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Abstract
Fans relate to their objects of interest in numerous ways, far more complex than the simple devotion so often expected of them. These ways bear comparison with the religious impulses which led to the use of the word “fan” in the first place, and yet they extend also into different areas. Even though definitions of fans based on essentialist discourses of personal differences are mistaken, and better replaced by considering fan behaviour and attitudes, the lens of identity is one way in which fan impulses are expressed, along with the pursuits of pleasure and knowledge. Underlying all of these is the attachment towards the fan object which operates on the level of affect. Examples of these can be observed in the response to the 50th anniversary of the TV show Doctor Who in 2013.

Introduction
The popular conception of a “fan” is of someone who very much likes something. The word commonly has connotations of uncritical admiration. There is thus often confusion when “fans” express extremely negative opinions about the thing they are supposed to be fans of (henceforth termed the “fan object”). It is clear that the relationship between fan and object is more complex than the popular conception, and is certainly more than uncritical admiration. Previous papers have explored the extent to which this kind of relationship is increasingly prominent in contemporary discourse thanks to the influence of the internet (Mason, 2012), and how the fan relationship can be found in an extraordinarily wide, though often interconnected, range of areas (Mason, 2013).

This paper will begin to explore the relationship between fan and fan object in more detail. An understanding of the relationship can help us obtain a more generalized understanding of the ways in which we interact with and approach culture. That this goes far beyond the relatively superficial relationship implied by the word “consumption” should be already evident, though in the wake of Baudrillard, such an approach has become increasingly influential (Sandvoss,
2005). The task will be to explore some of the dimensions of the human response to culture. The response is approached through the concept of “affect,” which as Grossberg (1992) explains, is a constructive understanding of mood: “Affect is what gives ‘color,’ ‘tone’ or ‘texture’ to our experiences.” (p. 57).

Problems

The first problem to overcome is approaching the field. As already noted, it is extremely wide-ranging and ill-defined. Exploring every niche of fandom would require such an investment of time and other resources that it would likely preclude any depth of analysis. Conversely, choosing one area and claiming that it is representative is methodologically indefensible. This paper will adopt a compromise. Fan response to the Doctor Who television program will be considered in depth, and the results compared with research on other fields. The choice of Doctor Who here has been made for a number of reasons. Firstly, in 2013 the programme celebrated its 50th anniversary; the resulting blitz of programming led to a correspondingly massive wave of fan activity. Secondly, the programme allows international comparisons. The 50th anniversary special was broadcast simultaneously in 94 nations, and shown in cinemas in many (Japan, thanks to perverse programming decisions by NHK several years ago, was not one of the 94). Thirdly, Doctor Who has for many years had both an active fandom, and scholarship related to that fandom (see, for example, Tulloch & Alvarado, 1983). Finally, I have considerable personal experience both of the programme itself, and of its associated fandom.

The latter point may be considered controversial in an academic context. Nevertheless, when the academic ideal of objectivity leads to ignorance of the subject matter under examination, it is hard to defend that ideal. One of the leading proponents of fan studies has addressed this issue: “To me, the essence of being methodologically self-conscious is to be honest about how you know what you know. And most of what I am writing about here I know from the inside out.” (Jenkins, 2006) In my case, I have watched the Doctor Who television programme since the late 1960s. Moreover, two coincidences in my background provide me with knowledge of the field without an active involvement: I attended university with three leading fans of Doctor Who, all of whom went on to write supplementary material for the programme. Furthermore, in my first job upon graduation, my two immediate superiors were both involved: one as a fan with little involvement in the community of Doctor Who fandom, and the other, subsequently, as the editor of the associated range of books. Thus I am fully prepared for research into the world of Doctor Who, even though I never participated in an active manner within its fandom.

On the other hand, scholarship in this field has fallen victim to the recent realization that academia cannot be “objective” in the sense of not taking sides. Failure to evaluate the object of
study implicitly endorses the status quo, which is, in itself, taking sides. Thus the field of cultural studies within which fan studies operate has assertively identified “problematic” areas (to such an extent that this word risks becoming a parodic emblem), and fan studies has been co-opted into cultural, economic, racial and gender critiques. This is hardly a bad thing in itself; on the other hand when academics are doing this out of embarrassment at examining the “frivolous”, “pleasure-orientated” aspects of fandom, they risk eviscerating their own analysis.

Zubemis and Larsen (2012, p. 228) note the lack of attention paid to emotion in fan theory. The great lengths to which fan studies often go to explain fan response in terms of cultural production, socio-political antagonisms and counter-readings are all very well, but surely it is dangerous to fail to examine the apparently obvious conclusion that fans are in pursuit of pleasure? Would it not be preferable to explore this pleasure, both to understand more deeply how it interacts with the aforementioned “serious” concerns, and in its own right. Karl Marx famously derided religion as the “opium of the people”. Surely, if this is true, it is even more important to examine the appeal, both of opium and religion?

The reluctance to examine affect also derives from a long-held insistence on the separation of emotional and cognitive systems. In the light of recent developments in the field of cognitive psychology, however, such a position is indefensible.

Emotions have long been conceived of as arising from a functionally separate system that is at best orthogonal to, or, more likely, at odds with effective reasoning and intellectual functioning. This view has been supplanted by an emerging acknowledgement of the elaborately coordinated interactions and, indeed, indispensable collaboration between the cognitive and affective systems. (Bodenhausen, Mussweiler, Gabriel, & Moreno, 2001)

The fan’s emotional connection with the fan object is part of this collaboration between cognitive and affective systems. And it is intimately connected with the formation of identity.

The meaning of fan

The most widely accepted origin of the term “fan” is that it is an abbreviation of “fanatic”, and that it was originally applied to baseball aficionados in late 19th century America (Jenkins, 1992). “Fanatic,” in turn, comes to us from Latin, in which it is cognate with fanum, a religious shrine or sanctum. Thus, we can understand that there is a religious overlay to the sense in which it was used when it entered the English language in the 16th century, to indicate a person prone to madness, frenzy or excessive enthusiasm. Indeed, as with the word “enthusiasm” itself, it formerly indicated the idea of possession by a god or spirit. Its use was generally pejorative, seemingly motivated by fear of behaviour considered beyond normative standards.
Although it has softened considerable, some of this pejorative connotation remains. “Fans” have often been considered socially deviant, with their excessive attachment to the fan object treated as a stigma. On the other hand, fans themselves have embraced the term for self-labelling. A point of comparison may be made here with the (later) appropriation of the term “queer” by those with alternative sexual orientations. The appropriation has been considered such a significant development that the term “Queer Theory” was adopted (de Lauretis, 1991) for a branch of post-structuralist theory which questions essentialism, as well as notions of normality and deviance. ¹

Unsurprisingly, Queer Theory is one of the prisms through which fan activity has been examined. Since the notion of the fan has been constructed as a challenge to societal norms, it has been subjected to intense scrutiny and analysis to see what it can tell us about those norms, and about the deviance they imply. In the case of the fan, one specific deviance appears to be excess. Music, television, movies, sport, games, hobbies: all of these are normal activities. The threat of deviance which the word fan identifies is when these normal activities are taken to excess. Here it is evident why this is a fruitful area of study: the fan forces us to confront our concepts of normality. In many cases, this challenge is seen as a threat. Jensen (1992) has explored the ways in which fan activity is seen as a “psychological symptom of a presumed social dysfunction.” An extreme example of this is Miyazaki Tsutomu, who raped and murdered four young girls, and was found to be deeply involved in otaku (“Japanese fan”) culture (Azuma, 2009). Similarly, Mark David Chapman – the murderer of John Lennon – has been characterised as a fan, as if this forms a sufficient explanation of his actions. In fact his pathological behaviour manifest in many ways, among which the most immediately present at the scene of the murder was his obsession with J.D. Salinger’s The Catcher in The Rye, and the most powerful, his Christianity (Jones, 1992). Literature, being high culture, is often excluded from identification with fan activity, even though the behaviour of its aficionados matches that of fans of most populist material (Tulloch, 2007; Pearson, 2007). However the reference to the highest of all high cultures returns us to the link between the fan and states associated with the religious, which will be considered in the next section.

The religious connection

As noted earlier, there is an inevitable connection between fandom and religion deriving from etymology. In addition to the terms already commented on, much fan activity concerns so-called “cult” media, yet another example of the application of a term from religion. All of this, of course, does not mean that such a connection is literal. It may be purely metaphorical, and even counterproductive in terms of understanding the true nature of fan affect. Yet this is no excuse for
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the “...embarrassment [that] has been clearly on show in recent studies of fandom.” (Hills, 2002)

Cavicchi (1998) tentatively asserts that “...while religion and fandom are arguably different realms of meaning, they are both centred around acts of devotion, which may create similarities of experience.” This seems an unarguable proposition, so we must reflect on whether the only point of commonality is indeed “devotion.” Here we face the difficulty that the nature of religion itself is far from clear.

Durkheim’s (1965) concept of the distinction between the sacred and the profane has been massively influential on writing about myth and religion. Significantly, this distinction evades the problem that many Western definitions of religion face, that a focus on the “divine” appears to exclude religions such as Buddhism that do not necessarily revolve around gods. Durkheim’s analysis is primarily sociological rather than experiential, but it did lead (albeit without acknowledgement), to Eliade (1996) using it to explore the experiential dimension of myth and religion. For Eliade, the profane is the everyday experience of life, while the sacred is the transcendent realm associated with gods and myths, as well as ecstatic religious experience. Eliade argues that the profane world offers no guiding discourse; such can only be obtained from the realm of the sacred.

Superficially it might appear that the social aspect of religion also identified by Durkheim occupies the realm of the profane, standing in sharp contrast to the sacred. However this is not necessarily the case: there is an overlap between the social and the sacred in the form of ritual. Eliade writes about the “eternal return”, in which religious behaviour – especially ritual behaviour – is not only an imitation of, but also a participation in, sacred events. In this respect it matches fan behaviour. “[T]here is something in common between fannishness and religious feeling and that thing is perhaps best thought of as an interest in spirituality, or at least a sense of transcendence.” (Kaveney, 2009) Eliade suggests that the realm of the sacred offers transcendence, providing us with a guiding discourse; in a world in which the truth claims of the supernatural have been widely discounted, it is hardly surprising that the “realm of the sacred” should extend away from myth and the supernatural, to other man-made agglomerations of meaning – including what theorists of postmodernism call grand narratives – and arguably even including fan objects.

