

Variations on *yatsushi* in the *ukiyo-zōshi* genre: Expansion of the Classical World and Transworld Identification¹

TAKAHASHI Akihiko

Translated by Jeffrey KNOTT

Introduction

The word *yatsushi* is a nominalization of the *ren'yōkei* 連用形 of the transitive verb *yatsusu* (a separate nominalization *yatsure* exists for the intransitive counterpart in *yatsuru*). As the dictionaries indicate, the word's original meaning is “being reduced to a ragged state.” And in early modern-period novels (*ukiyo-zōshi* 浮世草子) and theatrical works (*jōruri* 浄瑠璃, *kabuki* 歌舞伎), where we find many portrayals of the stylishly paper-suited hero, penniless from his overspending, perhaps on some courtesan (*tayū* 太夫), the performance of such a role was indeed termed *yatsushi-gei* やつし芸 (“the art of the *yatsushi* figure”). Beyond this, *yatsushi* has been seen as connected to the exiled prince narrative passed down through the course of Japanese cultural history (Takahashi Noriko 高橋則子),² or even as the expression of a world-wide, and perhaps universal, human longing for metamorphosis (Shinohara Susumu 篠原進).³ Protagonists might lose their wealth through excess frequentation of the pleasure quarters, come down in the world, present a wretched appearance, and wallow in the most abject behavior, yet precisely this pathetic end was the state that literature desired. The stylish hero was always destined to turn out that way.

Credit for the first notable *yatsushi* work among *ukiyo-zōshi* must go to Nishizawa

¹ This paper is based on my Japanese article, “Ukiyo-zōshi ni okeru ‘yatsushi’ no hensō: koten sekai no kakujū to sekai kōsa dōtei” 浮世草子における《やつし》の変奏：古典世界の拡充と世界交差同定, *Kanazawa bijutsu kōgei daigaku kiyō* 金沢美術工芸大学紀要 62 (2018), pp. 178–165.

² See Takahashi Noriko 高橋則子, “Mitate to *yatsushi* ‘shiron’” 「見立」と「やつし」〈試論〉, in *Zusetsu mitate to yatsushi: Nihon bunka no hyōgen gibō* 図説「見立」と「やつし」：日本文化の表現技法, ed. Kokubungaku Kenkyū Shiryōkan 国文学研究資料館 (Tokyo: Yagi Shoten, 2008).

³ See Shinohara Susumu 篠原進, “*Yatsushi-kō*: Miyako no Nishiki no satetsu” 〈やつし〉 玖：都の錦の蹉跎, *Ryōkō shirin* 緑岡詞林 1 (1974).

Ippū 西沢一風 (1655–1731), whose *Gozen Gikeiki* 御前義経記 (8 books (*kan* 卷) in 8 vols. (*satsu* 冊), pub. Genroku 元禄 13 (1700)) presents a Minamoto no Yoshitsune 源義経 (here named 元九郎今義 Genkurō Imayoshi) who frequents the pleasure quarters. Yet how is such a setting connected to the *yatsushi* topos? In my view, the *yatsushi* of a contemporary stylish spendthrift down on his luck, wretchedly attired and abject in his behavior, is far from the same thing as the *yatsushi* of a figure out of the classical world who, when placed into a contemporary social setting, proceeds to engage there in similar lowly behavior. It seems to me, in other words, that under the single term *yatsushi*, two things originally quite distinct have tended to become unified and confused, based on some sense that to make something contemporary is essentially equivalent to making it more vulgar. The reality, however, is that *yatsushi* encompasses a range of variations on a theme: from contemporary protagonists' ruination up to the classicization of such contemporary protagonists (or indeed the vulgarization of classical protagonists), extending even to the *yatsushi* of the story's setting itself.

Yet it remains the case that *yatsushi* has, in fact, largely been seen as a single particular expressive technique. Much in the way that the phenomenon of *mojiri* もじり (vocabulary-level parody) in *kana-zōshi* 仮名草子 and afterwards has been seen as a single expressive technique, so too has all of *yatsushi* been considered as one, though indeed as a comparably more advanced kind of expressive technique. For an illustrative example, in the recent collection of pioneering research *Zusetsu mitate to yatsushi: Nihon bunka no hyōgen gibō* 図説「見立」と「やつし」：日本文化の表現技法, published by the National Institute of Japanese Literature (Kokubungaku Kenkyū Shiryōkan 国文学研究資料館), the subtitle takes *yatsushi*, along with *mitate*, to be “expressive techniques of Japanese culture.” Regarding the *ukiyo-zōshi* genre, moreover, while the same collection does make some brief mention of Ihara Saikaku's 井原西鶴 (1642–1693) *Kōshoku ichidai otoko* 好色一代男 (8 books in 8 vols., published in Tenna 天和 2 (1682)), neither Ejima Kiseki 江島其磧 (1666–1735) nor Tada Nanrei 多田南嶺 (1698–1750) are addressed as subjects of research, to say nothing of Ippū himself. In the field of *ukiyo-zōshi* studies, of course, the problem of *yatsushi* is not one that can be avoided, but here, too, the way *yatsushi* is defined thus in advance as an “expressive technique” must invite serious doubt. Technique and methods are things that, to some extent, have set rules and procedures. It may well be the case that by the later Edo period, *yatsushi* had indeed, along with *mitate*, already become something popularized, generalized. But this was surely not true of the earlier Edo period. If one views *yatsushi* in such a delimited fashion, it becomes merely one among a number of easy, dependable methods for mass producing the commercial product that is the commercial novel, a thing no longer able to offer any possibility of uncovering therein some hidden intent, of finding therein something of the dynamism proper to literature. Earlier Edo was the period rather when *yatsushi* was itself discovered and created.

And after all, though from the very beginning of *ukiyo-zōshi* studies *yatsushi* has

always been a topic of research interest, in my view at least, it has certainly never been considered the sort of method whose nature is self-evident.

Taking them as three works representative of *yatsushi* in the *ukiyo-zōshi* genre, this article will examine and compare Nishizawa Ippū's *Gozen Gikeiki*, Ejima Kiseki's *Tsūzoku shomake toko gundan* 通俗諸分床軍談 (5 books in 5 vols., published in Shōtoku 正徳 3 (1713)), and Tada Nanrei's *Keisei Taibeiki* 契情太平記 (5 books in 5 vols., published in Kyōhō 寛保 4 (1744)). Through these three works, it will be shown how in the early Edo period the *yatsushi* idea in particular took shape and gradually developed variations, though the same development might also be seen as representing the evolution of the novel itself.

1. Hasegawa Tsuyoshi's Understanding of *yatsushi* and *ukiyo-zōshi*

As with any other aspect of *ukiyo-zōshi* studies, so too in the case of *yatsushi*, it is impossible to leave out of the discussion the work of Hasegawa Tsuyoshi 長谷川強. In his article “Ukiyo-zōshi to yatsushi” 浮世草子とやつし, Hasegawa begins by stating, on the topic of Saikaku's modelling *Kōshoku ichidai otoko* after the *Tale of Genji*, that: “For bringing the air of the classics, their narrative world into the realm of *haikai* 俳諧, there existed the method, or sensibility, known as *yatsushi*.” (I want to underline the care Hasegawa takes here to qualify *yatsushi* as *hōbō naishi ishiki* 方法乃至意識. It is clear that he sees *yatsushi* as being not merely a method (*hōbō*), but also a sensibility (*ishiki*), a way of perceiving). He continues:

Yet on Saikaku's part, the glory of the sheer technical accomplishment was not his chief reason for producing a *yatsushi* version of the *Genji*, and in fact he limits himself to expectant hints that invite the reader's own astuteness. Indeed, if Saikaku harbored any contemporary interest, above and beyond *yatsushi* it was directed rather towards the skewering of his contemporaries. Ever since *kana-zōshi* there had existed word-play-level *mojiri* of the classics, but likely it took the foundation of a content-level contemporization and vulgarization of the classics—a transformation from *mojiri* into the mode of *yatsushi*—for *kana-zōshi* as a genre to effect its own transformation into *ukiyo-zōshi*. Certainly, even earlier there had been adaptations of the classics by Asai Ryōi 浅井了意 [d. 1691], but works like his *Otogi bōko* 伽婢子 remain in part unable yet to shake off a consciousness of the traditionally literary, of the *waka*-like. It was an era, after all, when traditional literature continued to be the only model available to writers for their literary endeavors—or at least, the only model they had for producing works the era might recognize as possessing any merit. The purpose for Saikaku, so it seems to me, of producing a *yatsushi* of the *Tale of Genji*, lay in helping his work to achieve its own form as literature—in using the *Genji* as the finest of tools through which he might create a new kind of literature.⁴

In the excerpted article, Hasegawa first takes time to demonstrate how Saikaku used not only the *Tale of Genji* and the *Tales of Ise* but also collections of China-

⁴ Hasegawa Tsuyoshi 長谷川強, “Ukiyo-zōshi to yatsushi” 浮世草子とやつし, as contained in the same author's *Ukiyo-zōshi shinkō* 浮世草子新考 (Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 1991; originally 1971), p. 89.

themed tales (in the given example the *Shin Goen* 新語園) for his works of adaptation, in order to create various unique and uncanny stories. He then argues, as seen above, that the goal of such adaptations (of *yatsushi*, essentially) was not the ostentatious display of any technical prowess, but was motivated rather by Saikaku's desire to describe his own "floating world" (*ukiyo* 浮世)—to write *ukiyo-zōshi*. The original sources, moreover, that lay behind these adaptations were not indicated openly, but depended on the reader's own astuteness to be noticed. In contrast to this, his appraisal of the sort of *yatsushi* that "reflected the shadow [i.e. of the original classic]" (*omokage wo utsusu* 面影をうつす)—the mode that takes off with Nishizawa Ippū's *Gozen Gikeiki*—is a severe one, as can be seen below:

As a whole the *ukiyo-zōshi* genre, regrettably deceived by Saikaku's example, imitated above all his use of the remarkable and the uncanny—in Saikaku's own works but one aspect among others—thereby losing the energy needed to clear paths for novel developments within the world of actual reality; and when at length it faced the danger of its own dissolution, the genre, being aware that Saikaku too had in some sense made *yatsushi* versions of the classics, turned once again to a borrowing of the classics, as a method to ensure some degree of integrity for individual texts as unified works of literature. In contrast to Saikaku, however, instead of a *yatsushi* of the original shadow that would await the reader's own astuteness, their attitude became one rather of deliberately pushing *yatsushi* out to the surface. Their goal being above all to depict the sentiments and customs of the contemporary, such *yatsushi* was merely a sort of frame used to give their works the proper shape. In other words, leaving behind its original supplementary role, *yatsushi* came to be in fact a work's governing feature. On the one hand, this was done in order to gain a greater number of readers for the genre, by lowering its level to meet the decline that accompanied expansion of the reading population, by aligning itself with the style of the theatre world mentioned above; yet for *ukiyo-zōshi* this came at the price of abandoning any stance of facing the reality of the world head-on. In the straitjacket of *yatsushi*, the psychology and actions of characters became unnatural, or even unrealistic. Nonetheless, to the extent that they followed *yatsushi*, however merely conceptual in nature it became, it remained despite all this still in connection with the "floating world." And more than that, through its connection with the world of the theatre, it remained capable still of capturing the interest of readers in their modern-day focus. Falsified as it might be, the "floating world" was yet retained. By pushing *yatsushi* out to the surface, the genre had gained a framework for producing works which, while reliably connected to that "floating world," were conveniently also ensured the bare minimum of integrity they would need as works of literature.⁵

In contrast to Saikaku, for whom *yatsushi* had been a way to depict contemporary sentiments and customs—in other words, the "floating world"—for Ippū, *yatsushi* itself had become the guiding principle. This led to the psychology and actions of the depicted characters becoming wholly forced, while leaving the world of their setting something threadbare, unnatural, and unrealistic. For all

⁵ Ibid., p. 95.

that, this falsified version of the “floating world” was nonetheless received by readers with welcome—such is Hasegawa’s argument about the essence of the *ukiyo-zōshi* genre. As can be seen, in its development the argument of Hasegawa is quite complex, also abstract, and indeed attractive. Yet the view the argument presents is one that mostly failed to win the support of other researchers after Hasegawa. Moreover, in the reception of Hasegawa’s *ukiyo-zōshi* research as a whole, its textualist, empiricist character has been emphasized almost exclusively, despite the fact that Hasegawa himself, even in the midst of determining various textual sources, sought always—as above—to discover the *ukiyo-zōshi*’s essence, and only with this goal in mind delved into problems of determining sources and materials. Or in other words, today’s research, too, has seen the supplementary usurp the governing place, and finds itself given wholly to empiricist, indeed even to literalist investigation of antecedent literary sources.

