wakuraba sōshi*” わくらべ草紙 in the letter), and *Gekka seidan* 月下清談.<sup>15</sup> Part of the problem appears to be the classification of these

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid, p. 192.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid, p. 207.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid, p. 225.

works, a mistake in Bakin's memory that "brings sweat to my brow." He writes in August to Keisō of mistakes in the entries for *Shikidō ōkagami* 色道大鏡 and *Nigiwai gusa* にぎはひ草, the mistakes being associated with bibliographic data that Bakin wanted to consult *Kiryō manroku* 羈旅漫録 for accuracy. He also sees "great profit" in having been informed by Keisō that Ueda Akinari's *Harusame monogatari* 春雨物語 had been overlooked, and that he is adding the appropriate information.<sup>16</sup>

Two changes in the manuscript that are relayed by Bakin to the members of his literary circle show how these members themselves added content to "Edo sakusha burui". The first change is recommended by Jōsui. In a letter to Jōsai and dated June 12<sup>th</sup> of the sixth year of the Tenpō era (1835), Bakin writes:

Addendum. At the end of the first volume of the previously distributed manuscript of "Sakusha burui," for the section on writers of *chūbon* 中本 sized works, new details have been added underneath the text for Maruya Kakuko 円屋賀久子. Those details are as below: Afterwards, there was the octavo-sized work of Kakuko called *En no ito musubu kamikoma* 赤繩結紙古満 (2 volumes in all and 8 booklets). Just as written above, these details should be entered in a fine script of two lines per row underneath the main text.<sup>17</sup>

As can be seen in the above quote, Bakin is specifically recommending to Jōsai that these additions be made in the copy of the manuscript that Jōsai has, in order to keep consistency between the different copies. Another recommended change can be seen in another letter to

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid, p. 328.

<sup>17</sup> BSS 4: p. 12. By "fine text" (*komaji* 細字), Bakin means that the characters should be half the size of the normal writing and the two lines per row means that those half sized characters should be crammed into two small lines where there is normally one.

Jōsai dated January 6<sup>th</sup> of the seventh year of the Tenpō era (1836). Bakin writes that another subject heading should be added to the section on the writers of *sharebon* 洒落本. He writes:

Heizutsu Tōsaku, who composed *kyōka* poetry during the Tenmei era ( ) and operated a tobacco shop in Yotsuya's Shinjuku, just like as was told to us by the great master (Kyōden). After consulting this person's *zuihitsu* 随筆 called *Shinya meidan* 莘野茗談, I discovered that the writer of *Yūshi hōgen* 遊子方言 is Tanba(ya) Rihei. It was published by Suharaya Ichibei and very popular. It is said that because of this book, chapbooks with Chinese-style covers became popular.<sup>18</sup>

Bakin states that the above description had been sent to him by Mokurō who was in Sanuki, and requests that Jōsai update his copy of the “Edo sakusha burui.” Curiously, the Seikadō Bunko version of “Edo sakusha burui”, believed to be copied from Jōsui's copy, contains a near replication of Mokurō's suggestions, but with different kanji used for certain words and differences in the placement of diacritical marks.<sup>19</sup> These amendments also show that while Bakin may have composed the lion's share of “Edo sakusha burui,” his literary circle also participated in the creation of content.

These changes and corrections of mistakes in the copies have allowed scholars to speculate from which particular manuscript each of the surviving versions of “Edo sakusha burui” came. There are at least three different versions extant: one in the Seikadō Bunko; one in the Hibiya Library Kaga Bunko; and, one in the Sakurayama Bunko. The first published version of “Edo sakusha burui” is from 1893, published by Hakubunkan as part of the *Kinko bungei onchi*

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid, p. 135.

<sup>19</sup> ESB, p. 171-2. These differences can be summed up nicely in a small example from the texts. In the letter by Bakin, citing Mokurō, it is written: 貴翁御存のごとく. Diacritical marks of emphasis are placed next to the characters highlighted. The Seikadō Bunko manuscript reads: 貴翁のしらせ給ふがごとし. The entire phrase is marked with diacritical marks.

sōsho. A preface added by Jōsui to his copy of the “Edo sakusha burui” also appears in the Hakubunkan publication. Whereas, the lack of the “Jōsui okusho” 暈翠奥書; the inclusion of the diacritical marks for the *Yūshi hōgen* and the appended entry for Maruya Kakuko show that the Onchi sōsho edition is probably based on Bakin’s handwritten copy—the copy of the manuscript (*teibon* 底本) that was not written in Jōsui’s hand. Miyogo states, however, that the remaining two versions also have the “Jōsui okusho” and the inclusion of the diacritical marks for the *Yūshi hōgen* and the appended entry for Maruya Kakuko, suggesting that they are copies of Jōsui’s version of the “Edo sakusha burui” that was copied outside of Bakin’s literary circle and probably long after his and Jōsui’s death.<sup>20</sup>

### **What does this tell us about CKJT?**

As mentioned earlier, understanding the circumstances of the composition of CKJT is marred by the absence of entries in the Takizawa household diary and, to a lesser extent, the lesser number of letters sent by Bakin. The Takizawa household diary suffers a major interruption after the fifth year of the Tenpō era (1834): there is no section for the sixth year of the Tenpō era (1835) and the section covering the period between the seventh year of the Tenpō era (1836) and third year of the Kōka era is comprised only of extracts.<sup>21</sup> This lack of sources makes drawing an accurate picture of what textual exchanges occurred during the composition of the CKJT difficult. Although looking to the “Edo sakusha burui” is useful for establishing a possible model for understanding how the CKJT was composed, it should be noted that the circumstances of Bakin’s composing the “Edo sakusha burui” and his composing the CKJT are

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid, p. 178.

<sup>21</sup> The reason for that period being composed only of extracts is unclear.



somewhat different. Therefore, the model is imperfect and we should be cautious in assuming the extent to which Mokurō, Jōsai, and Keisō participated as they had before.

There are some references of the “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō” in Bakin’s letters. The first comes in a letter addressed to Jōsai and dated April 19<sup>th</sup> of the twelfth year of Tenpō era (1841).<sup>22</sup> In this letter, Bakin writes: “As for the abbreviated self-evaluation of my old work *Wankyū Matusyama monogatari*, I laughed when I sent it earlier, because you have seen the above mentioned volumes since then, I wish to express that you do what you wish ... when I have spare time, I will have my old works read to me and I will evaluate them. I hope for your help.” Bakin goes on to say that he will employ the services of his daughter-in-law Omichi, since his eyes have failed him. This letter shows that by April of 1841 Bakin had started writing about his own earliest works and was starting to think of a longer self-evaluation project.

“Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō” may have started with an evaluation by Bakin of his *Wankyū Matusyama monogatari*, which requires us to think more critically about why that self-evaluation is the last one included in Keisō’s copy of the manuscript.<sup>23</sup>

The next reference of “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō” is in a letter addressed to Keisō and dated June 6<sup>th</sup> of the fifteenth year of the Tenpō era (1844), and worth quoting at length:

Kyūsetsusaku no mono no hon ryaku jihyō,” Jōsai has distributed it, and when you make a copy, I ask that you send my manuscript on to Mokurō ... As for the above, there will be differences between the beliefs of the writer and the beliefs of the reader, quite the opposite, I know such a thing. Though it can be said to be a small thing, since there are differences like night and day between my beliefs

---

<sup>22</sup> BBS 5: p. 299.

<sup>23</sup> It is possible that the longer evaluations found in the second volume were written before Bakin set about writing the evaluations found in the first volume, since the evaluation of *Wankyū Matusyama monogatari* is the very final evaluation in the Keisō’s copy of the *Chosakudō kyūsakuryaku jihyō tekiyō*. Also, Bakin’s criticism of *Wankyū Matusyama monogatari* has a history that predates 1841, which will be discussed in the next chapter

from 30 or 40 years and my views now, or since there are many things about my past self, I am abbreviating and evaluating my works. The first part is the same as what you saw. If I may trouble you, you will see that there are differences in your beliefs after 30 or 40 years.<sup>24</sup>

In a second letter to Keisō, dated October 6<sup>th</sup> of the fifteenth year of the Tenpō era (1844), Bakin writes that another manuscript of “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō” had been completed and the original sent on to Mokurō from Jōsai.<sup>25</sup> He apologizes for mistakes in the copy and the errors of his memory, and asks Mokurō to review it and make any desired corrections. In a letter sent to Jōsai and dated January 1<sup>st</sup>, of the second year of the Kōka era (1845), Bakin speaks of giving Mokurō the manuscript of the 4<sup>th</sup> set of *Bishōnenroku* for correcting mistakes and ensuring the copier’s draft for making woodblocks (*hanshita*) are worthy. He goes on to say that the situation is the same for the “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyōtekiyō,” which he has been thinking of sending along since his surrogate reader (his daughter-in-law Omichi) does not have the time for review. Bakin also makes the point that he does not fully trust his own ability to review. He says that borrowing the eyes of another is not really seeing for oneself—suggesting the difficulty of effectively evaluating works by having Omichi read them to him.<sup>26</sup>

These few mentions of the “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyōtekiyō” in Bakin’s letters already show us some parallels with the “Edo sakusha burui”. Mokurō, Jōsai, and Keisō are once again given special access to at least one circulating manuscript. A substantive change, however, is that due to his failing eyesight, Bakin now more heavily relies on his literary circle, particularly Mokurō, to ensure the quality of his manuscripts. In other words, Bakin’s earlier capacity to act as the director of the project is diminished. Also, it is unclear what version of the

---

<sup>24</sup> BBS 6: p. 105.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid, p. 108.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid, p. 117.

manuscript was sent to Keisō for copying. If the version sent to him only contained the shorter “first volume,” this could be a possible explanation for why the first volume is on neatly ordered stationery and the second volume is written by hand on blank sheets. In other words, the extant copy found in the Sekisui Art Museum may represent two separate periods of copying out by Keisō. At the very least, these letters show that the “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō” had been circulating by October of the fifteenth year of the Tenpō era (1844).

Another significant difference between the “Edo sakusha burui” and the “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō” is that there are several extant copies of the former and only the one recently discovered copy of the latter. The death of Ishikawa Jōsui in 1841, several years before Bakin set about the “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō” project, is likely a contributing factor to the discrepancy: most of the surviving manuscripts of “Edo sakusha burui” are based on the copy held by Jōsui. That Jōsui was not alive to participate in the “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō” project means that those who copied out his copy of “Edo sakusha burui” did not have similar access to a copy of “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō.”

### **Recollecting of his Works**

The second section of this chapter looked at how the “Edo sakusha burui” project led to the proliferation of different manuscript versions that circulated between Bakin and his literary circle. His literary circle also served an important function for helping Bakin sell his collections when Bakin needed to raise the funds necessary to invest his grandson Tarō with a position as a samurai, and thus ensure the future financial stability of his family. He sold his personal collection from the seventh year to the eighth year of the Tenpō era (1836-37). These sales of his books had several effects on Bakin that are important for considering the CKJT. First, Bakin

lost possession of his earliest works—books that he describes as his greatest treasures. Second, it increased his reliance on his network of literary friends for acquiring or consulting texts. Third, it required Bakin to invest time and resources into reacquiring copies of his own books. This final point, that Bakin spent a considerable amount of effort to regain his works may have been one of the central impetuses for writing the CKJT. Perhaps, the CKJT can be thought of as a way that Bakin reclaimed a beloved library that he lost.

Bakin's sale of his books can be split into about seven major transactions. The first batch of books he sold at the end of September of 1836 on the common Edo book market to publishers with whom he had an established relationship. In October of that month, he sold books to his friend Keisō. In November, he sold books to the ruling family of the Chōshū domain (modern day Yamaguchi prefecture). The next year, he sold books to Mokurō and the brother of the manager of the residence in which he lived, a man by the name of Sugiura Kiyotarō 杉浦清太郎. Finally, he sold another batch of books to Mokurō and the samurai family of the Chōshū domain in the middle of the eighth year of the Tenpō era (1837). The majority of the books that he sold were his collection of Chinese and Japanese classics. The batch that he sold to the wife of ruler of the Chōshū domain, through an intermediary named Hayashi Udayū, is the sale that has the most pertinence to the study of “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō”. That sale included a large chunk of Bakin's personal collection of his earliest *yomihon*.

The sale of Bakin's books supplemented another effort by Bakin to raise funds for his grandson Tarō, other being a major party held to celebrate his seventieth birthday. Leon Zolbrod opens his chapter “The Blind Author (1835-1848)” with an account of an artists' and writers' party that was “supposedly to celebrate his seventieth birthday (by Japanese reckoning), but in

reality [was] to raise money for [his grandson] Tarō's future".<sup>27</sup> The need for ensuring Bakin's future arose out of the untimely death of Bakin's son Sōhaku in 1835. The preparations for this party began in June of 1836, and involved his personal extension of invitations to guests. These invitations included his bestowing signed fans and silk kerchiefs with designs by Kunisada 国貞 and Kuninao. Though scheduled for the 9<sup>th</sup> of September, Bakin had to delay the party until the 24<sup>th</sup>.<sup>28</sup> In the meantime, he commissioned a large number of food entrées, barrels of spirits, and different party favors to be handed out to the guests. The guests in turn, were supposed to reciprocate by offering gifts, usually in the form of money, to the Bakin household. The party was held at the restaurant Manpachirō in Yanagibashi, where the leading literati, artists, writers, publishers, and anyone else possibly associated with the publishing business were entertained. His letters after the event were careful to include exactly which distinguished persons came, and to what category (writer, poet, publisher, and so forth) they belonged.<sup>29</sup>

Shortly after the party, Bakin sought to supplement the gifts received at the party by selling off portions of his personal collection to his close friends, including Mokuurō. Mokuurō further assisted Bakin by introducing Hayashi Udayū 林宇太夫—the older brother of Fujiura, a woman in the service of Sōteiin, the wife of Mōri Norifusa, the lord of the Chōshū domain. Hayashi was in Edo looking for the works at the request of Sōteiin, who wanted her own collection of Bakin's books. On November 5<sup>th</sup> of the seventh year of the Tenpō era (1836), Bakin sent Hayashi Udayū a package of letters, including a description of the party, a receipt of sale for a number of books from his personal library, and an addendum directly addressing his feelings on the loss of those books.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Translated by Zolbrod. (Zolbrod. pg. 121).

<sup>28</sup> Ibid, p. 123.

<sup>29</sup> BBS 4: p. 238-246.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid, p. 247.

In his letter to Hayashi, Bakin begins by relating how he had heard that Udayū had been looking for copies of Bakin's oldest works the previous year. It appears that Udayū stretched his net wide, going to a number of different old booksellers, but quickly discovered that the ravages of time and fire had made many of Bakin's works rare. Bakin describes a world in which many of his most recent volumes are present, but "as for my old works from since the Kansei era, no matter how many times I ask publishers, I cannot get even a single one in my hand."<sup>31</sup> He goes on to say that possession of these earliest works is a prize greater than any other, even the valued books of other writers. It is only with great reservation that he is willing to yield his personal collection to Hayashi through the offices of Azabu (Mokurō). On a separate sheet of paper he includes a list of books he is relinquishing to Uta and the prices he wants for each. These include 15 *hanshi-bon* 半紙本 works at 1 *kan* 貫 a volume for most and 2 *kan* a volume for those whose woodblocks have been lost to fire. There are also 9 *chūbon* 中本 format works, each priced at 2 *kabu* 株, or 1 *ryō* 両 3 *kabu* in all. There are five additional and exceptional books on this list as well, with ranging prices and conditions. The total price for all of these books comes out to 8 *ryō*, 1 *mon* 文, 1 *kabu*, and 24 *monme* 匁. This is a considerable sum of money.<sup>32</sup> Of the books Bakin is sending to Hayashi, those that are reviewed in CKJT include, *Geppyō kien*, *Wakae no Hato*, *Shitennō shōtō iroku*, *Sangoku ichiya monogtari*, *Sono no yuki*, *Raigō ajari kaisoden*, *Kukuri zuki chirimen kamiko*, *Shunden jitsujitsuki*, *Itozakura shunchō kien*, and *Kumo no taema amayo no tsuki*. This represents ten of the eighteen reviewed works.

In the years following the sale of his beloved collection of his own books, Bakin begins to want to revisit those works and sets about reacquiring them. In some cases, the books are difficult to track down and Bakin asks his literary friends to keep an eye out for copies. Bakin

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid, p. 247.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid, p. 249-251.

writes in a letter to Jōsai, dated December 14<sup>th</sup> of the eleventh year of the Tenpō era, of his experiences purchasing his old books.<sup>33</sup> In this letter there are five books that he has ordered which have been particularly troublesome, including, *Sangoku ichiya monogatari*, *Shunden jitsujitsuki*, *Suiko gaden* 水滸画伝, *Geppyō kien*, and *Itozakura shunchō kien*. First, he states that he no longer needs *Sangoku ichiya monogatari* and says that he has stopped searching for it. Bakin mentions that the copy of *Shunden jitsujitsuki* in his library is unsatisfactory because there are a number of places where someone attempted to color in the illustrations. Such an ‘unusable’ book has led Bakin to place orders with local lending library (*kashihon* 貸本屋) and used book shops, and as he explains, these orders have been standing with publishers like Chōjiya for a number of years. Those copies of his earliest works that Bakin does find circulating in Edo, like *Shunden jitsujitsuki* and *Suiko gaden*, are incomplete or damaged. He purchases them anyways, “these dirty and damaged books are the same as the bad books, but I thought why not select them and match up the good parts?” A similar scene of reconstructing books can be seen with *Kumo no taema amayo no tsuki* in a letter dated May 20<sup>th</sup> of the eighth year of the Tenpō era (1837).<sup>34</sup> Bakin states that some of the pages of the book have fallen out of the binding and that he requested his daughter-in-law go to a lending library and copy out those missing pages. He notes that the book in his possession is from many years ago and that the pages being copied out come from a revised edition (*shinpan* 新板).

The letter to Jōsai – and a similar one to Keisō – shows that these members of his literary circle living in the far-off towns of Matsuzaka and Ise played an integral role in reconstructing those damaged books in Bakin’s library.<sup>35</sup> When Bakin purchased a copy of *Shunden jitsujitsuki*

---

<sup>33</sup> Ibid, p. 236-242.

<sup>34</sup> BBS 4: p. 335.

<sup>35</sup> This suggests a different level of attrition for books that exist outside of the capital center.

from Uta Hayashi, he noticed an unacceptable amount of writing in the book. Bakin asks for Jōsai to acquire a second half of the book and send it along to him. The remaining first half, he suggests, should be sold. He asks Keisō to send along copies of *Geppyō kien* and *Amayo no tsuki* that are first editions, claiming that there are no longer any undamaged first editions of *Amayono tsuki* in Edo—only reprints. He also makes standing requests for Keisō to acquire any newly printed copies of *Shitennō shōtō iroku* that he comes across.

### **What does this tell us about CJKT?**

Why is it that Bakin wanted copies of his earliest works above all other book? Perhaps, the onset of worsening physical conditions has made him yearn for relics from his younger years. Whatever the reasons for setting about re-collecting his personal library, the process placed the books in Bakin’s hands. The need to ensure that the quality of the library met his personal standard prompted him to read or have read to him each of those works, perhaps even numerous times. Undoubtedly, that reading process helped generate the ideas and critiques that are found in the CKJT.<sup>36</sup>

That process of building a personal collection of his own earliest works is not directly described in the CKJT, though there are traces of it nestled in his individual evaluations. For example, the process of acquiring another copy of *Geppyō kien* is described in the evaluation for that work. “My friend in Matsuzaka of Ise was able to find a copy in that region, but it is of a later version and from a lending library in a dreadful state, including 16 pages from the 3<sup>rd</sup> volume missing. Also, I ordered a single book in Edo and that was a reprint.”<sup>37</sup> The entries for *Sangoku ichiya monogatari* and *Kumo no taezu amayo no tsuki* are silent on the matter, though it

---

<sup>36</sup> It is worth noting that the some of the longest entries in CKJT are also the same books that Bakin has the most difficulty in acquiring.

<sup>37</sup> BJH, p. 177.



should be noted that they are from the first volume of CKJT and significantly shorter than his later evaluations.

### **The circulation of books after Bakin's death**

For February 13<sup>th</sup> of the third year of the Kaei era (1846), Bakin's daughter-in-law Omichi mentions the CKJT in the Takizawa household diary. "During the evening, Matsumura Gisuke came and returned the 4 booklets of Bakin's *gōkan Kingyoden* 金魚伝 that he borrowed the other day. He requested the 8 booklets of the second and third volumes, and he took those with a single volume of Chosakudō's self-evaluations."<sup>38</sup> In an entry for the 18<sup>th</sup> of that month, Omichi writes: "Matsumura sent his luggage man Yuhei to return the volume of a journal (*zakki* 雑記), the booklet of evaluations, and the second and third volume of *Kingyoden*." This is the only mention of the "Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō" in the diary kept by Omichi, but we see that at least once, Bakin's manuscript is given out to a family friend after Bakin's death in 1848.

The literary project of "Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō" may have contributed to the collation of Bakin's earliest works into a personal library in the Takizawa household, but the circulation of those texts did not end with the death of Bakin in 1848. The diary of the Takizawa household, kept by Omichi after Bakin's death, shows how that personal library continued to be accessed by acquaintances of the Bakin family.<sup>39</sup> For example, the entry for the March 14<sup>th</sup> of the third year of the Kaei era (1849), a person by the name of Iwai Masanosuke came to the Bakin household and returned two books: the first volume of Bakin's *Asahina shima meguri no*

---

<sup>38</sup> Shibata, *Omichi nikki*, vol 2, p. 100.

<sup>39</sup> Omichi had begun keeping the diary updated years before Bakin had died because of his failing eyesight.

*ki* (5 booklets) and the *jōruribon Sankatsu Hanshichi* (6 booklets).<sup>40</sup> In exchange for returning these volumes, he borrowed the 5 volumes of *Geppyō kien*. He appears to have finished *Geppyō kien* in two days, since he returns that book on March 16<sup>th</sup>, only to borrow Bakin's *Shin kasane*. On the same 16<sup>th</sup>, Kimura Mokurō returned the 4 booklets of the 3<sup>rd</sup> volume of *Asahina shima meguri no ki* and borrowed the next volume. On the 17<sup>th</sup>, Masanosuke returns the *Shin kasane* and takes out *Shitennō shōtō iroku*. The borrowing goes on and on.<sup>41</sup>

Similar accounts of other borrowers, like Ōkubō Yano and Fushimi Iwagorō, appear repeatedly throughout the entire extent of the diary. These visits are not solely for the purpose of borrowing books. Many of the journal entries describe how Omichi spends an entire afternoon or stays up all night conversing with her visitors. They bring gifts, stationary, and small donations, and their frequency suggests intimacy with the Takizawa. When they leave, it is usually with a book from the Bakin library in their hands.

These exchanges of books occasioned by visits raise a few questions about the “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō” project. Almost all of the works found in Bakin's “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō” are recorded as having been borrowed by one or another of these local household acquaintances, which suggests the possibility that these acquaintances also had access to the entries in the “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō.” It's possible to imagine that they read one or more entries with Omichi during one of the extended discussions, and having had the inspiration of Bakin's evaluations, decided to check out the work themselves. Such a scenario would represent a different (and traceless) form of circulation for the “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō,” something different from the borrowing or copying of manuscripts that we see in Bakin's lifetime. It is important to note, however, that

---

<sup>40</sup> Shibata, *Omichi nikki*, vol 2, pg. 102.

<sup>41</sup> Accounts of acquaintances borrowing books from the Takizawa household begin while Bakin is maintaining the diary and extend throughout the entirety of the Omichi's copy of the Takizawa household diary.

other works of Bakin not covered in the CKJT, like the *Bishōnenroku* and the *Mukashi gatari shichiya no kura*, are also repeatedly borrowed. So, perhaps, these acquaintances are simply curious to read through the entire Bakin oeuvre—and, as Bakin noted, many of these works were increasingly rare in the book market. Bakin’s personal library may have been the easiest means to access them.

These exchanges of books also suggest aspects of the practice of reading. The frequency and nature of the exchanges show that these acquaintances take a four or five booklet volume and return the book within a day or two, which suggests they had the time and leisure to read the book in a short period of time. We can also see by Kimura’s picking up the 4<sup>th</sup> volume of *Asahina shima meguri no ki* right after reading the 3<sup>rd</sup> volume that readers would progress through the works in a natural order. However, the fact that Kimura is in possession of the 3<sup>rd</sup> volume of *Asahina shima meguri no ki* when Masanosuke came to return the first volume of that same work also shows how reading a work of popular literature during the late Tokugawa period may not have been a simple matter of starting at volume one and reading until the end. If anything can be taken away from Bakin’s journals and letters, it is that books are continually suffering attrition from heavy usage. Copies lent from house to house by the traveling lending libraries of Edo, or those of the reading salons of Osaka, undoubtedly wore away in places. Readers no doubt became accustomed to skipping entire passages, abandoning a work halfway through, or starting a work at the middle. Masanosuke, at least, seems content to put off *Asahina shima meguri no ki* for another day and to enjoy *Geppyō kien* in its stead.

To this point, the discussion has centered on the possible ways that the CKJT came into being and the likely people who helped it along. These people include Mokurō, Jōsai, Jōsui, and Keisō, whose name is on the extant version of the CKJT manuscript. The next chapter turns

towards another literary figure in Bakin's life that may have exerted some influence on Bakin's decision to compose the CKJT. That person is Tamenaga Shunsui 為永春水 and his presence in the CKJT is rather negative.

## Chapter Two

### Why is Shunsui the only other contemporary writer mentioned in “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō”?

#### Introduction

The works evaluated in “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō” (hereafter abbreviated as CKJT) draw from a number of sources. Some of these sources, like the *Heike monogatari* 平家物語 and the *Genji monogatari* 源氏物語, are classics that have been transmitted for many years. Other sources, like local historical accounts (*jitsuroku* 実録) were still fresh when Bakin took up his brush to write his works. It is a remarkable feature that many of Bakin’s Bunka era *yomihon* 読本 are careful to give the source of information or ideas. CKJT, though not comprehensive, also tries to draw the reader’s attention to where a book is influenced by another story or work.

CKJT does not, however, discuss Bakin’s work as in dialogue with that of other writers of the day. The influences of living writers and their works go unmentioned. He does not compare his books against the works of his contemporaries, even though these works were clearly in dialogue with writers like Santō Kyōden 山東京伝 (1761-1816), Shikitei Sanba 式亭三馬 (1776-1822), and Jippensha Ikku 十返舎一九 (1765-1831). In CKJT, Bakin seems to erase almost any possible connection of his works to any other writer. Almost. There is one contemporary writer who repeatedly appears in the entries of CKJT: Tamenaga Shunsui 為永春水 (1790-1843).

Bakin's treatment of Shunsui is anything but generous. He is described in entries for *Kanzen Tsuneyo monogatari*, *Shitennō shōtō iroku*, and *Kukuri zuki chirimen kamiko* as an unscrupulous character. For example, in the self-evaluation of *Shitennō shōtō iroku*, Bakin writes:

In the end, while it is the complete biography of Yasusuke, it is about thieves and should not be called a biography. For this reason, I have titled the book *Shitennō shōtō iroku* 四天王剿盜異録. The two *kanji* characters for “*shōtō*” 剿盜 (“quelling the brigands”) is an essential point, and yet the entry in Shunsui's *Gedai kagami* 外題鑑 only records it as “*Shitennō*” 四天王. This is a matter of great regret.

Shunsui's career and especially his treatment of Bakin in *Zōho gedai kagami* 增補外題鑑 seem to have created a lasting sense of rivalry in Bakin.

### **Bakin and Tamenaga Shunsui**

Tamenaga Shunsui was one of the most popular writers during the Tokugawa period. His real name was Sasaki Sadataka 佐々木貞高 and he was a townsman (*chōnin* 町人) living in Edo. He also wrote under the pseudonym Echizenya Chōjirō 越前屋長次郎 and Tamenaga Chōsuke 為永長介. Shunsui's writing career began in the Bunka era as an apprentice for the publisher Seirindō, where he worked alongside other popular writers like Shinrotei, Ryūtei Tanehiko 柳亭種彦, and Shikitei Sanba 式亭三馬. Among his first publications was *Akegarasu nochi no masayume* 明烏後の正夢, published in 1819. Shunsui, like many of his contemporaries, wrote across a number of genres, including *gōkan* 合巻, *yomihon* 読本, and *kokkeibon* 滑稽本. The majority of his published works were published in the *chūbon-gata* 中本型 format and focused

on melancholic stories that borrowed heavily from the theater, a genre that came to be known as *ninjōbon* 人情本. His most celebrated work is *Shunshoku umegoyomi* 春色梅美婦禰, a story of a love triangle between the protagonist Tanjirō and two women.<sup>42</sup>

It is clear from Bakin's journals and letters that he knew of Tamenaga Shunsui from at least the Bunsei period onward. Among the first references to Shunsui by Bakin is a letter addressed to Tonomura Jōsai and dated January 28th of the thirteenth year of the Bunsei era (1830).<sup>43</sup> In the letter, Bakin states that he met with Tanehiko, the current Enba, and Shunsui at the publisher Nishimuraya Yohachi's residence. The substance of this discussion appears to be Tanehiko's evaluation of *Hakkenden*, which Bakin relates as gushing with praise, too long-winded to put forth in a letter. The letter does not go into specifics about Shunsui's contributions at this meeting, but it can be imagined that Shunsui sat in attendance as Tanehiko's pupil. A letter sent two months later (dated March 26th) gives the first inkling of Bakin's attitude towards Shunsui as a writer and as an intellectual. In this letter, also sent to Tonomura, Bakin writes that he had not been reading *gōkan* fiction at all, with the exception of the second volume of Tanehiko's *Shōhon jitate* 正本製. He claims that he has yet to even read the well-regarded *Nise Murasaki Inaka Genji* 倭紫田舎源氏. His reasons for a lack of interest lie in the scarcity of innovation in the genre, and he fails to see any sophistication in the works of Shunsui and the current Enba. Curiously, he returns to the issue of Tanehiko's earlier evaluation of the seventh volume of *Hakkenden*—perhaps suggesting a lingering sensitivity that may have affected his willingness to read his contemporaries, especially Shunsui.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> "Tamenaga Shunsui." *Nihon daihyakka zensho*.

<sup>43</sup> BSS 1: p. 259.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid*, p. 277-278.

### What is the *Zōho gedai kagami*?

In 1838, a few years after Bakin completed work on “Edo sakusha burui”—his own private literary project to classify the works of popular fiction in Edo and their writers—Shunsui participated in the publication of another catalog attempting to define the field of *hanshi-bon* books of popular literature. That catalog, entitled *Zōho gedai kagami* 増補外題鑑, was unlike “Edo sakusha burui” in that it was commercially published. More so than other such publications or bibliographies, *Zōho gedai kagami* appears to have tweaked a sense of indignation in Bakin.

*Zōho gedai kagami* is a catalog of *hanshi-bon* books supposedly organized and compiled by Okada Kinshū, the nom de plume of Chōjiya Heibei of the publishing house Bunkeidō.<sup>45</sup> Sasaki Sadataki, the real name of Tamenaga Shunsui, is listed after Okada Kinshū as “assistant” (*hōsha* 補者). The opening preface of *Zōho gedai kagami* is attributed to Sasaki:

Here, the second-generation master of the publishing house Bunkeidō has ordered the carving of a library and the publishing of bound volumes with devotion and sincerity. That which profits people searching for exceptionally rare and valuable books are inevitably copied or set out upon a woodblock and dispatched out to spread in the world. And so, he works industriously to sell books of illustrated historical fiction. [This catalog] contains not only the publications put out by this publisher, but also does not overlook the new works of the three capitals. He uses judgment to refrain from the many desires, and in so doing, month after month increases the property of all the land.<sup>46</sup>

In addition to this preface, it is likely that Shunsui also organized the catalog and provided the précis found within some of the entries, though the exact extent of his involvement is unknown.

---

<sup>45</sup> ZGK, p. 155.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid, p. 3-5.



The selections and structure of the work outline a limited scope of popular writers from the Edo region with a focus on their contributions to the *yomihon* genre. These writers include Kyokutei Bakin, Tamenaga Shunsui, Santō Kyōden, Saeda Shigeru, Shikitei Sanba, Shinrotei Shujin, Kanwatei Onitake, Jippensha Ikku, and others.