Religious behaviour has been a fundamental component of human social life since earliest times. Specific forms may have been proscribed or repressed, but religion itself has almost always been accepted. While religion may permit excess in its “sacred” space, fan activity applies a similar principle to an area which is explicitly man-made, and is therefore subject to stigma. Moreover, this is a stigma that explicitly references religious terminology. We may hypothesize that some of the stigma which attaches to the fan derives from this “abnormal”
application of religious behaviour. To a devotee of religion, treating something other than the divine as a recipient of religious behaviour can be a very serious offence. And although fans are commonly portrayed as over-serious, this is not always the case; even a superficial acquaintance with YouTube will reveal a host of fans making fun of their fan object, and their attitude toward it (see the discussion on Doctor Who, below, for a highly successful example) in a way that is extremely rare among the religious.

The interaction between the sacred and profane is managed by, amongst other devices, ritual. The element of identification in ritual has already been alluded to. For fans, identification is often an important element of the relationship with the object. This can manifest in a number of forms. In extreme cases, identification can involve assuming an identity. Such is the case with, for example, Elvis impersonators (Hills, 2002; Lockyer, 2010) and much of cosplay. I myself knew a fan of the silent actor Louise Brooks who expressed her admiration by sìrlng herself in imitation of Brooks, not simply for special occasions (part of the "sacred space") but in everyday life. Similarly, we are familiar with fans who wear T-Shirts or accessories adorned with a fan object, or guitarists who use the same guitar and amplifier as their heroes.

Identification operates on more subtle levels, however, which can be expressed through linguistic and behavioural habits, especially where there is a ritualistic dimension.

But before mid-century, attending a concert more often than not meant attending a special event that was as much social as musical, an opportunity for people in a community to come together in a ritual space. (Cavicchi, 2007)

Cavicchi is writing about the origins of music fandom in America in the nineteenth century. There is an implication in his work that the undoubted passion for music exhibited by the subjects of his research somehow precludes the existence of the “ritual space” to which he refers in the above quotation. Reading further, however, it is evident that what Cavicchi is describing is characterized not so much as a withdrawal of music from the ritual space, but as its expansion into other spaces such as the commercial one.

Fans and music lovers represent those who have refused to accept the anonymity and limited involvement of audiences necessitated by the large-scale commercialization of musical experience; they both instead seek to creatively imbue their participation in musical life with a lasting personal connection and depth of feeling. (Cavicchi, 2007)

Cavicchi goes on to argue that the stigma directed at fans derives from this desire to go beyond what was deemed normal: namely the passive consumption of music in a commercial form. The fan looks for personal connection with the fan object; in short, the fan attempts to undermine the
alienation of modern consumer culture. Once again, we find the fan’s quest for a transcendent guiding discourse.

It is hard to look at many aspects of contemporary music fandom without seeing social aspects, a community, and aspects of ritual. For example, the music fanzine *Frank’s APA* (O’Dowd), like all amateur press associations, functions as a form of community-in-writing, as it consists of contributions by participants, who are also its readers. The “mailing comments” which participants address to each other resemble the discussions in online forums and newsgroups. Indeed, it is evident from many cases of direct continuity that the two media are functionally the same: the fan activity prefigured the burgeoning world of social networks (Mason, 2012).

Furthermore, the abovementioned aspects are also features of a large proportion of fan behavior. *Frank’s APA* was itself started by fans of role-playing games who were also involved with fanzines in that field. It soon attracted contributors affiliated with science fiction fandom, *Diplomacy* fandom and music fandom, all of whom found the format and practice represented by the magazine a familiar means of fan expression – a familiar form of ritual.

**The pleasure principle**

Despite the foregoing discussion of the rarefied realms of religion and ritual, in some ways, analysing fan affect is one of the easiest things one could imagine. The answer is so obvious, and yet so often obscured by detail. Yet communication with fans themselves, spoken or written, overwhelmingly reveals that fans pursue fan activities because they derive pleasure from so doing. It is important to note that the pleasure is derived from the fan activity. Out of the window go all the analyses which focus exclusively on some sort of worshipful attitude towards the fan object. At a stroke, a viable explanation for the tendency of fans to be hypercritical of the object of their fandom arises: they do so in pursuit of pleasure (for more on the connection between criticism and pleasure, see the quotation from Sandifer, below).

Even if we succeed in persuading a reader that pleasure is an important object of study, we nevertheless often run into a second level of the same form of academic distaste. The pleasures of religion, of high art, of drugs, of sex: we may concede that these are socially significant factors, worthy of research. But what of mere fun? What of trivia, of manga and TV and electronic games which amuse and entertain? Once again, these must be looked down upon in order to maintain our academic seriousness, as if fun were somehow an infectious disease. But it isn’t (a disease, that is: it can be highly infectious, thank goodness). It is possible to study fun while remaining serious. How else are we to understand what fun – an extremely important drive in the lives of so many human beings – actually is, and how it operates? If we start with a presumption of unimportance, then we will not be able to examine the topic objectively.
McKee (2008) addresses the place of fun in cultural studies, and uses an analogy from Doctor Who fandom to describe it: on the one hand is the “gun” approach, which is serious, and on the other is the “frock” approach, which is frivolous. McKee shows how one or other of these attitudes permeate much cultural research. We have already identified Marx as a “gun”, critiquing both religion and drugs. Marx’s notion that both are inauthentic experiences is taken up in more extreme form by Adorno and Horkheimer:

Pleasure always means not to think about anything, to forget suffering even where it is shown. Basically it is helplessness. It is flight ... from the last remaining thought of resistance. (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1972)

Here the “gun” mentality is distilled into its purest form: the medieval flagellant dismissing happiness and pleasure as inherently wrong. Adorno and Horkheimer regard pleasure as a distraction from the important issue of overthrowing the capitalist system and eradicating man’s alienation from his own labour. But a fair question might be: why go to all the trouble of doing so if it is at the expense of pleasure? And come to that, what of the pleasure derived from an honest day’s work?

McKee traces the same line of thinking through other prominent figures such as Fredric Jameson (1991). He also shows how many “frocks” have, while stressing the importance of pleasure in entertainment and the significance of the audience, nevertheless relegated pleasure to the function of a means of resistance to capitalism. This approach is demonstrated by the massive influence of Michel de Certeau on the development of fan studies (see, for example, Jenkins, 1992).

Within fan studies, this “resistance discourse” has led to a problem of analysis.

This goes beyond merely acknowledging that fans are active producers who collaboratively produce transformative works, be they fan fiction, fan videos, or providing subtitling or translation services to foreign texts. Fans are mobilised as active participants in social and political movements because they are united by a common factor: their (consumption of) popular culture. At the same time, they equally “have become part-time collaborators with official producers seeking to incite and retain dedicated fan audiences, and part-time co-opted word-of-mouth marketers for beloved brands” (Hills, 2010: 58), resulting in the “curious co-existence within fan cultures of both anti-commercial ideologies and commodity-completist practices” (Hills, 2002: 28) that has come to characterise contemporary fan cultures. An insistence on seeing these seemingly contradictory tendencies not as two sides of the same (fannish) coin, but as two separate coins altogether, effectively pitches us into the “moral dualism” (Hills, 2002: 8)
of “resistance” discourse, within which fans and fan activities are divided into good/bad practices. (Chin & Morimoto, 2013)

As Chin and Morimoto make plain, the problem here is caused by the imposition of a totalising discourse on a complex phenomenon. There are, of course, “gun” elements to fandom, but the “frocks” should not be ignored. Discounting, or even disparaging, the role of sheer pleasure in fan activity weakens the scholar’s capacity to comprehend the phenomenon in its totality. Again, as Chin and Morimoto point out, the “moral dualism” is a false division: it is perfectly possible for fans to combine resistance and pleasure in their fan activities.

Moreover, pleasure itself is far from singular in character. Duffett (2013) identifies three forms of pleasure derived from fan activity: the pleasure of connection, the pleasure of appropriation, and the pleasure of performance. Connection refers to interaction with others through the object of fandom; appropriation to making use of the object of fandom for one’s own purposes, for example writing fan fiction; performance covers expressive fan activity such as costuming. A similar analysis based on “vectors” of fan activity is suggested by Mason (2013). All of these pleasures can be seen to be intimately related to personal identity.

Identity formation

In a discussion of different types of fans, Roberta Pearson reports the analysis of her MIT professor William Uricchio that the distinctive feature of the fan response to texts is that fans “incorporate the cultural texts as part of their self-identity, often going on to build social networks on the basis of shared fandoms.” (Pearson, 2007) Pearson goes on to note that this very tendency leads to fans being fans in multiple areas, a conclusion which appears to fly in the face of the popular conception of fan as unitary obsessive, but which has nevertheless been widely observed, including by the present author (Mason, 2013). Yet it has another obvious corollary: construction of identity and social networks are not fan-specific activities. These are fundamental human behaviors. And as we know from research on identity across a wide range of disciplines, from the sociological approach of Burke & Stets (2009) to the Queer Theory of Judith Butler (1990) and beyond, identity is constructed in complex ways on multiple levels.

Grossberg (1992) describes how affect has a “power to invest difference.” This is because it is affect which determines the importance we place on differences.

In social identity theory and identity theory, the self is reflexive in that it looks back on itself as an object and categorizes, classifies, or names itself in particular ways that contrasts itself with other social categories or classifications. This is the process of self-categorization. (Burke & Stets, 2000)
Since identity depends on the investment we place in these contrasts or differences, it can be seen that a fan identity is constructed by the importance placed on the difference between what the fan does and says, and what other people – who are not fans – do and say. Identities are not necessarily consciously constructed, but we can see cases where fans express their affect in such a way as to consciously construct an identity; an example would be wearing a T-shirt of a favorite band.

On the other hand, less overtly constructed identities may operate in areas of gender and sexuality. Here, as Butler (1990) and many others have explained, we are often at the mercy of social constructed norms which are presented to us as natural phenomenon. The artificial nature of such essentialism is suggested, however, by the performative nature of fans’ approaches to pleasure and fantasy. In fantasy, writes Constance Penley, “the subject participates in and restages a scenario in which crucial questions about desire, knowledge, and identity can be posed, and in which the subject can hold a number of identificatory positions.” (Penley, 1992) This is an important consideration in her analysis of slash fiction: fan fiction based on erotic couplings of characters in certain media franchises. These forms of fan activity reveal deceptively complex patterns of identification. For example, the earliest slash fictions were fantasies about Kirk and Spock, two characters from Star Trek. And yet the adherents of such fan fiction were predominantly heterosexual women. Slash (which derives from the abbreviation for fiction involving Kirk and Spock: K/S) has spawned many other forms which are equally resistant to simplistic explication. For example, hurt/comfort (h/c) stories are based on one character being injured in some way and tended to by another.