But let us set aside the topic of research itself. When Hasegawa speaks here of the supplementary taking the governing role, or of the price paid in “abandoning any stance of facing the reality of the world head-on,” so that “[i]n the strait-jacket of *yatsushi*, the psychology and actions of characters became unnatural, or even unrealistic”—even beyond *yatsushi*, does this not have the ring of a familiar argument? This is, of course, the example of *katagi*. What *katagi* came to designate is an amalgamated concept. It combined the Japanese word *katagi* 型木—literally “a shaped block of wood,” but figuratively the stereotyped stock personality expected of various classes and professions—with the Sinitic word 氣質 (read *kishitsu*, but commonly used to write *katagi*), referring to, in Zhu Xi’s 朱熹 philosophy, the unique individual’s typical character—as contrasted with the reasoning faculty essential and common to all humanity. Featuring centrally in a body of *ukiyo-zōshi* works also thereby known as *katagi-mono* 氣質物, the concept became an important literary motif. In the history of the *ukiyo-zōshi* genre, while *katagi* derived from discovery of characters’ inner aspects and personality, as well as from description of their outer aspects and appearance, its expression lacked realism, and through exaggeration, became a method for creating figures of comedy extreme in their eccentricity. As a result, *ukiyo-zōshi* has been criticized for becoming a form incapable of depicting reality as it is.

And those who have sought a reappraisal of *katagi-mono* pieces—including myself—have tended to focus not on the issue of realistic depiction of reality, but rather on the category’s formalist character (e.g., my own work arguing that *katagi-mono* should be seen as stories about idiocy,⁶ or Saeki Takahiro’s 佐伯孝弘 work arguing for their comedic nature⁷).

⁶ See Takahashi Akihiko 高橋明彦, “Gunin-tan wo meguru shōsetsu no keifu: katagi-mono no yōshiki to hōhō” 愚人譚をめぐる小説の系譜：氣質物の様式と方法, *Nihon bungaku* 日本文学 8 (1989), pp. 10–21.

⁷ See Saeki Takahiro 佐伯孝弘, “Kiseki katagi-mono to hanashi-bon” 其蹟氣質物と噺本, in *Ejima Kiseki to katagi-mono* 江島其蹟と氣質物 (Tokyo: Wakakusa Shobō, 2004; originally 1996).

Here, however, *katagi* is not our concern. Let us return to discussion of *yatsushi*. After the above excerpt, Hasegawa continues with discussion of Kiseki's *Tsūzoku showake toko gundan*, about which work he has the following to say:

Compared to the works of Ippū, the first thing to note is how [in Kiseki] the *yatsushi* is more refined and thorough-going. While in its reliance on the sourced original, a *yatsushi* can on the one hand be accomplished with a certain degree of ease, on the other, if only to cover its own forced unnaturalness, it also requires some refinement of technique. Indeed, because as mentioned above, the contemporary as encountered in *yatsushi* made do with a conventionalized “floating world,” its execution ended up relying more on technique than on anything else.⁸

Elsewhere, Hasegawa also says of it: “In the tradition of *yatsushi*-style works that starts with Ippū, this work can be called the most technically proficient.”⁹ In particular, comparing it to earlier works whose *yatsushi* characters had been men of the softer, more sensual type closely resembling their sources—such as Uki Yonosuke 浮世之介 for Hikaru Genji 光源氏, or Genkurō Imayoshi for Minamoto no Yoshitsune—he notes that Kiseki's work stands out for the remarkable gap with its sources, for example in its *yatsushi* transformation of the slaughter between the armies of Han 漢 and Chu 楚 on the battlefields of Ancient China into, of all things, a dispute between characters on the topic of how best to proposition prostitutes. As he notes: “The sheer scale of the gap, when the *yatsushi* succeeds, contributes to the scale of its effectiveness. And on this point the work is one that delivers success.”¹⁰ Thus, if indeed with the qualification that he speaks here to the work's technical execution, Hasegawa bestows upon *Tsūzoku showake toko gundan* the highest degree of praise. On the same work his study *Ukiyo-zōshi no kenkyū* 浮世草子の研究 is also very instructive, covering not only the contents of its *yatsushi* in concrete detail, but also going into questions of plagiarism from works by Saikaku, providing overall a great wealth of information.¹¹

By contrast, in the case of Tada Nanrei's *Keisei Taiheiki*, Hasegawa surprisingly gives the work, without much ado, a thoroughly low appraisal. In the same study he limits himself to the remarks: “The work is a *yatsushi* recasting of the *Taiheiki* 太平記 into a battle for supremacy over the Shinmachi 新町 pleasure quarters between Fujiya Izaemon 藤屋伊左衛門 and Yorozuya Sukeroku 万屋助六, each of whom controls the half. A poor specimen with no evidence of Nanrei's personal touch. The year was a low one for him.”¹² As argued below, in my view Nanrei's *Keisei Taiheiki* is the only *yatsushi* work in Nanrei's œuvre, and forms together with

⁸ Ibid., p. 97.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ See Hasegawa Tsuyoshi 長谷川強, *Ukiyo-zōshi no kenkyū: Hachimonjya-bon no chūshin to suru* 浮世草子の研究：八文字屋本を中心とする (Tokyo: Ōfūsha, 1969), from p. 334.

¹² Ibid., p. 508.

Tsūzoku showake toko gundan a pair of twin towering masterpieces of the *yatsushi* genre. Before that, however, a short detour.

2. Expansion of the Classical World

If *yatsushi* is defined as nothing but a mere method, there is no hope for further advances to be made in the reading of *ukiyo-zōshi*. And if, indeed, the genre of *ukiyo-zōshi* is nothing but a species of commercial novel to be merely mass-produced and consumed, then *yatsushi* should, in fact, be seen as nothing more than mere method, serviceable and easy-to-use. I myself, however, think that the *ukiyo-zōshi* was something more than that. In the reading that I want to propose, it was the sense of a world—the “floating world” or *ukiyo*—and represented in a certain way the author’s deliberate act of participation in this world (the *ukiyo*). This is my own view of the *ukiyo-zōshi*’s essence as a genre. It is moreover a view that prompts a question: why, in such a case, is it that in *ukiyo-zōshi*—literally “stories of the (contemporary) floating world”—the chosen subject is so often *jidai-mono* 時代物, or stories set in the past? Any answer that sees in this the influence of the *jidai-mono* of *jōruri* or *kabuki* is to be rejected. It has the causal relationship backwards, being equivalent to a restatement of the question that yet remains: why would *ukiyo-zōshi* be influenced by the *jidai-mono* of *jōruri* or *kabuki*? After all, given that originally the goal of *ukiyo-zōshi* was to depict the “floating world” (the pleasure quarters and the like) of the present, a repertoire limited to love-stories and tales of townspeople should have been more appropriate. Maybe it was the case that, compared to early *yomibon* 読本, *ukiyo-zōshi* works of the *jidai-mono* group were—to cite the formulation of Tsuga Teishō 都賀庭鐘 (b. 1718) in his preface to *Hanabusa-zōshi* 英草紙—merely “tales of *kabuki* theatre” (*kabuki no sōshi* 歌舞伎の草紙) and of very little value, depicting only the *ukiyo* (that is, contemporary society) and having in fact nothing to say about the past or about history.¹³ And perhaps that is indeed the case. Yet I persist in thinking that among *ukiyo-zōshi* works the *jidai-mono*, too, represent a form of participation, in the past and in history, and in point of fact such an understanding is not unexampled in previous research on *ukiyo-zōshi*.

About Nishizawa Ippū’s work *Gozen Gikeiki*, for example, already from Yamaguchi Takeshi 山口剛 one finds statements like the following:

The special characteristic of the *Gozen Gikeiki*, is that it incorporated in an unsystematic fashion all the various old and new trends swirling about contemporary works in the genre of love-stories. It is not a work in which a strict sense of integrated unity is necessarily a chief concern. One might even say that it put to paper, as-is, the most short-term changes on the stage of Genroku-era *kyōgen* theatre.

¹³ *Hanabusa-zōshi* 英草紙, in *Nihon koten bungaku zenshū* 日本古典文学全集 48, ed. Nakamura Yukihiko 中村幸彦 (Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1973), p. 74.

In the case of *Ichidai otoko*, that work reflects the shadow of the *Tale of Genji*, while also adding in the shadows of the *Tales of Ise* and the Noh theatre. Nonetheless it adopts an attitude of, in a sense, keeping these shadows on the edge of perception, that the reader who knows the original text may recognize them, while the reader who does not may yet remain at the level of the surface text. And if there be occasional direct reference to those original texts, with a nonchalant air, these are tossed off and let drop without much ado. With the *Gozen Gikeiki*, however, not only does it start by directly advertising the *Gikeiki* 義経記 as its source-text, it takes pains to specify of each and every such passage that it “reflects the shadow of so-and-such.” For example, regarding Imayoshi’s childhood guardian preceptor, in the table of contents itself he is noted as being “the reflected shadow of the monk Tōkōbō 東光坊.” Nor is this limited to the *Gikeiki*: drawing additionally on Yoshitsune-themed Noh pieces, one also finds remarks such as “the reflected shadow of *Benkei at the Bridge* (*Hasbi Benkei* 橋弁慶)” or “the reflected shadow of *Benkei in the Boat* (*Funa Benkei* 舟弁慶).” Such an approach, of course, leaves no possibility for the sort of subtlety of relationship with the original text that we see in a work like *Ichidai otoko*. On the contrary, there is a constant forcing of the story [to fit the original].

Even the adventures of Imayoshi and Isenojō 伊勢之丞 on their amorous sojourns are not necessarily of such a nature as to allow the reader some insight into the characteristics of various provinces’ pleasure quarters. At the most it amounts to a degree of variety added to scenes of sensual intercourse.¹⁴

There is a sense in which this analysis by Yamaguchi already anticipates the argument of Hasegawa as seen above. In addition, in Fujii Otoo’s 藤井乙男 work *Ukiyo-zōshi meisakushū* 浮世草子名作集 (1937), too, we already find this being argued in detail, but first let us reference his accessible synopsis, which runs as follows:

The protagonist Genkurō Imayoshi, resembling that of *Ukiyo Ichidai otoko* 浮世一代男, is born the heir of Tachibanaya Mitsuuji Gonnosuke Yoshikata 橋屋三津氏権之助義方, his mother being one Tokiwa 常盤, in the past a courtesan at the Ichimonjiya 一文字屋 brothel within the Shimabara 島原 pleasure quarters. However, in the autumn of his third year, a dispute arises between his father Yoshikata and one Namura Hachirōji 名村八郎次 over a gold mine in Tamba 丹波 Province, which his father loses, killing himself in grief. His mother Tokiwa, meanwhile, shunning the unwanted affections of the same Namura Hachirōji, flees with Imayoshi’s sister to hide near a place called Sumizome 墨染 in the village of Fushimi 伏見, entrusting Imayoshi himself to a wet-nurse. In the summer of Imayoshi’s fifth year, this wet-nurse in turn contracts a fever and dies. Now an orphan, Imayoshi, relying on the pity of people in the country, takes up residence at Aomezaka 青目坂 in the foothills of Mt. Kurama 鞍馬, making a living there by cutting firewood and selling people flowers. Then at length he arrives at the spring of his fourteenth year. This is the point at which the action of the story begins.