*Zōho gedai kagami* is useful for understanding how Bakin’s contemporaries like Kinshū and Shunsui defined the idea of a *yomihon*, and gives us an approximation of their understanding how genres were constituted within the field of *yomihon*. Our own, current understanding of *yomihon* genres comes largely from Yokoyama Kuniharu’s *Yomihon no kenkyū* 読本の研究, which splits *yomihon* into four fundamental categories, including *haishi mono* 稗史もの, *chūbon mono* 中本もの, *ehon mono* 絵本もの, and *zue mono* 図絵もの.<sup>47</sup> *Zōho Gedai kagami*, on the other hand, splits *yomihon* into eight categories, and includes a type of book, *zuihitsu*, that is not included as a *yomihon* in Yokoyama’s seminal study. The eight categories are *gunki no bu* 軍紀の部 (“military chronicles”), *katakiuchi narabi chūsei jitsuroku no bu* 敵討並び忠誠実録の部 (“revenge stories and historical accounts of valor”), *shoke shinpen yomihon no bu* 諸家新編読本の部 (“new *yomihon* works from assorted writers”), *tsuzuki monogatari taikan no bu* 続き物語大巻の部 (“large volumes of serialized stories”), *jidai mono no bu* 時代物の部 (“historical stories”), *kidan kaidan no bu* 奇談怪談の部 (“ghost and supernatural stories”), *kōsōden no bu* 高僧伝の部 (biographies of renowned religious figures”), *shotaijin zuihitsu no bu* 諸大人随筆の部 (“miscellaneous essays by assorted renowned writers”), and *Tōgun narabi shokiroku* 唐軍並び諸記録 (“Foreign books and other journals”).

---

<sup>47</sup> Ibid, p. 163-164.

A simple perusal of the entries with some study of their explanations—supported by ample reference to synopses of categorical works provided by the *Nihon koten bungaku jiten* 日本古典文学辞典—shows that “*gunki no bu*” is devoted to adaptations or re-workings of classical Japanese military histories into new books that include illustrations, cleaner fonts, and simplified prose. Accounts based on historical anecdotal stories and more recent events, with particular emphasis on revenge tales, are grouped in the “*katakiuchi narabi chūsei jitsuroku no bu*” section. An entry from the “*gunki no bu*” section shows some doubt on the part of the annotator for the inclusion of a book. “*Ōuchi Tatara gunki* 6 booklets in all A military tale (*gunki*) of the Ōuchi clan of Suō Yamaguchi. And yet, is this not a fictional tale? (*tsukuri monogatari* 作り物語)”<sup>48</sup> “*Tsukuri monogatari*” is a term that implies the story is not based primarily on historical sources, that it is made up or fabricated; this term appears frequently in the section “*yomihon no bu*” that most prominently features the medium-length works of Edo writers.<sup>49</sup>

The “*yomihon no bu*” section uses the *kanji* for “*haishi*” (稗史) with the furigana “*yomihon*”. This section begins with *Hida no takumi monogatari* 飛弾匠物語 by Rokujuen 六樹園 (1754-1830) and proceeds from there to include nearly 170 titles.<sup>50</sup> All of Bakin’s medium length fiction is included in this section, with the exception of his *chūbon-gata yomihon*. The inclusion of several titles from the Kamigata region with titles that begin “*ehon*” (although, sometimes the *Zōho Gedai kagami* entries omit the “*ehon*”) shows that “*yomihon no bu*” is not a

---

<sup>48</sup> Ibid, p. 12.

<sup>49</sup> Bakin also employs “*tsukuri monogatari*” in the CKJT.

<sup>50</sup> Rokujuen is a pseudonym used by the poetry *kyōka* writer Ishikawa Masamochi 石川雅望 for composing *yomihon*.

category applied solely to the works of Edo writers—however, it should be noted that the names of Kamigata writers are rarely included.

Despite being considered by modern scholars like Yokoyama as a serialized *hanshi-bon yomihon*, Bakin's *Hakkenden* is placed with other works into a section entitled “*tsuzuki monogatari taikan no bu*”. The binding logic of the section is that all of the works appear to exceed 10 volumes (*kan*) and most are works serialized over several years. *Hakkenden* is not the only work of Bakin's in this section: *Kinsei bishōnenroku*, *Asahina shimameguri no ki*, *Chinsetsu yumiharizuki*, and *Kaikan kyōki kyōkakuden* appear as well. The works of other writers appear too, though mainly those of Saeda Shigeru. Shunsui does take the opportunity to include his *Ōuchi Okitaka jissanden*, perhaps to help his prestige as a writer by placing his work in the company of the famed *Hakkenden*. The “*tsuzuki monogatari taikan no bu*” section, however, is clearly intended to highlight the *Hakkenden*, which has a separate entry devoted to each “set” of that work. Each of the *Hakkenden* entries also contains a long description and evaluation by Shunsui. Each of the remaining categories—*jidai mono no bu*, *kidan kaidan no bu*, *kōsōden no bu*, *shotaijin zuihitsu no bu*, and *Tōgun narabi shokiroku*—are shorter than the opening three categories.<sup>51</sup> A final concluding note in the introduction and a second note at the end of the catalog states that *Zōho gedai kagami* will be followed with volumes devoted to works published in the *chūbon-gata* format. No such sequel exists, so it is likely that Kinshū and Okada abandoned the project.<sup>52</sup>

As noted by Bakin himself, Okada Kishū's *Zōho gedai kagami* is the second publication by the Bunkeidō house to bear that title. Kinshū's previous master, the first Chōjiya Heibei, published a double-sided single-page broadsheet called *Eiri yomihon gedai kagami* sometime

---

<sup>51</sup> Importantly, Shunsui includes some *hanshi-bon* format *zuihitsu* of writers like Bakin and Kyōden suggesting that for Shunsui the genre appears to have some relationship with the other subgenres of *yomihon*.

<sup>52</sup> ZGK, p. 157-158.

after the tenth year of the Bunka era (1814). An introduction written below the header of this broadsheet announces that the intent of the publication is to list all of the books written between the Kansei era and the tenth year of the Bunka era (1814) as the number of such titles exceeds anything heard of in the past.<sup>53</sup> The publisher apologizes that the price of works and other details are overlooked, and promises to provide a separate list for Kamigata *ehon* another day. Unlike the *Zōho gedai kagami*, “*chūbon*-sized *yomihon*” are given an abbreviated section at the end that includes *kibyōshi* and *kokkeibon*. In his “Gedai” to the edited version of *Zōho gedai kagami*, Yokoyama Kuniharu writes that, Eiri *yomihon gedai kagami*, itself, may take the Meiwa era (1764-1772) publication *Taizō shojaku mokuroku* as a model for its own organization, and that other potential sources are *Wakan gunsho yōran* and *Kiroku benran*.<sup>54</sup>

### **Bakin’s Response to the *Zōho gedai kagami***

Bakin responded to *Zōho gedai kagami* with a manuscript called the “Haishi gedai kagami hihyō.” “Haishi gedai kagami hihyō” takes the form of a manuscript that opens with statements and questions posed by Kimura Mokurō and closes with Bakin’s responses and further elaborations. In many ways, it looks like an epistolary exchange between Mokurō and Bakin that has been copied out and bound for circulation and storage in a private library. Also, it is combined with other commentaries attributed to Mokurō on Bakin’s *Hakkenden* and *Shinpen Kinpeibai*.

Bakin first mentions *Zōho gedai kagami* in a letter to Jōsai dated October 23<sup>rd</sup> of the ninth year of the Tenpō era. In this letter, Bakin describes the *Zōho gedai kagami* as a publication by Chōjiya edited by Shunsui, and that Shunsui has overlooked a number of things, including

---

<sup>53</sup> Ibid, p. 156.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid, p. 156-157.

Kamigata *yomihon*. He draws Jōsai's attention to the problems of quality with Shunsui's annotations. He mentions the fact that Shunsui calls *Shunkan sōzu shima monogatari* his "best work". Also, he is critical of the omission of Bakin's *chūbon*-format *yomihon*.<sup>55</sup> In a letter sent on November of that year, Bakin actually encloses a copy of *Zōho gedai kagami* for Jōsai to review, stating that he did the same for Keisō, as well.<sup>56</sup> A letter to Jōsai (March 12th of the tenth year of the Tenpō era) contains the first mention of Mokurō and Bakin's "Haishi gedai kagami hihyō," which Bakin states that he copied out for Jōsai and Keisō to enjoy.<sup>57</sup>

These letters raise a number of questions about how "Haishi gedai kagami hihyō" came into being.<sup>58</sup> We see that some of the criticisms and examples raised in the "Haishi gedai kagami hihyō" are actually first introduced in letters sent to Jōsai. For example, the issues about the reworking of *Kukuri zuki chirimen kamiko*, the misattribution of *Shitennō shōtō iroku*, and *Shunkan sōzu shima monogatari* being labeled as Bakin's "best work" are all raised in these letters. This suggests that these points and others could be part of a wider dialog that included Jōsai and Keisō, or that Bakin is relaying points brought up in continued discussions with Keisō over a period of months. In other words, Mokurō and Bakin's criticism in "Haishi gedai kagami hihyō" may not be based on a spontaneous exchange of letters, but, instead, a composite that draws from several distinct conversations.

"Haishi gedai kagami hihyō" opens with an evaluation of *Zōho gedai kagami* attributed to Mokurō. Mokurō's complaints against the *Zōho gedai kagami* follow several specific themes, including Shunsui's misattributions, his erroneous understanding of genre, and his odd

---

<sup>55</sup> BSS 5: p. 52.

<sup>56</sup> Later letters contain a careful account of the money Jōsai exchanged for that and a copy of Bakin's most recent volume of *Hakkenden*.

<sup>57</sup> BBS 5: p. 63.

<sup>58</sup> I would draw the reader's attention to the 3rd chapter, where I discuss in greater length how Bakin and his literary friends cooperated to develop and copy manuscripts. The evaluation of *Zōho gedai kagami* seems to follow the same pattern as the *Kinsei mono no hon Edo sakusha burui* and *Chosakudo kyusakuryaku jihyo tekiyo*.

organization. Mokurō's evaluation goes through each section of the *Zōho gedai kagami* in order.<sup>59</sup> Bakin's response to Mokurō in the "Gedai kagami hihyō" is essentially an overarching disavowal of Shunsui's authority to compile such a list. There are several reasons for this disavowal. Bakin draws attention to the fact that Shunsui is primarily a writer of *chūbon* format books and mainly in the vein of humor (*kokkei*) and the sentimental (*ninjō*). Shunsui, Bakin continues, has no special knowledge of either Japanese histories or Chinese historical novels and so he is therefore ill suited to comment on historically-themed fiction. Bakin is critical of Shunsui's inability to use refined and vernacular language, saying that Shunsui is only capable of a laughable pretentiousness. He states that Shunsui is so ignorant that he does not realize *Gedai kagami* is a previous publication of Bunkeidō, and so Shunsui did not even change the title. Bakin has many other complaints: the organization of the work; the fact that Ishikawa Masamochi is included at the beginning of a section and his *Hida monogatari* listed as a great work; and finally, the exclusion of particular books.<sup>60</sup>

More than anything, what he sees as improper attribution is Bakin's primary problem with *Zōho gedai kagami*. Bakin's sense of the close association of pseudonym to type of literature can be seen in an example using Ōta Nanpo. "For example, just as Nanpo senpai's name is written "Nanpo" for the *jitsuroku*, his name is written "Nenboke Sensei" for *kyōshi*, and "Yomo Sanjin" or "Yomo Akara" for *kyōka* and *kyōbun*, and in his later years he was called "Kyōkaen" and "Shokusan". But, he [Shunsui] probably does not know of any "Nenboku" or "Yomo", and so only writes [Nanpo's] pen name for his *zuihitsu*. It is lamentable."<sup>61</sup> This example segues to Bakin thinking about where his own works are misattributed in *Zōho gedai kagami*. Using "Bakin" instead of "Master Kyokutei" seems to have angered Bakin. These

---

<sup>59</sup> ZGK, p. 347-350.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid, p. 351.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid, p. 351.

complaints suggest that Bakin was similarly concerned with which of his literary pseudonyms are attached to his *zuihitsu* and *yomihon* works.

### **Bakin's anxiety over *Wankyū Matsuyama monogatari***

Bakin's sensitivity over *Zōho gedai kagami* is connected to a larger fear over his literary legacy. Shunsui, because of his commercial successes and his connections with publishers, represented to Bakin a threat to the integrity of his own work. Even before the compilation of the *Zōho gedai kagami*, Bakin repeatedly complains of how Shunsui violated his work *Kukuri zokin chirimen kamiko*. Also, Bakin is aware of how Shunsui piggybacks on the success of *Hakkenden* by writing imitative novels. Finally, and connected to Shunsui's ability to alter previously published works, Bakin is acutely aware that ownership of a creative work lies in the hands of the publisher holding the woodblocks, not the writer.

The final entry of “Chosakudō kyusaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō” evaluates *Kukuri zokin chirimen kamiko*.<sup>62</sup> The evaluation begins with a lengthy description of Bakin's dissatisfaction with Shunsui's alterations of the book. Bakin writes of how *Kukuri zokin chirimen kamiko* came to be a book called *Wankyū matsuyama ryūkō wasetsu*:

A publisher called Osakaya Mokichi selfishly reprinted this work without informing the writer at some time during the Bunsei period. With the help of Tamenaga Shunsui, he renamed the work “*Wankyū Matsuyama monogatari*” and divided the three volumes into five. The illustrations (drawn by Toyokuni Hiro) are not based on the old woodblocks, but newly illustrated by Keisen. There are many places that are not the same as the old woodblocks. Also, with the three

---

<sup>62</sup> *Kukuri zokin chirimen kamiko*—like many of Bakin's works from this time—is a story about reaping the rewards of actions and the complexity of both love and family relationships. Among the principle characters are the merchant Wankyū and the courtesan Matsuyama, both of whom meet grisly fates. Bakin's story is heavily influenced by a previously existing story called *Wankyū isse monogatari*, which saw production in the Kamigata theater and novelization by the writer Ihara Saikaku in the early 18th century.

volumes being split into five volumes, many of the illustrations that should be in the first volume are now in the second volume, which is not appropriate for the main text. Mokichi requested all of this of Tamenaga and so selfishly distributed it! Having had that reprint read to me, while in general there are not a lot of differences with the older print, there are some mistakes, superfluous additions, and omissions. Also, the title is *Wankyū matsuyama monogatari*, with *Wankyū matsuyama ryūkō wasetsu* written within each of the volumes. Thinking on it, an old name, it is said that people of the world do not know of the written account of *Wankyū*, Mokichi ordered writing from Tamenaga, who ought to make this dull thing.

This quote covers several of the key points that I will discuss below. First, Bakin is angry that he was not consulted when a publisher reprinted *Kamiko*. Bakin says that he does not personally know the publisher and that the publisher had begun looking for access to Bakin's work without consulting him. After the sale, Osakaya Mokichi (an Edo publisher) asks Shunsui to rework the title and organization of the volumes. Bakin even notes later in the "Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō" evaluation that "in the fourth fascicle of the reprint, Tamenaga Shunsui inserted childish captions to the illustrations, something I did not know about. When I had this read to me, I split my sides with laughter."<sup>63</sup> Finally, the woodblocks of the newly re-named and reorganized *Wankyū Matsuyama ryūkō wasetsu* have fallen into the hands of the Osaka publisher Kawachiya Mohei.

*Kukuri zokin chirimen kamiko* is not the first time that Shunsui altered one of Bakin's works. The very first appearance of Shunsui's name in Bakin's correspondence describes how this un-established writer had taken over a literary work that Bakin abandoned unfinished.<sup>64</sup>

Bakin writes about a work he had been toying with called "Amako kyūgyū no ichimō den" that

---

<sup>63</sup> BJH, p. 208.

<sup>64</sup> The aforementioned letter to Tonomura that is dated January 28th of the thirteenth year of the Bunsei era.



he had been developing while planning *Hakkenden*. This work has nine characters associated with bulls (as opposed to the eight characters associated with dogs in *Hakkenden*), but he abandons the idea after deciding that dogs are closer to humans than cows and more intrinsically loyal. Yet, the publisher Chōjiya gives Bakin's uncompleted manuscript to Shunsui and they rework the main text and changed the title to *Shichikokushi den...* The work rides on the coattails of Bakin's *Hakkenden*, though it ends with only the first “set” that introduces each of the nine cow warriors and is not serialized further.<sup>65</sup>

The extent to which the episode with “Amako kyūgyū no ichimō den” soured Bakin's attitude towards the young Shunsui is not clear, since Bakin does not revisit “Amako kyūgyū no ichimō den” in his other writing. The episode of *Kukuri zuikin chirimen kamiko*, however, appears to have had a lasting effect on Bakin. The first mention of it by Bakin predates the publication of *Zōho gedai kagami* by over four years. In a preface to the middle volumes of the ninth “set” of the *Hakkenden*, Bakin discusses the crafty nature of publishers.

As for the story [*mono no hon*] and those illustrated chapbooks of mine called *gōkan*, I have heard that there are those who seek to buy the old woodblock rights [*itakabu*] and selfishly rework the illustrations, and with a change in the title, they pose them as new works, publishing them for profit. These are *Kanzen tsuneyo monogatari*, *Sangoku ichiya monogatari*, and *Bake kurabe ushimitsu no kane*, as I mentioned before in the preface to the previous set of this work. Recently, I have seen that the three volumes of *Kukuri zuikin chirimen kamiko* have been copied, and the name changed to *Wankyū Matusyama monogatari*, with new illustrations added.<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> “*Shichikokushi den*”, *Yomihon jiten*. P. 155.

<sup>66</sup> NSH 7: p. 22.

The preface goes on to say that readers unfamiliar with a work published 30 years ago will think ‘ah this must be a new work!’ Bakin does not like how the new title focuses on the titular character of Wankyū and Matsuyama. Bakin’s Wankyū is a wanderer and his Matsuyama is a prostitute, and even though he is working from an established story, but this still does not justify making that story’s name as part of the title. The ‘stupid new look’ is lamentable and fails to address the intents of the writer.

The preface uses the example of *Kukuri zukin chirimen kamiko* to probe Bakin’s literary career more thoroughly—inspired by how publishers change his works. This history starts with *Takao senjimon*, the “first of my *sōshi monogatari*,” that is so immature in its style that Bakin “cannot bear to look at it again.”<sup>67</sup> Yet he has noticed that this work was recently republished, with the prefatory illustrations redone. Though that printing admits itself to be a reprinting, it is intended to deceive readers into thinking it is new. What annoys Bakin most is that he was not consulted by the publisher and given a chance to look at either the illustrations or preface. The preface of this new reprint, with its assortment of stamps and bibliographic information he has never seen before, looks strange to Bakin and has errors in the usage of words. All of these things lead to what he sees as a dissatisfying presentation of his work, one that makes his writing and style seem dated. He is aware that many of his other older works are receiving similar treatment by other publishers.

In a letter dated April 22<sup>nd</sup> of the eighth year of the Tenpō era (1837) and addressed to Jōsai, Bakin writes of a work by Saeda Shigeru. He says to Jōsai that after seeing a synopsis of Shigeru’s new work *Yoshimune kōshinroku*, he thought it was possibly another of Shigeru’s novels entitled *Tama no tsuyu*—though he has never actually read *Tama no tsuyu*. His reasons for suspecting this is based on a rumor he heard recently that Chōjiya had purchased the old

---

<sup>67</sup> Ibid, p. 23.

woodblocks from Kadomaruya with the intention of posing those old woodblocks as a new work. “Are there readers who would be so fooled? They are far and wide in this world.” Upon making this statement, Bakin raises an example closer to his heart—that *Kukuri zokin chirimen kamiko* has had its title recently changed to *Wankyū Matsuyama monogatari*.<sup>68</sup> The next mention of *Wankyū Matsuyama monogatari* in Bakin’s letters occurs when he is discussing the problems associated with the *Zōho gedai kagami*. From there, the issue of *Kukuri zokin chirimen kamiko* wends its way into Bakin and Mokuō’s “Gedai kagami hihyō.”<sup>69</sup>

### **What can this tell us about CKJT?**

Bakin’s annoyance over *Kukuri zokin chirimen kamiko* remained with him until the publication of *Zōho gedai kagami*. Afterwards, Shunsui remained a topic of discussion for Bakin throughout the time leading up to and during Bakin’s composition of “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō.” And here we can begin to understand the question that I posed in title of this chapter: “Why is Shunsui the only other contemporary writer mentioned in ‘Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō’?” Bakin is so preoccupied with Shunsui at the end of his life that “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō” almost seems to be written *because* of the threat Shunsui represents to Bakin’s work in posterity. In some ways, parts of “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō” seem like a response to ideas Shunsui brings up in *Zōho gedai kagami*—particularly that *Shunkan sōzu shima monogatari* is Bakin’s best work. Shunsui was clearly on Bakin’s mind.

In a letter to Jōsai dated January 28<sup>th</sup> of the twelfth year of the Tenpō era (1841), Bakin wrote about Shunsui’s involvement in the publication of the 41<sup>st</sup> through 45<sup>th</sup> chapters of the 9<sup>th</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> BSS 4: p. 317.

<sup>69</sup> BBS 5: p. 83.

“set” of the *Hakkenden*.<sup>70</sup> During the previous winter, the manuscripts of those chapters had been made and Bakin was able to revise the work three times. He gave permission to the publisher to print and sell the story. There was a problem, however in the division of the books, and this was related to the revision process. During the previous fall, Bakin had been able to finish the manuscript in his own hand, though he could not see and there were several places too difficult to read (which Omichi helped with), and he handed off those manuscripts to the copyist. He could not make the draft illustrations, so with Omichi’s help, he handed detailed descriptions of those off to the illustrator Yanagawa Sadanobu 柳川定信, who Bakin felt lacked any real skill. Bakin eventually saw the completed manuscripts with the illustrations, which caused him fits since the illustrations did not match the main text and were of poor quality. He set about revising this final manuscript (*shahon surihon*), in which he discovered a number of mistakes.

Describing this process invoked a memory for Bakin of when he first began writing using Omichi as an amanuensis. During the time he still had to teach Omichi the characters, he got permission from his publisher Chōjiya to send his manuscripts entirely in *hiragana*. Chōjiya then had Shunsui change the *hiragana* version into a *kanji* version.

For the matter of changing the *kana* text into a *kanji* text, with words a little too reverent, like “Shunsui is a great writer” and “Since there is not even another person who can match his level of education it is easy to understand [why we should use Shunsui],” he [Chōjiya] recommended [Shunsui].<sup>71</sup>

The decision upset Bakin, but he had no choice in the matter. The memory, however, gave Bakin a moment to dwell on the question of why Shunsui is particularly unsuitable for the task of selecting the *kanji* for Bakin’s *kana* 仮名 manuscripts. He mentioned that Shunsui is only a

---

<sup>70</sup> Ibid, p. 250-252.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid, p. 250.

writer of *chūbon* literature, and therefore inexperienced with some of the more formal features of *hanshi-bon* literature.<sup>72</sup> Even Shunsui's *chūbon* 中本 literature was a problem, because though it sells well from the Tōhoku region to Nagasaki, publishers have a hard time selling 200 volumes in Edo. In other words, Shunsui did not reflect the savviness of an Edo writer.<sup>73</sup>

Even the punishment levied against Shunsui and his publishers for violating the codes of the Tenpō Reforms is a subject of interest for Bakin. He first notes the incident in a letter to Jōsai dated January 12<sup>th</sup> of the thirteenth year of the Tenpō era (1842). He is aware that the city magistrate is accusing the major “popular” (*jihon* 地本) publishers of violating propriety, which brings to his mind Kyōden's punishment for writing books like *Nishiki no ura* 錦の裏 a half century earlier. Bakin wonders at the effect that this crackdown will have on the publication of *Hakkenden*, since some of the publishers targeted by the authorities are involved in the serialization of *Hakkenden*.

What do Bakin's continued ruminations on Shunsui tell us about CKJT? It is not simply that Shunsui is the only remaining member of the cohort of writers active during the earlier Bunka-Bunsei era. Bakin's obsession with Shunsui has much to do with a sense of protectiveness over his works and his reputation, coupled with a touch of helplessness with regard to the prospects of success as he nears the end of his writing career and life. As demonstrated with his fixation on the alteration of the *Kukuri zuki chirimen kamiko*, Bakin knows that Shunsui and his publishers are capable of and willing to repackage Bakin's works. His melancholic reflection on Shunsui's handling of the *hiragana* ひらがな manuscript of the *Hakkenden* gives a sense that Bakin sees his own sophistication dumbed down by Shunsui's

---

<sup>72</sup> He uses *koji* [small print] instead of *hanshi-bon*, but the gist of the argument is that Shunsui cannot properly handle writing in *kanji* used in *hanshi-bon* works.

<sup>73</sup> His complaints that Shunsui is somewhat illiterate are repeated in when he discussed the publication of Shunsui's *yomihon Ehon Kanso gundan* in 1841.

supposed illiteracy.<sup>74</sup> In both cases, that Bakin's works will be changed over time and that his style will inevitably be misrepresented in those changes are connected to a sense of ownership over his writing.

Given the knowledge that his works are either disappearing from circulation or being remade in new ways, CKJT appears to have been an effort by Bakin to exert, in some small manner, influence over how his works were remembered. In effect, *Zōho gedai kagami* may have influenced the composition of “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō” because in the former Shunsui wrote an inordinately long evaluation of *Shunkan sōzu shima monogatari* in which he calls the book “Bakin's best.” The moon-shaped marks that evaluate a work from generally flawless (full moon) to absolutely horrible (new moon) may have been developed as a jab at Shunsui. After all, only two works receive the black mark, and *Shunkan sōzu shima monogatari* is one of them.

The description of *Shunkan sōzu shima monogatari* in *Zōho gedai kagami* is exceptional in its length and its structure. The entries in *Zōho gedai kagami* often contain only the title of the work, the number of volumes, and the names of the writers and illustrators. Only a few works—usually those to which Chōjiya holds the reprint rights—include a detailed evaluation or synopsis for the reader to read. Of these, for the medium-length works, *Shunkan sōzu shima monogatari* and *Mukashi gatari shichiya no kura* have the longest entries. The description of *Shunkan sōzu shima monogatari* in *Zōho gedai kagami* begins with a general description of the setting as being the world of the *Heike monogatari* and Shunkan's participation in a conspiracy. Shunsui praises the scene of Shunkan's facing Ushiwakamaru in a hut at Shishigadani. “As for the episode (*kidan*) of the enemy first facing Shunkan hiding in the hut at Shishigadani, no other author past

---

<sup>74</sup> This might explain some of the lengthy forewords at the end of *Hakkenden*'s publication history that exhaustively correct ‘misprinted’ *kanji* from previous volumes.

or present can match the fineness and interest of the writing.” He goes on to say that the passage (*dan*) at “Shunkan ga Shima” is an incredible innovation in which readers will not fail to perceive Bakin’s machinations (*kikan*). Shunsui ends the evaluation with, “of course, among Master Bakin’s *ehon* there are none that can be called stupid. Yet if you compare them when asked ‘of all his works which is the best? Why is it that this *Shunkan shima monogatari* is a beautiful tale?’ With the exception of his longer work *Hakkenden*, this *Shunkan sōzu shima monogatari* is the absolute number one work from within his *eiri yomihon*.”<sup>75</sup> Shunsui’s praise for the work gushes over. His evaluation, however, may be colored by how an advertisement for one of Shunsui’s own *yomihon* is carved into the final woodblock of *Shunkan sōzu shima monogatari*.

While in the evaluation *Raigō ajari kaisoden* that leads CKJT is compared to other works to make them seem more favorable—like, at least it is not as bad as *Raigō*. There is a stronger feeling of lingering resentment in Bakin’s evaluation of *Shunkan sōzu shima monogatari*. Bakin’s problems with *Raigō ajari kaisoden* is that the historical stories from which the setting and timeframe (*sekai*) of the work limited his freedom as a writer. He also mentions that the treatment of women was too cruel and unsatisfying. He gives similar complaints about *Shima monogatari*. He is more specific in saying that the anecdotes of Shunkan from the *Heike monogatari* and the *Genpei jōisuiki* are what constrained him as a writer. The various ways that the writing did not accurately adhere to rewarding good and bad is also raised as a reason for the poor quality of the book:

Afterwards, Kameō takes the name of Shirakawa Kankai and is employed by Shunkan and his wife, but he has no success and so kills the husband and wife. Although having his previous evil deeds forgiven is something that should be

---

<sup>75</sup> ZGK, p. 53-55.

found in a Kabuki kyōgen jōruri book and though it bears no resemblance to my writing style which seeks a correct form of kanzen chōaku morality, “it is my single greatest work”. Ha!<sup>76</sup>

There is one cryptic remark that seems to beckon to a criticism that Bakin has heard from some quarter. “To add one final thought, the reason for the deaths of Matsu no Mae and Tsuru no Mae were to match the historical accounts. Even if it did not match the historical accounts, I should not have had the mother and daughter die.” Whether or not this comment is a jab at Shunsui is not clear, since Tsuru no Mae’s death is not discussed in the *Zōho gedai kagami* evaluation..

## Conclusion

Bakin notes in his diary that he had heard from Chōjiya that Temenaga Shunsui died on December 23<sup>rd</sup> of the fourteenth year of the Tenpō era at the age of 54 years old.<sup>77</sup> In March of the fifteenth year of the Tenpō era, he relayed this information to Keisō, requesting that the latter mention it to Jōsai the next time he sees him. There is nothing further on the life and contributions of Shunsui in either the diary or the letter to Keisō. Bakin simply lets the matter drop after mention of the time of Shunsui’s death and his age. Bakin would only outlast Shunsui by four years.

This chapter has shown that Bakin’s rivalry with Shunsui and annoyance over Shunsui’s impact on the recirculation of his works is a noticeable aspect of the entries in CKJT. Likewise, the first chapter has shown that CKJT may be the result of an effort by Bakin to regain a treasured library that he had lost. Both of these are different aspects of a sense of attachment or ownership by Bakin towards some of the early works that helped distinguish him as a leading

---

<sup>76</sup> CKJT, p. 150.

<sup>77</sup> BN 4: p. 323.



literary figure. In both cases, Bakin is speaking to his literary circle about his feeling towards literature and the act of literary criticism. The next chapter explores exactly how Bakin engages in literary criticism with his literary circle, and shows that the CKJT possesses many of the same ideas that are found in his earlier criticisms.

### Chapter Three

#### Where does the style of the *Chosakudō kyūsakuryaku jihyō tekiyō* entries come from?

In this chapter, I will explore the nature of the evaluations contained in “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō” (hereafter referred to as CKJT) by comparing them with another self-evaluation by Bakin, the published manuscript *Ken’i hyōbanki*. Like CKJT, *Ken’i hyōbanki* 犬夷評判記(1818) evaluates Bakin’s *yomihon* 読本 produced during the Bunka era (1804-1818) and both are manuscripts that involve Bakin’s expanded literary circle. In addition, each of these manuscripts uses a unique system of symbols to bolster the written evaluations; the literary evaluations in both manuscripts have some focus on the role of theater in *yomihon* writing; and finally, CKJT and *Ken’i hyōbanki* use some of the conceptual frameworks of literary criticism that are now known as Bakin’s “*haishi shichi hōsoku*” 稗史七法則. The commonalities between *Ken’i hyōbanki*, written around 1818, and CKJT, written around 1848, show that many of the attitudes towards *yomihon* and styles of evaluation held by Bakin at the end of the Bunka era remained with him until the end of his life.

Although Bakin’s attitudes toward fiction and his style for literary criticism do not appear to undergo a fundamental shift, neither do they remain entirely static. One difference between CKJT and *Ken’i hyōbanki* is the proximity of the evaluation to the initial publication of the work; CKJT is a nostalgic reflection on works of the past while *Ken’i hyōbanki* looks at works still fresh in the literary market. A second difference can be seen in how the symbols in CKJT are reminiscent of phases of the moon, whereas the symbols in *Ken’i hyōbanki* resemble those found in *hyōbanki*. Third, although Bakin remains critical of representations of theater in *yomihon* from the Bunka era to the end of the Tenpō era, he no longer concentrates on criticism of writers of

*yomihon* using of theatrical phrases or words in their writing. Instead, in CKJT, Bakin's unease with the relationship of the theater and his *yomihon* is focused on how certain plots or histrionic scenarios are inappropriate for the genre. Finally, "Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō" clearly shows that there is still instability in how and where Bakin employs the concepts that are now known as the "*haishi shichi hōsoku*". This chapter, therefore, aims to show that the styles of criticism found in the entries of CKJT are neither entirely unique nor entirely derivative of his earlier literary criticism.