This is why I cannot – and think I should not – attempt a totalizing theory of h/c. Its affect needs to be interpreted through these social/personal histories, parts of which must necessarily escape us. We can theorize its potential and effects; we can describe our experiences of it to each other, look for more or less frequently recurring patterns in its pleasures and problems, and try to understand what that tells us about ourselves and our communities in the context in which we live. But the attempt to say what it is, and why people like it, will only lead us back to the exhausted, self-consuming mystery of an individual human nature detached from politics. (Fathallah, 2011)

Fan-created fiction of this sort is by no means limited to the English-speaking media: the Japanese phenomenon of boys’ love manga closely resembles it, and has itself spread around the world. (Nagaike & Suganuma, 2013). And if we turn to the home of manga, we can find another angle from which to view fan affect.
The Japanese otaku are now well-known around the world. We should be wary of the elementary translation mistake of treating otaku as an exact equivalent of “fan”. At the same time, however, we should be wary of the often ideologically-driven desire to assert Japanese uniqueness. For our purposes it is clear that there is considerable conceptual overlap between the terms “fan” and “otaku” and that will suffice for our purposes. In an interesting contrast with Uricchio, cited above, Azuma (2009) hypothesizes that modern otaku are distinguished by a difference in the way in which they approach the material in which they are interested. In simple terms, the otaku do not approach a narrative in purely linear terms, but in a manner for which Azuma uses the metaphor of the “database”. At the same time, Azuma links these characteristics to changes in use of language, and thereby describes otaku as animalistic. Even allowing for the recognition that this is intended as a metaphorical analysis, it is an unfortunate way of approaching the issue. People are sensitive to being compared to animals. For example, a Japanese student to whom I jokingly referred as a “teacher’s pet” became furious: he was not familiar with the term, and assumed I was calling him an animal. It was an innocent failing on my part, though it necessitated my learning an important lesson. In the case of Azuma, it appears there is an element of deliberate provocation.

I am not in the position to comment on the present state of creating derivative works out of the actual data taken from the original, but I wish to draw the reader’s attention to the fact that such a desire to create derivative works is not an aberration but a desire necessarily born out of the essence of the novel games (and, ultimately, the essence of postmodernity). (Azuma, 2009)

Saying that a desire is born out of the essence of postmodernity makes for a dramatic academic statement of position, but it doesn’t help us to understand that desire on a more human level. Ironically, while writing about how postmodernity structures human culture following the collapse of grand narratives, Azuma seems to be erecting postmodernity itself as a form of explicatory grand narrative. Yet Azuma’s observations on the specifics of the otaku appreciation and manipulation of what he terms “databases” is pertinent. His argument is that while modern human cultural pleasures were formerly structured by narratives, constructed by authors, the narratives are now a constituent element rather than the guiding principle. For the otaku, and by extension the fan, no longer derives meaning from culture by relating it to an overarching grand narrative. Instead, culture is related to itself, being reshuffled and rearranged in order to create new combinations.
Azuma goes on to claim that this behavior is “animalistic”, based on the assertion that while humans have “desires” – which are intersubjective and unsatiated by fulfilment – animals have “needs” which are satiable cravings. He uses this distinction to differentiate otaku behavior from others:

[T]his sort of otaku behavioral principle can be thought of as differing from that of intellectual aficionados (conscious people), whose interest is based on cool judgment, and from that of fetishistically indulgent sexual subjects (unconscious people). But rather, more simply and directly, the otaku behavioral principle can be seen as close to the behavioral principle of drug addicts. (Azuma, 2009)

That this is another in a long line of attempts to stigmatise the fan is clear when it is noticed how Azuma, while identifying fan consumption with postmodern consumerism, glosses over one of the defining characteristics of the latter: that it is perpetually unsatiatable. Indeed, one of the defining characteristics of otaku is that, in contrast to the former narrative model of consumption, they have little or no sense of completion. The database is ever-expanding.

The comparison with “aficionados” who exhibit “cool judgment” is equally spurious, as the work of Tulloch and Pearson demonstrates (Pearson, 2007; Tulloch, Fans of Chekhov: Re-approaching “High Culture”, 2007). The “snobbish” intellectuals noted by Azuma in modernist contrast to postmodern otaku cannot be so easily distinguished in terms of behavior. What differs is the cultural value society accords to the object of fandom, and this is in the process of changing. Azuma goes on to draw an analogy between the behavior of otaku, and the licentious consumerism of the so-called kogal of the 1990s. On the one hand, the latter is largely a media phenomenon. On the other, while the behaviors are, of course, reactions to the same social environment, this does not automatically mean that they are the same.

Azuma’s argument also suffers the indignity of being eroded by hindsight. “A novel game can never be a multi-player game,” he offers, as part of an argument that otaku have no sociality at the level of the simulacra. And yet the rise of multi-player games since 2001 demonstrates that there is a form of sociality being practised here. Azuma’s argument resolves to a notion that traditional “normal” social interaction is necessary in some absolute form, rather than being necessary in a personal, voluntary, sense like that of the “database sociality” which he ascribes to the otaku. And revealing the snobbery directing his argument, stray barbs are directed at “Hollywood films and techno music” as being equivalents to the otaku’s database.

Despite these problems arising out of Azuma’s polemical angle, his insight into the fan’s attachment to a “database” is fruitful, and worthy of development.
The desire to know

At a conference in Cambridge in 2012, I addressed a room of fans on the subject of what fandom meant, and initiated a discussion. The results were revealing in several ways. Firstly, the definition of “fan” and the meaning of “fandom” were hotly debated. Clearly, there is no single accepted definition even among a group of people who shared a specific form of fandom (science fiction in this case). Secondly, the level of the discussion itself, and comments by some participants, who were firm in asserting that I did not need to say anything about the characteristics of academic enquiry as there were a number of PhDs in the audience, provided a dynamic example of the way in which fans themselves operate as scholars. Indeed, the relationship between fans and academia has received attention over the years, often from academics who are themselves fans.

One of the largest fan gatherings in the world is the science fiction WorldCon (World Science Fiction Society, 2013). The programme of this convention is extensive, including discussions and panels featuring famous writers and producers, as well as entertainments and commercial activities. It even includes an academic conference within its programming.3 Azuma’s description of the “database” of the otaku has already highlighted the profound relationship which fans have with knowledge, but here we find ourselves drawing increasing parallels between fans and academics. “In the current landscape that I see in LiveJournal and elsewhere, fans are consummate theorists – they’re always explaining, analyzing, conjecturing about fan culture.” (Cryptoxin, 2006)

TARDIS Eruditorum (Sandifer, 2013) is without question a scholarly text: analysing the whole of Doctor Who in the context of the time in which it was made. And yet it is also a fan artefact: the result of fan activity. Its author describes in an interview the relationship between the fan and the critic:

For instance, a month or so ago I rewatched The Eleventh Hour so I could cover it on the blog. This is an episode of television I must have seen a dozen times now, because for two years it was my go-to starting point when introducing someone to Doctor Who. It’s long since past the point where I just idly recite the dialogue alongside the episode. And this is not a problem, because I love it dearly and think it’s a marvelous piece of television. I mean, really, we can say what we want about the Moffat era, but for me, personally, it made me love Doctor Who like I was eleven again. There is nothing close to ironic detachment going on here – this is just flat out one of my favorite hours of television ever. But the point where its jokes and surprises can land is long since gone for me, and probably never coming back, precisely because I love it so much.

But through criticism I can keep experiencing my love of the episode. I can ask
questions like “why is this bit so good” and “what is this episode trying to do in the first place.” And I can answer them, and study the episodes, and not only sustain my enjoyment but deepen it. I mean, it’s really strange to me that we have this strange idea that understanding how art works somehow means it stops working. It’s not like people imagine biologists like pictures of kittens less because they happen to understand a bit more about their inner workings. But art we have this bizarre idea that if we try to understand why it makes us feel the way we do then we’re going to ruin it somehow. (Greenlee & Sandifer, 2014)

Henry Jenkins, whose Textual Poachers is one of the establishing texts of fan studies, coined the term “aca-fan” to refer to academics who are also fans. His blog (Jenkins, Confessions of an aca-fan), though predominantly academic in orientation, nevertheless self-identifies Jenkins as one. The fan of Louise Brooks to whom I referred above was, coincidentally, also something of an authority on her, studying her work at postgraduate level; she is now a university lecturer.

The ways in which the fan and the academic can be mutually implicated is also explored by McKee (2007) in describing the behavior and feelings of many academics towards the “stars” of cultural theory. There are different processes at work here, however. Just as the academics described by McKee can experience the pleasures associated with appreciating stars (pleasures which may have religious and identity-related dimensions), fans may experience the scholar’s “desire to know”. Such epistophilia (Nichols, 2010) lies behind the appeal of documentaries, and to a certain extent that of news sources.

As already noted, fans are highly self-reflexive, and there is thus a large body of literature on the Internet concerned with fans and fandom which can be categorized as “aca-fan.” Hills warns against the uncritical acceptance of self-analysis by fans, however, and notes how fan knowledgeability has been used as an “excuse” for ethnography. He argues that fan knowledge and analysis is itself colored by fan affect. Of course similar arguments can be made of the various affective distortions which bear on academic discourse.

In any case, the important part that knowledge has to play in a fan’s relationship with the fan object is undisputed. It also connects with the various other manifestations of fan affect discussed so far. The place of knowledge within religion – especially in terms of its relationship with power – has been clear since Eve offered Adam the fruit of the tree of knowledge. To know something is to identify with it, to make it a part of one’s self, one’s identity. And humans, being thinking animals, derive pleasure from exercising their mental faculties.

The question remains, however, how does all this differ from the everyday conduct of human life for the non-fan? There have already been some tentative explorations of the ways in
which fan activity goes beyond the “norm” in terms of exploring the above relationships. One of
the problems is raised by an essentialist position that attempts to understand the topic in terms
of “the fan” and wonders how “the fan” differs from the normal person. I would argue that this
approach is fundamentally misconceived. Every time such differences are analysed in detail, they
break down. Cavicchi’s point, for example, doesn’t really differentiate between types of people,
so much as types of activity. Although there are those who call themselves fans, and those who
don’t, who perhaps present us with clear differences, in fact we may find “non-fans” occasionally
exhibiting behavior which we consider to define fans. A more fruitful approach, therefore, is to
consider what we have described so far as being fan behaviours or vectors (Mason, 2013), which
may be exhibited to a greater or lesser extent by people. Some exhibit them all the time, and
conspicuously adopt them as part of their identity. For others, they are an occasional affectation
(I would place myself in this category). But in all cases they provide a means of examining the
ways in which people react to objects or activities in which they are deeply interested.

The Doctor Who 50th anniversary

“Seemingly paradoxically, being a fan means being disappointed by the object of fandom as
much as it means appreciating it.” (Hills, 2010)

As a specific example of the workings of fan affect, it is instructive to examine the context
of the above quotation, the TV show Doctor Who, which in 2013 celebrated the 50th anniversary
of its first broadcast in November, 1963. As already mentioned, the programme is useful, as
it is unequivocally one with a large subculture of fans attached to it, and moreover one which
has attracted academic attention. Significantly, however, it is not by any means simply a fan
phenomenon or, as it is sometimes termed, a “cult”. At various times in its history it has been
one of the most popular television programmes in the UK; at present, a case could be made for it
being one of the more popular English-language programmes in the world. It therefore gives the
lie to the idea that fan objects are inevitably far from the mainstream, and enables us to examine
the fan response in contrast to the response of that mainstream, and the ways in which “non-fans”
may exhibit signs of fan affect in their behaviour.

