of collective identities competing with nationalism in Part I of this book. But it would be more appropriate to interpret the relationship between these ideologies and nationalism as being close to the "combination" comprised of appropriating, subsuming, or complementing of one over the other rather than as "competing." Moreover, the meaning and weight of the word "nationalism" may change with the passing of time in the thought of a person. As the author repeatedly emphasizes, if nationalism should be understood in the historical context in which it is conceived, the question of whether it is desirable to isolate elements on nationhood from the whole and de-contextualize them must be taken into consideration.

Next is the interaction between the intrinsic approach and external factors in explaining social change. On the whole, the author tends to emphasize the external variables rather than the intrinsic factors in the formation of the ethnic nationalism of this period. He mentions in the introduction that he has tried to overcome the bifurcated view of Korean nationalism and "to recover voices and stories marginalized by the master narratives of nationalist historiography" (p. 17). If marginalized voices and stories cannot be reconciled with external factors such as the forced annexation of Korea by Japan, the colonial policy of *naisen ittai* ("one body"), or the unilateral commands of Communist International, then researchers must pay more attention to excavating and interpreting the voices and stories within the context of Korean history.

Emphasizing the context of Korean history leads to the fact that the element of time is very important in historical studies. One of the things that must be mentioned is that the author sometimes fails to take time into serious consideration, thereby ultimately committing the fallacy of oversimplification. To suggest that a form of ethnic nationalism has emerged in a specific period under the assumption of a monolithic whole is apt to lead to a teleological explanation. There is a need to recognize diverse currents of thought, nationalism among others, within the "sub-periods" of Korea's modern history as incessantly changing with the passing of time and containing various contradictions, rather than as something that can be described as a monolithic whole.

Revealed Identity: The Noh Plays of Komparu Zenchiku.
By Paul S. Atkins. The University of Michigan Center for Japanese Studies, 2006. Pp. 292.
Reviewed by Noel John Pinnington, University of Arizona
E-mail noelp@email.arizona.edu
doi:10.1017/S1479591407000642

The number of scholarly works in English on fifteenth-century Noh seems to be rapidly increasing. There is a good reason for this, for in the case of Noh we not only have old playscripts, but also a continuous performance tradition, a fair degree of documentary evidence about the lives of the original playwrights and their society, and, more important, detailed discussions about performance art written by the playwrights and actors themselves, in terms of the high culture of their day. In the study of Noh there is enough material for scholarship to achieve an unusually rich level of discussion.

Occupying a prominent position in such scholarship is Thomas B. Hare's *Zeami's Style: The Noh Plays of Zeami Motokiyo* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1986). Hare reads certain of Zeami's plays closely in the context of Zeami's prescriptions for composition, resulting in both a fruitful explication of the plays themselves, and a deeper reading of Zeami's ideas. About the time when Hare's book came out, scholarly attention in Japan had begun to move on from Zeami to later playwrights, and at the same time, a number of revisionary investigations of plays began to appear. It was quite natural therefore that one of Hare's pupils, Paul Atkins, should have conceived of a similar project focusing on Zeami's pupil and son-in-law Komparu Zenchiku, for Zenchiku too left a number

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479591407000642 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of works discussing the art of Noh, its purposes and the aesthetics of its plays. The book under review was surely at one time conceived of as a "*Zenchiku's Style*" or perhaps, "*Son (-in-law) of Zeami's Style*."

Matters prove to be more problematic, however, in the case of Zenchiku than Zeami. To begin with, the attribution of plays to Zenchiku is unreliable. The problem is clear if we compare Atkins's list in the work under review (fifteen plays) with P. G. O'Neill's in 1953 (sixteen plays); only nine coincide. Atkins is painstaking and judicious, and has profited from recent finds, but the cyclic reasoning behind some earlier scholarship infects his choices, and the lack of certainty about attribution creates difficulties for his whole project. One wonders whether it would have been more profitable simply to take a set of plays as representative of a given genre or style, and study them as such, without reference to Zenchiku. A further problem is Zenchiku's theoretical writings, for they contain nothing equivalent to Zeami's account of how plays should be composed (*Sandō*). They are moreover far less comprehensible than Zeami's. Atkins knows his Zenchiku very well, but the connections he builds between the works and plays inevitably end up being tenuous and vague.

These difficulties are most evident in Atkins' first chapter: "Painting Landscapes in the Mind: *Bashō* and *Kakitsubata*." A lack of clarity is signaled early on when Atkins declares that he is going to "focus" on certain matters, and discover "resonances" that will be contextualized through an "ongoing relationship" between dramaturgy and painting (p. 29). He goes on to range through a number of topics, stringing them together like a renga sequence: plays have scenic descriptions, in Zenchiku's plays scenery is often described in emotional terms, this may be connected to Zenchiku's fondness for the Chinese literary critical phrase: "mind in landscape, landscape in mind," which in turn might be connected to the aesthetics of *suiboku* paintings, in which surely Zenchiku was interested, there being a landscape in one of his famous six circular diagrams. This recalls the ox-herding sequence, also circular, of which an example was painted by Shūbun, whom Zenchiku might or might not have known, but with whom he shared a "common well of cultural consciousness," and so on. Such vaguely linked networks (including similar excursuses into painting and waka, color, the enlightenment of plants, *Ise Monogatari emaki*, etc.), are set up as contexts for a discussion of the two plays *Bashō* and *Kaktsubata*, but in truth, distract from rather than add to our sense of what the plays are about.