### **CKJT's relationship to Bakin's other literary criticism**

CKJT is only one in a series of reflective pieces Bakin composed from 1831 onward. Here I will discuss where and how Bakin grapples with his own literary past and the history of the Edo *yomihon* in his other literary criticism. There are two particularly important sources: Bakin's essay "Kaigai jōhitsu" 回外剩筆, attached to the end of the *Nansō Satomi hakkenden* 南総里見八犬伝 and the unpublished essay "Honchō suikoden wo yomu narabi hihyō" 本朝水滸伝を読む並批評 (1833).

"Kaigai jōhitsu" is the final installment in the twenty-eight year serialization of *Hakkenden*, and placed after the 180<sup>th</sup> chapter in the nineteenth "set" 輯 *shū* that collects chapters 177 through 180. "Kaigai jōhitsu" is given a chapter heading similar to those found at the beginning of each of the chapters 回 *kai*, where the heading is split into two lines that describe the content of the chapter. That chapter heading reads: "The forty-eight castles discussed in bed with a traveling monk. The twenty-eight years of composing this work of

historical fiction.”<sup>78</sup> This chapter heading thus forthrightly acknowledges that the essay will be a literary history focused on the *Hakkenden*’s publication, spanning twenty-eight years beginning in the Bunka era. The chapter heading also hints that that literary history will be told through a narrative of a nighttime discussion between Bakin and a traveling monk. This narrative structure becomes apparent in the first lines of “Kaigai jōhitsu”:

During the spring of the eleventh year of the Bunka era (1814), Master Kyokutei, the writer of this work, for the purpose of writing this novel, formulated a plan and put his inkstone to use. He really opened up a new line of research. Well, there was a monk traveling throughout the country. One day he came to Kazusa and knocked on Chosakudō’s door, asking for an interview with the master.<sup>79</sup>

The monk asks for permission to stay the night and the chance to speak with the renowned writer. The remainder of the story takes the shape of a conversation between the monk and Master Bakin, with the monk playing the devil’s advocate and Bakin clarifying specific points. The chapter ends, “The monk became surprised and hurriedly said. ‘The night has passed unexpectedly. The time has come.’ He rose up and shuffled off, extinguishing the candle with a poof. The master yelled, ‘what?’ Surprised at his own voice, he woke up. This was all a dream.”<sup>80</sup> Thus, ends the *Hakkenden*.

Before proceeding into the substance of “Kaigai jōhitsu,” I wish to discuss this particular narrative structure in the context of the earlier *Ken’i hyōbanki*. “Kaigai jōhitsu” is written like an extended dialogue between the character Bakin and this fictional monk. The monk asks the character Bakin questions or makes assertions of his own regarding the *Hakkenden*, and the character Bakin answers the former. This question and answer structure of Bakin answering the

---

<sup>78</sup> NSH 12: p. 433.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid, p. 433.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid, p. 481.

question is also found in *Ken'i hyōbanki*. In the case of *Ken'i hyōbanki*—which is mimicking the well-known genre of theatrical ephemera known as *yakusha hyōbanki* 役者評判記—the questioners are multiple and based on character archetypes: “the patron,” “the bad mouther,” and “the lover of books,” and Bakin represents himself as simply assigned “answerer.” This pattern of question-answer is also found in a number of manuscripts by the writer focused on literary criticism of the *Hakkenden*, *Shinpen kinpeibai* 新編金瓶梅, and other works.<sup>81</sup> Both *Ken'i hyōbanki* and these later works of literary criticism are circulated between Bakin and his literary circle during the period of their composition. Yet, if you examine some of Bakin's letters, it is clear that some of the information that appears in the “questioner” role for him to answer is fed beforehand by Bakin himself to members of his literary circle.

“Kaigai jōhitsu” covers a number of subjects, including Bakin's dislike of visitors, some of the sources of information he uses in his stories, and the exact dates for the initial publication of each segment of the *Hakkenden*. The conversation often drifts into reminiscences of the time before the *Hakkenden* and he writes that for the past few years he had been reading his earliest *yomihon*. Among the most touching parts of “Kaigai jōhitsu,” however, is the discussion of how he lost his eyesight and the effect this had on his work writing the *Hakkenden*. Bakin associates this loss of eyesight with his reading and writing at night, saying that the candles on his desk burned out his pupils. He says the need to earn a livelihood allows him no chance at recovery, since he must continue working. In the summer of the following year, he loses sight in his left eye and is forced to write using larger and larger characters. This proves cumbersome, so he teaches his daughter-in-law Omichi to read and write on his behalf.

---

<sup>81</sup> For example, this questioner-answerer structure is found in the discussion of Tamenaga Shunsui's *Zōho gedai kagami* in “Gedai kagami hihyō.”

I could not write a single character. And, it was not just that I had no freedom with my writing brush, even if I looked at the writing and illustrations, I could not make them out at all. I frequently dictated all afternoon and evening, not knowing east from west and with no choice in the matter. I often pulled away from my desk and dropped my writing brush, giving off a single sigh.<sup>82</sup>

Here we see Bakin's frustration with his disability but also his fears that the *Hakkenden* would go unfinished.

It is precisely at the moment when Bakin is finishing the *Hakkenden* and writing the "Kaigai jōhitsu" that he begins work on the evaluation of his *Kukuri zuki chirimen kamiko*, which may have been the first attempt at an evaluation found in "Chosakudō kyusaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō." "Kaigai jōhitsu" and CKJT are closely connected chronologically, and it is possible to see CKJT as an extension of Bakin's reflection on his own work that ends "Kaigai jōhitsu". Some of the information contained in "Kaigai jōhitsu" also appears in CKJT most notably, the discussion of *Kukuri zuki chirimen kamiko*. They also fit well in a chronological sense, "Kaigai jōhitsu" primarily covers Bakin's literary career from 1815 until that year of 1844 and CKJT covers 1803 until around 1815.

"Kaigai jōhitsu" covers the 28-year literary history of the *Hakkenden* in the first half of the essay and touches briefly on his earliest writings towards the end of the essay. One important difference with CKJT is that "Kaigai jōhitsu" does not offer anything in the way of applied criticism of specific passages. In other works of literary criticism written during the Tenpō era (1830-1844), Bakin looks at works he had written decades before with the intention of direct literary criticism, similar to CKJT. One of these is the essay "*Honchō Suikoden wo yomu narabi hihyō*" (1833).

---

<sup>82</sup> NSH 12: p. 456

“*Honchō Suikoden* wo yomu narabi hihyō” looks at Takebe Ayatari’s 建部綾足 (1719-1784)<sup>83</sup> 1770s adaptation of the Chinese novel *Shuihu zhuan* 水滸伝, written in the 1770s.

“*Honchō suikoden* wo yomu narabi hihyō” is similar CKJT in that Bakin is thinking about the past through his analysis—an analysis primarily focused on the style of writing found within the work and the appropriateness of the morality. When “*Honchō suikoden* wo yomu narabi hihyō” is placed into context with Bakin’s other literary project of 1833, “Kinsei mono no hon Edo sakusha burui,” it is clear that part of his agenda for analyzing *Honchō suikoden* 本朝水滸伝 is to trace some of the Edo *yomihon*’s origins to Ayatari’s work in the Tenmei era (1781-1789).

*Honchō Suikoden*, first published in the second year of the An’ei era (1773), is one of the earliest works included in the genre of historical fiction now known as *yomihon*. In the introduction 発端 *hottan* to *Honchō Suikoden*, a mystical woman appears from the branch the old man Umashine fetched from the Yoshinokawa River. The woman told the old man that if he broke the branch into hundreds of pieces and set them afloat in the river, they will change into people of different ranks who will return to Yoshino. This scene shows the influence of the Chinese novel *Shuihu zhuan*, which begins with the release and incantations of 108 baleful star spirits, on the composition of *Honchō suikoden*.

For Bakin, Ayatari’s language is too eloquent and too archaic and clashes with scenes that remind the reader of their contemporary world.

---

<sup>83</sup> Takebe Ayatari was a literatus of the middle part of the Tokugawa period, who engaged in a variety of intellectual pursuits, including waka and haikai poetry, writing *yomihon*, illustration, and kokugaku (national learning). Takebe Ayatari is just one of several pseudonyms he used in those pursuits, others of which are Katsuso, Toin, Ryōtai, Kanyōsai, with his family and given name being Kitamura Kingo Hisamura. He was born into the family of a senior retainer to the Hirosaki domain and with a lineage that extends back to Yamaga Sokō, a noted scholar. When he was 20, Ayatari was expelled from the Hirosaki domain after having an affair with his elder brother’s wife. Afterwards, he wandered around Japan trying his hand at a variety of things and staying in many places. He eventually wound up living in Asakusa outside of Edo working as a teacher who was renowned for a style of poetry that was both fresh and simple. From there he expanded his artistic talents and left for Nagasaki to study Sansuiga painting under Hikangen. His painting also gathered him greater fame.

For *Nishiyama monogatari* 西山物語 and this work, Ayatari uses old language for his writing. Even though he models the words on the past, there are many places where matters that arise have an appearance of our own world. There are not a few times where I thought, ‘What is going on here?’<sup>84</sup>

Bakin’s main criticism is that heavy reliance on classical or refined language is a mistake. The emotions that are described in historical fiction are difficult to understand if vernacular language is entirely ignored. Bakin argues that it was the writers of Song and Yuan dynasties of China who first used vernacular language to in their writing, with the most notable examples being the *Shuihu zhuan* itself and the *Xiyouji* 西遊記. This should be the same for prose storytelling 草紙物語 *sōshi monogatari* in Japan. Bakin notes differences between how classical works of Japanese writing differ from his own day, stating that the literary apparatuses for expressing emotions have changed: “Think of [Murasaki] Shikibu, if she were born today and wrote passages of stories using old language, she would inevitably throw away her brush.”<sup>85</sup> The Japanese text on which he draws most heavily for comparison is the *Genji monogatari* 源氏物語.

In his letters from the 1830 and 1832, it is clear that Bakin is attempting to acquire copies of Ayatari’s *Honchō suikoden*. During this time he is continuing his work on *Kaikan kyōki kyōkakuden*, *Kinseisetsu bishōnenroku*, and *Hakkenden* and all of these works have a complex relationship with the *Shuihu zhuan*. It is likely that Bakin is looking to consult *Honchō suikoden* for ideas or comparison to his own work. Bakin has completed his essay on that work by January 14<sup>th</sup> of the fourth year of the Tenpō era. In a letter to Keisō he writes that he does not

---

<sup>84</sup> BKSS 3: p. 308.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid, p. 309.



know why he was gripped by an urge to write criticism, but that he evaluated up until the 24<sup>th</sup> chapter with such speed that it made him laugh.<sup>86</sup>

If the chronological proximity of “Kaigai jōhitsu” to CKJT asks us to consider the relationship between these two manuscripts, then the 1833 “*Honchō suikoden wo yomu naraibu hihyō*” similarly asks us to consider its relationship to the 1833 *Kinsei mono no hon Edo sakusha burui*. Bakin’s first inklings that he is working on the “Edo sakusha burui” project come almost at the tail end of his correspondences with his literary circle regarding their review of “Honchō suikoden wo yomu naraibu hihyō.” Most importantly, Ayatari is a significant figure in Bakin’s “Edo sakusha burui”. Bakin is quite specific in the introduction to “Edo sakusha burui” that he is concerned only with the writers of Edo and not with those of the Kamigata region—whom he says plans to examine in more detail at a later date. From Bakin’s perspective, Ayatari’s *Hōnchō suikoden* is the only work that falls within the rubric of “yomihon written in Japanese” 国字の読本 *kokuji no yomihon*<sup>87</sup> that is written before the popularization of *chūbon yomihon* 中本読本 of Edo.

## Evaluation Symbols

All of the entries in CKJT begin with a symbol that denotes either a positive or negative evaluation for the work. These symbols are white circles with different amounts of black shading. A comparison of the written evaluation found within the entry itself and the mark that heads the evaluation reveals that the less shading, the better the evaluation. For example, a full white circle is the evaluation reserved for only the best works and a full black mark is the

---

<sup>86</sup> BSS 3: p. 9-10.

<sup>87</sup> The exact word he uses is the kanji compound “稗史” without furigana, so it is not certain if he would read it as “*haishi*” or “*yomihon*”. ESB, p. 126.

evaluation reserved for the worst works. In some cases, like *Shin kasane gedatsu monogatari* and *Itozakura shunuchō kien*, there are lines that run through the circles as if to partition them off like fractions. This seems to say that *Shin kasane gedatsu monogatari* is 2/3rd good and 1/3rd bad. Inversely, *Sumidagawa bairyū shinsho* is 1/3rd good and 2/3rd bad. A half black and half white circle, like for *Shunden jitsujitsu ki* and *Kukuri zukin chirimen kamiko*, likely means that the work is neither particularly good nor particularly bad. There is more to these marks than simply full white, full black, and partitioned proportions. Some of the marks do not have partitions or the balance of half black and half white. *Kumo no taezuma amoyotsuki* and *Hachijō kidan* have decidedly more white than black and *Sono no yuki* has more black than white.<sup>88</sup>

This is not the first time that Bakin wrote an evaluation that used a system of black and white symbols to evaluate his own work. In *Ken'i hyōbanki*, Bakin mimics the well-known print ephemera genre of *hyōbanki* to critique specific points of the work.<sup>89</sup> *Hyōbanki* are most commonly used to critique actors and courtesans, ranking them using a system of symbols. The most common iteration of that system of symbols is as follows, in descending order from highest to lowest: *jō-jō-kichi* (上上吉), *jō-jō* (上上), *jō* (上), *naka-no-jō-jō* (中上上), *naka-no-jō* (中上), and *naka* (中).<sup>90</sup> These symbols are either aligned above or following the name of the person or thing being evaluated. The entries for the person or thing can be simply limited to that name, or can sometimes be quite long and informative. *Hyōbanki* are most commonly printed as a broadsheet or in booklet form using a horizontally oriented small sized page 横小型 *yoko kogata*. The popularity and ubiquity of *hyōbanki*, coupled with the tendency of popular writers of mimic

<sup>88</sup> A somewhat substantive discussion of these symbols can be found in Kamiya Katsuhiko's introduction to the transliteration of BJH, p. 14-18.

<sup>89</sup> Katherine Saltzman-Li discusses *hyōbanki* in her book *Creating Kabuki Plays: Context for Kezairoku*. See Saltzman-Li, 4-6 and 119.

<sup>90</sup> There are examples of *hyōbanki* that add other symbols, as well.

this format means that the genre became a target for parody, the most famous of which is Shikitei Sanba's *Kyakusha hyōbanki* (1810), which 'rated' the different denizens who patronized Edo's pleasure quarters—as opposed to the courtesans whom they visited. So, Bakin's decision to use the symbol system similar to that of the *hyōbanki* taps both an already well-established culture of critiquing and a culture of playful spoofing.<sup>91</sup>

Unlike the CKJT, the *Ken'i hyōbanki* provides the reader with a preface that explains, in part, how the evaluations work. The preface is attributed to Rekitei Kingyo, the brother of Tonomura Jōsai. "The master [Bakin] has many works, but none of them is stupid. Even still, two books have just been put out, and the following two volumes give a careful evaluation of them."<sup>92</sup> The two books are *Nansō Satomi Hakkenden* and *Asahina Shima meguri no ki*. The remainder of the preface strikes a humorous tone. The *hyōbanki* evaluations, themselves, are attributed to Sanshienchan, a pseudonym used by Tonomura Jōsai. The entries for the *hyōbanki* are organized into two lists per book based on the two "sets" 輯 of five volumes that comprise the books. Each entry in these lists is the name of a chapter, and below the name of that chapter is a small synopsis of the content. For example, the first entry on the list for the first set of *Asahina shima meguri no ki* reads: "jō-jō Kuritsu Genrokude [The passage of the death of Kiso Yoshinaka]: jō-jō."<sup>93</sup> There are 40 entries for *Hakkenden* and 40 entries for *Asahina shima meguri no ki*, each with its own evaluation symbol range.

Where the symbols of *Ken'i hyōbanki* are associated with *hyōbanki*, the symbols of *Chosakudō kyūsakuryaku jihyō tekiyō* are reminiscent of the moons found on astrological charts like those used for the *Kaiun hoshi matsuri*. *Kaiun hoshi matsuri* is based on a calendar

---

<sup>91</sup> Adam Kern discusses the spoofing of *hyōbanki* in his book *Manga from the Floating World*. *Kakusha hyōbanki* [although the title can be read both *Kyakusha/Kakusha* the union catalogue uses the latter so I think that's better for Sanba's work] is also discussed in Robert W. Leutner's *Shikitei Sanba and the Comic Tradition in Edo Fiction*.

<sup>92</sup> KH, p. 123.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid, p. 124.

supposedly handed down by the monk Kobo Daishi, where each day of the week is endowed with different properties of luck, happiness, fortune, disaster, and grief. There are nine days in all: the seven days of the week and two special “new moon” days of particularly bad luck and disaster. Charts explaining which ages are affected by which days are distributed to people at festivals held at temple complexes, and one such chart can be found in the Bakin household diary.<sup>94</sup>

That the symbols of the CKJT align to an astrology chart seems to be consistent with Bakin’s attitude later in his life. After the death of his son Sōhaku, Bakin writes about the unfortunate astrological position of his family in a small memoir called *Ato no tame no ki*. Sōhaku and Sōhaku’s son Tarō are positioned in such a way that they are halfway apart on the 60-year astrological cycle, which Bakin deems as “dangerous” for the father.<sup>95</sup> Similarly, Bakin applies the logic of divination systems to structuring his works. Bakin relates a discussion with Chōjiya about how to go about structuring the remainder of the *Nansō Satomi Hakkenden*, since he preferred a number of *shū* that reflect Japanese numerology. “Eight is the end of the Yin-related numbers. While above eight there is ten, ten contains “one”, and so is not the last of the Yin-related numbers. Nine is the last of the yang-related numbers. Therefore, it is not that there is no logic behind having the complete story of the Eight Dog Heroes made into nine sets in the end.”<sup>96</sup> Perhaps Bakin uses the moon-like symbols in CKJT as a way to emphasize a cursed-like quality for some works, like *Shunkan sōzu shima monogatari*, by giving them black dots.

### **On the Relationship of Bakin’s *Yomihon* to Theater**

---

<sup>94</sup> Shibata. *Omichi nikki*, v. 2, 690.

<sup>95</sup> BKSS 3: p. 129.

<sup>96</sup> NSH 7: p. 14-15.

Another theme in the evaluations of *Chosakudō kyūsakuryaku jihyō tekiyō* is the relationship of Bakin's work to the world of the theater. There are predominantly two ways in which Bakin talks about this. The first is to describe how the publication of his works inspired theatrical adaptations—predominantly in Osaka. For example, Bakin writes of *Sangoku ichiya monogatari*:

At the time, illustrated fiction with a focus on vendetta stories were certainly the rage, and even I penned a few. I think it was 1806 or 1807 when this [*Sangoku Ichiya monogatari*] was reworked into a play format in Osaka's theater world, with the title changed to *Katakiuchi takane no taiko*. My old friend in Osaka, Wada Shōchō, wrote to me saying, 'Kataoka Nizaemon played Asama Zaemon to great success and a full house.' Even now I have stored away in an old bamboo rattan a copy of the illustrated playbook from that time. Fuji Tarō is Arashi Sangorō, Sakurako is Sawamura Tanosuke, and the rest I have forgotten.<sup>97</sup>

Other entries in CKJT generally show his knowledge of how his work inspired theatrical adaptation and in most cases similar observations on how the theatrical world adapted his works can be found in Bakin's *Kinsei mono no hon Edo sakusha burui*.

The second way in which theater appears in “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō” is how Bakin describes the extent to which the style of his writing is reminiscent of the theater. In these cases, Bakin's tone is decidedly negative. For example, in his evaluation of *Shunden jitsujitsuki*, he writes:

Though an idea popular at the time—now that I think on it—the white cloth of Gansaburō set in the middle of snow is coarse here because it has the dressings of a *zatsugeki*. Its description in the writing and its depiction in the illustrations is

---

<sup>97</sup> CKJT, p. 161.

similar to a shadow puppet of a beautiful woman. It is not attractive. I am afraid it is a technique that lacks success despite the hard effort.<sup>98</sup>

The passage of the story described above comes at the end of the fourth chapter—found in the second volume—and it essentially sets up the revenge that is central to the story. The villain Gansaburō has stolen the treasured sword of his lord, but is interrupted while escaping by Takiguchi Yomohei on the snowy grounds of the garden. Saying that he will repent, Gansaburō pretends to prepare for suicide, but, instead, cuts down Yomohei. When the sword is used to kill Yomohei, the screams of two monkeys sound out and two of the carvings of monkeys on the sword’s scabbard disappear. This scene is illustrated in *Shunden jitsuki*, with Saburō striking a theatrical pose and dressed in white, while two shadowy figures of monkeys float off the page.<sup>99</sup>

The passage from *Shunden jitsuki* is only one of several mentions in CKJT of how using the theater [雑劇 *zatsugeki*] has negatively impacted his work. In the evaluation of *Itozakura shunchō kien*, he thinks that modeling the work on the Koishikawa act from the play *Itozakura Honchō sodachi* is one of the few flaws of the work. He also states that *Shunden jitsuki* is similarly flawed because it is patterned on the play “Shun Denbei.” He sees the interactions of the characters in the chapter of the Kinugawa River in *Shin kasane gedatsu monogatari* as slightly ostentatious; he says that it reads like the introduction of characters in a play script. Scenarios where characters suddenly no longer behave as expected, like in *Kukuri zuki chirimen kamiko*, where the protagonist Wankyū flees instead of fighting Naoroku, “seem like a *zatsugeki*.” Based on how the term “*zatsugeki*” 雑劇 is used in CKJT, Bakin’s concern about the “theatricality” of his work can be broken down into two basic categories: the writing

---

<sup>98</sup> Ibid, p. 142.

<sup>99</sup> BCYS 6: p. 122.

seems overly reliant on conventions of popular storytelling, and thus unoriginal. The actions and motives of the characters are overly histrionic and less plausible.

Bakin's attitude toward theater in *Ken'i hyōbanki* is not so overtly negative as that found in CKJT. In "CKJT, Bakin is more concerned with how scenes are overly violent or how the characters are illogical, but *Ken'i hyōbanki* and other literary criticism of the late Bunka era mainly focus on how the language of the theater is inappropriate for use in *yomihon*. For example, in *Ken'i hyōbanki*, a persona named "The Bad Moulder" says: "The chapter on the pursuit of the soldiers at Yashima no ura, and also, even in the *Hakkenden*, the passage where Yasunishi comes to the palace, feel like reading a zatsugeki play script 正本 shōhon." The persona "Patron" responds: "though that idea looks like *kabuki*, it does not mix in the phrases of a play script, nor does it take the lyrics of a *gidayū* 義太夫 book."<sup>100</sup> These comments indicate that Bakin and his literary cohort see a particular issue with using the language of the theater in the writing of *yomihon*. Similar sentiments can be found in earlier evaluations in three essays written by Bakin around 1813.<sup>101</sup>

One of the most common criticisms that Bakin raises in his earlier Bunka era essays is that language used in specific passages is inappropriate for *yomihon* books. One common form of this criticism is that the writers are using language more suited to the theater. This criticism is found in each of the essays, but perhaps is most prevalent in the essay evaluating Ryūtei Tanehiko's 柳亭種彦 (1783-1842) *Moji tezuri kukashi ningyō*. *Moji tezuri kukashi ningyō* is the final *yomihon* to be written by Tanehiko, whose love of theater can be seen not only in his use of

---

<sup>100</sup> HK, p. 155.

<sup>101</sup> The first of the essays is entitled *Heiben* (or "Horsewhip" in English) and evaluates Shikitei Sanba's *Akogi monogatari*. The second of the essays is entitled *Okonosusami* (or "Running wild with stupidity" in English) and evaluated Ryūtei Tanehiko's *Moji tezuri mukashi ningyō*. The third essay is entitled *Okame hachimoku* (or "From an Outsider's View" in English) and evaluates Santō Kyōden's *Sōchōki*.

plays as sources for characters and settings for source material, but also the extent to which he adopted the language and ideas of the stage. *Moji tezuri kukashi ningyō* combines elements of the *sewamono* 世話物 play *Yodogoishi shusse no takinobori* and the *Heike monogatari*, a story commonly associated with *jidai mono* 時代物. A small example of how Bakin disapproved of this mixture can be seen in this essay. “Koma Geta with a heart gone mad (page 11) this part is a historical story [時代物語 *jidai monogatari*], [the above passage] is not suitable to the style of the writing.”<sup>102</sup> Another example: “Quickly, he calls out ‘this house (*ya*)’ (page 20) Isn’t saying “*ya*” 屋 in place of “*ie*” 家 for “house” something limited to *jōruribon* 浄瑠璃本?” These are only a few of the shorter examples of where Bakin identifies a style of writing that he believes belongs to another genre and are not suitable for a *yomihon* book.

Even by 1813, at this early stage in Bakin’s writing career, he is developing an attitude that *yomihon* should not heavily borrow scenes and tropes that are associated with theater. He writes in his criticism of Kyōden’s *Sōchōki* 双蝶記: “All of the writer’s ideas 趣向 *shukō* are simply attempts at humor or are based on plays from the kabuki theater.”<sup>103</sup> He is critical of basing too much on theater, because for him theater represents human emotion in a way that does not have the fidelity he is looking for in *yomihon*. This criticism is best expressed in his evaluation of a scene in the second chapter of *Sōchōki*, where stolen money leads to the selling of a daughter to a brothel. He says that the set up of the scene is problematic. On the one hand, he claims that no parent would allow their child to endure a life in a brothel. On the other hand, he says that later scenes only make sense if the young girl had at least spent some time enduring the hardships of a brothel. “All of this is something you would see in a kabuki play, and does not

---

<sup>102</sup> BKSS 3: 298.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid, p. 312.



reflect human nature. Women and children will probably have a hard time understanding it.”<sup>104</sup>  
From Bakin’s perspective, scenes that are most readily recognizable as belonging to a kabuki play should be reserved for the stories of illustrated literature (合巻 *gōkan*).

### The *hashi shichi hōsoku*” 稗史七法則

The CKJT is an excellent place to see how Bakin applies his “seven rules of the historical novel” to analyze his fiction. The Seven Rules are first formally introduced to the reading public in a preface called “Hakkenden daikushū chūchitsu fugen” 八犬伝第九輯中帙付言 that is found at the head of the eleventh “set” (*shū* 輯) of the *Hakkenden* (contains chapters 104-115), published in 1836. In that preface, he writes, “the books written by the talented men of China’s Yuan and Ming period have their own set of rules. These so-called rules are subjects (*shukyaku* 主客), foreshadowing (*fusen* 伏線), framing (*shisen* or *shitazome* 襯染), resonance (*shōō* 照応), opposition (*hantai* 反対), reduction (*shōhitsu* 省筆), and subtlety (*inbi* 陰微).”<sup>105</sup> While the terms do not appear in the 1815 *Ken’i hyōbanki*, some of the concepts they represent are present. This suggests that Bakin has been working through these concepts as early as the end of the Bunka era.

CKJT has all of the Seven Rules, with the exception of “*shukyaku*” [主客].<sup>106</sup> Of the Rules, *fusen*, *shōō*, and *shōhitsu* are the most frequently used. The term *shitazome* is used only

---

<sup>104</sup> Ibid, p. 313.

<sup>105</sup> NSH 7: p. 16.

<sup>106</sup> If you consider that Bakin’s definition of *shukyaku* in the preface, it is possible to say that though the term is never employed, every entry is in itself concerned with the *shukyaku* of these books. Bakin’s definition of *shukyaku* in the *Hakkenden* preface is as follows: “*shukyaku* is like the *shite* (main character) and *waki* (important supporting characters) of recent *nō* theater. In that book there are different *shukyaku*. Moreover, in every chapter there are *shukyaku*. If there is a master, there is also a subordinate. If there is a subordinate, then there must be a master. For example, just like the pieces of a *shōgi* board, then you take the enemy’s knight, you are using that knight to attack the enemy. When your knight is lost, you feel anguish through that knight.” One of the main concerns of the entries is to exactly map out the relationships of characters and how the actions of one character affect the other.

twice, and *hantai* and *inbi* used only once each. *Ken'i hyōbanki* does not have any of these terms, but it does feature the term “*kesshi*” 楔子, which—as will be shown below—has a close connection to *shitazome*.

There are only two mentions of *shitazome* within CKJT and both of these occur in close proximity within Bakin's evaluation of *Sono no yuki*. The first mention discusses a connection between the name of the character and her later role in the novel.

In the passage in Fushimi that occurs a little bit earlier, Kurimon Sajirō's wife Nagiwai gave birth to a girl, and since she was born on the day of the rooster of the month of the rooster of the year of the rooster, that girl is called Kudakake 家鶏 and is a framing (*shitazome*) for how afterwards the fresh blood from the liver and intestines of Kudakake are used for the efficacious medicine for the eye-illness of her father Sajirō. Of course, since Kudakake's nature is like that of a bird, the reader's should notice this and ask ‘what source of use is there for this later?’<sup>107</sup>

The second mention of *shitazome* connects a series of events with a later passage.

There is the matter of Sajirō and Nagiwai's dreams, where Suwahira and his wife are blamed for the crimes committed by a plague god and are to be burned to death. When that fire spreads to their clothing they believe they are going to die but are saved by the manifestation of a strange infant. There is the matter of Sajirō and Nagiwai later having their lives threatened by plague. There is the matter of Sajirō being crippled and the two parents with their child wandering around Fushimi. All of these are a framing (*shitazome*) for the passage of Toribeno that occurs later.<sup>108</sup>

Both of these passages include some aspect of illness and medicine, so it is tempting to see

---

<sup>107</sup> BJH, p. 191.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid, p. 192.

Bakin's understanding of *shitazome* as being somehow related to ailment.

Kudakake makes her first appearance in the third chapter, which opens the second volume of *Sono no yuki*, entitled "A Temporary Residence in Fushimi." Kurimon Zajirō and Nagiwai escape to Fujimi to avoid a deteriorating situation in Harima resulting from a combination of ill-fate and active plotting against the lord Ono no Akimitsu. With the help of Zajirō's father, Zatao, they are able to hide in the house of a man named Suwahira. During the spring of the first year of Kōchō era (1261), Nagiwai gives birth to a girl, who is named "Kudakake" 家鶏 because that particular day is associated with the rooster on the Chinese calendar. Sajirō pays Suwahira enough money that he is able to live there for over 6 years. Eventually, Suwahira and his wife have their tongues plucked out by a starving monk, and for this they burn to death. The fire threatens to consume Zajirō and Nagiwai, but they are saved when a beam of light from the east strikes the monk and he disappears. In his place appears a young child, who sprinkles water and extinguishes the fire. He tells them that on a particular day of a particular month of a particular year, they will know the reason for his help. At this point, it is revealed to be a dream. A few weeks later a plague spreads throughout Japan, and Suwahira and his wife are struck down with illness. Here, Sajirō realizes that the monk within the dream was the god of plague and Sajirō and his wife, who had been nursing Suwahira and his wife through their illness, become ill themselves. That illness leaves them in destitute poverty, and, in the spring of 1267, they disappear on the road.

Sajirō and his family reappear in the story in the final chapter at Toribeno. Because of poisoning, Sajirō goes blind. After visiting a shrine and seeing a sacred relic associated with the monk Kōbo Daishi, they set off for home. On their return, they encounter a traveling monk, who tells them that to cure Sajirō's blindness, all they need to do is wash his eyes in the blood from

Kudakake's heart. This monk, it turns out, is a manifestation of the Kōbo Daishi. Sajirō is unwilling to sacrifice his child to cure his illness, even if both the wife and the child press him to do it. Meanwhile, Sajirō has grown suspicious that his wife is having an affair with Shibajirō. He thinks Shibajirō is in a room with his wife Nagiwai and slashes the figure before him. Blood splatters into his eyes and he is instantly cured. At his feet, however, is the dying body of his daughter Kudakake.

