

Final Discussion

Kitahara: I'm Itoko Kitahara, the "traffic controller" of this discussion. In the COE Program, there is a division relating to landscapes and natural disasters. I'm involved in the field of the traces of disasters and human activities. The topics we deal with aren't covered in this symposium but, as members of the program, we are all concerned with how to systematize nonwritten materials for human culture. So, I'm hoping to get some answers through this discussion. Yesterday we had two discussion sessions but no time for questions and answers. Today we have one and a half hours, so we'd like to invite your opinions and questions. A question-and-answer session will be held at the end of the discussion, so please stay with us until then and give us your views. First, each coordinator will give us a short summary of the session in the order of the presentation. Now please welcome Prof. Matoba.

Matoba: Yesterday's first session dealt with theories about nonwritten materials and was titled "Methodological Problems." With our program in its fourth year, a team dealing with the various theoretical approaches behind the implementation of the program. The subjects covered in this symposium aren't all we study, and various individual projects are near completion. My specialty is philosophy and history of thought. The other panelist in the session, Prof. Rieu specializes in philosophy, so none of us is an expert in the study of nonwritten materials. But we are working toward the systematization and theorization of nonwritten materials. The topics of our presentations were different; however, we both suggested we should be more adventurous in undertaking this new project and work on it in a broader framework. The Kanagawa University 21st Century COE program follows the framework approved by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. Prof. Rieu, however, differentiated the concepts of a project and program. He suggested that we should work on projects on a larger scale. Even if we make a mistake, it leads us to the next stage, and we can learn something from it. That's the way this project should be. Furthermore, he suggested that we develop sort of an internet museum of anthropology, even though we aren't sure if we are capable of doing that. He accented the technological revolution in the 1980s. Advances in science and technology have been influencing the field of learning. That is called paradigm transition. An economic anthropologist, Karl Polanyi named it the Great Transformation, and a historian of science, Thomas Kuhn called it Paradigm Shift.

The learning and research approach we pursued in the 1970s was running into a brick wall, but technologies have been innovated to change the situation. How can we ride this technological wave? Advances in computer technology have broadened our world. Traditional teaching and learning methods, such as perusing books and studying history have been replaced by more innovative approaches. Frankly speaking, universities are being left behind. According to Prof. Rieu an ideal replacement is a virtual museum. Traditionally, teachers passed on knowledge to students. But, now education has shifted to a more participatory style in which teachers and students explore a given subject together. He proposed that an online museum would be very effective. For example, to compile a pictorial dictionary, which is one of the topics covered in this symposium, the staff has adopted the method long used by the Institute of the Study of Japanese Folk Culture. That is, they look at each component of a painting and determine how folk implements in the painting were used. What goes on if we add some motion to such a drawing? Let's say there is a bridge. If we can see people crossing it, we will be able to learn how they led

their daily lives. When studying about folk implements, we should be able to see people who used them. In today's presentation on folk implements we couldn't see people, but in a virtual museum we could. That's the way the concept of folk implements should be presented. As for landscape, we should focus on how people interacted with one another in a landscape rather than topographic changes. I believe that is a new direction.

In my presentation yesterday, I talked about methodologies for systematizing nonwritten materials beyond the scope of text materials. To understand written materials we use a sort of syntactic code which is quite rigid. Thanks to the code, everybody understands a given material in the same way and discovers the same thing. But, it makes us blind to unseen factors, so we have to find a way of interpreting materials beyond the code. I called it non-coded reading. I believe we can find it through studying nonwritten materials. For example, when looking at a drawing to compile a pictorial dictionary, we should try to grasp what the whole picture signifies instead of analyzing details like each action and person, as Prof. Rieu suggested. That way, we can probably understand the way people of the era thought and the reason for a given action. As for folk implements we should pay attention to people using them and contemplate how they understood the implements. We can say the same thing about photographs. It's interesting to trace landscape changes. But, rather than visible elements of a photograph, we should focus on people who were viewing the scenery and how they saw it. That is, we need to consider how people in a given region viewed an ordinary scene in a certain period of time. I must admit that it will be difficult to put these ideas into shape, say by creating a database. But, our team has to introduce all sorts of ideas even if they are not fully thought out. So, I'll bluff my way out and pass the baton to the next coordinator. The rest of the groups can deal with what we've proposed.

Kitahara: Now I'd like to welcome Prof. Kim. Please explain what was discussed in the second session, taking the issues Prof. Matoba raised into consideration.

Kim: First of all I'd like to summarize what we discussed in the second session. The session was about what Group 1 of the COE Program has been working on the systematization of illustrated materials for the purpose of the study of human societies. Our primary objective is to compile a pictorial dictionary. Today in Session II, Prof. Fukuta and Prof. Tajima gave presentations on an actual process for compiling a pictorial dictionary. Prof. Fukuta emphasized the importance of the project and the creativity involved with it. He stressed that in order to compile a pictorial dictionary our group must consider how paintings relate to one another, rather than separately analyze them. He also pointed out that the information we extracted from illustrated materials could be used as clues to find out what daily life was like in a certain place and time. We in Group 1 have adopted Prof. Fukuta's view and methodology has formed the base of the efforts of Group 1 in compiling a pictorial dictionary.