First, a little background on the programme is necessary. When it was first broadcast, Doctor
Who was conceived as a programme for children that was nevertheless accessible to the whole
family. It was designed to contain educational elements – most particularly in the fields of science
and history – and yet be adventurous and entertaining. The programme was not the product of a
single unifying vision, and therefore its earliest days set the pattern for the subsequent 50: being
pulled in various directions by those involved in its creation (Mason, 2012). As an example, the
BBC executive who commissioned it, Sydney Newman, specified that although it had science
fiction elements, there should be no “Bug-Eyed Monsters” (Pixley, 2013), nevertheless, at the insistence of the programme’s first producer Verity Lambert, the second story broadcast featured the monstrous Daleks, which have become one of its defining features and an important part of the cultural fabric of the UK.

Thanks to the Daleks, the programme quickly became a popular fixture of Saturday evening television programming. But they do introduce a confusion about the nature of the show. Many believe that Doctor Who is science fiction, because it has such alien monsters, and because its protagonist travels in a ship capable of going anywhere in time and space. And yet a close reading demonstrates that the show is not simply science fiction: it could be more accurately described as genre-hopping. It can mix historical costume drama and horrific science fiction as easily as it blends comedy and political comment. This is one reason for its longevity: it can constantly reinvent itself. Indeed such reinvention is built into the show, as a result of the notion that the Doctor, the protagonist, can escape death by “regenerating” his body. Extra-diegetically, this enables the show to recast the principal actor without alienating a significant proportion of the audience. This enabled Doctor Who to survive the failing health of the first actor to play the Doctor, William Hartnell, as he was replaced by Patrick Troughton. The show’s ratings went up and down, picking up with the third Doctor, Jon Pertwee’s, appearance in colour broadcasts for the first time, and reaching a peak with the fourth Doctor, Tom Baker, who achieved some cult success in the US.

Following Tom Baker, the ratings went into decline. There are numerous explanations for this, including the reluctance of the BBC to maintain the show’s budget. One of the most frequently cited explanations for this decline, however, is that the show was increasingly being made for fans, rather than for the mainstream audience (Hills, 2010). Evidence for this includes the employment by producer John Nathan-Turner of a “fan advisor,” Ian Levine. This provides us with an opportunity to infer what such a difference may be. There is a danger, of course, that the dichotomy may be false; as Hills points out, it may be that it is perfectly possible for a show to simultaneously be a cult show for fans, and a mainstream success (the present state of Doctor Who would suggest this). Nevertheless, bearing this caveat in mind, comparisons can be made. From the 20th anniversary year on, Doctor Who became increasingly entangled in “continuity.” In simple terms, continuity is the reappearance of previously employed elements of the show. It offers pleasure to the fan by referring to established knowledge which the fan possesses.

In a work with as many creators as Doctor Who, however, continuity raises multiple problems. Since the show is continually redefining and reinventing itself, it becomes very difficult to reconcile certain present elements of the show with its past. Fan knowledge exceeds that of the people who are actually writing and producing the show, who are less concerned with
continuity. To choose a simple example: during the period of the Third Doctor, it was established that he was a Time Lord with two hearts. His origins had previously been shrouded in mystery. Yet there were references in programmes of the original Doctor to him having only one heart. This was not such a problem when the show was primarily an “on-air” phenomenon; early episodes were generally not repeated, and so memories would fade. During the 1980s, however, as use of VCRs became more common, such contradictions became more glaring. In this period, Doctor Who sought to please fans by bringing back elements from the past. On the one hand, the expectation of familiarity alienated casual viewers who were not, in fact, familiar with the returning elements. On the other hand, in almost every case the returning element was altered in some way, introducing even more contradictions.

In some cases the alterations are cosmetic. In other cases they can be profound. For example, the final foe faced by the original Doctor was the race of Cybermen, inhabitants of a twin planet of Earth which had departed from the solar system long ago. To survive the bleakness of space, this race had replaced its failing organs with machine parts, becoming in the process a hollowed out parody of humanity. The original Cybermen exhibited this qlippothic quality in their appearance, speech and actions. On each successive reappearance, however, their nature was altered. Their first return saw them repurposed as “replacement Daleks” (it seemed, for a while, that the writer who invented the Daleks would not permit their reuse in Doctor Who), which is to say, evil robotic cyborgs. Over the years, even their alleged cold logic and lack of emotion was replaced by megalomania, expressed in standard villainous phrasing; after the success of Star Wars their voices switched from cold, machine-like sounds to close facsimiles of Darth Vader.

1985’s serial “Attack of the Cybermen” (BBC) is a perfect example of the problem. In order to make any sense of the complex plot, one must be familiar with 1966’s “The Tenth Planet,” (BBC) the first appearance of the Cybermen. And yet not only are the Cybermen of the former significantly different in appearance from the Cybermen of the latter (see figures 1 and 2), there are multiple contradictions in motivation, behaviour and plot.

Figure 1. Cybermen from 1966’s “The Tenth Planet”
In the face of hostility from BBC management, and relatively low (though still respectable) ratings, the programme was cancelled in 1989. It then continued in the form of books and audio plays only, with novelisations of broadcast episodes steadily giving way to original stories, written by fans — and if truth be told, though published commercially by Virgin Books, mostly read by fans.

In 1996 a television movie was co-produced with an American company, as a possible precursor to a new series. The producer, Philip Segal, had moved to the US from Britain in his teens. He was a fan, and this affected the way he approached the project (Segal & Russell, 2000). Here, again, continuity problems raised their heads. On the one hand, Segal claimed to be re-inventing the programme for a new audience (particularly, a new American audience); on the other, it was full of obscure continuity references. Yet this continuity was altered in such a way as to infuriate fans. Although the movie’s ratings were good in the UK, in the US the inept scheduling and obscure continuity meant that the option for a follow-up series was not taken up.

The show continued in its non-televised incarnations until 2005, when it returned as a prestige production. Since then it has continued to prosper, and now stands as one of the BBC’s most reliable sources of foreign earnings, as well as of domestic viewing figures. Interestingly, however, the producers of the show no longer need the services of a fan advisor such as Ian Levine; like Philip Segal they are fans themselves. Yet they have repeatedly commented that they are not making the programme for fans, but for the mainstream audience (Hills, 2010). Viewing figures suggest that they have succeeded.

The fiftieth anniversary year was celebrated in a number of ways. Most significantly, the actual anniversary was marked by “The Day of the Doctor,” a special edition of the programme, shown in cinemas as well as on television, and produced in 3D. This special took advantage of the Doctor being a time traveller to enable him to “meet himself”: in other words, it saw the
return of actors who had previously played the role. This particular form of continuity, the “multi-
Doctor” story, is beloved of fans, and in the run-up to the anniversary there were countless online
comments by fans to the effect that they wanted all of the still-living actors who had played the
Doctor to somehow appear in the special. In non-fan terms, of course, this would be nonsensical.
How could a coherent plot be constructed around eight different versions of the same character?
In practice, the producers of the show succeeded, as they have since 2005, by refusing to meet
the fans’ expectations, yet offering, in passing, brief references.

The anniversary year saw a “mini-episode” of the eighth Doctor (BBC, 2013) – whose sole
television appearance had been the 1996 TV movie, and yet who had featured in numerous books
and audio adventures – continuing to do so even after the return of the programme to television
screens. The special edition, “The Day of the Doctor,” featured only the three most recent
Doctors, and yet at the very end a brief, climactic scene involved not only every previous Doctor,
but the Doctor-to-come, in cameos made possible through use of existing footage, and computer
graphics (The Day of the Doctor, 2013).

The fan desire to see former Doctors was also exploited by one of the former Doctors
himself, Peter Davison (the fifth Doctor), who made a drama based around the efforts of the
fifth, sixth and seventh incumbents’ attempts to appear in the fiftieth anniversary special (The
Five(ish) Doctors Reboot, 2013). By deliberately deriving humour from the fan hope, while
simultaneously partly fulfilling it, Davison’s drama succeeded in appealing not only to fans, but
also to mainstream audiences aware of the image of such fans.

The 50th anniversary special also saw the return of a monster beloved by fans: the Zygons
had appeared in a single story, in the 70s period of the Fourth Doctor. Yet their return was the
occasion for widespread online rejoicing by fans. Similarly, during the 50th anniversary year,
the Ice Warriors made a reappearance after some four decades. It appears that, for fans, the
appearance of familiar elements is a significant factor in fan affect.

The anniversary was marked by many other official releases, including novel series, special
editions of magazines and screenings at the British Film institute with question and answer
sessions. These were matched, however, by fan activity ranging from conventions to YouTube
videos to knitting patterns. The cinema screenings of the special were attended by many people
in costume. But fan activity was not only celebratory. One of the characteristics of the series
since 2010 is the animosity directed at the current showrunner, Steven Moffat, by certain fans.
Probably the most widely known example of this is the STFU Moffat Tumblr (Hallor, SH, & C,
2012). The earliest posts on this Tumblr noted that it would be identifying “problematic things”
about Moffat’s work. But those who run the site are clear that they are fans of Moffat’s work –
not only Doctor Who, but his other successful series Sherlock. The criticism derives from an
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emotional investment in the work, an identification with it, a need to know and understand; and, it has to be said, from the sheer pleasure of self-expression.

Conclusion

Fans respond to their fan object in diverse ways and to diverse degrees. Yet those responses derive from an affective relationship with the fan object, a response of closeness, even of identity. This relationship has something in common with the religious response to the sacred. Differences here reflect differences in the societal valuation of the religious, compared with that of most fan objects. Similarly, devotees of high culture, and academics, share affective dispositions with fans. In the latter two cases, changes over the last few years in the way that high culture and scholarship are understood and valued have made the affinities all the more evident.

Fan Studies have so far often taken a narrow focus on their topic, concentrating on singular fan objects (generally in the media), and approaching them from the point of view of discourses of power, resistance and so on. From now, it may be productive to consider fan response across a wider range of interests, focusing on the spectrum of fan affect.

Notes

1 It is worth noting that the fans who embraced the term in this way were those who were stigmatised by attachment to “low culture” fan objects. As the paper later considers, those who devoted themselves to Shakespeare, Mozart, Chess or some other high culture interest were less stigmatized, and correspondingly less willing to be referred to as fans.

2 This communication extends via email to fans of such forms as Doctor Who, Fighting Fantasy, music and animé in many countries, as well as through personal encounters at a range of conventions and meets, mostly in the United Kingdom.

