

About the Appearance of the False Hunting School of the Latter Half of the Muromachi Period in the Edo Period — As a Clue to the Hawk Hunting of the Netsu Clan Belonging to the Kaga Clan

by

Yasuko Nihonmatsu

Maeda Yoshinori, sixth lord of the Kaga domain, selected hawkers directly descended from Nezu Shoken, who had served Tokugawa Ieyasu from the Age of Civil Wars, and made the Yoda clan serve the Kaga domain. Since it had traditionally been the custom for lords of the Kaga domain to respect the manners of the shogun family, Yoshinori actively appointed hawkers of the Nezu-school which had connections with Ieyasu. Numerous hawk hunting books of the Nezu family had been handed down to the Yoda clan from Shoyoken, and the books served as a guarantee that the family were hawkers of the said school. In order to investigate the actual conditions surrounding the abovementioned appreciation of Nezu-school hawk hunting in the Kaga domain in the period before Yoshinori, this article considers a new text named *Takaezunomaki*. An ownership stamp with the inscription of “Maedashison-keikakuzu-shoki” is affixed to this text, and one finds a description in the postscript stating that the text had been handed down from Shoyoken. The ownership stamp indicates that the text was part of the collection of Maeda Tsunanori, Yoshinori’s predecessor. Furthermore, the text’s content is very similar to that of the text of the Yoda clan which claimed to be a hawk hunting book of the Nezu family. This confirms that in the Kaga domain, hawk hunting of the Nezu family who were directly descended from Shoyoken was already appreciated at least by the time of Tsunanori. In addition, the article presents the aforementioned situation of hawk hunting in the Kaga domain as an example of a hawk hunting school originating in the Middle Ages developing in the early modern era.

“*The Nankō*” (Great Kusunoki Masashige):
Images of Tactical Genius in Military Writings during the Early Showa Era

by
Takaya Matsumoto

It is a well known fact that Masashige Kusunoki and his son Masatsura were called the “*Nankō*” and revered in prewar Japanese society. The view that the “*Nankō*” was an important figure was also shared among soldiers. The “*Nankō*” was held with high esteem in terms of military capability, and he was considered to rival or even surpass the great commanders of history from around the world. The medieval Masashige’s strategy and tactics were reinterpreted based on modern military ideas and given high regard. In addition, regarding the discipline and mentality of soldiers, a historical myth was created and justified, according to which Masashige had advocated the independence of supreme command and defended it himself. The above indicates that, for soldiers in the prewar era, the “*Nankō*” was a hero with specific and actual traits. Furthermore, the view of life and death that Masashige showed in the *Taiheiki* was close to that which was presented to soldiers in the Showa era, as can be observed in the *Senjinkun*. Therefore, the kamikaze often used various designs evoking the “*Nankō*”, and this led to many young men losing their lives.

“The Cambridge Fragments” und Gheraert Leeu

von

Yoichiro Hieda

In der literaturgeschichtlichen Hinsicht spielen “The Cambridge fragments” eine durchaus wichtige Rolle. In der Reynaert-Überlieferung hat es sich herausgestellt, dass sie ein Bindeglied zwischen der niederländischen Reynaert- und der deutschen Reynke-Überlieferung darstellen. Nachdem G.H. Culemann im Jahre 1854 ihr Vorhandensein öffentlich kundgegeben hatte, gab es viele Auseinandersetzungen über ihre Stellung innerhalb der Reynaert-Überlieferung. Viele Vorschläge über das mögliche Stemma wurden gemacht, wobei sich die Edition von Ernst Martin vom Jahre 1874 als problemhaft erwiesen hatte. Viele vermeintlich falsche Wörter wurden willkürlich korrigiert und mit vermeintlich richtigen Wörtern getauscht, einige wurden neu eingesetzt, sogar aus anderer Quelle. Aus dem heutigen Stand der Forschung wurde erst der wissenschaftliche Vergleich nach der Veröffentlichung von W. Gs. Hellingas diplomatischer Ausgabe möglich. Leider sind bei dieser Ausgabe 4 Zeilen nicht aufgeschrieben.

Der vorliegende Aufsatz stellt sich die Aufgabe, erstens einen genauen Vergleich mit der Brüsseler Handschrift von “Reynaerts Historie” und “The Cambridge fragments” zu ermöglichen und zweitens beide Texte, und besonders ihre Abweichungen sprachlich zu untersuchen, wobei es sich aber um die Herstellung des Stemmas nicht handelt. Es hat sich dann herausgestellt, dass ihre Abweichungen zwei Charakteristika aufweisen. Einmal ist es offensichtlich, dass Gheraert Leeu die Sprache von den Bruchstücken an das brabantische Dialekt angepasst hatte, zu dem die Stadt Antwerpen gehörte. Zweitens ist es merkwürdig, dass er alte, höfische Wörter mit Absicht aufgegriffen hatte, um Erwartungen der Hofleute, die noch in der französisch-flämischen literairen Tradition stecken, entgegenkommen zu können. Die gezielte Leserschicht war ohne Zweifel Hofleute und Adlige. Andereiseits musste Leeu das luxuriöse Buch mit Bildern so viel möglich verkaufen, um die investierten Kosten für Buchproduktion zu kompensieren. Das führte notwendigerweise dazu, dass die Sprache seines Buchs möglichst vielen Leuten verständlich sein musste. Sein Dilemma war, Rückkehr zur französisch-flämischen literairen Tradition und allgemeine sprachliche Verständlichkeit gleichzeitig zu realisieren. “The Cambridge fragments”, bisher fast immer im Zusammenhang der Stemmata diskutiert, können doch, wenn man sie einmal aus der Sicht des Druckers und ihrer Rezeption in Betracht zieht, eine neue Perspektive eröffnen.