It goes without saying that Genkurō Imayoshi—Kurōjirō 九郎次郎 after coming of age—is a *mojiri* of the name Gen Kurō Yoshitsune 源九郎義経, with

¹⁴ Yamaguchi Takeshi 山口剛, *Kinsei shōsetsu* 近世小説 (Tokyo: Sōgensha, 1931), vol. 1, p. 142.

the naming “Imayoshi” signifying a reflection that transfers *Yoshitsune*’s shadow into the present day (*ima* 今). The question of why Yoshitsune and the various legends surrounding him were put into *yatsusubi* in precisely this fashion is one I will consider later separately. Yet in the manner of the rewriting, making Sama no Kami Minamoto no Yoshitomo 左馬頭源義朝 into Tachibanaya Mitsuiji Gonnosuke Yoshikata, making Tokiwa Gozen 常磐御前 into the courtesan Tokiwa of the Shimabara, making Hei Shōkoku Nyūdō Kiyomori 平相国入道清盛 into Namura Hachirōji Nyūdō Hōzen 入道法善, and making the root of the tragedy, the Heiji Disturbance (*Heiji no ran* 平治の乱), into instead a public dispute over a gold mine in Tanba—in all of these, the tale’s readers no doubt immediately perceived the clear popularizing trend characteristic of the arts in the early modern period.¹⁵

Moreover, regarding *yatsusubi*, which is to say the vulgarization of the classical, Fujii has the following to say:

In the same way that the characters of Chikamatsu’s 近松 *jidai-mono* all belong in language and custom to the Genroku period, in the field of novels, too, a vulgarization of the classics was being carried out. The chief motivation for this was no doubt a popularization and simplification for the sake of the masses, but it also strikes one as the expression of an age full of life, much like the Genroku era itself, when no one could be bothered to pay heed to the finer points of historical accuracy. With works like Nishizawa Ippū’s *Gozen Gikeiki* and *Kankatsu Soga monogatari* 寛潤曾我物語 regrettably setting the standard, there then came *Fūryū jindai no maki* 風流神代巻 and *Fūryū Genji monogatari* 風流源氏物語 by Miyako no Nishiki 都の錦, and in the wake of these two, many others followed.¹⁶

In other words, pointing out first the lack in *yatsusubi* works of anything like attention to historical accuracy, Fujii sees such an approach to writing as the expression of a lively contemporary spirit that had little time for technicalities. This was the pursuit of a basically haphazard sensibility, one focused only on the changes of the short term, and one which, indeed, he views as a “bad precedent.” Yet his is not the sort of argument to limit itself to appraisal at such a low level. Regarding the essence of the *ukiyo-zōshi* genre, Fujii offers characterizations such as the liberation of human nature, the destruction of tradition, the privileging of the present, and in moreover assigning the significance of *yatsusubi*’s own role to its expansion of the classical world—classicism, romanticism—he is unsparing in his praise for the potential of *Gozen Gikeiki* in this direction, as can be seen in the following:

Nonetheless, one is not to understand the success of this work as something stemming purely from Ippū’s own short-term-focused haphazard sensibility alone. If that is all that it were, the work would never have been able to secure such a massive response, nor been able to found on its own something like a lineage within the *ukiyo-zōshi* genre that might be termed *fūryū-zōshi* 風流草子. At the very least it must be granted that, to say nothing of contemporary novel-circles,

¹⁵ Fujii Otoo 藤井乙男, *Ukiyo-zōshi meisakushū* 浮世草子名作集 (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1937), p. 23.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

there existed more broadly also in society at large a certain something that lent it support, and greeted it with welcome. This certain something, in turn, was none other than the classicism and romanticism that, in this age, had permeated deeply into society at all levels. Most likely what constituted the keynote for our country's period of early modern artistic revival was the empirical, quantitative spirit of the townspeople. Yet the primary manifestation of this showed itself in the free liberation of human nature, in the destruction of tradition, and in the privileging of the present. Vivid reflection of this can be seen, for example, in the Danrin 談林 School of *haikai* 俳諧, in the novels of Saikaku, and in the *ukiyo-e* paintings of Moronobu 師宣—here for the first time was there an establishment of realism in the arts. The secondary manifestation of this showed itself, in turn, in classicism and romanticism. That said, what these signified was by no means a mere rebirth and resurrection of the classics. Rather it was a way of conduct that—all while rooting itself in what was, after all, ultimately a quantitative and intensely empirical spirit of practicality—sought the expansion of its own world into the world of the classics. The way in which Bashō's 芭蕉 *haikai* poetry made an ideal of *sabi*, *shiori*, and *hosomi*, appearing on the surface almost to constitute a step backwards from the Danrin *haikai* to something more medieval, derives precisely from this foundation.

... As for *yatsushi* of the classical, such examples can be found already with *kana-zōshi* works of the *gi-monogatari* 擬物語 type, and in works by Saikaku such as *Ichidai otoko*. In the case of the *gi-monogatari kana-zōshi*, however, a work tried to maintain the interest of the reader though *mojiri* of the classical text, and beyond that, in fact concealed an intent to teach, to be practically useful. Also, too, with Saikaku's *Ichidai otoko*, the core of the work's interest was not necessarily laid on its *yatsushi* of the *Tale of Genji*. Finally with this *Gozen Gikeiki*, for the first time, a work had succeeded at an expansion of townspeople's own world within the *yatsushi* of the classical. Even if, moreover, Ippū's borrowing and use of this as a method from *jōruri* and *kabuki* had arisen purely from coincidence alone, one must admit that he proved able to grasp nimbly the trends of classicism and romanticism that at least in one corner of novel-circles were already at work.¹⁷

Fujii, remarking that his work “had succeeded at an expansion of townspeople's own world within the *yatsushi* of the classical,” and again that he “proved able to grasp nimbly the trends of classicism and romanticism,” awards here to the *yatsushi* of Ippū his highest praise. Notwithstanding, it would be difficult to claim that Fujii managed to say much concretely about the work's actual content. Does his failure to speak concretely therefore imply, however, that his praise itself is merely superficial? And more fundamentally, are the Genroku-era (1688–1704) “classicism and romanticism” he mentions here nothing but examples of his outmoded modernist anthropology? No. To me, in fact, Fujii Otoo's argumentation here seems worthy rather of being commended as an insight simply brimming with potential. As for the portion of his argument making mention of Bashō, I lack myself the capacity to judge it on the merits. Yet when set alongside Inui Hiroyuki 乾裕幸, as quoted below—from his *Kotoba no uchi naru Bashō: aruiwa*

¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 20–30.

Bashō no gengo to haikaisei ことばの内なる芭蕉：あるいは芭蕉の言語と俳諧性— on the issue of Bashō’s own way of approaching the classical world, compared to Fujii’s theories those of Inui seem, if only in the consciously concrete detail the latter scholar employs, much closer to some kind of method. And method, as I mentioned already above, is a state where rules and procedures are to some extent already defined. Such a situation, to be concrete about the given case, would imply that, first of all, the nature of the classical world being aimed at was in fact something already grasped, and with the proper manner of handling it being thus well-understood, all that remained was to simply carry this out. In contrast to this, however inadvertently, Bashō as Fujii envisions him comes across as one trying to enter into the classical world without knowing beforehand the way back out. Against this, Bashō in Inui’s view is as one who, faced with the classical world, knows himself what to do precisely.

But first let us look at Inui’s theory in his own words. Here he considers one of Bashō’s famous *bokkeu* 発句, contained in his *Sarashina kikō* 更科紀行 (1 vol., written in Genroku 1 (1688)):

身にしみて大根からし秋の風

mi ni shimite daikon karashi aki no kaze

It stings a body deep, the radish’s own sharp bite, the winds in autumn.¹⁸

What follows is a passage where, choosing Bashō’s everyday *kotoba* (words, language) as used in this verse for his example, Inui discusses the nature of the effect they work against the classical context of traditional *waka*, their quality of “fluid permanence” (*fueki ryūkō* 不易流行):

When in *waka* literature the expressions *aki no kaze* 秋の風 (“autumn winds”) and *mi ni shimu* 身にしむ (“stings a body deep”) first made their appearances in poetic contexts such as “love” or “travel,” probably enough it did produce a certain fresh surprise. This, however, over the course of a history of extreme overuse, as evidenced eloquently by the presence of the countless variations thereof in the Eight or the Twenty-One Imperial Anthologies, was at length utterly effaced, reduced ultimately to a state of “degree zero.” Such is the accumulation—the history—of language that existed before Bashō. No doubt the paradoxical success had by *haikai* poetry of the Danrin School, in using their scrambling and swapping between different strata of language to recapture that original surprise, provided Bashō with powerful hints for his own linguistic revolution.

The plebian dimension of the expression *daikon karashi* 大根からし (“the radish’s own sharp bite”) neatly helps revive the surprise of *aki no kaze* and *mi ni shimu*. The very method of effecting revival, moreover, needed to be itself another surprise. And the surprise was none other than this: the ability of *haikai* to establish axioms even out of absurdities.

It was, in a word, a duet of surprise, a duet to which we can put the name

¹⁸ *Sarashina kikō* 更科紀行, in *Nihon koten bungaku taikei* 日本古典文学大系 46, eds. Sugiura Seiichi 杉浦正一 and Miyamoto Saburō 宮本三郎 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1959), p. 68.

“fluid permanence” (*fueki ryūkō*). Standing in the fluid linguistic field of everyday language, catching the words that spoil and erode as soon as they get discarded, the endeavor to root these words into a more permanent linguistic space on the one hand, and on the other hand the endeavor to hurl the half-dead language of classical literature into the vibrant language-field of reality—and through that passage to thereby quicken it—these are the dual endeavors of making poetry *haikai*, and it seems not incorrect to see the unification of this fluidification and this permanentization as the fundamental origin of the “fluid permanence” ideal.¹⁹

By methodization is meant, a situation in which the object of action is something already completely grasped and understood. And indeed, it is not impossible that Bashō was, in fact, already in possession of such an understanding. Wanting to bring innovation to the tired linguistic world of the classics, he may have engaged with the classical world from a posture of extreme self-awareness.

But of course Ippū’s case is different. Ippū, diving headlong into a classical world he only presumed to understand, only ended up finding himself lost in, and struggling with, that classical world. Yet even this struggle can be seen as itself a kind of literary act. Forced as each step might be judged in retrospect, to knead the sinews of a work one by one into a connected whole, is clearly a literary act.

It is true that Ippū’s method, in a trend criticized ever since Yamaguchi Takeshi, was one that indicated clearly its “reflection of the shadow” of the classical world being treated. And as a method it may well be both blunt and artless. But it was still a method of Ippū’s own making. Like with the egg of Columbus, criticism after-the-fact that anyone else could have done it the same way—if they had only tried—is mistaken. And after all, commercially-published commercial literature that it was, repetition of doing the same thing, in the same way, was for a genre like *ukiyo-zōshi* only the time-honored stance. In which case, the question is rather how Kiseki and Nanrei in their own turn chose to handle such a mode of *yatsushi*—but for the present, our detour continues.

3. On Transworld Identification

The term “transworld identification” refers to the disputed possibility, given the multiple potential versions of a certain thing that might well exist across various worlds, of discovering, between those fundamentally different versions, some form of identity. In this formulation the word “world” refers to any world that could possibly exist. This “possible world,” moreover, is meant in the sense of a world differing from the world that exists in actuality, as in for example a world—the concept is one already familiar from science fiction—where Nazi Germany was the victor in World War II, or a world in which Oda Nobunaga 織田信長 (1534–1582) had not been killed in the incident at Honnō-ji 本能寺 temple. The core of the dispute around “transworld identification,” in other

¹⁹ Inui Hiroyuki 乾裕幸, *Kotoba no uchi naru Bashō: aruina Bashō no gengo to haikaisei* ことばの内なる芭蕉：あるいは芭蕉の言語と俳諧性 (Tokyo: Miraisha, 1981), pp. 28–29.

words, lies in this: given one Nobunaga who was killed in the Honnō-ji incident and another Nobunaga who never experienced the Honnō-ji incident and instead lived a long life, whether these two Nobunagas are the same person or different people. For the sake of argument, let us consider that if, as a result of Nobunaga's death at Honnō-ji, Hashiba Hideyoshi 羽柴秀吉 (1537–1598) was the one to become supreme hegemon, then in the case of Nobunaga not dying, it would have been Nobunaga himself who went on to become hegemon—let us assume that there exists a world where such is in fact the case. Comparing the world where the hegemon is Hideyoshi with the world where the hegemon is Nobunaga, though both worlds each have their own hegemon, usually, in such a case, Hegemon Hideyoshi of World A and Hegemon Nobunaga of World B would still be considered different people.