Prof. Tajima reported on the process of compiling a pictorial dictionary of Japanese folk culture which covers the Early Modern Period. It is based on *Nōgyō zue* or the *Pictures of Farmers and Their Lives* from Kaga (present-day Ishikawa), and the focus of his group is everyday lives of common people. Using actual drawings, he showed us the process of analyzing the components of a drawing, finding a name for each component, and providing an explanation. It was shown that the group strives to use the regional language of the era to name and explain a given component.

The next panelist, Dr. Wang Cheng-hua from Academia Sinica, Taiwan, isn't directly involved in the compilation

of the pictorial dictionary. But, nobody in Group 1 is specialized in the history of Chinese art, so we invited her to learn about cityscape paintings produced in the late Ming and Qing Dynasties which is her special field. In her presentation she talked about paintings depicting folkways from the 17th and 18th centuries. She mainly showed us a variety of the cityscape paintings explaining why they were popular and highly valued in that time and the social background of the popularity. She approached the subject from a broad perspective, and so her presentation will no doubt be beneficial for us to compile a pictorial reference of daily lives in China.

I myself gave a presentation on the collection of data for compiling a Korean version of such a pictorial dictionary, I mentioned that Shin Yun-bok's *Genre Painting Album by Hye-won* and Kim Hong-do's *Genre Painting Album by Dan-won* are quite significant for our work, and I chose *Banquet for the Governor of Pyongyang* in order to explain how to interpret the depiction of Pyongyang, which was regarded as a regional city in the Joseon Dynasty, as well as the culture of that city.

We received valuable feedback from two commentators. Prof. Mostow pointed out that illustrated materials don't merely depict facts. They have a sort of power which works on us to interpret and re-create them. So we need to verify the accuracy of such materials as we utilize those materials for compiling a pictorial dictionary. Our group has been discussing this issue, but we must think anew about it to complete the compilation. Prof. Trede addressed on the critical views of genre depictions seen in the cityscape paintings and genre painting produced in China and Korea. That relates to another issue: confirmation of materials' accuracy. She raised a fundamental question about whether we could treat illustrated materials as valid research material. Do the paintings of Chinese and Korean towns accurately reflect the reality? Is it reasonable to assume that illustrated materials, no matter how realistic they appear, can in fact be trusted on face value?

Kōno: The theme of the third session was tracing the migration of East Asian peoples through a comparative study of plow shapes, a rather broad effort. Prof. Watabe of Tōkai University gave a presentation on China; Emeritus Prof. Kim, of Inha University, presented the Korean case; and I discussed Japan. We asked Prof. Yin from Yunnan University for feedback. I'd say our session was well-organized, but I don't attribute that to my capabilities as a coordinator. The session was successful thanks to the cooperative efforts of everyone involved. We didn't spare very much time preparing for this session. Exchanging ideas and opinions on a daily basis, we've come to admire each other's expertise. So, we have a trusting relationship. Everybody was willing to give top priority to this symposium and make themselves available for this opportunity. That shows on how firm our relationship is. I suggested investigating the ancient racial migration, and everybody agreed. Our work isn't completed yet, and we'll further explore this theme. We intended to use this opportunity to report to each other how far we have reached. We will strive to make more progress from now on. In a lunch meeting after the session, we talked about holding a conference in China, which we hope to realize.

Hachikubo: The fourth session has just finished, so I won't summarize what's been discussed. Instead I'd like to comment on overall issues and challenges in the light of what other coordinators have brought up in this discussion. With this program, we undertake research on nonwritten materials with the premise that they can be used as means of understanding human history. In this regard three challenges have been presented to our group.

The first challenge is how we should analyze and interpret one of our research materials, the Shibusawa Films.

As Prof. Jung pointed out, certain mistakes and misunderstandings occur when we conduct research abroad without proper knowledge on the area. So, we must collaborate with local researchers. Furthermore, in order to understand human history, individual researchers must deepen their knowledge of language and geography. Even professors involved in this program need to do so.

The second issue is that of the publication of what we've studied. As Prof. Okuno suggested, what kind of problems are we going to have if we present it in the form of virtual reality, such as in a virtual museum. We have broken down our research effort into various smaller sections. To achieve our ultimate goal, we need to clarify them and how we go about attaining those individual goals.

The third point is the need to work together with other groups. Prof. Kim thankfully just mentioned this, and also the two commentators and the panelists in our group all emphasized the importance of this point. We must integrate the elements of our program such as illustrated materials and photographs and ethnic migration and geographic landscape. We need to fuse together or perhaps achieve a fruitification of the various types of materials we work on. We should keep in mind that we are working toward the very same goal even though we take different paths. We must have a clear idea about where we stand and our own point of view. Then, we have to figure out what we can accept and what we should overcome.

The panelists from Session 4 are still here, so if you have questions, please ask them directly. Thank you.