3 I attended the 2005 Worldcon in Glasgow, which had a conference on the topic of the real and mythic nation of Britain. I will be attending the 2014 Worldcon in London, at which the conference theme is “Diversity in Speculative Fiction” but at which, more importantly, one of the keynote speakers is a leading academic authority on fan studies.
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『ボーディサットヴァ・アヴァダーナ・カルパラター』第32章、33章和訳

引田 弘道
大羽 恵美

ヴィシャーカ物語
—『ボーディサットヴァ・アヴァダーナ・カルパラター』第32章—

解説
この物語に対応するものを他の経典で発見することは出来なかった。妻の不貞を強調したこの物語は、アショーカ王に関連させて説かれているが、かの王にヴィシャーカという王子がいたかどうかは不明である。ターラナークの印度仏教史には、アショーカ王に11人の子供がいて、最も勝れたのがクナーラであったと言われている1。山崎氏はその11人の子供を特定しようと試みたが、そのいずれにもヴィシャーカの名前は挙がってこない。2

今回もサンスクリット原典からの和訳は引田が中心に行い、チベット訳の読みに関しでは大羽が行った。また対応する絵図の解説も大羽が行った。

和訳

女性の本性
女性というものは（vāmā）卑しいことに執着し、いたいには優れた人の反対の行動を取るものだ（sajjana-vāmāḥ）。ちょうど赤く染まった（sarāgā）日暮れ時が（samādhīyā）暗闇を志向して、山から太陽を（raivīṃ）追いやるのが普通であるように（prayēya）。(1) 4

1 寺本雅雅『ターラナーク 印度仏教史』国書刊行会、昭和52年（昭和3年）、79頁。
2 山崎元一『アショーカ王伝説の研究』春秋社、昭和34年。
3 原文は nīrogiyāh であるが意味がいまひとつはっきりしない。ここでは de Jong の読みに従って、nīca-rāginyaḥ とした。翻訳では、dman la chags dang ldan pa（卑しいものに執着する者）とする。
4 第1偈から第32偈までの韻律は Anuṣṭubh。
多くの他界に基づいたデーヴァダッタの行動が話されると、知識の海である世尊は再び語られた。(2)
以前、カリンガの地に敵を粉砕する王がいた。（彼は）光輝あるアショーカと呼ばれ、数えきれないほどの勇猛さで良く知られていた。(3)

４人の王子は高慢さのゆえに王によって追放される
彼には、シャーカ（Śākha）、プラシャーカ（Prāśākha）、アヌシャーカ（Anuśākha）、ヴィシャーカ（Viśākha）という４人の似通った、この世で有名な息子たちがいた。(4)
若きて高慢になった彼らは妻とともも父によって追放された7。
心変わりや侮辱心のある（savikāra-nikāraṇa）（父によっては）、息子への愛情さえ消えてしまうものだ。(5)
彼らは食糧も底をつけ、災難のような耐え難い恐ろしい森へゆっくりと(歩いて)到着し、飢えで痩せ衰えて(次のように)考えた。(6)
「これらの妻たちは困窮した時でも、螺に飾り鎚を結んでおり、我々がやっとのことで手に入れた葉の食事にさえ分け前にあず、かっている。」(7)
このように考えている彼らに妻を殺そうとする決意が生じた。災難で幸せが焼き尽くされた彼らにおぞましい考えが生じた。(8)

ヴィシャーカは妻と一緒に兄弟らと別れる
ところが、彼らのうちの（一人）ヴィシャーカは悪意を恐れて、慈しみの心から妻を伴って、（彼らから）別れて逃げて行った。(9)
彼女はカランカヴァティー（Kalaṅkaṭā）という名前であるが、たいそう当惑し、長い道のりを走ることに疲れ、気を失うと大地に倒れた。(10)
すると彼女は生気がなくなる瞬間に、慈悲の気持ちで心が濡れた夫によって、血管を切って(śiro-vedha-)流れ出す自身の血を飲ませてもらった。(11)
彼女が血を飲むことより生命を取り戻すと、善性の海ともいえる彼は自らの肢体を切っ

5 サンスクリット語のvikramaの蔵訳は、ram gnon（rampar gn）とする。
6 蔵訳では、Loma（シャーカ）、Rab tu lo ma（プラシャーカ）、rjes su lo ma（アヌシャーカ）、
Khyad par gyi lo ma（ヴィシャーカ）とする。
7 蔵訳では、chung mar bca s pa pha mas bkrad（妻ともども、父母によって追放された）となる。
8 意味がよく分からない。
9 蔵訳では、de rams rim gys lam rgyags zad（彼らは次第に食糧が尽きて）とも理解できる。
10 蔵訳では、sKyono Idan ma とする。
11 de Jong はśiro-vyadhana（頭に穴を開けて）の読みを採用すべきとする。蔵訳では、sphyi bo
phug pa las byung（P: phyung）ba（頭頂に穴をあけたところから出てくる））デルゲ版のサンスクリット語のチベット語表記は、si ra bya dha sa mu dbha ti とする。
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て、肉をもって生気の活動を可能にさせた。（12）
彼は二人は水のない恐ろしい森を次第に抜出来ると13、濃い影を作る樹で暗い、山の川沿に到着した。（13）

ヴィジャーラ、溺れた男を救助し、介抱する
彼は二人がそこで休息していると、手や足を切られた男が、ひどく泣きわめきながら、川の速さに流されて（彼らのもとに）やって来た。（14）
苦しい困難に陥った（男）を見るや否や、ヴィジャーラは慈悲の心を抱いて、川に飛び込み、両手で彼を渡らせた。（15）
それから、水・根・果実等によって彼が生気を取り戻すと、彼（ヴィジャーラ）は、実に数日で、彼の切断の傷が癒えて（sanrūđha-chcheda）苦しみがない状態にした。（16）
彼は元気を取り戻したけれども、步行がままならなかったので、どこにも行くことは出来なかった。彼の（ヴィジャーラの）妻によって時間になると用意された食事をとってそこへ居座った。（17）

いっぽう、王子は妻との交わりを持たなくなった。
[格言1]普通（prāyeṇa）、英雄というものは、相手を倒さんとすると、獅子のように（女性との）交わりが少なくなるものだ。（18）

妻、肢体の不自由な男との情事を望む
天界のような薬、ジュース、食物で身体がゆっくりと満たされると14、彼の妻は肢体の不自由な彼に対して、交わりをもちたいという欲望を（surata-sphām）起こした。（19）
自分の欲望で（相手に）触れることに幸せを感じる女性は15、愛情という油に塗られることもなく、美德という糸で結ばれることもなく、尊敬の対象という権威に執心することもない。（20）
豊満な胸をした彼女は夜、音もたてずに彼と楽しむと、恐れることなく（彼との）交わ

12 蔵訳では、dgon pa（荒野）とする。
13 サンスクリット語の krameṇa を「次第に」と訳した。蔵訳は rim gysis とする。同訳の第6傷では、サンスクリット語の śanaiḥ を「ゆっくりと」と訳したが、蔵訳ではこの語も rim gysis とする。
14 蔵訳では、デルゲ版、北京版ともに、dal gysis sman mchog ro dang ni // zas kyi lus ni yongs rdzogs pa / とするが、zas kyi を zas kyes として訳した。
15 蔵訳北京版の、bud med rang 'dod reg pas bde を訳した。デルゲ版は、bud med rang 'dod med pas bde とする。
16 ここには二重の言葉の表現（śleṣa）が用いられている。蔵訳は、rjé sa（P: rjes su）bla mas ma smad pa /（尊い師によって咎められることなく）とあり、サンスクリット語訳と一致しない。de Jong は蔵訳から、gaurāvaṇa na nindanti (?) の可能性を挙げている。デルゲ版のサンスクリット語のチベット語表記では、go re be na tsa sadzdzanti とする。
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りに満喫できなくて夫を邪魔者だと考えた。(21)

浮気性の彼女は彼とともに夫の殺害の計画を企てた。

[格言 2] 罪深い女性というものは悪事に対する手立てに巧みなものだ。(22)

彼女は自らの嘘の言い訳としてとてつもない頭痛がすると言いたながら17、彼女の額に
「罪」(-pāpa-)と描いてあり、(そこに)布を結んだ(paṭṭa-bandhanam)。(23)

彼女の頭痛によって王子は大変苦しんだ。(彼は憐みの心からその対処法として様々な
治癒の手段を(yuktim)思いついた。(24)

妻、夫の殺害を画策する

気落ちし、心配で身体が膠着し、ため息をついている(25)彼に彼女は言った。
(彼女は)寒さで苦しみながらも、蜜蜂がふんふん音をたてている、雪で Pistachia のよ
うであった。(26)

「以前、私が少女のとき、このような頭痛がありましたが、医者たちによって延命草
(pāṣaṇabheda)23の軟膏をもって、(頭痛を)防いでもらいました。(26)

この山のこの渓谷は延命草で一杯です。もし可能でしたら、貴方様は綱で降って(こ
れを)取ってきて下さい。(27)

私は両手であなた様の支えになるものを(ālambana)24握っております。」

---

17 蔵訳では、rang gi mgo bo mtshungs med ni // na bar ston (P: brjod) cing sgra ldan des (彼女は頭が
この上なく痛むと見せかけて騒いだ)とする。

18 インドにこのような風習があるのか不明。日本ではお宮参りに、額に大あるいは小の文字を描
く風習があるが、インドとの関係は全く不明。

19 原文は tasyāḥ sūryājñānār dovena vyanāthā prāthivātmajāḥ だが意味が今一歩はっきりとしない。ここ
では de Jong の読み tasyāḥ sūryājñānār dovena vyanāthaḥ prāthivātmajāḥ に従った。蔵訳では、de yi mgo yi
nad kyis ni (彼女の頭痛によって) P: drag tu gdungs pa'i sa bdag sras // (ひどく苦しんでいる王子は)、
あるいは、D: rtag tu gdungs pa sa bdag sras // (彼女がいつも苦しんでいるので王子は)とも取れる。

20 蔵訳では、mya ngan bsams pa byings (D: bying) de la (苦痛の心配で気落ちした彼)とする。

21 de Jong は stanantaI) (声を発している)と読むべきとする。蔵訳では、de yis 'khun cing (D: bzhin) rab smras ba
(彼女はため息をつきながら言った)

22 蔵訳では、rdo ba ni // zhu ba bskus nas (溶解した石／骨物を塗り付けて)

23 原典は prāghāgo (東側) とあるが、前後の関連性がない。蔵訳では、ni bo 'di yi g-yang sa 'di (こ
の山の渓谷となるこの場所) とあり、蔵訳の方が、次の「綱で降りる」と結びつき、意味がはっ
きりとする。prapāṭa を誤ったか。