Yet undoubtedly there also existed the possibility of Hideyoshi living out his entire life as a peasant in the Province of Owari 尾張. In which case the question arises: given World A in which Hideyoshi becomes hegemon, and World C in which he lives out his life as a peasant, are the two Hideyoshis in fact both the same person Hideyoshi? It stands to reason, of course, that in the case of the peasant Hideyoshi of World C, he would probably neither possess the surname Hashiba, nor indeed even have the name Hideyoshi. Yet would that make him a different person? It is a question about which one cannot avoid being made to feel ill-at-ease when pressed to judge definitively.

Let us consider, then, another slightly clearer (or at least more clearer-seeming) example. Let us say that there exists a university student, Adam, studying at Alpha University. Adam is enrolled at Alpha University, but conceivably, he might also have enrolled at Beta University. And had he in fact chosen to enroll at Beta University, undoubtedly his university life there would be different from his current life in a number of respects. Yet however undoubtedly different, surely it seems right to say that Adam of Alpha University and Adam of Beta University would both still be Adam, one and the same person. We might even set things further in the past: Adam moved to Tokyo while still a student in elementary school, but he might also have not moved, and remained thus instead back in Alpha Prefecture. The Adam who remained back in Alpha Prefecture, and the Adam who ended up moving to Tokyo, would of course be living very different lives, yet would one not still in general consider that the two were nonetheless both Adam, nonetheless both one and the same? Let us set things back yet further still. Adam's father is a certain Bob and his mother, one Carol. Yet what if, in a different world, Adam's parents were instead the neighbors, Doug and Elizabeth? What if we said that Adam's parents were actually the neighboring couple, or rather, that Adam was the child of the family next door? At this point, would there not be some who objected, declaring this an impossibility? Adam was born as such, they might say, because he inherited the DNA of his parents Bob and Carol, and could not possibly have been born from Doug and Elizabeth. Of if he had been born from Doug and Elizabeth, surely he would have been born as David, a

completely different child! This is the same, in other words, as saying that, though they might become the same one hegemon, Hideyoshi the hegemon and Nobunaga the hegemon would still be the same different people.

Regarding this question of “transworld identity,” the one who both raised the problem and thoroughly investigated it was the philosopher S. A. Kripke.²⁰

There exists a certain theory that what makes “transworld identification” possible is, generally, the fact of proper names. This is the idea that, in other words, what proves the Hideyoshi who spent his whole life as a peasant to be the same as the Hideyoshi who became Chancellor of State, what proves the Adam born to this family to be the same as the Adam born to the family next door, is their respective proper names. Criticizing this theory, Kripke also criticized the way of thinking about proper names that underlies it, arguing that “proper names cannot be reduced to a set of definitive predicates.” By “definitive predicates” is meant a set of predicates whose common subject is by definition unique. For example, “was born in the Province of Owari,” “was a vassal of Nobunaga,” “killed Akechi Mitsuhide 明智光秀 (1528–1582) at the Battle of Yamazaki 山崎,” “became Chancellor of State,” etc., constitute just such a set of definite predicates, one whose common subject can accordingly be reasonably determined to be Hideyoshi, and no other person.

These theories of classical linguistic philosophy and logic that Kripke was criticizing were, to be specific, those of Russell and Frege. Whereas Russell and Frege had understood proper names as equivalent to sets of definite predicates, Kripke, by introducing the idea of the possible world, rejected this earlier theory. In other words, the Hideyoshi of another possible world spent his whole life as a peasant, and neither became Nobunaga’s vassal nor ever became Chancellor of State. The proper name Hideyoshi, therefore, cannot be reduced to any particular set of definite predicates—this in its essence is Kripke’s claim.

If we simply accept Kripke’s argument in this form, however, then all predicates are always of indeterminate truth, or to put it more strongly, it seems to become impossible to determine anything at all. Yet such a skepticism of predication—the idea that no predicate can ever definitively *mean* anything—was not what Kripke intended. Rather, he opened the way to a more soundly-reasoned modal logic, that is, to a discipline of logic (the theory of determining truth) built on a more soundly-reasoned grasp of the modal conceptions (coincidence, necessity, possibility, impossibility). This is why he himself declared that arguments about whether in transworld comparison a given person is the same or is different are in and of themselves pure nonsense, that the very question was, indeed, a pseudo-problem.

No doubt it was smart of him to take such an attitude. Nonetheless, I think one might also judge it an attitude too smart by half.

²⁰ The argument is made in S. A. Kripke, *Naming and Necessity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972).

When one considers the problem of literature in which particular (historical) individuals appear as characters, and—all the more so—when one considers the problem of freedom, philosophically and ethically, it seems to me that the issue is one that cannot be simply dismissed as a mere pseudo-problem.

Among others, the issue was tackled by Kuki Shūzō 九鬼周造 (1888–1941), in his *Gūzensei no mondai* 偶然性の問題, where he examines problems of freedom and coincidence.²¹ The attitude taken there by Kuki is very much worth pondering. In one of the examples he takes up in the course of that volume, we find the statement “Suppose I were an Indian . . .” When I first came across this phrasing, I experienced an extremely strong feeling of incongruity, or perhaps a clear sense of a logical error. Supposing I were in fact an Indian (i.e. someone born in India, or at least to Indian parents), then obviously, I thought, one could definitively say that I would no longer be who I am! The reasoning is the same as concluding that, were I the son of the neighbors, then what I was would no longer be me.

But this is not what Kuki was trying to say. The given phrase is simply Kuki’s way of saying, in an abbreviated manner, that there exists the possibility of even myself being born, and living out my life as, an Indian. From a transworld perspective, the Japanese me and the Indian me can be one and the same. Or conversely, there exists the possibility of me myself being an Indian (by this is meant in no way the sense of me at some point nationalizing to become a citizen of the country India). The idea that there exists the possibility of an Indian me entirely different both in substance and appearance from the present me, is essentially to say that there exists the possibility of a me different from the present me in substance, in appearance, in name, in social position. If this be denied, then conversely it would imply that for me there is no longer any other possibility but the present one.

Between accepting on the one hand that there exists the possibility of me being born an Indian, or anything else at all, a cow even, and on the other hand that I might have gone to either Alpha University or to Beta University, or indeed that I possess freedom—between these two there is in fact no essential difference. What Kuki is trying to say is essentially this. If, like Kripke, we take the problem of transworld identity between such possibilities to be a meaningless one, then the concept itself of the possible world can no longer serve as a logical tool for recognizing the freedom of a different state of affairs to have potentially existed. In Kripke’s case—that of modal logic—it was no doubt sufficient to take up in argument the problems of truth with respect to the modal concepts (coincidence, necessity, possibility, impossibility), whereas the problem of freedom was simply not a matter of concern. From the outset, the world he aimed for was simply a different one.

The problem is that our issue of concern here—*yatsushi*—presupposes both the concept of the possible world and that of “transworld identification.” What

²¹ For further detail on the following, see Kuki Shūzō 九鬼周造, *Gūzensei no mondai* 偶然性の問題 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1935), p. 260; later collected in *Kuki Shūzō zenshū* 九鬼周造全集, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2011), p. 205.

this means is that there exists the possibility of a world in which Minamoto no Yoshitsune buys the favors of a courtesan—or more precisely put, both the world in which Minamoto no Yoshitsune buys the favors of a courtesan, as well as the world in which he never does so, can be said to simultaneously, potentially exist.

There exist worlds in which Minamoto no Yoshitsune, or indeed the Great Ancestor of the Han Dynasty Liu Bang 劉邦 (256–195 BC), led very different lives from those described as historical fact. And even in those so very different worlds, they nonetheless both lived out their lives being always the same Minamoto no Yoshitsune or Great Ancestor Liu Bang. Another way of putting it is that there exists a possible world in which even the human who in the here and now lives as me, might himself be living his life out as Minamoto no Yoshitsune. Likewise with the present world and the classical world: one might well describe the nature of the relationship obtaining between them as, from their respective standpoints, that of precisely such mutually alternative possible worlds.

If we interpret such “worlds” to be nothing but mere methods for mass-producing commercial novels for consumption, then what is the study of literature itself but a toy puzzle, a marketing analysis with pre-set conclusions, something with little of dreams and even less need for thought? Indeed, under such an interpretation, *ukiyo-zōshi* itself would—in my view—no longer be a research topic of very much value.

Needless to say, that is not my view.

4. On the *Keisei Taiheiki*

But here let us end our detour and return to the main argument.

An explanation of the *Keisei Taiheiki*, by Kikuchi Yōsuke 菊池庸介, can be found in the *Ukiyo-zōshi daijiten* 浮世草子大事典. There Kikuchi notes that the work portrays, in *yatsushi* form, a number of famous episodes—the “chronicle of the future” (*miraiki* 未来記), the “gathering without distinctions” (*bureikō* 無礼講), the “crying man” (*naki-otoko* 泣き男), the “parting at Sakurai” (*Sakurai no wakare* 桜井の別れ), etc.—from the *Taiheiki* (15th-century medieval war chronicle (*gunki monogatari* 軍記物語) depicting the wars of the Nanbokuchō 南北朝 period (1336–1392), 40 vols.; enjoyed a broad reception in the early-modern period, not only itself as reading material in printed form, but also as source of material for works in a variety of genres: theatre, storytelling, novels, etc.).²² Yet

²² Note on the texts:

(1) For the text of the *Taiheiki*, I have used: *Taiheiki* 太平記, 3 vols., *Nihon koten bungaku taikei* 34–36, eds. Gotō Tanji 後藤丹治 and Kamada Kisaburō 釜田喜三郎 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1960–1962).

(2) For the text of the *Keisei Taiheiki*, I have used: *Musume Kusunoki Keisei Taiheiki* 娘楠契情太平記, in *Hachimonjya-bon zenshū* 八文字屋本全集 17, ed. Hachimonjya-bon kenkyūkai 八文字屋本研究会 (Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 1998).

In some cases, for ease of reading, *furigana* have been omitted or *kanji* written out in *kana*, among other minor changes.

following, perhaps, Hasegawa Tsuyoshi's own assessment, Kikuchi also writes that “[f]or a work by Nanrei, it cannot be called skillfully done,” stating that “the [final] fifth book alone is only eight and a half page-sheets long, lacking a sense of balance when compared to the other four books, and the development of the plot towards its conclusion can be said to be rushed.”²³

As a work, then, let us consider the *Keisei Taibeiki* once again. The setting it depicts is that of the pleasure quarters. That is to say, the story takes as its setting the contemporary red-light district, a choice in which it follows the oldest traditions of the *yatsushi* mode. Moreover, while the classical world is present in the background throughout, the manner of that classical world's incorporation—into what is essentially a contemporary story—remains ever diffuse, dispersed. Though the *Taibeiki*'s hero, Kusunoki Masashige 楠木正成 (d. 1336), has a clear *yatsushi* version in Kusuriya Kihei 薬屋喜兵衛—in abbreviation Kusu-Ki 薬喜—the rest of the source-work's characters are not given such one-to-one *yatsushi* counterparts. Likewise, while a certain *mojiri* of transposition can be observed, in recastings, for example, of men as women (e.g., the “crying man” figure now a “crying woman” *naki-onna* 泣き女, Kusunoki's son Kusunoki Masatsura 楠木正行 (1326–1348) now a granddaughter O-yuki お行), such methods never strive for a wholesale transfer into modern settings of as much of the classical work as possible. In other words, the depicted present-day, the core-forming story, is in the case of this work more than a mere mirage fully subject to its classical source, but rather stands on its own as a thing independent. The classical itself functions here instead like something raining down into the contemporary—almost as if by chance—from outside and above.

Let us now examine this work, reviewing here below its story chapter-by-chapter, in order, from the beginning, with supplemental explanations given at need.