Kitahara: Thank you very much for summing up each session. Now I'd like each coordinator to discuss how we tackle issues common to all the groups which I know will be a hard task. Among the various problems raised in the fourth session, the issue of the relationship between photographs and illustrated materials concerns all of us. Prof. Hachikubo said even though we take different approaches to attaining the common goal, we have to come up with a method we can share while maintaining with awareness of our own stances. I'm sure all the groups have something to say about this issue, so I'd like each of you to tell us what will possibly hinder our efforts. Also, please give your opinion about the issues Prof. Matoba mentioned about how to disseminate our research, and also about the digital museum of anthropology.

Hachikubo: Regarding this matter, Prof. Okuno raised a question. So, I'd like him to refresh our memory, and I'll expand on it. How does that sound?

Kitahara: Well, that will take time so could you please briefly summarize what he said and make the point clear yourself?

Hachikubo: Session 4 has just finished, so I haven't really digested it yet. I'd like Prof. Okuno to repeat his comment.

Kitahara: Then, Prof. Okuno, could you please repeat your questions?

Okuno: I asked about illustrated materials and photographs. The Shibusawa Films only cover the 1930s, but now

we can take pictures of the same landscapes. Also, we can collect pictures taken between 1930 and now. To analyze landscapes, Prof. Fujinaga has been analyzing materials other than photographs including topographic maps. And, why have the photographs of the 1930s been used as the basis of exploring what villages, lifestyles, and landscapes were like in the past? How do we interpret those materials? We need to integrate and explain these points.

Hachikubo: Prof. Okuno's questions correspond to the third issue discussed earlier. Before deciding to use photographs to extract concrete information, we considered illustrated materials as an option. We've been trying to find differences between the two types of material, but I think there aren't any in broad terms. Illustrated materials were replaced with photographs in the 18th or 19th century. I discussed with Prof. Kim if they offer the same character. I haven't been able to come up with an answer, so I'd love to know what she thinks.

Kitahara: Now we'd like Prof. Kim to answer the question from Prof. Hachikubo as well as one from myself. In the second session, two panelists gave presentations on a pictorial dictionary, and Prof. Kim and Dr. Wang talked about the history of art. The participants in the former presentations explained what is depicted in paintings used for the pictorial dictionary and how to analyze them. The latter presentations discussed how illustrations were drawn, genealogical theory and how the theory has changed. These two topics might occasionally overlap, but I think the methods for analyzing materials are quite different. Nevertheless, there are some commonalities such as what was the intended subject of a given painting or a photograph and how to interpret such material. In other words, the intention of a painter or a photographer and what is captured in an illustrations or pictures are involved in the creation of both types of materials. Prof. Kim, we'd appreciate if you could give us an insight of these issues.

Kim: First I'd like to answer the question, "What are the commonalities between photographs and illustrated materials?" Regarding the presentations of Prof. Fujinaga and Prof. Hamada, the points that impressed me most are the importance of considering the intentions of the individual who took the photos, and the question of how we should use pictures that don't reflect the taker's intention. These points raise the issue of whether photographs and illustrated materials accurately capture reality or not. The COE Program, especially Group 1 and Group 3, have common task related to the interpretation of materials which call for deliberate, critical analysis. From Prof. Rieu's presentation, I learned something important. That is, in Europe before the advent of modern art in the 19th century, looking at drawings was like reading text materials. Until then some sort of icons were attached to portraits and landscape paintings, and there were underlying stories behind these pieces of art. So, looking at paintings, whether they were landscapes or portraits, meant interpreting icons which signify such stories and understanding the stories. We can say the same thing about East Asian art. We can say that Japanese picture scrolls in particular rely on stories as background because they are originally based on the stories and paintings come with texts. The most important thing in compiling a pictorial dictionary is to take a step backward from such stories. If there are stories behind photographs, then they indicate the takers' intentions. The existence of underlying stories which reflect the creators' intentions is what's common between photographs and illustrated materials.

It was pointed out that analyzing illustrated materials from the standpoint of the history of art seems quite different from the approach Prof. Fukuta and Prof. Tajima have taken. We must be aware that analyzing illustrated materials from an artistic perspective doesn't differ from analyzing them for the purpose of compiling a pictorial dictionary. As an expert in the history of art I was very surprised when I joined Group 1 in compiling a pictorial dictionary. At first I strongly resisted the idea of cutting up into parts the daily life captured in a painting. But, I've come to realize that a wealth of information about the daily life of a given era is hidden in the small details of a painting, which art history experts tend to miss. Given a painting, researchers in the field examine things like its composition, the intention of the painter, and when it was drawn. However, to compile a pictorial dictionary we look at paintings from a different angle and thereby expand their potential.

Kitahara: Thank you very much, Prof. Kim. At this point we must wonder if it is acceptable to look at a painting as a sum of its parts rather than as a whole. What do you think, Prof. Matoba?