24 蔵訳では、bdag gis khyod kyi dpyang (P: spyang) dhang ni / (私があなたを吊るす綱を)と具体的
に記す。
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このように妻によって愛情をこめて（praṇayāt）と言われると、王子は「そうしよう。」と応えた。（28）

さて、彼女の手に握られた綱によって、支えをしてもらう（girinādiṭatām）と、彼はゆっくりと石がごろごろと音をたてている山の川岸に（mahāśvabhre）降り立った。（29）

彼は薬草を採ることに集中していたが、彼女が支えになるものを放り投げてしまったため、女性の心のように揺れ動く（capalā-）水のある大きな淵に落ちた。（30）

王子、谷から落ちて激流に呑み込まれる

善業が余分にあることによって彼は身体が破壊されることはなかった。流れに運ばれながらも、彼は気をしっかりもって、（次のように）長い間考えた。（31）

「女性の心に似て、ころころ変わる（avarta111）、「自分本来の感情を示しながら、彼女によって、確かに女性を制御するための教訓が私に示された。（32）

[格言3] 幻想と女性というものは、広大な考えある人たちによっても理解され難く、夢のような考えに相応しく、欲望と闘志という（rāga-dveṣa-）悪行への（-vyasana-）苦しみに満ちた（-viṣama-）努力を行うことに執着し、確かに愛欲のゆえに、あらゆる人々を惑わすことを行い、幻想と女性たちに慣れ親しんだばかりの人でさえ、実に没落させてしまうものだ。」（33）

王子、プシュカラーヴァティーの王となる

まさにこのように考えながら、激しい川の流れによって、彼は善業のおかげであるかのように、プシュカラーヴァティー（Puṣkarāvatī）という都に到達した。（34）

そのとき、その（都の）王は子供がいないまま亡くなったので、占いの分かる（nimittajñaire）大臣たちによって、彼は立派な相をしているとして（sulakṣaṇaḥ）迎え入れられた。（35）

そこで彼は彼らによって吉祥な水をもって（stī-caritādbhutaḥ）儀軌に従って濯頂を受けたが（abhiṣiktaḥ）、女性の驚きの行為を（-strī-caritādbhutaḥ）知っていたので、結婚を嫌

25 蔵訳では、chung mas de smras rgyal sras kyis // mdza’ las de bzhin no zhes smras（妻がそのようにいうので王子は、愛情のゆえにそのようにします、と言った）とされ、「愛情から」の意味上の主語が王子とも取れる。

26 サンスクリット語のāvartaḥ「ころころ変わる」に藏訳‘khor ma (D: ‘khor mo)を充てる。

27 原文は kāmāt kāmāt だが、意味が取りにくい。ここでは de Jong に従い kāmāt kāmānt と読んだ。

28 韻律は Mandākrāntā。


30 第34 傷から第48 傷までの韻律は Anuśṭubh。

（246）91
悪していた。（36）

カランカヴァティー、困窮して自身を貞女だと偽る
いっぱい、カランカヴァティーは薔薇のいなくなた山で、薬草の効力も弱まり、その時に、生活手段がなくなり困窮してしまった。（37）
彼女は肢体のない（男）を肩に担いで、村や町のみちすがら、「私は夫に尽くしています。」（pativratāsmi）と言って、人々に施物を乞うた。（38）
夫に尽くす女性への（pativrata-）31 尊敬心から、皆が彼に多くの物を与えた。
[格言 4] 偽りの習性を（mithyā-sīla-）と言っても、困ったときには成功を産み出すものだ。（39）
彼女はゆっくりと歩きながら、ブシュカラーヴァティーの都に到着した。「彼女は貞女だ。」（satt）と皆から言われながら、（彼女は）王の門の近くに至った。（40）

宮廷祭官、王に偽の貞女に会うことを勧める
「王は女性の行動を憎んではおられるが、夫に忠誠を尽くす貞女には（pati-vratām）32 礼拝する。」と考えて、宮廷祭官は彼の（王へ）信愛を表して王に言った。（41）
「王様、遠い場所からとある夫に忠誠を尽くす貞女がやってきました。彼女の足跡によって（carāṇa-nyāsa）この大地は浄められますよ。（42）
あの、王様、肩に夫を担っている貞女を（sādhu）ご覧ください。夫に忠誠を尽くす貞女に敬礼することにより、人々の寿命は増大しましょう。」（43）

王、祭官に女性の悪の本性を語る
宮廷祭官によって、このように言われ、彼女に謁見することを請われると、王は彼に次のように答えた。「汝は何も知らない。汝は単純な考えをしたバラモンだ。（44）
『女性は愛おしい』というこれは噂にすぎず、『（女性は）正直だ。』というのは正しい考えを混乱させ、『貞女』というものは天空の花のように不可能なものを（vyomapuspā）得るように等しく、『女性は罪悪だ。』ということに疑いはない。（45）
女性というものは果報なく、脇の下の焼けるようなしこりに似て33、男性との交わりに（jana-samgame）ひたむきであり、根もなければ節もない藤の葛のようである。（46）

31 蔵訳は、bdag po'i brtul zhugs とする。
32 蔵訳は、bdag khrims ldan とする。
33 原典は cāṅgirohiniyaḥ であるが、今一つしっかりしない。de Jong は chinngrohiniyaḥ (?) の可能性を一応指摘するが、これもはっきりしない。蔵訳では、「bras bu med cing bcad la skye（果報なく、切断に生じる？）」とする。
仲違い、裏切りを（bheda-droha-）唯一の習癖とし、本性上、悪習をもつ女性34には頭が下がる。本当に女性には頭が下がる。本当に本当に、女性には頭が下がる。(47)

女性というものは、山の牝鹿のように愚かであり、他人を騙すことにもとて激しく、身体を投げ与えることに執着し、男性の寿命を奪ってしまう。

花の落ちる時には(bheda-droha-)唯一の習癖とし、本性上、悪習をもつ女性Mには頭が下がる。本当に本当に、女性には頭が下がる。(47)

花の落ちる時には [生理の時には]35（人を）恐れさせ、火にも入ってしまう。36。真っすぐであり、ねじ曲がったりしていて、何百回となく考えても（正確に）知られることはない。(49) 37

それにもかかわらず、汝がどうしてもと欲するならば、私はその女性と会おう。」

王、彼女が元の悪妻だと認識し、過去の顛末を大臣たちに告げる

このように言うと、王は宮殿に（harmyam）昇って、彼女を見た。(50) 38

彼の王は彼女が他ならぬ肢体を切られた（男）に懸想した罪深き（元の妻）だと認識して、その出来事を大臣たちに伝えた。(51)

罪深い彼女もまた王を認めると、すぐさま下を向いた。耳を覆った（pihaśravaṇa）人たちによって追い払われると、彼女はすぐに出立した。(52)

現世との接合

ヴィシャーカという名前の彼の王子こそ、私であり、彼の妻はデーヴァダッタである。

勝者によって語られたこのような出来事を聞くと、比丘たちの群れは彼女の行為を非難した。(53) 39

34 蔵訳では、rang bzhin nyid kyis tshul khrims 'chal（本性上、道徳律を乱す）とする。
35 サンスクリット語のpuspa、および蔵訳のme togには、「花」の意味と同時に「生理」の意味もある。
36 原文はpuspāyāte pibanti ca pāvakam（花咲き、火を飲む）であるが意味が不明瞭である。もしかすればpuspāyāte pibanti ca pāpakam（悪を花開かせて、飲み込む）の可能性もある。de Jongはpuspāyāte viśanti ca pāvakamと読むべきだとする。ここでは一応彼の読みに従った。「火に入るところは」『ラーマーヤナ』でシーター妃が自身の潔白を証明するために火に入ったことで有名である。蔵訳では、me:D:ma yi nang du ang mam par 'jug（火の中にすら入るのである）。北京版ではmeではなく、maとも取れるが、ここでは意味上、meと訂正して訳した。
37 韻律はHarinālī。
38 第50偈から第52偈までの韻律はAnuṣṭubh。
39 韻律はUpañjāti。
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ナンダとウパナンダ龍王の物語
—『ボーティサットヴァ・アヴァダーナ・カルパラター』第33章—

はじめに

目連がナンダとウパナンダ龍王を調伏したことは、『ディヴィヤ・アヴァダーナ』にも、次のように認められる。

ウパグプタ長老は目連尊者の(sthavira-mahāmaudgalyānasya) 塔を示して言う。「大王よ、これは目連尊者の塔です。この（塔）を供養しなさい。」と。〔アショーカ〕王曰く、「彼の美徳はどのようなものでしたか。」と。長老曰く、「彼は実に神通力ある者の中で最上であると世尊によってお示しになされた。というのも右足の親指によって神々の主、シャクラ（インドパ神）のヴァイジャヤンタ（Vaijayanta）宮殿が揺れ動かされたし、ナンダとウパナンダという龍王が調伏されたからである。」と。

シャクラの住居が彼の足の親指によって揺れ動かされたような、その最上のバラモンであるコーリタ（Kolita＝目連）を一生懸命供養すべきである。（61）

これら恐ろしい二匹の龍王はとても調伏しがたいが、彼によって調伏された。清浄な心をもち、功徳の海ともいえる彼が（渡った）彼岸に（他の）誰がこの世で渡れるか。（62）

同様の記述が『阿育王経』巻2（大正50、138b）にもある。即ち、

能降伏難陀優波難陀龍王。…
目捷連神力 仏説為第一 能以足指動 帝釈最勝殿
降伏二龍王 難陀波難陀 神力功德海 無有能称量

『雑阿合経』巻23（大正2、168a）にも、

降伏難陀波難陀龍王。…
以足指動地 至於帝釈宮 神足無与等 誰能盡宣説
二龍王凶暴 見者莫不怖 彼於神足力 降伏息難苦

さらに『大智度論』巻32（大正25、300a-b）でも、難陀、婆難陀という兄弟の龍王が舍婆提城を破壊しようとしたが、目連尊者によって妨げられたとある。また『龍王兄弟経』（大正15、131）には、難頭、和難という二匹の龍が須弥山を7重に撤いて気を吐いて霧を出していたが、目連は出向いてそれを止めようとした、とある。

また『根本説一切有部毘奈耶薬事』巻4（大正24、17a-b）では、世尊によって調伏された難陀龍王と優波難陀龍王は妙高山から降りて世尊を供養し、仏法僧に帰依したとある。

40 Divya, pp. 252–53. 平岡[2007：123]を参照。
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さらに、パリー語の註釈文献である『清浄道論 (Visuddhimagga)』にもナルドーパナンド (ナルダウパナンダ) 龍王調伏の物語が挿入されている。ナルダとウパナンダ龍王は八龍王として『法華経』序品 (大正 9、2a) に登場する。即ち、難陀龍王、跋難陀龍王、娑伽羅龍王、和修吉龍王、徳叉迦龍王、阿那婆達多龍王、摩那斯龍王、優鉢羅龍王である。
なおナーガ (龍、蛇) 信仰に関する文献研究は水野 [2014: 32, fn. 7] に紹介されている。