Book 1, Chapter 1

In Osaka two big-spending playboys (*daijin* 大尽), Fujiya Izaemon 藤屋伊左衛門 (abbreviated to Fuji-I 藤伊) and Yorozuya Bunroku 万屋文六, are in a contest to outdo one another, setting at odds the whole Northern and Southern halves of the pleasure quarters in their competition. On the North Side (Hokuchō 北町)—a play on the Northern Imperial Dynasty (*bokuchō* 北朝) of the Nanbokuchō wars—Fuji-I holds sway, where he pays to monopolize the services (*agezume* 揚げ詰め) of the courtesan Yūgiri 夕霧 from the Ōgiya 扇屋 brothel, keeping her at the assignation house (*ageya* 拳屋) of Yoshidaya Kizaemon 吉田屋喜左衛門, located in Kuken-machi 九軒町. For his part, Bunroku on the South Side (Nanchō 南町)—again with the pun on the historical Southern Dynasty (*nanchō* 南朝)—pursues a similar arrangement with the courtesan Agemaki 揚巻 of the Goishiya 碁石屋 brothel, maintaining her at an assignation house run by

²³ See Kikuchi Yōsuke 菊池庸介, entry for “*Keisei Taibeiki*” 契情太平記, in *Ukiyo-zōshi daijiten* 浮世草子大事典 (Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 2018), p. 270.

one Ibarakiya Jirōsan 茨城屋次郎三, located in Echigochō 越後町. Yet while Fuji-I is the well-heeled child of old wealth, Yorozuya Bunroku, dependent on a living father whose head clerk Heikurō 平九郎 is always trimming his wings, suffers from a lack of funds. One day, a famous warrior of old, Soga Jūrō Sukenari 曾我十郎祐成 (1172–1193), appears to Bunroku in a dream. There he bestows upon Bunroku the character 助 (*suke*), which the latter promptly adopts as his own under the new name Sukeroku 助六. He also follows Soga's instructions to seek out the *taiko-mochi* 太鼓持 (a sort of hanger-on) Kusuriya Kihei (“Kusu-ki,” in allusion to the *Taiheiki*'s Kusunoki Masashige) at the quarters' West Gate, where indeed he finds him. This Kusu-Ki argues eloquently that Sukeroku's luck is about to turn again, but though this gives Sukeroku the courage to visit the Shinmachi 新町 pleasure quarters, the sheer size of his unpaid bills there also gives him pause, and at length he decides instead to first send in for reconnaissance—dressed up as himself—one of his *taiko-mochi*, a pillbox (*inrō* 印籠) craftsman by the name of Taisuke 大助. The keeper of the Ibarakiya assignation house, however, laments the apparent lack of trust shown by Sukeroku in not coming himself. Here one of the *taiko-mochi* on the scene, an Oyama-doll (*Oyama-ningyō* おやま人形) craftsman named Tarohachi 太郎八, mocks Sukeroku, calling him a has-been on the verge of being formally disowned by his family.

In Volume 3 of the *Taiheiki*, emperor Godaigo 後醍醐 (1288–1339; r. 1318–1339) gains the services of Kusunoki Masashige though a dream telling him to seek the latter west of Mount Kongō (Kongō-zan 金剛山) in Kawachi 河内 Province. The answer given there by Masashige on the occasion to Godaigo's representative, the nobleman Madenokōji Fujifusa 万里小路藤房 (b. 1295), is alluded to in this chapter. The original:

With their recent rebellion the Eastern Barbarians have only invited the anger of Heaven, and bringing Heaven's chastisement down upon them in the wasting of their decline should prove no great trouble. Nonetheless, the work of renewing the world stands upon two things: strategy and cunning.²⁴

The *Keisei Taiheiki*'s rewriting of this is a thoroughgoing work of *mojiri*:

With the recent prosperity of Fuji-I [in *onyomi* reading—Tōi 藤伊—a perfect homonym for the Tōi 東夷 of “Eastern Barbarians”], he has only invited his own dissolution: to outspend him in the wasting of his extravagance should prove no great trouble. Nonetheless, the task of succeeding as a playboy stands upon two things: money and how it is spent.²⁵

A similar transformation is applied to the conclusion of Masashige's speech. What in the original reads:

²⁴ とうい 東夷近日ノ大逆、只天ノ譴ヲ招候上ハ、衰乱ノ弊ヘニ乗テ天誅ヲ被イ致ニ、何ノ子細カ候ベキ。但天下草創ノ功ハ、武略ト智謀トノニテ候。 See: *Taiheiki* (op. cit.), vol. 1, p. 98.

²⁵ とうい 藤伊近日ノ全盛。只分散をまねき候うへは。かれが^{おごり}奢^{つるへ}の費^{かい}にのりて。買勝給ふに何の子細^{さばき}か候べき。但大尺立派の捌は。金銀と。遣ひ所の二にて候。 See: *Keisei Taiheiki* (op. cit.), p. 240.

For know this: the very fact that word of this Masashige still being alive has found its way to his Majesty's ears betokens, in itself, that the imperial fortunes are on the verge of an upswing.²⁶

becomes in the *Keisei Taiheiki* the following:

For know this: having this Kusu-Ki as henchman in your service means, by itself alone, that your fortunes as a playboy are on the verge of an upswing.²⁷

Also in this chapter is an allusion to the episode in Volume 2 of the *Taiheiki* where the shogunal forces, believing they have chased down Emperor Godaigo, discover themselves to have been duped by an imperial doppelgänger. In the original, a sudden gust of wind reveals to them that behind the curtains of state sits only the nobleman Kazan'in Morokata 花山院師賢 (1301–1332), dressed in the exclusive clothing of the emperor:

At that moment there came a violent gale off the mountains that blew back the curtains of state. Yet when they made to take in the august countenance, it was not the sovereign himself, but rather Justice and State Counsellor Morokata sitting there, attired in the emperor's personal robes (*kon'e* 袞衣).²⁸

The *mojiri* of this passage in the *Keisei Taiheiki* runs:

At that moment there came a violent wind from the direction of Horie that blew back the curtains of the carriage. Yet when they looked to the face of the playboy they expected, it was not Sukeroku himself, but the pillbox craftsman Taisuke sitting there, wearing the playboy's *haori* 羽織 and *wakizashi* 脇指.²⁹

Book 1, Chapter 2

Hoping for a resurrection of Sukeroku's fortunes, Kusu-Ki goes to the Ibarakiya, where he explains that while indeed Sukeroku could expect to get disowned by his father any day now and has not a penny of his own, nothing, in fact, could be better for Sukeroku than this. It turns out that when his mother had died, she left for her then 11-year-old son an inheritance of 5,000 *ryō* as insurance against the chance of someday being disinherited, entrusting the sum to Sanpō-ji 山宝寺 temple. If being disowned gave him access to these funds, the event would be more than welcome. This inheritance, Kusu-Ki says, was his mother's own "Chronicle of the Future," her preparation against the disinheritance that she

²⁶ 正成一人未ダ生テ有ト被聞召候ハ、聖運遂ニ可被開ト被思食候へ。 *Taiheiki* (op. cit.), vol. 1, p. 98.

²⁷ 葉喜壺人御牽頭をだに持こたへば。遊運つみにひらかるべしとおほしめし候へ。 *Keisei Taiheiki* (op. cit.), p. 240.

²⁸ 折節深山ヨロシ烈シテ、御廉ヲ吹上タルヨリ、龍顔ヲ拝シ奉タレバ、主上ニテハワシマサズ、尹大納言師賢ノ、天子ノ袞衣ヲ着シ給ヘルニテゾ有ケル。 *Taiheiki* (op. cit.), vol. 1, p. 91.

²⁹ 折ふし堀江より呼風はげしくして。駕のすだれを吹あげたる御顔を。大尽かともれば助六さまにてはまします。印籠師の大助。大尽の羽織脇指をさしたるにてぞ有ける。 *Keisei Taiheiki* (op. cit.), p. 240.

had foreseen awaited him. Inquires made, the monks at Sanpō-ji confirm that the original deposit has now grown with interest to 7,127 *ryō*, and that the principal 5,000 *ryō* could be provided at any time (in reality, however, this is all only an act put on by the temple at Kusu-Ki's connivance). Rumors spread quickly, and soon moneylenders are approaching Sukeroku hoping to lend even more money, with the result that soon he has a full 3,300 *ryō* on hand for available funds. Once again surrounded by the *taiko-mochi*, Sukeroku makes plans to disgrace and drive out the Oyama-doll craftsman Tarohachi who had mocked him earlier, but the courtesan Agemaki defends the man, telling Sukeroku that he should take Tarohachi's contempt in the spirit of a lesson, as a warning against pride now that he has found himself again at the height of prosperity.

Book 1, Chapter 3

Fuji-I, now sour over Sukeroku's comeback, conceives a scheme to make Kusu-Ki promise in writing never to set foot in the Shinmachi quarters again: taking advantage of Kusu-Ki's rural upbringing, he plans a painfully formal banquet where he can force *sake* on the *taiko-mochi* and get him drunk into a stupor, so that he can then be bullied into submission. Dubbing this scheme the *inginkō* 慇懃講 (“gathering of strict ceremony”), Fuji-I sends his henchmen Gotō Suian 後藤酔庵 and Sendai Okuemon 仙台奥右衛門 to Kusu-Ki. Meanwhile at Fuji-I's Yoshidaya there arises a quarrel involving the courtesans Kaoru かおる and Wakanoura わか浦, along with others. On Kusu-Ki's end, however, calling it a local custom, he himself forces *sake* on Suian and Okuemon, succeeding in getting these into a drunken stupor instead.

Book 2, Chapter 1

Back at the Yoshidaya, Fuji-I and Yūgiri are in low spirits after learning of the failure of the plan to bring Kusu-Ki down. At this point, there comes running in a woman about thirty years of age, crying, announcing herself as Kusu-Ki's wife and informing them that Kusu-Ki is now racked with severe stomach pain after getting so drunk. Moreover, she tells them that she had found her way there by following Kusu-Ki's drinking partners, whom she saw entering the establishment. Realizing now that the author of the plan to get her husband drunk had been none other than Fuji-I himself, the wife threatens to make a complaint to the magistrate, but Fuji-I pays her 300 *ryō* to settle the matter. Receiving Fuji-I's own *haori* to boot in her revenge, the wife at last leaves for home. All of this, of course, has been Kusu-Ki's own scheme against Fuji-I.

In these few chapters alone, the deceased mother's “Chronicle of the Future” is a *mojiri* of the “Tennō-ji Temple Chronicle of the Future” episode in Volume 6 of the *Taiheiki*,³⁰ while Fuji-I's “gathering of strict ceremony” (*inginkō*) scheme is a *mojiri* play upon the famous “gathering without distinctions” (*bureikō*) where

³⁰ 天王寺未来記. *Taiheiki* (op. cit.), vol. 1, pp. 193–195.

plans were made to overthrow the Kamakura shogunate, as seen in Volume 1 of the *Taiheiki*, in the episode “The Gathering Without Distinctions and Gen’e’s Literary Talk.”³¹ The “crying woman” in Kusu-Ki’s scheme, however, is a *mojiri* not of anything in the *Taiheiki* itself, but rather of an episode found in the commentary *Taiheiki hyōban hiden rijinshō* 太平記評判秘伝理尽抄, whose story of the “crying man” (*naki-otoko*) came to be widely known.³²

Book 2, Chapter 2

Deeply frustrated, Yūgiri seeks advice from the keeper of the Yoshidaya, Kizaemon. They decide to have it bruited about that Agemaki’s friend, the courtesan Takahashi 高橋, had only joined her at the Goishiya brothel after quarreling with her patron, none other than Ōgiya Hachiemon, the proprietor of Yūgiri’s own brothel. Back with Sukeroku, Agemaki feigns illness, and with the idea of finding out the truth from Takahashi herself, writes Sukeroku to have the latter summoned in Agemaki’s place. Sukeroku accordingly does so, calling Takahashi to entertain at the establishment. Kusu-Ki also comes. Sukeroku confides in Takahashi that he has had a temporary bridge (*karibashi* 仮橋) built, and engaged the prayer services of a *yamabushi* 山伏 mystic, with the hope of making Fuji-I unable to frequent the Shinmachi quarters any more—but that he is having it done in utmost secrecy, since anyone not ritually pure crossing the bridge first before the spell can take effect will keep it from working. Immediately Takahashi writes a letter to the acupuncturist Suda Un’an 須田雲安, telling him she has heard something useful. Suda, then—“to help Fuji-I”—takes O-sen おせん, a maidservant from the Yoshidaya, and together they go to this temporary bridge in the Shinmachi Bridge’s vicinity. As they make their way across, however, precisely according to Kusu-Ki’s plan, the deliberately shoddily-built bridge buckles underneath them, and the two are saved downriver by party-boats belonging to Sukeroku’s entourage. Takahashi herself, realizing how she has been manipulated for the scheme, quits the Goishiya brothel in shame. After all this, a satirical poem slip (*rakushū* 落首) shows up on the Shinmachi Bridge, causing Fuji-I’s reputation to deteriorate yet further.