In the first mention of *shitazome* given, the name of Kudakake foreshadows a later association of her character with an animal. Because her name combines the ideographic characters for “house” 家 and “chicken” 鶏 and is phonologically pronounced the same as the Tokugawa period word for chicken, “*kudakake*”. She therefore gains at a key moment the attributes associated with that bird. Namely, her blood gains the curative properties that are associated with the use of animal parts in Chinese medicine. So the *shitazome* lies with the capacity of Japanese (or Chinese, for that matter) names to impart additional meanings or functions to characters. In the second mention of *shitazome*, the connection between the two passages is the manifestation of Kōbō Daishi. He first manifests in their dream and saves Sajirō from the fire. He then manifests as a traveling monk to tell them how to cure Sajirō's blindness, something that inevitably occurs.

Of the *shichi hōsoku* 七法則, perhaps defining a difference between *shitazome* and *fusen* is the most difficult, since both are employed to describe something akin to the English literary concept of foreshadowing. Hamada Keisuke states that the Bakin's cohort applied *fusen* and *shitazome* to the same passages at times in their criticism of his works, suggesting either an

interchangeability or instability in the terms.<sup>109</sup> Bakin clarifies the difference in the preface “Hakkenden daikushū chūchitsu fugen”, where he writes that *fusen* is “repeatedly placing small ink lines well in advance, so there is a idea (*shukō* 趣向) that inevitably occurs later.” In the same preface, Bakin writes that *shitazome* is “in order to achieve a deeply wondrous and pivotal idea (*shukō*), to soak [the writing] with the causes or the history of the matter [that causes the idea] repeatedly in advance.”<sup>110</sup> Both explanations emphasize that the writer prepares the reader for a shift in the narrative and that these preparations are accumulative. The “thin lines” described for *fusen* are reminiscent of the small marks by writers in books to highlight passages. By having a thin mark to the side of a character, the reader is certain to give the passage more careful consideration. The import of the idea (*shukō* 趣向) also seems to be greater for *shitazome*, like a series of foreshadowing that set up the major plot twist. *Fusen*, on the other hand, are limited to explaining how smaller, localized events in the narrative are enabled. Mizuno Minoru also notes that the two are easily confused. He likens *fusen* to the spindles of a marionette. When the spindles are taken up and away from the doll, suddenly a ghost has appeared before you. *Shitazome* is more akin to the process of gradual dyeing. In order to dye something black, first you dye the cloth a deep blue, and then you apply the black ink.<sup>111</sup>

Although Bakin first formally introduced the terms as the “*hashi shichi hōsoku*” 稗史七法則 in the preface “Hakkenden daikushū chūchitsu fugen”, he had been using them individually for some time before. In her study, *Bakin no sekai*, Itasaka Noriko has compiled a chart that explains where in Bakin’s various writings and self evaluations the terms used for the *shichi*

---

<sup>109</sup> See Hamda Keisuke, “Bakin no iwayuru haishi hōsoku nitsuite: In Bakin, edited by Yamazaki Sakoto, 136-145. Tokyo: Yūseidō, 1974.

<sup>110</sup> NSH 7: p. 17-18.

<sup>111</sup> See Mizuno, p. 118.

*hōsoku* 七法則 appear.<sup>112</sup> According to her chart, the first appearance of *shitazome* is Bakin's *Honchō suikoden wo yomu narabi hihyō*. The term *shitazome*, however, is partially derived from another term “*kesshi*,” which first appears in Bakin's 1809 *yomihon Raigō Ajari kaisoden* where he gives a definition of the term. He uses the term *kesshi* again in his first self-evaluation of the *Hakkenden*, in the *Ken'i hyōbanki*. *Kesshi*, like many of the *Shichi hōsoku*, is repeatedly redefined. For example, in *Raigō Ajari kaisoden*, he defines *kesshi*:

Moreover, I will establish how achieving the mice-cat dynamic is the main point of the first volume. This book takes as its starting point that Yoshinaka left the north as the *kesshi*. Yoshinaka prays at a mouse shrine, so the mouse shrine is the *kesshi*. The mouse shrine leads to the golden cat, so the golden cat is the *kesshi*. The golden cat leads to Saigyō, etc. etc. all these things are the *kesshi*. The *kesshi* is making something (mono) from something (mono). [The 5<sup>th</sup> fascicle] is entirely a *kesshi*.<sup>113</sup>

In the *Ken'i hyōbanki*, *kesshi* is defined as “direct connections between the topics that are the basis for the drama” and “an idea that uses a thing to reference a person.”<sup>114</sup> This structure is remarkably similar to that used by Bakin to describe *shitazome* in a letter to Ozu on January 8<sup>th</sup> of the eleventh year of the Tenpō era. In this letter, Bakin writes about his drafting process for both the *yomihon Hakkenden* and the *gōkan Konpirabune nerishō no tomozuna* 金毘羅船利生纜.

I received on the morning of December 21<sup>st</sup>, a copy of the final half of the 9<sup>th</sup> set of *Hakkenden*, complete with 5<sup>th</sup> fascicles and its binding bag. Having obtained it, I opened the bag in the afternoon and read until finishing it around 7 at night. Just as I have said previously, the five fascicles of this volume sets the stage (*shitajime*) for the following volumes.<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>112</sup> See Itasaka Noriko, p. 264-5.

<sup>113</sup> BCYS 5: p. 193.

<sup>114</sup> KH, p. 209.

<sup>115</sup> BSS 5: p. 155.

He goes on to say that his true intent for the 5<sup>th</sup> fascicle of the 9<sup>th</sup> volume was to set up the means for removing well-known characters—those characters that were not part of the eight dog brothers—in later volumes. This statement that the 9<sup>th</sup> volume is a *shitazome* is remarkably similar to the statement that in *Raigō Ajari kaisoden* the 5<sup>th</sup> fascicle is entirely a *kesshi*.

*Kesshi* continued to be used after *Ken'i hyōbanki*. The term appears in *Sansui heiyōden kokuji hyō* 三遂平妖伝国字評 (1833), *Kyōkakuden shohyōshū* 俠客伝初評集 (1833), *Zoku saiyūki kokuji hyō* 続西遊記国字総評 (1833), *Hakkenden kyūshū jōchitsu seppyō* 八犬伝九輯下帙拙評 (1836), *Hakkenden kyūshū gechitsu chūhyō* 八犬伝九輯下帙中評 (1838), and *Hakkenden kyūshū gechitsu geotsu chūhyō* 八犬伝九輯下帙下乙中評 (1841).<sup>116</sup> The final three of this list are after the 1836 publication of the *Hakkenden* preface that introduced the reading public to the Seven Rules, so Bakin and his cohort had not yet abandoned *kesshi* as an analytical term, despite having *shitazome*. This is not the only one of Bakin's Seven Rules that has its origins in another word. *Shōō* and *hantai* have a complicated relationship with the terms “*taishō*” 对照, “*ōshō*” 応照, and “*taiō*” 対応. Curiously, *shōō*, *hantai*, *taishō*, and *ōshō* are all in CKJT, and the usage of *shōō*, *taishō*, and *ōshō* is generally the same.

Another of the Seven Rules, *shōhitsu* 省筆, also appears to have a corollary in CKJT: *datsuhitsu* 脱筆. The usage of both of these terms in the entries means roughly the omission or reduction of writing to the point of negatively affecting the plausibility of the story. The difference is that *shōhitsu* is usually modified by the adjective “excessive”, suggesting that a positive omission or reduction is possible. This concept of excessive omission can be found in Bakin's literary criticism as far back as 1813. In an evaluation of Shikitei Sanba's *Akogi*

---

<sup>116</sup> See Itasaka Noriko, p. 264-5.

*monogatari* 阿古義物語, Bakin is critical that the art of frog magic is so nonchalantly transmitted from a mountain mystic to the main character—such a quick transmission is “difficult to believe.”<sup>117</sup> Although not given a specific term, the concept of omitting writing to streamline the story is discussed in *Ken’i hyōbanki*. Bakin writes: “All of the passages concerning Yasufusa are the *hottan* of the *Hakkenden*, anything inessential is omitted.” Another example quickly follows: “Also, can the episode of the representative being sent to Kamakura be called unnecessary? I do not think so.”<sup>118</sup> Although not addressing an omission or reduction, per se, this quote shows that early on Bakin is considering what can be cut in *Hakkenden* to improve the story.

## Conclusion

The above are only a few ways of comparing CKJT and *Ken’i hyōbanki*. Bakin’s repeated focus on unfortunate or unnatural deaths of characters (横死 *ōshi*), and his displeasure with certain characters not being rewarded for their good deeds in CKJT is another fruitful place for comparison with his earlier evaluations. The *kanzen chōaku* 勸善懲惡 system of morality is certainly a major focus of his evaluation for *Honchō suikoden*, but it is only loosely discussed in *Ken’i hyōbanki* and the other Bunka era essays. Understanding how and why “*ōshi*” became a central point for discussing *kanzen chōaku* will help better explain Bakin’s changing attitudes on morality and virtue.

---

<sup>117</sup> BKSS 3: p. 289.

<sup>118</sup> KH, p. 303.



## Appendix A

### “Kyūsaku ryaku jihyō tekiyō” 旧作略自評摘要

*Raigō Ajari kaisoden* 頼豪阿闍梨怪鼠伝 (1808)

6 Booklets 六冊

I have grown old and lost my memory, and now know only the titles of my old works from 30 or 40 years ago. There is little else that I remember. It is for this reason that when I had my daughter-in-law<sup>119</sup> read them to me on a full spring day this year, these works struck my ears with a new feeling—like they are the works of a writer departed from this world. To start with a particular example, the book *Raigō Ajari kaisoden* 頼豪阿闍梨怪鼠伝 is an old work from 1808 and followed the popular trends of the time. Everything is principled on the ideas of theater, and they are quite terrible. Of course, the numerous instances of completely loyal and chaste characters dying unwarranted deaths is based on the delight readers of the time had for brutality.<sup>120</sup> Yet, now I am not without regret when I think of those characters. Furthermore, while the creation of the character Nekoma Shintarō was an attempt at establishing a cat-mouse dynamic, Shintarō was incapable of achieving the true intent of his *revenge*. All he did was

---

<sup>119</sup> Literally “fuyō” (婦幼), which means “women and children”. This term appears several times throughout CKJT with different connotations, but in this particular section it is indicating Bakin’s daughter-in-law Omichi. Bakin lost his eyesight towards the end of his life, and to continue his practice of writing—the mainstay of his household income—he dictated his thoughts to Omichi who recorded them. In a well-known anecdote from a letter Bakin sent to his friend Tonomura Jōsai, he complains that he had to teach Omichi how to write the more complex kanji characters.

<sup>120</sup> In a footnote to the CKJT, Kamiya writes: “In Bakin’s Chosakudō zakki, there is an account for Bunka 5 (1808) where a lord once ordered to the emcee for “something in the spirit of a gōkan”. In addition to this statement there were descriptions deemed [by Bakin] in poor-taste like: “have them suffer some strange disease where something like fire bursts from their bodies”, “have the heads of people go flying”, and “corpses rotting in water”. From these snippets [of Chosakudō zakki], we can see that the readers of the Bunka era enjoyed somewhat violent scenes.” (136)

resurrect a once extinguished house. It was not a great success. Characters like the Crown Prince Yoshitaka have historical accounts that limit the creativity of the writer; he only attacked Ishida Tarō Tamehisa and could not attack Yoritomo.<sup>121</sup> Furthermore, that Karaito killed her own son, her daughter, and an infant, and then dying herself all for the sake of loyalty was not the least bit effective and should be pitied.<sup>122</sup> All of these things were tied up by the historical accounts and are displeasing. And so, it is hard to call the ending, which borrows the historical facts of Raigō to create a biography of the ill-fated Yoshitaka, a great success. Even though I have heard that the readers of the day were greatly pleased and the book sold well, after having the book read to me now and given time to consider it, all of the writing falters and is no good. "Does the reading experience die when the reader's eyes and tongue dull?" I do not know, but it screws the mouth up and should not be called clever.

Surrounding this book there are many works that don't seem familiar to me. For everything that follows, I will trust the meaning of the readers and not bother with a preface of publication details. Using my amanuensis, I have done self evaluations are abbreviated synopses just as seen above. This is simply so that I don't forget them.

---

<sup>121</sup> Bakin writes the "Crown Prince of Kiyomizu Daitarō", but fails to elaborate on the complex nature of that name. There are three central revenge narratives that structure RAK: the revenge of Kiso Yoshitaka against Ishida Tamehisa for the death of his father Kiso Yoshinaka, the revenge of Karaito against Yoritomo for the death of her husband Tezuka Mitsumori, and the revenge of Nekoma Shintarō for the suicide of his older brother Nekoma Mitsutaka. In RAK, Bakin follows the historical accounts of the *Gempei Jōsuiki* (though he calls it the *Gempei seisuiki*) and the *Azuma kagami* by having Minamoto no Yoritomo demand Yoshinaka's son Yoshitaka as a hostage to ensure the father's loyalty. A broader discussion of the complexities of RAK's structure of revenge can be found in Ishikawa Hidemi's articles "'Raigō ajari kaisoden' ron" and "Raigō ajari kaisoden to <myōso tairitsu> no monogatari". Isikawa's argument in both articles probes the three part structure of revenge and questions whether or not the revenge of Yoshitaka is based on "evil" (*aku*).

<sup>122</sup> Bakin's Karaito is based on the eponymous character of *Karaito sōshi*. *Karaito sōshi* is a late Muromachi or early Tokugawa period story of filial piety. In 1183, Yoshinaka is a general serving at the head of the Minamoto forces led by Minamoto no Yoritomo. One of Yoshinaka's retainers is Tezuka no Tarō Mitsumoro, who serves Yoritomo in Kamakura and has a daughter named Karaito. Karaito becomes privy to Yoritomo's plot against Yoshinaka, and after relaying the information to Yoshinaka, she is given a sword with which to kill Yoritomo. The sword is discovered in her robe, but she insists that it is a momento of Yoshinaka. Yoritomo orders her confined at Matsugaoka until the matter is resolved. She is hiding in seclusion in a monastery, however, and when a retainer comes to take her, the abbess refuses to surrender her. Karaito is later captured by Kajiwara Kagetoki when she attempts to return to Shinano and is imprisoned in a cave. Eventually, Karaito is released by Yoritomo, when her daughter Manjū pleases Yoritomo with her dancing. (Zen Sanctuary of Purple Robes, 41)

*Kumo no taema amayo no tsuki* 雲妙間雨夜月 (1807)

6 booklets 六冊

This is a work from 1807. Overall the work is well written and easy to listen to, but the unwarranted death of the good-hearted Takeaki is disagreeable.<sup>123</sup> Moreover, the adultery of Narukami with Hachisuba reflects the foul aura that surrounds Xinmen Qing and Pan Jinlian found in the *Shuihu zhuan* 水滸伝, but it is like seeing the grand opera of the *Shuihu zhuan* from a small theater house.<sup>124</sup> This is difficult to call clever. Still, the writing and the innovations are well done and the work is superior to *Kaisoden* 怪鼠伝. Rokujuen greatly praised the book, calling it a "wondrous work."<sup>125</sup> I have to laugh at myself: 'I expanded the play *Narukami*— which in its entirety is only a single act and an art form belonging to the Ichikawa house—to six

---

<sup>123</sup> A transcription error where Takeaki is written with the characters “武明” and not “武章”, as it appears in the text of the yomihon. The death of Takeaki occurs in the 12th and final chapter. Kannon visits the protagonists of the Myōun, Tajikichi, Ujyori, and Ren'ai in a dream and relates a story. In the past, a Iwado mountain, the hunter Amada Takehira called forth a speckled deer by reading the fifth article of the Lotus Sutra, and shot the deer dead. The father of Taketai and Takeaki, Ibara Takeshun, purchased the pelt of this animal for ten gold pieces and kept it as his favorite leggings. For this transgression, Takehira dies of an illness and the ascetic Raijin descends on Takeaki and Taketai, killing them in a deluge.

<sup>124</sup> The principle source for *Amayo no tsuki* are the 24th and 25th chapters of the *Shuihu zhuan*, where the hero Wu Song takes revenge on Pan Jinlian, who poisoned to death his older brother Wu Darang, and her lover Ximen Qing. This episode also plays a pivotal role in the *Jin Ping Mei*, another book from which Bakin adapted, but there is evidence that the *Shuihu zhuan* is the primary source for *Amayo no tsuki*. Among that evidence is the directness with which Bakin changed the names from the *Shuihu zhuan* for use in *Amayo no tsuki*, including: Ximen Qing (西門慶) → Saikei (西啓), Pan Jinliang (潘金蓮) → Hachisuba (蓮葉), Wu Darang (武大郎) → Ibara Takeyasu (伊原武泰), Wu Song (武松) → Ibara Takeaki (伊原武章). A difference between the SHZ and *Amayo no tsuki*, however, is that Ibara Takeaki mistakes Hachisuba when he attempts to kill Saike and is sentenced to death. Fulfillment of the revenge falls on his children Taekichi and Tajikichi.

<sup>125</sup> Rokujuen was the pseudonym used by Ishikawa Masamochi (1753-1830) for his *yomihon* work. Like many popular writers of the time, Masamochi participated in a number of different literary activities, including mad-cap poetry (*kyōka*) and “national studies” (*kokugaku*). He also ran a travelers inn in Edo's Kodenma-machi. He was the son of a famed *ukiyo-e* artist name Ishikawa Toyonobu, who encouraged his studies in literary and scholarly arts, notably Chinese studies. He began participating in poetry circles during the early Tenmei era, including publishing a number of his own collections. He became known as one of the “Four Heavenly Deities” of Tenmei's poetry circles. He continued publishing a number of poetry collections throughout his life. In 1791 he was falsely accused of a crime and sentenced briefly in an Edo prison. After his release, Masamochi concentrated on *kokugaku* studies, in addition to continuing his work with poetry, and published a number of *zuihitsu* essays. For a brief period from 1809-1811, Masamochi wrote five yomihon, including *Ama no hageromo* and *Hida no takumi monogatari*.

volumes. However did I accomplish this?’ It is quite strange. However, the discourse on the *Raijū* 雷獸 and issue of curing of the illness are preparations of the author that should be discernible to the readers.<sup>126</sup> Even now I remember them with pride. Though such a thing seems like a boast, it has its purpose and should be forgiven.

---

<sup>126</sup> The speech on *the raijū* may refer to two different sections of *Amayo no tsuki*. The first section is the opening prefatory section of the book, where Bakin provides a sort of evidentiary essay for the reader’s enjoyment. This essay is rather lengthy and is focused on the lives of mythical “thunder” (雷) creatures, including the *raijū* (thunder creature) and the *raichō* (thunder bird). Illustrations of these two creatures are provided as well, including a diagram of transformation for the *raijū* from a wolf-like beast to a monster resembling a spider with a human face. The essay states that Bakin is pulling the information from a book called the *Shinraiki* 新雷記.

*Itozakura shunchō kien* 糸桜春蝶奇縁 (1813)

8 booklets 八冊

This is a work from 1815 or 1816.<sup>127</sup> It is the first bit of writing done by the writer in some time and makes clear the style of my writing. Moreover, the plot is clever and was quite a hit. Compared to *Kaisoden* 怪鼠伝 or *Amayo no tsuki* 雨夜月, it is sufficient for understanding the development of my writing. The only flaw is that the work resembles a *zatsugeki* 雜劇 because I wanted to model only the Koishikawa 小石川 chapter on the Koishikawa act from the play *Honchō sodachi* 本町育.<sup>128</sup> Rather than make it better, it makes it worse. Moreover, the work was already packed with pages and since anything above 30 double-pages *chō* 丁 constrains the writer. I could not achieve harmony with my writing brush and the work was anticlimactic in the end. Even so, the readers of the time generally loved it and the book was even adapted to a *jōruri-bon* 浄瑠璃本 in Kyōto and Edo.<sup>129</sup> While the *jōruri-bon* is not worth reading, the *yomihon* reflects the trends of the time, and even now is difficult to put down. However, the woodblocks were destroyed in a fire and I have only the regret of their loss. While I hear rumors these days of publishers planning to reprint the work, it is a good thing that there has been no reprint, since no one has consulted the writer. To the question: ‘what is a leading novel?’ No

---

<sup>127</sup> Bakin is misremembering the date. *Itozakura shunchō kien* was first published in the 9<sup>th</sup> year of the Bunka era, or 1813 by the western calendar.

<sup>128</sup> As noted by Kamiya, there manuscript uses the kanji “糸桜本町育” *Itozakura Hōnchō sodachi*, which is not the real title of the play. The real title of the *jōruri-bon* is “糸桜本朝育” *Itozakura Hōnchō sodachi*. Santō Kyōden’s *Mukashibanashi inazuma byōshi* also is influenced by *Honchō sodachi*, but the handling of female characters is somewhat different and highlights stylistic changes developing between Bakin and Kyōden (Ōtaka, 2006). There are several articles that discuss *Shin Kasane gedatsu monogatari*’s relationship to the play *Honchō sodachi*, including, Tokuda Takeshi’s “Gesatsu”, Yuasa Yoshiko’s “‘Shin Kasane gedatsu monogatari’ kō,” and Tanaka Noriko’s “Inga ōhō—chōhen shōsetsu ni naizai suru rinen”.

<sup>129</sup> As noted by Kamiya, *Itozakura shunchō kien* is one of three books of Bakin that he notes in *Kinsei mono no hon Edo sakusha burui* as having been adapted as a *jōruri* puppet play. The other two are *Wakae no hatō* and *Chinsetsu yumiharizuki*.

one fails to mention this well-loved book. I will give a more detailed synopsis and so put my amanuensis *daihitsu* 代筆 to work. In the beginning, Ishitsuka Tōrokurō saves the courtesan Akebono from committing suicide and then begets two children after making her his wife. Afterwards, the dissolute patron Ichihachi uses his curse as an unjustly wronged ghost to cause husband and wife to be suddenly separated. This passage is written effectively and naturally. In this way, Akebono attempts to return to her home village with her child Toiko on her back, but while on the road Toiko is kidnapped by Urakoma and her companions. She encounters her older brother Jūbei on the road, and is taken by him to Edo. Eventually she becomes the second wife of Ichihachi's younger brother Todosaku. This passage highlights the difficulty of escaping fate. It is natural and all the cleverer. Also, Toiko's older sister Ofusa, once she has come of age, encounters a disastrous storm while traveling to Azuma by boat with her father Tōrokurō, who drowns. Ofusa has a difficult time avoiding a similar fate and wanders to Kamakura. Isn't the section where she is saved by Ichihachi's first wife, the Zen nun Sakusakura, and eventually winds up in Edo an innovation that ties together all of the karmic fates? Next, Komatsu, the child of Ofusa's younger sister Toiko, is raised by Urakoma. At the age of twenty-eight, Ofusa's fiancée Kamibara Sagorō (also known as Sashichi) kills Urakoma out of loyalty. He realizes that the adopted daughter Komatsu is related to Ofusa—whom he thought died with Tōrokurō when they fell in the water—and he takes her with him to Edo. This passage resembles the coincidental meeting of Hanshichi and Mikatsu in *Nanka no yume* 南何夢, but it is not the same.<sup>130</sup> For this reason, there a poem by the writer in the inscription to the illustration that reads: “When I look at that night shadows reflected on the eastern road, a full moon over Shirakawa mountain 白川山.” This is something the readers may know. In this way, Ofusa

---

<sup>130</sup> The similarity of *Itozakura shūnchō kien* to *Sanshichi zenden nanka* is discussed in Tokuda Takeshi's “Gedai” for the *Bakin chūhen yomihon* volume of *Sanshichi zenden nanka*.

arrives in Edo and has her black warrior's overcoat stolen by the villain Chōhachi. She is saved by Jūbei and temporarily stays in a textile shop. Also, on the day that Sagorō and Komatsu arrive in Edo, they battle Nisetorite, a henchman of the mountain bandit Yamagami Goheida, but are saved by Tsunagorō and so avoid peril. Afterwards, Tsunagorō sets off for the Yamagami's mountain fortress by himself and takes back Komatsu and overthrows the bandits. This chapter weaves great bravery with chivalry and is enjoyable. In this way, Sagorō temporarily stays in the cloth shop of Tsunagorō. That Koito keeps herself in Jūbei's lodgings on Tsunagorō's recommendation is natural and interesting. Meanwhile, there is the matter of Nisetorite going to the minister's house as part of an evil plan of Hantoki Kurohei. Because of this, Tsunagorō says that he will assume responsibility for the crime and has Sashichi take Ofusa as his wife and the management of the cloth shop. On the night of the wedding, Sashichi and Koito run away. In the past Itsuka Tōrokurō and Kamibara Yasohei promised their children for marriage and compared the fan and scabbard exchanged for the betrothal at a celebratory ceremony. Yet, because the return of these objects is an omen for the cancellation of the marriage, Koito becomes the wife of Sashichi and Ofusa is able to marry Tsunagorō later. Is this stuff not innovative and clever? However, It goes without saying that Hantoki is Nisetorite and Yamagami is Sashichi. Why is it that Tsunagorō never comes to this realization, suffers for it, and eventually dies? That sort of stuff resembles the dramatization of a *zatsugeki* 雑劇 play, and, since it does not bear the look of my writing style, should take the form of a *sewamono* 世話物. For everything after this, the Koishikawa volume is like the self-evaluation found above. However, Ishitsuka Tōrokurō and Kamibara Yasohei, with Akike, are not villains and their unwarranted deaths are displeasing, but all of this is simply the curse of the wronged spirit of

Ichihachi. When the vengeful spirit is finally delivered, there ought to be a happy ending. Is that not one type of retribution story with a basis in morality?



*Shunden jitsujitsu ki* 旬殿実々記 (1808)

10 booklets 十冊

The five volumes of the preface *johen* 序編 are neither good nor bad. The dutifulness of Yojirō and the taking of O-Shun, for example, are the preparations of the writer who saw difficulty ahead. They are probably worth of being called ‘original’. Yet, what about how although Yojirō picks up the treasured sword, he does not take it to the Tsutsuiya household to appeal [the disbandment of his family]? Yojirō had previously heard about how his father’s unfortunate death is due to this sword and so would not take it, a liberty of the writer that constrains his creativity. This is what may be called the flaw of the prequel. The characters “Jun” 筧 and “Shun” 旬 resemble each other. Having the lecherous woman O-Suzu lose her head is designed to be like removing the bamboo radical from the *kanji* character. This and the criticism of Hayanae no Shin making Suzu the wife of Denbei are great innovations. Aside from that, there are no major scenes that deserve such self-praise. Though an idea popular at the time—now that I think on it—the white clothes of Gansaburō set in the middle of snow is coarse here because it has the dressings of a *zatsugeki* 雜劇. The description of it in the writing and the depiction of it in the illustrations are similar to a shadow puppet of a beautiful woman. It is not attractive. I am afraid it is a technique that lacks success despite the hard effort.

The sequel is inferior to the prequel. In the passage about the hideaway of Shun and Denbei, Osawa, the wife of Denbei’s natural father Kizaemon, comes with her daughter and temporarily stays at the house of a *sanxian* player. Everything up until the dissolution of Denbei and Shun’s relationship is simply for the applause of the reader, and while it looks interesting at a glance, it can only be thought of as insincere and melodramatic. It does not support logic. Why? Because Denbei’s

natural father Kizaemon is a man of clear logic and righteousness. For this reason, from when Denbei was a child and up until this point, he did not give even the slightest hint that Hayane no Shin was adopted. And yet, how is it that despite protesting that she did not know the true nature of the relationship between Denbei and Shun, Osawa causes the dissolution of the relationship with O-shun and wants to beckon Denbei to his parent's house? Osawa was Denbei's nursemaid when he was an adolescent and therefore knew about the circumstances of the previous passage. It is a worthless idea, since this is all patterned on the act in the *zatsugeki* 雑劇 play *Shun and Denbei* しゅん殿衛 where there is the dissolution of the relationship. Even though this may be, readers of the time, particularly women and children, did not see the logic nor understand the morality. That this book caused so much delight is an unexpected profit for the writer and the good fortune of the publisher. In the passage about Horikawa River 堀川, Gansaburō is struck down by Denbei and the sword Denbei is searching for quickly falls into the hands of Yojirō. This passage of trading an enemy's head for a sword balances an equation with neither profit nor loss. While it looks original, it belongs to that category of 'Zhang orders the liquor and Rishi gets drunk'. Isn't it a technique that has little return as far as expressing the intention of the writer? If Yojirō is Rishi then he must achieve his father's *revenge*. Denbei is a man of loyalty and must set out searching for the treasured sword so that his father is pardoned. Yet, the target of Yojirō's *revenge* is cut down by Denbei and the treasured sword sought by Debei is picked up by Yojirō. The idea that he would trade for it is somehow an attempt at Rishi's faithfulness. Such an idea is extremely bad. At the time, the writer had a conceit that this was a masterpiece and that this is how a writing style should be. It should seem suspicious that readers of the world also enjoyed it and the stall of the publishers bustled with activity. That all of the woodblocks of this book burned up alongside *Itozakura shunchō kien* 糸桜春蝶奇縁 caused me a lot of regret

and frustration. Thinking on it now, it is not worth regretting. It is funny that I found ease when replacement copies were made. I cannot stop laughing.

*Sumidagawa bairyū shinsho* 墨田川梅柳新書 (1806)

6 booklets 六冊

This new book is a work of mine from 1806, 39 years ago. While it is a rough sketch of the writing style, the plot is well done and there are few unreasonable ideas. However, I felt that making the *shirabyōshi* 白拍子 Kamekiku into a wicked woman with a twisted heart is a bit excessive. Moreover, Yukoku—the sword given to Tadafusa by the general Yoshida—has a golden bird on its scabbard. Tadafusa is aware of the rumor that when the person wearing this item wants to try to hurt another person it gives off the cry of a bird, but he still tucks it into his waist and tries to cut Kikukame. Things quickly go awry, with Tadafusa dying instead. Tadafusa's plans were quite shallow. Later, when Kikukame tucks this Yukoku into her waist and tries to assail the temple, while it can be said that there should be a resonance (*shōtai* 正対) from the sudden bird cry, the preparation of Tadafusa is stupid and pitiable. Also, having Yamada Saburō kill his wife and son as a last resort is not effective despite the effort. Since Yamada's mother had already died out of loyalty to him, having the wife and the son killed as well is a little too much. Next, Umewakamaru temporarily transforming into a fox in order to escape danger, yet being killed by Shinobu no Shūda is based on a real incident and so naturally constrained the creative license of the writer. It proved inconvenient through and through. To say nothing of Matsui Gengo, who is essentially a villain killing his lord, that he is only slashed to death and with his last breath tells of his unceasing love to the ghost of Umewaka. A small resolution is well made by using the legend of the supernatural turtle 靈龜 *reiki* to hint at the cause 因 *in* and show the effect 果 *ga*. While this discussion does not touch on major flaws, it

must now be said that the overall work is well done and there is a happy ending for Matsuwaka.

Is this not superior to *Kaisoden*?

*Beibei kyōdan* 皿皿郷談 (1813)

6 booklets 六冊

The rise and fall of Kakesara is based on *Ochikubo monogatari* 落窪物語 and so resembles it, but they are not the same. The story proceeds smoothly from start to finish and is natural. The affair begins with Sō Sokei, and his child Karashima Naojirō becoming Motojirō's wife is original. The unfortunate death of the chaste Koromo, while unpleasant, came about at an unavoidable point. So she had to die. Readers applauded how the legs of Tenmoku Hōin are later used to reveal his true circumstances. The loyalty towards the father of Watatori is seen without mistake in the deeds and words of all of the characters on the page. However, though the miraculous response of Fudō and the ghost of the jealous woman unjustly condemned seem to be muddled together, they should not be confused if you examine them closely. The curse on the grave of the first wife by the living spirit *ikiryō* 生霊 is a reworking of the matters occurring today around the environs Tamagawa 多摩川, and all the more innovative. The manuscript of this book was written in October of 1814 and it began selling in the spring of 1815. The power of the writer's pen had already matured and the text is also good. Now, when the writer reflects on this work he believes that it should be thought of as his greatest masterpiece of that time.

*Shin Kasane gedatsu monogatari* 新累解脱物語 (1807)

5 Volumes 五冊

That Princess Taito is introduced before Kasane, though other things are similar, is original. It could not be helped that Suke and Taito met early deaths due to their chastity. While I make the reader think that these two chaste women die, they did not in fact die, but reappear at the very end. Readers should applaud this. However, the chapter of the Kinugawa River is slightly flawed because it parades the characters like a *zatsugeki* 雑劇 play. The tumor on the infant girl's face and the speech on the souls *ikiriyō* 生霊 and ghosts *shiryō* 死霊 are not worthless. Within these things, Kasane is the former incarnation of the chaste Suke. How about the murder of Nishiiri Ken-no-Jō's by Yozaemon, the only son of Narikanegorō? While that is a large distortion of intention found within this book, without Kasane's unfortunate death this story does not work. This is a point that limits the creativity of the writer, and perhaps a major problem within the novel *shōsetsu* 小説. This book is a fictional story *tsukuri monogatari* 作り物語 made at the request of the Osaka publisher Kawachiya Tasuke, and a work put out seven years before the publication of *Bei and Bei*. While it certainly was also a masterpiece of the time, there are the two problems mentioned previously. If you compare this work to *Bei and Bei*, it is one level below it.