A Consideration of Direct Comparison between the *Gleichung* in the Opening Part of the
Beginning Theory of Commodity and the *Gleichung* in the Theory of Value-Form
in Karl Marx's *Das Kapital*, Band I

by

Yasushi Inoue & Masaki Sakiyama

We have published *Marx und die Waarensache* in 2017 (Tokyo, Shakai-Hyoronsha Publishers) and pointed out that almost of all existing readings of the Beginning Theory of Commodity in Marx's *Das Kapital*, Band I, are erroneous. And we have contrasted our precise and detailed reading. We, however, did not directly deal with the definite difference between the *Gleichung* in the Opening Part where leads to the substance of value through logically analytical abstraction, and the *Gleichung* in the Theory of Value-Form. This paper aims to indicate clearly such difference by direct comparing between those *Gleichungen*. In this sense, this is an addendum to our book.

The former *Gleichung* commodity A = commodity B is an equality between two same exchange-values. Thus it means a simultaneous abstraction of the use-value (natural material aspect of commodities A and B as well as the concrete useful aspect of commodity-production labor) within human thinking. Consequently, the two different commodities become indifferent commodities, and the residue of abstracted both is a coagulation or crystallization of abstract human labors as the Another Third One which has only the "Ghostly Objectivity (*gespetige Gegenständlichkeit*)".

The abstraction of use-values from two real concrete commodities is such a singular and ultimate abstraction, which never remains any attributes or inferences, and the theoretical result of that abstraction is that both are values (not use-values nor exchange values, but just social *Werthe* only with complete indifferent "Ghostly Objectivities"). It is very much like Boson in quantum physics.

This "Ghostly Objectivity" is never a rhetorical term nor Hegelian notion. It is a very singular and unique definition of being that equated two different commodities, as theoretical objectives, have.

The latter *Gleichung* in the Theory of Value-Form is completely different from the *Gleichung* above. The theoretical goal of the Theory of Value-Form is, in the first place, to solve how labor-products become commodities in the real world. In other words, to clarify "The Money-Being (*Geldsein*) contained in all commodities". Its solution is acquired from the articulation of the way how commodity-values are expressed. Then what does mean the *Gleichung*, an expression of value, x commodity A = y commodity B? The meaning of this socially real *Gleichung* is that commodity B is in a form of direct exchangeability with commodity A. In short, commodity B is socially recognized as a *Sache* itself (therefore commodity B is Value).

Commodity A confirms its value in term of commodity B. That is to say, A confirms its own value by reflection in term of B as the "Value-Mirror". Such "Detour of Value-Expression" is based on the sociality as commodities. Then, what kind sociality is this sociality as commodities? To solve the problem needs to grasp the abstraction of the *Gleichung* itself in contrast to the former one. This *Gleichung*, which commodity A equates commodity B to A itself, means that the total of various labors producing A equates to the total of various labors

producing B. Although the total for A is apparently different from the total for B, equating both firstly reduces and abstracts the two totals of various concrete living labors to qualitative-equal human labors in general. In this way, the very reality of that *Gleichung* realizes such reduction and abstraction.

In this process, the socially real *Gleichung* is constituted of a simultaneous and in one swoop abstraction of the use-value of B, of both its natural material aspect of commodity B and its concrete useful aspect expressed in B. In such *Gleichung*, commodity A is positioned at the Relative Value-Form as well as commodity B is positioned at the Equivalent-Form. In this *Gleichung*, commodity A has the initiative and commodity B obeys A's initiative. This being of commodities is very much like Fermion in quantum mechanics. Besides, this real asymmetrical *Gleichung* polarizes the Relative Value-Form and the Equivalent-Form. The two poles of Forms exclude each other because those are dichotomous, like Pauli exclusion principle.

And, in commodity B positioned at the Equivalent-Form, the concrete itself becomes the Appearance-Form of the abstract. This can be called an extremely strange reversal. At the same time, another curious reversal occurs in the commodity positioned at the Equivalent-Form. That commodity in the Equivalent-Form, a product of private labors in its Natural-Form as it is, becomes directly a social labor-product. Then, the Use-Value of the commodity in the Equivalent-Form is socially recognized as the Value. Such reversed situation is the very Mystery of the Equivalent-Form, and it develops itself into the Mystery of Money. Then, that strange situation *verknöchert* into Money. Understanding that reversed world of commodities = *Sachen*, which are sensible and supersensible, is supremely difficult. And as we have described above, there is a definite and absolute difference between the *Gleichung* in the Opening Part and the *Gleichung* in the Theory of Value-Form.