Volume 3 of the *Taiheiki* features the characters Takahashi no Matashirō 高橋又四郎 and Suda no Jirozaemon 隅田次郎左衛門.³³ At the battle of Watanabe Bridge 渡部橋 in Volume 6, the victory there achieved by Kusunoki Masashige puts an end to their service, as expressed in this satirical poem, which appears in the battle’s aftermath:

³¹ 無礼講事付玄恵文談事. Ibid., vol. 1, pp. 44–47.

³² Original text in 40 vols., bearing a postscript (*shikigo* 識語) dated to Bunmei 文明 2 (1470). Published in Shōhō 正保 2 (1645) and frequently reissued. Text available in *Taiheiki hiden rijinshō* 太平記秘伝理尽抄, 10 vols. (planned), eds. Imai Shōnosuke 今井正之助 et al., *Tōyō Bunko* 東洋文庫 (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 5 vols. published since 2002). The episode of the “crying man Sugimoto Sahei” 歎き男杉本左兵衛 is found in vol. 15 (in the *Tōyō bunko* edition, vol. 4, pp. 245–249).

³³ *Taiheiki* (op. cit.), vol. 1, p. 99.

*Watanabe no mizu ika bakari bayakereba Takahashi ochite Suda nagaru ran*³⁴
 How swift it must be, the water at Watanabe—to have led to both
 Takahashi's own downfall, and Suda's getting washed out!

For this, the *Keisei Taiheiki* gives the *mojiri*:

*Yokobori no mizu ika bakari bayakereba Takahashi ochite Suda nagaru ran*³⁵
 How swift it must be, the water of Yokobori—to have led to both
 Takahashi's own downfall, and Suda's getting washed out!

Book 2, Chapter 3

Saburobei 三郎兵衛 of the Bingoya 備後屋 joins Fuji-I's side as a financial factotum. Not only a money-handler in his own right, Saburobei is also one of the city elders (*machi-doshiyori* 町年寄) of the Shinmachi quarters' South Side—Sukeroku's area. Easily perceiving, therefore, that Sukeroku's sudden maternal inheritance is an utter fraud, he makes plans to tell everything to the father, Bun'emom 文右衛門, to get him to disown Sukeroku, thereby cutting off all monetary support. Bingoya makes a speech here about the art of buying courtesans, arguing that the principal thing is to make unsparing use of all one's financial wherewithal, which for the cause of buying courtesans should be exhausted.

In the course of his speech we find the thought: “It is said that even Heaven does not abandon profits to disuse: put this money to work and see Sukeroku's dismay.”³⁶ This makes use of the episode involving Kojima Saburō Takanori 児嶋三郎高德 of Bingo 備後 Province, found in Volume 4 of the *Taiheiki*.³⁷ Stylistically, Saburobei's speech on the art of buying courtesans, a sort of maniac twist on the *katagi-mono* discourse, is skillfully executed and interesting. Citing the dictum of the *Analects* that states “he who performs virtue will not have wealth”³⁸ (actually from the “Duke Wen of Teng I” 滕文公上 chapter in the *Mencius*), Saburobei argues for pouring one's wealth into the pursuit of revelry, even if it means the liquidation of treasured ancient household heirlooms. Further citing the *Analects* (a quotation from the “Yong ye” 雍也 chapter) to the effect that “The wise man prefers water,”³⁹ he urges Fuji-I not let worries trouble him—even items pawned going forfeit—and doggedly pursues the theme, exhorting him to prioritize courtesan-buying, to be a man of style above all.

³⁴ 渡部ノ水イカバカリ早ケレバ高橋落テ隅田流ルラン。 *Taiheiki* (op. cit.), vol. 1, p. 188.

³⁵ 横堀の水いかばかりはやければ高橋をちて須田ながるらん。 *Keisei Taiheiki* (op. cit.), p. 258.

³⁶ 天口銭をむなしうせず共申す。此金をもつて助六がよはめをみて。 *Keisei Taiheiki* (op. cit.), pp. 259–260.

³⁷ Discussed below in the article's conclusion. *Taiheiki* (op. cit.), vol. 1, p. 140.

³⁸ 為仁不富矣。 See *Moshi* 孟子, ed. Uchino Kumaichirō 内野熊一郎, *Shinshaku kanbun taikai* 新釈漢文大系 4 (Tokyo: Meiji shoin, 1962), p. 168. *Keisei Taiheiki* (op. cit.), p. 260.

³⁹ 智者楽水。 See *Rongo* 論語, ed. Yoshida Kenkō 吉田賢抗, *Shinshaku kanbun taikai* 新釈漢文大系 1 (Tokyo: Meiji shoin, 1960), p. 142. *Keisei Taiheiki* (op. cit.), p. 260.

Book 3, Chapter 1

Following the advice of Bingoya Saburobei, Fuji-I decides to sell off 18 of the houses he owns and use the profits to support his continued lifestyle at the assignation house. Meanwhile Sukeroku finds that the sum of 3,300 *ryō* he had previously had on hand has now dwindled to but 40–50 *ryō*. The same Bingoya contacts Sukeroku's father Bun'emon, asking him to make good the borrowed 3,300 *ryō*. For his part, surprised as he is at the size of the debt, Bun'emon is unable to merely leave his son a criminal, and so orders his head clerk, Heikurō, to take care of the matter. This Heikurō is on the surface a “white rat”—that is, a faithful and trustworthy servant—but in truth is a villain who dreams of lining his own pockets after the headship falls to Sukeroku. When Bun'emon tells him to pay back the 3,300 *ryō* and make Sukeroku give up his revelry, Heikurō suggests that because his master has nothing to do with these sums, it would be better to simply give the money to Sukeroku himself and have him stop on his own. Thus it is that he heads over to meet Sukeroku with a bundle of promissory notes in hand. At the Ibarakiya, however, the message given to Sukeroku is that he, Heikurō, has the master wrapped around his fingers and got this money from him with ease. Take it, he says, and use it as you please. Handing Sukeroku the money, he heads home. Sukeroku is overjoyed, barely able to believe this behavior from the normally stingy Heikurō, from whom he had been expecting, if anything, a declaration of disinheritance. When Kusu-Ki arrives, however, knowing already about Bingoya's movements, he infers from the amount that the money had been prepared by Sukeroku's father for the purpose of paying back the loans taken out against the promise of his mother's inheritance. As such, he advises Sukeroku to use the money—for the present—to pay back those debts, putting his revelry on hold while they try to determine Heikurō's true intent. As it turns out, however, already around 200 *ryō* worth has been passed out here and there in the quarters, and even after efforts are made to re-collect this, the total falls 67 *ryō* short. This is the amount one of the *taiko-mochi*, a man known as Saizō 才藏 the Mosquito, has collected and hidden away. But Saizō was a playboy once himself, though now fallen on hard times, and he points out that things like collecting money already given out can only hurt one's reputation as a playboy. More than that, he argues, Sukeroku's good fortune, no less than his bad fortune, comes not from any stratagems or any efforts he might have made, but from the will of Heaven's destiny alone. Everyone present is touched.

In this chapter, when Kusu-Ki sizes up Sukeroku's current predicament, he states: “All in all, when it comes to the competition of play, victory at the end is the only important thing.”⁴⁰ This is a *mojiri* of Kusunoki Masashige's words to the emperor about the flight to Hyōgo 兵庫, in Volume 16 of the *Taiheiki*: “In battles, whatever anyone may say, victory at the end is what really counts.”⁴¹

⁴⁰ 惣じて遊びのほり合と申ス物は。始終の勝こそ専要なれ。 *Keisei Taiheiki* (op. cit.), p. 267.

⁴¹ 合戦ハ兎テモ角テモ、始終ノ勝コソ肝要ニテ候へ。 *Taiheiki* (op. cit.), vol. 2, p. 150.

Saizō the Mosquito, in turn, is the *yatsushi* of Prime Minister Bōmon Kiyotada 坊門清忠 (d. 1338), when he disagrees here with Kusu-Ki in these terms:

What Kusu-Ki says has its merit, but for these funds, apportioned to support revelry, to be not even put to use, and for you to shut yourself up a second time in a single year—not only does it treat your playboy's dignity too lightly, it robs your *taiko-mochi* and companions of their own esteem. Even if Fuji-I does sell 18 of his houses now, their strength would not approach that of your current 3,300 *ryō*. That everybody took you at your word about your mother's inheritance is not because your skill at getting money was itself superior—it is merely because your fortunes as a playboy aligned with the heavens.⁴²

This is based on Prime Minister Bōmon Kiyotada's similar speech in the *Taiheiki*:

What Masashige says has its merit, but for the imperial general commissioned to chastise the foes of the throne to thus abandon the Capital without a fight, and to head for Mt. Hiei a second time in a single year—not only does it treat the imperial dignity too lightly, it robs the imperial army of its purpose. Even if Takauji does approach the Capital now, leading his forces from Kyushu, their strength will not approach that of the time when, last year, he led the Eight Provinces of the East to the Capital. And after all, from the beginning of the war up to the defeat of the enemy's army, even when our forces have been small, it has not always been the case that we failed to defeat a great enemy. Nor is this at all because our military strategy was itself superior—it is merely because the fortunes of our sovereign aligned with the heavens.⁴³

Book 3, Chapter 2

Kusu-Ki encloses the remainder of the money in an envelope and entrusts it to the proprietor of the Ibarakiya, and leaving it up to Sukeroku to decide what to do next, he returns to his lodgings. But then he changes his mind. Deciding that it would be wrong for Sukeroku not to pay his debt just because of a shortage of 67 *ryō*, he takes his granddaughter O-yuki to the broker Tanbaya Nihei 丹波屋仁兵衛. Glad to hear that the owner of the Koichimonjiya 古一文字屋 brothel in Kyoto is apparently in town just then, with the idea of sending her to work there, like the proverbial lion casting its cub into the depths of the valley

⁴² 菓喜申所も其いはれ有といへ共。遊金の為にあてがはれし此金子。くはつとしたる事もなく。一年の中に二度まで御逼塞あらん事は。且は大尽の威勢かろきに似たり。又は牽頭仲間の面目をうしなふ所なり。たとへ藤伊十八ヶ所の家を売てあそぶ共。三千三百両見在の勢にはよもすぎじ。お袋様のかたみといふ事を諸人の一はいくふたるも。工面のすぐれたるにはあらず。たゞ遊運の天にかなへるゆへなり。 *Keisei Taiheiki* (op. cit.), p. 268.