*Hachijō kidan* 八丈綺談 (1813)

5 booklets 五冊

This book, like *The Story of Bei and Bei*, is a work from 1813. The writer's preparations are well done and there is no passage that is not thoroughly connected to karmic retribution. It is said that Saisaburō is the reincarnation of the filial son Kijirō—who makes his first appearance here and has his arm cut off. The use of the shape of the character *ki* and *sai* is interesting. Making Okoma the reincarnation of Gokōbō is also the same. Aside from Okoma there is Ikoma. Though there is a reason for the section of Okoma's licentious behavior and transformation into a mayfly, women and children will probably not appreciate it. That Okoma becomes the wife of Kizō is an innovation that shows one side of the human heart and has its origin in a historical account. The evil intentions against Shirogiya Shohei held by Jōhachi and Tatsuki are also in the above historical account. Inga Hill 因果塚 looks of the Inga Jizō 因果地藏 and the Wabokubashi Bridge smells of Wakokubashi Bridge 和国橋. The sleeping clothes patterned on a *shōgi* 将棋 board that are worn by Okoma reverberate her being drawn to the execution grounds by cavalry—thinking on it now—it is asking for a little too much. Simply, including a detailed account of the foreign origins of the goldfish and the mayfly found within the book are beneficial for readers of the world. However, the illustrations are inferior and I regret that. If I think on it now, while this is a masterpiece that ought to almost equal *Kasane monogatari* 累物語, what the readers can see is only three parts for every seven parts of the writer's preparations. Thirty years have passed and the mention of this book has become quite rare.



*Shunkan sōzu shima monogatari* 俊寛僧都嶋物語 (1804)

8 booklets 八冊

Hearing the ideas of this story now, [I see that] the anguish of leaving the capital is the basis for the story. Readers of the time (around 1807 or 1808) delighted over the tearful passages. While this may be the case, the affair of Shunkan is an historical account from the *Heike monogatari* 平家物語 and the *Genpei jōsuiki* 源平盛衰記 and so constrained the creativity of the writer. For this reason, it cannot be called successful in the end. Moreover, as is the case with the Kiyomizu crown prince Yoshitaka in *Kaisoden*, because there is no happy ending for the protagonist of this story it is a thoroughly unsatisfactory tale. Of course, I have killed off all of the faithful and good characters, including, Kuroi no Saburō (father of Ariō and Kameō), Yasuyoko (Ariō's wife), Matsu no Mae (Shunkan's wife), Tsuru no Mae (Matsu no Mae's daughter), Kuroi Kameo, Tokai (Kameō's wife), and even the faithful servant Shōmon Tarō. Their unwarranted deaths are displeasing. Also, Kameō became lost in Tokai's sexuality, and not solely because he used up all of his master's money. He did not meet his father Saburō previously, who committed suicide and offered that child up. Kameō became a drunkard and in order to repay the lost money, kidnapped and sold the wives of many people. Eventually, one dark night on a boat, he kills Tsuru no Mae and the young girl Yasuyoko. In this way, it is a real burglary and should not be the dream of a loyal and filial child. Afterwards, Kameō takes the name of Shirakawa Kankai and is employed by Shunkan and his wife, but he has no success and so kills the husband and wife. Although having his previous evil deeds forgiven is something that should be found in a Kabuki *kyōgen jōruri* 狂言浄瑠璃 book and though it bears no resemblance to my writing style which seeks a correct form of *kanchō* 勧懲 morality, "it is my single greatest work". Ha! Not

simply this, but in the passage of *Kikai ga Shima*, having Shunkan not give his name to his son is only designed to create pity. It must be the second verse from *Karukaya dōshin*. Yet, the matter of Shunkan becoming Kiichi Hōgan and the vengeful ghost of Tsuru no Mae marrying the Ushigome looks original, but is no different than a drunken dream in the end. Using the idea that Shunkan was the only person to be left on Kikai to make him into Kiichi Hōgan does not seem overwrought, only having Tokujūmaru escape to Nara with Ariō and hiding there is not successful. Is not leaving off the matter Tokujū maru and Ariō until the second half of the book the foolishness of a writer tied up by the historical account? Yet, while the story of the speech imitating the *tora no maki* 虎の巻 is an essential element, readers—especially women and children—who appreciated it should be rare. Well then, Kawashiya Hanzō, who published this book in 1808, had a child, but his house ceased when he separated from his wife and child. The woodblocks for this publication must have fallen into someone's hands. I heard that it has not been reprinted for some time. While it is not extinct, that it has become very rare in this world is something of a great joy for me. To add one final thought, it is said that the deaths of Matsu no Mae and Tsuru no Mae 'do not match the historical accounts'. Though they do not match the historical accounts, this mother and child should not have died. Now, when I look at this, I have many regrets.

*Shitennō shōtō iroku* 四天王剿盜異錄 (1807)

10 booklets 十冊

This book is a work of mine from 1804, a year which is now 41 years in the past. For this reason, though the writing style is still not yet refined, the plot on the whole reads naturally and there no section that is unreasonable. In the end, while it is the complete biography of Yasusuke, it is about thieves and should not be called a biography. For this reason, I have titled the book *Shitennō shōtō iroku* 四天王剿盜異錄. These two *kanji* characters for “quelling the brigands” is an essential point, and yet the entry in Shunsui’s *Gedai kagami* only records it as *Shitennō* 四天王. This is a matter of great regret. However, there probably were readers who thought ‘In the passage of the hanging bridge at Kiso, why on earth is Oboromaru—who was three at the time—possessed by the vengeful ghost of the evil old woman?’ It cannot be said whether Yasusuke is either possessed by a vengeful spirit that burgles or a bandit chief that could challenge Daozhi. Be this as it may, Yasusuke is not wicked, and this ghost could not possess him. The section where wings are attached to a tiger, if not in this chapter, than it should not be at all. In the passage where Hashihei and Rokurōji escape their cage and descend into the valley was made into a *zatsugeki* 雜劇 play at Fukiya-chō around 1808 or 1809, with their names changed. Also, there is a difference in how the Four Deva Kings appear in the world: the wisdom of Tsuna, the bravery of Kintoki, the piety of Sadamitsu, and the sincerity of Suetake do not lose their origins, but with Yasumasa’s courtesy, they form the five virtues. Combining Izumi Shikibu’s visit to Inariyama with Yasusuke is quite interesting. The strange fate of Himematsu and Suetake is quite deep because it is not based on sensuality. Kidōmaru’s transformation into a spider also required some work and is quite good. Finally, the passage of Kabutsuni refuting Yasusuke is

not long-winded, but arrives at the point with superb skill. There are many moments of feeling all the way until the passage where Setsusekini buries the head of Yasusuke in the grave of her daughter Miyuki. Now that I have evaluated my own work, it should not be unreasonable to say that this work is a masterpiece of the time. Are there not many readers of taste who know of this work of mine?

*Aoto Fujitsuna moryōan* 青砥藤綱摸稜案 (1811)

Prequel 5 booklets 前編五冊

Sequel 5 booklets 後編五冊

The five volumes of the prequel were created in 1811. The first and second were the Agatai volumes, where Agatai Shisaburō's scholarship brings about both fortune and disaster. The older brother, who is a monk, and his filial younger brother are used to set up the entire course of the volumes. Yet, Shisaburō's father Gytarō and Kanzashi Riheiji were both traveling merchants and superb scholars. There probably were readers who thought that Kanzashi Riheiji's assuming the position of director of the Kanazawa Bunko was not appropriate for a character of that time period. In the first place, the six stories of the prequel are adapted from Chinese novels and the writing is structured on previous works, so I had to open with a volume devoted to scholarship. To speak of the Kamakura period—to say nothing of China—it cannot be said that there were no merchants who loved scholarly reading. Substituting scholarship for martial arts is unrefined, and the blind love of the maiden Torokuya could not be helped. There are countless scholars in the world both past and present that are like the Kanazawa librarian, and this [volume] pokes at that. This one volume ought to be considered a masterpiece. The third volume has the gain and loss of a blue and yellow cow by Gaso Shichi, the adultery of his wife, a fortune of a shell-shaped fan, and Gaso Shichi's younger brother Soga Hachi being falsely accused. Until Aoto's judgment there is nothing that should be too troubling. The fourth volume has the discussion of Kakohimaru, a felicitous poem posted on a ridgepole by some monk, and divinations of compassion and malice from the cutting of a *katsura* melon by an old woman. I made the third volume (*hen*) into one bound fascicle 巻 *kan*. The 5<sup>th</sup> volume tells of how

Shoki Shinsuke murdered a man for his favorite painting. However, the wife of the innkeeper Yuhachi excels at craftiness, saying, ‘let’s try to abduct Shinsuke’s wife in order to turn a profit’, she hatches various plans. Why is it that she prepares poison and offers it to Shinsuke and his wife makes her superior to even the villainous slaver Onikurō? It does not suit her personality, and it is difficult to say that such a thing is natural to fictional stories (*tsukuri monogatari*). Even so, Shoki Shinsuke is not an unskilled illustrator and originally came from the warrior class. His being sliced to death by Yuhachi is displeasing. If I were to write this now, once Shinsuke dies of a grave wound, he would be revived by Aoto. Afterwards, he should take his wife and child back to his village in order to recover from that wound. Stuff like that are the small flaws of this volume. From within this volume, having Yuhachi don a demon mask and be pinned down by the spirit of the illustrated Zhong Kui is a contrivance of the writer thought up while laying in his bed. That the mask fall into Yuhachi’s hands after he hears that it has powers over Shinsuke’s daughter is not unreasonable and quite natural. When I think of this now, it probably should be said that this volume is superior to the completed volumes of “Agatai”. The sequel volume, made into 5 booklets, is a work of mine from 1813. They are not based on a Chinese novel. Everything comes from the writer’s heart. Zenkichi and Oroku are wise and benevolent, and their attainment of success and virtue should make this a beautiful story. The malignant wickedness of O-Soya and O-Ushi and the cruel craftiness of Hyōji and Shōkurō are well done and seem natural. In this volume there is no unwarranted death of Zenkichi and when Aoto arrives at his judgment, all of the evil people are killed for their crimes. Is this not pleasurable? When Zenkichi is first mistakenly sentenced to death by Taga’s military official, O-roku has the power to bring suit. Aoto arrives at that location and is able to clear up the confusion, just as if seeing daylight through mist and clouds. This passage is the most important scene. However,

the people of this world do not have sins in the slightest, and just like when a six-year old child yearns for a separated parent, they beg their husbands (Karui and Genji), and after a short while they come back home. While such an unwarranted death resembles the natural mistake of a child, is it actually an evil karma unknown to Shosuma and Shokuro for unknowingly killing a young girl. One should determine how to use common language to say that a child inherits the parent's fate. As for thinking about the other stuff, once Zenkichi rises in the world and becomes the head of his village, he should have two or three servants. Nevertheless, because having servants in the house when he is imprisoned for committing a baseless crime created so many useless passages, the writer freely omitted [those passages]. Even if having servants is something customary, everyone was supposed to be at the *yabui* 藪入 festival on that day and not home. So, it should have been fine. Moreover, when White-eyebrow Naga came from Kamakura to his older brother Yosō's house, they both visited Zenkichi. Yet, Naga did not have a single attendant, when he must have at least one. Since the fact of the lack of an attendant was overly troublesome, the [scene] should be intentionally omitted. While those things are the small flaws of this work, overall it was a masterpiece for the time, and should be evaluated. Isn't this acceptable? During the Bunka era, this was made into a *zatsugeki* in Osaka. Arashi Kichisaburō played Kaikoya Zenkichi and was a great hit to a packed house. The play script of that work was published by Kawachiya Tasuke in 8 volumes and with illustrations. Worldly people ought to know of this.

*Katakiuchi kidan Wakae no hatō* 敵討綺談推枝鳩 (1803)

5 Volumes 五冊

This book is a work drafted in 1803. Forty-two years have passed since Senkeidō—the same publisher who put out *Shōtō iroku* 剿盜異録—published it in 1804. It is a work from when I was 37 years old and the writing is only half-matured. While certain details that reflect my writing style are not yet present, when I think on it now, there are many original things. It goes without saying that the beginning passage where Tatenui Kusaku's dream shows the good and bad omens based on the *kanji* characters of Bensai Tensaku's name is a new innovation, but so is the passage where Kusaku unknowingly switches kids during a great earthquake. With the exception of this book, I have yet to see a Chinese or Japanese novel that describes an earthquake for use within the story. Afterwards, the passage where Tatenui Gomatsu strikes thunder during the great earthquake is an parallelism 正対 *shōtai* between the shaking of both heaven and earth. However, while the unfortunate death of Shichidori and Akatarō can be called bad timing, isn't such bad luck a bit extreme? The reunion of Ayatarō's real father Fukuroku and his little brother Gomatsu at that moment strikes the eye like seeing flowers blooming on a withered tree. Afterwards, Ayatarō is plotted against by his stepmother Osame, and Azakurō is, himself, killed by the target of his *revenge*. Both of these are displeasing. Readers should grumble over this. Revenge stories were fashionable in the illustrated volumes of *gōkan* 合巻 of the time, and I also have such works. Azakurō is not a prominent figure. So, it should not be strange to think that his attempted attack on brothers Aya Tarō and Gomatsu was an overkill. When I think of it now, Chidori, Aka Tarō, and Aya Tarō look like they died, but in reality they did not perish. Like Okitsu and Otone, having written in the means of their salvation through the graces of Kannon is



quite good. At the time there were many readers who preferred stories of cruelty, and I also followed these tastes. Yet, I regret having an infant die out of filial piety for the parents. However, while combining the Chidori pool with the Aka Tarō rock at the Oi River seems like a lot of work, the unfortunate death of the single child of these parents ought to be considered the flaw of the middle volume. The unfortunate death of Fukuroku and Osame is at the hands of the evil monk Dōgen, who cannot be killed. Having the poisoned rock carried off by the eagle and having it fall into an iron pot at Fukuroku's house is something akin to an evil created by the heavens. Osame is accosted by this disaster as a result of bad karma from her lecherous ways, but Furoku is without blame. On his way back, Aya Tarō is unexpectedly attacked by Azakurō. That he also eats poisoned rice and loses his life is something akin to the imprudence of a child's logic. However, he eats that poisoned rice alongside Osame, so not having Fukuroku suffer the same fate would be quite difficult to write. To reconsider that difficulty in writing, if Fukuroku did not die, would it not be a flawless masterpiece? Saying that, there is nothing to be requested as far provisions. Having had this volume read to me, I can only give self-evaluations of points of regret. Also, in the passage about Izumo Amako, the passage where Azakurō's brother Eguri casts down Tatenui Isami is a plot found in many novels and not worth evaluating. The five man gang of Ototsu's revenge is an adaptation combining a phrase from the first volume of the Chinese historical novel *Shidiantōū*: "marrying a woman of true constancy is returning blood." After this, one or two years pass, there was a *kyōgen* 狂言 play of a five-woman gang starring Segawa Rokō performed at a Sakai-machi which is based on *Wakae no hato* 推枝鳩. And just not this. At the time this story was made into a *jōruri* called *Kaikei miyagi no nishiki* in Osaka and Kyōto. There is a printed version, but it is not worth looking at. You should know that the readers of the time were enjoying *Wakae no hato* 推枝鳩 left and right. In the passage of

Yamaguchi castle in Suo, the passage where starving soldiers consume the flesh of men exceeds the cruelty popular at the time, but it should be appropriate for the lieutenants of the treacherous retainer Sue Harukata. As for the passage where human livers are butchered beneath the Yamaguchi castle, I wonder if there were readers who thought, ‘this is not something found in the nature of our countrymen.’ This was the in the middle of the Sengoku period, and like I said before, I was simply following the tastes readers of the time had for cruelty. However, the death of Otone is not real, she switches place with Fumonbun. It is quite successful. The death of Otone’s husband Isami in jail is not real, but instead he is saved by the farsighted plans of Umagawa Tonosuke. This is original and didn’t readers call out their praise? This is a parallelism 正対 *shōtai* of Otone’s remaining alive. Well, the revenge of Okitsu is simply the quieting of evil intentions and not a real revenge. That Gomatsu killed five people out of revenge is the real revenge. It muddles yin and yang, fact and fiction. This is quite interesting. Also, Azakurō and Dōgen are not worthy opponents of Gomatsu—to say nothing of Azakurō’s two henchmen. Yet, isn’t it clever how the sacred blade of Hoemaru, sensing the danger of Azakurō brandishing a torch, comes flying and cuts down a pine branch to extinguish the flame of the fuse? And not just that, isn’t Okitsu’s last testament falling into the hands of Gomatsu also clever? In this way, Gomatsu escapes with the heavenly help of Umanokami Kannon by riding a wooden horse 600 *li* in 3 days, and with the help of Umagawa Tonosuke, Okitsu is able to reunite with her husband who thinks her dead. This is also an opposition 反対 *hantai* of holy men and horses. The matter of this wooden horse is a foreshadowing (*fusen* 伏線) from the opening of the first chapter. It is probably worth knowing the author’s plan. While this *Wakae no hatō* 推枝鳩 may be writing from a time when the writer was only half-matured, when I think of it now, it is superior to my other older works. Without the unwarranted deaths of Waka, Aya

Tarō, Chidori, Aka Tarō, and Fukuroku there would be no flaws and it should be called a gem. The writer's preparations are based on the tastes of the time, and that the deaths of good people are not avoided is not simply restricted to this book, but a regret found in all of my old works from the Bunka era. There is the old saying, 'break your elbow three times and you become a doctor'. The can also be said about writing.

*Sangoku ichiya monogatari* 三国一夜物語 (1806)

5 Booklets 五冊

This book is from 40 years earlier and a work of mine from 1805. When I have all that I have forgotten read to me, [I realize] this is one of the great masterpieces of the time. For the first chapter, that Yoshimitsu looked at Mt. Fuji and understood Mt. Fuji is the essential point of this book and is really well done. While the explanations by Imagawa Yasunori of the origin of Mt. Fuji and the discussion on court music between Fuji Umon and Asama Terutsura are simply for women and children and should be boring, there is also some seriousness here. Discerning readers should realize the care for which the writer organized these passages (*yōi*). Also, the passage where Fuji Umon saves a giant turtle from death and then releases it into the sea is, of course, a foreshadowing (*fusen* 伏線) of the 10<sup>th</sup> chapter where Fuji Tarō and his wife escape life-threatening misfortune. Why is it that in the second chapter Fuji Umon—because he shamefully wants to borrow 5 ryō 両—is swindled out of his daughter to the villain Gojirō? Such thoughtlessness is unsuitable for the personality of Umon. Of course, Umon was not at the house at the time, and Umon’s wife Migumo [is the person] who entrusts Miyuki to Gojirō who shows her Umon’s straw hat as proof of the deal. Yet, that was the intent of her husband and the mistake lies with Umon. Though that may be the case, it should not be that even a gentleman makes a mistake in the face of disaster. Simply, knowing that this is a place connected to the sad fate of Miyuki means that there should not be any deep blame. Even after this, Umon is able to save Sakurako from great peril after he mistakenly thinks ‘isn’t that Miyuki?’ In the end he makes her his daughter-in-law. While this passage greatly resembles the passage in *Pigeons on a Sapling Branch* where Takenui Kusaku mistakes Fukuroku’s only child Ayatarō for his own child

Gomatsu and saves him during the great earthquake, these passages are not the same. I may think, ‘it certainly is an innovation and all the more clever.’ The passage after that, where Asama Zaemon unintentionally sets fire to Fuji Umon at Enma-dō temple in Kodō is a great innovation. While this may be so, because niter was being manufactured it is also gunpowder, there were people who criticized this in the past, saying that once fire takes hold on the ground it should move to anything yet to be processed. That is not the real intent of a novel that takes as a principle the creation of fiction from logic. Whether or not fire moves to niter on the ground is not something I have tested out—and so, not something I could know. Yet, if it is essentially only gunpowder being manufactured, why should this not be the case? Arguing back and forth is to make truth from fiction and a section where I did not adapt. While the martial fight between Asama and Fuji in a previous passage is seemingly not suitable for musicians, it should not be impossible in the middle of the Sengoku period. Yet, that Suguri Heisuke, a faithful servant, being attacked by Asama is to be lamented. As Suguri is being attacked, Sakurako first uses the drum to call someone for help—readers should not negligently overlook this. Afterwards, the passage where Migumo strikes this drum and is compared to the revenge house is a description of the song “Fuji Taiko” and also uses the *taiko* drum. It is a parallelism to the aforementioned drum of Sakurako. Ubara plans to kill Fuji and his mother by giving as a present a poisonous bush clover *hanamochi*, but instead the *hanamochi* is stolen and eaten by the thief Gojirō, leading to his own ruination. The rewarding of good and the punishing of evil seems natural and is quite pleasurable in this section. The passage of the brothel at the barrier of Nagato is the turning point and all the more interesting. The fight of Namiji and Namie over patrons achieves a lingering sensation of refinement. In the passage where Asama runs away with Namiji, that Asama kills Namie is the cutthroat plan of an evil man. It is unexpected for the readers and

Namiji's regret can be seen just as it is. For the passage where Fuji Tarō becomes deathly ill in the mountains of Kibi, readers should share his terrible headaches. The passage where Mikumo kills herself after encouraging Sakurako is a plot line that should be there. There should be very few readers who can see the difficulty of the writer's brush from where Sakurako encounters a ronin traveling on the road while she carries a child until the resolution of the *revenge*. The passage where Asama hides out on Hatomune Peak is an important scene. That Asama hides out while Ubara is sufficiently used is quite interesting. That the nun Shintoku saving Akiraka Tarō and coming here to praise the virtuous deeds of Kotohira is the nature of a bonze, and it is a mistake that the care towards good and bad are not the same. This is quite interesting. At this time, Namiji learns that Fuji Tarō and Miyuki are brother and sister. She regrets giving her body to Asama when she was ignorant of the *revenge* of their father against him. Simply, the passage where she is attacked by Shiraichi and dies from filial piety and chastity is filled with pathos and quite clever, eh? If I was to evaluate it as another's work, I think I would say that it appears from nowhere and vanishes without a trace. Isn't this feeling of boastfulness the work of a *tengū*? Afterwards, Fuji and his wife wash ashore on a deserted island. On the day they eventually shame Asama Terutsura and return to Harima, both Shintoku being Rōzo, the wife of Suguri Heisuke, and Namie, who was murdered by Asama, being the daughter of Suguri Heisuke and Rōzo are revealed. Is such a melding not clever? At the time, illustrated fiction focused on *revenge* stories were certainly the rage, and even I penned a few. I think it was 1806 or 1807 when this *Ichiya monogatari* [三国]一夜物語 was reworked into a play format in Osaka's theater world, with the title changed to *Katakiuchi Takaoto no tsuzumi*. My old friend in Osaka Wada Shōchō wrote to me saying, 'Kataoka Jizaemon played Asama Zaemon to great success and a full house.' Even now I have stored away in an old bamboo rattan a copy of the illustrated

playbook from that time. Fuji Tarō is Arashi Sangorō, Sakurago is Sawamura Dennesuke, and the rest I have forgotten. I have not read *Sangoku ichiya monogatari* 三国一夜物語 in 38 or 39 years and have forgotten it all. I feel as if it is the work from another writer who has departed from this world. For this reason—even though it is my own work—I evaluate it with a heart that it is someone else’s work. And simply not just this book, you should know that I have the same attitude towards all of the old works that are recorded earlier. Well, this book was published by the Edo publisher Kazusaya Chūsuke of Yokkaichi Aomono-chō in 1805 and began selling in the following spring. Though the great fire of March and April of that year spread to his house, the woodblocks were spared by the flame. Moreover, Chūsuke moved to a temporary house in Yoshichō, yet the great fire of Sakaimachi spread to his house again and the woodblocks completely burned up. The copy that I possess is a beautiful version from the spring of 1836. I recently wanted to take a look at it, but it was difficult to find in the marketplace. I pressed Tonomura Jōsaishi to acquire a copy, and the one he sent me is a long-used copy from a lending library that he purchased in his region. The illustrations have a regrettable amount of scribbling on them and are also ruptured like seaweed. Jōsai used his powers to restore it—and now it is the book that I am having read to me. For this reason, in the volumes mentioned above I have not completed my writing style. The writing is of a half-matured writer and not roughly handled. Due to the order of the publishers of the time, the whole thing needed to be 5 volumes of 124 or 125 woodblocks altogether. For this reason, my literary style could not be entirely reflected. [Readers] should know that in these works there are details from the old and the new and that I have modeled this on them. In the aforementioned argument, the people dying because of Asama are Fuji Umon and his wife Migumo, their daughter Miyuki (also known as Namiji), Suguri Heisuke, and Heisuke’s daughter Namie. These four men and women embody loyalty,

chastity, piety and righteousness. That they suffered unwarranted deaths seems like a violation of kanchō 勧懲 morality, but all of those deaths are inevitable. For this reason, they should die and all the more exemplify the names of loyalty, chastity, piety and righteousness. It should not be argued that [for them] to die instead of living happily ever after—as happens with Karaito of [*Raigō Ajari*] *Kaisoden* and her many cohorts and Tsuru no Mae of [*Shunkan sōzu*] *shima monogatari* and her many cohorts—is the same as a mistake. The only thing to regret is that because the woodblocks of this book burned it has ceased to be in the market. That no one wishes to republish should mean that they do not know my favorite books. To think on it again, the sun rises when Mikumo falls into sickness, and Kuboku comes and explains that he has heard that Fuji Tarō is deeply sick. The sun sets when Ubara is deeply injured, and Namiji's situation is heard. So, the rising and the setting of the sun are composed as an opposition. Also, the fire applied to the niter of Enma-dō and the stone lantern of Hatomune Summit used to attack the enemies is an opposition. Aside from this there are others, though none worth mentioning. Well, the self-evaluations of this volume are collections of details and abbreviations from those of my own works for which I am satisfied. Like [*Itozakura*] *Shunchō kien*, the woodblocks were lost to fire. While there is nothing in terms of the writer's satisfaction that equals [*Sangoku*] *Ichiya monogatari*, I have abbreviated the good points and can only speak of the Koishikawa volumes. The aforementioned self-evaluations of 13 or 14 volumes will be bound up. For the others, I should have them read to me over time when my proxy reader and copyist has the free time, and with the additional self-evaluations, compile a second half for this book.



The end of March of the fifteenth year of the Tenpō era (1844).

The Old man Chosakudō

My letter is attached to this manuscript (*honbun* 本文), since it has not been distributed to Mokurō, when the two of you are finished viewing it, it should be sent to him at your convenience. Once it has been distributed to Mokurō, I ask that you please have it sent back to me. In regards to the above two points, I must rely upon you. That is all.

March 26<sup>th</sup>

Chosakudō

To Jōsai

To Keisōs

## Appendix B

### “Sessaku kyūkoku no mono no hon ryaku jihyō kan no ge”

拙作旧刻の物の本略自評巻の下

*Geppyō kien* 月表奇縁 (1803)

10 chapters in 5 fascicles 五巻十回

This book is from 1803, 42 years ago, and is the debut volume of my *hanshi-bon* format *yomihon*. The booksellers of Edo at that time did not yet want to try and publish these works as storybooks (*mono no hon*), so I spoke with the Osaka publisher Kawachiya Tasuke and made him publish it. For this reason, the illustrations were entrusted to various Osaka artisans, as well. Revisions were not sent, so of course there were mistakes and omissions, and many things did not align to my intentions. For example, writing “弟” instead of “第” in “弟第二” is especially painful to see now. There is nothing but to regret the mistakes of the copyist. Aside from this, there are many errors with the ruby and more than a few mistakes with the “て” “に” “を” and “は” particles. All the more, the illustrator of the illustrations for the first two volumes (I have since forgotten his name) died after a long illness, and Kawachiya Tasuke entrusted the illustrations to another person. This delayed the publication, and in the fall of 1805, after three years had passed, a representative of Kawachiya Tasuke’s publishing firm Bunkeidō came to Edo to say: “five volumes have been carved and we are binding them”. The bound volumes of *Geppyō kien* had been loaded onto a boat, but that boat had overturned due to heavy winds and several hundred bound books had been soaked in mud. Kashichi was alarmed and dismayed, and quickly

returned to his master in Osaka to report this matter and request more bound volumes. The reprints of the book arrived in Edo and were sold around December of that year. If I remember correctly, this book was praised according to the tastes of the time and some five or seven hundred volumes sold out in the region. I heard that around 1,200 or 1,300 volumes had sold by spring of the following year, so that it was quite profitable—even considering those volumes lost to the water. After that, *yomihon* became quite popular and the pseudo-*yomihon* books of living writers came out in great volume every year. They were not worth reading once they sold, and readers quickly lost interest. During the Bunka era, publishers who printed new pirate copies were rare. While those sort of things seem outside the purview of a self-evaluation and inessential, no one really knows about them now, and I only write it down to show to those people who share my interest. I have completely forgotten this book and cannot remember a single thing. One day, I had my daughter-in-law read it to me, and so whittled away a long summer's day by writing a synopsis and a self-evaluation. That evaluation follows below.

The title of this book *Geppyō kien* comes from the idea that though the treasured sword Hanedori, the flawless mirror Genkyū, the filial son Kumagaya Shizue, and his younger sister Mikami Tamagoto are separated for a time, they all miraculously reunite later. The so-called Hanedori is a pheasant, and so too are Shizue and Tamagoto. Genkyū is a fox spirit and a flawless mirror of people. The sword is compared to ice and the mirror is compared to the moon. Once you see that as part of the main characters, that idea should become clear. ○ Well, the passage in the first chapter where Nagahara Sakon suspects the females servant Sazanami and unjustly kills her is too brutal, but he is a short-tempered man, so it could not be done any other way. And so, the ghost of Sazanami drawing the thief Iwami Tarō, just like she is forcing his hand, shows that she

is guilty of a terrible sin after her death, though it can be said that she was without sin while alive. There are three people who can be said to have killed Nagahara Sakon. Of them, the ghost of Sazanami is the leader. Also, the passage where Nagahara Sakon sees the rats stealing the eggs and so is filled with regret over the realization that Sazanami is guiltless is composed from similar story from China's Song period. Also, the matter of the foreign pheasant in an allegory, it is something appropriate to the world and believable for the people of Ashikaga Yoshimitsu's time—the Ōei era. It is an excellent opening act. Also, in the passage where the wife of Nagahara's vassal Kamiichi Tanji is admonished, I struggled to write it so that she is only driven away by angry screams, and did not have her exiled. Afterwards, having this Tanji assume the role of parent should probably be called 'expert writing that exceeds the expectations of readers.