This is unfortunate, for Atkins' readings of the plays are strong, deriving from his feeling for and knowledge of the plays themselves. As the book progresses and he tends less to force the connection to Zenchiku's writings, his interpretations become more absorbing. In the second chapter, the two plays taken up are *Teika* and *Shōki*. In the case of *Teika*, the link to Zenchiku again muddies the waters. Atkins sees a problematic ambivalence in Zenchiku's attitude to Fujiwara no Teika. It is true that the stance taken towards Teika in the play, and that guessed at from Zenchiku's works, do not appear to coincide. But there is again something cyclic about this. Although there is an external early sixteenth-century attribution of the play to Zenchiku (one that itself has problematic aspects), the main evidence of authorship is Zenchiku's interest in Teika and certain of his poems. If there is a difference of stance, the simplest solution is that Zenchiku did not write the play. Actually it is my view that the play is a revision of an earlier work by someone who has different aims from the original and that is the source of one set of oddities in its stance (the other is the common ascription of responsibility in sexual attraction to the object of the attraction). Atkins' close reading of this fascinating play, in any case, when he puts aside Zenchiku, is interesting and informative, both in his discussion of certain interpretative issues and of rhetorical and stylistic matters. Again, with the play *Shōki*, the links to Zenchiku's writings and to differences between Zenchiku's and Zeami's approach to demon plays seem to add little to our reading of the play itself.

Subsequent chapters continue the close reading of a number of plays related thematically or generically. Chapter 3 considers divinity, landscape and abjection; Chapter 4 the feminine ideal, and Chapter 5 delusion and ambiguity. The reading of plays in groups in this way enables Atkins to observe a number of contrasts and similarities that enrich our critical sensitivity to each of them.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479591407000642 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Atkins is both well informed of contemporary scholarship of the plays he takes up, and possessed of original insights. As can be seen from the topics chosen, his readings raise a number of issues that are central to the study of Noh.

This work is then a welcome addition to the secondary literature on Noh, full of original insights, by a well-informed scholar, and, as it happens, beautifully produced with a large number of illustrations. It suffers however, at times, from a lack of intellectual clarity. This probably derives ultimately from the insuperable difficulties in its aims, arising from the obscurity of Zenchiku's views and the uncertainty of his attributions.

Contemporary Japanese Thought.

By Richard F. Calichman, ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005. Pp. 320. Cloth. ISBN: 0-231-13620-X.

Reviewed by Andrew Barshay, University of California, Berkeley
E-mail abars@berkeley.edu

doi:10.1017/S1479591407000654

Some years ago, I contributed an essay on postwar social and political thought to a volume entitled *Modern Japanese Thought* (Cambridge University Press, 1998). The cover featured a large chrysanthemum flower, with a small drawing of a *torii* reflected on water toward the bottom, all set against a gray background motif consisting of stylized lotus leaves and blossoms. The message seems to have been that Japan ought to continue to be thought of in terms of its connections, symbolic or otherwise, with its own past rather than as embedded in any larger world, whether geographical or conceptual.

Not so this volume, which is all about Japan's embeddedness in the world. It is in many ways an admirable, engrossing, and valuable collection, if also, from time to time, a tendentious one. The gap between the volume of serious writing in Japanese – scholarship, criticism, polemics – and what is available of it in translation is immense, and Richard Calichman is to be congratulated for both addressing and redressing the problem, in this and his other work along the same lines.[6]

In his lengthy introduction, Calichman unaccountably declines to define the "contemporary" period, instead focusing on the contingency of such notions as "Japan" (or "Japanese") and "thought." "That which is called 'modern Japanese civilization'," he asserts, "… exists nowhere else but in the inscriptions that at each instant institute or found modern Japanese civilization" (p. 6) and is in no way "natural or necessary" (p. 4). "Institutions" are rather formed by a decision "made in the face of all contingency" that, with "prescriptive force," thereby produces "a new and entirely unprecedented reality" (p. 9). Rather than disclosing a tradition ("an experience that becomes extended," as the theologian Edward Schillebeeckx puts it[7]), the past can only exist "retroactively" (p. 7). Such a view may be meant as a corrective to a heavy-handed historicism that has no other function than to justify a particular present, or to counter a "naturalizing" perspective that fixes collective "identity" (such as that of a nation) to the exclusion of alterity. But it is surely an overcompensation to insist that these "institutions" are as momentary, as devoid of weight and subject to the next "decision," as Calichman makes out. Marx must have been delusional in thinking that the past (the "tradition

6 Richard Calichman. *What is Modernity? Writings of Takeuchi Yoshimi.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2005; *Takeuchi Yoshimi: Displacing the West.* New York: Cornell East Asia Series, 2004.

7 Edward Schillebeeckx. *I Am a Happy Theologian.* New York: Crossroad, 1994, p. 42.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479591407000642 Published online by Cambridge University Press