Matoba: I think like this Prof. Rieu pointed out that drawing technique changed in the 17th or 18th century. Before that, drawings represented icons or stories, but after the change, paintings, especially Dutch Art, started to depict landscapes. These paintings were drawn based on the idea that they could be realistic or that things could be coded objectively. So, painters of the era could draw objects as they were, and people could objectively interpret them as they were. The Encyclopedists of the 18th century also had the same idea, as I mentioned in my presentation. And, this idea led to the realization of syntactic code. People realized that objectivity could be attained through paintings. Based on the premise that the idea of depicting things and people naturally and realistically hence describing details accurately as they existed in the 18th century and based on the assumption that painters' perception of the reality was accurate, we can provide explanations about drawings of the era by using the syntactic code. But, the problem is that such point of view often changes. In the 19th century such realism was replaced by Impressionism, and people no longer drew paintings as if a camera lens had captured the reality. The way of perceiving objects or point of view changed. As I mentioned in my presentation, human perception is subject to contradiction and change as seen in philosophical changes after the emergence of Edmund Husserl. When looking into drawings of a given era, it's important to take into account when and where they were drawn. Even more important is to think about the painter's approach to art and how he or she tried to draw the painting. That's what looking at a picture as a whole means. We have to consider whether a painter intended to accurately capture reality rather than how each component reflects the reality. For example, we saw some drawings of cities in yesterday's presentation. How were they able to draw such paintings even though airplanes had not been invented? How did they draw landscape paintings seen from mountains without climbing them? It's not until we clarify the intentions of the painter that we can discuss the nature of the painting's objectivity. That's why I suggested we give thought to the painter's point of view.

Kitahara: Thank you, Prof. Matoba. This is a different issue, but in the third session ancient paintings were presented as well as archeological materials. That relates to the issue just discussed. Although the group has been studying materials of a different time and place, it also faces the same problem. Can they assume those materials accurately convey reality? Prof. Kono considers them archeological materials as well as the subjects of

investigation. Prof. Kono, could you follow up on the discussion here by telling us what issues have been raised in your group regarding illustrated materials?

Kōno: Sure. I started to work on folk implements at a museum 26 years ago. I've also been studying *Shiki Kōsaku Zu* or the Four Seasons Farming. It is not the study of the history of art. We look into whether a given painting can be used as material that can tell us something about the history of agricultural technology. That is like answering a true or false question. Japanese culture originates from China, and drawings on farming in each season started around 1340 when a collection of paintings called *Kōshokuzu* or Chinese Farming and Weaving was imported. Drawings by the painters of the Kano school like Morikage Kusumi appear to depict farming villages in Japan, but they were simply replications of Chinese drawings. In extreme cases, Japanese artists just painted Japanese clothes onto the Chinese characters. That's why it is imperative for researchers in the field to identify whether drawings are accurate or not, something which art experts are poor at doing, and that is why I am looking at actual agricultural implements in my research. There was a technique called *funpon* which means merely copying a model painting, and it is dangerous to use such materials for our study. As I studied the Four Seasons Farming, I found out that the number of such models available during the Edo Period from 1603 to 1867 was limited. The most popular model was *Ehon Tsūhōshi* or the Illustrated Book of the Record of Treasures published in Ōsaka in the early 1700s, and it was used throughout the country. Therefore, a painting on a folding screen found in northern Japan may not accurately reflect farming in the region. Furthermore, there is a votive picture in Ōita Prefecture which is almost identical to a picture drawn based on life in the Ōsaka area. Why did this kind of thing happen? These paintings depict farming villages, so farmers who saw them should have been able to tell they were inaccurate. Nevertheless, why were those paintings accepted? Artisans who drew them weren't familiar with or interested in farming. They were sensitive to the trends of their time but paid little attention to farmers' folkways. So, even if they received an order for a painting of farm scenes, they couldn't draw it so they copied a model. Why did farmers accept these paintings? Even though drawings contained in the Four Seasons Farming portrayed agriculture, the culture of such drawing originally started in Kyōto, the political and cultural capital. So, such paintings were considered sophisticated. Farmers in rural areas were satisfied as long as a famous artisan drew a painting for them and they didn't care about its accuracy.

Anyway, *Ehon Tsūhōshi* was the most popular model book, followed in popularity by paintings in *Onna Daigaku Takarabako* or a Treasure Box for the Greater Learning for Women. There were only a few other books used as models. As I mentioned earlier, there weren't so many model books available. That means paintings that don't imitate these models accurately capture the landscape and culture of a given region. This discovery has made our assessment of the validity of drawings fairly accurate.

Kitahara: Thank you, Prof. Kōno. What you said applies to Prof. Tajima's group working on the analysis of *Nōgyō Zue* or *Pictures of Farmers and Their Lives*. Now we'd like to invite opinions from the audience. So far we've discussed how to present the information we've obtained through our studies. In the first session, Prof. Rieu suggested the fusion of a library and a museum: virtual reality or digital anthropology. The last commentator, Prof. Okuno also commented on the issue. We also talked over more specific topics including when the digital version of the Shibusawa Films will be posted and what kind of challenges that will present. First I'd like each coordinator

and panelist to give an opinion about these issues. This is a valuable opportunity to exchange opinions, so I'd like each of you to briefly explain what you've been working on, how you can publicize your achievement. Then, we'll invite questions and suggestions from the audience regarding how to present the information and our program itself. Let's start with Prof. Hachikubo.