○ In the second chapter, the passage where Master Nenge receives the mirror and sword when Nagahara's first wife Karaginu is sick shows the later good and ill fortunes. In the fourth chapter, where Kumagaya places the head of Iwami on his father's grave is a parallelism (*shōō*) of the passage where he comes to the realization of the difficulty of escaping fate by seeing the gravestones of Nenge. Furthermore, not having Nenge appear and finishing the passage with a poem is an omission and extremely well done. While the poem is one of the writer's own compositions, the preparation is not shallow. Even now, being so moved is quite strange. Before all of this, there is nothing like Mikami Wahei wanting to try and marry Akome, and afterwards Sakon makes her his second wife. This is a foreshadowing (*fusen* 伏線) that Shizue is able to satisfy both wronged houses in the end, but at the time grudging words from Wahei. Isn't such a withholding of his true colors quite deep? Also, Iwami Tarō steals several thousand *ryō* of military funds, but is still not satisfied. Having him slash to death the male and female exotic pheasants taken from the bird cage is essential to his nature, but the reason for it is not apparent

here. Isn't this also an example of the deep care taken by the writer? Because of the murder of these pheasants, Takakazu is mistaken and becomes suspicious, thinking, "This is probably the work of foxes". And so, a foxhunt begins. Such a thing is natural and all the cleverer. ○ In the third chapter, Sakon's second wife Akome takes Gengorō, the son of Karaginu, in her arms and flees Ōmi with the help of the retainer Kinai. In the mountains, Kinai is killed in battle with bandits and Akome finds herself in trouble in the vicinity of Kan'ondō temple. Mikami Wahei saves her and has his subordinates take her to Yamato province. This passage is the origin of the evil leading to Wahei and his wife throwing themselves into the Yoshino River later, but at this point not even the faintest trace of that thread is revealed in the writing—it is quite deep. ○ Afterwards, in the passage where Sasaki Takakazu orders Wahei to go fox hunting in the Shiga Mountains, a white fox asks Wahei to save him. Since Wahei is also aware of the injustices [towards the foxes] and refuses to shoot any of the foxes, he is accused by his lord Takakazu of a crime and forced to leave Ōmi. Stuff like this is natural and not unreasonable. When the pheasants die and the fox spirits appear, the consequences of Akome and Wahei's passions are not apparent, and Shizue and Tamagoto appear in world. For example, this is the same as how the Hanetori sword and the Genkyū mirror appear in the world when Nagahara Sakon and his first wife Karaginu die. Isn't it deep to achieve a book of such craft? Up until that point is the framing chapter (*hottan* 発端) of this book. Several years pass after this and the story of Shizue and Tamagoto is begins. Tamagoto appears first and then Shizue appears later. Conveniently, within that Yin there is Yang. You should realize that this also is the writer's preparation. ○ In the fourth chapter, when Tamagoto is six years old, she is kidnapped by a villain. When they had traveled far along the Azuma Road, she escapes by running in front of the palanquin of Uesugi Noritada's wife Kawashide Omae and is able to be rescued. In this passage, Tamagoto's

circumstances are cleared up through questioning, and using the *matsuba* design on the villain's collar, they arrest him at his house of employment. While this is an intriguing story (*kidan* 綺談), such a genius with language and capacity to see the true nature of things is not suitable for a six year old girl. She really is a child prodigy. Yet, why is it that she cannot remember the name of either her village or her family and so cannot be sent home? Stuff like that is a liberty taken by the writer and seems like a difficulty of dealing with genius girl. ○ Tamagoto serves Kashiwade Omae, and when she reaches 15 or 16 years of age, is given to Noritada's longtime vassal Watanabe Daizen to be raised as his daughter and so comes to be in his house. The matter of the love of the Kumagaya Shizue, who lives in the storehouse nextdoor, brought about by her singing to *xian guan* music is a [plot device] found even in Chinese novels and not something that rare, so the passage when winter finally arrives and the leaves of the trees between the house and the store fall down, allowing the boy and the girl to first see each other, is the veritable definition of luster. Since Shizue did not know of the revenge of his father at the time and Tamagoto knew her adoptive father Daizen is disloyal, I wanted to try and tie their well-matched fates, but this rare specimen of man and women cannot escape the sin of lust. I cannot speak for other works, but I wonder: 'Why did I write it as such?' If I were to write it now, I would not start it this way. Also, that there is not even a single underling at the side of Noritada is a mistake. Even if they did not have any particularly duties, he should have one or two attendants. The writer should give a more thorough explanation (*datsuhitsui* 脱筆) for stuff like that. ○ Watanabe Daizen knows that Tamagoto is intelligent and that she has strong feelings of loyalty for Noritada. He fears that she will uncover his treason, and he wants to try to eliminate her. In this passage, he agrees to the plan of Gōhei and Gunnai to capture and starve wolf and then to send [Tamagoto] onto the mountain road to gather bamboo, where the wolf will eat her. Though

the wolf is starving, it has grown to fear people, and so the plan goes awry. However, the wolf in question is resonance of the wild boar Jūrōji later pursue through the snows of the mountains of the Yamato Road and the [BLANK SPACE] illusion of the wild boar. In this way, Shizue hoods himself with a boar skin and is reunited with his adoptive father Jūrōji, and Tamagoto is thrown into the water from the Hanabashi Bridge by Gōhei and Gunnai, and so the two lovers first meet. Also, the reunion of the foster father and the adopted son is an opposition (*hantai* 反対) to the first meeting of the child prodigy and the master, like mountains to rivers and moon to snow. Yet, why is that Tamagoto—even considering that she owes her life to falling into Shizue’s fishing boat—eventually lies with Shizue that night? If I were to write it now, Tamagoto would only entrust her heart to Shizue at that time, and not her body. Since they make a pledge for another day, it would not cross over into licentiousness and should be all the cleverer. Simply, I only wanted to meet the tastes of the time. It’s my first attempt at writing and not worth thinking about. ○ In the fifth chapter, Tamagoto returns home by herself and explains the evil of Gōhei and Gunnai to her foster father Watanabe Daizen. Watanabe strikes down the two underlings in question on the spot and blames them for the crimes, but Tamagoto perceives his evil heart and on a pretext returns to her own room, and so is once again entwined with Kawashide Omae. These things seem natural. The passage where Watanabe eventually slanders Noritada to the military governor Shigeuji, who has Noritada executed for [his supposed] crimes, is a mixture of the historical records. This leads to a passage where Shizue slashes Watanabe Daizen to death with a naginata and flees on the Yamato Road with Tamagoto and Kawashide Omae, only to have his sword unexpectedly stolen by a white monkey and suffering to get it back. This passage is quite original. This monkey later secretly helps Shizue and up until the matter of the western cloth bag, all of the opportunities to write in this monkey are quite innovative and all the more

clever. After that there is the scene of the sun and the snow, and the description of the master and his vassals struggling against the setting sun striking the snow-clad mountains amidst a sky overcast with snow clouds is quite good. The suffering lord and his two vassals request lodging at a hunter's house that evening, and after Shizue explains about the white monkey to the master of that house, Shizue is surprised to hear of how a storm demon is trying to awaken. When they try to flee, they borrow the master's straw raincoat and straw mat to withstand the snow. This is a foreshadowing (*fusen* 伏線) of Shizue reuniting with his father Jurōji later. In this way, Shizue stays behind on the road to frustrate any pursuers, but nobody comes. So, he follows after Kawashide Omae and sees the straw mats, women's hair, and the torn sleeve of a woman's undergarment scattered here and there. He becomes lost in the thought, "Kawashide Omae and Tamagoto must have been killed by bandits". In order to vindicate their deaths, he dons the boar skin hood given to him by master of the hut and lies in wait, and there unexpectedly encounters his father Jūroji. The idea of this encounter and that the straw mat, the hair, and the sleeve of an undergarment are from when a hunter attempting to take a wild wolf is tricked and himself killed ... and that the two women quickly console Jūjirō and stay at the base of the tree ... all of these things are detailed and not a few of them should surprise readers. I had to describe the scene of traveling against the sun setting on a snowy mountain. What you must read in this book is this passage and the passage where Shizue reunites with Tamagoto's vengeful spirit at Magome in Kiso. Are these not the writer's skillful writing? ○ In the sixth chapter, Juroji returns with Kawashide Omae and Shizue returns with Tamagoto to the hut, and Juroji's wife Toji confronts Shizue and the others there. While I will not evaluate how Shizue informs the two parents of the history of the fall of his lord's house, the history of his serving with Noritada's house since when he was a young boy sent to Kamakura is not detailed. While Shizue's mother has a relation that



is somehow connected to the origin of the Uesugi house, when he set off for the east as a child, he should have been taken in by relatives. Not having that concept (*gi* 義) mentioned in even a single line is like an omission (*datsuhitsu* 脱筆). Even so, at that time none of the readers criticized it. That my writing has become more detailed and even the tiniest detail is not revealed is inevitably an issue of coarseness and refinement ... of immaturity and maturity that inevitably arises over time. It has its own natural power. ○ Since I have overlooked things that should be said in the evaluation of the 5<sup>th</sup> chapter, I will write them down here. While Kawashide Omae is traveling, she becomes suspicious of Shizue and Tamagoto's explanations and says that she will arrange a marriage for each of them with other people. This passage is a resonance (*shōō* 照応) for when both Shizue and Tamagoto curse themselves and decide to try and jump to their deaths in the Yoshino River. ○ However, Jūrōji has heard that Tamagoto is the adopted daughter of Watanabe Daizen, and since he suspects that "she probably has an ulterior motive", he tells Shizue to kill her. A secret signal is already settled when Jūrōji calls in Tamagoto and questions her nature. He realizes that she is his daughter Teruko, whom he lost when she was 6 years old and did not know whether or not she was even alive, and he and Toji could not contain their happiness. On the other hand, Shizue and Tamagoto learn that they are brother and sister, and they are disgusted by their earlier actions. When the two parents go into their bedroom, Shizue and Tamagoto flee the hut and make to throw themselves into the Yoshino River. At that moment, they hear the sounds of Jūrōji and Toji coming along in pursuit with Kawashide Omae in tow. Shizue and Tamagoto hide themselves in a thicket of brambles, hoping to wait out their passage. Juroji and Toji see the clothing of Shizue and Tamagoto hanging from a pine tree at the water's edge and are overcome with grief. Jūrōji repents over and over and explains in detail several things. That Jūrōji's former name is Mikami Wahei. That Toji is Nagahara Sakon's

second wife Akome and the matter of Iwami Tarō. That Wahei also schemed with Akome and in the end became man and wife, and so gave birth to Teruko. That Shizue's former name is Gengorō, and his real father is Nagahara Sakon and real mother is Akome's younger sister Korogome, so they are not of the same womb but related on the mother's side. That the focus of his father's revenge is Iwami Tarō and Wahei. Shizue and Tamagoto's anxieties are turned, and they run out from behind the brambles to show that they are not yet dead. Akome is ashamed of being part of the scheming and slightly cuts Wahei before quickly falling on her own blade. Wahei also stabs himself. This passage is modeled on the third act of the *jōruri-bon* called *Myō to ike*. However, there are differences between the two texts, though readers will probably not notice many of them. In this way, a vassal of Uesugi's house Nakamura Hei comes from Kamakura to meet with Kawashide Omae, and Kawashide Ozen heads back to Kamakura in a palanquin. That Shizue takes time off for his revenge and temporarily lodges away resembles the arrangement of a *zatsugeki* play, but it is a fictional story (*tsukuri monogatari*) and its omission should be forgiven. However, the clothing hung by Shizue and Tamagoto in the pine tree are old gifts bestowed by their lord, and at that moment their exchanged cannot be seen. Also, Wahei and Akome are figures of both gratitude and grudge for Shizue and the mother and father of Tamagoto, their bodies are lost and there is no burying them. Like mentioned in the above evaluation, when viewed now, that resembles a rough sketch, but at there were no readers who criticized that. Based on that, both the trends of writing and the writer's own style are worth knowing. ○ In the 7<sup>th</sup> chapter, Kawashide Ozen travels to Kamakura, and Shizue and Tamagoto stay in the house of Wahei. There should be stuff like neighbors coming to offer condolences and Shizue informing the village of the matters [pertaining to the deaths]. These absences exceed the normal reductions (*shōhitsu* 省筆). Like I mention above, only the useful aspects of

that village are presented, so everything else is abridged. In this way, there is no means of curing Shizue's eye illness, but based on the instructions of Adachi Tenkage, they seek the liver of a white monkey. This is very clever. It is a bit of marvelous writing that left readers surprised to say, "this white monkey will become medicine for Shizue". Well, Tamagoto hears that the old lady Mutsuda can acquire from hunters a white monkey and will sell it for 50 *ryō*, so she eventually sets out on the Kiso Road and sells her body at an inn in Magome for 100 *ryō*. This passage is something found in *jōruri-bon* from a long time ago and though it is not rare, it is not found in other times. There is nothing about its timeliness that should be debated, and there is nothing unreasonable in the progression of the passage to that point. I am impressed with my own work. ○ In the 8<sup>th</sup> chapter, in the passage where Tamagoto is taken by a traveler to Magome in Kiso, she does not yet realize that this is the bandit chief's secret hideout, but there should be hundreds of things that make her suspicious. She simply protects herself against hardships and does not obey the master's desires, but the master says that he will not force her, but earn her gratitude, and tries to give her many things. Tamagoto does not dare to be happy, and when the Genkyū mirror is eventually handed to her, she perceives that the master of this house is Iwami Tarō of her revenge, and becomes angry and admonishes him at length. Here, she throws the mirror into the garden well. Iwami is enraged, and though he should have the violence and power of a bandit, Tamagoto is able to grip the tip of his blade in her mouth and will not release it. Can't it be said that how the blade eventually breaks is a vestige of the great tower that is the passion and courage of a principled woman? While at the time it was perfectly fine that [the writing] took the form of a mountain shepherd's flute ballad, but the main narrative is too Sinicized and not smooth. Readers should find it tiresome. That Iwami Tarō is alarmed by this strange occurrence and sets off for Moga in Musashi exceeds the normal omissions. Even if it is

a thief's secret hideout, having a master of a great house move to another village and not tell the village head is like ripping a kite—it's a little too easy. That is the result of my workmanship of old and new. ○ Tamagoto is not around while Shizue's eye-illness is being treated by this efficacious medicine, and there absolutely must be someone to nurse him for five or seven days. And yet, not having that exceeds normal omissions. ○ Shizue's blindness is cured and there is no news of Tamagoto, he deduces from what he hears that she went to Magome and so goes there alone asking round, but nobody knows. The passage where night falls and he arrives at a large deserted house and encounters Tamagoto is described really well. The arrangements where based on this encounter he learns both that Iwami Tarō went to Niishima-mura near Kumagaya in Musashi and of the issue of the Genkyū mirror are superbly skillful. In this way, dawn breaks and Tamagoto disappears. Shizue realizes that she is ghost and searching around, finds a snippet of a poem by Tamagoto. The scene in which he responds with an old poem is filled with pathos and very deep. In this book, the many single poetry stanzas must be sung [aloud]. However, the quoted poem at the end of the chapter is of the writer's own composition. This passage borrows the works of many classical poets, because the writer was often playing around with poetry at the time. Basically, the encounter of the boy and the vengeful ghost of his lover is found in the novels of China and so not original, but doesn't this chapter show deep preparations by the writer to purposefully trick the readers? ○ In the 9<sup>th</sup> chapter, Shizue arrives at Niishima village and—despite his inquiries—does not know the location of Iwami Tarō's secret hideout. That night, though there were two travelers in the neighboring building [earlier], when he returned to the inn one of them had gone out and not yet returned. The remaining one recites a poem that Shizue posted earlier at the hunter's house in Yamato that goes something like “one futon and one pot”. Shizue becomes suspicious and wants to question these travelers, and after the second one

returns and starts talking of Iwami Tarō, Shizue grows all the more suspicious. He enquires about their histories and learns that they are the brothers of the hunter who sold the white monkey to Shizue earlier and they are known to have a father Kamiichi Tanji who served Nagahara Sakon in the past. Also, when they paid the 50 gold pieces through the old woman, Tanji sees that the wallet is made of a particular western cloth and guesses, “the customer who requested the white monkey is probably the adopted son of Nagahara Sakon”. He argues with his two kids Tanzo and Tanpei and wants to return the 50 gold pieces. This stuff is natural and quite clever. However, Since Tanji quickly becomes gravely ill and dies, Tanzo and Tanpei wait out the day and are not able to meet Shizue, they follow his trace, and arrive at Magome, and due to the instructions of a single woman, learn that Shizue had departed for Niishima in Musashi and the details about Iwami Tarō. Tanzo and Tanpei arrive in this land together, and search for the location of Iwami, and learn of his frequent appearances and disappearances, encounter Shizue unexpectedly. That gathering is clever, and quite marvelous. Iwami has 10 underlings, while Shizue is brave and superior in martial arts, he ought to have difficulty attempting to take this great enemy by himself, he now receives the assistance of Tanzo and Tanpei, this should be unexpected for the readers, it wraps up the volume and make (me) laugh. ○ That evening, Shizue, Tanzo, and Tanpei, sneak into the environs of Kumagaya, the passage where they attack Iwami Tarō when he is returning with his 10 underlings in tow, there is nothing that ought to be evaluated. That evening, up in the hills, many torches are lined up, and they fight at night, it is said to be the art of a ghost-fox, there are probably readers who guessed this. However, having this revenge in the region of Kumagaya, this is the land of Shizue’s family name. Also, that Shizue did not declare the name of Nagahara, but took the Kumagaya-uji, since he did not know from the beginning that he was Nagahara Sakon’s child, and moreover is based on a shrine in

Edo's Asakusa called Kumagaya Inenari. ○ As for the 10th chapter, in the passage where Shizue fulfills his *revenge* and stops by the tavern near the temple at Kumagaya, the boy servants are alarmed by the blood-soaked clothing of Shizue and his two companions and flee. This is necessary for what happens next. While Tanzō and Tanbei are drinking sake, Shizue purposefully strolls about and enters the graveyard of Kumagaya Temple, where he unexpectedly encounters Tamagoto again. Her ghastly appearance in this passage should make many readers think 'she must be a vengeful ghost.' However, Tamagoto never went to Magome in the first place, and with the assistance of a fox spirit came to this store and became a geisha. Also, readers will first realize that she did not die when they read of her arrival here saying that she is caring for her bedridden master. Such a thing is quite innovative. Isn't it marvelous that the writer has achieved many deceptions since Magome? ○ That Shizue tried to give 20 ryō to Tamagoto as thanks for her caregiving is going to far. Tamagoto had not being staying at this tavern for over two or three months. Also, he could not have heard that high-priced medicine was being used to cure this illness. At most, 10 ryō should be sufficient as a gift of gratitude. At that time, Shizue had only 70 or 80 gold pieces in his pouch. Tanzo and Tanbei had money from the purchase of the white monkey. It should be reasonable to have them take 20 ryo from that money. Even if the two siblings in questionn refuse out of loyalty to take the money, Shizue have another mens by which to get the medicine made from the white monkey. Also, Tanzo and Tanbei both loyally and skillfully assisted in the revenge, and Shizue would not have achieved that revenge without their help. Which is to say, while this seems like making truth from fiction, it is only a criticism on the limited imagination of the writer at the time. ○ There is the passage where that night a fox spirit enters into the dreams of Shizue and Tamagoto and tells them of the past. A long time ago, thousand and thousand of the fox spirits vassals escaped death during a

fox hunt because of the compassion of Mikami Wahei. The fox spirit had the desire to repay Wahei's kindness afterwards, but Wahei was a man unknowingly cursed and such repayment was impossible. For this reason he became the guardian spirit of Shizue and Tamagoto. When Tamagoto sold her body and became the mistress of Iwami Taro, the fox spirit quickly transformed into Tamagoto and went to Magome. From the matter of the fox spirit recovering the mirror and intentionally making Shizue think that Tamagoto was killed by Iwami Taro, to the supernatural powers of the white fox, all the way until the fearsomeness of the sword and the mirror is explained and is quite good. If this is not explained in the dream, then the virtue of the fox spirit cannot be revealed. Also, Iwami Taro and his gang have all been killed, so there is a place where somebody should know of a fake Tamagoto being murdered by Iwami. All of this is told in the dream. That is the essential point of this chapter. ○ The white monkey of Tanzo and the others is a (*shōtai* 正対) of the white fox of Mt. Shiga. While the white monkey somehow does not have supernatural powers, it can be used as a magic medicine for Shizue's blindness. If Shizue's blindness is not cured, it should be impossible for him to fulfill his revenge. Also, it is because of this monkey that Shizue is given the assistance of Tanzo and Tanbei for his revenge. Therefore, the true virtuousness of the white monkey is almost equal to the heavenly assistance of the white fox. There should not be many readers who think so. ○ Shizue sticks Iwami Taro's head to his waist and sets off with Tamagoto, Tanzo, and Tanbei for Omi. While on the road, he passes by the deserted house in Magome and sees the grave marker for the fake Tamagoto. In this passage, the chrysanthemum that Shizue planted earlier has flowered and a pair of male and female white foxes emerge from their den, only to see Shizue and retreat back in again. This is only a feeling of reminiscence. The foxes in question are not creatures that would make a nest here in the first place. Also, having stuff like the Wago tavern in this passage is asking too

much. ○ In the passage where Shizue presents the head of the villainous Iwami Taro before the grave of his father Nagahara Sakon, in the center is the grave of Sakon and on the left and right of it are the graves of his first wife Karaginu and Sazanami. Also, the passage says that there is a *gatha* marker showing the future of Nenge. The loss of the military funds and the exotic mountain pheasant by Sakon lead to his unnatural death, and inevitably placed a crime on his head. And, at that moment his second wife Akome grabbed up the single child Gengoro and fled on the Yamato Road. These mean that, of course, his household had been destroyed. If so, who erected those three grave markers? There are grave markers by Nenge, so did this old monk erect them? If Nenge did erect them, the vengeful ghost of Sazanami should find rest. However, there is not a single line about that matter in the main text, and this is something that must not be overlooked. The absence of this matter is an omission (*shohitsu* 省筆). ○ Shizue presents himself before Sasaki Takain and earns his praise, but refuses a position. and with Tamagoto returns to Kamakura. He gains more than Uesugi Noritada's normal favor and trust, and afterwards Tamagoto gives birth to three men and two women. The eldest child gains a position with the Sasaki house and ascends to becoming master of a castle. He also is ordered by the lord Ashikaga and is said to have many successes at war. Shizue also should have a happy ending. However, at this end, nothing is said of Tanzō and Tanbei, and that is also another omission of the writer. In the beginning, Tanzō's father Tanji admonished Sakon and died for it, but intentions were of loyalty. Also, Tanji's older brother is Mikami Kihei, and when Akome flees to Omi, he fought mountain bandits and died from his loyalty. And, of course, Tanzō and Tanbei greatly participated in the revenge of Shizue, and so they should become long-time vassals of Shizue's house and share in his happy ending. However, not offering such an ending is the uselessness of the writer's first work, and something readers should tire of. Chōsakudō says: as



mentioned above, the book *Geppyō kien* is my first work to be made in the *hanshi-bon mono no hon* format, and not a great work that should be called a "changing of the guard." While the writing is quite poor, some of the dramatization has many original innovations. When I had *Wakae no hatō* read to me earlier, I thought, "however did I do this?" Now such thoughts seem stupid. None of the 5 or six *mono no hon* I wrote after this is superior to *Geppyō kien*. Isn't it regrettable? The writing looks like it is only for people who read and not for women or children. For this reason, there are many places where vernacular Chinese words are interchanged for our own language, and so some of the more graspable writing style is interchanged, as well. Also, including so many lines of poetry was a wasted effort--I forgot a saying (*gatha*) in the *Mumonkan* that says: "do not write poetry if it doesn't entertain poets". For example, Tanzō and Tanbei are hunters and pretend to fully read and understand the poetry of Shizue. Also, the verses hung on the ridgepole of the sake shop in Kumagaya are not appropriate for their personality or a country sake shop. They are the momentary playful jottings of the writer and when I think of them now, they are nothing to be praised. This would be my absolute favorite book from amongst my works if I had written it using my writing style from after the 5th and 6th volumes of *Hakkenden* and used Kunisada for the illustrations and Tanikanegawa as the copyist. Now that I think of it, the *Geppyō kien* that is circulating now is a reprint, and when it is compared to the original woodblocks, the illustrations and orthography are the same, but there are mistakes in the particles and mistakes with the ruby. Sure the original woodblocks had mistakes in the *kanji* and *hiragana* characters, but these problems are extreme in the woodblocks of the reprints. Considering this, the original woodblocks have already worn down, and the reprints should be, as it is vulgarly called, 'carved away'. The volume that I had stored away is from the original print run, but I lost it for some reason nine years ago. My friend in Matsuzaka

of Ise domain was able to find a copy in that region, but though it is from the original print run, since it came from a lending library it is in a dreadful state with 16 pages from the 3rd volume missing. I also ordered a single book in Edo, but that was a reprint. Anyways, that is why I know there are two different printings of the entire work and that there are many mistakes in the woodblock of the later print run. Just like I said earlier, there are many places where the main text of this book should be read with Chinese sounds, and women and children will probably have difficulty unraveling them. Now, this is occurring in the world and not especially original for dramatizations. Every year after that I would focus my thoughts on that, and in the end came to realize that I decided on a format that it was neither Japanese nor Chinese, neither refined nor vulgar. This is how I make my text. However, I forgotten all of the old works and since spring I have had my daughter-in-law read them to me and self-evaluated over 10 of them. Within those, *Geppyō kien* it is my first work and one that I think of lovingly. There are people who make useless speeches that reveal nothing and show their works to acquaintances of similar tastes to get a laugh. That sort of thing was only a cure for the idleness of a long day and a stupid playfulness!

On a day in April of the fifteenth year of the Tenpō era (1844).

Self-evaluation by Old Chosakudō, 78 years of age.

Michiko, receiving his thoughts for writing down.

*Sekigen ikyō* 石言遺響 (1804)

10 chapters in 5 fascicles 五卷十回

This book was written at the request of the publishers Nakagawa Shinshichi and Hirabayashi Shōgorō and completed in May of 1804. After *Geppyō kien*, this is the second of my story books (*mono no hon*) published in the *hanshibon*-format. The writing style of *Geppyō kien* had many places that would be difficult for women and children to understand—and while this time I made the format easy and excluded looking at poetry verses, none of the writing is too tricky and in the end it is only worth writing down the content. Even so, I have forgotten everything and so all of my points rely on having my daughter-in-law read it to me. The matter of the nightly weeping stone of *Sayo no nakayama*, the matter of the sweets of Nasotate, and the matter of the toothed-pheasant are in commoner tales from long past. The books published in this region that contain abbreviated accounts of that sort of stuff are also from a long time ago. The points that I will discuss about *Sekigen ikyō* now are based on those books. Though there are no new innovations, there is also nothing that should be criticized. Now that I look at it, it should be called an average work. However, in the first volume (*hen*), in the passage where Chōden sees the vengeful ghosts of Toshimoto and Muneyuki at Kikugawa, saying they are following the emperor's wishes, Toshimoto's vengeful spirit transforms into a monstrous bird and Tsurayuki's vengeful spirit possesses a woman with the intention of causing harm because the Emperor Godaigo summoned the grandson of Yoshinaga—a loyal retainer who died on his behalf? Because Toshimoto, despite being dead, is thinking of the child out of loyalty, his becoming an evil monstrous bird and attacking innocent local villagers is difficult to understand. Let alone, Tsurayuki—who in the time of the Emperor Go-Toba-in participated in a conspiracy and is

punished by Go-Daigo—possessing a woman to harm her does not follow that logic. While that sort of stuff was one of the essential parts, in the end it is a worthless variation. Also, in the passage of the bell-striking memorial service of Haruki Den'uchi found in the 10<sup>th</sup> volume, the performance of prayers is completely for Minister Toshimoto Ason and there is not a single word spoke on behalf of Muneyuki. Stuff like that needs the author's explanation. ○ In the 4<sup>th</sup> volume, Manji no Mae is a jealous woman and plots to trick Princess Tsukisayo. Having Yoshimasa stay the night with the Gabō is leading the reader by the nose, but it is something found in China and is a reworking of what I found in the *Zaden*. ○ Why is it that in 7<sup>th</sup> volume, Princess Koishi, with her husband away on the road, wants to sell her body to a brothel in order to arrange the alms celebrating the bell? At that time she was eight-month's pregnant, and so had a hard time selling her body. Moreover, while a married woman selling herself without informing the husband can be said to be filial piety towards the mother, it deviates from the path of womanhood. Those two points are difficult to resolve. For this reason, the woman is lying prostrate with sickness by the side of the road, when suddenly she is killed by Akō Goemon. The unfortunate death of Princess Koishi in this passage is the number one dissatisfaction of this book. Why? Koishi's mother Tsukisayo is a filial woman rare in this world. For this reason, even though she suffered for 10 years because of her absent father and she was not able to perceive the real intention. That she only lived 33 years and died at the Mugura Inn is an unhappy fate that should be lamented. The only passages from this book that should be looked are the above one and the volume with the Kashiwara passage. Nevertheless, the daughter Princess Koishi has a natural disposition that is no less pure than that of her mother Tsukisayo. She wants to continue her mother's dying wish, but is killed by a bandit. When I think on it now, such a thing is not suitable for rewarding good and punishing evil (*kanchō*). Even so, Princess

Koichi dies an unfortunate death [by stabbing] and from the wound a baby is born. The child's birth is intermixed with the legends of Kannon. Since such a thing is unavoidable, if I were to write this passage now, the unfortunate death would not be real, but through the help of a hanging scroll of Kannon, she would project her spirit from the ground. After two or three years, she would once again appear in this world in an unexplored valley in the mountains and fulfill the vow of Haruki Dennai and his wife. As for the stuff about Tamagoro being Dennai mistress, if I leave it as it is it should be flawless. The unfortunate death of good men and women is a violation of rewarding good and punishing evil. Even so, how about Koishi, a second-generation chaste woman, also being substituted and so not needing to be murdered. Also, when Adaka Goemon kills Princess Koishi, he mistakenly thinks that the metal statue of Kannon in her pocket is pure gold. Such a thing is not similar to this Kannon substituting her body and losing her head for the sake of Tsukosayo. Why is it that Gōemon thinks it is gold and brings disaster upon Koishi? This cannot be praised as logical and is the worthlessness of the ideas of the time. In this 7<sup>th</sup> volume there is only the writer's regret. ○ Gōemon's first wife gave birth to Hachigorō, a boy a filial boy who cannot admonish his father's evil deeds, but he plots against his father and dies tragically. Yet this is not the same as the death of Princess Koishi. That Hachigorō is filial and dies tragically is, instead, for the purposes of rewarding good and punishing evil. The unfortunate death of Manji no Mae's infant girl is also the same as this. Essentially, what you give is what you get. Furthermore, that the sound of the flute left behind by Hachigorō sounds like a spoken poem to Gōemon is borrowed from an old commoner tale. However, that because the flute fell into the hands of Haruki Dennai and became a clue for his to inquire about the revenge house, though this is not Hachigorō's original intention, it is the punishment of evil for Gōemon's series of evil deed. In the passage about Shukugawa of the 10<sup>th</sup> volume, because

Gōemon recognizes the sound of that flute when he hears it and asks Dennai for it, Dennai known that Gōemon is the killer of Princess Koishi and is able pay back her revenge. Though it looks like the beloved flute of the filial son has instead become the instrument to kill his father, it is the punishment of heaven. In other words, even the filial son could not save his father, but, instead, assists his enemy. Also, that this is a point connected with the rewarding of good and the punishing of evil should not go unnoticed by readers. In this way, since Gōemon does not realize that he murders Hachigorō, the beloved flute of Hachigorō being used to kill his father is something of an unavoidable fate and not a contradiction in the intentions of a filial son. Readers should know the author's preparations. ○ While Yoshimasa of the third rank uses his skill to put down the evil bird, the rest of him is not worth seeing. Well, he falls for the plot of Manji no Mae to kill his wise wife Tsukisayo and so loses both of his children. In the past, Yiyu of the later Han had a wife when he was low of rank, but when Master Guang offered his younger sister as a wife, Yiyu decline. It is said that one's life partner should not demolish a temple. Yoshimasa already had a woman put up her hair in the style of a wife. Also, when he confronts Tsukisayo at Nakayama, he promised to welcome her into his house soon. Afterwards, in the passage where Emperor Go-Daigo offer Manji no Mae as a reward for defeating the evil bird and Yoshimasa agrees to the marriage without mentioning that he already has a wife, there should be at least a little discussion on his past circumstances. The ideas of the writer at the time are still worthless. ○ Even though Yoshimasa's house affairs are in complete disarray, fortunately his retainer Suguri Keisuke has a brother. The filial son Masanori is invited to the imperial palace at Yoshino, but Masanori is embarrassed by the value of his virtue, gives up his rank, and goes into hiding. Also, the passage where he encounters Tsukisayo while on a pilgrimage and participates in a bell dedication ceremony is an achievement of the writer's preparations. Yoshimasa's

becoming a monk should be seen as an essential point of rewarding good and punishing evil. ○  
Revenge began to become popular in the illustrated fiction of that time. I also have some such works. *Geppyō kien*, *Wakae no hato*, and *Sangoku ichiya monogatari* are all of this variety. This *Sekigen ikyō* also has a number of mistakes by the copyist. Above all, the ruby is extremely erroneous. That I should have overlooked all of these at the time I revised it is, even for me, quite strange. This is one of my mistakes that has existed for 40 years.