Children's Cosmology and Parody Songs sung by Wartime Children:
Toru Kasagi's Research for Parody Songs, vol.6

by
Yusuke Uno

This paper will discuss the relationship between children's cosmology, with which I have dealt for over twenty years, and parody songs sung mainly by Japanese children during and after the Second World War. The purpose of my discussion is to present the importance of parody songs for the children's development and character building. Children's parody songs have been underestimated as being "HAMIDASHI (= jutting out of bounds)" in children's own culture, so that very few researchers of children's culture and their societies have tackled the meaning of the creation and transmission of children's parody songs for children's development and character building. In this paper I will explicate the linguistic and cultural features of the wartime children's parody songs eagerly collected by Toru Kasagi, a folk-singer and song writer, who was born in Gifu prefecture in 1937. He experienced secretly singing a number of parodies of military propaganda songs and nursery songs with his friends in his childhood, and continued to sing them in his concerts during his life time. Finally, I will try to answer the following questions; why did children in wartime dare to sing parody songs in spite of the risk of punishment by school teachers and parents, and why do we, as human-beings, need to sing songs?

PAIDEIA (XIV) — The Ideals of Greek Culture
Translator's Small Comment

by

Yoshihiko Murashima

This is the Japanese translation of G. Highet "PAIDEIA — the ideals of Greek culture —" (especially Book Four : The Conflict of Cultural Ideals in the Age of Plato, Oxford University Press, 1971). And Highet's work was famous as the English one of W. Jaeger "PAIDEIA — Die Formung des Griechischen Menschen —". When I tried to translate the latter original several years ago, the former was much helpful for me. For the former was much concrete and clear in comparison with the latter's abstraction and difficulty. Highet's work surpassed the level of mere translation and was a complete reading in itself.

Fortunately I had the nice chance to choose his work as the text of University lecture. According to the progress of my lecture I recorded my own translation into the personal computer. Reading it over again I was astonished by the smoothness of its meaning. So I dared to publish it on the University bulletin in order to compare each other.

Through the change of author contents itself also changed so dramatically. It was marvelous for me. Usually it is difficult for the translation to surpass its original. But often the former can be equal with the latter. Highet's work must be one of such rare exceptions.

By the limitation of paper I could not help showing only one translation in this paper like "Xenophon : The Ideal Squire and Soldier".

『立命館文學』投稿規定および執筆要領

1. 掲載可能な研究分野

人文科学に属する学術研究に資するものであり、立命館大学人文学会活動の趣旨に沿うもの。

2. 投稿資格

次のいずれかに該当する者とする。

- ① 立命館大学人文学会正会員・学生会員である者。
- ② 立命館大学人文学会評議員の依頼もしくは推薦を受けた者。

3. 原稿

(1) 言語

日本語もしくは任意の外国語。外国語の場合、日本語訳文の添付を求める場合がある。

(2) 種類と分量

原稿の種類は次のいずれかに該当するものとする。ただし、原資料の掲載・複写が過半を占めるものは不可とする。

- ① 論文・研究ノート・調査報告・資料紹介・訳注（20,000字以内、欧文は10,000語以内）
- ② 学界動向（12,000字以内、欧文は6,000語以内）
- ③ 書評（8,000字以内、欧文は4,000語以内）

(3) 掲載書式

掲載書式はA4判（縦25.0cm 横16.3cm）で縦書きと横書きのいずれかを選択できる。縦書きの場合、本文は32字×26行の2段組、注・参考文献は34字×31行の2段組で掲載する。横書きの場合、本文は44字×39行の1段組、注・参考文献は47×47行の1段組で掲載する。図表を含めて14頁以内におさまらない場合、連載を基本とする。

(4) 要旨と題目

論文・研究ノート・調査報告・資料紹介・訳注については、原稿の言語の種類に拘らず、400～600字の日本語の要旨と題目、200～300語の英語（もしくは同分量の任意の外国語）の要旨と題目を添付する。

(5) 提出原稿の形態

原稿およびデータ（CD、USBメモリ等）を提出すること。図版については清書すること。

4. 審査

投稿原稿は編集委員会にて審査の上、採否を決定する。なお、学部生・大学院生およびそれに準ずる者が投稿する場合、事前に専攻の教員の指導を受け、了解を得たものであることとする。

5. 校正

執筆者は本文2回、要旨1回を校正する。

6. 著作権

掲載された論文等の著作権は立命館大学人文学会に帰属する。掲載された論文等の転載は立命館大学人文学会の許可を必要とする。

7. 投稿先

〒603-8577 京都市北区等持院北町56-1
立命館大学文学部内 立命館大学人文学会

8. 備考

- ・原稿は原則として立命館大学のホームページで公開する。
- ・抜刷は30部まで無料、超過分については実費を負担する。