Hachikubo: As I mentioned earlier, our primary challenge is the way we define a region. There was a question from the audience about how to define Japan, and we need to find the answer. Prof. Kōno's group divided China into 9 regions. I think how we geographically divide a certain country or region is important. In yesterday's presentation which dealt with the painting of the Pyongyang city, the area was referred as a regional city. It might have been so in the Joseon Dynasty. But, it was the capital during the Goguryeo Dynasty, and paintings drawn in the era depict the place accordingly. We've been trying to determine if we should define a country or region by today's division in order to deal with materials of the past. Prof. Kōno's group used terms like urban town and rural village when explaining how paintings spread. But, the concept of urban and rural varied depending on regions such as Japan, Europe, and the New World. We are struggling to find a way to define regions geographically.

Kitahara: Prof. Hachikubo, you didn't mention about how to publish our achievement.

Hachikubo: So, to present the products of our study, we have to determine the method of dividing the contents in terms of geography.

Kitahara: I see.

Kōno: Regarding how to present our work, our group has been facing a difficult situation. I go to museums and reference libraries to see study materials, but reference libraries are generally closed to the public. In the beginning they don't let me in, making an excuse that they haven't sorted out their materials yet. I have to beg for permission to take pictures of their materials. In return they expect me to assess the importance of their folk implements because they don't understand the nature of those tools. That's our unspoken mutual understanding. I'm welcome to publish my work as long as my report touches on the significance of their materials. It would be a betrayal of trust to publicize data without mentioning their historical and academic importance. I believe such information is something reference libraries should organize and publish themselves. In 13 months right after the COE Program started in August 2003, I visited 174 reference libraries in the northern part of Japan and took a lot of pictures. But, the photographs can't be published as raw data. I must say it will be very difficult for our group to develop a database.

Kitahara: Our work doesn't have to be presented in the form of database. We can write a paper first.

Kōno: Yes, that's the right order.

Kitahara: We can publish our work in various forms, but we have to think about the issue Prof. Kōno has just pointed out. That is, it's not straightforward to carry out analysis of materials we don't own. This problem applies to illustrated materials as well. Prof. Kim, what's your opinion?

Kim: Yes, Group 1 is facing the same situation. The illustrated materials we are working on are copyrighted, except for Japanese paintings of the early modern period. Compiling a pictorial dictionary itself is a painstaking task, so I'd say we've been struggling against myriad difficulties. We also need to consider how to present our achievement urgently. What we are working on is a type of dictionary. To make it user-friendly, it would be ideal to create a database and post it on the Web.

Kitahara: If that's the case, have you already obtained consent from the owners of the materials?

Kim: Yes, for most Japanese materials on the early modern period. For a Chinese version of the pictorial dictionary we've been using a collection of picture scrolls called *Koso Hankazu* or the *Paintings of Thriving Suzhou*, which depicts what the city of Suzhou was like in the 18th century. It belongs to the Liaoning Provincial Museum in Shenyang City. We need to get their official permission to use it for compiling the pictorial dictionary. We've conducted research to examine their materials twice, and at that time we told them that we'd like to use their materials for a pictorial dictionary and publish it. As for the Korean pictorial dictionary, most paintings belong to the National Museum of Korea, so I don't think we'll have a big problem getting their consent.

Kitahara: So, you'll be able to develop and publicize a database, won't you?

Kim: Well, we'll try our best.

Kitahara: Now it's your turn, Prof. Matoba.

Matoba: I haven't really done anything, concretely so with less vested interest, I feel I can be irresponsible and say whatever I want. Please keep that in mind. As for a virtual museum we have to clear the issue of copyright of tangible, concrete materials, photographs, and paintings before publishing. This problem will be very difficult to handle. Yesterday Prof. Kitsukawa said there is a difference between real things and fakes, and the former are much more powerful. He also remarked that a virtual world is fake. Virtual world is rather fake one. Anyway, developing a virtual museum means we create fakes, which we can touch and even break. It will have nothing to do with a copy right to expose a fake in such a virtual world. Copy right is very important problem. Say when we write an article in a paper, where does the copyright belong to? If we only collect and present a material document, its copyright belongs to its owner. But we have copy right, if we reinterpret and add any new conclusion. We can have right to expose such a new method. Can we use this definition of copyright and expose anything to a virtual world? We can add motion to a painting in a virtual museum, a person's action for example. In my opinion, we don't have to worry about the copyright of the original painting because we can say that we own the copyright of this newly created version.

Another possibility is mapping, or I should say a culture map. Prof. Rieu said it would be the most reasonable thing to develop. Like the study on folk implements presented today, various individual research activities are completed. The next task is to lump them together into cultural groups to create a set of what could be called cultural nations which is to say a group of borders can be defined. That is what Kanagawa University does best, providing high quality research product. For the purpose of presenting our work in a concrete way, we can make a map based on our various researches. If we can find a way of consolidating such maps, that will be exactly what we are trying to accomplish. We don't have to worry about copyright to create them. For folk implements, it was shown in today's presentation that we could trace the migration of East Asian people, so we should post the work on the Internet. By adopting methods like this we can probably work out the copyright issue.