*Kanzen Tsuneyo monogatari* 勧善常世物語 (1805)

10 chapters in 5 fascicles 五卷十回

This book came a year after *Geppyō kien*. The manuscript was completed in 1805 and published by the publisher Kawashiya Hanzō in March of that year. It went on sale in December of the same year. However, half of the woodblocks were lost in the great fire of March 4<sup>th</sup> of 1805 and not reworked for a very long time. Hanzō died and his child was not filial, so his business withered away to nothing some time in the Bunsei era. Well, a pirate publisher (*nisefumiya*) named Osakaya Mokichi bought up those woodblocks that remained from the fire without informing the writer. I heard rumors that Osakaya entrusted Echizenya Chōjiro (meaning Tamenaga Shunsui) with having the writing and illustrations of the two volumes lost in the fire newly re-carved and the woodblocks of the second volume and so completed the book. How did it turn out? I do not know, since I have not yet seen them. The volumes I have had read to me are from the original printing run, and it goes without saying that there are many mistakes, omissions, and problems with the ruby. There are also many mistakes in the main text. I have nothing but regret for not having the revisions made at the beginning. Hearing it now after having forgotten everything, though it lacks the number of innovations found in *Strange Fate of Moon and Ice*, the rewarding of good and the punishing of evil is correct and worth reading. The passage of *Setchu no Hachi no Ki* found in the 10<sup>th</sup> chapter is especially well written and I am quite satisfied—though it is my own work. The piety and loyalty of Tsuneyo fused really well though out the book with the chastity and piety of Shiraeta. For this reason, the stepmother Tamaki who lacks charity changes her evil ways and becomes a loving mother in the end. That is a section that achieves a feeling of filial piety. And so, it is called *Kanzen Tsuneyo*



*monogatari*. If the Tsuneyo's virtues only transform the loveless mother and not the villagers, the readers will unconsciously reject this. "Is that rewarding good?" will be all they will say. The people whose 'evil is not being punished' are the two villains Daheida and Gentōda. Their bad karma is concealed, and while there is a section of the jealous woman Sagiri turning into a vengeful spirit, in reality heaven is censoring those evil deeds and should punish that evil later. And so, the rewarding of good is in people. The punishing of evil is in heaven. For this reason I did not title this book "*Chōaku*" ("Punishing Evil"), but that punishment of evil is already a part of rewarding good. It should be rare for readers to realize the deeper meaning of the writer. The grandfather of Sano no Kotarō, Sadatsune, deliberately attends Miurasuke in a fox hunt at Nasuno, and by cutting off the head of the fox spirit Tamamo, creates a curse on the grandchildren of his grandchildren by the vengeful spirit of the evil fox. The legend of Gennō is even mixed together in the *Genkō shakusho*, and since it is not something easy for women and children to understand, I simply open up the explanation of the logic behind the cause-effect. This is not the usual style of the writer. In the *Shuihu zhuan* and other Chinese historical fiction, there are places where the writer's deep meaning is hidden and difficult to realize. If you are not a person who excels at scholarship and enjoys looking for it, the secret wink will be difficult to spot. ○ In the 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> chapter, Tamaki uses the flower of a pear tree to attract a bee and uses this bee to fool Tsuneyo. This causes his father Tadayo to grow suspicious of him. That Masatsune orders Tsuneyo to Kamakura and plots to have him murdered is modeled on the historical accounts of Li Ji of Jin deceiving Shensheng. Discerning readers should know this. However, the Jin prince Shensheng is also a filial son and, thinking of his father, kills himself. Tsunetsune does not die, which makes him completely filial. While Tadatsune says he's perplexed, he does not blame Tsuneyo—that's because he sent Tsuneyo far off to Kamakura.

Readers should know that this is also one extent of rewarding good. ○ Tsuneyo visiting Shiraeta is truly something. In the 4<sup>th</sup> chapter, the meeting of Shiraeta and Tsuneyo at Ashigarayama is natural and not unreasonable. In this passage, Shiraeta's unusually strong feelings of righteousness appear. If readers look carefully, they should know the intentions of the writer. ○ Dankurō becomes suspicious of Shiraeta and Tsuneyo's role in the incident of Miura Yasumura's head after they spend a year in his house, and they are forced to leave by his wife Moga. The passage where Dankurō is punished is natural and not unreasonable. Really, wasn't it Tsuneyo? ○ The innovation within this work is that Shūroku, a servant of Sano no Tsuneyo, is Shiraeta's real father Inba Jirō Nao-kami. In the passage of Kasuga Shrine in the 4<sup>th</sup> chapter, Nao-kami and Shiraeta are first reunited as father and daughter. It is sudden for readers, but must be praised. The only other innovation besides this is the issue of Gentōda's manservant Kinkurō. That is something I also evaluate below. ○ After the 5<sup>th</sup> chapter there is the matter of Gentōda's wife Sagiri. Also, there are the matters of Yūhi Chōja Daheida, Sano Gentōda's wife Morodori, and Gentōda's three children. Daheida's servant Sesuke and Gentōda write out a passage from the *Shiki* and this describes the end in death of a single family beset by a concealed bad karma. Within that there is the story told by a person named Mōsanji of the first descent of a person's spirit. This is borrowed from an event that happened in Edo during the Tenmei period. However, after ten years had passed, when I was writing *The Story of Bei and Bei*, I included a scene of the descent of the spirit of Komoku Jōroku. I had forgotten that this was already in *The Tale of Tsuneyo* and wrote it. Also, when everybody is frightened by the ghost of his Gentōda's wife and scatters, only Gentōda's new servant Kinkurō stands his ground and does not leave. It cannot be said that his serving Tamaki is out of loyalty. That night, he strikes Tamaki and causes a deep wound, then steals all of the clothing and jewels. The passage of his escaping on two

horses should cause readers to taste bile. ○ In the 8<sup>th</sup> chapter, Tsuneyo hears from the monk Naokami of the evil happenings in the village, and with Shiraeta, heads to Sano. Midway, Shiraeta is kidnapped by bandits and Tsuneyo unexpectedly overhears the secret conversation of two of their comrades. These bandits know of the actions of Gentōda's servant Kinkurō, and that there is a rumor that a long time ago a child named Kinkurō stole the sword Fujinami from the Kamakura magistrate's office without leaving a trace. Tsuneyo throws down these two bandits. Eventually he takes Kinkurō alive and punishes him with bamboo spears for the sake of his mother. This is an innovation that readers should not expect and perhaps should not be called pleasing. Here the matter of Sano no Tadatsune losing his land holdings because the sword of Fujinami had gone missing in the first chapter is resolved. Isn't that innovative? Isn't that all the cleverer? At this time, Tsuneyo jotted down all of the details about Kinkurō and sewed the account into his sleeve with the small blade from his sword scabbard. It is a foreshadowing (*fusen* 伏線) of when in the 10<sup>th</sup> chapter Tokiyori Nyūdō had already taken up that letter and so quickly knew of Tsuneyo's great success. ○ In the 9<sup>th</sup> or 10<sup>th</sup> chapter, the description of Shiraeta and Tsuneyo possessing hearts of filial piety shown through their supporting their stepmother Tamaki while suffering poverty is really well done. My self-evaluation of the passage of *Setchū no Hachi no ki* can already be seen above, so I will not speak again on it here. Referencing the famous place Shimotsuke when Shiraeta binds up her hair and sells it for a *ryō* gold piece, like the Lord Saimyōji being given the reward of Kurokamiyama, is appropriate and really well done. The story from when Tsuneyo heads back to Kamakura and visits Lord Saimyōji to until the passage about the restoration of the family lands is modeled after a variation on the lyrical song, yet it is not the same as [such] a lyrical song. The writer's preparations should be clearly visible and quite clever. After that, Tsuneyo visits the second-hand merchant Dankurō and his wife,

who returns to him the sword, and is overcome by great happiness. Also, just like the monk Nao-kami being given control of a new temple complex in Shimotsuke, though it is nothing special, every single one of the characters in this book ends up without tears in their eyes. The conclusion is harmoniously achieved. Isn't the matter of Sano Genzaemon Tsuneyo in an old novel (*shōsetsu*)? As for the place that is told through lyrical song there is only the one volume from *Hachi no ki*, and the origins of the fact and fiction are not explained. Though this may be, while writing out three generations from the grandfather and making this story into a quarto-sized book (*mono no hon*) of ten chapters in five volumes seems like speaking of a dream while still dreaming, its the expedient means taught through rewarding good and punishing evil. Though my other works of the time, like *Geppyō kien*, *Sekigen ikyō*, and *Wakae no hato*, do not have the same idea, but having had this *Tsuneyo monogatari* read to me now, there is no major flaws that should be criticized. Praising one's self is exceedingly boastful, yet I think I can venture it here.

*Tōchū Sono no yuki* 標註園の雪

13 chapters in 5 volumes 五卷十三回

This book was requested in the early spring of 1806 by the publisher Kadomaruya Jinsuke of Kōji machi in Hirawa-machi and published around April. However, when fall arrived I ended my relationship with Jinsuke for my own reasons. And so, while it was carved the winter of the same year, I had quit and it was not revised. The copyist's mistakes with the particles are particularly severe and yet Jinsuke began publishing it in that condition from the first month of 1807. Thirty-eight years have already passed, and even though it is a work of my own, I have not looked at it again in all of this time and so have forgotten it all. Having it read to me now, I have first gained this general outline. The annotations that run above the margin in each of the volumes are only a brief playfulness of the author at the time, but now they seem extremely poor. Even though they explain the sources, women and children will not readily understand them. They are modeled on Chinese historical fiction, but above-the-margin commentary is not really appropriate for this book. Stuff like that is one of the things I know as inferior. That the annotator is named Kairaishi is simply a name sometimes used for fiction when I was young. I did not have a single pupil for my writing popular literature. People yet to be born should know that Kairaishi is found in the prefaces and afterwords of my works from the Kansei era until the middle of the Bunka era. When I think on it now, stuff like the explanation of *kadowakashi* within these abbreviated annotations is an extreme mistake. Sure it can be said that in an old poem the fragrance wafts, but it should not be thought that *kadohu* and *kadowakashiyu* have the same meaning. Annotations with mistakes like that now make me wipe my face in shame. The volume I possessed a long time ago was entirely from the original print

run, but I lost it nine years ago. I ordered a new copy two or three years earlier and now my daughter-in-law is reads it. Perhaps the printing did not apply the ink well ... perhaps they have rubbed off, but the poems are difficult to read. The eye does not perceive what is in the hand. The annotations in particular have severe wearing and places where the ink did not take. Uninterrupted sections of the text are rare. ○ In December of 1822, a publisher named ōmiya Naosuke from Kyoto's Sanjō-dōri came to Edo seeking an estimate on purchasing the woodblocks. Using Yamazaki Heihachi as a mediator, he visited me, Chosakudō, on the 7<sup>th</sup> day of the same month. He said: "I have requested the old woodblocks of Garden of Snow from Kadomaruya, which even now can be used for printing, but readers lament that there is no sequel. Is there any chance you can write one?" Now, Jinsuke is dead and the holder of the woodblocks is a different person. While I should have not refused, I was busy with a lot of popular works and it was difficult to accede. Not to mention that such an old work from so many years ago is behind today's trends and so a reworking will inevitably be inferior. I gave the response "wait for a little while" so as to avoid agreeing to do so. In the meantime, probably around the early Tenpō era, this Naosuke died and his son sold off the block that his father held. I hear that the old blocks of Garden of Snow were bought by Kawachiya Mōhei of Osaka's Shinsaibashi-suji, who still keeps printing them even now. The volume that possess is one of those new prints by Mohei and should have a number of worn characters and damage. Though this small literary history is not commentary, it is only that I make my stenographer toil, saying 'give a brief account of the origins of this book and afterwards describe the characteristics of the story'. The reasons that this book only has a prequel (*zenpen*) and not a sequel (*kōhen*) are written above. That there are many mistakes and omissions and the disastrous state of the particles is from when the manuscript was made. You should know that the reason for these issues is because the writer

and the publisher Kadomaruya Jinsuke ended their relationship without any revisions being done.

- This book only borrows the name of Usuyuki and Sonobe from Shin Usuyuki monogatari, but none of the sections are based on that old work. Just as it says in the preface, though it looks to be secretly modeled on the Tale of Kieu, it is not the same thing. Also, while—just as it says in the upper margin—the passage where the mother and child Usuyuki and Tama no Kata hiding within Kiyomizudera’s grounds is patterned on the Saiyōki, the idea is different. Though all of it is a great ostentatious scene, the work is bland.
- There is the matter of Ono Minister Akimitsu’s first wife Chie no Mae throwing herself into the garden well after growing sick with illness. There is the matter that afterwards the crown prince Munetaka bestows a second wife to Minister Ono. Also, there is the matter of Akimitsu admonishing Muentaka and then taking tonsure before disappearing. These are a foreshadowing (*fusen* 伏線) of Tama no Kata and Usuyuki hiding at Kiyomizudera Temple later. For this reason, the text is abbreviated and should perform that general outline.
- The speech about the dream of exchanging the ‘fact’ of son Sanewaka for the ‘fiction’ of the daughter Usuyuki seems like asking too much, but it explains the writer’s intentions and the principles of karmic retribution. I hope that it is easy for women and children to understand. Not simply just this book, but it is rare for my works from the Bunka era to apply karma and not explain it. This was not the case after the Bunsei era. Even based on this stuff, one should see that speculation is not the same in my older and newer works.
- In the passage of the temporary residence in the grounds of Kiyomizudera Temple, Usuyuki places a copy of the 15<sup>th</sup> volume of the Lotus Sutra on a small reading desk, which is brought to Magaki. The moment when they visit the main temple hall and Kannon appears, that scroll falls unraveling to the ground, and Sonobe Zaemon does not know that Takane grabs it. In the “Fukakusa” passage, that the scroll becomes a red rope of Imoitsu is really good. However,

Usuyuki is a young woman who endures the world. For example, why is it that with the fall of dusk, she takes to Magaki the desk with the candle on top of it to brighten that scroll still lit? If the scroll is not wrapped up in a silk cloth, it should be bundled in something like cotton cloth. There are many problems with the details in my books of that time. ○ It goes without saying that the passage where Chie no Matsuō sets off on the Ki road with her Sanewaka, saying that she would visit the lord Akimitsu's residence looks like fiction (*tsukuri banashi*). That matter does not stand up to principle. Why? While Matsuō has no other loyalties and works for the mother of the lord, Tama no Kata and Usuyuki should not rely on their sister Magaki and the mochi shop owner Magojūrō and set out on a journey. Not to mention, when Sanewaka buries his traveling money and hides while on the road to Ki, Matsuō was not able to question it. To say 'so', it can be said that returning home to Kiyomizu in that state to inform Tama no Kata is losing face. What's more, for the purpose of preparing money, setting off to his parent's place in Echizen is quite shallow. In this way, Matsuō, while having a great deal of loyalty, is a man with no wisdom. Matsuō is not the only one who lacked wisdom, so too did the writer at that time. At that time, Matsuō could not visit Sanewaka and becomes violently ill while on the road. The moment he lies down on the road is not expected. His uncle Ishidō Hatsubeiroku is staying at an inn in the northern region of Echizen and hears about his difficulties. That he insists that Matsuō ride in his palanquin as far as Echizen is something that must inevitably occur. Matsuō is able to avoid the circumstances of Tama no Kata and Usuyuki deliberately sets off for Echizen for the purpose of traveling money should be superior. ○ In the passage in Fushimi that occurs a little bit earlier, Kurimon Sajirō's wife Nagiwai gave birth to a girl, and since she was born on the day of the rooster of the month of the rooster of the year of the rooster, that girl is called Kudakake. Afterwards, the fresh blood from the liver and intestines of Kudakake is a framing (*shitazome*) of



the efficacious medicine for the eye-illness of her father Sajirō. Of course, since Kudakake's nature is like that of a bird, the reader's should notice this and ask 'what source of use is there for this later?' ○ There is the matter of Sajirō and Nagiwai's dreams, where Suwahira and his wife are blamed for the crimes committed by a plague god and are to be burned to death. When that fire spreads to their clothing and they believe they are going to die, but are saved by the manifestation of a strange infant. There is the matter of Sajirō and Nagiwai later having their lives threatened by plague. There is the matter of Sajirō being crippled and the two parents with their child wandering around Fushimi. All of these are a framing (*shitazome*) for the passage of Toribeno that occurs later. Though this may be, why is it that in the dream of Sajirō showing the future of this child exceeds the promise, and the unrevealed ill-fate of Suwahira and his wife, coupled with the unhappiness of Sajirō are the result of a demon's curse, yet such a curse is not put on the villains Asazak, Shibujurō, Sanewaka, and Shimon? In the passage of the plague demon, it is difficult to be satisfied with the writer's creativity. Without the aforementioned plague demon, it cannot be said lightly that Sajirō becomes lame during the time of plague. It should be good. Since all of these are to fulfill an omen, the author achieves license with his writing. Also, there are three or four explanations of ghostly dreams in this volume. First, there is the dream of Ono Minister Akimitsu seeing the tiger head on the hill associated with the birth of Sanewaka. After that, there is another dream of seeing a clam in a house that is associated with the birth of Usuyuki. Next, there is the ghostly dream of Sajirō and his wife suffering from illness. There is also the passage later where Ono Komachi confesses herself in Usuyuki's dream. Why are there so many ghostly dreams? It is said that all of them are making omens at the time, because they are the yellow of the beak of the writer who spun them. ○ In the passage of the pledge that occurs after "Fukakusa", the matter of the holy scroll lost earlier mediating the

omen of the younger sister when Princess Usuyuki, Sonobe Zaemon, and Takane meet should be called innovative and clever. Of course there is sex between a man and a woman in this passage, but there was no intent for a secret affair. The man pledges to marry the woman another day. Sure it is sex for the sheer pleasure of it, but it can be called the principle of a wife's loyalty and good conduct. This passage is also a warning to the women and children of this world. I can only think that if I wrote this passage now there would be nothing else. However, Usuyuki is a beautiful woman of 28 years. Magaki is also a young serving girl. Even so, though she visits the graves of her ancestors, going to the distant Onoe seems a little reckless. Having Magojūrō as a traveling partner would not hinder things, and having only the women traveling seems like the license of the writer. Though this may be, it is just a story and this sort of stuff ought to be forgiven. ○ In the passage of the pledge before "Fukakusa", Ono Komachi announces that she is in Echizen during a dream of Princess Usuyuki. Also, matters like the sermonizing of the point that she must suffer a variety of consequences for her evil acts from a previous life goes beyond the omens. Not to mention, having a fourth ghost dream here is annoying. Readers should generally praise how in the end, after resolving several difficulties and achieving great happiness, Usuyuki first realizes that she is a reincarnation of Ono Komachi. ○ After Sanewaka hides on the road to Ki, he is beset by villains in Osaka and loses his traveling money. In this helpless state, he arrives at the store of Shimon, a member of the house targeted by his revenge. Shimon has prepared a trick from him, and wants to fool his sister Usuyuki so as to make her his wife. Afterwards, for a variety of reasons, Magojūrō is fooled by the beggars of Toribeno. There is also the issue the disposal of the bodies of the bounty hunters killed by Sanewaka. When these beggars request 100 gold pieces as alms from Magojūrō, the bounty hunter Heijirō lends that 100 ryō to Magojūrō and forces him to give it to the beggars. Later, Heijirō applies pressure to

Magojūrō, saying that he would use the loan of the money as a pretext for making Usuyuki his mistress. Usuyuki agrees to sell her body out of filial piety and dallies with Heijirō. The above matters are not designed to resemble the sexuality found in a *zatsugeki* play. Magojūrō, having been fooled by the beggars, quickly buries the bodies and so is ensnared by Sanewaka and Shimon's evil plan. In this scene, the nature of his heart does not come across clearly and seems like the liberties taken by the writer. Yet, there should be no problem if you remember that it is fiction. Rewarding good and punishing evil is taken as the principle, and perhaps it should be there in the great writing of a principled heart. ○ Niseakibito Heijirō is a man by the name of Kawara Yanagi Tadakurō and the right-hand retainer of Shimon. At this time, he forces Usuyuki into riding to Magome where she will learn the four noble truths that life is suffering. On the way, five or six underlings of the ōmi bandit Katsurashima Yasha Tarō are lying in wait. They strike down Tadakuro and the two palanquin drivers by firing arrows and kidnap Usuyuki. What is the purpose of the good-guy Magojūrō becoming a bounty hunter and heading off to Omi when this happens? Because not having this Magojūrō around would be an unsuitable gimmick when Usuyuki escapes the bandit's mountain fortress, the writer took liberties with his writing that were not clever. Next, this Magōjūrō hears that Shige Matsuō is somehow connected. He opens a store on the grounds of Kiyomizudera and sells mochi. He makes a living, but has neither a wife nor servants. However, that he abandons his store and leaves Kyōto for the sake of Tama no Kata and Usuyuki is difficult to understand. It should be suspicious that at that time readers did not blame writers for rough writing and that writers themselves did not necessarily care about such roughness. ○ That Sanewaka first learns the four noble truths that life is suffering happens when he intentionally is struck down by Tadakurō and fakes his death. He does not know that Usuyuki has been kidnapped by bandits and arrives at Shimon's store to

request the promised money. Shimon is angry that Usuyuki is not available and ties Sanewaka to a tree in the garden. That night, Sanewaka slips out of the ropes and escapes, but he is unaware of the location of the money snatched by the beggars of Toribeno. Shimon is unable to bear his own anger. Tadakurō has his younger brother Tadahei lead five or six gunmen to capture Tama no Kata. Magaki and Tama no Kata flee to Toribeno. Tadahei and company come pursuing and have a bloody battle with Magaki. Though Magaki dies in the fight, her loyal spirit possess a lame beggar who fights with a fierce bravery and superior martial skill. He kills Tadahei and all of his men and saves Tama no Kata. This beggar is Kurimon Sajirō, and with his wife Nagiwai and his daughter Kudakake takes care of Tama no Kata. While everything in this passage looks like a *zatsugeki*, the are only sorrowful scenes in this prequel (*zenpen*), and here, there are both the opportunity for the aforementioned chicken to be principled on bravery. Readers probably have fits of laughter. However, Magaki is Matsuo's sibling and a woman of rare loyalty in this world. Especially now, the writer regrets having her die in battle here. Even so, once she is dead, it opens up a way for her to be reborn later, and saying that it is righteousness is probably alright. As for Sajiro and Nagiwai cremating that corpse, it would have to be done in the sequel (*kōhen*). Also, having the appearance of that cremation should described as only be small pine tree branches snapped for kindling with a single string of smoke in place of a burial, though they are still in a moment of urgency, a little too light-handed and also resembling an idea found in a *zatsugeki* play. If I wrote this passage now, I would find a way to not kill Magaki. This is the same for Magojūrō's unfortunate death. The unfortunate death of a good man is a violation of rewarding good and punishing evil. I have many regrets for the worthlessness of my thinking at that time. ○ In the passage where Usuyuki is abducted by Araheita and his men and brought with Magojūrō to the bandit fortress in Omi, Usuyuki, Araheita and his gang (who say they will

assail travelers) all run away towards the base of the mountain. The bear that guards the entrance of the bandit fortress sense Magōjūrō's passion for righteousness and responds with loyalty. Usuyuki escapes by riding on its back, and, like I said earlier, Magōjūrō is not tied up here because Usuyuki's being single is not convenient. Since Usuyuki thinks of the three disasters and is married to Shimon, she must die. Even though she is kidnapped by Yasha Tarō, she does not obey him, and at the point where she must inevitably be murdered, she is saved by the bear. She eventually takes the ferry at Imatsu, the arrows shot by the bandits cannot be helped, Usuyuki falls into the water by herself but does not die, her kimono sleeve is pinned to the boat by an arrow, the upper half of her body is above the water, and she does not sink. She is pulled by the boat and when she arrives at the shore, at the time that was the writer's plan for cleverness (*myōan*), and "this is the great innovation of this book" it cannot be said. What ought to be lamented, Mago and the faithful bear, because of the bandits, have heads offered, become the arrow of the pursuers, quite a grudge. The issue Mago and this bear, in the sequel, "what to do?" etc, while there ought to be that, now I forget, there is no old mental plan. Again, helping this Usuyuki, the travelers riding on this boat, a slaver called Jungorō, is tricked, takes Usuyuki to Echizen, the master of the brothel Tsunuga the passage where sold to the Matron (Isuba), the prequel all of the matters of Usuyuki are exhausted. Arriving at the sequel, Usuyuki endures her various hardships, ought to be strange story of protecting *kokusetsu*. At the time, the writer, the sequel, there was a mental plane for harmonious, even the prequel forgets it all, in the past, stuff like a mental plan was like what?, ought to remember at least something. Now, having the prequel read to me, I only have the feeling that this is the work from an author departed from this world. ○ The 5<sup>th</sup> volume is comprised of a storyline that goes from Sajirō, with Nagiwai and Kudakake, helping Tama no Kata and returning home to his village in Tanba until the fulfillment

of the revenge, which is the single longest storyline in the prequel. Well, Sajirō has Nagiwai and Kudakake stay in a mountain hut near the village, while he returns to the village with Tama no Kata to the village. At the village, they visit the village elder Kikusan and first hear of the unfortunate death of Saijirō's father Sadayū ten years earlier by snake bite somewhere around Shinomine. He is overcome by grief. Eventually, he is invited by Kikusan to his house, and while traveling there they encounter the lumberjack Shibajirō. At that moment, Kikusan stops Shibajirō with a hail and whispers something. That whisper is a foreshadowing (*fūsen*) that that night the beggars will break into Shibukurō's house and trash the place. Also, when Saijirō's stepmother Asazaka and brother-in-law Shibukurō come to the village and enjoy a banquet with Kikusan, about 10 of the village beggars break in and upset the party. They say that they are friends of Sajirō when he was a beggar at Toribeno long ago, and steal food and drink. This passage is a foreshadowing of when the beggars kill Asazaka later. For this reason, Sajirō cannot stay in the same house as Shibukurō. Shibukurō determines to have Sajirō stay the night in the stables and protect the cows and horses. Tama no Kata, Nagiwai, and Kudakake are all staying the same run-down grain storehouse. Sajirō is taken sick by poisoning. That illness is cured, but he eventually goes blind from another eye illness. Kikusan and Shibajirō quickly go to console Sajirō. Sajirō is dragged by Nagiwai to Ushiishi, and during that trip an old traveling monk instructs Sajirō and his wife on how to make a miraculous medicine for curing eye illnesses. Based on that instruction, Nagiwai wants to take the blood of Kudakake's liver to make the medicine, but Sajirō will not hear of it. Afterwards, Sajirō is led by the hand to Ushiishi by Kudakake, where they pray to the Kōbō Daishi. Sajirō suspects, 'isn't Nagiwai a treacherous woman?' He questions Kudakake and learns that Shibujirō is her lover. Because of this, Sajirō guides Kudakake and tries to cut down Shibujirō. However, Kudakake's torso is rent and her

blood spills out into her father's eyes. Saijirō's vision is cured on the spot, but he laments his mistake. Nagiwai and Tama no Kata come running, and Kudakake tells them, as her life drains from her body, of her wish to be filial by providing the means for the miraculous medicine. All of this and up until the revenge is the big scene of the prequel (*zenpen*) and if this were a *jōruri-bon* it should be considered the final act, but though it is the best part of the book, there is no section that should be praised as principled. Why? Isn't the monk who instructed Saijirō and his wife on how to make the medicine a manifestation of Kōbō? It is said that the killing of animals is the worst of the Buddha's five sins. Yet, the instruction on making the miraculous medicine from the blood of a murdered person is a contradiction of Buddhist teachings. Furthermore, medicine is a benevolent art. I have never heard of killing a person to make medicine in Chinese or Japanese medicine. Sun Simiao of the Tang is considered the greatest physician in the world, to the extent that he is a mystic. However, it is said that he died at the age of 92—impossibly young for a mystic—because snakes, bugs, rats, and their cousins are often used for the concoction of medicines in *Formulas of Emergencies of a Thousand Pieces of Gold*. Are there not those who say that even the killing of vermin has no place in a benevolent art? They should realize that the medicine of the Kōbō Daishi deviates from reason and justice. Furthermore, Nagiwai kill the chaste girl to cure an eye illness of her husband and wanting to try to attain his revenge of the father, while a passionate heart that is rare in this world, it is not an emotion true to a parent. If the formula for a medicine taken on the word of some unknown traveling monk had no efficacy, than Kudakake would have died a dog's death. There is an ancient saying: “to study a book is to waste paper, to study medicine is to waste people”. This should be common knowledge. Now I can only laugh at myself that, “As for *jōrurui-bon* and *zatsugeki*, it goes without saying, but this handling is particularly shallow in my old works”. Also, Saijirō is a man

who helps Tama no Kata, because he is possessed by the virtuous spirit of the passionate Magaki. Also, that his lameness does not return when the virtuous spirit suddenly leaves shows that Magaki's spirit absorbed the lameness. Furthermore, Sajirō does not know of the poisoning of Asazak and Shibukurō. The first deed of the spirit of Magaki is to absorb that poison and become blind and doesn't she use her powers to protect him later? This also shows how there are contradictions in the assistance rendered by the spirit throughout the work. To speculate, it seems like a criticism of the principle of making truth from fiction and though it is not my intention, stuff that is too fanciful even for stories did not occur in the world in the old days. There is no kindness in sympathy. This is also simply a mistake in my explanations, if women and children do not realized that sort of justice, there should be all the more praise for it today. It is not worth saying that it is for gentlemen. ○ When Sajirō's eye-illness is cured, Shibukurō comes leading his men and wants to try and capture Tama no Kata. This infuriates Sajirō and a fight breaks out, and he cuts down [Shibukurō's] evil underlings and arrests Shibukurō. He had plotted with Itazaka ten years earlier and killed Sadayū. For the matter where he wanted to try and take Tama no Kata, which infuriated Sajiro and a fight broke out, he cuts down the evil underlings, and arrests Shibukuro, he plotted with Asazak 10 years earlier, and killed Satahu issue, with the clearing of the confession, has Shibukuro pulled apart by the cows raised in the pastures, this is a very happy passage. At this time, Kikusan and Shibajiro, come with the beggars, deliberates on the matters issue, and 6 of the 10 beggars, that evening die of poisoning, the remaining 4 people, saying that they would take revenge, they guess which is Shibukuro's house and drop by, and kill Asazak, the issue of sticking that head on a bamboo spear, this head of Asazak, the passage of the boat at Imatsu, Araheitaro comes with the head of Magojuro and the bear's heads on the tips of spears, compared with Usuyuki, this is a hantai of good and bad.



And so, the issue of the revenge of Sajiro, while Asazak it is the father's revenge, she's a mother-in-law, killing by herself is not good. For this reason, the hands of the beggars are borrowed, the preparations of the writer that return that grudge, is stupendous. And, Shibukuro and Asazaka, correspond to the 5 greatest sins. The punishment of being drawn and quartered by cows, is not the cruelty of Sajiro. Asazaka, does not extend to that principle, being killed at the hands of beggars, also is the same as that punishment. Is it not an innovation of extreme variation? ○ At this time, the Ushiishi stone gradually splits and from the inside a stone *gatha* of Kōbō appears, which explains how Sajiro's revenge remains unfulfilled. Though it seems like asking too much, without this comparison, there would be no way of realizing the spiritual assistance of Kōbō. Can't it be said, "there is no oversight in the author's preparations"? ○ Saying, "this is Shimon's domain, we cannot stay here long", Sajirō and Nagiwai set off for Sonobe with Tama no Kata. The prequel ends with them crossing the Sakai River, saying "Kikusan, Shibujirō, and the beggars will probably leave. The nuns of Okuono say they despise the oppressive governance of Shimon and will probably move to Sonobe." After that, Tama no Kata does not go with Yoritane to his house, so she must be safe. Usuyuki and Sanewaka are already dead in my draft plan, but now that I think about it, there is no way for this to be. After Usuyuki saves herself from countless suffering, she should become the wife of Sonobe Yoritane. There is also the idea that Sanewaka is moved by the loyalty of Shige Matsuō, with the great achievement of turning away from evil and returning to good, and so resurrect the Ono household. I thought that this is the way I wanted to conclude the sequel. Now, I have forgotten everything, if there is another talented person unknown even to the writer that is continuing the sequel, shouldn't the writer honestly praise him? It's not clear. If there is no talented writer who after reading this abbreviated self-evaluation still doesn't realize the writer's intentions, it should

be better that there is no sequel at all. ○ Something I failed to mention earlier: when Sajirō received a warm welcome at Shibukurō's house, it can be seen in the main text that the beggars trashed the house, but there was not a lot of consumption of food and drink. Kikusan was also a guest that night; poison cannot be seen while he is partaking of the food and drink. Stuff like 'that Kikusan had not yet taken up his cup' so the poison has yet to be applied can also not be seen in the main text. If stuff like 'Also, the saké cup was replaced', Kikusan should not have been able to the escape. These things are omissions (*datsuhitsu*). Now that I think about it, there are many details that go unmentioned. I have examined the roughness and elegance of this book back and forth, and I have to think of this scribbling from 40 years ago as the work of someone else. It is not the same as a respectable old man.