⁴³ 正成ガ申所モ其謂有トイヘドモ、征罰ノ為ニ差下サレタル節度使、未戦ヲ成ザル前ニ、帝都ヲ捨テ、一年ノ内ニ二度マデ山門ヘ臨幸ナラン事、且ハ帝位ヲ軽ズルニ似タリ、又ハ官軍ノ道ヲ失処也。タトヒ尊氏筑紫勢ヲ率シテ上洛ストモ、去年東八カ国ヲ順ヘテ上シ時ノ勢ニハヨモ過ジ。オヨソ戦ノ始ヨリ敵軍敗北ノ時ニ至迄、御方小勢也トイヘドモ、毎度大敵ヲ責靡ケズト云フ事ナシ。是全ク武略ノ勝レタル所ニハ非ズ、只聖運ノ天ニ叶ヘル故也。 *Taiheiki* (op. cit.), vol. 2, p. 150.

to survive on its own, after one stern parental lecture on how to be a proper courtesan he sells her off for 70 *ryō*. This O-yuki is the child of his daughter O-sei, born after the latter became pregnant by an unknown man in the course of a boat journey made on pilgrimage to Rokujō 六条 in Kyoto. Born at the early Hour of the Rabbit on the 3rd of the Third Month, at the time she is 11 years old, and also motherless, O-sei having died immediately after giving birth. Now Kusu-Ki heads to the Ibarakiya, but finds that today Sukeroku is not there. A group of *taiko-mochi* there drinking on the sly make the argument that egging his playboy on is the job of a *taiko-mochi*, no matter how many times one dies and finds rebirth. Against this, however, Kusu-Ki argues that it is also the task of a *taiko-mochi* to keep his playboy from ruining himself, citing the adage that without playboys the pleasure quarters themselves cannot stand. Expressing his conviction that if Sukeroku can only pay off his current debts, then his reputation will improve and funds will be easier to come by, he announces that he has now sold off his own granddaughter, and produces the 70 *ryō*. At this point, however, the madam there informs him that Koichimonjiya is actually away in Edo, and tells him that she saw Tanbaya Nihei handing an 11-year-old girl over to Yorozuya's Heikurō. Kusu-Ki then goes to Tanbaya, but Nihei is no longer there, and he sets out to look for his grandchild. Meanwhile, the father Bun'emon, having heard from various quarters that Sukeroku failed to pay his debts, and gave no ear to Heikurō's remonstrances, decides at last to disown Sukeroku, even throwing him off the family register. Sukeroku himself is at Echigochō, spending his money with Saizō and the others and having a grand time. Heikurō comes to him there, carrying a box bearing the words "10,000 *ryō*." The recently-given 3,300 *ryō* are taken back from him, and the box itself is found to contain a paper suit. Heikurō informs him of the disowning and deregistration. Sukeroku dons the paper suit and leaves.

Continuing from the last chapter, this is a *yatsushi* of an episode from Volume 16 of the *Taiheiki*, the parting at the post-station of Sakurai 桜井駅 between Masashige and his 11-year-old son Masatsura, and the final parental lecture given then.⁴⁴ It also includes a *yatsushi* on the "Vow of Seven Lives" (*shichishō no chikai* 七生の誓い)⁴⁵ made by Masashige and Masasue 正季 at their suicide.

Book 3, Chapter 3

Heikurō had asked the Prelate Shinkoku 神谷僧都 of Tenma 天満 to pray that he himself might be adopted into the Yorozuya family. Told that for such a prayer there would be needed a virgin child, and moreover one born at the Hour of the Rabbit on the 3rd of the Third Month, Heikurō had then had various brokers make a search, with the result that he ended up buying Kusu-Ki's own granddaughter. Today is now the third and final day of the given prayer period.

⁴⁴ *Taiheiki* (op. cit.), vol. 2, p. 151.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

From the 3,300 *ryō* he has taken from Sukeroku, he makes a gift offering of 100 *ryō*. Kusu-Ki, however, discovers this on the gift-offering platform. He tries talking to one of the servants, but only ends up rousing suspicion, and decides to try again later. Going to Prelate Shinkoku, he announces himself as Heikurō's brother and is able to have a talk with him. After explaining things, he goes to the well, where he finds a girl hanging upside down. He pulls her out. The prelate takes the 100 *ryō* and flees. O-yuki herself is at death's door. Here Heikurō appears on the scene, and overhears their conversation by the well-side. Kusu-Ki tells O-yuki that when her mother was 17, she got pregnant by a stranger during a nighttime boat ride to the capital on the 23rd of the Eleventh Month, leaving her a fatherless child. The grandchild dies. Heikurō, who has heard all of this, commits suicide, telling Kusu-Ki that the man in question was him. Realizing that his suffering is the punishment of Heaven for trying to take over the family he serves, seemingly having become now the murderer of his own child, he repents of his evil heart, and taking 200 *ryō* from his breast-pocket, he begs Kusu-Ki to go find Sukeroku. Kusu-Ki accepts Heikurō as his son-in-law. Kusu-Ki then goes and makes a plea for aid at the magistrate's office (*daikansho* 代官所), but the inspector (*kenshi* 検使) tells him that the entire affair is only the fault of Sukeroku's own dissolution. Though now in the midst of personal tragedy himself, still Kusu-Ki worries about Sukeroku's fate, thinking there must yet be some plan or solution to be tried, even as he buries his grandchild and his son-in-law.

Book 4, Chapter 1

It is bruited about that anyone who joins Fuji-I's group will have his finances made good. The retired tenant of a temple called Jūyoku-in 重欲院 at Obase 小長谷 enters the Fuji-I entourage almost as a *taiko-mochi*, leading people to call the temple itself Fujii-dera 藤伊寺. Fuji-I has the idea to make said temple the setting for a drinking battle with Sukeroku and his gang, but with Sukeroku now in a paper-suit and declining the invitation, the whole plan is cancelled. Without Sukeroku, Fuji-I feels a lack of spirit in the revelry. Entrusting himself to the teachings of Bingoya Saburobei, he takes Sukeroku's own group of *taiko-mochi* under his wing as hangers-on, and has three large-sized "1,000-*koku*" boats (*sengoku-bune* 千石船) sumptuously decked for an amusement. Loading them with 17–18 prostitutes and piles of silver and gold cash, he has the *taiko-mochi* put dragon-king (*ryūō* 龍王) decorations and the like on their heads. One of these, dressed up as the dragon god (*ryūjin* 龍神) himself, pretends to watch the spectacle with surprise from the Sangenya 三軒屋 shore, and now comes forth to award Fuji-I with a gem to celebrate his victory-in-revelry over Sukeroku, but with too many people on the boat it sinks, and even the dragon god has to be rescued by the boatmen and others. At this point Fuji-I's uncle from the Capital, Fujiya no Inyū 藤屋の伊入 appears on the scene, having heard about his nephew selling off 18 of his houses, and come to talk him out of the idea. Thus it is that the fun is spoiled. But no: in reality this is not his uncle, only a masseur by the

name of Zennyū 善入, engaged as part of a stunt by Fuji-I himself. With the failure of the dragon-king stunt, however, the scheme has lost all interest.

This chapter is likely playing upon the “Battle at Fujii-dera Temple” episode in Volume 24 of the *Taiheiki*,⁴⁶ as well as on the “Kanegasaki Boat Party” episode in Volume 17,⁴⁷ but no examples of *mojiri* word-play on the original text can be found.

Book 4, Chapter 2

Sukeroku is back in Osaka, having travelled in secret. Agemaki has been called for by a samurai from Iyo 伊予 Province. Her *kamuro* 禿, Mojino 文字野, tells Sukeroku that the samurai from Iyo is trying to buy her mistress free from the brothel, and hands him a silk wallet with a letter in it from Agemaki. Meanwhile, back at the Sumiyoshiya 住吉屋, everything is in an uproar with the loss of the wallet containing the 200-*ryō* down-payment on Agemaki’s ransom. But the money has in fact been taken by Agemaki herself, refusing to be bought, and entrusted to Mojino for handing over to Sukeroku. One of the manservants, Shirobei 四郎兵衛, claims to have witnessed this, but Mojino herself refuses to say to whom she then gave it, enduring even physical punishment. Unable to bear this sight, one of the courtesans volunteers to take her place, but at this point one of the *taiko-mochi*, the Oyama-doll craftsman Tarohachi, declares himself to have been the messenger tasked by Mojino with giving the money to her friend, saying moreover that he is very sorry, because in fact after a gambling loss he had stolen the money. Tarohachi is then himself physically beaten and turned out of doors. Sukeroku, listening the whole time from the veranda, recalls the former bond of duty involving Tarohachi, and is deeply moved, thinking to himself that it must have been just like this when Oyamada Tarō 小山田太郎 returned to Nitta Yoshisada 新田義貞 (1301–1338) the favor he owed for having once been forgiven by the latter for the “crime of the green barley” (*aomugi no tsumi* 青麦の罪). The playboy from Iyo then returns home for the present, which allows Sukeroku to come out from under the veranda and meet Agemaki.

The mention here of the green barley, etc., is based on the passage “Where Oyamada Tarō Takaie Harvests Green Barley” in Volume 16 of the *Taiheiki*.⁴⁸ The Oyama-doll craftsman Tarohachi is modelled after Oyamada Tarō Takaie, and in the text of the *Keisei Taiheiki*, Sukeroku is shown to be moved in the following terms:

“For his earlier crime, because he spoke ill of someone behind their back, it would only have been natural for him to be thoroughly shamed, but the courtesan asked for forgiveness for him, remembering herself how he had given her

⁴⁶ 藤井寺合戦. *Taiheiki* (op. cit.), vol. 2, pp. 451–452.

⁴⁷ 金崎船遊. *Taiheiki* (op. cit.), vol. 2, pp. 222–223.

⁴⁸ 小山田太郎高家刈青麦事. *Taiheiki* (op. cit.), vol. 2, p. 163.

money in the past. And today, he suffered in her stead. That famous Oyamada Tarō was also pardoned by Yoshisada for the crime of the green barley. So this is what it means to return a debt of thanks!” he thought, moved.⁴⁹

As a case of an episode from the *Taiheiki* appearing here directly in the main text, this is an example of *mojiri* and *yatsushi*. Formally speaking, it is also an example of the classical world being discovered behind the actions of a person in the present.

Book 4, Chapter 3

Fuji-I appears at the Yoshidaya, wearing a paper suit. The clerk and Bingoya Saburobei, becoming wise to the dissolution of his behavior, have secretly sold off a scroll belonging to Rokujō Goyū 六帖吾由 with which they had been entrusted. After a claim to the magistrates from the owner, all Fuji-I's property has been seized, and he himself has been ordered to cut off contact with his friends and acquaintances. He explains that he had considered committing suicide, but in the end came here instead because he had something to return to one of the courtesans. Yoshidaya Kizaemon raises his spirits, and allows him to enter inside. Yūgiri comes. Fuji-I explains the situation. Yūgiri indicates she is willing to either die or to escape with him. Because of all that he owes to Fuji-I for services in the past, says Kizaemon, he offers to hide him away at a secluded residence in Ueshiochō 上塩町. Just at this moment, Sukeroku and Agemaki are walking along the roof above, having escaped in fear of their lives. And just when Fuji-I is musing, if only he knew where the said Rokujō Goyū's scroll were now, up on the roof he hears Sukeroku's voice saying that the scroll is actually right here. The two then meet face-to-face, now both of them wearing paper suits. By Sukeroku's account, this past spring, hearing rumors (from Bingoya Saburobei, no less) that the item was something valuable, he had bought the scroll—a forfeit pawn item—for 500 *ryō*. Indeed, he had come this way with the thought of selling it for 300 *ryō*, which would give him enough, when added to the 200 *ryō* from Agemaki, to fully purchase the latter's freedom. But because, he says, buying the freedom of a courtesan is a problem they both share, he will make Fuji-I a gift of the scroll. When Fuji-I then says that in that case, he himself will pay Agemaki's ransom instead, Sukeroku responds that if he did that then all their competition in the past would be in vain, to which in turn Fuji-I retorts that otherwise he will refuse to accept the scroll. The two prostitutes sigh, wishing there were some good plan to be tried.

⁴⁹ 前かど身共をかげにて悪しくいひたるゆへ。丸はだかにして恥かゝすべき処を。太夫が情にてわびことせし故。かへつて金子などをとらせし恩を思ひて。今日の太夫が難に代し事。
かの 彼 小山田太郎が義貞に。青麦あなむぎの罪つみをゆるされし。恩がへしもかくやと感心しながら。 *Keisei Taiheiki* (op. cit.), p. 283.

Book 5, Chapter 1

Through the joint scheme of the proprietors of the Ibarakiya and the Yoshidaya, it is decided that the money returned by Sukeroku had the whole time actually been lost somewhere in the house, and thanks to a report from Kusu-Ki, Sukeroku himself manages to secure a meeting with Bun'emon, father-to-son. It turns out, moreover, that the samurai from Iyo, too, had actually been only a scheme of Bun'emon's. Kusu-Ki now becomes a clerk for the Yorozuya. Also, with Kusu-Ki as messenger, the scroll is again brought to Fuji-I, still staying at the Yoshidaya, to be returned. As Kusu-Ki explains to Fuji-I, because refusing to accept the scroll would lead to Sukeroku being accused of the crime of buying stolen goods, he begs him to simply accept the thing without further ado, a request Fuji-I finds it impossible to refuse.