Kitahara: Prof. Matoba prefaced his remarks with the suggestion he could say whatever he wants, but his opinion is encouraging. The success of our studies greatly depends on our efforts. By making efforts, we can expand our possibilities. In a reception yesterday Prof. Rieu said it would be a significant work if we could develop a cultural map that extends beyond nationalities, the concept of politically constructed nations. I was very impressed by his words. It will be quite interesting to go into that direction. Up to now we've talked about the nature of materials we have and how to present them. We still have some time left, so now we'd like to invite questions and suggestions of the audience. We'll incorporate your opinions into our studies. Please feel free to give us your comments.

Raffin: I'm Christina Raffin from the University of British Columbia. I'm probably the least knowledgeable about nonwritten materials, so I feel bad to be the first to speak out. First of all thank you very much for inviting me to this symposium. I'm not a panelist or commentator. I'm here as the representative of an affiliated university. But, I hope my opinion will count. As Prof. Trede said, I'm looking forward to the completion of the pictorial dictionary. It may be hard to create a virtual museum, but it will be extremely helpful if we can view the pictorial dictionary or the data you have from inside and outside of Japan. We can use them for both undergraduate and graduate programs.

I'd like to mention one more point even though I'm not sure if I can put it in words well. I think how to distinguish nonwritten materials and written materials is a critical issue, and I'll think about it when I go back to my country. But, I think there is another important issue. It hasn't been raised in this symposium, but I'm sure everybody working on the projects is aware of it. It's an issue of underlying politics. I mean power relationships. We encounter the problem in various ways. In terms of language, how do you define nonwritten materials? If you are to go beyond national borders, how will you convey the connotation of a given expression? When I hear the expression folk implements, for example, common tools we are familiar with come to in my mind. I wonder if that's the right connotation. We also have to think about a gender issue. It was mentioned a few times in Prof. Kim's presentation. There is a power relationship regarding gender, and a painter's point of view on the issue is reflected in a painting. It also surfaces when we use drawings as study material. Furthermore, a quarter of the participants in this symposium are female, so the gender issue is important. Can we objectively see paintings through systematically compiling them or through focusing on only a part of a drawing? I'm very skeptical about that. For example, when I saw the photographs of South Korea taken in the 1930s, I wanted to know the political

situation of the time and the intention of the Japanese people who took the trouble to go there and take the pictures. I don't think it's right to cut these unseen factors from paintings and photographs and merely use them as research material.

Another point we have to think about is the difference between nonwritten materials and written materials. I'm still not sure to what extent we can distinguish between them. As long as we can clarify the difference, that will be enough. If you try to define nonwritten materials and written materials universally, there will be always someone who says, "That's not right in my field." So, you should stick with your own definition suitable for your purpose. That's what I think. Please excuse my blunt opinion.

Kitahara: Thank you, Prof. Raffin. She pointed out that we need to consider why a painting was drawn or why a photograph was taken as well as the politics behind it. It's a matter of intention and an underlying system.

Raffin: It's not only about who drew a painting or took a picture and what is captured. I'm saying how far we have to think about underlying politics to use such materials in our time.

Kitahara: Yes, and she also brought up a gender issue. Then, she questioned the connotation of Mingu (folk implements). Prof. Kōno, could you answer her concerns about that word?

Kōno: I think it's time to reconsider the traditional definition of "Mingu (folk implements). We can think about how it's interpreted in other languages later on when we make more progress. For now let's not worry about it, and let it be. We don't want to force our definition.

Kitahara: That's not a complete answer, but it's enough for now. Now let's move on to the gender issue. Prof. Kim, in the pictorial dictionary you are working on, is there any relevant section?

Kim: It's definitely something we have to think about. Let's put aside how we reflect it in the pictorial dictionary for now. We should pay a close attention to how women are depicted in paintings we use for the pictorial dictionary. Dr. Wang and Prof. Trede mentioned that women don't appear in *Qingming shanghe tu* (*Up to the River on the Qingming Festival*), painted during the Northern Song Dynasty and its copied versions produced after the era. From the Qing Dynasty, women gradually started to appear in paintings of towns. But, the absence of women doesn't indicate the social structure and life of the time. Rather, it reflects the mentality of patrons. It's been argued that painters drew ideal female figures and ideal scenes of daily life as patrons wished. Definitely we should also consider analyzing our materials critically from a gender perspective as well.

Kitahara: Thank you. Any other comments?

Matoba: Yes. This issue is exactly what I've been saying. Whenever we try to understand and interpret something, individual and societal value judgments play a role. That is politics. For example, I'm an individual male. I have to detach myself from these two factors and try not to be a male individual. Then, I can realize how the society

sees me. The word Jomin, which means common people, is used in the name of our institute. How and when did it come to be used? The institute was given the name in the 1920s. At that time, other synonyms for referring to common people such as proletariat, Jinmin (the public), and Minshū (the masses) were also commonly used. So, why was Jōmin (common people) chosen? We have to find an answer. The word Mingu (folk implements) is the same. And, how do we define folk implements? In addition, folk implements were used to serve some purpose, and we have to find out what it was. It is questionable to use these materials without analyzing the underlying politics or what's behind them.