*Kukuri zukin chirimen kamiko* 括頭巾縮緬紙衣 (1807)

10 chapters in 3 volumes 三卷十回

Because of the reprint, it is 5 volumes 再板の者为五卷

This book is written at the request of Sumiyoshiya Masagorō of Edo's Denma-chō in the spring of 1807. Since my friend in Osaka Umata Shōchō repeatedly begged me, the preface is entrusted to his brush. Now, after all of this time, only the preface is worth reading. For the rest of it, the reprinter carved it away at his whim and without informing me. The first printing was carved in January of 1808 and I hear that it was popular at the time. It is said that over a thousand books sold that year. Some seven or eight years later, when the original publisher Masagorō fell into ruin for one reason or another, his house burned in the great fire of Yotsuya and these woodblocks also turned to ashes. I have heard the rumor that Masagorō also passed away at some point. And so, a publisher called Osakaya Mokichi selfishly reprinted this work without informing the writer at some time during the Bunsei period. With the help of Tamenaga Shunsui, he renamed the work "*Wankyū Matsuyama monogatari*" and divided the three volumes into five. The illustrations (drawn by Toyokuni Hiro) are not based on the old woodblocks, but newly illustrated by Keisen. There are many places that are not the same as the old woodblocks. Also, with the three volumes being split into five volumes, many of the illustrations that should be in the first volume are now in the second volume, which is not appropriate for the main text. Mokichi requested all of this of Tamenaga and so selfishly distributed it! Having had that reprint read to me, while in general there are not a lot of differences with the older print, there are some mistakes, superfluous additions, and omissions. Also, the title is *Wankyū matsuyama monogatari*, with *Wankyū matsuyama ryūkō wasetsu* written within each of the volumes.

Thinking on it, an old name, it is said that people of the world do not know of the written account of *Wankyū*, Mokichi ordered writing from Tamenaga, who ought to make this dull thing. This *Wankyū* is bankrupt playboy, Matsuyama is a prostitute, while for example drafting that unexpected encounter, that name should not appear in the book's title. For this reason, the image of *Wankyū* that is circulating in the world, is hinted at, to title the book *Kukuri zokin chirimen kamiko*, has the heart reverberating the trends. Mokichi and Tamenaga and others, were not aware of this principle, and selfishly changed the name to a bad title, differing from my original intentions, really there is nothing but to sigh. While Mokichi is not a person who knows me, Tamenaga is an acquaintance, even if he was requested by Mokichi, not informing me on this matter is akin to a joke that doesn't care an ounce for another person's feelings. I blamed him for this impropriety and so broke off contact, I cannot possibly hide my grudge. Afterwards, in the beginning of the Tenpō era, when Mokichi's died and his house broke apart, these woodblocks were purchased by the Osaka publisher Kawachiya Mohei. I hear that they have been continually reprinted through the years until today. For this reason, in the volumes of the reprint it is recorded, "Published: January of Tempō 4; Osaka Kawachiya Mohei". While a lot of time has passed since the purchase of those woodblocks, the original woodblocks have been worn down with age, so there should be some readers who are perplexed. Those people who make a profit from the sale of books, although they sell my name, it's like they reprint without thinking to ask, and that selfishness is not confined to just this book. All of these despicable things like the aforementioned happen even in my lifetime. How will it be like when I am gone? While this is a pointless discussion, with a single sigh, I shall write down my self-evaluation using my pseudonym. ○ In the introduction (*hottan*) of this book, the merchant Hattori Hosuke

of the village Mukumoto in Ano district of Ise Province is miserly by nature.<sup>131</sup> His wife Wasurei is the younger sister of a man from the same village named Ichihei, and, when she was a child, she sold her body and became a prostitute for the sake of her brother. She suffered in that harsh world for 10 years before becoming the wife of Hosuke.<sup>132</sup> Because Hosuke was without a child, she prayed to Shirasu Kannon and gave birth to a daughter named Tsunebana. Hosuke achieved his longest dream and said that he would build a hall for Shirasu, however, being miserly, he neglects his praying and does not raise the offertory. Wasurei is an honest woman and admonished her husband, though she did not yell.<sup>133</sup> When Tsunebana is three years old her father Hosuke dies of illness. Ichihei, out of concern for his sister, seeks a new husband. Using the offices of a man named Noboshichi, the villain Danbei becomes the head of the household and later runs it into bankruptcy.<sup>134</sup> At that time, Ichihei dies.<sup>135</sup> When Tsunebana is 8 years old, Danbei tricks Wasurei and sells Tsunebana, pocketing 12 *ryō*. A man named Fujimatsu from Arima in Settsu purchases Tsunebana and returns home with her to Arima. Danbei kills his accomplices Noboshichi and Kokeroku so as not to split the proceeds from selling [Tsunebana], he steals all of the money and flees. Wasurei, saying that she will fulfill her late husband's lifetime dream, sets out on a religious pilgrimage throughout the different provinces. Up until this point there is nothing that ought to be evaluated. However, the preparations of the writer of the miserliness [of Hosuke] and the deception of the gods leading to evil karma inherited by the child are to be admonished. The evils committed by Danbei and such are not worth mentioning. Those places abhorred by the gods are not questioned, and their results should be known.

---

<sup>131</sup> For the *hottan* introduction, see Yoshikazu, p. 26.

<sup>132</sup> For the personal history of Wasurei, see Yoshikazu, p. 28.

<sup>133</sup> Hosuke does make some effort to fulfill his vows. See Yoshikazu, 30-31.

<sup>134</sup> Danbei is actually Noboshichi's cousin, see Yoshikazu, 32.

<sup>135</sup> For the introduction of Danbei and Ichihachi and Danbei's marriage, see Yoshikazu, 32-33.

Afterwards, all of those things are foreshadowing (*fusen* 伏線) that should be in a story of the Kabura Baba's fate. After that nothing occurs in the story for 6 or 7 years and the incident at Fujimatsu's bathhouse in Arima begins. ○ Tsutsuishi Sōtatsu, a retainer of ōmiya Ninsai who himself is a senior retainer of the Minister Kitabatake Tomonori, takes his child Matanosuke to Arima to heal in the waters. Tai Hachitarō, the child of Matanosuke's wet nurse, is also there. When Hachitarō was sixteen years old and Matsunosuke twelve years old, Hachitarō's mother had an affair with a man named Funae Kyūhei and fled. This section is a foreshadowing (*fusen* 伏線) of Wankyū falling in falling madly in love with Matsuyama and going broke. There should be readers who did not notice this many of the things here. ○ There are the 20 bathhouses of *uwanari-yu* springs that are the origin of the Arima *onsen*. It is said that spirit of a jealous woman, up until now, will curse any man or woman who promises betrothal at the house of Fujimatsu. Wasurei's daughter Tsunebasa is working as a bathing attendant at Fujimatsu's house and Sōtatsu consoles her. Sōtatsu is carried away in his love for the bathing attendant, so he jokingly promises to make her Matsunosuke's wife after [she] grows up. The bathing attendant take him at his word and asks for a sign of proof, so Sōtatsu has Tsunebana take two strips of short poetry that he has jokingly written out. This section is a foreshadowing (*fusen* 伏線) of the coincidental meeting of Wankyū and Matsuyama afterwards. ○ Sōtatsu sees the *uwanari-yu* springs. There is a snake. A mother and chick swallow die. Several years pass after that, and Matsunosuke grows up. When Sōtatsu requests a betrothal for him, he regrets how long ago he deceived the bathing attendant with his jesting, and sends a messenger to Arima asking after her. He learns that the bathing attendant in question is no longer in Arima because Fujimatsu sold her off to [somewhere in the] three provinces of the Etsu region after becoming frightened by the curse of the jealous woman. Sōtatsu is beset by regret and pities her purity, and

without any attendants, he sets off once more for Arima. The warrior Toriyao Shichirōji from the same province arrives at Arima with Sōtatsu (the matter of the snake and the sparrow are in this passage), and after asking about the location of the bathing attendant, they learn that she is not now at the Mikuni and that her whereabouts are unknown. So, Sōtatsu loses hope and returns to Ise with Shichirōji. Shichirōji suddenly becomes ill and has to stay in an inn. Sōtatsu says that he will go inform the Toriyao household of the illness and hurries off on the road alone. Shichirōji questions to the inn owner Ninsai—who is an angry spirit—and learns that he was killed by Sōtatsu. Shichirōji's wife also sees the same dream and complains. Ninsai sends an assassin and he kills Sōtatsu on the road. Tai Hachitarō defends himself against a mob of agents sent to arrest him and throws down Tsutsuichi Matanosuke. Hachitarō dives into the floodgate and escapes. Afterwards, because Shichirōji comes back and informs them of the truth, everyone believes that Sōtatsu's unfortunate death is the result of the curse of this jealous woman. ōmiya Ninsai has regrets and pursues Matanosuke, but in the end is unable to discover the direction in which he went. For this volume, because in the older story Wankyū is originally from Ise, that Tsutsui Matanosuke leaves his home village is Ise and wanders to the capital to unexpectedly become a merchant is foreshadowing (*fusen* 伏線). However, there should be readers who think that the curse against Sōtatsu by the jealous woman is far too much. Though this may be, if a grudging spirit touches upon something, it should curse the wronged house for 6 or 7 generations. There are examples of this in Chinese and Japanese books of past and present, and it ought not be debated using this principle. This book is divided into 3 volumes. The first volume performs the matters of Hattori Hosuke and the mother Wasurei. The second volume details the matters of the father Tsutsuishi Sōtatsu. The third volume ends with the tale of fate of the Kabura Baba and the unexpected meeting of Wankyū and Matsuyama. These three volumes are made into three

fascicles. Even so, that the re-printer divided them into 5 volumes is in disagreement with the writer's original intentions. Readers ought to understand that. ○ Tsutsui Matanosuke escapes an assassin at Azaka in Ise and hides away on the Iga Road, exhausting all of his traveling money. He wanders to Naniwa, and encounters his wet nurse Nozaki. Nozaki's husband Funae Kyūbe, after defecting at Azaka, came to Naniwa. After many years, he changed his name to Wan'ya Kyūzaemon and made a livelihood by selling kitchen and house wares. Kyūzaemon died without a child who should be his heir, and Nozaki becomes the proprietress of a store while a supervisor named Naoroku manages it. This Naoroku is Wasurei's second husband Hattori Danbei. Nozaki, for the sake of rewarding past kindnesses, makes Matanosuke the master of the Wan'ya store and has his name changed to Kyūzaemon. Because Naoroku (formerly Danbei) loses his hopes, he says that he will shame Wankyū and make various plans. Nozaki, for the sake of Wankyū, meets with Matsuyama and begs of him. This passage, even now, is an adaptation of the matters involving the mother of Wankyū that are now popularly told by the people of that region [Osaka]. ○ There is the matter of the Kabura Baba, master of an Osaka brothel. This matter of the Kabura Baba is seen in *Biography of Ibaragiya Kōsai*, and the rest is contained in publications written about Osaka's brothels—there are people in this world who know of this, and are the deliberate combination of the writer of this biography. Matsuyama, a courtesan of the Kabura brothel, is Tsunebana, the daughter of Wasurei and bathing attendant who was earlier sold to Mikuni, and was again traded to a brothel in the capital. Now, she has come to Naniwa and is at this brothel. While this may be, Matsuyama has been protecting the chastity of her marriage vow to Matanosuke, and has not allowed her body to a single patron since the beginning. Simply, she has been only doing what is called “the *zashiki*” duty, and such a thing is found in *jōruri-bon*, but there is no case where a prostitute should be forgiven for



refusing her body to a customer out of a sense of protecting her chastity. If that body is to be polluted, there ought not be anything but suicide before she arrives at the brothel. While that is an unreasonable idea (*shukō* 趣向), such a writing style is not inferior and will not cause readers to be doubtful. In the beginning that is fiction (*tsukuri monogatari* 作り物語り). And yet, when using that logic to criticize that mistake is only using the provisional to make truth. However, because the idea is unreasonable, it is difficult to call the writing clever. That is one of my past mistakes. ○ The young people of the village are incited by Naoroku, and calls for them to take Wankyū to buy Matsuyama and shame him. Matsuyama entertains Wankyū well, and the young people are themselves embarrassed and flee. Matsuyama recognizes that Wankyū is Tsutsuishi Matanosuke, and takes him to the bedroom and tells of her struggles over the past year. She shows the poetry slips that were given to her as proofs. Wankyū is moved by the unexpected encounter, and cannot take his thoughts off of her. Up until this point is Wankyū's issues, and half of it is fictionalized from the old story. The writer's preparations are natural and clever. ○ Wankyū becomes infatuated with Matsuyama and that leads to bankruptcy. Employees of the *wan'ya* store give in to their own selfish desires and scatter. Naoroku (formerly Danbei) steals some money and places the blame on Wankyū. Nozaki admonishes Wankyū and furthermore says that she has heard of a customer that is going to pay off Matsuyama's ransom and that he should hurry to her, giving him 100 gold pieces. That evening, Wankyū sets off for the brothel. Naoroku overhears of the issue in question and, saying that he will steal this money, sets off in pursuit of Wankyū. Wankyū encounters thieves at the Nagahori-bashi Bridge. A warrior disguised with a facemask saves Wankyū and returns the stolen wallet by throwing it to Wankyū. After Wankyū runs off, the warrior in question quickly ties up Naoroku and rides off somewhere in a prepared palanquin. While this passage resembles

a *zatsugeki* play, readers at the time found enjoyment of these things in the middle, and the writer of this volume is following the tastes of the time. However, Wankyū (formerly Matanosuke) is the child of a warrior and so is in the first place a warrior, when pressed by the mob of agents at Azaka in Ise, only the young man Tai Hachitarō fought back while Wankyū ran away. He doesn't look like a warrior here where he is attacked at Nagahori by Naoroku and has his money pouch stolen, but looks like Namiko Enjirō of the *zatsugeki* plays. Though they may be, even in the child of a warrior is a true nature of weakness and cowardice. The true nature of Wankyū (formerly Matanosuke) is no exactly like that, afterwards that he cuts his hair and wanders as a crazy religious pilgrim is not good. This should also be known as the writer's preparation. ○

When Wankyū arrived at the Kabura Brothel that night, Matsuyama hears that the customer who has come to pay off her ransom is in the area and has a young girl sneak Wankyū into a small side room. Matsuyama, on her way to entering into that customer's bedroom, briefly stops by the small side room and tells Wankyū of her anxieties. Matsuyama is already pregnant with Wankyū's child and is at the eight-month stage. The customer who has come to buy the ransom sneaks out of the room, and in the next moment an old woman disguised in a face mask sneaks in through the garden gate and talks with that customer. The customer who has come to pay the ransom says that he is preparing a parting gift for Matsuyama and in the garden is a long chest previously sent here. Wankyū tells Matsuyama of his adoptive mother's debt of gratitude and shows her the pouch of money, but it is not real money. Alongside his suspicions, he pulls out his *tantō* sword at his belt and prepares to kill himself, Matsuyama quickly remonstrates him and says that she too wants to die. At that moment, the Kabura Baba arrives. Wankyū does not have time to return his sword to his sheath, so he inserts it into the space between the slats of folding screen that is standing by his side, and so hides the blade. When Wankyū first comes into this

room, the infant girl is told to stand up this folding screen and leave without telling anyone. This is a foreshadowing (*fusen* 伏線) that this folding screen should be used to hide the blade here. ○

The Kabura Baba sees that the customer who plans to pay Matsuyama's ransom is not around, and scolds the secret meeting with Wankyū. She grabs Matsuyama's hair and strikes her repeatedly, giving into her anger and pushing her over. Matsuyama falls over with the folding screen at her side, and her side is brutally rent by the hidden *tantō* sword. At that moment she tells of the village of her birth and of her parents, including about the money pouch that she kept as a keepsake of her mother. Hearing this, the Kabura Baba is alarmed and realizes that Matsuyama is Tsunebana and that her mother is Wasurei, who disappeared into the world in order to raise money for building a hall devoted to Kannon. She cannot bear the unimaginable shame of the gold collected out of greed and with the *tantō* kills herself. At that moment, the woman eavesdropping on all of this in the next room is Nozaki, and while hiding that blade, regrets her mistake. If Nozaki did not know that Matsuyama was promised to Wankyū's earlier—and did not know about the pregnancy—“this encounter is strange, I have plotted with my child Hachitarō, and he has been playing the role of the customer interested in paying her ransom, the difficulty of explaining the mistake of cutting this young woman open is, well, it's suicide.” At that moment, Tai Hachitarō comes out and grieves over the mistake. In the evening, he informs Wankyū of the reasons for this small crime, pulls out Naoroku (formerly Danbei) from that long chest placed in the garden. Hachitarō blames him for that crime and tries to take his head. The Kabura Baba warns him of this, and since Matsuyama also begs for the life of her adoptive father, Wankyū says “I am moved by your chastity and filial piety. Forgive him!” Hachitarō consents, and unties Naoroku. Also, he has already realized that Sōtatsu is innocent. ōmiya Ninsai says “send back Matanosuke” and inquires about his location. Hachitarō informs

Wankyū of this, and while he urges him by saying “return home to Azaka in Ise”, Wankyū does not dare obey. He says “from now on I will be a wandering pilgrim”, and with his own hands shaves off all of his hair. The Kabura Baba (formerly Wasurei) regrets this disastrous money, and takes the money (*koban*, an oval shaped piece of gold) from her waist and throws it down on the seat. That string money wriggled like a snake. Matsuyama, Kabura Baba, and Nozaki all die from grievous wounds. The servants of the house are all dead asleep and no one realizes this. Simply, to jot down that outline, nothing is revealed and nothing persists. The details should enlighten the main text. ○ My self-evaluation says: this passage is the great scene that brings together parents, children, and lovers, and exhausts all of the ideas of tragedy and sorrow. Even so, if I think deeply on it now, there are many places that cannot be called righteous. Why? Wasurei’s true nature is that of chastity and she does not bear a deep grudge against the evil actions of her second husband Danbei. Simply saying that she is going to handle her husband Hosuke’s corpse and arriving at Naniwa, that disposition does not match the beginning, even for the purpose of building the hall, taking avarice as a principle, not having a heart capable of pitying people, and beating Matsuyama are the opposite of that disposition, and like a completely different person. While that stuff was so that the readers would not know that Kabura Baba is Wasurei from the beginning, even so there ought to be some better way of writing it. Also, that the young girl Matsuyama (formerly Tsunebana) being sold to Arima is when she is 8 years old. Even if she forgot her younger face, she quickly realizes that she is not in Kuramoto in Ise, “the shame of parents found in people”, even if she was able to hide her origins and her name and many years pass, that she would not sense that she is in the presence of her long-lost mother is not something like a child especially gifted in filial piety. Her true nature fluctuates over time. Such a thing is not natural. That the writer takes liberties is not worth calling ‘clever writing’. ○

Just like I write above, Wasurei is sincere towards her older brother and husband. That her heart fills with greed as she grows older is simply that she lost her drive to build a hall devoted to the Shirasu Kannon. It is not from accrued bad karma that she ought to receive. And yet, why does she kill a filial young woman and then commit suicide? Also, Matsuyama is filial and moreover chaste. She should marry marry Wankyū and live happily ever after. And yet, that she suffers an unwarranted death and is not rewarded in the least for her good conduct is simply because it is patterned on the various Wankyū stories and not thought through by the writer. This is not appropriate for karmic retribution, and so I have forgotten how I violated rewarding good and punishing bad. This is a mistake of 40 years that I regret here. “Aa! Aren’t stories so easy? My mistake, my mistake.” ○ The unwarranted deaths of Kabura Baba and Matsuyama and the ill-fated life of Wankyū can be said to be the curse of the jealous woman from Arima, and a place where the freedom of the writer comes out. Ghosts are not superior in virtue. And yet, when a curse worsens with the principles of chastity and faith, its like a mockery of justice and a violence on *kanchō* morality. This is something found in many *zatsugeki jōruri-bon* books, but in my older works that take *kanchō* morality as a principle, I have nothing but regret. ○ Nozaki, when she was the nursemaid of Matanosuke at Azaka, had an affair with the servant Funae Kyūhei. Her abandonment of the child she had with him and running off with with Kyūhei is a sin of true gravity. Though this may be, not does Wankyū (formerly Matanosuke) save Ochihaku, saying that he will reward him for past benevolence, he gives him his inheritance and is quite loyal. Afterwards, Wankyū goes to a brothel and there bankrupts himself, but Nozaki consults Hachitarō and forms a plan without raising a single word of censure. This and

○ My self-evaluation says: Naoroku escapes a death sentence, but instead only becomes a diseased beggar. Umunosuke, who was born from the wound of Matsunosuke (formerly Tsunebana), is raised in adversity until the age of 2 years old. While that heavenly punishment seems preferable to losing one's head, when I think on it now, this handling is also not clever. No matter what, Matsunosuke is a chaste woman. Wankyū (formerly Matanosuke) is the son of a warrior. His child Umunosuke follows his uncle's footsteps and inherits his uncle Sōtatsu's house. That he was raised by the cursed and diseased beggar Danbei is a great source of shame. Once Umunosuke had grown up and learned of the matters, he ought to bear a grudge against Danbei. The preparation of writer at the time only model the principle of this story on the concept of fate and retribution, and did not think of the shameful matters of the parents and child in question. Now there is nothing but regret. ○ Readers should know from the beginning that the snake that Sōtatsu killed at Arima is the vengeful spirit of a jealous woman. That snake ate the eggs of birds year after year and so many chicks were lost. The male and female sparrows are the reincarnations of Matsujirō and Fuji—which is in the end is revealed—is very good. That is the end of the snake and the sparrows—isn't it a bit of joyless writing? ○ The restoration of the hall devoted to the Shirasu Kannon ought to have worth if done during the lifetime of Kabura Baba (formerly Wasurei) and Matsuyama (formerly Tsunebana). In place of Fujimatsu, the accomplishment of that longtime dream is like being fond of something, and the ghosts of Kabura Baba and Matsuyama must think of it with shame. In this way, Kabura Baba and Matsuyama have the heart to return a trunk full of pearls, and the impossibility of Matsuyama's death is as I mentioned earlier. Aside from this, the matters about Wankyū and Nozaki can be seen in the earlier evaluations. ○ In the fourth fascicle of the reprint, Tamenaga Shunsui inserted childish captions to the illustrations, something I did not know about. When I had this read to

me, I split my sides with laughter. This art of humor is not simply this, but a comedian that ought to really be despised. ○ In the earlier evaluation, the original woodblock of this book wore away with time. There should be few people aware of this. The surrogate reader does not see the entire book, this is a mistake not told to me. Afterwards, having it read once more to me, in the 17<sup>th</sup> page of the 5<sup>th</sup> volume, is written “Bunka 5 (1808) original publication, Bunsei 14 (1831), reprint, Edo publisher Osakaya Mokichi.” By this the time between the original and reprinting can be known. To think on it, there is no Bunsei 14, the era name was changed to Tenpō on December 16<sup>th</sup> of Bunsei 13. So, the carving of this reprint was finished quickly sometime before December of Bunsei 13, and probably saying they would begin printing in January of the next year, recorded “Bunsei 14”. After the 17<sup>th</sup> page, there is a four or five double-page (*chō*) catalog for Kawachiya Mohei. Since there are not so many pages in for this main text, the number is raised with through advertisements. On that back of that editor’s page is written “Published: January of Tempō 4; Edo: Chōjiya Hirabei, etc. etc; Osaka: Kawachiya Mohei, etc. etc.”. Should that also be written and published on the original printing? Or the revised version? It’s very confusing. There should be people who think that it is like the new publications of that year. It goes without saying that Chōjiya Hirabei and Kawachiya Mohei changed the title of a work I knew to be published by Osakaya Mokichi and reprinted it. Those woodblocks were purchased by Kawachiya Mohei and reprinted year after year, and even until today I have not been informed of this. That ‘there is much profit in the marketplace, though there is little principle’—while this is not something new to me, still I have to give off a painful single sigh.

## Bibliography

Dowdle, Brian. *Transformations in Print: The Re-creation, Reception, and Representation of Edo-period Fiction in Turn-of-the-Century Japan*. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 2012.

Fleming, William. *The World Beyond the Walls: Morishima Chūryō (1756-1810) and the Development of Late Edo Fiction*. Dissertation, Harvard University, 2011.

Hayashi Yoshiko. “Kukuri zuki chirimen kamiko ge.” *Edo shunshū* 21 (1987) 20-47.

Hayashi Yoshiko. “<Honkoku> Kukuri zuki chirimen kamiko jō.” *Edo shunshū* 20 (1984) 26-67.

Hamada Keisuke. “Bakin no iwayuru haishi hōsoku nitsuite” In *Bakin*, edited by Yamazaki Sakoto, 136-145. Tokyo: Yūseidō, 1974.

Hamada Keisuke. “Bakin yomihon shohan shoshi no—to —sashie wo chūshin ni—” In *Bakin*, edited by Yamazaki Sakoto, 263-282. Tokyo: Yūseidō, 1974.

Hamada Keisuke. “‘Kanzen chōaku’ hosi.” In *Bakin*, edited by Itasaka Noriko, 214-252. Tokyo: Wakagusa Shoin, 2000.

Hattori Hitoshi, ed. *Bakin kenkyū shiryō shūsei*. 7 vols. Tokyo: Kuresu Shuppan, 2007.

Hattori Hitoshi. “Yomihon hyōban to haishi shichi hōsoku”. In *Yomihon no sekai edo to kamigata*, edited by Yokoyama Kuniharu, 177-204. Tokyo, 1985.

Hori Tomiō, et al., ed. *Bakin nikki* 4 vols. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1953.

Hong Soo Joon. “Bakin no Kanchōkan: ‘Sekigen ikyō’ wo chūshin ni.” *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 93 (2016): 51-64.

Ishikawa Hidemi. “Bakin haishi sakuhōno—han” *Bungaku* 5-3, (2004): 40-52.

Ishikawa Hidemi. “<Shiden mono> no seiritsu—Bakin yomihon to jidai jōruri—” In *Bakin*, edited by Itasaka Noriko, 85-101. Tokyo: Wakagusa Shoin, 2000.

Itasaka Noriko. *Bakin no sekai: gesaku to sono shūen*. Tokyo: Kazama Shoin, 2010.



Kamiya Katsuhiro and Hayakawa, eds. *Bakin no jisaku hihyō—Sekisui kabutsukanzō “Chosakudō kyūsaku ryakujihyō tekiyō”*—馬琴の自作自評—石水博物館蔵 『著作堂旧作略自評摘要』 — (Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 2010).

Kern, Adam L. *Manga From the Floating World: Comicbook Culture And the Kibyōshi of Edo Japan*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2006.

Kigoshi Shunsuke. “Bakin kōdan mono no seiritsu wo megutte—‘Kukuri zuki chirimen kamiko’ no ichi.” *Nihon bungaku* 50 (2001) 32-42.

Leutner, Robert W. *Shikitei Sanba And the Comic Tradition In Edo Fiction*. Cambridge, Mass.: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1985.

Liu Ying. “Bakin to zhōngkui—‘Aoto moryōan zenshū’ kango wo kō ni” *Kōjō ōrai* 9 (2006): 16-38.

Liu Ying. “‘Tōin biji’ to ‘Chinōho’—Bakin ‘Aoto Fujitsuna moryōan’ tenkyo no zaikentō” *Kōjō ōrai* 8 (2005): 1-18.

Mizuno Minoru. *Bakin*. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten, 1959.

Morrell, Sachiko Kaneko, and Robert E Morrell. *Zen Sanctuary of Purple Robes: Japan's Tōkeiji Convent Since 1285*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006.

Nakao Kazunori. “Bakin to Osaka—‘Geppyō’ seiritsu ni kansuru—kōsatsu.” *Kokubungaku* 94, (2010): 71-88.

Nakao Kazunori. “Bakin yomihon to zōken no koji” 97 (2013): 65-83.

Ōtaka Yōji. “‘Mukashi banashi Inazuma byōshi’ to ‘Shin Kasane togetsu monogatari.’” *Nihon bungaku* (55) 20-30.

Ōtaka Yōji. “Kyōden, Bakin to <kanzen chōaku>” In *Kyōden to Bakin: <Haishi mono> yomihon yōshiki no keisei*, 114-148. Tokyo: Kanrin Shobō, 2010.

Ōtaka Yōji. “‘Mukashi banashi Inazuma byōshi’ to ‘Shin Kasane togetsu monogatari’” In *Kyōden to Bakin: <Haishi mono> yomihon yōshiki no keisei*, 264-281. Tokyo: Kanrin Shobō, 2010.

Ōtaka Yōji. “‘Shitennō tōzoku iroku’ to ‘Utō Yasukata chūgiden’” In *Kyōden to Bakin: <Haishi mono> yomihon yōshiki no keisei*, 241-263. Tokyo: Kanrin Shobō, 2010.

Ōtaka Yōji. “‘Udonge monogatari’ to ‘Geppyō kien’” In *Kyōden to Bakin: <Haishi mono> yomihon yōshiki no keisei*, 114-148. Tokyo: Kanrin Shobō, 2010.

Oya Taeko. "Bakin no engekikan to kanzen chōaku: kōdan mono wo chūshin ni." *Nihon bungaku* 52 (2003): 33-41.

Ōtaka Yōji. "'Sekigen ikyō' ron." *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 55 (1978): 53-66.

Saltzman-Li, Katherine. *Creating Kabuki Plays: Context for Kezairoku, "Valuable Notes On Playwriting"*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Shibata Mitsuko. "'Fujizaemon Sangoku ichiya monogatari' kō—Kabuki kyōgenka wo chūshin ni—" *Kokubun* 55, (1981): 1-10.

Suzuki Saburō. "Bakin yomihon shohan shoshi no—to —sashie wo chūshin ni—" In *Bakin*, edited by Yamazaki Sakoto, 263-282. Tokyo: Yūseidō, 1974.

Takagi Gen. "Edo Yomihon no shinkan yokoku to 'Sakusha'—tekisitofo-mato ron sakusho—" In *Bakin*, edited by Itasaka Noriko, 25-41. Tokyo: Wakagusa Shoin, 2000.

Takahashi Noriko. *Kusazōshi to engeki*. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 2004.

Tanaka Norio. "Tokushū Edo bungaku no supirittsu Inga ōhō—chōhen kosetsuni naizai suru rinen." *Edo bungaku* 34 (2006): 123-133.

Tanaka Norio. "Tokushū <Yomihon yōshiki> kō jōruri no yomihonka ni miru edofū Kamigatafū." *Edo bungaku* 40 (2009): 92-105.

Tokuda Takeshi and Suzuki Saburō, ed. *Bakin chūhen yomihon shūsei*, 18 vols. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 1996.

Tokuda Takeshi. "'Geppyō kien' no ibi." In *Yomihon kenkyū*, Vol. 10 (上), Hiroshima: Hiroshima Bunkyo Joshi Daigaku Kenkyū Shuppan Iinkai, 1996, 211-226.

Tokumarū Satoko. "Kyokutei Bakn no Haishi hōsaku—chōfuku kara shoo e—" In *Bakin*, edited by Itasaka Noriko, 180-202. Tokyo: Wakagusa Shoin, 2000.

Walley, Thomas Glynne. *I would rather be a faithful dog than an unrighteous man": Virtue and vice in kyokutei bakin's "Nansō satomi hakkenden"*. Dissertation, Harvard University, 2009.

*Yomihon Jiten: Edo No Denki Shōsetsu = Yomihon Jiten*. Tōkyō: Kasama Shoin, 2008.

Yokoyama Harukuni, ed. *Tamenaga Shusnsui-hen Zōho Gedai kagami*, Tokyo: Izumi Shoin, 1985.

Yokoyama Kuniharu. *Yomihon no kenkyū—Edo to Kamigata*. Tokyo: Kazama Shobō, 1974.

Young, William Evan. *Family Matters: Managing Illness in Late Tokugawa Japan, 1750-1868*. Dissertation, Princeton University, 2015.

Yuasa Yoshiko. “Shin Kasane togetsu monogatari’ kō.” *Koijō ōrai* 6 (2003): 65-76.

Zolbrod, Leon. *Takizawa Bakin*. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1967.