OUKA
Osaka University Knowledge Archive

Title	待兼山論叢　美学編　第34号　SUMMARIES
Author(s)	
Citation	待兼山論叢. 美学篇. 2000, 34, p. 23-26
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/48197
rights	
Note	

Osaka University Knowledge Archive : OUKA

https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/

Osaka University

SUMMARIES

Literature and Language

—The Meaning in Verbal Art—

Noriyuki KURAMOTO

We try to consider the concept of literary work from the viewpoint of language.

Jean-Paul Sartre regards the language as the means of literary work. He requires that literature makes use of prose, which he calls 'instrumental language'. According to him, poetry is eliminated from literature.

Contrary to Sartre, Roman Jakobson regards the language as the end of literary work. He illustrates the concept of poetry with the 'poetic function' of language. His poetics makes all the literary works belong to the realm of poetry.

These two theorists lead us to reflect on the relationship between language and sign. We suppose the contrast between significative language and non-significative language. While the former, which Sartre's theory concerns, comprises both signifier and meaning, the latter, which Jakobson's theory concerns, lacks meaning.

We suppose another contrast between verbal sign and non-verbal sign. The relationship between them deeply influences the concept of verbal art. While the former contains the articulate meaning, the latter, which naturally connects its object, contains the natural meaning.

Though the articulateness of meaning sometimes opposes the art in general, we characterize the concept of literary work as the art which transmits meaning most articulately.

On Tsunetomi Kitano's *Michiyuki*

Yuri KAWANISHI

A pair of screens commonly referred to today as *Michiyuki* originally entitled *Asatsuyu* by Tsunetomi Kitano (1880-1947), was rejected by Bunten in 1913. According to the painter, the theme of *Asatsuyu* was *Shinju Ten no Amijima* by Chikamatsu.

The pose of the figures and the allegory show that Tsunetomi was influenced by Seiki Kuroda. The decadent atmosphere of this work indicates the influence of Western art in the end of 19th century. Tsunetomi was a member of "Le Masque", which broadened his knowledge of Western art. In addition to contemporary art, Tsunetomi was well versed in traditional Japanese painting. He used techniques such as metal foil backing (*ura-haku*), or raised coloring (*moriage-saishiki*) in his recapitulation of the early genre-painting of the Kinsei period.

Considering the rejection of *Asatsuyu*, we might recognize many aspects of Japanese art in the early 20th century. Some period critics referred to the relation between art and morality, and pointed out that society was intolerant of extraordinary individuals. *Asatsuyu* was regarded as immoral or too shocking of a painting for Bunten, where graceful but stereotyped works were admired. Tsunetomi seems to

have aimed to disturb the conservatism of Bunten by submitting this challenging work.

Reception of Max Reinhardt to Japan

— On the case of Osanai Kaoru —

Noriko OBAYASHI

Max Reinhardt played an important role in European and American theatre at the biginning of the 20th century. And also in Japan his name and productions were known to the people related to theatrical reform movement at that time. Particularly Osanai Kaoru contributed to introduce the art of Max Reinhardt to Japan.

Osanai was an important person in the movement. He studied the theory and practice of European major directors, including that of Max Reinhardt. So it seems that he regarded Reinhardt as his ideal director.

We can point out that there were three steps in reception of Max Reinhardt to Japan. First step was only from documentaly materials in 1900's, for example newspaper, books and so on. Next one was in 1912. Some Japaniese went to Europe to inspect Reinhardt's productions. At last in 1920's the understanding of Reinhardt fixed and spread in Japan. It is interesting to rethink on the reception of Max Reinhardt to Japan.

Mythos and Logos

Hiroshi KATO

The most characteristic feature of the Greek religion is perhaps its anthropomorphism. But did the Greeks believe in such a simple faith? Xenophanes, Heraclitus, especially Plato violently attacked this religion from the standpoint of Logos. Did Mythos perish in front of such an attack?

According to W. F. Otto, the authentic Mythos cannot be reached by means of Logos and reveals the truth of the existence in the shape. In addition, this embodied truth in the shape becomes the word through the Muses. Therefore, in order to arrive at the truth of Mythos, man must listen to the relevation from the Muses. Human beings cannot acquire their shape until the truth of the existence in the word is revealed to them in the shape. Then the Greek religion is not anthropomorphic but theomorphic.

Plato's attack on the poets is based on his assault upon the religion. But the poetical inspiration leads him to the truth of Mythos. Certainly, it is from his standpoint of Logos that he attacks on the imitation of the poets in the Republic 10. But it is obvious that he gains access to the truth of Mythos by identifying the philosophy with the greatest music (the art of the Muses).