Kim: I missed to answer one of the questions raised from Prof. Raffin, so please let me answer it additionally now. She asked if objectivity exists in a selected part of a painting. The act of cutting out a part from a whole illustration is not necessarily objective. So are such selected parts. Rather, in analyzing picture scrolls to compile a pictorial dictionary, it's our method to give objectivity to a certain component.

Kitahara: Please keep that in mind.

Female Audience Member: I'm a novice in this field, so please excuse me if my question confuses you. Nonwritten or written, regardless of the nature of materials, we want to benefit from the method for understanding the magnitude of human culture our ancestors cultivated. Prof. Jung said the picture of Imjado represents a special occasion, not ordinary life. Without her comment, we wouldn't have known that. So, I thought we should all be careful to interpret materials regardless of whether we are the ones who collect data or the ones who view finished work. In another presentation landscape photographs were introduced. To identify where they were taken, researchers use as clues man-made and natural objects which have remained untouched including hills and railways. But, hills can be leveled, and railways can be rerouted. So, we shouldn't be too dependent on such landmarks any longer. I think you should speed up the analysis of the Shibusawa Films.

Kitahara: Here is a warning to us. Can we manage that?

Hachikubo: I didn't have a chance to say this when we were talking about how to publicize our work. But, we have to overcome many obstacles in order to publish 4000 photographs we have collected. In case the photographer is alive, or the ownership of a photograph belongs to someone, we need to clear copyright before using it for commercial purposes. I know we have a time limit to complete our work, and we will take the warning seriously. That's all I can say for now.

Kitahara: Then, are there any other suggestions or questions?

Tsuda: Listening to all the presentations and comments for two days, I've got an impression that everybody is saying the same thing in different ways. It's about publication of the materials. It seems to me all the professors and commentators are saying the materials won't be published for a while. You are simply telling us you won't publicize your work until a clear framework is established. Prof. Rieu suggested a free, online encyclopedia, but I

think he tried to convey a totally different message. His suggestion sparked up the discussion, and other panelists and commentators talked about how to publish the pictorial dictionary and the Shibusawa Films. You should post them on the Web and ask for others' opinions. You should show to the public your stance as well as raw data. Then we can post our opinions about them. It goes without saying that your work has holes because experts in narrow fields are working on it. You should incorporate public opinions. Of course you need to manage the Web site well so that it won't be chaotic, but it's not hard to launch such a site. If you don't hurry up and identify where the Shibusawa Films were taken, people who know something about them will die out. But, there might be someone in Korea who knows about them. Even though the photographs depict the landscapes of 70 years ago, the scenery might have remained the same until 20 years ago. Or, it might not be so difficult to pinpoint where the pictures were taken. Anyway, it is a waste of time and effort for novices to go there and blindly try. To get opinions and suggestions from as many people as possible, you shouldn't hesitate to publish the data.

Kitahara: Thank you very much for your opinion. The point was that we should be able to publicize our data immediately. As many panelists reported, we have to clear the issue of copyright first of all. To publish copyrighted materials like the Shibusawa Films, we must obtain permission from copyright holders. It may seem we aren't going anywhere, but we are doing our best. How soon we can post the data depends on the paperwork as well, but everybody is expecting us to publish at least a list of the Shibusawa Films. Other materials are the same. That should be an immediate goal of each group.

Tsuda: That's right. But, it sounds like you are using the copyright matter as an excuse to buy some time. I'm somewhat involved in this program, so I shouldn't be saying this. When I visit reference libraries, I'm often told that I can't see the materials because they haven't been sorted out. You are saying the same thing. There is no copyright on paintings of the Early Modern Period, so why not hurry to publish them soon? You can show us how you've been working on your project. You also can explain how you choose those material, number it, and give a name to it yourself. Why don't you give others a chance to do that? That may lead you in a totally new direction. I would like to say that you have to get started pretty soon; otherwise, such work will lose its appeal. You have to be the first to do this sort of thing.

Kitahara: In other words, the flow of information should be two-way. That's what we should go for. It's going to take forever if we complete each work on our own and then publish it.

Matoba: I'd like to be frank and add a comment. Within our project we don't know what other groups are doing. We aren't interactive. We should publish our work and gather information and opinions from a larger population. That way we can do all sorts of things as long as the copyright issue isn't involved. Our work is premised on individual research, and we've merely put individual works together and called the aggregation "comprehensive" research. But, actually people around the world are taking part in the aggregated work, so we should abandon the premise. It will be nice if our work expands into a new direction, but now it's just a collection of individual researches.

Kitahara: That was a very incisive comment. It's hard to tell how it's going to be received, but we can't open up to the outside unless we first interact with one another within the program. So, we should take the comment seriously. Well, we are running out of time, so the next person will be the last.