和訳

功徳と寂静の力ある人は誰であれ、清らかな心ある者たちの中でも不死の本性ある人である。
というのも彼の威力によってあっという間に、残忍な人たちでさえ怒りの毒から解放されるからである。(1)

スメール山に住む比丘たちの歎き

以前、如来は祇園精舎の遊園に住んでおり、彼の命令により、比丘たちは山や林を遊行していた。(2)
スメール山の麓にいて、瞑想に集中していた比丘たちが、やつれ、青白く光沢のない顔色をしてやって来た。(3)
さて、彼らは世尊の蓮華のような足に敬礼をして、(ここにいる) 比丘たちによって尋ねられると、身体が痩せ細った原因を語った。(4)
「スメール山を三重に巻き上げて、ナルダとウパナンダカ」という二匹の龍がガルーダ鳥に見られることなく (adrṣṭau) 住んでいました。(5)
それら二匹はいつも散らされた火の出る毒息を三度吐いて、触れるだけで岩でさ

なお、このパリー語の『清浄道論』は14世紀に蔵訳され、西蔵大蔵経仏説部に単経として所収されている。「Klu’i rgyal po dga’ bo nyer dga’ ‘dul ba’i mdo」北京版、第21巻、304頁fol.3.7-305頁fol.3.7、および、台北版、第7巻、fol.557.1.2-fol.562.1.1。
42 韻律は Upajāti。
43 ここから第19偈までに韻律は Anuṣṭubbh。
44 蔵訳では D: nga’ bo (ナルダ) と nye nga’ (D: nyer nga’) (ウパナンダ) とする。
45 de Jong は adhrṣyau (攻撃されがたく) の読みを指摘する。蔵訳は、mkha’ lding gis kyang gzhom dka’ ba’i klu (ガルーダでさえも降伏するのが困難である龍) となる。デルゲ版にあるサンスクリット語のチベット文字表記では、adhṛṣyau となっている。
46 原典は trividhochhvāsām (三種の息を) であるが、意味が今一つとりにくい。ここでの訳は de Jong の読みに従った。蔵訳では、de dag rtag tu dug gi dbugz me yis rgyas pa lan gsum spro (彼らは
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え実にすぐさま灰にしてしまいます。（6）
私たちは瞑想に集中していますが、それらの毒息によって焼かれてしまいます。顔の光沢があせてしまい、痩せ細ってしまいました。」（7）

目連による龍の調伏
このように彼らによって言われたとき、面前で比丘のサンガによって請われた師は、二匹の龍の調伏に適した目連に命令した。（8）
頂きによって虚空が拡がっているスメール山に到着すると、彼はヨーガ（の力）によって自身の姿を隠して、眠っている二匹の龍王を見た。（9）
彼によってゆっくりと目覚めさせられたが（bodhyamānau）、それら二匹は目覚めなかったので、その時、彼は大龍の姿をとって、（二匹の龍を）縛り上げた。（10）
彼によって苦しめられて、目覚め二匹（の龍）は、恐ろしい形相をした彼を見るや、恐怖で懐いて、人間の姿をとると、逃げ出した。（11）

目連、二匹の龍に世尊に会うように促す
目連は龍の姿を捨てて、そして自身の姿をとると、互いに逃げまどっているそれらの二匹に言った。（12）
「二匹の龍よ、急いでどこに行くのか。このような恐怖を捨てなさい。汝ら二匹を退散させた龍はそこに実在しない。（13）
その（龍への）恐怖くらいで、汝らの平静さがまったくなくなるならば、なぜ帰依するのに相応しい仏陀に頂礼しないのか。」（14）
このように彼によって言われたことを聞くと、彼ら二匹は彼に恭しく言った。
「聖者よ、世尊の顕現によって（bhagavat-darśanena）私たち二匹に恩寵を垂れて下さい。」（15）
このようにしゃべっている二匹の龍王を世尊の近くに連れて行き、その出来事を伝えると、彼は頂礼して、近座した。（16）

世尊による二匹の龍の教化
さて世尊は庇護を求めた二匹の大龍に語った。

いつも火によって拡散する毒の息を三度放出する）となる。デルゲ版にあるサンスクリット語のチベット文字表記では、tri rbi ṣocchvā saṃ となっている。『根本説一切有部律』（大正23、87a）では、「毎日三時吐毒気」とあり、三時となる。チベット語も同様。

原典は yodhyamānau（攻撃される）だが意味がとりにくい。ここでは de Jong の読みに従った。
西蔵大蔵経北京版とデルゲ版では、dal bus bslang pa（ゆっくりと目覚めさせる）となる。デルゲ版にあるサンスクリット語のチベット文字表記では、bo dhya ma nau šanais となっている。
『ボーディサットヴァ・アヴァダーナ・カルパラター』第32章、33章和訳（引田・大羽）

（二匹は）宝石の輝きで大地が輝くほど（深々と）お辞儀をした。（17）
「戒律を（śikṣāpadāni）身に着けて一切の生類に安寧を（-abhaya-）与えている。
帰依することを信条とすることより（sarāṣa-prāpti-samayād）と、今や汝ら二匹は懸望なきものとなろう。」（18）
こう言って世尊によってご覧になられただけで（ālokana-mātreṇa）、完全に罪や憎しみが除去されて、彼ら二匹は彼に挨拶すると立ち去った。（19）

偉大な人の顕現の重要さ
偉大な人たちが顕現されるだけで（samdarśanenaiva）、光の名のもとに、憎しみの毒の熱で熱せられた残忍な者さえ、身体に付着している寂静の甘露によって、涼やかな状態になる。（20）

龍王の過去世の物語
（世尊の）威力に驚いて、彼ら（龍王）の過去世の出来事（jñeya）を比丘たちに問われると、勝者であり、一切を見渡す世尊は彼らに答えた。（21）
以前、ヴァーラーナシーに（Vārāṇasī）クリキという（Kṛkī）名前の光輝ある王がいた。彼はカーシャパという（Kāśyapa-）名前の世尊から教えを（dharmaśāsanam）受けた。（22）
ナングとウバナングという二人の大臣に王国を委ねて、彼は悟りに心を専念して、真実を見ることに満足した。（23）
彼ら二人の大臣は彼の王国を善きこと・悪きことの（mudrati）にしてしまったが、カーシャパのためにはあらゆる資具を備えた精舎を作った。（24）
時が経って、これら二人はナングとウバナングカという二匹の龍王として生まれた。精舎を布施した功德によって、彼らにはメール山という住居が生じた。（25）
以上、勝者によって語られた偉大な龍の行動と、他の身体に果報が熟すほどに蓄積され

48 de Jong は sarāṣa-prāpti-sahāyād（帰依を得ることを連れとすることより）と読むべきとする。蔵訳では、skyabs kyi grogs ni thob pa las（帰依の連れを得ることより）となる。デルゲ版にあるサンスクリット語のチベット文字表記では、śa raṣa prāṭi sa mā（mva?）pā da となっている。
49 韻律は Upajātī。
50 蔵訳では vyṛṭāntam を byung ba'i mtha' とする。
51 ここから第25偈までに韻律は Anuṣṭubh。
52 Divy(pp.22-23) に、ベナレスの王で、カーシャバ仏のために4宝の塔を建立したとある。
53 原典は satyadarśana-であるが、de Jong は satyadarśaneと読むべきとする。ただし最後の韻律は短母音を要求しているため、原典の読むの方がすっきりする。北京版とデルゲ版では、bden pa mthong la dga' bar gyur（真実を見ることを好む）となる。デルゲ版にあるサンスクリット語のチベット文字表記では、sa tya da rsha ne ni rbr taḥ となっている。
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図版解説

1. 『ボーディサットヴァ・アヴァダーナ・カルパラター』の絵画セットについて

チベットではクシェーメーンドラの『ボーディサットヴァ・アヴァダーナ・カルパラター』（藏語:「Byang chub sems dpal brjod pa’i dpag bsam gyi ’khri shing」、以下『BAK』）は13世紀にサンスクリット語からチベット語に翻訳され、14世紀に編纂されたブトンの大蔵経目録に初めて所収された。57このテキストに基づく絵画の作例は非常に多く、寺院の壁画やタンカ（チベットで普及した軸装の仏画）の画題となっている58。チベットで絵画において『BAK』が普及した理由の一つとして、『BAK』の全ての

54 サンスクリット語の paricita を「蓄積された」と訳したが、蔵訳は paricita に相当する語として yongs ’dris としており、「身についている、よく知られた、慣れた」の意味に解釈できる。

55 原典は muni-parinivaha であるが、意味が取りにくい。ここでは de Jong の読みに従って、munivara-nivaha として読むと解釈した。蔵訳は、thub mchog tshogs kyi thos gyur te（優れた聖者たちによっ
て理解されたのであり）となる。デルゲ版にあるサンスクリット語のチベット文字表記では、mu
ni pa ri ni va he となっている。

56 韻律は Aryāgni。

57 西岡祖秀「ブトン仏教史」目録部索引 II」『東京大学文学部文化交流研究施設研究紀要』第5号、1981年、63頁。[881]

58 寺院の壁画の例は後述するコンカルチューデの他に、ラサのツグラカン（大昭寺）の内回廊
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物語を表した絵画のセットがあり、それが現代まで複製され続けたことが挙げられる。現在見ることができる寺院壁画やタンカの作例のほとんどは次の二種類の原画に基づく『BAK』の絵画セットである。すなわち、一つは、ナルタンで開版された版木からなる木版画のセットで、もう一つはチベット仏教カルマカギュー派の僧シトゥ・パンチェン・チューキ・チューニー（Si tu paṅ chen kyi 'byung gnas, 1699/1700–1774）によるタンカのセットである。ナルタンの木版画とシトゥ・パンチェンのタンカはいずれも、後世にこれらの原画をもとに、変更を加えることなく複製され、結果的に多くの作例を残すことになった。

ナルタンの木版画からなるセットは18世紀前半に31枚からなる原画が作成された。このセットでは、中央となるタンカに仏の座像を表し、その左右に各15幅のタンカを配置するように作られており、左右のタンカに全108話の物語を表す。左右のタンカのそれぞれの中央にも座像の仏を表し、その周囲に物語の情景を描きこむが、山や雲や建物などを配置することでそれぞれの情景を詳細に分割している。画中には大小の二つの椀を二つ重ねた図形（以下、碑とする）があり、その中に章番号と物語の題を書き、さらに画中余白に銘文が書きこまれる作例もある。