Book 5, Chapter 2

The Prelate Shinkoku, while publicly working as a dentist in Kawachi, has been, in secret, engaged in all kinds of villainy. Yet he worries about Kusu-Ki. He decides to follow an evilly clever plan suggested by his younger brother Zōbana no Tokubei 象鼻の徳兵衛. Making it seem as if Kusu-Ki has a secret wife, he pens a letter in women's handwriting spelling out a plot to kill Yorozuya with poison. With this letter in pocket, the Prelate Shinkoku goes to Osaka. At the shrine of Tokuan-zutsumi 徳安堤, six waitresses—one of Osaka's famous sights, a group known as the Six "Too-Muches" (*roppon sugi* 六本過)—are having a discussion. In the past, they had been among those urging on Fuji-I and Sukeroku to compete with each other, but with friendship now between the two, the pleasure quarters are finding it more difficult to make money. More than this, they are now trying to get a new rookie playboy (*aodaijin* 青大尽) come up from Awa 阿波 Province to compete with Yamazaki Yojibei 山崎与次兵衛. Shinkoku, intrigued, addresses them, offering the six of them a banquet to buy their silence. In the course of this, he ends up alone with Kaya "Too-much-fashion" (*share-sugi* しやれ過), but after a night together, this Kaya turns into a fox and disappears up into the sky. Shinkoku awakes to find left in his hand a "tap-out hammer" (*uchide no kozuchi* 打ち出の小槌).

The "six cedars" (*roppon sugi* 六本杉) found in Volume 25 of the *Taiheiki*⁵⁰ have here in the *Keisei Taiheiki* become the waitresses known as the Six "Too-Muches." Respectively they are: Rin "Too-much-cheek" (*namesugi* 無礼過), Matsu "Too-much-nonchalance" (*nodo-sugi* 喉過), San "Too-much-drinking" (*nomi-sugi* 飲過), Kaya "Too-much-fashion," Kuma "Too-much-grasping" (*tori-sugi* 取過), and Han "Too-much-pluck" (*keuchi-sugi* 口過).

⁵⁰ 六本杉事. *Taiheiki* (op. cit.), vol. 2, pp. 447–449.

Book 5, Chapter 3

The “tap-out hammer” has the power to produce money, treasures—anything desired when tapped against something. Wishing for something he can use to bring about Kusu-Ki’s downfall, Shinkoku taps the hammer, and out comes a letter with writing on it. The message reads: “Disguise yourself as a woman, and apply this medicine to your throat.” So Shinkoku, disguised as a woman, heads to the Yorozuya. Attempting to mimic a woman’s manner, he seeks to be admitted, but Kyūsa 久三, the one who receives him, informs Kusu-Ki simply that a monk using women’s language has come. When Kusu-Ki sees the visitor, it is Shinkoku. After rushing him and tying him up with rope, out of nowhere there appears a ghost, telling Shinkoku that she is the girl he murdered, and that all of this—everything happening since the Six “Too-Muchses”—has been her doing, all in order to have him handed over to her father, Kizaemon (i.e. Kusu-Ki). Now that her anger has been appeased, she can blissfully pass on to Buddhahood. The work ends with Yūgiri becoming Fujiya’s wife, and Agemaki becoming the wife of Yorozuya, after which both families go on to prosperity.

This episode of Shinkoku dressing as a woman bears a resemblance both in setting and story to that of Izuna’s 飯綱 messenger in Book 4, Chapter 3, of Tada Nanrei’s *Ōkeizū Ezō no hanashi* 大系図蝦夷噺 (5 books in 5 vols., published in Kanpō 寛保 4 (1744)), a work published in the same year. There too, the story is one about a monk who imagines he can successfully use magic.

Above, we have gone through the entirety of the work. The ghost of Kusu-Ki’s granddaughter O-yuki appears, but in this chapter she has now become his daughter, making the logic of the plot fail—probably the result of author error. In this respect, perhaps as a work it is indeed “a poor specimen with no evidence of Nanrei’s personal touch” (Hasegawa). But surely what we should be looking at in *Keisei Taiheiki* is not trivial mistakes like this one. Whether a *yatsushi* work’s original source is made explicit or left implicit; whether its characters largely become fully the antecedent figures of the classical world, being merely disguised as contemporaries as they abandon themselves to amusement (the explicit type), or whether a work’s characters are, in word and deed, controlled as it were from behind, themselves all unawares, by the classical world’s own ways of being (the implicit type)—in the case of either type the *yatsushi* is of an already conventionalized mode. Not so with the *Keisei Taiheiki*: here we have a *yatsushi* characterized by the merest contact with the classics, and by a cast of characters otherwise completely different, who even when they make such contact maintain it for but a moment. Such a style may invite criticism for the ineptness of its neither thorough nor consistent *mojiri*, but conversely, by the same token it avoids falling into methodization, and to my mind, the characters thus depicted are for that very reason in fact truer to life. If we compare this to Kiseki’s own manner of depiction, precisely because the *mojiri* and *yatsushi* are so very thoroughly executed, however *textually* realized his works might be as a result, the world and characters

realized therein have only an extremely generalized, non-individuated quality. By contrast, at Saikaku and Ippū's stage of things, rather than the world of the work being a world brought about by its own language, it is a matter of two target worlds, both of them pre-existing *a priori*, being set in apposition the one against the other. The difference between the two earlier authors derives rather from the more explicit or implicit manner of this apposition. To summarize, then, these variations on *yatsushi* as explained above, we might divide them into: (1) pre-existing yet implicit classical world—Saikaku, (2) pre-existing and explicit classical world—Ippū, (3) textually-realized yet generalized modernity—Kiseki, and (4) textually-realized and individuated modernity—Nanrei.

For the present, however, these four types only suggest the possibility of such patterns, and the unit of contrast is rather the individual work, or even the distinct individual motifs within a work, with the authors not necessarily corresponding one-on-one respectively to the four types given above. Indeed, I think a breakdown in any such correspondences is likely. In the future, it will be necessary to broaden the investigation to Ippū's work *Tsūzoku Sangokushi* 通俗三国志, or to the works of Ippū's contemporary Miyako no Nishiki. The direction of development that I myself envision, however, is rather that of the following.

Put simply, it lies in drawing a contrast, on the scale of world literature, between modernity and the classical world. For example, it lies in the fact that James Joyce's *Ulysses* is written to follow the *Odyssey* of Homer. Itō Sei 伊藤整 analyzes this situation in the following terms:

This novel, *Ulysses*, borrows the structure of Homer's *Odyssey*, and for its main characters, it uses the personalities and circumstances of various figures in the *Odyssey*, putting them into the personalities and circumstances of people living in the modern world. Written with such a method, using the correspondences it creates between modern people and figures from the classics, the novel seeks to grasp what constitutes the essence of humanity.⁵¹

The state of living at once in the actual world of the present, while at the same time overlaying upon it the world of the classics, in other words, is a state of being that I take to be in some way a universal one. On *Ulysses* and the *Odyssey* in particular, and on the relationship between the two, one of the earliest to offer a useful reading was none other than T. S. Eliot, in the following terms:

It is here that Mr. Joyce's parallel use of the *Odyssey* has a great importance. It has the importance of a scientific discovery. No one else has built a novel upon such a foundation before . . .

In using the myth, in manipulating a continuous parallel between contemporaneity and antiquity, Mr. Joyce is pursuing a method which others must pursue

⁵¹ From Itō Sei 伊藤整, "Jeimusu Joisu: hito to sakuhin" ジェイムス・ジョイス：人と作品, in *Yurishizū* ユリシーズ, trans. Itō Sei, vol. 21 of the collection *Sekai bungaku zenshū* 世界文学全集 (Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1963), p. 465.

after him. They will not be imitators, any more than the scientist who uses the discoveries of an Einstein in pursuing his own, independent, further investigations. It is simply a way of controlling, of ordering, of giving a shape and a significance to the immense panorama of futility and anarchy which is contemporary history. . . . Instead of narrative method, we may now use the mythical method. It is, I seriously believe, a step toward making the modern world possible for art, toward that order and form which Mr. Aldington so earnestly desires.⁵²

This feature of a “continuous parallel between contemporaneity and antiquity” that Eliot notes in Joyce, when set alongside the forcedness (*kojitsuke*, 付け or こじつけ) of *yatsushi*, seems to achieve something one might well call *shinwa-zuke* 神話付け (“myth-buttrressing”). With this, in other words, he has advanced to a further stage beyond the *yatsushi* of Kiseki and Nanrei. Yet vaulting across the gap between eras, surely there is something at work here in common on both sides. “No one else,” claims Eliot, “has built a novel upon such a foundation before”—yet was Joyce not in truth *not* so lonely a figure as thus imagined?

It might be noted here in passing that Yamamoto Hajime 山本一, regarding the search within classical Japanese literature for examples of the meta-quality and self-criticism that those like Albert Thibaudet and Mishima Yukio 三島由紀夫 have seen as being characteristic of the true novel (the modern novel), has said the following, in what surely represents an endeavor akin to Eliot’s own:

A work that describes a protagonist who identifies himself with the world of books, who in fact tries to live out that world of books in reality—a work that, moreover, in describing such a man thereby in itself criticizes the world of books, if not indeed also its own author’s very act of writing—where in the history of Japanese literature is a work of that nature to be found?⁵³

The conceit, in other words, is that the essence of the novel is for the novel to itself possess self-awareness. Such a possession, however, is in no way a privilege of modernity alone.

Conclusion

Returning to the main thread, let us here present a conclusion.

The feeling of actually *living* the classical world is not, as I see it, some general sense of being always under that world’s dominion, or of living one’s own life in accordance with it. It is rather a flash of self-discovery, born when one experiences—despite a previous confidence of independence from it, despite indeed a previous feeling of almost complete alienation from it, and for a space, a moment, despite any number of differences with it bridged in that flash—the

⁵² Taken from his contemporary book review: T. S. Eliot, “Ulysses, Order, and Myth,” *The Dial* 75 (1923).

⁵³ See Yamamoto Hajime 山本一, “Bungakusei no mondai” 文学性の問題, *Hokuriku koten kenkyū* 北陸古典研究 22 (2007), p. 78.

sudden realization that a strong affinity with that classical world permeates one's very being. Bingoya Saburobei in Book 2, Chapter 3 of *Keisei Taiheiki* was the *yatsushi* of Kojima Saburō Takanori of Bingo Province as he appears in Volume 4 of the *Taiheiki*.⁵⁴ After trying—and failing—to save Emperor Godaigo, that Kojima Saburō Takanori left behind for his sovereign the following verse, the afterwards famous “ten character poem” (*jūji shi* 十字詩):

天莫空勾踐 Never shall Heaven abandon Goujian:
時非無范蠡 With time shall arise another Fan Li.⁵⁵

No more than it could abandon, captive in Gusu 姑蘇 Castle, the original Goujian 勾踐 of Yue 越, surely Heaven would not leave this king to his death; for how could time fail to bring forth another minister like Fan Li 范蠡, who saved Goujian and avenged all his humiliations? Here Kojima Takanori, by thus bringing forth from the world of the past a model for himself like Fan Li, in effect wrote the scenario of his own future, as one who would go on to live the life of a Fan Li. This represents a moment—the briefest of moments—where a man's own will (future) and the world of the classics (past) can be seen—in transworldly terms—to coincide. And though only a moment it be, surely within it we find, rising up at once to meet both the future and the past, growing, luxuriating, the life of the present. Thus do the classics rain down upon, flow into, our own lives as well.

In a similar sense, far from a *yatsushi* seeking in extremely deliberate fashion to pun its own sources underfoot, Nanrei's own more recombinatory, more sporadic quality seems to me directed rather at describing something closer to a more realistic feeling of how the classical is experienced.

For it is in this sort of experience, rather than in the play of words, that a true connection to the world of the classical consists.

In his *Keisei Taiheiki*, it is still only without self-consciousness that the various characters live such a life. Though history repeat itself, it is without self-consciousness that it lives that repetition. When, however, self-consciousness of this is at last born, at that point, I sincerely believe, a way of being in search of freedom—but not by Kuki Shūzō's method—as well as a way for the novel itself to be in possession of self-awareness—but not by the methods of the modern Western novel—will be found waiting to be found within the genre of *ukiyo-zōshi*.

⁵⁴ See description of the cited chapter above.

⁵⁵ *Taiheiki* (op. cit.), vol. 1, p. 140.