Male Audience Member: I understand that you receive a grant to study nonwritten materials. But, listening to this discussion, I've found that you are focusing on nonwritten materials too much. Written materials have been studied for a very long time, so the research methodology is firmly established and advanced. So, you have to take advantage of it. As done with written materials, you should first critically analyze illustrated materials, folk implements, and photographs. For paintings used for the pictorial dictionary, you should explain which source book or copy you are using and why you've chosen it. You probably didn't talk about them because that would be too technical, but that's the most important thing to do. Furthermore, you seem to merely look at paintings which are works of the modern period. In one of the presentations, it was mentioned that there are stories behind paintings drawn up to the early modern period, and thus they are similar to written materials. I'd say they have an entertainment aspect, too. By looking at what is captured in such a painting, we must discern technical rules and a pattern used. We can no longer understand *ukiyo-e* (Japanese woodblock prints) because we don't know the technical rules and patterns which give it meaning. Haiku poetry is also a form of literature which has technical rules and a pattern. Literary and art works have an entertainment aspect, and we have to look into it. The basis of paintings and calligraphy is copying originals. You need to keep that in mind when analyzing your materials. In the East, paintings and calligraphy belong to the same field in terms of theory and classification. According to today's Nippon Decimal Classification, paintings and calligraphy aren't classified in the same category. But, originally in the East, they were considered to belong to the same category, and they are both considered written materials. You shouldn't neglect this point. That's what I wanted to say after listening to all the sessions this year and last year.

Kitahara: Thank you. The same idea was suggested by our panelists, so we will embody it in our research. And, that was a very valuable comment, so each of us must accept it with proper attention. I'd like commentators' feedback before we close this discussion.

Matoba: We make a distinction between written materials and nonwritten materials for the purpose of our research. However, nonwritten materials don't exist without written materials. We are immersed in the world of written materials. So, naturally the basis of our research is written materials. But, in studying nonwritten materials, I'm hoping to discover something beyond the scope of written materials. It won't be easy to make such a discovery, but our study is an ambitious one. I think it is important to pursue our research in this spirit of ambition. But, we should of course take advantage of methods and knowledge accumulated up to now. I've been working on this project in the hope that we can discover things which haven't been revealed through traditional methods.

Kim: We've received a very inspiring opinion regarding our project of compiling the pictorial dictionary and the illustrated material themselves. We'll bear it firmly in mind as we continue our efforts. I believe our group has chosen source materials which serve our purpose, and we've been discussing over and over about how to deal

with replicas and a technical style which has been passed down from master to student. But I didn't go into details in this symposium. It is true that the existence of the reproductions of originals is a vital issue in the field of Asian art, and we have to be prudent when using such materials, particularly when considering the application of *funpon* in painting. In compiling a pictorial dictionary, we pursue objectivity and authenticity. So, we'll strive to extract facts from source materials.

Matoba: I think that we should find some possibility of new method of nonwritten materials, because our research is based on nonwritten ones rather than written ones.

Anyway we should clearly define the conception what nonwritten materials are. It will be probably no useful to use them as supporting evidence.

Kōno: I'd like to raise a point that I wanted to discuss earlier. Prof. Matoba suggested that we interpret nonwritten materials beyond the syntactic code. Well, for the purpose of this discussion if we say that his group is the Theory Group, then the rest of us form the Working Group. There is a huge gap between these two. We are supposed to "read" and decipher nonwritten materials. In my definition that means extracting information from nonwritten materials and encoding it into the syntactic code. Then, we can put written materials and nonwritten materials in the same arena. I mean we can link them together. I believe that's a common view among the panelists and commentators. One of the commentators asked, "The cigarette store next to the bridge was supposedly managing the bridge. Is there supporting evidence?" This question shows that this person has the same view. The syntactic code is science, or I should say a scientific theory we've accumulated. Everybody in this program follows this method in order to validate what is captured in past materials. To put our work together, we also have to adopt this scientific approach. I believe it's the only valid way. But, to determine how we actually publish our work, we should take Prof. Matoba's approach. That's what I think.

Kitahara: I don't know how to put these opposing views together. I guess you can see that there is such a big gap within our program. Please wait and see how much progress we make over the next year. Finally, I'd like to get the final word from Prof. Hachikubo.

Hachikubo: From my point of view it seems that everybody is paying close attention to the chronological issue. But spatial issues such as geographical divisions, defining countries, and languages have been ignored. For example, We cannot forget that the terms South Korea and North Korea are very different as both labels and as placenames. Of course it may be that it is my specialty that makes me think this but. We need to be more sensitive about difference of spatial concept such as Koryo, *Chosen*, and Korea. I'd really appreciate if Prof. Matoba could sort out these spatial issues.

Kitahara: It's a shame that we have to end this discussion now even though the problems the COE Program is facing have just been revealed. But our time has run out, so please accept these honest opinions as the conclusion of our discussion. Thank you very much for listening to us. We really appreciate that you've taken part in this two-day symposium. We'd like to consider all the issues raised here and incorporate them into our studies. We

look forward to seeing you again next year. Thank you very much again.