もう一方の『BAK』に基づく絵画セットはシトゥ・パンチェン自らがスケッチ等を行いながら指揮して制作されたセットである。全23幅からなるタンカのセットで、ナルタンの木版画と同様に中央に配置されるタンカの左右に、物語の情景が書かれるタンカや、サキ央寺の集会堂の前庭壁などにもみられる。なお、コンカルチューデの集会堂に隣接する祠堂に旧壁画が現存する箇所があり、チベット人絵師のケンツェの手による『BAK』と紹介されることもある。20世紀初頭のチベット巡礼の記録では、コンカルチューデの集会堂にケンツェの『BAK』が描かれているとの記述がある。以下を参照。現在は壁画の一部しか見ることができないため、同定は困難である。Kaṅ thog Si Tu (III) Chos Kyi rgya mtsho, Kaṅ thog Si Tü'i dbus gtsang gnas yig. bSod nams tshen brtan (ed.) (ラサ：西藏叢文古籍出版社, 1999), 113. また同書には、ディクンにも『BAK』の優れた壁画があると報告する。前掲書, 50-51頁。他にもタシルンポゴンパの集会堂壁画に『BAK』が描かれることが知られている。

不動産の木版画の全てのタンカは以下に『BAK』の抄訳とともに紹介されている。


この他に『BAK』の訳を紹介する書籍として以下があり、『BAK』のタンカの研究においてしばしば参照されている。しかしこれも全訳ではなく、全訳と比較すると増広や省略および変更した箇所が随所に見られる。


チベット人は慣用的に rdo ring（石碑）と呼ぶ。
トルを配置するように作られている。ナルタンの作例と比較すると、全体的に緑と青を基調とした淡い色調で描かれており、山や建物などで緩く区切られた箇所にそれぞれの情景を描いている。シトゥ・パンチェンのセットも複製が多く、チベット内外の様々な寺院やコレクションに所蔵されている。

2．ナルタンの絵画セットにおける同定

2.1 「ヴィシャーカ物語」の同定と阻髄について

本稿では、第32章（蔵訳33章）「ヴィシャーカ物語」と第33章（蔵訳34章）「ナンダとウパナルンタの物語」を翻訳したので、この二つの物語が絵画でどのように表されるかを検証するのであるが、まず先行研究における物語同定の錯誤について、問題となる「ヴィシャーカ物語」を同定することによって指摘したい。

ナルタンの絵画セットに描かれる物語を『BAK』の抄訳を紹介しながら同定したのはTucciである。Tucciはナルタンのセットのうち、「右10」（中央のタンカの右側の10枚目に配置されるタンカ）にあたる絵画を（蔵訳）第29話の「ダナーバー物語」（サンスクリットテキスト第28話）から（蔵訳）第33話の「ヴィシャーカ物語」（サンスクリットテキスト第32話）であると同定している。しかし、今回行った翻訳とともに検証したところ、「右10」に相当する絵画に「ヴィシャーカ物語」は描かれておらず、次に配置されることになる「右11」のタンカの左下に描かれていることが分かった。Tucci以降の研究も「右10」のタンカに「ヴィシャーカ物語」が描かれるとするので、おそらくTucciの記述を参照したために誤ったのだと考えられる。

「右11」のタンカを詳細に検証してみたい（図1）。図2は図1の部分図であるが、

61 シトゥ・パンチェンの『BAK』を含んだ芸術活動は以下に詳しい。


ほかにも、シトゥ・パンチェンのタンカセットの一部を所蔵する米国のルービンコレクション（Collection of Shelly and Donald Rubin）や韓国のハンビッツコレクションのカタログにシトゥ・パンチェンのタンカセットについての先行研究がある。


田中公明編、『ハンビッツ文化財団藏 チベット仏教絵画集成』第一巻から第六巻、臨川書店、1998年～。

62 Tucci 前掲書, 437–534.

63 Tucci 前掲書, 472–476.

64 Rani, 40, および田中前掲書、第5巻 80–81頁。

65 紙面の制限があるので本稿ではTucciの図版のみを図として掲載したが、Rani前掲書を含めた複数の作例を検討の対象とした。
左隅には碑があり、そこには「第33章ヴィシャーカのアヴァダーナ」と書きこまれる。その上にはアショーカ王が王妃を伴って王宮の中に坐し、その前に集まって坐す息子と妻を追放するシーンが描かれ、その上に追放された兄弟がさまようシーンが表される。さらにその上に（図3：図1の左中央部分）、兄弟で謀をするシーン、その左上にヴィシャーカが手足を切りられた男を水の中から救うシーン、その右に妻がヴィシャーカを崖のようなところから落とすシーンが描かれる。その上の王宮にはヴィシャーカが大臣と向かいあって坐し、その外には妻が背中に手足を切られた男を背負うところが表される。そしてその右に中央の仏に接する部分に、仏が僧たちにアヴァダーナを説くシーンが描かれる。

「右11」のタンカに「ヴィシャーカ物語」が描かれることを指摘したが、Tucciの「ヴィシャーカ物語」の項では、抄訳の後に絵画の記述あり、その記述と比較すると、Tucciの記述自体は誤っていることがわかる。つまり、おそらく

66 “Yal 'dab sum cu rtsa gsum pa khyad par lo ma'i rtogs brjod”
67 絵図の記述部分は、Tucci前掲書, 476. ただし、この中の“商人がヴィシャーカを認識するシーン”とする記述は誤りである。このシーンは、大臣がヴィシャーカを王の相を持つ人物であると見極
絵画の記述を正しく行ったのもの、それが表されるタンカを誤ったのだと考えられる。ナルタンのタンカセット「右11」は正しくは、（蔵訳）第33話の「ヴィシャーカ物語」（サンスクリットテキスト第32話）から、（蔵訳）第36話の「ゴーシラ物語」（サンスクリットテキスト第35話）までの四話が描かれることがある。「右10」のタンカに前後して配置されるタンカにも物語と絵画同定の齟齬があるが、この点については稿を改めた。

2.2 「ナンダ・ウパナンドの物語」の同定と壁画の例

「ヴィシャーカ物語」が描かれる区画の上、つまりタンカ左側の上部は「ナンダ・ウパナンドの物語」が描かれる（図4：図1の左上部分）。中央の仏の左側上に碑があり、「第34章ナンダ・ウパナンドのアヴァダーナ」と書きこまれる69。その碑の左には仏の前にスメール山で修行する僧が集まるシーン、その右上に目連の前から二人の人間の姿を取ったナンダとウパナンドが逃げようとするシーン、その上でタンカの左隅には海の中にあるスメール山に彼の体を巻き付けるナンダとウパナンド、さらに蛇の姿を取る目連が描かれる。その右でタンカ上部中央にはナンダとウパナンドがクルキン王の大臣であった前生のシーンが描かれる。

寺院壁画に描かれた例を挙げれば、チベット自治区ロカ地区のコンカルにあるコンカルチューデ（Gong dkar chos sde）の集会堂にはナルタンの木版画を模として描かれた壁画がある。「ヴィシャーカ物語」と「ナンダ・ウパナンドの物語」に該当する壁画は図

68 「右10」のタンカには、正しくは蔵訳第29話から第32話までが描かれる。
69 “Yal 'dab sum cu rtsa bzhis pa dga’ bo nyer dga’i rtogs brjod”
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5である。タンカの例と比較すると完全に同一ではなく、隣の説話図に接する箇所には簡略化されたり省かれたりするシーンがあり、銘文も示されていない。しかし、細かな点を除けば、全体の構成や物語のシーンの選択はナルタンの木版画に一致しており、コンカルの壁画がナルタンの木版画を模して制作されたことが明らかに見て取れる。

3. シトゥ・パンチェンのタンカセットにおける同定

3.1 「ヴィシャーカ物語」の同定

シトゥ・パンチェンのタンカのセットのうち、「左4」の書き込みがあるタンカの右下隅に描かれるのが「ヴィシャーカ物語」である（図6）。物語の順番通りに見ていくと（図7：図6の右下部分）、図7上部に樹木を背に三つの男性（ヴィシャーカの兄弟）が座って話している様子が描かれ、その右上に妻を連れて立って立ち去るヴィシャーカ（このタンカでは白い衣服を着ている）が表される71。逃げ込んだ樹木の右は倒れた妻にヴィシャーカ自らの血肉を与えるシーンである。次にその右下の川の流れの中に入って手足を切られた男を救い出すヴィシャーカ、左下に目を転じると、妻とヴィシャーカが手足を切られた男を介抱するシーン、その下には妻が鎧を着てヴィシャーカを下方に降ろし、ヴィシャーカが水の中へ落とされるシーンが描かれる。次に図7左下の樹木の右側に大臣とヴィシャーカが対面するシーンがあり、その右のタンカ右下隅には宮殿があり、バルコニーにヴィシャーカと大臣、その下の前庭に手足を切られた男を背負う妻が

70 書き込みについては、田中前掲書、第三巻no.22を参照。
71 このタンカの場合、樹木の下に金色か黄色で「第33章ヴィシャーカアヴァダーナ」と書かれる。
描かれる。このように、タンカ「左4」の右下の四分の一ほどの区画に「ヴィシャーカ物語」が文献に忠実に描かれているのが確認できる。

3.2 「ナンダ・ウパナナダ龍の物語」の同定と壁画の作例

「ナンダ・ウパナナダ龍の物語」は第34章から第38章までが描かれるタンカに表される（図8）。タンカの上部中央にスメール山があり、その中腹に僧侶が瞑想しているのが描かれる（図9：図8の上部分）。スメール山には一匹の龍が巻き付いており、麓には二匹の龍のナンダとウパナナダが描かれる。その左には目連と、ナンダとウパナナダが人間の姿を取って逃げるシーンが描かれる。次に右に目を転ずると、緑の三角形の山があり、仏が坐し、仏の右側に目連と、下半身が蛇の姿で合掌するナンダとウパナナダと三人の僧を表す。

4. おわりに

以上、第32章（蔵訳33章）「ヴィシャーカ物語」と第33章（蔵訳34章）「ナンダとウパナナダ龍の物語」の翻訳と絵画作例における物語の同定を行った。Tucci の研究を参照した研究などでは、ナルタンの木版画の系統にあるタンカに描かれる「ヴィシャーカ物語」が正確に同定されていない。本稿では物語の全訳を示すとともに絵画の同定を行ったので、同定の誤りを正すことができた。ナルタンの木版画とシトゥ・パンチェンのタンカは画の構成や個々のモチーフの描き方や様式は異なるが、いずれも文献に忠実に表されているのが明らかとなった。
『ボーディサットヴァ・アヴァダーナ・カルパラター』第32章、33章和訳（引田・大羽）

図版出典
図1-4 Tucci 前掲書、Plates, p.111.
図5 笔者（大羽）の現地調査による撮影
図6, 7 田中前掲書 第3巻 plate 22.
図8, 9 Marylin M. Rhie and Robert A. F. Thurman 前掲書、148頁。
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